AUG 8 - 1951

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 96—PART 17

AUGUST 4, 1950, TO SEPTEMBER 22, 1950

(PAGES A5633 TO A6878)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Secretary Acheson, Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of State issued a book entitled "Strengthening the Forces of Freedom," the same consisting of selected speeches and statements of Secretary of State Acheson. I am in receipt of a letter, well phrased and to the point, from Mr. Hoyt S. Haddock, executive secretary, CIO Maritime Committee, wherein he makes critical reference to a part of a speech contained in this volume. The Department of State has for a good many years shown an utter indifference to the welfare of the American merchant marine. I heartily approve of the criticism of the secretary's remarks contained in Mr. Haddock's letter, which follows:

CIO MARITIME COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1950.

Hon. EDWARD J. HART,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HART: We have read with great interest the State Department's Strengthening the Forces of Freedom. This book is a compilation of selected speeches and statements of Secretary of State Acheson. One chapter is titled "The United States as an Importer in World Economy." This was an address before the convention of the National Foreign Trade Council, New York, N. Y., on November 2, 1949.

The part of the speech that should be criticized is found on page 58 of Strengthening the Forces of Freedom. The Secretary said:

"We have laws and regulations which compel us in many cases to tell the citizens of friendly nations when they offer to carry our goods far across the seas that we must not employ them because we are obligated to use our own vessels regardless of the quality of service and rate of charge which they may offer."

We regret that the Secretary of State has taken upon himself to compare the quality of American service with that rendered by foreign vessels. I am sure that many of us would appreciate having pointed out any foreign service that is superior to our American service.

We also regret that the Secretary has mentioned shipping rates charged. He must be cognizant of the facts that foreign vessels employ seamen at deplorably low wages. They work them long hours and poorly feed and bunk them. The extremely low living standards of foreign countries also result in lower ship construction costs. Therefore, the rates charged in certain trade would be lower on foreign vessels.

Congress has considered all of the above factors when they enacted laws to protect the American merchant marine as well as other United States industries. We are sure that Congress has not passed these laws in the light of having the State Department or any Government agency apologize for them.

This negative approach is most unhealthy to the shipbuilding and merchant marine industries at a time when they are struggling in a losing fight for existence.

Sincerely yours,

HOYT S. HADDOCK,
Executive Secretary.

Hon. Francis J. Sinnott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 30, and which refers to the election as Democratic leader of Brooklyn, Kings County, of the Honorable Francis J. Sinnott. It is encouraging that a newspaper of the high standards of the Brooklyn Eagle should in such manner editorially note the selection of one of our citizens as political leader of the largest voting unit in the State of New York.

With what the editorial says with reference to the choice of Mr. Sinnott, I am in complete agreement. That agreement is based upon the privilege of having served for many years with and under Mr. Sinnott in his many worth-while community activities. We who know him know of his high qualities of leadership and know that he will well and creditably discharge the duties as leader of Brooklyn's great Democratic Party. In addition, Mr. Sinnott received countless numbers of telegrams of congratulations, including those from President Truman, Senator LEHMAN, and Democratic State Chairman Paul Fitzpatrick, as well as many other citizens of all political beliefs. The editorial is as follows:

SINNOTT IS A FINE CHOICE AS DEMOCRATS SUSPEND FEUD

The change in the Democratic Party leadership in Brooklyn is one that can be accepted by the people of this community without any fear that settlement of a political feud has been to their disadvantage. It was the decision of leaders that in the interests of party harmony it was advisable for Borough President John Cashmore to relinquish the helm. The issue was forced by Mayor O'Dwyer and some of the leaders.

We watched the course of the fight with considerable concern because it would be more than a mere party row if there was any suggestion that the best interests of Brooklyn might be hurt as it developed. As it was Mr. Cashmore was punished for his tenacity by being bypassed on patronage rightfully his and some appointments were made which did not set well with the borough.

The settlement has produced a new leader, county clerk Francis J. Sinnott, a man of integrity and responsibility and a devoted servant of Brooklyn and all its people. The choice was unanimous. It was not dictated by pressure from Manhattan nor by the anti-Cashmore forces in the borough.

Mr. Sinnott was the borough president's choice and he is assured of fine support since a majority of the district leaders were behind Mr. Cashmore. We know of no man we'd rather see as the successor than Mr. Sinnott. We have complete confidence in him.

It is regrettable that Mr. Cashmore who always does a fine job for Brooklyn remained silent for so long a time in the face of city hall's puzzling antagonism. His final statement when he handed over the crown left unanswered the question—what was the basis of the mayor's displeasure? Why did he want him removed when it was he who made his leadership possible in 1946? Mr. O'Dwyer never raised the question of the inadvisability of holding dual roles until just recently. We had hoped Mr. Cashmore would speak plainly and perhaps put to rest the suggestion that the rackets investigation was a factor in the fight.

It must be restated that we have always been against the idea of Brooklyn's borough president holding two jobs and yet we felt that Mr. Cashmore's departure from the party leadership must be delayed until a fine replacement appeared on the scene. He is here in the person of Mr. Sinnott and we offer him our very best wishes. The same goes for Mr. Cashmore. He acquitted himself with honor in both roles and we believe he will be an even better chief executive now that he has been relieved of the burdens of the county leadership.

A political boss should not be the borough president.

Blame Put on Johnson for Debacle in Korea Obscures Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by David Lawrence appearing in the Washington Evening Star August 3, 1950:

BLAME PUT ON JOHNSON FOR DEBACLE IN KOREA OBSCURES REALITIES—CONGRESS LEADERS HELD PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR UNPREPAREDNESS

(By David Lawrence)

There is a palpable effort to make Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson the scapegoat for America's unpreparedness today.

That's the easy, superficial, careless way. It tends to obscure realities. For the truth is the Congress of the United States is primarily responsible for the debacle in Korea.

The Constitution imposes on Congress these duties:

"To raise and support armies.

"To provide and maintain a Navy.

"To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

If America is unprepared today, the blame cannot be placed merely on just one or two individuals in the executive branch of the Government—either the President or the Secretary of Defense. They have a responsibility, of course, but if either or both of these officials was wrong in taking the advice of those who drew up a military concept of strategy based only on a strategic bombing war in Europe, then it was the duty of the legislative branch of the Government to check those policies and make final judgment.

WHAT DID CONGRESS DO?

What did Congress do during the controversy last year concerning reductions in the Navy, or the withholding of funds for the Air Force, or the need of the Army for tanks and tactical aviation? The House Armed Services Committee, led by Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, Democrat, did a faithful job of checking on what the executive agencies were doing. The House committee did more—it conducted public hearings and listened to witnesses who cried out against a concept of strategy which took into account only one kind of warfare.

What did the Senate do? Here was the biggest fall down. Here is where the real checking should have been done, because the Senate is recognized as the more powerful and influential body of the two. The Senate, however, depended on its Armed Services Committee. This is headed by Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland, Democrat, who studiously avoided any serious check up or investigation. With his colleagues, he repeatedly steered away from the controversy over preparedness which raged in the House committee last autumn. He intervened only to coerce the House Armed Services Committee and military men generally by threatening, in effect, to hold up the legislation providing for military pay increase unless the Navy and the Army officers knuckled under and accepted the Tydings unification plan. Thus far this plan has served only to weaken the defense structure.

All during the time that expert witnesses were telling the House Armed Services Committee that the United States lacked tactical aviation units for the Army, lacked tanks and lacked naval aviation, the Senate Armed Services Committee was looking the other way—trying to avoid what it called a controversial subject. At one time Chairman TYDINGS said he didn't think the Senate should inquire into the controversy raised over the matter of naval aviation and Marine Corps strength and B–36's, because this was being done by the House—as if the Senate could thus abdicate its responsibility to investigate vital matters of national defense policy.

SYSTEM NEEDS CHANGE

Before the "unification" propaganda sold the country the idea that the next war could be won in a few days by air power alone, the Congress had a separate committee for the Army and a separate committee for the Navy in each House. Now each has only one Armed Services Committee. Hence it was more important than ever that during 1949 and 1950 the Senate Armed Services Committee should not have shirked its task.

This same committee has just appointed several subcommittees to watch the defense effort. Nothing apparently is being done to investigate the past failures of the committee itself. Nothing is being done by the Congress to find out why its system of checking on defense matters broke down. Nor is anything being done to establish a method of censuring those committee members who neglected their duty to the people of the United States in 1949 when the die was cast to forget tanks and tactical aviation and to cut naval aviation.

The system in Congress needs to be changed. There should be a joint committee of both Houses and equal representation of both political parties, so that such things as Senator TYDINGS' clever whitewash of Secretary of Navy Matthews when he punished Admiral Denfeld for telling the American people the truth about their defenses will not be ignored by the Senate itself.

The present system is such that unless Senator TYDINGS brings to the attention of the Senate itself problems related to military affairs, they do not get much consideration by that body. There is no partnership of interest under the present system and a committee chairman can squelch any inquiry he wishes to squelch. That's why it is unfair to single out Secretary Johnson as the only one to blame in the present mess.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington," being program No. 30, delivered by me on July 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM No. 30

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

Two weeks ago I discussed with you some important phases of the Korean situation.

In that talk I reviewed the humiliating chain of events growing out of our disastrous foreign policy in China, Formosa and Korea which paved the way for armed aggression by Communist forces.

President Truman might have prevented the Communist conquest of China and the invasion of Korea if he had heeded the warnings that poured into the White House from many sources.

One of the most forceful of these warnings came from Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, former Secretary of War. He served as special representative of the President and as Ambassador to China from August 1944 until November 1945 when he resigned in protest against Communist influence in shaping State Department policies.

In his letter of resignation General Hurley wrote, and I quote:

"It is no secret that the American policy in China did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department. The professional foreign service men sided with the Chinese Communist-armed party and the imperialistic bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself.

"Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts to prevent the collapse of the national government did not represent the policy of the United States. * * *

"Throughout this period the chief opposition to the accomplishment of our mission came from the American career diplomats in the Embassy and in the Chinese and Far-Eastern Division of the State Department."

General Hurley continued, and I further quote:

"I requested the relief of the career men who were opposing the American policy in the Chinese theater of war.

"These professional diplomats were returned to Washington and placed in the Chinese and Far Eastern Division of the State Department as my supervisors. Some of these same career men whom I relieved have been assigned as advisers to the supreme commander in Asia.

"In such positions most of them have continued to side with the Communist-armed party and * * * against American policy.

"This, Mr. President, is an outline of one of the reasons why American foreign policy, announced by the highest authority, is rendered ineffective by another section of diplomatic officials."

Then General Hurley gave this significant warning, and I quote:

"There is a third world war in the making."

General Hurley's letter of resignation was not made public until the State Department issued its China white paper on July 30 of last year, more than 4 years after it was submitted to President Truman.

After its publication General Hurley made this comment, and again I quote:

"President Roosevelt was a sick man at Yalta. The State Department officials took over.

"The secret agreement at Yalta surrendered every principle of the Atlantic Charter and the Iran declaration. * * * The surrender of all these rights to Russia in China was legally and morally unjustified; and no white paper will ever be able to change the history of America's diplomatic failure in China.

"Nearly all the officials relieved by me in China because they were pro-Communist are now in the State Department, presumably writing alibi white papers."

I don't think I need remind you that one of the State Department officials referred to was Alger Hiss, who was among President Roosevelt's principal advisers at the Yalta Conference.

I will take time to give you one more example. I will read a brief extract from the report made to President Truman by Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer on September 19, 1947.

General Wedemeyer, who is an expert on conditions in the Far East, was selected by the President to head up a fact-finding mission in China.

In his report he stated, and I quote:

"Indirectly the United States facilitated the Soviet program in the Far East by agreeing at Yalta to Russian reentry into Manchuria, and later by withholding aid from the Nationalist Government."

General Wedemeyer advised, and again I quote:

"A policy of 'no assistance' to China * * * would be equivalent to cutting the ground from under the feet of the Chinese Government * * * and would certainly lay the country open to eventual Communist domination.

"It would have repercussions in other parts of Asia, would lower American prestige in the Far East, and would make easier the spread of Soviet influence and Soviet political expansion not only in Asia but in other areas of the world."

Was it the influence of Alger Hiss and others like him that caused the State Department to ignore General Hurley and General Wedemeyer? Was it on the advice of Communist sympathizers that we refused further assistance to China even though Congress appropriated funds for that purpose?

I made a reference to that dangerous situation in a speech at Oklahoma City in February of 1949, from which I now quote:

"We must call forcefully to the attention of the people the shameful outcome of a foreign policy which has placed millions of people in Europe and Asia under the tyranny of Soviet Russia.

"We must place where it properly belongs full responsibility for the secret agreements which betrayed free nations into Communist enslavement.

"We must point out, so all may understand, the fallacy of spending billions of dollars to prop up western Europe while we leave the back door wide open for Communist domination over 450,000,000 helpless people in China."

Since my last broadcast, President Truman has placed before Congress and the American people his estimates of our immediate needs in manpower, money, and home front sacrifice to meet the situation in Korea.

In his message he carefully avoided the use of the word "war."

But even though our resistance to Communist aggression is called police action in support of the United Nations, the boys who are fighting against terrible odds with true American heroism know they are at war.

We have served notice upon the masters of Soviet Russia and upon their puppet governments that we will defend freedom in the world against every form of armed aggression which seeks to destroy human liberty.

In support of that stand we are committed as a people and as a nation, no matter how high the cost may be in blood, treasure, and tragedy.

I have said many times that strength is the only language that tyrants and aggressors understand.

No one can predict whether or not the conflict in Korea will explode into a war of global proportions. Nevertheless, it should be clear to all of us, that we must be prepared for any emergency.

Therefore, to my mind this calls for a complete mobilization of all our forces, military, industrial, agricultural, financial, and spiritual.

The future of the world depends upon the strength of the United States. Complete mobilization may yet persuade Red Russia to back down. Weakness is an invitation to further aggression.

War is not won on the battlefield alone. Victory cannot be achieved by the mere spending of money for arms and equipment.

Wars are won when heroic and valiant fighting men are backed up by a united, resolute, hard-working, patriotic home front, willing to make any sacrifice in their country's cause.

All of us will be called upon to make many sacrifices in order to build and maintain our Nation's strength at its highest peak.

During World War II we observed how certain selfish and unpatriotic men enriched themselves by profiteering and by engaging in black-market operations.

There was tax dodging, price gouging, hoarding, artificial scarcities, and other illicit practices which sabotaged the war effort on the home front.

Some became millionaires overnight, so to speak, at the expense of their fellow citizens, while the flower of American youth gave their lives for their country on foreign soil.

This time it must not happen. It will not happen if an aroused public puts patriotism first and cooperates to prevent such dastardly practices.

Those who would take advantage of war for their own personal enrichment while their fellow Americans endure the hardships and tragedies of war deserve the contempt of every real American. They belong behind prison bars. They are traitors to their country.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, there are many phases of the present situation that have given me great concern.

We are a rich and powerful Nation, but there is a limit to our resources.

We have poured out billions and billions of dollars in the hope that we might be able to prevent the outbreak of another world war. At the moment we seem to have failed.

If we should be forced into another long-drawn-out war on a world-wide scale, the cost would be so great that we could lose our individual freedom even though we were victorious.

In a speech which I made last Saturday to my comrades of the Society of the Twenty-eighth Division I warned of this danger. On that occasion I said:

"The combat cost of World War II, which lasted 4 years, was $356,000,000,000. About 45 percent of that cost was paid for by taxation. The balance, approximately $215,000,000,000, was added to the national debt in the 4-year period.

"The price of weapons, equipment and everything that enters into waging war is almost double today. I have gone into the costs pretty carefully and I have figured out that a 4-year war would call for the expenditure of a minimum of $600,000,000,000.

"If taxes were levied to pay 45 percent of this war, as in the last war, we would come out with a new debt of about $300,000,000,000 in addition to the present national debt of more than $257,000,000,000.

"That would mean a total debt of nearly $600,000,000,000.

"Such a debt would put the whole economy of the United States in a strait-jacket from which we could never free ourselves. We would live forever in a planned economy, with regimentation, regulations and directives controlling every activity of our daily lives."

This is a gloomy picture but we must not look at it through rose-colored glasses. We must have the courage to face the cold facts.

This critical situation calls for a definite and courageous course of action. It calls for the highest patriotism and the most earnest prayer.

In the near future I hope to suggest a course by which we may be able to preserve the freedoms which are the heritage of every American.

The United States is at the cross roads. May God guide us along the right road to victory for peace and freedom.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Comparison of Public and Private Power Rates in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to point out that on May 19, 1950, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] took occasion to make a statement with reference to public power in Michigan in which he claimed that certain public power systems in Michigan provided electric energy at rates considerably below those charged by private power companies. He also claimed that the people of Michigan were being overcharged for electricity to the extent of more than $100,000,000 a year. Allegan, Bay City, Coldwater, Escanaba, Gladstone, Grand Haven, Holland, Kalamazoo, Lansing, Marquette, Niles, Norway, St. Louis, South Haven, Sturgis, Traverse City, Wakefield, Wyandotte, and Zeeland were cited as outstanding examples of Michigan public-power systems offering electricity at rates below those charged by the private power companies.

I wish to present at this point a comparative table of typical monthly residential bills for the municipal electric systems in Michigan mentioned above and the average rates charged by the Consumers Power Co., a privately owned utility:

Typical monthly residential electric bills for the larger municipal electric systems in Michigan on rates in effect as of July 1, 1950

Line No.	Community	Population (1940)	Net monthly bills			
			40 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours
1	Allegan	4,526	$1.60	$3.00	$5.75	$8.50
2	Bay City	47,956	1.62	3.10	5.80	8.50
3	Coldwater	7,343	1.85	3.75	6.75	11.75
4	Escanaba	14,830	2.02	3.63	6.62	9.62
5	Gladstone	4,972	2.64	4.44	8.19	10.69
6	Grand Haven	8,799	1.67	3.05	5.85	8.77
7	Holland	14,616	1.62	3.06	5.69	8.03
8	Kalamazoo	54,097	1.60	3.00	5.75	8.50
9	Lansing	78,753	1.40	3.00	6.12	8.62
10	Marquette	15,928	2.03	3.30	5.77	9.90
11	Niles	11,328	1.91	3.45	6.49	9.05
12	Norway	3,728	2.65	3.24	7.29	9.09
13	St. Louis	3,039	2.30	4.10	7.85	11.10
14	South Haven	4,745	1.97	3.62	5.87	8.12
15	Sturgis	7,214	2.05	4.00	6.25	9.00
16	Traverse City	14,455	2.25	3.60	6.60	9.10
17	Wakefield	3,591	1.80	3.55	7.30	9.80
18	Wyandotte	30,618	1.65	2.96	5.96	7.96
19	Zeeland	3,007	1.60	3.00	5.75	8.00
20	Average (municipal systems)	------	1.91	3.41	6.40	9.16
21	Consumers Power Co	------	1.80	3.45	6.45	8.50

Source: Bills computed on rates reported by Michigan Municipal Utilities Association as of July 1, 1950.

NOTE.—Above bills for 500 kilowatt-hours include discounts for water-heating use during off-peak hours.

The claims made by the gentleman from Mississippi do not square up with the facts presented in the above table of rates. There is also that ever-present question of whether or not the public power systems pay normal taxes or the equivalent so as to afford a true yardstick of comparison to taxpaying, privately owned power companies.

As I have stated on numerous occasions, I am not opposed to the public generation of hydroelectric power whenever and wherever a project can be economically justified. However, public power projects should, wherever practicable, provide for new outlets of demand and not be brought into direct competition with existing privately owned transmission lines. We should have a policy that coordinates public and private power for a maximum of national defense and to the end that there will be no unnecessary duplication of transmission.

I have stated many times before the House that the generation of electric power by the Government is desirable and necessary. The Government controls the water. It is the transmission and disposition of that power by the Government in direct competition with private investment and private enterprise to which I object. If the philosophy of public ownership, control, and distribution of electric power is sound then the philosophy on which this country grew great must be wrong.

The Government should sell the power at the bus bar and let private enterprise do the rest.

Danger of Communist Activities in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Clear and Present Danger," appearing in this morning's Washington Post, and dealing with the proposition that communism in this country has become something other than a political or economic theory.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

The opinion of the United States court of appeals, upholding the conviction of the 11 leaders of the Communist Party on charges of conspiracy to overthrow the Government by force and violence, is an important and possibly historic document. Its author, Judge Learned Hand, seeks to find an escape from the dilemma into which the Communist conspiracy has plunged the democratic order of society. The nature of this dilemma was indicated on this page last October 13, shortly after the convicted Communists had been sentenced by Judge Medina. We wrote:

"The truth is that traditional American political theory affords no really satisfactory means of dealing with such a problem as is now presented by international communism. Jefferson and his school envisaged revolution as a means whereby society could, when necessary, assert its priority to the state. The Constitution, as we have seen, has been interpreted as the instrument that enables society to assert this priority without recourse to revolution. But neither of these theories takes account of the possibility of a revolutionary conspiracy that is directed not only against government but also against society, that is, against the social order, and existing social institutions. If the Communist Party in the United States were merely a negligible sect like, let us say, the Bakuninite anarchists or even the Trotskyite Communists, the problem would not be particularly urgent; but the fact is that the Communist Party is a powerful international conspiracy that already has under its domination nearly half the world and is striving to dominate the rest."

With all this Judge Hand evidently agrees; for he observes that while it is one thing to permit the unhappy, bitter outcast to vent his venom before any crowds he can muster and in any terms that he wishes, it is quite another thing to give the same freedom to a highly articulated, well contrived, far-spread organization, numbering thousands of adherents, rigidly and ruthlessly disciplined, many of whom are infused with a passionate utopian faith that is to redeem mankind.

Thus it is not merely a question whether heretical or unpopular opinions, or opinions contrary to the premises upon which our democratic society is based, may be tolerated. It is rather a question whether by tolerating such a dangerous conspiracy, democratic society does not become an accessory to its own destruction. The Communists, observes Judge Hand:

"Claim the constitutional privilege of * * * indoctrinating their pupils, preparing increasing numbers to pledge themselves to the crusade, and awaiting the moment when we may be so far extended by foreign engagements, so far divided in counsel, or so far in industrial or financial straits that the chance [of revolution] seems worth trying. [The Communists] presuppose that the [first] amendment assures them freedom for all preparatory steps and in the end the choice of the initiative, dependent upon that moment when they believe us, who await the blow, to be worst prepared to receive it."

More than 30 years ago, in the case of *Schenck* v. *U. S.* (249 U. S. 47), the late Justice Holmes in a majority opinion by the United States Supreme Court laid down the famous dictum that the right of free speech guaranteed in the first amendment applies in all cases unless "the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to constitute a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has the right to prevent."

But Judge Hand holds that the court in determining what constitutes "clear and present danger" must apply a principle suggestive in some ways of the famous Jesuit doctrine of probabilism. The courts "must ask whether the gravity of the 'evil,' discounted by its improbability justifies such invasions of free speech as is necessary to avoid the danger." And in doing so they must take account of existing circumstances. In other words, the problem of free speech is not one that can be decided in vacuo like a problem in plane geometry. It cannot be separated from the context of the times. At present, observes Judge Hand:

"We do not understand how one could ask for a more probable danger unless we must wait till the actual eve of hostilities [with Soviet Russia]."

In short, it has become folly to deal with the Communist conspiracy in terms of the politico-philosophic abstractions formulated in the eighteenth century. We must deal with it in terms of what we know to be present realities. Judge Hand's argument is the argument of irrefragable common sense.

Need for a Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very splendid editorial under the headline, "The shipping outlook," written by Edward P. Tastrom, published in the New York Journal of Commerce.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHIPPING OUTLOOK—LET'S HAVE SOME ACTION

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

It should be quite apparent from the way world political forces are spinning now that we are going to be in need of a large and efficient merchant marine for a long, long time.

The Korean affair may be only the first of similar incidents involving our manpower and resources. No one can say with any certainty that it will end here.

But we can say with some degree of certainty that Korea has pointed up the lack of readily available shipping with which to conduct these oversea operations.

A good part of our trouble in the Far East today can be laid to the fact that we did not have the right kind of merchant marine ready to move troops and material the moment trouble started. We are paying for this lack in humiliating rearguard actions in the field.

Yet in the face of this situation it is virtually impossible to get any action from Congress on the several shipping bills which are awaiting consideration.

Senator MAGNUSON has seven bills which were reported out to the Senate late last week, only to meet objections in every single instance, which automatically prevented their consideration. We think that Senator MAGNUSON was perfectly justified in standing up and stating to his colleagues that it appears some deep-seated prejudice against the merchant marine is prompting this type of action by some Senators.

Senator MAGNUSON rightly observed that many bills of an emergency nature have been passed recently but that his committee cannot even get the Senate to extend the courtesy of examining the proposed legislation.

These measures represent the findings developed by MAGNUSON'S subcommittee in lengthy hearings held over a period of nearly 2 years during which time all phases of shipping were examined with a view to coming up with a coordinated program designed to fit the needs of commerce and national defense into the present international picture.

That basic legislative improvements governing American-flag vessel operations, as well as the position of the Government in the shipping industry, are called for at this time can be readily appreciated when it is realized, that aside from the Ship Sales Act of 1946, there has been no fundamental alteration of our shipping laws since 1936. But there have been plenty of changes elsewhere as they affect maritime affairs.

What we would like to know, and for that matter we surmise large sections of the pub-

lic would join in this curiosity if apprised of the situation, is why someone in Congress pops up with an objection every time a shipping bill is offered. Some of these measures represent important legislative changes that are as worthy of consideration by the Senate as almost any of the measures now being discussed.

Probably one of the mental handicaps is that we are thinking of shipping in commercial terms, whereas the emphasis now must be on shipping as it affects national security.

Now where do we stand if we look at the picture from this angle? Frankly, not so good. We have a woeful lack of troop-carrying capacity as well as of specialized types of vessels as has been frequently pointed out.

It has been stated in rebuttal to this, that the combined fleets of our allies would give us an adequate pool of sufficient carrying capacity to draw upon for all our needs.

This raises several questions such as whether it is better to charter or buy foreign vessels or permit American owners to build desired ships (putting up part of the cost), whether our allies will all be on our side if, as and when the chips go down, or whether an enemy, striking without warning, may immobilize some of our Allied tonnage.

Our strategy always has been to carry the war to our enemy, to keep our sea lanes open and fight on his territory. Now, whether we like it or not we have to be self-reliant to follow such strategy. That means we must have ships of the desired types and numbers and the cooperation of the industry in maintaining our merchant marine on a sound and continuing basis.

Let's have those objections removed from Senator MAGNUSON's bills and bring them up for consideration. The commercial phases of this program are secondary now. The legislation is as much a defense emergency program as many other bills that have been hustled through and sent to the White House for signature.

Steamship "President Jackson"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Mr. George Killion, president of the American President Lines at the launching of the steamship *President Jackson* at Camden, N. J., on June 27, 1950:

STEAMSHIP "PRESIDENT JACKSON"

Mr. Bossert, the Vice President of the United States and Mrs. Barkley, the ambassadors of many countries, other distinguished guests, and my friends, I welcome you all to this launching ceremony in behalf of the thousands of individuals within Government, industry, and labor whose cooperative effort has culminated in the creation of this fine ship, the *President Jackson*. Your presence here today is a genuine tribute to America's merchant marine.

Under the bow of this great ship are many distinguished guests, representatives of the United States and other great nations, whose interests are widespread—Nation-wide and world-wide. Many of them have played an important role in planning and building the *President Jackson*, and many others will have an active part in assuring the success of the *President Jackson* and of America's merchant marine.

We are highly honored today by the presence of several diplomatic representatives of great countries located on the world-trade route served by this vessel: The Ambassador from Italy, His Excellency and Mrs. Alberto Tarkiani; the Ambassador from Ceylon, His Excellency and Mrs. Corea; the Ambassador from the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, His Excellency and Mrs. Sastromajojo.

Heading the long list of artisans and engineers who have contributed their shipbuilding knowledge and long experience to this ship is its famous designer and noted naval architect, Mr. George G. Sharp.

Our Navy can rightfully claim part ownership in this vessel and share the pride assumed by its designers and builders. Representing the United States Navy here today is that able and distinguished gentleman, Under Secretary of the Navy, Dan A. Kimball.

Another distinguished and able naval official whose interest in this vessel as a potential troop carrier and as an active participant in the logistical support of our military forces serving in oversea areas is Rear Adm. William Callaghan, commander, Military Seas Transport Service.

Representative of the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, whose office is responsible for the national defense features of this vessel and who will direct, in time of national emergency, its conversion into a naval auxiliary unit, is Rear. Adm. C. D. Wheelock.

Representing the service to which the American merchant marine and passengers traveling on American-flag vessels owe a debt of gratitude for their part in making our ships the safest plying the seven seas, we welcome Vice Adm. Merlin O'Neill, the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, and his able assistant, Read Adm. Halert C. Shepheard, Chief of the Merchant Vessel Inspection Division.

Another distinguished military officer whose interest in the American merchant marine has been a source of encouragement to all of us is Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount, representing the Army Transport Service and the commander of the New York Port of Embarkation.

In carrying out its assigned mission to promote and develop a merchant marine our former Maritime Commission recognized the importance and necessity of a sound vessel construction program. They can find no more real and concrete results of their endeavor than this and other modern ships conceived and built during their administration. We are honored to have as prudent witnesses to the realization of that program and their achievement, a former chairman of the Commission and famous naval officer Admiral W. W. Smith; a former Commissioner, Joseph K. Carson, of Portland, Oreg.; and former Commissioner David Coddaire, of Boston.

They have rendered invaluable service to the merchant marine and to the country.

President Truman recently created a new Federal Maritime Board and charged it with the responsibility of directing the far-flung activities of our merchant marine. It has great and heavy obligations, and its representatives are here today to witness the launching of this great new ship which has now become a part of their responsibility to the Nation. We welcome a distinguished former naval officer, Rear Adm. Paul L. Mather, and his associate on the Board, another able public servant, Mr. South Trimble, Jr.

The Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board is ably represented here today by Capt. Lucius A. Chapel, aide to John Koehler, Acting Chairman of the Board, and Assistant Secretary of the United States Navy.

Demonstrating by his presence here today his interest in a ship-construction program and the merchant marine, to which he has contributed his wholehearted support as the former Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and who has recently been nominated by President Truman to the high position of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, is that soldier and notable public servant, Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming.

Gracing this gathering is a well-known figure, recognized and loved by all as a symbol of true democracy—your friend and mine—the Secretary of the United States Senate, Mr. Leslie L. Biffle.

We are thankful that the chosen representatives of the American people, the Members of Congress, have joined with us today in observing the launching of the *President Jackson*. It is Congress, whose wisdom and foresight, which establishes and is now maintaining a strong and healthy merchant marine, and who today are reshaping legislation destined to revitalize this essential maritime industry. It is, indeed, a privilege and a real pleasure to present the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina; the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama; the Honorable JOHN F. SHELLEY, of California; the Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., of California; the Honorable EDGAR A. JONAS, of Illinois; the Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas; the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey; the Honorable CHARLES R. HOWELL, of New Jersey.

This magnificent new vessel we are to launch is to be named for President Andrew Jackson, whose courage and progressive philosophy have been a source of encouragement to the millions of Americans who have helped to build this great Nation.

In that same progressive spirit we have now embarked on a program of building a modern merchant marine.

We have resolved to engage in a new shipbuilding program with full knowledge that a vast fleet of new vessels are being constructed in other lands to operate under flags that forced most of our merchant vessels from the sea lanes soon after the termination of World War I.

As all of you know, the result was detrimental to the interests of the Nation, to labor, and to industry.

More than the economic welfare of the Nation is involved now, for all of us realize that the world leadership that has been thrust upon us carries with it the responsibility of assuring that sea lanes are maintained to the ports of all free nations. A large part of that responsibility must be shouldered by the American merchant marine.

In discharging that responsibility we must assure that the world's raw materials and manufactured products will be borne peacefully to and from other free countries, thus providing the most important single factor that will keep those nations free.

In that undertaking we are backed by President Truman, the Congress, by labor, and by the many diversified interests that are essential to the well-being of the Nation. We confidently expect the continuation of that support. The *President Jackson* constitutes the initial contribution of the American President Lines to that program.

Two sister ships, the *President Adams* and the *President Hayes*, are being rushed to completion on adjoining way: and will join the *President Jackson* in the near future. They will be operated on the round-the-world

route and will be followed by four others now in the planning stage.

Although the *President Jackson* will carry cargo on a high-speed schedule, she is essentially a passenger vessel, affording every luxury the art of modern shipbuilding can devise. Thousands of men and women will be safely transported to 30 ports of 17 nations all over the world. I trust that this magnificent ship will bring them many days of comfort, relaxation, and joy.

This ship is exceptionally well constructed to fulfill that wish, and is a great credit to the fine artisans and engineers who have created her and who maintain the enviable reputation of her builders, the New York Shipbuilding Corp.

Upon completion the *President Jackson* will be manned by seamen who will carry on the fine traditions that have been handed down since the days of John Paul Jones. May it always be for them a happy ship. It should be a happy ship, for ship and crew will symbolize the renaissance of the American merchant marine.

Although the *President Jackson* is intended for peace, her design is such that she may be quickly converted into a vessel of war. She will serve us well, whatever the future may have in store for the people of the United States.

May God grant her a long and a useful life.

It is altogether fitting that Vice President BARKLEY and his gracious lady should be with us today, for he clearly exemplifies the high ideals and progressive spirit of Andrew Jackson whose name this great new ship will carry throughout her long and illustrious life.

I now present the Vice President of the United States, ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

(Vice President BARKLEY speaks.)

We thank Vice President BARKLEY for his address and timely remarks. It is always refreshing to one to listen to the wise counsel and the thoroughly American viewpoint expressed by our exceptionally able and beloved Vice President.

However, we have with us today another well-known personage who justly shares the high regard that has so readily been given to her famous husband by the American people.

I have the honor to present our charming sponsor, Mrs. Alben W. Barkley.

Thank you, Mrs. Barkley, for a perfectly executed christening ceremony. All sailors have some bit of superstition, and a successful christening and launching are good omens for the future of the *President Jackson.*

The Damon Runyon Memorial Cancer Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram from Walter Winchell regarding the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y.,
August 3, 1950.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building:

You will recall when Damon Runyon died December 10, 1946, I tried to enter the fight against cancer. The Damon Runyon memorial fund for cancer research has now received contributions of $3,750,000. All this money is allocated for cancer research in the 48 States as soon as it is received without deductions of any kind. The fund has allocated over $3,000,000 to date in 93 grants to 86 institutions in 37 States and 89 fellowships. Requests on hand exceed our funds on hand but we hope the Robinson-Fusari fight August 9 will raise another $100,000 for the fund. We get 15 percent off the top receipts and all of Sugar Ray's purse of 30 percent; the fund just made grants to Tuskegee Institute and Memorial Hospital in New York. From the earliest days of recorded history mankind has been under deadly and relentless attacks from cancer. All-encompassing good recognizes neither race, color, creed, nor boundary; neither does all-encompassing evil. Without regard to boundaries, religion or background, cancer strikes as impersonally at the mansion as it does at the tenement. But there is nothing which illuminates the common bond of all men more than a common great enemy. For 3,000 years we humbly accepted disasters. Now for the first time we are counterattacking on a wide front. To you who have so wholeheartedly assisted I give the thanks of a comrade-in-arms. It is in the nature of paradoxical reward that in learning the great evil of cancer I have come to know the great goodness in the human heart. I wish I could call your generous dollars the victory loan to humanity. But all I can promise is that the fight will continue and I have enlisted for life.

WALTER WINCHELL,
Treasurer, Damon Runyon Memorial Fund.

Necessity for Subversive Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Politics or Survival," published in one of the great newspapers of the United States, the Plain Dealer, of Cleveland, Ohio. The editorial calls upon Congress to do something now in the way of enacting subversive control legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of July 27, 1950]

POLITICS OR SURVIVAL?

The hour has struck when there can be no compromise with communism.

Americans are dying in the onslaught of communistic aggression in Korea. Troops are being dispatched from American ports to battle fronts, and the lives of these young men, therefore, could be snuffed out at sea by traitorous disclosure. Industry is looking toward war production, in which sabotage could bring about disaster.

It is a question of survival. Communists must be removed from government and critical industry. The gates must be closed against Communists as we organize for war.

Nevertheless, the Democratic administration in Washington is playing politics with this issue. It is, therefore, playing politics with survival.

We are not thinking only of the Tydings whitewash of the McCarthy charges. Granted that Senator MCCARTHY was reckless and that much of what he said was false, the fact remains that the Democrats on the Tydings committee convinced too many people that they were more interested in smearing MCCARTHY than in weeding Communists out of government.

We are thinking also of the fact that the Truman administration has thrown up a road-block in the path of the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill which would tighten the screws on communistic activities.

The Republican sponsors, Senators MUNDT and FERGUSON, have offered to withdraw their names and permit the bill to go forward under Democratic auspices if partisan jealousy should be a factor. But still the Democratic Policy Committee and the majority leader, Senator LUCAS, have refused to permit the bill to come to a vote.

Senator MUNDT reminds the Democrats that "the American public should be told who it is within this body who declines even now to permit the Senate to vote on a bill which has been endorsed by the American Legion in its convention, by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, by the Knights of Columbus, by the United States Chamber of Commerce, by the National Education Association, by the Daughters of the American Revolution, and by a great many other organizations."

The bill would compel Communists to register and to identify their front organizations in their literature. It would require that officers and members be listed by real names. It would compel the Communist Party to make a financial report. It would be unlawful for Communists to hold Federal jobs by appointment, or to obtain passports.

But the Truman administration has denied Senators the opportunity to support or oppose this bill. It has refused the opportunity to permit Senators to submit amendments in development on the floor. And a rumor has gone about that in due time the administration will bring out a watered-down substitute in an attempt to save face.

It doesn't seem credible that the administration which met aggression with force in Korea should coddle the enemy at home. It doesn't seem credible that the administration which is spending billions to draw a ring around communism all around the globe should protect Communists in Government and industry.

But it is happening, and the answer can be sought in politics. The CIO opposes the Mundt bill, and the Democratic high command has no intention of offending that loyal and powerful political machine. Moreover, the Democrats remember that the radical vote holds the balance of power in New York, and it isn't going to alienate it with election coming up.

Senator MUNDT is right when he says it is time to stand up and be counted on the question of communism at home. "Let us see what goes on behind the iron curtain of the Democratic Policy Committee of the Senate. Mr. President, this is war."

We must choose between unholy politics and survival.

The Pecosian Wildcats of Troy, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, times of severe national crisis prove the hearts of

men—real men. True and unchallengeable patriotism is forged down deep in the wellsprings of veneration for one's Creator, of loyalty to native land, of kindly consideration of one's fellow man, and a full and abiding respect for the verities which are the foundation of decent and dignified human conduct.

My colleagues, I proudly submit the list of men below as being worthy wearers of the badge of true patriotism—Americans in the highest sense. It comprises the members of the Pecosian Wildcats, the baseball team of Troy, Ala. Only one member is missing from this list—Charley Jackson, shortstop. He is only 17. Charley wanted to go, too, but they told him he would have to wait awhile.

Here they are:

Bobby Blackman, catcher; Buddy Jackson, pitcher; Billy Conner, first baseman; Mullis Barbaree, second baseman; Dave DeRamus, third baseman; Robert Howard, right fielder; Morris Flowers, center fielder; Dewey Barbaree, left fielder.

These splendid young men from the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress, enlisted in a group in the United States Navy and left Wednesday for the San Diego Navy Yard.

How To Lose a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks the article by Edna Lonigan entitled "How To Lose a War," published recently in Human Events.

Miss Lonigan throws new light on the established fact that only free, inventive, creative productive men win wars. Nations which put themselves in the straitjacket of the planned economy do not win their wars. They only build up a vast governmental propaganda machine, which says, "We, the Government planners, are responsible for the Nation's productive powers, and if only we can get more men and more money, we will win the next time."

A planned war economy brought Germany and Japan to their present low estate. Why should the proud, free, creative American people follow their examples? At this moment, when we are fighting for our very survival, we as individuals should be free from price compulsions and restraints that reduce our productive powers. It is increasing production we want. That alone reduces prices.

The article follows:

HOW TO LOSE A WAR

(By Edna Lonigan)

I

The idea is firmly implanted in the public mind today that to win a modern war it is somehow necessary to mobilize all the manpower and the resources of the Nation, putting labor, industry, farming, and even our intellectual life, under militarized central control, like that of the armed forces—what is currently described as total mobilization.

TAFT and other congressional leaders of both parties have said they would go slow in giving the President war powers over civilian life. But they rest their case on the hope that we are only partly involved in Korea. Thus they concede that if the war should spread there is no alternative to accepting militarization of all national life.

A great many Americans believe that victory in war, if it must be achieved by total conscription (with its inevitable dictatorship) will be hardly worth fighting for. The danger of all-pervading despair is real. From the purely psychological point of view, therefore, total mobilization is a dubious step. But there are more general objections.

It is too generally assumed that militarization of civilian life follows military developments which were inevitable because of the new technology, and that political totalitarianism ensued. The exact reverse is the truth. The political climate changed first, and political leaders remade the pattern of war in their image. When leaders possess total power, their war aims become more and more expansive. They mobilize more segments of national life and force them to greater efforts to win more fantastic ends.

Of course these political changes happen more easily in the crisis atmosphere of wartime. But the impulsion to make them does not spring from the problems of the new technology. It is to be found in the political shift from limited to total power.

Opponents of political totalitarianism will be impotent so long as they accept the fallacy that over-all mobilization is the only way to fight a war in the age of technology. Modern totalitarianism is weak, not strong; it is the product not of growth, but of decay.

The truth of the matter is that the war economy with its identical twin, thought control, is probably the best way to lose a war. Survival of the United States in the war in which we are now enmeshed, will depend on our ability to withstand the siren song of those who plead for total mobilization; for standing by the President.

II

Just as the alternative to total government is limited government, so the alternative to total war is limited war. In limited war the government of limited powers must set limited objectives, and so the military, whose means are always limited in fact, have a far better chance to win the war.

The idea of limited war lies deep in Christian ethics. The medieval church strove in every way to limit the impact of war and to surround it by restraints that would reduce its destructive power. When the Christian world divided, the humanists tried to limit war by the development of law, and farsighted rules had by Marlborough's time imposed restraints on fighting as formal as the rules of chess.

The French Revolution brought the turn to total war. When the badly defeated revolutionary government decided to draft all the manpower of France, war ceased to be limited and professional. This fatal step reversed the direction of our ideas and reached its logical end in the totalitarian state or militarization of all elements of modern life.

Mobilization spread in ever-widening circles to all sectors of national life. Prussia extended military conscription to peacetime and made it permanent. Then Hindenburg's staff worked out the total conscription of production, manpower, and scientific knowledge in 1918. Next, the men who had been trained in Hindenburg's war socialism, like Walter Rathenau and Richard von Moellendorf, carried the idea onward to make the planned economy or total mobilization in peacetime.

Hitler, studying the weaknesses of the welfare state, worked out the last link—the technique for conscription of the mind—by which masses could be made a base completely servile to the new Nazi elite.

It is curious how few people ask the $64 question: Do the nations which adopt total mobilization actually win their wars? Germany, the greatest exponent of total mobilization, last its last two wars. The gradual spread of total mobilization all over the western world has had truly disastrous results. Wars have become more brutal; war objectives more manic; fruits of victory more infinitesimal. The periods between open wars have grown shorter and the descent to barbarism has gained increasing speed.

III

The idea of total war spreads, not because it is efficient but because it trains a body of men who like planning and control over other men. War gives them a vast propaganda apparatus by which to tell people that they, like Chantecler, cause the sun to rise.

The germs of conscription were planted here in the United States in 1918 when we trained a body of young men in habits of "planning" and control. Then Bernard Baruch, one of the young men, wrote down the scheme for immediate total mobilization of this country in the event of another war. Between the wars inertia preserved the ingrained American hatred of regimentation. But there was no active rebuttal of the new ideas, and the seeds grew.

When the Second World War was over, the American people had the energy for only a limited and shallow civil demobilization. Finance was kept under war controls. Industry was kept in near-mobilization by orders for defense and foreign aid. The supervising staff for national mobilization was kept intact in spite of Senator BYRD's valiant efforts to demobilize it. Most important, the party in power kept its dominance over public opinion. By the lightest of pressures the opposition was slowly choked, so that it could not crystallize its emerging ideas into dangerous thoughts.

The managers of "Plainwirtchaft" dress their demands for total power to meet the changes in fashions. Our Moellendorfs and Rathenaus in the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and other high places, have worked out blueprints for permanent management of all national life by the State. If we have unemployment, they call the plan "full employment." If we have prosperity, they call it point 4 In wartime they call it the Defense Production Act of 1950—H. R. 9176. The plans are fundamentally all the same. They are essential steps in the winning of power. They are not essential steps in the winning of a war.

Total mobilization in the past has had one brief advantage. It skimmed the cream of past creative free effort. Coming after a hundred years of industrial progress, it could appear successful in 1918. The Americans refilled the creative reservoir between the two wars and won the last conflict.

If we have any idea that this may be a long war, we dare not yield to the President's demand for creeping total conscription of all national life. We did not, as we said earlier, return to full creative free enterprise after 1945. We did not refill our reservoirs as we did after 1918. We cannot be certain of winning the last battle this time. Our margin is so narrow today that total mobilization, under the suffocating rule of the planners, could mean defeat.

IV

The big fallacy in total war is that we trust the chiefs of state to be infallible at the moment when their judgment is most fallible—when the opposition is no longer permitted to point out their mistakes.

In peacetime, men at the center of government beehive offices do not make better decisions than the rest of us. Under total mobilization, these bureacrats are even less likely to be right. Those who disagree with the chief are labeled as traitors, trying to

lose the war. Thus the higher ranks are filled by timid men who say "Yes," trimmers, "Vicars of Bray," who work to build up the party so they can remain in power, and cold, clever men who deceive the chief while they build the power of their own faction.

When there is no strong opposition outside the party in power—not dependent upon it and not afraid of it—there is no way to protect decent men inside the Government whose objective is to serve their country, not to build a political machine. MacArthur and other patriotic military men cannot make the military decisions, and protect themselves against the State Department, without a vigorous opposition, able to tell their story to the country.

In wartime we need moral unity for one purpose—to win the war. Far from needing unity of ideas, we need competition of ideas. In the trial before us, we need a strong opposition party. We need also a strong independent Congress. On the economic front, we need all the free energy of farmers, industry, labor, instead of Government propaganda, forced saving, manpower, and price controls.

What of inflation? The greatest inflation today is in Government. If we take the inflation out of Government we can lay the specter of inflation for a long time to come. For example, the release of Government stocks of butter and cotton ought to precede the two-edged weapon of price controls. The short supply of steel could be relieved by full production in Germany. If we lay the myth that civil mobilization is a magic remedy we can deal with specific problems one by one.

Instead of total mobilization, we must be guided by the concept of limited war. We must take up again this idea of Christianity, of the humanists, of the great political theorists of the west.

It requires far more intelligence to manage limited war than total war. This offers a far more inspiring challenge to our abilities than the strait-jacket of total mobilization.

Income-Tax Exemption for Members of Armed Forces in Combat Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 9318, which would afford additional income-tax relief to those members of the armed services serving in combat zones only. It would give each person an extra $1,500 exemption.

With the reactivation of the selective service program, many selectees will sooner or later be found in combat zones. The financial hardship suffered by many of these men in the service, due to severing their positions in private life and giving up their homes, will be severe.

The fact that Congress has not declared a state of war exists or that the President has failed to declare a national emergency makes the proposed relief an equitable one between men on duty at the Pentagon or at stations in the United States of America and those at the fighting front.

Most of the individuals receiving relief from this proposal will be enlisted men and junior officers. Very few high-ranking officers, who are, incidentally, extremely well paid, will be found in the combat zones.

To be relieved of this amount of tax burden on their military pay while so engaged is surely a small reward for their sacrifices.

This would not be a continuing tax exemption; therefore, in the final analysis, the revenue lost to the Treasury would be comparatively small.

I hope that this suggested legislation will receive immediate and favorable action.

ECA Countries Still Doing Business With Communist Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks pertinent information indicating that our western European allies, for whom we are bleeding ourselves white, are still doing business with Russia and its satellite nations. These tables reveal that important potentials are going forward on a business-as-usual basis. I am sure the Members of this House will be interested in having the tables which indicate the extent of this inconsistent practice:

Partial list of exports from Belgium-Luxemburg during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations

Arms	$6,400
Iron, cast iron, and steel	19,782,840
Copper	11,028,820
Lead	1,583,160
Zinc	3,003,780
Tin	941,060
Base metals and alloys	1,387,360
Boilers, machinery, appliances, etc	7,937,880
Electical machinery and apparatus, etc	5,840,660
Railway and tramway rolling stock	430,600
Chemical products	1,709,540
Explosives, fireworks, matches, etc	1,447,960
Rubber and manufacturers items	942,600
Total	56,042,660

Partial list from France during 1949 to Russia and satellites

Chemicals	$2,530,142
Rubber and rubber products	1,678,616
Steel-mill products, hot rolled, etc	4,198,881
Steel-mill products, cold rolled, etc	3,087,703
Aluminum, crude, etc	360,245
Aluminum alloys	408,688
Lead and lead alloys	316,349
Metal manufactures	2,046,376
Machinery and apparatus	10,272,238
Machinery, electrical	2,015,230
Transportation equipment	8,281,011
Optical, surgical, photographic materials	1,113,145
Total	36,308,624

Partial list of exports from United Kingdom during 1949 to Russia and satellite countries

Ball- and roller-bearing parts	$243,600
Iron, steel	12,140,800
Steel bars and rods, not alloy	1,736,000
Bars and rods of alloy steel	504,000
Hoop and strips	422,000
Railway and tramway construction	708,400
Barbed wire	420,000
Cable and rope	425,600
Nonferrous metals	4,062,800
Aluminum and alloys	618,800
Brass and other alloys of copper, etc	1,142,400
Electrical goods and apparatus	6,806,800
Machinery	45,172,400
Electrical generators	11,986,800
Electrical machinery, other than generators	2,864,400
Machine tools	5,138,000
Vehicles, including locomotives, ships, etc	13,361,600
Rubber tires	229,600
Chassis for motor vehicles	1,660,400
Total	109,644,400

Recapitulation

Partial list of exports from Belgium-Luxemburg during 1949 to Russia and satellite countries	$56,042,660
Partial list from France during 1949 to Russia and satellites	36,308,624
Partial list of exports from United Kingdom during 1949 to Russia and satellite countries	109,644,400

Western European trade with eastern Europe—total 1949

Austria	$75,771,000
Belgium-Luxemburg	115,097,000
Denmark	55,473,000
France	105,616,000
Germany	59,248,000
Greece	4,780,000
Iceland	3,662,000
Ireland	288,000
Italy	86,247,000
Netherlands	107,002,000
Norway	54,987,000
Portugal	939,000
Sweden	109,213,000
Switzerland	70,314,000
Trieste	1,891,000
Turkey	30,838,000
United Kingdom	217,539,000
Grand total	1,098,905,000

Reports by ECA countries to eastern Europe—first quarter of 1950

Austria	[1]
Belgium-Luxemburg	$19,603,000
Denmark	12,318,000
France	18,694,000
Greece	1,231,000
Germany	[1]
Iceland	1,489,000
Ireland	[1]
Italy	26,897,000
Netherlands	15,747,000
Norway	8,255,000
Portugal	373,000
Sweden	21,541,000
Switzerland	14,016,000
Turkey	3,651,000
United Kingdom	42,532,000
Total	186,347,000

[1] Not available.

Recapitulation

Western European trade with eastern Europe — total, 1949	$1,098,905,000
Exports by ECA countries to eastern Europe—first quarter of 1950	186,347,000

Confusion on Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the situation that has developed in connection with the pending controls legislation, in the hope that some of the events may be better understood, the news story from the Washington Post of August 4 follows:

HOUSE BACKS AUTOMATIC CONTROL PLAN—VOTE IS MANEUVER BY DEMOCRATS TO BEAT AMENDMENTS ON FLOOR TODAY

(By Alfred Friendly)

The House last night tentatively approved price, wage, and other economic controls so modified as to be almost a burlesque of what the administration asked for.

The measure, adopted after a day of frantic debating and amending, contains a provision for the automatic freezing of prices and wages when the cost of living increases by 5 percent—a provision President Truman yesterday characterized as an invitation to inflation.

Furthermore, by an anomaly understandable only in the light of the parliamentary traffic control rules of the House, the Democrats passed the amended bill yesterday expressly in order to be able to defeat the amendments today.

But—as if to make the situation even more like the outline of a Gilbert and Sullivan opera—the Democrats miscalculated on the rule. They got themselves into one of the worst parliamentary muddles of recent years. They found that if they try to defeat the bill, as previously planned, they may get something much worse.

MAY NOT DEFEAT IT

As of last night here was the situation:

The Democrats have on their hands a bill they don't know whether they want or not.

If they decide they want it, they may not be able to pass it.

If they decide they don't want it they may not be able to defeat it.

If they do defeat it, they face a 3- or 4-day wrangle without any idea of what they may get in its place.

As a result of amendments passed during the day, the economic control legislation came out:

1. With a term of life of only 7 months.

2. Minus authority to regulate commodity exchanges.

3. Without any mechanism to handle the labor problems the wage control provisions in other sections of the bill are almost sure to create.

4. With an "automatic trigger" provision for the invoking of price and wage freezes that denies the President what he feels is enough discretionary authority to administer them.

It is this last provision, perhaps, which constitutes the most objectionable feature of the bill, from the administration Democrats' point of view.

It provides that the President must establish wage and price ceilings—it is not clear on how wide a range of items and employments—whenever the Bureau of Labor Statistics' cost of living index rises 5 percent above the levels of last June 15.

The amendment was offered by Representative MCKINNON, Democrat, California, while Democratic legislators steering the bill were napping. It passed on a different voice vote, without even a standing division.

HIT ON STRATEGY

As this and other amendments began to whittle down the substance of the legislation desired by the Democrats, they decided on what they thought would be a smart parliamentary maneuver.

It was to pass the bill, as amended, in expectation of voting again tomorrow, on a technically different issue, to defeat all the amendments at one fell swoop. Consideration then would revert, it was thought, to the language of the bill as it was originally brought to the House floor.

That language was almost exactly what the administration wanted—controls over allocations, priorities, requisitioning, production financing, and consumer and real estate credit. It contained no powers, even on a permissive or stand-by basis, for price and wage control rationing.

Acting on this expectation, the Democrats mustered the votes to pass the measure. The tally was 159 to 128.

Under the complicated parliamentary rules of the House—it took half an hour for the Parliamentarian to explain the situation to Democratic leaders, after it was too late—the majority found it was boxed.

It will have the option this morning of trying to make permanent the bill it tentatively adopted yesterday, or of trying to defeat it. But if successful in the latter course, the measure will be back where it was 3 days ago—again subject to any amendment any Member may offer.

If the Democrats decide on the first alternative—trying to pass the bill—they may not have the votes to do it. For at least 25 votes in yesterday's majority were obtained by Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, by the promise that the whole measure would be voted down today.

If, on the other hand, Democrats try to defeat the measure, they may find the Republicans suddenly making a switch and upholding the bill.

Even if they succeed in defeating all the amendments and getting back to the original bill, the prospect is for at least 3 or 4 days of considering new amendments—a process equivalent in rewriting the bill on the floor.

TRUMAN TOLD OF ACTION

As of last night, the Democrats had not decided what to do. Presumably they will have a plan of action when the House convenes at 10 this morning.

Shortly after the House passed the McKinnon amendment, reporters advised Mr. Truman of the action at his weekly news conference.

The President said he didn't think much of the idea. "It amounted," he said, "to an actual invitation to raise prices up to the 5-percent cost-of-living increase permitted." That automatic price rise would cause a wage rise. Then the old spiral such as we had in the last war would be repeated.

He added that he had never asked for price controls, but if the Congress insisted on giving them to him, he hoped there would not be any restrictions on the legislation.

He would like authorization, he said, to freeze prices, but not legislative direction saying he had to.

Meantime, the Senate Banking Committee, which is considering the economic controls legislation, battled most of yesterday with alternative proposals similar to that in the McKinnon amendment.

Initially, it heard testimony in closed session from W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. He relayed the administration's objection to automatic invoking of price and wage freezes.

Then, in a long session with Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, further objections to the scheme—initially proposed Wednesday by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas—were developed.

As the day ended, committee staff members were given the task of trying to work out a semipermissive, semiautomatic scheme. The proposal called for giving the President discretionary authority to set prices and wages, and in addition, requiring him to affix ceilings to certain commodities and labor if the cost of living rose by as much as 6 percent.

Life and Immortality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the quality of a man reveals itself most in his hours of crisis; on occasions when his sky is blackest; most of all, at times when he is on the borderline between life and death. Some months ago, Capt. James Patrick McGovern, who has often proved his devotion to the honor and freedom of his country, was suddenly struck down in body to such a degree that it was generally assumed he would die. Today, he is far on the road to recovered health and vigor. There is such a parallel between the will and spirit in his life and in his poem which he submitted to me, that I am glad to recommend it for publication in the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the poem entitled "Life and Immortality," by James Patrick McGovern, of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE AND IMMORTALITY

So awesome are the marvels of mankind,
The realms of earth and sun and galaxy.
No skeptic science and philosophy
Can strike the conquering brain and spirit blind.
The universe has light and breath and fire:
The gleam by which both faith and beauty grow,
The heart with joy and sorrows ebb and flow,
The finite love of infinite desire.
Our birth is man and God in unison,
A flower of nature in the body's cloak,
A wonder greater than the acorn's oak,
A sign that after death souls may live on.
Man's mortal quest can so transcendent be
Truth as his art wins immortality.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

How Much Can the People Take?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a letter from a constituent which indicates the temper of the people in my district relative to current problems and bungling in high official places in Washington, as follows:

Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH:

We the people who pay the astronomical bills, and furnish the loved ones, are getting fighting mad at the way the politicians are representing us. Truman should have been impeached. Acheson & Co. should get out, quick. There are men of unquestionable ability and patriotism to guide the United States through these bungled waters.

Instead of higher and higher and higher taxes (we know what lies in store for us), let us have longer working hours.

We're fed up with constant and conflicting Washington mouthings, and hurry up calls for more and more billions of our money, and for the lives of our loved ones to clean up the unholy messes (3 already in my 50 years of life) that the inept, or worse, leaders have created.

In '76, the Boston Tea Party acted with less provocation. How much are the people expected to take?

Our Government appears to strengthen the enemy and then to demand that the little people's money and loved ones go to save our way of life.

I am enraged at what has been going on in Washington during the last 20 years. We have crosses to bear without an administration getting us into "wah" every few years. America is running to ruin, and Russia won't have to do much fighting.

Oh, for some Lindberghs and MacArthurs in high places.

Sincerely,

Mrs. A. S. H.

Comparison of Benefits Authorized for World War II Veterans and Peacetime Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a table showing a comparison of benefits between World War II veterans and peacetime veterans. This material has been prepared by the office of legislation of the Veterans' Administration, and I am sure that the Members will find it most useful.

The table referred to follows:

Comparison of benefits authorized for World War II veterans and peacetime veterans

Benefit	World War II	Peacetime
Compensation (service-connected disability or death).	Rates: $15–$360 for disability. (Plus allowances for dependents if 50 percent or more disabled.) Death rates—$75, widow alone; $58, child alone; $60, 1 parent. Higher rates where additional children or both parents are involved. Presumptions: 1. Sound condition at time of enrollment. 2. Service-connection of chronic diseases within 1 year (tuberculosis, 3 years) of separation from active service of 90 days or more. 3. Service connection of tropical diseases within 1 year of separation from active service of 90 days or more. Public Law 300, 78th Cong. (service incurrence where injury or disease suffered after ordered to report, but prior to acceptance—available Aug. 27, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1946.	Rates: 80 percent of wartime rates and allowances for dependents. Same as wartime rates if (1) disability direct result of armed conflict; (2) while engaged in extrahazardous service; or (3) while United States engaged in war. Presumptions: 1. Sound condition at time of enrollment if there was 6 months or more active service. 2. No presumption for chronic diseases. 3. Service connection of tropical diseases within 1 year of separation, if veteran served 6 months and was honorably discharged. No provision available today similar to Public Law 300.
Pension (non-service-connected disability or death).	$60 and $72 per month, for permanent and total non-service connected disability; 90 days' service or disability discharge; income limitation. Death pension for widows and children if veteran at time of death had service-connected disability. (Examples of rates: Widow alone, $42; child alone, $21.60.)	No pension provisions.
Hospitalization	For service-connected disabilities. Non-service-connected disabilities if (1) bed available, (2) unable to defray expenses.	For service-connected disabilities. For non-service-connected disability only if discharged for line of duty disability or in receipt of compensation for service-connected disability.
Domiciliary care	Same as above, plus incapacity of veteran to earn a living.	Peacetime cases must also show no adequate means of support.
Vocational rehabilitation	Public Law 16, 78th Cong., for service-connected disabilities incurred between Sept. 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947.	No.
Education and training	Public Law 346, as amended (title II)	No.
Guaranteed loans	Public Law 346, as amended (title III)	No.
Readjustment allowances	Public Law 346, as amended (title V)	No.
Employment (placement and job counseling).	Public Law 346, as amended (title IV)	No.
Automobiles	For persons entitled to compensation for loss or loss of use of one or both legs above the ankle as a result of World War II service. (Application and adjudication must have been completed by June 30, 1950.)	No.
National service life insurance	Available to persons in active service after Oct. 7, 1940. Available to veterans who had active service between Oct. 8, 1940, and Sept. 2, 1945. Gratuitous insurance (maximum $5,000 for death, total disability, or if captured, between Oct. 8, 1940, and Apr. 20, 1942).	Available to persons in active service. Not available after separation (provided they had no World War II service). No gratuitous insurance provision.
Civil relief	Benefits of Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940, including art. IV (guaranty of civilian insurance premiums).	Same.
Burial expenses	Not exceeding $150; payable on behalf of any wartime veteran, with other than dishonorable discharge.	Payable for peacetime veteran only if he was in receipt of compensation at time of death or he was discharged or retired for disability in line of duty.
Burial flag	For any wartime veteran.	Peacetime veteran must have served at least 1 enlistment or been discharged for disability in line of duty.
Civil-service preference	Certain preferences in Federal civilian employment available to— 1. Veteran. 2. Wife of veteran who is unable to qualify by reason of a service-connected disability. 3. Unmarried widow. 4. Mothers (under certain conditions when widowed, divorced or separated) of deceased or service-connected, permanently and totally disabled veterans.	(See note 2): 1. Veteran, only if he served in campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized) or he has a service-connected disability. 2. Wife—same. 3. Unmarried widow, only if veteran served in campaign or expedition. 4. Mothers (under certain conditions, when widowed, divorced, or separated) only if veteran died on active duty during a campaign or expedition or veteran has a service-connected permanent and total disability.
Mustering-out pay	Payments from $100 to $300 upon termination of honorable service. (Certain categories of persons specifically excluded.)	No.
Homestead preference	Preference in acquisition and establishment of homestead rights to public lands. Veteran must have had 90 days service or service-connected disability. Widow and minor children also eligible.	No.

NOTE 1.—Benefits not listed herein which are available in like manner to both wartime and peacetime veterans are: Out-patient treatment for service-connected disabilities; prosthetic appliances; seeing-eye dogs plus certain equipment for the blind; special housing assistance (paraplegics, etc.); burial in a national cemetery; headstones or markers, and the death gratuity of 6 months' active duty pay for dependents.

NOTE 2.—For the purposes of sec. 2, Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, the terminal date of World War II has not been fixed by either statute or administrative regulation. Accordingly, persons currently being separated from the Armed Forces are not considered peacetime veterans for this purpose.

Further Evidence of Communist Sponsorship of Stockholm Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many of my colleagues have had their attention called to what is described as an information bulletin entitled "U. S. S. R.," published by the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics here in Washington. The issue under date of July 28 might well be featured as the Soviet Stockholm Peace Petition. It contains six articles, the titles of which are as follows: "The Soviet Union Is Leading the Fight for World Peace and Security"; "New Contribution of the Soviet People to the Struggle for Peace": "The Signatures of Peace Supporters Will Snuff Out Flames of War"; "One Hundred Million Signatures to Peace Petition in U. S. S. R."; "Russian Orthodox Church Supports Peace and Friendship"; and "Heroic Stalingraders Fight for Peace With Characteristic Valor."

The notation as to the covers reads: "The Soviet people vote for peace." The front cover purports to be a picture of a man signing something with a young man and a woman watching him. It is entitled "Signing the Stockholm Peace Appeal in a Kiev Factory." The back cover shows many people waiting to sign apparently similar petitions and is entitled "Factory Workers Signing the Appeal in Riga."

I now include four of these articles as further conclusive evidence of the Communist source of this false petition:

NEW CONTRIBUTION OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE TO THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

(By M. Mikhailov)

June 19, 1950, will go down in the history of the people's struggle for peace as an important date. On behalf of 200,000,000 Soviet people, the Supreme Sóviet of the U. S. S. R. on that day expressed its solidarity with the proposals of the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress, with the appeal of the congress' Stockholm session on the prohibition of the atomic weapon, establishment of strict international control over the implementation of this prohibition, and the condemnation, as a war criminal, of the government which first uses this weapon of aggression and mass extermination of people. The Soviet parliament expressed its support of the Stockholm appeal by adopting a special statement.

The parliaments of the capitalist countries, as is known, did not support the noble, simple, and clear appeal of the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress. This was not done by the parliaments of those countries which do not possess the atomic weapon, much less by those which possess it. The Soviet Union possesses the atomic weapon, but it has again solemnly affirmed that it stands for its unconditional prohibition, for stable democratic peace and international cooperation.

A favorite trick of warmongers is to assert that the peace movement is allegedly Communist propaganda, that the campaign for signatures to the Stockholm Appeal is a distracting maneuver and the Soviet Union, supposedly, does not want the prohibition of the atomic weapon. A reply to these false assertions has been given in the repeated proposals of the Soviet Government calling for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and institution of strict international control over the implementation of this prohibition. The consistent Soviet peace policy has been expressed once more in the statement of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on the proposals of the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress. This historical statement reads:

"The Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. unanimously declares its solidarity with the proposals of the Permanent Committee.

"These proposals of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress fully conform to the vital demands of all peoples and to their strivings for a stable and lasting peace throughout the world.

"Expressing the inflexible will of the Soviet people for peace, the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. declares its readiness to cooperate with the legislative organs of other states in the elaboration and implementation of necessary measures for carrying out the proposals of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress.

"The Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. expresses its confidence that the Soviet Government, which is consistently fighting for peace and cooperation among nations, will continue firmly and persistently to pursue this policy of peaceful and friendly relations among nations, to take necessary measures through the United Nations and to use all other measures to insure general peace and international security.

"At the same time the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. expresses its confidence that the peace movement, and primarily the afore-mentioned Stockholm appeal of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress, will receive the unanimous support of the entire Soviet people."

In its foreign policy the Soviet Government has always proceeded and now proceeds from the principle of the possibility of the coexistence of two systems—Socialist and capitalist. J. V. Stalin has repeatedly pointed this out, emphasizing that cooperation between the U. S. S. R. and capitalist countries is quite possible in spite of the difference in their economic and political systems. Replying to the question of the Moscow correspondent of the British Sunday Times in September 1946, as to whether, with the further progress of the Soviet Union toward communism, the chances of peaceful cooperation with the rest of the world would remain undiminished, insofar as this depends on the Soviet Union. J. V. Stalin said: "I do not doubt that the possibilities for peaceful cooperation, far from decreasing, may even grow." In April 1947, J. V. Stalin told Harold Stassen: "Collaboration does not require that people have one and the same system. One should respect the system approved of by the people. Only on this condition is collaboration possible."

Such is the ruling principle of the Soviet state. It has again been expressed in the statement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R.

It is common knowledge that the peace supporters in the various countries, while collecting signatures to the Stockholm appeal, demand an explanation from those political and public figures who directly refuse or, more often, avoid signing the appeal under various pretexts. Support of, or refusal to support the Stockholm appeal shows with whom this or that public man stands; with the fighters for peace or with the warmongers, for what he is striving, war or peace. But this is also applicable to governments and parliaments. In the Soviet Union, where there are no exploiting classes, which are the instigators of war, the entire people unanimously stand for peace. The people's representatives—deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R.—reflecting the unbending will of the Soviet people for peace, expressed their solidarity with the Stockholm appeal.

Why is it that the parliaments of the Western Powers are not acting likewise but are, on the contrary, refusing even to listen to the peace proposals of the Permanent Commmittee of the World Peace Congress? An explanation for this should be sought in the fact that the parliaments of these countries support the aggressive policy of the imperialist governments, directed not toward peace but toward war. Those parliaments which wish to deny this now have an excellent opportunity to do so: to meet halfway the proposals of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. for cooperating in drawing up and carrying out the necessary measures to realize the proposals of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress. Not by pharisaical phrases and hypocritical oaths but by practical deeds alone can one's adherence to the cause of peace be shown.

Unfortunately the activities of the bourgeois parliaments do not display such adherence. With what are those parliaments occupied? They allocate tremendous funds for the armaments drive, increase credits for colonial warfare; misanthropic speeches, fanning war hysteria, are heard from the platforms of these parliaments.

The work of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. is as far removed from the activities of the bourgeois parliaments, which are hostile to the cause of peace, as heaven from earth. The first session of the new Supreme Soviet, which adopted the statement in connection with the proposals of the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress, also discussed a number of other questions. All the decisions of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. every one of the speeches made from the platform, dealt with the peaceful labor of the Soviet people, with peace and only with peace. The Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. approved the budget of the Soviet state for the current year. This is a budget of peace. Two-thirds of the total sum of the budgetary expenditures go to finance the national economy and social and cultural needs. Expenditures on defense do not exceed 18.5 percent of the budget. As compared with the prewar year of 1940 the share of these expenditures has been almost halved.

This is one more convincing proof showing that the entire policy of the Soviet land is permeated wtih an active struggle to insure peace and the security of nations.

The statement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. of June 19, 1950, is a new contribution by the Soviet people to the noble cause of the struggle for peace. This statement will inspire the fighters for peace throughout the world, who once again can see that in their struggle for peace they may safely rely upon the Soviet people, led by the standard-bearer of peace, the great Stalin. Encouraged by the unanimous support of the Soviet people, the peace supporters will add new hundreds of millions of signatures to the Stockholm appeal to the 250,000,000 already collected, and will frustrate the criminal plans of the imperialist warmongers.

THE SIGNATURES OF PEACE SUPPORTERS WILL SNUFF OUT FLAMES OF WAR

(By Leonide Sobolev)

The Kazakh people have an ancient legend. Once upon a time, so it goes, an upright man was sentenced to be burned at the stake.

When his execution started, a swallow flew to a lake and, after dipping herself in the water, flew back and tried to put out the conflagration by sprinkling drops of water. A magpie saw it, laughed, and asked why the swallow was exerting herself so much, saying she could never put out the fire. Then the swallow gathered all the other swallows, they rushed in a veritable cloud to the lake, flew back, and the drops brought on their wings extinguished the flames, saving the upright man.

Perhaps to the ill-willed magpies in some countries our signatures to the Stockholm appeal may seem like drops on the wings of the swallow. But, like the swallows, there are many of us. And we carry on our wings to the flames or war not drops of water but drops of tears of widows, mothers, and fathers, drops of tears of children, victims of the recent war imposed by the Fascists, drops of blood, our blood, shed for victory. These tiny drops, our signatures to the Stockholm appeal, will form a vast sea of human strength. And this sea will put out the conflagration of war.

The collection of signatures to the Stockholm appeal is proceeding now throughout the world. Not as easily and as freely as we do it in the Soviet Union, but with the same feeling of their strength, of the justice of their cause, and with the same confidence in victory, all honest men and women of the world are putting their signatures to this appeal. They are threatened; they are intimidated; attempts are made to prevent them from expressing their will. Those who imagine themselves to be the masters of the earth are doing everything to stem the multimillioned movement of peace fighters which grows daily. Nothing will come of it. We, millions of people striving for peace, will win. For we are mankind.

ONE HUNDRED MILLION SIGNATURES TO PEACE PETITION IN U. S. S. R.

Reports received by the Soviet peace committee indicate that the campaign for signatures to the appeal of the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress demanding prohibition of the atomic weapon has acquired truly nation-wide scope in the U. S. S. R.

From June 30, the date of the opening of the campaign, to July 10, the Stockholm appeal was signed by 96,360,866 citizens in the Soviet Union.

The collection of signatures to the appeal is under way in every district of the country, in cities as well as in villages. According to reports received from commissions formed to assist the Soviet peace committee, the overwhelming majority of the citizens have already affixed their signatures to the appeal in many big industrial centers: Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Baku, Tbilisi, Tashkent, Riga, Stalingrad, Novosibirsk, Sverdlovsk, Gorky, Kharkov, Kuibyshev, Kazan, Odessa, Stalino, and Rostov.

The campaign for signatures has been crowned with success in all union and autonomous republics of the U. S. S. R. All peoples of the multinational Soviet country give their unanimous support to the appeal for outlawing the atomic weapon and condemning as a war criminal the government that would be the first to use this weapon of aggression and mass annihilation of people.

The campaign for signatures is taking place everywhere in an atmosphere marked by high political uplift and redoubled effort on the labor front. Hundreds of thousands of Soviet people spoke at meetings and rallies held in connection with the campaign. Workers, peasants, intellectuals, Soviet women, and youth declared their wholehearted approval of the peace policy of the Soviet Government and expressed the unanimous readiness of the working people of the U. S. S. R. to act together with the peoples of other countries in defense of peace and international security.

Signing the appeal of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress, Soviet workers, collective farmers, and intellectuals back up their ardent desire to safeguard the cause of peace with selfless labor designed to strengthen the might of the Soviet state as a bulwark of peace in the whole world. In factories and mills, collective and state farms, and in machine-and-tractor stations, the working people arrange Stakhanovite "peace shifts" with the object of exceeding production plans, raising quality, and reducing the cost of production. In districts where the harvesting has already commenced, the farms are making grain deliveries to the state ahead of schedule.

The success attending the campaign for signatures to the Stockholm appeal in the U. S. S. R. is a powerful demonstration of the moral and political unity of Soviet society, of the devotion of the Soviet people to their Government, to the Bolshevik Party, to the great standard bearer of peace, J. V. Stalin.

The collection of signatures to the appeal of the World Peace Committee demanding prohibition of the atomic weapon continues.

ONE-EIGHTH OF MANKIND HAS ALREADY SIGNED STOCKHOLM PEACE APPEAL

Only 4 months have passed since the peace appeal was initiated by the Stockholm session of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress, but today signatures to this historic document total about 250,000,000. Thus almost one-eighth of the population of the world has already taken part in the great referendum of peace, has spoken out for the prohibition of the atomic weapon, and the branding as a war criminal of that government which shall first use the atom bomb.

There is not a single country in the world where the campaign to collect signatures to the Stockholm appeal has not met with broad response. Ever new strata of the population are being drawn into the movement for peace. The consciousness of the threat of a new war and of the necessity to struggle for peace, the consciousness that only a steady and persistent struggle for peace can wipe out the threat of a new war has grown among the broad masses of the people.

The tremendous popularity of the Stockholm appeal is due to the fact that it reflects the most vital demands of the great majority of mankind.

The lists of signatures to the Stockholm appeal are lists of those who want peace and who are rising up in defense of it. These are lists of hundreds of millions of people of good will, and among these people the many millions of Soviet citizens hold a place of pride.

May I call to the particular attention of my colleagues the report in the first of these articles with reference to the "statement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. on proposals of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Conference" and the allegations with reference to the fact that the parliaments of the capitalist countries did not support "the noble, simple, and clear appeal of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress." Surely it is clear to the great majority of the peoples of the countries whose governments repudiate this false peace petition as to the reasons. But I do urge that the Congress of the United States should make even clearer, by taking specific action on House Concurrent Resolution 247 or similar legislation, the exact nature of this cynical and deceptive piece of Communist propaganda.

American Legion Deserves Compliments for Urging Parents To Teach Children Religion

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion has recently had printed for distribution a very beautiful and timely colored postcard. No; it is not a picture of the Stars and Stripes. No; it is not a picture of a battle-scarred hero. These cards you would rightly expect and welcome from this great patriotic order of distinguished veterans.

Mr. Speaker, it is a colored postcard picturing an American mother in her living-room chair at bedtime for her two children. The young daughter at her left, devoutly kneeling with folded hands, and plainly in prayerful attitude. At her other hand is pictured her young son, in like position, unto that of his sister, a little older than is he, as he too kneels in prayer with his head devoutly resting upon his mother's knee. And the mother? She, too, has an attitude of prayer—as well as an apparent sense of just pride and happiness for the occasion.

At the top of and above this postcard in attractive colored lettering are these powerful words:

No child has a chance who hasn't been taught to pray and love God.

And just below the knees of the two praying children on the card are these words:

How about your children?

American society may collapse for want of loyalty, decency, honesty, and unselfishness. Americans—let's give them and America a new chance—teach children religion.

On the face side of this strikingly significant card, is this language:

The altars of God are the hope of the Nation—the principles of religion alone can avert spiritual, moral, and economic bankruptcy. Going to church regularly will make happier homes and a better community life.

I bought and paid for some of these at 1 cent each. Mr. Speaker, you, my colleagues, can do likewise from the national office of the American Legion, Washington, D. C. I urge you to do like-

wise, for I know you concur in every word printed by the American Legion on this official card of theirs.

During my first term in this Congress I stated on the floor that there was no permanency to legislation unless it sounded in spiritual values and resourcefulness.

Think it over—as to what this American Legion card says to you and to us as national legislators. This card speaks to every thinking man, woman, and child in America.

I compliment the Legion upon this further contribution to sound, patriotic thinking and living in our great Nation.

War Claims Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared recently in the Washington Post:

WAR CLAIMS DELAY

One of the lingering tragedies of World War II is the way in which payments to former prisoners of war have been delayed. Under the War Claims Act, Americans who were prisoners of war in enemy countries are granted $1 for each day of their imprisonment, a sum designed to compensate them for violations of the Geneva Convention with respect to humane treatment, food, and the like. Although civilian internees were not covered by treaty, they likewise suffered inhumane conditions and are to be reimbursed a flat sum per month. Such payments come, not from the taxpayers, but from proceeds of enemy property impounded by the Alien Property Custodian.

Of the 135,000 claims received so far by the War Claims Commission, only 7,000 have been paid, although 5 years have elapsed since the end of the war. The appeals that come in from men broken in health and now destitute are heart-rending. At least 150,000 more claims are expected, since Filipino soldiers mobilized into the United States Army also are entitled to compensation for their treatment at the hands of the Japanese. Settlements are now running at the rate of 2,000–3,000 claims a month. Even allowing for a doubling in the rate of payment, it is apparent that nearly 4 years will be required to pay out the remaining claims.

The delay has resulted from no negligence on the part of the War Claims Commission. The staff has worked overtime to bring cases up to date; but it is simply inadequate to handle the volume. The appropriation for 1950 was only $286,000; for 1951 the request of over $1,000,000 has been pared by the Bureau of the Budget and stands at $700,000 in the Senate bill and $600,000 in the House bill. Since the money comes out of enemy funds and is only indirectly a charge against the Treasury, why cannot the Claims Commission be given the appropriations it needs to work at a maximum rate? One of these days war claims from the Korean conflict are going to be coming in, and certainly a better procedure for payment ought to be worked out before then.

A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1950, a deserved recognition was accorded to the senior Senator from Georgia, Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE. On that date a bronze likeness of Senator GEORGE was unveiled on the courthouse lawn in Vienna, Ga., the home town of the Senator.

The address of the occasion was delivered by the eloquent Representative of Georgia's Third Congressional District, Hon. STEPHEN PACE, who is completing his seventh term in the United States House of Representatives, and who, to the great regret of the membership of the House of Representatives, is not offering for reelection.

In his usual able manner Congressman PACE spoke eloquently of the great service which Senator GEORGE has rendered to the people of Georgia, to the Nation, and to the world.

It is most fitting that this inspiring address delivered by one of the most respected and beloved Members of the House of Representatives on the occasion which honored one of the most able and effective legislators ever to serve in the other body, should be preserved in our imperishable records.

Therefore, under leave previously granted, I insert herewith Congressman PACE's address:

A GREAT AMERICAN—A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR WALTER F. GEORGE

(Delivered by Congressman STEPHEN PACE in Vienna, Ga., on June 17, 1950, at ceremonies for unveiling the Walter F. George Recognition Monument erected by the Georgia Vocational Association)

It is a splendid thing you do today, to assemble here to honor a faithful public servant. It has moved me deeply to be chosen as the one to express a tribute in behalf of the people of Georgia.

In a little while you will witness the unveiling of a small bronze likeness of Senator WALTER GEORGE, erected here on the grounds of the courthouse where, in 1901, he began a long and distinguished career of public service: From 1901 to 1907 as a practicing attorney; from 1907 to 1912 as solictor general; from 1912 to 1917 as judge of the Superior court; from 1917 to 1922 as a justice of the court of appeals, and the Supreme Court of Georgia. Then, since 1922, as a United States Senator.

Certainly, there could be no more appropriate place for this monument.

Nor could there be a better time. So often we wait too late to tell those who have served us well that their efforts have won our appreciation and everlasting gratitude. How fine it is that the object of our admiration, while still in love with life, can be here with us today and observe this public demonstration of our respect and regard and witness this unveiling by four youthful representatives of the boys and girls and the men and women who have benefited so much as the result of his labors.

Yes, tell him now while he can know "all the sweet and tender feelings which from real affections flow."

Why this memorial? Who is responsible for its erection, and what prompted them to bring it about? But a generation ago, public education for the most part, was confined to the knowledge and training obtained from books. Our boys and girls were taught the three R's, some English, a few of the arts and classics, but none outside the professions were instructed in the practical application of their learning, except as teachers.

Our educational leaders realized the urgent need of going outside the classroom and offering our young people the opportunity of being trained in some vocation which would lead to their early employment and provide them with a livelihood.

Though still but a youth, after having taught school for 2 years, and while a student at Mercer University, WALTER GEORGE was faced with the stern realities of life and the fear of having no choice but to return to the classroom as a teacher in the event he was unable to secure the funds needed for instruction in the law. It was then, so early in life, that there came to him a full understanding of how different it would be if our schools offered courses in vocational training.

Soon after entering the United States Senate there came to WALTER GEORGE the opportunity to contribute in good measure to the rapid expansion of this type of education. The Congress had in 1917 responded in a feeble way to the pressing need. Then Senator GEORGE took over and has sponsored every piece of Federal legislation relating to vocational education since he began service in the United States Senate.

The result has been: The George-Reed Act of 1929, the George-Ellzey Act of 1934, the George-Deen Act of 1936, and the George-Barden Act of 1946. One after the other, advancing and expanding the basic objective of vocational education, which is to prepare our young people for occupations in industry, in home economics, and in the training and employment of physically disabled persons.

Rarely does there come to one the opportunity to be of equal public service. Never has one applied himself more earnestly and constantly in the service of the young men and women of our State and Nation. Aside from the millions who have benefited and profited from this training in the years before, we find that in 1949 there were 141,000 in Georgia, and over 2,000,000 in the Nation as a whole, taking advantage of the special training offered through vocational education programs.

Those are the ones who have placed this monument here; those are the ones who are responsible for its erection—the hundreds of thousands of Georgia boys and girls, men and women, able and disabled, whose opportunities in life have been broadened, whose standard of living has been raised, whose hopes and dreams have come true, through the long and tireless efforts of our senior Senator. In their hearts they have erected to him a shrine, and on this plot of ground, through the contributions of their nickels and dimes and dollars, they have placed a permanent memorial so that the generations to come may know and understand.

Some months ago, Senator GEORGE publicly stated that the most satisfying work of his public service has been in the field of vocational education, that through these programs he felt some permanent contribution has been made to the general welfare of the country.

How much the same was the reaction of Thomas Jefferson, one of our greatest Americans and public servants, when he requested that there be included in the inscription

on his tomb the words "Founder of the University of Virginia" because he regarded it as one of his greatest achievements.

In the same manner did Robert E. Lee look upon his work during the last years of his life. Although one of the world's greatest masters of military strategy, he took special pride in his service as President of Washington College at Lexington, Va., now Washington and Lee University. It was there that he directed the training of the future leaders of the New Era, upon whom would rest the responsibility for the solution of the problems, and whose shoulders would carry the burden of the social, economic, and political reconstruction, of his beloved Southland.

What a feeling of satisfaction must come today to Senator GEORGE—not only from the great service he has rendered in bringing about this expansion in our educational methods in order to meet the needs and changes in our national life—social, industrial, economic, scientific, and political, but also from the knowledge that his efforts to that end are understood and appreciated by those he has served.

And he continues his efforts to increase the educational opportunities of our young people, as well as improve the standards and economic welfare of the teachers who instruct them, by pressing for passage of a bill to authorize Federal aid for education. Of course such aid, to be acceptable to Senator GEORGE, to me and to you, must be as free from Federal control as have been the funds provided for vocational education.

And mention needs to be made of another outstanding accomplishment of Senator GEORGE in a closely related field—that is, on-the-farm training for veterans.

It will be recalled that during the war the Congress enacted what is commonly referred to as the GI bill for those young men and women who were defending our country in its hour of greatest peril. Among other provisions, this law promised the veteran, whose education or training was delayed, interrupted or interfered with, by reason of his service to his country, that following his return home he would be offered the opportunity to complete his education or training. He could, under certain limits, do this in the schools and colleges, but if he intended to follow a certain trade or profession, he could complete the necessary training on a job, rather than attend college. Millions of veterans availed themselves of the opportunities provided by this law, and the education and training they received has contributed to the economic welfare of the country as a whole.

But, in late 1946, General Bradley, then Veterans' Administrator, prepared for issuance an order which would have, in effect, denied this training to those veterans who intended to make farming their life work.

Upon learning of the contemplated order, Senator GEORGE immediately notified General Bradley that such an order was not in accordance with the law nor in keeping with the intentions of the Congress, and urged that the issuance of the order be delayed until the Congress could act on the question. After repeated appeals by Senator GEORGE, the order was delayed.

In early 1947 the House passed the Wheeler bill to make certain that this training would remain available to veterans who operated farms. But when the bill was brought before the Senate, then under Republican control, it met the violent objection of the Republican leader. Determined efforts were made to prevent the Senate from even considering the bill. Senator GEORGE made an impassioned plea to the Senate, pointed out the threatened discrimination against the farm veteran, and urged the immediate consideration of the bill. He succeeded in this effort, defeated the plan to recommit the bill, and secured its passage by the Senate. But for the skilled and effective work of Senator GEORGE it is doubtful this training would have continued for the farm veterans.

But, let it be said, this is only one instance indicating the service Senator GEORGE has rendered all living veterans and their dependents. Throughout his service in the Senate he has shown sincere understanding and appreciation of the Nation's debt to those who have gone forth to battle. And certainly it can be said that the veterans have shown their understanding and appreciation of his service to them.

Last December it was my privilege to come here and witness the delivery to Senator GEORGE of one of the most highly esteemed awards in this Nation—the distinguished service award of the American Legion. In presenting the award the department commander said: "This award is seldom authorized—few ever measure up to the standard required." After pinning on his breast the simple but cherished legion emblem, the department commander presented to Senator GEORGE the following citation:

"During his long and distinguished public service as Georgia's senior United States Senator, WALTER F. GEORGE has endeared himself to the veterans of Georgia, who have found him a tried, true, and trusted friend of every righteous cause to which the American Legion has dedicated its efforts.

"In the dismal depths of the severe economic depression of the 1930's when the Economy Act brought such tragedy to thousands of veterans and their dependents, Senator GEORGE proved his steadfast friendship by his vigorous insistence upon the redressing of the more glaring evils of this notorious piece of unjust legislation.

"Both in Congress and in private life, Senator GEORGE has proven himself a bulwark of strength in helping maintain a sound foreign policy, backed by an adequate state of national preparedness, a sound fiscal program for the United States, and has continued to back every effort sponsored by the Legion for a peaceful, just, and secure world.

"Wherefore, in recognition of his exemplary contribution to community, State, and Nation, and in appreciation of his unselfish devotion and service to the principles of liberty, peace, and the right of individuals to the pursuit of happiness, the Department of Georgia, the American Legion, at its thirty-first annual convention in Augusta, Ga., on this the 12th day of June 1949, confers upon Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, United States Senator and gold-star father, its distinguished service award in testimony of its abiding gratitude and regard."

And, of course, the successful efforts of Senator GEORGE to retain the GI training program for our farm veterans is only one of countless occasions when he has rallied to the support of the farmers of Georgia. It has been my high privilege for the last 14 years to work constantly, almost daily, with him in planning the national farm program and in securing its enactment by the Congress. Fortunately, having been born on a farm and being a farmer himself, he understands our farm problems and the difficulties we have encountered in meeting them.

Just as he brought about the expansion of our educational system with respect to vocational education, so has he supported and helped to secure the passage of laws to authorize and expand our present farm program to provide rural electrification, adequate farm credit, support prices, soil conservation, soil building, agricultural research, tenant purchase loans, and numerous other sound and helpful measures. No man in the Nation has contributed more than Senator GEORGE to raising the standard of living on the farm and assuring the farm people of their fair share of the national income.

Possibly there are some who may feel that the small monument which we unveil here today may not be in keeping with the monumental service our senior Senator has rendered his State and Nation. But I think I know the heart of the man—and I'm sure Senator GEORGE would have it this way.

As you travel over the world you will find here and there enormous statues and triumphal arches, reaching upward toward the sky. But for the most part they were erected with funds taken from the helpless subjects to commemorate blood-thirsty conquests.

Such is the Arch of Titus in Rome, commemorating the capture of Jerusalem and the scattering of the unhappy Hebrews to become a wandering race in many lands.

In Paris, in the center of the Place de la Concorde, there stands the Arc de Triomphe de l'Etoile, the largest triumphal arch in the world, placed there by Emperor Napoleon I to celebrate the French conquest of Prussia, Austria and Russia.

WALTER GEORGE would want no part in such as those. Much rather would he prefer the modest simplicity of the one we unveil today, paid for with the small voluntary contributions of those whose opportunities in life have been broadened through his efforts, and bearing the simple inscription—"WALTER F. GEORGE—Champion of Vocational Education."

"No crown of laurel does he seek,
No loud acclaim among the crowd,
For fame would prove a winding shroud.
And crown would mean a shackled hand
Tied down by the ungrateful band
Of men who trample down the weak."

Let me add a final word.

I have real concern regarding the future of our country. This fear arises from the present efforts on the part of men in prominent places to cause the people to believe that they should be supported by their Government. They speak only of rights and freedom; the right to jobs, the right to homes, the right to education, the right to have a voice in government, the right to equal justice; freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear, and on and on.

But not one single word about the duties, obligations and responsibilities of citizenship. Not one word of what men should do, of what men must do to earn these rights and to preserve these freedoms.

With every right there is a duty, with every freedom there is a corresponding obligation, and it seems to me the time has come when those in high places should get back to these fundamentals. The performance of our duties and the fulfillment of our obligations come first. We should first earn our privileges before we enjoy them.

For years now the people have been told of nothing but their rights, they have been advised constantly of the freedoms to which they are entitled, and today there are millions of people in this country who have no understanding of their responsibilities of citizenship and have no desire or intention of assuming them.

We all cherish our rights and they must be protected. We all treasure our freedom and it must be vigilantly guarded. But these rights will not survive, nor will this freedom long continue, unless those who enjoy them daily perform the tasks required for their protection and preservation. They are not self-perpetuating. They can be kept and rightly belong only to those who have the courage, the industry, and the determination to guard and defend them.

Those who claim the right to equal justice must first be just. Those who demand the right to a job must be ready to do an honest day's work. Those who demand a home must be willing to labor and pay for it. Those who would have a voice in government should contribute to its support and respect its laws. Those who would be free of want and fear must be ready to help the

needy and refrain from any conduct which would bring fear or danger to others. And those who would enjoy freedom of opportunity must undergo, if necessary, the same hardships, dangers, and trials as did the brave men who established here the greatest land of opportunity known to man.

Yes, the land of opportunity—that is America. A land where young WALTER GEORGE, born the son of a tenant farmer, could work and study and strive, and, through his own determination and efforts, rise to a place of the highest eminence in the councils of his country. There are few places on this earth today where that can happen. And now, as the most respected Member of the Senate of the United States, he is devoting his life to the effort to make sure that the young men and young women who come after him may have the same privileges and opportunities he enjoyed.

May I, in conclusion, express the earnest hope that when evening comes and the shadows fall, when the hour of quiet meditation is here, you drop to your bended knees and thank our Gracious God for WALTER GEORGE and for his continued strength of body and mind.

"He only asks to be a man whose will is right,
Whose law is truth,
Whose heart is just with age and youth;
And who can see in sky and clod
The rich deep nobleness of God."

Mining Equipment for Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege of extending my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter from Mr. Frank Lilly, of Spokane, which I think is well worth bringing to the attention of all Members of Congress:

SPOKANE, WASH., *July 27, 1950.*

HON. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALT: When I read in the paper a few days ago that a Spokane firm had secured a contract to provide half a million dollars worth of mining equipment for Tito's government in Yugoslavia, the first reaction was pleasant because I like to see business come to Spokane. But this feeling was dulled somewhat when the article went on to state that this equipment was to be paid for with funds which the United States had advanced to Tito.

Later on, when I thought the matter over and considered the use to which the lead produced with the aid of this machinery might be put, my attitude in the matter suffered a chill. This lead will either enter the United States to compete with United States producers or it will be shipped to Tito's side-kick Joe Stalin.

If the lead is shipped to the United States, Tito will be paid in gold on the basis of $35 an ounce and that gold will probably reach into the Russian economy where it is used on a basis of over $79 an ounce.

If, on the other hand, the lead is shipped to Russia, it could get into munitions that would be turned against us, as happened with the copper, lead, and iron we shipped to Japan.

I believe that Bert Lahr, if he were alive today, might say, "I was wrong when I said that monkeys were the 'cwaziest' people because some of the things we have done and are doing with our money put us in the category of the 'cwaziest.'"

With best regards.

Sincerely,

FRANK LILLY.

National Defense and Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me in reply to questions and inquiries on the war in Korea, American foreign policy, national defense, economic controls, and taxation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON NATIONAL DEFENSE AND KOREA

A visit to your Senator's office and a review of the thousands of letters that come to me every day, would outline in clear and unmistakable terms the thinking of the people of Minnesota and other parts of the country. What are the questions our people are asking? What is it they expect their Government to do? What programs do the people propose to meet the international crisis and the needs of our domestic economy? These and many other problems come over my desk in an ever increasing flow of letters, telegrams, resolutions, and long-distance telephone calls. It is the purpose of this news letter to give you my observations on some of these problems and questions. Needless to say, the situation that confronts us is an ever changing one. It is difficult to have precise and definite answers to meet the problems of a world that is in convulsion and a domestic economy that has been hard hit by the impact of a major international crisis.

A preponderant majority of the letters and telegrams I receive ask the questions: What have we done for South Korea? Have we provided any aid? Why was South Korea so unprepared to meet the Communist attack? Here are some of the answers:

American occupation forces were withdrawn from South Korea in July 1949. In looking back it is easy to criticize this decision, but it has been a traditional policy of our country not to extend our occupation in friendly areas, but to promote self-government and to restore the country to the people. Again we miscalculated and failed to understand the menace of the Communist conspiracy. This is due not only to the decision of our Government, but to the basic humanitarian and democratic desires of our people.

When we withdrew our Armed Forces from South Korea we left vast quantities of war material and munitions in the form of antitank weapons, artillery and other equipment in the amount of $110,000,000. This equipment was estimated to be sufficient for a force of 50,000 men. It included more than 100,000 rifles and other small arms; more than 2,000 antitank bazookas with 40,000 rounds of ammunition: more than 4,900 vehicles and a large number of 37- and 57-millimeter antitank guns, 105-millimeter howitzers, 60- and 80 millimeter mortars, with more than 700,000 rounds of ammunition for these weapons.

In addition, we turned over to South Korea more than 40,000 Japanese rifles with ammunition. To this must be added 79 vessels, including mine sweepers, landing craft, and picket boats, along with about $150,000 worth of spare parts.

American assistance to Korea, however, was more than military aid. Our economic aid totaled $350,000,000 from the end of World War II until the beginning of ECA for Korea. In the closing months of 1948, for example, the first year of ECA, Korea received more than $30,000,000 in aid, consisting of shipments of 75,429 tons of rice; 54,451 tons of wheat; 12,362 tons of barley; 150,775 tons of salt; 3,044 tons of dried milk; 190,967 tons of coal (from Japan); 148,926 tons of ammonium nitrate; 39,329 tons of ammonia sulfate; 12,352 tons of lime phosphate; petroleum, raw gum, cotton, wool, machinery, and cable cars totaling 679,807 tons.

Dr. Edgar A. J. Johnson, Director of the Korea aid program of the ECA, revealed that as of July 5, 1950, and since January 1, 1949, the ECA had authorized a total of $113,000,000 additional in commodities to aid the new Republic.

We also supplied many technicians and a great deal of technical assistance in order to help the South Koreans place their country on a financially sound basis. Out of the $113,000,000 in ECA aid received in Korea since January 1, 1949, $31,000,000 was for fertilizers; $16,000,000 was for coal and oil; $6,000,000 was for machinery.

As a result of our technical aid, the industrial output of South Korea was increased 62 percent in 1949, and has shown a corresponding increase in 1950.

The fertilizers shipped to rebuild the worn-out soil of the South Korean agricultural lands have been responsible for an increase in the rice yield per acre from 23 bushels in 1947 to 30 bushels in 1950.

In addition to these, our 1950 military assistance program provided some $27,500,000 for Korea, Iran, and the Philippines.

We face serious days ahead and it is important that we not be misled by political statements made for political advantage. We have aided South Korea, both militarily and economically. Some of those who are the most insistent critics of our present difficulties in South Korea were members of a political coalition, both in the House and in the Senate, that vigorously opposed the Marshall plan, the point 4 program, and military assistance. A few months ago a political coalition in the House of Representatives temporarily cut off all aid to Korea. It was only after a dramatic appeal by our President that the vote was reconsidered and Korean aid was reestablished.

The South Korean Army was primarily a defensive force. It was trained and equipped for local police action. It had no weapons of aggression. It is clear that the North Korean Communist forces have been supplied by the Soviet Union. The North Korean Army was trained for aggression and was equipped with powerful modern weapons to press a military attack. Both the South Koreans and our own county underestimated the force and power of the North Korean Army. We have a habit of underestimating the strength of our enemies. The most recent evidence before the North Korean attack was our failure to properly evaluate the power of Japan and the ruthless force of Hitlerism.

There is yet another factor that must be honestly faced. The peoples of the Asiatic areas have suffered under the yoke of colonial exploitation. They have a fervent desire for independence, to be rid of the white man's domination and particularly that of the Western Powers. The peasantry, the poor folks, the natives, want land redistribution. The Communist propaganda has found fertile soil because of the memory of colonialism and imperialism. The Communists have

redistributed the land. They talk nationalism, they talk a united Korea; a united Indochina; a united China. The hungry, the sick, and the illiterate peasant and native is easy prey for the subtle and vicious Communist propaganda and tactics. It is for these reasons that our program in Asia must not only embody sufficient Armed Forces to resist aggression and maintain law and order, but we must have a clear statement of our political aims and our economic objectives that can be understood by the underprivileged. the sick, the hungry, and the oppressed. It is here that we have failed, even more than in the military aspect. The President's program of economic and technological assistance to the underdeveloped areas of the world represents a political and economic offensive to clean out the points of political and economic infection where communism grows. Unfortunately, the Congress has failed to recognize this. Even now the point 4 program of economic and scientific assistance has been cut another 10 percent. This will furnish additional propaganda value to radio Moscow and the Communist propagandists. We must be as bold in our political and economic aims as we are in our military planning. American policy in Asia in particular must emphasize the protection of national independence, the lifting of the standards of living and the offering of economic and technological assistance to the governments and the people so that these new nations may help themselves.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE DEFENSE DOLLAR

Literally hundreds of letters coming to my office ask the question again and again: "What has happened to the better than $96,000,000,000 which we in the United States have appropriated for our national defense since the end of World War II. Why, with such tremendous expenditure of funds, do our forces appear to be so weak in Korea?" To answer these questions, the Washington Evening Star recently asked the Department of Defense for an accounting. The report is frank and honest and shockingly revealing of the tremendous cost of even elementary military preparedness in this day of modern warfare. It reveals how amazingly little of the defense dollar goes for the purchase of actual fighting equipment.

Few people realize that for every dollar that is contributed to the Army, Navy, and Air Force, only 18 cents is available for guns, ammunition, tanks, aircraft, and ships. The largest part of the dollar—40 cents—goes for pay or salaries, food, clothing, transportation. Here is a breakdown of the defense dollar:

	Cents
Salaries, food, clothing, transportation	40
Operations and maintenance of equipment	26
Weapons, planes, ships, etc	18
Research and development	5
Administration and secret work	4½
Reserves and National Guard	4
Industrial mobilization	1
Retired pay (nearly)	1
Construction, public works	½
Total	100

With this in mind, let us see just how much we have expended for defense in the 5 years since VJ-day. Our highest World War II budget for defense was $84,500,000,000 in 1945. The postwar budgets were:

1946	$45, 134, 000, 000
1947	14, 316, 000, 000
1948	10, 961, 000, 000
1949	11, 914, 000, 000
1950 (exclusive of Korean supplementary budget)	13, 335, 000, 000

This totals $95,650,000,000. Of this total, nearly $42,000,000,000 was spent from the end of 1945 until June 1946, our demobilization period, which responded to the very natural desire of the American people to have our boys back home. From June 1946 to June 1947, we continued to demobilize and spent about $14,000,000,000 in the process.

Defense officials tell us that our defense expenditure can most accurately be counted from July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1950. Almost $20,000,000,000 went for payrolls, food, clothing, and travel; $13,000,000,000 for operating and maintaining military installations and tactical equipment around the globe, and nearly $9,000,000,000 for procurement of planes, tanks, rifles, artillery, ships, and other combat tools. In evaluating these expenditures, we should also remember that they included the very costly airlift operations which saved Berlin not so very long ago and that these appropriations also included support of our occupation troops in Europe and Japan.

In summary, our defense dollar has had a huge chunk taken out of it by expenses which have produced no tangible equipment for our foot soldiers, fliers, sailors, and marines. In fact, 70 cents out of the dollar went for housekeeping and operational costs. Our fighting men must not only be supplied with ammunition and guns, but must be paid, fed, clothed, housed, and transported.

These facts should be made known to the American people.

During the past 2 years I have received many hundreds of letters demanding economy, urging reduction in the Marshall plan, in our armed services budget, and in a host of other essential appropriations. My files are filled with these letters. I am proud and happy to report that I have refused to vote for a single reduction of Marshall-plan funds or any other foreign-aid program, nor have I voted to reduce appropriations for the armed services. In fact, on several occasions, through public statement and public speech, both on the floor of the Senate and in public meeting, I have pointed out that our expenditures for national defense could not be reduced without jeopardizing the national security of our country.

In the month of May 1950, addressing the Kiwanis Club of St. Paul, Minn., I stated very frankly: "We need more money for national defense, not less. We need to expand ECA and the point 4 program, not restrict it. We are living in a world menaced by Communist aggression. It is either more dollars for defense or the sacrifice of your boys. As one Senator, I refuse to vote for a cut in military preparedness or in foreign aid." My observations were based upon the testimony of General Eisenhower and other military leaders who appeared before the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

ECONOMY OR FALSE ECONOMY

The Korean crisis has brought foreign policy to the forefront. The people are asking questions about our national defense and the general conditions and strength of our Armed Forces.

The main points of our American foreign policy are based upon (1) the Marshall plan or ECA, (2) the North Atlantic Pact, (3) military assistance, (4) the point 4 program for technological and scientific assistance to underdeveloped areas, (5) the Voice of America and other educational and informational services, (6) American participation in the United Nations and its support of UN agencies.

National defense, of course, means more than appropriations for the armed services alone. World War II taught us that national defense is also based upon the conservation and development of our natural resources, such as our forests, mines, waterways, and land.

We learned the importance of hydroelectric power in World War II. In the beginning of that war, we had a 40-percent reserve in electric power; today we have a 15-percent reserve. We learned the importance of adequate supplies of food in World War II.

Land reclamation and irrigation was a basic factor in our war effort. The production of sugar beets, for example, was vital not only for food purposes but also for munitions. Expanded sugar-beet production was made possible by irrigation and land-reclamation projects in Wyoming, Colorado, western South Dakota, and other Western States. It is therefore very clear today that efforts to curtail our programs for conservation, inland waterways, public power, REA, agriculture, land reclamation, and irrigation were as shortsighted in the interests of our national defense as were efforts to cripple our armed services. The same can be said for efforts to cut the Marshall plan, the Voice of America, point 4, and our foreign information and educational services.

American security is not fully protected by an army, a navy, and an air force alone. A militant, positive foreign policy is a fundamental part of our national defense. American military power is dependent upon the ability of our industrial economy to produce vast quantities of goods, and the ability of our agricultural economy to meet the requirements of total defense. Industrial production needs electric power and adequate transportation. The relationship of hydroelectric public power, water transportation, reclamation, and irrigation to American industrial and agricultural production is clearly evident.

All of these programs are vital to national security. Military power in great part depends upon long-range strength and productivity of industry, of land, and of people.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

The North Korean Communist attack crystallized American policy in the Far East. The President's program is not a reversal of past State Department and Presidential policy; we have always been pledged to the aid of the Philippines, we have repeatedly assured the United Nations that we would support its efforts to maintain peace and order; the ECA authorization provided funds for the China area, which included Indochina; military assistance also provided such funds. The North Korean attack necessitated quick and positive action (this action followed the developments of policy in the Far East insofar as our commitments were concerned through treaty, UN, ECA, and military assistance). The President's statement of policy following the North Korean attack is being altered and strengthened on a day-to-day basis as the military operations develop in that area. It is crystal clear that we are not going to be pushed around by Communist military pressure. It is equally clear that more attention will be paid to southeast Asia in the months to come. The Far East or Asiatic policy will include:

1. Our traditional policy of support for the territorial integrity and independence of the Asiatic nations.

2. Expanded and more generous economic assistance.

3. Military assistance in the form of supplies and key personnel.

4. Strengthening of bases in the Philippines, Japan, Okinawa, and Guam.

5. Closer collaboration with Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, France, India, and other free countries.

6. Information, educational and propaganda offensive by the United Nations and Voice of America.

The task of statesmanship today is to keep the war from going into an all-out war. We are mighty close to such a situation. We need time to increase our strength and to strengthen our allies. Any slip or ill-advised move could participate an all-out world war III. It is for this reason that American mobilization has proceeded step by step and rather cautiously. Our problem is not to get caught in Korea by diverting too much manpower and equipment there, only to have another major outbreak in Iran, or Yugo-

slavia, Finland, Germany, or somewhere else. President Truman, the national defense officialdom, and the State Department advisers are moving along the following lines:

1. An immediate request for an additional $10,000,000,000 for American defense.

2. A request for an additional $5,000,000,000 for military assistance to the North Atlantic Pact countries.

3. Relying upon General MacArthur and our forces in Japan, strengthened by additional divisions and replacements from continental United States to repel the North Korean attack.

4. Activation of selected Reserve units of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. Emphasis has been placed upon armored units, aircraft units, engineers, and other tactical combat teams. Also the strengthening of the Marines, America's valiant amphibious combat force.

5. An ever expanding use of the Selective Service to bring the Armed Forces up to a minimum of 5,000,000 officers and men. The Congress has removed all ceilings on the number of military personnel and extended the enlistment period for the duration.

6. Increased emphasis upon the stockpiling of critical materials. This program will be stepped up into high gear.

7. Selective opening of training camps and stand-by factories, such as powder plants, synthetic-rubber plants, tank and artillery factories. Four billion dollars of additional orders have been placed for combat aircraft. Emphasis will be placed upon tactical aircraft, the need for which is demonstrated in North Korea. Emphasis to date has been upon long-range bombers, capable of attacking the heart of the Soviet.

8. All-out production of the A-bomb and the H-bomb. Reports indicate that A-bomb production is being stepped up rapidly.

9. Reactivation of a substantial portion of the reserve fleet. This includes both combat vessels and maritime units needed for transporting supplies and men.

10. Refurnishing and putting into active service large numbers of combat aircraft left over from World War II. This same program extends to mechanized equipment, vast quantities of which are in storage.

11. Stepped-up production in weapons, many of which are still in the blueprint stage or available in only limited quantities. The new bazooka gun, more heavily armored and fast-moving modern tanks, are on the priority list.

The additional appropriations for military assistance to the North Atlantic Pact nations is vitally important. It is safe to predict that American forces on the European continent will be greatly strengthened and new equipment made available. Our North Atlantic allies have already been called upon to expand their own defense program, to step up military production, while we pour in new arms and equipment.

THE UNITED NATIONS—AN INTERNATIONAL FORCE

It is the general consensus in Washington that we may be subjected to an epidemic of these international crises along the North Korean pattern. The Soviet Union does not need to use her own national forces. She has her satellites who will carry the burden of the fighting. It appears that Soviet troops will be used only when Russia is ready to enter in an all-out war. It becomes obvious that if the United States must take the responsibility for squelching every Communist uprising and attack all over the world, we will seriously weaken ourselves. This hard fact demonstrates the importance of the United Nations and the collective and combined effort of the members of the UN, other than the Soviet bloc, to stand together and to undertake responsibility in their particular areas.

We should make it crystal clear that American troops are in Korea as UN forces. If America attempts to police the world on her own, the Soviet can bleed us white while we fight her Communist satellite armies and she continues to develop her own national forces without additional strain on her economy.

It is imperative that we recognize that the UN is our international force created to meet the conspiracy of international communism. Fifty-six nations are supporting the UN resolution on Korea. These 56 nations represent a great deal more strength than the Soviet Union and her satellite states. We as a people and as a Government must do everything within our power to bring the other 55 nations to an understanding that world peace cannot be maintained by the United States alone. It can and will be maintained by the United Nations acting together. We have demonstrated in Korea that we will do our part, but we ought to make it clear that the struggle against international communism can be successfully made only when the freedom-loving people represented in the United Nations work as a unit, each doing what it best is able to do, each contributing what it is capable, and each undertaking responsibilities according to its strength of manpower, industry, and armed services.

I believe this concept of the UN enforcing world law and world order is the one means that we have of defeating the Communist plot to overwhelm the free and independent nations of the world.

WAR ECONOMICS

The American people are asking their Government to take positive and decisive action to prevent a disastrous inflation.

We as Americans must face up to the hard facts of the world in which we live. Our Armed Forces must be strengthened. This will require billions of dollars of additional appropriations. Many of our industrial plants must be converted to the production of military equipment and supplies, both for ourselves and our allies. This will require curtailment of consumer goods and the allocation of critical materials to defense industries. Such a program will necessitate allocations and priorities. We will need to utilize our manpower to meet the requirements of national security. Skilled workers and technicians must be released from civilian production and shifted into defense production. We must be prepared to pay the bill. War is not cheap, nor is the protection of our national security to be had at cut-rate prices. All of this means higher taxes, sacrifice on the part of the people back home, while men are giving their lives to defend our freedom and to preserve law and order. Just as the Communist aggressor is an enemy on the international front, so is inflation, runaway prices and profiteering a vicious enemy on the home front. Your Government must take every necessary measure to take the profit out of war and to check skyrocketing prices.

The proposals advanced by the elder statesman Bernard Baruch, and more recently by a second great American, younger in years, but far-sighted and wise and forthright from experience, the Honorable Chester Bowles, Governor of Connecticut, are receiving widespread support. One thing is unmistakably clear. We must prevent price gouging, profiteering, and inflation. To do this action is needed. I support the following program and have recommended this program to the Congress.

1. The President must be given the authority to impose price ceilings immediately on basic commodities at the wholesale and producer levels. These prices must be rolled back to their level between June 15 and June 25.

2. The President must be given the authority to impose priorities, production controls, and the allocation of resources in accordance with our objective to maintain full production.

3. The President must be given the authority to impose consumer retail price ceilings to a level between June 15 and June 25.

4. The President must be given the authority to impose wage controls necessary to maintain the consumer price level.

5. The President must be given authority to impose rationing of those consumer commodities in which shortages may take place. It may be that such rationing will not be necessary at all, but we should be prepared lest inequities take place at the expense of the American consumer.

6. The President must be given the authority to allocate manpower when necessary.

7. The Congress must act to strengthen our existing rent-control laws, extend them and allow for recontrol whenever housing shortages exist.

8. The Congress must immediately enact a program of tax increases on individuals and corporations. Basic to such a program must be an immediate enactment of an excess-profits tax to be effective as of June 25.

There is no room for profiteering in a democracy while American soldiers sacrifice themselves on the battlefield and their families sacrifice on the domestic front.

All of these proposals are necessary if we are to save ourselves from a breakdown of our economy. The cause of human freedom is at stake. The world is engaged in a great conflict of the two philosophies of life—the one, the democratic philosophy, is based upon respect for the individual and his rights as a free man; the other philosophy—the Communist-totalitarian doctrine—is based upon the principle of force and fear where the individual is but a slave and tool of the power-crazed dictators. Sacrifice is never easy, but sacrifice in behalf of freedom is a noble work. I, for one, believe that the American people are prepared to make whatever sacrifices are necessary.

Editorial Exposure of Stockholm Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. HASELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am including eight excellent editorials which have been published recently in our American newspapers with reference to the Stockholm peace petition:

[From the Berkshire Evening Eagle, of Pittsfield, Mass., of Tuesday, August 1, 1950]

STRESS PUT ON "PEACE" PETITION SHOWS ITS IMPORTANCE TO RUSSIA

It is hard to see, after the Russian-sponsored invasion of South Korea by the North Koreans how anyone with an I. Q. over 85 can be sucker enough to fall for the so-called Stockholm peace petition demanding the abolition of the atom bomb. Yet the apparent fact that more than a million signatures have already been obtained in this country, and the number is increasing even while our soldiers are being killed by Russian tanks in Korea shows how some people will be gulled by words even when the words are simultaneously being discredited by the deeds of those who utter them.

The petition in question was composed by the Cominform, the Communist foreign-propaganda agency, which has made no secret of its sponsorship. Even more significant is the importance that the Communists put on the petition.

Since the imprisonment of alias "Eugene Dennis" for contempt of Congress, headship of the ACP has been taken by alias "Gus Hall" (Arno Gust Halberg) one of 11 convicted Commies awaiting the result of an appeal from Judge Medina's sentence. This is what Hall has written about the circulation of the petition:

"I want to state as emphatically as I can that the Communist Party must get into this campaign as we have never entered one before. This is one central campaign, and not the circulation of separate petitions in different cities and States, as has been the case thus far.

"This must become the central task of the party. There will be no exception to this. No district, no section, no club, no member is exempted from participation with the maximum energy in this campaign."

Why is Russia, with a military establishment bigger than all the rest of the world put together, so opposed to one kind of war? Why does it want to ban the atom bomb, when it has refused all efforts designed to restrict its production and to permit inspection of manufacturing by the UN? Why are the American Communists, who justify the North Korean attack and exult in the invaders' success in war, going into such a lather on the subject of peace when it involves the atom bomb?

One explanation supplies all the answers. The one place in armament-making where the United States leads Russia is in making the atom bomb. Winston Churchill declares that it is only the United States possession of the bomb that prevents Russia from starting war now. While Russia has the bomb, the belief is that it is several years behind us, and will not have any stockpile equal to ours for some years. If therefore, the A-bomb can be outlawed until Russia overtakes our lead, no nation can use it to defend itself in the event of an attack by Russia or its satellites.

The whole history of Russia's actions is proof of the hypocrisy and cynicism of the Kremlin. If Moscow wanted peace, disarmament and real international control of the A-bomb, it could have had all of them years ago. The present peace drive is a thorough phony, as shown by the fact that the Stockholm petition says nothing about surprise invasions like that of June 25. It is hard to see how it could fool anyone except a numbskull and there is no evidence so far that it has.

[From the New York Post of July 27, 1950]

WHEN WAR IS PEACE

Neither the fury of the North Korean attack nor the energy of the Stockholm peace petition squads shows any signs of abatement. By next Tuesday, the pro-Communists hope to have the names of a million New Yorkers on those "Sign for peace" petitions. This is language with a strong appeal to the ancient American hatred for war and violence, and a number of innocent people have been trapped by it.

The are in unpleasant company. The Stockholm peace pledge has been signed by Leonid Sobelov, a Soviet novelist, who interpreted it last month as an oath to sabotage food, trains, munitions, and communications all over the non-Communist world. The Communist armies in Indochina call the Stockholm pledge a "sincere decision to help in the slaughter of the French enemies." And German Nazis are taking the pledge, too, at the invitation of German Communist Leader Otto Grotewohl, who last week invited all who mourn for Hitler to join his national front of democratic Germany.

Such are the legions of the "peace loving." They know that the Stockholm pledge is as much a weapon of aggression as the tank. We hope that democratic Americans will understand this trick as well.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of July 31, 1950]

POISONED PEACE PLEA

The so-called Stockholm peace appeal was made in Moscow and put in circulation by a Stockholm meeting only to disguise its source and inspiration. The Swedish Government, through its premier, formally protested the use of the name Stockholm in connection with a piece of international Communist propaganda.

Since then, Moscow's Red jukebox Pravda has let the peace-plea cat out of the bag, revealing its inspiration and purpose. According to a Pravda writer, signer of the Stockholm peace appeal automatically pledged to sabotage the defense undertakings of every non-Red country. The signer was committed, the Red authority insisted, to these performances:

"It means that I shall do my utmost to prevent war. I shall stop the trains; I shall refuse to unload the ships carrying war materials; I shall not supply fuel for the planes; I shall seize the arms of the mercenaries; I shall not allow my son or my husband to go to war; I shall deprive the ministers of food, drink, telephones, transport, and coal."

That call to all-out sabotage in the free countries is addressed to the nationals who were duped into signing the poisoned peace plea. Signers living inside the iron curtain know better than to start any such foolishness against the aggressive military moves of their Russian masters. Whether American signers can be transformed, by the Red interpretation and command, into fifth-columnists and saboteurs apparently is doubted by some of the people who are circulating the spurious appeal in this country. In New York some of them denied any knowledge of the Moscow message and any purpose to incite treason and sabotage against the United States.

In Sweden, thousands who signed under a total misunderstanding of the "appeals's" meaning and purpose have revoked their signatures since their Government exposed the thing as an international Communist racket. The same popular revulsion against it is reported from Denmark. The masked Communist drive for signers in the United States persists. A lot of Americans are addicted to the bad habit of signing unread all petitions or appeals poked at them. But they should be on their guard against this misbranded and poison-baited Red proposal—manufactured in Moscow to make the way of Russian aggression easier.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 27, 1950]

FOG OF HALF-TRUTHS

In today's letter column from the people, Lou Kimmel asks the Post-Dispatch a question and by inference makes a serious charge against us. Mr. Kimmel, who is chairman of the organization circulating here the Stockholm peace petition, asks whether we propose the use of the atomic bomb in Korea.

We agree with military experts who point out that use of the atomic bomb in Korea is senseless, because bombing targets there are so small that high explosive bombs can do the job as well, or perhaps even better. We hope that it never will be necessary to use an atomic bomb anywhere, just as we wish it were never necessary to use rifles or tanks or fighter planes.

But as long as there is aggression in the world, and there is in Korea, then such old-fashioned weapons are necessary, and we cannot say, as Mr. Kimmel and his supporters would have us say, that an atomic bomb will never be necessary. The United States alone cannot agree to tie its hands in advance in this matter without knowing what the circumstances may turn out to be. Particularly can we not agree to dispense permanently with the atomic bomb when Russia has made it abundantly clear by its actions in the United Nations that it reserves the right to use the bomb whenever it likes.

For only Russia and its satellites blocked a United Nations plan which would have made use of atomic weapons impossible. Instead Soviet Russia wants to outlaw atomic weapons in the same way that poison gas was outlawed. This is by unenforceable agreement and where there is no good faith there can be no outlawing under that system, as was demonstrated when all nations in the last war made poison gas.

Further weaknesses in the Kimmel argument are listed in the letter from Mr. Cook which follows Mr. Kimmel's. In addition, as this newspaper has pointed out previously, the peace petition is a fraud because it defines use of atomic weapons, not aggression, as a crime; because it includes no workable method of achieving peace, and because of its Communist sponsorship. International communism is backing the invasion of South Korea. International communism hopes only to weaken and divide the free world by misleading people with good intentions into signing these petitions for the benefit of Moscow's propaganda machine.

Finally, Mr. Kimmel wishes to know whether we wish to abrogate the peoples' right to petition their government. That is a fundamental right which should not be abridged. But equally fundamental is the right to point out which petitions serve the best interests of the people and which do not; which are honest and which are spurious.

[From the Portland Oregonian of July 25, 1950]

NAME PHONY, TOO

The Swedes are indignant over the Communists' tying the name of their capital city to the phony Stockholm peace petitions now being circulated in many parts of the world, including Portland. So said Baron C. H. von Plate, first secretary of the Swedish Embassy in Washington, when he landed in New York the other day. Stockholm, he said, has no more connection with the petitions than any other democratic capital.

The Communists undoubtedly choose the name of the Swedish capital to promote their peace campaign in a deliberate effort to mislead potential signers of the petitions. Sweden is known the world over as a peace-loving nation where capitalism and socialism have worked well together. Its citizens have successfully served as neutral mediators between warring factions on several occasions. If it could be made to appear that the Swedes were behind the peace move, some otherwise reluctant signers might be persuaded that the petitions were legitimate.

The petitions could just as well bear the names of New York or Paris, for phony peace conferences were held by the Communists in these cities prior to the session last March in Stockholm. None of the three conferences reflected public opinion of the countries in which they were staged.

The Swedes should proclaim their indignation loudly enough for the world to hear, that the reaction may be directly opposite to that intended by the Soviet sponsors, which was to convince all people that the Soviet is a seeker of peace and the United States an imperialistic warmonger.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of July 28, 1950]

PRAVDA AND PEACE

We are glad to note that the Communists who are circulating their phony peace peti-

tion in many parts of the world, including Oakland, are running into opposition. A loud protest comes from the Swedes, because the Reds call their propaganda tricks the Stockholm peace petition. Baron C. H. von Plate, first secretary of the Swedish Embassy in Washington, pointed out the other day that Stockholm has no more connection with the petitions than any other democratic capital. Since the Swedes are known as a peace-loving people, famed as neutral mediators, the Reds try to make it appear that they are back of this piece of Soviet chicanery. To anyone who has the slightest comprehension of what is going on in the world today this is absurd, but the gullible are many.

At this late date if there are any who see any desire for peace in Stalin's words or actions, let them consult the way that the Soviet press is handling the Korean war. The contrast between peace petitions and the actual relation of Soviet propaganda to peace ought to be convincing to anyone outside the Communist Party. Pravda told its Moscow listeners of the foulness of the crime perpetrated on Korean soil. It said malignant capitalism is striving with maniacal persistence to herald its own exit by transforming the whole world into a graveyard. It asks:

"In what way is President Truman, that sanctimonious hypocrite, perpetrator of so many bloody deeds in all corners of the earth in postwar years, instigator of murderers, traitors, and marauders, today's murderer of Korean women and children, better than the mad Fuhrer?

"Truman, bustling like a haberdashery shopkeeper, scribbling envenomed, manhating epistles; whispering under cover with the professional butchers, the Bradleys, MacArthurs, and other Forrestals, signing the order for intervention in Korea with an ominously scratching pen—such is the unseemly, disgust-provoking spectacle of the world of imperialist gangsters in the grip of violent insanity."

The spirit of peace, indeed, and yet this is the home background of the petitions now circulated in our midst. Here we have not the will for peace but the desire of a dictator to terrify his own people into further submission out of xenophobian fears.

[From the Kansas City Star of July 28, 1950]

THE TRUTH AS A WEAPON

The "Stockholm peace appeal," which now has been repudiated by some 12,000 of its signers in Sweden, was drafted last March at a meeting of the permanent committee of the Communist-run World Peace Congress held in the Swedish capital. It marked the beginning of what was expected to be a new Russian peace offensive. Three months later North Korean troops, equipped with Russian tanks and obviously directed by Russian strategists, crossed the thirty-eighth parallel in what the United Nations Security Council has termed "unprovoked aggression."

The Stockholm appeal thus emerges as one of the most cynical gestures yet made by the Kremlin. For it is clear that the Korean attack was being prepared at the very moment when Moscow's propaganda agents were telling foreign Communists and fellow travelers that the only threat to world peace was the aggression being planned by the Anglo-American imperialists, with the aid (1) of the atomic bomb and (2) of the North Atlantic security pact.

So instructed, the eager dupes of the Kremlin drew up a manifesto to be circulated among peace-loving peoples throughout the world which pledged its signers to work for an international outlawing of the atomic bomb (without any effective international inspection or other safeguards consistently refused by the Soviet Union) and, in substance, to sabotage the distribution of American arms for the defense of western Europe. This typical piece of Communist trickery seems to have achieved its maximum effect in the Scandinavian countries. About 200,000 Swedes, for example, are reported to have fallen for it.

Of these, rather more than 5 percent would appear to have discovered their mistake—within a month after the United Nations had labeled one of Russia's Asiatic satellites an aggressor. A similar process of disillusionment is said to be evident among the fellow travelers in Denmark. And, indeed, the Stockholm maneuver already had failed of its basic purposes either to generate worldwide support for Russia's atomic hoax or to halt the flow of our military supplies to other Atlantic pact states, even before the invasion of South Korea.

On the other hand, it is disturbing to note that as yet the free world has done little or nothing to exploit the fact that communism—for all its talk about peace—has produced the first unmistakable act of armed aggression since the end of the Second World War. The United Nations today should be trumpeting that amazing paradox to the far corners of the earth. It should not be necessary for 12,000 Swedes to conclude on their own that they had been deliberately trapped into signing a spurious peace appeal for the benefit of the nonpeaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

The United Nations today is having to fight to defend what it long ago described as the only legitimate government in Korea against what it has more recently declared to be an aggressor, acting in defiance of the world community and jeopardizing world peace. The official Russian position is that this is a civil war and that the North Koreans are merely trying to unify their own country against illegal interference from the outside. The truth is that the United Nations is seeking to uphold the freedom of an Asiatic people in the face of an imperialistic attack. But this truth is not being used as a weapon.

[From the Los Angeles Times of Thursday, July 27, 1950]

HOW TO HANDLE PEACE PETITIONERS

This is a warning.

If anyone comes to your door, or accosts you on the sidewalk, with a petition sponsored by an association calling itself the Partisans of Peace—don't sign it.

If you really want peace, that is.

This petition is straight from Moscow, despite that the fact that it's sometimes called the Stockholm peace appeal. The Communists met in Stockholm, Sweden being one of the free nations that still tolerate these vermin, but the Prime Minister of Sweden has taken pains publicly to repudiate their actions.

A TROJAN DOVE

This petition, which Secretary of State Acheson called a Trojan dove, is part of Russia's phony peace offensive. So is the murder of American boys in the Korean war, which the whole world knows Russia started, and could stop in a minute if the Kremlin had any use for peace.

Don't stain your hands by signing.

Los Angeles, according to the official Communist paper, the New York Daily Worker, is a primary target of the petition effort. It calls upon every member of the Communist Party to turn his entire activity to the drive. Locally, the Daily People's World has echoed this party line.

ATOMIC WEAPON

The petition is cleverly gotten up. Uninformed persons, sincerely hoping for peace in the world, might see no objection to signing it. It starts off with an out-of-context quote from the UN Secretary General Trygve Lie, blessing everyone who works for peace. This is printed in large blue letters. It goes on to recite a resolution, passed by "delegates of 52 nations, including the United States," at the World Peace Congress in Stockholm, March 1950. Ironically, this is precisely the number of nations (though not the same ones) who have condemned the Communist aggression in Korea.

The peace resolution reads, in part:

"We demand the outlawing of atomic weapons as instruments of intimidation and mass murder of peoples. We demand strict international control * * * we believe that any government which first uses atomic weapons against any other country will be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal. We call on all men and women of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal."

There follows a place for the signer's name, address, and occupation. The Daily Worker gives away the reason for these blanks:

"If we can reach millions with the peace appeal, we shall be involving new millions in the success of all other struggles."

Unless you want to be involved, don't sign.

If you do sign, you are agreeing that the Government of the United States, from President Truman down to every member of the Armed Forces in World War II, is guilty of a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal. For it was this Government that first used the atomic bomb.

Notice that there is no mention of outlawing other forms of aggression and mass murder, such as shooting American prisoner of war in the face. Only atomic weapons, which Winston Churchill has said alone restrain Russia from plunging the world into another bloody war.

AND CALL THE FBI

A resolution of the International Red Cross, a widely respected organization, is skillfully worked into the petition propaganda. Red Cross officials have been quick to disclaim it. But such tricks may fool some Americans, as they have people in European countries. For example, 10,000,000 Frenchmen reportedly signed. Russians, Poles, Chinese, and East Germans, of course, signed or else.

The man or woman who asks you to sign this World Peace Appeal may be only a dupe of the Communists, though enough warnings have been published in this country to make it unlikely. If he is not, he is a traitor and an enemy of the United States working against this country while enjoying the freedom and protection of its laws.

What should you do? Don't punch him in the nose, or slam the door in his face. Reds are used to that. The thing to do is ask him for his credentials of identification; get his name and address if you can, take a good look at him, and then telephone the FBI. President Truman has asked all loyal citizens to report subversive activities known to them. But get some facts first.

And don't sign.

Auction Sale in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement sent to me by former Representative Gerald W. Landis, of the Hoosier State

of Indiana. It is something unusual in the nature of a public-sale bill. Believing that many of my colleagues will enjoy reading it, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC SALE

I will offer at public auction to the highest bidder, at the United States Capitol Grounds at 10 o'clock on Wednesday, November 8, 1950, the following described property, to wit:

One aged donkey, unbroken, good brayer.

One broken-down Brannan farm plan.

Four million six hundred thousand dollars worth of Communist grown soybeans.

One high-cost-of-living plan.

Eighty million dollars worth of spoiled potatoes at 1 cent per 100 pounds.

Thirty-one million eight hundred and eighteen thousand pounds of dried eggs on sale, at 22 cents a pound, which cost the American taxpayer $1.26 a pound.

One hundred and ninety-four unused automobiles from the Denver office of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

Unlimited quantity of highway and street chuckholes.

One million pounds of Polish hams.

Fifty thousand barrels of whitewash left over from Tydings committee.

One afternoon mail delivery badly used.

Unlimited quantity of State Department sleeping pills, no prescription needed.

Fifty-four thousand "red herrings."

Ten carloads of 57-cent dollars.

One million bottles of red ink.

One socialized medicine scheme.

One million copies of pamphlets such as Interaction of Sex, Shape and Weight Genes in Watermelons, Mist-Netting for Birds in Japan, and Habits, Feed, and Economic Status of the Bandtailed Pigeon.

Large assortment of broken promises and double crosses.

For hire, 1,000,000 unneeded political hacks on the Federal payrolls.

Large quantities of Russian furs, crabmeat, and nuts.

One hundred million pounds strong butter, unfit for hog consumption.

One million pumpkins, good for hiding important papers.

Entrance fee, one registered voters certificate.

First 100 customers get a deep freeze free.

Terms, you can use New Deal 57-cent dollars—hurry, hurry, your dollar will be worth much less.

Vote Straight and Put 'Em Out, auctioneers.

GOP, trustee and sales director.

UNCLE SAM,
Owner.

Declaration of Policy on the Present World Crisis by the Italian-American Labor Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Italian-American Labor Council was organized during World War II to unite Italian-Americans in the labor movement in the fight against the forces of nazism and fascism which were at that time threatening us. This organization never failed to recognize the evils not only of the dictatorships which emerged in Italy and in Germany, but also of the Soviet Communist regime which now threatens the world's freedom throughout the world. The Italian-American Labor Council has moved quickly to support the actions of the United Nations and of President Truman to combat aggression in Korea. The resolution is an admirable statement of the fight for freedom and democracy which we must wage.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD this declaration of policy of the Italian-American Labor Council.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY ON THE PRESENT WORLD CRISIS

The Italian-American Labor Council assembled at a special meeting on July 20, 1950, hereby officially defines its stand on the present world crisis in which are involved not only Korea but all of humanity.

Our organization was formed a few days after Pearl Harbor at a call issued by representatives of unions who had fought uncompromisingly against fascism, nazism, and bolshevism for many years.

A new, reliable, and vigorous leadership was given to all Americans of Italian descent who furnished during the entire duration of that war magnificent proofs of loyalty and a tremendous contribution to the victory of our country over black and brown totalitarianism.

While aimed principally at winning the war against Fascist and Nazi totalitarianism, the policies of the Italian-American Labor Council also took into account the potential dangers deriving from the so-called united fronts with totalitarian Communists, and therefore refused to enter any tactical combination with these enemies of freedom. The present world crisis, precipitated by the Moscow instigated, planned and directed aggression against South Korea, is a definite confirmation that the freedom-loving people can never expect any fair play from Stalinite totalitarianism.

It is also a reminder that when in its honest and sincere search for agreements, harmony and peace, democracy allows totalitarians to take control of strategic positions of any kind, these enemies of liberty, utilize them to attack democracy on the first favorable occasion.

So while our present aim is to win the war in Korea under the flag of the United Nations, we should be careful to prevent the defeated totalitarians of yesterday, black, brown, or yellow, being given the possibility of returning to the control of economic, political, geographical and military positions from which they could attack and destroy the freedom of mankind in a third world war. This warning is not the result of dreams into the future, but is based on historical experience and on clear signs of neo-Fascist and neo-Nazi come-back that can be observed in many places.

The Italian-American Labor Council pledges its full and energetic support to the stand taken by President Truman on behalf of the United States, and by the United Nations, to resist and defeat aggression in Korea, and calls on all the workers of Italian descent, who are such an important factor in the basic industries of our Nation, to cooperate fully and enthusiastically to the successful mobilization decided upon by the leadership of the entire American labor movement.

We as Americans of Italian extraction welcome news from Italy showing that only Togliatti's Communists and his satellites of Menni's party are supporting Moscow aggression, while all the Italian democratic parties, including the Socialist Party of Italian Workers and the Unitarian Socialist Party, have condemned the Cominform aggression in Korea and denounced the fake and fraudulent character of the so-called petition for peace being circulated by Moscow agents all over the world.

The Italian-American Labor Council feels that in this new world crisis, we can defeat more surely and quickly our enemies and safeguard the best interest of democracy, if we are careful to avoid—

(a) all policies that could help bring water to the mill of Moscow propaganda which is busy picturing the United States as the citadel of reaction and exploitation, of monopolistic capitalism, and which tries to link and identify our free democrary with fascism and Wall Street special interests;

(b) all policies and acts which could endanger or restrict our civil liberties, the very foundation of the invincible power of our Republic;

(c) all such nonsense as collective discrimination against native born or immigrants who had been deceived for some time into falling into Communist outfits, and who have later sincerely broken away from Moscovite communism, opposing effectively and skillfully for several years its principles, aims, policies, and organizations;

(d) all attempts to retreat from the road of social progress or to renounce the legislative reforms aimed at enlarging the horizon of social justice in America and in the world.

As an organization with much experience in international struggles, we warn the American people that enemies of freedom of any kind can never be our sincere and sure allies. These totalitarians have joined hands in the past and they can do the same all over again in the future.

The road to victory—definite victory—is to be followed with democratic methods and democratic forces serving democratic ideals. Along this road, the peoples of the world—including the enslaved people of Russia and the masses of European and Asiatic workers deceived and betrayed by the Cominform—will join us and work with us in building the unbreakable pillars of world freedom and peace.

Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement of Mr. Ewan Clague which emphasizes my remarks made on the floor of the House concerning prices:

TESTIMONY OF EWAN CLAGUE, COMMISSIONER OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND 1948–50

Beginning in April 1950, there was an upward movement of prices. This movement has been accelerated since the outbreak of the war in Korea.

In general, average prices, both at retail and in primary markets, reached their peaks in the summer of 1948. The over-all movement was then slowly downward until the spring and summer of 1949. At that time, prices generally became remarkably stable, and moved very little until the spring of 1950. High consumer incomes and generally good business then pushed prices slowly upward. By mid-June 1950, there were many indications that, for most commodities at lesat, there was again a tendency toward stability. Late in June, however, when the Korean outbreak occurred, prices began moving up again very sharply, following the same general patterns as in 1941.

I. THE BLS PRICE INDEXES

The Bureau of Labor Statistics price indexes measures price changes at three levels of distribution: (1) In the commodity markets and organized exchanges—the daily index of commodity prices; (2) in the primary markets where manufacturers sell their goods to distributors and to retailers and where they purchase the semifabricated materials that they need to make their finished products—the wholesale price index; and (3) at retail the prices that consumers pay for the goods that they need in their daily living—the consumers' price index.

The daily index of commodity prices is extremely sensitive and frequently has a large speculative element in it. It includes 28 basic raw materials—nonferrous metals, some agricultural commodities like wheat and corn traded on the Chicago Board of Trade, hogs and steers, and some imported raw materials like rubber, tin, and wool.

The wholesale price index is not as sensitive as the daily index because it involves over 900 commodities monthly, many of which have gone through extensive processing. These include not only wool in its raw form, but also yarns and finished apparel. It includes crude rubber as well as rubber tires. It includes copper ingot, and it also includes the motors, which have copper armatures. This index is issued officially monthly, and weekly for a shorter list of items.

The retail price index—commonly known as the consumer's price index or the cost-of-living index—is the least sensitive of all. It includes among its 200 items not only the goods that consumers buy each day, such as milk and other foods, for example, but those which they buy only infrequently like refrigerators and automobiles—and even hospital bills. It also includes rent, public utility bills, and other services.

II. PRICES ON THE COMMODITY EXCHANGES

When the war broke in Korea prices on organized commodity markets reacted immediately. Between June 23 and August 2 they jumped almost 15 percent on the average.

The imported commodities have since shown especially large jumps—rubber rose steadily from 28 cents a pound on June 23 to 54 cents on August 2; tin rose from 76 cents to 96 cents on July 14, and then receded to 90 cents; by July 26, it was back to 97.5 cents; it has since fluctuated around this level. Wool tops which had been $1.35 a pound back in 1946 are now at the peak level of $2.37 a pound; they have risen almost daily since Korea. Coffee beans broke through their previous peak to reach 56 cents a pound, up more than 7 cents since June 23. Even raw sugar has advanced above 6 cents a pound for the first time since early January 1948; this is an increase of 40 cents a hundredweight since Korea. The prices of many important domestic commodities have also risen sharply recently: Cotton is up from 34 cents a pound to 38 cents; lard from 11 cents to 16 cents, cotton print cloth from 15 cents a yard to 20 cents.

These price movements tend to be typical of a war situation in sensitive markets—manufacturers act on the assumption that prices are much more likely to be higher than lower in the foreseeable future. In 1939, for example, there was an increase of 25 percent in this index during the month of September 1939, when the war broke out in Europe.

III. PRIMARY MARKET PRICES

Commodity prices in primary markets also started up in the spring of 1950, and rose more steeply after the outbreak of war in Korea. These increases have affected all classes of commodities, both agricultural and nonagricultural. The Bureau's index of primary market prices—usually called the wholesale price index—is a remarkably accurate indicator of changes in business sentiment. The all commodities index on July 25 was 4 percent above the pre-Korea level and 8 percent above its 1950 low point.

Industrial prices

Large movements in the industrial component of this index normally reflect changes in the feelings of the business community. Excluding the agricultural commodities, this balance of the index turned down at the end of 1948 when business turned down, and reached its low point at the end of 1949. By early 1950, it was clear that the 1949 slump had been mild, and prices started moving up slowly. However, the increase kept moving at a progressively faster rate, and between the beginning of April and the end of July the total increase in the prices of industrial commodities was more than 4 percent. We are now only about 1½ percent below the postwar peak reached at the end of 1948. Building materials are at the new postwar peak and metals and metal products prices are only fractionally below their postwar peak. Lumber prices are setting new peaks each week. The movement from April to June reflected inventory accumulation—a reaction to general optimistic attitudes toward the business outlook for the future. The movement of industrial prices since June 20—an increase of 2 percent—has principally reflected the war situation.

Farm products and foods

The movements of farm products and food prices in primary markets have been largely controlled by the agricultural situation and crop outlook. However, these prices have also shown sharp advances since spring—12 percent between April 4 and July 25. More than half the rise has occurred since the Korean outbreak. The biggest increases have been in livestock and meats—more than 9 percent between June 27 and July 25, 1950. (A portion of this increase is seasonal.) These increases in livestock and meat prices have been promptly reflected at retail. It has been demonstrated in the past that a common characteristic of movements of prices of many foods in a war period is a great shortening of the time lag between changes in the prices of raw materials and their finished products, and between wholesale and retail. There are many indications that this is also true in the current period—replacements costs dominate the current retail food markets.

IV. THE CONSUMER'S PRICE INDEX OF THE BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Pre-Korea

The prices of goods consumers buy followed this same general pattern, but at a much slower pace. The Bureau's Consumers' Price Index had an over-all range of only 2 percent in 15 months, with the month-to-month movement never as great as 1 percent. This stability ended in April 1950, however, and by June 15, before the Korean attack, the index increased nearly 2 percent to 170.2 (1935–39=100)—primarily because of increases in retail-meat prices and rents.

The advance since April was the largest since the middle of 1948 when the index reached its peak. The increases of May and June wiped out about half of the decline from the postwar peak.

The movement since April has been largely the result of higher food prices, although rent has been moving steadily upward. Retail-food prices have risen about 5 percent since April and are now less than 6 percent below their postwar peak. The rise in retail-food prices from mid-April to mid-June has been almost wholly due to higher prices for meats. There have also been wide fluctuations in the prices of seasonal commodities such as fruits and vegetables and eggs. Retail-meat prices have advanced 14 percent since January of this year and in mid-June were within 8 percent of their postwar peak.

An example of what has happened to meat prices can be seen in two specific cases: In January, the national average price of round steak was 85 cents a pound; in June it was 97½ cents. Pork chops were less than 62 cents in January; in June they were about 81 cents, and we estimate that they have risen about 5 cents more in July.

The increases in consumers' prices through June in no way reflect the outbreak of war in Korea. More than any other factor, these advances reflect the general upturn in the national economy after the minor slump of 1949. High consumer incomes always bring big demands for meat, butter, and other high-priced foods.

Foods—post-Korea

Retail food prices continued to advance in July again because of higher meat prices. We have completed preliminary checks of food prices in four cities as of July 15. They lead us to expect a total increase of the same general magnitude as from May to June—that is, 2 to 3 percent for food. Part of this rise is scare buying and hoarding by some consumers, and part of it reflects higher raw material costs, like coffee and sugar, which have been passed on with great rapidity to the consumers.

Apparel, housefurnishings, and other commodities in the cost of living

With the exception of foods and rents, the other commodities included in the cost of living in June were either lower or practically unchanged from their levels at the start of 1950. As far as we can tell from scattered reports, it appears that they have not shown any substantial increase since Korea. Although there have recently been price increases for a few commodities, the retailers of the Nation have made a magnificent effort to hold the price line. The majority have not raised the prices of the goods they have in stock despite runs by consumers. They have increased their selling prices only when they have had to buy higher cost replacement merchandise.

Of course, many of the usual summer clearance sales of apparel and housefurnishings have not been so numerous nor have they offered as great bargains as last year. It is also no longer possible to buy appliances at a discount. On the whole, however, the picture is not yet one of actual retail price rises. These price rises will come, however, as the higher costs of raw materials filter through the manufacturing and distributive processes of the economy. For the past few days we have been receiving reports on primary market prices which show increases in the manufacturers' selling prices for stoves and refrigerators, sheets and mattresses, rugs and tires, hosiery, underwear, etc. When this merchandise reaches the retail counters, these increases will be reflected in higher prices. But these increases do not appear overnight—it takes weeks and even months before they are fully reflected in the prices consumers pay.

It is clear that the price situation is very uneven. Some prices have risen 50 or even 100 percent; some have risen moderately; some have not moved at all. The greatest increases have been in the prices of raw

materials, of basic commodities in general, and imported commodities especially. The increases in manufacturers' selling prices have been somewhat less, and the increase in retail prices, except foods, least of all.

We know that some of this rise is attributable to scare buying, the building up of inventories, and filling of pipe lines all the way from consumer to producer. This kind of buying has its own limits—when the locker is stocked up, that kind of demand ends. Then prices will be influenced by the demand-and-supply situation—they can level off or even decline.

On the demand side the new factor is the rearmament program—the speed with which it progresses and the commodities on which it falls. This is superimposed on an already high level of regular consumer demand.

On the supply side we are producing at a very high level. The real squeeze will come, and prices could start to move very rapidly, when consumer-goods capacity is diverted to military uses. Unless consumer-purchasing power has been cut back through taxes or purchases of savings bonds, the buying power will clearly exceed the supply of goods. It should be possible from advance knowledge of the military demand to know when and where the squeeze will come long before it appears on the markets.

American Legion Viewpoint on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. WILSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is strengthening to know that the veterans of our great land are and will be united in a foreign policy—to fight communism everywhere—to unite in efforts and actions toward the goal of destroying the threat of world dominion.

Members of the great veterans organizations of America, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and others, realize that the greatest contribution that can be made to gain a peaceful world is the preservation of freedom for those who will be free—and through our moral, military, and economic strength, the destruction and complete elimination of false and untruthful philosophies and ideologies.

A striking, timely, and concise statement of the American Legion's world policy was presented by its foreign relations commission to its national executive committee at the May 1950 meeting; and as adopted and printed in the American Legion magazine for July 1950 appears as follows:

LEGION'S FOREIGN POLICY STATED—NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ADOPTS CONCISE STATEMENT OF ITS WORLD POLICY PRESENTED BY THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION AT MAY MEETING—REJECTS DEFEATISM ATTITUDE

The foreign policy of the American Legion is primarily dedicated to the preservation of freedom, freedom of the individual, and of human liberties.

The menace in the world today is the spread of Soviet communism, whose aims are the destruction of human liberties and eventual world conquest. Therefore, the foreign policy of the American Legion is to fight communism everywhere.

Instead of condemning the mistakes and inadequacies of the past let us now unite our efforts and actions toward the one goal of destroying the threat of world dominion by our real enemy—Soviet Russia.

No longer should we contain communism in one part of the world, then ignore its continued and successful advance in another part. No longer will we tolerate trade or diplomatic expediencies which save us pennies today, but will cost us dollars tomorrow. Our foreign policy must be consistently dedicated to the principle that the greatest contribution that can be made by the United States to a peaceful world is the preservation of freedom for those who will be free—and through our moral, military, and economic strength, the destruction and complete elimination of false and untruthful philosophies and ideologies which are loose in the world today.

FAITH IN THE UNITED NATIONS

We retain our faith in the United Nations. We believe that it can be made an effective world authority which can prevent aggression if the charter is amended immediately as suggested by the American Legion in November of 1946—to accomplish the following:

1. Removal of the veto power in the two specific instances of matters pertaining to aggression and preparation for aggression.

2. The adoption of the United States proposals for the international control of atomic energy and the establishment of arms quotas, both to be guaranteed through a system of positive international inspection.

3. Establishment of an effective tyranny-proof international police force. This force would consist of two parts, an independent active force to be under the direct control of the Security Council and a reserve force made up of the national contingents of the major powers capable of backing up the active forces when necessary. The result would be that the United Nations, through an effective police force, could enforce its decisions, prevent aggression and the preparation of aggression, and so maintain the peace.

We believe that the American Legion plan for strengthening the United Nations provides the essential basic requirements of, and the first steps toward, true world-wide enforcement of law and order, which is the immediate necessity.

OPPOSES WORLD FEDERATION

The American Legion is opposed to any form of world federation or world government, at this time.

In 1948 the American Legion recommended a mutual self-defense pact composed of the nations of the north Atlantic area. Our suggestion was made fully a year before the North Atlantic Pact was approved by Congress.

As a result of the North Atlantic Pact the nations of western Europe, Canada and the United States are militarily stronger than at any time since World War II. Arms and essential materials are now flowing and must continue to flow to our allies in this area so that the North Atlantic Pact countries will have the necessary equipment and trained troops to make a formidable stand against any aggressor.

We now urge the countries of the North Atlantic Pact to join forces within the United Nations to insist on the amendment of the United Nations Charter to accomplish the objectives of the American Legion plan as stated above. In this way the democratic nations of the west would thereby declare to the world their intention of making the United Nations an effective authority for peace.

RECOVERY PROGRAM ENDORSED

We further urge these same democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Pact to send delegates to a convention to be held soon in the United States to explore the possibilities of the establishment, within the framework of the United Nations, of an association for closer political cooperation among freedom-loving democracies.

To preserve faith of others in our system of freedoms we must continue to help those war-torn nations and people of the world, who will first help themselves, to rebuild their countries and to regain their basic liberties. We therefore urge continuation of the European recovery program as provided for in the present Economic Cooperation Act, which the American Legion was the first Nation-wide organization to endorse. We believe that this program has been administered to the benefit of the American people and that it has accomplished its purpose of rehabilitating the economies of western Europe and has contained Communist expansion in this area. We urge all possible economies in the administration of ECA, so that our own economy will not be jeopardized. We heartily endorse a proposal that a study by a commission be made sufficiently prior to June 1952 so that appropriate recommendations can be made to the Congress and the American people as to what steps, if any, might be necessary after that time to continue economic help to the countries of Europe who have joined forces with us in our fight for freedom.

We should encourage economic, educational and spiritual development in western Germany. This area will again be a critical spot in Europe's development. But Americans must be realistic in their aid and ever watchful in their assistance in eliminating military power in Germany. We must not abandon these people to the Russians, but equally we must avoid the historic danger of strengthening them to a point where they will again menace their neighbors whom they overran in two world wars.

We should support in every way possible the religious minorities in the satellite countries in Europe that are trying to hold the last citadel of freedom in their countries—the right to worship God as they please. These people have seen the state subjugate the church, and then, try to abolish the church. We must support them in their fight to regain freedom of worship.

Some central European problems cannot be solved until the final settlement of the Austrian peace treaty. Many important issues are at stake. Confidence in western Europe and America will be greatly aided by our insistence that the treaty be concluded as soon as possible.

EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN AREA

Americans can view with pride the accomplishments of our helpfulness and aid in the eastern Mediterranean area. Greece would not have a democratic form of government today if it had not been for the bipartisan support of the Truman Doctrine of 1947—which stated that Communist aggression should advance no further in Europe without the United States, through the United Nations, taking notice of, and doing something about, such aggression. America fought Communist aggression in this area, for we wanted the people of the Near East to have a chance to mold a destiny of their choice—and not one dictated to them by Moscow.

We must continue to effectively and affirmatively enlighten the people of Europe and Asia as to the truth of the American way of life in the advantages, both material and spiritual, to be gained by free people operating under democratic processes—where the individual is served by the state without being dependent upon it. Containment of Soviet aggression is not enough. We must go forward to the destruction of the aggressive power of the Soviet police state. Massive propaganda projects must be launched to

take the truth to all corners of the world so that all peoples will have an understanding of the basic issues in this great struggle for freedom's survival.

We believe that good results in this direction have been obtained by the Office of International Information and the United States Information Service. We urge that these two agencies and others operating under the guidance of our State Department continue to take the truth to the far corners of the world. We urge Congress to allot sufficient funds to carry out this important phase of winning the cold war.

AID FOR CHINA AND FORMOSA

The American Legion urges opposition to the expansion of communism in Asia. We propose that our Government extend every reasonable assistance to foster all influences favorable to democracy. We oppose recognition of Communist China.

At the 1949 Philadelphia Convention we urged that our support should be made available to any patriotic groups or organizations of Chinese whose principles and stability are worthy of our confidence and who will vigorously fight communism and outside aggressors to preserve the basic rights and liberties of a free China.

We again say we reject defeatism and abandonment of this area to Communist aggressors. The immediate threat is at Formosa and in the Philippines. We abhor the idea of abandoning the free and independent Government of Formosa. If we are opposed to Communist aggression, and if we are the world's last and greatest protector of human liberties, then certainly we cannot abandon Formosa at such a crucial moment. If we do so, then we are merely borrowing a temporary period of peace until we are forced to face the same issue in another place, which will be just a bit closer to the heart of our national defense structure.

FORMOSAN DEFENSE IMPERATIVE

We believe it is imperative that our Department of Defense appraise the defendability of Formosa at once, with the thought that Formosa be preserved, with our help, as a bastion of freedom and a base for military operations against the Communist aggressors on the mainland of Asia.

We should also aid the Philippine Government in every possible way, to resist the infiltration of Communist aggressors and to maintain a free democratic government.

Because the North Atlantic Pact has been of such immense value and protection to the countries involved and because a similar regional alliance might be a deterrent to Communist expansion in the Pacific and far eastern areas, we again urge our Government to lend its aid in forming a regional alliance under article 51 of the United Nations charter, composed of those countries of the Pacific and far eastern areas, who, through self-help and mutual aid, desire to guarantee their mutual defense and to preserve individual liberties.

The President's point 4 program recommends that Congress provide funds to finance technical, scientific, and managerial knowledge to underdeveloped areas of the world, and also, limited financial assistance for the creation of productive enterprises. The President has requested $45,000,000 to finance the program for the first year.

This plan suggests assistance in many fields and emphasizes technical projects in health, industry, labor, agriculture and scientific research with respect to natural resources in underdeveloped countries showing particular need. The wise and careful administration of such a program bears great possibilities for the development of international understanding and cooperation, and would contribute considerably to the enlargement of world trade.

The American Legion approves, in principle, the President's point 4 program. We urge the full cooperation of our Government with private enterprise in the development of such a program.

MUST STRIVE FOR PEACE

The foregoing should constitute the foreign policy of the United States as visualized by our Commission at this time. The best evaluation of any foreign policy is whether or not it can keep the peace. We know that we cannot have peace by just wishing for it or by negotiating a temporary breathing spell with the Politburo.

We will have peace only after we have accepted and absorbed the fact that we in America must offer the leadership necessary to win this great global conflict of ideas. We must fight the insidious menace of communism and totalitarian aggression with all our might and resources. We must gather to us, as allies, all people who will be free—all who are willing to join with us in this final battle for liberty, justice, and democracy.

And when successful—as we will certainly be—our peace will be built upon the rock of self-reliance of all free people, good will, and international law, internationally enforced. Only then can we openly admit to ourselves and to each other that we have found true peace and real security.

All this is possible if we, as individuals, accept the responsibility to do our share to protect our own liberties. With our trust in God we shall find divine guidance along the rough road that lies ahead. This call for God's help is not to lull the peace-seeking into weakness and compromise. Only in strength of character and arms and purpose, based on Christian principles of justice and righteousness will America be able to offer proper leadership to peace-hungry citizens of the world who starve for God's most cherished gift—human dignity.

Mr. Speaker, indeed there is hope in the expressions that we retain our faith in the United Nations, and that we preserve faith of others in our system of freedoms. It is within the bounds of reason to carefully consider and weigh all possible means and proposals to strengthen the United Nations in the hope for real peace, but in doing so, let us keep the United Nations for what it was sincerely intended. Further, in considering any proposal, it is imperative that America preserve her sovereignty, and that we carefully examine and oppose any theory of world government which would entail the surrender of our national sovereignty.

Letter From Deputy Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Deputy Attorney General Peyton Ford:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This has further reference to your inquiry of June 2, 1950, addressed to the Attorney General, relating to the licensing of Schering Corp.'s patents and the effect on such licensing of sale of the stock in that corporation now held by the Government.

In December 1947, the Department of Justice publicly announced a policy under which many patents held by corporations in which the Government had seized a controlling stock interest would be made available for licensing at reasonable terms, except in some cases where the grant of a license would be prejudicial to the maintenance of competition in the field. Schering Corp. advises that in pursuance of that policy many of its patents have been and are now offered for licensing on reasonable royalty terms to qualified applicants. This offering covers patents owned by Schering in the hormone field as of the end of 1948, including patents which are used in the production of substances now receiving wide attention or being experimentally used in the treatment of rheumatism, arthritis, and other diseases. This policy remains presently in effect. To date, Schering Corp. has issued to 20 American companies, on reasonable royalty terms for the life the pertinent patents, irrevocable licenses to market such hormone substances as progesterone, pregnenolone, estradiol, estradiol benzoate, ethinyl estradiol and other pharmaceuticals. In addition, nine bulk chemical suppliers have been given royalty-free permission to supply the requirements of the drug trade for most of these products. The corporation advises that applications for such licenses are in fact currently being received and acted upon.

It may be noted that Schering Corp. has been a pioneer in the development of many of the pharmaceutical products referred to above. It has, however, been properly cautious with respect to their value in the treatment of specific diseases. In a press release dated May 26, 1950, Francis C. Brown, president of the corporation, stated:

"Schering was the first to introduce pregnenolone to the medical profession. While this drug shows promise for the relief of sufferers from rheumatism and arthritis, it is a cruel deception to hold out any hope that it relieves or influences cancer or that it is a miracle drug."

With reference to the rumors of impending changes in patent policy, these probably arise as a result of the Department's preparations to sell the vested Schering stock. It should be understood that imposing a patent-licensing policy which will be effective after sale is more difficult than maintaining such a policy while the Government owns all of the corporation's stock. This is especially so since the Department of Justice considers it desirable policy for the Government to relinquish as fully as possible its participation in the affairs of vested corporations after the sale of their stock to American buyers. It is the working out of an effective postsale licensing procedure for Schering's patents that is now under consideration. When this has been accomplished the vested shares of Schering Corp. will be registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission and offered at public sale under sealed bids through the medium of a prospectus.

The obligation imposed upon this Department in the exercise of the functions delegated to it under the Trading With the Enemy Act with respect to vested property is that such property shall be "held, used, administered, liquidated, sold, or otherwise dealt with in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States." We are fully aware of our public responsibility and are doing everything possible to resolve the problems involved in a manner calculated to best serve the interests of the United States. This is our primary responsibility in the administration of vested property.

Your interest in the matter is appreciated. The newspaper clipping which you enclosed with your letter is returned herewith, as requested.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
Deputy Attorney General.

The Curtailing of Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Daily Advance of Lynchburg, Va., relative to the order issued by the Postmaster General relative to the curtailing of mail service. I might add that this paper is considered very conservative:

THE POSTAL SERVICE

The United States Post Office Department was founded to provide postal service for the people. It was not expected to make a profit and was expected to be operated at a loss, but not being a business and designed as a Government service of the first importance, it should not be discussed in business terms.

When Postmaster General Donaldson cut home mail deliveries to one a day, he acted as if he were running a business which must show a profit. In attempted refutation of criticism he presented a statement which misrepresents the true nature of the service. For example he showed an operations deficit of over $500,000,000. By striking from this deficit about $300,0 0,000 in costs that are intended to be charged against service rendered, without any revenue of importance, the deficit is more than cut in half. This shows the phony bookkeeping used to support the position of the Postmaster General.

Third- and fourth-class post offices are operated at a considerable loss, if revenue and costs are presented on a business basis. They cannot be operated otherwise. They represent costs over revenue of about $45,000,000. Rural free delivery costs about $75,000,000 and so on with services considered vital and indispensable and to be operated at heavy costs.

The Hoover Commission recommendations called for efficient reorganization of the Post Office Department. Donaldson's only response is to pretend to effect savings by curtailing service. The mail carriers are thereby overworked, the public gets poorer delivery service, the expensively subsidized air mail becomes farcical in its delivery time in many instances and business mail also is delayed to an important extent.

There is a limit on the weight a mail carrier is supposed to carry on his trip. It is obvious that on a heavy day, with more mail than usual, he cannot get the mail delivered in one delivery. And substitute carriers, to help the regular carrier, are never sufficiently available under the new Donaldson system.

The present international crisis makes prompt mail delivery more important than ever. It makes more efficient service, prompter deliveries, mandatory, else there will come a situation which will force drastic action on the part of the Congress.

Congress will reverse the Donaldson action if the public makes itself heard. Congress might even, if moved to a thorough investigation, remove Donaldson. He plainly is not providing the service the Post Office Department is supposed to provide; he went over the heads of his superiors, the Congress, to curtail service; his rise in the Department to his present position can be associated with politics that refute largely the somewhat appealing story of his rise from mail carrier to Postmaster General.

As more and more thousands of men go into uniform, are away from home, there is going to be a big increase in letter mail. Some of that mail is going to be delayed, under the present restricted delivery service. There is going to be a howl that will get action from the Congress. It would be better if the public registered its complaints now, with Senators and Congressmen, to get full service restored before its need becomes more critical.

The Fruits of the New Deal in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion one of the most challenging political addresses that has come to my attention to date during this campaign year is that of the Honorable James M. Noland, a district judge of Colorado, which address was made before the Young Democrats' Organization of Colorado at their annual convention. The Young Democrats of Colorado led off, as usual, in our State in the beginning of campaign matters for this election year. Judge Noland in his talk not only treats of the political situation as it exists in Colorado, but he also enters into a very understanding dissertation on political matters in the Nation. Because he has set forth in such an admirable manner the political challenges of the hour and in a large measure expresses my personal feelings on some of the various questions which are perplexing us, I desire to have the address printed in the RECORD so that any others desiring to do so may benefit from the thoughts expressed by this talented and capable Democratic leader of Colorado:

ADDRESS OF JUDGE JAMES M. NOLAND BEFORE STATE CONVENTION OF COLORADO YOUNG DEMOCRATS, GUNNISON, JUNE 17, 1950

The words of the late great Edward P. Costigan, uttered in 1931, are as applicable to our present national situation as they were to that of those black depression days. Then he said, "in scientific and material development the advances of the last century outdistance imagination. Nevertheless, the general welfare continuously eludes us. If the ideal of the fathers had been that the many are to be impoverished while the few are to have and to hold then certain present-day economic conditions would not be so surprising. Happily many descendants of the fathers have reached the goal of plenty. But faced by the Jeffersonian dream of a country of equal and exact justice to all and of a land where none was to be excessively rich and none were to be poor, we are conscious of our fundamental national failure." Senator Costigan continued by quoting Thomas Paine, "When it shall be said in any country in the world, 'my poor are happy; neither ignorance nor distress is to be found among them; my jails are empty of prisoners, my streets of beggars; the aged are not in want, the taxes are not oppressive; the natural world is my friend because it is the friend of happiness'; when these things can be said, then may that country boast of its constitution and government."

We are members of a political party which has adopted that creed for its own; you, with the vitality, the inspiration and imagination of youth, have been constantly breathing into a sometimes ailing, a sometimes wavering patient that energy and sustenance, that courage and conviction so absolutely essential to our continued existence as the party of Jefferson, of Wilson, of Costigan, of Franklin Roosevelt, of Harry S. Truman—of the once forgotten men of the fields, the marketplaces, and the back streets.

We witnessed during that period when the strong voice of Senator Costigan was being heard, a virtual social and economic revolution in this country—a bloodless one, to be sure, but nonetheless as far-reaching and decisive as any that ever accompanied the clashing of swords. It marked what we had hoped was the beginning of a new era—the forgotten man came into his own—the general welfare became the paramount interest of a government which had been entrusted into the hands of the Democratic Party.

Let us review briefly just a few of the steps of that revolution.

Rural electrification came into being. It was an unheard of thing. Yea, it was socialistic. But it brought light and power—light and power both literally and figuratively to one of America's forgotten citizenry. For generations the men who tilled the soil had had to live under the most antiquated conditions. They were the very root of the American economic system, for they produced from Mother Earth the food for our people, and the raw materials for our factories. Yet our highly vaunted capitalistic system had not found it profitable to supply those millions of rural families with the comforts, necessities and conveniences enjoyed by the more fortunate urbanites. A liberalized Democratic Party, one unafraid to break with hide-bound precedent, found a way to raise in a few short years the living standards of a great class whose neglect had so long been a government scandal. Electric power and energy was brought to the living rooms and the milking sheds of 10,000,000 rural residents.

Within our own generation the total breakdown of an outmoded economic system had left 10,000,000 American citizens unemployed, 30,000,000 (approximately one-fourth our population) on the verge of want. An opposition administration had stumbled helplessly in the darkness, blinded by its old fetish of concentrated wealth, afraid to break with its tradition. Its advice was, Let us be calm and this shall pass. Hunger and wretchedness cannot remain calm, however, and it didn't pass until an enlightened, courageous party gave new meaning to the words, "We, the people of the United States * * * in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, promote the general welfare * * * and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity * * *."

That the hungry might be fed, that the naked might be clothed, that the jobless might have work, that the breaking American homes might be knit together again, our party conceived it to be the duty of the Nation—of those who were still able to pay taxes—to support programs of direct relief, WPA, PWA, and the like. Do you remember the hue and cry, even in the face of that terrible national crisis? Socialism, they screamed—methinks the sound of the voices that cried that word has a familiar ring.

Then it wasn't long ago when this land of ours was literally cluttered with poorhouses. Sometimes we eased our collective conscience by calling them county farms. They were designed as the final haven for the poverty-

stricken, disease-ridden, physically broken oldsters of our society—the human machines who were worn out and useless to the further needs of our great industrial Nation. Numerous as they were, there were still not enough of these institutions to take care of all the human junk, so the rest were left to the big-city garbage cans and the street-corner panhandling. Again, a great political party, condemning man's inhumanity to man, struck with the might and strength that is born of a just cause, and there came into being unemployment compensation, social security, old-age pensions, and their related programs, all designed toward establishing a decent, comfortable, respectable place in the American social and economic structure, and a dignified refuge for those whose unfortunate lot would eventually become that of sickness, poverty, and the ravages of old age. once more from the plush-bottomed chairs of the Nation was raised the old familiar cry.

We could go on and on with a proud recitation of those successful campaigns of the New Deal revolution—it would include water and power conservation, public lands reclamation and development, collective bargaining for capital and labor, banking security, home owners' loans, adequate housing, public health and sanitation—each and every one a new and liberal conception of the promotion of the general welfare of our people. Every step in that revolution was bitterly fought. Never a single one of those battles was won without the accompanying chant of the reactionary mourners, consisting principally of those who saw evilly acquired power and wealth slipping from their ruggedly individualistic hands. Each new victory for the people's forces was another toll of the bell that was sounding the death knell of a system which had kept millions of America's peoples for generations economically enslaved. Lives were given by our forces, and not the least of those were America's Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Colorado's Edward Prentis Costigan. Yet, bitter as that fighting was, there is the voice in America today that would have the courage to advocate the tearing down of the rural electric lines, the abolition of our social-security system, the denial of the right of labor to arbitrate, the blasting of the dams, the loosing of the rivers, the return of reclaimed millions of acres to dust bowls, the restoration of the poorhouses?

I come now to the purpose of these recitations. We have heard from the cradle the adage "History repeats itself," and there is strong evidence at hand to sustain that statement today. We are presently in what may be called the second phase of the bloodless revolution of which I have spoken. This time we are beset with opposition from both within and without. The aims and objects of those opponents are entirely different, and knowingly they would brook no alliance one with the other, but strangely, dangerously, they are a common threat to our existing democratic institutions. Americans, regardless of partisan political views are as one in their determination to stop the Communist threat. We are prone to forget, I am afraid, the insidious methods of the Communist, bent on our destruction. He may yet attack with force, but the history of his operations has been marked by another type of attack. He believes that a house divided against itself cannot stand, and proceeds accordingly. He implants jealousy, hatred, envy, and suspicion in his intended victim, then waits for the victim to destroy himself. There are indications that he is having some measure of success in our present national trends.

It is time that free Americans should rise to the defense of that freedom which can exist only in a democracy. On the military front we are arming defensively (and may God give us the courage and foresight to continue to do so), against the threat of powerful forces bent on the destruction of all democratic government. We have wisely and justly made it our policy that there shall be no aggression on our part, and no offense until it shall become necessary as a defense.

But there is another front on which we had better be taking the offensive, and soon. It is time, it is past time, that we put a stop to the demagogery that is going on in high places in this Government, and on our streets, and in our drawing rooms as well. It is something that follows the Communist pattern of infiltration through distrust and suspicion, and can well become as great a threat to democratic government as would military force from the outside. In high places it is typified by the performance of a notorious character from one of the great States of this Union. Clothed always with the immunity that he usurps from his position in the United States Senate, he mouths invectiveness, hatred, false suspicion indiscriminately among his fellow Americans. Does anyone in this room, does any thoughtful American believe for one moment that JOE MCCARTHY is hunting Communists? If it were so, he would have the help and encouragement of all of us. But no; Senator MCCARTHY is one of those die-hard mourners whom I have already mentioned. He sloshes through the mud and muck of the unkept grave of reaction and attempts to raise therefrom the ghost of that old character. It is the same ghost whose chains clanked with every advance of the New Deal, but it wears new robes fashioned by the adroit hands of the Senator from Wisconsin. Whereas it used to be a socialistic ghost, it is now a communistic one, and it is brought forth from the grave to frighten the people, this time from the Fair Deal and the social and economic advances which are being born of it. Americans who have the courage and intelligence to keep fighting the good fight for the promotion of the general welfare of our people and of all the peoples of the earth must now risk the slander and abuse of him and other cowards of his ilk who shield themselves behind a screen that was never created for any such purpose. And it is not to the credit of some of his fellow Senators who sit silently by, biding their cowardly time to speak up with either an "I told you so," or "I had nothing to do with it," depending upon the directions which the political winds may ultimately take. It is to the everlasting credit of a great woman Senator and American, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and a few brave and conscientious Members of the opposition party, that they should have said these things in a much abler way than can I. It would seem appropriate to hear a little more from the Democratic side of that Chamber.

And we need give our attention to similar lesser but still effective performances in places not so high. It seems to have become the vogue in these times of stress to label liberal thought with varying shades of one of the primary colors now in great disrepute. There are too many good Americans who are being hoodwinked by that practice which again is inspired by the bogeyman tactics of the old mourners. More and more often of late the cry that challenges liberal thought and action, foreign and irreconcilable as it may be to communism, is "Red; Red." It is used, of course, because it is guaranteed to create fright and panic. The shade depends upon the degree of liberality in its relation to our past and now outmoded theory of the real function of government. For instance, if rural electrification were now being proposed for the first time under the Fair Deal, it would probably rate pink, whereas reclamation might get into the salmon shade. And surely Abraham Lincoln's program for the abolition of slavery would be hailed a very brilliant red.

We Democrats and Republicans alike need to reappraise our Americanism, and take account of the true import of the liberties and the freedom which we guaranteed ourselves by our own Constitution. Our system envisages the right to espouse those things which within the limits of that Constitution, the greatest, most perfect ever devised by men, we deem will best promote equal and exact justice for all. When we reach that stage where we indiscriminately label those who disagree with us in principle or politics as adherents of a foreign concept of government then we are creating in our people the distrust, the jealousy and hatreds which of themselves can well destroy democracy. And we thus play into the hands of communism.

This very organization which I have the honor of now addressing has itself been a victim of those tactics. One of your members, whose strong liberal voice will be heard and heeded in the Senate of the United States ere another year shall have passed, knows the cruelty, the sting and the injustice of that sort of attack, and will, as the coming campaign progresses, no doubt become a further target for it. The mourners will find, though, that John Carroll does not cringe in the presence of ghosts.

It behooves you, the younger members of America's greatest political party to take the lead in combating these modernized methods of attack on our constitutional rights of freedom of thought and freedom of action. There are many, many battles yet to be fought before we shall have attained our ultimate goal of equal and exact justice to all. There are still great groups of our people who are being denied the right of suffrage, and the right to attend free American schools on a basis of equality with others whose rights appear to be based on some chimerical superiority of color, blood, or nativity—certainly not on the constitutional guaranties bequeathed us by our founding fathers. There are still countless American citizens who have no conception of the joy of breathing clean air, of drinking pure water, of seeing any horizon beyond their own squalid walls; whose children, our future citizens, know only an America bounded by the alleys in their dingy neighborhoods. There are yet acres to be reclaimed, rivers to be dammed—there is water to be brought to parched farm lands, there are harbors to be dredged, schools and hospitals to be built. And even as evidenced by the wails of the mourners today, each of those battles will be desperately fought. The McCarthys and the Tafts, with their assembled horde of ghosts will continue to rattle the chains and play bogeyman. We will hear repeated again and again the mourners chant of "Welfare State," "Communism," "Socialism," "Red," "Pink,"—that is, we will hear it until a fully enlightened and thoroughly disgusted America shall rise in its wrath, and say to these men, as did Senator SMITH, "We have heard enough." And when that time comes, we shall turn fully to the final task of establishing justice and promoting the general welfare, according to the concepts of those who gave birth to this Nation.

An Open Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Le Roy (N. Y.) Gazette-News of August 3, 1950:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President, United States of America,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You are the executive head of what is perhaps the leading nation of the world today. I am the editor of a little country weekly newspaper that has been published in the village of Le Roy, N. Y., for 134 years. We are both citizens of this Nation—a nation which guarantees to us freedom of speech and permits the humblest citizen to express his thoughts to the man holding the highest honor within the gift of his fellow citizens.

By some turn of the dice along the pathway of mankind in these United States of America you became alined with the Democratic Party and I became a Republican. As such we may honestly have divergence of thought as to the best policies for the conduct of our national affairs. That is, we may have these differences of opinion in normal times. But, Mr. President, as good Americans and patriotic citizens, we cannot allow ourselves any difference in thinking when grave danger menaces our Nation.

We are involved in a war in Korea and every hour American boys—boys who might be your sons or mine—are giving their lives far away from home and loved ones, to uphold the Stars and Stripes under which you and I had the great good fortune to be born, and to have lived for many years with greater freedom, larger opportunities, and more comforts than are enjoyed in any other land we know. I have every confidence of ultimate victory in Korea but I am sobered and tremendously concerned in the connection between Korea and a greater war that looms, with Christian civilization and communism as the opposing forces.

We must not only win the war in Korea but we must, along with associated nations, prepare for a much more devastating war possible at some time in the future.

It is because of this, Mr. President, I beg of you to firmly, squarely, courageously, and promptly meet the issue that confronts us, and use the authority you possess to conscript not only the fighting men but capital and labor as well, to win the war in Korea and prepare for the war that may come. I know there is the temptation to you and to Members of Congress as well to consider political factors and to temper your acts in the light of the coming election. God forbid that you or any Congressman yield to this temptation. Our boys are dying on the hills of Korea and a slinking enemy in Europe is awaiting the opportune time to pounce.

The young men that are being conscripted into the Armed Forces have no choice in the matter. They must go, accept the prescribed wage, eat the war rations however good or bad they may be, and face the bullets, any one of which may have their names on it. You fought in World War I. Tell me, if you will, if there be any justification or excuse for permitting capital, as represented in manufacturing necessary for the prosecution of war, or allowing those producing and processing the necessary food, and the labor involved in both, to gain profits beyond those common before war started in Korea?

This is not a battle to be fought by the soldiers alone. It is a battle for all of us. Let us face it as Americans all, and not as profiteers, hoarders, or politicians.

The Nation as a whole today—the folks back home—find it difficult to comprehend the thinking, or absence of clarity in thinking, that has been so alarmingly revealed in the Korean situation. If those in whom you manifested confidence have not measured up to the needs of the hour and the place we occupy in international affairs, it involves a correction you as our leader must promptly make.

I appreciate, President Truman, that you or no other one man can contain within a single mind all of the factors relevant to the present situation. You have delegated much of this to others, but the great decisions must be made by you. It is difficult for me to accept your expressed thought there is no need at the present time for regulating much of anything or placing the Nation on a war basis. This, in my humble opinion, indicates you are being ill advised or else you are unwilling to accept your responsibility as President and face the most important issue within your life.

Not hours, Mr. President, but minutes are wasting. Despite grim courage and heroic valor, our men, greatly outnumbered and lacking in necessary equipment which we have failed to make available to them, are foot by foot being forced into a small perimeter in the southeast corner of Korea. Before them death is riding rampant; behind them there hovers a Dunquerque. Rome burned while Nero fiddled. God alone knows what is going to happen to our boys in Korea and to us as a Nation if you fail to act and act immediately, to place every resource of our Nation on a war basis.

As one who is willing to make any sacrifice necessary to bring victory in the war in Korea, and to prepare for like success in a possible war that will determine history for centuries ahead, I pledge you my efforts and pray God to give you the wisdom and Christian courage to measure up to the challenge of the hour in your great responsibility as President of our Nation.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD M. PERKINS.

Daniel Simon Building, Denver, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, my State of Colorado is rich in cultural and charitable institutions. The climate of my State has always been ideal for the treatment of various physical ailments, some of which fail to respond in other sections of the country. One of the best known curative institutions in the State of Colorado is the National Home for Jewish Children, situated in Denver. Recently delegates from many localities gathered in that city to dedicate an addition to this hospital—a wing for asthmatic children, established in the memory of one of our boys who died in World War II, Paratrooper Daniel L. Simon.

At this dedication, the principal address was prepared by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein. In this address, he brought into bold relief the heroic contributions of another outstanding Colorado soldier who gave his life in the last war, Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD General Klein's address, preceded by the introductory remarks of Mr. Harry Pells, a well-known citizen of Denver:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MR. HARRY PELLS

It is a distinct honor to have been selected to introduce my dear friend, Gen. Julius Klein, to you, and I am grateful.

Since, due to aggravated international conditions, General Klein cannot be here in person, he prepared a speech and sent it to Dr. Birnbaum, and I have been given the honor of reading it to you. Before I do so, I would like to tell you something about General Klein. He is a native of Chicago, a former newspaperman, and head of a Nation-wide public relations business. He is a veteran of World Wars I and II, served in the Illinois National Guard for many years, and with this outfit went into active Federal service in June of 1941. He served with distinction for over 5 years and was appointed special assistant to the Secretary of War in 1946. He spent over 3 of the 5 years in the Pacific area in command of various combat troops. He was awarded the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, and the Soldiers' Medal, and received decorations from foreign governments.

In my opinion, next to the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Soldiers' Medal for Heroism is the highest reward that one could receive, and General Klein was awarded this medal for risking his life to save the lives of various military personnel when a terrific explosion wrecked the docks and ships and part of the base at a port in New Caledonia, where he was stationed.

General Klein is past national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, and, in this capacity, not only furnished our organization with outstanding leadership, but represented other Jewish organizations as our national leader. He had a great part in bringing about the recognition of the new State of Israel by our Government. We can all be proud of Gen. Julius Klein as a great American, a great Jewish leader, a statesman, and a soldier.

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN, COMMANDING GENERAL, ONE HUNDRED AND NINTH AAA BRIGADE, AND PAST NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS—NATIONAL HOME FOR JEWISH CHILDREN, DENVER, COLO., JULY 23, 1950

I wish to thank your board of trustees for bestowing upon me the honor and granting me the privilege of addressing you on this occasion which is another important milestone in the splendid history of a great institution.

My words are uttered in humility, for I have great respect for those who have dedicated their lives—like Mrs. Lorber, Mrs. Williams, and others—to something about which I learned in my father's home—to Ze'dokoh, to charity.

I am humble, too, because in my mind your city will always be identified with a great hero and soldier, my comrade-in-arms, the late Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose, who gave his life for his country, so that you and I may live * * * and so that you can bring health and happiness to the unfortunate children to whom fate has been unkind.

General Rose was a brilliant military leader of great courage. Since receiving the invitation to speak here I have found out about the personal life of Daniel L. Simon, and I am glad to pay tribute with all of you here assembled to his glorious past. Of two things I am sure, however, that he, too, must have had courage, for it is the prerequisite of a paratrooper. And he comes from a fine, spiritual family, since they thought of keeping his name alive not through monuments of marble and stone, but through the erection of a building dedicated to helping the unfortunate children of our fellow men.

May I compliment all those responsible for the planning and erection of the Daniel L. Simon Building? I know that the families and the children who will benefit from it will bless you all.

You have taken the name of a soldier and given it to a building—the name of a soldier who died in a war which ended but a bare 5 years ago—and today the world is holding its breath and asking whether we are on the threshold, or perhaps even across the threshold, of the next conflagration.

As I thought about this talk and wondered what I might say to you, my mind went back to a few years ago when I had the privilege of commanding combat troops and when it was always my sad duty to officiate or be present at the last rites of some of my boys. I've seen boys who died because in this twentieth century of ours man has not yet learned the art of living peacefully with his fellow man. I've seen boys die—boys like Danny Simon—because there was a dictator who dreamed of conquering the world, and I regret to say that the end of mass slaughter will not even be in sight as long as other dictators can keep large masses of people enslaved. For people raised and educated in the democratic tradition there is no difference between the dictatorship of Hitler and his murderous henchmen and Stalin and his men of the Kremlin.

I spoke a moment ago about some of my boys who gave of themselves to the last ounce of devotion, and I recall the vows at their graves—the promises to fight, and work, once the shooting was over, to make this little earth a better place to live in.

Some have forgotten those vows and promises. It is good, therefore, to see that here in Denver some have remembered.

Frankly speaking, when I first heard from Dr. Birnbaum, inviting me to speak, I thought of this institution as a place, a hospital for asthmatic children. No more, no less. What was the image I had?

Rows on rows of beds. Doctors and nurses working quietly, examining, ministering to children, children in the throes of asthmatic attacks, struggling, fighting for breath, eyes bloodshot and glassy, blue lips, and faces bathed in clammy perspiration.

That's what I visualized. A place of sadness and sorrow. But there is laughter here and joy, and you're not only healing the bodies that are sick, but also the souls, for your patients' sickness has emotional effects too.

For a man who has seen as much of war and destruction as I have, and who at the moment must hold himself in readiness to go back to war again, the thing about your institution which strikes and impresses me most is its constructive contribution.

I say my thoughts went back to the days of fighting in the Pacific, and they came to rest when the name of my best buddy came to mind, Father Lynch was his name, a Catholic chaplain who didn't return and who, through his action, taught me more about real tolerance and understanding for my fellow human beings of different faiths than all I could learn by reading the books and pamphlets of our tolerance-preaching organizations.

The scientists tell us there is no Aryan race, there is no blueblood. We know they are right, but it was in the field of battle that the American GI discovered the evidence of it and it wasn't done with microscopes and test tubes. The whining bullets were a factor, and when they came over we all behaved alike, officers and men, Negroes and whites, Protestants, Jews, and Catholics—all of us.

For us, of the minorities, there were no quotas there. The enemy didn't say only 5 percent of America's population is Jewish, so we will kill a proportionate number of Jews. To them we were all Americans—enemies we were, better dead than alive. And they did not discriminate. It is for that reason—and without reference to the Bill of Rights—that we demand the end of quotas in the colleges for any person who is an American. It is for that reason that we, as members of a minority group, must continue the fight against discrimination.

This building will be dedicated to life but it bears the name of a man who gave up his life. I say to you, give that name meaning. Danny Simon died in a war against nazism and fascism which ended less than 5 years ago, but we are so preoccupied with the new menace that the Nazi beast is rising again and nothing is being done to stop it from growing.

In Danny Simon's name, I say, let us be vigilant.

At the outset I spoke of Ze'dokoh, the Hebrew word generally translated as charity. Let me end with that word too. It's a beautiful word, because it also means justice and righteousness. It ties together the religious, social, and ethical concepts which are the basis for decent human relations. It applies to all—to the rich and the poor. To those who can and do give to the home as much as to those who receive from the home.

Ze'dokoh is a commandment, for it is written in the Good Book "Thou shalt open wide thy hand unto thy brother—and to the poor and needy in the land."

Through your devotion to the National Home for Jewish Children, and through your work you are fulfilling God's commandment. Ladies and gentlemen, I know I find myself in good company. I congratulate you on your accomplishment and wish you continued success for the future.

Permit me again to express my deep appreciation for the honor you conferred on me by asking me to help you dedicate this beautiful institution. I cannot conclude my remarks without a personal tribute to one of the fine, great leaders in your community, my old comrade, Harry Pells, whose name and contribution to everything that is good have gone far beyond the borders of your magnificent city.

Let us hope and pray that we shall be privileged to meet again here in peace and contentment. And now, as an old soldier, I would like to salute the memory of Private Simon, who symbolizes everything that is good and sacred in America. Private Simon—and all our comrades—we shall try to show ourselves worthy of your sacrifice. This new home, dedicated to children, is a worthy part of our purpose and intention to carry on for a better world and future for our children. I thank you.

Ten Million Dollars to Douglas County in Federal Aids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, to give all people an insight of just how a Congressman can be of help to the folks back home by being on the job, I wish to have printed in the official RECORD a report to the people to this effect. I propose to do this county by county for each of the 14 counties in my district.

The Federal-aid programs outlined below are all sound and needed. I supported all of these aids and had a direct part in formulating laws in Congress which outline these Federal aids for the people back home. All of these aids were drawn up and passed into law during my term in Congress.

On each of these Federal-aid programs I appeared before the proper committee and helped draw up the bills which are now law. After they became law I saw to it that each county back home got its fair share. Many of the applications for these aids were handled through my office. When many of the applications were slow in being approved, as soon as my office was contacted I got positive action.

Douglas County in the last 8 years received in Federal aids and offices more per capita of population than any county its size. Even after the war, when there was a retrenchment of Federal employees and bureaus, Douglas County was not among them. In fact, Douglas County gained two new bureaus after the war—the Farmers Home Administration office and a branch of the Veterans' Administration office. Both of these were established through my efforts.

My office has always been a clearing house for all these projects. When not handled properly, your Congressman was the first to hear about it. When slow in being approved, your Congressman was the first to hear about it. When any information was desired, your Congressman has always supplied that information. When push was needed to speed approval, your Congressman was always on the job to give it a push. It has never been necessary during my tenure in Congress for any county, city, or town to send a representative to Washington. All they had to do was to contact me by mail or phone and they get action at once.

In my term as a Member of Congress I receive numerous invitations to travel all over the world at Government expense. I am one of the very few who refused. I turned all of them down. I stayed on the job and worked on the job to get things done. It has never been necessary to censor me to devote full time to my job, because I was always on the job 12 to 16 hours a day. I never took 3 months off from my public job to go around campaigning as some candidates for Congress do. My services are always available. That is why Douglas County got so much with so little effort. Douglas County would not be in very good shape today without those Federal aids.

Here is how my being on the job has brought huge dividends to the folks in Douglas County. Here is a list of projects and the amount of Federal money for each coming into Douglas County during my term in Congress.

SUPERIOR HARBOR

During my term in Congress, maintenance work has been done on Superior

Harbor in the amount of $920,901, and the estimated expenditure in the present appropriation bill for 1951 is $168,000 for maintenance work on Superior Harbor. Four thousand five hundred dollars, as a result of a bill by me, will be spent before 1951 for a new survey of needed improvements in the Superior Harbor. Total for Superior Harbor alone during O'KONSKI's term—$1,093,421.

I have introduced and secured the passage of a resolution for the investigation of the need for further new work on Superior Harbor. A public hearing has already been held. The Army engineers advise me that their report will be completed in 1952—following which I will see, as I did in the past, that it gets an appropriation for the new work needed. I have never been turned down on these projects. That in itself is quite a record. It is to be noted that during my term Superior Harbor got more funds than any other harbor in the State of Wisconsin.

PUBLIC HOUSING FOR SUPERIOR

Public housing has gone over well in Superior. In 1944, 60 temporary dwellings at Bayview Courts were constructed at a cost of $205,450. On April 25, 1950, $130,000 was approved for planning of 400 housing units in Superior. If accepted, this will bring $4,000,000 to Superior: 200 units to be constructed in 1950 and 200 units to be constructed in 1951. Total Federal money to Superior for public housing during O'KONSKI's term in Congress—$4,335,405. No city in Wisconsin, the size of Superior, can compare to what Superior received during my term in Congress for housing.

AIRPORT AND SEWAGE FACILITIES

Fifteen thousand dollars has been advanced to the city of Superior for the planning of its airport, and $19,000 has been advanced to the city of Superior for sewage facilities planning. The city of Superior, or Douglas County, can get as much as $395,000 from the Federal Government to complete up to a class III airport if it decides to sponsor same on a Federal, State, and local matching basis. Thirty-one thousand dollars are presently programed for this Superior airport. The next step is up to Superior or Douglas County. The Federal money is available. Total for Superior Airport already given, programed, or waiting, $460,000, during O'KONSKI's term as Congressman.

FEDERAL ROAD AIDS FOR DOUGLAS COUNTY

The postwar Federal Road Aid Act was first passed in 1944 when I was a member of what is now the Public Works Committee. I had a direct hand in drafting this legislation. The distribution of money on a mileage basis rather than a population basis was a hard-fought victory for Members of Congress like myself from rural areas who put up the fight for this provision. Douglas County benefited much from this provision in the law. Read here what this Federal aid has brought to Douglas County.

Douglas County, Wis., Federal aid received for primary, secondary, and urban road systems from 1944 to May 1, 1950

PRIMARY

Route No.	Description of termini	Character of work	Federal funds received	Length in miles	Status
US 53	From Washburn County line north (Minong-Gordon)	Grade and drain	$84,000.00	6.9	Completed.
Do	do	2-lane high-type pavement	91,000.00	7.1	Do.
US 53 and 2	From 53d Ave. East in Superior southeast to junction USH-53 and 2 (Rockmont-Superior).	Grade and drain	108,000.00	7.7	Progress only.
Do	From 50th Ave E in Superior southeast to junction 53 and 2 (Rockmont-Superior).	2-lane high-type pavement	224,000.00	8.0	Do.
State 35	From north limits Pattison State Park north 3.966 miles (Manitou Falls-Superior).	Grade, drain, and bridge	188,580.48	4.0	Completed.
Do	From north line Pattison State Park north 4.1 miles and from CTH A north to south limits Superior (Manitou Falls-Superior).	2-lane high-type pavement, including grading and draining of approximately 2 miles adjacent to city of Superior.	162,000.00	5.8	Do.
	Douglas County Federal money received for primary roads, 1944-50.		857,580.48	39.5	

SECONDARY

Co. H	From approximately 3½ miles north of USH 2 northerly (Brule-STH-13).	Sand-gravel ballast, intermediate-type surface course	$20,000.00	3.5	Under way.
Do	From junction with STH-13, 4 miles north of Maple St. 2 miles (Maple-STH-13).	Sand-base and gravel-base course	6,500.00	2.0	Completed.
Co. F	From junction STH-13, 4 miles north of Maple south 2 miles (Maple-STH-13).	Construct 2-lane low-type bituminous-surface course	1,455.37	2.0	Do.
Co. K	From 3½ miles west of Hines south and west to junction with CTH-B (CTH-B-South Range).	Sand-base and bituminous-treated gravel-surface course	6,762.65	1.5	Do.
Co. A	From junction with CTH-B, 2.5 miles east of Pattison State Park south 3.490 miles (Solon Springs-Superior).	Sand-base and gravel-base course	9,200.00	3.5	Do.
Do	From west limits Solon Springs west 2.992 miles (Solon Springs-Superior).	Sand-base, 2-lane gravel and low-type bituminous treatment.	11,440.54	3.0	Do.
Do	From junction with CTH-B, 2.5 miles east of Pattison State Park south—3.490 miles (Solon Springs-Superior).	Construct 2-lane low-type bituminous surface course	3,556.53	3.5	Do.
Co. C	From Borea southwesterly 2 miles (Borea-Dewey)	Sand-base and gravel-base course	8,500.00	2.0	Do.
Do	From Borea southwesterly 2 miles (Minnesota-Dewey-STH-35).	Construct 2-lane low-type bituminous surface course	1,843.19	2.0	Do.
Do	From 1 mile west of Dewey easterly 2½ miles (Minnesota-Dewey-STH-35).	Sand-base and bituminous-treated gravel surface course	14,287.59	2.5	Do.
Co. A	From 6.5 miles east of Solon Springs east 3 miles (Solon Springs-C. Co. Line).	Construct 2-lane bituminous-treated soil surface course	4,546.96	3.2	Do.
Do	From STH-27 westerly (Solon Springs-E Co. line)	Construct bituminous-treated soil surface course	6,225.00	2.9	Under way.
Co. C	From CTH-K at south range west 4 miles to CTH-A (junction CTH-A-junction CTH-K).	Sand-base, 2-lane gravel and low-type bituminous treatment.	18,649.32	3.9	Completed.
Co. B	Scattered locations between CTH-A and village of Lake Nebagamon (Pattison State Park-Lake Nebagamon).	Sand-base and gravel-base course	14,326.08	9.2	Do
Do	do	Construct 2-lane low-type bituminous surface course	7,006.10	9.2	Do.
Do	From approx. 0.8 mile East of CTH-A easterly 8.099 miles (CTH-A-Hawthorne).	Sand-base and bituminous-treated gravel surface course	29,785.15	8.1	Do.
Co. T	From USH-53 at Wascott West 5 miles (Dairyland-Wascott).	Construct 2-lane bituminous-treated soil surface course	7,001.53	4.9	Do.
Do	From 5 miles West of Wascott westerly (Dairyland-Wascott).	Construct bituminous-treated soil surface course	6,400.00	3.0	Progress only.
	Douglas County Federal money received for secondary roads, 1944-50.		177,486.01	69.9	

Douglas County, Wis., Federal aid received for primary, secondary, and urban road systems from 1944 to May 1, 1950—Continued

URBAN

Route No.	Description of termini	Character of work	Federal funds received	Length in miles	Status
US 2 and 53	City of Superior on 2d St. between 23d Ave. East and 43d Ave. East except the N. P. R. R. o'head (Superior-Solon Springs).	4-lane multiple span bridge approximately 254 ft. over all; grade, drain and high-type pavement—44 and 56 ft. between curbs.	$288,285.69	1.7	Completed.
Do	City of Superior on East 2d St., between 6th Ave. East and 23d Ave. East.	Grade, drain and high-type pavement—56 ft. between curbs.	158,525.34	1.4	Do.
Do	City of Superior on East 2d St. between 43d Ave. East and 50th Ave. East (Bluff Creek-Subway Apprs.).	Grade, drain and high-type pavement—36 feet between curbs.	77,000.00	.7	Under way.
Do	City of Superior on East 2d St. approximately 450 feet east of 44th Ave. East (Northwestern Coal Ry. subway).	7-span railway trestle, concrete main span piers, timber-pile abutments and intermediate piers, timber and steel superstructure approximately 128 feet over all.	22,000.00	----------	Do.
Do	City of Superior-relocation between Belknap St., Hill Ave intersection and 4th Ave. East 2d St. intersection and on East 2d St. to near 6th Ave. East (Belknap extended).	Grade, drain and high-type pavement—56 feet between curbs.	75,000.00	.7	Progress only.
Do	City of Superior-Belknap St. extending crossing with C. St. P. M. & O. R. R. at East 6th St. (Belknap St. crossing signal).	Install crossing signal	10,300.00	----------	Do.
	Douglas County Federal money received for urban roads (1943-50).		631,111.03	4.5	
	Grand total for all roads, Federal money received by Douglas County (1944-50) during O'KONSKI's term as Congressman.		1,666,177.52	(1)	

[1] 113.9 miles of roads in Douglas County improved.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

Electrification of farms and small towns has been among my chief interests as a Member of Congress. Every REA bill got my full interest and complete backing. I fought every attempt to reduce or slow down the REA program. I was always on the side of those who fought valiantly for full-speed ahead on this program. As a result of this effort the head of the Lakes Cooperative Electric Association at Superior received six loans totaling $731,000 for distribution and lines. This is almost three-quarters of a million dollars to the Superior REA during my term in Congress. Not only did I work for appropriations for the REA but many of the applications for these loans I had a direct hand in getting approved. So add $731,000 to benefits received by Douglas County folks for REA during my term in Congress. Ask the REA officials of the head of the Lakes Co-op office how willingly and effectively I have been of service to them.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The Farmers Home Administration to help needy and marginal farms, to encourage farmers, has been a pet hobby of mine while in Congress. No agency in our Government is more justified in its existence. Funds for this work were always my deep concern. Being a farmer by background, I understand their problems. My first 18 years were spent on a family-owned farm which reared a family of 10 children.

FHA leaders and officers will verify how I have sold its existence to fellow Members of Congress. It was this kind of selling to city Congressmen that kept the program going. Drought loans alone as the result of my bill, the first so introduced, brought $60,000 for farmers stricken by the dought disaster. During my term in Congress, FHA loans to Douglas County farmers exceed the $500,000 mark. So check up another half million dollars in direct help by the Federal Government to Douglas County folks during my term in Congress. Besides this, I was directly responsible for the establishment of an FHA office in Superior to better aid Douglas County farm folks. The salaries of the Superior FHA employees are not included in the abovementioned amount.

It should be mentioned here that when legislation was passed to help drought-stricken farms with soft loans, Douglas County and other northern Wisconsin farmers were the first designated by Federal authorities as a disaster area and were, therefore, the first in the Nation to receive this aid. This was directly handled by my office upon application of a county agent.

RIVER FLOOD CONTROL IN DOUGLAS COUNTY

During my term in Congress I have introduced bills calling for War Department Corps of Engineers surveys of every river and stream in Douglas County flowing into Lake Superior or the St. Croix system. The Amnicon, Poplar, Tamarack, Black, and every other major river or stream in Douglas County flowing into Lake Superior or the St. Croix system are now being or will be surveyed to plan a Federal flood-control system. Every town chairman who wrote me got action. Not once has the Congress turned me down on these bills. Every one was passed speedily and without objection. This has never been done before in the history of Douglas County. If any stream is left out of this planning, it is because some town chairman has neglected to call it to my attention. Just think of it. Not one major river, but all rivers in Douglas County are being considered in this flood-control plan. No county in the whole Nation ever got so much consideration. These surveys and plans will mean an expenditure of another $20,000 for Douglas County as a direct result of my work. When plans are completed Federal expenditures will run into another million for completion.

I started all of these projects and have never yet failed to deliver. What I need is cooperation and not obstruction to complete the job. To get such speedy action one must have the confidence and acquaintance of fellow Members of Congress. Do you want to set this program back several years or to go forward?

SCHOOL AND OTHER FACILITIES RECEIVED BY SUPERIOR FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I had a direct part in getting school and other facilities for the city of Superior from the Federal Bureau of Community Facilities. Every request made of me was fulfilled speedily. Not once was I turned down. Among the facilities gotten by me for Superior during my term as Congressman are as follows:

City of Superior: Advance planning school facilities, $4,420.

City of Superior: Advance planning school facilities, $2,700.

City of Superior: Fire truck, $5,500 Federal grant.

Superior State Teachers' College: Laboratory facilities.

Superior vocational school: Automobile mechanic shop with heating facilities.

Superior vocational school: Furniture and equipment.

Superior Teachers' College: Furniture and equipment.

Superior Teachers' College: Office, cafeteria, biology and physics laboratory facilities.

Superior nursery school: School facilities for children, $61,966 Federal Government contribution.

The school facilities Government contribution above were given under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act—a bill which I cosponsored. The nursery school and the fire truck Federal grant of $5,500 were under the Lanham Act, which I appeared before the committee and helped formulate and secure passage.

Here then we have another $200,000 in Federal aids for the city of Superior. All of these applications were granted with the help of my office. I not only helped draw up and pass the laws setting these aids up—but saw to it that

Superior got its fair share. In fact, about $200,000 is far more than any city the size of Superior received in these kinds of aids.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Thousands of dollars come to Douglas County schools as Federal aid for the school lunch program. Nine years of teaching in high schools and colleges have put me in a position of personal knowledge of the need and the good of such a program. I have appeared each year before the proper committee to get adequate funds for this program. This is another of the good Federal aids that no one would banish. This Federal aid brings several thousand dollars a year in employment and food to Douglas County folks. I had a most active part in setting up this program and securing enough funds for its operation.

FIVE MILLION RFC LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS

During my term in Congress the RFC has loaned more than five million to small businesses in the Tenth District. Every applicant who wrote me got immediate results. Sometimes applicants did not contact me until after they were turned down. Even then I got to work and in most cases succeeded in getting the loan approved.

My offices handled the processing of more than 40 loans. On another 40 loan applications information and procedure were secured through my office. About 50 cases are still pending and securing my help. No small-business man who contacted me was refused action or help on my part. So here we have another five million of Federal money coming to northern Wisconsin folks.

This does not include large defense contract loans which will be dealt with under war contracts. Almost $1,000,000 of these small loans went to Douglas County folks. Here is another one million of Federal aid to Douglas County folks.

SUPERIOR CAN GET AS MUCH AS $450,000 FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Another of my pet projects while in Congress has been better hospital facilities for the people of northern Wisconsin. I had a direct hand in formulating and passing a Federal hospital aid program during my term in Congress.

Fifteen cities in the Tenth District have been declared eligible for this aid. Five cities have already received this Federal aid during my term amounting to $200,000. These cities get up to 45 percent of the cost of hospital construction from the Federal Government.

Superior is designated as one of the eligible cities by the Federal Government. All Superior need do is get approval of the State board of health at Madison, Wis. As far as the Federal Government is concerned, due to legislation I had a direct hand in formulating, the job is done.

Should Superior decide to go ahead on a $1,000,000 hospital construction program they can get $450,000 of this amount from the Federal Government. This gives another example of what it means to have an alert Representative in Congress.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

I appreciate the fact that each and every old age pension group is mindful of my work on behalf of the aged people. Their testimonials are unanimous in praise of my work for the aged. All old age pension groups support me in my work.

I have always worked for and voted for a decent old age pension system. I have voted and worked for increased social security benefits. The present benefits are a pittance and a disgrace. The House of Representatives with my vote a year ago passed a decent social-security benefit bill. It has been stymied in the Senate since then.

In 1946 I voted for an increase in the ceiling for old age pensions. I have always voted to increase the Federal Government's share. The burden on counties, cities, and towns is too heavy and costly. I support the proposal that the Federal share should be increased and local share eliminated. This is the only way old folks will get a break. Here again about a quarter of a million dollars comes to Douglas County folks in old age pension aids.

PROMOTING SUPERIOR AND DOUGLAS COUNTY

On many occasions I have called personally on Government departments to promote Superior and Douglas County. There is not a single agency of our Government that does not have information about Superior and Douglas County before them. I delivered this in person.

The Superior Chamber of Commerce sent me a hundred promotion bulletins and materials of promotion. These were delivered in person to the proper agencies. It was my work that sends each day to the Superior Chamber of Commerce and the new industries bureau all notices of bids for Government contracts and all information needed in this respect. Way back in 1948 the shipbuilding facilities of Superior were strongly placed before the Navy Department. As a result of my efforts Navy representatives were in Superior to survey facilities.

I was not asked to do this. But I did it anyway. Superior now has an application in for a huge laboratory to be built by the Federal Government in several places in our Nation. I was not asked for this information. Nobody had to prod me to do this. The information was sent to Superior authorities by me because I am alert and on the job.

It is not necessary for Superior or industries in Superior to spend money to send someone to Washington to get something for them. All they need do is go to the chamber of commerce or new industries bureau and they will find that O'KONSKI has seen to it that the information is sent to Superior even before they themselves think about it.

SUMMARY

By being on the job Douglas County has received from the Federal Government during my term more than $10,000,000 in Federal aids—either directly expended or available. There are two classes of folks in Douglas County. There are those few businessmen who are opposing me and raising money to defeat me who say Douglas County is getting too much Federal aid. Then there are those who say ten million is not enough, they should get more.

I am mindful of both critics. I have fought for only those aids that are necessary to keep Douglas County going as a sound county. I fought for only those aids that no sensible or reasonable person would stop.

What is most important, I had foresight to look ahead. Much criticism has been heaped upon me for the public-housing program in Superior. I have been denounced for supporting it. However, if the world crisis continues so that billions of dollars of contracts are given out for construction of war matériels, adequate housing would be a good talking point.

Folks of Douglas County, I have done the best I could. I know for sure nobody else could have done more or better.

Let's Clean House and Mobilize All Manpower and Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, the people of Mecosta County, Mich., in my district, have been known down the years for their genuine patriotism and love of country. Their approach to their responsibilities as citizens has always been outstanding. They look with apprehension upon the inroads made by Communists who, because of Executive carelessness or worse, have been able to invade that branch of Government. They view with alarm the resistance to attempts to remove Communists, subversives, and perverts from the public payroll. They are particularly exercised over the mishandling of the situation and conditions leading up to the present military activities in Korea. They believe, and I am in complete harmony with them, that one of the most important things to be done by this Government is to retire to private life the present Secretary of State, Dean G. Acheson, and the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson. They want this done immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I have resolutions adopted by the Mecosta County Republican Committee, setting forth their views on the more important questions before the public at this time. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks and include therein these resolutions in which I fully concur:

RESOLUTION FOR SUBMISSION TO STATE AND NATIONAL COMMITTEES AND TO MICHIGAN CONGRESSMEN AND SENATORS—REPUBLICAN

Whereas it is becoming increasingly evident that Truman party liners are going through an all-out effort to whitewash Truman-appointed high-ranking bureau and Cabinet members, and members of the State Department in particular as evidenced by the recent Senate investigation on the Mc-

Carthy charges—a report so misleading that one of the minority members, Senator LODGE, submitted a 32-page minority report opposing the majority (Democratic) report, and the other minority member, Senator HICKENLOOPER, wouldn't even bother to issue a retort; and

Whereas it is so patent that the bungling and ineptness of our State Department is to a very large degree responsible for the very serious straits in which we find ourselves in Korea today—(if we may believe Brig. Gen. William Roberts, recently returned from Korea for retirement from the United States Army, who stated when interviewed on the west coast that it was due to State Department insistence that the South Koreans were not properly armed or instructed—that the State Department firmly forbade instruction of anything but defensive tactics because it was afraid that the "South Koreans would wage war on the northern Koreans); and

Whereas the empty boasts of Defense Secretary Johnson were to a large degree responsible for our lack of preparedness in the present Korean conflict as evidenced by his recent statements prior to Korea, that the United States was in the finest shape that it had ever been—that we had nothing to worry about insofar as warfare was concerned due to the "secret" weapons which were and had been developed—and his patent inability to bring about order and unity among the various branches of the armed forces—a situation which frankly has resulted, together with the State Department's bungling, in loss of American lives, loss of "face" for the United States throughout the Orient and the balance of the world; and

Whereas the slipshod methods which characterize the conduct of our executive branch, the many instances in which President Truman has implicitly and tacitly put personal loyalty to friends and political appointees above loyalty to his country—a situation which is being negatively commented upon more and more by the man on the street—the evasive assurances of our troops' successes in Korea (which are refuted daily by reports from the Orient)—the seemingly superconfident attitude struck by President Truman relative to the Korean situation; the lack of any coordinated program for the successful pursuit and fruition of this conflict at executive level; the misleading reports as to the over-all picture on the Korean police action, and the constantly changing reports issued from Washington regarding calling up of troops, draft, National Guard, etc., is constantly causing more and more distress, puzzlement, and disgust on the part of the average citizen of this section of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State and National Republican committees, every Michigan Republican Senator and Congressman (and sane-thinking Democrats as well) be petitioned to enact legislation which will call for a thorough investigation into the State Department and Defense Department, beginning first with a request for the dismissal or resignations of Secretaries Acheson and Johnson; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be petitioned to forcefully and strongly urge the President of the United States to clean house and putting loyalty to his country above all else, remove the deadwood from the various executive bureaus which have caused so much concern in the past and at present; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be petitioned to call for immediate 100-percent mobilization of all manpower and industry to the end that we shall put ourselves on a national preparedness basis that will allow us to take care of the Korean situation with as much dispatch as possible, and to maintain a National Military Establishment of such size and equipment that we will be able militarily or psychologically to ward off the threat posed by Soviet Russia, and that, if necessary, to pursue such ends by means of defensive aggression; and be it further

Resolved, That legislation be passed by the Congress providing for the instant dismissal of any employee in any department for suspected disloyalty to the United States, if such legislation has not already been passed, because we feel that to permit any person whose integrity is not far beyond reproach to serve the United States is to give Russia an open pipeline into our Government secrets; and be it further

Resolved, That the very deepest and strongest consideration be given by the State and national committees and Members of Congress to the resolutions listed above, due to the fact that Republicans, and we might say a good many Democrats as well, are fed up with the vacillating policy of our National Government in this time of dire peril, and if firm steps are not taken to remedy the grievous situation existent, it will be remedied at the polls this fall.

Unanimously adopted by the Mecosta County Republican Committee, Paris Township Hall, July 19, 1950.

The War Takes on New Meaning in Northwest Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. WILSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma's Forty fifth National Guard Infantry Division, the famous Thunderbird, has been called to the colors and will go into Federal service on September 1 for training at Camp Polk, La. Gov. Roy J. Turner, commander in chief of the guard, has made an official announcement that the Forty-fifth has been alerted, stating that he was advised of such action by the Secretary of the Army. The Governor also announced that the Forty-fifth's summer training camp at North Hood, Tex., previously set for August 6 to 20, has been canceled.

Activation of Oklahoma's Forty-fifth National Guard Division will affect nearly 1,000 northwest Oklahoma men, according to Col. O. T. Autry, of Enid, commander of the One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Field Artillery Battalion. Mobilization will call heavily on men in the units located at Enid, Cherokee, Blackwell, Tonkawa, Alva, Ponca City, and many other Oklahoma towns, as well as the Chilocco Indian Agricultural School.

Mr. Speaker, a very timely, thoughtful, and important editorial was published Friday, August 4, 1950, by the Enid Morning News, of Enid, Okla., upon this subject, and it is as follows:

The war on the other side of the world in Korea has suddenly taken on very real meaning in Enid, Garfield County, and northwest Oklahoma generally. Designation of the Forty-fifth Division as one of four National Guard divisions to be mobilized hits the city hard. In addition to great personal sacrifice on the part of the men and their families, the calling of the Forty-fifth will mean sacrifice for the community as a whole.

The same qualifications that make good soldiers also make good citizens. The more than 400 Enid men who will enter training in September are from the ranks of the city's most productive and responsible citizens. Maj. James E. Tindle is a member of the city commission. Col. O. T. Autry, Lt. Col. Harry H. Hughes, Capt. Jewel W. Ridge, and Lt. Hardin Wilkerson hold responsible positions in the school system. There are businessmen, skilled workers, students, farmers, clerks—all doers and builders.

It will not be easy to adjust to their absence. But, as in wars past, the men themselves see the necessity of undertaking an unpleasant task and the community stands ready to make its sacrifices. For all its unpleasant aspects, the mobilization of the Forty-fifth Division does honor to the men who comprise it and to the communities from which they come.

The Forty-fifth has a proud tradition. Its successes in Sicily, at Salerno, and Anzio and in the drive through southern France, into Germany form one of the most heroic chapters of the last war. The fact that the division is one of the first called in the present emergency is evidence of its efficiency and state of readiness.

Enid takes great pride in its units of the Forty-fifth. No one doubts but that they will give a good account of themselves if events should require their active participation on the battle fronts.

Maj. Gen. James S. Styron, of Hobard, Okla., the commanding general of the Forty-fifth, is quoted recently as saying:

None of us like war, particularly the large number of veterans we have in officers and top grades of noncoms, but we seem to be in it, and there's no looking back now.

Further:

There's a rich heritage in the Thunderbird history, and, although it is somewhat of a dubious honor, it still is an honor to be considered one of the Nation's best outfits.

Just 10 years ago the famous Forty-fifth Division was notified on August 31, 1940, and the division went into Federal service on September 16, 1940. The outfit's first action in the war was in June 1943. This was followed by 511 days of combat, including eight campaigns and four amphibious landings.

Its front-line record earned for the Forty-fifth the title of the "Fightingest Outfit in World War II." The Oklahoma men fought in Sicily, at Salerno, Anzio, and in southern France. Its first taste of war was July 10, 1943, in Sicily. The division fought its way over Bloody Ridge and helped capture Messina. Then came the Salerno landings on September 10. The Forty-fifth went in and helped halt a German break-through and followed it up with 2 months of continuous fighting at Naples, Foggia, and the Benafro-Cassino district.

The division saw 125 days of combat in the Rome-Arno campaign and came out fighting in spite of casualties that reached 118 percent of its original strength. Replacements from every State in the Union took the places of the men lost. The Forty-fifth landed in southern France, and on March 28, 1945, fought its way across the Main River. On VE-day, May 9, 1945, the Forty-fifth was in Munich.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, the Forty-fifth has a proud heritage and will give a good account of itself.

Profits Must Help Pay for the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I introduced H. R. 9344 to reimpose excess-profits taxes and I sincerely hope that the Ways and Means Committee will report this or similar legislation favorably in the very near future.

The strongest instrument available for stabilizing the economy at the high production levels and preventing creeping inflation lies in a tax policy which takes back through taxes substantial portions of the funds which the Government pours into the economy in the purchase of war goods and services. Inflation does no one any good. Inflation will not produce extra output and thereby aid the defense effort. What it does is to raise the cost of living, make profits for the speculator and profiteer, create labor unrest, and add to the cost which the Government must pay for its defense materials. Costs of defense are sent spiraling to still higher and higher levels.

An indispensible element in any tax program for war or near war conditions is an excess-profits tax. No part of the population can be permitted to reap big profits out of war while another part of the population is fighting and sacrificing in military uniform. Ever since the first excess-profits tax was imposed during World War I, the American public has accepted, indeed, demanded, an excess-profits tax as a major instrument in preventing the enrichment which some are able to find in the activities necessary for preservation of the Nation against aggression.

Corporate profits have been running at extraordinarily all-time high levels since the shooting of World War II stopped and reached a peak of nearly $34,000,000,000 in 1948. Preliminary estimates indicate that in 1950 profits are again on the rise after having leveled off in 1949.

In 1940, before we entered the war, the corporate profits before taxes amounted to $9,300,000,000. In 1950 it is expected that they will be more than four times that amount. Corporate profits can and must, therefore, make a substantial contribution toward defraying the current costs of war. Nothing can now be gained by postponing the taxation of these profits, just as nothing can be gained through permitting further price increases and further inflation. Next year will be too late.

The schedule of excess-profits rates contained in the bill which I have proposed will impose no hardship upon any corporation. The bill is drawn upon the structure, the regulations, and detail provisions of the World War II excess-profits tax. It preserves the alternative methods whereby the tax may be calculated on either the invested capital basis or on the basis of average earnings for a base period. It preserves intact the provisions to take care of extraordinary individual cases in which the specific formula might provide inequitable results. Recognizing the special problem of small businesses, a specific exemption of $25,000 is allowed.

The bill is designed to apply to all excess income accruing after July 1, 1950, which was to all intents and purposes the beginning date of the Korean war. Differences from the World War II law relate only to: First, the base period; and, second, the schedule of rates to be applied. The new base which has been selected is 75 percent of the average rate corporate profits for the 3 years 1947 through 1949. The excess-profits tax will thus not apply to 75 percent of the average profit earned during these three base years when profits were running at record levels. It is only upon the top 25 percent of the profits earned above that high average that the schedule of increasing rates will apply. The rates proposed begin at 65 percent and are stepped up to 100 percent when the net income of a corporation goes 25 percent above the high levels of the base years.

Growth of Marketing and Purchasing Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from News Bulletin for August 3, 1950, by Paul O. Peters:

GROWTH OF MARKETING AND PURCHASING COOPERATIVES

(Seasons 1932–33 to 1947–48, inclusive, compiled from Miscellaneous Report No. 137, issued by the Farm Credit Administration)

TABLE 1.—*Number of farmers' marketing and purchasing associations*

Crop period	Marketing associations	Purchasing associations	Total number
1932–33	9,352	1,648	11,000
1933–34	9,052	1,848	10,900
1934–35	8,794	1,906	10,700
1935–36	8,388	2,112	10,500
1936–37	8,142	2,601	10,743
1937–38	8,300	2,600	10,900
1938–39	8,100	2,600	10,700
1939–40	8,051	2,649	10,700
1940–41	7,943	2,657	10,600
1941–42	7,824	2,726	10,550
1942–43	7,708	2,742	10,450
1943–44	7,522	2,778	10,300
1944–45	7,400	2,750	10,150
1945–46	7,378	2,772	10,150
1946–47	7,268	2,857	10,125
1947–48	7,159	2,976	10,135

Of the 10,135 cooperatives operating during the 1947–48 crop year, the Farm Credit Administration reports the marketing co-ops divided as follows: Cotton and products, 514; dairy products, 2,091; fruits and vegetables, 929; grain, dry beans, and rice, 2,233; livestock, 552; others, 840.

Of the purchasing cooperatives, 2,879 were classified as local and 97 as large.

Volume of business

Year	Marketing	Purchasing	Total
1932–33	$1,199,500,000	$140,500,000	$1,340,000,000
1940–41	1,911,000,000	369,000,000	2,280,000,000
1943–44	4,430,000,000	730,000,000	5,160,000,000
1947–48	7,195,000,000	1,440,000,000	8,635,000,000

The statistics reveal that while the cooperatives have decreased in number, the volume of business has increased by 600 percent in marketing and over 1,000 percent in purchasing.

The question arises now, Shall the Congress move to tax cooperative marketing and purchasing associations on their earnings, distributed back as "patronage refunds" or "patronage dividends," on a basis comparable to the tax on individual enterprisers?

Our Greatest Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I made Saturday, August 5, 1950, at ground-breaking ceremony:

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I came down from Washington last night to be present for this occasion. This ground breaking marks a further distinct step forward in the development of Barksdale Air Base. It means the beginning of the construction of 692 housing units on this base under the terms of a new law that we know in Washington as the Wherry plan. Such construction will furnish more work for our people and more homes for our people to live in.

In a larger sense, this ground breaking today means not only a further expansion of Barksdale Air Base, it symbolizes an intensification of our efforts to obtain adequate national security for our people. The time for maintaining small standing military forces has long since run its course; and for a long time to come, we as a people must maintain a much stronger national defense.

This national readiness should provide for the greater Air Force of 70 air groups, the return to active service of much of the mothballed Navy and a substantial expansion of our Army and Marine Corps. The President has estimated that over $10,000,000,000 more is needed entirely for our defense—more than the $13,200,000,000 already provided in the appropriation bill will be required, making a total to date of over $23,100,000,000 in all, in the next 12 months, for the defense of this Nation, including the Korean action. The total budget of expenditures will, therefore, be in the neighborhood of $50,000,000,000—a record expenditure in a time of comparative peace.

As a matter of fact, we as a people are not exactly in a state of peace; and yet we are not in a state of war. We are in a condition of neither war nor peace; we are in the twilight zone which may lead to the one or the other. This is a status which is difficult for any nation or any people; but this status is especially difficult for a democracy. We are about to be surrounded by controls and

regulations which will effect our daily way of living and which will most certainly annoy us and vex us greatly. At the same time, we are not at the point where the full flood of our patriotic emotions calls for all-out sacrifice or for all-out war. In such a condition we, the people of the United States, find ourselves; and we do not know just how long such conditions will remain with us.

One thing we do know, however, and that is that free nations have their backs to the wall with the odds against them greater than at any time since the Moslem invasion of Europe centuries ago. After the First World War, we chided our leaders that we did not assume our rightful place as a leader in world affairs. Perhaps it was a miserable mistake to have failed to work for the fruits of victory after the end of World War I. Perhaps this failure more than anything else may have brought on the Second World War and may have been the reason for so many of the untoward events which have plagued civilization since the end of the early twenties. We cannot now fail to realize that the United States has finally assumed a position of full leadership in the affairs of mankind; and all of us know that this position carries with it an awful responsibility, a responsibility of using our influence to create a just and a peaceful world. It carries with it the further necessity of hardships and privations which have not been too widespread in America during times of peace; and we may find that the burden of leadership in the affairs of mankind is especially heavy upon our people.

At this point, we have no alternative. To turn back to a condition of isolation in the world is but to court immediate disaster and to give the world over to communism. It is the road which promises short surcease from the burdens of the day; and it is in effect selling our birthright for a mess of pottage. Our only course is to go ahead—push on in spite of the perils of the path and the hardships and sacrifices of the rough road. It is the one chance of working this matter out so as to attain a lasting peace in our time. It is the one method of supporting the United Nations and making this great Organization work.

In making this decision, our people are not beguiled or fooled. They know the meaning of more taxes and rationing and privation. They know what it is to endure hardships and sacrifices. They know rigid economy and austerity. In Government, it means the cutting down of useless and unnecessary expenditures. But it means far more than this.

In the future, and for a long time to come, the United States must place national security first of all on its list of boasted securities. Before any problem affecting the lives of our people is solved or before any problem effecting the development of our great land is approached, we must first provide for national defense. We must do this if we are to live and survive in a world threatened constantly by dictators. We must do this if we are to remain free men—not slaves to a communistic tyranny. Irrigation, reclamation, power development, internal improvements—may all be pushed aside for the time being in the face of the urgent need for self-preservation. Government economy alone is not enough. It is going to take Government sacrifice and Government austerity and rugged honesty.

Even more closely home, may come the burden of family sacrifices and economy. As a people, we may, for the time being, be compelled to forego the boast of our great national American prosperity and high standard of living—with an automobile for each family and each individual of each family; a radio set for every home and every room in the home, a television set, a family washing machine and many other things which so many of us accept as every-day necessities and requirements under our American standard of life. This may be part of the post-war requirement of world leadership in our all-out effort to provide for a lasting world peace. This may be part of the cost to make the world secure that our grandsons and their sons may not be called upon periodically to leave their homes and offer their lives on a foreign field of battle.

My friends, I regret that this speech must be somber on such a happy occasion as that of the beginning of construction of 692 homes for enlisted men and officers of the Air Force. Providing homes for those who need them is always a happy occasion, whether it be within or without the Armed Forces. We rejoice with the commanding officer of this great air base that the beginning of this work will mark our active efforts to provide long-needed housing for Air Force personnel. It will mean a more contented garrison with a far greater percentage of reenlistments. It will mean a finer and a greater Barksdale Air Base, a greater national defense and a stronger, although perhaps for the time being a less comfortable, Nation. For it is only by strength and sacrifice in times such as these that our priceless liberties and our sacred heritage shall be preserved to our children and to succeeding generations.

As I look around me today I see others whose forebears have gone through the pioneer days of toil and privation. Our people hewed a Nation out of a wilderness and brought it to full maturity through effort and sacrifice. In two great world wars during my lifetime, our people have shown courage and stoicism and sacrifice; and today, in far-off Korea, our boys are making the supreme sacrifice on the field of battle. Our people know what to expect. They are accustomed to sacrifice, and they also know that our American heritage has been obtained and maintained through the years only by sacrifice and privation. I am satisfied that they have the courage and will meet the test.

California Farm Bureau Says Broadcasting Essential to Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the information of you and my other distinguished colleagues, the text of the following resolution. It is self-explanatory. This resolution was first adopted at their convention in my home city of Long Beach on November 20, 1947, and again readopted at their annual business sessions, in 1948 and 1949.

I have noticed that several of my distinguished colleagues have heretofore extended their remarks on related subjects to this important resolution. For instance, Hon. CARL HINSHAW on May 5, 1949; Hon. CLINTON ANDERSON, January 19, 1950; Hon. TOM CONNALLY, February 1, 1950; Hon. O. C. FISHER, July 11, 1950; and others:

CLEAR CHANNEL RESOLUTION—CALIFORNIA STATE GRANGE ANNUAL MEETING, 1949

California State Grange in annual meeting, Sacramento, Calif., is aware of the threat to clear channel radio stations in legislation pending before both Houses of the Congress of the United States. We are also concerned over possible detrimental action by the North American Regional Broadcasting Conference now in session in Montreal, Canada. The California State Grange requests that this conference allow no duplication of American clear channel broadcasting frequencies by foreign countries. We further urge that the rights of rural radio listeners in the United States be protected and that we be heard by the United States delegation to the conference if any such action is contemplated.

The California State Grange reiterates its previous position that there be no further break-down in the number of clear channel radio stations. We oppose any legislative measure that would limit in any way the ability of clear channel stations to serve rural people. We further vigorously request that the Federal Communications Commission allow clear channel radio stations sufficient power to serve adequately rural areas now receiving little or no service.

Passed unanimously, November 18, 1949.

Austin Cramps Malik's Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from New Orleans States of August 4, 1950:

AUSTIN CRAMPS MALIK'S STYLE

On the UN diplomatic front, our line is holding, thanks to the astute, forceful generalship of our chief delegate, Warren R. Austin.

He has had to fight an enemy who occupies the commanding ground of the battle scene, the chairmanship of the Security Council. Since August 1, that position has been held by Soviet delegate Jakob A. Malik.

Despite this Red advantage, Austin has fought an aggressive battle that has kept the Soviet chairman from imposing his will on the Council.

And in the course of his struggle to keep Russia from diverting the council from its initiated course against the Red aggressors in Korea, Austin has provided the world with vigorous diplomatic passages that are a far cry from the usual mealymouth stuff bandied about in the striped-pants circles.

His refusal to enter into a suggested "deal" for the settlement of the Korean war was enhanced by;

"So long as men are dying in defense of the United Nations, this council will not wish to cheapen their suffering or sully their heroism by seeming to engage in the consideration of deals."

That kind of language will go far to counteract the propaganda harvest Russia expects to reap from the speeches of its Malik in the Security Council.

It is obvious that one of the main reasons Russia returned to participation in the Security Council was to use it as a sounding board for propaganda. The strategy is for Malik to sound off as often as possible on the theme that the United States is the aggressor in Korea; that the Soviet is the fervent seeker of peace.

For instance, he declared that Austin's resolution for localization of the conflict was diplomatic language that really meant: To increase and expand the conflict, increase the munitions, and the flying fortresses.

For a dictator nation to accuse its opposition of aggression that the dictator nation

itself is plotting is an old routine. You would hardly expect anyone to be fooled by it. But the Russians remember another maxim that accompanies this sort of trickery. And that is that a lie repeated often enough will be believed as truth by many people.

To the Russians, the United Nations Security Council is a good stage on which to present their act. Thanks to Delegate Austin, the Soviet act is being loused up.

The Federal Incentive Income-Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an address delivered by Frank Wilbur Main, CPA, of the firm of Main & Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., public accountants, at the Twelfth Annual Institute on Accounting, Ohio State University, May 19, 1950.

The subject of the address is the Federal Incentive Income-Tax Plan. The subject matter is such as to challenge the thoughtful consideration of all who are interested in the subject of a proper basis for our tax structure. The thoughts expressed by Mr. Main in his address take on greater significance and importance because of his many years of activity in the field of public accounting. The experience he has gained and the high repute in which he is held in his profession entitle anything said by Mr. Main on the subject of taxation to the greatest consideration and attention.

I include the address to which I have referred as part of my remarks. It is as follows:

THE FEDERAL INCENTIVE INCOME-TAX PLAN

It is a pleasure and a privilege to meet with so many outstanding certified public accountants, educators, and leaders in business, finance, and industry.

The Federal incentive income-tax plan has been before the country for the past 5 years and has been subject to wide discussion, including opposition as well as commendations. The plan was first presented to Congress and to selected groups in April 1945 and was based on 2 years' careful research and specialized study by my partners and myself, preceded by more than 30 years' experience, both extensive and intensive, in the field of Federal taxation. Since that time there have been three revisions of the plan, the last being that of April 1950. No change has ever been made in the plan's basic philosophy or structure. Modifications appear only in the proposed exemptions and rates of taxation.

The Federal incentive income-tax plan is based on an entirely new concept of Federal taxation, namely, the taxation of income rather than the taxation of individuals and corporations. This taxing of income automatically simplifies the tax structure. This new concept is accomplished by identical rates for individuals and corporations, with the same general exemptions, same graduations, same ceiling, and by freeing dividends from taxation in the hands of the recipients. This simplified tax structure, if adopted, will completely neutralize the question as to whether business is done as a corporation, a partnership, or an individual.

Specifically, this tax plan will eliminate what are probably the greatest sources of difficulty and controversy in our present income-tax structure. These are:

1. The taxing, at different rates, of identical amounts of income, depending solely on the manner in which the business is conducted.
2. The reasonableness of salaries and other compensation of corporation officers who are also major stockholders.
3. All the questions in respect to unnecessary accumulation of surplus.
4. The double taxation of dividends.

While the accomplishment of simplicity in the tax structure was a primary purpose in the devising of the Federal incentive income-tax plan, it was secondary to the recognized necessity of bringing about incentive in our national economy.

This incentive we would accomplish by raising exemptions so that there will be more income in the hands of all taxpayers. We have especially in mind those who are dependent on fixed incomes, from pensions or otherwise, and so are unable to adjust their incomes to the inflationary trend. This is only one part, however, of the incentive feature. The other is to place a ceiling on the taxation of any income, and thus to provide funds for investment both in already established concerns and in new and risk-taking ventures.

Specifically, we would raise the exemption of single individuals from $600 to $1,000; of married couples from $1,200 to $2,000; of corporations to $2,000; but leave the exemption for dependents at $600. The graduated scale of taxes we propose ranges from 15 percent on net taxable income, after all allowable deductions and exemptions, to 50 percent on all net taxable income over $50,000. By placing a limit of 50 percent on any part of taxable income, and by freeing dividends from taxation, a substantial incentive is provided for investment.

The freeing of dividends in itself not only would bring about increased investment, but also would probably result in relieving sound companies from fixed indebtedness. Investors, in our opinion, would much prefer a dividend on which they pay no taxes rather than interest on which they do pay taxes. In such cases, Uncle Sam would not lose anything, inasmuch as the interest is now free of taxation to the corporation but is subject to taxation on the recipient; on the other hand, under the Federal incentive income-tax plan the dividend income would be subject to taxation on the corporation but would be free of tax on the recipient.

Inflation can only be leveled off and controlled, we believe, by increased production. This involves two factors: First, increased ability to buy on the part of all citizens, and second, increased investment on the part of those with surplus income.

You may be interested in the background and philosophy of the Federal incentive income-tax plan and in the response which we have received to it.

In April 1945, we stated that the present Federal taxing structure needed not so much amendment and adjustment, which would further complicate an already very complicated system of taxation, but rather a complete overhauling. Our present tax structure is geared to war economy. What we must have is a taxing philosophy patterned for years of peacetime living.

Let me review briefly our Federal taxing structure and the factors that have controlled its development.

As early as 1909 we had an excise corporation income tax. In 1913 the income-tax amendment to the Constitution was passed, and graded income taxes became possible. These taxes, however, did not amount to much until 1917, when the impact of the First World War brought about the necessity of drastic increases in taxes, with the resultant high normal and surtaxes for individuals, and high normal and excess profits taxes for corporations. In the 1918 act the taxes were increased still more.

In the years that followed there were reductions and then further increases, culminating, during the Second World War, in the very high normal and surtaxes for individuals and normal, surtaxes, and excess-profits taxes for corporations. In addition to these taxes, there were the victory tax on individuals and the capital stock tax on corporations. One major objective of all these very high taxes was to siphon off the income of individuals so they would not have the money to buy the articles and products that either did not exist or were very scarce. Another objective was to take away from the corporations all excess profits, so that they would not profit unduly from wartime activities.

During the war period a single person with a net income of $1,500 before personal exemption paid a Federal tax of $230; a married couple without dependents with a net income of $2,500 paid a Federal tax of $360. In the case of high individual incomes, the rates rose to in excess of 90 percent. The rates for corporations rose to extremely high percentages. The purposes were sound and the desired results were attained. As an indication of the accomplishment of these taxes, the number of tax returns increased from approximately seven to eight million in 1940 to forty-odd million in 1945.

The excess-profits taxes on corporations have been eliminated; likewise we no longer have the victory tax. There have been some adjustments in exemptions and tax rates, and we now have the benefit of split incomes for married couples. For the calendar year 1950, it is estimated that under the present law there will be about 55,000,000 income-tax returns.

Under the Federal incentive income-tax plan, with our assumption of national income for the year 1950, there would be about 35,000,000 income-tax returns, or approximately five times the number in 1940. We would relieve 20,000,000 taxpayers of income-tax liability.

You may well say, "Why should there be 20,000,000 less income-tax payers?" Our answer to that is, first, that income taxes are threatening the living standards of many in the lower economic brackets; and second, that citizens with lower incomes pay the greater part of the excise taxes. By the way, those excise taxes now approximately equal the total income of the Federal Government from all sources in the year 1940. In other words, an amount equaling all the Federal receipts in 1940 is now being paid through the taxes on amusements, tobacco, liquor, gasoline, and the various miscellaneous excises. It is at once apparent that these taxes are largely paid by those in the lower income groups, because of the simple fact that they comprise most of our population.

The first Federal incentive income-tax plan proposed in April 1945 was based on a postwar national income of $160,000,000,000, and a Federal budget of $25,500,000,000. Other tax proposals made at that same time were based on a postwar national income of $100,000,000,000, with a possibility that it might reach $125,000,000,000. These plans were also generally based on an assumed Federal budget of from sixteen to eighteen billion dollars. Why were we so far out of line with other proposals in our assumptions of national income and Federal budget? Let me give you a little economic background.

The national income, during the period from 1932 to 1940, had varied from approximately $40,000,000,000 to $78,000,000,000. The highest national income this country had ever had before the Second World War was that of 1929, namely, $83,000,000,000. The Federal budget, during this same period, viz, from 1932 to 1940. had varied from

approximately $4,000,000,000 to $9,000,000,000, the Government take averaging approximately 11 percent per year. Our Federal debt, which had been on an almost stationary level of $2,500,000,000 from the Civil War to the First World War, had increased to $25,500,000,000 as a result of the First World War. Along with many other Americans, I personally was much concerned by this great increase. The late Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, advocated a reduction in income taxes at the close of World War I. This advice was followed, and the tax incentives resulted in expanded business, which produced sufficient Government revenue to reduce the debt in a few years to $16,500,000,000. Then came the thirties, and at the time we entered the Second World War, our debt was approximately $45,000,000,000. However, we were a richer country than I had realized in 1918 and 1919, and this debt was handled more easily than I had anticipated.

With the advent of the Second World War, it was necessary to win, whatever the cost. Our estimate in April 1945 was that our Federal debt would go to approximately $300,000,000,000. Our studies also convinced us that with this debt and with our obligations to our veterans, a large army and navy, and many other additional expenses, the minimum budget that we could expect would be at least $25,500,000,000.

How were we going to raise a budget of twenty-five billion five hundred million dollars? Certainly not from income such as we had in 1932, or from the income we had in 1940, or from an income of one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five billion dollars, such as many predicted in 1945. During the period from 1932 to 1940, as already stated, the Government take had been approximately 11 percent per year. We figured that the Government perhaps could take 15 percent without permanently endangering the national economy. With a budget of $25,500,000,000, and a Government take of 15 percent, a national income of at least one hundred and sixty billion would be required.

We now doubt very much that the Government can continue to take as much as 15 percent without further puffing up our income through inflationary forces. In 1946, before the national income reached one hundred and sixty billion, we went on record in Washington and elsewhere that we were not at all in doubt that the national income would go to $160,000,000,000 and beyond. We were certain that without a sound incentive tax plan, geared to peace, the national income could not be held at this figure, and that we would be faced with ever-rising inflation until such time as we had a sound taxing plan, together with economy in our national administration. A sound taxing plan is not the only step necessary for the elimination of inflation and for the establishment of a sound economy, but, in our opinion, it is a most important one. It should be followed closely, perhaps it would be better to say accompanied, by economy in the administration.

While our plan, in 1945, was based on a national income of one hundred and sixty billion, our current revision is based on the assumption that personal income in 1950 will amount to two hundred thirty-seven billion five hundred million, and that there will be thirty-five billion of corporate compiled net profits. Whether or not we seem today to be a little high in our estimate does not greatly matter, because the inflationary forces are still at work, and if our forecast is high today, it will, we believe, be low before too much time has elapsed.

Now as to the reception given to the Federal incentive income-tax plan, and the reaction of the public and interested groups—at the time the plan was first proposed, we thought that we could anticipate the criticism which we would receive. We felt that such criticism would center largely around the complete freeing of dividends and the placing of a limit of 50-percent tax on any income. This did not prove to be the case.

The first criticism received was that in the postwar period it would be impossible to have a national income of $160,000,000,000. You will recall that there was a great deal of agitation in the closing months of the war to make certain that our national income did not drop too drastically and thus bring about mass unemployment. The New York Sun, on June 1, 1945, had a very interesting review of the plan. The editorial writer stated, however, that inasmuch as the plan was based on an assumed national postwar income of $160,000,000,000, it was quite impractical. The writer did, however, commend a private citizen for interest in this matter. There was also a great deal of criticism in respect to an assumed budget of $25,500,000,000. I was practically referred to as an advocate of Government extravagance. The passage of time has more than taken care of these two criticisms.

There was likewise a great deal of criticism in respect to raising the exemptions. It was and is still felt by many that everybody ought to pay some share of the cost of Government. Actually everybody does, through the multiplicity of hidden taxes. The fact seems to be overlooked that if we are to have a sound, healthy economy, as well as decent and equitable society, we must leave in the hands of all citizens, and particularly in the hands of those dependent on pensions and other fixed incomes, sufficient to live with some degree of comfort. The inflation has already gone so far that if such people are completely relieved from taxation, a fixed income of say $100 per month, which at one time was a rather substantial amount, will not now provide any great comfort.

Perhaps the feature of our proposal which has been most criticized is that we would raise the corporation tax on all taxable income over $50,000 from the present 38 percent to 50 percent. The principal objection to this is due to the theory, on the part of many, that corporations actually do not pay taxes—that they only pass them on. Our answer to this is that all taxpayers pass their taxes on as best they can. The workman asks for increased wages; corporations raise their prices; the professional man endeavors to raise his fees—all succeed to a certain extent, but nobody is too well satisfied with the manner in which he passes on taxes. There is one great group, however, that has not been able to pass on the taxes, and that is the pensioners and the others who are dependent on fixed incomes.

One answer to the criticism against raising corporation taxes has been that the Government has to have a certain amount of money. While our original plan and the first revision provided for a ceiling of taxation of 50 percent, we felt, just before the cold war became quite hot, that with the reduced Government spending which then appeared to be in the offing the maximum ceiling could be reduced to 40 percent. This is the percentage that we had planned to propose on our second revision, but with the changed conditions such a maximum would not have been honest, since it would not have provided sufficient revenue.

Even with a maximum of 50 percent on corporations, our studies also convinced us that corporate stockholders would be better off for several reasons. In the first place, their dividends would be free of taxation. In the second place, in order to provide the officers with the income to which they are entitled, if the individual paid no more than 50 percent on any part of his income it would not be necessary for as large salaries to be paid at the higher levels. With an economy expanding on a sound basis, we are also convinced that a 50-percent tax on the corporate income that would be earned would be better than the 38 percent in an economy which has been expanding very largely through inflationary forces.

While there has been some criticism of the incentive income tax plan, there has been a great deal of commendation, too. More and more citizens are becoming interested in it. We were naturally quite pleased that Life magazine, in its February 13, 1950, issue, referred to this plan as one of four proposals now under consideration. We were also pleased with articles by Mr. G. A. Price, president of Westinghouse Electric Corp., in reference to the Federal incentive income tax plan which appeared in Fortune and Coronet magazines. While many in Washington and elsewhere know about the plan, this is a tremendously big country, and, after all, many still do not know about it. If you believe the plan is meritorious, and that its enactment would be a good thing for our country, I hope you will say so to your Senators and Congressmen.

I thank you.

What Are We Fighting For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Moley, outstanding news columnist for Newsweek, in its issue of August 7, asks a most pertinent question, What are we fighting for? I commend it to the attention of all Members of this body and I include it at this point in my remarks:

The Korean operation once more reminds us of the critical needs of considering again the distinction between immediate military victory and the steady pursuit of long-term international political objectives.

This broad question is the subject of a little book, Great Mistakes of the War, by Hanson W. Baldwin, perhaps this country's most penetrating military writer. Baldwin's criticism in pregnant with meaning for the present and the future, as well as the past.

The deep meaning of international politics is that we live in the midst of living forces, movements, and all sorts of national ambitions. The absence of war does not mean freezing these forces. Nations guided by wise and far-reaching foreign policy take account of them and adjust their permanent policy to the ultimate preservation of their interests and ideals. Since they generally seek peace on terms favorable to their own security, they take account of the possible aggressions of other nations. There was plenty of evidence of Communist purposes long before the Second World War began. But brushing this danger aside and ignoring the more worldly wise Churchill, Roosevelt and his military high command concentrated upon the quickest military decision against the German and Japanese alliance.

Baldwin puts his point in these words: "Our major American wartime errors were all part and parcel of our political immaturity. We fought to win, period. We did not remember that wars are merely an extension of politics by other means; that wars have objectives; that wars without objectives represent particularly senseless slaughters; that unless a nation is to engage in an unlimited holocaust those objectives must be attainable by the available strength, limited by the victor's capacity to enforce them and the willingness of the vanquished state to accept them; and that the general objective of war is a more stable peace."

It seems strange that two master politicians on the domestic scene like Roosevelt and Truman have been unable to comprehend this point. But in domestic politics the candidate looks only to the next election or two. He cannot chart a course for decades and generations.

Some of the mistakes that resulted from mistaken policy were the unready Philippines, the refusal to adopt Churchill's "soft underbelly" strategy, unconditional surrender, the Morgenthau plan, the pause before Berlin, Prague, and Vienna, Winant's permission for Russian encirclement of Berlin, and the unnecessary use of the atom bomb on Japanese cities. Then there was capitulation to the Russians at Yalta.

The Truman regime continued this course in the wanton destruction of German and Japanese industry under the direction of theoretical social reformers and of military people ignorant of either politics or economics. Finally, there was the Acheson policy in Asia.

All this is not second-guessing, as the record will show.

Years of war and years of peace are indistinguishable when the course of a nation's policy is unrolled. Wise nations have had such policies. There was Bismarck's Germany, and England from Chatham to Churchill. Changes in party ascendency should not alter these deep currents of foreign policy. But in the past 2 years Acheson has reversed Seward, Blaine, Hay, Root, Hoover, and Stimson in the Orient. And the Nation stands perilously on the edge of an uncharted wilderness, without a policy and with still indeterminate resources.

The question is now raised whether vast expenditures shall be made in lives and matériel in land operations or whether we shall continue the operation with the Air Force and the Navy. Baldwin makes the point that Japan was reduced to the point of surrender without a land invasion and before the atom bomb was dropped. Korea is smaller, and we are based on Japan. We must also consider this operation as a background for future possible engagements on a similar scale or on the wide continent of Europe. The road ahead is long and our resources, however great, are limited. Let us look to our political objectives and guide ourselves accordingly.

Mobilize Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the small-town newspapers frequently have a better appreciation of the problems confronting Congress than do the editors of the metropolitan dailies.

I desire to extend my remarks and include a paragraph from the Lovilia (Iowa) Press, edited and published by Mr. Gayle M. Bennett, a young man of character and ability who served in the Armed Forces during the recent war with distinction and credit and is now publishing a very fine small-town newspaper. The editorial is as follows:

The problem of complete or partial mobilization of the military and the civilian economy is plaguing the administration.

However, the Nation must realize that there is a definite possibility of another wide-scale war. Partial mobilization will cause the least convenience and cost much less at the moment, but if we are plunged into another terrible war, it may also be disastrous.

A crystal ball for Congressmen at this time might be appropriate, but we don't have much faith in them either.

It might save money and many lives if this Nation mobilized for war now and prepared to stave off any attack. We already know how costly it is to have too little, too late. The next time might see our way of life go up in smoke, and our freedoms cannot be regained, once lost, through the expenditure of money.

America's Most Rugged Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD, an article by the Honorable Richard Neuberger on the Lewis and Clark Trail. Dick Neuberger is America's outstanding authority on the American Northwest and I commend the article to the membership of the House not only because it is well written but because it shows there are still frontiers for the people of our country to develop.

The article, from the Portland Oregonian of July 23, 1950, follows:

AMERICA'S MOST RUGGED HIGHWAY—COSTLY ROAD BEING PUSHED THROUGH IDAHO WILDERNESS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, of "War is hell" fame, also said something else. While serving as chief of staff of the United States Army in 1877, the old leader of Civil War troops said: "From all reports received at the War Department, the Lolo Trail in Idaho Territory must be the most terrible trail on the North American continent."

A road over this formidable route now is within 35 miles of completion. When construction ends, the road will be the first highway ever thrust across the vast Salmon River wilderness of Idaho, the most immense roadless area in the Nation.

Eastward out of the remote Idaho settlement of Kooskia, men have hacked a 26-foot roadway along ledges of solid granite. Westward through pine forests from Lolo Hot Springs in Montana, crews have cleared a corridor for 19 spectacular miles.

The closing of the breach will make accessible to tourists a succession of mile-deep canyons and rocky peaks never before glimpsed from a tonneau. It also will reduce the distance by car between the seacost cities of the Pacific Northwest and the population centers of western Montana—Missoula, Butte, and Helena.

On the maps this route is known officially as Idaho State Highway 9. However, to the people of this backwoods realm it is the "Lewis and Clark Trail." The first white men to trudge across the continent were also the first to use the Lolo Trail. On this tortuous path, worn by many generations of tribal moccasins, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark were lost in dark chasms and desperately divided a half-starved timber wolf among their 27 followers as food.

The journals of the celebrated explorers record the Lolo Trail as by far the grimmest phase of the 2-year trek which planted the American flag on the shores of the Pacific. In the 1870's the Second United States Cavalry under Gen. Oliver O. Howard pursued the Nez Perce Indians up the Clearwater and Lochsa watersheds, through which the Lolo Trail dips and circles.

The terrain was so pocked with frightening ravines that Chief Joseph, leader of the Nez Perce, could pitch camp within sight of the troops and still know they would be unable to establish contact with him in less than 24 hours. Hardened veterans of the Indian wars, many chevrons and service stripes ribbing their blue tunics, dismounted to lead their horses gingerly over perilous switchbacks.

The awesome aspects of this scenery are reflected in prodigious construction costs for Idaho Highway 9.

The average expenditure per mile is $115,000, and this takes care only of surfacing and drainage. Bridges and gravel are not included. A number of 1-mile stretches have required $200,000 apiece. Near the Idaho end of the road, where pneumatic drills and explosives must erode away the frowning bluffs above the Lochsa, one particular mile cost a fabulous $304,000.

Engineers of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads point out that this sum, merely for advance work on a two-lane highway, may well approach some sort of national record. It also explains why completion of the road has been long delayed.

A highway over the Lolo Trail first was planned in 1920, according to James Reid, chief engineer of Idaho's bureau of highways. In the beginning it was a project of the United States Forest Service, for the road invades three huge national forests: the Nez Perce, the Clearwater, and the Lolo. Not until just before World War II, however, did pioneering survey crews of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads map a route up the Lochsa River and across the summit of Lolo Pass. "Most rugged and cantankerous country I ever was in," summed up the foreman of this venturesome undertaking.

Some idea of the wilderness pierced by the Lewis and Clark Highway may be gained from the fact that the finished Alaska Highway, breasting the mighty solitudes of the Yukon Territory cost $47,500 a mile. This is considerably less than one-half the $115,000 budgeted for each mile between Kooskia and Lolo Hot Springs.

Idaho Highway No. 9 received its greatest impetus when a Federal prison camp was opened near the hamlet of Lowell in 1943. Conscientious objectors and other prisoners hung in rope slings from the precipices and helped to hew a rocky ledge along the Lochsa. This closed the breach between the Idaho and Montana ends of the road to 35 miles; it will be down to 33 by this summer.

Ultimate completion of the spectacular highway depends entirely upon how fast the necessary funds are allocated by the United States Government and by the State of Idaho. In the meanwhile, motorists can cover the graded sections which already have been completed. These stretches of 26-foot, graveled roadbed get cars deeper into the Salmon River fastnesses than ever before.

Missoula is the principal transportation center to reach road's end in Montana. It lies on United States Highway No. 10 and also is served by the main lines of the Northern Pacific and the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific. Missoula is the seat of the University of Montana, sprawling at the base of Sentinel Peak, and boasts one of the most modern hotels in the Rocky Mountain region, the Florence.

Lewiston, where the Clearwater River pours its glacial tribute into the Snake, is the Idaho portal for this wilderness saga. Sixty miles of road, all except eight of it

hard-surfaced, connect Lewiston and Kooskia. U S 95 serves Lewiston, and so do branch passenger routes of the Union Pacific and Northern Pacific. These lines operate the wandering Camas Prairie railroad to the very jumping-off place for the Lochsa hinterland. Appropriately enough, Lewiston's traditional hotel is the Lewis and Clark.

The total cost of the highway over the Lolo Trail will be $8,121,000. The Bureau of Public Roads recently announced that approximately $3,000,000 of this sum already had been invested. Although a wide gap still separates the two beginnings of the highway, travelers can wheel their automobiles into one of the Nation's great hunting and fishing meccas.

Thirty-inch trout are not uncommon. Elk, deer, and moose forage in the groves of Ponderosa pine. Some of America's few remaining grizzly bears compel the unarmed wayfarer to be careful. The Lochsa and the Clearwater are flecked with white-capped riffles. Where the Lewis and Clark Highway twists close to the water, a man can practically cast from the driver's seat and fill his creel.

It also is a land of picturesque people. School children cross forbidding chasms in miner's buckets, using a rope and pulley. In a few schoolhouses the youngsters live from Monday until Friday, because it is too far to go home each night. One prospector, when he leaves his cabin, invariably nails a sign to the door: "Some of everything here has been poisoned."

It is a land of history and tragedy, too. In White Bird Canyon, 21 miles from Kooskia, Chief Joseph and his warriors wiped out Lieutenant Theller and 34 troopers of H Company. It was the most tragic slaughter of soldiers on any one day of the Indian wars except that of the Custer Massacre. A hush hangs over the gloomy defile where the cavalrymen were ambushed.

Not only tourists are pressing for the Lewis and Clark Highway to be completed. Idaho's people also are bringing pressure on Boise and Washington, D. C., for an accelerated program of construction. Along a distance of 300 miles, no road stretches east and west across Idaho. U S 30 follows the Snake River at the southern edge of the State. U S 10 is far to the north, in the wooded panhandle. In between, no land route spans Idaho.

This is why the closing of the 35-mile breach on the Lolo Trail looms as so essential. "This road will reach into a region," explains James Reid, Idaho's chief highway engineer, "where there has been practically no transportation except by air. The country is of such rugged grandeur that there even have been comparatively few usable air strips."

In fact, the men now doing another summer's work travel as did their predecessors of long ago—Lewis and Clark. Beyond the end of the highway, they trudge on foot, ride horses and embark in rafts and canoes on the Lochsa. Even in a drive to the end of construction, the motorist feels that he is heading his car where few internal-combustion engines have been operated before.

William R. Moore, ranger on the Lochsa district of the Lolo National Forest, advises tourists to bring along tents, blankets, and canned goods. No inns or lodges are expected to dot the Lewis and Clark Highway until the gap along the Lochsa is closed. Until then, the wayfarer must tote his own food and shelter.

The contractors on North America's most rugged road this summer are Miller & Strong Construction Co. Their headquarters are located in Roseburg, Oreg.

A Time for Action at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tablet of July 15, 1950:

A TIME FOR ACTION AT HOME

The news that comes from Korea is tragic because hundreds of American boys are being killed and thousands of others are suffering in a war over 7,000 miles away from home. With it comes the promise of more casualties. In addition, there is the threat that the Soviet may disperse our limited Armed Forces by starting warfare in one, or more, or all, of six other widely separated places in distant parts of the world. Americans will b expected to provide the flesh and blood and sinews of war in Asia, Europe, and Africa for what are called the United Nations. The latter Organization has been induced to furnish the flags—to show that the troops are fighting for the United Nations, not the United States.

That this situation is serious is obvious. But what makes it doubly serious is not receiving sufficient attention. The fact is that the very same men in the State Department whose record is one of compromising with and whitewashing communism and Soviet Russia are still in office. These men will have great influence over our Armed Forces and will play a large part in directing the strategy upon which we must depend to defeat a vicious and satanically directed enemy. When the warfare dies down, if it ever does, these same men will go to another Yalta to "handle" another peace.

These are the same men who were entrusted by Congress to spend $10,500,000 for the defense of Korea and $27,600,000 to strengthen the anti-Communist defenses of the Philippines, Iran, and Korea, and who spent only $200 of it—for wire, which, incidentally, has not arrived in Korea yet. Why? According to testimony reported as given recently before the Senate Appropriations Committee, it was because the State Department "thought it unwise to leave the South Koreans weapons with which to become aggressive." The State Department's policy has been, "Don't arm South Korea," "Don't arm China," "Don't arm Spain," "Don't arm Japan," "Don't Arm Germany." Could Stalin have adopted a better policy to insure a Soviet triumph? Could the Communists want a better program than to have the United States spread its strength all over the world without allies and without sufficient manpower to fight satellites which Russia has armed, trained, and indoctrinated, and whose millions the Soviet can direct against us to do their fighting?

Again, these same individuals, who helped turn China over to the Soviet, who were willing to sacrifice Formosa, who kept telling the American people the Chinese Reds were not real Communists but "agrarian reformers, now shout demands for unity. They expect the American people to be confused and to forget the State Department's bankruptcy. Unity, to them, means unity with the blunderers who are still in control.

It is the very same demand that was made when lend-lease was given Russia, with the result we built up the Soviet to be the menace it is today. It is the same cry that smeared all criticism of the barbaric Morgenthau plan, the unconditional-surrender policy, the boundary agreement for Poland, and the insistence of a government in that heroic country which would be partly Communist, the setting up of tyrannical Red governments in a dozen other countries which had been "liberated," and, finally, the undeniable weaknesses of the United Nations Organization.

Strong criticism might have revealed these colossal blunders in time, but the American people were given a bogus unity appeal and told to feed on the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," world peace, and democracy. "Stand by the President" was the sloga that contributed much to the strengthening of Soviet Russia.

One thing should be done at once. The people should be told the truth. Back in January, when Senator TAFT publicly asserted the United States Navy should patrol Formosa and not permit China to be completely sold out by State Department policies modeled upon the Amerasia and Institute of Pacific Relations pro-Communist programs, the Senator was bitingly scolded. Secretary Acheson used terms of ridicule in referring to "this distinguished statesman who is often in error but never in doubt." Finally, in July, President Truman did what Senator TAFT had recommended 6 months previously, without, of course, acknowledging the latter's sound judgment.

That the people have been continually misled is conceded on all sides. Why not tell them the Reds' aim is and always has been to control the world? Why not admit frankly that some Americans have betrayed our Nation and assure the people that every Communist and Communist sympathizer within our Government—as well as every quisling and fifth columnist—will no longer hold a public post? Why not tell them who is responsible for sending the small, ill-prepared and poorly armed troops of Americans into the Korean shambles against a well-trained and strongly armed enemy of whom we know little?

The American people know that their country is in peril. Let them be told that the State Department policies which have played into the hands of the Communists are at an end, that neither in Washington nor in any State or city will Communist conspirators be permitted to bore from within?

Then, to prove the point, appoint a Secretary of State in whom the people can have some confidence and of whom it cannot be said that he is "a product of the tea-cozy camarillas (composed of Washington press and politicos) with whom the Secretary's synthetic English accent and oh-so-cute ventures in humorous understatement went over great guns." Senator MCCARTHY has so completely unmasked the State Department that today he needs no FBI files or photostats to prove his case. Events have done that for him. Those attempting to make "McCarthyism" a term of opprobrium in their attacks on a man striving to defend his country against the common enemy might well ask themselves whether the international tragedy in which we are mired is not due to "Achesonism" rather than to "McCarthyism." It is now evident that the floundering around of Senator TYDINGS, the smothering of the Amerasia case, and the throwing of mud at the Wisconsin legislator have been not only lending comfort but strengthening the imperialistic designs of Communist Russia.

The warning of George Washington, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight," is, as our cartoon of last week pointed out, both applicable and vital at this hour of crisis. The day of the Marxist, his stooge, and his collaborator in Government must come to an end. The task is not easy, for the enemy has organized and placed his forces well.

St. Benedict's admonition, "Ora et labora," must be the watchword of every American. Let us pray for God's assistance in our work to save America from the curse and slavery of Godless communism.

War Measures—or Hysteria?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article that appeared in Newsweek on August 7 by that well-known economist and writer, Mr. Henry Hazlitt. His article on war measures or hysteria calls the turn on our responsibilities in Congress. The article is as follows:

From laxity and unconcern prior to June 25, Washington has swung over to hysteria. Technically we are still fighting only a police action in a tiny country. Yet Washington acts as if our only hope of national survival lay in immediately turning our whole economy inside out and frightening to death the very corporations responsible for our unparalleled production. The proposed measures into which Congress is being stampeded reflect not so much real war necessities as the familiar demands of a statist and controlist ideology.

Congress should, of course, appropriate without delay whatever additional amounts can be spent quickly without misdirection or gross waste. But even if all of the President's additional appropriation request of $10,500,000,000 is really necessary, is it also necessary that the Federal Government should add that net amount to the expenditures it had already planned? Most of the bureaucrats and Congressmen who are so sternly calling on the consumers and taxpayers for more sacrifices are singularly silent about any cut in their own pet programs for handing out taxpayers' money to pressure groups or diverting resources to unessential welfare or pork-barrel projects. Apparently, aside from mere token cuts, these are to go on as usual.

Yet Arthur Krock, writing in the New York Times, considers $7,000,000,000 a moderate estimate of what could be cut from the Fair Deal budget if some of its programs were suspended during the crisis.

Nor is the nonmilitary budget the only one that needs to be critically examined. The American public is entitled to a much more convincing explanation than has yet been offered of why the almost $50,000,000,000 spent on defense in the four fiscal years since July 1946 bought apparently so little of it. The sum is not negligible. We spent on defense in the last fiscal year alone as much as we spent in the whole 16 fiscal years before Pearl Harbor.

The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee now wants to know just what there is on hand to show for the military expenditures of the last 4 years. This is a laudable, if belated, curiosity. One would have supposed that a committee properly carrying out its responsibilities to the American people would have been checking on this at least every quarter. The Armed Services Committee urgently need a numerically adequate permanent full-time staff of military experts and investigators, responsible to Congress alone, to check on the requests from the services and to know at all times how much defense the people are getting for their money.

The ideological hysteria of the moment is reflected in the demands, even on the part of so-called conservatives and professed believers in a free-enterprise system, for overall Government economic controls, including a blanket freeze of prices and wages. Such demands stem from a complete misreading of the lessons of the last war. These controls and freezes would tie the economy in red tape. They would delay or prevent the very price and wage readjustments that are most necessary. It cannot be pointed out too often that the only way to control the general level of prices is through money and credit policy.

The administration has still to show real awareness of how serious, compared with present practices and proposals, money and credit control would have to be to accomplish this purpose. It must begin with restraints on the Treasury and Federal Reserve System. We must severely limit the expansion of credit by the Federal Reserve banks themselves. These banks must abandon the inflationary policy of cheap money rates and Government bond pegging. The Government must shut down on all new loans from the RFC or the Export-Import Bank. Commercial bank credit must be restricted by allowing interest rates to rise, by tightening reserve requirements, and by scrutinizing new loans. Demands for installment credit and real-estate mortgage control only divert attention from these more serious credit controls.

Address of Hon. Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1950, Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado, addressed our State Republican Assembly. I include his address as part of my remarks, as well as excerpts from an editorial in the Rocky Mountain News of Denver, Sunday, July 30, 1950:

REMARKS OF EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, REPUBLICAN SENATOR OF COLORADO, BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN STATE ASSEMBLY, DENVER, COLO., JULY 28, 1950

Within 5 years of the end of hostilities of World War II, the peace that was to follow and endure has been shattered and our servicemen are again fighting and dying on foreign soil.

Once more our young men are being drafted and trained for battle. Once more the pangs of leave-taking, the anxieties over the missing and wounded, the mourning for the dead. Once more all of the hateful dislocations of peacetime life, sparing nothing and no one.

Whenever and wherever our servicemen confront the enemy, the Republican Party, its members and public officials, along with all other patriotic citizens, will do whatever is required to support their effort and to assure their victory.

We shall insist that our fighting men shall be promptly armored and supplied, not with blueprints or fancy plans, but with the best munitions that American ingenuity, resources, and industry can produce.

Every needful measure to guard their health, to sustain their morale, to shelter them from needless peril, to care for the wounded, the widows, orphans and dependents and to give practical expression to the Nation's gratitude when they return, shall have our devoted backing.

Their sacrifices shall spur our unending efforts to find a durable peace with honor.

We shall continue our vigorous and relentless efforts to cleanse from our Government all disloyalty, all divided allegiance, all security risks by whatever name they may be known, and under every mask with which they disguise themselves.

Our fighting men abroad will know that by our election they will not be stabbed with treachery at home. They will know that when they have finished their tasks abroad they will return to a purified land of freedom at home.

These Republican efforts will be continued despite all attempts of the opposition to villify, divert, discourage, obscure or thwart them.

We pledge that we shall spare no efforts to take this Government out of the control of those who have lost the promised peace earned by the costly victory of World War II and who have gravely imperiled our present and future security.

We pledge that we shall spare no effort to retire from public life the bunglers and wastrels who, since the end of World War II, equipped with unstinted billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to keep our country safe and enable us to defeat aggression wherever it might appear, have shamed us at home and throughout the world with such nightmarish lack of preparedness that a twentieth-rate country can enjoy even a temporary victory over American forces on the field of battle.

No wonder that nations which have been subsidized with our bounty and which have promised to join their military strength to our own are thinking strongly of neutrality.

Let us bring back the objectives of World War II so that we can measure their betrayal and better understand why we have been in a cold war and are now fighting in Korea and why we are threatened with World War III.

It is especially important that the veterans of World War II know clearly why the promised peace to follow the complete military victory which they won for us has never materialized. They were fighting during a good part of the time while the peace was being betrayed in secret and after they came back home the propaganda machines of the guilty did their best to keep us thinking of other things.

In August of 1941, President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill met on the Atlantic. We were being readied for war and an inspiring standard of justification had to be raised. And so at that meeting it was declared among other things, that—

"Their countries (the United Kingdom and the United States) seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcefully deprived of them; * * *"

Russia specifically approved and charged herself with the obligations of the Atlantic Charter by signing what is known as the "Declaration by United Nations" of January 1, 1942.

By that time we were in World War II and that declaration gave long-term meaning and encouragement for the sacrifices of our fighting men. It should be added that this declaration designed to motivate a war was so lightly and cynically regarded after it had been widely publicized that for a long time not even a copy of it could be found.

The promise that you were fighting a war to be followed by a just peace, not merely to provide an exchange of oppressors or to create a new and even more dangerous enemy, was reiterated in numerous and various ways.

It was included in the resolution of November 5, 1943, of the United States Senate. The Charter of the United Nations ratified by the United States Senate on July 28, 1945, proclaimed among other things:

"We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and,

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; * * * have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

Now let us see what those in control of the executive department of this government were actually doing in secret behind closed doors at the Big Three conferences of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Russia. Let us see how they related their actions to the peace-making pledges which I have described.

The Big Three meeting at Tehran ended on September 1, 1943; that at Yalta, on February 11, 1945, and that at Potsdam on August 2, 1945.

At Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, the partition of our ally Poland which Russia had accomplished while she was an ally of our enemy, Germany, was confirmed.

Wholesale evacuations and resettlements of several millions of persons in many parts of Europe and without their consent, were decreed.

It was agreed—

That Europe was to be carved up into spheres of influence.

That Communist Russia was to have predominance over what we now know as the satellite countries;

That Communist Russia was to occupy eastern Germany;

That she was to have the Kuriles and Sakhalin;

That she was to be in Northern Korea;

That she was to have dominating special privileges in Manchuria and other parts of China;

That we were to have a place in Berlin without a road to get in or out of it, subject to blockage at any moment by Communist Russia which surrounded that city. You will remember the airlift operation which was necessitated by that fantastic piece of stupidity.

It was agreed that the Chinese Government, our friend and ally, grievously weakened after years of resistance to the invading Japanese, a resistance which commenced long before and continued throughout World War II was to be persuaded—which meant that she was to have her arm twisted—into accepting these degrading and destructive arrangements made in secret and without her knowledge or participation.

Please know, veterans of World War II, that, as has been said, most of you were fighting while these things were being done, that you were not permitted to know, and the American people were not permitted to know what was going on, and you were not consulted and the American people were not consulted whether they favored this switcheroo which gutted the moral basis of that war and which laid the foundations for others to come.

Those disastrous appeasements of Communist Russia at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam not only stultified the moral incentives for our participation in World War II, they fueled Communist aggression all over the world. They led to Korea. And is that the end?

That which our Government collaborated in doing at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam put communism in East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Manchuria, and Northern Korea.

Turkey, Italy, Greece and Iran are never free from the menace of the giant predatory bear who was unleashed by those deals to prowl all over the face of the earth.

When those deals were made it was well known that murder, terror, slavery, concentration camps, banishment, lying and aggression are considered as legitimate means and are advocated and practiced for the desired ends of communism.

When those hundreds of millions of people were handed over to communism with the aid and connivance of those in charge of our foreign affairs, it was well known that the free exercise of religion is not safe under communism because religion deals with the spiritual lights and duties of the individual, and exalts his individual, spiritual personality. And thus it competes with the totalitarian ideologies of communism which exalts the state even above God.

It was well known that the totalitarianism of Communist Russia cannot exist anywhere where human dignity shall prevail, cannot exist in the presence of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, the right of people to assemble and petition the government for the redress of grievances.

How could anyone believe that what was done at those meeting places for treachery would conform to the promises to stop aggression, to promote peace, to assure the sovereign rights of independent peoples? Nothing was learned from the broken pledges which induced this nation's naive recognition of Russia back in 1933.

Did these things satisfy the pledge that territorial changes should accord with the freely-expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; with the pledge that sovereign rights and self-government shall be restored to those who had been forcefully deprived of them as a result of World War II?

Did those perfidious deals provide the promised reaffirmation of faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small?

It was obvious that the constant appeasements, the groveling "Yes, yes" to every request of Communist Russia would generate the appetite for more and ever more conquest by demands, threats, intrigue and these failing, by armed aggression under the theory that there was little too fear from peoples with gutless and faithless leaders who were determined to play Trilby to Stalin's Svengali.

The results of these treacheries were quickly apparent. The nations which were the victims of these deals became through murder, terror, and conspiracy, the obedient vassals of Communist Russia and they passed from the world of freedom into the blackness and terror of communism.

The Russian bear saw tempting honey pots extending to the channel and the shores of the Atlantic, yes, even in the Mediterranean areas, and he coveted them.

The intervening nations looked like easy prey, especially if they could be taken piecemeal.

And so we were compelled to draw a line beyond which aggression would not be tolerated.

The leading figure in this attempt to salvage something from the previous mistakes of the opposition was Republican Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG.

And thus we promoted the North Atlantic Alliance and then the arms implementations program and the ECA program, all intended to build an economic and military base for resistance to further aggression.

These measures may work; they may not work. It seemed to me to be worth a try even with the expense and risks if we were to keep Communist Russia from our eastern shores.

The scene changes to China. Despite our observation of what had happened to the satellite nations of Europe, our President and our State Department actually tried to pressure Chiang Kai-shek to take communism into China which had already been dismembered with our assistance.

Chiang Kai-shek refused. He was then deprived of help which had been authorized by Congress. This below-the-belt blow to our friend and ally carried with it the loss to the Nationalist Government of that indispensable element of strength in the Orient, called face.

Chiang Kai-shek chose to fight to hold his country against communism. Our leaders wanted to give China to communism for free.

What were some of the reasons for these appeasements, these aids of incalculable benefit to communism in the Orient?

It was said that the Communist movement in those areas was disassociated from Russian communism and from Russian plans of aggression. It is said that the native Communists were misnamed—that they really believed in democracy. It was said that they were simply trying to better their ways of life; that they were gentle agrarians who meant no harm to anyone except those at home who had oppressed them.

Today those dear hearts and gentle agrarians in North Korea, of a piece with those in China and Manchuria, are breaking the backs and shooting off the faces of our sons taken in battle.

Lincoln liberated 3,000,000 slaves and won humanity's deathless gratitude. He gave the Republican Party the inspiration for its being.

At Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam, Cairo, and other meeting places for the hatching of treachery, the befouled gang in power collaborated in putting chains on 600,000,000 children of God, and put a lighted torch in the hands of a known arsonist for burning the dwelling places of freedom.

They now ask that we bestow our approval and confidence.

We commend the awakening after the burning embers had blown into the firehouse and singed the fire chief and his dozing crew.

We will help find the water and man the pumps and carry hose to extinguish the conflagration, but we will not join any chorus of "Hail to the Great Fire Chief."

If that outfit must have praise and confidence to bolster its nerve as it stands in the rubble of its self-created wreckage, let it take back some of that which it gave to Alger Hiss.

No; we are going to get rid of them, lock, stock and barrel. Half of the job will be done next November and the other half in November of 1952.

The highest skills of the tens of thousands of public-relations men and thought-controllers on the public payroll put there to make sour notes sound sweet, will not be able to begin, to commence, to start, to hoax the people into the notion that the gang in power is indispensable for running this Government, either in war or in peace.

Now let us establish the Republican position in these matters. Please let it never be forgotten that what was done at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam was done in secret without the knowledge of the Republican Party or any of its leaders. We were not invited to attend.

From the first time that we learned what had gone on there, we denounced it and we actively supported the policy finally established of no further appeasement; of resistance by all Atlantic Union nations to aggression against any one of them.

From the moment we learned of the appeasements intended to bring communism into the Government of Nationalist China we voiced our opposition. We knew that there was corruption among Chinese officials; we knew that there was inefficiency, but we preferred to have our Pacific flank guarded by a friendly nation rather than a murderous enemy.

But nevertheless, the appeasement process continued and China was taken by communism.

The Republicans opposed the policy of excluding Korea and Formosa from our defense area in the Pacific—which policy made those countries ripe plums for Communist picking. We demanded the reversal of those policies. But nothing happened until those harmless agrarians of North Korea put into motion their ferocious aggression against South Korea.

Then the administration in power did a complete flip-flop, thus admitting that we were right from the beginning. For that we may be grateful.

One of the great issues of this campaign can be put this way: Will the people give their confidence to those who have been right from the beginning, the Republicans of Congress, or to those who have been wrong from the beginning and whose blunders are spelled out for all to see in South Korea?

I have no doubt of the outcome of this issue. The angry voice of a disillusioned and outraged people is swelling all over the land, is swelling all over the State of Colorado.

The peope now know that members of the Republican Party have stood alone in their battle to drive Communists and lovers of communism out of our Government. They know that the gang in power has obstructed our efforts, has praised the guilty and has attempted to divert their pursuit.

The Republican campaign will not be embarrassed by communism. Unlike our opponents, we are not divided on that subject. We do not depend upon Communist support to win. We are not plagued with the problem of getting Communists out of our party, of hiding their presence within it, or of defending them. They never have been, and they never will be, in the Republican Party.

This is a campaign of redemption. There will never be a more inspiring campaign.

We are fighting against those who are pilfering your earnings to feed their hoggish appetite for more and more squandering and more and more usurpation of what remains of your freedom to make your own pocketbook decisions.

We are fighting to save the Nation from the destruction of class warfare with its corrosive hatreds which are burning away good will among men and the vital unity of our people.

We are fighting to save for the people, their wages, savings, interest, rentals, dividends, pensions, annuities, everything of material value from debasement by a government which smiles on debts and deficits and which abhors solvency.

We are fighting to save our young people from an administration which measures prosperity by the size of the debt which it can load on them.

We are fighting the tariff policies of the administration in power.

Already these policies have killed off our Colorado fur industry and most of our Colorado mines.

How long will it take us to learn that we must never cease trying to be self-sufficient in the production of strategic minerals?

We did not learn that in World War I. We did not learn that in World War II. And here we are once more in deep trouble and again find ourselves dependent on foreign-produced minerals, the supply of which is always at the mercy of the enemy, to get our planes off of the ground, to munition all arms of the services, to produce atomic weapons, and to run a high-speed wartime economy.

The administration now in power believes in keeping in operation only the richest and most profitable of our mines. It thinks that the others, those now shut down, can be put into or out of production with the ease of turning on or off an electric light switch whenever there is need for their production.

Those interested in our Colorado mines, including our idle metal miners, will give the administration some much-needed instruction next November.

Our fur farmers, agricultural, and livestock interests, threatened by these tariff policies, will also have something to say on the subject at the same time.

We are fighting to banish Pendergastism from our Government, to restore a moral basis for Government policy.

In a word, we are fighting to save the United States of America.

The Korean situation has deferred some of our Republican programs but it is even more necessary than before to have our party in control of the Congress and later to have a Republican in the White House so that we may return to these programs and complete them at the earliest possible moment.

Taxes will be increased, but the point is, the opposition wants to keep them increased for war and then for peacetime. The Republicans, on the other hand, will decrease taxes as soon as consistent with the maintenance of our security.

This assurance may be accepted with complete confidence on the basis of our past performance. We promised to decrease taxes and we did decrease them over President Truman's veto when we controlled the Eightieth Congress.

Perhaps the budget will be unbalanced until we can end hostilities and have better assurance of peace. But the opposition believes in unbalanced budgets; believes in unbalanced budgets in peacetime and in wartime. They cannot carry out their wasteful spending policies except with unbalanced budgets.

We will balance the budget at the earliest possible moment after we get out of this terrible mess into which we have been plunged by the opposition's stupidity and immoral policies.

Again the people may accept this assurance with complete confidence on the basis of past performance. We promised to balance the budget and during the Eightieth Congress we did balance the budget for the first time since the coming into office of the New Deal in 1933.

The Korean situation and its possible enlargements may require controls and allocations. The Republicans will fully support our military efforts. But we promise you we will get rid of wartime controls and allocations when the necessity for them has ceased to exist.

Again the people may accept this pledge with full confidence that it will be made good. And again on the basis of past performance. We said that we would remove the controls and allocations of World War II and we got rid of most of them during the Eightieth Congress.

But the administration in power to get ahead with its socialistic designs wants and must have these controls and allocations all the time—in peace and in war. In fact, they had their control and allocation bills ready. They had them introduced and they were pending in committees for processing and for use long prior to the developments in Korea.

A part of their program is socialized medicine; another part the Brannan plan. But I can assure you that these smelly vagrants from British socialism will never become law under a Republican-controlled Congress.

There are many other issues of great importance.

They will be fully developed during the campaign. And this will be a campaign.

Our message will be carried by dedicated workers to every citizen of the State and will carry winning conviction.

Reports which have come to me from all sections of Colorado, and this assembly attests their truth, show that there is more enthusiastic and energetic interest and determination to win among Republicans than during any election year for a long time back.

The men and women offering their candidacies for places on the State and local tickets have never been surpassed in character, ability, and in the qualities which persuade the confidence of the voters.

This is regarded all over the country as a crucial State in the battle which is coming to a rapid climax to determine this Nation's direction—whether toward the promotion of the welfare of all of the people with freedom, or whether welfare with freedom shall be destroyed by surrendering the direction of our affairs and by delegating the decisions of free men and women to a super, central socialistic authority at Washington.

The latter has been rapidly jelling into accomplished fact.

Just a little more expansion of the type of things already done.

Just a little more time in office by those who have done them, and there will be no turning back.

Here in Colorado, under the watchful eye of a disturbed Nation, the Republicans will have the honor of spearheading the reversal of the trend.

We ask you, and I am sure we will receive, the support of the independents for we are fighting for their independence.

We ask for, and I am sure that we will receive, the support of Democrats who can no longer support the gang in power which rides under the name of their party while debauching its cherished political principles.

We ask especially for the support of our young men and women, for they are inheriting this country—and the shape of what they will get and its influence on their ways of life, and the ways of life of their children, will be largely determined in this coming election.

I am sure we will receive their support, for they know that a useful and happy life cannot be built out of one war after another and a constant state of interim crisis.

They know that a happy and useful life cannot be built in a political environment established by the oppression of freedom and decent principles in the conduct of government.

This is it. Let us give this battle to save our country the best that is in us. Doing that, and I know that we will do it, victory will be ours.

[From the Rocky Mountain News of July 30, 1950]

A FIGHTING SPEECH

Senator MILLIKIN stepped in swinging when he led off his party's campaign at the Republican designating assembly.

He was eloquent, forceful, and above all, specific. He finally took command of Colorado Republicans who have long needed direct, active leadership.

His attack on the Truman policies was, of course, expected. Administration policies are always and properly the main issue in an off-year election, especially in a gravely critical period. Senator MILLIKIN specifically charged the administration with bringing about the present crisis by diplomatic blunders and inepitude and by failing to prepare against danger. Like the able lawyer he is, he carefully documented his case.

He did more. He pledged full Republican support of the war effort, including price-

wage controls if the President asks for them. He called for a balanced budget as soon as the emergency is over.

His speech should help give new spirit to the Republican Party in Colorado, which badly needs new spirit after its defeat of 2 years ago.

For Senator MILLIKIN actually gave the Republican State platform.

Senator MILLIKIN really rose to the occasion.

He spoke not merely as a senatorial candidate but as a former chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee, as the ranking minority of that committee today, as the head of the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate, and as Colorado's top Republican.

Because of our strong belief in the two-party system, in which a vigorous opposition is essential, we are glad that Senator MILLIKIN has started to breathe new life into the Colorado GOP.

Public Employment Offices in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous materials in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit a statement which I made Thursday, August 3, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with S. 3546 which would have the effect of extending United States Employment Service to Puerto Rico:

TESTIMONY OF DR. FERNÓS-ISERN, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF PUERTO RICO, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE (S. 3546)

The Wagner-Peyser Act (act of June 6, 1933) as amended, created a national system of public employment offices on a Federal-State cooperative basis. The act provided for grants-in-aid on a matching basis to States (defined as including Hawaii and Alaska) cooperating with the United States Employment Service in carrying out the purposes of the act.

S. 3546 would also extend the operation of the Wagner-Peyser Act to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. At present, by virtue of the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, the United States Employment Service is authorized to maintain a public employment service in Puerto Rico for veterans only.

Since 1938 when the States commenced paying benefits under their unemployment insurance laws, the administration of the public employment offices has been closely associated with the administration of unemployment insurance. Claims for unemployment insurance benefits are filed in local employment offices where the claimants are also required to register for work.

The conferees of the Senate and House on the amendments to the Social Security Act, H. R. 6000, have agreed to provisions extending public assistance to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands under a matching formula. This includes old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children. If the Congress adopts the recommendations made by the conference committee, this program will be instituted in Puerto Rico on October 1 of this year. Thus, under the present plan, Puerto Rico will participate in every provision of the Social Security Act with the exception of unemployment insurance. We hope, ultimately, to have the security of unemployment insurance in Puerto Rico, for the need is present and urgent. Bills to that effect are pending consideration in both Houses of Congress.

We realize that Rome was not built in a day and we are anxious to make a beginning in having in Puerto Rico the benefits of the Wagner-Peyser Act which created the national system of public employment offices. We are anxious for this program to get started as soon as possible, both as a preparatory step toward laying the ground work for the ultimate extension of unemployment insurance and because of the special need in Puerto Rico for employment services growing out of the large number of unemployed in the island. I regret to report that we have in Puerto Rico an average of 80,000 persons who are chronically unemployed. This ratio in our island's population makes the situation grimmer than was unemployment on the continent during the darkest days of the depression of the thirties. In addition to the unemployed, we have a similar situation existing as to those who are underemployed.

Let us be entirely realistic about these circumstances in Puerto Rico as they relate to the current national picture. Employment on the mainland is higher than at any time in this country's long histroy. The ratio of employed to the total number of employables is higher than ever before. This is how we find ourselves on the mainland on the eve of rearmament and all of the implications of rearmament. We are being called upon to expand industry, to provide defensive weapons for ourselves and the democratic world, to meet the threat of an aggressor. We must not only maintain pace with him, we must overtake him. At the same time, we are going to have to maintain enough industrial outflow to meet civilian needs both at home and abroad. This means, without a shadow of doubt, that we are going to be faced with a serious manpower shortage which will grow more and more acute as the months pass and we get into full-scale production.

During the last war, it was necessary to import a great deal of labor from foreign countries. This time, I hope and urge that any such importation of labor comes first from United States areas afflicted with unemployment. Puerto Rico for 50 years under the sovereignty of the United States, is chronically afflicted with unemployment. Puerto Ricans are American citizens and they are patriotic. They have a stake in the future of this country and they know it. They are wiry and they are used to hard work. Perhaps some of you have visited Puerto Rico and have watched the workers in the cane fields labor throughout the long day in the hot sun and wondered how they could do it on a mouthful of rice and beans. Not all Puerto Ricans are accustomed to working under factory conditions, but they can do that, too. The industrial development program in Puerto Rico has proved that Puerto Ricans are quick to learn and are particularly skillful in any occupation which requires manual dexterity.

If the United States Employment Service were to set up employment offices in Puerto Rico through which were channeled mainland requests for labor and labor skills, Puerto Rico could promptly furnish to the mainland a labor force of 80,000 persons. This would be no insignificant figure, and its effect would surely be noticed in the national production indexes. We all know that during wartime or during threat of war, the civilian production army is every bit as necessary as the armies at the front.

Parenthetically, here, I should like to say that in addition to the labor force of 80,000 persons which could be brought to the mainland from Puerto Rico, the island could provide a military force of at least 75,000 as it did during World War II. From my own observation when I was in Puerto Rico recently, I say that these 75,000 youths could be recruited without resort to the draft. They would volunteer.

Sometimes, our actions have chain results which ordinarily would be difficult to anticipate. I should like to point out that recruiting 80,000 persons in Puerto Rico through the establishment of United States Employment Service offices there, would leave just that many less in the island—that many less that might have to be taken care of in Puerto Rico in case of submarine warfare in the Caribbean. The type of situation to which I refer is the situation which developed during the months following the attack on Pearl Harbor. German submarines were numerous and active in the Caribbean and threatened cutting off shipments of food to Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico imports from the mainland more than 50 percent of the food it consumes. In case of another full-scale conflict, we might be faced with a similar emergency. Obviously, the fewer people who remained in Puerto Rico in such an event, the fewer would have to be attended to.

In my opinion, we should not wait any longer to embark on this program of recruiting labor among my people. We should start right now—immediately—as a national policy. It is just such a program as could be initiated by the extension of the United States Employment Service to Puerto Rico which could go far toward preventing a future emergency. Instead of being a liability to both the Government of the United States and the insular government of Puerto Rico, this army of unemployed manpower could become a real asset whose efforts could be felt all along the line from the housewife in the kitchen to the soldier at the front. Unfortunately, Puerto Rico has little money, but, fortunately, it has a wealth of manpower. Extension of the United States Employment Service would be the beginning of a place to put that wealth wisely to work.

Friendship With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the Washington Star. This article coincides with the judgment of my friend, Dr. (Father) Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs:

ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLAR LOAN FOR SPAIN

It looks as though the ugly but inescapable facts of life are about to force a revision of the policy—if it can be called a policy—which we have been following with respect to Spain.

The drive against Spain began with an attempt by some of the Communist stooges in the United Nations to indict Franco as a threat to peace. An investigation revealed the absurdity of that complaint, and it was abandoned. Nevertheless, the UN undertook

to administer a diplomatic spanking to Spain by calling on its member states to withdraw their ambassadors from Madrid, and we went along with that ill-advised project. Since then we have been spending billions of dollars to check the spread of communism in Europe, while shunning what is probably the most anti-Communist country on the Continent.

When the Senate votes, 65 to 15, for a $100,000,000 loan to Spain, however, it looks as though a real change of attitude is in the making. This loan would link Spain to the Marshall-plan project, but the funds for it would not come from the ECA allotment. Secretary of State Acheson says he is still opposed to such a loan. But the reasons which he offers in support of that position are no more convincing now than they have ever been.

Senator TYDINGS, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, put his finger on the real heart of this issue when he said that Spain "is necessary to the defense of the United States." If that is true, the dictatorial character of Franco's government becomes of secondary importance. After all, in the name of security, we have done business with a variety of little dictators, and for 5 years after the war we did everything but give away the shirt on our back trying to appease the greatest dictator of them all. It is even sillier to argue, as some have done, that bringing Spain into the Marshall program might offend some other countries which have been getting millions of American dollars and cause them to be less than wholehearted in their cooperation.

It is high time for us to put first things first. If Spain is essential to the defense of the United States, then we should try to work out a mutually satisfactory arrangement with Spain. The fear that this might offend somebody may be real or it may be imaginary. But in either event it is a secondary consideration. The one clear fact is that if there is to be a war with Russia the burden of that war is going to fall on the United States, and we should be making preparations accordingly.

Chromite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I note with a great deal of satisfaction that the Senate on Friday adopted an amendment by Senator ECTON to the general appropriations bill to provide for the reacquisition of certain property and facilities at the chromite mines near Nye, Mont.

Members of the House will recall that these mines were opened for production during the last war, when our foreign sources of chromite had been cut off, at a cost to the Federal Government of approximately $25,000,000. After the war the buildings and facilities were dispersed through surplus sales.

Some of the property is still on the site, and the purchaser of this property has held it intact with the view that it would be needed by the Government in case of emergency. He is willing to deliver it back to the Government for the same amount he paid for it plus some charges, amounting to approximately $55,000, for property which cost us originally $1,500,000 to build and would cost far more than that to replace.

The Bureau of Mines has been interested in this reacquisition for some time not only because we would need the property in the event our foreign sources of chromite ore are cut off but also to aid in the current 3-year program the Bureau is conducting at the mines. The present program is an investigation of methods of extracting and processing the ore.

We are dependent now upon Russia and other foreign sources for this vital, strategic material. We cannot afford to continue this dependence. We should have started long ago to develop our domestic chromite resources. This acquisition is a necessary first step, and I sincerely hope that the conferees on the appropriation measure will accept this Senate amendment.

Nothing but Headaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of August 6, 1950:

NOTHING BUT HEADACHES

The State Department is trying to unload a few of its dilemmas on the United Nations by proposing that UN create a permanent watchdog committee. One of the tasks of this group would be to decide what is to be done after the North Korean Reds are driven back over the thirty-eighth parallel, provided they are. Mr. Truman and Secretary of State Acheson hustled the United States into the war without thinking of the answer to that one. Now they want UN to read a few tea leaves and tell them what comes next.

This is a nice example of the New Deal habit of getting embroiled in a war without knowing what is to be accomplished or how to go about it. The Buffalo Evening News, in a long article by Victor Knox, a correspondent formerly with the American occupation in Korea, has just reviewed the blunders of the occupation. The article shows that the administration's trait of blundering into a job without clearly perceiving why it is taking the job on or what is to come of it is no new departure.

Mr. Knox recounts in depressing detail how we went into Korea after the defeat of Japan with no understanding of the country or the people, no knowledge of their capacity politically or economically, with no perception of the inevitable outcome of artificially splitting the country and installing Russia in control of half of it, and no idea of what we intended to accomplish. The Army did not prove either tactful or efficient in administration. Our civilian administrators, with some exceptions, were not much better.

Then, having denied to the army of South Korea the heavy weapons to withstand a Communist assault, we pulled out all of our soldiers. We professed to be shocked and surprised when the inevitable happened. Mr. Truman hastily improvised a war, in which we started with two strikes on us. What a mess.

Mr. Knox is indignant at the record, as well he may be. But there is no mystery about the business. Korea merely duplicates results that have attended our intervention in World War II everywhere. The whole world is a mess, and the United States, in security, in the regard of other peoples, and in internal strength, is far worse off than if it had never fought World War II.

The reason is that a war is sensible only if fought for sane political ends. Military triumph is meaningless unless the victor employs his military advantage to reach his political objective. Mr. Roosevelt neither knew nor cared what he intended to accomplish in World War II. Even as devoted an apologist as Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., of Harvard is constrained to admit that he "proceeded [with a] lack of specific content in his political objectives." In other words, he didn't know why he had committed the country to the war or what he expected to accomplish by it.

Korea is merely one of the proofs of this basic fact. We were going to get Japan out. When we did, it seemed to trouble nobody in authority that we let Russia in. Starting out with no rational objective, how could it be expected that we could improvise one later after we had destroyed the basis of a rational settlement? After Japan was defeated—and, indeed, long before we got into Korea—the chances were 100 to 1 that we would make just the kind of mess we did.

Our Government has little experience in colonial administration and our people have known, since the Declaration of Independence, that only self-government is good government. Accordingly, only our hacks can be interested in playing proconsul—a fact that was particularly true after the military phases of the war ended and everybody was crazy to get home. If we wanted to run Korea right, we would have had to be imperialists, like the Russians.

Korea is another illustration of the essential phoniness of all of the tall talk that is used to get Americans into wars and make the wars seem noble. The tall talk in question included the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," and the Cairo declaration that "in due course Korea shall become free and independent." Was it visualized when Mr. Roosevelt tossed off that pledge that American youth would have to die in a new war to redeem it only half-way, and that, after their slaughter on the new battlefields, Korea would still be only a house divided against itself?

No wonder the Truman administration now asks: Where do we go from here? It never knew, any more than the Roosevelt administration, where it proposed to go, and it has scarcely the intelligence even to know where it has been, or why.

CONTROL CRAZY

We constantly have it from the pro-New Deal columnists and commentators that the people are 'way ahead of Congress and the administration on what has to be done to win the Korean war. This statement is usually employed to suggest that the public is crying for rationing and price controls. Some Members of Congress, among them some deluded Republicans, have fallen for this guff, and to show that they are 'way ahead of Mr. Truman, are breaking their necks to bring back OPA.

Memories are short, indeed. It is only 4 years since we got rid of meat rationing, after beef had been reduced to a memory. The Congressmen seem to have some dim recollection of these events, for one of their first tax proposals is to slap a 10-percent tax on home freezers, which the foresighted, knowing what is coming if OPA returns, will use to stock up against the shortages which will be sure to develop under the system.

But if the Congressmen think that OPA solves anything, they have surely lost their

senses. The central item of faith in the OPA creed was that if something was said on paper it was done. In fact, the commission of the regulation to paper was only the beginning of the process of multiplying perplexity, trouble, and, finally, inertia and shortage.

Have Congressmen forgotten how these regulations read? We will refresh their memories by citing a few examples:

"Unless the Office of Price Administration or an authorized representative thereof shall, by letter mailed to the applicant within 21 days from the date of filing the application, disapprove the maximum price as reported, such price shall be deemed to have been approved, subject to nonretroactive written disapproval or adjustment at any later time by the Office of Price Administration."

Or again:

"Ultimate consumer means a person or group of persons, generally constituting a domestic household, who purchase eggs generally at the individual stores of retailers or purchase and receive deliveries of eggs at the place of abode of the individual or domestic household from producers or retail route sellers who use such eggs for their consumption as food."

Another example:

"For any car sold after the 6 months period described in paragraph (a) (beginning on July 10, 1944, and ending on January 9, 1945) has expired, the seller must figure the maximum price as in paragraph (a), except that he must subtract from it 4 percent of the total of the base price and the equipment allowance, if any, for each half year after such 6 months period up to and including the half year containing the day of sale."

Give up? The bureaucrats hadn't:

"The maximum price for any second hand machine * * * shall be the higher of the following, but shall not exceed 80 percent of the new base price for such machine:

"(1) 55 percent of the new base price for such machine * * * or

"(2) the price determined in accordance with the depreciation method * * *."

Which, if it means anything, means that 55 percent shall never exceed 80 percent.

The planners had tens of thousands of these baffling examples of jargon to befuddle the manufacturer, the wholesaler, the retailer, the purchaser, and everybody else. The regulations are all ready to be plucked out of their resting place in the Federal Register and sicked onto the people again. Gov. Chester Bowles, the former OPA Administrator, has already called upon Mr. Truman to advise him on how to resurrect the whole smothering system.

And yet some Congressmen think the people are crying out for the return of all this, so that they may be badgered, harassed, threatened, and made to do without by the New Dealers.

Who's crazy now?

How To Make a Liberal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ed E. Reid, of Montgomery, Ala., the executive secretary of the Alabama League of Municipalities, has, perhaps, done more for municipal government in the State of Alabama than any other individual.

Recently, Grover C. Hall, Jr., editor of the Montgomery Advertiser, requested Mr. Reid to write a guest editorial, under the heading "The making of a down-to-earth liberal." Ed Reid has set out a most interesting description of an Alabama liberal. I commend it to your attention:

THE MAKING OF A DOWN-TO-EARTH LIBERAL

(By Ed E. Reid)

This effort does not stem from choice but from the following command of the editor of the Advertiser:

"I think you would write something of enduring interest if you would describe what political and economic viewpoints you started out with at the beginning of your career and which ones you have discarded or altered."

I would prefer to write something about the growth and improvement of municipal government in Alabama during the past quarter of a century but that subject has been reserved for another, so I am left to discuss a relatively dull subject—a young man's philosophy as his career opens.

Often we hear it said that environment and the times play a greater part in the shaping of man's point of view—his philosophy—than any and all other factors. This undoubtedly is true but events and circumstances also play an important role in the development of a lifetime point of view. My own case is but an average example.

I started out as a liberal—or what I considered to be a liberal. I still classify myself as such. Much of the reason for the development of a liberal point of view for myself was inevitable. I came up in a small town where everyone, even the financially well-to-do, were progressive thinkers. As a boy I heard the old-timers talk about their active support of B. B. Comer in his fight against railroads, and there were more copies of Tom Watson's "Watsonian" coming to rural box-holders in the vicinity of my hometown than there were copies of the county seat newspaper. The town had voted overwhelmingly in support of Richmond Pearson Hobson against Oscar W. Underwood for the Senate. Even earlier—during the days of Populism—the community had been strongly in favor of Reuben F. Kolb for governor. When William Jennings Bryan would come to Alabama to speak a good-sized delegation would board the train and travel to the scene of his oratorical demonstrations. I mention these facts to indicate that so far as environment was concerned it was almost impossible for a young man in my home town to grow up as anything but a liberal.

The times played a significant part, too, in the trend of thinking as far as my home town was concerned—especially during the days of my high school and college age. The farmers were talking about Federal aid under the terms of the then pending McNary-Haugen bill—aid that did not come until the Roosevelt administration. The folks in my town became enthusiastically interested in the development of public power—the development of Muscle Shoals and the great Tennessee River region—because their young Congressman, LISTER HILL, had taken up the cudgels in support of the idea. The Advertiser's good roads campaign had stirred the people to talking about replacing muddy, impassable roads with hard-surface thoroughfares. My town was interested in this movement but it did not favor the election of the Advertiser's candidate for governor—Charles S. McDowell, of Eufaula.

The great majority of people in my town were actively campaigning for Col. Bibb Graves. Colonel Graves came to my town and it was my first opportunity to see and meet a candidate for statewide political office. Quite naturally, I was manifestly impressed. My father let me go with him to a barbecue sponsored by local friends in honor of Colonel Graves. There the "Little Colonel" spoke in support of his campaign for governor. The political evangelism he spread and the sermon he preached stuck with me for years afterward.

He was the first great man I had had the pleasure of shaking hands with. I would doubtless have been just as awe-stricken and just as thrilled had the candidate been B. M. Miller or Frank M. Dixon, but I was at the age when the meeting of an important political figure by a young man interested in politics was more than a mere experience. I was inspired to follow the campaign of Colonel Graves and his progress down through the years. Needless to say, I became a Bibb Graves advocate—one of his strongest local "plumpers." Several times during the course of that campaign Colonel Graves came to my father's barbershop and there I heard him repeat to hometown leaders what he proposed to do for Alabama—for schools, roads, improvement of prison conditions and the development of a statewide public health service on a county unit basis. There was no doubt about it—I had seen and met the man who was to have the greatest political influence over my life.

Colonel Graves became governor. I graduated from high school the same year. Interestingly enough, my commencement speaker was another man who that year had just been elected for the first time to high political office—Senator Hugo L. Black. What could have provided a greater thrill for a liberal in the making than to have witnessed the election in the same year of Col. Bibb Graves as Governor and Hugo L. Black as United States Senator, and then in the same year to have the opportunity to sit at the feet of the illustrous Senator Black on commencement night?

Back in my home town there was a man interested in the welfare of all youngsters. He spent a lot of time interesting high-school boys in reading about current events and national and State political matters. That man was Herman Pride, editor of the Butler County News. Besides my parents, he was more interested than anyone else in helping me to launch upon a political career. All through my high-school days he insisted on my reading the daily issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He would point out the pages embracing the debates of Senators George W. Norris and Robert M. La Follette on public power and Senator William E. Borah on the World Court plan. In other words, he was helping to develop my interest in national affairs. He knew that an abiding interest in State and local affairs was bound to follow. Editor Pride would drop by my father's place of business almost daily and argue with me about some of the things that he had suggested I read—anything to get my argumentative powers to functioning. He was a great teacher and was himself a solid liberal. Today he is the postmaster of my home town and still does much to stimulate ambition and study on the part of Georgiana's high-school boys and young men.

While Governor Graves was starting his humanitarian program for and on behalf of the people of Alabama, I went on to the university where I was privileged to affiliate with some of the State's future leaders—Congressman George Andrews, of the Third District; State Senator Albert Boutwell, of Jefferson; and Hugh Cardon, now deputy commissioner of internal revenue of Alabama. Hugh Cardon had more to do with developing young liberals on the university campus than any other man I have known. Under his direction many a youngster who attended the university became a useful and down-to-earth liberal.

By the time I had left college, and had spent a few years in the country newspaper field, Governor Graves was preparing to run for a second term as Alabama's Governor and Franklin Roosevelt was being boomed by Jim Farley and a well-organized group of New Yorkers as the 1932 nominee of the

Democratic Party for President. Where could a young liberal have found more to appeal to his fancy than in these two campaigns? As the editor of a struggling weekly newspaper in Flomaton, I came out early in support of the pro-Roosevelt candidates for places in our delegation. I remember my friends twitting me about my political friend, Col. Bibb Graves, being for the election of an uninstructed delegation to Chicago instead of the pro-Roosevelt slate. This did not lessen my admiration of Colonel Graves but I labored hard in my community for votes for the Roosevelt slate.

In my enthusiasm for Graves and Roosevelt, I must confess that I built up inside me a feeling that the only good that big business served in this country was as something to be taxed and harangued. If I have discarded any part of my original philosophy it has been that part that caused me to feel that there was no place in this country for the liberal cause and prosperous business at one and the same time. I have learned that there is room for both—that a government can be an agency of help for those needing help and assistance and can at the same time be of great value in the encouragement of the free enterprise system.

The U. S. S. R. Scheme on Macedonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Soterios Nicholson, entitled "The U. S. S. R. Scheme on Macedonia," as carried in the July 30, 1950, issue of the Atlantis. The article follows:

THE U. S. S. R. SCHEME ON MACEDONIA
(By Soterios Nicholson)

WASHINGTON.—The Macedonian question is a key to Balkan peace and its effect on the turn of the cold war cannot be underestimated. There is conclusive evidence to show that Russia, following its ascendancy to great power after World War II, embarked on an ambitious 5-year plan which embodied three major points. First, the country was to achieve economic stability by reconstruction. Second, Communist agitation in capitalist countries was to be intensified. And third, Greece was to be conquered by the Communists because of its commanding position in the Mediterranean. Paramount in the Soviet Union's plans was the status of Macedonia—that area was the door through which the U. S. S. R. hoped to pour its sympathizers and cohorts on the threshold of three areas of world conquest—Europe, Asia, and Africa. This strategic stroke would be accomplished by 1950 leaving communism unchallenged across the three continents.

Two phases were part of the Soviet scheme to upset the Greek Government and impose its way of life. The first of these concerned Macedonia. By aggression, the U. S. S. R. hoped to seize Greek Macedonia, which makes up one-third of modern Greece, and incorporate it into the so-called independent Macedonian state. This in turn would be combined into the Federal State of Yugoslavia assuring the Soviet Union an outlet to the Aegean Sea through the satellite nations. A second objective was no less calculating. This plan was to establish a Communist government in Athens in order to transform Greece minus its northern provinces, into a "people's republic." Such a move, the Cominform reasoned, would cut off Turkey from the western world and place the Soviet Union in its most strategic position attainable in the cold war. That this plan was aborted in its early stages is to the credit of heroic Greeks who resisted the aggressors, by fighting and shedding blood in defense of national independence and democratic liberties. From this resistance, the western world gained an insight into Soviet strategy and were able to bulwark their strength with promulgation of the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the Atlantic Pact—all direct or indirect results from this same decision to hold off the aggressor.

In order to gain introspect in this battle of the Balkans, it is necessary to dip into history. Macedonia covered a much larger territory in ancient times than does the area known by that name today. Romans who conquered the territory following the reign of Alexander the Great who had created it as an entity, had attached Albania to Macedonia. Nowadays, by Macedonia, it is generally meant the territory extending from the south of Mount Rhodope to the north of Mount Olympus and from Thessaly east of Pindus and of Char-Dagh, all of whose rivers flow into the Aegean Sea.

The Turks captured Macedonia in 1430 with the fall of Salonica. The Macedonian question did not again arise until the latter part of the nineteenth century when the flame of nationalism was rekindled by greedy neighbors who played on the mixture of races during the Ottoman occupation. In modern times, the territory of Macedonia was settled in a three-way split: Yugoslavia acquired the northwest, Greece the south, and Bulgaria the northeast. Greece's Aegean province totaled 34,602 square kilometers—the largest third. Turkish statistics compiled in 1905, showed a population division of Greeks 648,962; Bulgars, 557,734; Serbs, 167,601.

Further population shifts have occurred since then. By 1928, however, population figures reported in 1928 by the International Refugee Settlement Committee at the League of Nations showed the Greeks with 88.1 percent, or 1,237,000; Slavophones with 5.8 percent and others at 6.1 percent. The 1940 census shows a similar make-up. Thus, its ethnological question no problem, Greek Macedonia enjoyed relative peace and prosperity until World War II. These facts are important because Soviet propaganda in recent years has pointed up Aegean Macedonia as a country inhabited entirely by Slavs, who seek union with Slavophone brothers of Macedonia of the Vardar and the Pirin and for union in a single, all-encompassing state.

The so-called independence question was revived by the U. S. S. R. with the granting of autonomy to Servian Macedonia within the framework of a federal Yugoslavian state and by launching the Bulgaro-Yugoslav project. Other versions of this plan considered by the Cominform and satellite leaders was the creation of a new Macedonian state to which Greece, as a Communist state, would cede its richest provinces: Salonica, Florina, Serres, and Drama. These plans were abandoned, however, because they clashed with Serbian and Greek Communists' position of not wishing to cede territory. Also, the Bulgaro-Yugoslav federation project had to be put aside. It was then that Moscow became aware of Tito's nationalism.

But this did not deter the Moscow direction toward gobbling more land. By eliminating Markos of the Greek Communists who opposed the ceding of territory and replacing him with Johannides and other loyal Communists, the plan, while modified, still existed.

These newly inspired Communists in Greece were dealt their crushing defeat in 1949 and forced to seek refuge in Albania and Bulgaria. Because of Tito's opposition and the U. S. S. R.'s failure to liquidate him, the Bulgaro-Yugoslav project was replaced with a Slavo-Balkan federal republic plan to make Bulgaria the pivot for a Soviet offensive. After this shift in command of Greek Communists, the latter Communist Party became a docile and very sensitive needle point of Russian policy. This party alined itself to the Macedonian plan advanced by the Soviet. And it was here that the reason of this party was manifested. By supporting the theory that there are two distinct peoples, the Greek and the Macedonian, the Greek Communist Party has admitted conspiracy against the fatherland. It subscribes to the plan of first snatching Greek Macedonia away from Greece and then forcing the nation into the iron-curtain line-up.

Since 1945, when the Soviet Union agreed to set up a federation of southern Slavs, with Bulgaria and Yugoslavia as the key points, the mood has changed and the plan scuttled. Today's U. S. S. R. position is a renewed interest in a Balkan federation in which an independent Macedonia would play the leading part. This plan, to leaders in Yugoslavia intent on Tito nationalism, appears as a "demolition of New Yugoslavia," and thus a political threat against that country. That this plan would achieve to bring pressure against Tito there can be no doubt. But the more fundamental purpose of the project in Macedonia is to give Russia that access to the Mediterranean, the dream of Russia since the early days of Tsar imperialism. Such an operation, bypassing Turkey, would place the people of the steppes in the heart of the Balkan Peninsula and at the entrance of the eastern Mediterranean.

For this long-range plan—that envisions the eventual conquest of the world's peoples—the Russians would obliterate Greece. The country of ancient and modern heroes again was picked as the victim—a victim who repeated its valiant defense at a time of crisis.

One City's Stake in United States Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the city of Eureka, Calif., depends largely on two types of products for its very existence. These are the lumber from nearby forests of redwood and fir, and the fish and crabs from Humboldt Bay and the sea. Without these, Eureka could not have become the modern and thriving community it is today. Without these, the purchasing power of her 20,000 citizens and of her neighboring communities could not buy the products of the industrial East or of the farms of the Midwest, nor could it contribute its share to the growing industrialization of California itself.

Yet today we find the trade policies of the present administration striking deeply at the roots of Eureka's economy, and the economy of all of Humboldt, Del Norte, and adjoining counties.

I have here two clippings which point up this situation and what the workingmen of the north coast of California are doing about it. This is the action of union men, mind you—men whose bread and butter depend upon the pros-

perity of the industries by which they are employed.

Both clippings are from the Humboldt Standard of July 31. Here is the first:

RUSSIAN CRABS CLEARED FROM LOCAL STORES

Merchants in Eureka are being asked by the fishermen's division of the A. F. of L. butchers' union to clear their shelves of canned crab meat from Russia, Harold Pavey, union secretary, reported yesterday.

Pavey said several stores in Eureka were found with such stock on hand, bearing the tag of Russian importation on the label. He said the proprietors were being asked to send it back to its purchase point.

And here, Mr. Speaker, is the second clipping from the same edition of the Humboldt Standard:

FISH IMPORTS PROTESTED

A resolution protesting the importation of fish and fish products into this country as detrimental to the fishing industry and requesting a boycott of such products has been drawn up by the fishermen's branch of the local A. F. of L. butchers' union.

Harold Pavey, secretary of the local, said he submitted the proposal to the central council here and the resolution was initiated, approved and sent to all central councils in Oregon, Washington, and California for concurrence.

Pavey emphasized the measure as a protection need for the fishing industry locally and nationally.

Mr. Speaker, the men of the sea have stated their case. The men of the forest and the mill, too, are faced with threats from the importation of lumber and lumber products from cheap-labor areas. In addition, the plywood industry of the United States is seriously threatened by a proposed tariff reduction at a time when overseas markets are contracting due to the sale of plywood manufacturing machinery to many foreign nations.

The people of Eureka and of the north coast—and many areas from California to Maine, from Mexico to Canada—are looking to Congress for assistance or at least encouragement while their livelihoods are threatened. But all they are getting is the discouragement caused by the inexplicable foreign-trade policies of the Department of State.

Patriotic Americans Applaud Jailing of Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain most of the Members of this House join me extending heartiest congratulations to Federal Judge George Harris, of San Francisco, and Special Assistant Attorney General F. Joseph Donohue in the revocation of the bond and the jailing of Harry Bridges, alien Communist and convicted perjurer.

I particularly want to congratulate F. Joseph (Jiggs) Donohue who prosecuted Bridges successfully and then moved deliberately to have his bond revoked so this Communist cannot be afforded any opportunity to carry on any subversive activities in these critical times.

This has been a job well done by Jiggs Donohue and his many friends on Capitol Hill applaud him. Being a veteran of two world wars and a Marine Reserve in peacetime, he is a patriotic American, sincere in his efforts to thwart an alien pledged to destroy our American system of government.

The incarceration of Harry Bridges, Mr. Speaker, is a ray of hope, but it is only one ray. What we need is many more such rays of hope that this administration is alert to the peril of these times.

Every Communist or fellow-traveler known to want Russia to take over should be interned until we are assured of peace. A householder would be tragically derelict if he allowed a rattlesnake, or a nest of rattlesnakes, to run unmolested about his house. Our Government is tragically derelict in permitting such men as Steve Nelson, Paul Robeson, Alger Hiss and all other Soviet-lovers to walk the streets and carry on their nefarious activities.

It is not necessary to engage in a witch hunt to protect ourselves against men and movements that would destroy us without giving us the warning a rattlesnake gives in most instances. The FBI knows who the Communists are. They should be rounded up, herded into concentrations camps and guarded so that they cannot be in a position to stab us in the back when the Soviet leaders begin to move.

No American sympathizer would live 10 minutes in Soviet Russia, and we all know it. Why should we permit these Soviet sympathizers to walk about the streets and either engage in sabotage or confuse and divide our people?

The 11 Communists convicted in New York several months ago wanted to sabotage our Government, but the Government moved in and beat them to the draw. The courts have held that it is perfectly legal for the Government to protect itself in a time of peril. If this is not a time of peril there never will be one. Let us finish the job that has so well been started.

Slave Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of honest law-abiding citizens now idle because competitive imports have taken our domestic market from them. This is bad enough under the free-trade policies of the New Deal, but to open our market to the products produced by conscript or slave labor by enemy nations can serve only to strengthen the economy of those nations and at the same time weaken our own economy. Why should Red China or Red Russia enjoy our domestic market at the expense of American labor? Why should the New Deal administration continue to coddle these communistic nations by letting into our country competitive goods produced by slave labor while these same countries at this very minute are cutting the throats of our boys in Korea?

I notice that the New York Times for Sunday, August 6, carries the thought-provoking letter to the editor from a prominent Washington attorney, Mr. Edwin G. Martin, who was for many years general counsel of the United States Tariff Commission. I think this letter is well worth consideration by every Member of the House and accordingly include it as a part of my remarks.

Briefly, the subject matter is the importation of products of slave labor or, if you wish, call it forced labor. At any event millions of people behind the iron curtain are now being forced to engage in the production of goods for export to the United States. These goods compete here with the products of our free labor and as a result many of our workmen are out of jobs or alternatively working at jobs where their skills are not fully utilized.

Our present law is anomalous indeed. It provides for the prohibition of entry of goods produced by forced or slave labor. Countries who legitimately occupy a place in the family of nations, France, for example, permit inspection of their penal colonies and as a result we are able by discrimination to determine which of their products are produced by forced labor. On the other hand, countries behind the iron curtain do not permit inspection so that our enforcement officers are not able to determine whether the goods are actually produced by forced labor. Results such as this which penalize our friends for the benefit of our enemies should not be tolerated. I call on the Members of the House to examine their consciences and determine whether they want the present situation to continue or whether they will join with me in making appropriate modifications of the law.

Members should not need to be reminded that many products are now being imported from Russia and other iron curtain countries—furs and crab meat from Russia; shoes, glassware, pottery, and textile products from Czechoslovakia; tung oil from Red China; and so forth, and so forth. Some of these products are seriously undercutting domestic goods produced by free American labor. Is it not time that we took action to protect our own?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the letter, which appeared in the New York Times on August 6, 1950, to which I have just referred:

PRODUCTS OF FORCED LABOR

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In a period of growing concern about the problem of increasing competition from imported goods produced by forced labor, is it not reasonable to consider whether our laws are adequate?

I submit they are not, either in principle or in practical application. The Tariff Act of 1930 (sec. 307) prohibits entry of products of

forced labor only if similar goods are produced in the United States in sufficient quantities to meet the consumptive demand. (This qualification is to protect domestic consumers.)

In the case of many articles (e. g., furs) domestic production is not adequate to meet domestic consumption. Imports are available, however, from several sources to supplement domestic supply. If one of these foreign sources uses forced labor, but supplies from other free labor countries are adequate, why should not our producers be protected from competition from the forced-labor countries?

The fact that such protection would also benefit the free labor products of other countries should not make it objectionable.

Should not the law be changed so that goods produced abroad by free labor would be added to the domestic supply for purposes of determining whether goods produced by forced labor are to be excluded?

Under present law the Secretary of the Treasury must determine that the particular goods were produced by forced labor as a condition precedent to their exclusion. But how can such a determination be made for goods produced behind the iron curtain?

Would it not be reasonable to add to the law a presumption that goods are produced by forced labor if they are from a country where forced labor is known to be employed, and if that country does not permit inspection by representatives of the United States, or possibly, the International Labor Organization?

There may be a better way of handling this pressing problem, and if so, let it be brought forward. However, unless some change is made in our law, the protection Congress extended to American labor by Sec. 307 is likely to be nullified, at least so far as the iron curtain is concerned.

EDWIN G. MARTIN.

WASHINGTON, *July 31, 1950.*

State Department Record Calls for a Change in Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly of July 31, 1950:

STATE DEPARTMENT RECORD CALLS FOR A CHANGE IN COMMAND

Back in 1940 when asked what Britain was fighting for, Winston Churchill replied: "If we stopped fighting you would soon find out." Fortunate would be this country if those in charge of its foreign policy could risk a similar abrupt answer.

In the showdown between nazism and civilization Churchill could stand on his record. In the developing showdown between communism and civilization in the Far East the United States State Department under the leadership of Mr. Acheson has no such record, and having none is compromised in facing and moulding the future.

Yet the future has to be faced if the heroic effort which the country is now making is to come to any fruition. The Korean War can obviously no longer be written off as a police action against bandits. It has involved bitter defeats. It is taking a mounting toll of American lives. It is the justification for a mobilization plan which if put into action will affect the American economy for years to come. On the President's own estimate Korea is only an episode in a continuous conflict calling for the best this country has to give in courage and statesmanship.

TIME FOR CONFIDENCE

In these circumstances confidence in those who are day by day making America's foreign policy is of the essence. Such confidence is lacking. The response of the United States to the President's commitment of American forces to Korea was astounding, and may well have surprised even Mr. Stalin. Its faith in General MacArthur and General Bradley is unbounded. Despite all the brickbats thrown at Defense Secretary Johnson his mistakes seem more of omission than of commission. But in the case of the State Department the cancerous suspicion remains—a suspicion voiced almost every day in Congress itself—that all is not well and cannot be made well without a clean sweep.

Why? The record is a familiar one and has been ably presented by such men as former President Hoover, Senators TAFT, KNOWLAND, and SMITH, and Congressman JUDD. It does not rest, be it noted, on the now faraway days of World War II, on the policies of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, on the admitted tragedy of Yalta. The record rests strictly on the events of the year that preceded Korea, in which the United States State Department, while standing on the Truman Doctrine in Europe, appeased and opened the flood gates to communism in Asia.

The history of this fateful year already reads like some strange fantasy. In July 1949, the United States, having earlier agreed to the line of the thirty-eighth parallel, withdrew its forces from Korea. Such withdrawal opened the way for what has happened and was in conformity with the known views of such men as Owen Lattimore who said: "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall—but not let it look as though we pushed it."

In August came a far more revealing and clear-cut diplomatic move—publication of the Department's famous white paper on China. That paper, sponsored by Mr. Acheson, placed the sole blame for the defeat of Nationalist China on the head of Chiang Kai-shek. It completely overlooked the fact that for almost 2 years the United States had kept Chiang's force immobilized through pressure to make him come to terms with Mao Tze-tung. It justified this policy of appeasement and error and in effect tried to write finis to the whole Nationalist cause.

INVITATION TO AGGRESSION

Fortunately for the United States, Chiang Kai-shek retired to Formosa and proceeded to carry on the war. Mr. Acheson opposed that effort and took responsibility for a directive to United States information agencies abroad that Formosa was of no strategic value and would soon fall. In late 1949 he took direct issue with the Defense Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur on sending military aid to Chiang.

In January he went further, openly declaring that the strategic line of America's defense in the western Pacific was Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. That line not only omitted Formosa but also Korea. It was an open invitation, if further invitation were needed, to the Communists to launch their Korean attack.

With that attack Mr. Truman reversed most of the Acheson line, and in the case of Formosa completely repudiated it. The United Nations was rallied to the defense of the Korean Republic. But even with the war on, the attitude of the State Department toward communism in China remained and remains peculiarly ambivalent.

Veterans of the Chinese Red army are heavily reinforcing North Korean forces. Yet in connection with the recent interchange of notes between Premier Nehru of India and the United States, the State Department again let it be known that it will not veto the admittance of Red China into the UN Security Council. This is apparently still a procedural matter even though Red China is to all intents and purposes at war with the UN. The policy perhaps explains why last week Russia decided to return Mr. Malik to the Council to manipulate it to its own purposes.

NATIONAL UNITY

What can be done with such a record? The answer seems to be that nothing can be done, and it is this which makes the present State Department regime a real liability to this country's war effort and its legitimate hope for a secure peace. The fruitless vendetta against Chiang Kai-shek apparently stands in the way of accepting the aid of 30,000 Chinese troops who are ready and willing to fight. As long as the flim-flam about letting the Chinese Communists into the UN continues, it is clearly impossible to reorganize that body in the interests of the free world. Finally, it is stretching the imagination to suppose that men who have blundered as badly as the leaders of the State Department have blundered in the Far East can be entrusted with deciding on the future of Korea, or any other related matter.

It is on these grounds that the case against the State Department rises above personality. Mr. Acheson has proved himself not only a brilliant but in many ways a devoted public servant. Yet, neither brilliance nor devotion can compensate for a year's record of ineptitude and wavering of the fundamental issue of whether this country is against communism in Asia or not.

The issue is as simple and as hard as that. The times call for national unity. Such unity will scarcely be promoted by overlooking the causes of national division.

Joint Action by Religious Leaders Against Signing Stockholm Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging, indeed, that the patriotic religious leaders in this country have taken direct action against the so-called Stockholm peace petition, which they so correctly describe as this spurious peace petition. Their warning to the people of the three major faiths in the United States should be most effective.

I sincerely hope that our Committee on Foreign Affairs will arrange soon for a hearing on this matter so that it can recommend House Concurrent Resolution 247, or some similar legislation, placing the Congress of the United States on clear record as to the nature of this petition and as to the proper alternatives for patriotic Americans sincerely seeking means of achieving peace in this world. In my judgment, such action by Congress is particularly important in view of the reported action of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. endorsing the Stockholm peace petition.

The following article is from the New York Times of August 3, 1950:

THREE FAITHS DENOUNCE RED PEACE APPEAL—LEADERS OF JEWS, PROTESTANTS, AND CATHOLICS JOIN TO FIGHT AGGRESSION IN KOREA

Leaders of the Jewish, Protestant, and Roman Catholic faiths joined yesterday in a statement condemning Communist aggression in Korea as the greatest menace to world peace and denouncing the Stockholm appeal as spurious and deceptive.

The joint statement was the first on an international issue since the end of World War II to carry the signatures of spokesmen for the three major faiths in the United States. It was signed by officers of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Synagogue Council of America.

It appeared to be prompted chiefly by the circulation of the Stockholm appeal by Communist and pro-Communist groups. Issued in March of this year by the Congress of Partisans of Peace, the appeal called for outlawing the atomic bomb, but did not condemn aggression with other weapons.

REAL PEACE EFFORTS FAVORED

In their joint statement the leaders of the three faiths said:

"We are heartily in sympathy with every genuine proposal in the pursuit of international peace. We warn the people of America, however, to be on guard lest they be misled by the so-called Stockholm appeal now being circulated by Communist and pro-Communist groups. This spurious peace petition, which has already deceived many well-meaning people here and abroad, is a camouflage designed to confuse the three societies and to conceal the aggressive policies revealed in the invasion of Korea. It is these aggressive policies and actual aggression which constitute the greatest menace to world peace.

"Genuine peace requires practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society, are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God. Genuine peace requires of every people:

"1. Renunciation of the use of war or threats of force as an instrument of national policy.

"2. Loyal adherence to the solemn obligations of the United Nations Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

"3. Respect for the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

"4. Participation in positive programs of the United Nations for the common welfare and better standards of life.

"5. Acceptance of international agreements for the effective reduction and regulation of armaments, including atomic weapons, by all nations, through a trustworthy system of international inspection and control.

"We urge men of good will to support these objectives of a genuine program for peace."

SIGNERS OF DECLARATION

Those signing the declaration were: Rabbi Bernard J. Bamberger, of New York, president of the Synagogue Council of America; the Reverend Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, of New York, general secretary of the Federal Council of Churches; Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, of Washington, director of the Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Rabbi Morris Kertzer, of New York, chairman of the Social Action Committee of the Synagogue Council of America; the Reverend Raymond A. McGowan, of Washington, director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; and Bishop John S. Stamm, of Harrisburg, Pa., bishop of the Evangelical United Brethren Church and president of the Federal Council of Churches.

A Cabinet Shakeup Is Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of July 25, 1950:

A CABINET SHAKEUP IS OVERDUE

Ever since the Korean war exploded on our unsuspecting Government and caused an abrupt reversal of practically every major policy the administration had been pursuing, the great buck-passing game has been on.

The blame for our tragic unpreparedness has been passed back and forth from the State Department to the Pentagon, from the administration to Capitol Hill, from Washington to Tokyo, and from the Government to the people. But always it comes back to roost on the doorsteps of these three key officials:

1. Secretary of State Acheson, whose whole far-eastern appeasement policy was flatly reversed by events in Korea and by the President's decision to take an historic stand there.

2. Secretary of Defense Johnson, who, in the name of economy, drastically cut into the muscle as well as the fat of our defense establishment, hitting with particular force the very services and weapons most needed for this kind of war—tanks, naval aviation, Marines, ground-support aviation, etc.

3. President Truman himself, who has consistently refused to take the Communist challenge seriously, or to put the need for preparedness above the playing of domestic politics-as-usual, and who has repeatedly misled the public with soothing and confusing words to the effect that we were nearer peace than any time since 1946.

These are facts which the public cannot easily forget, as it is asked to rally behind this same administration for the tremendous mobilization job that lies ahead. It should be painfully clear by now that the crisis confronting us calls for the fullest public support of the Government, in a spirit of sacrifice and unity such as only a grave emergency can evoke. But it should be equally clear that the Government, in order to command that kind of support, must do everything possible to merit the public's confidence. And how can it do that except by getting rid of those officials whom the public identifies with the past disastrous policies that have just been so spectacularly reversed?

What we are suggesting, in short, is the need for an immediate shakeup in the administration's highest echelons. No one but the people can fire the President, and that question can't even arise for two more years. But the public can and must hold the President responsible for ridding his administration of the advisers in whom it has lost confidence.

We are not interested in scapegoats, and we are not out for scalps. But we submit that it is utterly incongruous to put an all-out rearmament program in the hands of those who have been so busy disarming us for the last year and a half, or to entrust the conduct of our new Asiatic policy to those whose policy until 1 month ago was the very opposite.

It is futile to quibble over whether Secretary Acheson is more or less to blame for our diplomatic and military unpreparedness than Secretary Johnson. Both are the archsymbols of policies that events have reversed at tremendous cost. Both, therefore, should have resigned or been dismissed before now. And with them should go the politics-as-usual advisers who have prevailed on the President to play down the Communist threat. What possible excuse could there be, moreover, for keeping a man like Secretary of the Navy Matthews, who willingly executed the Johnson decrees to whittle down the Navy and marines?

These are the officials whom the public identifies with the policies that the Korean crisis has shown to be so disastrously wrong. Already, too much precious time is being wasted on efforts within the administration to vindicate these past policies, to pass the buck from Pentagon to State Department and back again. The cleanest way to end this situation and to rally public confidence in the new policies so belatedly adopted is to clear away the symbols of appeasement and disarmament in the far Pacific and to bring in new men whose records of past performance need no apology.

This is no time for face-saving cover-ups or run-of-the-mill political appointments. It is time for national unity and for the rallying of public confidence, by getting rid of the architects of failure, and bringing into the Government the men who are most competent to run it, regardless of their politics. And certainly the most obvious vacancies needing to be filled as a result of the Korean affair are the offices of Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense. Messrs. Acheson and Johnson should be retired forthwith.

Republican Advance Gets Cold Reception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article by Frank R. Kent, one of our most highly regarded political observers, which appeared in the Washington Star Sunday, August 6, 1950:

REPUBLICAN ADVANCE GETS COLD RECEPTION—WRITER SAYS GOP NEEDS NO SUCH RENOVATION

(By Frank R. Kent)

Politically observant persons must have noted that since the 1948 election, every few months there arises a new Republican movement sponsored by more or less well-known, but very seldom potent, party figures, the avowed purpose of which is to rehabilitate and reconstruct the Republican Party along modern lines.

This performance has been repeated so often as to have now reached the stage where only the most incurably credulous take it seriously. The most recent of these movements calls itself the Republican Advance and is promoted by a New York attorney named Henry Poor and Russell Davenport, once briefly in the public eye as an adviser of the late Wendell Willkie. Before that it was Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, who called for a Republican reconstruction.

And before him there was a group which wanted to be to the Republican Party what the so-called Americans for Democratic Action are to the Democratic Party—an odd ambition, to say the least.

Every one of these movements differs somewhat from the others, but basically they are identical. Each is hotly denunciatory of the Old Guard and vehemently insistent upon the party gearing itself to the times and facing the future with a broader and more attractive appeal. Each makes lavish use of the shopworn and meaningless adjectives "liberal," "progressive," and "constructive." They are all strong on generalities and extremely foggy concerning specific facts.

In two other respects these efforts for Republican rehabilitation are exactly the same: (1) They seem to have an equally unstable existence. Some stay alive longer than others but soon or late they shrivel and fall off the vine. (2) Invariably, they secure rather important publicity for a short time. Certainly, a sure way for a Republican to get publicity is to proclaim himself a liberal and express discontent with the reactionary party leadership. He does not have to have a program. He does not even have to have an idea. All he has to do is beat his breast and strike the pose. At once, he is hailed by the left-wing and advanced thinkers among the columnists, commentators and press agents. They start in to make a hero of him. From that time on he is referred to in chorus as the hard-hitting, clear-thinking Senator So-and-So, or the able and independent Representative This-and-That.

And though, unless completely stoneheaded, he must know that these journalistic greasers are unshakably New Deal, Fair Deal, and Welfare State Democrats, it becomes the main purpose of his life to have their commendation continue. One would think the intelligent among them would realize they are behaving like political saps, lending themselevs to Democratic propaganda about the desire of Republicans to return to the Harding and McKinley days.

Of course, this talk of reactionary leadership is the cheapest kind of clap-trap. The Republicans did not lose the last four elections because they were reactionary. They lost two of them because of the war and the other two because, in a silly effort to outbid and outpromise the Democrats, they gave the voters no choice between liberalism and conservatism. Twice there have been two neglected issues upon which there is strong reason to believe they could have won. One of these is the evil effect of an enormously expanded Federal machine, the weight of which tends to keep the administration in power and the tremendous cost of which has brought us close to economic chaos.

The other is the shameful subservience of the Democratic administration to the greedy labor bosses, whose reckless waves of strikes have at times endangered the economic life and health of the Nation. With these two issues and the right sort of candidate, the Republican Party can afford to disregard these boresome movements to renovate and redecorate it.

What About Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Friday, August 2, 1946:

WHAT ABOUT RUSSIA?

(Speech of Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Friday, August 2, 1946)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, wars upset the fortunes of nations as well as men. This has always been true, and World War II has proved no exception. Out of this global struggle a new order of world political powers has resulted. No longer, for instance, does Britannia rule the waves. The new world power—America—has become the mistress of the seas. Meanwhile, other significant changes have taken place. Whether our English and French allies like it or not, they realize that a new giant has arisen from the debris of this the greatest of all wars—Russia. Proud of its accomplishments in battle, fully conscious of but not materially weakened by its enormous sacrifices, Russia is the dominating European power today, and no nation now or ever heretofore has been more conscious and proud of that new-found strength and position. In fact, it is obvious to even the most casual thinker that the future peace and opportunity of nations to survive in the new atomic age is largely, if not entirely, in the hands of the United States of America and the Soviet Republic.

Whether these statements are fully concurred in or not, it is certainly worth while to consider the question on the tongues of so many people throughout the world today: What about Russia? Will Russia cooperate with America and thus bring about the coveted goal of peace, or will the peoples of the Soviet Republic follow Stalin, even as others have followed Alexander, Napoleon, the Kaiser, and Hitler, on world conquest, assuming that Stalin has world conquest as his objective? Or do Stalin and his small group of commissars and advisers have in mind the construction of a great economic nation with much of the more abundant life for their millions of subjects? What about the Russian system as a whole? Is it something that the people of this Nation should adopt instead of the system of individual enterprise and freedom of the individual which has made it truly great? Was Mikoyan serious when, asked what exports Russia could make to the United States in the postwar period he said timber, furs, gold, and so forth, but not communism?

These and many other questions were raised in the minds of a subcommittee of the House Select Committee on Postwar Economic and Policy Planning, of which I have the honor to be chairman, as the result of our visit to Russia and 13 other European countries a few months ago. Congress authorized and financed the mission and the study in order that a first-hand knowledge of the European economic situation and its effect upon our own country might be gained. Although only 7—Representatives Zimmerman, Missouri; Wolverton, New Jersey; Hope, Kansas; Wolcott, Michigan; LeFevre, New York; Simpson, Illinois; and myself—of the 18 members of the committee who made the trip, our report to the Congress and the country on our conclusions and recommendations was unanimously adopted by the full committee of 10 Democrats and 8 Republicans; and I hope it may be stated with pardonable pride that this report—the committee's eighth—has been substantially followed in many instances by the administration in its dealings with the several countries visited.

Both the committee and I realize that as a result of such a short dipping into the stream of Russian life we would subject ourselves to the charge of being presumptuous to set ourselves up as authorities on the economic and political problems involved in dealing with the Soviet Republic. However, it will be borne in mind that we were the first and only congressional committee to visit with Generalissimo Stalin and to make anything like a comprehensive study of that situation.

I might also point out that the committee made thorough and adequate provision for its mission. We were accompanied by our staff director, Marion B. Folsom, and our special consultant, Dr. William Y. Elliott, of Harvard University.

In addition to free and sometimes bold conversations with Generalissimo Stalin and his commissars, our group, also with equal frankness, interviewed Prime Minister Atlee and other members of the British Labor Cabinet, as well as the leaders of all other countries visited in Europe and the Middle East. We also talked with our own military leaders and economic advisers throughout the countries visited, including Generals Eisenhower, Clay, and McNarney. Nevertheless, in the subject at hand and the impressions that follow I shall speak only for myself.

While the entire trip, despite its strenuous nature, was most interesting and profitable, I think we all felt that our greatest education on the trip came in the first-hand analysis of the Russian system at work, which was made possible by the intimate talks with the chief officials of the Government, including several members of the powerful Politburo of the Communist Party, in addition to the more formal conference with Stalin himself.

While the economic structure of the Soviet Government is the business of the Russian people, and others, especially Americans, who believe in the right of all peoples to govern themselves, should not question that system, it might be well to point out some of the elements of that system, especially as it concerns the economic and political freedom and rights of the individual. This might be particularly profitable now, in view of the growing tendency in this country by friends of the Russian system to try to sell it to American citizens, and particularly to our wage earners, who now enjoy the highest standard of living of any laboring people in the history of the world. We had ample opportunity to observe first hand the living conditions of the Russian people. The standard of living there apparently has not improved substantially since the days of the Russian czars. Surely the American people do not covet the standard of living under the Soviet system.

As guests of the Russian Government, our committee was given the privilege of visiting both a factory and a collective farm. We were informed, incidentally, by attachés of our Embassy that these particular institutions which we visited were the pride of the Soviets. They were the same institutions always shown to visiting foreigners. The manager of the Stalin auto works received us in the rather elaborate office suite of the factory. He, like all other important men in the party, was dressed in a uniform not dissimilar to that worn by the Generalissimo himself. There in this office, too, hung a large picture of Stalin and another of Lenin. This was a familiar scene, for we observed that all important buildings had these photographs or paintings prominently displayed, while in practically every square or in front of every important Government institution statues of Stalin and Lenin were found. It was our consensus of opinion that Lenin was the only competitor of Stalin in Russia—and he is dead.

Before we were shown through the factory we were thoroughly briefed by the manager, who took great pride in pointing out the productive capacity and other features of that enterprise, which we observed was largely copied after the assembly-line production of our own American factories. When I inquired of him—I confess somewhat naively—if he was bothered by strikes, he, with a smile, replied "No," and something to the effect that strikes were an American institu-

tion. When further pressed as to what happened if the workers became dissatisfied with either their working conditions or pay, he replied that such things never happened and that the workers were all satisfied. But pressed still further as to this, he replied, in answer to the question of what would happen if such complaints were made, that in such event the representative of the trade union and the representative of the factory would get together and iron everything out and everybody would be happy. He, of course, neglected to state that the representative of the trade union and the representative of the factory were both representatives of the Government and the party.

At the collective farm I inquired of the superintendent about the freedom of the workers on the farm to change from one farm to another. Again the answer was that nobody wanted to change; that everyone was satisfied with their working conditions and the fruits of their labor. On further investigation of this after we had returned to the embassy, we learned that these were the true conditions and that both the laborers in the factories and the workers on the farms were virtually frozen to the jobs assigned them. We were also advised that only some extraordinary service for the party would warrant any change in their status.

The NKVD still operates in Russia as effectively as the Gestapo did in Hitler's Germany. It all reminded me of a story that came out of World War I.

It seems that the American mother of a soldier of that war had not heard from him in many months. To her great joy, the long-awaited letter was finally brought by the postman. Nervously tearing it open, she read this:

"DEAR MOTHER: I know you have been muchly concerned about me, since you have not heard from me in several months. Don't worry any more. I was captured at the battle of Chateau-Thierry and am now imprisoned in this German prison camp.

"I was never better treated in my life. I receive three good meals a day, have no work to do, sleep on a feather bed, and am even given good books to read. So please don't worry.

"Your devoted son,

"JOHN."

Then this significant postscript caught her attention:

"P. S.—You remember Bill Grimes, who went into the service with me? He, too, was interned here. He was shot this morning at sunrise for complaining about the prison fare."

What is the system, itself, like? It is no secret, of course, that the control of Russia is in the hands of a smaller group of men than in any surviving world power. The 16 to 18 members of the Politburo may have some internal difficulties, but they are held together in the tightest oligarchic discipline by Stalin's domination of the party and by the necessity of keeping the great Red Army and the marshals in line after the Soviet successes of these years in the war. The internal measures of control mean keeping a very substantial part of the Russian population itself in concentration camps or under the discipline of forced labor in Siberia or in any part of the great area of Russia where they are needed. For that matter, labor's position seems to be one of complete subservience to the party control of the state.

It is a curious thing that we throw open all our industrial secrets, permit the downright appropriation of any copyrights and patents protected in all other states by the act of international copyright laws, allow well over a thousand Russians to be attached to various official capacities in the United States, and legions of Russian representatives who are, in the nature of things, necessarily agents, to explore every aspect of our country and engage in any type of propaganda that they see fit, while the bare thought of such activity on our part in any section of Russia or in the territories which Russia controls would throw the NKVD into convulsions.

The NKVD, by the way, is the group of initials that apply to the security branch of the army and the police who have incorporated the old CHEKA of the earlier Russian terror. Though they are not all in uniform and operate in some instances in plain clothes, the efforts of the NKVD have as pervasive a hold on the Russian system as the Himmler Gestapo and SS organizations had on the Nazi system. We were unable to learn any difference in methods; in fact, the Fascists and the Nazis both simply imitated the highly efficient Russian model.

It does not require a Solomon to figure out the importance of Russia in world economics, as well as world politics. Figures are sometimes produced to show that Russia in the prewar days accounted for an average of only 3 to 5 percent of the world's total international trade, but we are not dealing with that prewar Russia any longer. The rest of the world has changed as well as Russia. Britain is visibly hard pressed to build back an export trade from her own war economy that will put her once more in the sound position of being able to pay for her necessary imports. She has been in the past, and will probably remain, the largest single import market in the world for raw materials and food. France is recovering slowly and with great difficulty. Germany is shattered by war to a degree that can only be believed when seen in its cities and its transportation system, and is being stripped of its industries by the French and Russians directly in their own zones, and by reparation from the western zones for Russia, indirectly. Italy is in a state of prostration and seems unable to develop, in the aftermath of fascism, a broadly supported strong policy. The smaller countries like Greece need raw materials to get back to work, quite as much as the larger ones. Greece has itself probably suffered more in the war than any single country from starvation and deliberate looting of its resources. Only the Scandinavian countries and Belgium seem well on the way to a healthy recovery, though Holland gave promise of rapidly following, and Switzerland was an island of stability in the whole war-lashed sea of Europe. Eastern European countries were, of course, prostrate, subject to "Russian requisitioning" to a degree almost paralelling the stripping of Germany in some instances. The whole continent appeared to give little prospect of sound recovery until some basic political problems and greater freedom of movement and trade had been achieved.

On the other hand, Russia was already making very rapid strides toward reestablishing its industrial system by stripping the wrecked zones of the west and had developed, from all that we could find out, tremendous new strength behind the Urals and in Siberia. This was being supplemented by the importation of machinery, transportation in the form of automotive equipment and anything usable, both from the eastern and western zones of the war. We know now that Manchuria, delivered from the Japanese, was treated to systematic stripping of its industrial machinery in much the same way that eastern Europe and Germany have been. The Russians have a very simple theory about war booty and are not concerned about the niceties of ownership, either American or any other. Apparently in the agreements made at Potsdam, no effort had been made to protect American property and plants, in the zones controlled by Russia, from sharing the fate meted out to everything else that was movable and useful to the Russians. We learned of American factories in Berlin being loaded on trains and moved east, even though their products were primarily for peacetime uses. We also learned that the German skilled labor was being shipped to Russia along with the machinery.

But the real point is that Russia is able today to reach out and harness the resources of the productive capacity of almost one-half of Europe, to add to its own tremendous potential, and is building up the same sort of control in Korea and in Manchuria, adjoining her Siberian provinces in the Far East. It may be true that Russia will be preoccupied primarily with her own reconstruction for a long time to come. If she gets the loans that she hopes to raise she will become a great importer also from outside the region that she controls for several years at least, mainly from this country. If she does not raise these loans, she will have to force her exports as she did in the early thirties, even at the cost of starving a lot of Russians at that time in order to pay for the equipment that she needs and cannot take from territories under her control.

We got the total impression of desperate haste to build up a system so powerful that it could support the flood of the Red Army and pour it in any direction in the very near future. Stalin's speeches have themselves emphasized this point.

For a country that is posing as the source of true democracy and as a liberator of oppressed peoples, the record in eastern Europe alone would be disillusioning. No capitalist country, to whom Stalin has charged the inevitability of the last war, has ever possessed so complete monopoly capitalism as Russia or been so barefaced in its use of power. It can hardly be said, for instance, that Rumania and Hungary have had their economies liberated or an opportunity given them for an economic basis for reconstructing their shattered lives after domination by the Axis. Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia were treated more leniently but with an absolute enforcement of the priority of Russian demands on the controlled governments of those countries.

We got the same story everywhere of the steady lowering of American prestige in every region under Russian control by the refusal to afford adequate quarters to our diplomatic representatives or to let in an adequate staff, to say nothing of the black-out of any sort of news out of Russia except the most closely censored stuff from the few correspondents who had been permitted to penetrate the screen.

The whole system of education in which some of us were very much interested and which we discussed with several groups seems to be in for a thorough overhauling. The classics are coming back, the great heroes of Russia today are not just the products of the Marxian revolution. Indeed, one is tempted to say, and I believe truthfully, that Marx is pretty well dead or translated to a harmless heaven of pure theory so far as internal consumption is concerned. However, Marxian dogmas including the perpetual attacks on monopoly capitalism and encirclement from abroad make the Communist doctrines a useful article of export, in spite of all professions to the contrary. If the Comintern was buried, for understandable reasons, to placate the democracies during the struggle for life of the Russian system against Hitler, the Communist international was never dead. It was buried alive and is manifestly revived today in as crusading a form as it has ever enjoyed, so that Moscow can seek to change the head of the Communist Party in the United States via French Communists.

To the new Russian nationalism, the fatherland has once again become holy, and Stalin an object of universal veneration far beyond anything dreamed of by the czars. The use of the Communist Party abroad is ironical when considered in this light but it is still mighty useful in terms of national interest.

Nothing could be more impressive, and to a democrat, more alarming, than the apparently absolute power of propaganda to

sway the Russian masses in any desired direction. The scale which has been developed in the use of this instrument is applied in every field from production to foreign affairs. Any current of opinion can be reversed so quickly as to leave the detached observer gasping; at one moment it may be the line to conceal, as apparently it was for a considerable part of the war, outside help from the United States on lend-lease. So completely successful was this effort that Russian soldiers, when they contacted our own, asked what we were doing with Russian-made jeeps, tanks, trucks, etc. Later on, in order to create a proper atmosphere for Tehran, Yalta, and the Potsdam agreements, Roosevelt became an object of great affection and along with this the acknowledgment of American aid, in general terms, was handsomely made by Stalin. The British have, however, been treated as imperialists from the beginning, and Churchill probably never enjoyed a real success in Russia as one of the Big Three, even before he became the "bogeyman" of imperialism that he now is.

Naturally, one of the high lights on the trip to Russia was our visit to the Kremlin and our conference with Generalissimo Stalin. We had heard so much and had read so much about the little man with the black mustache that he had become somewhat of a legendary figure in our minds. Both our curiosity and desire to secure information on these momentous questions had been whetted. Before we had left Washington on our 2 months' arduous task we had arranged this as well as most other meetings through the Department of State, whose blessings we seemed to enjoy as the result of previous work done by the committee. Our appointment with Stalin, like all other state appointments that he has, was at night. Our Embassy officials, in the days spent in Russia preceding the appointment, never lost the opportunity to impress upon us that we were the first American Congressmen to be received by the Generalissimo and that the occasion was a very important one.

On the appointed evening we proceeded to the Kremlin in three Embassy automobiles. At the gates we were stopped by the Kremlin guards, who first thoroughly satisfied themselves of the identity of our party and then permitted us to enter the grounds of the Kremlin. We observed as we drove through the several blocks before arriving at the appointed place for our interview, that the grounds were extremely well guarded by Russian soldiers. When we alighted from our automobiles there were still more guards who hastily passed us into the building itself. And there our party, although accompanied from the beginning by a representative of the Kremlin, was escorted down a series of long corridors—how many I do not recall, but it seems that there were at least three or four. At the end of each were more Russian guards. When we reached the end of these seemingly interminable corridors we were taken into a rather large reception room where we waited until our escort reappeared through two large sliding doors and announced our presence to the generalissimo and his commissars, Beryia and Vishinsky. As we proceeded into this second and larger reception room the man of mystery and legend, who was seated at the end of a long table at the far end of the room, got up and came forward to greet us. After introductions had been made all around we were asked to be seated on the opposite side of the table from Stalin's staff, while Stalin sat at our right at the end of the table.

It was agreed in advance that as chairman of the committee, I should do the talking and submit the questions which we desired to have answered. In a session of the group with representatives of the Embassy the line of questions was agreed upon. They were to be forthright and to the point without any surperfluous or too fulsome praise of either the generalissimo himself or the accomplishments of his country as our ally in the late war.

No good purpose would be served by a lengthy report nor have we ever heretofore publicized our Stalin interview which was conducted through Stalin's interpreter and a Mr. Kennan of the Embassy staff, who served as our interpreter. After appropriate but brief courtesies had been exchanged I explained to Stalin on behalf of the committee that our mission was largely an economic one; that naturally economics and politics were inseparable and that the United States was interested in doing as much postwar trade as possible with the Soviet Republic. I stated that we had understood that to this end Russia had made some declaration of its desire to make a postwar loan of the United States. He replied that Russia had several months prior to our visit expressed a desire to borrow $6,000,000,000; that there had been some preliminary negotiations in which the question of the interest rate had been discussed; that America had apparently wanted something like 2 percent and Russia had wanted something less than 2 percent; and that nothing further had been heard from the negotiations. Naturally, we wanted to know several things: First, to what purpose Russia expected to use this money; second, how she expected to pay it back; third, what exports and imports there would be; and, fourth, what could America expect in return.

Without going into all of the details, the Russian leader said in substance that the money was desired to rehabilitate Russia, to increase its industrial capacity, and generally to raise the standard of living in Russia. To all questions his answers were on the whole responsive although at times we thought them evasive. Some of our questions were boldly frank. For instance, I, in more diplomatic language than it sounds, asked what he proposed to do with the millions of German and other war prisoners then within the boundaries of Russia. He came back with the answer that they would be returned to their countries as soon as conditions in Russia permitted. It was when I asked, in an ad lib fashion, how he expected to pay back the loan that he seemed a bit ruffled. With some show of spirit he replied that we were talking of great loans to China who had no resources with which to repay and seemed somewhat perturbed that we should question the ability of Russia to repay her loans with all of the natural resources which she has.

When all of our questions had been asked and answered, we arose, thanked the Generalissimo for the conference, all took a Russian cigarette which was proffered us, shook hands and bade the man of mystery and his advisers good night.

Everyone who visits Russia, and for that matter most other countries, must be impressed by the apparent desire of friendliness by the people in the main, insofar as contacts are permitted. But we were cautioned by the best sources, including our newspaper friends, that we would get anyone in serious trouble which might result in the loss of a bread card or the sudden removal of that person to less desirable parts of the country, possibly to the salt mines, if we tried to cultivate unofficial contacts. The alarm with which anyone in Russia receives the visit of a foreigner is unmistakable and damning.

It is this cloak of complete isolation and secrecy, which is the essence of the whole system, that troubles me most. When we had to fly back to Hamburg from Stockholm, rather than go directly over the American occupied zone to Berlin to see our own occupying forces there, and were seriously warned that we might be shot down if we ventured off the marked route, we had an indication of what distrust the Russians had of our alliance. The plane that we were using had been cleared for going into Russia. But as usual, at the last minute no clearance was given and we had to go in General Eisenhower's *Sunflower II*, a nice plush job, but one that left us stranded in Russia when it took Ambassador Harriman back to the conference of foreign secretaries in London. The Russians insist that none but their own planes traverse any of the territory under their control. Everyone seems to be regarded as a potential spy in Russia. No doubt the struggle for power and control, with the purges that have been necessary to establish Stalin in an unchallenged position of leadership, have left their marks. But it is a system that breeds tough and ruthless masters who feel that they alone can guide the destinies of their own people, and for that matter, that they alone have the key to world organization. This is, of course, an impression, but after all it is well supported by the record.

The Russians are certainly a great and talented nation, though their past history and their present system have conditioned them to quite different ways of looking at things than our own. Those who wish to get on with Russia at all costs are always reminding us that the Russian people are friendly to the United States and that war with them is unthinkable. For that matter, we have been told the same thing before about others.

But it is the totalitarian system of Russia, really governed by a handful of zealots, that we must deal with and not the Russian people. Unless the controls of that system can be relaxed we can never know what is going on in Russia, and the first principles of an exchange of real human contacts are impossible.

Moreover, we were convinced, possibly above everything else, that the policy of appeasement toward Russia, which had been begun during the war by the Allies with the possible justification of bringing the European war to a speedy conclusion and bringing Russia into the war against Japan, must cease. In fact, in a recent conversation which I had the privilege of having with the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, I was convinced that there was ample justification for that policy by both Roosevelt and Churchill. But I am also convinced that Stalin and his advisers understand but one language and that is force. There is nothing that they appreciate more than power and strength. They came to power by force and have since maintained their power in that manner. It is difficult for the average Russian to understand, for instance, why America would expend so many lives of its soldiers and so much of its natural resources to win a war, without also profiting on the theory that to the victor belongs the spoils. It is hard to make them believe that America's only objective is world peace. That just does not make sense to the Russian mind.

On our way back from Moscow to London we visited with both the leaders of such countries as Greece, Egypt, and Iran and our own military and Embassy officials in those countries. It was in these countries that we received our greatest disappointment. In none of these little countries—or, in fact, nowhere on our trip—did we hear the United Nations Organization mentioned. On the contrary, we found a genuine fear and abiding apprehension in all of these countries that it was only a question of time when the soldiers of the Soviet Republic would move in upon them. In fact, we had scarcely left Iran when that happened. In view of this the question was raised in our minds as to whether anybody outside of the United States really took the UNO seriously.

Upon our return to London in a conference with Secretary of State Byrnes, who was then attending the ill-fated Conference of Ministers there, I took occasion to point out these conditions which we had found, and emphasized to him the necessity of stiffening our collective backbone in dealing with the Soviet Republic. Again, upon our return to Washington when our committee made an oral report to President Truman we respectfully urged the same conclusion.

The general attitude of Russia toward her late allies; her strong evidence of acquisition of additional territory; her overt efforts toward the political and economic domination of not only her satellites of the late war, but her apparent objective in the same acquisition or domination of other smaller countries; her secretive and closed-door policies, plus her continuous evidences of unwillingness to fully cooperate in the United Nations Organization, have all added up to a question in the minds of many Americans and citizens of other countries as to whether war with Russia is inveitable.

Without attempting to speak as an expert on the policy of this new giant of Europe, it is our considered opinion that Russia is no more anxious for such a conflict than America or Britain. While it is true that there has been no demobilization to speak of in the Russian military forces such as has occurred in this country, and while it is also true that Stalin is calling for an ever-increasing and more efficient military establishment, it is equally true that the Soviet Republic is suffering from both the heavy economic and military losses sustained at the hands of the Germans. Her transportation system, never too good, must be greatly improved, if not largely rebuilt. Any ideas of grandiose world expansion and imperialism entertained by Stalin and his party advisers must of necessity be considered as a distant objective. There must be new 5-year plans, not only envisioned but realized, before such an ambitious program could well be undertaken. Certainly in the absence of the secret of the atomic bomb no nation would dare provoke such a conflict. And with equal logic, that and other military secrets should not be shared by us with any additional nations until an executive organization with real control has been perfected by UNO.

In the meantime, there is nothing to be lost from the Russian point of view by both a strong economic and political program which will bring about as much such "security" as possible, short of war.

It must be apparent to all nations that we in America covet but one thing in this aftermath of the global war—to the winning of which we contributed so substantially—a stable and perpetual world peace. Surely America cannot be expected to make gargantuan loans to Russia or any other nation without some definite and conclusive assurances that that objective will be realized. So long as Russia maintains the closed-door policy and denies us and other nations, through both the press and other vehicles for exchange of ideas, the knowledge of what is going on in that country even as they now have every opportunity to observe what is going on here, it is unthinkable that we should make substantial contributions in the way of additional financial assistance from our already overburdened Treasury.

The hope of the peoples of the world depends upon the ability of Russia and the United States to cooperate. We all want one world; not one enforced by a crusading system that forces others to live by its pattern, but one where all powers are prepared to live and let live. No people desire cooperation to the end of cessation of warfare among mankind, especially in this atomic age, more than do the American people. But it must always be remembered that cooperation is not a one-way street.

Safeguarding Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address by Mr. Fred Brenckman which he delivered July 28, 1950, before the National Granges of Bucks County, Pa., at Plumsteadville, Pa.:

SAFEGUARDING OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

(By Fred Brenckman)

No other people in the history of the world ever possessed a heritage as rich and precious as ours. It was bequeathed to us by the brave and hardy spirits who carved this Nation out of the wilderness and who laid the foundations of its freedom and greatness. In days long past it was considered a great honor to be a Roman citizen, but I know that I am voicing the sentiments of every thinking person in this audience when I say that it is a still greater honor to be a citizen of the United States of America.

Today we are faced with the stern responsibility of protecting and preserving our heritage against aggression from the ruthless forces of international communism on the one hand and against the dangerous drift toward statism, which is gradually undermining our traditional institutions of Government here at home.

A month ago the alarm bells rang throughout the civilized world when the sudden and unprovoked attack on the defenseless Republic of Korea was launched. This little republic of eastern Asia was established under the auspices of the United Nations following World War II, and the United Nations agreed to protect it against aggression.

Nobody is simple enough to believe that the attack against South Korea was made by the Communists of North Korea, acting on their own initiative. It was Soviet Russia that organized and equipped the army of North Korea, and it is Soviet Russia that is directing the whole undertaking.

AMERICAN HELP FORGOTTEN

When Hitler invaded Russia in 1941, Russia called out loudly for help. She pleaded for the establishment of a second front. She needed tanks and guns and other war equipment to defend herself. After we were drawn into the conflict we furnished Russia with equipment and food valued at billions of dollars, most of which was sent by way of the North Cape and the Arctic Ocean, through waters infested with German submarines, and with German bombers pursuing our ships. Under such perilous conditions we gave Russia the help without which she could not have survived.

One might think that all this would be remembered by Russia with a sense of gratitude. But gratitude is a word that cannot be found in the lexicon of the Communists, who pride themselves on deceit, treachery, and double dealing.

As soon as the shooting in the European theater of war had stopped, Stalin issued a public statement in which he spoke sneeringly about the capitalistic countries, and from that day to this Russia has thrown every impediment in the way of the establishment of peace. She has kept her own army on a war footing and has exerted every effort to increase her fighting strength, as well as arming her satellites, for the sole purpose of subduing the free nations of the world.

This is the situation with which the United States and the other free nations of the world are confronted today. Nothing is to be gained by ignoring it. The only argument that Russia respects is force, and the only safe thing to do is prepare to defend ourselves.

When the order of the United Nations to cease firing in Korea was ignored, we undertook, almost alone, to halt the drive of the Red army of North Korea. Lacking time to mobilize our manpower and equipment, we have encountered serious difficulties, from which we hope to extricate ourselves in due time.

Nevertheless, it was our duty to intervene in Korea. The League of Nations signed its own death warrant when it did nothing to stop Japanese aggression in Manchuria, or to halt Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia. To have done nothing about the invasion of Korea would have meant the death of the United Nations. But if the United Nations is to be anything more than a name or an international debating society, the United States alone should not be expected to carry all its duties and responsibilities.

ON THE HOME FRONT

But while we are making such great exertions and sacrifices to restore and maintain peace throughout the rest of the world, we must do all in our power to preserve the American heritage of freedom here at home.

Let us not forget that ours is not only a government of and for the people, but by the people. We will elect a new Congress this year, with one-third of the Members of the Senate to be chosen, too, together with State officials. Here in Pennsylvania a new Governor will be elected.

As the Pennsylvania State Grange said in a resolution adopted at our last annual meeting, it is both the right and the duty of every qualified elector to go to the polls and cast an honest ballot at primary and general elections. Slackerism at the polls has frequently reached scandalous proportions, with little more than half of the voters participating even in Presidential elections.

As the Grange resolution on this subject set forth, such a situation is a reproach to the civic virtue and intelligence of the people, frequently making it possible for well-organized minorities to elect to public office those who are pledged to serve some special interest or group, regardless of the general welfare. When that happens those who have disfranchised themselves by staying away from the polls have only themselves to blame when the wrong kind of people are elected to public office.

Roughly speaking, there were more than 93,000,000 potential voters in the United States in 1948. The actual vote cast for President was only 48,834,000. In other words, only a little more than 52 percent of the qualified electors took the trouble to vote. The number of stay-at-home voters aggregated about 44,000,000, a figure exceeding by about 13,000,000 the total population of the United States at the time of the Civil War.

The United States has the distinction of being the first country to establish manhood suffrage, and there was a time when the right to vote was more highly prized than it is today, which is to be deeply regretted. Is there not justification for saying that the future of democracy cannot be regarded with too much confidence when those who were once ready to die for the privilege of voting must be driven to the polls against their will?

Let us not forget that those who vote belong to the governing class, while those who fail to vote belong to the class that is governed. If that truth can be firmly driven

home, perhaps we will have a smaller percentage of stay-at-home voters in the future.

THE DRIFT TOWARD STATISM

One of the most disquieting tendencies in our national life is the rapid drift toward statism or overcentralization of government. If our American heritage of freedom is to be preserved this tendency must be halted. It should be clearly kept in mind that there are two sovereignties in this country, the sovereignty of the Nation, and the sovereignty of the States. It was not the intention of the founding fathers of the Republic that the Federal Government should meddle in any unwarranted degree in the affairs of the States and their minor subdivisions.

If it had been otherwise, the Constitution of the United States could not have been adopted, because the people of that time were passionately attached to the freedoms and blessing that flow from local self-government.

It is often pleaded in attempting to justify the tendency toward centralization which has been so strongly in evidence during recent years that, with our improved facilities of transportation and communication, State lines and State rights no longer have any particular significance and should, therefore, be disregarded, leaving it to the Federal Government to look after things in a big way in the interest of greater efficiency.

A DELUSIVE DOCTRINE

This is both a delusive and a destructive doctrine. While it is true that science and invention have annihilated time and space, human nature is still the same as it was 160 years ago, or a thousand years, for that matter, and it is fatal to the workings of our free institutions to make the governmental unit so large as to destroy the local and individual sense of responsibility. This is particularly true in the expenditure of public moneys.

This Nation, with its wide domain, its diversified interests, and its teeming population, is too great to be wisely and democratically governed, down to the most minute details affecting the daily lives of the people, from the seat of the Federal Government at Washington.

Let us not forget that there is only one way in which the powers of the Federal Government can be expanded, and that is by contracting or restricting in a corresponding degree the rights of the States and of the individual. Woodrow Wilson gave utterance to a profound truth when he declared:

"The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist the concentration of power we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

The Pennsylvania State Grange has always believed that we will get the best results if each unit of government, national, State, and local, will stay within its proper sphere, with each unit faithfully performing the duties and functions devolving upon it, and with none encroaching on the rights and prerogatives of the rest.

It is certainly true that in the same proportion that we deprive the people of the right of participation in the affairs of government, they lose all knowledge of government. Nothing could be more fatal to popular rule than that.

THE BRANNAN FARM PLAN

A good illustration of the drift toward overcentralization of government is the farm plan advocated by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, which has the support of the President of the United States. Less than 20 years ago, no person holding a position of responsibility in our public life would have dared to bring forward such a plan, the adoption of which would be the longest step in the direction of state socialism that this country ever took.

Briefly stated, under the Brannan plan prices of most farm commodities would be allowed to find their own level in the market place, promising cheap food for the consumer, while the farmer would be guaranteed a good income through the use of Federal subsidies. But the farmer would be subjected to the strictest regimentation. To all practical intents and purposes he would become a mere ward of the state, and he would be subject to fines and jail sentences for violations of certain provisions of the act. The money needed to pay subsidies and to meet the heavy costs of administration would naturally have to be raised by taxation, placing heavy burdens on both the producer and the consumer.

While it is proper for the Government to assist agriculture in the solution of the manifold problems with which it is continually confronted, the grange and all the other national farm organizations of the country, with a single exception, are opposed to the adoption of the Brannan plan.

If we want to preserve our American heritage of freedom, we cannot afford to experiment with such crudely socialistic theories as that. There is only one plan under which any government can long endure. That is when the people support the Government. Any attempt to reverse this fundamental process, asking the government to support the people, cannot fail to result in disaster.

It was Patrick Henry, the flaming orator of the Revolution, who laid down the dictum:

"No free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people, but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

California Water Project Makes Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL F. WHITE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, the records of the Department of Agriculture show that the San Joaquin Valley is the richest farming area of its size in the United States. However, this great farming area has been plagued with a serious water shortage during the last decade. The Department of the Interior long ago recognized the existence of this devastating water shortage and they accordingly conceived what is known as the Central Valley project, to bring water to the San Joaquin Valley from the Sacramento Valley to the north, where a water surplus exists.

The building of this great water project has been fraught with many difficulties over the years. Those of us who have fought for it have been up against what is perhaps the greatest and strongest lobby in this Nation, the private power trust and the Army engineers.

It is, therefore, with great pride, Mr. Speaker, that I insert in the RECORD today following my remarks, a news release from the Orange Cove irrigation district, one of the irrigation districts in my congressional district, outlining the great progress and accomplishments in the Orange Cove irrigation district, a part of the Central Valley water project.

Mr. Speaker, I hope when the appropriation bills come before this Congress for the continued work on the Central Valley project that the Members of this great body will recall this splendid report on the Orange Cove irrigation district and will vote generous appropriations to carry on this great project, which means so much to the supply of food and fibre for our country, not only in this wartime era, but in the normal peacetime era as well.

ORANGE COVE IRRIGATION DISTRICT NEWS RELEASE

Officials of the Orange Cove irrigation district today announced the completion of another pipeline unit of their water-distribution system. This unit, the fifth to be placed in operation this season, will service approximately 900 acres. Upon completion of a sixth unit now scheduled to start functioning soon, the total district acreage receiving water from the Friant-Kern canal will be approximately 7,000 acres.

Members of the board of directors point out that a year ago the Orange Cove irrigation district had no distribution system of any kind. They also note that water conditions in this area along the eastern edge of the San Joaquin Valley have been becoming steadily worse during the current dry period of years. The water made available to the district from the Friant-Kern canal has meant the difference between failure due to lack of water and a successful operation to many farmers.

During the 1949 season water was available only from July 10 until September 10, but during this period feverish efforts were made to utilize as much water as possible. Many owners reported that the water delivery beginning in mid-July came when their ground-water supplies had become insufficient to mature their crops.

The 1950 water season has been marked by a great increase in the amount of water diverted by the district. While water was available earlier, district users did not take delivery of water until early May and the demand increased until the maximum was reached in mid-July. While the current season is expected to end on September 1, the supply during May, June, July, and August has done much to alleviate the extreme water shortage. It is hoped that the cessation of ground-water pumping by the users of Central Valley project water will result in better pumping conditions for other water users in the district.

The Orange Cove irrigation district contains 25,450 acres of which approximately 8,300 acres lie in the zone above the Friant-Kern Canal. Of this land up hill from the canal, about 1,300 acres are now taking water through a series of concrete pipelines.

Construction costs have been held very low through the use of local equipment and facilities as far as possible. Contracts for pipe work have been let on the basis of competitive bidding among the pipe manufacturers in the area. The pipe systems are of low-head, nonreinforced concrete irrigation pipe which is used in conjunction with series of low-lift pumps. In this manner the water pressure on this type of pipe is held within allowable limits.

Operations have been surprisingly smooth in spite of the fact that economy dictated the elimination of costly automatic controls. In approximately 2 hours per day, one water tender has been able to regulate two pipe systems, each involving a total lift of approximately 85 feet through 2½ miles of pipelines with a total of 11 pumps at 9 lift stations.

In some cases where immediate water delivery was necessary to prevent crop losses,

landowners agreed to allow temporary open ditches to be run through plantings and natural-drainage channels. These ditches have been relatively inexpensive to construct and have already paid for themselves many times over. In every instance the thought has been, let's cooperate and get the water where it is needed.

Completion of these units climaxes a year of planning. Beginning in July 1949, informal public meetings of landowners in the various areas were begun with the purpose of exploring the possibilities for systems which could be placed in early operation and financed locally. At these meetings, which were held at the Navelencia School, the irrigation district office, and the East Orosi School, committees of landowners were appointed to work on plans in conjunction with the district's engineer-manager. As definite plans were developed and proposed, additional meetings were held, at which landowners were free to express their wishes. Where improvement districts were desirable, the irrigation district prepared the necessary legal forms and assisted the landowners' committees wherever possible. Up to the present time, all costs have been met by voluntary assessments plus a small amount of warrants sold to local landowners. Following approval of plans and advance deposit of funds, bids were prepared and the jobs were started under contracts. The irrigation district's engineer-manager also directed the design and construction of the systems and all collections and disbursements were made through the district office.

As the systems and installations have been completed, many landowners have made immediate use of the water supply. Some have used the water to save permanent crops or to shift from single to double cropping on open lands, while others have preirrigated grain lands. Grain growers have reported as much as twice the yields from preirrigation as from their former dry-farming operations.

Most of the area in the Orange Cove irrigation district was formerly intensely developed, and it may be expected that with an adequate supply of water available, the area will return to its former high standing in the diversified-farming picture. The early maturing dates of crops in this area have been recognized and considerable emphasis is expected on garden and field crops:

The board of directors of the Orange Cove irrigation district is composed of M. N. Jensen, president; Harvey S. Chase; Fred H. Bear; Oscar Orlopp; and John Hudson. The district's engineer-manager is J. F. Sorenson, and the secretary-assessor-collector is A. J. Vortmann.

Unpreparedness for Korea Should Be Investigated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting an article which recently appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of July 25, 1950:

UNPREPAREDNESS FOR KOREA SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, July 25.—General MacArthur has dissassociated himself from responsibility for the defense of Korea prior to the aggression by the North Koreans.

This step is significant because it means that some day Congress will have to place the blame elsewhere for the failure of adequate United States forces to be in the far-eastern area. The exact words of General MacArthur are to be found in a message telegraphed to President Truman last week. The pertinent paragraph about responsibility for the unpreparedness of America in the Far East said:

"I do not believe that history records a comparable operation which excelled the speed and precision with which the Eighth Army, the Far East Air Force, and the Seventh Fleet have been deployed to a distant land for immediate commitment to major operations.

"This finds added emphasis in the fact that the Far East Command, until the President's great pronouncement to support the epochal action of the United Nations, had no responsibility for the defense of the Free Republic of Korea. With the President's decision, it assumed a completely new and added mission."

The foregoing second paragraph quoted could not have been inserted by the general without purpose. Whatever the reason, General MacArthur's statement opens up a new avenue of discussion. For if the Far Eastern Command wasn't responsible for military contingencies that might arise in Korea, who was responsible?

There was a time when weeks ahead of a crisis—the moment the newspapers began making mention of any possible trouble in areas where American interests were not far away—the Secretary of the Navy would walk over to the Secretary of State and ask if there would be any objection to sending a cruiser or a battleship to patrol somewhere near the area where there might be danger of friction.

Nowadays, however, under unification, the procedure is far more complicated and clumsy. The Secretary of the Navy doesn't go direct to the Secretary of State at all. He has to lay such a matter before the joint Chiefs of Staff. After they find out how much money the Secretary of Defense will allot to them, the chiefs have to decide what ships the Navy shall or shall not have in commission.

The matter of what areas shall or shall not be defended has to go before the National Security Council. It takes a persistent Secretary of the Navy to get anywhere. By this time the whole problem can be lost in a maze of red tape and complex unification machinery. In this instance nothing at all was done. Everybody's business was evidently nobody's business.

The question of why adequate naval forces and marines to handle a mission in Korea were not on hand either in the Philippines or at bases in Okinawa or even in waters near Japan is one that should soon be answered by a nonpartisan board of inquiry. Such an investigation is essential if America is to develop a system of command—civilian and military—which will be prepared for contingencies that can arise in fulfilling the new American responsibility of policing the seven seas.

Either new legislation or a sharper delineation of responsibility for command areas is needed to protect American interests against sudden outbreaks of aggression.

Let's Help People Quit Being Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Morris Ernst, a distinguished New York lawyer, who has long studied the problem to which the article deals. He makes original and constructive suggestions that are well worth reading:

LET'S HELP PEOPLE QUIT BEING REDS

(By Morris Ernst)

An attractive, soft-spoken young scientist sat in my office recently and told me a story I had heard from half a dozen other young men during the previous year. His story began when he was in college. He had joined the Communist Party.

After graduation, he applied for a job. wherever he looked for work, whether with the United States Government or with one of the large corporations, he found on the application blank the inevitable question: "Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?"

With its usual determination to leave as little as possible to the judgment and conscience of the individual, the Communist Party already had instructed him how to answer such a question. Ordinary standards of truth are unimportant in underground movements. The party's instructions to the young scientist were to answer the question "No."

My client told me, as the others had, that as soon as he wrote the word "No" on the application, he knew he was a prisoner for life. He knew that if he ever tried to leave the Communist Party, the party itself would send annonymous communications to his employer giving him information to prove that the scientist had been a member of the Communist Party at the time he had filled in his application.

Like thousands of others, this young man today is trapped. He is no longer in sympathy with Communist aims or methods. He would like to get out. But how can he? Would not he lose his job and be unable to get another? Wouldn't he be ostracized by all decent people?

MANY JOINED PARTY WHEN YOUNG, NOW KNOW BETTER

The predicament of the young scientist points up the stupidity of the way we have been handling communism to date. Our whole policy has been to ostracize and persecute and, in short, to drive the Communists underground. We have recognized the danger of communism and spent millions of dollars through Government and private agencies to come to grips with the movement. But the effects have been almost negligible. Communism today still thrives.

It is time for us to adopt new techniques, and start afresh with a new plan of action.

POSITIVE PROGRAM NEEDED

Our biggest objective in the future should be to drive the Communist Party out into the open. Some people have urged that we outlaw the party. But that would accomplish nothing; its members would simply bob up with a party bearing a different name. What we need is a positive program.

One of the best ways to start such a program would be to help young Communists quit the party. The blow to the movement would be tremendous. After a number of people like the young scientist had come to me with a similar problem, I talked with some former Communist leaders whom I now trust. I came to the conclusion that one-third to one-half of the people in the Communist Party under 30 years of age would get out if they knew where to go.

Many of the party's members are people who joined in their late teens or early twenties. Unlike the Democrats and Republicans, the Communists recognize that youngsters are aware of political and economic problems long before their twenty-first birthdays. And in many cases, the young people who succumb to the Communist appeal do so out of fundamentally decent motives.

This is vividly illustrated in the recently published book, the God That Failed, in which well-known people tell why they joined or worked for the Communist Party and why they left it.

The party appealed to Andre Gide, for instance, because he hated poverty, though he himself was not poor; Richard Wright became a member because of his genuine desire to help other colored people; Ignazio Silone embraced communism from a desire for pure Christianity.

But only part of the attraction of communism for young people can be attributed to its appeal to altruism. Adolescence at best is a period of uncertainty and insecurity. For those whose emotional background makes them fear the transition from protected childhood to responsible maturity, the Communist Party offers the warm safety of an intellectual womb. The movement fills up the lives of its people. It creates in the minds of its members a kind of dedication, a sense of belonging.

WHY MANY WANT TO QUIT

If we understand why people—especially young people—join the Communist Party, we can also see why so many want to get out.

Those who join for altruistic motives generally find that the same desires force them to break with the party. Thus, Gide was disillusioned after a trip to Russia. He realized that the existence of squalor side by side with wealth, which offended him in capitalistic countries, had been carried over into Communist society. The only change was in the personnel of the privileged classes. Wright broke away when he discovered that the Communists had no real concern for the problem of the Negro. Silone, seeking a more truly Christian society, was alienated by the Communists' ruthless disregard for principles of ethics and decency.

Similarly, those whose emotional instability leads them into communism do not always remain in a perpetual state of psychological adolescence. Maturity brings to many the willingness and ability to think and act as responsible, independent people. They find that they no longer need the crutch of communism. They begin to appraise the party, its aims and its methods, and find it wanting.

OSTRACISM HELPS REDS

Yet our attitude of ostracism merely plays into the hands of the Communists by keeping such people in the party even when they are ready to quit it and rejoin decent society.

To give these people a new chance, I propose that employers and labor unions get together to set up a special employment office. To run the office, one of J. Edgar Hoover's top screening officials should be hired on some kind of leave-of-absence basis. It could then be announced that people under 30 years old who are in the Communist Party and want to get out and get jobs as decent Americans could apply to that employment office.

To be sure, the party would try to plant some continuing Communists as applicants. There unquestionably would be some danger in that. But obviously we are facing greater danger if we continue with our present stupid strategies. Above all, we must have faith that we will be smart enough to catch the spies that the Communist Party will plant.

In any case, the office could not be used as a means to get Communists into strategic jobs. Under my plan, it would refer applicants only to nonsensitive jobs in private industry. Employment opportunities would still be plentiful, for 95 percent of our jobs don't concern national security. At the same time, the employer and the trade-union would be aware of the previous record of the applicant. I don't advocate secrecy, but the public's tendency to ostracize ex-Communists will probably require that applicants remain unidentified.

I am quite persuaded that such an operation, even conducted on a small scale to start with, at a cost of maybe $50,000 a year, would bear immediate fruit. Above all, it would throw consternation into the Communist ranks.

But more methods than that are needed to combat communism. If we agree that the best thing is to bring it into the open, there is one method that would really hurt.

PARTY HAS MANY FRONTS

As most people know, the Communist Party is not just an ordinary political party. In most States, it is not a political party at all and is not on the ballot. Its main effort, therefore, has been to sell ideas in the market place through innumerable front organizations. These are the organizations that express themselves in favor of decency and democracy, and generally sound good on the surface. In reality, of course, they merely serve the purposes of the Communists by creating confusion between what is progressive and what is communistic. So clever have they been that even eminent Americans like Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Henry Stimson, among others, have been tricked into letting their names be used by such organizations.

TO BEAT REDS, WE MUST EXPOSE, NOT SUPPRESS, THEM

To help beat the Communists, therefore, we need a plan to hit them here too. We should establish a reporting service on the lines of Dun & Bradstreet, the well-known business research organization. I should imagine it would not be difficult to get 50 Americans to contribute $500 apiece to set up such a service on a nonprofit basis. At most, there are only some 500 organizations that would have to be investigated. When files on these are complete, the current expense of examining new organizations would be small. To meet costs, a nominal fee could be charged.

How would the service work?

When a request for information came in, a full report would be made on the facts. The report would give information as to names of officials, directors, and other personnel of the group inquired about. It would give a brief history of the work done. And it would indicate whether or not the particular group published financial statements.

HOW REDS SPEND FUNDS

Whether or not financial statements are published should be of particular interest. The Communists, for instance, raised a million dollars for the Scottsboro case and spent only $60,000. What happened to the rest? More recently, the Communist Party has been planning to raise $2,000,000 for the appeal and defense of the 11 convicted Communist leaders. Of that amount, it is expected they will spend under $200,000 for such legal expenses.

The reporting service would draw no conclusions, however, about a suspect organization. It would not even, as Dun & Bradstreet does, offer a rating of the group. And it would not advise an inquirer whether or not he should support a particular organization. The function of the service would be to report all the information without screening. But it would, as the FBI does at times, appraise the trustworthiness of an anonymous source.

In brief, the service I have in mind would not be unlike the National Information Bureau, which provides information on charities. The NIB was set up some years ago because of the need for similar caution in the philanthropic fields. Now a prospective donor who does not have the time or the resources to make a personal investigation can get a full report on any charitable or educational group in which he is interested.

Similar reporting agencies, on a smaller scale, have already been established in a few other fields. For instance, Jewish groups and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People have been keeping complete files on anti-Semitic and anti-Negro organizations.

But there is no reporting agency to which inquirers may turn when they are approached to give money or support to, say, the Civil Rights Congress. Many people, I am sure, have given contributions to that organization under the impression that they were dealing with the thoroughly loyal American Civil Liberties Union. With a reporting bureau like the one I suggest, mistaken support of front organizations would be held to a minimum.

OTHER METHODS NEEDED

Such, then, are two effective ways we might begin the new campaign against communism we urgently need to undertake.

Other methods must also be worked out. But we should never forget the basic principle that the best weapons against deceit and stealth are full knowledge and disclosure, not suppression.

If we use them in every way possible against communism we will achieve what we have failed to do by ostracism and persecution.

In the light of day, decency and democracy will win out.

Authorization for Additional $5,000,000 Should Not Be Approved at This Time

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against the legislation providing for the authorization of a $5,000,000 so-called disaster fund. This is a fund that will be placed under the control of the President and to be used when he and his representatives feel it should be expended in the event of disaster. Of course it does not apply to military disasters, but to disasters of various kinds.

I would not be misunderstood. I am in favor of the Federal Government rendering such assistance as it should in the event of tornadoes, floods, and other kinds of disasters that come to the people of this country. It should share in taking care of damages resulting from destruction of property and the need for helping to take care of the expenses to alleviate human suffering.

This is a matter that Congress has always taken care of in a generous way since our country began. Whenever there were disasters where Congress believed assistance should be granted liberal contributions have always been made. Not in any case have such requests been turned down. The Federal Government through Congress has worked with the Red Cross and other agencies in taking care of these expenses.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation in substance provides a fund so that a group of people may make application to the

President whenever an alleged disaster occurs, and it will be then for the President and not Congress to decide if and when such funds should be used. This is putting too much power in the hands of one man. Furthermore, it extends invitations to groups to make application for the use of funds to a Federal agency in place of submitting the request direct to Congress, where the question of allocation of funds can at least be examined.

Mr. Speaker, these are abnormal times. They are serious times. They are times when we should be extremely careful with regard to the expenditures and allocation of taxpayers' funds. I think it is for the best interests of our country not to adopt this legislation. We do not have any demands for the use of funds presently before us. When such requests are made, we can take care of them on their merits as presented.

Federal Assistance to States and Local Governments in Major Disasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, facing as we do, necessary expenditures of stupendous magnitude to insure our survival, it seems to me that this is an ill-advised moment to bring before us a bill to set up this entirely new method of spending Federal funds. True, the limitation on the authorization here is $5,000,000, but it is the foot in the door. Next year, effort is likely to be made to double it, and the year after, to double it again. Soon it may be fifty million, and soon thereafter, one hundred million.

No one would quarrel with the proposition that in cases of extreme and sudden hardship, where local authorities are not able to cope with a disaster, the Congress should help out with the use of Federal funds. We have frequently done that, for instance in the case of the unprecedented storms in the West last winter. The Congress will do it again when disaster strikes and there is no other way of meeting it. But let us face each such situation as it arises. Let us not abdicate our responsibility and turn over a blank check to the President. The Congress has been all too ready in the past to follow that course. Now, more than ever, we need to husband our Federal resources and scrutinize with a critical eye the many requests for Federal assistance for this, that, or the other worthy project.

Under this bill, as now worded, the President alone, in his sole and absolute discretion, determines what shall constitute a major disaster to justify him in sending funds to a local community. Only two requirements are laid down. One is that the governor of a State must ask for the money and certify that it is needed. Two, the governor must give assurances that either the State or a local subdivision is going to spend "a reasonable amount" of its own funds to match the funds that come from the Federal Government. Now experience would dictate that we cannot rely upon the governors of the various States to exercise prudence or conservatism in asking for Federal funds. Nor does it seem to me consonant with our responsibility to leave with them to determine what is "a reasonable amount" for their State, in each instance, to contribute. Very naturally, they are going to try to get all the Federal money they can in order to relieve their State treasuries. This is intended as no criticism of them. It is simply an unquestioned fact which it is completely unrealistic not to face. It is our responsibility, not theirs, to protect the Federal purse.

It seems to me that inadequate consideration has been given to the possible implications of this legislation. Let us suppose there is a big fire in some community. While serious and disastrous, it is the type of catastrophe which has always in the past been handled by local authorities, possibly aided by the State, and by such private agencies as the Red Cross. If this bill passes, where will the people at once turn? If precedent can be relied upon, they will turn to the Federal Government. Multiply that situation many times all over the country in the case of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, storm, and other catastrophes and you have some conception of what this legislation might eventually entail. It is an open invitation to come to the Federal Government to solve what is essentially and primarily, in each instance, a local problem.

Then the next thing we will face will be that the Federal Government will say that it needs to have some supervision over the local agencies which are intended to control and prevent the occurrence of such disasters. That will be an excuse to set up another huge bureau in Washington to provide Federal stanards for fire and police protection and other preventive agencies throughout the country. The argument will be made with some plausibility that such action is necessary, to prevent the Federal expenditures from getting out of hand.

If we are going to retain the home rule principle of having local problems solved in each community, with recourse to the Federal Government only in extreme and individual cases, we should try to nip such proposals as this in the bud, before they flower into another gigantic Federal give-away program.

The President, each year, is given a large discretionary fund intended to meet just such situations as are envisioned in this legislation. This is simply, in effect, an effort to boost those funds by $5,000,000, without any showing of need. No community which can show to the Congress that it cannot meet a great disaster, need have any fear that the Congress will not respond promptly and generously. But the people look to us to pass upon such situations. They do not expect us to turn over money to the President to be passed out without any strings attached to it and with no adequate safeguards in the way of standards.

The very least that we should do is to recommit this bill and provide that the Congress, as well as the President, shall have a say in determining when a major disaster requires the expenditure of Federal funds. In my judgment, the passage of this measure without such protection as a very minimum, would represent a surrender of legislative responsibility.

Mobilization Production Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. JAVITS, Mr. Speaker, the appended editorial from the New York Herald Tribune bears out my contention that a central operating agency like the War Production Board of World War II is essential if we are really to do the job the present situation requires. This is the agency to be established under my bill, House Joint Resolution 511:

TOO MANY COOKS

Congress is coming to grips with the problem of deciding what kinds of control are needed to mobilize the economy, but it is paying too little attention to deciding where the power to exercise the controls should be assigned. Controls will not work automatically, they will have to be administered. When power to wield them is divided, the results inevitably include vague assignment of power among agencies, overlapping authority and blind spots in the control program. These weaknesses lead to interagency feuding, to lack of uniformity in control standards and to a shopping for favors by the economic groups under control. The harmful effects on the mobilization effort require no imagination to predict. Our experience in two world wars provides the answers: unnecessary bottlenecks in production, delays in the switch-over of men, materials and facilities from peace to war goods and profiteering which a single control authority could reduce.

The case against divided authority is so indisputable that the President's position on the question gives cause for serious concern. He has expressed his intention to have the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce and Interior supervise the allocation and priority powers requested in his message to Congress on economic mobilization. He has failed to designate any single authority to synchronize the mobilization program, whether it be limited or all-out. Although the National Security Resources Board is specifically charged with responsibility for designing a coordinated plan, Mr. Truman has not indicated any intention to call upon the board to perform the operating function.

The President appears to believe that a partial mobilization does not require single, coordinated execution. This is surely a mistaken view. Even the partial program would require synchronization of controls over industrial production with controls over credit and with manpower activities. If separate agencies operate in these fields or, worse still several agencies within a single field, hope for effective coordination may as well be given up; partial mobilization will be a failure.

We must be prepared to go to full mobilization in any case. How much more effectively we could accomplish it if we had already set up the single authority, made a good start on the coordination of all controls in use and avoided the conflicts, wastes, and production lags that inevitably accompany divided authority. The President has done a careful job in designing an industrial and taxation program that offers the chance of success. To improve that chance and to prepare for the contingency of full mobilization, we believe he should turn to the National Security Resources Board for the task of control execution. If any doubt exists as to the Board's legal mandate, Congress should be called upon to clarify it, giving the Board clear operating power for the coordination of all elements in the mobilization effort.

Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorials which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times on August 4, 1950:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 4, 1950]

GET ON WITH CONTROLS

While Washington engages in uncoordinated debate over economic controls, prices continue to climb. Public sentiment is mobilized to fight inflation, but Congress is not. It is understandable that Congressmen should be confused by the plethora of anti-inflation proposals coming from every quarter, but unless Congress gets on with the job of legislation, the toll of rampant inflation will be inexcusably high. The need of the moment is an order of priority for the anti-inflation and mobilization measures that have been thrown into the hopper.

First place on the agenda should be given to the increase in taxes requested by the President and approved by most Members of Congress. An increase of $5,000,000,000 is the minimum amount that offers any chance of safety. Unless the tax boost is effected without delay, there will be no point in debating partial economic controls; full controls will be necessary. In the absence of adequate taxation now, even full controls could not repair the inflationary damage that would be wrought by uncurbed purchasing power.

Immediately following the tax boost should come the passage of the limited economic controls set out in the President's message of June 19. Defense production must be stepped up and must flow without hindrance. Authority is needed to limit nonessential uses of scarce materials, to allocate them, to assure priority for military equipment, to requisition facilities where needed, and to curb inventory hoarding. Certainly, too, power to encourage military output should be added to the power to cut back nonessentials. Credit restrictions on consumer purchases, on private mortgages, and on commodity dealings are overdue. This is the skeleton kit of economic powers needed to expedite production and reinforce the tax brake on inflation.

Next should come passage of a bill giving the President stand-by authority to wield full economic controls and assigning him the responsibility to decide when they should be invoked. Any attempt to substitute a mechanical formula for the responsibility of the Chief Executive should be resisted. We are not content to wait for full controls until prices have risen another 7 or 10 percent; we want them before that much damage is done.

If full controls should be needed, they must be ready. Plans to fix prices and wages and to ration consumer goods should be completely blueprinted. Congress should state its intention that if the President invokes any of them, he invoke all of them. To fix prices without freezing wages, or vice versa, would be farcical, and to adopt price fixing without rationing would be no less so. Moreover, the interconnection between prices and wages should be extended (though not necessarily in the same bill) by a link with profits. An excess-profits tax, applicable no later than the fourth quarter of 1950, is urgently needed whether or not wages and prices have to be controlled. Fair treatment of taxpayers demands it, and so does the campaign against inflation and profiteering.

There would be no objection to coupling partial controls with fuller stand-by controls if the legislation could be approved quickly. It seems likely, however, that both could be speeded if they were separated. Neither should be delayed. The limited controls are necessary to meet the situation we are in. The stand-by powers have a double function. They provide insurance against being caught short if partial controls fail; and since they would incorporate authority to roll prices back, they would take much of the temptation out of present hoarding and speculation, thus helping to give partial controls a chance to be effective.

[From the New York Times of August 4, 1950]

HYSTERIA ON CAPITOL HILL

The House voted tentatively yesterday to go far beyond providing the President with stand-by controls over prices and wages in case of serious rearmament inflation. It passed by a voice vote an amendment to the pending Defense Production Act which would invoke such controls automatically when and if the Government's cost-of-living index reached a level 5 percent higher than that prevailing on June 15.

The fact that the House could approve such a proposal even tentatively reflects a lack of understanding of the problem before it and of the possible consequences of its action that are gravely disturbing. Only a few short weeks ago this same Congress was making plans for a sweeping reduction in excise taxes, although the Federal Government was then running in the red at a rate of more than $5,000,000,000 a year. This newspaper and many others warned more than once in recent months that the time was at hand to consider a reversal of the inflationary fiscal and monetary policies then being pursued; but until the Korean invasion such warnings fell for the most part on deaf ears.

Then the administration, acting with commendable intelligence and speed, moved toward disinflation with the Defense Production Act and a request for an increase of $5,000,000,000 in taxes. And now Congress, suddenly aroused from a deep slumber by the flurry of scare buying which has followed the outbreak of Korean hostilities, has given way to hysteria. Before a single one of the anti-inflation weapons proposed by the administration has even been tested, it is demanding that the country be plunged into the kind of regimented economy that would require a police state to enforce it.

To propose a complete freeze of the domestic economy at this time, declared Leon H. Keyserling, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, would be fantastic. "For the next year," he added, "you'd do nothing else but throw out 90 percent of what you froze." The first mobilization task, declared the President's chief economic adviser, "is to figure out what your top problems are, and then clear them up. Those top problems are mandatory allocations of scarce materials, credit controls, and higher taxes."

Whatever may be said for an all-out freeze of the economy when war, as in 1942–45, was the almost exclusive business of the United States, and when the Government was running an average deficit of more than $54,000,000,000 a year, it is plain economic quackery to suggest that the same prescription is indicated when only 10 percent of the Nation's product is marked for defense, and when the administration has made it clear that it means to finance the defense effort on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Dr. Stanley Hornbeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky. The quotations from Stanley Hornbeck are deserving of the closest study. What a tough break for boys dying in Korea as a result of our Government's miscalculations that it was deprived after 1944 of the counsel of the real expert on Asia, through the successful efforts of the Acheson-Hiss crowd which drove him, along with Berle and others, out of the Department:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Dr. Stanley Hornbeck used to be chief of the far eastern division of the State Department (1928–37). From 1937 to 1944, he was adviser on political relations of the State Department. Then he was kicked out to make room for the Alger Hiss crowd. He was made our Ambassador to the Netherlands, and then retired.

Hornbeck has been the leading far eastern expert of the United States since he went to the Versailles conference in 1918.

Those most familiar with China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines and such countries realize that Hornbeck's specialized knowledge is extensive, intimate, and important.

At the annual meeting of the American Society of International Law last April, Dr. Hornbeck delivered an address which has just become available to me, in which appears the following:

"The United States withheld recognition of the Soviet Government until a new administration here had become convinced that that government met most of the standard tests of what constitutes a recognizable government and that it would be reasonable and advantageous to accord it recognition.

"Then we laid down conditions; we asked and we were given pledges, and, even at that, we were deceived. The Russian Soviet Government has disregarded both its general legal obligations and its particular pledges, including those made then to us and those made before and since to us and to other countries.

"There is little if any warrant for an expectation that, with or without recognition and with or without pledges, the performance of the Communist regime in China will differ very greatly from the performance of

the Communist regimes in Russia and in other Communist countries.

"All Communists are committed to the destruction of persons and peoples, institutions and agencies which stand in the way of world domination by communism. The Chinese Communists, whether they are or are not controlled by the Kremlin, are allies of the Kremlin. They imitate the Russian Soviet system, they use its methods and they follow the made-in-Moscow party line."

The particular purpose of Dr. Hornbeck's address was to discuss the recognition of Soviet China by the United States and the United Nations. Despite the war in Korea, this is not an academic question. Nehru, of India, is pushing Soviet Russia's demands for such recognition. Nehru is naturally scared of Russia which, moving out of China, Afghanistan, and Mongolia, can overrun Pakistan and India as Ghengis Khan did.

Nehru hopes that by playing the role of the honest broker, he might save India and even enhance its influence in international affairs. This has never succeeded with Soviet Russia. The best known example of the destroyed middleman is, of course, Jan Masaryk. It is generally forgotten that at the beginning of his career, Chiang Kai-shek played exactly that role in China.

Hornbeck brings this matter to a head in the following references:

"The Chinese Communist regime demands that it be admitted (in the United Nations) and the representation of the National Government be expelled. The Soviet Union supports those demands and is trying, with its walkout and boycott tactics, to blackmail the United Nations into compliance with that twofold demand.

"The United Nations, embarrassed first by the Chinese National Government's preferring of charges against the Soviet Union and embarrassed further now by the Chinese Communist government's demands and the pressure applied by the Soviet Government in support thereof, is greatly concerned about the menace to it of this Soviet pressure, more concerned, it would seem, than it has thus far appeared to be about the menace to the world of Soviet pressures of the past 5 years in China and against a government there which the Soviet Government had expressly pledged itself in special agreements to support.

"In and regarding this situation, the Government of the United States has taken an affirmative position toward sidetracking consideration of the Chinese Government's charges against the Soviet Union and has taken a negative position toward the question of representation of China in the United Nations. Its spokesmen have declared that its delegation will vote against recognition by the United Nations of the Communist regime but will not resort to a veto and will accept such verdict as may be arrived at by the votes of others."

How can the State Department justify not using the veto as long as we are actually at war with Soviet Russia and Soviet China and every Soviet country in Korea?

In Defense of a Dead Defender—Eisenhower Unavailable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be recreant to myself and disloyal to the memory of a friend did I not join with Stewart Alsop to say:

If Johnson had simply told the country that for economic reasons it was his policy to reduce American strength, he would have been tragically wrong, but at least he would have been honest. To attempt, as he has repeatedly done, to conceal what he has been doing under a cloak of bombast, is not honest. As for this most recent attempt, to identify the policies of the dead Forrestal with his own failures, that is positively indecent.

And to quote again for emphasis, may I say:

When the record of a great public servant, who is dead, is distorted in order to excuse the follies of his successor, it is time to set that record straight.

Loyalty to a friend is a commendable virtue so long as one does not make that loyalty an excuse or an alibi or puts such loyalty above loyalty to his country as did Secretary Acheson unnecessarily when he endorsed Alger Hiss or as does President Truman when he notifies the country that come what may to the people of the United States he will retain both Secretary Acheson and Secretary Johnson.

The President's alleged loyalty is a mistaken policy for the great majority of the American people have no confidence in either or both Secretaries. Since that is so, and it is so, the President defies the people. He bespeaks for himself the same lack of confidence had by the people in the Secretaries named.

The Secretaries should have the patriotism to submit their resignations before confidence in them is further shadowed by legislation to impeach them which has been threatened and is seriously contemplated.

EISENHOWER UNAVAILABLE

While I would agree with Senator TOBEY's suggestion that General Eisenhower be drafted to be Secretary of Defense, were such a thing possible, it is true the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, provides in effect that no person who has within 10 years been on active military duty may be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense.

Without legislation to repeal or to waive that act any attempt to make General Eisenhower Secretary of National Defense is a waste of effort.

However, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted I include an article by Stewart Alsop in yesterday's Washington Post that reads as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF A DEAD DEFENDER

(By Stewart Alsop)

When the record of a great public servant who is dead is distorted in order to excuse the follies of his successor, it is time to set that record straight. It has been intended to avoid, as far as possible, mention of the name of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson in this space. But when Johnson uses the words of James V. Forrestal to defend his own disastrous policies, this is no longer possible.

Johnson's recent elaborate defense of his record was squarely based on a statement by Forrestal before the Senate Armed Services Committee in March 1948. Forrestal then recommended an increase of $3,500,000,000 in defense spending, at the same time warning the committee that "as a military matter" a $9,000,000,000 increase was urgently needed. "In other words," Johnson says, "the dilemma presented by the competing military and economic considerations was resolved at the $13,500,000,000 level" by Forrestal.

Johnson then goes on to claim that the "substance of this decision"—to hold defense spending at this level—has been "repeatedly ratified," and slickly implies that he, Johnson, has thus only done what Forrestal wanted to do. As anyone reasonably well informed should know, this is simply untrue—grossly and demonstrably untrue.

The truth is that when Forrestal asked for the $3,500,000,000 increase in the spring of 1948, he knew that this was insufficient, and had so informed President Truman. Forrestal accepted the $14,000,000,000 defense limit—then imposed by Truman—under protest, and regarded it as temporary. The Soviet blockade of Berlin which soon followed was a clear signal that the Russians were willing to risk war, and confirmed Forrestal's judgment.

Forrestal accordingly asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff to prepare a new budget figure. That August the Joint Chiefs came up with an inflated estimate of more than $30,000,000,000. After many conferences with his old friend, Robert Lovett, then Under Secretary of State, Forrestal reduced this figure to $23,000,000,000, which he believed would permit a reasonable balance between the vast political commitments of the United States and American military strength.

TOO MUCH FOR TRUMAN

Early in October, Forrestal presented this new figure to Truman. Truman flatly refused to accept it. Forrestal went back to work, and in November, shortly after the election, he submitted to Truman a $17,000,000,000 defense budget, which he believed was an absolutely bedrock minimum for the security of the United States. But Truman, suffering from the euphoria which overcame him after his electoral victory, insisted on the Budget Bureau's wholly arbitrary $15,000,000,000 defense limit.

It was then that Forrestal, in long anxious conversations with his friend Lovett, discussed the question of whether he should resign in order to dramatize the danger. Perhaps wrongly, Lovett counselled his friend to stay on at least for a time. Forrestal did so, but the conviction that the weakness of the United States placed the country in jeopardy preyed on his mind like a cancer, and led soon to his tragic end.

This is the true record of Forrestal's position on defense. Obviously President Truman must bear a share of the responsibility for American weakness, but at least his $15,000,000,000 limit would have provided some of the strength we now so tragically lack. Since that time, the danger signals have multiplied—the Soviet atom bomb, the fall of China, the threat to all Asia and all Europe. And Johnson, with the President and the Congress all too ready to believe his boasts about increasing combat capabilities at less expense, but below the President's own limit, freezing money appropriated by Congress for defense, discharging combat troops, mothballing ships, slicing into aircraft and weapons procurement.

FIGURES TELL THE STORY

The facts and figures which make nonsense of Johnson's claim that over-all combat potential is higher than ever, have been reported repeatedly in this space, and they have not been denied. As for Johnson's claim that he has done only what Forrestal intended to do, a few figures on the strength planned under the Forrestal regime for June 30, 1949, and the actual strength provided under the Johnson regime on June 25, 1950,

tell the story. Forrestal—nine infantry divisions at 94 percent strength; Johnson—seven such divisions at 75 percent strength. Forrestal—24 naval-air groups, 34 patrol squadrons, 31 marine squadrons; Johnson—9, 20, and 12 in the same categories. Forrestal—10,559 active Air Force planes; Johnson—7,967 active Air Force planes.

And so on. If Johnson had simply told the country that for economic reasons it was his policy to reduce American strength, he would have been tragically wrong, but at least he would have been honest. To attempt, as he has repeatedly done, to conceal what he has been doing under a cloak of bombast, is not honest. As for this most recent attempt, to identify the policies of the dead Forrestal with his own failures, that is positively indecent.

It is high time the people of the United States understood what is confronting them despite the attempts of those named to hide from them the awful fact that we were never so ill-prepared; never in so great danger; never so complacently led to slaughter as by those who have undertaken to do a job so far beyond their capacity and ability as at this moment.

In defiance of Congress the executive departments have refused to comply with its specific instructions.

If that is not both cause and ground for impeachment, it should be, in a democracy.

Personalities cease to be an issue. Alleged loyalty to consistent betrayers of the people is not a virtue. The President himself should act to rid himself of those who have ill-advised and misinformed him. To do otherwise is to approve their actions in the premises which the people will never forget nor condone. The responsibility for the situation which obtains rests squarely upon the President and his advisers who have repeatedly disregarded the explicit and specific acts of Congress, which is the people.

For the situation which confronts us, responsibility rests on Acheson and Johnson, and more largely on the latter.

Just ordinary common decency of consideration of the public demands should suggest to him that he insist upon his right to resign. He has established every reason why the President should accept such resignation.

Position of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce Relative to Mobilization, Controls, and War Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am extending in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of general principles adopted by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce on pay-as-you-go taxes, controls, and mobilization. They are certainly worthy of consideration:

The board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce believes that every thinking American should call upon Congress to place the United States on a pay-as-we-go basis for the duration of the Korean crisis.

Since we demand our troops in the field display the greatest fortitude, it should be obvious to all that at least some measure of fortitude should be displayed on the home front.

By postponing the day of fiscal reckoning for costs of World War II, those of us who remained at home during that war have succeeded in transferring a share of the burden to the men and women who bore more than their fair share of the costs by fighting the war for us.

We should not permit this to happen again. If we have courage, we will embark on a pay-as-we-go policy and at the same time avoid needless controls by:

1. Immediately reducing all nondefense expenses. We are convinced we are wasting billions on nonessentials.

2. Immediately setting up substantial increases in taxes sufficient to pay for this new mobilization program. Let us acknowledge that national defense costs money. Let us start paying for it now.

We are now being threatened with dictatorial economic controls. These controls would erect mountainous road blocks of red tape at every strategic production intersection. They would regiment our daily life needlessly.

The basic arguments presented in favor of such new regimentation are that economic controls would prevent a runaway inflation and would assure availability of materials for military purposes.

First, let us point out that in existing laws the President already has all the powers he needs to assure military production. The Selective Service Act alone authorizes the President to mobilize the manpower, the factories, and the materials needed to fight a Korean war or pack some weight into "peace offensives" elsewhere.

Second, inflation cannot be prevented by controls. The evil effects of inflation are only postponed unless the causes are removed. These causes are not connected with controls. The primary cause is the creation of new credit by Government printing of money and issuing of bonds.

Inflation has followed every war in our history because we have not paid our way as we went. No matter how many controls we adopt, inflation will follow this mobilization if we follow the same easy path of deficit financing.

The point that escapes too many is this: There is no easy way to fight a war. Wars cost lives and money. Postponing payment of the costs has never made it easier to pay. We should have learned this lesson within the decade. Every American should insist that we pay as we go.

Let Us Act Before It Is Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, after 6 weeks of war against bloody Stalin in Korea we have about 30,000 poorly equipped troops there. At the same time Stalin has 58,000 spies and agents operating freely in the United States of America. They are well-financed, well-trained, and united. Day and night they plot and scheme against our boys who are dying in Korea. Nothing is seemingly done to stop them.

It is sickening that our Government even permits these traitors to use the radio, television, and even the mails to plot the betrayal of our country. Why in the name of decency should our boys die in Korea to stop communism when we cannot even stop their traitorous activities within our own shores. If this Congress continues to sleep, the people are not going to be patient much longer. Already groups are taking the law in their own hands and bodily throwing Communists out of factories, offices, and meetings. The people are confused and disgusted with our "Little Boy Blue" approach to stopping communism.

Immediately when we declared war in 1941, all Italian, Japanese, and German aliens in our country had to register and sign for all the possessions they owned, such as books, radios, and guns. We placed all Japanese in detention camps. Are the Communists a special kind of people who must never be molested? Are they alone to plot and scheme without limit? Where is our common sense?

I plead for positive action now. There was only 1 Communist for every 2,700 people in Russia when they took over. There are in the United States today 1 Communist for every 2,400 people. Are we blind to realities so that we will wait a little longer before we take action?

Without delay, let us pass here and now laws to do the following:

First. Outlaw the Communist Party—label it for what it is—a ring of spies and traitors.

Second. Freeze their bank accounts and safety deposit boxes and compel them to register all money in their possession.

Third. Compel all of them to register, including all their aliases with penalty of life imprisonment if they refuse.

Fourth. Inspect their offices and their places of meeting.

Fifth. Deny all radio, press and television facilities for their traitorous propaganda and lies.

Sixth. Prohibit the use of the United States mails to their traitorous cause.

Seventh. Place in detention camps any and all Communist spies and traitors—at least while our boys are dying to undo their traitorous work.

Unless we take action now we are not worthy of the trust the people placed in us.

Letter From Kelly Ingram Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Kelly Ingram Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Birmingham, Ala., are worried about publicity on our war activities that give aid and comfort to the enemy. I, too, have been deeply

concerned about this particular problem. So under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include a resolution from my own VFW post condemning this practice and offering a suggested remedy:

KELLY INGRAM POST,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Birmingham, Ala., July 28, 1950.

Whereas the United States of America is now involved in a major conflict with a Communist nation on foreign soil and many miles from our main base of supply; and

Whereas many news releases have been made in the last few weeks, telling of troop movements, equipment and supply movements to our operating centers and the type and capabilities of material used by our soldiers in battle; and

Whereas the indiscriminate broadcast of this information undoubtedly costs the lives of many American soldiers: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of Kelly Ingram Post 668 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America in regular session strongly recommend to the Commander in Chief Harry S. Truman that he immediately set up an office of censorship to see that no information is published or broadcast that gives aid to our enemies and results in loss of life to our comrades; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Alabama congressional delegation, the commander of the department of Alabama of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Birmingham News, and the Birmingham Post-Herald.

JOHN A. JENKINS,
Commander, Kelly Ingram Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Attest: WESLET A. WARMACK,
Adjutant.

Addresses by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of three addresses which I made.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS AT VETERANS' DAY CELEBRATION AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA.

I come before you at a critical hour in the tactical timetable of Communist aggression. I want to emphasize tactical as contrasted with a strategic timetable. The bloody battle developing on the southeastern corner of the Korean peninsula will not—whatever its outcome—decide ultimate victory in the Korean war for the red invaders.

The history of aggressive warfare is full to the point of overflowing with accounts of battles won by invaders who in the end lost the wars they had started. There is, as all of you know, a world of difference between a tactical victory in battle and the outcome of a war conceived on false strategic concepts. The Nazis achieved one tactical victory after another in overrunning Europe more than 10 years ago. The sneak attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japs was a brilliant tactical success for them that had been prompted without provocation and which relied heavily on surprise. But in the end, it was the failure of Nazi strategy and Jap strategy which lost the war for them. Both the Nazis and the Japs made the common error of underestimating the vigor, the resolution, resourcefulness, and the strength of free peoples.

Yet the Reds—in the face of those recent lessons in strategy—have now made the same blunder. For five postwar years, the Communist propaganda line has played the same tune—you've heard it—"Americans will talk big, but they won't do anything when the chips go down." Evidently, the Reds used this line so long that they began to believe it themselves.

I suppose, though, in fairness to the Kremlin strategists, it should be pointed out that the Reds have had some assistance from American isolationists in making their big mistake. If the Reds have read the record—as I'm sure they have—they have seen one of the two major political parties in this country vote 3- or 4- or 5-to-1 in the Congress against virtually every measure to strengthen the free world against communism.

The Reds have seen that the support of bipartisan foreign policy within the Republican membership of Congress is indeed narrowly confined. The small bloc of congressional Republicans, once ably led by Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, today has no effective leader as a result of Senator VANDENBERG's continuing serious illness. But most significant of all that the Reds have been able to observe is the fact that even at the high tide of Senator VANDENBERG's influence on Republican policy, he never once had the support of anything approaching a majority of the Republican congressional delegations—nor did he have a controlling voice in shaping the official Republican line that was to be followed by orthodox Republicans in Congress.

Instead, obedient majorities of three or four to one within the Republican delegations followed the isolationist "don't-help-any-free-peoples-anywhere" line laid down by the entrenched Republican leadership.

I think it is readily apparent that the Communists could be misled into the belief that the overwhelming Republican support for isolation represented the thinking of most Americans, and that this isolationist attitude would be embraced by a large enough group of our people to bankrupt any efforts which might be made to resist Red aggression if aggression was in fact decided upon.

Now while it is true you have never heard a Republican, or a Democrat either, say he had any love for communism, the overwhelming number of congressional Republicans have demonstrated a remarkable reluctance to do any more about communism than talk against it. The usual Republican approach to our programs to strengthen the free world can be summed up in one word: economy. They have been so obsessed by the desire to economize that they have gone to the extent of wanting to spare the water needed to put out a fire.

When you look at the record, you will see that most Republicans gave lip service to sending military assistance to Greece and Turkey, and they supported—so many of them said—the "principle" of the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, the military-assistance program for other free nations, and point 4. But when it came down to a vote on the funds needed to make these programs effective at all, you could find only a tiny handful of Republicans who could understand that inadequately financed programs were as bad, or worse, than no programs at all. Obviously, if the programs were cut back to levels which would not permit them to do an effective job, what money we did spend for them would simply be wasted entirely.

So, year after year, since the end of World War II, we in Congress have witnessed the spectacle of vote after vote where we have barely squeaked through—or have at times failed to beat off—efforts to lop off funds designed to strengthen the free world. We have seen the Democrats vote 4 or 5 to 1 to sustain adequate funds for these all-important programs—and we have seen the Republicans vote 3 to 5 to 1 to cut the funds far below levels imperatively needed to make the programs successful.

I firmly believe that it was such votes as these which led the Reds into the fatal strategic mistake they made by pushing the button for the Korean attack.

Several weeks after the unprovoked aggression launched against the Republic of Korea, my Republican opponent who seeks election to the Senate this fall in my place announced that in his opinion our Nation had made commitments in the Korean War without having corresponding force to back them up. I want to ask you, if you will, to analyze that observation. I have thought about it a great deal, and frankly, it troubles me very much.

The observation is ambiguous—and so is the context from which it is drawn. It isn't at all clear just what he had in mind. By this, does he mean that we should have allowed the Reds to swallow up Korea without lifting a finger? Or does he think we should now pull out of the fray altogether? The Reds would have preferred to see us stay out of the Korean business—but I certainly don't believe the American people would have wanted us to stand idle while an aggressor walked all over a weak neighbor. The free world hasn't forgotten the lesson of Munich that quickly.

Or perhaps the remark means simply that he doesn't believe America has the wherewithal to carry through on our commitment to Korea and the United Nations. If that's what he had in mind, he has a lot less faith in America than do the rest of our people. The American fighting man understands the job he tackled. He knows—and he's demonstrated by his valiant actions in the past 6 weeks—that he's got to buy time, needed time, to get reinforcements and supplies to match the tremendous numerical strength that was gathered secretly and launched without warning on a tiny country armed only to the extent of downing border raids and keeping civil order.

Remarks that imply we haven't got what it takes to make good on our word are a flat sell-out of the brave men who are fighting the battle of freedom in Korea. Such statements as these accomplish nothing more than disunity among our own people and despair among our allies.

Now I have never been more serious in my life than I am in saying right now that the time has come to take stock of ourselves, our resources, and our policies. We need criticism—constructive criticsm that mends our shortcomings, that promotes unity and strength among the free people the world over. But carping criticism that isn't clear as to its meaning, or criticism which disregards the facts, isn't constructive.

I opened my remarks to you today with the observation that Communists have made the same disastrous strategic mistake that the Nazis and Japs made before them—they underestimated the strength and resolution of the free democratic people.

More than any single event in the crucial postwar years, the Communist decision to undertake aggressive warfare has cleared the air and has revealed with crystal clarity what is required to halt Communist efforts to dominate the world. With a single stroke the Communist attack on South Korea has exposed to bright sunlight the fuzzy thinking, the irresponsible arguments, and the enormity of the error committed by the isolationists and their comrades in arms who in

the name of economy have systematically sought to cut to the quick every anti-Communist program that has come before the Congress. In their penny-wisdom and pound-foolishness, they have screamed against the Communists and, at the same time, have turned thumbs down on every single proposal to operate our national and international programs at adequate levels.

Thus, the Korean attack has exposed the blind economy bloc and the isolationists as being the same breed of cat.

The thought occurs to me here that it is appropriate to say something about our spending for national defense since the close of World War II. The isolationists and their cohorts parading as economizers haven't been content to confine their attacks to the programs designed to strengthen other free nations. Even our own national defense has come in for its turn at their hands. Last year, for example, we were just barely able to beat down in the Senate, by a vote of 41 to 36, a move that would, if passed, have forced the President to cut back by as much as 10 percent of all Government spending, including defense.

But today the Monday-morning quarterbacks who have been exposed for their isolationist and false-economy moves at the expense of world freedom now demand to know what has happened to the sum of forty-eight and three-quarters billions of dollars which have been appropriated and spent for our own national defense during the past 4 years.

They now hope to shift the limelight from their own errors to an attack implying that most of the nearly $50,000,000,000 has been misspent or otherwise poured down a rathole without buying us military security.

Well, here's their answer—though they knew the answer before they began talking.

Approximately six out of every seven dollars spent for defense during the past 4 years went for necessary overhead. This included about $20,000,000,000 for military personnel—for their pay, food, and clothing. It included another $13,000,000,000 that was used for maintenance and operation of military equipment such as ships, aircraft, military installations. Another $5,000,000,000 was spent for such things as maintaining the civilian personnel who form such an important arm of the military, for retirement pay, for military public works, and industrialization programs. These three—provision for military personnel, for operation and maintenance of equipment, and the last item of $5,000,000,000 for such things as the civilian arm and retirement pay—reach a total of $38,000,000,000.

Of the balance of the $48,750,000,000 spent, there was $10,750,000,000 available for procurement of new equipment and for vital research. Two and a quarter billion went into research programs on such things as guided missiles, supersonic aircraft, radar, high-powered, recoil-less antitank guns, and other developments exclusive of atomic weapons.

The remaining $8,500,000,000 was devoted to procurement of new types of equipment, about three-fourths of which went for new types of aircraft, and the balance was used for ships, combat weapons, and vehicles.

The high percentage required for overhead—six out of every seven dollars as I have explained—is what we must regard as a fixed expense for operating our Military Establishment on a basis which will permit a ready expansion if and when needed. The fixed nature of this overhead is, I think, well illustrated by the fact that less than one dollar in twenty of the additional $10,500,000,000 requested recently by the President for additional defense must go to overhead. In other words, $10,000,000,000 of the $10,500,000,000 will go exclusively for purposes of increasing our combat strength.

Those who would seek to undermine our faith in our military defense by casting doubt in our minds are doing a grave thing indeed to the security of the free world.

As I indicated earlier, we do need criticism—constructive criticism. We need the kind which can strengthen us by pointing to specific examples of weakness and which suggests constructive ways of overcoming them. Irresponsible political attack, however, does not fall into that category.

Isolation has been exposed for what it is—and the false economy of seeking to economize on our security needs has also been exposed. The mistake which the Reds have made in attacking Korea has now swept away the phony argument of the isolationists and the false economists.

Those who have been completely consistent in standing by the programs such as aid to Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, a full-fledged program for military assistance to the free nations, point 4, and an adequate national-defense system are the ones who have been true to our efforts to halt communism and preserve world peace.

With the phony arguments now demolished by Red aggression, we are going forward with full-scale plans to strengthen the free world quickly enough that the Reds will not again dare to tamper with the peace. We are going forward as a united people, and we are going forward with the friendship, encouragement, and support of free peoples all over the world who, though poorer and weaker than we, are doing everything which is in their power to further our common goal of bringing about lasting peace in a free world.

More than ever before, it is now clear that the real effort against communism cannot be fought with mere unsubstantiated charges and attacks upon the loyalty and capability of our civic leaders. Those who feel that the complete answer to communism can be found by shaking our fists in supposed anger—while at the same time cutting down to nothing our help to our free neighbors or refusing to help them when they are attacked—are completely discredited by the march of events.

Americans—the overwhelming majority of Americans—know that actions speak louder than words, and as we've done throughout the postwar era, we are acting in defense of world freedom—acting faster now than before, because the isolationists and the blind, penny-pinching internationalists have been revealed for what they are.

We are not committed in Korea beyond our power. We are not committed to stand by the free world without the ability to carry out our commitments. Anyone who suggests that has underestimated the American people as completely as the Kremlin has.

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF AUGUST 4–6, INCLUSIVE

A tremendous amount of my mail recently has dealt with questions of controls over our domestic economy, and of mobilization for defense.

I'd like to use this particular radio report to the people of Pennsylvania as an opportunity to summarize the questions that have been asked me about controls, and to answer as many of those questions as time on a 15-minute broadcast will permit.

Here, then, is a picture of the sentiments expressed by the overwhelming majority of the people who have written me recently about controls:

Prices on a great many commodities have sky-rocketed. In some instances, goods that are ordinarily available in abundance can no longer be found at any price. Several reasons appear to be responsible for the higher prices and the shortages. For one thing, there has been a great deal of scare buying and hoarding. For another, some merchants have stepped up their buying in the hope of piling up big inventories that can be unloaded later at higher prices.

Curiously, many of our present shortages are artificial. You might find it hard to believe after looking at the shelves in your grocery this week, but the truth is that we have more sugar than we know what to do with. Store shelves are bare simply because people have been buying far more sugar than they usually do, just to have some extra on hand. This extra purchasing has overtaxed the packaging and distribution facilities with the result that artificial shortages have occurred.

Thus many of the shortages and high prices have been artificially created by hoarding and by some unscrupulous merchants who have tried to profiteer. We have seen, too, I regret to say, the occasional use of sharp practices by merchants who have tried to pawn off shoddy, second-rate goods by starting rumors of scarcity, of plants about to be converted, or what have you.

My mail makes it abundantly clear that our people want controls imposed on prices and wages. They want rationing as a means of protecting fair-minded people who are not trying to hoard or profiteer. They want these controls imposed not only to protect our home-front economy, but also because they are aware that the selfish practices of hoarding and profiteering are downright unpatriotic and unfair to the brave Americans who are fighting the Red invaders, unfair to the men who are being drafted, unfair to the Reserves who are being called up, and in fact, unfair to free people the world over who realize fully that our primary task is to halt Communist aggression.

Now let me tell you something of the developments presently shaping up in Congress.

In the past several weeks, we have heard the testimony of dozens of military and civilian experts who have discussed various phases of our defense mobilization needs. There have been, as you know, sharp but honest disagreement among them as to what is needed at the present time. But of these experts, none has commanded the attention and respect accorded to our great elder statesman, Bernard M. Baruch.

Rather than tell you what Mr. Baruch said, however, I would prefer to have you hear him summarize, in his own words, the recommendations he made for our mobilization needs. The Honorable Bernard M. Baruch:

"One, organize America for all-out mobilization, with a general ceiling over the entire economy to prevent further inflation and an all-embracing system of priorities to strengthen our defenses and minimize dislocations.

"Two, the very least that must be done is to amend this priorities legislation to provide for effective price and wage control and rationing authority. To do less is to invite cruel suffering and possible disaster.

"Three, taxes high enough to eliminate profiteering and to cover all defense costs. These taxes should take effect for at least the second half of this year.

"Four, continued rent controls with provision for clearly justifiable increases.

"Five, prompt creation of an over-all mobilizing agency to synchronize all our efforts.

"Six, postpone less essential expenditures. As an aid to that, a capital issues committee should be established under the Secretary of the Treasury to review all capital issues, public and private, deferring less essential projects to make sure housing, schools, hospitals, and other more essential needs are met first.

"Seven, strengthen the United Nations by coordinating our efforts with it in common defense of peace.

"Eight, speedier assistance in rearming of those nations ready to resist aggression, along with the expansion of our own defense forces.

"Nearly 3 years ago, I clipped an item from a newspaper which seems ominously prophetic today. It told of a boast made by a Soviet general. This general boasted that the western democracies were bound to be defeated by the Soviet Union because they would not make the sacrifices necessary to arm themselves. They prized their standards of living too highly. They would not be willing to accept the disciplines to put guns over butter.

"In Russia, though, this general boasted, the people were inured to hardship. The Soviet Government would force the sacrifices to mobilize. A lean and hungry, but mobilized Russia, would overrun a Western World which could not bring itself to mobilize in time.

"That is the test which confronts us—not only this country, but all of the free peoples of the world. It is the choice of peace or butter, of mobilizing our strength now, while peace can still be saved, or of clinging to petty wants and petty profits, imperiling our freedom and our civilization.

"No outside enemy can defeat us. We can defeat ourselves. Gentlemen, yours is the decision. Which shall it be—discomfort or defeat?"

This is Senator MYERS again. You have just heard our great elder statesman, the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch summarize the recommendations he recently made to Congress for undertaking our expanded defense program.

As might be expected, the Baruch proposals were attacked by those who—though they fully support drafting men and calling up Reserves to meet the new Red threats—nonetheless feel there is no need for comprehensive controls on our economy. These critics seem willing to send men off to fight and die in defense of freedom, but they are unwilling to curb the profiteer and stay the hand of the hoarder.

I believe the critics are dead wrong.

I have weighed carefully the various recommendations which have been made, and I have read the arguments posed by the critics. As I see it, this is the situation which confronts us:

There is some belt-tightening ahead for all of us if we are to meet our responsibilities fully.

I believe the President should be given comprehensive powers to impose controls. I believe they should be available on a standby basis. Not all of them are needed at once. Some may not be needed at all unless the international situation worsens greatly.

The use of comprehensive stand-by powers has the great advantage that they may be imposed without delay if and when needed. These powers must be broad enough to permit a roll-back of prices to sane levels. They must permit the control of wages, the assignment of priorities, and powers of allocation to assure adequate supplies for defense needs, and to guarantee the maximum production of essential consumer goods.

It is obvious to all but a few die-hards that the very existence of stand-by powers will act as a big deterrent against price increases and hoarding. The only ones who have cause to fear controls are those who would seek to boost prices out of line, or to hoard. The fact that controls are standing by, ready to be used if necessary, will make any potential bad actors think twice before misbehaving.

Heaven knows, no one likes controls for controls' sake, and we certainly won't use any more of them than are absolutely necessary. Controls—though most people appear to want them now—won't be popular once they are in effect. The American people have never liked controls, and they know full well that however carefully the controls are administered, they inevitably impose greater hardship on some than on others.

But little as we like controls, they must be readied for use. We Americans will not be satisfied to set up one standard for men in the armed services, and another standard for the selfish few who would profiteer or take more than their fair share of what we have to go around.

Inflation can be our worst enemy. You will recall that our industrial production was running close to peak levels when the Korean attack occurred. Now we plan to add perhaps $15,000,000,000 worth of new defense spending to that already loaded output.

In terms of our economy, the $15,000,000,000 expansion would mean an increase of about 6 or 7 percent in our total industrial output—a figure small enough that it would not cause serious disruption of our economy. When you consider, however, that hoarding buyers and businessmen seeking to build up their inventories are also adding new burdens to our output, it is obvious that the total effects of stepped-up defense activity and increased consumer demand would gravely overtax our industrial capacity.

Controls such as suggested by the Baruch proposals will halt the hoarding and inventory stockpiling. We will also reduce the inflationary effect of our defense program by making severe cut-backs in Government spending for nondefense programs, so that the net increase in the Federal budget as now planned will be far below the $15,000,000,000 level.

As Mr. Baruch pointed out, we should seek to pay for our new defense program as we go. This can be done—and we can curb inflation at the same time—by the combination of higher taxes, reduced Federal spending for nondefense work, and by tighter controls on consumer credit.

I believe our new tax program should be designed to curb profiteering and to close the inflationary gap. We should be able to accomplish this without imposing new tax burdens on families with low fixed incomes who are always the worst victims of high prices.

Credit buying has a tremendous inflationary effect—and today, Americans already owe the record amount of nearly $20,000,000,000 for consumer goods they are purchasing on credit. The inflationary effect of credit can be offset to a large extent by requiring larger down payments.

The steps I have indicated are necessary in light of what we can now foresee. We are not on a total war footing, far from it. While all of us pray that total war does not lie ahead, it is nevertheless a contingency we must keep in mind.

Our actual needs are for limited war, not the full-dress, all-out affair. As I say, we must in our planning keep in mind the possibility of total war, and be fully prepared should the present, localized version of war spread out into the real thing.

Our present task is merely to speed up the job that has been under way throughout the postwar period, that is, the task of building up our defenses and those of the free world.

The present situation does not call for total war mobilization, and although a sudden change in the international picture might shift us into complete mobilization, our present plans do not contemplate a big curtailment of production of basic consumer goods.

But it is unthinkable that we should not accelerate our defense plans at this time. Aggression, whenever and wherever it appears, must be stamped out. To do otherwise would lead us through a series of Munichs, and cause a gradual eating away in the strength of the free world as the Communists picked off independent nations one at a time.

Our opposition to Communist expansion has been the focal point of our foreign policy, and for the present, we're all in for some belt-tightening to see the job through.

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE MEMBERS AND GUESTS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA AMVETS, FORT STANWIX HOTEL, JOHNSTOWN, PA., JULY 29, 1950

I am doubly glad to be with you tonight. For one thing, I've always enjoyed other AMVET gatherings in the past, and I've looked forward to joining you this evening.

But I'm also pleased to be here because this provides me—as one of your two United States Senators—with the opportunity to bring you a report from the Senate and elsewhere in Washington on some of developments which are shaping up now on the international front.

Without question, the international question is the issue of the day. It's uppermost in everyone's mind—and it is imperative that all our people should have the facts on what is taking place. A fully informed public in times of this sort is all-important.

A great many of you in this room, I am sure, know at first hand the enormous complexity of any military operation. You are familiar with the great initial advantage gained by any military force which brings a surprise attack. You know, too, the vast supplies which must be secretly marshalled before a surprise attack can be launched. And I am sure you recognize the unprovoked Red attack on South Korea as one which had been carefully planned long in advance and the attack was put into motion on a split-second time table.

Any of you—and I'm sure this applies to most of you—who have followed carefully the Communist tactics in the postwar era are fully aware that the Communist attack might have been launched against West Germany, or Yugoslavia, or Greece, or Turkey, or Iran, or India, or Indochina—instead of against South Korea. In your mind's eye, you can see the vast half-circle of the iron curtain as it hangs across eastern Europe, and runs across the continent of Asia to the east, and thence north to Siberia on the Pacific Ocean opposite Alaska. The uninhabited, frozen wastes of the polar cap complete the circle of iron curtain back at its beginning in northeastern Europe.

The essential thing to recognize here is that the Communists have sought incessantly to push the iron curtain ever outward into larger and larger circle, within which new millions of oppressed people could be swallowed up and subjugated by Communist masters.

The free nations which rim the border of the iron curtain found themselves—almost without exception—terribly weakened by the total impact upon them of World War II—and from the end of the war forward, it was obvious that the Soviet grand design for world conquest visualized a capture, one at a time, of the weaker neighbors who lived on the free side of the curtain.

The Communists, who at the end of World War II were in no shape to undertake another one, sought to carry out their conquest of individual free nations largely by subversive, internal means. They tried to capitalize on the economic chaos in Europe by fomenting strikes and insinuating themselves into the political life of countries like France, Italy, Germany, and so forth. The Marshall plan, which has already cost America over $8,000,000,000, came just in time to stop cold the Communist efforts to capture the countries of western Europe from within. The postwar starvation in western Europe is a thing of the past—thanks to the Marshall plan—and the free nations of the west are gradually getting back on their economic feet.

Economic recovery in western Europe has been a bitter pill for the Communists to swallow, because it has completely thwarted the Communist efforts to control Europe the cheap way by means of internal overthrow of the free governments.

In Greece, the Communists stirred up a guerrilla war in the hope of undoing the results of free elections in that country. American aid made it possible for the people of Greece to suppress the guerrillas completely, and there, as in Turkey as well, internal Communists subversion was a failure.

When the Reds tried to freeze us out of Berlin, the airlift, manned by American and British pilots, supplied that city, the size of Philadelphia, completely by air for almost a year—and once more Red pressure was abandoned in the face of determined opposition.

All of these Communist measures I've discussed up to now relied, as I have pointed out, primarily on internal political and economic means, rather than on techniques which would involve outright aggression or war. And it is quite evident that those efforts have ended in failure for the Communists.

You will recall that our expenditures for military purposes since the close of World War II have been substantially above the levels we have ever maintained in a so-called period of peace. On the other hand, there have been a number of Members of Congress, who were either outright isolationists, or who were so anxious for economy that they were willing to cut anything and everything in order to save money, have opposed our defense spending.

Just last fall, for example, the isolationist and economy blocs ganged up in an effort to order a 5 to 10 percent across-the-board cut in all appropriations, including the military. That effort was beaten back in the Senate, but the vote of 41 to 36 was a little close for comfort.

Our defense program since 1945 has managed to achieve a unified defense force, bringing into balance the Army, the Air Force, the Navy—and, of course, the Marines. That was a huge job that still isn't finally settled, but the understandable jockeying for position and squabbling among the forces that broke out last year has, from all reports, been settled peaceably, and we now have a single striking power of all the forces, organized, cooperating and acting as a team.

A steady increase in defense spending has taken place in the past several years as a result of the growing possibility that the Communists would dare to risk an act of aggression if they continued to fail in the use of internal tactics. The Soviets have continued to build up their own forces, and today have the largest standing army in the world.

American foreign policy, which has received some bipartisan support in Congress, has developed along the lines that defense of the United States cannot be confined merely to arming ourselves alone. It was perfectly obvious—or obvious at least to everyone but a noisy handful of isolationists, many of them in Congress—that our freedom depended upon the freedom and independence of the other democracies in the United Nations.

Many of the free countries who were fellow members of the United Nations were economically weak, and unable to develop adequate military forces with their limited resources. These same free governments did, however, see the Communist menace clearly, and they turned to America for economic support and assistance in the form of military equipment which would enable them to build up their resistance to Communist threats.

When you consider that the Communists, with a growing military machine being assembled behind the iron curtain, were in a position to concentrate their forces at any point along the iron curtain, and strike suddenly with great strength, it at once becomes apparent that the free world could not create overnight a solid military barrier around the entire periphery of the iron curtain strong enough at every point to overcome at once any attack in force which might be brought to bear.

It was a matter of building up the entire border of the curtain—and building at the same time, reserve forces which could be moved in to beat back the attack wherever the Communists might decide to launch it. The defense forces around the edge of the iron curtain would, until the reserve help could be brought into the fight, be forced to buy time and to delay in every way possible the aggressor's time table for conquest until sufficient enforcement arrived.

Needless to say, the free countries—and this certainly includes America—hoped very much that the Communists would not be so insane as to indulge in rank, raw aggression against a free world. And it has been the announced policy of all the free countries that aggressive action against any one of them would not be tolerated.

The Atlantic Pact, initiated by the United States last year, informed any would-be aggressor that the nations who signed the pact would stand fast against any aggressive act. And to back up the Atlantic Pact, we inaugurated the military assistance program late last year—once more over violent isolationist objection—to give more than a billion dollars' worth of military assistance to nations which would join in the common purpose of resisting aggression by any other nation.

Under the terms of the military assistance program, any nation wishing to participate in it had to sit down with military officials of the other allied nations and work out a common defense program—evidently a matter which took a great deal of planning, and necessarily quite a bit of time. When the common defense program was mapped out, it was necessary to list the equipment which would be needed to carry it out.

We had some of the needed equipment on hand in America as surplus, but much of it was not available as surplus, and orders and plans were needed to get it into production.

The military assistance program, first enacted into law late last summer, has come in for some criticism recently—and I might add here that the criticism has come largely from the very Members of Congress who actually voted against military assistance last year—but their criticism quite obviously represents a complete misunderstanding of what the military aid program involved. This isn't too surprising, because in their votes against it last year, they clearly failed to understand it at the time.

In criticizing the very program they voted against last year, they have apparently assumed the funds they opposed could be converted overnight into military equipment which had not even been manufactured when the bill passed. And apparently they expected, too, that the equipment once made, could be transported on some sort of magic carpet—at the speed of light—to countries all over the world.

The Korean Reds weren't this blind. They saw the American forces hand over to the South Koreans more than $100,000,000 worth of ground force equipment in 1949 when our troops were withdrawn under instructions of the United Nations. And the Korean Reds saw that before long, last year's military assistance program would have progressed to the point that finished equipment would start arriving after a 5,000-mile journey from America.

For them, aggression was now, or never. Neither the United States nor the free countries of the United Nations which assisted in establishing the Republic of Korea south of the thirty-eighth parallel, intended to build up a South Korean fighting force designed to launch aggressive warfare. The $110,000,000 worth of American equipment furnished the South Koreans last year consisted of infantry equipment such as rifles, bazookas, mortars, howitzers and some 60 or 70 small naval patrol vessels. This equipment, altogether, was enough to supply some 50,000 ground forces adequately to meet the needs for internal security of the country in putting down border raids and suppressing Communist-inspired uprisings.

The Korean Reds were also able to see what American economic assistance had been able to do in rebuilding the economy of South Korea. Over $400,000,000 worth of economic assistance has reached South Korea since the end of World War II, and these funds were being put to work in raising the economic levels of the country. The economic progress helped further to make it clear to the Reds that they would have nothing to offer the South Koreans.

When the decision was made to attack south of the thirty-eighth parallel, the Reds brought with them a huge force that clearly had been designed to overrun the country in a matter of hours so that the job could be finished before the stunned free world could do any more than protest what had happened.

But the decisive political action of the United Nations and the immediate follow-up by President Truman must have come as a big surprise to the Reds. Despite the advances the Reds have continued to make, the decision of the free nations to stand together against Communist aggression had an electric effect in strengthening the opposition to the Red drive. We sent what forces we could spare immediately without endangering other key points in our Pacific defenses, and steadily since that time nation after nation has accumulated what forces it has to offer and is getting them off on the long journey to that distant trouble spot in Asia.

As this time ground forces from countries of Latin America and western Europe are already en route or about to go. Additional American forces are moving, along with more supplies, across the 5,000-mile pipeline to Korea.

The bravery and resourcefulness of the United Nations forces in buying the needed time to get divisions of men in to replace the battalions that are now slowing down the Red divisions are deserving of the highest honors in the annals of warfare.

General MacArthur said this well in his first report to the United Nations Security Council last Tuesday when he observed:

"But the issue of battle is now fully joined and will proceed along lines of action in which we will not be without choice. Our hold upon the southern part of Korea represents a secure base. Our casualties, despite overwhelming odds, have been relatively light.

"Our strength will continually increase while that of the enemy will relatively decrease.

"His supply line in insecure. He has had his great chance but failed to exploit it. We are now in Korea in force, and with God's help, we are there to stay until the constitutional authority of the Republic is fully restored."

Thus, General MacArthur summarized the Korean situation a few days ago.

In the meanwhile, plans are being shaped rapidly to make certain of General MacArthur's success. Men and equipment are en route across the Pacific as rapidly as they can be dispatched.

Other plans are shaping up to prepare a more rapid strengthening of all the free nations. Congress is now working out the details of the projected $10,000,000,000 increase in military spending which the President recommended. The Draft Act will provide for the early call of 100,000 men without previous military service, and specially trained Reserve units will be activated to meet particular needs in Korea and elsewhere that potential trouble might be expected.

The defense program, as it is projected for the present situation, is clearly not designed for Korea alone. We readily recognize that other efforts may be made by the Reds to

find soft spots in the defenses around the iron curtain, and we are moving ahead to strengthen ourselves and the other free nations who, under the United Nations, have denounced aggression.

It terms of the American home front, some belt tightening is ahead. As plans stand at the moment, it will not be severe. Both the Senate and the House are readying legislation which will provide for rationing and price controls with provisions for price rollbacks. I regret to say that the need for consumer controls has been brought about primarily because of scare buying on the part of a relatively few businessmen and consumers who, either because they have to build up inventories with the hope of profiteering, or because they want to accumulate a hoard of things they don't presently need, have succeeded in creating artificial scarcities and pushing up prices on goods we have in abundance.

Sugar is a good illustration. The surpluses of sugar have haunted us in the past year. We still have more than we know what to do with. But in store after store, the prices have jumped and the shelves are bare, simply because unfounded rumors have sent the packaged stocks off into basement hoards.

We need stand-by controls for rationing and prices now—and if prices do not settle back as they should, the controls will have to go on.

Some materials, notably steel, will be short, because our steel industry was operating at peak levels prior to the Korean invasion. While our present defense needs will not make serious inroads into the production of basic consumer goods, a system of priorities and allocations is being fashioned which will assure the flow of adequate quantities of critical materials into our defense effort. But, as I say, the $10,000,000,000 defense expansion presently contemplated will not seriously disrupt our economy or living standard. If the Korean business is settled without other difficulties arising, our industrial capacity can quickly absorb the new load, and by curtailing Government spending on many nondefense activities, we are easing the pressure on our industrial machinery.

The interim $5,000,000,000 tax bill is being drawn now, and as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, which is handling the matter, I want to see the new taxes act primarily as a curb on profiteering and against inflation. I have no intention of seeing it applied in a fashion that will work harm on families with lower, fixed incomes who are always the first victims of high prices.

These, in brief, are the recent developments. Where we go from here, no man can say with certainty. We fervently hope, of course, that the concerted resistance to aggression in Korea will serve to convince the Reds that we mean business when we say aggression will not be tolerated. However, as we have done throughout the postwar period, our national policy will continue to be built on the proposition that we will work hand in hand with the free peoples of the world to protect the individual dignity of peoples and nations. To do so, we must continue, as we have in the past, to be prepared for eventualities which might confront us.

While I pray that Korea will go down in the books of history as one more failure of Soviet expansion short of war—as has been the case in Berlin, and Greece, and Turkey, and in all of western Europe—we can be certain that the free nations will not stand by watching their fellow nations swallowed up one at a time. And to meet that grave obligation to world freedom, we all have a task to perform. But with moral right on our side, and with our abiding faith in the future of free men, we will succeed.

Why We Need a New Secretary of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, attempts on the part of Secretary of Defense Johnson to make it appear that efforts to expose his inefficiency are prompted by political partisanship are boomerangs.

For him to charge that Congress is responsible for the awful lack of adequate military preparedness for either attack or defense; for him to boastingly state there was no question as to our security and to intimate we could repel any attacker in hours—these things and many more are the measure of his egocentric incompetency for the job he persists to retain.

His continuance in office impedes national security for that Congress distrusts him, rightfully doubts that money it may appropriate for defense will be expended by him as directed by it; resents his previous willful disregard of their express directions, their being ample ground for that conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, other reasons why we should have a different Secretary of National Defense too numerous to mention are to some extent set forth in the following editorial to be found in Business Week—the issue of August 5—which, for the convenience of all, I include under unanimous consent as an extension of my remarks:

THE TREND—WHY WE NEED A NEW SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

It has been said of Louis Arthur Johnson, Secretary of Defense of the United States of America, that he hoped for the best without preparing for the worst.

The brutal facts from Korea bear tragic witness to the awful truth of this estimate of the man.

Even if a Dunkerque can be averted and our offensive can be mounted from South Korea instead of Japan, a horrible failure here at home must be accounted for. The time is now to ask the question why so few had to face so many with so little.

Who is to blame for the Korean tragedy? Who left us hopelessly unprepared to meet this murderous Communist aggression? Who lulled the Nation into a sense of false security by boasting of our growing military might under reduced military budgets?

The blame must be shared by every American, not least by the President and the Secretary of State. But the chief blame belongs where the chief responsibility is—with the Secretary of Defense.

Louis Johnson should resign. If he fails to show that sense of public duty, the country should make it plain to him.

THREE FAILURES

The Secretaryship of Defense is a high office of public trust that should seek out the man who is to fill it. No such narrow view, however, trammeled the ambitions of its present occupant. From as far back as 1940, when FDR had to back away from an earlier promise to make him Secretary of War, Louis Johnson campaigned to be this country's top military civilian.

His chance—a long one—came in the summer of 1948 when Democratic candidate Truman was apparently prepared to promise anything to anyone who could replenish the bankrupt party treasury. Johnson took over, according to widely accepted reports, on the condition that he become Secretary of Defense. He did a miraculous job of political money-raising, the President was reelected, the bargain was kept, and in March 1949, Louis Johnson succeeded the late, great James Forrestal.

His administration of the Defense Department has been stormy—perhaps unavoidably so. He inherited the whole stubborn unification mess. He has done good work on the administrative side in making unification work. And he has brought about some legitimate, badly needed economies.

It is a pity that his good works pale into obscurity alongside his calamitous failures.

First, Johnson has had no adequate conception of the defense policy needed to match the foreign policy of this country, wobbly as that has been. To be sure, the blame here extends beyond him to his Commander in Chief, the President, and to the Secretary of State as well. But his was the responsibility to lay before Congress a military program equal to our commitments. He failed to do so.

Second, Johnson's department failed to provide the kind of military strength that Korea shows we need. There has been a consuming preoccupation with intercontinental atomic war and inadequate preparation for the satellite cat's-paw type of war that Russia chose to use in Korea and may use elsewhere. The result is that our men have only a few light, outgunned tanks to oppose the Red monsters thrown against them. We must rely on jet fighters to do work they were never designed to do in support of ground operations. The new weapons about which so much was heard last spring seem still to be on order.

Third, Johnson's repeated assertions that his economies and budget cutting have resulted in a stronger defense are revealed as tragically false. Before Korea, he prated that we're in grand shape, that if Russia starts something at 4 o'clock in the morning we would go into action by 5, and that we were prepared to lick the hell out of Joe Stalin if he started anything.

He told the country that his smaller budgets would merely cut out fat and convert fat into muscle. After holding defense obligations below the $13,900,000,000 authorized for fiscal year 1949–50, he submitted a $13,000,000,000 budget for 1950–51. This compared with the $18,000,000,000 figure Forrestal regarded in 1948 as the minimum for meeting our responsibilities around the world. We are now hastily—and wastefully—in 1 year trying to expand the defense budget by twice that $5,000,000,000 saving.

Johnson's budgeting went far beyond cutting off fat. It cut down Army ground force strength, almost decimated the marines, shrank Navy fighting power, held back the 70-group air force, reduced aircraft replacement programs, ignored glaring weak spots in tanks and tactical aircraft, and retarded research and development.

CUTTING THE MUSCLE

On the floor of the House of Representatives on April 4 last, Chairman CARL VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee challenged Johnson's propaganda. Said VINSON, "I want to state emphatically that, in my judgment, Mr. Johnson's economy scalpel has not only carved away some service fat but has cut—deeply in some areas—into the sinew and muscle of the armed services."

An example, tragically documented in Korea, is what happened to Forrestal's tank-modernization program. The plan was to take our medium tanks, rearmor, and regun

them so they could at least handle their Russian opposite numbers. GI's in Korea today could hardly be expected to agree that Johnson's economy in budgeting that program out of existence was only cutting off fat.

Louis Johnson's record does not qualify him to continue as the civilian leader of our great new military effort. Nothing he has done in office would so become him as the leaving of it.

Laws or Morality?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of August 5, 1950, discusses a frequently used expression, "There ought to be a law." The editorial is as follows:

LAWS OR MORALITY?

"There ought to be a law." How often do we hear that expression or repeat it? As humans we always want the law to restrict some other fellow, of course. Few if any of us want a law passed that will restrict our own freedom of action or our right to do what we think is proper and to our own advantage.

Right now a great many people are saying, "There ought to be a law," about a great variety of subjects. Most of the concern over a new law relates to our war and preparedness efforts. Congress is being pressed by a number of groups as well as by individuals to pass a hopper full of bills restricting the other fellows.

If they pass one-fourth of the bills proposed, our war effort will be bogged down under the extreme weight of a lot of useless red tape. Many people who now are very much in favor of restrictive laws will be very much disappointed when they find some law restricting them.

There is one law that could cover most of the subjects now being proposed as a basis for innumerable new laws. It is a simple law given to man many generations ago by the Great Teacher.

Simple in language, easy to interpret, it could relieve the modern world of many of its heartaches. That law, which we know as the Golden Rule says, "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law of the prophets."

The last war produced its full crop of war profiteers, despite the many and complex laws that hindered many honest men in the performance of their daily tasks. Its aftermath was less liberty for all of us; freedom and wealth for most of the 5-percenters and additional grants and wealth for those offenders who had the good will of powerful politicians on their side.

History records the downfall of many great nations. Quite often the downfall of those nations was brought about by a complexity of laws that worked injustices on larger and larger portions of their population. Our own Nation was brought into being by a revolt against unjust laws. We must be ever vigilant lest we wreck this one last bulwark of free people by a maze of laws in which every man needs a legal guide.

Americans are the great revolutionists of the modern age. They revolted against the authority of kings, and of unwise laws. They revolted against the stupidity of the Dark Ages. Their active minds and vigorous bodies led them to revolt against things as they were; and brought about things as they are. They revolted against unncessary hard manual labor and created the greatest quantity of labor-saving devices in the annals of history.

They revolted against human slavery. Having freed the body of man, they set about to free his mind and his imagination. Their inventions have freed the housewife of a multitude of chores, they have freed the masses of much back-breaking labor.

Revolting against time and space, this Nation's inventors came forth with the steamboat, the locomotive, the automobile and the airplane. We built the greatest railroad system on earth, we still are perfecting it. Our miles of highways are equal to the total mileage of the rest of the world, and we are adding to it.

Our great transportation system is equaled by our great system of communications. Our industrial know-how is the marvel of all other nations.

Will we, the great revolutionaries of the ages, now surrender these things that free men with free minds and bodies achieved, to those who thirst for power? Will we first be fettered by needless laws and then chained to the chariots of the enslavers because we have forgotten the moral laws on which a great Nation was built? Will we pass from a Nation governed by law to a Nation confused by law and eventually to a Nation governed not by law but by men?

The German people in the despair of the twenties called out for a leader. They gave up their liberty for the intoxication of great power in the hands of a few. They almost destroyed the world as we know it. They did destroy Germany. Were they guiltless? Did their pleas of innocence because of poor leadership impress you?

Shall we delegate the great power and responsibility imposed upon us as American citizens to a few, or shall we as free men and women, proud citizens of the greatest Nation on earth, shoulder our responsibility and obey the primary moral laws, making other laws unnecessary?

Boykin Defends Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I last week told you all of the innumerable telephone calls, letters, and telegrams which I received subsequent to the several talks made with respect to Louis Johnson, who, I repeat, is to my mind the greatest Secretary of War, or should I say of Defense to which the peace and the security of this Nation has ever been entrusted.

Mr. Speaker, experienced in administration, a great executive, a public official who does the right as he sees the right, Louis Johnson is a man who gets things done. The hundreds of thousands who work under him, believe in him because they know him. They know also that when he issues an order, he wants it carried out at once.

It is said that on more than one occasion he has told his subordinates:

Have no fear of the consequences of what you do under orders. * * * I will take all blame * * * and I am taking this off your backs in order that you can get the job done as it should be done—economically with precision and with dispatch.

I did not have to read in the daily press that President Truman was behind his Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson—"come hell or high water"—because I knew that the President and Americans everywhere are conscious of and appreciate the work he is doing as Secretary of Defense and are behind him to a man.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly pleased yesterday to receive a copy of an editorial published in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser headed "BOYKIN defends Johnson," and which editorial truly exhibits the basic problems which confront this country. That our people are generally becoming more aware of these problems is made clearer each succeeding day.

So far as the strength of our armed services is concerned, the United States now has two separate and distinct defense problems. The first is the continental defense of the United States themselves and second to that is the defense of all countries represented in the United Nations whose independence we, as well as all signatory nations, are pledged to support.

It is generally conceded that the strategic warfare—one of the missions charged to the United States Air Force and which invokes the use of the atom bomb and the Air Force long-range, intercontinental bomber, the B–36—is the solution to the problem of our continental defenses.

There is general agreement, moreover, that what the editor of the Montgomery Advertiser called "the black fury of the A-bomb," plus the Air Force's ability to deliver it represents the most powerful reason why Russia has not as yet started and hesitates to start a war against us.

I am in hearty agreement with what General Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, Air Force, once stated when he declared, "The only war you can really win today is the war that never starts." I do not believe that there is a person in this House who will dispute the fact that the one thing that has contained Russia and made her fearful to launch an attack either against any of the weak countries of Europe, or this country itself has been the existence of the atom bomb, the Air Force B–36 long-range bomber and the ability of the United States Air Force to deliver the bomb.

The second problem confronting the Nation is to formulate a policy of peace or a method of defense participated in by all of the 59 countries in the United Nations Assembly, this in order to prevent the Russian satellite nations from engaging us in a war on a half a dozen or more fronts, all of which are at great distance not alone from the United States, but from one potential theater of war to the other.

Mr. Speaker, everyone reading the article will find a wholly factual, impartial, disinterested, and brilliantly keen analysis and expression of opinion exhibited in the editorial as clipped from the Montgomery Advertiser.

Knowing of its interest to the membership of this House, I am asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks and

place the same in the RECORD of our proceedings.

The article reads as follows:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of July 28, 1950]

BOYKIN DEFENDS JOHNSON

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it is seen that Congressman FRANK BOYKIN, of Alabama, has made a spirited defense of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson. BOYKIN considers that Johnson is being made the fall guy for disasters that are not of his making. BOYKIN makes the points about Johnson:

1. Never at the beginning of any war have we possessed so powerful a Navy as now.

2. On January 1 the Army, due to Johnson's reorganization moves, had 4,000 more men in combat units than it had in such units 6 months before.

3. "I was myself in attendance at the Pentagon when Louis Johnson told us of the economies and improved efficiencies that he planned to effect, and it was patent there that he was encouraged to make all possible economies, and by every Member of this House that was present, provided, however, that he made them in some other fellow's congressional district or at some other Congressman's expense. Do you not remember his thundering response—

"'If Congress expects me to make the Defense Department a Federal WPA relief project merely to provide jobs, I will quit this job right now.'"

4. The gathering reverses in Korea have had the effect of discrediting Johnson's oncevaunted economies. There is a disposition to blame Korea on these economies. What is not understood is that some of the economies are as desirable now as then. Among them was firing 177,000 civilian employees in the armed services set-up. The Hoover Commission and all the rest of us, including this newspaper, roared approval.

5. It is easy to forget that a year and a half ago the country was impatient with Johnson's predecessor, James Forrestal, because he was too soft to effect unification. This, Johnson accomplished.

Congressman BOYKIN offers some praise of Johnson that appears extravagant to us, but certainly Johnson's performance has not been lacking in merit in some directions. Early last year the State Department—not Johnson—wrote off Korea as not being worth American blood.

But even here there is an extenuating circumstance. Prior to Korea we were all thinking of armed conflict entirely in terms of a slugging match between the United States and Russia.

Had we been at war with Russia since June 25, we would have been able, as we are not in Korea, to employ our mightiest resource—the "black fury" of atomic warfare.

The millions we have spent on B–36's are not in action now. But in any war with Russia, the greatest air force on earth would have struck crippling blows. A-bombs can't win a war, but until Russia provokes war, we may conclude that they can prevent wars.

We undoubtedly have been reckless in the limited scale of our preparations for war, but neither have we been entirely improvident. Never at any time in our history have we been as well prepared with weapons and millions of trained veterans as now.

We have proven leadership in Bradley, Sherman, Collins, and Vandenberg.

It is singular to us that our vast reservoir of seasoned soldiers, out of uniform for less than 5 years, has not been a more widely discussed asset than it has. Some 15,000,000 men and women passed through our armed services in the course of World War II. Of these, millions could, with brief training, resume their service. How essentially different from 1941 when this country took up arms against the battle-seasoned hordes of Germany and Japan. Those 1941 servicemen didn't know a PX from a M–1.

A very grave time is upon us. For the indefinite future we are going to live in times that will make the last 5 years seem like the tranquillity of the Coolidge era. But the indications still are that Russia simply doesn't want our A-bombs. Otherwise, she would have taken Berlin last year. Churchill has always made that point all the time, and so far events bear him out—as they usually do.

Freedom Is in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the great industries in my district is the Freeman Shoe Co., of Beloit, Wis. Its President is Mr. H. T. Cary, and recently in Freeman Unlimited, a factory publication, he offered words of wisdom which justify a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I include them as part of my remarks and commend his message to all Members:

Everything I am about to say undoubtedly has been said many times, by many people but, in these anxious days, it might be refreshing to repeat them. No one in America, official or otherwise, should be a master, and, likewise, no one in America should be a slave. This is my idea of democracy, to the extent that any nation differs from this to that extent it is not a democracy; if, in fact, it remains one at all. The purpose of government is primarily that of furnishing machinery to protect the property of its citizens from destruction or seizure by another, so that, when the other accumulates property, it will likewise be safe. The protection should also embrace the principle that an individual's property should be safe from its own government, which more recently has been taking the property of private citizens through confiscatory taxes.

Government has few positive virtues, if, in fact, any. Therefore, it is best when it governs least. It should be a servant of the people and never its master.

The American people, I am sure, consider their freedom too precious to ever permit it to perish, unless it is destroyed by the implement of its own government. Therefore, it is disturbing to observe that for many years now, American Government has not been compatible with traditional American freedom, as the greatest freedom of all is freedom from Government encroachment, but Government encroachment has been progressing for the last 20 years.

In Russia the politicians preach freedom, but they do not practice freedom. On the contrary, they desire to enslave the earth and the people. In more recent years, the pattern of our own Government is following theirs too closely for comfort, and it is time that all Americans be alert to the sign of creeping socialism by way of Government interference with business and its citizens' activities. All Americans should be aware of concentration of power and abuse on the part of its Government, because, frankly, freedom here is already in grave peril. Our Government's financial policies are no longer consistent with traditional American freedom. It has abandoned the traditional gold standard and has cheapened the value of our currency. It has, therefore, partly confiscated the value of our insurance policies and has decreased the quantity of food, clothing, and housing that our dollars will buy. A continuation of deficit financing, which is the implement by which the value of dollars is cheapened, will eventually impoverish the entire Nation.

Another war will greatly increase the national debt as no economy can be looked for if we are to wage world war III, with which we are now threatened. While victory must be won, it will not finally be achieved unless the people are free to achieve it and the advantages of victory will be conspicuously absent if, while fighting, we permit the Government to become more concentrated, dictatorial, and abusive. Therefore, we must remember that, while fighting for freedom on the battlefield, we must fight equally as hard for it at home, and win both battles, for one without the other will indeed be a hollow victory.

It seems to me that a victory on the homefront battle to keep our freedom can only be won by a constitutional amendment which will prohibit our Government from levying confiscatory taxes and the continuation of deficit financing. It seems to me that our situation now is not that the budget alone is out of control, but, rather, that the Government is out of control. That is to say, the people no longer control the Government. They have not controlled it for some time, and if a third war is to come it will be the direct result of complete lack of statesmanship on the part of our Government. Ninety percent of the people knew that America should not have allied herself with Russia in the last war. That act, in my opinion, will go down as one of the greatest disasters in American history. And even worse than this was the fact that, by giving comfort, aid, and assistance—which permitted Russia to emerge from the last was as a powerful, aggressor nation—our Government substantially provided the necessity of world war III.

Wars are usually won—even by a free people—because of the inspirational genius of great statesmen. Today it is obvious such genius is sadly lacking, and while the American people will again bear arms and sacrifice their sons and daughters, if necessary, their hearts will not be in it. Three disastrous wars in one generation can only be the result of diplomatic bungling.

Regulation of Commodity Exchanges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting a statement by Mr. Perry E. Moore, president of the New York Cotton Exchange, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and which deals specifically with subtitle B of S. 3936:

On behalf of the Exchange, I would like to make two recommendations to this committee. We urge:

1. That subtitle B of S. 3936, the Maybank bill, be stricken from S. 3936.

2. If the committee deems this inadvisable, we recommend that the consideration of subtitle B be transferred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, which is familiar with this entire subject, for consideration.

We recognize the situation this country confronts and realize the necessity of some legislation to give the Government power to

deal with the crisis resulting from the international situation.

We strongly feel, however, that subtitle B, section 411, which gives the President broad powers to fix margins and promulgate regulations to deal with trading in commodities on the exchanges will not do what it is intended to do.

We feel, for reasons which I shall state briefly, that the proposed legislation is likely to raise cotton prices, instead of lowering them and to be a strong factor in forcing price controls over the entire economy.

In this connection let me tell you briefly how the New York Cotton Exchange functions and the service it gives the cotton industry.

As their name indicates, the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges are cotton markets not only for the United States but for the world. As a matter of fact, the New York and the New Orleans Cotton Exchanges are the only world cotton markets left today. For one reason or another, the other markets are closed or function under such handicaps that they are not world markets.

The primary function of the cotton exchanges in this country is, of course, to serve the cotton industry, including the farmer. I think it is generally agreed, even by some of the proponents of subtitle B of S. 3936 that the cotton exchanges do serve a useful purpose. We want to continue to serve a useful purpose and that is why we are urging the elimination of sections 411 and 412 of subtitle B.

Let me briefly state some of the services which the exchanges furnish the cotton industry:

1. They provide a market where cotton can always be bought or sold. Without marts where buyers and sellers are always available, there is a question whether the producers would at all times be able to dispose of their cotton. History shows that when futures markets were closed there was chaos in the cotton spot markets and farmers had difficulty in disposing of their cotton.

2. The exchanges furnish, through hedging operations, price insurance for the shippers and manufacturers of cotton which enables them to buy and sell cotton freely throughout the year. This not only results in a better price to the producer—it decreases costs to the consumer.

3. The exchanges are a valuable source of price and other information about cotton.

To illustrate how hedging furnishes price insurance, the following is an example: A cotton merchant buys cotton in order to have an ample stock on hand to fill orders for his cotton-mill customers. He may buy several thousand bales when he has no immediate outlet for them. Let me emphasize that almost every bale of cotton is bought by merchants and others the moment the farmer is ready to sell. Someone will take the cotton. The operations of the cotton futures markets enable the farmer to sell his cotton when he wants to sell it. Obviously, a merchant who buys several thousand bales without an immediate outlet for them at the mills runs the risk that the market may decline sharply before he can resell his cotton. Consequently, he sells on the exchanges cotton for future delivery in a quantity approximating the amount he has bought. When the merchant sells the actual cotton he has on hand, he disposes of the future hedges. If the price has advanced, what he loses on his futures sale will be made up on his spot cotton. Conversely, if the price declines, his loss in the sale of spot cotton is compensated by a similar profit on his futures contracts. This is the standard method used by mills and merchants for protection against price fluctuations. A hedge, in reality, is price insurance. Banks demand more collateral on cotton that is not hedged.

There are many ramifications to hedging. There is always some risk involved. But the risk is greatly lessened by hedging, which is nothing more or less, as I stated, than a form of price insurance.

If a cotton merchant had to buy cotton and could not hedge, he would have to charge more for his service than he charges today. The risk and cost would be so great that he would have to pass these along in the form of higher prices to the mills. Similarly the mills, if they could not hedge, would have to pass along their risk and costs in the form of higher prices to the consumer. It is generally agreed that hedging in the commodity markets performs a useful and vital function, and I might add, an indispensable function unless the Government is to take over the cotton market and fix prices all the way from the producer to the ultimate consumer. If this were done, it would, of course, mean the end of the free-enterprise system so far as cotton is concerned, and none of us want to see that.

The exchanges have always cooperated fully with the Government in the past with regard to margins and propose to cooperate fully in the future. The Secretary of Agriculture testified in 1947 before a congressional committee that "throughout the war the exchanges were extremely cooperative and did about what the Government requested."

Cotton margins, as administered by the exchange, have been on a sliding scale for years and are periodically reviewed to meet changing conditions. The cotton exchanges can always act quicker and in a manner more responsive to market conditions than can the Government. Our procedures are simpler and we have more information at our command.

Present margins required by the exchange equal the cents per pound by which cotton is now selling above parity. However, this should not be forgotten. The exchanges have the responsibility to see to it that there is enough activity in the markets to enable them to perform their primary function of price insurance. If the only trading in the cotton futures markets consists of actual hedging operations, there will not be enough activity in the market to enable them to be carried out successfully.

We strongly feel that section 411 of subtitle B of S. 3936 will do more harm than good. We feel that it is likely to intensify price fluctuations in cotton rather than to minimize them.

If section 411 is enacted as it is now and the present international situation continues, undoubtedly the Government is likely to raise margins substantially in almost all commodities. Our experience is that power in the hands of the Government is likely to be used. If the margin required for futures cotton trading is high enough to drive speculation out of the market, the only ones in the market are likely to be those who wish to hedge, and possibly a few well-financed speculators. If there is any substantial quantity of cotton to be hedged, the speculative interest probably will not be sufficient to absorb it. If this situation comes to pass, the cotton exchanges will have lost the primary reason for their existence and their usefulness will be nullified—to the detriment of the entire cotton industry, including the cotton farmer.

I would like to point out that the cotton exchanges continued to function throughout World War II and that there was no governmental interference until the war actually was over.

The cotton exchanges were closed July 31, 1914, after the outbreak of World War I and remained closed until November 16, 1914. The lesson which this taught us should not be forgotten. The farmers were trying to market their cotton but there was no market for the big crop. Some of you will remember the "please buy a bale" movement. Something like chaos prevailed in the market. Adequate or reliable information on the demand for cotton was lacking. Prices varied several cents even in local areas of the belt. The price of cotton was depressed, the bulk of the crop was offered around 6 cents. The next spring the price of cotton rose to around 12 cents but this was after the cotton had left the farmers' hands. The consumers got little benefit. The farmers lost millions of dollars.

There was speculation in cotton, lots of it, while the exchanges were closed, but the speculation was in actual cotton. The closing of the exchanges did not prevent the speculation but it did cause confusion and misunderstanding which injured the producers. The exchanges were reopened and have never been closed since with the exception of several days during the bank holiday in 1932 when similar conditions prevailed.

You are well aware of the fact that the President, under the proposed bill, has the power to fix margins at 100 percent of the purchase price of cotton, or at any other figure he may determine. Any substantial increase in margins will impair the usefulness of the market, and easily could put the exchanges out of business for lack of trading. In that case, we would have 1914 all over again.

In April 1946, OPA stepped in and did raise the margins required for futures trading in cotton. It is generally admitted, I believe, that the effect of this action was to impair the usefulness of the cotton exchanges as a price-insurance medium. The action did not lower cotton prices but, as a matter of record, cotton prices continued to rise, proving our oft-repeated contention that margins do not regulate prices. With the expiration of OPA in June 1946 the exchanges again resumed their function of regulating margins and have performed that function, I feel, satisfactorily.

The recent sharp rises in cotton prices are not due to speculative trading in cotton. The speculative interest in cotton today is less than it was last October, at the height of the cotton-marketing season. Speculative interest on July 21, 1950, was over 11½ percent less than it was on October 14, 1949.

The price increases in cotton are due in large part to:

1. The shock to all commodity markets and the inflationary forces generated by the war in Korea and subsequent developments.

2. An unexpectedly low cotton acreage report. As a result of acreage restriction by the Government, the 1950 acreage is one of the lowest on record. With the exception of 1945 and 1946, it is the lowest since 1887.

3. The fact that the Government did not offer its stocks of cotton, approximating 3,300,000 bales for sale, until the cotton market had passed by several cents the figure at which the Commodity Credit Corporation is permitted to sell cotton. The CCC is permitted to sell its cotton stocks at around 34 cents a pound. It did not offer them for sale until the market was around 37 cents and then actual sales were restricted and handled in such a way that a further inflationary force was added.

Over any period of time, speculation is not a decisive factor in the cotton market, or other commodity markets. The market reflects the general opinion of supply and demand factors. Let me emphasize that speculation does not control the market and is a factor for only short periods.

In previous years, the cotton exchanges have been blamed both for price increases and price declines. In instance after instance, there have been thorough investigations of the operations of the exchanges and in every instance the verdict has been that speculation has not been the real reason for the increases, or declines.

If the Government raises the margins to the point that the speculative interest in cotton is not sufficient to absorb legitimate

hedging operations, the situation can result in an alarming inflationary spiral.

By way of illustration, let us say that there is no speculative interest of any consequence in the futures market and that someone enters that market—seeking to buy large quantities of cotton either to hedge, or speculate. If there is no one to sell this cotton the market could be driven up sharply and quickly. It would be comparatively easy to drive the market up, for, with speculative offerings absent from the market because of excessive margins, the purchases would have much more effect than if the market were a broad one.

We know very well that the very word "speculation" has a bad connotation. But let me point out that speculation is not confined to the commodity markets. It enters into hundreds and thousands of business operations every day. There is speculation in every field. It is a part of our economic process and simply reflects the opinion of business, industry, and the public on what is likely to happen in the various fields of our varied economic life.

I would like to point out that this proposal—section 411—is not new. If you will examine the Barkley bill to regulate the exchanges which was introduced in the Congress in 1948 you will find it almost identical with section 411. The only change is that the power in the Barkley bill would have been given to the Secretary of Agriculture. Now it would be given to the President.

The Barkley bill, and similar measures, have been carefully considered by the Senate Agriculture and House Agriculture Committees and they failed to approve these bills. Now, under the guise of a wartime emergency, this authority is sought again. In our opinion, it reflects the attempt on the part of certain forces to extend Government power over our economic system. It is not needed and will do little to check any inflationary forces that are present in our economy.

I might remind you also that the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report considered in 1947 the proposal to extend Government power over the commodity exchanges and failed to recommend the passage of such proposals. In this connection, I would like to read you a paragraph from the 1947 report of the joint committee:

"The committee and two of its subcommittees have heard considerable testimony on speculative trading in commodity futures. Experienced and responsible witnesses, including representatives of the administration, the grain trade, and the mining industry, agree on the importance of maintaining efficiently functioning hedging markets, and on the fact that commodity speculators as a body perform a useful economic service in this connection."

The Commodity Credit Corporation of USDA has almost 4,500,000 bales of cotton available for sale on the market at 105 percent of the current Government support price, plus reasonable carrying charges. With the crop beginning to move to market, this stock of cotton constitutes the real brake against inflation in the cotton market if the selling policies of the CCC are wisely used. The power asked in S. 3936 is not needed, but, once the Government acquires the additional powers over the exchanges, we fear this power will be continued. That would be a big step toward the elimination of the exchanges and the socialization of the marketing machinery for agricultural commodities.

We favor also the elimination of section 412 of subtitle B of the bill before you. It is clear that the operations of this section would result in a ceiling price on cotton at a figure below parity price and, as all of you know, that parity has been the objective of most of the agricultural legislation enacted since 1932.

Summarizing, we believe that all subtitle B should be taken out of the measure you are now considering. The proposed authority to regulate margins for trading on the exchanges is not needed, would not halt prices, or curb inflation, and easily could result in unwarranted price increases for agricultural commodities. It represents an unnecessary interference with the functioning of free enterprise. Such steps should never be taken unless they are imperative and then only after due consideration. We recommend that section 411 be referred to the Senate Agriculture Committee if it is not to be abandoned altogether. The Agriculture Committee is familiar with such proposals and we would be willing to trust its judgment.

We have stated briefly our reasons for proposing the elimination of section 412. We feel there is no justification for this section.

We have not addressed ourselves to the many other sections of this measure, leaving them to be discussed by others more familiar with their import than we are on such short notice.

Austin Rebukes Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Saturday, August 5, 1950:

AUSTIN REBUKES SOVIET

Warren R. Austin, American chief delegate to the UN, expressed a noble sentiment when he causically repudiated a suggestion that peace could be bought in Korea for the price of recognition of Red China. In ringing words, he said that "so long as men are dying on the battlefield in defense of the United Nations, this council will not wish to cheapen their suffering or sully their heroism by seeming to engage in the consideration of deals." "Deal," in this context, has a hatefully cynical connotation which embraces all the wickedness of artful power politics. By rejecting the proposal as contemptuously as he did, Mr. Austin was truly the spokesman for American opinion, which sees Korea in the isolation of what it is costing a handful of GI's, not as an expendable pawn on the international chessboard.

At every turn of the road, by their consistent ignoring of human values, Soviet leaders make it all too plain that their concern is dynasty—the perpetuation of their dogma at whatever cost to the people it is supposed to emancipate. The difference between old monarchical tyranny and this new enlightened kind is that the former pretended no interest in the common welfare, while the latter promises redemption from misery at some future—always future—date, asking only that the masses patiently endure their exalted serfdom until the day of millennium cometh. The old tyranny was really more benevolent in that it did not impose the condition that it be loved and respected; it made it apparent that it didn't care a whit what people thought, and thus left the door unlatched for the assassins. The new tyranny, with devilish cunning, leaves the door unlatched, too, but to disarm the assassins by letting them catch a glimpse of the luxury their children's children may partake of—if all goes well. The trouble is that the stomach is not sustained for long by dreams of delightful victuals, although the promise of a deferred utopia can be sufficiently enticing to hold revolt in check for long enough to see a cheated generation to the grave.

Although it would, of course, save American lives to come to terms with the Russians over Korea by yielding to their demands, it would be yielding too much. It would be yielding too much of that nebulous thing called freedom—that happy state we enjoy and can't adequately define because it has a thousand meanings. Life is not supposed to be grim; it is not immoral, not a bit, to want to enjoy some of its fruits while you still have all your teeth. This Government of ours, even as now constituted, criticism to the contrary notwithstanding, permits us to enjoy hot from the griddle some of the richness we help create. It doesn't snatch it all away from us, like a stern parent, and lock it up for consumption at a time which may never come. Austerity, which is always building for the future, makes lean citizens, and glum, but it does not make joyous ones. This fact alone is one of the best weapons in our armory.

Preparedness by Ansul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of our critical problems of today is civil defense, and it is readily apparent that our local communities must lead the way in the absence of leadership from Washington. How one of the industrial concerns in Marinette, Wis., a thriving city in my district, has taken the lead in disaster preparedness is told graphically in a recent issue of the magazine Pathfinder. As a fine example of American resourcefulness and independence, I include it as part of my remarks and commend it to the membership of the House:

PREPAREDNESS BY ANSUL

"We won't have our civil defense forces ready until 1952," Paul J. Larsen, director of civilian mobilization of the National Security Resources Board, told a reporter. "We are taking a calculated risk that Russia won't feel able to launch a 'winning war' until then."

Last week, as worried industrialists wondered whether Stalin would abide by Larsen's schedule, it fell to individual towns and businesses, acting on their own, to prepare for air raids which might liquidate much of the United States industry on the first day of total war. Among the most enterprising: the small (300-man) Ansul Chemical Co., Marinette, Wis.

Ansul, which produces synthetic rubber ingredients, lies on the path of Detroit-and-Milwaukee-bound Russian bombers. A single bomb plopped on one of its storage tanks might blow up half the town. "I was really worried," said Ansul safety director Joseph J. Banuch, last week. "We weren't prepared for a disaster."

THE FIXINGS

But Banuch, a rugged, 36-year-old ex-cop, had known one thing Ansul could do right away: form a disaster rescue team. Three years ago, he secured from company officials a promise of anything he needed—workers' time, training quarters, even $3,000 worth of

first-aid kits, asbestos suits, tools, and a combination inhalator-aspirator-resuscitator.

Banuch quickly picked 15 plant workers of the type wanted: athletic, public-spirited, willing to serve without pay. Two were former Army hospital corpsmen.

Three hours a week, for 21 weeks, they studied Red Cross first aid. Then after studying the inhalator-training pamphlets, they answered emergency calls for a week with the Milwaukee Fire Department's rescue squad. Ansul's team came back convinced that plant rescue work was only a part of what they could do. Since Marinette and its Michigan sister community, Menominee (combined populations 30,000), could not support paid rescuers, why not serve the entire area?

Today, Ansul's team handles emergencies ranging from near-drownings to hands caught in car doors. It revived two men knocked out by a power line atop a four-story building and, last month, evacuated and treated survivors of a dry-cleaning plant explosion.

"If war comes now," Banuch proudly predicts, "we know just how to relieve the shortage of doctors, maintain order, and pull out the entrapped."

Give the Ground Forces Their Own Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the following thought-provoking editorial written by Allen Griffin, publisher of the Monterey Peninsular Herald, deserves the attention of every Member of Congress and our military leaders as well.

I have heard the same sentiments expressed many times by our colleagues in the House who fought with the Infantry during World War II:

GIVE THE GROUND FORCES THEIR OWN SUPPORT

The men responsible for the national defense, inclusive of high rank and the politicians, may as well get down to brass tacks now and not later. The Army must be authorized without delay to organize its own air force for the excluusive purpose of close support of ground forces.

What we learned by experience in the Second World War we are today being taught by a far more bitter experience and by humiliation that is hard to take. One factor in that situation is the inability of the Air Force to give ground troops close support. The United States Air Force, as it is composed and as it should be composed, is neither equipped, trained, nor prepared to give this type of support, and we should recognize that that is not its mission.

This is not a criticism, therefore, of the Air Force. Its gallant young men are making every possible effort to save the forlorn situation on the ground in Korea, but they have neither the planes nor the training to do the job. The whole show in this respect is, on their part, an improvisation. Their lack of success in the intimate field of close teamwork was inevitable, just as other failures for which they were not responsible were inevitable.

When the Department of Defense, with the consent of Congress, was emasculating the Marine Corps, with some great minds prepared even to abolish this proven and tried arm of the service in the name of unification, the Marine Corps went into a desperate and obstinate defensive action to retain its own air arm. The ranks of the Marines were decimated and its air units ruthlessly depleted, but the principle was retained—and the understrength Marine division that is now en route to Korea is going there with its own Marine air support, thanks to those stubborn and unreasonable Marine and Navy officers who refused to be unified out of usefulness.

It should not be necessary for the Army to be transferred to the Marine Corps in order to have equal support and training, which can be accomplished only by close association and unity prior to conflict.

What the Army needs and must have now is well-armored, slow (175 miles an hour is sufficient) and uncomplicated planes operated by pilots thoroughly trained with ground forces, capable of dive and glide bombing and accurate, prolonged strafing.

This type of operation requires a high degree of specialization, thorough understanding of ground force tactics, and consistent training with ground troops. It is what the Germans had to break resistance to their infantry-tank teams in the first 2 years of the war in Europe; and it is something that the Russians had at the end of the war and have today.

The relative safety of such air supporting planes lies in hedge hopping and evasive tactics and in the Air Force proper keeping the skies cleared of the enemy.

If the Army's ground forces cannot get such an arm to support their operations, that belongs to them completely and that is fully coordinated on the ground, then there isn't going to be any close support.

There are two primary missions of the Air Force and one secondary mission, and nothing more should be expected, because nothing is more practical and economical. The primary missions are (1) interception and destruction of enemy aircraft, whether bombers or fighters, and the control of the air, and (2) strategic bombing. The secondary mission is support of ground forces, a tactical operation, but not close support. It is improper, wasteful, and furthermore, ineffective to expect of the Air Force more than the fulfillment of these, its proper missions.

The high ranks in the top drawer of the Army ground forces are not likely to stick their necks out on this issue and earn the enmity of the autocracy that demands a closed mouth unless it opens to say "yes." Therefore the pressure to create for the Army a small close support air arm under complete Army control must originate with the public and its representatives in Congress. Ground force leaders can then follow it up. The decision, however, should not be postponed. The Air Force should be relieved of a requirement that it should not be called upon to fill. The Army must be equipped for infantry-tank-air close teamwork. The morale factor involved is of the highest importance. Moreover, it will be economy of the first order—of men, equipment, and planes.

New England Prepared?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald, Boston, Mass., Sunday, August 6, 1950:

NEW ENGLAND PREPARED?

One of the great uncertainties in the present war crisis is the extent to which industry will be called upon to convert to military production. Only time will tell, because it depends on the kind of struggle in which we ultimately find ourselves, and there is little in the over-all that the individual can do to prepare.

There is, however, a certain mental preparedness which we in New England might well cultivate.

This highly industrialized area will doubtless do its part as it has in all past emergencies. During World War II the six-State region filled approximately 9 percent of the Nation's war contracts, although it has but 6 percent of the Nation's population and 2.1 percent of its area.

What is worth considering, in the breather before this new crisis, is whether our potential is not for something greater than that, whether, with initiative and drive, we cannot do better both for the country and for ourselves when the chips are again down.

New England did an extraordinary production job during the last war, largely with existing plant. When the big production drive came this region was already tooled up, owing to earlier overseas orders, and it went to work with what it had. Most of the heavy Government expenditure for new plant went elsewhere, and so did the later contracts when the plants were built.

There was a reason for this at the time. New England was already heavily industrialized. There was concern over plant dispersal for defense purposes, and there was also need to find areas where the labor supply was not already preempted. But times have changed. In this air age New England is no more vulnerable to long-range attack than some of our still-booming centers in the Midwest and West. Also, it now has what many experts consider a chronic oversupply of labor. One of its chief needs is for plant modernization.

The several committees and agencies which are now studying New England's long-term economic situation will almost certainly recommend that, in the event of a new war effort, this region make a bid for major Federal aid in the form of new plant construction. They should also urge individual companies to use any windfalls from a war boom for complete plant modernization.

War, if it comes, will do great injury to this area, as well as to all others. But we must be alert to pluck every chance we can to improve our immediate and long-term productivity. And all-out production for war can provide many such chances, if we are ready and willing to grasp them.

Truman Performance in Switzer Case Is Dismal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Mr. W. Earl Hall, managing editor of the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-

Gazette, and published in the August 4, 1950, issue of that newspaper:

TRUMAN PERFORMANCE IN SWITZER CASE IS DISMAL

The story of the evolution of a little man named Harry Truman is contained in the history of the Carroll O. Switzer case.

Once—in his humbler days—Mr. Truman would have come to his former Senate colleague and asked:

"Who do you think would make a competent judge for the southern Iowa Federal district?"

But after becoming seized by his indispensable-man complex—this was spawned in connection with the last Presidential election—his whole approach changed.

Then, despite his acquaintance with the time-honored custom of consulting majority party Senators, he sought to bull through an appointment on a strictly political basis.

The action was taken in the face of an alternate of nominations by Iowa's Senator GILLETTE, nominations based on a bar referendum in the interested judicial district.

Senator GILLETTE from the start let it be known that he would oppose Switzer's appointment, that he considered it an affront by one who owed him decent consideration.

It wasn't surprising therefore that the Senate Judiciary Committee should reject the Switzer nomination even though he is now serving an interim appointment—another bit of presidential gall.

Nor will it be surprising if in the very early future the matter is brought up on the floor of the Senate for a test which almost certainly will be unfavorable to Mr. Switzer.

The reflection is on the President, not on Mr. Switzer. He's a likable young man of perhaps average competence as a lawyer.

That he made the sacrifice of seeking the governorship 2 years ago with no chance of success could not be reasonably considered as a legitimate qualification for serving on the Federal bench.

When the question was: "What lawyer would make the best judge?" it's significant that Mr. Switzer received not even the slightest consideration from his professional brothers.

History will record that he didn't come into the picture until the President began tossing some of the political curves he learned from old Tom Pendergast, his first political mentor.

Who Runs the Air Force?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Rome (N. Y.) Sentinel of May 16, 1950:

WHO RUNS THE AIR FORCE?

The chamber of commerce in Red Bank, N. J., is protesting to Congress the interference by the Rome Chamber of Commerce in the Watson Laboratories transfer.

We suggest to the Red Bank organization it look into its own backyard if it wants to find interference with plans for national defense.

The Air Force makes a thorough 4-year study of its ground electronics research and development program. It decides it must, for national safety, move Watson Laboratories from its exposed position at Eatontown, N. J.

It studies five possible new sites. It selects the $66,000,000 Griffiss Air Force base at Rome, ideally suited as an electronics installation and, most important, more secure from enemy attack.

The transfer is scheduled. Civilian employees at Watson Laboratories raise so much fuss a political storm arises in New Jersey and spreads to Washington.

This inteference by Air Force employees, channeled into political pressure, suspends the transfer and costs the Nation heavily in precious research work.

One electronics laboratory's work practically comes to a halt. Part of its personnel and equipment are in Rome, the balance in Eatontown. Planning and work that should go ahead with all speed are in a state of suspense.

The Rome Chamber of Commerce's interference consists of reminding Congress no group of private citizens can be permitted to jeopardize national safety by dictating to the Air Force; that the Air Force is in a better position to know its own needs for research and development than employees of Watson Laboratories.

Can the Red Bank Chamber of Commerce dispute this?

Is the day here when its civilian employees can tell the Air Force what it can or cannot do?

The inteference in this situation came from Red Bank and Eatontown. It is dangerous to the welfare of the country.

Interior Department Would Build Unsound Projects Under the Guise of Wartime Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret to report that an agency of this Government assertedly is planning to deceive the Congress and take advantage of the war emergency with total disregard for the Nation's general welfare and for the men who are fighting in foreign fields.

According to information I have received, the Department of Interior, and specifically the Reclamation Bureau, will call upon Congress to build a number of large, costly, and totally unnecessary projects under the false assertion these projects are vital to the war effort.

No one knows better than we in Congress the importance of separating the sheep from the goats in a perilous time like this, yet agents of the Interior Department are now making pat speeches—secretly, of course—to Congressmen under the title "How To Get Your Project Built—Call It a War Project."

Here we have a discreditable display of sinister bureaucracy by men who place their own selfish schemes above the needs of men who are dying in conflict. Here we see officials of our Government plotting to take advantage of the Nation's profound desire to do everything possible to win the war. Here we see men of position and power attempting to wrap in the American flag projects they could not get approved in peacetime, and which have no value whatever in our struggle for victory against an unscrupulous and cruel aggressor.

A few days ago, on July 25, I recommended to the Congress that all costly and unnecessary reclamation projects be put in moth balls for the duration. At that time I anticipated precisely what is happening now. I feared that the Bureau of Reclamation, with no regard for the terrible financial burden now increasing on the American taxpayers, would attempt to get some of its fantastic projects approved under the false guise of wartime requirements.

I am informed that the Bureau of Reclamation has now cooked up what they describe as a package deal. That is, lumping together some of the sounder proposed projects with some completely unsound projects that could not pass in Congress at any time. Why? Because the Bureau of Reclamation wants to keep new projects going regardless of the national emergency. It wants to keep its great payroll intact, and the officials want to keep their personal power.

Let me cite a specific example. The Bureau of Reclamation has failed thus far to get even committee approval for the proposed central Arizona project, that would cost the taxpayers more than $2,000,000,000, which would never be recovered. It is the nefarious plan of the Reclamation Bureau to include the central Arizona project in the package deal. Representatives of the Bureau have told the Arizona proponents to term the proposed project a wartime necessity. The scheme involves building a gigantic dam on the Colorado River, allegedly for hydroelectric power to serve the war. At this time, the Arizona supporters would not request an appropriation for the irrigation features of the bill. Yet, the truth is the Colorado River Dam is the main feature of the whole central Arizona project. The scheme is to get the dam built as a war measure, and then, of course, the irrigation features would be requested.

Let me illustrate how deceitful is this plot. The building of this dam could not be started in less than a year if approval was given today. Secretary Chapman has estimated it would take at least 7 years to build the dam and power plant. I think it more likely that 10 years would be required, for this is a gigantic structure in a remote area of the West.

So at least 8 or 9 years would pass before the dam could supply power.

If power is needed for the war emergency it would be much better to construct steam-generating plants and use coal as a fuel. These steam plants could be constructed in a comparatively short time.

It is not the intention of the Arizona proponents to build this dam at Bridge Canyon on the Colorado River without regard for the irrigation features. It is the intention of the Arizona proponents to use the cry of patriotism to get the main feature of their fantastic irrigation project built.

What about essential materials that would be required for such a project at a time when we may face serious shortages? Let me tell you some of the things

such a dam would require. The dam site is in a wilderness, far from any city or sizable town. There is no highway and no railroad anywhere near it. A highway 25 miles long would have to be constructed for the hauling of material alone, and a railroad at least 14 miles long would have to be built. Even then the railroad would not reach the dam site, for a railroad could not be built into the great canyon or even up to it.

Here is a scheme to spend almost half a billion dollars to get a power plant in an isolated area; a plant that would require vast amounts of vital material and an enormous supply of manpower in a place where there is no manpower at all; a plant that could not deliver 1 kilowatt of energy for at least 8 years.

But I have not yet revealed all there is to this disreputable plan hidden behind the false whiskers of wartime necessity. The proposed dam at Bridge Canyon, if built, would be virtually useless within 20 years. Why would it be useless in that time? Because, without another great dam farther upstream, the Bridge Canyon Dam Reservoir would be filled with silt in 20 years and power production would cease.

The Bureau of Reclamation knows that, and is planning to build another dam above Bridge Canyon. Yet they would come into Congress crying Bridge Dam is needed for the war, and say nothing now about the second great dam above that must be built to protect Bridge Dam.

Now, in the face of the war emergency, there is no telling when the upstream dam would be authorized to protect Bridge Dam. It would be a wicked waste of a great natural resource to build Bridge Dam at this time; it would be deceiving the people of this country; it would be double-crossing the fighting men; and it would be undermining the war effort.

If we were to open the door to such a scheme, we would find a rush of other proposals from the Bureau of Reclamation for other gigantic projects which could contribute nothing to the emergency and would only serve to sap our financial and material strength when it is most needed.

Milk Market Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to inform the Members of the House of the outcome of conferences between Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, Senator LEHMAN and myself concerning the recent administrative order affecting the 37 milk market administrations throughout the Nation.

Two different orders were to have been issued in the last few months which would have disputed the efficient operation of the New York milk market administrator's office. One of these was an announcement by the Civil Service Commission that the milk market administrators and their staffs would be included under Federal civil-service regulations and retirement. This was done because many administrators had requested that they and their staffs be eligible for Federal retirement system being open to them.

The second order was from within the Department of Agriculture itself and contained regulations and restrictions for market administrators which would have, in effect, abolished the independent status which these administrators have enjoyed for so many years. It would also destroy the Federal-State cooperation which has marked the operation of the New York milkshed for so long.

There may be some market administrator's offices which need to come under these two orders, but the New York office is not one of them. In regard to the Civil Service Commission order, the administrator and staff of the New York milkshed are already eligible for retirement benefits under the New York State retirement system.

The executive order of the Department of Agriculture regarding regulations and restrictions to be placed on the milk market administrators was not only unnecessary, but might well have broken down the smooth-functioning character of the New York office. That office has functioned as a semiautonomous unit for many years, and its operation has been punctuated by excellent Federal-State relations as well as the complete confidence of milk producers, marketers, and buyers.

Realizing that these orders should not be applied to the New York milk market administrator's office if there was any way to avoid it, I conferred with Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, with officials of the Department of Agriculture, and with Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan. I explained my reasons for believing that the New York milkshed should not be included, and suggested that, as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I requested Chairman COOLEY to appoint a special subcommittee to investigate the situation. This committee would have studied each administrator's office and made individual recommendations concerning them. Senator LEHMAN also conferred with the Secretary and presented his arguments.

At the termination of these conferences, Secretary Brannan announced that the relationship between the New York milk market administrator and the Federal Government would remain unchanged. He also agreed not to press for the inclusion of the New York administrator under the Federal retirement plan, pending a review by the Civil Service Commission.

In short, New York milk producers can be assured that there will be no change in the status of the marketing administrator's office or in the organization and regulation of that office.

I wish to publicly commend Secretary Brannan for his willingness to work out an agreement acceptable to all sides; it is the mark of an exceptionally able public servant.

GI Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in including the following self-explanatory letter from a former GI. It is indeed inspiring to receive this type of communication from a young man who is sincerely grateful for the assistance he has received from his Government.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF., *July 5, 1950.*
Congressman JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I recently graduated from San Jose State College. During this period of 4 years, I was enrolled under the GI bill and this cost the American people several thousands of their dollars. The purpose of this letter is to thank them, through you, one of their chosen representatives. I sincerely hope that with this education, which the Government and the people have given to me, that I can repay my debt, at least in part, by being a better American and therefore be of greater service to our country, which, by the way, I feel is one of the main purposes of an education.

Thank you again and if you should care to relay this note of thanks to any of your colleagues in Congress it will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
GERALD A. SHOEMAKER.

Discouraged But Not Quitting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, appalled by the situation which confronts us abroad, it is discouraging to see the Congress doing business as usual. Every tax dollar which we can dig out of the people, every dollar which we can borrow, is needed to carry on the war to which, at the request of the Security Council of the United Nations, President Harry S. Truman has committed us.

August 4, the Senate put through a bill calling for $34,237,000,000. The House will shortly approve an appropriation of an additional $4,000,000,000 for foreign military aid. A request coming up within a few days will call for an additional $16,640,000,000. There will be requests for additional billions. Where they are to come from I do not know. Yet the Congress is authorizing and appropriating—and there will be spent—additional billions to aid the people of other nations to live more comfortably at less cost to themselves.

On August 2 in the other body, the junior Senator from Michigan said that to bring this country up to its requirements for highways, flood control, hospitals, schools—for a domestic program,

would require upwards of $180,000,000,000.

But I am not talking now about money to be spent here at home in war time on desirable but not absolutely necessary projects. I am talking about the money which it is proposed to spend abroad, not in a war effort, but just to help the people of other nations to live "more abundantly."

Here are some of the overseas development projects—not military—which were either approved or under consideration in May of this year.

For the United Kingdom, to be spent on local nonmilitary projects in her colonies for agriculture in Cyprus, roads in northern Rhodesia, roads in north Borneo, roads in British Honduras, roads in Sarawak, food production in Uganda, cotton and food development in Tanganyika, rice in Tanganyika, soil conservation in Tanganyika, water development in Tanganyika, road development in Tanganyika, cottonseed in Uganda, roads in Uganda, roads in Nigeria, $3,807,072.

To France for her colonies for road development in French West Africa, iron ore in Conakry, soil erosion in Algeria, rice cultivation in Morocco, road development in Cameroons, roads in French Equatorial Africa, $3,948,932.

To Belgium for her colonies for soil conservation in Belgian Congo, navigation aids in Belgian Congo, roads in Belgian Congo, $9,046,000.

The June 30 report of ECA stated:

Hundreds of miles of roads opening up isolated areas of Africa and the British East Indies will be constructed with the help of Marshall plan (your) dollars, the Economic Cooperation Administration announced today.

Nearly 1,000,000 ECA dollars will buy United States equipment to be used in road development projects in seven British territories. The funds are coming from the special reserve fund set aside by ECA to help the development of overseas territories of Marshall plan countries, both for their own economic well-being and their contributions to the economic stability of the mother countries.

Other illustrations might be cited, but the foregoing is enough to justify the asking of this question.

What can be said for an administration and a Congress which, when we have a national debt of more than $256,000,000,000, on which there is an annual interest charge of more than $6,000,000,000 while we are fighting world war III which calls for every dollar we can raise or borrow, not only does "business as usual" here at home, but continues to send billions upon billions of dollars abroad to build up the colonial possessions of European nations?

With Mr. Truman right now calling for $54,877,000,000, is there any reason why we should not cut the additional $11,600,000,000 which he asks for purely domestic activities here at home by at least $5,200,000,000? That would still leave, for the home front, $6,400,000,000, which was the amount spent in 1948, when a Republican Congress balanced the budget for the first time in many years.

Do you wonder that I am discouraged, that when I think of Korea I grow more angry and determined, if that is possible, to do everything within my power to end the foolish, ruinous policies which, if continued, can destroy us?

No, I am not giving up. I am not even weakening. I'm sticking to that old slogan of Teddy Roosevelt, which is, "We never quit 'til the hearse comes 'round."

For Your Welfare and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, during my entire term in Congress it has been my policy to appear in every city, village, and township in the Tenth District in person to give a report of my work. Each year it has been my policy to give every person in the district a chance to see me personally and discuss their problems with me personally. I never asked the Government to set up an office for me in various parts of the district which I could have done. I paid all expenses of office rent, office supplies, and secretarial help, as well as telephone and telegram expense out of my own pocket. All travel and hotel expenses likewise were paid by me personally. These frequent contacts with the people did not cost the taxpayers a penny.

It is my hope to come into every community again this fall. But with the war on I may be compelled to stay in Washington. That is what the people would want me to do. They expect me to stay on the job and they know I will be on the job. They know that in time of need and worry they can always call on me to help them. For that reason I may not be able to appear personally in every community as I would like to do.

People of the district expect some report from me. For that reason at my own expense I am printing and sending to the people this report. I am sending it out as an official report just in case I am not able to see them personally as I have in the past.

SAVED THOUSANDS BY REFUSING FREE MAILING

As a Member of Congress I am entitled to send out an average of 25,000 official reports or documents each month without cost to me. This right was established long before I came to Congress. I have never abused this right. In fact, I have hardly used it at all. I have not even used 5 percent of my allotment during my term in Congress.

As a Member of Congress I could have made several trips around the world at Government expense. I never abused that right. In fact, in my 8 years in Congress I have not used it at all. I have yet to make my first trip anywhere at Government expense.

The savings to the people on these two items alone on my part has more than paid my salary. When it is known that in addition each year I pay out of my own pocket an average of $2,000 per year for extra help when flooded with mail and telephone calls and telegrams, it can be realized how anxious I am to do my job with very little cost to the taxpayers.

THIS REPORT NOT COSTING THE TAXPAYERS A CENT

So if there are those who have nothing else to say who will shout that I am abusing my right to mail, simply tell them that the printing and paper cost as well as postage are paid by me personally and all the while I have been in Congress I have used less than 5 percent of my free mailing allotment. This written official report comes only because I believe the people want me to stick to my post here in Washington during wartime. From past experience the people know they can count on me for service and I will always be available when they want that service.

BEING ON THE JOB MEANS RESULTS

During my term in Congress I have not missed a single day on the job except for 7 days in 1946 when I had an operation. Outside of these 7 days I have never missed a full day's work. By a full day's work I mean from 12 to 16 hours a day. In my entire term in Congress I have been on the job every day of the week, except on Sunday morning. My record of service is known to more than 40,000 people who have called on me for help. Not one was ever turned down. For verification, all you need do is ask your friend or neighbor. I have not taken a vacation or trip during my entire term in Congress. I have always been available to the people of the district.

PROBLEMS SOLVED FOR 14,152 VETERANS

By being on the job and employing a capable staff my office is known for its efficiency and speed and willingness to help. Here is a summary of a job well done. Here, for example, is a rough summary of individual veterans' cases handled by my office to give you folks an idea of what it means to have somebody as your Congressman stay on the job:

VETERANS' CASES

Collection and adjudication of dependents' claims	4,946
Appeals for pensions	560
Veterans' loans	360
Veterans' training	495
Collection of veterans' pay	560
Insurance collections	320
Insurance records	203
Discharge cases and records	115
Information requests	2,650
GI-bill benefits	214
Location of veterans	160
Reenlistments	93
Appeal type of discharge	64
Collection of death benefits	240
Reinstatement of pensions	160
Veterans' hospitalization	116
Dependency discharges	160
Collection of pension pay	36
Retirement pension	29
Reemployment rights	114
Unemployment compensation	236
Arrangements for foreign wives to States	41
Arrangements for American wives to other countries	94
Civil-service employment	241
Collection of travel pay	94
Court-martial cases	31
War-surplus priorities	60
Insurance-premium refund	460
Farm training applications	290
Prisoner-of-war collections	60
Miscellaneous requests	940
Total veterans' cases handled during my term	14,152

BENEFITS RUN INTO MILLIONS OF DOLLARS

The benefits coming through as a result of my service ran into millions of dollars. I have not asked nor accepted a penny for any of these services. Every penny of it went directly and fully to the veterans and their dependents.

Veterans' cases always get top priority from me. No veteran can say he was let down when he asked me for help. During 1945 and 1946 when veterans' problems were acute I hired an extra secretary and paid her out of my own pocket to come to Washington and work in my office so that each request could be answered the same day it was received.

In 1944 I spent $800 of my own money to print and send a booklet to every family in the district—more than 80,000 copies—explaining what their rights and benefits were and how to contact me to receive those rights and benefits.

I am a high-ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee by my own choice. There is not an office in existence where veterans can get better and more prompt and willing service than from my office. No matter what their problems might be every veteran who contacted me will verify he got action. Every case got immediate response and action.

My work for veterans is known to every national leader of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars and every service officer in the district. But the best proof is the veteran himself. Ask them and verify for yourself. Almost one out of every two veterans in the district has asked me for help in my term in Congress. There is not another office in existence that can point to such a record of faithful and prompt service to the veterans. To do the job right I have spent an average of $2,000 out of my own pocket for extra help and supplies to do the job as it should be done.

EVERY CITIZEN GOT SAME GOOD SERVICE

Since I have been in Congress more than 40,000 people of the district have written me or contacted me in some way for help and service. Not one was let down. They always got service by return mail.

These cases varied and dealt with every department of our Government. I have collected claims as old as 20 years in negotiation. If it dealt with the Federal Government, every one of the 40,000 are living proof of my devoted service to the folks back home.

I never said I was too busy. I never said to wait until the work let up. I never said, "Go see somebody else." I never passed the buck to anybody else.

I never said the Government does not give us enough help or materials and limits our work. If I could not do the work with the help and materials the Government gave me, I hired more help and bought more materials and paid for them out of my own pocket.

LETTERS FROM VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS WHO KNOW

Read the following letters from outstanding veterans' organizations who know what is going on in Washington:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., August 4, 1950.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALVIN: As final adjournment of the Eighty-first Congress draws near, I wish to express to you on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States our very high regard for you personally and our sincere appreciation for the splendid work you have performed as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Your votes on legislation relating to veterans and their dependents have been 100-percent favorable and your sympathetic and tireless efforts in behalf of veterans of all wars have been outstanding.

In our opinion, all veterans owe you "the debt immense of endless gratitude," and with warm personal regards and best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1950.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'KONSKI: Thank you for your letter of the fourteenth in reply to mine of February 6 in reference to H. R. 7267 which you were good enough to introduce at our request.

I also appreciate your forwarding the additional copies.

Please be assured that we are deeply grateful to you for your courtesy and consideration in this and other matters.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN,
April 7, 1949.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'KONSKI: We have followed with great interest and concern the tactics adopted on the floor of the House of Representatives by the opponents of the American Legion pension plan bill, H. R. 2681.

We have noted, however, with great satisfaction in the RECORD that you voted against adopting the motion to recommit the bill to the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and we wish to take this opportunity to extend to you our thanks for your stand in behalf of the veterans.

There are many occasions which prompt us to write to those who represent us only when we wish to register some complaint, and too often we forget to recognize their efforts in our behalf; therefore, may we again express our sincere appreciation to you for the position you had taken in the face of all opposition.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. O'MELIA,
Department Commander.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1949.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'KONSKI: In behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I wish to express to you our deep appreciation for your declared support of H. R. 4617, when it was brought up and passed by the House on June 1, 1949, and particularly for your vigorous objection to the unemployability requirement, which was a very important issue, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 1, 1949.

All veterans and their beneficiaries owe you a debt of gratitude for this concrete evidence of your determination to protect their best interests.

I take this opportunity also to extend to you my own personal thanks for your good work, and with continued good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1949.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'KONSKI: Please accept our sincere appreciation for your forthright letter of May 21, 1949, in reply to my circular letter of May 17 with respect to H. R. 4617, a bill which would grant pensions, under certain conditions, to World War I and II veterans.

It is encouraging to note that you share our opinion with respect to the unemployability test which would be applied to veterans 65 years old or over.

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1949.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'KONSKI: This is to express the gratitude and appreciation of the national organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for your steadfast loyalty and support of the traditional policy of pensions for aged and incapacitated war veterans during House consideration of the pension bill, H. R. 2681, on March 22–24, 1949. Although this bill was voted back to committee by a slender margin there is reason to believe another pension bill will be brought up for consideration in the near future.

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Spanish-American War veterans are today enjoying benefits of security because of my bill enacted into law in the Eightieth Congress. The law under which their benefits are being received today is my bill enacted into law. Every Spanish-American War organization in existence in the Nation has written me a letter of appreciation. Need I say any more to the veterans of this Nation?

BUSINESSMEN WILL VERIFY RESULTS

Small- and large-business men know of my record on their behalf. There are in operation today at least 100 small businesses who are in existence because of the help they have received from me. With the crisis we are now in, all indications are that it will be even worse than the last war; it is important that businessmen have somebody in Washington who will heed their pleas for help.

Sometimes it was some regulation that was hampering them. I got the regula-

tion changed. Sometimes it was their inability to get materials. I got the materials for them. Their problems were as different as the number of cases. But all of them got action when calling upon me for help.

I have championed small business as the bulwark of our Nation. I have championed the free-enterprise system under which they operate. But let the small-business men speak for themselves.

There is not a businessman in the district who contacted me who can say I let him down. There are in my files hundreds of letters from businessmen expressing amazement at the results after contacting me for help. Many of them thought the situation hopeless and in sheer desperation decided to ask me for help. But let the businessmen speak for themselves. Here is one of hundreds of letters in my files from businessmen or business groups:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN
SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS,
Chicago 4, Ill.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Mercer, Wis.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'KONSKI: During the sessions of Congress this conference has been watching very closely the work of individual Congressmen with respect to their interest in legislation which might affect the welfare of the small-business concerns of America.

You, more than most of the other Members of the House of Representatives, have shown your active interest in the problems confronting small business and we are mindful of your efforts to aid us in solving some of the problems small business is facing, especially that large percentage of retail and wholesale trade and small manufacturing, which has been regimented and harassed by bureaucracy beyond any emergency necessity.

We wish especially to commend you for your statesmanlike stand on what are regarded as controversial issues. Your public statement to the effect that what is best for this country as a whole is also best for business as a whole and best for labor as a whole, the country as a whole is also best for business to be commended as a forthright statesman takes courage to back up the conviction.

We wish to take this opportunity of expressing to you deep appreciation for your constructive work in promoting the passage of good legislation to save our free enterprise system and private initiative in America, as typified by small business.

We also appreciate your unfailng courtesy and friendliness whenever we have had occasion to call on you in your Washington office.

I wish it were possible for me, personally, to tell every businessman throughout the Tenth Congressional District in Wisconsin that he should feel under obligation to you.

Cordially and sincerely,

FRED A. VIRKUS,
Chairman.

LABOR GETS FAIR DEAL

Labor is a most important part of our economic structure. The last few years particularly have been trying years with increased cost of living and general insecurity and doubt all over the world. With rising living costs, labor today is more concerned than ever about its security and future.

Generally speaking, labor groups are reasonable and understanding. They seek only their just due and a fair portion of our productive effort. I have found this so during my term in Congress. We have had differences of opinion and serious ones, but I always gave labor a fair deal.

I have supported and voted for increases in the minimum wage law for labor. I have supported and voted for increases in social-security benefits for labor. I have voted for and supported their rights at collective bargaining.

Labor groups who have representatives in Washington know of my fair record. But let these groups speak for themselves. Here is all the proof one needs that I have been fair to labor and worked and voted for their welfare and security. One hundred and seventy-four of the Nation's largest labor groups endorse my reelection.

LABOR.
Washington, D. C., August 3, 1950.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you may know, Railway Labor's Political League has endorsed you for reelection. We carried the announcement in this week's issue of Labor, and I am sending you a copy.

If there is anything we can do to help you during the campaign, please let us know.

Sincerely,

EDWARD KEATING,
Manager.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Washington, D. C., August 5, 1950.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'KONSKI: I take pleasure in informing you that you have been endorsed by the brotherhood for reelection from the Tenth District of Wisconsin in the primary election of September 19.

We wish you the best of luck, and you may feel free to make this letter public.

With kindest personal regards.

Respectfully,

HARRY SEE,
National Legislative Representative.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT FARM RECORD

As far as the interests of the farmer are concerned, I have a 100-percent record. The Farmers Union Roll Call Record is the only farm group that rates me less than 100 percent. But they do give me 80 percent, which is also excellent.

I have championed the farmers' cause in REA. Likewise, the FHA and FCA have received my support. Soil conservation and crop insurance got my support. Drought aid and seed loans got my support. Improvement in rural-telephone systems got my support. Having been born and raised on a farm, I clearly understand their needs.

Full parity prices for farmers has always received my support. In every instance I voted for the best farm bill before the House. Not once did I oppose their interests. I have always viewed with alarm any tendency in falling prices for farm products.

Even beyond this, thousands of farmers asked me to help with their individual problems. In each case they got action. Not once was any farmer turned down.

I have always fought and voted against the oleo trust, which aims at the destruction of dairy farming. Likewise, I have fought against imports of farm products from foreign countries. As one who understands by background farm needs, and as one who has always worked and voted in their interests, I am proud to say I have a 100-percent farm record. It will profit the farmers nothing to send a city boy down here who has never seen the inside of a farm or who does not understand their problems.

OLD PEOPLE NEED FRIEND

One of the sad blots on our Nation is the care of our very own people who made our Nation the greatest on earth. They did a much better job of it than we in this generation are doing. They gave us a nation which was the envy of the world. They deserve better treatment than what they are now receiving.

For a nation like ours that proposes to play Santa Claus to the world, giving billions to people who never were or will be our friends, we do not do a very good job at taking care of our aged and disabled. This has been and is one of the most heartbreaking conditions in my entire experience.

We have increased old-age benefits some. But we still have a system where the aged have to beg for what they get. I have supported and voted for these increases. If we were to take just 5 percent of what we throw away all over the world, we could finance a decent old-age-pension system.

The old-age problem is not one which will always be with us. In a few years our social-security benefits will do most of this job. That is why I have also voted for and supported increased benefits and the inclusion of more people in our social-security laws.

In this work, I have the solid support and confidence of the Townsend groups and every old-age-pension organization in the Nation. Without exception, they are 100 percent behind me. I am glad to be their representative and shall continue to strive for their betterment. We can do a much better job with an old-age pension set-up. We should do a better job and we should do so at once. The increases we have made in the last few years have more than been eaten up in increased cost of living.

I shall continue to strive for their betterment. That we cannot afford it is hogwash. We cannot afford not to do it. We can easily cut spending where it is doing us no good. From what dollars we gave Communist Russia in the last 10 years would pay $60 at 60 for the rest of our generation. At least the old people would not have used that money to kill our boys as Communist Russia is now doing.

Below is one of the hundreds of letters I have received in behalf of the old folks:

THE TOWNSEND PLAN
FOR NATIONAL INSURANCE,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'KONSKI: Townsend Club members everywhere, both in your own congressional district and elsewhere throughout the Nation, join me in congratulating you on your successful election to the Eighty-first Congress.

We are especially gratified over your victory because you have shown by word and deed that you want America's senior citizens

to get a better social-security deal. You proved your friendship when you signed petition 7 in the Eightieth Congress, the petition that sought debate and a vote on the program the Townsend Clubs advocate. We are most grateful for the help you gave us then. Our people voted for you this year because they know they can count on you to champion the cause that is closest to their hearts.

It is also a source of satisfaction to us that the Townsend congressional district council in your district, fully aware of your devotion to the problems of senior citizens, unanimously recommended your election. We are proud, indeed, that the votes cast by our members were instrumental in your victory.

Thank you for your support. Thank you for remembering the old folks. Thank you for your courage in endorsing a program that has not yet won universal acceptance in this country. We count you among the pioneers of a new social movement.

Very sincerely yours,

Dr. FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND,
Founder and President.

THIS IS MY REPORT AND MY RECORD

This, folks, is my report of my record and my work. These are the things I would talk to you about if I could come home, but the war prevents me from doing so. For your own good and mine I must stick to my post of duty regardless of any consequences. We demand it of our boys in Korea. Who am I to do less?

If you need me, call on me. In the meantime, I rest my report and record with you. You are the judge—and you alone, the folks back home.

Medical Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely editorial entitled "Medical Education," which was published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL EDUCATION

When the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recently tabled a bill proposing Federal aid to medical, dental, nursing and public health schools, it was not aware that a desperate need for more graduates of such schools would very speedily develop. If the need was not sufficiently plain then, it certainly ought to be so now. The Army has issued a call to reserve officers in the Medical Corps to meet the critical need arising out of the Korean crisis. As mobilization progresses, greater numbers of medical men and nurses will be needed. The Nation has far too few of them even for normal peacetime conditions.

A program to aid the schools producing such personnel cannot, of course, cure the present scarcity. But it can lay the groundwork for correction of a situation which threatens the country's health even in normal times and seriously impairs security in times like the present. The shortage of doctors is acute. The shortage of dentists is scarcely less so. The shortage of trained nurses is very much worse. The problem arises not from any dearth of young men and women eager to enter these fields but from a dearth of institutions qualified to educate them for these professions.

The proposed legislation would help accredited medical, dental, nursing and public health schools to expand their facilities and increase their enrollment. It would make a Federal contribution up to $500 for each medical student currently enrolled—a fraction of the cost of his medical education—and up to $1,000 for each new student added to a school's roster. The ceiling is set somewhat lower in the case of dental schools and nursing schools. In addition, the bill would provide up to $5,000,000 for construction aid to such institutions.

The measure was passed by the Senate but tabled until today by the House Interstate Commerce Committee. When it comes up, we hope it will receive a favorable report. No form of Federal aid can make a more direct and useful contribution to the country's health. No form of promoting the public welfare is more urgent.

Investigate Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
August 4, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to direction of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, I enclose herewith a certified copy of resolution No. 249, C. C. P., July 25, 1950, re: Investigate present cost of living.

Yours truly,

JAMES W. MOCKLER,
Acting City Clerk.

Resolution 249

Resolution to investigate cost of living

Whereas the United States of America is now engaged in resisting communistic inspired aggression in Korea for the preservation of peace in the world and maintaining the prestige of the United Nations; and

Whereas it is the responsibility and obligation of citizens of all walks of life, and especially business establishments engaged in the production of commodities necessary to maintain a decent American standard of living, to wit, to operate their establishments at a fair profit without exploitation of the American citizenry by increasing prices on such commodities without justification; and

Whereas since the invasion of Korea by the communistic forces the cost of living of necessary commodities has spiraled to an unprecedented high, thus causing an unbearable hardship to the citizens of the United States, and especially those on fixed salaries, old-age pension, white-collar workers, and the average working man and woman in general; and

Whereas there is evidence that the increased mark-ups have been made on commodities predicated on labor and material cost prior to the Korean invasion; such mark-ups are not justified and suggest profiteering: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the common council go on record memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact necessary legislation to create a special congressional committee to investigate profiteering and exploitation of the citizens through unnecessary and unjustified increases in prices; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Congressmen of western New York, including the Honorable CHESTER GORSKI, the Honorable ANTHONY (JACK) TAURIELLO, and the Honorable WILLIAM PFEIFFER.

Adopted.

Ayes, 15. Noes, none.

Attest: Dr. J. J. TRONOLONE,
City Clerk.

The Portland Plan Against Hoarding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made in Portland, Maine, Sunday evening, August 6, 1950, at the rally of the Portland (Maine) plan against hoarding.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our country is in far greater peril than most of us realize. It is in far greater peril than we have been told or permitted to know. The principal reason for the withholding of this grave fact from the American public has been the belief that the American people might not be able to take it and might become panicky.

There is more than one way to succumb to emotional panic. There is more than one reaction of panic. Panic is not measured in terms of physical fear alone. Panic is often measured and evidenced in terms of greed and selfishness.

Sometimes a person's courage is found to be very thin in depth. Too often we mistake bravado for courage—bravado that asserts itself only when things are going along smoothly without conflict—but bravado that evaporates when the going gets tough.

Courage and patriotism cannot be accomplished and proved by oratory. They are produced by acts, not mere words. One has to experience fear in order to have courage. One has to make personal sacrifices in order to prove patriotism.

Courage follows fear—it does not precede it. Patriotism follows sacrifice—it does not precede it.

World War I and World War II tested to the fullest the courage and patriotism of Americans. They were not found wanting.

The Korean war has tested the courage and patriotism of many Americans—especially those boys who are fighting for our defense thousands of miles away in Korea.

But our fight is not localized in Korea. Nor is our test of patriotism limited to the members of our Armed Forces.

We have a civilian fight of our own back here at home. Now basically that fight is twofold. The first part of it is to crush the traitorous communism that seeks to destroy

our way of life and everything that we respect, cherish, and hold dear. Communism is no longer merely a scare word. It is an alarming menace that has taken full advantage of the constitutional right of free speech and personal protection guaranteed by our free republic.

Communism seeks to destroy our democratic liberty and freedom by the abuse of that very liberty and freedom. Communism seeks to force the suicide of democracy in its tolerance of free speech.

The fight against communism is not the fight of our Government alone. It is your fight too. And you can do more to crush communism than your Government can. Communism can't be destroyed by laws alone. Instead it will only be driven underground all the more. Communism can best be destroyed by the individual will, courage, and patriotism of each American.

The second part of our fight here at home is self-control and the will to personal sacrifice. The opposite to self-control is panic, for panic is the loss of self-control. The opposite of personal sacrifice is selfishness.

Hoarding results from panic and selfishness. Hoarding is patriotism in reverse. Hoarding is full retreat from conscience. Hoarding in time of national crisis and war is despicable. And don't let anyone gloss over our present crisis as merely "police action," because for all practical purposes we are in a national crisis and we are at war.

Hoarders give comfort and aid to our enemy—and to that extent turn their backs on our country and line up with the enemy. One hoarder does more damage to our national security at a time like this than the good that 10 patriots provide by their personal sacrifices. The slogan so admirably puts it, "Hoarding Helps Communism." The blunt fact is that there is no place or excuse for hoarders in our national security.

Yes; hoarding is a direct challenge and threat to us in our fight at home—and on both parts of that fight—that part of the fight against communism, because "Hoarding Helps Communism"—and that part of the fight for patriotic self-control and personal sacrifice, because hoarding is a deady subversive against self-control and personal sacrifice.

The American people are on trial—each one of us. Our boys fighting in Korea have the toughest role—they are challenged with death and injury. But those of us here at home must face the test of remaining calm and keeping our self-control.

What you and I as civilians do will be watched by every Russian spy and Communist in this country. They will keep a close eye on the public's reaction simply because it may indicate what we will do when the going gets tougher.

If we show signs of hysteria and personal selfishness against national interests—if we should show an inability to remain calm, fail to practice self-control or to accept even minor sacrifices or inconveniences, Russian agents here will probably report back to the Kremlin that the American people will be an easy prey—or suckers, if you prefer that designation—to planned panic and chaotic sabotage.

If we can't maintain self-control and resist fear buying and other panic action at this time, what would we do if Russia attacks us with atomic bombs? The implied answer isn't a good one.

But if we show an ability of self-control—avoid shortages by keeping our heads and buying just we normally buy, and disregard those of our neighbors who talk about the smart thing being to stock up on food and other commodities—then there will be a strong indication to the men in the Kremlin that the civilian American public is possessed of such courage and determination that they cannot be thrown into panic by Communist attacks on this country.

Such a display of restraint and disciplined control of ourselves surely would discourage Stalin from any hopes of full exploitation of mass panic here. More than that, it would help discourage the Communists from making an attack, the potential success of which would be doubtful, and the potential failure of which would appear to be probable.

This may seem to be a little thing. But the little things often betray the big things—the little things make up the big picture.

Our boys in Korea are risking their lives for our own protection and even for our own convenience. Surely then, it is not asking too much for those of us back home, in the comfort of our homes, to practice self-control and to resist the temptation to stock up.

And those who might stock up would find in the event of war, that they would be caught up with. The temporary gain they might have achieved would be wiped out by drastic wartime controls that would ferret out the hoarders. And if war doesn't come, surely those hoarders will literally be left holding the bag with food stocks subject to spoilage.

No one can gain from hoarding food or other commodities by Americans—except Joe Stalin and his associates.

It is seldom that I make a speech on the floor of the United States Senate. I don't talk unless I have something of importance to say. Thursday I made one of my rare speeches in the Senate.

I had something important to talk about. I had something to report to the Senate about which I had the greatest pride. I was talking about my home State of which I am always proud. But this time I had unusual pride—for I was reporting the Portland plan to the Senate.

What you have started here has given me a deep-seated pride that squares my shoulders and makes me stand a little taller. With the Portland plan, you have given new and fuller meaning of Maine's motto of Dirigo for you are truly leading the way and setting the example for the rest of the country in the fight against hoarding.

What you are doing should be an inspiration to the rest of the country—an inspiration and campaign that I hope will sweep the country from Maine to California. I shall wear the antihoarding button you have given me with as much pride as a soldier wears a military medal. I expect that people here will clamor to sign the antihoarding pledges and obtain their buttons and wear them proudly.

Surely these buttons are no less than the badges of the soldiers of self-control. May that army of soldiers of self-control in Maine grow into the thousands. May that army of soldiers of self-control in our Nation grow into the millions out of this first mobilization of self-control here in Portland, Maine.

Young American Medal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a letter written by Mr. Justice Clark on August 2 to my dear friend and fellow colleague, the Honorable FRANK L. CHELF, of Kentucky, in which Mr. Clark congratulates Mr. CHELF upon his ceaseless efforts and his untiring work to enact into law H. R. 157, a bill that would for the first time in the history of this Nation recognize the youth of America by awarding an appropriate medal in the name of the Congress of the United States and presented by the President on behalf of Congress for outstanding bravery and unusual service rendered to a given community.

For years, Mr. Speaker, the nations of the world, including America, have recognized bravery and valor on the field of battle by awarding various medals of honor but never, I repeat, has the Congress of the United States heretofore extended to a civilian of any age such recognition. It is fitting and proper, Mr. Speaker, that the youth of America be awarded this distinction and it is refreshing to know that such has been made possible by the efforts of FRANK CHELF, who incidentally is a person of sterling qualities and who fits in every way that saying that we use so often that "to know him is to love him." Frank, as many of us know, was an orphan and his interest in the youth of America which he has portrayed throughout his entire life is so highly commendable, therefore it is with extreme personal pleasure that I join with Mr. Justice Clark and the membership of the House in extending sincere congratulations to our colleague and friend, FRANK CHELF. It is indeed a job well done and long after the President of the United States and the Membership of this House and Senate have gone on, our friend Frank will be remembered for being the one who conceived and brought about this recognition of the youth of our Nation. I again repeat, it is indeed a job well done.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1950.

HON. FRANK L. CHELF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I noticed that the young American medal bill was finally approved by the Senate.

After working so faithfully on this bill for such a long time I am sure it must give you great satisfaction to see it finally go through and I do want to send my congratulations. Much good will come from this.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

TOM CLARK.

DEAR FRANK: You certainly deserve great credit for this legislation—congratulations! It will mean much to young Americans.

T. C. C.

State Department Loyalty Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted by Williams Bridge Post 1070, Department of New York, American Legion, and various newspaper articles, relating to the investigation of the State Department.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Resolution of Williamsbridge Post, No. 1070, Department of New York, American Legion]

Whereas the United States is now actively engaged in a war in the Far East, "police action" notwithstanding; and

Whereas this condition was brought about through the disastrous policy of the State Department, which refused aid to the Republic of South Korea after millions in arms and ammunition had been voted for it by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas gallant American servicemen are now dying in the hills of Korea because of this lack of arms and equipment to the South Korean Army; and

Whereas the charges of Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, a former member of the Marine Corps and at present a Legionnaire, regarding Communist influence in the State Department have not been disproven to the satisfaction of the American people; and

Whereas the labored report of the Tydings committee, appropriately termed a "whitewash," has failed to allay the fears of the American people by incompletely, inconsiderately, and inconclusively terminating its investigation and calling Senator MCCARTHY'S charges a hoax and a fraud; and

Whereas the State Department officials named by Senator MCCARTHY have failed to purge themselves of the Communist taint to the satisfaction of the American people; and

Whereas it would be disastrous to the welfare of this country to continue to allow the present State Department officials to remain in their positions of influence and continue to shape American foreign policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Williamsbridge Post, No. 1070, American Legion, go on record demanding the resignation or dismissal from Government service of Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Advisers Owen Lattimore, John Stewart Service, John P. Davies, John Carter Vincent, and others of like sentiment still in Government service who have had any influence in shaping American far eastern policy; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Bronx County American Legion, and that it be brought to the attention of the national body through proper channels; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be dispatched to all Bronx County posts for their consideration and similar action.

Drawn:

JOSEPH J. CORRADO,
Finance Officer.

Approved:

FRANCIS R. MAIS,
Commander.

LOUIS J. TAMBOHIN,
Recording Adjutant.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 5, 1950]

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

The great blast of favorable propaganda which the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times published on two successive days, Sunday, July 30, and Monday the 31st, vindicating Owen Lattimore and damning Senator JOE MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, becomes the more interesting and significant on better knowledge of certain facts.

To summarize this political performance in the guise of literary criticism, the Herald Tribune and the Times each gave this book all of page one of its Sunday book review section plus a breakover and each followed this lavish plug for the defense with another vindication of Lattimore the next morning.

The Monday pieces were three columns wide and about half the depth of the page. None of the four even pretended to confine the discussion to the literary quality of the work. A token tribute to the art may be said to exist in such phrases as "fighting book," "intensely personal story containing elements of nightmare" and "it is a story which makes one shiver."

There is an assumption that the propagandists who wrote the pieces somehow are qualified to pronounce the last word and vindicate him. This is not a new development in New York papers.

The Herald Tribune habitually has plugged political issues and personalities distinctly to the left of center, and slurred or ignored issues and writers to the right.

This book is advertised as an Atlantic Monthly Press book, meaning a book published by the press of the Atlantic Monthly magazine whose tendencies have been marked and well known to many for a long time, although they occasionally surprise an unobservant old client of the double-dome press.

But beneath this line about the Atlantic Monthly Press there is another as follows: "Little Brown & Co., Boston."

The editor of Little, Brown & Co. is Angus Cameron.

Against the background of MCCARTHY'S charges on the Senate floor and in committee that Lattimore was a Communist and "the top Russian espionage agent in the United States," the political background of Mr. Cameron is unusually interesting.

A press release of the national Wallace for President committee, dated March 23, 1948, when Wallace had the backing of the Communists, names Cameron as a member of that committee.

The program of the Progressive Citizens of America, which launched the Wallace candidacy, dated October 25, 1947, names Cameron as a sponsor.

The New Masses, a Communist magazine, issue of October 14, 1947, page 24, reports that Cameron was a speaker at a protest meeting on behalf of Howard Fast, author of a eulogy of Tito, the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia. Fast had been sentenced to prison for contempt of Congress.

Cameron was named in the catalog of 1945 of the Samuel Adams School of Social Studies, of Boston, as one of the trustees. This school was cited on the official list of the attorney general of the United States as communistic and subversive.

Cameron was listed as a signer of a brief amicus curiae presented to the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1949, by a group called The Cultural Workers in Motion Pictures and Other Arts, on behalf of the so-called Hollywood 10 who were sent to prison for refusing to answer whether or not they were Communists.

Cameron was named as sponsor of a dinner in honor of Henry Wallace on September 12, 1948, after Bubblehead's defeat as the Communists' candidate for President but before his repudiation of the Communists, Russia, and his party on the Soviet invasion of Korea.

Cameron was named as a sponsor of the Call for the Bill of Rights Congress, held July 16 and 17, 1949, which was cited by the Attorney General as communistic and subversive. This "congress" attacked the FBI for going after Communists.

Cameron was named on the program of a conference held by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, January 23 to 25, 1948. This committee was cited as Communist and subversive on the Attorney General's list.

His name was listed as that of a signer of a release from the Council for Pan-American Democracy, June 5, 1945. This council was cited as communistic and subversive by the Attorney General.

Cameron was listed by the Daily Worker as a member of a committee to welcome the Reverend Hewlett Johnson, the Red Dean of Canterbury, on September 22, 1948. The Archbishop of Canterbury asked churchmen in other countries to ignore the Red dean.

In the New Masses, a Communist magazine, dated October 28, 1947, page 2, Cameron is named as a sponsor of Mainstream, a Communist quarterly.

Referring to the list of sponsors for the Henry Wallace dinner in September 1949, Cameron's name is found in alphabetical order after those of John Abt, a member of the Vermont community where Lattimore bought a house, who refused to answer under oath whether or not he was a Communist, and Harry Bridges.

Paul Draper's name follows Angus Cameron's, and the names of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, William Gailmor, the thief, and Ben Gold, of the furriers' union, ensue in order.

This and other information was available to the propagandists for Lattimore's book if it was not known to them. It is presented for their consideration. It remains to be seen whether their political endorsement of Lattimore's book will be in any way changed.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 4, 1950]

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

On Sunday, July 30, the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times devoted the whole of page 1 of their respective ostensible literary review sections to whooping propaganda for a self-serving book by Owen Lattimore, who had on the Senate floor been called the top Russian spy by Senator JOE MCCARTHY.

In each case there was a break-over into the inside pages.

The Herald Tribune's job was done by John K. Fairbank, professor of history at Harvard and chairman of the China program for the university's committee on international and regional studies, a loud and furious title which may signify little but, on the other hand, may signify much.

The Times' article was written by R. L. Duffus, described as "a member of the Times editorial staff who writes frequently on civil rights and allied subjects."

As though that were not enough to ballyhoo Lattimore's defense, consisting of another monumental disparagement of another earnest campaigner against treason in the Government, both the Herald Tribune and the Times gave the book a double take on Monday.

Each carried a spread the width of three normal columns extending from the top of the page practically to the fold.

The tenor was the same and from the professional editorial standpoint these were repetitions and therefore unjustified except by a determination of the managements to plead Lattimore's cause and discredit his accuser.

Moreover, The Times, in the Sunday book section, carried a two-column ad more than half the depth of the page quoting from the Duffus piece published in the same issue and from Fairbank's piece in the H.-T. and stating, jubilantly, in each case, that the article occupied the front page. Other laudatory opinions were quoted from Francis Biddle, William L. Shirer and Edgar Snow.

Biddle was one of Roosevelt's numerous undistinguished, to say the best of them, Attorneys General. He is remembered for a political pilgrimage to Sidney Hillman at one of the conventions which nominated Roosevelt during the time when the Communists were permeating the Government, and is a committed partisan of the political party which is Lattimore's codefendant.

Shirer is a former run-of-the-mine reporter who lived the easy continental life for pleasant years between the wars and became a broadcaster, which is not a learned profession nor even, on the whole, a respectable one from the standpoints of intellectual and political breadth.

Snow is a political reporter for the Saturday Evening Post for foreign affairs. It would have been no more than fair to the readers of this advertisement to state the facts of the political background of Shirer and Snow.

The Herald Tribune's policy of log-rolling books of a tone consonant with the "liberal" line is well known, having been shown up many times over a term of years. The Times is less uninhibited. The term "liberal" in this usage is a deceptive euphemism.

Often it is applied to politicians who try to impose dictatorial conditions on the people particularly through the medium of unions which are used as a sub-government to set up a despotism under the patronage of government.

Continuing his campaign against Lattimore, whose innocence was proclaimed by a vote of three Senators on strict party lines, Senator McCarthy last week set forth two interesting coincidences.

First, Lattimore bought a half-interest in a house in a region of Vermont secretly infested by Communists and notorious New Dealers of the Frankfurter alumni or cult who refused to testify whether or not they were Communists.

He bought it from Vilhjalmur Stefansson, sometimes known as Bill Stevenson, who was named more than 30 times in various connections, but of a general type, in the records of the House Committee on Un-American activities.

He soon sold the house and Senator McCARTHY before the Senate identified the buyers as avowed Communists, naming them as Ordway and Mary Southard, husband and wife. He said Ordway was the Communist candidate for Governor of Alabama in 1942 and Mary a Communist candidate for the Alabama State Senate in the same year.

Senator McCARTHY thought it significant that Lattimore bought his house from Stefansson, of all people, and sold it to the Southards, of all people.

The blazing indignation of the reviewers of Lattimore's book would be much more convincing and reassuring if it had been expressed in the defense of many individuals who have been damned without trial or proof by other Members and committees of Congress and by private societies as Fascists and hate mongers.

These terms are equally injurious and are applied with intent to smear the victims by the process of association and insinuation often without the slightest evidence of association. The political characters of the seller and the buyers with whom Lattimore dealt may be pure coincidence.

It may be true, as Lattimore said, that the Southards were complete strangers about whom I knew nothing and of whom I had previously never heard. But, upon examination, that statement still does not exclude the possibility set forth by Senator McCARTHY that the Southards were put into the situation by the Communist Party as buyers.

That could be a fact even though Lattimore knew nothing about the Southards and never had heard of them.

Senator McCARTHY insisted that the Government files had been stripped of significant data concerning many persons and that he was denied access to official information.

Withholding judgment on Lattimore, I argue that the publicity here lavished on his book stands in sensational contrast to the treatment of George Morganstern's Pearl Harbor, Charles Beard's President Roosevelt and the Coming of World War II, and John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead.

CAPITAL CIRCUS

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 7.—A heretofore undisclosed chapter in the fascinating career of Owen (Ordeal by Slander) Lattimore, which even Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY overlooked, has just come to light.

It can here be revealed for the first time that in the late 1940's, the Owen Lattimores and a group of Commie suspects, left-wingers, and fellow travelers helped found and finance radio station WQQW here in the Nation's Capital.

Mrs. Lattimore served on its board of directors.

Lattimore, who stoutly denies McCARTHY'S charges that he is a Communist, recently took his case to the people in a book entitled "Ordeal by Slander" and published by Little, Brown & Co. In it he writes, "I have never advocated the Communist cause, and have no Communist connections."

The office address listed by Owen and Eleanor Lattimore as stockholders of WQQW in 1947 was 1710 G Street NW. Strangely enough, this was the identical address at that time of the short-lived Committee of One Thousand, a group of left-wingers formed to smear the House Un-American Activities Committee.

TELEPHONE NUMBERS 8666 AND 8665

Apparently the Committee of One Thousand and Lattimore's Institute of Pacific Relations shared the same suite, since their telephone numbers were District 8666 and District 8665, respectively.

The owner of the building was Samuel J. Rodman, a fellow stockholder in WQQW, who last year refused to answer a long list of questions posed by the Un-American Activities Committee concerning Communist activities on the ground that it might incriminate him.

Rodman's wife, Bella, who has been accused before the committee of being a duespaying member and heavy contributor to the Communist Party, was also a WQQW stockholder. Bella, a native of Warsaw, Poland, is being cited this week by the Un-American Activities Committee for contempt of Congress.

Both Samuel and Bella Rodman admitted making heavy contributions to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, an organization cited by the committee as subversive, but Mrs. Rodman refused to tell committee members whether she was a member of the Communist Party for fear that it might incriminate her.

Samuel's brother, Morris Rodman, an original trustee of WQQW and its president since the reorganization last summer, has also frequently been mentioned in testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee.

Morris Rodman, born in Russia in 1903 and naturalized in Baltimore in 1928, was permitted by the Federal Communications Commission August 11, 1949, to take over control of the stock of some 200 stockholders, including apparently that of the Lattimores.

Another stockholder at the time of the Lattimores' connection with WQQW was Sol B. Minowitz, who, according to public hearings before the Un-American Activities Committee, received $57,000 from the Russian Embassy for printing the Soviet Bulletin in his Superior Print Shop. Mrs. Minowitz, as a subpenaed witness, refused to answer whether she was a Communist Party member, but admitted belonging to the Washington Bookshop, an organization cited by the Attorney General as a Communist front.

Two more stockholders with the Lattimores were John P. and Rose Leaf Anderson. About the former, the Un-American Activities Committee reported last year: "During the course of the committee's investigation, it was reported that John Anderson was a member of the white-collar branch of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia and that meetings of that branch of the Communist Party had been held in his home."

ADMIT INVESTING IN RADIO STATION

It identified Anderson as the treasurer and an executive board member of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and as a member of the Washington branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy and the Washington Committee for Aid to China, both cited as subversive by the Un-American Activities Committee.

Both Mrs. Anderson, who was born in Russia 59 years ago, and Swedish-born Anderson admitted to the committee that they had invested several thousand dollars in WQQW and had contributed to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, but declined to say whether they were Communists for fear of incriminating themselves.

"Have you made any large contributions for the benefit of the Communist Party?" asked committee counsel, Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., of Mrs. Anderson in June 1949.

"Mrs. ANDERSON. I refuse to answer. It might incriminate me."

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the white-collar branch of the Communist Party in 1944, and the holder of membership card 53456?"

"Mrs. ANDERSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason."

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a stockholder in radio station WQQW?"

"Mrs. ANDERSON. Yes, I am."

In summing up its investigation, the Un-American Activities Committee wrote, "During the course of the committee's investigation of Bella Rodman, it was reported that she was responsible for the sustaining fund of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia and that she has discussed Communist Party financial affairs with Martin Chancey, former Communist organizer in the District of Columbia."

RECEIVED $2,000,000 FHA LOANS

Of Samuel Rodman, who was naturalized in 1927, the committee wrote, "It was ascertained that he had been the recipient of loans totaling more than $2,000,000, which were to be used in the construction of housing enterprises under permission granted by the Federal Housing Authority.

"During the committee's investigation, it was reported that Rodman had been associated with the Friends of the Soviet Union, that he had attended Communist Party meetings of a public nature, that he had made contributions for the benefit of the Communist Party in the District of Columbia, through his wife, and that he had discussed Communist Party affairs with Martin Chancey."

Samuel Rodman, a former UNRRA executive in Yugoslavia and Egypt, refused to discuss his alleged Communist associations but denied having been a member of the Communist Party of the United States. Morris Rodman has not yet been questioned by the Un-American Activities Committee.

Neither have the Lattimores.

Appointments to the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding appointments to the United

States courts by President Truman, together with a letter I wrote to the President on August 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY CONDEMNS PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S HUMOROUS ANSWER REGARDING OVERLOADING OF COURTS BY DEMOCRAT JUDGES

Mr. President, last Tuesday, August 1, I wrote again to the President of the United States asking him to correct the terrible overloading of Democratic judges on the Federal court of the United States. I thus renewed a fight which I have waged for some years now for the purpose of securing a balance on the Federal judiciary. I feel that now, more than ever before, it is important that as a symbol of national unity the President begin to appoint able, well-qualified Republican jurists to posts like the two pending Illinois vacancies.

I pointed out in my letter that in 17 years since the New Deal came to power, of 192 Presidential appointments to the bench, 184 were Democrats and only 8 were Republicans. Such lop-sided unbalance makes a farce of our judicial system.

While this extreme Presidential partisanship might be considered to be the mere extension of the old Jacksonian psychology "to the victor belongs the spoils," I, for one, feel that it is extremely harmful to the best interests of the American Republic and intolerable in this day and age. I would say that if a series of Republican Presidents were guilty of the same poor judgment. I wrote to President Truman very frankly mentioning that my own party has not always been farsighted enough to recognize that fact. But we all know that two parties' wrongs do not make a right, and besides, never before have there been so many court positions, has there been such lop-sidedness, nor have Federal judgeships been so important in affecting the lives of 150,000,000 Americans.

President Truman very kindly and promptly answered under date of August 4. Now, I do want to compliment Mr. Truman and his White House secretariat for their real speed in answering, considering the fact that the President is tremendously busy these days with problems arising out of the Korean emergency. I say that very sincerely, that the President is to be highly complimented for his speed in responding.

TRUMAN RESPONSE WAS A GRIM JOKE

I do wish that I could supplement that compliment and say that the President gave some clear-cut indication to me that he would correct this basic grievance. Unfortunately no such assurance was forthcoming.

I should like to read the President's brief and grimly humorous response:

"DEAR SENATOR: I read with a great deal of interest your letter of August 1 and I am more than happy to have your views on the appointment of judges to the Federal courts.

"It has always been my policy to be very careful in the selection of men who sit on the Federal bench and I am very glad to have your endorsement of that policy."

"I'SE REGUSTED" OVER TRUMAN REPLY

Now, Mr. President, it seems that Mr. Truman either did not read my message very carefully or that he has such a keen sense of ironic humor that he felt he could joke about it. Very obviously, I did not, to use his words, "endorse his policy." All in all, to paraphrase a certain comedian, "I'se regusted" over the President's reply. Seriously, I believe that Mr. Truman's reply will be an extreme disappointment to the American bar—fair-minded judges and attorneys of both political parties—and that, more important, it will be a disappointment to the American public.

I say, Mr. President, that we have had business as usual, we have had politics as usual, and the Chief Executive insists on having patronage as usual even during a war.

I want to appeal, therefore, to his sense of justice and his sense of fair play once again. I do not make this appeal as a Republican for the Republican Party. On the contrary, as I pointed out, the mere fact that the President appoints a Republican jurist would not of itself necessarily help the Republican Party. (On the contrary, the President usually chooses a type of Republican who lacks the faith of the Republican Party.)

Be that as it may, I want to appeal for a beginning toward the correcting of this deplorable unbalance on the Federal courts. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter of August 1 be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
August 1, 1950.

Re restoring the balance on the judiciary.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Blair House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am respectfully writing to you concerning a matter which I have previously taken up on several occasions with yourself and with the Department of Justice. I hesitate to intrude upon your busy schedule, recognizing, of course, that you are tremendously concerned with a thousand and one critical problems arising out of the Korean emergency. I present this matter however, namely the restoration of the balance on the Federal courts, because I feel it is of importance to the prosecution of the defense effort as well as being important on a long-range peacetime basis.

As you so well know, during the last two decades, appointments to the courts of the United States have been almost exclusively on a partisan, Democratic basis. Thus, during the hearings conducted on Supreme Court Justice Sherman Minton's confirmation, it was brought out that from 1933 onward, 192 Federal justices had been appointed and of that number, all but eight were Democrats. This unbalance is particularly serious on our Supreme Court, where there are eight Democrats and one Republican in contrast to the period from 1922 to 1932, when there were six Republicans and three Democrats and to the still more balanced situation from 1917 to 1921, when there were five Republicans and four Democrats.

I wish each of the present justices of the Supreme Court long life and good health, and it is obvious that the present unbalance will continue for some time there. But insofar as the rest of the Nation's courts are concerned, for example, insofar as the filling of the 3 present vacancies on the Illinois bench are involved, I respectfully submit that in the interests of national unity, your administration would be performing a patriotic act in the appointment of a number of ably qualified Republican jurists.

It is obvious that all of the major wartime statutes which we will write will sooner or later be tested and interpreted by the courts, but how can the millions of Americans who voted Republican feel they are getting a square break when the courts are obviously completely overloaded by Democratic appointees? "Business as usual" must go out the window during the war effort but so should "politics as usual" and "patronage as usual."

I am writing, therefore, not in the interests of the Republican Party (because the appointment of a few Republican jurists of your own selection will actually not do any particular good to that party); I am writing in the interests of the great American tradition of checks and balances.

It is obvious that the Republican Party, when it has been in power, has not always exercised the vision and judgment which I am now urging. It, too, in the past has occasionally been partially guilty of appointing a disproportionate number of its own members to the courts. But let me point out these current circumstances:

1. Never before have the courts been so important. They are taking up today more momentous issues affecting more people than ever before in American history.

2. Never before have there been so many court positions and has there been such a disproportionate overloading of those positions by members of one political party.

I believe that any Republican to be considered for a judicial appointment should have the same high standards of—

Experience and ability;

Integrity and unassailable honesty;

Complete devotion to the American Constitution and to the free-enterprise system.

That I would ask of Democratic nominees.

I believe that if you were to appoint worthy Republicans—men who are not rubber stamps of the Democratic administration but men of high independent Republican ideals, if you were to do this, your patriotic act would be a tremendous shot in the arm for the American people. Just as the national administration should take in various Republicans in the executive field of domestic and foreign policy in order to assure bipartisan unity, so I believe should Republican jurists be appointed.

I think that it is a terrible loss to the Nation that in all of these 17 years the magnificent talents of scores of great Republican attorneys have been denied to public judicial office because they have been frozen out due to their political affiliation.

It is inconsistent for us, I believe, to draft 19-year-olds into the Army and give them a gun, to recruit older workers into war factories and put them behind a machine, but to fail to use the tremendous talents of these GOP lawyers who could serve with distinction on the bench on behalf of the Nation in this grave hour of need.

I trust, therefore, that my appeal will be considered not on a bipartisan basis but on a nonpartisan basis in which I assure you it is sincerely intended. Let us not breed cynicism on the part of our people to the effect that "to the victor belongs 99 percent of the spoils," including the spoiling of the national welfare.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Color Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD three letters which have a bearing on the controversial subject of color television. The first letter is signed by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, and is addressed to the Honorable Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. The second letter is written by Mr. Frank Stanton, president of Columbia Broadcasting System, to Mr. Coy. The third letter was written by me to Mr. Coy.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., August 2, 1950.

Hon. WAYNE COY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COY: We write with reference to the color television matter which is pending before the Commission.

Items have appeared in the trade press that there are those who are in favor of delay in the disposition of this matter by the Commission.

On behalf of RCA and NBC we wish to reiterate that we have not and do not favor any delay in the establishment, by the FCC, of commercial standards for color television.

Sincerely yours,

RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA,
DAVID SARNOFF,
Chairman of the Board.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N. Y., August 4, 1950.

Hon. WAYNE COY,
Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Commission is aware, I believe, that there is talk in industry circles that some groups would welcome delay in determination of the color television case.

I would like to underscore what the record already makes clear—that Columbia has always wanted and now wants a prompt and definitive decision adopting a system of color television and fixing full commercial standards therefor. We are not and never have been in favor of any deferment whatever of a definitive color decision.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK STANTON,
President.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., August 4, 1950.

Hon. WAYNE COY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We have noted with great interest copies of letters sent you during the last 2 days from two of the leaders in the television industry with respect to the pending color television decision. We presume these letters grow out of the current rumors and intimations in the trade press that a final and conclusive decision is to be postponed indefinitely, using the war as an alibi. We put little credence in these incredible fears.

These letters from the Columbia Broadcasting System and the Radio Corp. prove conclusively once and for all that the selfish interests conspiring for delays are not the pioneers who have fought the hard battle in the laboratory and expended millions of dollars to make this amazing recreational and educational development available now to the American people.

On the other hand, busybody scandalmongers are spreading these stories for a wicked purpose and obviously not in the public interest. They ignore the 9 months of tedious, detailed, and searching hearings only recently completed—the most intensive ever held by an administrative agency. They forget the time and money spent by CTI, RCA, and CBS in presenting their cases. They overlook the patience, the continuous attendance, and the intense study and concentration which each Commissioner has given the mass of testimony which was presented in the tense atmosphere of good American rivalry and free-enterprise competition. They overlook, too, the fact that this vital matter has been before the Commission for almost a full decade. Any further delay will place us far behind the rest of the world in this potentially phenomenal improvement of the television art.

Most certainly, the Commission now has before it all of the basic and scientific facts which can be presented. The eminent and unbiased committee of scientists, popularly known as the Condon committee, has declared unequivocally that color television is ready now. Every Member of the Senate is receiving a copy of the Condon report with a covering letter from me calling attention to its findings. Already, more than 1,100 copies have been sold by the Government Printing Office and Senators are requesting more and more copies for their constituents.

The employment of the current Korean crisis as an alibi for delay by the detractors of color television shows how desperate they are for any excuse for procrastination, deferment, or weasely worded proposed findings which would have the deadly effect of delay itself. When delay is the objective, of course any expedient will serve the purpose but it is wholly unrealistic for these selfish interests to seize upon the war needs as an excuse; it indicates an utter lack of appreciation of the important part played by electronics in modern war. The immediate commercial utilization of color television could be of vast aid to the defense effort in testing jet engine flame colors, observation of guided missiles, surveillance of various atomic processes, and in a number of other still secret processes and developments. Whether or not the Korean conflict, or even a major expansion of it, would seriously affect production in the electronics industry is beside the point. Korea is not part of the testimony in the record and even if it were honestly believed that a decision for immediate utilization of color could not be put into effect because of the war, the commission has no duty or responsibility or even right to use such an anticipated development as a prop for "no decision now," or for a proposed or tentative decision, or for anything other than a clear-cut definitive decision based on the record before it. I am certain that you will agree that to do otherwise would subject the commissioners to the sharpest criticism.

However, I find it hard to believe such expediences will be resorted to when I recall that the two most recent Commissioners to appear before us for confirmation, Messers. Webster and Sterling, are firmly on the record as favoring a quick and positive decision on color television; in fact, they took considerable credit personally for "pushing" their colleagues into doing something about color. The viewpoint of at least two other commissioners with respect to the advisability of a speedy and definitive color decision which would authorize immediate operation on existing channels is well known. I have such confidence in your common sense, responsibility to duty, appreciation for effective public relations, and deep concern for the general public interest that I have no qualms about your personal position. Therefore it is obvious that at least a majority believes that a decision now would in no way prevent future development of improvements in color which could and would be made as experience is gained from actual operation in the present TV band.

Consequently, I am grateful to the present Commissioners for their constructive approach to the imperative need for speeding the commercial operation of color television. I know the devious character of the opponents. They have tried to bring pressure on Congress also. They will not hesitate to confuse the issue, spread false rumors, and even attempt to induce Commissioners to postpone, equivocate, or hedge.

You know my deep concern over the color question but I am equally as concerned over the standing and stature of the Commission with the Congress and the public generally. Everyone realizes that the Commission is itself before the bar of public opinion in this matter.

In any event, I want it on the record now in advance that I have been in this campaign too long to surrender without a struggle. If there is any temporizing with a clear-cut decision now, the fight must go on until the American people enjoy the beneficent gift which science already has brought out of the laboratory.

I feel so strongly about this entire matter that it seemed wise to write you as I do. With my warmest personal regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,

ED. C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

Senator Myers' Washington News Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my Washington news letter of August 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prices have risen steadily since April of this year, but the rise was gradual until the Korean invasion prompted "scare buying" which sent prices up sharply after June 25 and has created artificial shortages of goods actually available in large enough supply to meet our needs. The recent, drastic price increases were caused primarily by a handful of businessmen who hoped to profiteer or to unload "white elephants" from their shelves—and by selfish buyers who wished to hoard. The merchant who sold 50 pounds of sugar to a customer shared the guilt equally with the hoarding consumer.

I unhesitatingly support the principle Baruch proposes. Some controls are needed at once, and "stand-by" powers must be available for comprehensive rationing, priorities, and controls over wages and prices. Price-control powers must contain provision for roll-backs. Stand-by controls influence price stability, and can be used quickly if and when needed.

The planned $10,000,000,000 increase for defense won't disrupt our economy. This amount would require less than a 5 percent expansion in our productive output—and since Government spending not connected with defense will be curtailed, the net expansion will be about one-half that amount—a task our economy can easily manage. However, unnecessary inventory stockpiling and consumer hoarding have added new burdens to our industrial machinery and make controls inevitable.

Our defense program should be paid for as we go. We can balance our cash budget and reduce inflationary pressures by a combination of higher taxes, reduced Government spending for nondefense programs, and tightened credit. Here are some of the details.

A $5,000,000,000 tax increase has been recommended by the President. I believe the increase should be designed to curb profiteering and to discourage unnecessary buying. It should also plug loopholes in our present tax laws. The new tax burden, however, should not be imposed on families with low,

fixed incomes who are the worst victims of high prices.

Nondefense Government spending will be severely cut. Many needed programs will be given lower priorities and work will be slowed up or stopped altogether on many federally-assisted programs. Planning for public housing and slum clearance work will continue so the work may be undertaken as soon as conditions permit. Construction of Government buildings will be curtailed—and some stand-by war plants built during World War II will be reopened. But present needs call for little new Government construction of war plants. Public health programs, including research on polio, cancer, heart disease, mental health and others, will be continued because of their importance to our national health.

Consumer credit must be tightened. Just before the Korean invasion, Americans owed more than $19,000,000,000 for goods purchased on credit—the highest level in history. Easy credit for installment buying exerts a tremendous inflationary pressure, particularly when scarcity rumors stampede our stores. Much of this pressure can be relieved by requiring larger down payments.

Some shortages will result from our defense expansion. Our steel capacity, as President Truman predicted a year and a half ago, has proven inadequate to meet our combined civilian and new military needs. Plans are being developed now, however, for private expansion of our steel production. Steel and other critical materials must be assigned priorities to assure allocation of sufficient supplies for defense needs. But unless the international situation worsens, present defense needs won't make serious inroads into production of basic consumer goods.

Fifty-two members of the United Nations have made it clear that aggression won't be tolerated. We've acted to counter the Red decision to launch an unprovoked attack on a free nation. We've acted to enlarge our defenses—and those of other free nations—as further insurance against attack at other points along the iron curtain. A bit of belt-tightening at home is called for, but present needs are far short of demands of total war. If the danger doesn't spread, our economy should be able to expand quickly to meet our combined civilian and defense requirements. But to attain success, every American must do his part by purchasing only the things he must have to meet his immediate needs.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Billions Lost Through Tax Loopholes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in crucial times such as these when our expenditures for defense purposes are so high in order to safeguard this Nation, many of our citizens are utilizing certain loopholes in the tax laws for their personal benefit. Although we have no exact figures on the amount of taxable income that escapes taxation through these legal loopholes, it has been roughly estimated that the figure may be as high as $50,000,000,000 annually.

We are engaged now in a bitter struggle to retain our free and democratic way of life. For the past few weeks there have been terrific demands on Congress for new appropriations for defense purposes, and we shall probably be faced with more such requests. This means new and greater taxation for all of us; that is, all except the tax dodgers and the loophole scrutinizers. We must put a stop to this most unpatriotic and selfish practice. Our tax laws should be properly strengthened, all possible loopholes eliminated, and drastic measures prescribed to deal with tax dodgers in a way which would not only make their dishonorable practice most unprofitable but would expose them to the public.

Following is a most interesting article on the subject by A. G. Mezerik, which appeared in the magazine Sales Management on June 1, 1950. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

YOU AND I ARE TAX SUCKERS—WANTED: IMMEDIATE ACTION BY CONGRESS TO PLUG THE LEGAL LOOPHOLES THROUGH WHICH BILLIONS OF INCOME NOW GO TAX-FREE

(By A. G. Mezerik)

A bright radio entertainer has gone to Puerto Rico and formed a corporation. In Hollywood, a producer and his wife organized a collapsible corporation to make a quickie movie. In Rhode Island, a textile executive—in the name of sweet charity—pyramided $500 into $4,500,000. Out in Nebraska, operators of two of the Nation's largest farms have donated their plantations to a foundation. A New York City doctor says to his patient, "Would you mind paying in cash?" And further down the same street, hundreds of men are fresh out of cash, their jobs gone.

If you think all these doings and a lot of others—just as seemingly unrelated—have nothing to do with you or your business, look at the tax bill which you just paid. High, eh? But the President is talking about the need for further increases in taxes, which would make the diverse and far-flung activities of oil men, movie producers and unemployed furriers a matter which, as you will soon see, affects your pocketbook.

Millions—even billions—of dollars a year, which might otherwise be paid as taxes, are sticking to the fingers of people who have had the benefit of strong lobbies in Congress or of high priced tax lawyers. If these sums were collected the balanced budget, about which everybody talks, might be achieved.

Take the case of the oil and the mining men. Since 1918 they have had a strong lobby and a lot of all-too-compliant Congressmen whose actions have already delivered to them a sum well up in the billions. Called "special depletion allowance," this gimmick works year in and year out for oil, gas, and sulfur operators and, to a lesser extent, for miners of metals.

Starting on a par with the rest of us, these men are permitted to deduct their business expenses, which is fair enough. But that's only the beginning. From his profit for the year the operator then deducts any and all expenses for developing new wells. After that, for as many years as the well produces, he deducts 27½ percent of his gross income from the well to help him to amortize his capital investment which, you will remember, he charged off in his first year. The net is that he deducts the expenses of developing the well over and over again. Behind this is the theory that a natural resource has, in contrast to a factory, a limited life, for which allowance should be made.

In practice, the United States Treasury reveals that this theory has produced astounding results. One man whose returns from 1943 to 1947 were analyzed by Treasury officials earned $10,500,000 from oil and gas enterprises, plus almost $4,000,000 from other sources during those years. On this huge income he paid a total of $80,000 in all for the entire period, the special tax privilege making this possible.

The Treasury pointed this man out as one of a group of 10 who, in the 5 years, had a combined income of $47,000,000 from oil and gas operations alone, on which all taxes were entirely and legally escaped, during a period when wartime rates for others with $1,000,000 incomes ran as high as 80 percent. This law applies not only to individuals but to corporations. The 1947 figures reveal that total taxes paid on the $926,000,000 profits earned by 20 oil and gas corporations averaged 19 percent as against the 38 percent paid by corporations in other fields. In other words, this industry pays 50 percent less than others must pay.

How sizable the sums involved here are, need not be left to imagination. Always conservative, the Treasury estimates that the revenue gain, were this one loophole plugged, would be between $400,000,000 and $500,000,000 annually.

The loophole available to the oil and mineral interests is about the size of an airplane hangar. The movie industry and the radio and the entertainment glamor boys have one which, if not nearly so large, is quite as effective and more dramatic. They are the masters of the "collapsible corporation."

The short but not so simple annals of the movie moguls begin, according to Thomas Lynch, general counsel of the Treasury, with the basic and undeniable premise that tax rates for individuals, on ordinary business income, range as high as 82 percent, while on long-term gains it is only 25 percent. Should a producer make all his pictures as an individual, his profits would be taxed at the individual rates. Were he to produce them through a single corporation, that corporation would pay 38 percent, in addition to which our producer friend would pay an individual income tax on the profits when the corporation distributed them.

Many a producer has avoided these dire results by organizing a separate collapsible corporation for each picture. Once he has completed the single film for which the corporation was organized, the corporation is liquidated. Assets are distributed before the first nickel of box office income has made its appearance. Since there has been no income, no taxes are paid by the corporation. The amount of tax which does subsequently get paid by the producer is based on the difference between his cost and the fair market value of the assets distributed by his collapsible. When rates are 25 percent as against 82 percent, it can—and does—amount to quite a chunk of money which the Government does not get.

The bright radio entertainer who moved his corporate body to Puerto Rico had something more in mind than the climate of that island. He took advantage of another loophole.

Under an obscure section of the tax code an American citizen may obtain, in any of our possessions except the Virgin Islands, complete exemption from Federal income tax on his foreign income. Presumably, to make this as convenient as possible, there is no need for him to remain abroad for a specific length of time. What counts is that his income is derived from sources within a possession.

The popular radio personality, acting on this knowledge (no doubt conveyed to him by a wise old tax lawyer), has moved the ostensible scene of his operations to Puerto Rico and thereby has qualified for this exemption. This entertainer has succeeded in gilding his already bright tax exemption lily. Before moving to Puerto Rico he entered into an arrangement with the government of Puerto Rico, under which he agreed to produce all his radio and television transscriptions and films on that wonderful island, in return for an exemption from the Puerto Rican income tax. It could be that a radio comedian at long last has disproved one-half of old Ben Franklin's adage: "Nothing is certain but death and taxes."

Puerto Rico's tax exemption has quite naturally attracted more than 50 individuals, among them one of this country's largest textile operators.

Our possessions have tax advantages not only for corporations but for United States Government employes stationed in them. All of these employes are exempt from payment of Federal income taxes—although everywhere else in the world, including of course inside the United States, our Government employes are always subject to taxes on their salaries.

COST TO TAXPAYERS

The support of our possessions, especially Puerto Rico, costs taxpayers of our country a sizable sum every year. In addition to that cost, the possessions are responsible for a huge income tax loss to the Government. Taxpayers who have in the past complained bitterly about the money voted directly to Puerto Rico each year, will not appreciate whatever humor there is in this picture.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, in the process of investigating why it was that a large New England textile mill was moving to Puerto Rico, revealed another method by which taxes manage not to find their way to the Treasury. This is the use of a so-called charitable trust—naturally tax-exempt. Trusts can be—and have been—set up with as small a contribution as $100.

In the charter, obtainable in almost every State, the founder designates himself or one of his associates as trustee. If there is more than one trustee, there are more associates. A trust must, of course, have a beneficiary, and therefore this worthy object of charity is also named in the charter. However, any provision for the beneficiary to receive a specified percentage of the trustee's resources or income is strangely lacking. This detail, minor in the light of the real aim of tax avoidance, is left to the exclusive judgment of the trustees.

Once the charter has been granted, the trust swings into high gear to accomplish its real purposes. The founder's corporation lends substantial sums of money or securities to the trust. The trustee uses these assets for speculation in the founder's own properties or in those which he wants to acquire. Profits from this speculation are tax-exempt, which is of course the reason for all this activity in the name of sweet charity.

Operating along these general and completely legal lines, one New England trust grew from $500 to $4,500,000 in 11 years. The United States Government did not receive a cent from all this profit pyramiding and the beneficiary received only $50,000.

The movement into the formation of foundations and charitable trusts where profits are tax exempt, is on a huge scale and involves huge properties, among them the Campbell ranch, the world's largest wheat grower, and the Giffen plantation, the country's premier cotton ranch. In Lincoln, capital of the State of Nebraska, three foundations were recently incorporated. The original trustees included George W. Diesing, Omaha lawyer, who was named president, secretary, treasurer, chairman of the board of trustees, general counsel and resident agent, and the articles of all the foundations provided that the funds and business of the foundations "shall be managed and controlled by the president and treasurer."

Meanwhile, three corporations, the United States Wheat Corp., Rancho San Bernardo, Inc., and the Rancho San Theresa were set up to support the foundations. All were founded as nonprofit, charitable enterprises claiming exemption from income tax. These corporations had not only the benefit of Mr. Diesing's participation, but the strength and significance added by wheat grower Brig. Gen. Thomas D. Campbell of Hardin, Mont., and cotton rancher Russel Giffen of California.

The United States Wheat Corp. purchased the 95,000-acre Campbell Wheat Co. farm for approximately $2,000,000. Rancho San Bernardo, Inc., bought the 35,000-acre San Joaquin Valley cotton ranch, owned by Giffen's firm, for $4,800,000. Capital stock of the two corporations that purchased the two ranches is $10, and it is all held by one of the foundations. One last and not so surprising fact: Brigadier General Campbell and Mr. Giffen have been retained by the new owners as managers—salary unknown.

On September 16 Representative MASON (Republican) blasted the program on the floor of the Congress by announcing that "Tom Campbell's famous wheat ranch in Montana has been sold for $2,000,000 and its earnings which have heretofore been subject to a 38-percent corporation income tax will now go free." To which Representative MASON added that "doing business without paying taxes is becoming a national racket."

This use of charity and education as a guise for obtaining tax-exemption is presently under considerable fire. So much so that a congressional committee recently was privileged to hear Royal Little, the genius behind the Textron textile charitable trusts, recommend that the practice should be discontinued. We, like Mr. Little, are eager to lock the barn door now, although we were not in the barn when he was and, after all, it was our horse. Nevertheless, belated self-criticism is welcome.

A little more self-criticism is being heard from heads of colleges and universities, whose activities in buying and selling real estate, making chinaware and noodles, and garnering profits from race tracks and hundreds of other unrelated activities, were described in the December 15, 1949 issue of Sales Management (Alma Mater Is in Business Now—Tax Free).

Harold Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, has publicly deplored these activities which not only cost the Government about $150,000,000 a year in tax loss, but which represent unfair competition to privately owned businesses. However, the universities—including the University of Pennsylvania, which owns the building occupied by Lit Bros. store in Philadelphia—have not divested themselves of their holdings, nor do they show signs of curtailing their march into business and banking.

Every one of these methods of not paying taxes is legal. Of course there are many illegal ways of dodging taxes. Twenty-three thousand full-time Bureau of Internal Revenue investigators check 2½ to 5 million returns each year—about 5 percent of those filed—to find cheaters. But professional men, like the New York doctor, and farmers, and small-business men who deal chiefly in cash are difficult to keep tabs on. A few people will always try to outsmart the Government by failing to report cash income, claiming exemption for dependents who are dead, falsifying their records or keeping two sets of books.

However, we aren't terribly worked up about small-time evaders. The old game of dodging the tax collector is a sport to which people of every country have been addicted since the first tax collector made his appearance—which must have been a week or two after Adam and Eve moved out of the Garden of Eden. Our main concern is with the holes in the law which make our tax pattern look like a sieve.

Big money is being lost by these legal loopholes. Experts say that more than a billion dollars annually could be collected in tax income just by filling the law's cavities described above—which are by no means the complete list. This was made startlingly clear in statements made by Representative MASON and Senator TOBEY that as much as $50,000,000,000 annually escapes taxation. That there are ways to get more tax income without raising taxes is the substance of our contention.

"Taxes can and do have an important effect on business conditions and economic activity. It should be our constant objective to improve our tax system so that required revenues can be obtained without impairing the private initiative and enterprise essential to economic growth." From left to right, no one could better or more clearly state the case for plugging loopholes and removing wartime excise taxes (a crusade inaugurated by Sales Management in August 1949) than did President Truman when he used the above words in his tax message. The trouble is nuisance taxes are still on the books and the loopholes are as big as ever.

Meanwhile, congressional committees hold one hearing after another in Washington. Businessmen and others trek down to Washington at their own expense to tell their stories to Senators and Congressmen. Yet, chances seem better than good that constructive action on the floor of the Congress, which is the only place where action really counts, will not happen until and unless a lot of mere taxpayers get into the picture. They should warn their Congressmen that they, the voters who put them in office, are serious about getting a tax pattern which neither penalizes—as with the excise taxes—nor favors—as with the big loopholes—one group above another.

The Steel Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, an article by Richard L. Strout and published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 26 discusses the important problem of our steel capacity and production. We all know how vital steel is to our national security, as well as for the production of goods for civilian uses. Mr. Strout has a penetrating understanding of the problem, and I recommend that all Members of this body take the time to read his article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OH FOR THOSE STEEL STAND-BY PLANTS—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman has been issuing 6-month economic reports to Congress now for over 3 years, and Congress sometimes seems to take real delight in knocking his proposals on the head.

Mr. Truman objected to the killing of OPA. Congress killed it. Mr. Truman said prices would soar. His opponents said, "Not so." The anti-OPA sentiment whipped up became so strong, and the unpopularity of continued curbs on civilian buying so intense that they affected the 1946 congressional election where Mr. Truman's party lost control of the House.

Prices soared as Mr. Truman predicted. His council of economic advisers in their January 1948, statement reported: "The abolition of OPA (was followed) * * * by the sharp rise of wholesale prices between June and December 1946. This was at the annual rate of almost 50 percent, one of the steepest rises ever recorded. Consumers prices rose at an annual rate of 30 percent."

Then again, Mr. Truman repeatedly opposed tax reduction. The excess-profits tax had been removed when the war ended and corporation profits were soaring. The economic report of January 1948, mentioned that corporate profits had reached a new peak in 1947; the report a year later again noted that corporate profits for 1948 had surpassed all previous records. Mr. Truman argued that some of the profits should be skimmed off to pay the cost of the war and that the budget was not too solidly balanced anyway.

Congress went ahead and cut taxes. It overrode a Presidential veto the third try. The tax cut was about $5,000,000,000 at a time of heavy inflation, Mr. Truman commented in his July 1949 report. He deplored the present deficit of the Treasury and attributed this to "the untimely tax reduction of $5,000,000,000 during the height of the inflation against which I so strongly advised."

Another field is steel. Almost from the start of the economic reports Mr. Truman and his economic advisers have had a running controversy with the steel industry. Repeatedly the administration has urged steel: (1) not to increase prices; and (2) to expand production to prevent a bottleneck for American industry, of which it is the mainspring. On the "bottleneck" thesis, the CEA was recommending "substantial increases in the output of such basic commodities as steel" in January 1948.

Again in its July 1948 report the CEA mentioned "the shortages which the national defense program will in due course accentuate" and mentioned that "steel is another case in point."

Mr. Truman went so far in his January 1949 State of the Union message to Congress as to ask "priorities and allocations for key materials in short supply." Specifically he urged "an immediate study of the adequacy of production facilities for materials in critically short supply, such as steel. He wound up with the proposal that "Government loans" be made available if found to be needed to relieve such shortages, and with the unprecedented recommendation that, in extreme circumstances, the Government itself should engage in "the construction of such facilities directly if action by private industry fails to meet our needs."

In his simultaneous 1949 economic report, Mr. Truman declared, "There are shortages of supply in certain critical areas which are so serious as to impede maximum production * * * and to limit programs related to national security."

Did Congress grant Mr. Truman's recommendations? No. No study of production facilities was made, and the unprecedented proposal to set up stand-by steel plants was roundly denounced as "socialistic," which in a sense it was. Such stand-by plants would, of course, be of prime military advantage today.

Fortunately, the steel industry did expand its own facilities to some degree. And shortly after the Korean outbreak the big industry announced, January 19, a great billion dollar steel expansion program. This will be completed toward the end of 1952, which will be fine if the Russians are willing to wait. One difficulty is that it takes steel to expand steel. The steel expansion program will compete for steel with the Armed Forces and civilians in the emergency scramble.

Streit Forecast Kremlin's Shift to Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the third of a series of five articles by Clarence Streit, editor of the magazine Freedom and Union, published at 700 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and author of Union Now, which have appeared in various newspapers in the United States and Canada, pointing up the urgent lesson which I find Korea teaches, namely, that the Atlantic Union resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 57—cannot be passed too soon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA'S LESSON: THE FREE MUST FEDERATE SOONER

(By Clarence K. Streit)

"The trend of recent events in Asia," Freedom and Union warned back in February 1949, "makes it all the more urgent that the democracies which are now working on an Atlantic alliance should meet in a Federal convention to work out an Atlantic union instead. This for two major reasons:

"1. These events prove that the present policy of the Atlantic democracies in the Pacific is bankrupt; they need a common policy there that will honor the ideals of individual liberty they uphold at home and encourage Asians to follow the free way of life.

"2. Continued glaring inconsistency of their Asian policy with their ideals can only encourage communism everywhere, and lead the Kremlin to correct one of its most helpful postwar blunders by shifting its major pressure from Europe to Asia.

"Consider this second point first. The Kremlin could hardly have adopted a policy more certain to bring the Atlantic democracies to unite than the one it has followed since 1945 in Poland, Trieste, Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Germany, and brought to a climax by its establishment of the Berlin blockade * * *.

"Instead of taking advantage of this to end the fatal disunion of the democracies once and for all, by energetically framing a firm federation while Soviet pressure facilitated this, Atlantic policy-makers have been dabbling with western European union and Atlantic alliance. Their 'gradualist' approach to the immensely difficult problem of solidly uniting the free is as stupid as the Kremlin's blundering, for it is based on the assumption that the Kremlin will kindly continue to apply pressure on Europe generally, and Berlin particularly, as long as the timid statesmen in Washington, London, and Paris need this pressure to paint their snail's eye picture of peace * * *.

"Suppose it (the Kremlin) wakes up soon to its present folly. Suppose it seeks to exploit the latest divisions among the democracies, their longing for peace, their wishful thinking * * *. The Kremlin can gain a good name for magnanimity merely by restoring to the western powers their land access to Berlin, though this leaves it still in the strongest military position around that city. Suppose it accompanies this peaceful gesture with those pleasant noises with which one sidles up to a jackass which he means to saddle. * * * Suppose it contrasts the mild reaction of the American people to Communist success in vast China with the alarm caused by Communist success in little Czechoslovakia.

"Such considerations might conceivably lead the Kremlin to turn to a policy of conciliation in the west temporarily—long enough for it to gain most of the rest of Asia by concentrating its aggressive activity there. Suppose it did this. Where, then, would be the statesmen of the west who depend on Russian pressure in Europe, not on any positive policy of freedom and union, to unite their peoples and win the friendship of Asians? These statesmen now seek to build a solid wall by pouring gravel between concrete forms without adding any internal cement to hold it together. Where will these blundering builders be when Stalin suddenly removes the concrete forms he now supplies?

"In the east, as well as in the west, these leaders of the free have failed to provide a positive policy for freedom. By this failure in the east, they encourage Stalin to concentrate on Asia and knock the props from under their flimsy building in the west.

"Lest I be charged with easy hindsight, let me cite this excerpt from an article I wrote while attending the San Francisco Conference that drafted the United Nations Charter. It appeared in the Federal Union World for June 1945:

" 'The leading democracies at the conference here have given the impression of aiming mainly to maintain or improve their national positions in the game of balance of power politics * * *.

" 'They have been sacrificing their good names and their basic principles for considerations of material power that are picayune compared to the power they could all gain by uniting to advance their common democratic ideals * * *.

" 'Either the democracies must work out separate postwar policies in their Pacific territories, or they must work out a common policy. The former course means dangerous divisions among them * * *.

" 'Imagine, on the other hand, the effect of the democracies deciding to get together in a Congress to work out a common program to achieve, say, these democratic ends for the people of their Southwest Pacific territory: (1) Self-government and self-determination within a specified time; (2) Economic development to raise the lowest native standard of living 100 percent in a specified time, while making their raw materials equally accessible to all; (3) Free grade school education for all native children within a specified time; (4) Long term credits to finance this program.

" 'The mere announcement that a Congress of democracies would be set up to work out such a concrete program as this would restore confidence in democracy in Asia and everywhere, give it the dynamic impulse it now lacks, help shorten the war and secure the peace, improve the European situation, and lead toward real Union of the free.

" 'On the theory that they should not unite more closely behind their free principles than they could unite with their Russian ally, the democracies let go the opportunity the war in Europe gave them (to federate). The results are only too visible in the Old World and in the muscle-bound league that San Francisco is now completing.

" 'In the hope that the more disunited and imperalistic the democracies remain in the Pacific, the sooner the Russians will decide to give their lives in Asia to save our sons (in the then looming invasion of Japan), shall we fool away the opportunity we still have left?' "

Korea proves it is only truer today than it was in 1945: The free cannot federate too soon.

Social Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, in the Christian Science Monitor of August 2, there was published an article by Richard L. Strout entitled "A Great Social Revolution," which I believe deserves the attention of every Member of this body. In that article Mr. Strout briefly and concisely outlines the history of social security both in this country and abroad. He explains very clearly what social security has come to mean to our people, and calls this social insurance "one of the greatest democratic revolutions of our time." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GREAT SOCIAL REVOLUTION—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—I still have somewhere in my roll-top desk the front page of a Boston newspaper published a few days before the congressional election of 1934, announcing in an eight-column banner headline the alleged decision of the Roosevelt administration to have all workers wear "dog tags." The story wasn't true, but it was a politically effective one. There was even a picture of the aluminum "dog tag" to band free-born American workers, each carrying a number.

The article made it appear that Mr. Roosevelt was pushing the slave state for all he was worth. Presumably it had been kept until just before election day to have maximum political effect.

You have to go back to specific little incidents like that to remember the passion and poignancy of half-forgotten times and to appreciate what a long way we have come in a short time.

Congress has just voted to extend the now well-established social-security system to another 10,000,000 people. It is the single most important piece of domestic legislation of the Eighty-first Congress. The issue has passed from violent partisanship into general acceptance. Last October 5, the House approved the measure by the smashing majority of 333 to 14. On June 21, the Senate passed it by 81 to 2. It is supported, among others, by the National Association of Manufacturers.

Yet only 15 years or so ago many believed they had a sure-fire political issue in opposition to this unprecedented Federal social security. These foes reached their climax in the ill-fated Alf Landon campaign of 1936. Mr. Landon, you remember, carried only two States. The opposition today is almost forgotten and lies moldering in musty newspaper headlines preserved by whimsical observers of the passing scene who enjoy such examples of a complete misreading of the temper of the times.

As a matter of fact, the United States was about 40 or 50 years behind most of the other leading industrial countries in coming to social security on a national basis. Bismarck started the thing in Germany in 1889. Then Britain, under Lloyd George, provided the first comprehensive national compulsory unemployment insurance program in 1911.

It was fairly obvious to any reasonable observer that the United States would follow suit when the need of the optimistic young country became more urgent and when the advantages of insurance over the almshouse and poor farms became more evident. The time came in the disastrous 1929 crash. By 1932–33 some 15,000,000 workers were unable to find jobs. (For comparative purposes, with a bigger population today in America, there are only 3,500,000 unemployed.)

The idea of social insurance against the misadventures of life on a national scale was wholly alien to American individualism. Victor Berger, Socialist Congressman from Wisconsin, had introduced a bill for Federal old-age pensions in 1911, but it never got out of committee. "Wasn't this a job for the States if undertaken at all?" it was asked. Mr. Hoover resisted all demands for Federal assumption of a share in the growing relief burden for 2½ years, then allowed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans—not grants—to the States for relief purposes. That, in a sense, really began the whole big movement.

The Federal Social Security Act finally passed in 1935. Now it is being expanded to include 10,000,000 more workers. Once in effect, it is significant that big business has swung behind the program. It has done this because aggressive trade-unions were getting pension clauses written into contracts with individual firms. Naturally enough, the firms want the burden carried by everybody rather than by them alone.

Now, the extended law will cover about 45,000,000 workers. The law is less inclusive than some of the cradle-to-grave systems in Europe. It will moderate some of the hazards of life for low- and middle-income groups. It should help to make old age more dignified for many, and put a prop under purchasing power for the unemployed which in itself may help stabilize the business cycle.

Without doubt, this is one of the great democratic revolutions of our time.

The Creeping Shadow of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I recently had called to my attention an important address made by a friend of mine, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N. J., vice president of the Edison Cos., before the Rotary Club of Wichita Falls, Tex., on August 3, 1950. Mr. Stringfellow's address has so much wisdom in it, and is so relevant to some of the issues before us today, that I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CREEPING SHADOW OF SOCIALISM

(By George E. Stringfellow)

I'm highly complimented to be asked to speak before such a fine group of public-spirited, liberty-loving citizens. It is you and men such as you who have made America great, and it is you and men such as you who will keep it great, if it is to remain what our forefathers envisioned.

Since politics invades every segment of our human family, I shall speak of politics and its influence on our lives. I shall not speak in the narrow partisan sense, but rather I shall speak in the sense defined by Webster as "the science of government." I shall suggest what we citizens must do to influence our public servants to save our way of life.

I have selected as my subject the Creeping Shadow of Socialism. Extravagance and deficit spending always produce inflation and inflation always produces statism in one form or another, socialism or communism. The difference between capitalism, socialism and communism is one of principle. The difference between socialism and communism is one of degree. Socialism is the bridge over which capitalism passes to communism. Capitalism produces things for people to divide. Socialism divides the product of capitalism until there is nothing left; then communism takes over and chaos reigns.

I would like to remind you of a very forceful statement in George Washington's Farewell Address. It is, "Cherish public credit and avoid the accumulation of debt."

If we continue the accumulation of debt we shall destroy public credit. The destruction of public credit would end our form of government. The danger of deficit spending, which, of course, means the accumulation of public debt, was pointed out very forcefully by President Franklin D. Roosevelt during the early part of his first term when he said, "A government, like a family, can spend a little more than it earns for a year or so, but you and I know that the continuation of that habit means the poorhouse." Our Federal Government has continued that habit for almost a fifth of a century.

Governments go to the poorhouse when they habitually spend more than they earn. When governments go to the poorhouse, they take their citizens with them.

It was Lenin, that patron saint of communism, who said, "Sooner or later we will force the United States to spend her way to destruction." It seems to me that during the past 20 years we have done much to spend our way to destruction. During the past 20 years we have done much to destroy ourselves financially. The cost of Federal Government 20 years ago was less than $5,000,000,000. The cost of Federal Government for this fiscal year, excluding the cost of the war with Korea, will be more than $45,000,000,000. The national debt 20 years ago was less than $20,000,000,000. Today it exceeds $257,000,000,000, and the President budgeted a $5,000,000,000 deficit before the war with Korea. Our Federal budget has been balanced but once in the last 20 years. It was balanced by the Eightieth Congress.

If our business were in the red, as the Federal Government is and has been for almost a fifth of a century, and we told our stockholders that we could not balance our budget until the volume of business increased (as the President tells us, his stockholders) our stockholders would say, "Cut your cost or we'll find new management."

When a business runs a deficit for several years, it gets into financial difficulty and then the courts appoint a receiver who is responsible to the courts. The receiver takes over and liquidates the corporation's assets, pays its bills, and, if there is anything left, reorganizes and staffs it with a set of officers who have enough business intelligence to live within the corporation's income. If there's nothing left after paying the bills, the firm folds up, the employees lose their jobs, and the stockholders lose all they invested in the business.

When a government runs a deficit for a long period of time as ours has, it builds up an unmanageable debt, it gets into financial difficulty and, of course, there is no court of law to appoint a receiver for a government as in the case of a business. A self-appointed dictator arises and takes over.

Dictators are responsible only to their own whims. Under such circumstances, the people lose their savings, they lose their property, and, what is more important, they lose their liberty. Their way of life is prescribed for them by a self-appointed dictator. History bears mute evidence to the fact that when a government habitually spends more than it takes in, inflation follows as surely as night follows day. The thing that alarms me is that we have been unable to balance our budget in the height of peaceful prosperity. If we can't balance our budget when the Nation is at peace and prosperity reigns, we certainly cannot balance it in a depression or in a war. However, even in war we can and must reduce waste. We must reduce waste if we are to avoid inflation, for it will avail us nothing to win the war with Russia and lose our way of life through inflation.

We know that it was inflation that produced Mussolini; it was inflation that produced Hitler; it was inflation that produced Stalin; and inflation is certain to produce a dictator in America. The buying power of the American dollar is worth about 50 cents today compared with what it was 20 years ago. At the rate it is losing its value, it will not take long for the dollar to drop to zero. Then we shall have a worthless dollar and, of course, inflation. Then we shall lose our Republic and all the benefits which our citizens enjoy thereunder.

On leaving Independence Hall in Philadelphia in the late afternoon of September 17, 1787, following the signing of the Constitution of the United States, Benjamin Franklin was asked, "What have we got?" The wise old man replied, "We have got a Republic, if we can keep it." If we are to keep our Republic, the greatest form of government ever conceived by the mind of man, we must avoid inflation.

Twenty years ago the annual cost of Federal Government was about 75 percent of the annual income of all the citizens of the State of California. The annual cost of Federal Government this year, excluding the cost of the Korean war, will equal the total income of every citizen of the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and 11 percent of the income of the people of Minnesota.

This creeping shadow of socialism, motivated by Government extravagance, will cover the entire country at an early date unless our citizens rise up and rebel against it. This creeping shadow of socialism, if it isn't turned back, will produce the kind of state socialism here which Britain has today. The Hoover Commission has shown the President and the Congress how to save $4,000,000,000 a year without affecting our war effort. That is 75 percent of the annual cost of Government 20 years ago. I would suggest that each of you contact the President, contact your Congressmen, and contact your two United States Senators and urge them to work for the enactment of the Hoover Commission's recommendations and thus reduce the cost of Government by $4,000,000,000 a year. This will help stem the creeping shadow of socialism.

I submit that the Chief Executive of this Republic should be a symbol of economy. It is he who should set the example for the Nation and especially for his fellow administrators of Government. During the last year of the Hoover administration, the White House payroll was $127,200. During the last year of the Roosevelt administration, the White House payroll was $256,431. During last year of the Truman administration, the White House payroll was $998,254. Many of you recall the President's recent nonpolitical trip to the Pacific Northwest which cost the taxpayers more than a quarter of a million dollars. That, I submit, was a wanton waste of our money.

President Truman would lead us to believe that he is against socialism, yet every move he makes leads in that direction. "We in this country," said the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, senior United States Senator from Virginia, one of the ablest statesmen of our time, "will be irrevocably committed to state socialism if Congress adopts the following Fair Deal proposals advocated by the President: (1) Socialized medicine; (2) socialized agriculture; and (3) socialized housing."

Of course, the President does not call these projects socialism. His leftist advisers who would socialize and communize America have other names for them. To call them what they are—socialism—would be too forthright and too revealing to the public.

Only you and others like you can roll back this creeping shadow of socialism by demanding that the Government reduce nondefense expenditures and eliminate waste wherever humanly possible in the prosecution of the war. We should demand that our Government desist from buying votes with the taxpayers' money through subsidies and desist from making RFC political loans, such as Lustron, Rattlesnake, and for building of gambling joints.

We have, in my opinion, reached the period in our history where men worthy of their heritage must lift up their voices in defense of the principles of government for which our forefathers worked, bled, and gave their lives. Sixty years ago someone asked James Russell Lowell, "How long will the American Republic endure?" That great statesman responded, "As long as the ideals of the men who made it continue dominant." Those who would socialize our people, destroy their initiative, and confiscate their wealth through deficit spending are not imbued with the ideals that made America great.

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues. * * * We must make the choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude," said Jefferson. "If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, the people will be happy," concluded that great statesman.

The politicians of this Republic have in recent years tried to teach our citizens to believe that our Government is something to live on instead of under. It is that philosophy which has given impetus to the creeping shadow of socialism. It is that philosophy which is accumulating the great public debt which will destroy public credit and produce inflation. It is our duty as citizens to tell our administrators of Government at all levels, regardless of political label that they must eliminate extravagance and live within the Government's income. We must tell our public officials very forcefully that the way to cherish public credit is to avoid the accumulation of debt. That is plainly our duty.

"Duty," said Robert E. Lee, that great American patriot, "is the sublimest word in the English language. Do your duty in all things," charged this great patriot, "you cannot do more and you should never wish to do less."

It is plainly our duty to force our public servants at all levels of Government, from the President down, to eliminate waste, thus avoiding confiscatory taxes. Over 100 years ago, Karl Marx said, "There is only one way to kill capitalism * * * by taxes, taxes, and more taxes." Marx knew what he was talking about. He had studied history. Waste means high taxes. High taxes destroys incentives; high taxes produce socialism; and socialism produces communism.

The President seems to think the way to prevent inflation is to take the moneys away from the people through high taxes made necessary by the wastage of public funds. The way to avoid inflation is to reduce the cost of Government, but this never dawns on politicians.

I should like now to say a few words about the threat of communism. The President's Loyalty Board recently stated that they uncovered only 200 Communists in the Government departments in recent years. Someone has said that if we could put 200 GI's in and about the Kremlin, Stalin would be whistling Dixie in a few months.

You perhaps recall that two of our Associate Justices of the Supreme Court recently testified as character witnesses for Alger Hiss, who was subsequently convicted in a court of law of lying about giving State Department papers to Whittaker Chambers, a self-confessed Communist courier. At the time Hiss gave those confidential papers to Chambers he was on the payroll of the State Department. After Alger Hiss had been found guilty by a jury of his peers the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, proclaimed that he would not turn his back on his friend—a man who had turned traitor to his country.

Acheson has refused to take a definite stand against recognition of Red China. He has refused to take a stand against seating Joe Stalin's Chinese representative in the Security Council of the United Nations. He did all he could to discredit the Chinese Nationalist Government which was favorable to us and thereby helped Joe Stalin take over China and place in slavery 400,000,000 people. Of great significance, I think, is the fact that the Daily Worker, the principal Communist publication in this country, has from time to time been very complimentary of our Secretary of State.

David Demarest Lloyd, formerly a member of the Washington Cooperative Book Shop, which is on the Attorney General's list as a subversive organization, and who was for a number of years a member of the National Lawyers Guild, which is listed by the Un-American Activities Committee as a Communist-front organization, at present has an office in the White House and is one of President Truman's speech writers.

Since resigning from the Washington Cooperative Book Shop and the National Lawyers Guild, Lloyd has written complimentary articles about the traitor, Alger Hiss.

Most of you will recall that while in search of "liberal votes" President Truman referred to one of the most notorious and despicable characters of our time, Joe Stalin, as "good old Joe." And during that address he expressed a fondness for that godless man who would rule the world by saying, "I like old Joe."

When Alger Hiss was under investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee President Truman referred to that investigation as "red baiting" and he characterized it as "red herring." Little wonder that our people are not too much impressed with the President's most recent appeal to our citizens to report any Communists or other subversives to the FBI.

I have no doubt but that Stalin's agents in our Government are reporting to the Kremlin daily on our activities and our plans. I have no doubt but that Stalin's advisers look over these reports daily and make their plans accordingly. It is my feeling that we have more to fear from the Communists in our Government than from the Communists in Moscow.

We have, I think, reached a period in our history where the basic principles upon which our Government was founded are threatened. They are threatened from within as much, if not more, than from without. We should, therefore, support those men in public office and those men who seek public office who are animated by a sincere desire to preserve our way of life. It should make no difference with us whether those men call themselves Democrats, Republicans, or Dixiecrats.

Only you and others like you who place the welfare of our Republic above partisan politics can keep the light of liberty alive in America.

May I close my address with this prayer:

"O God, Our Father, let us not be content to wait and see what will happen, but give us the determination to make the right things happen. Give us the courage to stand for something lest we fall for anything."

Red Leader Is Very Happy About Minute Women—Says They're on Our Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret deeply the necessity of reporting not only that we have a very few Communists in western Massachusetts, but that we have a particularly obnoxious one who describes himself as the secretary of the Communist Party of western Massachusetts. I can assure my colleagues that his following is very limited. But he and that following, apparently, do have it within their power to mislead otherwise decent and loyal Americans with the Communist propaganda upon orders from Moscow, and it appears he has induced a group of ladies to organize what he describes as the Springfield-Chicopee Minute Women for Peace. He is careful not to indicate how many ladies have joined this organization in support of the Communist-inspired Stockholm peace petition, but it is apparent from an article appearing in the Saturday edition of the Springfield Daily News that some of them met recently and adopted some kind of a resolution of endorsement which caused Comrade Lipshires to report great gratification.

The article is as follows:

RED LEADER IS VERY HAPPY ABOUT THE MINUTE WOMEN; SAYS THEY'RE ON OUR SIDE—SIDNEY LIPSHIRES, AREA COMMUNIST SECRETARY, PLEASED AT SUPPORT HERE FOR STOCKHOLM PEACE PETITION, GENERALLY VIEWED AS KREMLIN SMOKE SCREEN

Sidney Lipshires, secretary of the Communist Party of western Massachusetts, allowed today that the party has an excellent ally in the Springfield-Chicopee Minute Women for Peace—an organization which came out strongly last night for the Communist-inspired Stockholm peace pledge.

Lipshires said anyone circulating the so-called Stockholm peace pledge petition or endorsing its aim is on our side. He said he would have more to say on the subject later on.

Meanwhile, it was recalled that Representative JOHN W. HESELTON, of Deerfield, had urged all true Americans to recognize the Stockholm petition as an attempt by Soviet Russia to catch peace lovers everywhere in the Communist trap.

Similar warnings against this spurious peace petition—a camouflage designed to confuse the free societies and to conceal the aggressive policies revealed in the invasion of Korea—were issued recently by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Synagogue Council of America.

UNANIMOUS PLEDGE

Yet a pledge to continue support of the campaign to ban production and use of the atomic bomb, as expressed by the Stockholm petition, was unanimously voted by the Minute Women for Peace, of which Mrs. Clyde H. Dorr, of this city, is chairman.

Meeting in St. John's Congregational Church, the group also endorsed Indian Prime Minister Nehru's proposal for a speedy solution to the Korean problem, based on admission of the Chinese Communists to the United Nations, as demanded by Russia.

In line with the Minute Women's actions, Communist Lipshires said he and his party will continue to urge Americans to unite to change the present war policy of the United States Government.

Speaking for Communists everywhere, he said:

"We will continue to urge the American people to override the veto of President Truman on Indian Premier Nehru's proposal to end the lock-out of China and the Soviet Union in the UN. We will continue to back Nehru's plea for a just and peaceful solution for the war in Korea.

"We will go on asking all peace-loving Americans to urge our Government to abandon its plans for atomic war, and to accept the outlawing of atomic weapons through international agreement."

UNJUST WAR

These and other remarks were contained in Lipshires' first press statement since the United States court of appeals upheld the conviction of 11 top Communist leaders. Of this action he said:

"The decision of the court goes hand in hand with the war program. The unjust and undeclared war against the Korean people grows more unpopular every day. Increased numbers of Americans are shocked by the sacrifice of both American and Korean lives in order to guarantee corporation investments in the Far East."

Containing the usual Commie harangues against big business, Wall Street bankers, and the monopolists, Lipshires' statement said the Communists will continue to teach and advocate the necessity of replacing the worn-out capitalist system which threatens to plunge the world into its third world war within the last 36 years.

Airmail Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include herewith the following editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, July 29, 1950:

AIRMAIL PAYMENTS

The full House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will soon vote on the question of separating airmail payments from Government support of the airlines. Such segregation should be made in the interests of business-like handling of this phase of the Post Office Department activities and in the true interests of the airlines, whose development and soundness must be maintained for the sake of both national defense and economic well-being. The President, in his budget message to Congress last January, asked immediate action in this matter. The proposal has been supported by the Secretary of Commerce, the Postmaster General, the Committee for the Hoover Report and many others. The question of the desirability of segregation seems to have been determined by a strong weight of evidence. These spokesmen have declared themselves in favor of the bill (H. R. 2908), which would establish immediately such separation of airmail payments and subsidies.

Nevertheless, at the coming hearing, the Commerce Committee will be asked to choose between this bill and House Joint Resolution 331, which would require the Civil Aeronautics Board to make a further study of the desirability of segregation and proposes that $500,000 be appropriated for the purpose. Its adoption would effectively kill the whole matter for this session of Congress and probably for the first session of the next Congress. We believe that H. R. 2908 should be voted out by the committee and passed without further delay.

The Reds Reach for Your Wallet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "The Reds Reach for Your Wallet," written by J. Anthony Marcus, president, Institute of Foreign Trade, and published in the August 1950 issue of the American Legion magazine.

The article is a provocative one which all Americans should read. Mr. Marcus has spent 24 years on the European Continent and knows what is going on.

Unless, and until Members of Congress get the facts respecting international affairs we cannot react wisely.

I have been advised by the Government Printing Office that the article slightly exceeds the two printed pages allowed under the rule, and that the cost of printing it in the RECORD is $205.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REDS REACH FOR YOUR WALLET

(By J. Anthony Marcus)

Very few of us ever stop to think how Soviet imperialism is eating into our pockets—rich and poor alike. Every pay envelope is being rifled by the invisible Kremlin hand. Every dividend check is being robbed by the same international brigand. Every grocery bag contains less food because a fanatical gang at Moscow has decreed perpetual war until either they or free men survive.

Due to the rise of the Soviet counterrevolution against free institutions in 1917, economic normalcy has become a thing of the past. Long-range development programs are not undertaken, jobs are not multiplying fast enough to take care of the ever-rising population because Moscow wants conditions to remain uncertain, chaotic in order to fish in muddy waters. War-weary and impoverished nations must spend huge fortunes on armaments to prepare for the show-down which Lenin, chief architect of the Russian slave state, had proclaimed as unavoidable.

To gain our diplomatic recognition in 1933 the Kremlin dangled billions in trade for our

then idle factories. We fell for it and found ourselves cheated and deceived. Soviet purchases actually fell off. With recognition, however, came Stalin's hoped-for opportunity to flood this country with industrial spies disguised as buying commissions to steal our technological secrets in order to strengthen the Soviet war potential.

At Tehran and Yalta Stalin cheated President Roosevelt by promising peaceful cooperation after the war. With men like Alger Hiss as his advisers, he was unaware of Stalin's strict adherence to the old Russian principle: "If you don't cheat, you don't sell." No sooner were our common enemies defeated than, with renewed fury, the Soviet Government resumed the perpetual war against the democratic nations which is costing us over twenty-five billions of dollars a year. No nation has ever been confronted with so deadly and costly an enemy. No nation has ever had less reason to have so little understanding of the true conspiratorial nature of its adversary than we have.

Busy as we are with the humdrum of everyday living, we have yet to sense the ruinous economic war with which Stalin hopes to weaken us before launching the final onslaught for the bolshevization of the world—a goal which neither he nor his successor will ever abandon.

Stalin knows that a shooting war now might spell the doom of his regime. Why? Because his tyrannical rule has embittered against him more than 90 percent of the Russian people. There is hardly a family in Russia which has not had a loved member tortured or liquidated by this sadistic secret police state. He remembers that in numerous (thousands, one might say) Russian towns and villages the invading German armies were welcomed with open arms, with the traditional bread and salt; that by the end of the first year of war with Hitler, millions of Red army men had surrendered to the enemy because they had no use for their Communist oppressors.

If this could happen in a war with a traditional enemy like the Germans, he knows that the desertions could be much greater in a war with the United States—the traditional friend of the Russian people, the country which had afforded millions of Russians a haven and a refuge, the country which had saved millions of Russians from famine and epidemics, and in the last war actually saved them from certain conquest.

Stalin is therefore turning to his foreign-trade monopoly to carry on the war with the United States. In recent years we have been in a habit of locking the international stable after the horse was stolen. We have paid very dearly for lack of vision and foresight. If we fail now to see the true nature of the war the totalitarian countries are determined to wage against us, there will be no stable left to lock. Having had close contact with Russia's foreign-trade monopoly since 1920, I have known since 1925 that once backward Russia became industrialized the benefits would not go to the domestic consumers to help raise their very low standard of living.

In 1946 and 1947, for instance, the Soviet Government exported hundreds of thousands of tons of grain to European countries while millions of Russians starved because of crop failures. It was done in order to bolster its prestige and to keep its stranglehold upon large bodies of subversives abroad. With millions of men and women in slave-labor camps exploited in mines and industries on a 12- to 16-hour schedule without pay, housed in filthy and unheated barracks, dressed in rags and without medical care, with the entire Soviet working population chained to their jobs and exploited mercilessly, Stalin or his heir can make their people go without the most elementary necessities and dump their industrial or agricultural products abroad to the injury of the United States or the other nations not under the Kremlin domination.

In this thirty-third year of the Soviet regime the income of the Soviet worker and all other segments of the producing population is unbelievably low. While a pound of bread is about 41 cents, sugar $1.50, butter about $6, a shoddy man's suit from $120 to $200, a pair of shoes from $50 to $120, a fall coat from $90 to $200, a pair of ladies' shoes from $60 to $140, the monthly income of an engineer is about $240, a locksmith's from $100 to $180, a highly qualified worker from $160 to $200, a common laborer from $60 to $100, a charwoman $50.

Since the Government owns all the means of production and distribution, the citizen must pay the prices demanded or do without, he must accept the low wages or be mercilessly liquidated in a slave-labor camp. In disregard of the Russian people's welfare, the Soviet Government, when it suits its over-all international game, can dump anything abroad and at any price.

While from time to time Stalin has been heralding to the world the false statement that he sees no reason why the two systems—his and ours—could not live side by side, his all-embracing foreign trade monopoly has already embarked upon a plan to swell the ranks of our unemployed by monopolizing trade in the conquered satellite countries and by dumping. On a national scale, to be sure, the effects are not as yet felt here. In individual American industries and communities, however, it is beginning to lay its deadly hand on the incomes of the workers and employers alike. And it is not too soon to begin looking at least 5 to 10 years ahead. A few recent developments are worth recounting here.

Czechoslovakia: In our oldest center of the hat industry, Danbury, Conn., thousands of workers find their livelihood undermined by the dumping of felt hats from Czechoslovakia, one of the best industrialized puppet states of Russia. With America a heavy importer of the finer fur for hat felting from eastern Europe, our leading source of raw materials is now at the mercy of Moscow's powerful foreign trade monopoly. Counting on the greedy nature of some individual traders in a free-enterprise economy, the marshals of the totalitarian trade war know that not only could they strangle our hat industry by denying us the raw materials, but could extract further profits by fabricating the hats themselves and selling them here at prices far below our cost of production. This is now going on, and it is only the beginning.

With America as the world's largest and most efficient producer of shoes, Czechoslovakia is nevertheless underselling us right here in America. Between January 1 and April 1 of this year nearly 500,000 pairs of such shoes have been landed in New York at the ridiculous price of 87 cents per pair. They are exact copies of American-made shoes, and no manufacturer here could possibly sell them for less than $2.40 to $3.40 per pair and remain in business. When the Czech citizen buys them at home with a ration card he must pay the equivalent of about $7.50 per pair. On the black market they cost around $30. With the country of origin concealed, and with some of our retailers conniving to pack them in domestic boxes, the American consumer is tricked into supporting slave-labor products shipped by an enemy government monopoly to the injury of our economy.

In some instances the merchandise is sent to western European ports for reshipment to this country. Recently Czechoslovakia has been shipping here large quantities of rubber dolls, balls, and inflatable rubber toys. Large shipments of burlaps have arrived from the ports of Hamburg and Gdynia (Poland) by transshipment from Rotterdam, Holland. Glassware, beads, and other manufactured items, as well as permanganate of potash, malt for the beer industry, mineral waters, etc., have also commenced to move into our ports.

Poland: Despite the fact that most of the Polish population is undernourished and impoverished, while hard-working Americans of Polish origin are sharing their food with relatives in Poland by sending them food parcels and paying high duties to the Polish government in addition, the Polish Communist government is shipping large quantities of canned hams and shoulders, as well as many other foodstuffs to the United States and other countries. About the middle of April, for example, the steamer *Mormacelm* arrived in New York with a large consignment of Polish hams; the steamship *Paraguay* landed considerable shipments of candies and other general cargo. Substantial consignments of Polish hams have also arrived recently from British ports.

China: For generations America has been China's main customer for hog bristles. In 1948, for example, United States imports from China averaged about $1,842,000 per month. They fell to an average of $1,126,430 during January–April, 1949, and in January, 1950, they were 38 percent below the corresponding period of 1949, according to United States Department of Commerce figures. From the same authority we learn that the importation of Chinese bristles from the Soviet Union rose from a monthly average of $17,465 in 1948 to an average of $60,000 in the last 4 months of 1949. And during the first 6 weeks of 1950, bristles imported from the U. S. S. R. were valued at $865,000—a monthly average of over half a million dollars. This represents a rise of 2,900 percent over the 1948 monthly average above quoted.

With China producing 75 percent of the world's supply of hog bristles, and America its principal customer, it is quite apparent why the Soviet Government would want to monopolize this vital raw material. It also portends what is ahead of us in our trade dealings with the formerly free countries now slipped behind the iron curtain. One by one all other vital raw materials we have been importing from China will be forced to move through the rigid Soviet monopoly.

Take still another highly strategic metal—tungsten. The domestic production is totally inadequate for our steel industry requirements. Of the 17 countries supplying us with tungsten ores and concentrates, about 50 percent of the total imports have been coming from China and 18 percent from Korea—a total of 68 percent from the Far East, now sunk in the Soviet cesspool. It will not be long before this too will come under the domination of the Soviet world-wide foreign trade monopoly.

Accustomed, as the Russian Government is, to selling the most inferior quality merchandise to their captive clientele, and living up to the principle of no cheating, no selling, the Soviet Government and its satellites will stop at nothing to fleece our consumers by misrepresentation, concealment of facts and falsification of trademarks and patent rights.

For the time being the Soviet super-duper foreign-trade monopoly is compelled to allow a certain amount of independence to the recently conquered countries. Busy as they are now with fortifying the secret police network in the satellite nations and China, modeled after the Soviet brand, preoccupied with the rehabilitation of their war-devastated areas, they must postpone for the time being the complete integration of all the foreign trade of the Communist world. When the day of complete integration arrives—and it is as inevitable as the rising and the setting of the sun—we will be confronted by one colossal monopoly wherever we are selling in foreign markets. How do I know that this is inevitable? Of course I am not in Stalin's confidence. But there is documentary evidence, recently come to light, to prove the case:

On May 9, 1941, the executive committee of the Communist International (the old Comintern now renamed the Cominform—worked out a blueprint for the future conquest of the Balkan countries, for example. Section (e) of the first paragraph stipulates:

"Once power has been seized by the party, foreign policy will be laid down by the diplomatic representatives of the U. S. S. R., who will receive the necessary directives from the Comintern * * *"

Then paragraph 2 makes this significant statement:

"The country where the central committee has recently assumed power should not apply for inclusion in the Soviet Union until the necessary instructions to this effect have been received from the executive committee of the Comintern * * *."

And who dominates the Comintern—now the Cominform? The Kremlin, of course. Since the founding of that conspiratorial body in Moscow, only two men have thus far dared to stand up against its determination to rule the actions of the Communist parties in foreign countries as well as in their own country. They are: Benjamin Gitlow, the first titular head of the American Communist Party, and Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. Their experience settles for all time the question as to whether or not the Communist Party in any country is an independent body or a mere branch, a stooge of Moscow.

To listen to Soviet propagandists and their parroting American Red Fascists, one would conclude that not they but we are the dangerous monopolists, not they but we are interested in subjugating the rest of the world. Of course the very opposite is correct.

One of the first actions of the Soviet Government upon coming into power by force and violence, and with the aid of a mere handful of 240,000 followers as Lenin himself admitted, was to form the foreign trade monopoly. It was inevitable. Having monopolized the entire economic life of the nation, in fact, having monopolized, too, the life of every man, woman and child from cradle to grave by making of them involuntary slaves of the state, there were no longer any free enterprisers left to carry on international trade. Since that day every purchase or sale abroad, no matter how small or large, has had to move through the tiny eye of the foreign trade monopoly needle. And this has given the government a powerful weapon against us and the other nations not in the Communist camp.

This weapon is not used against capitalistic countries alone. The countries within the Soviet orbit are now finding out that the Soviet octopus is implacable to friends as well as enemies. Yugoslavia was the first country to make this discovery and she incurred the undying enmity of the Soviet hierarchy because she fought it. But the other satellite countries are also finding out that the true meaning of Soviet friendship is, "You give us everything you have and we give you nothing in return."

The Rumanian Government, for example, is compelled to export its entire surplus oil and oil products to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government fixed its own price, based on world prices, for these petroleum products, which is considerably below the cost of production in Rumania. On the other hand, it compels the other satellites—Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia—to import petroleum products from the Soviet Union only, and charges them Soviet prices, which are much higher than world prices. Since these countries do not possess sufficient dollar exchange to pay for the petroleum products, the Soviet Government compels them to ship machinery, locomotives, textiles, coal, coke and ores. Retaining the best of these imports for herself, in accordance with the Soviet principle "If you do not cheat, you do not sell," it resells to Bulgaria, for example, agricultural machinery imported from Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Polish coke and ores and Bulgarian coal are reexported to Czechoslovakia, and to Hungary and Rumania.

Through this double dealing the Soviet manipulators are now able to dump Czech textiles in India, Bulgarian tobacco in Italy, Hungarian and Rumanian foodstuffs to western Germany and, as we have seen before, Chinese hog bristles in the United States. All this is affecting the pockets of our consumers and our industries.

About 100 years ago a frustrated and antisocial Prussian—Karl Marx—had taught, the embittered Lenin of Russia had imbibed and confirmed those teachings, and a man with the morals of a head-hunter—Stalin, the Georgian—has been parroting ever since in his semiliterate Russian that since a capitalist country cannot consume all it produces, because of the low income of its masses, it must export or die. Well, then, he would meet us with ruinous competition in overseas markets, help swell the ranks of our unemployed, recruit them into the Red-Fascist movement and hasten the collapse of our free institutions.

One might forgive Marx for his now exposed silly writings about the development of capitalism. He could not have foreseen the miracle of America's mass production system with the lowest unskilled worker enjoying a much higher standard of living than even the highest engineer in Russia. But the refusal of his disciples to recognize the superiority of a free-enterprise economy to their totalitarian form can only be ascribed to the deranged mentalities of the leaders and the blindness of their followers. A rude awakening, of course, is awaiting them. But until it comes, we must accept the challenge of relentless trade war here and everywhere. Defensive measures alone will not suffice. We must take the offensive in concert with like-thinking nations if possible—alone if we must.

As our continued prosperity becomes more and more dependent on international trade, both exports and imports, the Soviet intriguers are taking to that channel as a means of doing injury to our economy. Throughout their existence the Russian peoples have been accustomed to getting along on next to nothing, on a close-to-animal existence. On the other hand, their leaders know that if Americans suffer a drop from their high standard of living, discontent among our people will be widespread. Although the Soviets have been in need of consumer goods worth tens of billions of dollars since 1917, they bought none here or anywhere else. Averaging a meager $46,000,000 a year during the 20 years prior to the last war, those purchases were primarily (87 percent, for example, in 1938) of our most modern machines and equipment. Sample units were bought so their designs could be pirated for domestic consumption and exported to other countries in order to impress those peoples with "Soviet industrial achievements." Such business was obviously disadvantageous to us and most profitable to the Soviet Union. Under the hammer blows of this intensified trade war, our Government followed the advice of well-informed people and since 1948 has cut down the flow of strategic machinery and equipment to the Soviet Union and its satellites. Many loopholes, however, are still to be plugged.

The disappearance of much of the world behind the iron curtain has already cut us off from markets laboriously developed by our people. Of course the Soviet Union would like nothing better than to use those countries as a means to obtaining here the needed machinery and equipment. But that is all the Soviets will allow these nations to buy from us. As long as they are under the yoke of the Kremlin, the satellites won't take any of our consumer goods. Formerly, before Czechoslovakia came under the control of the Soviets, we used to sell her 13,000,000 people almost as much as we sold Russia's 180,000,000 in the course of a year. This business was profitable to both Czechoslovakia and to the United States. The same was true of our trade relations with Poland—until the hand of the Kremlin stopped all that "nonsense."

It is therefore clear that once the foreign-trade war gathers momentum, hundreds of thousands of our workers and employees will feel the pinch; so will the United States Treasury in reduced income-tax receipts; so will the stockholders of corporations with or without overseas trade.

This outlook will not change as long as there is a Soviet Government in Russia. Under the circumstances the reader is bound to ask the inevitable question: Can anything be done to remedy the situation? What should it be?

1. Sever trade relations with Russia and all the Kremlin-ruled countries. This step appears to be inevitable and it would be to our advantage to take it now. As Soviet military and industrial power grows, as consolidation of human and material resources in eastern Europe and China is accomplished, their arrogance, insolence, and hatred of us will express itself in even more serious forms than the shooting down of an unarmed American plane over the Baltic Sea. If need be, they will press down still further the standard of living of their own people and dump their increased output on world markets to eliminate us as a competitor.

Our severing trade relations would bring cheer to the enslaved millions and consternation to their tyrants. Many a time brave Russian functionaries have said to me:

"Mr. Marcus, why do you Americans come here to deal with our Government? You are enhancing the Kremlin's prestige, you are tightening the noose around your necks."

2. We must make it perfectly clear to Moscow that if diplomatic relations are to be continued, it will have to be on a strict reciprocity basis. Up to now Stalin's interpretation of reciprocity has prevailed and it has amounted to his saying to us: "You Americans must do in our country as we tell you to, and we will act in your country as we damned well please." And he has got away with it. Washington has done considerable injury to our interests by permitting this to go on with impunity.

The Soviet Embassy in Washington must not be allowed to have a single member on its staff more than we have in Moscow. From the Ambassador down their personnel must be restricted in their movement about the country as ours are in Russia. Under no circumstances should they be permitted to address public meetings, issue interviews or write for publications. Their official publications here should be subjected to the same searching censorship as ours are in Moscow; their circulation must be restricted to the number of our magazine copies allowed in Russia.

3. Attacks against our Government and people by the Soviet press and radio must be construed as an attack by the Soviet Government, since all means of communication are owned and operated by that Government. We must demand and receive equal space or time in the Soviet press and on the radio to answer their slanders and lies against us.

4. If our just demands are rejected, diplomatic relations should be broken off altogether. It is serving no good purpose to us and merely affording them a means of villifying us to our face and before the whole world.

5. Stop all relief shipments to Russia and the satellites; prohibit the remittance of all funds from this country to individuals and organizations in the Soviet Union or the satellite nations. It all goes to help strengthen the enemy; it impoverishes our

people directly and indirectly by reducing their purchasing power.

Adding insult to injury, we have permitted those gangster governments to set up right here on our soil customs stations to fleece our people by imposing duties on food, clothing, and medicine parcels sent by our kind-hearted people to the needy in the iron-curtain countries. It is indeed monstrous that our officials proved to be so stupid or pliable as to overlook such flagrant violation of our rights.

The more we help worsen conditions in those countries by increasing discontent among their masses, the sooner will the tyranny be ended. The guns and bombers are still in the hands of the people—the sons of peasants and workers, the first victims of the Red nightmare.

It is futile to leave the conduct of this perpetual war with the implacable enemy to bureaucrats alone. It is perfectly clear that our best and ablest men are still outside and not inside the Government. Some of the immediate steps should be:

1. Declare a national emergency until our goal of bringing an end to Soviet imperialism is achieved.

2. Forge a united nation. There must be no room in America for hate-mongers—whether the field be race, color, or religion. Whoever engages in such hate-mongering is as valuable a servant of Red fascism as though he were a card-carrying Communist.

3. Labor and management must pull together, making a conscientious effort to maintain peace and uninterrupted production. The belated drive against Communist infiltration into labor unions must be intensified and continued until the last subversive has been purged.

4. Rally the Nation behind the All-American Committee formed at the All-American Conference last January, sponsored by the American Legion to launch a vigorous campaign against the Soviet counter-revolution. The Communists are giving the whole of their lives to fomenting unrest and the destruction of liberty. Is it asking too much that the patriotic people of the country give the whole of their lives to preserve and perpetuate our freedoms?

5. Under the driving and coordinating power of a citizens' general staff of the All-American Committee, clubs, societies, labor-union locals, trade associations, educational, religious, and fraternal organizations, etc., should dispense with all non-urgent activities and devote themselves to the emergency campaign by contributing funds, ideas, services to the relentless prosecution of the war of liberation.

6. Our millions of naturalized citizens must take their places in the front ranks of this movement. In America they found the liberty and opportunities denied them in their native lands. Those whose ancestors did not help build the free institutions under which they now live should deem it their sacred duty to help strengthen and preserve those institutions.

As one of America's naturalized citizens, I may be permitted to add that we have much to atone for. The Communist movement here is the creation of former immigrants; they still provide most of the leadership and the rank and file membership. Of the 4,980 militant subversives, no less than 91.4 percent are of foreign origin or married to former immigrants, according to the United States Attorney General's testimony before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. America does not deserve such thanklessness on the part of people who have benefited from the free institutions of this country. This disgraceful stain must be washed away with indefatigable labor and sacrifice in the cause of freedom on the part of us naturalized citizens.

7. The hundreds of thousands of DPs from eastern Europe and Russia are willing fighters in this cause. If we give them the wherewithal, they can inflict some mortal blows to the tyranny across the iron curtain. The partisans who are still fighting in the forests of the Ukraine and Byelorussia must be helped to continue with renewed effort. A dozen or more weekly publications must be made available to them to reach the masses of the afflicted countries. A dozen or more powerful radios would be the cheapest investment to help preserve freedom. The hundreds of thousands of Soviet occupation troops in Europe must be reached and influenced to carry the torch of liberty into the enemy camps.

If this were done we would soon see an increase in sabotage against the tyrannical governments. Disorder and confusion would follow; as reprisals by the governments multiplied, so would the number of embittered and desperate people in the Red domain. The late war helped rip the iron curtain. Millions of Russians have seen life outside their borders. They know that for decades their government lied to them about conditions abroad. They have seen with their own eyes that even the humblest worker lives better than the privileged Russians, that the Soviet oppressive atmosphere is totally unknown outside their borders. Before the Soviet government manages to liquidate the remnants of the millions of former slave laborers in Europe and the war prisoners, the tide will turn against it.

The virility, imagination and self-sacrifice which has made this Nation great must now be applied to solving our problem No. 1 in Russia by renewing hope and bolstering the spirit of revolt among hundreds of millions of people. In the absence of such a movement they feel abandoned to their fate.

8. Stalin's most cherished dream is to place the German people with their industrial and organizing genius under his heel to help his designs for world domination. Americans with German family ties, therefore, must bestir themselves to help save our freedom and their kinfolk overseas before it is too late.

What we fail to do during the next 3 to 5 years may well decide the fate not only of these United States but of civilization. Stalin is already gaining converts in Germany for another Rapallo agreement among the same selfish former diplomats, militarists and narrow-minded industrialists who not so long ago helped bring Hitler to power and with him the consequent German downfall. If they succeed this time in cementing a union between the Kremlin and Germany, it might well mean the end of all civilization.

Surely there must be within this Nation at least 54,000 red-blooded Americans ready and willing to match the 54,000 card-carrying Stalinists in the United States of America, to fight them here and all over the world, to bring an end to the Soviet counter-revolution and thereby forestall the inevitable third world war. The Red plague must be destroyed at its source.

The hour of decision is here. Our sacrifices are already great and promise to become even greater. Yet that need not be the case if we only use better judgment in employing the billions we are now spending and the effort we are now putting forth. Mediocrities in government and civilian leadership must give way to the ablest and most imaginative. These new leaders must come forward, they must give up their present unproductive pastimes to devote themselves to the saving of their country's free institutions and world civilization. If we do not default, victory will be ours.

Dick Doyle Comes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a newspaper story from the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., and the Montana Standard of Butte, Mont., under date of August 3 and relating to Dick Doyle's athletic exploits overseas.

Dick is one of Montana State University's great all-time athletes. A fine student, an outstanding sports participant, and a real man, Dick represents all that is good in the American youth of today. He is a credit to his family, his school, his State, and his country and we welcome him home not because of the honors he has received but because he is Dick Doyle—a good American boy that we are all proud of and from whom we expect to hear much in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the news story follows:

[From the Daily Missoulian and Montana Standard of August 3, 1950]

DISCUS CHAMP DICK DOYLE HEADS HOME WITH HONORS, TROPHIES—MONTANA UNIVERSITY ACE HAD BIG TIME ON TOUR

NEW YORK, August 2.—Dick Doyle came home loaded.

No, not that way, buddy. Dick was loaded with silver loving cups, crystal vases, javelins, skis, track shoes, discuses, and other trophies of his jaunt to Finland with an AAU track and field troupe.

Dick Doyle is national collegiate discus champion. His home is Missoula, Mont., and gals, we guarantee if he was put in a line with movie stars, crooners, and other glamour boys you'd point to him and say: "I want that."

He's 6 feet 3 inches and 195 pounds of good looks, charm, and modesty, but don't get the idea he is a Mr. Meek and start to push him around. He plays a spot of end on the University of Montana football team, and his huge right mitt sent a 4½-pound platter spinning 171 feet 5 inches as he won his national title.

Doyle went to Finland June 26 with 14 other athletes, including Fortune Gordien of Minnesota. Gordien holds the world record for the discus throw, which accounts for the fact Doyle won that event in only 8 of the 10 meets in which he took part overseas.

AIMS AT 1952 OLYMPICS

The 15-man squad competed in three meets as a unit. Gordien won the discus event in two of them, and was unable to take part in the third because of a muscle strain, so Doyle won that one. After the three big meets, including one at Helsinki witnessed by 13,000 spectators, the squad split into small groups for barnstorming tours.

"The people there really are track-minded," Doyles says. "They start training as kids for the different events. They're very fine sportsmen, too, and applauded us wholeheartedly.

"We all enjoyed the trip tremendously, and I'm looking forward to going there for the 1952 Olympics, if I can make the team, of course. They are enlarging the beautiful white stadium at Helsinki to accommodate about 80,000 people and are making plans for an Olympic village.

"We ate pretty well over there. Vegetables and fruits are scarce, but there is plenty of meat and fish." Dick winced a little as he mentioned fish and you gathered he'd rather be an innocent bystander at a goldfish-swallowing contest.

"The weather, for summer, was quite cool. When it got up to 60° you considered it a hot day. One night it got down to 42°. They don't use fuel in summer, no matter how cold it gets, so we piled into bed with our warm-up suits on to keep warm."

We mentioned that he must have brought home eight trophies, as he had told us he won eight discus events.

HELPED BY FINNISH COACH

"More than that," he grinned. "I won a couple of 110-meter hurdle events, too, and, oh yes," he added, "I got the honor prize in two meets." It developed the honor prize was something like a most-valuable-player award. The best man in the meet, no less.

Doyle's best mark over there was 170 feet 2 inches. We suggested he'd probably be gunning for 175 feet now.

"One eighty," he corrected. "After what Armas Valste taught me—he's the Finnish Olympic coach—and after watching me he suggested that I wasn't getting enough legs into my throws. The advice helped me and I'm going to keep practicing on it."

Dick returned here last Saturday by air, toting 132 pounds of baggage, not counting a pair of skis and four new javelins, which made him look like a man trying to get through a revolving door with an armful of trombones. He'll reload and head for home this week end.

Recommit the Knowland Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, as I was one of the conferees on the social-security bill, H. R. 6000, and did not sign the conference report, I have received many inquiries as to the reason for my refusal to sign the report and what course I intended to pursue with respect to the report.

I refused to sign the report because of the failure of our House conferees to insist upon the inclusion of total and permanent disability insurance and because of their acceptance of the Knowland amendment, which appears in the Senate version of the bill.

I have this day sent to each Member of the House a letter which, as briefly as I could make it, sets forth my position and the course I hope to pursue.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 8, 1950.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The conference report on the social-security bill, H. R. 6000, is programed for House action on Thursday, August 10. I was one of the conferees, but did not sign the report. If I am recognized by the Chair, I shall offer a motion to recommit the report with instructions to the House managers to insist upon the House provision for total and permanent disability insurance and to reject the Knowland provision in the Senate amendment.

I believe that the Knowland amendment strikes at the foundation of the entire unemployment-insurance program. Briefly, the Knowland amendment:

1. Makes it possible for a State unemployment-compensation agency to deprive a worker of his unemployment-insurance benefits for refusing to be a strikebreaker.

2. Makes it possible for a State unemployment-compensation agency to deprive a worker of his unemployment-insurance benefits if he refuses work on a job where the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are below those prevailing for similar work in the locality.

3. Makes it possible for a State unemployment-compensation agency to cause a worker to lose his unemployment-insurance benefits if he refuses work on a job where he is required to belong to a union or where he might be required to resign from, or refrain from, joining a bona fide union.

4. Compels an unemployed worker, aggrieved by an unfair or unjust ruling of a State administrator, to go to court and exhaust every legal remedy in the State courts before the Secretary of Labor may act. To my mind unemployment-insurance benefits should be given during the period of unemployment—not 2 or 3 years later, after every legal remedy in the State courts has been exhausted, and at his expense.

5. Will break down the standards established by Congress and will substitute therefor the interpretations of the law by the courts of the 48 States.

6. Is a threat, in the present Korean crisis, to manpower mobilization, as most of labor, especially skilled labor, must, of necessity, depend upon uniform interpretation of the unemployment-insurance law.

7. Is not stopgap legislation as the report indicates. It is permanent legislation—so permanent that it can only be terminated by repeal legislation.

It is to be noted that the deprivation of the workers' benefits as indicated above may be accomplished entirely without any action of the State legislature and wholly upon a ruling of an appointed official, the State administrator. We all know that law is made by administrative agencies as well as by legislative bodies.

It has been suggested that if the motion to recommit, with instructions as outlined above, is carried, no further action will be had on the bill during this Congress. I entertain no such fear. I have too much respect for the integrity and wisdom and political sagacity of my fellow conferees to believe that they would let this bill die through their inaction.

It is quite possible that a simple motion to recommit will be offered, or a motion to recommit with certain instructions, but without reference to the Knowland amendment. Either of such motions will be designed to freeze the Knowland amendment into the bill and will be definitely aimed at undermining the entire unemployment-insurance program and should be defeated.

I trust that this explanation will assist you in your decision with respect to the Knowland amendment.

Cordially yours,
WALTER A. LYNCH,
Member of Congress.

Letter From Governor of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include herewith the following letter addressed to me by the Honorable Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico:

LA FORTALEZA, PUERTO RICO,
August 1, 1950.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROONEY: Both in my personal and official capacity and on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico I wish to express to you my heartfelt thanks for your participation in bringing forth favorable action on the bill recognizing the right of your fellow citizens of Puerto Rico to approve their own constitution. I truly think that this step, that speaks so highly of the American democratic tradition, opens new political possibilities worth while watching by the world at large.

With renewed expression of my appreciation, I am

Cordially yours,
LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN,
Governor.

Korea Exposes One of Worst Blunders in American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of Monday, August 7, 1950:

KOREA EXPOSES ONE OF WORST BLUNDERS IN AMERICAN HISTORY—THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR MILITARY WEAKNESS SHOULD BE RELIEVED

(By David Lawrence)

Whatever the immediate significance of the Korean war, a profound effect on the long-range military policy of the United States has been produced.

Never again can America depend on that narrow concept of a one-weapon strategy, the failure of which has brought the Nation to its senses suddenly to learn that American interests can be as gravely injured by a series of local attacks in different parts of the globe as by a blitz at a given point by the large-scale forces of an enemy.

For one of the worst blunders in all American history has been committed. It is a blunder inexcusable because it defied the plain lessons of history taught in every naval or military war college in every nation of the world for centuries past.

The truth is that a nation with global responsibilities, disregarding the simple fact that three-quarters of the earth's surface is covered with water, ignored the age-old doctrine which called for the stationing of naval and military forces at strategic locations outside continental United States. America's offensive strength has always been her best defense.

Today Soviet Russia has acquired a vast coast line on the mainland of China and is reaching down with her land armies to Korea and is plainly threatening Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. Against this the United States has an insignificant fleet in the Pacific Ocean. Its air power from floating bases is relatively small. Its fire power from battleships and heavy cruisers for shore bombardment is virtually nonexistent. Its "hunter killer" defense by planes from small carriers

against submarines is tragically absent from important sea areas in our line of communications, though the planes and the ships have been available for 5 years.

History shows that sea power is basic to the transportation of men and supplies and for the effective use of land power and air power at the point of trouble.

NAVY LOSES ITS STATUS

Whoever, therefore, scuttled the American Navy is responsible for today's debacle, having deprived the Navy of its status as a "fleet in being" recognized for centuries as a fundamental principle of national st ategy. Those responsible for this mistake in judgment should be relieved of office—civilian or military.

Whoever took away from the United States Army its own airplane units capable of operating always with ground troops—compelling the Army to rely instead on the intermittent help of bombers or inadequate tactical units furnished by a United States Air Force primarily and rightly concerned with long-range strategic bombing—should be relieved of office, whether civilian or military. For to send a ground army into action without its own air artillery is like sending infantry into action without ground artillery.

Whoever fostered the idea that land armies of the United States could fight nowadays without armored divisions of tanks in sufficient numbers should be relieved of office—civilian or military.

Whoever sold Congress the idea that America would not need overseas bases—floating or fixed—with adequate forces maintained constantly in areas of potential trouble distant from our shores should be exposed to view now.

Politeness, personal friendships or sensitivity, partisanship are criminal excuses if they stand in the way of punishment of the blunderers. No other course will satisfy the mothers of the men who are dying in Korea nor the mothers of the many more young men about to die as a consequence of these mistakes.

WHITEWASH INDICATED

The Congress shows signs of preparing a whitewash. A subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee has been hastily appointed with hand-picked partisans, and already it has been announced, in effect, that past mistakes will be ignored. What a travesty on congressional government. Will the American people have to punish the Democratic Party at the polls next autumn, deprive it of its majority status, and accept Republican leadership which has also been indifferent if only now to register a protest and get the President to clean house? He might do it by transfers and camouflaged changes in function, but the end result should be to get some new military and civilian planners of strategy at the top.

America today needs to fix on a new long-range policy commensurate with her responsibilities in the United Nations. America needs at least 3,000,000 troops with plenty of tactical aviation of their own, a naval fleet close to what it had in 1945, an Air Force of 70 groups for strategic bombing, and a mobile force of United States Marines of at least 250,000 men to be stationed in various parts of the world where it can be supported by the sea power and air power.

These are the real costs of survival. These are the elements of a national strategy based on the lessons of history and experience. The price of peace is never inexpensive and the price of survival always is economic discomfort and sacrifice. The tragedies of ancient Greece and Rome, the tragedies of Italy and France and Germany and Japan in modern times attest too plainly from a military and naval viewpoint to the disregard by their top commanders or civilian rulers of the significant lessons of strategy in world history.

Development of Critical Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, on July 31 my good friend, Hon. BEN JENSEN, of Iowa, made the following statement with regard to certain administration officials:

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that while American boys are fighting and dying in Korea, the Truman administration has delayed an all-important meeting to stimulate much-needed minerals and metals production program so that a high Government official can travel around the country making speeches.

The Associated Press reports that Interior Secretary Chapman has delayed from August 1 to August 3 a meeting of the Department's National Minerals Advisory Council because Crow Girard Davidson, the Department's Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources, is off on a political junket and will not be in Washington on August 1.

Mr. Chapman notified the 44 members of the Advisory Council that the meeting is urgent and important. I agree that such a conference is urgent and important. But, despite the urgency of the situation and the need for wartime speed-up in the development of vital minerals and metals now needed on the Korean front, Chapman delays the meeting in the interest of politics, as usual.

I believe that the Members of this House and the people of the Nation want Government officials, particularly those concerned with the war effort, to remain on the job in Washington in these serious days. I believe the people of the country are getting sick and tired of the double shuffling of the Truman deal, fighting a war with one hand and playing politics with the other.

A delay of 2 days in a program for the development of critical materials is not only shocking, it is criminal.

The boys in Korea cannot take 2 days off from the bombs and the fire of the blazing Red tanks. They must stay on the job every second, fighting for the principles of freedom and liberty while the Washington bureaucrats delay the war effort with a political junket on the taxpayers' time and money, speaking at Democratic rallies in Montana, Idaho, and other points.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that at least one Montana newspaper editor agrees with the gentleman from Iowa concerning this political junket. I include at this point an editorial from the Bozeman Daily Chronicle, which is published by Mr. Jefferson Jones:

TELLING MONTANA HOW TO VOTE

At a cost of some $500 a day to the taxpayers of the country, C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Interior, flew to Great Falls last Friday to tell the people of Montana how to vote in the coming election. Ignoring the fact that the country is at war, Davidson comes into our midst to beat political drums and to work indirectly for a socialized authority by which the people of Montana can be robbed of their constitutional rights and control over the State's water resources.

It is a sad commentary on the times that while fathers and mothers are readying their sons for the draft that there are demagogs like Davidson in Government who are oblivious of the war and who waste public funds in plane journeys, hither and yon, to talk twaddle to anyone who will listen. Evidently, it is to be politics as usual with some Government officials this year as American GI's fight to the death to hang on to the tip of the Korean peninsula.

Probably Washington was glad to get rid of Davidson for a few days at least. What's $1,500 of the taxpayers dough for a 3-day jaunt to and from Montana if in the expenditure the Interior Department can be rid of the individual who has sunk the Department to a low in good will throughout the West.

As a matter of fact Davidson and his policies are under attack from all sides in this country. Only 2 weeks ago Bernard De Voto in a scathing article in the Saturday Evening Post captioned, "Shall we let them ruin our national parks?" knocked Interior Department officialdom, including Davidson, so breathless that no reply has yet been made. Davidson is supposed to have been handling national parks for the Interior Department.

Only some 60 days ago Davidson's policies were the target of the CIO Utility Workers Union of America, which in resolutions declared that if Government participation in the utility business was permitted to continue "we will soon have authorities, not elected by the people, but appointed, who will constitute a supergovernment with control of practically all the electric power in the Nation." To this statement, also, Davidson has been silent.

But the Davidson policies hit the Interior Department its worst blow when the American engineering profession in a sharply worded report, through an 80-man committee, spoke out bluntly against excessive and unsound water resources practices, which it attributed to competing Federal agencies and congressional "response to pressure and trading" and which called for a halt in further authorizations.

Davidson, it would seem, has enough to answer for without taking a $1,500 taxpayers' joyride into Montana to tell citizens how to vote. He could better spend the time in sticking to a job which he was appointed to do, and which the evidence shows he has neglected.

Tribute to Alice Carter Oliver by May M. Cresswell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Miss May Cresswell, State home demonstration agent of Mississippi, in regard to the outstanding career of Alice Carter Oliver, district agent in charge of Negro home demonstration work in Mississippi, who is retiring from active service. This statement from the Extension Service Review, a publication of the United States Department of Agriculture, contains appropriate tribute to a woman who has served her people for more than 30 years in an effort to help them improve their home practices and living conditions. Her success in this field is widely recognized in Mississippi and over the Nation, and she is respected and appreciated by the people of her home State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALICE OLIVER RETIRES

(By May M. Cresswell, State home demonstration agent, Mississippi)

Alice Carter Oliver, district agent in charge of Negro home demonstration work, 1917 to 1950, is retiring this year. She was the first Negro home demonstration agent in Mississippi. Her first salary was $1 per year, and her first task was to organize groups of women and girls to study better homemaking practices on Coahoma County. This was in 1917. Less than a year later Alice was placed in charge of organizing home demonstration work for Negro women and girls in the counties of northwest Mississippi. Her work was so successful there that, as provision was made for the expansion of extension work, Alice was named district agent in charge of Negro home demonstration work in Mississippi.

On March 1, 1946, when the number of counties employing Negro home-demonstration agents had grown to 50, the second district agent was appointed. This district agent, Daisy M. Lewis, was given supervision of half the counties; and, like other Mississippi home-demonstration agents, she had been selected and trained by Alice Carter Oliver.

The career of Alice Carter Oliver in extension work has been unique and her service outstanding. She was born in Frankfort, Ky., in 1887, the youngest child of Mose and Lucy Carter. She attended Greenhill public school in Frankfort and Kentucky State College. Later she took advance courses at Cheyney Training School in Pennsylvania and at the University of Illinois. Alice taught for 6 years in the schools of Frankfort, coming to Sunflower County in 1910 where she engaged in social-service work with the Negro people at Stephensville. In 1911 she married Georg H. Oliver, superintendent of Negro schools in Clarksdale. For a while Alice served as supervisor of home economics under the Jeanes fund and for several years taught in the Negro schools of Clarksdale.

George and Alice Oliver were highly respected by both white people and Negroes in the county and the surrounding Delta. They were leaders among the Negroes and had the confidence of the white citizens of that area. Having observed the work of white home demonstration agents and realizing that her own people might improve their living conditions through work of this kind, Alice Carter, in 1917, applied to the director of extension, E. R. Lloyd, through Susie V. Powell, State home demonstration agent, for permission to organize groups of rural Negro women and girls in agricultural and home-making projects. Alice's first compensation was $1 per year, with the use of the franking privilege. Her first groups were organized in Coahoma County.

She found that the white planters readily understood the needs of the Negro families and, for the most part, were in sympathy with her efforts. Near the end of her first year, Alice's efficient service was recognized. She was given a salary and the title of district agent in charge of Negro home demonstration work. Her district consisted of 17 counties in north Mississippi.

Alice visited boards of supervisors and told them of her work and of the needs of her people. In many instances she was able to convince them that the services of a Negro home demonstration agent would be a valuable asset to the county. When asked how she, an unknown Negro worker, managed to get an audience with these boards, Alice said: "Many times I got in through the front door of the board room by seeing a supervisor's wife or some other influential white lady at the back door. Sometimes she would put on her hat and go with me to meet the board.

When Alice accepted the dollar-a-year job in 1917, she was the lone Negro home demonstration agent in Mississippi. This year, as she now retires, there are full-time Negro home demonstration agents in 54 counties, working with 21,121 4-H Club girls, and as many adult women. These women and girls are striving to improve their homes and the family's standard of living through the adoption of better practices in homemaking, gardening, poultry raising, and marketing. They are learning the importance of sanitation, of healthful living, and of good family and community and race relationships. Most of the 54 home demonstration agents are college graduates, trained in home economics. Some of the older ones who do not have their degrees have, nevertheless, had special training courses in home economics and are strengthened by years of successful work in the field and under the supervision of Alice Carter Oliver.

Alice's health has failed now so that she must live quietly, giving up the hard travel schedules which took her into the highways and byways of Mississippi. She retires with the respect and affection not only of all the Negro extension workers but of the entire extension staff who knew her and have seen her work. Her work has been so outstanding that often she was called on to go to other States to tell about the progress of Negro extension work in her State. Alice will be missed, but she leaves behind her a sound organization and a staff of trained conscientious workers who have the interest of the Negro people at heart.

In a farewell letter to the State office, Alice expresses her gratitude and her affection for her white coworkers in the Extension Service. She writes: "It has been a privilege to work with you, and I shall always be grateful for the kindness you have shown me and the support you have given me in my work." "Please, ma'am," Alice adds, "call on me if I can ever be of service in any way."

Alice's retirement marks the close of a useful career. She served with humility but with dignity at all times. Her life has been an inspiration to thousands of her own race and to us, her coworkers, who have watched her tireless efforts, her enthusiasm, and her loyalty to her people and to her work.

California Cost Accounting on Arizona Reclamation Projects—One-Column Unbalance Sheet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, not all of us are accountants, and I find myself confused by the intricacies of bookkeeping. It appears to be good bookkeeping practice when it is desired to present a financial picture of a business investment to draw up what is called a balance sheet. I have seen such a picture but my recollection is that it usually has two columns—one entitled "Resources" and the other "Liabilities." Lately a new type of bookkeeping picture of capital investment has been presented by California authorities which has only one column, and since it does not balance with anything, I presume this new calculation might be called an unbalance sheet.

This new picture has been presented with reference to the proposed Government investment in the central Arizona project, embodied in S. 75 now before Congress. Congressman POULSON, of California, is one who has presented this new type of investment picture, as will be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A5358 Congressman POULSON calls the central Arizona irrigation project a fantastic proposal, and to try to back up his assertion he pictures it as costing billions and mentions an interest cost alone of $2,000,000,000 on the proposed investment over a period of 75 years. If that is the whole and correct picture, it is not a pretty one; but is it the correct picture?

Congressman POULSON even has Secretary of the Interior Chapman helping him draw up this unbalance sheet it would seem, for he says the Secretary of the Interior was asked the question concerning the amount of interest which would accumulate on a given sum—the cost of the project—through 75 years and that Secretary Chapman said the arithmetical amount would be $2,000,000,000. Is Secretary Chapman condemning it? Let us see, for it is strange in view of the fact that Secretary Chapman has given his official sanction and approval to this project and urges that it be built. A little later I will explain how the Secretary of the Interior happens to be doing this homework in arithmetic.

If I were an accountant after this new California bookkeeping pattern, I could draw up an unbalance sheet on numerous great capital investments, some in California, but to begin, let us consider Thomas Jefferson's investment of $15,000,000 in the year 1803 in a piece of real estate west of the Mississippi River, known as Louisiana. If this unbalance sheet is to be the California one-column affair, we must compute the interest which would accrue on $15,000,000 at say 4 percent compounded semiannually from 1803 to the present date. A mathematician tells me that $15,000,000 so invested through 147 years would amount to $5,269,000,000, which of course must show as a loss to the American taxpayer on this investment. Therefore, from this California type of accounting, we must conclude that that real estate project was a serious mistake and a financial blunder of the first order.

I always supposed that big corporations under our private enterprise system commonly borrow money thus creating an interest bearing debt in order to carry on their business venture but this California interest cost calculation has me confused. Let us take the biggest corporation in California, or to be specific, we might take the Southern Pacific Railroad, which has been organized for perhaps 75 years. That great railroad company no doubt has outstanding bonds representing the money it has borrowed and those bonds undoubtedly bear interest. Would Congressman POULSON picture the financial worth of the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. by drawing up one of his unbalance

sheets for this great corporation showing only one column and have that made up only of the total amount of interest which the railroad company has paid out or was obligated to pay out on its borrowed money? If so I fear that great railroad company would not seek his services to present such a sheet, for it would not be a pretty picture either to the owners or to any financially minded person and certainly not to investors.

However, I shall not attempt levity to match the Californian's sophistry. The utter absurdity is apparent of charging up the possible interest on any good investment and presenting it as a half statement without any consideration whatsoever being given to the far greater offsetting benefits. These counterbalancing benefits are in wealth-creating, taxpaying, social, and economic cultural developments which make the money cost seem small in comparison even to the money returns. Yet this distorted half picture is the type of figuring the new accountancy which this school of obstructionists in Los Angeles are presenting to Congress and to the country concerning irrigation projects in Arizona. I wonder how many people are being fooled by such a distorted, halfway presentation of these economic and financial facts.

When Secretary Chapman computed some interest costs in relation to the seventeenth question which the Californians submitted to him about the interest charge on the central Arizona project, he merely performed what any mathematician would do in computing a problem in arithmetic, but he did not say thereby that the investment was fantastic or unworthy. If I had asked the Secretary how much interest $15,000,000 invested in Louisiana would have accumulated in 147 years at a certain stated rate of interest, he would have answered $5,269,168,668 correctly, but that would not have expressed his opinion that Jefferson made a blunder in such an investment. If I wanted to deride the founding of New York City and figure the cost according to this California style, I might recall that the Dutch, in the year 1609, paid $25 for Manhattan Island. Now, interest rates were high in those days. So we might compute the interest on $25 at 10 percent during the 341 years and show what a bad bargain and crazy investment the Dutch made in the purchase of that land. However, I have never seen any such one-column unbalance sheet drawn up by the chamber of commerce or the Chase National Bank, or any other financial authority for advertising purposes in America's greatest city. Ask any New Yorker whether this special California brand of accounting in computing interest charges alone appeals to him.

Perhaps this special brand of California bookkeeping coming as it does out of Los Angeles does not have great appeal to the Californians in the great Central Valley. Knowing Congressman POULSON's attitude, as I do, toward reclamation projects, in California, as in Arizona, I am sure he would just as soon apply this picture to the great California development in the Central Valley as he would to apply it to the central Arizona project. The other day he said that reclamation projects ought to be put in moth balls, but I think he meant to say, all such plans should be thrown into the ashcan, and that is the purpose of his variety of accounting. If we apply his brand of cost accounting to the great California development which may take more than a hundred years to complete I am sure the interest charge alone on the hundreds of millions of dollars put into the project would total five or six billions of dollars. That is the comparative picture which these so-called friends of irrigation would have Congress see and have the American people believe their Government is attempting to do in that great agricultural empire only now half developed in central California.

If we listen to these men for whom Congressman POULSON appears to be spokesman we will put an end to irrigation and turn over as quickly as possible all the power-producing facilities thus far built in order to furnish the Power Trust the cheapest possible hydroelectric power at the bus bar. Los Angeles wants more and cheaper power for her growth. That is the hoped-for effect of their figuring and this is a sample of their method of figuring.

How Communists Operate, by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, and Answer to Vicious Editorial in Washington Post

---

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question just asked concerning Communist publications, I desire to call attention to the fact that one of the outstanding publications that is doing more harm than anything else here in the District of Columbia is the Washington Post, sometimes referred to as "the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker."

On yesterday, August 7, that publication quoted with approval Soviet Russia's attack on the United States to the effect that "American democracy is false, because we flagrantly violate the premises of democracy by discriminating against particular groups in our own country, because they have different national origin or racial derivation."

Remember, that was an editorial in yesterday's Washington Post. That publication is lined up with an un-American front known as the "Anti-defamation League," which has a file on every man who amounts to anything in America—whether he is a Member of Congress, Governor of a State, member of a State legislature, a businessman, or just a private citizen of influence in the locality in which he lives. It is carrying on the most infamous persecution of white Americans ever known in all the history of this country.

This Washington Post is also lined up behind the so-called National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which is doing the law abiding Negroes of this country more harm than any other organization outside of the Communist Party itself.

The Post, in this editorial, commenting on the attack on the United States by Soviet Russia, says:

> These charges have the sting of truth.

A more infamous falsehood never stained the pages of an American publication, or polluted the cowardly lips of depraved humanity.

Russia's charges not only do not have the "sting of truth"; but they are vicious lies that are being spread throughout the world to try to destroy our form of Government, and to wreck the civilization of mankind.

This same editorial goes on to say that—

> The Capital of the United States, with all its memorials here dedicated to liberty, maintains the policy of Negro segregation in housing, in the schools, in most forms of business, in hospitals, and in churches.

This Washington Post has for several years carried on this Communist smear propaganda to try to force Negroes into white schools, playgrounds, swimming pools, and churches of the District of Columbia, for the sole purpose of stirring trouble between the races here in Washington. The better element of the Negroes here in the District of Columbia have appealed to us to help them get segregated places where they can meet and not be bothered with members of other races, especially the ones who are interested in promoting communism and stirring up racial friction throughout the country.

The white Americans throughout the country are appealing to us to protect them from these communistic influences.

The editorial to which I refer will undoubtedly be repeated in Pravda and other Communist publications throughout the world.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting excerpts from an article from the United States News entitled "How Communists Operate," an interview with J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In this connection, let me say that J. Edgar Hoover is a great American, and he is doing everything he can to expose the Communists and to protect our country from these enemies within our gates.

In this interview Mr. Hoover was asked this question:

> Do you think, Mr. Hoover, that Communists are basically agents of a foreign country, or do you draw a distinction between those who are philosophical Communists and those who are tools of the Communist spy rings?

His answer was:

> The teachings of communism are directed toward one final result—world revolution and the triumph of international communism. The achievement of this aim would mean the violent and complete destruction of the American Government. Any person who subscribes to these teachings, regardless of his reason, is working against American de-

mocracy and for the benefit of international communism's chief leader, Soviet Russia. The "philosophical Communist" who advocates Marxism-Leninism might just as well be working as an agent of a foreign power because he is aiding its cause. He is, in fact, however, being "played for a sucker" by the Communists, who consider him a dupe, a person not to be trusted but only to be used and then discarded.

Then he was asked:

Do your investigators show that the basic allegiance of a Communist is to a foreign government rather than our own Government?

To which he replied:

Most emphatically. As I mentioned in my previous answer, the ultimate loyalty of fully indoctrinated Communist Party members is to Moscow. Stalin is represented as the foremost leader of international communism, the omnipotent oracle from whom all wisdom flows. The Communist Party is today a Trojan horse of disloyalty, coiled like a serpent in the very heart of America.

It may mouth sweet words of "peace," "democracy," "equality," and flourish gay slogans of "international solidarity" and "brotherhood of men," but its body and feet are from the Russian bear. Wherever the Trojan horse of Communist fifth columns has walked, the indelible footprints of Russian imperialism remain behind.

The interview proceeded with the following questions and answers, which I hope every Member of Congress, and every other law-abiding American, will take the time to read:

Question. How do the Communist cells operate? Are these the training units out of which larger numbers of Communists are recruited?

Answer. The basic unit of the Communist Party is the club. These clubs may be shop or industrial clubs, that is, Communist units within a special manufacturing or industrial plant, or neighborhood clubs, drawing members from residential areas. These clubs are coordinated through an elaborate apparatus, from ward, city, county, state, and district organizations to national headquarters in New York City. Because of security reasons, they have now been divided into small groups consisting of three to five members. In these clubs the Communist Party conducts its basic and fundamental activities: instruction in Marxism-Leninism, organization of pressure campaigns, the passing out of leaflets and handbills, the circulation of petitions. Here Communist literature is sold, dues collected, instructions received from higher officials disseminated. The club is the basic operating unit of the Communist Party. Through the club, of course, new members are recruited and indoctrinated.

Question. Do your studies of the Communist techniques over the years show that the Communists are trained to lie about their status?

Answer. The basic premise of communism is deceit and hypocrisy. The Communist philosophy teaches that every available means must be utilized to achieve the final end—world revolution. For this reason the Communist will lie, cheat, and resort to any tactics which will gain his end. He will advocate today exactly what he denounced yesterday. And with a straight face. Has he lied? No; he will say, he's only carrying out party policy. The concept of morality and fair play, as practiced in our democracy, is alien and repugnant to him. Moreover, the Communists employ a purposive double-talk, roundabout style, known as Aesopian language, in their literature and speeches, designed to deceive and evade, to clothe their true thoughts. This technique, utilized by Lenin, is the very epitome of deceit.

Question. What does membership in the Communist Party really mean? Does it mean a formal joining or does it mean informal adherence?

Answer. When an individual joins the Communist Party he agrees to accept, in full, the principles of Marxism-Leninism. I mentioned previously that to accept these teachings means, in the final analysis, working for world revolution—in the boots of Russian imperialism—and the destruction of American democracy.

There is no halfway point: The individual accepts fully these obligations or he does not become a member. If later he refuses to abide by these rules—as defined by the party hierarchy—he is expelled. This is no informal adherence. You are either a full member or an enemy.

NO MORE PARTY CARDS

Question. Do Communist members carry cards any more? Did they previously carry cards?

Answer. As a security measure no Communist Party membership cards were issued in 1949. In previous years, with certain exceptions, they were issued. I might mention, in this connection, that the open maintenance of membership records has been discontinued. Today the Communist Party is becoming more and more deceitful and underhanded in its operations.

Question. Are there any sections of the country which are relatively free from Communists?

Answer. Communists may be found in most sections of the United States. Of course, in some areas, the Communists are more thickly located than in others. But, as a general rule, the Communists are less strong in agricultural areas. And there is a reason for this.

Question. In what centers do Communists tend to congregate.

Answer. The Communists are strongest today in the industrial areas of the United States—in States such as New York, California, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan. Of course, these States being heavily populated, you would expect more members there than in the less populated States. But that is not the entire reason. The Communists, as a basic principle of infiltration, are interested in possessing strength in heavy industry, that is, coal, steel, rubber, automobile, etc. It is here that, in event of an emergency, they can do their greatest harm to the country's economy.

Moreover, in these industries one Communist Party member located in a strategic job can wreak damage completely out of proportion to his own strength. Through this heavy-industry concentration policy the Communists are able to exercise a power far in excess of their numbers. In fact, one of the highest-ranking leaders of communism in the United States has openly admitted:

"The Communist Party bases its work directly upon the mills, mines, and factories. Its principle is to make every shop a fortress for communism. * * * It concentrates its work upon the heavy industries and those of a war character."

That is one of the potential sabotage dangers facing America today.

WHY CONVICTIONS ARE DIFFICULT

Question. Are there many suspected Communists or suspected agents of foreign governments who could not be successfully prosecuted even though you have considerable suspicion about them?

Answer. The matter of prosecution, of course, is the exclusive responsibility of the Department of Justice. However, to successfully sustain a prosecution, legal evidence is necessary. Our laws regarding espionage are technical, requiring legal evidence, which is often most difficult to obtain because spies do not carry on their activities in the presence of witneses but under a cover of stealth, because party members trained in deceit either decline to furnish information or misrepresent the facts in an attempt to conceal the acts of their associates.

Question. Is this because you need corroborative evidence and this is not always possible to attain, or is it because the laws at present are not clear concerning the unlawfulness of Communist activitities?

Answer. We have had frequent cases in the past where we have developed the full facts, but, due to the passage of time, the fleeing of witnesses from the United States, and other matters beyond our control, the development of corroborative evidence is physically impossible. As to the adequacy of existing laws, this is a matter not within the province of the FBI.

Question. Have you suggested from time to time to Congress any principles that might be embodied in legislation concerning Communists?

Answer. The FBI is not a policy-making organization and the advocacy of specific legislation is not within the scope of its authority. The FBI, however, has furnished, from time to time, its observations to the Attorney General on ways to strengthen its activities.

Question. Does the FBI have adequate means for the detection of Communists who are foreign agents or saboteurs?

Answer. The Communists, foreign agents, and saboteurs operate behind a smoke screen of stealth and deception. There must be a starting point in every investigation. The FBI has the means of detection if it receives sufficient information on which to predicate an investigation.

EVERY ONE A POTENTIAL SPY

Question. Is the FBI interested in knowing of the detection of any Communists, or is it interested only in those who are connected with espionage rings or possible sabotage?

Answer. The FBI is primarily interested in those members of the Communist Party who might be engaged in espionage, sabotage, or who constitute a potential threat to the internal security of the United States. Increasingly, however, with the development of the outward manifestations of a revolutionary movement in the Communist Party, the FBI is interested in knowing the identity of all Communists in the United States, as any Communist, properly qualified, might be recruited into espionage. He may today be circulating peace petitions or selling Communist literature. Tomorrow he may be sabotaging American industry or serving as an espionage courier. We are interested in identifying, therefore, every member of this international conspiracy in our midst, because every Communist is a potential saboteur and espionage agent.

Question. Would you, for instance, have an actual list of 55,000 Communists, or is this an estimate?

Answer. When the figure of 55,000 Communists in the United States was made public, there was considerable speculation in party circles as to the accuracy of the figures. Later, when detailed tabulations by States were made public, the Communists in various districts manifested great concern as to where we obtained our figures.

Question. Are there many Communists who have confessed and turned in valuable evidence to the FBI?

Answer. An individual who has seen the error of his ways and has been converted from the ensnaring tentacles of communism can be as reliable as any other type of witness. Many former members of the Communist Party have been of invaluable assistance in our investigations.

Question. What motivates these Communists to confess their relationships with espionage, etc.?

Answer. What motivates one person might be a minor factor for another individual. Many influences affect these individuals, causing them to seek the truth. However, from an over-all point of view, one factor emerges crystal clear: These individuals have realized that communism was a falsehood and a perversion of the truth.

MANY DISILLUSIONED

Question. Do you believe there are many people who formerly were Communists and who now have changed their views?

Answer. Many individuals associated with the Communist movement—even some of those in high places—have become disillusioned with this godless conspiracy and have renounced their allegiance. They have tasted of communism and found the taste bitter and repugnant. Many of these men and women hoped, through joining the Communist Party, to work for a bright new world, for peace and improved democracy. But these hopes became shattered, for some, quickly; for others more slowly.

Once inside the Communist world they could see with their own eyes the hypocrisy, deceit, and terror which is the essence of Marxism-Leninism. They recognized communism for what it is—brutal tyranny coated with false hopes and promises. For them there was only one course: to renounce communism.

The fact, however, that they have seen the errors of their ways and renounced communism does not entirely excuse their wrongs. The alibi that every person was radical in his youth or was a Communist sympathizer in the 1930's is a malicious falsehood. The great masses of Americans never fell for the schemes of the Communist swindlers.

Question. Do you generally find that confessed Communists or confessed espionage agents are reliable in their testimony—that is, where you have been able to verify or check upon their statements with one or more witnesses?

Answer. The testimony of any person must be judged on the basis of that individual's knowledge of the truth, his ability to know of what he speaks, and, from a practical standpoint in any type of case, the value of his testimony must be interpreted by corroboration. In each case we endeavor to verify information furnished us. In some instances the very nature of the information makes verification impossible, such as a meeting of two people. But, if one of the individuals traveled extensively, or stayed in the locale, these facts, subject to verification, can lend credence to his story. Weight must be given to the witness whose recital of facts can be verified by proof.

Question. Does the FBI determine who shall or shall not be prosecuted, or is the function of the FBI solely to collect the information and transmit it to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice?

Answer. The FBI is the investigative arm of the United States Department of Justice, charged with the duty of investigating violations of the laws of the United States, collecting evidence in cases in which the United States is or may be a party in interest, and performing other duties imposed by law. The FBI's function is solely and exclusively that of investigation, to obtain the complete and accurate facts. The FBI does not, at any time, evaluate, make recommendations or draw conclusions from the results of its investigations. That is the responsibility of the Criminal Division and the United States attorneys.

Question. Do you believe that pitiless publicity will be helpful in running down Communists?

Answer. Absolutely. The Communists, by their very nature, are conspiratorial. They operate under a cloak of deceit. Communism can be defeated by an alert and aroused public opinion, conscious of the evils of Marxist-Leninist chicanery. The newspapers and magazines, the radio and television, by informing the Nation of the true character of communism, are rendering invaluable services.

I would never fear communism in America if all Communists were out in the open, peddling their wares in the market place of free speech and thought. But they are not. We cannot meet them on an even basis. They are working behind the masquerade of hypocrisy. For this reason America must be vigilant to recognize communism for what it actually is—a malicious evil which would destroy this Nation.

Question. Do you believe that public exposures through congressional committees, when properly safeguarded to avoid implication of innocent parties, could be helpful in drawing public attention to instances and episodes involving espionage and other Communist activity?

Answer. With the laws of libel and slander militantly used by subversives, exposures, under oath, with safeguards to protect the innocent, are necessary. A private citizen or even a great metropolitan daily paper does not have the facilities to make the investigations. Hence, many exposures can be made only through an official investigating committee possessing the power of subpena with persuasive facilities such as laws covering perjury and the power to cite for contempt.

Question. Are there any suggestions you can make as to how the public can detect Communists and report them to the FBI?

Answer. A Communist is not always easy to identify. He is trained in deceit and uses cleverly camouflaged movements to conceal his real purposes. But he may frequently be detected by certain common characteristics. He will always espouse the cause of Soviet Russia over that of the United States. His viewpoint and position will shift with each change in the Communist Party line. He will utilize a language of double talk—referring to the Soviet-dominated countries as democracies and complain that the United States is imperialistic. He will attempt to infiltrate and gain control of organizations and subvert them to the use of the party.

Mr. Speaker, if I had my way, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of which Edgar Hoover is the head, would be made an independent agency of this Government, and given the power to secure information in every quarter of the world and report directly to the Congress of the United States.

That would do more to turn back this tide of communistic fanaticism, expose the enemies within our gates, and protect our Nation now and in the years to come, than anything else that could be done at this time.

God save America.

Social Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the pending social security bill has been held up for several weeks by an amendment offered in the other body on unemployment insurance. Many Members of the House do not know that the Knowland amendment to break down the unemployment insurance system which was adopted on the floor of the other body was opposed by the Senate Finance Committee. This amendment has nothing to do with old-age pensions at all. The Knowland amendment deals with unemployment insurance administered by the Secretary of Labor. It is a bad amendment.

But even more important than the fact that it is a bad amendment is that it is holding up final passage of the social security bill. Millions of American people are anxiously waiting for the passage of the social security bill so that they can get the increased benefits which Congress has voted. But the adoption of this irrelevant amendment by the other body has jeopardized the possibility of millions of aged persons, widows, and dependent children getting their increased benefits promptly.

The Knowland amendment jeopardizes the welfare of the aged. It jeopardizes the welfare of widows and dependent children. I am opposed to it.

Weevils in the Storehouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the July issue of the Farm Journal, entitled "Weevils in the Storehouse."

This editorial clearly points out how the reckless spending policy of the present administration for the past several years has been undermining the value of the American dollar.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEEVILS IN THE STOREHOUSE

Farmers have long respected the United States dollar. As a storehouse of value, as well as a medium of exchange, the dollar was for generations as good as a hog or a steer. It was better; the animal might get sick or die, or decline in price. The dollar was durable. If paper, one could easily get a gold dollar for it.

One could put away a few spare dollars in full confidence that they would perform as expected when needed again. The work which earned a dollar could be stored for future use. At any time it could be exchanged for equivalent work done by someone else.

The American dollar is still the strongest currency in the world. The regard which other nations entertain for the dollar helps to obscure its shameful failure to keep serving as a storehouse of value.

Your $10 bill says that "The United States of America will pay to the bearer on demand ten dollars." Take your bill to a bank or to the Treasury and demand $10. The most you will get will be another piece of paper with the same printed promise.

The $10 bill looks about the same, and you can still trade it for another $10 bill. Not since 1934, however, has paper been exchangeable for gold.

Suppose that in 1939 you laid a $10 bill aside. You stored what was then $10 worth of your work. You plan now to use the $10 in its other function, as a medium of exchange. Can you exchange it now for as much work as you put into it? You know the answer.

"Prices have risen," people say. Your 1939 $10 bill will now buy about what you could have bought in 1939 for $5.94. "Prices have risen" is only another way to say that "$10 bills have gone down."

Weevils have been in the storehouse. They have chewed away at every insurance policy and savings account. They endanger today's savings. The rate of decline has been such that compound interest cannot keep up with inflation.

The failure of the dollar to store full value is an extremely serious matter. The weevils are the pressures which lead Government to keep on spending more than it takes in. The temptation to spend public money bears heavily upon every ordinary politician. The pressures upon him to support spending are specific. They represent votes he can identify. The sentiment for not spending is general. The pleasures of inflation tend to overwhelm common sense.

As long as Government spends more than it takes in, the ability of the dollar to store value will sift out. The fact is unpleasant. Only support by informed and courageous people will create statesmen courageous enough to reverse this trend.

We Cannot Do All the Fighting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "We Can't Do All the Fighting," published in the Kansas City Star under the date of Sunday, July 30, 1950. This editorial reflects the thinking on the part of millions of Americans and points out some realistic approaches that all of us should have the courage to face. The editorial is so challenging and worth while that I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Senate and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN'T DO ALL THE FIGHTING

The Russians are showing themselves to be the ruthless masters of a new military-political technique. They first enslave a helpless population such as the North Koreans. Then, under the guns of Soviet armed might, a native army is formed, trained, equipped and subsequently sent to fight—for Russia. But, while the fighting is on, the Soviet Union pretends to have nothing to do with it and goes ahead proclaiming itself the great protector of world peace.

Under this procedure the Kremlin may hope to wear down the United States by using the soldiers of other nations against us, provided we continue to insist on fighting them with our own men, instead of enlisting the support of others as the Russians have done.

What is the administration going to do about it? Congress has vetoed any plan for a foreign legion. But at least a start has been made by a recent law under which a few Germans, Japanese, Poles, Czechs and others will be recruited for service with the American Army. They will be trained with American weapons, they will receive the same pay as Americans and after 5 years of service will be entitled to American citizenship.

It is the intention to scatter these men through the American forces and in the event of another war to use them in their homelands to make contact with the underground forces. The proposal originally was for 25,000 enlistments, then the number was whittled down to 2,500 by Congress before the Korean crisis.

But certainly this force is not enough. Under the impact of the Korean experience military men believe the number of these foreign forces will be increased. Why should only American men be sent to fight and perhaps die in defense of world trouble spots when men of other nationalities are available?

This Government surely is not so stupid as to fail to find some method of directly countering Russia's use of non-Soviet peoples in Asia and Europe to conduct wars for the advancement of communism.

Our great difficulty in trying to meet the Korean situation with the military strength now available to the United States and less-powerful United Nations allies ought to convince us that we should find another way. But if this so-far-localized conflict has not already made the need clear, we should keep in mind other developments which could provide the makings of the global war we have been trying so hard to prevent.

In east Germany the Russian occupation officials are organizing an army along with an air force and a navy of sorts. It reliably is reported to number at least 75,000 men, including many combat veterans of the old wehrmacht. For purposes of deceit, this organization is called the "people's police" by the Communist government of east Germany. Yet it is equipped with tanks, heavy artillery, machine guns, mortars, and all the weapons used by a modern army but not needed to maintain law and order.

The intended mission of this new army is as clear as the present aggression in Korea. It one day will be ordered by the Soviet commanders in east Germany to march against west Germany. By that time it will doubtless be much larger than it now is. Its declared objective will be "reunification" of Germany. When this force crosses the border between east and west Germany, it will expect to find little opposition.

Certainly there would be little if this army only had to confront the small allied forces stationed in Germany. Nor would west Germany as it is now organized be able to defend itself. For, in accordance with the four-power agreement to demilitarize Germany, we have permitted the establishment of only a 50,000-man police force. Its members are not equipped with military weapons.

The question therefore is whether we are going to stand by and let the west Germans be overrun by the east Germans just as the North Koreans are doing to the South Koreans. We know that the agreement to deprive all Germany of arms has been voided by Russia.

Why, then, should we continue to honor it? Why not make certain that west Germany can be defended? If we were to do that, Russia would be must less likely to order an east German attack against an area capable of resisting effectively.

There is a closely related question of why we do not make use of trained Japanese manpower to help turn back the Korean Communists. The answer is that Japan's new constitution, whose drafting was guided by our occupation officials, forbids military activities by the Japanese. But it was drawn up under conditions much different from those we have been able to recognize since the assault on Korea. We now should consider whether the neutral state we decreed for Japan ought not to be changed so that the Japanese at our direction could have a part in defending their section of the Far East against Communist enslavement.

Such moves would be drastic. They would be a complete departure from our present postwar policy toward Germany and Japan. But if we are to avoid further use of the technique developed by Russia for Korea, we shall be compelled to find the way to check or defeat its employment.

America does not have the manpower to police the whole world against future Soviet aggressions. We are going to require a lot of assistance. The logical source of it is the native populations of countries which otherwise would be the helpless victims of attacks plotted and directed—if not actually carried out—by the Russian rulers of the world Communist movement.

Columbia University Bars Circulation of Stockholm Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have received from Dean Kenneth D. Johnson a copy of the memorandum from the provost of Columbia University denying the use of the university facilities for the circulation of the so-called Stockholm peace petition and of the notice from Dean Johnson's office with reference to the use of the grounds and buildings of the New York School of Social Work. This type of prompt, constructive action on the part of the officials of a great American university is highly commendable. It should be a further inspiration to us in taking equally prompt and vigorous action expressing the opinion of Congress in this matter.

The memorandum and notice are as follows:

[Columbia University in the City of New York, N. Y. Provost of the university]

MEMORANDUM FROM THE PROVOST'S OFFICE

The University has been requested to recognize a new student organization entitled Student Peace Committee. The primary, and perhaps the sole, purpose of this organization, apparently, is to secure signatures in the University community to the so-called "World Peace Appeal" or Stockholm "Resolution."

Secretary of State Acheson, in his press conference on July 12, branded this resolution as "a propaganda trick in the spurious 'peace offensive' of the Soviet Union." The Secretary further pointed out that proposed special condemnation of the use of atomic weapons was "an utterly cynical begging of the question. The real crime against humanity is aggression, and in particular, the

deliberate resort to armed aggression in defiance of the United Nations. The war criminals are the people who sanction such action."

In view of this official statement of the attitude of the United States Government toward this peace petition, it seems quite clear that the University should refuse to allow its facilities or its sponsorship to be used for such propaganda purposes. The request, therefore, must be denied.

GRAYSON KIRK.

NOTICE

Attention is called to the attached copy of Memorandum from the Provost's Office referring to "Student Peace Committee."

Pursuant to University policy expressed in this memorandum there is to be no circulation of the so-called "World Peace Appeal" or "Stockholm Resolution" on or within the grounds and buildings of the New York School of Social Work.

KENNETH D. JOHNSON, *Dean.*

JULY 27, 1950.

The New Dilemma of Europe and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an important dispatch from Rome by Anne O'Hare McCormick appearing in the New York Times on July 19, 1950, entitled "The New Dilemma of Europe and the United States". When I spoke to the American Chamber of Commerce in Rome, I urged the imperative need of agrarian reform. This column emphasizes the importance of building up our defenses in the west as well as in the east. I particularly call attention to the statement that "the spread of the Communist peace campaign to cover war moves is almost as great a danger to Europe as physical aggression." Unhappily, we in the United States have not been sufficiently conscious of this danger—and are doing pitifully little about it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW DILEMMA OF EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

ROME, July 18.—The great dilemmas of Italy are overshadowed for the time by thoughts of another war. Even before news from Korea, the bright varnish of recovery and reconstruction distracted the stranger's eye from the darker aspects of the picture. It is easy for Italians to take cheerful views of the future and easy for the visitor in this genial atmosphere to share their confidence that, if peace holds, another 5 years will see the country out of the worst of its troubles.

For the past 5 years the Italian economy and the plans and prospects of the people have been geared to peace. The nation has manifested such recuperative power that it surprised itself as well as outsiders and led many to believe that there were no problems that time and tranquillity will not solve. The problems are still th[illegible] however, and they rise to the surface [illegible]in with the threat to peace and the fear that there may not be a time to build anew before there is another smash.

Once more the matter of survival begins to preoccupy the mind of western Europe. How can we defend ourselves against sudden attack? How much help can we expect from the United States? These are the questions Europeans are asking themselves—and us.

A LONG WAY BACK

It seems a long way back since the foreign ministers of the Atlantic Pact countries met in London and decided to take immediate steps to pool their military resources into one army. The note of impatient urgency Secretary Acheson introduced into that conference has been justified by events, but in 2 months practically nothing has been done to translate the resolution of the 12 ministers into action. The deputies who were to be in continuous session have not yet held a meeting.

The effects of this uncertainty are so disturbing that American diplomats over here are urging the President to reiterate in an unequivocal statement that our engagement in the Pacific, instead of lessening our military aid to Europe, impels us to increase it. They believe that the Atlantic Pact deputies should meet at once to carry out the commitments made in London. To dispel the uncertainties of our friends in the West, as well as to deter Russia from striking here while we are occupied elsewhere, nothing is needed so much as decisive proof that Europe comes first in our calculations.

For these are the nations that can be most easily helped to help themselves. They are pretty weak and defenseless at this juncture, because like ourselves they believed that war would be followed by peace and that the best way to perpetuate peace was not by maintaining armies but by restoring order, prosperity, and freedom. As a country which has been disarmed militarily, reformed politically, and built up economically and morally, Italy is a good example of the success of a postwar policy which put all the emphasis on recovery.

FROM RECOVERY TO DEFENSE

But present developments compel the Italians, as they compel the French and the British, to turn their thoughts from recovery to defense. Two events occurring this week in Italy illustrate the point. One is the adoption of that part of a far-reaching agrarian reform bill that applies to the most neglected areas. The program of expropriating uncultivated land and distributing it among the poor peasants is already being carried out in some arid and undeveloped districts in the south. The present law will extend the program to other regions on terms that will distinguish between the productive and unproductive landlords and spread ownership among the landless. Even the general law, if put into effect, is not adequate to solve the agricultural problem. Italy itself is not adequate. The dream plan to settle a million persons in Sardinia depends for its realization on the results of a survey of the island's resources to be made by the Rockefeller Foundation. The question is: Will the fulfillment of this thrilling project be postponed; will the slow-paced land reform be still further slowed down because the cost of this essential work of reconstruction will have to be diverted to building up the army?

The second event is the inauguration of "a crusade of truth" to counteract the Communists' "crusade of peace" which is using the Korean war for all it is worth to organize popular opposition against the United States, the United Nations and the Atlantic Pact. When Premier de Gaspari told this correspondent the other day that instead of suppressing Communist activity he meant to start a movement in every commune to unite all opposing parties, he was not speaking in general terms. The "positive campaign" has already begun. Whether or not it is inspired by the American decision to wage a grand scale propaganda war, there is no question that the spread of the Communist peace campaign to cover war moves is almost as great a danger to Europe as physical aggression.

Korea has shocked western Europe into the realization that it not only has to fight on two fronts but that part of its economic and social defense program has to be sacrificed to armament. But the extent to which it will arm itself depends on the assurances it receives of American support. If the United States hopes to build up an effective mutual defense system the best way to go about it is to ship over here some highly visible tokens of military power.

Unjustified Increases in Price Levels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Mr. Albert J. Loveland, former Under Secretary of Agriculture, to Mr. Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, and another letter, also written by Mr. Loveland to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 3, 1950.

HON. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRANNAN: In view of the international emergency and the inevitable rising costs, I recommend and urge that the Department of Agriculture initiate as soon as possible a program to increase hog production.

A program of this kind is needed now both to increase the meat supply for whatever might be ahead, and to help stabilize the price of meat to consumers.

Such a program must necessarily be backed up by a reasonable price guaranty that will assure a fair return to farmers. It should go into effect, in my opinion, this fall, and be extended through the marketing period for the 1951 spring pig crop, for which farmers will be making breeding plans soon.

I would suggest a price-support level assuring the farmer a corn-hog price ratio of not less than 12 to 13 to 1. This is well below the market price for hogs now and the probable price for hogs next winter and spring. It would be beneficial to consumers, and would enable farmers to plan with confidence.

Our experience has proved that food is one of our greatest assets, whether in a campaign for peace, or one against aggression. We know also that in a period of inflation one of our best safeguards against excessively high and burdensome food prices, especially for those with fixed incomes, is to produce more food.

We have good reserves of most commodities now, except meat. While our present production of meat is high, our population is

growing and there is demand for an even higher production.

A program to increase hog production would begin to have beneficial results by early winter. It should also be helpful in stabilizing meat prices during the period immediately ahead.

Our fortunate policy of building and maintaining large reserves of corn and other feed grains puts us in a favorable position to call for an increase in hog production now.

We will have between 900,000,000 and 1,000,000,000 bushels of corn in the carry-over reserve next fall. We can profitably use a part of this now to increase the meat supply and to help stabilize food costs. But the corn taken out of the reserve should be replaced as rapidly as possible, so we can keep it at the present high level.

Our corn crop in Iowa is from 2 to 3 weeks late. We cannot expect as large a crop to be harvested as had been anticipated a month ago.

Therefore, I recommend that there be no acreage allotments on corn for the year 1951, and that full production be encouraged within the limits of good soil conservation.

I further recommend that every effort be made to keep the full 90 percent of parity loan rate on corn for the year 1951.

I am aware that this would require revision of the present farm law to prevent the sliding scale loan rate (85 percent of parity for the 1951 crop) from automatically going into effect. I am writing to the chairmen of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees asking that they consider this suggestion.

In formulating any program to increase hog production, the present high and still rising level of farm costs must be kept in mind. It would not be right to ask the farmer to add to his already high costs without some positive guaranties that he will not be left holding the bag, in the event markets might be depressed temporarily as a result of the increase in hog production.

It is important that the mistake made during the last war not be repeated. I refer to the December-January period of 1943–44, the year farmers were asked to make a big increase in hog production to help win the war. Hog growers went all-out to increase production. They expected to receive a minimum floor price of $13.75 a hundred, Chicago basis, for good and choice market hogs.

However, the weight classification for hogs eligible to receive the guaranty was not broad enough. Markets became glutted. Farmers had to hold back. Market weights became heavier, and good heavy hogs were discounted as much as $1.15 below the minimum price farmers had expected.

We should not, in my opinion, ask farmers to expand their hog-production facilities without a more positive method of guaranteeing that they will not be caught short.

Therefore, I am recommending to the chairman of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees that production payments be authorized for hogs, and be used if necessary.

Should world events make it advisable, a program for increased production along similar lines could be adopted for other livestock, dairy, and poultry products.

In my opinion, a plan of this kind not only would help consumers, but at the same time would give farmers a more positive form of price protection.

We all hope the Korean War can be ended soon. But we cannot be sure, and we dare not gamble on that possibility.

Should the international situation improve in a few months, everyone would benefit from an increase in meat production. Should the war be prolonged, a very large increase in pork will be essential.

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT J. LOVELAND.

AUGUST 3, 1950.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: I am writing today to the Secretary of Agriculture making a number of recommendations as to measures which, in my opinion, should be given careful consideration at this time concerning agricultural programs related to the present war emergency. A copy of this letter is enclosed.

I have recommended to the Secretary: (1) That the Department of Agriculture initiate as soon as possible a program to increase hog production, not only to increase the meat supply but to help stabilize meat prices.

(2) That this program be supported by a price guaranty assuring farmers a corn-hog price ratio of not less than 12 to 13 to 1—roughly $18 to $19 a hundredweight.

(3) That the Department of Agriculture have no acreage allotments on corn for the 1951 crop, first, because our present large reserve will have to be used in part to get more hog production, and second because it is important in my opinion to replace what we use out of the reserve as rapidly as possible.

I am sure you will agree that in the present emergency, with both farm and city family costs rising, an increase in meat production is both desirable and necessary.

In addition, I respectfully submit for your serious consideration two proposals involving revisions in present legislation which I feel would be helpful in carrying out a program to expand meat production.

The first concerns corn. We will have an abundant carry-over of corn this fall. However, the corn crop in Iowa, the largest producing State, is late. Production will fall short of what had been expected a month ago.

In view of this prospective shorter crop, plus the fact that corn will be needed from our present reserve to increase pork production, I would like to recommend that the present 90 percent of parity loan on corn be continued.

As you know, this would require a revision of the present farm law in order to keep the sliding scale rate, or 85 percent of parity, from automatically going into effect in 1951.

In troubled times like these, next year seems a poor time to initiate a lower loan rate for a crop that is so basic, not only to food production, but to essential war industries. Furthermore, in the long run the Government has never lost money on basic commodities which are easily stored.

The second legislative proposal involves a change in the method of guaranteeing farmers a fair return for increasing hog production. The only method now available is Government purchase of pork in the open market.

During the last war this method was used, along with a direct subsidy to packers. You may recall that in the winter of 1943–44 this system brokn down under pressure of a big increase in hogs. It was unsatisfactory to consumers, and producers suffered unnecessary losses.

Therefore, I wish to recommend that your committee seriously consider authorizing production payments for hogs as a more positive and satisfactory method of guaranteeing that the farmer who is asked to increase his costs by expanding production will not be caught short, should the increase in output depress prices temporarily.

It is my sincere belief that the production payment method of guaranteeing prices for increased production would enable farmers to plan ahead with more confidence, and would in the long run benefit consumers.

I am confident that your serious consideration of these proposals would be applauded by farmers not only in Iowa but all parts of the country.

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT J. LOVELAND.

Stop Government Waste

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the alarm of the gentleman from Minnesota and the splendid remarks he made a moment ago. I think a lot of us in the House are disappointed in the fact that the big one-package appropriation bill sent to the other body, having been reduced in the House by about $1,500,000,000, is now coming back into conference with a reduction of only about $550,000,000.

Another point I would like to raise is this, we should not use the war as a license for unbridled spending. I think, because of the war, we ought to cut the cost of Government on the home front to a greater degree than we cut it when the bill went over to the other body. We can use that money now to buy implements of war with which our soldiers can defend themselves.

Mr. Speaker, when the appropriation bill was passed in the House some 2 months ago and went to the other legislative body, the big budget had been reduced by over a billion dollars. The other body has now considered the legislation and as it goes to the conference committee of the House and Senate it provides for a reduction of only about $550,000,000.

The Republican leadership in that body, joining with Senator BYRD and others, for several days made a strenuous effort for greater reductions, but were not able to overcome the efforts of the administration's leadership. It is regrettable in these serious times that greater reductions could not be made in that body.

All of us realize that as a result of the war with Korea, we will have to appropriate more billions of dollars. The war, however, should not be used to unloose unbridled spending on the home front. It should, and does call for the reduction of every unnecessary expense on the home front. This Congress should cut out every unnecessary expense on the home front, and it should reduce the amount of funds we are giving away as economic aid to other nations.

In 1948 the Republican Congress reduced the cost of Government on the home front to a total of $6,400,000,000 for the departments covered in this bill. For comparable items of domestic spending for these bureaus this year, the President wants to spend $11,600,000,000—an increase over 1948 of $5,200,000,000.

There is no sense in spending this extra $5,200,000,000 in these critical times. Because of the war, domestic spending should be cut back to a total not above

what we spent in 1948. If this Congress now controlled by a heavy Democratic majority in both the House and the Senate would have joined with we Republicans, there could have been saved this extra tax load of $5,200,000,000.

In addition, this Congress has voted about $4,500,000,000 for Marshall-plan aid to some 12 or 15 foreign nations. Our economic aid to foreign nations was for the purpose of helping to raise their living standards to the level those countries enjoyed prior to World War II. All statistics and evidence prove that those nations on the domestic fronts have recovered to a point of about 25 percent above the living conditions they enjoyed before that war, with the exception of Germany, and possibly Austria.

It is my opinion we should reduce this foreign-aid spending in this budget by at least $1,800,000,000.

The Congress on home-front spending, should have cut it back from $11,600,000,000 to $6,400,000,000. This would save $5,200,000,000, to which a saving in Marshall-plan funds of $1,800,000,000 would effect a reduction of $7,000,000,000. Another billion or more could be saved by approving more of the Hoover recommendations.

The President is asking for new taxes in the amount of $10,000,000,000. Had these savings been made, we could turn this money into the war effort and the President would only have to ask for $2,000,000,000, instead of $10,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, it does not seem fair to me to increase the taxes on the American people, and to continue to lavish bountiful financial hand-outs to the civilian economy of the other nations. In fact, we are now up against a battle for the survival of this Nation.

If we refuse to economize on the home front as to Government expense and continue to build up a greater horde of money-burning political bureaucrats here in Washington, we will be playing right into the hands of Stalin who has predicted that this country would spend itself into financial bankruptcy, making it an easy prey through cooperating with the Communists here to take over this country.

Unbearable debt and taxation can destroy our solvency, and if we do not reduce nondefense home-front spending wherever we can, we will hasten such a national disaster.

Our debt today is $260,000,000,000. That is a danger signal that should be heeded—even by this administration.

The Propaganda Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial called The Propaganda Front, from the August 1 issue of the Reporter, published in New York. It is written by Mr. Max Ascoli, the editor, an Italian scholar who went into exile because he could not endure the Mussolini regime. I have admired Mr. Ascoli for years, though our acquaintance is light, and most recently for his efforts to pioneer with his magazine, the Reporter, a magazine which I commend to the Congress. In this editorial, Mr. Ascoli puts his finger on an important point concerning the debate now going on about our propaganda. Some people argue that we cannot preach freedom to people who are living in misery. Mr. Ascoli says: "We must see to it that the largest possible number of people find out by themselves that freedom is the imponderable, all-persuasive element which leavens their lives. It has been so in America; the technical skill and productivity of the American people have developed at about the same pace as their free institutions. There is no reason why this should not be so elsewhere. Now the time has come when other people must have a chance to go through the American experience, with whatever changes and adaptations local circumstances may demand."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROPAGANDA FRONT

We are engaged in a limited war that is kept from turning into a total war by the respect that the United States and Russia have for each other's power. This is a sample war, between ourselves and the Russians, in which our country fights as leader of the United Nations, while Russia sends in weapons but not men. Our military preparedness is being tested and found wanting. Our prestige in the civilized world has proven greater than we ourselves, and certainly the Russians, had ever thought. Anything that happens in a limited war is a portent that strongly influences the thinking and the decisions of men. A limited war is the propaganda equivalent to total war, and may prove to be a substitute for it.

This is indeed the time for propaganda if the bloody effort of our soldiers in Korea is not to prove irrelevant and meaningless. Our propaganda cannot be just a containment of Commnuist lies. It must carry the same poised determination and quiet courage that have charcterized the political decisions of our leaders. It must spell out what our actions imply: that with their next aggression, no matter how disguised, the Russians will bring total war upon themselves. At the same time, as the leader, but by no means the master, of the United Nations, we must state the basic conditions that we deem essential to the reestablishment of peace.

OPERATION TRUTH

The need for an intensified propaganda effort has been quickly felt by some of our outstanding national leaders. Men like Secretary Acheson, General Eisenhower, and Bernard Baruch testified at the congressional hearings on Senator BENTON'S resolution calling for increased funds for the Voice of America. General Eisenhower spoke of "a new kind of general staff"—presumably composed of high-ranking propaganda experts and technicians of persuasion. Mr. Baruch proposed that a "body of thinkers," similar and possibly related to the National Security Council, be set up to direct American propaganda abroad. Every speaker at the hearing was most eloquent on one point: that truth must be the keynote of our propaganda.

This insistence on truth is both heart warming and disconcerting. Whatever we say to our own or to foreign people must be guided by respect for truth, but truth alone cannot determine the aim of what we say. What we say about the future organization of the world must be decided by our intelligence and our will—the intelligence to find out the causes of the world's misery and the will to attack those causes at their roots. After we know what we want, we must tell it to the people of the world with absolute candor, but, first of all, we must have objectives that people everywhere will understand and share. Truth is an invaluable weapon in our propaganda armory, but it is a tactical rather than a strategic weapon.

Moreover, there is something rather disturbing in the insistence that with a hundred million dollars' worth of radio programs we can effectively counteract Communist propaganda. The Moscow radio may be powerful and there may even be some people in our country who listen to it. But Radio Moscow is hardly the main vehicle, or even one of the most important vehicles, of Communist propaganda. In every non-Communist country the Voice of Russia comes through native residents rather than through radio sets.

THE BERLIN MANIFESTO

A "body of thinkers," to use the expression of Mr. Baruch, met recently in Berlin. After a 5-day debate on freedom and peace, eminent writers from all over the non-Communist world finally launched a manifesto addressed to all people—east and west—but primarily to their peers—the craftsmen of expression. In it they tried to summarize their common beliefs—the beliefs that they must defend not for themselves alone but for all those whose thinking and whose emotions are influenced by their work, for it is the function of writers and thinkers to be the caretakers of other people's spiritual life.

In defining freedom, the manifesto is concerned "first of all," as it says, with the "right of the individual to form and express his own opinion"—a right, the manifesto says, that should be enjoyed by everybody with the exception of those who, like the Communists, do not tolerate views different from their own. This is undoubtedly an important aspect of freedom, of particular relevance to opinion-molding or opinion-addicted people. The largest possible variety of different contradictory opinions seems to be the main aim of those who signed the manifesto. Opinion, incidentally, is defined by Webster as "belief stronger than impression, less strong than positive knowledge"—a sort of tentative knowledge, a half-finished product of the rational mind.

But what about those countless human beings who haven't the leisure to form or even understand opinions? What about all those who are so degraded by age-old misery that all their energy is spent in the effort to keep alive? The opinion makers of Berlin seem to have no answer to the plight of those who cannot afford to be consumers of opinion. When it comes to what the world most urgently needs and what thinkers, in a body or individually, are supposed to provide—the beliefs and plans of action that will defeat communism—the manifesto has this to say: "The defense of cultural freedom imposes upon us the duty of creating a culture which shall constitute a positive answer to the questions posed by the revolution now in process throughout the world." This seems to mean that totalitarianism must somehow be contained, while the cultured people are busy looking for the "positive answer." All this does not have much to do with freedom, the patrimony of all men. Rather, it seems to be designed to protect the craft interests of opinion-mongers.

EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

No "body of thinkers" will ever succeed in giving men the burning beliefs that this

fight to a finish demands unless the thinkers themselves become convinced that freedom is essential not only to their own but to every type of labor. Hundreds of millions of human beings need to be given the evidence that freedom pays, that it is an essential condition for the attainment of the things they care about most: Physical survival and improvement of their lot. Men can be free to have different opinions as to the use of what they have or what is available to them only if they have something at hand or within reach. Too many millions of people in the world today need to acquire the minimum conditions of well-being that come before the making of any choice.

The largest possible number of men must have work that allows them to make the best of their lives and gives them, aside from their sustenance, a margin of privacy and of independence. If this margin is enlarged and made secure, if men have leisure enough to figure out how their lot can be further improved, then they start realizing what freedom is. Men can then do better work, for they can acquire a broader view of the things that affect them. They can stop being just toilers and become citizens. The road to freedom doesn't start until men have some work to do, work that brings them profit, develops their individuality, and gives them some independence. There are huge masses all over the world who have not yet started on this road and who under the pressure of evil men may rush to their own destruction.

A relentless attack on misery all over the non-Communist world, wherever some progress can be made, should be the main strategic aim of our leaders and the theme constantly hammered at by our propaganda. We must see to it that the largest possible number of people find out by themselves that freedom is the imponderable, all-pervasive element which leavens their lives. It has been so in America: The technical skill and productivity of the American people have developed at about the same pace as their free institutions. There is no reason why this should not be so elsewhere. Now the time has come when other people must have a chance to go through the American experience, with whatever changes and adaptations local circumstances may demand.

In these days of limited war, the attention of the world is focused on us, on the decisions our leaders make, on the way our soldiers fight, and on the steps we take for both war and peace.

This is the time for the greatest propaganda effort we have ever made, backed up by the example that we set. This is also the time when our bodies of thinkers should emerge from the tumult of opinions and suggest how free institutions may become workable everywhere in the world; for freedom, far from being the particular business of their craft, is everybody's business, and it is their job to prove it.—MAX ASCOLI.

Long Beach, Calif., Junior Chamber of Commerce Wins First Place Nationally in Field of National Security Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have just received word that the Junior Chamber of Commerce of my home city of Long Beach, Calif., was awarded first place at the Chicago convention on the important subject of national security committees.

It appears that Nation-wide these junior chambers of commerce have voluntarily reactivated their membership in this important and imperative field of national security. The digest of the activities of the Long Beach committee shows clearly that it has stayed on the job and been vigorously and vigilantly active in the important matter of national defense as it came their way. The variety of subjects from No. B to XI, inclusive, clearly indicates their voluntary and valuable cooperation in this important field.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt you, too, would like to have the privilege and opportunity of seeing the text of the total report by this winning committee. But, as I only have a digest, I am honored and pleased to present it for the information of yourself and of all my colleagues. I also specifically call your attention to paragraphs A and B and III:

DIGEST OF JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PROJECT IN THE FIELD OF NATIONAL SECURITY—FIRST PLACE WINNER IN THE UNITED STATES

I. GENERAL PLANNING AND PROCEDURE

A. Committee organization: Committee composition, 30 members. The committee is presided over by a chairman elected by the membership. Other elected officers include a vice chairman, a secretary, a public relations chairman, and a special events chairman. The board of directors at the time of the committee's inception authorized two honorary memberships for each armed service: Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, and the California National Guard. The holders of these honorary memberships are, in fact, working members of the committee. Their cooperation has proven of vast aid to the committee. Weekly meetings were held to follow the general pattern:

1. To aid in any way possible the formation of a sound plan for national security.

2. To discuss, investigate, and develop new projects along the above line.

3. To have members and invited guests meet to discuss and investigate all projects in which the committee may aid the community and/or Nation in any way to formulate or carry out any plans for the general security of this area and/or Nation as a whole.

4. To increase the membership and efficiency of the committee.

B. Scope of the national security plan: To act as an effective informant. To inform the public and obtain public support of the program or programs that have and are being formulated by the committee and various other groups for the defense planning of this area and/or Nation as a whole. Also to aid the community in any worth-while endeavor. This broad general plan was carried out as follows:

1. Save the Long Beach Naval Shipyard: A resolution was drafted and sent to Members of Congress, the Secretary of Navy, the Secretary of Defense, and the President of the United States. This project was not successful although a great deal of time and effort was spent on it. Perhaps the reason nothing could be done to save the shipyard was due to the fact, in the words of the Honorable Francis P. Matthews, Secretary of the Navy, "because of the unpredictable nature of the subsidence and the lack of meals for determining the future rate of subsistence."

2. Membership on the Armed Service Commission: The National Security Committee is represented on the Armed Services Commission by the committee chairman.

3. National security to be in charge of aircraft observation posts: The committee was asked by the Long Beach Disaster Council to organize and supervise the men necessary for this project. We feel this is one of the most important tasks a committee of the Long Beach Junior Chamber of Commerce has ever been asked to do by the city of Long Beach. In the future one member of the committee will be appointed to head this project for a period of 1 year and that will be his only duty for that year.

4. Membership on the Long Beach Disaster Council: The Long Beach Disaster Council was formed in 1934, immediately after the Long Beach earthquake, to aid in the time of floods, riots, earthquakes, fires, war, and other civil disturbances. The commmittee, along with the heads of the various departments of the local government, is represented on the council.

5. Opposes closing of the Long Beach Naval Hospital: A resolution was adopted and sent to all interested parties, i. e., Secretaries of the Navy, Defense, the Veterans' Administration, the President, etc., vigorously denouncing the closing of the naval hospital. As yet no final action has been taken by the Government.

6. Distribution of Army Day and Coast Guard Day posters.

7. Members of committee aid services in Reserve program: Radio broadcasts and newspapers were used to inform the public of the Reserve programs.

8. National Security Committee rifle team: Team organized April 1, 1950. Meets once a month for practice and competitive shoots.

9. Veterans' information service set up by committee: This service was set up in cooperation with the Veterans' Administration, manned by members of the committee, on a voluntary public service. The purpose of this project was to help the veteran obtain the information he desired with the least possible red tape and delay.

10. Committee works for release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender: The National Security Committee worked in conjunction with other local organizations to publicize the plight of these two men held prisoner by the Chinese Communists; also to bring pressure to bear on the State Department to hasten their release.

11. Military and naval members of the committee in the news.

12. Last year's award winning scrapbook: This committee's 1948–49 scrapbook won the second place award in national competition.

II. PARTICIPATION

No financial support was necessary. Financial gain was not an objective. The full committee, including honorary members, participated in many programs and projects.

III. BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY

The Long Beach area is a generally attractive area to an enemy attack for many reasons. For this reason the committee has devoted a great deal of time and effort to the formation of an efficient disaster plan. The committee has been in close contact with the Long Beach Disaster Council and hopes to have a complete attack protection plan to present to the public in the near future. The foregoing digest of projects (I. General Planning and Procedure; B. Scope of the National Security Plan: Items 1 through 11) will give a fairly complete survey of the projects completed by this committee that we consider of benefit to the community.

IV. BENEFIT TO ORGANIZATION AND MEMBERS

The fruits of the committee's labor have been fully appreciated by the community as a whole. Belonging to a committee which is active in a most worth-while way is most gratifying and is in itself a great reward. The organization is proud of the committee's

achievements and will realize the full extent of the many contributions made to the Nation's security and well-being by the National Security Committee of the Long Beach Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Respectfully submitted.

LONG BEACH JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL SECURITY COMMITTEE,
BENNETT H. JACOBS, *Chairman.*

This digest furnished me is signed by Bennett H. Jacobs, chairman of this important Junior Chamber of Commerce Committee. It is a pleasure for me to know this able, vigorous, and vigilant young man personally—a successful young merchant in his own right—as being typical of each and every other member of this committee. I congratulate him as chairman. I congratulate the entire committee personnel. And I congratulate the Long Beach Junior Chamber of Commerce on this further achievement in this timely field.

The Vanishing American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the Honorable Malcolm McDermott, professor of law at Duke University, before the Virginia State Bar Association at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va. This able address is entitled "The Vanishing American."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VANISHING AMERICAN

A few years ago there came from the pen of one of your talented fellow citizens a delightful volume entitled "The Vanishing Virginian." It was read with keen enjoyment by all your neighbors, as I can testify, not because we were intrigued with the idea of the approaching extinction of the species "homo Virginiensis," but rather because of the charming manner in which Mrs. Williams gave us an insight into the wholesome family life of Virginia at the turn of the century. One could not lay the book down without uttering the prayer, "God forbid that this manner of living should vanish from the earth," for here was real American life—lived by truly American characters.

Virginia, which has given so much to the formation and molding of our national character, must see to it that in this unhappy era of false doctrines the fundamentals of your State's greatness shall not be lost to the Nation. It may well be that by the preserving and holding up of these, America may yet be led back into paths of sanity and saved from the course that now threatens her undoing. As one who has long admired and been grateful for what your State has done, let me say that I hope you will never cease to take pride in her history. You are entitled to it. By cherishing and preserving that noble record of the past you will keep aflame a beacon light so desperately needed in these times of confusion.

I rejoice, therefore, whenever I see manifested the spirit of Virginia. It was exemplified in a delightful story told me recently about a young Virginia girl who had been invited to her first dance at West Point. Naturally, she was the belle of the ball. Her escort and numerous admirers kept pressing her for expressions of admiration of the beauties and atmosphere of West Point. Finally, she voiced her approval by sweetly stating that "it might even be called the VMI of the North." You just can't beat that for inborn loyalty—the kind woven into the very fabric of the character of your people. I cannot believe that those fine qualities which have marked your citizenship down through the years are really being lost; nor do I think Mrs. Williams meant to imply as much. Mere changes on the surface do not go this deep. As the outsider views Virginia, he is struck with the continuity of its high-minded, intelligent leadership among the States, motivated by a spirit of patriotic service. The very fact that this has persisted from the inception of the Republic makes me secure in the hope that it will abide through the years to come.

Nevertheless, there is something that is vanishing from our national life about which you and I may well be concerned, and deeply so. That is why I have ventured to paraphrase Mrs. Williams' title and elected to address you upon the subject The Vanishing American.

Anyone, however casually familiar with our country's history, cannot fail to note the striking change that has come about in American character within the past two decades. It is not the mere exaggeration of an alarmist or pessimist when one states that those elements of self-reliance, independence, diligence, and thrift that marked American character in earlier days are fast vanishing from the national scene. This is but a statement of plain fact, and one about which I take it little difference of opinion can exist. There are many who glory in this change. There are those of us who mourn it.

Sophisticated leaders of the first group glibly tell you and me that America has outgrown her past, and all that is old must now be discarded for something that is new. My first answer to this arrant nonsense is that this country of ours is not old. As nations go, she is very young indeed. The late James Beck, that scholarly lawyer and statesman of our own time, had a way of emphasizing this fact. Some of you may have heard him on this point, for he was fond of adverting to it at bar association gatherings. Mr. Beck died only a few years ago. He might well be alive today had his years been extended a bit beyond the usual span. He used to say that during his boyhood in Philadelphia there still lived in that city, at an advanced age 'tis true, that great leader of the early American bar, Horace Binney, and that Horace Binney could recollect in his boyhood seeing Washington and Franklin as they entered and left Independence Hall in attendance upon the Constitutional Convention of 1787. In other words, here was a man known to us who in his youth knew a man who in his youth saw Washington and Franklin at the very birth of the Nation. Just two full life spans have intervened. That gives you some idea of how youthful America as a Nation really is.

One might have some patience with these wise men who are wont to talk of changed conditions and new problems as calling for new foundations for our national structure, provided they could show wherein the original foundations had failed us. This they cannot do. On the contrary, what was conceived and put together 163 years ago, has proved the greatest boon known to mankind. It succeeded beyond fondest expectations in preserving liberty and bringing happiness to the most fortunate people in all human history. It has become the last hope of freedom-loving men everywhere.

Despite these indisputable facts, you hear men and women, even in high places, some ignorant, some misguided, some downright corrupt, blithely ridiculing or lightly brushing aside the basic principles of the American Constitution. So persistent have they been, so plausible their arguments, and so seductive their promises, that not only have they gained an ear, but power as well.

If what I am saying to you today sounds trite, I make no apologies. It must be said again and again, by all who hold dear this blessed heritage of ours, until the rank and file of our citizenship becomes aware of what is happening here.

To make clear my meaning I bring you a simple message. It has but two points. The first relates to the stripe of men who made, who built, and who preserved this Nation. The second is concerned with the sort of citizen now being substituted as the typical American. The contrast will be obvious, the conclusion as deplorable as it is inescapable.

What manner of men were the founding fathers and those who held up their arms? The descriptive terms that at once flash into your minds are such words as "stalwart," "self-reliant," "independent," "sturdy," "freedom-loving," and the like. Such was the stuff American patriots were made of.

Let it not be thought that these men were lawless insurrectionists. On the contrary, they were inherently loyal to the mother country. Those of you who have read Lynn Montross' very recent book, Reluctant Rebels, will have been reminded of this fact, and will recall how loath those men were to sever the political bands that held them to the land of their origin. It was only bitter resentment of despotic government that drove them to the step. Having taken it, they were equally determined to set up a government of their own whereunder the individual citizen should be entitled to his unalienable rights, which included not only life and liberty but also the pursuit of happiness, according to his own dictates. These men proposed to plan their own lives, provide their own economic security, and to assume responsibility for their own destiny. To this end the individual was guaranteed the right to order his own life, whether for good or ill, without interference by governmental bureaucracy however well-meaning.

These men were steeped in all the philosophies of government. They were experienced in all the pitfalls and dangers of governmental power. They knew the corrupting effect of such power. Thus it was that after their independence had been won, and they were engaged in the difficult task of constructing the machinery of their own government, the immortal Jefferson wrote these wise words:

"In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

Out of their own experience they knew that in last analysis "government" is nothing other than a man or group of men, and that such men on being elevated to posts of power do not thereby become saints. Many of them are weak, exceedingly weak. In the nature of things they are subjected to manifold temptations. One taste of power creates a lust for more power, and quickly engenders the notion that any tactics are justifiable in holding onto and enhancing that power.

If the smart gentlemen who today so readily talk of changed conditions as warranting new concepts in our organic law,

think this inherent trait of human nature has changed, then let them look around, both abroad and at home, for the answer. Governmental power is the most dangerous force known to man. From the dawn of civilization it has plagued the race. No sooner have men entrusted it to their rulers than it has been made the instrument of tyranny and oppression. With full understanding of all this unhappy experience did our forefathers set about to construct a Government against which the individual should be protected, no matter what political party or group might gain control of the machinery.

This was truly an experiment in the art of government. Washington in his inaugural address so denominated it. Lincoln repeated it in his memorable address before Congress at the outbreak of war in 1861. Visitors who came from abroad in the early years of our history to observe, and later to write of their impressions, adopted the term "experiment." It is well that Americans of today should thoroughly understand the nature of that experiment. The gist of it was that government should be restricted to the business of governing, while citizens enjoyed the fruits of their labors and rose or fell according to their merits. It was not enough that governmental officers and agencies should be selected either directly or indirectly by the people. An equally important factor was that after being thus chosen their sphere of activity was restricted by laws designed to guarantee to the citizen a maximum of personal freedom of action.

How that experiment worked, how it opened up a new continent and new vistas for freemen everywhere, how it produced a citizenship that repelled every attack from without, and repressed every upheaval from within, is the history of America, and needs no repetition here.

Early visitors who wrote of their travels in America, such as Captain Hall, Mrs. Trollope, de Tocqueville, and Charles Dickens have much to say of the American's inordinate pride in his country. They were often irritated and even disgusted by what appeared to them as a spirit of swashbuckling and boastfulness. But those Americans were entitled to a high degree of satisfaction, for at long last the basic problems of government had been largely solved. The key to that solution is set forth in the preamble of the Constitution. There the true functions of government were succinctly stated: "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense," and thus "promote the general welfare." The business of life was left to the citizen himself. The avowed purpose of this scheme of things, as aptly stated, was "to secure the blessings of liberty unto ourselves and our posterity." The liberty they here meant was individual liberty, free from encroachment by their own government as well as by any foreign foe.

World history has nothing to compare with the record of achievement by these men and their descendants under such a system of government. Of course, all was not smooth sailing, nor did all men fare equally. The fact that difficulties were faced and overcome is the significant thing. The further fact that the worthy, the diligent, and the thrifty generally succeeded, while the indolent and the unworthy suffered for their weakness, explains the development of a citizenry that made America strong. Out of all this has come an economy that is the marvel of the ages, one that has produced the highest state of well-being any people ever knew, one that has produced armies and the sinews of war that twice within our own time have literally saved civilization.

Consider now the amazing change that has come to pass. By devious methods it has been brought about that the Central Government now holds unlimited power to tax, unlimited power to spend, and virtually unlimited power to regulate the daily affairs of the citizen, even unto his hours of labor and his wages. Such financial and economic controls alone mean complete domination of the life of the individual, for whoever controls these can ultimately determine the destiny of a people. Not only are these powers now conceded, but they are regularly exercised in increasing measure. Moreover, they are being exercised for all manner of purposes, many of which are purely political. For example, hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money are spent annually to buy up food which is later destroyed or becomes worthless, for no other purpose than to promote scarcity, increase the price of farm products to the consumer, and thus give the farming class the benefit of high prices. The plain political effect of such a policy is to buy the farm vote at public expense. Other wholesale expenditures, such as purchasing silver at a price far above its true worth, paying out benefits, bonuses, and pensions to politically powerful groups, have made of Government a farce and have prostituted it, so that the candidate or the party that now makes the highest bid stands to get the vote of the recipients of this form of bribery.

As I have watched this evil process develop apace, I have often recalled those splendid words of honest Grover Cleveland in his message to Congress back in 1886, when he said:

"When more of the people's sustenance is exacted than is necessary to meet the just obligations of government and expenses of its economical administration, such exaction becomes ruthless extortion and a violation of the fundamental principles of a free government."

Not only are the unrestrained taxing and spending powers of the Federal Government being used in this fashion, but the regulatory power as well. If an office seeker today wants the support of organized labor, he must stand for an ever higher minimum wage, and for the enactment of laws designed to give special privileges to labor at the expense of the public.

Time will not suffice to point out all the instances of similar kind. They are legion, and are rapidly extending into every department of the Nation's life.

What is vitally significant is that the American conscience has come to tolerate this nefarious system. It carries an infectious poison that seems to stupefy our sensibilities and warp our better natures. I talked with a farmer recently trying to explain to him the iniquity of Government's so-called aid to agriculture, which had just reached him in the form of a check of considerable size. His reply was as follows: "I know all of this is wrong, but the other fellows are getting theirs, so we farmers might as well get ours." The sad fact is that this attitude has become common among the farming class that once stood as the very bulwark of stalwart Americanism.

It might seem odd that these different groups, none of which constitutes a majority, should be able to push through such measures designed for their special benefit. Here comes into play another political process that must never be overlooked. It was best described by that remarkable Virginian, John Randolph, of Roanoke, a master of telling statement. In one of his powerful speeches in Congress he on one occasion referred to the "cohesive power of public plunder." We ought never to forget that phrase. It carries a world of meaning, and tells the sorry story of pork-barrel, log-rolling and welfare legislation. It explains how politics does make strange bedfellows.

Thus it is that politics in this country has long since forsaken principle, and has degenerated into a mere game of selling the taxing power to organized groups in return for their votes.

Do not think I speak in any spirit of partisanship, for these methods have been resorted to by all parties, and have been adopted by candidates regardless of party labels.

The point I make is that public plunder has become the order of the day. It was started under a guise of emergency. It was carried further because of wartime necessity. It is now tolerated, if not accepted as an established national peacetime policy.

Were there nothing but dollars involved, I should not view the situation so seriously. Unfortunately, there is more here than meets the nose. At the urging of demagogues, agitators and ambitious office seekers, the American people have been led to turn to Government for the solving of all their problems. When this is done and Government assumes the task, such measures are called liberal.

I often wonder how it is that the usually clear and practical mind of the American citizen has not long since discovered the jokers in this sinister game being played at his expense. Let us take a look at a few of them.

The very process of having Government assume the role of guardian or father of its citizens is regularly held up as something novel and progressive in political science. In truth it is as old as government itself. Practically every king, dictator, and benevolent despot of old professed to operate a welfare state. He claimed the right to function as a father and thus to make his subjects his children. That is the very system that our American forefathers would not tolerate. Reverting to that system, cannot be liberalism, nor is it progress. It merely means a reversion to the age-old philosophy of government that cursed humanity until the American experiment lighted a new way.

The next joker follows as a corollary to the first. The paternalistic state cannot function as such unless the citizens surrenders his freedom of action and becomes a child. I venture that most men when they clamor or vote for regulation out of Washington fail to realize this simple fact. Every whit of paternalism on the part of government calls for a corresponding surrender of freedom of action on the part of the citizen. When such surrender reaches the basic activities of life, then the citizen becomes truly a helpless child whose only course is to obey his master. Then despotism is ready to set in.

The third joker consists in this, that not only does the citizen surrender his freedom, but his substance also. He must pay and pay dearly for all the petting paternalism he gets. Government first says, "Let us do the job for you," then calls for payment of the cost of the job, plus Government's inflated expense in doing it. That is why taxpayers to their consternation were denied any substantial relief after the close of the late war. They were rudely made to know that they must go on paying the cost of the vast paternalism already built up, with more to come.

The last joker I present is the relevation of whom we are surrendering our freedoms and our substance to. With pious face the professional bureaucrat will say you must have faith in the great American Government, and that you dare not discredit that noble institution. Let me remind you again of what our forefathers found out, and that was that Government means men, and men in matters of power cannot safely be trusted. Let us get this matter clear and straight. When you and I are asked to surrender our liberties and our property to the control of and use by Government, we are surrendering them to men, just plain ordinary men, who generally belong to the class called "politicians." Many of them are mediocre men or worse, who have never succeeded at anything beyond corralling votes, and often by questionable methods. The hoax is that such

men, under the high-sounding title of "government," are held up as being qualified to spend the citizen's earnings and to regulate his life better than he can do so for himself. Two evil consequences flow from this surrender. Politicians thus surfeited with power can and do traffic in the very life substance of private citizens, as if this were a commodity to be bartered for votes. At the same time the short-sighted citizen who has been led to think only in terms of some immediate benefaction bestowed upon him, readily gets the idea that such is the only meaning and purpose of government.

In closing I leave with you what has ever seemed to me the most significant story that came out of the late World War. The incident occurred in those heartbreaking days of June 1940, when French troops were crushed and fleeing before the oncoming Germans. One young French officer pressing southward came to the cottage of an old peasant who had been his father's friend and companion in arms years before. He paused for a brief respite from his headlong flight, and while conversing with this old family friend he said to him, "Tell me what has happened to my country that she now lies broken and conquered. You with my father fought for France in the days of her glory. What is the meaning of this her downfall?" The old peasant promptly replied, "My young friend, I can tell you the secret of France's collapse. In the days of our generation when your father and I served and fought in the legions of France, the dominant spirit and only question in the breast of Frenchmen everywhere was, What can I do for France, what can I give to my country? While in this your generation you and your fellows have been thinking only in terms of, What can I get out of France, what can France be made to do for me?"

Yes; France collapsed long before her armies went to pieces. She collapsed from within, and when her sons began to think only in terms of what they could force from her. Here before our very eyes has been demonstrated the tragedy that can come to a people, a people with a great army and a great navy, when this creeping paralysis sets in.

As one contemplates the Vanishing American his soul is troubled within him. He wonders whether the fate of France awaits his country.

Where Is the Economy Under the Reorganization Act of 1946?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am inserting some interesting statistics furnished by Paul O. Peters under date of August 8, 1950, with reference to alleged economy under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946:

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946
ECONOMY DUD

Public Law 601, approved August 2, 1946, popularly known as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, was enacted for the declared purpose to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government has turned out to be a dud when when it comes to saving money for the American taxpayers.

If the efficiency of the legislative establishment has been increased, and this is a matter upon which judgment is reserved, there is no disputing the fact that the costs of the legislative branch have increased by leaps and bounds since 1946, as illustrated by the following table:

Expenditures by fiscal years for the legislative branch of the Government

1946	$22,815,830
1947	39,584,898
1948	43,126,172
1949	46,506,024
1950	56,028,687
1951 (estimate)	70,655,064

The budget for 1951, estimates the appropriations for the legislative branch, as follows:

Senate	$11,840,391
House of Representatives	21,804,970
Legislative miscellaneous	268,715
Architect of the Capitol	15,177,400
Botanic Garden	196,500
Library of Congress	9,369,200
Government Printing Office	19,052,736
Permanent appropriation, Library of Congress	86,495
Total general and special appropriations	77,796,407

Further proof that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which, by title II, section 206, directed the Comptroller General to make an expenditure analysis of each agency in the executive branch of the Government, failed to live up to expectations, may be found in the fact that no appropriation has been made by Congress to enable the Comptroller General to carry out this directive.

As the so-called watchdog of the Treasury, the Comptroller General was specifically authorized by law as follows:

"SEC. 205. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of restrictions placed in general appropriation acts limiting the expenditure of specified appropriations therein, with a view to determining the cost to the Government incident to complying with such restrictions, and to report to the Congress his estimate of the cost of complying with such restrictions and such other recommendations with respect thereto as he deems necessary or desirable.

"SEC. 206. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to make an expenditure analysis of each agency in the executive branch of the Government (including Government corporations), which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, will enable Congress to determine whether public funds have been economically and efficiently administered and expended. Reports on such analyses shall be submitted by the Comptroller General, from time to time, to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to the Appropriations Committees, and to the legislative committees having jurisdiction over legislation relating to the operations of the respective agencies, of the two Houses."

In view of the fact that the Federal Government has operated on a deficit basis for 18 out of the last 20 years and total expenditures have amounted to $577,541,437,902, it is important that the Congress implement its directive to the Comptroller General and have at hand a comprehensive analysis of the past expenditures to determine whether or not they have at all times been economically and efficiently administered and expended.

A good starting point would be on the $91,548,245,781 in expenditures for national defense during the past 5 years.

Then, too, the Comptroller General might find out and report to Congress just who authorized the procurement of a 93-year supply of fluorescent light tubes, a 247-year supply of binders and carloads of similar easy obtainable articles now cluttering up Uncle Sam's warehouse space in various parts of the country.

But most important of all, if the Reorganization Act of 1946 is ever to reach its prime objective, the Congress must stop appropriating more money each year than the bureaucrats have been able to spend.

The Congress willing, economy in the Federal Government is not impossible.

Russians Slow Export of Strategic Materials to United States to a Trickle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times in this House, one of the most important strategic materials our Nation needs, in war and in peace, is chrome.

The Senate has now adopted an amendment to the general appropriations bill which will aid materially in the development of our chromite resources in Montana, where 75 percent of our domestic supply is found. In order to point out further the importance of developing this domestic resource, and ending our dependence upon far-away places including Russia, I include the following newspaper article dealing with imports from the Soviet Union:

RUSSIANS SLOW EXPORT OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS TO UNITED STATES TO A TRICKLE

The Russians have demonstrated that they know how to use export controls, too.

When the United States in March 1948 instituted a ban or quantitative restriction on some 2,300 commodities for shipment behind the iron curtain, there was no immediate reaction by Russia.

There were only two strategic materials we normally had imported from Russia—manganese and chrome ore—but they were extremely important. Both are essential to the production of steel and are being stockpiled.

In 1948 Russia exported 427,000 tons of manganese ore—some of the richest in the world with a content of about 35 percent. That was an increase of 96,000 tons over their 1947 shipments.

RUSSIA REACTS SHARPLY

The picture was about the same for chrome ore. In 1948 the U. S. S. R. exported 351,755 tons to the United States, compared with 236,699 tons in 1947.

Last year the Russians reacted sharply. While not banning entirely the sale of the two vital metals, they cut down sharply. The 1949 figures were 81,500 tons of manganese ore and 95,653 tons of chrome ore.

So far this year there has been only the faintest trickle. In fact, last week the first 1950 shipload of chrome ore from the Soviet arrived in Baltimore—6,700 tons of it. Only 6,500 tons of manganese has been received, with 7 months of the year elapsed.

The United States produces less than 10 percent of the manganese it consumes and this is low grade. Last year our output was 126,000 tons. We consumed 1,360,042. The bulk of what we now get comes from India,

the Gold Coast, Brazil, and the Union of South Africa.

TRANSPORT IS PROBLEM

Officials say there is plenty of manganese in the ground in these places, but that the problem of transportation from the mine head to the seacoast is the stumbling block.

United States steel companies reportedly are pouring money into Brazil in an effort to step up production, and American transportation experts have been working in India to improve the situation there. Once this is done the United States won't have to worry about manganese, whether for war or peace, it is said.

As for chrome, American production is negligible. Last year the output was 433 tons. Our total consumption was 1,204,344 tons. Government spokesmen say, however, that chrome is no problem, either for current needs or stockpile purposes. In fact, stockpile requirements of one grade (refractory) already have been met. Our principal sources are Turkey, southern Rhodesia, South Africa, Cuba, and the Philippines.

FURS ARE BIG ITEMS

Furs made up more than half the Soviet exports to the United States last year, as they usually do, and are the biggest dollar earner for the U. S. S. R. We bought $24,000,000 worth in 1949 when our total imports from Russia totaled $42,000,000.

(An ECA official, commenting on this, said it was ironic that furs—a luxury item for capitalist America—help finance the Communist Party here perhaps as much as any other one item.)

Metals and manufactures took second place among Russian exports to the United States in 1949, totaling $8,000,000.

The Real Issue in the Knowland Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of a statement sent to each Member of the House by the Honorable WALTER LYNCH on the Knowland amendment, I should like to keep the record clear by pointing out:

First. That his statement is an indictment of every other member of the 12-man conference, as every one of them signed the report adopting the so-called Knowland amendment;

Second. That his statement is an indictment of our State legislatures, our State administrators, and our State courts, for it assumes that unless the Secretary of Labor has unbridled authority over the States—

a. Workers will be deprived of benefits for refusing to sign yellow dog contracts, accept sub-standard work, give up their union membership and join company unions.

b. That the appeal process of the States is unfair in that it takes some time to pursue the remedy in the approved State law; and that therefore the Secretary of Labor should be permitted to step in and coerce the State to follow his ruling instead of following their orderly process before he tries them for noncompliance with the Federal standards;

Third. That our States are so inherently vicious in their administration and court rulings, that the Federal standards contained in their own laws will be disregarded and nullified, and that requiring the Secretary to wait until the State court has spoken—to quote him "will break down the standards established by Congress."

If these accusations are true, we are wasting time in considering the amendment recommended by our State administrators and governors. We are wasting time in considering their request to preserve their State administrative and judicial processes. We should be considering the question of abolishing our State systems.

Make no mistake, despite all innuendoes to the contrary, the real issue is not the alleged issue of preserving the standards Congress has written. Rather it is the issue of protecting the States against complete domination in their administrative functions, and circumvention of their judicial processes by the Secretary of Labor.

State administrators and courts can of course misconstrue their law and violate their law today, and if the Knowland amendment is passed they can of course still do so. But our States have a proud record of fairness. They are not vicious, unfair to labor, or interested in violating Federal standards. If they did, they can still be penalized by the Secretary of Labor. The amendment does not relieve our States of compliance with Federal standards. It merely prevents the Secretary from dominating their day to day administration and circumventing the State procedure in the guise of enforcing Federal standards.

Appointment Quotas to Annapolis To Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, due to a shortage of living quarters, which cannot be expanded because of the defense economy program, the United States Naval Academy will be forced to reduce its appointment quotas beginning next year. Members of Congress have already been advised that their quotas would be cut from five to four candidates for each Congressman and Senator. With the exception of the President's quotas of 75, and the State Department's privilege of naming 20 men from Latin-American nations, all other quotas will be cut approximately 20 percent. At present, 3,400 midshipmen are quartered in Bancroft Hall—which was designed to accommodate 2,750 men—and larger quarters are urgently needed. Under present world conditions it is difficult to understand how this sacrifice in preparedness, with its relatively minor saving, can be justified while the Nation is spending billions for other types of defense, both at home and abroad.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Meeting of West Virginia Oil and Natural Gas Association, Weston, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the annual meeting of the West Virginia Oil and Natural Gas Association at Weston, W. Va., Saturday, August 5.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WEST VIRGINIA OIL AND NATURAL GAS ASSOCIATION AT WESTON, W. VA., AUGUST 5, 1950

It is an extreme pleasure to address this organization of oil and gas producers who maintain the American tradition of rugged individualism.

Yours is a dangerous and hazardous business. It has developed into one of the greatest and most useful industries in the world because men of courage, vision, and initiative took great risks, both personal and financial.

Since that memorable day in 1859 when Col. E. L. Drake brought in the world's first oil well in the hills of northwestern Pennsylvania, the search for oil has gone forward.

It has led men with the spirit of adventure into the most inaccessible places.

They endured hardship and back-breaking toil. They lived and worked under the most primitive conditions. They experienced disappointment and discouragement.

But they went ahead with persistence, resourcefulness, and enterprise. They relied on their own efforts and energy.

They didn't look to the Government for grants, loans, or subsidies. They raised their own capital.

They invented improved machinery. They expanded into new fields of discovery and development. They called upon science for research into new technology and better products.

They created new transportation systems and improved marketing methods to give better service to the public.

Today the average citizen takes all these things for granted. But it should be remembered that the oil and gas industry, of which you are an important part, came up the hard way.

You are familiar with the difficulties which produced the American way of life. Therefore you appreciate the rewards of American achievement—our high standard of living, our spendid cultural and spiritual attainments and above all, our freedom of the individual.

The economic greatness of the United States was not built in legislative halls. It was not established by Government decree. It was not created by the decisions of our high courts. The same courageous spirit of individual enterprise and initiative that is represented in the oil and gas industry built our giant steel production, our coal industry, and our great transportation systems.

The men who contributed most to the economic strength of our country were not hampered by an army of bureaucrats pretending to look after their interests. They were not controlled by Government directives and regulations designed to serve political purposes. They did not encounter Government competition with private industry.

The American Republic was founded by men who loved freedom. The Declaration of Independence was a protest against unwarranted taxation, political interference and big, centralized government.

In drafting the Constitution the founding fathers recognized the dangers of big government. They knew that government could in time become oppressive and could encroach upon the liberties of the people.

They sought to restrict the power of government, to safeguard individual freedom and to protect the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Their ideal was a government that would be the servant of the people and not their master.

Under that concept the United States has made greater progress than any other nation in the world. In less than 200 years we have built the richest and the most powerful nation on the face of the earth.

Is it because we had greater natural resources than other countries? No; that is not the reason. Many other countries have richer natural resources than we possess.

We have about 7 percent of the world's population and only 6 percent of the world's land area, yet we produce one-third of all the world's goods.

Why have we accomplished so much more in 200 years than any other nation in all history?

Why have we been successful in 6 wars?

Why has American inventive genius been able to lighten the labors of workers in all parts of the world?

Why have our men and women served successfully all over the globe as teachers and instructors?

Why have our men and women gone to every island of the seas teaching the glories of Christ?

There is only one answer, and that is because we possess the God-given freedom of the individual.

This freedom imposes great responsibilities. In order to have freedom, the individual must love freedom above security. To maintain freedom of the individual calls for sweat, sacrifice, thrift, hard work, tolerance, shedding of tears and blood, and love of God.

Those qualities have had a prominent part in the progress and prosperity of West Virginia.

Your early settlers had deep religious and patriotic convictions. They wanted to be free. They wanted opportunity. They were willing to work for security and happiness and the well being of their posterity.

Your people are hard-working, courageous and independent. They are strong believers in the free enterprise economy and the American way of life.

Like all real Americans, they are naturally opposed to socialism in any form. They would vote almost solidly against this doctrine if the question was submitted for a direct vote.

That, of course, will never happen, but nevertheless, during the last 18 years we have witnessed a departure from the philosophy of government contemplated by the founding fathers of these United States.

We have become increasingly aware of a dangerous trend in the thinking of some of our people and in the administration proposals which are taking us down the slippery road to socialism.

It is natural to ask:

"How can it happen here when we are opposed to socialism and don't want it?"

The answer is found in indifference, neglect of our civic duties, the desire for an easy way of life, government paternalism and too much government at too high a price.

Let us look at some facts.

In 18 years the Federal Government has increased its number of employees threefold and its cost 10 times. Its debt is increasing daily and now amounts to more than $257,000,000,000.

At $10,000 each, this would drill 25,700,000 wells.

This tremendous debt is destroying the value of the dollar. It is one of the principal causes of inflation.

In the fiscal year ending June 30 of this year Government spending exceeded revenues by $3,100,000,000 dollars.

What has brought this about?

It is the result of increasing and expanding governmental functions. In the beginning the Federal Government looked after national defense, rivers and harbors, banking and currency and foreign affairs.

Now in addition, the Federal Government wants larger appropriations for roads, education, health, welfare, airports, housing, and relief work all over the world.

Federal men are now out on the farms and down in the mines. They conduct health clinics, supervise conservation, and plan for public works projects.

The Federal Government owns or is financially interested in about 100 important business enterprises with a direct investment of about $20,000,000,000.

The Government is engaged in the business of lending money, guaranteeing loans and deposits, writing life insurance, producing, distributing, and selling electric power and fertilizers, operating railways and ships, buying and selling farm products, and smelting and selling metals.

Some of these enterprises invest their surplus funds in Government securities, thus compelling the Government to pay interest on its own investment.

You are all familiar with the Government's plan to extend control over natural gas by regulating prices to be paid independent producers and gatherers in the field.

As a result of all these increased functions, Federal, State, and local governments now cost us more than $65,000,000,000 per year.

We pay Federal, State, and local government employees more than $10,000,000,000 per year in salaries.

More than 25,000,000 Americans receive a regular check of some kind from government.

Let us be fair. It is not all the Federal Government's fault. Hat in hand, with bowed heads, States, municipalities, chambers of commerce, business groups, labor organizations, farmers, and educators seek help from Uncle Sam.

Through governmental hand-outs, subsidies, price supports, loaning of money, and grants to subdivisions of government, we are getting away from individual independence and we are becoming more and more dependent upon government.

Let us look at some other dangers.

There are those who would destroy our way of life and substitute for it a socialistic form of government. That would wipe out the freedom of the individual and make us subservient to an all powerful totalitarian State.

There are those who feel that Government can better operate business, hospitals, schools, and other enterprises than individuals.

My own State of Pennsylvania has made great progress. It has a greater diversity of industry, natural resources, and transportation systems than any other State in the Union. Its development has been the result of private capital.

Pennsylvania, however, has experienced a glaring example of the failure of government ownership. I am referring to the canal system in Pennsylvania.

A little more than 100 years ago Pennsylvania embarked on a great public-works program, financed by public funds, including canals, bridges, turnpikes, and railroads. The canal project alone cost $40,000,000, an enormous sum in those days. The main canal and railroad system ran clear across the State from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh.

The dreamers of that period thought the net profits would pay all the expenses of State government and would relieve the people of all State taxes.

How easily they were fooled. This venture of government in business was so badly managed and was so unprofitable that it almost depleted the State treasury. It placed the whole economy of Pennsylvania in danger of destruction.

Things were so bad as far as the canals were concerned that the general assembly abandoned the project and directed that the State-owned transportation facilities be sold.

Further legislation was enacted, forbidding the State to engage directly or indirectly in any corporate enterprise. To show how deeply the State was involved, it was not until 1913 that all the bonds which financed this system of public works were finally paid off.

Another example of Government inefficiency in business was the operation of the railroads by the Federal Government during World War I.

Government operation extended from January 1, 1918, to February 9, 1920. The railroad revenues during that period accrued to the Government. They proved insufficient to meet the rentals. The cost to the Government for that period was a little more than $1,575,000,000.

In World War II the railroads were operated by the railroads themselves. From December 1, 1941 to August 3, 1945, which was the period of the war, the railroads paid $1,140,000,000 in Federal income taxes and approximately $100,000,000 in other taxes. In addition they paid $873,000,000 in payroll taxes for support of the retirement and unemployment benefits set up by Federal statute. Railroads also paid State and local taxes as well as dividends to their stockholders.

The comparison is convincing evidence of the inefficiency of Government management.

That type of management in our domestic affairs during all but two of the last 20 years has increased the national debt to more than $257,000,000,000.

In all that time, except for the 2 years when the Republican Eightieth Congress was in control, the Federal Government spent beyond its income and failed to balance the budget.

Any private corporation operated in that manner would have ended up in bankruptcy long ago.

The same type of incompetent management in our foreign relations has brought us to a crisis which may explode into the most terrible war the world has ever known.

While we fight for human liberty and to maintain freedom in the world we must remember that we are in danger of losing the freedoms that we prize so highly here at home.

The big question before the people of the United States is how far we can go and still preserve individual freedom as the keystone of the American way of life.

To my mind it is most important to realize that the cost of a long-drawn-out war can destroy individual freedom even though we crush Communist aggression everywhere in the world.

To that holy purpose we must dedicate all our power and all our resources. Every ounce of strength we possess must be placed in the balance to defend liberty against tyranny and enslavement.

We must be prepared to pay any price and make any sacrifice in the supreme emergency that may arise out of the war in Korea.

Such a war could more than double the national debt under which our people are now staggering.

The combat cost of World War II, which lasted 4 years, was $356,000,000,000. About 45 percent of that cost was paid for by taxation. The balance, approximately $215,000,000,000, was added to the national debt.

The price of weapons, equipment, and everything that enters into waging war is almost double today. I have gone into the costs pretty carefully and I have figured out that a 4-year war would call for the expenditures of a minimum of $600,000,000,000.

If taxes were levied to pay 45 percent of this war, as in the last war, we would come out with a new debt of about $330,000,000,000 or a total debt of nearly $600,000,000,000.

Such a debt would put the whole economy of the United States in a straitjacket from which we might never free ourselves. We would live in a planned economy, with regimentation, regulations, and directives controlling all industry, business, agriculture, and labor.

With that gloomy picture before us continued deficit spending on the home front would be dangerous, dishonest, and unpatriotic.

We must, therefore, face the situation with firm determination to cut to the bone all Government spending not connected with national defense.

We must, without delay, eliminate every form of waste or extravagance in the financial operation of the Federal Government.

We must stop at once all spending for purposes which may be classified as nonessential.

Many desirable services which government now provides must be abandoned or curtailed.

In the interest of economy on the home front many normal functions of government must be suspended.

All public works not immediately necessary must be postponed.

The economies I have enumerated will help build America's financial strength in support of the principles to which our Republic is dedicated.

On the other side of the world American boys are giving their lives to defend these principles for us and for the world.

The sacrifices we are called upon to make here at home are insignificant compared to the price they pay so heroically.

Behind the armed forces that have violated the peace of the world in Korea stands the cruel and ruthless power of Communist Russia.

This enemy of God and mankind has conquered a large part of Europe and has brought much of Asia under virtual enslavement. Its evil purpose is to rule the world by terror, tyranny, and bloodshed.

Peace with freedom can be restored only by American strength, fighting to maintain the integrity of free people in a free world.

We will succeed because we fight in a righteous cause.

With prayer for God's blessing and protection we will go forward to save the world from destruction and to assure a future of liberty and progress for all mankind.

Turkish Attitude on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a recent news release, issued by the Turkish Information Office, in which the Premier of Turkey goes into some detail concerning the aid which Turkey is making available to the United Nations forces in Korea. It is a very encouraging and commendatory statement, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREMIER MENDERES OUTLINES TURKISH ATTITUDE ON KOREA

At a press conference Turkish Premier Adnan Menderes elaborated on Turkey's recent decision to send 4,500 troops to Korea.

In reply to questions put by reporters, Premier Menderes said:

"Let us make it clear at the outset that the decision reached by our Government is not a decision of war; on the contrary it is a decision arising out of an attempt to preserve the peace. In our opinion, it is only by way of decisions similar to ours, to be arrived at by the other freedom-loving nations, that acts of aggression can be prevented and world peace can be safeguarded. As a matter of fact, a sincere attachment to the ideals of the UN requires a belief in this basic principle. The unparalleled calamities and tragedies of the Second World War were the outcome of the belief that peace could be preserved by means of separate and independent efforts by individual states, that taking care of one's own interests would suffice to protect against the disasters that threatened other nations.

"There are those who would have us adopt the irresolute and undecided attitude of certain countries in the Korean affair. We know that between the two world wars countries that were believed to have attained the highest degree of political and diplomatic development nurtured similar dubious hopes and acted in a hesitant and wavering manner; the blunders thus committed caused humanity untold suffering. After these misfortunes, and in view of the experience gained thereby, it would be an unthinkable inadvertency to fall a victim once again to such egotistical sentiments and to believe that the world can be protected against the disaster that threatens it, simply by adopting a course of indecision and vacillation.

"Secondly, let us make it clear that our Government has taken its decision on Korea in full realization of all its implications: our decision would still be the same were we to be faced a thousand times with the same situation. The two great wars, and the experiences of the postwar years, have demonstrated that the existence and freedom of nations are not necessarily defended at their own geographical frontiers. It is clear that we are living in an era that imposes worldwide identity of destiny in war and peace; the unfurling of the Turkish flag at Korea is the outcome of both the most idealistic and the most realistic aims and views. Writings that criticize the sending of Turkish troops to distant lands serve to underline the fact that certain people are employing camouflaged tactics. There is no juridical justification for the assertion that our sons who are called to serve their country may only be employed within Turkey's national boundaries. Such views only go to show what kind of defeatism is adopted by their authors.

"We are convinced that the Government's decision on Korea is in complete conformity with the will and spirit of the Turkish people. That is why we are also certain that the nation has accorded the Government its full and unqualified support, and that it will continue to do so."

Remember Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Remember Yalta," which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, August 9, 1950]

REMEMBER YALTA

The curious think about the rapid warming up of the cold war is that the place of diplomacy in the struggle has grown in significance. There are many blows that can be struck for peace which are available to our diplomacy. We come back to the desirability of denouncing the 1945 compact at Yalta. The document is such a thing of shreds and patches that the principle of respect for international obligations requires of the United States and Britain a denunciation of that instrument and a statement of particulars. Several times the opportunity has been provided; the last was when our new antiaggression policy in the Far East was announced June 26. However, though timing is sometimes all-important, there is no necessity to wait for time and place in exposing a cynical failure to carry out a solemn obligation.

In international law there is ample reason for a denunciation of the Yalta Pact. When a party to a contract fails to carry it out, the other signatory is at perfect liberty to withdraw his own obligation. This is simply the extension of the principle in domestic contracts which makes a contract null and void when it is frustrated. What has happened to the undertakings arrived at at Yalta is now common knowledge. Balkan countries whose independence was pledged at Yalta are virtually incorporated in Soviet territory. Independence has been extinguished, freedom has been denied, and those countries have become vassals of Moscow. In the Far East, the Yalta conferees agreed to roll back the map to 1895 in behalf of Russia. In that year, for instance, the Russians stole from the Chinese rail and port concessions in Manchuria, and these were restored to Russia as a bribe to come into the Pacific War, though nothing could have induced the Russians to keep out. These prizes have become the entering wedge for the russification of Manchuria. Secretary Acheson in his National Press Club speech of January 12 said:

"Armed with these new powers, what is happening in China is that the Soviet Union

is detaching the northern provinces of China from China and is attaching them to the Soviet Union. This process is complete in outer Mongolia. It is nearly complete in Manchuria, and I am sure that in inner Mongolia and in Sinkiang, there are very happy reports coming from Soviet agents to Moscow. This is what is going on. It is the detachment of these whole areas, vast areas—populated by Chinese—the detachment of these areas from China and their attachment to the Soviet Union."

It is bootless to lament what happened at Yalta. More constructive is to denounce the pact in behalf of the sacred principle of respect for international engagements. This is an elementary duty. The delay in so doing binds this country to the subversion of the deal as well as to the deal itself, and makes us accessory to both. Denunciation would also bring to the attention of the Chinese people the immorality that the Russians have practiced at their expense. Thus, in addition to putting the record straight, our diplomacy would be doing a service in the struggle with Russia that is going on in Asia. As time goes on Manchuria is bound to become the sharpest point of friction between China and Russia, and anything that can be done to keep the loss of Manchuria before the Chinese people is good diplomacy.

Declaration of Policy Adopted at the Fifty-fourth Annual Convention of the Wisconsin Bankers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Wisconsin we find that business, labor, and agriculture are rather equally divided as to the economy of the State. The watchword of our State is "Forward," and the progress that has been made is largely the result of the cooperation between business, labor, and agriculture. These groups have been able to work together closely for the general welfare of the State, and the results are manifested in many of its programs such as the workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and insured farm mortgages.

The Wisconsin Bankers' Association, at its annual convention on July 19, 20, and 21, 1950, adopted a declaration of policy urging, among other things, the reduction of Federal expenditures and the deferment of new welfare programs until it is possible to balance the national budget. They have declared that—

> The policy of the Federal Government to spend more than it receives in taxes at a time of high national income is extremely dangerous to the country's welfare.

They further point out that the banks of the country have sufficient loanable funds to meet all meritorious requests for business loans, large and small, and do not believe there is any necessity for Government to create new credit agencies. They favor an adjustment downward in Federal income tax of 53 percent imposed on smaller corporations and oppose any Federal legislation that would vest in the Federal Reserve Board the authority or power to regulate the reserve requirements of any banks that are not members of the Federal Reserve System.

Atlantic Federal Convention Could Halt Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the fourth of a seres of five articles by Clarence Streit, editor of the magazine Freedom and Union, published at 700 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and author of Union Now, which have appeared in various newspapers in the United States and Canada, pointing up the urgent lesson that I find Korea teaches, namely, the Atlantic Union resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 57—cannot be passed too soon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA'S LESSON: THE FREE MUST FEDERATE SOONER

(By Clarence K. Streit)

"It would have been far wiser," Freedom and Union said in April 1949—more than a year before the Korean war—"if the United States instead of starting with an alliance with the other Atlantic democracies, had invited them to meet with it in a federal constitutional convention to explore the possibility of uniting in an organic Atlantic union of the free. * * *

"The Kremlin would have faced this difficulty: It could not attack or take a hostile line toward the convention without thereby assuring and speeding agreement on a federal constitution. * * * All this would be particularly helpful to the United States. So long as it has troops in Europe it is bound to be involved in any major European war. The danger is that the Kremlin will continue its expansion in Asia and come into conflict there with the United States.

"We Americans would be much more sure of the backing of the Europeans there if we had invited them to a federal convention with us than if they were merely our allies. The Kremlin would not miss this point, either."

True, in this Korean test our British allies promptly put their far eastern fleet at the disposition of the United States. But the point remains: By relying only on alliance and the UN, each of which permits each democracy to act at the show-down as it sees fit, we encouraged the Kremlin to gamble that the democracies would again remain divided long enough for aggression to win.

After all, the Kremlin had just seen that the Atlantic Pact and the UN Charter had not prevented the United States and Britain from pursuing opposite policies as regards recognition of Communist China. Atlantic federal union clearly would have prevented this, insured a common policy. This being true, the Kremlin is bound to reason that continued refusal of the Atlantic allies even to explore federal union is strong proof that each is jealously preserving the right to do as it pleases whenever it pleases, and that the possibility of winning through division among them remains good. Two world wars should be proof enough that nothing short of federal union can succeed in discouraging aggressors from wishfully gambling on democratic division. Wars, leagues, alliances—everything else but union has already failed, and failed repeatedly, to discourage this gambling.

If we are to halt the Kremlin in good time from going further down this road to world war, the only safe course is for Congress to pass the Atlantic Union resolution in the short period left before it adjourns this summer. Failure to do this now means the resolution must go over to the next Congress, with the probability that the proposed exploratory convention cannot come to grips before 1952 with the problem of constituting the union. Who can assure us it will not then be too late to prevent a third world war, even by union of the free?

To measure how much the situation may change for the worse by 1952, one needs to recall how much it has already worsened in the brief period since the Atlantic Union resolution was introduced in Congress on July 26, 1949. That was less than 1 year ago, yet we have already suffered the following surprises: devaluation by the British, not only sharper than expected, but copied by more countries; a British election resulting in a weak, unstable government, when stability is needed; the disclosure that Moscow has broken our atomic bomb monopoly; the Fuchs' confession; the decision to make the hydrogen bomb; the loss of all China to communism. On March 13, Senator KEFAUVER reminded the Senate of these disasters, and exclaimed:

"How imprudent to assume, as the State Department implicitly does, that the next 10 months will be fair-weather sailing. How dangerously rash to conclude that we must hasten to explore every way to make the hydrogen bomb, but that we have no time in which to explore the free federal way to keep it from wrecking the world. How foolhardly to believe that we can safely wait until 1951 to debate on this floor whether we should begin exploring whether our American principles of free federal union can lead us to peace."

Already we are engaged in a police war in Korea. Where will be in 1951—1952?

Seoul now—St. Louis when?

Again I say, let us lose no more irretrievable time.

The free cannot federate too soon.

The Plain Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I concur in everything that the editor of the Olean Times-Herald has to say in regard to the lieutenant governor, Joe B. Hanley, of New York State. The people of the Empire State owe much to this fine American for his splendid service. Here is a man who is every inch a patriot, the very type who is needed for leadership in this hour of the Nation's peril. I am inserting under leave to extend, the editorial which ap-

peared in the Olean Times-Herald of recent date:

THE PLAIN TRUTH

Lt. Gov. Joe R. Hanley, hearty and vigorous after reaching the so-called allotted span of threescore years and ten, has led a most active and varied life.

And during the course of that life he has achieved a store of wisdom that, unfortunately, is not granted to all of us.

Moreover, it is an all-embracing wisdom. It applies to men and their foibles and frailties; but especially to government in a democratic land.

And one thing the lieutenant governor had to say the other day at Hamilton College following a 3-week vacation in Iowa far from the madding crowd should be noted by all of us, for nothing ever was truer, and the vast majority of us appear to be completely oblivious to its implications.

"Every time the state steps in and does something for us," said Joe Hanley, "we lose a part of our precious liberty."

At this moment we are actually fighting for our precious liberty.

We are fighting to maintain the principle of human freedom.

We know that if we don't fight for it, and if we don't win that fight, we shall not have any freedom.

We know that our lot, sooner or later, will be that of other peoples who, loving freedom just as much as we love it, have disappeared behind the iron curtain to live at the behest of a ruthless taskmaster.

This fight in which we are engaged will be costly, both in human life and in money.

But we must see it through, in company, with our associates of the United Nations. And we must see it through successfully, if freedom is to survive in this world.

Yet do most of us ever think that "every time the state"—and Mr. Hanley means the national state especially—"steps in and does something for us, we lose a part of our precious liberty"?

Yet it is perfectly true.

It is as true of nations as it is of individuals.

The going is rough indeed, eventually, for the person who has always relied on someone else for virtually everything.

The son who was born with a silver spoon in his mouth and who has had it there ever since invariably goes through a heartbreaking experience when the inevitable time arrives when not only must he fend for himself, but may have to fight a hard and possibly losing battle.

All of us, under such lush circumstances, lull ourselves into a false sense of security. We persuade ourselves that the easy times will last forever; and we let others do more and more for us, and relieve us of as much responsibility as possible.

"Let George do it" has become a notorious American expression.

This country was made great not by governmental paternalism, but by what has been termed, and quite correctly, "rugged individualism."

Its foundations were laid by men and women of courage, endurance, and faith.

They worked hard and long; they had a minimum of comforts and they had an abiding faith in themselves and in their God.

They spent their hardy lives largely by the axiom that the Lord helps those who help themselves; and they built better than they knew.

For the foundations of this great land are sound. Today they are carrying not only America but half the world as well; and they may have to carry more.

But they are stanch and strong; and they will not crumble.

Our concern is the edifice that we shall build on them. Will it—50, 100, 500 years from now—be as rugged as they?

Will it withstand all the shocks of the ages, rocklike against all who would tear it down? Will it continue to be the beacon-light of freedom, and the lodestar of human liberty?

That, friends and neighbors, is something that we and those who shall come after will have to decide; for our destiny lies in our own hands.

And we may well remember the warning of one who has only the welfare of his country at heart—"every time the state steps in and does something for us, we lose a part of our precious liberty."

Illinois Should Keep Lucas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Illinois Should Keep LUCAS," published in the Chicago Sun-Times of Monday, August 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ILLINOIS SHOULD KEEP LUCAS

There are two big reasons why we believe Illinois voters should return SCOTT W. LUCAS to the United States Senate in the election that now is only 90 days away.

1. The American people need men of the caliber of SCOTT LUCAS in Congress. He has shown a straight-thinking appreciation of the problems of this twentieth century world.

Senator LUCAS has grown in stature since he first went to Washington in 1934 to succeed the late Henry T. Rainey in the House of Representatives. Along with Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Mr. LUCAS is rated by independent observers among the 10 most able and valuable men in the Upper Chamber.

In taking the position that Illinois should keep Mr. LUCAS in the Senate we do not say that we think he has always been "right" in his votes. On occasion, he has disagreed with this newspaper's editorial policy. He sometimes disagreed with President Roosevelt, and he has talked back to President Truman, telling him frankly what was possible to accomplish in Congress and what wasn't. The latest such disagreement was over the Spanish loan question a few days ago.

Mr. LUCAS stands on his record. It shows that he has been on the progressive, liberal side on social and global matters, consistently and courageously. He has mixed good sense, political savvy, and human understanding with independent judgment. We'll have more to say about his record later in the campaign.

2. Our second reason for being for LUCAS is our inability to stomach another of the Chicago Tribune's stooges.

Mr. LUCAS' Republican opponent, Everett M. Dirksen, is, in some respects, an even more unfit candidate than the Trib's last two offerings for the Senate, Dick Lyons and C. Wayland "Curly" Brooks.

They were Trib naturals. Dirksen has executed a flip-flop on political matters to win the Trib's support.

It is always a great mistake for any State at any time to send to the Senate a puppet who responds to the jerks on wires running to any newspaper office.

In all American history there is no better illustration of the danger of political wildness in a newspaper office than the attempt of the Tribune's editor to make a mockery of the policies and ideals of Abraham Lincoln by an editorial decision to quit the Civil War, on the eve of victory, with an agreement to let several southern States secede from the Union and keep slavery within their borders. In that flip-flop enterprise the Tribune office tried to use a Republican politician who had gained prestige and power in Washington as a Member of Congress from Illinois.

Mr. Dirksen is a smooth article. His words, flowing like those of a scholar and a statesman, gave him prestige in the House of Representatives. But he was a different Dirksen then, and the Tribune didn't care much for him. Before entrusting to him the power of a United States Senator, the people of Illinois should carefully examine the record.

In 1933 he was a Republican New Dealer. He supported President Roosevelt's domestic program enthusiastically. Thirteen years later, in 1947, he said those measures were "a great departure from the course of freedom."

In his early years as a Congressman, he had a horse-and-buggy outlook toward world affairs. He was a deep-dyed isolationist.

In 1935 he tried to tie up the United States Navy so that it could never operate more than 300 miles off our shores.

While Hitler overran Europe, Dirksen was against selective service, lend-lease, and other safety measures.

When the war was over, Dirksen was soon back at his old stand. In January 1947, he tried to cut military appropriations. Ten months later, he changed his mind again. He was for strengthening the United States. The following year he was all-out for the Marshall plan and strengthening Europe.

Last year he reversed himself again. He said his vote for the Marshall plan was a mistake. This time, the reason for the latest flip-flop was obvious. Dirksen wanted the undivided support of the Republican Party in Illinois for his Senate ambition. That meant kowtowing to the Tribune.

We believe independent voters as well as great numbers of progressive Republicans will be easier in the mind if they support Mr. LUCAS. At least they know where Mr. LUCAS stands—and will continue to stand—on fundamental matters affecting every American's security.

A Water-Resources Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding a water-resources policy made by Alfred Shackelford, international representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, before the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in a hearing at Denver, Colo., in June 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Alfred Shackelford. I am an international representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (A. F. of L.) assigned to the State of Arizona. My home is in Tucson, Ariz. Our headquarters office of district 7, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (A. F. of L.), is 1201 Jones Street, Fort Worth, Tex. I report to W. L. Ingram, international vice president, at that address. In Arizona we have 21 IBEW local unions, representing more than 3,500 workers. District 7, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (A. F. of L.), comprises the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and in that area there are 105 IBEW local unions.

My presentation to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission will be brief. In order to state clearly and concisely the position of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers with respect to some of the matters on the general subject of water resources policy, let me quote a statement issued May 25, 1950, by the international office of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

"In the interests of the commonweal there is no more pressing need than provision for flood control, irrigation, navigation, and the prevention of soil erosion.

"By reason of geography and the topography of the land such provision and prevention is necessarily and inescapably within the realm of Federal obligation.

"In the fulfillment of such obligation our Federal Government properly conceived the idea of utilizing hydropower for the purpose of generating electricity as a byproduct of soil conservation and irrigation. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., heartily endorsed and diligently supported the idea.

"However, in the interval since the inauguration of this program there have been developed and instituted procedures engendered by a false concept of the fundamentals of Americanism.

"The Rural Electrification Administration was brought into being for the purpose of facilitating the transmission of electricity into rural sections. Under the Government power program, however, the facilitating intent has been substituted for by a plan involving what could well be and assumes all the aspects of the first step in the evolution of governmental ownership of the generation, transmission, and sale of electricity to the individual consumers. Under this program the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration combined with the functioning of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the Army engineers, have extended the scope of the program to a point that threatens peril to legitimate free enterprise.

"The scope of the program now embraces the generation of electricity by power other than that procured through irrigation and flood control, steam as an instance; the distribution of electric power and the sale of electric power in direct competition with privately owned electric utility companies.

"The Rural Electrification Administration, through its financing of cooperatives, has proceeded to the extent of using public moneys supplied by the taxpayers for the building of electric transmission lines parallel to existing privately owned distribution systems. The progress of this procedure is such as to clearly indicate complete duplication of transmission facilities in competition that can only lead to extermination of private utility companies. Such complete extermination has been accomplished in the State of Tennessee and is rapidly approaching completion in the State of South Carolina and is making rapid progress in the State of Nebraska.

"In pursuing the above policy the Rural Electrification Administration has lowered the quality of work standards and ignored the rights of electrical workers to bargain collectively.

"The resulting situation is anomalous indeed. In the first instance while the fundamental policies of the Federal Government champion the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively, the administration of the Rural Electrification completely ignores these rights of labor. In the second instance, one branch of Government is engaged in the prosecution of trusts and combines on the premise that the operation of such trusts is inimical to the commonweal. At the same time, a department of the Government is nurturing a governmental monopoly of the generation, distribution and sale of the greatest power man has mastered for industrial production, home necessities, and public convenience.

"The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers does not raise its voice on the subject of public power in behalf of private companies or their management. We have met the abuses of power by these companies in the past and have achieved substantial correction. Today 90 percent of the workers in the privately owned electric light and power industry are covered by union contracts and the IBEW itself represents more than 75 percent of the organized employees in this industry.

"The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers raises its voice on the subject of public power at this time in the interest of organized labor in the electric light and power industry. The subtle transformation of the Government program from the proper purposes of providing power as a byproduct of the initial program and of furnishing a yardstick for private utilities has reached the stage where it threatens free enterprise in this industry. We support free enterprise not only in our capacity as citizens of the United States but also in our capacity as representatives of organized labor. The increase in the area of Government and quasi-Government ownership operation of utilities necessarily carries with it a decrease in the area of freedom for labor as well as other groups.

"Labor cherishes its right to bargain collectively for wages, hours, and working conditions. It fights the abrogation of such rights whether in the form of antilabor laws or in the more complicated form of transferring their status to employees of the Government without any rights to bargain collectively or otherwise exercise their economic strength.

"The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has had drastic experience with the effect of its interests resulting from the transfer of utilities from private to public or quasi-public ownership.

"In a recent case where the ownership of a utility was transferred to a municipality the IBEW was deprived of collective bargaining rights by an order of the court even though the majority of voters of the municipality had enacted an ordinance requiring their officials to bargain with the union.

"Labor does not choose to have its welfare determined by the administrative orders of Government officials no matter how well intentioned they may purport to be.

"Under fascism, nazism and communism the people work for the state. Under the policies inaugurated by the Rural Electrification Administration those employed on electrical properties work for the Government under the guise of cooperatives. It is a distinction without a difference.

"That the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has been cognizant of these developments for some time was indicated by its expressed concern in 1948, when its international president, D. W. Tracy, in an address before the members of the Edison Electric Institute, in the course of his remarks said:

"I would not be talking heart to heart in a manner consistent with my expressed desire in my earlier remarks if I did not say: 'we need and must have more democracy in government and more democracy in business with less government interference in business and in labor. In an effort to prevent possible misunderstanding of my statement I emphasize the fact that the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers endorses, advocates, and defends the profit system. Call it capitalism, if you will, but the fact remains the system is an element of Americanism because it is the economic system of our land and has contributed to the higher standard of living in this country which at once becomes the envy and the hope of common people in foreign lands.'

"The international executive council of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers today endorsed the action of International President Tracy and unanimously subscribed to this public release in defense of freedom of labor, in defense of freedom of legitimate enterprise, the common-weal through safeguarding the elements of Americanism, against assault, by authoritarian or state power on the liberties that have identified America as the country where labor has an effective voice in the establishment of conditions of its employment."

With this statement as a background, we take the position that on all water resources projects:

1. The full rights of labor to bargain collectively should not be abridged in any manner whatsoever;

2. The sovereign rights of States should be respected by the Federal Government; compacts between States should be protected; State water laws should be observed; and, where there is a conflict of interest between the Federal Government and the States, the rights of the States should be given precedence by the Federal Government;

3. Regional authorities or administrations as are presently being proposed should be opposed;

4. All of the benefits, as stipulated by Congress, should exceed all of the costs with the Congress being the final authorizing agent;

5. Where power is produced, it should be sold at wholesale only at its competitive market price, without preference as to distributors, as between private or governmental distributors; it should be made available to all distributors in such manner as will not result in the Federal Government building transmission lines, but if it is absolutely necessary for the Government to build such lines to market power they shall not duplicate existing adequate lines, except where the owners of such lines will not cooperate with the Government; and, the Government should discontinue its program of using subsidized power to nationalize the power business;

6. Power should be used to help defray the cost of irrigation by an equitable plan that will result in maximum benefits to an area in terms of a sound economy;

7. The Federal Government should be required to pay to the States and their subdivisions the same taxes on the power facilities of projects as would be the case if the facilities were owned by private power companies; and

8. The policy should be so drawn as to put the Congress back into the business of making the laws of the land and not some administrative agency of the Federal Government.

Labor has as great a stake in what is done in determining water resources policy as any segment of our society. We appreciate very much the privilege and opportunity of presenting our views on these important matters to the Commission. We trust that our views

will be accorded the full weight to which they are entitled in your deliberations as your report on water-resources policy is being prepared for the President.

Respectfully submitted.

ALFRED SHACKELFORD.

Public Utilities Admit Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a most enlightening article from the current issue of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association News, official publication of the organization of municipal and cooperative distributors served by the TVA.

The article, entitled Private Utilities Admit Failure, makes some interesting disclosures concerning the efforts of the powerful power lobby, through its propaganda agents, to distort the facts about TVA, and to smear the agency with the brush of socialism.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE UTILITIES ADMIT FAILURE

(By N. W. Ayer & Son)

The most interesting document received in this office since the formation of the association comes from the most unexpected source. It is a report to the private utilities by their advertising agency, N. W. Ayer & Son. The report is based on a survey made by the Opinion Research Corp. to ascertain the public's attitude on TVA.

"To us, the TVA is a symbol of socialism, Government competition, bureaucracy, and waste. To the majority of the people, who have received much propaganda and little information on TVA, it is a symbol of progress.

"Some fewer people in 1949 approved of TVA than did in 1947 * * * but still, only 10 percent say they disapprove."

This is an admission that we never expected to see from the private utility lobby. In spite of the slurs of socialism and such contained in the quote, the closing 7 words of the quotation are very revealing. The report goes on to say that in 1947 a similar survey showed that 4 percent more people approved of TVA than they did in this report. In some respects this is one of the finest tributes ever paid to the Authority. In spite of the intense campaign of newspaper, radio, motion picture, and word-of-mouth propaganda, only 4 percent have been affected.

SMEAR CAMPAIGN

The report goes on to say, in an effort to explain the failure of the campaign: "It is apparent that to link our fight to the TVA question would run us into a lot of opposition, most of it based on lack of knowledge. But to link our fight to socialism is something else again. The people do not want socialism." The audacity of that admission is rather hard to comprehend. It simply says in so many words that you can't destroy TVA on the facts. You have got to resort to a smear campaign and call it socialism. It is doubtful that most of us in the valley directly concerned with the TVA program fully realized that TVA's record of accomplishment was so outstanding that even their bitterest opponents would admit that the program can't be destroyed simply by presenting the facts.

PRIVATE UTILITY EMPLOYEES APPROVE TVA

There are many interesting things in this report besides these already quoted. It is not our intention to burden you with too many quotes, but we do wish that we had sufficient copies of the report to send to every distributor of TVA power. One of the more interesting things is the fact that 45 percent of the private utility employees approve of TVA. Forty percent disapprove and 15 percent had no opinion. These people who should know the private utilities better than most anyone; these people who have been told times without number that TVA constitutes a threat to their job security; these people who are being told that TVA is a superstate, and socialistic, still approve the idea.

INTENT OF REPORT

Anyone would undoubtedly be puzzled over why such a report was released if it were not for the conclusions at the end of the report. Questions such as this are raised: "What can my company do to change the minds of the people in our communities?" It goes on to say that national advertising provides a persuasive background but doesn't supplement the individual's job. There is another question: "Are you using the mat service?—Is your local advertising program geared to the national program?" It is entirely apparent to anyone what these questions mean. It means a call for more money. It is a suggestion to redouble the efforts to destroy public confidence in the great Tennessee Valley program.

EVERY CHALLENGE MET

It has been our contention for quite some time that the private utilities would never rest until they had seriously damaged or changed the TVA set-up. As long as TVA is as outstandingly successful as it has been, it goes without saying that other sections of the country will demand such a regional development. This the private utilities figure they must stop at all costs. We know what we may expect. We have met every challenge that has been thrown at us so far. We are being attacked from many different points. We do not have the resources to meet 1 percent of the propaganda being thrown against us. Individual effort on the part of people of the valley by sending information such as this to friends and acquaintances outside the Tennessee Valley is the most effective way that we have at our command to tell the real truth about TVA. We do not have to resort to smear campaigns and name calling. We can stand on the facts and win. That is what their own advertising agency admits.

Time United States Replied to Vile Red Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bill Cunningham from the Boston Sunday Herald of August 6, 1950:

TIME UNITED STATES REPLIED TO VILE RED LIES

(By Bill Cunningham)

Who speaks for us, and what is he saying?

The charge coming in from important listening posts the world over is that we're suffering bigger and steadier losses in the field of propaganda than any yet suffered in the Korean fields of battle. For one thing, from powerful stations—especially Radio North Korea at Pyongyang—Russia is drenching the entire Asiatic world with the most violent and concentrated abuse the United States has yet received anywhere.

Nobody makes any effort to answer for us. The Russians have the air to themselves. Their lies go unanswered; their claims unchallenged. The peoples of China, India, the Philippines, Indochina, Burma, and even the Japanese are urged to unite against us as murderers and enslavers.

Their endless broadcasts beamed toward the southern Koreans are extremely cunning, and monitors are afraid they are very effective. Completely ignoring the fact that the northern Koreans are responsible for the invasion that started the fight, we are charged as the aggressors—the invaders.

Russia, they say, offers the Koreans peace, while we not only offer them war; we're making war upon them. Ignoring the United Nations, they charge the United States with having tried to divide Korea on the "traditional imperialist theory of 'divide and conquer.'" Russia stands by as a great and loving friend, hoping only that Koreans—meaning North Koreans—will be successful in freeing their entire nation of the American thieves who are trying to seize it, enslave its people and strip it of its wealth.

When victory comes, says this North Korea radio, a real all-Korean election will be held. In that great, glad day, says this monstrous instrument of perfidy, the only dastards not permitted to vote will be "pro-Americans, Japanese, and the insane." That latter is repeated over and over, and it's that that is so insidious, and is possibly so effective.

RELENTLESSLY HAMMERED INTO PEASANTS' MINDS

It hammers relentlessly into the minds of the peasants that any believers in the honest intentions of the United States are to be classed with Japanese, bitterly hated because of their long and ruthless occupation, and the mentally incompetent. It likewise hammers hard at the fact that even if we win, Korea will still be divided at the thirty-eighth parallel.

The Communists, it says, offer unity, the reuniting of the several halves, peace and restored prosperity under the mothering love of holy Russia, while what, it demands, are we offering? What are we even saying? Obviously, it tells these simple people, our tongues are still because our hands are red and our hearts are black.

But the answer, it says, can be had for the looking. The answer is in the native dead, the bomb-blackened cities of both North and South Korea, the crops that are trampled, the villages destroyed, the roads that have been mined, the costly and vital bridges that have been blown.

The fiery finish, of course, is the call to arise, to turn on the white man, join the freedom fighters from the north, kill the invader, spy on him, destroy his supplies, throw him, in short, back into the sea. This booms from the air endlessly, day and night.

We simply shoot and say nothing.

The hard truth of the matter is, we haven't much of any way to say anything. Forgetting Korea, to consider the Russian zones of influence as a whole, there's no way we can get an equal shot at the native ear. We make an effort of sorts through the Voice of America and we've recently activated a powerful "Radio Free Europe" in Germany.

These efforts presuppose the existence of personally owned short-wave receiving sets in the Communist countries and citizens brave enough to risk their lives to listen.

It further assumes that if they listen, they'll believe what they hear and be converted. That's a worthy, but a very vulnerable assumption.

The Russians, and their agent, however, take no such chances. Borrowing an idea from the Nazis, they have a public-address system in every village square and every citizen is required to listen to the daily government harangue. Many of these places, of course, have no newspapers. That's just as well because there are undoubtedly many who can't read. They all, however, can understand the spoken word. All get their daily treatments of the glory of communism and abuse of the capitalistic world, with special attention to us.

SYSTEM USED IN NAZI GERMANY

I saw this system being used in Germany in 1936. At regular intervals along the sidewalks of every important street, even in Berlin, loud speakers were installed on poles after the fashion of street lamps. Sometimes they were silent. They frequently played pleasant music, and not too loudly. But occasionally they'd thunder, "Achtung! Achtung," which means "Attention." Then everything and everybody stopped still in its tracks for that was the government speaking and every German was required to listen.

Every German was thereupon told whatever the "all high", or Herr Doktor Goebbels had in mind right then. These speakers were in every public place, indoors and out. It was a serious offense to turn one of them off. The Nazis took no chances upon the individual listener. They didn't depend upon a citizen's owning his own set.

The Russians are using that same system now, and there's no way we can break into it, hope to blanket it, or even to compete with it. We naturally can't originate, as the radio expression is, over their own facilities, and that's the only way we possibly could reach those loud speakers. We have to gamble on secret reception, dared at risk of imprisonment or death. There may be some of that in the iron-curtain countries. There may possibly be some inside Russia, itself, but it stands to reason that few of the peasants of China, say, have the funds to own and maintain a radio set.

Russia has the full advantage in the back areas of the earth and is endeavoring at the moment to exploit it to the uttermost. There seems to be no way we can compete with it, but we at least should clearly understand what is being done to us.

Over in the other direction, the newest and most intelligent move yet is the so-called Crusade for Freedom recently announced "to combat communism." This is backed by a powerful committee representing national leaders of all faiths and fields, with Gen. Lucius D. Clay as its national chairman.

Its prospectus says: "The Communists are trying hard to make the world think we started the Korean war and that we are a Nation of imperialist warmongers out to conquer the world. It is vitally important that we step up our campaign of truth to blast this false propaganda—to demonstrate before the world our true aims of freedom and friendship for all peoples. * * *"

This goes on to announce what amounts to a national campaign next month to have millions of Americans sign a statement of belief in the cause of world freedom. The symbol of this freedom is to be a great freedom bell, after the idea, apparently, of the Liberty Bell. This 10-ton bell, 8 feet high, has already been cast in England, and is intended for installation in Berlin.

FIRST STEP IN WORLD CAMPAIGN

The dedication, given deep religious significance, will be the first step in the world-wide campaign to establish the ideals of America before the world. The first peal of the new bell will be broadcast world-wide by radio and will be the signal for all church, schoolhouse, city hall and all other sorts of bells to ring all over the Christian world.

"Later," it says, "consideration will be given to the casting of a similar bell for erection in Korea, to ring for freedom in the eastern world."

That's beautiful, and all, but that's not exactly any sure-fire plan for winning native souls from the gloating Russian Satan.

On the point 4 front, they're outselling us completely through what amounts to a mechanical monopoly. But how about the other fronts, the fronts we can reach, and, especially, the most important and most accessible of all fronts at the moment—the tremendous sounding board of that United Nations meeting with the Russian in the chair?

It seems perfectly obvious by now why Comrade Malik returned. Russia called off the boycott and ordered him back to stall, argue, abuse, and dissemble, first, to delay in every possible way further United Nations procedure while the Communists shoot their all for quick victory in Korea, and, secondly, to use his chairmanship as an excuse to preach the twisted Russian gospel officially to the Asiatic, and all the rest of the Russian-fearing world.

His deliberately carpentered lies and his cold abuse of the United States synchronize perfectly with the propaganda broadcasts from that North Korean radio. Here's a man who definitely does speak for his government and who definitely says what it wants him to say. His story is monstrous. He's nothing but a liar, and so is his government, but that is their coldly calculated stand before the world, and for the record.

And who speaks for us, and what does he say?

So far as that body is concerned, our gentleman is the Honorable Warren Austin, and in terms of the ground the Russian Malik is covering, our Mr. Austin hasn't said anything. Every man in the room knows the Russian is lying. There isn't any difficulty in getting the votes necessary to slap down his loaded contentions and proposals. His only support comes from the controlled Russian lickspittles—and, strangely enough, India, a queer people at best.

But why haven't we seized the same opportunity to give the world our message, our side of the story?

Why hasn't our Mr. Austin, instead of accepting the defensive, instead of merely counterpunching, as we say in pugilism, hauled off and slugged the big Russian oaf from the tacks in his heels?

WE'VE FAILED TO DENOUNCE THE VILE LIES

This mouthy apostle of the international anti-Christ has denounced and abused our Nation by name. He's charged us before the world with deceit, treachery, untruth, and murder. In complete perversion of the facts as all the free world knows them, he has charged that we deliberately attacked Korea because we itched for a war, instead of the truth there on the record before him—that we moved only to try to enforce an official ruling of the Council he's now presiding over, and only with that Council's blessing and backing.

The whole of the civilized world is on record against him. The minutes of all the past meetings contradict every word he utters. Yet, ignoring the term "United Nations" entirely, he, in the name of Russia, stands there vilifying the name of the United States, verbally defiling the grave of every American soldier, and directly insulting us all with every foul word he utters.

And where is our answer?

It's apparently choked somewhere in the gullet of Warren Austin, or possibly the Honorable Dean Acheson, because it's taken for granted that Mr. Austin says only what he's told to, too. The telling must come from the State Department, because that's our official control station for foreign affairs. It's got to be Mr. Acheson and/or President Truman. That's the top echelon.

We haven't even mentioned Russia by name. Maybe that should be written, "dared mention Russia by name." Are we afraid? That's the impression we must be selling the Russians, and that can be a fatal impression.

The forthright stand for the United States, as an agent of the United Nations, is to charge Russia officially, and by name, with having broken United Nations law by arming, training, then ordering the Korean Communists to defy the United Nations mandate in Korea. We should demand that Russia forthwith be tried as an international criminal, and we should have challenged the right of Malik even to preside at this meeting of the Council.

We then should go ahead with our present preparation and in the meanwhile tell Russia that we've had all her lies, her abuse, her double dealing and chicanery the Western World intends to take. We should tell her the lie she's trying to establish concerning Korea is disproved, sadly enough for us, by what's happened out there. If we'd deliberately started that trouble, we'd certainly have had, at least, something on hand to see it through.

We should remind the Kremlin—the world listening—that although we've looked bad in Korea because we made the mistake of trusting Russia and weren't prepared for Korea, we are powerfully prepared for the kind of war Russia will be inviting if she takes another step toward us. That's with a mighty air force of intercontinental bombers, that can freight the atomic bomb, and which will—without notice.

We should inform our late allies that, while we cut back our Navy, we didn't sink the ships. We've got a great fighting fleet that could be refloated. There are plenty of aircraft carriers. We, or no nation on earth, could mass the manpower necessary to occupy Russia, but we don't want Russia. All we want is for Russia to leave us alone, and one certain way to make sure of that, would be to bomb it to rubble and leave it to rot.

But who speaks for us? The professionally prissy Mr. Acheson. Or has our President lost his tongue? He was cocky enough when he made that "nonpolitical" tour out to the Grand Coulee Dam back there in May. I remember particularly because I saw him in Chicago at that great revival the local politicians held.

He was full of fight then—but the potential enemy was only a lot of mythical Republicans.

Mr. Truman was full of fight the other day—but it was fight against a fallen brother, a Democratic Representative named PRIEST, who, hard-pressed at the edge of a primary election, said he thought Secretaries Acheson and Johnson ought to resign. Millions of, maybe most, Americans agree with him, but the President took occasion next day to hurl a rebuke at him, and then assured the Nation, and the world, that the Messrs. Acheson and Johnson will remain in office as long as he, Mr. Truman, does.

That makes them one with that beloved military hero, Gen. Harry Vaughan—and by the way, whatever happened to him, except that he's still attached to the public udder? There was never a time in history when one who formerly said so much has recently said so little. In fact, he's been mute ever since the deep freezers and the molasses came back to haunt him.

The President will stand up for his friends, an admirable trait under certain circumstances, but when will he start to stand up for his Nation? It's being blackguarded and vilified in the ears of the world, deliberately lied about and placed through its very silence, on the defensive. After watching Mr.

Austin, I have some personal doubts about his being the proper person to serve as the mouthpiece. He lost his temper pretty clearly in the proceedings the other day, and while that's understandable, it's likewise a sign of weakness. The British representative, Sir Gladwin Jebb, does the more professional job. He drives the cold steel with a disarming smile.

It's not yet too late. Malik has succeeded in stalling action for exactly a week, giving the North Koreans that much more time. At last reports, however, they hadn't won the victory, and the Security Council goes back into session on Tuesday. The United States should go in then strictly on the offensive, take no more back talk, demand that Malik hold to the facts, or give up the gavel, charge Russia by name as an international criminal and demand that the case go on trial. There's no other policy consistent with honor, courage, and truth.

Some Views on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, granted by the House, I include therein a statement on the subject of inflation.

I recommend it to my colleagues in view of the present situation in the world, and especially the condition of our own domestic economy.

The specter of inflation is again spreading its deadly wings over our fair land. With a consumer's price level already 44 percent higher than 1946, when a Republican Congress had temporarily halted inflation and the average wage level in manufacturing industries only 30 percent higher, we face an ever-widening gap between what a man earns and what he has to spend to maintain his 1946 standard of living. This gap will widen if our money is further cheapened to pay for this war in Korea.

When the Democrats went off the gold standard in 1934 they unhitched the dollar from gold. Not only did the Government confiscate 41 percent of the gold value of every dollar in circulation on January 31, 1934, but it made it unlawful to buy gold with dollars. So that raising the price of gold in dollars became meaningless as an effort to raise commodity prices. As the gears were changed to increase the speed of the driving wheels in relation to the speed of the engine, at the very same time the driving shaft was disconnected. We have had a free-wheeling dollar ever since, which has fluctuated absolutely independently of the price the Government pays for gold.

Prices did not rise as expected by the amount we had raised the price of gold which was 59 percent. Instead by 1940 the wholesale price index stood at 78.6 as compared with 74.9 in 1934, only a 5 percent increase. In 1941, however, they had jumped to 87.3, a 140 percent increase in 1 year over the increase of the entire previous 6 years. At present they stand at 163.0, an 87 percent increase over 1941. The reason prices shot up in 1941 was due to the sale of war bonds. These acted just like money and this increased the velocity of the circulating medium in relation to the velocity of the movement of goods. This spells inflation. The purchasing power of the dollar is cheapened and all persons on fixed incomes, all holders of bonds, life-insurance policies, all pensioners, in fact all persons except the labor racketeers who hold the public up for wage increases and the commodity and stock-market gamblers, who profit in each price rise, suffer a set-back in their standard of living.

The other day we received advice from two sources. One was that veteran adviser, Mr. Bernard Baruch. The other was the President's Economic Advisory Council. Their advice was miles apart. Mr. Baruch proposed that we establish drastic controls that would prevent further inflation as a result of the Government spending necessary to defend ourselves against Russian aggression. He wanted us to raise taxes "higher than a cat's back." The President's Economic Advisory Council, however, saw no need for such drastic controls and this is reflected in the President's recommendation that only about half of the $10,000,000,000 he requests, should be raised by taxes.

Opposed as I am to high taxes, I am more strongly opposed to inflation. Unless we raise taxes and cut out unnecessary Government expenses to fight this war we must further inflate the currency and this may in our present condition bring on an inflationary spiral that would lead us down the road to disaster.

I am perfectly familiar with the economic philosophy of the President's Economic Advisory Council. It is the philosophy of the expanding economy. This is just a fancy way of saying "inflation." As I have shown, wage increases have lagged behind price increases since 1946. And under our present free-wheeling dollar they must continue to lag, because each increase in wages is immediately reflected in an increase in prices. The dog never catches his tail. The gentlemen who advise the President, however, are like the man who wants to increase his volume of business in order to offset his net loss on each item he sells. If we are lagging 14 percent behind 1946 today in real wages, let us inflate and inflate and boost and boost both wages and prices, they advise, until in some mythical future year with ever-mounting prices we will have reached a total national income of $500,000,000,000 per year. It makes no difference to these gentlemen whether our larger national income involves a 14-percent loss in real wages on every dollar we earn. We will all be making more money, even though we will be spending still more to live. In that path lies national bankruptcy.

I cannot go along with the President's program of inadequate measures of control over prices and wages. The time to freeze the inflationary spiral, that will surely follow our appropriations of $10,000,000,000 and the many billions more that must inevitably follow to finance the war against communism, is not 6 months from now, but now.

We owe it to the farmer, to the worker, to the businessman, to the school teacher, and others on fixed incomes to assure them that their dollar in 1951 will purchase just as much as it does in 1950—not 14 percent less but just as much. The only way in which we can assure them that further inflation will not set in, is to tax as we spend, establish adequate controls over prices and wages and freeze our economy in its present position for the duration of this emergency be it 10 months or 10 years.

Do not imagine that Mr. Stalin is acting blindly in waging this satellite war of aggression in Korea. Do not imagine that he is goading the Chinese Communists to invade Formosa, despite our warning, without a purpose. Do not imagine that he is rattling the saber in Berlin, Iran, and Bulgaria just for the fun of it. Mr. Stalin knows that the greatest test for this Nation at any time is not on the battlefield, severe as that may be and may still become. Mr. Stalin is fighting our American way of life. That way of life, that high standard of living which we have reached, once it begins to totter will invite every Communist rat in this country out of his hole to gnaw at the vitals of our weakened economic body. It is here, thanks to Mr. Stalin, that the ultimate victory of communism can best be achieved. While our boys are fighting the North Koreans and the 10,000,000 Communists in China, we must not permit inflation to undermine the American system. The American dollar is the symbol of our economic strength just as the American flag is the symbol of our military strength and national honor. If our dollar loses more of its real value, in an upward spiral of inflation, then the flag must inevitably dip in ignominious salute to the Reds. We are fighting communism to maintain our way of life. But that way of life can be easily undermined, our standard of living can drop and drop, as it has already in the last 4 years, unless we plug every crack in the dike against the disastrous flood of inflation.

Our Little Helpers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following pertinent article from the Washington Star by Constantine Brown, one of the Nation's foremost writers on international affairs:

WILL THE NEXT NATION TO BE ATTACKED BE ONE THAT SENT REGRETS ON KOREA?

(By Constantine Brown)

The real testing ground of the United Nations today is not at Lake Success. It is on the beaten-up peninsula of Korea.

Conceived in high hope, the United Nations was founded on a determination to save

succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to defend the equal rights of nations large and small.

The United States took a leading role in this magnificent conception. The United States, never an aggressor nation, has taken a lead role in trying to make this conception a fact of life in the world. With patience, even if not always with best judgment or soundest wisdom, the United States, or more importantly the American people, has tried to guide this collective effort in the direction of peace.

There has been one recalcitrant nation, Soviet Russia. Working out of a pattern which was clear even before the United Nations was founded, Russia has followed a policy of aggression, of conquest and even of genocide in the envelopment of neighboring nations and peoples. It is confirmation, perhaps, of the stated ideals and objectives of the United States that Russia during the postwar years has recognized and publicized our country as its real target.

Aggression in Korea was a Soviet move, a calculated gamble that peace-loving America would not react to a point of armed intervention. If Moscow had been right it could have ridiculed the softness of purpose of the United States, played to advantage the propaganda line that America was a friend only of the great western powers. But Moscow lost as the United States threw its resources of blood and steel into defense of a weak little republic far removed from the perimeter of our own territorial or economic interests.

WE SHOWED THE WAY

In so doing, the United States showed the way to the United Nations to make this cause a collective one, one which could serve to hearten many other nations who live today too close to the shadow of the iron curtain. It led and it joined the United Nations in calling upon the other member nations, large and small, to do their respective shares in this effort.

There was no thought in this country that ours would not be the major effort, that we would not supply most of the manpower, most of the money and most of the material. We have reached out in the past 5 years to assume the major burden of rehabilitating and strengthenening the free world.

But this endeavor has been far from a selfish one, and when an overwhelming majority of the United Nations accepted the challenge of aggression in Korea we had reason to expect that there would be friends on the firing line as well as at the message centers.

To date the results have been disappointing. Elements of air and naval strength of other nationalities have appeared in the combat zone, a few promises have been received of ground troops to come, a scattering of other offers have been acknowledged and some regrets have been filed.

Today American men are dying in Korea and new billions of American dollars are being ploughed into the armaments of war, the vitals of defense of others as well as of ourselves.

STRENGTH HAS LIMIT

Perhaps it is presumptuous to lecture the other free nations on what they should do. But it is not inappropriate to point out to them that the United States is not a bottomless reservoir of military and economic strength, that our astounding success in placing fighting men in a far off field in a matter of days and weeks is not matched by promises of the men of other nations in 3 months or a year, and that the American people are being confronted constantly with the persuasive suggestion that we might more profitably and justifiably concentrate on conserving and strengthening our own internal defenses and economy.

Tomorrow some other nation of the free world may be the target of Soviet aggression. If such happens, the victim can look nowhere but to the United States for aid. Will it be a nation that offered and speeded all it could to the collective effort in Korea? Or will it be one that expressed regrets?

The WCTU and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of Monday, August 7, 1950. The editorial follows:

THE WCTU AND THE WAR

It is hardly surprising that the energetic ladies of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union already are urging, in the light of the Korean crisis, that legislation be passed to curb liquor sales in the vicinity of Army posts.

Mrs. D. Leigh Colvin, national president of the organization, says: "Our boys are entitled to protection from brass hats and politicians who seem to think that booze, immorality, and gambling are essential to military morale."

Reasonable regulations to control the recreational activities of men in the armed services are, of course, greatly to be desired. At the same time, one may be pardoned a bit of skepticism concerning the program of control which the WCTU might be expected to favor.

For the word "temperance," as used as part of the name of that organization, doesn't mean "temperance" at all; it means absolute prohibition. The WCTU wants prohibition of all forms of alcohol, and is evidently not concerned with the fact that the "noble experiment," of fragrant memory, failed utterly to prohibit when it was on the statute books, and merely produced a huge new crop of lawbreakers, hypocrites, and grafters.

The WCTU would, if it could, prevent every man in uniform from having so much as one glass of beer on leave. If this organization really believed in temperance, as the word is commonly understood and defined, that would be important. Temperance is one of the most desirable of the virtues, and one of the most essential places for its cultivation is in the use of alcohol, for overindulgence in alcohol has produced a vast amount of misery. Unfortunately, this sort of temperance is not to be found in the lexicon of the WCTU.

Of course, all Mrs. Colvin and her compatriots are saying at the moment is that our boys in the Army camps should be "protected." What they really have in the back of their minds is the "protection" of everybody through the enactment of another prohibition law.

In contrast to this program there is that of the Temperance and Tolerance Association of America, founded by a former leader in the WCTU, Mrs. Ida M. Thurber. Mrs. Thurber had been a WCTU leader for nearly half a century when she decided in 1944 that she could not go along with that organization in its campaign for State-wide prohibition in her State of Nebraska. She concluded that prohibition was an evil, and she took an active part in fighting the effort to bring it back.

Despite her nearly 50 years' work for temperance, she was expelled from the WCTU. So she founded the Temperance and Tolerance Association of America, with headquarters in Lincoln, Nebr. Among those active in it are the Reverend Alson J. Smith, a Methodist minister, and the Reverend Harold J. Hamilton, a Baptist. The organization says it has members in 46 States.

Its program is far more realistic and sensible than that of the WCTU and its allies. Temperance, in the true sense, and tolerance are goals for which every citizen of good will should strive. Prohibition can only be a malignant farce.

Voice of America: Is It Effective?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House to extend my remarks, I include therein the statement appearing in the Evening Star of Washington for August 7, 1950, by Julius Epstein.

It is difficult to believe that the Voice of America withholds facts because they might be offensive to Russia, but such is the contents of the article I am inserting herewith, by one who knows something of the subject:

SOFT-SPEAKING VOICE

I want to express my gratitude to The Star for David Lawrence's column of July 18, on the ineffectiveness of our psychological warfare.

Mr. Lawrence is certainly dead right when he states that the absolute incompetence of our Voice of America cannot be explained by lack of funds. I agree completely with him when he says: "But the truth is that even if $100,000,000 is appropriated, it would be ineffective if our Government fails to express itself forthrightly in the propaganda field." I want to contribute a recent example of what he is talking about.

A few weeks ago, Count Joseph Czapski visited the United States. He is not only a great Polish writer and a good painter, but also one of the very few survivors of the mass slaughter of more than 15,000 Polish officers during World War II on Russian soil. He was invited to address the Polish people through our Voice of America. When he submitted the draft of his speech to the New York office of the Voice, he was advised to omit any mention of Katyn, where many of the Polish officers had been slain.

This fits perfectly the answer I was given by high officials of the Voice and the State Department when I inquired some months ago, why the Voice did not broadcast the speech delivered by our former ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, and his letter to Russian Foreign Minister Vishinsky, both issued at the occasion of the formation of the American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre, Inc. Those gentlemen told me: "It would create too much hatred of Stalin among the Poles."

I asked the gentlemen of the Voice: "What do you want to create among the Poles? Love for Stalin, at the expense of the American taxpayer?" There was no answer to this question.

There are still too many of the old OWI (Office of War Information) employees working for the Voice, both in this country and overseas. I mean those writers, translators and broadcasters who so wholeheartedly and

enthusiastically tried for many years to create "love for Stalin," when this was the official policy of our ill-advised wartime Government and of our military government in Germany. There is no doubt that all those employees were at that time deeply convinced of the absolute correctness of that pro-Stalinist propaganda. How can we expect them to do the exact opposite now?

Even if they try to do the impossible—they certainly do not want to lose their well-paid jobs—they cannot change their skin and speak with the same power of persuasion against the bloody monster in the Kremline as they spoke for so many years in its favor, when they ardently tried to sell the story of our "gallant ally," the "democratic and peace-loving Stalin."

As long as the officials of our Voice of America are afraid "to create hatred against Stalin," the real embodiment of evil on earth, and as long as those old friends of Stalin, now in the disguise of weak anti-Stalinists, are allowed to run the show, no good can come from it and the money spent on that enterprise is wasted.

Modern Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, attached hereto is an article from the August 7 issue of my home town newspaper, the Greenville Piedmont, Greenville, S. C., which recalls the Horatio Alger stories of long ago. I should like to make it a part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It has been my privilege to know "Gene" Stone and his family through the years and I can personally vouch for his outstanding record. This is another example that there are still opportunities in this great country of ours under its system of free enterprise. Frequently I go through the Greenville plant with Mr. Stone, and have been impressed with the friendly relationship existing between him and his many faithful employees. We have few labor problems. If others would emulate Eugene Stone and his associates then contentions and dissensions would eventually disappear. I am honored to bring you, my colleagues, this interesting and inspiring story:

GREENVILLE INDUSTRY—STONE'S IS MODERN SUCCESS STORY—COOPERATION BETWEEN MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEES KEYSTONE OF SUCCESS

(By Leonard Turnbull)

Trillions of stitches make millions of sunsuits, ladies' slips, aprons, men's woven shorts, pinafores, creepers, western shirts, and pants every year for the Stone Manufacturing Co., of Greenville.

The local industry drives for production on an assembly-line basis. As President Eugene Stone III explains it, "We're in a highly competitive business. We've got to do things better and faster than the other man."

Today Stone Manufacturing Co. has spread outside Greenville. In addition to two sewing plants and a warehouse here, the firm has a sewing plant in Columbia. Over 1,200 workers run over 1,000 machines from 8 a. m. to 5 p. m., 5 days a week.

Gene Stone was 24 years old back in 1933 in the rough days of the depression. Yet on July 9, 1933, the young man had confidence enough to open a plant at 154 River Street, employing five workers.

Jersey bloomers and cotton slips were the only clothing varieties offered by the Stone firm during the first years of trial. Young Gene went on the road, selling all the bloomers and slips his struggling firm could produce.

By a policy of consistently adding machines each year and increasing employees, Mr. Stone expanded his organization. He built up a sales organization throughout the South, "and in a few years nationally."

ANOTHER EXPANSION

In 1942, the Stone firm moved from River Street to the present plant on East Court. The American Cigar factory there had decided to call it quits in Greenville.

A total of 200 machines were set up in the new plant. Workers made these hum.

Another enlargement came when the firm bought a plant at River and Cox Streets. Cutting many strips of cloth at a time is done here. The cutting plant has been enlarged twice in the last 2 years.

Three years ago marked the construction of a plant at Webster and Calvin Streets that frankly is the apple of Gene Stone's eyes. This model plant is air-conditioned, "and is the last word for this section," Mr. Stone said.

All testing and trying out of new numbers is carried out at the new plant. Its 250 workers "see what is best and the most efficient manner of making it. All equipment is brand new," Mr. Stone said.

Finally, for Greenville, there is a warehouse off Buncombe behind the Piedmont Shirt Co. Here garments are stored which are fabricated off season like sun suits which are switching styles right now, the executive added.

AT COLUMBIA CAPACITY

The plant in Columbia was purchased 3 years ago, brand new. A garment manufacturer had become worried over a minor recession in the business at that time. Stone took over with over 200 workers under the direction of Miss Quincy Coggins of Greenville. "Now we've reached capacity of production and have got to expand," Mr. Stone said.

The life of Mr. Stone is the story of a young man made good. He was born in Spartanburg, moving here in 1918. He attended Fishburn Military School in Virginia, Georgia Tech, and the University of South Carolina. He started his business here shortly after schooling. His firm's expansion tells the rest about the man classed by Life magazine as one of the South's millionaires.

Sun suits for children is the main fare for the firm. It is known as one of the largest manufacturers in the world of such. Approximately 25,000 dozen different garments are produced each week by the company.

A trip through the East Court Street plant proves the high production element stressed. Women employees have their own individual machines. "That's why we can't run but one shift a day—a girl gets used to her machine and doesn't want anyone else to run it."

Sewing machines buzz like king-sized bumble bees. Stitches are taken at the rate of 5,000 per minute with the super-fast sewers. The average housewife has a slow poke in her average home machine by comparison.

NOTHING IS WASTED

Workers are on the piece-work basis. "They'd have it no other way," Mr. Stone explains. Nothing is wasted, i. e., cloth strips are turned into slip straps, etc.

Buttons are put on in one operation. Another worker turns a buzzing machine loose on making button holes in one operation, including the cutting. Another sews in fast half moons (ask the average woman how hard it is to sew a curve).

Through all the Stone organization there is a feeling of cooperation—of everyone working together. They have to—workers become expert on one operation. Another worker takes the phase to the next step, and on up until sun suits, slips, and the like are ready to be boxed up and shipped to all points of the compass.

Another big help for unity of spirit is building up of a recreational area for workers above Caesar's head. Over 1,000 acres there are fast becoming a beautiful network of roads, four artificial lakes filled with crystal-clear water, playgrounds, picnic areas, and everything for a good outing.

NOT ONE-MAN OUTFIT

Workers can go up any time. It's free. Mr. Stone recently was told, "I can't believe you have made such a beautiful spot out of a wilderness, but you certainly have."

Stone Manufacturing Co. isn't a one-man outfit by any means. A brother, Ward Stone, does most of the purchasing and handles upkeep of property. Mrs. Juanita Young, one of the first employees, is in charge of all Greenville plants.

Machinist Bright Few is priceless for giving an edge on competitors with new machine parts made in his plant shop. Then there's a "whale of a lot" of workers who receive service awards each year for service up to 5, 10, and 15 years with the firm.

Cotton Crop for 1950 36 Percent Below 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cotton Crop for 1950 36 Percent Below 1949" by John W. Ball, published in today's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON CROP FOR 1950 36 PERCENT BELOW 1949

(By John W. Ball)

The Crop Reporting Board yesterday broke the bad news that this year's cotton crop will be 36 percent less than last year, and about 3,000,000 bales—or about one-third—short of normal domestic requirements.

The shortage resulted from a confused cotton acreage allocation law passed late last year. Varying interpretations put upon its provisions in different States resulted in only about 18,678,000 acres being planted instead of about 21,000,000 its authors promised.

NO SHORTAGE SEEN

Cotton experts last night said there was little danger of an acute shortage, however. Heavy carry-overs from the 1948 and 1949 crops, totaling about 7,000,000 bales, are considered ample to meet all foreseeable demands. Normal requirements are for about 9,000,000 bales for domestic consumption, and 5,000,000 for export.

The estimate was for 10,308,000 bales, or 5,820,000 bales less than the 16,128,000 bales harvested last year.

New York futures shot up as much as $8.45 a bale (500 pounds) before profit taking trimmed the gain. They closed from $4.15 to $4.50 a bale above Monday's close. New Orleans spot cotton closed $4.05 a bale higher than on Monday.

At the same time, the Agriculture Department revealed that Government price-support loans and Government inventories of cotton have melted like snow in the last few weeks.

Out of 3,190,150 bales of 1949 cotton that had been put under Government price-support loans, more than 2,600,000 have been redeemed. On July 27 only 500,637 bales were under loan, and at least a third of these have been redeemed since that date, officials estimated.

BALES UNDER LOAN

A total of 5,271,000 bales of 1948 cotton were put under loan. Farmers redeemed 1,490,000 bales. The Government placed the remainder, 3,781,369 bales, in a pool. By July 26, the Government had sold 612,169 bales of the pooled 1948 cotton. Since that time sales have been held every other day. Estimates last night were that total sales now may reach 1,500,000 bales, leaving only about 1,600,000 on hand.

Total Government investments in cotton, which on April 30 were about a billion dollars, are expected to have declined to about one-third of that figure.

The cotton-pooling law, which operates on a heads-I-win, tails-you-lose formula, was put through Congress during the war by the potent cotton-State lawmakers. When World War II broke out, the Commodity Credit Corporation had tremendous stocks of cotton it had bought to maintain prices between 1935 and 1941. It sold this cotton, largely to other Government agencies, at a substantial profit.

Now, however, when the Government forecloses a price-support loan on cotton, it must pool that cotton. Each bale is stored with the grower's name attached. If CCC sells the cotton at a profit, even to another Government agency, it must return the profit to the original grower, even though he gave up possession of it through foreclosure of the loan, years before. If, however, the Government should sell the pooled cotton at a loss, the Government must assume the loss.

Will the Korean War Teach Us a Lesson in Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Korean situation today is a direct outgrowth of the policy of the Democratic administration which had its inception in the recognitzion of Soviet Communist Russia in 1933.

At that point, on November 17, 1933, a date which must go down in history as an infamous landmark which changed the course of our great Nation, the socialistic planners of America began to bore from within setting in motion the forces which took us into the alliance with Russia during the last war and prodded our leaders into the series of agreements and treaties which perpetuated the strength and growth of communism through Russian expansion, and set the stage for the present American dilemma.

Never in history has the leadership of a great Nation demonstrated such complete failure to protect and safeguard the interests of the people through lack of ability and judgment at the best—or deliberate nefarious motivation at the worst.

During the last war, there were voices raised in protest against our alliance with Communist Russia, there were protests against our enormous lend-lease program which supplied Russia with materials for war and which sent American technicians to train Russians in the methods of mass production without which no Nation could hope to produce the tools for a world-wide conflict.

But these voices were brushed aside by the administration and labeled traitorous as giving comfort to the enemy. And the aid to Russia continued.

Today the results of our alliance with the nation termed by the administration as "democratic Russia" are apparent. We are faced with a struggle for survival in which every citizen may be required to surrender a portion of his personal liberty, to make sacrifices, even to face loss of life itself, if America is to survive.

And the greatest tragedy of all is the fact that is now finally starkly apparent to every American. The fact that this could have been avoided, should have been avoided, and would have been avoided if we had had competent leadership in our Nation.

Even now with the complete failure of our State Department to conduct an aggressive foreign policy which could have brought lasting peace out of our victory in 1945, we find the Chief Executive condoning every mistake and challenging all criticism with a flat statement that the present leadership in the State Department and in other branches of the administration shall remain unchanged as long as he holds the Presidency.

For the blunders of the State Department and of the executive branch of the Government, American boys are dying in far-off Korea. And the average American citizen now asks, when will the blunders end? How can we win a war of global proportions, if that comes, when we must depend upon the same men to lead us, men who have already proven that they have neither sound judgment nor ability, and have consistently failed to profit from experience?

The administration's blunders in the Korean affair are now self-evident. Russia, after staying neutral in the war against Japan, was permitted to declare herself an ally of the United States in that conflict for a total period of 6 days for which she gaind in return and with the full consent of the administration a foothold in China and Korea.

President Truman agreed to the division to Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel with Russia occupying the northern sector. That total communization of northern Korea would result could not have been a surprise to Mr. Truman. Nor could he have expected anything less than the development of a puppet state in northern Korea which could be expected in the future to respond to the will of the Kremlin.

After this initial Korean blunder, others followed with alarming regularity. Our foreign policy in China, or rather our complete lack of one, resulted in the fall of all China to the hands of Communist troops. The State Department took no action to deter communism in China, and President Truman early this year announced that the United States would not become involved in the civil conflict in China.

Danger signals were flashing in Korea but the administration declined to heed their warning. In July of 1949, Congress voted $10,230,000 for military aid to the Republic of Korea. Under the administration only $200 worth of supplies were actually sent.

On June 13 of this year, William C. Foster, Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, further declared the administration's attitude concerning Korea when he testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee as follows:

> I am happy to tell the Appropriations Committee, that, in my judgment, the trend of events in South Korea is more favorable than it has been at any time since the liberation of that country in 1945.
>
> The reasons for optimism are military, political, and economic. It is my considered opinion that in the face of great difficulty the government of the Republic of Korea is now steadily gaining in each of these three sections.
>
> A rigorous training program has built up a well disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers; one that is prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces.

On June 25, just 12 days after Mr. Foster made this statement before the Appropriations Committee, the North Korean Communist forces attacked South Korea sweeping the defenders before them. The South Koreans had no adequate arms to meet the invaders. Arms for which funds were appropriated by Congress were never sent to Korea. They were not sent because the administration disregarded the action of Congress and made no effort to deliver them to the Korean Republic for defense against an invasion.

At the same time the administration made serious errors in the maintenance of our own Armed Forces, errors which have resulted in our defeats on the Korean battlefront. Reduction in our Marine Corps—which incidentally was saved from extinction by the Eightieth Congress—was a serious error. The scuttling of our Navy and our naval air force was another.

The lack of sufficient carrier-based planes and planes specifically designed for use in conjunction with ground troops and in support of them during combat have seriously handicapped our fighting forces and has been responsible at least in part for our military reverses.

No one can doubt the final outcome of the Korean war. We will win. But it will be costly. American boys who can never be considered expendable by the American people will be sacrificed. Our

resources and material assets will be drained.

Victory in Korea may not bring any decisive results. It is probable that even if we go beyond the thirty-eighth parallel to the northernmost boundary of Korea, a free election may result in a Korean Communist government. This will be a defeat of the purpose and intention of the American people.

It is also becoming more evident that recognition of Communist China by the United Nations in spite of the protest of the United States will be Russia's price tag for temporary peace in Asia. If this recognition becomes a fact, then our efforts in Korea will have been in vain and the final results the same as if this Nation had never entered the war.

So long as the threat of aggression remains, we must prepare for our defense, and as a result of this preparation, our economy will be changed, our standard of living lowered to what extent no one can foresee, and our liberty will be curtailed for an indefinite period which has been estimated by some at not less than 10 years.

These are the results of incompetent leadership in our Nation. We cannot rectify past errors, but we can, and must, prevent their recurrence.

We must have competent leadership in our Government now. This is as important as the need for more men in uniform, control of vital materials, and regulation of national economy.

If the Executive refuses to dismiss men who have blundered and lost the confidence of the American people, it is then necessary that Congress assume leadership in behalf of the American people. As the representatives of the people, the Members of Congress must produce legislation which will solve the problems we now face as a result of the miscalculations of the administration, and which at the same time safeguard our American principles of liberty and individual freedom.

This is a big job, but it must be done effectively by Congress if our Nation is to survive the outside aggression of communism and the onslaught of socialistic planners at home.

Panic Buying and Hoarding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, within the past several weeks there has been a rather frantic buying of lumber and other building materials, which has resulted in rather panicky conditions in that entire field, causing many grades and classes of lumber to go very high in price and in many instances making it quite difficult to obtain the required lumber.

In the August 4 Washington Letter of the National Association of Home Builders of the United States, the national president, Mr. Coogan, has written to all of his members a letter in which he cautions against such procedure, and urges them to cooperate in every way possible to cut down on that type of frantic buying and price boosting. I commend the letter to the careful reading of all Members of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT COOGAN

This is another plea for cooperation and straight thinking by the membership of NAHB. I have asked the builders to do their buying on a day-to-day basis. Please do so. If you and your friends keep your heads there will be enough materials to go around and supply everyone on a reduced program.

Panic buying, hoarding, outbidding your competitor for scarce materials will have only one result—control and price fixing. You know and I know how vicious and dangerous these controls are to our industry. We can avoid them by voluntary action—please cooperate with us and let's see this thing through properly.

If this becomes a full-fledged war or if the President decides on an expanded defense policy we will have to divert our energies from home building to war housing, or some other defense work. Remember, the President has better sources of information than we do—even better than the columnists—and so far he has called for only limited controls. Let's use our heads to operate within this framework.

Remember—things are different now than in 1941. Our economy is vastly expanded, our production capacity is tremendous, and instead of just emerging from a fearful depression, when people had little money and few durable goods, we are now finishing our fifth year of prosperity. The people generally are well equipped; our plant capacity is high; our food larder is running over, and we don't have to feed the rest of the world. In reverse, American manufacturers are placing machine-tool orders in France, Sweden, and Switzerland. In our materials industry production is high and will continue so.

If builders will refrain from panic buying our supply lines will catch up with our curtailed production. There are only two real shortages—gypsum boards and cement—and they are almost seasonal at this time of year.

The credit controls imposed on us are reasonable, but they will reduce housing starts drastically for the balance of the year. When the President receives authority from Congress (not granted as yet) he will impose similar curbs on private credit and commercial building. It is my opinion that unless the war situation becomes extremely worse, or unless you make it necessary, we will not have additional controls.

We are busy denying all sorts of rumors regarding cut-offs, limiting orders, curtailment by FHA and VA. Needless to say, these are not true. Do not believe rumors—we will keep you advised—do not repeat rumors.

Your country needs your industry on a sound basis. We accept willingly any curtailment required for the war effort. We pledge ourselves and our membership to the aid of our country as it may be needed. Meanwhile we will continue to do our job as we have in the past.

Special Committee Needed To Investigate Veterans' Education and Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, last, I introduced a resolution (H. Res. 710) calling for a complete and impartial investigation and study of the veterans' education and training program under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. I introduced this resolution following the shocking disclosure of a number of instances in my own State of Tennessee where the benefits under this meritorious program were being abused. The resolution which I introduced in this connection, as I have said, followed the disclosure of abuses in my own State but it was drawn up with the full knowledge that abuses were by no means confined to the State of Tennessee, but were, in fact, even more flagrant and harmful in a large number of other States.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans' education and training program has proved to be one of the greatest acts which the Congress has ever passed in the interest of men who have served their country in time of war. Many thousands of young men have received under this program untold benefits which have fitted them for useful careers and professions. It is therefore of the utmost regret that such a program should be tarnished in any way by bad practices such as have been revealed. We all know that the instances of abuses are by no means common—but the existence of any abuses at all of this great program is sufficient reason for the Congress to undertake an examination of the program as a means of clearing away any suspicion on the part of the public that the program is not being administered properly. We can do this only by seeking out the offenders.

My resolution was introduced for the purpose of protecting, first of all, the interest of the public; and next the interest of legitimate and meritorious training schools and the interest of our veterans themselves. I sincerely trust and I strongly urge that the House take favorable action in regard to this resolution at an early date. There should be no whitewashing of abuses. The true facts should be made known.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included with my remarks four editorials from daily newspapers of my own State of Tennessee which express the interest of the public in this proposed investigation. I urge the reading of these editorials by the Members of the House as they call for needed action in this connection.

An editorial, entitled "No Whitewash Here," from the Nashville Tennessean of July 16, 1950 follows:

NO WHITEWASH HERE

Mr. Carl Gray, head of the Veterans' Administration, has invited Tennessee members of Congress to meet with him Tuesday to discuss the final report of his investigation on the conduct of the veterans education and other GI programs in Tennessee.

Reprehensible practices on the part of a number of the GI training schools operating in Tennessee already have been revealed by Representative JOE EVINS, of Smithville, a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Whether criminal acts by officials of the Nashville regional office of the Veterans' Administration were involved in violation of regulations by these schools was not clear from Representative EVINS' report.

There is no doubt, however, from the Congressman's statements, which were based on facts uncovered by VA investigators, that severe disciplinary action is indicated both against the schools and the Veterans' Administration officials responsible for their supervision.

The fact that irregularities in connection with the handling of some veterans' claims also were reported uncovered by the investigators from Washington indicates that the laxness on the part of local VA officials extended beyond the educational program.

The sourest note in all these revelations from Washington and from Representative EVINS was the Washington report crediting to a Veterans' Administration spokesman the statement that "the VA can whitewash the whole matter."

The cynicism implied in such a statement is an affront to the veterans of Tennessee and to all the people. The fact that the so-called VA spokesman also outlined as possibilities the turning-over of the investigators' report to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution and civil-service action against responsible officials does not lighten the effect of his remarks.

The fact that $40,000 in taxpayers' money was involved in an overcharge made by a single school is indicative of the degree of mismanagement of the veterans' program in Tennessee.

Administrator Gray and the Tennessee Congressmen who meet at his office Tuesday do not need to be informed that the citizens of Tennessee will resent any efforts at a whitewashing where such items as those disclosed by Representative EVINS are involved. The situation obviously is one that cannot conveniently be shushed. It must not be.

An editorial entitled "VA Facts Must Come Out," from the Nashville Banner of July 19, 1950 follows:

VA FACTS MUST COME OUT

Veterans are citizens and taxpayers, and necessarily concerned as such in two things:

(1) Adequate facilities, intelligently established and operated, and on a basis equitable to all concerned, for fulfillment of the program designed for veterans. The so-called GI bill of rights, that is.

(2) Protection of that program from abuse in any particular—which is to say, any reprehensible treatment embracing any of the several rackets that have been alleged from time to time over the Nation.

No information has as yet been released to pin-point charges filed in Tennessee, and highlighted yesterday by Veterans' Administration action at Washington suspending 10 VA employees here and elsewhere in the State. They are serious charges in the aggregate if in the judgment of these authorities they justified this step, and the investigation is proceeding on a wide scale.

The public is entitled to all the facts available, this being a matter of public business. Those inferentially accused are entitled to a full review, and the opportunity to answer charges, in the interest both of clarifying the facts and of vindicating those who are innocent.

Representative JOE EVINS undoubtedly is right in his resolution for a full-scale investigation of the whole program, not just in Tennessee but everywhere. The fact-finding effort must be prompt and thorough. The public interest asks no more than that, plus requisite action on any dereliction found. It demands no less.

An editorial from the Nashville Tennessean of July 20, 1950, entitled "Time for a Clean-Up," follows:

TIME FOR A CLEAN-UP

The Veterans' Administration in Washington finally has acted on the 13 weeks' investigation of the conduct of veterans' affairs in Tennessee completed early this summer. The executives of the Nashville regional office and its branch offices throughout the State have been suspended from their jobs and more may be suspended later.

While most of the suspensions involved failure to regulate properly 17 GI training schools throughout the State, National Veterans' Administrator Carl Gray also made the general charge of "irregularities of major proportions," "inefficiencies, maladministration, and general laxness."

Records of comparative performance for regional offices of the Veterans' Administration in the Southeast have shown the Nashville regional office constantly at the bottom in most categories for more than 3 years. The general atmosphere of laxness and inefficiency showed up in the service rendered veterans in repeated delays and alibis even before it became apparent on VA performance charts.

The wonder is that the National Veterans' Administration should have waited so long to send its crew of investigators in to determine the causes of the situation.

The veterans of Tennessee and all of the citizens who are interested in the welfare of veterans are pleased that, at last, the VA has moved to correct these unsavory conditions.

Tennesseans generally do not believe that all of the thousands of VA employees in their State have been inefficient and lax. Neither do they believe that all of the 217 GI training schools operating in the State have connived to obtain overpayment for their services and misrepresented their accounts. In both groups it may be assumed that the majority have faithfully performed their duties and fulfilled their obligations.

We believe that Representative JOE EVINS, of Tennessee, has acted wisely in demanding a full congressional investigation of the conduct of the veterans' training program throughout the country. The operation of some of these schools has smelled as badly in other States as have a few in Tennessee.

Such an investigation should serve to clear the air and to stamp out unsavory practices at a time when the confidence of the people in the way the Government will treat future veterans' needs to be bolstered to the maximum.

An editorial from the Memphis Commercial-Appeal of July 19, 1950, entitled "Keep After This One" follows:

KEEP AFTER THIS ONE

Suspensions have been handed out to 10 Veterans' Administration employees in Tennessee pending investigation of what are termed "irregularities of major proportions." The suspensions include the manager of the State headquarters of the VA, his assistant, and the man in charge of the Knoxville office. While the whole story has not yet been told, it is indicated that overpayments of $60,000 to two so-called GI training schools are involved and it is understood still other schools are under investigation.

This move brings into the open a matter that has been the subject of suspicion in Tennessee and many other States in the Nation. Rumors of all sorts of scandalous shenanigans and worse have been rife. In the beginning of the GI training program, designed to equip trainees for making a living, there was a ridiculous range of choice. It was so absurd, however, for the Government to be paying for dancing lessons and the like that some adjustment in the program was obtained.

In numerous cases schools have been organized almost overnight to offer training to veterans, and it seemed to us that the value of the subject matter was frequently subject to question, not to mention the quality of instruction available. Unquestionably there has been some prostitution of one of the most sensible and commendable proposals made for the postwar period. It has been charged that trainees went from one course to another, sometimes to the number of four or five alleged vocations.

The cost to the taxpayers has been great, though there has been no widespread feeling of resentment, because the basic notion was so sound. It is the more despicable, therefore, if any conniving people have taken advantage of the program to feather their nests, to graft and cheat. This is one piece of business that should be pushed through swiftly, vigorously, and effectively in spite of the national emergency. Speedy discovery of guilt where it exists and drastic punishment would be a form of reassurance the people need as they face another all-out effort for defense.

Representative JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, is proposing a Nation-wide investigation of such cases, and Congress should set it up and follow it up without hesitation or delay.

The Knowland Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AUGUST 9, 1950.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you because I am deeply concerned over a statement made yesterday by the Honorable WALTER LYNCH on the Knowland amendment. If it did the things suggested in this statement I, too, would oppose the Knowland amendment.

He states that if the amendment were adopted, a worker would lose his unemployment insurance if he refuses work on a job where he is required to belong to a union or where he might be required to resign from, or refrain from, joining a bona fide union.

These matters are covered by the Federal labor standards. Under existing Federal law every State is required to have specific prohibitions against this being done. Every State law contains these provisions. The Knowland amendment does not touch this requirement. If the Knowland amendment is passed exactly the same penalty will continue to be visited on any State which would take one of these safeguards out of its law.

Under the present law it is, of course, possible for a State court to misconstrue one of these provisions, and the Knowland

amendment does not change this possibility in any way. Our courts will be no more likely to misconstrue these standards than they are today if the Knowland amendment is adopted. For exactly the same penalty would be imposed as under existing law. The Knowland amendment does not take away the Secretary's power to hold a State out of compliance when the State court vested with final jurisdiction issues an opinion which he finds would fail to comply substantially with the Federal standards.

The State administrators of every State are bound in their administration by their courts application and interpretation of State law, including its labor safeguards. The amendment the State administrators requested Senator KNOWLAND to introduce is basically to preserve this State requirement and procedure. If the States are allowed to have any judicial review, the State administrators must be allowed to follow their own courts in interpretation of State laws and not in interpretation of someone else. The amendment only allows the State courts to act before the Secretary can step in.

It leaves him free to hold a State out of compliance but only after the State court has acted.

I know you will appreciate the fact that our States have as much integrity as the Federal Government in preserving the rights of citizens and in interpreting the law—including the labor safeguards of their unemployment compensation laws.

In my opinon if the Knowland amendment did what it has been accused of doing, no State administrator would be for it. They do not want State systems broken down. They do not want labor standards violated, and they will not be. They do feel it is vital to preserve the integrity of the State systems, and know that the Knowland amendment will do no more than this.

My kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. RHODES, Jr.,
Chairman, Legislative Committee of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies.

Meat Inspection Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I have received from Mr. Saul Graff, one of the largest meat wholesalers in Brooklyn. He calls our attention to a fact that so many of us may have overlooked in our efforts to reduce the administrative expenses of the Government. Production in meat plants and in packing houses is being delayed due to the insufficient number of inspectors. On July 1 of this year 346 meat inspectors were placed on forced leave, thereby dropping the total staff to less than 3,000. This is no time to destroy the meat-inspection service of our Government. On the contrary, this Bureau should be maintained at full strength to insure proper inspection of the principal food of the major portion of our population. We are paying the highest prices in history for meat. It does not appear to me that the salaries for 3,000 meat inspectors is too high a price for this Government to pay for adequate inspection. Let us at least have the assurance that what we buy has been properly inspected by the Federal Government. We have educated the housewife to look for the Federal inspector's stamp on all meat. But how can we have adequate inspection if this Bureau is reduced below cperating level? The letter follows:

THE J. H. RODMAN-GRAFF CORP.,
Brooklyn N. Y., August 2, 1950.

Hon. EDNA F. KELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR EDNA: I wish to add my sincerest protest to the forthcoming cuts in the services of the Agricultural Department, especially in meat inspection, a long-established branch of the Bureau that has for years amply and efficiently protected the health and well-being of the American people. I take violent objection to the action of the past Congress in reducing the personnel of these old bureaus which have not been made a hideaway for political jobs.

I believe that you should sponsor an amendment—or support one—that would exempt this service from the drastic reductions provided in the budget for the coming year. To me, these health services are on a par with other exempted agencies which deal in protecting the well-being of the American people, such as the FBI and other Government health departments.

Ill-advised and untimely is the consensus among my many acquaintances in reference to the drastic economy cuts in these old bureaus, and I would deeply appreciate any support you can give to restoration of these services to their former efficient and morale-building duties.

I speak from my personal experience in the slaughtering business for the past 37 years.

Sincerely yours,

SAUL GRAFF.

Politics Crimps War Effort, So Skip It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Kermit McFarland, from the Pittsburgh Press of Sunday, August 6, 1950:

POLITICS CRIMPS WAR EFFORT, SO SKIP IT

(By Kermit McFarland)

Many of our politicians, especially those running in this year's election, are following the hackneyed, times-are-normal way of going after votes.

That's one fact. Here's another:

Most of the leadership in meeting the national catastrophe welling up on the horizon must come from the politicians.

Let's leave the Washington part of it in more experienced hands, for the moment, and deal with the politicians in our own back yard.

If this war explodes into the cataclysmic proportions it seems destined to reach, there will be an imperative need for steady, skillful, and courageous leadership on the home front—as well as in Washington or on the battle lines.

More than any other war in our history, this one is studded with the twin dangers of internal sabotage and external attack.

RIGHT ON FRONT PORCH

It is unlikely that we can sit at home and listen—however anxiously—to the progress of the war in far-off places. It doesn't take an alarmist to see that this war almost certainly will have its violent aspects right on our front porches.

In that case, responsible public officials and political leaders, at both the State and local levels, will be called on for aggressive, forthright, speedy, and efficient action. If they fumble, it can be costly and perhaps fatal.

And it isn't enough for them to wait until the storm pours down on our heads with all its impact. They should be showing their leadership qualities now—if they have any.

Instead of quibbling among themselves over whether the Republicans or the Democrats are to blame for the mess we're in, they ought to be doing their utmost to get us on the right road.

It isn't enough, in this emergency, for candidates for governor or United States Senator to belay each other with the usual epithets, accusations, innuendo, rumor, and mud.

It isn't enough to be going around the State trying to outpromise each other.

It isn't enough to be hoarding up great gobs of campaign cash, to be spent both openly and surreptitiously. It isn't enough to be handshaking adults and kissing babies. It isn't enough to be making deals with ward and county politicians, and giving away public jobs before the election.

THERE IS ONLY ONE ISSUE

There is only one issue before the voters. And that is how do we get out of the scrape we're in—and how soon can we be about it?

Any political candidate who can't offer something constructive in the light of this single issue is off base—not worth having his name printed on the ballots.

If the voters don't give him short shrift it will be only because his opponent is confining himself to the same type of small-time, politics-as-usual campaign.

It would be a mighty useful thing, in this crisis, if the campaign as such could be called off. And the candidates for public office, instead of indulging in their usual mouthings, were compelled to prove their capacities for leadership in the clutch.

The times call for statesmanship, at least. More accurately, they would seem to call for miracles.

Farmers Home Administration Loans to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article appearing in the current issue of the American Legion magazine by Pitkin entitled, "How the Legion Fights for the Farm Veteran." An editorial comment on this article is carried in the same issue.

In this connection, I am delighted to attach herewith a statement regarding Farmers Home Administration loans to veterans in South Carolina as compiled by R. F. Kolb, State director of the FHA. Much has been done for our veterans

and much more must be done to aid them in securing farm homes:

FACTS REGARDING FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION LOANS TO VETERANS

(By R. Frank Kolb)

Here are some facts about service to farm veterans in South Carolina through the supervised credit program of the Farmers Home Administration:

OPERATING LOANS

During the year ended June 30, 1950, there were made to farm veterans in South Carolina 1,557 operating loans totaling $579,330. Our totals since November 1, 1946, through June 30, 1950, are 6,937 loans to veterans amounting to $2,285,436. Administrator Lasseter's 1949 annual report shows that South Carolina ranks seventh among the States in the cumulative number of FHA operating loans to veterans.

On repayments we do not have amounts separately for veterans and nonveterans. However, since the Farmers Home Administration was created (November 1, 1946) through December 31, 1949, our total operating loan advances in South Carolina have amounted to $10,554,712. Repayments during the same period have been $8,778,775 or 83.2 percent of the entire principal amount. An additional $302,629 has been collected as interest. Some of the loans are repayable over a period of years and therefore are not yet due, meaning that the percentage delinquent is quite small.

REAL ESTATE LOANS

Since the inception (1938) of the farm ownership program, 480 veterans have obtained loans for purchasing or improving family-type farms in an aggregate amount of $2,161,394. Even though these loans are amortized over a 40-year period already 83 veterans have paid them in full. Many others are well ahead of schedule. During the past year 100 percent of our initial farm ownership loans in South Carolina from appropriated funds have been to veterans.

We have a substantial volume of veteran business in our two comparatively new real estate activities. Within the last 15 months 20 insured mortgage loans financed with private funds (and insured by the Government) have been made to veterans in the State which have totaled $94,748. Of the 107 farm housing loans made between December 1, 1949, and June 30, 1950, 55 were to veterans for a total of $312,000. Good repayment records are being made by farm veterans with all types of FHA loans. The Farmers Home Administration extends preference to veterans in all its services.

Democracy Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, while agreeing that the security of the Nation must be preserved at any cost, there were those after World War II who opposed a peacetime draft. This was done in the belief that the postwar world should be organized around the principle of cooperation and that compulsory military service would seem to show a lack of confidence in postwar agencies for peace even before those agencies were organized. The adherents of the policy of no peacetime conscription asked merely for time to determine the nature of the postwar world.

Today, the nature of that world has been determined. With a magnificent desire for peace and a patience born of charity and yet with the very human fear of a doubting Thomas, America has lived for the past 5 years in the hope of achieving a just peace and world security. To this end we have given aid of a financial, social, and political nature. In addition we have been prime movers in the setting up of an international organization with constructive, not destructive, intent to build a community of states so that through discussion not argument, through peace not war, this worn-out world may again live in magnificence and splendor to the fulfillment of its God-given days.

"Democracy is the name for a great political discovery—that power can be made effectively responsible." That it has not been properly demonstrated in these United States is admitted. We have in spots been nationalistic and isolationist. That in some other countries of the world, power is not effectively responsible, is likewise admitted and for them no apology is offered. Yet with all our quarrel here and elsewhere with the composition and policies of government, our basic philosophy of life is agreed upon. The western philosophy rests upon the statement of man as a rational animal, a social animal, the creature of God—in consequence of which he has been endowed with many and varied prerogatives; the right to life, bodily integrity, to obtain the necessary means to existence, the right to tend toward his ultimate goal, the right of association and the right to possess and use property. Society is a natural means which man can and must use for the development of all individual and social gifts bestowed upon him. "Society is for man, not man for society." In order to form a more perfect union, to provide for our freedoms, security, and tranquility, we have set up governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. We have recognized the distinction between the State and the community. The content of democracy implies the existence of unalienable rights and individual equality which no government has power to abrogate. It recognizes that all men are equal in value but not in function—that there is a hierarchy of society in which men of particular abilities, so recognized by their fellow men are placed in positions of sacred trust in administering the government in whose treasury the rights of equal men are preserved. This, gentlemen, is the natural law, and the law of America.

Today, a nation of the world is seeking to undermine this philosophy of life. Not concerned is she in method of government, of ascertainment of rights and duties in world cooperation, this new enemy seeks to impose on the whole world a new unrealistic, false, and pagan philosophy. For years it was concealed under seductive trappings but the philosophy is based on the false analysis of Hegel, Marx, and Engel—a philosophy of dialectical materialism in which the goal of human existence is a classless society and the progress toward this end, taking whatever violent means may be necessary, is a crusade for the human race.

Its economic factor is based on the idea that in all history men have been faced with nature and the success with which they could produce from nature such things as they needed. The particular form of production determines the whole nature of society. This emphasis on production as the key to all men's activities leads very naturally to the view that man, as an individual, has no great significance. Production must always be a collective act, and the collective—government—is the unit. Man exists merely for the state.

In all societies hitherto existing and existing today—capitalism—the mode of production has been and is imperfect according to the Communist. It has left too many human needs unsatisfied, and so man has imagined to himself another world in which the needs will be met. This "religion" is his opium.

To the Communist there is only one reality, matter—the blind forces of which evolve into plant, animal, and man. By a law of inexorable necessity and through a perpetual conflict of forces, matter moves toward the final synthesis, through class war, of a classless society. No God, no spirit, no soul, no survival of the soul after death, is recognized. The Communist claims that the conflict which carries the world toward its final synthesis—classless society wherein finally even government is unnecessary—can be accelerated by man. To do this they endeavor to sharpen the antagonisms which arise between classes of society, and hence hate and destruction takes on the aspect of a crusade for the progress of humanity, and all obstacles to these violent yet systematic efforts must be annihilated as hostile to the human race. Such is the philosophy of communism.

To the orderly and well-lit mind the philosophy of the west and the philosophy of communism are diametrically opposed. In the strength and danger and falsity of this enemy all other enemies pale. Man, as a creature of God, with unalienable rights and equality, becomes pure matter evolving toward an end, and as such is expendable and valueless. This "system" is unrivaled in its methods and the grimness of its objectives and its lack of salvation for the ills of mankind.

Just as truer democracy in the political order is the offensive against communism, and prayer is the spiritual offensive against diabolical paganism and materialism, so, in the military order, mobilization is our only offensive against destruction through communism.

God gave America a hemisphere to itself. This insulation was formerly interpreted to mean that our divine destiny was to look to ourselves alone. Steel and steam have long since destroyed our insulation and with it our philosophy of isolation. The freedom of Europe and Asia, the future of democracy, and the rights of man have become to us matters of concern, for we are recognizing our responsibility to God and to the peoples

who mothered us and are now struggling in the upward march of civilization. This is the spiritual goal of Americanism.

"The hour has struck for Americanism to rise and meet this destined mission, walking humbly in the sight of God, or else retreat to its Atlantic stronghold, admit the existence of two worlds, and wait grimly for the Ice Age of international relations to set in."

Events show that we have arrived at the greatest crisis in recorded history. It is necessary that we face the future with hope, with courage, and with faith in God. We must square our shoulders and face facts. We cannot fail posterity. We cannot fail those who died that this Nation might survive. We are faced with authorizing billions of dollars for self-preservation and, since the leaders of the Kremlin understand only military might, let us meet their challenge by the means they understand. We must arm and re-arm men of good will everywhere who will freely join us in the struggle ahead.

The military is mobilizing. Economically, we must mobilize; no other course is open. This is a struggle of uncertain duration and cost. Real peace or true peace is remote. Our generation may never live in a peacetime economy, but we will live and must pass on to our succeeding generations the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, secured and maintained by sacrifices unequaled in the history of any nation.

For our military needs and to insure our economy, I support the President's request for immediate passage of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which is designed to increase defense production and curb consumer credit. The granting of stand-by powers to bring every phase of our economy under control—when and if needed—was not sought by the President, but Members of Congress wisely desire to authorize stand-by controls to check inflation.

Production or Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, shall we have production or controls?

This is a desperately serious war. Therefore, everyone of us is concerned that the whole gigantic productive power of the American people should be turned loose if we are to win war III. It is on that front of production and invention we shall win. There is a real danger in the shock of the sudden change from indifference and unawareness to fierce action. That action may be the worst thing we could do. I refer to the insistent demand that Congress impose price controls, rationing, taxing of profits, and various other so-called mechanics of the all-out mobilization for war production.

How can managers in Washington compel higher production than all of us working voluntarily without control and restriction will provide?

Everyone knows that our American free-way system gives us higher production for peace than the controlled Russian system. Why on earth then should we swallow the idea that our first duty is to abandon that system when war comes? If freedom gives us more peacetime production, why should it not give us more in wartime? Is it not true that the nations having a free economy outproduced and won past wars against the nations of the planned and controlled economies?

Some talk as if the American economy was a horse which could be turned around and started in the opposite direction—on war production—by putting on a heavier harness and a deadening hand at the reins. The fact is that the American economy is a delicate sensitively balance thoroughbred kind of economy. If you had a thoroughbred horse, and you had suddenly to ride him in desperate need in the shortest possible time, you would not dream of putting him in a heavy harness nor would you turn him over to a rider who knew nothing about horses. Those who preach a controlled economy admit Stalin's system is best. Why fight him at all if Stalin is right; if a controlled economy produces more.

We know controls reduce production, they have never failed to do so. They tried them as long ago as the Revolutionary War; they abandoned them then long before that war ended.

Let us look at the recent record. Do you remember the first year after World War II was over the planners were going to control and guide the building industry so we would build houses. They were going to allocate labor, and they had all kinds of fancy controls over the prices people were going to be allowed to pay for a house, no matter how desperate their need. Do you remember what happened? Building came almost to a dead stop. Even President Truman could not endure his planners any longer, he suddenly removed controls. Then what happened? We built a million new dwellings a year, year after year. Now landlords are advertising for tenants. Tenants have a choice of houses. But in England and France, where the planners were able to keep their feet on the necks of the people only a handful of new houses went up. Controls reduce production. Why?

The New Deal housing planners made builders write paper reports, fill out forms, keep books, and fix prices that failed to meet costs and that made no bricks and built no houses. Now the Government is controlling the price of corn so I cannot feed my dairy cows to produce butter at the price people can pay. So I sell my cows for beef and kill my little calves. Because of that we have had too high prices for butter and beef since 1946. But, you will say, war is different. Is it?

Controlled production did not win the last war. When the war started the administration brought William Knudsen of General Motors down to Washington. He worked out with the Armed Forces and the heavy industries what would be needed and how to retool. Things got under way fast. After we got production going, the New Dealers began sniping at Knudsen. They did not intend to leave any real representative of American free enterprise in a key place in the war industries. So they sent Knudsen over to a fancy desk job in the War Department, and Henry Wallace, Harry Hopkins, Robert Nathan, and Leon Henderson took over. Do you think the weekly reorganization of SPAB, FEA, and WPB won the war? What happened was that Knudsen had let American industry have its head, and convert itself to making what their country needed to win the war and even the planners could not wreck our magnificent performance. Freemen will win their wars. The controlled men will lose theirs.

The President's Message Vindicates My Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened yesterday to the reading of the President's message on internal security, and again read the message with care this morning.

The only word I know to describe it is magnificent.

Today I sent the following telegram to the President:

AUGUST 8, 1950.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington:

I beg leave to offer my most sincere felicitations on your magnificent message to the Congress on internal security yesterday. There is not a word in this splendid statement with which I disagree.

I am especially gratified because I find in your message complete vindication and support of my own position on proposed legislation already pending in the area of internal security.

Most important of all, your message is reassurance to the people of the United States and of the world that our faith in democracy is so great that we do not fear the assaults of hell itself.

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

I HAVE SAID THE SAME THING

Mr. Speaker, over and over, in the face of criticism and even of suspicion, I have stated the same things. My only regret is that I am not so gifted as to have said them so well; yet I can take comfort from the fact that some of the President's phrases are no more clear and vigorous than my own.

My opposition is and has been to the "unwise or excessive security measures" which the President himself condemned in clear and ringing language, and, like the President, my opposition has

stemmed from my profound belief in the strength and the glory of American democracy.

Although the President refrained from specifying by name and number certain bills to which he objected, they are readily identifiable to anyone who has followed the legislative program of recent Congresses.

I myself submitted a lengthy statement in opposition to the so-called subversive activities control bill, in which I attempted to make the very same points made in the President's message.

Reduced to succinctness, every useful end which could be acomplished under this proposed measure can be accomplished, and better, under existing laws; and those ends which cannot be accomplished under existing law are themselves either pernicious or subversive.

MORE, NOT LESS, DEMOCRACY IS ANSWER

Our proper answer to the threat of totalitarianism, whether it is the threat of fascism or the threat of communism, is more and better democracy.

This great country of ours was conceived in the minds of our forefathers as a dream of a citadel of freedom and equality. They could not have foreseen our vast material strength; but the genius of Thomas Jefferson mapped our road to political freedom and equality under law.

President Truman's message to the Congress yesterday could have been written by Jefferson himself—certainly it was animated by the living spirit of that great exponent of the democratic way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember a time when I have not been proud to be an American and proud to be a Democrat; but on some days I am doubly proud, and yesterday was one of them.

Pass Price Control Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the rule for consideration of the pending bill I called the attention of the Members to the ridiculous increase in prices for life's necessities, since the Korean war started.

A letter from M. H. Thorsen, director of child welfare in the public schools of Hammond, Ind., is a sample of hundreds of communications which I have received protesting profiteering in the Calumet region of Indiana:

HAMMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Hammond, Ind., August 7, 1950.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: This noon I stopped at the grocery store to pick up a few groceries. A 5-pound bag of sugar that 6 weeks ago sold for 39 cents was marked 51 cents today, and that was no special sale either. At the same time Secretary Brannan says that more sugar than we will ever need is in storage in the United States and Cuba.

Today, a widow with a crippled child and on relief called to ask if this department could give her a little food at the end of the month because she knew that she was simply not going to come out.

Over in Korea we are blowing the guts out of youngsters trying to preserve our democratic principles. Everybody is preaching war. If all these circumstances are true, and there is no question but what they are, why does it take the House and Senate so long to establish war regulations and retain at least a sensible economy even at high levels? Surpluses, subsidies, profiteering on a national scale are not only undemocratic in time of war but they are wholly unpatriotic.

You people have in your command the power to do something. What are you waiting for?

Sincerely,

M. H. THORSEN,
Director, Department of Attendance and Child Welfare.

The Knowland Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion on H. R. 6000, the social-security bill, to be made tomorrow by Mr. Lynch to recommit the report with instructions to the House managers to insist upon the House provision for total and permanent disability insurance and to reject the Knowland provision in the Senate amendment.

What does the Knowland amendment do? In my opinion, the Knowland amendment undermines the entire unemployment insurance system. It—

First. Makes it possible for a State unemployment compensation agency to deprive a worker of his unemployment insurance benefits for refusing to be a strikebreaker.

Second. Makes it possible for a State unemployment compensation agency to deprive a worker of his unemployment insurance benefits if he refuses work on a job where the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are below those prevailing for similar work in the locality.

Third. Makes it possible for a State unemployment compensation agency to cause a worker to lose his unemployment insurance benefits if he refuses work on a job where he is required to belong to a union or where he might be required to resign from, or refrain from, joining a bona fide union.

Fourth. Compels an unemployed worker, aggrieved by an unfair or unjust ruling of a State administrator to go to court and exhaust every legal remedy in the State courts before the Secretary of Labor may act. To my mind unemployment insurance benefits should be given during the period of unemployment—not 2 or 3 years later, after every legal remedy in the State courts has been exhausted, and at his expense.

Fifth. Will break down the standards established by Congress and will substitute therefor the interpretations of the law by the courts of the 48 States.

Sixth. Is a threat, in the present Korean crisis, to manpower mobilization, as most of labor, especially skilled labor, must, of necessity, depend upon uniform interpretation of the unemployment insurance law.

Seventh. Is not stopgap legislation as the report indicates. It is permanent legislation—so permanent that it can only be terminated by repeal legislation.

I also favor including permanent total disability insurance in the social-security bill. This provision was in the social-security bill as it passed the House. Thousands of disabled persons would have benefited by this provision which was struck out by the conference committee.

At the present time the State of California is making insurance payments to persons who are sick or disabled for a period of 26 weeks. But persons who are disabled for longer periods of time also need insurance protection.

The social-security bill as it passed the House provided insurance benefits for persons permanently and totally disabled after the first 6 months of disability. This was a very desirable provision. It should be restored. We should not forget our disabled people. They have needs too. The welfare of our disabled people is a responsibility which we should not avoid.

A Lesson to the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely editorial entitled, "Appeals Court Upholds Communist Conviction," which appeared in the August 4 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette. The article follows:

APPEALS COURT UPHOLDS COMMUNIST CONVICTION

Because the principle of freedom of speech was involved, the case of the 11 Communists aroused great interest. They said they were only expressing opinions, one of which was that the working class should eventually take over the Government by violence if necessary. They said they couldn't be jailed for that.

But the decision of the circuit court of appeals in upholding their conviction showed that the law is flexible enough to accommodate an obvious threat like that of these 11 Communists ("obvious" in the sense that most of our people and the Government see it that way) without changing its essential safeguards.

Two points should be remembered in connection with the decision. The first is that "precedents" in cases of freedom of speech are not the potent factor that they are in

other types of cases (though many of them were cited). We can be sure that each case on the border line between legitimate advocacy and actual danger to society will be handled on its merits as of that particular time. Because the Communists are convicted it doesn't mean that any intellectual heretic will be jailed. Sometimes—as in the Terminiello case—the decision goes in favor of the radical advocate, sometimes it goes against him.

The second point follows the first. The laws has proved to be pragmatic. It keeps up with the times. The decision will go against the advocate when the condition of society and the history of recent events demonstrate that it should. Judge Learned Hand in his decision went so far as to mention the Berlin airlift, and he used the phrase "the accepted mores of society." Society recognized that these Communists were a threat, so they wind up in jail. An anarchist shouting from a Battery soap box would not be the same kind of threat, and would probably go free.

Pragmatic law has caused concern to many people. During the New Deal stage the Supreme Court "kept up with the times" so much that many people feared the Constitution had become meaningless. But in a case like this one the concept has been of great assistance. The Communists tried to stick by a narrow construction of the letter of the law; the Court saw the real situation.

We need not fear that freedom of speech has been "chipped away" by this decision. The Communists existed in great enough numbers and had great enough influence to be a threat to our society. They were proved to have conspired to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government. So, as a "clear and present danger," they were convicted. But that doesn't mean individuals still cannot advocate change in our existing structure if they want to.

We Need Clean Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, how to obtain clean air for America is a problem which vitally concerns citizens throughout the Nation. In October 1948, at Donora, Pa., 20 persons died during a prolonged smog. Five thousand nine hundred and ten others became seriously ill. Only a few weeks ago scores of people in Baltimore had the same frightening experience. For a period of 2 or 3 years, the Los Angeles area, which has been sorely plagued by air pollution, has been spending more money than any other area in the country on its own problem. Despite its ample resources, Los Angeles must call on outside help.

Smoke damage alone, according to a national survey conducted last year, causes an annual loss of one and one-half billion dollars. That is about one thousand dollars for every person in this country. But our cities now spend only about 7 cents per person for control activities of polluted air.

Air pollution can be controlled. The Nation-wide drive for cleaner air and elimination of unsightly, smelly, or poisonous industrial wastes has now become one of the country's most pressing industrial problems.

The problem has grown in importance. Industrial production during the last decade has grown tremendously—it has increased more than 200 percent in dollar value. To accomplish this tremendous expansion in output, many new plants had to be built and many workers had to be hired. All this expansion means that new industrial communities have sprung up and that more objectionable materials are discharged into the air. Many plants that once sat quietly in thinly populated areas, or were located where smoke fumes or wastes did no harm, have surprisingly discovered themselves near or in the heart of populous communities.

When smoke, dust, and fumes are discharged to the air in an area faster than they are removed by natural cleansing forces—then you have air pollution in that area. Many communities are having this experience for the first time.

High officials, including the President of the United States, have expressed concern over the problem of air pollution. In a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, President Truman, on December 10, requested the calling of a United States technical conference on air pollution.

In this letter, he warned that—

> The contamination of the atmosphere and its potential adverse effects on health, industry, agriculture, and natural resources are causing wide concern. The agencies of the Federal Government are being called upon to assist private, State, and municipal interests in finding a solution of air-pollution problems.

The importance of the conference, which took place at the beginning of May here in Washington, appears from the large number of people who attended: over 750 outstanding scientists, representatives of universities, industry, and of Federal, State, and local governments through the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and the Netherlands took part. The conference urged the Federal Government to support attempts to solve the air-pollution problems.

The President has said that he considers corrective action and enforcement to be a local responsibility. With that I agree. Primary responsibility and authority for effective action rest with State and local governments, because the needs for control of air pollution vary from locality to locality.

However, because the problem is Nation-wide, because air pollution recognizes neither State nor even national boundaries, and because only an overall campaign can be effective, with the cooperation of the States, local governments, and citizens groups, an organization should be formed which would assume responsibility for initiating, promoting, and coordinating a national campaign. Furthermore, there is need for the Federal agencies to compile information and to undertake the more expensive Nation-wide research that will provide the local areas with a proper approach to the solution of the problem.

For this reason, I have drafted, and am submitting to the Congress a bill which assigns to the Public Health Service and to the Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Mines, responsibility for the public health and engineering research aspects of this problem, respectively.

The medical and public-health aspects of air pollution are more complex than the engineering phases of the problem. For this reason, the medical aspects require more time for the accumulation of substantial information. The public is interested in the health aspects of the problem, but it is on the engineering processes that correction or mitigation of the problem depends for ultimate success.

If we grant the relatively small amount of funds provided in this bill, these agencies will be able to assist the local governments materially in advancing toward the elimination of this cause of increasing damage to property and this threat to public health.

The bill I have introduced will provide the technical information.

While we still need much additional information for a successful conquest of air pollution, we do have enough data on hand now to begin the planning of the attack. We cannot afford to wait until we have all the information that could conceivably be compiled on the subject, either on its health or its engineering phases. We must now face the serious danger and the continuing damage caused by air pollution.

Passing laws is not enough. It is essential that on the local level all the groups interested in civic welfare become increasingly aware of the problem; that they learn as much as we now know about air pollution and the methods of combating it. Local governments, women's clubs, church groups, and fraternal organizations should place emphasis on this program as one of the real contributions they can make to their communities. Since the sources of air pollution are multiple, it requires broad community cooperation and widespread support to eradicate it thoroughly.

It should be easy to arouse this broad support because there are many groups in the community who will directly benefit from the elimination of air pollution. Among the groups who stand to profit most are the industries who spend thousands of dollars fighting lawsuits because of the damage their waste materials have caused; there are the property owners whose property has been damaged; there are the housewives whose curtains have not only been blackened but also chemically deteriorated, leading to eventual decomposition; there are also the people who manufacture equipment to purify industrial wastes so that they will not pollute the atmosphere; and there are consultants who advise industries how to prevent this pollution.

All these individuals and groups who would derive this benefit from the clean-air campaign should be grateful for the opportunity to join civic organizations in a drive to solve this problem on the community level.

Curtailment of Postal Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Congress a recent survey of the effects of the post-office-service curtailments. This survey appears to be highly objective and informative. It is certainly worthy of study and consideration.

The survey follows:

EFFECTS OF POST OFFICE SERVICE CURTAILMENTS—REPORT ON SURVEY CONDUCTED JULY 13–21, 1950, BY THE COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, INC., NEW YORK, N. Y.

On April 17, 1950, the Postmaster General issued an order directing local postmasters to effect curtailment of several established postal services and complete discontinuance of others. The changes were to become effective not later than July 1, 1950; and all curtailments and discontinuances were fully operative in New York City by June 1.

Changes in New York postal services were:

1. Delivery: In residential areas deliveries were reduced generally from two to one per day, including Saturdays.

Business areas continued to receive three daily deliveries, except Saturdays, when they received one instead of two. (Deliveries became slower, arriving from 30 minutes to 2 or 3 hours late.)

Parcel post was reduced to one delivery per day, except in such business areas where parcel-post volume necessitated additional deliveries.

2. Collection service: Since May 15 daily mail collections have been made from street- and chute-mail boxes so that mail might reach the post office not later than 8:30 p. m., requiring deposit in such boxes not later than 6:30 p. m.

3. Window service: All carrier stations or branch post offices are now open to the public only during the hours of 8 a. m. to 5:30 p. m. on Mondays through Fridays and until 12 noon on Saturdays, and are closed on Sundays and holidays. Post office finance stations render service between 9 a. m. and 5 p. m. on Mondays through Fridays and are closed at all other times.

The general post office, the Church Street Station, the Grand Central Station, and the Bronx and Brooklyn central post offices operate from 8 a. m. to 6 p. m. daily, including Saturdays. After 6 p. m. daily, and on Sundays and holidays, these stations maintain one window for acceptance only of fully prepaid first class and air mail, newspapers, and emergency matter. No other service is available after 6 p. m.

INCONVENIENCES CAUSED BY CURTAILED SERVICE

Acting on complaints to the association from members, the postal affairs committee on June 1, 1950, rendered a report, adopted by the board of directors, citing the detrimental effects of the discontinuance on April 28 of directory service, and suggested further study of the postal situation after the service changes had been in effect long enough to be fully tested.

Accordingly, on July 13, after more than a month's experience with the postal curtailments, the association instituted a survey.

THE SURVEY

The questionnaire's three principal parts covered outgoing mail, incoming mail, and miscellaneous service items, the last designed to cover directory service, registry, special delivery, parcel post, and other aspects of importance to the membership. More than 500 New York business concerns participated in the survey. Among them were some of the largest volume mail users in the city—publishers, direct-mail firms, mail-order concerns, and others. They represented a true cross section of the city's business community, from small proprietary firms to the big-business corporations, from every field of commerce. A summary of the survey follows:

A. Outgoing mail

Three hundred and thirty concerns, or 66 percent of those responding, now deliver their outgoing mail directly to the post office. Many commenced such deliveries only after experience with the new collection regulations had emphasized the necessity for this move.

The vast majority reported delay in receipt by addressees of first class and virtually every other class of mail. However, delays in first-class mail were fewer and less disruptive than those in other categories, including parcel post, registered mail, and special delivery. The consensus is that from 1 to 2 days longer, depending upon distance, now is required for first-class mail to reach its destination. As to parcel post, packages now are taking from 2 days to a week and more to arrive at destination.

Large quantities of mail are being delivered to branch and other post offices by senders now in an attempt to beat the closing deadline either of 5:30 or 6 p. m. At branch offices particularly resultant congestion has caused confusion, messengers', and truckmen's overtime pay, and little, if any, decrease in mail delays.

For outgoing service the most frequent complaint revolved about the shortened working hours.

B. Incoming mail

The survey evoked a variety of complaints concerning incoming mail service, with which the respondents have more direct contact than with outgoing mail. Some are mentioned in connection with the discussion of miscellaneous services below.

Delays in receipt of both first-class and other mail appear to fall into the same relative pattern, with delays ranging from a fraction of a day up to a week or more.

C. Miscellaneous services and operations

Service through the various post offices in the city is far from uniform. A sharp difference among them was noted, with the Church Street Station evidently rendering the best service. Of the people served by Church Street, a greater number were satisfied with outgoing mail service than complained of delays.

Most complaints arise from among those served by branch or carrier offices.

1. Effects of Shortened Postal Hours on Business Operations

Numerous firms reported that the first daily mail is received so late no work can be done with it before 10 a. m., resulting in loss of 1 to 2 morning hours. To get outgoing mail into the post office in time for handling that day, all mail must be ready for delivery to the post office by 4 p. m., cutting the business day by 1 to 2 hours. In addition, it was indicated that even when mail is delivered by hand to the post office at 5:30 p. m., it often is set aside until the following morning, because it is physically impossible for the post office to handle current daily volume of mail on the day it is received.

Many firms now are picking up their mail at the post office, especially the first morning mail. However, the branch offices, which serve the great majority, do not open to the public until 8 a. m., by which time long lines of mail messengers, all assembled for the same purpose, create just as much daily delay as would the current postal delivery.

Many firms found special delivery had lost its utility, taking as long as an ordinary letter to arrive at destination. Other firms found it necessary to utilize special delivery where first-class mail formerly would have sufficed, to insure delivery in the time formerly required for ordinary first-class mail. This condition prevails particularly with firms (such as real-estate management, insurance, etc.) sending large volumes of mail to areas classified as residential, with only one daily delivery, where timely delivery is essential for both addressee and sender. This situation has resulted in an inordinate increase in mailing costs (which must be ultimately reflected in higher consumer charges).

Under the new rules registered mail also has created a problem. In the foreign-trade field many firms must utilize registered mail to transmit important documents, such as letters of credit, notices, and shipping forms, with the time element of paramount importance. In innumerable instances documents must be prepared upon just-received advices for action the same day. In order to have them in a branch post office for such action they must be sent in by 4 p. m., since any later posting results in a long wait because of the pile-up of similar business at the post office. The resultant queueing up to meet the 5:30 closing hour creates a danger that, because of the volume of final hour business, registered pieces may be held over until the following day before they are handled. Many firms, therefore, have discontinued using registered mail in favor of hand delivery, resulting in an increase in cost to the sender and a loss of revenue to the post office.

2. Intracity Mail Service

Since June 1 there has been a noticeable increase in the time necessary for mail to get from one place to another within New York City. This condition appears to exist in all classes. First-class mail from a midtown address has been known to take as much as 2 or 3 days to reach a business address in the downtown area. Similar delays are noted in mail going from one borough to another. Only the fact that shorter workdays have increased the daily volume of mail in each individual post office or station, making it impossible for postal employees to handle a full day's mail within the usual time, can reasonably account for this condition. A contributing factor may well be curtailment of deliveries in some districts. Whatever the cause, these delays have created serious disruption in ordinary business operations.

3. Directory Service

As pointed out in the report of the Postal Affairs Committee on June 1, 1950, the discontinuance of directory service is severely burdensome on many New York business concerns. In the import and export field, much mail from abroad, frequently carrying important shipping documents, is received with incorrect addresses. Untold thousands of dollars in foreign-trade business might well hinge upon whether such mail is received or "returned to sender." Large retail establishments with extensive mailing lists essential to their business now find that mail is returned to them, in some cases to the tune of hundreds of pieces per month, because directory service is no longer available. Since the directory service normally was applied only to first-class mail, and since first-class mail always has been self-supporting, no logical reason, in the interest of economy or otherwise, seems to justify its discontinuance in New York.

4. "Business" and "Residential" District Service

Because the Postmaster General's order provided that deliveries in "residential" districts would be restricted to one per day, the city was divided into "business" and "residential" districts. Some unusual results of this apparently arbitrary division have been noted. A large office building has been included in a "residential" area, although its 40 or more tenants all are engaged in business or professional activity, and notwithstanding that it is surrounded on all but one side by business and professional property. Similar instances have been reported where "business" and "residential" postal zoning has resulted in clear inequities, requiring review without delay.

INDICATED ACTION

From all of the facts gathered as a result of the survey, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. In New York City service curtailments effected by the Post Office Department have had a disruptive effect and have increased costs of business operation out of all proportion to the probable economies to be realized. While businessmen generally approve the Postmaster General's desire for economy in a governmental operation, they feel that the postal service to the general public is the last place where economies should be attempted.

2. Reevaluation of services rendered by individual branch offices in New York City should be made at the earliest opportunity. As revealed by the survey, certain branch offices are more important in some respects within the area served than even the general post office. For example, the Bowling Green and Wall Street stations are called upon to handle a large volume of mail, including much special delivery and registered business, generally too great to be handled properly or adequately within the curtailed working hours. They serve by far the greatest part of two business fields, both of which depend upon adequate and efficient postal facilities—export-import and the securities market. They should be authorized to remain open for business during the same daily hours as were effective prior to June 1.

3. A reappraisal, particularly in Manhattan, of what constitutes a business district entitled to three daily deliveries, and a residential district limited to one daily delivery, is clearly indicated. Of the first 20 questionnaires received from business firms located within areas classified as residential, no less than 16, or 80 percent, properly complained they should be within business areas; the 4 noncomplainants were hotels and similar institutions.

The very nature of a city, particularly New York City, requires progressively increasing decentralization by business and industry to areas removed from the business hub. As businesses have moved they have encroached upon and entered into predominantly residential areas; to restrict them to residential service is not only unfair but may well result in future disinclination on the part of new enterprises to locate in available areas outside the limited confines of Manhattan.

4. Second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, and particularly parcel post, have suffered serious setbacks, particularly because of time between dispatch and delivery. No valid reason has been advanced why it should take anywhere from 2 to 7 days for a parcel to travel from one zone in New York City to any other New York zone, yet such delays have become so much more frequent in the past month as to indicate that action is required to expedite this class of mail.

5. Intracity mail procedures must be examined to discover why properly addressed first-class mail should take from 2 to as much as 4 or 5 days in transit from one city office to another. Even assuming heavier daily volume, caused by shorter working days, creates some slowing down, pneumatic tubes carry a large portion of the city's internal mail; and, whereas a letter may be expected upon occasion to arrive 1 day late, more than 1 day's delay (an occurrence only too common since June 1) is inexcusable.

6. Directory service is essential primarily in large urban areas, which are relatively few in number. As an important adjunct of the first-class mail, this service never has caused appreciable drain upon postal revenues so far as may be determined from published figures. In view of its clear importance to the city's business community the directory service should be reinstated in New York as a normal part of first-class service.

7. New York businessmen during the past 5 weeks or more have attempted, through innumerable expedients, to surmount the difficulties raised by early branch office closing hours, all to no avail. Among other methods, they have tried trucking mail to branches other than those customarily used, only to run into parking difficulties, new crowds of mailers, and similar conditions; they have utilized employees' autos to carry parcel post to outlying residential districts for mailing, only to run the dangers attendant upon keeping parcels overnight in the autos before they may be posted; and they have used local mail boxes and chutes, necessitating use of ordinary stamps instead of their postage meters. None of these has been efficacious and all, naturally, have added needless expense to business operations.

8. The association, with almost unanimous spontaneity, is convinced that postal economies and an increase in postal efficiency can both be attained, but not by such cutbacks in service as those now in effect. They point to the Hoover Commission report as the solution to postal problem of service with economy. The Hoover recommendations for streamlining the Post Office Department along realistic, modern lines offer the blueprint for practical economy and efficiency, and adoption is strongly advocated by our membership.

Communism in Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a newspaper article and an editorial, both from the Washington Daily News of August 10, 1950.

Having been in Belgrade last October with the Special Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I can vouch for the truth of the material in the article by Andrew Tully.

The editorial expresses my sentiments toward Tito exactly, and I agree that America should be very, very careful in dealing with this bloody dictator.

I think both the article and the editorial are worthy of reading by every real American. They follow:

BIG BUICKS FOR YUGOSLAVIA'S BIG WHEELS

(By Andrew Tully)

BELGRADE, August 10.—Only two kinds of autos are seen on Belgrade's streets.

There is the modest, medium-price job driven by Americans and assorted other foreigners, and there is the big Buick with heavy silk curtains affected by top drawer Yugoslav bureaucrats.

These Buicks are glaring symbols for all to see of the contrast in the living standards between the Yugoslav man in the street and his Communist bosses.

While the average man in this "people's republic" walks or rides overcrowded trams on an empty stomach to his one- or two-room apartment shared with three or four other persons, the bureaucrat roars about town in his Buick, eats hearty meals and shacks up at the state's expense in premium housing.

Under the law, top bureaucrats aren't supposed to make more than 10,000 dinars, or $200, a month. There is a strong suspicion that this law is winked at, to put it mildly, for the bureaucrats live on the scale much more lavish than would be possible on 10,000 dinars a month in a town where an omelet for two costs $16.

Even if they stay within the law, however, the bureaucrats can do O. K. They get free housing, and no state functionary is going to try to palm off a slum tenement on an official who may some day occupy a high, dangerous position. Their servants are furnished by the state. They have expense allowances, the details of which are never disclosed, and then there are the Buicks.

In a way, these Buicks are amusing. They represent a throwback to the old European tradition of royalty being too bright for the eyes of the masses. Thus, in this "people's republic," those heavy silk curtains. They are even on convertibles. They expose the phonyness of a state in which men are supposed to be comrades existing on a common level for the good of all.

Marshall Tito himself, of course, is the prime example of this hypocrisy. He lives in splendor that would bankrupt any but the top-drawer kings. In Belgrade, he has two homes—the white palace in town which formerly housed Prince Regent Paul and a villa up in the hills overlooking the city. He summers in Paul's old palace at Bled, has a castle on the island of Brioni in the Adriatic and another villa at Dubrovnic on the lower Adriatic.

Tito is about as close to the people as old Louis XV was to the people of France. He appears in public only after all buildings along the route have been evacuated. Wherever he is, no ordinary Yugoslav can approach any closer than a couple of city blocks. In Brioni, none but officials and servants is permitted on the island while Tito is there, and he is always accompanied by silent, sinister Aleksander Rankovic, vice premier and minister of interior or head of the UDBA secret police.

In fact, there are only two similarities between the people and their bureaucratic bosses. Here, some bureaucrats have steel teeth, like the man in the street, instead of gold ones. And because neckties are considered a bourgeois emblem, the bureaucrats take pride in going about with open collars. The average man, of course, leaves off his necktie because he hasn't the money to buy one.

PLAYING BOTH SIDES

A new term, "Titoism," came into popular usage as a byproduct of the cold war when Yugoslavia was expelled from the Cominform.

In the Communist world it meant treason to Moscow. But outside the iron curtain the term was used to define Communist movements which adhered to Marx but revolted at Russian dictation when it impinged upon national rights and interests.

Wishful thinkers entertained the hope that Titoism, spreading out from Yugoslavia, eventually would undermine the new empire Stalin is building in Asia and eastern Europe.

However, the war in Korea has taken all of the fight out of Yugoslavia's tough-talking dictator and his crew. Begging Moscow for peace, they insist they are not under obligations to or in agreement with any other government or political group—meaning America and her friends. This is quite different from the tune the Titoists sang a few weeks ago when they were seeking loans in this country.

This should be a warning to us to beware of these sudden turncoats who approach us with a tin cup held in bloody hands. For if the tide turns in our favor, the line will form again.

J. Hardin Peterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beloved and likable Members of the House has decided to retire, J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida. All Members of the House are familiar with the devotion to hard work, with the loyalty, with the integrity and capability of Mr. PETERSON.

I had an opportunity to see the high regard and respect that the people of his district had for him, when, several years ago, as a member of the House Public Works Committee, I visited his district in connection with some beach-erosion problems which he sought to have corrected. I found his people devoted to him, and it was easy to see why, because he had for years worked hard to represent them in Congress and had given personal and particular care to each and every problem brought to him for consideration.

Mr. PETERSON'S retirement will be a great loss to the Congress and the Nation. He has served with distinction for years and will leave a void that will be hard to fill.

Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a circular issued and distributed by the Communist Party of Maryland. This circular has been distributed throughout the city of Baltimore and area in an effort to disorganize and cause disunity in our all-out effort to defeat communism in the world. It demands that our American forces be withdrawn from Korea and that we join hands with Stalin and his cohorts. It goes to show what the Commies are doing today and will continue to do. Notwithstanding their attacks upon me in the Daily Worker, and other questionable publications, and their threat to defeat me for reelection, I wish to bring this to the attention of the Members today in the hope that it will speed the enactment of legislation which will control the activities of the Communists and their groups.

The circular represents their same old palaver and follows the Communist Party line of quickly grabbing and capitalizing anything they can get their hands on that will further their cause. In this particular case, it is the statement of a battle-fatigued American soldier which was printed in connection with a war story coming out of Korea.

Certainly we owe it to our fighting men and to ourselves to see that these persons and organizations who are not loyal to this Government be controlled, or deported. While our boys are fighting communism in Korea, the corridors of the Senate and House yesterday were jammed with these very same people who are busying themselves circulating Communist-inspired peace petitions.

It is a sad commentary on the governing body of this country that at a time when our boys are being registered and taken to training camps preparatory to going overseas, that persons of this type on such an un-American mission are permitted to roam the Halls of Congress with their phony peace petitions.

Two weeks ago I contacted J. Edgar Hoover seeking his counsel and recommendations on the type of legislation which would best control communism. I told him that I stand ready to introduce any legislation which he felt would strengthen his hand in controlling subversive persons, or groups, and eliminating by deportation persons who are in this country illegally.

It is the duty of every citizen, and, particularly of their representatives in Congress who speak for them, to establish safeguards that will assure the people of this country freedom from defeatist influences of this kind.

Perplexed United States People Are Wondering Whether To Trust Our Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Washington Evening Star:

PERPLEXED UNITED STATES PEOPLE ARE WONDERING WHETHER TO TRUST OUR LEADERS

(By Dorothy Thompson)

We are on the way toward a general mobilization, economically and militarily. In the event of the continuation of the war in Korea, which if not settled by the United Nations, will necessitate the reconquest of the peninsula, the people of the United States can anticipate total conscription and total control of everything—life, labor, capital, and income—by the state. In short, and by whatever name it is called we can anticipate that coercive military and bureaucratic state collectivism which, when practiced elsewhere, we call communism.

Accompanying this development will be the old demand for unity, the protest "Don't rock the boat," and the urge to trust our leaders. To raise disagreeable questions will soon become tantamount to conspiring with the enemy.

Before this state of affairs is achieved and we are reduced to the condition described in the late George Orwell's 1948, let us then raise a few questions.

WHY TRUST OUR LEADERS?

Why should we trust our leaders?

Have the policies they have hitherto pursued brought us peace, stability, and international security, or have they brought us war, inflation, and international chaos?

We have had a continuing administration in office since 1933, or at least have one now, which has defended all the international acts of its predecessors backed up by bipartisan Republicans. Many of the persons who advised these acts are still advising. It is now apparent that they did not know for what purpose they were leading us in the last war; that they were afflicted with an almost incredible blindness to geographical, political, and social realities; that, for the sake of world peace, they vested the security of the United States in an international organization incapable, because of its composition and structure, of framing let alone enforcing international law, and that now, via that body, we are again engaged in war for the purpose of enforcing peace.

Now, "war" is not "peace," despite the new vocabulary which manages to define things by their exact opposites. Nor are "United Nations" repelling aggression in Korea. Soldiers of the United States are, so far unsuccessfully, trying to reverse an aggression initiated by another member of the United Nations, whose delegate is presently president of its Security Council. Without the Russians, the United Nations was, briefly an alliance against aggressive communism, resting on the real and potential forces of the United States. With the Russians it is a fiction. But for the sake of this fiction real persons—almost entirely Americans—are risking and losing their real lives.

FEELING OF UNREALITY

It is no wonder that bewildered Americans have a strange feeling of total unreality about the struggle, as though it were a dream.

For what is its object—its tangible, not fictional, object? The fiction (as it turned out) was the hope that a decisive action by the United States would, of itself, bring about a halt in hostilities or by putting overwhelming force against an aggressor, he could be halted in his aggression. Well, the overwhelming force was not on the spot, nor is it in existence. What force could be mustered had to be imported, and before it got there the aggressor was in occupation all over the place, and now he cannot be halted he must be driven back, during which process most of South, and perhaps North Korea will be destroyed.

Assuming that this can be accomplished—what then?

Korea (like Europe) is a peninsula of Asia. It is bounded on land by Red China (estimated population 400,000,000), and flanked by the Soviet Union (estimated population with European satellites 300,000,000).

That is three-quarters of a billion, all armed.

Question: Can the United States continue to police the Korean peninsula (assuming that we win the localized war) without an Asiatic ally? Shall we rearm Japan to police Asia in behalf of the white man's peace? Or can we do this with the aid of troops from Australia and South Africa, both of which countries practice white supremacy? Can we police the whole Eurasian continent, three-quarters of the globe, militarily and economically organized from the Russian center, the colossus that now stands astride the great continent, with one foot on the Elbe and the other on the border of India—which stride the policies of our leaders encouraged her to take?

Apparently our leaders (if they are thinking) are thinking in terms of the British policing of the nineteenth century, when naval power was decisive and control of the peninsulas of Eurasia was sufficient to police a divided mainland. Today that notion is idiotic.

Recognition of Communist Russia—the Greatest Blunder of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in any consideration which may be given to the series of administration blunders which have culminated in our present war in Korea priority must be given to our original recognition of Communist Russia. Throughout the terms of three Republican Presidents we steadfastly refused to recognize the Red regime as anything other than a band of lawless psychopaths and continued to deny to them that place in our official intercourse which is reserved for those who follow the basic rules of civilization.

When the New Deal came to power, however, one of its first acts was to extend to these brigands full recognition as a sovereign nation, which we know now was nothing more than an invitation for the Reds to embark upon their studied program of undertaking to sabotage and wreck our free Government and besmirch our democratic way of life.

Today we are locked in a bloody conflict with forces which have been launched by Soviet Russia and it makes even less sense than it did in 1933 that we should continue recognition of this group of lawless killers. Certainly a review of history will reveal that we have repeatedly withdrawn our diplomats from other countries when the provocation was not half so great and it seems to me as only a logical conclusion that we should without hesitation sever all ties with the Kremlin and thus announce to the world that we will no longer traffic with these international pariahs.

There will, of course, be a protesting wail from those who will argue that we will thus lose a valuable listening post where we could keep tabs on the gyrations of the Cominform but to that I would simply inquire as to just what of value we have gleaned from our present official contacts. Certainly, we got nothing which gave us a clue to the plan to invade Korea and certainly, too, continued association with thieves and murderers can only result in the lessening of our stature in the commonwealth of nations.

Incidentally, I feel that there are a great many in the administration today who realize that extending diplomatic recognition to Russia was a mistake. It may well be, therefore, that smarting under the just criticism now being directed at the White House, a move may be made just prior to the election in November to regain favor with a disgusted and disillusioned public by canceling our relations with the U. S. S. R. and it is with that in mind that I am now putting myself on record, as a Republican, as favoring such action.

Truman and His Advisers Were Warned of War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic administration had plenty of warning that war was about to break out in Korea. The statements of surprise by Mr. Truman, Mr. Acheson, and Mr. Johnson was a false front to conceal the real facts.

Mr. Ray Tucker, in his column on August 8, points out revealing facts that the people of this country should have. I include the salient statements from his account as part of my remarks:

NATIONAL WHIRLIGIG—DATA SHOWS TRUMAN, AIDES WERE WARNED OF KOREA WAR

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—Documented evidence presented to the House Armed Services Committee by Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, convinces both Democratic and Republican members of that body that President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and Secretary Johnson were given full warning of the North Korean attack on June 25, but failed to heed it.

The contrary testimony of Admiral Hillenkoetter and Secretary Johnson has precipitated demands for impeachment of the national defense head, for a majority of the members believe the Intelligence Chieftain, on the basis of the factual reports he turned over to the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon Building for more than a year.

BLAME

They find it impossible to reconcile the facts and figures in the intelligence file with Mr. Johnson's flat statement before the committee to the effect that "the North Korean attack came as a complete surprise to us."

* * * * *

AGREEMENT

Admiral Hillenkoetter's reports on North Korean preparations for war covered the period from February 28, 1949, to June 23, 1950, 2 days before the invasion itself. They were delivered to the three top officials periodically—sometimes daily, semiweekly, or weekly.

The most informative data, which was relayed to the White House and the two other departments in May of 1949, told of a secret agreement looking toward aggression between the North Korean Government and Russia. It leaves no doubt of Stalin's inspiration of the present conflict.

PACT

Under this pact, Russia was permitted to assign 50 military officers to the North Korea capital to plan the strategy. The number was later increased to 100.

Russia also agreed to furnish trucks, tanks, aircraft, artillery, ammunition, and all other kinds of war material.

North Korea promised to build or repair docks, railroads, highways, and warehouses for transporting and storing these supplies pending zero hour.

TESTED

Admiral Hillenkoetter subsequently reported that on quiet Sunday mornings the Communist forces created disturbances in border villages, made feint attacks, and tested the strength of opposing southern forces.

In view of these depredations, he forecast that withdrawal of our occupation army would precipitate a large-scale invasion.

In April of this year Intelligence gave word that the military material promised by Russia under the 1949 agreement was beginning to reach North Korea.

On June 10, Admiral Hillenkoetter told how all civilians had been evacuated from a zone two kilometers deep just north of the thirty-eighth parallel. That is always a routine, prewar precaution.

On June 19, White House, State Department, and Pentagon were warned of intense concentration of troops in this evacuated no man's land, and a massing of material. On June 23, 2 days before the take-off, an invasion within a few days or weeks was predicted.

GOAT

The committee, including such a loyal Democrat as CARL VINSON of Georgia, Armed Services chairman, insists that it has no alternative except to believe that Secretary Johnson, as spokesman for the administration, was seeking to avoid responsibility for the debacle.

Although no high official has dared to hold MacArthur at fault, there have been suggestions by prominent Democrats on Capitol Hill that the blame should be unloaded on our commander at Tokyo. In view of these Central Intelligence reports, MacArthur seems a likely "goat" as Admiral Kimmel and General Short were so pictured in the Pearl Harbor disaster.

RESPONSIBILITY

But "Mac" is too smart to be caught that way. In a public statement, he has made clear that, until President Truman decided to resist the North Koreans' invasion, this area was never included within his command. Every newspaper and magazine correspondent in the Far East has given testimony to that fact.

In short, the accumulating evidence seems to make it impossible for Harry S. Truman, Dean Acheson, and Louis A. Johnson to escape individual and collective responsibility.

Military Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald, Monday, July 24, 1950, entitled "Freedom Legion":

FREEDOM LEGION

Where the Communists have outstripped us is in innovation. While we have fought diplomatically and militarily on traditional lines—even the strategic A-bomb is a classical use of a new weapon—the Soviet has set out radically. In China it helped the native Communists take over an agrarian revolution. In Czechoslovakia it won a nation by infiltration into the government. Even its military flanking maneuvers in Korea are a new use of an old strategy. And its stunt of exhausting the west by multiple crisis is a considerable improvement on the Hitler technique.

Let's take one respect in which we have not failed to use any bold thinking. The west is desperately in need of fighting men, not only in Korea, but to stand ready in any of the half dozen danger areas. Yet we leave millions on our side unarmed.

There are the west Germans. Among them are fine fighting material and able officers. The Communists are arming the east Germans into a powerful military force. Yet we have found no way to arm the men on our side of the border. Even the appeal of Chancelor Adenauer for 25,000 Federal police is understood to have been rejected, in favor of enlargement of the State police.

Of course there are considerable political problems involved: The French particularly are afraid of any renascence of the German military might. But is there no way out?

There are the Japanese—the finest kind of fighting men we could get for Asiatic engagement. Yet we leave them unarmed, adding to the economic difficulties of the occupied nation. Again there are strong arguments why we should not arm them as a Japanese force, in violation of their constitution and in the peril of a revived militarism. But is there no other solution?

There are the hosts of east European refugees in DP camps in Germany, as Edgar Ansel Mowrer indicated on his page the other day. Unquestionably there are anti-Communists in China who have refused to serve the Nationalists but would join some international freedom force.

What to do to gather these millions into such a force organized, weaponed, and officered, is a challenge to our resourcefulness. Perhaps it can be done through the United Nations, by a UN force subject to the assembly where the Russian veto would not apply. Perhaps it could be done through regional organizations, such as the Atlantic Council. It is not inconceivable that it could be an American foreign legion provided with safeguards against its use for any other purposes than those prescribed by the UN.

The point is, here is the enormous pool of manpower ready, even eager, to join the defenses against communistic tyranny. Here are we who desperately need their aid. Yet because there is no conventional method to join the two, we struggle along without them.

The Russians have been outthinking us. They organize a tributary economy to consolidate the productive forces behind the iron curtain, yet we have difficulty working out the minor advances of a steel pool. True, it is more difficult to make democratic nations march together than to regiment satellites, but all it demands is a more imaginative, a bolder, approach.

We let the Germans get away with their propaganda about potato bugs dropped on east Germany, and fail to make the imaginative answer, the shipment of free DDT to the east German farmers, as Senator FLANDERS suggested the other day.

This is a new day in world conflict when the old ways won't do. Communism could win just because we never found a way to unite her enemies effectively.

Will Whittington Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the Eighty-first Congress the House of Representatives will lose one of its most valuable and respected Members, the Honorable WILL WHITTINGTON of Mississippi, who has voluntarily elected to retire after a long and distinguished tenure as a Member of the House.

I have had the privilege of serving with him as a Member of the House Public Works Committee, under his competent leadership as chairman of that committee. His knowledge of the many and various bills and issues that have come before that committee for consideration is remarkable. He has been influential in the passage of the first flood-control bill which has been such a great help to the Nation as a whole and to Los Angeles County in particular. I knew of the great and beneficial work of Mr. WHITTINGTON long before I came to Congress, in connection with my services as a member of Los Angeles County Flood Control Board. Mr. WHITTINGTON is held in high esteem in Los Angeles County because many thousands of acres of land, many homes and public highways, and many lives are safer from the destruction by floods on account of Mr. WHITTINGTON'S thoughtful consideration of our flood problems when he was chairman of the House Flood Control Committee and later as chairman of the House Public Works Committee.

I personally regret to see Mr. WHITTINGTON retire from service in the House. His competent and capable services will be missed and difficult to replace. It is my sincere hope that he may have many years of health and happiness which he has earned and deserves because of the years of faithful service he has rendered to the Nation.

The Boy Scout Court of Honor, Tyrone, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my great honor and privilege to address the Boy Scout Court of Honor at Camp Anderson, near Tyrone, Pa., on August 6, 1950.

My address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE BOY SCOUT COURT OF HONOR, PORTER DISTRICT BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, TYRONE, PA., AUGUST 6, 1950

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, Scout leaders and Scouts, I am highly honored by the kind invitation to participate in the annual program incident to the Boy Scout Court of Honor, of the Porter District Boy Scouts of America.

In accepting your kind invitation, I am reminded of the fact that the Scouting movement is recognized as one of the finest programs ever conceived for the development of youth and the building of good citizenship.

I recall that it was in the performance of a good turn by an unknown London Boy Scout that paved the way for the introduction of the Scouting movement in America.

It was a foggy night in London in the fall of 1909 when an unknown Boy Scout helped Mr. William D. Boyce, a Chicago publisher, to find a difficult address in old London. Mr. Boyce offered the Scout a shilling as a tip, which was courteously refused in these words—"No thank you, sir; I am a Scout, and a Scout never accepts tips for being helpful."

Mr. Boyce expressed surprise and inquired what the boy meant. The boy in turn expressed astonishment that anyone did not know of Baden-Powell's Boy Scouts and asked permission to take Mr. Boyce to the headquarters of the British Boy Scouts.

There he was told of the experience of Robert S. S. Baden-Powell, later Lord Baden-Powell, when he went to South Africa as a member of the British constabulary during the Boer War, 1899–1902. Baden-Powell was dismayed to find that recruits sent to him lacked the fundamentals of dependability, resourcefulness, self-reliance, and cooperation.

Baden-Powell planned outdoor recreation programs to develop his men and make them strong and reliant.

In 1903, when he returned to England he found that his program was being used by leaders in boys' work. In 1907 he organized a Boy Scout troop and took 20 boys to a camp on Brownsea Island off the English coast to try out the idea. It proved a tremendous success and the Scouting movement became a reality with many more troops being organized.

The motto "Be Prepared" was adapted from the law of survival in the jungle and is inscribed on the Scout badge.

Mr. Boyce, the Chicago publisher, after hearing the story of Baden Powell and his founding of the Boy Scout movement, was so impressed that he secured and brought with him to America a trunkful of literature on the subject as well as uniforms, badges, and insignia.

Forty years ago, on February 8, 1910, the Boy Scouts of America were organized by an act of incorporation as an organization in the District of Columbia. Thus Scouting in America was born in the Nation's Capital. In 1916 the organization was officially recognized by Congress when a Federal charter was approved and signed by President Woodrow Wilson.

Nearly 2,000,000 American Boy Scouts are banded together this year under the 1950 Boy Scout slogan, "Strengthen the Arm of Liberty."

The fine spirit symbolized in the famous Statue of Liberty is not a theory, but an actual practice of the whole Scout family.

For it is in Scouting that you will find Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Senior Scouts, and all of their leaders pledged to practice clean living in their daily lives. They provide the strength that is found in the Scouting movement and are responsible for the remarkable record achieved in the development of character and good citizenship.

Many of the Boy Scouts of yesterday have served their country with valor and distinction in two world wars. Tonight in the rice paddies of Korea, thousands of miles from home and fireside, many former Scouts are among the gallant men of our Armed Forces fighting valiantly despite tremendous odds, against the godless communistic hordes that seek to extinguish the torch of liberty and plunge the world into slavery and spiritual darkness.

Kelly, Anderson, Hansen, Donovan, Silberstein, and Warder are only a handful of names of former Boy Scouts whose fame is forever written in the history books of our Nation.

Their names are indicative of the many races and creeds that make up America.

One of the finest tributes ever paid to the Boy Scouts is recorded in the words of Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz when he said after World War II, "Forty percent of the men I commanded in the Pacific had been Boy Scouts. But that 40 percent won 60 percent of the awards for valor."

These words of Admiral Nimitz further justify the ideals and the visions of the early leaders in the Scouting movement.

In paying tribute to these former Boy Scouts as American war heroes, we are reminded that their brother Scouts in Europe and the Philippines also served the cause of liberty with honor and distinction, for the Scouting movement is international in scope.

It is our hope and prayer that the principles of Scouting may be inscribed on the hearts of the youth of all nations and aid in hastening the day when we may enjoy true brotherhood among all nations.

The history of World War II reveals that the first steps taken by Mussolini and Hitler were to subjugate youth and banish the Boy Scout movement.

In Japan the same diabolical tactics were employed by the dictator regime as it captured and enslaved youth in its mad desire for world conquest.

The Japanese in China sank to the lowest depths by encouraging the cultivation of opium and then selling the drug to Chinese youth, mindful that in China boys 13 years of age were eligible for military service.

By contrast here in America during World War II, our youth were more fortunate. It is true that child labor legislation was modified to help the manpower situation and, as a result, there was a marked increase in the use of America's youth in industry. But the employment of our youthful citizens was kept within reasonable bounds.

Boy Scouts in America rendered conspicuous service to their country during World War II by engaging in scores of activities connected with the war effort, among which were the collecting of tin, waste paper, and metal, and the selling of war bonds.

In all these projects Boy Scouts achieved a remarkable record for industry and faithfulness to these patriotic tasks.

Today as we witness the war clouds gathering again over a troubled and anxious world, we are shocked at the realization that the so-called "police action" in Korea may prove to be the first shot in world war III.

It is deplorable to realize that the youth of the world is face to face every few years with devastating wars.

If the principles of Scouting could be inscribed on the hearts of the youth of all nations, the world could look to the future with confidence.

That is the crusade that world Scouting must carry on to a successful conclusion.

Here in America we all have a mission to perform in meeting our responsibilities to the youth of this Nation. I know of no finer means of accomplishing our mission than by continued support and interest in the Scouting movement.

I want to congratulate you mothers and fathers, relatives and friends for the active support you are giving the Boy Scout movement in this area.

Your presence here this evening is a tribute to the Scouting movement for you are giving not only active and moral support in particular to all the Boy Scouts of Porter district, but in general to the Boy Scouts of America.

At these ceremonies today Boy Scouts of all grades are honored and rewarded for the progress they have made and for the credits they have justly earned. These Scouts could not have made such fine progress unless they had Scout leaders who were interested in them and parents and relatives who encouraged them.

Tyrone and vicinity may well feel proud of its youthful citizens for they reflect due credit on their parents, teachers, churches, and the civic and fraternal organizations who have demonstrated a lively interest in their welfare.

These Boys Scouts, junior citizens of today, are the future senior citizens who are going to carry on what you have started.

The boy today will be the man tomorrow who will sit where you are sitting and attend, when you are gone, to those things which you think are so important.

You may adopt all the policies you please, but how they will be carried out depends upon him. He will sit in your legislatures, and occupy places in the courts of your land.

The boy of today will assume control of your cities, State, and Nation; your prisons, churches, hospitals, schools, universities, and corporations.

All your work is going to be judged, and praised, or condemned by him. Your reputation and future are in his hands.

Whether you realize it or not, all your work is for the boy of today. The fate of the Nation and humanity rests with him. Since all this is true, is it not evident that we should continue to pay the boy of today the attention he deserves?

We can do this very thing by continuing to give our wholehearted support to the Scouting movement and its program of building better citizens; and by awakening the interest of our neighbors who may not have had an opportunity to appreciate the widespread benefits that accrue from the Scouting movement.

A boy has been defined as—

A piece of skin stretched over an appetite.

A noise covered with dirt.

Like an iceberg, seven-eighths of him is hidden away, waiting for some explorer to come along.

He is called a tornado, because he comes at the most unexpected times, hits the most unexpected places—and leaves a wreck behind him.

He can run like a deer, climb like a squirrel, bellow like a bull, balk like a mule and eat like a horse.

He is a growing animal of superlative promise—to be fed, watered, and kept warm.

A joy forever, a periodic nuisance, the problem of our times—the hope of a nation.

Every new boy born is evidence that God is not yet discouraged with man.

A Boy Scout has been defined as a youngster from 9 to 16 years of age who belongs to an organization that provides its members with clean fun, lasting ideals, and whose basic job is character building and citizenship training.

The Scout oath requires that a tenderfoot Scout shall promise: "On my honor I will do my best: To do my duty to God and my country and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

The Scout law requires that a Scout be trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.

As you look into the shining faces of these eager and resourceful Boy Scouts here today, you have a good example of the success achieved by the Scouting movement. No wonder you mothers and fathers are beaming with joy, for you have a right to be proud of your son's progress in the realm of Scouting.

Certainly there are no problems of juvenile delinquency among these wholesome American boys.

Today, as never before in the history of the world, we need men with the qualities of real leadership. It is such leadership that the Scouting movement develops and nurtures.

At the same time, it teaches boys the priceless virtue of doing things together in a spirit of cooperation and teamwork. There is no time for grandstand players, because the emphasis is placed on the group. This spirit of cooperation is needed in America today as we face what may prove to be the greatest crisis in the history of this Nation.

Tonight we are part of a world that is in turmoil. Nations still distrust each other despite two global wars that were supposed to be fought to rescue humanity from slavery and to build a world where all of its inhabitants might dwell in peace.

While we survey this unhappy situation we realize that all our confidence and hope for a better world depends upon the youth of today. Meditate for a moment on the potential power the American boy represents with his energy, vitality, and boundless enthusiasm.

If all of these boyish attributes are developed in the right manner we need have no fear of the future when these junior citizens become the citizens of tomorrow.

Our influence on the youth of today is of paramount importance. If we shirk our duty we cannot escape the fact that we are responsible to a marked degree for our failure in building good citizens.

The American boy needs our guidance and support during his formative years because without it, evil influences can corrupt and lead him astray.

One of the outstanding laws of the Boy Scouts is that he must be reverent toward God. Teaching a boy to be faithful in his religious duties and to respect the convictions of others in matters of custom and religion is the sure way of banishing intolerance, bigotry, and racial persecution.

It promotes love of God and respect and affection for our neighbor, and puts in actual practice the divine command "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart,

thy whole soul, and thy whole mind—and thy neighbor as thyself."

A godless nation cannot long survive even though it may lull its citizenry to sleep with the promise of an abundant life without the cares and worries that make up the art of living.

In short—we need religion in our daily lives, for a life without love of God is barren and fruitless. In like manner, nations that turned their backs on God crumbled away and their prestige and glory are relics of the dim past.

With this thought in mind, we should be grateful that the 2,000,000 Boy Scouts in America are imbued with love of God and their neighbor.

This deep-seated reverence for divine providence is one of the foundation stones upon which the Scouting movement has flourished in the United States.

In closing, I hope that all of us will take renewed faith in the youth of our Nation from the ceremony we have witnessed here this Sabbath evening.

When we think of the regimentation of youth in Germany, Italy, Japan, China, and Russia, we should utter a sincere prayer of thanks to Almighty God that American youth is not recruited into shirted brigades like those organized by Hitler and other dictators.

Let us solemnly resolve that we shall keep forever before our American youth the great moral principles upon which this Nation was founded and which are encouraged and fostered by that great youth organization—the Boy Scouts of America.

For What Are You Willing To Pay Taxes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Willford I. King:

FOR WHAT ARE YOU WILLING TO PAY TAXES?

(By Willford I. King)

It can be taken for granted that you, Mr. Typical Thrifty American, being a patriotic citizen, are willing to pay to any feasible extent such taxes as are required to win the war. President Truman says he needs immediately for that purpose an extra $14,000,000,000. That means around a dollar per day per family—and a dollar missing each 24 hours puts a decided crimp in the average household's spending money.

Being intelligent, you know that there is no possibility of financing the war by soaking the rich, for the present total after-tax income of all of those fortunate enough to get $50,000 per year, before taxes, is probably less than $2,000,000,000, or a mere seventh of the amount for which Mr. Truman is asking. Willy-nilly, you, and I, and other plain everyday Americans are going to be compelled to pay practically all of the war costs.

Being familiar with business affairs, you also know that, in a competitive society, the efficiency of an enterprise is generally indicated best by the size of its profits; and, understanding human psychology, you are likewise aware that burdensome levies on profits (excess or normal), and confiscatory taxes on high incomes take away the incentives which induce the leaders of our great industries to work tirelessly to establish new production records. And, when these keymen slacken their endeavors, output falls, and the volume of sorely needed supplies moving to the front diminishes. You do not want this to happen; hence you will cheerfully pay whatever taxes are required to keep production at a maximum.

Furthermore, you prefer to be taxed openly rather than to have your savings surreptitiously filched away by inflation—a device used to cover up the fact that the national budget is unbalanced. And you are not going to be "kidded" into accepting the view that the rise in the price level which confiscates your savings is the result of hoarding or profiteering by some wicked scoundrels. The Congressmen and the officials who permit a Government deficit to continue are the real villains.

Because you know that efficiency is needed even more in wartime than in peacetime, you naturally object strenuously to paying out your good money to hire a vast army of bureaucrats and clerks to administer price controls, production controls, priorities, allocations, and other devices the prime results of which are to waste the time of people who ought to be helping with the war effort, create scarcity where otherwise there would be abundance, and bring daily weariness to the millions of housewives who must stand in line to get daily necessities.

Yes, you are willing to make whatever sacrifices are really necessary to do your part in winning the war, but are you equally ready to make sacrifices to facilitate the process of turning our country into a socialistic or fascistic state? In other words, are you ready to spend your hard-earned dollars to help our Federal Government take over little by little our school system, our power projects, our banking and insurance business, our medical care, and our housing industry? You are well aware that the socialistic nations of western Europe took over their large industries a few years ago so that their governments could be supported by the profits of these enterprises, thus largely eliminating the need for taxation. How has this arrangement worked out? All the industries have proved to be "white elephants," for they are running huge deficits which the European governments are meeting partly by added taxes and partly by inflation.

Their experience furnishes an excellent illustration of the inefficiency inherent in the business undertakings of democratic governments. Among the reasons accounting for it are the following:

1. Governments must keep prices of their products low in order to catch the votes of the consumers.

2. Governments must keep wage rates high in order to secure the backing of the workers.

3. If appropriations are not fully spent this year, appropriations for next year are likely to be reduced.

4. The bureau chief's pay, power, and prestige commonly depend upon the number of persons working under him; hence he opposes any measures tending to reduce the number of his subordinates.

5. To maintain efficiency in a bureau or office requires constant effort, and the bureau chief does not profit financially if expenses are lowered, and is not out of pocket if money is wasted.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, outstanding statesman and one of the Nation's most thorough students of Federal finance, asserts in a recently published letter that, by discontinuing various socialistic Federal projects, by cutting out numerous luxury items, and by vigorously eliminating waste all along the line, it is entirely feasible to trim $10,000,000,000 from the Federal budget without in any way hampering our war effort. Cutting the President's demands for new revenue from $14,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 would reduce the average family's daily new tax burden from about a dollar to less than 30 cents. Do you choose to have that remaining 70 cents per day devoted to paying for waste, for hiring regulators to hamper production and annoy you, and to further socialistic undertakings, or do you prefer to have the personal privilege of spending it for family needs? Bear in mind that to pay for $10,000,000,000 needless, nondefense expenditure would cost 100 percent tax rise in corporation taxes, or 60 percent increase in all personal income taxes. Do you want to pay this for needless waste in Washington?

Mr. Typical Thrifty American, this is your Government. Even the highest officials keep their ears to the ground. Whatever policy you demand clearly and forcefully, they will follow. For just what purpose are you willing to pay taxes? It is up to you to decide and to express your viewpoint to your Congressman and the President.

The Copper Import Tax Should Be Retained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is no valid reason for further suspension of the import tax on copper.

This important natural resource is as much entitled to tariff protection as any other domestic commodity. There is no basis for singling out copper for chastisement. The special interests which advocate suspension of the import tax on copper are the very ones who would cry most bitterly if there was a general suspension of all import taxes.

Under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a letter which I wrote to the editor of the Washington Daily News on this subject, his editorial in reply to my letter, and my reply to the editorial:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1950.

Mr. JOHN T. O'ROURKE,
Editor, Washington Daily News,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'ROURKE: Your editorial in yesterday's paper on the suspension of the import tax on copper is one of the most unfair and distorted pieces I have read in a long time. The gist of your contention is that reimposing the tariff would be unpatriotic at a time when there is a shortage of copper in this country; and in violation of our good neighbor policy with Latin America. These arguments are ridiculous for the following reasons:

1. The testimony presented to the House Ways and Means Committee on this legislation was undisputed that the suspension of the tariff would have no effect whatever upon the amount of copper imported—it wouldn't increase it or decrease it.

2. Most of our imported copper comes from Chile. The 2 cents per pound tax is the result of a reciprocal trade agreement entered into with Chile in 1947. Since when has it been regarded as an unfriendly act to require a foreign country to carry out a voluntary agreement? The original 4 cents per pound tax was reduced to 2 cents as a result of this agreement.

3. Ninety-six percent of the Chilean copper is controlled and produced by two large monopoly copper companies in the United

States. Who is the good neighbor to be affected by the tariff? The Chilean Government—or the American companies who own all the Chilean copper?

4. There is an import tax on lead and zinc. There is also an import tax on other strategic metals. We are importing large quantities of all these metals. Why should copper be singled out for suspension?

In March of last year when the tariff on copper was suspended, the price fell from 23½ cents a pound to 16 cents a pound in a few weeks' time. This precipitous price drop had the effect of closing all of the copper mines in Michigan, and many of those in the western States. During the period our domestic mines were closed nearly 300,000,000 pounds of copper came to the United States from foreign countries. While thousands of copper miners in the United States were walking the streets looking for jobs the Chilean and African copper miners continued in their employment. Is this the kind of good-neighbor policy you are advocating?

Your reference to Korea as a reason for suspending the tariff is a smokescreen. Domestic copper has always been our principal source of supply in fighting wars. When we take down our tariff barriers we put a large segment of domestic mining industry in jeopardy. As a result we make ourselves more and more dependent on foreign sources of supply. Do you think it is wise to place ourselves in that kind of a position?

In fairness I think you ought to have your editorial writer get the facts about the copper tariff, and revise the erroneous statements he has made.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. BENNETT,
Member of Congress.

REPLY TO REPRESENTATIVE BENNETT

We print a letter from Representative JOHN B. BENNETT, Republican, of Michigan, in the adjoining column, disagreeing with our opposition to an import tariff on copper at this time.

He says our position is unfair, distorted, and ridiculous.

He is entitled to his opinion.

He says that the copper tax was duly negotiated, and asks since when has it been unfriendly to require performance of a voluntary agreement? Like Shylock's bond.

He says copper mines in Chile, which produce most of our imported copper, are controlled by two American monopolies, and why should a tax on them affect the Chilean Government? Certainly Representative BENNETT isn't serious when he asks that one. The thousands of Chilean miners' jobs involved, the Chilean taxes, the fact that a large segment of the Chilean economy depends on copper make it obvious that there are profound political implications.

Furthermore, we don't understand about those two monopolies. We thought monopoly meant one. If there's collusion between United States companies—and who are we to deny it?—Representative BENNETT should call on the Justice Department and report what he knows about a violation of the antitrust laws.

He says lead and zinc carry import taxes; why not copper. Without going lengthily into the political economics of lead and copper, we wouldn't know whether the cases are parallel or not. We can't answer that one.

He says we fought previous wars on domestic copper. Could be. But it is certainly a fact that today we are using up about twice as much copper as we produce from domestic mines. With world war III threatening, isn't it better to have too much than too little? Right now we have too little. Furthermore, we can't depend on production from high-cost, marginal domestic mines to fill the gap. In that case, the too little might arrive too late.

Is Representative BENNETT fighting for these high cost, inefficient marginal mines that can only operate at an artificially high price? It would seem so.

He says that when the copper tariff was suspended in 1947, copper dropped from 22½ cents to 16 cents. He infers that these events are related. We can find no connection. The depression-born copper tariff was suspended at the beginning of World War II.

It was suspended for the very reasons we urge that the suspension be continued now; to give us more copper, and to stimulate the economy and production in Chile, one of the friendly democratic governments in South America.

Certain inefficient high cost marginal mines may need tariff protection, even in these days of short copper supply, and their owners may contribute to the political campaigns of legislators who may feel as they do about protective tariffs. Furthermore, we agree, such protective tariffs may create jobs for miners in marginal mines.

But that won't get the country cheaper copper, nor more copper.

And, to paraphrase Representative BENNETT, that's not the kind of policy-making we advocate.

We have a suggestion, though:

Continue suspension of the copper tariff for 1 year.

During that year, work out a bill containing a formula providing for reimposition of a copper tariff if, as, and when foreign copper gluts the domestic market and average-cost domestic mines cannot meet the competition. Please note the words, average-cost.

Can anyone quarrel with that?

Yes. Some political champions of owners of inefficient, poor-strain mines can and will oppose it, even if their policies contain a danger to the country.

We assure Representative BENNETT that if mine State Senators logroll the tariff on copper, those mine State Senators and those Senators who helped them will have selfishly and shortsightedly set in motion a whole series of adverse political reactions in Latin America, which can only aid the disruptive Communist activities there, and will have deprived this country of a critical metal in a time of urgent need.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 5, 1950.

Mr. JOHN T. O'ROURKE,
Editor, Washington Daily News,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'ROURKE: I do not want to carry on a protracted argument with you about the copper import tax, but I do feel that I should comment briefly on your editorial replying to my letter.

You continue to imply that an import tax will affect the amount of copper imported. Are you not deliberatey ignoring the undisputed fact that the amount of copper imported will not be affected—tariff or no tariff? If you remove that contention from your editorial you would have one argument remaining; namely, that we ought to look to the welfare of the Chilean copper miner ahead of the welfare of the domestic copper miner.

If you eliminate the so-called marginal copper mines which produce about 20 percent of our domestic supply you thus increase our dependence upon foreign copper to that extent. It is true that marginal mines are more costly to operate, because many of them get their ores more than a mile below the earth's surface. Certainly this makes for high-cost production as compared to open-pit mining. But don't overlook the fact that these marginal mines provide large quantities of copper; and they have been desperately needed every time this country has been faced with a real emergency. I want to keep those mines in business, and I want to assure continued jobs for thousands of miners who work in them. I want a copper tariff to protect these miners against the slave wages that are paid the copper miners in Chile, Africa, and elsewhere. The issue is that simple.

You argue that a shortage of copper in the United States justifies the removal of the import tax. That same argument could be used with respect to hundreds of other commodities which are in short supply, and yet you are not contending that there should be an across-the-board suspension of tariffs. There might be some merit to your position if you were urging suspension on every commodity in short supply. For example, I am sure you know there is a tariff on products manufactured with copper. Is it fair to permit the purchaser of raw copper to buy it duty free, and then protect him with a tariff on the articles he manufactures with copper? Do you believe in that kind of rank discrimination?

If you don't want to be fair, at least you could be logical on this issue and urge the Congress suspend tariffs on all articles in short supply instead of isolating copper for this chastisement. That would put the subject in its proper perspective even though it might leave you on the end of a limb.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. BENNETT,
Member of Congress.

Where Does Our Defense Money Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union, Manchester, N. H., Tuesday, August 8, 1950:

WHERE DOES OUR DEFENSE MONEY GO?

Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee wants to know what the Government has to show for the military expenditures of the past 4 years. Since July 1946 approximately $50,000,000,000 has been spent on national defense. This is not a negligible sum. During the last fiscal year, defense costs totaled a sum equivalent to defense expenditures for the 16 fiscal years preceding Pearl Harbor.

Yet the war in Korea finds us short of almost everything that is needed. The President has been compelled to ask for additional appropriations to provide guns and tanks and planes, and to meet our military manpower requirements. It is logical to ask what became of the $50,000,000,000 already spent. Where did it go?

An answer to this question is given by the staff of United States News and World Report in its issue of July 18, following an exhaustive investigation. This answer makes some startling revelations. It discloses that two-thirds of all military spending went for services performed, not for weapons or military supplies. These services include wages, travel, telephone bills, freight costs, rents, pensions, and other services. In addition, eight billion was spent on supplies already used up, such as food, fuel, ammunition, clothing, and materials of all kinds.

Of the defense dollars spent for wages, the United States News reports that eighteen and seven-tenths billion went to noncombat servicemen and civilians, while only six and

two-tenths billion went to men in the combat units. Of the eight billion spent for supplies, only about one-fourth went to combat personnel and three-fourths for overhead personnel. In short, as the periodical puts it, more than $2 out of every $3 spent for defense went for housekeeping. Total charges for housekeeping are put at $34,700,000,000, and the total for men and machines for use in fighting at fifteen and three-tenths billion. Of this fifteen and three-tenths billion, eight and two-tenths went for a force of fighting men; four for a fleet of new planes, and three and one-tenth for other war equipment. Only $600,000,000 was spent during the whole period on weapons.

As a result the spending on combat equipment was inadequate to replace worn-out items. No new tanks were bought. Only a few World War II ones were remodeled. No big artillery guns, rifles, machine guns, or new naval guns were purchased. No new Navy ships were ordered. New weapons were still in the planning or testing stage. On land the fighting divisions fell from 17 to 10. Air groups declined from 52 to 48. The number of combat ships fell from 291 to 245, and manpower in the Navy declined from 985,288 to 379,000.

All this prompts the question: What do we maintain a Defense Establishment for? Is it just to support a vast bureaucracy that has no combat value? Or is it to provide men and weapons for defense? Chairman VINSON is on the right track. Before pouring added billions into defense, we had better find out what is being done with the money appropriated and that our defense dollars are going to buy what they are intended for. We have played with this situation too long already.

Some Facts About the Last War, the Peace, and Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting from the July 26, 1950, Elwood (Ind.) Call-Leader an editorial written by Rowland R. Peters which I believe correctly expresses the thinking of our people.

The mess which the politicians have made of things is appalling. Nothing remotely like it can be found in previous history. Roosevelt and Truman in their fanaticism for communism threw the peace away at Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and so forth.

The politicians blundered in extending lend-lease to Russia and to so many other countries. History teaches that allies fall out with each other after they win a war.

Lend-lease was a deliberate fraud. Its purpose was neither to lend nor to lease anything, but simply to give away American war matériel. In order to have Congress pass the Lend-Lease Act the politicians had to put a false label on it. Now, as was the case with the gift we made to Japan in buying her gold at $35 per ounce, the Russians are shooting our sons because of what our politicians gave them during and after the war.

The United Nations is a colossal swindle. It is a Communist organization. Alger Hiss was the secretary-general of the conference which wrote its articles. Assuredly he had much to do in formulating them. And he was not the only Communist at the San Francisco Conference. Would Stalin have accepted and joined the organization if it had not been to his liking, if it had not been a Communist set-up?

And so are all the other international organizations attached to the United Nations Communist organizations, such as the United Nations Economic and Social Counsel, International Trade Organization, International Labor Organization, and so forth.

Do not look to the United Nations for material support to the United States in the Korean war. Some of its members will talk big and possibly send a few token forces to help us, but more than this should not be expected from this organization. Whatever help we may get from the other nations will come because of their self-interest, and this would be forthcoming if there were no United Nations organiaztion. The editorial follows:

LET US FACE SOME FACTS ABOUT THE LAST WAR, THE PEACE, AND KOREA

Wherever Elwoodites gather these days there can be heard utterances of apprehension. We are becoming increasingly alarmed over world conditions with emphasis, of course, on Korea. We have reason to be alarmed. The time has come for all of us to pay mare attention to international affairs than we ever have because we are involved in a tragic situation that can set the whole world on fire. We are, in fact, involved in a situation which can, if the atomic and hydrogen bombs are to be used by both sides, wipe out much of our civilization and set us back centuries.

We are involved in a tragic political situation as well as two-continent war. Some of our politicians are attempting to put out the lie that the Korean conflict is not a full-scale war. Whenever Americans are dying as they are dying in Korea we are fighting a full-scale war, not just an overnight skirmish. Politicians in Washington are putting out news items that we "suffered a few casualties," and in the same news items they say that enemy losses were "heavy." We wonder who those fellows think they are kidding. When fighting is severe enough for heavy losses on one side it is severe enough to inflict heavy losses on the other side. Here is an example of confusion.

We need to consider, too, that the war in Korea is all the proof that we need that we have definitely lost the peace that we won on Okinawa, Guam, Japan, the Battle of the Bulge, and throughout the European theater of war in the early forties. Here we are being governed at the beginning of another war by the same crowd that lost the peace. Common judgment dictates that our affairs in time of war certainly are not in good hands when they are in the hands of politicians who couldn't keep the peace after thousands of our young men died to win it and thousands of others are still in hospitals as a result of winning it.

They won that peace back in 1945, but the politicians have not yet recognized it. The politicians are still clinging to the wartime taxes they imposed "temporarily" to win the war. They permitted months and years to pass without declaring that the war was over. They insulted those who died and those who were injured and those who fought but survived the war. They made concessions to Russia at Yalta when all the time they knew that Russia was not our friend. They even stopped General Eisenhower and his forces at the gates of Berlin so that the Russians could take the city that the Americans had won. They made concessions to Russia to get her into the Japanese after the Americans had that war won and surrender of the Japanese was a matter of days away.

The same crowd is in office. The same crowd is in a position to bungle this war as they bungled the peace. What assurance have we that the crowd that bungled the peace will not bungle this war at heavy and unnecessary loss of American lives and dollars? One by one, the politicians who lost the peace are crying for new taxes, warning us of new controls over our economy. If the war gets bad enough the American people will, as they always have done, be willing to make whatever concessions they must make to help their sons win the war.

The politicians are crying for new taxes on the age-old lie that they want to balance the budget because of the current emergency. They knew this emergency was inevitable when they knew they were losing the peace. Did they balance the budget? No. Instead Harry Truman and his crowd kept piling more and more billions upon the debt. Of all of the silly assertions the politicians could make it is talking about balancing the budget in time of war when they didn't do it in peacetime. They could have slowed down on taking money from those who work to give it to those who do not work, or paying it out in subsidies for which Uncle Sam gets nothing but more and more indebtedness. They say that more taxes will help fight communism, but they keep in office one Dean Acheson, so-called Secretary of State, who said he would not "turn my back on Alger Hiss," an American enemy. They want more tax money to fight communism, but they permit such persons as Senator TYDINGS to steamroller a report condemning Senator MCCARTHY for trying to reveal communism within our Government bureaus.

They want more taxes yet they profess to stand by President Truman who was so naive as to say the Hiss case was "just a red herring," and then refused and failed to admit he was wrong after Hiss was convicted. These are the persons who are pulling the strings while America's young men are dying and those at home are worrying, even those who fought the "last war," the war that was supposed to end wars. They are being alerted again. Among them there are those thousands who were just getting a good start in life when the depression, the result of our own recklessness after the First World War, gave them a jar. That over, they just got a good start again when they had to fight the Second World War. Now they are once again on the way to a normal life and they are being called upon to go back into service. Sure, they'll go because they are loyal Americans, but surely, too, they are getting tired of being kicked around by politicians who lack the common sense of knowing how to get along with each other without having to call upon the young men of their countries to die for their mistakes.

Our Washington politicians have been trying for years to subject us to socialized control, which, in effect, is little different from communism. As Congressman FREDERICK C. SMITH of Ohio, told the House 2 weeks ago: "There is really no quarrel between the forces controlling the United States and those controlling Russia, as regards to mode of government. The real difference between the two countries relates to jurisdiction over lands and peoples. Roosevelt and Truman sanctioned Russia's vast accrual of territory and population. All the subversive forces within and without our Government have built up Russia to its present size and strength."

Yes, we lost the peace and those in control when we lost it are still in control now that we are reaping the results of losing it. There is still one power that favors right over might and right over politics. Our young men of today are in His hands. They may die but He will not let them down.

Blundering Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extension from the Omaha Evening World-Herald of August 7, 1950:

BLUNDERING INTELLIGENCE

There is apprehension in this country that Russia may duplicate the Korean invasion in some other part of the world.

If America's record at out-guessing the enemy is any criterion, this worry is unjustified. Our opponents almost never act the way our intelligence services expect them to.

In fact, the record of failure in that line is little short of amazing. Two reporters for the New York Herald Tribune recently compiled a list of the notable errors by American intelligence since World War II and came up with six major blunders, including, of course, the Korean affair of recent and painful memory.

These are the other five:

The fall of Czechoslovakia, which America's best minds thought was only a routine change of government.

Tito's split with Soviet Russia and the Cominform, a defection which was some time in the making but which caught our intelligence people flat-footed. Army G–2 was still busy analyzing Tito in terms of his being Stalin's valet when he had in fact fallen out with the Kremlin.

The fall of Nationalist China: In this case Army G–2 looked good. Other intelligence services "discounted the capabilities of the Communists to overrun China." The Army's minority opinion was, of course, ignored.

Palestine: All American intelligence groups overrated the military ability of the Arabs.

Bogota: A Colombian revolution exploded right under the noses of Secretary of State Marshall and others gathered at the capital of Colombia for the International Conference of American States. Intelligence had said there might be some picketing, but no shooting.

The above would indicate that this country's system for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information is a bad one. The results discredit it completely and the known facts about its methods and its duplication of effort add up to story of dangerous and costly bungling.

Many Americans assume that because the United States has a Central Intelligence Agency it has a well-integrated system which channels information and analysis to the various Government departments.

This is far from the truth. This country has, in fact, no less than six separate and sometimes competitive intelligence organizations gathering information from abroad and trying to figure out what it means.

Each of the three military services has its own intelligence machinery. The State Department has a set-up of its own. There is the above-mentioned Central Intelligence Agency, which is supposedly a coordinating office responsible only to the President and the National Security Council. Lastly, there is the Joint Intelligence Group, which is the separate intelligence service for the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Too many cooks not only spoil the broth, as the saying goes. They don't seem to know "what's cooking." There is widespread criticism of the caliber of the agents and analysts who make up some of these intelligence services. Our foreign agents seem to be poorly chosen and lack training, compared with those of some other countries, notably the British. Most important, there is no real coordination of the six agencies, no over-all control, no official who is responsible for the terrifying blunders that threaten national security.

Part of the funds and the planning that go into our new expanded military program should be used to overhaul and improve the intelligence set-up. The country cannot afford more such surprises as in Korea.

"How simple," said the foreigner, regarding our two-party system, before it was explained that some Democrats are more like Republicans than Republicans are, and vice versa.

Our Greatest Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of August 8, 1950:

OUR GREATEST DANGER

"The United States is today in greater peril than ever before."

That statement comes from the National Planning Association's Committee on International Policy, a group made up of representative leaders from agriculture, business, labor, and the professions.

And that statement is true.

Our country's peril arises, as the committee says, from the fact that "Soviet imperialism is committed to a policy aimed at destruction of the free world, of which we form an integral part."

But ruthless, despotic Soviet imperialism is not all we have to fear.

Our country's peril is immensely increased because too many of its people's chosen leaders do not recognize the terrible urgency of the present situation.

Steps necessary to deal with the menance created by Soviet imperialism are being taken in slow motion or not at all.

Time, the most precious commodity we have, is being squandered by men in Washington whose motto seems to be:

"Be careful not to do too much too soon."

The planning committee urges that America embark at once upon a costly and comprehensive program of which President Truman, so far, has presented merely the preview.

Among the elements of such a program, it lists:

A speed-up of industrial conversion to manufacture of weapons, and diversion for that purpose of a far larger proportion of the national production than has been called for by Mr. Truman.

A building up and training of the Armed Forces on a much greater scale than has yet been announced.

Heavier taxes, elimination of governmental waste and extravagance, and other anti-inflation measures.

And, much as we may dislike it, we should recognize that economic controls have again become a matter of urgent necessity.

In all, the committee displays intelligent awareness of the truth that adequate preparedness to win, if America is forced to fight another great war, offers the best hope of discouraging Soviet imperialism's aggressive plans for world domination and so averting such a war.

But surely, say the advocates of half steps, we can win the war in Korea without need for all-out industrial mobilization, price and wage ceilings, rationing of scarce essentials and other economic controls.

Maybe we could, though that has not yet been demonstrated.

Korea, however, is not the main event. It may be only the curtain raiser for an immensely bigger war which, if it found America ill-prepared could spell defeat and ruin for us before we knew what had hit us.

There is no safety in the plans now being made to be prepared for a major war 2, 3, or 4 years hence. Russia is now readier than we are in most respects, and will spare no effort to increase her lead.

We cannot do too much too soon. Our greatest danger is that we may fail to do enough in time.

Speculation in Soybeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

SPECULATION IN SOYBEANS—VOLUME AND PRICES

The erratic and upward course of futures prices in soybeans on the Chicago Board of Trade since March has been the subject of complaints from trade interests that the futures market was so completely dominated by speculative forces as to be useless for merchandisers and processors in hedging against price risks.

Prices rose sharply in the 5-month period, March to July 1950, the July future advancing from $2.31¾ per bushel to $3.45½, an increase of 49 percent. This rise was accompanied by wide swings in price. On 18 days in this period, the July future reached the fluctuation limit of 10 cents a bushel, 8 times on the high side and 10 times on the low side. In the July future out of 120 trading days, from March 1 to July 22 when trading ceased, there were 83 days in which the daily high-low range of prices was 4 cents a bushel and over.

The wide speculative interest in soybean futures was reflected in the large volume of trading on the Chicago market. Although the seasonal peak of hedging was past, the volume of trading on the Chicago Board of Trade in the March-July period substantially exceeded the previous 5-month October-February period. Trading in the March-July period, totaling 1,926,464,000 bushels, was 40 percent greater than in

the October-February period which included the peak of marketing by farmers. Throughout this March-July period, speculative interest in the market mounted, while reported hedging contracts showed a continuous seasonal decline.

MARCH 27, 1950, MARKET SURVEY

The predominantly speculative nature of the soybean market was shown by a survey by the CEA of all accounts in soybean futures on the Chicago Board of Trade as of March 27, 1950. The results of this investigation showed that 87 percent of the 3,096 accounts in the market were those of speculators who held the bulk of the positions on both sides of the market, and as a group were net long. Speculative holdings far outweighed the needs of hedgers for price protection. The tabulation that follows shows the number of accounts and amount of commitments of speculators and hedgers on March 27, as reported by futures commission merchants:

	Traders		Commitments			
			Amount (1,000 bushels)		Percent	
	Number	Percent	Long	Short	Long	Short
Speculative	2,688	86.8	50,800	40,084	77.6	61.2
Hedging	408	13.2	14,658	25,356	22.4	38.8
Total	3,096	100.0	65,458	65,440	100.0	100.0

JUNE 30, 1950, SURVEY

With the arrival of the delivery period for the July future and the large number of open contracts outstanding in that future the CEA made a second survey of all accounts in the market as of June 30, 1950.

This survey, like that of March 27, showed that the market was predominantly speculative. The number of accounts, and the total of open contracts, had declined considerably with the expiration of the May future, but the general composition of the market was substantially unchanged.

Of the 2,330 traders in the market on June 30, 84.5 percent were speculators and 15.5 percent were hedgers. Commitments of speculators accounted for three-fourths of the long side of the market and about two-thirds of the short side, with hedgers holding the balance. Again, the speculative holdings were considerably in excess of the requirements of hedgers. More than one-half of the short commitments of hedgers were offset by long commitments of hedgers. The following tabulation shows the details of the market composition:

	Traders		Commitments			
			Amount (1,000 bushels)		Percent	
	Number	Percent	Long	Short	Long	Short
Speculators	1,968	84.5	31,518	24,733	78.8	61.9
Hedgers	362	15.5	8,473	15,260	21.2	38.1
Total	2,330	100.0	39,991	39,993	100.0	100.0

The breakdown of accounts runs the usual gamut of occupations and indicates the extent of public participation found in a highly speculative market. The number of traders and the amount of commitments of speculators and hedgers on June 30, as reported by futures commission merchants, appear in table 1.

DELIVERIES IN THE SETTLEMENT OF THE JULY 1950 FUTURE

July futures contracts totaling 5,624,000 bushels were settled by delivery of soybeans. Of this amount, 3,094,940 bushels represented initial deliveries, and 2,529,000 bushels were redeliveries. In other words, of the initial deliveries amounting to 3,094,940 bushels, 2,529,060 bushels were received by various firms and then turned back again on the market. Deliveries accounted for six-tenths of 1 percent of the total volume of trading in the July future. The remaining 99.4 percent of the futures transactions were offset and closed out without involving any delivery of the actual commodity. This percentage of contracts settled by delivery is not out of line with that usually observed in the larger futures markets. Of the 3,094,940 bushels of actual soybeans delivered on the July 1950 contract approximately one-half were received and held by one account, which will be discussed later. The amounts received by the six largest accounts taking delivery were as follows:

	Bushels
Trader A	1,500,000
Trader B	605,000
Trader C	430,000
Trader D	355,000
Trader E	80,000
Trader F	50,000
Miscellaneous smaller accounts	74,940
Total	3,094,940

MARGINS FIXED BY CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE

In the March–July period initial margins for speculative transactions in soybean futures fixed by the Chicago Board of Trade were changed on five occasions. The schedule of applicable margins over this period is as follows:

Effective date	Minimum initial margin speculative transactions	Margin as percent of price of near future on effective date
Prior to Mar. 13, 1950.	20 cents per bushel for all futures.	8.3
Mar. 13, 1950	15 cents per bushel for all futures.	6.1
Apr. 6, 1950	20 cents per bushel for all futures.	7.6
Apr. 27, 1950	30 cents per bushel for May and July futures.	10.4
	20 cents for November and January futures.	9.2
May 4, 1950	40 cents per bushel for May and July futures.	13.0
	20 cents for November, January, and March futures.	9.0
July 22, 1950	30 cents per bushel for all futures.	12.0

The reduction in speculative margins on March 13 from the already low level of 8.3 percent to 6.1 percent was made in the face of an active speculative market.

The daily average volume of trading in soybean futures between March 13 and April 6 amounted to 15,173,000 bushels, compared to 10,893,000 bushels between February 15 and March 13, an increase of 39 percent. Even the margin rates shown above were not applied to all speculators in the soybean market. The exchange-established margins are not applicable to members of the exchange who execute or clear their own speculative transactions. There are also many instances where the established rates are not required even of traders to whom they supposedly apply.

CHINESE SPECULATORS IN SOYBEAN FUTURES

Toward the expiration of the July soybean future there were rumors and trade comments concerning trading by a Chinese group. The CEA has received inquiries on the subject from the press and from trade interests. On August 7 the Chicago Journal of Commerce carried a front-page item stating that the president of the Chicago Board of Trade had refuted published reports that a virtual corner of soybeans by "Chinese Nationalists interests had been instrumental in causing prices to soar from $2.20 to $3.45 a bushel."

It is not unusual for foreign accounts to appear in the commodity futures markets of this country. In the soybean surveys discussed in this report traders were found located in China, Canada, Great Britain, France, Italy, Mexico, Switzerland, and Venezuela.

In the current investigation it was found that there was very sizable trading by persons with Chinese names, and in some instances with Hong Kong addresses. Because of the extent of these activities, and the inquiries on the subject which have been received by the CEA, the findings so far developed on this aspect of the investigation are being reported and commented on herein.

The market survey of March 27 disclosed a number of accounts with Chinese names. On that date there were 31 accounts of this nature holding 3,145,000 bushels long and 125,000 bushels short in all futures.

Reports on large-scale traders showed that during April a considerable number of new accounts with Chinese names entered the market and those already in the market added to their positions. All these accounts were speculative.

On April 13, 1950, an account with a Chinese name began what developed into a sizable operation on the long side in July soybean futures. The record of purchases in this account follows:

	Bushels
Apr. 13, 1950	195,000
Apr. 15, 1950	195,000
Apr. 17, 1950	310,000
Apr. 20, 1950	500,000
Apr. 24, 1950	1,365,000
Total position, Apr. 24	2,565,000

Between April 13 and 24, while this account was making the purchases shown above, the price of the July future rose from $2.65⅝ to $2.90¼ per bushel. On April 24, when 1,365,000 bushels were

purchased, the July future advanced the full 10-cent permissible limit.

From information subsequently developed it appears that this account is that of a Hong Kong commission merchant, and that the purchases of 2,565,000 bushels were distributed among the accounts of 14 customers of the commission merchant. Of these 14 individual accounts it also appears that 9 held positions of 195,000 bushels each. This figure is just one trading unit below the 200,000-bushel reporting requirement under the Commodity Exchange Act.

These accounts retained their positions unchanged until delivery began on the July future. They then took delivery of 2,150,000 of actual beans and sold out the remaining 415,000 bushels in futures. Later in July they redelivered 650,000 bushels of beans and retained 1,500,000 bushels in store in Chicago elevators.

The circumstances surrounding the trading in the 14 accounts carried by the Hong Kong commission firm point to common control and possible common ownership. If these accounts are considered as a group, it will be seen that their long position of 2,565,000 bushels comprised 17.4 percent of the total of 14,759,000 bushels open in the July future as of June 30. This was the largest position held in any one account or by any group of accounts which appeared to be related.

The continued growth in accounts with Chinese names in soybean futures led to a special investigation of such accounts at the end of May. This investigation of brokers known to have Chinese accounts disclosed 49 speculative accounts with Chinese names or with Chinese connections. The extent of their holdings in the July future on May 31, 1950, was as follows:

Number of accounts	Commitments (bushels)		Percent of July open contracts	
	Long	Short	Long	Short
49	5,961,000	175,000	31.9	0.9

The survey of June 30 showed that the number of accounts with Chinese names and connections had increased further since the special investigation of May 31. There were 56 accounts of this nature reported holding positions in soybean futures on June 30. The holdings of this group were as follows:

Number of accounts	Commitments							
	Amount (1,000 bushels)				Percent of total open contracts			
	July		All futures		July		All futures	
	Long	Short	Long	Short	Long	Short	Long	Short
July future, 51 (all futures, 56)	6,986	335	7,212	1,610	47.3	2.3	18.7	4.2

The above figures show a considerable proportion of the long July contracts held in Chinese accounts. As previously indicated, a considerable number of these traders show Hong Kong addresses. The others are located in this country. Except for the 14 accounts previously discussed, no indications have so far appeared of any significant connection or common control among the remaining Chinese accounts. Speculation in futures by Chinese is not unusual. Such activities have been observed during previous surveys involving other commodities, although not to the same extent. No previous instance has been found, however, in which Chinese held as large a proportion of the total open contracts in any commodity as in the 1950 July soybean future.

There is, of course, no prohibition against trading in commodity futures on United States markets by foreign nationals. Such traders would be subject to sanctions only in the event that it could be proven that their activities were manipulative, or in some other manner in violation of the Commodity Exchange Act. From the investigation as so far developed such proof has not appeared.

GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Beginning in March and up to the present time the Commodity Exchange Authority has received a large number of complaints from the trade, mainly soybean processors, to the effect that the soybean futures market has recently been completely under the control of speculators and has served no useful purpose to legitimate hedgers. Typical excerpts from these communications follow:

When excessive speculation in soybean futures has about put all the nonspeculative soybean processors out of business because of the squeeze between the value of soybean oil and meal and the unduly high price of soybean futures, in which the processor has his products hedged, then we think your office should start looking into the matter.

On a crop of 223,000,000 of soybeans there is daily more beans traded on the Chicago Board of Trade than all the other principal grain futures. * * * This should be proof enough that most of the daily trades on the Chicago Board of Trade are of a speculative nature.

* * * * *

This rapid upturn in bean prices at this time is helping only the speculator as a large majority of the farmers have already disposed of their farm holdings. This in turn makes the end products higher to the consumer.

Please make just a casual quick investigation of the manipulation that is now taking place in the commodity markets more particularly in soybeans.

As stated in my message to you, the soybean processing industry is gradually being destroyed by excessive speculation in the bean market on the Chicago Board of Trade.

* * * * *

Several of the Chicago commission houses have been putting out very bullish dope on beans since October first and gotten the general public, who do not know anything about the real value of beans, very much excited to the extent that they are buying beans "blindly" and they simply have run away with the market causing processors to lose heavily.

* * * * *

As you know, most of the farmers have sold their beans and they are not reaping the reward of this advance. The speculator or gambler is the only one that is benefiting by the advance, and in most instances at the expense of the processors.

* * * * *

The processors not only have to have their money tied up in plants but have to pay cash for the beans they buy to run these plants, whereas, the speculator on the Chicago Board of Trade is only required to put up 15 cents to 20 cents a bushel, and naturally exerts as much or more influence on the bean market than processors.

Suggest check sudden advance again on soybeans. * * * This whole soy deal is manipulation. Have requested Senate committee investigation.

During the past few months we surely have had an extremely volatile soybean futures market. The speculative element was completely in control. Processors as a whole in the industry have some pretty serious red figures to face. This surely is an unhealthy situation.

* * * * *

Now that the old crop options are expiring, I am just wondering if we are going to experience the same kind of volatile markets in soybeans as we experienced during the past year. Today (July 21, 1950) it begins to look so. Old crop July with only one more day of trading declined the limit almost at the opening, but the three future months, November, January, and March went up abruptly almost a like amount.

These communications were received from responsible trade interests who ordinarily use the futures market in connection with their merchandising and processing operations. Their views as to the market situation which has prevailed so far this year are well supported by the CEA analyses of futures trading in soybeans.

It was found that some trade interests with large holdings of actual beans had ceased to attempt to protect themselves by means of hedges in the futures market. Large stocks were carried unhedged in preference to accepting the hazard of the erratic price movements which occurred from day to day. The wisdom of these processors and merchandisers is demonstrated by the fact that the July future on the Chicago Board of Trade was 6 to 8 cents above the going price of actual beans shortly before the expiration of that future. Obviously the hedgers who had sold futures earlier when the futures price was in proper relationship to the price of beans would have suffered a heavy loss by the subsequent distortion in price.

The predominantly speculative character of this market is further illustrated by the fact that of the 7,463,000 bushels traded in the November future on July 21, 96.5 percent of the purchases and 90.7 percent of the sales were speculative.

No individual holdings were found which appeared to be of the size and type

ordinarily associated with corners, manipulation, or market control. The situation appeared to be merely another example of the classical speculative splurge in which a large number of small and moderate-sized speculative accounts enter the market and by their feverish activity aggravate and accentuate the basic price trend.

TABLE 1.—*Soybean futures, Chicago Board of Trade: Occupational breakdown of speculators and hedgers showing number of traders and amount of positions, June 30, 1950*

[Positions in thousands of bushels]

Occupational groups	Number of traders	Position	
		Long	Short
HEDGING			
Grain merchandisers and elevator operators	204	2,434	6,916
Millers and feed manufacturers	23	470	1,083
Processors of grain products and byproducts	31	5,050	4,833
Cooperative organizations	37	185	1,129
Grain exporters and importers	8	240	525
Feed and seed dealers	13	20	192
All other trade accounts, reported as hedging	2	50	345
Farmers, ranchers, etc	44	24	237
Total	362	8,473	15,260
SPECULATIVE			
Grain merchandisers and elevator operators	67	705	863
Millers and feed manufacturers	3	59	
Processors of grain products and byproducts	4	355	985
Cooperative organizations	1		2
Grain exporters and importers	4	77	106
Feed and seed dealers	11	22	94
Brokerage houses (stocks, bonds, and commodities) not in cash grain business	64	3,106	2,243
Floor traders active on market being surveyed	97	7,124	6,149
Commodity and business counselors, forecasters, etc	12	113	184
Professional speculators	14	1,225	1,505
Capitalists, financiers, and bankers	29	871	189
Manufacturers, wholesalers, and contractors	133	2,640	1,419
Retailers of goods and services	189	2,957	1,204
Brokers other than stock, bond, and commodity	80	2,300	1,534
Public utilities, labor unions, trade associations and newspaper and magazine publishers, etc	7	38	37
Farmers, ranchers, etc	382	1,893	2,132
Salesmen, manufacturers' agents, etc	66	340	334
Housewives	136	2,868	1,937
Feeders and livestock dealers	19	67	160
Employees of grain merchandisers, elevators, millers, processors, and other members of trade	22	97	110
Employees of brokerage houses (stocks, bonds, and commodities)	3	17	10
U. S. Government employees, including military personnel and contract mail carriers	17	61	49
State and local government employees	13	60	69
Administrative and planning personnel, including sales managers, purchasing agents, department heads	27	193	100
SPECULATIVE—continued			
Office, store, and other nonmanual workers, stenographers, typists, office-machine operators, telephone, telegraph and teletype operators, office clerks, and sales clerks	60	251	227
Skilled and semiskilled workers such as bakers, barbers, beauticians, bartenders, butchers, cooks and chefs, decorators, electricians and linemen, foremen, miners, motion-picture operators, shoemakers and woodworkers, railroad employees	59	153	183
Unskilled laborers such as cab drivers, chauffeurs, bus and truck drivers, dock workers	10	16	86
Domestics such as porters, maids, janitors, waitresses, bus boys and butlers	4	3	3
Lawyers, trustees and administrators of estates	29	309	449
Physicians, surgeons, dentists, nurses, dietitians, chiropractors, osteopaths, and pharmacists (except owners or managers of drug stores)	71	792	726
Chemists, technicians, graduate engineers, and other persons engaged in research	23	120	235
Clergymen	1	5	
Teachers and administrative personnel of public, parochial and private schools, colleges, and other institutions of learning	22	244	80
Independent teachers (art, music, etc.) and persons engaged in the fine arts (artists, sculptors, musicians, actors, etc.)	6	19	15
Economists, analysts and statisticians not connected with academic institutions	2	1	3
Accountants and auditors	31	101	142
Athletes	1		25
Other professional occupations such as architects, social workers, camp counselors, public relations directors, etc	7	45	32
Semiprofessional occupations not otherwise classified such as reporters, draftsmen, etc	8	22	27
Students	9	26	19
Unemployed	23	42	84
Retired	183	1,430	799
Reported as speculative, occupation unknown	19	751	183
Total	1,968	31,518	24,733
Grand total	2,330	39,991	39,993

The Consumer Pays and The Copper Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post entitled "The Consumer Pays," and also an editorial published in the New York Times of today entitled "The Copper Tariff."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 10, 1950]

THE CONSUMER PAYS

Testifying recently before the Senate Banking Committee on the administration's defense-production bill, Secretary of Commerce Sawyer said, speaking of copper, "Even without the addition of a new program for military purposes, and without the addition of an accelerated stockpile program, the heavy demands for copper, combined with the low level of working stocks, would mean that supply would be inadequate and consumers would meet increasing difficulty in obtaining supplies. The expanded military and stockpile program will of necessity reduce the amount available for civilian use and will create shortages and hardships to industries dependent on this important material." The result, therefore, of retaining the 2-cent import "tax" on copper imports, suspended in 1947 and restored at the end of last June, would be to give another boost to copper prices which are now about 22½ cents a pound—close to the postwar peak—contrasted with a 16-cent 1949 low.

Since the domestic supply of copper is not equal to the domestic demand, the levy will probably have little immediate effect on the volume of imports, but it will be reflected, no doubt, in higher prices paid by consumers for automobiles, household appliances and other products that call for the use of copper. Furthermore, it is extremely shortsighted to endanger our relations with copper-exporting countries, especially Chile, upon whom we depend to supplement domestic supplies of copper. Finally, it is a foregone conclusion that copper will be one of the basic materials that will have to be subjected to controls, since, with or without the tax on imports, it will be in short supply. Unless controls over allocations are combined with some form of price control, whether voluntary or compulsory, therefore, the stage will be set for a further rise in copper prices that would be accelerated by retention of the import tax. If it should become necessary to stimulate the production of domestic copper, the way to do so would be to subsidize high-cost marginal producers, as was done during World War II, instead of raising prices all along the line and at the expense of consumers and taxpayers.

Nevertheless the Senate Finance Committee has tabled a bill passed by the House to continue suspension of the import tax for another year. Thus the country is confronted by the strange spectacle of a Senate committee approving a procedure that would raise the prices of an important strategic material, while Congress is considering a control program designed to keep prices from rising. Fortunately there is still a chance that the Senate will repair the damage done by its Finance Committee in placing the interests of a special group above those of the Nation by passing the suspension bill in the form of an amendment from the floor to other legislation.

[From the New York Times of August 10, 1950]

THE COPPER TARIFF

On June 30 a tariff of 2 cents a pound on imported copper, suspended during the war, went back into effect. On Tuesday the Senate Finance Committee rejected by 9 to 4 a bill to restore that suspension. This seems to us a short-sighted and ill-advised decision. Copper is one of the most important raw materials in our defense program. The committee has chosen a time when we are facing great inflationary pressure to try to force a

cut in our copper imports and add to consumer costs. At the same time, the tariff would deal a hard and unnecessary blow to Chile, where copper is the major export. Peru would also be hard hit, but it could stand the blow better.

Chile is one of our true friends in Latin America and a country that has progressed well toward the sort of democracy we like to see. It is Chile that is leading the move to organize the Latin-American countries into a collective effort for the United Nations in Korea. At the moment, Chilean economy is severely extended by inflationary factors and a reduction of her dollar income would be serious.

W. H. Hoover, president of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co., said last month that a restoration of the 2-cent duty on copper would not materially increase United States production. Chilean copper, he pointed out, is as integral a part of the United States industry as domestic copper. The Chilean industry is, moreover, largely owned by American companies. Of course, there are other American copper companies that want the protection and it is the legislators from mining States, or those who are willing to help them, who are now trying to restore the 2-cent duty. It is not as if the domestic producers have to have this protection to keep going; they cannot produce nearly enough for present American consumption let alone the strategic stockpiling that is now more necessary than ever.

From both the economic and diplomatic viewpoints it is wrong to reimpose the copper tariff. Our Good Neighbor policy cannot be measured in dollars and cents, but its value is nevertheless enormous. There is no adequate reason today to harm one of the most important Latin-American countries simply to provide some unnecessary help to a United States industry. The decision of the Finance Committee is not final and there is time to reverse it on the floor of the Senate. It would be the part of the statesmanship and common sense to do so.

What a Layman Can Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "What a Layman Can Do," issued by the Laymen's Movement for a Christian World, Inc., and which I feel is worthy of consideration at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT A LAYMAN CAN DO

What can we do in the critical situation developing in our world? The Laymen's Movement through its chairman, Wallace C. Speers, presents the following seven points which suggest constructive action, which any thoughtful person can take to improve our chances of peace over against war. Take these suggestions into consideration as you read your newspaper or listen to the radio, as you talk to friends and business associates, or as you think over the situations alone.

1. Have faith in God, in man, in yourself. Faith is the ultimate victory of right over wrong. Have faith in our leaders and in God's ability to use them for His purposes.

2. Be an island of calm confidence in a world of turmoil—not blind wishful thinking, but belief in the power for right of a God who cares.

3. Be friendly to everyone you meet. Throw a pebble of kindness into the pool of human relations to help overcome hatred.

4. Pray repeatedly, realizing that you are using an overwhelming power for good. Use spot prayers more and more frequently during the day to try to beneficially condition destructive situations as they are reported.

5. Practice the exclusion of doubt and fear from the mind. Keep a record of constructive thoughts put into words during the day and of destructive thoughts not uttered. Be sure the balance at evening is on the positive side.

6. Develop the consciousness that there is a constructive answer—no matter how depressing events may seem.

7. Look upon yourself as a child of God, made in His image—then love your neighbor as yourself.

These suggestions for positive action are designed for wide use—such as office bulletin boards, plant publications, mailing enclosures, church bulletins and for distribution among friends and associates.

Yes-Man Psychology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when the editor of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune on April 19, 1950, said—in his editorial entitled "Yes-Man Psychology"—"There is a dangerous situation here that stems directly from big Government" he put his finger on one of the factors that found us unprepared in handling the Korean crisis.

Yes-man psychology is fully analyzed in Editor Robert Boyer's editorial which follows:

YES-MAN PSYCHOLOGY

It is a strange viewpoint indeed that leads our Government executives to play politics with the defense of the Nation. Yet, that appears to be the situation.

With a vast and inefficient Federal bureaucracy from which to trim, it is astonishing that national defense has been made a major objective of government economy. While there is no real effort to reduce spending in other Government departments, and at a time when our relations with Russia are as dangerous as they were with Hitler in 1939.

There is considerable cause for public doubt as to the adequacy of our defenses. Secretary of Defense Johnson some time ago spoke belligerently on the subject of Russia, declaring we could "lick the hell out of Stalin."

But, the reaction among military men to that statement was one of open skepticism, although none apparently dared take direct issue with him.

Of course the American people don't want any more money wasted. But, they do want to know that with the vast expenditure of public money Mr. Truman proposes that their country is being given the necessary protection—especially in view of Russia's obvious unfriendliness.

There is a dangerous situation here that stems directly from big government.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Altoona, put his finger on that situation again on April 5, when, in his remarks in the House, he declared that yes-man psychology is ruining our national defense.

The Altoona Congressman spotlighted this situation last summer in the B–36 investigation. He pointed out again April 5 that qualified military men dare not give their expert professional opinion unless that corresponds with the opinion of the Secretary of Defense and the President.

In other words, expert military opinion in our Government has been made entirely responsive to political control, and as such, is well-nigh worthless.

The Congress, as Mr. VAN ZANDT pointed out, cannot discover the true state of our defenses because the qualified military experts are afraid to talk.

Said Mr. VAN ZANDT, "We all know what happened to Admiral Denfeld after he was given assurance by the Secretary of the Navy that he was free to testify and give any information he wished without fear of reprisal."

Admiral Denfeld was fired later because he disagreed with the Department of Defense on Navy requirements.

"And," went on Mr. VAN ZANDT, "on the heels of Admiral Denfeld's dismissal, we have now the transfer of Admiral Joel T. Boone, Chief of the Joint Plans and Action Division, Office of Medical Services, Defense Department, who violated this yes-man psychology when he spoke his own mind before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services."

The local Congressman traced this authoritarian clamp-down on military leaders to a directive issued by President Truman.

"The President said this to the Director of the Budget, 'When you notify the heads of departments and agencies of the amounts to be included in the 1948 budget, for their activities, I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress.' "

The Congressman declared this yes-man attitude was plainly evident when the House Armed Services Committee met to consider budget requirements for the Department of Defense.

The other day Admiral Halsey blasted Navy leaders who deprecated the big carriers, and spoke of our submarine defense in terms of small carriers and sub chasers.

The latter, said Admiral Halsey, are defensive only. And, he declared, a nation can't win a war on defensive tactics. He said the late war showed that big carriers are necessary to wage offensive warfare, and Halsey was the Pacific leader in this type of conflict.

He may have had Admiral Sherman in mind. The Chief of Naval Operations recently spoke of naval preparedness in terms of small carriers and sub chasers.

But, what is Admiral Sherman's professional opinion? Is it the same as Admiral Halsey's?

We don't know. Halsey is retired, Sherman isn't.

Representative VAN ZANDT struck at a vital weakness in American national defense—the enforcement of political opinion, instead of expert opinion on such matters as the Nation's defense needs.

Get Ahead of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that before this day is over the House will have adopted the Defense Production Act vital to our mobilization effort and our all-out campaign against inflation. There is every reason for both the legislative and executive branches to act promptly in this emergency. Time is as important an element in our present emergency as any strategic material or armament. Let us act promptly and decisively. In this connection, an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor for Tuesday, August 8, 1950, is most apropos, and appears below:

GET AHEAD OF INFLATION

The American people acting in concert can beat inflation. The best way to beat it is to get ahead of it—by united action. Separate efforts of individuals or companies trying to get ahead of it by hoarding, by raising prices or wages, simply give it a boost. Only by acting through their Government can the people beat inflation. Every day this action is delayed inflation gains ground.

Promptness should be the watchword for Congress now. There has been too much fumbling with an emergency, both in the White House and on Capitol Hill. The House of Representatives wasted a good part of last week concocting a drastic automatic control plan which it then found it couldn't stomach. Much time has been spent in debate over all-out stand-by controls suitable to a general war situation. Meanwhile taxes and controls which would hobble inflation in the current crisis are neglected.

For instance, curbs on installment buying could have been slapped on immediately. So could other controls on credit. Very little machinery would be required for these measures and it is familiar from recent usage—installment controls continued long after the war. The Federal Reserve Board has experience and information. Once Congress gave the word it could be quickly passed along to banks and dealers. One aid to scarce buying and hoarding would be curbed.

Application of priorities and allocation for scarce supplies and those needed by the Armed Forces should not wait until the smart operators have stocked up far beyond current needs.

There is equal reason for prompt assessment of heavier taxes to draw off surplus spending power. This effect will be delayed in any case. President Truman's $5,000,000,000 tax bill should be passed, and an excess-profits tax added. Why there should be objections to immediate application of an excess-profits tax we cannot understand. The same applies to curbs on prices and wages. The sound basis is to declare that tax and control policies shall be aimed at keeping anybody from profiting by a war which requires such severe sacrifices from men who do the fighting.

Part of the trouble is partisan politics—efforts to protect one favored group or another from controls. There are also political maneuvers to get credit for popular measures or attach blame to the opposition for unpopular restrictions. Some legislators are hesitating further between automatic measures and those leaving wide discretion to the executive. But basically the choice lies between early application of selective controls plus taxes to head off inflation and later application of more drastic controls to stop inflation that has already run away.

In the circumstances, the worst hoarders are those who pile up delays, the wisest patriots those who agree on prompt action.

The Smudge-Pot Saint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Nation's Business for April 1950, praising the work of the United States Weather Bureau in Los Angeles, and its regional director, Floyd Dillon Young, and the radio station KFI:

THE SMUDGE-POT SAINT
(By Andrew Hamilton)

Anybody can talk about the weather. But only Floyd Dillon Young, regional director of the United States Weather Bureau in Los Angeles, can drive a top Hooper-rating radio show off the air and bring it back again—merely by discussing temperatures, wind velocities, and dew points.

A baldish, 57-year-old man with a tired voice, Young gives away no $50,000 jackpots, doesn't even boast a sponsor. Yet every night during the winter months over KFI, Los Angeles, he conducts the most popular program heard by western listeners.

By giving farmers and nurserymen advance warning on nightly frost conditions, Young has saved an estimated $200,000,000 worth of oranges, lemons, grapefruit, avocados, lettuce, tomatoes, commercial flowers, and other crops. He can light up all 3,000,000 smudge pots in California if necessary.

In the big freeze of 1937, Young urged red-eyed citrus growers to hang on one more night after they'd smudged for 11 consecutive nights. His advice saved 70 percent of the crop. And last year, when snow blanketed southern California, citrus farmers lost only 5 percent of their fruit by dialing Floyd Young.

In 20 years of broadcasting, Young has built an audience of several million listeners, not only the citrus and truck farmers, but contractors who worry about freshly laid concrete, poultry breeders wondering if they should turn up the burners under their chicks, motorists undecided whether or not to drain their radiators.

Young goes on the air with this simple introduction, "We now bring you the station of the Fruit Frost Service. * * *"

If it's a balmy evening, he merely reports, "Above 32 degrees in all districts. No firing will be necessary. Good night."

But if the thermometer is skidding downward, he will predict wind velocities, humidity, and temperatures for more than 90 agricultural areas in California. His monotonous "Pomona, 28; Ontario, 29; Cucamonga, 27; * * *," is as well known to radio fans as the chant of the tobacco auctioneer.

Young shares the 8 p. m. spot on KFI with whatever NBC network show happens to be broadcasting at this time. For every minute he is on the air, it costs the station a cool $125. But KFI is happy to chalk the loss up to public service.

He began to supply frost warnings for radio broadcasts in the 1920's, took over the microphone himself in 1930 and since then has batted consistently between 90 and 96 percent in his frost warnings.

A couple of years ago when his 8 p. m. broadcasts were turned on Sunday nights in churches in the citrus district, an imaginative newspaperman dubbed him "Patron saint of the smudge pots." Somehow, the title fits.

Mission to the Vatican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following excellent and timely editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, August 10:

MISSION TO THE VATICAN

At his news conference last week President Truman made it known that he is considering the nomination of a regular diplomatic mission to the Vatican. The arguments in favor of this project outweigh, in our opinion, any possible arguments that can be brought against it; indeed, we have yet seen no argument to the contrary that has had any sounder basis than historical prejudice. Since the Lateran Treaty of 1929 the Vatican has been a sovereign state; and though it is territorially insignificant, its ruler commands a powerful influence in world affairs. In the political sphere this influence is being exerted along lines that are in many respects parallel to those of current American policy, especially so in the question of international communism.

It requires more than ordinary confusion of mind to suppose that the reestablishment of formal diplomatic relationships with the Vatican in any way implies an official endorsement of the religious tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, or an encouragement of its temporal ambitions. Nor would the American principle of separation of church and state be compromised by such a mission, any more than is the case with the diplomatic missions to other countries which have established churches or whose heads of state combine the functions of spiritual and temporal rulers. The proof of this is to be found in the fact that the governments of Protestant and anticlerical and even non-Christian countries have found it of advantage to engage in diplomatic relationships with the Vatican. The Imperial Japanese Government, for example, retained its embassy at the Vatican until the moment of surrender to the American forces.

Nor would the creation of an American mission to the Vatican establish any precedent. An American consulate was maintained at Rome from the adoption of the Constitution and the organization of the Department of State until the collapse of the temporal power of the papacy in 1870. In 1848 a full legation was established there and was continued until 1867. It proved enormously useful to Secretary Seward in his efforts to defeat the purposes of the Confederate emissaries who were seeking recognition by European governments. This mission was never formally recalled; but in 1867 Congress, against the protests of Seward and of Rufus King, the Minister to the Papal States, withdrew the appropriation under which the legation had been operating.

At the end of 1939 President Roosevelt appointed Mr. Myron Taylor as his personal representative to the Vatican. He was eager

to reach an understanding with the Pope concerning certain aspects of the policies he was about to launch, to offset the influence of the embassies maintained at the Vatican by the Axis powers, and to give the United States the benefit of an ear at the most advantageous listening post in western Europe. In this way Mr. Roosevelt circumvented the necessity of obtaining congressional approval. There is little doubt that the presence of Mr. Taylor at the Vatican throughout the war years was of incalculable benefit to the United States. Mr. Truman saw fit, despite the vociferous opposition of certain organized Protestant groups, to continue Mr. Taylor in this capacity. But Mr. Taylor's resignation has left the post vacant.

It is possible, perhaps even probable, that prejudice may even at this stage of affairs be strong enough to block senatorial confirmation of Mr. Truman's plan to nominate a regular diplomatic representative. But this is the sort of prejudice that the country can now ill afford. Those who are familiar with the operations of diplomacy know very well that matters frequently arise upon which consultation with the leadership of the Catholic Church is either necessary or desirable. These consultations are now held indirectly and unofficially and often through the mediacy of members of the American Catholic hierarchy. But it would be far more satisfactory on all counts if they were held directly with the Pope himself.

General Walker and Our Americans in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem by Willard B. Golovin dedicated to General Walker and our Americans in Korea, which I feel is worthy of insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL WALKER AND OUR AMERICANS IN KOREA

"We die before retreat"—
Desperate pledge, born of the heat
Of free men's battle, to contain the frenzy
Of uncaged hordes, forced on the loose
By the aggressors, obtuse
To freedom's ingenuity to produce and war
With sinews of free men
To blast open the traps,
Red-webbed, to ensnare a universe
In labor chains of slaves.
Wake, Americans! Demand wise leadership of statesmen!
Eliminate personal aims, party-line claims;
Burn off the fog of inertia shrouding action.
Each and every thinking human
Reclaim for a shrinking free world
The path out of this greed-grown jungle,
Or damnably suffer the aftermath
Of a civilization drained of civility:
Gray morning, dark noon, ever-cursed night of futility.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Oakfield Veterans of Foreign Wars Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently it was my pleasure to address a fine VFW picnic at Oakfield in my State. I commented, of course, on the critical foreign situation which is a major concern of the American people at the present time. Mentioned also was the vital subject of meeting the needs of our servicemen and ex-servicemen.

I pointed out in particular in connection with foreign policy review that we must bear in mind the Leninist strategy of attempting to bleed America dry.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of my Oakfield address, followed by a gracious editorial published in the August 3 issue of the Manitowoc (Wis.) Herald-Times commending my review of the situation.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA, COMMUNISM, AND AMERICA

The fiftieth year of this twentieth century may well be the turning point of this and succeeding centuries. The battle now raging around the port of Pusan may well become one of the landmarks of world history—the history of man's fight for freedom against the forces of slavery and aggression.

The staggering series of reverses which we have suffered in southern Korea is the climax of an era of blind attempts at appeasement of the Soviet Union. This was the era in which our officials acted like naive children who sold away the rights of free peoples at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran. As a result, Red Russia, controlling 150,000,000 people in 1938, now controls 800,000,000. Our American boys dying in muddy foxholes are now paying the supreme price for the conference table blunders of the past. But, however much we may deplore those blunders, the big question now is, "Where do we go from here?"

WE ARE IN FOR A LONG PULL

The American people must tighten their belts and prepare for a long pull in meeting the world-wide Communist threat. The eventual defeat of the northern Korean armies will very definitely not be the end of our military problem.

It has been predicted that we may be engaged in a long, 15-year struggle of attrition with the Soviet Union, with the military scene of operations shifting constantly. Even the blindest wishful thinker is now aware that the fanatic Communist conspiracy has now entered a new stage of world-wide aggression. The first stage was internal penetration by subversive influences, use of Red propaganda in the schools, in labor unions, in the Army, in the press, and over the radio in every country on earth. This has gone on continuously since 1945 in southern Korea. However, when this penetration did not succeed in itself the Soviets entered stage two.

WE MUST PREVENT RED SATELLITE AGGRESSION

2. This second stage is the use of Red satellite troops in direct aggression against a sovereign and independent republic, established by the United Nations—Southern Korea. This second stage may last for many years all over the globe, as I have mentioned. At any time Red satellite troops in northern Iran, in Bulgaria, and Rumania may load and fire the cannons of war. Only by decisive defeat of the satellite forces which may go on aggression can we hold back the Red tide. It is our hope and prayer that by our success in this second stage we may prevent further satellite attacks, and most important, we may prevent the third stage from ever developing.

3. In the third and final stage Red Russia might use her own gigantic Red army (200 divisions strong), navy, and air force themselves in direct operations against the West. This would, of course, mean a third world war.

REDS WANT TO BLEED US DRY

We must be constantly vigilant against all three of these possible facets of aggression—internal penetration, satellite aggression, or Soviet Army aggression. Two decades ago Nicolai Lenin, founder of the Soviet Union, stated that he expected to be able to bleed capitalistic America dry. Undoubtedly the masters of the Kremlin hope that by having us dissipate our resources defending Formosa, Indochina, Malaya, the Philippines, Iran, Greece, and all of the other countries in which we have military outposts—that by doing this we will, indeed, be bleeding ourselves dry. It is up to us, therefore, to do three basic things:

1. Get maximum support from our western allies so that the United States itself does not bear the entire economic and military brunt.

WE MUST HAVE ENOUGH TROOPS TO DEFEND UNITED STATES ITSELF

2. Encourage the various threatened nations such as Iran, etc., to clean out domestic corruption, to enact land reforms, etc., so that their native populations do not fall sucker to the Communist appeal. We are deeply disturbed by the continued reports of corruption in the southern Korean government, corruption which has made many Koreans turn to the Red banner.

3. Establish in our own country a system of defense priorities so that we know which are the most important areas here and elsewhere and which are least important areas for defense. We cannot scatter every last United States division throughout the world and leave our own beloved country defenseless. Yet right now we have a bare handful of combat divisions to protect the 150,000,000 Americans.

These, then, are the basic challenges to us abroad.

RELIEVING ANXIETIES OF SERVICEMEN

One of the paramount needs of the present day is to make absolutely sure that we relieve any anxiety which may exist in the hearts of National Guard men, Reservists, and draftees who are called to the colors to meet the needs of our Nation in the present Korean emergency.

I believe that one of the vital matters which Congress can and should do along this line before it recesses is to consider the subject of extension of the GI bill of rights to the veterans of the Korean conflict. As you undoubtedly know, the GI bill, known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, provided educational benefits, training benefits, and assistance in procuring homes and businesses for World War II veterans. But that bill does not, of course, apply to veterans of the Korean conflict. It should be recalled that the GI bill (of which I was glad to be an

original cosponsor) was enacted 3 years after World War II began, and that the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which applies similarly to benefits to disabled veterans was enacted 2 years after the Second World War began. In other words, Congress gave much prior study to both laws.

Now I am glad to report that the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has directed inquiry to the Veterans of Foreign Wars among other nationally chartered veterans' organizations, to learn whether they feel the GI bill of rights should be extended to Korean veterans.

VARIOUS VETERANS' STATUTES ALREADY APPLY

I am glad to say that certain of our veterans' statutes, unlike the GI bill, do now already apply to veterans of the Korean conflict, such as the National Service Life Insurance Act, and the Soldier's and Sailor's Civil Relief Act. This latter statute gives protection to any man called into service by suspending the enforcement of civil liabilities such as on debts, mortgages, etc., which he may have on him before going into the service.

Of course, any veteran of the fighting in Korea who suffers a service-connected injury is also entitled to hospitalization under the present laws governing the activities of the Veterans' Administration.

MOBILIZING THE HOME FRONT BY COOPERATION

Aside, however, from specific aid to our servicemen, the greatest means of instilling confidence in them will be to maintain the home front strong and sound. We must remain united. We must set aside minor partisan differences. We must push aside nonessential controversies in order to meet the over-all challenge. We must curb profiteering, hoarding and panic-buying. To the greatest extent possible, we must get voluntary rather than compulsory cooperation at the present time so as to prevent run-away prices and wages. We don't want too little controls, too late; neither do we want too much, too soon.

Of course, it is our prayer that we will be able to prevent the fire in Korea from spreading throughout the world. Whether or not we will succeed in doing so, however, is up to Joe Stalin and Company.

WE MUST PASS STRONG ANTI-RED BILL

For our part we must protect the security of our country against the Communist menace from within. This means the Senate must act on the anti-Communist legislation—the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill—which we on the Senate Judiciary Committee reported months ago—legislation to register and identify Reds and Red-front groups, to prevent them from getting a foothold in government, to prevent them from getting passports to visit overseas to conspire with their associates.

BEWARE OF PHONY STOCKHOLM "PEACE" PETITION

But as for the individual citizen, he personally must be on guard against subversive propaganda wherever it exists—in his labor union or yes, even possibly in his veterans post, in his school or anywhere else. Right now the individual citizen must combat the infamous and misnamed Stockholm "world peace appeal" which was designed by the Communist International to trap gullible citizens into believing that by signing the appeal they would be helping the cause of world peace.

As you know, this appeal is a petition for the destroying of the existing stockpile of atomic bombs, without however setting up international inspection of atomic factories. Obviously it would be fantastic for America to give up her present stockpile (which is one of the few, if any advantages, we have over Soviet Russia in military strength). I caution our citizens therefore not to sign this or any other phony petition. The Communists are obviously playing on the heartstrings of the American people and we dare not allow them to succeed in their iniquitous plan to divide and conquer us, to weaken our Korean effort and to leave our men under-equipped on the battlefield.

NO REASON FOR VIOLENCE ON REDS HERE

At the same time, I caution any overzealous citizens not to take the law into their own hands, nor to attempt to change the opinions of Red sympathizers by cracking their skulls. The Reds love to pose as martyrs, love to claim persecution, love to create riots. Let's not play into their hands. Let us have no hysteria.

I think that there is none of us who has witnessed the events of the last month and a half without feeling a profound sense of humility. Here it is only 5 years since the guns ceased firing in World War II and once again American boys are dying in far-distant lands. We thought at the end of World War II that we were on top of the world. We felt stronger, richer, sounder, better prepared than any other nation on earth. We thought we had the best Army, the best Navy, the best Air Force, the best tanks, the best planes, the best guns, the best training.

Now we learn that a relatively obscure land with a population only a tiny fraction of ours, with a civilization that does not have the barest element of industrialization is beating back our own troops in Korea. Naturally we ask why? Obviously it is because the hand of Soviet Russia has been in this matter from the beginning as regards training, equipping, and directing the North Korean forces.

WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TO SWEAT PLENTY

We have learned, therefore, that although we are the greatest Nation in the world, we are going to have to sweat a good deal in order to put our fighting forces in effectiveness above that of any other nation.

GETTING ADEQUATE EQUIPMENT

I feel the Congress should make absolutely certain that the American people get $1 worth of value for every single dollar we appropriate to our Armed Forces. We are not going to deny our men a single cent to get the finest possible equipment. At the same time, we do have a right to ask what happened to the $50,000,000,000 which we appropriated to the National Defense Department between 1947 and 1950. You will recall, my friends, that after World War II it turned out that the Army had spent money riotously in all sorts of unnecessary fields. We learned that the Army had bought a lot of luxurious swivel chairs and the like that it didn't need, when it should better have devoted its money to buying fighting equipment for our Armed Forces. We don't want that to happen again.

These, then, my friends, are a few of the aspects of this turning point of the twentieth century.

I am sure that great organizations like the VFW will continue their magnificent patriotic contributions particularly in this hour of international crisis.

SOME SOUND ADVICE

United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, who is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in talk in Wisconsin over the week end has given some sound advice on how to prevent the United States being bled dry by the Communists. He submitted a concise three-point program that sums up the situation in a nutshell and left his listeners with food for thought.

His first point is that our associates in the United Nations should lend us some practical support in the Korean fight to drive the Reds out of South Korea and not leave the entire burden up to Uncle Sam. High-sounding pledges of support from the big wigs in the United Nations does not help much in driving back the hordes of North Koreans trying to push the Americans off the end of the peninsula.

His second thought is that the United States must urge other nations threatened by communism to clean up conditions at home so that the natives at home do not fall victim to Red propaganda.

His most important point driven home was that we must establish a system of defense priorities so we may know the most important areas of defense here and abroad.

"We cannot scatter every last division of United States troops throughout the world and leave our own beloved country defenseless," WILEY warned.

As a member of the important Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs the senior United States Senator from Wisconsin is in a position to know whereof he speaks. He has come forward with three important points, that the administration should ponder in the present conditions at home and in the Far East.

A Forgotten War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Pruden Coleman, president of Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa. is one of the outstanding authorities on Russian communism. On July 22, 1950, he delivered an address at Jan Kanty College, Erie, Pa., at annual Polish Day sponsored by the Erie Federation of Polish Clubs. These remarks by Dr. Coleman are a valuable contribution to our thinking on communism at this time. I include it as part of my remarks:

A FORGOTTEN WAR

(By Arthur Prudden Coleman)

The recent events in Korea and the ever-growing consciousness of the Communist danger to the Western World may indeed remind us of a frustrated Soviet attempt to dominate western Europe after the First World War.

After the November armistice of 1918, the retreating German Army group Ober-Oct was immediately followed by the Red army which already displayed aggressive tactics by occupying some of the territories claimed by the reborn Republic of Poland. This, naturally, brought them into conflict with Polish troops.

For some 18 months the war went favorably for the Poles, as important elements of the Red forces were engaged in domestic struggle with the counter-revolutionary armies of Denikin and Kolczak. But in July 1920, the Polish front cracked under the onslaught of a gigantic Russian offensive.

There followed 6 weeks of a dangerous retreat which brought the Communists into the very heart of Poland, and within what seemed to be an easy reach of their coveted aim—a world revolution. Behind Poland lay a defeated and discontented Germany, ripe fruit indeed for Communist propaganda. It is doubtful, moreover, whether France, almost bled to death on the fields of a 4-year conflict, would have offered effective resistance to the victorious Soviets. Great Britain, too, was having its full share of postwar troubles and could not be counted upon for resolute opposition to the magic idea of a "soviet paradise," while the United States was relapsing into a comfortable, yet disas-

trou. attitude of splendid isolation. Such was the picture in 1920.

Verily, the last barriers of western civilization were truly symbolized by the thin line of Marshal Pilsudski's soldiers on the Vistula. A hostile attitude on the part of the supposedly liberal German Government deprived them of urgently needed military supplies from the west. Western help took the shape of a military mission headed by a young strategist of the French Army, General Weygand. Yet even Weygand could not perform miracles, and the final question remained whether the Poles were to be able to brace themselves and repulse the Russian invaders. Few thought that they could, and embassy after embassy soon left the threatened capital where the thunder of guns could already be heard. The British Government, significantly, offered its services as a mediator in the conflict, so forlorn were the western hopes.

But a miracle happened on the Vistula in those hot days of August 1920. On the fifteenth Pilsudski threw four of his badly mauled but still eager divisions into the overextended flank of his opponent. In 4 days of heavy fighting the victorious Red march to Warsaw was turned into a full scale defeat. within 2 months the U. S. S. R. asked for an armistice, and the peace of Riga in 1921 delayed the Communist menace to the world for over 20 years. Has the West forgotten Poland's sacrifice 30 years ago?

There are no more Polish armies on the Vistula today to oppose the progress of the world revolution, still the ultimate aim of the Machiavellian planner in the Kremlin. Indeed, the whole of Poland was calmly delivered into the hands of the Russian dominated regimes, for "(allied) unity must not be sacrificed to idealism." I am afraid that this thought has dominated the thinking of too many high officials in the United Nations.

A peace built on such sacrifices could only be a "Pax Sovietica," and such a peace could not last. The price which we paid for it is now being heavily redeemed by the heroic blood of the Eighth Army in Korea, where American youths pay with their lives for the mistakes of self-appointed experts on Russia and advocates of further amendment.

August 15 used to be Army Day in Poland and it is still celebrated as such by thousands of Polish veterans who have refused to return to "Jalta-Poland." Let us join them on August 15 in paying respect to their dead of 1920. These heroes gave their lives for America as truly as they gave them for Poland. Honor to their memory.

Why We Fight in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on the 24th day of July there was reprinted in the Perth Amboy Evening News an editorial under the caption "Why we fight in Korea," written by Mr. Clinton B. Axford, editor of the American Banker, and originally printed in that publication. The editorial has since been reprinted by the First Bank & Trust Co., of Perth Amboy, N. J. It is one of the most interesting, most illuminating editorials I have had the privilege to read, and I suggest that every Senator read it in tomorrow's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it may be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE FIGHT IN KOREA

Let no one ever mistake it. These United States are the fruit of a bitter revolution and that revolution marches on in the world. And once more it is engaged in battle against the forces of reaction and tyranny. This time it is in Korea.

It is the revolution that began in England with the Magna Carta, and which, in Anglo-Saxon tradition, has spread across the seas via America to the whole world.

It is the same old battle for democratic rights of man: Free government by representatives chosen by free people. Trial by a jury of free citizens. Freedom of religion, of speech, of press. A government of laws, not men, its military power at all times subject to the civil power. No cruel or unusual punishments. The secret ballot and free elections. Faith in God and truth. The right of all citizens to hold public office. The right to education of our own choosing. The right to own property. A man's home is his castle. Government, a servant, not master of the people. Constitutional government. The right to believe in the fatherhood of God and all men equal in the brotherhood of man.

We are engaged once more, even in little Korea, in the everlasting fight that government of the people, by the people, and for the people under God shall not perish from the earth.

Make no mistake about it, ours are the revolutionary principles. In Korea, once again, men are fighting, men of two races, and dying, for those principles.

Remember:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident.

"That all men are created equal.

"That they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

"That among these are: Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

"That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them should seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

These flaming ideals of revolution, expressed by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, inspired the men who marched with Washington, from Valley Forge to victory. They still march on, a great revolutionary idea, all over the world.

It is a revolution in which all classes did and can take part, be they bankers or laborers. "God is just," wrote Jefferson in his later years, and justice as the right of their fellow men was as dear in 1776 to wealthy George Washington and Tom Jefferson, and to bankers like Robert Morris and Haym Salomon, as it is to any man today.

Unlike the Bolshevik revolution, which sets class against class regardless of injustice, the essence of the American Revolution is that its objective is a classless society, in which all men enjoy equal rights. In fact, the essentially revolutionary character of the Jeffersonian idea is that it aims at a classless world, in the finest Christian tradition of the brotherhood of man.

How much, therefore, the unhappy dictatorship that rules Russia must fear the march of the idea that united the United States and wrote the Constitution to bind them together in peace in a Republic governed by representatives elected by all the people.

How tyrants everywhere must fear the world march of that idea, manifested now in the United Nations dedicated to the rights of man everywhere, a constitutional assembly, deriving its just powers from the consent of its members.

The Soviet masters of Muscovy see very clearly that the march of the American Revolution will certainly set their people free; perhaps within their own lifetimes. Certainly, too, it will free the peoples in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, China, Manchuria, and North Korea, whose governments have been overrun by Communist agents supported by the Soviet military and secret police. It will set them free in the democratic pattern, even as it has set free India and Indonesia, in our times, and a century ago set free the nations of South America and Cuba, and even gave to the Russian people, yearning to be free, a half century ago, the Duma, their first and last representative assembly.

In the inexorable march of the American Revolution, some day the Russian people will once again be free to rule themselves. In the certain progress of the liberal ideals of Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Paine, James Madison, Samuel Adams, John Hancock, and George Washington, slave-state, Communist capitalism is doomed. It fears for its life. Rightly so, for mankind, including the Russians, simply cannot tolerate for long, government in which trust, justice, human dignity, and honor are denied. Mankind, even the people now deluded by the masters of the Kremlin, cannot remain subject for long to a regime in which lies, slavery, and cold political murder are instruments of government and of imperialistic enslavement of every small nation that is unfortunate enough to be a neighbor.

Some day these nations will be free again, and it is the march of the American Revolution that will set them free. Perhaps it is later than the masters of the Kremlin think.

We need no clearer explanation of Russia's imperialistic expansion and its shameless economic, political, and military exploitation of its own and its neighbor peoples than the psychopathic fear that grips the Kremlin gang as they behold the progress of the idea of liberty and democratic government. Marching on in the minds and hearts of men, it inexorably spells their certain doom, at the hands of the very people whose liberties they have attempted to destroy. This we know and certainly shall see.

Russia's leaders know and believe this and are afraid. In their fear they have thus far stopped at nothing, neither the murder of former political associates like Trotsky nor the mass murder of millions of people who died because they held dear the rights of the individual man. Their victims include ministers of God, teachers, priests, farmers, trade unionists. The blood of these modern-day martyrs for the ideals of Jefferson and Lincoln cries out for justice. Jefferson knew this when he wrote: "The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants."

There is not one Russian Communist leader who does not live in daily personal fear that he will be the next victim.

Russia is in this respect a psychopathic state. Its fear complex foreshadows its certain fall in God's good time. It was old Benjamin Franklin who wrote: "Resistance to tyrants is the will of God." Our revolutionary forefathers believed that, we believe it today. It is the reason we fight in far Korea.

This thing called revolution in Russia is about as revolutionary as the absolutism of Alexander the Great, Caligula, or Ivan the Terrible. It invokes the names of Jefferson and Lincoln. But it drowns them

in the blood of countless victims from whom it ruthlessly has taken life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It calls itself the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but its assemblies are travesties upon representative government. It claims to be a democracy, but its elections are mockeries of the democratic process. Russia today is not revolution, but counterrevolution.

Contrast Russia's predatory imperialism with the freedom which democratic America has granted to the Philippines, established in Cuba, and now supports all over the world. Contrast the terror that is the instrument of the Kremlin's international policy with the free assembly of the United Nations. Who in the long run of history could mistake the Soviet slave state for an heir of Jefferson and Lincoln and the democratic ideals of the American Revolution?

Implicit in the concept of free peoples and free nations is union of such nations to defend their liberties and the rights of their peoples. Without some such union, as is now being demonstrated in the United Nations front in Korea, and also in western Europe, the alternative is loss of liberties and enslavement for the peoples of the world and their exploitation under the heel of the Communist state capitalists. America and the free world must fight for its life, as well as its ideals. Free peoples must, as Franklin reminded the Continental Congress debating the resolution declaring our independence, "hang together, or we will all hang separately."

Is there no hope of peace then?

By the march of the American Revolution, under God, some day, Yes. A peace of free peoples in a parliament of the world, which has its successful prototype in the peace among the Swiss Cantons and the American States, peace under a constitution of laws those first purpose is the preservation of human rights.

To the peoples of Russia and her unwilling satellite states and allies, that peace beckons with a lamp of hope. How far down the road of enslavement, imperialism and wars the Communist-dominated peoples will be driven, only history will tell. But when they choose to join the march of the American Revolution and replace their totalitarian masters with free and democratic governments, they will be welcome forever to participate as equals in the peaceful government of the free world.

Loan to Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the interesting analysis prepared by my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs. This scholar, who is known as an apostle of the good-neighbor policy, understands how vital in South and Central America is an attitude of friendship toward the good people of the Iberian Peninsula.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In opposing a loan to Spain, the New York Times (August 3, 1950) cites the 1946 resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In the same editorial, it is alleged that the United States Senate, in voting 65 to 15, to accord some help to the people of Spain, is going against the almost universal condemnation of the present Spanish Government throughout the democratic world. Summarizing the reasons which led to a favorable vote in a thoroughly democratic body, the editors of the Times claim that these may be based on the premise that Spain is anti-Communist and that it has great strategic value from a military standpoint. Then the readers of the Times and, presumably, the Members of our Congress are admonished that it would be extraordinarily shortsighted if now we fought communism with fascism as an ally.

If, as the Times rightly contends, it is vital for Americans to keep in mind that the enemy in our century is totalitarianism, whether it take the form of communism or fascism, then we must continue to be on our guard with respect to the Marxist totalitarian, Josip Broz-Tito, who has shown somewhat less respect for fundamental human rights than the present head of the Spanish state. It is a policy of calculated risk or a deliberate gamble when we bolster up a totalitarian regime, whose dictator ordered our brave American airmen shot out of the skies over Marxist Yugoslavia, whereas the same intellectuals, who applaud the slightest rapprochement with the totalitarian left, throw up their hands in pious horror when a gesture of friendship is attempted with a Spanish military dictatorship which, according to the highest United States officials in Madrid during World War II, treated our people with fairness and loyalty.

Can it be that the editors of the Times did not study the full text of the discussion in the United States Senate on August 1, 1950? The question is relevant because, in that debate, the most powerful reason, submitted by proponents of the loan, was based upon a passage (p. 19) of Admiral William D. Leahy's book, I Was There. According to the judgment of the wartime adviser of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the evidence suggested that the Spanish Chief of State, while desiring to appear neutral in the war, really was on the side of the Allies. This testimony, coupled with the fact that the judiciary is independent throughout Spain, furnish solid grounds for for concluding that the present administration there, although dictatorial, should not be characterized, in fairness, as either Fascist or totalitarian.

As Father Edgar R. Smothers, S. J., pointed out in the Times (May 20, 1949) the Spanish Government "has always acknowledged that the state is for man, not man for the state; that besides the proper rights of temporal governments there are inalienable rights of persons, families and social groups; that there is an ultimate source of all rights in the divine law, which transcends all human governments put together." All citizens who have analyzed the magnificent address which Congressman ABRAHAM MULTER of New York made on the floor of the House of Representatives know that, in his submission (Jan. 24, 1950) the rights of conscience are respected in the Iberian Peninsula. The Senators, Democratic and Republican, who led the fight for Spanish friendship, were aware of the facts reported by Representative MULTER.

With reference to the 1946 attitude of the General Assembly of the United Nations, it is a matter of record that our own State Department has been obliged to admit, with the editors of the Times, that the attempted ostracism of a great nation has failed. The bulk of the democratic world agrees: Brazil, one of our best friends in the Western Hemisphere, twice took the initiative to reverse a bankrupt attitude. Almost two-thirds of the General Assembly were rallied to support the good-neighbor move. Next September, our own delegation, at long last, is expected to keep the pledge made by Secretary of State Dean Acheson to the Congress of the United States. This is democratic action: A recognition of the popular will as well as a response, in the words of House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, to "the national interests of the United States." If and when the United States House of Representatives concurs with the Senate on the loan to Spain, it may serve as a hint to the United Nations that the free world can benefit by the cooperation of a number of sovereign states that, up to the present, have been blackballed by the Soviet Union. Perhaps it would be good for the world organization to secure a group of members that would live up to the obligations of the Charter.

If I read history correctly, Spain did not rape Czechoslovakia; it was not Spain that wrought the brutal sovietization of Poland; it was not Spain that created Soviet China. And not even Mr. Jacob Malik has suggested that it was the Fascist beast, Spain, that must be considered the aggressor in Korea. In other words, some of us may be right in thinking that "time has passed since Potsdam" and since Mr. Alger Hiss presided as Secretary General at San Francisco. Whereas the Times makes its case on the basis of an admittedly hopeless policy and an outmoded resolution, the Senate, overwhelmingly and democratically, has decided to initiate a new era of good will toward the people of Spain, in the light of right principles of international law and for the sake of our own security.

Trygve Lie's Attitude Toward the United States and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's America Versus Russia," from the Indianapolis Star of August 9, 1950, indicating Trygve Lie's stand in a show-down between Russia and America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S AMERICA VERSUS RUSSIA

All doubt as to where Trygve Lie stands in a showdown fight between Russia and America was dispelled yesterday when the secretary of the United Nations showed his hand in three astounding statements. Here they are from Mr. Lie's own lips:

1. "I am still convinced Russia wants peace."

2. "The United Nations should seat the Chinese Communists as representing China because they control the largest part of China."

3. "It will be up to the United Nations, not the United States, to say what happens after the North Koreans are driven back behind the thirty-eighth parallel."

How long will it take America to wake up to what Trygve Lie is doing as secretary of the United Nations?

Recently Mr. Lie made a trip to Russia, ostensibly to try to work out a formula for peace. What was the result? He returned

to New York and made an impassioned plea to have Red China admitted to the United Nations.

Mr. Lie insists, despite everything Russia has done during the last 3 years to stir up international turmoil, that the Russians want peace. Of course they want peace. At the price of making every American and every other citizen of a free country the abject slave of the Red Politburo. Yet Mr. Lie pleads with the world to listen to Russia's plans for peace.

For the last 6 weeks American boys have been dying in a war in Korea for which we were unprepared. To this day nobody understands why President Truman reversed himself, General MacArthur, and the Joint Chief of Staff and got us into this war. Into it up to our necks. And the United Nations hasn't sent even a nurse, janitor, or a street cleaner to aid American ground forces. However, when an American counteroffensive is launched, Mr. Lie solemnly announces that it will be up to the United Nations (that is, Mr. Lie) to say whether we push the North Koreans back into Russia or stop at the thirty-eighth parallel.

What more proof does our stupid, blind, inept, and faltering State Department want that Mr. Lie is merely a stooge being used by Russia every day to confuse us and weaken our defense against the Red menace?

And who is the most vigorous supporter of this brazen Lie in the United Nations? You are right. None other than Eleanor Roosevelt. The same Eleanor, who when she was the First Lady of the land, helped, nourished, protected, and abetted such outright Reds as Hiss, Bridges, and Eisler. It was Franklin Roosevelt who at Tehran and Yalta made the deals with Stalin that have enveloped us in the most dangerous mess ever confronting the United States.

How much longer will the American people stay asleep to the danger that confronts us? How much longer will we tolerate leadership in Washington that betrays us with a continuous array of Hiss, Eisler, Coplon, Gold, Fuchs, and Bridges—not to mention other undisclosed Reds in the State Department?

We cannot appease Stalin, although our State Department has been trying to do so for 5 years. We cannot even do business with Russia. We ought to refuse to give aid or funds to any nation that ships Russia so much as a single bag of salt. As Churchill says, "You cannot kill an octopus by clipping off its tentacles. You must cut its heart out." That is the only thing that will stop the Communists. This is Armageddon. Either we are for a free world or we are for a world ruled by the Reds.

America will win this fight with bold leadership, courage and clear vision. Or we will go down in humiliating surrender to the ruthless Reds. There is no appeasement. The sooner we get leadership in Washington that understands this, the better. This is it. Either we win all or we lose all.

And we will be carrying the fight almost single-handed. We have spent many billions trying to influence nations and make friends abroad. But when the show-down came, how many friends had we bought with our billions? How many nations sent planes and troops to Korea? They will always take our money, but they will let us fight the battles.

It is America versus Russia. And God have mercy on our souls if we don't wake up and understand how tragically true this is.

What can you do about it? Why, bombard Washington with demands that we quit listening to the appeasing pleas of the Lies and Eleanors and the pinky cowards of procrastination. Demand that we start now and lose not a day or an hour in getting ready to meet the Red challenge. Demand that we make all other considerations, especially the fall election so close and dear to Mr. Truman's heart, completely secondary to our national survival. In other words, let's quit living in a rosy fog and begin to acquit ourselves as realistic Americans who are faced with the gravest danger in our whole national history.

World War III Has Started

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the statements below were made by me in 1948. My record of warning the people and our Nation's leaders began in 1934. I did all I could to prevent world war III. I am one of the few here in Washington who was never duped by the Communists.

Now everyone running for public office or Congress is against communism. But where were they before Korea? They were strangely silent. Since 1934 we have built Communist Russia into a monster with our money and materials. Those loud voices now were strangely silent during all those years.

People in northern Wisconsin will remember how in 1939 and 1940 I appeared everywhere I could to try to wake our our leaders to the danger of world communism. So I am no bandwagon climber on this issue. I was one of the few who saw the light long ago.

That is why I voted for a 70-group Air Force as long as 4 years ago. But our leaders said we did not need it so we have very little Air Force.

That is why I opposed the sabotaging of our Marine Corps, our Navy and Coast Guard. But our leaders said we did not need them, so we have not much of any preparedness.

That is why I opposed billions of dollars of loose spending all over the world, much of which eventually got to Communist Russia. But our leaders said we must prove to the world how big-hearted we are. So Stalin got most of it in the end.

That is why I voted against the silliest give-away program we have ever seen—throwing away our tanks and ships and planes to irresponsible people and governments all over the world. Now we are caught short. But our leaders said we must make everybody happy. So we gave it away and have little left.

That is why I supported a universal military-training program, because I knew some day we would wish we had it. But our leaders said "Stalin isn't a bad fellow, it is somebody behind him."

That is why my voice alone was lifted in protest way back in 1945 against the criminal appeasement of Stalin at Yalta. But our leaders said if we give Stalin enough he will get to like us.

That is why, in 1945 and 1946, I accepted the presidency of the World Bill of Rights Association, the presidency of the American Anti-Communist Association, and directorship of the World League To Stop Communism. It was unpopular to talk against Russia then. Yet, I had the courage to do it. But our leaders said we must not do anything to make Stalin mad at us.

That is why I voted for and supported the Committee on Un-American Activities to get the Communists off the Government payroll. But our national leaders said "that is just a red herring."

That is why I voted for the Mundt-Nixon bill to get all Communists to register, and prohibit the use of United States mails by them so that we could stop their traitorous work. But our natonal leaders said that interferes with freedom of speech.

So, while our boys are dying in Korea to stop communism, we have 58,000 Communist agents in the United States. Sounds silly, does it not? But it is true.

Yes, I am one of the very few who saw the light, and my vote never gave a gun or a nickel to Stalin. Too bad there were not enough of us here in Washington. We would not be in world war III if there had been more of a like frame of mind here.

Organization for Security at Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial appearing in the Wilmington Press-Journal of July 27, 1950; an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times of July 27, 1950; and a news story appearing in the Los Angeles Times of July 26, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the fact that the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor is the first port to be organized on a security basis for the present emergency. Spearheaded by Admiral Frank D. Higbee, United States Coast Guard, retired, highly skilled technical men of the Los Angeles Harbor area have been forged into a force that can swing into action in case of war or any other emergency. Admiral Higbee and his associates are to be commended for this most excellent achievement which has been duly noted by the press. Recognition of this achievement by the press appears in the editorials and news story which follow:

[From the Wilmington (Calif.) Press-Journal of July 27, 1950]

Admiral Frank D. Higbee, United States Coast Guard, retired, security officer here during the early part of World War II, and currently captain of the port for the harbor department, this week earned another stripe and medal for being the first of the Nation's port officials to formulate a security force similar to that which operated this port during the last war, and similar to security forces which controlled operations in other American ports during the period beginning in 1941 or thereabouts and continuing until hostilities ceased in 1945.

Admiral Higbee is a man of action—not promises. He also is a two-fisted gentleman who has intestinal fortitude enough to call his shots and then stick by his guns.

He should have been a fighting marine—but, then, America has other fighters, too, like the admiral, and in other branches of our military. So we won't quibble about this.

The nice thing to know is that in emergencies the great Los Angeles Harbor has a gentleman at its helm in Admiral Higbee who is capable, efficient, and a man of action and, best of all, a gentleman who won't take "guff" from anyone, big or little, influential, or just a "joe blow." They all look alike to the admiral, and he treats them the same.

[From the Los Angeles Times of July 27, 1950]

HARBOR DEFENSE

Civilian and Government elements at the harbor are to be commended for their forehanded action in organizing a unit to work for the protection of that vital area. Industry, security organizations, Coast Guard, Army, and Navy joined in the unit which will operate along lines developed during World War II.

It is, of course, unnecessary to worry about an enemy fleet sailing into the Catalina Channel and shelling the port. An air bombing attack also seems to be in the indistinct future, but there are plenty of other means a determined enemy may use to injure our harbor facilities. As the Korean affair develops, Los Angeles Harbor will continue to increase in importance.

This country was wonderfully free of enemy sabotage in the last war. The situation is quite different now. Laxity in vigilance, lack of preparation, may result in incalculable damage being done the port.

Likewise, uneconomic and uncoordinated operations can cause losses equally as damaging as subversive activity.

[From the Los Angeles Times of July 26, 1950]

EMERGENCY HARBOR FORCE APPOINTED

Highly skilled technical men of the Los Angeles Harbor area have been forged into a skeleton force that can swing into action immediately in case of a war or other emergency.

Announcement of their appointments followed a meeting yesterday in Wilmington of 40 representatives of industry, security organizations, Coast Guard, Army, and Navy.

Admiral Frank D. Higbee, USCG (retired), captain of the port, presided as head of the harbor emergency force.

A security pattern similar to that followed during World War II was outlined. And a belief was voiced by a number of leaders that a unified identification procedure be set up in case of emergency, with the unit cooperating with the FBI.

SHIP HALTING DENIED

Except for the skelton force of experts, the harbor emergency force planned no additional action at the meeting.

Rumors that foreign vessels were to be halted by the Coast Guard 3 miles offshore for inspection by Customs and United States Public Health Service officials were branded false.

Russell A. Williams, Deputy Collector of Customs; Capt. John Trebes, commandant of the Eleventh Coast Guard District, and a Health Service official all joined in saying they had not heard of any such program.

Jack Malseed, veteran oil terminal manager, was appointed deputy commander of the harbor emergency force under Admiral Higbee.

GROUP CHAIRMEN

Chairmen of various groups pertaining to harbor facilities and security were named as follows:

Arthur Woll, tank ships; William Harrington, shipyards; Bert Hale, ships assistance; Orlo Peugh, Long Beach Harbor Department; John Fipps, small boats; Carl Moribito, ship service; C. T. Solomon, marine surveyors and underwriters; Commander E. H. Zecher, pilots, and Carl Sennema, tugboats.

Most of these appointees served in similar capacities during World War II.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Ottavio Silvestri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a translation from the New York Italian newspaper Il Progresso Italo-Americano, Sunday, August 6, 1950, relating to the death of Monsignor Silvestri, one of the best known priests in the diocese of Brooklyn. Monsignor Silvestri died last Saturday and was buried yesterday from the church he founded nearly 40 years ago.

In the death of Monsignor Silvestri the people of my district have lost an irreplaceable friend and leader. His death is felt deeply by all denominations. The results of his more than a half century of service to his God, his adopted country and community will never be forgotten. His eulogy is expressed in the article which follows far more beautifully than is within my power to put into words:

THE DEATH OF THE VERY REVEREND MONSIGNOR OTTAVIO SILVESTRI—HIS WORK FOR THE EMIGRANTS

GENERAL MOURNING

Last night the Very Reverend Monsignor Ottavio Silvestri, beloved parish priest of the popular Church of San Giuseppe and founder of the Roman Catholic Church at 185 Suydam Street, Brooklyn, rested his soul in God.

The news spread rapidly through the neighborhood where many families of Italian origin live and was received with vivid sorrow and regret. Monsignor Silvestri was revered by all. Many women wept.

Monsignor Silvestri had directed the important parish with love and faith ever since the day on which the church was built in 1921, and his apostleship was an inspiration for all.

He had not only dedicated himself wholeheartedly to the building of the beautiful church, but also looked after the construction of the rectory, the important parochial school, the convent, the playground, and the community center, which is regarded as one of the best of the diocese of Brooklyn.

The body may be viewed at the community center, which was so dear to him, and on Tuesday night will be carried into the church.

It is requested not to send flowers; only mass offerings will be accepted.

HIS WORK

About 40 years ago the section of Suydam in Brooklyn was only tangled underbrush. Tangled were the roads, and tangled also were the souls of the Italian immigrants, desolate in the vastness of the land, left to themselves, scoffed at, miserable and lonely.

But there came a man, a Christian priest, and settled in their midst. From that time on the underbrush began to sprout the first pallid flowers, and then, as the years went by, everything all around experienced a prodigious flowering; the souls, the work, and the Christian beauty.

This priest, who bore the beautiful Latin name of Ottavio Silvestri, gave life to the parish of S. Giuseppe. Priest and founder of this Roman Catholic Church. The modest little church stands at 185 Suydam Street, and since the day it was founded, how much work, what miracles of self-denial, almost heroism, were performed in order to give new courage, more real faith to this mass of workers. But from that day on the name of this vigilant apostle of the Catholic Church was spoken with love, with reverence, by thousands of emigrants who sensed in him a token of the old country which they discovered in him with the deep-seated affection of the native of the mountain or the plains. His name was on the lips of the young and the old, of the good, and also of those who had gone astray, to whom he always lent a hand, ready to help, to ease a pain, to forgive, just as Christ had once forgiven man.

The years rolled by fast, but the work was immense and the time passed swiftly and then the year of 1947 arrived which marked a date brilliant with glory for the parish of the church of S. Gouseppe—50 years of apostleship, a mark of holiness stamps his everyday action, a deep well of good works which neither man nor time can easily drain.

But on that festive day, the praise of his people, delirious with enthusiasm, surpassed all limits, and the reverance and admiration of the sacerdotes and high prelates and persons from every field of human endeavor told him that the seed profusely sown in 40 years of indescribably hard work had not been sown in vain.

Monsignor Silvestri was the soldier of Christ who for many long years knew how to fight the good fight, he was the wise and noble leader of souls, who knew how to guide, through thick and thin, the legions of Christians who trusted him, toward a goal which surpasses any earthly interest; he was the master who always knew how to inscribe, inculcate, and maintain in the hearts of his believers, firmly and unshaken, the teachings which Christ had sealed with his blood.

To the mind of the young Levite the grave and impelling social and religious problems which the mass emigration of Italians to America presented at the beginning of this century were nothing new. Especially in the large metropolis of the East, where the biggest stream of our emigration flowed, it was profoundly felt to be the business of the priests of the disposition, of the apostolic caliber of Monsignor Silvestri.

In those days the Italian emigration presented the most discouraging and miserable picture in the history of the movement, or displacement of masses of people in search for work.

The governments occupied with other problems could not, or did not know how to, find time to occupy themselves with this grave and complex social and political problem, whose solution must necessarily have grave and important repercussions upon the economic and civil life of the country. To relieve this astonishing negligence, this shameful negligence, help came from the great mother, the Catholic Church, which with generous solicitude and manifesting its truest, inherent, universality searched in the realm of the mind for means with which to relieve that which so unfortunately warps the minds of and keeps poor our emigrants.

And what did Monsignor Silvestri do in those days when our people wandered all over the world and presented the most mis-

erable spectacle which can possibly be presented by an amorphous mass, without discipline, without protection, and without faith?

He was precisely the product of that ancestral faith of the force, resistance, courage, perseverance, complete ignorance of the language, history, customs, traditions of a nation known only by name. Added to all this was that sense of diffidence, doubt, animosity, and contempt for everything Italian.

Monsignor Silvestri dedicated practically all the better part of his life to the welfare of the Italians. He sowed on sand and made corn grow in sand, he sowed on stone and among the stones there were plants and blossoms too. He made one of the poorest parishes into one of the most important in the United States.

Government Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate a few days ago and gave his views and the views of his organization with reference to Government controls. I think the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be interested in what Mr. Goss had to say on this timely and important matter.

The following is the statement that Mr. Goss made and to which I refer:

TESTIMONY OF ALBERT S. GOSS, MASTER, THE NATIONAL GRANGE, ON S. 3936 BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, JULY 26, 1950

1. The brief time allotted to discuss so far-reaching a bill precludes doing more than present two or three recommendations which we consider most important.

2. In time of emergency it is often necessary for democracies to increase the power of their executive officers in order to make quick decisions and quick action possible. Thus, the Government becomes farther removed from the control of the people. The control of the Federal Government by the people is not exercised by the election of a President once in 4 years, but rather by the election of their Representatives in Congress. Usually the President is elected on a very few major issues, sometimes a single issue. Many of these are of transient importance. On the other hand, the Members of the Congress are elected for the purpose of representing the people of their districts on every issue which arises, and the very life of a true democracy depends on keeping the control of governmental policy in the hands of the people's constitutional representatives.

3. In time of emergency speed and ability to make quick decisions are needed, but the counsel of the people's representatives is also needed. Congress can provide adequately for speed and quick decisions without surrendering its responsibilities and without placing in the judgment of one man absolute powers over the economic life of the Nation. He might be the ablest man in the Nation, but the problems confronting the President in a defense emergency are so extremely complex that Congress has no right to assume that any one man can meet them without adequate aid. The people have every right to expect that Congress will provide sufficient aid and at the same time maintain adequate control of those powers upon which their freedom depends.

4. The bill under consideration gives the President almost complete powers over our economic life for a period of 2 years. No matter how many mistakes might be made, or how serious they might be, only by a procedure almost equivalent to impeachment could those powers be retrieved, and then possibly too late to prevent irreparable damage. The powers might be wisely administered in some respect and poorly administered in others, in which case Congress would be practically helpless to correct the weakness, no matter how glaring it might be.

5. On the other hand, quick decisions and quick action, where action is needed, must not be subjected to the slow processes of congressional deliberation. We deem the present situation so serious that all practical steps should be taken without delay to mobilize our full economic strength to meet any emergency which may occur. Events may soon develop which justify the immediate exercise of any one or most of the powers conferred in the bill. Even more power to ration supplies at the consumer level and to control prices and wages may be needed. With two or three exceptions, which we will point out, we think it probably wise to grant the President most of the powers contained in the bill, if and only if, adequate safeguards are provided so that the Congress is kept in touch with the situation at all times; so that mistakes may be promptly corrected; and so that limitations may be provided where powers are not wisely used.

6. Many costly mistakes made during and since World War II could have been avoided if the representatives of the people had been consulted. These are still fresh in our minds, and should serve as a warning not to depend almost entirely on the judgment of one man, but rather to provide for adequate consultation and the sharing of the responsibility by the Congress.

7. We believe this can be accomplished without sacrificing in any respect the power for quick decisions and quick action by providing two amendments to the bill.

8. First, we would recommend that there be established a bipartisan Joint Security Committee of eight members, four to be selected from each House. It should be the purpose in the selection of the members of this Joint Security Committee to give major consideration to the experience, the capacity, and the trustworthiness of those selected, without regard to their seniority or committee position. To accomplish this it is suggested that, by caucus, the majority and minority parties in each House each select two members, and that the eight members so selected be confirmed by two-thirds vote of each House, thus putting a firm stamp of approval upon them. Any member should be removable by a two-thirds vote of the House of which he is a Member.

9. This Joint Security Committee should act as an advisory committee to the President, and the powers conferred upon the President in this bill should be exercisable only after he has consulted with the Joint Security Committee with reference to them. The committee should be constantly available throughout the life of the emergency. The President's hands should not be tied by any requirement that the committee assent to his action. However, the committee should know what is going on except in one type of case, when, in the judgment of the President, the military security of the Nation demands complete secrecy. It is thought, however, that with men thus selected for this position of trust, such cases would be rare. The Joint Security Committee should make to the Congress such reports and recommendations as it determines are justified.

10. Thus, the Congress would continuously work with the President in carrying the heavy war responsibilities, while leaving to him the right to make decisions after the benefit of conference with the representatives of the people.

11. The second amendment should be to provide that the Congress by joint resolution might withdraw or modify any one of the powers granted.

12. With such safeguards, much broader powers could safely be granted to the President than if there were no such safeguards. Without some such amendments, we believe practically every title of the bill would need very careful study, with many revisions, because of the possibility of the serious consequences which might easily arise from the unwise exercise of the extremely broad powers provided in it.

13. We wish to comment on two sections specifically. Section 412 would serve no useful purpose and should be deleted. Its sole purpose is to place in the President's hands power to prevent inflation in the price of a few commodities of which the Government holds a supply. It authorizes their sale at the support price instead of at 105 percent of the support price plus carrying charges as under existing law. There can be no danger of an inflated price as long as Government stocks can be sold at less than parity. That is already provided in existing law. The proposed provision abandons the whole parity concept and establishes an uncertain support level as a fair market for farmers. It is the opening wedge for possible roll-backs which proved completely unworkable during the days of OPA. When the support price and the sales price are the same, no private dealer could enter the market, with the result that Government trading would soon be substituted for private operations. The very fact that such a futile and unworkable provision should be proposed demonstrates clearly the need the President has for consultation with representatives of the Congress.

14. Section 411 deals with a highly technical subject which has had extensive study by the Committees of Agriculture. We feel that this section should also be deleted and a new bill covering this section alone should be introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, because we believe that limitations should be provided to avoid the possibility of costly errors.

15. Summing up, we recommend the deletion of sections 411 and 412. We believe the bill provides a dangerous delegation of powers unless a Joint Security Committee of the Congress to confer with the President is created, leaving him freedom of action, but providing advice and counsel so that our democratic processes may be preserved and put to practical use.

Understanding the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an address delivered by Arthur Pruden Coleman, president of Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa., entitled "Understanding the Russians." I commend this excellent speech to all Members of this body. It was delivered on

June 25 at Monessen, Pa., on the seventieth anniversary of the participation of women in the Polish National Alliance. It follows:

Friends, as we celebrate our national Independence Day in this peaceful and idyllic retreat, the news that comes to us from the outside world is frightening indeed. At last, it seems, we are beginning to reap the whirlwind we sowed the seeds of at Yalta and Potsdam. The crisis comes in the Far East. But the seeds of this crisis were sown in Europe. The cloud "no bigger than a man's hand" from which this tempest has grown first took form in Europe, on the very territory from which the ancestors of you my listeners once emigrated. The misguided policy which has led us to the Korean clash was begotten by our State Department for eastern Europe. Now its liquidation is seen in Korea, but only its liquidation, not its origins. The origins were in eastern Europe. In Korea all the errors of judgment with respect to the peoples of central and eastern Europe have come together in one awful culmination, and brought us to the brink of war.

Yes, the Korean crisis is the fruit of our policy as a nation with respect to the peoples of central and eastern Europe. What has that policy been, and what is it still today? Let the man who was one of its chief architects tell you. Let George Kennan, one of the master minds of our State Department, define that policy.

In an address delivered recently before the Russian Institute at Columbia University, and now reprinted in shortened form in the June 26 issue of the New Republic magazine, Kennan gives us a clear exposé of our State Department's policy. "Understanding the Russians," Kennan's address is called, and this title, in mockery, I have taken from him as the title of my own address to you today.

As we read Kennan's words, we are at once brought up sharp, for here, in clearest terms, is a confirmation of our worst suspicions. In clear outline—and coming from such a source it can certainly be taken as official—we have the pattern of thinking that has prevailed in our State Department for at least 6 years now. Here we have the policy analyzed that has brought us by one false step after another to our present deadlock with the Soviet Union and, specifically, to the Korean crisis.

Kennan's statement is, first of all, a masterpiece of omission and evasion. It is a plain sidestepping of the central issue in our dealings with the Soviet Union. The central issue in those dealings should properly be the question of the races other than the Russians who are now held in bondage within the Soviet orbit. Kennan has not a single word to say on this issue.

As everyone who has studied history knows, Russian foreign policy has since the time of Peter the Great had a single fixed idea driving it forward. That idea is that the Russian state cannot fulfill its destiny, cannot even, in fact, exist as a state, until and unless it embraces within its sphere of influence all the Slavic branches. This means not only the orthodox Slavs of Serbia and Bulgaria, whose culture has the same roots as the Russian, but also the western Slavs—Poles, Ukrainians, Slovaks, Lusations, Czechs—whose culture, along with our own, derives wholly or, as in the case of the Ukrainians in part, from Rome.

This fixed idea of Russian policy, this idea that never changes though the centuries elapse, is never once mentioned by Kennan in his address before the Russian Institute. In complete silence this spokesman for our State Department passes over the aspect of Russian thinking that is at once most central and at the same time most crucial for us in our relations with the U. S. S. R.

From the policy which I have referred to above, the Russians have never, I repeat, deviated in all the centuries. At times they have been able merely to inch forward in the direction of its realization. At other times they have gone forward to their goal with leaps and bounds. The latter we have seen them do in our own time, and with the sanction of our own State Department.

Yet nowhere, in his whole address, as reported in the New Republic, does this spokesman for our Nation's policy at any time, either directly or by implication, once refer to this fixed idea of the Russian policy.

What Kennan does do, on the other hand, is spend long paragraphs in an effort to show us why we as Americans must be patient and tolerant and infinitely forbearing with the Soviet Union. Kennan is, of course, as a patriotic American, against communism. But despite this, his plea turns out almost as an apology for communism, as he urges us, the American public, to be endlessly patient with the evils of communism. The Russians, Kennan argues, have suffered so long and so bitterly through the centuries; have patience, you Americans, with their struggles upward. They lived for so long, these Russians, Kennan says, in archaic darkness and intolerance, forgive them now. Be tolerant with the Soviet system, he tries to persuade, and help the Russian people as they strive to emancipate themselves, ever so painfully, from the grip of ancient usage and symbols. Never forget, this official of ours urges, that in the Russian people there is immense good, immense faith in humanity, and a profound belief in certain abstractions such as decency, honesty, kindliness, and loyalty.

Of course, Kennan is right. Of course, we must be patient with the Russian people and pity them as they rise from the darkness of the past. But what about the people who are the victims of the Russians—the people who are slaves today—because they stand in the way of the realization of Russia's ancient and fixed idea? What about expending a little patience on them—a little effort in order to understand their point of view? What about a little pity for their fate—the more so as they are, culturally, our brothers born?

It is here that we find the terrible and tragic fallacy underlying Kennan's smooth reasoning. In all the dealings of our State Department for the last 6 years and more the effects of this fallacy are seen. Daily we have been led, by this cruel and unsound reasoning on the part of our officials, deeper and deeper into the abyss, ever and ever further on the road, not of understanding the Russians but, actually, of utterly and completely misunderstanding them.

Kennan wants us to understand the Russians. Yet he, and other officials like him, have consistently misunderstood them, for they have evaded, as we have said, the principal issue in Russia's thinking with respect to the outside world. They have side-stepped the central matter of Russia's relations with the rest of the Slav world. These other Slavs, Russia has always considered her own legitimate prey. Yet, in all Kennan's address, there is no mention whatsoever of this. In his tender and nostalgic concern for the Russian people—among whom he has spent much time and whom, understandably, he loves—this State Department spokesman has permitted himself to forget the very existence of at least half a dozen peoples. In his sympathy for one race he has shown himself willing to throw half a dozen races straight to the wolves.

This is the great and tragic fallacious premise on which all our foreign policy for at least 6 years has been built. Russia's fixed idea of absorbing the other Slavs has been whitewashed. It has been accepted as inevitable, and its manipulators—the most skillful diplomats in the world—have been given the green light. Poles and Czechs, Slovaks, Ukrainians, and other Slavs of Latin orientation, have been viewed as proper material for Communist-Stalinist exploitation. This is putting it brutally, but truthfully; nevertheless, this is the way the State Department, in its heart, really feels about the matter.

As long ago as in 1930 I saw with my own eyes the origins of this policy. In the summer of that year I was in Warsaw when the Sherwood Eddy party came through on its way back from the Soviet Union. The members of the party were all leaders of American life. Perhaps the most conspicuous of the group, both because of his height and his high position, was the Honorable Francis B. Sayre, who figured recently in the news in connection with the Alger Hiss case. The Eddy group was rapturous in its praise of what was then called the great experiment and full of the wonders of the new gospel. The lecture on Polish culture which Paul Super, as director of the Polish YMCA, had arranged for the party in Warsaw was listened to politely but with pleasant unbelief and often downright skepticism. Only the paradise to the east captured the imaginations of the party and they had no patience with the slow evolution going on in other countries.

It was then that the nefarious policy we have been following ever since 1944 got its start. In the early thirties Americans by the carload made the great pilgrimage to the Red god in Moscow, and all too many of the pilgrims came away captivated. It was a great trip, every minute of it guaranteed enjoyable by a well-drilled army of modern Potemkins, and those who took part in it were all too often deceived. All too many have looked back to those days with nostalgia ever since.

Kennan and his associates in the State Department are victims of that old mood, which saw everything that transpired in the Soviet Union as good, or, in the light of history, forgivable. Toward the Soviet Union they wear blinders, and refuse to see things as they really are. Mainly, they take no cognizance of the central purpose of Soviet policy—the fixed idea of which I have spoken.

So our officials go on telling us: Forgive the Communists, and pity them. Be patient with Stalinism. Look with tolerance and forgiveness on the new, Red Czardom that has replaced the White. Do not be disturbed when this new terror far outstrips the old Romanov terror in spreading its tentacles about the Slavs of the west.

It is a dreadful thing to have to report the above. We who are familiar with eastern and central Europe know how desperately fallacious the advice is. We know that the Red Czardom of Stalin is infinitely more dangerous to the world than the White Czardom ever was. As a people we Americans had no use for that, because by tradition we are against hereditary absolutism in any form. But with Stalinism; ah, here we do not even recognize the danger, much less combat it. Here we are childish and gullible. Be patient with the Red Czardom, our officials counsel, even forgive its brutalities. Not only that: Some even go so far as to see in Stalinism a great force for good. Some are urging that Stalinism is playing the role of deliverer in the case of such peoples as the Poles and Ukrainians, Slovaks, and Czechs. Daily I read statements in the American press to the effect that these branches of the great Slav family naturally belong inside the Stalinist empire.

Understand the Soviet Union, Kennan exhorts. To which I reply: We understand the Red Czardom only to well. Poles and Ukrainians, Czechs, Slovaks, and the other Slavs understood the policy of their neighbor centuries before our State Department officials were born. It is rather into a complete misunderstanding of Soviet policy and

ideals that these officials have led us. It is high time the tide was checked, and the officially created misunderstanding reversed.

Do not lose heart. The tide can be turned. The English element in our population has long been the dominant and most numerous, and in consequence we have, as a Nation, pursued a consistently pro-English policy. From this we may deduce that, as the Slavic element becomes larger, as it assumes greater and greater responsibility in public affairs, we may gradually see our Nation entering upon a course more favorable to the Slavic nations. Favorable, that is, not alone to the largest of the Slav peoples, the Russians, but to the smaller nations as well, in the spirit of Woodrow Wilson. Slowly we shall forge ahead, if only the whirlwind now loose in Korea, which had its source in eastern Europe, does not prove too great for us to cope with short of a general cataclysm.

We must hang onto the thought that, in the long run, justice does prevail. We must not give up, but keep fighting, in the hope that, at long last, we may have a part in seeing that justice is done in the heartland of Europe, among the peoples of Poland and all the other countries, tragically located, between the German sphere and the Soviet Union.

My Second Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the article, My Second Life, by Stephen L. Debalta, of Washington, D. C., which appeared in the August 1950 issue of Life and Health.

Mr. Debalta was born on the shores of the Black Sea, and studied in France. While still an undergraduate at the University of Paris, he became the youngest editorial assistant of the great French statesman, Georges Clemenceau. After receiving his bachelor's degree, he devoted himself to work on the French daily, Le Figaro. Coming to the United States on an exploratory visit, love at first sight prompted him to apply to Uncle Sam for adoption. Thanks to his knowledge of English, Mr. Debalta had no trouble carving for himself a United States newspaper career. Less than a year after he landed, his first byline feature appeared in the New York Times. The late Melville Stone of the Associated Press entrusted him with assignments in Europe on two different occasions. In 1938, while editor and publisher of a Long Island weekly newspaper, he was stricken with cancer. Still convalescing from the operation which left him without a larynx, but determined to overcome all handicaps, he took a job on the night shift in the New York Times editorial department. At present, Mr. Debalta is a member of the National Press Club and an active news writer on the Washington political scene. He contributes to several dailies and magazines, covering Capitol Hill and the White House.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY SECOND LIFE—A MESSAGE OF FAITH AND HOPE

(By Stephen L. Debalta)

"Operator, I am calling New York, Academy 2-1443—Please be patient. Don't yell at me; I have heard you."

Far from resenting the angry rebuke of the Senate press gallery switchboard operator, I felt rather amused. To accuse one totally bereft of vocal cords of yelling seems no less preposterous than to suspect a blind man of being a peeping Tom.

Twelve years ago my voice box was carefully removed and deposited in a jar of alcohol. One spring morning I was informed that I had a pimple on my vocal cords, and that my larynx would have to come out. When pressed for an explanation, the surgeon whispered sympathetically, "My boy, you have drawn a bad number; it's cancer."

In those days cancer was not as popular or as publicized as it now is. It was spoken of only in hushed tones, as if it bore the stigma of a shameful infection that the French so discreetly designate as maladie honteuse. Moreover, patients were seldom, if ever, told outright what was in store for them, as quite often the shock of the diagnosis alone was more fatal than the disease.

As I reached instinctively for a cigarette, the addict's ultimate resort in moments of mental stress, it suddenly dawned on me that after all excessive smoking may have largely, if not altogether, contributed to my predicament, and what until a few hours ago procured me an imaginary feeling of beatific relaxation became all of a sudden a suicidal vice.

A few days later I entered the operating room with the confident assurance that the miracle of modern surgery would work wonders for me and that, blessed with a strong heart and immune from the alcoholic blight, I would come out victorious in my fight for survival.

After my nicotine-soaked larynx was removed, I woke up about 12 hours later with a throat slashed wide open and a gust of wind wheezing from under the bandages every time I made an attempt to say something. It took my numbed mind quite a while before I realized that, even worse off than a deaf-mute, I could not utter a human sound.

When discharged from the hospital 2 weeks later, I faced the world as a total newcomer, or a reincarnation of my former self, resolved to begin life anew, and above all, to discover some means of communicating with my fellow men.

I entered into what I am pleased to look upon as my second life.

I was told that somewhere in downtown New York there was an institution dedicated to the task of making people speak. My informant directed me to the National Hospital for Speech Disorders, founded and presided over by Dr. James Sonnett Greene. With pencil and pad in hand I approached the miracle man, who, like Balaam, of Biblical fame, could make even a dumb animal talk.

The doctor's first stern command was "Throw away this pencil and pad." Having thus surrendered my only means of communicating with the outside world, I feared I would have to learn the intricate sign language of the deaf-mutes, certain that my clumsy fingers would totally fail me. I was much relieved when I found out that I could be trained to produce noises by contracting the muscles of my diaphragm, forcing the air out through my esophagus, and then molding the words with my lips as when the sound normally originates in the larynx.

It took me three endless months and a long spell of abdominal pain before I succeeded in squeezing out some weird noises that I shaped into syllables. Dame Nature allied herself with the teaching staff of Dr. Greene's oratorium, and when I graduated at the end of 6 months, I was an accomplished speaker, ready to join the soapbox brigade of preelection campaign spellbinders.

Except for the fact that my esophageal voice does not possess the pleasing modulation of a professional tenor or baritone, it serves my purpose, and I am able to make myself well understood by anyone willing to listen to me at close quarters and even over the vast network of the long-distance telephone. For practical demonstration purposes I have spoken several times into a microphone, and, thanks to radio amplifying powers, my speech was not only distinct but very loud.

I have thus overcome the principal handicap with which the laryngectomy—the removal of my vocal cords—left me, and more fortunate in certain respects than a cripple whose legs have been amputated. I am, to all appearances, a normal human being, suspected by the average uninformed man on the street of being afflicted with nothing more serious than chronic hoarseness.

The will to live and the faith in the supremacy of mind over matter carried me through the first and most critical phase of my illness, giving me the moral stamina to face an extremely hazardous operation and a painful, protracted convalescence afterward.

The uphill fight for rehabilitation that ensued when I was ready to resume my place in society was a further test of the strength each and every one of us draws from a firm belief in man's mission on this earth.

Self-pity was always abhorrent to me and sympathy inspired by physical handicaps has a humiliating taint, even when sincere and spontaneous. I discovered in the course of my long road to normalcy that in order to leave physical shortcomings unnoticed you must first believe that you are no different from your neighbor and then act accordingly.

In many instances I could have considered my voice deficiency as an insurmountable obstacle, even in my career as a writer, in which the written word has precedence over speech. Very often I am called upon to have long conferences and discussions with editors and publishers, and have never yet failed to stand my ground as if I were physically their equal. Gradually I have grown so oblivious of the scars with which the dread disease left me that not infrequently I wax impatient with people who do not grasp at once the meaning of my muffled sounds.

The wisdom I have gathered during the chastising transition from my former life into my present regenerated existence gives me an irresistible urge to tell my story to all comers and to proclaim over the rooftops the need for every one of us to cultivate these two indispensable virtues—faith and hope—faith in man's immortal destiny and hope in the ultimate triumph of the spirit over the passing ills of his physical body. Courage can conquer calamity.

The World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey at the annual convention of the New York State Federation of Labor, Monday, July 31, 1950, broadcast nationally over the facilities of the American Broadcasting System:

THE WORLD CRISIS

A distinguished friend sat at my desk the other day and said, "I was in France at the outbreak of the Second World War. Not until that fateful hour did the Government mobilize its full armed strength and call for full conversion to war production. The leaders of the opposition made appropriate statements supporting the Government. France was belatedly ready to work and fight, and she lost."

"I have a horrible feeling," he said, "that the whole world is now in the position I lived through in France 11 years ago."

Ladies and gentlemen, that man was right. The people of France had been concentrating on their own individual welfare. When they did mobilize, they had neither the weapons, the trained leaders, nor the national determination which flows from facing reality. There was a failure to understand the true nature of the desperate struggle that faced them until it was too late and black totalitarianism had engulfed them.

In my solemn judgment, the free world stands in similar peril today. The threat is immediate, urgent, and perhaps desperate.

My purpose in speaking to you today is to say, with all the earnestness at my command, that we of the free world must wake up and realize today the true nature of the onslaught against us by a new and more powerful totalitarianism. We must face reality if we are to survive.

Eleven years ago, there was no single aggressive power controlling one-third of all the people of the world. In fact, the shoe was on the other foot. Germany, Italy, and Japan together had only a tenth of the people of the world and yet they came perilously close to conquering it.

I do not know the timetable of world communism and I doubt if anyone outside the Kremlin does know it. But some things are desperately obvious if we will only look.

For 4 years, I have been saying to all who would listen to me that this crisis was rushing toward us at headlong speed. I have been saying—and have been sneered at for it—that national unity in this country was the most important thing of all because we faced very grave perils.

Two and a half years ago in a formal address, I forecast what has since happened in China and what is happening today in Korea.

I now say to you that while no one can know the timetable in terms of days or even years, it is equally obvious that the Communist schedule includes a similar attack on Formosa. If we defend Formosa, as we have announced we will, then America will be put in the position of being at war with Red China. The problem of military supply and again providing American youth to do much of the fighting is very grave indeed. Moreover, United Nations support is questionable since Great Britain and India have recognized Communist China, which may or may not include her claims to Formosa.

On the other hand, if we do not defend Formosa, then the recent commitment by our Government will be found to be worthless and we shall lose still more of the confidence of the free world.

The problem of Formosa is critical and it should be raised at the United Nations now, rather than when it may be too late.

The Communist timetable obviously includes invasion by satellite nations from Bulgaria through Greece to the Mediterranean.

The Communist timetable obviously includes an invasion of Yugoslavia, which might come at any time.

The Communist timetable obviously includes Tibet, where advance guards have already arrived. It includes Indochina and ultimately all Asia.

They can do all this without showing their hand. They can use their satellites to do the fighting and the dying. Russian troops need not come into action at all until they launch their attack on Iran, which also appears to be on the schedule. That attack will presumably go on to Iraq and probably on through Israel to the Mediterranean. The purpose would be to isolate Turkey and to grab the huge oil resources of the Near East, without which Europe might not survive.

The grand prize on the Communist schedule—short of the world—is, of course, the industrial capacity of Germany and Japan. They feel they then would no longer have to fear American productive capacity.

It is regarded as certain that the Soviet Union has 200 divisions ready for action. It is no secret that 10 divisions represent the present limit of American armed strength. When and whether the Soviet finds it desirable to launch her 200 divisions through western Europe, only time and expediency will determine.

Looking at our own situation for a minute, we must assume that the Soviet has bombers which could reach the Northwest and the northeastern part of the United States and return to Russia. I assume we could retaliate—if we were ready—and had a place to land our planes.

It is believed that the Soviet could also easily conduct what is called "Operation Hot Springs"—that is, sending planes to bomb the great production plants and cities of the entire country, then having the pilots bail out and spend the rest of the war comfortably as prisoners of war at Hot Springs. Needless to say, we could not make similar plans with any confidence that our pilots would be similarly treated.

It is reliably reported that the Red Korean forces contain large numbers of veterans of the successful Communist conquest of China, including many Korean veterans of Soviet armies.

This raises the specter of an invasion of Alaska. Are we any better prepared to resist such an army, which could be of any magnitude the Soviet willed? The first wave of Chinese satellite troops could be sent over and they might or might not succeed. If we successfully resisted the first wave, at whatever cost in American blood, there would then be the second wave and if necessary then a third. There would still be tens of millions of able bodied Chinese males in reserve.

If Alaska should fall, it is difficult to be hopeful about our future.

Now what is the condition of the free world? Obviously the United States is the leader. Yet, apparently it was not even a contemplated part of our strategy to defend Korea. I understand that there were absolutely no plans for the defense of Korea when we moved in and no available adequate arms or trained manpower.

I now raise the question of whether even after this prolonged notice there are today detailed military plans for the defense of any of the other sections of the world in which aggressive action is obviously going to occur and to which we are irrevocably committed.

Even with the programs the President has now proposed, our effort and that of our friends is too much if we are living in a world at peace and too little if we are living in a world at war.

If there are any tanks of adequate size or in adequate numbers why have not some reached Korea after 5 weeks?

If we have enough antiaircraft guns and trained crews in the entire United States to defend one single city, then the rest of the country is better defended than New York.

If there is any civil defense organization in Washington, what has it done? As near as I can find out, the State of New York, through Gen. Lucius Clay, is organizing the most effective civil defense in the entire United States. This is entirely without coordination or leadership from the National Government.

After our program was launched, I was called on the telephone by a nice young man who was supposed to be in charge of this job in Washington. He asked me to make no plans which would be inconsistent with those of the Federal Government. I said, "Which plans of the Federal Government?" He said they hoped to have some in September. I asked him whether he had an enforceable guaranty against attack on the meantime, and he said, "No."

I advised him we would go ahead in doing our best to protect our own people, and would be glad to lend our plans to Washington any time they want them.

Meanwhile, our National Government ended its fiscal year 30 days ago with a billion dollars appropriated by the Congress for the Defense Establishment lying in the Treasury unused.

I give you this summary of our position without the slightest interest or desire at this time to assess responsibility for it. I am not attacking the administration or the Congress. I have not the slightest interest in how we got here. I am desperately concerned with where we are and where we are going.

I state these facts to you because I believe our country and the whole free world are in imminent peril and, as I have said so many times, the whole concept of human freedom is in danger of being wiped off the face of the earth.

I do not ask total mobilization now. I do ask total planning, which is now absent, vastly accelerated production of arms and trained cadres to operate them, so if and when we do mobilize we will be wholly effective. We will never again have months and years to prepare. We must be physically ready at all times and—even more importantly—spiritually ready to resist a peril we really understand.

No one knows whether this peril is simply the ancient oriental device of inflicting a thousand cuts. No one of the cuts is fatal, but over a long enough period the victim dies. It may be the thousand cuts or it may be all-out atomic warfare which may be waged against us. It makes little difference which kind of peril it is, so long as we recognize and recognize immediately as a nation and as a free world, that the time has come for national unity for a single objective and for sacrifice and unity throughout the free world.

This I know: The Soviet Union has expanded in 5 years to the point where she controls 800,000,000 people, or one-third of the world's population. With each succeeding Soviet conquest, more and more people of the free world doubt their capacity to stay free or even the desirability of resisting.

For just one example, it has been dismaying to see the failure of American diplomacy over the last decade in the Near East and to find Arab nations, including Egypt, already seeking to be neutral.

If we weaken or if there is any increase in the flight to neutrality elsewhere in the world, then freedom is lost.

Listen to this—you who may still believe that the United States could live alone in the world or could survive without friends. We—all of us in the United States of America, are only one-fifteenth of all the world.

We need friends who have confidence in our leadership and faith in our ideals. We need friends in vast numbers who believe as we do—or we will not survive. If every male American between 16 and 70 bore arms, our numbers could still not match the hordes of even the Soviet satellites.

Up to now every conquest of Communist aggression has been achieved by spending the blood of Soviet victims—the Soviet satellites. Today young Americans are dying in Korea, fighting the imprisoned and misguided youth of North Korea. It is absolutely essential to the existence of human freedom that everyone opposed to communism unite and do his share. I do not advocate arming a resurgent Germany or Japan but with all my heart I advocate inspiring their youth, together with the remaining free peoples of the world, to join up in defense of their own liberties.

The United Nations is the agency for this leadership. It must not be thwarted by any maneuver or strategic retreat that Mr. Malik may propose on behalf of Russia tomorrow. While we still have a preponderance of friends of freedom there, the United Nations should be asked to lead in calling for the building of a mighty force of those who believe in this single cause. This force for freedom should be recruited from every nation and every people who are willing to defend freedom against Communist slavery.

Specifically, for example, the Japanese Constitution prohibits the maintenance of arms but it does not forbid individual Japanese serving the world organization for the preservation of peace. I am confident that under United Nations leadership and with a full understanding of the necessities, the people of the free nations of the world will respond.

I ask you to listen to me with all your hearts and minds in an appeal which may be premature by 5 or 10 years. Or it could be the last 30 days in which we have to act. No one knows how much time we have.

The only hope we have of making this appeal premature or perhaps unnecessary is if we respond with a sense of urgency and sacrifice to the nature of the world threat. The only way to avoid the dire things that are being plotted against us and our fellow human beings is to act swiftly in all areas at once with a boldness and skill which has not yet been brought to bear.

I beg you to listen to me on this subject because this is not solely a task for those who hold public office. There is a limit to what public officers can do without public support. I ask you to listen and respond because you are elected leaders of organized labor in the State of New York, and you have a mighty influence among our people and among the leaders of labor throughout the free world—there are, of course, no leaders of labor behind the iron curtain. It will not be popular for you as elected officers to accept a call to sacrifice, but it is the duty of elected officers to make unpopular decisions and to provide leadership.

You have a rare opportunity. In your hands lies much of the stability of our economic system, without which we cannot meet this long-continued drain upon our limited resources. If you say to me: "How long will this last?" all I can say is, "It must last until we have assured our freedom and the possibility of armed attack has disappeared."

It will not be over by Christmas, as some are hoping. It will go on for a long time to come.

You may ask: "How much must we sacrifice?" I say to you: "Whatever is necessary. We could not sacrifice enough for freedom. If we should sacrifice most of our physical possessions, we still should not be reduced to the misery of the people behind the iron curtain."

Recent evidence of mass buying by our people is a tragic display of selfishness and lack of understanding. When we are in trouble we customarily help our neighbors. We do not try to grab food or clothing they need. Moreover, the only sure way to create shortages is to buy more than we need now. We are all in this together, and 5 pounds of sugar won't make much difference in the job of saving freedom.

Now I may be called an alarmist—in fact, I already have been. I am not an alarmist. I am a realist. If our way of life is in danger the most important thing in the world is that we face it—squarely and honestly—not hysterically. Then we should tighten our belts, compose our souls, and go to work.

I recently talked with a girl from Czechoslovakia. Her father was a successful farmer and veterinarian, and she and her two sisters had lived with their parents through the Second World War, and then through the period of increasing Communist domination of the Czechoslovakian Government. While the Government was still ostensibly free, a Government agent came to her father and said: "You will continue running your farm as always—but from now on you will take orders from me."

That man and his family abandoned everything they had in the world and escaped from Czechoslovakia with the clothes they had on their backs. They felt the breath of liberty slipping away, even before the Communists took over. They chose to abandon their home, their farm, their relatives and their friends and flee to poverty and hunger in western Germany.

I say to you that no physical poverty which any of us could suffer could equal the spiritual poverty of the loss of liberty.

I have spoken of our own necessary industrial mobilization. More important is to rally the whole free world. But even more important than military strength is that we mobilize spiritually to help save our neighbors.

The peasant family which has been divided in Korea, some killed, some sent to slave labor, cries out for our aid. They cry out in Korean and we may not be able to hear it. But they are God's children too.

Other voices are crying from behind the iron curtain. We cannot help them today but if we are not prepared to help our brothers and sisters of the free world, we shall be earning any tragic fate which may befall us.

There will be no peace of soul for any of us unless we respond to the call of suffering people as Americans have always done. There will be no security or peace until we have learned that unity and sacrifice are the only road we can follow.

We shall never save ourselves unless we first save others.

The hour is very late—I do not know how late. Whether we still have a day or a year or 3 years or 10 years, not a second should be lost. Our Government, our people, the United Nations and the spokesmen of the free world should rally now. If we do—all of us—I do not know how much we will save but at least we will save our consciences, our souls, and we may have an even chance to save human liberty.

Fumbling in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial recently appeared in the Hammonton (N. J.) News entitled "Fumbling in Asia May Cost Us World Peace." With the permission of the House, I am putting a copy of this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

FUMBLING IN ASIA MAY COST US WORLD PEACE

Some say Mr. Truman's order that our troops, ships, and planes fighting invading Communist forces in Korea "cleared the sky" as to our foreign policy. It might be well to review the background.

Russia, after staying neutral in our war against Japan gained a strangling foothold in China. That was our payment—dating back to Yalta—for her intervention against Japan for a total of 6 days in a war we had carried unsupported for over 3 years.

Mr. Truman then agreed to divide Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel with Russia occupying the northern sector and the United States the southern.

Republicans began clamoring early for a clean-cut Far East policy. "What is our policy toward China?" they asked the President when he was demanding bipartisanship. They asked for assurance that the United States would not recognize the new Communist regime. Secretary of State Acheson told them the administration policy was to "wait till the dust settled."

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was recommended to be named commander of all forces in the Far East. It was suggested that our Navy be used, if necessary, to protect Formosa, and even favored long-term United States air and naval bases there. It was believed that Formosa might be saved with relatively little United States military assistance if handled properly. Mr. Truman told a press conference he was not aware that the Republicans making such suggestions were military experts.

The Department of Defense became interested in Formosa. The Secretary of State said Formosa was of no strategic importance. Foreign Service officers were tipped off to pass the word that Formosa's downfall was "widely anticipated" and that military strengthening would be useless.

The split between Defense and State Department views over policy in China and Formosa spread to Japan and Korea. Congress, in 1949, appropriated $10,500,000 for military aid to South Korea.

But the administration policy was to give South Korea only enough arms for internal security, not enough for defense against aggression. Congress has just discovered that only about $200 worth of the appropriation actually reached Korea before the Communists struck.

Had certain influences not prevailed, our southeast Asiatic flank might not now be exposed and Chinese Communists might have been frightened back into the hinterlands of China.

The Community Services Mental Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the community services mental health program, written by Jerry W.

Carter, Jr., and published in the April 1950 issue of the Journal of Clinical Psychology.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately two and three-quarters pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH, UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

(Jerry W. Carter, Jr.)

Following World War II, congressional hearings revealed that various mental and emotional disorders and inadequacies accounted for the rejection or discharge of 2,000,000 men by the armed services. Moreover, despite the large number screened out before induction, mental disorders among veterans accounted for as much as a third of all pensionable disabilities and over one-half of hospitalizations in the Veterans' Administration. Concern over this cost to the Nation in manpower losses and veteran care led Congress to study the mental health problems and needs of the country.

It was found that more than half of the patients hospitalized in the United States on any given day—some 600,000—were mental patients, and that about 8,000,000 individuals in the country were suffering from some mental disorder. No adequate programs for the prevention and early treatment of mental illness existed anywhere in the country. There were thought to be about 600 outpatient mental health clinics in the country against a minimum need for 1,400. Five States were without any public or private mental health services outside of State hospital care. The foremost authorities in the country testified that the total number of all the psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, psychiatric social workers, and psychiatric nurses in the country amounted to only about 12,000 individuals, or considerably less than the minimum number needed in any one of the four disciplines; that training facilities were adequate to train only a small fraction of the needed personnel; and that the skills and scientific knowledge required to attack seriously the mental health problem on a Nation-wide basis were wholly inadequate.

To help remedy this situation, Congress passed the National Mental Health Act in July 1946. The legislation gave the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service responsibility for developing a broad program to improve the mental health of the Nation through: (1) training mental health personnel; (2) research in the problems of mental illness; and (3) development by the States of preventive mental health programs in their communities.

This program is administered by the National Institute of Mental Health, one of the National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service. The major objectives of the program are: (1) To develop economical methods of bringing mental health care to persons in need of such assistance; (2) to develop preventive and control methods in the mental-health field; and (3) to promote positive mental health.

A National Advisory Mental Health Council consisting of leading scientific and medical authorities is provided for in the National Mental Health Act. This body advises the Surgeon General on such matters as policy, the distribution of grant funds, personnel standards, and other problems relating to the program. The present members of the Council are: Dr. Franz Alexander, Dr. Leo H. Bartemeier, Dr. Karl M. Bowman, Dr. Alan Gregg, Dr. S. Bernard Wortis, and our symposium chairman, Dr. Carlyle Jacobsen. Assisting the Council are committees on community services, research, and training. The training committee has four subcommittees in each of the following fields: Clinical psychology, psychiatry, psychiatric social work, and psychiatric nursing. The research committee is likewise multidisciplinary including representatives from the various medical, biological, and social sciences. On the community services committee are representatives of the general public as well as the mental-health professions. In addition, the Institute has several panels of consultants which advise on scientific and professional matters, program planning, and special problems. In brief, every effort is made to use the best advisory and consultant resources available.

The National Institute of Mental Health is directed by Dr. Robert H. Felix and consists of the following branches: the training and standards branch, the research projects branch, the biometrics branch, the publications and reports branch, and the community services branch, all operating on an interdisciplinary basis.

The Training and Standards Branch of the Institute administers grants for improving and expanding graduate training in the fields of psychiatry, clinical psychology, psychiatric social work, and psychiatric nursing; stipends to trainees in the above four mental health disciplines; and grants to medical schools for undergraduate instruction in psychiatry. In the current fiscal year, $2,500,000 are available for graduate training grants and stipends and $400,000 for undergraduate psychiatric training in medical schools. Other training activities include demonstrations in professional education and conferences to improve teaching methods, such as the Boulder Conference on Graduate Education in Clinical Psychology held August 20 to September 3, 1949.

The research program of the National Institute of Mental Health is divided into research grants and intramural research projects. Grants-in-aid for research are made to universities and other public or private institutions and to individuals for research in mental health on the etiology, diagnosis, treatment, control, and prevention of mental diseases. Projects are supported from a wide range of disciplines and are not confined to any one field. In addition, fellowships are provided for the training of promising research workers, in any relevant discipline, who are interested in mental health. In this fiscal year, $800,000 will be available for research grants and $100,000 for research fellowships. Since this program has been in operation for 3 years and since many projects run from 3 to 5 years and many fellowships are renewed beyond the initial year, only a fraction of the above amounts will be available for new grants and fellowships during the year. The intramural research program is still in its initial stages of development and will entail a major interdisciplinary research program with its focal point at the Clinical Center now under construction at Bethesda, Md.

In addition to these research activities the Biometrics Branch of the Institute compiles and evaluates statistics on patients in mental hospitals and other related problems, functions which were taken over from the Bureau of the Census in 1948. The Publications and Reports Branch is responsible for the planning, production and dissemination of information about mental health.

The program of the Community Services Branch is one of assistance to States in developing their own community mental health programs based upon local needs, resources, and problems. The expectation is that, with 53 States and Territories developing their own local mental health programs, the more successful patterns of outpatient, preventive, and positive mental health services will emerge for more widespread use throughout the country. In other words, this program is in the Public Health Service tradition, of encouraging the development of strong and independent local and State health resources rather than developing a large nationally integrated program and of emphasizing the control and prevention of disease rather than its treatment.

Prior to this assistance program, which began operation in July 1947, only 22 States had mental health programs. At present all but two of the 53 States and Territories are participating in the community services program. Grants to States available in this fiscal year total $3,550,000. The States are required to match one dollar of State and local money for each $2 of Federal funds received and to submit a plan and budget annually for the use of these funds. They may use funds for any mental health purpose they decide upon except institutional care. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the States budgeted 51 percent for their mental health funds for the establishment, improvement, or expansion of mental health clinics; 15 percent for preventive and educational activities; 11 percent for professional services other than clinic services; 10 percent for training mental health personnel; 11 percent for central administration; and 2 percent for special studies.

In addition to administering grants to States, the Community Services Branch provides professional and technical planning, development, coordination, and general direction in the assistance-to-States program. These activities are carried on through 10 regional offices by 17 mental health consultants in psychiatry, clinical psychology, psychiatric social work, and mental health nursing. Insofar as possible, each regional office is to be staffed with complete teams of mental health consultants in all four of these disciplines. In addition, the Branch operates and directs demonstration projects to try out new and better methods and techniques of rendering community mental health services for use by States in developing their local programs. The Branch also maintains liaison with other governmental and nongovernmental agencies concerned with mental health problems, conducts comprehensive on-the-spot surveys of existing and projected State mental health facilities, and provides, upon request, consultative services to mental hospitals and institutions.

The mental health consultants in psychiatry, clinical psychology, psychiatric social work, and mental health nursing assigned to regional offices carry out the assistance-to-States program by maintaining liaison with State and local mental health authorities, professional groups, universities, and other institutions; by reviewing State mental health programs; and by recommending action on State mental health grant-in-aid plans and budgets. Their chief objective is to assist the States to develop community mental health programs which will: (1) determine mental health needs and resources as a basis for planning and comprehensive and adequate State mental health program; (2) establish an organization with responsibility and authority for the program; (3) develop public interest and responsibility for meeting the mental health needs of the people in the State; (4) furnish mental health information and encourage the application of available mental health knowledge by the public; (5) provide special opportunities for mental health education and training for physicians, teachers, nurses, social workers, clergymen, and others whose daily work may have a preventive and positive mental health influence on appreciable numbers of people; (6) provide educational services for the de-

velopment of well-adjusted children and adults; (7) provide professional services to infants, children, and adults who have behavior, educational, vocational, personality, or social difficulties which interfere with their functioning to the limit of their abilities and with their personal and social adjustment in life; (8) support or conduct studies which will increase knowledge and make possible a better understanding and handling of behavior problems; and (9) increase the number and competence of psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric social workers, and mental health nurses qualified for work in community mental health programs by establishing and supporting service facilities in cooperation with training centers and by supporting the training of partially qualified mental health personnel.

The success of community mental health programs over the country will depend on the knowledge, methods, skills, and the quality and quantity of personnel the several mental health disciplines develop and bring to bear upon the mental health problems of diagnosis, treatment, prevention, and ways of promoting positive mental health. The mental health field is so large and the needs are so great that all the mental health disciplines will have to supplement each other's effort and extend themselves to the utmost if any real progress is made toward improving the mental health of the Nation.

Consider the magnitude of the problem. Mental illness is prevalent in all communities, among children and adults and in every level of society. Moreover, it may be as malignant as a cancer or as mild as a cold. It is conservatively estimated that in the United States at least 1 person in 20 will be hospitalized for mental illness at sometime in his life and that at least 1 individual out of 5 will fall into some category of serious but less acute behavior disorders such as those often associated with criminality and delinquency, accident proneness, divorce, economic dependency, and other individual failures in the performance of major social and personal roles. The annual cost of handling behavior disorders and the loss in earning power and productivity in the communities of this country are calculated in billions of dollars, but the more important intangible costs in human misery and frustration, in disrupted homes, in children deprived of security, happiness, and normal opportunities cannot be calculated. The urgency of this problem is further heightened by the forecast of an increase in behavior disorders out of proportion to the population increase unless something is done, because the incidence of mental disorders increase with age and the number of Americans aged 65 and over is expected to double in the period 1940–75.

To meet these needs for community mental health services there are some 5,000 psychiatrists in the country, but probably not more than 2,000 engage in out-patient work, private practice, and other kinds of services at the community level. Of the 7,000 psychologists we have, there are probably not more than 1,000 in the community services field. Of approximately 1,200 psychiatric social workers, only around 800 work in community mental health. Of the 5,600 graduate nurses working in the mental health field, probably less than 50 are working in the community mental health field. Accordingly, in all the mental health disciplines there are probably not more than 3,800 individuals, including many working only part time, to serve the millions needing community mental health services.

As one of the mental health disciplines, psychology has unique and major opportunities and responsibilities for research, training, and service in the community mental health field that have scarcely been touched.

From the standpoint of psychological research, consider the present state of knowledge concerning the etiology, treatment, and prevention of mental illness and what we know about positive mental health or the principles which will insure mental health. The diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders at best is only in its early adolescence. Prevention is just a toddler and positive mental health is little more than a gleam in the eyes of the National Institute of Mental Health and a few individuals like Daniel Prescott and Ralph Ojeman with their mental health through education programs, Leo Bartemeier with his Cornelian Corners, Lloyd Rowland with his Pierre the Pelican for parents with their first baby and Edmund H. Bullis with his Human Relations in the Classroom. Our best developed community mental health resources are our clinics with their multidisciplinary or team approach and the various unidisciplinary services such as those rendered by psychologists, psychiatrists, and psychiatric social workers. Perhaps the most that can be said for these resources is that they are limited primarily to the early diagnosis and treatment of behavior disorders acute enough to be referred to them. Their work is preventive mainly in the sense that they attempt to prevent even more serious developments which might otherwise lead to institutionalization. Very few of these clinics and professional services attempt much in the way of prevention at the subclinical level and practically none do more than make occasional verbal gestures toward positive mental health, so great is the demand for all available clinical services and so great the lack of knowledge and skills in how to do preventive and positive mental health work. Unanswered are such questions as: What are the major kinds of mental ill health and in what segments of the population are they found? What are the factors underlying mental health and mental ill health? What specific mental health services are needed? How should we go about meeting these needs? The answers to these questions will require research on the basic problems of behavior development; on the nature, etiology, and treatment of behavior disorders; on the development of mass screening and treatment techniques; on community life, its attitudes, cultural mores, problems, needs, resources, and potentialities; and on a host of other related problems, all of which are proper concerns of psychology in some degree.

Upon such researches as these will depend ultimately the answer to the question—What should be the preparation of clinical psychologists for work in the community mental health field? As we now know it, however, the demand is for well-qualified psychologists able to assume positions of professional responsibility and leadership and with enough knowledge of related professions and of the organization and dynamics of communities to recognize, use, and help develop potential mental health resources in the community. Beyond this, clinical psychologists working in this field, as in other fields, should be able to formulate a psychological diagnosis as a basis for treatment planning, participating in treatment, planning, and carry out treatment plans either by providing consultation for others doing remediation or by executing direct treatment measures with consultation or supervision as may be needed. Training and experience for work with infants, children, and adults are also essential. In brief, the need in this field is for clinical psychologists who are interested primarily in extending the application of mental health principles involved in a given case to similar types of cases and in contributing as much as possible to positive mental health.

Concerning the need for clinical psychologists in the community mental health field, there is probably not a rural or urban community of 100,000 people in the country that is not in urgent need of a community clinic with at least one staff member from each of the four mental health disciplines, to say nothing of the needs for psychological services in schools, and other health, welfare, and social institutions. There is an immediate need in this field for a minimum of 1,500 clinical psychologists. Long-range estimates of needs far exceed these modest estimates and make community services potentially the largest field of employment for psychologists.

Study of data published recently by Wolfle and Black in the American Psychologist and unpublished data collected by Limburg reveals that of some 7,000 known psychologists in the United States there are probably only 2,000 in the clinical and other closely related fields of psychological services, with around 1,800 additional individuals in training. Between 900 and 1,000 of these 2,000 are estimated to be engaged in some type of community services work such as in clinics, schools, and other community organizations. Probably very few of those now being trained in clinical psychology are receiving adequate preparation or even orientation for work in the community services field. Whereas about 60 percent of the APA membership have completed their training for a doctorate in psychology, only about one-third of the psychologists now in the community services field have such training. As a group they receive the lowest salaries in the several occupational groups in psychology. Because of lower salaries and lesser status than other psychologists enjoy, psychologists in community services either have had less encouragement to complete their training or the field has not been able to attract better trained psychologists. This is a serious situation because out-patient work or work in open-ended settings like community services requires at least as high if not a higher degree of competence than is required in closed or institutional systems. For instance, in closed systems like hospitals, errors of omission or commission are more readily righted by supervisors than they are in open-ended or out-patient settings where patients are not under control. Also, the variety of patients and problem situations are greater in the community services field and require relatively more extensive if not more intensive skills. The need in this field is for better-qualified psychologists who can render more adequate community mental health services on a professional rather than a technical or clinically useful level. With more status and an improved salary situation, more and better psychologists should be attracted to this field. Needless to say, the National Institute of Mental Health is encouraging just these things in its assistance-to-States program and making every effort to break the impasse that has prevented greater contributions from clinical psychology to the community services field. While the Public Health Service has always been interested in mass services, it has never been interested in quantity at the expense of quality. Rather, in its long history it has found in comparable situations that the argument "something is better than nothing" may be a dangerous fallacy, especially if the "something," such as inadequate personnel, operates to spoil opportunities and make for failures. All too often, after such failures, areas have to lie fallow, sometimes for many years, before another attempt can be made.

In conclusion, the opinion is hazarded that if psychology supplies its share of the research and the personnel needed in the community mental health program, its success will have important implications for all fields

of psychology. All psychologists are invited to consider their responsibilities and opportunities in the community services field, regardless of whether their principal interests be in systematic, experimental, animal, social, genetic, educational, clinical, or any other field of psychology. Contributions from all fields of psychology are needed and all psychologists will find some problem in the community mental health program worthy of their attention.

Constructive Action in Combating the Communist Campaign in Support of the Stockholm Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I tried to present to my colleagues, and particularly the Members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, concrete evidence of the activities of a professed Communist in western Massachusetts, one Sidney Lipshires, described as the secretary of the western Massachusetts Communist Party. I know that the membership of that party in western Massachusetts is but a handful and that they have relatively no influence in that part of Massachusetts. I was disturbed, as I think each of my colleagues would be if this had happened in her or his district, that such a person could have influence over one decent American in enlisting her or him in any campaign to obtain signatures to this Communist-inspired campaign. I called attention to the fact that he was very careful not to disclose the number of those who had joined in this effort. I suspect that they were but a very few. Yet, I understand that among the 600 who came to Washington Tuesday but were unsuccessful in obtaining support from Members of Congress, there was at least one person from western Massachusetts. That person did not make any effort to see me. I confess I would have liked to have been in a position to provide her with the evidence I have obtained as to the vicious deceptiveness of this entire program.

I now want to report on the immediate and constructive action taken by all Veterans of Foreign Wars posts in the four western Massachusetts counties. That report is as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of August 8, 1950]

VFW URGES PUBLIC TO SPURN STOCKHOLM PEACE PETITIONS—RED STRATEGY CONDEMNED BY VETERANS; AGGRESSION CITED IN STAND OPPOSED TO MINUTE WOMEN

The unqualified opposition of all Veterans of Foreign Wars posts in the four Western counties to the Stockholm peace petition was voted at a recent meeting of the Western Counties Council held in Amherst, it was announced this morning. The veterans' organization strongly urges all veterans to oppose the signing of this petition and to bring out arguments exposing it.

The resolution approved by the Veterans of Foreign Wars declares veterans cannot understand how peace-loving people could countenance the bringing home of the Air Force and other military units from Korea in the face of the North Korean aggression into southern Korea, where a free and independent government was already in existence.

They also question why the petitioners agree with the Soviet stand that Red China should be allowed representation in the United Nations to the exclusion of the Nationalist government, which had been in existence many years and had been forcibly pushed out of its country by the Red aggression.

In the face of these ruthless acts of aggression by Soviet-inspired forces, which have overturned free and democratic government, there can be no peace solution of the problem, the veterans stated. The action of the minute women for peace in backing the peace petition was condemned by the spokesman.

I was also glad this afternoon to see the report in the Springfield Daily News of August 9 that the lady who had been elected president of the so-called Springfield-Chicopee Minute Women for Peace has resigned that position. It is disturbing to read that about 300 ladies had been induced to join the organization. I hope they will take prompt steps to submit their resignations. This article is, as follows:

LEADER OF MINUTE WOMEN FED UP WITH WHOLE THING—CLYDE DORR SAYS WIFE TO RESIGN AFTER CRITICAL COMMENTS ABOUT ORGANIZATION'S STAND; OTHERS MAY DO LIKEWISE AT MEETING TONIGHT

In hot water because of supporting ideologies paralleling those of the Communists, the Springfield-Chicopee Minute Women for Peace are going to lose their president, Mrs. Clyde Dorr, of 106 Massasoit Street, it was learned today.

Mrs. Dorr, who was not available, will resign as soon as possible, her husband said this morning.

"She is fed up with the entire thing," he said.

The Minute Women, reported to number about 300 in this area, have since their formation several months ago continually supported many of the views advocated by Russia and "fellow travelers."

Their motions were connected with the Stockholm peace proposal, now revealed to have hoodwinked many Americans into adding their signatures to the Moscow-inspired document.

The group has been strongly condemned by those who saw the true reason for the Stockholm proposal. Its "essence" has been the same as the line spouted by Jakob Malik, Russia's UN representative.

The Minute Women have circulated a petition of their own, which is reported to call for the same things as the Stockholm document. Last week, Sidney Lipshires, local secretary of the Communist Party, praised the action of the women and said they are "on our side."

Some of the members are now said to be seeing the trap into which they have fallen and many are expected to bow out following their president's resignation.

The Minute Women have a meeting scheduled for tonight at which time it is expected Mrs. Dorr's resignation will be announced. She is, according to her husband, "out of town" and cannot be reached.

Before the Stockholm proposal was recognized for what it is, thousands of people throughout the world had already affixed their signatures to it.

The document calls for the outlawing of the atomic bomb and is specifically directed against the nation having it and not against aggressors. As such it is being used to gain a foothold in the sympathies of peace-loving people.

I also include an excellent editorial upon this particular group in the Springfield (Mass.) Union of August 9. It follows:

THE MINUTE WOMEN AND PEACE

Doubtless, the Springfield-Chicopee Minute Women for Peace comprise an estimable and patriotic group of women. But their executive committee has made a rather lame excuse, bordering on an apologia, for supporting the abortive Stockholm peace pledge.

This so-called peace pledge is an out-and-out phony. It was inspired by the Communists and is being circulated by Communists and anybody else they can use as stooges. It calls for outlawing the atomic bomb, but it does not condemn aggression with other weapons. It is not directed against war, but only against the nation which employs atomic weapons, a very significant difference.

Of course, we all want peace. We all hope the atom bomb will never be used. Who in his right mind doesn't? But it is aggressive Soviet policies and actual Soviet aggression, as in Korea, which constitute the greatest menace to world peace. If any further proof is needed that the spurious and deceptive Stockholm peace appeal is Communist-inspired propaganda, it was given last week by Sidney Lipshires, who is secretary of the Communist Party of western Massachusetts.

Mr. Lipshires was quoted as saying that he welcomed the minute women as an ally for the Stockholm peace pledge. He said that anyone circulating this petition or indorsing its aims is on our side. That should be clear enough.

Thousands of persons in this and other countries who were sucked in by this bit of dishonest and deceitful propaganda have later discovered their mistake and have gone to great lengths to reject their signatures. We think the minute women, who deny they are acting as Communist stooges, should either make honest admission that they were taken in by this Communist-inspired device or should change their name to something more appropriate. The title is all too reminiscent of the minute men who sprang to the defense of their country in a grave emergency against an enemy bent on their destruction.

Gambling on Grain Market Must Cease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a week now, this House has been debating a bill to control inflation in this country. We have all recognized the great need to do something to stop runaway prices. The public is demanding that Congress act and act at once. It appears to me that everyone wants controls on someone else, but none on them. They take a "holier than thou" attitude, and say "we can control ourselves, our motives are clean." Now let us see about this: The realtors have been writing to Congress asking that they be exempt; the banks do not want credit restricted; the automobile dealers association feels that they can handle their own affairs; the

wholesale grocers organizations blame the housewife for the increase in prices. All of these groups and many others still insist that we need controls, and want them enacted at once, but "please, Mr. Congressman, do not hurt us."

I say to you now, that the great unorganized citizens of this country who are now suffering from one reeling blow after another in this battle of inflation are demanding action.

I am strongly against the Cooley amendment to this control bill. I respect the experience and knowledge of this distinguished gentleman that heads the Agriculture Committee, and I hate to disagree with his views, but why should the farmers and the consumer suffer an additional blow, merely to allow the speculators in the commodity exchange markets to make millions upon millions of dollars each year by their gambling on the prices of grain.

In February of 1949 I introduced a bill, House bill 2624, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to regulate speculation upon the commodity exchanges. This bill has laid in committee ever since and no action has been taken. My bill would give to the President of the United States, through the Secretary of Agriculture, the right to increase the margin funds used in the purchase or sale of grain and other commodities on the commodity exchanges.

At one time, early in the 1920's, the Chicago Board of Trade recorded transactions of nearly 27,000,000 bushels of grain. In that particular year the farmers of America harvested less than 5,000,000 bushels of grain. And at the same time, thousands of our farmers were losing their homes under the hammer of foreclosure sales. Who was making the profit on the speculation and sale of grain futures? Men on the Chicago Board of Trade, that hardly know an ear of corn from a kernel of wheat. Men that purchased and sold millions of bushels of grain, and did not see one grain of it.

Talk about your gambling investigations; what we need is a complete investigation of gambling, at the expense of the farmer who raises our grain and produces our livestock, and is then at the mercy of the speculators in a plush office in a high building in Chicago or New Orleans. These men are nothing more than glorified gamblers. We have a special crime committee in the House and a Kefauver committee in the Senate, investigating gaming, and yet today, in this important bill to curtail speculation, so as to help control runaway prices, we see serious objection raised from the well of this House.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, we are trying to place some brakes on the price of bread, milk, meat, butter, and other foodstuffs, so everyone in this land of ours can have a fair chance to purchase the same, and yet much of the price we are going to pay for these items is partially determined by the future prices on the New York, Chicago, and New Orleans exchanges.

I strongly oppose the Cooley amendment.

Defense Production Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, our action on this legislation may change the course of history for decades to come and determine the type of world in which our grandchildren will live. Our decision may well spell success or failure for the undertaking in which we are presently engaged in Korea, and, even more important, may be the deciding factor in determining the future actions of the aggressors who menace the freedom of liberty-loving people the world over.

Because of the gravity of the situation and the ever-changing character of the problems which we face, Congress must remain in session. We cannot abdicate our constitutional obligations or shirk the decisions which are rightfully ours to make. We would be turning our back on our form of representative government and the principles of responsibility on which it rests if we were to delegate what amounts to legislative duties to the executive branch. The people at home, particularly the parents and relatives of the boys fighting 7,000 miles away, expect the Congress to assist the President in solving the gigantic and manifold problems involved in gearing our economic machinery to the emergency requirements of this critical hour. Our congressional committees should be on the job not only to deal with necessary legislation, but also to exercise constant supervision over the operation and administration of the program in order that the pitfalls and mistakes of former days may, so far as possible, be avoided.

There is no question that we must show our willingness to mobilize totally for this effort in Korea. As I stood on the sidelines and watched the first three casualties brought home, I determined that insofar as I personally was able, I would do all I could to see that the men called on to do the fighting and dying are fully supported on the home front. After all, human lives come ahead of material comforts.

This is everybody's war. If minor inconvenience or irksome regulation here at home will give the boys in Korea one more rifle or one more tank, we must and will cheerfully endure any privation or hardship.

Our boys are fighting powerful Russian-made tanks with bazookas, and up to the last 2 days have been fighting a losing battle. They are sacrificing their lives while we on the home front deliberate the imposition of controls.

While we may deplore the shortsightedness of the administration policies, which have brought us to our present desperate plight, we must meet the immediate situation with what we have on hand now and go forward with all the speed at our command.

Perhaps by our total mobilization, or evidence of our willigness to sacrifice some civilian conveniences, we can turn the Korean so-called police action—but which in my book is war—into a short war.

If, by our prompt action and lack of thought about personal comfort, we can convince the aggressors that Americans are neither soft nor selfish, then temporary total mobilization will be the most effective, and incidentally, the least expensive program the United States can undertake.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I say that our action on this legislation may be the most important we shall ever be called upon to take. If we can stop total war on this globe by merely voting to mobilize all segments of our population for this war effort, we shall have accomplished the greatest feat in history, for another world war may be the last for all time.

That is why we must not allow any factor in our economy to go unregulated—prices, wages, and profits alike—since all might be lost in the holocaust that would follow a full scale, all out war, whatever the result of such a conflict.

Second only to the importance of giving the President immediate authority to take the emergency steps embodied in this legislation, is the desirability of providing that the wide controls over the lives of our citizens, which we impose hereby, be terminated at the earliest practicable date. There are those who believe in complete peacetime regimentation of our people and who have for a long time wanted to install controls as a permanent part of our national economy. Under no circumstances can we allow this result to be achieved. For that reason the definite termination date in this measure is an eminently desirable, indeed, an indispensable feature of the legislation.

In my judgment those who are most violently opposed to peacetime controls should take their stand on the side of complete control over all segments of our economy during time of war. If we have partial controls, that means some parts of our economy will be restricted in their activities in order to benefit other parts. When normalcy returns, those enjoying the benefits of controls will be reluctant to take their chances in a free competitive society again and will be inclined to oppose the removal of controls. On the other hand, if all segments of economy are under control, all will be equally anxious to put an end to burdensome restrictions and regulations at the earliest possible moment, thereby rendering less difficult a return to the normal functioning of a free opportunity system which has built this country to its position of eminence and power.

It is our duty, of course, to scrutinize carefully all of the provisions of this legislation. We would be remiss in our responsibility were we to accept without question or study whatever is sent up to us in the way of legislation. I am convinced that the people generally have

greater confidence in the collective judgment of the Members of Congress regarding the needs of the moment than they have in the views of any one person, even the Chief Executive. I am equally convinced, however, that the American people are ready for, will accept, and cooperate with such controls as are considered necessary to support on the home front the Armed Forces fighting our battles in the field.

Additional Editorials Warning Against Signing Stockholm Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make available to all of my colleagues and particularly to the members of our Committee on Foreign Affairs additional excellent editorials exposing the Communist-inspired and supported peace petition now in circulation in this country.

I realize that that committee, undoubtedly, has many commitments of long standing with reference to urgent matters, but I believe that I have been able to provide its members with an incontrovertible case for direct action by this Congress without further delay. I filed House Concurrent Resolution 247, 21 days ago as a basis upon which a hearing could be held and the committee's recommendation could be made. With the State Department's public denunciation of this petition, it is inconceiveable that the Department would not have reported to the committee its approval of congressional action in this matter. I can think of no reason why any other interested department would file any objection. I am not at all concerned as to the specific language which may be considered appropriate but I am deeply concerned that we should have the opportunity now of voting upon some form of resolution expressing the sense of Congress as to the nature of this petition, warning American citizens against signing it and recommending a course of action which can meet constructively the challenge made by these traitors among us who are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government and the subjection of the American people to the dictators in the Politburo. I am particularly concerned because of the obvious progress which has been made among perfectly decent American citizens who want to work for peace, as all of us do, but who have been misled by these traitors.

The editorials follow:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of August 3, 1950]

A-BOMB LOGIC

The minister who defends his signing of the Communist-inspired "Stockholm Petition" on the ground that he is for peace, should, we believe, reexamine the logic of his position. If the Stockholm petition were genuinely a peace petition it would condemn the use of all offensive weapons and not merely the one in which this country perhaps has a current advantage.

Is there a difference in kind between a stone flung with lethal intent and the A-bomb? If so, what is it? Both are intended to kill. There is a logical distinction between offense and defense, it may be granted. But between weapons of offense the difference is merely one of degree.

The efforts of the United States to get a general agreement that atomic weapons shall not be made are based, genuinely, on expediency and not on principle. There is no logical objection to atomic weapons that cannot be applied to any other weapons. We have a feeling that they are somehow unfair, because not available to everybody. But we do not hesitate to use a superior airplane or rifle, or a machine gun which shoots faster or more accurately.

The objection is to offensive action. It is offensive action which prevents peace—not the A-bomb. Hence, the Stockholm petition which condemns the A-bomb instead of condemning offensive action is a weasel-worded document and a Communist booby trap. Anyone who signs it under the impression he is promoting peace is plainly mistaken.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of August 4, 1950]

WHO IS FOR PEACE?

If there is any one thing on which Americans are united, it is the desire for peace. That is what gives a superficial appeal to such propaganda as the so-called Stockholm peace petition now being circulated by Communist and pro-Communist groups. That petition opposes, among other things, any use of the atom bomb.

It is heartening, therefore, that Jewish, Protestant, and Roman Catholic leaders have joined, for the first time since World War II, in a statement warning against the Stockholm appeal. Spokesmen for the three faiths urge the American people to guard against being misled by the Communist-sponsored petition. It has, they say, "already deceived many well-meaning people here and abroad."

We should know by now that there is no easy way to peace. Signing petitions is usually more of a pious gesture than an effective way of shaping world affairs. When they give aid and comfort to the Kremlin in its aggressive foreign policy, signing them is a positive disservice to the cause of peace. And it is, of course, aggression such as the Russians have sponsored in Korea that is the greatest threat to peace, not America's possession of an unused atom bomb.

Leaders of the three faiths offer a five-point program of peace that would be, if universally followed, more effective than any number of popular petitions. It includes renunciation of the use of force as an instrument of national policy; adherence to the obligations of the UN Charter; respect for human rights and freedoms; participation in the positive programs of the UN; and acceptance of international agreements for regulation of armaments, including atomic weapons, by a trustworthy system of international control.

The United States is willing to accept all those terms, and is actively trying to secure full international backing of them. Russia has refused to accept any of them. Consequently, any peace petition circulated under her auspices is a deliberate attempt to confuse world opinion. As Warren Austin has told Jakob Malik in the UN Security Council, Russia has ample opportunity there to present any proposals she has for furthering world peace. Up to now, Mr. Malik has had nothing at all to offer.

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of July 17, 1950]

GAMBLING ON HUMAN CREDULITY

How much will people believe? Anything and everything (according to Adolph Hitler) if you say it loudly and keep on saying it.

Communism confidently follows the Hitler pattern and practically gilds it. It declares that the Soviets are the most democratic and peace-loving of all peoples, this in face of the patent facts that theirs is a slave state; that they have transformed and demoted the free countries on their western margin into submissive satellites; that they are devoting their revenues and major energies to armaments; that they are plotting against all the Asiatic neighbors whom they have not yet terrorized, and that their agents are attempting to undermine the institutions and subvert the government of every free people on earth—notably us Americans.

Furthermore, all this they have repeatedly avowed, as their deliberate purpose, in the writings and public statements of Marx, Lenin, Stalin. And they have said other things: that religion is the "opiate of the masses," good faith is mere "bourgeous morality." It is commendable to lie, to steal, to murder. The leaders use names not their own; travel on forged passports; began their careers—some of them—as bank robbers and train wreckers; periodically rid the scene of each other through assassinations or mock trials. Basically, they are gangsters of a peculiarly vicious type, nothing more. Herbert Hoover sums most of this up in a single sentence: "The men of the Kremlin have in so short a time violated over 35 solemnly signed treaties."

The facts are recalled and arrayed here in view of the numerously signed pro-Russian peace petitions being circulated in our own and other countries. Why should millions, why should anybody, play the simpleton?

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of August 5, 1950]

SEND PETITIONS TO MOSCOW

The American Red Cross in Detroit was surprised and not a little horrified to find that a Red Cross appeal to ban atom warfare bearing the Red Cross symbol was being circulated by a bunch of peace appealers.

The Red Cross denounced the use of its name and symbol, pointing out that there are laws against their unauthorized use.

The petition reads like an offshoot of the Stockholm petition, a sly bit of Kremlin propaganda against which all America has been alerted the last several weeks. It has all the earmarks of a typical Communist dodge.

The new peace appeal group is called the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives. It has an imposing list of chairmen, cochairmen, vice chairmen, and executive board members, most of them clergymen and educators. Their program is simple, aside from being as impractical as a week-end trip to the moon.

Signers are asked to telegraph or write President Truman to order a cease fire immediately in Korea, to name a United Nations commission to find a peaceful solution to the Korean problem, to get a world agreement outlawing the atom bomb and to give full support to the United Nations.

President Truman can't order a cease fire in Korea, of course, without subjecting American troops there to slaughter. There was a UN commission which tried to find peaceful solution to Korea's problems for months, but Russia refused to let it enter North Korea. The United States has tried since 1945 to get the atom bomb outlawed, but Russia has refused to participate in the program. We have always supported the

UN and are now giving it fullest possible support by serving as the UN police force for Korea. Russia, on the other hand, has blocked UN action from the start, by use of both veto and, recently, the boycott.

The Committee for Peaceful Alternatives is implying that President Truman and not Stalin is to blame for Korea. The group may not be Communist, but it's doing Stalin's work. The Communists must love such fuzzy-minded thinking.

The archbishop of York, Dr. Cyril Carbett, had the answer to this kind of peace petition when he was asked to sign one the other day. He might be interested, he said, "if it were addressed not to the House of Commons but to the Kremlin."

I also want to make available the box story on page 1 of the August 10 issue of the Machinist. I think most of my colleagues will recall that I became particularly interested in this program when I read an extremely able editorial from that paper in its July 20 issue, which I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A5246.

The article is as follows:

EVERYBODY NOW APPROVES UN ACTION IN KOREA, PHONY PEACE PETITIONS HIT

IAM Lodge 66, Milwaukee, Wis., at its recent membership meeting adopted a stinging resolution warning its members and their families against signing phony peace petitions "which would jeopardize our democratic institutions." The resolution urged that the union avail itself of wider circulation in the public press "affirming our belief in the American way of life."

Charles Stuart, publicity chairman, also reports that the lodge voted to endorse William Sanderson for the office of United States Senator in the Democratic primaries.

From New York City, William Oram, recording secretary for IAM Lodge 402, reports that the recent district 15 resolution condemning Communist aggression in Korea and backing President Truman's action in support of the United Nations has now been made unanimous.

Originally, delegates representing lodge 402 opposed the antiaggression resolution when it was proposed at the district meeting. This action clears up the impression given by the district delegates "as to the thinking of our membership on this important question," Oram wrote.

Resolution of Revere (Mass.) City Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution which was adopted by the City Council of Revere, Mass., on July 31, 1950. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas this country is currently engaged in an international struggle which will eventually determine whether we as a democratic Nation can survive the onslaughts of autocratic communistic dictatorship; and

Whereas this country has produced and is continuing to produce bumper crops of the necessaries of life enough so to insure that all of our people should have plenty to eat at a moderate cost; and

Whereas through the selfish actions of a majority of our citizens, prices of bread, milk, meat and other necessities of life have risen immensely: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the City Council of Revere, in order to protect the citizens of our community do petition you, as President of these United States, to take the only wise, practical and expedient course in the face of these facts, namely, immediately institute the control of prices, rolling them back to the prices established as of June 15, before this present wave of exorbitant price increases took effect.

In city council, July 31, 1950.

Ordered adopted on an affirmative vote.

Attest:

JOSEPH F. MCCHRISTAL,
City Clerk.

Contribution to the War Effort by Large Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star of August 10, 1950, written by David Lawrence, in which he points out the great contribution which is being made by America's big corporations to our war effort.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DU PONT OFFER SPIKES OFT-REPEATED CHARGE OF PROFITS IN WAR—CORPORATION TO DO WORK ON HYDROGEN BOMB FOR FEE OF $1

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe the Voice of America took note of and transmitted abroad a news item the other day which was about the strongest rebuttal that could be made to the oft-repeated charge of the Soviets that America's big corporations are eager to make profits out of war—and maybe the item was missed altogether. Anyway, it didn't get the conspicuous mention in this country that it deserves.

For it was announced that the task of carrying on the development of the hydrogen bomb in a Government-owned plant had been entrusted to the du Pont Co., of Wilmington, Del., and that the du Ponts had agreed to do the job and charge exactly $1 for their entire fee. The work may take years to do but that's all the profit the du Pont organization will accept.

There is a tremendous amount of social significance in that piece of news. For it reveals that the biggest chemical company in America is the only one that can really do the important work that has to be done with the H-bomb. Its staff and organization alone has the background and know-how. Incidentally, the du Pont Co. did a similar job—also for $1—in operating an atomic-energy plant for our Government during World War II.

STANDARD OIL CO. PLAN

But, speaking of big corporations, this isn't all the news that might have been transmitted overseas by the Voice of America. The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey announced that the families of its employees who are called to war are going to continue to be paid each week during the emergency a substantial part of their regular wages. There are other large companies which are putting into effect somewhat similar plans.

The larger companies will prove even more valuable to America in the war effort of the future than they have in the past. This time, however, their production will exceed all past records. Thus, the General Electric Co., through its president, Charles E. Wilson, has just announced that, in the event of an all-out mobilization, it can produce substantially double what it produced during World War II.

America's total manufacturing capacity is 50 percent greater than it was 10 years ago. Steel has a much greater capacity than a decade ago and electric power production is double what it was in the period before World War II. The railroads are in better condition today than in 1940 and America now has an independent rubber supply if it should be cut off from the East Indies.

The truth is that the period from 1933 to 1939, before the last war broke out, was a period of depression, and hence it was not until after 1945 that America began to get enough plant capacity to take care of the demands of the people for consumer goods and manufactured products.

But how has this amazing development and productive capacity been made possible? By a system of private enterprise and by integration of the varied operations of larger companies. As a matter of fact, America is lucky today to have well-integrated companies, and might not have been so lucky if the radical theory about splitting up integrated operations had been adopted. Most significant today, for example, is to read in the light of the war situation what Judge John C. Knox wrote on June 2 last—just 23 days before Korea—about the proposal to split up the Aluminum Co. of America—largest aluminum producer of the country.

CALLS INDUSTRY VITAL

He said in his formal opinion in the United States District Court of New York:

"It is my considered and firm judgment that a strong and resourceful domestic aluminum industry is a vital necessity, not alone from the standpoint of national security, but also for the peacetime welfare of the general public. By this I mean that the future development of the industry depends upon its being composed of financially sound and well-integrated organizations.

"Rightly or wrongly, from an economic and social standpoint, big business in many industries is an actuality, and if such enterprises are to be subjected to effective competition, their trade rivals must be of somewhat comparable strength."

Two world wars were won with the aid of the industrial production and manufacturing know-how of the United States. It is fortunate for America that large-scale enterprise has expanded to the point where it is now able to turn out more tanks, more planes, more ships, more guns, and more bombs and ammunition by far than any other country or group of countries in the world. So big business has at least one justification, if no other, for existence, subject, of course, to any curbs on price-fixing or unfair competition which a fair enforcement of the laws may require.

Suits designed to attack bigness as such, where conspiracies to violate laws are inferred rather than charged as having occurred, would weaken America's industrial production. During any war period ahead, there probably will be a moratorium on lawsuits that would bring about dissolution of any of America's larger manufacturing companies.

Desertion and Abandonment of Women and Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced S. 4032, a bill to authorize the Federal courts to take jurisdiction in cases of desertion and abandonment when these cases involve individuals separated by State lines. I am in receipt of a copy of a letter written by Mr. Raymond Hilliard, commissioner of public welfare of New York City, addressed to Representative EDNA F. KELLY dealing with the effect of abandonment on the case load of the Department of Welfare.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE,
New York, N. Y., August 2, 1950.

Hon. EDNA F. KELLY,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KELLY: This is in response to your letter of July 25. Several years ago the department of welfare absorbed the case load and administration of the board of child welfare, which gave assistance to needy women with children.

The department of welfare now provides aid to dependent children for the type of case which would formerly have been administered by the board of child welfare. Such assistance is granted mainly to needy women with children under 16, or with children between 16 and 18 if regularly attending school, or if one parent is dead, continually absent from the home, or incapacitated. The aid to dependent children case load has risen rapidly in the postwar era. In April 1945 there were only 13,923 cases receiving aid to dependent children. In June 1950 there were 43,303 such cases—a rise of 211 percent over the corresponding figure for April 1945.

A large factor in this increase has undoubtedly been in the deserted-women category. Unfortunately, however, separate figures are not available showing the number of desertion cases receiving aid to dependent children. The reason for this is that the department of welfare administers this program for the State and Federal Governments, and the statistical data maintained are those required by the Federal Government. At this time we are not required to tabulate the reason for acceptance for aid to dependent children.

In June 1950, 142,636 persons in 43,303 families received aid to dependent children, amounting to $4,550,330. Included in these families were 95,471 children under 18 years of age.

Please advise me if I can be of any further assistance.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND M. HILLIARD,
Commissioner.

What Is Going On in Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by Clyde A. Lewis, of Plattsburg, N. Y., commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars, over the radio network of the Columbia Broadcasting System on July 4, 1950, Independence Day.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly raised on this floor the very issue which Mr. Lewis so eloquently and ably discusses. The American people need to know what is going on in Germany. We cannot, we must not, become so bemused by our fight against totalitarianism in the Soviet countries that we forget the brutal, bloody, and ruthless totalitarianism in western Europe which cost the world millions of lives and plunged us into generations of fear, suspicion, and hunger.

The text of Mr. Lewis' address follows:

One of the major and most formidable tasks in the international field of politics and diplomacy is the material and political recovery of western Germany—a Germany that is the residuum of the autocracy of Bismarck, and militarism of Kaiser Wilhelm, the ineffective republic of Weimar, and the savage nationalism of Hitler.

Thoughtful Americans will, in general, agree that to solve intelligently a major part of the many problems confronting us in Germany will require the best leadership and intelligence that the United States can produce in a specialized field—that of dealing with foreign peoples.

The international problem of assisting to create a new Germany is unique in history because our country, a victor, is spending a vast amount of money and time to help a conquered nation toward political and economic recovery. In short, this means finding markets for German goods, helping to rebuild German cities, and most important, an attempt on our part to discourage in the foreseeable future German plans of world conquest or aggression. This latter can only be accomplished by eradicating superman philosophy, master-race propaganda, and the theory that might is right.

Hyper-nationalism and militarism must, insofar as humanly possible, be eliminated. The German people must be shown that the Hitler government, based on hyper-nationalism and militarism, brought their rich land into the most tragic and destructive wars of all times. That will be the verdict of history.

Only by sympathy, patience, and properly directed firmness of purpose on our part, will the ghost of German militarism be laid.

We have no positive assurance that German officialdom appreciates the substantial assistance of the United States. But it is believed that the people, the plain people, of Germany—they who have been so tragically exploited and deceived—will in time see the light—but only if denazification of the official and military classes is expeditiously and efficiently accomplished.

In a recent speech at Stuttgart, our High Commissioner in Germany, Mr. John J. McCloy, said this:

"Our main purpose is to help Germany achieve political recovery."

VICTORY IN COLD WAR

How well we are achieving that laudable objective is a matter of grave concern, not alone to us here in the United States, but to the entire world. It may well mean the difference between winning and losing the cold war.

There are those who challenge our right to mix into the political problems confronting Germany. To these I say: How can we hope to reap the full fruits of our victory in World War II if we fail to stamp out once and for all the evil forces that led Hitler's Reich afield in quest of world domination?

I submit that the problem of Germany is a political one, and must be dealt with as such. Politics brought Hitler to power, and his National-Socialist political organization implemented his ill-starred dream of world conquest.

Recently, a world-wide news agency revealed that there are some 19 new and active political parties in Germany. Leaders of most of these new groups are spreading the virus of Hitlerism. As members of the present Bonn Parliament, they have a voice in the drafting of legislation and, more significantly, in the shaping of public opinion.

We are disturbed by what we hear about Germany today. In spite of what some of our leaders tell us, we know that nazism is boldly renascent.

Encouraged by the Soviet masters of eastern Germany, and heartened by the reluctance of our leaders to crack down in the west, nationalism is flourishing—the selfsame brand of fierce and articulate nationalism that spawned the Bismarcks, the Kaiser Wilhelms, and that archdemon of them all, Adolf Hitler.

RISE OF NAZIS FRIGHTENING

Recent statistics tell a revealing and alarming story. Figures published by our own military government officials and advisers disclosed the sordid fact that in Bavaria alone, as of last November, there were approximately 35,000 persons employed in Bavarian ministries and their administration, and of this number, more than 15,000—almost one-half—were former Nazis. Highest percentages of these former Hitlerites in responsible positions were in the Ministry of Finance, with 60 percent former party members; food, agriculture, and forestry with 70 percent, and the department of justice with 81 percent. This latter figure includes only the judges and prosecutors, and not administrative personnel.

Germany has been likened to a vast area where the forces of totalitarianism on one side, are arrayed against the forces of democracy on the other. And while these gladiators engage in a struggle to the death, sitting by as spectators are the millions of free men and women throughout the remainder of the world. They are more than spectators; they are the prize which each side in the death struggle seeks to win to its cause.

The forces of democracy must win this titanic struggle if the world is to remain free. The denazification of Germany is a must if there is to be lasting peace. And denazification must be on our terms—not Germany's.

We cannot, and we must not, tolerate a Germany in which youths swagger through the streets singing Hitler songs; a Germany in which 90 percent of the newspapers are operated by the same crowd which operated them under Hitler; a Germany in which members of a pro-Nazi parliament brazenly proclaim racial hatreds and antidemocratic sentiments.

Recently, a leading member of the German Party, now a member of the Bonn coalition government, was applauded frantically by German audiences when he declared:

"Germany is least responsible for the Second World War. It is the anti-Nazis who have brought about the present misery. Germany did not break down from exhaustion, but only on account of the treason and sabotage committed by the anti-Nazis."

Another member of the Bonn parliament, Dr. Richter, told a recent meeting that Germany lost the war because of the "treachery of the democrats." One of Hitler's former henchmen, ex-Storm Trooper Ernst Remer, is leader of another noisy political party which has a name reminiscent of Hitler's organization. Remer recently declared that "we will be the masters of Germany in 2 years."

NEW DICTATOR FORETOLD

With the aid of Dr. Schacht, the old Deutsch-Nationale Volkspartei, which was instrumental in raising Hitler to power, has been reestablished. Another dictator in 5 years is the bold prediction of August Haussleitner, leader of a new right-wing party, Deutsche Union.

Meanwhile, there are reports of several secret Nazi organizations. One of these groups has brazenly declared that "the principles of national-socialism were and are true; they evinced a tremendous success. The goal of the group is to educate the elite of the coming Germany."

Not infrequently in Austria, where the upsurge of nazism is even more conspicuous than in Germany, mass meetings are held where participants appear in SS uniforms and sing Hitler songs. Secret SS and youth organizations are spreading terror throughout the country.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States believes the American people are entitled to know what we are doing to block the resurgence of nazism. We are building strongholds of democracy here and abroad, and are taking every measure to thwart communism in its ruthless march toward world domination. The potential threat of nazism is equally as ominous, yet we blink our eyes and do little or nothing.

What happened to our campaign of education that was to teach German youth the blessings of democracy? Why do we permit indifference and inertia to let German nationalism grow and flourish under the selfsame slogan that brought Hitler to power—the conviction that Germany is the predestined master of the world?

A New York Times survey last December brought the conclusion that the resurgence of reactionary radical nationalism with nazi overtones is the most dangerous long-range problems facing the Western Powers in Germany."

Drew Middleton, New York Times correspondent in Germany reminded us on January 23 of the past affinity between German and Soviet militarism. He stated that "each step which the United States takes leading to a strengthening of the extreme right increases the future danger of a new Russo-German alliance."

HANDED BACK TO NAZIS

One high United States occupation official in Germany blandly tells us that nazism has been destroyed in Germany, but in the same breath proposes that Germany be handed back to the same crowd that made a god of Adolf Hitler and brought upon the world the most horrible blood bath in its history. Fanatical German nationalism and nazism are from the same cloth. Both must be destroyed if democracy is to survive.

We must make the Germans understand that the world is fed up with superracism, that no one nation, no one ideology, whether it be nazism, fascism, communism, or by whatever name it may be called, is going to rule the world.

Nazis, like Communists, understand but, one language—the language of force. Only through a show of force—moral as well as military—can we hope to stave off another and far more horrible world conflict.

We are prone to forget Dachau and Buchenwald. We realize with indifference that scoundrels like Schacht and Von Papen are free; that Ilse Koch, the wretched beast of Buchenwald has been released; that characters like Fritz Thyssen, who started Hitler on his rise to power, have been dismissed as minor Nazis. Do facts such as these lend credence to High Commissioner McCloy's declaration at Stuttgart when he said: "One of the primary purposes of the occupation has been and is to eradicate Nazi influence and leadership from German political, economic, and cultural life"?

Today, in this great free land of ours we are observing the one hundred and seventy-fourth anniversary of our Declaration of Independence. Since that day in 1776 when our forefathers courageously proclaimed our freedom from oppression, this Nation has been the leading champion of free democratic government throughout the world.

We are working to safeguard democracy in the cold war. Only recently, we joined with 11 other North Atlantic countries to strengthen alliance of the free countries of the west to meet any challenge from Russia. We have implemented our bid for strength of the democracies through the Marshall plan. We have, through orderly legislative processes, made material military aid available to these friendly nations.

GERMANY IS BATTLEGROUND

Twice within a generation, we have thrown our total resources into world struggles to stem the tide of totalitarianism. Now, 5 years after the conclusion of World War II, we are at bloodless war with an arrogant aggressor nation which has avowed its determination to rule the world regardless of cost.

Germany is the battleground in this cold war. Likewise, Germany is the real key to world peace, and upon the outcome of the titanic struggle between the western forces standing for freedom and democracy, and the totalitarian forces in the east, may well depend the fate of our civilization.

There must be a declaration of independence for Germany if civilization is to survive. Our apathy, our indifference have retarded progress toward that goal. Only a few months ago, High Commissioner McCloy stated that, in his judgment, "there is still too much totalitarianism and authoritarianism in German life. * * * There is still resistance to reforms long overdue, and too many German people are apathetic or negative in their approach to political responsibility."

Not long ago, while visiting in Munich, a distinguished American educator was shown a textbook then used in the elementary schools of that city. One page of this book contained instructions for the formation of capital letters, and opposite each letter was an example of its use. Here are a few of the letters—and the examples presented:

A—as in Adolf.

D—as in Dolch (a dolch is a small dagger worn by Nazi soldiers).

F—as in Feuhrer.

K—as in kreig (krieg means "war").

P—as in panzer (the Nazi tank troops).

S—as in sieg, meaning victory (remember the Nazi song Sieg Heil! Seig Heil!).

U—as in uniform.

V—as in vaterland.

W—as in wehrmacht—the German army, and, I have kept for last—H—as in Hitler!

Does this indicate that nazism is dead in Germany?

Let us listen for a moment to Gen. Telford Taylor, who was chief of counsel for the war crimes trials in Neurmberg. Less than 6 months ago, General Taylor declared:

STALIN PLAYED SMARTER

"If the Germans failed to measure up to what one might have hoped for in denazification, our own neglect of the reeducation program has been ever more disastrous. Indeed, each failure contributed to the other. * * * The Germans speedily concluded that reeducation was not a seriously intended program and that most of our talk of democratization was nothing but window-dressing."

Or this, from Emelyn Williams, of the Christian Science Monitor, one of the Nation's great and most respected newspapers, who said:

"All over Germany great sympathy is being shown toward people tried and sentenced as war criminals or as Nazis. Fugitive war criminals are never betrayed to the allied authorities or to the German authorities by the population itself. There are thousands who at times opposed the Nazis who today join the Nazis in opposing democracy."

There is further evidence from reputable American correspondents in Germany that our efforts to organize German youth against communism have failed completely.

A glaring example of our failure in this respect is the program to bring baseball to Germany. The Army spent many thousands of dollars to provide gloves, bats, masks, and other baseball paraphernalia. One American writer said he saw literally mountains of this equipment rotting in German Youth Association clubs.

The fact is that German youths have never played baseball. They don't understand it, and they don't want to. They consider it sissy—just as they regard the free cokes and the Mickey Mouse movies sent to Germany at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Stalin has played a smarter game. To him, German kids are German kids. In eastern Germany, he has reorganized the very successful Hitler youth group—the jugend—and has renamed the Freie Deutsch Jugend. A lad joining the FDJ is given a badge and a natty blue uniform, and as in the Hitler days, he and his fellows parade through the streets goose-stepping to the tune of a military band.

To the young German of today, that is real fun. It reminds him of the days when his father, Hermann, and his uncle, Otto, strutted so proudly in their SS uniforms.

One high American youth official put it this way:

DENAZIFY IN FACT

"The little youth work we are doing is based on the occupation directive to make German kids forget the regimentation of the Hitler regime and to think, pray, and live like American kids.

"We are forbidden to discuss current politics, and open mention of the Soviet Union would be against State Department policy. Our program is similar to the Boy Scouts or the YMCA."

We may dislike Soviet Russia's methods, and we may abhor their willingness to embrace the rudiments of Hitlerism in dealing with German youth. But the fact remains that they are outstripping us in their dealings with the young people of Germany. We must admit that sovietism is far more acceptable to German youth than the brand of democracy we are attempting to sell them.

We must not forget that it was Hitler, the god of the Nazis, the so-called defender of Europe against communism, who made a deal with Soviet Russia. His followers, if encouraged, will build a renazified Germany that might well make a similar deal with Russia—the more so because the Soviet Union can offer Germany the markets and the raw

materials which the West cannot promise her.

What can we do?

We can insist that our Government take appropriate and decisive action leading toward denazification of Germany in fact. We must take effective action to strengthen every democratic force in Germany. We must see to the removal of all supporters of nazism from key positions in the administrative, political, and educational life of Germany.

We must halt the concentration of power in the hands of a few German industrialists.

We must assure for Germany an adequate standard of living, but at the same time, we must provide impregnable barriers against Germany ever again becoming an aggressor.

In the words of President Truman, we must prove by "hard work and practical demonstration, that free men can create for themselves a good society, in which they can live together at peace and advance their common welfare."

America's veterans cannot forget what they saw as our victorious troops moved into the heart of the Reich. They can never forget the terrible price we paid in the crusade to crush Hitlerism.

NO THIRD WORLD WAR

Today, 5 years after, veterans insist that there must be no renascence of nazism. They demand a realistic and effective acceleration of our program of national security, of military preparedness, and of democratic education and progress.

We must assist western Germany by material aid and spiritual support to gain a government wherein its citizens have the fundamental freedoms. But, meanwhile, we must by a show of force beforehand, serve notice of our intention to brook no arrogant dreams of world conquest by any ism.

There must be no third world war. Above all, there must be no more Dachaus or Buchenwalds.

And in conclusion, on this, the Fourth of July, it is appropriate to refer to an eternal verity of foreign policy, as enunciated by the great George Washington:

"Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it?"

It is a policy of truth and value—of an infinite worth that "time cannot wither or custom stale."

Policy Toward Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Turn Formosa Over to the UN," which appeared in the Des Moines Register for August 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S TURN FORMOSA OVER TO THE UN

At the first shock of the Communist invasion of Korea, President Truman was compelled to act hastily and drastically. In order to preserve the faith of the world in organized law and decent principles, he decided to go to the defense of the South Korean Government militarily. In order to protect our flanks in Asia, meanwhile, he froze the status of Formosa—preventing both provocative attacks by the Chiang Kai-shek government against Communist China on the mainland and new aggression by the Communists against Formosa. He also promised support in the fight against communism in both Indochina and the Philippines.

The Register defended all these steps as emergency expedience. The United Nations Organization promptly endorsed the defense of Southern Korea. But it has taken no action—and has not been asked to take any action—with respect to Formosa.

In our judgment this is now the weakest link in our Asia policy, and as we have said in other editorials of recent weeks, United Nations study and action with respect to Formosa is urgently needed. The American "ultimatum" regarding this island refuge of the Chinese Nationalist Government smacks altogether too much of the kind of "imperialism" which the Communists are exploiting throughout the Asiatic continent.

The real danger is even greater than the mere psychological one.

While our present Formosan policy remains unilateral and lacks the support of other nations in the UN, it is almost an invitation to the Communists to draw us into a trap. All that the Chinese Reds have to do is to send a boatload of soldiers out toward Formosa, let the American naval forces there sink the ship, and then announce to the world that we have "attacked" Communist China.

This could easily release a couple of million armed Chinese Communists into Korea, Indochina, or anywhere else the Moscow strategists wanted to send them. And it would bog us down in an impossible quarrel about who was the aggressor, to say nothing of the military weight that it would throw against us.

The reason that a quarrel about the aggressor would probably ensue is that the other members of the United Nations are nothing like as united on our Formosa policy as they were about Korea. On the contrary, it is not impossible that our Formosa declaration as it stands would be repudiated by the United Nations majority.

The fact is that the Chiang Kai-shek regime commands no more respect, even among our potential allies in Asia, than it does in our own State Department. Secretary Acheson certainly could not have been in favor of our Formosa commitment on political grounds, judging from his previous attitude; he no doubt acquiesced in it for the obvious military reasons, as most of the rest of us were disposed to do.

India, just to cite one example, is desperately important to us as a moral ally in this struggle against communism. Prime Minister Nehru is essentially on our side, and he is the spiritual leader of most of the millions of Asiatics who have not yet been swallowed up by communism. But he knows that the Chiang regime had become intolerable to the Chinese people, and he would probably say that the sooner the corrupt Nationalist Government ceases to exist as an influence in the world, the better. So he will surely refuse to have any part in our protection of the Chiang clique on Formosa—no matter how good we think our reasons are.

Even Great Britain herself is in an embarrassing dilemma regarding this. British has offered to recognize the Chinese Communist government. She has vast interests in China through which she can maintain a contact between the Western World and the new China if they are not expropriated. She also holds the key to trade and communications in all south China, through the island of Hong Kong. So Britain certainly will not want to jeopardize her whole position in Asia by risking independent action in the Formosan Straits.

Even France itself, harassed by Communists as it is in Indochina, has been indirectly embarrassed by our Formosa policy—which is being used in Indochina as further proof that the western powers have ganged up against self-determination for the Asiatics.

What are we to do in the face of all this?

We dare not let the Communists take over Formosa, because it would expose our defense lines between the Philippines and Korea. Yet if the Reds decide to precipitate a struggle for Formosa, we may be without allies and repudiated by a large part of the world.

The solution, we repeat, seems to us to be to throw the whole question of Formosa into the United Nations' lap just as fast as possible.

The UN clearly is not going to act capriciously in a situation as complicated and fraught with peril as this one.

Yet to have the UN studying the situation would take the heat from us before irreparable damage can be done to our whole Asian policy.

Our naval vessels in the Formosan Straits would then at least have the virtue of defending a temporary UN trusteeship, rather than backing a discredited refugee government.

We Have No More Time To Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when it became readily apparent in the postwar period that the Soviet Union had no intention of cooperating for world peace I strongly urged that we adopt a system of universal military training as one of the keystones in our arch of national security.

In a speech to the House on January 26, 1948, I called for the immediate enactment of universal military training, even though I had previously opposed any form of peacetime conscription, because it was clear to me that we could no longer regard ourselves as actually at peace. I termed universal military training a basic necessity in our national-security program, and, at the same time, I called for a vastly increased Air Force program, as recommended by the President's Commission on Air Policy, a highly efficient intelligence organization, continuous scientific research and development, industrial-mobilization planning, and real unification of the Armed Forces.

I pointed out that the continuing threat of war posed by the attitude of Russia required readiness on the part of large bodies of men to meet the attack, no matter what its form or direction. I said:

This will require large numbers of trained men organized into Reserve units. True, we could expand the size of our Regular Army to provide these men, but this would require that practically the whole Nation be under arms constantly. To maintain such a large number of men in Reserve units it is my opinion that universal military training, which will give the rudiments of training to our young men for 6 months, then require that they join one of our Reserve Armed

Forces units and train with it for a certain period is essential and necessary.

At the same time, I was deeply concerned with the effectiveness of our Reserve program, particularly the Army Reserve program. It was obvious, if we adopted any program designed solely to provide manpower for our Reserves, that our Reserve program must be extremely well-organized and efficiently run. Reiterating my support of universal military training, I said, in a speech to the House on May 6, 1948:

If we take seriously the recommendations of every responsible military leader since Washington, namely, that the principle underlying our Military Establishment is a comparatively small Regular Establishment supported by well-trained citizen reserves, then we must provide a steady flow of trained men into the civilian components from the bottom as attrition reduces their strength from the top. I know of no other way this can be accomplished except by a system of universal military training.

But as I said on the floor of this House on April 2, "We cannot support UMT blindly. We recognize that it will not provide defense in and of itself but only as it contributes to the strength of the civilian components which it supplies. It would be useless to pass this legislation unless we are assured that our Reserve program is a sound, well-managed, and cohesive part of an intelligent whole."

In this same speech, I pointed out the then-existing grave deficiencies in our Reserve program, and I attempted to show that the excuses offered by the then Secretary of the Army for its ineffectiveness were scarcely valid. Subsequently, improvements in the Reserve program were made, but not until a great deal of enthusiasm on the part of the officers and men had been lost and not until much precious time had been wasted. We are paying the price today, as we call up under-strength and inadequately trained Reserve units, for the errors of omission committed then.

I call your attention to these facts, Mr. Speaker, not for the purpose of recrimination, but in the hope that they will provide an insight into the problems facing us today. I am firmly of the opinion, in this time of crisis, that we need to look forward instead of back, and that mistakes made in the past have no bearing upon the present unless they serve as pitfalls to be avoided in the future. The fact that a universal military program was not established and the fact that our Reserve program, for too long a period, suffered from gross neglect were tragic mistakes, in my opinion, and they should be reflected upon seriously so that we may avoid similar ones in the days and years ahead.

Our principal concern, then, should be: What course of action shall we pursue today? I, for one, do not believe Congress should stay out of session a single day until it has solved satisfactorily the problem of providing this Nation with the methods by which it can achieve a high degree of military preparedness. And surely, the problem of providing trained manpower for our Armed Forces and the building up of those forces is a vital ingredient in any preparedness program.

Not one of us knows, of course, what the next day, or month, or year will bring. It appears now, however, that we must prepare for at least two major eventualities: First, all-out war with Russia when and if that nation decides the time is ripe for her fatal move; and second, continuing peripheral warfare, of the nature of the Korean war, at the points of friction between Russia and the free world. Either happening requires that no time be lost now in providing training for the men who will be called to the defense of our country. We are far below our needs now; particularly and urgently we require trained ground forces.

How shall we provide these trained ground forces as quickly and as rapidly as possible? We can assume and hope that this problem is being urgently considered by our military leaders, and that a proposed solution will be advanced soon. In the meantime, I believe it is a problem to which we should all devote our utmost energies, because the solution is long overdue.

I firmly believe that our basic principle of a Regular Establishment, expanded now to meet immediate needs, supported by a large, well-trained citizenry reserve, available for call-up and immediate intensified training to meet whatever crisis confronts us in the future, should underly any solution which might be adopted.

At present, our policy appears to be to enlarge our Regular Establishment as rapidly as possible by calling up Reserve units, National Guard units, and by supplying new manpower through selective service and enlistments for the Regular forces. This is certainly necessary, if a realistic view of the present situation is taken. Our Regular Establishment must certainly be increased in size now, and it is entirely possible that it may have to be expanded beyond limits which no man can presently foresee. We cannot quarrel with this policy. It is a policy forced upon us by the march of events and by our unpreparedness. We shall soon be forced to consider, however, a program beyond this.

It seems to me we have two major alternatives:

First, we can continue the policy of increasing the size of our Regular Establishment as rapidly as facilities for training and housing become available, until we have a force in being of a size to meet any possible need.

The objection to this course, however, is that our possible needs are so great that we would require a vast Regular Establishment, a virtual nation constantly under arms, seriously disrupting the production of war goods by draining manpower from industry and actually harmful to our real national security. At the same time, we would lose a considerable period of time while we prepared facilities and procedures for the reception of such a large force.

As a second alternative we can continue the building of our Regular Establishment to meet immediate and short-term needs as they are determined by our military leaders, backing our Regular forces, however, with greatly increased and better-prepared citizen Reserves. With an enlarged Reserve program on a more realistic basis, we can remove the critical time lag, should our needs become greater, between the calling up of men and their readiness for combat. The secret of the effectiveness of Reserve forces is the cutting of the time needed for basic training, specialist and unit training, and the organization and equipping of units. Such a program would interfere far less with the production of war goods. We have the framework for such a program now, but the crying need is for its expansion, an increase in the tempo of its training, and the assignment to it of the best military planners and administrators available.

It is this second alternative—a Regular force supported by a vastly increased, efficiently operated Reserve, trained with imagination and zeal, and receiving the devoted attention of our top military brains—which I believe best represents our safest and most practical course in the situation confronting us, and which we will adopt sooner or later.

Such a program, however, depends, like practically every defense activity, upon manpower. It was for this purpose that universal military training was proposed, since the major objective of UMT is to channel basically trained men into Reserve units for further specialized training. The enormity of the mistake made in not establishing this program, when time was on our side, is now apparent.

I believe that we should not only seek to repair that mistake by establishing universal military training now, but there is a grave question in my mind, until we have fully manned Reserve units, organized under a master plan and engaged in accelerated training, whether we can afford the luxury of the months and months it will take to establish, organize, and put into action a universal-military-training program. Until such a program begins turning out basically trained men for our Reserve forces we are faced with a serious time lag, which might prove disastrous in the critical days ahead. We should consider seriously whether an immediate stopgap program, designed to fit the seriousness of our present situation, should be put into action at once and remain in effect until we can get a universal-military-training program in operation.

It is for this reason that I advance, for the consideration of the Members, a plan of action proposed by a Reserve officer in my district. This officer is Capt. Talbot Peterson, an Armored Cavalry officer, and commanding officer of a Reserve reconnaissance company stationed at Appleton, Wis., who has devoted much time and thought to the whole Reserve problem. I might say, parenthetically, that it has been my good fortune, as a Member of Congress, to have in my district a group of Reserve officers and men, of whom Captain Peterson is one, who have never lost their faith in the basic need for a sound Reserve program in spite of the difficulties they have faced and the disappointments they have encountered in organizing and building up their units. This Nation owes a debt of

gratitude to men like these, many of whom will shortly be called once more to serve their country in battle, for their foresight and courage during a period when many others chose to close their eyes to the realities of the world situation. Under leave to extend my remarks I include at this point Captain Peterson's plan for bringing up our Reserve units to full strength with the least possible delay:

A PLAN FOR BRINGING UP TO FULL STRENGTH ALL NATIONAL GUARD DIVISIONS, ARMY RESERVE DIVISIONS, AND SUPPORTING UNITS OF BOTH

I. GENERAL

(A) Serious situations require serious action. The present world situation shows us we are short of ground forces to meet any present move by the U. S. S. R. Our only reserve of units is found in the Army Reserve and the National Guard. The National Guard divisions, are, in general, at somewhat less than half strength. Reserve divisions are a cadre only (all officers and about 10 percent of enlisted strength).

(B) To call all guard divisions to active duty, unless the situation becomes much more serious, and to break up all Reserve divisions and send them to Regular Army or guard divisions on active duty, would place a huge burden on our manpower resources and our already burdensome national debt.

(C) Because National Guard divisions are under the control of the States and are subject to orders from the Governors which might not fit with Army orders, all National Guard divisions and units should be placed at once under Federal control.

(D) Because speed is all important, September 1 is the date suggested for start of plan, and December 1 is target date to have all units at full strength, on orders, in training, or present for drill meetings.

(E) This plan will, in no way, slow down plans to draft men, to fill up Regular Army units or National Guard units, or stop the calling of any units or personnel involved.

(F) Although it is against the policy of the Army to have full divisions from any one State due to possible heavy casualties from one area, the present situation calls for getting men in units now and training them as much as possible, and letting any other worries work themselves out at a later date, such as changing men from one division to the next when they are ordered to active duty. (It might be added, in passing, that British units are organized from one area and called as such. The spirit of the unit, therefore, is outstanding, and losses from these units were not above the national average.)

(G) Changes can be made, replacing officers within the divisions if they prove unfit, and the Army can move units from one area to another (such as changing an Army Reserve regiment into a part of a National Guard division and vice versa).

II. PRESENT STRENGTH AND STATUS

(A) National Guard: Not called to active duty at this time are 21 National Guard divisions and many combat teams and support units scattered over the 48 States. They are assumed to be at somewhat less than half of the 18,000-man strength for infantry divisions.

(B) Army Reserve: There are 23 Army Reserve divisions in being and hundreds of support units and supply units. The majority of these units are filled with about 10 percent of enlisted strength and 95 percent of officer strength.

III. MANPOWER REQUIRED

(A) To fill 21 National Guard divisions to full strength, about 10,000 men per infantry division, or 210,000 men, will be required.

(B) To fill 23 Reserve divisions (16 infantry, 4 armored, and 4 airborne), about 15,000 men per division (infantry), or about a total of 345,000 men, will be required.

(C) To fill up the required Reserve and National Guard support and supply units which are required to supply (if called), Regular Army units as well, about 500,000 men. This group will go into Reserve and National Guard units of the following types: Separate small combat units, artillery, QM units, MP units, bands, medical units, truck transport companies, MI, AGD, and separate antiaircraft battalions.

(D) The full requirements will, therefore, be a total of 1,055,000 drafted men or enlistees. The State quotas will depend on required "fillers" needed for units within each State.

IV. THE PIPELINE

(How they are called, processed, assigned)

(A) The senior Army officer in each State, appointed by each Army commander of the five armies in the United States, will be told what units within the State will be "filled." He in turn from the National Guard and Army Reserve instructors in each town will receive a list of the number of men needed in that town to fill up the units he has ordered to full strength.

(B) The draft board in each town will then receive their orders from the State headquarters, giving the number of men to be "pulled" from their area for duty with these units. In the meantime, each unit will make every effort to recruit as many men as possible for their unit. These enlistees will be processed at a local level.

(C) As soon as a man is drafted or signs up with a unit he meets the commanding officer of his unit, is assigned to a unit position, and is then sent for a month of training at centers established within each Army area. At this camp Regular Army personnel and National Guard and Army Reserve officers and men (who will be there on short tours of active duty) will see these men receive the following:

1. Basic training, with the main training on subjects that cannot be handled in their own units at home station (firing of weapons, squad, platoon tactics, demonstrations of fire power of artillery, tanks, etc.).

2. An understanding of the Army, its organization, ranks, and the reasons why they are there and what they must learn to fit them with speed for duty at home station with their units.

3. Uniforms, dress and field, and weapon-rifle, or carbine depending on their position in home unit. These they will take with them upon return to home station, and they will be placed in home armory.

(D) Upon return to home station after month at camp, they will report to commanding officer of their unit and receive instructions as to drill nights at home station, time, place and SOP that will govern unit.

V. HOME TRAINING WITH UNITS

(A) A master training plan will be made by Army under which each unit of each type will carry out the same training. Before "fillers" return, the cadre, in the case of reserve units, and officers and men of guard units will prepare to receive the new men and carry out the assigned training.

(B) All units will meet four times per month. Drafted or new men will be at each meeting, or else they will be faced with a call to active duty. Sickness or death in family or a marriage will be the only reasons for nonattendance. Work will not be used as a reason for absence at drill.

(C) As well as covering basic subjects with new men, field problems will be worked and a liaison maintained between all units of a town for joint use of space, joint use of facilities, joint use of special weapons, and joint use of instruction given by an expert in a given field. Two weeks of summer training (in the field) will be required.

(D) Attention will be given to local defense problems, especially in the case of antiaircraft units against air attack, MP and MI and CIC units against sabotage, and all other units except medical against riots, paratroop landings, etc. Local units will join for parades, etc.

(E) Shortage of officers will be met by assignment of ROTC officers to units, and the appointment of top grade NCO's to officer positions. All other NCO promotions will be based on ability and an Army wide plan.

(F) Pay will be handled through regular Army Reserve and National Guard channels as at present.

VI. SUPPLIES, SPACE, TRAINING AIDS

(A) Armory space will be in short demand. In good weather, training will have to be conducted outside as much as possible. In cold or wet weather, if too crowded, extra space will have to be rented or taken over by the Army for training space. Again, the seriousness of the situation dictates action no matter how it will have to be worked out in the field at a local level.

(B) As much equipment as can be spared and is on hand will be placed with units despite proper storage facilities. This includes field pieces, tanks, jeeps, etc. They are sitting in the open in Army depots now—they might as well be sitting outside in town where they can be used in training of Reserve and guard units and be on hand in case of need. Antiaircraft units will receive full share of equipment, and all units will be equipped with all personal weapons and as many crew-served weapons as can be spared for training.

VII. GENERAL

This general plan will give the Nation a ground force in being, that can be called to training camps with full strengths of men and start unit training for combat duty, in a short period of time. If by December 30, 1950, this force was on hand, and we were at full war with Russia, we would have saved at least 3 to 4 months of time in organizing and training these units and men.

It will also give the Army over a million men who will have received some training as against a million men with no training, and it will give them at less than one-tenth of the cost.

Antiaircraft units, MP units, QM units, truck companies, signal, CID, ADG, TC units, and medical units would, under this plan be able to start operation at once upon call to active duty and be able to support our combat forces overseas. This would save months and months of training, and, if full war breaks out, time is not going to be a thing we can waste a lot of.

Drafted men to serve in these units will be drafted for the same length of time, as those drafted into Regular Army direct (which will be for duration no matter what it might say on the books).

A suggested plan such as this must not get all bogged down with red tape. Unit commanders of the various NG and Army Reserve units have some brains and can work out small problems themselves without waiting for a pile of orders and plans from the Army headquarters. This suggested plan is the same as the Legion UMT but it is conditioned to meet the times, and situation, which calls for speed. It is also based on most limited knowledge of the British Army system at present in being. It actually is a creation of a part-time Army to back up our full-time Army.

Speed is the important thing here, directed by the situation and the need for full strength ground units in the Reserve and guard.

TALBOT PETERSON,
Captain, Armored Cavalry USAR.

As can be seen, the essence of Captain Peterson's plan is to provide now,

through great reliance on the resourcefulness and energy of our present Reserve officer and enlisted personnel, for the immediate building up of our Reserve forces, both National Guard and ORC, by speeded-up training within the Army areas. In the critical months ahead, it would have the obvious merit, as Captain Peterson points out, of providing a million men with some training as contrasted with the needs of these units for a million men today—none of whom have trained at all.

Captain Peterson would be the last to claim, I believe, that his proposal is complete, or that there are no difficulties in it which would have to be overcome. Obviously, there are many details and questions of policy which would have to be settled before such a plan could go into operation. The problem, for instance, of how to devise an equitable draft to channel men simultaneously into both the Regular Establishment and Reserve units would have to be solved.

The important thing, however, about Captain Peterson's suggestion is that it is A plan. It is a plan at a time when we do not have one, and at a time when, it seems to me, we are badly in need of a program, operating now, to make up our grave deficiencies in trained ground forces. But, whether it be this plan or another Mr. Speaker, I urge the membership to devote its best efforts to the immediate solution of this problem. We have no more time to waste.

Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution adopted by the Mason-McCauley Post, No. 6688, of the American Legion of Chattooga County, Ga., on the fourth day of August, 1950.

The resolution is self-explanatory:

Whereas our Nation is now facing a grave crisis and deep responsibility rests upon its leaders to make decisions concerning our future life; and

Whereas the VFW Mason-McCauley Post, No. 6688, of Chattooga County, Ga., is vitally interested in our Nation's safety and security; and

Whereas the members of this post, some 400 strong, having fought in previous wars to secure our Nation's safety, are desirous that the leaders of our military force maintain our military strength sufficient to resist any aggressor; and

Whereas our Congressman HENDERSON L. LANHAM has taken a strong position opposing Secretary of Defense Johnson's continuance in office; and

Whereas the members of Mason-McCauley Post fully believe that Hon. HENDERSON L. LANHAM'S position is correct, and further believe that the Secretary of Defense has failed to carry forward and maintain our Nation's security; and

Whereas we further believe that he has led the American people into a sense of false security by stating that America was ready for any form of aggression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Mason-McCauley Post, hereby commend Congressman HENDERSON L. LANHAM in his stand and opposition to Mr. Johnson's continuance in office. We wish to urge our Congressman to maintain his vigorous opposition to Secretary of Defense Johnson's continuance in office, and use his influence to see that he is removed and a proper person, or persons, be placed in this responsible position; be it further

Resolved, That copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Mason-McCauley VFW Post, No. 6688, that copy of same be forwarded to Hon. HENDERSON L. LANHAM, that copies be forwarded to Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, United States Senator from Georgia, and to Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, United States Senator from Georgia.

Passed by Mason-McCauley Post this 4th day of August 1950.

JOS. MURPHY,
Post Commander.

Attest:

C. B. BRICKER,
Post Adjutant.

Support the Un-American Activities Committee in Its Effort To Punish Those Who Refuse To Recognize Its Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the House now has under consideration resolutions declaring 58 witnesses, who appeared before the House Un-American Activities Committee and refused to answer questions addressed to them, in contempt of Congress and directing appropriate action to be taken against them.

Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the purpose, intent, and objective of these resolutions. We cannot permit Communists to set at naught the functioning of the Un-American Activities Committee, or any other committee, engaged in conducting hearings for the purpose of ascertaining facts, concerning problems of government, on which Congress wishes to legislate in the public interest. To permit subversive, or any other elements in our country, to defy Congress, or any of its committees engaged in the work of the Congress, would result in making the individual superior to the Government and preclude its functioning in behalf of all the other people of the Nation.

The issue raised by the contempt resolutions now before us is whether these 58 individuals named in the resolutions, and, having records of subversive activities or affiliation with, and membership in organizations that have been recognized as subversive, shall have the right to act contemptously in refusing to recognize the right and authority of government acting through its proper agencies. It is inconceivable that any true or loyal American would claim such a right. It is time that we put these Communist and subversive elements where they belong. They have been coddled too long. They have taken advantage of the rights and privileges of free America to teach a godless religion and a theory of government that would destroy the fundamental principles upon which the Government of ours was founded. It is time for America to awake and demand that all within our gates shall be loyal to America and not to a foreign government that seeks to destroy us.

The Safety of Our Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette Daily Magazine for August 8, 1950, and also two letters with reference thereto:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette Daily Magazine of August 8, 1950]

PITTSBURGHESQUE—WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN

(By Charles F. Danver)

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
Old House Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hate to bother you when you're so busy, but I wonder if you would do me a favor? If possible, I would like you to send me one machine gun, several hundred rounds of ammunition, and an easy book of instructions.

My reason for wanting these things is that I'm getting uneasy about the way the big shots down there in Washington are looking out the window for votes while the bad kid from next door builds a fire under the piano. I feel that it's up to me to do something now to protect my home when the Russians reach Pittsburgh.

Of course, my home really isn't mine. It's just a modest apartment that I pay rent for in somebody else's building. But my wife has it fixed up real nice. We just had it all painted and papered and the new stove and refrigerator are almost paid for, and I'd hate to have to give it up without a fight.

If I had the machine gun, I'd feel better. A lot of fellows here go in for hunting, so, of course, they'll have their rifles and shotguns to fire at the Soviet tanks. But it looks like most of us will just have to use sticks and stones or whatever we can pick up in a hurry to protect our women and kids.

I'll need the book of instructions because I don't know anything about a machine gun, or any other kind of gun, for that matter. In the first war they had me waving semaphore flags and tapping a blinker-light key down at the Lewes (Del.) Naval Base, and the Navy wouldn't take me the last time because they said I was too old. So I never did get a chance to learn to shoot a gun—just like a lot of our boys who will soon have to die.

But I think the janitor and I can handle it all right, if we have the book of instructions. He was in the Army once, I believe, and he's handy with tools, anyway. I figure on setting it up on the roof, which will be the best place when the Commies come down Maple Terrace from Grandview Avenue.

I realize you may have a hard time finding me a machine gun because the Government got rid of most of that stuff after the

last war, and never did replace it because Stalin was a good old Joe, like President Truman said, and never intended any harm to anybody. Still, maybe the generals in the Pentagon might be able to recall where there's one buried that you could dig up. If it's a little rusty, that won't matter because our janitor is pretty good at fixing things up.

Again let me apologize for bothering you. But the way I look at it, it could happen any day now, and I decided that I ought to do something. If a fellow just sits back these days and doesn't do anything to protect his own home, who will? Hoping to hear from you real soon, I am,

Anxiously,

CHARLES F. DANVER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *August 8, 1950.*

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
Old House Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I'm not making any apologies about writing to you, because, when we elect some one to any political office, we expect to have them do something for us, and for our country when it is necessary, and at the present time I feel that it is very necessary that some one with some intestinal fortitude does just that.

I have talked with your secretary, and she advised writing to you, so now I'm doing just that.

When I read Mr. Dauver's column this morning, I thought he expressed exactly what is in the minds of any thinking person.

I lost a son in World War II and I'm glad I don't have to live through that agony again.

I want you to read this letter, Mr. FULTON, and publish it if you want to.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. W. T. McNALLY.

REGISTRATION COMMISSIONERS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 8, 1950.

Mr. CHARLES F. DANVER,
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR CHARLES: Your Tuesday column on the unnamed subject The Safety of Our Homes is one of the best articles I have ever read.

It is amazing the number of people in this supposedly well-protected Nation of ours whose daily thoughts, whose expressions, whose fears coincide exactly with those effectively expressed in this simple little story of yours.

Very sincerely,

FRED E. OBLEY,
Chairman.

Came Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I note with some interest an article appearing in the Marion (Ind.) News Herald. This little news item, or editorial, is somewhat in answer to a recent special newspaper that was published in Washington, Ind., on the life of our senior Senator, HOMER CAPEHART. Part of the article about Mr. CAPEHART was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I know the Congress will be interested in the News Herald's observation:

CAME BACK

News Herald recently received an eight-page section of the Washington (Ind.) daily paper which was completely devoted to HOMER CAPEHART, who is seeking reelection to the United States Senate from Indiana.

Now we aren't going to scream "propaganda," just because the issue was about CAPEHART, a Republican. It was a darn good paper and did a fine job of outlining CAPEHART's life—poor farm boy, earnest school boy, World War I soldier, traveling salesman, small factory, big factory, United States Senator. The American success pattern. HOMER CAPEHART followed that pattern and he deserves every credit in the world. We do want, however, to make a point—a good point.

One story in that paper—and we believe it—was that, in 1932, HOMER CAPEHART was down to 15 cents for 2 days' lunch. Things did get that bad—the News Herald publisher and his wife once lived on raw apples for 3 days, apples picked off the ground in a country orchard. (It's not a very good way to live.)

Another story was about the 1938 cornfield conference, held on CAPEHART's southern Indiana farms, financed by—CAPEHART. (The cost isn't known, but had to be thousands and thousands of dollars.)

The Democrat Party came into power in 1933, the year after CAPEHART, and all the rest of us, hit rock bottom.

By 1938 CAPEHART appears to have recovered enough financially to have those farms and to pay, personally, for a midwestern cornfield parley attended by thousands of the GOP faithful, all well entertained and well fed.

Those 6 years under the Democrat administration must have been very good ones, indeed.

Hawaii Molds State Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold S. Roberts from the Christian Science Monitor of August 7, 1950:

HAWAII MOLDS STATE CONSTITUTION

(By Harold S. Roberts)

Hawaii has on 16 different occasions petitioned the Congress to grant statehood. Unlike other Territories which have been permitted to come into the Union, beginning with the Northwest Territory in 1787, Hawaii has more than met the qualifications for statehood.

On 37 different occasions since 1920 bills have been introduced in successive sessions of Congress to provide statehood. In the past 15 years there have been nine separate hearings held by congressional committees on the question of statehood for Hawaii.

The Congress has more information and statistical data on Hawaii than on any other Territory previously admitted to the Union. Despite the record, Hawaii is still seeking equality with other States.

The most recent attempt to obtain statehood began by the introduction of an enabling statute by Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON on January 3, 1950. Hawaii has one Delegate to Congress, but without vote. This bill passed the House on March 7, 1950, by a vote of 262 to 110. On July 12 the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, by a vote of 9 to 1, recommended statehood. Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, cast the only negative vote.

ANOTHER AVENUE TRIED

While this bill was going through the congressional mill the Territorial Legislature passed a bill to try another avenue for achieving statehood, should the enabling act procedure fail.

Some 15 States have been admitted to the Union by the alternative procedure of drafting a State constitution and going to Congress, knocking on the door, and asking to be admitted. At the present time Hawaii is launching its campaign for statehood in a two-pronged offensive. The people of the Territory desire to come into the Union as a sovereign State on an equal footing with 35 other Territories previously admitted to statehood.

On Saturday, July 22, 61 delegates affixed their signatures to an historic document—the constitution of the State of Hawaii. The ceremony took place in the throne room at historic Iolani Palace, Honolulu. There was a touch of deep solemnity, offset by the bright Hawaiian flowers and the chanting strains of island music. The ceremony ended with the singing of the Star-Spangled Banner.

The new document is a product of Hawaii and its people. It reflects the thinking of an essentially conservative community, but one that is responsive to changing times and needs. The constitution has borrowed and adopted provisions from the Federal Constitution, the Hawaii Organic Act, the model State constitution, and the constitutions of the other States.

DIFFERENT PRODUCT

Although it has studied and tapped all of the available resources, the final product is unlike that of any other State. It has its own flavor and features which find roots in the problems and needs of the community. Typical of these are the provisions dealing with Hawaiian homelands, the limitations of bonded indebtedness and the use of assessed land valuations to adjust these limits; and the sections dealing with local government, drafted in the light of a centralized tax structure and a coordinated and centralized system of public education.

The basic conservatism of the constitution is reflected in the limited number of elective officials. The governor and lieutenant governor are the only elected officials. The cabinet members and the judges of the courts are appointed by the governor, with the advice and consent of the senate. The members of the board of education are to be appointed by the governor, from panels nominated by the counties. There is no provision for the initiative, referendum, and recall—so popular during the first two decades of the century.

VOTING AGE REDUCED

Although fundamentally conservative, the constitution does contain many progressive features which reflect the forward-looking character of the community. The new constitution provides for the reduction in the voting age from 21 to 20. Only one other State in the Union has a voting age of less than 21. A provision recognizing the right to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining, as a constitutional guaranty, has been included. Only three other State constitutions, Missouri, New Jersey, and New York, provide such constitutional guaranties.

Many features of the document reflect the best current thinking in he field of government. For example, the executive departments of government in the new state are to

be coordinated in no more than 20 major departments, to permit the governor to keep a personal check on the functioning of the executive branch. There are provisions to eliminate the pocket veto. The salaries of the governor, the judges, and members of the legislature have been increased to attract the best qualified men to office. The salaries compare favorably with the highest 10 States of the Union.

Provision is made for post-audits of State expenditures, as well as a requirement that the legislature pass the general appropriations bill before passing other finance bills. This may prevent the last-minute rush so typical of many legislative sessions, which makes it difficult to give careful scrutiny to final drafts of bills and leads to political logrolling and deals.

HEAVY VOTER TURN-OUT

In many other respects recognition is given to practices which are conducive to good government; Hawaii is conscious, however, that good government is more a product of the people of the community than of the written document which forms its base.

The 63 delegates, elected by the people at primary and general elections last February 11 and March 21, began their official task on April 4. Although the campaign was run on a nonpartisan basis (there were no party designations on the ballot), there was a heavy turn-out of voters. In excess of 80 percent of the registered voters cast their ballots. Of those elected, approximately one-third had never run for an elective office before.

For many of the delegates it will be their one and only campaign. These men and women were attracted by the nature of the job to be done. Writing a constitution for a new State comes but once in a lifetime. On the other hand, some of the newcomers may well try their wings in the political arena. No American community can overlook "new blood" for its political melting pot. Federal, State, and local government must continue to attract the best from all segments of the community.

The delegates, elected from all parts of the territory, represented a broad cross section of the community. Among the 63 delegates were two pineapple company presidents, two union representatives, a judge of the circuit court, two former attorneys general, a member of the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii, the superintendent of public instruction, one physician, two dentists, the speaker and vice-speaker of the Territorial House of Representatives, four members of the Territorial senate, a number of schoolteachers, and others. Of the five women who won seats, two are attorneys, two are housewives, and one is a member of the Territorial legislature.

Racially, the convention contained 27 Caucasians, 20 Japanese-Americans, 11 Hawaiians, and 5 Chinese-Americans; generally representative of the population. Politically there were 29 Republicans, 21 Democrats, and 13 nonpartisans.

PROVISIONS FOR ELECTION

Should the Congress pass the enabling act in its present form, the constitution could be submitted to the people for ratification at the general elections in November. H. R. 49 provides that an election be held within 60 to 120 days after the passage of the enabling act. If the constitution is ratified by the people, it will be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Congress for approval. If Congress approves the ratified constitution, the people will then proceed to elect the State officers and two United States Senators and Members to the House of Representatives. Should the voters or the Congress fail to ratify the constitution, the delegates to the 1950 convention will have to reconvene to draft another constitution that will meet the objections of the Congress or those of the people.

Should the Congress fail to pass H. R. 49, the Constitution will be submitted to the next session of the Territorial legislature. The legislature may not change the constitution. It may, however, draft an alternative. The people will then have the choice of voting for the constitution drafted by the delegates elected by them, the one drafted by the legislature, if any, or neither. If the people reject the constitution, the convention has to reconvene to draft a new document. If the people approve the document, it will be submitted to the Congress with a request for direct admission into the Union.

HAWAII AT DOOR

In the meantime, Hawaii knocks at the door for statehood. It alone of the Territories that have shown their ability for democratic self-government, the ability to finance their own operations and to support our free institutions, has been denied equality of rights with the other States. Unlike Puerto Rico, which elects its own governor and pays no Federal taxes to the United States, Hawaii, which was a free republic when it entered into a mutual agreement with the United States in 1900 and has paid in over $1,000,000,000 in taxes to the Federal Government and paid close to $90,000,000 in 1949, is denied the right to elect its own governor, has no voting representation in Congress, and is denied the right to vote for the President of the United States.

If taxation without representation was tyranny in the middle of the eighteenth century, it is no less so in the middle of the twentieth.

Hawaii, the meeting place of the cultures of the east and west, a dynamic outpost of democracy in the Pacific, waits impatiently for recognition of more than a half century of democratic progress. It is ready and willing to assume its responsibility in the new Pacific era. Admission of Hawaii into the Union now would, in the words of the Senate committee: "* * * give notice to all the world, and particularly to the peoples of the Pacific at this critical juncture of international affairs, that it is the policy of the United States to provide self-government among all the peoples without political, economic, racial or other distinction."

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

Both major parties have, in the past 10 years, included statehood for Hawaii in their platforms. Hawaiians say it is high time to transform these promises into political realities.

The constitutional convention was democracy in action. The delegates convened on April 4, adopted rules of procedure, elected officers, set up 20 working committees, and began their deliberations. Members indicated their preference for committee assignments on the basis of interest and special technical qualifications. The committees ranged in size from 5 to 15 members; they studied all of the proposals introduced by the individual delegates; invited experts in the special fields under consideration, and held public hearings.

Unlike many political conventions, and for that matter different from the convention which drafted our own Federal Constitution, all of the committee meetings were open to the public, press, and radio. A weekly report was prepared by the committee on submission and information which was distributed to many community groups, which in turn made copies available to constituent members. Four radio stations provided time during the week for summaries of the work of the convention. The press provided good daily coverage.

REPORT SUBMITTED

As each committee completed its deliberations, it submitted a detailed report setting forth the scope and character of the problem before it and the results of its work. At the conclusion of each report was a proposal which contained the specific language recommended by the committee for incorporation in the proposed constitution. Copies were duplicated for all the delegates, the press and community groups which desired them. These standing committees' reports were then placed on the calendar for full consideration and debate.

To provide the maximum flexibility and informality of discussion, most of the debate on the reports was held in committee of the whole. Through full and free discussion (completely open to the press and public), by amendments and suggestions from the floor, the committee proposals and recommendations were dissected, paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence, and occasionally word by word.

Unlike the deliberations of many legislative bodies, proposals underwent substantial modification on the floor. The debates were frequently intense, sometimes acrimonious. On the whole, however, the discussions were on a high plane, directed toward the basic issues under consideration. One rather unusual feature of the deliberations, and a tribute to the delegates, lies in the fact that at no time was it necessary to place a limitation on debate. The rules made ample provision for such limitation, but they were never put to use.

Ample time was provided to give each of the respective chairmen of the committee of the whole to prepare his report and recommendation, which was then presented to the delegates for adoption. The reports and proposals so approved were then sent to the committee on style for arrangement and form. The style committee was under specific instruction to confine its work to form and style and was prohibited from making any change of a substantive character. It could, and did, however, call attention to discrepancies, omissions, or conflict, and report to the convention for further instructions or action.

SEQUENCE GIVEN

The style committee then resubmitted each of the articles to the convention for approval and adoption on form and style. The articles were again sent to the style committee for final arrangement and review of all of the sections into an integrated and cohesive document. As finally adopted, the provisions of the Constitution are arranged in the following sequence:

Preamble.
Adoption of Federal Constitution.
Article 1, Bill of Rights.
Article 2, Suffrage and Elections.
Article 3, The Legislature.
Article 4, The Executive.
Article 5, The Judiciary.
Article 6, Taxation and Finance.
Article 7, Local Government.
Article 8, Public Health and Welfare.
Article 9, Education.
Article 10, Development and Conservation of Resources.
Article 11, Hawaiian Home Lands.
Article 12, Organization, Collective Bargaining.
Article 13, State Boundaries, Capital, Flag.
Article 14, General and Miscellaneous Provisions.
Article 15, Revisions and Amendments.
Article 16, Schedule:
(a) Representative districts.
(b) Transitional laws.
(c) First officers, election procedures.

ONE-HUNDRED-AND-TEN-DAY CONVENTION

The convention lasted 110 calendar days. Actually there were 78 days devoted to plenary sessions. At other times there were committee meetings, hearings, and preparation of committee reports. During the preliminary period of committee work there were, on the average, 20 to 30 meetings each week occupying in excess of 40 hours of work.

No verbatim transcript was kept of the deliberations of the standing committees.

Each committee did keep a brief summary in the form of minutes, and these were available to the other delegates. These minutes will also be part of the record to be kept in the archives with other official documents.

The convention did keep a complete verbatim transcript by means of electronic tape recordings of all the session after April 9. Over 365 reels of recording tape were used, or about 87 miles of recording tape. It has been estimated that approximately 5,000,000 words were spoken during the floor debates. Only 14,000, however, found a place in the Constitution. Of these, approximately 4,000 are in the schedule which describes the political districts to be used in the initial elections and for subsequent reapportionment every 10 years.

Admission of Korean Veterans to the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by Capitol Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, of Topeka, Kans., on August 3, 1950:

Resolution in relation to the admission to the membership in the American Legion of veterans of the armed conflict in Korea or any further extension thereof

Whereas the Charter of the American Legion, enacted by Congress, approved September 16, 1919, and as amended by Congress October 29, 1942, and July 9, 1946, limits the membership in the American Legion to otherwise eligible veterans of two World Wars between the dates of April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and between the dates of December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945; and

Whereas the American people are cognizant of the fact that all free people throughout the world are being threatened by armed aggression on behalf of the communistic nations; and

Whereas the free peoples of the world joined together and formed the United Nations Conference for the purpose of preserving peace; and

Whereas in direct violation of the duties and obligations assumed by all nations under the United Nations Agreement, the Government of North Korea invaded with armed forces the territory of South Korea; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, under official sanction of the United Nations Conference, sent a military force to the assistance of the South Korea Government; and

Whereas American soldiers, sailors, and marines, many of whom have died or been wounded, are now in active combat for the preservation of peace and free governments of the world; and

Whereas these fighting, wounded, or deceased patriots have given or endangered their health and lives for the same purpose that the soldiers, sailors, and marines fought for during World War I and World War II; and

Whereas the present armed conflict is still confined to Korea, there is great danger that it may spread to all portions of the world; and

Whereas the membership of the American Legion have a close kinship to the present members of our Armed Forces presently engaged in the Korean War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by members of Capitol Post, No. 1, Department of Kansas, That the Department Convention of the American Legion take proper and necessary action to request that the Charter of the American Legion, as enacted and amended by the Congress of the United States, be further amended in an appropriate manner so that the veterans of the present Korean conflict, or any further extension thereof be made eligible for membership in the American Legion.

The above resolution was voted upon at the regular post membership meeting of July 27, 1950, and passed unanimously.

JAMES W. GRAHAM,
Commander, Capitol Post, No. 1.

Attest:

BENJAMIN P. KRENTZ,
Adjutant, Capitol Post, No. 1.

Whereas the Korean situation and Communist activities throughout the entire world has reached the critical stage; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover and other authorities inform us there are thousands of Communists living in America; and

Whereas it is common knowledge and the findings of the highest Court that the overthrow of America is the avowed purpose of every Communist; and

Whereas another Pearl Harbor would undoubtedly be fatal and eventually may be too late: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Capitol Post, No. 1, the American Legion, Department of Kansas, assembled in regular meeting, Thursday, July 27, 1950, That we urge and demand by the Congress of the United States, the immediate passage of S. 2311, known as the Subversive Activities Control Act, 1950; be it still further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution shall be sent to each Member of the Kansas delegation in Congress, and to the leading newspapers and Legion posts in the State of Kansas.

The above resolution was voted upon at the regular post membership meeting of July 27, 1950, and passed unanimously.

JAMES W. GRAHAM,
Commander, Capitol Post, No. 1.

Attest:

BENJAMIN P. KRENTZ,
Adjutant, Capitol Post, No. 1.

Whereas American Army, Air, and Naval Forces are now engaged in combat operations in Korea which have attained the full proportions of a state of war so far as these fighting forces are concerned; and

Whereas the casualties suffered in the fighting are in nowise different from those of a fully declared state of war insofar as their effect upon the fighting men and women involved and their families and dependents are concerned: Now, therefore, be it and it is hereby

Resolved by Capitol Post, No. 1, the American Legion, Department of Kansas, in regular meeting assembled, Thursday, July 27, 1950, That we urge upon the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be required to extend by law to the members of the Armed Forces now in the field or who may hereafter be ordered into the services under the present emergency circumstances, the status of veterans for the purpose of assuring them and their dependents the death, disability, and dependency benefits now applicable to veterans of the great wars.

The above resolution was voted upon at the regular post membership meeting of July 27, 1950, and passed unanimously.

JAMES W. GRAHAM,
Commander, Capitol Post, No. 1.

Attest:

BENJAMIN P. KRENTZ,
Adjutant, Capitol Post, No. 1.

Another Side of the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a group of Alaska workmen have been called unpatriotic because of the work stoppage at Anchorage resulting from a wage dispute. There is another side to this story. The American public is entitled to know that side. Therefore I present here a letter from a constituent who is a resident of Anchorage, the text of a radio talk made by Mr. W. S. Cruthers, member of the Anchorage plumbers and steamfitters local, and text of a newspaper advertisement printed on behalf of Local 367, United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters:

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, *August 8, 1950.*

DEAR DELEGATE BARTLETT: It just came over the radio that President Truman and Chief of Defense Johnson stated the plumbers' strike in Anchorage was delaying defense work.

As our Delegate in Washington, you are entitled to know all about the entire controversy. I am taking it upon myself as an individual member of the plumbers local 367 to send you the enclosed information.

Since the above was printed, we have had two meetings with the local master's association, with a United States mediator sitting in; also, our international representative, Clayton Bilderbach. I was told last night's meeting was not productive of results. Although the plumbers offered some concessions, the masters refused to budge.

At our meeting last Friday night we voted to remove the retroactive clause from the letter sent to the outside contractors; also, sent telegrams asking them to come and meet with our negotiating committee to draw up a contract with or without the local masters.

We are now paid $3 per hour in Anchorage, plus room and board on jobs a certain distance from Anchorage.

We are asking $3.50 per hour due to the high cost of living existing here—an item I am sure you are familiar with.

We have made no other demands, such as paid holidays, paid vacations, old-age pensions, welfare fund, or any of the extras that exist in many contracts in the States.

Fairbanks Association of Master Plumbers and the local there, No. 375, of the plumbers came to an agreement giving the plumbers $3.50 per hour.

While I am writing this as in individual, I will stand by anything I state in this letter.

What most people cannot understand is why the Army will allow four small commercial contractors, who have no defense work, to tie up $100,000,000 in military work.

The outside contractor who has the defense work has an agreement with our international union to comply with all wages and conditions existing in the Territory that he moves into to do work. There being no contract at the present time, we have agreed to make a separate contract with the outside contractors, manning their jobs at the old scale while negotiations are being conducted. Even this offer has not brought results.

AN ADDRESS BY W. S. CRUTHERS OVER RADIO STATION KENI, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, JULY 28, 1950

(Mr. Cruthers is a member of local union No. 367, Plumbers and Steamfitters of the

United Association of America. Also a delegate to the Central Labor Council, and to the Building and Construction Trades Council, of Anchorage.)

Good evening; there are many facts in the present controversy between the Master Plumbers Association and members of the local union 367 of the plumbing and pipefitting industry, which should be brought to the attention of the public. Many people believe that vital construction work of a military nature will be stopped. This is not true.

While negotiations are in progress for a new working agreement, local union 367 has notified all contractors on this type of work that we will continue to man their jobs at the prevailing wage scale, plus retroactive pay from the date the men are dispatched.

The plumbers and steamfitters of Anchorage, local union 367, at their meeting on July 21, 1950, voted to strike on July 26, only those members in good standing for the past 6 months were eligible to vote. This action was founded on the fact that an adequate wage was necessary to carry them through the slack winter months.

Now, the sequence of events leading to this vote date back to March 1947. At that time, Burch-Johnson-Lytle Co., signed an agreement with the Army covering all military construction within the jurisdiction of this local union.

This contract, No. 1000, was a cost-plus-fixed-fee arrangement with the Government. This contract proved to be very unsatisfactory to all groups concerned. Industrial contractors were dissatisfied because this type of work was not open to competitive bidding. The Army was not satisfied because each project undertaken was excessively costly in material, money, and man-hours. Labor disliked the arrangement because wage rates were established in Washington, D. C., and any adjustments necessary because of the ever-increasing high cost of living in the Territory of Alaska were often delayed a year or more.

The members of local union 367, together with members of other crafts in the Building and Construction Trades Council, sought to discover some means by which the welfare of each group concerned could be improved.

In order to induce the Government to award contracts on a competitive basis, labor agreed, temporarily, to accept a lower wage scale than the one prevailing in Anchorage.

In November 1948 the Goverenment called for competitive bids on military construction. In due time these contracts were awarded and the experiment proved successful for two of the groups concerned in this work, leaving the third group, labor, out in the cold.

First. The Army was well pleased because their work was completed months ahead of schedule, and at a great saving in cost, enabling them to obtain more appropriations of money from Congress for other badly needed construction.

Second. That the contractors were well satisfied goes without saying, as witness their eagerness to bid on the contracts awarded for the 1950 construction season.

In almost every instance the successful bidders on the current construction program were awarded the contracts at a figure far below the engineer's estimate, in some cases, nearly 40 percent.

It was stated by a Congressman on the floor of the House of Representatives that a certain type of dwelling on the post had cost $70,000 to build on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. Now we know that this same type of house, using the same amount and kind of material, cost $35,000 under competitive bidding.

Third. Labor was dissatisfied because it found itself in the peculiar position of having to decline a proffered increase of 13 cents an hour, which was granted to all other crafts in the building and construction trades at that time.

Two of the major plumbing and heating contracts for 1949 had already been awarded on bids based on our 1948 wage scale, and to have accepted the increase would have worked a hardship on all plumbing and heating contractors.

Then, in order not to find ourselves in the position we occupied in March 1949, and have to decline another prospective increase in wages so as to protect the interests of the several plumbing contractors, we took the precaution at that time, to notify all prospective bidders that we would recognize the prevailing Anchorage wage scale only in 1950. The experimental wage scale had proved its point and served its purpose, that is, we had agreed, and did work until March 1950, at the 1948 wage scale.

We were approached by all plumbing and heating contractors who contemplated submitting bids on the 1950 construction program for a wage scale on which to base their bid estimates. All were advised that our proposed wage scale was $3.50 per hour, and to submit their bids accordingly. Three of the successful bidders have since notified us that their bids were based on this wage scale.

In January of this year we began our efforts to negotiate a wage agreement for 1950 with the Master Plumbers Association of Anchorage. To date they have made no fair reasonable offer.

To promote harmony within the plumbing and heating industry of Anchorage, the members of local union 367 have worked for a lower wage scale than one consistent with the increases awarded other trade crafts since March 1, 1948. All other crafts received two wage increases since that date.

The chairman of the Master Plumbers Association was credited in the press with the following statement, and I quote, "The constant wage raise demand must be stopped now to prevent jeopardizing the economy of the entire area," end of quote.

What kind of a warped perception of economic science does a man have, when he decries a living wage to a workingman, who spends his entire earnings in the area, and then this man's voice is silent when an absentee employer will take out of the Territory a million or more dollars in profit, from which the area receives no benefit?

I have before me a telegram from Fairbanks, dated July 24, 1950, addressed to our local union 367, which states, "Wage negotiations complete here with the following contractors signed up at the new $3.50-per-hour wage scale."

And then the telegram goes on to name the 12 contractors signatory to the agreement, including the P. S. Lord Co. of Portland, Oreg., one of the biggest companies in the West. The telegram was signed by Carl J. Slatburg, business manager, Plumbers and Steamfitters Local Union No. 375, Fairbanks, Alaska.

This gives the lie to the rumor that was circulated that only two small firms had signed the agreement.

Surely, the Master Plumbers Association of Fairbanks were not unmindful of the economic stability of the territory, but they also were aware, no doubt, that the former wage scale was inadequate.

Many of the men in both districts, and their families, are battling a high cost of living that threatens to go much higher.

In some cases they are paying $125 per month rent for a shack with no modern conveniences, and another $75 per month to heat and light it in the winter months.

Almost all the master plumbers of Anchorage were journeymen plumbers at one time. But apparently they feel they are now in the big league, and can force the journeymen to work for any wage.

They forget that it was the United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters that gave them their present comfortable position. It has long been the policy of our organization to insist that the prime contractor on a project give the plumbing and heating to a legitimate plumbing shop, in order to protect the health of the community.

Organized labor is more than a means for increasing the size of the worker's pay check. It is quite true that the first and primary interest of labor unions has rightly been to give the individual employee strength and security on the job.

However, the value of trade-unions goes far beyond this function. The trade-union movement represents basically the workers' demand for justice in their job relationship. It represents their aspiration for a life in which they have a voice, making their own decisions, and effective opportunity, to share in social progress.

Organized labor has always stood with those who have worked for statehood for Alaska, and now wishes to go one step further and stabilize the economy by working for a 40-hour week.

We feel the action we have taken is in the best interest and welfare of the community. A 40-hour week will have a tendency to spread the available work over a greater part of the year. Business and industry will benefit from this stabilization of the economy. Families will be attracted to Anchorage by the assurance of a fair living wage.

Wages earned here will be spent here.

The future of free economic enterprise in this country, and the preservation of government itself, depends upon the establishment and perpetuation of cooperative relations, between capital and labor.

It is the desire of Local Union 367 to have a mutual settlement of this controversy, so that all work can go forward. But we are in this fight to the bitter end.

We know we are right. We are not making any unjust demands.

We have the support of all progressive union men, including the Central Labor Council. The Building and Construction Trades Council has shown their concern for our welfare by appointing a committee, at their meeting Tuesday night, to work with both sides for an early settlement of the dispute.

With their help and guidance we are sure to go forward to victory.

I wish to state at this time that I am a member of Local Union 367 and their authorized spokesman for this broadcast, and again repeat the opening statement I made, that many people believe vital construction work of a military nature will be stopped; this is not true.

Local Union 367 has notified all contractors of this type of work that we will continue to man their jobs at the prevailing wage scale, plus retroactive pay from the day the men are dispatched.

By telephone yesterday, Sam Odle, business agent of Local Union 367 brought Clayton Bilderbach, International Representative of our craft up to date on all details of the strike.

In this conversation Bilderbach again stated that under no circumstances should we withdraw our letter to the outside contractors, consenting to man their jobs at the present wage scale, plus retroactive pay from the date of the dispatch of the men to the job, pending a settlement.

A settlement which all of us hope will come soon.

Thank you for listening, and good night.

AMERICANS ARE A CURIOUS LOT—MOST OF THEM LIKE TO HEAR BOTH SIDES OF ANY QUESTION—HERE IS OUR SIDE

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, *July 24, 2950.*

Mr. SAM ODLE,
Business Agent, Local 367,
Anchorage, Alaska:

Wage negotiations complete here with the following contractors signed up at new $3.50 per hour wage rate.

P. S. Lord Co., Portland, Oreg.; L. E. Stevens Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; R. G. Chapman Co., Tacoma, Wash.; West Coast Plumbing Co., Seattle, Wash.; Wilbur-Bell Co., Fairbanks; Gull Plumbing Co., Fairbanks; Fairbanks Plumbing Co., Fairbanks; Berry Plumbing Co., Fairbanks; Baggett Plumbing Co., Fairbanks; Hemen Refrigerator Co., Fairbanks.

CARL J. SLATBURG,
Business Agent, Local 375.

(Copy of letter to all plumbing and heating contractors who now hold military contracts in the jurisdiction of local 367, United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters:)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, *July 22, 1950.*

GENTLEMEN: The Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 367, of Anchorage, Alaska, at their regular meeting of July 21, 1950, voted to call a strike, effective July 26, 1950, at 8 a. m.

Upon receipt of a letter from your firm, stating that you will meet all conditions and wage rates eventually agreed upon by the members of local 367, and the Master Plumbers Association of Anchorage, retroactive to the effective date of the strike, July 26, 1950, at 8 a. m., we will continue to furnish men to your firm at the existing wage rate of $3 per hour.

It is not our intention to inconvenience those plumbing and heating contractors who are not signators to the local agreement, nor do we wish to hinder in any way, the progress of vital military or civilian installations.

Cordially yours,

SAM ODLE,
Business Manager, Local 367.

The widely held public belief that vital military construction is jeopardized by the present dispute between the Master Plumbers Association of Anchorage, and the members of local 367 is not true. All contractors on this type of work have been notified by this local union that we will continue to man their jobs at the prevailing wage scale of $3 per hour, pending a settlement of this dispute.

The plumbers and steamfitters of Anchorage, local union 367, at their meeting on July 21, 1950, voted to strike on July 26, 1950, at 8 a. m. Only those who have been members in good standing for the past 6 months were eligible to vote. This action was founded on the knowledge that an adequate wage was necessary to carry them through the slack winter months. The sequence of events leading to this vote date back to March 1947. At that time the Birch-Johnson-Lytle Co. signed a contract with the Army covering all military construction in the jurisdiction of this local. This contract, No. 1000, was a cost-plus-fixed-fee arrangement with the Government and proved unsatisfactory to all parties involved. Industrial contractors were dissatisfied because this type of work was not open to competitive bidding. The Army was dissatisfied because each project undertaken was excessively costly both in money and man-hours. Labor was dissatisfied because wage rates were established in Washington, D. C., and wage adjustments necessary because of the ever increasing high cost of living in the Territory of Alaska were often delayed a year or more.

The members of local 367, together with members of other crafts in the building and construction trades council, sought to discover some means by which the welfare of each party concerned could be improved. In order to induce the Government to award contracts on a competitive basis, labor agreed to (temporarily) accept a lower scale of wages than that then prevailing in Anchorage. In November 1948, the Government called for competitive bids on military construction. Subsequently these contracts were awarded, and the experiment proved to be successful for two of the parties involved.

The Army had the satisfaction of seeing their work completed months ahead of schedule, and at a great saving in money.

That the contractors fared well was evidenced by their eagerness to bid on the contracts awarded for the 1950 construction season. In almost every instance the successful bidders on the current construction program were awarded the contracts at a figure far below the engineers' estimate of cost, in some cases, nearly 40 percent.

In the spring of 1949, local 367 found itself in the peculiar position of having to decline a proffered increase of 13 cents an hour, which was granted to all other crafts in the building and construction trades at that time. Two of the major plumbing and heating contracts for 1949 had already been awarded on bids based on our 1948 wage scale, and to have accepted the increase would have worked a hardship on all plumbing and heating contractors.

So that we would not again find ourselves in the position we occupied in March 1949, and have to decline another prospective increase in wages to protect the interests of the several master plumbers, we took the precaution at that time to notify all prospective bidders that we would recognize only the prevailing Anchorage wage scale in 1950. The experimental lower wage scale had proved its point and served its purpose. We agreed then to work until March 1, 1950, at the 1948 wage scale.

We were approached by all plumbing and heating contractors who contemplated submitting bids on the 1950 construction program, for a wage scale on which to base their bid estimates. All were advised that our proposed wage scale was $3.50 per hour, and to submit their bids accordingly. Three of the successful bidders have since informed us that their bids were based on this wage scale.

In January we began our efforts to negotiate a wage agreement for 1950 with the master plumbers association of Anchorage. To date they have made no fair or reasonable offer.

To promote harmony within the plumbing and heating industry of Anchorage, the members of local 367 have worked for a lower wage rate than was consistent with the increases accepted by the other building crafts since March 1, 1949. All other building crafts have received two wage increases since that date.

We feel that our recent action was taken with the interest and welfare of the entire community at heart. A 40-hour week will have a decided tendency to spread the available work over a greater portion of the year. Business and industry will benefit from this stabilization of economy. Families will be attracted to Anchorage by the assurance of a fair annual living wage. Wages earned in the Territory will be spent in the Territory. Alaska is on the verge of statehood. Opponents of statehood in the Senate have stressed the fact that Alaska is sparsely populated. We feel that the only way to overcome this obstacle is to make this area more attractive, economically, for permanent residents. A fair wage agreement, as asked by the members of local 367 is a firm step in this direction.

UNITED ASSOCIATION OF PLUMBERS
AND STEAMFITTERS, LOCAL 367.

Our Civil Defense Isn't

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hanson W. Baldwin, from the New York Times of August 11, 1950:

OUR CIVIL DEFENSE ISN'T—AND SOLUTION IS DOUBTED TILL WE SET UP WAYS OF DISPERSION AND CENTRALIZATION

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

City, State, and Nation have awakened suddenly since the guns started firing in Korea to the importance of civil defense in the atomic age.

But many of the steps so far taken, and the plans being made, though impressive on paper, have but limited value. Several of the basic problems of civil defense have been attacked but sketchily, if at all.

The old adage, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, is just as applicable to civil defense as it is to health. Yet, so far, we are stressing the cure rather than the prevention.

The New York City Fire Department has estimated the cost of new equipment needed to fight atomic conflagration at $100,000,000. A $450,000,000 shelter-building program for the city has been proposed, and we are organizing auxiliary police and firemen and medical and hospital aid.

Now these all are desirable measures, provided they do not detract from more important steps, but they represent at best palliatives, not protection.

Against an atomic attack such measures are no defense. They may serve at best to reduce the casualty list. Against attack by conventional explosives they are far more useful. But no really heavy and continuous bombardment with conventional explosives is likely against any mainland United States area. The distances from Russian bases are too great.

THE DANGER INCREASES

The threat from atomic attack is, however, a real one, not acute perhaps today, but more dangerous with each passing month, as Russia acquires a stockpile of atomic bombs and the carriers to bring them here. We have discovered civil defense at the eleventh hour. Shelter-building programs, desirable though they may be, could not possibly be completed for months or years. Yet a well-rounded civil defense program must be put into effect immediately.

We must put first things first, and two things above all should have priority.

First, as Dr. R. E. Lapp, atomic physicist, said recently at Colgate University, the only effective atomic defense "involves before-the-fact measures, not after-the-fact relief."

This means a program, not merely a blueprint or a plan, for evacuation of hundreds of thousands of people from our large cities. The immensity of this task is self-evident. Shelter, food, transportation, and a means of subsistence must be provided for those evacuated.

Dispersion is the main defense against atomic attack. For the same reason, we "will begin to be serious about the protection of our cities," in the words of Dr. Lapp, "when we stop cramming more buildings into them."

PROBLEM OF DISPERSION

The reduction of the density of population is an imperative. It does no good to eliminate slums only to replace them with model skyscraper apartments, as New York is doing.

Again, in Dr. Lapp's words, "even if you increase the size of your fire department to 10 times its present size, it will not have much effect on fire damage."

"To be truly effective, before-the-fact measures must be undertaken," he declared. "Such projects as green belts or fire lanes through a city will be most effective in confining the myriad fires which break out simultaneously after a bomb explosion."

If Central Park were extended from the East River to the Hudson, such a fire lane would be far more effective in the saving of life and property than all the shelters and extra fire equipment now planned.

In the same way the recently instituted examination of ships entering New York harbor is largely meaningless and would be farcical if such serious issues were not involved. The much advertised inspection of the Polish liner *Batory*, during which crews' lockers were searched presumably for the atomic bomb, would have been completely futile had an enemy chosen to use the *Batory* as a Trojan horse and to conceal an atomic bomb in its cargo.

AN IMPOSSIBLE TASK

Only a complete inspection of the entire cargo of a vessel before it enters port, not after, could hope with certainty to reveal the presence of an atomic bomb in time to prevent catastrophe.

A superficial Geiger-counter search would not necessarily reveal the atomic bomb's presence. Packing crates would have to be opened. All the cargo would have to be removed, obviously a gargantuan and impossible task for our small force of inspectors, one that could not be carried out at sea.

So far, therefore, we have been making gestures, but that is about all. Until a better intelligence system is developed, until a more complete and thorough program for the control, routing, and inspection of foreign-flag ships is put into effect, and until an orderly rehearsed evacuation of part of New York City's population has been conducted, we cannot claim to have reasonable civil defense.

The second basic civil defense problem that must be tackled is the problem of national organization. Civil defense against the atomic bomb is too big a problem to be shouldered by city, State, or section. An atomic catastrophe in New York would require assistance from all neighboring States. There must be an effective Federal organization and coordinating authority, something that does not now exist and apparently is not being planned.

The blueprint for this was laid out in the Hopley report, which was shelved, but the President emasculated the program 2 years ago when he divided various functions of civil defense among some 27 Government agencies.

NO UNIFIED OFFICE

Today, civil defense on the national level is headed by Dr. Paul J. Larsen, director of civilian mobilization for the National Security Resources Board.

The Board itself has been limited by Presidential directions to planning and advisory functions. It is not an operational agency. Dr. Larsen's office is only one small cog in the Board. The level of his office is in no way commensurate with its importance. He has no real authority, a very small budget, and ill-defined responsibilities.

All the major aspects of civil defense should be brought together in one office, which ought to be either an independent executive agency under the President, or a principal division of the Board. The National Civil Defense Office must have authority at least to coordinate State and regional efforts. This may require congressional action, but it must be met. Civil defense must be decentralized in operation and administration, but centralized in policy and planning and coordination.

Until these two problems are resolved, evacuation and dispersion programs drawn up, and a real National Office of Civilian Defense established, there will be no civil defense worth the name.

"Our basic strategy must be to have done our job before the bomb drops," Dr. Lapp has stated. "Any civil defense plan which is based upon after-the-fact relief measures is doomed to failure."

A Vote on the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by H. I. Phillips from the Buffalo Courier-Express of July 31, 1950:

MUSE, NEWS, AND VIEWS—A VOTE ON THE MAILS

Congress has been forced to schedule a vote August 14, on the matter of bringing the mail box back into American life and restoring the letter carrier to his position as a morale builder. For which three cheers. In the dizzy Washington scene with all its flubdubbery, snafu, red tape, and waltzing in the dark, few things have seemed as incredible as the April blitzing of our once great post-office service. Public indignation has at last resulted in forcing the House to show whether it regards the mail as important.

By a push-button routine the Postmaster General has made the United States mail service a shadow of its old self. That old-time institution, the summer resort postcard, has been getting through by luck only, national love life has been notably slowed up and the order-by-mail routine made a vaudeville gag. It may be for years and it may be forever has replaced the time-honored post office 'Not snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." An Administration that has spent millions of dollars for experiments in global economies has repudiated the efficacy of a 3-cent postage stamp.

Congress and the Postmaster General have turned the mail service into a study of tortoise life. The schedule of collection hours on the street corner mailbox has been replaced by a notice "The acceptance of a letter by this box is not to be interpreted as a promise to deliver or as an indication of any intent to deliver. This is purely a prospectus proposition."

The post office window, long the most dependable thing in American life, has become a part-time opening in a deep-freeze unit. If you want to be sure of attention you have to bring your own opener.

By the April order of Postmaster General Donaldson the letter carrier has been seen this summer as infrequently as the milkman. He has become strictly a once-a-day operator, except in some business zones. Post offices have become so jammed with unassorted mail that postal workers detailed to assort it had to be qualified mountain climbers, yodeling as they worked. "Did you get my letter?" has become a query calling only for the reply, "No. What made you think I might?" The greatest mail service in the world has been hamstrung, pulverized, hogtied and left a shambles by any comparison with the past. And not until the other day did Congress get around to scheduling the matter for attention. August 14 is the date. We shall see what we shall see. And we hope we don't have to wait to get the result by mail.

Forty Million Dollars to Northern Wisconsin in Federal Aids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, to give all people an insight of just how a Congressman can be of help to the folks back home by being on the job, I wish to have printed in the official RECORD a report to the people to this effect. I propose to do this county by county for each of the 14 counties in my district.

The Federal-aid programs outlined below are all sound and needed. I supported all of these aids and had a direct part in formulating laws in Congress which outline these Federal aids for the people back home. All of these aids were drawn up and passed into law during my term in Congress.

On each of these Federal-aid programs I appeared before the proper committee and helped draw up the bills which are now law. After they became law I saw to it that each county back home got its fair share. Many of the applications for these aids were handled through my office. When many of the applications were slow in being approved, as soon as my office was contacted I got positive action.

My office has always been a clearing house for all these projects. When not handled properly your Congressman was the first to hear about it. When slow in being approved, your Congressman was the first to hear about it. When any information was desired, your Congressman has always supplied that information. When push was needed to speed approval, your Congressman was always on the job to give it a push. It has never been necessary during my tenure in Congress for any county, city, or town to send a representative to Washington. All they had to do was to contact me by mail or phone and they got action at once.

In my term as a Member of Congress I receive numerous invitations to travel all over the world at Government expense. I am one of the very few who refused. I turned all of them down. I stayed on the job and worked on the job to get things done. It has never been necessary to censor me to devote

full time to my job, because I am always on the job 12 to 16 hours a day. I never took 3 months off from my public job to go around campaigning as some candidates for Congress do. My services are always available. This is why northern Wisconsin got so much with so little effort. Northern Wisconsin would not be in very good shape today without those Federal aids.

Here is how my being on the job has brought huge dividends to the folks in northern Wisconsin. Here is a list of projects and the amount of Federal money for each coming into northern Wisconsin during my term in Congress.

ONE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THIRTY-FOUR THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND THIRTEEN DOLLARS FOR HARBORS IN NORTHERN WISCONSIN

This is the total sum contributed by the Federal Government during my service in Congress in the Tenth District for rivers and harbors projects. During my tenure I introduced bills so that at the present time every harbor has been or is under consideration and has been or will be approved for work to be done.

Each appropriation act was watched carefully by me to make certain that work was included for our district. The current appropriation act will result in an additional amount of at least $218,900 for our district. The breakdown during my tenure per year for the $1,534,413 already contributed by the Federal Government is as follows:

1943 (laws passed before O'KONSKI's term)	$52,173
1944 (start of O'KONSKI's term)	110,995
1945	153,849
1946	119,433
1947	160,919
1948	153,919
1949	195,899
1950	369,326
1951 (this year's appropriation bill)	218,900
Total Federal aid to harbors for northern Wisconsin during my term in Congress	1,534,413

SUPERIOR HARBOR

During my term in Congress, maintenance work has been done on Superior Harbor in the amount of $920,901, and the estimated expenditure in the present appropriation bill for 1951 is $168,000 for maintenance work on Superior Harbor. Four thousand five hundred dollars as a result of a bill by me will be spent before 1951 for a new survey of needed improvements in the Superior Harbor. Total for Superior Harbor alone during O'KONSKI's term, $1,093,401.

I have introduced and secured the passage of a resolution for the investigation of the need for further new work on Superior Harbor. A public hearing has already been held. The Army engineers advise me that their report will be completed in 1951, following which I will see that it gets in an appropriation bill and later gets an appropration for the new work needed. I have not yet been turned down on any harbor project I requested during my tenure in Congress.

ASHLAND HARBOR

I have secured the authorization for and the appropriation for the completion of new work on Ashland Harbor to widen the west channel to a width of 750 feet, and the work is now in progress. It is expected it will be completed in 1950 at an estimated cost of $45,000. Maintenance work done on Ashland Harbor during my tenure in Congress totals $29,959. Total I secured for Ashland Harbor, $74,959.

PORT WING HARBOR

I have introduced and secured the passage of a resolution and have secured the passage of an authorization and appropriation for new work on the Port Wing Harbor of widening the channel 50 feet between the piers with a depth of 15 feet and dredging the two inner channels to a depth of 8 feet at an estimated cost of $20,000. The work is now in progress and is expected to be completed in 1950. Maintenance work done on Port Wing Harbor during my term in Congress totals $199,666, with an estimate of $15,000 more for 1951. Three thousand two hundred and ninety-nine dollars was spent for surveys and planning during my term in Congress. Total money I secured during my term for Port Wing Harbor, $237,965.

BAYFIELD HARBOR

I have introduced and secured the passage of a resolution and have secured the passage of an authorization in Congress for proposed improvements on Bayfield Harbor in the amount of $130,000. The improvements proposed consist of extending the city pier and the city breakwater by 118 feet each and dredging in the municipal harbor basin. Besides $5,117 has been spent during my term for planning and surveys for improvements. Total authorized funds I secured for Bayfield Harbor during my term, $135,117.

SAXON HARBOR

I have introduced and secured the passage of a resolution for the improvement of Saxon Harbor and a preliminary report has been turned in. It was sent back to the district engineers for some changes. The proposed work for this Harbor is estimated at $306,000 for new work. I will obtain the authorization for this in the 1951 Rivers and Harbors Act. Approval is too late for this session of Congress. Seven thousand one hundred and sixty-one dollars has been spent as a result of my resolution for surveys and plans on Saxon Harbor. Total planned or spent for Saxon Harbor during my term, $313,161.

CORNUCOPIA HARBOR

I have introduced and secured the passage of a resolution for the improvement of Cornucopia Harbor. The report has been submitted to the Chief of Army Engineers and calls for an estimated amount of $169,500 for proposed new work. I will obtain the authorization for this in the 1951 Rivers and Harbors Act. Maintenance work done on Cornucopia Harbor during my term in Congress amounts to $31,023. Besides, $4,500 has been spent on a survey and planning of needed improvements during my term in Congress. Total planned or spent for Cornucopia Harbor during my term, $205,023.

HERBSTER HARBOR

I have introduced and secured the passage of a resolution for the improvement of Herbster Harbor, and the report is due on this in August 1950. The report is expected to provide entrance piers, dredging and entrance channel, and providing channels in an easterly and westerly direction from the inner end of the entrance channel. It has been difficult to get the Federal Government to undertake new harbor developments in this crisis. I look for favorable action in spite of this difficulty. It must be remembered that according to the rules set down it takes 3 to 5 years to get a new project approved. No Congressman or Senator has ever done it in less time. Herbster is due this year. Six thousand nine hundred and forty-two dollars as a result of my resolution has been spent on surveys and planning for Herbster Harbor during my term. This is the first time the Federal Government has shown interest in a harbor at Herbster. It could not show that interest except for my resolution. The fact that $6,942 has been spent by the Federal Government for surveys and plans shows serious interest and a bright future. Not until I was elected to Congress did the Federal Government show any interest in Herbster Harbor.

SIX MILLION NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVEN THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THREE DOLLARS FEDERAL ROAD AIDS FOR NORTHERN WISCONSIN

The postwar Federal Road Aid Act was first passed in 1944, when I was a member of what is now the Public Works Committee. I had a direct hand in drafting this legislation. The distribution of money on a mileage basis rather than a population basis was a hard-fought victory for Members of Congress like myself from rural areas who put up the fight for this provision. Northern Wisconsin benefited much from this provision in the law. Read here what this Federal aid has brought to northern Wisconsin.

Federal aids for roads to Tenth District

Ashland	$1,211,349
Bayfield	497,036
Burnett	46,727
Douglas	1,666,177
Iron	31,266
Lincoln	479,250
Oneida	728,133
Polk	291,274
Price	675,279
Rusk	521,000
Sawyer	368,531
Taylor	193,816
Vilas	140,000
Washburn	87,445
Total Federal-aid highways to northern Wisconsin during my term in Congress	6,937,283

The wide difference in amounts to various counties is not the fault of the Federal Government. The county must act first. Then they go to the State. The State then comes with its plan to the Federal Government for approval. There was no trouble in getting approval at the Federal level. Some counties felt little need for Federal funds or new or improved roads. Hence the difference in

figures for counties. It should be noted that as of May 1, 1950, more than $10,838,000 was yet available as unused and unprogrammed funds for the State of Wisconsin. In other words, there was that much more money available to counties in Wisconsin not applied for. This is evidence that the Federal aid was overabundantly available. Federal aid for roads was one of my first and major interests as your Congressman. The fact that more Federal money was available than actually applied for by counties and States is proof that the Federal Government has more than done its part in this respect while I have been serving you in Congress.

FIFTEEN COMMUNITIES IN NORTHERN WISCONSIN IN FEDERAL HOSPITAL PLAN

I have long felt that the answer to socialized medicine was to provide better and more hospital facilities and I have, therefore, supported the Federal Hospital Construction Act. This act was passed during my term in Congress. Under it 15 communities in northern Wisconsin will receive considerable Federal assistance in an outright grant for the construction of new hospital facilities or for the expansion of present facilities. I vigorously supported this legislation and had a hand in formulating this legislation.

The following communities in the Tenth District have received or are approved to receive funds to date under the plan: Osceola in Polk County has been approved for Federal funds in the amount of $57,492. Spooner in Washburn County is approved for a Federal grant of $80,775. Minocqua-Woodruff in Oneida County is approved for a Federal grant of $54,585.

Other northern Wisconsin communities included in the plan are as follows: Park Falls with an "A" priority. Amery, Hayward, Rhinelander, Eagle River, and Merrill with a "B" priority. Medford and Tomahawk with a "C" priority. Superior with a "D" priority. Ashland with an "E" priority. Ladysmith and Frederic with an "F" priority.

Under the Federal public law the Federal Government's share can go as high as 50 percent or as low as 33⅓ percent. The State can exercise its judgment in determining the percentage, and in Wisconsin the Federal share was set at 45 percent for all projects in the State.

In the hospital program the Federal Government's responsibility has been met. It is now up to the State and local communities. I had an active part in formulating and supporting the Federal aid for hospitals program. Continuation of this program can bring a million dollars or more of Federal grants to northern Wisconsin.

PREPARATION FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

For a time after World War II it looked like there might be an unemployment problem. Foresight on the part of Members of Congress like myself wanted in readiness a plan of public works so that we would not be caught napping as once happened. We formulated an advance planning program of Federal money advances to communities to plan for much needed public works.

If the unemployment problem did arise, we were, in addition, ready to pass legislation of Federal grants to the local communities for building of public works such as schools, streets, sewers, city halls, and so forth.

More than 30 communities in northern Wisconsin received a total of $155,945 of Federal money for advanced planning. More applications are pending. Most of the applications were handled through my office.

Applicant	Type of project	Federal advance approved
Jacobs	Water facilities	$500
Mellen	Sewage facilities	2,000
Do	do	2,250
Do	River improvements	2,800
Ashland	School facilities	10,500
Do	Sewage facilities	36,000
Superior	Airport facilities	15,000
Do	Sewage facilities	19,000
Do	School facilities	4,420
Do	do	2,700
Iron County	Public hospital	5,600
Hurley	Sewage facilities	4,477
Do	Water facilities	769
Amery	City hall	600
Centuria	Sewage facilities	4,000
Balsam Lake	do	2,850
Frederic	School facilities, school district.	3,173
Osceola	Sewage facilities	3,050
Clear Lake	do	4,750
Park Falls	School facilities	4,920
Ladysmith	Sewage facilities	15,000
Do	City hall	5,400
Hayward	Sewage facilities	6,300
Spooner and Beaver Brook.	School facilities for school district.	4,834
Spooner	Public library facilities	1,050
Grand total during my term for advance planning of public works.		155,943

ONE MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED SEVENTY-THREE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS IN FEDERAL AIRPORT PLAN FOR NORTHERN WISCONSIN

During my term $1,873,550 is the amount of Federal funds allocated for the airports in the Tenth District of Wisconsin which are included in the national airport plan. The national airport plan has been drawn up entirely during my term in Congress. I have worked for and watched appropriations and authorizations to make certain that northern Wisconsin received an equal and just share. Twenty-seven communities in northern Wisconsin are presently included in the national airport plan. Several of these communities have already requested funds. Some have received them. Others have not yet made their applications.

Other communities than those now included may be given consideration by showing local interest in assuming the sponsor's share of the cost and in making application as the plan may be changed from year to year.

AIRPORTS IN TENTH DISTRICT INCLUDED IN FEDERAL AIRPORT PLAN AS OF 1950

ASHLAND COUNTY

Ashland: New site has been selected. Class 3 airport. For feeder-type service. Federal funds requested. Ashland also designated for seaplane base and helicopter service.

Clam Lake: New site not selected. Class 1 airport. Federal funds requested. Airport programed.

BAYFIELD COUNTY

Cable: Presently a class 1 airport. Proposed airport is class 1. Federal funds have been requested. Airport programed. Some Federal funds have been granted.

Iron River: New or existing site not selected. Proposed class 1. Federal funds not requested yet.

BURNETT COUNTY

Grantsburg: Present airport class 3. Proposed airport class 3. CAA site 7 mps. FTW.

Siren: Present airport class 3. Proposed class 3. Federal funds have been requested and airport has been completed. Federal law appropriated over $300,000 for completion.

DOUGLAS COUNTY

Superior: New site has been selected. Proposed class 3. Federal funds have been requested and airport has been programed and some funds already available.

IRON COUNTY

Hurley: New site not selected. Proposed class 1. Federal funds not requested yet.

Mercer: New site selected. Proposed class 1. Federal funds have been requested.

LINCOLN COUNTY

Merrill: New or existing site not selected. Proposed class 2. Federal funds have not been requested yet.

Tomahawk: New or existing site not selected yet. Proposed class 1. Federal funds not requested as yet.

ONEIDA COUNTY

Minocqua: New site not selected. Proposed class—seaplane base. Federal funds not requested yet.

Rhinelander: Present airport class 3. Proposed class 3. Feeder-type service. It has been designated and is operating such service. Federal funds have been requested, programed, and some granted.

Three Lakes: New site not selected. Proposed class 2. Federal funds have been requested.

POLK COUNTY

Amery: New site not selected. Class 1 airport. Federal funds not requested yet.

Luck: New site not selected. Proposed class 1. Federal funds not requested.

Osceola: Present class 1. Proposed class 1. Federal funds have been requested. Airport programed and some Federal funds granted.

PRICE COUNTY

Park Falls: New site not selected. Proposed class 2. Federal funds not requested yet.

Phillips: Existing class 1. Proposed class 2. Federal funds have been requested. Airport programed. Federal funds not granted yet.

RUSK COUNTY

Ladysmith: New site not selected. Proposed class 2. Federal funds have been requested.

SAWYER COUNTY

Hayward: Present airport class 1. Proposed class 2. Federal funds have been requested.

Radisson: New site not selected. Proposed class 1. Federal funds not requested yet.

TAYLOR COUNTY

Medford: New site not selected. Proposed class 2. Federal funds have been requested.

VILAS COUNTY

Eagle River: Present airport class 2. Proposed class 2. Federal funds not requested yet.

Manitowish Waters: Present airport class 2. Proposed class 2. Federal funds have been requested, airport programed, and some funds granted.

WASHBURN COUNTY

Birchwood: New site not selected. Class 1 airport. Federal funds not requested yet.

Shell Lake: Present airport class 1. Proposed class 1. Federal funds have been requested.

FOREST SERVICE RESEARCH CENTER, RHINELANDER, WIS.

There has been a long felt need for a forest service research center in northern Wisconsin. After serious study it was decided to locate this center at Rhinelander, Wis.

I appeared before the proper committee to plead for an appropriation for this project. I was successful in getting money to start this center in the fiscal year 1947.

An average of between $30,000 and $35,000 is spent each year by the Federal Government to keep this center going. Total expenditures by the Federal Government for this center started during my term and continued since it was started, $125,000.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

Electrification of farms and small towns has been among my chief interests as a Member of Congress. Every REA bill got my full interest and complete backing. I fought every attempt to reduce or slow down the REA program in northern Wisconsin. I was always on the side of those who fought valiantly for full-speed ahead on this program. As a result of this effort 10 electric co-ops received loans totaling $17,003,000 for facilities, distribution and lines. This is over $17,000,000 to the northern Wisconsin REA during my term in Congress. Not only did I work for appropriations for the REA, but on many of the applications for these loans, I had a direct hand in getting approved. So add $17,003,000 to benefits received by northern Wisconsin folks for REA during my term in Congress. Ask the REA officials how willingly and effectively I have been of service to them.

The northern Wisconsin REA electric cooperatives which received loans during my term are as follows:

First. Head of the Lakes Cooperative Electric Association, Superior, six loans, totaling $731,000 for distribution and lines.

Second. Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative, Cornell, four loans totaling $808,500 for distribution lines and $7,500 for office facilities.

Third. Taylor County Electric Cooperative, Medford, three loans totaling $470,000 for distribution lines.

Fourth. Clark Electric Cooperative, Greenwood, seven loans totaling $1,051,000 for distribution lines and $95,000 for headquarters facilities.

Fifth. Barron County Electric Cooperative, Barron, eight loans totaling $1,734,500 for distribution lines and $10,500 for office facilities.

Sixth. Polk-Burnett Electric Cooperative, Centuria, five loans totaling $1,651,000 for distribution lines and $40,000 for office facilities.

Seventh. Jump River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Ladysmith, eight loans totaling $1,190,000 for distribution lines.

Eighth. Price Electric Cooperative, Phillips, six loans totaling $1,385,000 for distribution lines and $65,000 for office facilities.

Ninth. Bayfield Electric Cooperative, Inc., Iron River, six loans totaling $1,264,000 for distribution lines.

In addition the Dairyland Power Cooperative Dam and auxiliary power facilities on the Flambeau River in Rusk County received $6,500,000. This dam supplies power to the REA co-ops in northern Wisconsin.

REA loans to improve rural telephone service also got my support. Several applications have already been made and action should go along very shortly. This will bring added Federal aid and improved telephone service to remote rural areas.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Almost $150,000 comes to northern Wisconsin schools as Federal aid for the school-lunch program. Nine years of teaching in high schools and colleges have put me in a position of personal knowledge of the need and the good of such a program. I have appeared each year before the proper committee to get adequate funds for this program. This is another of the good Federal aids that no one would banish. This Federal aid brings $150,000 a year in employment and food to northern Wisconsin folks. I had a most active part in setting up this program and securing enough funds for its operation.

FIVE MILLION DOLLARS IN RFC LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS

During my term in Congress the RFC has loaned more than $5,000,000 to small businesses in the Tenth District. Every applicant who wrote me got immediate results. Sometimes applicants did not contact me until after they were turned down. Even then I got to work and in most cases succeeded in getting the loan approved.

My offices handled the processing of more than 40 loans. On another 40 loan applications information and procedure were secured through my office. About 50 cases are still pending and securing my help. No small-business man who contacted me was refused action or help on my part. So here we have another five million of Federal money coming to northern Wisconsin folks.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS

During all the years the United States of America was at war, northern Wisconsin was one of the few areas in the Nation which did not get or have a major military establishment of some nature.

That condition has changed. During my term a classified military installation is being erected in Polk County at an estimated cost of $1,250,000. This is a permanent installation during peace or war. It will employ during normal times 200 employees—about 100 military and about 100 civilian.

Northern Wisconsin is coming to the front in this recognition. One installation usually brings another. The future in this respect is bright. The point to note is that for the first time northern Wisconsin is recognized.

POST-OFFICE BUILDINGS FOR NORTHERN WISCONSIN

During my term I worked unceasingly to improve the postal facilities of northern Wisconsin. As a result of my efforts, 14 cities in the district are marked and approved by the Post Office Department for new post-office buildings.

Congress was almost ready to vote funds for the construction of these post offices under a public-works program to relieve threatened unemployment in 1948. The unemployment problem never materialized so the program was not brought up for passage.

Tomahawk is on the preferred list for needed improvements. Site for a new post office has already been selected. A new post-office building at Tomahawk is a certainty in the immediate future.

Other cities on the preferred list already marked for new post-office buildings are: Amery, Eagle River, Frederic, Grantsburg, Hurley, Luck, Mellen, Phillips, St. Croix Falls, Shell Lake, Spooner, Three Lakes, and Washburn.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The Farmers Home Administration to help needy and marginal farms, to encourage farming, has been a pet hobby of mine while in Congress. No agency in our Government is more justified in its existence. Funds for this work were always my deep concern. Being a farmer by background, I understand their problems. My first 18 years were spent on a family owned farm which reared a family of 10 children.

FHA leaders and officers will verify how I have sold its existence to fellow Members of Congress. It was this kind of selling to city Congressmen that kept the program going. Drought loans alone as a result of my bill, the first so introduced, brought $450,000 for farmers stricken by the drought disaster. During my term in Congress, FHA loans to northern Wisconsin farmers exceed the $3,000,000 mark.

It should be mentioned here that when legislation was passed to help drought-stricken farms with soft loans, northern Wisconsin farmers were the first designated by Federal authorities as a disaster area and were, therefore, the first in the Nation to receive this aid. This was directly handled by my office upon application of a county agent.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

All rivers which flow into Lake Superior from the counties of Douglas, Bayfield, and Ashland are being investigated as a result of my bills to determine what flood-control work needs to be done on each. These streams include: Onion River, Sioux River, Whittlesey Creek, Amicon River, Brule River, Namadji River, Black River, Middle River, Poplar River, Iron Ore River, White River, and numerous other streams.

In addition my bills resulted in a War Department study on the flood-control needs of the Bad River which floods so seriously at Mellen and Odanah. The Army engineers feel that flood conditions at Mellen can be improved by straightening, deepening, and widening the stream bed and increasing the floodway capacity of several bridges and at Odanah. It may be possible by a combination of diking, filling of low areas, and relocating of some buildings to reduce flood damages.

I am advised by the Army engineers that these two reports will be completed and submitted by August 1950. As soon as they are in and approved, I shall get

them in the next authorization act of Congress so that the needed work will be done. All this is the result of resolutions introduced by me and passed by the Congress.

All streams that flow through the Tenth District into the Mississippi via the Wisconsin River and the Chippewa River are now under investigation for flood control and these include the following: East Fork of Chippewa River, Brunet River, Thornapple River, Elk River, Flambeau River, Jump River, Fisher River, and Yellow River, all of which flow into the Chippewa River; Somo River, Spirit River, New Wood River, Cooper River, Prairie River, Pine River, and Rib River, all of which flow into the Wisconsin River. This work is the result of resolutions introduced by me and passed by the Congress.

If it is found after the War Department surveys that any of these are under Federal jurisdiction, I will see that action is taken to get funds for any such project. I have never been turned down yet on any of these bills and requests if, after War Department survey, it is shown that these rivers are or can be placed under Federal jurisdiction. If after the survey and study they recommend funds for projects, I will get these funds for them. In no case has Congress turned me down on any of these projects.

WORK ON BEHALF OF INDIANS

During my term in Congress the Indian population of northern Wisconsin received much attention. Ten bills were introduced by me to improve their conditions and standing. Among the most prominent of these bills are:

First. Bill to give more land to Lac Courte Oreilles Band's Reservation. Passed the House April 4, 1949.

Second. Bill to give more land to Bad River Band. Passed the House May 2, 1949.

Third. To end discrimination laws against Indians. Defeated in House August 1, 1949. It applied only to Wisconsin. Members of Congress want it to apply Nation-wide, but Congressmen from other Indian States are against it.

Fourth. Bill to place Indian reservations in Wisconsin under Wisconsin laws in certain acts. Passed House October 17, 1949.

Fifth. Bill to speed claims of Indians against Federal Government. Passed House June 5, 1950.

Sixth. Bill to appropriate $5,000,000 in Wisconsin to rehabilitate all Wisconsin Indians. Committee approval expected soon.

Seventh. A bill to advance 80,000 dollars Federal money for School of Town of Hunter. Passed and now law. School being built.

There is not a Member of Congress who has introduced more bills for Indian welfare than I have. House action is easy. The Senate not so easy. But I have done my part. No one has ever done more or better for the Indian welfare than I have.

CONCLUSION

This folks, is a repartee to you on my work on your behalf. It is a true report of the highlights of my activities. This is the report I would deliver to you in person if it were permissible for me to come home.

With the present world crisis there is too much for me to do here protecting your interests. Under such conditions I will not leave my post here to go around campaigning. The people want me to stay on the job and I intend to stay on the job.

After reading this report you the folks back home are the only judges as to what you are going to do about it. It is up to each and everyone of you the folks back home.

Hoarding Condemned by Camp Fire Girls—Drive Inaugurated To Secure Pledges Against Hoarding—Camp Fire Girls Will Ask Homemakers To Promise To Purchase Only Normal Everyday Needs of Their Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Richard W. Blalock, president of the National Council of Camp Fire Girls, has telegraphed the President of the United States regarding the campaign being launched by 360,000 Camp Fire Girls throughout the length and breadth of our country. This patriotic campaign by one of the finest organizations in the United States is of paramount importance. It is with pride that I disclose that the president of this great organization resides at Marshall, Tex., and is therefore one of my constituents.

Mrs. Blalock, the council's Blue Bird leaders, Camp Fire guardians, Horizon Club advisers, and every one of the splendid young girls who are members of the Camp Fire Girls deserve unstinted praise for undertaking this great drive against hoarding. Hoarding in times of stress is the equivalent of giving aid and comfort to our enemy. There is an abundant supply of the necessities of life for us all and the supply will continue to be ample if a few of us do not fill our basements and attics with supplies for which we have no immediate use. As to those items of merchandise which may be considered luxuries, surely our money may be put to far better use through systematic purchase of United States E or other bonds.

In her telegram to the President, launching the "I Won't Hoard" campaign, Mrs. Blalock stated that 360,000 Camp Fire Girls will ask shoppers to sign the following pledge:

Camp Fire Girls, the homemakers of tomorrow, ask you to sign this pledge: "I promise to purchase only what is necessary for the normal everyday needs of my family. I will not hoard such items as sugar, fats, nylons, or canned goods."

This fine group of young American girls will, I know, perform splendidly and spread the gospel of patriotism in every city, town, and village of our country. I know that many other organizations of our young people will join in this campaign against hoarding. I salute the Camp Fire Girls for undertaking this campaign and all organizations composing our patriotic youth who are truly not only the homemakers but the leaders of tomorrow.

I am happy to have the privilege and opportunity of including Mrs. Blalock's telegram to the President in its entirety, as well as the bulletin of the Camp Fire Girls headquarters in New York, outlining the details of the "I Won't Hoard" campaign. The telegram and the bulletin follow:

NEW YORK, N. Y.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

I Won't Hoard is the campaign being launched by 360,000 Camp Fire Girls across the country who will ask shoppers to sign the following pledge: "Camp Fire Girls, the Homemakers of Tomorrow, ask you to sign this pledge—I promise to purchase only what is necessary for the normal everyday needs of my family. I will not hoard such items as sugar, fats, nylons, or canned goods." In sponsoring this community service project Camp Fire members are pointing up the organization's Home Craft program which stresses wise buying, and its Citizenship Craft program which emphasizes service to and for the community. Since the founding of Camp Fire Girls in 1910 conservation of our resources and consideration for the needs of others have been two of the most important features of our program. We believe that our members will be able to influence cautious buying habits among millions of people throughout our great country.

Mrs. RICHARD W. BLALOCK,
President, National Council of Camp Fire Girls.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS,
CAMP FIRE GIRLS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., August 1, 1950.

To Blue Bird leaders, Camp Fire guardians, Horizon Club advisers.
From National Department of Public Relations.

Enlist your girls in Camp Fire's newest community service project—the "I won't hoard" campaign. Your girls can do a major job in their community by helping to make their neighbors aware of the need to buy only consumer goods necessary for normal living. With this in mind we have had the following pledge printed:

"Camp Fire Girls, the homemakers of tomorrow, ask you to sign this 'I won't hoard' pledge: 'I promise to purchase only what is necessary for the normal every-day needs of my family. I will not hoard items such as sugar, fats, nylons, or canned goods.'

"——— ———."

We have enclosed 30 of these pledges for you to divide among members of your group. If you need more pledges ask your local chamber of commerce, board of trade, better business bureau, local printers, or any other persons who might be willing to cooperate by mimeographing extra pledges.

Our national president, Mrs. Richard W. Blalock, wishes all of us to give this project our sincere support, especially since conservation of our resources and consideration for the needs of others are two of the most important things a Camp Fire member learns.

We have asked executive directors, presidents of councils where there are no executives, and chairmen of independent leaders associations to get in touch with their mayors, chamber of commerce presidents,

heads of the board of trade, and civic and service club officers to ask for their endorsements. We have also requested our executive directors to make arrangements with local merchants for Camp Fire girls to obtain pledge signatures from their customers.

Please check immediately with your executive director, council president, or chairman of your Independent Leaders Association to see what plans are being made in your area. If you are a Lone Leader you will want to get in touch with your own civic authorities before meeting with your group.

Your girls might take turns obtaining pledges in their neighborhood stores. It would be advisable not to have too many girls stationed at one store. Be sure that each girl has a supply of pledges and several sharp pencils.

At the end of a month please send your council a report of the number of signed pledges your girls have collected.

The "I won't hoard" project gives Camp Fire girls an opportunity to show their families and neighbors what is meant by home craft, wise buying, and citizenship craft, concern for and service to the community.

You will discover that "I won't hoard" pledges will make new friends for Camp Fire girls and influence more people in becoming better citizens. We know that you and your group will do an outstanding job in bringing this about.

P. S.—Not a moment should be lost in getting this program under way.

New Look at Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of August 10 commented editorially on Alaska and Hawaii statehood urging prompt action on the two bills which are now pending in the Senate. Under leave to extend my remarks I include that editorial:

Senate Democratic Leader SCOTT LUCAS has come out strongly for the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills.

In a brief speech Tuesday on the Senate floor he underscored one of the many reasons for admitting Alaska to the Union without any further delay.

"From the standpoint of our own defense," he said, "Alaska is in a strategic and a very critical position. Everyone who has talked to the military about the situation, or who knows anything about what is going on in the world at the present time, can reach only one conclusion, which is that Alaska is one of the outposts which will be of extreme importance to the defense of all the States of the Union."

Reminded by Senator KNOWLAND, of California, that Hawaii was equally important to the security of the United States and equally deserving of statehood, Senator LUCAS said he was "just as strong" for admitting the one as the other.

Then he revealed why the two measures had not been brought before the Senate, though they have been approved by the Insular Affairs Committee. He said the Democratic leadership had been told by Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, that if either bill were brought up he would try to displace it by pushing the Mundt-Ferguson measure to the front. If that happened, said Senator LUCAS, he feared some Senator might try to attach the civil-rights amendment to the Mundt-Ferguson bill, thereby creating "a difficult parliamentary situation."

Maybe so. But we have an idea that Mr. LUCAS as majority leader can get around the straw-man obstacle in some way, particularly since President Truman's message to Congress makes possible a brand new or revised bill dealing with subversives and internal security, which is the subject of the Mundt-Ferguson bill.

In any event, we hope the Senate majority leader takes a new look at the parliamentary situation and finds a way of bringing these two important statehood bills up for prompt action. The House of Representatives has passed them, both major parties and the administration are for them and now Mr. LUCAS has left no doubt about his stand.

The whole question has been thrashed out thoroughly before the House and the Senate committee. As President Truman has pointedly observed, it will take only 10 minutes to pass these bills.

Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association Calls for Community Employment Plans Now for Reserves Being Called to Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of the Congress a letter sent by one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Melvin A. Maas, a brigadier general in the United States Marine Corps Reserve and president of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association to the membership of MCROA.

General Maas has called upon the membership of MCROA to exert every possible effort to back up their fellow Marine Reserves now being called to extended active duty. In his message to MCROA chapter presidents in some 50 cities, General Maas said:

We members of the Marine Corps Reserve who have not been called and who may not be called for some time while the corps builds up its strength in platoon and company officers have a great responsibility to those now being called, particularly the volunteer enlisted Marine Reserve.

I call upon all chapters to spearhead community programs aimed at making certain that these Reservists now being called to duty will receive exceptional opportunities for employment upon their return. Many of the enlisted marines will have no reemployment rights because they are not now working and have no work experience. In particular, we must make certain that no marine wounded in the present conflict shall have any trouble in finding employment upon his return to civilian pursuits. We will not fail our wounded upon their return. But, planning is necessary in advance and each community should consider this matter, not when the men come home but when they are leaving.

We naturally welcome and will solicit the active support of the Reserve Officers Association and the National Guard Association in making this a truly national community endeavor. However, we shall go forward ourselves at once because of the immediate mobilization situation which confronts the enlisted ground reserve and junior combat-experienced officers in the corps.

We have already formed local committees of Marine Reserve lawyers in several cities to handle legal matters for Reserve units called to duty. This work will increase and expand. We are actively cooperating with marine recruiting officers across the country to bring the finest young men into the corps and once again rebuild it into a realistic instant force in readiness. In Seattle this week our Reserve officers worked with the unit being mobilized there for 2 days in handling legal problems. In Fresno, our National Chaplain, Rev. Paul J. Redmond, captain, (ChC), USNR, retired, helped spark-plug a citizen's committee in handling these and other matters for the local detachment prior to its departure for Camp Pendleton, California. In Washington, D. C., the chapter president, Capt. Robert Leonard, has offered all possible assistance to the Fifth Reserve Battalion and has named Maj. Helen Crean as contact with Maj. David Condon's men at Camp Lejeune. He has named Capt. John Pratt as head of a team of lawyers to assist in this work.

First MCROA Chapter to embark on the legal assistance phase of the Reserve mobilization was the Louisville (Ky.) Chapter under the leadership of Capt. Stephen Cisler, chapter president. As other opportunities for service arise in backing up the officers and men who will fill out our Fleet Marine Force to combat strength from its present skeleton force, we shall notify individual Reserve officers as well as chapters.

This message by General Maas is only the latest in a series to MCROA chapters and individual members offering Marine Reserve officers an opportunity of assisting those whose call to active duty has been so speedy.

Let's Take It Easy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission of the House to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by George J. Burger, Jr., which appeared in the Burger Tire Consultant Service Bulletin. Mr. Burger's father is a resident in New Rochelle, in the Twenty-eighth Congressional District of New York:

LET'S TAKE IT EASY

We do not know, any more than you do, what international developments will bring in the next few weeks or months.

But we do know that unless producing and selling businessmen pitch in wholeheartedly to help curb the present wave of hysteria buying, the task of supplying our fighting forces and keeping the country on an even keel is going to be very tough. At worst it may become impossible for Government to conduct even the limited Korean war without controls to check inflation and curb shortages. At best it may become necessary for our industry and others to engage in some sort of voluntary allocations.

There's no doubt that a war-frightened public has gone hog wild. In some cases buying has been so heavy that temporary shortages have appeared on certain tire sizes.

More than this, there have been some disturbing reports about the actions of certain factors within our industry. One, that a certain tire supplier is refusing to sell at least some of his dealers in less than trailer-load lots. Another, that one big auto maker is buying for inventory far above his known immediate requirements. There's no doubt that if we looked far enough we could find some small and large dealers who are thoughtlessly riding the crest of the wave.

This sort of stuff doesn't make sense.

Certainly no secret should be made of the fact that if war with Russia does come there will be tire shortages and rationing. We could be cut off completely from far eastern rubber-producing areas. We haven't enough of a stockpile on hand and we haven't the synthetic rubber producing capacity to support a world war and business as usual.

But at the same time the consuming public—all the way from large corporations to individual car owners—should be impressed with the fact that we aren't yet in such a war. We may never be. Neither have we been cut off from the Far East. Additional synthetic rubber plants are in production. Tire manufacture for peacetime use is running at record rates. Manufacturer inventories are ample. No consumer who really needs tires has been unable to procure them—except where greedy neighbors have commenced hoarding.

More than this, the greater needless buying the greater the pressures on prices. Prices are already up. This means that war charges and daily living costs are going up too. You, the consumer, and we are going to pay for this—not only in daily purchases, but in increased Government deficits and taxation.

You know, there's one thing that Stalin & Co. would dearly love to see—America going into a tail spin on its own initiative. That's what is in the book of Marx. And that is exactly what we are in danger of building up to now.

So, let's take it easy. And let's tell our customers to use their heads. Let's not bring on more inflation, with resultant bureaucratic red tape of controls when there is no major war. Let's use restraint—our men in Korean fox holes will benefit, too.

INDUSTRY REVIEW

Prices up: Tire makers have increased prices on replacement passenger tires by 5 percent, and on replacement truck tires by 7½ percent. Last week prices on original equipment tires were raised from 8 to 10 percent. Prices on original equipment truck-bus tires went up 12½ percent. And prices on original equipment farm implement tires went up 6 percent.

NOTE.—Talk in Washington is that Congress may act on the sweeping price increases that have come about on many commodities since the Korean war started.

Rubber stocks: The United States Department of Commerce reports that May 1950, natural rubber inventories totalled 101,079 tons, as compared with 106,124 tons in April and 111,875 tons in May 1949. May 1950 synthetic rubber stock totaled 74,672 tons, as compared with 83,440 tons in April and 112,739 tons in May 1949. These stocks are less than a 2 month's supply at current consumption rates.

Synthetic rubber operations: Now that Government has decided to expand its synthetic-rubber program, just what is what? Seventy-five percent of the Nation's Government-owned GR-S production facilities are now operating, compared with 63 percent before the expansion decision. One hundred percent of the Government-owned butyl facilities are now active, compared with the former 81 percent. And 82 percent of the butadine facilities are in action, compared with the 69 percent that were active before the order.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Present Protest to Senator Connally Against World Government and Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including a letter by Clyde A. Lewis, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, addressed to Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The attitude of that great veterans' organization has considerable bearing upon the propaganda now being waged for world government and the Atlantic Union:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
August 7, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: I note by the New York Times of this morning that nine former officials of the Department of State have written you asking your support of the Atlantic union resolution.

On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I earnestly request that you give this matter your most serious consideration before acting, and that, unless better arguments than have been heretofore forthcoming are supplied, you refrain from rendering the requested support.

I assure no organization on earth is more anxious to take effective measures opposed to communism than is the Veterans of Foreign Wars. But we are just as concerned to see that in the process we do not give away our national inheritance to the point of impoverishing the Nation and relinquishing the freedom of its citizens.

We are opposed to the resolution of the Atlantic Union Committee for at least three basic reasons:

1. The proposed coalition of nations would not have their military power enhanced as a result of such a union as is proposed. The member nations still would have the same arms and the same manpower as now. Their striking ability could not be increased through a merger of men of all nationalities and languages. And the United States would have entered a body the decisions of which would override those of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of our own Government.

2. The proposed Atlantic union would split the world on a color line, thus affronting nations friendly to us which would not be invited as members. Its establishment would be a signal to Russia to speed up her military production in what could become the greatest arms race in history. The Atlantic union's formation would weaken the structure and the basic conception of the United Nations.

3. The Atlantic Union Committee is the political arm of Federal Union, Inc. Federal Union, Inc., proposes a world currency which could seriously damage the position of the United States in world trade.

We would like to point out that the Department of Texas of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has gone on record as being strongly opposed to world government. And I believe it is only fair to say that passage of the Atlantic union resolution in question would be a significant step by the United States Congress toward a world government.

The fact that support of the Atlantic union resolution was urged on you by nine former officials of the Department of State might seem to indicate the support of that Department. In actuality, as evidenced by the enclosed copy of Assistant Secretary John D. Hickerson's testimony, the Department has not endorsed world federation plans and has said that matters of such import must be decided by the people as a whole.

Also enclosed are these other documents:

A Warning on World Government, reprint of an article appearing in Harper's and written by Senator Warren R. Austin.

World Government—Medicine with a False Label, a speech prepared by the American Sovereignty Section of Veterans of Foreign Wars.

World Government—No Answer to America's Desire for Peace, a copy of a speech delivered at Ellensburg, Wash., by Mr. Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar Association.

We particularly commend your attention to that section of Mr. Holman's speech concerning the effects of international treaties on domestic law.

I deeply appreciate the fact that in these troubled times your hours are more than fully occupied. But we hope you will find the opportunity to study the enclosed material and reach the same conclusion we have.

With every good wish, I am

Respectfully yours,

CLYDE A. LEWIS,
Commander in Chief.

The Road Block in UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time the administration recognizes the threat of communism not only in the United Nations but throughout this fair land of ours. If the United Nations is going to be effective and the instrument for bringing about lasting peace, we either have to reorganize it without Russia and its satellites or start a new organization made up of those nations which disavow communism. After the sincere and conscientious efforts we have made toward making the United Nations the representative body to bring world peace, it is disgraceful to have the Russian representative, Mr. Malik, delay the progress expected of UN and so disgracefully attack our own Government as the aggressors in the Korean war. Certainly the one-world idea is blasted. Russia has definitely proved she will not work with us so now we must organize the anti-Communist nations in our fight for survival.

Mr. Speaker, there is plenty to do right here at home. Since the Korean war began, reports are that many leading Communists and fellow travelers have turned turtle claiming that they are loyal Americans. These people must be watched. Now is the time for us to clamp down on these Communists and fellow travelers as probably they are

just keeping under cover in the expectation that the Red army will some day strike against the United States and give the signal for fifth column action on the American home front. We have been gullible dupes. This Congress must act promptly and pass all the provisions of the Mundt-Ferguson Communist-control bill and put real teeth in it. The article follows:

THE ROAD BLOCK IN UN—MARK SULLIVAN OFFERS A REMEDY: A UN THAT EXCLUDES RUSSIANS

(By Mark Sullivan)

The war in Korea, and the wider war in prospect—along with accompanying developments in the United Nations—are at a stage which presents a primary need. The need is to know the objective for which we fight—the objective, that is, other than the military one of victory. In the lack of understanding this ultimate objective, and keeping it in mind, we are likely to experience again the futility and disappointment which was our fate following the First and Second World Wars.

In the present war we have no recognized and consciously self-chosen objective other than the military one, which is defense against aggression by international communism wherever it attacks—a series of repetitions of Korea. In the sense other than military we have no objective that is equivalent to what military men call over-all strategic concept.

This is not a new phase, it has been our national way. As put by a distinguished military historian, Hanson Baldwin, of the New York Times: "The United States has fought wars differently from other peoples. We have fought for the immediate victory, not for the ultimate peace. * * * We have had no * * * well-defined political objective to chart our military action. We fought to win—period."

Yet war should have an objective additional to the military one; there should be a purpose for which military victory is sought. This was emphasized by ex-President Hoover, in a speech he made last month at the dedication of a memorial to William Allen White at Emporia, Kans. Mr. Hoover cited the words here quoted from Mr. Baldwin, and for himself added: "The valor of our men won great battles. But we have won no lasting peace. However, from these sacrifices we can deduce some vital truths. I suggest to you a fundamental truism. War is justified only as an instrument for a specific consequence. That consequence for America was lasting peace."

During any war, lasting peace is a hope and ideal, tacit in the minds of practically all, and sometimes expressed in slogans, such as the First World War's "the war to end all wars." During the Second World War the hope was expressed in another slogan, "One world," the peace was to be not only lasting but universal. Toward the end of the war this ideal was given form; an institution to embody it and operate it was set up, the United Nations.

Presently we recognized that the United Nations would not bring lasting peace; it would not even bring the formal peace settlement with our recent enemies that normally should have followed the ending of the war. The reason was Communist Russia. In conference after conference, within the United Nations and out, Russia prevented peace settlements. We were forced to recognize that Russia did not want peace, indeed that prevention of peace was a conscious purpose it held. It wanted continuation of postwar chaos to the end of promoting communization of the world. Within the United Nations Russia used its membership, not to cooperate for peace but as a means of promoting hate and fear among peoples.

After some 5 years of this there was general recognition that the United Nations, with Russia and its satellites holding membership, could not be an instrument for lasting peace. This general recognition, and a proposed way out, was in a speech ex-President Hoover made last April 27 to the American Newspaper Publishers Association:

"I suggest that the United Nations should be reorganized without the Communist nations in it. If that is impracticable, then a definite new united front should be organized of those peoples who disavow communism. * * * It is a proposal to redeem the concept of the United Nations to the high purposes for which it was created."

Two months after Mr. Hoover spoke, with the outbreak in Korea June 25, the United Nations pulled itself out of futility into vitality. It asked its member nations to join with the United States in opposing the Korean aggression, and practically all except the Communist ones did so. But Russia remains within the United Nations and enlarges the perverse use it makes of its membership. It happens that for August the presiding official of the Security Council is Russian Representative Malik, and he makes use of that position for delay and denunciation. The other members seek some means by which the Russian representative can be checkmated. If they look logic and fact in the face, their problem is how to achieve a United Nations that does not contain Russia.

Statement of Louis Bartlett, Attorney for the Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Louis Bartlett of Berkeley, Calif., is recognized as an authority on water and power problems in the West.

He recently made a statement before the Water Resources Policy Commission that should be preserved for future reference.

Under unanimous consent I therefore include it as part of my remarks:

MEMORANDUM FOR WATER RESOURCES POLICY COMMISSION, SUBMITTED JUNE 24, 1950, BY LOUIS BARTLETT, ATTORNEY AND FORMERLY LEGAL AND ECONOMIC CONSULTANT FOR THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

A large number of the questions to be answered by your commission cannot be answered without exact knowledge of facts, which, though available, have not been assembled and published.

I

For example: Questions 2, 3, and 4 refer to reimbursable and nonreimbursable costs of projects.

The answer you seek, in the context of the Central Valley project, is extremely difficult. Power is generated at the Shasta Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation and now sold to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which resells it over its system. The price received by the Bureau not only pays the cost of the power, but includes repayment over a term of years of the cost of irrigation features. When the west side main transmission lines and lower voltage lines are completed, all cities and irrigation districts in the area will have the right to receive Shasta power at the price the P. G. & E. pays for it near the dam.

The following table, prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, is a comparison of what all the irrigation districts taking power at one point only, paid the P. G. & E. in the years cited, and what they would have paid the Bureau of Reclamation if its transmission lines were then available. (See vol. XLIV, No. 3, Transactions of the Commonwealth Club of California, November 28, 1949, p. 143.)

Comparative commercial power costs, organized irrigation districts

(All districts served by P. G. & E.)

District	Year	Power cost to districts using—				Difference or annual saving	Percent savings with CVP
		CVP commercial power		P. G. & E. power			
			Mills		*Mills*		
East Contra Costa irrigation district [1]	1939	$29,356	4.38	$40,102	5.98	$10,746	26.8
Do	1946	31,708	4.25	42,406	5.68	10,698	25.2
Banta Carbona irrigation district	1945	42,259	4.52	65,577	7.01	23,318	35.6
Do	1948	53,521	4.53	90,382	7.65	36,861	40.8
Westside irrigation district	1946	20,580	4.85	37,692	8.89	17,112	45.4
Do	1948	25,065	4.87	44,544	8.66	19,479	43.7
West Stanislaus irrigation district	1948	64,623	4.80	103,929	7.72	39,306	37.8
Glenn-Colusa irrigation district	1947	31,563	4.12	60,444	7.89	28,881	47.8
Patterson Water Co	1945	20,400	4.73	35,816	8.30	15,416	43.0
Composite totals	------	319,075	--------	520,892	--------	201,817	38.74

[1] East Contra Costa irrigation district purchases power under a special contract entered into October 1933.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Reclamation.

This table shows an average saving of 38 percent by the districts. A number of cities buy power from the P. G. & E. and usually resell it at lower rates than the company's, and make substantial profit, greatly in excess of the taxes paid by the company. These profits are used for rate reductions and local improvements or tax reduction.

It should be possible to obtain from cities, Federal agencies such as the Army and Navy which buy large quantities of power, and public districts of all kinds, the exact amounts they now pay to the P. G. & E. for power, and in what quantities and uses, and to obtain from the Bureau of Reclamation the exact cost to these same agencies of power generated at Federal power plants delivered direct by Bureau of Reclamation lines. With these data it will be possible to answer much more accurately a number of the questions now subject to investigation by the Water Resources Policy Commission. It is information to which the public and Congress are entitled, since Congress provides the money for the project, and the tax payers pay the initial costs, whether reimbursable or not. The table included above is a pattern which gives a clear and understandable idea of these relevant facts.

II

What happens now to the 38 percent average savings that Bureau of Reclamation power will give the irrigation districts?

If we can assume that the P. G. & E.'s operating expenses are not grossly in excess of those of the Bureau of Reclamation, the 38 percent savings go for P. G. & E. taxes, divi-

dends, surplus, and miscellaneous purposes; some political, disguised as donations to charities, Christmas trees, memberships in organizations, etc.

California taxes its public utilities on their real and personal property. It cannot tax the United States Government's lines, so this tax on consumers in California is unnecessary where the Bureau of Reclamation lines are available. These latter, not only pay their own way at the reduced rates they charge, but in addition, reduce the cost of irrigation by ultimately paying off all costs allocated to irrigation features of the Shasta Dam.

Since a constant effort is being made to persuade the public that the construction of transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation will hurt the public generally, and the stockholders of the P. G. & E. particularly, and public support is necessary to carry on whatever policies this commission ultimately recommends, it would be helpful if a study were made in the Central Valley showing the growth of electric needs and facilities, both public and private. This will show that additional publicity-owned generating and transmission facilities will not impair the financial status or profits of the privately-owned utility. Actually, increasing power needs in the Central Valley area are so great that both public and private systems in northern California failed to meet the needs in 1948, and rationing practices were put in force by the Public Utilities Commission of California. To keep up with the demand, both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Company are building new installations.

At the hearing before your commission at Berkeley on Saturday, June 24, I asked permission to supplement the written statement left with you by additional comments. I am, therefore, respectfully submitting the following, which relate to point (d) of your assignment, viz: "Desirable legislation or changes in existing legislation relating to the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources."

This memorandum raises these questions:

(a) What water rights become appurtenant to land in a watershed other than that of origin of the water, when brought there by Federal project?

(b) Particularly when the imported water is product of a number of different streams feeding a canal to the land served;

(c) The practicality of transferring control of imported water from the Bureau of Reclamation to the irrigation districts served.

These topics are illustrated by conditions in the Central Valley project of California.

(a) and (b) The main purpose of the Central Valley project of California is to transfer surplus water from the Sacramento River watershed to the southern two-thirds of the Central Valley where there is a water deficiency.

The waters of all of the northern California rivers involved flow into the delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and will be taken from that point by a high level canal to the Mendota pool on the San Joaquin River, where they will be turned into the channel of the San Joaquin River and flow back north. Coincidentally, the waters of the San Joaquin will be deflected at the Friant Dam and used in the upper (southern) San Joaquin Valley.

Thus, the waters of the Delta-Mendota canal will be a part of the flow of the Sacramento, Feather, Yuba, American and other rivers. If farmers receiving that water acquire a water right, to what water does it attach? In these circumstances, what is the legal relation between the individual irrigator, the district of which he is a member, and the Bureau of Reclamation as to the water received?

(c) At the hearing before the commission a great number of organized groups took the position that the Bureau of Reclamation should have no control whatever over the irrigation districts receiving water from the Central Valley project, even though a portion of the cost was repayable to it, because the districts themselves were ready, willing, and able to pay their share of the reimbursable costs and needed no direction. Among these were the State chamber of commerce, various local chambers of commerce, the Irrigation District Association of California, and many individual irrigation districts. Few, if any, dirt farmers protested.

In the 1930's there were approximately 4,000,000 acres of land in these districts with approximately $100,000,000 of bonds outstanding, which would indicate an average debt of approximately $25 per acre. Over $80,000,000 defaulted as to principal and interest. Those in default took advantage of the Federal bankruptcy law under which the RFC bought the bonds in default and accepted new bonds as security for new loans.

In making these loans the value of the lands and the probability of repayment were carefully surveyed by the RFC and the bonded debt scaled down. The new loans in no case exceeded 75 percent of the outstanding old bonds surrendered, and as little as 6 percent in one instance. The average loan was about 50 percent of the face of bonds then outstanding.

The claim that all irrigation districts are now ready, willing, and able to pay their share of irrigation costs, should be considered in the light of this experience, particularly since all agriculture is now being subsidized by the Federal Government on the parity-price principle and that the so-called Brannan plan which will reduce the present subsidy somewhat is meeting very strong farm opposition in Congress.

These facts are clearly relevant to whether the present moderate controls by the Bureau of Reclamation in furnishing water to irrigation districts should be abolished or transferred to the State of California.

When Loyalty Is Misplaced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Outlook, Santa Monica, Calif., for August 5, 1950:

WHEN LOYALTY IS MISPLACED

In his press conference Thursday, President Truman took note of a suggestion made by Democratic Representative PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, who is the Democratic whip in the House. Representative PRIEST had said that Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Defense Secretary Louis Johnson should resign. Mr. Truman said that Secretaries Johnson and Acheson would not resign as long as he is Chief Executive.

The Department of Defense and the Department of State are the two most important agencies of our Washington Government today. The first is headed by a man who arbitrarily stopped construction of a new aircraft carrier, cut the Marine Corps to a skeleton force, refused General MacArthur's request for a larger army in Japan, persuaded the President to veto an addition to the Air Force—and then boasted that we were ready to whip Russia. Yet Secretary Johnson spent $13,000,000,000 on national defense last year, without achieving any kind of war preparedness.

As for Secretary Acheson, he stood out for more than a year against any aid for the Chinese Nationalists, against any arms for the South Koreans, against any defense of Formosa, against any realistic policy of combating communism in Asia and the Pacific. For more than a year he tried to appease the Chinese Communists and opposed every suggestion that General MacArthur be consulted in far-eastern policy. Even today he is standing out against a loan to Spain, and President Truman again is siding with him.

Apart from any question of their individual competence, Secretaries Johnson and Acheson have always pulled in opposite directions and still are in disagreement as to United States policy in Asia. The President has listened first to one and then the other, with the result that our shifting policy deceived the Russians into thinking that this country would not fight for Korea. It was the utter inconsistency of American policy in the Orient, added to our military unpreparedness and the State Department's lack of realism, which landed us in the Korean mess.

Yet President Truman thinks he must go on being loyal to both Secretary Acheson and Secretary Johnson. Presumably he will go on listening to their conflicting counsels and blowing hot with Johnson one day and cold with Acheson the next.

Mr. Truman's code of loyalty, which he learned under Boss Prendergast, might be respected if it acknowledged any higher loyalty, such as that to the national welfare. But in the present instance it reminds us of the equally misplaced loyalty of Secretary Acheson when he said, "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss."

It is truly appalling that this great Nation must continue to muddle along, through a great world crisis, with Louis Johnson running the Defense Department, Dean Acheson directing foreign policy, and Harry S. Truman trying to fill an office for which he never was fitted.

The Hungry Horse Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, many of the dams and reservoirs now under construction or proposed for construction by the Federal Government will cause the flooding of Government-owned lands and improvements administered by Federal agencies other than the agency constructing the dam. It is customary for the constructing agency to plan for replacement in kind of physical improvements which will be submerged or otherwise rendered useless by the reservoir. Providing a duplicate road, camp ground, or administrative headquarters in lieu of submerged improvement may not, however, furnish the same degree of transportation service or allow resources to be utilized to the same extent as was possible with the original improvements.

Following the principle of replacement in kind a narrow road is replaced with a narrow road without regard for possible lack of similarity in the conditions at new and old locations and the impact of additional travel and, consequently, the probable need for higher road standards because of reservoir construction. Roads

submerged by reservoirs are often on comparatively flat valley bottom locations where they can be widened and improved at comparatively low cost. Relocation of such roads above reservoir levels often places the road on steep, rugged side hills where subsequent improvement is many times more costly. Consequently, the construction of a reservoir often leads to a triple impact on road conditions, two roads required in place of one in order to serve both sides of the reservoir, costlier betterment because of rougher country and need for better roads because of traffic induced by the existence of the reservoir.

It does not seem reasonable to burden the appropriations of an agency administering Federal lands with the increased cost of road work made more expensive and more urgent because of the construction of a dam by another Government agency. To follow such a procedure will, moreover, mean a long delay in the restoration of adequate transportation facilities for some of the federally administered areas where reservoirs will be built. It may also mean the disruption of local economy.

The latter is a matter to consider in conjunction with the replacement for a road to be submerged by the Hungry Horse Reservoir in Montana. On July 17, Senator MURRAY, speaking from the floor of the Senate, requested that the current appropriation for forest development roads and trails be increased by enough to improve the roads around this reservoir—the road which the Bureau of Reclamation proposed to build on the west side of this reservoir. In opposition to this request several Senators stated that this road cost should be borne by the agency building the dam.

In this instance the Forest Service has a large block of timber adjacent to the new reservoir which, properly harvested, will contribute a payroll to the area of over a million dollars annually. Under the present policy of replacement in kind, the Bureau of Reclamation, which is building the dam, will build a road suitable for hauling only a very small part of the timber that can be harvested with an adequate road. The road as planned will accommodate only comparatively light loads and only during the few dry summer months. Economic utilization of this timber requires the use of large trucks and spring and autumn as well as summer logging. It will be years before Forest Service appropriations for development roads and trails afford the funds that will be needed to improve the narrow road that will be built as part of the Hungry Horse project. Meanwhile the local communities and the State will lose the value of a million-dollar annual payroll and the Government stands to lose by insect infestations and the decreased productivity of the timber lands.

The road that is necessary for the proper administration and utilization of the timber in that area should be built now as a part of the Hungry Horse project and not be left for the Forest Service to do after the dam and reservoir are finished. The same conditions as outlined for the Hungry Horse project will prevail on other similar projects proposed in the West.

This additional road work will not contribute to flood control, power, and irrigation benefits that will accrue from the construction of the dam, and so I propose that this cost will not be a reimbursable item in the construction of the dam.

Since the agency administering the land is required to completely alter its plans for the area when such a reservoir is built, and since the administering agency is best fitted to analyze the effect of reservoir construction on its plans, I propose that the cost of revising these plans, as well as the construction costs be included in the cost of the reservoir and dam.

Mr. Speaker, in order to correct the present situation, I am today introducing H. R. 9427 and I hope the House Committee on Public Lands will call for hearings on this measure as soon as possible.

Outlawing the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, August 13, on the subject, Outlawing the Communists.

The New York Times is noted for its thoughtful editorials, which try to present both sides of an issue fairly. With the growing interest in the internal security of the United States, the arguments set forth in this editorial should be of interest to the membership of the House.

I invite particular attention to the following sentences:

To outlaw the Communists as such comes perilously close to outlawing an idea, and there is no law in the world strong enough to do that. No matter how wicked or objectionable the idea may be, it can be overcome only by other ideas. The founding fathers realized this, and their descendants should never forget it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is an excellent statement of a fundamental principle of democracy. I commend this editorial to my colleagues.

The editorial referred to follows:

OUTLAWING THE COMMUNISTS

"Congress should enact legislation to outlaw the Communist Party and all of its affiliated agencies and publications. * * * It is * * * absurd to permit a 'Russian party' on our ballot."

These words pose a question which is increasingly forcing itself upon the attention of all thinking Americans. The words are not those of irresponsible extremists. They come, rather, from Freedom House, a highly respected, liberal-minded body of citizens of various political views but of unified devotion to American democracy.

The problem of outlawing the Communist Party goes to the very roots of our entire political system. It is essential that the answer be found through mature consideration, not through emotional judgment. The peculiar difficulty of this problem lies, of course, in the nature of the Communist Party itself. The primary reason not to outlaw the party springs from the most fundamental principle of the American political system. The freedom of assembly, of speech and of press guaranteed by the Constitution obviously is not merely freedom for those with whom we agree. It is freedom for those with whom we disagree, for the dissenter, the unorthodox, the unpopular. It is freedom to denounce the existing Government and to advocate a peaceful change in the political or economic structure.

On the other hand, it is not freedom to commit or promote sabotage or sedition or to attempt to overthrow the Government by violence. Nor it is freedom to assist our enemies in time of war. But a good argument can be made that if any of those things is done, there are ample laws (perhaps with a few minor additions) to protect the integrity of the United States. Any action of treason, or espionage, or sabotage, or violence, is punishable under existing law. In this way we are protected against Communist action. But to outlaw the Communists as such comes perilously close to outlawing an idea, and there is no law in the world strong enough to do that. No matter how wicked or objectionable the idea may be, it can be overcome only by other ideas. The founding fathers realized this, and their descendants should never forget it.

By attempting to legislate against the party as a whole it would appear that we negate the principles of a liberal democracy; we deceive ourselves into thinking that we have added to our own armor; we take a long step toward the very totalitarian danger from which we are trying to protect our country and we do not actually eliminate a single Communist; we merely drive him underground, where he is harder to find and to watch.

Against these arguments we submit that there is no longer any doubt that the Communist Party follows the policy of the Russian Government, rather than our own, and that it aims at the overthrow of democratic government, either through internal pressure or with Russian assistance. The recent decision of the United States court of appeals affirming the conviction of 11 Communist leaders, noted that "the violent capture of all existing governments is one article of the creed of that [Communist] faith, which abjures the possibility of success by lawful means." In the light of this decision, it would certainly not be illogical to declare the party outlaw. As Justice Jackson said in a recent opinion, "Conspiracy, violence, intimidation * * * are all that keeps hope alive in the Communist breast."

It was, we believe, President MacCracken who advised the girls in a graduating class at Vassar to "keep an open mind, but not so open that your brains fall out." In our pursuit of the true essence of freedom at a time like this we find ourselves much in danger of having it happen to us.

Yet for the reasons given here it seems to us that the course of wisdom is to defer action at this time. The issue can be solved pragmatically. If and when it becomes evident that order cannot be maintained without outlawing the Communist Party, then we shall support the executive branch of the Government in taking that step. We hope that time will not come. But if it should, such action would not then be in conflict with Mr. Truman's words, which we endorse, "It would be tragic in the highest degree if we were to frighten ourselves into destroying those very liberties which are the basis of our moral leadership in the struggle for peace."

Bunk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the oft-repeated statement made by the administration's spokesmen, in substance and to the effect that all who venture to criticize any administration suggestion or program give aid and comfort to Stalin is nonsense—a thinly disguised attempt to intimidate, to stifle criticism.

The Saturday Evening Post characterizes the attempt in this way—I quote:

WE CAN'T SELL OUR IDEALS ABROAD IF THEY DIE AT HOME

Hardly had the Korean incident settled down to the status of normal war news when Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, made in the United States Senate a remark which represents one thing that we hope will be avoided for the duration. Senator TAFT had urged the resignation of Secretary of State Acheson on the obvious ground that events had cut the heart out of the Acheson policies. LUCAS' comment was that TAFT's speech gave aid and comfort to Stalin, and there should be nothing but unity from now on.

The public and Members of Congress will have to be on the alert lest present events provide the opportunity for closing the book on the blunders of an administration which made this Red thrust inevitable. Unity is all very well, but a group of politicians who messed up a peace the way the Truman-Acheson policy makers have done will bear watching as they try their skills in a new field. If it is to be considered immoral to criticize the man who wouldn't defend Formosa 24 hours before President Truman ordered that such a defense should be set up, it is difficult to see what area for free discussion remains. Freedom of criticism is now more important than ever, but it will take stout men to defend it.

The Truman administration will be sorely tempted to use the fracas in Asia as a pretext for pushing all sorts of socialist planning and governmental boondoggling, on the theory that it is needed for national defense. As the Wall Street Journal warned on the first day of the Korean incident, "National defense in the lexicon of Washington means more government regulation, more government control over the economy and over the people. Any man who now speaks up for economy or freedom from controls can have a shooting war thrown at him." Senator LUCAS set the pitch on the very first day.

Another thing we ought to be thinking about is political warfare, whether the war remains cool or gets hot. We must be far clearer than we have been in explaining what we will settle for. "Unconditional surrender" convinced the Germans and Japanese that for them it was victory or destruction. In Russia and its satellites there are millions of people who regard war as the one hope of liberation. Millions of Russians felt that way about Hitler's invasion of their country in 1941. At least two Ukrainian armies went over to the Germans in the first few weeks, and more would have followed had Hitler paid any attention to political warfare. Why must we wait for a general war before making the American position more attractive to outsiders?

Up to now, evidence of confidence in our own way of doing things must have come through only dimly to the Orient. Our diplomacy has been party to betrayals and intrigues with Communist infiltrators. Almost at the hour of the strike in Korea, American officials were assuring reporters that Korea was not our baby. When we propose economic assistance to backward areas, it is not by means of the tried American way of private investment, but via a gigantic boondoggle sifted through the United Nations bureaucracy. The peoples who have run under Stalin's umbrella have not done so from love of communism, but from fear that they will be abandoned. President Truman's forthright act did much to restore the prestige which Roosevelt and Acheson had done so much to shatter. But not even MacArthur and a flock of B-29's can keep hope in free America alive in the world if liberty and individual enterprise are assassinated here at home—by the same breed of planners and stuffed shirts who have done so much to murder them abroad.

It Is the Duty of Every Citizen To Be Vocal as Well as Patriotic in Times Such as These

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the responsibilities of the perilous times in which we live must be shared alike by officials of the Government and private citizens for a satisfactory solution can come only from a mutual understanding of the situation. I have received a letter from a constituent expressing a viewpoint deserving consideration by the Congress. Under permission granted by the House, I am including the text of his letter in the Appendix of the RECORD. The writer, Mr. Joseph E. McNaughton, is publisher of the Effingham (Ill.) Daily News, executive of a radio station serving the same area, and an informed student of public affairs. His letter follows:

EFFINGHAM DAILY NEWS,
Effingham, Ill., August 7, 1950.

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
Paris, Ill.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENISON: Since I believe it is the duty of every citizen to be vocal as well as patriotic in times such as these, I want to point out a situation which worries me.

American troops are fighting on the Asian land mass. I wonder if this is the smart way to fight Russia. Russia can use hundreds of thousands of satellite troops to bleed us in an Asiatic land war.

I am strongly of the opinion that we must be very careful not to permit Russia to bleed us while fighting Russian equipped satellite troops who are inflamed with revolutionary verve.

It seems to me the best policy is to prepare with all posisble speed and vigor and then to fight more or less the type war the English fought against Napoleon. Sort of a low manpower loss perimeter war. While we are fighting the perimeter war I suggest we send highly trained secret military, espionage, and sabotage agents into enemy lands, and broadcast propaganda to enemy peoples on a great scale.

I'm not a bit sold on receiving revolutionary Asia on the point of our lance in enormous, sanguine, close range Verduns.

Far better for us I believe to produce military supplies in vast quantities and using such places as Japan and Formosa as bases, blast the Russian, Chinese, and so forth, factories and cities into ruins with air power.

A war which finds our infantry fighting Russian mercenaries and not bombing the factories in Manchuria which supply the Russian infantry strikes me as asinine, and the very reverse of the type war we should be fighting. If we must pit our manpower against the Asian hordes, for God's sake let's bomb hell out of the factories which are supplying the enemy.

Thanking you for your indulgence.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. MCNAUGHTON,
Publisher.

Farce of Soviet Collaboration Leading United States to Global War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Sunday Herald of August 13, 1950:

FARCE OF SOVIET COLLABORATION SEEN LEADING US TO GLOBAL WAR

(By Jan Ciechanowski)

Wars are not won by military effort alone. The United States won the last world war not only because its Army, Navy, Air Force, and war production were powerful, effective, and perfectly coordinated. The American victory was also largely due to the fact that, while hostilities lasted, its foreign policy was likewise coordinated and consistent with its war effort.

While the shooting war lasted, it would have been unthinkable for the diplomats of the two fighting camps to hold joint conferences even for the purpose of mutually complaining to one another of any single aggression launched by any of their country's allies.

However insistently we stress the official version that the war in Korea is only a clash between the aggressive North Koreans and a United Nations police force, we know that, in realty, it is a shooting war between the Soviet-led forces of communism and the American-led forces of western democracy.

In the light of this fact, the current meeting of the UN Security Council, presided over by the delegate of Soviet Russia—the power behind the Korean aggression—appears somewhat incongruous.

We know that the North Koreans are entirely armed, equipped, and at least partly commanded by the Soviets. We have reason to expect that, when the tide of battle turns in favor of the American troops, Communist Chinese reinforcements, likewise armed and commanded by the Soviets, will enter the fight against the American UN forces.

Notwithstanding these circumstances, the American Government is still acting as if it believed that the Soviets might be swayed by diplomatic arguments at the United Nations Council and influenced to change their policy of world domination to one of collaboration for a one-world peace.

Surely, in the face of the record, such a hope appears to be unfounded. From the outset the Soviets have almost completely stalemated the UN. At the UN and at

other conferences they managed to prevent the United States of America from achieving any of its major postwar policy aims such as the conclusion of peace treaties with Germany, Austria, and Japan.

UNTENABLE SITUATION

They brought about the partitioning of Germany, Austria, and Korea. They created an untenable situation in Trieste and in Korea. They have violated practically every clause of every treaty they ever signed. They have never ceased to attack and to vilify the United States of America in their speeches, their press, and in their skillfully conducted propaganda.

They have caused American diplomatic officials to be insulted, arrested, expelled, and restricted in the performance of their normal duties in Soviet-enslaved, satellite countries. They are now working to turn the Asiatic peoples against the United States of America and its allies. They have succeeded in dividing the world, which was to have been a one world of peace, into two opposing worlds of communism versus democracy.

To continue to ignore the present cleavage of the world and the growing menace of the ever dynamic Soviet policy can only lead to disaster. To allow the Soviets to misuse casuistic and parliamentary dilatory methods in order to prevent the UN Council from performing its duty, while American soldiers are fighting and dying in a war launched and directed by the Soviets, does not appear to make sense.

TWO AXIOMS

Two axioms stem from logic and history, namely, that once hostilities have started, it is futile to count on the effectiveness of diplomatic methods that have failed to prevent them and, that in the course of a conflict the side whose troops are retreating can hardly expect to obtain fair terms of peace by negotiation.

One might also add that, while a conflict is actually in progress, diplomatic moves intended to placate the enemy are doomed to failure. For instance, the United States of America could not seriously hope to placate the Soviets by not opposing the admission to the UN of Communist China.

The Soviets would certainly interpret such a move as a sign of weakness and as an attempt at appeasement, while American prestige would be lowered in the Far East and, particularly, in Indochina, the Philippines, and Japan and among the European allies of the United States of America.

LIKE IT OR NOT

Whether we like it or not, in Korea the Soviets have challenged the United States of America and not the UN. Their chief aim in returning to the UN Council after a 7 months' long walkout is to stall the Council's work until the UN police force is thrown out of Korea. Their second more far-reaching aim is to show their power to the nations they are trying to draw away from American leadership by intimidation.

Their third aim is to probe American determination by means of direct challenges, in the hope that they will succeed in demonstrating the weakness of American policy, should the United States of America fail to take up their challenge.

Surely it is time to face the fact that the world is divided and cannot be united by using defensive diplomatic means. It is time to realize that there are in existence two rival international organizations: the UN, still ready to follow the American lead, and the Sovietic Cominform, the international branch office of the Moscow Communist Vatican.

The record shows that the UN can only function on the portion of the globe still free from Soviet domination and, even there, only when the Soviets do not take part in its meetings.

The Soviets are certainly not anxious for western democracies to collaborate in their Cominform in the shaping of a Communist world. On the other hand, the American-led western democracies still appear to regard the presence of Soviet Russia in the UN as indispensable to its functioning in the task of working out and of defending the democratic way of life in the portion of the world still outside the iron curtain. We have thus reached a supreme paradox in statesmanship.

The time appears to be ripe for taking up Herbert Hoover's suggestion and either finding the procedural way to expel the Soviets as an aggressor power from the UN or to set up a new international organization without them on truly democratic lines. It is urgent to do so while American leadership, coupled with the growing danger of Soviet aggression is still sufficiently potent to convince the American-led nations that their security and the survival of democracy make it imperative.

To continue the tragic farce of Soviet collaboration allegedly for peace and democracy in the present UN and to pursue a policy still on the defensive in the face of the Soviet challenge, is the surest way of drifting into another war.

Diplomatic Blunders in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I am referring to various editorials from the July 24, 1950, issue of Life magazine.

No one should object to sound criticism or an evaluation of their past actions. Only the weak, when previous mistakes are more obvious than ever, hide under a self-preservation smoke screen and say, "This is no time for bygones."

Ever since the Soviet aggression into South Korea, the Democratic administration leaders have been wanting the public to forget the terrible diplomatic blunders of the State Department in Asia and the Far East. Fortunately the American people, through editorials such as those in Life magazine, are being told the truth. The full and complete truth of our Pacific stupidity may hurt the "let the dust settle" policy makers of the State Department, but the full and complete truth as to why we have lost China and why we are currently fighting a war in Korea will be helpful in setting a proper course in the months ahead.

The Life magazine editorials of the afore-mentioned date demand the resignation or dismissal of Acheson. If Secretary Acheson does not publicly disavow his previous China and Pacific policies, I likewise believe he should resign. If Mr. Acheson is now convinced of the fallacies of his underlings, those who assisted in setting the bankrupt Pacific policy, and will renounce straightforwardly their views, then he is qualified to remain in the President's Cabinet in the months ahead. However, if Mr. Acheson still believes in such previously discredited theories for combating Communist influence in Asia, and is only standing by till we win in Korea, then he should leave his present position of responsibility. This is no time for half-hearted cooperation. Either Mr. Acheson is wholeheartedly opposed to Communist and fellow-traveler policies in the Far East, and if so he should publicly renounce all past views, or he should step aside for another who will do more than acquiesce by silence.

In the newspapers for August 8, 1950, that so-called expert for the Far East, Mr. Owen Lattimore, urges that Communist China be seated in the United Nations. This is the same tune played by Joe Stalin and the Russian delegate to the United Nations, Mr. Malik. Birds of a feather seem to flock together.

In closing let me compliment the editor of Life magazine for discussing frankly matters which too long have been glossed over and covered up by the administration leaders.

Advice to the North Koreans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call the attention of the Members of this body to the following statement sent to me by Mrs. E. C. Slocum, of Mound City, S. Dak., for the enlightenment of the North Koreans:

You poor misguided brown brothers. You let the Russians lead you into killing your brothers of the South. All they want is to have you kill and be killed so they can come and live in your homes and take your land and make into slaves to work it your women and children. When it is too late, your spirits will look down and see this, but you cannot come back to make it right, for you have heard and minded the Russians now, and that is why you must mind them forever.

The Spanish Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the viewpoint of one of the foremost Catholic priests in my district on the Spanish question has been ably presented in a letter written by Msgr. Vitus Stoll, of Creston, Iowa, to the editor of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include Father Stoll's letter:

HE THINKS SPANIARDS HAVE MORE FREEDOM

To the EDITOR:

The Franco question seems to be fast drawing to a close. Prepare to weep, ye editors of

the Register, who have coddled Russian communism for 25 years and bewailed the "tyranny" of Franco.

The Spanish question unleashed a great deal of anti-Catholic prejudice, carefully cloaked behind a pretended love of popular freedom. No doubt the Spanish people have more true freedom now than under the brutal republic that did not hesitate to shed blood for the sake of interests that had no connection with any particular form of government Spain might have. Lodgeism, syndicalism, socialism, communism, liberalism, proletarian lust for power, sectarianism, all were clamoring for the death of the Catholic church. Neither age, nor sex, nor God's law received any consideration. Eleven thousand clergy and religious were slain in cold blood. * * * but it is to no purpose to rehash the lurid story. The so-called republic died the death it deserved. Let the coddlers of communism mourn, the rest of us thank God that we still have a foothold for freedom there.

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

Another step, of course, remains to be taken before the problem is completely disposed of. Ambassadorial relations must be restored. There should be little difficulty. We have chosen to hold our ground against Moscow from now on. It will be a costly and deadly affair, thanks to the Communists, fellow travelers, pinks in pulpits and editorial chairs, Russia's friends in the State Department, all of them will continue some show of resistance till the very end.

But how is it that President Truman did not see the light all these years and insist on leaving undisturbed the settlement Roosevelt had made of the Spanish question? May not it be that nature denied Mr. Truman any flicker of the statesman's vision, and imparted to him only the short sight of the politician? He may have deemed it smart politics to play up to Mrs. Roosevelt, who herself deemed it smart to play along with leftists, religious bigots, and doctrinaire editors.

COMFORT TO RUSSIA

Mr. Truman should have seen that such people eventually gave aid and comfort only to Russia. At last he sees it now to his humiliation, and the humiliation of his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, whom he even went out of his way to belaud as the greatest Secretary of State since the days of Charles Evans Hughes. Not such as he were a Hull, a Marshall, a Stettinius, a Byrnes, who, one by one, found no good purpose and no honor in continuing to serve him.

Now that the dead bodies of American soldiers are being brought back, the people may yet arise in wrath and demand to know, why all this stupidity, blindness, graft, waste, and unpreparedness in the face of rampart surging communism.

VITUS STOLL.

CRESTON, IOWA.

Props Under the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, for many years when I was in the California Legislature, I could turn to the pages of the Petaluma Argus-Courier to read very discerning comments on the news of the day. In Congress I have continued to follow the editorial columns of this newspaper. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an excellent editorial on the Nation's economic situation. It was written, I presume, by John A. Olmsted, publisher of the Argus-Courier, and appeared in the August 4, 1950, edition of that newspaper.

PROPS CAN'T SAVE US FROM ULTIMATE COLLAPSE

We have knocked the New Deal and the Fair Deal to a fare-thee-well for several years now and have seen no good in them. The trend has been in the wrong direction and we have tried to point out the fallacies of most of the New Deal reasoning.

There is one effect of both of them, however, which seems temporarily to have created a good effect.

This effect is pointed out by Fortune magazine which says:

"It may well be that the 1932 style of depression has become a political impossibility. Government is now the employer or purchaser of nearly one-quarter of the goods and services produced by the United States economy. In the other three-quarters of the economy—through credit, tax, and monetary powers, through labor and welfare legislation, through subsidies, guaranties, and controls of one sort or another—Government has a great deal to say about what goes on. In all this apparatus there are obvious elements of built-in stability for the economy."

In other words the Government, with the powers it has taken unto itself, can prevent a depression or control the economy to the extent that no incipient depression can become disastrous, at least for the time being.

This is accomplished by putting props under the weak places, just as we might put props under the collapsing portions of an old house.

These props keep the economy going until the elements which have tended to destroy the whole structure can be to a certain degree controlled. We can still live in the old structure.

These props however, lead us into very dangerous positions. No prop can strengthen an old house to the point that the house will be as good as new. But we get the idea that we are safe as long as we prevent this or that segment of the economy from collapsing.

Fortune goes on to say that there are "some dangers to the mainsprings of the economy. Here it is the trend rather than any very palpable damage to the business mechanism that is disturbing."

In other words, Fortune takes a roundabout, highfalutin way of saying that we can stop a depression by giving the economy a shot in the arm once in a while.

The magazine goes on to say that an economy that is 25 percent government can work, at least for a time, and work very well. But it looks with misgivings upon the supposition that, because this 25 percent control works for a time, we can go on up the control ladder to 30 percent or 50 percent and be assured that that percentage will work, even for a short time.

Yep, we can prop the old house from time to time and still make it livable for a time. But it isn't safe to count on the old house to suffice for the kids when they grow up.

That's what's the matter with the New and the Fair Deals. They figure on the props for the time being—especially at election time, and ignore the future consequences.

Some day this old economy of ours is going to collapse like the deacon's one-horse shay, if we don't quit depending on props to keep it from collapsing.

Every time we use a prop on it we go deeper and deeper into debt and it costs more and more to keep the old structure from going to pieces. So we pile debt onto debt and cost onto cost without stopping to think where such a course leads in the end.

Fines and Jail Sentences Under the Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, criticizing me for a speech I made over 5 months ago which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then reprinted to meet the demand of Members who wanted extra copies of it. Mr. Brannan advises me now that he is "both surprised and alarmed to discover" that my speech pointed out that the so-called Brannan plan bill, S. 1971—introduced by Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma—contained 15 pages of penalties ranging from fines to jail sentences for those farmers who failed to keep books according to the directives of the Secretary of Agriculture or who made false reports or records. The penalties vary up to $1,000 in fines and up to 1 year in jail, or both.

Mr. Brannan advises that these provisions were put in the bill to reduce penalties ranging from fines up to $10,000 or 5 years in jail, or both, which would be applicable under general statutes already on the books, to the operation of the so-called Brannan plan program were it enacted into law.

The Secretary inadvertently has let the cat out of the bag.

First, he concedes, whether he intends to do so or not, that drastic fines and jail sentences would have to be in the law to make his plan operate.

Second, he discloses that he has not studied the matters of fines and jail sentences, or he would know that S. 1971, the so-called Brannan plan bill, states in the penalty section that—

> The remedies and penalties provided in this title shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any of the remedies or penalties under existing law.

In other words, this bill, instead of reducing penalties, confirms existing penalties and adds new ones.

Third, the bill creates a new crime in America, the failure of farmers to file reports, which the Secretary of Agriculture under the bill may prescribe as he pleases.

I have searched Mr. Brannan's speeches, and nowhere do I find that he has ever mentioned these drastic penalties, either those in the bill or those already on the statutes which he now reveals would be applicable.

Certainly Mr. Brannan would not want me to be a party in any conspiracy to keep the facts from the American people generally and our farmers specifically.

The Secretary makes a plea for cooperation and fair play in the consideration of farm programs. With that plea I am in hearty accord. If I have stood for one thing more than another during the time I have been in Congress, it is that agricultural legislation should be kept out of partisan politics. I have served under both Republican and Democratic Secretaries of Agriculture, from W. M. Jardine to Clinton P. Anderson. Every one of these men viewed farm questions from the standpoint of the national interest and kept them out of partisan politics. They worked with Republicans and Democrats, with farm organizations and farmers in trying to reach a solution of the vexing problems of agriculture. That, I am sorry to say, cannot be said for the present Secretary.

For 24 years I have served on the House Committee on Agriculture under both Republican and Democratic leadership. Never during that time has there been partisanship on that committee. There have been differences of opinion, yes, but politics has not entered in. That is the case today under the leadership of our able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, HAROLD D. COOLEY.

I am anxious to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture. I know that the leaders of the farm organizations are anxious to cooperate. I know that Members of Congress of both parties feel the same way. But there cannot be this cooperation unless Secretary Brannan is willing to treat agriculture and agricultural legislation as his predecessors have done—as an economic and not a political problem. Whenever Secretary Brannan is in the frame of mind to consider it from that standpoint, he can count on my hearty cooperation.

Red Russia Really Dumb—Not Clever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bill Cunningham, from the Boston Sunday Herald of August 13, 1950:

RED RUSSIA REALLY DUMB—NOT CLEVER

(By Bill Cunningham)

The hope was expressed in this space last Sunday that Russia would be charged unequivocally, by name, and without further delay with international crime in the case of Korea and that unless her agent, Mr. Malik, reformed in his parliamentary conduct of the United Nations Security Council meetings, that he be challenged and forced to surrender the gavel. Part of that hope was realized this past week, when both the United States and British representatives spoke Russia's name for the first time, and if they didn't charge Russia with starting the war in the East, they did charge Russia can stop it if she will.

So far as Malik goes, he's still going—after 2 weeks. By what even the President of the United States has now publicly denounced as a filibuster, this latest of the moon-faced Muscovite flap-jaws has managed to keep the world's police body from considering anything. If the issues weren't so serious, the entire performance would be comical.

The Council has been barred from considering the questions the whole world waits to hear, because Malik refuses to give his decisions, as presiding officer, over whether the representative of the Korean Republic, meaning South Korea, can take his place at the table. The question, with deadly persistence, keeps being brought up by Dr. T. F. Tsiang, the representative of Nationalist China—a gentleman who's anathema to Malik, anyhow.

Dr. Tsiang keeps arising to a point of order and demanding a ruling. Sometimes he does it in no more than a half dozen words. The Russian then explodes a speech, seldom shorter than 45 minutes, in which he abuses the United States, Nationalist China, goes into a lot of meaningless gibberish concerning the history of the point, or even yields the floor to other orators.

But he won't render a decision. Hence, there's been no business, and there may be no business until his turn in the chair ends on midnight of August 31. In line with the suggestion made here, the other delegates, in secret meeting and open discussion, have discussed at least three ways of dispensing with Malik.

One of these would be to amend the rules. The second would be to boycott any further meetings while he is presiding. The third is to demand a special session of the United Nations General Assembly and take the issue of Malik to it. It is believed at the site that any of these methods might work, but it likewise considered that the precedent established might be dangerous, that any of these moves could be called undemocratic and that, as matters stand to here, Malik's malingering isn't too important anyhow.

It's not too important, unless Russia has further aggression in some other quarter immediately in mind, because the Korean action is already under way, its legality within the framework of the United Nations already established, the call has already gone forth for as many troops as the member nations can spare, and there's nothing further for the Security Council to do, but stand to its guns.

FROM CENTURION TO CLOWN HIS ROLE

Unless there's something more to the Malik performance than he's indicated to date, he's merely turning from a forbidding into a comical figure. The Kremlin's centurion is becoming the Lake Success clown. When he came roaring back to take over, there seemed to be two dread possibilities. One was that he might be moving in to block unified action against the next Red strike—possibly against Formosa, where we're out on a limb. This he could do by hurling the Russian veto, thus cutting us loose on our own.

The other possibility was that Russia might be planning, through him, to curse us all for the record, withdraw from the United Nations for good, and consider herself provided with full pretexts for war. We can still keep our fingers crossed, but 2 weeks of the gentleman's allotted four have elapsed.

There are no reports of new action in the vicinity of Formosa and, so far at least, Mr. Malik has shown no signs of walking out. Rather, he seems determined to sit it out.

The various experts are now trying to figure what the Russian reasoning is, and the nearest to unanimity is that Russia may feel she's profiting vastly from the Malik tirades against the United States delivered on the soil of the United States. These are being beamed all over the Asiatic world, and their impact as propaganda cannot be measured from this distance.

Following the old sports proverb, "Never underestimate the opposition," we'd be foolish not to grant that this impact may be terrific. There seems to be just as good a chance, however, that the Russians have no very real idea of what they're doing, that they're simply caught on a foolish spot with, as the Hollywood phrase is, egg on their chins, and that they're doing what they're doing because they don't know what else to do.

The popular theory in this country is that the Russians are far cuter than we are, that they are equipped with a diabolical cunning that enables them to outfigure, outmaneuver, and outtrick us every time, whereas the record clearly proves them utterly and stupidly dumb. They haven't gained anything they haven't been handed, and they'd have a lot more now if they really had been smart.

The faithful here have heard that expounded from this pulpit steadily since 1945, 1946, and 1947 when this correspondent had the chance, first to study their armies in Germany, and later their negotiators at San Francisco, Paris, etc. Now others are newly publicizing the same conclusions. From Germany, recently, the crack Associated Press correspondent, West Gallagher, summed up the serious and damaging diplomatic mistakes the supposedly smart Russians have made in Europe ever since the end of the war.

He likened their record to Hitler's, recalled that when the Nazis were rolling, Hitler's slightest move was awesomely regarded by us as a stroke of malvolent genius. The Nazis were supposed to have the best propaganda, the most miraculous spies, the most efficient general staff, the most ruthless and effective planning. When, however, the show was over, captured records and other irrefutable evidence revealed that Hitler was a vain, misinformed little man, and that most of the rest of the machine was more horrendous in our imaginations than it was in truth.

If Russia had really been smart in Europe, she'd have most of it by now. So far as Germany's concerned, if Russia had cooperated with us, instead of pulling back and drawing a deadline through the middle of Berlin, she'd have veto power now in the handling of all Germany, including the vital Ruhr, which she so burningly covets. But Russia would not cooperate in the allied control council.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT

Communists were in the governments of France and Italy and were integrated into every labor union in Europe. Cleverness, instead of stupidity, would have called for disarming cooperation instead of snarling obstruction in all these key places. Instead of winning friends and stealing power, as they easily could have done, they merely aroused opposition, forced coalitions in defense of the common cause, and lost out completely, with Russia calling all plays from Moscow.

Their most monstrous blunder of all was Foreign Minister Molotov's walking out of the founding meeting of the European recovery plan in Paris. This cost them any chance to help regulate the ERP with consequent credit to themselves. This left us all the credit, and the full chance to combat communism by the elimination of much of the misery upon which communism thrives.

Then such things as the Berlin blockade, and their dropping all pretensions of friendship to turn terrific propagandistic tirades loose against the United States and Britain,

started pulling the western nations together again, bringing the Atlantic Pact and the rest.

The whole constitutes one of the greatest records of consistent diplomatic stupidity in the history of the world.

There's a lot more of this—their inability to handle their own creature, Tito, their noisy foozles in Greece, and Iran, their stupid and futile boycott of the United Nations, and now the bovine Mr. Malik and the item of Korea.

Most experts are agreed they're now making their greatest mistake of all, that instead of Malik's making face for Russia in Asia or anywhere else, he's really the greatest engineer of unity the western world could possibly wish. For, whatever he is or is not doing for Russia, he's surely hammering the 53 nations who've endorsed the UN action in Korea into a solid ferrous unit against his own nation and all its procedures. By vilifying and antagonizing these 53 nations, with his repeated libels against their decency, integrity, and truthfulness, he's turning the entire world security organization into a vast, determined and solidly unified anti-Comintern pact. So, in just about such words, wrote James Reston of the New York Times from Lake Success the other day. This is the dumbest of all their performances, and if they are working around in a general way toward making war on us, they couldn't possibly be rendering us greater service. The mouthy Mr. Malik is doing far more for us at the moment than we could ever hope to do for ourselves.

It's not superintelligence the Russians have on us. In the fields of diplomacy, it's duplicity. In his new book Behind Closed Doors, Rear Adm. Ellis M. Zacharias, former deputy head of the Office of Naval Intelligence, gives a new interpretation of Yalta, which is where it all began. As a matter of fact, it's Stalin's own interpretation, given in direct quotes.

Part of the Yalta agreement called for universal suffrage, secret ballots and a free election in Poland. This caused great consternation in Red circles in Poland because Stalin already had a puppet government operating there and had assured the members they would be permanent.

These wildly distressed native commissars appealed to Stalin's personal representative in Poland, Nikolai A. Bulganin, for an explanation. He truthfully said he was stumped but that he would fly to Moscow and ask the generalissimo, himself. Now I quote the book:

"Bulganin flew back to Lublin with the message. He said, in effect (and we heard his words repeated by one of the men who had actually been present at this momentous Bolshevik palaver):

"The Yalta declaration is a scrap of paper. It was necessary to satisfy Roosevelt and Churchill—but we will not abide by it. We will go ahead with our plans as stated to you by the great Stalin. I give you my word that you have nothing to fear. You will be the government of Poland, no matter how these elections might turn out and whatever might happen in the meantime. Be steadfast and have faith in Stalin.'"

They have that sort of duplicity. They have complete control of their people, and they have a much more fatalistic, or realistic, approach to war. Our own is very weak in comparison. Their standard of living is so low that war is no sacrifice, and since the government owns all materials and sets all wages they can wage war at a fraction of the cost to us.

We could very easily fight ourselves broke. In fact, we may not now be far from it. The basic cost of equipping one United States armored division today is $20,000,000, and that's only the primary expenditure. Medium tanks cost $400,000 each. A heavy bomber costs $4,000,000. Modern jet fighters with all spare parts cost $632,000 each.

These prices have skyrocketed since before World War II. The jet fighter costs $632,000 now, but the pre-World War II fighter cost but $28,800. The heavy bomber today costs $4,000,000, but the twin-engined bomber, the "heavy" of its day, cost but $123,000. The medium tank costs $400,000 today. Before the last war, it cost $30,000.

These astounding figures are cited as part of the answer of "what happened to the $50,000,000,000 spent on national defense?"

Even the Congress, not easily stunned by financial figures, is asking how the new costs could possibly have gone so high. Some of the increases must be charged to inflation, they say, but the bulk must be charged to the installation of delicate and costly equipment such as radar.

If weapons now cost this much, and if we're to go into all-out production—the talk is of complete mobilization—it will be necessary to cut every production cost possible, and that in a nation going really all out, would include labor. The Russians have no such troubles as ours. Nobody gets rich out of war with them. Not even a war worker can truthfully say, "I never had it so good." That's not true here, as memories not older than 7 or 8 years can attest.

Before we were even in the war, in the days of lend-lease, I was interviewing a local merchant marine officer who several times made the bleak and bitter run to Murmansk. I was asking him if he'd seen any Russians and if so, what his impressions were.

He said he saw plenty of them at Murmansk, both men and women, because they unloaded the boats. They were wonderful, he said. They were working only for Russia. Working hours, weather, long labor without rest meant nothing, as long as they were unloading those supplies for their soldiers. Their only interest was in emptying the boats as fast as possible, so the boat could turn around and hurry back here for more.

INSTANCE OF RUSSIAN DEVOTION

As an instance of their devotion, he cited the case of a middle-aged woman who had been working for hours on the docks when the Germans pulled one of their infrequent air raids. Word came down to her that her home had been struck and her family killed. She left the dock and went up to the ruins. Her home was truly gone, and her children had perished inside it. Within an hour or two, tearless and grim of face, she was back on the docks working without a word on her job. This was to be her revenge—working harder.

"And what were these people paid?" I asked him.

"Paid!" he echoed, "I don't think they were paid anything. I never saw any money, nor heard any mention of it. As nearly as I could see, they were merely trying to help their country."

I have never seen the official pay scale of the Russian Army, but I am informed that the Russian private soldier is paid $16 a year. From what I saw and heard in Europe, most of his food, funds and incidental treasure is looted from the neighborhood through which he is marching, or where he is billeted. He doesn't cost his Government much.

There, in their primitive lives, their loyalty and their far lower expenses is the real strength of the vast, conglomerate nation we're embroiled with. It's not their superior intelligence because they haven't any.

It doesn't take much memory to recall what our picture on the home front was when we were fighting for our lives a few years ago. The American war machine could stall and GI's die and to hell with 'em, while John L. Lewis struck his mines. A 6-week course in some high school cellar turned $30-a-week help into "skilled mechanics" ready to draw junior executives wages, with time-and-a-half for anything over an 8-hour 5-day week. The CIO took over the merchant marine, and the unions screaming against "war profiteers," profiteered the most richly of all.

This time, if we have to go, there should be a universal draft and a new sort of law that would pay the workers in war plants exactly what the men in uniform get, even less, if anything, because they don't have to risk their lives. Of course, that won't be done because the politicians haven't guts enough to propose it, let alone vote it.

We conceivably could fight ourselves broke, and so become the natural victims of communism through complete economic collapse, but, again, Russia wouldn't deserve the credit. She'd simply be standing by when it happened, ready to step in and take over.

The Russians are really stupid. They only look brilliant in flashes because we seem to have the exquisite genius of being stupider at all vital times. You've just seen a classic example in the end of the Pax Trumana. Wait until we really start to mobilize, and then watch the rest.

Statement Made and Resolutions Adopted at Fifteenth American-Russian Festival, Stratford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two remarkable documents which were contained in the program of the fifteenth annual American-Russian festival held on Sunday, August 13, at Stratford, Conn., and sponsored by the Holy Ghost Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church and the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, of Bridgeport, Conn. Many thousands of Americans of Russian descent attended this festival, at which Governor Bowles and I spoke. These are the people whose relatives are not only sitting in the front row facing the iron curtain, but are locked up behind it. These are the people, these are our fellow Americans, upon whom the strain of divided loyalties might be expected to fall, yet there is no trace of communism among them. The first document, prepared by Father Simko, of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, explains the faith of these people, their faith in our American democratic way of life, in sketching the contributions of these two great and prosperous Russian parishes to America.

The second document was eloquently presented to the 5,000 people gathered at Woodland Grove in Stratford by Father Kivko of the Holy Ghost Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church. Father Kivko asked for a show of hands

on this resolution, a copy of which is being presented to President Truman, Governor Bowles, Senator McMahon, Representative Lodge, and myself.

Mr. President, every hand in that great assemblage was raised. Here we have moving testimony to the strength of our free institutions—to their overwhelming appeal to those Russians who are among us and who have become such a vital and important part of the great industrial city of Bridgeport and of many other communities through Connecticut and the Nation.

Mr. President, I am inviting these two documents to the attention of Mr. Edward Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State, who is my successor in the State Department responsible for the Voice of America broadcasts. I think that he and his people may find material in these two documents most suitable for our international broadcasting.

There being no objection, the statement and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CONTRIBUTIONS TO AMERICA

Greetings, dear brothers and sisters in Christ: a most sincere welcome is extended to everyone, both young and old, today in attendance at the fifteenth annual American Russian festival.

This event is a great and public manifestation of loyal and patriotic American citizens of Russian extraction residing in the large metropolitan Bridgeport area.

All of us are here to demonstrate our devotion to the land which has given to us the blessed opportunity to live peacefully with our neighbors and the freedom to secure for ourselves and our families an abundance of happiness and the better things of life.

The greater majority are those who came as immigrants to these shores from Russia and Carpatho Russia some 30, 40, and 50 years ago to settle in New England and made Bridgeport, Conn., one of the great colonies of American Russian life. At once they took the necessary steps toward citizenship. Then they gave their will, heart, and strong arms to help mold this magnificent land by going into the factories and mills, and to till the soil as farmers. They were then and still are today a frugal and moderate people, imbued with a deep religious piety, to which imposing edifices of God are everlasting tributes.

In World War I our nationality was in the forefront to come to the aid of its adopted country. World War II brought even greater sacrifices. Over 1,000 young men and women of both parishes are veterans of the last global conflict. Today we stand ready again to perform our duty as good citizens.

The last 15 years has brought a new generation to carry on a magnanimous tradition given to us by those early immigrants. These are our young Americans born here, and as products of American schools and culture will further enrich the American scene with their family and religious background. They are priests, doctors, dentists, attorneys, legislators, teachers, skilled technicians, engineers, scientists, and prominent in the industrial and commercial life to America.

Our people have made the most of their opportunties guaranteed them by the United States Constitution regardless of race, color, or creed. America is proud of them. And American Russians are proud to be true citizens of this land of the free and the brave. Na Mnohaya i Blahaya L'eta.

Rev. JOSEPH G. SIMKO.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED THIS DAY AT THE FIFTEENTH AMERICAN-RUSSIAN FESTIVAL, WOODLAND GROVE, STRATFORD, CONN., SUNDAY, AUGUST 13, 1950

1. Over 5,000 members of St. John the Baptist Carpatho-Russian and the Holy Ghost Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Churches of Bridgeport, Conn., together with affiliated veterans chapters, clubs, fraternal societies, and numerous other groups residing in the vicinity are assembled here today, to demonstrate not only their religious and brotherly unity in the one Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic faith, but to express most emphatically the unanimous acceptance of the following declaration:

2. Whereas native-born and naturalized citizens of the United States of America from Russian and Carptho-Russian ancestry wish to declare their gratitude to this, the greatest and most democratic country on earth for the opportunities and for the cherished freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution; be it firmly

3. *Resolved*, That we assert complete loyalty to the United States of America and support of President Harry S. Truman in pursuing his present policy in voicing a courageous, active defense of the principles of democracy against Communist aggression, both here and abroad, which dangerously threatens the peace of the whole world.

Copies of this declaration will be sent to President Truman, Governor Bowles, Congressman Lodge, Senator McMahon, and Senator Benton.

Program for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, all Members of the Senate who heard him speak on July 18 will recall the forceful address by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on a program for America. That address has received just recognition in an editorial appearing in the current issue of Life magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life magazine of August 14, 1950]

PROGRAM FOR AMERICA

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, made a speech on the floor of the Senate which he entitled "A Program for America." It was so packed with good sense, high courage, and statesmanly foresight that we are delighted to make it the basis of our own checklist of what, as a Nation, we need to do.

Here are some of Senator BRIDGES' points. The comments represent his views, except for what we have put in parentheses:

1. Call the National Guard to the Federal service at once.

2. Establish immediately an American radar network (to make an interceptor air force effective).

3. Mobilize full-speed, around-the-clock industrial production to provide military equipment of the best type available. The American people are ready to use steel for tanks instead of for automobiles.

4. Establish and activate a civilian defense program. It is almost criminal to have advanced 5 years into the atomic era without having such a program in full force.

5. Congress should at once prepare legislation to provide 100-percent mobilization of our people and our resources for enactment within hours when and if it is needed. This program should be aimed solely at achieving the safety and security of the United States. It is no place for dreamy planners to impose the controls which will lead this Nation to socialism.

6. Handout programs should be ruthlessly abolished. (P. S. We add: so should the pork-barrel grabs that 47 Senators voted on July 27 to keep in the rivers, harbors, and flood control bill.)

7. Register all Communists in the United States * * * immediate enactment of the Mundt-Ferguson bill.

8. Clean out the State Department. For many years our State Department has been infiltrated with men who either have unbelievably poor judgment or whose loyalty is open to serious question. When a naval officer loses his ship or runs it aground in the mud he is court-martialed. But when foreign-policy advisers lose a continent, they are applauded or even promoted.

9. Improve and expand our intelligence operation. (In cruder words, this means underground operations in iron curtain countries.)

10. Mobilize anti-Communists everywhere. Make use of the Chinese Republican Army, the stateless Europeans, and, if MacArthur advises it, arm and train Japanese divisions. Make Spain a full partner in the fight against communism. * * * We should ask ourselves two questions: Does Spain oppose communism? Will the Spanish fight communism? The answer to both questions is "Yes."

11. Stop all trade between the Soviet Union and its satellites with the United States and its allies, which, directly or indirectly, has military significance.

12. Advise our allies that we will not assist countries which continue to pamper and coddle a fifth column.

Senator BRIDGES' program was set forth way back on July 18. So far very few of his points have been carried out, though all of them are important and most are essential. But it is profoundly encouraging that we have leaders like Senator BRIDGES setting the pace for the administration. They express the sentiments of the American people in terms of their practical knowledge of what can and must be done.

Protection of Government Against Communist and Subversive Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Facing the Future in a Fog of Doubt," published in the Catholic Review of August 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEWPOINT—FACING THE FUTURE IN A FOG OF DOUBT

Never before have the people of the United States faced the future of such fearful possibilities for themselves and their country. And never have they faced a crisis from a position of so little confidence in the ability of their leaders. And never have they been in a position where they could not count upon the loyalty of the men in whose hands rested the decisions that could determine the event of victory or defeat, success or failure, survival or absorption.

Disloyalty charges did not originate with Senator MCCARTHY: His was simply the latest official voicing of the situation that gave birth to the Dies committee. Citizens everywhere had long been disturbed by the vote-bartered tolerance of F. D. R. and the open favoritism of his consort toward Communists.

The over-all picture of investigations into subversive and disloyal activities has been that of alarmed patriots trying to find out the truth and smugly confident politicians pooh-poohing the efforts openly, and at times obstructing them, in the attempt to cover up against any suggestion of political venality or treasonable opportunism on the part of the recent administrations.

The result has been to leave the people with the impression that our country is led by a group upon whose integrity they cannot count. Call the defect ineptitude, inefficiency, bungling, temporizing, timidity, disloyalty, treason—it remains true that America faces a future of unforeseeable and vital possibilities under the guidance of leaders who have proved their inadequacy. And they are practical enough to know that this is a situation which invites and presages failure.

Had there been on the part of our leaders an open, earnest, fair attitude of cooperation with the loyalty investigations, Americans would have been restored to a sense of confidence. They are not dismayed to face enemies. They are alarmed at the possibility of finding themselves stabbed in the back.

Nor have the doubts been diminished by the conviction, with evidence beyond reasonable likelihood of error, of the originally disdainful Mr. Hiss. Nor is it likely that any book, however timely to the publishers, will offset the fact of a China policy that could not have suited Russia better had it originated, as it may have, in the Kremlin.

Everybody, except official Washington, is aware of Communist infiltration in radio, stage, screen, unionism, higher education. Baltimore, a quiet ammunition dump for Communist activities convenient to the Capital, has its little expressions of subversive activities from the halls of Hopkins to the purlieus of racketeers.

A recent Johns Hopkins New-Letter, which I have not yet seen disavowed by university authorities, seemed to think it had restored Lattimore to impeccability with a banquet and called upon its readers to attempt the restoration of Hiss. The editor missed the implication that followed from associating the professor with the convict.

The entire effect is to leave the American public in a fog of uncertainty and doubt. We know what America has always stood for; but we are not sure that our leaders know. We know the America we will fight and die for; but we cannot feel too sure that the America we love will survive our sacrifice. We cannot, from this fog of doubt and suspicion of disloyalty, see where we are going and whether what we get to will be worth striving for.

Our leaders are being persuaded this way one day, and that way the next, which indicates uncertainty at the top—so it is not strange that this should be communicated from the high places down to the stratum of even the most humble of citizens. Our statesmanship is very much like an unpleasant weather report—cloudy, with fog.

And the shame and pity of it all is that the clouds can be dispelled in a moment by the determined and patriotic action of loyal leaders.

The Copper Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Copper Tariff," published in the Washington Star of August 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COPPER TARIFF

The Senate as a whole, at the earliest possible moment, ought to undo the mistake made by its Finance Committee in voting to table the House-approved bill to suspend the tariff on imported copper. Looked at from any angle—from the standpoint of protecting our own domestic industry, from the standpoint of our inter-American relations, or from the standpoint of our shortage of this critical material in a time of grave world tension—the tabling action simply lacks justification.

Under the House bill, our 2-cents-a-pound copper tariff—which was suspended throughout the Second World War but which became operable again last June 30—would be done away with for another year. Led chiefly by protective-minded members from the mining States, however, the Senate committee has in effect buried the measure by a surprising vote of 9 to 4, even though not a single common-sense argument, in the light of present-day realities, seems possible to advance in defense of the burial.

Actually, as far as our domestic producers are concerned, the plain fact is that they require no protection. As matters stand, wholly apart from the need to build up our strategic stockpile, the amount of copper being turned out in this country is nowhere near enough to satisfy civilian consumption and our stepped-up military demand. In such circumstances, imports from abroad can hardly have an adverse effect, and the 2-cents-a-pound duty is therefore lacking in sense.

The only thing the duty can do is to hurt the economy of Chile, and to a lesser extent Peru. As it operates now, its effect is to deprive the Chileans of dollar income that they sorely need. They are among our very best friends in South America. Accordingly, in terms of our good-neighbor policy, we are working against our own best interests, as well as theirs, in imposing a tariff on their copper—a tariff altogether unnecessary for our own industry.

In view of all this, it must be hoped that the Senate will show more wisdom in the matter than has its Finance Committee. The mistake that has been made can be corrected if approval is won for Senator MCMAHON'S proposed amendment to the House-approved bill providing for duty-free, imported scrap metals. This bill has already received the committee's favorable vote. If Mr. MCMAHON'S proposal is enacted, regular copper will be included and the tariff on it thus will be suspended.

If the Senate takes this action, the scrap-metals legislation will then go into conference or reconciliation with the version passed by the House. Since it has already approved suspension of the copper tariff, the House will almost certainly go along with the MCMAHON amendment. Some such legislation is necessary to reverse the short-sighted position taken by the majority of Senators on the Finance Committee.

Necessity for Propaganda Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two illuminating news dispatches on the front page of yesterday's New York Times; one by Richard J. H. Johnston from Tokyo which points up the problem of morale among our forces now fighting in Korea, and which shows once more how we have neglected the psychological factors not only in dealing with the Koreans but in handling our own Armed Forces; and the other by Robert Trumbull from New Delhi which describes the rise of anti-United States feeling in India. Here again we see a failure in the implementation of our foreign policy by the world-wide campaign of truth which is called for in my Senate Resolution 243. Mr. Trumbull quite properly points out that if east-west relations are to be improved, it is essential that these divergencies in philosophical approach be recognized and taken into account. Evidence continues to pile up on all sides that our traditional reliance on military, economic, and diplomatic policy is not enough; that we must supplement these three aspects of our foreign policy with a fourth, a great psychological offensive in the field of ideas.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GI'S IN KOREA HANDICAPPED BY UNAWARENESS OF MISSION

(By Richard J. H. Johnston)

TOKYO, August 11.—A lack of psychological preparation for violence and the dangers of armed combat has proved one of the greatest weaknesses among average American soldiers in their efforts in Korea to stem the relentless and fanatical tide of Communist invaders.

On one's return to this headquarters after more than 2 weeks with the troops along the fringe of the defense line, an evaluation of the GI's predicament in Korea begins to take form.

The average GI seems not to know why he is fighting in Korea. He does not seem to understand why as a United Nations soldier he has only South Koreans beside him in the battle line. He appears puzzled that he was thrust with all haste from the soft comforts of garrison duty in Japan, Okinawa, and Hawaii, or the peaceful atmosphere of the United States into the filth and violence of the battlefield.

He faces a foe who is zealous, resourceful, and hard. All of this adds up in the GI's mind to a conclusion that someone has put him into a mess he does not understand.

This correspondent has talked with soldiers beside thundering artillery pieces, on chow lines, in convoys moving to the front, in fox holes, aid stations, ambulances, and hospitals, aboard trains and planes to and from the battle area, aboard troop ships tied up at Korean piers, in the heat of sun-baked river beds and at lonely mountain-top outposts.

Only a few of the older noncommissioned officers and officers expressed knowledge and understanding of the significance of their mission.

But to the GI who must bear the brunt of the fighting, the realization that service in the regular peacetime Army involved the risk of death on a strange battleground came only when he moved into the combat area.

GI IS DISILLUSIONED

"The recruiting posters didn't say anything about this," one young infantryman said as he moved toward the front. "I'll fight for my country, but damned if I see why I'm fighting to save this hell hole.

"I heard some stuff on the way over about this being a United Nations deal. Where's the rest of the United Nations?"

Asked what they were doing when this war began, the soldiers gave such replies as these:

"I guarded dependent houses on Okinawa."

"I swam every afternoon at Waikiki."

"I just finished basic training back in the States."

Talks with troops who had been blooded in battle revealed bitterness and a conviction that they were being sacrificed to American unpreparedness.

The flame of determination here glimmered fitfully in a few individuals. The majority revealed no inspired determination.

VETERAN FIGHTS FOR LIFE

"I'll tell you what I'm fighting for," a veteran of the Bulge said. "I'm fighting for my life."

The tragic commitment under the press of events of handfuls of troops daily in the war left the GI's with a feeling of hopelessness and nakedness.

They saw themselves as a small scattered band dropped into the Korean Peninsula with paralyzing suddenness. They had at the time only a thin tenuous supply line. Behind them lay the homeland, momentarily neither at peace nor at war.

There have been acts of heroism, but in the words of one colonel:

"Acts of heroism inspire others to do the impossible, but in war the final impossible can be achieved only by teamwork. We have an army but no team. We are only a handful here and the enemy seems limitless. We can hold for a while here and there, but until there are many more of us, there is little we can do except die."

A commander of infantry said: "I can tell my men what to do. I can show them how to do it. But until they understand why they are doing it, they can't do it well.

"These men are doing the best they can, but as you can see it's not enough."

His observations were paraphrased by a 19-year-old corporal, recounting his experiences after his position had been overrun:

"I keep asking myself what I am doing here. The funny thing is I can't answer my own question."

ANTI-UNITED STATES FEELING IS ON RISE IN INDIA—NEWS OF KOREAN DESTRUCTION SETS OFF WIDE CRITICISM OF POLICIES IN ASIA

(By Robert Trumbull)

NEW DELHI, INDIA, August 12.—Anti-United States feeling in India never has been so widespread as it is now. With every day of the Korean war bringing more news of bombed cities and flaming villages, the unpopularity of the United States is growing.

This adverse sentiment appears to be based mainly on two factors. The first is abhorrence of the involvement of Asians in what Indians consider essentially a quarrel between the United States and the Soviet Union. The second is the inability of Indians to feel the same urgency in the struggle against the world Communist movement as the United States does.

With Parliament in session, it has been possible to assess public opinion throughout India as reflected in the public and private utterances of legislators from every province. United States Embassy officers also have noted a growing criticism, or at least a questioning of United States policy among their acquaintances in official circles here.

Premier Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and other intellectuals disagree with the United States policy in a limited sphere bound by their specialized approach to world problems. On the lower levels, there is simply distrust of the western powers on general principles, coupled with a native inability to understand the United States point of view in the conflict with Russia.

The political thinking of the ordinary Indian seems to be based on looking backward and on a philosophical disregard of immediate consequences. There is a strong tendency to suggest what the United States should have done in regard to Asian problems 4 or 5 years ago, without any proposal as to what it should do now. The fatalistic Indians, who perhaps are more conscious than the Americans of the magnitude of time stretching before man, seem more willing to let history take its course, confident that right will win out in the end.

Many Indians are unworried that communism may win in Korea and Indochina at this stage. They argue that if the United States system is better, it eventually will come to the top; so what does the moment matter? This illustrates one of the divergencies between eastern and western thinking that appear irreconcilable.

Descending from this metaphysical plane to everyday considerations, many Indians feel that the United States action in Korea represents foreign domination in Asian lands, which they resent. Several declare passionately that the United States should get out of Japan, Korea, Indochina, Formosa, and wherever else it may be involved in Asia and let the Asians settle their own problems.

In this, there is something of the philosophy that motivated the late Mohandas K. Gandhi, when in 1942 he suggested to the British that it should be no concern of theirs if anarchy and chaos resulted if they quit India at that tense period. Any feeling of responsibility by the major powers toward the less advanced countries of Asia is resented as being patronizing.

Nothing, except possibly the development of the atomic bomb, has hurt the United States in Indian eyes so much as its alliance with the French in supporting the Bao Dai regime in Indochina. Anything having to do with France in Indochina represents western colonialism to the Indians. What the alternative to Bao Dai might have been does not worry the Indians as a group; there again they do not share the United States' sense of urgency in the Communist crisis.

It is plain to observers here that if East-West relations are to be improved, it is essential that these divergencies in philosophical approach be recognized and taken into account. The existence of inherited and unchangeable suspicion of western motives in Asia also must be accepted as a fact.

Many Indians refuse to appreciate the harsh facts of the war. This refusal stems from the Indian conviction that war is a confession of failure in foreign policy and merely compounds the error. However, Premier Nehru believes it is right to meet aggression with force. It was on the premise that aggression existed that he has put an Indian army in the field on this subcontinent several times since India became independent in 1947, and that he has backed United Nations' action in Korea.

The horror of the consequences of war is universal, but to the Indians there is a special horror when it is Asians who are suffering. Accounts of repeated bombing of Seoul by the United States aircraft and reports of villages left in flames as United States troops withdraw arouse indignation here. Consideration of military necessity is overshadowed by the fact that an Asian people is "getting it in the neck again."

The Indians argue that killing Koreans and destroying property is not making friends for the United States in Korea, or in India. But they can suggest no alternative that meets with the United States ideas of the urgency of the situation.

One of New Delhi's major newspapers recently commented—it has been printed often in India—that the United States dropped atomic bombs only on the Asian people, the inference being that the United States did not want to use the bomb on Europeans. This illustrates the kind of thinking that the United States is up against when it tries to win good-will in Asia.

The expensive United States "compaign of truth" has had a reaction in some Indian circles opposite to that intended. To be the target of a propaganda drive is resented here. The result of this propaganda often has impelled the Indians to go to Russian sources to see what the Soviet replies.

Soviet literature is available at low price, whereas United States books are prohibitively expensive.

Military Considerations Are Behind Loan to Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanmous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Military Considerations Are Behind Loan to Spain," written by Randolph Leigh, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of August 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY CONSIDERATIONS ARE BEHIND LOAN TO SPAIN—ADVANCING UNITED STATES FUNDS TO FRANCO GOVERNMENT MAY BE FIRST STEP TOWARD CREATING STRONG BASTION TO STEM COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

(By Randolph Leigh)

The pending loan to Spain would mean for the United States the crossing of the

Rubicon, or perhaps it should be said the crossing of the Pyrenees. The amount itself ($100,000,000) is trifling alongside the billions poured out for the perennial revival of our Allies in Europe in the last 33 years.

It would be significant, however, as the first deliberately and solely military move made by the United States in a struggle which up to the present has been treated as primarily diplomatic. Korea was a diplomatic bluff which, being called, had to be turned over to the unalerted military. Whether it was a justifiable risk on the diplomatic level, time alone will tell.

Heretofore we have masked sentimental and economic considerations behind military considerations in our aid to Europe. That is, we wanted to help certain nations because we like them. We also wanted to assure the sale of our surplus goods, thereby hedging against a recession. We hoped that the aided nations would be inspired and inspirited to vote down communism. In due time, according to the diplomatic theory, this example of a richer life through right thinking and voting would triumph over the concepts of communism.

SOURCES OF OPPOSITION

Likewise it was believed that these revived nations would soon rearm themselves in their own and our interests, thus serving as our first line of defense in Europe. In this way a military argument was adduced from a basically ideological development.

The chief difficulty with this theory was the "in due time" element. It soon became apparent that Russia, and not the United States, was to be the timekeeper. We will probably never know whether the complete European aid plan would have worked fully or not, for it now seems certain that it will have to be merged with a plan which will be primarily military and only secondarily propagandist and economic. The granting of the Spanish loan would mark the beginning of the changeover from the old plan to the new.

When we recall other leaders whose aid we have welcomed in the last 2 wars, our choosiness regarding Franco is puzzling.

Opposition to Spain outside the administration actually springs from two totally different sources, namely, Communist agents seeking to deprive America of an excellent military base, and thoroughly loyal Protestants who honestly fear Franco as a tool of Catholicism. That communism is the stronger factor in this turmoil is indicated by the fact that less fuss has been made over the question of the reappointment of a representative of the President at the Vatican than over the recognition of Franco as a possible tool of the papacy.

SPAIN OUSTS REDS

The fact that aid to Spain will have to override all these obstacles will emphasize the urgency of the military considerations prompting such a decision, if it is made. Obviously this small loan to Spain, would be only a first step. It would mean besides:

1. That we would build a strong base in Spain and increase and strengthen Spanish armies, already of considerable strength and in high morale.

2. That we would indirectly serve notice on our long-subsidized and at present surprisingly tranquil allies in Europe, especially Britain and France, that unless they can speed up their preparedness we must fall back on a stronger bastion, Spain, as a bridgehead for both Europe and Africa.

3. That we would inform Russia by deeds that we do not intend to let her select her own battlefields and her own timetables around the world, but are going to create bases and raise mercenaries in all major areas.

4. That with Spain and Spanish Morocco as a background we would be able to make Britain's great contribution of Gibraltar play a much larger role than in the last war, when it was dangerously hemmed in. With the most recent weapons used against it and with Spain again neutral, Gibraltar would probably fall or be deprived of its worth.

FIGHTING NATION

Oddly enough the chief factor which has blocked aid to Spain will make her attractive as a military ally—she has rooted out Communists. Few things have been more alarming to our strategists than the fact that neither Britain nor France has been rigorously against local Communists. The situation has been similar in the smaller western nations. France is today about 25 percent Communist, according to general report.

Spain, by contrast, is ruthlessly anti-Russian, to a degree found nowhere else in Europe. In an ideological war a friendly population is of immense value to an army, and a hostile one is a source of perpetual danger. That is one of the reasons that Spain rates high as a possible base in the calculations of our strategists.

Furthermore, the Spaniard himself is a great fighter. Professor Sorokin calculated that over a period of 1,000 years Spain had done more fighting than any other power in the world.

The Iberian Peninsula, with Portugal thrown in, has, in addition to good harbors, numerous physical advantages as a base. The Pyrenees are the most formidable natural barrier in Europe, higher on the average than the Alps. They are, besides, flanked by water, whereas the Alps always have been bypassed to the northwest. In addition an enemy landing on the northern or eastern coats of Spain would soon find himself confronted by secondary mountain ranges parallel to the coasts.

Spain is twice as large a base as Britain and a much better protected one than France or Germany, both of which are wide open toward Russia. Another factor is that the Spanish population is practically self-sustaining, whereas Britain presents a heavy problem with its hungry and crowded civilian population which can neither produce the food it needs nor earn the foreign exchange with which to pay for it from overseas.

Spain is slightly short of food and fuel but her people have never lived in the style in which the United States and Canada generosity have enabled the British public to continue to live even after it lacked the funds to pay its own way. Therefore, dollar for dollar, the effect of American aid on public opinion in unaccustomed Spain would be far greater than in long-habituated Britain. Of course, the United States will continue to do all she can for Britain and in turn hopes for continued aid from Britain as an ally and a base. Nevertheless many strategists think that as of today Spain is a more important base than Britain, or certainly is as important. Beyond any doubt they would welcome her as an ally, regardless of rating.

MIGHT SLOW SOVIET

A rarely mentioned but important factor, if we are to stand for a time on the defensive in Spain, is that of the atmosphere around the mountains. The French slopes of the Pyrenees have the clearest atmosphere anywhere in Europe outside Greece. This would expose an enemy attacking from the French side—assuming that the Russians got that far—to severe punishment from the air in an attempt to break through the mountain barrier.

It is hardly too much to say that a broad-scale deal with Spain at this time would almost certainly mean that our global strategists had won a memorable victory.

It would also put Russia on notice that we were ready, if necessary, to enter upon a struggle to the death—along Roman-Carthagenian lines—and reaching to the uttermost parts of the earth. That might give her pause. Failing that, it would certainly give us a better chance.

Cackling Can't Win Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cackling Can't Win Wars," written by Roscoe Fleming and published in the Denver Post of August 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CACKLING CAN'T WIN WARS

(By Roscoe Fleming)

Once upon a time there was a little red, white and blue hen who was so busy taking care of her own chicks and a whole flock of adopted ones, that she sometimes wondered how she was going to get through the day. She found some grains of wheat and she said:

"Now, who will help me sow this wheat?"

"Not I!" said most of the barnyard animals in chorus. "We have so many unprecedented prior commitments and our military, economic and social conditions are so deteriorated that with the utmost consideration it is utterly inexpedient for us to accede to your extraordinary request. But please accept our good wishes."

"Then I'll sow it myself," said the little red, white and blue hen.

When the wheat was grown up tall and ready to cut, she asked:

"Now, who will help me cut the wheat?"

"Not us," said most of the animals.

"The concomitants and varying implications of our domestic situation combined with the urgent requirements of our foreign involvements render it to our utmost regret impossible to alleviate the exigencies of your situation. In fact, we were just about to ask that you clean up this dirty barnyard in your spare time."

"Then I'll cut it myself," said the little red, white and blue hen.

Then she asked: "Now, who will help me thresh the wheat?"

"Not me," said most of the other animals. "The combined revalutory effort of inflation, deflation, and the revaluation of the franc, lira, peso, pfennig, and pengo, plus categorical exorthosis in world trade, render too exiguous our ability to aid. In fact, we were just about to ask that you keep the children for the afternoon."

"Then I'll thresh it myself," said the little red, white, and blue hen.

When the wheat was threshed, she asked: "Now, who will help carry the grain to the mill?"

"Not us," said most of the animals. "The emergency situation in our interior departments, coupled with foreign and domestic

trends, compel us retroactively and regretfully to withdraw. Accept instead, Excellency, our most distinguished considerations. In fact, we were just about to ask you to pump us a pail of water."

"Then I'll take it myself," said the little red, white, and blue hen.

When the wheat was ground, she said:

"Now, who will help me bake the bread?"

"Not us," said most of the animals. "In view of the rapidly deteriorating decline of our heavy industry, combined with the exigent requirements of defense and domestic expropriation, we are fully involved without assuming any of your responsibilities. In fact, we were just about to ask you to run to the village for us."

"Then I'll bake it myself," said the little red, white, and blue hen.

When the bread was baked she said: "Cluck, cluck. The bread is done; it's light and sweet; now who will come and help me eat?"

"We will," said most of the animals in chorus. "In fact, we were just about to suggest that we all have a bread-and-butter picnic dinner—you to bring the bread and butter, of course."

In short, when are some, not all, of our alleged partners in making a brave new world, going to cut the cackle and can the gobbledegook, and really start helping us to keep the present one from flying to bits?

Communist Peace Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, Martin Ebon wrote an excellent factual summary and analysis of the efforts being made in the world by the Communist Party to delude decent people into supporting its deceptive and vicious peace petition. It appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on August 3, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 3, 1950]

UNITED STATES COMMUNISTS PUSH PEACE PLEA IN EFFORT TO CAMOUFLAGE INTENTIONS

(By Martin Ebon)

The Communist Party of the United States is finding peace a still powerful slogan in its current campaign for 5,000,000 signatures endorsing the Soviet-sponsored appeal of the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress.

This congress, which met in Stockholm from March 15 to 19, initiated a world-wide campaign for signatures and drafted an appeal which has been circulated in all parts of the globe. The Stockholm meeting represented the continuation of a series of peace conferences that begun in Wroclaw, Poland, in autumn, 1948, and continued with congresses in New York, Paris, Prague, Montevideo, Mexico City, London, Melbourne, Toronto, Vienna, and many other cities.

The Communist peace offensive represents a well-prepared propaganda effort to use basic human desires for lasting peace as a means of obtaining support for the policies of the Soviet Union and its satellites, while strengthening opposition to the efforts of the United States and those United Nations members now backing the Republic of Korea against Communist invasion.

CAREFULLY WORDED APPEAL

The Communist appeal, in order to gain maximum support, is worded in a way that makes it widely acceptable. Here is its brief text:

From a talk by Valentine Gorin over the Moscow Radio, July 7:

Subject: The Workers of America in Their Struggle for Peace.

Excerpt: The Christian Science Monitor states that Americans are sending to Congress an unprecedented number of letters demanding an end to the armaments race. Members of Congress are obliged to admit that the avalanche of letters is a truly spontaneous and sincere expression of the popular masses. The newspaper adds: "If one looks through the enormous batch of letters, there can be no doubt left as to the feeling of Americans and their ardent desire for peace."

ITEM JUXTAPOSED

This item is juxtaposed with a report on the "peace" campaign undertaken by United States Communists.

"We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon, a weapon of aggression and mass extermination of human beings, and the institution of strict international control to enforce this. We shall regard as guilty of war crimes the government that is the first to use the atomic weapon against any country."

The world-wide drive for signatures has, of course, brought the greatest results in the Communist-controlled countries. In the United States the Communist Party began its campaign in early June. During a 3-month period the party seeks to obtain 5,000,000 signatures. The campaign began with a rally at New York's Manhattan Center.

ROBESON SPEAKS

Paul Robeson, the singer, made the keynote speech, in which he stated: "We shall impose the peace. We do not ask for peace. We demand it."

The rally also heard an address by Abbot Simon, executive secretary of the Peace Information Center, an especially established organizational clearing house for the propaganda drive.

Among the speakers was Dr. Joseph Fletcher, clergyman of the Episcopal Theological Seminary of Cambridge, Mass. Dr. Fletcher had attended the All-Australia Congress of Partisans of Peace, which took place at Melbourne from April 16 to 21. At the New York meeting he said:

"No peace movement which refuses to recognize the Communist and Socialist world can succeed. For the coexistence of different social orders we must accept the coexistence of different social ideas in our own community."

ROGGE DISAGREES

Also present was O. John Rogge, former Assistant Attorney General. However, the Communist Daily Worker noted that Mr. Rogge attempted to "put equal responsibility for the cold war on the United States and the Soviet Union." For this attempt, the paper reported, Mr. Rogge was "sharply slapped down" by Rockwell Kent, artist, and Albert E. Kahn, an official of the International Workers Order, an organization listed as subversive by the Department of Justice. (Mr. Rogge has since denounced the Communist invasion in Korea.)

Following this rally, the peace commission of the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States published the itinerary of its campaign as follows:

"July 4: First national mobilization, with mass outpouring to the beaches, camps, resorts.

"August 6: Second national mobilization, the anniversary of the Hiroshima bomb, 1,000 open-air rallies and shop-gate meetings, booths and tables for street-corner collection of signatures.

"September 4: Labor Day mobilization—brigades, caravans, motorcades to rural communities, fairs, countryside.

"October 24: United Nations Day—conclusion of campaign, delegations to UN."

HIGH LIGHTS OF CAMPAIGN

These are the high lights of the Communist campaign. The Communist Party's peace plan, under the slogan, "Every party member a fighter for peace," calls for 1,000 party members to pledge to collect 500 signatures each, 10,000 members to pledge individually to collect 200 signatures, and 20,000 members a minimum of 100 signatures each.

Incentives, in the Russian tradition of Stakhanovism, are not lacking. Those who pledge 500 signatures are known by the party as heroes and heroines of peace. There are also sentinels of peace, and peace stewards.

The campaign is not, however, for the most part done directly by the Communists as Communists, but either through the peace committee or through the Labor Conference for Peace. This organization has been formed by Communist-controlled unions and by Communist splinters of other unions.

On July 25, the Labor Conference for Peace advised Andrew Cordier, executive assistant for UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie, that it had collected 1,250,000 signatures for the peace appeal. However, Marcel Scherer, coordinator of the labor conference, quoted Mr. Cordier as stating:

"It is urgently important that the police action in Korea be brought to a quick end. And, if we can bring it to a quick end, the question of the A-bomb becomes academic."

Since the beginning of the Korean hostilities, the peace campaign slogans have been supplemented by the phrase: "Hands off Korea. We want peace."

Coincidental with the Communist Party's efforts, the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions—which denies any connection with the Communists—has adopted a five-point peace plan. The council sponsored the cultural and scientific conference in defense of peace which took place at New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in the spring of 1949.

PROGRESSIVES HAILED

At its national convention on April 30, Harvard University astronomer, Dr. Harlow Shapley, retired as chairman and Dr. John H. DeBoer became chairman of the national council.

Three days before, the Moscow newspaper Trud published an article which observed that, although American progressive circles had begun to circulate the Communist appeal, the United States peace front was still weak and feebly organized. The Soviet paper added:

"In the struggle for peace an important part is played by the United States Progressive Party, which unites representatives of the intelligentsia, certain strata of workers, Negroes, farmers, the petty bourgeoisie and middle classes, which stand in opposition to the big monopolies.

"The growing movement for peace throughout the world is a guarantee that the criminal conspiracy of Wall Street against the peoples of the world will be thwarted."

Since then, the Soviet press has reflected that the peace campaign is making good progress in the United States.

The United States Communist Party's peace commission has advised members that "the party's peace campaign is our major task for the next months." The commission added: "It is primary and transcends all other issues and struggles. But the other and very important issues will go on, and the party must learn how to dovetail them, and win them, in the course of the peace campaign."

"If we can reach millions with the peace appeal," the commission observes, "we shall be involving new millions in the success of all other struggles."

Obviously, the Communist—using the innocuous labels of the peace committee, the labor conference, and other organizations—are reaching a relatively wide public with its on-the-surface nonpartisan peace appeal. The signatures of those Americans who signed the peace appeal are scheduled to be presented at a second world peace congress to take place in Italy in the autumn.

On August 8, another article by Neal Stanford in the Christian Science Monitor describes this Soviet peace petition, alias the world peace appeal or the Stockholm resolution as a phony and proves it beyond any possible question of doubt.

The American Communists are adept in this technique of coercion and word-twisting and have deceived all too many good American citizens. I hope and urge that our Committee on Foreign Affairs will schedule an early hearing on House Concurrent Resolution 247 so that the Congress may be given an opportunity in the near future to add its warning and advice to that being given so effectively by the American press and radio, the American religious organizations, the American veterans' organizations, the American labor unions, and other groups in this country.

I hope all my colleagues will note particularly the date set by the peace commission of the national committee of the Communist Party of the United Sates and will recognize that they propose to use Labor Day for their vicious and un-American purposes. That is but 3 weeks from yesterday. I hope it will also be noted that October 24 is scheduled for the date when delegations will be sent to the United Nations. By that date I hope that the united efforts by the executive department, Congress, and patriotic American organizations and groups will result in the elimination from this Kremlin-sponsored petition of the names of everyone except avowed Communists in this country.

The article is as follows:

PEACE PROPAGANDA—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet peace petition, alias the world peace appeal or the Stockholm resolution, is a phony.

Nothing illustrates this better than the following two incidents:

The first concerns the International Congress of Architects that was scheduled to meet in Warsaw this October. A meeting of the executive committee of this international professional body was held in Paris in May. Its purpose was to prepare the agenda and list of activities for the Warsaw meeting.

Presumably, the architectural profession is nonpolitical. At least in noncurtain countries political ideology does not color the professional proclivities of the architectural fraternity. But behind the iron curtain apparently there is no such thing as a nonpolitical vocation or activity.

It has become common knowledge that Communist writers, musicians, and natural scientists are prisoners of the party line. But not until this Paris meeting of the executive committee of the International Congress of Architects has it been made clear that architects in Communist countries are also subject to party discipline.

At Paris the representative of the organization of Polish architects handed down the following two-point ultimatum:

1. The Polish architects cannot continue to participate in the activities of the International Congress of Architects if Yugoslavia continues to be represented;

2. Poland's architects demand that the International Congress of Architects approve the Stockholm peace petition or be branded an organization no longer serving the progress and development of architecture.

Of course the Polish demands that Yugoslavia be thrown out of the organization and that it support the Stockholm petition were unceremoniously rejected. The result was that the Polish representatives, copying the tactics of their Soviet mentors, walked out of the ICA in a huff.

The October meeting of the ICA, it perhaps should be added, is going to take place, but in Paris, not Warsaw.

The Communist technique of coercing groups and individuals to support the Stockholm petition dramatically failed in this instance. But what is perhaps more important, the public got a good look at how Communist propagandists work to line up people and organizations behind the Kremlin's phony peace proposal.

The other incident also involves Poland, and shows how the Communist regime in Warsaw is using the Stockholm petition to win its war with the Roman Catholic Church. It also shows how any agreement with Communists means only what they interpret it to mean.

In the recent church-state agreement in Poland that was supposed to stabilize relations between those two strong forces, it was agreed among other things that the church would use its influence to instill respect for state authorities among the people and work for peace.

Now Communist dogma holds that the Stockholm petition, despite its spurious nature, is a major milestone toward peace, and that all peace-lovers must sign it—if they don't they are considered warmongers.

In Poland the Communist regime has been using this bit of dialectic sophistry to purge Poland's church schools of unsympathetic instructors.

This is the technique: The officials call in the church instructors in a locality and ask them to sign the Stockholm pledge. If they demur—as most Roman Catholic priests would do, being aware of the spurious nature of the petition—they are reminded that the church is committed to working for peace; that this is a peace resolution; and that if they refuse to sign it the state has no alternative but to forbid them to continue teaching the young, as apparently peace is no longer their purpose.

By this technique of coercion and word-twisting, the Warsaw regime has forced not a few priests to sign the petition. It then announces to the local populace that the best proof that the peace petition is genuine is that their church leaders have signed it.

By such deceptive and coercive means do the Communists manipulate organizations and individuals in order to present an impressive list of signers to their hypocritical peace appeal.

Wisconsin Central Airlines Franchise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a press release which I issued on an aviation subject vital to my State, namely, immediate renewal of the temporary franchise of Wisconsin Central Airlines.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement, which includes a letter which I have directed to the Civil Aeronautics Board, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY BLASTS CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD'S FAILURE TO RENEW WISCONSIN CENTRAL AIRLINE FRANCHISE

"The strongest possible" protest has been sent by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, Wisconsin) to the Civil Aeronautics Board because of its failure to issue an immediate extension of franchise of Wisconsin Central Airlines.

Senator WILEY has denounced the Board's "unfair" decision to follow a lengthy hearing procedure that will take perhaps a year to review the franchise. The time lag, said WILEY, would "leave the airline hanging in mid-air" and would "cripple it."

The senior Senator from Wisconsin pointed out that the CAB's refusal comes at a time when "Wisconsin Central Airlines is prepared to do the finest and most important job that it has ever done in its great record of service to Wisconsin" by handling needs arising out of the present Korean emergency.

WILEY pointed out that 10 Wisconsin cities will be deprived of regular certificated airline service, unless the franchise is immediately renewed. He appealed to the Board to grant a petition for rehearing filed by the airline's attorneys.

"The State of Wisconsin has appropriated a million dollars in the last 2 years in order to improve the airports served by Wisconsin Central. In addition, the various air-minded communities have matched that total. * * * Let not the CAB kick Wisconsin and its communities in the teeth by this crucial decision. We won't stand for it, I assure you."

FULL TEXT OF WILEY LETTER

The full text of Senator WILEY's letter to Acting Chairman Oswald Ryan reads as follows:

"I am writing to you and to the other members of the Board to respectfully convey my strongest possible recommendation that the CAB immediately kindly reconsider its unfortunate action taken in connection with the Wisconsin Central Airlines. As you know, the Board decided not to issue a show cause order—either favorable or negative, but to hold a hearing at a later date as to the extension of the temporary Wisconsin Central franchise.

"I deeply regret to say that the failure of the Board to issue a favorable show cause order will practically cripple this vital airline. It would in effect be telling the airline to hang in mid-air for a year or so while the lengthy hearing procedure is under way—a sheer impossibility for Wisconsin Central at a time when it is prepared to meet the present emergency by doing the finest and most important job that it has ever done in its great record of service to Wisconsin and our neighboring States.

"Airline must secure larger planes

"The action of the CAB was taken at a time when the airline was prepared to convert to DC–3's to replace the obsolete Lockheed 10–A's. Lacking a favorable show cause order, it will be impossible for the airline (a) to secure private financing to cover the cost of the DC–3's nor (b) could the airline obtain an RFC loan for that purpose.

"DC–3's obviously will be becoming as scarce as proverbial hens' teeth shortly. Speed in their procurement is essential. The

airline has done a magnificent job for Wisconsin and its neighbors and to place it in this continued grave jeopardy with inadequate equipment is, I believe, unfair to the State of Wisconsin, to the people and industries of my State, as well as to Michigan, Illinois, and Minnesota.

"It is, moreover, unfair and harmful to the interests of the United States Government itself as will be shown in this letter and as I hope to cite in speaking to you over the phone shortly. I cannot believe that the Board was aware of all the harmful consequences that will now result if your action stands. I realize that the Board is tremendously busy with innumerable actions, but I feel that a reappraisal of the situation is essential.

"May I make the following further points on this issue:

"Airline has done subperbly even with small planes

"1. I believe that the Board did not give a fair appraisal to the outstanding record of the airline in view of CAB's constant attempted comparison between Wisconsin Central with its nine-passenger planes and other feeder airlines with their modern 21-24-passenger craft.

"2. It is inconceivable to me that this action of the Board could have been taken in view of the excellent traffic record established by Wisconsin Central (particularly in recent months) which has involved waiting list passengers on nearly every flight. It would appear that the Board's decision was based on the company's traffic prior to its acquisition of up-to-the-minute navigational aids which have tremendously improved its brilliant reliability record of flights completed.

"Wisconsin Central gets only small United States mail subsidy

"3. I invite your attention to the fact that according to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee report, the airline gets one of the smallest amounts of subsidy of any feeder airline in the United States. It is realized that this determination arises from the fact that Wisconsin Central provides exclusive service to a large number of cities, and it is important to note that the total subsidy received was approximately one-half that which was paid to certain other feeder airlines.

"4. Wisconsin Central is anxious to get the new craft so as to pay its own way insofar as possible rather than to have to appeal to the Federal Government later on for retroactive mail increases.

"CAB is kicking my State in the teeth

"5. The State of Wisconsin has appropriated a million dollars in the last 2 years in order to improve the airports served by Wisconsin Central. In additdion, the various air-minded communities have matched that total. Anyone who has lived in these towns knows what a herculean effort they made to improve their airports—what tremendous financial sacrifices individuals, businesses, and organizations have made in chipping in the total. Let not the CAB kick Wisconsin and its communities in the teeth by this crucial decision. We won't stand for it, I assure you.

"6. I understand that this is the first time in the CAB's history that the Board has failed to come to a show cause order in connection with the renewal of franchises of a feeder airline. I feel that this is a very bad precedent which will harm not only Wisconsin Central but other feeder airlines in the future.

"7. Yes, I cannot conceive that the Board was aware of all of the dangerous consequences of its failure to provide the favorable show cause order. That failure was equally as bad as if the Board had decided to issue a negative show cause order.

"Ten Badger cities will be harmed

"8. If Wisconsin Central Airlines is forced out of business as now looms probable, it will mean that practically every community in Wisconsin will be deprived of vital aviation service with the exception of Madison, Milwaukee, La Crosse, and Eau Claire. The following cities would lose certificated airline service—Oshkosh, Green Bay, Marinette, Clintonville, Stevens Point, Wisconsin Rapids, Wausau, Rhinelander, Land O'Lakes, Beloit, and Janesville. This will prove extremely dangerous to our country, especially in view of the fact that Wisconsin is prepared at the moment to again make tremendous contributions to the national defense effort, as it made in World War II.

"9. I invite your attention to the fact that the Federal Government has poured in hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of dollars into Wisconsin airports in its matching program. Those funds will be comparatively wasted if one Federal agency—your own—decided to persist in its present position. Soon the National Defense Department will be clamoring for Wisconsin goods shipped by air freight, but it too will find that it, as a Federal agency, will have been harmed by the actions of another Federal agency—namely, your own.

"So, may I respectfully urge that you grant the petition for a review of your action and that you further decide to issue an immediate favorable show cause order to Wisconsin Central.

"I know that all the members of the Wisconsin delegation—both Democrats and Republicans, as well as legislators from our neighbor States—join with me in this earnest appeal.

"Thanking you and with all good wishes, I am

"Sincerely yours,

"ALEXANDER WILEY."

Who Aided Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Russian communism in its march on Manchuria, China, Korea, and the rest of the world is not only aided by the ships paid for by the taxpayers of the United States but the GI's who served in the South Pacific know something about tanks. I am including a letter addressed to me as to what happened in one single instance of some 175 tanks sealed off for American security.

AUGUST 12, 1950.

Representative WEICHEL,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: So Russia has our ships.

This comes from a GI who for good reasons must remain nameless.

He was on Okinawa in the maintenance department. Some 175 tanks were sealed up for security.

These tanks were sold to Russia for $12 a ton.

And these tanks are those in Korea. Russian guns only.

I happened to be on a broadcast with a correspondent interviewing a GI. He said to him these Russian tanks are good. "Good," said the GI, "these are the same tanks I—" bang, they went off the air.

Yours sincerely,

The Measure of a Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my privilege and pleasure to participate in paying a well-earned tribute to one of Brooklyn's foremost citizens. It was the occasion of his fourteenth anniversary as Democratic leader of the second assembly district, which was coincident with his thirty-eighth wedding anniversary.

In this time of stress, when so many of our acts are determined by the economic pressures which affect our personal needs, it is refreshing to note that there are still many citizens whose daily actions are motivated by the common needs of the community, rather than by their own welfare.

Such a one, I am happy to relate, is one of my neighbors who has devoted his entire adult life to the service of the people of the district in which he resides.

I speak of the Honorable Joseph B. Whitty, the chief clerk of the appellate term of the supreme court of the second judicial district in the State of New York.

He was a close personal friend of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and Alfred E. Smith, and is an ardent supporter of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN and President Harry S. Truman.

As a member of the Democratic State Committee of the State of New York he has sponsored for public office men who have risen to great heights and who have brought credit to their sponsor. These include Supreme Court Justices Joseph Fennelly, Murray Hearn, E. Ivan Rubenstein, and Michael F. Walsh; County Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz, City Court Justice Sylvester Sabbatino, United States District Judge Leo F. Rayfiel, Magistrate Albert D. Schanzer, Commissioner Maurice H. Matzkin, State Senator Louis L. Friedman, Assemblyman J. Sidney Levine, Councilman Edward Vogel, and this humble speaker, as well as a host of others, too numerous to mention.

Mr. Whitty has led every worthwhile civic activity in our neighborhood. He has led the fight for more schools, better housing, veterans' rights, reduction of local assessments, and innumerable similar activities. He has been chairman of the Red Cross drive, the Boy Scout drive, the cerebral palsy drive, the cancer drive, and many other charities. The Democratic meeting rooms at 1634 East Fifteenth Street, Brooklyn, have been made available by him for these and other worthy endeavors as their local official headquarters.

Mr. Whitty has for many years been Chairman of the Christian Committee for Palestine, and has worked closely through the years with Mr. Benjamin G. Browdy, now president of the Zionist Organization of America. He has contributed to and has always been active

in Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant affairs of the community.

Such service should not go unnoticed. I am happy to place upon the record this tribute to Mr. Whitty for his selfless service to the community in which we both reside.

The Copper Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, unity in the national effort at a time of crisis like the present requires that special local interests be laid aside. At this point actions speak even louder than words and pleas for unity sound hollow if not accompanied by performance. American mining communities cannot be harmed today with the great demand that exists for copper in the defense effort by a suspension of the tariff. These are the real points involved in the refusal to continue the wartime suspension of the tariff on copper dealt with in the appended editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, August 10:

THE COPPER TARIFF

On June 30 a tariff of 2 cents a pound on imported copper, suspended during the war, went back into effect. On Tuesday the Senate Finance Committee rejected by 9 to 4 a bill to restore that suspension. This seems to us a short-sighted and ill-advised decision. Copper is one of the most important raw materials in our defense program. The committee has chosen a time when we are facing great inflationary pressure to try to force a cut in our copper imports and add to consumer costs. At the same time, the tariff would deal a hard and unnecessary blow to Chile, where copper is the major export. Peru would also be hard hit, but it could stand the blow better.

Chile is one of our true friends in Latin America and a country that has progressed well toward the sort of democracy we like to see. It is Chile that is leading the move to organize the Latin-American countries into a collective effort for the United Nations in Korea. At the moment, Chilean economy is severely extended by inflationary factors and a reduction of her dollar income would be serious.

W. H. Hoover, president of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co., said last month that a restoration of the 2-cent duty on copper would not materially increase United States production. Chilean copper, he pointed out, is as integral a part of the United States industry as domestic copper. The Chilean industry is, moreover, largely owned by American companies. Of course, there are other American copper companies that want the protection and it is the legislators from mining States, or those who are willing to help them, who are now trying to restore the 2-cent duty. It is not as if the domestic producers have to have this protection to keep going; they cannot produce nearly enough for present American consumption, let alone the strategic stock piling that is now more necessary than ever.

From both the economic and diplomatic viewpoints it is wrong to reimpose the copper tariff. Our good-neighbor policy cannot be measured in dollars and cents but its value is neverthless enormous. There is no adequate reason today to harm one of the most important Latin-American countries simply to provide some unnecessary help to a United States industry. The decision of the Finance Committee is not final and there is time to reverse it on the floor of the Senate. It would be the part of statesmanship and common sense to do so.

Labor Supports the American Struggle Against Totalitarianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Charles S. Zimmerman, chairman, Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party of New York, embodying a statement adopted by the council to show that the labor movement is actively supporting the American struggle against totalitarian ideology and aggression, but expects to have a full voice in the conduct of the long campaign and to be protected against ruthless exploitation. The letter follows:

TRADE UNION COUNCIL OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE,
New York, N. Y., August 11, 1950.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We wish to call your attention to the following statement embodied in a resolution passed yesterday by the executive committee of the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party, embracing more than 250 local unions AFL, CIO, and independent.

This resolution expresses clearly where labor stands on important questions involved in the present emergency and we hope it will help to guide you in your deliberations upon legislation affecting the welfare of the country at this time.

The resolution reads as follows:

"The present fighting in Korea is a matter of the deepest concern to the American workers.

"Korea is the Spain of Asia. To surrender Korea to Communist dictatorship can only be an invitation to world war, just as the surrender of Spain to Fascist dictatorship was the prelude to the last war.

"Korea is also a test for the concept of world peace, enforced through the United Nations. If the Soviet Union, directly and through its satellites, is permitted to defy the UN, then the only instrument in the world for the maintenance of international peace will be destroyed.

"To win the fighting in Korea, therefore, is to advance the peace and to defend democracy.

"To cover the savage aggression of the Soviet Union upon Korea and upon the peace and freedom of the civilized world, the international Communist movement has launched a hypocritical peace petition.

"This petition, timed to reach its height simultaneously with the height of the Korean offensive, is the organized effort of the world Communist movement to exploit the normal peace-loving instincts of all civilized people to clear the way for the Soviet offensive against peace and democracy everywhere.

"If the Communists wished peace, they could have it tomorrow with just one word from the Kremlin. Instead, the Kremlin acts through its satellites in Korea and prepares to act similarly in other parts of the world, while calling upon its Communist Party fifth column in the democratic world to undermine our will to resist aggression by a phony petition of peace.

"Unfortunately for the Soviet Union, their timetable is off schedule. By now, they hoped to have full control of the Korean peninsula. They then hoped to coordinate their peace petition with their chairmanship in the Security Council of the UN to call for a "cease-fire" in Korea.

"The Communist timetable was upset by the prompt and decisive action of President Truman and by the remarkable courage and skill of the American troops in Korea.

"As in the last war against totalitarianism, the trade-unions are prepared to make every possible sacrifice to speed our victory, for only in a democracy can free trade-unionism exist.

"Our democratic ideals, however, demand that sacrifices be shared equally and that no one section of the population shall be made to carry an undue burden.

"Up to the present, labor—along with all others who have fixed incomes—has been made to carry the major cost of the fighting. June 25, the day of our declared stand to resist aggression in Korea, was the date when many businessmen and industrialists jacked up their prices. Overnight the cost of living rose and then rose again, automatically cutting into the living standards of labor. This came at a time when labor's real wage had already been reduced by the increased cost of living during May and early June.

"To check this profiteering at the expense of labor and the consumer, the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party calls upon Congress and the President of the United States to roll back the price level to May and then to set a ceiling on prices to protect the Nation against inflation.

"Because of the unbalance created by the continuous rise in prices since the first of the year and the special jump in prices since June 25 without any similar rise in wages, we are opposed to a wage freeze at this time. Whatever controls may ultimately be established over wages, there must be readjustments that will bring current wages in line with price increases and that will allow improvement in those trades operating under substandard labor conditions.

"Rents must not be omitted from a system of over-all controls. In view of the present materials shortage that will slow down the already slow-moving building program, it becomes doubly important to reimpose stringent rent controls of a wartime character.

"The Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party is also aware of the fact that the fighting in Korea will involve great costs and new taxes. At this time, the first source of revenue for such fighting must be the war profits which corporations are reaping as a result of the conflict. We resent the talk of taxing incomes, especially lower income brackets now, while postponing action on excess profits until later. A new tax schedule must not be aimed at hitting those whose standard of living has already been hit by price increases, but must be aimed at deriving maximum revenue from those corporations who are profiteering in this struggle.

"The issue in Korea is clear: it is democracy versus dictatorship; it is world peace based on a strong UN versus world war based on Communist aggression.

"In this struggle, we are confident that peace and democracy will conquer. To ensure the maximum coordination of all energies, labor must be given a voice in policy-making and administrative posts bearing upon the national defense.

"As trade-unionists, as liberals, as Americans, we pledge ourselves to guarantee this victory by supporting the fighting forces of peace in Korea and maintaining the fighting morale of democracy at home."

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN,
Chairman.

A Farmer Veteran, With Legion Help, Makes Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the July 1950 issue of the American Legion magazine comes the following story:

HOW THE LEGION FIGHTS FOR THE FARM VETERAN—YOU CAN'T KEEP A GOOD MAN DOWN, THEY SAY, BUT SOMETIMES YOU GO TO BAT FOR HIM

(By Robert B. Pitkin)

If you were a banker what would you do in the following case?

Into your office one morning comes a rangy, young blind man guided by his petite, bespectacled, blonde wife.

"Mr. Banker," the blind man says to you, "my name is John Hayhurst and this is my wife, Ethel. We've just spent all our money to buy a dairy farm, but we don't have any livestock. Will you lend us a couple of thousand dollars so we can get 10 good milk cows and a bull?"

You look at his sightless eyes and ask: "Who's going to run the farm?"

"Ethel and I will run it," Hayhurst tells you.

"I suppose you've had some experience operating a dairy herd?"

"No, sir," says Hayhurst. "I was a factory mechanic before the war. Then I went into the Pacific with the First Cavalry and 2 days before the firing stopped in Manila I lost my eyesight in enemy action. Now I can't stand life in town, so Ethel and I decided we'd make our living in the country."

Your heart sinks at the idea of an inexperienced blind man going into debt to run a dairy farm. Finally you say hopefully, "Ah! Then your wife knows dairy farming."

"Oh no, sir," says Ethel Hayhurst. "It's going to be something new to both of us. I've always lived in town."

"Well," you say, "if your farm is good security, we might put a mortgage on it. But I'd hate to. You're bound to fail and then we'd have to foreclose. So if I lend you the money it would be like taking your farm away from you. Do you want to take that chance?"

"I wouldn't mind at all," says Hayhurst. "However, the farm is already mortgaged. But I get a pension, so Ethel and I and the two kids can keep alive and meet the mortgage with that. Yet if we're going to do better than that we need those cows. We hope the cattle we buy with your loan will help secure our note."

All right. You're the banker. What do you do?

Answer. The Hayhursts are a bad banking risk on the face of things. And live animals are, too, especially when managed by inexperienced people, one of whom is blind. Good, average banking practice requires that you refuse the loan.

However, you might send the Hayhursts to your county supervisor of the Farmers Home Administration, a bureau of the Department of Agriculture.

John and Ethel Hayhurst are real people. In 1948, when no bank would lend them money to buy cattle, they took their problem to J. B. Warner, Van Buren County supervisor of the Farmers Home Administration in Paw Paw, Mich. This FHA has Federal money to lend farmers.

Warner was startled by the Hayhursts' proposition. But he talked it over with a voluntary committee of three county residents. Without approval of such local committees no FHA farm loan can be made.

The committees was startled and said "No."

Then Warner got to thinking the case over and noted a number of favorable things about John and Ethel. They were:

1. John Hayhurst seemed eager to learn, so he would probably make the most of veterans' farm-training courses under the GI bill or Public Law 16.

2. If a loan were made, one of Warner's duties as FHA supervisor would be to help the Hayhursts plan a successful dairy operation.

3. John Hayhurst aimed to make good. Blind, and having spent 18 months in a VA hospital, he was still ready for life.

4. Ethel Hayhurst was a wonderful gamble as a human being. She was the girl back home who waited for John. She married him after he lost his eyesight and had since borne him two children.

5. Hayhurst drew veterans' disability compensation, but refused to be satisfied with it. He wanted to work and produce.

6. John and Ethel had already bought the farm on their own initiative, and it was a good farm.

Warner called on the Hayhursts and together they worked out a sound plan for the management of the dairy herd. And a plan for a budgeting and bookkeeping system. And a plan for the education of John and Ethel as dairy farmers.

Then he went back to the committee, and they finally certified the Hayhursts for $2,500 at 5 percent interest on a 5-year Farmers Home Administration note.

With the money John and Ethel bought 10 milk cows and a bull and began their milk business. They followed the supervisor's farm plan. John and Ethel learned all they could from Department of Agriculture agencies and John took GI bill farm training.

One year later the Hayhursts paid back almost half the 5-year note. They paid $1,100 out of income earned by themselves on their 209-acre farm 9 miles north of Paw Paw, Mich. Today they operate a successful family farm and blind John Hayhurst is carrying a man's share of the work.

You can say the Farmers Home Administration played a long shot when it lent Federal money to the Hayhursts. John and Ethel proved that it only looked like a long shot. And FHA, in 15 years of unusual lending experience, had reason to believe in its method of lending.

You might better say that your Uncle Sam played a long shot with your money when he set up the Farmers Home Administration. This FHA is entrusted with millions of dollars to lend to family farmers whose credit is not good enough to make private loans against their farming needs.

While FHA does not lend to every farmer who cannot borrow from his bank, it may not lend to anyone who can get the credit he needs elsewhere.

But, like John and Ethel Hayhurst, FHA Administrator Dillard B. Lasseter and his staff have proved that their proposition only looks like a long shot. In fact the agency's record of lending your money to farmers who have no credit is so successful, and fills such an important need in America, it has been the official position of the American Legion for several years that the Farmers Home Administration should have more millions than it does to lend in the same way.

The story of the Hayhursts is a fine example of what this FHA does and how it differs from private lending agencies. The Hayhursts are also an extreme example of why FHA exists. People like John and Ethel are the salt of the earth, and they can feed America. But to get started they need credit.

Back in 1935 the Federal Government recognized the unjust credit position of thousands of farmers of good character but little property. It was too often easier to get a private farm loan if you had property but little character.

From a national welfare point of view it is important that our land be in the hands of people who will farm sensibly and take good care of the soil. So there was set up in the Department of Agriculture a bureau called the Farm Security Administration which later became the Farmers Home Administration. It is a bureau which has had a bad time with its initials. As FSA it was the alphabetical twin of the Federal Security Agency, and now as FHA it shares its abbreviation with the Federal Housing Administration. It was and is a lending and teaching agency. Under the Bankhead-Jones Act it gave credit equality to farmers who wanted to be good farmers, and it advised them on good farming practices.

There was an emergency in those early days. The agency worked on a bad farm credit situation that had existed for generations and had become worse as a result of the depression.

But 1944 saw the beginning of a different emergency. Veterans of War II began to return, many of them to seek a livelihood on the farm. Far too many veterans were looked upon as bad banking risks, and it began to appear that America might lose the better part of a generation of farmers.

The American Legion had foreseen this, and it had written, into the GI bill, loan guaranties for farm purchases, and farm operation, as well as farm training courses under VA. The GI bill also stipulated that veterans were to get definite Federal loan priorities under the existing Farmers Home Administration.

Two years later John Stelle, who had been chairman of the Legion's special GI bill committee, was national commander. Fearful for the veteran farmer, he created within the Legion a permanent agriculture committee to keep watch on what actually happened to veterans on the farm. And the new committee saw that the farm provisions of the GI bill were not firing on all cylinders.

In far too many cases banks would not make GI farm loans even under the 50 percent Government guaranty. Good farms and good farm equipment had skyrocketed in price so that where GI credit could be had it was only a beginning. Often, to get a GI loan, the veteran had to make a down payment out-of-pocket larger than he could raise. And as a farmer, the veteran had almost no credit. Private lenders often felt that the veteran had never learned farming or had just spent several years forgetting it.

This was a double-barreled blow to the GI and to the intent of the GI bill. It meant, in many cases, that the veteran who took VA farm training couldn't use it afterward. He had no farm. Or he had a farm without proper equipment.

The Legion and Congress intended that the farm credit and the farm training of the GI bill go hand in hand, and it wasn't working that way entirely. While many veterans were in a position to get full worth from the combined GI loans and training, thousands of others were left with a piece of paper in their hands called the GI bill of rights. These included both the just and unjust, be-

cause the root of the evil was not the veteran's worth as a man. It was credit based more on property than on character.

The Legion's agriculture committee watched and saw that one of the soundest and most realistic parts of the GI bill farm program was the little-heralded item that gave veterans a priority for loans under the old Farm Security Administration. That is the agency we met at the beginning of this account. It had just changed its name to the FHA or Farmers Home Administration.

Dillard B. Lasseter had just become Administrator of the FHA. Years earlier Lasseter, a veteran of World War I, had been injured in action and returned home in 1919 to find that in his absence he had been demoted to the bottom of the heap in his State Department job. He thus had personal knowledge of the economic disability that years in service can inflict on a veteran. A member of Atlanta Post, No. 1, of the Legion, Lasseter had never lost his interest in veterans' problems.

In 1946, as head of Farmers Home Administration, Lasseter was busy applying all the veterans' priorities the law demanded in FHA loans. Beyond that he was applying all the veterans' priorities the law and his budget allowed.

His agency was making three loans to GI farmers for every one granted by private lenders under GI bill guaranties. And Lasseter's three were to veterans who could not get GI loans.

Right down to this day that figure still holds. As of last Christmas, GI bill farm loans totaled 53,789. During the same time the FHA had made 155,978 farm loans to veterans.

In 1946, Lasseter's supervisors were out in the field talking to thousands of veteran farmers who couldn't get GI or any other farm loans from banks or loan associations. The procedure was about the same as it was later with the Hayhursts.

Was the veteran intelligent? Was he earnest? Was he serious about good farming? Was he a good farmer? If not, could he learn good farming? Would he learn good farming?

If he wanted to buy or equip a farm, what farm? Was the farm a good producer? If not, was the veteran apt to make it a good producer? If he wanted an operating loan, how did he propose to spend the money?

What was the veteran's plan for operating the farm? Was it a sound plan? If not, would he agree to a plan worked out with him by the supervisor and other Agriculture Department agents? Would he keep financial records properly?

The FHA supervisors looked for the chance of that man making that farm pay.

If satisfied, the supervisor called on the FHA's voluntary county committee. Every agricultural county in the United States has an FHA county committee, and that is nearly every county in the country.

The committee is made up of three reputable county residents, at least two of whom must be successful farmers. The third is often a banker.

They are local people and are never paid anything except per diem expenses while meeting. Presumably they know the farm in question and they know the borrower or his family, or they investigate him. Unless the committee certifies the loan, it cannot be made.

If the loan is certified and made (often it is certified and not made for lack of FHA funds) the supervisor continues to check on the farm operation for the duration of the loan to help the borrower solve his farming problems. FHA makes 100-percent loans with ceilings that vary according to type of loan and locality. The certified farmer need not put up any money himself to borrow the full amount.

How did this system work?

Woodrow Holliman was the first World War II veteran to get an FHA farm-purchase loan in Arkansas. Terms allowed him 40 years to pay. Holliman repaid in 4 years.

Jack Strickland, disabled Navy veteran of Altha, Fla., was a share cropper until he borrowed $9,500 from FHA in March 1947 and bought his own farm. Under terms of his 40-year note he should have repaid $340 by the end of 2 years. By then he had paid back $4,232.91 and increased his net worth from $2,385 to $8,960.

Charles Llewellyn, of Allegany County, Md., and his wife—a city girl—"had only a little household goods, an old car, a few chickens, and some odds and ends of equipment in 1946," says a supervisor's report. "Naturally their assets wouldn't rate them a bank loan, neither would a GI loan meet their needs * * *." But Llewellyn and his wife got an FHA loan to equip the farm they rented and in 3 years they increased their net worth 12 times over.

Charles F. Cline, a single disabled veteran of Ontario, Oreg., made two loans from FHA in 1945. One of them was a $12,000 loan on a 40-year mortgage to buy his farm. In 1946 he paid the installment then due on both loans and also paid the ownership loan for 2 years in advance.

Here's the whole story. Since 1945, FHA borrowers have met 98 percent of payments and interest when or before due. Since 1945, about 28 percent of all farm-purchase borrowers have paid their 40-year loans in full in advance. The rest average 2 years ahead in their payments. And none of them could get the credit they needed locally.

In the combined history of FSA and FHA dating back to the depression years of 1935, the record is not quite so good. It includes the years when the agency was feeling its way, and it includes loans it made when times were much harder on farmers generally. But look at the record.

More than $1,500,000,000 have been lent in 15 years ($1,575,000,000).

Of each dollar lent, 71.3 cents have been repaid, 22.8 cents are not yet due, 5.9 cents are in arrears. Meanwhile, 10.3 cents interest have been paid. Put another way, for every dollar lent "Uncle" can show you a little over $1.04 in the black and a little over a nickel to be collected the hard way. And that's for all borrowers since 1935. The record of the veterans is better.

Most of the old FHA borrowers are now such good credit risks they won't be able to borrow from FHA again. Their banks are doing business with them now.

Watching all this, the American Legion's agriculture committee saw plainly that FHA was doing more good for veteran farmers than GI loans were. It was specifically helping those veterans who were worthy but could not get GI loans. And it had hit on the very best way to use Government millions to reestablish veterans on the farm.

Here was the Government in the lending business without competing with private lenders. Here were millions of dollars of Government money being used to help people—veterans and nonveterans alike—without 1 cent of handout. In fact, "Uncle" was earning interest from the people he helped. And they were feeding the Nation and increasing the national wealth at the same time.

Here was a program which could not be wrecked by boondogglers and which should not be wrecked by the taxpayers' fear of boondogglers. The FHA county committees had proved themselves the best of all safeguards against fly-by-nights and poor farm investments.

The Legion was for this program, and it went to bat for it. The Legion said FHA should have money to lend any man it could certify under its proved system.

But FHA has never had that amount of money. Each year it has had to turn down certified veterans and nonveterans because its money wouldn't stretch far enough.

In 1946 the Legion made enough noise to arouse Congress' interest in the amount of money available for the wave of veteran farmers. The veterans already had a priority but there wasn't enough money even for them, thus their priority was not enough and it was shutting all other farmers out of the program.

As a result $15,000,000 was appropriated to FHA exclusively for loans to veterans. That was not enough, but it was better. The appropriation has never been big enough, although for 4 years now farmers who have borrowed have been putting the money back into the Treasury faster than it has been coming out.

But since 1946 the appropriation has been smaller. In one of those queer "economy" gestures Congress in 1947 slashed FHA's 1948 loan appropriation.

There was no economy, there was even waste. The fixed costs of FHA remained about the same, while the amount of good it could do was reduced. Although the number of veterans FHA could certify in 1948 increased considerably, the number of loans it could make fell off from a third to a half in the major categories of operating loans and ownership loans. The demand for FHA farm loans has risen steadily since the war as more and more veterans completed GI farm training and were ready to go to work.

When the 1948 cut was proposed in Congress in the spring of 1947 the Legion's agriculture committee howled bloody murder. And rightly so.

Charles L. (Farmer) Brown, of Springfield, Mo., was then chairman of the committee. He sent a strongly worded telegram to key Members of the Senate and the House.

It said, in substance: The Legion condemns the cut in FHA lending funds. FHA loans are economic, not political. They do not boost farm inflation, for they are based on production values, not land prices. They are doing the job Congress and the Legion want done on the farm.

Brown also sent the Congressmen a copy of official Legion policy stating that even more, rather than less, such loans should be available to render the best service to worthy veteran farmers, other worthy farmers, and the Nation.

But the cut went through. So, acting for his committee, Brown attacked the job of eliminating the cut the following year. In the winter of 1948 he wrote long and detailed letters to Senators and Representatives in important committee spots.

One old friend in the Senate wrote him and said, "I heartily share in your opinion. * * * You may know that I and other sponsors of this program have had a difficult time every year securing any funds at all for this purpose."

But another Senator said he was afraid of overprotecting the veteran into too heavy a debt load during times of inflation. His motives sounded good, but as Brown had pointed out the year before, FHA had never lent money on farms inflated beyond their productive worth.

However, the Legion and other supporters of FHA were effective, and the foolish cuts were eliminated in 1948 for the 1949 lending program.

Yet the Legion still holds to its original position that even more money should be available. The biggest need for FHA loans is now and in the future, as more and more veterans complete their farm training. There are too many John and Ethel Hayhursts, too many Woodrow Hollimans, too many Jack Stricklands, Charles Llewellyns, and Charles F. Clines still left to whom FHA has to say, "Sorry, no funds." The Legion still asks, "To what better use can we put our millions than to lend them to those who need the money to help themselves, and who will

use it to feed us and give us our money back at interest?"

Farmers Home Administration is a Government adventure in capitalism, and the way they work it—it works.

House Joint Resolution 516

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some information in regard to House Joint Resolution 516:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., August 14, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to conversations between you and the office of the Secretary with respect to supplying certain information in connection with House Joint Resolution 516, which authorizes the President to conclude and give effect to agreements for the settlement of intercustodial conflicts involving enemy property.

Representatives of the Department of State have been in consultation with representatives of the Office of Alien Property and it is understood that the Office of Alien Property is transmitting a memorandum to you which contains the information available to it. The State Department, for its part, desires to submit the following additional information:

Under part IV of the Brussels agreement protection is accorded to American and other nonenemy interests in property outside of Germany owned by German corporations. This is based on the principle which has been urged by this Government throughout the world that nonenemy interests in so-called enemy property are not properly subject to seizure as reparations. The State Department expects that there will be considerable amounts of property in other jurisdictions beneficially owned by United States citizens which would be released upon the adoption of the principles of part IV of the Brussels agreement. The Department of State has never taken a census of United States cases falling in this category: the uncertainties as to the countries involved, as to the exact terms of protection to be accorded, and to the form of the legislation have heretofore militated against such a procedure.

Consequently, the information of the Department of State as to the amounts of property to be released in other jurisdictions is fragmentary and scattered. The Department of State is accordingly most reluctant to make any estimate of this amount, but if you deem it helpful to have some idea of the magnitude of the amount, the Department ventures that a sum in excess of $25,000,000 belonging to American beneficial interests may be involved.

Sincerely yours,
JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *Washington.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your telephone conversation on August 11, 1950, with a representative of this Department concerning the amounts of property subject to the Brussels agreement relating to the resolution of conflicting claims to German enemy assets.

We are not in a position to answer your inquiry since the administration of enemy assets within this Government is not a function of this Department. It is suggested that any further inquiries with regard to this subject be directed to the Office of Alien Property in the Department of Justice.

Very truly yours,
WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., August 14, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Pursuant to your informal request, the War Claims Commission submits the following comment with reference to House Joint Resolution 516, Eighty-first Congress, "Authorizing the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, to conclude and give effect to agreements for the settlement of intercustodial conflicts involving enemy property."

House Joint Resolution 516, Eighty-first Congress, is a clean bill reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, August 1, 1950, and substituted for House Joint Resolution 475, Eighty-first Congress, similarly entitled and with a similar purpose.

The War Claims Commission was requested to comment upon House Joint Resolution 475 and in its report the Commission pointed out that the language in paragraph (3) of the resolution, to wit: "Reimbursement to the United States by other governments pursuant to such agreements shall be administered as vested property, but shall not be subject to any claim under laws applicable to such property" might be construed to prevent the administration of claims authorized by the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public, 896, 80th Cong., July 3, 1948), as amended, against the funds resulting from such reimbursement.

It is noted that paragraph (4) of House Joint Resolution 516, which corresponds to paragraph (3) of House Joint Resolution 475, provides simply that "Reimbursement to the United States by other governments pursuant to such agreements shall be administered as vested property," and omits the objectionable language in paragraph (3) of House Joint Resolution 475.

However, the Commission is not fully satisfied that claims authorized by the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, are fully protected by the terms of House Joint Resolution 516, and in a communication addressed to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, as of this date, a copy of which is enclosed, recommended certain clarifying language which if incorporated into House Joint Resolution 516 would, it is believed, fully protect the claimants under the War Claims Act of 1948.

The Commission bases its belief that adoption of House Joint Resolution 516 and the conclusion of the proposed intercustodial agreements would accelerate the vesting rate of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and eventually render more funds available to the War Claims Fund, upon testimony given by representatives of the Department of State and the Office of the Alien Property Custodian, Department of Justice, before the Subcommittee on Settlement of Intercustodial Conflicts Involving Enemy Property on July 12, 1950, in the course of hearings on House Joint Resolution 475, Eighty-first Congress. At this hearing it was testified that $60,000,000 to $100,000,000 might be vested under the terms of the proposed agreement.

Sincerely yours,
DANIEL F. CLEARY,
Chairman, War Claims Commission.

Admiral Denfeld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, several months ago Admiral Louis E. Denfeld was summarily replaced as Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral Denfeld found himself in trouble because he talked very bluntly to a committee of the Congress regarding certain deficiencies in our national defense, which under the Constitution and the law he had a right to do. In this connection I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an excellent editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 2, 1950, entitled "I Told You So."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I TOLD YOU SO

Remember Admiral Louis E. Denfeld? He was the Chief of Naval Operations, who was humiliated and all but kicked out of the service 8 months ago because he dared to talk back to Secretary of Defense Johnson about the Nation's military weakness. He, as the top brass in the Navy, went to the front for the Navy when others were scurrying for cover or saying "Yes" to Johnson or the pliant, supine Mr. Matthews, who still presides over that branch of the service.

Because he believed Congress and the rest of the Nation should be informed as to the deterioration of our national defense, he spoke the truth—and was sacked. He is now in retirement.

Today, as he views what goes on in Korea, he may well say, "I told you so." He isn't doing just that, but as he campaigns for the governorship of Massachusetts on the Republican ticket, he is saying a few things about the way our defense has been handled. And, of course, he doesn't like it.

Talking the other day with Blair Moody, of the Detroit News, he disclosed that in no year since World War II has the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff been dominant in deciding what was needed to defend the United States. He told him:

"The first ceiling on the military budget was set by Jimmy Webb (former Budget Director, now Under Secretary of State) and the Budget Bureau, on the basis of what they thought the country would accept. The amount was approved by the President. James Forrestal, as Secretary of Defense, fought it but was overruled. Louis Johnson accepted it and cut it further. Except for the atomic bombing job, it was never enough for any of the three services to do their immediate job in case of trouble.

"Two years ago Forrestal asked each Joint Chiefs member to report what would be needed by his service in case of an emergency. The total was more than $30,000,000,000—" which does not seem as high today as it did a month ago. We were told to cut it and got it down to around $23,000,000,000. The lowest budget the Joint Chiefs ever said would be adequate in the last 4 years was $20,000,000,000. This was cut to $18,000,000,000 as a compromise. (The 1950 budget called for $13,000,000,000.)"

Admiral Denfeld emphasizes that the basis of all the defense cuts as applied to the armed services was ill-conceived economy. He says a "passion for economy" denuded Ame-

ican forces in the Far East, and it was this "policy of weakness" that prompted Russia to make its move in Korea.

Secretary Johnson, in order to make a showing, cut the "fat" too deep. He reduced the Navy to one combat carrier in the Orient; scrapped the new supercarrier (which we could use today) already under construction; reduced active combat carriers from 8 to 6; reduced active marine combat teams from 11 to 6 (at one time the very life of the Marine Corps was threatened); stood fast against even an approach to the 70-group Air Corps, which the then Air Secretary Symington championed. And he went all out for the B-36 bombers, which haven't dropped a bomb in Korea—and won't.

In justification of Secretary Johnson, it must be remembered that economy was a Washington must. Pressure on Congress was exerted by some of its Members, by the public. The President talked it, urged it for defense, even though he simultaneously refused to preach economy in areas where it could be practiced without weakening the Nation. Johnson at that time had Presidential ambitions; perhaps he still has. If he could make a showing in defense, where billions of waste were suspected, he had a campaign-talking point. The trouble was he cut off too much fat, played favorites—the Air Force at the expense of the Navy. Now the Nation pays in security for his ill-advised and intemperate reductions.

Admiral Denfeld, whom the ordinarily even-tempered General Bradley once referred to as a "fancy Dan," may be excused if he reminisces in some bitterness on what happened when he told us the truth.

Mail Delivery Curtailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record in support of H. R. 8195, a bill to rescind the Postmaster General's order of last spring which reduced mail deliveries all over the Nation by 50 percent. I urge the House to pass H. R. 8195 without further delay. The mail delivery curtailment was an ill-advised and irresponsible action on the part of the Postmaster General—it has caused much inconvenience to the public, and represents a body blow to the entire postal service. It is the responsibility of Congress to correct this injustice, and the way to do this is to pass H. R. 8195.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared recently in the Fayetteville Observer at Fayetteville, N. C., which relates to the curtailment of mail deliveries, and which reflects the public's desire for the restoration of previous mail service:

NEW POSTAL BUS: BUT HOW ABOUT TWO CITY DELIVERIES A DAY?

The new postal bus to Florence is going to mean quicker mail service between Fayetteville and South Carolina points just as the postal bus to Greensboro and Warsaw has brought Fayetteville into quicker communication with eastern and central North Carolina.

Employment of the busses represents a shift in mail tastes from railroads to highway and air.

The railroads remain able to render splendid long-distance service, especially with heavier mail, but the trend of the railroads themselves has been to eliminate trains where possible on local runs, such as, for instance, the Fayetteville-Wilmington route.

We look for quicker intercity service from the new busses.

We wish we could look for better intracity service by the restoration of twice-a-day residential deliveries.

It really doesn't do too much good to get the mail quickly from town to town if you hamstring the service between post office and residence.

Proposed Legislation Dealing With Spying, Subversion, and Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman Discovers Mundt-Nixon Bill," published in the Los Angeles Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN DISCOVERS THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL

In his special message of Tuesday, dealing with spying, subversion and sabotage, President Truman appears to have discovered virtues in the Mundt-Nixon bill, which he has not hitherto been able to see with a telescope. The failure of the administration effort to appease the Communists seems to have enlightened him—and it is high time.

Mr. Truman proposes, in addition to extending the possible period of prosecution for espionage (now 3 years), and protection of military bases, to require registration of "persons who have received instruction from a foreign government or political party in espionage or subversive tactics."

The difference between that plan and the Mundt-Nixon bill, which would require the registration of all Communists and Communist-front organizations, will seem to most people to be in favor of the latter. Mr. Truman's plan would be designed to catch only those Communists trained in sabotage; but what we learn from our agents in the party is that practically everybody in the party is so trained—or at least trained to obey orders without hesitation or question. If there is any advantage in requiring Communists to register, why not register all of them?

In his message, the President gives Congress a long list of laws dealing with espionage, sabotage and conspiracy, already on the statute books; and mentions, in addition to the criminal statutes, the laws governing immigration, naturalization and travel between our country and others. Then there is a set of laws dealing with Government employees, he says, intended to prevent the employment of the disloyal or potentially disloyal. Why these laws are cited, unless their citation is intended as an argument against more stringent legislation, is hard to see. But in urging that there is no need for further stiff legislation against subversives, Mr. Truman places himself and his administration in an embarrassing situation.

If these laws are sufficient, why are we not better protected?

Is it because the statutes are not being properly enforced? And whose fault is that? Mr. Truman and his predecessor have been in charge of enforcement for more than 17 years.

It seems from the message that President Truman would like to see the Mundt-Nixon bill passed, but only if neither MUNDT nor NIXON got any credit for originating it.

Kremlin-Inspired Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am including an excellent editorial and a thoughtful and analytical article by Neal Stanford which appeared in the August 10 edition of the Christian Science Monitor. They follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 10, 1950]

IS THIS FOR PEACE?

Communist publications all round the world have put great gusto into talking up their so-called Stockholm peace petition, which calls for "banning of the atom weapon."

The signers overlook the fact that the U. S. S. R., by refusal to permit effective inspection, has prevented international control of atomic weapons.

But as interpreted by Leonid Sobelev in Pravda, the resolution has little to do with atomic warfare once it has been signed. He says it means:

"I shall do my utmost to prevent war. I shall stop the trains; I shall refuse to unload the ships carrying war materials; I shall not supply fuel for the planes; I shall seize the arms of mercenaries; I shall not allow my son or my husband to go to war; I shall deprive the ministers of food, drink, telephones, transport and coal."

This pledge plainly is not intended to be observed inside Russia.

Just how peaceful is this avowed "peace" move? Three recent incidents in the British Empire throw a flame-lighted meaning on Sobelev's words.

One was the explosion of nine ammunition barges in the harbor of Portsmouth, England, which Prime Minister Attlee says was the result of sabotage. Another was the setting afire of a string of oil tankers on a river in Burma by incendiary bullets. A third, the starting, assertedly by Communists, of a fire which burned $1,400,000 worth of rubber in Singapore, Malaya.

Are these acts of peace? They are apparently part of the same pattern with a "peace" petition which seeks to prevent the democracies from successfully defending themselves.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 10, 1950]

WHO WANTS REAL ATOMIC CONTROL?—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Moscow's present "peace offensive" is directed to selling the world the Stockholm resolution.

That resolution, the handiwork of a Communist-organized rally held in the Swedish capital last spring, would:

Condemn atomic aggression—ignoring completely the other forms of aggression

now being practiced by Communists in Korea;

Call for acceptance of the Soviet proposals for atomic energy control—which all the United Nations members, except Moscow and its Communist satellites, have agreed are unenforceable and therefore unacceptable.

In light of the Moscow peace offensive and Stockholm proposal which center so largely on the atomic bomb and atomic controls, the following review of the UN atomic impasse, that shows clearly it is of Russia's, not the west's making, may be in order;

There is a UN majority plan approved by all the non-Communist nations that calls for an international cooperative agency to run all atomic activities on behalf of signatory nations. It would: Own all uranium and thorium from the moment they are mined, through their intermediate processed forms and the refined products until they are finally consumed; own, manage, and operate all facilities using or producing dangerous quantities of nuclear fuel to prevent diversion of nuclear fuels from peacetime to military use; license all nondangerous facilities and activities which are operated nationally; carry on research in all phases of atomic energy; exercise thoroughgoing rights of inspection and survey, subject only to appropriate procedural requirements and judicial review, in order to locate new ore sources, and to prevent or detect clandestine activities. Military reservations would not be exempted from inspection.

This agency would be the servant of the signatories. The principles governing the agency's policies in the production and stockpiling of production facilities would be spelled out in the agency's charter. The treaty would also provide for the prohibition of the manufacture, possession, and use of atomic weapons by all nations party to the treaty and by all persons under their jurisdiction. The treaty would provide for the disposal of existing stocks, would prescribe the stages whereby controls would go into effect, define violations, and provide effective enforcement measures.

This plan rests on two fundamental technical facts that have nothing to do with political ideologies: the first is that atomic energy at present can be derived in significant quantities from only two metals, uranium and thorium; the second is that the production processes of nuclear fuels for warlike or peaceful purposes are identical and inseparable up to a very advanced stage of manufacture.

If these two metals are fully controlled, atomic energy itself is controlled. The release of atomic energy from any other substance depends in the first instance on energy derived from these two metals. Therefore the UN plan—which effectively controls atomic weapons—would apply equally well to a hydrogen bomb.

The Soviet's plan shies away from strong international authority and argues for continuance of atomic operations mainly on a national basis: Atomic weapons would be "prohibited" by a simple agreement based only upon the promises of the signatories; there would be established within the framework of the Security Council, an "international control commission" with powers limited to making recommendations to governments and to the Security Council (any action by the Council could be blocked by a Soviet veto); nations would continue to own, operate, and manage dangerous atomic energy facilities and would continue to own source materials and fissionable materials; atomic plants would be subject to "periodic" inspection, and "normally, inspectors will visit only declared plants." There could be "special investigations," but only when "suspicion of violation arises."

"Periodic" inspections no matter how often could not assure against diversion of nuclear fuel from peacetime to military use. Therefore the UN majority rejects the idea that a force of detectives can prevent diversion, and would require that agency personnel themselves operate atomic plants.

The difference between the UN plan and the Soviet proposals reflects a fundamental cleavage between the aims of the majority and the minority. The free nations put world security first, and are prepared to merge their individual sovereignties in the common interest. The Soviet Union puts its own sovereignty foremost, and rejects measures which might impinge upon Soviet sovereignty or interfere with its rigid exercise.

If the Soviet Union honestly wants to get atomic weapons outlawed and atomic energy controlled internationally it has only to accept the UN majority plan which Moscow and its puppets have blackballed. For the treaty that would put this plan in force would prohibit "the manufacture, possession and use of atomic weapons by all nations," and there would be no loophole in its control plan—as there is in the Soviet scheme.

Last week I reported upon alleged organization in western Massachusetts called the Springfield-Chicopee Minute Women for Peace and I also included timely and constructive editorials from the Springfield Union and the Springfield Daily News. At that time I called attention to a report by one Sidney Lipshires, who describes himself as the secretary of the Communist Party of western Massachusetts. I expressed very substantial doubts that he and the handful of Communists in western Massachusetts could have any real influence over the women of western Massachusetts. He sought to give the impression that some 300 ladies had joined this group. On August 10 the Springfield Union reported upon its efforts to locate the meeting place and report the facts. It is quite consistent with the devious attitude and the consistently false statements made by the Communists to learn that a street address was given where the meeting was to be held but there is no such address in Springfield. It is also a commentary upon the characteristically false statements made by these Communist agents to learn that, apparently, not a single lady attended the meeting if, in fact, there was one. The article is as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of August 10, 1050]

"MINUTE WOMEN" SEEM TO HAVE GONE UNDERGROUND—NO ONE APPEARS TO KNOW WHETHER MEETING HELD LAST NIGHT; MANY LEAVE GROUP

Reduced to a core of three or four members, reportedly without a chairman, the executive committee of the Springfield-Chicopee Minute Women for Peace was to have met last night to take action on the resignation of its president, but even former strong supporters of the league didn't know where the meeting was held or if it was even held at all.

Four of the original eight members of the committee were known to have dropped out of the alleged Communist-party-line organization by last night.

This number includes Mrs. Ann Dorr, president, whose husband, Clyde Dorr, said yesterday he did not think she would be at last night's meeting. He said he thought she was through with the organization and "fed up with the whole thing."

Mrs. Dorr was at her summer home in Holland, and could not be reached.

There was much secrecy among members as to where the meeting was. Most said they did not know. Others said they knew no one else on the committee.

Those who said they have quit the league seemed to be frightened, and afraid their names would again be linked with the organization.

The purported publicity chairman of the committee said the meeting would be at 46 Prince Street, but there is no such address.

The meeting was also to have taken action on Communist Sidney Lipshire's identification of the group's aims with his party's interests. The Minute Women earlier released a statement alleging that critics were trying to accuse them of guilt by association.

A Chicopee Falls woman who was publicity chairman said, "Naturally, I'm glad to be out of it."

Another Chicopee Falls woman said simply: 'I haven't been to any more meetings." She said she just wasn't interested in what the Minute Women had to say.

A Bowdoin Street member said she'd stopped attending the meetings and hoped she was "no longer on the committee."

Still another one-time member said she hadn't attended the last two meetings and was positive she couldn't identify any of the other members, except one.

That one, whom all the women knew, is listed neither in the 1950 city directory nor telephone book. None of the members knew her address. One thought she was "new in town."

One reported she was called by a woman, who served as treasurer of the original committee, and told of last night's meeting. When she said she was no longer interested, there was no mention of the location of the meeting.

It was a question whether the Minute Women for Peace had gone underground or just couldn't function with their members dropping away.

Five of their number were supposed to have been in Washington yesterday to tell President Truman what they thought of United States action in the Korean war and United States silence on the Kremlin-sponsored peace petition. Nobody knew whether they went or returned, and nobody seemed to care much.

In talking to the Springfield Daily News, Mr. Lipshires engaged in another typically Communist swerve. He sought to disassociate the Minute Women for Peace from the Communist Party and denied that he had said the members of that organization were on the Communist side in circulating peace petitions. I think no one except a Communist would take his word for it rather than the report of a reputable reporter. The article is quite right in describing all of this as "much devious reasoning." The article appeared on August 11 and is as follows:

RED CHIEF DENIES ANY LINKS TO MINUTE WOMEN PEACE PLEA—IF FAIR SEX STAND PARALLELS COMMIE PARTY LINE, IT'S JUST COINCIDENCE, LIPSHIRES SAYS

The main thing that the Minute Women and the Communists have in common is that they think alike on outlawing the atom bomb and working for peace, Sidney Lipshires, Communist leader, said today.

Mr. Lipshires was moved to exonerate the Minute Women for Peace of Communist association in connection with the peace petitions they are pushing at the present time. The Minute Women have received considerable publicity, indicating that if they are

not alined with the Communists, their ideologies on peace and the atom bomb are at least parallel.

Previously, Mr. Lipshires was quoted as saying the Minute Women were on the Communist side in circulating peace petitions. Mr. Lipshires now denies that he said anything like that in talking with a reporter.

The Communists, he said, support outlawing the A-bomb with strict international control, which is the principle of the Stockholm peace pledge.

The Minute Women want peace and no atom bombs. But their stand, it is said, is purely coincidental, in relation to that of the Communists.

Mr. Lipshires pointed out that everyone, who thinks like a Communist, is not necessarily a Communist. However, Mr. Lipshires in his capacity as a party organizer makes no secret of that fact that he would like to make as many people Communists as possible.

There is a lot more to all this, but much devious reasoning is involved. It suffices to say that even if there had been no Russian revolution, Mr. Lipshires says he would still believe firmly in the principles laid down by Karl Marx.

However, Mr. Lipshires wants to clear the atmosphere about the Minute Women. They are only fellow travelers on peace and the atom by accident, not design.

On the same page of this paper is a report that another veterans' group in western Massachusetts has characterized this as a "phony" peace resolution and warned against signing it. That article is as follows:

STOCKHOLM PEACE PETITION DUPES INNOCENT, AVC WARNS—VETERANS SAY COMMUNIST-FRONT GROUPS PUSHING RED SCHEME TO HOODWINK THE GULLIBLE

Another veterans' group today added its voice to the condemnation being heaped upon the Stockholm peace petition.

The executive board of the local Americans Veterans' Committee issued a statement in which it said: "This phony peace resolution was adopted by the Communist-controlled World Congress of Partisans for Peace on March 19 in Stockholm. It is now being circulated as a petition throughout the world, particularly in the iron curtain countries. The goal is 500,000,000 signatures with 5,000,000 from the United States.

"The Communist Party and front groups are now circulating it in the United States, aided also by many innocent people who seriously desire peace. So far the Communist Party claims 500,000 signatures in the United States, and on June 11 the party directed an all-out effort."

Finally, I want to include another article by Allan Taylor appearing in the New York Times of Sunday, August 13, as follows:

STORY OF THE STOCKHOLM PETITION—A COMMUNIST DEVICE TO TURN OPINION AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

(By Allan Taylor)

For 2 weeks last March a meeting of the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress of Peace Partisans was held in Stockholm. Chairman of the committee was Frederic Joliet-Curie, the French Communist, who was removed as French High Commissioner for Atomic Energy.

The meeting was the culmination of a series of international conferences. The first was a "World Congress of Intellectuals" held at Wroclaw, Poland, in 1948. In 1949 there were a "Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace," held at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York, and a "Congress of Partisans of Peace," held in Paris. At all these gatherings the theme was "peace." The participants were Communists or extreme left-wingers.

Stockholm was the grand finale. At the meeting a "peace petition" was adopted. Preparations were made to obtain signatures to the petition throughout the world.

TEXT OF THE APPEAL

This document is headed: Your hand can stop atomic war; sign for peace.

This is the text:

"WORLD PEACE APPEAL

"We demand the outlawing of atomic weapons as instruments of intimidation and mass murder of peoples. We demand strict international control to enforce this measure.

"We believe that any government which first uses atomic weapons against any other country whatsoever will be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal.

"We call on all men and women of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal."

Accompanying the text of this petition—now being distributed in the United States—is a statement to the effect that millions of people of all faiths, creeds, and races are signing and that "if we the people say no to war there will be peace." Quotations from a number of prominent persons in support of peace are appended.

The world peace appeal of the peace partisans has become a major weapon of Russian propaganda against the west. In Moscow the official party journal, Pravda, laid down the dictum that anyone in any country who refused to sign the petition automatically exposed himself as "an accomplice and henchman of the warmongers."

The Communist parties on all the continents have made extraordinary efforts to obtain signatures to the petition. Left-wing labor groups, idealists, and people whose hatred of war exceeds their knowledge of Soviet tactics have been marshaled to roll up the peace vote.

Last week the first comprehensive results of this immense effort were disclosed. In Paris M. Joliot-Curie, the committee chairman, announced that the Stockholm peace petition had been signed by 273,470,566 persons. This is one-eighth of the human race.

TABULATION BY COUNTRIES

Analysis of where the bulk of the claimed vote comes from reveals some interesting facts. One is that the vast majority of the signers live in countries behind the iron curtain. The ratio between populations and signers of the peace petition in some of the principal countries is shown in these figures:

	Population	Signers
U. S. S. R.	193,000,000	115,275,000
Poland	24,500,000	18,000,000
Czechoslovakia	12,500,000	9,500,000
Hungary	9,200,000	7,500,000
Bulgaria	7,200,000	5,801,346
Korea (North)	9,000,000	5,680,000
China	463,000,000	44,000,000
East Germany	18,500,000	17,046,000
West Germany	49,700,000	2,000,000
France	41,200,000	12,000,000
Italy	46,000,000	14,631,523
Great Britain	50,500,000	790,277
India	347,000,000	127,389
Japan	83,000,000	1,345,000
United States	150,000,000	1,350,000

The complete list of national totals is an indication of how and where most of the signatures were obtained. These are some sidelights:

1. Of the world total, 235,000,000—or 86 percent—came from Communist-dominated countries—Russia, China, eastern Germany, and the various Soviet satellites. The Soviet Union alone is said to have rolled up 100,000,000 signatures in a 2-week period. This was after the supreme Soviet had made it plain that signing was the thing to do by giving the petition its own unanimous endorsement.

2. Some of the Soviet satellites did even better at signing up than the U. S. S. R. In east Germany, for example, the announced total of signatures equals over 92 percent of the whole population, infants included.

3. Western Europe contributed 32,000,000 signatures. Italy and France—which together contain only a third of western Europe's people but have strong Communist Parties—supplied 80 percent of the west European total. No signatures were reported from Spain or Portugal. Yugoslavia didn't furnish any, either.

4. The non-Communist countries of Asia provided 2,868,000 signatures, most of them from Japan and Burma. Only 1 person out of every 2,700 in India signed. The African total (reported only from Algeria, Morocco, and Egypt) was about 300,000.

5. The Western Hemisphere contributed 3,850,000 signatures from 11 reporting countries. The largest totals came from the United States, Argentina (1,000,000), Brazil (600,000), Cuba (400,000), and Canada (300,000). Claimed signatures from the United States indicated that an average of 1 person out of every 111 Americans signed.

EXPLOITED IN COMMUNIST PRESS

The peace appeal is still being trumpeted in the Communist press everywhere. The Daily Worker in New York has been giving considerable space and big headlines to the petition and to peace meetings throughout the country.

The August 4 issue of the weekly organ of the Cominform, published in Bucharest, gave the leading position on its front page to a series of items about the petition. These told of huge rallies in France, Italy, and Brazil, and of mounting success in obtaining signatures in Finland, Australia, and the United States. The names of several prominent American signers, including a Nobel Prize winner and a justice of the Utah Supreme Court, were listed.

Famous names have been thoroughly exploited. Among the signers claimed by the sponsors are Dr. Oswaldo Aranha of Brazil, former President of the United Nations General assembly; Lazaro Cardenas, former President of Mexico; Vittorio Orlando, former Premier of Italy; Thomas Mann; George Bernard Shaw; Henri Matisse, and Pablo Picasso. Some of the well knowns have denied signing and some have withdrawn their names. But many remain.

The ultimate destination of the signed petitions is something to be determined by committee members in the various countries. Members of the committee in the United States are O. John Rogge and W. E. B. DuBois. The latter is head of the Peace Information Center in New York which is distributing the petition. They are delivering the signatures to the United Nations Secretariat. In most other nations the signatures are sent to the central government as votes for peace.

Why so many millions of people have been persuaded to sign their names to the Stockholm appeal calls for examination. Some light is thrown on the question by the size of the poll in the various world areas.

Persons who make it their business to sample public opinion note that the United States total of 1,350,000 signatures far exceeds the estimated number of Communists and fellow travelers in this country. They believe that many of the signers are idealistic people who are horrified by the thought of atomic war—but who haven't thought much beyond that. In addition, there are a certain number of people in any community who will sign virtually anything they are asked to sign, without close examination.

Abroad, there are other factors at work as well as these. In Europe and Asia millions of

confused, war-weary people dread the prospect of an atomic conflict in which their own lands would be battlefields. There is suspicion, exploited by the Communists, that the United States and the Soviet Union are engaged in a struggle to the death for world domination. Many of the signers of the petition want, above all things, to be neutral in the war they foresee. Communists are doing all they can to further this idea.

These general interpretations of west European reactions are borne out by on-the-spot observations by correspondents of the New York Times.

WHAT IS RUSSIA'S MOTIVE?

Why has the Soviet Union gone to such lengths to circulate its peace appeal and publicize the claimed results? Why has so much effort been expended to befuddle world opinion?

Two suppositions are advanced to answer the questions. One is that the Kremlin, realizing the depth of the fears and uncertainties aroused throughout the free world by the present international situation and awful threat of atomic conflict, is seeking to weaken the resolution of its adversaries by the same "upside down" arguments it has advanced in the Security Council debate over the Korean war. Millions of people hate war and want peace; if the United States can be pictured as a warmonger eager to use the A-bomb, potential allies will be alienated and discord will be sown in the United States itself.

The other supposition is that the Russians greatly fear the American lead in the atomic field. Winston Churchill has said that the United States stockpile of A-bombs is the only thing that has prevented a full-scale Soviet invasion of Europe. If the Russians could somehow muster sufficient world opinion to weaken America's determination to use its chief present defense against Soviet aggression, the Kremlin's ambitions might be more easily realized. And Russia itself would escape the dire penalty of its actions.

Statements About Black-Eyed Peas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some letters concerning black-eyed peas:

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
January 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your recent letter in regard to black-eyed beans produced in California.

The California acreage of black-eyed beans are grown as dry beans. Practically all the production is shipped to the Southern States. The main California producing areas are the Ojai Valley, Camarillo in Ventura County, San Fernando Valley and similar valleys in Los Angeles County, the hilly areas of Orange County, and Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.

If we can be of further assistance, please feel free to call on us again.

Very truly yours,

LA ROY DUVALL,
Agricultural Consultant.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your several letters regarding black-eyed peas.

The information on production is not fully comparable as California production is on the basis of dry weight whereas Texas production is on green measure. The latest information available is for 1948 when California produced 1,087,000 hundredweight and Texas 720,000 bushels.

We enclose a press release which explains the various names under which this commodity is known. There is no price support for cowpeas under any name.

Sincerely,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am in receipt of your letter of November 30 regarding the production of black-eye peas. Production estimates of black-eye peas are made only for the State of California. In that State they are classed as beans and are commonly called California black-eyes. They are, however, the same type as the black-eye peas grown in Texas and other Southern States. In all producing States, except California, black-eyes are included in the estimates of dry cowpeas. No estimates are made of the quantities used fresh or canned as green peas.

It is our understanding that a large part of the canned black-eyes are produced in Texas, although there are small quantities used fresh and for canning in the other Southern States. The extent to which black-eyes are harvested for canning in Texas is largely dependent upon the moisture conditions during the summer months and, of course, the market price of the peas. Even in years of heavy production the quantity of black-eyes harvested dry in Texas and the other Southern States is much below that of California.

The 1947 production of black-eyes in California was estimated at 638,000 bags (100 pounds) of cleaned dry "beans." In 1948, the production was 1,087,000 bags of cleaned "beans." An estimate of the 1949 production of California black-eyes will be issued on December 19.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your several letters regarding black-eyed peas.

The information on production is not fully comparable as California production is on the basis of dry weight whereas Texas production is on green measure. The latest information available is for 1948 when California produced 1,087,000 hundredweight and Texas 720,000 bushels.

We enclose a press release which explains the various names under which this commodity is known. There is no price support for cowpeas under any name.

Sincerely,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., August 25, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have your letter of August 17 asking that a comparison of the food value of green peas and black-eyed peas be made based upon the data furnished you by the Department of Agriculture.

As we are sure you will appreciate, the nutritive value of a food is dependent upon a wide variety of factors. The tables which you obtained from the Department of Agriculture list the principal factors, but there are of course other important ones for which no data are given. A careful study of the available information reveals that there is no nutritionally significant difference in the food value of these two products. When consideration is given to the manner in which these foods are consumed and the normal variations which might be expected in their nutritional content each food would serve essentially the same purpose in the diet. The quantity of protein, fat, and carbohydrate in each food is essentially the same. Both products are regarded as a significant source of protein and carbohydrate. The fat content is insignificant. The quantities of calcium, phosphorus, and iron which are important minerals for man are likewise present in both products in essentially the same quantities. This is also true of the vitamins for which data are furnished.

Sincerely yours,

L. D. ELLIOTT,
Associate Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

STOKELY FOODS, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., May 5, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am returning the statistics on black-eyed peas. I appreciate your sending me this information.

As you know, we recently installed a packing operation in Dallas, Tex. We intend to pack black-eyed peas at that plant if we are able to obtain favorably raw produce in an area not too distant from the plant.

For your information, we have already started packing Van Camp pork and beans at this plant, and will pack in the near future other Van Camp products for distribution in the State of Texas. We look forward to a very successful operation in Texas.

Kindest regards.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED STOKELY,
Assistant to the President.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., August 14, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in response to the request from your constituent, Publisher A. G. Pat Mayse, Paris, Tex. Mr. Mayse requested information concerning the number of canning plants in Texas which can black-eye peas and also the number of such canning plants in the Third Congressional District. He also requested statistical data concerning the planted acreage of black-eye peas and the average value of the crop in Texas.

According to information supplied by the National Canners Association, 33 firms in Texas reported that they intended to can peas (black-eye, cream, crowder, and purple hull varieties) during 1949. However, the total number of individual canning estab-

lishments may have exceeded this number since each firm may have operated more than one canning plant. Published data indicating the number of plants operating in each county are not available.

Harvested and planted acreage and production data are not available for black-eye peas. The Department of Agriculture does not report acreage and production data separately for each variety of peas.

The National Canners Association reports that during 1949 canners packed a total of 1,234,178 cases of peas (black-eye, cream, crowder, and purple hull varieties) in the United States. During that same year canners in Texas canned 976,267 cases of peas, including black-eye, cream, crowder, and purple hull varieties.

For information relative to the United States Standards for Grades of canned field peas and canned black-eye peas we are attaching pages 1539–40 of the March 18, 1950, Federal Register.

We trust that the information given above will be satisfactory.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

[From the Federal Register of March 18, 1950]

TITLE 7. AGRICULTURE—CHAPTER I. PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION (STANDARDS, INSPECTIONS, MARKETING PRACTICES), DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PART 52—PROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES, PROCESSED PRODUCTS THEREOF, AND CERTAIN OTHER PROCESSED FOOD PRODUCTS

Subpart B—United States standards for grades of processed fruits, vegetables, and other products

United States Standards for Grades of Canned Field Peas and Canned Black-eye Peas

On September 23, 1948, a notice of rule making was published in the Federal Register (13 F. R. 5530) regarding proposed United States Standards for Grades of Canned Field Peas and Canned Black-eye Peas (7 CFR 52.538). After consideration of all relevant matters, including the proposals set forth in the aforesaid notice, the following United States Standards for Grades of Canned Field Peas and Canned-Black-eye Peas are hereby promulgated under the authority contained in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1087; 7 U. S. C. 1621 et seq.) and the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 146, 81st Cong., approved June 29, 1949):

SEC. 52.538. Canned field peas and canned black-eye peas—(a) Identity: (1) "Canned field peas" means canned field peas as defined in the definitions and standards of identity for canned vegetables (21 CFR, Cum. Supp. 52.990) issued pursuant to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(2) "Canned black-eye peas" means canned black-eye peas as defined in the definitions and standards of identity for canned vegetables (21 CFR, Cum. Supp., 52,990), issued pursuant to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(3) "Canned peas" means canned field peas or canned black-eye peas.

(4) "Snap" or "snaps" means a piece or pieces of immature unshelled pods.

(5) "Canned peas without snaps" means canned peas which do not contain immature unshelled pods or pieces thereof.

(6) "Canned peas with snaps" means canned peas which contain pieces of immature unshelled pods.

(7) "Unit" means an individual field pea or black-eye pea or a piece of immature unshelled pod of either.

(b) Grades of canned peas: (1) "U. S. Grade A" or "U. S. Fancy" is the quality of canned peas that possess similar varietal characteristics; that possess a normal flavor and odor; that are fairly young; that are practically free from defects; that possess at least a fairly good color; and that score not less than 85 points when scored in accordance with the scoring system outlined in this section.

(2) "U. S. Grade C" or "U. S. Standard" is the quality of canned peas that possess similar varietal characteristics; that possess a normal flavor and odor; that possess a fairly good color; that are nearly mature; that are fairly free from defects; and that score not less than 70 points when scored in accordance with the scoring system outlined in this section.

(3) "U. S. Grade D" or "Substandard" is the quality of canned peas that fail to meet the requirements of "U. S. Grade C" or "U. S. Standard."

(c) Recommended fill of container: The recommended fill of container is not incorporated in the grades of the finished product since fill of container, as such, is not a factor of quality for the purpose of these grades. It is recommended that each container of canned peas be filled with field peas or black-eye peas as full as practicable without impairment of quality and that the product and packing medium occupy not less than 90 percent of the total capacity of the container.

(d) Recommended drained weight: The drained weight recommendations in table No. 1 of this paragraph are not incorporated in the grades of the finished product since drained weight, as such, is not a factor of quality for the purpose of these grades. The drained weight of canned peas is determined by emptying the contents of the contained upon a No. 8 sieve of proper diameter and allowing to drain for 2 minutes. A sieve 8 inches in diameter is used for the No. 2½ size can (401 x 411) and smaller sizes; and a sieve 12 inches in diameter is used for containers larger than the No. 2½ size can.

Table No. 1

[Recommended minimum drained weight, in ounces, of field peas, or black-eye peas, including snaps when canned with snaps]

Container size or designation:	*Ounces*
No. 1 (Picnic)	7
No. 1 Tall	10½
No. 300	9¼
No. 303	11
No. 2	13¼
No. 10	72

(e) Ascertaining the grade: (1) The grade of canned peas may be ascertained by considering, in conjunction with the requirements of the respective grade, the respective ratings of the factors of color, absence of defects, and character. The relative importance of each factor is expressed numerically on the scale of 100. The maximum number of points that may be given each factor is:

Factors:	*Points*
(i) Color	20
(ii) Absence of defects	40
(iii) Character	40
Total score	100

(2) "Normal flavor and odor" means that the canned peas are free from objectionable flavors and objectionable odors of any kind.

(f) Ascertaining the rating of each factor: The essential variations within each factor are so described that the value may be ascertained for each factor and expressed numerically. The numerical range within each factor is inclusive (for example, "15 to 20 points" means 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, or 20 points).

(1) Color: (i) Canned peas that possess a good color may be given a score of 15 to 20 points. "Good color" means that the canned peas possess a fairly uniform color and are typical of fairly young field peas or black-eye peas of similar varietal characteristics.

(ii) Canned peas that possess a fairly good color may be given a score of 10 to 14 points. "Fairly good color" means that the canned peas possess a color that may be variable and typical of nearly mature field peas or black-eye peas of similar varietal characteristics.

(iii) Canned peas that are definitely off color for any reason or fail to meet the requirements of subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph may be given a score of 0 to 9 points and shall not be graded above U. S. Grade D or Substandard, regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule).

(2) Absence of defects: (i) The factor of absence of defects refers to the degree of freedom from extraneous vegetable matter, from loose skins and pieces of skins, loose cotyledons and pieces of cotyledons, mashed or broken units, and units blemished by pathological injury, insect injury, or other means.

(a) "Extraneous vegetable matter" means hulls or pieces of hulls, unshelled pods or pieces of unshelled pods (except in peas canned with snaps), leaves, stems, and other similar vegetable matter.

(b) "Mashed or broken" means seriously crushed so that the unit has lost its original conformation or is broken to the extent that a cotyledon or portion thereof has become separated from the unit.

(c) "Blemished" means discolored or spotted by pathological injury, insect injury, or other means to such an extent that the appearance or eating quality of the unit is materially affected.

(ii) Canned peas that are practically free from defects may be given a score of 35 to 40 points. "Practically free from defects" means that for each 12 ounces drained weight of units there may be present not more than 2 pieces of extraneous vegetable matter, and the combined weight of all loose skins and pieces of skins, loose cotyledons and pieces of cotyledons, and mashed or broken units does not exceed 5 percent, and the weight of blemished units does not exceed 2 percent of the drained weight of the canned peas.

(iii) If the canned peas are fairly free from defects, a score of 30 to 34 points may be given. Canned peas that fall into this classification shall not be graded above U. S. Grade C or U. S. Standard, regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule). "Fairly free from defects" means that for each 12 ounces drained weight of units there may be present not more than 4 pieces of extraneous vegetable matter, and the combined weight of all loose skins and pieces of skins, loose cotyledons and pieces of cotyledons, and mashed or broken units does not exceed 10 percent, and the weight of blemished units does not exceed 6 percent of the drained weight of the canned peas.

(iv) Canned peas that fail to meet the requirements of subdivision (iii) of this subparagraph may be given a score of 0 to 29 points and shall not be graded above U. S. Grade D or Substandard, regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule).

(3) Character. (i) This factor refers to the tenderness and maturity of the canned peas.

(ii) Canned peas that are fairly young may be given a score of 35 to 40 points. "Fairly young" means that the units are tender and in a fairly early stage of maturity.

(iii) If the field peas or black-eye peas are nearly mature, a score of 30 to 34 points may be given. Canned peas that fall into this classification shall not be graded above U. S. Grade C or U. S. Standard, regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule). "Nearly mature" means that the units are fairly tender and may be mealy but not hard.

(iv) Canned peas that fail to meet the requirements of subdivision (iii) of this subparagraph may be given a score of 0 to 29

points, and shall not be graded above U. S. Grade D or Substandard, regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule).

(g) Tolerances for certification of officially drawn sample: (1) When certifying samples that have been officially drawn and which represent a specific lot of canned peas without snaps or canned peas with snaps, the grade for such lot will be determined by averaging the total scores of all containers if:

(i) Not more than one-sixth of the containers comprising the sample fails to meet all the requirements of the grade indicated by the average of such total score, and with respect to such containers which fail to meet the requirements of the indicated grade by reason of a limiting rule, the average score of all containers in the sample for the factor, subject to such limiting rule, must be within the range for the grade indicated;

(ii) None of the containers comprising the sample falls more than 4 points below the minimum score for the grade indicated by the average of the total scores; and

(iii) All containers comprising the sample meet all applicable standards of quality promulgated under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and in effect at the time of the aforesaid certification.

(h) Score sheet for canned field peas and canned black-eye peas:

Container size		
Container code or marking		
Label		
Net weight (ounces)		
Vacuum (inches)		
Drained weight (ounces)		
Style		
Factors	**Score points**	
I. Color	20	(A) 15-20 (C) 10-14 (D) [1] 0-9
II. Absence of defects	40	(A) 35-40 (C) [1] 30-34 (D) [1] 0-29
III. Character	40	(A) 35-40 (C) [1] 30-34 (D) [1] 0-29
Total score	100	
Grade		
Normal flavor and odor		

[1] Indicates limiting rule.

(i) Effective time: The United States Standards for Grades of Canned Field Peas and Canned Black-Eye Peas (which are the first issue) contained in this section shall become effective 30 days after the date of publication of these standards in the Federal Register.

(Sec. 205, 60 Stat. 1090; 7 U. S. C. 1624, Pub. Law 146, 81st Cong.)

Issued at Washington, D. C., this 15th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] JOHN I. THOMPSON,
Assistant Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration.

[F. R. Doc. 50-2243; Filed, Mar. 17, 1950; 8:50 a. m.]

If's Won't Win the War, but—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, only a complete understanding of the requirements for victory can weld the military might necessary for victory over the forces of aggression now arrayed against us. Dwelling on the mistakes of the past will not do it. Yet we must be mindful of those costly errors in shaping present and future policy.

Two writers of distinguished reputation have voiced a similar theme within as many days. What they have to say seems of such obvious importance as to merit the thoughtful attention of every Member of Congress. For that reason, under permission granted by the House, I am including for the RECORD current articles by David Lawrence and Robert C. Ruark. They follow:

FEW IF'S, WRITER SAYS, COULD HAVE CHANGED SITUATION IN KOREA—SIX ADDITIONAL AIRCRAFT CARRIERS AND FOUR BATTLESHIPS WOULD REVERSE PICTURE

(By David Lawrence)

This is the story of what just a few "if's" could have meant to the fathers and mothers of those boys who are fighting against great odds in Korea and to the fathers and mothers of those boys soon to fight—they all should know more about why the battles have been going against us.

1. If, in addition to the 3 big aircraft carriers in the Pacific, 6 more were in operation off the coast of Korea—and we have available 17 large-sized and 60 smaller-sized carriers still in mothballs—there would conceivably be no loss of the port of Pohang today and no loss of the valuable airstrip behind it, thus leaving us only one field behind our lines in South Korea.

2. If, along with the light cruisers and destroyers, there was in Korean waters a division of four battleships—we have several in mothballs—there would not be a railroad operating within 12 miles inland on either coast and no substantial amount of supplies would be able to move down from North Korea, Russia, or Communist China. The big 16-inch shells of the battleships, firing from short distances off shore with unerring aim in all kinds of weather, can do more damage by steady bombardment than can be done by similar weight projectiles dropped indiscriminately from high altitudes by the large bombers at infrequent intervals. If the battleship *Missouri* had only been stationed in the Far East, the news would be different today.

3. If there were 9 big aircraft carriers off the Korean coasts with a total of approximately 900 planes aboard, there could be 24-hour bombing and strafing and air artillery support given to our ground troop movement. As it is, the enemy moves men and supplies at night and we do not have enough planes there with those flares giving a huge candlepower of illumination to carry on strafing and bombing around the clock.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS NEEDED

4. If enough of the big aircraft carriers of the Navy were in Korean waters, the ground troops would not have to worry about protecting the only two airstrips they have had behind their lines. For planes dependent on ground bases alone must remain there for servicing part of the time and this leaves them open to attack by enemy artillery or planes. The aircraft carrier, on the other hand, moves its floating base offshore at will and is ready 24 hours a day to attack or defend itself because it gets a vast amount of antiaircraft protection from the cruisers and destroyers that surround it in what is known as carrier task force.

5. If the American people had been properly informed, they would never have consented to the sabotage of naval aviation carried on during the last 3 years by the generals in the Pentagon and their civilian Secretary supporters who placed all the emphasis on intercontinental bombing over the Atlantic and forgot the 8,000-mile distances in the Pacific and its trouble areas.

Some of the same misconceptions which resulted in mistaken policies before the Korean war are being perpetuated today in the news dispatches and official communiqués. The work of all airmen is lumped together and the same stories are widely printed as heretofore about the weight of the total number of bombs dropped—as if this has anything to do with the effectiveness of the fire if targets are missed as they were repeatedly by high-flying bombers in the last war and as official reports and surveys testified.

The recent news dispatches and official releases do not clearly differentiate, for example, between the frequent and numerous sorties flown by naval air force fliers from the decks of carriers just a few miles offshore and the fewer sorties necessarily flown from distant bases in Japan at less frequent intervals and with less time over the targets by Air Force fliers.

NOT GETTING PROPER CREDIT

The Air Force isn't getting proper credit for these hazardous missions. In the announcements, the total of the sorties is combined and the public doesn't know what each service is doing—and Congress is not learning what to provide to strengthen our air power in all its phases.

There is needed a definite designation for the Navy flyers. They have a right to be given a separate name, such as the United States Naval Air Force. The news dispatches and official communiqués should enable the reader to identify these three different air operations:

1. Flying from Japanese land bases, the high-flying strategic bombers of the Air Force when engaged in strategic bombing or medium bombers when engaged so bravely in strafing for which they are not fitted. Such hazardous and extraordinary missions deserve great praise.

2. Air support for ground troops furnished by Marine Corps aviators flying from the decks of naval carriers, and the naval flyers also from these carriers.

3. Low-level dive bombing of a strategic nature by the aviators of the Naval Air Force flying from the broad decks of aircraft carriers. These flyers stay over the targets for hours at a time because they do not have to fly back long distances and they fly low enough to see what they are aiming at. They do not, moreover, kill noncombatants unless the latter happen to be right at the targets, and this is something of growing importance if the Korean population isn't to be turned against us because of indiscriminate bombing from high altitudes.

These three differentiations are necessary also to build up the morale and fighting spirit of each of the three services engaged in air operations to stimulate the Reserves in training, and to help recruiting.

OUT OF THE LABS BY TOMORROW AFTERNOON

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK.—We see now in big black headlines the first semicheerfulness from Korea, and also that the Marines have called up their entire volunteer Reserve. We seem to be fairly glad to have the boys aboard again, to demonstrate, as ever, the value of know-how when you need it.

In light of our present appreciation of the gyrenes it is wryly amusing to reflect that a few short months ago the decimation of their force, as fighters, was contemplated in Washington. The idea was to whittle them down to a color-guard status, because in the new pushbutton warfare we were not apt to need them.

This was at a time when we were also deciding the Navy had about outlived itself, except as a transport organization, the car-

rier was obsolete, and that the dogface had seen his day. As I recall the words of the Air Force laddybucks, the atom bomb and the B–36 could handle anything we had to handle.

Push-pull. Click-clack. The new world war will be over in a day or so. Push the button and pull that cord, and we'll have the boys out of the laboratories by tomorrow afternoon. The Korean war began on June 25, and it has taken a late-blooming consignment of outmoded leatherheads to spark the first real counterattack.

There is a frightening repetition to the presence of the Marines on Korea. These babies are the same bunch that straggled ashore on Guadalcanal 8 years ago to fight the knife-and-carbine war with the Japs, who also knew how to infiltrate and decoy. Those were good Japs, elite troops, on Canal. They were imperial marines who had their dress blues with them, to wear on Geary Street when they took San Francisco. Our leathernecks were useful then, and will be extra useful now. The 50,000 men who have been immediately called up, and the 30,000 tough boys behind them, are the hard-bitten old-stagers of the Pacific war. They are the seasoned men who can fight you a delaying action while the unwieldy draft gains impetus, and the children are taught the rudiments of staying alive in combat.

If it tells you nothing else, the reversion to foot soldier, bayonet, foxhole-and-fall-back war, greatly disputes the wisdom of our military wiseheads who got so enmeshed in intramural strife they were willing to sacrifice practicality for political expediency.

We were the big production kids, the A-bomb and H-bomb boys, the round-the-globe-airplane, all-purpose Buck Rogers, but I hear tell it will take us 2 years to get that good tank into practical usage—and that only a half dozen of the effective big bazookas were immediately available on Korea.

This foul-up ought to have preached a bitter lesson, which we may do well to remember, amidst the mouthings of the scientists and the political appointees and new-fledged experts and high military officials with both eyes pinned beadily on appropriations.

So long as wars are fought, we will need an even balance in force. So long as wars are fought we will need sailors and soldiers and marines and airmen. The bayonet is still an important weapon, and no one segment of the whole is bigger than any other branch. And no self-seeking politico, be he civilian or military, is any wiser about the future's needs than the last batch of guys who struggled through the mud and the blood.

Reactions in Europe to Events in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, late last week Mr. Howard K. Smith, the noted author, war correspondent, and radio broadcaster, reported from London over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the reactions in Europe to the recent events in Korea. He described the tremendous wave of support which American policy had attracted, the support which led the United Nations to assume sponsorship of the resistance to Communist aggression. Mr. Smith also reported on some of the less favorable aspects of the picture, most notably the adverse European reaction to the recent vote for a loan to the Franco regime in Spain.

Mr. Smith's report provides food for thought. I commend this broadcast to the attention of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of Mr. Smith's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Seven weeks ago, when the Korean war began, a lot of heartfelt praise flowed over the Atlantic from Europe to the United States for America's prompt virile response to an act of aggression. This week, by rights, a good deal of that praise should be making the return journey from America to Europe. The United States has called on governments over on this side of the Atlantic to cooperate in creating a strong defense force for the west and Europe has responded with more speed and resolution than democracies have ever yet reacted with to an emergency not directly on their own frontiers.

Here in London, night before last, the first meeting of the 12 North Atlantic Treaty deputies came to an end with a far reaching unanimous agreement. The talks lasted only 10 days. There was no quibbling from any quarter. According to a well-informed source—it was agreed to put 40 first-rate divisions, on foot, on the European continent within the very near future. It will be a painful and costly effort for the 9 barely convalescent European partners in the pact, but if it is done, it can make war profitless for an aggressor in western Europe.

Earlier this week, France and Great Britain answered a direct appeal from President Truman with detailed facts and figures of the sacrifice that they are willing to make for the common defense. The French document is still secret. But the British answer to President Truman has been made public.

According to it, Britain is prepared to spend close to $10,000,000,000 on arms for herself and her European partners in the next 3 years. On condition that America provide essential machine tools and raw materials that Britain does not have the dollar resources to import.

To realize the full scope of this British offer, it is necessary to quote a few relevant figures. Where the United States has up until now been spending 6 percent of our national income on defense Britain has been spending 8 percent of her national income on defense, and that is the highest figure in the western world. With this new offer now Britain proposes raising the proportion of her national annual wealth going into arms to 10 percent.

Where President Truman has, in effect, requested equal sacrifices with America for our European allies, Britain is now offering to make a greater sacrifice than we are. At present, the American people give up 25 percent of its annual income in taxes. At present, the British people give up 40 percent of their national income in taxes. The new British program will require the overtaxed people of Great Britain to pay out still more in taxation. The British program will, finally, derange British economy more than our arms program will affect our economy. America has had 5 and 6 percent of our working population unemployed; they can now be absorbed into arms production and defense without gravely affecting the amount of manpower in other civilian industries. Britain, however, has next to no unemployed, which means that every man called into the new army or into arms production must be taken out of civilian production. With the new program then a standard of life, which is not very high now, is going to have to fall.

As heartening as this bold program itself has been the public's reaction to it, though the country is deathly weary of war, it has not yet materially recovered from the last one, all major political parties in this country are nearly unanimous in support of that program. The only criticism which the bulk of the British press makes is: "Can't we do still more for the common defense?"

However, one point deserves to be made with special emphasis—only a clear-cut case of principle and of justice—like America's action against aggression in Korea, could have brought forth so ready and selfless a response from a war-tired people. Any watering down of the principle for which the sacrifice is being made is likely to damage badly Europe's willingness to make the sacrifice at all.

This week, unfortunately, there have been two incidents that have indicated a readiness on the part of some people to water down our principles and to (one word indistinct) the clear-cut issue of Korea. The first was the vote in the Senate in Washington to include Franco Spain in the Marshall plan and the second was General MacArthur's amicable visit to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa. Both incidents have made deep and disappointed impressions over here and it's the duty of an American reporter on the spot to sound a warning.

In regard to the first event—it should be made clear that Europe regards the Marshall plan as a cooperative effort by equal nations to preserve democracy where it's been weakened by the war. In the European view, it's a mere coincidence that America came out of the common war unharmed and is therefore able to contribute aid, and that Europe came out badly damaged and has to receive that aid. It is only in Communist propaganda that the Marshall plan is conceived of not as a cooperative effort among equals but as a project imposed by rich America on poor western Europe. Unfortunately, the Senate vote this week supports the Communist theory—"by including Franco in the plan without the consent of and against the repeated and loudly stated wishes of the other and European participants in the plan."

Aside from the raw impression of dictation which the Senate vote has created, it has also given rise to one serious material fear—the fear, namely, that America has secretly written off western Europe as indefensible and is preparing main defenses on the Spanish Pyrenees. This is a dangerous suspicion to let loose in western Europe. For if it ever takes hold of the people of France, Germany, Holland, and Belgium, and Scandinavia, they will certainly stop trying to defend themselves and try to come to terms with the Communists, to whom they imagine they are being abandoned.

It is my own private opinion that if world tension continues, the west European democracies will eventually come around to accepting Spain—however, reluctantly—as a unit in western defense; but that time is certainly not yet. And any more moves like that in the Senate this week can bring to pass calamitous consequences.

Fortunately, Secretary of State Acheson did a good deal to reassure democratic Europe by his disavowal of the Senate's action in a press conference in Washington this week. Unfortunately, there has been no similar disavowal of the second incident, the visit of General MacArthur to Formosa. And it has evoked over here some acrid and very disillusioned comments. The influential British left-wing magazine, the New Statesman, wrote day before yesterday: "We must hope that there is enough sane opinion in America to put a stop to the Formosan activities of General MacArthur."

Yesterday, on the right-hand side of the political field, the London Economist had

this comment: "The Russians are on strong ground when they claim that the Chinese Nationalists represent nothing and when they accuse America of supporting forces which for their very weakness and corruption have been driven out of their own land."

The conservative London Observer this morning says that General MacArthur's action has, and I quote, "Gravely endangered our highest common interest in Asia. As friends and partners in a common cause, it is our duty to talk frankly to America at this grave juncture. We should do all in our power." Britain's leading Sunday paper says, "to induce America to see and to redress a mistake which, if persisted in, means tragedy for her no less than for us." Add to these remarks a comment made to me privately by a very eminent European this week, who asked that his name not be used. "This only proves to me," he said, "that Clemenceau was right—'War is far too serious a thing to be left to generals.'"

The attitude of Europe toward Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek deserves some clarification. The dominant opinion here is that General Chiang is not a support for the west but a pitfall. The main effort of the Russians in Asia today, it is thought here, is to maneuver the western powers into the pit with Chiang. If the western cause can be identified with him then the issue of the cold war changes; we can be depicted as fighting not for principle but for the reinstatement of corruption and reaction which all Asia has decisively rejected. And that leaves Russia with a monopoly on the wave of nationalism now irrepressibly sweeping Asia.

The Russian game is possibly more apparent to Europeans than it is in America because they've seen more of it. They have seen Russia angrily and repeatedly demand that the western nations recognize Mao Tse-tung and then they have systematically sabotaged every effort of the western powers to do so. When France was preparing to recognize the Chinese Reds some time ago, Russia induced Mao to forestall it by recognizing the Communist rebels fighting against France in Indochina. Which made it impossible for France to carry out her intention of recognizing the Chinese Communists. Britain got in under the wire and did recognize the Chinese Communists and she has been subjected to every possible humiliation by Peiking as an example for the rest of us of what might happen to a nation who does it.

Some weeks ago the rumor was current over here that the American State Department was preparing to recognize the Chinese Communists too. Moscow prevented that with the Korean war.

Nonetheless, President Truman, though unable to recognize the Chinese Communist Government, did avoid the obvious trap that Moscow had laid for us. He did not accept Chiang Kai-shek as an ally and he required Chiang to cease using Formosa as a war base against the Chinese mainland.

Now, this week, after all that delicate and intelligent effort of sidestepping the snake pit, General MacArthur has flown right into it. Chiang has virtually been declared an ally of the United States. American fighter planes have been sent to his support. Against President Truman's specific orders, Chiang has resumed bombing the Chinese mainland from bases on America-protected Formosa.

Unless Mr. Averell Harriman, the President's adviser who has just arrived in Tokyo, can redress this situation—America shall in fact have been committed to war against the wave of nationalism in Asia, which means we have very little chance of winning.

If General MacArthur's policy is allowed to develop, moreover, it is bound to have repercussions here in Europe no less great than those in Asia. This week, over the luncheon table, I talked with a junior British Minister of the Government about the present situation and I pass on his interpretation to you for what it is worth.

"Europe," he said to me, "is nauseously sick of war. No matter what we in the Government decide our peoples are going to find every basis for equivocation to keep out of another conflict and it's only human that they do so. Therefore, no room for equivocation must be left; every issue must be clean cut; we must be indubitably on the side of justice and principle. The only reason that we in Britain have been able to muster the people—nearly unanimously—for a rearmament program as painful as that we published this week, has been because the Korean war has been just such a clean-cut issue. But now," he went on, "with this week's events, a shadow of a doubt, no bigger than a man's hand, hangs over the issue. Please," he said, "don't let the shadow grow. I predict," he went on, "that if another war comes morale will be the decisive factor as it has never before been in any war in history, and the quality of Europe's morale is going to depend almost entirely on the quality of leadership circumventing the pitfalls that America gives to us."

California Retailers Association Promptly Sends Cooperative Analysis on Important Subject of Inventory Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from the California Retailers Association through the offices of Vincent D. Kennedy, managaging director of that important group of merchants in my native State of California, the following very timely statement relating to controls of inventory. I am sure that this statement will be immediately and constructively recognized as valuable to the congressional committees concerned, and to all Members of Congress, and to the administrative and executive branches of Government charged with the responsibility of legislation and its administration. The statement follows:

During the last world war and after the formation of the Wholesale and Retail Inventory Policy Committee of the Office of Civilian Supply, War Production Board, the committee recognized the peculiar problems of Pacific coast retailers arising out of the fact that we were so far away from our sources of supply. The committee also recognized that uncertainty of transportation would require increased stocks when it said, "As the burden upon our transportation facilities becomes heavier, and deliveries become slower and less certain, it will be necessary for many merchants to carry larger inventories in relation to sales than they carried in the base period." That condition came to pass for these reasons:

1. Most of our supplies are purchased east of the Mississippi River. Our shipments are, therefore, subject to the uncertainties of all phases of transportation; namely:

(a) Short haul by truck to original point of shipment;

(b) Consolidation of shipments in order to comply with less than carload lot regulations;

(c) Transportation from point of consolidation to Chicago, St. Louis, or New Orleans through the congested transportation system of the East;

(d) Transportation of goods 2,000 miles to the Pacific coast with a choice of only three transcontinental lines to any one point on the west coast.

These uncertainties increased our transit time, on the average, for express from 5 to 7 days, and for freight from 9 to 17 days. The increase in time would not be so important if it were regular and certain. We were not able to plan on the receipt of goods at any definite time, even after it was in the hands of common carriers.

2. Just as important as uncertainties of delivery, were the uncertainties of manufacturing schedules. This factor, added to the uncertainties of deliveries, increased the time between the placement of the order and the receipt of eastern goods from an average of 24 days to as much as 70 days. On the average, the time doubled between the placement of the order and the receipt of eastern goods. This uncertainty made it impossible for us to plan as we did in the base period.

The Pacific coast area performed a stupendous task of converting civilian production facilities to war production, in addition to increasing its production capacity manyfold. We are again to face this condition. If civilian morale, war workers' morale, is to be maintained, the workers and their families must be supplied with essential consumer goods. As Pacific coast retailers, we feel our responsibility in the war program to keep a steady and adequate supply of goods available to workers, including the tens of thousands of new ones pouring on to the Pacific coast.

Faced with the uncertainties of the market on the one hand, and our duty to our customers on the other, we will have to carry inventories that are larger in relation to sales than they will be in the base period. We respectfully say that inventories must continue to be larger in relation to sales than in the base period, if we are to fulfill our responsibilities to our immediate communities, and through them our responsibility to the National War Production program.

The committee referred to above, after thorough study, did recognize and grant Pacific coast retailers an allowance of 15 percent over the normal inventory before the imposition of penalties.

We respectfully submit that we are entitled to and should be granted a 15-percent allowance. Such an allowance will cause us to reduce stocks through a retarded buying program, but will allow a margin which we feel is not excessive in the face of the uncertainties of war conditions.

VINCENT D. KENNEDY,
Managing Director, California Retailers Association; Chairman, National Conference of State Retail Associations; President, Western Retailers Council.

The Communist Peace Petition—Poison in Sugar Coating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, those of you who heard the news broadcast by Earl Godwin Thursday night over WRC will recall, I am sure, the very forthright

and accurate comment he made with reference to the circulation of the so-called Stockholm peace petition in this country. However, for the RECORD I do want to include it now. He said:

The Russians are manufacturing an international line of bunk, trying to fool people into signing a peace petition which is poison in sugar coating, because it is peace on Russia's terms which means slavery and a collapse of American principle. If Russia wanted peace it would stop the Korean invasion.

Last week I received from a friend a copy of a petition in a somewhat similar form to that of the so-called Stockholm petition phrased in equally deceptive and devious language. This, however, is entitled "Petition To Ban H-Bomb and A-Bomb." It was purported to be under the sponsorship of the National Labor Conference for Peace, of Chicago. I asked our Legislative Reference Service to obtain any material they could with reference to this group. I have been given four extracts from four issues of the New York Daily Worker. Upon reading the statement that the signatures were to be delivered to President Truman on April 12, I asked the White House for advice as to whether any such group had presented any such petition. I have been advised that no such petition had been presented by anyone.

This petition is as follows:

"The idea of achieving security through national armament is, at the present state of military technique, a disastrous illusion."—Dr. Albert Einstein.

PETITION TO BAN H-BOMB AND A-BOMB

President Harry S. Truman and the Congress of the United States:

We believe that the manufacture of the hydrogen bomb will not advance the cause of peace. It will only hasten the outbreak of a new horrible war which will destroy untold millions.

Only genuine negotiations between the leaders of our country and the Soviet Union to outlaw the hydrogen and atom bombs and to find a basis for peace rather than cold war will dispel the nightmare of hydrogen- and atom-bomb warfare.

We, of labor, join with leaders of church and civic organizations in calling upon you to halt the manufacture of hydrogen and atom bombs and to work for peace by direct negotiation with the leaders of the Soviet Union.

We further believe that the end of the cold war will make possible a vast expansion of trade with the countries of eastern Europe and China and will help fight back the threat to American men and women of war and growing unemployment.

We working men and women petition you, Mr. President and Congressmen, to stop the drive toward world destruction—before it is too late.

Name _____
Address _____
City _____

Return this petition to National Labor Conference for Peace, Suite 905, 179 West Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill.

The extracts from the Daily Worker follow:

A petition campaign calling for UN action to outlaw atomic weapons, was begun here yesterday by the National Labor Conference for Peace.

Samuel Curry, chairman of the conference, said a million signatures will be sought by April 12.

"Dean Acheson's statement abandons any pretense that the administration is seeking honest understanding for world peace," officers of the conference declared. "It is a confession that the role of the United States State Department is not that of speaking peace through diplomacy but war through propaganda and the ominous threat of the H-bomb."

"Mr. Acheson can state that power must be the key to United States policy, but the working people will show that they want peace through negotiations and not through annihilation," the statement of the NCLP continued.

The NCLP petition calls for UN atomic control through international inspection and the destruction of existing stockpiles. It urges a conference between the United States of America and the Soviet Union to settle outstanding differences, for lifting the trade embargo to provide jobs, and defense of democratic liberties and the rights of minorities. (February 15, 1950, p. 3.)

A million signatures for peace and jobs will be collected during the next few weeks among the working people in this country as an answer to Secretary of State Dean Acheson's statement that the H-bomb diplomacy will continue.

The drive for these signatures is being launched by the officers of the National Labor Conference for Peace.

They will be presented to President Truman April 12, the anniversary of President Roosevelt's death.

The petition calls for immediate action through the United Nations to outlaw atomic weapons, control through international inspection and destroying existing stockpiles.

It further calls for an immediate conference between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. to settle outstanding differences.

Officers of the National Labor Conference for Peace are Samuel Curry, chairman: James Wishhart, secretary, and Frieda Schwenkmeyer, administrative secretary. (February 23, 1950, p. 4.)

A call to all labor in Chicago went out this week for an all-day conference to discuss jobs and peace on Sunday, March 12 at Ashland Auditorium.

Its sponsors were some 75 leading trade unionists who are members of the Chicago Labor Conference for Peace.

CIO, AFL, railroad and independent unionists were listed among the sponsors of the parley which is being organized from offices at 179 West Washington Street.

James Wishhart, one of the conference leaders announced that the parley was open to all labor, "regardless of union affiliation." (March 1, 1950, p. 5.)

Labor groups across the country were reported here as actively pushing the campaign to obtain 1,000,000 signatures on petitions calling for the outlawing of atomic weapons and negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union to end the cold war.

The petition drive is sponsored by the National Labor Conference for Peace founded here last October at a grass roots parley attended by over 1,300 delegates from AFL., CIO and independent unions.

The signature campaign for peace will be climaxed on April 12, anniversary of the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, when a delegation from the labor peace group will present the petitions to President Truman.

Chicago's labor's slogan for the peace petition campaign is: Let's stick together to prevent being blown apart. (March 19, 1950, p. 1.)

Then I received an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times on July 25, commenting on the action taken by the Chicago Industrial Union Council:

SPOTLIGHT ON A PEACE FAKE

The Chicago Industrial Union Council, the central body of the CIO's 250,000 members in this city and vicinity, is so far from being hoodwinked by the notorious Communist peace petition that it has issued a vigorous warning against it.

Trade-unionism had a good reason to react against the petition scheme here. Petitions have been circulated by a something calling itself the Chicago Labor Conference for Peace. The name lends itself readily to an appeal to union members.

The CIO council warns:

"The prime objective in securing signatures on this phony peace petition is an attempt to confuse the American people and weaken the morale of the workers in the trade-union movement in order that Communist agents may better be able to perform their task of sabotage against our soldiers and our country when so instructed by the Soviet Union."

In a Resolution on Home-Grown Traitors adopted the other day, the council called on all CIO members to be on guard against the petitions. It condemned the big-lie technique of the petition-pushers and asserted that "we resent and reject the use of the good name of the labor movement by this core of Communists and Communist-minded agents."

These petitions, which unfortunately had been signed in good faith by many Americans before the North Korean aggression reminded the world of Communist double-dealing, don't mention aggression.

They demand strict international control to outlaw atomic weapons. Coming from Communist sources, this demand sounds more than strange. It's the United States that offered a genuine control program to the United Nations. Only the Communists blocked it.

The petitions urge that any nation which first uses atomic bombs against another be declared a war criminal. American leaders are not now planning to atom-bomb Korea. Fut in the uncertain future, with the possibility of all-out war, the atom bomb could come into use—and let's all realize that it would be used not by us for aggression but to help turn back aggression.

If that happened then Russia, using the peace petitions as evidence, could tell the world that the United States is a war criminal by the definition of many of its own citizens.

Signers of such petitions are helping communism in its drive for world conquest. The CIO has performed a valuable, patriotic public service in putting the spotlight on a fraud.

How much peace some nations may expect from such petitions may be seen in the case of North Korea. Not many days before North Korean Red soldiers and tanks crashed southward across the thirty-eighth parallel their government—a Soviet satellite—boasted that 5,500,000 North Koreans had signed Soviet-sponsored peace petitions, and that 17,000 local peace committees had been formed. Undoubtedly the petitions resembled those being circulated in America.

Peace, huh?

I also have two articles from the Daily Worker of July 2, and July 7, purporting to report upon this group:

[From the Daily Worker of July 2, 1950]

FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND AMERICANS SIGN PEACE APPEAL

The peril of world atomic warfare created by Truman's decree of intervention in Korea has spurred the peace crusaders to unprecedented efforts as they passed the half-million mark this week en route to 5,000,000 signatures to ban the A-bomb.

The men, women, and teenagers on the Nation's streets and in the factories circulating the world peace appeal report a leap in the fear of atomic war. "I can see the atom bombers over the city right now," a New Yorker told a peace crusader as she signed the petition.

The National Labor Conference for Peace called upon the American people to veto Truman's call for intervention in order to prevent America and the world from being dragged to catastrophe by way of Korea.

In spirit of the hysterical rantings of the war-minded press and the cold-war promoters, the peace can and will be saved, the conference declared. It called on all affiliated groups and individuals throughout America to double and redouble the work for peace.

Thousands of peace collectors had immediately recognized the stepped-up atom danger, even before the call, and were out on the streets before work and after to get additional names.

Ethel Davidson, of the Garment Peace Committee, in New York, is a good example. This veteran needle trades worker leads the peace procession in New York, and nationally—so far as is known—with 1,690 names. She began hitting on all cylinders June 19 and reports that the Korean episode has awakened many to the immediate threat of atomic war.

Peace crusaders report that many they approached the first few days since the Korean episode began reflected the confusions spread by the press, but signed when their questions were answered.

Characteristic was the response of the Brooklyn mother who told a Labor Conference peace worker that she would sign today though she had refused to sign a week before. "Then it seemed to me a far away question," she said. "But now." She said she has two sons of draft age, and that though she doesn't understand all that happened in Korea, she knows she wants no world war to rise from it.

"When I read that Truman sent bombers to Korea, my hands began to tremble." Her hand was still trembling when she signed.

Others relate similar experiences. A New York newspaperman hostile to this paper told one of our reporters. "When I first read the Korean reports, I got ready to get into uniform again. Suddenly I remembered my son is of draft age. And I said to myself, 'Whoa, there, fellow. This means him, too.' And I decided that come what may this Korean business can't be allowed to degenerate into world war III."

This week saw a new crop of famous American signatures to the world peace appeal. Protestant leaders are included, men like Bishop Sherman L. Greene, African Methodist Episcopal Church, Birmingham; the Right Reverend G. Ashton Oldham, Protestant Episcopal bishop (retired), of Albany, N. Y.; the Reverend J. Burt Bouwman, executive secretary of the Michigan Council of Churches; the Reverend J. Clyde Keegan, district superintendent of the Methodist Church of Wyoming; and Aubrey Williams, former Government official and publisher of the Southern Farmer.

The war hysteria of the press cannot stifle the American people's will to banish the A-bomb and to win peace. As the New Yorker said, "I can hear the atom bombers over the city."

[From the Daily Worker of July 7, 1950]

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND IN CHICAGO SIGN WORLD PEACE APPEAL

(By Ruby Cooper)

CHICAGO, July 6.—This city has hit the 125,000-mark in signatures for the Stockholm world peace appeal, it was reported today by the Chicago Labor Conference for Peace. Hundreds of peace workers out in full force over the July 4 week end carried the petition campaign far beyond the original objective of 100,000 signatures by Independence Day.

The intensive effort over the holiday week end alone resulted in more than 50,000 signatures for the petitions urging outlawing of atom war and declaring the first government to use the atom bomb shall be branded a war criminal.

Announcement of the 125,000 signatures emphasized that this was the amount already on hand in offices of the labor-peace group. It was reported that additional thousands of signatures were known to have been obtained but not yet turned over.

Singled out for special commendation by the labor peace group were the youth workers and signature collectors in the great Negro community on the south side.

YOUTH GETS 28,000

The youth, spearheaded by the Labor Youth League, garnered and turned over 28,000 signatures.

Prior to President Truman's order to invade Korea on June 28, they had gotten 5,000 names. Since then their total is 28,000.

Twelve young workers and students have from 500 to 1,000 to their credit.

One 21-year-old steel worker, for example, has 450 names; 375 of them are Irish-Americans, mainly Catholic.

He signed up two entire Catholic soccer teams. In one Chicago community, 13 captains of neighborhood baseball teams signed.

FIFTEEN THOUSAND IN NEGRO AREA

The south side Negro community came through with 15,000 signatures, over 50 percent more than its objective for July 4.

The holiday week-end saw hundreds of peace workers reporting to assembly points designated by labor unions and other organizations throughout the city and then fanning out into the city's beaches, parks, streets, shops, and picnic grounds.

Peace workers universally reported that response to the petitions has been much greater since the Korea fighting because of the people's determination to stop any development toward a world atomic war.

It was learned that Chicago police had issued instructions to balk the petition campaign by intimidation and harassment of signature collectors.

Despite numerous instances of police apprehension, peace workers refused to be intimidated and continued their signature collections unabated and at an even more determined tempo.

Simultaneously, the labor peace group announced that more than 1,000 Chicagoans were already eligible for the peace awards for obtaining 100 or more signatures each.

It announced that top honors went to a young Negro mother of three children, Mrs. Molly Lucas, who has so far secured over 1,300 signers to the peace petition.

Industrial areas showing the way in the peace drive were announced as steel district in South Chicago and the garment district.

Nearly 5,000 signatures were reported from steel workers in the vicinity of the big Carnegie-Illinois steel mill.

Garment workers, members of the A. F. of L. International Ladies Garment Workers Union, to date reported 3,000 signatures obtained during lunch periods in the garment district.

The next objective set by the labor peace group is a total of 300,000 signatures by August 6. The full goal here is 500,000, of which one-fourth is already achieved.

It was indicated that preparation for continuation of the peace campaign at an even stronger pace would be mapped at a city-wide rally of trade-union stewards to be held July 19. Nearly 1,000 stewards are expected at the rally, which will plan to intensify the peace campaign in and around the city's largest shops and mills.

It was also announced that as part of the week-end's petition push, more than 150,000 leaflets issued by the labor peace group calling for the withdrawal of American troops from Korea had been distributed.

The Illinois Communist Party said that large quantities of the party's national committee statement on the intervention in Korea had also gone out to Chicagoans over the holiday week end.

DETROIT, July 6.—One thousand General Motors workers and members of their families signed the Stockholm peace appeal in a few hours last Sunday, it was reported by the peace committee of Flint.

The youth peace committee in Detroit collected more than 1,000 signatures last Sunday in the parks, beaches, neighborhoods.

In Ecorse, Mich., three petition-getters collected 215 signatures in 2 hours among steel and Ford workers around the neighborhood close to the Great Lakes steel mill.

It is estimated that within 1 week some 10,000 people have signed the Stockholm peace appeal in lower Michigan.

Finally, I have a column from the Daily Worker by one George Morris attacking the national CIO, President Truman, Philip Murray, William Green, and referring to this peace petition:

WORLD OF LABOR—THE CIO TAKES NOTICE OF THE PEACE PETITIONS

(By George Morris)

The national CIO has for some weeks tried to ignore the world peace appeal and the movement to get millions of signatures for it. But with the signatures drive within the United States progressing on the second half of the first million, a sizable chunk of it from CIO members, something had to be said. So Editor Allan L. Swim, of the CIO News thought up an editorial and it begins:

"Nuts!"

That just about reflects the level of the entire editorial in which Swim goes into the usual hackneyed and stupid description of the Soviet Union as the cause of every disturbance in this world, including Korea.

Swim either did not read the World Peace Appeal for which signatures are sought, or, not knowing how to meet it to suit his crowd of saber rattlers in the labor movement, chose to dismiss it with "nuts."

The pledge which tens of thousands of CIO members are signing, simply says:

"We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as a weapon of intimidation and mass extermination of human beings. We demand the institution of strict international control to enforce this. We shall consider as war criminal that government which first employs the atomic weapon against any country. We call upon all people of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal."

Can Swim point to one word or thought in that statement that is objectionable to him or to anyone else in the CIO's leadership? If they do object, they apparently don't dare say so openly. Even the most hard-bitten supporters of the CIO's right-wing don't want war, especially an atomic war.

Swim simply makes the claim that the peace movement favors the Soviet Union. He doesn't try to explain how. He relies on the current war hysteria to do the convincing for him. Some people are convinced that way, but the CIO has a high percentage of people who think for themselves.

The fact is that the number of signers throughout the world is well over the 100,000,000 mark. The Soviet Union is now beginning its drive for signatures. The leaders from Stalin to officials of unions or other organizations have already initiated the petitions with their own names. In China a similar drive is under way.

The bulk of the populations of the new democracies of eastern Europe signed. But especially significant are the many millions of signatures from Italy, France and other western countries.

If Stalin and the other leaders of the Socialist world are not afraid of tying themselves to the pledge along with tens of millions of their peoples, why are Truman, Philip Murray, William Green, and others of their mind afraid to sign? There isn't the slightest partisanship in the pledge. Any country that first uses the atomic bomb would be branded the war criminal.

From a reading of the American press one gathers that Americans are even more fearful of atomic warfare than the people of the U. S. S. R. Only people who think there is a chance to win by using it first want that advantage left open.

Inferentially, however, those who so stubbornly fight the peace petition campaign, admit the power in those signatures. That's why their papers editorialize against signing. That's why they got Walter Winchell to broadcast the threat the FBI will photograph the petitions.

The CIO's leaders are simply helping to drown out the cry for peace. They are delivering on the bargain they struck with the warmakers long ago. But the members struck no such bargain. They are signing and they will also demand that their organizations become a force for peace.

Incidentally, the CIO's official cartoonist "Coak" is doing his part. His cartoon in the July 3 issue lifts Hearst's traditional "Yellow Peril" character and puts a hammer and sickle on his arm. He is the image of the beastlike cartoon character that served to represent Japan during World War II. He is now shown with a machine gun mowing down South Koreans. Not shown are United States bombers that are really scattering death. "Coak" apparently doesn't know that South Koreans look no different than the North Koreans. "Coak" is the same cartoonist who revived Hitler's well-known anti-Semitic portrayal of a Jew and labeled him "expelled unions."

All of this evidence is a case study into the devious and unprincipled manner by which these Soviet propaganda efforts are being conducted in this country. The vicious and unprincipled attacks upon those who see the true nature of this Communist effort are transparent. It does seem to me we should be given, as Members of Congress, an early opportunity to support any action recommended by our Committee on Foreign Affairs to unmask this sham and identify those authors to the American people.

Why Penalize a Reserve for Being a Reserve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. WILSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, recently I read in the July 1950 issue of the Reserve Officer Magazine an article by Col. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, as chairman of the legislative committee of the Reserve Officer Association, calling attention that there are procedures still "ununified" for establishing precedence of Reserve officers among themselves and with Regulars when the civilian components are mobilized. That article reads as follows:

There is a wide divergence between the services in the matter of adjusting the position of their Reserve officers when called to active duty. The Army and Air Force credit only active duty performed in grade toward arriving at the relative precedence of Reserve officers among themselves and with Regulars when the Reserves are mobilized or otherwise report for active duty. The Navy and the Marine Corps in general, place their Reserve officers on the precedence list according to the dates of their commissions.

What this means is that a Reserve officer of the Army or Air Force, with only the usual 2 weeks' annual active duty, will be ordered to active duty very low on the list of officers of the same grade and date of commission in the Regular services, and, as to Reserve officers of like service in the Navy and Marine Corps.

As an example: Officer A, a captain in the Army Reserve, whose commission is date July 1, 1949, has had 15 days' active training duty in 1946, 1947, and 1949. He has, therefore, performed a total of 45 days' active duty. Officer B, a captain in the Air Force Reserve, also commissioned a captain on July 1, 1946, performed 2 years' active duty, and on July 1, 1948, went on inactive duty. Officer C, a captain in the Marine Corps Reserve, with the same date of commission as his brother Reserve officers A and B, performed 15 days' active duty during each of three intervening years, so he, like A, has a total of 45 days' active duty.

On July 1, 1950, all three are mobilized. Let's see what happens to their relative precedence.

A takes his place in the Army behind the captain in the Regular Service who was promoted to captain 6 weeks before: That is the middle of May 1950. B takes his place in the Air Force behind the Regular who was made captain July 1, 1948. C on the other hand ranks with a Regular marine captain commissioned July 1, 1946.

A has lost all but 6 weeks of 4 years on the initial list. B has lost 2 years. C has lost nothing and has kept up with his running mate in the Regular Marine Corps. (The Naval Reserve officer of comparable rank has held his regular Navy running mate like the Marine reservist.)

A more extreme example but a typical one would be—

An Air Force Reserve captain who reached that rank on July 1, 1946, has had 2 weeks active duty each subsequent year or a total of 2 months. An Army Reserve captain was promoted to the grade on April 1, 1950, and immediately reported for 90 days active duty. They are both mobilized on July 1, 1950. The Army Reserve captain immediately takes precedence over the Air Force Reserve captain who was promoted to captain nearly 4 years after the Air Force Reserve officer.

Apparently the theory of the Army and the Air Force is that only active duty contributes to the value of a Reserve officer for his wartime assignment.

The Navy and Marine Corps on the other hand believe that a Reserve officer is growing and expanding in his general knowledge, abilities, and capacity for leadership. They believe that a successful civilian career contributes to a Reserve officer's ability to quickly adjust himself to the new problems of the military which always develop in time of war. These problems are also new to the Regulars.

Those officers of the Regular Establishment who insist on denying parity to Reserve officers in time of war, use as their main argument that a Reservist, training only part time cannot possibly be as competent as a Regular who puts in full time in the military. This is not necessarily true at all. The Reservist certainly is not as well trained as the Regular, but this is not necessarily a gage of either's competence, once in a war. None of us contend that the Reserve officer is as well trained as the Regulars, grade for grade, but that is not the issue. The test should be rather—is the Reserve officer competent to perform the duties of his rank? If he is not, he should not be continued in the Reserve at all.

It is up to the Regular Establishment to institute and conduct training programs that will qualify the Reservist for his duties and which will also result in a constant weeding out of those who are found unwilling to or incapable of becoming competent.

This is exactly the attitude and program of the Navy and Marine Corps for their Reserves. In this policy the Naval and Marine Reserves concur wholeheartedly. The Navy does expect a Reservist to be the equal of his Regular running mate upon mobilization. They do expect the Reservist to be capable of performing the duties to which he will be assigned.

They expect to eliminate the incompetence among us through the selection-for-promotion system. This will produce a Reserve capable of immediate and complete integration with the Regular Establishment upon mobilization. So thoroughly does the Navy believe in this that they propose that there be no distinction whatever upon general mobilization, and then the Reserve become in every sense part of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps during the war service. To have such a Reserve requires that the date of commission of the reservist determine his position on the combined lineal list in peace and in war.

Any other system results in a Reserve being from two to five or more years older than his contemporary of the Regular Service. From the highest authorities in the Navy came testimony after World War II that Reserve officers, 3 months after mobilization, were indistinguishable from Regulars in the duties for which they were assigned. Thereafter, both Regular and Reserve learned their war duties from the war itself.

No less an authority than Admiral Nimitz made this statement repeatedly. If this is true, then there is no justification for permanently penalizing the Reserve officer from 2 to 5 years of age in grade compared to the Regular. The result is that a Reserve officer of the Army or Air Force upon reporting for active duty is penalized thousands of numbers on the precedence list which is far, far more drastic than a stiff court marshal would award as disciplinary punishment. Once lost, these numbers cannot be made up.

This penalizes a Reserve officer for being in the Reserve in peacetime. A civilian commissioned during a war suffers no such penalty. The day he is commissioned and reports for active duty determines his place on the lineal list. The Reserve officer who has contributed liberally of his time and effort during peace to prepare himself for war, may be placed with a Regular who is years his junior.

Such a system as is in force in the Army and Air Force does not assure getting the most competent officers into the right spot. A lieutenant colonel in the Air Force Reserve who has commanded an Air National Guard squadron, for instance, for 6 years with the usual 15 days' annual field training would immediately become junior and lose his command to a Regular major who had only reached the rank of lieutenant colonel 3

months before and had never had command of a squadron. Who will say that the Regular under such circumstances, 6 years younger and with little if any squadron command experience, is better qualified to command the squadron than the Reserve who has had 6 years experience and training in actual command. Yet that is what the Air Force says. The Army likewise contends that a Regular lieutenant colonel who had just made colonel a few months before is more competent than a Reserve or National Guard colonel who has been commanding a regiment for 7 or 8 years. I don't believe it; and furthermore the record doesn't warrant the conclusion reached by the Army and the Air Force.

The "only active service" theory of the Army and Air Force as applied to reserves is narrow and unrealistic for at least two apparent reasons. First, a comparatively small amount of a Regular's service is spent in strictly field military duties or with troops. Actually taken all in all much of an officer's career in peacetime is spent in administrative and similar duties. Secondly, there is so much that is fundamentally the same in civilian experience and the military service in time of peace that both the Regular and Reserve come out at any given time with pretty much the same basic mental equipment. Accordingly there is no justification for the vast gap created between the two as results from the present Army and Air Force system.

Of course, the regular service provides more valuable training for war than that provided in the reserve, but we don't maintain the military for the prestige or personal aggrandizement of the individual, whether he is a Regular or a Reserve. The Regular's compensation is a paid career. The Reserve, on the other hand, contributes his time from his career and family life in order to prepare himself for war. The drill pay that a portion of the Reserves receive don't constitute even a semicareer compensation. It seldom covers the actual expenses of a Reserve for participating in the program.

These factors should not enter into the question of an officer's place on the lineal list. The governing factor should be the officer's value to the over-all war effort. We think that this being true, there should be no penalty imposed upon a Reserve officer by reason of his being a Reserve officer and that the precedence of all officers should be determined by the date shown on the commission.

Mr. Speaker, to bring this subject to the attention of the Members and in an effort to bring about uniform treatment in these procedures and to attempt to close the vast gap created by the system of the Army and Air Force on the one hand of crediting only active duty performed in grade toward arriving at the relative precedence of Reserve officers among themselves and with Regulars when the Reserves are mobilized or enter active duty, and of the system of the Navy and the Marine Corps on the other hand of placing their Reserve officers on the precedence list according to the dates of their commission, I did on August 8, 1950, introduce H. R. 9371, a bill to amend the National Defense Act to achieve relative rank of officers of the United States Army and United States Air Force when in active service, by amending paragraph 8 of section 127 (a) of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended.

Amazing Sophistry of Certain Cost Per Acre Arguments Opposing Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, many are the arguments put forth by the opponents of the central Arizona project, some of which are fantastically illogical and amazingly fallacious. These arguments may sound impressive, but they will not bear analysis or close inspection. One of the worst of them I wish to comment upon here, such as their cost-per-acre figures.

In trying to thwart the legislation and kill the project, opponents have tried to bolster their claim that the project is "fantastically infeasible" by declaring that the cost per acre is outlandish and unreasonable. While it is not uncommon for good reclamation projects to average from two to four hundred dollars per acre construction costs, certain opponents of this project in central Arizona declare with a straight face that the cost will range upward of $1,600 per acre, some say $1,800 per acre, and a few place it between two and three thousand dollars per acre. One of these California lobbying mathematicians, influenced in part perhaps by the change in climate from California to Washington, has solemnly stated that the cost of this project will average more than $14,000 per acre.

Any one of these costs per acre figures would be amazing enough even if the California lobbyists left off the other half of this story, which is that the Arizona farmers would not repay any of this cost but that it would be a raid on the United States Treasury to benefit a handful of Arizona farmers at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation. So California opponents say. Whenever they have time and space, they put in the whole ridiculous story. I am not joking, all of these arguments have been put forth with the evident expectation—or hope at least—that such will be believed by Congress and the American people in opposition to the legislation which is embodied in S. 75 now before Congress.

Before I forget it I must say that it takes a rather high-priced lobbyist to make these calculations. Such a one must have several varieties of arithmetic besides the brand taught in schools to arrive at such astronomical figures but even so, the opponents, not content with doing their own calculations, a few weeks ago asked the Secretary of the Interior to figure the cost per acre on the Central Arizona project. This was the second of a certain list of 17 questions which was put to the Secretary of the Interior with a view of obtaining information about the bill.

It is interesting to note that when that question was touched upon the Secretary of the Interior replied:

> The central Arizona project has been designed to meet this threat of devastating drought to the area's economy through the provision of a supplemental water supply. * * * It is clear that the values which will accrue to such beneficiaries as these and, beyond them, to still others far outside of the confines of the State of Arizona cannot properly be reduced to a cost-per-acre figure and that it would, therefore, be inappropriate for us to attempt to relate the irrigation allocation of the project to an acreage figure.

This was merely a polite way of saying that cost-per-acre was not the proper way of computing this cost. I want to add that cost-per-acre in this case is a phony method of calculation, and I will also give a few illustrations of the absurdity of it. If the public can be fooled by the opponents of any good work on a cost-per-acre basis perhaps this method is as good as any to fool them. But does it fool anybody?

Let us suppose that there were individuals in Washington who objected to spending any money to erect a monument to George Washington, such as the 555-foot obelisk which stands near the Potomac. Let us assume that the Washington Monument cost a half million dollars, and that the promoters who planned it estimated the cost to be a half million dollars. The drawings of the foundation indicate that it is square and of such dimensions that 14 such squares will exactly cover 1 acre of ground. Now everybody knows that the ground down near the Potomac was not worth very much per acre in that early day. Could not the opponents say, with some show of superficial logic, How silly to build something on one-fourteenth of an acre that will cost $500,000, making the cost per acre the fantastic price of $7,000,000 per acre. What would any reasonable person think of that sort of argument against building the Washington Monument?

Let us try another illustration: Up on the New England coast at the mouth of Boston Harbor on a rocky piece of land stands a lighthouse, circular in form at the base, and it cost $300,000. The interesting thing is that that circular foundation covers only one-sixtieth of an acre. In that case the opponents of such a project could use California methods of bookkeeping to figure that the per acre cost for this lighthouse was $18,000,000 for an acre on that rocky area on a "stern and rock-bound coast." The method of computing cost in relation to benefits just illustrated are disgusting and insulting to intelligence, but no more so than some of the per acre cost attributed by Californians to the central Arizona project.

Someone may say, "You have been talking about a different class of projects of needed public works where the benefit is a public benefit and not a private benefit." Yes; I do recognize that, but I can give other illustrations. In the days of the great depression the Government furnished money to certain railroad com-

panies and to certain banks and business concerns owned by private enterprise. Take any one of the railroads receiving financial aid. It has so many miles of right-of-way, perhaps running through several States. It would be an easy matter to compute the number of acres actually covered by the tracks, but would any opponent think of condemning the financial aid to such a railroad company by figuring it on a per acre cost basis by dividing the millions of dollars furnished by the number of acres covered by the tracks? That would be ridiculous.

Again, suppose the Government furnished money to a great banking institution to save it from closing its doors, say $50,000,000. Shall we divide the $50,000,000 furnished the bank by the half-acre plot on which the bank building stands and thus condemn Government aid to private banking business on a cost-per-acre basis because it figured out to be a $100,000,000 per acre? Such would be getting pretty close to the extreme of absurdity. However, that is no more absurd than the figuring of a $50,000-a-year lobbyist from California who figured out that the Central Arizona Project would cost more than $14,000 per acre.

Well, if this is not the correct way of figuring costs on the central Arizona project, what is the correct way? I would say one correct way is the same in principle as used by the Government when $50,000,000 was advanced to the banking institution above mentioned. Why did the Government lend $50,000,000 to this bank, which by the way is a private institution operated for profit? Unquestionably, the Government felt that the bank must not fail, for it had a public duty to perform and the public generally, as well as the owners, would be hurt through its destruction. Undoubtedly, the Government felt that the money advanced would save the institution; and would be repaid probably with interest; and the whole community would be financially better off because of the transaction. If an economic institution was saved in that manner and continued to create wealth and serve the community and furnish tax revenues for the public treasury it would not be a foolish thing for the Government to advance $50,000,000 in such a case. The only foolish thing would be to oppose the project on the basis that the cost seemed to be a $100,000,000 cost-per-acre.

Having shown the absurdity of the tricky and deceptive cost-per-acre propaganda of the Californians, it may logically be asked how should the cost and repayment of the central Arizona project as now represented in S. 75 amended, be properly and appropriately computed? Competent authorities have done so and declare that it will repay its reimbursable costs, that is 98½ percent of its total construction cost, under existing reclamation law, within a period of 73 years. It is a Federal investment and those responsible for Federal property ought to ask, What will be the cost of this project and how will the reimbursable costs be repaid? To answer those questions we must ask, What are the probable benefits and the computed revenue to be derived from the project annually when in operation?

The project will have two main sources of income: First, revenue from the sale of commercial power, and second, revenue from the sale of water for irrigation purposes and municipal uses. So long as this remarkable land is occupied by Americans there will be an unquestionable demand both for power and water and there are any number of reliable contractors willing to bid, and more than willing to enter into long-term contracts to purchase both at or above the computed prices. Reliable engineers have computed that the sale of power and water on reasonable terms will bring in enough revenue to operate the project, maintain it, keep it in functioning order and repay the reimbursable costs to the Government in 73 years. It is as significant an investment in the middle of the twentieth century as Jefferson made in Louisiana in the beginning of the nineteenth century. That is the thing about which statesmen need to be informed.

To those who are honestly concerned that this project would enhance the value of some land now held in large private ownership, I will repeat that no ownership in excess of 160 acres can participate in the benefits under Reclamation law and this development would be under Reclamation law. Most of the area is in private ownership of small holdings. It would certainly please me to have many, many more home units—family sized farms—of small acreage even not to exceed 40 acres each. I have always favored such small irrigated farms for veterans. These are details, however, which Congress will direct the Bureau of Reclamation to work out to the greatest good and maximum benefit in the public interest.

Address of Hon. Paul H. Griffith, Assistant Secretary of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Paul H. Griffith, Assistant Secretary of Defense, before the American Legion Convention, Department of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., Wednesday, August 9, 1950:

Fellow Legionnaires, it always has been a great pleasure to me to come back home, particularly at the time of the Department Convention of the American Legion. For the past month no one in the Department of Defense has been making any speeches. This is my first talk since the Korean invasion. In fact, it is the first talk which has been made by any high official of the Department. I am glad to have the opportunity of breaking this silence in my own State before you who have done so much for me in giving me prominence in the Legion.

I have a natural pride in your achievements. I have the comfortable feeling of genuine comradeship in your company. I have great faith in the soundness of your thinking—the kind of thinking which leads to sane and decisive action.

Today, more than ever before, I am grateful for the privilege of addressing this convention of my comrades of two World Wars. It provides me with an opportunity to discuss fast-moving world events with men whose understanding of such events has been enlarged and quickened by personal experience in uniform.

These events, particularly those relating to our military operations in Korea, must be calmly and sanely appraised by all of us. Only then will we respond with the sane and decisive action demanded of us by the trend of these events. The grave nature of these events make it appropriate that they be discussed at this memorial ceremony.

Right now these events add up to a situation confronting our country which above all else demands unity—unity of thought, unity of action, unity which will multiply our strength.

I am certain, indeed, that unity and faith in our Government, so greatly needed in time of stress, will be forthcoming from the vast bulk of men and women who have served their country under arms. I feel certain that you who once wore the uniform, will rally to the support of the President's program for ending the present, and preventing future acts of armed aggression. I am sure that you can be counted upon to inspire the support and confidence of the thousands with whom you associate in your normal walks of life. Unfortunately, in times like this, it is too often true that fast-moving events of far-reaching importance leave a wake of confused thinking—a faulty understanding of the situation. This leads often to actions which are unwise, if not actually detrimental.

In such an atmosphere, many are prone to forget that strength lies in unity; that calm judgment must not be overthrown by hysteria; and that tried policies must not be junked for fantastic schemes born of panic. They forget that faith must be maintained and all-out support given to constituted leadership.

Disunity, hysterical action, lack of confidence in our Government, panic, are among the conditions and states of mind Communist propagandists have fruitlessly attempted to establish in this country for the past quarter of a century. I want to warn with all the emphasis at my command that we should guard against creating, ourselves, the very conditions and states of mind the Communists so long have vainly tried to produce by subversive propaganda.

I would like to give you a detailed consideration of recent events, weigh their significance, appraise what we have done about them, and take a look ahead at what we are preparing to do.

We all know that Communist forces, without warning, launched an unprovoked attack June 24, our time—it was June 25 in Korea—on South Korean Government forces, armed only to prevent border raids and preserve internal security. On June 25 the Security Council of the United Nations met in an emergency session. The Council held that this attack was a brazen breach of the peace. It called upon the North Korean forces to withdraw to the thirty-eighth parallel. Now, to borrow the words of our Commander in Chief—I quote from his statement of June 27—"This they have not done, but on the contrary have pressed the attack. The Security Council called upon all members of the United Nations to render every

assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution. In those circumstances, I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support."

The United States subsequently decided to employ ground forces as well as naval and air forces, in assisting the United Nations in the execution of its resolution. All actions taken by the United States in Korea have conformed with the recommendations or requests of the United Nations.

All of which makes it plain that our military operations in Korea are, as the President frequently has pointed out, police action undertaken to fulfill our obligation as a member of the United Nations.

I want to enter into a more detailed discussion of this military operation in Korea a little later. First, however, I want to talk about the broader aspects of our effort to repel the invaders of a free nation.

One aspect of great importance is the fact that our action in Korea has clearly demonstrated the absolute soundness of virtually all the major concepts upon which our military policy has been based since the establishment of the Department of Defense. This is true despite a great amount of foggy thinking and loose talking in evidence since South Korea was attacked.

These concepts, briefly stated, are:

That we must maintain an armed force in a high state of readiness, prepared to heap dreadful retaliation on any enemy which might attack us.

That we must maintain an armed force capable of quick expansion in time of emergency.

That we must get the greatest amount of defense for every dollar spent.

That unification is a necessary means for achieving these ends.

It is of utmost importance that the public be given a full understanding that these major concepts have been proved sound by the affair in Korea. Such an understanding must be the basis of confidence in what we have done to defend this country and in the further steps we propose to take. And it is this calm, studied confidence that will give us the unity we must have.

As to the state of readiness of our forces, let me offer the testimony of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commander of the United Nations forces in Korea. I quote from his message of July 20 to our Commander in Chief:

"I do not believe that history records a comparable operation which excelled the speed and precision with which the Eighth Army, the Far East Air Force, and the Seventh Fleet have been deployed to a distant land for immediate commitment to major operations. It merits the highest commendation for the commanders, staffs, and units concerned and attests to their superior training and high state of readiness to meet any eventuality. This finds added emphasis in the fact that the Far East command, until the President's great pronouncement to support the epochal action of the United Nations, had no slightest responsibility for the defense of the free Republic of Korea. With the President's decision it assumed a completely new and added mission."

If any further evidence of our state of readiness is needed, we have it from Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the United States Army. I quote from his report to the President after visiting the front:

"Our far eastern forces were organized and equipped primarily to perform peaceful occupation duties in Japan. However, under General MacArthur's magnificent leadership, they have quickly adapted themselves to meet the deliberately planned attack of the North Korean Communist forces, which are well-equipped, well-led, and battle-trained, and which have at times outnumbered our troops by as much as 20 to 1."

It is true, of course, that nothing about the Korean incident has made it necessary for us to demonstrate our state of readiness to deliver a paralyzing retaliatory blow at any who attack this country. It should be strongly emphasized, however, that there is nothing about the Korean affair that suggests we cannot deliver such a blow.

There seems to be a tendency on the part of the public to overlook one of the essentials of the Korean situation. It is simply this: We have not been attacked by anyone. Technically we are not at war with anyone. Regardless of what may happen in the future, we still are engaged in a police action undertaken by troops without prior responsibility for the defense of the Korean Republic, at the urgent call of the United Nations.

Under such circumstances, it was readily apparent to military leaders that our first troops available to answer this call would be confronted with one of the most difficult of military operations—fighting a delaying action.

It is my information from military experts that the manner in which we have fought this delaying action was superb. In his report to the President, General Collins described this action of our troops in Korea as "a splendid tribute to the ability of our Armed Forces to convert quickly from the peaceful duties of occupation to the grim duties of war."

The highly skilful fashion in which our garrison troops, with no prior responsibility for the defense of the Republic of Korea, were able to fight this delaying action, must be regarded as further tribute to their high state of readiness. It is fortunate that we had troops at not too great a distance from the Korean outbreak. But it must be remembered that whether we had maintained 10 or a hundred trained divisions in the United States, our first units would have faced the same necessity of fighting a delaying action until reinforcements could arrive. We are without assurance, too, that maintenance of 100 divisions in continental United States would have deterred the invasion of Korea.

It might be well to observe at this point that stretching diagonally across Asia and Europe for thousands on thousands of miles is a Communist borderland. Along it inspired acts of armed aggression already have transpired or might be expected at any time the Communists choose. These never can be crushed quickly by any nation. No nation could maintain a military establishment strong enough and widely enough dispersed.

Now let us turn to another significant aspect of the Korean situation. It was described by the President in his statement of June 27. He said, and now I quote, "The attack upon Korea made it plain beyond all doubt that communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and will now use armed invasion and war."

In making it plain beyond a doubt that they are prepared to use armed force to subject free nations, the Communists have resolved a perplexing dilemma; it is a dilemma which has confronted the Department of Defense since its creation; it has confronted the Congress which is constitutionally responsible for the defense of the country, the Commander in Chief, and all the people of the United States.

That dilemma has been, to state it briefly, how much weight should be given to purely military considerations in defense preparedness and how much should be given to economic considerations; or as it was expressed by Chairman GEORGE MAHON is supporting the House Appropriation Committee's recommended military budget for 1950—and I quote: "If war comes soon we are appropriating too little. If we have miscalculated the dangers, if the threat of war is just a deceptive mirage on the horizon, we are appropriating too much. * * *"

By armed aggression, the Communists have resolved the dilemma in favor of military considerations. In view of the actual fighting taking place in Korea, economic considerations have been largely outweighed. As a result, the President has asked for a supplemental appropriation of $10,487,000,000 for the immediate expansion of our Military Establishment.

This expansion is intended not only to insure a favorable outcome of the Korean operation but as preparation for possible further attacks which the invasion of the Korean Republic indicates may be expected. The President's intention to increase our military strength with considerable rapidity must be regarded as the speeding up of a military policy of strength building which has long been in process.

In fiscal 1947, only 6 cents out of every military budget dollar could be spent for tanks, ships, aircraft, weapons, ammunition, and other heavy items. This was due to the burden of liquidation costs of World War II and to heavy overhead. It is worth noting that we were able to use 19.5 cents on the dollar for hardware in the fiscal year that ended on June of this year, in part at least because of a reduction in overhead. About 59 cents out of every dollar asked by the President in the supplemental appropriation will go for this vital hardware.

The appropriation also will provide for a total of 2,100,000 in our Army, Navy, and Air Force. In this expansion, the Marines will be increased 90 percent. This money will provide for the calling up of a number of Reservists and the mobilization of needed National Guard units. Incidentally, I know you share my pride in the fact that our own Twenty-eighth Division is among the first called.

As I said a while ago, one of the major concepts about which our military policy has been integrated was the need for developing an armed force which would be readily and quickly expandable in time of emergency. The proof of our success in this part of our preparedness efforts may be found in the ease with which we have been—for many days now—absorbing new men, individually, and civilian components as units into our forces, and the advanced state of preparedness for procuring additional tanks, aircraft, and other "hardware" needed for our expansion.

It is safe to say that few Americans, if any, doubt the necessity of military expansion at an accelerated rate, regardless of cost. However, it should be a source of pleasure to the taxpayer that the cost in dollars will not be so great as would be the case if we had not, in months past, learned to get the greatest amount of defense for every dollar spent. Indeed, if this emergency had arisen not too long ago, many of the dollars which now can be spent for planes and tanks and guns and ships would have gone into useless overhead. This situation is not accidental. It was brought about by the earnest work of Secretary of Defense Johnson.

Incidentally, I am proud to be associated at this critical time with our great Secretary of Defense. My first real association with him was in the American Legion, when he was national commander and I was commander of this great department. I have been associated with him in many capacities since that time and I want you to know that he is the most sincere, honest, and capable executive that can be found any place in the world. His plan from the very beginning of his administration has been to assure peace through strength and he has endeavored to build that strength within the capability of the American economy. He still believes that even in this time of crisis we should not tolerate waste and extravagance. Recently in his appearance before the Congress he expressed this idea—and I quote—"this determination to get the maximum return

on the defense dollar will continue to govern our activities."

It is probable that every delegate here has heard me one time or another advocate the virtues of unification of the Armed Forces. That advocacy no longer is necessary. Unification beyond any previous experience flowered in the Armed Forces with the invasion of Korea.

The action of our land, naval, and air forces under General MacArthur is one example of it. The President's recommendations to the Congress had the complete support and concurrence of all civilian and military leaders in the Defense Department. The benefit of unification in an emergency has been further exemplified by the quick decisions which have been possible in recent weeks to coordinate the combat efforts of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

I'm sure it is apparent that our military policy has been developed around sound concepts; that our Military Establishment has been organized to provide a sound mobilization base in case of war.

Those who recognize these facts should be free from any apprehension that we are stepping off into a new world, along uncharted paths. They will receive more readily a suggestion that I want to make. That suggestion is that the citizens of the United States become, like the Armed Forces, unified in their determination to support the President's latest program for defense. It actually is our greatest bid to maintain the peace.

We Can't Buy Friendship With Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the last war in 1945, the American taxpayer has watched his hard earned dollars roll around the world in a global spending program which he was told would endear the American Nation to the peoples of the world, and would result in an understanding by citizens of recipient nations of the benefits of our democratic form of government and their lasting friendship for our people.

Today Americans are wondering just what has been achieved through this program. Do the people of foreign countries receiving American aid know that American dollars are buying construction projects and other improvements for their benefit?

The following article by Gault MacGowan would indicate that ERP is falling short of the mark in demonstrating the advantages of American democracy to the citizens of European countries receiving our financial aid for reconstruction and this is a situation which should receive attention now:

AUSTRIAN TYROL, August 8.—We're nuts. We are pouring millions of dollars of United States aid into Europe without impressing the natives.

A big road sign here announces one Alpine road project being carried out through the ERP—but none of the locals could even guess what the letters stood for.

"ERP?" said an old man, shaking his head. "It must be the name of the contractors."

I gave a bright-looking boy a bar of candy. He accepted it gratefully.

"We haven't seen much candy since the United States Army went through," he explained. "It's too expensive. The last piece I had was for my first communion. You are from America?"

"How do you know?"

"I know the number plates of all the automobiles that come through the Austrian Alps."

"Then perhaps you can tell me what ERP means on that sign?"

"I'm not sure—I think it's the name of a patent road-making process. I watch them working sometimes. They are making 15 kilometers (9 miles) of new road. It will straighten out a big loop in the road to Innsbruck and the Brenner Pass."

I decided to enlighten him, and a knot of other children who had cast themselves in the role of sidewalk superintendents. But when I had finished, they still seemed more impressed by the candy bars.

"If it means what you say," a bespectacled girl remarked, "it should be EWP—Europaische wiederaufbau program. Reconstruction is not an Austrian word."

The childish wisdom left me silent. These are the boys and girls of the next generation among whom we are supposed to be peddling democracy.

All the top brass speaks about educating the children—GYA projects, exchange-student programs, more millions of dollars for it—and they don't know what ERP means.

European politicians who get the spending of the money know what ERP means, all right. It's easy money to keep them in office. They have the spending of it, and they get the credit for it. Why should they pass the word along that it's United States taxpayers money?

The Leave-To-Print and Franking Privileges: Their Use and Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, various acts of Congress allow Representatives and Senators to send free through the mails under their individual franks the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or any part thereof, or speeches or reports contained therein, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe. They may also send and receive free through the mail all public documents printed by order of Congress, until the 30th day of June following the expiration of their terms of office. They may also send postage free any mail matter to any Government official, and to any person correspondence not exceeding four ounces in weight, upon official or departmental business—House Rules and Manual, section 984.

Any speech made in Congress appears as a matter of course in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under the leave-to-print privilege, customarily granted by the House, Members receive unanimous consent to extend their own remarks in the RECORD. Matter inserted in the RECORD under leave to print, if in continuation of remarks actually delivered on the floor, appears in connection with the speech in the body of the RECORD. It is also customary, on account of its large membership and limited time, for the House at times to grant unanimous consent to Members to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD speeches not actually delivered on the floor. Extension of remarks under the 1-minute rule, if within 300 words, are printed in the body of the RECORD; if in excess of 300 words, in the Appendix. It is also customary to grant leave to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD newspaper or magazine articles, editorials, letters, or other matter not germane to the proceedings on the floor. No extraneous matter covering more than two pages of the RECORD can be inserted under leave to print unless accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the cost of printing which was obtained by the Member at the time leave was secured.

The right to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a valuable privilege. In a large legislative body where time is necessarily at a premium, it affords Members an opportunity to explain their attitude on pending questions and so give constituents a basis on which to approve or disapprove their actions. At the same time it apprizes colleagues and the country at large as to local sentiment the Member is elected to represent.

The extent to which the "leave to print" practice has grown is seen in the expanding size of the Appendix of the RECORD. Matter inserted in the Appendix during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress occupies five huge volumes and consumes 6,800 pages. At the current printing cost of $82 a page, the extensions and insertions of a single session thus cost the taxpayers $557,600.

The quality of the material that appears in the Appendix of the RECORD is very mixed. Some of it has educational value and general interest. Much of it consists of local editorial opinion, letters from constituents and campaign documents of no lasting value or general interest. But whatever its worth, the Public Printer is required upon order of any Member to print and deliver to him extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in such quantities as the Member may desire, at his expense, in franked envelopes ready for mailing.

During the fiscal year 1949 Members of Congress mailed free under the franking privilege 19,299,608 pieces weighing 2,243 tons in all, which cost the Post Office Department $1,031,823 to handle and distribute and which, at the usual postage rates, would have yielded to the Government a revenue of $1,027,692. However, the cost of handling franked congressional mail is less than 1 percent of total postal expenditures and of the postal deficit.

Each Senator may have 100 copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and each Representative may have 68 copies, which they may send postage free to constituents or others.

A survey of past practice indicates that the saving of postage permitted by the franking privilege has been a great temptation to Members of both Houses to advance their own personal interests at public expense. Both the "leave to print" privilege and the franking privilege have at times been abused. Many instances of such abuses have been chronicled in the annals of Congress during the past century. For examples of abuse of the "leave to print" privilege, see V Hind's Precedents, 6990–7017.

USE FOR CAMPAIGN PURPOSES

Perhaps the most frequent and familiar use of the "leave to print" privilege is found in the insertion of personal campaign material in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Nomination by direct primary elections has converted the franking privilege into a vehicle of purely political service—

Writes Haynes in his history of the United States Senate.

For a Senator or Representative who has qualms as to the propriety or doubts as to the legality of sending directly under his frank a purely electioneering appeal to his constituents under guise of "official business," this remains as the most available and least personally expensive form of electioneering. All that is necessary is to go through the perfunctory performance of requesting permission to "extend his remarks." Then into the Appendix of the RECORD, with no limitation upon its length or its purely personal and private advantage, goes his bid for votes. When once it has found a place in that "catch-all," no question is raised as to its frankability (pp. 901–902).

Use of the Appendix of the RECORD for personal political campaign purposes and to save personal expense has become commonplace in recent years. Hundreds of thousands of "extension of remarks" are sometimes printed at the Member's expense and franked free throughout his district or State.

Such use of the franking privilege is defended by some Congressmen as "primarily for the benefit of our citizens," as a proper means of reporting to the folks back home concerning "happenings in Washington" and the Member's activities and voting record, and as a legitimate way of informing the people about the conduct of public affairs. Other Congressmen regard the insertion of "an enormous amount of useless stuff and personal political advertising" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $82 a page, as a costly and serious abuse of the "leave to print" privilege, and its distribution under the franking privilege as a substantial burden on the Post Office Department.

There is also involved a moral cost—

Observes Haynes—

in the Government's allowing itself to be made a party to the shabby evasion by which thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are filled with grotesquely inappropriate matter masquerading as "remarks" of its legislators (p. 904).

USE BY PRIVATE LOBBIES

The frank may be used to the advantage of private interests as well as in aid of personal political ambitions. Haynes recounts an instance of a prominent Senator being embarrassed when an investigating committee disclosed that thousands of copies of an expensive pamphlet filled with effective propaganda in favor of a high tariff on sugar had been distributed under his frank at an alleged cost to the United States Treasury of $28,000. The most recent evidence of wholesale use of the franking privilege by private lobbies was disclosed at hearings held in June 1950 by the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. Dr. Edward A. Rumely, secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, which has registered as a lobby, told the Buchanan committee that his organization has distributed eight to ten million pieces of literature under congressional franks in less than 4 years. The CCG paid for the printing of the literature, but saved $240,000 to $300,000 in postage by obtaining franked envelopes from cooperative Members of Congress.

Benedict F. Fitzgerald, Jr., Buchanan committee counsel, put into the record a breakdown showing 692,000 mailings in 1947, 1,216,000 in 1948, 2,853,000 in 1949, and 475,000 in the first 4 months of 1950.

Mr. Fitzgerald read into the record several letters from Members of Congress to the committee for constitutional government declining to have literature sent out under their franks. One Member said that it was an inappropriate use of the frank. Another said that it was an imposition. In an editorial on franking unlimited the Christian Science Monitor—June 30, 1950—questioned whether some Congressmen have carried their franking privilege much beyond the purpose for which it was intended; that number of communications mailed free by a lobbying organization by courtesy of Members of the very body the organization exists to influence certainly stretches the proprieties to the breaking point.

PROPOSED REMEDIES

Various remedies have been proposed from time to time for these alleged abuses of the congressional franking privilege. Certain bills that have been introduced would prohibit Members of both branches of Congress from permitting their franking privileges to be used gratuitously or for pay by any person, firm, or corporation engaged directly or indirectly in any kind of lobbying activities or other propaganda efforts. Violation of this act would be punishable by a fine of $10,000, 10 years' imprisonment, and loss of office.

It has also been suggested, first, that the distribution of franked matter be limited to a Member's district or State; second, that the quantity of franked matter distributed be limited in some proportion to the population of the congressional district or State; and third, that persons and organizations which have registered under the lobby law be forbidden to distribute their literature under congressional franks.

Mr. Speaker, by judicious use of the leave to print, the Member of the Congress can make a real contribution toward economy.

Defense Production Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to address the House on the controls bill—actually called the Defense Production Act of 1950. Because the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. SPENCE, was given unanimous consent for all Members to have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks, I decided to make known and explain my position and views.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the 435 Representatives in Congress I do not believe the people of the Twentieth Illinois District expect me to vote for legislation giving the executive department blank check authority. I think they have this view regardless of which party is in power. I am of the same belief.

Constitutionally, the Chief Executive, as Commander in Chief, can and has sent the Army and the Navy to Korea. They are, according to the announcement, doing police duty at the request of the United Nations Security Council. As of today a few other nations in the group have offered or sent token help.

Historically, this is the eighty-sixth time the Nation's Army and Navy have moved by such orders. This is not the first but the fourth time the United States Army and Navy have been ordered into Korea:

In 1871 to capture Korean forts after a surveying party which had been granted permission to make certain surveys and soundings in the interest of science and commerce had been treacherously attacked.

In 1888 to protect American residents.

In 1894 to protect the American legation.

Of course, the other 85 times troops have been alerted and ordered into action, there was never a world conflict involved. It was only to protect American rights and property.

May God in his wisdom be on our side in the eighty-sixth order.

By agreement internationally, and with our executive department, Korea was divided at the thirty-eighth parallel. The legislative branches of our Government had nothing to do with it.

Like any citizen, I have a right to an opinion. A nation can no more be divided at an imaginary line than you can divide the United States at the Mississippi River or Illinois at route No. 36.

Neither should those in authority be condemned for not having enough military equipment in Korea to stop and hold the North Koreans at the thirty-eighth parallel. The reason I think this is because Korea is only one of many places over a wire area—thousands of miles—where a satellite nation could be pushed into war.

We could not move equipment fast enough should the same push have been in Iran, Indochina, India, Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Arabia, the Balkans, France, western Germany, and other areas.

By a roll-call vote, I voted for the United Nations in the hope something could be done toward a permanent peace. Congress had no vote as to whether Russia should be given such veto powers in the United Nations Councils.

The member nations having similar views to ours so far have only been able to give little help. We practically stand alone in Korea, but, as we all know, we are there. As Stephen Decatur, a hero of the War of 1812, said, "My country, in her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be right, but my country, right or wrong."

Mr. Speaker, because of this now comes another of our three branches of Government—the legislative, which had before it the economic-control bill. The Constitution defines the legislative branch as the one to make the laws with the veto power in the executive branch. Because of this I do not believe the Congress should give up that function of Government. For my part, I do not propose to do it. That is why the lower House is elected every 2 years.

Why should blank-check authority be given on the economy of this Nation? Congress is in session to pass any needed and emergency legislation. There is no reason why they should not be prepared to do that under present conditions, regardless of this being an election year. To be frank and blunt, Congress should stay right here.

In asking for no territory increase, in fighting communism, dictatorships, and tyranny, let us not create the conditions for a dictatorship for ourselves. Then why should we walk out on or be afraid of our own responsibility. I voted against the legislation on this basis, although if world war III becomes a worldwide reality, I believe in controls on everything and everybody.

This legislation in the main does five things:

Section 1: Permits the President, at his discretion, to put ceilings, separately or all at once, on wages and prices and to institute rationing. Prices would not be rolled back automatically, but they could be as far as May 24–June 24, 1950, levels. Wages would be frozen at that level, though some higher wages would be possible under various exceptions.

Section 2: Permits the President to allocate scarce materials.

Section 3: Permits the President to set priorities that would give preference to defense contracts.

Section 4: Permits the President to requisition materials or equipment for defense and to make defense production loans up to $2,000,000,000 in all.

Section 5: Permits the President to reinstate wartime consumer credit controls—meaning higher down payments—and to establish new credit controls on new building—meaning higher down payments for homes and business buildings.

As far as section 5 is concerned, I believe the Federal Reserve Board has ample power to control credits merely by raising the rediscount rate.

Section 1 lets the executive department make the law by Executive order. Should this be done it appears to me it would create an unfair situation. Prices could be rolled back as of May 24–June 24, 1950, levels. This would be fair in some instances and unfair in others.

It would be unfair where agricultural prices in the Midwest are concerned. Practically every commodity is down 25 percent today as far as the prices the farmer receives.

Hogs reached a top after World War II of $32 per hundred. Last fall, 1949, they were around $15 to $16. This week around $24, or 25 percent under the high.

Cattle top grade reached $42.50. Remember only one feeder obtains top price. On August 10, 1950, at Chicago, good and choice steers brought $29.50 to $30.75. Choice vealers, $27 to $33. At least 20 percent down according to grade.

The highest corn sold for was $2.25 to $2.50 per bushel. Last year's 1949 crop, $1.10 to $1.25 at the elevators, the Government loan being $1.35. This fall it might bring $1.40 or $1.50. At least $1 per bushel under top price.

Soybeans were about $3.25 to $3.50 per bushel last fall. This year's November quotation on August 10 average is $2.40. Again $1 below the maximum.

The dairy farmer is receiving at least 25 percent less for milk than he did at the top level.

You can easily see that even though farm prices have advanced some from the extreme low, that to freeze these prices as of June 24 would be unfair. This is certainly true, because there is little, if any, reduction in prices of anything the farmer must buy.

As to new additional control over commodity exchanges, every rural elevator, when buying grain, uses the commodity exchanges to hedge these purchases immediately. They would not have, nor could they borrow enough funds to handle a farmer's grain if they could not do this. Neither could they afford to handle crops in any other manner. Gambling in grain is one thing, and rural elevator hedging is another. The exchanges are regulated at present.

As evidence of the fact that there is no shortage in agricultural products, Secretary Brannan appeared 2 weeks ago before the House Committee on Agriculture in support of a $40,000,000 authorization to repackage bulk perishable agricultural commodities now owned by the Government, namely, by the Commodity Credit Corporation. If passed, these commodities stored in bulk could be shipped to States for their institutions and seaboard ports for needy foreign countries under certain conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I see no reason in Congress setting up a possible dictatorship in this country. We have been at war since December 7, 1941, supposedly to stop just that.

Free enterprise and high production stopped black markets in 1948 in farm implements and automobiles from selling above the regular retail prices. I do not believe the citizens of the Twentieth Illinois District want any more of it. They know what I mean when I say they do not want another Knetzer affair.

Tidelands Encroachment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

TIDELANDS ENCROACHMENT

That the Interior Department already has moved to take over jurisdiction of offshore drilling, etc., without a law to back it up, is not surprising. That the United States engineers have been influenced to base approval of plans, etc., for oil-well structures outside Texas-Louisiana inland waters, on Interior Department O. K.'s, is regrettable. These encroachments have been rightfully protested by the Louisiana Mineral Board; and they provide another reason for congressional action on this matter.

The haziness of the situation is emphasized by lack of a dividing line, or clean-cut distinction between inland and offshore waters, which can only be drawn by law, but which the Interior Department apparently is making on its own hook—interfering, to that extent, with State operations. The same right of arbitrary distinction is given the Secretary of the Interior under the proposed O'Mahoney interim escrow bill.

The great objection to the O'Mahoney bill, however, is that it violates the principle of possession and prior jurisdiction, by seeking to give interim administration of the tidelands to the Government. Why wasn't this bill drawn to maintain such administration in the States, under the same conditions, pending final disposition of the issue? Senator O'MAHONEY knows that, as the record stands, a majority of Congress supports quitclaiming title to the States. It may require a two-thirds majority to effect this; but meanwhile the premature recognition and endorsement of Federal jurisdiction is contrary to sentiment.

Since Senator O'MAHONEY did not see fit to draft his legislation in accord with the status quo, it behooves tidelands-rights advocates to submit their own interim escrow bill, with provisional and unprejudicial demarcation lines, retaining State jurisdiction pending final settlement.

American Legion Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Department of Alabama, sent me a copy of its resolution

adopting a seven-point program for the protection and welfare of our country. Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this patriotic resolution, as I think the seven-point program is meritorious, commendable, and helpful in this crisis:

Whereas the American Legion has, since its inception, advocated and supported a strong national defense; and has through its manifold programs attempted to instill into the minds and hearts of the American people a true sense of patriotism; and does now reiterate and reaffirm its continued dedication to these purposes;

Whereas the armed invasion of South Korea by the forces of communistic North Korea on June 25, 1950, has created an ever-increasing danger to the peace and security of the world; and

Whereas the entry of the United States into the conflict, to combat this overt act of aggression on the part of communism has caused our Government and its people grave concern over the possible outbreak of another world conflict; and

Whereas the foregoing requires of the American people a firm and definite plan of action to meet this crisis: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Alabama, That we do hereby state this positive seven-point program and do hereby pledge the manpower and resources at the disposal of the American Legion to the fulfillment of this plan for the protection and security of the Government of the United States and its people.

1. We endorse the action taken by the leaders of our Government and the United Nations organization in this crucial hour and again advocate an adequate defense of the United States. We do now reiterate and renew our demand for passage of Federal legislation which will secure a permanent program of universal military training, placing the obligation of military service on all citizens of proper age equally to the end that our Nation will always in the future be better prepared to defend itself and our institutions.

2. We demand that the Congress of the United States now perfect all plans for instant application when necessary to draft all manpower, military and civilian, industry and capital for successfully combating acts of aggression against this Nation and the free peoples of the world.

3. We pledge our unqualified support, full cooperation, and active participation to the State and Federal Governments toward the setting up of an adequate civilian-defense program for the protection of our people.

4. We do now condemn, as selfish and unpatriotic, the practice of hoarding and will exert our efforts to discourage it wherever encountered.

5. We advocate that the Congress now empower the President of the United States to institute price controls and rationing of foodstuffs, commodities and all necessities when necessary to assure an equitable division of the available supply.

6. We reiterate and renew our demand for the immediate passage by the Congress of the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnson bill, providing for the control of subversive activities and the registration of all subversive individuals and groups. We express our contempt for Communists and all those who abuse the freedoms, rights, and privileges afforded by our constitutional Government in their efforts to undermine those same freedoms, rights, and privileges. We feel that the penalties for such action are totally inadequate.

7. We assure the fighting men of this country and their dependents that the American Legion will in the future, as in the past, advocate and prosecute all just claims arising from their service and sacrifice: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent the President of the United States, the Governor of Alabama, and to each member of the Alabama delegation in the Congress.

Adopted July 30, 1950.

Miracle on the Vistula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, just 30 years ago, the forces of the Republic of Poland stopped the wave of Bolshevik aggression on the banks of the Vistula River. Times have changed for the Polish people since that historic occasion. While events have taken a turn for the worse, it will not be long, in my opinion, before the now Poland's Defense Minister, Soviet Marshal Rokossowski's plan for Poland, will be thrown out and the Polish people will once again stage a "miracle on the Vistula."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, with my remarks, a speech I made, both in English and Polish, to the people of Poland, over the Voice of America, on the thirtieth anniversary of this memorable occasion:

HON. THOMAS GORDON, OF ILLINOIS, ON THE "MIRACLE ON THE VISTULA"

Thirty years ago Poland was waging her first war for independence, a war climaxed by the battle of Warsaw, which history knows as the Miracle on the Vistula. Thirty years have passed since that memorable August of 1920 when the wave of Bolshevik aggression was repulsed from the walls of the Polish capital. History has appraised the battle of Warsaw in 1920 as one of the decisive battles in the history of the world.

The imperialistic aims of the Bolshevik offensive of that time extended far beyond Poland. Soviet Russia was carrying on a policy which differed from the Czarist government's rapaciousness, only in its theoretical and ideological motivation. To cover up their aggressive intentions, the Soviet authorities juggled with the slogans of the self-determination of nations and created allegedly independent satellite governments composed of people blindly carrying out Russian orders. This creation of fictitious states and governments as a propaganda smokescreen for imperialistic intentions was a natural consequence of the long-range aims of Soviet policy—aims which had been formulated already before the revolution and which are still systematically being implemented.

As early as 1920 it was becoming clear that Soviet Russia was aiming at the seizure of all Poland to use Poland as a springboard for a criminal attack upon the world. The Communist vision of world domination was eloquently revealed in the order issued to the Soviet armies marching westward in 1920. The order read as follows: "The fate of world revolution hangs in the balance in the West. Over the dead body of Poland leads the road to world conflagration."

Thus did Soviet Russia intend to deprive Poland of her newly born independence, won not only on the battlefield but also at the conference table by the then President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. Wilson's thirteenth point had given tangible expression to the deepest understanding by the United States of Poland's independence aims. Hence, this free and independent Poland, which had become a thorny obstacle to Soviet expansion, was dear to the American heart.

The Polish nation understood better than any other the far-reaching Soviet aims. The Polish soldier fighting at the gates of Warsaw in 1920 knew that a moment was at hand which would decide about the life or death of the Republic. Backed by the entire nation's intransigent will to battle the enemy, the Polish soldier summoned his strength for the supreme effort which saved his country and brought a magnificent victory. In keeping with its age-old tradition, the Polish Nation once again saved Europe from the barbarian deluge from the East. As she had done so often in her history, Poland again in August 1920 was true to her role of bulwark of Christianity and bastion of democracy.

The historic miracle on the Vistula halted the eastern aggressor in his attempt to bring enslavement to Poland and the world. The fate of Europe hung in the balance in that memorable battle. The whole world realized this fact at the time. Much was written and said about what was then going on in Poland. But the United States was not content with mere words. From the very moment in which Poland had regained her independence, America had been sending economic aid to the renascent republic. But something more had now become needed. The Polish soldier fought the Bolshevik invader with intrepid valor. But Poland had no airplanes. The Kosciusko squadron came into being in the United States. Its very name—a symbolic one—indicated that Americans remember their debt of gratitude to Poland and this great Polish patriot. Soon afterward a squadron of 12 American planes landed in Poland. Thirty years ago 12 airplanes were a great number. All of the members of the American squadron had volunteered. Their leader was an American—Maj. Cedric Fauntleroy. The American fighters for freedom were fighting for a common cause, arm in arm with the allied Polish nation.

According to the testimony of Polish military authorities, the American Kosciusko Squadron rendered invaluable service to the Polish cause. Out of 12 American aviators, 3 were killed on Polish soil while several were wounded. The second in command of the squadron, Capt. Marian Cooper, had to make a forced landing and was taken prisoner.

The then Polish Government expressed the nation's gratitude by decorating the American fighters with the Virtuti Militari. And so, during the period of the miracle on the Vistula, when through its unflinching will and courage the Polish nation tipped the scales of victory in favor of freedom and civilization—Americans came to its aid not only with words but with armed deeds.

Today, in a Poland governed by Moscow agents, the anniversary of the miracle on the Vistula is passed over in silence. There is nothing strange in that, for this date recalls that Poland is a bastion of Christian western culture and that she has never renounced her role. This date recalls the role Poland has played and will continue to play in the battle with the barbarian imperialism of the East.

But in exile, Polish soldiers and all Poles solemnly celebrate the anniversary of the miracle on the Vistula just as they used to celebrate it in free and independent Poland. Because of the friendship of the American Nation for the Polish people in days of glory and in days of enslavement as well, this anniversary is also a memorable date in America. And when on this day our thoughts go out to Poland, we do not even for a moment cease to believe that Poland will again be free and independent.

The Big Sleep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the tragic consequences of New Deal blunders are pouring in upon us day by day. Those who have voted for these blunders are now very sensitive to criticism. The time has come, however, when this kowtowing to New Deal propaganda, much of it on the Russian-Communist order, should not deter the Representatives of the people from airing the truth. Now that we can see what is happening as a result of wasted defense money and playing politics with the lives of our boys, there must be a forthright challenge on the part of the people to those who are responsible for the holocaust, the end of which, and the consequences of which cannot be known until a terrific price has been enacted in the way of human lives.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of August 15, 1950:

THE BIG SLEEP

We have gone from war to war again in the space of 5 years because, as four Republican members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee so truthfully state, two administrations—Roosevelt's and Truman's—slept the big sleep. Today is simply the tomorrow of Yalta and Potsdam.

But there is a bitterer and more important truth. That is that the people themselves were lulled by a magic potion called bipartisanism. The Republicans themselves seemed drugged by it. For too long a time there was no one to cry out that the sentry slept.

And now, once more, there is talk that we should drink it again. Those who venture to criticize the past or present conduct of our affairs, as these Republicans have done, are accused of playing politics; we should once more swallow the questions and the criticism, keep the war out of politics, and be bipartisan.

Nothing could be more dangerous. And for the proof of it we need look no further than the sorry state of affairs today.

What made Yalta and Potsdam possible? They stemmed first of all from the hallucination that the Communists were pleasant, peaceful people whose only desire was to join the fellowship of nations; and secondly from the nation that foreign affairs were a field forbidden to the people, that what the experts and the great leaders did must be accepted without question lest we destroy unity.

Both were blunders. But what reason did the people have for doubting them at the time? During the war and its aftermath there were few with the courage to strike at the illusion of Communist Russia or to question the wisdom of the great leaders. And the few who did speak were discredited and swept away with the easy slander that even to question was to play politics.

A man ran for President of the United States in the middle of a war and the plans for peace, yet, in the name of bipartisanism, he would debate neither the war nor the peace. The war won, distinguished and capable men still held to a moratorium on the use of one part of their critical faculties for fear of the fetish of bipartisanism.

The overt blunders, it is true, were committed by Democrats. But where, one may ask, were the Republicans? The Democrats were at least carrying out their function of proposing policy, however ill-chosen the policies. The Republicans, as the minority representatives, were not even carrying out their one and only function, which is to examine, to question, to criticize, and upon occasion to oppose.

All these things the Republicans did on domestic matters. But on foreign affairs they slept the sleep of bipartisanism. And then one day be awakened to find that the pleasant opiate was a Mickey Finn.

Neither the men in Korea nor the rest of us can now escape the consequences of past blunders. But it would be insanity to return to the drug that made them possible, to recommit our destiny into the unquestioned hands of the men who made them.

As never before we need, in the phrase of the four Senators, "to scrutinize relentlessly"—not only what was done but what is done and what is proposed to be done. Our greatest hope is that the four awakened Senators will awaken others and that the people will not again swallow this thing called bipartisanism. Else from the next big sleep we may be suddenly aroused by terrors unimagined.

Surplus Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., Sunday, August 6, 1950:

HUGE FOOD SURPLUS NOT FOR ARMY, NAVY—UNITED STATES WON'T GIVE IT TO SERVICES; EVEN INDIANS WON'T TAKE IT

(By George Minot)

The whole Government policy of buying food and taking it off the market to keep prices high was preposterous before Russia gave the Koreans the order to march. Now it is obsolete as well as being absurd.

Yet while the administration is pleading with people not to hoard, it is continuing to do the same thing itself. The consequences border on the ridiculous. In no other one thing in the tangled series of contradictions, uncertainties, and confusions that have characterized our domestic policy have our elected officials looked as pitiful.

If you were looking for anything on which to base your battle cry of "Let's throw the rascals out," you couldn't choose better than to take the whole silly matter of crop supports and food surpluses.

It was virtually unnoticed in the excitement that followed the treachery in Korea, but President Truman made one of the most extraordinary about-faces in a career that has been characterized by such incidents. That was when he asked Congress for authority to put these billions of dollars worth of surplus foods back on the market.

PRESIDENT DOES AN ABOUT-FACE

Under his proposal, sales of the Government-hoarded food would be made to wholesalers, thus presumably checking the rise in food prices. This would end price support by Government to the extent that Mr. Truman would exercise the authority he asked for.

This is a major change in policy here at home, just as we have changed our mind on what to do in Asia. In the past Mr. Truman has been for more and more support of crops and this policy has paid him big dividends in the farm States. He undoubtedly was less surprised than anybody else when Congressmen from the South and West would have nothing to do with his proposal. Most of them are up for reelection this fall and they want the farmers to love them as they did in 1948.

And you probably noticed that the happiest hoarder of them all, Secretary Brannan, scorned any proposal to dispose of food when he went before a Congress committee. Under the law, most of these surpluses of butter, dried eggs, potatoes, cheese, wheat, and corn, among others, can be sold only at 5 percent above the support price. This should be removed.

It is better to go along with the newest idea of the President and make it possible to unload the hoarded food at the price the Government paid, not only to halt scare buying, but to get rid of a lot of the stuff that is spoiling.

CAN'T UNLOAD THEM

Brannan asked Congress only for $50,000,000 to repackage and transport some of the spoilable surpluses now piling up.

He is having a terrible time giving them away to overseas organizations in the welfare field, to persons on relief rolls and for consumption in the school-lunch program. Nobody wants them, but the Government under the law has to go on losing millions in order to keep the prices up. Even the Indians who are on the schedule for the free handouts have sent word to Washington that they have had enough.

While the storage and refrigeration bills are piling up for the Department of Agriculture, the Defense Department is trying to figure out how much extra money it is going to need to buy butter, eggs, cheese, and dried milk for our expanded fighting forces, both in camps in this country and overseas.

Do you think the Army and Navy can have any of those millions of tons of surplus food Brannan has stored all over the country? Now don't be silly. Of course not. That is not the way this Government does business.

POLITICAL HOWL

Of course it is all owned by the Government, and you, the taxpayers, bought it. To a sensible person, it would seem to be logical simply to turn over a few hundred thousand pounds of surplus butter to our fighting forces. But you have forgotten one thing. That wouldn't be good politics.

There would be an awful howl from the farm belt, and it was those States that used to be in the Republican column that carried the Democrats to victory 2 years ago. You wouldn't want to offend those farmers in an election year, would you?

Even if Mr. Truman would like to change the price-support program he can't get the other Democrats to go along with him—either in Congress or in the Agriculture Department. Instead, Secretary Brannan is trying to explain that all his hoarded food has been "a stabilizing factor to counteract sudden inflation of food prices."

In asking for his $50,000,000 to repackage and move some of the stuff, Brannan revealed how rapidly this perishable food has been piling up. For instance, in the year ending the middle of July he bought 208,000,000 pounds of dried eggs, 228,000,000 pounds of butter, 609,000,000 pounds of dried milk and 94,000,000 pounds of cheese.

STORY ON GRAIN

Nobody really knows how much of this stuff he had a year ago, but Brannan realizes there is danger of a $281,000,000 loss if he can't find a way to dispose of a lot of it now—that is, as long as the Army and Navy doesn't get it.

Hoarded grain isn't quite as embarrassing to the Government, but the support price of feed works a terrible hardship on Massachusetts farmers who produce poultry and dairy products. They are dependent on the feed they must have through shipments from the West and this is kept at an artificially high price while the Government bins literally are bursting with the surplus.

Senator SALTONSTALL pointed out the other day how the local farmer is caught in the squeeze and how the Government is working against his best interests.

In 1949, 6¾ dozen eggs would buy 100 pounds of feeds. This year it takes 9¾ dozen to buy the same thing. A year ago it required 11⅗ pounds of poultry meat to buy 100 pounds of feed. Now it takes 21 pounds. In 1949, 100 pounds of milk would buy 123 pounds of grain. Now it will buy only 112 pounds.

CUT IN HALF

Thus it isn't surprising that since the middle of 1949 our poultry farmers' returns over feed costs, in the sale of eggs, have been about half those received the year before.

But SALTONSTALL added he was even more interested in the consumers, who are getting the rawest deal out of this whole silly support program. In a Senate speech just before the outbreak of the present emergency, he put it better than perhaps it had been put before:

"The consumers of my State have repeatedly written to me that they cannot understand why the taxpayers' money is used to buy farm commodities which are then stored out of reach of the consumer, in many cases until they are unfit for human consumption. This the people of Massachusetts cannot understand. They believe it to be foolishness. * * * Could there be a greater paradox than exists in this situation? The American taxpayer and consumer is being asked to pay money in taxes for price support on the one hand so that he may have the doubtful privilege of paying excessively high prices for his food on the other."

If Mr. Truman wants to reverse himself now and if he is sincere in asking Congress for authority to get rid of his tons of surplus, for goodness' sake let him. And then see if that can't be the opening wedge in ending the whole foolish program. Pretty soon the Department of Agriculture is going to have 65,000,000 bushels of new potatoes on its hands that nobody wants. Then we start all over again.

Investigations of the Buchanan Lobby Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Buchanan Lobby Committee announced that, in the course of its investigation of the Civil Rights Congress, it had examined the records of the Amalgamated Bank, of New York.

It is to wonder whether the Buchanan committee learned the facts concerning the payment of Gerhardt Eisler's defaulted bond—defaulted when he left the country on the Russian vessel *Batory* to assume his present position as chief propagandist for the Soviets in the Russian zone of Germany.

Here are the facts:

Eisler's defaulted bond was paid with a certified check drawn on the Amalgamated Bank, of New York, drawn against the Civil Rights Congress' bail bond fund; and that certified check was delivered to, and accepted by, the clerk of the District Court of the United States in and for the District of Columbia.

The check was drawn by the trustees of the Civil Rights Congress' bail bond fund which, it would seem, must have been created to provide bail bonds for other Communists than Eisler, as the name of the fund would seem to imply.

These facts may be verified by inquiry of Harry Hull, Esq., clerk, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

The Amalgamated Bank of New York, along with several others of the same name, is owned by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union, which union also owns and operates many other commercial businesses throughout the country, including a chain of four frequency modulation radio stations, licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. A few years ago, that union represented to the FCC, in writing, that its commercial concerns represented investments of more than $81,000,000.

One of the union's frequency modulation radio stations—WFDR, of New York City—has a working arrangement with a Washington, D. C., frequency modulation station, namely, WCFM, the officials and stockholders of which have somewhat questionable backgrounds and connections for being in the radio business.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union was headed by Sidney Hillman—of "clear it with Sidney" fame—during the lifetime of that labor leader.

Let us hope the Buchanan committee develops the facts of these matters, and reports them to the House.

Universal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a pointed and challenging editorial, Universal Service, appearing in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., of August 11, 1950:

UNIVERSAL TRAINING

For a long time this country has resisted the idea of universal military training. The atmosphere of compulsion, intrinsic in such a system, does not mix easily with the air of free democracy which we are used to breathing. As a peace-loving nation, we would much prefer to have our young men preoccupied with planning useful careers for themselves than to start them off with a tough, hardening course in war tactics designed primarily to teach them how to fight and kill.

But, the world situation being what it is these days, we are coming to the realization that we cannot always have things as we like them. The Korean war, for the second time in less than a decade, has taught us a lesson on the cast of the lack of preparedness, and the international crisis, as it goes along, seems to get worse instead of better. Certainly there is no easy solution on the horizon, and many in positions of authority believe there will not be for years to come.

The course of events is forcing us to a decision that will have to be faced soon, regardless of how the fighting goes in the Far East, for this is a basic issue that goes deep into the family fabric. How it will be settled will affect virtually every American to a greater or lesser extent. It will have far-reaching consequences on our way of life for years to come.

Congress has long shied from taking a stand. But now it will have to do so. It was learned yesterday, through a spokesman for the Defense Department, that a bill for universal military training is already in process of preparation and will be presented in short order. It will require training for all youths of 18 and 19.

Contrasted with the draft, this will not be a rush job. It will not even go into effect until after the Korean war, regardless of whether it wins early passage or not. It is designed to bring our country up to snuff on a long-term basis in conformance with the uncertain days that lie ahead.

It will be hard to argue against the need of such a measure in these times. It will be a step toward stability in a field where we have blown hot and cold in the past with costly results. Certainly we do not intend to let our military machine rust after the Korean war, as we did after each of the two World Wars, only to be caught by surprise again, with consequent heavy loss of life at the start and an immeasurably harder job to be done than if we had been ready in the first place.

There is much to be said for UMT also on the grounds of responsibility and education. The training, under such a program, would not be all for war. Its instruction would be mental as well as physical, with many facets reaching into courses of college caliber. It would provide openings for many boys that might not otherwise have a chance to develop their talents. And it would indoctrinate in all a sense of duty and responsibility toward their country that would make them better citizens the rest of their lives.

Our better minds are all for such a program. A special committee of civilians 3 years ago recommended that it be adopted. President Truman has said that he is in favor of it. Now the final word rests with Congress.

That it will be expensive, quite aside from the human angle, goes without saying. At the start it will cost an estimated $600,000,000 a year, rising to a possible $2,000,000,000 later. It will involve 900,000 youths annually, as well as 200,000 military men who will be needed to train them.

The project is of great magnitude, indeed. But so are the stakes of the international game in which it will strengthen our hand.

Well Done, Tribute to American Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude and the thanks of my people

in Minnesota's Ninth Congressional District to the American Red Cross for the aid it furnished during the Red River Valley floods this spring and summer.

The disaster services of the Red Cross county chapter chairmen in the disaster area—Paul Hanson, Kittson County; Clarence B. Johnson, Marshall County; Philip A. Anderson, Polk County; A. H. Fikkan, Roseau County; and Oliver W. Poole, Clay County.

A report on the disaster flood-relief program of the American Red Cross as given to me in a letter dated August 8, 1950, by C. F. Rowland, assistant administrator, disaster services, American Red Cross, follows:

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D. C., August 8, 1950.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
United States House of Representatives, Washington D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HAGEN: The American Red Cross has just terminated its disaster relief program in North Dakota and western Minnesota which has been in operation since March 28.

We thought you might be interested in some of the statistics included in the final report of the operation as they affect the state of Minnesota. The director of this particular operation reports on the very excellent cooperation received from the Governor of the State and all the State agencies involved and also speaks most highly of the service rendered by over 450 volunteers who worked long hours over an extended period of time helping to relieve the suffering and assisting their neighbors who were unfortunate enough to be victims of this disaster.

This disaster covered a distance of approximately 700 miles, extending from Bowman County in the southwestern part of North Dakota to the Lake of the Woods in the northwestern part of Minnesota. We have operated in five counties in the State of Minnesota. There were no lives lost during the evacuation but four deaths were contributed to the disaster; one man in Marshall County was electrocuted when a high-tension wire broke and fell into the water near where he was standing. Two persons were killed in Crookston when their house was demolished by a gas explosion caused by the high water and one boy was drowned in Moorhead when he broke through the ice on the flooded area. We estimate that 3,150 families suffered a loss. Of this number 1,777 families requested assistance. One thousand four hundred and ninety-eight families were given emergency assistance in one or more of the following services: Mass feeding, mass shelter, transportation and feed for livestock. In addition, 241 families received individual assistance. There were 153 houses repaired and 3 houses built. We also repaired 14 and built 22 barns and other buildings.

The total amount spent for relief was $81,349.35, and was distributed as follows:

Rescue, transportation, and shelter	$25,327.10
Food and clothing	7,594.26
Rebuilding and repair	33,721.11
Medical, nursing, and sanitation	1,482.21
Household furnishings	11,794.06
Farm supplies, livestock, and equipment	1,430.61

Relief expenditures, by counties, are shown below:

Minnesota

Kittson County	$15,229.96
Marshall County	18,392.82
Polk County	44,616.16
Clay County	2,088.39
Roseau County	1,022.02

Our statistics covering estimated property damage caused by this flood in Minnesota are as follows:

Number of homes destroyed	27
Number of homes damaged	240
Number of other buildings destroyed	133
Number of other buildings damaged	1,040

Very truly yours,

C. F. ROWLAND,
Assistant Administrator, Disaster Services.

Lay Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as some publications, like the Washington Post, and some individuals, like the Roosevelts and President Truman, have over the years regarded communism as a heresy, not a conspiracy, and its exponents and advocates as superior individuals, superintellectuals, exercising the right of free thought, speech, and press, even though the net result of their efforts, if successful, would be the overthrow of our Government, now that communism and its disciples are being recognized for what they are, a conspiracy to overthrow our Government, either by force or subterfuge, let those who have criticized, attempted to intimidate and silence, all who over the years have been attempting to expose and eradicate communism and its adherents, lay off.

America is now reaping a harvest of thorns and thistles as the result of their sowing. The least they can now do is to cease to claim the right to tell us where we should go from here.

An editorial from the South Bend Tribune of August 11, captioned "Great change," reads as follows:

GREAT CHANGE

As the Christian Science Monitor expresses it the American tradition up to June 25, 1950, was "more or less willingness to consider communism at home a heresy, not a conspiracy." To a marked extent that tradition was primarily official, not popular. Most Americans at least sensed that communism actually was a conspiracy instead of a mere heresy and were inclined to approve of protective measures in conformity with the conspiracy situation. In Washington, especially in the executive branch, the attitude toward Communists was essentially unrealistic.

Communists and fellow travelers made the most of the opportunities provided for them by the official attitude in the war years. Since 1945, even while the revolutionary, conspiratorial nature of communism was becoming plainer every day, avowed Reds and persons who were pro-Communist while refraining from actual Communist membership have benefited by official tolerance. By waiting until the war in Korea developed to act in accordance with the long-plain fact that communism is a conspiracy the Truman administration forfeited public acclamation for forthright, realistic action against the Reds in this country.

Now President Truman is recommending extension of the Foreign Agents' Reservation Act to cover Communists and impliedly fellow travelers. A Federal judge in San Francisco, convinced that Harry Bridges is one of the most important Communist figures in America, has ruled that the alien longshoremen's union leader is ineligible for bail. It looks as if much damage has been done by the prolonged official pretense that communism was a mere domestic heresy. Many Americans are relieved by the signs of a more realistic official attitude from now on.

But it is not enough that communism be stamped out here. There is no reason at all why those who tolerated it and by their tolerance encouraged it should now be accepted as guides pointing the way out of the potentially disastrous situation in which we are involved.

Let us have some concrete evidence that their apparent repentance is sincere, a cessation of their efforts to tell the rest of us what to think, say, and do.

Address by Senator Martin at American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at the annual convention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, held at Philadelphia on August 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT PHILADELPHIA

It is always an inspiration to attend the meetings of the American Legion.

Since it was organized in Paris 31 years ago, the Legion has worked ceaselessly to spread the gospel of real Americanism.

Not only has the Legion preached patriotism and loyalty to the flag, but it has exerted all its powerful influence toward building American strength as a bulwark of peace and freedom in the world.

Through all its existence the American Legion has been guided by the sacred principles formulated here in the city of Philadelphia 174 years ago.

Grave problems confronted the founding fathers when they met in the Old State House to establish a new Nation.

They had no thought of personal safety when they defied the armed might of the British Empire.

They knew that the struggle for American liberty would be long and perilous.

They knew that victory would not be achieved without blood, suffering and sacrifice.

But they faced the future with faith, confidence and courage. In signing the Declaration of Independence they proclaimed their "firm reliance in the protection of Divine Providence" and pledged to each other "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

We of the American Legion meet here today in the shadow of Independence Hall. We meet at a time when the United States faces problems just as grave as those of 1776.

To preserve American freedom and to have the world from Communist slavery calls for the same courageous spirit of sacrifice.

Again we are called upon to pledge "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor" in the cause of freedom.

To every member of the Legion and to every other loyal American those soul-stirring words have the same meaning as they did 174 years ago.

It should be perfectly clear to everyone that the Godless philosophy of communism aims to conquer and dominate the world.

It should be perfectly clear that we face a well organized and strongly equipped offensive which hopes to overrun and destroy every nation where human rights are recognized.

It should now be perfectly clear that the conflict in Korea is not just a little war to be fought and won in a short time by heroes on the front line.

We would be lacking in patriotism if we closed our eyes to the fact that the blazing battle line in Korea may spread into the fury of world war III on many fronts in the Far East and in Europe.

How many previous American lives must be lost before we fully understand that the future of civilization hangs in the balance and that the outcome will be decided by the measure of American military and spiritual strength?

I believe most Americans are aware by this time that we are headed for a final showdown.

It may not come immediately. Will it come this year, next year, or within the next 10 years?

It is not within the power of any of us to answer that question. But I am firmly convinced, and I am sure my comrades of the Legion agree with me, that the showdown is coming and we must be prepared.

To the everlasting credit of the Legion it must be said that it was among the first to warn against the dangerous course we were following.

Long before World War II the Legion demanded that we be prepared to meet any threat from fascism or communism or any other alien philosophy which sought to destroy freedom.

The Legion advocated that we build up our Army into the most powerful striking force in the world, that we strengthen our Navy on every ocean and that we give our Air Force complete superiority over that of any potential enemy.

The Legion sought support for universal military training so that Uncle Sam would have a reservoir of men ready for service in any emergency.

The Legion advocated industrial preparation so that when necessary the tremendous productive capacity of the United States could be converted immediately to war production.

The Legion demanded that every Red and every fellow-traveler be removed from positions in the Government where many held places of trust and importance.

If your plan of an adequate national defense and 100 percent Americanism had been heeded there might have been no Pearl Harbor and no South Korea.

The Legion program for national defense was not popular but it had my complete support. Back in May of 1947 I had the honor of addressing the national convention of the Legion in Indianapolis.

In my speech I said, and I quote:

"While war with Russia may not be imminent we must be ready for any eventuality—strong, alert, and united at home. We've got to keep America a powerful enemy and a powerful friend abroad.

"Our national defense must be based upon the ideals of a republic. That means equal obligation as well as equal rights for every citizen. In the kind of world we live in today, in which things happen swiftly, equal obligation means to me universal military training. That is the only way to be ready on time when an emergency occurs.

"I stand for, and I know the American Legion stands for, a highly trained Regular Army, backed by a well-organized, properly trained civilian reserve.

"We should have the best and strongest Navy and the best and strongest Air Force we can conceive.

"We had them in the recent war. Only fools would think of surrendering them now.

"No matter how hard we hope and pray, this world and this Nation have not yet finished with conflict for all time.

"Until the aggressor nations agree to lay down their arms and prove they want to live at peace with us, let us keep our muscles hard.

"An America gone soft and flabby is an America inviting attack.

"Behind the front line of steel and fire we must keep our industry, our labor, and our agriculture ready."

But we failed to keep our muscles hard. And today we are paying the price of our unpreparedness with the lives of American boys who are fighting against heavy odds in far off Korea.

Why do we find ourselves in this critical situation?

Why are we faced today with nearly all of Asia and a large part of Europe under Communist domination?

Let me tell you why. It is because we sold out one country after another—at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam—in the hope of appeasing Joe Stalin.

Because our leaders threw in the ash can the recommendations and the warnings of Gen. Pat Hurley, General Wedemeyer, and other real Americans, and followed the advice of fuzzy-minded pro-Communists in the State Department like Alger Hiss.

Because the Truman-Acheson policy in the Far East was responsible for one blunder after another.

Because our Government announced publicly that we would not defend South Korea or Fomosa, giving the Communists a formal invitation to take a free ride.

Then, when President Truman suddenly reversed that policy, we found ourselves outnumbered and outgunned in Korea, completely unprepared to stop the Communist-trained and equipped North Korean divisions.

It was shocking to learn that of the $90,000,000,000 appropriated by Congress for defense during the last 5 years only nine billions were spent for new aircraft, ships, tanks, and other weapons.

That figure and the developments in Korea make it perfectly clear that we are totally unprepared now to meet a formidable foe.

It was estimated recently by Winston Churchill that Russia today has 175 active divisions and that within a few months she could put 300 divisions in the field. Of the active divisions one-third are mechanized or armored.

What do we have to match that strength.

If the Communists should strike tomorrow in western Europe, using half of their divisions, the defending forces of the United States, England, France, and Belgium combined would number only 12 divisions, of which only two are armored.

Well, my comrades, the big question now is, What are we going to do about it?

I can't answer that question because Washington today is a bedlam of political confusion. The administration in control apparently has no definite plan of action. There is delay, hesitation, and pussyfooting at a time when decisions of paramount importance must be made.

Playing for political advantage, whether by Democrats or Republicans, is too dangerous when the safety and welfare of the American people are at stake.

Politics should have no part in the defense of the United States.

The American people should be told now that the present situation calls for immediate and complete mobilization of all our forces, military, labor, industrial, agricultural, financial, and spiritual.

We must arm to the hilt—now—because this time there will be no one to hold off the enemy while we get ready as our allies did in World War I and World War II.

We must do everything possible to stabilize our economy and to prevent inflation.

This calls for rigid control of materials needed for war production.

It calls for immediate freezing of prices and wages to prevent a race between earring and the cost of living. Price control cannot be effective without wage control.

All Government spending not connected with national defense must be cut to the bone.

The American people should be told, completely and honestly, the dangers that may be encountered on the road ahead.

They should be told, fully and fairly, the sacrifices they may be called upon to make if we are involved in total war.

They should be told about the sharply increased burden of taxation they will be called upon to assume to pay the cost of our Nation's defense.

The people should be given this information now. It should not be delayed until after the November election.

When the American people are honestly informed they can be trusted to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary, willingly and patriotically.

If we are to retain our freedom as we Americans know it, we must pay for the cost of this war as nearly as possible out of current revenues.

When are comrades are giving their lives in battle no patriotic American should be thinking in terms of increased profits, bigger dividends, or higher wages.

We have come to a time when everyone of us should be willing to push all his chips into the game.

All that counts is victory.

During World War II, we observed how certain selfish and unpatriotic men enriched themselves by profiteering and in black-market operations.

There was tax dodging, price gouging, hoarding, artificial scarcities, and other illicit practices which sabotaged the war effort.

Some became millionaires overnight, so to speak, at the expense of their fellow citizens, while the flower of American youth gave their lives for their country on foreign soil.

This time it must not happen. It will not happen if an aroused public puts patriotism first and cooperates to prevent such dastardly practices.

Those who take advantage of war for their own personal enrichment while their fellow Americans endure the hardships and tragedies of war deserve the contempt of every real American. They belong behind prison bars. They are traitors to their country.

While we are preparing to defend freedom in the world against Communist aggression overseas, let us not relax our vigilance against the spread of communism at home.

Every enrolled Communist is an enemy of the United States. They advocate the overthrow of our Government by force. They are traitors to the country which has given them freedom, opportunity, and protection.

Steps should be taken to revoke the citizenship of those who have been naturalized and they should be deported. All native-born Communists should be placed where they can do no damage to our American institutions.

There is no group in the United States with such an important part to play in this crisis as the American Legion.

We may have a hard road to travel. But Americans in every generation have endured defeats and hardship to gain liberty and to sustain it.

Our forefathers fought for freedom. They carried their flintlock rifles, with fixed bayonets, in order to gain that freedom.

In subsequent wars all over the world men have carried their rifles, with fixed bayonets; they have fought on every sea; they have battled in the air; and they have gone under water in order to protect those freedoms.

Regardless of the brutal hand of the Reds in Korea, this is no time for hysteria in the United States.

We must not be dismayed. We must tighten our belts and work and fight harder.

We must have courageous leadership. We must have willing discipline. We must move forward with our flags flying.

The American flag in this crisis must be the banner of 100-percent freedom of the individual. It must be 100 percent for tolerance and 100 percent against bigotry. It is the flag of 100-percent Americanism.

We will welcome the flags of all nations, who believe in God, in individual freedom, and tolerance.

All those flags can wave gloriously together, symbolizing faith in our ideals, faith in ourselves, and faith in our God. With these ideals in our hearts, we will come forth victorious.

Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Thursday, August 10, 1950:

Before another day passes the American people should come to grips with the tremendous decision they face in Formosa. The statement of Averell Harriman following his hurried trip to Japan makes it clear that if there is to be a change in policy, the people will have to press it upon the Government.

At this moment the United States stands on the brink of a far graver danger than Korea. It faces the possibility of war with China. It would enter such a war not only without United Nations sanction but without allies and even against the desires of its best friends in Europe and Asia. It risks, indeed, not only war but the turning of Asia to communism.

Why? To defend the principle of nonaggression, as in Korea? No. Formosa is involved in a civil war in China, with no line crossed and no indictment of an aggressor. To obtain a vital military base? No. Formosa is less than vital if America strongly holds Okinawa and the Philippines.

Why then? Because emotionally, politically, and financially certain groups in the United States are committed to the Chiang Kai-shek regime. Many Americans have become accustomed to regard it as the best agency for American efforts to check Cominform plans in Asia. Others greatly admire the long struggle of Generalissimo and Madame Chiang against Japan and the Reds.

But has not America fulfilled its obligation to the Chiangs? Will not continued support of them harm the struggle to save Asia from communism and from Russian domination? Can anyone cite impartial testimony which holds that Chiang can rewin the confidence of the Chinese people or defeat the armies of Mao? Are not the anti-Communist forces in China more likely to form around new leadership, free from the record of corruption, incompetence, and unpopularity which clings to the Chiang regime?

What are the likely results of continued support of the Chiangs? Embroilment with the Chinese Reds. That is the Chiangs' best hope—as it is Stalin's. Moscow doubtless counts also on such a course promoting Russian and Communist influence by further alienating Asian opinion—plainly stated by India—which supports the United Nations in Korea but not America in China.

The decision announced on June 27 to interpose the American fleet between Formosa and the mainland was a reversal of earlier refusals to intervene in China's civil war. It aimed at neutralizing Formosa and leaving its future status to negotiation and possible determination by the UN. But the commitment appears too small to insure protection of Formosa and too great to avoid entanglement.

There should be no glossing over of the ugly features of an alternative policy. It would risk Red China's conquest of Formosa. The American people should face all the implications of that risk. They should also recognize that the present policy does not escape it. And they should count the positive advantages of freeing themselves from all the risks entailed by continued involvement with the Chiangs—including the possibility of war on the Chinese mainland.

Stockholm Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have here a clipping from this morning's New York Times which demonstrates conclusively the urgent need for the passage of the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston Communist registration bill, S. 2311.

This clipping tells of a prominent Canadian clergyman, editor in chief of the United Church Observer, a periodical which reaches 2,000,000 people, who signed the phony Stockholm peace petition, and has now repudiated his signature.

He said he signed the petition in good faith on the ground that the appeal was one to which any peace lover might honestly subscribe. Subsequently, he discovered his picture spread across the Toronto Communist newspaper, the Canadian Tribune, revealing the close tie-up between the Communist and this phony peace petition.

"Had I known of the tie-up between the petitioners and the Communists," he declared, "I would certainly have had nothing whatsoever to do with it."

Mr. President, hundreds of thousands of well-wishing people have been similarly deluded by the cunning front strategy used by the Communists.

It is precisely for the protection of these people that S. 2311 provides for the complete identification and registration of Communist conspirators. Innocent people, busy with their daily affairs, do not have the skill or the facilities of following the Communist cunning and strategy. For their protection there is required careful criteria, expertly administered by competent Government authorities, to expose Communist-front strategy.

This protection is provided by S. 2311 which ought to be passed at once.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SIGNER CONDEMNS STOCKHOLM APPEAL—EDITOR OF CHURCH PAPER WARNS CANADIANS AGAINST PETITION AS LINKED WITH REDS

(By George Dugan)

TORONTO, August 14.—One of the signers of the so-called Stockholm peace appeal warned Canadian clergymen and churchgoers today to refrain from adding their signatures to the controversial petition, despite their "passion for peace."

The warning was voiced by the Reverend Dr. A. J. Wilson, editor-in-chief of the United Church Observer, in the leading editorial of the periodical's August 15 issue, out today.

The Observer, published in Toronto, is the official organ of the church, which claims a membership of nearly 2,000,000 persons.

Dr. Wilson said he had signed the petition "in good faith" several weeks ago on the ground that the appeal was "one to which any peace lover might honestly subscribe."

Shortly thereafter, he wrote, "My picture was published under a six-column banner heading in the Toronto Communist paper, the Canadian Tribune. This demonstrated a close tie-up between the sponsors of the petition and the Communists."

APPEAL IS CONDEMNED

Subsequently, Dr. Wilson added the central committee of the World Council of Churches, meeting here, warned church members that the Stockholm appeal must be regarded as a "strategy of propaganda rather than a genuine peace proposal."

With that judgment "I am, in the light of my experiences, in full accord," he declared.

"Had I known of the tie-up between the petitioners and the Communists, which the hurried publication of my picture in the Tribune and the subsequent news release have established beyond the shadow of a doubt, I would certainly have had nothing whatsoever to do with it."

The editorial was written, Dr. Wilson noted, after he had received a query from the Montreal Gazette asking confirmation of an announcement from the Canadian Peace Congress that he had signed the appeal.

Dr. Wilson said he was publishing the exchange of correspondence "to make clear to our readers the views of the editor, and to warn ministers and members of the church what they may expect if their passion for peace should lead them, as it led us, to sign the peace petition, which is widely circulated and has come to be known as the 'Stockholm Appeal.'"

OUTLAWING OF BOMB URGED

The Stockholm appeal was issued last March by the Congress of Partisans of Peace. It demanded the outlawing of atomic weapons but without "effective" international inspection and control.

At a press interview this afternoon, the Reverend Dr. Toyohiko Kagawa, Japanese evangelist, said that he had expected the outbreak of the Korean war. The Japanese clergyman is here to address the World Convention on Christian Education, now in session at the University of Toronto.

He predicted that even if the North Koreans were driven back to the Thirty-eighth Parallel they would continue to be a threat.

Asked if the Korean conflict might lead to a third world war, Dr. Kagawa replied that the crisis in that country was a "continuation of the Second World War."

He discounted the possibility of an increase in Communist strength in his country.

Secretary Brannan's Zeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Secretary Brannan's Zeal," published in the New York Herald Tribune of August 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY BRANNAN'S ZEAL

It is strange to find Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan so disturbed about the recent rises in some commodity prices. He is the campaigning Secretary who has developed a whole Federal program to maintain farm prices at a high level. But since the Korean emergency, with its resultant stimulant to prices, he has been militantly seeking out speculators on the several commodity exchanges with intent to bring legal action against them if he possibly can. He has succeeded in arousing some public sentiment against speculation as though it were something reprehensible and had no place in the economy of the Nation, though, for the volume of energy he has expended in this direction, the interest is relatively pathetic.

There is more than concern for the administration's useful little people in this outcry from Mr. Brannan and his speculator-probing Commodity Exchange Authority. Pending before Congress is the administration's bill for economic controls and in it is authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to fix margins on futures trading in the seven commodities under the Commodity Exchange Act. These commodities—wheat, soybeans, cottonseed oil, lard, eggs, wool tops, and cotton—account for 90 percent of the trading. This would give the politically operated Department of Agriculture strong control over the market places of the Nation's commodity buyers and users.

Unlawful speculation is policed at all times. It is hard to get away with anything which violates the letter of the Exchange Act. Because commodity prices rose after the Korean incident, it should not indicate anything more than is indicated by the price rises in other goods and services. The use of futures trading to hedge against price fluctuations is an old, honorable device to maintain equable operating costs throughout the year and assure stable retail prices. Without the speculator there would be no futures market in which to hedge. Care should be taken by Congress to see that nothing is done to upset the established and natural function of this important center-cog of the Nation's economic machinery. Mr. Brannan has done little to show he would be able to administer commodity trading any better than those who do it now under a free system.

Will Farmers Be the Goats of a Wartime Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Will Farmers Be the Goats of a Wartime Inflation?" I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in full, and also the table, which was prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, which was released in May 1950, together with the figures thereon.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Farmers Union Herald of St. Paul, Minn., for August 7, 1950]

WILL FARMERS BE THE GOATS OF A WARTIME INFLATION?

Farmers have been squeezed since the end of World War II by falling prices and increasing costs. Will they be the goats again of inflation if prices are frozen or rolled back?

Here is the record of what farmers have received in terms of wages. Will the freeze be at two bits an hour or on a par with labor and industry?

Type of farming	Hourly wage, 1937 to 1941	Hourly wage, 1948	Hourly wage, 1949
Spring wheat, wheat roughage, livestock	$0.25	$1.57	$0.64
Corn Belt cash-grain farmer	.35	1.62	1.07
Corn Belt farmer, hog, dairy	.24	1.02	.81
Spring wheat small-grain farmer	.28	1.65	.95

The above figures are from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, released in May 1950.

The figures represent what you get when you divide all your net earnings by the number of hours of all labor used on your farm.

Farmers demand stability at full parity.

Improvement of Our Intelligence Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article. This letter appeared in the column of the Boston Sunday Herald, Boston, Mass., August 13, 1950:

FORMER ZACHARIAS AIDE QUESTIONS SET-UP

To the EDITOR of the HERALD:

I have just read Senator SALTONSTALL'S plea for support of our countrymen in Korea, Bill Cunningham's analysis of the Korean situation, and your splendid editorial entitled "Prophecy of Peril," in which you analyze my former associate, Admiral Zacharias' forthcoming book, Behind Closed Doors.

In view of the above it is interesting to recall some suggestions we made in 1944. At that time I was serving as a special assistant to Admiral Zacharias, who was then deputy director of naval intelligence. We had just completed a personnel audit of the United States Naval Intelligence Service, for which work we were ostracized and divorced from intelligence activity. (Incidentally, the Earl Report on the United State Naval Intelligence Service, which has never been declassified as a secret document to my knowledge, might make interesting reading for some of the brass in Washington now.) Admiral King, who was one of the really great naval officers of all time, thought that our intelligence activities could be improved. We agreed and set out on the task of doing it.

Generally it was our notion that we would have to sharpen to razor keenness our real and partially developed skills of intelligence and psychological action. We felt that it was important to do this so that we could prevent war and win the peace. It seemed to us that intelligence soundly conceived, properly organized, and well administered offered the most fruitful avenue along which to proceed toward peace.

We felt rather strongly that the force of ideas, proven time after time, of tremendous effectiveness during the war was undeniably an area of effort which needed further methods, although necessary in some areas were felt to be about as important as the massed infantry attack, and, about as effective. It seemed to us that psychological action so effectively developed by the Russians could well be the mechanism by which we could lose the peace, and perhaps the very things we were fighting for.

Unfortunately for this country our notions fell on deaf ears, or our writings commanded the eyes of men who could not read. All except one, and that one, a great man, and a strong one, Jim Forrestal. He agreed with us. Admiral Zacharias' broadcasts to the Japs resulted. These were practical manifestations of what we meant by ideological intelligence activities.

Our stupid national policies soon caught up with our efforts. There was the larger problem of the unification of our armed services. Intelligence was shelved. Knowledge of what a potential enemy was going to do was again relegated to the "cookie pusher." To all intents and purposes effective, dynamic as opposed to static, intelligence activities went by the board. There seemed to be a feeling pervading our national thought that the usefulness and necessity of psychological action agencies, and dynamic intelligence organizations terminated with the cessation of hostilities. How fatal this kind of thinking has been is known only to our dead and rotting countrymen in Korea.

The future security of this country depends largely on an objective and scientific approach to the basic functional problem of the most propitious use of our intellectual faculties.

Although the present outlook is grim and very grave, I for one have faith and a firm belief in the inherent ability of our leaders finally to focus their attention on problems that need attention and with fairness to all and spite toward none clearly and intelligently solve those problems. I hope they don't wait too long before focusing on it.

The Russians, our present opponents are students of the psyche (the mind), and have long known to be, they have perfected this form of warfare to a point where it is as effective as the blitzkreig first was. It seems to me that we had better perceive this and understand the characteristics of the people with whom we have to deal and provide a mechanism which can deal with them.

You imply that Admiral Zacharias has a few axes to grind, including by implication the sale of his book. I associated personally with Admiral Zacharias for more than 3 years on and off, and since for upward of 10 years in all. He is absolutely of sterling integrity. There is no finer naval officer in the country today. There is no better informed man on intelligence activities. His treatment by the United States Navy is shocking, perhaps as shocking as his book is. He is a great American, a true patriot, a man who has unselfishly taken on the mission of trying by his books and lectures to teach the uninformed something about the finer arts of intelligence activities. If by these activities he is able to better promote the mission, I say praise God, for we are pretty nearly in the position of being desperately in need of divine guidance.

It seems to me that the time has come when we had better do a little hard and clear thinking.

ELLIOTT EARL.

Aid to Franco Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the St. Louis Post Dispatch, one dated August 3 and the other dated August 4, pointing out the significance and seriousness of the Senate action recently in voting aid to Franco Spain. The editorials express the opposition and the concern of many people and groups in connection with this action, and urge the House of Representatives to rectify the error of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 4, 1950]

FIFTEEN SENATORS VINDICATED

President Truman displayed leadership by his prompt and direct oppostion to the O'Mahoney amendment to the foreign aid bill. This amendment attempts to order the Export-Import Bank to lend $100,000,000 to Franco for his limping regime in Spain.

As Mr. Truman says, such an amendment is entirely out of place in the foreign-aid bill. It should be removed. If the Senate does not rescind its ill-considered act, the job will be one for the House. The bill should not be sent to the White House with this out-of-place amendment tacked on.

Secretary of State Acheson also pointed out the impropriety of a shotgun order from Congress to the Export-Import Bank for a Spanish loan. Thus, this 65 to 15 vote in the heavily Democratic Senate has now been repudiated by the two officials most responsible for American foreign policy, the President and his Secretary of State.

The sponsor of this headlong amendment was Senator O'MAHONEY of Wyoming and its supporters included Senators MCCARRAN of Nevada, O'CONOR of Maryland, and MCCARTHY of Wisconsin.

Since the side of the 15 opposing Senators has now been upheld by President Truman and Secretary Acheson, this small band deserves to be saluted for its courage. They did not know they would have such high-placed support. They voted against the Franco amendment because they believed it was bad business. Their constituents deserve to know who they are:

Republicans: MORSE, Oregon; ECTON, Montana; FLANDERS, Vermont; and WILLIAMS, Delaware.

Democrats: ANDERSON, New Mexico; BENTON, Connecticut; BYRD, Virginia; DOUGLAS, Illinois; FREAR, Delaware; GRAHAM, North Carolina; GREEN, Rhode Island; HILL, Alabama; HUMPHREY, Minnesota; LEHMAN, New York; and THOMAS, Utah.

Delaware has the satisfaction of knowing that both of its Senators voted "no."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 3, 1950]

AND NOW FRANCO

Secretary of State Acheson's opposition to the proposed $100,000,000 loan to the Franco dictatorship in Spain is qualified, but it is welcome however limited. Surely the House will now give more thought to what is involved than did the Senate when it passed the loan bill by the headlong vote of 65 to 15.

Before the Truman administration directs the Export-Import Bank to send a loan to Spain's Fascist overlord, somebody around the White House should count the terrific cost of such a step. And this cost needs to be reckoned, hardly at all in terms of money, but in the good will of democratic people and peoples aspiring to be free around the world.

Franco was set up by Hitler and Mussolini. The Axis dictators used the little Fascist's war against the Spanish Republic as a proving ground for World War II. They tried out new weapons, new tactics, and put armed forces in as though they were taking part in maneuvers. Without the support of the dictators in Berlin and Rome, Franco's armed rebellion would have lasted only a few weeks at the most.

As it turned out, El Caudillo was the only one of the despicable trio who survived popular wrath. By a series of good fortunes, if such they can be called, he has managed to hang on, though the financial basis of his iron-handed rule is and has been shaky for a long time.

A loan to Franco would do the United States a vast amount of harm among distant peoples whose support we should be very eager to have. It would amount to official notice that we will support any dictator, no matter how repressive his regime, if we think it is to our advantage—or if some influential pressure group is able to put that idea across.

Just how many police state characters do we in the United States intend to tie up with? We gave our backing to such a small-scale dictator in South Korea's Syngman Rhee. Now we are having to explain that the United States went to the defense of peace in the Orient and not to uphold Rhee and his reactionary, strong-arm methods.

After backing Chiang Kai-shek much too long without obtaining a change in his dictatorial and corrupt rule, the Truman administration finally decided it had poured money down Chiang's rat hole long enough. Now because of the possible relation of Formosa to our military operations in Korea, General MacArthur is talking about all-out defense of Formosa. That could involve the United States in a war with Mao's Chinese government which has driven Chiang off the continent of Asia. Naturally Chiang would like nothing better than to unload his lost war on us.

Indochina and Greece also come to mind and the list could be extended. In too many places we are seeming to back the unpopular dictators or puppets against whom communism has been able to present itself as a people's movement.

Why do we need to lend more color to this by sending $100,000,000 to Franco to bolster up his sagging economy? If this is a military move, let the Joint Chiefs of Staff say so and let the case, if there is one, be presented for it on that basis. If it is merely the economic shot-in-the-arm which Senator MCCARRAN of Nevada and other Franco apologists have been trying to arrange, then let that be no less clear.

And if the loan is proposed as a military measure Washington should reflect on its inevitable effect on all of western Europe above the Pyrenees Mountains. Is it our wish to serve notice that France, western Germany and the Low Countries all are written off in advance?

Franco is against democracy just as much as Stalin is. All he wants of us is our money. We should have as little as possible to do with him and his denial of the human rights we cherish.

Address by Edwin S. Lanier Before the Kiwanis Club of Durham, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Edwin S. Lanier, mayor of Chapel Hill, N. C., delivered before the Kiwanis Club, of Durham, N. C., on August 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM IN CHAPEL HILL

Figuratively we in Chapel Hill dwell in glass houses. Nearly anything that happens in Chapel Hill has enough State-wide interest to give the newspapers a chance to splash it across their pages.

For Chapel Hill I beg you and the other people in North Carolina who may have done so to quit ridiculing and speaking unkindly of us just because we are cursed from time to time with the temporary presence of some transient, lying, rattlesnake Communist and a few of his loud-mouthed, moronic sympathizers. Because two of them now happen to get their mail through the Chapel Hill post office and some of their propaganda lie sheets through the local express office (although they do not live in Chapel Hill and are rarely seen on the streets of Chapel Hill), still we get branded throughout this State for being a spawning and breeding ground for Communists and circulators of the communistic Stockholm peace petition.

One of those traitors, we believe, is the one who recently slipped around town under cover of darkness scattering handbills denouncing your Judge Wilson. That rag was signed by an anonymous, crowning lie.

Percentagewise, what town in North Carolina of 20,000 or more people can guarantee that it has less Communists than we have in Chapel Hill?

Still we are ashamed that we have had or may now have a single one there. The people of Chapel Hill despise a Communist and his fellow travelers just as much as any of you do. We hold the termitic traitors to our

country in nauseating contempt and begrudge them the free air they breathe. I don't believe there is a community anywhere in this country more alert and more diligent than Chapel Hill to get the facts about Communists and communistic activities and to report those facts to the FBI.

There is not an official file or governmental agency personnel folder in Chapel Hill that is not readily available to the FBI and the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities.

We are not Klu Kluxs, and we will not take the law—or the lack of needed law—into our own hands. We have done, and we will earnestly continue trying to do, in Chapel Hill, as we all everywhere have been directed to do by J. Edgar Hoover—report all the facts we can get to the FBI.

Furthermore, we will continue pleading to Congress and the Supreme Court to declare Communists to be what they actually are, and to strip them naked of the protections of our Constitution which they hide behind while they fanatically seek the use of every deceit and trick their pathetic, sordid, twisted minds and imagination can concoct to overthrow and destroy the Government based on that Constitution. We have not refrained from enacting legislation against burglars for fear that thieves would go under ground, nor against bootleggers on the theory that legislation against bootlegging would make all of them law-abiding citizens. Because I have subscribed to constitution of humane treatment to animals does not prevent me from dealing decisively with a bedbug or rattlesnake which I may find in my home. Everything in me rebels when I see a picture of a young husband and father leaving his family to face death at the hands of Communists in Korea and on the same page the picture of 2 of the 10 Communists who for 10 months heaped contempt and insults on a Federal court judge during their trial for advocating the overthrow of the American Government.

If we stop our personal efforts to combat communism when we have reported facts to the FBI and then stand around burning out the wires of our nervous system denouncing communism, we have overlooked one of the most effective weapons of defense.

We are grossly and densely ignorant about communism. The truth about communism would frighten every one of us—and all of the people of these United States—as much as scales frighten an overweight person.

Comparatively few people in the United States, other than members of the Communist gang, really know and understand what communism is driving at and what it has done wherever it has succeeded in dividing, conquering, and enslaving.

Not a dozen 1950 graduates of the Durham High School, or the Chapel Hill High School, or any other high school in North Carolina, can write two factual and intelligent paragraphs about communism. How many of us in this room could stand up and from his own knowledge cite three points set out in the Communist manifesto, or give the barest sketch of the history of the Communists from Karl Marx to date?

Just as we will continue living in elemental fear of polio until we learn its secrets and how it paralyzes, we will live in fear of and face the dangers of communism until there is wide knowledge among all people of the facts about communism. Be not deceived—communism, regardless of all its slobberings about civil rights and the imperfections of a developing democracy, is aimed at and relentlessly and fanatically pushed toward one over-all objective, namely, the complete annihilation of personal freedom, the complete overthrow of representative government, and the smothering out of every expression of faith in God and the practice of Christianity.

Ohio Soldiers in the Capture of Manila

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the New York Herald Tribune dated July 24, 1950, and published in that newspaper under date of July 27, 1950. The letter deals with the part taken by the Thirty-seventh Division in the capture of Manila.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE PRESENT AT MANILA

ROWAYTON, CONN., *July 24, 1950.*

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

If we're going to set the record straight on who took Manila, let's really set it straight.

Mr. Milton MacKaye writes to point out that the Eleventh Airborne Division did much of the dirty work that enabled the First Cavalry to drive the initial column into the Philippine capital. He makes a passing reference to the Thirty-seventh and Twenty-fifth Divisions, which deserve a good deal more than that, especially the Thirty-seventh. As a war correspondent who at one time or another was with all the divisions named, I can attest to the statement that the Thirty-seventh "Buckeye" Division, an Ohio National Guard outfit, bore the brunt of the Manila fighting. Coming down the Luzon plains from Lingayen Gulf, it ran into the toughest opposition and made possible the last-minute dash of Brigadier General Chase's First Cavalry column. The latter indeed reached Manila first and liberated the Santo Tomas prisoners, but the Thirty-seventh actually took Manila in force hours later and then had the dirtiest job of cleaning out Jap snipers.

There has—Mr. MacKaye is right—been some exaggeration of the First Cavalry superiority. Nevertheless, it was and is one of the best in the business. It did the most dashing work in Luzon, as elsewhere, and has therefore been the most publicized. The all-around teamwork in the Luzon campaign, involving a half a dozen divisions or more, has never been fully appreciated and is, in the final analysis, a tribute to General MacArthur's leadership and strategic genius.

ROBERT SHAPLEN.

The Stockholm Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Peace—It Could Be Wonderful" published in the Jewish Veteran, monthly newspaper of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE—IT COULD BE WONDERFUL

Even while it was getting ready to wield a big stick in Korea, communism was talking loudly of peace on March 19 of this year, when a covey of red-tinted doves lit on Stockholm for a meeting of the World Congress of Partisans of Peace.

From this temporary cote there emerged the Stockholm resolution, a straight-faced expression demanding prohibition of atomic weapons, strict international control of the atomic bomb, and condemnation of the first government to use atomic weapons as a war criminal.

The gimmick in this seemingly noble statement of principle was that the strict international control advocated for the production of atomic weapons was the Soviet plan rejected by the United Nations as unenforceable because it failed to provide for the United States-backed principle of inspection of atomic plants.

On May 31, less than a month before North Korean troops were to surge across the thirty-eighth parallel, the partisans of peace claimed 100,000,000 signatures to their resolution. In the United States, the busy little bees on the Daily Worker began promotional activities and the soliciting of signatures in major American cities. In no time at all, the wares of the partisans for peace were on display at the Peace Information Bureau in New York and the National Labor Peace Comference. This September something called the National Peace Congress is to convene in New York.

There is a strangely familiar lift to the paeans sung to peace in Communist circles these days. The tune differs in minor details from the melody intoned by Hitler at Munich in September 1938. There is also a new fiddler calling the tune, a musician named Stalin. But at the bottom, there is the war in Korea just as in 1939 there was the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Peace, it is generally agreed, could be wonderful. But on the terms set forth by Communist-petition backers the buzzard would replace the dove as the bird of peace.

The peace petition, aimed at inveigling all people who have a genuine desire to see tranquility restored to this quivering planet, reveals nothing of the intentions of its Communist authors. For those, one must turn to Soviet deeds as reflected in communism's past record and in its naked aggression in Korea today.

The pattern of Communist behavior until now gives no encouragement that Soviet cries of peace bear any closer relationship to the cause of man's freedom than when Molotov and Ribbentrop signed a peace pact in 1939.

Hungry Horse Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the news stories and editorials, I included with my remarks on the passing of Harry Kelly yesterday, I have today received the following on the passing of our beloved friend.

Under unanimous consent granted to me, I am inserting a front-page editorial from the Times-Monitor, of Kalispell,

Mont., Harry Kelly's old paper; a news story from the same, both dated August 10, 1950; and an editorial from the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., dated August 9, 1950:

[From the Kalispell (Mont.) Times-Monitor of August 10, 1950]

HARRY J. KELLY

Everlastingly in western Montana the stature of Harry J. Kelly will grow. His lifetime ended at 3:15 Monday afternoon, quietly and mercifully. Sadness pervades us now—but we know that Mr. Kelly fulfilled every design of God or man during that span. Life had no more rewards than those bestowed on him in a 1-month period just 2 years ago. On July 10, 1948, he rode as grand marshal to the scene of the first blast and formal beginning of construction of Hungry Horse Dam. On August 4, the same year, with his family (for whom he lived) around him, he and Mrs. Kelly entertained hundreds of friends on their golden wedding anniversary.

Endowed with indomitable spirit and a sense of right, allied by a persuasive charm, Mr. Kelly became the most influential weekly newspaper editor in the State of Montana. An analyst, even more than a man of vision, his arguments almost indisputable in the minds of other farsighted men who gradually and wholeheartedly enlisted their aid in western Montana's greatest development—Hungry Horse Dam. We here today can yet only visualize the benefits which will come in the form of power, flood control, irrigation, large and small industry—benefits which were clear in Mr. Kelly's eyes 25 years ago. The turning point came when the President of the United States, impressed by the personal charm and clear portrayal of the need and feasibility of the project as recited by this man, turned and said: "Hungry Horse? Well, I guess we'll have to give it some hay."

From the day the project was assured, Mr. Kelly looked forward. He advocated greater diversification of crops which would assure the success of small processing plants in the valley and a more stable income for a greater population here.

Backed by lesser resources, nevertheless Harry J. Kelly was a man of the full O. S. Warden-Rufus Wood stature. He defended his principles stubbornly, but pettiness or prejudice had no part in his speech or his writing. Montana has lost one of its most loyal and useful citizens. We of this office have lost our stanchest friend and wise and trusted confidant.

[From the Kalispell (Mont.) Times-Monitor of August 10, 1950]

H. J. KELLY PASSES AWAY MONDAY

Harry J. Kelly, for 20 years editor and publisher of the Flathead Monitor before his retirement 6 years ago, passed away at his home in Kalispell Monday afternoon. He was born in Prairie du Chien, Wis., October 6, 1869, and with his parents moved to Omaha, Nebr., while a child. He attended Creighton University, learned the printing trade, and came to Montana in 1888, establishing a weekly paper in Missoula. He later worked at the printing trade in Butte, returning to Missoula in 1895 to conduct the Bitter Root Times during the capitol fight. In 1896 he was married to Miss Mary See, a native of the Bitter Root Valley.

For a short time Mr. Kelly operated a newspaper at Hamilton and was sergeant at arms in the State legislature during the famous sixth session when the "war of the copper kings" was at its height. In 1905 he and Tom Stout started the weekly Fergus County Democrat at Lewistown. Later they purchased the Daily News and founded the present daily paper in that city. He was appointed registrar for the United States Land Office at Lewistown and served until after World War I.

Mr. Kelly sold his interest in the Lewistown paper and came to Kalispell in 1924, purchasing the Flathead Monitor. Determining the feasibility of a multi-purpose dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River, he devoted 20 years of influence and energy to the project. Kelly served as president of the Montana Press Association in 1943, and retired the following year after 54 years of newspapering in Montana.

Surviving are his wife, four children, Mrs. E. P. Peterson, of San Francisco; Miss Margaret A. Kelly, of Kalispell; Harry J. Kelly, Jr., of Seattle, and William G. Kelly, former postmaster here and now operating the radio station at Lewistown; and an only grandchild, William Patrick of Seattle.

Requiem high mass for Mr. Kelly was celebrated at St. Matthews Catholic Church Wednesday morning, with Rev. Father James Sheerin as celebrant. Burial was in Conrad Memorial Cemetery. Pallbearers were T. W. Elliot, F. O. Williams, Harry E. Lay, Jack Burg, Henry Lokensgard, and Howard Miller.

[From the Daily Missoulian of August 9, 1950]

HARRY J. KELLY

No other man is more responsible for the great project of the Hungry Horse Dam than Harry J. Kelly, veteran Montana newspaperman, who has just reached the end of his life. Mr. Kelly, once sure in his own mind of the value of the enterprise, devoted much space in his Flathead Monitor, published at Kalispell, to propaganda for it, until he was known as Hungry Horse Kelly. He was indefatigable in this promotion for almost a quarter century, retiring from his newspaper a few years ago with the satisfaction of knowing that the project was assured.

Harry Kelly was of the best type of printer-publisher, an expert at his craft and a wise man in the editorial part of the newspaper business. He left the marks of his ability and enterprise in several Montana cities and, since 1888, had a share in the progress of the State. He was one of the best of the old-timers.

Internal Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Security Legislation," published in the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal on August 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITY LEGISLATION

President Truman in a special message to Congress asks emergency legislation to protect the Nation from Communist spies, saboteurs, and fifth columnists.

But it will perplex many Americans as to why the Chief Executive at the same time denounces pending legislation known as the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill which would require all Communists and members of the Communist-front organizations to register.

The President brands the Mundt-Nixon bill as repugnant to our traditions and so vague in its terms as to endanger the freedoms of speech, press, and assembly as protected by the first amendment.

The President says he is in the main interested in a law that will tighten present laws covering espionage and registration of foreign agents, added protection for defense installations, broad authority to the President to establish security regiations for military bases, and other Defense Establishments.

One wonders why the President urges compulsory registration of spies and subversives, yet frowns upon a blanket law covering all members of the Communist Party.

If the Communists in this country, in the main, are not spies and subversives, then why are we so concerned about them?

FBI Chief Edgar Hoover only this week labeled the Communist Party in this country as a Trojan horse of disloyalty, coiled like a serpent in the very heart of America.

Hoover further declared that the Communist infiltration of United States heavy industry is the greatest potential sabotage danger facing America.

The President's request for spy and sabotage legislation is timely but it is doubtful whether he goes far enough in covering the Communist menace.

We wish the boys now fighting in Korea could voice their opinion on this vital subject.

Tax Status of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under special order on July 31, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] addressed the House on the question of taxing the untaxed. In the course of that address he undertook to establish, in addition to several other things, that the cooperatives in the United States were escaping taxes in large amounts, and that this tax advantage somehow brands them as unpatriotic, if not un-American institutions. I think the RECORD should be set straight.

The gentleman includes in his remarks a report of the amounts of taxes which the Government is failing to collect because of certain tax exemptions. The figures which he refers to, as the result of careful research by Homer E. Marsh, of the National Associated Businessmen of Washington, D. C., and by Lovell Parker, former Chief of Staff for the Joint Committee on Taxation indicate that these so-called tax-exempts hold 29 percent of our total national resources. I think it important that we examine this list to determine which are cooperatives, and also in that examination to remember that the National Associated Businessmen's organization, together with the National Tax Equality Association, spend approximately a half million dollars a year in attacking the cooperatives. These figures are in the lobby files of the Clerk of the House.

These are Mr. Marsh's figures:

Life insurance companies (most all are mutuals and pay some income tax)	$50,000,000,000
Foundations	2,500,000,000
Mutual savings banks	20,000,000,000
Building savings and loan associations	12,000,000,000
Government pension trust funds	35,000,000,000
Educational institutions	2,500,000,000
Federal Government corporations	23,000,000,000
Cooperatives	2,500,000,000
Mutual fire and casualty insurance	2,000,000,000
State and local retirement funds	2,500,000,000
Municipal and REA utilities	2,000,000,000
Postal savings	3,500,000,000
Total	157,500,000,000

Actually in this table the cooperatives make up less than 2 percent of the resources my colleague refers to as tax-exempts. Yet he devotes almost his entire attention to the 2 percent and neglects the other 98 percent.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue reports that only half of the rural co-ops took advantage of the minor tax exemption provided in section 101 (12) of the Internal Revenue Code, because of the strict compliance provisions. The rest paid taxes just like other businesses. Yet, my colleague would have you believe that co-ops are tax-exempt. As I have indicated, co-ops are not tax-exempt. In his discourse he implied that co-ops, among all the others listed, are unpatriotic. Profits of cooperatives, after regular business taxes are paid, are returned to the members, who pay income taxes upon them, under the personal-income-tax laws of the country. Propaganda spread by the enemies of cooperatives has left a false impression. Members of cooperatives are certainly not unpatriotic, nor are cooperatives un-American. The State of Minnesota has long been famous for its cooperatives. We count the members of cooperatives as among our finest citizens.

The slogan, Tax the untaxed, has been developed principally as an instrument to be used against the cooperatives. Let me set the record straight by giving you the facts on the tax status of cooperatives.

Jerry Voorhis, a former distinguished member of this body who served five terms, is now executive secretary of the Cooperative League of the United States of America. In testifying before the House Finance Committee on the tax bill some months ago, he pointed out that—

The alleged tax advantages which co-ops are supposed to enjoy today vanish into thin air upon any fair examination of the facts. The truth is that, with one exception adopted long ago by a conservative Congress as an aid to agriculture, co-ops today are subject to tax under the same laws and the same regulations as any other business. The further truth is that even the bitterest opponents of cooperatives have declared that the one exception, namely, section 101 (12), makes no real difference and that its repeal would add hardly a drop of revenue to the Treasury.

Cooperatives in America can no more make for themselves taxable income without paying full tax on it than can any other business. If cooperative members receive any funds as a result of dealings with their cooperative which would constitute taxable income to anyone dealing with any type of business, then the co-op member is subject to tax thereon right now. We would not have it otherwise.

All the fuss and furor about cooperatives and taxes results from a basic misinterpretation of the facts. The central position of the cooperative is this. If one business, a cooperative, deliberately binds itself to forego the making of profit in order to benefit its patrons, it should no more be subject to income tax on income it doesn't receive than a profit business is subject to tax on profits it fails to make.

With our contention that cooperatives have today no tax advantage, a long series of Congresses and an unbroken succession of court decisions have agreed. The House committee, in preparing the bill before you and the House in passing it, has confirmed once again this basic truth.

If any institutions in our country are typically American, cooperatives are so. True cooperatives cannot exist in a totalitarian country at all. Their very chance for existence depends on the maintenance of free institutions, political and economic. The essence of cooperation is free voluntary association of free people.

On the other hand, the very essence of a true democracy is participation by the people, by all the people, in every phase of its life. This means not only political participation but social and religious and economic and every other kind of participation. The very basis and essence of economic participation is a share in ownership. The very basis and essence of economic participation is a share in ownership. For a share in ownership carries with it a share of responsibility for what we own. And with that kind of responsibility, and probably only so, there develops a readiness to take the still more basic responsibility for meeting one's own problems and those of one's neighbors by one's own efforts. If America means anything it means a country that encourages that sort of thing—that wise participation by the people in ownership and responsibility.

Well, that is precisely why we have cooperatives. It's what they exist to do. The whole net effect of the organization and operation of a cooperative is to spread ownership and with it responsibility for their own economic welfare widely among millions of people who would otherwise not be participants in free enterprise to any significant extent at all. I therefore simply ask the question as to whether cooperatives should be confronted with an organized, highly financed campaign of misrepresentation against them or whether they do not deserve the full moral support of every thoughtful person who sincerely cares about the future of democracy in America.

We come before this great committee—

Mr. Voorhis said—

in no spirit of supplication or appeal for a single special consideration. We come here with our heads high and our hearts thankful to point out that participation by the people in every phase of its life is the very genius of a vital democracy and to point out further that it is to promote such participation that cooperatives basically and primarily exist. We are in business for one primary reason—to spread private ownership and with it responsibility among the people more broadly than can be done in any other way and thus to shift back to the people again responsibility for their own welfare. Since we know this is what you too desire in our country, we confidently solicit your continued interest in and moral support of cooperatives in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize what Mr. Voorhis said about cooperatives being democratic. Here is a movement that is rebuilding democracy as we have knowr it in the past. Here is the very essence of democracy, not only in politics, but in every other phase of fruitful living—economic, religious, and social. Cooperatives have no tax exemption as cooperatives. Certain co-ops have an available exemption given to them as farmer organizations to encourage agricultural production. If we face that issue and face it squarely, we may find out that that assistance given to them as farmers is not enough. I hope we, as lawmakers, never yield to the force of this campaign of misrepresentation being conducted by the highly financed group of self-seeking interests whose objective is to destroy the cooperatives so that they will have no competitive force to check them in their drive for unlimited profits. There, gentlemen, is the issue in this case.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is to me a matter of pride that an agency so vitally concerned with our financial welfare and so important to the confidence and safety of 104,000,000 depositors in this great Nation should be so efficiently managed as the record indicates is the case with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

It is now more than 6 years since any insured bank failed or since the depositors of any insured bank suffered a penny's loss. Bank difficulties continue to happen and they will probably never be eliminated, but we have arrived finally at the goal of every supporter of the independent dual-banking system and the satisfaction of every depositor in an insured bank. Banks may continue to get into difficulty, but depositors will suffer no loss. That is what makes the situation different from the years before FDIC.

During the sixteen-plus years of its operation, only 413 insured banks have required FDIC financial aid. That is fewer than the number that failed during any one of the years from 1923 through 1933.

The record of the FDIC has been the subject of much editorial praise from the Nations's newspapers. The Ironton (Mo.) Register and several other papers editorially had these things to say about the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:

[From the Ironton (Mo.) Register of April 13, 1950]

Banker praises New Deal. Did you ever think you would live to see the day? The following is an excerpt of a letter from Chairman John S. Wood, of the board of the Manchester Bank of St. Louis, written to Repre-

sentative MELVIN PRICE (Democrat, Illinois): "I was chief national bank examiner at St. Louis from 1920 to 1930. During 1930 I became chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank at St. Louis and in that capacity directed the operations of the examining department of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. From 1921 to 1933 I saw a number of commercial banks in the United States decrease from approximately 30,600 unit banks to fewer than 14,000 banks. The public lost confidence both in banks and bankers. The FIDC (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, a New Deal agency established in 1934) restored public confidence both in banks and bankers. It is gambling with fate to, in any degree, diminish the fund that enables the FDIC to promptly take care of the depositors of any insured bank that may get into an unsafe condition."

[From the Fresno (Calif.) Bee of May 15, 7, 1950]

WHY THEY WEREN'T SCARED

The Westphalia State Bank at Westphalia, Mich., must have been an unusual financial institution. It has had trouble. Its assets have been taken by another bank, and it will hereafter operate as a branch. This bank's troubles seem to have been brought out in the open when Government investigators disclosed irregularities reaching about $300,000. Nobody was accused, or has been accused of taking anything, but it must have been a rather friendly institution. If a depositor knew the bank well enough, he could overdraw almost at will, and he did. Thus, when investigators began their work, they simply found the bank's money tied up in overwithdrawals. Townspeople were resentful when the Government's inquiry disclosed this condition, and maintained full trust in the bank. They were even resentful when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation offered to throw in a million dollars to save the institution, if this became necessary. Everybody in Westphalia seems to have overdrawn, but nobody was scared.

And why were they not running up and down Main Street, wringing their hands, and why were they not afraid? They knew their deposits were safe, because of the guarantee of bank deposits. And the bank deposit guarantee was one of the pieces of legislation put on the books during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

[From the Fresno (Calif.) Bee of May 15, 1950]

BANK DEPOSIT INSURANCE HAS PROVED ITS WORTH

Individual bank accounts up to $5,000 have been insured by the Government against loss since 1933 when an amendment to the National Banking Act established the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

It was one of the first of the important New Deal reforms.

Recently the Senate approved a bill to raise the maximum individual insurance from $5,000 to $10,000; and the House Banking and Currency Committee shortly is expected also to recommend favorable action on the measure.

There is a reason.

When the insurance system was set up in 1933, the $5,000 provision covered 98½ percent of all deposits then in commercial banks.

But such is no longer the case. Because of the greater amount of money in circulation and the increase in incomes during the war and postwar years, only 45 percent of deposits now are insured.

So present coverage fails to achieve the basic objective of the law—full protection for the individual depositor.

It is a tribute to the manner in which FDIC has been operated that it has built up a fund more than adequate to support the higher level of coverage.

In its 16 years of operation, FDIC has accumulated from assessment receipts and other earnings a surplus of $1,100,000,000. In the system are 13,440 commercial banking institutions.

The FDIC has been compelled to go to the aid of only 407 banks. Most of these were merged with stronger institutions through assistance from the FDIC. Actual losses to depositors have been less than $2,000,000.

What a contrast to the 1930–38 period, when 3,643 banks failed and total losses to depositors amounted to more than $1,000,000,000.

FDIC is one reform that even the most hardshell conservative knows is here to stay because of its manifest benefits.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Telegram of May 15, 1950]

A GOVERNMENT AGENCY THAT ACTUALLY MAKES MORE MONEY THAN IT SPENDS

One of the most successful of the innovations of the Roosevelt administration was the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, established 15 years ago to safeguard depositors in commercial banks against loss. The FDIC has not cost the taxpayers a penny. Through the payment of one-twelfth of 1 percent of total deposits by the banks, the corporation has had enough money not only to pay off all losses resulting from bank failures or financial troubles, but it has paid back the capital contribution made initially by the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks and it has a $1,100,000,000 reserve.

It is true there has been no major economic crisis during the existence of the FDIC to test its ability to withstand real financial trouble in the Nations' banking system. But the fund is believed adequate now to meet any crisis, no matter how severe. The reserve is approximately equal to the total of reported losses of all depositors in the 1930–33 debacle. Of course, deposits have increased since then, and losses today could be proportionately greater, but on the other hand the very existence of the deposit-insurance program should avert the panic which helped to make for heavy losses.

It is astonishing what an excellent record the FDIC has had through the years. There have been 407 banks which have required FDIC assistance of one kind or another since the Corporation was established. In settling their affairs the FDIC has paid off all insured depositors and taken a total loss in the process of only $25,000,000.

Because deposit insurance only is extended to a maximum of $5,000, some larger depositors did suffer losses in these bank failures. Those losses amounted to about $2,000,000. There is now a proposal before Congress to increase the $5,000 maximum for insurance coverage to $10,000. A bill to make that change has been passed by the Senate and is now being studied by the House Banking and Currency Committee. The increased coverage could, it is said, be easily extended without placing any very great added burden on the FDIC.

In view of the change in the value of the dollar since 1934, and the sound condition of the deposit insurance program, it seems only right that the maximum be increased.

At the same time there might be a reduction in the assessment levied against participating banks. The Corporation has a reserve which should be enough to guarantee it against any financial crisis short of a catastrophe which would destroy the Government itself along with any such governmental agency as the FDIC. It actually gets enough from earnings on this reserve and miscellaneous sources of revenue to pay its way without any further assessments at all on the banks of the Nation.

It is in any event a cheering thing to have one agency of Government give such a demonstration of efficient operation that it actually makes more money than it spends.

[From the Mamaroneck (N. Y.) Times of May 11, 1950]

RAISING THE INSURANCE

It was back in 1933 that Uncle Sam, to restore public confidence and protect against banking failures, initiated Federal insurance of bank deposits. The new law provided for insurance to depositors against loss for deposits up to $5,000. Observers say that the proportion of depositors fully insured is now about 96 percent.

But inflation, rising prices, increasing wages, have set new standards in money. The average size of deposits has increased, and at present only about 45 percent, or $62,000,000,000, of the total dollar amount of bank deposits is insured.

Accordingly Uncle Sam now proposes to take another step in this direction. The Senate passed the new law in March and the House is expected to hold hearings. The new law will raise the amount of insured deposits to $10,000.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in its 15 years of existence has now accumulated from its assessments upon banks and from other earnings $1,100,000,000, which approximates the total reported losses of all depositors in the crisis of the early thirties when banks were bursting like popcorn all over the Nation. Also the 13,440 insured commercial banks are paying in assessments at the rate of about $120,000,000 a year. Such assessments are one-twelfth of 1 percent of total deposits.

Apparently the FDIC fund is in a sufficiently healthy condition to justify the new step. Bank suspensions have fortunately been rare and bank-deposit losses insignificant in the 15-year period. During this time, as a matter of fact, the FDIC has lost only $26,000,000 and actual losses to depositors have been less than $2,000,000.

The new law should create even greater public confidence and security.

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner of April 27, 1950]

TOWN BANK IN TROUBLE, BUT CITIZENS CALM, PROTECTED

Although a State bank was in trouble in Bruneau, Idaho, because of shortages and there was a rash of rumors and other excitement, no depositor will lose any money and the bank will continue to operate for the benefit of the community.

Thanks to the operations of the Federal deposit insurance law, depositors were calmed as soon as they were reminded that their savings were guaranteed by the United States Government.

We should be accustomed to these quiet reactions that follow news that a bank is in trouble, because the deposit insurance program has been in operation for a long time, but some of the older citizens, remembering unhappy panics in the past, still blink their eyes a few times in pleased amazement as they murmur, "It was not like that in the supposed good old days."

The Liberty Bell—A Symbol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Harold Dempster Cullen, editor of the

Bertie Ledger-Advance, Windsor, N. C., recently had an editorial in his paper that strikes a keynote for all Americans. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include this timely editorial:

THE LIBERTY BELL—A SYMBOL

The visit of the replica of the Liberty Bell to North Carolina towns has brought again to our attention the fact that the freedom and prosperity we enjoy should go to the credit of our founding fathers—those men of democratic beliefs and the daring to put them into effect in the face of opposition that seemed insuperable. It is well for us to think sometimes of the problems those men had to face. The world was against them. The greatest and strongest nation in the world at that time was to be faced in warfare, if they made the decision that their consciences endorsed. Their own welfare and prosperity would undoubtedly be the price to be paid if they went through with their intention of declaring their freedom from foreign rule.

But they had the courage and the daring to lead their people into the field of freedom. They fully recognized the risks they ran. They knew that their own lives would be forfeit if their struggle should fail. But they unflinchingly proclaimed to the world their determination to become free people, along lines that had never been tried in the world before—with the people themselves as the final arbiters of their own welfare.

The peal of the Liberty Bell announced to the world that the struggle for freedom would be undertaken.

Their challenge was accepted. The mother country made its best effort to subdue these recalcitrant children. But through 8 years of struggle and sacrifice and death they clung firmly to their beliefs—and finally emerged victorious.

Today in America we face a similar challenge, but on a far larger scale. The freedom of the entire world is at stake. The leaders of the world face the challenge that the Continental Congress faced in 1776. The lines are being drawn from day to day.

Have we the courage to march into a struggle that might mean slavery instead of freedom? Have our leaders and our people the fortitude of the founding fathers and their followers? It is altogether possible that the present struggle may be confined to Korea, but we cannot tell.

Are we in America willing to make the sacrifices and undergo the suffering necessary, either by war or by peaceful means, to assure the world of freedom, as these United States were assured of freedom 174 years ago? The challenge faces us, with our 150,000,000 people and with the 2,000,000,000 people of the world, no less than it did the 3,000,000 people that lived along the Atlantic coast of this country in 1776.

The Potato Dump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is time to call a halt. In these perilous times, when the Congress is exploring every potential source of revenue and is calling upon individuals and corporations to ante up more and more taxes in order that this country may meet the demand for greater and greater expenditures, we learn of the travesty which permits the harvesting of a bountiful crop of potatoes and the leaving of them in the fields to spoil. The finest crop of potatoes ever grown in New Jersey will never reach hungry mouths, simply because the potato farmers, on instructions from the Government, have already dug and spoiled 40 percent of the crop.

Not so long ago an ad appeared in a newspaper in Poughkeepsie, N. Y., which advertised a bid for potatoes for the armed services of the United States. Only a few days ago, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture and requested $50,000,000 to be used to pay transportation costs of a half billion dollars' worth of foodstuffs which were in danger of spoiling. What justification, other than planned economy, is there for this ruthless destruction of needed food? Our armed services could use everything in surplus and thereby obliterate great expenditures of dollars.

If the planners of our economy continue to pay for foodstuffs that are only raised and destroyed, we will not only bring ourselves closer and closer to bankruptcy, but we will at the same time thwart nature. If it comes to pass that nature concludes we no longer welcome her bounty, nothing on earth will ever save us.

There was a time when the Government paid for pigs and corn that were never raised, but even that crazy philosophy was better than the philosophy adopted by the Department of Agriculture in the present instance where manpower, seed, gasoline, and equipment were used to raise potatoes that were dug and sacked and then permitted to spoil.

I beseech all Members of Congress to take cognizance of this situation and join with me in insisting that this practice be immediately suspended.

Views of Mr. D. D. Wright, Guin, Ala., With Reference to Our Relations With Russia, and So Forth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, as per the request of Mr. D. D. Wright, a citizen of Guin, Marion County, Ala., that I make available to the Senate and the House his views with reference to the United Nations, Russian aggression in Korea, and atomic warfare, I am including his letter to me dated August 5, 1950, and his letter of the same date addressed to the Senate and House at Washington, D. C.:

GUIN, ALA., *August 5, 1950.*

HON. CARL ELLIOTT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter received and contents noted. Will say that if it is not asking too much of you, read the enclosed letter to House and Senate.

Your friend,

D. D. WRIGHT.

P. S.—Bomb Russia. They outnumber us in tanks, planes, submarines, etc.

GUIN, ALA., *August 5, 1950.*

To the SENATE AND HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: I have kept close after the United Nations organization since its beginning. Also, I have tried to keep up with Russia's vetoing and objections to everything practically that all the other nations favored. You have tried with all means to get them to work with you on the right terms for the last 5 years, but it seems the impossible. Now, you can't deal with a gang of atheists and bandits for any right cause. As possibly you noticed the Gallup poll that was taken over this Nation this week. A large majority of the people want the A-bomb used. Russia started this Korean war, as you know. They have no A-bombs to amount to anything. If they had, they would be the last country in the world to want it outlawed. You are calling our boys from 18 and up to service, to go over there and be slaughtered by that gang of bandits.

It will cost this Nation billions and multiplied thousands of our boys who have never got anything out of life. Russia has millions of men that they can keep sending as recruits to the North Korean Army and to other countries that they will strike later. They are working as slave labor, possibly a million men trying to build up a stockpile of A-bombs, planes, tanks, and other war equipment. If they win or don't win in this struggle, Russia will back up another start in some other country over there. They want to get all of our manpower possible, planes, tanks, and war equipment over there, and 2 years from now they will have their stockpile of bombs and will blow the face of the earth in America. They would have done been here if they had had any bombs.

I think you Representatives of this Government should listen to what a large majority said about the A-bomb. As you noticed the poll taken, a large majority said drop the A-bomb. The two bombs dropped in Japan or nearby brought that war to a close. Now I think that our commanders should give the American Army and the South Korean Army a night secret fall, backed with all equipment, and by dawn have three of the greatest concentrated places in that North Korean Army and drop three A-bombs, 20 to 30 miles apart, and hit Moscow at the same time with two A-bombs, and your war is ended. There is no use to spend billions of dollars and lose multiplied thousands of lives thinking that they might quit.

Yours truly,

D. D. WRIGHT.

Crusade Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks,

I include extracts from a letter written by Jan J. Erteszek, a naturalized American who was born in Poland and received the degree of doctor of laws at the University of Cracow. This article was published as an editorial in the August 18 issue of the United States News and World Report, and David Lawrence, editor, says that Mr. Erteszek's descent and background give him an understanding of the Slavic mind. This, together with his Americanism, enables him to make a convincing presentation of the faith needed to combat world communism.

Mr. Speaker, I have been saying almost exactly this same thing, perhaps in different words, ever since my return from the iron-curtain countries last fall. I believe that this article sums up and points up that the crusade against communism in which we are engaged is basically the old battle of God versus the Devil. I think it is worthy of the time of everyone to read this article:

The main difference between communism and our philosophy of life is of a spiritual character and revolves around beliefs pertaining to the nature and destiny of human beings. Thus, it is in the realm of faith that our conflict must be fought out.

We might defeat the Russians by force of arms alone but never will we defeat communism by force of arms alone. If we lose the spiritual battle, we will have gained nothing except chaos and spiritual vacuum.

The main precept of our philosophy of life is not democracy, but our faith in God—consequently also our belief in sovereignty of the soul and dignity of human beings. As believers we follow, obey, and seek God. Our founding fathers have thought democracy to be the best system of Government to fulfill the spiritual objectives and aims for which they have come to America.

Communists, on the contrary, live without and against God. Our lives are determined by morality—theirs by expediency; ours by belief in the higher destiny of the human being—theirs by contempt of his limitations; ours by hope and faith—theirs by material gain and human greed; ours by brotherly love—theirs by class hatred; ours by trust—theirs by cunning.

Democracy is a system of government—the best that has been known to civilized people, but it is not the common denominator of all righteous peoples of the world.

Only to the American has the word "democracy" an emotional appeal. For better or for worse, it is absolutely meaningless to the great mass of little people in the rest of the world. If they are sufficiently educated, and most of them are not, it will be at best for them an intellectual or political term. I can assure you, however, that the Polish peasant, the Russian worker, the South American peon, or the Hindu untouchable does not emotionally react to the term "democracy."

No system or way of life has survived once it was satisfied to limit its efforts to its own preservation. We must not be content just in preservation of our way of life alone. We must have an ideal which in free interplay of social and spiritual forces will find its prophets, its zealots, its missionaries, and its converts.

Our great moral cause must be an expansive, positive, universal ideal. On behalf of this ideal, we must be ready to crusade among all the peoples of the world, to rally universally the masses to our standards and lead them to a better and nobler tomorrow.

God only, and our trust in Him, is the great moral cause in which we differ from the Communist. God, and trust in Him, is the common denominator between us and all peoples of the world.

One cannot serve God and communism at the same time. When one chooses to serve communism he has made a decision to sell his soul, either for material gain or other advantage. He has decided to trade his freedom for whatever gain he has been promised individually or for a group. The Communist chooses to become a spiritual, and in due course, a physical slave. Once he becomes a slave he is at the mercy of his masters who do not deem it necessary to keep their promises to their slaves. Thus, he serves the cause of evil.

It is God against devil, as basic and simple as that. There is no choice in between. All the people, humble and mighty, educated and simple, know where God is, and where evil is. On does not need for this intellectual speculation. There is a divine spark in every human being no matter on which side of the fence he is, and it can be kindled into a great fire against evil and for justice under God, for peace, brotherly love, freedom, and equality, for a nobler and better tomorrow.

If we truly believe in godly justice, we must find a solution for human ills, for privation, for race and class hatred. In the economic field, we must support a thorough land reform in all agricultural countries. We cannot close our eyes to the plight of millions of land-poor and landless peasants. We must provide them with tools to pursue their endeavors. For the rest of the people we must give assurance of the right to work at a decent wage. Land reform and the privilege to work for a decent wage will not destroy the capitalistic system of economy but, on the contrary, will remove its greatest weakness—the fear and frustrations of the contemporary man. It is the frustrated and fearful men who are the Communist's prey.

The Red horde is on the move, the time is running out fast. If we do not win this spiritual conflict, nothing will matter. Let's take the banner and lead the fight.

San Angelo (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce Makes Clear, Concise, Unanswerable Statement Showing Error of Supreme Court in Texas Tidelands Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by the San Angelo (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce regarding the recent Supreme Court decision in the Texas tidelands case. The statement is one of the clearest and most forceful I have seen on the subject, and I submit it for the RECORD:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

On June 5, 1950, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a 4 to 3 decision which attempted to give title to the Federal Government of the tidelands off the shore of Texas. In 1845 the United States Government entered into a written contract with the people of Texas which specifically provided that these lands would remain the property of Texas after the Republic of Texas became a State. This decision of the Supreme Court, if allowed to stand and become effective would be a clear-cut breach of this contract. Today, more than ever before, the United States is looked upon over the entire world as the example of a democratic country which keeps its obligations and treaties faithfully and to the letter. The United States of America should not allow the world to witness it breaking a contract, which its representatives made in good faith, and has stood for over 100 years. In writing its decision, the Supreme Court refused to allow the attorney general of Texas to present and develop the multitude of evidence it had regarding this case. In making its decision the Supreme Court completely ignored the historical facts which are relative to this case. The entire citizenship of Texas is greatly disturbed and insulted by this action. The documented facts of history stand, regardless of the varied political interpretations which come and go with the generations of time. We, the people of Texas, ask you to look at the facts:

1. After winning its independence from Mexico on the battlefield of San Jacinto in 1836, the First Congress of the Republic of Texas fixed its limits by a boundary act of December 19, 1836, as follows: "Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River, and running west along the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues from land, to the mouth of the Rio Grande * * *." Thereafter, in 1837, President Andrew Jackson advised the Congress of the United States as follows:

"The title of Texas to the territory she claims is identified with her independence."

2. On April 12, 1844, after formal negotiations, a treaty was signed between Texas and the United States, providing for the annexation of Texas. In this treaty Texas was to give up its public land and public property. The United States was to assume the public debt of Texas and was to annex Texas as a territory. On April 22, 1844, President Tyler sent this treaty to the Senate of the United States, which on June 8 voted and defeated the treaty by a vote of 36 to 16. One of the main reasons stated on the floor of the Senate for the defeat of this treaty was the allegation that Texas' lands were "worthless" and would never amount to enough to pay the indebtedness of that Republic. One Senator said: "Let Texas keep her lands and pay her own debts."

3. Accordingly, the same Congress submitted a counterproposal to the Republic of Texas for annexation. From December 10, 1844, until February 14, 1845, 17 drafts of a counterproposal came before the United States Congress. Some of these had provisions which would have required Texas "to cede its minerals, mines, salt lakes, and springs," and to give up its land and mineral rights. None of these proposals passed. Finally Representative Milton Brown, of Tennessee, who had previously introduced a resolution stipulating that Texas cede her minerals, offered again the general proposals of his original resolution, but omitted the ceding of mineral clauses, which his earlier resolution had contained and which had just been defeated in the rejection of an amendment of Representative Burke, of New Hampshire, which stipulated that Texas cede its minerals and mines. Brown's revised resolution was adopted by a vote of 120 to 98. Thus the claim of the United States to the minerals of Texas was considered and rejected by the House of Representatives in its formation of the resolution which was submitted to and accepted by the Republic of Texas as the basis of its admission to the Union.

This House resolution that finally passed contained two paragraphs; the first proposed that Texas should be admitted to the Union as a State, with a republican form of government adopted by the people of Texas and approved by the Congress of the United States. The second paragraph specified the

details of the annexation; namely that the constitution of the new State must be submitted to Congress before January 1, 1846, and that new States, not exceeding four in number in addition to the State of Texas might be formed out of Texas. The most important of these specific provisions was that Texas was to retain its public debt and was to retain title to all of the vacant land and unappropriated lands lying within the limits of the Republic of Texas. Nothing was in these first two paragraphs about "equal footing" with other States.

The United States Senate amended this resolution and added a third paragraph which gave the President of the United States the option at his own judgment and discretion to negotiate the annexation of Texas by treaty which would admit Texas into the Union "on an equal footing with the existing States," instead of submitting to the Republic of Texas the proposals of the first and second paragraphs as prepared by the House.

President Tyler chose not to exercise this option to negotiate by treaty, and instead submitted the provisions of only the first 2 paragraphs of the joint resolution. President Anson Jones of Texas submitted this to the Texas Congress, which unanimously approved it, and then called a convention of the people of Texas to prepare a State constitution and to ratify the acceptance by the Texas Congress. This convention passed an ordinance of acceptance which states, "—We, the deputies of the people of Texas, do ordain and declare that we assent to and accept the proposals, conditions, and guaranties contained in the first and second sections of the resolution of the Congress of the United States." On December 29, 1845, James K. Polk, President of the United States, signed a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, which referred to the offer by the United States and the acceptance of Texas of the provisions of the first and second paragraphs of the initial joint resolution of March 1, 1845, which made the offer, and declared that effective upon December 29, 1845, and upon those terms, Texas was a State in the Union. Thus, although the President of the United States was authorized by the third paragraph of the resolution, at his own discretion, to offer Texas an opportunity to come into the Union on "equal footing" by treaty, he instead submitted the alternate proposal which outlined specific provisions allowing Texas to retain her lands. The proposal actually submitted to and accepted and ratified by Texas contained no mention of the "equal footing" idea. One of the specific proposals, conditions, and guaranties offered by the United States in good faith and accepted faithfully by the people of Texas was that Texas was to retain the public domain which had belonged to it while it was an independent nation. These lands consisted of an estimated 237,906,000 acres of public lands which extended to 3 leagues off shore. The new State of Texas retained the General Land Office, which had been established by the Republic to administer the ownership of these lands. And for over 100 years Texas has had possession of these lands and has administered them accordingly, and its ownership has been recognized by all parties, including the United States Government.

These are the facts of history. It is not the romantic imagination of Texas, nor is it a wishful dream of ours. It is true, pure, and clean factual history. To violate this written contract made in good faith by both parties and kept by both for over 100 years is to cast a dark shadow of dishonor upon the whole of American life, public and private, which rests upon the integrity, the faithful observance of agreements.

Four members of the Supreme Court of the United States, less than a majority of the full nine-member Court, have ignored the provisions of the annexation contract by which Texas retained these lands and minerals. In justification therefore, these four members have cited and relied upon the alternative "equal footing" provision which was never submitted by the President of the United States to Texas and was never considered, accepted, or agreed upon by the Republic of Texas. It was contained in none of the proposals to or negotiations with Texas except the above-mentioned alternative and rejected third paragraph. The result is that an alternative proposal which was rejected both by the United States and Texas has been allowed by the Supreme Court to control over the proposal specifically submitted by the President of the United States and accepted by the Congress and people of Texas, and which provided that they retain all lands "lying within its limits."

THE RULING OF THE SUPREME COURT SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO STAND

As Chief Justice John Marshall said, suits involving constitutional issues and treaties should not be decided by less than a majority of the full Court. In no event should four members of the Court, over the protest of three dissenters, be allowed to break a provision of the solemn contract between the United States and the Republic of Texas and take away from the State 2,680,000 acres of land which has been in its possession for over 100 years. If the Court persists, then Congress should remedy the injustice.

Since it was a joint resolution of Congress which established the provisions of Texas' affiliations with the United States, we, the people of Texas, appeal to you whose high privilege it is to make the policies of this Nation, to uphold the dignity of our great country by enforcing the agreements made by your predecessors over 105 years ago. Today, the United States is the leader of nations in the fight to uphold the high moral principles of honor, and good faith in government. Now, while its representatives are negotiating treaties and agreements with nations all over the earth, is no time for the Government of the United States to exhibit to the world that it will stoop to the depth of regarding a written document made in good faith by two nations as a "scrap of paper." The people of Texas cannot accept such a conduct of Government. We respectfully urge that the Eighty-first Congress by a joint resolution uphold the honor and dignity of the Twenty-ninth Congress and support the provisions of its annexation agreement with Texas, and declare that all right, title, and interest in the public domain of Texas, including its tidelands, 3 leagues into the sea, remains and is vested in the State of Texas.

Passed by the board of directors of the San Angelo (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce this 10th day of August 1950.

H. C. CHARLESS,
President.

The Poorest Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Evening World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., on August 9, 1950, carried an editorial on Government controls. The editorial is especially timely since this issue is now before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POOREST POLITICS

Of all methods yet proposed for handling the economic problems arising from the Korean War, the Senate Banking Committee this week voted for the worst.

It gave unanimous approval to what is called the home-front mobilization bill.

For all practical purposes, this is the bill which President Truman asked for. Among other things, it authorizes him, whenever he may consider that the time is ripe, to take any or all of the following steps:

1. Set up wage and price controls.
2. Provide a system of rationing.
3. Establish machinery for settling labor disputes.
4. Devise a system of allocations and priorities for handling critical materials.

Obviously this plan would give the President the authority of a dictator over the American economy. For the duration of the emergency (which is anybody's guess) one man would carry vast and arbitarary powers under his hat.

Why is such a step necessary? Why should Congress delegate instead of legislate?

We don't know. Congress isn't going any place. If the world crisis grows increasingly severe, it will be in session or on quick call from now on. It will be in position to pass any important bill within the scope of 2 or 3 days—which certainly is fast enough for a bill dealing with economic matters.

Politically, of course, the bill as now phrased has considerable appeal—especially to Congressmen who are running for reelection. No matter what might happen or fail to happen, they would be able to say: That's the President's fault. We gave him the authority he asked for, and look what he's done with it.

Mr. Truman himself appears to have no qualms. He seems convinced that he will be able to handle the powers conferred on him in this bill to the satisfaction of the pressure groups which have supported him in the past.

And he may be right. Which is another reason why Congres should reflect long and earnestly before it delegates those powers to him.

In one other important respect the Congress, thus far, has completely abdicated its responsibility.

When the Korean war broke out some 6 weeks ago, the national budget already was about $5,000,000,000 out of balance. Since that time President Truman has asked for extra appropriations of $16,500,000,000, and Senator BYRD, of Virginia, predicts that huge new requests are in the works.

So despite the higher tax rates (which so far are only talk) and higher tax collections (as a result of war activity) a huge deficit is in prospect for the coming year. It may run anywhere from $10,000,000,000 up, depending on the size of the extra military appropriations yet to come.

In the face of a deficit of that size, no power on earth could prevent inflation. Only the tightest controls could temporarily, maybe, restrain the effects of inflation.

Yet hardly anybody in Congress pays much heed.

A week ago Senator BYRD offered a plan for cutting $10,000,000,000 out of nonmilitary spending. That plus an adequate tax increase would have put the rearmament program on a pay-as-you-go basis. It was the only realistic anti-inflation measure yet proposed. But it fell with a dull thud.

Nobody can see ahead to the end of this cold-hot war. But of this much the American people can be certain:

It will be a tough war against resolute opponents, and if it is to be won by our side it will be won by responsible men who, at home

or at the front, are not afraid to do what the times demand.

Too many Members of Congress thus far have not acted the part of responsible men. On issues of the greatest importance they have hedged and evaded and, for the sake of political security, sought to delegate their constitutional responsibility.

If they do not mend their ways they may discover that today, when America's sons again are headed for the wars, politics-as-usual is the poorest politics of all.

Wiley Blasts Wisconsin People's Progressive Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we of Wisconsin are disgusted that there has crawled out of the woodwork in some few parts of our State some intellectual vermin who parade under the title of People's Progressive Party. These "characters" slavishly back the policy of the Soviet Union in its aggressive war on the South Korean people through the North Korean satellite troops.

I note that the candidate for Governor in Wisconsin of this misnamed People's Progressive Party announced his backing of the statement of the national committee of that party against America's fight in Korea and against Mr. Henry Wallace's recanting of his former position.

The best way by which the people of Wisconsin can meet the challenge of the People's Progressive Party and other Communist-front groups is by:

First. Informing each of our neighbors, friends, and acquaintances of the vicious character of these Commie groups.

Second. Refusing to be provocated into any physical violence or illegal action against these groups.

Third. Refusing to give them undue attention which they thrive on.

The recent incidents in certain Wisconsin's factories at which circulators of peace petitions were manhandled was 100 percent the wrong way of dealing with Commies, fellow travelers, and misguided individuals who have swallowed the Red line.

I have in my hand two articles:

First. One from the Friday, August 11, issue of the Wisconsin CIO News. This is a straight-shooting frank piece entitled "Don't Help the Commies," giving some horse sense advice to CIO members on how to avoid falling into the Red trap.

Second. I have also in my hands a copy of the Communist publication, The People's Daily World, showing the tremendous extent to which the Reds have gone in circulating the misnamed Stockholm Peace Petition in my State.

I believe that this latter article describing the circulation of the Stockholm pledge in Mosinee, Wis., and elsewhere, will serve as a warning to every Wisconsinite, particularly members of minority groups and students for whom the Reds are especially putting out their bait.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article from the CIO paper and from the People's World be printed in contrast to one another in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin CIO News of August 11, 1950]

DON'T HELP THE COMMIES

For those who are so inclined, there are a number of ways to help the Communists. You don't have to be a party member and pay dues. You can be of great help to the Communists in many other ways.

For example, you can be active in Communist-front organizations. The CP will appreciate any help it can get in its front activities. You can be a member, and pay dues, or you can just help out now and then.

Or you can support Commie newspapers, or front newspapers or magazines such as the National Guardian or the Daily Worker. It will be appreciated by the Stalin stooges.

But that doesn't end the list of activities a friend of the Commies can engage in. He can sign Commie petitions—such as the phony Stockholm peace petition. That helps the Commies.

Or, if you are not sympathetic to the Communists, you can still be of help. You can help them, indirectly, by giving them publicity. The Commies go on the assumption that any publicity is good publicity. And they'll spare no pains to get publicity—even if it means provoking violence against themselves.

On very reliable information it was learned this week that Communists in Wisconsin—the very few of them that are still around were very pleased with all the publicity they got recently as a result of the incidents at Nash. They were so pleased that, according to this information, they are planning to provoke some more incidents in other parts of the community.

So if you don't want to help the Commies get publicity, watch out for their shady tactics. You might be one of the people to receive a peace petition in the mail, asking you to circulate it. You might be one of the people to be approached on the street, in the shop or in a bar to sign a petition, or on some other Communist phony.

If you don't want to help the Commies, then throw that peace petition in the waste basket and forget about it. Because what the Commies want you to do is to get in an uproar about it so you'll holler good and loud, and maybe sock one of their stooges to boot. That's what they want you to do. So if you don't want to help the Commies, don't fall for their tricks.

But if you do give the Commies satisfaction—if you do help them get their name in print, to get more publicity than they've already gotten in the daily newspapers, then don't expect us to sympathize with you when the smoke has cleared.

[From the People's Daily World]

MOSINEE WELCOMES SCROLLS FOR PEACE

MILWAUKEE, July 2.—Mosinee, Wis., population 1,300, is in the news again. This time for peace.

A month ago the name of Mosinee was blazoned from coast to coast as the scene of the hippodrome red coup stunt staged by the local Legion post. Americans recall that the mayor and minister died of a heart attack as a result.

But most residents of Mosinee cannot be tarred by the local Fascists.

Peace crusaders, here Sunday, got a hearty welcome as they went door to door with petitions to ban the A-bomb. A hot Sunday, 90 in the shade, many were out swimming or at ball games, but 100 of those at home signed.

This in a town of 1,300. The peace crusaders were greeted in many homes with a "God bless you." They report there was no opposition and no red-baiting.

The surge of peace is strong in this Midwestern State. Seventy-five young peace crusaders got 3,000 signatures Sunday in Milwaukee, and over 2,000 at the University of Wisconsin, just before the summer vacations began.

A Milwaukee Croatian fraternal union picnic Sunday signed up 300 for peace. On one beach in this city nine crusaders got 450 names in an hour and a half. In a Negro church the minister called on the congregation to take petitions and circulate them, and to sign at a table put up by the church for that purpose.

At the Greenfield Park trailer camp at West Allis, which was the scene of an attempt to evict a Negro family by mob violence a summer ago, over 350 names were gotten by a group of West Allis peace workers Saturday and Sunday. The 600 trailers are occupied by veterans and their families.

Last Thursday 15 women invaded the Wisconsin Avenue district on shopping night, collected nearly 400 signatures and aroused great interest throughout the city.

Friday, six canvassed the Waukesha shopping area with similar results. All this despite the violet red-baiting press campaign against the World Peace Appeal.

The Baruch Plan for Youth at 80

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the New York Times, magazine section, of August 13, 1950]

THE BARUCH PLAN FOR YOUTH AT 80—HIS ONLY RULE IS TO LIVE IRREGULARLY AND HIS MAIN HABIT IS TO BREAK HABITS

(By Burnet Hershey)

Bernard Mannes Baruch, who will be 80 years old next Saturday, is entitled, perhaps, to feel that he has earned a rest from public duties. But right now he is busy in official hearings, public statements, and private conversations trying to impress on the American public the need for all-out economic controls and full mobilization. For Mr. Baruch the state of retirement appears to be as remote as it was 30 years ago.

"They mentioned rest after World War I," he says, smiling. "I was 50 then. Supposed to be middle life, 50 is, but it's just plain youth. Didn't have time to think about rest. Sounds too much like a rut, anyway. Ruts are hazardous to intellectual keenness, and they're death on quick perception and youngness of body."

After each period in which the elder statesman played out his active role, there has always come the suggestion that now it was time for him to let go, to sit the next one out. He never has. After his service under Woodrow Wilson, on the Supreme Economic Council of the Versailles Conference,

he devoted himself to harmonizing industry and agriculture. His name and ideas are stamped on civic undertakings of the three subsequent decades—projects like the National Transportation Committee plan of 1933, the rubber-defense program of 1939, the manpower shortage relief plan, a medical research foundation to aid thousands of handicapped peoples, and the atomic-energy plan which formed the basis of the United States proposals to the UN Atomic Energy Commission.

If some geriatrician were looking for the perfect specimen of vigorous old age, he would be hard-pressed to find one better than Mr. Baruch. He is a handsome man, his white hair standing out in contrast to his pink, kinetic face. He is tall and straight, and his physical ease is especially noticeable; he seems to be moving around incessantly, with the graceful fluid stride of one who genuinely enjoys activity.

Mr. Baruch sums up his habits in a playful way: "It's a habit of mine to break habits. I like to make the area of contact with all phases of life as large as possible; to spread out in many directions, mentally, sympathetically, and to penetrate deeply in some, or at least in one. I have no rules, except a belief in the unswerving regularity of irregularity. I gave up smoking when I was 64 simply because it didn't agree with me any more. I take a cold bath every morning. I've cut down on my drinking, and today take very little except an occasional toast or congratulatory highball, because it doesn't agree with me.

"But there just aren't any rules. That's because old age is not inevitable. Although what we call the year-period, that is, the years' succession, may be advanced, old age is a state of mind that often happens to the middle-aged and sometimes to the old."

Mr. Baruch does admit to a couple of habits, but he deplores them. The more vexing of these is sleep. He agrees with Oscar Wilde, a contemporary of his who died some 50 years ago, that "no civilized man should ever go to bed the same day that he arises."

"Generally I'm a late stayer-upper, but sometimes I go to bed early just to start coping with the problem of going to sleep. If you've got a problem you might as well face it. And going to sleep is mine."

Eating is another habit for which he chides himself mildly, but not without a certain pride. "I'm always hungry. I eat like a young boy. Certainly I've been on diets, but that was when I had gout. A man should learn self-control. I never have."

He feels that he has learned other valuable practices, however, which may compensate for this deficiency.

"Men often don't pace themselves well," he observes. "They drive too hard toward breakdowns, toward the wear and tear of their tissues, and then, suddenly, they drop. Mind you, again, there's no rule, not even here. Some men might do their best this way. But the idea of frequent short vacations is a good one. Only if it suits—never if it doesn't.

"Of course, I don't mean week-enders. They wear themselves out. I'd rather stay in New York week ends. I go down to my farm in South Carolina, mostly in winter, from Thanksgiving to the 1st of March. There I'll go shooting wild birds up to the limit that the law will allow. You know, I can still sit in the saddle for from 2 to 4 hours and follow the dogs. But that's because I like it—not because I think it's healthy. The minute I stop liking it, I'll stop it."

Mr. Baruch looks upon all the aged in the world as his friends and contemporaries and has made their problems one of his chief concerns. He has been busy of late helping revaluate the potentialities of the Nation's oldsters toward insuring their useful participation in the life of the community. With noted gerontologists and with the Federal Security Agency of the Government, he has sought to define the nature and extent of the old-age problem and to seek their solution.

"The economic problem of the aged," Mr. Baruch points out, "is increasing. Down through the ages, there have been every kind of pills, theories, treatments, to avoid old age. The old-age fight is as old as the history of man. The ancient Greeks believed in rejuvenation by waters. I read just recently how the wealthy of the Middle Ages thought that pure gold was the greatest kind of rejuvenator, and rich men would swallow a few ounces a day.

"In our country and in our time, we don't need these weird ideas. Science and American organization have easily added 20 years to man's life expectancy. Today, any man can look forward to 20 more years of physical vigor than he could two generations ago.

"As I see it, there are two major issues to be faced. First, we must throw out our depression-born philosophy of forcing older workers out of jobs just because they are old. Broadly speaking, it is unwise to judge a man by his years, when his faculties are as keen as those of younger men. We are creating a vast human waste material here, with some tragic portent. And second, we must check all forms of inflation, because if we don't our plans for old-age benefits, private annuities, and even savings, will be useless when the time comes to use them.

"Any form of so-called economy that saps the value of pension money, savings, or annuities is the enemy of those who expect to grow old. And this includes just about everybody, doesn't it?

"And last, but most of all, we must remember never to become too statistical where human beings are concerned. The problem of what to do about the aged is primarily one of recognizing them first as individual human beings, full of fears, hopes, despairs, and appetities. We can't regulate them according to meters. Our problem now is to make industry understand them, and absorb them, for we are definitely entering upon an era of a new kind of old age."

The greatest contributing factor to the increased lifespan of the average American of today, Mr. Baruch feels, is private enterprise.

"A man who is free can mold his life, just as a nation that is free can mold its life—even control, to an extent, the building forces of his body and brain just as we can today control great forces of nature in electronics, dynamics, and atomic energy."

State Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum by District Attorney L. H. Perez, of Plaquemines Parish, La., appearing for the State of Lousiana, as special representative for the Attorney General of Louisiana, before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 195, dealing with State tidelands, on August 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 195 by Senator O'MAHONEY would complete the nationalization of the State tidelands by giving to the Secretary of the Interior full control and power over all operations for oil and other mineral production in offshore submerged lands in all coastal States of the Union.

ALL POWER TO SECRETARY

By the provisions of this resolution the Secretary of the Interior would be substituted for all the coastal States in the control and power over development of the tidelands for mineral purposes. For a period of 3 years he would be authorized to grant mineral leases for a term of 5 years, or as long thereafter as oil or other minerals may be produced from the area in paying quantities.

All revenues collected by the Secretary under existing State leases, or under leases issued by him under authority of this resolution, would be deposited in a special fund in the United States Treasury pending legislation by Congress respecting their disposition—which could be ordinary appropriations of Congress—and not legislation regarding the ownership of tidelands and their resources.

The Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this resolution—a blanket authority for the Secretary to issue regulations which would have the effect of administrative law, without enactment by Congress, and in substitution for all State laws and authority regarding the development of their natural resources in State tidelands, including all coastal submerged lands and waters within their boundaries.

The resolution affords no relief to inland States by providing that the United States is not claiming (as of now) their water bottoms, without a quitclaim or recognition of their proprietorship.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY DESTROYED

The States, with respect to their ancient and historic ownership of their own tidelands would be reduced to the status of puppets of a domineering, grasping, imperialistic Federal Government, with the Secretary of the Interior placed in the position of absolute czar of their erstwhile sovereignty lands which the States have always held for the benefit of their people in their united sovereignty.

This resolution would effectively destroy sovereignty of State governments over their public properties, which they have owned and operated by regulation of their State legislatures since the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, the provisional Treaty of Independence between the Original States, through the Congress of the Confederation and the British Crown, on November 30, 1782, and the final ratification thereof with the British Crown, on April 11, 1783, by which the British Crown relinquished to the Original Thirteen States, by name, as free, sovereign and independent States, "proprietary and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof" and fixed the boundaries of the Original States into the sea, "comprehending all islands within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States."

STATE OWNERSHIP SECURED BY TREATY

The right of State proprietorship of their tidelands, as a result of the Declaration of Independence and the Treaty of Independence which was wrung from the British Crown at the expense of incalculable sufferings and hardships and the shedding of the blood of our patriotic forefathers, has been adjudicated upon time and again by the highest court of the land.

In the interim between the Declaration of Independence in 1776, the Treaty of Independence in 1783 and the adoption of the United States Constitution by the people of the Original States in 1789, a Federal Government was set up under Articles of Confederation, article IX of which provided that—

"No State shall be deprived of territory for the benefit of the United States."

In the first recorded decision by the United States Supreme Court in 1827, *Harcourt* v. *Gaillord* (12 Wheat. 523), the United States Supreme Court held:

"There was no territory within the United States that was claimed in any other right than that of some one of the Confederate States; therefore, there could be no acquisition of territory made by the United States distinct from, or independent of some one of the States."

The sanctity of that Treaty of Independence with the British Crown was written into the United States Constitution, under article VI, clause 2, which provides—

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

In this connection, it should be pointed out that on Saturday, August 25, 1787, on motion of Mr. Madison, made in the Convention, article VIII (later made article VI by the Committee on Style and Revision) was reconsidered and after the words "all treaties made" were inserted the words "or which shall be made," with the explanatory statement that, "This insertion was meant to obviate all doubt concerning the force of treaties pre-existing, by making the words 'all treaties made' to refer to them, as the words concerned would refer to future treaties." (69th Cong., 1st sess., H. Doc. No. 398, p. 618.)

So it is, that the 1783 treaty of the Revolution by which the British Crown relinquished to the Original States all "proprietary and territorial rights" of the British Crown became, and is now, the supreme law of the land.

OFFICERS SWORN TO UPHOLD TREATY

The same article VI of the Constitution requires all Members of Congress, and State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States to support this Constitution, which makes said treaty the supreme law of the land.

If the plain provisions of the Declaration of Independence and the 1783 treaty with the British Crown require interpretation, the decisions of the United States Supreme Court furnish ample authority for the proprietary rights acquired by the Original States in all of the submerged lands within their boundaries.

STATE PROPRIETORSHIP, LAW

Over a hundred years ago this question of the right and title of the Original States to their submerged lands was passed upon by the United States Supreme Court.

In the case of *Martin* v. *Waddell*, reported in 16 Peters (41 U. S.) 367, decided in 1842, where the question of the ownership of submerged coastal waters in New Jersey was at issue, the Court held:

"When the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government."

The Court then cited approvingly a statement by Lord Hale in his treatise de jure maris, when speaking of the navigable waters, and the sea on the coasts within the jurisdiction of the British Crown, that the King is the owner of this great coast. The Court further stated that the lands under these waters were held by the King as a public trust for the benefit of the whole community, and that this dominion and propriety was an incident to the regal authority, and was held by him as a prerogative right, associated with the powers of government; and that when the people of New Jersey took possession of the reins of government, and took into their own hands the power of sovereignty, the prerogatives and regalities which before belonged either to the Crown or the Parliament became immediately and rightfully vested in the State.

The Court followed that decision consistently in holding that New Jersey, Maryland, Massachusetts, Delaware, New York, and other original coastal States on the Atlantic Ocean and Great Lakes had title to their navigable waters and soils under them.

The Court, in *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1 (1893)), held:

"At common law the title and the dominion in lands flowed by the tide were in the King for the benefit of the nation. Upon the settlement of the Colonies like rights passed to the grantees in the royal charters, in trust for the communities to be established. Upon the American Revolution these rights, charged with a like trust, were vested in the Original States, within their respective borders, subject to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the United States.

TIDELANDS NOT GRANTED TO UNITED STATES

Again, in *Memford* v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423, 436 (1867)), the United States Supreme Court reaffirmed that settled jurisprudence of our country when it again held:

"Settled rule of law in this Court is, that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the Original States were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the several States and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the Original States possess within their respective borders.

"When the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign and in that character held the absolute right to their navigable waters and the soils under them, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution."

And as to the sovereignty rights over their tidelands and waters and their resources, the United States Supreme Court consistently has held that States since admitted on an equal footing with the Original States have the same sovereignty rights and proprietorship as the Original States.

In *Pollard* v. *Hagen* ((1845) 3 How. 212, p. 230), the United States Supreme Court held:

"By the preceding course of reasoning we have arrived at these general conclusions: First, the shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States but were reserved to the States respectively; Secondly, the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the Original States."

These positive decisions were reaffirmed scores of times by the Court, as witness again in the case of *I. C. Railroad* v. *State of Illinois* ((1892) 146 U. S., p. 43):

PROPERTY SUBJECT TO PARAMOUNT RIGHT OF UNITED STATES

"It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by tidewaters, within the limits of the several States, belong to the respective States within which they are found with the consequent right to use or dispose of any portion thereof, when that can be done without substantial impairment of the interest of the public in the waters, and subject always to the paramount right of Congress to control their navigation so far as may be necessary for the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and among the States. This doctrine has been often announced by this Court, and is not questioned by counsel of any of the parties. (*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (44 U. S., 3 How. 212 (11: 565); *Weber* v. *Board of State Harbor Comrs.* (85 U. S., 18 Wall. 57 (21: 798).)

SAME RULE FOR GREAT LAKES

"The same doctrine is in this country held to be applicable to lands covered by fresh water in the Great Lakes over which is conducted an extended commerce with different States and foreign nations. These lakes possess all the general characteristics of open seas, except in the freshness of their waters, and in the absence of the ebb and flow of the tide. In other respects they are inland seas, and there is no reason or principle for the assertion of dominion and sovereignty over and ownership by the State of lands covered by tidewaters that is not equally applicable to its ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by the fresh waters of these lakes."

PARAMOUNT POWER OVER TIDELANDS

And, again, in *Scott* v. *Lattig* (1913) (227 U. S. 229, 242–243), as follows:

"* * * Besides, it was settled long ago by this Court, upon a consideration of the relative rights and powers of the Federal and State Governments under the Constitution, that lands underlying navigable waters within the several States belong to the respective States in virtue of their sovereignty and may be used and disposed of as they may direct, subject always to the rights of the public in such waters and to the paramount power of Congress to control their navigation so far as may be necessary for the regulation of commerce among the States and with foreign nations, and that each new State, upon its admission to the Union, becomes endowed with the same rights and powers in this regard as the older ones. (*County of Ct. Clair* v. *Lovington* (23 Wall. 46, 68); *Barney* v. *Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324, 338); *I. C. R. R. Co.* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 338, 434–437); *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 48–50, 48); *McGilvra* v. *Ross* (215 U. S. 70).)"

At least 50 other cases could be cited and quoted affirming and reaffirming the same doctrine and the same settled jurisprudence of State ownership of its tidelands.

PARAMOUNT POWER OVER PRIVATE LANDS, TOO

The United States Supreme Court held and reaffirmed that, the same Constitutional paramount powers of the Federal Government apply to privately owned property, as, for instance, the Federal power of eminent domain over lands needed by the United States for governmental or defense purposes. (*Kohl* v. *U. S.* (91 U. S. 367, 23 L. ed. 49); *Chappell* v. *U. S.* (160 U. S. 499, 40 L. ed. 510, 16 S. Ct. 397).)

Even further back, in 1819, Chief Justice Marshall, in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat., at 403), held for the Court:

"If any one proposition could command the universal assent of mankind, we might expect it would be this—that the Government of the Union, though limited in its powers, is supreme within its sphere of action."

POWER NOT CONFISCATORY

However, in spite of the supremacy, the dominance and paramount character of the regulatory powers of the United States, construed within its delegated constitutional powers as far back as 1819, the same United States Supreme Court has held consistently for over 100 years that when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable

waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the general government. And therefore, the Original States succeeded to the proprietary rights of the British Crown by the Declaration of Independence, confirmed by relinquishment of such proprietary and territorial rights in the 1783 treaty, which was made the supreme law of the land by article VI of the Constitution, and all States since admitted in the Union on an equal footing with the Original States, have the same proprietary and territorial rights to the beds of all submerged lands and tidewaters within the boundaries.

We repeat that the United States Supreme Court has consistently held that under the Declaration of Independence, under the Treaty of Independence with the British Crown, under the Articles of Confederation and under the Constitution of the United States, not only the Original States, but every State since admitted on an equal footing with the Original States, have ownership and title of all submerged lands and waters and their resources, including all tidelands within their boundaries, and that the States only granted to the United States Government regulatory powers necessary for the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and among the States, which constitutional authority in the United States is the same over the inland navigable waters within each and every State of the Union.

This consistency recently was violated by the United States Supreme Court in the California decision in 1947 and, later, by the application of that same tideland grab ideology in the opinions rendered in the Louisiana and Texas cases in June 1950.

CANNOT ADOPT FOREIGN IDEOLOGY

The question for Congress to decide now is whether the foreign ideology adopted by the United States Supreme Court in these later three cases can be adopted as a national policy by the United States Congress.

Is it in the national interest, or is it conducive to rational international relations for the Congress of the United States to be importuned by Senate Joint Resolution 195 to ratify the foreign ideology adopted by the United States Supreme Court recently in the California, Louisiana and Texas cases, that the sovereignty of the States can be destroyed with impunity, that their public properties held in trust for their people in their united sovereignty can be destroyed, and their properties confiscated on the unconscionable pretense that the United States Government owes the responsibility of national defense, and such paramount power and dominion transcends those of a mere property owner, and by virtue of such paramount power, the United States has the right to appropriate the public property of the sovereign States, and to determine by what agencies, foreign or domestic, the oil and the other resources of the soil of the marginal sea may be exploited?

Can Congress adopt this foreign, grasping, imperialistic ideology as held by the Supreme Court, in its relations with the sovereign States of the Union, without damning its offer of defense, through the United Nations to other weaker sovereign states against communistic aggression?

Bear in mind that the Court refused to hold that the United States had proprietorship, or title, in the California case, and that the Court held that title was not an issue in the cases against Louisiana and Texas, but that the paramount power and dominion of the United States Government transcended bare legal title and entitled the United States to take and control the taking of mineral resources from the State tidelands.

This pronouncement of such un-American ideology for the destruction of the sovereignty of our States is indeed frightful to the weaker sovereign nations of the world who are tendered protection and defense either through the liberality of the United States Government under its present administration or through the United Nations, with paramount power furnished by the United States, under its policy of international defense against aggressor nations.

SUPREME COURT DECREES UNITED STATES AGGRESSOR

But, here, who is the aggressor against the sovereignty and public property rights of our States, with an implication that the same destructive force of paramount power and dominion will extend to the destruction of private property rights?

No exception is made by the United States Supreme Court in its California, Louisiana, and Texas decisions that the paramount power and dominion of the Federal Government transcends those of a mere property owner who has only "bare legal title," without the paramount power to protect his possession thereof.

Certainly, the Congress of the United States cannot vote to adopt Senate Joint Resolution 195 and, by implication, adopt the foreign ideology of appropriation of property, or its confiscation, because of the exercise of paramount power and dominion of the Federal Government, or any government, without ratifying the aggressive, confiscatory acts and policy of the Kremlin.

The issue here far transcends the tideland grab or the power grab by some departments of the Federal Government.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 195, coupled with the Supreme Court decisions in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, are merely invitations to Congress to adopt a policy of appropriation and confiscation wherever the paramount power and dominion and the force of arms of the United States are used, supposedly for the protection and defense either of the States of the Union or the citizens thereof, or any other sovereign state or nation which accepts the protection and defense of its might and power.

To our shame, the Korean war situation is being used to liquidate our State sovereignty, and to put the clincher on the Federal tideland grab.

Congress certainly will support the Constitution of the United States and the supreme law of the land, the Treaty of Independence, and the rights of the States and its citizens flowing therefrom as the Members of Congress are sworn to do, and Congress will repudiate the suggestion of adopting a policy of appropriation and confiscation of property as a result of the use of this country's paramount power and dominion for national or international defense and, therefore, Congress must reject Senate Joint Resolution 195.

The Prayers-for-Peace Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as the sponsor of Public Law 74, which calls upon the President to proclaim each Memorial Day as a Nation-wide day of prayer for peace, I am pleased to pay my respects to Mr. Hervé L'Heureux, who is doing splendid work in furthering the prayers-for-peace movement which he has sponsored.

As Members of the Senate know, Mr. L'Heureux is one of our finest Government career men, presently head of the State Department's Visa Division. He is one of the founders of the American Legion, and a wounded veteran of World War I. For the past 2 years he has been devoting himself to the prayers-for-peace movement in order that America might prepare itself spiritually as well as materially for the ordeal of these times.

Since this was the same premise which moved me to introduce the resolution to designate Memorial Day as a day of prayer for peace I am, as I say, most pleased to compliment Mr. L'Heureux on his fine work.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. L'Heureux entitled "Prayers for Peace" which was published in the magazine the Gold Star for May 1950, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that excerpts from an address delivered by Mr. L'Heureux on July 19 to members of the United Action Committee for Expellees and of the Volksverein of Philadelphia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Gold Star of May 1950]

PRAYERS FOR PEACE

(By Hervé J. L'Heureux)

My message is simple: Prayer, a minimum of 1 minute of prayer, daily, at noon, by every man, woman, and child in the United States, each in his own way, each according to his own faith, to seek divine guidance and assistance in securing world peace.

The original prayers-for-peace resolution, adopted at Manchester, N. H., October 28, 1948, is simple and self-explanatory. Here it is:

"Having complete confidence in the ability of our fellow men, with the aid of Almighty God, to establish a just and enduring peace in the world.

"We, the members of the Last Man's Club, William H. Jutras Post, No. 43, American Legion, do hereby unanimously resolve to pause for 1 minute in the midst of our daily task, at 12 o'clock noon each day, and raising our heart and mind toward God, ask Him to help us adjust our international differences to enable the nations of the world to secure an equitable and abiding peace; further

"We urge that this movement be endorsed by all the spiritual, civic, and business leaders in the United States, and that a similar resolution be adopted and implemented by every organization in our country to the end that this custom may become universal in effect."

Those of us who initiated this movement were actuated by a conviction that each and every person, regardless of his station in life, or his religious belief, can assist materially, through daily prayer, in achieving the peace which all of us desire so ardently. It was thought that a pause, in the midst of our daily work, at 12 o'clock noon, is an appropriate time to marshal the spiritual force of our Nation for peace, with the hope that such a custom might become universal in effect. The establishment of this practice generally would not only be a national acknowledgment of our dependency upon God, but it might also be a source of inspiration and encouragement to the masses of unfortunate people throughout the world who look

to us for moral leadership, as well as for material aid. The prayers-for-peace movement is thoroughly patriotic, consistent with our basic philosophy of life and with the fundamental precepts upon which this country was founded. It is not pacifist in character; it is not a substitute for adequate armament, but an indispensable, spiritual component of adequate preparedness—in fact, a properly balanced preparedness. And at this point I should like to emphasize, if I may, that it need not be a question of enlisting God's aid in our defense only, but in the positive prosecution of our task as a nation, according to His will, whatever that prove to be.

While our potential enemies are straining every effort in preparation for total war, and we in the United States are taking necessary precautions to meet the challenge, why not unite simultaneously, at least in a national, if not in a world-wide mobilization of daily prayers for divine assistance and return to good morals and true Christian principles, with the hope of dissipating the causes for another world conflict? There is hardly a person who believes in God who, whether he goes to church or not, does not turn to God for help in times of peril to himself or to a loved one. Since this be true why wait until the eleventh hour? Why not seek God's graces now, before it is too late?

Occasionally, I am told that prayer will not deter those diabolical forces that are planning war. This, to me, indicates a lack of faith in the efficacy of prayer. It is hoped by those of us who sponsor this crusade that if we can muster a sufficient force of fervent prayers throughout the world, the balance might be tilted in favor of law and order. To this end some of us at least are dedicating every possible effort. Let us ask ourselves whether we, individually, are doing everything possible with the means God has given us to help avoid the horrors of another war. There has been a definite recrudescence of spiritual thinking in the United States in the past 20 years. Religion is on the march. Each of us should do our part to accelerate its pace. We must pray increasingly, in number and in fervor, if we hope to witness a millennium of genuine peace. However, each of us should daily and constantly endeavor to improve our individual behavior that we might be worthy of that which we seek through prayer. In the light of the moral decadence and selfishness which prevails in the world today, is it not too much to expect God to assist us in reconciling our differences and in securing world peace until through mass individual effort we shall have shown Him that we are worthy of His assistance?

As a clergyman has recently written to me from Los Gatos, Calif., "it may be that God demands more than an occasional furtive gesture of acknowledgement on the part of some of our governmental leaders, with the implied desire that He should, so to speak, leave the needed packet of divine assistance politely at our back doorstep and slip silently away."

The prayers-for-peace movement has no organized head; it calls for no financial subscription of any kind; its spread depends entirely upon the spontaneous and voluntary efforts of those individuals, and groups of individuals, who wish to interest themselves in this crusade of prayer. The individual effort required to pause daily for a 1-minute silent prayer, and to pass on the idea to a friend or to a group, is very little indeed. Yet, through such means alone, with the limited coordination I have been able to effect, the movement has made considerable progress since it was started in 1948. It has been endorsed by religious leaders of several faiths, including Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish. Many Members of our Congress have commented upon the movement in the House of Representatives or have brought it to the attention of their constituents. One governor and several mayors have issued appropriate proclamations. Some business firms have sent out printed literature with their monthly statements. The members of at least 920 groups and organizations in the United States have formally adopted resolutions of endorsement. I have received more than 13,000 letters. The practice of a 1-minute daily prayer at noon is presently being followed by unknown hundreds of thousands of persons, perhaps millions, in this country and in foreign lands. I wish I had the time to tell you about the development and spread of this movement outside our borders. I have received a large number of letters, from 16 different countries, requesting information concerning this movement, or relating what is being accomplished outside the United States.

Most of the 920 resolutions adopted in this country have come from individual units of veterans' and auxiliary organizations—542 of them. The others have come from service clubs, fraternal societies, sororities, student bodies, church groups, business firms, groups of Federal employees, and so forth. The following organizations have approved the idea on a national scale at their respective annual meeting during 1949:

1. The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States—convention, Cleveland, July 13, 1949.

2. Greek-American Progressive Association—convention, Milwaukee, Wis., August 5, 1949.

3. The Order of AHEPA—convention, Miami, August 9, 1949.

4. The Society of American Legion Founders—meeting, Philadelphia, August 27, 1949.

5. The Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity—convention, Detroit, Mich., August 31, 1949.

6. Jewish War Veterans of the United States—convention, Miami, October 19–23, 1949.

7. The American Legion—meeting, national executive committee, Indianapolis, November 6, 1949.

Several other national groups are planning to take similar action at their respective, forthcoming, national conventions this year.

Among the readers of this message will be many whose sons, husbands, and fathers experienced the horrors of war and who have called upon God in their hour of need. Out of the tragedy of the loss of loved ones should emerge a great desire to do all possible toward the goal of world peace.

If you should find it practicable to adopt an appropriate resolution in any organization to which you belong, I would urge you to take the necessary steps so that the subject will be brought before your next national convention for similar action.

I feel that everyone should take part in this crusade of prayer, which has won the admiration and support of so many good people. Such support seems clearly to be our duty, and we should respond with unshakable and absolute trust. We need not know what form God's answer will take. In view of some of the factors in the international situation, we cannot know. But at least we should place our trust in God, as our forefathers have done, and hope for the peace upon which civilization itself seems to depend.

THE PRAYERS-FOR-PEACE MOVEMENT — IN UNION WITH GOD, THE FREE NATIONS OF THE EARTH CANNOT FAIL

(By Hervé J. L'Heureux)

There frequently evolves something worthwhile and noble in the gathering together of men of sound mind and of good will for the accomplishment of a lofty purpose. On the night of October 28, 1948, a group of veterans of the First World War, assembled at Manchester, N. H., resolved to pause for one minute in the midst of their daily task, at 12 o'clock noon each day and, each in his own way, according to his own faith, to implore Almighty God to help us adjust our international differences with a view to enabling the nations of the world to secure an equitable and abiding peace.

The resolution, adopted by these veterans, included a plea that this movement be endorsed by all the spiritual, civic, and business leaders in the United States, and that a similar resolution be adopted and implemented by the members of every organization in our country to the end that this custom may become universal in effect.

This idea, of a 1-minute silent prayer at noon, has come to be known as the Prayers-for-Peace Movement. During the past 21 months, it has spread progressively throughout the United States and in several foreign lands. Although it is not possible to evaluate the growth of the movement outside the United States, it is known to be making substantial progress. Here in this country, at least 1,535 organizations and other groups, whose members embrace nearly every faith and creed, have formally endorsed the idea by passing resolutions. The following will give you some idea of the nature of these groups:

Veterans' organizations (individual units)	688
Veterans' auxiliary groups	99
Service clubs, including Rotary, Lions, etc	21
Fraternal societies, clubs and sororities	113
Student groups (schools, academies, colleges)	193
Alumnae groups	31
Church groups, including lay organizations	146
Business firms, professional offices, etc	185
Groups of Federal employees	18
Other groups and organizations	41
Total (as of July 15, 1950)	1,535

Here are some of the national organizations whose members have endorsed the prayers-for-peace movement:

1. The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States—annual convention, Cleveland, July 13, 1949;

2. Greek-American Progressive Association—annual convention, Milwaukee, Wis., August 5, 1949;

3. The Order of AHEPA—annual convention, Miami, August 19, 1949;

4. The Society of American Legion Founders, annual meeting, Philadelphia, August 27, 1949;

5. The Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity, annual convention, Detroit, Mich., August 31, 1949;

6. Jewish War Veterans of the United States, annual convention, Miami, October 19–23, 1949;

7. The American Legion, annual meeting National Executive Committee, Indianapolis, November 6, 1949;

8. Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, annual convention, Milwaukee, Wis., June 17, 1950.

In addition to these resolutions, the prayers-for-peace movement has been endorsed by many Government officials, including at least 20 Members of Congress, one Governor, several mayors, ecclesiastical authorities of different faiths and by business and industrial leaders. More than 14,000 letters have been received. Here are some of the comments, contained in one of these letters, from a patriotic, two-fisted American businessman in California. Referring to the movement, he wrote:

"It is simple and workable, perfectly free of all the familiar antipathies of the American mind (organizational propaganda, sectarianism and the like) and it is so exactly

adapted to our personal and social necessities in this breathless hour of history, that it ought to spread like wild fire. If the twofold problem confronting our young Republic is to achieve a unity of spirit against the new barbarism threatening our civilization, and at the same time to forge that unity without destroying our own precious diversities, I know of no ready means to that end more happy and worthy than this beautiful proposal. It can become the Providential bond of unity among all men of good will, in whatever diverse tongues and idioms of belief, and nothing in our turbulent times is clearer than that the ultimate salvation of our western society, its faith and its culture, will only be won on the plains of reason with the sword of the spirit.

"The job now is to spread this movement through all the media of a mass organizational society without giving the idea itself the shape or character of another particular organization. God and our need of Him is a concept implanted in the nature of man, as we know, but it can be tragically smothered by our own petty prejudices, allergies and suspicions almost as readily as by sin. It is wonderful, really, how many groups (and how many anonymous persons) have already adopted this inspiration of yours, and many, many more will surely follow, as it spreads through our multiple and instant means of communication.

"But once let it be tagged as a specially sponsored program, however, unimpeachable the particular sponsor (American Legion, the Federation of Churches, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, etc.) and its burning appeal is promptly confined within fixed boundaries, and barricaded off from millions who need it and would otherwise eagerly adopt it. These groups, and many besides, will, I am sure, accept and urge it, but let them adopt it, not take it over; it should be kept as you have started it, an idea for one and all, conceived in faith and charity * * * 12 o'clock noon is a change of shifts for many great plants and whistle-time for virtually all. What an hour for a moment's prayer."

There is considerable food for thought in the remarks which have just been quoted. Also, there is considerable work yet to be done if the prayers-for-peace movement is to effect its purpose. The world has never been in greater need of prayer. The free nations need God's guidance in their efforts to stop the impending avalanche of armed conflicts in various areas of the globe; they certainly should have the benefit of His grace and His blessing in their common struggle to eradicate the communistic cancerous growth, with which the world is afflicted, and to restore natural law and order among the society of nations.

Our ignominious neglect of God and our failure to adhere to His divine law undoubtedly are responsible for most of the ills in the world. All too many of us, who have faith in God, are prone to neglect Him and to disobey Him. It may be that our poor mortal leaders have been playing the game of world politics alone altogether too long. Why not call in the Master Planner before it is too late?

It is here in Philadelphia, the cradle of American liberty that, as the originator of the prayers-for-peace movement, I suggest that our entire Nation be called to spiritual arms. In this dark hour in the world's history, let every leader—spiritual, civic, industrial, and business—and every newspaper, television and radio commentator take it upon himself to issue this call to all persons of good will, who believe in God.

Let us all unite daily, through the prayers-for-peace movement, in asking Almighty God to guide our destiny, to give our leaders the necessary wisdom and courage, to deter our enemies from carrying out their evil designs, and to bless our people and our associates in this crusade, to the end that, with the assistance of God, and the righteous efforts of the free nations of the world, liberty, justice, and charity might prevail once again, here on earth.

Let us proclaim our dependency upon God. Let us have complete spiritual mobilization. Then, with His guidance, and in union with Him, let us accept the challenge of His enemies. Let us not fear, for in union with God, the free nations of the earth cannot fail.

We in Government Are Working for You, the Citizens of These United States—We Are Your Employees—We Want You To Know What We Are Doing—To See Us, Hear Us, and Know How We Are Directing Our Efforts Toward Solving the Problems Which Face Our Nation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are fortunate enough to own television sets were really afforded an opportunity on Sunday night last, to see a demonstration of truly representative government in action.

The program, Battle Reports From Washington, which made this possible was planned and projected by the Honorable John Steelman, assistant to the President. It was done in order to give millions of Americans an opportunity to see and hear top-flight officials here in Washington personally speaking on subjects of vital and of current interest to the American people. Politics were absolutely taboo.

The projected program will follow somewhat the type of White House meetings which have been conducted for some years past when national leaders in the field of agriculture, labor, finance, commerce, transportation, and trade were brought to Washington and given a so-called briefing or an intimate insight into what was the inside on public affairs as of that day and hour.

Last night's presentation—the first of a series of such telecasts—was positively captivating. It was opened by a forceful presentation as to the policies and purposes of the program, candidly, frankly, and eloquently presented to the American people by the Honorable John Steelman, assistant to the President.

Mr. Steelman was followed by the Honorable Steve Early, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and he in turn by Admiral John L. McCrea, Mr. Orris B. Wells, Senator Brien McMahon, and Mr. Averell Harriman, each of whom discussed the problem of the conflict in Korea as it affects their particular departments of Government here in Washington.

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON'S statement on the atom bomb, its peace potentialities as well as deadly effects in wartime, ought to be made a "must" reading for every Member of this House.

The entire program, monitored as it was by Robert McCormick, the well-known newspaper writer, war correspondent, and radio commentator, was beautifully and forcefully presented. Mr. McCormick's comments and excellently spoken introductions of the various speakers were clear, concise, and added striking continuity to the various statements.

Mr. Speaker, I carried to my bed the memories of the simple, honey truths so sincerely and eloquently spoken by John Steelman, the strong, rugged, courageous, and sagacious statements made by the able, experienced, and beloved Steve Early, the factual report of Mr. Averell Harriman, who has just returned from his visit with General MacArthur, and the interesting and fascinating talks on military personnel and food supplies made by Admiral John L. McCrea and Mr. Orris V. Wells, of the United States Department of Agriculture.

That last Sunday evening's telecast was of great import was evidenced by the fact that at its conclusion—and every few minutes thereafter throughout the evening—one would hear either on his radio or the television some news commentator making mention of the telecast and particularly of the statements made by Mr. Steelman, Mr. Early, and Senator McMahon. I noticed that the Monday morning papers carried a half-column report about the broadcast of the previous evening.

In order that all my colleagues may have an opportunity of informing their minds of the nonpolitical, disinterested, wholly unbiased, and informative telecast headed by the Honorable John Steelman, I am asking unanimous consent to insert the same into the RECORD:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. ROBERT MCCORMICK. Exactly 8 weeks ago, North Korean tanks rolled across the rice paddies of the thirty-eighth parallel and bombs burst the peace in "the Land of the Morning Calm." As the cold war melts under the heat of guns into a hotter one, NBC television, inaugurating today a new series of teledocumentaries, turns its cameras upon the Nation's Capitol.

Washington—suddenly again not only the nerve center of the Nation, but the heart of the democratic world—bestirs itself to supply men and materials to fight a war 8,000 long miles away.

For a report on Washington, August 13, 1950—and a statement of the purpose of this series—here is the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good evening, fellow citizens.

Tonight we begin a series of telecasts which we hope will bring your Government in Washington closer to you—and also to give you precise, authentic information on many national problems.

It is but natural that in a country as large as is ours, the Federal Government in Washington should seem remote to a large percentage of our people. We in Government, however, do not wish to be distant from you. We are working for you—the citizens of these United States. We are your employees. We want you to know what we are doing. We want you to see us, to hear how we are directing our efforts toward solving the many problems which face our Nation today.

Several years ago, I instituted a series of annual meetings at the White House, with various groups of leaders in labor and industry. At these meetings, Cabinet officers and the heads of independent agenices tell of their problems and what they are doing to solve them. These gatherings have become very popular and those who have attended have been quite lavish in expressions of appreciation. All, I feel sure, obtained a better understanding of the work which is being done.

The present television program is an extension of that activity. In this instance, we propose to discuss not alone labor, but agriculture, finance, commerce, transportation, and last but not least, the peace and security of our Nation.

Everyone hears rumors. Doubtless, you hear them every day. Someone who works for someone else might speak as if he knew the innermost secrets of high Government officials. The story he might tell—grows with each telling, and, of course, it is often difficult to obtain a clear picture of a given situation or even of a certain personality. By the medium of television you yourself can see the personality. We propose that you shall henceforth see and hear directly from the officials who are doing their part in administering the laws and carrying out the programs and policies of your Government.

Through the magic of television we hope to bring millions of our citizens in close touch with official Washington. On this program you will both hear and see the men who are working for you.

We hope that during these telecasts you will feel as if you are attending a meeting in a conference room in Washington, with Cabinet officers and other high-ranking officials. The agenda for these programs will follow the same pattern as the one used for the White House meetings I have mentioned. However, instead of attending an annual meeting, you will henceforth receive reports each week.

The officials whom you will meet during the weeks to come will speak very frankly. They will be reporting directly to you, as a citizen and a taxpayer. The information you get will be authentic. It will be altogether—the same facts and figures, which these officials use in making both their plans and decisions.

I think all will agree that these intimate meetings with the officials of the Federal Government can truly be called an exhibition of democracy in action.

Mr. ROBERT MCCORMICK. As American soldiers—now battling under the United Nations flag as well, carry the brunt of the war in Korea—and as the Nation, its complacency shattered by reports from the front, puts aside all hopes for a quick victory, 150,000,000 uneasy voices ask 150,000,000 uneasy questions of the men in charge of our military.

One such man is with us today. For 50 years he has been no stranger to the Washington scene. He has served under two Presidents. Though suddenly finding himself Deputy Secretary of Defense, he nevertheless remains an old newspaper man by instinct, still with a reporter's nose for facts. Let's hear the facts on our Armed Forces from Steve Early.

Mr. EARLY. I wish I could answer all of the questions the American people are asking about their Armed Forces, and especially about the fighting in Korea.

The American people can take the news—good or bad. As a reporter for many years, I learned that the American people want the facts. Here they are.

The last 50 days have seen the accomplishment of a military miracle. It is the first time in history—as far as I know—that any nation has made a successful piecemeal commitment of its armed forces in the face of a moving, hard-striking enemy army—and won the initial decision. I refer to the failure of the enemy to drive the American advance forces out of Korea. The Communists confidently expected to do this.

It is not the style of action Americans would have chosen. Normally, we would mobilize a sufficient number of troops to do the job; we would back them up with all the supplies and guns and ammunition and airplanes and bombs that they would need. And then, when ready, we would go to work. That's the way it happened in Normandy on D-day.

In Korea, that was not the case. When we spotted this invasion by the North Koreans as an all-out attack, we started to get out the American women and children. And they got out safely.

The President of the United States acted promptly. MacArthur never hesitated. A battalion of soliders flew to South Korea, got out of their planes, and began at once to fight the Communist enemies of that little country.

The South Koreans—out armored and out numbered—put up a terrific battle. And, I say this despite reports to the contrary. American soliders, sailors, and Marines and Airmen came to help them. And the nurses were there too.

It was the most valiant and well-executed rear guard action—stand, fight and retreat to stand and fight again—that modern arms has seen. Valiant battles went virtually unreported. They were the Bunker Hills of 1950.

We here started to build up supplies, and numbers of men. In 50 days a force has been rallied that equals the D-day effort on Omaha and Utah beaches in Normandy. And we have started local counterattacks to clean out the salients of a 140-mile battle line.

It has not been easy. Americans have died. Many have been wounded. Many more are missing.

It was from this one battalion that the forces today had to be built. They have stopped the advance and gradually will win back the territory that has been lost to the Communists.

That's the way it looks to this reporter's eyes. And, as the Deputy Secretary of Defense, I can assure you that that is about the same way it looks to our Joint Chiefs of Staff.

One thing has impressed me above all others. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have worked untiringly. Even more important, though, is the attitude of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They regard their problem—to a surprising degree—from a civilian viewpoint, never losing the broad perspective, never forgetting what each move means to their country. Much of this comes from the attitude of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—the GI general—Omar N. Bradley. He "carries the ball" between the Chiefs and the Secretaries and the President. You might like to know a little of the inside story of how he operates.

Early every morning, General Bradley is at his desk, checking on the latest reports from Korea and Tokyo. Exactly at 8:45, he is in Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson's office briefing us, bringing the recommendations on what should be done next. He helps to coordinate our efforts with those of the men out there on the battle fronts.

From Mr. Johnson's office, he goes to the White House and briefs the President. By 10 o'clock, General Bradley is back at his desk, ready to start a day's work that leads more often than not well into the night.

Americans have never been afraid to face the facts, and here is one of the facts we must face: This job in Korea is going to take time and effort, American troops and troops of other nations; it is going to have an impact on Americans, on the way we are going to live, for some time to come.

This is a fight for peace—for the United Nations—and for ourselves. The fight for peace will go on and on. It will not be easy, but Secretary Johnson, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the rest of us would like to have you know from this reporter that no effort will be spared to carry out the will of the American people and the orders of the Commander in Chief, our President.

Mr. ROBERT MCCORMICK. To gird ourselves, America, for the kind of war Under Secretary Early tells us we may expect, we are God-blessed with an agricultural bounty that before has nurtured us and our allies through two world wars. As the Nation gradually moves toward a war footing, as our defense forces siphon manpower from these farms, and war orders cut into the production of agricultural equipment—what will be the situation this time? Can we long have guns and butter, too, or what may we expect.

Mr. CLARENCE J. MCCORMICK. There never was a time in the history of the United States that agriculture was as well prepared for war as we are today. Before Pearl Harbor farmers had reached new production levels and large reserve levels. Today those production levels have been greatly extended. Farmers can now produce must faster than they could in prewar days and the total supply of food is larger than ever before in our history.

I would like to introduce to you Mr. Orris V. Wells, Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, who will tell you more about our total supply of food. Mr. Wells.

Mr. WELLS. Well, Mr. Secretary, I think the simplest way to summarize the current food situation is to say that we have ample supplies of food in this country to feed everyone as well as they have been eating for the last 2 years or some better. Let's consider some of the facts or details about this food situation. Americans generally are now eating better than they were before the recent war. For the last 2 years average per capita food consumption has been running about 11 percent higher than it was in 1935–39. That is, people have been eating more meat, more eggs, drinking more milk, than they did before World War II.

When I say food supplies are ample to maintain this level of consumption or further increasing it, I am thinking first of all about the current prospects for food production this year. Most crops are now well into their growing season and on the basis of the August crop report which was released only last Thursday, it appears that total food production in the United States this year will be as large as it was last year. Production of some crops may be down slightly but we ought to have more livestock products this year than last.

Further, we have very large stocks of some of the more important food and feed items on hand. One of the interesting things about the current situation is the fact that a great many people who seemed excessively worried about surpluses only a few short weeks ago now realize the desirability of having reserves of such things as corn and wheat. Let's look at some of these stock figures for a minute. In the case of wheat, I suppose we would ordinarily think of normal or ordinary working stocks of around 150,000,000 bushels of old crop wheat on hand July 1.

This last July 1 we had about three times that much, or 450,000,000 bushels. This means that we have more than enough wheat to assure bread supplies in this country this year, to maintain or meet all export and military requirements that may be in sight, and to have large stocks of old crop wheat on hand at the beginning of the new crop year in July 1951. In the case of corn—and everyone who is interested in meat or milk ought also to be interested in corn because it is our principal feed grain for livestock—ordinary normal working stocks again might be thought of as around 300 million bushels of old stock corn at the end of the feed year. It now looks as though we will have three times this much, or around 900,000,000 bushels, of old crop corn on October 1. Further, the last crop report indicates that we

have another bumper corn crop in sight for this year—a crop running well over 3 billion bushels.

Another item that might be of some interest is butter. Actually, farmers are producing more milk and dairy products than are now moving into the commercial market, dairy products have shown no appreciable rise in price since the Korean incident, and butter stocks at the present time instead of running around the 100 million pounds that they used to run before the war, are double that or around 200,000,000 pounds. In short, we are fortunate in having ample stocks of most of the storable agricultural commodities and we have considerable stocks of some of the more perishable commodities such as butter and other dairy products, including the dried milks and cheese. There has been some concern about food prices but I think the wave of price increases which occurred during the first part of July has been halted and farm prices at any rate have not shown any appreciable increases since about July 15.

Perhaps I should also mention some of the things which the Department of Agriculture has done during the last few weeks to help assure food supplies. Some three or four things come to mind immediately. First of all, the Secretary has taken immediate action with respect to sugar. The consumption quota—that is, the amount of sugar available to domestic consumers in this country—was immediately increased from 7,500,000 tons to 7,850,000 tons. The Department of Agriculture has also contracted for purchase of an additional 650,000 tons of Cuban sugar and is currently negotiating for some additional quantities from Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Briefly, the Department has available an extra 1,000,000 tons of sugar if needed.

Second, the Department of Agriculture has announced wheat acreage allotments for the coming year equal to the acreage from which wheat is now being harvested. In effect this allotment is liberal enough so that in effect it is more of a conservation than it is a control measure.

Third, the Department of Agriculture is continuing to see that Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of various agricultural commodities—not only food commodities but also cotton—are easily available to the consumer market.

I am sure that all of you realize that food depends more than anything else upon what farmers do and I have already tried to say that the recent crop report indicates that farmers are holding food production at a high level this year. There are also some increases in prospect. For example, farmers have indicated that they intend to have more pigs this fall than last and for those people who like beef it should be comforting to know that our estimates indicate there were 34 percent more cattle on feed in the Midwest this July than a year ago.

In addition to the supplies of food on hand we are always concerned about the ability to produce more food. The present census is showing that our farm population is lower than ever before. In 1940 one farm worker produced enough food for a little more than 11 people. In 1950 one farm worker can produce enough for more than 14 people.

Due to the increased use of farm machinery we farmers are in position to produce not only faster but more efficiently. Rural electrification too has helped increase production through the use of many small machines on the farm that were never before available.

Today farmers have about three and one-half million tractors—twice as many as in 1940. We have three times as many corn pickers as we had in 1940, and about twice as many combines. These are the two great harvesting machines for corn and wheat and many other grains.

Milking equipment has also greatly increased—we have twice as many milking machines as we had in 1940. This would also be true of many other smaller machines that are used on farms.

Automobiles also play a large part in farm production as the car on the farm is used for the delivery of cream, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables to market. Farmers have about 25 percent more automobiles now than they had in 1940, and twice as many trucks as in 1940. Trucks are also used in delivery of farm products to market.

In addition to the large increase in the use of farm machines, it is important that we point out that even though we have this machinery it will be necessary that we do have fuel and repairs to keep it in running condition.

Other things that have added to the increase in production of agriculture include the use of fertilizers. We have doubled their use in the last 10 years and use 20 times as much lime as we did in 1933. This increased use of fertilizers and limestone means better pastures. Better pastures mean more and better livestock.

Speaking of livestock, through our research and experiment stations in the Department of Agriculture and State universities we have developed better breeds of hogs, dairy cattle, beef cattle, and poultry, and better methods of feeding and handling of our livestock. All of these things do make for increased production of meat, dairy, and poultry products.

However, it is true that no one can foretell the demands that may be made on agriculture in an all-out war. Drought, insects, or a shortage of labor may all make it difficult for a large production of agricultural products. But regardless of what the problem would be agriculture is better prepared to produce food than ever before in the history of our country.

Mr. ROBERT MCCORMICK. Not food for the stomach, but food for troubled thought is the mushroom that shaped itself over Hiroshima and Nagasaki * * * and whose secret is not in possession of the Russians, too. Already Washington realtors are advertising: This charming bungalow, outside the radiation area. Within the past 24 hours, a report on the effects of atomic weapons was released to the public for the first time by the AEC. And here, with some pertinent comment on that report is the chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, Senator BRIEN MCMAHON.

Senator MCMAHON. The vitally important report which reached the American people today does not describe how atomic energy can conquer disease and relieve human want. It is not a report telling how the atom will enrich your life and mine. Such might have been the nature of this report issued today—if the rulers of Russia were not striving to build a huge atomic war machine. Today's report might have dealt solely with putting the atom to work for the benefit and ennoblement of all mankind—if the rulers of Russia had not rejected our offer of effective world-wide control.

No; the report covers a different subject—not how to improve our homes and factories, but how to defend those homes and factories against atomic attack. In this fact lies the deepest and starkest tragedy of our time—a tragedy which threatens 10,000 times more casualties in an hour than all the heroic American soldiers who have fallen along the Korean battlefront.

We are given no choice but to study the atom used for destruction. The Kremlin and the Kremlin alone forces this grim project upon us. It is a simple, indisputable fact that Soviet Russia now possesses some atomic bombs. It is a simple, indisputable fact that her supply of atomic bombs will increase as the months and years pass. Not only our troops in Korea but every man, woman, and child on our home front live amidst growing danger. Regardless of what else happens, that danger will inevitably continue to grow so long as the rival stocks of atomic weapons in Russia and America are permitted to pile higher and higher.

Today's report on the effects of atomic bombs—nomimal atomic bombs of the old-fashioned Hiroshima and Nagasaki type—confines itself to facts. It is calm, dispassionate, and courageous—just as the American people can and will be themselves in confronting the peril of the future. This report has been in preparation for many months. The Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of State, the Department of Defense—all have worked on it; all have spared no pains both to guard national security and to give you the authoritative information you need for self-protection in an era of atomic crisis. The report is a major landmark in our efforts to establish a sane system of civil defense.

I still cherish the faith that the men of the Kremlin can be brought to their senses—that a day will come when reports on atomic energy deal only with the thrilling promise of a better world created by this elemental force. Until we solve the atomic crisis, nothing fundamental is solved—but when we do solve it, a new and noble life for all men everywhere lies ahead.

Mr. ROBERT MCCORMICK. So far, America, this has been anything but a push-button contest of rocket-borne atom bombs. To meet the demand for war's inevitable raw material—men—not only have draft boards blown the dust off the strange alphabet that begins with 1A and ends with 4F, but calls have gone out to members of the Nation's Armed Forces Reserves. Reporting on the Reserves picture—Vice Adm. John L. McCrea, staff director of personnel policy planning for the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MCCREA. Recently, many military reservists—both as individuals and in organized units of the Reserve and National Guard—have been called to active duty. Many of you already have become aware of this firsthand, because the knock of the messenger of military service has come to your door—or soon is expected. These calls to active duty will continue as long as essential military manpower needs exist. The country is fortunate, indeed, to have available to it—and ready to render patriotic service—considerable resources of trained and experienced reservists from which these calls can be met.

Among our reserve personnel, there are many who possess critical civilian skills, or, who are in nationally vital positions which may make it more advisable—in the over-all national interest—to delay their calls to active duty for specified periods of time. The primary requisite of a reserve component is prompt availability for military service in emergency. However, the Department of Defense recognizes that the retention of a reservist in his civilian capacity may often contribute more effectively to total national security than would immediate service in uniform.

The Secretary of Defense has announced criteria under which calls to active duty of reservists critical to civilian purposes may be controlled. These criteria are designed to provide a basis for call-up which will cause minimum disruptions to the national economy without serious sacrifice to uniformed operations.

Normally, requests for delays will be initiated either by the employer of the individual concerned or by the individual himself. Requests will be given consideration—(1) if the skill appears on the Department of Labor list of critical skills, and (2) if the essential activity in which the reservist is involved is cataloged as such by the Department of Commerce, or, (3) if he occupies a key managerial

post not otherwise accounted for, but from which his removal would cause material loss in production, service, or research necessary to the national health, safety or interest.

Responsibility for the interpretation and implementation of the Department of Defense policy governing the call-up of reservists is vested in the separate military departments for their own reserve personnel. It is the job of each department to reconcile the factors in each case and to determine whether the requirements of active military service or of continued civilian employment are paramount.

The military departments, under the overall Department of Defense policy, are collaborating closely with the other governmental activities presently charged with keeping the national manpower program of the Nation in balance. Through the joint efforts of all concerned, the most effective application of the manpower of the Nation in the interests of national security appears to be assured.

Mr. ROBERT MCCORMICK. Finally—as if to cap our report for today—the wheels of a constellation bearing W. Averell Harriman touched the runway at Washington airport this week. Disembarking at the end of a Presidential mission that took him half way around the world to the Far East, the President's special assistant on foreign affairs had some extra-special words for the home folks.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I have just come back from a quick trip to see General MacArthur at the President's direction. I left Tokyo Tuesday evening and arrived here Wednesday morning. That may sound like some kind of a record but actually when you think that there's 14 hours difference in time, the elapsed time is 29 hours, which in itself seems to me pretty fast. I spent a day, too, at Korea, and I was tremendously impressed with the confidence our people have in the South Koreans. That went all the way from the generals down to the GI's. These South Koreans have reformed into five divisions and are fighting bravely and courageously to defend their soil from the invaders from the north. Now, not only are they fighting with us, but they are supporting us in every way they can. They are unloading our ships; they are running the railroads; the local police are taking care of the situation—preventing sabotage in spite of the fact that there are many northern Koreans that have come down for no good purpose. That to me is extremely encouraging because it makes one feel that in the liberation of Korea, there will be people who can carry on with determination—determination to maintain a free life as was promised them by the United Nations. Now I saw Syngman Rhee, the president, and I saw Mr. Muccio, our Ambassador, and they all confirmed my impressions. The President asked me to discuss with General MacArthur all the political problems that there are in the Pacific and the Far East. I stayed with General MacArthur and that gave me an opportunity to discuss many matters informally and I have been able to report to the President General MacArthur's views, which the President was anxious to obtain. I found General MacArthur in complete support of the President. He considers the action of the President, quick action in bringing together the United Nations and recognizing that this Korean incident was a challenge to all free nations and one of the magnificent steps in our history. He believes that the President's policies are those which can bring us to success and believes that if we deal with these matters firmly as is outlined in the President's policies that we can find a way to peace—and it is the only way to find a way to peace.

Mr. ROBERT MCCORMICK. Thus the Nation, America, as top Government officials have come before you to report—musters its forces to meet the threat to our security and the headlines, still warm, that tonight reflect the seventh week of action.

Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another informative teledocumentary—this, then, against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your first battle report, Washington.

Russian Aggression Has Strengthened the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Thursday, August 10, 1950, issue of the Northwest Alabamian, of Fayette, Ala., dealing with the effect of Russian aggression on the United Nations:

RUSSIA'S ACTIONS HAVE DONE MUCH TO STRENGTHEN UNITED NATIONS

There are two diametrically opposed views concerning the origin of the Korean war. One is that it was stimulated by the Russians on the theory that the United States and its Allies would do nothing more than write formal letters of protest; that the North Koreans would overwhelm the ill-equipped South Korean defenders in a couple of weeks or so, and that another nation would easily be added to those within the Kremlin's sphere of influence. If that view is correct, the Russians could not have been more wrong.

The other view is grim. It is that Russia anticipated in advance what we would do, and that it was a deliberate, Kremlin-conceived trap. We would spend our resources in Korea, while Russia contributed nothing to the conflict except some equipment and top leadership. In due time, this view holds, the same will happen elsewhere—in Iran, Formosa, perhaps Europe. The west will be forced to spread itself paper thin all around the world. Eventually, it will be bled white, and then Russia, with her strength unimpaired, will move in for the kill.

That view is enough to send chills down any spine. There is no question but what a basic Soviet technique is to have other peoples do the fighting. The Asiatics are particularly useful grist in this kind of a mill. They are fatalistic and fanatical. Human life has small value in their eyes. Americans who have been at the Korean front have all been impressed by one dreadful fact—no matter how many of the enemy are slaughtered, they keep on coming in wave after wave.

However, a strong case can be made on behalf of the view that this time the Kremlin woefully misjudged the temper of the United States. The Korean war has done more than any single thing since World War II to cement the western nations. The United Nations is no longer just a debating society on the international level—it is a belligerent, and its flag flies in South Korea. The war is a UN, not merely a United States, operation.

The most encouraging thing that has happened so far has been the response to Trygvie Lie's appeal to the UN membership for substantial aid in Korea, including trained ground troops. An impressive list of countries has responded. In many instances, the size of the forces dispatched will necessarily be very small, but the total will be considerable. And, going beyond purely military considerations, the fact that many countries will be physically represented in the actual fighting in Korea must certainly cause some hard thinking in the Politburo. At least, the ranks of the anticommunist world—and it is most of the world—are gathering.

Some time ago Herbert Hoover proposed the creation of a United Nations without Russia and her satellites. This may come about through the force of events. Russia is still a member, of course, but she has small influence now. The great majority of members has served final notice that Communist aggression must stop.

The Democratic Party Is the Party of the People—the Republicans Represent Special Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, during my 16 years in public office, on two occasions I have had the experience of serving in legislative bodies while Republicans were in power. In 1931 and 1932 I served in the Michigan State Senate as the only Democrat in the Brucker Republican administration. At that time the Republicans and Hoover were in power in Washington. It was the time when the Republican depression hit the Nation. During that Republican administration 9 out of 10 families in my district were completely wiped out; jobless, homeless, bankrupt, hungry, and destitute. Hundreds of desperate men committed suicide. The Republicans at Lansing did nothing to help the hungry and depressed. They offered, instead, a large State police constabulary and a finger-printing bill to quell, subdue, and frighten the desponder ; and jobless citizens. Apple peddlers on every corner was the only plan that Hoover and the Republicans in Washington had to offer.

Some of you voters may have been too young to remember these old days under the Republicans. If so, just speak to your fathers and mothers and the older citizens. It was a cold and inhuman Government.

Then came Roosevelt, the Democrats, and the New Deal. I was elected to Congress and served with this vigorous and constructive Democratic administration. The big job of reconstruction and rehabilitation went forward. People went to work. Credits were restored. Factories began to hum, farms were restored and reactivated, new homes began to spring up like mushrooms. Then after several years of good Democratic administration people became sort of easy-going, forgot their miseries and misfortunes. The people began to take prosperity, employment, and good times for granted. They became self-satisfied, and even neglected to vote. So much so, that in 1946, 4 years ago, only 37 percent

of the people voted. The Republicans were not asleep, however. They voted, and they obtained control of both Houses in the Eightieth Congress. Yes, by a small minority vote of the people the Republicans took over the Congress of the United States and immediately began to serve their masters—big business, big bankers, the trusts, and the profiteers and the gougers. They did this brazenly, openly. They did not even bother to hide or camouflage their intentions. A tax bill for the relief of the rich and the powerful; off came controls on food and necessities; RFC put out of business; and all credits and mortgage loans placed at the mercy of the big bankers; no slum clearance, no rental housing. Home construction down 40 percent; veterans denied loans—sabotage of the electric-power program, no minimum wage increase from 40 cents, no increase in social-security benefits, no extension of the civil-rights program, no aid to education, no health program, no strengthening of antitrust laws, and for labor they took a leaf out of Hitler's book and gave them the Taft-Hartley bill. They emasculated the Labor Department by cutting its appropriation by more than one-half.

In the brief period of 2 years the Republicans again exposed themselves as the party of the National Association of Manufacturers, of big business, the profiteers, the bankers, and monopolists.

In 1932 the Democratic Party was entrusted with responsibility, after 12 years of Republican neglect had blighted the hopes of mankind, had squandered the fruits of prosperity, and had plunged us into the depths of depression and despair.

The Democratic Party rebuilt a shattered economy, rescued our banking system, revived our agriculture, reinvigorated our industry, gave labor strength and security, and led the American people to the broadest prosperity in our history.

We introduced the spirit of humanity into our law, as we outlawed child labor and the sweatshop, insured bank deposits, protected millions of home owners and farmers from foreclosure, and established national social security. We Democrats reject the Republican principle that Government exists for the benefit of the privileged few. We Democrats believe that it is the duty of the Government to serve the interests of all, and not the few; to assure a world in which peace and justice can prevail; to achieve security, full production and full employment.

It is our first duty to provide leadership in the world toward the realization of the Four Freedoms. We believe that Democracy, when dedicated to the service of all and not to a privileged few, proves its superiority over all other forms of government.

We support the United Nations fully, and we give our wholehearted support to give it strength, growth, and development. We desire to see the United Nations established as a strong international organization that can and will prevent aggression and maintain world peace and security.

We have exerted every effort to bring peace. The road has been hard and rough. We shall not seek peace by appeasement, weakness, and a surrender of our national dignity. I believe that we shall attain peace by showing strength and national unity and by giving full and powerful support to the United Nations.

We offer to the people of the world peace, while helping them to reach their goal for better economic conditions without the loss of freedom and liberty. To all Americans the words "peace, freedom, and liberty" have a special meaning. We reject totalitarianism either from the left or the right. There can be no freedom and liberty when the individual must live in constant fear of the Gestapo or the NKVD.

Confusion in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the President and his chief advisers, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, have led our land to the very brink of a serious crisis without military preparedness and without an understandable plan or policy.

I have recently made two short speeches on the radio dealing with this situation, one discussing the woeful lack of military preparedness, the second, the equally tragic lack of a coherent foreign policy.

With the consent of the House, I am including them now to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

PART I

WAR AGAIN—WITHOUT PREPARATION

Last week most of my short time on the air was devoted to the President's message, and some of the effects it would have in our own area. However, I did then suggest that again, as at Pearl Harbor, we were surprised by the action in Korea, and were wholly unprepared for it. I want to talk now about just how badly prepared we were, and some of the background for this state of unpreparedness—which, incidentally, is costing the lives and blood of our boys and is also losing face and prestige for us in the Orient, prestige which may never be recovered.

Of the scores of letters that I have received on this particular subject, I want to refer to an exceptionally thoughtful one from Henry P. Megargee, Jr., of Atlantic City, whom many of you probably know. His letter is typical of many others in that he confesses a groping sense of utter confusion regarding the present state of our military preparedness, or rather lack of it. When he says that, he can truly speak for all of America because we are all astounded and confused by the revelations of the action in Korea.

I wish time permitted quoting all of his letter. It is well worth it, but only brief reference to it can be made and perhaps some answers given.

For example, he says, "We were told that the mission of the Army Air Force, both strategic and tactical, made the naval air arm obsolete for all intents and purposes. And the opposition to this theory was squelched in a shameful and disgraceful purge of those officers who dared to raise their voices against it." He is right. The President, in his 1950 budget, called for the laying up of three attack carriers, three antiaircraft cruisers, and nine light cruisers, and halted construction on a supercarrier on which millions had already been spent. Seventy-two naval vessels were put out of use, and nine naval air stations, of which the great station at Pomona was originally one. (Fortunately it was retained in active status and it took a lot of doing to retain it.) In the 1951 naval budget there was a further reduction of approximately 1,500 naval planes, and by the end of those 2 years the naval air arm had been reduced approximately 40 percent.

A couple more fully equipped aircraft carriers in the Pacific right now would make all the difference.

Mr. Megargee goes on to say that the people were told the Army Ground Forces would carry out all functions heretofore performed by the marines, and that the marines virtually served no useful purpose. Again he is right. The Marine Corps was saved from virtual extinction in the Eightieth Congress, but nevertheless its strength has since been whittled down. For many years, indeed for decades, the Marine Corps almost alone maintained the prestige of this country in the Pacific and the Far East. Today, although Congress has authorized a strength of 107,000 men, its actual strength has been allowed to go down to 70,000. The corps was the spearhead of our successful amphibious actions in World War II. Our high command told us we wouldn't have amphibious action again; notwithstanding which on July 19 we again used a landing in Korea 60 miles north of the American held and vital port of Pusan.

Apparently we were prepared only to bomb Moscow and no lesser action was foreseen.

My correspondent goes on to say, "Only shortly over a month ago the President of the United States, speaking about the question of peace in the world, stated that we were closer to peace than at any time since World War II." Last June the Secretary of the Army, at the graduating exercises at West Point, told his audience that we now had defensive weapons that would make the whole concept of armored warfare, as we know it today, a thing of the past. "We have weapons so effective that we can repel any tank known to military intelligence," Megargee adds: "It must be a great comfort to the troops in Korea to know that these weapons are still on paper or in the experimental stage at the Ordnance Department's proving grounds."

What answer can we in Washington give him? He says he is shocked beyond words; so am I. He fears that we will never learn our lesson; I share his fears.

For more than 2 years, I, with a majority of Members of Congress, have been urging and appropriating for a 70-group Air Force. The President disagreed with us, and as a result the Air Force is inadequate.

In Secretary Johnson's report of March 1950 he told how he did not use $435,000,000 in funds that Congress had willingly appropriated. Add to this, if you please, seven hundred and thirty-five million in funds, appropriated for the Air Force by Congress, and which was not spent, and indeed was arbitrarily refused.

In September 1949, Congress provided over $10,000,000 in cash for military assistance to Korea. On June 25, the day of the North Korean attack, $200 of this fund had been used.

Three years or more ago, Congress passed the long-hoped-for unification bill. The man who was appointed to head the unified forces said a few weeks ago that if trouble broke out at 4 o'clock, the United States would be ready at 5 o'clock. He didn't say what year!

About 3 years ago, Congress established a Central Intelligence Agency. They faithfully

reported the concentration of troops in North Korea weeks before the outbreak of trouble. The high command apparently paid no attention.

About 3 years ago Congress appropriated $125,000,000 for military aid to China to fight communism. Aid for China was opposed by the administration and although the China aid bill was signed in April 1948 it was 8 months later when the China war was actually lost that some help began to dribble to the Chinese people.

A year ago, apparently with a fixed intention of abandoning Korea, we withdrew all of our Armed Forces from that country. Although we helped to arm the South Koreans, it is now clear that we armed them purely for the purpose of internal security and not to resist attack from the north.

On June 26, 2 days after the attack, Secretary of State Acheson, before a Senate committee, admitted that it was known that North Korean forces were along the border. He was asked, in view of that knowledge, why there was only a 10 days' supply of ammunition in Korea. So far as I know, no answer to that question has yet been made.

There were no mine fields, no tank traps. In short, nothing to resist an attack which seemed inevitable. The American people are entitled to ask why.

We are involved in war now, and it is clear that our paramount duty is to fully and patriotically support our Government's efforts and to do everything that need be to restore the peace if possible. Nevertheless, it would be a breach of duty not to point out the remarkable blunders which for the third time in a single generation have led us into armed conflict without adequate preparation.

Our postwar appropriations for the national defense have totaled $95,000,000,000. Some day people are going to require an answer to the question: "What became of this money?"

PART II

FOREIGN POLICY—STUMBLING AND FUMBLING

In the beginning of this series of short talks on Korea, I recall that I made the statement that we are involved in a mess largely because of stumbling and fumbling with our foreign policy in Asia, or, rather, with a lack of a policy in Asia. It is not fair to make such a charge without being prepared to prove it, and I am prepared to prove it.

A couple of years ago I made the suggestion that in order to avoid trouble with Russia we should put in unmistakably clear words precisely what our position is, and draw a line marking the area of our vital interests, and say quite bluntly "thus far and no farther." I am quite convinced that if Stalin knew exactly where we stood he would avoid deliberately treading on our toes. Thus, in Berlin, we made it plain by our dramatic air lift that we refused to be pushed out of that area, with the result that we were not pushed out.

In Korea, however, our policy has been exactly the opposite, and has invited the aggression which finally took place.

It all started with the extremely serious error of inviting Russia to participate in the last few days of the Japanese war, which was wholly unnecessary, and gave to the Communists their opportunity to demand the arbitrary and unwise division of Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel, which was bound sooner or later to cause trouble.

Then, of course, a year or more ago, we withdrew from the peninsula a very substantial army which we had there, at the very instant when common sense demanded no retreat from the realities of the situation. That was the time for decision. Either we should have concluded that Korea was a part of our vital interests in the Pacific, in which case our troops should have remained, or else we should have concluded that we had no vital interest in Korea, in which case the troops should have been withdrawn and the area finally abandoned.

It seemed perfectly clear to all of us, and it must have seemed equally clear to the Communists, that our policy was to abandon Korea, and not thereafter to intervene. All the rest of China had been abandoned (and Korea is geographically a part of China); the President openly and officially stated that we would not defend Formosa and bitterly criticized Senator TAFT for suggesting that we should, and it seemed to have been finally determined by the administration that the vital area which America would defend was Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines.

In a major policy speech before the National Press Club here in Washington on January 12, 1950, the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, laid down the policy that we could not and should not go further than that, and that no such line of containment could be drawn in south and southeast Asia, where we had no direct responsibilities and only limited opportunities for action. That clearly excluded China, Korea, and Formosa.

As late as May 5, 1950, Senator TOM CONNALLY, who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and is the administration's spokesman on foreign policy in the Congress, said that Korea could be overrun by Communist aggressors any time, but that Korea was not an essential part of the defense strategy and not very important. This, of course, was the equivalent of telling the North Koreans that we were not going to bother about South Korea, and they could go ahead and do what they pleased. Earlier CONNALLY, in referring to Formosa, said that if we occupied it, we would have a liability on our hands instead of an asset. He concluded in a burst of oratory by saying that he would not "send American boys to Formosa to bleed and to die, and to be buried in the jungle soil 7,000 miles away."

I respectfully submit to you that this was a clear invitation to the North Koreans to march, and they must have been as surprised as the people, the Army, and the Congress itself was when overnight the administration turned the greatest flip-flop in history.

Obviously, we must now unite with complete determination to settle this affair, but I believe the American people would go forward with more confidence and more enthusiasm if those responsible for this remarkable shilly-shallying would resign, to be replaced by men who know their own minds; men who would be frank and honest in their dealings with the American people.

Maj. Gen. Philip Fleming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of the great Americans born and raised in the First Congressional District of Iowa is Maj. Gen. Philip Fleming whose record of achievement is well known to every Member of Congress. General Fleming's boyhood home was Burlington, Iowa, and he went to the United States Military Academy from there.

That Burlington, Iowa, is very proud of her native son is well shown in a recent editorial that appeared in the Burlington Hawkeye Gazette which I include in my remarks so that Congress and the Nation may have the privilege of reading it. At the same time I take this opportunity to extend General Fleming my commendation and my congratulations on the outstanding record he has made throughout his exceedingly busy and useful lifetime.

The editorial is as follows:

JACK-OF-ALL-TRADES

If there is any man who has been jack-of-all-trades in Government in recent years and who has covered himself with honor in so doing, it has been Burlington's Maj. Gen. Philip Fleming.

Long a confidant of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, he was called upon by F. D. R. to administer many civilian capacities as well as military. Probably the most important was at the head of WPA in its latter days. He also served on the Maritime Commission, made junkets to foreign countries and otherwise made himself generally useful.

Upon F. D. R.'s death, President Truman continued to use Fleming's talents. His assignments have been numerous. The most recent is as Under Secretary of the Department of Commerce for transportation. In the event of an all-out war, which seems more than possible at the moment, Fleming's would be a most responsible position.

The genial general is no longer a spring chicken. On October 15, he will celebrate his sixty-third birthday. A native of Burlington, he cut his eyeteeth as a kid along the streets and playing in the ravines of town. As a part of his early experience, he was a newspaper boy for either the old Hawk-Eye or the Gazette, he once told us.

Anyhow, Burlington is always proud of her own when they do well, and Phil Fleming has done better than well in the field of military and political planning. He is one of the town's outstanding sons.

It Is Everyone's Duty To Register and Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in our generation two world wars were fought for freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of faith, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

The freedom of the ballot box is the guaranty of these other freedoms; yet in our generation we have seen our people exercise this basic freedom less and less.

History shows the trend. In 1896, on an election day that history records as cold and rainy, over muddy roads and without the modern conveniences of transportation that exist today, 85 percent of the potential voters of this Nation trudged to the polls to vote on issues which were purely domestic and which most people have long since forgotten.

But in 1946, at the end of the greatest war in history, fought to preserve this Nation and other freedom-loving nations from subjugation and slavery, only 39 percent of the voters could find time

enough to climb into their cars and roll off to the polls at a time when postwar decisions that would affect the history of the world were to be made.

An election was won—a congressional majority was voted into power by two-ninths of the voters of the United States.

In 1948, in a Presidential election, when the issues were world-wide, when great decisions affecting the future of the world were being made, only 51.6 percent of the voters bothered to leave their television and radio sets and go to the polls.

Americans seem to place a low value on the ballot for which their fathers fought and died. They seem to place small value upon the price we paid in blood and treasure in World War II to keep freedom alive in the world.

In Europe, the nations who have been fed by us, who have been aided by us as they sought their salvation under the threatening guns of a hostile power, these nations place no such low valuation on such a priceless heritage. In England 85 percent of the electorate went to the polls. In Italy nearly 92 percent of the voters went to the polls. Similarly in France.

But here at home our citizens seem to take their liberties for granted. They say, "Let George do it." Too often our citizens defer until election day their desire to participate only to find on election day when they want to vote, that they have not registered and therefore cannot vote.

Thus millions of non-voters, by negation, settle by lazy inaction the pressing problems of our times.

This is bad—in our democracy, it is unforgivable. For most of us take part in our Government only by means of the ballot.

Voting has been termed the sacred right of every citizen. Voting is more than that; it is a duty. Voting is the foundation stone of our democracy.

When we were in school as youngsters we stood up with the rest of the children, and took the oath of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America. We must not let that schooltime pledge end our job as useful citizens. That pledge was to impress upon us our priceless heritage as free citizens of the United States. Let us make that pledge come true by exercising our franchise by registering and then voting in all elections.

Remember that your elected representatives really represent you. The Members of the Congress of the United States in Washington represent you. Your governor represents you. Your mayor represents you. These people are your servants. They are your voice. They speak for you. When you vote, you are having your say on how this country is run. When you don't vote, you have nothing to say, and you have no reason to complain if things are not run to your liking.

So it is up to you, as a thinking citizen, to get your name on the registration books, and then to vote in the primary elections and in the regular elections next November.

We have greater problems today than ever before. The world is smaller in size, and greater in population and in problems. It is more necessary that the people express their will today than ever before in history. You know that I make this appeal in all sincerity. I have been a Member of the United States Congress for 14 years. I am a member of two powerful and important committees in Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I know of the tremendous responsibilities and the complex and vital national and international problems that are facing us. Two devastating world wars in our generation have added greatly to these problems. Our health, our housing, our agriculture, our conservation, labor, wages, prices, profiteering, taxes, inflation, to name just a few, are problems, the solution of which will affect our future, and the future of our children.

It is your solemn obligation to have your say in the solutions of these and all other problems of government.

To preserve that heritage of freedom for which our forefathers fought many generations ago, millions of Americans have fought and shed their blood in all parts of the world. So, how can anyone neglect their duty to vote?

By wise decisions at home, and wise choices at the ballot box, we can preserve our freedom, and create a peaceful world, and a prosperous America.

We must send our best brains into action. This is no time for scrubs or second-raters. The stakes are high and we cannot afford to lose. Government therefore, is your business. All of the activities of Government, international, national and local, affect you personally, intimately, and directly. They affect your jobs, your homes, the prices you pay, the education and future of your children. Make your action in government positive and effective. Register now. And then vote, both in September and in November.

Nineteenth Century Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an excellent article by Sylvia F. Porter, appearing in the New York Post and other papers on July 12, concerning H. R. 2908, the bill to separate subsidies from air-mail payments:

NINETEENTH CENTURY MAIL

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

London's residents get three mail deliveries a day. In Brussels there are also three, in Paris at least two. But the residents of the great cities and towns of America? We now get only one.

In the middle of the twentieth century, in an era of atomic energy and flight faster than sound, we are being forced to submit to a nineteenth-century, "horse and buggy" mail-delivery schedule.

Today all of us are feeling it, for the slowdown in the mails is on in full force. Your mail comes in irregularly and late; your letters arrive at their destination after often devilish delays.

If you've a really important message to send, you dare not trust it to ordinary delivery via a 3-cent stamp. You take on the extra expense, send it special delivery or by telegraph or phone.

It would be laughable if it weren't so unintelligent; ridiculous if it weren't so infuriating.

Yet, Congressmen shrug their shoulders at the situation. They cluck sympathetically, turn their attention to other affairs while they wait for you to insist on action.

Post Office officials shrug their shoulders too. So far, their appropriation for this year is substantially under their spending needs—so they've chosen the easy way out of cutting the service to you and me, citizens and taxpayers.

This is not the answer. It is not sensible. It is not necessary either. The gap between Post Office income and outgo can be closed in much more intelligent, efficient ways.

And here's one answer Congress should approve at once under any circumstances. In brief:

The concealed airline subsidies—conservatively estimated by the Civil Aeronautics Board at up to $60,000,000 and probably above that—should be removed from the Post Office budget so that for the first time, the President, Congress, and the public can know definitely how much of our tax money is being spent on flying the mails and how much on subsidizing private airlines.

Today, the Post Office pays out about $1 for 60 cents of air-transportation service. The extra 40 cents should not be charged to the Post Office; it should be assigned to the CAB.

And if it were, the Post Office budget would be much closer to balance. The subsidy would be out in the open. An embarrassing, unhealthy subterfuge would be ended.

A bill to achieve this desirable reform of separating subsidies from air-mail pay has been introduced (H. R. 2908) and will come to a vote Thursday, July 20, before the full House Interstate Commerce Committee.

Just about every responsible, objective official and group is in favor of it. For instance:

President Truman, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, the Postmaster General, Commerce Secretary Sawyer, labor and veterans' groups and the Big Four airlines—American, Eastern, TWA, and United.

Why then hasn't it been passed by now? Because it is being fought by airlines afraid revelation will endanger the subsidies.

John L. Sullivan, former Secretary of the Navy, has been hired by several of them to push another phony bill that would order "further study" of the situation and a report July 1951. That would mean no action until at least 1952.

Sullivan's law firm, Sullivan, Bernard, and Shea, is getting a fee of $30,000 for this. Believe it or not, he has a good chance of winning against virtually the entire Nation.

It's another painful example of what can happen when the high-paid lobbyists go to work for selfish interests. But these are facts.

Armed with them, you can demand—and then you'll get—action. And your mail service will be restored pronto.

Character Assassins Are Worse Than Thieves, Thugs, or Gangsters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the coming of the fall elections the question is, How can we make more citizens exercise their right to vote? In the last national election only a little more than one-half of the potential voters cast their ballots. In 1896 during the McKinley and Bryan contest, 83 percent of our citizens voted. Why are there not more voters participating in elections? The small number of the voters may be a sign of strength or confidence in the Government. The citizens may feel confident that the foundations of their social order are secure, and that no shattering fundamental issues are at stake. There is great danger, however, when only a bare majority of the voters participate in an election. Free government such as we enjoy demands a full expression by all of our citizens. Let us never forget the warning that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. The sacred Bill of Rights and the Constitution should be read and studied at regular intervals because there are so few people in the world who can enjoy the rights and freedoms which have been handed down to us as a heritage and which we must preserve for posterity.

Apathy and indifference can cost the people dearly. Many years ago the great labor leader, Samuel Gompers, stated in simple words the desire of the common people. He said:

> We want more school houses and less jails, more books and less arsenals, more learning and less vice, more constant work and less crime, more leisure and less greed, more justice and less revenge; in fact, more of the opportunities to cultivate our better natures, to make manhood more noble, womanhood more beautiful, and childhood more bright and happy.

This has been our program and it has had the support of the liberal and progressive Democratic Members of Congress, who are now being viciously attacked by the powerful reactionary big-money interests. Vicious lies and smears are being spread, and unlimited amounts of money are being spent to defeat liberal and progressive Members of Congress.

On May 5, in my radio broadcast, and also in my speech in Congress of the same date, I revealed how the Republicans and the reactionary tories were planning a campaign of smear, fear, hate, and suspicion. On June 1, 1950, this was admitted on the Senate floor with great shame by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican of Maine. She was joined in a statement of repudiation by six other Republican Senators. These seven Republicans admitted publicly that they could not stomach the dirty, filthy, smeary character assassination campaign that their own Republican Party was engaged in.

We Democrats of Michigan have been attacked and subjected to these vile, ugly, filthy smear attacks for some time. Our press, with the exception of a few weekly labor publications, is all owned, controlled, and dominated by Republicans and big business associates. The one Polish language daily, Dziennik Polski, is a rabid, reactionary Republican sheet. Radio stations in the Detroit area likewise are owned and controlled by Republicans. Those of us Democrats who are sincerely liberal and progressive, and who are faithfully trying to carry out the provisions in the Democratic platform adopted at our great Democratic Convention, attended by delegates who were duly chosen and elected by the people—we are the ones particularly chosen for these spiteful and venomous attacks. My Polish friends will recall the full page advertisements, reeking with hate, filth, venom, and vituperation, which appeared in the Republican Dziennik Polski in previous elections. These pee wee Polish Peglers hate Roosevelt and the New Deal. They forget that the Democrats save them from bankruptcy.

In our district they have filed Republican carpet-baggers as candidates on the Democratic ticket. These political fakers are running as Democrats to cause confusion and dissension within the Democratic Party. These Republican carpet-baggers have the full support of the Republican newspapers, Republican radio commentators and the Republican big-money interests. This is a Trojan-horse campaign. To beat progressive Democratic Congressmen, Republican stooges are being filed in the Democratic primary and then are glorified and publicized by the Republican press. I sincerely hope that the Democratic voters will not be fooled by these Republican Trojan-horse tactics. Why, a couple of the candidates do not even live in the first district, and they have the brazen gall and nerve to run from our district.

I do not mind fighting a campaign on the issues. I resent the smears and character vilifications that these carpet-baggers are engaged in. I serve notice now that I intend to sue them, and the publications engaged in this smear campaign, for slander and libel. I wish to remind them that some time ago my business associate, who was a candidate for the Detroit Common Council, won a $15,000 libel suit against the Dziennik Polski.

The voters of the First District have honored me by electing me to the State senate and then to the Congress of the United States for seven terms. During my 14 years of service, I have been faithful and loyal to my duties and to the trust and confidence placed in me. I realize that in politics a tough and thick hide is needed, and I am willing to take it and to give it. But character assassination as practiced in this campaign is another thing. These vilifiers are worse than thieves, thugs, or gangsters. When they steal your purse, they have stolen only money, but when they steal your good name and assassinate your character, they have stolen everything.

May I remind my friends that when Federal Judge Arthur Koscinski was up for appointment, the smear artists started to paint him Red and began to tear his character apart. Some supporters ran away, but I did not flinch. I stood loyally by and fought off the attackers. When United States Marshal Joseph L. Wisniewski was up for appointment, again the vicious character assassins went to work. Communist, Red and other charges were hurled at him. Again I stood firmly by the side of Joe Wisniewski; we proved the attacks false, and the confirmation went through. When several post-office employees, who were outstanding and fearless Democrats, were being attacked and smeared, I came to defend their good name and character. These charges were proven false and unfounded and provoked by jealousy and envy.

Some disgruntled Pennsylvania Republican politicans, headed by Republican Judge Blair F. Gunther, who helped to create the Slav organization and then lost control of it, desiring to discredit the organization brought a questionable character, a stool-pigeon, to testify before a congressional committee. Although he was headlined as an FBI agent, on checking with the Department I find that he was never an employee, never a part of the FBI, and never authorized to make any statement on behalf of the FBI.

I say that he is a questionable character, because he was charged with cruelty and nonsupport of his wife and children. This is all a part of the Pennsylvania court records. This witness admitted that he was instigated to make these smear statements by the unscrupulously ambitious Republican, Blair F. Gunther. The reactionary Republican machine of Pennsylvania paid off Gunther by giving him a judgeship.

This stool-pigeon, this Republican hireling, testified that he found 2,000 of my speeches in the headquarters of this organization. I had sent these speeches to a United States Army captain, in the paratroopers, who had 3 years of active and dangerous overseas duty. He had been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross and other military decorations, and is, as I understand it, 75 percent disabled. This speech was written in support of the program advocated last summer by the Quakers, the Friends Service Society, a thoroughly American and devoutly religious organization with headquarters in Philadelphia. The great William Penn established the Quaker colony in order to escape religious persecution in Europe. The Quaker program called for peace, trade, and commerce between all nations. They pointed out that hundreds of years of religious wars had decided nothing and that finally the different religions found that they could live in one world together.

It is nothing unusual for a Congressman to get requests for copies of his speeches, and 2,000 copies is not a large number for distribution. If these

speeches were part of a propaganda campaign, then not 2,000, but 2,000,000 would hardly be enough. I have over 150,000 registered voters in my district alone and there are 435 congressional districts in the Nation.

I have challenged the press and my opponents to publish the text of the speech. This, of course, they will not do, because there is nothing wrong with the Quakers' program, and the Secretary of Commerce is at this moment proceeding with plans for a world-wide trade fair.

This is a slimy, snakey attack. They do not challenge the text of the speech. They wish to make political hay out of the fact that the speeches were seen in a Slav organization headquarters in Pittsburgh.

I had sent the speeches to a private citizen, a former United States Army captain. I did not send them to his club. Why have they made a mountain out of a molehill?

I have engaged an outstanding libel attorney to check thoroughly into the statements made by this Republican stoolpigeon and family deserter from Pittsburgh, and all references made to me in the Polish Republican paper in Pittsburgh, the Republican Saturday Evening Post, the Republican Dziennik Polski, and any other rabid Republican reptilian publications.

The voters of my district are intelligent, hard-working people. Time and again they have demonstrated their ability to think for themselves and their independence of the Republican smear artists. I believe that the voters are entitled to know something about the candidates. I invite all the candidates to reveal their family and political background.

My father and mother settled in Detroit, in the First Congressional District, 70 years ago. They were married at St. Josaphat's Catholic Church. The first four of the nine children were baptized there. The other five were baptized in St. Stanislaus' Church, of which parish my father was one of the pioneer members. My aunt and uncle were the first couple to be married at St. Stanislaus' Church. My father's place of business was located at Farnsworth and Dubois. He was an active worker and leader in the ninth ward Democratic organization 50 years ago.

I became active in Democratic politics before I was old enough to vote; that is, while I was attending law college at the University of Detroit. Together with a group of University of Detroit students we took an active part in the 1924 campaign. In 1928, during the Al Smith campaign, I ran for State senator on the Democratic ticket and came within 202 votes of being elected. In 1931, in a special election, I was elected Democratic State senator by a large majority. I was the first Democrat to sit in the Michigan State Senate in 16 years. As the lone Democrat I came out for old-age pensions, for repeal of prohibition, in opposition to Governor Brucker's anti-labor policies, the use of State police on gestapo raids, and so forth. I was one of the organizers and was elected first president of the Detroit Democratic Club, and I was also given the job of chairman of the committee on clubs and organizations by the Wayne County Democratic Committee headed by that highly esteemed and great Democrat, Roscoe Huston. This task called for a lot of hard work, campaigning every night, and the expenditure of much energy and money. We organized 75 Democratic clubs in Wayne County and set up the precinct-captain organization by congressional districts. Our First Congressional District became the leading Democratic district in the State, and has held that position ever since. I have been a Democratic delegate for 22 years, and active in all of the Democratic conventions. I have held the position of congressional chairman and have been a member of the Democratic State Central Committee.

My wife is a Detroit girl and was born in the First Congressional District. We belong to the St. Hyacinth's parish, at McDougall and Frederick, of which church Bishop Stephen S. Woznicki was the pastor until he was recently elevated to take charge of the Saginaw diocese.

In Washington we are also members of the Annunciation parish. My children have all attended parochial schools and then have gone on to attend Catholic high schools until graduation. My son serves mass as an altar boy, and my eldest daughter is secretary-treasurer of the parish Newman Club, and all of my daughters are active Sodality members.

I respectfully request that my opponents discontinue the smear tactics and discuss campaign issues.

The peculiar menace of this hour is the pressure toward extremes. It was the tactic of nazism and fascism first to destroy the middle ground—the moderate and the liberal—and then to claim that all must choose between the dictatorial left and authoritarian right. It is the tactic today of the Communists.

I am one who still believes that we do have choices other than a communistic collectivism or a cold "devil take the hindmost" individualism.

As a Democrat, I believe in the American way that has been built upon competition to excel, not to destroy; upon the free interplay of divergent ideas and opinions; upon the concept that the state serves the people, not the people the state, and that the individual has the right to protection against the tyrannies both of political power and of mob rule; upon the ideal that the integrity of the individual is not incompatible with the brotherhood of man.

We who take the middle road; we liberal and progressive minded Democrats must hold our ground firm. We have fought hard and gained much in social and economic justice for the people. We must preserve our hard-fought gains for posterity.

The great poet, James Russell Lowell, wrote:

They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak;
They are slaves who will not choose,
Hatred, scoffing, and abuse,
Rather than in silence shrink
From the truth they needs must think;
They are slaves who dare not be,
In the right with two or three.

We Democrats have a creed, we have a program that the American people, yes, all the people, can accept with enthusiasm and confidence. We liberal Democrats must never give up the fight, for to do so will mean a submission to tyranny, cruelty, deception, hate, and fear. We believe in a democracy based on the concept of the rule of law; we believe in a society in which every man has rights—inalienable rights—rights which are not based on race, creed, color, rank, or economic power, but on equality. We believe in dealing out justice among the citizens and preserving justice between the citizens and the state. Our concept of individual rights was our greatest weapon in the Revolutionary War. Today it is still our greatest weapon against communism and all forms of totalitarianism. Fascism, nazism, and communism all have tried to convince the people that our concern with individual human rights is false and fraudulent; but the people all over the world are beginning to realize that wherever the extreme left or the extreme right—wherever totalitarianism has come into power, that they, the people, are subjected to tyranny, torture, kidnapping, gas chambers, slavery, murder, midnight arrests, and judged by courts where the judges sit as prosecutors. We, the liberal Democrats, are waging the great fight for human rights as against tyranny in any form. We have faith and confidence that our cause is anchored on solid rock.

Let us not be silenced. There are entirely too many people who have been so frightened into silence that they are afraid to say anything for fear that they will be smeared.

It should be no secret that there is a great postwar offensive being waged by big business and finance to recapture their former dominant influence in government. The Buchanan Lobby Investigating Committee has revealed how millions of dollars are being spent by big-business interests to recapture control of the Government. The people must be on the alert.

The great Democrat, educator, and statesman, Senator FRANK GRAHAM, has expressed most beautifully our creed:

In spiritual faith and the American dream, America is being made safe for democracy without hate, and excellence without arrogance; where men become brothers in the sight of God and in the human heart; where the opportunities of the children in homes and schools are the chief concern of present progress and the chief hope of a nobler society; where enduring progress in human relations is made through religion, education, and voluntary cooperation in the minds and hearts of the people; and where the struggle for the fulfillment of our historic Americanism is the best answer to fascism and communism in the present global struggle against totalitarian tyranny for freedom and peace in the world.

In this America of our struggles and our hopes, the least of these our brethren has the freedom to struggle for freedom; where the answer to error is not terror, the respect for the past is not reaction, and the hope of the future is not revolution; where the integrity of simple people is beyond price and the daily toil of millions is above pomp and power; where the majority is without tyranny, the minority without fear, and all people have hope. This is America. God bless America.

I shall conclude by quoting from President Truman's message to Congress on August 8, 1950:

Throughout the world, communism is seeking to discredit our system of constitutional liberties. The Communists know that the leadership and good will which our Nation enjoys arise in great measure from the fact that men here have the blessings of liberty. Consequently, the propaganda of communism is devoted to a bitter and unceasing attempt to blacken and distort our national character and our way of life.

This propaganda is a formidable threat to the unity of the free nations in working for peace. The best answer to it is not words, but deeds. We must demonstrate that we are a country in which men can live together and advance together as a free society. This alone can prove the falseness of the Communist attack. It would be tragic in the highest degree if we were to frighten ourselves into destroying those very liberties which are the basis for our moral leadership in the struggle for peace.

I am determined that the United States shall be secure. I am equally determined that we shall keep our historic liberties.

Success in achieving both of these objectives is of exceptional importance in the present period of international tension. For by our actions we must maintain the United States as a strong, free people, confident in our liberties, and moving forward with other free peoples to oppose aggression and to build a just peace for all mankind.

Excerpts From Speeches on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as long as it has been my honor to represent the Seventeenth Ohio District in the House of Representatives, I have endeavored to voice the opinions of the people on the floor of Congress.

To learn these views I have tried to keep in constant touch with my constituents through personal meetings held annually at the courthouses of each county in the district, through personal letters, and through annual questionnaires.

Under consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts of various speeches I have made in order that the people of the district may know my position on national issues.

If anyone desires to find these remarks in full, they are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the dates indicated:

OUR DEFENSE

(December 5, 1947)

Mr. Speaker, my survey has shown to me that our defense program is at a very low ebb.

We must decide whether or not we are going to strengthen our own defenses, both military and economic, or give to other nations more and more American dollars. Our own defense and economic situation in this country is in such a weakened condition that it will take hundreds of millions of dollars to restore it to the level we maintained as of VJ-day.

(April 11, 1949)

Mr. Speaker, we are told that this money is being used to prevent the spread of communism. If such is the case, why do we find money and aid going to satellite nations of Russia and, yes, to Russia itself.

It has been charged and not denied that countries to which we are giving aid under the European recovery program have been shipping copper to Poland, which is under Russian control, and, yes, Mr. Speaker, shipping steel rails and locomotives direct to Russia. The records will show that we are furnishing to European nations materials which are critical in this country and which are badly needed for the establishment of our own defense program.

Our military position needs a tremendous expenditure in order to protect ourselves. I am asking you, are we going to continue a policy of weakening our economic structure and weakening our military position? I am of the firm conviction that it is time for us to give recognition to our own needs. Let us be fair with the American people—recognizing their need, recognizing the weakness of our own country—put our own house in order.

COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM

(May 5, 1949)

Mr. Speaker, this morning we are informed that recent investigations of the FBI reveal that 8,881 employees have been dismissed from the Federal service within the last few months as a result of loyalty investigations.

We all recall that President Truman and various candidates for Congress, including my opponent from the Seventeenth District of Ohio, ridiculed the congressional spy investigation as a "red herring" designed to divert attention from the record of the Eightieth Congress. Mr. Speaker, the facts now disclosed would lead me to say the "red herring" of 1948 has reddened faces in 1949.

In my opinion, the Communists in America are traitors, agents of a foreign power. Mr. Speaker, their aim is sedition, espionage, and treason and I believe a definite decision must be made by our Government at once and strong measures taken to protect our American way of life. It seems ridiculous to me to ask our American taxpayers to continue to pay high taxes in order to send money and materials to Europe to fight communism—approximately $28,000,000,000 sent since the closing of the war—and, at the same time, pamper and allow communism to spread here in our own country.

RUBBER-STAMP CONGRESS

(January 17, 1950)

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article released by INS from which I quote:

"WANTS ONLY FAIR DEAL CONGRESSMAN

"President Truman made it clear today that he wants only Fair Deal Democrats in Congress.

"The Chief Executive indicated in strong terms at a Democratic Party gathering that a new purge is on to get rid of those who oppose his program."

This article makes it clear the President is going to purge anyone who opposes his program.

I have always opposed any program which, in my opinion, would lead us down the road to socialism and communism, and I definitely oppose the President's program of taking power from the people back home and placing it in the hands of Federal bureaus here in Washington. I am not in accord with the President's socialized-medicine program and I will continue to strenuously oppose unnecessary Federal expenditures and the philosophy of spend and spend—tax and tax. Because I believe as above stated, I will be one who will be on the "get rid of" list of the President. The Fair Deal candidate who will receive the support of the President will be one who agrees with the philosophy of statism and is in accord with the views of President Truman and his Fair Deal. This philosophy, in my opinion, is not in accord with the views and beliefs of the people, Democrats as well as Republicans, of the Seventeenth Ohio District.

Mr. Speaker, the President is to be congratulated for his outright statement which makes the issues of the coming election clearly defined, freedom and security against bureaucratic control and socialism, a challenge I shall gladly accept.

(January 27, 1950)

Mr. Speaker, elections will soon be here and the left-wingers and those who are friendly toward communism will support many candidates. The people should carefully analyze and scrutinize the various candidates to make certain they have not pledged themsleves to those who would attempt to destroy our form of government.

During the last campaign, Mr. Speaker, the President as well as some candidates for Congress attempted to tell the people that communism was but a "red herring." Events since that time certainly prove that communism is still a menace to our freedoms and should be considered as such. Let us remember those who attempted to belittle this threat.

GAG RULE

(October 4, 1949)

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolution which is now before us for consideration, known as House Resolution 372 which certainly can be categoried as a gag rule. This resolution prevents any amendments being offered to the social security bill, known as H. R. 6000.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of action certainly is not a symbol of the freedoms for which many of us have fought. I have just finished conferences in my district and over 600 people came to the courthouses to express their views and many of them on the subject of social security, and may I say, Mr. Speaker, many of their suggestions merit the consideration of this Congress. Yet, under this rule I am not allowed in the form of amendments to submit their views as well as my own for the consideration of this body.

(January 26, 1950)

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the membership of this body to be willing to go on record so that the people that elect us will know how we stand on various issues. Then, after we are recorded either by "yes" or "no" vote, the people will have the opportunity to determine whether or not we express their views, and they will so tell us at the next election.

We should be honest enough to come out in the open and put ourselves on record in voting on legislation before us for our consideration. It is time for all of us to be willing to stand up and be counted so that the people can decide by our record whether or not they want us to represent them in this legislative body.

NONESSENTIAL EXPENDITURES

(January 27, 1950)

Mr. Speaker, no nation can spend itself into real prosperity. Prices are rising and the real value of saving, pensions, annuities, and insurance are shrinking and being cut almost in half. Taxes are enslaving the American people of their right to spend their own money. The average American family of four is paying approximately $31 a week in taxes—four times as much as just 10 years ago. If we are to continue and

have a real prosperity, unnecessary Federal expenses must be immediately reduced and they can be reduced, Mr. Speaker.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(October 5, 1949)

Mr. Speaker, social security is a much-needed program as it provides financial independence for old folks no longer able to work. Properly administered, it would do just that.

The social-security objective is excellent—the plan for financing it is deceptive.

(August 14, 1950)

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to note this legislation, H. R. 6000—social-security bill—now exempts State and municipal pension plans as well as the school teachers' retirement system from the Federal social-security program. I have always opposed attempts to include existing pension plans in social-security legislation, and I am glad that this bill includes provisions making these groups exempt from coverage. The provisions of this bill will assure the school teachers of the State of Ohio that their retirement funds remain intact, and teachers cannot, in any way, be denied their rights under their own retirement system. This same applies to police and firemen, and other employees covered under the State and municipal plans.

LABOR AND BUSINESS

(April 27, 1949)

Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the combined welfare of labor, agriculture, little and big business, because I know that any legislation passed should be fair and just to all, and should also be in the interest of over 80,000,000 people, who cannot be classified either as employers or employees. I recognize that whatever legislation is passed by this Congress may not meet the full approval of management, nor of labor, but I think we all realize that we must compromise on certain issues and that we must do our best to pass, within the next few days, legislation that will encourage us all to work together in an effort to keep wages at a high level; agriculture at a high level; and business and production at a high level; so that we can have continuous prosperity in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am against any law that will give business too much power or control, and I also am against any legislation that will put into the hands of a few labor leaders the power to choke the Nation to its knees and slow down and endanger the welfare of our country. I am interested in legislation that will be beneficial to all the people and which will provide the same rights, privileges, and prerogatives, to both labor and management. If this type of legislation is passed, the right of the individual citizen and the collective interest of the public will be protected. I pledge my support to legislation that will bring this about.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

(February 9, 1950)

Mr. Speaker, the subject before us today, known as the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1949—H. R. 1211—vitally affects all Americans, the farmer, the workingman, and the consumer. My candid opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that American-trade policies are too vital to the Nation's welfare to trust to the whims of one man, however well intentioned that one man may be. H. R. 1211, as it is now written, would give to the President of the United States the right to lower or raise tariff rates as he sees fit. In my opinion, the present bill will legislate, regulate, and finance the abolishment of hundreds of thousands of American workers' jobs. This legislation will allow products to be brought into this country from foreign nations where the living standards are much lower than ours in this country. Our farmers will also be forced to compete with the prices of farm products of foreign nations which certainly are at a lower level because of the foreign wage element involved. I firmly believe that this act should be amended so that the peril point will be protected.

We all believe in reciprocal trade, Mr. Chairman, but let us make sure it is reciprocal, taking into consideration the welfare and living standard of our own people.

KOREA

(August 14, 1950)

Mr. Speaker, we recall in 1916 an administration was elected to power because it promised to keep us out of war; in 1940 the same administration was returned to power, as we all recall, on a promise made "again, again, and again" that American boys would not have to fight and die on foreign soil; and now, today, for the third time we are engaged in a war and Congress has not declared it.

This time, Mr. Speaker, the ridicluous charge has been made by some candidates for Congress and left-wing New Dealers in the Democratic Party that the Republicans are to be blamed for the Korean debacle, because we did not vote for aid to Korea early this year. Nothing could be more stupid or unfair. A school child should know that it would have been folly to give economic and meager military aid to Korea without backing it up with full military aid for the Far East, including Formosa.

At the time of the debate on this subject of aid for Korea it was testified by military leaders, as well as the heads of our Department of State, that we could not defend Korea should the Communists decide to invade.

I voted against the Korean aid bill, because it was proven to me beyond a doubt that it would be inadvisable to send economic aid and a token military aid to build up a rich prize for our enemies unless we were willing to make an all-out effort to defend it.

I do feel that those in our State Department responsible for a change in our Far East policy should not continue in control but be replaced by someone having definite knowledge of existing conditions and the importance of the program from an international viewpoint. And certainly that those in control of this program should not be friendly with those who associate with Communists. We cannot fight communism in the Far East and allow it to run rampant in our own country, yes, even in our own Federal departments.

Mail Delivery Service Should Be Reestablished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the bill, now before the House, to reestablish the delivery of mail on the same basis that prevailed prior to the order of the Postmaster General, of April 18, 1950, which cut deliveries to one per day.

The bill is nothing more or less than an effort upon the part of the Congress to make effective the will of the people. Since the Postmaster General issued his order to curtail mail deliveries in residential districts to one per day, there has been constant complaint upon the part of the people who have been deprived of the former service. I have received many letters protesting against the change and demanding restoration of the service. Many of these letters have contained illustrations of the harm that has resulted in business matters and other important situations that called for earlier and more prompt service than is rendered under the changed conditions.

The reason given by the Postmaster General is the need for economy. There is no one who is a taxpayer who is not anxious for some evidence of economy by the present administration. It has been profligate, wasteful, and extravagant in all of its departments of government. But, when billions are being sent to nations all over the world it seems foolish economy to attempt to economize at the expense of our own people, especially when the amount saved amounts to only a few million dollars. The amount that it is alleged would be saved is so small in comparison with the billions being misspent in our own land, in addition to the billions for foreign aid, that it seems ridiculous to speak of this small amount as economizing. Certainly the people of our own country are entitled to something in return for the high taxes they pay to the Federal Government.

Furthermore, we must not overlook the fact that the Post Office Department is a service organization for the people of the Nation. It costs millions of dollars every year for the Post Office Department to carry on the service it renders to the several Government departments, bureaus, and agencies in the conduct of Government business. This is an important and necessary service, and it would not be justifiable to eliminate such service on the theory that it costs something. It is a service that is natural and to be expected in government. For the same reason delivery of mail to our people in the conduct of their daily affairs is a duty of government, and is a service that is paid for by the individual patrons of the Post Office Department. They are entitled to have adequate service in return for the postage rates they pay and for the taxes they also pay.

The order of the Postmaster General does not provide the kind of economy that the people want and the Nation needs. It is so small that it would make no appreciable difference. It would hardly be noticeable on the balance sheet of the Government. What this Nation needs is over-all economies that will run into billions of dollars and that would result in real savings to our taxpayers. The net result of the Postmaster General's order would be the distress it would bring to the many faithful postal workers who would lose employment, inconvenience to our people who depend upon adequate and speedy mail service, and without any genuine or real saving to the taxpayer.

Trans-Isthmian Canal Problem: Tehuantepec Ship-Tunnel and Ship-Railway Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, during the perennial discussions of trans-Isthmian problems attention has been focussed on several historic route areas. One of these is Tehuantepec.

Among the schemes suggested for that location is a combination ship-tunnel and open canal at sea level, as proposed by Dr. William H. Hobbs, an eminent geologist, in the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, February 1950, volume 75, No. 2, page 129, entitled "The Problem of a New Trans-Isthmian Canal." This idea, just as was the Panama sea-level proposal, appears to be premised upon extreme interpretations of the needs of national defense rather than on the true criteria of canal capacity and operational facility.

Another idea frequently mentioned in promotional literature of Isthmian projects is that of a ship-railway at Tehuantepec. An instructive discussion of these proposals by the distinguished author Arthur Stanley Riggs, commander, United States Naval Reserve, retired, was published in the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, August 1950, volume 76, No. 8, page 911, which I now quote:

TRANS-ISTHMIAN CANAL PROBLEMS

[By Commander Arthur S. Riggs, USNR, retired]

I have read with no little interest the article entitled "The Problem of a New Trans-Isthmian Canal" by Dr. William H. Hobbs, in the February issue of Proceedings, and wish to congratulate you and Dr. Hobbs for what seems to me a lethal blow at both the Panama sea-level lock and the Nicaragua high-level, lake-type canals.

Since I am neither a geologist nor a civil engineer, it may be a work of supererogation for me to discuss Dr. Hobbs' position. I may, however, note that the present article is an elaboration of Dr. Hobbs' original thesis, published in the Proceedings (1948) of the ASCE. An even more irrelevant idea was presented in Washington January 14, 1949, before a large general audience in the auditorium of the Department of Commerce by the Mexican engineer Don Modesto C. Rolland, who subsequently published his findings and pictures. Señor Rolland, it may be remembered, was author of the trans-Isthmian railroad plan for dragging vessels across Tehuantepec—an idea evidently derived from the Eads suggestion of half a century ago.

The sole function of a canal is to transit vessels of all sizes and types safely, quickly, and economically between two points. It is perhaps not unreasonable to inquire if Dr. Hobbs ever navigated anything anywhere, or if he has first-hand experience with restricted channels and shoal water, whose dangers are perfectly familiar, especially in view of the elaborate series of tests precisely calculated and carried out over a long period at the Carderock naval testing basin. As a number of naval officers know by their own experience, there is constant evidence of vessels of all types and tonnages striking the walls of Gaillard Cut, due to failure of steering gear or propulsion, and subsurface conditions. It is obvious that similar eventualities must be considered in any such tunnel as that planned. The tunnel, moreover, is far more restricted in width than the cut, whose minimum width is 300 feet.

We may also properly remark that by his own statement Dr. Hobbs has not personally tested the homogeneity of the Tehuantepec rock formations. All rocks are not as solid as they seem to the eye. When New York City excavated its great subterranean aqueduct the engineers in charge, to get the homogeneity that could be depended upon, had to go to a depth of 1,114 feet below sea level at one point, in solid granite at that. And that tunnel is a picayune affair compared with a ship tunnel.

No adequate tests have as yet been made of the formations on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, and my personal experience of that region makes me feel assured that no one can tell offhand, or even by analogic reasoning, what lack of homogeneity, what fractures, what faults and other features heavy blasting will develop. In all probability the chief discovery to be made should the Tehuantepec Canal be authorized—which discovery can be confidently predicted by even a mere sailor—will be a gold mine of limitless possibilities for the contractors. The titanic size of the tunnel guarantees that: 250 to 300 feet from top to bottom instead of the inadequate 175 of Dr. Hobbs, and at least 150 feet at water level.

All we need in any trans-Isthmian canal is operational and navigational adequacy. We have the makings now. The simple and relatively inexpensive Terminal Lake plan for the existing Panama Canal is the point all the theorists refuse to see. It is still urgently needed for the solution of the pressing problem of Isthmian transit, and should not be obscured by irrelevant issues.

Postal Curtailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. BUCKLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, having worked long and diligently on postal legislation during my term of membership in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to state I have doubled my efforts in behalf of the Morrison bill to rescind the April 17 curtailment order of the Postmaster General. For I believe this order has not only crippled our former excellent delivery service to the American public, but has worked hardship by virtue of unemployment in the postal service itself, has seriously affected business houses depending on mail for orders and fulfillment of orders, and has caused lowered morale and growing discontent among the taxpaying citizens of the United States with this manifestation of unwisely administered economy in government.

I was instrumental to a degree in aiding the completion of the necessary 218 signatures on discharge petition No. 31, in order to bring this matter before the Congress. I, myself, introduced a bill, H. R. 8226, to rescind the Postmaster General's order. Only today I received a telegram from branch 11, National Association of Letter Carriers, in Chicago, reading as follows:

Forty-six hundred Chicago letter carriers would highly appreciate your cooperation in supporting the Morrison bill, H. R. 8195, which comes up for consideration on Tuesday, August 15. Thanking you in advance for this courtesy, I am,

FRED O. ANDREWS,
President.

Again, quoting from a letter received by me from the National Association of Letter Carriers, signed by William C. Doherty, president, I set forth in brief the serious results of this order:

The need for a first-class postal system becomes more pressing with the approach of war. In one of the many letters we received from business firms relative to the slowdown in postal operations, a complaint was made about a tool part being delayed several days, causing a substantial loss in operation. This type of postal service, whether in the handling of first-class mail or parcel post, can and will cause the United States a great deal of harm in a period when the Nation should be producing the necessary materials to maintain our democratic way of life.

Drawing from complaints of citizenry, office routine in business houses is seriously upset. Mail comes in about 10 a. m.; much later than formerly. This often means the whole day's planning is thrown off, for much hinges on what is contained in the morning mail.

And to quote further from a newspaper excerpt written on this subject:

The postal service is one of the very oldest services our Government has furnished to its people. The public was conditioned to good postal service. So efficient was the service that the courts came to hold that proof of posting a letter in the mail was actually proof of delivery. Letter carriers are being told to do just a half-way job after being bred in the tradition of tiptop service. There may possibly be a slight economy insofar as the actual cost of running the Post Office Department is concerned, but from the public's standpoint there is no economy, considering hardships and actual money losses to business places and the inconveniences that affect everybody.

It is my understanding that England, where the standard of living is far below that of America, has its normal number of deliveries, and that Belgium serves its public with seven deliveries a day. And we lend or give Europe billions of dollars in order that it may meet the standards of and pattern after the American way of life.

Have we no thought for the American boys in Korea, in Germany, in any part of a lonely land, waiting for the letters from home, the letters that are racing with fate, the letters that will mean courage, hope, that will give them reason for fighting on? Can you see those grimy faces, eager, yearning? Can you see them turn away, tears streaking the grime, because of the letters that did not come? Some tomorrow—they hope. But why not today?

I ask you to picture this proud service—stumbling, today overburdened with yesterday's half-completed deliveries; the carriers, men such as you and I, eating lunch on the curbstone, their usual

smiling faces as the good-will emissaries of family to family and neighbor to neighbor drawn with haggard and weary lines, wondering why their Government has relegated their services to the era of the pony express. So, my worthy colleagues, in this House, representing 48 States of the Union, where these men serve the vital needs of communication and the interweaving of the interests of a vast population of 150,000,000 people, made possible through their Government postal service, I urge that we, the Congress, restore to this fine old American institution its former high plane of efficiency and fine delivery program; and in so doing let us honor these men of the carrier service, about whom it has been said, "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stay these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

Early History of Washington City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 16 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article by Mrs. Maud Proctor Callis, on the early history of Washington City. It was written in connection with the sesquicentennial celebration of the founding of the Capital City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, June 1950]

WASHINGTON CITY WAS BORN IN THE GOLDEN AGE OF PLANTATION LIFE

(By Maud Proctor Callis)

George Washington's selection of the location for the permanent seat of Government was approved by Congress, in session at Philadelphia, by acts passed in 1790 and 1791. By these acts Congress established the Territory (or District) of Columbia, on a site 10 miles square and containing 64,000 acres, which was ceded to the United States by Maryland and Virginia. The tract included Georgetown and Alexandria. The site was a beautiful, wide, undulating plain especially adapted to the purposes of a large city. The Indians had left the land about a century before when it was patented and farming by European settlers began.

Below Georgetown and within the District of Columbia a tract of about 6,000 acres, facing the Potomac River and extending to its eastern branch, was set aside for the Federal City. Two settlements were included: Carrollsburg and Hamburg. The Federal City was named "Washington." This waterway, the widest and most historic river in our Nation, winds its way from Allegheny mountain tops, passing through gentle rolling hills and fertile valleys of the Virginias and Maryland, for 383 miles to the Chesapeake Bay. When the District was created most of its roads were a little better than Indian trails, and as the Potomac was the main street of the area boat travel reigned supreme.

An excellent natural harbor within the District is formed by the Eastern Branch of the Potomac. At the head of navigation of this branch, not far beyond the District boundary, in those colonial days stood a thriving town, Bladensburg. Bladensburg as a port rivaled Alexandria and Georgetown. Many ships anchored there to exchange silks, satins, and velvets, and other imports for tobacco. Bladensburg was so prosperous that it became a center of luxurious living, and the gayest place in the area. People from miles around went there to celebrate, and to attend the horse races and cock fights. Often they attended plantation parties. The colonists made a fine art of these parties and delighted in dining, dancing, hunting, and hard riding.

Fine homes within the District were few indeed at the time, but many colonial mansions dotted the adjacent countryside. Washington City is quite close to the old homes of George Washington and of other immortal patriots, their plantations lining both sides of the Potomac. These planters worked and played, legislated and fought, and helped to establish the greatest Nation on earth. Many of their mansions have come down to us in a splendid state of preservation. Some have been equipped for present-day living and are occupied by a favored few who possess an abundance of historic appreciation. Some of these old houses have been extensively altered, some that were destroyed have been reconstructed in keeping with historic records, while others have "sprouted wings," and the rambling type has rambled on. These homes are show places and retain much evidence of plantation elegance. Some of them are: Stratford Hall, Mount Vernon, and Gunston Hall—well-known Virginia shrines; and in Maryland: Haber de Venture, Bostwick, Dower House, Belair, Montpelier Manor, Oxon Hill, Hayes Manor, and Falling Green.

The demand for tobacco in the middle 1700's became so great that fabulous prices were paid for it. This created a new era of luxurious living resulting in the replacement of many wooden houses. Brick mansions arose in many places. They were basically of Georgian architecture, each vying with the other in elegance and beauty. Each was distinctive in its individual features. Bricks were often manufactured on the premises. The antiquity of some old mansions can be authenticated by their oversize home-made bricks, and the distinctive color given to them by the native clay.

The usual eighteenth-century mansion was one-and-a-half or two-and-a-half stories high, with dormers and picturesque brick chimneys. Outbuildings, were workshops, servants' quarters, etc. The great house usually stood on a knoll overlooking a river and commanding a superb view. A wide center hall extended through the house with an entrance at each end. One door could be approached by the tree-shaded shell drive, and was for those who traveled by carriage, saddle horse, or foot. The main entrance faced the river for convenience of those who came by boat. It opened out on a wide rolling lawn amid ancient oaks, chestnuts, and other native trees. Boxwood hedges and formal gardens of roses and old-fashioned flowers adorned the lawn, which often extended to tidal marshes. A path led down to the wharf. When a ship arrived from the West Indies bringing molasses, sugarcane, and rum—and with news from the other colonies—that was an occasion; but, when an English vessel landed with Hepplewhite furniture and French carpets—and perhaps brought home the planter's son from his European tour—that was a great event, creating much excitement.

The pioneer planter had developed his plantation out of a dense woodland. He loved every good soul, animal, tree, and plant that was his. He read his Bible faithfully. His chief counsel was his faith in God and in himself, his friends, and his well-chosen books. He read the classics, and books on the subjects of agriculture, animal husbandry, the law, home remedies, and Poor Richard's Almanac. He was a shrewd trader who bargained well with his tobacco and grain for the goods he wanted.

This woodland squire was the lord of his plantation and an all-round expert. He improved his breeds of stock and varieties of fruit by careful selection. He produced meats, dairy products, wool, leather, and other commodities to supply the needs of his community. He watched with pride his stock beyond the ha-ha wall, his orchards, his corn and beans, and his great fields of green tobacco plants. While his undertaking was tremendous, his vast acres fairly breathed with fertility, order, and peace.

These plantation communities consisted of the planter's family, overseas and indentured servants, many slaves, and their children. As this outdoor life was conducive to healthy, happy children, the young folks kept fun alive. Life was smooth and unhurried, and Christianity was taught to all who dwelt within. The planter's family, as well as the plantation workers, attended divine services, usually in a sturdy little church nearby.

The owner was always ready to serve his country; he would attend the House of Burgesses; he would make a decision to settle a dispute, and he would diagnose an illness and personally compound herbs for its treatment.

While his life was exacting, the planter surely knew how to live. In this period when dress was important, he spent much time and thought, and the proceeds from his tobacco, bedecking himself and his family. Men, women and children wore imported fabrics made in the finest fashions. Their costumes were gay and of many colors. Men and women wore wigs, and face powder was generously applied.

The men wore knee-length coats with many bright buttons, fancy vests, lace frills and cuffs, knee breeches, silk stockings, and black pumps with squarish silver buckles.

Women's clothing was strikingly beautiful. Milady's wardrobe included formal dresses with the tight-fitted basque having elbow sleeves finished with flowing lace. The neckline was round, exposing the shoulders. The skirt was very full and swept the floor, showing only the toes of her high-heeled shoes. Black accessories were favored and included long fingerless mitts, and many little ribbon bows. Milady was so stunning in her broadcloth riding habit that she often wore it to pose for her portrait. This costume had the finger-tip length coat, lace jabot, long full skirt, and a large picture hat trimmed with several ostrich plumes.

Hospitality was ever present, especially when many parties were given in season at the various plantations. Sometimes an extra one was had * * * probably to exhibit an imported horse.

The plantation folk were in a flurry when an equipage with outriders, or a boat arrived. Then doors opened wide to receive the guests. The hall was lighted with innumerable candles, whose light was as mellow as the chimes of the grandfather's clock which so often stood near the foot of the classical stairway. The lights of the chandelier in the living room caused the satin costumes to glimmer, while the flames from the blazing logs in the fireplace reflected a glow on the mahogany furniture, the ornamental plaster on the walls, and the wide oak board floors.

Silver and crystal, port and sherry sparkled on the long dining room table. There would be luscious roasts, seafood, pheasants and quail, sweetpotatoes, and always good old corn bread and jam. Food appeared in abundance * * * and disappeared. To avoid cooking odors and overheating in summer, the kitchens were apart from the mansions. In the kitchens locally famous old colored cooks made food masterpieces which remain a mystery, for their art was passed on by word of mouth, and the secret was jealously guarded. At mealtime the latest news was told, and the merits of the most

recent books circulating among plantation families were discussed.

Entertainment for guests included the singing of hymns and songs to a harpsichord accompaniment. Square dances and jigs were popular. The accomplished performers danced the minuet with grace and ease. The chase had become colorful hunting.

The serious-minded plantation owners retired to the library for a chat between puffs on their pipes, pinches of snuff, and sips of brandy. Then they discussed politics, tobacco, and horses. They discussed politics because the country was in its formation and they were careful to preserve their new-born freedom and ideals; they talked about tobacco because it was the main source of their income; and horse racing was their favorite sport.

Tobacco more than paid the plantation bills. As wealth was reckoned with this product, tobacco was always part of the thoughts and life of the planter. There has been little change in the Indian method for its cultivation. Then, as now, tobacco required the greatest amount of hand labor of the farm products. Labor was cheap and water transportation convenient. Conditions for its production in Maryland were ideal, and the tobaccos grown there possessed superior burning properties. Virginia tobacco has a special flavor. These products rank high among the tobaccos of the world, and this "old Indian weed" is still the money crop of those two States.

Many horses were of blooded stock and horseback riding early became the most favorite exercise of the planter's family. Riding led to racing, which became a most thrilling sport, so much so that it was enjoyed by the people of the countryside. Then horse stealing was punishable by death without benefit of clergy.

Professional horse racing in this country is said to have been born at nearby Belair. Belair plantation originally consisted of 3,600 acres, including the usual race course, deer park, and a kennel for hounds. The hounds were named and petted, and trained with great patience. Belair mansion was built by Benjamin Tasker for his daughter Ann, upon her marriage in 1741 to Gov. Samuel Ogle. First the Honorable Benjamin Tasker, and later Governor Ogle, procured thoroughbred horses from merry old England and raced them professionally. A few of these horses were unbeatable in their heyday, and many celebrated American race horses stem from Mr. Tasker's mare Selima, which he imported about 1750, and the Arabian stallion Othello. Today's Gallant Fox, winner of the Kentucky Derby and many other honors, is a Belair animal.

In this golden age of creative development and merited elegance Washington, the so-called city of magnificent distances, was born. Perhaps the Washington of today bears little resemblance to its founding era, yet the historian can find many remnants to direct our thoughts back a century and a half and more, to those great colonists—the planters.

Reorganizing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 16 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which appeared in the New York Times of August 6, 1950, dealing with the reorganization of Congress, written by Mr. Howard N. Mantel, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

REORGANIZING CONGRESS

BROOKLYN, *August 1, 1950.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

As the second session of the Eighty-first Congress draws nearer to a close it is becoming increasingly evident that a thorough house cleaning of House and Senate procedures is needed. A great amount of important legislation is doomed to failure each session of Congress because of peculiarities of precedents and rules of both Houses. Particularly in need of revision is Senate rule XXII, sections 2 and 3, which permits cloture on debate only when 64 Members—a constitutional two-thirds—vote for it. As a direct result of this clause, the entire civil-rights program has been killed, even though a clear majority of the Senators favored it.

Another unfortunate situation is the seniority precedent, which virtualy dictates the choice of committee chairmen, and which has given committee chairs to Senators and Representatives who should not hold such positions. Coupled with this is the problem of pigeonholing vital legislation in committee.

To work out equitable solutions to these problems, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, have introduced identical resolutions in their respective Chambers to create a Joint Select Committee on the Organization of Congress. This committee would have the power to investigate and recommend changes in the relationships between the two Houses, the relationships of Congress with other branches of the Government, and to recommend, fundamentally, changes in "* * * the rules, parliamentary procedure, and practices of each House." As readers of the New York Times will recall, the famous La Follette-Monroney committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress was responsible for the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601), which did much to fortify congressional practices, but which, unfortunately, was limited in its scope and jurisdiction, and consequently is in serious need of revision.

The United States Congress must be capable of meeting the challenge of a world torn between strife and peace. It must be a legislative body that will stand out in the world as a democratic institution capable of meeting the needs of the people of the world. To do this the machinery of Congress should be strengthened and revised by enactment of practicable changes in the present system. With this in mind, I strongly urge prompt consideration of the Humphrey-Holifield resolution.

HOWARD N. MANTEL.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 16 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a broadcast entitled "Happenings in Washington," which I made on August 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM NO. 31

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

Since the invasion of South Korea brought us face to face with the grim realities of war, I have received a flood of letters and telegrams from all parts of Pennsylvania.

These messages from the folks back home have been most encouraging. They brought me renewed assurance that the people of our great Commonwealth are imbued, in full measure, with the spirit of patriotic Americanism.

Since I last talked with you the war has been brought closer to thousands of homes in Pennsylvania with the calling of the Twenty-Eighth Division into Federal service. Many more of our sons have been summoned by selective service.

As a former commanding general of the famous Twenty-Eighth Division, my heart goes with them wherever duty may call. It will be comforting to all of us to know that they will be led by a great soldier, my friend and comrade, Maj. Gen. Dan Strickler, who will always be concerned with their safety and welfare.

We pray that our boys may be spared the horrors of war. Humbly we implore Almighty God to take them under His divine protection.

Almost unanimously the letters and telegrams I have received expressed approval of President Truman's reversal of his administration's disastrous policy in the Far East.

The great majority agreed that we had been brought to a time of crisis under the influence of fuzzy-minded men in positions of importance in the State Department.

And many denounced in no uncertain terms the tendency on the part of the administration to play politics with the security of the Nation while American lives are being sacrificed on the front lines in Korea.

Yes, my fellow Pennsylvanians, that is the shocking, disgraceful course which must be abandoned if American fighting power is to be developed to its highest peak.

Nothing less than total mobilization of all our strength will save America. It must be done now. Tomorrow may be too late.

Yet, in matters of vital importance to the future of the United States and the world, pussyfooting continues in Washington.

And while we hesitate and delay the armed might of communism sweeps across Korea and prepares to strike another blow at freedom in another part of the world.

Every American must understand what tremendous sacrifice will be required if we are forced to defend ourselves and our allies on many fronts.

Can we wait until after the November elections to tell the people of America the real truth? Can we place votes first?

I regret to tell you that some of the maneuvering in Washington indicates a disposition on the part of the administration and its supporters in Congress to give priority to political considerations rather than the safety of the Nation.

Recently the Senate passed the general appropriation bill for 1951. Time after time during the consideration of this bill some of us in the Senate urged—yes demanded—deep cuts in domestic spending.

We wanted to eliminate or suspend all public works projects except those which the Secretary of Defense would certify as necessary to national security or those on which suspension would result in unnecessary loss.

Administration leaders fought this economy proposal and it was defeated.

We wanted to cut the public-works programs by 50 percent in order to save money for defense purposes.

Again the administration leaders rose in opposition and again we were defeated.

We then proposed a 15-percent cut in all nonmilitary appropriations except those for fixed charges. And once more we were defeated by administration opposition.

Then we fell back to a 10-percent cut in domestic spending and finally we were able to have that proposal adopted in the Senate.

If finally approved this will mean a saving of about $525,000,000, a small sum as measured by the billions we will need for defense.

It will come as a shock to many of my listeners to learn that during the debate the administration leaders made a most vigorous and successful fight against any cut in funds for the Marshall plan.

They argued that the 10-percent reduction should not be applied to European recovery money.

It was said that we must be careful not to destroy the morale of the people of those countries.

Now I have always favored helping the friendly nations of Europe to get back on their feet. But I cannot understand why billions of dollars, taken from the earnings of American workers, are needed for construction of projects far removed from the countries of western Europe.

Let me tell you about some of these projects that the administration considers so important and so sacred that they could not be cut 10 percent.

They include road building, soil conservation, and water developments in various African colonies of England, France, and Belgium. They include a soil-erosion project in Algeria, a road project in the Belgian Congo, a rice-cultivation project in Morocco, an irrigation project in Jamaica, and a land-reclamation project in South America.

These are only a few of the projects. There are many more on the list, all to be paid for by the American taxpayer.

Now I ask you—do any of these projects contribute one single thing to the defense of America or to the defense of any country of western Europe?

Do you think Congress should appropriate millions of dollars for these projects while Americans are being asked to pay higher taxes to provide arms and equipment for our heroic fighting men in Korea?

Do you think a cut of 10 percent in these appropriations would destroy the morale of our European friends?

Well, a majority in the Senate apparently thought so and the Marshall plan funds were excluded from the 10-percent cut.

Even with the 10-percent reduction we will still be spending more money for domestic programs than was appropriated by the Eightieth Congress during either of the years 1947 or 1948.

It has been argued that the increased spending since 1948 was due to bigger expenditures for military purposes. But when the figures are compared we find that many more billions of dollars were spent in recent years for the administration of departments not connected with national defense.

Here are a few examples:

The Department of the Interior in 1947 received an appropriation of $290,000,000. In 1950 the appropriation was increased to $646,000,000, or more than double the 1947 figure.

During the past 10 years the Department of Justice appropriation has doubled from $67,000,000 to almost $136,000,000.

The deficit of the Post Office Department has increased during the last 10 years from $30,000,000 to $550,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1950. And you know that the taxpayer is getting poorer postal service than he got 10 years ago.

Just one more example:

The appropriation for the Department of Commerce which was almost $148,000,000 in 1941 has jumped to $688,000,000, an increase of over 400 percent.

In the face of these figures can anyone doubt that millions and millions of dollars could be chopped out of these appropriations and used to build the defense of our country.

To my way of thinking the 10 percent slice approved by the Senate was only a token of what could and should be done.

Let me repeat, in part, what I said during the discussion of the appropriation bill on the Senate floor:

"When we ask the American people to make the sacrifices that are part of the price of war we must make sure that every expenditure by the Government not necessary for national defense is cut to the bare essentials.

"I contend, Mr. President, that in order to hold the line on the home front we must practice the most drastic economy in every Government function not directly connected with defense.

"Every cut we make in Government spending is a step for the preservation of our freedom."

And I continued:

"I submit, Mr. President, that we should attack this problem courageously. We must stand firm against the demands of the free spenders.

"In the face of the situation that confronts us and the sacred responsibilities that are ours, we cannot continue the present free-spending program on the domestic front.

"If we do, we will spell out in bold letters the final destruction of individual freedom in the United States.

"When we are through fighting this war, and the Stars and Stripes are carried to victory, we must be in such financial condition that our individual liberties will not have been destroyed."

In charting our future course we must be guided by developments which stand out clearly in the world picture.

1. Soviet Russia will not cooperate for peace.

2. Communist power is being concentrated for eventual warfare to gain world domination.

3. Aggression in Korea may be the opening battle of World War III, with the United States paying nearly all of the costs.

Now with this clear picture before us we must proceed at once with full-scale mobilization for victory.

We must enact laws now to protect our people against the rising cost of food and the other essentials of life.

We must enact legislation for sharply increased taxes in order to pay the costs of war out of current revenues as far as possible.

We must renew our fight for deeper cuts in all spending not connected with defense.

I had those things in mind when I addressed the Senate. In concluding my remarks I said:

"Can we, in voting on this bill, close our eyes to the changed conditions forced upon us and the world?

"Can we justify spending programs which would require the use of money, manpower, and materials vitally needed for defense purposes?

"Mr. President, brave men are dying on the front lines in Korea. In time of war there must be battle casualties.

"Here in this Chamber we must have the courage to face the political fire of those who continue their demands for legislation favoring their own pet projects.

"The situation confronting us calls for courage to stand and fight for the whole United States.

"If we must have political casualties in the battle to build the strength of our Republic and to preserve our freedom, then I say to you, my colleagues, we must be ready to make that sacrifice."

I say to you, my fellow Pennsylvanians, this is no time to play politics. It is a time for real Americanism.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Address of Brig. Eric Dorman O'Gowan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD the speech delivered by Brig. Eric Dorman O'Gowan before an audience in the city of Belfast, following his return from a triumphant visit to the United States.

Because of his 32 years of military service with the British Army and his keen insight into questions of military strategy, his address is of importance to all students of current world problems. Moreover, he speaks with the authority of a military statesman, the vision of a profound student.

Pointing out the division of Korea as similar to that of Ireland, Brigadier O'Gowan rightly urged a prompt and peaceful settlement of the Irish border question. He urges that settlement in the interest of strengthening the defenses of Europe, which are recognized to be not only weak at the present time, but totally inadequate. He forceably points out that strategically a united Ireland can be of vital and inestimable military value in the event of European warfare. On this, there can be no argument.

Ireland is of vital and critical importance in any realistic plan for the defense of the west. Americans should be greatly concerned over the unwarranted situation that exists there today because it could conceivably be disastrous to the defense of the west.

The division of Germany today is cause of concern in the European situation. The division of Korea has proved the pretext, if not the cause, of our present warfare in the Orient.

Before the division of Ireland can become the occasion of further concern or warfare in western Europe, we should avail ourselves of every possible means to eliminate that division which is so obnoxious to freemen everywhere. The great value of a united Ireland to the Western World is clearly set forth in the very able speech of Brigadier O'Gowan. I urge my colleagues to read it with consideration.

The speech is as follows:

ADDRESS BY BRIG. ERIC DORMAN O'GOWAN, BELFAST, JULY 17, 1950

Friends of Ireland, fellow Ulstermen, defenders of western Christendom, I am privileged to speak to you tonight, not because I am of any importance in Irish or in world affairs, but because I am an Ulsterman of the oldest native stock in whose family history meet many of the conflicts and stresses which have marked and molded the Ulster of our time. My great-great-grandfather wore the white cockade in the '45, his son was killed near Newry. My grandfather came shoeless from the Mourne

Mountains and ended the possessor of a large estate in Cavan. My father was the last appointed high sherrif of Cavan; the last time we spoke together before he died, his view was that the border had gone on too long and he hoped I would help to get rid of it. I am what I am, my second brother retired from the Royal Navy as a captain, my youngest brother has been a minister of the Crown and Governor of Burma. Ours has been a family of mixed marriages, we produce all sorts, except bigots. Today we live in County Cavan, 70 years ago we had never lived elsewhere than in County Down. We were in Ulster before the Normans, we were before the plantations. If God is generous we will see the strangers either gone or Irish.

Let it be clear then that my country is Ireland; no man can have more than one country. The mistake of our minority in Ireland, what tears them into pieces, is their efforts to have two countries, Great Britain and Ireland. That cannot be done, it must be one or the other.

As an Irish citizen I wish to see Ireland independent and prosperous, taking her proper place in the great commonwealth of free Atlantic nations as one of the defenders of western Christendom. For Ireland to achieve that high duty she must, like all other effective nations, whatever their size, be united under one government controlling all the historical territory of the nation.

Unfortunately for Ireland, and I believe for the civilized world, the United Kingdom of Great Britain maintains possession of the six northern counties of the Irish isle, to the ultimate disadvantage of both nations, and to the detriment of the strategic security of the sister Atlantic nations, especially of the United States, Canada, and France.

The administrative arguments against the division of Ireland between two administrations are insuperable. Were it not for an act of resentment on the United Kingdom's part, no one would have dreamed of administering the island in two sections, one part through a British Governor in Belfast responsible to the British Government, for the remainder, through a sovereign independent State. No more reasonable are the economic effects of partition. Could anything be better designed to cripple a Nation than to separate industries from the major agricultural area, and then to impede or to ban the free passage of labor and commodities between one section and the other. This crime against the unity and well-being of the Korean Nation has already provided the excuse for open war. No nation will submit to partition permanently.

I am satisfied historically that partition was imposed on Ireland in the strategic and economic interests of the United Kingdom as well as in annoyance at Ireland's demand for independence. The result has been wholly bad, especially since in the part of Ulster retained by the United Kingdom it has not proved possible to establish true democratic institutions because of the abiding resistance to British rule, maintained in the face of all attempts at suppression, by the pro-Ireland element in the population of Northern Ireland separated against its will from the people of free Ireland. This undemocratic state of affairs creates profound frictions between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of Ireland respectively. As a result a unified defense system for the island is impossible, since there can be no agreement as to the senior partner, in consequence Ireland is precluded from taking her proper place in the defensive organization of the Atlantic Commonwealth under the Atlantic Pact. Thereby partition threatens peace, for a virtually defenseless Ireland is a standing menace to the security of the Atlantic community in the event of war.

It is useless for spokesmen of the United Kingdom to urge Ireland to cooperate while she remains divided. Any Irish government which complied would fall overnight for much the same reasons that the Government of the United Kingdom found it impossible to take part in the Schuman plan without compromising the British Nation's economic sovereignty.

It is my contention that the presence of British rule in Northern Ireland is a denial of democracy and a threat to world peace, different in kind but not in effect from the partition of Korea.

In the light of these arguments, I consider it supremely unwise for the Government of the United Kingdom to have permitted their chief of the local government in Northern Ireland, the leader of the anti-Ireland and pro-British minority in Ireland, Sir Basil Brooke, to undertake a propaganda tour in the United States of America and in Canada.

Indeed, it is difficult to see what good purpose Sir Basil Brooke's tour was intended to serve, particularly when the Government of the United Kingdom had, by the Ireland Act of 1949, placed in the hands of the minority of which Sir Basil Brooke is chief, the absolute right to decide how long Ireland should remain divided. Thereafter not even the Parliament of the United Kingdom could take the initiative in restoring the six counties to Irish government. In so apparently impregnable a position, what need was there that the Unionist chief in Northern Ireland should expose himself and the United Kingdom to criticism in the United States of America?

The Unionist chief's tour was prepared with the greatest care. All the, not inconsiderable, resources of the United Kingdom Foreign Service in the United States of America, a powerful and ubiquitous body of highly skilled propagandists, was at his disposal, despite the fact that his status as Premier of a nebulous subgovernment of the United Kingdom was outside the normal protocol. The tour was lavishly supplied by public funds raised from the Province. The United Kingdom Government allocated invaluable dollars. His retinue was to include a police and a publicity official, a senior civil-servant stood at his elbow on all occasions. The Government of the United States of America was invited to cooperate on the highest levels.

Shortly before the tour began, it seemed to me that, since the leader of the anti-Ireland Ulster Unionists was, by going to the United States of America, appealing to Caesar, in the form of American democracy, it might not be inappropriate for a pro-Ireland non-Unionist, non-Tory Ulsterman, particularly one who had served the British Crown, to be in the United States of America at the same time as Sir Basil Brooke in a position, as an independent person, to speak for an undivided Ireland.

My departure was not publicized; there was no previously arranged program. I was about as well equipped for the job as was David going out against Goliath. But like David the weapons on which I relied were novel. (a) A modern outlook on Ireland and her strategical and economic relationship with the United States of America and Europe. (b) Photostatic copies of the Northern Ireland Special Powers Act. "Goliath" Brooke's weapons were the British Empire, lots of brass and protocol. I traveled reliably by TWA (American); Goliath flew British. It might have been more tactful had he, too, flown American, but that would have entailed a halt at Shannon in Free Ireland.

On my arrival, a day before he reached the States, I was met by the full battery of the New York press, plus television, a car from the mayor's office, and kindness from everyone.

Goliath (tell it not in Gath) was met by Judge Troy's minute men, a disciplined body of American citizens who strongly disapproved of the presence of the United Kingdom in Ireland. It says much for their discipline and keenness that they defeated both the efforts of the authorities to keep the expected time of arrival secret as well as the uncertainty of his aircraft.

A word about Judge Troy's minute men and women. I made a point of following their activities closely while I was in New York. Sir Basil Brooke affects to have discovered two species of American—the decent American and presumably the indecent American. The criterion of the decent American, which by definition, excludes Colonel McCormick and the mayor of New York, is belief in the divine mission of the British Empire and the British way of life, particularly in Ireland. Indecent Americans, include all of Irish origin, which brackets, presumably include Major General Dean, now in ground command in Korea. All minute men and women are by Sir Basil's standard, not decent Americans. The facts are very different; few democratic Americans when made aware of the true situation in northern Ireland were found to approve. I placed the Special Powers Act in the hands of several judges whom I met at receptions, etc., and I was amazed at the instant horrified repudiation of that instrument as being un-American in the extreme. On the night when Sir Basil Brooke spoke to a carefully hand-picked Anglo-American group in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel upward of a thousand picketers paraded around the hotel for 2 hours on a cold evening bearing appropriate slogans. They were well-dressed, mostly middle-aged, orderly American citizens who knew well what they were doing and against what they were protesting. They were striking a blow for democracy as they knew it.

I will not bore you with a record of Sir Basil Brooke's travels. President Truman he did not see. All America heard that one of his forebears burnt the White House. That joke recoiled. Chicago heard it said that, at a reception there, he told his neighbors the funny story of the two soldiers, one of whom asked the other if he knew the difference between the King of England and the President of the United States. The difference apparently lay in the fact that the King of England had a father—decent Americans were not amused. His press conferences were not always easy, the Special Powers Act hung round his neck much as the Albatross hung about the ancient mariner's. I caught up with this Goliath in Chicago, because the mayor received Sir Basil Brooke; so the enraged Irish insisted that their man, myself, be received, too. I felt sorry for the mayor by the time he was through with Ulster free and unfree.

But in terms of publicity and news space, the League for an Undivided Ireland killed Goliath dead in Chicago.

The West Coast challenged him to visit. He declined. I went instead. His non-appearance there was not unnoticed by decent Americans.

Early in his tour he began to fade out as news. The fact was that beyond saying how nice it was to be British, he said little the press could bite on.

I, on the other hand had good and interesting press conferences. Everywhere press men were anxious to get the hand of the strategic aspect of partition and the way United States security was compromised by it. Sir Basil Brooke, by the way, stressed that if the United States of America was at war Ulster would be at war, he forgot to point out, but I did it for him, that as part of the United Kingdom, Northern Ireland had no say in either peace or war. The British Parliament decides that one. He avoided saying whether in the event of war Northern Ireland would have conscription.

The press was also interested in the special powers act. So also were Congressmen, even those not normally affected by Irish affairs.

I spoke at New York, Pittsburgh, Washington, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Chicago, Providence, Boston, San Francisco and Los Angeles. I flew well over 20,000 miles—the Atlantic both ways. It was a strenuous tour minus those aids to relaxation provided for Goliath by the taxpayers both pro and anti Ireland of Northern Ireland.

I did not go to Canada, there was no need—the Government of Canada had already summed up Goliath or what was left of him.

Had he been concerned solely with the affairs of his party as a minority group in Ireland he would have been legitimately engaged in a way Irishmen understand, but it is necessary to stress the point that Sir Basil was not speaking solely in the interests of his minority group but was upholding the right of the British Government to rule in Northern Ireland.

I maintain that no loyal Irishman should discuss with any minority representative the matter of Ireland's unity and integrity. That is an issue between Irish and British, but Brooke spoke as a Briton and was treated therefore as a British representation. He cannot have it both ways. For example, Lady Brooke is reported to have said at a women's meeting in New York that she wished that there could be a canal dug around the six counties and the sea let in to make an island of Northern Ireland. * * * Such people cannot call themselves Irish, in Ireland they serve Britain alone, Ireland never.

The important task for us was to use Brooke's tour as a lever for reopening the Hiberno-United Kingdom issue, so as to fortify the freshly revived American-Irish organizations everywhere. These are formidable allies grouped under the general control of the American League for an Undivided Ireland. This redoubtable body operates not purely in the interests of seeing justice done in Ireland on the general American principles, but also in the general interest of American security, strategical and financial. I must repeat that its outlook is not Irish but American. Among other activities it operates a lobby in the American Congress which serves to counteract the very powerful British influences in the State Department and the Pentagon. The league's effect was strongly demonstrated in the Fogarty resolution on Marshall aid to Great Britain, action which is now leading to the consideration by Congress of a wider-based resolution approving the unification of Ireland under an Irish Government and the cessation of United Kingdom interference in Irish affairs.

It may be interesting to note that the address I made to the Overseas Writers' Club on my arrival in Washington has been placed on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as being of national importance to the conduct of affairs in the United States of America. That was a very great compliment to Ireland. It was also valuable for that address emphasized the strategic weakness of a partitioned Ireland.

It will thereafter be seen that I did not go to the States in a negative attitude, to contradict a man whose sole status in a united Ireland would be the leader of a pro-British minority, but to use the publicity so generously provided by the British Government as a means of presenting Ireland's case against the United Kingdom, and Ireland's position in the Atlantic community to an audience wider than is normally reached by Irish speakers visiting the States. I was also able to develop the important but secondary issue, that of the misgovernment which is inevitable under the present regime in Northern Ireland

Decent people in the United States of America have no longer any excuse for not knowing of the special powers act, of unionist gerrymandering, of the immense and wholly disproportionate political police force, which is in fact the pro-British element's private army paid out of public funds. They heard of political discrimination, of the avowed intention to liquidate awkward political majorities.

A secondary object of Brooke's tour was avowedly to attract American industry to the six counties. Several interested Americans did comment on the risks attendant on opening up in so unsettled a political situation, which they felt quite outweighed the advantage of governmental access and special privilege curiously proffered by Brooke. They also wondered whether it would not be wise to consult the Government of Ireland proper before investing in the United Kingdom zone of Ireland.

One last line of British propaganda needs mention. It was suggested that there was some analogy between the border between Canada and the United States of America and the border in Ulster. Brooke is weak on history. Canada and the United States were at no time one country under one administration. If within the last 25 years this had been the case and Canada had been torn out of a greater United States of America by a foreign power, leaving North America partitioned and weakened, would not the people of the United States of America have by now gone to war to regain what was rightly their own? There is no doubt whatever that they would, just as they went to war to preserve the Union from the partition policy of the seceding States. Americans know well that the act of Union, which deprived Ireland of its parliament, was enacted to prevent Ireland going the republican way of the United States of America and France. They also know that in Northern Ireland we see the final stage of that iniquitous act.

Paul M. Herzog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 16 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials paying tribute to the high public service of Mr. Paul M. Herzog as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, and commending him for his willingness to continue to give of his wisdom and experience in these troubled times.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of July 31, 1950]

MR. HERZOG STAYS ON

President Truman paid an unusual tribute to Paul M. Herzog in appointing him to another term as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

The President revealed in a letter that he had twice drafted Mr. Herzog to stay on the job over the Chairman's insistence that he should return to private life. Mr. Herzog has been anxious to leave the Government for personal reasons.

It was the kind of letter a President usually reserves only for a departing public servant in reluctantly accepting his resignation. The President referred to Mr. Herzog's exceptional qualifications for his job, and concluded by saying he had no recourse in these troubled times except to ask the Labor Board Chairman "to continue to give your Government the benefit of your wisdom and long experience."

Mr. Herzog, who is 43, came to the NLRB 5 years ago after service first as a member, then as chairman, of the New York State Labor Relations Board. He has served the NLRB during one of the most difficult periods of its 15-year existence. Three years ago, the Board, which had been administering the prolabor Wagner Act, was called upon to administer and interpret the more evenly balanced Taft-Hartley Act.

The transition was not an easy one to make. And Mr. Herzog seems to have accomplished it with a minimum of valid criticism from either labor or management.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 1, 1950]

NEEDED WHERE HE IS?

The President has nominated Paul M. Herzog for a second full term as chairman of the National Labor Relations Board and has persuaded him, if confirmed, to forego his intention to return to private life.

The job, in many ways, is a thankless one. And the post is often a hot spot—particularly of late. As a result of the unfortunate attack on the board by its general counsel, Robert L. Denham, and the later fight in Congress over whether the NLRB and its counsel should continue independent of each other, Mr. Herzog was drawn into a maelstrom of controversy.

The vigor with which employer groups backed Mr. Denham thrust upon Mr. Herzog the appearance of being prolabor—a role which would hardly serve the interests of good labor-management relations at any time. Mr. Herzog, as we understand him, is not prolabor. He does, however, understand labor and gives a receptive hearing to its side of a case.

In view of labor's solid conviction that Mr. Denham represents management's interests in the dual set-up, it is all the more important to retain Mr. Herzog's judicial temperament and long experience to help hold the balance.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of July 26, 1950]

TALENT AND EXPERIENCE THAT CANNOT BE SPARED

Capable public servants are hard to get and easy to lose. President Truman, who knows that story all too well, is unwilling to let Paul M. Herzog leave the National Labor Relations Board. He has been Chairman since 1945. He wanted to resign in August, but Truman has nominated him for another 5-year term.

Herzog is that rarest of individuals—a genuine expert on labor relations who has maintained a degree of impartiality. His fairness is his greatest asset. Next comes his experience, which is remarkable for a man who will be only 44 next month. He has been in public service almost constantly since 1933. He has ridden the crest of the swift-running tide of labor legislation that has swept America in the past two decades.

He began as assistant secretary of the old National Labor Board, by appointment of Senator Wagner, in 1933. In 1937 he joined the New York State Labor Relations Board on its formation. There he served as chairman under both Democratic Governor Lehman and Republican Governor Dewey. He left the board only to go into the Navy in World War II. Governor Dewey paid him this tribute on his resignation: "Under your leadership the State Labor Relations Board has impartially, without fear or favor, built a great record in solving the problems of employers and employees. The board has served as a model of good administration."

President Truman appointed Herzog chairman of the National Labor Relations Board under the old Wagner Act of 1945, and re-

appointed him under the Taft-Hartley law in 1947. The second appointment was a bold gesture of confidence. Herzog had opposed the passage of the Taft-Hartley law and urged the President to veto it. Yet Truman felt so sure of the Board chairman's fairness that he sent him back to continue his job under the new law when it passed over the President's veto.

Thus, the Federal Government has kept the services of a man whose experience is not equaled in his new, vital, and complicated field. The trials of such a job require a Hercules for strength and a Job for patience. Through it all, Paul Herzog has kept his hair, his sense of humor, and his addiction to pipe smoking.

His persistently youthful appearance conceals a mature philosophy. "Labor and management had to adjust themselves to more new rules since 1932 than during the entire preceding century," he observes. "Is it any wonder that Government, labor, and industry—all three of them—have deviated at times from the ideal course, or that irritation and confusion have occasionally been the order of the day?" His conclusion is that "such aberrations are part of the price a democratic nation should gladly pay for the right to experiment with its institutions."

German Steel Scrap to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent United Press news release, the headline of which reads "Germans selling scrap to Reds, United States dealers charge." It will be recalled how insistent I have been over the past few years with respect to bringing back steel scrap from the German Ruhr to the United States. It was only on June 12 that I said on the floor of the House:

I have never been able to understand the wisdom of leaving in western Germany a huge stockpile of just the kind of steel scrap we particularly need. Common sense should have dictated a greater use of homecoming empty bottoms resulting from carrying relief to western Europe for transferring this stock pile from a highly exposed position to a more protected and much more advantageously useful one in the United States of America.

Now, in the papers of yesterday a United Press despatch reveals certain facts which make it evident that my fears were not ill-grounded. I quote the dispatch, as follows:

FRANKFURT, August 15.—Angry American steel-scrap dealers accused West German Government officials and industrialists today of sabotaging the United States rearmament program by slashing exports to America so they can sell more to Russian satellite countries.

The Americans said the action was outright sabotage and will add millions of dollars to the present price tag on United States rearmament expenditures.

The scrap dealers cabled a protest to high officials in Washington over the signature of D. J. Lewis, secretary of the Scrap Iron & Steel Import Corp., New York, largest United States dealer in scrap.

"Soviet satellite countries," the protest said, "are obtaining the major part of the available scrap supply." It said United States efforts to buy scrap were hamstrung by newly imposed West German Government restrictions.

The protest was cabled to Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, Under Secretary W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and Senator Millard Tydings, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

The scrap dealers said they protested to United States High Commissioner for Germany John J. McCloy but that he said the restrictions were purely a German affair.

The basis for their complaint was the cancellation by the West German Government of a license for shipment to the United States of 325,000 tons of first quality, heavy melting steel. The cancellation was made after the former Allied Joint Export-Import Agency turned its operations over to the West German Government.

American buyers then were given a license for 150,000,000 tons of steel scrap, but on August 1 Germany announced a sharp restriction of scrap export and advised contractors that only 50 percent of the reduced shipments could be high-grade melting scrap.

The remainder, under the German restrictions, would have to be inferior grades. The dealers said the inferior grades would be useless to American mills and too expensive to ship.

Meanwhile, the dealers charged, 220,000 tons of high-grade scrap have been moved to iron curtain countries under trade agreements the West German Government continues to honor.

The scrap dealers said curtailment of German shipments will skyrocket American domestic scrap prices from its present price of just over $40 a ton to $50 or $60. They said the cost of the present $23,000,000,000 American rearmament program will soar proportionately.

Experts estimate that Germany has about 10,000,000 tons of steel scrap in reserve.

The Administration's Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a timely and pertinent editorial from the San Francisco Examiner. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE ADMINISTRATION'S DUTY

President Truman is asking Congress to provide $10,486,976,000 in new military funds, and to meet part of the requisition by levying $5,000,000,000 in new or increased taxes.

The President wants the $10,000,000,000 because, as the little war in Korea suddenly demonstrated, our national defense is inadequate, although we have expended in 4 years of peace $50,000,000,000 for military purposes.

Our unreadiness to meet promptly a so-called police action in an area as limited as South Korea indicates that the administration has made no wise use of the immense funds it has already had.

So the administration wants more money to do what it should have done before.

And, of course, Congress will assign the funds, if no better way can be found.

But there is a better way—or, at least, one that should have priority.

For how has it happened that the administration now calls for war taxes to meet its military needs?

Actually, we have continued on a war-tax basis all during the peace—or cold-war—period.

The excise war taxes have never been repealed or reduced.

The personal income and corporation taxes have remained at high levels.

Payroll taxes still flow into the Treasury.

Consequently, new war taxes must be added to the war taxes already in effect, which have been retained ever since the last war ceased.

This happens partly because of the New Deal's gross mismanagement of defense expenditures.

It happens more largely because of the New Deal's extravagant expenditures for nonmilitary purposes.

Obviously—and in view of the administration's current deficit—the primary defense need is to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures and put to defense uses the sums retrieved.

If this be done, no tax increase would be justifiable at this time, since the administration would have in hand the $5,000,000,000 which it seeks in new taxes.

If the job were well done, the administration might have even the whole $10,000,000,000 desired for military requirements—and perhaps enough besides to balance the budget.

Until the administration is willing to make some political sacrifices for national security, its demands for sacrifices by the public are made with very ill grace.

From the Korean Fighting Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present for the information of the Congress a letter I have today received from one of the young men in my district, now with the fighting forces in Korea. The writer is Staff Sgt. George W. Spreng, whose parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Spreng live in Moorestown, N. J. Sergeant Spreng spent about a year in Korea with the Korean military advisory group prior to the North Korean invasion of the South and wrote to me at intervals to describe the work of our advisory group there. In all of his correspondence, Sergeant Spreng has praised most highly the Korean soldier and the civilian citizens of South Korea; they have won his respect and admiration for their courage and their perseverance under difficulty. I call the attention of the Members particularly to the section of Sergeant Spreng's letter which praises the Korean soldiers in battle—this refutes most effectively the Communist-inspired reports that the South Korean soldiers do not want to fight. Sergeant Spreng's letter follows:

[From the Korean fighting front]

UISONG, *August 7, 1950.*

HONORABLE SIR: I received your most welcome letter. I am serving now on detached service from Corps of Engineers with the

Second Korean Corps; I have been given this assignment because there is a shortage of engineering officers. I have applied to have the commission which I held during the last war renewed, as I have found on occasion that lack of rank is a handicap when dealing with the Korean soldiers.

Things still look dark, but I'm very optimistic about the favorable outcome of the situation. To me it is a question of having the men and equipment to exploit a breakthrough. The North Koreans are getting ready for a knock-out punch, but I feel sure we can hold them. We are not yet ready to make a similar attempt from our side.

Psychologically our American units were unprepared for war when first committed. They are getting a little hardened now and are making a better showing than at first. The South Korean soldiers are doing a fine job; we are proud of what they have been able to do with the equipment they've had to do it with. American soldiers and the American people should be told about how the Korean soldier is fighting.

From what I've observed of our American fighting units sent here from Japan, most were under strength and not fully equipped, which is not unusual with an occupation mission, and a shortage of funds for equipment. However, I believe the Korean situation proves that all American units retained on active duty even in peacetime should be at full strength, fully equipped and undergoing all types of climatic training; then we will be ready with troops for any emergency, any place, any time.

Right now I'm sweating it out, trying to get some demolitions. I've used up all demolitions in my two infantry divisions, plus that of my rescue corps in our latest retrograde movement. Our supporting depot is all out, too, so we are trying to get some on hand to replace our depleted stock. We are using anti-tank and anti-personnel mines quite extensively to try to slow up North Korean armor and infantry.

I hope you receive this in good time. I am hurrying to catch the mail courier who is going to the rear. I will keep you advised about the fighting and our progress.

Respectfully,

GEORGE W. SPENCE.

Importance of Stockpiling Minerals and Metals Finally Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of August 12, 1950, Marquis Childs in a column entitled "Lagging Stockpile" says that—

One of the things that almost no one in Washington talks about—publicly—is the status of stockpiles of strategic materials.

Apparently Mr. Childs has not been following the record, because my committee has been talking about the situation of our stockpile for many months. At present there are three bills to aid the production of critical and strategic minerals and metals bogged down in the Rules Committee. On two occasions during this Congress, we had measures on the floor for consideration and in both instances those measures were defeated. During the discussion of those bills, the situation of our strategic stockpile was clearly and bluntly explained to the House and to the Nation. In addition, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] as chairman of the Armed Forces Subcommittee dealing with the stockpile of critical and strategic minerals and metals has held numerous hearings and made many statements on the floor in regard to shortages in the stockpile. Last week when the Defense Production Act of 1950 was before the House, the matter of the stockpile was discussed and I secured an amendment to that bill which would aid in the exploration, development and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals. However, Mr. Child's article is very timely and I am glad that he has called attention again to this vitally important matter. His column on the subject is as follows:

LAGGING STOCKPILE—FOOT DRAGGING OVER MANGANESE

(By Marquis Childs)

One of the things that almost no one in Washington talks about—publicly—is the status of stockpile of strategic materials. This is a grisly kind of secret because nobody wants to expose the deficiencies to public view.

On vital materials such as aluminum, copper, manganese, tin and rubber, the totals give no comfort at all. In some instances they are truly frightening. It is very much like the story of the early years of World War II when raw material deficiencies caused such harrowing concern as Nazi submarines sank American cargo ships almost at will.

In view of this, it is astonishing to discover a behind-the-scenes dispute in which the same old forces seem to be dragging anchor. The dispute is over manganese, one of the scarcest metals and one that is absolutely essential. It is the "cement" that must go into every bit of steel that is made.

The only country in the world with large known deposits of high-grade manganese is Soviet Russia. In the past a considerable share of our imports has come from Russia. But in the past 2 years this has been reduced to a trickle.

That has made it imperative to develop new sources of supply. A group of engineer promoters came to Washington to urge development of manganese deposits their company had staked out in New Mexico. They were not asking for Government loans or aid. But they did want a contract from the Government agreeing in advance to buy the ore they produced at a sufficient price.

Because the New Mexican deposits are not so rich as the ore imported from Russia, the processing cost is naturally higher. The independent company proposed to install a processing furnace—these are in surplus left over from World War II—at Deming, N. Mex., to do the job.

It would seem to have been a natural in view of the acute shortage of a metal that is in reality more precious than the gold hoarded in Fort Knox. But, just as in World War II, the company's representatives in Washington found officials either strangely reluctant or, in some instances, deliberately obstructive.

They became convinced that this was due to the influence of the world steel cartel which has long dominated the manganese picture. The United States Steel Corp. had pushed the development of a manganese project in the Gold Coast of Africa. This was a high producer. But in the first months of World War II only 5 out of 100 shipments escaped German subs, according to one report.

The mysterious dragging of feet continued. The Bureau of Mines lost a report on the extent of the manganese deposits in the Southwest. Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer was urging development of manganese in Brazil. Jess Larson, Administrator of the key General Services Administration, and his aides talked the excessive cost of the New Mexican development and the possibility that the independent company might lose money.

At this point the frustrated promoters told their story to two officials who immediately saw its significance. One was Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, the other Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman.

ANDERSON promptly began to investigate. He says that what he found out startled him. One manganese mine in the Southwest was bought up by a large company and promptly closed down. A rich deposit in Mexico, just across the United States border, had gone undeveloped because the price offered by the steel-manganese cartel was impossibly low.

Chapman, who for several months had been riding the Munitions Board about the need to build up stockpiles, put his influence behind the New Mexican project. There is every likelihood now that a contract will be signed for 100,000 tons of ore from the Southwest.

A year and a half ago Representative WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, put a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the stockpile of manganese was then 1,840,000 tons, little more than a year's supply at the then level of production and probably less than that with the present record use of steel. Edward Newton, a mining engineer at one time connected with the Bureau of Mines, testified:

"I urge that further consideration be given to this subject, with a view to continuing the investigation of processes of realizing the potential wealth that lies in the manganese deposits of this country. We are tackling a difficult problem and one in which the competition of the foreign supplies is against us, but it is a patriotic and selfish duty to try to develop our own industry and through public and private stimulation the work should be continued."

That advice was given in 1919.

Postal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have cast my vote against adjournment and regard it as a duty, as well as a privilege, to vote for this bill, of which I am a coauthor.

If I had not been fully convinced that the postal service and the Nation were being severely penalized by the drastic order of curtailment issued by the Department, I would not have originally introduced the companion bill, which is similar in every respect to the one pending before the House.

Let us embrace this opportunity to rescind the unwise order which, if continued, will do irreparable damage to the postal service. It is daily inflicting unwarranted and unnecessary hardship

upon faithful employees of the postal service. We cannot tolerate such a condition.

This is the greatest Nation in the world and our people are entitled to have the greatest, best and most efficient postal service. To restrict this service at this time is not economy; it is foolhardy penury. It will, in the end, be far more costly to the Government, as well as damaging to the industrial, business and professional life of the Nation and harmful to the morale of our fighting sons and patriotic people in this time of crisis.

As I have stated before, this order is a retrogressive, detrimental measure. It is the clear duty of this House, in my judgment, to vote to rescind it. I urge prompt, speedy action and hope that the House will manifest, by an overwhelming vote, its desire to restore the postal service to a satisfactory basis which will give proper consideration to the employees and public alike and result in efficiency and dispatch in handling the communications of the American people of every class and station. It is imperative that this lamentably unwise and unsound situation be corrected forthwith.

Republican Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—REPUBLICAN ADVANCE

(By Frank R. Kent)

WASHINGTON, August 5.—Politically observant persons must have noted that since the 1948 election every few months there arises a new "Republican movement" sponsored by more or less well-known, but very seldom potent, party figures, the avowed purpose of which is to "rehabilitate and reconstruct" the Republican Party along "modern lines."

This performance has been repeated so often as to have now reached the stage where only the most incurably credulous take it seriously. The most recent of these "movements" calls itself "The Republican Advance" and is promoted by a New York attorney named Henry Poor and a Mr. Russell Davenport, once briefly in the public eye as an adviser of the late Wendell Willkie. Before that it was Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, who called for a Republican "reconstruction." And before him there was a group which wanted to be to the Republican Party what the so-called Americans for Democratic Action are to the Democratic Party—an odd ambition, to say the least.

Every one of these movements differs somewhat from the others but basically they are identical.

Each is hotly denunciatory of the Old Guard and vehemently insistent upon the party gearing itself to the times and facing the future with a broader and more attractive appeal. Each makes lavish use of the shopworn and meaningless adjectives liberal, progressive, and constructive.

They are all strong on generalities and extremely foggy concerning specific facts. When you get through reading their verbose pronouncements, including the indignant denial that they propose to, me too, the old Roosevelt New Deal and the new Truman welfare state, you find that if that isn't their proposition then they have said nothing whatsoever and the whole business is wind.

In two other respects these efforts for Republican rehabilitation are exactly the same:

1. They seem to have an equally unstable existence. Some stay alive longer than others but soon or late they shrivel and fall off the vine.

2. Invariably, they secure rather important publicity for a short time. Certainly, a sure way for a Republican to get publicity is to proclaim himself a liberal and express discontent with the reactionary party leadership.

He does not have to have a program. He does not even have to have an idea. All he has to do is beat his breast and strike the pose.

At once, he is hailed by the left-wing and advanced thinkers among the columnists, commentators, and press agents. They start in to make a hero of him. From that time on he is referred to in chorus as the hard-hitting, clear-thinking Senator So-and-So, or the able and independent Representative This-and-That.

And though, unless completely stone-headed, he must know that these journalistic greasers are unshakably New Deal, Fair Deal, and welfare state Democrats, it becomes the main purpose of his life to have their commendation continue.

One would think the intelligent among them would realize they are behaving like political saps, lending themselves to Democratic propaganda about the desire of Republicans to return to the Harding and McKinley days and giving encouragement to such old political frauds as Mr. William Green, of the A. F. of L., who regularly denounces the Republicans as bankrupt of decent principles and barren of political honor.

Of course, this talk of reactionary leadership is the cheapest kind of claptrap.

The Republicans did not lose the last four elections because they were reactionary. They lost two of them because of the war and the other two because, in a silly effort to outbid and outpromise the Democrats, they gave the voters no choice between liberalism and conservatism.

Twice there have been two neglected issues upon which there is strong reason to believe they could have won. One of these is the evil effect of an enormously expanded Federal machine, the weight of which tends to keep the administration in power and the tremendous cost of which has brought us close to economic chaos.

The other is the shameful subservience of the Democratic administration to the greedy labor bosses, whose reckless waves of strikes have at times endangered the economic life and health of the Nation.

With these two and the right sort of candidate, the Republican Party can afford to disregard these boresome movements to renovate and redecorate it. It does not need a new dress or a new look or new principles or a new program.

It does need fewer men who, attracted by publicity bait, can be lured into attacking their own side and it does need a man to nominate 2 years from now who can indict this administration in a way to make the people see clearly what has been done to them.

Bulldozing Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 16 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Bulldozing Counsel," which appeared in the Washington Post of August 5, 1950, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was printed, as follows:

BULLDOZING COUNSEL

The fact that the National Labor Relations Board has had to ask the Circuit Court of Appeals in Cincinnati to disregard a brief filed by its general counsel is, to use Walter Lippmann's phrase, the grand piano that broke the camel's back. In this case, involving the Vulcan Forging Co. and the CIO United Auto Workers, General Counsel Denham ignored the specific instructions of the NLRB not to present the particular brief. The friction between Mr. Denham and the NLRB is "old hat," but the confusion it causes in labor matters is something else. President Truman recognized the anomaly of a semiautonomous general counsel in proposing in a reorganization plan that the functions of the counsel be consolidated with those of the Board proper—but Congress rejected the plan. Thus, the question of who is boss remains unsettled, and Mr. Denham obviously is forcing the issue. This is so flagrant a piece of nose thumbing that if Mr. Denham does not resign of his own volition it is hard to see how the President can avoid asking his removal for cause.

The Problem of the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the National Conference on Aging held in the Nation's Capital assisted in emphasizing one of our country's most pressing problems—the plight of elderly American citizens.

To many of us in Congress the problem of the aged is well known. We have only to walk down the streets of our home towns to be reminded in personal interviews and observations that the elderly citizen is sadly neglected.

Since my election to Congress in 1938 we have only had one opportunity to vote in the House of Representatives on an old-age-pension bill and that was in the Seventy-sixth Congress when 101 Members of the House registered a vote in approval of the Townsend bill. At that time it required courage to stand up and be counted, for there were many in our midst who branded any advocate of pension legislation as a moron of the lowest

type. I am proud that I am listed among the 101 Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress who sincerely believed that the issue of an adequate old-age pension was not one that could be dismissed lightly, but that in fairness to our elderly citizens it deserved Nationwide study and positive action.

Since the vote on the Townsend bill in 1940, 10 long years have passed and an adequate old-age pension is still in the discussion stage. Here in Congress for the past 10 years we have had all kinds of excuses ranging from war to a plea to wait until the Social Security Act could be carefully studied and recommendations made as to how the subject of old-age pensions could be handled.

In the interim, time has marched on and the misery of old age for millions of American citizens continues to be shunted aside as our Government ponders over programs designed to aid backward nations and their inhabitants.

It is time that we abandon pussyfooting and recognize the plight of elderly citizens who by hard work and untold sacrifices have helped to build this Nation that now is inclined to turn a deaf ear to the anguished appeals for an adequate old-age pension system in America.

The following editorial from the August 15, 1950, issue of the Washington Evening Star paints a verbal picture of the plight of our aging population. The statistics and the facts compel us to take immediate action on a situation that has long been a national disgrace.

The editorial is as follows:

THE PROBLEM OF THE AGING

The national conference on aging—which comes to a close here today—has been overshadowed by news about war and rumors of war. But the problem it has been dealing with is nevertheless one of paramount importance to the future well-being of America, politically, economically, and socially.

In 1900, 1 out of every 25 Americans was aged 65 years or over—a total, all told, of 3,080,000. Today, a half century later, the total in this oldster bracket, out of a national population of 150,000,000, is 11,514,000, or 1 out of every 13. The figure, moreover, is growing at such a rate that it is expected to reach 20,000,000 within the next three decades.

Proportionately speaking, owing to improved medicine and surgery and to the striking gain in average life expectancy since 1900, what this means is that the number of Americans 65 years or over is growing faster than the number of the young. In itself, that fact would not necessarily constitute a serious problem, but the unfortunate reality is that most of our aging people are finding it more and more difficult to support themselves and lead happy and constructive lives after their retirement from gainful full-time employment—a retirement that is compulsory in many of our industrial enterprises.

Thus, of the 11,514,000 Americans now in the 65-and-up age group, approximately a third—3,500,000—have no cash income whatever. Another third have an income of less than $500 a year. Of the total, according to the Census Bureau, only between 10 to 20 percent have attained financial independence. In other words, most of our aging citizens are dependent on Government aid, private charity and/or the help of their younger relatives, who in large numbers are reluctant to bear the burden. In short, the situation is one in which the average oldster is having a tough and lonely time trying to keep body and soul together.

Under our program of social security, old-age benefits this year will amount to $2,735,000,000, or close to five times the total in 1939. A decade from now, when 14,700,000 Americans are expected to be over 65, this aid, if it is kept within its present individual limitations, will involve an outlay of $6,767,000,000 annually, and if it goes up to $100 a month, it will cost more than $17,000,000,000. These staggering figures serve as a measure of the problem of the aging—a problem whose solution, in economic terms, is likely to require a system of part-time employment and broader private pension plans.

Further, wholly apart from its economic aspects—including the oldsters' importance as a great consumer market whose purchasing power has a key bearing on our over-all prosperity—this highly complex problem has significant political and social implications. As far as politics go, such a big segment of our population, if shabbily dealt with, would be meat for the demagogs. And socially, of course, as a simple human matter, it is in the Nation's interest that its aging citizens should be able to live out their sunset years in reasonable contentment.

Needless to say, this is not a problem that can be solved overnight by a magic formula. But a sound, step-by-step solution to it can be worked out by just such conferences as the one now drawing to a close. At any rate, though put in the shade by more critical and more urgent world events, it is serious enough to require sober thinking and planning—not least of all because our average life expectancy is steadily increasing and may, according to some scientists, be in excess of 100 years in the predictable future.

Economic Controls Seen Posing Political Problems for Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sullivan has brought to our attention the welfare of a very important segment of our Nation's population. Certainly Mr. Truman has to give the country's savers very careful and serious consideration. These people have been taking the brunt of our inflation for the past few years and practically nothing has been done to help them. We used to urge thrift and that qualification has accounted in a large degree for our economic success. Now the tendency is quite the opposite and I regret that people give such little thought to their future security. Mr. Truman has a problem here which calls for much more than snap judgment and it will be interesting to see how he deals with the situation. The editorial follows:

ECONOMIC CONTROLS SEEN POSING POLITICAL PROBLEMS FOR TRUMAN—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS ADMINISTRATION MAY HAVE TO COUNTER DEMANDS OF FARMERS AND LABOR

(By Mark Sullivan)

President Truman will shortly have authority to impose several controls on the country's economy. The authority, as contemplated in discussion in Congress, is to be discretionary. After Mr. Truman gets it the important thing will be what ones of the controls he chooses to exercise.

Two of the proposed controls are to be over wages and over prices, including prices of food. To control these, in the sense of preventing further rise in them, would run counter to two groups, labor and farmers. These two have had, during the Truman administration, an extraordinary position in the country's economy and in politics. They were the main reliance to whom Mr. Truman appealed in his 1948 campaign for the presidency, and they have had corresponding deference from his administration.

This deference was an outstanding part of the picture of the country, as a country and as an economy, at the moment when sudden and utmost strain was put upon it, almost its very capacity to survive challenged, by the outbreak of war in Korea. On that fateful 26th of June were two conditions which, both symbolically and actually, went to the heart of the administration of the country's economy and government. If any future historian should write an account of the country's economy as it was during early June—Russian communism hopes the account would be an obituary—he could reasonably stress these two conditions as symbolic.

POTATOES BOUGHT UP

In North Carolina and elsewhere in the South, where the early crop of potatoes was ready for picking, an immense agency of the Federal Government, the Department of Agriculture, was buying millions of bushels—photographs of Government-bought potatoes piled in heaps were printed in the Raleigh Observer of June 21. The potatoes were bought at prices fixed artificially high by the Government, and for the purpose of keeping up the price received by farmers and paid by consumers.

To that distortion of the country's economy through deference by government to a group as distinguished from the common interest of all, a companion picture was an exercise of power by organized labor. A strike by railroad workers, after several weeks of unsuccessful negotiation, took effect on the day of the Korean outbreak; and for more than a week, during which mobilization of the country's economy for war was urgent, suspended traffic on four western railroads.

If President Truman is to exercise effectively and justly the authority for controls he is about to be given, he will need to set his face against the two groups to which in the past he had paid deference. The picture as it was on June 25 continues to the present time. The Government is still buying food in order to hold it off the market and support prices. Within organized labor important unions make demands for higher wages with threats of strike to enforce them. During the last 10 days there have been local strikes which crippled public transportation.

HIS THEORIES CITED

Mr. Truman will need to go counter not only to groups to which formerly he has paid deference and from which he has solicited and received political support. He will need to go counter also to the economic theory he has proclaimed. Seven weeks before the Korean crisis, in a speech at Pendleton, Oreg., May 10, Mr. Truman exulted over an increase of $100,000,000,000 in the total national income during the last 10 years; and set up as a goal an increase of another $100,000,000,000 during the next 10 years. A President thus committed to increase of the national income for the sake of increase will find it embarrassing now to resist increase of prices paid to farmers for their crops and increase of wages to labor.

Besides, regardless of the war and from the broadest viewpoint, Mr. Truman needs to settle with the country's savers, greater in

number than labor and farmers combined. Persons who have savings in bonds, life-insurance policies, and the like, have seen the purchasing power of their saved dollars practically cut in half during the 10 years of increase in the national income which Mr. Truman exulted over. The effect of past policies of the Truman administration on savings as savings and on thrift as an economic virtue has been itself a threat to the country's economy.

Fire Louis Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune for August 14, 1950:

FIRE LOUIS JOHNSON

Before we get any deeper into war, this country should make one major change in our leadership:

We should have a new Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Louis Johnson has met with dismal failure the first great test placed upon him and his new "unified" department.

And, this time, there is less excuse for it than, perhaps, at any time in our history, since, on this occasion, we, ourselves, have been talking about the Soviet peril for 5 years, and it has been a major topic of discussion by every one of our top leaders—including Mr. Johnson.

Yet, this much-discussed Soviet peril materializes suddenly in the form of a shooting war, and we find ourselves no better prepared than we were in World War I, and not as well as in World War II.

This is not a situation to be tolerated by the American people.

Congress, apparently, is willing to let this governmental failure slide. A general whitewash of Mr. Truman, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Acheson seems to be in the making.

There appeared an abortive attempt a few weeks ago to lay the Korean failure at General MacArthur's doorstep—something like the Pearl Harbor situation, in which Admiral Kimmel and General Short were left holding the bag for shortcomings of the administration and high command.

But, General MacArthur forestalled this one quickly. He got the truth out at once—that he, as commander of Japan, had nothing to do with Korea, which was the State Department's responsibility—a responsibility, by the way, which it had been eager to eliminate according to its own record.

Columnist Ray Tucker reported recently that "documented evidence presented to the House Armed Services Committee by Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, convinces both Democratic and Republican members of that body that President Truman, Secretary Acheson and Secretary Johnson were given full warning of the North Korean attack on June 25, but failed to heed it."

And, as plain indication of his unfitness for the task of head of our unified Armed Forces, Mr. Johnson was instrumental in the elimination of our Navy and Naval Air Force as immediate defense arms.

The President undoubtedly shares Mr. Johnson's guilt in this respect.

Carriers and other warships, had they been readily available, could have carried marines and naval aircraft to the scene of the Korean war within hours after it started. Much perhaps could have been done by a hard-hitting blow at once, the kind of assault our Pacific task forces delivered so effectively against the Japanese.

The Navy lost several of its top-bracket veterans in the disagreement last year in the Defense Department over the role of the Navy and Air Force.

Mr. Truman and Mr. Johnson held out for trimming the Navy, and for abolishment of plans for the proposed giant aircraft carrier *United States*.

The Defense Department backed the Air Force in a dispute brought to a head by Altoona's Representative JIMMY VAN ZANDT over the big bomber, the B–36—about which nothing has been heard in the Korean war.

Representative VAN ZANDT was critical of the B–36. So was Admiral Denfeld, who was later fired as Chief of Naval Operations for defending his own branch of the service.

It seems beyond belief that our Government could pursue a course of such international ramifications as ours, combined with a constant feuding with Soviet Russia, without realizing the necessity for maintaining a well-rounded Armed Force.

Yet, despite the victory of the Chinese Communists, and the critical Asiatic situation, nothing was done to strengthen the Navy or our Army Air Force in the Far East.

Mr. Johnson misled the people of this country when he assured us that his program of reorganization and economies had made us a stronger armed force. It has done nothing of the kind; quite the contrary.

Mr. Johnson's record deserves recognition: instant dismissal.

Americans do not want to pay with the lives of their boys for the mistakes of such incompetent executives as Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Truman has indicated he would not displace him. Mr. Truman should face a demand by Congress and the people that he fire Mr. Johnson.

The country's welfare, the lives of our fighting men, deserve the protection of the best leadership we can get.

Mr. Johnson's record does not show that kind of leadership.

Let's Have an End of Demagogic Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of August 15, 1950:

LET'S HAVE AN END OF DEMAGOGIC APPEALS

Judging from the statements of candidates for public office in Pennsylvania thus far this year, the only issue confronting a troubled people is communism. Every candidate seems to feel that he has to outdo the opposition in ferocity of attitude toward the Reds.

This has led to a number of proposals, not all of them judicious by any means, for dealing with the enemy. This strikes us as a demagogic approach to the November election. The candidates for high office in Pennsylvania must surely be capable of something better than that, and the people ought to let them know that they expect something better.

Let us concede without argument that all of the Republican and Democratic candidates for office—like all good Americans in every walk of life—are militantly opposed to communism. We believe that they will do anything within reason, or even beyond reason, to combat subversion on the home front.

All right. Now, let's get on with the business of discussing other issues, many of them bearing indirectly on the issue of communism, in this year's campaign.

The candidate who rattles on interminably about putting Communists in jail, or taking similar action, puts things all out of focus. It is not enough to try to eradicate a disease once it has broken out. Even more important is a sound program of preventive medicine.

An effort to punish those few Americans already lost to communism is essentially a negative approach to the problem of disloyalty. What we need is a positive approach aimed at strengthening democracy so that communism will not attract that vast majority of Americans who are loyal citizens.

Instead of talking about hanging Communists or hounding them out of the Commonwealth, the candidates ought to tell us what can be done to preserve our basic freedoms. It is better to build confidence in our present system of government than to boil Communists in oil or ride them out on a rail, however pleasurable such pastimes may be.

Confidence in the American system can be built in a number of ways readily available to citizens in public life. It is helped by weeding out of office those who abuse public trust. It gets a boost when the citizen feels that he is equably taxed and that his money is not squandered by a profligate government. Confidence and pride attend the republic that takes an enlightened interest in the economic welfare of its citizens, that provides a measure of security consistent with basic freedoms, that develops adequate programs for education, public health, and military defense, that avoids the violent fluctuations of inflation and depression, and is subject to continuous reorganization in the interests of economy and efficiency.

The man who feels that his government exists to serve rather than to enslave him, that it will help create and preserve job opportunities in a healthful environment, that it will protect his right to work, to worship, to speak freely, and to compete on equal terms, does not readily fall prey to communism.

Communism becomes a menace only where freedoms are denied. It thrives in an atmosphere of want and discontent. The man who is hungry, who feels discriminated against, who has been made to feel that constitutional guarantees of freedom and equality are a mockery rather than a reality—there is the most likely candidate for communism.

In the world struggle of democracy versus communism, on the ideological level no less than on the field of battle, a strong offense is usually the best defense. Let us proceed to discuss intelligently ways in which we can make democracy a living, breathing reality not only here in Pensylvania but wherever men aspire to freedom. Candidates who do that need not throw a single Communist to the lions in order to win the favor of the electorate.

Reaping the Red Whirlwind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 16 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota and now president of

the University of Pennsylvania, made a very important address over a national hookup of the Columbia Broadcasting System on August 15, 1950. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that this will make approximately 2½ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $205.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAPING THE RED WHIRLWIND

(An address by Harold E. Stassen)

My fellow citizens, for the next few minutes I should like to talk to you earnestly and straight from the shoulder about the position of the American people in the world today.

Our country is in grave danger. It is in greater danger today than at any time in the last 50 years.

We face across the world an unfriendly power with far greater military strength than was possessed by either Hitler or the Kaiser.

It is an unfriendly power which in 5 years of cold war has established its dictatorships over one-third of all of the peoples of the world—in Poland, eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, North Korea, and China. It is an unfriendly power which behind its Kremlin walls undoubtedly made the decision which sent the North Korean aggressors slashing southward through the Republic of Korea. It is an unfriendly power which has active fifth-column agents throughout the world. It is an unfreindly power under a leadership which follows an ideology that might makes right, that man is meant to be dominated by other men, and that there is no God.

For 5 years that unfriendly power has been practicing a ruthless, vicious imperialism toward other peoples and other nations more destructive to their liberties, more degrading to their dignity, more crushing to their independence, more repressive of their worship, and more devastating to their standard of living, than any other imperialism in all history.

We face this unfreindly power with our own country under an executive administration which during those same 5 years has made a series of tragic major mistakes in policy. These men with responsibilities for our country's administration have been almost unbelievably confused and inefficient. They have been wasteful and neglectful. Thus they have added to the strength of this foreign opposition and have sadly weakened our own preparedness.

This administration of our country has sown so many pink seeds that now the American people must reap a red whirlwind.

It is with reluctance that I use such strong words, but I believe that a correct appraisal by the people of their executive leadership is an essential prelude to wise national action. And I do believe that history will adjudge our country's administration in these 5 years to be one of the most incompetent in our Nation's lifetime.

Tonight is not the moment to dwell in either anger or disappointment upon the familiar story of how we got into this perilous position. Our thoughts must be concentrated on how we move forward from here to national security and a brighter prospect of lasting peace.

It is late, but not too late. I am completely confident that the United States can and will win through. We can and will win through, not only to preserve our own safety and freedom, but to expand the freedom and progress of all mankind. But to do so we must recognize the basic facts and then move with that firm courage and unshakable determination of which our great, free people are capable. We must especially realize that the situation calls for a quality of leadership in Congress such as ordinarily is not required.

We should all observe that Congress as a whole has been more right these last 5 years than has the executive administration. Therefore, public opinion and the press should encourage Congress to exercise increasing leadership. The situation requires statesmanship of a high order in Congress. The statesmen are there and they are beginning to respond.

In a democracy there is a normal tendency to criticize, even belittle the legislative branch of Government, which necessarily moves somewhat more slowly and always includes a few members of very questionable judgment; and at the same time, a tendency to take the side of the executive branch against the legislative branch. In normal circumstances, such tendencies are understandable. But I submit that under the circumstances which our country faces, the people and the press would do well to look to Congress for increasing leadership. What are we to expect of that leadership? On what are its policies to be based?

First of all, the only safe basis for our future policy is to conclude that the ruthless rulers in the Kremlin have world domination as their grim, fixed objective; that they seek to realize that objective through bringing all other nations under national Communist dictatorships, with each of these dictators in turn subordinate to the central dictatorship in Moscow; and that they have a program and plan to carry out that objective.

No one can conclusively prove that that is their objective. But certainly the actions of the Politburo in these last 5 years, and the writings of Stalin and Lenin, and their excessive armament program, point unmistakably in that direction. Certainly also, their actions in these last 5 years reveal no sincere desire for peace and progress. Therefore, we cannot base our American policy on any other concept of Kremlin policy.

It would further appear that their program for pushing toward this objective may employ one or more of the following four sets of action:

First, the conquering of other nations one by one, moving first on the weakest, and using methods of infiltration, of civil war, of external pressure, and of armed invasion.

Second, the continuous embroiling of the major free nations of the world, including the United States, in minor wars at distant, difficult points to tire and weaken us and bleed us white.

Third, an effort by repeated threats of aggression to overstretch the American economy so as to cause an economic crash and chaos and weakness in this center of the free world.

Fourth, a direct surprise attack upon the United States as the strongest opposing power, by land through Alaska, by air through the northland, by sea through submarines, and by subversion, sabotage, and Communist terrorism.

If this analysis is correct, then America must develop policies to meet any one of these four alternatives. In addition we should include some positive actions and programs of our own.

Clearly we cannot permit the other nations of the world to be picked off one at a time with the weakest and ripest falling first. With the callous willingness to spend human lives which characterizes the Kremlin's policies, the satellite nations of the Communist dictatorship can overrun almost any nation on which they border, unless the United States throws its power, through the United Nations, into the balance.

But if, following Korea, the Kremlin directs an attack of the Chinese Communists down into Indochina or into Burma, or of the Bulgarian Communists into Greece or into Turkey, or of the east German and Polish Communists into western Germany, or of the Hungarian Communists into Austria, or orders other similar moves; and if the United States attempts to meet each of those aggressions where they occur; our armed strength will be dissipated and spread out in jungles and mountains and valleys in distant points of the world. Our young men will die facing satellite troops of which there will be no end in numbers, and we will become a giant pinned to the earth by our own errors of policy, weakened and laid open to direct assault.

Do not these two alternative facts mean that it must be American policy that if further aggressions occur at any point in the world by these Communist imperialist forces, we shall hold the Kremlin strictly responsible? Must it not be our policy to ask the United Nations Assembly to fix that responsibility upon the Kremlin? Should we not make it clear that an attack in Indochina, or Burma, or Greece, or Turkey, or Germany, or Austria, will not simply mean that war comes to Indochina, or Burma, or Greece, or Turkey, or Germany, or Austria, but will mean that war will come to Moscow, to the Urals, and to the Ukraine? Can the situation be thought through on any other basis? And if this is the logical conclusion, should we not then make it plain well in advance? Should not Congress declare it to be, by appropriate resolution, the policy of the United States of America, in its determined desire for world peace and justice and freedom? Should not this policy be then laid before the United Nations Assembly for approval? I believe and urge that this should be done.

Let me make it clear that I definitely am not proposing that the United States start a preventive war. But I am saying that we should set forth with unmistakable clarity that if the Communist leaders do in fact start world war III by aggression through their satellites and puppets, we and our associates in the United Nations intend to finish it, in due time, against the Kremlin itself.

To reemphasize this analysis let me state it this way: Uncle Sam is a world-champion fighter when he is aroused, when he understands the necessity of the fight, and when he is prepared. We must not permit Uncle Sam to be chopped down finger by finger, arm by arm, by preliminary fights for which he is not prepared. If the persistent, ruthless actions of others makes a world fight unavoidable, a ready, alert, wise Uncle Sam must move directly to the main fight.

Once this broad basic policy is established our military leadership will know how to prepare and for what. It should be said that the repeated statements of policy by the State Department and the President that we would not defend Korea and Formosa and the eleventh-hour reversal of that policy placed our military in a very, very difficult position. It is to the credit of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and to the everlasting credit of each and every soldier, sailor, airman, and marine in the Korean war that they are discharging, as well as they are, the sudden responsibility placed upon them by the administration's belated reversal of policy.

Under this vital policy America must be prepared to bring war directly to the centers of Communist power if they persist in starting world war III through satellite aggression. America must be prepared to defend itself against a direct assault, including a civilian-defense program such as England had in World War II. America must assist in arming the free and peace-desiring nations for their joint defense, provided they move decisively and effectively to arm themselves. To do these essentials will require a total of $35,000,000,000 or more per year for a number of years. Thus we must turn our attention to how we can do this job and yet not so overextend or damage our own

economy as to cause our own crash and failure even if war does not come. In other words we must be prepared to fight a world war and also be prepared to remain sound and strong at home if no war comes. To do this is increasingly difficult because of the inflationary policies that have been followed by the administration these past 5 years. The war in Korea has had such upsetting effects upon our prices and our economy at home because America was already in an inflationary situation. Thus it is absolutely essential that as we move into this military program we must also move upon the financial and economic policies that go with it. Otherwise we will stretch our economy so thin that the Communists will need do no more than keep us under such intense economic pressure for a period of years and we will crash after a mad inflation.

The medicine to cure this fever of inflation is not a pleasant medicine to take. It is not a popular medicine to prescribe. Inflation itself is a political coward's method of meeting of meeting financial problems. But inflation is a disease that brings in its wake a pernicious anemia in any economic system.

These then are the steps America must take as we move in this crucial armament program.

We must cut down on nondefense Federal spending by at least $4,000,000,000 per year, and preferably by as much as $6,000,000,000 per year. We must cut down on nondefense State and local spending by at least $1,000,000,000 per year. These cuts, of course, can only be made by real reductions in the handouts of Government and in other activities which may be desirable but are not essential under these conditions.

The hard facts of the rearmament requirements must cause a reevaluation of all other programs of our Government and of friendly governments as well. For example, it will mean that the United States will be buying such quantities of rubber and tin and other supplies from the British sterling area and from other nations, that the dollar-gap question of the Marshall plan is entirely changed.

The United States must not attempt to carry on Government as usual, nor Marshall plan as usual, nor pork barrel as usual, nor even services as usual during these next crucial years while priority is given to adequate rearming of ourselves and our friendly associates in the United Nations.

The Government must also increase taxes of all types upon everyone to raise a minimum additional $10,000,000,000 per year.

The Government must follow through and reinstate controls over the credit systems of our country, keeping a steady check on installment credit and shrinking to an appropriate degree all forms of credit which add to the inflationary pressures.

Finally, we must place into readiness a system for allocations, price and wage ceilings, and rationing; using it only when needed; but definitely having it promptly and completely set up and ready to go.

Such a system will be adopted with understandable reluctance because of the distastefulness of controls to the American people and because of lack of confidence in the administration and fear that clumsy administration will seriously handicap production and that the controls might also be used for Socialist purposes because of the many Socialist schemes that have been proposed by the administration in these last years.

The public and the Congress should insist that these controls be administered by a special emergency agency under an executive, not in politics, confirmed by the Senate, who has the confidence of both political parties, who has business management and labor and agriculture of excellent qualifications to administer these key economic mobilization controls and regulations.

Congress must also place time limits upon the control legislation and should provide that the controls can be lifted in whole or in part by congressional resolution to further prevent the President from abusing the power.

The experience of our country in both World Wars shows that an economy can be mobilized effectively only if the mobilization program is in the hands of a central coordinated agency, and that it depends so much upon the ability of the men in charge and upon the confidence placed in them. Thus Congress should rise up and refuse to permit these emergency powers to be scattered among the present politically appointed members of the Cabinet, or any of the other present members of the administration who have been involved in these weakening internal feuds and errors of basic policy.

The people of the United States have not received their money's worth from the fifty billions spent for defense in the past 4 years.

The public and the Congress should insist that a top caliber man, not in politics, be brought into the administration to take charge of armament production. Only in that way will the American people get their money's worth for the increased billions which must now be spent. Far more important, only in that way will the job be done. Only in that way will our fighting men have the armament they need.

Coupled with these military and economic policies we must embark upon a major offensive in the cold war. There is an understandable tendency to shift all attention right now to the Korean war. But we must not forget that one of the reasons that we are engaged in this Korean war today is the administration's failure to wage the cold war successfully. It must become increasingly clear to the many millions of peoples of the world on both sides of the iron curtain that it is the sincere objective of America and of the United Nations to advance their standards of living; to recognize their human dignity and their rights regardless of color; and to expand their individual freedom. This requires the early initiation of a comprehensive Asiatic economic program, parallel to the Marshall plan, and yet different because of the different conditions in Asia.

It should involve only a small fraction of the amount of money spent on the Marshall plan, both because we do not have the resources to spend more and because the nonindustrial economy of Asia has different and lesser needs in terms of dollars.

In many instances American surpluses can materially assist in Asia. As one specific example, India today needs wheat. India has needed wheat badly for the past 10 months. India has sought 36,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat from America. America has over 300,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat on hand. Yet America has not shipped any of this surplus wheat to India. This is an inexcusable shortcoming in American action. American surplus wheat should be promptly shipped. In fact America can quite likely receive valuable raw materials, in future years, useful to our production and to our stockpiles, in repayment.

Initiative in developing an economic program for Asia should come from leaders of Asia itself. Such men as Pandit Nehru and Liaquat Ali Khan and Carlos Romulo and Elpidio Quirino should be encouraged to work out an economic plan for Asia, and under their leadership, America and the United Nations should move upon a far-reaching Asiatic economic advance. Such action has been requested by Congress in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, but the State Department has not acted.

America should constantly point out the imperialistic aims and evil objectives of the Soviet Union and contrast this with new deeds of a nonimperialistic, modern, enlightened approach of the Western World to Asia.

Assistance and encouragement should be given to all of those throughout the world who wish to advance the cause of freedom, including those millions within the countries now under Communist dictatorships. This part of our program should best be characterized as the front line of our offensive in the cold war. It should be placed under able leadership of high caliber, preferably someone who has had successful experience in a position of leadership in the Office of Strategic Services during World War II. The methods and details cannot be spelled out in advance, but if able men are given the responsibility and the resources to conduct a cold war offensive, I am confident of excellent results.

We should always remember that a cold war can only be won with hot ideas.

As these major policies unfold consistent efforts should be made to have Great Britain and France and India and other members of the United Nations move with us. One of the most difficult problems in this regard is the question of the application of the Communist Chinese government for the seat in the United Nations. Clearly this application should not be granted. But Great Britain and India have voted for it. It would appear wise to ask Great Britain and India to join with us in the United Nations for the appointment of a special commission to go to China and investigate the application. The seat carries with it a veto power and thus it is a situation without precedent. Thorough inquiry should be made before passing on the appliciation as to whether or not the applicant government is under the complete domination of another power and as to its recognition of its international obligations and of the fundamental human rights of its own people. This commission should also observe the Manchurian-Korean border and the Chinese-Indochina border to determine whether the Chinese are violating the United Nations Charter.

If such a United Nations commission is refused entry to China, all nations will then have clear ground for rejecting the application for the veto seat. If entry is permitted, the resulting period of investigation will constructively ease the present tension and may well result, through the good offices of Nehru and others, in a trend toward the better in the entire confused Asiatic scene.

A further United Nations request should be issued to its Korean Commission and to the United Nations commander, General MacArthur, to assemble and report all information bearing upon any assistance given, following the cease-fire order, to the invading North Korean forces by any member of the United Nations.

Through it all we must exercise moral leadership in keeping with our fundamental philosophy and the teachings of our great religions. We must express a continuous willingness to meet in conference at any time, seeking the avenues for true peace. We must make it clear that our experiences have been such that we will not accept mere words or documents or treaties as assurances of peaceful intentions; but that we will look for actions that will definitely reduce the tensions of war, increase the freedoms and independence of people, and move toward a just and lasting peace. We must clearly indicate that we are not seeking to freeze a reactionary status quo, that we do encourage genuine progress in the well-being of men.

In spite of my grim over-all analysis, I do not consider that world war III is inevitable. I am certain that the non-Communist millions among the people of Russia do not want war. I believe that if the United States and her peace-loving associates quickly and steadily build sound armed strength and at the same time carry on an alert, intelligent idea and economic offensive against the Communist dictatorships, we have a better than even change of winning a just world peace without incurring the horror of world war III.

For the good of the people of Russia and of the United States and of the world, I pray

God this peaceful competition of systems without war will be the answer.

We must show leadership toward the strengthening of the United Nations. It should now be apparent to all that the United Nations in its present form is not adequate for coping with world conditions. If it had not been for the boycotting absence of the Russian delegate from the United Nations Security Council, the Korean action could not have been voted, for a veto would have stopped the Security Council. The return of the Russian delegate and his actions since his return clearly show that the veto will be used in future events. Likewise, the lack of United Nations police forces in being and, consequently, the heavy burden that fell upon our unprepared American divisions; and the slowness because of individual national decisions of other nations to reach the point of battle, clearly points out the need of a genuine United Nations police force.

The United States, then, should take the leadership in planning a future convention to rewrite the United Nations Charter, which can be done under article 109 without a veto, and to strengthen it in the light of experience and of common sense. At the same time, within the present Charter, through a special Assembly motion, action would be taken by those nations which are in accord with us to enlist and equip and train a truly United Nations police force, permitting any man to enlist therein, from any nation in the world, provided he can convince the recruiting officers that he is sincerely interested in serving to advance the objectives of the United Nations. This would permit the enrollment not only of citizens of the democracies which are members of the United Nations, but also of refugees from the iron-curtain countries, and of young men of Italy, of Germany, and of Japan. These forces could have great effectiveness in deterring future aggressive moves anywhere in the world or in containing the aggressors at remote battlefields during the period that the resulting world war would of necessity be fought directly against the Kremlin.

Finally, it is high time that the free countries of the world, including the United States, reexamine their policies toward the Communist Party. For too long our governments have been blind to the vicious subversive nature of these foreign Communist Party organizations. For too long these fifth column organizations have assisted in the recruitment that has resulted in spying and stealing the most important scientific, atomic, and diplomatic secrets. The legal privileges extended to these fifth column organizations should be removed. These privileges should be removed with the greatest care to preserve the fundamental freedom of speech, and of thought, and of academic and scientific inquiry. But freedoms are not served by giving legal shelter to organizations so clearly a part of a world conspiracy directed by an unfriendly foreign power. Freedoms are truly endangered by such soft and confused thinking—such coddling of organized communism.

As you review this message you may get an impression of measures too far reaching and of a scope too extensive. Let me plead that you realize that we are in this desperate condition in the world today because we have not had policies with vision far reaching enough, with a scope broad enough, with a perception deep enough. Our problem is no less than that of the future well-being and freedom of all mankind. Our stake is no less than the survival of this great free Nation. Our responsibility is no less than that which devolves upon the leading nation of the world which with one-sixteenth of the world's people, is producing one-third of all the world's goods and services. Our challenge is no less than the most fundamental one in all of history. It is a clash of basic ideology that can be traced back to the first philosophers of ancient Greece. Unless we think deeply, unless our plans are broad, unless our vision is farseeing, we will fall. But if this great Nation and its people have a sense of their mission in this critical hour, if they draw strength from their faith and their heritage, if they keep in mind the fundamentals upon which their nation was founded, we will win.

If the United States waits until the last minute to think these problems through and if we shift and reverse our decisions at a late hour, our entire national defense will be as desperate and unprepared and costly as the small-scale action in Korea has been. The Red whirlwind would then indeed be devastating.

My fellow citizens, let us face this grave danger with a clear understanding of its nature and power and with a calm determination to win through. Let us make the sacrifices. Let us take the decisions. We can win through. We must win through.

It will require treasure and toil, thoughtfulness and blood. But I believe, under God, we will win. And in victory we may yet find that out of these dark days will come the brightest dawn for freedom and for the happiness and well-being of mankind that the world has known. I have faith that this is so because I have faith that the underlying philosophy of our way of life is right. Man was meant to be free. And there is a God.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 16 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that immediately following the address of Harold E. Stassen, which was submitted for the RECORD by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] there be inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Policy That Can Win," published in the Washington Daily News of August 16, 1950. The editorial makes comment on Mr. Stassen's address.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POLICY THAT CAN WIN

On numerous occasions, this newspaper has urged the need of a firm, positive American foreign policy which would meet the challenges confronting us as a nation. By permitting the Russians to call the turns—in our opinion—we were letting them lead us into a war we could lose.

Harold E. Stassen has offered the Nation a policy with which our country can confront Russia.

There isn't anything namby-pamby about it. It will not appeal to the faint-hearted, who deal in half measures and appeasement. It does not offer any quick or easy way out. But it is a policy that can win, if it is advanced with the same courage, candor, and clarity with which it has been presented to the American people—provided it is backed by the determination and stamina it will take to see it through.

Mr. Stassen has his sights trained right on the bull's-eye.

Russia is the only real threat to world peace, and—

If our armed strength is dissipated and spread out in jungles and mountains and valleys in distant parts of the world we will become a giant pinned down to the earth by our own errors of policy, weakened and laid open to direct assault.

That assault can come by a direct surprise attack upon the United States by land through Alaska, by air through the northland, by sea through submarines, and by subversion, sabotage, and Communist terrorism.

So if further aggressions by Communist forces occur at any point in the world, we should hold the Kremlin strictly responsible and take the war directly to Moscow, the Urals and the Ukraine.

We should make our intentions plain and well in advance, by a joint resolution of Congress and by presenting our plans to the United Nations for approval.

This is not a proposal for a so-called preventative war, as the former Governor of Minnesota points out. It is public notice to the Russians that if they start world war III by prodding their satellites and puppets into aggression, we and our associates intend to finish it against the Kremlin itself.

Of course, we must be prepared to back up our brave words with everything it takes, if it comes to a show-down.

We must be prepared for war.

The money for this will demand reductions in nondefense spending far more drastic than anything Congress or the administration has proposed. Mr. Stassen puts the reductions in Federal spending at not less than $4,000,000,000, and preferably as much as $6,000,000,000. Similar reductions must be made in State and local budgets. Nothing can go on as usual, here or among our allies abroad. Great sacrifices are essential. A minimum of $10,000,000,000 will be needed in new taxes, Mr. Stassen estimates. A system of price-and-wage ceilings and rationing should be placed in readiness.

To do this job we'll need abler men in the Government than we have at present. We'll need much better machinery in the Government.

But all of these things may be necessary if our country is to surmount this crisis. It's better to be safe than sorry. The stake is the survival of this great, free Nation. The challenge is the most fundamental one in our history.

A third world war is not inevitable. Courageous, determined action now may forestall it. But we can't stop a steam roller by passing resolutions and appointing committees. We've got to be prepared to fight.

That demands the mobilization of all of our resources.

We are facing a ruthless enemy that can be stopped by nothing less than a show of superior force. To produce that show of strength will require sacrifices by all of us.

The tempting alternative is to relax and enjoy ourselves until the avalanche hits us. Then it may be too late even to be sorry.

New Deal Alibi for Failure in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal has charged the American people with the responsibility for failure of our foreign policy in Korea. But the record is too clear that this debacle was caused by its short-sightedness and a prejudiced view in its far

eastern policies. I am including an article by that outstanding journalist, David Lawrence, that appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 15:

PEOPLE BEING BLAMED IN NEWEST ALIBI FOR FAILURE IN KOREA—WAVE OF CRITICISM RISES AS TRUMAN REFUSES TO SHAKE UP TOP COMMAND

(By David Lawrence)

There's a new alibi around here—it seems that now the American people are to blame for the failures in Korea. Nobody in Washington presumably had any responsibility—it was just the failure of the people to let Washington spend more money.

This type of argument assumes that the military men in our top command must forget their duty as military advisers and be swerved by political considerations and public opinion's desires about spending. Evidently they must not speak up and tell the country what is really needed for military defense and safety.

But the people will not be fooled by these alibis. They are insistent that something be done about the blunders—no tanks, no aircraft carriers, no Marines, no tactical aviation in the Far East when trouble came. The bitterness of feeling against the President is growing. Letters from different parts of the country show that his recent refusal to shake up the top command and the civilians who bungled the job is turning a wave of new criticism against him.

ORDER ISSUED IN 1946

The President's responsibility will be a subject of wide discussion. For it was his Executive order issued in 1946—and reiterated regularly since—which has squelched the military men below the top group of political general and prevented them from speaking their minds.

The Executive memorandum was referred to in a speech in the House of Representatives on April 5, 1950, by Representative VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, whose courageous demand for an investigation last year brought out a record of facts that tells the story of why there has been failure in Korea. The President's order, dated November 15, 1946, was addressed to the Director of the Budget. It has been the basic policy of his administration ever since. It reads in part:

"I cannot condone the practice of seizing upon any opportunity which presents itself to indicate an opinion, either directly or indirectly, that my estimates are insufficient.

"When you notify the heads of the various departments and agencies of the amounts to be included in the 1948 budget for their activities, I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress."

This created a "yes-man" psychology. Any military man who differed conscientiously and tried to offer an expert opinion was called an insurrectionist. Admiral Denfeld was removed as an example. A rereading of the testimony in those House hearings last year tells what is wrong today. The President picked the wrong advisers—and still keeps them.

When the Navy's battleship *Missouri* ran aground, a fine naval officer was court-martialed and his career ruined—but that's the inexorable rule of the Navy.

NOBODY COURT-MARTIALED

Today, when the United States Army is without proper air support for ground troops in Korea or anywhere else, nobody is court-martialed.

Today, when the United States Navy has most of its aircraft carriers in mothballs and the Marine Corps has been cut to pieces by the combined votes of General Bradley and General Vandenberg in the Joint of Chiefs of Staff, neither the President nor Congress has taken the generals to task.

Only last fall the Marine Corps was fighting for its life—against dismemberment by Generals Bradley and Vandenberg. But the Marine Corps managed somehow, with the help of Congress, to keep some of its integrated combat teams, with their own airplanes. And here is the payoff as told in a dispatch this week from a United Press correspondent at the Korean battlefront:

"The smash down the coast was the acid test for close air support. Two units—one Army, one Marines—of the same comparative size jumped off at the same point at the same time against similar enemy concentrations in identical terrain.

"The Marines, with close air support, moved 27 miles in 4 days with light casualties. The Army, which had just the usual air coverage, bogged down after suffering heavy casualties."

That's the tragic story of the colossal blunder made by a majority of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff that is depriving the United States Army of its own air-support units.

There is too much politics in Washington or else there would be some heads removed, both civilian and military. Softness and political thinking have no place in a wartime set-up, as lives are being sacrificed. It may take more indignation from the people before they get the changes they want.

What the People Are Saying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave that has been granted me I include for the RECORD the following letter that has come to me from my district.

It is typical of what the people are saying and demanding:

JULY 25, 1950.

Hon. LEONARD W. HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALL: Every real American will support President Truman until the United States is again victorious in an unfortunate, needless war. The national administration, however, owes it to the citizens to prosecute a war, not a political show. In its debt to the citizens the national administration certainly should install men in whom public confidence has not been impaired by their undue political activities or their incompetence. I have in mind, specifically, Acheson and the so-called Secretary of Defense, Johnson.

Our far-eastern policy has been such a horrible fiasco that men are dying daily. Surely Acheson is not the man to aid effectively in the prosecuting of war in the far-eastern theater. The policy which provoked the war was either a result of nincompoops' or traitors' efforts, and the citizens can have no confidence in such public officials during a period as serious as that which now exists.

Without attempting to be facetious at all, I honestly believe it would be in the public interest to have Acheson, Johnson, and Tydings, and perhaps Truman himself, for he has been a party to the policy, join the men in Korea, for there is no reason why they should not do the fighting, since they have helped bring it on.

If we can only get this national administration to turn over a new leaf and make national welfare its objective rather than personal aggrandizement or party welfare, the procession to victory would be speedier with fewer lives and less treasure lost. Raise our national administration above the status of door mat for groups or individuals with votes to wield.

There is one feature of public spending that can and should be stopped immediately. Bureaus, departments, etc., are voted vast sums annually or for specific periods. If, as the periods draw to a close, divisions of Government have funds remaining in excess of what they really need, they spend recklessly to use the total allotment for fear that when money is next voted to them it will be reduced by the amount they did not spend (see August issue Reader's Digest, p. 11, too).

The reckless waste of the funds that taxpayers are called upon to supply is common knowledge among people who supply Government agencies. For heaven's sake, stop that.

With the earnest hope that you will devote your time while in office exclusively to the welfare of the Nation, I remain,

Yours very truly,

———.

Coudert Bids Truman State World Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 16:

COUDERT BIDS TRUMAN STATE WORLD POLICY—OFFERS HOUSE RESOLUTION CALLING ON HIM TO SAY WHERE UNITED STATES WILL FIGHT

(By Robert L. Moora)

WASHINGTON, August 15.—Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., Republican, New York, introduced a resolution in the House today calling upon President Truman to tell the American people specifically what this country would do in the event of new Communist aggression elsewhere in the world.

Charging that the Korean situation was painfully convincing proof the administration had no consistent foreign policy and military strategy to support it, he submitted a list of 81 questions about American policy in 18 sensitive areas all over the globe.

URGES POLICY BY CONGRESS

Should the President fail to answer the questions, Mr. COUDERT proposed that Congress itself establish a special committee to recommend a national foreign policy designed to meet the vital questions pressing for decision by the American people.

"The American people, Mr. COUDERT told the House, "have a right to know what is the foreign policy of their Government, the right to assess that policy before they are called upon to shed their blood and spend their treasure in wars all over the world. There must be a truly national policy, openly and freely arrived at in traditional American fashion. No secret, personal Presidential substitute will do."

The administration's foreign policy also came under attack again today in the Senate. Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Republican, Massachusetts, charged that the President's program to win the Korean conflict and arm to resist aggression elsewhere does not go far enough.

"We have got to go further and say this is a struggle for existence and act accordingly," he asserted. "If you ask a man to make a sacrifice you must give him a great objective, and that hasn't been done yet."

He called for immediate and all-out measures to regain the initiative in the struggle with communism. With luck, he told reporters later, this could be accomplished in 3 or 4 years.

The Senator defended the foreign policy statement issued Sunday by four Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee, which was the subject of hot debate on the floor yesterday. It was not a political statement, he said, but a constructive and helpful one framed to promote the best interests of the country.

OPPOSES "YES MAN" ATTITUDE

"It is utterly pernicious to attempt to play politics with foreign policy at any time, and particularly at a time when the nation is in danger," he said. "But," he added, "to be bipartisan doesn't mean you become a 'yes man.'"

Representative COUDERT's questions led off with Korea, Formosa, and Communist China.

"What does the United States intend to do," he asked, "if and when the North Koreans are forced back to the thirty-eighth parallel—and what are its plans if the North Koreans succeed in driving our forces out of Korea?"

"What does this country plan to do," he asked," if Formosa is attacked by the Communists, and what if it should be conquered?"

About Communist China he asked: "Is the policy of the United States to go to war with the 450,000,000 people of Communist China in support of Formosa, Indochina or any other Asiatic country?"

ASKS ABOUT PACT NATIONS

Regarding the North Atlantic Pact countries, Mr. COUDERT asked: "What is the policy of the United States now if (a) Soviet satellite forces or (b) Russian forces attack a North Atlantic Pact nation? Is it intended to make unlimited commitment of American Ground Forces in defense of Atlantic Pact nations?"

LISTS 15 OTHER AREAS

Then he listed 15 other sensitive areas in the world and asked what this country's policy would be if any one of them should be attacked by Russian or satellite forces, or conquered by them, or overthrown by a Communist internal revolution.

The areas he listed, along with their populations, were: French Indochina, 25,000,000; Hong Kong, 1,000,000; British Malaya, 5,000,000; Thailand, 17,000,000; Burma, 17,000,000; Pakistan, 70,000,000; Tibet, 3,700,000; Iran, 18,000,000; Turkey, 19,000,000; Greece, 7,800,000; Yugoslavia, 16,000,000; Finland, 4,000,000; western Germany, 48,000,000, and the North Atlantic Pact nations.

"The magnitude and difficulty of securing the above-mentioned countries from aggression is evident from a consideration of their populations," Representative COUDERT said. The total population of these Asiatic countries is well over 1,000,000,000. Western Europe has a total population in excess of 250,000,000.

"Americans are certainly entitled to demand immediate answers to these life-and-death questions. * * * They have a right to know now what their Government intends to do with the men and resources which it is now mobilizing. It is not enough merely to mobilize. Where and to what extent are American military forces to be committed? Americans want to know that now and should know it now. The rest of the world should know it.

"We were caught by surprise in Korea. Six weeks have elapsed since that attack. We must not be caught by surprise again. We must know where we are going and what we are going to do. Our political plans and commitments must not exceed our military capacity."

"Mariposa" and "Monterey"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the people in the San Francisco Bay area witness the accumulation of war material and men for shipment out into the Pacific areas day by day and see the ships in which the men and materials depart. It continues to cause comment that men are traveling on slower ships designed to carry cargo while two very splendid transports which might have been available continue to lie at the local docks unavailable for want of completion of reconditioning, which might still be quickly done.

I include as a part of these remarks an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of August 8 which is as follows:

WASTED SHIPS

Two fine Pacific ships with splendid records in peace and war lie idle and temporarily useless at Alameda.

They are the *Mariposa* and *Monterey*, of the Matson Steamship Line, once luxury liners and during World War II efficient troop transports.

Congressional delays, disputes, and red tape have halted their reconditioning.

Now if they were in shape they would be valuable, swift troopships such as are needed in the Korean war—and whatever else may happen.

Engineers estimate that the *Mariposa* and *Monterey* could be made ready for transport service in about 3 months, at a cost of about three and a quarter million dollars each.

Now they are loafing in the bay off Alameda.

The vessels were put out of commission by the long dispute between the Matson Co. and Washington. Several compromises between the Matson interests and the Government have been considered, but Congress has withheld approval.

The Defense Department's rush to get other ships out of mothballs shows the need for such ships as these two 26,000-ton craft, with speed of 21 knots. Each would carry 7,000 troops, and of American vessels they are second only to the Atlantic liner *America* in value to their country.

But they lie in the estuary as idle as painted ships upon a painted ocean—when the real ocean is being churned by war.

H. R. 8195, Rescinding Order for Curtailment of Postal Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, this bill directs the Postmaster General to maintain delivery and other services on the basis existing immediately prior to April 19. I cannot vote for it. This is the first chance we have had since Korea to vote on a nondefensive expenditure. There is a lot of politics in this. I suspect Mr. Donaldson may have cut two-a-day delivery because he hoped there would be public clamor to increase his appropriations. The committee, however, never gave him a hearing on this bill. He said over the phone yesterday that it would cost $70,000,000. In the absence of hearings and cross-examination, I think we have got to take his word for it. I cannot justify a vote to require such increased expenditures for postal services now. I voted for the bill to increase postal charges. If the Post Office Department would put into effect the Hoover recommendations they could make two-a-day deliveries without extra cost. Any private business would be seeking to increase service in order to increase revenues, but that is not the way the Post Office does things.

I think the Post Office Department plays politics with service. They have cut out station B in the Republican north end of Columbus. I hear they intend to restore service at this substation just before election, in a way to help Democratic candidates. They may do the same thing with two-a-day deliveries. I realize that many people in my district are suffering inconvenience and business losses from slow mail deliveries. Much of this is not connected with the April 19 order, but is due to the inefficiencies pointed out in the Hoover report. The fact remains, however, that we cannot put efficiency in and politics out of a department by passing a law. The fact remains that a vote for this bill, without hearings, will be used to justify a $70,000,000 increase in nondefense expenditures. I cannot vote for it.

Democracies and Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is but rarely that musical comments appear in the RECORD. Under the leave that has been granted me, I desire to include a very short, but most interesting, review made by Felix Deyo, music critic of the Baldwin Citizen, of the 1950 concert by the Baldwin (Long Island) Junior-Senior High School bands and orchestras.

This condensed review by Mr. Deyo is taken from the Baldwin Citizen of April 27, 1950, and is as follows:

DR. EDWIN FRANKO GOLDMAN GUEST CONDUCTOR AT HIGH SCHOOL CONCERT

(By Felix Deyo)

The 1950 concert, in the now well-established annual series, by the Baldwin Junior-Senior High School bands and orchestras, was held last Friday evening at the high-school auditorium, under the artistic direc-

tion of Gene North. It was a brilliant event, made additionally so by the presence of Dr. Edwin Franko Goldman as guest conductor and impromptu speaker. Naturally, this superlative occasion attracted a very large and socially distinguished audience.

Opening with the Tannhauser march, Gene North's program, cleverly arranged, alternated popular items with equally favorite classics. In the former category were such characteristic members as Stardust, Knights of Honor, Coast Guards march, Lochinvar overture, Sleigh Ride, Call to Victory march, Chimes of Peace, the last named with Beverly Lish at chimes, and Constance Garguilo at glockenspiel. The playing of these selections call for elan and accuracy, of which Baldwin's high-school instrumentalists possess an abundance.

Gene North continues his wonders to perform in achieving artistic finesse with the treasure trove of tenn-age musical talent at Baldwin High School. The band and orchestra ensembles are splendidly synchronized both in technical prowess and interpretative viewpoint.

And now the guest conductor, another redoubtable figure to honor Baldwin by his visit here. In retrospect we recall Morton Gould's local appearance at one of Asta Nygren's conservatory concerts. And 1950 will have yet other guests of national fame, it is our professional prediction.

Edwin Franko Goldman is the foremost band king of today. For many, many years now have his free summer concerts—a Guggenheim gift—at Central Park in Manhattan and Prospect Park in Brooklyn been a pivotal attraction for the vast outdoor music loving public at large. It is a fact that prosperous democracies strengthen their purpose and stamina by the possession, among other assets, of superlative concert bands, sponsored both governmentally and as independent enterprise. That is a historical symptom, strikingly so, in these our beloved United States. Goldman's predecessors include such notable figures as John Philip Sousa and Patrick Sarsfield Gilmore, magnificent pioneers in the development of the concert band.

Dr. Goldman's reading of Jean Sibelius' monumental Finlandia inspired the senior-high-school band to give all that they had in a performance of quality heights. Of course, the group of Goldman marches was eagerly anticipated. These included World Peace, Jubilee, Builders of America, University, and, for extra measure, that great favorite—On the Mall. In this latter the audience members participated, lifting their singing voices aloft to the syllables "La, la." It was community singing at its happiest. Dr. Goldman's felicitous remarks disclosed him as a humble recipient of vociferous applause. Such tribute, he stated, actually should be bestowed upon Gene North and fellow teachers of the high school. The celebrated bandmaster Goldman reminds one of the late David Belasco, America's supreme stage director. No doubt they are kindred masters in accomplishment, personal grace, and colorful sense of humor, and humanity. The country takes to its heart such men as these. They are historical milestones.

Even Baruch May Be Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a release by Willford I. King, dated August 14, 1950, and an editorial from the Chicago Tribune indicate that, even when great men speak, their statements should not be accepted without examination and consideration.

The release and the editorial follow:

Mr. Bernard M. Baruch is justly regarded as one of our most outstanding citizens. As a financier he has been eminently successful. Everyone recognizes that he is a man of the highest integrity and is thoroughly public-spirited. His plan for control of atomic energy is a masterpiece and deserves the support of all those who wish to protect the safety of the people of the United States. Because of the facts just mentioned, it is by no means surprising that his remarks before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on July 26 were given by the Senators unusually careful consideration.

It appears, however, that in his testimony before the Senate committee Mr. Baruch assumed a greater knowledge of economics than he actually possesses. Despite his wide experience in controlling industry during World War I, it is obvious that he never realized the paralyzing effect of price controls upon production. He did not understand that when the price of any goods is kept below the level which would be attained in a free competitive market marginal producers are eliminated and hence the goods becomes scarce.

He took it for granted that when the Government enters the market with war demands it necessarily raises the general price level. However, in fact, this is not really the case if the war is paid for by taxes, for, in that case, the shrinkage in the total demand of the taxpayers is exactly equaled by the expansion in the Government's demand for goods. Neither did Mr. Baruch understand that taxation curtails civilian expenditures far more effectively than can any system of Government controls. What he recognized was that when one control is imposed it immediately generates the need for other controls, but he completely failed to understand that all of the controls are undesirable.

Mr. Baruch, furthermore, betrayed his ignorance of the facts when he assumed that inflation and its effects can be prevented by price controls. During World War II, the OPA, with a vast number of employees, was doing its best to hold prices down while the Government was inflating the currency supply. But, despite all the efforts of the OPA, the price level kept pace with the rising money supply. Although prices of the necessities were held down nominally, the black-market prices of the same articles climbed so that, eventually, it became impossible to purchase many articles, except in the black market. Moreover, the prices of all unrestricted services and material goods increased to a far greater extent than would have been the case had the Government not intervened by price fixing.

Mr. Baruch completely failed to grasp the fact that the price increases following the beginning of the war in Korea were occasioned not at all by inflation but entirely by fear on the part of the public that the Government would soon engage in price fixing and rationing.

Only a few weeks before the war in Korea started Mr. Baruch made a speech lauding the advantages of free enterprise. Since free enterprise maximizes production in peacetime, logic would seem to indicate that it constitutes the best productive system for wartime, but Mr. Baruch takes the opposite point of view and assumes that in wartime we should have a completely fascistic regime. He could not come to this conclusion if he realized that free competitive pricing and unrestricted profits are essential features of the free-enterprise system, and that no other forces have yet been discovered which control production so effectively for maximum output.

It is, indeed, unfortunate that the Senators assumed that because of Mr. Baruch's outstanding ability, success in business, and patriotic service, he was in a position to give them sound advice concerning the economics of Federal finance, for there is every probability that if his advice is taken and our whole economy is regimented our production, both for war purposes and civilian needs, will be greatly curtailed, and the difficulty of winning the war will be correspondingly increased.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

HOW BARUCH GOT THAT WAY

Bernard Baruch appeared before Congress Wednesday to urge all-out mobilization, including rationing and the freezing of wages, prices, and rents. For years Mr. Baruch has been talking this way. Thus in June 1947 he urged immediate passage of a law empowering the Government to draft men and women for farms and factories as well as for military service.

After making millions in railroad, steel, copper, rubber, and other stocks and promotions, Mr. Baruch became interested in politics. An acquaintance with William F. McCombs, chairman of the Democratic National Committee in 1912, and a large campaign contribution that year, put him in on the ground floor with the Wilson administration and he was made head of the War Industries Board.

This experience with the functioning of the Government so impressed him that he has ever since constituted himself the adviser to Presidents, Cabinet members, Members of Congress, and candidates for public office. When he was with the War Industries Board Baruch didn't have all the authority he thought he should have had, and no doubt that is why he can usually be found on the side of giving more authority to office holders.

In 1946 he told a congressional committee that wartime price control ought not to be allowed to lapse. This was at a time when the price-fixing regime had resulted in discouraging production and disorganizing distribution. So large a part of the meat produced was going into the black market that the Department of Labor was obliged to say that it could not report what the price of meat was because there was none for sale in the stores from which it regularly obtained quotations.

In spite of the fact that Mr. Baruch's proposal for the continuation of OPA had Mr. Truman's enthusiastic support, and in spite of the fact that the Democrats were in control of Congress in early 1946, OPA was allowed to lapse. Thereafter goods came back to the market and production of consumer goods assumed truly remarkable proportions. Within a short time all shortages which had existed under OPA disappeared, except one—housing. Continued rent control was responsible for that. Where the whole economy would have been if Congress had followed Baruch's advice in 1946 is indicated by the unrelieved shortage of rental housing.

That Mr. Baruch is not the great genius some people seem to suppose him to be is indicated also by the part he played in the early phases of the Roosevelt administration. Baruch's outstanding contribution to the first Roosevelt administration was NRA. He contributed his $25,000-a-year employee, Hugh Johnson, to the brain trust to work out and direct the NRA, which was sometimes referred to as a Baruch masterpiece.

The National Recovery Act, it will be remembered, was the act signed by President Roosevelt June 16, 1933, providing for industrial codes of fair competition which, it was asserted, would restore the country to prosperity by increasing employment and raising

wages. The act was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court on May 27, 1935, in the Schechter, or sick-chicken, case.

Baruch's NRA did not have the expected effect. Prof. Garfield Cox, of the University of Chicago, reported to an annual meeting of the American Economic Association that the 4-month drop which followed the introduction of the NRA has never been equaled except in the panic collapses of 1893 and 1907. On the other hand, the advance which followed the Schechter decision against NRA is the broadest and best sustained to date.

Mr. Baruch's testimony is that of a Washington character who had a Government job the war before last and ever since has regarded himself as a sage.

Goods Produced by Slave Labor Compete With American Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, American workingmen and American manufacturers cannot be expected to maintain competition with slave laborers and State-controlled industries abroad. Yet, under the present administration's trade policies, this is exactly what is happening.

Goods of all types are pouring into the United States from behind the iron curtain, competing with goods produced by Americans and because of much lower prices are actually stealing the American market from under our nose.

During the past several years there have been frequent reports of the use of slave and forced labor in the Soviet Union and her satellites. But because a curtain of secrecy is maintained, our Government has no way of proving these reports. It is assumed by the administration, therefore, that because we don't know what kind of labor is producing goods behind the iron curtain, it must be free labor. Existing law prohibits goods produced by slave or forced labor from entering this country.

I need not go into great detail about the shipments from Soviet-dominated areas. Large quantities of furs, hats, pottery, glassware, jewelry, and shoes have come into this country. The people of my district are particularly angered by shipments of hops and crabmeat from Soviet-dominated areas. Just yesterday, 80 tons of canned Russian crabmeat valued at a quarter million dollars arrived at New York aboard a British ship.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] today has introduced a bill in the House which would overcome the bad situation which today allows these goods to enter our land. It provides that if the Treasury is unable to investigate and determine the facts and inspection is prohibited or restricted, then the products of that country are assumed to be products of slave or forced labor and, therefore, are barred. A country without such slave or forced labor has nothing to hide.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Members of the House to join in support of this bill. In giving it such support, they will be halting aid to the forces of tyranny which are running amok in the world today. And they will be giving help and encouragement to the American businessmen and workingmen who then must no longer compete with a standard of living far, far below ours in the United States.

A. F. of L.'s Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, August 10, 1950:

The unwarrantable and unjustified invasion of South Korea by Soviet Russia cannot be regarded as an isolated incident. Communist aggressors may start another conflict at a number of key points whenever their leaders determine the time is opportune. Indeed Soviet Russia and her satellites would not hesitate to attack the United States directly if they believed they could do so successfully. Our national program and that of free democratic nations of the world must therefore be sufficiently broad and inclusive to meet any and all of these contingencies. It cannot and must not be confined merely to the immediate needs of the present situation in Korea.

When the United States undertook its defense program in 1939, we had idle factories, unemployed workers and copious supplies of materials available. Today, with peacetime industrial production at an all-time peak defense orders for new equipment cannot be filled without curtailing a substantial portion of our going national economy.

Our foreign-aid program is an integral part of our national and free-world defense program. The ECA and point-4 program supplement our defense effort and are equally essential to combat the Communist threat to world peace. They cannot be curtailed without inviting danger to ourselves and the free world.

These considerations lead to the inescapable conclusion: We can no longer safely continue on a "business as usual" basis. We must mobilize for defense. We must increase our production and adjust our economy to meet our needs and those of the free nations of the world.

There is no painless way to make the necessary changes in our national economy. The defense program initiated has already precipitated a wave of speculative buying, unjustified price increases, hoarding, and a serious threat of runaway inflation. Prices of basic commodities have advanced 15 percent since June 23.

These trends and developments cannot continue without serious consequences to the well-being of all our people. It is evident an unchecked inflation can and will wreck our defense program. It can only help those who wish to weaken and destroy our order and institutions. We must deal with this problem promptly and realistically. To meet this situation the executive council of the AFL offers the following program:

1. Prices: Price controls should be put into effect as soon as possible at levels prevailing during the month of June preceding the outbreak of the Korean war.

2. Taxes: Taxes must be increased, on a basis reflecting a genuine equality of sacrifice. There must be effective excess-profits tax because the best way of combatting inflation is to take the profits out of profiteering. Tax loopholes should be closed, estate and gift taxes should be strengthened. Congress should enact a progressive schedule of income tax rates, in accordance with ability to pay, as recommended to the Senate Finance Committee by the tax committee of the AFL.

3. Wages: We realize that inevitably wage controls may become necessary. However, we would point out that any attempt to freeze wages at present rates would do an irreparable injury to the economy and deal unfairly and unjustly with the wage earners of our land. Wages have already fallen far behind the rising cost of living. Wages therefore must be permitted to rise through the process of collective bargaining and otherwise, to meet these higher living costs and to establish a basis of parity. Wage adjustments must embrace as well compensation for increased productivity and in addition machinery must be provided for the adjustment of labor disputes and adjustment of grievances and labor must be adequately represented on such boards or commissions.

4. Rationing and material controls: The President should be given stand-by power to ration consumer goods whenever shortages develop and to regulate heavy industries and allocate scarce materials so that defense needs will have adequate priorities.

5. Manpower: There is no need for compulsory and rigid manpower controls. The problem of providing sufficient trained workers to man defense industries can be best solved by the voluntary cooperation of labor, management, and Government representatives. Any attempt to draft workers for jobs in private industry, operating for private profit, will defeat itself and prove disastrous to the war effort.

The foregoing program is not an easy one for the American people to take, especially as there is no present indication as to when the defense emergency may terminate. However, we are ready to make every necessary sacrifice to prevent a third world war. And we are certain that the only way to prevent such a war is to achieve an overwhelming superiority in armed strength on the part of the democratic nations of the world over the forces of Communist aggressors.

In this national and world emergency in order that labor may exert its full influence in maintaining peaceful bargaining relations with employers, enhance production and in all other ways render service to our National Government it is important that the Taft-Hartley law with its unfair and unjustified restrictions upon trade-union activities be annulled. Repeal of this obnoxious and undemocratic restrictive law is important and essential if we are to advance and further real and effective labor-management cooperation in this emergency.

Far East Already Lost to America by Failure To Change Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD,

I include a very truthful, thoughtful, and wise article by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of August 15.

We would do well to pause and heed these words of wisdom before it is too late.

The article follows:

FAR-EAST ALREADY LOST TO AMERICA BY FAILURE TO CHANGE FOREIGN POLICY

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Those of us who believe that the American foreign policy is utterly reckless and leading us straight into catastrophe are effectively disfranchised. There is only one party, and it is a war party. There is no patriotic leadership that challenges the course on which we have embarked, or has the brains or the courage to chart another.

The present course is to offer ourselves as the policemen of the world, to enforce, by the sacrifice of American lives and fortune, the court orders (as it were) of United Nations countries who will not or cannot themselves fight to enforce them, and to put down aggression wherever it may raise its ugly head, in whatever corner of the globe.

The "law against aggression," which Mr. Truman, the generals, and the majority of Republicans have committed us to "police" is now law. There is not even a definition of aggression in the UN Charter. There is no impartial judgment to which it can be referred. The judges include the charged aggressors or their partisans. There is no international police force to execute judgment, nor is any nation required to commit its own forces.

ARENA FOR POWER POLITICS

The United Nations, divided into two factions, sharing no common notions of civilization, law or order, is, as an institution to enforce peace, pure fiction. It is, in fact, an arena for the great game of power politics. Stalin and company, who know this, use it for what it is and play the game supremely well, while our vacant-minded leaders appoint the American people to be the Galahads of the world, to liberate all victims of aggression—whether they want to be liberated or not. Since the process, once the initial aggression has succeeded, involves the wholesale destruction of the countries and inhabitants to be liberated, enthusiasm is notably lacking. That is the lesson of Korea.

The Russian game is to fight for nobody except Russians. It is to use the armies of its allies to fight Russia's enemies, under the conditions Russia picks.

Now, I submit that if the United States irrevocably commits herself to fighting for all who won't or can't fight for themselves, while Russia pours into the fray only her allies' resources while reserving her own, there can be but one outcome. The final phase of the conflict will find the west utterly exhausted, its forces dispersed, and unable to defend itself on its own ground.

WAR WE CANNOT WIN

Stalin's game is to involve this country in war with China. It is a war we cannot win, morally, politically, or militarily.

We cannot win it morally because no Asiatic trusts the foreign devil, no matter what banner he carries.

We cannot win it politically, because we have not one ally in Asia—having already done our best to extirpate all western influences and sympathetic powers. A policy which commands the British to get out of India and the Dutch out of Indonesia, and then decides to support the French in Indochina—who desperately need their troops to defend France in France; which refuses to support Chiang in China, and then decides to support him in Formosa; and which totally disarms Japan and then decides to defend it, is not a policy. It is a tale told by an idiot. Nehru's recent bitter words about both Russia and America were spoken by a true Asiatic.

We cannot win a war involving China militarily. If there is any general who can tell us how to accomplish what Asiatic Japan could not, or how to overcome by any sort of superduper weapon the numerical superiority of half a billion Asiatics, fighting on familiar terrain, highly trained in guerrilla tactics and utterly careless of death; or how to blockade a land mass with interior sources of supply that reach from the Yellow Sea to the Elbe in Europe, let that genius arise and tell us how.

We have already lost Asia, chiefly by the great Nationalist revolts that the last war let loose, aided by our own past policies.

It is a loss we can acknowledge and sustain.

For Stalin has not yet won Asia. He wants us to win it for him, by a war with China, which will force China into servitude to Russia.

Wisconsin Conservation Congress — A Symbol of Badger Pioneering in Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 16 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress, a grass-roots organization embodying the very finest ideals of public participation in regulation of sports and wildlife activities. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that there be appended to it the Conservation Congress Roster for 1950-51.

There being no objection, the statement and roster were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. President, I might preface my remarks by referring to the conservation pledge:

"I give my pledge as an American to defend from waste, to work for wise use and good management of my country's natural resources—its soil and minerals, its forests, waters, and wildlife."

This pledge symbolizes the ideal of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress. In the current issue of the Wisconsin Conservation Bulletin, published at Madison, Wis., there is a very fine write-up on the work of this splendid organization. The bulletin describes the Madison 1950 meeting of the Conservation Congress, representing all 71 counties of my State and constituting a symbol of the Badger State's pioneering in grass-roots decisions on fish and wildlife regulation.

The 1950 congress was described as the best in the 15-year history of the congress. The meeting came up with recommendations on fish and game which were based on the best interests of the 3,500,000 people of Wisconsin and the natural resources with which they have been blessed.

I point out the Wisconsin Conservation Congress because I feel a tremendous sense of pride that it is America's Dairyland—wonderful Wisconsin—a fishing paradise, which is showing the rest of the Nation how citizens can get together, discuss the facts on varied subjects like combating of stream pollution, opposition to unnecessary engineering projects and dams, restoration of wildlife habitat, greater cooperation between Federal, State, and local wildlife authorities, hunting safety programs, stream stocking, game licenses, hunting seasons, and dozens of interrelated issues.

In the past we in America have been prodigal in dissipating our precious resources. We have looked on with indifference to the deepening scarcity of what has been summarized as "fin, fur, and feather." We have watched our forests being chopped down, our streams being befouled, our most beautiful recreational areas being defiled. No wonder our Waltonians have risen in response to this challenge.

The Wisconsin Conservation Congress shows how the average man in the street, the merchant, the laboring man, the salesman, the doctor, the lawyer, and every other type of individual can develop leadership at the grassroots to cooperate with a State conservation commission and State conservation department.

The Wisconsin experiment has been watched eagerly by all 47 other States in the Union. Upon its continuing success will depend much of the success throughout the rest of our country in preserving our resources. Make no mistake, conservation does not mean merely having more fish to catch, more birds, and deer. It means having a total prograr for preservation of the tangible as well as the intangible values of American field and stream.

I salute, therefore, all of the folks in all of the 71 counties who have worked so hard toward making the Wisconsin Conservation Congress the symbol of American conservation leadership. I express moreover my sincere appreciation to them for their many gracious endorsements of my efforts on behalf of conservation. Their kind letters and telegrams encourage me to carry on in the fight.

CONSERVATION CONGRESS ROSTER, 1950-51

(Representatives who were elected at the county meeting in May. First name is that of the chairman; next two, regular members; last two, alternates.)

Adams: William Bixby, route 1, Friendship; Artman Ellingson, Adams; Claude E. Olson, Strongs Prairie; Raymond Garthwaite, route 1, Adams, Otto Roberts, Friendship.

Ashland: Gilbert Paulson, 1406 East Sixth Street, Ashland; Basil G. Kennedy, Mellen; Dwight Kenyon, 109½ East Second Street, Ashland; Frank Kontny, Mellen; Harold Smith, Mellen.

Barron: L. C. Sykes, route 1, Cameron; Howard Buck, Cameron; Alex J. Schnacky, 615 West Eau Claire Street, Rice Lake; Irvin Pearson, route 1, Turtle Lake; Neil McDonald, Turtle Lake.

Bayfield: Howard Ihrig, star route, Solon Springs; W. G. Nordby, Drummond; H. A. Hansen, Bayfield; Peter Hanson, West Pine Street, Washburn; Frank Roman, Cornucopia.

Brown: Lyle Kingston, 135 South Oneida Street, Green Bay; John Schuster, Denmark; John Torinus, 916 Lawton Place, DePere; Virgil Muench, 232 St. Matthews Street, Green Bay; Dr. T. S. Burdon, 1026 South Webster Avenue, Green Bay.

Buffalo: Elmer Hohman, Cochrane; Raymond Accola, Alma; Lyle Loomis, Mondovi; George Pronchinski, rural free delivery, Cochrane; LaVern McCabe, rural free delivery, Alma.

Burnett: Dr. George Grindell, Siren; Glen Sherman, Siren; Peter Boogaart, Danbury; Levi Johnson, Siren; Myron Howland, Danbury.

Calumet: William D. Jaeger, Chilton; Edwin Hillmann, route 2, Brillion; Gilbert Puetz, route 1, New Holstein; Merle Mortimer, Chilton; Norbert Holzschuh, Sherwood.

Chippewa: Vincent Squire, Cornell; D. B. Sullivan, Chippewa Falls; Ivan L. Boldon, New Auburn; Phil McCaffery, Stanley; Martin J. Johnson, route 1, Cornell.

Clark: Edward L. Murphy, route 2, Neillsville; Arthur Baures, Fairchild; Merrill C. Hare, Greenwood; Francis Suckow, route 3, Greenwood; Merton Holt, route 3, Granton.

Columbia: Ross Bennett, Portage; John Owen, route 2, Portage; Ed Swalheim, route 3, Lodi; Don Packard, route 1, Poynette; Dewey Potratz, route 1, Portage.

Crawford: C. H. Norwood, Gay Mills; John Slama, Eastman; Jack Johnson, Prairie du Chien; Art Degnon, Wauzeka; Kenneth Holly, Prairie du Chien.

Dane: John A. Lawton, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison; Jerome Hillebrand, Cross Plains; Robert L. Peck, Marshall; William Riedner, route 1, DeForest; Helmuth Schroeder, 1904 University Avenue, Middleton.

Dodge: Lee H. Burrow, Horicon; John Mueller, route 7, Watertown; Arnold Zietlow, Juneau; Anthony Schnaderbeck, 310 Kekoskee Street, Mayville; Otto Jancen, Fox Lake.

Door: John B. Pivonka, 422 Michigan Street, Sturgeon Bay; Melvin Kramer, Ellison Bay; Marvin Meunier, Forestville Railroad, Maplewood; Walter Fisher, Baileys Harbor; Ray Slaby, Fish Creek.

Douglas: John R. Lynch, Gordon; S. E. West, 1713 Winter Street, Superior; A. J. Revier, Solon Springs; Frank Bugel, 2620 John Avenue, Superior; Herb Dann, 1413 Twenty-sixth Street, Superior.

Dunn: Ed Skouge, Route 2, Menomonie; John Hammer, Colfax; Ernie Halverson, 308 Thirteenth Avenue, West, Menomonie; Don Se man, Rout 1, Downing; Vaughn Welch, Eau Galle.

Eau Claire: Hilbert Kling, Augusta; Lester Lowman, Augusta; George Erickson, 1817 Bellevue Avenue, Eau Claire; Elgart Bremel, Fall Creek; Frank Michels, Fall Creek.

Florence: John D. Roberts, Box 11, Florence; Lloyd Cleveland, Route 1, Florence; Robert Biller, Fence; Henry Kilberg, Jr., Fern; Dean Malin, Route 1, Iron Mountain, Mich.

Fond du Lac: Ceylon Kohl, Ripon; Leo Schoebel, Route 4, Fond du Lac; L. W. Frei, Fairwater; Don Sartori, 325 Sixth Street, Fond due Lac; Ted Grahl, Route 1, Eden.

Forest: Glen Garlock, Argonne; Garth Wilcox, Wabeno; John Kluss, Armstrong Creek; Reno Flechtner, Laona; Bruce Ison, Route 1, Wabeno.

Grant: Hugh A. Harper, Lancaster; J. B. Eberhardy, Glen Haven; Dr. B. L. Bernhardt, Cassville; Arlie Nickel, Route 1, Potosi; Carl Hoffman, Lancaster.

Green: H. F. Zingg, New Glarus; Myron Stair, Monroe; Ben Maddrell, Browntown; Farry Thurman, Albany; Stanley Knight, Broadhead.

Green Lake: Joe Jezwinski, 200 Spring Street, Berlin; Adolph Freiheit, Route 1, Markesan; Rev. Strohschein, Princeton; Norm Drews, Green Lake; Alfred Kurtzbein, Route 3, Markesan.

Iowa: Harry Nohr, Mineral Point; LaVere Lewis, Route 3, Dodgeville; Harold Pittz, Dodgeville; Mac Swinehart, Avoca; Darwin Peterson, Hollandale.

Iron: Leonard Scheels, Mercer; Alvin Haglund, Hurley; John Brown, Montreal; Evert Seifert, Sr., Springstead Right, Park Falls; Roy Vandersehagen, Iron Belt.

Jackson: Howard Glanders, Black River Falls; Harry Palm, Merrillan; Leonard Drescher, Warrens; Wayne Fabian, Melrose; Harlyn Larson, Taylor.

Jefferson: Marvin Lederer, Jefferson; Oliver Hayes, 800 North Main Street, Fort Atkinson; Robert W. Schneider, Johnson Creek; Edward Sands, Route 1, Fort Atkinson; Martin Buss, Route 1, Helenville.

Juneau: W. M. Alexander Necedah; Marvin Fry, New Lisbon; Harold A. Leist, Elroy; Donald Robinson, Mauston; Otto Haukom, Camp Douglas.

Kenosha: Phil Sander, 6203 Twenty-second Avenue, Kenosha; Casper Wenske, Camp Lake; Louis Lutz, route 2, box 160, Antioch; Milton LaViolette, 7907 Twenty-ninth Avenue, Kenosha.

Kewaunee: Adrian O'Konski, Kewaunee; Arthur Poehls, Algoma; Joe Krueger, route 1, Luxemburg; Elmer VanDrisse, Luxemburg; Art Dettman, Algoma.

La Crosse: Alfred Rice, Fourth and Cass Streets, La Crosse; Elmer J. Newburg, Bangor; Ernest F. Storandt, West Salem; Dr. O. C. Olson, Holmen; Leonard Yeske, West Salem, LaFayette; Roy Simpson, Argyle; Robert Franz, Darlington; Walter Gould, Blanchardville; Arthur Bertram, Shullsburg; Rex Graham, South Wayne.

Langlade: Royce R. Hix, 833 Langlade Road, Antigo; M. Harvey Alft, Markton; Joe O. Hanke, Lily; Dewey L. Montour, Pickerel; Earl Weaver, Elcho.

Lincoln: Herbert Guenzl, Merrill; Ralph Theiler, Tomahawk; Clarence Reed, Gleason; Henry Magnuson, Irma; Felix Wiesneske, route 1, Merrill.

Manitowoc: Harry Klemme, Kiel; Anton Novy, Manitowoc; Ed Keip, Two Rivers; Clifford Mullins, route 2, Manitowoc; Gil Berge, Valders.

Marathon: Merrill Sischo, Sr., 3420 Horseshoe Spring Road, Wausau; Richard Hemp, Mosinee; Clifford Binning, Unity; Andrew Hettinga, route 2, Mosinee; F. Virl Peters, Schofield.

Marinette: Herman Parlow, 2101 Hall Street, Marinette; Frank A. Dewick, 116 Hemlock Street, Niagara; Curtis Olson, route 2, Crivitz; Frank Fetterly, route 1, Oconto; Miles Kresl, route 1, Crivitz.

Marquette: Robert Long, Westfield; Charles Kempley, Endeavor; Albert Stelter, Montello; Fred Hollander, Oxford; L. Lipert, Westfield.

Milwaukee: Larry C. Whiffen, 209 West Wells Street, Milwaukee; John Fraser, Jr., 757 North Broadway, Milwaukee; Lorin G. Vanselow, 2623 North Fortieth Street, Milwaukee; Roman H. Paka, 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee; Raymond G. Eschenburg, 1929 W. Marne Avenue, Milwaukee.

Monroe: Arthur Pedersen, Warrens; Dwight Duncan, route 3, Tomah; Morton Wadephul, route 4, Tomah; Peter Favre, 819 Woodard Avenue, Tomah; B. O. Johnson, 322 Superior Street, Tomah.

Oconto: Reuben LaFave, 636 Brazeau Street, Oconto; Joseph J. Schalz, Townsend; Arvid Pederson, Lakewood; Ray Mueller, Gillette; Frank Erler, rural free delivery 1, Townsend.

Oneida: Emery A. Premeau, 827 Margaret Street, Rhinelander; Walter Goldsworthy, Three Lakes; William C. Johnson, Pelican Lake; Robert R. Foster, route 1, box 220, Rhinelander; Edward F. Butler, Hazelhurst.

Outagamie: Fred Rehfeldt, 1716 North Harriman Street, Appleton; Joe Weyers, route 2, Kaukauna; Leonard Buchman, Hortonville; Hugo Schuldes, route 1, Hortonville; Harold VanderVeldon, 3430 East Wisconsin, Appleton.

Ozaukee: Otto T. Wilke, Port Washington; Delvin Koopmann, Grafton; Ray Schwengel, Saukville; Lawrence Feltes, route 1, Saukville; Paul Borleske, 205 Columbia Street, Cedarburg.

Pepin: Roland Johnson, Pepin; Helmer Erickson, Arkansaw; Fred Blair, Durand; James Goss, Durand; Fred Thompson, Arkansaw.

Pierce: E. W. Palmer, Ellsworth; Earl H. Foster, River Falls; Tom K. Gfall, Plum City; George E. Wentland, Spring Valley; William Pirius, Ellsworth.

Polk: Fred Lichtenberg, Clear Lake; Harry Adams, Amery; Donald Curnow, route 2, Luck; Robert Soderberg, Dresser; Art Nelson, Luck.

Portage: Leo Gwidt, 1021 Briggs Street, Stevens Point; Arlie Sutheimer, Amherst; Andy Dobbe, Rosholt; Francis Wysocki, route 1, Custer; Lyton Fox, route 4, Stevens Point.

Price: John Leopold, Phillips; William Smart, Park Falls; Ernest A. Heden, Ogema; Louis Hladish, Phillips; Albert Waszak, Park Falls.

Racine: Otis Hulett, Burlington; Roy Kousek, 2205 Blake Avenue, Racine; William Pugh, route 2, box 145, Racine; John Olsen, 103 Howland Avenue, Racine; Bert McNamara, Kansasville.

Richland: Foster Patch, route 2, Viola; Floyd N. DeVault, Cazenovia; Norman Egstad, route 3, Richland Center; Fredrick Lawrence, 179 South Central Street, Richland Center; Francis Hanko, Cazenovia.

Rock: Jess Hogans, 772 Elmwood Street, Beloit; R. J. Antes, Evansville; M. R. Egbert, 798 South Main Street, Janesville; Charles E. Jones, 730 Eleventh Street, Beloit; Jesse M. DeVoe, Orfordville.

Rusk: Dr. William B. A. J. Bauer, Ladysmith; R. D. Jenkins, Bruce; Ivar Bergstrom, Glen Flora; Martin Bachar, Conrath; Glen Grunseth, Ladysmith.

St. Croix: Theodore O. Myren, Baldwin; Frank Hathaway, Hammond; Gerald R. Wallace, Hudson; Walter Schnitzler, Emerald; Elmer Sendrick, route 1, Stillwater, Minn.

Sauk: Hilbert Kleeber, Reedsburg; Jesse T. Walker, Baraboo; Gordon Baken, Spring Green; Peter Blankenheim, Sauk City; Irvin Schulte, Rock Springs.

Sawyer: Henry Brandt, Hayward; Harry Lutes, Birchwood; Rudy Prah, Loretta; Martin Raddatz, Couderay; Art Schmidt, Hayward.

Shawano: Sylvester Paiser, Gresham; Carl Radtke, Shawano; John Blasezyk, Krakow; Clarence Catencamp, Shawano; Joe Turcek Wittenberg.

Sheboygan: Arthur Nikisch, 911 Niagara Avenue, Sheboygan; Arthur Korff, 142 Market Street, Kohler; Emil Klemme, Route 1, Sheboygan; Glenn Zimmermann, 124 South Street, Plymouth; Elmer Zeinnemann, Route 2, Sheboygan Falls.

Taylor: William Zagorski, Route 2, Withee; Ed Kountz, Star Route, Westboro; William Fetzer, Stetsonville; Al Zastrow, Medford; Raymond Ludwig, Stetsonville.

Trempealeau: Nick Jensen, Arcadia; Walter Carter, Osseo; Melvin Skogstad, Eleva; Lloyd Anderson, Trempealeau; Charles N. Keilholts, Whitehall.

Vernon: Robert Koenig, Chaseburg; Henry A. Nerison, Westby; Harry E. Lounsbury, LaFarge; Fred G. Cook, Hillsboro; Byron Deaver, Viola.

Vilas: Pat Wilsie, Boulder Junction; Larry Bent, Land O'Lakes; John Brigowski, Manitowish; Charles Weisse, Eagle River; Gilbert Sanborn, Eagle River.

Walworth: Walter Besecker, 207 South Third Street, Delavan; L. J. Kloppstein, Genoa City; Kenneth Hackett, Whitewater; Roy Kurtz, Box 81, East Troy; W. J. Hugg, 616 North Wisconsin, Elkhorn.

Washburn: R. D. Stouffer, Shell Lake; Tom DeWitt, Spooner; Louis Frosli, Birchwood; Harvey Gillette, Spooner; Robert Bailey, Sarona.

Washington: G. E. Otten, 234 North Main Street, West Bend; Clem Mayer, Jackson; John Daehn, Route 1, Hartland; Roland Miller, Slinger; Sylvester Koenig, Richfield.

Waukesha: T. H. Bloom, 422 East College Avenue, Waukesha; Truman Stone, 116 Maple Terrace, Oconomowoc; T. B. McNulty, Delafield; Matt Grinwald, Route 1, Hartford; Louis Roso, Pewaukee.

Waupaca: Ralph Hanson, New London; William Mathwig, Manawa; Frank Smith, Fremont; George Spiegel, Clintonville; Arthur Ritchie, Weyauwega.

Waushara: Arthur Johnson, Wautoma; William Boose, Poysippi; Charles A. Patterson, Hancock; Norman Jorgensen, Route 1, Berlin; Ky Thompson, Hancock.

Winnebago: Willis DeVall, Winneconne; Carl Schueler, Larsen; E. G. Steinhilber, 2 Josslyn Avenue, Oshkosh; John Heigel, 307 South Lake Street, Neenah; Gordon Hanson, Larsen.

Wood: John G. Pinion, Marshfield; Albin Krzykowski, 2951 Eighth Street South, Wisconsin Rapids; Emil Mueller, Arpin; Lester Staege, Nekoosa; Albert Vieher, Vesper.

A Good Medical Prescription by Dr. Fair Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Louisville Times of August 7 states the case for Federal aid to medical education well and concisely; it stresses the importance of this crucial legislation to national defense as well as to the survival of many of the Nation's medical schools:

A GOOD MEDICAL PRESCRIPTION BY DR. FAIR DEAL

In the present crisis, which is not likely to be over soon, the Times believes that Congress ought to submit to highly critical scrutiny any social legislation involving large expenditures. The country's situation is not exactly what it was in the years 1941–45, when President Roosevelt said Dr. New Deal had been replaced by Dr. Win-the-War. Nevertheless, a time has certainly come when it behooves Dr. Fair Deal to go into at least partial retirement. Dr. Fair Deal has, however, written at least one prescription which still ought to be filled. He wrote it before the crisis, but the crisis has only increased its importance.

It is in the form of the administration-backed Biemiller bill to extend a 5-year emergency Federal-aid program to medical, dental, nursing, and related schools. International events are obviously not going to relieve this country's shortage of doctors, dentists, and nurses. Instead, the Korean crisis already has sent the Armed Forces in quest of these people and has emphasized again the fact that there are too few of them.

Professional education—especially medical education—is a long process. The Biemiller bill plainly could not increase the supply of doctors, dentists, and nurses at once. But it is a prudent measure of preparedness, civil and military, whether the future holds war, or an indefinite prolongation of what we have now, or peace.

We find impressive support for filling Dr. Fair Deal's prescription in a statement made late in July by Dr. George W. Bakeman of the Medical College of Virginia: "Up to this time the administration of the Medical College of Virginia has hesitated to take any strong stand in regard to the question of Federal support for medical education, as we have hoped that under peacetime conditions the somewhat slower but more normal current development of institutional facilities would take care of the increased demand for medical personnel. We have felt keenly the need of additional funds in this medical center, but we have at the same time so strongly disapproved of increasing Federal expenditures that we have been reluctant to give voice to our own needs.

"Now, however, the national emergency is going to require so many more doctors in the Armed Forces that there seems no possibility of our existing schools meeting the requirements of the country over the next 10 years without materially increased funds. I doubt very seriously that we can obtain sufficient support from local sources."

Thus Dr. Bakeman now supports Federal aid. So for some time has Dr. Murray Kinsman, head of the University of Louisville medical school. The subject is of vital importance to the Louisville school, Kentucky's only one, and to the State as a whole, where doctors, dentists, and nurses are in extremely short supply. According to Lorenzo Martin, the Times' Washington correspondent, the Biemiller bill will be considered probably this week in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We hope that Kentucky's member of that committee, Representative TOM UNDERWOOD of Lexington, will support it.

Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the problem of providing economic security to the retired worker is today a matter of top priority. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial relating to the old-age security problem which appeared in the August 15 edition of the Washington Evening Star:

THE PROBLEM OF THE AGING

The National Conference on Aging—which comes to a close here today—has been overshadowed by news about war and rumors of war. But the problem it has been dealing with is nevertheless one of paramount importance to the future well-being of America, politically, economically, and socially.

In 1900 1 out of every 25 Americans was aged 65 years or over—a total, all told, of 3,080,000. Today, a half century later, the total in this oldster bracket, out of a national population of 150,000,000, is 11,514,000, or one out of every 13. The figure, moreover, is growing at such a rate that it is expected to reach 20,000,000 within the next three decades.

Proportionately speaking, owing to improved medicine and surgery and to the striking gain in average life expectancy since 1900, what this means is that the number of Americans 65 years or over is growing faster than the number of the young. In itself, that fact would not necessarily constitute a serious problem, but the unfortunate reality is that most of our aging people are finding it more and more difficult to support themselves and lead happy and constructive lives after their retirement from gainful full-time employment—a retirement that is compulsory in many of our industrial enterprises.

Thus, of the 11,514,000 Americans now in the 65-and-up age group, approximately a third—3,500,000—have no cash income whatever. Another third have an income of less than $500 a year. Of the total, according to the Census Bureau, only between 10 to 20 percent have attained financial independence. In other words, most of our aging citizens are dependent on Government aid, private charity and/or the help of their younger relatives, who in large numbers are reluctant to bear the burden. In short, the situation is one in which the average oldster is having a tough and lonely time trying to keep body and soul together.

Under our program of social security, old-age benefits this year will amount to $2,735,000,000, or close to five times the total in 1939. A decade from now, when 14,700,000 Americans are expected to be over 65, this aid, if it is kept within its present individual limitations, will involve an outlay of $6,767,000,000 annually, and if it goes up to $100 a month, it will cost more than $17,000,000,000. These staggering figures serve as a measure of the problem of the aging—a problem whose solution, in economic terms, is likely to require a system of part-time employment and broader private pension plans.

Further, wholly apart from its economic aspects—including the oldsters' importance as a great consumer market whose purchasing power has a key bearing on our over-all prosperity—this highly complex problem has significant political and social implications. As far as politics go, such a big segment of our population, if shabbily dealt with, would be meat for the demagogs. And socially, of course, as a simple human matter, it is in the Nation's interest that its aging citizens should be able to live out their sunset years in reasonable contentment.

Needless to say, this is not a problem that can be solved overnight by a magic formula. But a sound, step-by-step solution to it can be worked out by just such conferences as the one now drawing to a close. At any rate, though put in the shade by more critical and more urgent world events, it is serious enough to require sober thinking and planning—not least of all because our average life expectancy is steadily increasing and may, according to some scientists, be in excess of 100 years in the predictable future.

After Korea?—China?—Formosa?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the Korean war came as a great surprise to the American public and the Congress.

Early in June 1950 President Truman had said that peace was nearer than at any time since 1945.

The first that Congress knew of the proposed action was the reading of the press release announcing the President's decision. No message to the Congress. In fact no message came for over 3 weeks Even now, as then, the President has never admitted that we are at war, or that any national emergency exists. But, the casualty lists come in daily.

The Korean conflict was called a police action against bandit gangs armed with heavy tanks to support the plea of the United Nations which we invited. No such reason was given for sending the Seventh Fleet to protect Formosa. That was Truman's own decision.

In the early days some military men referred to the Korean affair, somewhat callously, as a "game." Losses of life, they said, must be expected. "That's part of the game." It is not a game in my book, and I am sure the hard faces of life, and death, have not convinced them that it is not.

The question everyone is asking now, in spite of the President's reassuring words, is: How did we get this way?

It's a long story, but I will try to tell it as briefly as possible:

Since China is such a vital part of the Far East, let's go back as far as the Cairo conference late in 1943. With Russia not in the war against Japan, Stalin was absent. Present were Churchill, Roosevelt, and Chiang Kai-shek, then known and heralded as the "Great Christian General" and the "Washington of the Orient." China had been weakened by many years of war with Japan, and had come to the point of "throwing in the sponge." We needed China's help against the Japs. President Roosevelt, with Churchill's OK, promised Chiang that if he would keep on fighting, Manchuria, control of the Trans-Siberian Railway, and other Japanese-captured provinces would be restored to the Chinese Republic. Chiang fought on.

Then came Yalta, in February of 1945, just before Roosevelt's death, where Alger Hiss was FDR's adviser. You can't say right-hand man. Hiss was too far left to be right of anything. Chiang was not present, since China was not in the war against Germany. Churchill and Roosevelt there promised Stalin that if he would get into the war against Japan—which he did a very few days before the surrender—Russia would be given, among other concessions, Manchuria, South Sakhalin, and the Kuriles. Russia has them now. Sakhalin and the Kuriles are much more dangerous daggers pointing at Japan than South Korea.

Somewhere, some time—it's quite a mystery—it was agreed that Russia should enter North Korea to accept the surrender of the Japanese north of the 38th parallel. Although she helped not a whit to beat Japan, Russia was in North Korea weeks ahead of our entry into South Korea, where we were to take the surrender of the Japanese—all this was confirmed by Truman at Potsdam—the Russians stayed in North Korea, built up a nation of stooges and an army, equipped it well, and defied the United Nations when it tried to hold a Korea-wide election. Then, on June 25, 1950, came the attack. More of this later.

Back to China:

For some unfathomable reason—love of Russia, sheer stupidity, or the influence of men like Hiss, all unforgiveable—China, once Japan was conquered, was blacklisted. With Japan out of the way, Russia could then get going in that land of teeming millions, especially after we turned over the fabulous resources of Manchuria. Russia lost no time. Communist China moved fast. We pulled our troops out of China, gave up bases at Shanghai and Tsingtao, left millions of dollars of supplies behind us, and brought the Marines back to the United States. Chiang was driven back to Formosa.

How did that happen? Uncle Sam, upon advice of our State Department—Hiss, Acheson, Lattimore, et al.—said the China situation was just a revolt of Chinese agrarians—farmers—against, according to State Department propaganda, the corrupt, wicked, vile Chiang—the same man who for so long fought Japan for China.

Since they had started playing "footsie" with the Commies, our State Department decreed that Chiang must take the Communists into his arms. General Marshall was sent to China to force Chiang to accept Communists into his government. Chiang knew that would be the end of the Chinese Nationalist Republic. He refused. Marshall was angry. Upon his return he became Secretary of State. All military aid to China was stopped. It is still stopped. Though we had furnished them guns, planes, combat vehicles, and weapons, the United States denied them ammunition, fuel, and repairs. The rest is history. Without our military aid China, with rich resources and 600,000,000 people to be enslaved to work for Russia, fell to the Communists.

China is the heart and soul, the key, to all the Far East. Without Communists in Manchuria and China there would have been no Communist North Korean Army. With no Communist North Korean Army, American boys would not today be fighting and dying in Korea, the lousiest place in the world to fight—to die, where our military and economic strength can be sapped—and for what? Certainly nothing of any real permanent value.

Let us look at some other angles regarding Korea. Remember, I was there 2½ years ago.

I felt then that they did not like us; they wanted us out; they resented our trying to change their way of living. They stole us blind. Our military leaders then informed us South Korea had no military or strategic value. North Korea, with its power and industry, is the rich part. South Korea was and is impoverished. Now it is battle-scarred, blasted, desolate, ruined. We were told that if Russia wanted to, and would use the force she could muster, we could not hold it; that with no roads or railroads as we know them, with a 28-foot tide affecting the two harbors worthy of the name, we would face a most difficult problem of supply and reenforcements.

We eventually withdrew our troops and left in Korea over $125,000,000 worth of military supplies, such as jeeps, trucks, light arms, ammunition, clothing, and food.

From that time on Korea was no longer under MacArthur's Far East command. The State Department and the United Nations took over, and South Korea was denied tanks, planes, and any heavy military equipment. Such was the situation on June 25, 1950.

Undoubtedly MacArthur was surprised. I am sure he had little notice that he would be called upon to send an expeditionary force into South Korea. With what he had, with his men trained and equipped only for occupation—internal police—duty, not combat, he and the American troops serving under him have made a remarkable record. It takes weeks to assemble and prepare the men, munitions, material and supplies, for even a small military operation.

Since Formosa is also a key operation, let us look at it for a moment:

In December 1949 our military leaders recommended that a military mission be sent to Formosa to see what the needs were. The next day a secret message was sent by the State Department to its representatives saying military aid to Formosa would be useless—its loss was a foregone conclusion.

In January former President Hoover and others urged defense of Formosa, with our Navy if necessary. On January 5, 1950, President Truman said:

> The United States Government will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China. Similarly, the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa."

That was followed by a statement by Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

> No, Mr. President, I shall not favor sending a single American boy with a gun in his hand to Formosa to settle a civil war six or seven thousand miles away from home, in order to appease the political ambitions and the oratorical frothings of Senators * * *. Mr. President, it is my belief that if we did what certain Senators propose, if we should go into Formosa and occupy it, we would have a liability on our hands instead of an asset.

Note: Korea was then not in the picture.

On January 12, in a news release, Mr. Truman still maintained we would give no aid to Formosa. On that same day Mr. Acheson in effect told Russia we would not defend Korea or Formosa when he declared our defensive line runs along the Aleutians, to Japan, to the Ryukyus, Okinawa, and the Philippines.

In March General Chennault predicted an early attack on Formosa. In May the American consul advised all Americans to leave the island.

All this time, however, our military leaders felt Formosa was strategically valuable—especially important that we should keep it out of enemy hands. Apparently the State Department's view that we should shun it then governed the President's decision, for, on June 23, 1950, Acheson said our policy of nonintervention in Formosa had not been changed.

Finally, on June 27, 1950, President Truman suddenly changed his mind and ordered the Seventh Fleet to defend Formosa, while ordering air and naval operations in support of South Korea. Confusing? Certainly.

There has been a lot of loose talk about Korean aid. Let us look at that:

Many of us who had been in Korea, who had seen how little results had been obtained from the hundreds of millions we had spent on economic aid while the Army was there, felt that it would be money wasted in more ways than one. Knowing, too, as we did, that South Korea could and possibly would be invaded at Russia's will and pleasure, we could see no good reason for fattening the Korean pig—for the Communist thief to steal. Neither could we see why the United States should carry the whole load. We also realized that what we

spent came out of the pockets of American taxpayers who could ill afford to pour more dollars into a losing proposition.

There had been repeated reports of possible invasion. Border raids at the thirty-eighth parallel were daily occurences. Read these words from the Committee Report on Economic Aid to Korea, July 26, 1949:

There are factors which indicate that such a program is foredoomed to failure. Korea is hopelessly out-flanked by the adjacent land mass of China, and the peninsula has no connecting (land) link with any friendly continental power. * * * The flanks and the frontiers of South Korea are open to attack at any time by the militantly hostile forces of Communist aggression. * * * Every authority who has testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs with respect to the Korean situation has acknowledged that there could be no effective defense against an armed aggression originating in the northern half of the country.

If this is the case (that Soviet troops attached to the North Korean puppet government armies are in positions of command as well as acting as advisers) and there is no reason to doubt the report of the South Korean Government, the Soviet has actually entered the conflict along the frontier. This development may well presage the launching of a full-scale military drive across the thirty-eighth parallel. Unless this Nation is prepared to meet force with comparable force, economic assistance cannot of itself insure the safety or the integrity of South Korea. To the contrary, there is every reason to believe that the lending of economic assistance at this time will only enhance the prize to be taken by force of arms and internal intrigue.

Our forces, with the exception of an advisory mission, have been withdrawn from South Korea at the very instant when logic and common sense both demanded no retreat from the realities of the situation. With our forces on the scene of action, there might have been advanced substantial arguments in favor of economic assistance, but without the presence of an adequate force to protect delivery of, and guarantee practical utilization of, the great volume of material and supplies, it appears folly of the highest order to embark upon the program.

Admittedly this country has no policy with respect to the Orient. * * * What Korea requires, what China requires, what the United States requires is a statement of policy with respect to our future conduct in the Pacific and on the land mass of continental Asia. * * * Our position is untenable and indefensible.

It should be remembered, too, that the Democrat leaders in Congress and the administration failed to bring this bill for economic aid for Korea up for a vote until January 1950, 6 months after the committee had reported it. Apparently they did not think it very important then.

In other words, many of us who opposed it believed that, if any aid was to go to Korea, it should be military aid to make them secure against attack and the loss of whatever our help would later build up. In October 1949, $10,000,000 of military aid was granted for Korea, but actually only $200 worth of this aid ever got to Korea. That was some signal wire. None of the economic aid finally voted in February 1950 ever got there.

The State Department was in control all this time. It must have the answer. Maybe that answer is to be found in the words of Owen Lattimore, who now says we should admit Red China to the United Nations, published on July 17, 1949, in a liberal if not a radical paper—the Sunday Compass:

The thing to do was let Korea fall but not let it look as though we pushed it.

So, there it is, with South Korea washed out by the State Department, the Army withdrawn, and South Korea considered as of no military value, there was no reason to feel there was any wisdom in spending more money there. There was no reason for the military to ever believe they would be called upon to defend, let alone to hurriedly send an under-armed, under-manned expeditionary force into South Korea.

We are there.

So, the question is: Where do we go now?

Back, eventually, to the thirty-eighth parallel? That is the minimum, I suppose. That in itself will cost heavily, and would leave us just where this war started, with a divided Korea, a strong armed force in North Korea—plus a war-torn South Korea—which I assume we will be asked to rebuild—and the necessity for maintaining a strong defense force for a long time at a huge cost.

Go north of the thirty-eighth parallel? How far? Undertake a major war to drive Communist forces back to the Manchurian border? Manchurian and Chinese Red forces are there too—close to their supplies. Should we go up that far and be in a position to be squeezed between Chinese and Manchurian forces?

I have written the State Department and the Department of Defense trying to find out what, if any, plans they have. They have none. The Truman administration is still drifting from hour to hour, from day to day. We need—we must have—a plan, a program, a goal, and men capable of carrying it out and bringing us victory. Personally I do not trust those who got us into this mess to get us out of it. Acheson either cannot or will not. It is time for a change.

Since hundreds of thousands of Chinese Nationalist guerrilla troops are still fighting the Communists in China, perhaps an answer is yet to be found in China, by paying, or subsidizing if you prefer, the Chinese province generals to fight on Chiang's side—our side—against the Chinese Communists. We would probably have to pay the Chinese soldiers under these generals, possibly $1, American, a month. There is no Chinese Army as we know an army. It is composed of separate little armies each under its own leader. We may have to see that the rice gets into the mess gear of these soldiers. We will have to see that they are clothed and warm. And, finally, we will have to supply them weapons and ammunition. That done, I am sure, from what I learned when I was in China, millions of Chinese would fight for the Chinese Republic years on end. That would make Russia pull her forces out of North Korea. It would keep them out of French Indochina, Burma, and Siam, for they would have their hands full in the depths of China. Chiang does not ask for American lives and blood, he wants military supplies.

Frankly, we have a bear by the tail. If we let go it may turn on us and destroy us. If we hold on we will get dragged, bruised, and possibly killed.

Whether this is the prelude to world war III or not, no one knows. Whether it can be localized in Korea, nobody can foretell.

The outlook is dark. The answer is not here. There is one refuge: Our faith in God and the prayer that in His infinite wisdom He, as He alone can, will give us the answer and the wisdom and strength to carry on.

Questions and Answers on Old-Age and Survivors Insurance—Questions and Answers on State-Federal Public Assistance and Welfare Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will welcome any assistance that may be furnished to them in these burdensome days, in answering inquiries relating to social-security legislation. There has been prepared at my request a series of questions and answers explaining the social-security law as it now exists and the changes under H. R. 6000 when it shall have become law. I hope this will prove useful to my colleagues.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the questions and answers to which reference has been made:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

1. What is the purpose of the old-age and survivors insurance program under the Social Security Act?

(a) Present law: It is to insure workers in covered employment against wage loss of old age and to provide survivor insurance for these workers in the event of their death. Supplementary benefits are provided to the aged wife and dependent children under age 18 of such retired workers and survivors benefits are provided for widows, children, and sometimes aged dependent parents of deceased workers.

(b) H. R. 6000: In addition to the above protection furnished to workers by the present act, monthly benefits are provided for dependent aged husbands and widowers of insured women workers and also on a more liberal basis to surviving children of deceased women workers.

2. To what are the monthly benefits in each case directly related?

The monthly benefits in each case are directly related to the wages earned by the worker in employments covered by the program.

3. In general who does old-age and survivors insurance cover?

(a) Present law: In general, covers workers in industry and commerce and excludes

the following: The self-employed household workers (domestics), employment in agriculture, nonprofit organizations, Government employees, and railroad employees.

(b) H. R. 6000: In addition coverage (beginning in 1951) is provided for the following new groups: The self-employed, except farmers, and certain professional workers (such as doctors and other medical men, lawyers, engineers, accountants, etc.), nonprofit organizations on an elective basis, regularly employed domestic workers, agricultural processing workers off the farm, and regularly employed farm workers, Federal, State, and local employees not covered by a retirement system (such State and local government employees on an elective basis), Americans employed by an American employer outside the United States, and employment in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

4. Are teachers, policemen, firemen and other State and local government employees already covered under their own retirement systems brought into social security by H. R. 6000?

No. State and local government employees already covered by their own retirement systems are specifically excluded from coverage under H. R. 6000.

5. The amount of the taxable wages paid to the worker is reported to whom?

The amount of the taxable wages paid to the worker is reported to the Bureau of Internal Revenue every 3 months by the employer, who pays at the same time his and his employees' contributions, or premiums, as required under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

6. What portion of the wages of a covered employee is taxed?

(a) Present law: All wages up to $3,000 a year paid a covered worker by each of his employers subject to that act are taxable.

(b) H. R. 6000: All wages up to $3,600 a year paid a covered worker by each of his employers subject to that act are taxable.

7. What is the contribution rate on these wages?

(a) Present law: The contribution rate on these wages is 1 percent each for employer and employee for all years up through 1949. In 1950, the rate is scheduled to rise to 1½ percent each, and in 1952 and thereafter to 2 percent.

(b) H. R. 6000: The contribution rate for employer and employee is scheduled to be as follows: 1½ percent each for 1950–53, 2 percent each for 1954–59, 2½ percent each for 1960–64, 3 percent each for 1965–69, 3¼ percent each for 1970 and thereafter.

The self-employed persons who are covered contribute 1½ times the employee tax rate, or, in other words, three-fourths of the combined employer-employee rate, namely: 2¼ percent in 1951–53, 3 percent in 1954–59, 3¾ percent in 1960–64, 4½ percent in 1965–69, 4⅞ percent in 1970 and thereafter.

8. What special provisions as to taxes apply for employment by nonprofit organizations and State and local governments?

(a) Present law: These groups are not covered under present system.

(b) H. R. 6000: The nonprofit organization is not required to pay tax as an employer; however, the organization may waive the tax and elect coverage and then for such coverage to be effective at least two-thirds of the employees must concur in coverage. All employees concurring in coverage and all new employees are then covered. Employees of State and local governments are covered only if they are not under an existing retirement system and if their employer elects such coverage.

9. Who keeps the wage records?

The employer wage reports are forwarded by the Bureau of Internal Revenue to the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Social Security Administration which keeps a continuous record of each worker's wage credits under his individual social-security account number.

10. What do these wage credits determine?

They determine the worker's insured status and the amount of benefits for which he and his dependents may qualify.

11. What amount of the worker's wages is taxed?

(a) Present law: Not more than $3,000 a year; if any tax is collected on more than this amount, the excess is refunded.

(b) H. R. 6000: Not more than $3,600 a year; if any tax is collected on more than this amount, the excess is refunded.

12. What is the maximum wage credits allowed a worker for any calendar year?

(a) Present law: Cannot exceed a maximum of $3,000.

(b) H. R. 6000: Cannot exceed a maximum of $3,600.

13. Upon what is the amount payable to persons entitled to monthly benefits based?

The monthly benefits are based on the worker's average monthly wage.

14. How is the average monthly wage determined?

(a) Present law: It is determined by dividing his total wage credits by the number of months he could have worked under the system—that is the number of months between 1936 or beginning with attainment of age 22, if later, and the first month of the quarter in which he becomes entitled to benefits or dies.

(b) H. R. 6000: In general, it is determined in the same manner as under existing law except that a "new start" average beginning after 1950 may be used for those having 6 quarters of coverage after 1950.

15. How is the worker's retirement (or primary) benefit computed?

(a) Present law: It is 40 percent of the first $50 of his average monthly wage plus 10 percent of the next $200, with the resulting amount then being increased by 1 percent for each year of coverage (a year in which the worker received $200 or more in covered employment).

(b) H. R. 6000: For those with a "new start" average wage (see previous question), it is 50 percent of the first $100 of his average monthly wage plus 15 percent of the next $200. For all other individuals (including present beneficiaries, the benefit is computed under present law (but with no 1 percent increase for years after 1950), and is then increased by means of a special conversion table (described in question No. 18). Further those who do have a "new start" average wage may use the conversion table if it produces a larger benefit than this new formula.

16. Give an example showing how the primary benefit is computed under the present law.

Assume that the worker's average monthly wage is $150 and that he has 20 years of coverage. Then his monthly benefit is 40 percent of $50 (or $20) plus 10 percent of $100 (or $10) plus 20 percent of the preceding two items (or 20 percent of $30 which equals $6) giving a grand total of $36.

17. Give an example showing how the primary benefit is computed under H. R. 6000:

Assume that the worker's average monthly wage is $200. His benefit is then 50 percent of $100 (or $50) plus 15 percent of $100 (or $15) giving a total of $65.

18. What is done about the amount of the benefits for those now on the rolls?

A special conversion table is provided which adjusts these benefits upward, effective after September 1950, by as much as 100 percent for those with the lowest benefits to 50 percent for those with the highest benefits (with the average benefit increasing by 77½ percent). This is done, in part, to recognize the increase in the cost of living and in part to recognize the more liberal benefit formula for those who will retire in the near future, including those who will retire in the immediate future.

19. To what are the benefits payable to worker's dependents and survivors related?

The benefits payable to a worker's dependents and survivors are related to the amount that his wage record would yield as his own primary benefit at the time the computation is made.

20. At what age can a fully insured worker become entitled to a primary old-age benefit?

(a) Present law: He must be at least 65 years old.

(b) H. R. 6000: He must be at least 65 years old.

21. If the worker is fully insured and has become entitled to a primary benefit, what supplementary benefits are payable to his dependents?

(a) Present law: Supplementary benefits equal to half the primary benefits are payable to his wife if she is at least 65 years old, and to each unmarried dependent child under age 18.

(b) H. R. 6000: Supplementary benefits equal to half the primary benefit are payable to his wife if she is at least 65 years old, or if there is an unmarried dependent child under 18 present, and to each such child. In addition, under certain circumstances, such benefits are payable to the dependent husband if he is at least 65 years old.

22. What is the amount of a widow's benefit, and when is it payable?

(a) Present law: The widow's benefit is three-fourths of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death, and it is payable after the widow reaches age 65.

(b) H. R. 6000: The widow's benefit is three-fourths of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death, and it is payable after the widow reaches age 65. In addition, under certain circumstances, such a benefit is payable to a dependent widower after he reaches age 65.

23. What benefits are payable to a deceased worker's widow when children are present?

(a) Present law: The widow's benefit is three-fourths and each child's benefit is one-half of the monthly amount of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death.

(b) H. R. 6000: The widow's benefit is three-fourths and each child's benefit is one-half the monthly amount of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death. An additional one-fourth of the primary benefit is payable to the family.

24. What is the amount of a parent's benefit, and under what conditions is it payable?

(a) Present law: The parent's benefit is one-half the monthly amount of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death. It is payable after the parent reaches age 65 and only if the deceased worker left no widow or children under 18 and if the parent was chiefly dependent on the deceased worker.

(b) H. R. 6000: The parent's benefit is three-fourths the monthly amount of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death. It is payable after the parent reaches age 65 and only if the deceased worker left no widow, dependent widower, or children under 18 and if the parent was chiefly dependent on the deceased worker.

25. What are the minimum and maximum amounts of monthly benefits payable to a retired worker without considering any supplementary amount for his dependents?

(a) Present law: The minimum is $10 a month and the maximum as of 1950 is $45.60 a month.

(b) H. R. 6000: The minimum is $25 a month unless the average monthly wage is less than $35 (then the minimum is graded down to $20 for average monthly wages of $30 or less) and the maximum for the next year and a half is $68.50 a month.

26. What are the minimum and maximum amounts of monthly benefits payable on the basis of any worker's wage record?

(a) Present law: The minimum for the total benefits payable is $10 a month, while the maximum is $85, twice the primary benefit, or 80 percent of the average monthly wage, whichever is least.

(b) H. R. 6000: The minimum is $15 a month, while the maximum is $150 a month, or 80 percent of the average monthly wage, whichever is least.

27. Under what conditions are lump-sum death payments made, and how is their amount determined?

(a) Present law: The lump-sum death payment is made if there is no survivor immediately entitled to monthly benefits. The payment amounts to six times the worker's primary benefit and is made to the surviving spouse; if there is no such spouse, then the lump sum is payable to the person who paid the funeral expenses (but in no case can it exceed such expenses).

(b) H. R. 6000: The lump-sum death payment is made for all deaths of insured workers. The payment amounts to three times the worker's primary benefit and is made to the surviving spouse; if there is no such spouse, then the lump sum is payable to the person who paid the funeral expenses (but in no case can it exceed such expenses).

28. Show by a table the monthly amounts payable to a single retired worker and to a married couple on the basis of various assumed years of coverage and average monthly wages.

(See table 1.)

29. Show by a table the monthly amounts payable to the survivors of a deceased worker.

(See table 2.)

30. Show by a table the lump-sum death payments payable in respect to a deceased worker.

(See table 3.)

31. How does the covered employee qualify for a retirement benefit?

(a) Present law: He must be fully insured.

(b) H. R. 6000: He must be fully insured.

32. When is a covered employee fully insured?

(a) Present law: He is fully insured if he has received $50 or more in covered employment in at least one-half the number of calendar quarters elapsing after 1936 (or attainment of age 21, if later) and the quarter in which he reaches age 65 or dies (whichever is first). A minimum of 6 such quarters of coverage is required, and a maximum of 40 such quarters will make a worker permanently fully insured. For workers now near age 65, or beyond, such insured status can be acquired with fewer quarters of coverage.

(b) H. R. 6000: Same as present law except that a "new start" provides that the quarters of coverage (which may be acquired any time after 1936) must at least equal half the quarters after 1950 (or attainment of age 21, if later) and the quarter in which he reaches age 65 or dies (whichever is first). There is the same minimum of 6 quarters of coverage required and a maximum of 40 such quarters. Thus all persons now age 62 or over need have only 6 quarters of coverage whether acquired in the past or in the future in order to be fully insured. However, this "new start" is not applicable for deaths prior to September 1950.

33. On what basis are survivor benefits payable?

All types of survivor benefits are payable if the deceased worker was fully insured. Even if the deceased worker were not fully insured, the lump-sum death payment and monthly survivor benefits for children and the widowed mother are available if the deceased worker was currently insured.

34. When is a worker currently insured?

The worker is currently insured if at his death he has received $50 or more in covered wages or $100 or more in covered self-employment in at least 6 out of the last 13 calendar quarters including the quarter in which he died.

35. What conditions as to income and retirement from gainful work are imposed on beneficiaries?

(a) Present law: Benefits are not payable for any month in which the beneficiary has wages of $15 or more from covered employment. There are no restrictions on the amount of income from investments or earnings from noncovered employment.

(b) H. R. 6000: Benefits are not payable for any month in which the beneficiary has wages or self-employment income of more than $50 from self-employment income or more than $50 from covered employment. There are no restrictions on the amount of income from investments or earnings from noncovered employment.

36. What special benefits are provided for veterans?

(a) Present law: Special survivor benefits are payable for veterans who died within 3 years after discharge if no veterans' pensions are payable.

(b) H. R. 6000: The above provision is continued, and in addition wage credits of $160 for each month of military service are given to veterans and also in respect to those who died in service.

37. What provisions are made for Government contributions to the financing of the system?

(a) Present law: Authorization is provided, although it has not as yet been used, for appropriations from the general Treasury as may be required to finance the program. In addition, the added cost due to the special veterans' benefits described previously is currently being met from the general Treasury.

(b) H. R. 6000: There are no provisions as to appropriations from the general Treasury for financing the system since it is anticipated that the rates provided will be sufficient to make the system self-supporting.

38. Are farm workers covered under H. R. 6000?

(a) Present law: Not covered.

(b) H. R. 6000: Yes; but in order to be covered a farm worker must work 3 months for a single employer and then in the following quarter must work 60 full days and receive $50 cash wages from the same employer.

TABLE 1.—*Illustrative monthly benefits for retired workers*

[All figures rounded to nearest dollar]

Average monthly wage	Present law		H. R. 6000	
	Single	Married [1]	Single	Married [1]
Insured worker covered for 5 years:				
$50	$21	$32	$25	$38
$100	26	39	50	75
$150	32	47	58	86
$200	37	55	65	98
$250	42	63	72	109
$300	[2]	[2]	80	120
Insured worker covered for 40 years:				
$50	28	40	25	38
$100	35	52	50	75
$150	42	63	58	86
$200	49	74	65	98
$250	56	84	72	109
$300	[2]	[2]	80	120

[1] With wife 65 or over.
[2] Present law includes wages only up to $250 per month.

TABLE 2.—*Illustrative monthly benefits for survivors of insured workers*

[All figures rounded to nearest dollar]

Average monthly wage	Widow and 1 child		Widow and 2 children		Widow and 3 children		1 child alone		2 children alone		Aged widow [1]	
	Present law	H. R. 6000	Present law	H. R. 6000	Present law	H. R. 6000	Present law	H. R. 6000	Present law	H. R. 6000	Present law	H. R. 6000
Insured worker covered for 5 years:												
$50	$26	$38	$37	$40	$40	$40	$10	$19	$21	$31	$16	$19
$100	33	75	46	80	52	80	13	38	26	62	20	38
$150	39	86	55	115	63	120	16	43	32	72	24	43
$200	46	98	64	130	74	150	18	49	37	81	28	49
$250	52	109	74	145	84	150	21	54	42	91	32	54
$300	[2]	120	[2]	150	[2]	150	[2]	60	[2]	100	[2]	60
Insured worker covered for 40 years:												
$50	35	38	40	40	40	40	14	19	28	31	21	19
$100	44	75	61	80	70	80	18	38	35	62	26	38
$150	52	86	74	115	84	120	21	43	42	72	32	43
$200	61	98	85	130	85	150	24	49	49	81	37	49
$250	70	109	85	145	85	150	28	54	56	91	42	54
$300	[2]	120	[2]	150	[2]	150	[2]	60	[2]	100	[2]	60

[1] Age 65 or over.
[2] Present law includes wages only up to $250 per month.

TABLE 3.—*Illustrative lump-sum death payments*

(All figures rounded to nearest dollar)

Average monthly wage	Present law	H. R. 6000
Insured worker covered for 5 years:		
$50	$126	$75
$100	158	150
$150	189	172
$200	220	195
$250	252	218
$300	(1)	240
Insured worker covered for 40 years:		
$50	168	75
$100	210	150
$150	252	172
$200	294	195
$250	336	218
$300	(1)	240

[1] Present law includes wages only up to $250 per month.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON STATE-FEDERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND WELFARE SERVICES

1. What is the purpose of State-Federal public-assistance programs?

Notwithstanding old-age and survivors insurance, there will always be some persons in the population who cannot meet their needs through their own efforts and who are not covered by or entitled to insurance benefits, and also persons entitled to benefits who need supplementary income; therefore the Federal Government makes grants-in-aid to the States to aid them in giving financial assistance to groups of needy persons.

2. What groups of needy persons are eligible for State-Federal public assistance?

(a) Present law: The needy aged 65 years of age and over; the needy blind; and dependent children—under the age of 16 or under the age of 18 if regularly attending school, who are living with relatives and have been deprived of parental support or care by reason of death, continued absence from the home, or incapacity of a parent.

(b) H. R. 6000: The needy aged 65 years of age and over; the needy blind; dependent children—this program would be modified so that the relative with whom a dependent child is living is classified as a recipient for Federal matching purposes, and needy children as under present law; permanently and totally disabled needy persons. Federal grants-in-aid to the State would be provided for assistance to this group on the same matching basis as for old-age assistance and aid to the blind.

3. To what extent does the Federal Government share in the costs of State-Federal public-assistance programs?

(a) Present law: (1) Old-age assistance and aid to the blind: For Federal matching purposes the maximum payments are $50 per month. The Federal share of expenditures within these individual maximums is three-fourths of the first $20 of the State's average monthly payment plus one-half the remainder. Thus, for an individual payment of $50 or more, the maximum Federal share is $30.

(2) Aid to dependent children: For Federal matching purposes the maximum payments are $27 per month for the first child and $18 for each additional child in a family. The Federal share of expenditures within these individual maximums is three-fourths of the first $12 of the State's average monthly payment per child, plus one-half the remainder. Thus, for an individual payment of $27 or more for the first child in a family the maximum Federal share is $16.50, and for each additional child receiving a payment of $18 or more the maximum Federal share is $12.

(3) Administration costs: Federal Government bears one-half the expense incurred by the States in administering the programs.

(b) H. R. 6000: Federal share for aid to the permanently and totally disabled is the same as under present law for old-age assistance and aid to the blind. For aid to dependent children, there is included for Federal matching purposes all payments within individual maximums of $27 for the relative with whom the children are living. Administrative costs continue to be shared 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the States for all categories.

4. May State-Federal assistance be furnished to individuals without regard to their income and resources?

(a) Present law: No. All income and resources available to a claimant of old-age assistance or aid to the blind or aid to dependent children must be taken into consideration in determining eligibility for or the amount of the assistance payment.

(b) H. R. 6000: (1) No change as to old-age assistance and aid to dependent children and the same requirement as for these two programs would apply to aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

(2) Aid to the blind: In order to encourage and assist blind persons to become self-supporting a State must, effective July 1, 1952, disregard earned income up to $50 per month (prior to then the State may disregard such income).

5. Are the State and local agencies administering aid to dependent children required to take any action to obtain support from their parents when children are on the rolls because they have been deserted or abandoned?

(a) Present law: No action is required.

(b) H. R. 6000: The agency administering the program would be required to notify the appropriate local law-enforcement officials of the furnishing of aid to any child who has been abandoned or deserted by a parent.

6. Are the States required to provide State-Federal public assistance to all individuals who are eligible under the State plans approved by the Federal Government?

(a) Present law: No specific Federal statutory requirement.

(b) H. R. 6000: The States would be required to furnish assistance to all persons who qualified under the State plans.

7. Is State-Federal public assistance furnished to persons in public institutions?

(a) Present law: No; except for persons in public medical institutions for short-time treatment.

(b) H. R. 6000: Recipients of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled may reside in public medical institutions including nursing and convalescent homes without regard to the duration of such residence. Recipients residing in such mental institutions or tuberculosis sanitariums are not eligible for assistance.

8. How are other needy persons in the population who cannot qualify for one of the State-Federal public-assistance programs cared for?

The other needy persons are cared for under general assistance which is financed by States and/or local governmental units without Federal financial participation.

9. How do the public-assistance provisions apply to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands?

(a) Present law: Federal funds for public assistance are not available to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

(b) H. R. 6000: The four categories of assistance are extended to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The Federal share, for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled is limited to one-half of the total sums expended under an approved plan up to a maximum payment for any individual of $30 per month. For aid to dependent children the Federal share is limited to one-half of the expenditures under an approved plan up to individual maximums of $18 for the first child and $12 for each additional child in a family. Administrative costs are matched by the Federal Government on a 50–50 basis. However, the maximum annual Federal grant shall be $4,250,000 for Puerto Rico and $160,000 for the Virgin Islands.

10. To what extent does the Federal Government participate in the costs incurred by the States for child-welfare services for neglected children, children in danger of becoming delinquent, etc.?

(a) Present law: Federal appropriations of $3,500,000 per year is authorized for grants to the States for child-welfare services.

(b) H. R. 6000: The authorization for Federal appropriations for this purpose would be increased to $10,000,000 per year.

11. What other changes would be provided by H. R. 6000 relative to child-welfare services?

A State would be authorized to use Federal funds to pay for the costs of returning runaway children to their homes in other States.

12. To what extent does the Federal Government participate in the costs incurred by the States for maternal and child health services?

(a) Present law: Federal appropriations of $11,000,000 per year is authorized for grants to the States for maternal and child health services.

(b) H. R. 6000: Authorization for Federal appropriations for this purpose would be increased to $15,000,000 for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, and to $16,500,000 for subsequent years.

13. To what extent does the Federal Government participate in the costs incurred by the States for services for crippled children?

(a) Present law: Federal appropriations of $3,500,000 per year is authorized for grants to the States for services for crippled children.

(b) H. R. 6000: The authorization for Federal appropriations for this purpose would be increased to $12,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, and $15,000,000 for subsequent years.

American Federation of Labor's Denunciation of Fake Peace Petitions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the RECORD on Monday, at page A5830, I reported on a new form of peace petition entitled "Petition To Ban H-Bomb and A-Bomb" and stated that it was alleged to be under the sponsorship of the National Labor Conference for Peace of Chicago. I inserted extracts furnished me by our Legislative Reference Service from the Daily Worker referring to this so-called conference for peace. In at least two places, the Daily Worker sought to leave the impression that this was an organization of delegates from the A. F. of L., the CIO, and independent unions. I also inserted an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times referring to a vigorous repudiation of this petition by the Chicago Industrial Union Council, the central body of the CIO's 250,000 members in that city and vicinity. I shall now insert an equally vigorous and forthright statement by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor issued August 5. So as

to emphasize them, I want to quote the first and the last paragraphs, although the whole statement is worthy of careful study and is a significant contribution to the effort being made by so many American groups and individuals to make crystal clear that this is the rank fraud which the executive council of the American Federation of Labor calls it. These paragraphs are as follows:

The American Federation of Labor vigorously condemns the so-called Stockholm peace appeal as a rank fraud. We urge every workingman and workingwoman to spurn the peddlers of this spurious petition. We call upon every loyal American, every true lover of peace, to refuse to sign or circulate it. We cannot urge too strongly every self-respecting American to treat those who are the organizers of this "Stockholm movement" and the purveyors of its petitions as enemies of the American people operating under false colors.

The Communists are not waging a peace offensive. The Communists are waging an offensive against peace, liberty, and social progress. The AFL is confident that organized labor will lead the Nation in unmasking and upbraiding these enemies within our country with the same determination that our Armed Forces are fighting against the Communist enemy from without.

It is indeed encouraging to have this expression of confidence that organized labor "will lead the Nation in unmasking and upbraiding these enemies within our country with the same determination that our Armed Forces are fighting against the Communist enemy from without."

I urge that our House Committee on Foreign Affairs give us, as the representative body of the American people, an immediate opportunity to join with the President, the executive department, our press and radio, and these patriotic and intelligent groups of Americans in a counteroffensive against these efforts by these Communists within our country. The exact form of any resolution is not of any importance. The opportunity to act on some clear resolution expressing the sense of this Congress as to the deceptive and vicious nature of these activities at this time, to add its voice to those who are exposing the nature of this outrageously false effort, and to indicate the way in which American citizens can support effectively honest efforts to secure peace in this world should be provided the Members of the House by its committee. I call particular attention to the fact that the schedule of these Soviet puppets points up to October 24. I submit that Members of this House should not be deprived of an opportunity to take effective action on House Concurrent Resolution 247 or some similar legislation in the immediate future.

The entire statement by the executive counsel of the American Federation of Labor is as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

The American Federation of Labor vigorously condemns the so-called Stockholm peace appeal as a rank fraud. We urge every working man and working woman to spurn the peddlers of this spurious petition. We call upon every loyal American, every true lover of peace, to refuse to sign or circulate it. We cannot urge too strongly every self-respecting American to treat those who are the organizers of this "Stockholm movement" and the purveyors of its petitions as enemies of the American people operating under false colors.

Not only in far-off Korea do enemies of the American people disguise themselves as Americans. In our own country, in our factories, shops, offices, churches, schools, and on our streets, enemies of America also disguise themselves and pose as Americans. Camouflage is a Communist weapon of war which can be just as deadly against our sons and brothers in the United States as in Korea. The so-called Stockholm petition is precisely such a weapon.

This fake peace petition does not oppose all aggression with all weapons. It singles out only one weapon—the one in which our country still holds the lead and which provides our country and the other democracies with a measure of military security against the gigantic Russian war machine. Unlike America and the other democracies, totalitarian Russia never demobilized but only remobilized its fighting forces at the end of World War II in 1945. Were this fake peace maneuver to succeeed, were the United States to fall into the Russian bear-trap of banning atomic weapons—while Russia rejects America's plan for their effective international inspection, control and elimination—the possibility for Communist world domination by the Soviets would be enormously enhanced. That is just what the petition-promoters and the sinister signature-seekers want.

As long as the democracies have atomic superiority, the Russian warlords fear and hesitate to use their own massive armies as direct instruments of aggression and conquest. They rely instead on Chinese, North Korean, Indochinese, anti-democratic Germans and other puppets and satellites for extending totalitarian tyranny and engaging in adventurist aggression. Since the policy of our country has been not to use atomic weapons against satellite aggressors and since the democracies have—under the Marshall plant and point 4—mobilized for peace and are unprepared for war, Moscow figures that its indirect, yet wanton, aggression can proceed unchecked.

Clearly the so-called peace petitioners seek to ban America's use of atomic weapons in order to enable Russia to catch up with and surpass our country in this field and to aid Moscow's catspaw aggressors by rallying public sentiment against the United States ever using such weapons against them. Cruel confirmation of this strategy of the Stockholm petitioners is at hand in Korea. That is why the Communist drive for signatures coincides with the Moscow-directed invasion of South Korea. It was carefully planned to hide and help the brutal aggression of the Soviet dictators against the people of Korea, the American people and the United Nations as an effective agency of world peace. In fact, nearly every man, woman, and even child in North Korea was forced to sign—or rather thumbprint—this "peace" petition only a few days before the Russian-inspired invasion of South Korea was started.

Moscow's "dove of peace" is only a lead pigeon out of which are made poisoned bullets against democracy. Those who sign this so-called peace petition are, knowingly or otherwise, serving Russian imperialism, aiding its bloody adventure in Korea, and helping the Soviet dictatorship to plunge mankind into another world war. Those who sign this petition are striking a dastardly blow at the United Nations. Those who circulate and sign this document are stabbing our own country in the back at this critical hour when thousands of Americans are giving away their lives in order to preserve peace, freedom, and human decency.

The Communists are not waging a peace offensive. The Communists are waging an offensive against peace, liberty, and social progress. The AFL is confident that organized labor will lead the Nation in unmasking and upbraiding these enemies within our country with the same determination that our Armed Forces are fighting against the Communist enemy from without.

National Security Panel for Independent Laboratories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting excerpts from the report of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories, Inc., which sponsored the national security panel for independent laboratories. This report takes into consideration the cooperation that must exist between Government and independent laboratories with regard to research and development for defense if the country is to remain strong. It explains both the military side from the Government viewpoint and the independent laboratories viewpoint.

The report follows:

On December 2, 1949, the American Council of Commercial Laboratories, Inc., participated in a panel discussion of military procurement which was addressed by a group of distinguished speakers from the Department of Defense. Dr. Gustavus J. Esselen, of Boston, vice president of ACCL and vice president of the United States Testing Co., presided. In view of the military emergency a number of the statements made will repay a careful review.

Dr. Esselen said:

"The meeting will help to get better acquainted on both sides. It is a meeting of representatives of the Research and Development Board, the Munitions Board, Army, Navy, and Air Force under the auspices of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories.

"Speaking for the council, we feel we have a really vast amount of scientific talent and scientific equipment and experience which we'll be very glad to place at the disposal of whatever branch of the armed services can use them, and we are interested in finding out the best way of accomplishing this.

"Our first speaker is Dr. S. D. Cornell, Director of the Planning Division, Research and Development Board, of the Office of the Secretary of Defense."

QUALITY OF RESEARCH

Dr. Cornell said:

"Given the most perfect planning in the world, the quality of the research and development program is still in the last analysis entirely upon the quality of the laboratories and of the men and women who actually carry on the work. Planning is an important function. But without planning you can still get along; with the people doing the work, you cannot. And I am reminded of Dr. Esselen's little story—the people that do things are the important ones. The Board recognizes that ultimate success or failure of the research and development programs in assuring the technical supremacy of this country in the art of war depends on laboratories and staffs such as your own, and, of course, many, many others."

PRAISES ACCL AND SIMILAR GROUPS

Excerpts from the remarks of Col. Lewis S. Griffing, Chief of the Research Branch, Research and Development Group, Logistics Division, Department of the Army:

"I have been made constantly aware of the importance of yours and similar organizations in making available to the Government the materials with which a war is to be fought. It is such a truism that I almost hesitate to say it, but the contributions of American industry, particularly that of independent testing laboratories in the last war in speeding the production of the mass of essential items that were required, especially in the mass production of the innumerable small items that require special tooling, special testing, and particularly precise controls to insure that they meet the rigid specifications that the military set up—it was here that your laboratories made a tremendous contribution. It was so great as to be one of the number one things that American industry did. You must be particularly gratified at having played such an important part, and the fact that you are here today to discuss with the Army the ways and means indicates to me that you are anxious to continue to serve and be available for any emergency that we may have.

"I realize, of course, that your primary interests are with the American public. That is where the big market lies, and during peacetime, of course, that is where the life blood of industry is directed. But because that is true I think you are even better equipped to do your job with respect to the military than you would be otherwise.

"Organizations such as this council can be of very real aid to us in discharging our responsibilities, and you can do it best by passing on to us whatever pertinent information you have. We would like to know all you care to tell us of what you are doing. You may have some new devices. We are interested in them, of course, but more valuable to us may be the techniques or uses which you are developing.

"You may have some new methods in precision measurements that shorten testing time or which improve recording or controlling, or you may have made other progress in technical phases of production of such diverse items as tools, vehicles, electronic devices, fuels and lubricants, protective surfaces, etc."

Dr. Esselen said:

"May I say that while it is true that many of our organizations emphasize the side of their testing and analytical work, there are also many of our members which are research and development organizations, and still others which have research and development divisions to supplement the testing. You will find that the council is a well-rounded group and can help not only in your testing problems but in your research and development problems as well."

NAVY HAS RESEARCH SETUP

The next speaker was Dr. Alan T. Waterman, the deputy chief and chief scientist of the Office of Naval Research. Dr. Waterman is the author of a book entitled "The Combat Scientist."

"The Navy differs from the other departments in having a special office for research only, known as the Office of Naval Research which was established by act of Congress in 1946. It is the function of this office to coordinate research for the Navy and by its own program to supplement the work in the bureaus of the Navy. This does not mean that all the research for the Navy is done by the Office of Naval Research by any means.

"As a matter of fact, the Office of Naval Research encourages the research of the bureaus and in many cases actually supports it. But it does recognize the fact that research can be of a general nature which is of value to all developmental work, and that is one kind of responsibility of the Office. It also provides an agency which can keep in touch with all developmental work in the department and see to it that if bottlenecks develop on the research side, the office can be of assistance."

Excerpts from the remarks of Col. J. Stanley Holtoner, Chief of the Aircraft Branch in the Engineering Division, United States Air Force:

"Every business and industrial organization in the country which has the capacity for the development of Air Force matériel is of interest to us. The supply of technical personnel and the development facility afforded by all these organizations, is our most effective instrument for peace."

INDEPENDENT RESEARCH INTERESTS AIR FORCE

"Our organization for pursuing programs of research and development consists mainly of a small staff agency in the Air Force headquarters, and the operating agency at Wright Field, the Air Matériel Command. In addition, we have electric research and development stations at Cambridge, Mass., and Red Bank, N. J. Our aircraft flight testing is conducted at Muroc, Calif., and guided missile testing at Holloman in New Mexico. Our programs are developed on a continuing basis by Wright Field under the supervison of the Air Staff personnel of the Research and Development Directorate.

"The resulting programs are reviewed and approved by the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense. The contracts for individual projects within a program are negotiated by the Procurement Division at Wright Field. These are based on procurement requests which have been furnished by the Engineering Division of Air Matériel Command.

"We realize that the wide dispersal of research and development activities is essential to defense against the potentialities of modern warfare; that the broad distribution of the research and development work contributes to the national potential; and that aggressive and progressive research and development requires new and radical points of view and approaches. When we make an analysis of research requirements we find that there are many common problems of basic research, applied research, development, and engineering."

SMALL BUSINESS AIDED BY DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

The last speaker was Col. Alfred B. Denniston, Chief, Office of Procurement Methods of the Munitions Board:

"In the procurement field the Munitions Board has two main responsibilities—the coordination of the procurement plans of the three departments and the recommendation of procurement responsibilities among the departments. In connection with these two responsibilities, these two missions, I would like to emphasize that the procurement itself, under both the Unification Act and its recent amendments, and under the Procurement Act of 1947 which is a companion act, is our bible. As far as buying is concerned, the responsibility rests in each department. The Department of Defense itself and its creature, the Munitions Board buys nothing, nor does it direct the buying of anything. The three Secretaries in their fields, in their departments, have the final responsibility for procurement. I think it is well to bear that in mind because it is not too well understood. The Unification Act as generally known throughout the country, I think, is considered to assign more authority, more responsibility to the top than is actually so—certainty in procurement.

"I think it will interest this group to know that we have in the Department of Defense what we think is a good small-business program. That, frankly, is one of our large problems. It is a difficult problem. We base that on several acts of Congress and the Procurement Act of 1947, in which there was the statement that 'it is the intent of the Congress that small business receive a fair share of military procurement.' Thirty percent of our dollar value in fiscal 1949 went to qualified small business directly. And a large additional volume of dollars went to small business as sustaining contractors."

Shall We Use the Veto?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a very timely and pertinent editorial entitled "Must We Avoid the Veto?" which appeared in the August 12, 1950, issue of the magazine America. The article follows:

MUST WE AVOID THE VETO?

Developments at Lake Success have amply justified Russia's decision to end her 6½-month boycott of the Security Council. They have also justified her choice of Jacob A. Malik as the mouthpiece of the Politburo. Mr. Malik has skillfully exploited his position as president of the Council. He has exhibited, too, a viciousness and a venom unequaled by either Vishinsky or Gromyko.

Malik's outrageously mendacious propaganda speeches, which he injects into the proceedings at will, are directed at the still independent peoples of Asia. There, we may be sure, they will be used with good effect by the local comrades. Even if the representatives of the free nations on the Council were skillful enough to throw Malik's lies into his teeth, which they are not, their rebuttals would not be heard in far-eastern lands. It appears, therefore, that we must reconcile ourselves to paying this price to maintain the fiction that the United Nations is a real world organization for peace. Some may find consolation in the widely held hope that as long as the Russians are allowed to shout they won't shoot.

Mr. Malik's efforts in the Security Council are not limited to shouting. He is under orders to secure the admission of the Chinese Red Peiping regime, and has already served notice that he will continue to work toward that end. The United States has declared that it is opposed to the admission of the Chinese Reds, but that it would not use its veto if seven of the Council members voted affirmatively.

That, however, was before the Communist aggression in Korea. While there is no evidence to date that the Chinese Reds have materially aided the North Koreans, there is no doubt that they have given their moral support. In his August 1 protest against including the question of Chinese representation on the agenda of the Security Council, United States Delegate Warren R. Austin declared:

"At a time when the United Nations is faced with overt defiance of its authority, it is pertinent to recall official statements made by the regime which the Soviet representative would like to have seated in the Security Council. That regime has denounced United Nations action in Korea as 'armed aggression,' as 'intervention in the internal affairs of Korea,' and as a 'violation of world peace.' These and other statements amount to giving assistance and encouragement to the regime against which the United Nations is taking preventive action. It would be particularly unwise to consider at this time the seating of a regime that has offi-

cially condensed the efforts of the United Nations to halt aggression in Korea."

In Mr. Austin's denunciation of the Peiping regime, there is encouraging evidence of a stiffening official United States attitude toward it. In view of his critical remarks about what he called "the declared opponent of the United Nations' effort (in Korea)," it is hard to see how the United States could refuse to exercise its veto against the admission of the representative of the Chinese Reds if the occasion demanded it.

Malik's Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent item that appeared in the editorial section of the Boston Globe, Boston, Mass., Tuesday, August 15, 1950, which warrants the attention of the Members of Congress:

LET HIM TALK

With American boys fighting and dying in Korea, many of us are finding it hard to take the remarks of Soviet Delegate Jakob Malik in the Security Council. We have all heard people ask, "Why don't they throw him out?" With the feeling that causes the question to be put, it is impossible to avoid sympathy.

In the Council itself, there was a belief last week that Mr. Malik should be compelled to end his tactics of obstruction. Among the alternatives considered was a revision of the rules of procedure to eliminate the Soviet delegate as presiding officer for August. Such a move would have undoubtedly driven Russia from the United Nations. It was decided, instead, to meet Mr. Malik's propaganda argument point by point, at least for the time being. The decision was a wise one.

It is worth recalling that Russia, in the diplomatic field, like General MacArthur's forces in the military, have been fighting a delaying action, following an initial surprise. Either because Mr. Malik's grossly underestimated the effect of the Korean aggression on American opinion, or because the Politburo would not believe its delegate's size-up of the situation, he was still boycotting the Security Council when the conflict on the thirty-eighth parallel began. Mr. Malik was not present to interpose a veto when the Council issued a cease-fire order in Korea and declared a breach of the peace when it was defied, then set up a United Nations command of the forces repelling armed Communist attack, and even voted arrangements for the care of refugees. When Mr. Malik returned to the Security Council, he was under the disadvantage of being compelled to discredit what had already been done with the support of 47 of the 59 United Nations. This he attempted to accomplish in two ways. First, as dignified official spokesman, he has argued that the Council's actions in his absence had been illegal. He has argued this case with great skill, but with a construction of the UN Charter, which is so strict that it is belied by precedents already set with Soviet consent. Second, as Communist propagandist, he has spread the world party line.

This has forced him to ride two horses simultaneously under the spotlight—perhaps it would be better to say three, for he has also had to maintain some appearance of being a fair presiding officer in the Council. He has had to combine the roles of statesman and hatchet man, which the politically wise in America always know enough to separate. The result is that Mr. Malik has carried little conviction anywhere outside the iron curtain, except in Asia. Sometimes he has done the reverse. Certainly no single human being could have done more than the Soviet delegate to unite the American people behind a strong military and foreign policy. There is even some danger that he will create here a mood that will demand war against Russia.

His obstructionist tactics have obviously disgusted the other Security Council members, including the delegate and Government of India. If, as some fear, he intends to use his position to prevent Council action against further Soviet aggressions, the whole world is now alerted. The General Assembly, which has no veto, could be got together in 2 weeks to do what the Council did in the Korean case.

Mr. Malik's multiplicity of roles has even hobbled him somewhat as a propagandist. It will surprise most people, who have just begun to follow the Security Council closely, to learn that the world spotlight upon him has caused him to pull his punches. The day he returned to the Council some correspondents regularly assigned to its sessions found themselves scooped. They had long ago given up reporting Russian insults. One actually wired his news service, what many believed, that Mr. Malik was below his usual form.

Communist propaganda will continue whether he speaks in the Security Council or not. It is effective chiefly in Asia—among undernourished peoples and nations now, or until recently, unfree. But the picture at Lake Success should do something to counter even this. On a world scale, Mr. Malik, to quote Thomas Jefferson, is a monument "of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." We lose little by the airings of the Korean war and stand to gain something. Mr. Malik has been wearing out his welcome. It has been wise to let him talk.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Mineral Depletion of Soils Cause of Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the District Health Officer gave a talk that again focused attention on a matter I have mentioned many times in the past. The talk follows:

Dr. Daniel L. Seckinger, District Health Officer, yesterday placed part of the blame for chronic diseases on mineral-depleted soils.

Through unchecked erosion, the health officer said, the soil loses mineral elements essential to vigorous plant growth. The end result thus menaces human health, particularly increasing the problems of degenerative diseases, he said.

The District Health Officer, a member of the Interstate Commission, Potomac River Basin, described the Potomac as a sick river, comparable to many rivers beset by industrial wastes, sewage wastes, sewage diposal, and the weight of soil erosion.

Soil erosion, he said, menaces health not only by depleting the soil of its minerals but by adding to the pollution of the streams. As a result of this mineral depletion, plants cannot pick up the minerals which humans get through eating the plants.

Wanted: A Formula for Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appears in the August 19 issue of America, titled "Wanted: A Formula for Formosa":

WANTED: A FORMULA FOR FORMOSA

Neither the shouting war in the Security Council of the UN nor the shooting war in Korea should make the United States forget Formosa. There are alarming indications that the Chinese Reds will invade that strategic island during the next month, before the monsoon season sets in.

We know that most experts do not believe the Chinese Reds will strike so soon. The Chinese, they argue, would not venture out against the United States Seventh Fleet without assistance from Soviet submarines and fighter planes. The Soviets could not help them without bringing on war with the United States, and they do not want such a war at this time.

This argument is not too reassuring. The Russians have been helping the North Koreans in many devious ways and have gotten away with it. Will not their success in embroiling the United States in one costly little war tempt them to try the same tactics in the case of Formosa?

What should increase the temptation is the deplorable and dangerous fact that the United States has done nothing during the 8 weeks since its original action on Formosa to relate that action to the United Nations. On June 27 President Truman bluntly declared: "I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa." That was a unilateral commitment and remains a unilateral commitment. This, despite our repeated protestations that the United States bases its foreign policy squarely on the UN Charter.

If the Chinese Reds attacked Formosa tomorrow, it is entirely possible that the United States would be at war with Red China all by its already harassed self. Which of our reluctant allies could be counted on for assistance?

We were careful to secure the sanction and support of the UN for our intervention in Korea. At the same time we acted unilaterally in Formosa and for some unaccountable reason have drifted along all alone in our own little boat ever since.

The Russians have not been slow to take advantage of our sluggishness. Their delegate, Jacob Malik, has argued in the Security Council that the Korean war is a civil war, like the American and the Chinese civil wars. Walter Lippmann was quick to warn that Malik may be preparing an argument for use later "when the Formosa question comes to a head." Since the war between Chiang and Mao is a civil war, by what right, we may expect Mr. Malik to ask, does the United States intervene? Is that not aggression, which the United Nations must condemn?

Even though an invasion of Formosa were not imminent—and we pray that it is not—we believe the United States must speedily find a formula for Formosa which will, at least, make it harder for Russia to isolate us from our allies and discredit us among the Asiatics.

Mr. Lippmann believes that "it is not possible for the Truman administration to take the initiative in extricating itself from the vulnerable position it is in." The reason? "This is an election year and, moreover, it is never easy to reverse a reversal." Because they are not as entangled as we are, he suggests that our allies could, acting within the framework of the UN, "raise a new standard of hope and of peace to which the people of the world could rally."

Mr. Lippmann may have in mind some definite moves our allies might make, but he does not describe them. We believe that the nature of the move that must be made is fairly obvious, and that Mr. Truman should make it, election year or no election year. He will gain more credit for courageously "reversing his reversal" than by exposing the United States to a fighting war, all unaided, with Communist China.

The United States delegation to the UN should bring up the Formosa crisis at once. Since recourse to the Security Council would be fruitless as long as the Russians remain, our delegation should ask Secretary General Trygve Lie to convene a special session of the General Assembly at once. Mr. Lie told interviewers August 7 that he would not hesitate to call an extraordinary session on 24 hours notice if necessary. The Charter provides, it is true, for an interval of 14 days between the time of call and the special session, but, as Mr. Lie stated, "a simple majority would be sufficient to make it (the special session) a legal assembly."

Let the United States delegation then ask that Mao's threats, the shelling of Quemoy, and the concentration of an invasion force be considered a threat to the peace, that a UN watchdog commission be dispatched to Formosa forthwith, and that the United States be authorized by the UN to provide forces to forestall any invasion.

He Makes People Proud of Their Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members to an article entitled "He Makes People Proud of Their Jobs," beginning on page 105 in the Reader's Digest for August.

It seems to me that every employer and employee in the Nation, and everyone interested in their welfare, should read this article.

Defense Jobs in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House will be interested in a summary of questions most frequently asked at the Civil Service Commission in connection with Federal employment by defense agencies during the present emergency.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, therefore, I am inserting the questions and answers, as prepared by the Commission:

Since the announcement was made in July that the defense departments would be expanded during the current emergency, thousands of persons have called at the Civil Service Commission's main building, Seventh and F Streets NW., for information concerning the defense program. Although most of the inquiries have come from people who are not now in the Federal service, many have been received from Federal workers who are also interested in the new defense jobs.

Following are the answers to the questions of general interest that have been asked most frequently by persons who are not now employed by the Government:

1. How should I go about getting one of the new jobs in the defense departments?

The best way is to take and pass any of the civil-service examinations that are announced from week to week for which you can qualify. Most of the jobs, except those for stenographer and typist, are now being filled from the Commission's registers of eligibles. Persons living in the Washington, D. C., area are certified first for the new emergency-indefinite appointments authorized for the defense departments.

2. I have taken no civil-service examinations and do not have permanent status, but I would like to go to work soon. Are there any possibilities of quick employment for me?

Yes, if you are a good typist or stenographer. The defense departments have authority to make temporary appointments directly to typist positions in grades GS–1 through 3 and to stenographer positions in grades GS–2 through 4 in the Washington, D. C., area.

3. How about people who are not typists or stenographers and have never worked for the Government? Is there any chance of an immediate appointment for them?

Generally speaking, the answer is "No." Thus far, with the exception of typists and stenographers, the Commission has been able to fill most requests for personnel from its registers of eligibles. As long as a sufficient number of qualified eligibles are available from the Commission's registers, appointments of other persons (except those with permanent status and certain former defense employees) will not be authorized.

4. I was offered a defense job, but declined. Will my name be put back on the register and, if so, how long will it take? Do I have to take any action?

Appointing officers normally have 21 days in which to make their selections. By the end of that period, they report the selections made and the Commission restores the remaining names on the certificate to the register. No action is required on your part, and inquiries about your individual case cannot be handled. The Commission is rapidly certifying the names of eligibles to the defense departments, and if it delayed the procedure by checking each individual's standing at his request, the entire process would slow down, with the result that everyone would have to wait longer to get a job.

5. If I accept a temporary defense job and later resign, will my name be restored to the register?

Yes, if the register is still in existence.

6. When I filed my Form 57, I indicated that I would not accept temporary appointment. Should I advise the Commission now that I will accept a defense job?

No, it is not necessary. Since emergency-indefinite appointments differ from the usual temporary appointments, the Commission disregards applicants' answers to this question in certifying for the new type of appointment.

7. How much leave will I earn under an emergency-indefinite appointment

The same amount earned by a permanent employee—26 days of annual leave and 15 days of sick leave each year.

8. Will within-grade salary increases be possible for persons with emergency-indefinite appointments?

Yes.

9. Does the "members-of-family" rule apply to emergency-indefinite appointments?

No.

10. I understand the Defense departments need draftsmen. I have been on such a register for a long time and have never been contacted. Why is that?

Probably because there have been a sufficient number of people with higher ratings than yours to fill the needs thus far.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT CLERK JOBS

Because of the large number of persons in the Washington area who have eligible ratings in the clerk examination, more questions have been received about the possibility of getting clerk jobs during the past few weeks than about any other types of job. Following are the most frequently asked questions about these jobs:

1. I passed the clerk examination. Why haven't I been offered a defense job?

It may be because your rating has not been reached on the register. Or it may be that when your name was certified to an agency, the agency chose someone else instead of you. An appointing officer has the right to select one out of three available eligible for any job he has to fill.

2. I passed the clerk examination. Can you give me any idea of what my chances are of getting a clerk job?

If your rating is in the nineties or the high eighties, you have a good chance of being certified by the Commission, and you will be considered for selection by the agency to which certified. The Commission cannot predict whether you will be selected.

3. If I take an emergency-indefinite appointment as a clerk and my name is removed from that register, will my chances for appointment from other registers, such as the junior professional assistant, be affected?

No. Your name will remain on other registers, and you will be certified for appointment when your name is reached.

4. My legal residence is the District of Columbia. I have been offered an emergency-indefinite appointment as a clerk. If I should decline, could I, a nonveteran, expect to be offered a permanent appointment in the near future?

No. The Commission does not believe that nonveterans with legal residence in the District of Columbia or in the nine States that are in excess of their quotas under the apportionment law—these nine States include Maryland and Virginia—will be certified in the near future for probational (permanent) appointments from the clerk register for the apportioned service.

5. I did not take the clerk examination when it was announced and have never worked for the Government. As the examination is now closed and I will therefore have no opportunity to take it, do I have any chance of getting a clerk job in the Washington area?

Your chances are poor. There is little prospect for the appointment to clerk positions in this area in the foreseeable future of persons who have not already passed the clerk examination.

QUESTIONS OF EMPLOYEES AND FORMER EMPLOYEES

Following are the questions asked most frequently at the Commission's Information Office, Seventh and F Streets NW., by Federal employees and former employees:

1. Will the Defense departments have to call back former nonstatus employees who have been displaced before they can hire people from registers?

No. In fact, only under certain conditions may such employees be appointed (see next question).

2. I am a World War II veteran. I worked in one of the defense departments before being separated a few weeks ago, because I did not have status. Are there any special provisions for hiring former nonstatus employees in the defense departments?

Yes. Authority has been granted the defense departments to appoint such former employees, provided (a) that the former employees have veteran preference; (b) that they previously served satisfactorily in the Department for at least 3 months, and (c) that the positions to which they are appointed are in the same line of work as the positions in which they previously served. Former employees who are not veterans may also be given emergency appointments under the same conditions, but only after proper consideration has been given to any veterans whose names may be on certificates for the positions concerned.

3. If a permanent employee transfers to a defense department job, will he have reemployment rights in his old agency?

No.

4. If I have permanent status and transfer to a defense department, will I continue to have retention rights of a permanent employee?

It depends on the type of transfer or appointment you are given by the Defense Establishment. If you are given a transfer with status, you will be in the permanent group for reduction-in-force actions—the last group to go. If you are given an emergency-indefinite appointment, however, you will be in the war-service and temporary-indefinite group, and will have none of the rights that accrue to status employees in reduction in force.

5. I have read that retirement deductions will not be made from salaries of emergency-indefinite appointees. I have a permanent appointment with the Government now, and would like to have retirement deductions continue. Will this be possible if I accept the emergency-indefinite appointment I am now considering?

Yes. If retirement deductions are now being made from your salary and you take the new job without a break in service, deductions will be mandatory in your case.

Protecting the National Security of the United States—H. R. 7439

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1950, the House considered H. R. 7439, a bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

I offered an amendment which would have provided anyone separated as a so-called security risk with the right to an impartial review of his case by the Civil Service Commission.

This amendment offered by me received bipartisan support but failed to be included in the legislation by a 6-vote margin, which indicated the concern of almost a majority of the members regarding the inherent dangers in the bill which allowed the heads of certain departments and agencies to separate employees on secret charges without the right of an independent review. After the House passed the so-called security risk bill it was referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Certain amendments to the legislation were adopted by that committee which carried out the purpose of my amendment.

The bill then passed the Senate unanimously on August 9, 1950, and on August 15 the House concurred in the Senate amendments, and the President will sign this measure within the next few days.

The amendments to H. R. 7439 approved by the Senate in effect provide that any person separated from one of the agencies covered by the bill on grounds that such person is a security risk, may ask the Civil Service Commission to review his case to determine whether he is suitable for reemployment in another Government department or agency. The right of the person under the provisions of the Senate amendment corresponds exactly to his right to an independent review of his case under my amendment which has now been approved by the House of Representatives.

As I have stated, there is a very definite difference between a person who is disloyal to the United States and one who may be classified as a security risk. It would have been unfortunate had the Congress approved this legislation without the inclusion of an amendment such as the one I offered, or such as the one adopted by the Senate and approved by the House after the Senate took action.

The sacred American tradition of the right to an independent review of an administrative action which affects the property or livelihood of an individual must be preserved, and this bill should not have become law unless a proper opportunity for such a review is provided.

I am pleased, as are my colleagues who supported my amendment, that the Senate saw fit in its wisdom to provide that a person discharged as a security risk would have the right to have his record cleared if the action by the head of the department or agency concerned was arbitrary and based upon unsupported charges.

The Senate also included an amendment which was adopted by the House providing that the right of the person who is suspended as a security risk should be protected by the requirement that such person be given a written statement of the charges against him within 30 days after his suspension, and a reasonable opportunity to answer such charges at a hearing or through the submission of affidavits.

In my judgment, the inclusion of the Senate amendments vastly improved this legislation, and in effect adopts my views, and for this reason I supported the legislation with such amendments.

Divine Guidance

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, each Member of the House of Representatives recently received a letter from a friend of mine. I think, however, today it is quite fitting and proper that I call it to your attention by reading it.

Here is his letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I feel that I am speaking for millions of other Americans when I say that we are vitally concerned and deeply disturbed over the utter disorder and the terribly confused conditions from which we are suffering. Your present task is unquestionably the most important in your lifetime. The lives of millions of human beings are at stake; so I plead with you to pray to Almighty God for divine wisdom and inspirational guidance in conducting the important post you now hold.

I know you are not indifferent to the challenge of this fateful hour, when the clock is telling of perhaps the end of the world that we have known. What is the challenge? The challenge is to throw aside all considerations of partisan expediency, to forget the usual prattle of politics, and with a deep sense of responsibility to strive only to meet the needs of the Nation. The challenge is to face the situation courageously and to be ready and willing to do something about it. I have every confidence that you, God's servant, will prove yourself equal to the task.

If I were in your position, I would ask for divine guidance to give me strength to withstand the influence of all pressure groups whose passions of misconceived self-interest must be restrained. Because of human nature man is the sole hope of mankind.

Divine guidance is necessary. Perhaps the many problems that face the world today and cause much misunderstanding, misery, and fear could more easily be solved if the men who meet at the conference tables would realize that men alone do not have the power to alter existing conditions until they submerge their egos, and in humility and sincerity call upon God for guidance in making wise and just decisions. For it is only by recognizing that any power we have comes from this source, and only when we appeal to this higher knowledge will we be able to live in truth, justice, and peace.

Patriotically yours,

HARRY R. NIGHTINGALE.

Mr. Speaker, the human race is sick. A regiment of doctors is sitting by our bedside, feeling our pulse, suggesting cures. Complicated treatments have been tried, but the patient lingers on. A few superficial improvements have been brought about, just as a hypodermic quiets fever for a while. But the real cause of our illness has not been touched, a real cure not even begun. The cause is that the human mind has run amuck; the cure is the recapture of our souls.

The cure of the disease with which we are afflicted does not consist of regulations, taxes, and codes, but of a rigorous spiritual diet. It is the only cure.

Address of Hon. Willard L. Thorp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, lest this little gem be lost to posterity, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILLARD L. THORP, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE AMERICAN AUSTRALIAN ASSOCIATION, UNIVERSITY CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, AUGUST 4, 1950

When Alice tumbled down the rabbit hole and began her involuntary expedition to Wonderland, the report of her adventures states that she had "plenty of time as she went down to look about her, and to wonder what was going to happen next." She began to talk out loud to herself, and part of her monolog is reported verbatim as follows:

"I wonder if I shall fall right through the earth! How funny it'll seem to come out among the people that walk with their heads downwards! The Antipathies, I think—" (She was rather glad there was no one listening this time, as it didn't sound at all the right word) "but I shall have to ask them what the name of the country is, you know. Please, ma'am, is this New Zealand or Australia?" She never had the opportunity to put the question, because "Suddenly, thump! thump! down she came upon a heap of sticks and dry leaves, and the fall was over." Of course, if she had had proper navigation aids with her, she would have known that, if she had started in London, her probable destination would have been New Zealand, but that, if she had started her descent in New York City, the land nearest to her exit, to use subway terminology, would have been Australia.

Alice's notion that things would be reversed on the opposite side of the globe, is further supported by the conclusions of mathematicians. In spherical geometry, it is a simple theorem that a figure on one side of a sphere appears in reverse when reflected through the center to the opposite side.

Mr. Prime Minister, I wish today to denounce these false notions whether presented by fantasy or by mathematical theory. Antipathy certainly is the wrong word, and contrariness does not describe the relationship. The plain fact is that the Commonwealth of Australia and the United States of America have an extraordinary resemblance, a natural affinity, and a great area of common interest.

There are obvious elements of similarity—for example, that we speak approximately the same language. But it is more important to remind ourselves that we both have backgrounds of pioneering and all the effects resulting from the existence of an undeveloped frontier. We are not ancient societies bound by habits of thought and institutional forms developed and hardened over many centuries. We are new countries who have taken the values of the Old World, but have developed our own variations and invented our own innovations. With the assistance of space and extensive national resources, we have provided new opportunities for the vigorous and the venturesome. In the absence of ancient and rigid tradition, we have been free to develop our political, economic, and social institutions with greater freedom.

Even our political history has its striking similarity. Both countries developed originally as a group of separate British colonies. After considerable difficulty, we both achieved freedom to direct our own affairs, a condition which you seem to have won with somewhat less struggle than did we. And finally, we each have brought our various separate states together into a federal union under a constitutional form of government.

But if the past shows such resemblance, it is perhaps even more important to record that we seem to look to the future through the same window. We have both been strong supporters of the United Nations and its various specialized agencies. We have worked together in the effort to find ways and means to expand world trade. The most important of all, we are in basic agreement that aggression must be driven from the face of the globe. We in the United States will not soon forget that the first to join with us in the great United Nations effort to halt the criminal aggressors in Korea were members of the air force of the Commonwealth of Australia. This is not the first time that we have fought together in the cause of freedom, and it further strengthens the ties of our kinship.

Mr. Prime Minister, we are all exceedingly happy that you have visited us in our country. We hope that you are carrying away with you a sense of the warmth of our feeling towards you and your fellow countrymen. We hope that we can ever stand side by side, not only in military operations, but in building a world where freedom and democracy, where peace and prosperity, will no longer be challenged.

The Minute Women of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, August 8, page A5717, there appears some remarks concerning the Minute Women for Peace, from Springfield-Chicopee, Mass. The Minute Women of Connecticut and the Minute Women of the United States of America are in no way to be confused with the group in Massachusetts. Their aims are obviously very different and they are completely opposed in ideology. For a clear understanding of the intents and purposes of the Connecticut organization of the Minute Women, I am requesting that with my remarks, a statement of their principles be included. The National and State of Connecticut chairman of the Minute Women of the United States of America is Mrs. Suzanne Silvercruys Stevenson. The statement of principles follows:

The Minute Women of Connecticut is a voluntary group which welcomes into its membership, any woman citizen of this State, regardless of party affiliation, who, inspired by her faith in the traditional American way of life, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, has the following purposes:

1. Actively to fight communism in every form.

Inasmuch as it has been adjudged libelous in some States to call any person a Communist, the Communist or any other party dedicated to the overthrow of our constitutional form of government, should be outlawed.

2. To demand the removal of supporters of socialism and communism in our Federal and State Government, and in our educational system.

3. To work for the rebirth of free enterprise, free production, free markets in our country, so that people can work, plan, risk, save, and dream for themselves, without governmental restrictions and regulations, except those which are indispensable for the defense of the United States.

4. To advocate just plain good housekeeping, economy and efficiency in Government, with the adoption of the waste-saving points of the Hoover Commission report, not, however, in any way weakening our national defense.

5. To oppose all measures under the guise of war measures, which aim to transform our free economy into state socialism.

6. To secure the passage of the constitutional amendment, limiting the tenure of office of the President of the United States, to two terms of 4 years each. (Until 1940, the two terms of the Presidency had been accepted as a tradition laid down by President George Washington himself. Since that precedent has been broken it can only be restored now by a constitutional amendment, which passed the House and Senate in 1947, and since that time, is being held up by various States, 36 of which must ratify it to become law.)

7. To pray for spiritual guidance for enlightenment and the ability to inspire others to join our crusade, thereby giving us the courage to work to achieve the above aims.

We pledge in honor, to vote at every election.

Growth of United States Economy Under Democratic Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that many Americans will be interested in facts and figures dealing with the expansion and progress of free enterprise in this country in the last 18 years. Free enterprise is still the basis of our economy and our political system. No other country in the world has made such tremendous progress in so short a period of time. In the 18 years between 1932 and 1950 our total national income has risen from $46,000,000,000 to nearly $210,000,000,000 and it is still rising.

It should be noted that all this was accomplished under the Democratic administrations, first under the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and now under President Harry S. Truman. To those who may wish to have the exact figures of this economic growth I commend the article United States Economic Gains Since 1932, by William M. Boyle, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, published in the

August issue of the Democratic Digest. The article is as follows:

UNITED STATES ECONOMIC GAINS SINCE 1932

(By William M. Boyle, Jr.)

Americans have a tradition of teamwork, and during the past 17 years the most highly developed teamwork between businessman, farmer, and workingman in our history has paid off in the greatest expansion of productivity and rise of living standards any nation has even seen.

How the partnership of all classes and sections, blossoming under a progressive National Government, has brought about great gains in our free-enterprise economy is shown dramatically in the figures below. These figures are from a newly completed comprehensive analysis of official Government statistics on the expansion of the American free-enterprise system which has raised total national income from $46,300,000,000 in 1933 to $209,800,000,000 in 1949, an increase of 353 percent. After adjusting for price changes, the increase was about 150 percent.

The statistics, gathered by an independent analyst at the request of the Democratic National Committee, tell the story of the tremendous progress the United States has made since 1933.

BUSINESS AND WORKERS

In 1933 income payments to individuals in the United States totaled $46,273,000,000. In 1948 residents of the Nation received $211,900,000,000. This is an increase of 358 percent, or, if measured in constant dollars, about 150 percent.

There were 240,881 manufacturing establishments in the country in 1947. The average number of production workers employed in these industries during the year was 11,916,188. Total wages paid to production workers in 1947 amounted to $30,242,343,000. The value added to commodities and goods as a result of manufacturing processes totaled $74,425,825,000.

By contrast, in 1933 there were only 141,769 manufacturing plants in the Nation. The average number of production workers during the year stood at only 6,055,737. The total payroll for production employees in 1933 was but $5,261,577,000. And the value added by manufacturing amounted to only $14,548,018,000.

The payroll increase was 475 percent or over 233 percent in adjusted dollars. The manufacturing value added was 412 percent or 170 percent in adjusted dollars.

By September 30, 1949, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had made 51,028 loans totaling $4,078,529,660 to businessmen in the United States, aiding our free-enterprise economy to produce more goods, more jobs, and more profits. The Federal Government spent $152,624,785 in 1949 to help pay for the costs of carrying out employment service and unemployment insurance system services.

In the year ending June 30, 1949, the Bureau of Public Roads spent $410,396,000 for highway construction, and $30,390,000 was spent by the Federal Government to help build airports. Both helped speed the flow of goods.

FARM GAINS

Fair prices and increased production have brought the level of farm income and rural living standards close to parity from a position in which the farmer was the bell wether of depressions.

Following are the figures which show the farm prosperity which has been brought about during 16 years of national Democratic administration, despite the recent downward trend which has brought about Democratic proposals for an improved farm price-support program:

Cash income of United States farmers totaled $30,801,999,000 in 1948. It was only $1,800,000,000 in 1932. This means an increase of about 1,600 percent. In real terms, the increase was about 640 to 650 percent.

Hogs were selling for only $3.34 per hundredweight in 1932. The average 1948 price was $22.80. Corn was selling at only 29 cents a bushel in 1932. The average 1948 price was $1.30. Tobacco was selling for only 10½ cents a pound in 1932. The average 1948 price was 44 cents. Cotton was selling at only 6½ cents a pound in 1932. The average 1948 price was 31 cents. Farm mortgages, an excellent index of rural prosperity, have decreased steadily since 1933. More than $6,600,000,000 in mortgages was outstanding in 1940. On January 1, 1949, the debts had been reduced to $5,100,000,000. On June 30, 1949, 78.2 percent of farms had electricity. When the Rural Electrification Administration was set up in 1935, only 11 percent of the farms had electric lights.

In 12 years REA has helped farmers to energize 839,685 miles of lines.

On July 1, 1949, 69.5 percent of the farm land was included in soil-conservation districts.

In 1948 payments to the farmers under the agricultural conservation program totaled $124,503,000; 56 percent of the cropland was included under this conservation plan.

The Farmers Home Administration made 2,371 loans totaling $14,890,231 to help persons buy farms in the 1949 fiscal year. It also insured 1,181 farm-ownership loans in that year for $8,116,155.

In addition, the Farmers Home Administration made 125,354 operating loans totaling $93,053,951 in the 1949 fiscal year.

On June 30, 1949, the Production Credit Association had 252,458 loans valued at $528,026,386.

Federal land banks had 303,567 loans worth $880,137,999 outstanding on June 30, 1949.

Commodity Credit Corporation loans made on 1948 crops through August 31, 1949, totaled $2,189,479,334. Loans on 1949 crops on that date stood at $384,436,493.

The school-lunch program, started in 1935, served 6,700,797 children in the year ending June 30, 1949. A total of $91,051,145 was spent on the program in that year.

In the 1949 fiscal year $40,450,885 was spent for agricultural experiment station and cooperative agricultural extension work.

SAFETY FOR DEPOSITORS

Bank deposits have risen greatly, while bank failures which robbed depositors of their life savings have become a thing of the past. The following figures tell the story:

On June 30, 1932, only $35,484,000,000 was deposited in United States commercial banks. By June 30, 1949, deposits in banks had increased 288 percent to $137,520,000,000. In 1932, 1,453 banks with deposits totaling $706,000,000 failed. None failed in 1948.

From 1934 through 1948 the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation spent $266,976,000 to help 407 banks with deposits of $522,678,000. At the end of 1948, 95.1 percent of all money in banks was insured by the FDIC at the rate of up to $5,000 for each depositor.

A total of 12,922 commercial banks with assets of $147,640,821,000 were insured by FDIC in 1948.

HOUSING

More Americans own homes than ever before—many assisted by housing programs put into effect by the national Democratic administration to prevent foreclosure or to make home financing easier and cheaper. Here are the details:

On December 31, 1948, the Federal Housing Administration had outstanding in the United States, 8,735,620 insured loans on small homes and for property improvement. The FHA insurance on these loans totaled $3,338,550,000.

On that same date the FHA had insured 1,981,951 mortgages on one- to four-family homes for $9,904,058,000.

In addition, the FHA had underwritten the construction of 207,606 units in large apartment projects for $1,304,522,000 by the end of 1948.

As of July 25, 1949, the Veterans' Administration had guaranteed 1,528,607 home loans for $4,120,865,000.

There were 3,769 member institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank System on December 31, 1948. At that time they had $9,689,792,000 outsanding in home mortgage loans.

At the end of 1948, 2,616 associations were insured under the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The associations had $7,777,308,000 outstanding in home mortgage loans.

The Home Owners Loan Corporation aided 1,202,424 families refinancing home loans totaling $3,496,977,000. All but $319,342,000 of those loans had been repaid by June 30, 1949.

As of June 30, 1949, the Public Housing Administration had spent $3,173,689,000 on 1,159,583 public-housing units. These include special veterans' housing projects and war housing as well as units built under the United States Housing Act.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The United States has made great gains in developing power facilities, curbing floods, and making more waterways navigable.

In the 1949 fiscal year the Department of the Interior spent $96,157,200 for power facilities at or in connection with Federally constructed multiple-purpose developments. In addition the Interior Department spent $58,970,000 for construction of dams and reservoirs which have or will have power facilities.

In the same fiscal year the National Military Establishment spent $694,042,857 in the Nation for rivers and harbors projects to improve transportation and reduce flood damage. This compares with $116,586,376 expended for those purposes by the Army in 1933.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Federal assistance has enabled our people to do a better job of conserving and preserving the human resources in the years of national Democratic administration which followed the depression of the 1920's and early 1930's.

Here are the figures which show how Federal assistance has enabled the State to expand its activities in the fields of health, education and social welfare:

In the year ending June 30, 1949, the Federal Security Agency spent $2,058,530,544 to aid health, education and social welfare activities in the United States.

The Federal share of the old-age assistance program in the Nation accounted for $718,011,653.

During the fiscal year Americans received $607,036,339 under the old-age and survivors insurance program. FSA spent $26,145,531 for its vocational education program during the year and $5,030,000 was appropriated under the land-grant college program.

From 1933 to 1948 nearly $10,000,000,000 in Federal funds was spent for education in the United States.

Public Health Service expenditures in the Nation in the year ending June 30, 1949, included $13,138,382 for venereal disease control; $6,786,066 for tuberculosis control; $11,212,895, general health assistance; $7,924,403, mental health activities; $10,762,299, hospital survey and planning; and $2,360,905, cancer control.

TO HELP VETERANS

Medical and educational programs voted by a Democratic Congress are aiding war

veterans to become trained, productive workers, successful businessmen, and useful citizens. Here are the details:

In the year ending June 30, 1949, the Veterans Administration spent $6,552,063,282 in the United States, distributed as follows:

During that 12-month period 2,905,786 veterans and survivors of deceased veterans received $1,850,028,748 in pensions and compensation and retirement payments. A total of $502,737,158 was distributed in the State under the unemployment and self-employment allowances programs. The number of veterans who were discharged from VA hospitals during the year totaled 543,214.

In the 1-year period the average number of exservicemen in training under vocational rehabilitation legislation was 216,729. They received $260,812,310 in subsistence allowance.

The average number under the GI education and training program stood at 2,017,739. They received $1,815,216,977 in subsistence allowance and $825,633,589 for tuition and equipment. From the start of its loan insurance program after the end of World War II through June 25, 1949, the VA had guaranteed 51,522 farm loans. The guaranties covered $1,051,064 while the total amount of the loans was $197,739,968. In this same 4-year period the VA has insured 107,244 business loans. These guaranties covered $127,129,820. The total amount of the loans was $337,628,543.

Freedom and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Post of August 9, 1950:

FREEDOM AND SECURITY

The President has grasped both horns of the great dilemma of our society—the dilemma of protecting our liberties while safeguarding our security—in a singularly statesmanlike message to Congress. As Governor Dewey pointed out in his famous debate with Mr. Stassen at Portland, May 18, 1948, "We have 27 laws on the books, and I have the whole list of them in front of me, outlawing every conceivable act of subversion against the United States." However, agents like Gold who worked with Fuchs succeeded in evading all 27 of these laws in stealing the greatest secret in the history of this country in behalf of its enemies. It was crystal clear from then on that the time was overdue for a review of the laws against subversion with the view to improvement in case the law and not enforcement was defective. But the "there ought to be a law" pressure upon Congress produced bills containing clauses which threaten the liberties enshrined in the Bill of Rights—the Mundt bill, S. 595, and the Hobbs bill.

The President's answer to the dilemma falls into two categories. He would provide an extended statute of limitations beyond the existing 3 years in peacetime espionage cases, require persons who have received instruction from a foreign government or political party in espionage or subversion tactics to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, give broader authority than now exists for the President to establish security regulations concerning the protection of military bases and other national-defense installations. The second category of recommendations has to do with aliens. Legislation is proposed permitting the Attorney General to exercise supervision over aliens subject to deportation—legislation that would require them under sanction of criminal penalties to report their whereabouts and activities at regular intervals. All these proposals have been either suggested or backed from time to time in this newspaper. Another thing, in our opinion, ought to be done. There should be, as there was in the war, registration of the financial statements of groups appealing for public funds, for all subversive activity has to be financed, and could not exist if the light of day were cast upon the nature and source of its financing.

This program of action is vital to the defense of our country. It is, indeed, first business on the home front. Some people will not be satisfied that it goes far enough, but they are apt, in their overexcitement over the dangers in our midst, to overlook the liberties upon which our society was built. They likewise err in other respects. For one thing, they would push this country in the direction of a police state. Such action endangers rather than adds to security. For the history of police states, as the President reminds Congress, is marked by successive purges, and growing concentration camps, as their governments strike out blindly in fear of violent revolt. Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures, until it becomes a source of terror to all its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear.

For another thing, extreme legislation of the nature of existing bills would serve Communist ends in discrediting our system of constitutional liberties. Finally, the extremists forget that laws themselves don't protect, what mainly count are the administration of those laws and the cooperation of public opinion, and the best insulation against inside danger comes from strict enforcement and from what the President calls a vigorous, functioning democracy which succeeds in meeting the needs of its people. Mr. Truman has furnished Congress with a new starting point in tightening up the laws against subversion.

Why Shouldn't We?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the editor of a South Dakota county seat weekly has written an editorial which more nearly sums up grassroots opinion of the day than anything which has come to my attention in some time. The editor's name is Harold Card and his paper is the Webster (S. Dak.) Reporter and Farmer. Under leave to extend, I place the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

WHY SHOULDN'T WE?

Patriotism and common sense dictate that full support be given to the present war effort in the undeclared conflict in Korea. As American citizens, we must and should cooperate in the mobilization of our manpower and material resources to cope with the present situation and be prepared for anything further that may come.

But we would be less than human if we did not "boil" under the collar at some of the things that have been happening.

It wasn't long ago that our Defense Secretary Louis Johnson made this gem statement: "If Russia starts war at 4 o'clock, the United States is ready 'to give 'em hell' at 5 o'clock."

The kindest observation that can now be made of Korea is that the United States clock stopped.

In the meantime, the people of a muddled world get the impression that Uncle Sam talks big but doesn't back up his talking.

South Koreans were told that Uncle Sam would act swiftly and effectively to protect their sovereignty. But in spite of Army Intelligence reporting troop concentrations in North Korea, Washington was caught flatfooted and Truman was away on vacation. Again we are confronted with the stark reality of our embattled GI's getting help "too little and too late." Now we are told it will be a long, hard struggle, and we see it with United States reverses being piled on reverses.

What is United States policy in the Orient? Is Korea important as a symbol of United States strength in the Far East? If so, do our present bumblings build up Uncle Sam as big and powerful? And in retrospect, are a few hundred thousand South Koreans more vital to United States security than were several millions of Nationalist Chinese to whom perhaps some help months ago would have drastically altered today's situation. Again in retrospect, are secret agreements made at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran now hitting us in the face?

Here at home, has the United States internal situation changed so quickly that a President who only a few months ago "poohpoohed" the suggestion of Communist infiltration in high places, on Tuesday pled for all possible help to the FBI to tighten its program against espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities? Is this lack of foresight building another "government by crisis," of which we have seen so many in recent years?

No patriotic American would for a moment hamstring the war effort, and by the same token, no patriotic American should condone mistakes that imperil our national security. We have a right to demand from our officials the same type of service our Government expects from us. Partisan politics has no place in today's crisis, but every definition of patriotism we subscribe to calls upon everyone to do all in his power to put an end to national leadership unequal to the task.

As another election approaches Americans are sure to hear the old canard, "Don't change horses in the middle of the stream." To which we answer, "Why not?"

And, as if in approving answer to the Webster editor's query, the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader, follows a reprint of the editorial with this brief one from the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil:

Events of recent weeks made it plain that if we don't swap horses—elect a Republican Congress—the country may be sunk.

Secretary of State Acheson and Defense Secretary Johnson have demonstrated their incompetence in the present emergency and Truman may ditch both of them before election.

Their dismissal would not satisfy the voters, who are coming to realize that the whole administration is so incompetent that only the election of a Republican Congress will bring about any improvement.

Cannon or Automobiles—Keys to American Survival or Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial expresses so sensible a viewpoint, I feel that every American should read it.

It translates from the dollar sign into the sacrifices which will be required of us if we are to meet our future obligations and survive.

CANNON OR AUTOMOBILES—KEYS TO AMERICAN SURVIVAL OR SLAVERY

(By Walter Leckrone)

The gentleman from Prague was openly admiring the modest, but still new and shiny car in which I'd volunteered to drive him to his hotel.

"I have never," he repeated in his heavily accepted English, "been able to afford a car like this."

The streets were full of cars like that, and better ones, too, so obviously plenty of people around there could afford them. He went on:

"But you do not understand. In Czechoslovakia I am not a poor man." (And he mentioned a list of his enterprises that certainly didn't sound like poverty.)

"For a long time my income has not been less than $50,000 a year, United States. On such an income I could not afford a car, not even an electric refrigerator. We have an ice box.

"You see we have to keep an army at our borders all the time. If you in America had to keep an army guarding your borders from an attack, perhaps you, also, could not afford luxuries."

MAUSERS OR MERCURYS

What he was saying, of course, was that if you spend part of your income on guns and bullets you'll have just that much less to spend on sporty convertibles.

Czechoslovakia, then a free though threatened nation, has disappeared behind the iron curtain now. But last week the Congress of the United States was beginning gingerly to say the same thing.

The Congressmen, to be sure, didn't use the same words. They talked about corporate levies and higher income-tax rates and credit and production controls.

From as far away as Indianapolis they seemed to be well ahead of the President in their thinking along that line * * * though still far behind the people around here.

For the first time in our history, it was becoming clear, Americans might have to choose between guns and gadgets, might have to lower their own living standards in order to go on living at all.

We haven't faced that before. "Miracles of production" got us by with hardly a jolt in every previous defense crisis. During World War II, even, the standards of living, in most ways and for most people in this country actually went up. America produced enough to keep vast armies supplied with everything, and enough more to keep everybody at home living in comfort.

National income, which is just the yardstick by which we measure the whole value of everything everybody produces, rose so high that even after you took out what we were spending on the war there still was more left for everybody than there ever had been before. Price went up * * * but wages and salaries and profits and incomes went up even farther.

Next time production may not be enough.

Last week we published a fascinating series of articles outlining some of the things that can be learned about production in Russia. The figures were startling. In munitions of war they appear to be almost ready to produce as much * * * or more * * * than we did even at wartime peaks.

No one seriously believes that Russia, a backward and primitive nation, actually can make as many things as we can make in America, of course. Not in totals.

The catch is that they don't even now, bother about making much for the people's comfort. They don't, for example, have to produce enough gasoline to run their war planes plus enough to keep millions of civilian automobiles running. There are no civilian automobiles. They don't have to make clothing for their army plus new clothing for the civilians. Civilians will just make out with what they have, as long as war lasts. They don't even have to build war factories plus houses for civilians who work in them. They just jam the civilians into what houses are already built * * * two, three, five families to a room.

If Russia could manufacture only half as much, altogether, as we can, Soviet armies might still have more weapons than ours. By Russian standards everything except the minimum essentials of bare existence can be used for war.

The production power of the United States, used like that, would be invincible. No nation on earth, and no combination of nations, could stand against it.

It is not, of course, going to be used like that. No one in Congress or out expects that American standards of living will be lowered to the Russian level * * * unless Russia wins a war against us.

We do, though, have to face the question presently of whether they should be reduced a little * * * in the common defense.

NOT UNTIL AFTER ELECTION

That's what the President proposes we don't talk about until after election, and what Congress is so cautiously talking about anyway, in Washington this week.

One-fourth of our national income would amount to about $50,000,000,000 a year * * * or just about what the Nation's defense chiefs believe it would cost the first year to fight a major war. If we turned over that much more for our national defense it would lower our living standards approximately 25 percent below what they are now. We'd have to do without one-fourth of the things we buy now * * * for the double reason that we wouldn't have the money to buy them and they wouldn't be for sale anyway.

We'd still have standards of comfortable living far above any others in the world * * * far above even those our own grandparents ever had.

Seems like a modest price for survival, at that.

The Mountain Has Labored and Brought Forth a Mouse

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, suppose we get back to the United States for a moment and turn our attention to the welfare of that great segment of our people known as the American farmers—who are either enjoying the benefits of rural electrification or begging to have it extended to their homes.

I need not remind the Members of this House that the Rural Electrification Administration in extending this service to the farmers of the Nation has done more for the people living in the rural section than anything else that has ever been accomplished in all history.

I have before me a report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which is really a report of the subcommittee which took it upon itself to investigate the Rural Electrification Administration. This subcommittee report reminds us of the mountain that labored and brought forth a mouse.

The report itself when studied and carefully analyzed thoroughly might not be so bad, but a press report based on that document has done the Rural Electrification Administration a great injustice that should be corrected. The truth of the matter is that the Rural Electrification Administration should be complimented instead of criticized for the reason that it showed such clean bill of health as few Government agencies could have shown under the circumstances.

The cases of impropriety or misconduct of any kind which were exposed by this investigation were few indeed; and none of them could be attributed to any misconduct on the part of the Rural Electrification Administration. In only three instances, out of more than a thousand cooperative power associations that have borrowed from the REA—in only three instances—was there shown to be any action by the cooperative personnel that might be termed dishonest in any sense of the word and in only one case was there any embezzlement—and that case was prosecuted as a result of the suggestion, and insistence, of Secretary Wickard, in 1945.

That was a case in which an individual in New Hampshire embezzled $14,000 of money belonging to a local cooperative power association. It was discovered in 1944, and Mr. Wickard, when he later became head of the Rural Electrification Administration, demanded that this man be prosecuted.

The Federal Government did not lose a dime in any of these cases, and I understand the power association in New Hampshire was adequately insured against such a loss. Yet this case is being paraded by the Power Trust for the purpose of discrediting the Rural Electrification Administration.

This report discusses nine specific cooperatives, under the heading "Administrative difficulties." But, as I said, in only three of these instances was there any action by a cooperative personnel that might be termed dishonest in any sense of the word; and in only one case were funds embezzled. That was the New Hampshire case to which I have just referred.

Now remember, the Rural Electrification Administration has made loans to 1,067 borrowers throughout the country. Remember also, that in 1934 when

we first started this drive for rural electrification, there were only 743,954 farm homes throughout the entire Nation that were enjoying the use of electric energy. On June 30 of this year, there were 5,067,000 electrified farm homes throughout the Nation—as a result of the magnificent work of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The Rural Electrification Administration had already discovered the case of embezzlement referred to in the committee's report and had initiated corrective actions before the committee started its alleged study.

I wonder why the committee has not had printed the hearings in this investigation.

Let me call attention to the fact, also, that in none of the cases cited did the Federal Government lose a single penny. The officials of the rural electric power associations are bonded, and even this report shows that whatever loss was sustained in this single case of embezzlement has been made good. I repeat that neither the cooperative power association nor the Federal Government lost a penny.

Yet we find an alleged news article spread throughout the country smearing the Rural Electrification Administration and misleading the public into believing that its officials were guilty of misconduct.

Let me call attention to the fact that in 1934 we only had 10.9 percent of the farm homes of this country electrified. As a rule they were the farms right up near the large towns and cities. Today we have about 85 percent of the farm homes of this country electrified, and are moving forward to extend this service to every farm home that can be reached by the draft in times of war or by the tax collector in times of peace.

Let me also remind the House that during the fiscal year 1950 the Federal Government was repaid about $27,000,000 in principal, and paid about $13,500,000 in interest on REA loans. This brought the total repayments since the start of the program to $244,500,000, including more than $23,000,000 repaid ahead of schedule—while the loan payments that are overdue, more than 30 days, throughout the entire country, total only $763,000, or less than one-half of 1 percent of the total amount due.

I daresay there is not another agency of this Government, and few private enterprises, that can show a record for efficiency that even begins to compare with that of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I understand this committee now proposes to investigate loans for generating plants and transmission lines. I wonder who is behind that movement. It looks like the "hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob."

The Power Trust is doing its dead level best to get its hands on the water power of this Nation by browbeating Congress into stopping the construction of these transmission lines. If they ever succeed, it will cost the American people untold billions of dollars in overcharges for electricity in the years to come.

The power business is a public business.

Electricity is a necessity of our modern life. It must be handled by a monopoly, since the overhead expenses would be too great for a half dozen or a dozen concerns to attempt to supply electricity to the people of any one city, town, or community.

Besides, the water power of the Nation, which is the greatest wealth in America outside of the soil from which we live, already belongs to the Federal Government, as the Supreme Court of the United States definitely decided in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

To outlaw these transmission lines and turn this water power over to a private monopoly, with enough water in its stock to float the Navy—including the *Missouri*—would be one of the greatest outrages of modern times.

It must not happen.

These generating plants are necessary to firm this power up to the peak of the average year, or to supply electricity to those communities that are not able to secure an adequate supply at reasonable rates in any other manner.

If this committee is going to let itself be used to discredit agencies, such as the Rural Electrification Administration, which has rendered such marvelous service to the people of the Nation, then the committee ought to be abolished.

The Light of Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD an article written by Walter Lippmann and appearing in his syndicated column, Today and Tomorrow:

THE LIGHT OF ASIA

(By Walter Lippmann)

On Monday, in the Security Council, Sir Benegal N. Rau, representing the Government of India, offered, if he found enough support in principle for the idea, to move a resolution dealing with a settlement in Korea. The idea he presented is so well conceived, is so well timed in relation to the diplomatic situation in the UN and to the military situation in Korea, and has been put forward so deftly, that any government had better think twice before it fails to support it.

The crux of the idea is that the permanent members of the Security Council are, for the time being, not only incapable of agreeing on any settlement but that all are in varying degrees suspect in the eyes of the Koreans and the other peoples of Asia. The nonpermanent members only—none of them great military powers and none of them imperial powers—cannot, said Sir Benegal, "be accused or suspected of any expansionist ambitions."

There is no serious question but that this is a true expression of the judgment of Asia. Any proposal for a settlement originating among the Big Five is doomed to fail. It is doomed because the Big Five no longer dare to agree lest they appear to be weak. It is also doomed to fail because the suspicion of the peoples of Asia against the great powers is so very strong.

The Indian proposal would take the diplomatic initiative away from the great powers and give it to the small powers, led by India. Thus the proposals for a Korean settlement would be uncontaminated by the suspicion of imperialism and power politics, and they would bear the invaluable, indeed the indispensable, recommendation that they were the work of Asian thought and statesmanship.

The Indian action is well timed. The debate in the Security Council has reached a point where there was no chance of any understanding and yet there was nothing more to say. Mr. Malik had made his speech half a dozen times, and his principal arguments had been answered half a dozen times.

The law of diminishing returns had begun to set in for the arguments of both sides. Mr. Malik's constituents, having heard for 2 weeks that the United States is the aggressor in Korea, are soon bound to begin to ask what the great Soviet Union, the alleged lover and defender of the peace, is going to do about it. And our constituents all over the world, satisfied as they no doubt are that Mr. Malik is mischief bent, are beginning to ask what we are going to do about it except to make cutting remarks.

The time has clearly come when somebody has to act. But for the Russians as for ourselves the only actions left are to fight or to compromise. If neither is ready to fight and neither is willing to offer a compromise, then someone else, whose prestige is not at stake, must intervene.

The Indian action will help any government which has the sense to support it actively and cordially. It will embarrass any government which rejects it or evades it.

For it will provide the acid test in Asia, and almost certainly among the peace-loving masses of the western world also, of a disinterested purpose to achieve a just peace.

The Indian proposal is well timed in relation to the military situation. Though it is not as yet entirely certain, it is now probable that the United Nations forces will retain a foothold in Korea. In that event the world will not be dealing with the accomplished fact of the reunification of Korea by the North Korean Army. The campaign launched on June 25 will, despite all its successes, have been indecisive. The North Koreans will be faced with a long war unless there is a diplomatic solution. If there exists the plan of a fair and peaceable settlement for the whole of Korea, originated and sponsored by India and by the uncommitted nations of Asia, the North Koreans will find it hard to explain why the war must go on and why all the cities of Korea must be destroyed.

On the other hand, there is no use pretending that we too have not the strongest reasons for wishing to see a diplomatic solution. A victorious campaign back up the peninsula, assuming that the Korean war can be localized, is, of course, entirely within our power. Everybody knows that. Nobody would think of denying it. We do not have to prove to the world that the United States, supported by the British Commonwealth, is able to defeat North Korea.

What we do have to prove to the world is that we can help a country without destroying it. If we have to spend a year building up ground forces in the beachhead while the Air Force demolishes the roads, bridges, public utilities, and factories of all of Korea, the victory when it comes will indeed be Pyrrhic. Even if the operation is successful, the patient will be dead. We shall not have proved that we can contain aggression but only that we can wreck a country while the aggressor is trying to enslave it. That is not what we wish the Japanese, the Ger-

mans, the French, or anyone else to think that reliance upon collective security comes down to.

The Indian proposal is, therefore, most opportune as the Korean campaign is tending to end in what might be a long, expensive, and destructive stalemate.

Is Russia Ready?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard Wilson from the Miami Herald of August 11, 1950:

IS RUSSIA READY?—SPREAD OF UNITED STATES A-BOMB STOCKPILE HOLDS KEY TO WORLD WAR III

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Russia's military might is big but it can be made a mere illusion if the United States takes the right road in the next 6 months.

This is the conviction of a group of younger officers—a Pentagon brain trust—which has been studying the relative strength of the United States and the U. S. S. R. for several years.

It takes imagination to grasp the new line of thinking which is taking root among the younger officers at the Pentagon. First, it is necessary to shed the concept that 350 or 400 atomic bombs—which is not far from our present supply—is a large stockpile.

Second, the idea must be abandoned that atomic weapons are costly. They are the cheapest form of destruction known to mankind.

Third, the idea must be rejected that one atomic bomb of the improved Eniwetok type is so destructive that a very few of them can achieve victory.

The general impression on how the bomb will be used pictures a valhalla of devastated cities: New York, Chicago, Washington in ruins. This could certainly happen if Russia should decide to use its growing supply of weapons in one-way missions against this Nation's industrial centers.

But military men are emphasizing more and more the "tactical" use of the bomb against troops and frontline installations, rather than the strategic use against cities and industrial concentrations.

Thus, an atomic bomb might be used to attack a 30-ship convoy crossing the Atlantic. Or, it might be used merely for the destruction of a bridge which was of crucial concentration of troops, on railway yards, on tank and truck parks.

If the Russians adhere to their military psychology of past wars that is the way they will use their bombs in world war III. Some doubters still think the Russians do not have an atomic weapon, citing as their only evidence one fact and one fallacy.

The fact is that President Truman referred only to an atomic explosion when he announced that the United States had detected atomic particles in the air which could have come only from the U. S. S. R. The fallacy is that a country must be big, rich, and like the United States in its industrial technology before it can make a bomb.

Physicists know, however, that once atomic fission is discovered the discoverers know how to make a bomb. Physicists also know that the technology of actually manufacturing bombs does not require a technology anywhere near the level of the United States, in spite of the popular impression to the contrary.

Therefore, qualified atomic scientists must assume, as most of them do, that Russia not only has an atomic bomb but a supply of them. It has known the theoretical secret and technology long enough to have manufactured a supply. The number 15 is chosen because of the time element involved since the first atomic explosion was detected.

Military planners looking to the war of the future, 3 to 5 years hence, must assume, therefore, that the Red army will have a formidable supply of atomic weapons. They already know that atomic development is given a higher priority in Russia than in the United States.

What should the United States do about it? The answer is simple if the concept of the advanced thinkers is followed. We should take the blinders off and begin a vast expansion of the atomic program on the order of 300 to 55 percent. This expansion might ultimately provide us a stockpile of 15,000 atomic weapons rather than 1,000.

We should, without any further delay, develop the whole panoply of weapons—atomic artillery shells, baby bombs (the full-sized atomic bomb in a small package), shaped charges (to penetrate tanks), atomic guided missiles, atomic fighter-bombers.

We should equip Europe's 17 divisions with these new death-dealing weapons at a rapid pace.

Furthermore, we should organize in Europe a plan of demolition in the path of a possible Red Army advance.

And then we should take a further step which requires us to think in new terms. We should recognize that for the first time in history it is possible for a nation to stockpile enough bombs so that even though the enemy could win the war, he could not accept the damage that would be inflicted on him. An atomic bomb does not become obsolete.

What nation would fight a war without a certain promise of victory?

What nation would start a war knowing that it would end in self-destruction?

Would the Russians move at all in Europe if they knew that England and France each had hundreds of bombs loaned or sold to them by the United States?

Why don't we take advantage now of our superior position in atomic production by vastly increasing it and by supplying the English and the French with bombs? What can be gained by further secrecy and limitation when the Russians already have the bomb?

These questions are still met by the familiar reply in Washington: "We must protect our atomic know-how." But a new line of thinking is developing which, if finally accepted at the highest level, at least arouses the hope that the atomic strength of a defender can be made so great that no aggressor will start a general war.

Private Enterprise Collects Federal Taxes Without Cost to the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, actual costs of many phases of government today are hidden in services rendered the Government through private enterprise and at the expense of private enterprise.

These costs represent the time consumed in collection and the paper work involved in withholding taxes, social-security funds, and savings-bond sales. One firm for example, Chrysler Corp., recently released statistics showing that during 1949 Chrysler prepared and filed 255,000 separate tax forms and returns. Paper work in connection with taxes cost the corporation $500,000 a year. Also Chrysler collected in 1949 more than $20,000,000 in income withholding and old-age taxes. From July 1941 to June 30, 1950, it sold through its own staff and processed 6,161,379 bonds having a maturity value of $201,754,575.

Sometime ago I recognized the burden placed on private enterprise which is required to act as an agent for the Government in making tax collections, and I introduced H. R. 5230 to provide a reasonable reimbursement to firms for the expenses they incurred in such collections.

Since expenses of firms in behalf of the Government are reflected in higher costs of production and of necessity passed on to the public in retail pricing, no loss to the public and to the taxpayer would result if the Government assumed at least part of its rightful obligation for the cost of tax collections, and the American people would then know the actual cost of this function of Government which is now hidden and not calculated in Government expenditures.

In these days of fantastic budgets and fabulous spending, it is high time that we cease ignoring costs and examine our whole domestic budget with a view of charging all actual and necessary expenses to the Government and to eliminating all wasteful and nonessential spending.

The following is a copy of H. R. 5230 which, in my opinion, should receive the attention of this Congress. In the face of increased corporation taxes and many other expenses, it would appear only fair to give consideration to relief for private enterprise from the burden it must assume in the collection of taxes for the Government.

H. R. 5230

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide compensation for employers required to withhold income tax at source on the wages of employees

Be it enacted, etc., That subchapter D of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the collection of income tax at source on wages) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1628. Compensation to Employers for Withholding.

"(a) Compensation granted: The Commissioner shall, not less frequently than once a year, compensate each employer (other than a governmental employer) for the actual cost to the employer of deducting and withholding a tax at source on the wages of his employees, as required by this subchapter.

"(b) Claim required: No compensation shall be granted under this section to any employer for any period unless claim therefor is made and filed in accordance with

regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(c) Limit on compensation: The amount of compensation under this section to any employer for any period shall not exceed 10 percent of the aggregate amount lawfully deducted and withheld by the employer under this subchapter during such period.

"(d) Proof of cost: Compensation shall be granted under this section for any period only if the employer establishes to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the actual cost to the employer for such period of deducting and withholding tax under this subchapter.

"(e) Relation to income tax: For the purposes of the tax imposed by chapter 1—

"(1) compensation granted under this section shall not be considered income; but

"(2) to the extent that compensation is granted under this section for any cost, such cost shall not be allowable as a deduction for any taxable year.

"(f) Governmental employer defined: As used in this section, the term 'governmental employer' means the United States, or a State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of one or more of the foregoing."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to costs incurred on or after the date of enactment of this act.

Some Quotations on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

SOME QUOTATIONS ON KOREA—WHAT OUR LEADERS SAID, BEFORE AND AFTER

(Compiled by Richard Spong)

Given 4 or 5 months more training, American ground troops throughout the world will be able to take on anybody, any time, anywhere—Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, November 3, 1949.

The reduced budget of $13,545,000,000 for the armed services offers an adequacy of defense for any situation that may arise in the next 2 years—Defense Secretary Johnson, January 10, 1950.

If South Korea were invaded, our attitude would be that South Korea would be able to resist—Secretary of State Acheson, January 12.

The defenses of the United States are in better shape than they have ever been when the country was not at war—President Truman, March 2.

The situation is now not nearly as bad as in the first half of 1946—President Truman, May 4.

The basic reason I have for concluding that there will not be a war soon is because of the changed nature of war—General MacArthur, May 26.

The world is closer to peace now than it has been in the last 5 years—President Truman, June 1.

As you establish here a wholesome society of steadily expanding well-being, you will set up a peaceful influence which will disintegrate the hold of Soviet communism on your fellows to the north and irresistibly draw them into unity with you.—John Foster Dulles to Korean Assembly, June 19.

If we can hold for a month, the worst will be over—Gen. Chung I. Kwun, South Korean chief of staff, June 28.

The morale of North Korean troops is reported deteriorating under the continued pressure of United States air attacks—MacArthur headquarters, July 11.

The enemy has had his great chance but failed to exploit it—General MacArthur, July 20.

We aren't going to give up one more inch. We are going to stand and fight. There is no thought in the minds of anybody in this army that there is a chance—even if we were so disposed—that there could possibly be a Dunkerque—Gen. Walton H. Walker, July 29.

We had hell kicked out of us this morning.—General Walker, July 31.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

On this fifth anniversary of VJ-day, we face this grim fact:

All-out war may come again to us, any day.

And we are not prepared for it. For we have neither the trained men nor the proper equipment to defend ourselves.

These deficiencies can be remedied, if we have time. We pray that we will.

Meanwhile, we must pay the price of our short-sightedness. It is a high price, too. Lives are being sacrificed in Korea. Lives which might have been saved had our troops been better trained and better equipped—and if we had had enough trained men to do the job our troops have been called upon to do.

This emergency has demonstrated that there is no adequate substitute for a sound system of universal military training. In no other way can we build up a reservoir of trained manpower of sufficient size to defend the Nation against attack.

Russia has 2,900,000 men in her army.

The United States has 591,700, and hopes to increase that total to a million within a few months. But more months of training will be required before the new recruits are prepared to take the field against troops as well trained as the Russians, or even many of the Soviet satellite troops, are known to be.

Until this new army is built up, largely from green draftees, and is ready to fight, this country will be in grave danger.

We would not be in this position if universal military training had been enacted in 1946 when President Truman, General Marshall, Governor Dewey, General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, and many other national leaders asked for such a law.

The plan provided for training 850,000 men each year. That would have given us trained Reserves of between three and four million men. If we had had that kind of force last June the Soviet probably would not have launched its campaign of aggression.

Britain is in much better shape than we are in this respect.

The British have a combination selective service and universal military training system. Under it, a million Britons have received training under actual service conditions since the end of World War II.

All qualified men between the ages of 18 and 26 must serve 18 months in one of the three fighting services. This period of full-time service is followed by 3 years of part-time service in the territorial army, similar to our National Guard. By 1954 the British Territorial Army will consist of 500,000 men who have had regular army service, most of it overseas. They also will have a million and a half trained men in reserve.

The legislation the American Legion currently is sponsoring calls for 6 months' basic military instruction. After that the trainees would be granted several options, including National Guard service, to complete the remainder of a required year's training. We are far from satisfied that this plan would produce the needed results. But it is better than having no training system at all.

In war, training, discipline, and equipment are decisive.

The penalty for being second best is surrender or death.

Our boys in Korea have been outnumbered. They've also been up against an enemy better trained and better equipped.

When a soldier turns tail and runs he isn't necessarily a coward. It's usually a case of confusion, because he hasn't been taught what to do instinctively in a crisis. That is a result of lack of training and poor discipline.

The well-trained soldier knows that the best defense is a strong offensive, in which every man plays his part. He knows that a break in the line invites disaster both for himself and his comrades. Moreover, he is confident the other members of his unit will not look back. That is the difference between an army and a mob.

Every American must share responsibility for the disasters in Korea, because the men we've sent there haven't had the training, the equipment, or the numbers to do their job.

We should adopt a universal military training system promptly, so that this can never happen again.

Shoot a Few

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN H. GUILL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Borger (Tex.) News-Herald:

SHOOT A FEW

Although the situation in Korea is grave, our greatest danger is right here at home.

Too long we have listened to those who have told us that capitalism could live side by side with communism; that Chinese communism was of a different and better brand than Russian communism; that we, instead of Russia, are the warmongers; and that we should soft-pedal our criticism of communism because Russia was our ally in World War II.

Russia was not our ally in World War II. Russians did nothing for us in World War II that could possibly offset the harm they did our national-defense effort up until the very minute that they became engaged in a war with Germany. We all remember how they sided with Hitler and his Nazi regime in trying to keep our Nation weak up until those two evil persons, Stalin and Hitler,

ceased to be friends when Hitler betrayed Stalin by attacking Russia.

June 22, 1941, when Germany invaded Russia, Stalin's communistic party in the United States made an abrupt change from pro-Nazi and anti-American to anti-Nazi and everything to save dear old Russia.

Six months later, when we entered the war, Russia was fighting for its very existence, and was practically a defeated nation. We became their ally and proceeded to defend Russia against Germany. All Russia did was to fight for her existence and accept billions of dollars of war material from us, giving us in return only insults and obvious contempt. Yes; we were their ally, but they were not in any sense of the world at any time our ally.

It is no longer a question of business as usual in our own Nation, faced again with wartime controls. That of its very nature places us under what we can only hope must be a temporary form of dictatorship. It can be good, temporarily, for the purpose of winning the war, if we immediately and vigorously set our house in order so that we may win this world war III.

LEADERSHIP NEEDED

It is a time that calls for courageous leadership. We need national leadership that will do what should be done to win this war regardless of political considerations. This means that we need men who have the courage to make all Communists and fellow travelers within our own country incapable of doing us further harm.

Now is no time to have one eye on Korea and the other eye on the November elections. If our present leadership displays the sort of courage and intelligent action that loyal Americans have a right to expect at this critical hour, these gentlemen need not fear the popular voice of the people when reduced to ballot form at our regular elections.

There is no need trying to hide facts and avoid honest self-criticism at this time when we must put our house in order.

Only the strong will survive this war and we as a nation of people must be the stronger.

The facts are that our Nation today is under a continuation of the leadership that won victory in World War II only to display exceedingly poor judgment in the matter of preserving world peace which should have been the fruits of that victory. In other words we lost the fruits of the victory because our leadership proved unequal to the situation, whether we like to admit this fact or not.

Notwithstanding all that has been said during the last war and since the last war by prominent Americans, over the radio, in our national magazines, and in our newspapers, giving adequate and fair warning as to what would happen to us if we permitted Russia to continue, as we have permitted Russia to continue, to force democracy into one constant retreat, our leaders have permitted communism to become a definite threat to our very existence.

Too many people in our country have espoused the cause of communism and have directly and indirectly shielded communism and its fellow travelers. Otherwise, why would it be so difficult for us to convict those whom we have placed on trial because of things they have done or said that strongly condemn them in the eyes of decent and loyal American citizens?

Americans are an intelligent people. They also love peace. Charity, faith, and hope are their constant companions. This, unfortunately, has left them open to the most brutal conspiracy ever designed by the mind of man, and that is the conspiracy of communism with its goal to enslave all people.

Perhaps this will explain why Martin Dies and others, who as members of the Un-American Activities Committee have worked hard to expose communism in our Government and in our Nation, have met with such strong and bitter rebuffs from people who should have known better but who no doubt were being guided more by the nobler instincts of their hearts than by cold reasoning based on the reflections of current events.

It will do us very little good to sacrifice our men overseas, as we are now doing in Korea, if we continue to permit Communists and fellow travelers right here at home to do their evil work.

If we would isolate all known Communists either on some island or in some camp remote from civilization, we would probably save the lives of thousands of our men and boys who otherwise would die in combat with Russians and Russian slaves.

No one would suggest that these people be mistreated, although it would be quite proper to shoot a few of them when found guilty of treason. The main thing is to put them where they cannot do us any further harm.

It will be bad enough for them to consume the food and other essentials so vitally needed by loyal Americans making every possible sacrifice to defend our way of life.

This might leave the fellow travelers out in the open but with the known Communists locked up, it would not be quite so hard for the FBI to keep an eye on the fellow travelers. Then, whenever a fellow traveler should expose himself as an enemy working against our war effort, we could provide him with comfortable living quarters with the rest of his Communist friends in their isolated retreat from the responsibilities of the world.

If ever there was a time when we needed men in political office who would put duty to their country first, second, and last, it is now. Politicians and lesser politicians can go their way but when the chips are down the people will vote for the man and men who have the intestinal fortitude to win this war and make the rest of the world respect us forever.

UNTIL WE KNOW

Isn't it bad enough that our weakness is obvious to all the world in the defeats we are now suffering in Korea, thanks to the neglect of our military and diplomatic departments that failed to properly prepare for such a grave emergency?

Must we continue to leave ourselves open to further defeats through neglect on the home front where the agents of communism constitute an element of danger even greater than the possible loss of every man now in Korea which now confronts us?

Decent and loyal Americans look to their leadership for total preparedness.

We must, as quickly as possible, place our Nation on a total-war footing and we must stay on a basis of total preparedness for war until such time as we know that the enemy is totally disarmed and made harmless to cause further suffering throughout the world.

We cannot again demobilize until we know that Russia will keep the peace.

Services of Hon. J. Hardin Peterson, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a member of the House of Representatives is voluntarily retiring this year who will be missed by everyone. I refer to the genial, lovable, distinguished gentleman from Florida, the Honorable J. HARDIN PETERSON. In my 14 years here, I can think of no Member who has more friends or who has worked harder or more effectively.

It was my privilege to become fairly well acquainted with Mr. PETERSON during my first term, when in the summer of 1938 we both served on the Joint Select Committee for the Investigation of Phosphate Resources. I found him then to be industrious, sincere, pleasant, fair, and honest. Those are attributes which are prized in any group and nowhere more than in the House of Representatives. Years of association have only increased the degree in which I would ascribe them to the gentleman from Florida.

I also saw him in action at close range some years later, when he brought a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands to South Dakota to consider some questions of peculiar interest to our State. He gave every witness who appeared the most courteous of treatment and many people were impressed by the interpretation which his conduct gave to the dignity and character of a committee of the Congress.

During the Eighty-first Congress, we have all again had occasion to witness his great industry and generous giving of time to the flood of bills on the wide range of subjects handled by the Committee on Public Lands. I have the opinion that this committee under his leadership has considered and acted upon a greater number of bills than any similar committee in the history of the House. "Pete" has done a great job; he has earned his retirement. We all hope he lives many, many years to enjoy it and to return once in a while to visit old scenes and old friends on Capitol Hill.

Hon. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, and the House Un-American Activities Committee—Great Credit Due Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by George Rothwell Brown which recalls the gallant fight by our colleague, Hon. JOHN RANKIN, for the establishment of the old Dies committee to be a permanent House committee, under the name of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The value of the committee to this country cannot be judged now. It is safe to say, however, that it is the one committee which has brought to judgment one Alger Hiss. Others of his type are still at large but are well known.

Mr. Speaker, it was the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] whose persistent effort forced a change in the

rules on the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress. I shall never forget his fight. His victory will always be a monument to him while a Member of this House.

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

SAN FRANCISCO, August 15.—On January 3, 1945, the House of Representatives made a decision upon which the fate of this country depended, although perhaps few realized then the extent to which this was true.

On that fateful day, over the protests of Roosevelt's stooges in the Democratic leadership, the Un-American Activities Committee was established as one of the standing committees of the House with full powers to make investigations into the Communist conspiracy and to formulate and report proposed legislation to deal with it.

This function it is now exercising, and the Red peril is being dealt with.

The old Dies committee was expiring. When the usual routine motion was made on the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress to adopt the rules of the previous Congress, Representative RANKIN (Democrat), of Mississippi, offered an amendment to create the present Un-American Activities Committee.

Caught off guard the Democratic leaders strove vainly to prevent its adoption.

RANKIN charged that if it were defeated a vast amount of evidence gathered by the Dies committee over a 7-year period, would be destroyed.

We now understand what a national calamity that would have been.

A coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats forced the adoption of the Rankin motion, 208 to 186.

As we look back we realize that no more important vote than this has been taken in Congress for many years.

If the committee investigating the Communist conspiracy had died that day, and no successor had been created, Alger Hiss would not have been exposed, indicted, tried and convicted.

We would be at war with Soviet Russia—as actually we are—with a fifth column of traitors in our midst, whose treason has neither been suspected nor laid bare.

The top Communist leaders who have been put on trial in New York, and for whom the jails are opening their doors, would still be at liberty, free to carry out their plots against the security of this Republic.

"There is a world-wide conspiracy," Representative Cox of Georgia, told the House—"There is a campaign against constitutional government going on all over the world.

"The people who are engineering and participating in the furtherance of this campaign are the people who are most often denouncing the work of the Dies committee."

Among the 186 House Members who voted to end the investigation of the Communist menace in this country, on that eventful day, were some who were just too plain dumb and fuzzy-minded to realize the gravity of what they were doing.

But VITO MARCANTONIO knew what he was doing all right, and you may lay to that.

Some there were who realized that if the Dies Committee passed out of existence the Department of Justice would raise no hand to expose the spies of the Kremlin, and their traitorous American pawns.

They were right. It was not the Attorney General, but members of the Un-American Activities Committee, who relentlessly pursued and finally brought Alger Hiss to justice.

There is a significant connection between that fateful vote in the House and the senatorial contest in California.

One of the members of the committee who kept relentlessly after Hiss until they got the goods on him, pumpkin papers and all, is the Republican candidate, Representative RICHARD M. NIXON.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, first session, Seventy-ninth Congress, January 3, 1945, shows that on that date the former movie star who is running against him for the Senate, Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, voted to kill the Un-American Activities Committee.

That this was by no mere accident is further shown by the fact that subsequently she has consistently voted to deny funds to this committee which enable it to carry on its exposure of the Kremlin's conspiracy against the safety and security of the American people and their form of government.

In all the 10 States whose political situations have been surveyed by this reporter for the past month, the people are making the Communist menace—and especially subversion, actual or suspected, within the Government in Washington—a paramount issue.

They see it closely connected with the war in Korea.

In California where the line is so sharply drawn, it may be the determining factor in the senatorial campaign.

Questions the President Should Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an unusual, sincere letter from a young wife from my home town.

She has asked me many questions which only the Democratic Party can answer because the Democratic Party is in control of all three branches of our Government.

As a Member of Congress I have patiently waited for President Truman to tell the people his plans, his policy. This he has not done; the people remain in the dark. I deeply regret that it will be necessary to write this young lady that I cannot answer her questions until the Chief Executive informs Congress of his plans.

GALENA, ILL., *August 14, 1950.*

HON. LEO ALLEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My husband, home for a brief four and a half years after 3 years service in the Marine Corps, is again being forced into active service. The Marine Corps issues a blunt command, my husband and thousands of other men are forced to leave their families, jobs, everything they hold dear, without being told even one simple fact as to their future.

Therefore, you, as a representative of the people, one of the men who passes the laws which govern and rule our country, are being asked to give me these facts.

First, I wish to know how long the Government can force my husband to remain in service? If there is no world war III after the Korean conflict is settled, can my husband be forced to remain in service for years waiting for a war?

Secondly, my husband is a veteran, he is 28 years of age, has a family and is trying to buy a home, whereas there are millions of men in this country single and married who enjoy all liberties of this country, but have never served a day in the armed services. Will there be some form of replacement, so that as time passes these men being called on now can expect to be released?

Third, will my husband and other American men be sent to fight in every foreign country that a shot is fired? Most Americans do not object to fighting and dying to protect their own country, but the American people are greatly concerned and outraged that American men be forced to fight and die for other countries—anyone of whom would stab us in the back were the opportunity presented.

Therefore, will you please, if possible, relieve some of the heartache and tension going on in the minds and hearts of millions of Americans by telling people a few facts. The majority of people are kept in ignorance—that is why there is so much fear today. We are supposed to be a free people—these days that is quite difficult to keep believing.

Last, explain to me the laws and functions of the Reserve Corps of the various services. My husband joined against my wishes—he'll never join any military organization again—neither will a large majority of the men who have been caught in this trap.

I do not mean to be rude or in any way criticize my Government or its lawmakers—I have much to be grateful for due to my Government and these lawmakers. I only wish to understand these things that I have asked you. If you could and would explain some facts to me my heart and mind would be greatly relieved when my husband has to leave me.

Sincerely,
LAVONNE (SCHLEICHTER) DAVENPORT.

The Postal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the passage of H. R. 8195 because I felt that the arbitrary action of the Postmaster General in issuing the curtailment order was unnecessary and certainly not in the best interests of the people.

It seemed to me that more valid means of economy were available to the administration. Indeed, had the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to the reorganization of the Post Office Department been carried out, there would have been no need for such drastic action and a sum far in excess of the savings accomplished by this move would have been realized. Had these recommendations been carried out, it is estimated that a saving of $256,000,000 would have resulted. The curtailment of so vital a public service is certainly not the answer to the need for economy. It would be more feasible, it seems to me, to increase the cost of the luxury services of the Department, such as air mail and parcel post.

Moreover, it is important that our industries should have the benefit of adequate mail service, particularly at this time of national danger. Let us not be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Furthermore, rapid mail service is a tremendous factor in the morale of our fighting men.

Originally the need for the curtailment of postal service was explained as

resulting from action by the House Appropriations Committee in cutting the Post Office budget for the fiscal year 1951. The fact of the matter is that a substantial cut in the appropriations for the Post Office Department for 1951 was made by the executive department—by the Bureau of the Budget. In addition, on October 16, 1949, H. R. 91 was signed into public law. This measure provides a long-range development program for improvement in the functioning of the Department. It is high time to implement this legislation.

I hope that the present administration, realizing the popular demand for economy, particularly at this time of defense spending, will proceed to effect the changes and adjustments necessary to make this Government Department an efficient modern functioning agency.

Malik's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

MALIK'S SERVICE

Jacob Malik, head of the Soviet Union's delegation to the United Nations, serves as President of the Security Council during this month. He has so far succeeded in stalling all progress toward a discussion of an American resolution that would condemn North Korean aggression and urge all member nations to use their influence to stop the fighting and to avoid any further incidents of the sort.

Mr. Malik has, however, served one good purpose. The tone and content of his harangues has proved to the entire free world that the Russian Government is cynically dedicated to the Hitlerian technique of the big lie. Mr. Malik lies, and knows he is doing so, but, of course, he has a secret police agent right at his back, and with him it is a case of whether to lie or die.

Mr. Malik's performance indicates that no one would ever want a Red government, unless it were people who are essentially thieves, despots, and liars themselves. Incidentally, the people we have lately been arresting for betraying their country look the part.

To Win, Our Men in Korea Need a Cause To Fight for—Our Foreign Policy Needs Defining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, what are we fighting for? Why are we in Korea? There are but a few of the questions that reports from the war front inform us are being asked by the average GI.

The answer to these questions must be supplied before our Armed Forces can be welded into an effective team force capable of fighting with an aggressive determination that will produce maximum gains on the battlefield.

The GI understands that he has been sent to fight for his life in a war which he has been informed is a part of a United Nations action. But where are the soldiers from other nations who were to support him in the Korean war? Why is he facing the reality of guns, bullets, bayonets, and all the ingenious monster of destruction devised by man while soldiers from other member nations of the UN remain at home?

FROM UN MEMBER NATIONS

To date, military help actually in the field in the Korean conflict consists of one fighter squadron, one destroyer, and one frigate from Australia. Great Britain has sent two aircraft carriers, three cruisers, six destroyers, six frigates, one hospital ship, and one tanker. Canada has produced three destroyers and one air-transport squadron. The Netherlands sent one destroyer.

Where are the infantrymen, the combat flyers from other nations? They are not in Korea and our American GI's want to know why all the suffering and the dying for a UN cause has been assigned to them.

WHERE IS UN HELP?

Military help, which may be too little and too late, has been offered from other sources to be delivered in the future, including 2,000 troops from Australia, 2,000 to 3,000 troops from New Zealand, 5,000 infantrymen from the Philippine Republic, 4,500 troops from Turkey, a 4,000-man combat team from Thailand, a self-contained ground force of 6,000 from Great Britain, a volunteer brigade of 4,000 to 5,000 troops from Canada, 500 volunteers from Costa Rica, and 30 officers from Bolivia.

Offers of men for combat total approximately 28,000, but the GI in Korea still asks "Where are the others?" They are not in Korea fighting and dying side by side with an estimated 75,000 Americans.

Nationalist China offered 33,000 troops and 20 transport planes for use in Korea, but this offer was not accepted.

In addition to the military assistance already listed, Panama has offered volunteers, but not stated the number. In materials Norway offers some sea transportation. India offers one ambulance unit and one surgical unit. Belgium offers air transportation. France offers one sloop, Greece six transport planes. The Union of South Africa offers one fighter squadron, Denmark 10 ambulances with personnel, and Sweden a 200-bed field hospital with personnel.

Thus far, however, the aid given or promised by other UN members is small compared with United States forces now engaged in combat in Korea and the vast number of men now being drafted into the Armed Forces in America.

It is time for American leadership to emerge with some definite constructive explanation of our policy abroad, both as a nation and as a member of the United Nations organization, and including our objectives in the Korean conflict. The time has come for the United States to assume the initiative in world affairs.

WILL KOREA VICTORY STOP COMMUNISM?

American GI's have a right to know whether victory in Korea can be expected to stem Communist aggression in Asia, whether when victory is won the administration will follow military success with appropriate action to bring Asia into the fold of democracy. If Korea is permitted, at the end of this bloody war to return to the Communist fold and continue as a satellite of Russia, then the question of the American GI can well be echoed by Americans everywhere.

Two world wars have been fought in this century to "make the world safe for democracy." Twice have the young men, our best and finest, been sacrificed on bloody battlefields in the far corners of the globe to win decisive victories which they were told would save their sons and grandsons from the horrors of future war.

And the American soldier marched away to battle, fought and won to protect and preserve his country and to secure the blessings of liberty and peace for posterity.

And at the end of each war the administration in power, a Democratic administration, failed completely to consolidate the victory won by force and forge an effective and lasting peace.

Today our leaders vacillate from one position to another. President Truman hailed American intervention in Korea as a step which would bring lasting world peace nearer than it had been prior to that momentous occasion. But within a few weeks' time the inevitability of a third world war was being discussed in many quarters. Americans are being called upon to sacrifice, but are told that whether their sacrifices will bring peace or war only a handful of men in Moscow know and will decide.

FIRM FOREIGN POLICY NEEDED

This Nation, founded by men such as Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and John Adams, cannot remain in such a state of submission to the whims of another unfriendly power. This United States, which in its infancy accepted the challenge of the British Empire in the War of 1812, surely cannot assume passive acceptance of the present situation.

We must have a definite policy both as a nation and as a member of the United Nations. If we are to act in coordination with other nations of the world to prevent the spread of direct threats to the freedom of the western world, then the time has arrived for our allies to shoulder that burden to the full extent to which they are able and with equal sacrifice to that of the American people.

Unless we know at least where our leaders hope to take us, what we can hope to accomplish through the program of world-wide commitments of American resources and manpower, the GI in Korea or any other part of the world where he may be engaged will continue to ask that simple question, "Why am I here?"

The following article from the New York Times by Richard J. H. Johnston indicates the total lack of an adequate, strong, and positive foreign policy:

GI'S IN KOREA HANDICAPPED BY UNAWARENESS OF MISSION

(By Richard J. H. Johnston)

TOKYO, August 11.—A lack of psychological preparation for violence and the dangers of armed combat has proved one of the greatest weaknesses among average American soldiers in their efforts in Korea to stem the relentless and fanatical tide of Communist invaders.

On one's return to this headquarters after more than 2 weeks with the troops along the fringe of the defense line, an evaluation of the GI's predicament in Korea begins to take form.

The average GI seems not to know why he is fighting in Korea. He does not seem to understand why as a United Nations soldier he has only South Koreans beside him in the battle line. He appears puzzled that he was thrust with all haste from the soft comforts of garrison duty in Japan, Okinawa, and Hawaii or the peaceful atmosphere of the United States into the filth and violence of the battlefield.

He faces a foe who is zealous, resourceful, and hard. All of this adds up in the GI's mind to a conclusion that someone has put him into a mess he does not understand.

This correspondent has talked with soldiers beside thundering artillery pieces, on chow lines, in convoys moving to the front, in fox holes, aid stations, ambulances, and hospitals, aboard trains and planes to and from the battle area, aboard troop ships tied up at Korean piers, in the heat of sun-baked river beds, and at lonely mountain-top outposts.

Only a few of the older noncommissioned officers and officers expressed knowledge and understanding of the significance of their mission.

But to the GI who must bear the brunt of the fighting, the realization that service in the regular peacetime Army involved the risk of death on a strange battleground came only when he moved into the combat area.

GI IS DISILLUSIONED

"The recruiting posters didn't say anything about this," one young infantryman said as he moved toward the front. "I'll fight for my country, but damned if I see why I'm fighting to save this hell hole.

"I heard some stuff on the way over about this being a United Nations deal. Where's the rest of the United Nations?"

Asked what they were doing when this war began, the soldiers gave such replies as these:

"I guarded dependent houses on Okinawa."

"I swam every afternon at Waikiki."

"I just finished basic training back in the States."

Talks with troops who had been blooded in battle revealed bitterness and a conviction that they were being sacrificed to American unpreparedness.

The flame of determination here glimmered fitfully in a few individuals. The majority revealed no inspired determination.

VETERAN FIGHTS FOR LIFE

"I'll tell you what I'm fighting for," a veteran of the Bulge said, "I'm fighting for my life."

The tragic commitment under the press of events of handfuls of troops daily in the war left the GI's with a feeling of hopelessness and nakedness.

The saw themselves as a small scattered band dropped into the Korean Peninsula with paralyzing suddenness. They had at the time only a thin tenuous supply line. Behind them lay the homeland, momentarily neither at peace nor at war.

There have been acts of heroism, but in the words of one colonel:

"Acts of heroism inspire others to do the impossible, but in war the final impossible can be achieved only by teamwork. We have an Army but no team. We are only a handful here and the enemy seems limitless. We can hold for a while here and there, but until there are many more of us, there is little we can do except die."

A commander of infantry said: "I can tell my men what to do. I can show them how to do it. But until they understand why they are doing it, they can't do it well.

"These men are doing the best they can, but as you can see it's not enough."

His observations were paraphrased by a 19-year-old corporal, recounting his experiences after his position had been overrun:

"I keep asking myself what I am doing here. The funny thing is I can't answer my own question."

OUR FOREIGN POLICY NEEDS DEFINING

Our foreign policy is so doubtful that our military leaders have been unable to inform our fighting men in Korea of what they are fighting for. How can the most modern military equipment in the hands of well-trained men, who have no understanding of the issues for which they are fighting—which has reduced the effect of their arms to the serious point of almost defeat—be successful against the fanatical determination, courage, and drive of the North Koreans with less-modern arms and no supporting air power or naval force?

There is a crying need for adequate leadership in the executive branch of the Government, for fewer politicians and "stripe pants 4-o'clock tea diplomats," and for more men of purpose and unquestioned loyalty to the people of the United States.

Undoubtedly the reason we do not have such men at the present time in these important offices is because the Democratic Party has been in power too long, has become indifferent to the needs of the people, and evidently believes that its entrenched power cannot be challenged.

The Faith of Our Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a noteworthy address recently delivered by the Honorable William Jennings Bryan, Jr., the son of the son of the great Commoner.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS

(By William Jennings Bryan, Jr.)

So, let's take another look at American democracy, and try to understand the spiritual basis of the ideals under which it was created.

These ideals are expressed in the first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Such were the ideals for which our forefathers fought the War of Independence. It is no mere figure of speech to say that America was the cradle of liberty, for in that struggle for independence, there was born the kind of democracy of which men had long dreamed, but had never before achieved.

But our Constitution was not achieved without a bitter struggle, for there were in the Constitutional Convention many strong men who did not trust the people, and who fought for a strong centralized government. Moreover, the States were jealous of their individual powers and did not want to surrender them to a government set up by all of the people of all of the States.

It was a herculean task to overcome the doubts and fears and prejudices of the delegates to the Continental Congress and to the Constitutional Convention. The ideals of democracy expressed in the Declaration of Independence trembled in the balance until the last desperate struggle for ratification in the State conventions was ended. In some of these States, a margin of one vote spelled the difference between victory and defeat. So grave were the doubts of ratification that the convention made the acceptance by 9 of the 13 Colonies sufficient to establish the Government.

The thing that made our Government different from all other forms of constitutional government was not the division of its functions into legislative, executive, and judicial departments, and the system of checks and balances to limit the powers of each of its branches, rather it was the fact that it recognized the individual as supreme, and that each citizen held in his puny hands all the powers of government.

The Constitution itself is replete with reservations of powers to the States, and to the people. In construing it, our courts have held time and time again, that every power is reserved to the people, that is not, either in express terms or by necessary implication, given up by them, and vested exclusively in the Federal Government. The most vital words in the entire document are to be found in the preamble itself, "We, the people, in order to form a more perfect union * * * and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution."

And yet, the ink was scarcely dry upon the Constitution, when at its very first session, the Congress passed the first 10 amendments, known as the Bill of Rights, and presented them to the States for ratification. These expressed further limitations and reservations upon the powers of government, and defined in specific terms, certain rights of the people, certain liberties, upon which even the Government could not infringe.

The first amendment forbade the Congress to make any law abridging religious freedom, freedom of speech, of the press, or the right of the people to peaceable assemble, and petition the Government for redress of their grievances.

The fourth, expressed the right of the people to be secure in their persons and homes, against searches and seizures.

The fifth, that no person could be held to answer for an infamous crime, except upon indictment, or be compelled to be a witness against himself, or be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; the sixth, gave the right to trial by jury.

Then through the years, followed still other amendments, the abolition of slavery, direct election of Senators by the people, women's suffrage—all adopted to secure still further the rights and liberties of the individual.

But that was not all; the people took steps to make the State governments ever more responsive to their will. They adopted the direct primaries, so that individuals might run for elective office, regardless of political organizations or party action. They adopted the initiative and referendum, so that they might make or repeal the laws, regardless of the action of their legislators. They adopted the recall, so that public officials might be removed from office, if they betrayed the trust imposed in them.

In fact, the whole history of our democracy, from 1776 to this day, has been a continuous chronicle of measures and reforms, adopted to make Government, both State and Federal, more and more responsive to the will of the people.

We owe a debt of eternal gratitude to Thomas Jefferson, who did more than any other man to write into our organic law the freedoms of the common man. He was unalterably opposed to statism in any form. Even in his declining days, 30 years after our Nation was born, he still wrote of his faith. He must have had the statists in mind when he wrote: "It is sometimes said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others?" And witness the gentle irony of his conclusion: "Or have we found angels in the form of kings, to govern him? Let history answer this question."

And history has always answered. It has answered with the Hitlers, Mussolinis, and Stalins, and Quislings, and horrors of Pearl Harbor, and Lidice, and Auschwitz, and Buchenwald.

It has been an unending struggle, but there the laws stand, the principles of American democracy are now the law of the land. But that does not mean that our liberties are secure.

I want here, to challenge the statement that is so often made, that the Constitution guarantees our liberties, for it does nothing of the kind. We know from our own experience, there is sometimes a vast difference between the letter of the law and the spirit in which it is carried out. If we could just change men's hearts by passing a law, how simple our problems would be.

No; they cannot be changed in that way. The laws can state the rules and regulations to govern human conduct, but they cannot force men to carry them out, for no law can change human nature. No law can create patriotism or the desire for equality, or justice, or a passion for freedom, for these are spiritual attributes, that are born of the ideals and hopes and aspirations, that exist only in the hearts of men. There is no guaranty of your freedoms except the power, which comes from a spiritual determination, to achieve the equality and justice and good will, that our Constitution seeks to create.

The only reason we have our Constitution today, is that the blessings of liberty, were more precious than life to the men of that generation, and they were willing to fight and to die, in order to gain them. The same dauntless "spirit of '76" that inspired the men of that day is the only thing that can preserve them now. I sometimes wonder how many of us have lost that spirit today.

Have you ever stopped to think why this individual freedom was more precious than life to the revolutionary patriots and why it has been the goal of mankind since the beginning of time? Why, in every epoch in history, and regardless of race or color or creed men have fought to achieve it?

I think it was because out of the brutal slavery and serfdom of countless generations throughout the ages came the belated recognition of this spiritual freedom, as the source of all culture and progress, and as the divine spark that fires the creative spirit of man and generates the only force that can lift him above the brute.

I think it was because man learned from bitter experience that when thought is regimented it ceases to be creative; that when science is regimented it ceases to be science; that when literature is regimented it ceases to be literature and becomes propaganda; and that spiritual freedom is essential to the creative processes.

This spiritual freedom is a personal matter; it is an attribute only of the individual. Men can cooperate and work together to carry out a common plan. Ideas, once they are created, can be developed and explored and amplified, but there is no such thing as a collective mind.

Thoughts have to begin somewhere, and there is no fact in all the realm of science or of literature or of music or the arts that is not the product of individual thought.

There is literally nothing under the sun that has been gained in any other way. The paper on which this is written, the books you read, the painting you admire, the music you enjoy, the clothing that you wear, the medicines that cure your ills, the homes in which you dwell, the infinite machines that do your labor or flash your voice to the ends of the earth, the ships that plow the seas, the planes that track the boundless skies, all that you have that makes your life worth while was first a nebulous thought in the mind of some fellow man.

Each one of us profits from the labors of all who have gone before. All that you have you have received from your fellow man. In this respect you are the heirs of all the ages, and in this simple fact is the divine basis for the real brotherhood of man.

It seems to me there is something wrong with our histories which clutter their pages so largely with the rise and fall of empires, and the stratagems of wars, when the victories that have meant most to humanity, have been won without noise or fanfare in the humble shelters where man makes his home.

One by one we do count in all human affairs. By the mere fact of birth our individual unit is added to the sum of life's problems, and the part we can play in solving them depends upon whether we are free to create and upon what use we make of our freedom.

This spiritual freedom is the vital essence of American democracy. I think it is even more than that. I believe it is a part of the Creator's plan for the upward progress of the human race.

This philosophy of spiritual freedom is the thing that communism denies and inevitably destroys, and that is all we need to know to understand the specious sham of all its doctrines. It makes no difference whether they follow the pattern of a Marx or Engels, a Trotzky, a Lenin, or a Hitler, or a Stalin, or whether they talk of communism or socialism or fascism; their objectives are all the same.

They seek to construct a Frankenstein state, to control and coerce, to take over business and industry and the means of production, to take over the distribution of the products of labor, and make every man dependent for his very existence upon the dictates of the masters, of the omnipotent state. This is no step forward in human relations.

This was the dream of tyrants, before the days of Ghengis Khan. It is a brutal doctrine, that can only live through force and violence. It is a philosophy, which leads back to the darkness, from which man through the ages, has painfully groped his way, and not towards the welcoming dawn of a better day.

Our principles of democracy, express a philosophy of Government that inspires an abiding faith, in the ultimate triumph of right. It justifies hope, and confidence, in the betterment of human relations; for all things are possible, where man's spirit is free to create.

There are no insolvable problems, in a society where every man is equal in political power, and even the lowliest citizen, is still free to think, and act, and give of his individual efforts to make democracy live; for all things are changeable, save the inherent and unalienable rights of man.

Can there be any doubt, but that the minds that can split the atom, and unleash the physical forces, that can destroy the human race, can develop the spiritual forces that will enable men to cooperate and to live together in peace?

I suffer no delusions, as to the problems that will have to be met. We still have a long way to go, before we can gear our democratic processes, to keep pace with the changing demands of an ever-changing world. It can be done, for the power to change is in our hands, but it will take time, and patience, and effort. As Jefferson once said, "The ground to liberty, must be gained by inches, and we must be content to secure what we can gain, from time to time, and eternally press forward, for what is yet to come. It takes time, to persuade men to do, even what is for their own good."

The main thing, that is wrong with our country today, is that we of this generation, have taken our freedoms too much for granted, and have failed to assume the responsibility that is ours, to see that our democracy works.

We have failed in many respects to achieve the equality of opportunity our principles have sought to create, or to soften the social impacts a free competition entails. We believe in democracy, but we view with dismay many of the things that go on in our country today. Things that go on because we have been too much concerned with material progress to give much thought to our spiritual needs. We seem to have forgotten there is as much need for social stability and tranquillity as there is for progress of reform.

We certainly have not achieved the optimum distribution of the enormous production of our industrial machine; we suffer from overproduction and underconsumption of many of the necessities of life; too many of our people are hungry and unemployed; the security of the aged is far too uncertain; small business finds it harder and harder to meet the competition of vast aggregations of wealth; there are too many individuals who feel the Government owes them a living, regardless of their contributions to society. There are too many organized groups who, by political pressure, are demanding special consideration at the hands of government, at the expense of the public, who must pay all the bills.

These are all problems we will have to do something about. But let us make no mistake as to where the remedy lies.

The problems that plague us are not due to the failure of government. They are due to the failure of the American people to use the powers that are in their hands to keep the changing circumstances of an industrial age within the bounds our democracy requires.

The responsibility for much of this failure must be laid at the door of those who have created our vast industrial machine. They have been too busy with the problems of business to give much thought to the problems of life; too busy erecting an industrial empire to examine the social foundation upon which their world rests. For this reason they have not understood the spiritual basis of American democracy and the moral obligation our philosophy entails to see that the liberties under the law that we claim for ourselves are likewise preserved for every other citizen.

Oh I know there is no end to the problems that will have to be solved, but I know too that they can only be solved in the American way, by the creative genius of free men, working together for the common good.

Twenty-eighth Called Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 17 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Twenty-eighth Called Up," published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter, of August 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-EIGHTH CALLED UP

The expected has come to pass.

Ever since the North Korean horde was turned loose and sent smashing across the border into South Korea the American people have been warned that National Guard units would be alerted for active duty, and so the orders late yesterday afternoon calling up the famed Twenty-eighth Division, Pennsylvania's own, were received in stride.

It had been anticipated that when fighting men were needed, with training and background considered, that the famous Iron Division, which has an illustrious history, would be among the first to be called and thus the orders to return home for summons to service about the first of September were no surprise.

However, there is no dancing in the streets of Washington and the other communities which are sending their men into active service. The road ahead is certain to be filled with hardship and suffering, but we realize that a job of more than ordinary magnitude has to be done and we are confident that the men to do that job are found in the ranks of the Twenty-eighth.

The Old Tenth, the forerunner of the Twenty-eighth Infantry Division, established its fighting qualities in the Spanish-American War and as such was sworn into Federal service shortly after the entrance of the United States in World War I.

Prior to that the men of the outfit saw service on the Mexican border.

Several years of jittery peace followed and then the flame of war again seared much of the world with the Twenty-eighth being activated for service in World War II.

And now again scores of young men, who have gone beyond the ordinary demands of citizenship by offering themselves to the Nation, will march away from Washington, ready to face up to whatever comes.

And that they will do so in the tradition which surrounds the Twenty-eighth goes without saying.

Washington has always been proud of the National Guard men who represented her on the field of battle because, when the chips were down and the enemy was pouring it on, the men of the Division could be depended on to do what had to be done.

Like it or not, and none of us like it, we must face up to realities and when we do that we come face to face with the fact that a savage lust for power is abroad in the world and that, if free men and women are to continue to enjoy the blessings of freedom they must fight for it.

War is a strength sapping, nerve wracking business at the best and, at the same time brings out the best and worst in humankind.

It has the faculty of making us walk shoulder to shoulder with our fellowmen in the face of a common danger, and at the same time it degrades the mind and harms the body.

It is not a series of clean-cut actions with flags flying and battle cries issuing from the throats of charging men as they rush to meet the enemy. It is far from that. It is fought in the mud and dust of whatever terrain presents itself. It is a clock around challenge to jaded nerves and numbed bodies and minds and to that army which, possibly through superior training or having the advantage of better equipment, comes the victory.

Not total victory. That we have learned to our sorrow. The men under arms and in hourly contact with the enemy have always done a fine job and are continuing in that tradition today. They have always brought the enemy to its knees and when they have laid down their arms a beaten foe has acknowledged defeat.

But around the counsel table we have been weak and, because of vacillation; because of a lack of an aggressive and well thought out program, we have had to bow to others, with the result that nothing has been settled, nothing has been decided.

That is one of the chief reasons why our young men have received orders to again prepare themselves for a shooting war. They must do what they can to make up for our weaknesses in the diplomatic field and they do it the hard way.

Because the defense of this Nation and its way of life demands the best we have in fighting men it was no surprise when the Twenty-eighth was called to turn its attention from peacetime training to that of active fighting.

We are sorry that once again these men will be taken from their firesides to live the life of a soldier, but since it has to be we will watch with pride their progress and achievement and give just that little something extra which spells the difference between winning and losing.

They have dedicated themselves—these men of the Twenty-eighth—to carry high the banner of freedom.

Can we fail them in this crisis?

Not only has the Twenty-eighth been called to action. The entire State, this proud commonwealth, has received a challenge which must be answered and it can be answered in only one way.

Let's get down to work and clean up this nerve-sapping mess as soon as possible and, when that is finished, let's be as strong in after-war maneuvering as they were on the field of battle.

Our hearts go with the Twenty-eighth today as they train at Indiantown Gap preparing themselves for any eventuality and with our hearts also goes a fierce pride in them.

It's Time for a Declaration of Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States should be prepared now to give a decisive answer to the top question of the day, the question which lies uneasily in every American mind.

With the first phase of the Korean conflict approaching a crisis this paramount question is—where do we go from here?

We may be sure that the shrewd men of the Kremlin have been thinking long hard thoughts on that same question. Are we to let the Kremlin answer it for us first? Are we to wait until a great Soviet toe draws a line in the dirt along the thirty-eighth degree parallel and dares us to cross that line?

Are we to continue the perilous policy—if indeed it is a policy—of allowing the Soviet imperialists to pick the time and the place for us to commit our meager forces while they commit only the forces of their satellites? Are we to be ignobly jostled from one improvised blood-letting to another?

Actually Moscow, not Washington, has up to now determined our military action in Korea. Starting with the gross miscalculations at Yalta and Potsdam in the year 1945 when we threw away the peace, the administration has in the brief intervening years allowed this country to be maneuvered into a dilemma where our own efforts are little more than a reflex to Russian decisions. Even today while our troops, in large part untrained and ill-equipped, are fighting with their backs to the sea we have no announced policy, no statement of aims.

This is not a matter for partisan recrimination. But it is a matter for close scrutiny by members of both parties. Surely nonpartisanship in foreign affairs does not require that a Republican voice approval of the grave errors in our foreign policy for which the party in power is responsible. Surely also, as I have repeatedly stated, it is more important to be right than to be bipartisan. Certainly for some this is not hindsight. For my part I wish most earnestly that I had been wrong in my gloomy forecast.

Now that we have by our action in Korea been given hopeful evidence that we intend to face the grim facts of the world we live in it is urgent that the Truman administration should display some leadership. It is useless to prate about unity unless there is a grand design behind which the people can become united. When will the Truman administration proclaim to the world in plain language our military intentions in Korea? When, furthermore, will it declare our ultimate political objectives? Both the honor and the safety of the United States are at stake. The very survival of the United Nations is in jeopardy. Without a clear pronouncement of American objectives our most brilliant military successes will be nothing more than a mere thrashing about of American power.

We have heard much about the need to strengthen the Voice of America abroad. For years I have pleaded for a complete reorientation of this vital implement of foreign policy. It should be vastly expanded. More important still, it should be transformed into a psychological warfare program in order to buttress our fighting forces. But is it not time also that we found the words and ideas which will make clear to the people in this country what our young men are fighting and dying for on a peninsula 7,000 miles away? Is it not time that our leaders underscored in eloquent and contagious terms that our very sur-

vival is in jeopardy and that on our survival depends a free world at peace?

A nation's foreign policy should be a steady long-range policy, not a thing of day-to-day expediency which fluctuates from one Presidential election to the next. Where there is no vision the people perish. In the last several years the present administration has chosen to reverse tragically the policies laid down by a succession of clear-thinking American statesmen, men who understood the nature of the world they lived in and who were resolved that American power should be in line with American commitments. Under our present leadership that current has been split and channeled into a thousand stagnant trickles meandering through a meaningless marsh of confusion and expediency. Let us hope that the administration's tardy action in Korea signals the end of the policy of appeasement and vacillation.

It is now nearly 8 weeks since events in Korea awakened our administration to the relentless realities of the Communist threat. Surely in that time our leaders have had opportunity to formulate a statement of principles which will proclaim to the people of America and to our friends throughout the world that we know where we are going and that we have a master plan. Surely our leaders have had time to announce to those who are determined to destroy the free world that we too are determined; determined to safeguard our national security, determined to create a peace with freedom.

For the preservation of that principle the United Nations was founded. The United Nations should be not a propaganda vehicle for Soviet aggression, not just a pious hope for peace, but a vibrant and effective organism working to bring about a world in which aggresison plays no part.

Let us at long last make our intentions unmistakably clear. Let us meet the challenge. Let us take the lead. Let us discharge our responsibilities. Let us grasp our opportunities. On the vigor and promptness of a resounding declaration hinge consequences of grave import to the people of America and to the free peoples of the world.

Washington and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Washington and the War," written by the able editor of the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Virginius Dabney, and printed in that newspaper on August 17. The editorial was written as a result of a visit to Washington by Mr. Dabney.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON AND THE WAR

WASHINGTON.—The people in charge of our National Government in this crisis are as uncertain concerning the future as the average citizen. Most of them feel that we are in for a long, hard pull, lasting many years, but they are admittedly guessing.

Nobody has any idea what Russia will do next. Governmental chiefs and Congressmen appear willing to play politics with the country's future, rather than take drastic steps now to get us in fighting trim as quickly as possible on the home and foreign fronts. They are gambling on our having time to prepare after the November elections.

Pessimism as to the future is widespread in Washington. The present situation is regarded as one with few bright spots anywhere. The consensus, as I get it from talking with high officials, Members of Congress, and well-informed newspapermen is that we are either in for a series of "pint-sized wars" with Russian satellites, like the one in Korea, or a war for survival with the Soviet Union—maybe both.

Only one man expressed any optimism to me. He is a highly intelligent Member of the House of Representatives who is a strong advocate of world federalism.

"We are on the threshold of one of the truly great moments in history," he said. "If we play our cards right, and I believe we can, this will be a turning point in the history of the world."

I have seen no one else in this frame of mind. The others are all resigned to big or little wars, lasting anywhere from 10 to 30 years.

Official circles reveal deep disappointment over the failure of United Nations members to respond more promptly and generously with aid in Korea. The small consignments of ground troops that have been promised are considered inadequate, and none of these has yet arrived.

There is general confidence that we are going to hold the beachhead in Korea, and ultimately reconquer that country. Most persons feel that complete reconquest will come some time in 1951. But nobody has any reassuring answer to the question: "After the reconquest of Korea, what? Are we going to pay out more billions rebuilding that devastated country? Are we going to garrison it indefinitely, and if we don't, won't Russia come right back in again?"

The prevailing view is that we shall have to rebuild Korea, and then hold it indefinitely with American troops.

What about Formosa? Are we going to get into a shooting war with the Chinese Reds just as we're becoming more and more deeply committed in Korea? One view is that, although we have ordered our seventh fleet to shoot at the Reds, if and when they attempt to invade and conquer the island with their thousands of Chinese junks, we will not get into a war with the Chinese Reds on the mainland of Asia. It will be exclusively an air and naval action, as far as we are concerned, according to this opinion, which appears to have something more than mere surmises behind it.

Are the Communists going to break out somewhere else, just as we become involved in Korea and Formosa? This is not only possible but probable, most observers here feel. Indochina is regarded as the most likely place for this.

A good many view with alarm the possibility of our getting into the fight on the side of the highly incompetent Bao Dai and the imperialistic French, whose record in Indochina is far from good. Both Bao Dai and the French are hated by most of the people of Indochina. If there is an invasion of that country in the next few weeks by the forces now being trained over the border by the Chinese Reds, is the United States going to furnish new ammunition for Comrade Malik's propaganda mill by getting into this fracas on the side of a regime that is detested throughout Asia, and which symbolizes to the Asiatics exactly those western traits and attitudes which they dislike most?

Our intentions are unclear. The drab alternative to our intervention on behalf of Bao Dai and the French would be to let them fight alone to hold Indochina's vast natural resources, with the probability that the country will fall to the Communists.

What of the situation in western Europe? Can the signatories of the Atlantic Pact be counted on to resist to the end against the Reds, if we aid them substantially with arms, and build them up over the next few years?

One question is whether Russia will permit this build-up, or whether she will suddenly overrun western Europe with her enormous array of tanks and ground troops before any effective joint defense can be organized. In that event, it is argued that many of the weapons supplied by us would be seized by the Red Army, along with the huge steel-making capacity of the Ruhr, the Saar, Alsace-Lorraine, and so on. In that event, our pulverization of Russian centers of heavy industry might not be too effective, unless we also pulverized those of western Europe—which most Americans would consider abhorrent.

The Europeans are widely depicted as battle weary, and sick unto death of bombs. Some Americans fear that these Europeans would almost rather be taken over by Russia than see their remaining sons killed or wounded, and what is left of their proud cities reduced to rubble. The poor showing of the United States in Korea to date seemingly has increased the feeling among Frenchmen and Germans and Italians that they would like to remain neutral, in the event of war between the United States and Russia.

Many here in Washington believe, however, that western Europe can be effectively organized against the U. S. S. R. if that power refrains long enough, because of fear of our atomic bombs, from overrunning the Continent. Such is the official policy, and they are proceeding to put it into effect with appropriations of billions for the arming of western Europe.

Will the Soviet Union drop dozens of such bombs on us in the United States, once it gets a sufficient stockpile. Nobody knows, of course. Some contend that fear of retaliation will prevent this, while others disagree. One topflight Federal official expresses the view that Russia will certainly attack the United States with atomic bombs as soon as she thinks she has enough of them.

Is Washington panicky at the thought of being a primary target, if the Kremlin decides to assault this country with nuclear explosives? Not at all. Washingtonians are taking this in their stride. However, some Americans are viewing the prospect with alarm, for a private girls' school has just closed here. The thing that gave it the coup de grâce, it is understood, is the fear of parents to enroll their daughters in a school situated in this target city.

A depressing feature of the whole picture in the Nation's Capital is the widely held belief that preparation for what is ahead can never be adequate, so long as the Truman administration is in office.

One man who was once a strong backer of President Roosevelt, and who had an important post in the Federal service under Roosevelt, is positively bitter concerning what he terms the "utter failure" of this administration.

"Truman, Dean Acheson, and Louis Johnson have got to go," he said with vehemence. "Theirs are the policies that have failed. Until we get new leadership at the top, we cannot hope to approach this crisis in the way that it must be approached."

He admitted that there is no way to oust this triumvirate, short of the 1952 presidential election, unless President Truman chooses to appoint new Secretaries of State and of Defense.

Some of those who are anxious to replace Truman, but who recognize that nothing can be done for 2 years, are not clear as to how they could improve matters by putting Acheson out. They recognize that the Secretary of State has made some bad mistakes, but they also regard him as able, and they don't know where to find anybody who would discharge the duties of the job more effectively than he is doing.

As for Defense Secretary Johnson, the amount of opposition to him is tremendous. He has lost the confidence of many persons, not only inside the services but outside. Newspapermen are especially strong in feeling that his usefulness has been heavily impaired, if not destroyed.

Meanwhile President Truman and a large number of those in Congress have their eyes on the November elections, instead of on the Nation's welfare. There is a real possibility that the reverses in Korea, and the other evidences that we are not prepared will cause the Democrats to lose control of Congress in those elections, and that this will foreshadow the election of a Republican President 2 years hence.

Still Far Short of Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

STILL FAR SHORT OF NEEDS

In all probability legislation setting up a universal military-training program will be introduced into the Congress this week. It should be passed without unseemly and unnecessary delay.

There is no need for extended hearings. Everything which can be said for or against UMT has been said and is a matter of congressional record. If the Congress would elect to cut out the time-wasting oratory and political haymaking, which is a normal part of the legislative process, it could get final action on UMT within a few days.

It is the sensible way of recognizing the inevitable. Regardless of when a general war comes, military manpower needs are going to remain tremendous over a long period of years. The slap-happy draft system will not begin to meet them.

There may be merit in the Defense Department's argument that it cannot spare the experienced men or facilities to undertake a training program now. In light of the existing shortage of both, that's probably true. UMT can be written into the law, though, so that it can be undertaken as soon as the Defense Department can go into it.

Appointment of Maj. Gen. Norman D. Cota as Director of Civil Defense in Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Mayor of Philadelphia has appointed Maj. Gen. Norman D. Cota as the director of Civilian Defense in that great city. He commanded the Twenty-eighth Division during World War II and is a wonderful soldier and a grand American. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer relative to the appointment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY'S NEW DEFENSE HEAD

Mayor Samuel's decision to name a military man to the full-time post of director of civil defense in Philadelphia has been followed promptly by his appointment of Maj. Gen. Norman D. Cota.

He has made an excellent selection. General Cota, commander of Pennsylvania's Twenty-eighth Division during the Battle of the Bulge in the Second World War, has a distinguished military record. His training and experience fit him admirably for his new position of command. As the mayor points out, his services as a military man will be of far greater value than those of a civilian in coordinating our security plans with the heads of the United States Armed Forces in this area during a time of emergency.

Philadelphia's civilian defense program had been in a precarious state because of its dependence upon civilian and part-time directorates. It has been shown that proper administration of such programs requires a full-time, paid staff.

General Cota will have the same status as other members of the mayor's cabinet and will have ample authority to plan and direct defense measures. And he will have the services of a paid staff devoting full time to their jobs. The new program gives promise of greater security for Philadelphia.

California Wants No Columbia River Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, newspaper and radio reports of the past 3 days have described in vague detail a gigantic project to bring Columbia River water into southern California. The project is proposed by the Department of Interior, and assertedly has the interest of President Truman.

I wish to make clear the following facts:

First. Neither the idea nor the plan was initiated by any one connected with the State of California. No engineer or other responsible official in California, either employed by the State or the various California water agencies, has made such a proposal or has endorsed it. Neither the California State government, nor any of its branches, has proposed such a project.

Second. Prosperous as California is, it could never afford to finance a project of such magnitude as the Columbia River diversion proposed by the Interior Department.

Third. California would never call upon the taxpayers of the Nation to pay for such a project, as Arizona has done in the case of the proposed central Arizona project, which Secretary Chapman says would cost the Nation's taxpayers more than $2,000,000,000 in interest alone.

Fourth. California does not need and does not want water from the Columbia River or any other river of the Northwest. Our State engineer has said that California's water supplies are sufficient, and that the State does not have to go beyond its boundaries for more water. The Colorado River water awarded to southern California in Federal Government contracts, and other available supplies, are sufficient to meet the foreseeable needs of that area.

Fifth. The Columbia River diversion plan is brought forward at this time by the Interior Department in a desperate attempt to aid the fantastic central Arizona project, which would take an enormous share of California's Colorado River water. It is a nefarious scheme to rob California of Colorado River water by diverting attention to the Columbia River diversion proposal. The scheme also is intended to give Representatives and Senators from northwestern States the false impression that California has a plan to acquire Columbia River water. I wish to assure the entire Congress that California has no such plan, and does not support such a plan.

Sixth. Southern California has always paid its own way. The people of southern California have obligated themselves for more than half a billion dollars for water projects, and they are paying these debts with unvarying regularity.

Seventh. The Columbia River scheme is even more infeasible, grotesque, and absurd than the central Arizona project. It would cost an estimated five to ten billion dollars. As a member of the Public Lands Committee, and as a leader in California's fight to protect its vital water supplies, I disavow the Columbia River proposal and proclaim California's opposition to it.

Lily-White Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 17 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the following editorial from the August 6, 1950, edition of the Washington (D. C.) Post. It seems appropriate that a representative of the people of Indiana, where no such segregation is practiced by the bar association, should request this insertion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LILY-WHITE BAR

The District of Columbia Bar Association recently rejected a proposal advanced by 100 of its leading members to change its by-laws to admit local lawyers regardless of their color. This was the first time that the restrictive provision has been challenged in a formal referendum. Scarcely more than half the members of the District Association voted. We hope the challenge will be made again—and under circumstances that will let the whole membership realize the ugliness of the discrimination practiced in its name.

The local group will be host in September to the national convention of its parent body, the American Bar Association, which has no such barrier against Negroes. It is out of step with most of the State Bar Associations including those in Florida, Alabama, Virginia, Texas, and other Southern States. Its position is in shabby contrast to that of the Federal Bar Association. Acting in the Capital of the United States, it follows a policy that runs directly counter to the great premises of the Constitution which its members are peculiarly obligated to serve.

No group is lodged with more responsibility for community leadership than the bar association. No group is looked to by the community with more respect. Yet here in the Capital, the District Bar Association, chartered by Congress and acting as the official body of the community's lawyers, adheres to a racial attitude as outmoded as it is irrational. This body, devoted to the ideal of Equal Justice Under Law, ought to set an example of equal opportunity as well. Its example, for good or ill, has much to do with shaping the patterns of community life. We hope it will make itself an exemplar of equality.

Educational and Vocational Training Benefits for World War II Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Members of the Congress are interested to learn of the status of the combat soldiers in Korea as to their eligibility for the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, commonly known as the GI bill of rights. As a Member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I want to see that our World War II veterans are properly advised as to their rights and benefits as veterans and especially to see that the thousands of younger veterans who will again see service on the Korean front or somewhere else with the Armed Forces are fully informed.

On July 10, 1950, I wrote the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Gen. Carl Gray, and asked several questions which I believe will be of interest to our veterans now in educational institutions or who contemplate using some of their educational benefits. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the reply received from the Assistant Administrator for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, in a letter dated July 20, 1950:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1950.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter addressed to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under date of July 10, 1950, in which you ask several questions relative to the initiation of training under Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, which has been referred to this office for a reply in view of the inquiries made.

It is noted that you have read the Veterans' Administration regulation concerning the pursuit, on or after July 25, 1951, of courses of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. In this connection, it is pointed out that in view of the purpose and intent of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, that is, the provisions for means of readjustment of veterans into civilian life through Federal aid, it has been necessary to consider that if the purpose of the act is to be realized, it must be required that where a veteran has satisfied the conditions for initiation of the course he will be expected to pursue the course continuously until completion except for conditions which normally would cause interruption by any student, veteran or nonveteran.

With regard to interruption for summer vacations, you are advised that the Veterans' Administration regulation referred to specifically provides for normal interruptions for summer vacations. Ordinarily, therefore, a veteran who pursues training under Public Law 346, during the spring semester of the school year, 1950–51, and whose conduct and progress are satisfactory, may interrupt his training during the 1951 summer vacation period and reenter training at the opening of the regular school year of 1951–52 for the purpose of continuing his course under the act.

The position of the veteran-teacher in respect of the requirement for continuous pursuit of a course of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, after the statutory delimiting date, that is to say, July 25, 1951, may be said to be unique among other classes of veteran beneficiaries. Accordingly—and only because of the historical aspects of the matter, that is, the long recognized practice of the members of the teaching profession—it has been determined that an eligible veteran who pursues a graduate course under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, pointing directly to a degree, in a college or university during the summer sesion 1950, who is regularly employed as a teacher during the school year 1950–51, pursues graduate study under the act during the summer session of 1951 (or is regularly enrolled in a summer term on or before July 25, 1951) and is regularly employed as a school teacher during the school year 1951–52, may be permitted to continue graduate study during successive summer sessions following employment as a teacher during successive school years and that this shall be deemed to be continuous pursuit of his course of education or training within the meaning of the governing law and regulations.

While current Veterans' Administration instructions relate specifically to veteran-teachers who pursue study on a graduate level pointing directly to a graduate degree, it has been determined that a person actively engaged in the teaching profession may—under conditions identical to those indicated in the preceding paragraph—pursue an undergradute curriculum for the purpose of obtaining a degree during consecutive summer session subsequent to July 25, 1951.

In response to your inquiry concerning progression from an elementary course to a vocational course after July 25, 1951, you are advised that a veteran who completes an elementary course of study which has been prescribed as a preparatory course or a prerequisite to an elected vocation course, and who wishes to progress to such vocational course after July 25, 1951, will be able to do so provided he files a request with the Veterans' Administration prior to the completion of his elementary course and provided he pursues his training continuously except for normal interruptions and subject, of course, to the extent of his remaining entitlement.

With regard to initiation of training under Public Law 346, for persons who reenlist, the first and second provisos of paragraph 1, part VIII, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, are quoted herewith for your constituent's convenient reference:

"* * * *Provided*, That such course shall be initiated not later than 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later: *Provided further*, That no such education or trainng shall be afforded beyond 9 years after the termination of the present war."

As you know, World War II was officially terminated as of July 25, 1947, insofar as the provisions of Public Law 346 are concerned, except that section 11 (a) of Public Law 190, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, amends the above legislation and provides further that the war shall not end for a person who enlisted thereunder between the dates of October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946, "before the termination of such individual's first period of enlistment or reenlistment * * *."

Therefore, in view of the specific wording of the above-cited legislation an eligible veteran who was discharged on or before July 25, 1947, must initiate his course of education or training under Public Law 346 before July 26, 1951; and persons, including enlistees under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945 who were in the service after July 25, 1947, or are still in the service, must initiate their course of education or training within 4 years from the

date of their first discharge after July 25, 1947.

However, it may be noted that in view of the specific wording of the second proviso of the above-cited legislation educational or training benefits under Public 346 may not be afforded beyond July 25, 1956, except for persons who enlisted during the period between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946, under the provisions of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945.

As indicated above, the law makes no exception with regard to the initiation of a course, therefore, it would be necessary for a hospitalized veteran to initiate training under the act prior to the statutory delimiting dates. Of course, if a veteran is hospitalized for a reason which has been determined to be service-connected for disability compensation purposes, vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, may be available to him. The statutory provisions setting a deadline date for the initiation of a course applies exclusively to education or training under Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended. Public Law 16, supra, contains no such provisions there being only the requirement that vocational rehabilitation training be commenced in sufficient time to permit restoration of employability through the selected course on or prior to the date "9 years after the termination of the present war."

Your interest in veterans' affairs is appreciated and it is hoped that the foregoing will provide the information which you desire.

Very truly yours,

H. V. STIRLING,
Assistant Administrator for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education.

Also under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my letter of July 26, 1950, to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, requesting that hearings be scheduled by the committee to publicize the fact of the July 25, 1951, cut-off date as far as the GI bill is concerned. Such a hearing would also give members of the committee, as well as other Members of Congress, an opportunity to make suggestions as to what other groups might continue their studies after July 25, 1951, even though their training is interrupted or may not have been initiated by that date. My letter to the Veterans' Affairs Committee chairman and his reply are as follows:

JULY 26, 1950.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Sometime ago I wrote you suggesting that our Committee on Veterans' Affairs might be unjustly criticized by both veterans and other Members of Congress if we did not do everything possible to publicize the effect of the July 25, 1951, cut-off date as far as the GI bill is concerned.

I have in mind a few cases which I believe deserve serious consideration, and I know that other meritorious cases will be brought out by other committee members if hearing are held. I have already been contacted by several veterans who have been hospitalized for tuberculosis, but whose illness became known after the presumptive period. They will probably be hospitalized for a period of 2 years and will not be entitled to Public Law 16 benefits. Even though eligible for education and training benefits under Public Law 346, it was not feasible for them to enter school. I think they should be considered as exceptions to this cut-off date. Another group would be our elementary school teachers who want to do undergraduate work during the summers after working the 9-month period in every year. I think that they should be allowed the same benefits that teachers doing graduate work will be receiving.

Those men volunteering for active duty in the war in Korea together with those veteran servicemen who have had their enlistments extended by an act of Congress will also no doubt be affected by this so-called cut-off date of July 25, 1951. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee advised the Congress recently that there are approximately 300,000 servicemen whose enlistments will expire within the next 12 months and for that reason it was requested that additional legislation be passed to extend their enlistment during this conflict. I believe it is safe to assume that a large number of this group have eligibility under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and would have used some of these additional benefits had they been allowed to terminate their service within the next year.

It is respectfully requested that committee hearings be held in order that a study can be made of suggested exceptions to the so-called cut-off date other than already granted to the medical students and teachers doing postgraduate work.

Please be assured of my desire not to have the cut-off date changed for all groups but only to make exceptions in deserving cases. I sincerely feel that by having committee hearings on this subject we will in this way be rendering an additional service to our veterans.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman, Sixth Texas District.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1950.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have your letter of July 26 concerning the July 25, 1951, cut-off date for initiating training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

You are probably familiar with the hearings conducted by a subcommittee composed of Messrs. ELLIOTT, NOLAND, and PHILLIPS on H. R. 7235, to extend the period for initiating courses under this act for certain medical and dental students. At page 1757 of these hearings there is a letter from General Gray addressed to the Honorable JOHN SANBORN stating in effect that teachers who desire to pursue graduate courses each summer after July 25, 1951, and who remain in the teaching profession will be permitted to do so as their entitlement continues.

As a result of these hearings, the Administrator also issued a statement providing in effect that any qualified student who is accepted in a recognized medical or dental school after July 25, 1951, may continue his medical or dental training so long as his entitlement exists.

On yesterday the Administrator addressed a letter to me announcing that the July 25, 1951, date will not apply to any veteran who has initiated his course of education or training and who is prevented from completing his training by reason of reentrance into the active military or naval service. This, of course, does not in any way change the July 25, 1956, date.

Public Law 573, Eighty-first Congress, extended the presumptive period for tuberculosis from 1 to 3 years, and thus the fact that the veteran had tuberculosis would probably not have prevented him from having had an opportunity to initiate a course. If the veteran had initiated a course of training and was prevented from continuing or completing that course by reason of the disease the present VA regulation would apparently permit him to continue when he had recovered. If the veteran contracts tuberculosis within the 3-year period, he would be eligible to receive training under Public Law 16, which has, as you know, no initiation cut-off date.

There has been wide publicity concerning this cut-off date and undoubtedly the service organizations will continue to publicize it between now and next July.

The Veterans' Administration has shown a complete willingness to place a reasonable interpretation upon this regulation.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. RANKIN, *Chairman.*

High Time We Cracked Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Department Store Economist for August 1950:

HIGH TIME WE CRACKED DOWN
(By D. Allyn Garber)

In the throes of war again—call it full scale or not—for the third time in our generation.

Who is at fault? That can wait. The question now is how to expose the paid traitors, get them out of the woodwork of our bureaucracies, businesses, schools and universities, our social life.

They are far too powerful an influence to remain concealed.

Retailers will have a heavy responsibility—that of supplying our civilian population with the necessities of life. They will be harassed by restrictions and endless bureaucratic regulations, administered by whom? Even while lining up to a man behind the President—we have no choice—we have the right and obligation to ask for answers to some long-unanswered questions. Who engineered the division of Korea and gave Russia the industrial half? Who put the jokers in the United Nations Charter that have given the Kremlin such an advantage? Who painted the conquest of Manchuria, then China, as merely a spontaneous agrarian revolt against landowners? Who delayed, sabotaged, and effectively prevented the delivery of aid to the Chinese? Who insisted we permit the conquest of Formosa and Indochina? Who was and is behind the determined drive to smear MacArthur?

The slimy trail leads back step by step. Who sold the administration on the political nurturing of Reds within the Democratic Party—permitted their infiltration into every echelon and bureau of Government? Who has so effectively prevented their exposure again and again?

What legal brains directed the maneuvers and prepared loopholes by which Harry Bridges' expulsion was twice thwarted? What now prevents throwing him into Alcatraz, instead of leaving him free on bail to follow his orders at this critical time?

What men of great influence planned and provoked the series of court rulings by which it is now actionable to call a person a Communist (though with impunity he can be called a Democrat or a Republican or even a Socialist) while the party line is that Communists are a political party?

And lately, what treacherous brains worked out the successive stages by which our Federal courts were obstructed, ridiculed and

openly taunted until a truly loyal American, Judge Harold Medina, stopped them? What men are behind the smear campaign long directed at J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI?

Go back another step. Who engineered betrayal of our bomb secrets—we mean, what Americans? Who gave American planes to fly our patent files and industrial secrets to Moscow? Who put in the fix in Washington by which armor, planes, munitions, ships, and strategic materials continued to go to Russia for years after the war ended?

What influences persuaded Truman to let Russia in at the last minute in the surrender of Japan? Or persuaded Roosevelt earlier to prevent our armies from coming into Germany via the Baltic approach, which would have saved the Balkan nations from Kremlin conquest later? Why did he hold our armies at the gates of Berlin for almost 10 days to let Russian armies in first? Who? Why? And what distorted thinking led to the present partitioning of Germany, or left Berlin deep within the Russian section of divided Germany? No errors of judgment those, but a deep-laid plan which our leaders fell for.

We are in a war of disastrous possibilities. We do not question the intent of Harry Truman, but we distrust his brand of political friends and cronies. We can only conclude that the one way to get the Communists out of Government and influence, while we still have a Government, is to retire the current misleaders and rely more on the many able men in Congress, of both political parties, who should take over now.

This is no time for softness or protection of anyone. Let us put known paid Communists in Federal penitentiaries—no freedom on bail, no appeal until the war is over—as we handled known Bund members in 1941 with such success.

Retailers are closest to the public and have more influence than the politicians. Retailers can force action if they feel they should. We have faith that they, with divine guidance, can and will set about cleaning up the slimy mess and get ready for what may come.

Goats in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times yesterday carried a fine editorial pointing out the absurdity of Congress having to regulate goats and barbers and other purely local District of Columbia matters, and urging that Congress rid itself of this unnecessary burden by reporting out the District home rule bill for a vote.

I urge my colleagues who have not yet done so to sign the home rule discharge petition in the immediate future so that the District suffrage bill can be approved during the Eighty-first Congress.

Extension of one of democracy's most potent weapons—the right of the ballot—to nearly a million disenfranchised Washington citizens will strengthen our hand in the propaganda front of our fight against totalitarianism. It will also permit Congress to devote more time to the urgent national and international affairs which have arisen during these critical times.

The full text of the editorial is set out below:

GOATS IN WASHINGTON

The grant of power to the city commissioners to regulate goats in the District of Columbia may be of immediate concern to a good many inhabitants of the District of Columbia; but it isn't of much interest to the remaining 150,000,000 people of the United States. And the same may be said about the posting of prices in Washington's barber shops. Yet these supremely unimportant subjects—and a great many more like them—must be brought forward for the consideration of the Congress of the United States; each has to be handled in committee; each has to be discussed—or at least voted on—on the floor; each has to be sent to the President.

A great many points, and most of them very good ones, can be made against the absurdity of Congress acting as a board of aldermen for the city of Washington. But when all else fails, one would think that a glance at the type of legislation that Congress must handle in this capacity would clinch the argument. Yet the folly persists. True, the Senate has passed a home-rule bill for the District; but this measure remains bottled up in a House committee. A petition to force the bill to the floor needs only 14 more signatures. A real victory for democracy at home would be won if that bill could be pried loose so that it at least could be considered by the House. And a victory for efficiency and common sense in the workings of the Federal Government would be won with its passage. It would be a relief to the citizens of Washington and of the rest of the United States if Congress no longer had to turn its attention to such vital subjects as the regulation of goats in the District of Columbia.

Four Hundred and Forty Thousand Dollar Plan To Bring to United States 85 Titoists Wisely Blocked by Rooney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brooklyn Eagle of August 15, 1950:

FOUR HUNDRED AND FORTY THOUSAND DOLLAR PLAN TO BRING TO UNITED STATES 85 TITOISTS WISELY BLOCKED BY ROONEY

Dr. Harvey Branscomb, chancelor of Vanderbilt University, went to Washington recently on a simple mission. All he wanted was $440,272 of the American taxpayers' money to bring in 85 visitors from Tito's Yugoslavian Communist jungle and to show them the sights around America.

Brooklyn's Representative JOHN ROONEY spotted the item on an $82,000,000 budget requested by the State Department for anti-Communist propaganda. When Mr. ROONEY and a few of his colleagues on the House Appropriations Subcommittee finished questioning Dr. Branscomb the subcommittee showed every sign of disapproving the request. It would be stupidity of the sheerest kind to pay the least attention to proposals of this kind.

We wonder when these so-called intellectuals will ever learn. The enemy of mankind, of civilization today is communism. Not merely Stalinist communism but any kind of communism. Tito is opposed to Stalin simply because he refuses to allow Uncle Joe to muscle in on his Yugoslavian racket. There is no difference between the Tito-Stalin feud than there would be between an Al Capone-Dutch Schultz dispute in the days of prohibition.

There is no such thing as a good Communist. There are simply differences in degrees and in the approach of conflicting Commie outfits. The remnants of the Trotskyite factions still want a world revolution in every country in the world. Stalin angles to cut up the world into piecemeal segments and take them over on a well-planned time schedule. Korea is just one of the first whistle stops.

Tito's communism is as thoroughly Marxist-Leninist as Stalin's but he is trying to maintain autonomy for it in Yugoslavia. If and when the Soviet pressure becomes too strong for him to resist any longer he will either be forced to succumb to the Russian war machine or some agent within or without his organization will put a slug in his body and the loyal opposition willing to do business with Stalin will take over.

Any one who maintains that there is any hope of winning over a Communist regime to the democratic ideal is either woefully ignorant of communism or just a starry-eyed idealist.

We are officially supplying Tito with war potential materials. Dean Acheson calls it a calculated risk. It is the same kind of a calculated risk that we took when we sent Alger Hiss to Yalta. When, oh, when, will the seers in Washington stop gazing into a crystal ball looking for a reform in Communist tactics and read the reports coming in from Korea and those going out from the Cominform?

Hats off to Representative ROONEY for the prompt tagging of Dr. Branscomb's childish effort to put across one more pro-Communist move on the American people. There is only one foolproof attitude to take on communism. You can't do business with its advocates no matter what form or front the movement may take.

Keep Congressmen on Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 19, 1950, I made a speech on the floor of the House calling upon Congress to remain in session to its last minute, if necessary, to insure complete and rapid victory in Korea. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. The message contained in this editorial is a most important one. The editorial follows:

KEEP CONGRESS ON JOB

As a result of war in Korea, Congress should deny itself the pleasure of political campaigning this year. Those Congressmen who stick closest to the job of getting on with the war will have the greatest vote appeal in November.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Congress is required to adjourn by July 31, unless war or other national emergency exists, or unless Congress shall fix another adjournment date.

When adjournment time rolled around this week, there was a war on and Congress was responding well. The House marked the occasion by taking final action on legislation lifting ceilings on the size of the armed services and authorizing $350,000,000 for modernization of the fleet.

Still there is talk in Washington that Congress, with an election only 3 months away, will agree on a "conditional adjournment" so that its Members will have an opportunity to campaign back home. A conditional adjournment provides that Congress can be recalled by the Vice President and the Speaker according to their own judgment or on request of the majority or minority leaders of the Senate and the House. That device was used during the war years of 1943 and 1944 and again in 1947 and 1948. In each of the 4 years, however, the President called Congress back.

There is a big job ahead of Congress. Among other preparedness measures, it must provide for adequate mobilization and enact new tax legislation. There also remains much unfinished business on the old peacetime agenda. If the call to politics should presently prove stronger than the call to duty, President Truman should promptly fetch Congress back to Washington. It should stay on the job until the war in Korea is won and the threat of war on other fronts subsides. This is no time for politics as usual.

Clark W. Griffith—A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, from past experience in the newspaper game I am fully aware that it is not news when a dog bites a man, and when we set out to eulogize an individual, a public figure shall we say, it is not news either. News is made only when the man bites the dog or the public figure is vilified or smeared. However, I am going to give myself the pleasure of so eulogizing someone, whether or not my words have headline value. This someone of whom I shall speak is a great American, long identified with our national game of baseball—Clark W. Griffith.

You may ask: For what reason do I rise to speak of Mr. Griffith at this time? Is it his birthday? No. Mr. Griffith is not preparing to celebrate his birthday until sometime later in the fall. Is there any reason why I should not postpone my little talk until he does celebrate that eighty-first birthday? Well, I will tell you. I am not getting any younger, and although Mr. Griffith may, and I hope he does, go on forever in his good work, I cannot hope to live that long myself, so with your indulgence I will present my remarks at this time.

Now you all know of Mr. Griffith; even the youngest in point of experience in this body must know him, because he has been around long enough to be a landmark in this city and in the world of sports. You all may know of a few of his many charities. Perhaps you recall that he turns over the stadium which bears his name for the use of the congressional baseball teams when they hold their annual charity game. You may know, too, that for this game he furnishes our august Members with necessary equipment and uniforms in addition to the use of the park. Well this is a minute fraction of the extent of his civic interest.

What most of you may not know is that Mr. Griffith donates that stadium—not just to Members of Congress, which we might expect him to do—but to any and every charitable cause, the instigators of which approach him, when he is convinced of the worthiness of the project. This includes such civic activities as the Community Chest, the Red Cross, the Police Boys' Club, as well as scores of others whose names do not immediately spring to mind. Among these others, we recall, is the Masonic order's annual Night of Thrills, receipts from which, over the years, have built and maintained the beautiful Eastern Star Home out New Hampshire Avenue.

But Mr. Griffith is not only interested in civic affairs and social betterment—he is also deeply and sincerely patriotic. It was his effort during World War I which brought about the establishment of the famous and valuable Clark C. Griffith Ball and Bat Fund. It seems that during the early months of that conflict there was no plan, no organizational set-up to provide recreation for the homesick lads "over there," nor for those in the camps scattered over the country. And there was a great need for some type of morale building activity for these boys. Then it was that Clark Griffith conceived the idea of supplying the members of the Armed Forces with the equipment necessary to play baseball, a sport which of all others provides wholesome recreation, promotes mental stimulation because of its demand for quick thinking and immediate decisions, and at the same time furnishes ideal muscular exercise.

From his initial idea to the end of that war, Mr. Griffith and his associates continued to supply all comers with outfits, and completed their task on the proud note that "no authorized request from any unit of the Army or Navy was turned down." Of course, Mr. Griffith did not accomplish this tremendous task alone, but his was the inspiration and guiding force that brought it to a successful conclusion.

With reference to Clark Griffith's attitude toward the armed services during World War II it is well known that the Washington Senators Ball Club was composed, during those years, of older men and those rejected by the services. He did not then, and I will readily gamble that he will not in the future, do anything to keep a ballplayer, no matter how valuable, out of his country's service.

Those of us who have been in Washing during and since World War II recall that it has been the practice at Griffith Stadium to admit all those in uniform free of charge. In addition ambulatory patients from Walter Reed, St. Elizabeths and Mount Alto are also admitted without charge. One section of the park is set aside for these servicemen and women and in addition, 40 box seats are reserved for amputees who cannot mount the stands. Stretcher cases too, are accommodated at the park, admission free. And this rule has no exceptions, no matter how important the game to be played is, or how attractive the opportunity to sell every seat to the general public.

Again, Clark Griffith is aware that ministers of the gospel are among the lowest paid professional men in the world, and for this reason he provides every minister in the city with a season pass to the park.

All of this I have just recounted for you is, or could be a matter of public information—if anyone is interested enough to inquire. But there is another side to the charitable impulses of this grand old man. And that is the side which the world, and in fact, few even of his close associates see. It is that real charity which he exercises among the poor and needy and those whose lives may be temporarily blighted—the unfortunate in fact with whom we are all surrounded did we but open our eyes. This Christian work he carries on as our Lord instructed us to do when he said:

> Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them.
>
> But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth; that thine alms may be in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret Himself shall reward thee openly.

Clark Griffith has carried out this precept of the Savior's teaching throughout his more than 80 years. But we have to go to objects of his kindness and generosity themselves to learn what he has done. It is to the widow and the deserted wife, the orphan boy or girl whom he has helped and for whom he has found homes and security that we must appeal to get any indication of the extent of the private charity which he has exerted throughout the years.

And it is from such as these that I have learned a little of the man's character—not from Mr. Griffith himself. In fact, he is in total ignorance that I am speaking of him at this moment, and will be the most surprised person in the country when he does learn of it. It will be my little joke on him. I hope he will receive it with his customary good sportsmanship.

Thank you for permitting me to indulge myself by giving this oratorical salute to one whom I consider to be a real man and a great American.

Is American Democracy Doomed Because of Excessive Spending?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the great tasks confronting a people who would maintain representative govern-

ment is to decrease the number of "stay at homes" on election day. Why so many persons who would loudly protest loss of the right to vote fail to do so is one of the mysteries of America.

In 1948, in the State of Illinois, nearly a million eligible voters failed to go to the polls. Such public indifference must not continue. It is heartening to note that some effort is being made to correct the situation this year. A challenging message on this point is contained in a guest editorial contributed to the Danville (Ill.) Commercial News by Mr. G. C. Mahle, prominent business executive of Danville. Under permission granted by the House, I am including his editorial in the RECORD, for what he has to say should be of interest to all. It follows:

IS AMERICAN DEMOCRACY DOOMED BECAUSE OF EXCESSIVE SPENDING?

(By G. C. Mahle)

Many people think so. They realize that the Korean situation, and its possible consequences, result from the stupidity and the blindness of American diplomacy at Potsdam, Yalta and elsewhere. They know that the division of Korea was an open invitation to a civil war, and that locating American and British troops in Berlin without any ground ingress at all was suicidal.

They are appalled in spite of the billions we have spent for arms in recent years, to see us caught unprepared in Korea, and using armament which is not a match for that of our opponents. In September 1949, $10,500,000 in military aid was voted Korea. Nine months later, when the Communistic forces attacked that country only $200 in signal equipment had reached its destination. On June 13, 1950, two weeks before the invasion of South Korea, William C. Foster, deputy administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee, and said:

"I am happy to tell the Appropriations Committee, that in my judgment, the trend of events in South Korea is more favorable than it has been at any time since the liberation of that country in 1945. A rigorous training program has built up a well-disciplined army of 100,000 troops that are prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces."

Yet, the Russian menace, much greater than it ought to be, is not the greatest danger that faces this country. Communism we can eventually overthrow. Surely our diplomats at the close of the next war will be smarter than those who functioned for us before, but unless some economy is brought into Government, then American democracy is indeed doomed. In the Truman administration more money has already been spent than was spent by all of the Presidents from Washington through Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Taxes, which, according to that late President, are paid in the sweat of every man's brow, were never higher. Figures show that if all incomes over $8,000 were completely confiscated, it would lower the tax load of the rest of the country only 10 percent.

You and I must insist that in spite of the Korean situation, economy can, and because of the Korean situation, must be an actuality in Washington. There is no such feeling in Washington today. After tossing billions of dollars away on the price-support program, Mr. Brannan came to Congress recently and wanted another $50,000,000 to give away products so bought. In addition, he urged the House Agricultural Committee to approve H. R. 8356, which authorizes the expenditure of $8,000,000,000 for a Missouri Valley Basin farm development program.

Since the Korean invasion a hundred thousand more civilian employees have been added to the Government payroll. Senator DOUGLAS fights in vain to cut $90,000,000 off the pork-barrel appropriation. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, claims that Government expenses can be cut $6,000,000,000 and that is 60 percent of the ten billion that is asked for defense in Korea. He gets no support.

It was Benjamin Franklin who said that in times of war the utmost economy must be practiced in all other governmental functions. If we are asked to lower our standard of living, and give up many things formerly dear to us, should not the Federal Government do likewise and retrench?

What can you do about it? Some 900,000 people in Illinois did not vote at the last election. Two out of every 10 of you who read this editorial did not vote. You have a chance next November. Don't forget that Lenin once said: "We can never conquer the American Republic—we can only hope that it will spend itself to destruction."

If you stay at home and do not vote, you are helping Joe Stalin and the Russian Communists carry out Lenin's plan. You are admitting that American democracy is doomed.

Liquidation of Jewish Life in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the extermination of spiritual, cultural, religious, and community of Russian Jewry has been known for some time. The Soviet leaders are ruthlessly exterminating every trace of Jewish religious and cultural activity and obliterating every facet of organized Jewish life in Russia. In this respect the Communist leaders are no better and no different than Hitler and his henchmen.

If there were some Jews who until recently believed that Soviet Russia was the champion of the oppressed and suffering minorities and small nations through the world, they are rapidly becoming disillusioned. Today, Russia is the most imperialistic state in the world. Her imperialism is leading her to the suppression of all cultures and civilizations which become subservient to the Russian police state. Russian imperialism is also the driving force behind Communist aggression against peace-loving nations.

An excellent account of the plight of the Jews in Russia and the obliteration of Jewish life in that country has just appeared in the August issue of Jewish Frontier. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article the Future of Soviet Jewry by Bezalel Sherman. It will be a revelation to many of us for its forthright evaluation of a very tragic situation. The article follows:

THE FUTURE OF SOVIET JEWRY

(By Bezalel Sherman)

No reliable information is available concerning the number of Jews living today outside the borders of the State of Israel. We may nevertheless assume that the figures generally cited are not altogether imaginary and are based on some sort of statistical data. This does not hold, however, for the Jews in the Soviet Union. Here we deal only with individual estimates which are frequently but an expression of pious hopes. Lacking an alternative we must nevertheless reckon with these estimates and assume that about 2,000,000 Jews now live in the U. S. S. R. If we add to these another 600,000 living in the satellite countries of eastern Europe, it will become evident that 24 percent of all the Jews in the world—26 percent if Israel is excluded—live within the zone of Soviet rule or influence. These percentages are based on the common assumption of a Jewish population in the world of 11,000,000.

Under present circumstances it is a matter of indifference whether there are one, two, or three million Jews in the Soviet Union. What is important is that these Jews are so many individuals and do not constitute a community. Within the Soviet Union there is not a trace of Jewish organization, institutions, internal collective activity or the slightest participation in world-wide Jewish activities. There are no locally organized Jewish communities nor is there any contact with Jews in other lands. The Jewish press has been liquidated. Jewish literature is no more. Jewish intellectuals have been eradicated. Jewish cultural activity has been suppressed. No institutions of Jewish education are in existence. All Jewish people's movements are forbidden. Jewish national aspirations are taboo. Whatever still remains of Jewish religion has for the most part been introduced from the territories recently annexed by the Soviet Union and even this is confronted with biological extinction. Hebrew is forbidden. Yiddish is vanishing. In what sense are Soviet Jews today a part of the Jewish people as a whole? Try as one might it is impossible to escape the conclusion that Soviet Jews no longer exist as a community. The same fate awaits the Jews in the Soviet satellite countries.

Apologists for the Soviet Union have been laboring to explain the lack of all contact between Jews of the Soviet Union and of the United States on the basis of the cold war between East and West. They justify this complete severance of relations by saying that anti-Communist elements among American Jews prevent such contact. But these apologists forget, intentionally, that there is no more contact between the Jews of the Soviet Union and those of such Communist countries as Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia any more than there is with the United States, Canada, Argentina, or Israel. They likewise overlook the fact that Soviet Jews are not only prevented from reading the anti-Communist Jewish Daily Forward, but also the Communist Morning Freiheit, that works of pro-Communist Ikuf authors are just as taboo in the U. S. S. R. as the works of non-Communist authors affiliated with the Jewish Cultural Congress. Furthermore, Jews in Moscow have no more contact with Jews in Kiev or Minsk than with those of New York, Warsaw, or Tel Aviv. The matter of contact between Soviet Jews and those abroad is thus not dependent on ideologies. It is an outgrowth of communism itself. The Soviet Government will not permit Jews to do what it does not permit its other citizens. Formally the Soviet Government practices equality between Jew and non-Jew. Actually its practices are not so equalitarian, and apologists for the Soviet Union choose to overlook the difference. Thus it is clear that Russia will remain a Russian country even if it severs its contacts with the outside world. Poles in Poland will not be nationally obliterated even though they are forbidden to maintain contact with Poles abroad and they lack freedom at home. Jews of the Soviet countries, on the other hand, must inevitably cease to be Jews, if they are cut off from other Jews throughout the world and are at the same time deprived in the land of their residence of all opportunity for group existence.

The Soviet sector of the dispersion is unique in Jewish annals. Here Jews are not forced into a ghetto nor is one compelled to remain a Jew against his will. The characteristic trait of the Soviet scheme of affairs is that it introduces the Jews into the general pattern of regimentation and transforms their Jewishness into an object of state utility. For the first time in history we are confronted with the phenomenon that a person is a Jew when the ruling political party orders him to be such, and he ceases to be a Jew when the same party thus decrees. It is clear that a great many Jews undergo these humiliating metamorphoses only externally and in their hearts remain devoted Jews. But under pressure of Communist rule the number of those for whom these changes are not mere tragicomedy is increasing. This is evident from the behavior of the large number of Jewish fellow travellers in the democratic countries where they have no occasion to fear police persecution or repressions should they fail to conform. The new element in Jewish experience that has been introduced by the Soviet system consists in eradicating within Jews all intellectual or emotional, national or social, spiritual or ethical attitude toward their Judaism. The Judaism of these does not stem from awareness or feelings; instead it pours like water from a tap which is turned on or off by the Communist Party as its exigencies require. Jews in other countries have always made the highest sacrifices and fought with all their strength in order to remain Jews. Such a struggle would be hopeless in the Soviet Union, even were they to feel inclined to embark upon it. Sovietism undermines the resistance potential of the Jews and reduces their Judaism to a thing lacking meaning, value, and dignity. It might not even be worthwhile to fight for this kind of Jewishness. Soviet Jews—and soon also those inhabiting the Soviet satellite countries—are thus rapidly transformed into spiritual nudists. This nudity is still regretted and disparaged insofar as there still exist large numbers of Jews who have been brought up in Jewish homes, have obtained a Jewish education and still possess a measure of sensitivity to Jewish needs and interests. Coming generations will not even know that they are naked. They will have no idea that they had been stripped of something.

All this is a consequence of the political conditions prevailing in the Soviet Union, where everything must be transmitted through the mechanism of state control. In the Soviet Union there is no room for any kind of voluntary community. It should be added, however, that prevailing conditions in the U. S. S. R. were not the only factor contributing to the ruin of Soviet Jewry. The attitude of communism toward the Jewish question played a no less significant role.

Recently many Jews have been confusing the political support of the Soviet Government for the establishment of a Jewish state in a part of Palestine with ideological acceptance of Zionism by the Communist movement. In the midst of the enthusiasm aroused by Gromyko's historic speech at Lake Success which played a decisive role in the UN decision of November 29, 1947, it was not noticed that he spoke of Jewish suffering in western Europe. Anyone even faintly familiar with Soviet pronunciamentos who realizes that not a single word is ever inserted accidentally, could have read the future course of events in Gromyko's speech: the prohibition of Jewish emigration from eastern Europe. (So far as the Soviet Union is concerned this prohibition had been in effect for some time previously.) The Soviet Government took the attitude that those Jews who needed it—the Jews of the capitalist western countries—had the right to constitute themselves as a Jewish nation in Israel. But this was not to be construed that the Jews of the world were one people. The Jews in the Soviet zone in particular were not part of this people. This was ever the Communist view. The surprise caused by Ilya Ehrenburg's famous article which denied that the Jews were a people was therefore unmerited. In this article Ehrenburg merely parroted what outstanding Communist spokesmen had said before him.

As far back as 1903 Lenin said: "The scientifically absolutely unfounded idea concerning a distinct Jewish nation has a reactionary political significance. The idea of a Jewish 'nationality' runs counter to the interests of the Jewish proletariat because directly and indirectly it arouses within it a mood that is hostile to assimilation, a 'ghetto' mood." [1]

In 1913 Stalin wrote: "What sort of a nation is a Jewish nation that consists of Georgian, Daghestanian, Russian, American, and other Jews, the members of which do not understand each other (since they speak different languages), inhabit different parts of the globe, will never see each other, will never act together, whether in time of peace or in time of war." [2]

Stalin wrote the above in connection with the formulation of the program of the Bolsheviks—at that time they still called themselves Social Democratic Party—for the various people who had been enslaved by Czarism. To make it clear that this program did not apply to Jews, Stalin added: "No, it is not for such paper 'nations' that the Social Democratic Party draws up its national program."

Lenin, Stalin, and other Communist leaders visualized the disappearance of the Jews and assimilation as the sole solution to the Jewish question. It was therefore inevitable that they should look upon every Jewish national movement as a reactionary manifestation that hinders the process of assimilation. Even the Bund was thus not acceptable to them, because by its very organization of Jewish workers it retarded the process of assimilation. Only the working class of a nation is entitled to a separate socialist party, Lenin taught his disciples. Since no Jewish nation exists there can be no independent Jewich proletarian party. It is, hence, not surprising that Communists have from the very beginning declared zionism to be "a counter-revolutionary movement of the Jewish bouregeoisie," to quote the formula of a resolution of the Comintern.

In hundreds of statements and in countless acts during half a century Communists have demonstrated their belief that Jews are not a people and that it is the revolutionary duty of Jewish Socialists to hasten Jewish assimilation. Throughout Communist literature it is impossible to find a single instance of deviation or of modification of this standpoint. Only twice did it seem as if a change was being introduced in the attitude of the Soviet Government toward the Jews within its borders. The first time it was in connection with Biro Bidjan, which, as Kalinin at first formulated it, aimed to consolidate Soviet Jews into a nationality. Nothing came of Biro Bidjan, and still less of Kalinin's declaration. The second time occurred during World War II, when tanks were named after historical Jewish personalities and it was permitted to admire the heroism of the Jewish people. The historical personalities, though dead for hundreds of years, have now been banished from the Soviet Union, and, as far as Jewish heroism is concerned, there is no one left to admire it. When Ehrenburg now states that Soviet Jews have nothing in common with Israel and that they reject any idea of ideological or organizational ties with zionism, he reflects recent developments within the Soviet Union in regard to the Jewish population. Lenin's program for the hasty submergence of Jews in the environment is now being put into practice. Since Biro Bidjan was a failure and the war is over, what is there to hinder the Soviet Government from solving the Jewish question in accordance with Communist principles, by creating conditions favorable for the disappearance of the Jews? Stalin has taught that a Communist state must control elemental forces—this is perhaps his most important contribution to Socialist theory. If the assimilation of the Jews is desirable, then it should be accomplished in planned fashion, and the entire power of the state should be put at the service of this program. This explains why all possible sources of Jewish cultural development have been cut off and why Soviet Jewry is being spiritually pulverized.

One should not rule out the possibility of a change for the better sometime in the future. But time is a decisive factor in this respect. Russians, Poles, Czechs, Rumanians, Hungarians, can wait. Jews cannot. If more favorable conditions for Jewish survival in the Soviet Union should come into being within the next 5, 10 or 15 years, it would still be possible to salvage much for Jewish survival. Should more than one generation pass under present conditions, it will be too late. There will remain no raw material from which to forge anew Jewish group existence.

The obliteration of the Jewish nation in the Soviet Union is being accomplished from both ends. At one end the political structure of the Soviet regime objectively precludes all forms of Jewish organization within the country and all communication with Jews outside. At the other end there is the consuming fire of Jewish national nihilism: assimilation, intermarriage, indifference to Jewish affairs, complete lack of a feeling of responsibility as Jews, uprooting of the Jewish milieu, estrangement from the Jewish cultural heritage, and the Jewish religion, opposition to the very idea that the Jews constitute a people. All of these deprive the individual Jew of any subjective desire to preserve Jewish life. One quarter of the entire Jewish people is being consumed by these two fires.

[1] V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, Against the Bund. White Russian Scientific Academy, Minsk, 1934, pp. 36–7.

[2] Joseph Stalin: Marxism and the National and Colonial Question. International Publishers, New York, pp. 11–12.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Marine News:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—LITTLE KNOWN FACTS

Most of the public has no conception of the value of the Nation's harbors and channels. Every important city in the Nation, many vital industries, every Navy, shipbuilding and ship repair yard are located on an improved harbor or channel. A great part of America's commerce and all of its defense is vitally linked to waterways. Through transshipment, waterways are indispensable to other methods of transportation necessary for commerce and defense. Improved harbors and channels properly maintained are vital to the Nation—but few Americans realize it.

Life Indemnities for Survivors of Members of the Armed Services Who Die While on Active Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, because of the widespread interest in national service life insurance, I want to quote the findings and recommendations of my subcommittee as contained in House Report No. 2761:

FINDINGS

I

The National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 was passed by the Congress during the closing days of the third session, Seventy-seventh Congress. The initial legislation, which later became the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, was prepared by the Veterans' Administration.

No professional consultation or advice was sought regarding this initial legislation.

The report by the conferees of the House and Senate regarding that portion of the bill dealing with national service life insurance made the significant recommendation that "this legislation be carefully reviewed and more thoroughly studied." Until the inquiry of this subcommittee, no comprehensive study such as that recommended by the conferees has ever been conducted.

No hearings whatsoever were held by the House or Senate on the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940. This act was passed as a rider to a revenue bill and was introduced in the Senate, the House having passed the initial legislation.

The basic National Service Life Insurance Act has been frequently amended; all such amendments have had the effect of liberalizing benefits of the basic legislation.

II

The national service life insurance has not met the objectives of Government life insurance. It has failed to provide uniform protection in the form of income for the dependents of persons dying while serving in the Armed Forces, and it has failed to lessen demands for pensions.

The gratuity provisions included in the national service life insurance program are superimposed upon the present Government pension system.

III

Federal Government contribution for administrative expenses and benefit payments coincident with national service life-insurance operations have cost the Federal Government, from appropriated funds, more than $5,500,000,000 in the last 10-year period.

There is no evidence that the Congress of the United States has ever been fully or adequately appraised of the total cost to the Federal Government of the national service life-insurance program.

All costs of the national service life-insurance program borne by the Federal Government are continuing costs from both an administration and benefit-payments standpoint.

IV

The National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 was proposed and passed primarily to protect the equity value of the United States Government life-insurance policyholders in the USGLI fund. In the event of a future national emergency, a fourth Government insurance program may be proposed for reasons similar to those advanced when national service life insurance was established.

There is serious doubt that the manpower to administer national service life insurance or any other Government insurance plan would be available in the event of a future national emergency.

National service life insurance may not be a proper vehicle through which to grant insurance protection to participants in a future emergency in that the present policyholders, especially veterans of World War II, may become vested with an interest in the national service life-insurance fund in which it would be unfair and inequitable to permit future policyholders to participate.

V

Since October 8, 1940, more than 22,500,000 national service life insurance policies have been issued.

Three out of every four, or slightly more than 75 percent, of all former national service life insurance policyholders have permitted their national service life insurance policies to lapse. Of the veterans of World War II, only one out of six are covered by NSLI.

One million four hundred and fifty-one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven, or 25.9 percent, of NSLI policies currently in force are held by in-service personnel.

Only 78 percent of those currently serving in the Armed Forces have taken out national service life insurance. These individuals have varying amounts of NSLI in force, ranging from $1,000 to $10,000. Less than 60 percent have the full $10,000 protection.

One out of every nine combat casualties of World War II had no national service life insurance whatsoever.

The average face value of policies issued from Pearl Harbor day to VJ-day was slightly over $7,000. The average face value per policy as of March 31, 1950, was $6,422.

VI

The use of the word "insurance" in characterizing national service life insurance operations is a misnomer.

The paradox of national service life insurance is made clear when it is realized that the Federal Government underwrites the extra hazards of military or naval service only to the extent to which an individual was insured for normal civilian risk under the national service life insurance program. The insured having in force national service life insurance on a personal paying basis, generally speaking, is a condition precedent before the United States Government becomes liable for any death-benefit payments.

This condition presents an inequity and results in discrimination among beneficiaries, reiterating at this point that one out of every nine combat casualties during World War II had no national service life insurance whatsoever.

VII

The use of the American Experience Table of Mortality for calculating annuities was outmoded by 1940, and its use has had the effect of granting annuity payments considerably in excess of what more modern actuarial calculations would justify.

Testimony before this subcommittee revealed that the use of the American Experience Table of Mortality was deliberately adopted in order that the annuity payments to beneficiaries of World War II would be no lesser amount than similar payments being made to beneficiaries of World War I casualities. The legislative history does not indicate that the Congress, or the conferees of the Congress, were fully apprised of this deliberate action.

The continued use of the American Experience Table of Mortality for calculating annuities can only be interpreted as a subsidy to the national service life insurance fund.

Through October 1, 1948, the use of this mortality table has required the Government to appropriate to the national service life insurance fund in excess of $502,000,000 in annuity differential payments. These costs are continuing costs and are being charged against the NSLI appropriation on a case-by-case transfer basis. Whereas the use of the American Experience Table of Mortality, in view of unforeseen risks of World War II, may have been prudent for the calculation of NSLI premiums, there was, and is, no justification under accepted insurance practices to use this table for national service life insurance annuity calculations.

The use of any annuity table without regard for the difference in life expectancy of male and female lives is contrary to modern insurance practice.

Under the National Service Life Insurance Act as presently written and administered, the total cost to the Government of a $10,000 face value policy may be in excess of $12,000.

VIII

Although the Veterans' Administration has conducted many studies from time to time, such as the possibility of installing mechanical equipment for premium billing and posting, or matters regarding centralization of the numerous district offices, action has been negligible.

The administrative officials of the Veterans' Administration in charge of the national service life insurance operations have done little in the effectuation of efficiencies in administrative operations. This is due in part to their being uninformed as to operational cost breakdown and in part to a tendency to study problems for long periods of time without reaching conclusions.

IX

Through the conclusion of the fiscal year 1948 (ending June 30, 1949), the total Federal contribution to the national service life insurance fund was greater than the total amount collected from the insured in premium payments.

X

On an over-all average, an amount exceeding 75 percent of the total premiums paid on national service life insurance was returned to the insured in the form of dividends during the first 6 months of 1950.

XI

The present rate of interest (3 percent) paid on invested national service life insurance funds is considerably in excess of the interest rate being paid by the United States Treasury in securing adequate sums required to fund and refund the debt obligation and current expenses of the Federal Government.

Payment of this liberal rate of interest is an undisclosed subsidy to the national service life insurance fund.

Continuation of payment by the Treasury Department of 3 percent interest on the NSLI trust fund is of questionable justification.

XII

The testimony before this subcommittee did not clearly establish a moral or legal necessity for the Government to pay accrued interest claimed to be due the national service life insurance fund because of delays in transferring moneys from the national service life appropriation to the national service life insurance fund.

XIII

The insuring of aviation cadets under present applicable statutes is excessively costly.

It would be tens of millions of dollars less costly for the Government to assure each aviation cadet in training that his dependents in the event of his death during such training would receive a gratuitous life indemnity from the Government of $10,000.

XIV

The decision of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs regarding the possible recovery of dividends by the Federal Government on

insurance premiums paid by the Government for aviation cadets personnel is of doubtful propriety.

The policy determinations of the Veterans' Administration are inconsistent. This is illustrated by the fact that no charges were made against USGLI appropriations by the fact that no charges were made against USGLI appropriations for annuity differential payments or accrued interest, while under NSLI these charges were made against NSLI appropriations. The law in each case was the same.

Under the GI educational program the Veterans' Administration has upon occasion advised the Congress of certain discrepancies and abuses occurring from time to time resulting in the extravagant expenditure of public funds. As a policy matter the Veterans' Administration has not felt disposed to make similar suggestions regarding national service life insurance operations.

XV

Upon analyzing testimony of the Veterans' Administration, substantiated by supplementary testimony of the Bureau of the Budget, there is no evidence that the Congress has ever been fully or adequately advised as to the over-all cost of the national service life insurance program.

The requested NSLI appropriations for administrative expenses cover only a portion of the total administrative cost of national service life insurance operations.

National service life insurance administrative costs are at least twice the amount reflected for such costs in the annual budget request. The present budget procedures do not adequately inform the Congress or the taxpayers as to the true administrative costs of NSLI, all such costs being borne by the Federal Government.

National service life insurance administrative costs appear to be exorbitantly high. Although certain causes or justifications were offered as partial explanations, there appears to be a strong reluctance on the part of the Veterans' Administration to effect any significant changes in present methods or procedures which, if adopted, would result in greater efficiency and greater economy of operations.

XVI

The administrative and clerical duties performed by the various personnel of the Armed Forces relative to the maintenance of in-service national service life insurance policies has had and continues to have the effect of dissipating military appropriations and manpower.

In addition to this fiscal cost factor, during the war years, hundreds of officers and thousands of enlisted personnel devoted full time to in-service national service life insurance administrative duties.

Cost to the armed services of administering in-service national service life insurance policies from October 8, 1940, through March 31, 1950, is conservatively estimated at $96,409,212.

XVII

The delegation of power granted by the Congress to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, through section 608 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, has had the effect of circumventing the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

To a considerable degree this delegation of authority virtually eliminates the system of checks and balances inherent in our democratic form of government. The constitutionality of this delegation of authority is questioned, but aside from any constitutional considerations, this subcommittee questions the wisdom of such a broad grant of authority.

XVIII

National service life insurance policies are contracts which consist of the applicable statutes, the lawful regulations of the Veterans' Administration, and the policy.

These contracts may not be unilaterally terminated by the Government. However, there exists no legal or equitable reason why the Government cannot specify a cut-off date for eligibility for national service life insurance, thus terminating the present inequitable, relatively inefficient, and costly program.

All outstanding national service life insurance policies are definite irrevocable contracts between the Federal Government and the insured.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I

In view of the many administrative difficulties encountered in the administration of national service life insurance and the resultant effect upon the policyholders as well as the significant, if not exorbitant, costs to the United States in financing its obligations under this program, it is recommended that—

The appropriate committees of the Congress consider the feasibility, desirability, and appropriateness of establishing a gratuitous life indemnity for all men serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, such indemnity in lieu of, and not superimposed upon, the present insurance program available to military personnel.

II

If the present plan of Government insurance is to continue, then it is recommended that—

There be a complete legislative reappraisal of the present National Service Life Insurance Act giving special attention to the following features thereof:

1. Changing the manner in which the Government liabilities to the fund are currently being calculated and charged.

2. The rate of interest paid on invested NSLI funds.

3. The continued use of the American Experience Mortality Table for calculating both premiums and annuities.

4. The ineffectiveness of the present insurance program in providing 100-percent insurance coverage for Armed Forces personnel, and the varying amounts of payments being paid NSLI beneficiaries.

5. The relative efficiency, and at what cost, can the present program be operated in the future.

6. The demands upon the time of military personnel in the administration of in-service policies, and the dissipation of military appropriation for in-service administrative expenses coincident with NSLI operations.

III

The recommendations of the subcommittee regarding certain policy determinations of Government agencies are as follows:

Veterans' Administration

The present policy of the Veterans' Administration regarding this agency's fiduciary relationship with the Congress of the United States should be carefully reappraised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should review his policy determination with respect to future-dividend payments on policies held by aviation cadets, with a view to redetermining the legality and propriety of having excess premium payments revert to the Federal Government.

Treasury Department

It is recommended that the Secretary of the Treasury reexamine the propriety, or necessity, of continuing to pay the present rate of interest of 3 percent on invested NSLI funds. Any excess payment in this regard which could be regarded as a "subsidy" to the NSLI fund should be deleted.

IV

Section 608 of the National Service Life Insurance Act stands out, among similar grants of authority by the Congress, as being the most absolute and the most definite in its finality.

This subcommittee recommends that the Congress review the extent to which it has reliquished its control of public expenditures under the absolute authority granted the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs through section 608 of the National Service Life Insurance Act.

V

If the Congress of the United States should not grant a gratuitous life idemnity to all members of the Armed Forces at this time, this subcommittee recommends unanimously that such a program be immediately adopted for insuring aviation cadets. By so doing the continued wasteful and extravagant means of "insuring" aviation cadets could be discontinued without impairment of any benefits extended under present law.

VI

Because of the present world situation and the resulting demand upon this Nation to greatly expand its military force—all persons serving in these forces having the immediate need for life indemnification or insurance protection—it is recommended:

That the appropriate committees of the Congress give full consideration to the immediate effectuation of some interim legislation, covering the insurance needs of the thousands now entering the Armed Forces. Such legislation should be so framed as to provide 100-percent coverage to all Armed Forces personnel; be more easily administered; if possible, less costly to the Federal Government; and have the effect of replacing the availability of national service life insurance to new entrants into the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act Should Be Amended as to Section 304, Subsections (a), (b), (c), (d)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this day I have filed a bill, I do not yet have the number, in the following language:

A bill to amend section 304, subsections (a) and (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

Be it enacted, etc.—

That subsection (a) of section 304 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 331) is amended by striking the balance of the sentence following the words "dangerous to health" and changing the comma after "health" to a period,

And it is further amended by striking all that portion of the last sentence of such subsection following the words "between the parties" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or, if no such stipulation be filed within a reasonable time, the court, on motion for the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, may transfer the case for trial to any other district or division thereof."

That subsection (b) of section 304 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 331) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following sentence: "Cases brought hereunder shall be entitled to preference on the trial calendar."

And it is further amended by striking from the third to the last sentence all words following "such court," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "On motion, for the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, may transfer the consolidated proceedings for trial to any other district or division thereof."

My interest in this important matter dates back to about a year ago when it appeared to me from the evidence then presented to me upon inquiry that, in my judgment, an important, valued and long-established business located in the Eighteenth District of California, which I represent, was being irreparably interfered with and damaged even to the point of possible destruction thereof by methods then being taken by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency under alleged authority claimed by the representatives of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, Twenty-first United States Code, pages 301–334a, section 304, which provided:

That more than one libel for condemnation proceedings may be brought upon the same alleged misbranding "when the Administrator has probable cause to believe from facts found, without hearing, by him or any officer or employee of the Agency that * * * the labeling of the misbranded article * * * would be in a material respect misleading to the injury or damage of the purchaser or consumer."

The firm is engaged in the making, manufacture and interstate distribution of a combination of substance commonly trade-marked "Nutrilite."

Upon the representations then made to me upon my inquiry, I did, on January 27, 1949, write the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, as follows:

I trust that all of the persons passing upon the problem before it comes to your desk for your own personal finding and signature will make very sure that the finding they ask you to sign is true in fact, and that the finding they ask you to make is consistent with existing law and facts in the premises.

Furthermore, I respectfully request that, inasmuch as my constituents emphatically maintain to me that, under the Food and Drug Act, their product, "Nutrilite," is not misbranded by their printed matter. And inasmuch as the reported determination of the department to consecutively libel the interstate shipments of this product could and would normally bust or break the corporation producing the same before the matter could get to a final court decision—it would appear reasonable, would it not, Mr. Ewing, that there be no finding by you which would result in forcing the producing company to insolvency until there had been a reasonable hearing opportunity given the producing corporation to the end that there be opportunity to make a showing before yourself as to their contention that this Nutrilite product is not misbranded.

Subsequent thereto, in civil action No. 5208–48, my constituents as plaintiff against the Administrator, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, on this same subject matter, obtained a unanimous decree of the three-judge court in which as to findings of fact and conclusions of law of said court, convened pursuant to the provisions of section 2284, title 28, United States Code, entered the following conclusions of law, amongst others:

5. Nutrilite contains no substance or material or combination of substances or materials harmful or deleterious in any manner to human users thereof when taken in suggested dosage. No claim has been made by any Federal, State, or other governmental agency that nutrilite is adulterated or harmful in any manner to the health of human users thereof, insofar as the record before the court shows.

6. The label of the package in which nutrilite was and is sold complies with all requirements of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

7. The objection of the defendants to the sale of nutrilite, which is the basis of this action, is the use by plaintiff of an advertising pamphlet entitled "How To Get Well and Stay Well." Nutrilite is sold directly to users thereof and this pamphlet is used in making about 40 percent of the initial sales of nutrilite.

8. The product now sold as nutrilite was first marketed about 1933; defendants' records show they received information about it in 1939 and had correspondence about it in 1940; plaintiff has been its exclusive national distributor since 1945; defendants received their first copies of the then current edition of the pamphlet How To Get Well and Stay Well on December 5, 1946, together with names and addresses of certain of plaintiff's distributors outside of California.

* * * * *

32. (a) On December 30, 1948, the instant injunction action was filed. At this time it was the intention and plan of the defendants to file many more libel seizure actions and seize Nutrilite throughout the Nation. The Food and Drug inspectors knew of this general policy.

* * * * *

(c) Defendants made no effort to secure an early trial in the libel cases and in order to effect seizures more quickly, mimeographed copies of the booklets, How To Get Well and Stay Well, were prepared for transmission to United States attorneys.

* * * * *

34. On January 24, 1949, Judge David A. Pine of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia found that the actions of the defendants in rendering said decisions were unfair, drastic, shocking, and harsh, and held that the decisions of defendants Crawford, Larrick, and Dunbar, described supra, were unlawful because the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency did not have the authority to delegate this power to make such decisions to said defendants.

* * * * *

39. The seizure actions caused plaintiff a sales loss of some $100,000 per month from the time of the first seizure until the instant action was filed, and the defendants were restrained from making further seizures. The seizures had the effect of frightening plaintiff's agents and distributors, so that they worked less, and some resigned, with the net result of loss of morale among agents and distributors, loss in sales volume and loss of personnel. Unfavorable opinions and injurious information with respect to the labeling of plaintiff's product reached many private individuals and organizations. Publicity about the seizure cases initiated by defendants appeared in newspapers and magazines in a way which did injuriously damage plaintiff and this led to loss of customers. Plaintiff was compelled to hire counsel in the 10 libel cases and put up bonds and costs in each case. The value of the Nutrilite seized by defendants in the 10 libel actions is $6,822.17, and the product so seized will be unsaleable if returned to plaintiff. The nature of plaintiff's business makes good will of the public one of its most valuable assets and the acts of the defendants in the embargoes and seizure actions in widely separated parts of the United States has caused the plaintiff's injury and damage. Dedendants admit injury to plaintiff and that there has been a serious impact on plaintiff's rights by their actions, and that there is no provision of law requiring or permitting defendants to reimburse plaintiff for the damages herein found or for the injury or for destruction of its business and good will by the actions of the defendants, in the event of a determination of said libel actions in favor of plaintiff. The injury and damage to plaintiff which has occurred and which is threatened by defendants is therefore substantial and irreparable.

40. The defendants have never advised plaintiff of the particulars of plaintiff's literature considered to be objectionable by defendants. The defendants have not provided an opportunity to plaintiff whereby such literature could be corrected, revised and amended in a manner which would conform to the views of and be acceptable to the defendants.

41. That plaintiff would have been subjected to many additional seizures of its product throughout the United States in addition to the existing 11 seizures of its product, if not enjoined from so doing, is admitted by defendants. It was a general policy and plan of the defendants to make with all possible speed many seizures of plaintiff's product. Such additional seizures, and the product could be seized by defendants in the hands of more than 5,000 of plaintiff's distributors, would have the effect of destroying plaintiff's business prior to any possible adjudication of the disputed issues on plantiff's labeling in any of the libel actons already filed or threatened.

42. There was and is no emergency involving injury or damage of any kind to the public or to any purchaser, consumer or user of Nutrilite or in connection with Nutrilite and plaintiff's use of the three pamphlets which constitute defendants' sole objection to Nutrilite's sale. Defendants have not, at any time, indicated or contended that there is an emergency or situation of compelling public necessity with respect to the labeling of plaintiff's product and no such emergency or situation did, in fact, exist at or prior to any of the actions of defendants described herein.

43. The evidence herein on the actions conduct and course of action of defendants before and after the decisions of Crawford, Larrick, Dunbar and Kingsley described above reveal, as do their decisions and actions in making said decisions, that the defendants in making said decisions acted capriciously, arbitrarily, unreasonably, oppressively, and unlawfully.

Thus, you will see that, by the unanimous statement of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Court held that the action of the Administrator and his representatives in the enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act were held to have been capricious, arbitrary, unreasonable oppressive, and unlawful. It would, therefore, appear that my communication to the Administrator on January 27, 1949, almost a year prior to the unanimous decision of these three judges was not illy founded.

As the instant case involving my constituents then and now involved the subject commonly termed "multiple seizure," and as I am informed that H. R. 9158 includes this same subject matter and deals with title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs,"

is to come before this House of Representatives shortly, I am pleased to present for the information of my colleagues the following treatment of the amendments which I am informed and believe are essential in the interests of justice and for the purpose of removing a presently claimed unrestrained power to destroy a legitimate business selling a worth-while, harmless product simply because the Government officials do wrongly charge that advertising or labelling is slightly misleading:

MEMORANDUM ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 304 OF THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT (21 U. S. C. 334)

1. THE MULTIPLE SEIZURE PROVISIONS

The adoption of the amendments I propose is essential because the Food and Drug Administration and the courts have interpreted the multiple seizure provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 as giving unlimited power to make multiple seizures of harmless products. This means that arbitrary Government officials have unrestrained, and the courts have said unrestrainable, power to destroy a business selling a worth-while and harmless product simply because the officials wrongly charge that advertising or labeling is slightly misleading. I do not believe that the Congress ever intended to give such tremendous unchecked power to any Federal official and have drafted these proposed amendments to protect the people who are regulated by the Food and Drug Administration now and who, under the courts' interpretation of congressional intent, have no protection whatsoever to prevent destruction of their business prior to any possible hearing today.

Section 304 (a) permits multiple libels or seizures of any product which is adulterated. The proposed amendments do not seek to alter such provision but relate solely to those instances of multiple seizures where there is a charge of misbranding.

Section 304 (a) presently authorizes more than one libel for condemnation to be instituted for the same alleged misbranding in four specified instances: (1) When the alleged misbranding has been the basis of a prior judgment in favor of the United States; (2) where the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency has probable cause to believe from facts found, without hearing, that the allegedly misbranded article is dangerous to health; (3) where the Administrator has probable cause to believe from facts found without hearing that the labeling of the allegedly misbranded article is fraudulent, and (4) where the Administrator has probable cause to believe from facts found without hearing that the labeling of the allegedly misbranded article would be in a material respect misleading to the injury or damage of the purchaser or consumer. These provisions are the so-called multiple seizure provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Experience has shown that in many instances so-called multiple seizures under questionable circumstances have proved to be a harsh and drastic remedy. This is particularly so where multiple seizure campaigns by the Food and Drug Administration have been instituted under Nos. 3 and 4 above, to wit, where it is claimed that the labeling is fraudulent or misleading.

It is obvious that more than one seizure action should be permitted where a product or its labeling has already been judicially found to be misbranded. A shipper who continues to use labeling which has already been judicially condemned should have no right to protection against further legal action based against the product or its labeling.

The present provisions of section 304 (a) authorizing multiple seizures when the Administrator has probable cause to believe from facts found without hearing that a product is dangerous to health would appear to have complete justification. Historically speaking, such a summary procedure has never been anathema to due process of law, for confiscation is often the only way to promptly protect the public health.

The proposed amendment seeks to limit the instances where multiple seizures or multiple libel proceedings may be instituted to the circumstances outlined above. Experience has shown that multiple seizures under the third and fourth instances outlined above find little justification for the exercise of such a drastic remedy. Multiple seizures of a product throughout the Nation based upon an ex parte determination by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency has a particularly devastating effect on shippers and companies engaged in the food, drug, and cosmetic field. In many instances, a thorough multiple seizure program by the Federal Government has been tantamount to destruction of the business prior to any possible judicial decision on the merits of the Federal Security Agency's claim. Where it is claimed that a product is dangerous to health the protection of the public would seem to outweigh any deprivation that a private shipper may suffer. On the other hand, where there is no question of danger to the public health, but it is merely alleged and claimed that the labeling of an article is fraudulent or misleading in a material respect justice and common sense would seem to demand that the shipper or claimant should not be subjected to the possibility of being put out of business by a multiple seizure campaign long before the merits of the controversy are settled. It is with this end in view that the proposed amendment to section 304 (a) of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act seeks to strike those provisions which authorize multiple seizures when the Federal Security Administrator has probable cause to believe from facts found without hearing that the labeling of an allegedly misbranded article is fraudulent or in a material respect misleading. Overzealous, erroneous or even misguided administrative action in authorizing widespread multiple seizures on the claim of fraudulent or misleading labeling has and could result in irreparable damage and injury to shippers and producers. The attendant adverse publicity has often shattered the morale of a highly developed distribution system and destroyed customer good will developed through years of honest business practices. The fact that a shipper or producer ultimately prevails in a trial on the merits will not serve to resurrect what has become in effect a lifeless enterprise. The difficulty and expense of filing claims of ownership, answers and bonds in widely separated jurisdictions and in arranging for consolidation and removal may be enormous. Even after consolidation and removal further seizures may be filed for there is nothing in the law to prevent it. No Federal statute or theory of jurisprudence authorizes suit to recover damages caused by baseless multiple seizures. A moral victory is poor compensation at best. Furthermore, the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that a shipper or producer does not have the right to seek injunctive relief against widespread multiple seizures even though there has been a gross abuse of discretion by officers of the Government in instituting multiple seizures based upon a claim of misleading labeling.[1]

It is with these possible abuses in view and the absence of any remedy available to a shipper or producer to protect against such abuses, that the amendment to the multiple seizure provisions of section 304 (a) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is proposed. Acceptance of the amendment would still leave to the Administration the right to institute multiple seizures (1) where a quesion of adulteration is involved; (2) when the misbranding has been the basis of a prior judgment in favor of the United States; and (3) where it is believed that the misbranded article is dangerous to health.

In the event that the administration believes that fraudulent or misleading labeling should be taken off the market, a full and complete remedy exists under section 302 of the act which authorizes an injunction proceeding to enjoin violations of the act. By this device any fraudulent or misleading labeling may be cut off at its source. This speedy and effective remedy of injunction fully protects the public and at the same time is to the advantage of the shipper or producer. Multiple seizures of allegedly fraudulent or misleading labeling and its product not only may visit unjustified punishment on a shipper but also fail to protect the public since a seizure only affects isolated quantities of the product and its labeling and leaves future shipments undisturbed.

2. REMOVAL AND CONSOLIDATION

Section 304 (a) presently provides that where a libel proceeding has been instituted the proceeding may be removed for trial to any district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties or, in the case of failure to stipulate, the claimant of the articles seized may apply to the court to have the trial removed to a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business. These removal provisions relate to cases where there has been only one seizure action. Substantially similar provisions are contained in subsection (b) of section 304 which provides that the multiple libels may be consolidated for trial in (1) any district selected by the claimant where one of the multiple libel proceedings is pending; (2) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties; or (3) a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business.

The relief ostensibly accorded the claimant by removal and consolidation of multiple libel proceedings is in many instances only partial relief and in others completely illusory. In each jurisdiction in which a libel action has been brought the claimant must file his claims, answers, and bonds unless he is willing to permit the various actions to go by default. Even if consolidation is effected, substantial burdens are placed on the claimant in attempting to try the consolidated proceeding in a jurisdiction far removed from his home district where his witnesses, records, and other materials are located. Of course, if the seizure has been effected in a claimant's home district other seizures predicated upon the same claim could be removed and consolidated in a claimant's home district for trial. Experience has shown, however, that seizures ordinarily are not effected in the claimant's home district, but rather in jurisdictions far removed. In practice, the statutory right to have multiple libel proceedings consolidated in one of the jurisdictions where a libel has been instituted is meaningless for often the closest jurisdiction in which a libel proceeding has been instituted is hundreds or thousands of miles removed from the claimant's principal place of business.

While it would appear that under the statutory provisions of section 304 that the parties to a libel proceeding could stipulate to removal to and consolidation for trial in the claimant's home district, the Food and Drug Administration has a declared policy never to agree to stipulate to removal to

[1] *Ewing et al.* v. *Mytinger and Casselberry* (94 L. ed. adv. op. 776).

or consolidation in such a district. This policy apparently is applied under all circumstances, regardless of individual cases of hardship.

As has been noted previously, both subsections (á) and (b) do authorize a court to transfer a single proceeding or consolidate multiple proceedings for trial in a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business. There are no appellate court decisions interpreting this provision, but the few district courts which have had occasion to pass upon it have held that a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business excludes the claimant's home district. (See *U. S.* v. *600 Units of Nue-ovo* (60 Fed. Supp. 144); *U. S.* v. *6 Dozen Bottles of Dr. Pepper's Kuriko* (54 Fed. Supp. 458); and *U. S.* v. *26 Dozen Bottles Cervigards* (60 Fed. Supp. 626).) Such a ruling does not work an apparent hardship where the claimant's home district is in the East where district courts are reasonably close together. Far different circumstances prevail in the West where district courts are frequently hundreds of miles apart. If a claimant's principal place of business were in Los Angeles, for example, and a number of seizures were made in the East what district would be one of reasonable proximity to the Southern District of California which holds court in Los Angeles? The closest adjoining districts are the Northern District of California located in San Francisco and the District of Arizona in Phoenix. Each of these two cities is nearly 450 miles from Los Angeles. It is easy to conceive of circumstances where it would be difficult and expensive to properly try a lawsuit 450 miles removed from one's place of business. To take another example, suppose the claimant's principal place of business is in the district of Hawaii and seizures are made in various parts of the continental United States. Under the ruling in the cases cited supra it would appear that the claimant's only hope would be to have the multiple libels filed in the United States proper consolidated for trial in either the Northern or the Southern Districts of California, which are some 2,000 miles away from Hawaii.

The proposed amendments to section 304 (a) and (b), therefore, seek to make adequate provision whereby a court in which a libel action has been filed may upon proper application consolidate multiple libel proceedings for trial to any district or division thereof. A similar provision is proposed to apply to a single libel proceeding brought under section 304 (a) of the act. It should be noted that under the proposed amendments, transfer of a single libel proceeding or consolidation of multiple libel proceedings to any other district or division is not mandatory, but is discretionary with the court for the convenience of parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice. It is respectfully submitted that the proposed amendment to subsections (a) and (b) of section 304 (a) in regard to transfer for trial and consolidation would make it possible for the courts to transfer the cases to the claimant's home district where there exists a definite hardship. If the proposed amendment is adopted consolidation or removal could still be effected by stipulation to any district agreed upon between the parties or to any district where a libel proceeding involving the same claim has been filed. The only practical effect of the proposed amendment in regard to removal and consolidation is to authorize removal when justice so requires to any district or division thereof and to delete the provisions authorizing removal to a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business.

3. PREFERENCE ON TRIAL CALENDAR

The proposed amendment to section 304 (b) also seeks to provide that cases brought under section 304 shall be entitled to preference on the trial calendar. The reasons for such a provision are obvious, particularly where multiple libel proceedings are involved for until there is a decision on the merits the Federal Government would be free to make as many seizures as possible. While unlimited seizures may be justified where there is a claim that the public health is directly threatened, justice and fair play would seem to demand that in such an exigency a trial be had as soon as possible for a prompt decision on the merits would not only serve to further protect the public health for judicial condemnation would in effect authorize Nation-wide confiscation if the product were in fact dangerous. Furthermore, provisions for prompt trial would also relieve a shipper whose product is, in fact, not dangerous to health from the devastating and irreparable damage and injury caused by Nation-wide multiple seizures.

Mr. Speaker, when a three-man United States District Court, having heard all the evidence on both sides of an important controversy and after due consideration on this very point involved, unanimously hold and declare in their findings of fact and conclusions of law, as this three-man court did on December 14, 1949, to wit: "that the defendants"—note is mine: the defendant was the Federal Security Agency, charged with the administration and enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—"in making said decisions acted capriciously, arbitrarily, unreasonably, oppressively and unlawfully," it is time for Congress to pause and look to see whether or not expressed statutory authority should be given for such multiple seizures.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Naming of the Village of Leeds, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I know the Members will all want to join with me in commemorating the one-hundredth anniversary of the naming of the village of Leeds, in the Second Congressional District in Massachusetts.

Leeds was previously known as Shephard's Hollow. A 2-day celebration is to be held on August 19 and 20, with many activities to celebrate the occasion. There will also be a reunion of present and former residents of the village.

Leeds has had a long and interesting history. I wish time permitted me to discuss it in detail with the Members, as I know you would all enjoy hearing about it.

Between 1800 and 1812, three mills were erected in Leeds. The first was a saw mill, the second a cotton mill, and the third a woolen mill. James Shephard, one of the early settlers, was one of the first in America to manufacture broadcloth and woolens.

In 1849 the inhabitants petitioned the Government for a post office and for a change of the name to Leeds. Both requests were granted and the post office was established on May 27, 1850. In 1874 the village was nearly destroyed by a flood which demolished many homes and caused the loss of 51 lives. The citizens had great energy and courage and Leeds survived and prospered in spite of the disaster.

I know all the residents of the Second Congressional District wish to extend congratulations and best wishes to Leeds and to the residents of Leeds. I also know that all Members of Congress of both parties wish to pay their respects to Leeds on the one-hundredth anniversary of the naming of the village.

Our Sins Find Us Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House, I am including an editorial from the Wichita Eagle, Wichita, Kans. It is entitled "Our Sins Find Us Out." The author of this editorial sets forth the facts quite pointedly. The editorial follows:

OUR SINS FIND US OUT

The situation in which this Nation now finds itself as regards possible war with Russia did not come about overnight. It began with the fall of Berlin, when American troops who had fought their bloody way across the Rhine were forced to wait days until the Russians came up from a distance to march triumphantly through the streets of a city conquered almost entirely by American forces. In the shameful negotiations which followed the United States was permitted to take over a part of Berlin entirely surrounded by Russia, and so definitely under Red control they can even shut off our electricity.

In Austria we continue to play a bad second fiddle to Russia, and that country continues to be a staging area for Communist activities. In the name of a peace settlement Korea was divided into two areas, separated by a mythical line known as the thirty-eighth parallel. As usual our state and military representatives permitted Russia to take over the relatively prosperous industrial northern sector, while we now are forced to defend the muddy tip of the peninsula.

Russia has ample reasons for feeling superior to America because we have bowed to the Reds in every transaction since the last war. They have been petted and nursed in the United Nations, where they have been able to block any move in behalf of peace. Now they hold all the important bases in Asia, making possible an invasion of Japan, which may be their next move. Then we'll have only the Hawaiian islands and our own West coast between us and actual invasion.

Hawaii Molds a Constitution and a Lever for Obtaining Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Hawaii Molds a Constitution and a Lever for Obtaining Statehood," written by Harold S. Roberts and published in the Christian Science Monitor of August 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII MOLDS A CONSTITUTION AND A LEVER FOR OBTAINING STATEHOOD—DOCUMENT GLITTERS IN RESOURCEFULNESS—EVEN TONE UNDERLINED

(Although the outcome of this year's endeavor by the Territory of Hawaii to achieve statehood is, in the words of an informed Washington correspondent, still "just a toss-up" in Congress, the people of Hawaii are proving their resourcefulness. If one door is closed to statehood, they will knock at another, with a parchment in hand that should turn out to be a key as well. That parchment contains the new Constitution of the State of Hawaii. If the present Enabling Act should be lost in a congressional rush for adjournment, the people of Hawaii will be ready to return to Congress next winter, submit their State constitution, ask its acceptance, and upon granting thereof, thereby attain statehood. Fifteen States already have used this process to gain admission to the Union. The story of Hawaii's constitutional convention, as told by one of the delegates, follows.)

(By Harold S. Roberts, dean of the College of Business Administration, University of Hawaii)

Hawaii has on 16 different occasions petitioned the Congress to grant statehood. Unlike other Territories which have been permitted to come into the Union, beginning with the Northwest Territory in 1787, Hawaii has more than met the qualifications for statehood.

On 37 different occasions since 1920, bills have been introduced in successive sessions of Congress to provide statehood. In the past 15 years there have been nine separate hearings held by congressional committees on the question of statehood for Hawaii.

The Congress has more information and statistical data on Hawaii than on any other Territory previously admitted to the Union. Despite the record, Hawaii is still seeking equality with other States.

The most recent attempt to obtain statehood began by the introduction of an enabling statute by Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON on January 3, 1950. Hawaii has one Delegate to Congress, but without vote. This bill passed the House on March 7, 1950, by a vote of 262 to 110. On July 12, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee by a vote of 9 to 1, recommended statehood. Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, cast the only negative vote.

ANOTHER AVENUE TRIED

While this bill was going through the congressional mill, the Territorial legislature passed a bill to try another avenue for achieving statehood, should the enabling act procedure fail.

Some 15 States have been admitted to the Union by the alternative procedure of drafting a State constitution and going to Congress, knocking on the door, and asking to be admitted. At the present time, Hawaii is launching its campaign for statehood in a two-pronged offensive. The people of the Territory desire to come into the Union as a sovereign State on an equal footing with 35 other Territories previously admitted to statehood.

On Saturday, July 22, 61 delegates affixed their signatures to a historic document—the Constitution of the State of Hawaii. The ceremony took place in the throne room at historic Iolani Palace, Honolulu. There was a touch of deep solemnity, offset by the bright Hawaiian flowers and the changing strains of island music. The ceremony ended with the singing of the Star-Spangled Banner.

The new document is a product of Hawaii and its people. It reflects the thinking of an essentially conservative community, but one that is responsive to changing times and needs. The constitution has borrowed and adapted provisions from the Federal Constitution, the Hawaii Organic Act, the model State constitution, and the constitutions of the other States.

DIFFERENT PRODUCT

Although it has studied and tapped all of the available resources, the final product is unlike that of any other State. It has its own flavor and features which find roots in the problems and needs of the community. Typical of these are the provisions dealing with Hawaiian homelands, the limitations of bonded indebtedness, and the use of assessed land valuations to adjust these limits; and the sections dealing with local government, drafted in the light of a centralized tax structure and a coordinated and centralized system of public education.

The basic conservatism of the constitution is reflected in the limited number of elective officials. The Governor and Lieutenant Governor are the only elected officials. The cabinet members and the judges of the courts are appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the senate. The members of the board of education are to be appointed by the Governor, from panels nominated by the counties. There is no provision for the initiative, referendum, and recall—so popular during the first two decades of the century.

VOTING AGE REDUCED

Although fundamentally conservative, the constitution does contain many progressive features which reflect the forward-looking character of the community. The new constitution provides for the reduction in the voting age from 21 to 20. Only one other State in the Union has a voting age of less than 21. A provision recognizing the right to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining, as a constitutional guaranty, has been included. Only three other State constitutions, Missouri, New Jersey, and New York, provide such constitutional guaranties.

Many features of the document reflect the best current thinking in the field of government. For example, the executive departments of government in the new State are to be coordinated in no more than 20 major departments, to permit the Governor to keep a personal check on the functioning of the executive branch. There are provisions to eliminate the pocket veto. The salaries of the Governor, the judges, and members of the legislature have been increased to attract the best qualified men to office. The salaries compare favorably with the highest 10 States of the Union.

Provision is made for post-audits of State expenditures, as well as a requirement that the legislature pass the general appropriations bill before passing other finance bills. This may prevent the last-minute rush so typical of many legislative sessions, which makes it difficult to give careful scrutiny to final drafts of bills and leads to political log rolling and deals.

HEAVY VOTER TURN-OUT

In many other respects recognition is given to practices which are conducive to good government; Hawaii is conscious, however, that good government is more a product of the people of the community than of the written document which forms its base.

The 63 delegates, elected by the people at primary and general elections last February 11 and March 21, began their official task on April 4. Although the campaign was run on a nonpartisan basis (there were no party designations on the ballot), there was a heavy turn-out of voters. In excess of 80 percent of the registered voters cast their ballots. Of those elected, approximately one-third had never run for an elective office before.

For many of the delegates it will be their one and only campaign. These men and women were attracted by the nature of the job to be done. Writing a constitution for a new State comes but once in a lifetime. On the other hand, some of the newcomers may well try their wings in the political arena. No American community can overlook new blood for its political melting pot. Federal, State, and local government must continue to attract the best from all segments of the community.

The delegates, elected from all parts of the Territory, represented a broad cross section of the community. Among the 63 delegates were two pineapple company presidents, two union representatives, a judge of the circuit court, two former attorney generals, a member of the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii, the superintendent of public instruction, one physician, two dentists, the speaker and vice speaker of the Territorial House of Representatives, four members of the Territorial Senate, a number of school teachers, and others. Of the five women who won seats, two are attorneys, two are housewives, and one is a member of the Territorial Legislature.

Racially, the convention contained 27 Caucasians, 20 Japanese-Americans, 11 Hawaiians, and five Chinese-Americans; generally representative of the population. Politically, there were 29 Republicans, 21 Democrats, and 13 nonpartisans.

PROVISION FOR ELECTION

Should the Congress pass the enabling act in its present form, the constitution could be submitted to the people for ratification at the general elections in November. H. R. 49 provides that an election be held within 60 to 120 days after the passage of the enabling act. If the constitution is ratified by the people, it will be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Congress for approval. If Congress approves the ratified constitution, the people will then proceed to elect the State officers and two United States Senators and Members to the House of Representatives. Should the voters or the Congress fail to ratify the constitution, the delegates to the 1950 convention will have to reconvene to draft another constitution that will meet the objections of the Congress or those of the people.

Should the Congress fail to pass H. R. 49, the Constitution will be submitted to the next session of the Territorial Legislature. The legislature may not change the constitution. It may, however, draft an alternative. The people will then have the choice of voting for the constitution drafted by the delegates elected by them, the one drafted by the legislature, if any, or neither. If the people reject the Constitution, the convention has to reconvene to draft a new document. If the people approve the docu-

ment, it will be submitted to the Congress with a request for direct admission into the Union.

HAWAII AT DOOR

In the meantime, Hawaii knocks at the door for statehood. It alone of the territories that have shown their ability for democratic self-government, the ability to finance their own operations and to support our free institutions, has been denied equality of rights with the other States. Unlike Puerto Rico, which elects its own governor and pays no Federal taxes to the United States, Hawaii, which was a free republic when it entered into a mutual agreement with the United States in 1900 and has paid in over $1,000,000,000 in taxes to the Federal Government and paid close to $90,000,000 in 1949, is denied the right to elect its own governor, has no voting representation in Congress, and is denied the right to vote for the President of the United States.

If taxation without representation was tyranny in the middle of the eighteenth century, it is no less so in the middle of the twentieth.

Hawaii, the meeting place of the cultures of the east and west, a dynamic outpost of democracy in the Pacific, waits impatiently for recognition of more than a half century of democratic progress. It is ready and willing to assume its responsibility in the new Pacific era. Admission of Hawaii into the Union now would, in the words of the Senate committee, "give notice to all the world, and particularly to the peoples of the Pacific at this critical juncture of international affairs, that it is the policy of the United States to provide self-government among all the peoples without political, economic, racial or other distinction."

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

Both major parties have, in the past 10 years, included statehood for Hawaii in their platforms. Hawaiians say it is high time to transform these promises into political realities.

The constitutional convention was democracy in action. The delegates convened on April 4, adopted rules of procedure, elected officers, set up 20 working committees, and began their deliberations. Members indicated their preference for committee assignments on the basis of interest and special technical qualifications. The committees ranged in size from 5 to 15 members; they studied all of the proposals introduced by the individual delegates; invited experts in the special fields under consideration, and held public hearings.

Unlike many political conventions, and for that matter different from the convention which drafted our own Federal Constitution, all of the committee meetings were open to the public, press, and radio. A weekly report was prepared by the committee on submission and information which was distributed to many community groups, which in turn made copies available to constituent members. Four radio stations provided time during the week for summaries of the work of the convention. The press provided good daily coverage.

REPORT SUBMITTED

As each committee completed its deliberations, it submitted a detailed report setting forth the scope and character of the problem before it and the results of its work. At the conclusion of each report was a proposal which contained the specific language recommended by the committee for incorporation in the proposed constitution. Copies were duplicated for all the delegates, the press, and community groups which desired them. These standing committees' reports were then placed on the calendar for full consideration and debate.

To provide the maximum flexibility and informality of discussion, most of the debate on the reports was held in committee of the whole. Through full and free discussion (completely open to the press and public), by amendments and suggestions from the floor, the committee proposals and recommendations were dissected, paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence, and occasionally word by word.

Unlike the deliberations of many legislative bodies, proposals underwent substantial modification on the floor. The debates were frequently intense, sometimes acrimonious. On the whole, however, the discussions were on a high plane, directed toward the basic issues under consideration. One rather unusual feature of the deliberations, and a tribute to the delegates, lies in the fact that at no time was it necessary to place a limitation on debate. The rules made ample provision for such limitation, but they were never put to use.

Ample time was provided to give each of the respective chairmen of the committee of the whole to prepare his report and recommendation, which was then presented to the delegates for adoption. The reports and proposals so approved were then sent to the committee on style for arrangement and form. The style committee was under specific instruction to confine its work to form and style and was prohibited from making any change of a substantive character. It could, and did, however, call attention to discrepancies, omissions, or conflict, and report to the convention for further instructions or action.

SEQUENCE GIVEN

The style committee then resubmitted each of the articles to the convention for approval and adoption on form and style. The articles were again sent to the style committee for final arrangement and review of all of the sections into an integrated and cohesive document. As finally adopted, the provisions of the constitution are arranged in the following sequence:

Preamble.
Adoption of Federal Constitution.
Article 1: Bill of rights.
Article 2: Suffrage and elections.
Article 3: The legislature.
Article 4: The executive.
Article 5: The judiciary.
Article 6: Taxation and finance.
Article 7: Local government.
Article 8: Public health and welfare.
Article 9: Education.
Article 10: Development and conservation of resources.
Article 11: Hawaiian home lands.
Article 12: Organization, collective bargaining.
Article 13: State boundaries, capital, flag.
Article 14: General and miscellaneous provisions.
Article 15: Revisions and amendments.
Article 16—Schedule:
(a) Representative districts.
(b) Transitional laws.
(c) First officers, election procedures.

ONE-HUNDRED-AND-TEN-DAY CONVENTION

The convention lasted 110 calendar days. Actually there were 78 days devoted to plenary sessions. At other times there were committee meetings, hearings, and preparation of committee reports. During the preliminary period of committee work there were, on the average 20 to 30 meetings each week occupying in excess of 40 hours of work.

No verbatim transcript was kept of the deliberations of the standing committees. Each committee did keep a brief summary in the form of minutes, and these were available to the other delegates. These minutes will also be part of the record to be kept in the archives with other official documents.

The convention did keep a complete verbatim transcript by means of electronic tape recordings of all the session after April 9. Over 365 reels of recording tape were used, or about 87 miles of recording tape. It has been estimated that approximately 5,000,000 words were spoken during the floor debates. Only 14,000, however, found a place in the constitution. Of these, approximately 4,000 are in the schedule which describes the political districts to be used in the initial elections and for subsequent reapportionment every 10 years.

Social Security Combats Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to speak in favor of expanding and liberalizing the provisions and benefits of our present social security law, because I have steadily fought for this objective since becoming a Member of Congress.

The ever-rising living costs in America impose a real obligation upon us to increase social-security payments. To preserve our economy and national welfare it is mandatory that we provide for the inclusion of those millions of our citizens who are at this moment ineligible to receive social-security benefits.

I support this bill in substance because I am among those who earnestly feel it is the responsibility of the Government to aid the men and women who have spent a lifetime in the development of this great Nation. It is practical wisdom, in the encouragement of a high national morale, for the Government to reasonably insure these worthy workers are not left, in the sunset of life, facing desperation and want. Such governmental action involves no change in our democratic processes or objectives. Surely this great and mighty economy of America, which virtually challenges the human imagination in its productive capacity and gigantic income of over $225,000,000,000 annually, is able to set up guaranties against hardship and privation and fear for those who have made such consistent contributions to its effectiveness, strength, vitality, and success.

In my firm judgment, adequate social-security legislation is a sound barrier against the advancing scourge of communistic propaganda and philosophy which is challenging us this very hour and is forcing us to fight for our very survival. How much stronger, how much more resistant to Communist intrigue and entreatment our Nation will be when its citizens are assured that our great business system and our Government, working harmoniously together, have established a dignified, humane way to make them eligible for that which

every loyal citizen of this great democracy is entitled to receive, namely, security in time of adversity and need. Because this measure is founded upon humane, progressive principles calculated to strengthen our democratic free-enterprise system, I am supporting it.

Before I have the privilege and pleasure of casting my vote, I earnestly hope the Knowland amendment will be removed. This amendment proposal was placed in the bill on the floor of the other legislative division of Congress. It was hardly accorded 10 minutes of debate upon the floor of that other body, and I do not think there is any Member who has had the time to assess the full meaning and import of the procedural changes in the law that would be made necesary by the Knowland amendment. This amendment would destroy the Federal minimum requirements in a program which has been created by Federal legislation and which is operated by Federal legislation. It would impair State and Federal cooperation with reference to the unemployment-insurance program.

In essence it would open the door for the creation and confusion of 51 unemployment insurance programs by the States which would thereby become the controlling factor with reference to the Federal Government. At a time when it is vitally necessary to have fair and peaceful industrial relations for all-out production for national defense and essential goods and services, the inclusion of this amendment threatens disaster.

Moreover, subcommittees in the House and Senate are scheduled to shortly begin the study of the whole question of unemployment compensation insurance and it would be only practical wisdom to wait until we have authoritative information on the subject, provided by these committees.

It is true the measure we are now considering is a substantial improvement on existing law. Nevertheless, I cannot let this opportunity pass to remind you it is the first comprehensive change proposed in the social-security law, since its enactment in 1935. With the accelerated development in modern economy and accompanying complications, I should like to point out the commonsense observation that even this legislation will have to be revised in the near future.

The figures show us that the number of older citizens among us is steadily growing and there is no doubt that our outlays on social security will become increasingly great in the years ahead.

This social-security legislation we are acting upon today is good, but the debate has clearly shown the whole system should be reviewed and revised. Our social-security system has been operating without any over-all review or change for the past 15 years. I most seriously recommend that standing committees be set up to conduct a searching inquiry of the social-security problems with the objective of effecting basic administrative and financing improvements in the operating procedure we now have.

The Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, August 15, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] delivered a speech on the subject of our so-called bipartisan foreign policy, which I think will be of interest to all Members of the Senate. The speech was delivered before the Rotary Club of Indianapolis. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Indianapolis Rotary Club and guests, the American people are now beginning to realize that the eruption of war in Korea has finally exposed the frightful bankruptcy of our so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

And across this Nation today, our fellow-Americans are demanding to know what has happened to all the slogans, panaceas and promises of peace—what is now at stake in the Korean crisis, and where we are going from here?

Surely, if ever the American people needed to be told the truth and to be taken into the confidence of their Government, now is the time.

Yet, from the very moment the Korean war broke out, the American people and their elected representatives in both Houses of Congress have been groping around in the dark in their efforts to find an answer to these vital questions.

Meanwhile, the dangers we confront and the disasters that are in the making are growing graver by the hour. This is why I want to talk with you frankly, as a fellow Indianan and fellow American, about the significance of the outbreak of the war in Korea.

Frankly, America is now caught in a grim struggle for sheer survival and the crisis confronting us is far too grave for any one of us to seek personal or political gain.

The facts behind this crisis are so shocking they have rendered party affiliations meaningless. For reality is no respecter of partisan politics.

I ask you, how are we going to get at the facts if we permit ourselves to be browbeaten, bribed or blackmailed into silence, in the face of determined efforts to cover them up? At this very moment the same bungling policy makers who got us into this mess are crying "don't play politics with the Korean war," and have now issued a public statement claiming that isolationists must shoulder the responsibility for the Communist attack on South Korea.

On July 20, 1950, the State Department put out an official white paper, whitewashing the past by saying nothing whatever about the documentary evidence of events and decisions leading up to the Korean war.

On July 23, 1950, Mr. James Reston wrote in the New York Times—and I quote, "Nobody outside of the top level of the executive branch of Government has access to the only papers that would really tell how we got committed in Korea and how we decided to pull our troops out of there without deciding what we would do if the North Koreans attacked."

In the July 26, 1950, issue of the United States News we were told the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the Senate is anxious to bottle up a few Senators who might be too inquisitive about the war, and the manner in which it is run.

So instead of telling the American people the truth, those responsible for the debacle have dragged out the old propaganda line again, calling for unity.

This line is reflected in a recent broadcast by my colleague, Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, in which he said, "only one thing could give the Communists in Asia and Europe renewed hope for victory over our brave fighting men—that would be the rise of disunity here in America."

And we further realize how the facts have been withheld when we also read in the same article by James Reston, to which I have referred: "For years official Washington built up the Soviet Union and Nationalist China, concealed and distorted the true facts of life in those countries, and condemned reports to the contrary as detrimental material that gave aid and comfort to the enemy * * *, but reporters who publish the facts in this case are still getting the same old line that such articles are not helpful—that they give aid and comfort to the Russians."

In other words, every statement of fact and honest criticism of this Korean crisis is being smeared as "giving aid and comfort to the Russians," no matter how dangerous or suicidal these policies may be so far as the future of America is concerned.

Even such a stanch defender of our bipartisan foreign policy as Marquis Childs has been forced to admit in the Washington Post of July 18, 1950, that: "Certainly the American people are entitled to a frank and complete statement of where we are and how we got there, and where we go from here. In any survey of the tragic deficiencies of the past year or more, almost none ranks higher than the deficiency of information."

This is nothing but a repetition on a more fantastic scale, of the very same type and technique of propaganda and smear which helped to produce the present desperate world situation.

I am absolutely convinced it would now be a criminal disservice to America for anyone to line up in blind support of a repetition in the future, on a larger scale, of the disastrous blunders and betrayals of the past.

Certainly we now need a united American people, but we must unite in a common cause to save America. And I see no way in which we could do this unless we can unite behind the truth of what has happened, and an intelligent understanding of what is now at stake.

Since we continue to be denied the facts we are forced to piece the Korean puzzle together ourselves, and while some of the details may be lacking—here, in the broad outline, is the picture we will get.

On June 25, 1950, the North Korean Communist army broke across the thirty-eighth parallel and headed south. And as the following facts will show, this successful surprise attack was a more complete and overwhelming defeat than Pearl Harbor. Those responsible for safeguarding our vital interests and security, both in the Orient and Washington, were caught flat-footed—or so they would have us believe, although they were in complete possession of the following information.

These men to whom I have referred, knew they had engineered the sell-out of China and Manchuria at Yalta. They knew they had also carved Korea in two at the thirty-eighth parallel, thus leaving South Korea economically unable to support itself, politically divided and militarily undefendable. And they knew these sell-outs were made at

a time when Japan had already offered to surrender.

They knew of Russia's intentions from the outset. For from the very beginning, Russia refused to let the economic barriers down between North and South Korea, refused even to ship coal south from the North Korean coal mines and forced us for the first time in history, to export coal from Japan to South Korea to keep our own American troops from freezing to death.

They knew of the military intentions of Russia, for they had been in possession of a confidential report by Edwin C. Pauley, the President's personal adviser, that was sent to Mr. Truman in 1946, warning that at that time, the Soviet Union was a deliberate aggressor.

As far back as November 24, 1947, 12 former Ambassadors of the United States jointly telegraphed the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, warning of Russia's intentions in the Far East and pointing out how grave a threat to our own security these intentions were becoming.

These men were in possession of the reports of the United Nations Commission on Korea which, for over 2 years, has known of Russia's political intentions, since Stalin would never permit the holding of over-all Korean elections by this Commission.

They were in possession of ECA reports on conditions in Korea; of a long series of reports by Ambassador Muccio; of a whole file of secret reports from General MacArthur, who had been completely divorced from any jurisdiction over the Korean situation.

They had been in possession of reports by Ambassador at Large Phillip Jessup, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Mr. John Foster Dulles.

They were in possession of the secret reports of the Central Intelligence Agency, under command of Admiral Hillenkoetter, who has testified before a Senate committee that these reports have been warning of an unexpected attack by North Korea for over a year.

These American intelligence reports contained the information that the North Korean Communist Army included more than 100,000 men, at least one regiment of tanks and between 50 and 100 planes, and also advised of the build-up of the Army strength starting in January 1950.

These men also had turned down a request from President Rhee, of South Korea, more than 7 months before the invasion, calling for arms against a threatened attack.

But this is not the whole story, for in the face of these facts, and in the face of these warnings, the State Department had been following the pro-Communist Acheson-Jessup-Lattimore-Service-Amerasia line in the Far East which had written off China, Manchuria, and Formosa as late as December 1949.

So far as Korea was concerned, right up to the outbreak of the war, the State Department had been following Owen Lattimore's advice in which he urged us to "let Korea fall but not to make it look as if we pushed it."

Why even Mr. John Foster Dulles recently admitted to a group of Senators that the State Department Far Eastern Division has been run by a group advocating "that a good dose of communism would be good for the Orient."

And now that the Communists have been turned loose in the Orient, none other than Owen Lattimore, himself, just one week ago, urged the United States to seat the Communist China delegation in the United Nations since it is imperative that the spread of communism be checked in Asia.

This situation would be tragic enough, in itself. Yet to make bad matters worse, the Korean crisis is being used to maneuver us into a position where we are now being committed to financial, economic, and military action in every nook and cranny of the world.

Korea has now become the symbol of a fantastic foreign policy which now confronts us with similar commitments in a hundred other Korean debacles which are in the making all around the borders of Russia's iron curtain.

But the most frightening fact of all is that so far as the basic policies are concerned, nothing has really changed, except that American GI's are fighting and dying in Korea.

The same economic absurdity, the same financial insanity, and the same military lunacy which dictated our bipartisan foreign policy up until the Korean conflict are still in operation, and we are being asked to surrender blanket powers to control our economic, industrial, and social system, and turn our pocketbooks inside out to enlarge and extend the suicidal pattern of these follies, both at home and abroad.

The records show that those who were willing to flaunt the lessons of history, in engineering the sell-out of the Orient, are determined to continue pushing us down the road we are traveling, both on the domestic and international scene, even though the signposts of history warn that this road has destroyed every other free people who have tried it.

Indeed, there are many who feel that we have been following this road so long and have goten ourselves in so deep, there is no alternative—that we just have to continue going the way we were going, and that we will be damned if we do, and we will be damned if we don't.

For myself, it would be fatal to our future as a free people, if this growing feeling of despair should prevail, for we can be absolutely certain just where this road is taking us.

First, the Korean crisis has proved that for the past 18 years, our destiny has been in the hands of men who are either traitors, or such political fanatics, that, with the sincerest of intentions, they have been tearing up by the roots, the basic American principles which have safeguarded the dignity of our free institutions, and thrown them on the ash heap of lost civilizations.

For the record clearly shows that the powers which the President is now requesting to back up his global Korean policy, are the very same powers which these self-appointed saviors have been demanding we surrender into their hands so they could remake our form of government, our economic system, and our social structure, both from within and from without.

We now have only ourselves to blame if we fail to realize that these hand-out fanatics have been insisting through depression and prosperity, through good times and bad, through war and peace, that these are the powers they had to have for the remaking of America.

The record clearly shows, throughout a whole generation, certain groups have been attempting to saddle on us permanently, even in peacetime, a perpetual wartime economy with its government by crisis, government by control, government by decree, government by regimentation, and government by deficit financing which would destroy America as we have known this beloved land of ours. And this strategy of boring from within, developed to the point where, just before the Korean outbreak, Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson were engaged in a political horse race, trying to give America away.

On the domestic scene Mr. Truman's welfare state program, the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, the Spence bill, and the rest, which he had promised the American people, had grown until it would have cost us $67,000,000,000 annually to buy the votes necessary to keep him in power.

And on the international scene Mr. Acheson had underwritten 27 foreign hand-out programs which cost us thirty-five billions in our attempt to buy our allies. So that our bipartisan foreign policy now turns out to be nothing but the extension on the international scene, of the hand-out philosophy at home. They are part and parcel of each other, and they are leading us further and further down the road to a bankrupt dictatorship at home, dominated and controlled by an international semi-super-state abroad.

And now Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson want the powers to finish the job. They are determined to set Mr. Truman up as a global policeman and a global warlord, who can make and break international agreements and commitments at will, without being accountable to anyone; and as an economic czar and financial dictator who can take what he wants of our manpower and resources to back up these commitments; who can turn our Armed Forces into a permanent foreign legion, to defend everyone else's interest but our own, and who can force the American people to finance this global goose chase and put them on a ration system for what is left.

This is exactly the direction in which we are moving and it means if we surrender these powers—we shall surrender them forever.

There is a second reason why we can be sure of what lies in store for us if we continue down the road we are traveling. That reason is, the staggering defeat that has been inflicted on the American people by the outrageous betrayals of our interests, in the secret conferences of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

These betrayals paralyzed the European and Asiatic economies, reduced the nations on this side of the iron curtain to permanent bankrupt wards of the United States, transplanted power politics between big nations, to a struggle between right and left between every nation under the sun, destroyed Germany and Japan, the only two nations capable of resisting the threat of Communist military might, and left us holding the bag.

This defeat has been so disastrous that every program we have undertaken to undo the damage has also played directly into Stalin's hands. Stalin is determined to force America to spend herself into bankruptcy trying to undo these mistakes that cannot be undone.

Our resources have been strained already to the breaking point in this attempt to correct the tragic blunders that have been made, but we need no imagination to understand how suicidal the consequences will be if we now take the lid off and start pouring what is left of our resources and our wealth into sinkholes of Europe and Asia, in our last-ditch attempt to do the impossible.

America cannot underwrite the economic, financial, social, political, and military needs and defenses of the whole anti-Soviet world without destroying herself.

And, so far as I am concerned, there are some mistakes in history which cannot be corrected. I am more interested in saving America than I am of saving face.

Those in control of our Government during the tragic years have deliberately torn the world in two and handed one-half of it on a silver platter to Russia. Now, I do not intend to help them destroy America, trying to salvage what is left of the half they did not give away.

I still believe that foreign policy, to make any sense, should be only an outward expression of our own internal needs and interests. And that war itself can only be justified, if ever, as an attempt to achieve these objectives by armed might.

That is why I have been trying to arouse the American people to the futility of the course we are following, and to the desperate need for a day of reckoning. America now desperately needs a redefinition of what constitutes the legitimate and vital areas of interest and security; areas the protection of which are necessary to our national survival as a free people, areas which can be defended within the framework of constitutional government and which are within our economic, financial, social, and military means to defend.

Uncle Sam has been forced to stand on his head in too many places at the same time, all around the world, and certainly the world looks different when you are standing on your head.

As a result, as of this very moment, there is a cry for the surrender of powers and a call for God knows how many additional billions, not for the purpose of defending these United States and our own vital and legitimate interests, but, instead, for the purpose of launching an all-out crusade of a global goose chase against communism everywhere else except in Washington.

Incredible as it may seem at this very moment, your Government has no plans which state the minimum requirements for the impregnable national defense of the continental United States. At this very moment Canada still does not know how it can contribute to the defense of the Western Hemisphere, except that it will get 10 percent of our new war contracts. South America is in the same boat, and, of course, you know Alaska has 7,500 men standing between it and Russia, 50 miles away.

We do not even have an American policy for the Pacific, none for the Middle and Near East, and plans for the so-called North Atlantic Pact are not even in the blueprint stage.

And so far as our allies are concerned, sure, England and France both have advised us they will fight to the last American dollar and the last American man.

For us to continue to surrender more powers and endless billions into the hands of men who say they are going to save the world, when they have not yet made up their minds what is necessary to the defense of these United States, is an open invitation to suicide.

We are caught in a grim struggle for sheer survival and the time has come to put Uncle Sam back on his feet, to draw a line which we can defend as a free people: to extend the Monroe Doctrine to cover it; to encourage federation of nations in Europe and Asia, to organize for their own mutual defense; and give priority to our own defense requirements in the allocation of our raw materials, manpower, and war material.

Then let us put an end to the senseless policy of building up Russia behind the iron curtain by secret trade pacts, by subsidizing their production and exportation of gold, by feeding dollars into their state-controlled trade monopolies behind the iron curtain, by continuing to destroy the economic, industrial strength of western Germany, by continuing to leave the initiative in the hands of Stalin, who can light the fuze, raise the ante, and pull the strings in new outbreaks of civil and guerrilla warfare around the world, and force us to squander our substance, piecemeal, around the four corners of the globe, trying to stop the spreading outer rim of the Communist cancer, while the very core of it feeds and grows on its spoils of war, in serene security in Moscow.

It may be too late, but I still believe the American people, when they get the facts and when they understand the alternatives before us, will yet unite in such a common cause as this, to defend America, in their determination to keep America sound, strong, and free.

A Nonpartisan Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have commented on many previous occasions on the vital issue of restoring the balance of appointments between the two major political parties on the Nation's judiciary. I do not want at the present time to take the valuable time of the Senate floor for a further discussion of this issue. However, I ask unanimous consent there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a supplementary statement which I have prepared on this problem, as well as an editorial which was carried in the Tuesday, August 15, 1950, issue of the Chicago Daily News.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NONPARTISAN JUDICIARY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the editorial to which I have referred begins with the paragraph:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, has made a suggestion to President Truman so sensible it is almost sure to be rejected."

I appreciate the compliment which this great newspaper has paid to me. It has one of the finest editorial pages of the country, and I say that very sincerely and wholly aside from consideration of this particular editorial. I am afraid, however, that judging from past experiences this suggestion for a balanced judiciary which I do indeed feel to be sensible, will be rejected. Certainly President Truman's flippant reply to my letter to him suggests that the President still is committed to a policy of "to the victor belongs the spoils."

It is indeed a shocking condition that in 17 years, a mere 8 of 192 Federal judicial appointments should have been Republicans while 184 were Democrats. Continuation of this policy is outrageous amidst the present grave war situation. It is an absolute farce that the Democratic administration asks bipartisan unity in the field of foreign policy and yet makes such a mockery of a field almost as important, namely, the Federal courts. Every time one of us Republicans gets up to ask for more equality in appointments to the judiciary, the Democrats start to sneer, "Oh, that is simply a Republican partisan appeal." It does not occur to these Democrats that their own actions are the most partisan of all.

I speak for a balanced judiciary, not because I am a Republican, but because I am an American, because I am a United States Senator, because I am a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, because I am an attorney and a former district attorney. I know that the members of the American bar, regardless of their political appointments, feel that the Truman and Roosevelt administration's unbalanced appointments have dealt a severe blow to the integrity of our entire judicial system.

Not so many years ago, the American people were thrilled when Members of Congress rejected the infamous Court-packing scheme. But the Court-packing attempt of the 1930's was as child's play compared to the continuous court packing which has been carried on for 17 years. Never before has the Nation's judiciary been more important. Never before has it been called upon to act in so many critical cases. Never before has it been more important that the President make at least a gesture toward our Nation's unity.

AN APPEAL FOR GOP APPOINTMENTS AS IN ILLINOIS

I appeal to responsible elements in the Democratic Party to recognize their obligation and to urge the President that in the pending judicial appointments such as for vacancies in Illinois, qualified Republican jurists receive fair consideration.

During the Republican Eightieth Congress, when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, we had the potential votes in the Senate to prevent action on any single judicial nomination. If we Republicans had intended to act partisan, we could have halted the entire confirmation procedure. Instead, we chose to continue confirming Democratic jurists who had received recommendation of the American bar. We appealed time and again, we waited patiently for the President to change his policy, but the President refused to do so.

ALL AMERICA IS OUTRAGED AGAINST COURT PACKING

The Democratic National Committee felt then, as it apparently feels now, that they could get away with anything, that they could keep on packing the judiciary without ever having the Congress rise in righteous wrath against this shocking procedure. I warn the Democratic National Committee, however, and I warn the partisan zealots of the Democratic Party that it is not just we Republicans that are outraged by this court packing; it is the American people as a whole.

In November 1948 21,970,000 Americans voted for the Republican ticket. According to the Democratic National Committee, apparently, the judicial rights of those Americans don't seem to count. I believe, however, that they do count, and I believe that most of the 24,000,000 Americans who voted Democratic are fair enough to recognize the need for a more balanced judiciary.

[From the Chicago Daily News of August 15, 1950]

AS WE SEE IT

FOR NONPARTISAN JUDICIARY

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, has made a suggestion to President Truman so sensible it is almost sure to be rejected.

The Senator proposes that the President appoint some outstanding Republican judges or lawyers to the vacancies on the Federal bench. This, he contends, would strongly reinforce the nonpartisan character that the judiciary ought to have.

During the recent hearings on the appointment of Sherman Minton to the Supreme Court, it was brought out that of 192 Federal judges appointed from 1933 onward, all but 8 have been Democrats.

There are three judicial appointments to be made in Illinois. At the suggestion of Senator LUCAS some months ago, President Truman did promote a Republican, Judge Walter C. Lindley, from the district court to the court of appeals. This promotion, however, did not add anything net to the minority party's representation on the Federal bench.

In the months ahead, President Truman is going to make many appeals for bipartisan support. He could earn some by a more nonpartisan treatment of the judiciary.

What Price Efficiency—We're Not So Hot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by the American Taxpayers Association:

WHAT PRICE EFFICIENCY—WE'RE NOT SO HOT

The stopgap tax bill will be whipped in shape by the Senate Finance Committee within the next few days. It will call for $5,000,000,000 additional taxes. Keep this figure in mind, we will refer to it again.

Remember, also, we have had wartime—not peacetime—taxes for the past 5 years. We have continued on a war-tax basis during the cold war. Excise war taxes have never even been reduced. Personal income and corporation taxes have remained at high levels. Payroll taxes still flow into the Treasury. Now we are told that new war taxes must be added to the war taxes already in effect.

The President has asked Congress for new appropriations totaling nearly $16,000,000,000. Of this sum, $4,000,000,000, in addition to a billion and a quarter already voted, is to help other non-Communist nations arm.

Yes, neither the President nor his advisers have a program and can't even say why they ask for $4,000,000,000 instead of some other sum. This Government has no commitment from any nation as to how the money will be used. It has no commitment that these nations will expand their armed forces or how far they will go in making arms. It has no commitment that we will have bases in any other country. Administration spokesmen say, further, they expect no such commitments. They don't know how much more will be needed, but say that $4,000,000,000—and probably much more—will be needed yearly through 1952, maybe much longer. If foreign countries, after receiving these huge sums, do not perform as expected, administration spokesmen say the United States will have to do them. A pretty picture!

We don't know—and nobody knows—how much the Korean police patrol will cost, or what will come after. We do know—and common sense dictates—that the Government's billions of nonsecurity expenditures should be cut back drastically. Not a single person will begrudge a single penny to give our fighting forces what they must have. That is understood without saying. But the time has come when Congress should know the specific purposes for which it appropriates money and see to it that the money is spent for that purpose.

TIME FOR SANITY

Washington officialdom is utterly confused. Jitters approaching hysteria are observable in every congressional action. Congress is panicky in its feverish haste to grant powers and make additional appropriations far in excess of those actually requested—and the latter by no means are modest.

Here is a sample of the hysteria: A few days ago the House permitted just 30 seconds each for discussion of 16 important amendments to the proposed war-control bill. One—an excess-profits tax—was voted without reading and without a single Member except the proponent knowing what it contained. After some fast parliamentary maneuvering, the Members learned what they had voted for and promptly changed their votes.

Unfortunately, the tax increases which have been proposed so far are quite obviously designed to keep up the pretense that huge expenditures can be met by taxing corporations and the well-to-do. Some people may be fooled by this program, but they'll soon find out to their sorrow.

WHERE DID DEFENSE BILLIONS GO?

Taxpayers during the past 4 years shelled out a record $50,000,000,000 for military defense. Now, Members of Congress, high-ranking Defense officials, and committee chairmen—somewhat belatedly—are trying to find out what this huge sum purchased. The answer will be found in the United States News and World Report printed several days ago in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That report shows that two-thirds of all military spending has gone for services performed, not for weapons or supplies bought. It went for pay, travel, telephone bills, transportation, rents, pensions, and other similar items. They call it "military housekeeping."

Only $1 in $7 has been spent on arms of any kind in the past 4 years. Only $600,000,000 was spent on weapons—less than the amount spent on military travel, half the cost of shipping military freight, and barely twice the amounts spent for rent and utilities at military installations.

No big artillery guns, rifles, machine guns, or new naval guns have been purchased. New guns have been developed, but not bought. The report shows how our war strength in fighting divisions, ground and air forces, and all through the service has been decreased. If only 50 percent of the defense outlays during the past 4 years had been spent for weapons and equipment we could have purchased new postwar equipment for 100 Army divisions—more than we used in World War II—plus 100 air groups—plus 50 big aircraft carriers, twice the number in use at the peak of the last war.

How did we get in this position? Some folks are running their hands over their brows and muttering that maybe we had too many small men rattling around in big places.

The Defense Department employed 2,495 workers and spent $8,465,000 in the fiscal year ended June 30 on publicity activities to acquaint the American taxpayer with what was being done for security. Senator BRIDGES a few days ago charged that the President and Defense Secretary Johnson had misled the people by glowing statements which failed to give an accurate picture of the Nation's unpreparedness. He accused the administration of using Government funds to buy votes instead of bullets. Referring to the huge amounts appropriated for defense, Senator BRIDGES said: "The fact is we were not prepared for a show-down in Korea or anywhere else. The administration spent billions of dollars to buy surplus commodities to keep food prices high and provide other hand-outs."

We have a few thousand boys from almost every State in the Union backed into the hills of a far-away land and committed to a battle which they must win if they are not to die. Our leaders sent them there. Whether the decision and the advice which led to that decision were bad, time alone will tell. We are in this thing up to our necks, and we must see it through.

However, it has come as somewhat of a shock to learn that we are so shamefully weak when the test comes. If any doubt remained as to the need for the strictest possible economy in Government, the grim march of recent events must have removed it. This country is now committed to a policy—which has the approval of the leaders of both political parties—whose costs no one can estimate. In view of this, how can further waste and unnecessary domestic spending be countenanced?

THE PARTY IS OVER

Continued deficit spending perils our financial structure which will be further weakened by demands of war. It isn't pleasant to parade this situation before the public. Little can be accomplished by mourning or pointing with alarm. What is needed is action. Federal Government extravagances which brought about the present condition must be curbed. It must be made clear to the spendthrifts in Washington that the party is over—that the time has come to pay the fiddler and turn out the lights.

With American soldiers dying in Korea, with others being called into military service, with war taxes about to be piled upon war taxes and civilian restrictions multiplying, the Government ought to be setting an example in economy. We are being urged to prepare for sacrifices, yet a spendthrift Government sets an example of waste and extravagance unparalleled in the face of the urgent need for economy. How absurd to say that everyone must tighten his belt and prepare for new sacrifices, except governmental agencies.

EXPENDITURES MUST BE CUT

The House did some pruning of the omnibus single-package appropriations bill carrying some $34,000,000,000. But the "spenders" in the Senate called the House efforts a dangerous "meat-ax" attack. They said the cutting must be "selective."

So a few Senators made a gallant effort at "selective" cutting. They studied the bill carefully and concluded that more than $1,000,000,000 could be eliminated from the "pork barrel" provisions. One Senator rose 68 times in the Senate and explained how the appropriations could be reduced—68 times his fellow Senators voted him down, usually with derision and without debate.

Even a proposal to cut one item $1 was shouted down. Administration spokesmen led by by Senate Leader LUCAS opposed all attempts at economy, actually restored to the bill the cuts made by the House, and in many instances increased them substantially.

FOOD PROGRAM BASED ON VOTES

The Defense Department requires large stocks of food for our Armed Forces. The Department of Agriculture already has billions of pounds of dried eggs, butter, potatoes, dried milk, and other foods purchased at a cost of many billions of dollars.

Secretary Brannan says these huge stocks of food will spoil shortly unless they can get to the cook stoves. Why not turn them over to the Defense Department? That would be too simple. Besides, it would mean the loss of many votes in the Farm Belt. So now two separate branches of the Federal Government are competing in the open market for identical foodstuffs. All the money comes from the taxpayer, as usual. Agriculture will spend more billions for food to be stored in caves until it spoils, or is destroyed, or rendered unfit for human consumption. At the same time, the Defense Department will spend more billions for the identical foodstuffs. Does it make sense to you? If that isn't "trimming" the taxpayer twice, then our arithmetic is faulty.

WHERE TO SAVE $5,000,000,000

That's the figure we mentioned before. There is nothing magic about it. It is a simple plan to save $5,000,000,000 a year now being thrown away by the Defense Department. Anybody can find the facts by merely reading the report of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government or by looking at hearings on H. R. 321 held in May 1949, by the Armed Services Committee.

This bill provides for a single supply catalog system for the National Military Establishment. Simple? Logical? Certainly. No sound reason has been advanced against the system and, once listed, the things

needed by the fighting forces can be located promptly and moved as required for the safety and security of the United States. Yet Congress refuses to correct this ridiculous condition.

WHERE TO SAVE ANOTHER $5,000,000,000

Let's start with the 1948 budget. In that fiscal year Federal expenditures reached their postwar low and business was good. The budget was balanced. National debt was reduced. And taxes were cut.

In that year Federal expenditures for strictly domestic-civilian activities totaled $6,400,000,000. This year the President wants to spend $11,600,000,000, an increase of $5,200,000,000. If these domestic-civilian programs were merely cut back to the 1948 level the saving would be $5,200,000,000. That reduction would still leave $6,400,000,000 for such activities. A conservative estimate would indicate that probably further reductions under present circumstances would approximate another $1,000,000,000.

Most of the cuts would come from funds sought by nondefense Federal agencies for personnel, travel, transportation, communications, printing and other expenses. The other cuts would come from funds for material, supplies and manpower for rivers, harbors, navigation, flood control, reclamation, and other "pork barrel" undertakings.

We have in the above two proposals a clear saving of more than $10,000,000,000—the amount the President says must be appropriated right now. This is not dream stuff. As Senator BYRD stated recently: "Unbearable debt and taxation can destroy our solvency and if we do not reduce nondefense Federal expenditures wherever we can we shall be hastening indefensibly to the precipice of national disaster."

The Defense Department plans to hire 237,000 additional civilian employees next year. But they need not be an addition to the Federal payroll. Government departments, other than defense, now have 1,350,000 civilian employees. Congress must ruthlessly cut spending and employment by these departments on every program and activity that can be deferred or reduced and the Defense Department can fill its needs for more civilian workers by taking on those from other Federal jobs made nonessential since Korea.

Of course no agency head will voluntarily admit that his work is unimportant and his employees nonessential. But are they necessary? For example, there are more than 10,000 people employed full time gathering Government statistics. Many of them overlap; most are of questionable value. These employees can be shifted to the Defense Department. Instead, every agency is figuring how it can get a role in defense, and thus share in the extra money. Government hiring is stepping up and agencies which are not even remotely connected with any war effort are seeking additional funds.

Maybe you would like to express your views to your Congressman and your Senators. Well, why not do it?

Adequate Hospital Facilities for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to me by John Walker Jones, chairman of the rehabilitation committee, Department of Oregon, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The letter is dated July 7, but for some reason did not reach me until the first part of this week. The letter relates to the very serious problem of providing our veterans with adequate hospital facilities. It deals with the subject matter of hearings which the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been holding this year. I happen to be a member of that subcommittee. Mr. Jones has set forth so clearly in the letter the position I have taken as a member of the committee that I should like to have his letter made a part of the RECORD; and I should like to say that I completely endorse the recommendations Mr. Jones sets forth in the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., July 7, 1950.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: With American youth fighting and dying on the Korean battle front and war clouds hovering overhead (clouds that any moment might burst forth their rain of destruction upon American cities) we believe that this is no time to argue but time for action.

In the hope that our foresight might benefit by our hindsight, may I respectfully submit the following for your careful consideration and should it meet with your approval, your perusal to the end that it may become a reality.

The Secretary of National Defense recently ordered several Armed Forces hospitals closed and declared surplus. There are no doubt others in the same category. As a precautionary measure, could these hospitals be frozen in their present status and turned over to the Veterans' Administration pending the outcome of the present emergency? Then the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs could be directed to immediately prepare plans for instant reactivation of these units as the need becomes apparent.

Such a move would have many advantages:

1. It would relieve Regular Armed Forces hospital personnel for front- or first-line duty. Permit patriotic experienced hospital personnel, who, by reason of age or partial disability, would be barred from active duty, to render emergent service in time of dire need.

2. It would assure the wounded or sick members of the Armed Forces the best in medical and hospital care immediately upon their return to the United States, without the necessity of a long and expensive hospital-building program, thereby saving untold millions of dollars, and maybe considerable precious time, yet rendering the finest service possible to those who so justly deserve it.

3. It would give the Veterans' Administration a complete record so that when discharged to a veteran status much confusion and controversy would be eliminated. It would also assure an uninterrupted treatment program which would greatly facilitate the veterans' eventual rehabilitation, for those veterans channeled through these specific hospitals.

4. In order to effectuate such a program it probably will be necessary to enact legislation similar to that already in force which authorizes the care of World War I and II service-connected disabled veterans. This program would then include men and women presently in, or who may later be in, the Armed Forces in combat service.

In the development of a hospital program the immediate expansion of the VA outpatient service should be effected in order to care for those patients who might not require hospitalization but would be in need of out-patient treatment.

Many other bona fide reasons could be added to substantiate my claims which are based upon over 30 years of gratuitous service in the field of veterans' rehabilitation.

Something else that could, and should, be done without further delay to help the present overcrowded conditions in some VA hospitals is that at least 500 medical-domiciliary beds should be activated at Camp White in order to relieve and free many of the so-called frozen beds presently occupied in general medical hospitals, i. e., patients who need some medical and/or nursing care, which cannot be furnished under present VA regulations in a strictly domiciliary center. I refer to Camp White as an example because you are quite familiar with its set-up, as well as Schick Memorial Hospital in Clinton, Iowa, which could likewise be used to excellent advantage for similar purposes.

I am directing this letter to you, Senator, because of our close affiliations in the battle for Camp White, but am taking the liberty of sending copies to all Members of our Oregon delegation for their information. Also copies to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Secretary of National Defense, and Col. George E. Ijams, director of our national rehabilitation service.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

JOHN WALKER JONES,
Chairman, Rehabilitation Committee, Department of Oregon, VFW.

(Copy to Guy Cordon, Senator; Harris Ellsworth, Homer Angell, Lowell Stockman, and Walter Norblad, Representatives; Louis Johnson, Secretary of National Defense; Carl R. Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; Col. George E. Ijams, director, national rehabilitation service, VFW.)

Lattimore, the Expert, and the Mess We're In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Fargo Forum has printed in its issue of August 10, 1950, an editorial entitled "Lattimore, the Expert, and the Mess We're In." I subscribe completely to the views expressed in the editorial, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATTIMORE, THE EXPERT, AND THE MESS WE'RE IN

We are not discussing here the charges of Senator MCCARTHY against Owen Lattimore, but a portion of a review of the Lattimore book Ordeal by Slander that was written by R. L. Duffus for the New York Times Book Review of July 30.

Lattimore, it should be remembered, has posed as an expert on far-eastern matters

and on Russia, and he has been used as an expert by the United States State Department.

Says Mr. Duffus: "Lattimore's own case for his own integrity (as set forth in his book) is a good one. And it is his own integrity, not the soundness of his views, that was at stake. To say this is not to say that one agrees with his opinions, founded though they were on half a lifetime of study. He may have been wrong in the belief that some middle ground could be found between the Communists and the Nationalists. It may be that we have to choose the lesser of two evils. It may be that the Nationalists are not as inefficient and corrupt as Lattimore thinks they are. The point is that he has a right to be mistaken, if mistaken he is. Democracy, like horse racing, flourishes on honest differences of opinion."

We have no quarrel with this appraisal from the standpoint of Lattimore as an individual, but we cannot but wonder how a fuzzy-minded person, such as Lattimore has shown himself to be, could be accepted as an authority by the State Department. The State Department has a responsibility to the American people to be right, at least, in some of its conclusions.

And the State Department, partly on the advice of Lattimore, got us into a mess in Asia, and it is going to take some figuring to get us out of that mess. The State Department is an arm of the Government. The presumption is, or should be, that it knows where to go for advice, that it has enough fundamental common sense, because of its supposed background knowledge, to steer the country along right paths.

Back in 1949, when a House resolution was pending calling for the granting of $150,000,000 in aid to South Korea, this man Lattimore said in a magazine article:

"The thing to do is to let South Korea fall, but not let it look as though we pushed it. Hence, the recommendation of a parting grant of $150,000,000."

Note the expression "parting grant." We were going to hand the South Koreans, if Lattimore had his way, some money as the easiest way to let them go to the dogs.

Yet, if we had followed that course, it would have been the opposite course to that which we are taking.

Probably Moscow was banking on this viewpoint of Owen Lattimore's when it moved against South Korea. It may be that it looked upon this reference the same as an "engraved invitation" to take over.

That is, Lattimore was suggesting a course here that would have immeasurably buttressed Russia in the effort to further her objective in Asia.

Again, in 1949, Lattimore sent a memorandum to the State Department. In it he said:

"South Korea is more of a liability than an asset to the interest and policy of the United States."

That seems strange today when Americans are fighting on bloody battlefields in South Korea.

These Americans are fighting there because, so far as the picture of Asia as a whole is concerned, Lattimore was dead wrong.

Then there is another Lattimore gem utterance of 1949:

"The United States should disembarrass itself as quickly as possible of its entanglements in South Korea."

We suppose this meant that we should back away from any contact with South Korea just as we backed out of China. But if we kept on backing out, the western world would soon be out of Asia altogether, and Russia would have an open field to communize at will.

However, it seems that our expert on far eastern affairs has somewhat changed his mind. That is a man's privilege, but it can be serious when a so-called State Department expert gets his country into an awful fix before he changes his mind.

In reciting these changes, the Chicago Tribune points to a speech he made at Mount Holyoke in July. It says Lattimore held that the Truman doctrine of holding the line against Communist aggression in Greece and Turkey offered a precedent for the present military intervention in Korea, but he added that we ought to build up behind the line by instituting a Marshall plan for Asia.

Thus he threw the 1949 parting grant idea out the window.

Then the Tribune summarizes remarks made by Lattimore at a press conference in New York on August 1. It points out that Lattimore again defended American steps in Korea, saying that Russia was morally responsible for the developments there and that the United States had acted properly in furnishing military aid, and that Russia has overreached in Korea.

Lattimore now appears to be trying to lock one barn door after the horse has been stolen and after the Russians are making him eat his 1949 words.

But it is terribly late—so terribly late.

If it had not been for the Lattimore-type of experts, it is reasonable to believe that it wouldn't be so late.

It was also terribly late when Dean Acheson was telling the American people only a few hours before the North Koreans launched their drive across the thirty-eighth parallel that Formosa had no strategic value.

Proposed Loan to Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Commonweal, a well-known and widely read publication, published in New York City, has just printed a very interesting and incisive editorial on the action by the Senate in voting a mandatory loan to the Franco regime in Spain. This editorial should be read by all those who are interested in the subject. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE LITTLE THINGS

There was a thing called fascism and for a time almost the whole world went to war about it. To us in this country, except for our combat GI's, it never had the full meaning that it still has for Europe. For most of us fascism was an idea we denounced at mass meetings, or signed petitions against, or used as a dirty word. For the people of Europe it was more than an idea. It was something they lived with, hour after hour, day after day, for years.

It was the silence of a forbidden speech, the burning of a book, the suppression of a pastoral letter or the closing of a scientist's lab. Fascism was the rounding up of Jews and political dissenters in the middle of the night, the long silence and then, eventually, the discovery of Buchenwald and Auschwitz. It was the troops marching down the cathedral in the middle of the bishop's sermon, the castor-oil treatment for those who dared to lift a voice in protest, the mocking of the ballot box. For others fascism was the march of invading soldiers through their own streets, the strutting conquerors moving about the town square, the slow hopeless procession of oxcarts down the country roads while enemy planes menaced overhead, the sudden death-orders and the long, hungry, bloody liberation. Fascism was many things, none of them pleasant.

Facism is still something the people of Europe live with. There are the war-crippled, the orphaned and widowed at hand to keep the memory of it alive. Now people thumb through the snapshots of their dead and in the face of new threats are disturbed at night by the memory of a thousand old horrors. What was never more than a vicious idea for most of us is still a living fact for them.

At one time, for all of us, fascism in Europe was three uniformed men. One of them, presumably was finally buried in the debris of battered Berlin; another was hanged upside down on a lamp post in Milan; the third, the one who above all others means fascism, today lives and rules in Madrid.

He was not the worst of the dictators and, to some degree, may be comparatively benevolent. But to millions who remember only too well, he is the living symbol of all that was once called fascism.

Now the threatening thing is called communism, and in many details it is practically the same thing all over again. To fight it, the United States Senate voted to grant the Spanish dictator a $100,000,000 Marshall plan loan. There were only 15 dissenting votes. Senator WAYNE B. MORSE said that his vote amounted to a "wrestle with my conscience." The Senate spokesmen designated their action as a realistic move in the struggle against communism. Everyone of course was aware that Francisco Franco is a symbol of fascism in Europe and knew that by supporting his regime the United States—which has already given aid and comfort to the repudiated Chiang Kai-shek and dictator Tito—has further compromised its own defense of freedom. But these considerations did not seem to be as real to the Senators as the immediate political and military situation in Europe. They chose in the name of realism to ignore the popular sentiments.

Feelings and sentiments, memories and symbolism are intangibles which are sometimes difficult to appreciate. Senator MCCARRAN said: "It is time that we lay aside the little things." But it is the little things that add up to the spirit of resistance. And without that most careful military planning and political maneuvering may come to naught. Even in politics and war man himself is the ultimate measure.

Repudiation of Communist Stockholm Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make available to my colleagues three interesting and significant reports with reference to the growing repudiation of the Communist Stockholm campaign, both in this country and in other free countries. Three of these reports were

printed in the Weekly News Service Supplement of the American Federation of Labor of August 4. They are as follows:

ICFTU COUNTERS REDS' PHONY PLEA

[From the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service Supplement, Washington, D. C., of August 4, 1950]

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM.—The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has called on affiliates representing 50,000,000 of the world's workers to counter the Communists' "Stockholm peace campaign," the only aim of which is to create confusion about the true imperialistic character of the Soviet Union's policy.

"We cannot let the Communists go on parading as the champions of peace and collecting signatures for the so-called Stockholm campaign from hundreds of thousands of well-meaning but uninformed people, while at the same time conducting a full-fledged, flagrant, undeniable war of aggression in Korea," the ICFTU has advised affiliated trade union centers.

The ICFTU—the anti-Communist world trade organization including both A. F. of L. and CIO—asked that these facts about the Korean war be publicized:

"Whatever the immediate outcome of the fighting the following facts are clear and indisputable:

"1. The fighting was started by forces of North Korea—a Soviet satellite state.

"2. The Security Council has charged North Korea as the aggressor and called on member states to render all possible aid—including military aid—to South Korea.

"3. Moscow's claim that the Security Council decision taken in its absence has no legal validity has been rejected by every competent international legal expert.

"4. The accusation that South Korea started the fighting is a falsehood.

"5. The World Federation of Trade Unions campaign to secure the support of trade-unionists, and particularly transport workers, for the war against South Korea is further evidence of Moscow's desire to use the trade-union movement for the political aims of Soviet imperialism.

"As soon as the facts were clear the ICFTU protested against this latest Communist aggression.

"We do not hold any special brief for the social or economic policy of the South Korean Government. Our delegation at present visiting Asia intended to include Korea in its itinerary, and would undoubtedly have produced practical proposals for the economic and social development of the country in the interest of the people, as it is doing elsewhere.

"Korea had a heavy legacy of Japanese misrule to overcome. Nevertheless, they were making a start with important reforms. Chief of these—for remember South Korea is 90-percent agricultural—was the distribution of all land holdings over 7.35 acres to tenants. This law went into force on June 1 last—perhaps that was one reason why the attack was timed when it was.

"Irrespective of the character of South Korean Government, there is no justification for armed aggression in defiance of the United Nations."

HINES LABELS PEACE PETITION A PHONY

WASHINGTON.—A. F. of L. Special Representative Lewis G. Hines joined with spokesmen for 12 other American organizations in labeling the so-called Stockholm peace petition a "phony peace petition to disarm the United States."

The organizations are represented in the All-American Conference to Combat Communism. Mr. Hines and the 12 other spokesmen said:

"The circulation, under the direction of the Communist Party, of the phony peace petition to disarm the United States is in keeping with its historic procedure of infiltrating and later paralyzing a nation which it wishes to invade.

"This petition was initiated at the recent so-called peace conference at Stockholm. All men kindly disposed toward their fellows favor peace.

"We favor peace, but we are forced to conclude that the nations which have associated themselves with this alleged peace move are aggressors, not peacemakers."

Pointing out that 1,000,000 Americans had already signed the petition, the group expressed the hope that "no other Americans or organizations will be caught in this trap."

FRENCH LABEL RED PEACE PLEA SWINDLE

PARIS, FRANCE.—The French Force Ouvière labeled the Stockholm peace petition of the Communists "a monstrous moral swindle."

The free French trade unions headed by Leon Jouhaux issued a poster in response to the request of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions for action to counter the Reds' phony peace plea for which they are seeking petitions around the world.

The Force Ouvière said in part:

"For weeks you have been asked to sign the Stockholm appeal. It is presented to you as the peaceful will of the Communist Party and Confederation of Labor.

"This is a monstrous moral swindle.

"Peace is the property of every worker. It is one and indivisible.

"There is no good or dirty war, but just war, with its sacrifices, miseries, ruins and dead.

"The Stockholm appeal is a treachery that we must denounce.

"It masks the ways of Soviet expansion.

"We call upon the workers, we call upon public opinion to act against the campaign launched by a well-organized fifth column."

Mr. Speaker, the fourth appears in the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service of August 15 and is as follows:

COMMIE PEACE DOVE IS A LEAD PIGEON

CHICAGO.—The A. F. of L. executive council condemned the Stockholm peace petition of the Communists as a rank fraud.

"Moscow's dove of peace is only a lead pigeon," the council said. It urged every American to refuse to sign the petition.

Almost all of the North Koreans were forced to sign it before their Russian masters sent them into war against the United Nations, the council said. Following is the text of the council statement:

The American Federation of Labor vigorously condemns the so-called Stockholm peace appeal as a rank fraud.

We urge every working man and working woman to spurn the peddlers of this spurious petition.

We call upon every loyal American, every true lover of peace, to refuse to sign or circulate it.

We cannot urge too strongly every self-respecting American to treat those who are the organizers of this Stockholm movement and the purveyors of its petitions as enemies of the American people operating under false colors.

Not only in far off Korea do enemies of the American people disguise themselves as Americans. In our own country, in our factories, shops, offices, churches, schools and on our streets, enemies of America also disguise themselves and pose as Americans.

Camouflage is a Communist weapon of war which can be just as deadly against our sons and brothers in the United States as in Korea. The so-called Stockholm petition is precisely such a weapon.

The fake peace petition does not oppose all aggression with all weapons. It singles out only one weapon—the one in which our country still holds the lead and which provides our country and the other democracies with a measure of military security against the gigantic Russian war machine.

Unlike America and the other democracies, totalitarian Russia never demobilized but only remobilized its fighting forces at the end of World War II in 1945.

Were these fake peace maneuvers to succeed, were the United States to fall into the Russian bear trap of banning atomic weapons—while Russia rejects America's plan for their effective international inspection, control, and elimination—the possibility for Communist world domination by the Soviets would be enormously enhanced. That is just what the petition-promoters and the sinister signature-seekers want.

As long as the democracies have atomic superiority, the Russian warlords fear and hesitate to use their own massive armies as direct instruments of aggression and conquest. They rely instead on Chinese, North Korean, Indo-Chinese, antidemocratic Germans, and other puppets and satellites for extending totalitarian tyranny and engaging in adventurist aggression.

Since the policy of our country has been not to use atomic weapons against satellite aggressors and since the democracies have—under the Marshall plan and point-four—mobilized for peace and are unprepared for war, Moscow figures that its indirect, yet wanton, aggression can proceed unchecked.

Clearly, the so-called peace petitions seek to ban American's use of atomic weapons in order to enable Russia to catch up with and surpass our country in this field and to aid Moscow's catspaw aggressors by rallying public sentiment against the United States ever using such weapons against them.

Cruel confirmation of this strategy of the Stockholm petitioners is at hand in Korea; that is why the Communist drive for signatures coincides with the Moscow-directed invasion of South Korea. It was carefully planned to hide and help the brutal aggression of the Soviet dictators against the people of Korea, the American people and the United Nations as an effective agency of world peace.

In fact, nearly every man, woman, and even child in North Korea was forced to sign—or rather thumbprint—this peace petition only a few days before the Russian-inspired invasion of South Korea was started.

Moscow's dove of peace is only a lead pigeon out of which are made poisoned bullets against democracy. Those who sign this so-called peace petition are, knowingly or otherwise, serving Russian imperialism, aiding its bloody adventure in Korea, and helping the Soviet dictatorship to plunge mankind into another world war.

Those who sign this petition are striking a dastardly blow at the United Nations. Those who circulate and sign this document are stabbing our own country in the back at this critical hour when thousands of Americans are giving away their lives in order to preserve peace, freedom, and human decency.

The Communists are not waging a peace offensive. The Communists are waging an offensive against peace, liberty, and social progress. The American Federation of Labor is confident that organized labor will lead the Nation in unmasking and upbraiding these enemies within our country with the same determination that our Armed Forces are fighting against the Communist enemy from without.

Mr. Speaker, the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics here in Washington, through its so-called information bulletin, continues to wage its obviously specious campaign in behalf of this piece of propaganda by printing in its August 11 issue a report of the Soviet Peace Committee. It may well be

that the masters of the Kremlin have been able to induce the entire adult population of Soviet Russia to sign this petition, but if that is the case it is clear to anyone with any intelligence that the people imprisoned under the Communist regime would not dare to do anything else than to comply with the demands of their rulers.

Nevertheless, with this sort of report being made, I submit that it is of increasing importance that the Members of the House be given an early opportunity to join with the patriotic groups and organizations in this country, and with the executive department of the Government in making it clear that Congress does recognize the false nature of this activity and wishes to recommend to the American people whom it represents an alternative, constructive, and honest effort which they can make to secure real peace. The Soviet Embassy article is as follows:

ENTIRE ADULT POPULATION, 115,275,940, SIGNS STOCKHOLM APPEAL IN U. S. S. R.

The Soviet Peace Committee has issued the following statement:

"The Soviet Peace Committee has summed up the results of the campaign in the Soviet Union of the collection of signatures to the Stockholm Appeal of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress demanding the prohibition of the atomic weapon and branding as a war criminal the government which shall first use this weapon of aggression and mass extermination of human beings. In accordance with the decision of the Soviet Peace Committee all citizens 16 years or more of age were entitled to put their signatures to the Stockholm appeal.

"On the basis of the reports which have come in from all over the country, the Soviet Peace Committee has established that the collection throughout the country of signatures to the appeal for prohibiting the atomic weapon has been completed, with the exception of certain remote areas where this campaign will likewise end very soon.

"Since the campaign was launched—between June 30 and August 1—a total of 115,275,940 Soviet citizens have signed the Appeal of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress.

"The results of the campaign show that the entire adult population of the Soviet Union has unanimously expressed itself against war, for the prohibition of the atomic weapon, for establishment of international control over the observance of this prohibition, and for branding as a war criminal the government which first uses the atomic weapon against any country.

"In unanimously putting their signatures to the Stockholm appeal, the Soviet people have demonstrated to the entire world their profound peaceableness and unbending will to cooperate with all nations, and have made a fresh contribution to the noble cause of struggle against war, for the strengthening of peace, and for the security of the peoples.

"In the Soviet people the world-wide organized peace front has a loyal and reliable bulwark.

"At numerous meetings and rallies the Soviet working people stigmatized foreign aggressors who are waging brigand war on the Korean people and demanded the withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea.

"The campaign for collecting signatures to the Stockholm appeal in the Soviet Union proceeded in an atmosphere of enormous political enthusiasm in town and countryside. The Soviet people demonstrated their full and unanimous approval of the Stalinist foreign policy of peace conducted by the Soviet Government.

"The results of the campaign for collecting signatures to the Appeal of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress prove that, under the leadership of their Government, the peoples of the Soviet Union will continue as hitherto to march in the forefront of the struggle against war, for the consolidation of world peace."

No Common Cause With Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Common Cause With Fascism," published in the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Oreg., of August 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

NO COMMON CAUSE WITH FASCISM

It is difficult to explain the Senate's persistence in the proposed $100,000,000 loan to Spain. Either it is due to the persuasiveness of Senator MCCARRAN of Nevada, who has long been pro-Spain and pro-Franco, or it indexes a major change of loaning policy on the part of the United States Government.

If Senate approval was a compliment to MCCARRAN, who was wined, dined, and entertained by Franco during the former's stay in Spain, then the Senators who voted "aye" could do so sure of ultimate reversal.

But if the idea is to make loans to strengthen any nation that is anti-Communist, then we go with President Truman in unalterable opposition.

Even if the money, ostensibly, is to go for air bases the United States can use, the price is too high. Use of air bases can be had on better terms and without such compromise of principle.

The Franco Government is Fascist. Fascism is as totalitarian as communism. It is as far from democratic freedom. There is as little reconciliation of fascism with democracy as there is of communism with democracy.

The consummation of such a loan would break faith with our own ideals and give weight to Soviet censure that America tends to imperialist fascism.

Statement Issued by Radio News Club of Southern California Re Federal Communications Commission's Hearing on News-Slanting Charges Against Radio Station KMPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been widespread publicity about the Federal communications hearings on news slanting charges against the Los Angeles radio station KMPC. In the interests of giving one of the principal parties to the action—the Radio News Club of Southern California—an opportunity to clarify the situation, I attach their formal statement of July 10:

Because of the many specious and misleading statements made in connection with the Federal Communications Commission hearing into news slanting charges against Los Angeles radio station KMPC, we of the Radio News Club of Southern California wish to clarify the issues.

In February 1948 it came to the attention of the Radio News Club that three radio newsmen employed by KMPC were ordered fired by owner G. A. Richards, allegedly for their refusal to slant the news on the air in accordance with his wishes. We were apprised by News Director Clete Roberts, one of the three men fired, of numerous instances in which Mr. Richards had ordered the news to be slanted against Jews, labor unions, the Roosevelt family, the Democratic Party, and others. At a special luncheon meeting of our organization the matter was taken up and thoroughly discussed. Mr. Roberts, at the time, was president of the Radio News Club, and the other two men involved also were members of our group. But during the course of the discussion they were asked to absent themselves and did so. A number of other cases involving other former KMPC newsmen also were brought to our attention, and we discovered that news slanting charges involving Mr. Richards was not a new thing. Rather, it apparently had been going on for some time, and a number of other newsmen assertedly had been fired for refusing to prostitute their typewriters or microphones.

Roberts and others turned over to us material which was well documented, and which seemed to us to constitute a flagrant violation of the spirit and letter of the news standards of the National Association of Broadcasters, one of the National Association of Radio News Directors, and of FCC regulations relative to fair presentation of controversial issues and of the news. As a matter of fact, if the charges were true, they would violate our own RNC code of proposed news standards, which earlier had been mailed to managers of every radio station in the area. These news standards, by the way, had elicited a great deal of favorable comment. The reaction was excellent, and there had been no opposition or objection from management, agencies, or anyone else. Significantly, not from KMPC.

At any rate, by a unanimous vote of the Radio News Club, it was decided to send a committee of three members (not including Roberts or any other former or present KMPC employees) to KMPC manager Robert O. Reynolds to determine his answer to the charges. A meeting was held with Mr. Reynolds, with a KMPC attorney present. The Radio News Club representatives were courteously received but told that neither Mr. Reynolds nor anyone at KMPC had any idea of what was meant by the charges of news slanting. Told of information submitted to the club, Mr. Reynolds persisted in denying any understanding of the complaint—offered no rebuttal to the information submitted by the ex-KMPC employees.

On the basis of this refusal to offer any defense, explanation, or rebuttal to the charges made to the RNC, the membership voted unanimously to discover whether the FCC had any interest in the matter. The Commission requested the RNC to submit its findings in the matter, particularly documentary material. This was done. Subsequently, the Commission indicated that it could act on such evidence if a complaint were filed. The Radio News Club, in the absence of any expression of interest and

concern by the management of KMPC—as indicated above—did so.

At this point, let us look at some of the innuendoes and fabrications by interested parties which have served to cloud the entire issue. KMPC has asserted that three disgruntled former employees, members of the Radio News Club, started the action. That is a distortion of fact. Rather, the Radio News Club, by unanimous vote, decided to turn the case over to the FCC. Clete Roberts and the other men directly involved were not even present when the matter was discussed.

KMPC's attorney, among others, has charged that the FCC took up the matter at the instigation of James Roosevelt. This is a deliberate untruth. The record is clear that the FCC acted only on the complaint of the Radio News Club, and not on the action of anyone else. Mr. Roosevelt's letter was only one of several hundred on the subject received by the Commission. Neither James Roosevelt, nor any organization which subsequently became interested in the case, was involved with the RNC. We acted in concert with no one but the professional radio newsmen who make up our group. As a matter of fact, we rejected offers of support from many individuals and organizations. Any others who pressed the issue did so without our consent or sanction. On the other hand, we attempted to prohibit no one from carrying out their own business.

Some 2 years passed before the Government hearing finally got under way early in 1950. During this period, and in the course of the hearing which at present is still continuing, there was no attempt on the part of KMPC to refute the specific charges of news slanting. Rather, a smoke screen technique was adopted, and an attempt at character assassination of the chief government witness, Clete Roberts, ensued. May we point out at this juncture that Clete Roberts is one of the most highly esteemed radio newsmen in the world. His background is excellent and his character above reproach, and he enjoys a respected reputation among his professional associates. As to his ideology, he is a registered Republican, with no extremist views.

Since some have attempted to hint that the Radio News Club acted at the instigation of Communists, let's take a look at the record. The Radio News Club was organized at the suggestion of Arthur Stringer, a paid representative of the National Association of Broadcasters. That was in the summer of 1946. The idea for a professional association of radio newsmen in this area took firm hold. In the course of organizing the group, several early meetings were held at station KMPC.

The Radio News Club, as organized, was composed of professional radio newsmen—newscasters, news writers, and news commentators—it is not a labor union, nor is it interested in economic issues, but only in elevating the professional news standards of the broadcasting industry. Since it is comprised of working newsmen, it is not political in any sense. There are probably a representative number of Republicans and Democrats included in the group. In that respect it is a good cross section of professional America. There is no room for extremist ideology in the Radio News Club, and it does not act in concert with, or at the instigation of anyone, politically or otherwise.

Now, who are some of the men who make up the Radio News Club? Here are a few of the key names:

David Anderson, National Broadcasting Co.: Chosen the top news writer of southern California during the past year.

Jack Beck, news director of CBS on the west coast.

Chet Huntley, CBS: Chosen the best news commentator of this area during the past year.

Roger Sprague, news director of the National Broadcasting Co., west coast.

Elmer Peterson, NBC coast-to-coast commentator.

James MacNamara, news director of KLAC.

Al Gordon, news director of KFWB.

Bob Garred, American Broadcasting Co.: Chosen the top newscaster in southern California during the past year.

Ted Myers, KFI.

Glenn Hardy, KHJ.

Frank Goss, CBS.

Hank Weaver, KECA.

Nelson Pringle, CBS.

These are some of the names in the organization; the list could go on and on. But it should serve to point up the type of professional radio newsmen who comprise the membership of the Radio News Club.

We of the Radio News Club see in the present action by the FCC an attempt to secure and preserve free speech in one of the most important media of communication, the broadcasting industry. We disagree with those who contend that the FCC action is a threat to freedom of speech. We feel, moreover, that the issue does not concern the personal views of G. A. Richards, whether or not he hated Jews, Negroes, etc., but rather, whether or not he caused his newsmen to slant the news on the air to carry out such prejudices.

Because of the great interest nationally in the KMPC hearing, we of the Radio News Club feel it important that any innuendoes, and misleading or untrue assertions given play of late be corrected. In this statement we have attempted to set the facts straight.

Cost of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cost of War," published recently in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

COST OF WAR

American counteroffensives in Korea, though not yet on a large scale, are immensely heartening. The present performance of soldiers and marines with their sea and air support high lights the job done by the earlier arrivals in Korea, and by the South Koreans themselves. The withdrawals for the most part were not retreats in the usual sense, but were planned delaying actions, often executed under the greatest difficulties, until troops reached a line that could be stabilized. The new engagements also proved that the American soldier, properly trained and equipped, has lost none of his fighting spirit.

Many persons wonder why, in an age of bazookas with new ammunition that makes mincemeat of tanks, so many men are needed and the cost of war is so high. The answer is that as the Armed Forces have developed new and refined weapons, they have become highly specialized. Instead of the old masses of infantry, relatively fewer soldiers are required actually to man weapons (though the continuing importance of the foot soldier has been demonstrated in Korea). Vast crews are required behind the lines, however, for supply and to keep equipment in order; for example, highly trained tank and electronic repairmen. Thus, while the percentage of casualties has steadily gone down (in Caesar's time there were so many as 80 percent casualties in any given engagement), the number of men involved—and the cost—has constantly risen with specialization.

The general rise and the price level and improved pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces have, of course, combined with improved and more elaborate equipment to boost the cost of war. For example, in 1935 the average yearly cost of maintaining an individual soldier outside combat (pay, food, clothing, etc.) was $960; just before the Korean invasion is was $2,640. A few other figures, allowing for changes in specifications of the items listed, also are revealing:

	World War II	Today (before Korea)
Pay of recruit	[1] $21	$75
Garand rifle	31	64
Medium tank	55,000	200,000
Antiaircraft gun	10,000	300,000
Medium bomber	185,000	1,246,000
Pursuit aircraft	50,000	183,000
Infantry division (with original equipment but exclusive of pay, clothing, food, etc.)	14,500,000	74,300,000
Airborne division	15,000,000	75,000,000
Armored division	30,000,000	200,000,000

[1] Later $50.

In light of these figures it is easier to understand why an appropriation of $444,000,000 sustained an army of 188,000 men in 1939, whereas $4,000,000,000 was needed for an Army of 593,000 before Korea. The very size of the new ten and one-half plus billion Armed Forces request, of course, magnifies the need for economy. Now more than ever there is no excuse for extravagance, and it is essential to keep check to insure that every dollar actually produces added defense.

Proceedings on Occasion of Dedication at West Point of Monument to Gen. George S. Patton, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on August 19 last, on the grounds of the United States Military Academy at West Point, there occurred the dedication of a monument to a great American soldier, Gen. George S. Patton. This event is of such great interest to the Congress and to the country that I ask unanimous consent that an account of these proceedings be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the account was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR., MEMORIAL IS DEDICATED AT WEST POINT

(By Capt. Joseph F. H. Cutrona)

WEST POINT, N. Y., August 19.—A favorite son was honored at West Point today. One of the most colorful figures of World War II, Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., famed commander of the Third Army who displayed brilliant leadership in Africa, Sicily, France, Germany,

and Austria, was memorialized by the dedication of a statue donated by the George S. Patton, Jr., Memorial Association. The dedication was attended by more than 1,000 invited guests who heard Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, distinguished writer, historian, and editor, known particularly for his Pulitzer prize-winning Lee's Lieutenants, extol the many accomplishments of General Patton.

The statue, erected in a place of honor at the United States Military Academy, is an especially fitting tribute to the great soldier in that the donations which made it possible came from General Patton's former comrades of all ranks from private to general as well as from his admirers from all walks of life. Although the George S. Patton, Jr., Memorial Association made no widespread attempt to contact large numbers of people, the word got around that a tribute was planned to the memory of one of the Nation's outstanding soldiers. Soon, unsolicited contributions poured in with dimes just as much, and more, in evidence than dollars.

The ceremony today was a fitting climax to the plan of the memorial association, founded soon after General Patton's death on December 21, 1945. A company of cadets dressed in spotless white uniforms flanked the memorial to provide an honor guard. In front of each platoon of the honor guard was a color guard. One color guard carried the national colors and those of the United States Corps of Cadets, while the other carried General Patton's flag and the Third Army flag. The United States Military Academy Band supplied appropriate music throughout the ceremony.

The official party arrived promptly at 2:30 p. m. In the party were Mrs. George S. Patton, Jr., the late general's wife; Mrs. John K. Waters, his daughter; Mrs. James W. Totten, a second daughter; Lt. George S. Patton III, who returned from Germany to attend the ceremony honoring his father; Miss Anne W. Patton, the general's sister; and many distinguished persons representing the Government, the Armed Forces, and civilian activities.

As the official party arrived, the honor guard came to attention and the band played the Second Armored Division March. The Second Armored was the famed Hell-on-Wheels Division of the Third Army. Following this, a portion of the band played God of Battles, the special music written to accompany General Patton's widely known poem, while a glee club composed of the remaining members of the band sang the words.

After the singing and playing of God of Battles, Chaplain Frank E. Pulley, of the United States Military Academy, gave the invocation. Upon the completion of the prayer, the honor guard and colors executed "present arms" and the gathered crowd came to attention for the playing of the national anthem.

Throughout the program, Maj. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn, United States Army, retired, acted as the presiding officer. He, as did General Patton, served in the Cavalry upon graduation from the Military Academy. During World War II, he was chief quartermaster for the European theater. It was he who suggested the memorial to Mrs. Patton at the general's funeral. On behalf of the George S. Patton, Jr., Memorial Association, General Littlejohn accepted the bequests of the donors. He then paid tribute to Mr. James E. Fraser, the sculptor, who was unable to be present because of illness.

At this point, the ceremonies reached a climax. General Littlejohn introduced Mrs. Patton, who unveiled the statue. In closing his introduction, he said, "Today it is a great honor to have with us a most charming and gracious person, the one who is really responsible for backing George Patton in the great role played by him in the Third Army after the breakthrough at St. Lo—Beatrice Ayer Patton."

Before unveiling the statue, Mrs. Patton spoke briefly. "Soldiers of the Third Army and friends all," she said, "this statue, unveiled today, could well stand for the motto and spirit of duty, honor, country; it stands for something else besides, the love of men for a man." Mrs. Patton continued by pointing out the statue was an excellent likeness of her husband, making it possible to "* * * perpetuate the inspiration he gave you, handing it on to those who come after, who never knew him."

The General's wife related a story told her by an MP she met last year in Panama when she asked him if he had known General Patton. "Yes, I knew him well," he said. "We were going up to the Bulge and our truck got stuck in the snow on a hill and we couldn't move. All of a sudden we saw a jeep coming up the road and in it was the General. His face was awful red and there was a white patch on his cheek like it was froze. He yelled, 'Get out, you soldiers. Get out of that truck and push,' and we did. When I looked up, there was the General himself, pushing right alongside of me. Yes, sir, the General never asked anyone to do a thing he wouldn't do himself."

In closing her remarks, Mrs. Patton said, "Life is a book in which each chapter is different, but every chapter is built on those that have gone before. Glory with honor never grows old. May this statue ever stand for duty, honor, America. Duty, honor, country is the motto of the United States Military Academy."

As Mrs. Patton finished her remarks, the Honor Guard executed "present arms" and stood at attention while Mrs. Patton pulled the cord which removed the American flags and shroud covering the memorial, to reveal General Patton in battle dress. The sculptor had depicted the General in his familiar battle uniform, wearing his two pearl-handled pistols and holding binoculars at his chest—the way he was known to thousands of American fighting men.

The statue itself is a full 9 feet tall and beautifully displayed on a specially designed base facing the Military Academy Library. On the sides of the base the following quotations are inscribed:

"Never take counsel of your fears."
"Pursue the enemy with the utmost audacity."

These are words which General Patton used often and a code which he followed. The front of the base was inscribed with the General's name, while on the back is mention of the donors and a list of the campaigns in which he participated.

Following the unveiling, Lt. George S. Patton III, the General's son, laid a wreath at the base of the monument. It was presented by the Church of Our Saviour, San Gabriel, Calif., the church where General Patton was baptized and confirmed. On it were inscribed the words, "In memory of Gen. George S. Patton, Jr." After he had placed the wreath, Lieutenant Patton stepped back and saluted the image of his father.

When Mrs. Patton and young George had returned to their seats, General Littlejohn introduced the principal speaker, Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman. Dr. Freeman opened his remarks with an anecdote which illustrated the qualities of leadership which he felt General Patton possessed to a marked degree. "Purely by chance the other evening at the United States Naval Academy," he said, "some of us were discussing instruction and leadership. Most of us were agreed that the books on psychology prepared for the use of students there and at West Point were not as yet in terms practical enough to be applied by the students. All of us agreed that we could teach leadership better from the leader than from the book and that biography offered perhaps the soundest approach to psychology.

"Then one of the admirals present spoke up * * * and made this remark: 'I have often thought that it is very difficult to abstract from the works, even from the works of military authorities, lessons that are concrete and explicit in themselves * * * I believe if I wanted a textbook on leadership, I would rather have a good biography of General Patton than anything else that could be written.' "

Dr. Freeman continued the discussion of General Patton's outstanding leadership by pointing out that in all the essential qualities of that remarkable man there was the embodiment of all the tradition of American leadership. He pointed out that there was never a single thing that he did otherwise than with his whole heart—that there was "* * * never, never, never, anything shoddy about George Patton as a student, as a young officer, an an Army commander, as husband, and as father."

In his remarks, Dr. Freeman paid tribute to the professional soldier. "Accidental triumph is the work of the unprofessional soldier," he said. "George Patton exemplified the wisdom of that system of military education in the United States which begins here (at West Point) and carried a man on to the National War College, where in reality he begins his preparation for Army command."

"* * * From the cavalry sword of personal contact to the tank encompasses the life of George Patton," he continued. "Never, never was there any end to his inquiry, any end to his research, to his study. * * * Wholeheartedly, endlessly preparing himself, and understanding better than almost any man of modern American military history the psychology both of the officer and of the enlisted men. Put the emphasis on the conjunction, because there is the distinction. Others there were who understood the officers and not the men; some knew the men and not the officers; but Patton knew them both.

"He knew them flawlessly * * * knew the roughneck and knew the gentleman. He knew how to be a gentleman because he was one * * * knew how to meet them all because he mastered their thinking."

Dr. Freeman continued by pointing out that as Americans we seek no conquest save that of right and freedom. He described General Patton as one who possessed valor and courage and employed those virtues in the fight to protect the American way of life.

When the guest speaker had completed his remarks, General Littlejohn formally presented the memorial to the United States Military Academy. Major General Bryant E. Moore, Superintendent of the Military Academy, accepted on behalf of West Point. "West Point accepts with pride," he said, "this magnificent statue of her distinguished son and great soldier, George S. Patton, Jr."

The program was concluded with a benediction prayer by Chaplain James Hugh O'Neill, former chaplain of the Third United States Army. It was Chaplain O'Neill who was with General Patton and composed the Third Army prayer for good weather during the Battle of the Bulge.

The Third Army prayer for good weather must have been used by the many former members of that organization who attended the ceremony. Immediately before the dedication was to begin, there was a downpour. However, throughout the dedication and the cadet parade which followed, the rains were held back. Again, immediately following the parade, the rain returned.

Interior Department Will-o'-the-Wisp Plan Would Take Columbia River Water From Northwestern States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, it is reported to me that the Department of Interior is proposing a gigantic project to bring Columbia River water into California for the avowed purpose of solving California's water problem. Assertedly, President Truman has interested himself in this project.

The purpose of this proposed project is not, as stated, to solve California's water problem. The purpose is to solve Arizona's water problem by turning over to Arizona California's water in the Colorado River.

California will not be fooled by this obvious strategy into giving up her established rights and huge investments on the Colorado River for any such will-of-the-wisp. Moreover, the people on the Columbia and Snake Rivers should clearly understand what is going on—their water is to be exported at huge expense in order that an exchange can occur by which Arizona will get the water in the Colorado River.

It is a clever scheme designed in the Interior Department to eliminate California's opposition to the fantastic Arizona project, which has been proposed by the Interior Department, and would use water to which California has long-established legal rights. California is to be promised pie in the sky from the Columbia River and asked to drop her opposition to the central Arizona project, to give up long-established legal rights to the waters of the Colorado, and to abandon diversion works on the Colorado costing hundreds of millions of dollars.

Of course, if Arizona is able to perpetrate a theft of the Colorado River waters from California, it may be necessary for California, at some future time, to look elsewhere. For the present, however, California will stand on her established rights and investments, and will develop the remaining water potential, which is substantial, within her own borders and in the Colorado River.

Some $64 Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of August 20, 1950:

SOME $64 QUESTIONS

Is the United States committed to fight Russia as guardian for some 950,000,000 people of Europe and Asia?

If so, how and when and where? Also, why?

If you know the answers to these questions, you know more than most American taxpayers, soldiers, sailors, mothers, fathers, children and interested bystanders.

Does Truman know the answers? You get an idea of the kind of performance this ex-haberdasher is turning in as President of the United States, when you learn that one of the most high-minded and respected Members of Congress has introduced a resolution which in effect strips the President of his most critically important present function in office.

Representative FREDERIC COUDERT (Republican, of New York) is author of the resolution, and on Wednesday last, while introducing it, he also introduced some several $64 questions with which Americans who want to survive the present era, may now wrestle for answers. Observed Mr. COUDERT:

"The American people have a right to know what is the foreign policy of their Government, the right to assess that policy before they are called upon to shed their blood and spend their treasure in wars all over the world.

"There must be a truly national policy, openly and freely arrived at in traditional American fashion.

"No secret, personal Presidential substitute will do."

ARE YOU CITIZEN OR SUBJECT?

If we truly are a self-governing Republic of free citizens, surely Mr. COUDERT has laid down a sound rule. Assuming that the American Nation is made up of independent citizens, the said citizens are entitled to know what their hired servants in public office want them to do in the matter of wars and sacrifice. Of course, if such a notion of citizenship is in error, and we are willing to be mere subjects of King Harry I, then we must ask no questions but obey the lord and master who rules by divine right, responsible to none but himself.

So in considering the further things Mr. COUDERT has to say, the first $64 question is one you must answer to yourself. Are you a citizen and does the Government work for you, or are you a subject and do you work for the Government?

Mr. COUDERT gets down to the hardpan as follows: Communist China has 450,000,000 human subjects to draw on. What do we do about them, as we fight our way back to the old Korean dividing line of the thirty-eighth parallel? Next, do we fight them for Formosa? Do we fight the Russians, too?

WHEN DO WE FIGHT?

Same questions, concerning French Indochina, 25,000,000 people; Hong Kong, 1,000,000; British Malaya, 5,000,000; Indonesia, 70,000,000; Thailand, 17,000,000; Burma, 17,000,000; India, 337,000,000; Pakistan, 70,000,000; Tibet, 4,000,000; Iran, 18,000,000; Turkey, 19,000,000; Greece, 8,000,000; Yugoslavia, 16,000,000; Finland, 4,000,000; western Germany, 48,000,000.

Add in the other fringe nations of Europe and you come very close to 1,000,000,000 people. That is one thousand millions.

Truman keeps rolling his mind's eye across this teeming horde and calculating how they can be used to make him secure as King-Emperor now and beyond 1952. But the $64 question is: How does it profit the American people to play around with these satisfactions of the king?

MUST CONGRESS TAKE OVER

Thus to force disclosure, Mr. COUDERT has introduced his resolution that calls on Truman for specific answers to specific questions of United States foreign policy in Korea and in each of the other above-mentioned places. He also asks what we intend to do if Russians or their satellites move on Atlantic Pact nations. And he concludes:

"Be it further resolved that in the event of the failure of the President to supply within reasonable time the information heretofore requested, then the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint a select joint committee of the two houses for the purpose of considering and recommending a national foreign policy designed to meet the vital question pressing for decision by the American people."

He proposes that the membership be equally divided between the parties and that not more than half the members be on Senate or House regular committees of foreign relations or affairs.

That resolution is just short of actually moving the impeachment of the President in office. It says he is incompetent to execute his most pressing and important duty of the present era, and that Congress must do the job, itself.

If Truman is so hot for a "bipartisan" foreign policy here is a plan for him to think over, and for citizens who must pay the bill it is an opportunity and a sign of the trend in the minds of serious men concerned for the Nation's survival.

Industry-Government Contract Makes State Future Bright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the August issue of the Reader's Digest there appeared an article by former Governor Leslie Miller, of Wyoming, which attacked Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, and stated: "He [referring to Dr. Raver] has refused to let private companies have long-term contracts for any part of the power produced by Bonneville dams."

As I stated on the floor of this House on July 24, 1950, that statement is false. In addition to the remarks I made on that occasion, I am today calling to the attention of the House news stories covering the long-term Montana Power Co.-Bonneville Power Administration relationship, which further exposes the falsity of the Reader's Digest article and indicates very clearly that business-Government cooperation can function and that by working together we can build up industry for western Montana and security for our people.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a front-page story from the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., and a front-page story from the Butte Daily Post, Butte, Mont. Both of

these are dated August 19, 1950. They follow:

[From the Montana Standard of August 19, 1950]

INDUSTRY-GOVERNMENT CONTRACT MAKES STATE FUTURE BRIGHT

Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, concluded a series of conferences here Friday on the operation of a unique business Government cooperation contract which probably will mean more industry and prosperity for Montana.

The contract which provides for the Bonneville Power Administration to deliver power to Montana for distribution over Montana Power Co. lines to customers is the first of its kind ever negotiated. It may well become a pattern for similar contracts in other parts of the country, proving that such cooperation between private industry and Government will work to the benefit of the people and eliminate much harmful strife.

Dr. Raver, who was making his first visit to this area, expressed himself as completely satisfied with the conferences he participated in with officials of the Montana Power Co., Victor Chemical Co., Anaconda Copper Mining Co., and others. "I am most gratified at the spirit of cooperation on the part of the Montana Power Co. to attain our objective," he said, "and I am convinced that our contract will work."

The contract was executed several months ago. The Government will build a transmission line from Hungry Horse Dam to its 230,000-volt substation at Anaconda from where power will be distributed over the Montana Power Co. lines.

"This agreement opens up new industrial possibilities for Montana," Dr. Raver explained. "Under it we cooperatively work out a plan to use power in a constructive manner for Montana, adding to the employment opportunities and wealth of the State. And the contract in all its aspects gives protection to the people."

The principal purpose of Dr. Raver's meetings here was to make certain that all details were agreed upon for supplying power for the operation of the Victor Chemical Co.'s $5,000,000 phosphate plant which is now under construction near Silver Bow.

As the plant is expected to be in operation about September of next year—or before the line from Hungry Horse to Anaconda is completed—it will be necessary for power to be supplied from another source during the interim period. This the Montana Power Co. will do, enabling the Victor Co. to start operations sooner than would otherwise be possible if it was required to wait for the transmission line to Anaconda.

When the Government line is completed to Anaconda, the Montana Power Co. will deliver Government power from that point to the Victor Chemical Co. plant, a distance of about 18 miles.

"Getting the plant in production as quickly as possible is important not only because of the economic benefits to this area but also from the standpoint of national defense," Dr. Raver said.

Establishment of the Victor Chemical Co. plant here, which brings an important new industry to Silver Bow County, actually is the result of cooperation from three sources. The Montana Power Co., Bonneville Power Administration, and the Anaconda Copper Mining Co. all played important roles in locating the new plan here. The agreement between the Power company and the Bonneville Administration assured the Victor company that it could go immediately forward with its plans, certain that it would have ample power for its operations. Meanwhile, the Anaconda Co. made arrangements to provide the right to phosphate deposits which will be used in the manufacturing process and affords a tunnel site for development of other properties. Thus, a new industry, which will add materially to the local payroll, is being brought into existence.

The idea of close cooperation between the Bonneville Administration and the Montana Power Co. appears to be working out smoothly, Dr. Raver said, and it may now be entering upon a broad and beneficial phase for the people of the State and especially of western Montana.

As a part of the general program the Montana Power Co. at the present time is making power available to Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives, at Government rates, and will continue to do so after the Hungry Horse project is completed and Government power becomes available from there.

It is believed that the contract involving the Hungry Horse-Anaconda transmission line will open the way for continued exploration of industrial possibilities in the portion of Montana west of the Continental Divide which is the boundary for Bonneville's operations. Through the same type of cooperation between the Bonneville Administration and Montana Power Co. which enabled the Victor Chemical Co. to locate here, an aluminum industry in the western Montana area is under definite consideration.

"People of Montana can be assured that the waters of Montana and the power they generate will be used here," Dr. Raver said. "This is illustrated by the fact that Bonneville will be sending a block of power to the Montana Power Co. and that more will be available for continued industrial development in western Montana."

The whole thing is expected to demonstrate what can be attained by private industry and Government power working harmoniously together. The uniqueness of the program lies in the fact that private power and Government power, long regarded as bitter-to-the-end enemies, are here in Montana showing how each, working with the other, can truly render the maximum of service and be of the greatest benefit to the people.

Dr. Raver will go to Spokane today but expects to return in the future for more conferences in western Montana which may well result in further development of the State.

[From the Butte (Mont.) Daily Post of August 19, 1950]

POWER CONTRACT BRIGHTENS FUTURE OF STATE

After concluding a unique business-Government cooperation contract that bodes well for the future prosperity of Montana, Dr. Paul J. Raver, administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, left here Saturday for Spokane. He probably will return later for more conferences concerning similar matters.

The contract which provides for the Bonneville Power Administration to deliver power to Montana for distribution over Montana Power Co. lines to customers is the first of its kind ever negotiated. It may well become a pattern for similar contracts in other parts of the country, proving that such cooperation between private industry and government will work to the benefit of the people and eliminate much harmful strife.

Dr. Raver, who was making his first visit to this area, expressed himself as completely satisfied with the conferences he participated in with officials of the Montana Power Co., Victor Chemical Co., Anaconda Copper Mining Co., and others. "I am most gratified at the spirit of cooperation on the part of the Montana Power Co. to attain our objective," he said, "and I am convinced that our contract will work."

The contract was executed several months ago. The Government will build a transmission line from Hungry Horse Dam to its 230,000-volt substation at Anaconda from where power will be distributed over the Montana Power Co. lines.

"This agreement opens up new industrial possibilities for Montana," Dr. Raver explained. "Under it we cooperatively work out a plan to use power in a constructive manner for Montana, adding to the employment opportunities and wealth of the State. And the contract in all its aspects gives protection to the people."

The principal purpose of Dr. Raver's meetings here was to make certain that all details were agreed upon for supplying power for the operation of the Victor Chemical Co.'s $500,000,000 phosphate plant which is now under construction near Silver Bow.

As the plant is expected to be in operation about Septembter of next year, or before the line from Hungry Horse to Anaconda is completed, it will be necessary for power to be supplied from another source during the interim period. This the Montana Power Co. will do, enabling the Victor Co. to start operations sooner than would otherwise be possible if it was required to wait for the transmission line to Anaconda.

When the Government line is completed to Anaconda, the Montana Power Co. will deliver Government power from that point to the Victor Chemical Co. plant, a distance of about 18 miles.

Getting the plant in production as quickly as possible is important not only because of the economic benefits to this area but also from the standpoint of national defense, Dr. Raver said.

Establishment of the Victor Chemical Co. plant here, which brings an important new industry to Silver Bow County, actually is the result of cooperation from three sources. The Montana Power Co., Bonneville Power Administration, and the Anaconda Copper Mining Co., all played important roles in locating the new plant here. The agreement between the power company and the Bonneville Administration assured the Victor Co., that it could go immediately forward with its plans, certain that it would have ample power for its operations. Meanwhile, the Anaconda company made arrangements to provide the right to phosphate deposits which will be used in the manufacturing process and affords a tunnel site for development of other properties. Thus, a new industry, which will add materially to the local payroll, is being brought into existence.

The idea of close cooperation between the Bonneville Administration and the Montana Power Co. appears to be working out smoothly, Dr. Raver said, and it may now be entering upon a broad and beneficial phase for the people of the State and especially of western Montana.

As a part of the general program the Montana Power Co. at the present time is making power available to Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives, at Government rates, and will continue to do so after the Hungry Horse project is completed and Government power becomes available from there.

It is believed that the contract involving the Hungry Horse-Anaconda transmission line will open the way for continued exploration of industrial possibilities in the portion of Montana west of the Continental Divide which is the boundary for Bonneville's operations. Through the same type of cooperation between the Bonneville Administration and Montana Power Co. which enabled the Victor Chemical Co. to locate here, an aluminum industry in the western Montana area is under definite consideration.

"People of Montana can be assured that waters of Montana and the power they generate will be used here," Dr. Raver said. "This is illustrated by the fact that Bonneville will be sending a block of power to the Montana Power Co. and that more will be available for continued industrial development in western Montana."

The whole thing is expected to demonstrate what can be attained by private industry and Government power harmoniously together. The uniqueness of the program lies in the fact that private power and Government power, long regarded as bitter-to-the-end enemies, are here in Montana showing how each, working with the other, can truly render the maximum of service and be of the greatest benefit to the people.

Medical Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore obtained, I include in the RECORD an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "Medical Service," and dealing with the House Commerce Committee's apparent decision not to report out the bill providing for medical, dental, and nursing schools and for assistance to medical students. The editorial reads as follows:

MEDICAL SERVICE

The House Commerce Committee has done a distinct disservice to the Nation in voting to shelve President Truman's proposed 5-year program to provide $250,000,000 of Federal funds for the expansion of facilities of medical, dental, and nursing schools and for the assistance of medical students. The committee voted 9 to 8 against reporting the bill, which had already been passed by the Senate. The reason for the opposition, according to news reports, is the fear of creating a precedent—meaning that the measure would be an opening wedge for Federal aid to education and for the health insurance and welfare proposals. The argument is as much beside the point as any objection on the ground of regimentation to economic controls in time of emergency. For the medical measure is a vital element in civil defense. At any time American cities may be under attack, yet doctors, dentists, and nurses are so short, with the military services again demanding adequate recruitment, that the situation has become critical.

Not only is the medical measure badly needed, an adequate plan is necessary for distribution of doctors between the military services and the civilian population. Already the services are justifiably complaining that recruitment of doctors is too slow. Medical societies have promised, the latest being the Maryland Medical Society, to start machinery in motion to determine medical mobilization. In 1942 this newspaper declared that most efficient utilization of doctors, as with other classes of manpower, could not be obtained by reliance upon doctors to allocate themselves. We said then "It is an eloquent commentary upon the haphazard character of our program for utilizing manpower * * * that the recruiting of medical men should have been permitted to proceed without prearranged plans for estimating and providing for the minimum medical needs of our civilian population." This remains true in the present situation. In the event of war the minimum medical needs of the civilian population will be enormously beyond anything at all like World War II, and that fact ought to be faced promptly and adequately.

Where Do We Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Daily Mirror of August 17:

WHERE DO WE STAND?

Foreign policy is a kind of nebulous expression meaning little unless pinned down. We thank Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Republican, of New York, for doing some pinning in an understandable way.

He doesn't just berate our failure of policy. He asks what our policy is in these specific instances:

1. If and when the North Koreans are forced back to the thirty-eighth parallel? If the North Koreans succeed in driving our forces out of Korea? What do we do?

2. If Communist China attacks Formosa? If it succeeds in conquering Formosa? Will we go to war with the 450,000,000 people of Communist China? What do we do?

3. What is policy as to the following countries (a) if attacked by Soviet satellite forces, (b) if conquered by Soviet satellite forces, (c) if attacked by Russian forces, (d) if conquered by Russian forces, (e) if taken over by internal Communist revolution: French Indochina, Hong Kong, British Malaya, Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Tibet, Iran, Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, Finland, western Germany? What do we do?

4. What is the policy of the United States now if (a) Soviet satellite forces or (b) Russian forces attack a North Atlantic Pact nation? Is it intended to make unlimited commitment of American ground forces in defense of Atlantic Pact nations? What do we do?

Let us add another question: What is our policy if several attacks are made at once?

Mr. COUDERT points out that the total population of the Asiatic countries which we might defend is over 700,000,000 and the population of western Europe over 250,000,000. He says:

"It is not enough merely to mobilize. Where and to what extent are American military forces to be committed? Our political plans and commitments must not exceed our military capacity."

We wish President Truman would clarify all those points.

Are we pledged to do more than we can ever possibly do? Or are we just on a day-to-day basis of expediency?

For instance, our Korean policy, before war broke, was to abandon Korea. Russia and the North Korean Communists may have counted on that. Had our policy been clear, the attack might not have occurred.

It is imperative that Americans, wholeheartedly supporting the war, know where they stand.

The Public Demands That Johnson and Acheson Be Fired Now

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the time has come, yes, long overdue, to terminate the striped pants-4-o'clock tea, double talk type of diplomacy that has been emanating for too long from our State Department. The people all over the Nation are disgusted, aroused, and angry. They have lost patience and confidence in our Hiss-loving, Russian-romancing, world-wooing Secretary of State. They want a man of consistent and dependable loyalty to the United States regardless of party affiliation who can develop a firm, sound, logical foreign policy that will command respect among the nations of the world and for an adequate Military Establishment to support such a policy for this Nation and then stand on it and stick to it. They want a change now, not after the November elections, and they do not hesitate to say so.

Here are some of the typical letters I have received from my constituents:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 29, 1950.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Dean Acheson and Louis Johnson must be forced to resign.

MARJORIE L. COLF.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 31, 1950.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Acheson and Johnson must be forced to resign.

MARJORIE C. VAN SCOYOC.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *July 30, 1950.*

DEAR SIR: I see no strong desire on the part of Congress to get rid of Acheson and Johnson. When can we expect them to be chucked out on their ears?

May I express my disgust on the part of certain officials to "wait until after elections."

Contemptible, when lives are at stake. Why must the public be treated as morons? When will we be given the truth? We can take it. Its pretty frustrating, Mr. McDONOUGH, to be thoroughly disgusted with the actions of certain people and lack the means to make your disgust known. I'd like to write the President, but since my letter would only be filed in the trash I must ask you to be my voice. For heaven's sake get rid of these stupid, incompetent nincompoops before they hand the country over to Joe Stalin.

Very truly yours,

FRANK E. CARROLL.

AUGUST 13, 1950.

DEAR GORDON: We are on a long trip. What we hear and learn in various States is so alarming, I wonder that more Congressmen do not speak up.

Surely those from Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, even Washington, and especially Oregon want Truman impeached.

All talk against Acheson remaining in any Government job. Young and old say the United States propaganda is only to fool United States citizens. They want fresh horses to cross troubled waters.

They say, to win in Korea we must defeat Communists in Washington, D. C.

Never before have I heard men say, "If you write your Senator, I'll write mine." A Democrat tells me he was forced out of the Treasury Department by Reds who speak openly of their contempt for America.

We Americans must begin making friends throughout our own country, and the world as well. Gifts of money and supplies don't do it. Too much talking doesn't do it. Can't you insist the United States boys in Korea and elsewhere be kept together; fight together and live together. Then infiltration can happen only once. Koreans don't live as we do; don't think or act as we—and their sanitation! Oh God, save our men from the disease, distress, and discouragement.

Note clippings. Really, United States citizens hereabouts are aroused. Much success to you in November and thereafter.

Sincerely,

CLEM AUSMAN.

The people's distrust and disgust is not limited to Acheson. They demand a nonpolitical Secretary of Defense. They want to know what the billions appropriated for defense was spent for. Why don't we have better tanks than the Russian-supported North Koreans? Why have our men been sent against a supposed third-rate enemy only to find that we are outgunned, undermanned, and caught off guard by poor intelligence and military advice?

Here we are engaged in a war with Russia through the back-door by way of Korea and our Secretary of Defense allows our Air Force to release vital and strategic photographs of one of our most important target areas—Los Angeles—which will undoubtedly be used to good advantage by Russia.

Read the following letter I just received from a disgusted and angry constituent about this:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *August 14, 1950.*

Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCDONOUGH: I was shocked this morning to open my newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, and see a photograph just released to the public by the Air Force and taken by the Nation's newest camera plane, the North American Aviation Co's 4-Jet-RF-45-C Tornado, after the craft climbed to more than 40,000 feet. You probably by this time have seen the photograph. I also picked up a Los Angeles Examiner and to my astonishment there was printed a full-page reproduction of this same air map, showing all of the reservoirs, such as San Fernando, Stone Canyon, Franklin Canyon, pointed out on the margin so that any enemy plane would have no trouble in finding our water supply. On the front page of the Examiner is an article, Los Angeles Is Focal Point in Raid Defense, covering details of the probable areas that might be attacked, stating that 16,000 citizens are to be trained for defense.

We are spending billions for defense, arming friendly nations all over the world, and fighting a Red war in Korea, and then somebody in the Air Force releases an air map of one of the vital areas in the United States with oil storage facilities and large aircraft factories clearly shown. This map is released to the newspapers and could be, and probably will be, transmitted to Russia and all of our other enemies.

I ask you, "wha' hoppened"?

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE H. MCCARTHY.

There are millions of confused, frustrated and angry people all over the Nation who feel the same way. Many of them go further than demanding the removal of Acheson and Johnson—they want the whole executive department cleaned out from Truman down.

Let me read to you items in the latest edition of the United States News of statements from all parts of the Nation from people who are thoroughly disgusted and have lost confidence in the administration.

From Maine:

It is quite apparent our great President is no leader. In my opinion he should be impeached for the mess he has gotten us into.

From Colorado:

What goes on in Korea? Where is the money appropriated for defense going?

From a small Minnesota town:

The people are angry about our Government from the President on down the line. It is now evident that a lot of us made a great mistake in voting for Truman & Co. in the last election—

Writes a Midwestern farmer:

Unless some changes are made, I will do all in my power to influence voters in my group against the administration.

Repercussions from the charges of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, about Communists in the Government show up in statements from people in various parts of the Nation such as the following:

From Alabama:

MCCARTHY's charge of communism in the State Department sure hasn't been disproved.

From Maine:

Why don't you clean the Communists out of our United States?

From Colorado:

How could a thing like this have happened unless it is true that our Government is riddled with Communists?

From Ohio:

I'd like to see the State Department cleaned out and fumigated.

The war in Korea causes a former GI from Minnesota to raise a question:

Those if us who have been in the Pacific are wondering what happened to all of the equipment we left out there. We've been wondering who gave the order to destroy the tanks on Okinawa, the LST's on Iwo Jima. The reports coming back say, "They have nothing to shoot with. Why?"

Many point fingers at Secretaries Acheson and Johnson.

From a New York minister:

It is the head of the Democratic Party and his Secretary of State who have exposed Korea to its downfall.

From Alabama:

Try to send Mr. Bull-in-a-china-shop Johnson back to private life. His widely advertised economy in the Defense Department has resulted in a disgrace to the military forces.

From Maine:

Secretary Johnson went around the country saying that he was cutting off fat but not muscle, and now its develops that we have the fat but not the muscle.

From Ohio:

We now find we are being given loose and false information. I do not believe Mr. Johnson is capable for what may be ahead.

From Minnesota:

Replace Acheson and Louis Johnson. They have made a sorry mess of things and people have lost faith in these men. If they are allowed to remain we will lose faith in the whole administration.

There can be little doubt that the rank and file of this Nation is aroused and demand action.

This is the first time in the history of the United States that we seem to have completely lost the initiative and seem to be subject to the whim and caprice of an unfriendly foreign power, Russia.

Never before in our history have leadership and wisdom in high places been so lacking, and the Government been rendered so impotent as it is this critical period due to the past mistakes of the administration.

The people of the Nation have spoken. Are their demands to be ignored or are we going to respond to their righteous indignation and act to save our beloved Nation from demoralization brought about by incompetent fumbling, bungling politicians in the administration.

Radio Broadcast of Col. S. W. A. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks I include the text of a discussion by Col. S. W. A. Marshall, military commentator of the Detroit News. This excellent talk was given by Colonel Marshall over WWJ on Monday, August 7, 1950, which I recommend highly as reading for those citizens interested in the vital problems facing our Nation and the world in this critical hour.

The discussion follows:

Good evening. The hands of the clock stood at about 11:59 for the Eighth Army in Korea last Friday, and have remained there since, the situation not having materially changed.

You all know why it is so late over there. Having made retreat after retreat, according to plan, the Eighth Army at last stood on the line along the Naktong River where planned withdrawals could no longer serve a purpose. Henceforth every plot of ground yielded to the enemy was a sharp knife pressed directly against Eighth Army's jugular.

It was at this time that the President of the United States spoke to a group of White House correspondents. While he spoke, the Eighth Army was waiting with its back to the sea and its front to the devil.

In balance was the great question of whether, having been thrown into war undertrained, undermanned and undergunned, and having had, as General Menoher put it, the hell whipped out of it, Eighth Army would be able to hold to life with its final

breath and thereby save the American Nation a shameful and full defeat at the hands of a fifth-rate people.

For about 55,000 men, this was—and still remains—an issue of life and death; for all the rest of us it is, at least temporarily, just a matter of whether the flag will float as proudly as ever and we can keep from hanging our heads. For the strains of their embarrassment were on our hands.

Collectively, they had been given one of the sorriest deals ever handed a lot of men called on to serve their country. They had been ordered to undertake a task they did not understand, with weapons which could not conceivably serve the purpose, under conditions for which the Nation whose uniform they wore had in no wise suitably prepared them.

They were not geared for a fight; their organizational structure, their level of training and their supply discipline were still those of peacetime; they have paid a hard price in lives for these shortcomings.

Yet, in any case, they were pitifully understrength when weighed against the assignment; this, though the barrel's bottom had been scraped to provide Eighth Army with a facade of fighting power. At the moment of action, it was in fact weaker, and the Army as a whole was weaker, in relation to the immediate and world problems which confronted that Army and us than this Nation and its arms have been since colonial times.

These were sobering thoughts to any American. They were particularly sobering thoughts to those millions of Americans, now in civil life, who having in times past served their country in war, feel toward the situation of our countrymen in Korea only that awful futility which grips men when they would like to help but can do nothing. Our chief prop in these times is that, in spirit, this host is ready as ever.

But it was not of these things that the President spoke while the Eighth Army waited and hoped.

He picked that hour to tell the Eighth Army and the people who are behind it, and are sweating and praying for it, that Defense Secretary Johnson is not only all right, but triple-plated, superduper all right in his eyes.

No one could have caviled at a little pat on the back for a Secretary who is having more missiles heaved his way currently than an African dodger at a country carnival.

But the President went far beyond that; he said that Louis Johnson would keep his job and continue to manage the security machinery of the United States so long as he remained in the White House. No matter that Louis Johnson said 3 months ago that we had all the military strength we need, and that events have proved only the vanity of this boast. * * * No matter that he said 5 months ago that if an enemy struck at 4 a. m. some day, we would be ready by 5 a. m., and that that has already proved to be the longest 1 hour in our history. No matter that he put away in mothballs carriers now sorely needed in the Pacific action. * * * No matter that 1 year ago he demolished infantry training divisions just beginning to do a job of reestablishing the field power of the United States. No matter that last fall he let the pruning knife sweep through the armories and cut away an irreplaceable percentage of that small crew of experts who knew how to condition tanks, get artillery out of the grease and send it on its way, and unlock the secret improved recoil mechanisms for Army and Navy guns. No matter that under Louis Johnson our field training exercises have looked more like a workout for PIO officers and news cameramen than a pass at the serious business of readying men for war. The man is all right; he is a very all right.

He is indeed! This is to his credit, if this is what we want, that he took over a generally inefficient and confused combined establishment and in 18 months shook it down until most of the guts and fire had been shaken out of it.

There are thousands of good men in it—men who in other days were not afraid to think along original lines and act according to their thinking. There is less of the spirit of challenge in them today than was ever before to be found in the American armed force. They know their master's voice and they sit there like the terrier at the phonograph waiting for something to come out of the horn.

No one of sound mind would say that this is all Louis Johnson's fault; but to say that he is without fault in the matter is to ascribe to his critics a venom and sinister political motive which they obviously do not possess. And now he has been told that he is good "for the duration."

That is one way of saying that, with impunity, he can double in spades every one of his incredible mistakes, regardless of who pays the price. That is the way of it.

But once upon a time there was a sense in this country that public office was a public trust. This meant that given a post of ultimate responsibility, any man was entitled to hold it so long as the people had satisfaction and confidence in his stewardship. That, but no more than that.

In the midst of crisis, Americans in former days could rally with a patriotic stirring to the ideal: "My country—right or wrong." Can the bonds of a strong spiritual unity, whence comes action, endure if in the midst of war we are given only the precept: "My man—right or wrong"?

After all, it is our Government; it is not a trusteeship; it belongs to the people; by law it is accountable to the people; their fate is at stake in its every act; their blood must pay for its failures; it cannot endure except as they possess it and take pride in that possession.

Were these things not so, young Americans would not be dying now among the hills and rice paddies of Korea in behalf of ideals which they have scarce had time to understand.

That is why the rifleman crouches in a foxhole while the bullets graze overhead; it is not to liberate South Korea, but to keep high the torch of freedom in its main dwelling. Each of these men has to face his final risk on a day-to-day basis. For every mistake made, a terrific price is exacted.

Is it just, is it decent that any higher hand touching the policy which may make or break such men should be judged and found other than on his own day-to-day record, rather than according to a promise that he will still be around in 1952?

This may seem a far cry from the war which I am supposed to be discussing. I argue, on two grounds, that it is not. First, that during World War II, we found that it was hard enough at best to rally American combat men to any real conviction that the main stakes were worthy of a life-and-death gamble; they still loved the square in the old home town, but they had become a bit cynical about the system under which they lived.

Second, the crucial struggle of today is the fight for men's minds. There is no point spending additional billions to beam messages to the enslaved masses of the world if we keep saying the wrong things to ourselves, and miss repeated opportunity for a strengthening of the common faith.

This is not a fight to put communism down; it is a fight to keep democracy up and to expand the ranks of those who continue to believe to the last punch and bell that freedom is the main thing.

We possess no special secret which can inveigh against those truths of history to which all people are subject. There is strong following only when the light burns strongly up ahead. Either we set a higher standard, or the standard we have will go down.

It would be a bad thing for us if the Eighth Army were to lose its final battle. But it would be a worse thing if there were to be defeated on this shore those possibilities of more perfect union and more courageous dedication which mature in a free people only when they know that their leading is the best possible.

In a sense other than the one intended, the Pentagon spoke perhaps far more wisely than it knew these recent days when it declared that Korea would not be another Dunkerque. True enough, that reference was to an army that in other days was beaten where it stood, and had to return, weaponless, to its home shore. But the other half of the story was that Lord Gort's army got back to a people already thrice armed because they knew what they wanted to do and were getting from their government and its leaders clear orders, steadying action, and some of the most stirring words ever said by men.

No, this isn't likely to be another Dunkerque, win, lose or draw. As greatly desperate as is the situation of the Eighth Army along its last river front, they need to hold on over there, for our own good even more than for the good of themselves, that we may again come to understand that holding on is the main thing, whether it be to old and tested ideals or to a fresh package of ground. This is the great virtue that one great example might inject into our cautious and careful manner of life.

Diocletian, cultivating lettuce in Salerno, said, "You cannot have butterflies in the summertime unless you are willing to feed worms in the winter." And if our eyes are open, we should now understand what he was talking about.

Is International World Student Congress Communist Controlled?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to state that my attention has been called to a press dispatch of August 15 stating that an American delegation attending the International World Student Congress in Communist-controlled Prague led the assembly in a demonstration in honor of Communist North Korean Lt. Col. Kan Buk, who told the gathering that his country had been attacked by the United States. He asked the congress to condemn the war criminals. The congress then adopted a resolution condemning the United States for imperialist aggression and the mass bombardment of peace-loving Korean population, for which the American delegation voted.

I rise for the purpose of raising certain pertinent questions. Why did the State Department, which has discretionary powers in such matters, grant passports to this delegation whose purpose it was to blacken the name of the United States before the world in a time of war? What punitive action, if any, will be taken against members of this traitorous

delegation who consciously stabbed our boys in the back?

I propose to ask the State Department for the names of the members of this anti-American delegation so that the country may know who they are. It is high time that Communists be deprived of the privilege of traveling abroad on their nefarious and traitorous business in which they now engage with the official permission of the State Department.

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Loveland Reporter-Herald, August 17, 1950, on the Korean war:

AMERICA THE GOOF-ICAL

So you are not too happy about this war in Korea? So you are not so sure it was necessary? So you can't understand how we came to get mixed up in it anyway?

Well, it doesn't seem just that your son should be lying with a bit of shrapnel in his spine in some Korean rice paddy if there had been another way out. Surely the war was not of his making. It was not he who helped create the conditions that brought it on. Even if he had recognized those situations, he probably would have been too young to have voted against them. But he is paying the price as our boys always have paid the price.

Right now we are in a war—a war that may be over in the short matter of months or may drag on interminably until the whole world is engulfed in the holocaust. Unfortunately we Americans cannot necessarily determine now how long or how horrible it will be. That answer will be written in the Kremlin. Ours only is the obligation to face the exigency, regardless of cost or sacrifice. Our national honor was challenged in Korea and our future was jeopardized when Russia flung down the gantlet. It is said we should not look back, but forget the past and face the terrible ordeal ahead.

Perhaps. But if America ever is to cease being silly and stop making the same mistakes over and over again for no good reason, then perhaps a little looking back might be beneficial. Even a little sober perusal of an old history book might be productive of some thoughts that have escaped the proponents of the new world thinking.

Japan took our scrap iron and threw it back at us in bullets and shrapnel. We gave Russia boxcars, airplanes, industrial experts, and weapons of war. Our tanks and our payment is sudden death. We didn't know? We didn't suspect? Why? Is there no American intelligence service? Has our military no eyes or ears? Is our State Department entirely oblivious of world thinking or world intentions? Why was the military caught flat-footed in Korea?

Obviously many half answers can and are given for our failures and our Pearl Harbors. When we catch an Alger Hiss red-handed it is merely a "red herring." When our atomic secrets are stolen from under our very noses it takes years before the politicians will admit to the defalcation.

Not too many years ago our own America permitted Korea to be severed in twain. We almost insisted that the Soviet Union take half. No so long ago we had conferences at Yalta and Potsdam and we asked for Berlin but gave Ivan the key to the gate. Ivan, we were told, was "good old Joe."

Certainly, this is a complicated world and its problems are many and complex. But certainly also it would seem that a little simplified thinking in high places is going to be necessary if this Nation is to survive.

Electric Power Available in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, electric power is a vital factor in the overall mobilization of industry in the national defense effort. Detroit, Mich., played an important part in providing the tanks, the automobiles, the planes, the ammunition, and other essentials necessary to win World War I and World War II. In short, the fate of our national defense must of necessity depend much upon the great industrial city of Detroit and its environs. In these circumstances, it is reassuring to know that there is plenty of electric power available in the Detroit area.

Pursuant to unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am including herein, as a part of my remarks a press release by the public information division of the Detroit Edison Co., on August 13, 1950, which is as follows:

"There is plenty of electric power available here in Michigan's industrial heart to carry out the area's full share of the Nation's new defense production program," Detroit Edison President James W. Parker said today.

There is available as much power as can be used when industrial plants take up their allotted share of the defense production loads, he said. In most instances, manpower will be the limiting factor. With every employable person in the area on the job, there will be enough electric horsepower to go around.

Parker declared there would be—just as during the last war—enough power to take care of the defense program without curbing either residential or farm use of electricity. He said the electric industry as a whole will have power to meet the country's needs provided no governmental restrictions are imposed which would retard the construction program now under way.

"Even though new peaks of demand have been reached during 1950," the Edison president said, "our capacity is advancing well ahead of use."

Present capacity of the Edison Co. is about 1,500,000 kilowatts—roughly 2,000,000 horsepower. This includes the 200,000 kilowatts added recently at Trenton Channel. Two new turbogenerators which will go into service at Conners Creek within a year will bring capacity to 1,750,000 kilowatts.

Also important are the interconnections with others. Between Consumers Power and the Edison Co. the interconnections have been tripled to strengthen Michigan's overall electric supply system.

Parker also announced that construction will soon start on a project to add another 250,000 kilowatts. Originally scheduled in part at an existing plant, this addition may, in view of recent events, require the building of a new plant.

The company's revised expansion plan will enable it to keep longer in service three older generators which were slated for retirement before the outbreak of trouble in Korea, Parker explained.

"I hope present stepped-up expansion of the Nation's electric power will not be interrupted," Parker said. "It is vital that the Government should cooperate in private power company expansion plans."

The present Edison expansion target is 1,850,000 kilowatts by 1953 or before. This represents an increase of more than 750,000 kilowatts since 1945.

Parker said this goal has been set with an eye to maintaining year-round, around-the-clock industrial production—either for armament or for whatever the Nation calls upon the Detroit area to build.

Commenting on Nation-wide power adequacy, Parker said reports of the entire electric industry show that power supply in most parts of the country is geared to keep well ahead of both industrial and civilian needs. This takes the defense production program, as now known to the industry, fully into account.

Electric generating capability today is nearly double that of 1941, totaling 66,000,000 kilowatts. Since World War II 16,500,000 kilowatts have been added. Another 18,000,000 kilowatts at least will be available by the end of 1953, according to present estimates.

At present, 80 percent of the Nation's electric power is being generated by investor-owned companies, whose systems have been built entirely with private capital.

Parker reiterated his hope that Government limitations would not halt scheduled expansions. Most electric companies' expansion programs have been speeded up since the United Nations undertook the task of driving the Communists out of South Korea.

Confidence was again expressed by Parker that the interconnected power systems of the United States are well prepared to cope with added defense loads. "The light and power industry has made tremendous strides since the end of World War II," he said. "The national power situation is good—and don't let anyone tell you otherwise."

Veterans' Loans in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have just received information from Gordon A. Huseby, director of the Department of Veterans' Affairs of the State of Wisconsin, that the Wisconsin Department of Veterans' Affairs, in 9 months, has either completed or committed funds for 1,271 housing loans for a total of $1,905,600. This represents a remarkable record for the first 9 months of operation of this work.

It is interesting to note how this record compares with the record of Federal agencies in making loans to veterans and other individuals. During the first year of its operation—1935—the Federal

Housing Authority completed 255 loans in the State of Wisconsin. During the first year of its loan operations—1945—the Veterans' Administration completed 628 loans in the State of Wisconsin.

As Mr. Huseby aptly put it in a letter dated August 16, 1950: "I think our record will stand on its own."

Kansas Democrats Reject Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith including an article by Mr. A. L. Shultz, able and well-known political commentator for the Topeka State Journal. Mr. Shultz's syndicated column of political comment is carried every week by a large number of Kansas newspapers, both daily and weekly. In his latest column Mr. Shultz analyzes the part which the Brannan farm plan played in the defeat of Carl V. Rice, Democratic National Committeeman, in his contest for nomination for the United States Senate. The article is as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., August 16.—Kansas Democrats who plan an elaborate and expensive all-out drive for handsome Paul Aiken for the United States Senate as the gold-rimmed, diamond-studded champion of the lofty principles of President Truman will start the campaign with red faces.

Mr. Aiken surprised a great many people in his smashing defeat of National Committeeman Carl V. Rice for the senatorial nomination. The victory was hailed as a glorious triumph for the man in the White House, who is a close friend and confidant of the nominee. There was no secret about Mr. Aiken's resignation as an assistant postmaster general and his return to Kansas to take Mr. Rice definitely and maybe permanently out of circulation as a potent factor in party affairs. Mr. Aiken was a master workman. All credit for his triumph, though, was placed at the President's door, and nobody was denied access to the secret that his candidacy was at Mr. Truman's personal request.

The senatorial campaign pattern, which was developed almost before the vote count in the 2,793 precincts in the State had been completed, was one to uphold the hands of the President in all things. Now, the vote tabulations reveal, the load that has been placed on Mr. Aiken's shoulders will not be easy to carry as the November election approaches. The very resqurceful and capable Mr. Aiken, who got his lessons in political skill at the knee of the genial James A. Farley, waged his preprimary campaign almost entirely on the necessity of removing Mr. Rice to a spot of absolute oblivion. He went very little beyond that point except in his expressions of devotion and loyalty for President Truman. In the meantimo Mr. Rice conducted an aggressive campaign, sponsored Fair Deal philosophies without qualifications or reservations and almost daily stressed the thought that the Brannan farm price-control plan had come almost directly from Heaven.

On the farm policy Mr. Aiken adroitly had little to say. He was friendly to the farmer. He was ardently for the laborer who was to receive lower food costs while the farmer got high commodity prices under the plan boosted by his opponent, Mr. Rice. When Mr. Aiken spoke he never mentioned Secretary Brannan's name. And he was wise beyond normal reason. He rode the fence on the Brannan plan and came through the campaign without saddle sores, but with the senatorial nomination in his inside coat pocket.

Now, the returns reveal, Carl Rice's enthusiastic endorsement of the farm-price-support plan as presented by the Secretary of Agriculture, probably cost him the senatorial nomination. The big wheat-growing area of Kansas turned thumbs down on Mr. Rice. That, in simple analysis of the primary returns, was nothing short of a protest against the Brannan plan.

Mr. Aiken won by being noncommittal on the subject. But the hurdle he must take is in the weeks ahead. The Brannan plan, loudly praised at the White House and by Democratic leaders in many sections of the land, is coming into the campaign as big as the giraffe at the circus. Mr. Aiken's stout endorsement of the President and his philosophies will hardly be able to ride around the commodity-price-fixing program on a greased track. So the voting areas where Mr. Rice was weak and Mr. Aiken was strong will certainly require adjustments to meet conditions as the campaign progresses. Some day Mr. Aiken must get on the line for or against the farm-price plan.

It is decidedly interesting to observe that in 22 of the big wheat-growing counties of the State, Democratic voters registered protests against the champion of the Brannan plan in the August 1 primary. Not only did they vote a definite "no" regarding Mr. Rice's candidacy, but they rolled up a 3-to-1 majority for Mr. Aiken. That was for the 22 counties. In a number of other counties, the Aiken majority was staggering. In all those 22 counties—complete but unofficial—the party vote for Mr. Aiken was 6,768 as against 2,261 for Mr. Rice. That's 3 to 1 as straight as the crow flies.

The Brannan plan was clearly and definitely the top-flight issue before voters in the Democratic Party which sponsored the program. Its rejection probably is the most significant expression in the primary vote viewed from the national standpoint. It checks with the June 5 Iowa primary when Democratic nominee Loveland went before the voters with Brannan's personal endorsement, plus blessings from the White House and a 100-percent farm-price-support pledge. His meager plurality was 38 percent of the party's primary vote.

Democrats in the Kansas farm belt gave Rice an even more impressive thumping. A plurality carried Loveland to a place on the ticket in a divided field. But Rice, who bared his breast to support the philosophy before the Kansas farmers, lost almost every important grain-growing county in his State—most of them registering emphatic Aiken majorities.

Comanche County, for example, voted 181 to 41 against the Brannan plan champion, Finney County went 6 to 1 against Rice. Lane County testified 104 to 24 for Aiken. Pawnee was 411 to 80. Stafford County was against Rice better than 9 to 1. Wichita County Democrats voted 230 for Aiken, 19 for Rice.

Majorities of 2 to 1 were a common pattern out in the area where the farmers and small-business men have been doing serious, sober thinking about Washington controls. Carl Rice, who had put his head knowingly and deliberately on the political block, almost has his brains knocked out as a reward for stalwart endorsement of one of Mr. Truman's pet proposals. Paul Aiken observed the mauling from the sidelines. His comments regarding the farm problem went only to expressions of friendship for the men who plan and harvest the crops or watch their grain wrecked by hail, floods, and hot winds.

Campaign workers will give great heed to voter expression in the recent primaries. Because of the tremendous importance of Kansas as a grain-growing State, reactions of Democrats in their recent voting is a matter of major concern. There was a specific and clear-cut pattern for the farm belt generally and the big wheat-growing counties particularly. Their answer to the Brannan plan appears to have been a clear cut "No."

All of this is decidedly interesting and for November election day results, highly important. Paul Aiken, colorful, likable, handsome, and resourceful emissary of the President, however, is on a spot. His skillful evasion of definite expression for or against the Brannan proposal enabled him to win an impressive primary day victory. The big tussle, though, is in the weeks ahead. You can do a not of speculating as to just the manner in which the skillful and thoroughly trained Mr. Aiken will uphold the hands of the President while peddling his campaign wares to the Kansas grain growers.

Congress Too Timid on Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register which I believe reflects the thinking of a great majority of Americans:

CONGRESS TOO TIMID ON INCOME TAXES

Federal personal income taxes are going up sharply, probably beginning October 1. The Senate Finance Committee has approved a bill which will boost rates as much as 20 percent in some cases. Withholding rates on wages and salaries, after exemptions, will rise from 15 percent to 18 percent.

The House and Senate are expected to approve a bill of substantially these specifications.

Congressional tax experts believe such an increase in rates will pull in about $3,000,000,000 more per year in personal income taxes.

This is not enough. It is not nearly enough.

True, Congress is planning to jump the rates on corporation taxes also. But corporation taxes are not as effective antiinflation medicine as personal income taxes. Many of the larger corporations are capable of passing on an increase in taxes to consumers in the form of higher prices.

Moreover, corporation taxes do not reduce purchasing power for consumer goods in the right places.

A wartime tax program should be aimed to cut down the buying power of the whole population in order to curtail demand for consumer goods. This is the only way that inflation can be stopped.

For this purpose, the personal income tax is ideal. It extracts buying power from people on a progressive basis: the higher the income the higher the rate. The machinery is all in operation and requires no new employees. All we need to do is push up the rates.

Excise taxes are very effective at reducing inflationary pressures, also. They take a uniform slice out of the pockets of every-

one who buys the article being taxed. The only thing wrong with these taxes is that they bear heaviest on the consumers least able to pay. They make the poorest people bear the heaviest share of the load.

For that reason, excise tax increases should be used sparingly. They should be applied only to specific commodities, the consumption of which must be curtailed to conserve critical raw materials or to conserve labor. Luxury goods are a good place to apply heavier excises.

But we repeal, our main reliance for inflation control must be on the personal income tax. And the present bill in Congress is too timid.

As nearly as can be told now, our defense spending is likely to rise by $20,000,000,000 a year. We should try to get at least half of this from heavier personal income taxes. The other 10 may be obtained by (1) reducing nonmilitary expenses of Government, (2) the general rise in total production which will increase the tax take from given rates, and (3) increases in other taxes.

Congress is aware of the inflation danger, and it is making a good start toward a sensible wartime fiscal program. But it is not yet facing our real needs in personal income taxes.

Our Military Situation in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "We Have Had Our Pearl Harbor But We May Still Be Asleep," written by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, and published in the Boston Herald on Sunday, August 19.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE HAVE HAD OUR PEARL HARBOR, BUT WE MAY STILL BE ASLEEP

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, August 19.—After dinner, over a very respectable German brandy, the American official relaxed.

"How do you see the world situation?" he asked me.

"Much better. We have had our Pearl Harbor before the outbreak of war. If we wake up and do what is necessary, we shall, I believe, avoid world war III altogether. The boys who are dying in Korea may be, in the finest sense of the word, the saviors of their country from an unspeakable calamity."

"Check," said the American official. "But are we still not awake."

E. A. M.: "That is how you read the picture?"

A. O.: "How else can you read it? See here. When Korea broke, President Truman electrified the world. Boy, were we proud over here. Things began to buzz. When he demanded ten billion cold from Congress, we felt sure that finally Washington's eyes were open. And then—what a flop."

E. A. M. "How can you say that? Finally, all the free governments are doing something—something pretty big."

FORCE INCREASES

A. O.:"Big as this (disgustedly pointing to a cigarette butt on the tray.) So far as we have heard, the American ground forces are being increased—the regulars, I mean—by just two divisions. Call that pretty big? What an anticlimax. No wonder the Germans are again jittery and turning to the commies."

E. A. M.: "But think of the rest of our military effort. Think of the atom bombs, the huge Air Force, the mighty fleet, we are putting into shape."

A. O.: "I have thought. That's just the trouble. Now I don't say that A-bombs may not win a world war. I just don't know. Furthermore, neither does anybody else. But I know that if they can't, then the United States is sunk if we ever become so crazy as to let Asia and west Europe go. Are these places—are the only powerful friends we've got in the world—going to be protected by airplanes and ships? They aren't. If Korea shows anything, it shows that the man on the ground, the infantryman, is still boss. All other weapons exist to support him. We saw it at Okinawa and at Cassino—and forgot it. We see it again in Korea—and call for just two new ground divisions. Mr. Mowrer, that is the way to sure defeat."

E. A. M.: "But we are building up in international ground force of imposing proportions."

A. O.: "Imposing my eye! Against an adversary with 175 ground divisions we plan to defend Europe with a force in being of thirty-five. Defend it where? Not on the Elbe. Not even on the Rhine. Maybe on the Pyrenees."

E. A. M.: "Then you favor rearming the Germans?"

A. O.: "Of course I do. But as matters now stand, we may not have the Germans with us, or at least, not armed in time. I do not say that with the forces we have planned we may not ultimately win a war. In the process we shall have seen Europe occupied and destroyed again. I want to prevent the next war, not win it."

E. A. M.: "So what do you propose?"

A. O.: "To prevent the next war, save Europe and have the Germans with us, we shall have to arm and put into Europe and keep there 20 American divisions, at least, as long as the present tension lasts. Those 20 American divisions have to be the hard core of a Western ground force, not of 35 but of about 60 divisions."

E. A. M.: "Mostly Germans?"

A. O.: "Of course not. I don't trust the Germans any more than you do. Give them an overwhelming force, they'll begin telling us where to get off. But a reasonable German force of five to seven divisions incorporated into the army of Europe now could not possibly get out of hand. Their presence would keep 80 percent of all Germans on our side. If we put 20 ground divisions in Europe, the Germans 5, then we have a right to expect our European allies to organize and equip those other 35 divisions and pronto. Short of that, I just do not see how we are going to avoid world war III. To avoid getting ulcers, I have accepted that fact and stopped worrying about it. But 60 divisions, of which 20 are American, in Europe will still prevent that catastrophe.

HELP FROM ALLIES

E. A. M.: "I am almost sure you won't get them all. From what I have learned wandering around west Europe, our allies may be able to furnish their 35. If we recruited now—say for Korea—8,000 or 10,000 Germans and trained with the new standard weapons, they could grow into five German divisions. I am afraid Congress will not be willing to station 20 American divisions in Europe. But I agree that 2 new divisions—12 regular divisions in all—are pretty silly. How would you settle for an American ground force of 25 regular divisions, whereof 5 to be stationed in Europe, and the present 25 National Guard divisions, making 50 in all? That would give you, with the Germans, 45 divisions more or less on the danger spot and 20 more in the United States."

The American official knocked the ashes out of his pipe. "That size force," he said slowly, "would not necessarily prevent the next big war—but it might. But by the almighty God, tell them when you go home that nothing less will."

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, a few days ago a bill providing for universal military training was introduced. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials favoring universal military training, published in the Pittsburgh Press, the Philadelphia Bulletin, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, and the Philadelphia Inquirer. I should like to make the statement that the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, while it has not spoken at this time editorially, informs me that it favors universal military training, as does also the Philadelphia News.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of August 20, 1950]

THE GI'S CAN'T ADJOURN

President Truman would like to have a universal military training law. But he does not wish to press the issue at this Congress session because of the greater urgency of other legislation more immediately related to the fighting in Korea and the limited time for its consideration.

What limited time?

And which is of more concern to the American people: National defense or the forthcoming congressional elections?

The boys in Korea are fighting in temperatures of 100°—not working in air-conditioned chambers and offices, as Members of Congress are. They cannot recess or adjourn at will—as Congressmen can.

Congress well can afford to stay in continuous session until every bit of essential legislation has been enacted. Any Congressman who doesn't like the work under those circumstances can quit, which is more than our GI's in Korea can do.

Our troops can't even get the rest they need between battles because we do not have replacements to relieve them. Universal military training will provide replacements if there are any more "Korean" situations, as we fear there may be.

It isn't asking too much of Congress to make sure of that by staying on the job until this legislation has been approved.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of August 18, 1950]

WE NEED UMT NOW

Universal military training has long been urged by the leaders of our armed services as an essential part of a sound program of national security. The President recommended it at the start of his administration and again in January.

The idea was supported by an advisory commission headed by Dr. Karl Compton, which spoke for enlightened public opinion after a close survey of the problem.

The administration had decided not to press for it at this time because of the many other urgent problems, but Secretary Johnson wants to push the matter and the Armed Services Committees of Congress have been asked for instant action, at least on a stand-by basis.

The universal training issue has been a victim of the disposition of Congress to postpone action on contentious issues for political reasons. To many in Congress who approve it on principle, it never seems the right time for action. In a period of war, or of close attention to national defense, other questions, which appear of more immediate concern, get preference. In a period of demobilization and relaxation after immense efforts, nobody wants to urge it on a public seemingly indifferent. It's the old situation of the leaky roof: You can't mend it when it rains, and it doesn't seem so necessary when skies are clear.

However, our experience in Korea has been an eye opener not to take chances in the future with national security, even if they should seem of the calculated risk variety. While opposition has been very vocal, military training has long had the backing of a large majority of the people. A Gallup poll this week shows 78 percent favor it. If we need a strong Army and continuation of selective service, we need UMT.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette]

ENACT A UMT LAW NOW

Congress ought to enact immediately a law providing for universal military training as requested by the administration.

Our Nation is engaged in a life-or-death defense of western democracy against communism. It cannot compete on anything like equal terms without an adequate reserve of trained manpower comparable to that in Russia.

The only way to provide such a reserve is to require physically and mentally qualified youths between the ages of 17 and 20 to devote a minimum of six months out of their lives to military training.

Until now, opponents of UMT have argued that we have entered into an age of push-button warfare obviating the need of great armies. Military success, it has been contended, would depend more upon scientific achievement than upon manpower.

The war in Korea has knocked the bottom out of that argument. The fact seems to be that no matter how much technical progress is made in this atomic age, wars will still be won or lost on the ground. We simply must have forces sufficient to take and hold land. Manpower will always be a decisive factor, as it is today in Korea.

The question of timing is important in the administration's request for immediate enactment of UMT law. It can give rise to much confusion which we should make the greatest effort to avoid.

Defense Secretary Johnson pointed out in his letter to Congress that we are now engaged in a rapid expansion of military forces on active duty. Obviously, then, we could not spare at this time enough officers and men to plan and launch a UMT program.

Hence, even though immediate enactment of UMT is requested, it is specified that the program would not be initiated until such time as the President may direct. In other words, it would be set up on a stand-by basis.

The timing, then, appears to allow for two considerations. First, it seems to be an acknowledgment that the chances of winning approval of a UMT program are better now, while the country is emotionally keyed up over war in Korea, than they may be once this particular war is over. Even more important, the request takes into consideration the possibility that war in Korea is only a curtain-raiser to a much greater tragedy ahead.

The best way to avoid that tragedy is to provide now for an integrated and balanced system of national security of which UMT is an essential element.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

KOREA'S LESSON: NATION NEEDS UMT

Reports of the enormous hardships and savagery our soldiers are facing as the Reds launch another offensive in Korea lend weight to the administration's request for passage of a law requiring intensive military training for American youth.

Our troops in Korea, although they have been reinforced recently, are still outnumbered by the hordes of North Korean Communists hurled against them. They are fighting in murderous heat over rugged terrain. They are slowly getting the weapons whose lack was a big factor in the early retreat.

But it is clear from front-line accounts that many of the men thrown into battle against the Reds were not adequately trained. Many had no combat experience, which was to be expected in an army that fought its last campaigns 5 years ago. Many more lacked the hardening up and training under simulated battle conditions which was the least they—and their country—had a right to expect.

A dispatch from Don Whitehead, Associated Press war correspondent, in the Inquirer yesterday emphasizes that the value of training for the Korean war can hardly be exaggerated. There are some lessons that can be learned only the hard way—not to underestimate the enemy, to be ready for his tactics of infiltration, to be on guard against refugees who turn suddenly with guns blazing.

There are other basic features of combat readiness which can be learned in camp, however. Whitehead stresses the need for physical stamina, for elementary tactics to avoid exposure to enemy fire, and for precautions against being isolated, which might have been learned before the soldiers went to Korea.

It is obvious that training alone can't spell victory in battle. But it is equally obvious that untrained men, no matter how brave, will pay for their lack of training in battle with defeats and needless loss of lives.

The first duty of the Defense Department is to make sure that the men now entering the Armed Forces get the kind of training they will need if they have to be sent up against the Reds in Korea. It is encouraging that the Army began to put its men through rigorous maneuvers under highly realistic combat conditions soon after the Korean war started.

This program must be pressed in all units which may be called upon for action in Korea or anywhere else in the near future.

But a more consistent, long-range program of training for possible future emergencies must be launched if the Nation is to avoid having to send untrained or partly trained men into battle again. For it is increasingly evident that the threat of Soviet communism may continue for years and that it will be necessary to keep our military defenses in readiness as long as that threat exists.

Defense Secretary Louis Johnson's request for immediate passage of legislation granting stand-by power to institute universal military training may seem belated. It clearly represents a switch from the administration's viewpoint voiced a few days ago that this measure should not be pressed at this time.

Most Americans, however, will appreciate the need for this program to train youths of 17 to 20 for military service. It is a necessity from the standpoint of manning our armed services, and it could be of vital importance in saving the lives of our young men by teaching them what to expect if they should have to go to war.

There may be reasons why UMT could not be started immediately. First call on training facilities and experienced officers must go to the units which may be needed in Korea.

But the Korean war has shown us some of the cost of our failure to train American youth. We should not repeat that failure. The universal-military-training program should be passed by Congress and put into operation as soon as possible as a vital factor in protecting both our country and the lives of our young men.

The Big Sleep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Big Sleep," published in the Wall Street Journal on August 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—THE BIG SLEEP

We have gone from war to war again in the space of 5 years because, as four Republican members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee so truthfully state, two administrations—Roosevelt's and Truman's—slept the big sleep. Today is simply the tomorrow of Yalta and Potsdam.

But there is a bitterer and more important truth. That is that the people themselves were lulled by a magic potion called "bipartisanism." The Republics themselves seemed drugged by it. For too long a time there was no one to cry out that the sentry slept.

And now, once more, there is talk that we should drink it again. Those who venture to criticize the past or present conduct of our affairs, as these Republicans have done, are accused of "playing politics"; we should once more swallow the questions and the critisism, keep the war out of politics and be bipartisan.

Nothing could be more dangerous. And for the proof of it we need look no further than the sorry state of affairs today.

What made Yalta and Potsdam possible? They stemmed first of all from the hallucination that the Communists were pleasant, peaceful people whose only desire was to join the fellowship of nations; and, secondly, from the notion that foreign affairs was a field forbidden to the people, that what the experts and the great leaders did must be accepted without question lest we destroy "unity."

Both were blunders. But what reason did the people have for doubting them at the time? During the war and its aftermath there were few with the courage to strike at the illusion of Communist Russia or to question the wisdom of the great leaders. And the few who did speak were discredited and swept away with the easy slander that even to question was to "play politics."

A man ran for President of the United States in the middle of a war and the plans for peace, yet, in the name of bipartisanism, he would debate neither the war nor the peace. The war won, distinguished and capa-

ble men still held to a moratorium on the use of one part of their critical facilities for fear of the fetish of bipartisanism.

The overt blunders, it is true, were committed by Democrats. But where, one may ask, were the Republicans? The Democrats were at least carrying out their function of proposing policy, however ill-chosen the policies. The Republicans, as the minority representatives, were not even carrying out their one and only function, which is to examine, to question, to criticize and upon accasion to oppose.

All these things the Republicans did on domestic matters. But on foreign affairs they slept the sleep of bipartisanism. And then one day we awakened to find that the pleasant opiate was a mickey finn.

Neither the men in Korea nor the rest of us can now escape the consequences of past blunders. But it would be insanity to return to the drug that made them possible, to recommit our destiny into the unquestioned hands of the men who made them.

As never before we need, in the phrase of the four Senators, "to scrutinize relentlessly"—not only what was done but what is done and what is proposed to be done. Our greatest hope is that the four awakened Senators will awaken others and that the people will not again swallow this thing called bipartisanism. Else from the next big sleep we may be suddenly aroused by terrors unimagined.

Cheapest Government in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, every day we in the United States hear statements in reference to the cost of maintaining our various branches of government, local, State, and Federal. No one can deny that our citizens bear a heavy burden, yet comparative figures indicate that the cost of government in America is relatively low in comparison with the burden of other people throughout the world.

As part of my remarks I include part of a column entitled "Observatorials" from the Coopersville Observer of August 17, 1950. The publisher of the Observer, Mr. L. W. Shears, runs an excellent weekly newspaper in the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan and he is to be commended for publishing such important facts as those contained in the following:

OBSERVATORIALS—CHEAPEST GOVERNMENT IN THE WORLD

One of the chief gripes of the American people is the cost of government—and in view of the terrific increase, especially during the Truman administration, they have reason to register a complaint and to worry about the future.

The other day in reading a recent issue of the United Nations World, official publication of the UN, there appeared an article so challenging that we are using some of the statistics given, in order that we may see something of the other side of the picture.

The article is entitled "The Cheapest Government in the World," and was written by David Cort. Following are the amounts in income taxes paid to the governments by a married man with two children, who has an income of $5,000:

Israel	$2,795
Finland	2,075
Norway	1,840
Belgium	1,660
Denmark	1,500
Sweden	1,500
Netherlands	1,460
England	1,450
Indonesia	1,120
Australia	1,118
Ireland	1,000
India	920
France	840
Switzerland	650
Brazil	600
United States	345
South Africa	317
Hong Kong	130

Now, after you have read this far, is there anyone who would like to trade places with their overseas brethren?

But—here is the question: If we continue to increase the cost of government, and are to pay for the arming and protection of the democratic world—a task that we have undertaken—just what will be the relative position of these countries, say, 5 or 10 years from now?

Overhauling of State Department Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Mrs. A. D. Lange, of New Augusta, Ind., and published under the headline "Overhauling of State Department Needed," in the Indianapolis Times for August 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER TO THE PEOPLE—OVERHAULING OF STATE DEPARTMENT NEEDED

(By Mrs. A. D. Lange)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter was written by Mrs. A. D. Lange, of Rural Route No. 1, New Augusta, Ind., wife of the president of Pictorial Publishers, Inc., 107 South Capitol Avenue, as a spontaneous expression of her views on the world crisis. Mrs. Lange is not actively connected with any political or civic group.)

What I am about to write will probably bring me criticism and unfavorable publicity because, once the Armed Forces of the Nation are committed, the patriot is supposed to forget personal views and principles and get behind the administration at whatever cost.

In defense of my patriotism most of you who receive this know that my husband and my father fought in World War I. Even now, at age 80, my father is Arizona director of selective service and adjutant general of the National Guard—also, incidentally, a lifelong Democrat. My son was a fighter pilot and my son-in-law an ensign in World War II. We all stand ready to serve again to the best of our ability.

My son and son-in-law are just 25, so theirs will again be active service—which brings me to the reason for this letter.

If my boys have to give up promising careers and again go to war, I want them to have the benefit of support from leadership of unquestioned loyalty and outstanding ability.

To that end and as a beginning I want to see a general overhauling of the State Department.

There is no need to cite examples of the present Department's mistakes. The results of these men's judgment—whether deliberately traitorous or just plain stupid—are clear for all to see. We came out of the last war the strongest nation on earth. Today our boys are dying in a situation strikingly like Bataan. We have little more than a foehold in Asia. Russia is calling the plays.

If the views of MacArthur and General Wedemeyer had prevailed, Manchuria would have been placed under a UN trusteeship, China would not have been lost, and Korea would not now be under attack. Washington was warned more than 3 years ago that the Reds were organizing an army to invade South Korea. But the native troops we trained there were not, according to Gen. William L. Roberts, head of our military mission in Korea, allowed any offensive weapons such as tanks—this on order of our State Department.

MacArthur has had nothing to do with Korea or its defense program for 2 years. But when Truman suddenly reversed the Acheson Asiatic policy MacArthur was given only a few hours to meet an attack the Reds had been preparing for 3 years.

Now MacArthur and boys like my sons are heroically trying to salvage a situation for which our diplomats and politicians are wholly to blame.

There is no less pain for a mother who loses her son, or a wife her husband whether she be Republican or Democrat. Should not Republicans and Democrats all insist that the Achesons, Lattimores, Jessups, Services, et al., be routed from their positions of influence? To replace them there are Democrats and Republicans of unimpeachable honor and ability to choose from.

When our President asks us for the sacrifices necessary to carry this conflict to a successful conclusion, he should show his sincerity of purpose by acknowledging and correcting the tragic mistakes of his administration. Immediate action on his part is vital.

There are others in high places who share the blame for the agony of our outnumbered and poorly equipped men in Korea, but let's take first things first and start with the State Department.

While our boys are winning battles on far off battlefields, the American way of life may be lost in Washington.

Control of Floods on the Connecticut River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a long-range plan to ease and control flood threats by the Connecticut River through the length and breadth of the Connecticut River Valley, covering a highly valuable section of New England.

The plan is outlined in a letter written by George C. Waldo, chairman of the Connecticut State Park and Forest Commission, and sent to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission at Springfield, Mass.

Mr. George Waldo has championed the cause of conservation for many years. Indeed he has been a pioneer protector of our natural resources and is recognized as a public servant dedicated to preserving these resources.

Mr. Waldo's letter sums up briefly the long-range conservation program recommended for the New England area by the United States Forestry Service and the United States Soil Conservation Service. These two agencies cooperated in studying the flood problems caused by the Connecticut River. Their recommendations, as outlined in Mr. Waldo's letter, were drawn up jointly.

I feel the people of my State of Connecticut, as well as those of the other New England States, should be aware of the necessity for controlling flood threats. They should also know how these threats can be checked or completely eliminated. If the recommendations made by Mr. Waldo were followed there would be no need to fear the damage and hardship caused by recurring floods of the Connecticut River.

I agree with Mr. Waldo and the two Government agencies involved here that New England should proceed at once with a reforestation program to prevent further flood damage in the Connecticut River Valley.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 21, 1950.

To the PRESIDENT'S WATER RESOURCES POLICY COMMISSION,
Springfield, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: A study of major flood crests on the Connecticut River as recorded at Hartford, Conn., over a period of nearly three centuries, brings to light two alarming factors. First, that such major floods have greatly increased in frequency in strictly modern times. Second, that they have markedly increased in violence, or high water level.

Between 1683 and 1893 the river averaged one major flood every 12 years.

Between 1905 and 1940 a major flood was incurred every 3½ years.

For the first 200 years of the river's recorded history the major flood crests exhibited a surprising uniformity, an average of 25 feet with 1 or 2 feet plus or minus. Not until November 1927 did the river attain a flood stage of 29 feet at Hartford during the present century. But in March 1936 it rose to 37.6 feet and in September 1938 to 35 feet.

It is hardly necessary to point out that every added foot of flood stage increases the possibilities of damage in geometrical ratio.

While all major floods are due to special weather circumstances such as sudden thaws, or heavy rainfalls, or both, there is nothing in the records of the period covered to show that there has been any increase in the average precipitation during that time. Both of the factors mentioned—the increasing frequency of floods and their increasing magnitude—are due to the same basic causes, namely, the stripping of our woodland cover in the drainage area of the river, thus eliminating much of the old forest floor which once acted as a sponge to hold the water and feed it out slowly, and bad land practices resulting in erosion and gullying and thereby increasing the rapidity of run-off.

From these factors alone it becomes apparent that the flood problem of the Connecticut River Valley cannot be solved by the erection of enormously expensive flood-control dams. So long as present conditions are permitted to continue such dams will rapidly lose their capacity by being silted up with eroded topsoil, while increasing flood crests will overwhelm them. In any case, such dams are enormously expensive and utterly wasteful except for the one purpose of holding back major flood crests. They take thousands of acres of productive land and eventually must be dredged at enormous cost to retain any effective capacity. Meantime a great part of the major damage—the erosion of our valuable topsoil—continues unabated.

The only intelligent long-range attack on this program would therefore consist of means for checking floods where they originate, by holding more of the water where it falls in the first place and by checking soil erosion.

To this end I submit a survey of the entire drainage area of the Connecticut River from the Province of Quebec to Long Island Sound together with a plan for checking floods and ending soil erosion, and ask that it be made a part of the records of your commission.

This survey was made by the United States Forestry Service and the United States Soil Conservation Service in cooperation. These two Federal agencies are highly respected for their scientific and objective approach to such problems. Their Connecticut River survey and tentative flood-control plan—a document of 150 pages—covers all factors in great detail.

The two major elements of the flood-control plan can be stated very simply. They consist of the reforestation of all cut over or abandoned land in the drainage area of the river, where reforestation is the highest use to which the land may be put and the practice of modern soil-conservation measures on all cultivated land draining into the river valley.

In reaching their conclusions as to the effect of these measures the two services did not indulge in any guesswork. They sampled the soil in all of the regions drained by the Connecticut River, estimating its water-holding capacity; they measured the extent of the existing forest floor and computed the possible increase both in its area and water-holding capacity; they measured the rapidity of runoff, the extent of soil erosion, and all other factors entering into the problem. They envisage a 50-year program in which erosion will be stopped almost immediately and in which the frequency and intensity of floods will decrease as the forest is restored. The plan offers a permanent cure, not a temporary expedient.

Furthermore, it offers the prospect of immense economic benefit to the whole valley.

For example, the reduction in average annual flood damages would amount to a saving of $1,518,000 a year. The reduction of gullying, protection of fish and wildlife, and stopping of bank erosion would result in a saving of $1,750,000 annually.

The average annual cut of timber on reforested lands, both public and private, would bring an income of nearly $12,000,000 a year. The increase in the value of farm crops because of better soil practices and a higher water table resulting in more luxuriant crops, would amount to nearly $9,000,000 a year. These are direct and measurable benefits which can be closely estimated.

In addition there would be many other benefits, difficult to estimate in terms of dollars and cents because of the great enhancement of the fish and game resources, great increase in recreational possibilities and protection to the natural beauty of the whole region.

I might add that the measures proposed have the effect not only of cutting flood crests but of raising low water levels in the river during periods of drought. This stabilization of water flow would be an immense advantage of all power projects, public and private, on the main stream or its tributaries.

Melting snow or rain water held back at the source by the methods mentioned, sinks into the water table and replenishes it, becoming a source of supply for our springs and brooks between rains and for our private wells or city water systems. And the methods of control suggested for Connecticut's major river are equally applicable to minor streams, and might very well become a pattern of water control for other affected areas.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE C. WALDO,
Chairman, Connecticut State Park and Forest Commission.

Appointment of Francis S. Murphy to Connecticut Aeronautics Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, titled "Mr. Aviation." This editorial pays high and much-deserved tribute to Francis S. Murphy, publisher of the Hartford (Conn.) Times. Mr. Murphy's leadership in the development of aviation in the State of Connecticut is well known from one end of the State to the other, as are his many other contributions to public service. Too often we hear allegations that the taxpayer does not receive his money's worth. As the article points out, we taxpayers have received more than our money's worth from Mr. Murphy's public service.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

MR. AVIATION

Connecticut spends a deal of money annually at which the taxpayers grumble but the State also gets a large amount of free service, concerning which the taxpayers know very little. What the same service would cost the State if compensated at strictly commercial rates we cannot say, but we are sure that the total sum would make the finance department dizzy.

As an example we might consider the reappointment by Governor Bowles of Francis S. Murphy, publisher of the Hartford Times, to the State Aeronautics Commission. When it comes to promoting aviation for the benefit of Connecticut, Mr. Murphy is a one-man whirlwind. He has headed the aeronautics commission since 1946 and far from profiting by the arrangement, has given endlessly of his time, and has spent substantially of his own funds in promoting the cause.

Frank Murphy was responsible to a large degree for the development of Bradley Field near Hartford and recently gave a party there, at which General Eisenhower was the guest of honor, to celebrate the breaking of

ground for the new headquarters building. The purpose of the party was not mere jubilation but to impress visitors from other parts of the State with the facilities available at Bradley Field and to invite the maximum use of such facilities.

But being a Hartford man doesn't limit Commissioner Murphy in his geographical outlook. He is equally interested in the promotion of the most modern means of transportation in every part of Connecticut. The commission of which he is chairman—a commission made up of other volunteer citizens like himself—hopes to keep Connecticut in the forefront of aviation not only because the State needs the best transportation facilities possible but because Connecticut industry is a large factor in aviation. The State's industrial payrolls benefit correspondingly.

For this, so far as we know, nobody has said, "Thank you, Mr. Murphy." He doesn't expect to be thanked. A wise person in public service never does.

This May Be Extreme—But

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in today's Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from the August 4, 1950, edition of the Granite State News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MAY BE EXTREME—BUT

As the news out of Korea continues to get worse, it is only fair that we stop and take stock of our perilous position. We have been in a dominant position in world affairs so long that it will take some time for us to adjust our thinking.

Since traitors sold us out on the know-how of making the atomic bomb we are now at Russia's mercy if she should decide to attack. Probably the only reason she does not use that weapon at once, is fear of airborne retaliation. On the other hand, she may be waiting until the moment she has a stockpile of sufficient size to permit the smuggling of an atomic bomb into each one of our defense industry centers and the simultaneous exploding of these weapons. With our wide open coast line there is no reason why Soviet submarines cannot land atomic bombs. These bombs can be trucked to our defense cities and triggered off at a given day and hour.

We are at the mercy of the Soviets as to where the next world shaking incident will break out, using up our men, machines, money and material.

We practically handed China to the Reds. Now they have so much manpower that they can run mass infantry attacks at us without bothering to count the cost. A few hundred thousand dead Koreans and Chinamen mean nothing to the men in the Kremlin. A few thousand dead American youths mean everything to us.

So here we are!

Since the close of the Second World War we have been disarming while our enemies have been arming. Everyone knew it except some men in the administration. Our President cut armament costs. When armament costs are cut, disarmament takes place.

There is no use arguing about the Army-Air Force-Navy-Marine Corps now.

The fact remains that the one restraining influence on the Russians is the existence of the great bombers that can come over the roof of the world to use atomic weapons on their cities.

As far as defense of our outposts is concerned our Army is useless unless we can carry the men to the scene of action quickly. They must have the best of equipment and training.

Today we cannot carry our men to the point of combat quickly and when they arrive they do not have the arms or the training.

Today we have developed a civilization with the highest standard of living in the world. Here in New Hampshire we let our fuel wood stand till it falls and rots, for we burn oil. Our farms are going back to the woods again, for we find it cheaper to bring food from the Middle West and South than to raise it ourselves.

There is hardly a family in the State so poor but that it owns a radio, an automobile, an electric washing machine, an electric refrigerator, and hopes to acquire a television set as soon as stations are established. The more well-to-do families have luxuries in proportion.

This is no attack on creature comforts. Easier living and a fuller life are the objectives toward which we all work in one way or another.

But if we are to survive we must begin to change our habits of thought. While we may continue to debate around garages and coffee shops whether the new Hudson or the new Olds has the better automatic transmission, we should also begin to argue as to who has the better tank, ourselves or the Russians. The question as to what is the matter with the Red Sox is most interesting, but a far more vital question is how effective is our national radar screen and if it is in operation? And if not, why not?

We have been living in something of a fool's paradise. Too often the most important problem has been as to whether or not we could afford to buy a second or third radio set for our home. Now we must face grim reality. If we do not, there may be no more radio sets of any kind, and, for all too many cities, no homes to put them in, and no people to live in those homes.

Some citizens, sitting in the lovely quiet of our August New Hampshire countryside may read this editorial and say that it is extreme and alarmist in tone. But Herman Goering told the people of Germany, with sound reasoning, that enemy bombs would never drop on their homes. In 1940 the Japanese military would have laughed at any man who prophesied that American bombers could and would tear the heart out of Tokyo five short years hence.

Peace or War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Banner, Knightstown, Ind., for August 18, 1950:

PEACE OR WAR?

Many pros and cons are being heard on the Korean situation, and whatever anyone may decide, the international situation at the present writing looks anything but rosy.

For a Nation that has supposedly been indoctrinated with peaceful thinking, the United States in the past 12 years has changed to being a warring Nation—even if it is in defense of ideals and territory. It even now appears that our troops, our tanks, our planes will be expected now, and in the future, to police the entire world against communistic aggression. Not a pleasant thought, is it?

Yet, that is exactly the role the United States has adopted internationally.

The shrewd, chess-playing Russians are not to be underestimated in their ability. Their strategy appears to be that of wearing us down by degrees until we are incapable of denying them.

If the United States is going to plunge into the thick of international controversies, let's get prepared and in a hurry. If the United States is to be the police power of the world, we must expect trouble from now on, and the only thing which can preserve this Nation is preparedness—whether we like it or not.

Frankly, the United States was sold down the river when our leaders naively placed reliance in Russia and cooperated with that nation by sending her tanks, planes, food, ammunition, etc., during the last war and then conceding her every wish at the conference table.

Now our innocent blunders are going to provide a fight to the finish.

In Washington today, our lack of leadership, which the American people chose in 1948, may be our downfall. An example is the way the President is playing politics and looking toward the November elections while our soldiers are dying in a merciless campaign in Korea. At a time when we need administrative and organizing ability, along with diplomacy, we're sadly lacking.

The only thing we can do, however, is give our very best in the war effort and the defense preparations, and even though our present leadership is weak, America's preservation demands the united efforts of everyone toward the common goal of liberty.

Construction of School Facilities in Areas Affected by Federal Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD BREEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to set forth a few reasons why Senate bill 2317, a bill relating to the construction of school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, is extremely important at this time and deserves the support of this body.

The immediate vicinity of Dayton is one of nine districts in the State of Ohio in which Federal activities have caused a tremendous increase in the school population. This increase is over and above the power of the real-estate tax duplicate to carry.

The increase in school population without an accompanying increase in the size of the real-estate tax duplicate has resulted: First, from loss of taxable land because of Government acquisition; second, presence of tax-exempt Federal

housing; and, third, an influx of new population.

Such a condition is present in the Mad River Township school district, which is adjacent to the east boundary of the city of Dayton. On the other side, Mad River Township is bounded by the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Its area is 11.7 square miles. Its population in 1939 was less than 4,000. Today Mad River Township has a population of roughly 20,000.

This has resulted in a tremendous increase in the school population. This increase is so tremendous that it far exceeds the tax revenues, and as a result the school system there is in a distressed and critical condition.

I would like to cite one example. Harshman and Overlook Homes projects of 1,040 living units have added 1,000 children of school age to the township school system.

The school census has increased from 836 in 1939 to 2,980 at the beginning of the last school term. The tax duplicate has also increased, but at not such a rapid pace—$2,610,240 in 1939 to only $4,215,568 at the opening of the 1949–50 school term.

Brought down to simple terms, this means that the taxable wealth per pupil has been reduced from $3,122 to $1,880. In other words, the enrollment has increased 222 per cent, the taxable wealth to support schools 36 percent.

The increase in school population had resulted in a shortage of classrooms and other facilities. This has become so acute that it has become necessary to limit some 1,600 elementary pupils to half-day sessions and to "farm" out to other districts nearly 500 high-school students.

In Mad River Township alone two elementary-school units and a complete high-school unit are needed, but the district is bonded almost to the legal limit set by the State of Ohio. Through the acquisition of land for Federal activities, taxable wealth of $1,111,230 has been lost to the district.

To add to this present condition, within the same district some 1,000 Wherry housing units are to be constructed within the next year. This will increase the school enrollment by another 800 students, according to the best estimates.

Congress must give some aid and remedy to school districts such as Mad River Township. This can be done through S. 2317.

GOP Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer on August 4, 1950, entitled "GOP Opportunity."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP OPPORTUNITY

The Truman administration's inconsistencies and crimes of omission and commission in far-eastern policy have been under unceasing Republican attack in Congress since Korean Red troops crossed the line in late June.

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin, member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, has laid before his colleagues a detailed report on testimony given to the committee by General Marshall, when he was Secretary of State, and by generals and admirals. It reveals that the military men and the administration were in agreement that our troops should be withdrawn from Korea and that we should not intervene if the southern republic were invaded.

We quote from the record.

"Mr. JUDD. If North Korea and Manchuria should be taken over and organized by the Communists, do you think our position in Korea would long be tenable?

"Secretary MARSHALL. I think it would not be tenable."

* * * * *

"Mr. RICHARDS. I just want to ask one question, is it your position that it would not be wise to keep troops in Korea?

"General TIMBERMAN. Yes, sir; it would not be wise.

"Admiral WOOLRIDGE. I concur.

"General HAMILTON. I concur fully, and that has been the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has been unanimous. There has been no difference so far as I know."

On the same day that Representative SMITH was making this testimony available in the House, STYLES BRIDGES was reviewing far-eastern policy by means of other materials in the Senate. He began with the State Department's China white paper, which he called a product of the thinking of Philip C. Jessup—our American Ambassador at Large—whose personal prejudices and those of his associates against the Republic of China are too well known to require further comment." He went on to remind his colleagues that Jessup's last trip to south Asia was delayed while he testified for Alger Hiss.

Then Senator BRIDGES traced some of the steps by which Formosa and Korea were written off by the Truman administration as part of a policy which fed all of China to the Russian bear.

On January 5 President Truman gave impetus to the policy by releasing a State Department bulletin which said: "The United States Government will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China. Similarly, the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa."

Secretary Acheson followed up 1 week later by warning against "foolish adventures" in the Far East, and proclaimed to the world that Korea was not included in American defense plans, an act which has been severely criticized as constituting an invitation to Red Koreans to take over.

Over in the House again, Representative VORYS, of Ohio, was pointing out that Korea was peculiarly the child of the United States, Britain, and China by virtue of the Cairo and Potsdam agreements. He reminded his colleagues that up to June 30, 1949, the American Army provided Korea's defense and American funds bolstered its economy.

VORYS went on to show that Owen Lattimore strongly advised the disastrous course we have followed since June 30 of last year. VORYS quotes Lattimore as recommending: "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not let it look as though we pushed it." And in a memorandum to Jessup, according to VORYS, Lattimore said: "South Korea is more of a liability than an asset to the interests and policy of the United States. * * * The United States should disembarrass itself as quickly as possible of its entanglements in South Korea."

The administration, we see, withdrew military aid from Korea and excluded it from our defense zone. Then, when the invasion so often discussed and long expected came to pass, it turned around and intervened. It is quite obvious that by adopting one policy and following another, we have fallen into unnecessary perils and military difficulties.

The tragic events of the last 5 years set forth clearly the duty and responsibility of the Republican Party. While giving unstinted support to war mobilization, which the Republicans are doing, they must formulate a complete and specific program for American participation in world affairs.

Let them state what we will do when we have driven the invaders back to the thirty-eighth parallel. Let them state what our policies should be elsewhere. So far, unfortunately, they have been more critical than constructive.

But if they will come forth with a complete and sensible foreign program, they will capture national confidence, and help save the Nation from bungling tragedy.

Clear and Present Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Spirit of Jefferson Advocate for August 17, 1950:

CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

This newspaper has contended for some time that we ought to be careful in our zeal to suppress the insidious evil of communism, lest in being overzealous we suppress some of the basic liberties guaranteed to us by the constitution. It was for that reason we opposed the shameful acts of Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, in conducting a witch hunt on Capitol Hill with utter defiance of the rules of fair trial and fair play. It is for the same reason that we have always been hesitant to endorse any type of legislation which infringes on our civil liberties.

Now we are faced with the grave question of deciding whether legislation designed to curb the teaching and preaching of communism constitutes an encroachment on the constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech.

The first amendment of the Federal Constitution prohibits Congress from making any law abridging the freedom of speech. The Supreme Court has held time and time again that the fourteenth amendment is a similar prohibition against the respective States. Superficially, it would therefore appear that any Federal or State legislation designed to limit and curb the teaching and preaching of communism would be in direct conflict with the constitutional prohibition, and therefore invalid. Such an interpretation would mean that the only way Congress or the States could curtail communistic activity, short of overt and treasonable conduct, would be by repeal of the first and fourteenth amendments. But, fortunately, court interpretation has not been so literal.

The late Justice Holmes has said that when there is a clear and present danger of a substantive danger which Congress has

a right to prevent, then Congress may pass legislation which, but for the presence of the clear and present danger, would otherwise be invalid. In other words, the Communists cannot hide behind the constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech contained in the first and fourteenth amendments, and in so doing seek to overthrow the Government which Congress has a clear right to preserve by such legislation as may be necessary. The freedom of speech guaranty cannot and should not be prostituted in such a manner as to obtain the elimination of the basic freedom it guarantees.

There is certainly ample justification for the statement that international communism constitutes a clear and present danger, and that therefore its disciples are not protected by the letter or spirit of the Constitution in the espousal of their cause. Inasmuch as the legal power to suppress the doctrine is present by virtue of its exclusion from the constitutional guaranty, the only question remaining is the question of the practical or political expediency of doing so. In other words, the question is not whether the Congress can legislate against further Communist missionary work, but whether Congress should legislate in such a manner.

We are of the opinion that Congress should so legislate. We are brought to this opinion by the realization that we are engaged in a struggle to the death with a dangerous and sinister force that will stop at nothing to realize its objective. To allow such a force freedom of action in our society would seem to us comparable to arming the enemy we seek to destroy. We therefore advocate legislation designed to outlaw the Communist Party, to deny the right of free assembly to those groups who assembly for the purpose, direct or indirect, of advocating the overthrow of this Government, and to deny all constitutional guaranties, except that of a fair trial, to all those who advocate the overthrow of this Government by force.

We are fully aware that such a course will involve serious encroachments on the basic civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution, but in our opinion treasonable utterances are part of treasonable acts, and therefore not entitled to the constitutional cloak.

Doctors and Dentists for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Mineral Daily News-Tribune, Keyser, W. Va., for August 16, 1950:

Since Congressman HARLEY STAGGERS reads this department, we'll use the Colyum to air our views on a sore spot with us, rather than write him a personal letter.

As each day goes by we're getting more and more burned up at the way all those doctors and dentists who were educated by the Government during World War II are avoiding military service now. According to a recent United Press dispatch, there were 4,500 men who were picked out by the armed services during the last war and educated into doctors, dentists, and veterinarians.

Many of these men never served a day after graduation. The war was over and they went right into private practice. What's more, only 43 of them even took Reserve commissions, according to the UP story.

It was the taxpayers' money that educated these men. They were given everything free, room, board, tuition—and were even paid. It seems to us they owe their Government something.

But are they responding to the urgent pleas for their services in the Army, Navy, and Air Force? Apparently not.

Under existing laws, only those 43 out of the 4,500 can be called to active duty. The others can continue their practices in private life, while hard-working doctors and dentists, many of whom made sacrifices to educate themselves, are being called back.

What to us would be a popular action, would be for Congress to pass a special law, requiring that all doctors, dentists, and veterinarians who were educated under the Army specialized training program be put into service first, whether they belong to the Reserve or not.

It's the only fair thing to do.

It was back in October of 1945 that we, and several thousand others, were back on Clark Field in the Philippines sweating out our return home. The war was over, but transportation was scarce.

One of those anxiously waiting to get home was a dentist friend of ours from Syracuse, N. Y. Doc had been overseas almost 4 years. He had followed the long, torturous route from the Solomons, up New Guinea, through Morotai to Luzon. He had had a real tour of duty.

One day he received a letter from his wife, but before he was halfway through it, he slammed it on the floor and started swearing in true soldier fashion.

"What's the trouble, Doc?" we asked.

"Here I am over here in these so-and-so islands for almost 4 years," he muttered. "I gave up a good practice back home to help my country. And what do I get for it? The Army picks out a neighbor of mine, sends him to dental school and educates him free. The war is over just about the time he graduates. And now he has opened up an office and is practicing in the same block where my office is."

And chances are, if the law isn't changed, Doc will be called back into service before his charity-educated competitor.

Business-as-Usual War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph Alsop from today's Washington Post:

WITH UNITED STATES FORCES IN KOREA.—Our thin lines here in Korea are held by increasingly exhausted troops, whose customary rest is a few moments of troubled sleep in a ditch or foxhole.

When these men attack, their first task is to scale precipitous mountain heights in blazing heat under enemy fire. And when they are attacked, which is more usual, it is by a seemingly omnipresent enemy skilled in mountain fighting, fatalistically tenacious and vastly more numerous.

Add to that the want of reserves, which makes it necessary to keep even the worst-mauled divisions in the line indefinitely, with almost no relief. It may then be understood why this Korean fighting is as cruel and disheartening as any that American troops have known, despite our improving ground-fire power and complete air supremacy. And it is then also understandable why anyone who has been with these Americans at the front, grows bitterly indignant at the all too visible signs of business-as-usual in the rear areas.

These unpleasing hints of continuing complacency and political-mindedness take two well-refined forms. First, things are not being done that obviously ought to be done—almost all our huge trans-Pacific air transport and ocean cargo capacity is still given over to profitable commerce and a luxurious tourist trade, while reinforcements and supplies are long and breathlessly awaited in Korea.

Second, and almost worse, the real gravity of the situation here in Korea is still being elaborately concealed from our people at home—the dreadful toll of the fighting is being hidden, for example, by greatly delaying announcement of totals of known dead, missing, and wounded.

Nor is this all. In two previous reports in this space, the hard fighting on the Chinju approaches, the first American offensive action in Korea, has been described at some length. While well conducted as an exercise, it must now be added that in the outcome this tough and painful American effort seems to have served no visible military purpose whatever.

At heavy cost, our men fought their way forward. They had hardly reached their objective on the heights above Chinju when they were recalled again and with bitter anger retraced their steps to the same positions where they had jumped off.

When all the facts are known, this maneuver will seem an imitation of the "good old Duke of York who had 10,000 men, who marched them up the hill and marched them down again." In other circumstances, we might have afforded a sally to probe the enemy's reaction, even at considerable cost. But in this case the potential reserves that were so desperately needed to bolster our thin line were gravely impaired in value. Little was added to the security of our main Korean harbor, Pusan (although this excuse will also be offered), since our actual defensive position is now almost exactly the same as it was before. Meanwhile we lost the immediately valuable Pohang airstrip at the other end of the beachhead.

And in the face of these facts, one of the highest possible authorities has frankly admitted that the real motive of the fighting on the Chinju approaches was that we needed a victory.

In brief, in the area involved, the North Koreans had only their somewhat understrength Sixth Division, with limited artillery, almost no armor and no air support at all. In contrast, besides many tanks and powerful air support, it has already been published that we had in this fighting the First Marine Brigade and the Fifth, Thirty-fifth, and Twenty-fourth Regimental Combat Teams, with all their many attached units.

We enjoyed, therefore, a manpower superiority of at least 1⅓ to 1; a superiority in tank and artillery firepower of at least 4 and perhaps 5 to 1; an estimable advantage in a strong, wholly unopposed air effort, and an incomputable superiority in transport and supply. In interpreting these facts, special allowances must be made for certain special circumstances, such as the absolute greenness of some of the key American outfits involved. Yet what still stands out is the great weight we had to muster in order to overwhelm one division of the enemy.

With 15 divisions now in the field, the North Koreans are more likely to take heart than lose heart from their Chinju defeat.

Of course, we may reasonably expect that our continuing air effort will eventually dry up the supply of all the North Korean forces, gradually starving them of ammunition and other necessities. Of course, this attrition of North Korean strength will ultimately make the problem here much more manageable.

But the facts still remain: this is a very big job. We have not enough strength here, even now, to be sure of avoiding a fearful catastrophe in the rather near future. Even after we have passed the crisis, we are going to need vastly more strength to get this job done in a reasonable time. And it is downright treasonable to try to do the job on the basis of business-as-usual, politics-as-usual, and the usual doses of poisoned soothing sirup for the American people.

A United States Peace Academy

REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, when we have won this war we must not stop before we have won the peace. Since we are in this crisis we must make an all-out effort to back our boys on the fighting front to bring the war to a successful conclusion, but we must also begin to make plans for winning the peace. The loss of lives in Korea today demonstrates very clearly the importance of our foreign policy and the necessity of taking steps to make it as strong as possible for the future. We cannot overestimate the importance of our foreign policy. It largely determines whether or not we will have war, and how much in taxes we will have to pay. It sets limitations on our peaceful developments and enjoyment of our culture. In this atomic age, our foreign relations determine whether or not we will continue to exist as a free nation or whether we will exist at all.

Annually it is necessary to spend billions of dollars on our Armed Forces, including the operation of two great academies, naval and military, in preparation for war. It is high time we spent a few pennies, relatively speaking, toward the prevention of these wars. I urge the Congress to establish a United States Peace Academy, to train some of our best young men and women from every State of the Union and from all walks of life, in national and international relations. We should give them on-the-job training here in Washington. The graduates of the peace academy would form an available pool of well-trained Americans, for service abroad or in our Government at home. The graduates who did not go into this work would become leaders in their own communities which would bring about better understanding and broader participation in these important matters. Much has been done to broaden the field from which our foreign service personnel is drawn. However, it is still not broad enough, because the training necessary for this type of work is not available in many sections of the country and to many outstanding young people with potential greatness. Selecting the best personnel available throughout the United States and giving them the best possible on-the-job training in Washington for work in the field of national and international relations will constitute a positive investment for peace.

For too long a time our Foreign Service personnel has been more or less restricted to those who could afford the higher education obtained from expensive institutions in the United States. The result has been that as late as 1949 over one-half of our Foreign Service officers came from six wealthy States and the District of Columbia—681 out of 1,319. This is not a wise or a healthy procedure. I think our foreign affairs would be on firmer ground if we could bring into our Foreign Service more diverse points of view, from varying backgrounds representing all sections of our great country. My bill would accomplish this by allowing entrance into this graduate academy to be won on a competitive basis, with at least four persons coming from each State.

The Peace Academy would instruct and train our young persons on a graduate level in international and diplomatic relations and in the political, economic, social, and cultural affairs of the world. All of the talent of those in Government in Washington would be at the disposal of the dean of the academy. All of the Government departments, including the legislative and the judicial, would be close at hand for the students to study in operation. This graduate school would fill the present gap between our colleges and the demands of a Foreign Service career. We should invest more time, money, and effort in selecting and training our diplomatic and foreign representatives who have so much responsibility for keeping us out of war.

This academy would accomplish more than the broadening of our foreign service by bringing fresh viewpoints from the people who after all have to support the policy if it is to be successful. It would also create a reservoir of trained personnel upon which the Government and business could draw, not only in sending representatives abroad but in their operations here at home as well. Graduates of this academy would be very valuable in the teaching profession, or any other line of endeavor they should choose. Regardless of what field they entered, they would be capable of spreading an enlightened and informed point of view on world affairs throughout the country. This, I believe, would promote among the people of the United States a better understanding of world affairs by stimulating constructive thinking with respect to world problems. It would help to promote peace, good will, respect, and understanding among the peoples of the world.

The students of the academy will be chosen on the basis of merit through open and competitive examination. My bill calls for four students to be enrolled from each State annually, and two from each Territory, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. The President may appoint 10 students, who must also pass the entrance examination, and the remaining 42, making a total enrollment of 250, will be chosen from Government employees through open, competitive examination with approval by the Secretary of State. The academy will be located in Washington, D. C., and will be operated by a dean subject to the authority of a nonpartisan board of trustees. The board shall be composed of nine members: Four from Congress—chairmen and ranking members of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees of the Senate and House—Secretary of State or his representative, a former United States ambassador appointed by the President and three persons well versed in educational principles and methods appointed by the President, not more than two from a single political party.

Mr. Speaker, in the days of our country's beginnings, we were blessed with statesmen of unusual stature to guide the destiny of our American democracy. Our forefathers, with their vision and imagination, decided that above all else peace was the thing they should strive for in our relations with other countries. It is significant, I believe, that they created a national peace establishment, rather than a war or defense department as we have today.

When we have won this war, we must not stop before we have won the peace. It is time we adopted the type of sound, practical thinking of our forefathers to help prevent future wars through positive steps such as this peace academy. The emphasis should be placed where it belongs. We must look ahead and develop real peace programs to augment our defense establishment. Positive investments for peace could help absolve the reasons for war.

I call on Congress to take this step forward by establishing this peace academy and training our young people to guide us and the world through the stormy times ahead.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a copy of the bill I have just introduced for the purpose of establishing this peace academy:

A bill to establish a United States Peace Academy

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to provide for the instruction and training of a group of citizens of the United States who—

(1) will be qualified to fill positions in or out of the Government requiring education and training in world affairs;

(2) will promote among the people of the United States a better understanding of world affairs by stimulating constructive thinking with respect to world problems; and

(3) will promote peace, good will, respect, and understanding among the peoples of the world by dissemination of enlightened and informed views and attitudes with respect to world problems.

SEC. 2. In order to accomplish the foregoing purpose, there shall be established and maintained in the District of Columbia, as an independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, an Academy for the instruction and training of persons in international and diplomatic relations and in the political, economic, social, and cultural affairs of the world. Such Academy shall be known as the "United States Peace Academy" (herein referred to as the "Academy").

SEC. 3. There shall be a Board of Trustees for the Academy selected on a nonpartisan basis consisting of the following members—

(1) the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Secretary of State (or an officer of the Department of State appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Secretary);

(4) a former United States ambassador to a foreign country appointed by the President; and

(5) three persons (at least one of whom shall be a woman), who are well versed in educational principles and methods, appointed by the President, not more than two from a single political party.

The terms of office of persons who are appointed by the President as members of the Board shall be 4 years, except the terms of such members first taking office shall expire, as the President may designate at the time of appointment, one at the end of 1 year, one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, and one at the end of 4 years after the date of enactment of this act. Any person appointed by the President to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Members of Congress who are members of the Board of Trustees and who have been reelected to the Senate or to the House of Representatives, as the case may be, may continue to serve as members of the Board notwithstanding the expiration of Congress. The Board shall select a chairman from among its members. A majority of the membership of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 4. The members of the Board of Trustees shall receive no compensation for their services as members, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Board.

SEC. 5. The Board of Trustees shall have general supervision and charge of the Academy. The Board is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary with respect to the Academy.

SEC. 6. (a) There shall be a Dean of the Academy, appointed by the Board of Trustees, who shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Dean shall have immediate supervision and charge of the Academy and shall be subject to the authority of the Board.

(b) The faculty of the Academy shall be composed of such assistant deans, full, associate, and assistant professors, and instructors as may be necessary for the proper education and training of students attending the Academy. The Dean of the Academy, subject to the approval and authority of the Board of Trustees, (1) shall appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws, qualified persons to serve as members of the faculty of the Academy for such period and upon such basis as he deems advisable, and (2) shall fix their compensation without regard to the Clasification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 7. (a) In order to supplement the instruction and training regularly provided at the Academy, the Dean of the Academy is authorized (1) to procure the services of specially qualified guest or occasional lecturers and other persons, and (2) to utilize the personnel, equipment, and facilities of any department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government with the consent of such department, agency, or independent establishment.

(b) Any such lecturer or other person shall receive no compensation for his services at the Academy but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with his services at the academy.

(c) Any expenses incurred in the utilization by the Dean of the Academy of the personnel, equipment, and facilities of any such department, agency, or independent establishment shall be reimbursed from appropriations, allocations, or other funds available to the Academy.

SEC. 8. The course of instruction and training at the Academy shall be an advanced course designed for graduates of accredited colleges and universities and shall, in accordance with the purpose of this act, be prescribed by the Dean of the Academy with the advice of the faculty and subject to the approval and authority of the Board of Trustees. Such course shall be designed to give students at the Academy a thorough knowledge of (1) international and diplomatic relations, (2) the historical development of the foreign policy of the United States, (3) the theory of government on Federal, State, and local levels, and (4) the history, culture, and economic and political affairs of the peoples of the world. Such course of instruction and training shall be for a period of 1 year. Upon satisfactory completion of such course, students shall be awarded an appropriate graduate degree.

SEC. 9. (a) The number of students at the Academy at any one time shall not exceed 250 and shall be selected for admission to the Academy as provided in this section.

(b) There shall be selected annually 4 students from each State, 2 students from each Territory, and 2 students from Puerto Rico, making a total of 198 to be so selected. Such students shall be actual residents of the State or Territory from which they are selected, or of Puerto Rico, as the case may be. Such students shall be selected by a committee of three members chosen by the State college association (or similar education association) in the State or Territory concerned and in Puerto Rico, in the order of merit established through open competitive examinations prescribed by the Dean of the Academy and held by such committee and in accordance with such character qualifications as the Dean may prescribe.

(c) Ten students shall be selected annually by the President from the United States at large, except that two of such students shall be actual residents of the District of Columbia. Such students shall be required to pass the examinations held under subsection (d) and to satisfy the character qualifications prescribed under such subsection.

(d) Forty-two students shall be selected annually from officers and employees of the Federal Government in the order of merit established through open competitive examinations prescribed and held by the Dean of the Academy and in accordance with such character qualifications as the Dean may prescribe. Any such officer or employee so selected shall have performed not less than 1 year of service as an officer or employee of the Federal Government.

SEC. 10. No student shall be admitted to the Academy unless he is a citizen of the United States, of good moral character, and a graduate of a college or university approved by the Board of Trustees.

SEC. 11. No tuition or other fees shall be charged any student admitted to the Academy. Each such student shall be paid the sum of $1,000 for quarters, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in attendance at the Academy.

SEC. 12. Each student admitted to the Academy shall agree in writing to accept appointment (if tendered), upon graduation or at any time within 3 years thereafter, to a position in the Federal Government requiring education and training in world affairs and to serve in such position, or in a position requiring comparable qualifications, for not less than 2 years after such appointment. The Board of Trustees may, in its discretion and upon application, release any person from his obligations under such agreement.

SEC. 13. No graduate of the Academy who is subsequently appointed to a position in the Foreign Service of the United States under the Department of State shall, by reason of his attendance at or graduation from the Academy, be exempted from undergoing any specialized training required of any officer or employee in the Foreign Service in preparation for assignment to duty outside the continental United States unless the Secretary of State determines that such specialized training shall not be required in the case of such graduate.

SEC. 14. The Board of Trustees shall make an annual report to the President and to the Congress with respect to the operations of, and other matters concerning, the Academy. Such report shall contain, among other matters, such recommendations as the Board deems advisable.

SEC. 15. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

A Million Like Her—Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, there is printed herewith a letter from a mother, which appeared in the Readers' Forum in the August 15, 1950, edition of the News-Palladium, a newspaper published at Benton Harbor, Mich.:

FROM A MOTHER

BENTON HARBOR.

EDITOR, THE NEWS-PALLADIUM,

I have just returned from visiting my son and his family in a distant State. He is in the Air Corps. I didn't let them know I was coming. I anticipated his surprise and joy as I knocked on the door. He met me with: "I knew you were coming, Mom; I called home last night. They told me you were on the way."

"But why, what happened?" I asked, knowing he only "calls home" for special reasons (like when he called to tell us the twins had arrived safely).

"I'm going overseas, Mom." Just like that. Overseas. That dreaded, far-away place where boys go to and men return from * * * sometimes.

"But why you? You leave a wife, babies, dependents; you should be deferred; you * * * ," me, making noises like a mama. I thanked my lucky stars, the powers that be, the mother's instinct or whatever it was that had prompted me to make the trip at this time.

Eventually I met my daughter-in-law, held my first granchildren in my arms. Was I thrilled! Almost as much as the first time I held their father. My mind went back and back. Back to the time when a certain small boy used to give me a hard time. He was a "pistol!"

"I want Pauline and the kids to be near you, Mom, while I'm gone." he broke into my thoughts. "I want my kids to be brought up the way I was." A beautiful compliment? Looking at him, I thought so.

I thought of the time when, at a district meeting of my organization, the guest speaker said, "You mothers are a very important

factor in our Nation." That is a prize understatement if I ever heard one. Mothers important? Say, we are the Nation. Who helps build strong bodies, who guides little feet into the paths of righteousness and hopes they never stray therefrom? Who bandages cut fingers, doctors black eyes, kisses hurt places, listens to prayers, gives vitamins? Science is wonderful, but there has never been a machine invented that will turn out a mother's son.

You put in your coins and out come cigarettes or soft drinks. Yes, mothers are important.

I bought my son a small Bible. It has a bronze colored steel cover on which the words "May the Lord be with You" are engraved. I heard those Bibles saved many a life in the last war.

I couldn't stay with them as long as I wanted to. Their apartment is tiny and hotel rooms so expensive. Anyhow, what did they want me around for, when their time to be together is so short. Besides I left four at home, and they need me, too.

They took me to the depot. There were other mothers there too. Most of them got on the bus before the tears came. My son tried to be cheerful. "The fellows don't call me 'Junior' any more, Mom, since I'm a daddy of twins. I'm making sergeant by the 26th," he bragged. He was the youngest in his outfit when he enlisted at 16. He's 19 now.

I kissed his young wife, kissed each small twin, then I patted a familiar cheek, roughish—he shaves now. He said, "Don't cry, Mom, I'll be all right." I pressed the dearly loved one close again and said "Good-by, son." What else could I say?

Mrs. Pearl Allen,
Mother of World Wars II and III.

Ring Around the Rosy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that in the first 5 months of this year the United States imported more than $17,000,000 in goods from Russia, and that during the same period we sold Russia only approximately $500,000 in American goods.

I pointed out, that by this trade with Communist Russia we have been supplying her with about $3,000,000 a month which Russia is using to buy war goods in western Europe. This trade, which permits Russia to obtain war goods to be used against United States troops, should be stopped.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, one of the largest and most influential newspapers in Washington State, dealing with one aspect of this trade with Russia. The editorial follows:

Ring Around the Rosy

The refusal of American longshoremen to unload a cargo of Russian crab meat from a British vessel in New York City has brought to light an amazing case of ring around the rosy in international double-dealing.

The longshoremen themselves were only showing their patriotic reluctance to help Russia make money in this country now that we are at war.

But the British Ministry of Transport, owner of the cargo, disclosed some interesting facts about the shipment, which it frankly described as having been rammed down our throats.

What happened was that the British, under the terms of their trade agreement with Soviet Russia, had shipped a quantity of industrial machinery to Russia with repayment to be made in timber.

The Russians, however, failed to supply the timber as they agreed, although Britain's need for it was very great; and sent in its stead the crab meat, for which the British had no use whatever.

It was a simple case, as far as the British were concerned, of taking the crab meat or nothing; and having already shipped the machinery to Russia, they took the crab meat.

But the British, with a reputation for sharp trading of their own, found a prompt solution of the problem by dumping the unwanted crab meat on the American market.

They were undeterred by the fact that American crab-meat industries would be impaired by this solution.

They were previously undeterred from making the original trade agreement with Soviet Russia by the fact that Russia was America's potential and even avowed enemy, and that any industrial machinery sent from Britain would arm Russia for war against America, and that it was only because of American assistance that Britain has any machinery to trade away.

What a sweet pocket full of posies this situation had turned up.

The British are selling Russian crab meat in the United States, to get American dollars with which more British machinery can be produced for shipment to Russia to be used in possible and probable ultimate war against America.

Indeed, it is quite possible the war of aggression in Korea, which is unquestionably supported by Russian industry, has been tooled in some part and perhaps a considerable part by British machines produced with American dollars.

This is the interesting game of international ring around the rosy into which the patriotic American longshoremen have thrown an unexpected but very enlightening diversion.

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to submit an editorial from the Washington Post of August 20, 1950, as follows:

Statehood Runaround

If the Hawaii and Alaska statehood bills were presented to the Senate for a vote, there is good reason to believe that both would pass. In view of this, and in view of the administration's pledge and President Truman's express interest in the bills, it is hard to understand why there has been no more assurance forthcoming from Majority Leader Lucas. The Senate, to be sure, has some more essential defense and tax measuses that must be passed, and there is always the off-chance that some bitter-ender would try to prevent a statehood vote by bringing up other controversial legislation. But statehood has strong bipartisan support, it is thoroughly justified by every fair-minded investigation that has been made, and it would be an important asset, not only in military defense, but also as an example of enlightened treatment of dependent territories. As Senator Knowland noted Tuesday in answer to some of the venomous attacks on Hawaii, the best way to judge Hawaii's loyalty in the fight against communism is by the number of Hawaiian casualties in Korea. Surely it is within Senators Lucas' power so to manage the Senate calendar that a vote on the statehood bills will be assured.

Moscow Works Over Four United States Labor Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I attach the following article by John Herling in the August 21 issue of the Washington Daily News for the benefit of those who have sometimes been unable to distinguish real anti-Communist leaders in the United States:

New Target for Wordmongers—Moscow Works Over Four United States Labor Leaders

(By John Herling)

Russia knows the key importance of labor support in the the world-wide battle raging today.

The Kremlin knows that the battleground is at the worker level.

So this week the Soviets stepped up their propaganda campaign all over the Far East. The special target is not Wall Street. The target is the American labor movement.

Fifteen million members of organized labor in the United States, including the milkman in Omaha, the auto worker in Detroit, the steel worker in Pittsburgh, etc.; they're all going to get a terrific bang out of the latest Soviet propaganda.

And throughout the country responsible labor leadership feels pride and importance in the new recognition of the role American labor plays in international affairs.

Here are some of the men singled out for special propaganda burns by the Soviet word mongers:

CIO President Philip Murray, who approves "the criminal United States intervention in Korea."

AFL President William Green, who is the "arch traitor to the interests of the working class."

Maritime union President Joseph Curran, for "repeating the lying standardized assertions of the American official propaganda."

And auto workers President Walter Reuther, for "his acts of treachery to the working class."

AFL President Green is given a special Soviet working over for "demanding from the workers constructive collaboration with the Government and employers—in other words, unconditional support for the imperialist intervention of the United States against the Korean people."

Yes, screams the Soviet radio: "Murray and Green gave the lead to the American trade-union bureaucracy. On their order the reactionary trade-union leaders of all classes supported the American intervention in Korea."

The labor press gets a special belaboring. And how: "The trade-union papers are no

better than the American monopolist press in the vile slanders against the Korean people and the democratic republic, the international camp of peace and democracy, headed by the Soviet Union."

REASON FOR WRATH

Then the Soviet leaders reveal their special reason for anger: the systematic elimination of the Communist elements from the CIO by the CIO.

These CIO'ers are charged as follows: "They are cruelly persecuting the progressive elements in the American trade-union movement and slander in every possible manner the partisans of peace."

Moving along from one propaganda theme to another, it's also pretty clear the Soviet policy boys are boiling because the AFL, CIO and independent maritime unions have set up a voluntary antisabotage screening program. Actually, the unions met in Washington a few weeks ago to make sure that union rights would be respected while national interests are protected.

This leads the Soviets to charge: "There is a complete conspiracy between the Government and the reactionary trade-union leaders as to the best way to fool the American workers and to exploit them in carrying out the intervention against the Korean people."

SINKFUL OF SCORN

Pounding his gums hard, the Soviet commentator charges: "The reactionary trade-union leaders are ready to aid the Government to transform the American trade-unions completely into a branch of the military, bureaucratic United States state apparatus."

An especially tasty bit is reserved for CIO auto workers' President Reuther. For him, in fact, a whole sinkful of scorn:

"In the interests of monopoly, the trade-union reactionaries are committing more and more acts of treachery to the interests of the working class. In May of this year, Walter Reuther signed an agreement unprecendented in the history of American trade-unions, with one of the largest corporations of the United States—General Motors."

And what did Reuther do? "For a few cents' worth of concessions by the company, the trade-union bosses have abrogated for 5 years the right to strike in the plants of General Motors."

Since the Soviets are confident they have got everybody east of Suez by the ear, their commentator can tell the biggest lies and multiple untruths without fear of successful contradiction.

The Soviet mouthpiece then remarks: "The reactionary newspapers praised Reuther and the routine act of treachery to the working class."

HAPPY ENDING?

But this long Soviet tirade gets a happy ending for the anxious listeners in the Far East:

"The reactionary policy of Murray and Green is being met by the growing resistance of the progressive elements in the American trade-union movement."

And, says the same source: "United States public opinion more and more demands the withdrawal of American troops from Korea, including the progressive trade-unions of the United States." Hm-m-m-m. Go ahead, tovarisch, name them.

Meantime, American labor leaders who weren't named by the Soviet radio—all those we could reach in a few hours—are furious at being overlooked.

Says President David Dubinsky, of the AFL Ladies Garment Workers, one of the pioneer anti-Soviet labor spokesmen:

"What have Green, Murray, and Reuther got that I haven't got? I'm going to fire my publicity man."

A Nation Is Only as Secure and Strong in Peace or War as Its Aims and Purposes Are Righteous and Its Soil Productive

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include one of the best articles I have ever read on the conservation of our natural resources. This article should inspire every deep-thinking, Christian, loyal American in our land to do his part in conserving our priceless soil and all the natural resources by which we live, and by which our children will live and on which depends the very existence of our God-given free Republic.

I am proud of the fact that most every Iowa businessman's organization and many ministers of the gospel have joined hands with the farmers and farm organizations, in my district and all over Iowa, in the all-important duty of soil conservation and flood prevention as recommended by the Iowa Conservationist, the Soil Conservation Service, the PMA, the Iowa State Extension Service, and now the Iowa State Watershed Association.

To further accelerate this all-important program, valley-wide watershed soil conservation and flood-control organizations have been established in the several watersheds in the Seventh Iowa District, which I have the honor to represent in Congress. To further assist the program, about a year ago, a magazine entitled "The Nishna Valley Bulletin," began its publication under the editorship of Mr. Barr Keshlear, of Shenandoah, Iowa, a landowner and businessman, and a tireless worker for proper and effective soil conservation and flood control in the Nishna-Botna Valley. The value of such an organization and magazine was immediately recognized by the people in many other sections of Iowa to the end that a State-wide meeting was called in Des Moines, Iowa, last spring, at which time the Iowa State Watershed Association was organized and the Nisha-Botna Watershed Bulletin was made a State-wide publication. The Iowa State Watershed Bulletin is published at Shenandoah, Iowa. Barr Keshlear, of Shenandoah, Iowa, is editor, and association officers are Barr Keshlear, president, Shenandoah, Iowa; William P. Gannon, vice president, Valeria, Iowa; Paul A. Johnson, secretary-treasurer, Denison, Iowa.

The first issue of the Iowa State Watershed Bulletin was published in July and much valuable information to the farmers and to the people of Iowa is contained even in the first issue. Great and lasting good, at relatively small cost, will come to the people of Iowa through active participation in this program by the farmers with the proper cooperation by the Department of Agriculture, the Iowa Extension Service, the Iowa Legislature, the businessmen, the churches, and schools, with the help of such publications as the Iowa Conservationist and the Iowa State Watershed Association Bulletin.

The people of Iowa invite every State in our Nation to follow Iowa in the goal it has set for complete soil and natural resources conservation, remembering always that a nation is only as secure and strong in peace and war as its aims and purposes are righteous and its soil productive.

The article follows:

[From the Iowa Conservationist of August 15, 1950]

THE SPIRITUAL SIDE OF CONSERVATION

(By Earl L. Shaub)

Volumes have been written from the scientific angle on the needs of conserving our natural resources. We should also see these needs from a spiritual viewpoint. The fact that we draw our very life from these resources carries with it some tremendous moral obligations.

One of the greatest of these is our duty to wisely use, conserve and restore the natural resources from which we live, so that future generations may enjoy the same abundance that we have. This is a sacred obligation, stressed in the Scriptures as well as in the experiences of the human race. Dominion over the earth with its plants and animals, fish and fowl, is a big responsibility that should be met wholeheartedly and with solemnity and dignity.

The first of these resources, of course, is the soil. The Scriptures refer to man as a handful of clay into which the Creator has blown his warm breath. Though this may be taken as an allegory in Scriptural language it is in reality a great truth. Most of the elements in our bodies came from the soil into which the processes of creation have blown the warm breath of sunshine, air, and water.

Good health, then, and even life itself depends on good soil. In fact, everything we have or hope to have—our food, the wool and cotton in our clothes, the materials in our houses, all the commodities in our commerce—came from the soil. Our standard of living, therefore, and even civilization depends on the fertility of the earth.

Nations of the past flourished as long as their soil was good and decayed when their soil was depleted. Palestine, large stretches of China and Greece are glaring examples of what happens to once prosperous countries that fail to conserve and restore the ground from which they draw their sustenance.

So, if we are to have healthy bodies, a high standard of living, and a thriving, prosperous civilization, we must keep the soil in good condition. The conservationists and the soil chemists know how that can be done, but they are having a stubborn uphill fight against ignorance, greed, and public indifference, and it is every man's duty to assist them in every way we can, for we all have a stake in the good earth.

More of this should be taught in the schools; more ministers of the gospel should base sermons on this subject; more bankers should deny loans to farmers who fail to practice conservation and all businessmen and housewives should be alert to this vital cause because their health and prosperity depend on it.

Next in importance to the soil is the forest. We must protect and restore our trees as rapidly as we use them. Exploitation of the woods is a crime against nature and society. The importance of wood in our

daily lives and in our economic world is seen in the fact that forest industries are second only to agriculture. A tremendous number of useful products, in addition to lumber, come from trees. Where the woods have been slashed, we find desolation and poverty.

Forests also ameliorate climate and guarantee a perpetual and even flow of clear, pure water in the streams and rivers. When the forests are gone, they will be replaced by deserts. Then at times the river beds will be dry and at other times they will be the paths of raging floods that will destroy property and lives. Fish and other forms of aquatic life for which we are responsible will vanish as well as the water we need in our homes and factories.

It is in the forest that we get a clear sense of unity. Anyone who meditates for 5 minutes in the grove will feel his kinship with all. Then he must realize that one source of life equally animates the tree, the bird, the deer, and man.

Trees and other forms of vegetation also provide the habitat and food for the birds and animals of which we are the guardians. They are an active part of the plan of creation and we could not exist without them. It is a high privilege to be the custodians of those creatures and we must meet that responsibility by maintaining the balance of nature or suffer the natural consequences.

And so it is with all other natural resources, including the streams, which we must keep clean and free from eroding silt and the pollution of cities and industries. If we fail to protect and replenish the bounties we use we must suffer and die. That is the natural penalty for failure to keep the sacred trust.

The results of our neglect to keep faith with nature are appalling. Forests are disappearing before the ruthless axes; fertile land is washing down the rivers and into the sea at a costly rate; many species of birds and beasts are becoming extinct. Our neglect is all the more shameful because we know how to repair the damage. Conservationists have all the scientific remedies to the problem but they are helpless without public support.

Conservation is just sound common sense economics and good business from which everybody will profit, and any practice that will benefit the world is surely based on fundamental spiritual laws.

We must conceive of the earth as the Lord's, not the property of individuals who hold legal title to the land. The Scriptures word it this way:

"The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof:"

We also read:

"The cattle on a thousand hills, all these are mine."

When we take that to heart we will realize that we are treading on holy ground and that we are the stewards who have the privilege of caring for the earth. Then we shall know that conservation is a vital part of spiritual life and an expression of practical love for those who will come after us.

We should meet our obligations with devotion and joy. Our task should be as pleasant as working in a garden where the rewards are manyfold, with full larders, good health and prosperity.

This work is a means of self-expression, for we are a part of the living landscape. The man who participates in it is a partner with God in a creative act. The very subject is alive and the thing that binds us in fellowship is a quiet, deep feeling a—love of the land, the source of our sustenance, our inspiration, our enjoyment.

It is a high calling to preside at the mystery of the growth of the plants, the birds, and the animals. It is in this work that we live closely with nature and read the story she is continually writing. Let's be acutely sensitive to perceive and feel and appreciate that story. Let's live and enjoy it.

It is in that story that we read that creation is all one piece. We must conserve all or we will lose all. Soil, water, forests, wildlife are but pieces in the pattern. All are bricks with which the Master Builder has created the pyramid of life—a pyramid on which man stands at the apex, presiding over all.

All this was aptly summed up by Charles N. Elliott in what he calls the eleventh commandment, which reads:

"Thou shalt inherit the holy earth as a faithful steward, conserving its resources and productivity from generation to generation. Thou shalt protect thy fields from soil erosion and thy hills from overgrazing by the herds, so that thy descendants may have abundance forever. If any shall fail in this stewardship of the land his fertile field shall become sterile stones and gullies, and his descendants shall decrease and live in poverty or vanish from the face of the earth."—The Tennessee Conservationist.

Analysis of Columns and Broadcasts of Leading Commentators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles appearing in the Providence (R. I.) Journal and Bulletin from June 25 to July 11, 1950, analyzing the columns and broadcasts of Drew Pearson, Walter Winchell, Westbrook Pegler, and Fulton Lewis, Jr.:

Along the Main Street of American journalism there are many permanent establishments dispensing the complex news of the day in a manner that is sometimes dignified, sometimes snappy, and sometimes dull as dishwater. But here and there on raised platforms in plain sight of the passing throng are a number of engaging gentlemen who urge one and all to step right up and get the news of the day in one neat package, brightly wrapped, and containing easily swallowed capsules that will cure broken political bones, subversive snake bite and military migraine. These are the pitchmen of the press.

These are the columnists and commentators, the men of publishing and radio who bring warmth and personality to the news of the day. In the past there have been suspicions that some of them also brought a good deal of artificial sensation and manufactured suspense. Three years ago the Commission on Freedom of the Press said of such false sensation and phony suspense:

"The worst offenders in this direction are to be found among the newspaper columnists and radio commentators. The members of this craft have come to perform an indispensable function in American public discussion. But they must attract the maximum audience, too. Some of them have thought that the way to do this is to supply the public with keyhole gossip, rumor, character assassination, and lies."

But that was 3 years ago. How do our leading columnists and commentators operate today?

FOUR SELECTED FOR STUDY

Four of the most spectacular newspaper columnists and radio commentators were selected for a study in accuracy and fairness. They were selected not necessarily because of any failings but because they are among the best known men in the trade.

They are Walter Winchell, and his weekly radio news program; Drew Pearson, and his weekly radio predictions; Fulton Lewis, Jr., and his nightly newscast; and Westbrook Pegler, and his daily syndicated newspaper column.

For 15 weeks, beginning in January and ending in April, the radio programs of Lewis, Pearson, and Winchell as heard locally were recorded and analyzed. During the same period the syndicated column of Westbrook Pegler also was analyzed. The Pegler column is distributed by a Hearst syndicate and in order to see the printed column as closely as possible to the way Pegler wrote it, a Hearst paper, the New York Journal-American, was selected as the paper in which to read Pegler. Other papers with standards of news and taste that differ widely from Pegler's often cut out parts of Pegler columns and not infrequently omit entire columns. As it was, the Journal-American omitted one column that was clipped for the study from another paper.

PEARSON, WINCHELL COLUMNS EXCLUDED

The newspaper columns of Pearson and Winchell were not studied. Pearson's column contains a preponderance of straight news and acknowledged editorializing. Winchell's column contains much Broadway gossip not related to ordinary news.

If the estimates of their employers are accurate, these four men have a tremendous following. They have, according to the syndicates and networks involved, an aggregate audience of 95,000,000 Americans. Undoubtedly, there is much duplication in that figure. A man who reads Pegler faithfully, for example, is likely to be found among the admirers of Fulton Lewis, Jr.

The rewards of these men are also impressive. Their aggregate income from the activities studied is nearly $1,500,000 a year. This does not include income from Pearson's and Winchell's newspaper columns, from books, magazine articles, personal appearances, fees for posing as a "man of distinction," and other activities connected with being a commentator.

The politics of the four men covers a wide range, from Pearson who appears generally sympathetic to the Fair Deal, to Pegler who accuses Governor Dewey of being a Socialist.

SOMETIMES HIT AT EACH OTHER

These four giants in American journalism tell their public not only the news of the world but also about themselves. Pearson has accused Lewis of fabricating a spectacular story for commercial gain and Lewis has said that Pearson told an unqualified lie. Pegler has called Winchell a gent's-room journalist and Winchell has called Pegler "a louse in the blouse of journalism."

These men wield a powerful influence in public opinion and in politics. Yet the 15-week study showed that the methods of some of them are nothing short of astonishing.

The study was concerned primarily with accuracy of fact and fairness of comment as based on the facts.

While errors were looked for in the study, it was realized that any man handling a large number of facts in a short period of time will make mistakes. It is absurd for any reporter or commentator to claim infallibility and it is just as absurd for the reader or listener to expect infallibility. Thus, the study was not a project for looking, at leisure, for errors made in haste.

But when errors consistently fell into a clear pattern, and when these errors permitted the commentator to reach conclusions that would be impossible with accurate facts, it was felt reasonable to record such mistakes or misrepresentations and the patterns into which they fell.

In some cases, these lapses from fact permitted the commentator to create a political atmosphere to his liking; in others they simply gave the commentator a glamour that would disappear under cold fact.

While the 15-week study was concerned primarily with factual accuracy, it was born in mind that many commentators in the past have appealed to emotions and—having discovered the adrenal glands easier to stimulate than the brain—arranged the news to produce an agitated audience that would return periodically for further doses.

Giraud Chester, writing in Public Opinion Quarterly last year, warned that the popular commentator "should not through excessive emotionalism induce panic or extreme insecurity in his listeners * * * his ability to popularize and dramatize should not be employed on one side of an issue only."

Many leaders in American journalism have been dismayed by the tendency of commentators to hold onto audiences through souped-up news, artificial suspense, and superdramatic deliveries. This commercial emotionalism, they argue, comes at a time when civilization is in a crisis and the fate of society depends on the sound knowledge and sober judgment of its citizens.

While no measure of emotionalism seemed possible during the 15-week study, it was interesting to note that the commentators more often appealed to emotion than addressed themselves to the facts.

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the first of three articles on the broadcasts of Walter Winchell.)

Every Sunday night at 9 o'clock an estimated 25,000,000 Americans tune in to hear a fast-talking, superdramatic, ultrapatriotic gossip fling information at the nations of the world, the Government of the United States, the listeners themselves, and, lastly, to the newspapers which try so feebly to compete with him in bringing news to the public.

This international ball of fire is Walter Winchell. Nothing is too large, nothing too small for his consideration. In just one broadcast he was able recently to tell his audience that he was the first man to announce the name of a new atomic weapon, and a few moments later, in the same dramatic staccato, proclaim that a midwestern actress might elope at any minute.

(The fact that both of these items were inaccurate did not dampen Winchell's enthusiasm for bringing truth to the American public.)

ONE THOUSAND-DOLLAR-A-MINUTE TALKER

In return for this generous service, Winchell gets for his single weekly broadcast about $650,000 a year. This amounts to exactly $12,500 a broadcast, and since his personal delivery on each program is limited to 12½ minutes, he gets $1,000 a minute for every minute he talks.

A check of his facts over a 15-week period shows that scarcely a broadcast went by without items that were either untrue, or predictions that were inaccurate.

But there can be no doubt about the quantity. Winchell's 12½ minutes are full ones. In his syndicated newspaper column on March 3, he wrote: "A clocker at the last broadcast reports: 'The first 3 minutes were paced at 226 to 228 words per minute.'" An ordinary radio announcer speaks from 150 to 175 words a minute.

What is the nature of this highly paid wordage?

The listener hears a somewhat harsh, staccato voice firing off news items and advice in white-hot bursts, punctuated by an occasional slow-down for dramatic emphasis. He opens his program with, "Good evening, Mr. and Mrs. North and South America and all the ships at sea; let's go to press."

3,000-MILE EXTENSION

(On April 9, and on that night only, for some undisclosed reason he extended his territorial claims some 3,000 miles with: "Good evening, Mr. and Mrs. North and South America, Midway, the Hawaiian Islands and all the ships at sea, let's go to press.")

He leads off each new section of his newscast with such headings as "A reporter's report to the Nation", or "The international news," or "Tips to the papers." All of it sounds as infallible and competent as a smoothly working machine gun.

On one program recently, he gave 35 items to his listeners. Four of them were predictions (one of them the reverse of a previous prediction and another that the Federal budget would not be balanced this year). Two of the remaining items had been broadcast on previous programs that night; four were marriage or divorce notes; three were reports of surgery or childbirth among celebrities; seven were news items that were carried on the standard news service hours before Winchell went on the air. Among the remaining items was such disparate information as: "The French Army in Indochina is flanked. The door to Singapore is wide open" and the intelligence that a certain gentleman on the west coast had placed a large bet on a horse named "Your Host."

SERIES OF QUICK FLASHES

The first section of Winchell's broadcast frequently is a series of quick news flashes from all over the country. At no time does he say outright that these are exclusive tips, but it is easy for listeners to get that idea from his use here and there of such phrases as "I can now state with authority" and "exclusive."

But an analysis of one recent opening batch of news flashes showed that at least half the items had been carried on the wires of the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service hours before Winchell went on the air. The remaining items consisted of four hospital or divorce items about celebrities, one prediction and one historical item.

A newspaper reporter listening to Winchell broadcasting standard wire service news at the rate of $1,000 a minute might ask what makes such news so expensive in the mouth of Winchell.

The answer is that Winchell has built a reputation for possessing inside information, he has surrounded his news with the air of spectacular drama, and he has the advantage of broadcasting news on the one day when America, for the most part, sees no afternoon newspapers.

PRESSES HAVE BEEN SILENT

Almost none of the 1,700 daily papers in the country publish afternoon papers on Sunday. By the time the Winchell drama goes on the air Sunday night at 9 o'clock, the presses of the Nation have been silent for more than 18 hours.

Thus, Winchell can say, as he does from time to time after an item, "Monday papers will confirm," giving the impression that the newspapers will have learned the item from Winchell and will have found it correct. During the 15-week study a reporter discovered that such items frequently originated with newspapers in the first place and were made available to newscasters like Winchell, already confirmed.

Naturally, broadcasting accurate news quickly is a service, whether it comes from radio or newspaper. And it is true that from time to time Winchell does score a news beat. But when news items processed through the disciplines of factual reporting are broadcast alongside speculation and personal whimsy, the reader has no way of exercising critical judgment. When this mixture of news and speculation and advice is spewed out at machine-gun speed, the listener is faced with taking it all or leaving it all.

PEARSON GETS FIRST CRACK AT WIRES

Winchell's spot at 9 o'clock Sunday night is complicated somewhat by the fact that Drew Pearson, also aided by the publishing void on Sunday, goes on the air 3 hours earlier. Pearson gets first crack at the waiting wire service news piled up unpublished all day Sunday, though he appears to use less of it than Winchell.

Both Winchell and Pearson make some predictions that any newspaper reader could make. Winchell once declared, "The FBI, I can report with authority, is determined to solve the $1,000,000 hold-up of the Brink bank." Pearson once predicted, "J. Edgar Hoover will give convincing arguments tomorrow why FBI files should be kept secret." If you are to predict that the sun will rise in the east, the only factor you must worry about is to make the prediction before anyone else. Thus, Pearson has the advantage over Winchell.

On January 22 Pearson said that Admiral Leahy would be sent to Spain as an Ambassador. Three hours later Winchell predicted that we would send an ambassador to Spain. So far they are both wrong.

BOTH WRONG ON COAL STRIKE

The next week Winchell and Pearson both predicted the President would intervene in the coal strike before 48 hours. Both were wrong.

Sometimes, their predictions weave around each other, now contradicting, now in harmony. On March 19 Pearson said that the French Embassy had reported that Stalin may be ill. Three hours later Winchell said, "The Russian Embassy at Bern, Switzerland, has broadly hinted that Joseph Stalin would be willing to leave Russia for a peace rendezvous." The next week, however, Winchell apparently came around to Pearson's point of view. Without referring to his previous Stalin travel item, he announced, "Stalin's rheumatic heart is keeping him at rest." Some time later, Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, saw Stalin personally and flew in the face of both Winchell and Pearson when he announced that Stalin was "healthy and lively."

Winchell is outraged by conflicting statements from others. When Government officials disagree on a matter that he is interested in—such as going to war—he is apt to say bitterly of Government officials, as he did on February 19, "In the 12½ minutes I have at this microphone, I could not begin to tell you how many times a day they keep contradicting each other."

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the second of three articles on the broadcasts of Walter Winchell.)

One of the major attractions that Walter Winchell holds for many of the estimated 25,000,000 Americans who listen to this Sunday night broadcast is Winchell's genius for turning any piece of information into a red-hot inside tip.

On the night of March 5, millions of people heard Winchell proclaim breathlessly:

"Washington. There may be another super bomb. The hydrogen-trittium—trittium—t-r-i-double-t-i-u-m. The hydrogen-trittium bomb. That's the first time, I think, those words have been used over the radio.

The H-T—the initials—are the President of the United States."

It is hard to tell from this presentation whether Winchel mean that the elements hydrogen and tritium were so named as a sentimental gesture toward the thirty-second President of the United States or vice versa.

PRINTED 33 DAYS BEFORE

But the joy or dismay of hearing this red-hot, inside tip from Winchell may have been dampened for those listeners who were aware of the fact that on February 1—33 days before Winchell's dramatic announcement—there appeared high up on the front page of the New York Times, an article by Pulitzer-prize winner William L. Laurence, which said:

"This, the most powerful superbomb that can be built on earth, it can now be revealed, actually is a triton bomb in which the basic element is tritium, a hydrogen isotope (twin) of atomic mass 3. It is an element hardly known to the public but well known to nuclear physicist. A triton is a nucleus of tritium composed of one proton and two neutrons." Laurence was careful to spell it t-r-i-t-i-u-m, with only one "t" in the middle.

The story of the hydrogen-tritium bomb was picked up by radio newscasters on the night of January 31, even before the Times hit the street. So Winchell was not the first man to utter the word "tritium" over the air. He was 34 days late. But, anyway, he undoubtedly was the first man ever to misspell it over the air.

TIPS TO THE PAPERS

Winchell spreads the benefit of his inside tips to newspapers as well as to lay listeners. One of the major portions of his program is his final section, "Tips to the papers."

On the night of February 5, for example, in his "Tips to the papers," he announced, "New York Mirror and Boston Record: That rumor last week that the insurance people in the Brink's hold-up are hedging, was unfounded. The companies have already paid out over a million dollars."

He did not add, however, that that rumor was circulated by Winchell in the broadcast 1 week before and presented as an inside tip. That week he had said, "Boston Record: Insiders tell me that the insurance companies are hedging on that million-dollar Brink's hold-up."

In another of his "Tips to the papers," on March 19, he barked that Gypsy Rose Lee would become a disc jockey at the Diamond Horseshoe, a New York night club. It is not recorded whether the papers of the Nation snapped to action with this flash but apparently Gypsy Rose Lee and the Diamond Horseshoe did not. In his newspaper column 3 weeks later, Winchell wrote sulkily, "That disc-jockey deal between Gypsy Rose Lee and the Diamond Horseshoe is off, now that both swindled us out of some hefty broadcasting advertising."

SLANDER TIP FAILS TO MATERIALIZE

Another time, when interest was high in the mercy-killing trial of Dr. Hermann Sander, Winchell gave the following tip to the papers: "Legal experts here and in Washington say that any action against Dr. Sander in New Hampshire will start off the greatest civil-liberties case in United States history." Thus warned that they should expect something bigger than the Sacco-Vanzetti case, the Scopes trial, and the appeals of the Scottsboro boys, the newspapers of the Nation may have been somewhat surprised when Dr. Sander was indeed suspended by his medical society and his license revoked but riots did not break out in all the major cities.

Possibly while waiting for the Sander riots, newspapers could have contemplated Winchell's talent for bringing together in conjugal bliss the great and small issues of the day. Probably nobody else ever thought of connecting the Alger Hiss perjury trial with the daily double at Hialeah. The week end of Hiss' conviction, while the jury was apparently following the judge's instructions not to reveal the jury vote, Winchell told the newspapers and his listeners, "The jury in the Alger Hiss trial was 10 to 2 for conviction. The two who held out for awhile were jurors 5 and 8. That's a good hunch for me for tomorrow's daily double at any track."

NEWSPAPER STORY DIFFERS

The next day, the New York Journal-American, ignoring Winchell's generous tip, carried a story said to be from one of the jurors, saying that the first count in the jury room was 9 to 3.

The only major track with daily doubles that week was Hialeah in Miami. On Monday, the daily double was won by horses 12 and 4. On Tuesday, though Winchell limited his tip to Monday, the daily double was won by horses 2 and 8. Not one 5-and-8 combination won all week.

Yet the next Sunday Winchell gave yet another proud "tip" to the papers: "Morning Telegraph and Racing Form. Hunch players who heard me announce last Sunday night that the two jurors who held out the longest (he had not said "longest" the week before) in the Alger Hiss trial were numbers 5 and 8, played 5 and 8 all week and won plenty. It paid $325 for two and it clinched the great daily double at Hialeah—$1,635."

The truth is that most newspapers flagrantly ignore Winchell tips. For example, listeners heard him say on March 5 in his tips to the papers, "Minneapolis Star-Tribune: Mildred Mayo, the actress daughter of the topman at the Mayo Clinic may elope at any moment." Only readers of the Minneapolis Star-Tribune realize that the Star-Tribune gratuitously ignored that tip, as did Miss Mayo who, at this writing is still uneloped and still unmarried.

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the last of three articles on the broadcasts of Walter Winchell.)

"I realize that a microphone is a great moral responsibility."

These words were uttered on the night of February 12 by Walter Winchell in his regular Sunday night broadcast of news, rumor, and speculation.

A 15-week study of the Winchell broadcasts shows that part of this "great moral responsibility" as Winchell considers it is to see that the United States goes to war as soon as possible, an act that would verify a Winchell assertion of 3 years' standing. Almost weekly he castigates the Government for not beginning war on Russia as he advised so long ago.

KEPT LASHING THEM ON

Even when certain Government officials were reported—by Winchell—to be coming around to his way of thinking, he kept lashing them on. On March 26 he said scornfully of these officials, "These are the same leaders, ladies and gentlemen, who for the last few years consistently contended that war with Russia was not inevitable, but highly improbable—when your New York correspondent (Winchell) every Sunday night tried to wake them up."

When Life magazine devoted an entire issue to war preparations, Winchell said that Time and Life had heckled Winchell's call to war in 1947 but "Now they feature the same warnings using almost my identical language—3 years tardy."

Winchell neglects to consider the possibility that the Government and Time and Life may simply have been indoctrinated by the Winchell party line 6 years ago rather than the Winchell line only 3 years ago. Six years ago Winchell was proclaiming the splendid cooperation of the two great democracies, the United States and the Soviet Union and castigating bitterly those who disagreed with him.

NO MERE GENERALITIES

Winchell's declarations of war are not mere generalities. Together with Drew Pearson, he reports the moves of Russian divisions, now to Siberia, now to the Yugoslav border, back to the Baltic, down toward Manchuria. Nevertheless, Pearson and Winchell do have differences in their attitude toward the tenuous peace in the world today.

Pearson, a Quaker, frequently urges all peoples to work for peace. He devoted an entire broadcast—which was ultimately sent by short wave—to Europe in general and Russia in particular—to a plea for sanity and peace. Winchell, on the other hand, looks with suspicion at those who talk of peace.

Neither Winchell nor Pearson, however, has ignored the opening move in the war.

Winchell recently set the stage for firing the first shot of World War III—not a unique instance for him—with a typically patriotic service. This service includes the reading of "confidential intelligence reports" to the public as he hears about them.

On the night of April 2, Winchell said that the garrison of the tiny Kattegat islands between Sweden and Denmark would fight if invaded, a move that might come soon. He said, "London intelligence has reported that these islands will witness the start of the third world war, which is what I have been saying all along."

DISAGREED WITH SELF

(Winchell apparently did not consider this in conflict with his flash 5 weeks earlier: "London! Interception of secret Russian orders unquestionably disclose that the big showdown—Stalin's D-day on a global basis—may be October 1952!")

Pearson was somewhat later in starting the war. It was not until April 30 that he reported, "Allied defense chiefs think the Russians may be ready to move on Bornholm Island which belongs to Denmark but which Moscow has long wanted as a submarine base. If this should happen, then world war III would almost be here." It is interesting that Pearson began his war only 150 miles from the islands that Winchell selected for his opening shot.

Winchell's "great moral responsibility" involves not only getting the Nation successfully launched into war, but also informing all interested parties of confidential moves. On one Sunday, for example, he said that gangsters were going to a certain Southern State to murder a man. But, he told the public, the gangsters were certainly going to get a surprise. (Winchell may have assumed that gangsters do not listen to his program.)

The next week, on April 16, the gang apparently had not killed its man and had not been surprised, for Winchell gave the following tip to a newspaper: "Miami Herald: Regarding last Sunday's tip that gamblers were planning to kill at least one man in a Southern State, I can now state with authority that the Southern State is not Florida!"

DIVORCE A FAVORITE TOPIC

Any count of Winchell items reveals a substantial number of flashes about Hollywood divorces, rumors of divorces, guesses at divorces, results of divorces. Yet, on occasion Winchell draws back in disgust at the sight of newspapers printing Hollywood divorce stories. After announcing that Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Goldwyn would celebrate their twenty-fifth wedding anniversary soon, he added piously, "Recommended to all newspapers that play up Hollywood divorces."

Another exercise of his "great moral responsibility" came recently while the city of New York was urging its citizens to conserve water because of the shortage. On April 9, Winchell declared that there would be no more attempts at artificial rain-making in New York—because the reservoirs

were overflowing. The day he made that broadcast, officials of the New York water system announced that while one reservoir was overflo[illegible]g, the total reservoir system for the city was only 75-percent full as compared with 94.7-percent full at the same time the year before. Numerous artificial rainmaking attempts were made shortly afterward. In order to get the Nation forthright into the atmosphere of war and in order to make his great moral responsibility effective, Winchell appears willing to sacrifice a fact for a dramatic effect. On April 16 he concluded his program with: "I remain, your New York correspondent, Walter Winchell, who leaves the President and the Department of Defense with this nightmare: The Russians shot down one American plane—cutting our Air Force right in half!"

It is hoped that even those devoted followers of Winchell's colorful figures of speech did not believe that the destroyed Navy Privateer constituted 50 percent of our Air Force. Presumably Winchell was merely underlining his complaints that our Air Force is too small. The loss of the Privateer was tragic, but as a matter of simple, unimaginative fact, it was not 50 percent of our operational Air Force but eleven one-thousands of 1 percent.

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the first of three articles on the broadcasts of Drew Pearson.)

Sometime after 6:10 o'clock on any Sunday night, some 15,000,000 people hear an excited announcer proclaim:

"Now, Drew Pearson with tonight's predictions of things to come—predictions that have proved 86 percent accurate."

That is how the Nation's top prognosticator enters the final of his 15-minute news program. His broadcast contains news, editorial comment, and predictions, but probably the greatest of these in the public mind is the predictions. They are a major factor in a reputation that gives Pearson a radio income of $400,000 a year. This awe at the man's powers of prophecy is not diminished by the announcer's proclamation of 86-percent accuracy.

NEARER 47 PERCENT

A study of Drew Pearson's radio predictions of 15 weeks shows that the announcer, if he is talking about the current period of Pearson's prophesying career, would be more accurate if he said:

"* * * predictions that have proved 47 percent accurate."

The predictions which are said to be 86 percent accurate are uttered in a special prediction portion of Pearson's program. During the main body of his program he makes other predictions and these, the study showed, are approximately as accurate as the prophecies in the special section.

Pearson's predictions were not always simple to tabulate. Sometimes the events he predicted came true but not when he said they would. Sometimes part of a single prediction turned out to be accurate and another part inaccurate. Some of the predictions are for events which still have not transpired.

THREE TABULATIONS MADE

Three tabulations were made: 1, a strict tabulation which held Pearson to the very letter of his prediction and which called a prediction inaccurate if any part of it was inaccurate; 2, a lenient tabulation which ignored small errors in timing and which gave Pearson credit for fractions of predictions that were otherwise wrong; and 3, a charitable tabulation which assumed that the predictions for events still to come—about a quarter of all those made during the study period—will turn out to be completely accurate.

The results of these tabulations were:

1. Strict test—47 percent accurate.
2. Lenient test—55 percent accurate.
3. "Charitable" test—67 percent accurate.

In all fairness to Pearson, it should be said that he appears to make fewer errors than other superdramatic and supersalaried commentators. He scores genuine news beats with regularity, and his sources are among the best in the Nation's Capital.

Pearson does make mistakes. What is astounding for a high-powered commentator, he sometimes admits them.

NO TABULATION HITS 86 PERCENT

But under no circumstances can his predictions during the study period be tabulated to come within striking distance of the 86-percent accurate figure with which the final portion of Pearson's 15-minute broadcast is introduced.

At first glance, a 47-percent accuracy seems to be some 3 percent lower than mere chance. A 5-year-old child predicting the flip of a coin would, if he carried on long enough, predict 50 percent of the results accurately. It would appear, then, that Drew Pearson would do better to flip a coin for his predictions. But this is not necessarily so.

It is true that Pearson makes some yes-or-no type predictions. For example, he predicted on February 26 that Dr. Herman Sander would be acquitted in his mercy killing trial. This had only two likely outcomes and anyone would have a 50–50 chance of being right on a prediction. Pearson said Dr. Sander would be acquitted and he was right. Another simple prediction was the one on April 30 that Senator PEPPER would win in the Florida primary. Here, again, there was a 50–50 chance at being right. Pearson said PEPPER would win and was wrong.

UNLIMITED POSSIBILITIES

But a large number of Pearson predictions deal with an unlimited number of possibilities. For example on February 5 Pearson predicted that the Justice Department would bring an antitrust suit against the Shubert Theaters. Three weeks later the Justice Department did. No ordinary 50–50 guesswork would have produced that prediction. Official appointments, in which Pearson specializes, also offer more than two possibilities. On April 2, for example, he predicted that Roger Lapham would be appointed to run the State Department's point 4 program. The number of possible appointees here was considerable. Actually, Capus M. Waynick was given the appointment, at least temporarily, and Pearson would appear to be wrong.

Under the strictest accounting, some 18 of Pearsons' 52 predictions were accurate. Twenty were wrong, and 14 were predictions of events still to come. Under these conditions, only 47 percent of the predictions of events already transpired are accurate.

But giving Pearson the benefit of ignoring slight errors in timing, and giving him credit for parts of predictions that were otherwise wrong, 21 predictions, or 55 percent, for events already transpired were accurate.

Even assuming that the 14 predictions of events still to come should turn out to be 100 percent accurate, only 35 of the 52 predictions would be accurate. This would make for 67 percent accuracy.

A GENEROUS ASSUMPTION

(That these future events will be 100 percent accurate is a generous assumption. Some of the still untested predictions are that if the Treasury Department changes the color of paper money to orange, racketeers will be foiled; that the next time a Russian submarine gets too close to an American shore the Navy will not hesitate to fire; that when the perspective of time returns to the country the present hysteria will appear worse than the Salem witch burnings.)

It might be said that the announcer says merely that the predictions "have proved" 86 percent accurate, that it was at some time in the past that Pearson reached the 86-percent score. It might also be said that Pearson was proud of this past score and continued to announce it in the manner of a mustard manufacturer who continues to print on his labels a medallion for excellence in mustard granted at the Columbia Exposition in 1893. But there is little doubt that the impression most Pearson listeners get on Sunday nights is that the predictions are—not just have been—86 percent accurate.

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the second of three articles on the broadcasts of Drew Pearson.)

Drew Pearson, one of the leading brothers in the fraternity of radio prophets, occasionally breaks the club regulations by admitting that he has made a mistake. This is a grave and highly unusual infraction of the rule of infallibility. Nevertheless, through one means or another, it is still possible for many of his 15,000,000 listeners to get the idea that Pearson approaches infallibility in his predictions.

Perhaps the plainest of these devices is the announcer's statement that Pearson's predictions have been 86 percent accurate. A 15-week study showed that the predictions during that period were only 47 percent accurate.

Another device is to rephrase a prediction after the event has occurred. In this way, a prediction is made to appear better than it really was.

ENGLISH ELECTIONS AN EXAMPLE

On the night of February 19, for example, Pearson said of the forthcoming English elections:

"I predict that the next government of Great Britain will be—a Labor government. But I also predict that the margin will be so close that Winston Churchill will be invited by the Laborites to become a member of the Cabinet."

On the surface, this seemed to be a daring prediction. Many other professional prognosticators were freely predicting the fall of the Labor Government.

(On February 7, 2 weeks before Pearson's prediction, the British Gallup poll gave the Labor Government a 45½-percent victory over 44 percent for the Conservatives. This was made available to Pearson before his own prediction.)

The election was held on February 24. The Labor Government did win. It was by a slim margin. Winston Churchill's joining the Cabinet failed to materialize but there was talk of a new election. The Sunday after the election, Pearson's announcer proclaimed:

"And now, the man who hit it right on the nose last week with his prediction that the Labor Government would win but by a margin so low that new elections might be held soon—Drew Pearson."

HADN'T MENTIONED NEW VOTE

Of course, Pearson had said nothing about new elections. He said said, "so close that Winston Churchill will be invited to become a member of the Cabinet." As it turned out, Churchill was not asked to join the Cabinet and 3 months later, no new elections had been held.

In the tabulation for accuracy, in the severest test (which showed 47 percent accuracy), Pearson was given a failure for that one, since the prediction as a whole was wrong; in the lenient tabulation (which showed 55 percent accuracy) he was given

credit for two-thirds accurate and one-third inaccurate for that prediction.

Even when Pearson commits the unspeakable sin of admitting error, he softens the blow for his listeners by reminding them of the glories of the past. On the night of January 29, for example, he was introduced:

"And now, the man who went wrong in predicting that the FEPC would pass the House last week, but whose exclusive revelations regarding the hydrogen bomb has focused Nation-wide attention on this question—Drew Pearson."

ANOTHER DIFFERENCE

Pearson differs from his soothsaying brethren in yet another respect. He apparently bears no ill will toward people who have attacked him. The other columnists and commentators studied during the 15-week period devoted much of their time attacking others and castigating those who have attacked them. Ordinarily, to attack such a commentator is to be condemned to everlasting criticism.

But Drew Pearson, a Quaker, seems to have the power of forgiveness. Pearson and Dean Acheson were once good friends but after a quarrel 12 years ago they have not spoken. Yet Pearson has defended Acheson in the recent attacks by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY. Last year President Truman was so provoked by Pearson's revelations about certain White House personnel that the President called Pearson an "S. O. B." Pearson, who has a wry sense of humor, suggested on February 26 that in honor of Brotherhood Week, the President's epithet be known as "Servants of Brotherhood."

Few of the spectacular commentators could have been called an "S. O. B." without forever after being tempted to color their news about the man who called them that. But when Truman's Kansas City political friends were being mentioned in connection with the killing of the two racketeers, Binaggio and Gargotta, Pearson said that Truman had ordered a grand jury investigation and that the investigation was a thorough one. "Let's be fair," he said.

AN EMOTIONAL PATRIOT

In at least one respect, Pearson is a brother in good standing with his fellow prophets. He is an emotional patriot. On one program he told his 15,000,000 listeners that for the good of the country they should not repeat what he had told them. On the same program he let them in on a "confidential" cable: "London—exclusive—the American Embassy has cabled the American State Department confidentially that * * *"

In a fury of secrecy he announced one night: "Attention all Americans along the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Canadian border: The Air Force will soon start building a radar wall completely around the United States to detect enemy airplanes. The location of these radar sites must be kept secret. So, if the Government has bought land for a secret project in your neighborhood, pay no attention to what goes on, and, above all, please don't talk about it."

MANY NOTABLE SCOOPS

In the presentation of news, Pearson has scored many notable scoops. One such beat was broadcast on April 30. That night he opened his program with this item:

"Moscow—this will be denied. However, intelligence reports from Moscow state that Russian fishing boats have located the American Navy bomber at the bottom of the Baltic and are trying to salvage the highly secret radar equipment in the sunken plane. This is the most secret equipment we have. The wreck of the plane, by the way, is reported about 40 miles offshore, not near the Latvian coast."

Eleven days later the Associated Press carried a story quoting "a Government official in a position to know" substantially verifying the Pearson scoop, minus the portion about the radar equipment.

Just to show that his knowledge of the incident over the Baltic was not completely accurate, it should be recorded that on April 16 Pearson stated as a fact: "The 10 Americans (on the lost Navy plane), instead of crash-landing, which might have given the Russians our secret equipment, undoubtedly and deliberately crashed their plane into the sea."

Six weeks later the Navy said that an investigation of the remains of the plane showed the craft probably had exploded in mid-air.

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the last of three articles on the broadcasts of Drew Pearson.)

Drew Pearson, the newspaper columnist and radio commentator, has a number of useful skills and one of them is the ability to make politicians boiling mad.

A study of his radio broadcasts for 15 weeks early this year ordered several examples of the pixie-ism tactics that give certain Congressmen high blood pressure. On February 5, for example, Pearson said on his regular Sunday night broadcast:

"GOP leaders have been meeting all day yesterday and today to form a new magna carta. Yesterday a pledge of secrecy was sworn to and Senator BREWSTER warned his colleagues that this pledge really meant business. He said he didn't want to hear the inside story of what they had done on Drew Pearson's radio broadcast tonight. However, Senator, though I hate to scoop you, here, in brief, is the report your policy committee will submit tomorrow * * *."

TWO-DAY BEAT

And Pearson went on to give a fairly accurate summary of a policy statement that did not appear on front pages across the Nation until 2 days later.

On March 5, Pearson may have irked General Eisenhower. The general was in the midst of what seemed to be a quadrennial boom for the Presidential nomination, a boom that was based on his statesmanship and high purpose in life. Pearson was irreverent enough to report that the statesman-general has a one-third interest in a restaurant in downtown Washington together with Ed Pauley and George Allen, both one-time intimates of President Truman.

Pearson's barbs are both small and temporary ones and large and long-lasting. On April 12 he shot out a small item on Senator MCCARTHY saying that MCCARTHY was so afraid of being sued for libel on his charges against Owen Lattimore that the Wisconsin Senator had conferred with experts to make sure he would not suffer financial loss. But Pearson's campaign against MCCARTHY took on much weightier material. In April Pearson publicly suggested that a special lobbying committee find the answers to the following questions:

"Who pays for Senator MCCARTHY's secret headquarters in room 316 in the Congressional Hotel? Who paid for 200 long-distance telephone calls from that room? Who paid four ex-FBI agents who worked for MCCARTHY and they quit in disgust? How much did Alfred Kohlberg contribute to MCCARTHY's campaign funds?" (Kohlberg is a leader in the so-called Nationalist China lobby.)

PEARSON REVEALED NAME

When Senator MCCARTHY announced publicly "that he had the name of Russia's top espionage agent in the United States" it was Pearson who revealed that the name MCCARTHY had was Owen Lattimore. When MCCARTHY said that this "top espionage agent" had brought "three Communist agents" into the country Pearson announced that the three men were the "living Buddha" and two Mongolian princes, all with Communist prices on their heads, and that Lattimore brought them here so they could plan resistance to Communists in their native lands.

While concentrating on high-level attacks on MCCARTHY, Pearson could not resist the tiny, wry items he uses to embarrass public figures. On April 30 he announced:

"Senator MCCARTHY's outcry against sex unfortunates in the State Department is about to backfire against him. While he has been calling the roll on these persons, he has overlooked a member of his own staff who is on the Washington Police Department secret list. When this man offered to resign after he was arrested by police, believe it or not, MCCARTHY wouldn't let him but kept him on the payroll another 3 months."

(While certain other columnists were referring to homosexuals in the most violent terms of contempt, Pearson called them "sex unfortunates.")

APOPLEXY IN HIGH AND LOW PLACES

Pearson can induce apoplexy in high places and low. President Truman became so riled up last year he called Pearson an "S. O. B." Yet Pearson still had time to stimulate strong emotions in some obscure municipal official. On February 12 Pearson announced:

"Los Angeles: Mayor Bowron, did you know that one member of your equalization board has a mysterious income of $60,000—not including his salary from the city?"

While he seems to get pleasure from startling complacent politicians, Pearson is not perverse. He and Dean Acheson had a personal falling out 12 years ago and have not spoken to each other since. Under similar circumstances most other popular commentators could not resist carrying out their personal hurts into the news they broadcast. But Pearson has consistently defended Acheson against charges that he believed were unfounded. On February 19 he said: "It is not true as reported by another commentator that Dean Acheson contributed $25,000 to the defense of Hiss. He gave nothing." (It is also interesting that Pearson did not mention that it was Walter Winchell who printed the allegation.)

On January 29 Pearson said, "Secretary of Defense Johnson who doesn't like Acheson, is whispering about that Hiss has something on Acheson and that's why Acheson made his famous statement. I can state, however, that this is not true." Pearson then went on to give the background leading up to Acheson's statement, a background that was later verified by conventional news sources.

HIGH SCORE ON INSIDE TIPS

Pearson has a high score of accurate inside tips. During the study period he revealed that two more scientists were being watched and that more arrests would follow (this was months before the arrest of Harry Gold and Alfred Slack.) In January he accused five New York collectors of internal revenue of taking bribes, and on March 3 the five men were indicted.

Frequently, Pearson broadcasts items that are based on knowledge that cannot be documented by conservative news standards but which carry some weight because of Pearson's reputation for having facts most of the time. He said on January 29 that fellow-prisoners in the Federal penitentiary at Danbury, Conn., were protesting the special privileges given ex-Congressman Parnell Thomas. On February 5 he said that the American Ambassador had demanded that France fire Joliet-Curie, an avowed Communist, as head of the French atomic project. (Later Curie was fired.) On February 12 he said that the FBI is under fire for wiretapping but that most of the tapping is being done by the Army and Navy.

CAN AFFORD TO TAKE CHANCES

Pearson has been able to score many news beats because he could afford to take long chances that ordinary, competent reporters could not afford. For example, by using judgment he can use items picked up at cocktail parties that most correspondents would not dare to use as news. Pearson also has been able to get a beat on other reporters, say correspondents, by violating confidences from time to time.* Other times he obtains news items from interested parties who are willing to reveal inner secrets to a popular commentator for purposes of their own. (A minority Congressman emerging from a conference in which he lost a position might reveal the inside information if it will embarrass the majority for example.)

Pearson has also been accused of sloppy reporting and phony sensationalism. In February he reported shocking conditions in a two-cell, log jail in Taylorville, Ky., where "a 13-year-old runaway boy was locked up * * * for 4 days with a screaming, laughing maniac." A local newspaperman said that the jail was built in 1927, was built of concrete, had four cells, and had not been used for a runaway boy for 7 years. A reporter from the Louisville Courier-Journal wrote that Pearson had learned his facts from one of his legmen who had picked up the information from the recollections of a worker in the United States Children's Bureau. Pearson presented the story as a current condition as reported by the United States Children's Bureau.

BASED ON SHREWD GUESSES

But many of Pearson's items are based merely on shrewd guesses. On February 26 Pearson said he would give a hat to Congressman SMATHERS, then in a primary race against CLAUDE PEPPER for United States Senator from Florida, if SMATHERS could shake hands with President Truman while Truman was in Key West. It would seem not too hard for a Congressman to shake the hand of the President while the Chief Executive is visiting the Congressman's home State, especially with national publicity centered on the handshake. But Pearson knew that Truman preferred to have PEPPER win since PEPPER was a supporter of the Truman program, but could not make overt moves in support of PEPPER because of the delicate civil rights issue in the South. So it was almost a certainty that Truman would not then shake hands with SMATHERS, an admitted enemy of most of Truman's program. A handshake would have given the anti-Truman SMATHERS the Presidential blessing. As far as is known, SMATHERS did not get to shake the President's hand. He lost Pearson's hat but won the election.

Not all of Pearson's shrewd guesses turn out to be right. On April 30 Pearson said that Truman would pay his personal respects to Senator MCCARTHY in MCCARTHY's home town of Madison, Wis. Presumably this was based on the President's itinerary, released the night of Pearson's broadcast. The itinerary included Madison and it was generally assumed the President would use that whistle stop to combat MCCARTHY's attacks. But the President did not refer to MCCARTHY or his charges in the Madison speech.

Any list of Pearson news beats is impressive. Any list of his news flops is impressive. It leaves him in the same position as any commentator who gives the impression of being infallible—since the listener is faced with accepting all the news as infallible he must have serious doubts when any of it fails.

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the first of four articles on Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

The most confident reporter in the Nation's Capitol has been called "probably the most influential man of his profession on Capitol Hill." A former President of the United States called him "lucid, fearless," and a man "of profound importance to all good Americans." A certain Chicago publisher called him a "great reporter," and a west coast businessman said, "No man in our time is so fearlessly on the side of truth, so inspired by God's universal justice."

That man is Fulton Lewis, Jr., whose 15-minute news program each weekday evening from 7 to 7:15 reaches nearly 10,000,000 Americans through 400 radio stations.

A careful analysis of his programs over a 15-week period shows that this tremendous figure in the reporting world in 70 percent of his news programs uttered statements that could be regarded as misleading to the public.

WAR WRITER'S BOARD CRITICAL

That Lewis is not universally accepted as "inspired by God's universal justice" can be seen by the finding of the War Writer's Board, a body composed of professionals such as Clifton Fadiman, Carl Carmer, Franklin Pierce Adams, Rex Stout, Russell Crouse, and others. That board declared that Lewis' wartime news broadcasts constituted "a shockingly isolationist, intolerant and divisive program."

Later, during the 1948 Presidential campaign John Crosby, radio columnist for the New York Herald-Tribune and the Providence Journal-Bulletin, declared: "I think he ought to be recognized as a campaigner, not as a commentator, and his national air time paid for and so listed by the Republican National Committee."

Just last year, Lewis was singled out as an example in a study of "irresponsibility on the air," by Giraud Chester in the Public Opinion Quarterly.

But Lewis seems little bothered by such criticism. He feels that his position as a top-salaried radio commentator was predestined even when he was a Hearst reporter.

"My keen sense of the dramatic and my knowledge of the use of the human voice made it clear even then that broadcasting should be an important part of my professional life," he has said.

VOICE A MAGNIFICENT INSTRUMENT

And he is right. His voice is a magnificent instrument. It has been called the Golden Voice of Reaction. Whatever one's opinion of the words that issue forth, there is no doubt that Lewis' voice is, indeed, golden. It is honey-smooth and confident. It is fully as decisive in its manner as that of H. V. Kaltenborn, but it is much more suave. His delivery is easy going and sincere. Now and then he stops to think of a word; occasionally he seems to make a mistake—"the Alger Hissky, ah, ah, ah, Alger Hiss case." His rich enuciation reminds one of movie actor Carey Grant. He pronounces his own last name, for example, with a sharp distinction between syllables, "lew-ISS."

Lewis' voice is golden in another sense, too. It is a remarkably profitable instrument. Income from his broadcasts alone is in the vicinity of $350,000 a year. The voice was so well thought of that the National Association of Manufacturers was willing to pay him $1,000 each for a series of 50 short broadcasts during the war. During the war he also received a $1,000 award from du Pont for "excellence in news commentary."

His voice is close to being invulnerable. He has enraged thousands, maybe millions. But they cannot reach him, economically.

NO SINGLE SPONSOR

Lewis has no single sponsor. He is carried by Mutual Broadcasting System, a network partly owned by an enthusiastic Lewis admirer, Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune. Mutual pipes the Lewis broadcast to 400 local stations, which, in turn, can sell three available commercial spots in the program to local sponsors. Lewis has 530 of these local sponsors. If the people of one city protest to an advertiser, the advertiser may stop subsidizing Lewis. So then Lewis will have 529 sponsors instead of 530—and the network probably will continue to broadcast the program as a public service.

Some idea of Lewis' independence of the commercial spots on his program can be gained from the broadcast of March 29, when, at least locally, the 30-second spot in the middle of the program was a free commercial for the Bureau of the Census, which ended "Help the census taker by truthfully answering his questions." When Lewis came back on he spent the final 6½ minutes of his program ridiculing the farmers' census.

DEFENSE A STRONG OFFENSE

Lewis must occasionally defend himself against other reporters whose facts disagree with his. This defense usually takes the form of a strong offense. In one such attack during the study period, he prefaced his assault with "Now, ladies and gentlemen, I dislike very much indeed to become involved in any personalities with my reportorial colleagues, however sharply I may disagree with their views. But * * *." A quick survey of the 15-week period shows that Lewis in that time attacked by name or made derogatory remarks about 15 reporters, writers, and radio newscasters.

The 15-week study revealed that more than 70 percent of Lewis' broadcasts could be judged misleading. A random selection shows that Lewis told his listeners:

That President Truman apparently invented some statistics in a congressional message whereas the statistics came from a standard source which was named by the President; that the libel suit of William Remington against Elizabeth Bentley, who called him a Communist, was no different from the libel suit of Alger Hiss against Whittaker Chambers, who called Hiss a Communist, whereas Remington in effect won his suit and Hiss did not; that Mrs. Roosevelt apparently wishes to help Russia to act against the United States, whereas all the known statements and acts of Mrs. Roosevelt point in the other direction; that certain persons removed from Government jobs were fired for disloyalty, whereas they were named only bad risks, an important distinction, since a man with a Communist aunt may be perfectly loyal but a bad risk; that Senator TYDINGS is secretly related to Communist programs, whereas all the known evidence points in the opposite direction; that a former Government official publicly attacked Lewis, whereas Lewis had actually attacked the official; that certain Government publications were "peculiar" and "anonymous" whereas independent authorities agree with the contents and the authors were plainly indicated in the front of the publications.

OTHER WEAPONS, TOO

But Lewis has other weapons, too. One of these is a unique literary invention, known to the trade as Lewisisms. A Lewisism is a word or phrase which draws the life blood out of any other word or phrase near it. Some Lewisisms are "so-called" and "purported," which, without further explanation, tells the listener that the words they modify ar really fraudulent ("I listened with some curiosity last night to a gentleman who purports to be a great factual reporter * * * Mr. Elmer Davis * * * a sample of his so-called factual reporting"); the term "individual" which implies that its object is subhuman; "none other than," which is used to imply that Lewis has just lifted a political rock and found underneath a subversive cockroach; "the same" is used to reintroduce an "individual" who has been previously introduced with a "none other than." Sometimes when Lewis is about to quote an unfriendly sources he merely

giggles before the quotation in order to show that the following statement is not to be taken seriously.

Another weapon in the hands of Lewis is the compound adjective. No piece of legislation that Lewis dislikes can escape the machine-gun fire of hyphenated description. The Brannan plan is one such measure that has been ridiculed. On one occasion during the study period, Lewis declared, "It is the same old program of consumer subsidies which the OPA long-haired, left-wing, star-gazing, mouth-hanging-open, fair-haired boys insisted upon all the way through the war."

Having perforated the Brannan plan supporters with adjectives at close range, Lewis went on a short time later, to castigate President Truman for suggesting in a press conference that a certain woman reporter should write some sympathetic articles about the Brannan plan.

"She might well have answered," said Lewis in a pious defense of unbiased reporting, "that her job is as a reporter and as such it would be entirely unethical of her to work for or against the Brannan plan or any other piece of legislation."

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the second of four articles on Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

Every night on the radio from Monday through Friday, Fulton Lewis, Jr., like the poet Milton, describes a titanic battle between the good angels and the angels of the Devil.

This war of the angels is for control of the social and economic structure of the United States.

Regular listeners to Lewis' "top of the news" come quickly to recognize the good angels and the bad angels, as revealed in the gospel according to Lewis.

Some of Lewis' favorite angels are Senator TAFT, Senator BYRD, Senator MCCARTHY, Senator WHERRY, Senator BRIDGES, Senator HICKENLOOPER, Senator MUNDT (who once called Lewis "the fairest and most accurate news commentator in America"), Representative "CHARLIE" HALLECK, Representative VELDE, and Representative NIXON.

There are also organized squadrons of angels, including such organizations as the Republican National Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee.

DEVILS IN THE STRUGGLE

The devils, on the other hand, include President Truman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Senator Humphrey, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, Secretary of State Acheson, Federal Security Administrator Ewing, former Vice President Henry Wallace, the late Harry Hopkins, Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter, Governor Bowles of Connecticut, Representative Sabath, Wilson Wyatt, Elmer Davis, Drew Pearson, and many others.

The squadrons of devils include such bodies as the Democratic Party, the Americans for Democratic Action, the CIO, and the British Labor Party.

Needless to say, Fulton Lewis, Jr., is on the side of the angels. The list of angels and devils, as a matter of fact, was compiled by a look at the persons and organizations consistently quoted by Lewis with praise (the angels) and the persons and organizations consistently quoted by Lewis with criticism (the devils).

Sometimes devils are elevated to temporary angelhood. Sometimes angels fall from grace.

Since he became an outspoken critic of the late President Roosevelt, James A. Farley has become, according to Lewis on February 17, "probably the best-loved, most-respected high political officeholder, so far as the press is concerned, in the last 20 years."

SUPERLATIVES AWARDED

Similar superlatives have been awarded by Lewis to entire organizations who have qualified for a temporary angelic state by an act pleasing to Lewis. When the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, a nominally Democratic body, voted a criticism of Dean Acheson for his statement on Alger Hiss, Lewis climaxed his critical statements on Acheson on the night of January 27 with:

"The really stunning blow, however, so far as Mr. Acheson is concerned, came when the Mississippi House of Representatives, passed an official resolution of censure against Dean Acheson * * *."

That the lower house of the Mississippi Legislature could deal such a really stunning blow to the Secretary of State probably was never before appreciated by most citizens.

Just as there is some chance for salvation among the devils, by the same token, there is always a danger that an angel might fall. Ordinarily, Senator GURNEY, a Republican from South Dakota, would be safe in Lewis' heaven. GURNEY has a voting record more antiadministration on key issues than his Dakotan partner, Senator MUNDT, or Senator TAFT. He voted against the President's slum-clearance program, the educational finance act, the measure to end injunctions in strikes, and other similar Truman bills. But when an even more conservative angel, Representative FRANCIS CASE, decided he wanted GURNEY'S seat in the Senate, Lewis rushed to CASE'S aid. On February 21 he said CASE would tell the electorate that our national life is in peril from the power-drunk, colorblind, inept and spendthrift leadership. This technique received Lewis approval. It shows, said Lewis, a strong and positive campaign of opposition to administration policy. CASE defeated GURNEY.

TYDINGS FALLS

Another angel who fell from grace was Senator TYDINGS, an economy-minded, conservative Democrat. TYDINGS plummeted out of paradise by appearing skeptical about the recent charges by angel JOSEPH MCCARTHY that there were Communists in the State Department.

The division of angels and devils is important in any understanding of Lewis' reporting technique. A Washington correspondent who has seen Lewis in action for years said that the greatest single reportorial quality of Lewis is his ability to select facts that he agrees with.

One program—that of April 5—was selected at random for an analysis of Lewis' statements for and against his angels. On that night he devoted his broadcast to three main items: (1) The administration agriculture program; (2) the administration budget; (3) the Senate hearings on the charges of communism in the State Department.

On item 1, the agricultural program, Lewis devoted 308 seconds (5 minutes, 8 seconds)—all of it against the program. He quoted all antiprogram sources, such as the Farm Bureau Federation, the National Milk Producers Association, the National Council of Farmers' Cooperatives, and Representative HAROLD COOLEY of North Carolina.

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE SECONDS TO BUDGET

On item 2, the budget, he devoted 225 seconds (3 minutes, 45 seconds), 140 seconds of it quoting Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH against the budget, and almost all the remaining 85 seconds to his own arguments against the budget.

On item 3, the State Department hearings, he covered the session which was the State Department's day in court. All the actual testimony was pro-State Department. Lewis devoted 158 seconds to the entire subject—59 seconds presenting the testimony, 99 seconds to his own attack on the testimony.

The next day, he started with the administration's program for expanded social security. He devoted 45 seconds to explaining the program, 205 seconds to attacking it. On that day it was Owen Lattimore's day in court. He had been accused of being Russia's top espionage agent by Senator MCCARTHY, charges which Lewis had aired at great length. On April 6 Lattimore gave his side of the picture. Lewis devoted 75 seconds to the matter, most of it attacking Lattimore.

On April 20, two persons appeared before the same hearing committee. Louis Budenz, who gave anti-Lattimore testimony, and Brig. Gen. Elliott R. Thorpe, who gave pro-Lattimore testimony. Many leading papers divided the headlines or lead paragraphs of their stories between Budenz and Thorpe. Lewis devoted 20 seconds to Thorpe, and 630 seconds to Budenz.

LOP-SIDED DIVISION

It would be unreasonable for a listener to demand that Lewis divide up his radio time equally between his angels and his devils. but it would be reasonable to expect that the division of time should not be so lopsided as to obscure the facts as they exist. After the recent British elections, for example, Lewis quoted his angels who heralded a Conservative victory and referred to the Labor Party's outcome in the election as a "resounding repudiation by the British people." From such a presentation it would be easy for the average listener to overlook the fact that the Laborites had won the election, though narrowly.

Lewis' devotion to his angels and his hostility toward the devils has produced some useful results. He has, on occasion, combined it with his skill as reporter.

His reportorial skill was first exhibited 2 decades ago when as a reporter for Hearst's now-defunct Universal Service, Lewis uncovered almost single-handedly the air mail contract scandals. It was this favoritism in awarding air mail contracts that led to the Government's disastrous attempt to fly the mail, but the exposure of preferential contract awards was a notable Lewis scoop.

EXPOSED CANOL PROJECT

In recent years Lewis has turned his devil-harassment to some good use. It was his documented criticism which exposed the expensive and abortive Canol oil project. He also disclosed the futile attempts at completing the Latin-American highway, and his constant barbs helped accelerate the synthetic rubber program.

But critics of Lewis have pointed out that his angel-devil standards produce negative effects, as well. They say that while his criticisms sped the synthetic rubber program needed for wartime defense, his bitter denunciation of Roosevelt's armament program before World War II retarded our wartime successes. They also argue with Lewis' method of selecting angels and devils.

What makes a citizen an angel and what makes him a devil, in Fulton Lewis' battle? Lewis makes his political standards pretty plain.

On the day that Lewis announced an increase in FBI funds he said, "That is one increase in Government spending that very few American citizens worthy of the name are going to complain about. And if you find anybody who does complain, look him over carefully and suspiciously."

"GUESS WHO?"

When some Representatives voted against additional funds for the House un-American Activities Committee, he listed the names, ending with "guess who, Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, of California."

Another Lewis yardstick is the attitude toward the United Nations. If a public figure speaks in favor of maintaining the United Nations, he is described by Lewis as "a member of the Russian appeasement group."

Still another indelible blot on a man is to have served the OPA during the war. On

March 28 Lewis reported that Willis Ritter of Utah would run into serious objections in his nomination for a judgeship. "I might mention," said Lewis darkly, "that Mr. Willis Ritter was regional rent director for OPA for the Mountain States during the war."

People who object to wire tapping are also of doubtful loyalty, according to Lewis. On January 19, he told his listeners, "Why should any honest man be worried one way or the other about whether his wire is being tapped? * * * I have nothing to be ashamed of. I am not engaged or involved in any shady or illegal deal. Doesn't worry me in the slightest who listens in on my telephone calls. But if I were a part of an underground movement * * *."

This casting of suspicion on all who object to wire tapping puts the cloud of disloyalty on Attorney General McGrath, who once called wire tapping a violation of civil rights, and members of the United States Supreme Court, who refuse to recognize evidence obtained by wire tapping. But this, presumably, would not bother Lewis. He has indicated from time to time that he is not too sure of those people, either.

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the third of four articles on Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

"My integrity as a reporter had never been questioned before."

In a sense, this statement made by Fulton Lewis, Jr., in 1947, was a reflection on his integrity as a reporter.

Up to that time his integrity as a reporter had been attacked many times. In 1943 a Congressman called him a "hatchet man." In 1945 the War Writers' Board termed his news commentary "intolerant and divisive." And a short time before Lewis made the above statement, the Rev. Wilfred Parsons, then editor of the Catholic magazine, America, had said publicly that Lewis' reporting "could only proceed from some obscure ill will."

SHOULD KNOW FACTS ON SELF

The 15-week study of Lewis broadcasts showed that more than 70 percent of all his programs contained statements that could be regarded as misleading. It is conceivable that he was misinformed about some of the news he reported. But on at least one story, he was reporting the activities of Fulton Lewis, Jr., and it can be assumed that he knew the true facts. On the evening of February 14, Lewis told his audience:

"The garish and lurid scheme of the erstwhile high-pressure Federal Housing Expediter, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, who was going to cure the postwar housing shortage by underwriting a $50,000,000 project of metal prefabricated housing, came to a dim and dingy end of the trail today. You recall, no doubt, the violent and indignant attack which young Mr. Wyatt made against me * * *."

A student of Lewis' reporting integrity might recall that:

1. "The violent and indignant attack which young Mr. Wyatt made against me * * *" was in fact an attack by Lewis against Wyatt. Lewis claimed over the radio that Wyatt's office made a certain decision because of bribery and added, "I have sworn affidavits telling this entire story in detail." An official investigation showed no bribery and—incidentally—that Lewis had no affidavits.

2. Lewis had to issue a public retraction of his attack on Wyatt. The "retraction" was so accusing that four subsequent retractions were necessary, the last being time on Mutual Broadcasting for Wyatt to make his own defense.

ATTACKED WYATT'S JUDGMENT

3. Lewis attacked Wyatt's judgment in recommending that a certain war-surplus factory go to the ill-fated Lustron housing concern. Lewis failed to remind his listeners that his own recommendation was to give the factory to Preston Tucker, "a good, red-blooded American." Tucker is head of a corporation that was to have manufactured a "dream car" for the postwar market, turned out 40 hand-made cars in all the years since the war, was subject to endless litigation, was indicted by the Government for mail fraud and conspiracy and violation of Securities and Exchange Commission regulations. The corporation officers were acquitted of the Federal charge, but the firm is now in Federal bankruptcy.

On other occasions Lewis exercises his favorite device of presenting only those views that he approves of, leaving the listener with the impression that they are the only views in existence.

On January 30 Lewis broadcast from Dallas, Tex., and devoted a large part of his newscast to the effects of lifting rent control in Dallas. These effects have been argued bitterly. But for Lewis listeners there was no dispute. He assured listeners that there had been practically no hardships, that "average rents here in the Dallas area are up 10 to 12 percent." Listeners to Lewis might never have discovered that there was another version of the Dallas housing picture if Lewis had not 12 weeks later given his own unique report on a Presidential message involving Dallas housing. On April 21 Lewis' version of the President's message was:

"In rental units under $30 he [President Truman] said in the city of Dallas, Tex., rents have increased 56 percent. Just where he got that figure is something of a mystery, because the Dallas Times-Herald several months ago made a spot survey to find out what happened to rents in the city since decontrol and came out with the finding of an 11-percent increase. The Bureau of Labor Statistics conducted its own alleged survey and said the increase was 35 percent. Not even he [the man who headed the Government survey], however, suggested anything like the President's figure of today, 56 percent. But there it is, and it looks very frightening and impressive when stated so specifically and authoritatively. If a President of the United States says it, it must be so, presumably."

LISTENERS MIGHT HAVE LEARNED

Listeners whose interest was piqued by the implication that President Truman had invented the figure "56 percent" might have discovered the following:

1. "Just where he got that figure is something of a mystery" was an odd statement for Lewis, the reporter, to make, since part of the President's message was a plain reference to the source.

2. As for the bureau's "alleged survey," it was conducted in Dallas by way of 800 personal interviews in each type of housing by rental rate, income level, and white and nonwhite. The Times-Herald survey was made by 300 telephone calls and it included no Negro housing.

3. "Not even he, however, suggested anything like the President's 56 percent" is also a strange piece of information to give the public, since the President gave the source, which was the March 1950 Monthly Labor Review, volume 70, No. 3. On page 254, table I, entitled "Changes in residential rents, by rent and income group, all units, by city, 1949," is the notation:

"Dallas area average percent increase, 36.1 percent."

The very next line is: "Under $30 a month, 55.6 percent."

ATTACK ON EWING

On another occasion, Lewis' reporting might be ascribed to a fervent devotion to alarming language and a slightly less intense attachment to fact. In describing a meeting of the House Labor Committee in its study of the bill for Federal aid to education, he attacked the Federal Security Administration, which would handle the education program, by an attack on Oscar Ewing, whom he attacked in turn by "revealing" some pamphlets issued by Ewing's agency.

These pamphlets, Lewis reported, "the Federal Security Administration is circulating to parents purporting to advise parents in the sexual handling and education of their children between the ages of 6 and 12, the advice being along ultramodern—and, in the minds of many House Labor Committee members—highly questionable lines. The gist of it was to let the children go their own merry way on certain sex problems and not to deter or even speak to them on certain sex problems for fear of giving the children an inferiority complex. I might interject that another bulletin by the Federal Security Administration, entitled 'Guiding the Adolescent,' goes even further in its advice to the parents in the handling of children above the age of 12."

A nervous listener could easily get the impression that the Federal Security Administration is conducting a correspondence course in sex mania—unless the listener examined the pamphlets themselves.

MOST "STARTLING" PASSAGE

Selecting the most startling passages from Your Child From Six to Twelve, one finds this passage about sex play in small children:

"It is often better to say nothing whatever to the children, for fear of saying too much, or the wrong thing. Instead, divert their minds, give them new interests. Wholesome attitudes toward sex are not built up by making a child feel that his interest in his body is something dirty or bad."

The pamphlet, Guiding the Adolescent, contains on page 11, what Lewis termed this "highly questionable" line:

"* * * more real harm may come from the worry, anxiety, fear, and feeling of guilt and inferiority caused by unwise efforts on the part of the parents to prevent or stop an undesirable sex practice than the practice itself. This does not mean that the subject should be permitted to go on without parental intervention. It does indicate, however, that sex instruction should be frank, honest, and in keeping with the facts."

Lewis apparently believed that "This does not mean that the subject should be permitted to go on * * *" is telling parents "to let the children go their own merry way."

Lewis then concluded his dissertation: "The head of the Federal Security Administration is none other than Mr. Oscar Ewing, our old friend. * * * But the question that was brought up (about policies of the proposed Federal aid to education) * * * whether Mr. Ewing, perhaps under the guidance of the anonymous individuals who wrote these peculiar pamphlets, will be dictating these policies."

PAMPHLETS NOT ANONYMOUS

Not only has Lewis assured his listeners that the pamphlets are peculiar but now that they are anonymous.

Your Child From Six to Twelve is prefaced:

"This bulletin was written by Mrs. Marion L. Faegre under the direction of Dr. Katherine Bain, director of the division of research in child development."

The preface to Guiding the Adolescent declares:

"The principles underlying the guiding of adolescent children have remained the same since this bulletin was written for the Children's Bureau in 1933 by Dr. Douglas A. Thom, director of the Habit Clinic for Child Guidance, of Boston."

One can only gather that (1) Lewis does not know the meaning of "anonymous"; or (2) he did not bother to look at the pamphlets before he told 10,000,000 people they

were "peculiar" and "anonymous"; or (3) he read the books and deliberately misled his audience.

Perhaps the high point in Lewis' recent reporting career was reached in Lewis' accounts of a story he had created himself. This was the now-famous "bomb powder plot." On the night of December 2, 1949, and subsequent nights Lewis unfolded a story of the shipping of secret atomic materials and information to Russia during the war, a story involving treachery in high places. The story was launched when Lewis introduced one George Racey Jordan to his radio audience and vouched for the story Jordan told.

THROUGH LEND-LEASE AIR BASE

Lewis and Jordan said that the Russians spirited uranium compounds, or "bomb powder," heavy water, atomic blueprints, and other secrets through the lend-lease air base at Great Falls, Mont., where Major Jordan was stationed in 1943. They added that Harry Hopkins, President Roosevelt's most trusted aide, had conspired to arrange these shipments in violation of the country's security regulations. They made similar charges against Henry Wallace, then Vice President.

A congressional investigation was started at once. The hearings showed that the uranium shipments were of negligible quantities as far as an atom bomb was concerned, that all the shipments were approved by the proper authorities at the time, that Hopkins and Wallace had nothing to do with the shipments.

As this information came out, Lewis each night assured his listeners that his story was being proved. Actually, the majority of the House Un-American Activities Committee, the investigating body, consistently made public statements ridiculing the story.

An example of Lewis' reporting accuracy of these hearings is the account on the night of March 2 after the committee investigator, Donald T. Appell, told the results of an exhaustive probe of Jordan's claim that he had made many reports on the alleged secret shipments and that he had seen numerous high officials in Washington about the alleged treachery.

NEVER MENTIONED IT

Appell said that the superior officer that Lewis spoke to every day during the period in question said Jordan never mentioned uranium compounds, atomic plans, Harry Hopkins or any of the story that the major and Lewis broke 6 years later. Appell also said that the two high officials in Washington that Jordan said he had seen during the war about the bomb powder shipment, said they had never seen or heard of Jordan during that period.

The committee counsel then asked what about Major Jordan's warnings to high officials after the war? Appell replied:

"The records show that after Major Jordan was out of the service, he went to the State Department, and in the memorandum there, he reported some Russian pilots bringing furs into the United States without paying duty."

Reported Fulton Lewis, Jr., that night.

"Mr. Donald Appell produced 2 hours of documentation and affidavits substantiating to about 98 percent the story of Maj. George Racey Jordan * * * the 2-hour testimony was a mass of documented substantiation of the Jordan story. Mr. Appell blasted to bits the attempted criticism of Jordan that he should have reported at the time as to what was going through—did so by showing records showing a succession of such reports."

That was Fulton Lewis, Jr., reporting on his own biggest story of the year.

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the last of four articles on Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

Fulton Lewis, Jr., the personable commentator who broadcasts the news to 10,000,000 Americans every weekday, has been credited with a number of impressive projects. He is said to have been instrumental in killing the wartime OPA program, of paving the way for David Lilienthal to leave Government service, and of managing to cast a cloud of treason over a former Vice President of the United States.

But Lewis has now undertaken what must be regarded as the most impressive project of his career—the destruction of the United Nations.

This is not to intimate that Lewis is capable of dismantling the international organization single-handed. But his activities in the present campaign to disband the United Nations are a good example of Lewis' peculiar role in the task of bringing information to the public.

CITES REDS' PRESENCE IN UNITED NATIONS

Lewis began his jibes at the United Nations during the study period in what was, for him, a mild enough manner. On February 8, for example, he was able to limit himself to a remark that a known Communist was a member of a subcommittee of the UN, under the kindly protection and good offices of United Nations credentials."

In all his subsequent attacks on the United Nations, Lewis apparently looked upon it as a strictly American institution, an arbitration service to which no one who disagreed should be admitted.

On March 13 he objected to the United States paying anything toward the United Nations since the United Nations does not close its doors to those opposed to this country. "What a goofy set-up that is, when you come down to it. And what a monumental collection of suckers we are."

On April 14 he increased his fire. Talking of the case of the lost Navy privateer in the Baltic, he said, "It is destined to go before the United Nations, but with the appeasement and mollycoddling of the Soviet Union since the beginning of the United Nations, nothing can come of it. There at Lake Success they deliberate and discuss, discuss and deliberate, and then deliberate and discuss some more. And it's all very pious and all very polite. But nothing ever gets accomplished, and if it were to be accomplished there is no way to effectuate it.

SEES PROTECTION FOR SOVIET

"The truth is, and this is an excellent and forceful demonstration of the fact, that not only is the United Nations Organization as it is presently constituted, not solving any international problems, but it actually is serving as a protective blanket for the Soviet Union to do whatever it wishes to do in its ruthless and reckless campaign of world piracy. As long as the United Nations Organization exists, the participating powers have to attempt to use it, a completely impotent implement, to try to settle their difficulty. And as long as Russia knows that she has no fear of retaliation or any reprisals from anybody, regardless of what she does. Think it over. It's worth thinking about.

"That's the top of the news as it looks from here."

An examination of this line of discourse by Lewis would impress one first of all, with the factual disputes involved. 1. The United Nations has accomplished a number of useful functions since the war; 2. Russia has a fear of retaliation since she must face the nations of the world at the UN for what she does; 3. the participating nations are not impotent to settle their own problems, as witness, the Marshall plan, the Greek-Turkish aid, the Atlantic Pact, the Economic Cooperation Administration, the military-aid program, etc.

What a student of Fulton Lewis, Jr., would notice most, however, is the familiar Lewis strategy of building up a subject with increasing intensity, to have the build-up climaxed with a major move by a well-known public figure. Lewis did just this, for example, in the campaign against David Lilienthal that ended with Senator HICKENLOOPER'S statement of incredible mismanagement in the Atomic Energy Commission. In the case of the United Nations, one sees similar possibilities.

FORMIDABLE PERSONAL RELATIONS

Lewis has formidable personal relations to bring to bear. In 1930 he married Alice Huston, daughter of the chairman of the Republican National Committee at the time. President Herbert Hoover sent a silver salad bowl to the couple, and later became personal friends with the couple. Not long ago, Hoover said of Lewis: "His lucid, fearless, and exhaustive examinations of the vital issues of our time are of profound importance to all good Americans."

In the early spring, however, an observer would have to move carefully along the premise that Lewis' new attack on the United Nations had anything to do with a high-level political campaign. It would hardly do to fall into the same guilt-by-association thinking that Lewis practices.

By April 25, Lewis had uttered strong statements against the idea of the United Nations with increasing frequency. On the 25th, the fifth anniversary of the San Francisco conference where the United Nations was created, Lewis said, "It all looked very glamorous and promising then, or we said it did * * * we were very palsy-walsy with the Communist Russians under the friendly aegis of Mr. Alger Hiss' direction and management. * * * There were a few who were skeptical. * * * In looking back, if it has served any purpose at all, the result has been to help Russia in what Russia has done. The nations which hight have taken individual action or even collective action cannot do so and could not do so because such action is supposed to be the sole province and prerogative and responsibility of the United Nations."

REVERSE OF THE FACTS

Again, an observer would assume that Lewis had either not read the Charter of the UN nor any news about the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, the Greek-Turkish aid program; or else he decided to tell his audience the reverse of the facts.

The next day, Lewis again returned to the United Nations.

"I might suggest that you be on the lookout for a speech tomorrow night which I understand will be carried by some of the networks, a speech by former President Herbert Hoover on international policy, because I personally have seen an advance copy of that address and it really is of major importance. He proposes some new approaches on the international picture that make a lot of sense in my language and, I suspect, will make a lot of sense in yours. That's the top of the news as it looks from here."

In his next broadcast after Herbert Hoover proposed to kick out Russia and the iron-curtain countries from the United Nations, Lewis, having prepared the way with 10,000,000 listeners, moved to the next phase in a typical Lewis program—destruction of the opposition.

BRANDS FOES APPEASERS

After discussing the Hoover proposals, he said:

"It soon became rather evident that the latter proposals rests very poorly, indeed, with the Russian appeasement group because they hastened to express their criticism at once. And it might be injected here that this issue constitutes a very illuminating selective test as to just where certain impor-

tant people stand. Whether they are Russian appeasers secretly feeling that the Soviet Union is all right and the present trouble will all blow over or whether they have the facts realistically. So count them: Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt * * * apparently the lady seems to think that with the Russians having gobbled up nearly half the world under the very noses of the United Nations organization in the past 5 years of its existence and that organization having been completely impotent to do anything about it * * * prefers to have it remain ineffective and unworkable, thus enabling Russia to continue to gobble up the world unmolested and unhampered * * *."

Others who issued statements disagreeing with Hoover were John Foster Dulles, former Senator Sherman Cooper, and Assistant Secretary of State John D. Hickerson.

Having assumed for his 10,000,000 listeners that Mrs. Roosevelt wishes to help Russia gobble up the world and having placed such bitter foes of Russia as Republican John Foster Dulles into the Russian appeasement group, the golden voice of Fulton Lewis, Jr., was able to conclude his program with the usual:

"And that's the top of the news as it looks from here."

Since then certain highly placed political figures have started a campaign to disband the United Nations, some of them repeating terms and phrases used by Lewis 3 months ago.

Next: Westbrook Pegler and the Gravestone.

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the first of four articles on Westbrook Pegler.)

Westbrook James Pegler writes a newspaper column that is read each day, according to the Hearst syndicate that owns the column, by 45,000,000 Americans. This column is called Fair Enough in some papers but in others, As Pegler Sees It.

The syndicate estimates its figure on the basis that the two-hundred-odd newspapers that print Pegler in this country have a combined circulation of 15,000,000 and that at least three persons read each of the 15,000,000 newspapers sold, and all of the readers follow Pegler.

If that is so, then on January 13 some 45,000,000 Americans—approximately all those who vote in Presidential elections—had their attention held to some eight-hundred-odd words, for about 4 minutes, of violent attack by Pegler on 10 words from a book written by a physician. At first glance the 10 words would not seem to warrant 180,000,000 reader-minutes or rage. The 10 words were:

"At Harvard he rowed on the crew and played football."

BEGINS TO HAVE MEANING

But at second glance, and at careful glances made during a recent 15-day study of Pegler's printed words, the attack on those 10 words begins to have some meaning.

For the "he" in the above sentence refers to the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In the 15 weeks of the study, ex-sports-writer Pegler wrote 72 daily columns. Of these 72 columns, 33 (or 45 percent) of them were devoted entirely to attacks on Roosevelts, dead and alive. Of the remainder, some 23, or 32 percent, were attacks on the Truman administration (which Pegler blames on F. D. R.); 10 columns, or 14 percent, were devoted to attacks on unionism (which Pegler also blames on F. D. R.); and the remaining six columns were on miscellaneous items.

The miscellaneous six were not without some significance. One was an attack on Marshall Field, whom Pegler accuses of being sympathetic to Roosevelt. Another was on the State of Arizona were Pegler lives half the year—"there are few foreigners in Arizona," he said—and in which he suggested that officers of the Phelps-Dodge Copper Corp. should take over the government of the State. Another was a whimsical piece against the mixed cocktail in which Roosevelt was attacked for only one paragraph. Another was an 800-word denunciation of Charlie Chaplin as "a detestable alien guttersnipe who had four wives, three of them just kids, and, in his nasty senility seduced another young American girl, got her pregnant and had her run out of town." This same column also attacked the Atlantic Monthly for printing an article about Chaplin, which article, said Pegler, was evidence that the magazine's stately old character has been modified by strong but undeclared political inclinations. One column was an enthusiastic campaign plug for Vivien Kellems, the Connecticut woman manufacturer who is running for GOP nomination for United States Senator. And the last miscellaneous column was on the sanctity of the marriage ceremony.

CAN'T RESIST OCCASIONAL JABS

Even when Pegler is in his miscellaneous columns, he cannot resist occasional jabs at the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt. A psychologist might regard this as an obsessive trait. If it is an obsession, Pegler pursues it with the required energy, willing to find a Roosevelt error in little things and great things alike. In the study period, Pegler addressed himself to proving that Roosevelt was a traitor to his country, a somewhat effeminate mama's boy, and at the same time, an unfaithful husband with a secret attachment to another woman.

First, Pegler takes the historical view. He asserts in his column of January 24 that the recognition of Russia in 1933 was an act of treason. "The original culprit in this historic calamity," he wrote, "wrought by a combination of recklessness, vanity, and treachery, was Franklin D. Roosevelt, who recognized Soviet Russia and built up her power when it was plain that only Russia could profit from this mistake. It was more tragic than any defeat that we have ever suffered in battle. It was worse because it was wrought by a vain, willful man."

OVERLOOKED 16 YEARS

Without examining Pegler's opinion of the character and personality of the late President, students of recent history might regret that Pegler overlooked the fact that Soviet Russia had existed some 16 years without United States recognition and that every major power in Europe had recognized Russia 8 years before the United States.

Nevertheless, the next day Pegler returned to the theme, declaring: "The decline of the United States dates from December 5, 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt 'recognized' Soviet Russia." It would be unfair to call Pegler a Marxist simply because he agrees with the Communists that capitalist old America is in a decline. But even Pegler might be taken aback by the fact that he missed a chance to add 19 days to Roosevelt's guilt. The United States recognized Russia not on December 5, 1933, but on November 16.

Part of the Roosevelt treachery, according to Pegler, was a carefully laid plan to ruin the Constitution and to place Moscow agents in key Government positions. On January 28, Pegler declared: "There is absolutely no doubt that Roosevelt did permit Communists to filter into the Government, well knowing, for he was an all-wise leader, that communism was fundamentally hostile to the American Constitution which he was sworn to uphold."

TIME FOR SMALLER MATTERS

While not neglecting the major strokes of history, Pegler does find time for smaller matters. In probing the cosmic significance of "At Harvard he rowed on the crew and played football"—words written by Dr. Ross T. McIntire in his book, "White House Physician"—Pegler says, "I cannot offer to say whether the misleading statement was deliberate or innocent, Roosevelt was a mama's boy * * * and did not take part in the rough-and-tumble of body contact sports * * * Roosevelt did not row on the crew at Harvard and there is no record in the archives of the Harvard Athletic Association of his participation."

Many of the people that read this particular column must have voted for Franklin Roosevelt a few times and it might have troubled some of them that the man they elected to be thirty-first President of the United States was not on the crew at Harvard. For such conscientious readers, there is relief. The Harvard Athletic Association did tell Pegler that young Roosevelt rowed on several house crews, though not on the varsity. And though there is no record of F. D. R. playing football at Harvard, there is this letter he wrote to his mother, 51 years ago, when he was a 17-year-old boy at Groton:

"We played football all afternoon * * * as it is the last line-up before the game. * * * I got both knees banged again and my head cracked, but very hot water and massage took down the swelling * * *. Mr. Sturgis has been made a first substitute so I now fill his place at halfback, having been moved there from end * * *."

MAY SEE HOLY MISSION FOR SELF

It would be unkind and probably untrue to suggest that Pegler carries on such a virulent campaign as a mere commercial enterprise that pays him an estimated $90,000 a year. It is more likely that Pegler believes himself on a holy mission. He seems to feel that Franklin D. Roosevelt was not only a traitor while masquerading as President of the United States, but that he planned to extend his treachery beyond his death by keeping his memory alive. Pegler believes that all respect to the dead President is part of his plot to promote Roosevelt's memory. Any statement that is complimentary to Roosevelt becomes part of the plot to destroy the United States, another stone wickedly placed in the treacherous temple to Roosevelt's memory.

Consequently, Pegler spends much of his time—and most of his writing—trying to batter down the temple. In his attempt he examines microscopically the entire life of Roosevelt and his heirs. The temple is a terrible challenge. Pegler's ambition is to see that temple reduced to powder. If he should spy just one stone upon another (at Harvard he rowed on the crew and played football) Pegler hurls himself at the tiny construction, pounds it with his fists, kicks it with his feet, stamps on it passionately, and, in the end, stops only to catch his breath, panting and perspiring, as he stares at the imagined rubble.

DISTRUST OF DEMOCRACY

It is not clear whether Pegler's hatred of the Roosevelts began with a distrust of democracy or whether he went from hating F. D. R. to hating the democratic forms of government. In either case, Pegler has traveled almost the entire distance. On February 7 he wrote in his column:

"Democracy has tried to corrupt the Republic and substitute emotional popular rule by means of initiative and referendum."

Last year he told a congressional committee:

"I am not interested in democracy, except to oppose it."

This growing dislike of democracy has brought him against the political institutions of his country. On February 8 he wrote:

"Instead of saying, 'Democracy is no good, so to hell with it,' this Republican organization goes wheedling for votes with promises of modified democracy."

He thinks Democrats are unspeakable. He refers to the "Marxian organization called Americans for Democratic Action." And he writes, "We have even more prominent Communist Republicans."

Pegler has his political heroes. He persistently boosts the cause and candidacy of Vivien Kellems, the Connecticut woman manufacturer who has been in the headlines for refusing to pay the Government withholding taxes for her employees.

GERALD L. K. SMITH A HERO

Another Pegler hero is Gerald L. K. Smith, the anti-Catholic, anti-Negro, anti-Semitic propagandist. Pegler, though a devout Roman Catholic himself, has said he would like to raise Smith to a dominant position in American broadcasting. Pegler at one time advocated revival of the Ku Klux Klan.

As a leader in the hate-Roosevelt cult, Pegler is regarded as a man of many talents, bringing both scorn and wit as sledges on the temple. He has termed Roosevelt a "culprit," "a ghastly betrayer," and "conniver." In scorn he wrote on March 17: "Some Democrats say it is terrible to say such things about a crook because the crook is dead." Examples of Pegler's humor are his titles for the dead President, "the late Mahatma" and "Emperor Moosejaw I." Another instance of the Pegler humor is his reference to Roosevelt when the President was dying after the trip to Yalta, "a feeble Fuehrer with one foot in the grave."

At Roosevelt's family home at Hyde Park, in a backyard garden, there is a grave with a plain headstone bearing the inscription: Franklin Delano Roosevelt, 1882–1945.

On April 22 of this year, 10 days after the fifth anniversary of Franklin Roosevelt's death, Pegler admitted in print that he looks forward to the day when someone will mark up that grave. In his column for that day Pegler wrote:

"In the 5 years since the death of Roosevelt, great progress has been made to discredit him, his wife and those of his progeny who have, with characteristic effrontery, continued to trim suckers in their old man's name, to exploit his grave as a pitchman ballyhoos an embalmed whale. * * * The day will come when patriots will profane the core of the Hyde Park honkatonk."

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the second of four articles on Westbrook Pegler.)

One of the major themes in any collection of recent Pegler columns is sex.

It is appropriate that Pegler during the 15 weeks that his column was studied, officiated at the marriage of his primary literary obsession, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and what may be his second, sex. He did this by the ingenious method of dealing with the sex life of the Roosevelts.

Pegler accomplished this nice combination by asserting that Franklin D. Roosevelt had a romantic attachment for another woman and, having described an allegedly unfaithful husband, went on to assert that his wife, Eleanor Roosevelt, had a romantic attachment for another man.

SEES "STAIN OF GUILT"

Of F. D. R.'s alleged extra-marital love interest, Pegler wrote on April 4: "The relationship was not platonic. The very fact that the widow and other beholden people * * * concealed her presence put the stain of guilt on the situation."

Pegler, who can see a stain of guilt faster than any man alive, refers to the presence in the cottage at Warm Springs, Ga., at the time of Roosevelt's death, of the late Mrs. Winthrop Rutherford, then aged 53. Pegler bases his expose on the mention of Mrs. Rutherford's presence at Warm Springs in a book by Grace Tully, Roosevelt's secretary.

Why Pegler assumes that there was an illicit connection is never made clear. Grace Tully refers to Mrs. Rutherford as "a saintly old lady." When Roosevelt died he was having his portrait painted. Mrs. Rutherford commissioned the painting and presumably was in Warm Springs to observe its progress.

Pegler began his F. D. R.-Rutherford affair in 1949, carried it on through the study period, and soon referred to it as established fact.

FOUND "FRIEND FOR ELEANOR"

Having consigned F. D. R. to sexual sin, Pegler then proceeded to find a romantic friend for Eleanor Roosevelt. For 3 days during the study period Pegler told millions of Americans in unmistakable innuendo that Mrs. Roosevelt had an extra-marital attachment for a former New York State policeman, Earl Miller, who had been a bodyguard for Roosevelt when F. D. R. was still Governor of New York and who became a friend of the family. At no time did Pegler say outright that Mrs. Roosevelt was unfaithful to her husband. But after nearly 3,000 words of innuendo, he concluded that he still wasn't able to see the meaning of his "evidence" of the Earl Miller-Eleanor Roosevelt affair. "I have wracked my brain to the bone," Pegler writes, possibly with an eye for libel, "but the answer eludes me, although sometimes I think it is almost within my grasp."

What is the basis for Pegler's theory? He made the startling discovery that a rock crystal vase that had belonged to the President's mother, Mrs. James Roosevelt, was given, after Mrs. James Roosevelt's death, to Earl Miller. As a conclusive piece of evidence, Pegler says, "Eleanor Roosevelt mentions Miller three times in her book. She says he gave her his horse, Dot, when they left Albany for Washington, and confirms the fact that 'when Franklin left Albany Earl Miller went into the department of correction and became personnel director.'" This was plain evidence—from Mrs. Roosevelt herself—to Pegler that Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Miller were up to some damnable business. When Miller and his second wife started divorce proceedings and, apparently, some friends of the Roosevelt family tried to patch things up, Pegler also saw a sinister clue to the "affair."

NAMED POLETTI

One of the people who Pegler said intervened was Charles Poletti, one-time lieutenant governor of New York, or as Pegler put it, "a former henchman of the Hillman-LaGuardia machine which worked in congenial partnership with the Communists, and a corps d'elite of uptown latinos and ghibonnes, meaning gorillas."

Thus, Pegler wound up Franklin Roosevelt and Eleanor Roosevelt in the traps of sin and, for good measure, tossed a former lieutenant governor of New York into a congenial partnership with Communists, had the presence of mind to wallop the corpses of Sidney Hillman and Fiorello LaGuardia, and got in a few licks at his hated "foreigners."

Pegler would not want to be accused of having a dirty mind or a petty one. He saw history in his speculations on the sex life of the Roosevelts. On March 3 he wrote:

"It was dramatic, historic news that Mussolini died with his girl friend. It was good American journalism to print pictures of them hung heads down like beeves. By what standards would it be wrong, then, to prove that Roosevelt's widow, the Secret Service, and the White House suppressed the fact that Roosevelt's old flame was with him when he collapsed, whereas his wife was hundreds of miles away, as usual?"

FINDS HER DISQUALIFIED FOR UN

At about the time that Pegler was airing his thoughts about the sex life of Franklin Roosevelt, the Journal-American, the New York outlet for Pegler's column, began a serialized version of Eleanor Roosevelt's memoirs, dealing with her husband's last days. Aside from the fact that Pegler had lived to see the day when a solid Hearst paper like the Journal-American would print Mrs. Roosevelt on page 1 and Westbrook Pegler on page 3, this series by Eleanor Roosevelt had tremendous significance. According to Pegler, it disqualified Mrs. Roosevelt as a representative of the United States to the United Nations.

The reasoning behind this assertion by Pegler was that Pegler had claimed that Mrs. Roosevelt's dead husband had had an affair with another woman. Pegler dared Mrs. Roosevelt to admit this story. Eleanor Roosevelt, as part of an old policy toward Pegler, did not even acknowledge the Pegler dare. Therefore, Mrs. Roosevelt should be kicked out of the United Nations. Explained Pegler on February 10:

"Accumulated proof of her intentional withholding of material information from writings sold to the public as truthful historical background renders Eleanor Roosevelt inappropriate to represent the United States of America in any parliament of the world. She gave the clients shortweight in denying them the truth about the scene at Warm Springs when her husband collapsed in the presence of a woman who had been for many years the third person in a triangle. She (Eleanor Roosevelt) should get out, be honored with eclat or, failing either of these painless escapes, kicked out for the good of the United States."

Reminded by the phrase, "withholding of material information from writings sold to the public as truthful," some gullible reader might wonder why Pegler did not at that instance tell the public to whom he sold this story that this other woman was present at a portrait painting for which she was paying.

TURNS ON OTHER ENEMIES

Having used sex to guarantee Franklin Roosevelt's residence in perdition and wielding it to oust Mrs. Roosevelt from the United Nations, Pegler then turned sex onto other enemies, such as Dean Acheson.

In the midst of the study period, the State Department released the information that 91 employees had been discharged for homosexualism on the basis that homosexuals are peculiarly vulnerable to blackmail and therefore poor security risks.

Pegler had used the homosexual theme before. A favorite device is to describe enemies as flouncing and pouting in plain reference to effeminacy even when the men described are unquestionably masculine. But the State Department's discharge of the 91 gave new impetus to Pegler.

With an intensity that must have surprised even hardened Pegler students, the old master dug up a casual reference in an interview on the radio with Mrs. Roosevelt. Said the gleeful Pegler on March 25:

"In the light of the disclosure of the 91, it is not cynicism to wonder whether the Empress Eleanor was being naive or imposing on the naïveté of the public when she said on the air that she always had lots of queer friends. She certainly is a woman of the world and, some of her associates considered, can hardly expect to be regarded as an ignoramus on such matters. Queer was right."

RETURNS TO REFERENCE

Though few would assume that Mrs. Roosevelt was using the vulgar term for homosexual when she talked about "queer friends" on her radio interview, this was a reference that Pegler ultimately returned to as an admission by Mrs. Roosevelt that she was involved in extra-marital romantic affairs.

As far as the State Department was concerned, Pegler was scandalized. He struck at the complacency of the Sate Department over the presence of homosexuals. He pointed out that this compared poorly with the vigilance of Adolf Hitler who shot his old friend, Captain Roehm, when Roehm was accused of homosexualism. That Hitler shot Roehm for strictly nonsexual reasons, and that many persons would not regard the firing of 91 men as complacency, did not deter Pegler.

Pegler reached his high point in two funny columns, one an open letter to Dean Acheson, the other a poem about the girls in the State Department. In these columns Pegler used all the printable vulgar terms for homosexual—and a few that most newspapers had previously regarded as unprintable. This adventure into the field of taste was presented as a magnificent comic gesture by Pegler, who two weeks later said in an outrage at some Supreme Court and other officials: "Vulgarity and bad manners, even bad morals, were preferred to honor, decorum, and propriety by the spiritually unwashed."

In column after column, Westbrook Pegler, champion of honor, decorum, and propriety, kept his mind glued to the subject of homosexualism. In no other place in the country, he said of the State Department, is there such a collection of homosexuals, "with the possible exception of the bevy known as Q Section in the Pentagon." This mysterious reference was transferred later on to "Q Section of Welfare Island and other cesspools of depravity."

NEVER CITED NATIONAL RATE

At no time did Pegler bother to tell his readers that the known rate for homosexualism in the general population is 4 percent for confirmed homosexuals, and as high as 50 percent for occasional homosexual outlets for older bachelors. Using the more conservative figure of 4 percent, the State Department with 5,000 permanent Washington employees, has a rate of less than 2 percent. Thus it has only half as many homosexuals as the general population and it can now be accused of excessive masculinity.

Perhaps the most revealing reaction to sex that Pegler made during the study period was his blast at a reference to the Kinsey report. In a book about the first Kinsey report, Morris L. Ernst and David Loth say that one reason that there is a wide difference between the laws regarding sex and the sexual practices of people in general is that laws are frequently made or influenced by those who know little about normal sex. "Celibates have been the most dogmatic expounders of the normal and the moral in sexual behavior," the authors wrote.

When Pegler read the Ernst-Loth statement about celibates, he exploded in print:

"Who, then, however, would Mr. Ernst prefer—prostitutes, homosexuals, and other perverts as arbiters of sexual behavior."

Pegler, who is often praised by admirers as a man who can sure use the English language, apparently assumed that celibate is the opposite of "prostitutes, homosexuals, and other perverts," and was not aware, possibly, that every normally married person is a noncelibate.

If Pegler had continued his reading of the book on the Kinsey report he would have found on page 48, on the seventh line, the following sentence:

"Lewdness, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder."

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. This is the third of four articles on Westbrook Pegler.)

"I abhor exaggeration in journalism."

This pronouncement was made by Westbrook Pegler in his newspaper column for January 19.

Thus instructed, a reporter combed Pegler's columns for 15 weeks, looking for practical demonstrations of this admirable concept.

One such demonstration was:

"The Department of Labor is a colossal fraud performing no useful service for the whole public, but, on the contrary, serving only the unions and the racketeers to the public injury."

It is to be regretted that Pegler did not document this unexaggerated statement, since many of the millions who read it may remember only that the Department of Labor as a part of its duties produces statistics on the number of people employed and unemployed in the country, keeps a file of all labor contracts to which management and labor both have access, issues a quarterly survey of industrial accidents and monthly data on building activity, conducts the United States Employment Service and a conciliation service to reduce strikes. And Pegler missed a chance to be valuable to the financial and industrial system of the Nation which gears its operations in part to the statistics of the "colossal fraud performing no useful service."

ANOTHER LESSON

Another lesson by Pegler in how to avoid exaggeration in journalism came as a result of an incident in President Truman's inaugural ceremonies. The incident was reported by the Associated Press on January 21 in a description of the parade that passed the President's stand. "But there was barely a smile on the Presidential lips when Gov. J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina rode past. Thurmond was the States' Rights Party candidate for President."

On February 24, presumably after waiting a month to let his feelings cool down to the point where he would commit none of the abhorrent exaggerations, Pegler wrote:

"This was beyond challenge the dirtiest piece of personal business done by any President in modern times, as cowardly as well, because the same affront as a private citizen to another's wife would have got him a damn good licking on the spot. The guttersnipe in this fellow is irrepressible, as he proved. A few of Truman's partisans, being naturally without honor, tried to lie away the incident, but a thousand witnesses had seen him stare with cold malice at the Thurmonds, with never a twitch of recognition."

His horror at exaggeration presumably was still at work when Pegler on March 10 described for his readers the wartime powers created by Roosevelt and espoused by the present administration. Those powers, he said, provided that "any newspaper or press association, any radio station, any great or little business could be seized by the Army, as Montgomery Ward was, on the ground that any Communist members of any union had been kicked out for sabotage by a foreman with a son dead on Guadalcanal."

MEANING NOT CLEAR

It is not clear here whether Pegler means that the Communist members of any union would be kicked out because a foreman with a son dead on Guadalcanal had committed sabotage or whether the Communists did the sabotage and the foreman with a son kicked them out. Neither is it clear under what NLRB provision the Government can seize a plant "on the ground that any Communist member of any union had been kicked out for sabotage by a foreman with a son dead on Guadalcanal." But what is of interest at this point is that if this explanation of the Montgomery Ward case by Pegler is not an exaggeration, then the newspapers of the Nation carried an erroneous story at the time. The version of the story told to the public then was that during the war 1,000 Ward workers went on strike at the Chicago plant of the firm. Because their production was vital to the war effort, the Government ordered them back with the agreement that the dispute would be arbitrated. The workers obeyed and went back, the issues were arbitrated, but then Sewell Avery, head of Ward's, refused to abide by the arbitration and his plant was seized.

On April 14, in another example of Pegler reserve, the column contained an attack on the Luce magazines, Time and Life, declaring: "Time is more harmonious with the Henry Wallace wing of the Democratic Party than with Republican principles." This could have confused those Pegler readers who remembered that during the campaign Time carried a cover of Wallace showing him as a Pied Piper leading his party, members of which were, by unmistakable implication, rats. Possibly Pegler saw an implication that escaped Time in portraying Wallace as a Pied Piper who, according to legend, was a public benefactor deliberately leading the pack to their doom. But Time's story of Wallace declared: "He has not been a man distinguished for moral courage * * *, a weak leader driven by ambition * * *." This was, said Pegler, a harmonious relationship.

STANDARDS HAVE CHANGED

Pegler's journalistic standards have changed over the years, according to people who have followed the volatile columnist for the last 17 years. In 1933 Pegler was a sports writer when Monte Bourjaily, a syndicate executive, persuaded Pegler, then one of the most colorful sports writers in the business, to turn his attention to world affairs.

For many years Pegler brought his strong language and militant skepticism to the general news. In many columns he also brought good reporting and persistent investigation. In the late thirties, with the help of a rival union, Pegler exposed Willie Bioff, the west coast racketeer who was running Hollywood unions. In 1940 Pegler won the Pulitzer Prize for a series of articles exposing the president of the Buliding Service Employees International Union, AFL. The then-president, George Scalise, fell before the factual reporting of Pegler and was sent to jail.

But somewhere along the line, Pegler who used to announce himself as a friend of labor and who even used to print admiring phrases about Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt became embittered both about American unions and American politics. By 1950, when this study was made, he devoted himself almost entirely to the free use of epithet to attack entire institutions. In this way, Pegler, who used to take pride in his ability to dig out facts like a good reporter, began to replace the hard facts with colorful figures of speech. But apparently he still regards his own figures of speech as factual reporting.

AMAZED AT LYNCHING FUSS

Twenty-seven days after Pegler announced, "I abhor exaggeration in journalism," he wrote a column in which he expressed amazement that there should be so much fuss about lynching down South. For every Negro lynched in the South, he said, "union murderers under the Truman party's political protection have killed 100 and mobbed 1,000 innocent citizens in wild insurrections across the Northern tier and in bloody California."

If this is a conservative ratio, then Pegler has unearthed a story warranting another Pulitzer prize. He refers to 100 union murders per lynching under the protection of

"Truman party's political protection," meaning presumably the Democratic Party. Taking just the first year of that party's administration in the era of Pegler, 1933, one finds that there were 28 lynchings in the South. According to the Pegler formula, of 100 union murders for every lynching, this would mean that in 1933 union people murdered 2,800 citizens in the North and in "bloody California." But according to the "Unified Crime Reports" of the FBI, there were in 1933 only 1,761 murders and nonnegligent manslaughters in all the United States and its possessions.

So if union members murdered 2,800 persons in 1933 and only 1,761 murders were recorded by all the local police and the FBI, then a large number of citizens—1,039, to be exact—were murdered in cold blood but were never recorded by the police or the FBI. This is a startling figure and speaks ill of our law-detection forces. On the other hand, since this cannot be an exaggeration according to the solemn words of its author, this means that all the murders committed in 1933 were done by labor unions, leaving not a single stabbing, shooting, or strangulation done by scab—that is, nonunion—murderers.

(Four of the Nation's top columnists and commentators recently were checked over a 15-week period for accuracy in the news that they printed or broadcast. Articles already have been printed on Walter Winchell, Drew Pearson, and Fulton Lewis, Jr. This is the last of four articles on Westbrook Pegler.)

Out of the mass of Pegler writings collected for 14 weeks early this year there arose, among other things, a device that could be called the Pegler syllogism. An ordinary, old-fashioned syllogism goes something like this:

1. All lemons are sour.
2. This fruit is a lemon.
3. Therefore, it follows that this fruit must be sour.

NEW-TYPE SYLLOGISM

This type of logic has been in vogue for some time but on March 4 Pegler revealed his new-type syllogism with a blinding example. The text is presented untouched except for the insertion of numbers:

1. "Mr. Truman is demanding a law from Congress which is called an antilynching law."
2. "All good citizens oppose lynching."
3. "It follows that Mr. Truman is not a good citizen because he insists on excusing all lynchings of innocent victims by mobs of union goons."
4. "So, obviously, its advocates favor lynching by their own cohorts."
5. "The principle here is practically identical with that of the Nazis in their ferocious eradication of the town of Lidice in the war."

WHAT PEGLER "PROVES"

Thus by this excerpt—reproduced here without any omissions—the Pegler syllogism has proved that because President Truman has asked for an antilynching law he is endorsing the principle by which the Nazis wiped out an entire town during the war.

The Pegler syllogism, like any new invention, might be resisted at first, so the inventor goes on to explain:

"Some citizens of Lidice had killed a high Nazi. Therefore, the Nazis killed some, perhaps all, of the men and boys, deported the women and children, and razed the town. The degree of revenge was severe, but the principle was exactly the same as Truman's in the antilynching matter. If Selma, Ala., should have a lynching and it seemed to a Federal authority that the police and sheriff were remiss, then all Selma would have to pay. But if Flint, Mich., were to suffer another criminal insurrection under the auspices of the CIO, that would be no lynching."

LOGIC PUZZLING

How "all Selma would have to pay" under the antilynching law and where Flint, Mich., and "another criminal insurrection" came from is puzzling to a prisoner of the old-fashioned laws of logic.

But thus launched, the Pegler syllogism continued to grow into a major philosophy. Another time, the inventor said:

"If all the unions in the United States were to succeed totally, every worker in the country would be a member of some union and competition would die."

In the next paragraph, he then says, "Under total unionism they would come to the point where they would all be preying on one another and all of them on the rest of the population."

Again, a plodder trained in the old school would ask how "preying on one another" agrees with "competition would die."

Some idea of what Pegler regards as a "reasonable surmise" can be gained from Pegler's unhappy tangle with the Bullochs of Georgia. In his microscopic examination of the Roosevelt genealogy, Pegler turned up, he thought, a post-Civil War scoundrel named Rufus Brown Bullock, "one of the foulest rascals of a day when rascality was truly in flower." Pegler accused Mrs. Roosevelt of being descended from Rufus. Pegler's column inspired a howl of outrage, however, from Mrs. Roosevelt's real kin in Georgia, the Bullochs. They told the world that Rufus Bullock was a damyankee and no kin to the Bullochs or Mrs. Roosevelt.

A "REASONABLE" ERROR

This was a "reasonable" error, Pegler explained to his readers on March 23. It was also Mrs. Roosevelt's fault:

"In view of flagrant reticence in her works, notably concerning Mrs. Winthrop Rutherford and Sergeant Earl Miller, the New York State cop, I therefore was seduced into a reasonable surmise that the empress (Eleanor Roosevelt) was concealing something."

(He added: "* * * I make few mistakes and never lie.")

Not all of Pegler's logic is his own invention. A favorite is that primitive weapon, guilt by association, so admired by certain other columnists. In describing a psychiatrist who appeared in the Alger Hiss trial, Pegler reported "Binger is a crony of Dr. Gregory Zilboorg, who came from Russia after the Kerensky and Lenin revolutions." (The line of reasoning here is that the Lenin and Kerensky revolutions in Russia were Communist affairs. Dr. Zilboorg was in Russia at the time. Dr. Zilboorg is known to be friendly with Dr. Binger. Therefore, Dr. Binger is a dangerous character.)

Another time Pegler proved—by his standards—the "pro-Communist" character of Publisher Marshall Field by saying that at one time Field had a lawyer and this lawyer had a sister and this sister represented some Communists in court once.

NOTORIOUS LETTER TO ACHESON

In his notorious open letter to Dean Acheson, in which he used vulgar terms for homosexual, Pegler made his innuendos and then asked: "By the way, have you checked with Harvard lately on the courses which are offered for young men of distinction who have heard the call of the Wilde and are thinking of taking up careers in the Department of State? Is there a course in millinery there? What about flower arrangements? Fair Harvard must keep in step. I think I will write to the proper official just to check up. What is his title? Duchess?"

The reasoning behind this innuendo that Harvard University is an institution of homosexuals went something like this: "(1) The Loyalty Review Board in Washington said it released 91 homosexuals from Government service; (2) these 91 men came from the State Department; (3) the head of the State Department is Dean Acheson; (4) therefore, Dean Acheson must be a homosexual; (5) Dean Acheson is a Harvard man; (6) therefore, Harvard must be a homosexual institution.

Despite this magnificent stretch of guilt by association attained by Pegler, there is the disappointing fact that Acheson is not a Harvard man but a Yale man. Acheson got his law degree from Harvard but graduated from Yale and is a trustee of that institution. By turning his finger of guilt on Cambridge instead of New Haven, Pegler also missed a golden opportunity. You see, if he had remembered that Acheson was a Yale man and not a Harvard man, then Yale would become a suspicious university and that would make another enemy, Henry Luce, also a Yale man.

YET ANOTHER DEVICE

While readers are still gasping in admiration at Pegler's stunning manipulations of logic, he is apt to sweep them off their feet with yet another device—contradiction. On February 24, Pegler commented on the exclusive interview that Arthur Krock, New York Times columnist, got from President Truman.

"My own congratulations are special," said Pegler, "because I tried to put over the same deal a year ago and was turned down because, among other things, I had not promoted Truman in the campaign. Neither, for that matter, did Krock. * * *"

On January 10 at the top of his column he wrote with injured innocence:

"I still find myself referred to as a labor baiter by men who are demonstrably harsh and greedy enemies of labor. * * * I wince because I assume that some of the rank and file and even some of the people who are supposed to be intelligent will believe them."

Having thus set the rank and file apart from people who are supposed to be intelligent, Pegler, less than 800 words later and presumably still wincing because some uncharitable person might think him an enemy of labor, writes:

"I hope the foregoing, respectfully submitted, will not be construed as an admission that unionism in any of the forms that we have seen in this country, is fit for anything but to be blown to hell."

WEAPON NOT NEGLECTED

Pegler did not neglect this powerful weapon of logic. In January he attacked the Washington Post for an editorial which said that during the thirties there were widespread illusions about communism. Pegler is scornful of the statement. "How widespread were those illusions about communism?" he asked. "I never was a victim of them. Were you? The truth is that those illusions were not widespread at any time." But only 3 days later, on January 31, he said calmly, "it is possible that many influential men and women were victims of those widespread illusions about communism. It never fooled me."

It is possible that Pegler, who knows the power of guilt by association and contradiction, was purging himself in public. In the thirties Pegler had to miss an invitation from the Communist magazine New Masses to do an article but wrote pleasantly to them, "Hope there'll be a return date." In 1935 he gave an interview to the Daily Worker, and said he thought that the latest plans of the Communist Party for a farmer-labor movement was a good idea. Pegler himself has called Heywood Broun a Communist and Mrs. Roosevelt a pro-Communist. His best friend was once Heywood Broun, and at one time when he was still living in Connecticut Pegler went over to Krum Elbow to play croquet with Mrs. Roosevelt. (This guilty association of Pegler's cannot be excused merely by the fact that two of the most brutal columns ever written by Pegler denounced Broun as a Communist, while Broun, newly converted to Catholicism, lay

dying.) And as later as 1940, Pegler called William Randolph Hearst (who was not Pegler's boss yet) a "never to be adequately damned demagogue and historic scoundrel."

1. An open collaborator with the Daily Worker. 2. A man who is saddened that he cannot also contribute to the New Masses. 3. A known intimate of a man he admits is a Communist, and a croquet chum of a woman he admits is a leading pro-Communist. 4. An attacker of the greatest anti-Communist of them all.

It is fascinating to ponder what Pegler would do if he ever went to work on a man with a background like that.

Intelligence As An Instrumentality of National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by Col. Walter L. Furbershaw and reprinted in the June 1949 issue of Men and Events.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTELLIGENCE AS AN INSTRUMENTALITY OF NATIONAL SECURITY IN PEACE AND WAR

(By Col. Walter L. Furbershaw)

National security is today the most vital issue affecting the American people, and one of the most important instrumentalities to insure national security is an adequate and efficient intelligence service. At the outbreak of every war in American history the intelligence service has been the weakest link in the national defense chain.

The general mission of a national intelligence service is (1) to collect, evaluate and disseminate positive information of the enemy or potential enemy and (2) to counter and prevent agents of the enemy or potential enemy from securing information in regard to our military plans and activities. These functions are operative ones, and should and must be performed by personnel carefully selected and trained for the work.

The third function of the intelligence service is to deduce from the intelligence at hand the strategical or tactical intentions and capabilities of the enemy and to advise higher authority as to those deductions. This latter is a staff function.

Military and naval intelligence are not directly concerned with any counter-intelligence activities among the civilian population, except in occupied territory in time of war or with respect to civilian personnel under military or naval jurisdiction. Counter-intelligence activities among the civilian population in the zone of the interior are normally under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, operating through its Federal Bureau of Investigation.

REGULAR ARMY LACKS INTELLIGENCE PERSONNEL

An efficient intelligence service should be equipped to secure all possible information concerning the military, political, geographic, economic, scientific, psychologic, and sociologic situation in enemy or potential enemy countries. Unfortunately, our armed services have been unable to maintain or were unfavorably disposed toward the maintenance of even small cadres of efficient intelligence personnel until our country has been actively engaged in warfare.

The Regular Army of the United States has no intelligence branch, although there is such a branch in the Organized Reserves. Between the two world wars the Regular Army intelligence (G–2) officers were drawn from the infantry, artillery, or other arms of the service, detailed as members of the General Staff Corps, and assigned to military intelligence duties. After a short tour of intelligence duty, such officers were returned to service with their respective arms, and many of them lost what interest or adeptness they had in intelligence functions.

Officers sent abroad as military and naval attachés were not always selected because of their aptitude, but in many cases because of their ability to stand the financial strain of living up to the social demands made upon them in foreign capitals. Usually these attachés secured only such information as the authorities of the countries to which they were accredited felt disposed to give them or allowed them to obtain.

At the outbreak or imminence of hostilities, it has been necessary to recruit, train, and assign intelligence personnel under conditions that made it difficult to build an efficient intelligence organization.

PEACETIME INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

In the past very little provision was made for counter intelligence. There is a report to the effect that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, just a few months before the United States entered World War I, only $11,000 was appropriated for use by the military intelligence service on counter intelligence activities.

A considerably better showing was made before the outbreak of World War II, when a large number of military intelligence Reserve officers were called to active duty and, under the direction of intelligence-minded Regular officers, given intensive training in intelligence operations and techniques. This group of officers was the nucleus around which was built up an intelligence service which, after overcoming many obstacles, attained an efficiency comparable to that of our allies. This, however, came only after considerable loss of time and unnecessary expense.

Shortly after VJ-day the service, which by that time had become one of the best intelligence services, was allowed to disintegrate by the relief from active duty or discharge of trained and experienced personnel—this at a time when such a service was needed as urgently as it was during actual hostilities.

EVEN MOSES HAD AN INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

The collection of this military, political, geographic, economic, scientific, psychologic, and sociologic information should be a continuing process rather than a service to be activated only in times of international crisis, when the procurement of such information is difficult and costly.

Great Britain and France have maintained permanent national intelligence services over a period of several centuries. These services were headed by men of ability and long experience. Drawn from men in every field of endeavor, the operating forces were so situated throughout the world that the British and French homelands were at all times supplied wtih accurate information needed to protect their interests. At headquarters in London and Paris the information received was evaluated and then disseminated to the governmental departments interested.

In the past our national authorities never gave whole-hearted support to the organization of an effective intelligence system. They were influenced by the false concept that this country should not interest itself in the private affairs of other nations, and that to do so is unethical and beneath the dignity of the United States. That this concept is false and that we should have no qualms of national conscience in respect to an intelligence service is supported by Bible reference. Some 3,500 years ago, according to chapter 13, verses 1, 2, 17, 18, 19, and 20 of the Book of Numbers, Moses received a divine directive to collect and evaluate information concerning the land of Canaan. This directive was:

"1. And the Lord spake unto Moses saying:

"2. Send thou men that they may search the land of Canaan, which I give unto the children of Israel; of every tribe of their fathers shall you send a man, every man a ruler among them;

* * * * *

"17. And Moses sent them to spy out the land of Canaan and said unto them, Get you up this way southward and go up into the mountain;

"18. And see the land what it is; and the people that dwelleth therein, whether they be strong or weak, few or many;

"19. And what the land is that they dwell in, whether it be good or bad; and what cities they be that they dwell in, whether in tents or in strongholds;

"20. And what the land is, whether it be fat or lean, whether there be wood therein, or not. And be ye of good courage and bring of the fruit of the land."

A careful analysis of the orders to Moses shows that the information sought was geographic, psychologic, economic, military, and political—almost identical in type with the information now necessary to a proper evaluation of the war potential of an enemy or probable enemy country.

POOR INTELLIGENCE TECHNIQUE

In addition to our woeful lack of foresightedness in the collection of positive information, we have been equally culpable in handling what little information we had. This is particularly true with respect to the evaluation and dissemination of information, which is practically useless unless it is carefully evaluated and speedily placed in the hands of those who can and should make use of it.

Our experience at Pearl Harbor, where we failed to protect ourselves against attack, knowing full well that Japan had attacked China (in 1894) and Russia (in 1904) before a formal declaration of war; at the Battle of the Bulge (in December 1944), where failure to heed or faulty evaluation of intelligence reports of German strength and capabilities proved so costly to us; and several years later at the Pan-American Conference at Bogota, where careless valuation and lack of proper dissemination of intelligence proved so embarrassing to us, are but a few examples of poor intelligence technique. In each instance mentioned the unfortunate results were not the fault of the operative intelligence personnel in the field but that of personnel in higher echelons.

Another weakness in our intelligence system was the tendency at times of one armed service or executive department to discount information received from a coordinate arm or department. Whether this was due to interarmed service or interdepartmental jealousy or competition for credit, it is difficult to say.

ESPIONAGE AND INTRIGUE NOW RAMPANT

At no time in our history has espionage and intrigue made such attacks on our national security as during the last decade. Our failure to take proper and effective steps to uncover and prosecute those engaged in disloyal and subversive activities has, to a large degree, contributed to the dangerous international situation that now confronts us.

For years, Soviet Russia, through its own agents and its fifth column in this country, has been kept informed of our strength, intentions and capabilities. Through members of the Communist Party of the United

States and its controlled satellite front organizations in high or strategic positions in Federal executive departments, the Soviet Union has had access to the most secret documents concerning our national policy and security.

Many of these office-holding agents of international communism also used their official status to beguile and influence their superiors to adopt measures that furthered the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and compromised and discredited that of the United States, the Constitution of which they had sworn to uphold and defend. Due to the diligence of the Intelligence services of the Armed Forces, very few of these disloyal or disaffected elements were able to infiltrate any of the active units of Army or Navy Intelligence, notwithstanding constant pressure of their friends to secure such assignments for them.

The public press of late has been filled with reports of the investigation by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, showing the extent of the Soviet conspiracy to obtain secret official information from our executive departments. No effective action in the way of prosecution of the individuals involved has been taken by the Federal authorities charged with such duty.

HOW CANADA REACTED TO SOVIET ESPIONAGE

The Canadian Government has blazed a trail that our Government would do well to follow. One Igor Gouzenko, a cipher clerk on the staff of the Military Attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, revealed the existance in Canada of a network of Soviet espionage involving more than 20 officials and employees of the Canadian Government, one of them a member of the Canadian Parliament. A Royal Commission was appointed on February 5, 1945, to investigate the facts and make a report.

Under date of June 27, 1946, the Royal Commission submitted a comprehensive 700-page report revealing a Soviet espionage system the extent of which is almost beyond belief. The member of the Canadian Parliament and 10 other arrested officials and residents of Canada were convicted and the officials of the Soviet Embassy ordered deported to Russia.

The Premier of Canada personally saw to it that copies of the Royal Commission's report were laid before our top officials in Washington, as the evidence tended to establish that the conspiracy had contacts operating in the United States along much the same lines. Every American should read the report of the Royal Commission.

It is fair to assume that if the Soviet Union maintained such an elaborate system of espionage and official corruption in Canada it has a vaster and more dangerous espionage system in operation in our country, which Russia considers the greatest threat to its ideological and political objectives.

COMMUNIST INTRANSIGENCE

We should never forget that international Marxist-Stalinist communism, as represented by the Soviet Union, has never deviated one iota from what it considers as its main objective—world communism controlled and dominated by a ruthless conspiratorial cabal with headquarters in Moscow. This objective is to be attained by the violent overthrow of capitalism and free enterprise and all they stand for and their replacement by a dictatorial world Soviet regime, under which every vestige of individual freedom will be extirpated.

Bear always in mind that Soviet policy, national and international, is a policy of expediency under which moral principles are subordinated to what is politic or advantageous for facilitating the Soviet ends or objectives. An uncompromising policy of that kind brands those responsible for its execution as devoid of national and individual honor, as we understand the words, and without regard for the sanctity of treaties or the pledged word. "Peace feelers" from a nation so disposed are to be ignored unless they are accompanied by positive action attesting to their sincerity.

The Soviet Union operates on the assumption that all capitalist nations are antagonistic to Russia and its satellites and, like the Communist regime, are capable of and intend to make use of every deceitful practice that is standard operating procedure in the Kremlin. At times Soviet power will retreat or trim its sails and change its tack by making apparent concessions in an effort to overcome more than expected opposition by the capitalist world. Such maneuvers are tactical only and are used to soften up foreign sentiment by creating an illusion of a Soviet change to a policy of nonagression and conciliation. Russia thus hopes to so delude the confused and irresolute among the nationals of the capitalist countries that they will act or bring pressure to lessen security and defensive measures.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

So long as the Soviet Union maintains its present policy and ideology, the United States should not lessen in any degree its measures to provide for adequate defense and security. An efficient intelligence service is one of the most important of those measures.

Many intelligence officers had hoped that the National Security Act of 1947 (Unification Act), under which the Central Intelligence Agency was established, would provide the means of correcting many of the deficiencies in American intelligence operations. That act provides in general that the Central Intelligence Agency shall act on the national level; shall be concerned only with national security from the foreign aspect; shall coordinate and evaluate information received from other intelligence services, such as those of the Army, Navy, State, and other departments, and shall prepare estimates of the situation for higher authority at prescribed intervals.

It was intended to be a coordinating agency with operating functions only in the foreign field and not in fields now covered by any of the other agencies. There is, of course, bound to be some overlap, but this can be kept at a minimum to prevent duplication of effort and cross-purpose operation. It is to be expected that intelligence estimates sent to the Central Agency by the other agencies will be subconsciously colored by their respective service interests. Army, Navy, and Air Force intelligence officers naturally stress information that most concerns their particular services.

Any conflicts are to be ironed out and reconciled by the experts the Central Intelligence Agency is expected to assign to the important tasks of evaluating the information and preparing national estimates of the situation.

Since its organization but a few years ago, the Central Intelligence Agency has been headed by three different directors—one Air Force general and two admirals, of whom only one, Admiral Souers, had any experience as an intelligence officer.

NECESSARY ADJUSTMENTS IN CIA

From reports of surveys and comments of fair-minded critics, it is apparent that the Central Intelligence Agency will be able to accomplish its important mission only if and when organizational and functional adjustments are made and put into operation, and a clear-cut and strictly enforced delimitation agreement entered into among the CIA and the several other specialized intelligence services, similar in effect to the agreement among the two armed services and the Department of Justice during World War II.

Such an agreement, if enforced in good faith and in the national interest, would tend to discourage the activities of power-conscious empire-building individuals and cliques. It would make for closer and better relations among the personnel of all ranks in the several intelligence services, would eliminate petty official jealousy and competition for undue credit and would build up a needed esprit de corps that would be conducive toward, what all loyal Americans hope for, an active, aggressive, and efficient national intelligence service.

Such a service is possible if the Central Intelligence Agency, the Army, Navy, and Air intelligence services and the civilian intelligence services in the executive departments work in close harmony in their respective spheres of action with national security and defense as the one and only reason for their existence.

WE MUST ARM WITH CAREFULLY EVALUATED INFORMATION

No competent business or professional man enters into an important conference or deal without previous complete information concerning all of the elements that contribute to produce the results he desires.

Our country cannot plan for its security and defense and should not enter into any international conference or agreement without previous adequate and accurate intelligence reports or estimates of the situation with which it is confronted.

Armed with carefully evaluated information concerning all elements involved in an international controversy, representatives of the United States (assuming, of course, that such representatives are not tainted by sympathy with antagonistic foreign nations and subversive ideologies) could enter into negotiations without at any time giving consideration to the necessity or expediency of appeasing a potential enemy or entering into agreements or making concessions incompatible with our national principles and policy.

Past Mistakes Can Help Prevent Future Mistakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence in a recent article points out some important mistakes in our national defense that must not be overlooked in future planning. The following are excerpts from the article, which I ask to be included for the purposes of the future and not for the purposes of recrimination or causing disunity and argument over what is in the past:

If, in addition to the three big aircraft carriers in the Pacific, six more were in operation off the coast of Korea—and we have available 17 large-sized and 60 smaller-sized carriers still in "mothballs"—there would conceivably be no loss of the port of Pohang today and no loss of the valuable airstrip behind it, thus leaving us only one airfield behind our lines in South Korea.

If, along with the light cruisers and destroyers, there was in Korean waters a division of four battleships—we have several in "mothballs"—there would not be a railroad operating within 12 miles inland on either coast and no substantial amount of supplies would be able to move down from North Korea, Russia, or Communist China The

big 16-inch shells of the battleships, firing from short distances off shore with unerring aim in all kinds of weather, can do more damage by steady bombardment than can be done by similar weight projectiles dropped indiscriminately from high altitude by the large bombers at infrequent intervals. If the battleship *Missouri* had only been stationed in the Far East, the news would be different today.

If there were nine big aircraft carriers off the Korean coasts with a total of approximately 900 planes aboard, there could be 24-hour bombing and strafing and air artillery support given to our ground troop movements. As it is, the enemy moves men and supplies at night and we do not have enough planes there with those flares giving a huge candlepower of illumination to carry on strafing and bombing around the clock.

If enough of the big aircraft carriers of the Navy were in Korean waters, the ground troops would not have to worry about protecting the only two airstrips they have had behind their lines. For planes dependent on ground bases alone must remain there for servicing part of the time and this leaves them open to attack by enemy artillery or planes. The aircraft carrier on the other hand moves its floating base off shore at will and is ready 24 hours a day to attack or defend itself because it gets a vast amount of antiaircraft protection from the cruisers and destroyers that surround it in what is known as the "carrier task force."

Some of the same misconceptions which resulted in mistaken policies before the Korean war are being perpetuated today in the news dispatches and official communiques. The work of all airmen is lumped together and the same stories are widely printed as heretofore about the weight of the total number of bombs dropped—as if this has anything to do with the effectiveness of the fire if targets are missed as they were repeatedly by high-flying bombers in the last war and as official reports and surveys testified.

Also, low-level dive-bombing of a strategic nature done by the aviators of the Naval Air Force flying from the broad decks of aircraft carriers. These flyers stay over the targets for hours at a time because they do not have to fly back long distances and they fly low enough to see what they are aiming at. They do not, moreover, kill noncombatants unless the latter happen to be right at the targets, and this is something of growing importance if the Korean population isn't to be turned against us because of the indiscriminate bombing from high altitudes.

Compton Post, No. 2089, VFW, Unanimously Votes Resolution Re Communist Party, Subversive Groups, Foreign Control Parasites, Etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, for the information of yourself and for that of my other distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body, and for the immediate information of all concerned, I am pleased to call to your attention the following important resolution which was just received by me from the VFW Post, No. 2089, at Compton, Los Angeles County, Calif.

This dynamic, vigilant, patriotic group of veterans is one of the most important in my native State of California, and its leadership and membership is always on its toes in the interest of the security of our beloved Nation and in its national defense. The resolution follows:

Whereas Compton Post, No. 2089, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is comprised solely of veterans who served our Government overseas and on foreign soil during the various wars and campaigns; and

Whereas these members are, from personal experience, aware of the extreme detriment to our Government and to all Americans collectively and individually, by the undermining and undercover activities of the Communist Party and their sympathetic supporters; and

Whereas these members having seen the results of unoppressed similar activities in other countries and the ultimate drastic results therefrom, are determined to insure action by our various legislative bodies to remove these hazards from our great country; and

Whereas to date the United States of America has not concluded peace negotiations since the cessation of hostilities from World War II and therefore we as a nation are, in fact, still in a state of war; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America justly provides rights, freedoms, and protection for its loyal citizens, it likewise provides punishments for treasonable acts of which the maximum during a state of war is punishment by death; and

Whereas the ultimate goal of the Communist Party members, rampant throughout our country today, is the overthrow of our Government by unlawful and forceful acts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Compton Post, No. 2089, in regular session assembled, this 24th day of July 1950, unanimously go on record to make the necessary demands upon our legislative representatives at any and all levels of Government to remove the shield of protection given these members of all subversive groups insofar as equal rights and freedoms are granted to loyal citizens and to enact whatever legislation as required, to interpret the dastardly acts and plotting of these foreign-controlled parasites for the eventual detriment and/or overthrow of our present form of government a traitorous acts; and be it further

Resolved, That punishment for convictions of any individual or individuals for treason under the aforementioned circumstances be effected quickly, firmly, and in its most severe form; and be it further

Resolved, That during the current international emergency all persons, known to be members of the Communist Party, or any other subversive party or group and/or their sympathizers be remanded to custody and deported or placed in a centralized location subjected to constant guard to insure against any possible sabatage to public and/or private property or well being of the citizens of this glorious country, and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be immediately forwarded to the fourth district commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America for endorsement and further forwarding to the State Department of California Veterans of Foreign Wars and on the national council of administration, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for action on a national level, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Los Angeles County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and to the various local newspaper publications and the legislative representatives of our local districts after endorsement by the fourth district, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

G. A. FLOYD,
Commander.

Attest:

DALE H. LEWIS,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE,
H. A. CASTEEL,
Chairman.
K. A. NIELSEN.

Monday Quarterbacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Monday Quarterbacks," which was published in the Boston Post on August 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONDAY QUARTERBACKS

The statement issued by the four Republican members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a strange document. Five years after the fact they now censure the Democratic administration for failure to realize what were Mr. Stalin's plans when the Second World War ended.

The Republican statement says: "The major tragedy of our time was the failure and refusal of American leadership in 1945 to recognize the true aims and methods of the rulers of Soviet Russia. To this failure can be traced the disintegration of our Armed Forces in 1945, which would not have occurred if the need for retaining adequate forces had been explained to the American people, and the senseless destruction of billions of dollars' worth of military equipment which the United States and its friends so desperately need today."

That is what the Republican leaders in the Senate say now. But, in the past 5 years what have they been saying? Until the fighting broke out in Korea, they were saying that they were wholeheartedly backing up the Democratic administration in its foreign policy. Governor Dewey, John Foster Dulles, the Republican expert on foreign affairs, and the able and sincere Senator VANDENBERG all pledged themselves to a bipartisan attitude on the foreign policy as outlined by the administration.

What did General Dwight D. Eisenhower say in Moscow 5 years ago? The General said: "I see nothing in the future that would prevent Russia and the United States from being the closest possible friends." This from the man whom the Republicans are trying to draft as their candidate for President.

Five years ago yesterday the war with Japan ended. Who among the Republican leaders at that time suggested that we keep the boys under arms and continue to spend more billions in preparation for another war? What chance would any such suggestion then have had as a resolution before Congress? The millions of veterans were clamoring to come home and were busily counting up their "points" to be sure they had the needed 85 which would qualify them for early release from the services. What government

could stay in office who would refuse to let these millions of boys come home to their mothers, wives, and sweethearts, merely because of suspicion of Russia's motives for the future?

The Republican Senate leaders now say that the loss of freedom in Europe by the peoples of Poland, eastern Germany, the Baltic states, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, and in Asia by Outer Mongolia, North Korea, and China can be laid to the blindness of the Democratic Administration at Yalta and Potsdam. But after a large part of this program of Communist domination of these peoples had been accomplished, when the Republicans had control of Congress in the years 1946–48, did these Republican leaders then clamor that our warships be taken out of mothballs, and that millions of new soldiers be mobilized to be ready for a further more direct attack?

That is not the way we heard it. Instead they were going along on a nonpartisan basis for the Marshall plan and the ECA, and commending practically every move the Administration proposed on foreign affairs.

Brief Statement by World War II Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I received the following comments from a distinguished veteran of World War II in my native State of California. He is a married man with a family—a diligent and tireless worker in industry and in civic work, and a veterans' leader. Coming from him I recognize it represents the considered thinking of a young citizen who is manifestly thinking about the destiny of our Nation and the security of the world from Communist aggression. I submit it for your consideration:

DOES CHARITY BEGIN AT HOME OR ABROAD?
(By Harold P. Camp, Veteran of World War II)

June 25, 1950, saw the beginning of another armed conflict involving the Armed Forces of our country. From whence come the men and women who comprise that same array of fighting power which we term the Armed Forces? I am sure that no one needs to look in the dictionary for the answer to that question. The answer is still fresh in the memory of every American citizen. It was our brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, nieces, nephews, cousins, fathers, sons, daughters; yes, and even our mothers, who made up that array of fighting strength and spirit needed to rid the world of aggression by the Germans and Japs. And yet, today we face aggression by another nation and its satellites—the Soviet Union.

Today's newspaper quotes as a news release the fact that the Armed Services Committee has referred to Congress its findings concerning the necessary provisions for enactment of legislation to provide family allowance for dependents of those in military service. My reaction, upon reading the amounts listed in the committee's report, was to throw the paper to the floor in disgust. I asked myself if perhaps I might have misread the article so I again picked up the paper and carefully reread the entire article word by word. Sure enough, the same congressional Representatives who are charged with the responsibility of supplying the Armed Forces with the necessary personnel and equipment to safeguard our Nation from aggression, have again, for the so-called sake of "economy," sold the man in the front lines short by refusing to properly provide for those dependents necessarily left without proper support. And why should this be? The man in service has no right to speak for himself, to choose where he is to go, to question orders, to come back home from overseas when he is needed by his dependents, nor the protection by any laws other than military law.

We, as a Nation, are proud of our ability to provide relief for the needy, assistance through the Red Cross for our citizens who have been involved in a major flood, tornado, fire, or other disastrous event, aid for the crippled, maimed or blind, through cancer, tuberculosis, and crippled children's societies. Our congressional Representatives have continued that same spirit of giving and assisting by enactment of legislation to aid foreign nations to the tune of several billions of dollars. Now, I ask you, where should "economy" begin and end? May I recall to your memory the untold billions of dollars' profit paid to corporations engaged in defense work during the last war? Economy. Ours is the greatest Nation in the world, and surely, if we are to practice economy, let us not do so by forcing the dependents of our men in service to do without.

Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, and others who are greatly interested in the welfare of the physically handicapped people of this country, the Honorable Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor, gave a very interesting and informative address. I commend its reading by everyone.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF LABOR AT THE NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK MEETING

Admiral McIntire, members of the President's Committee, administrators of the State employment security agencies, members of the Governors' National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week Committees, and guests, let me say in welcoming all of you to this conference that I deeply appreciate this opportunity to meet the men and women who are on the firing line in our nationwide campaign to stimulate maximum employment of physically handicapped workers and disabled veterans.

I wish also to express my appreciation of the keen interest in this program which you are demonstrating by your presence here.

Once again we have before us the task of planning for the observance of another NEPH week scheduled for the period beginning October 1, next.

The conditions we face today are vastly different from those of a year ago. Then we were just emerging from the first sharp decline in employment that had occurred in a decade. Our assignment, accordingly, was to shape a program assuring to the handicapped their fair share of a shrinking supply of job openings.

Today employment is high and going higher. We meet in the grim shadow of a tense world situation. Our troops are fighting in Korea. To meet the growing demands for manpower and supplies, this Nation is speeding defense production and rapidly expanding its armed might.

Here, in the Department of Labor, we are throwing all the resources of every bureau and agency into the task of drawing up plans to meet the current civilian manpower situation, as it is affected by the President's program. The Bureau of Employment Security and the State employment security agencies which operate the Federal-State public employment office system are already working on these plans. They are also using all their facilities to help defense plants expand manpower to meet production goals under the President's program.

We in the Department are weighing our manpower resources, not only in the light of immediate future needs, but also with respect to any more serious future developments. In these studies we are giving thought to all potential sources of labor, including youth, minority groups, women, older workers, and the handicapped.

In these studies, we are giving the most careful consideration to possibilities of labor-force expansion which lie in the great reservoir of unused skills represented by unemployed handicapped workers. This is true for both those who are ready for jobs, but unemployed, and for those who can be made ready for jobs through vocational rehabilitation and training.

Our goal this year cannot be confined merely to obtaining job equality for the physically handicapped. It must be enlarged by a vigorous campaign to bring to the attention of employers, as dramatically as we can, the very real manpower asset we have in our handicapped population. As the demand for manpower expands, employment of handicapped workers must be maximized to the extent needed in defense production.

The great and real value of handicapped workers was strikingly demonstrated in World War II for the first time. As manpower shortages became more and more acute, greater and greater use was made of the handicapped. Handicapped job placements jumped from 27,700 in 1940 to 297,000 in 1945. Altogether, 877,000 handicapped workers were recruited and placed during the war. Those handicapped workers did an outstanding job. They proved they were dependable, safe, and productive.

Hundreds of thousands of employers learned through necessity the worth of handicapped workers. They carried this knowledge into their postwar operations. In the 5-year period after the war, local employment offices placed almost 1,000,000 handicapperd workers.

As most of you know, the United States Employment Service in 1940 launched a program which has become known as Selective Placement of the Physically Handicapped. It is a technique to make sure that handicapped men and women are properly placed in jobs they are equipped to do. It is based on the principle that handicapped workers, when employed in jobs utilizing their abilities, are as efficient and dependable as nonhandicapped workers. What happened during the war, as well as studies conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics after the war, has clinched the soundness of this principle.

Today we know that the physically handicapped are people with the same interests, abilities, knowledge and skills as others who

are not handicapped. Those who are not employed should be employed. Those who are not trained should be trained. The handicapped should be given the right-of-way to take their place in the common effort to build up the strength of the Nation. When selective placement is properly applied in hiring handicapped workers the handicapped will always meet the test, whether in the shop, the office, the laboratory, or on the farm.

We must encourage every employer who does not now use handicapped workers to consider them for employment, as new manpower is required in our defense effort.

We must continue to fight for equal opportunity for the physically handicapped, not merely because it is their inalienable right as American citizens, but because they are an invaluable asset to our country.

I pledge the best efforts of the Department of Labor. I know the Nation can count on all of you, as well as on other participating organizations and individuals to carry on intelligently and vigorously.

Statement No. 1, Examining Congressman Poulson's Recent Extension of Remarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on August 17, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A5916, is an extension of remarks by Congressman NORRIS POULSON, of southern California, entitled "California Wants No Columbia River Water." To me that item is very revealing, and I find that I must raise a question about the accuracy of certain of his statements while agreeing with him in other respects. In order to keep the record straight, I must add some information on the subject treated to make the picture complete.

In the extension referred to, the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] groups his comments under seven heads, two of which will be treated here. Quoting the first sentence of the first numbered point he says, concerning the importation of Columbia River water:

> Neither the idea nor the plan was initiated by any one connected with the State of California.

Is he not overlooking something here? This notion of diverting Columbia River water did not originate within the last few days but started several years ago. He and I were both members of the Public Lands Committee in the Eightieth Congress at which time the Honorable Richard J. Welch, of California, was chairman. Now, Chairman Welch was a great student of the water problem in California and was much concerned about the unusual drought which prevailed in California in 1947. Records show that Chairman Welch introduced on June 12, 1947, House Resolution 244, a resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to investigate the feasibility of bringing water from the Columbia River into California. Congressman Welch made a speech on the floor of the House on June 12, 1947, stressing water needs along the California coast all south of San Francisco Bay.

I distinctly remember that when a point was made in a Public Lands Committee meeting on July 1, 1947, as to a possible connection between this proposal and the central Arizona project bill that Chairman Welch stated he had introduced his bill on his own initiative and had not consulted with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] or anyone else. Certainly I had no advance notice of Chairman Welch's Columbia River proposal.

The transcripts of the Public Lands Committee meetings of June 23 and July 1, 1947, were not printed but are on file showing 2 days of committee discussion. Having just reread this whole file I find that this spokesman for southern California [Mr. POULSON] favored this idea of a study on June 23, 1947, when it first came up in committee.

The second point of Congressman POULSON's statement is as follows:

> Prosperous as California is, it could never afford to finance a project of such magnitude as the Columbia River diversion proposed by the Interior Department.

I agree with him in this statement. Certainly California alone is not prosperous or wealthy enough to carry through such a proposed project extending as it does through more than one State. Neither was California able to carry through, as it ought to be carried through, the great Central Valley project of California, lying wholly within the State. A great engineer, Colonel Marshall, planned the Central Valley development in California as a State project, but it was soon found that the Golden State itself could not carry through successfully such an undertaking. Therefore, California gladly turned its Central Valley project over to Uncle Sam, and now, after nearly 20 years, Uncle Sam has spent several hundred million dollars on the Central Valley project in California and it is not nearly complete, and will probably cost 10 times the amount already spent to complete it properly—and I want to add—all of this development has my sanction, although I am a taxpayer in another State.

Further referring to what California reclamation efforts may reasonably do, let me add that the development of the great California Imperial Valley subjugation was also started as a local California project. No irrigation district in America has had such a checkered career or so many ups and downs as has Imperial Valley before Californians realized that it was too big for local effort alone. Therefore, Uncle Sam was asked to complete the development as it is today. It, too, has cost many millions to date. Incidentally, the final work of completion by the Bureau of Reclamation—in general, but not in certain specific details—has my hearty approval, and I own no property in California. Yes, California is a great State, but some of her water problems are too large for her to handle alone. The Central Valley project in California is of national importance and should be fully developed by the Nation. The Imperial Valley project is of international importance and should be completed by no less an authority than the Nation.

These are my comments on only two of the seven points covered in Congressman POULSON's extension of August 17. All seven of his points are crowded with meaning to the whole cause of reclamation, and they deserve careful study. Permission granted, I shall analyze the other five in subsequent statements.

The Defense of Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "The Defense of Western Europe," delivered by our former colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky, Hon. John Sherman Cooper, on Saturday, August 19, 1950, at the reunion of the Third Army Association in New York City. Former Senator Cooper served with the Third Army during the last war, in all of its campaigns, being promoted from private to captain during his service. I believe that his experience gives the address deep interest.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

It is a great honor to be asked to speak at the first reunion of the Third Army Association.

The Third United States Army is one of the legendary armies of history. A few days ago, I asked at the Library of Congress for a newspaper dated August 20, 1944. Its war bulletin of the 19th was a typical story of the Third Army. On the 19th of August, 6 years ago today, Third Army tanks were probing in the outskirts of Paris, yet unliberated; to the north, at Mantes, its Seventy-ninth Division was exploiting the first crossing of the Seine; while in the south its columns of armor and men were sweeping through Orleans in the movement that was to reach the Danube and penetrate six countries in 8 months.

Tonight we remember its famed divisions; the leaders Gaffey, Gay, Koch, Matthews, Maddox, Muller, and Campanole who guided its movements; the field commanders and the fighting men who struck terror everywhere in the hearts of the foes. It is significant that Generals Gay and Walker lead the fight in Korea today.

But, at last, the soul of this Army was its leader. I cannot fix in words his restless spirit. By every standard he was one of the great combat leaders of all time. But he was more than that. His toughness, fearlessness, and daring inspired and gave pride to his men. He was proud of them. On his visit home after the war, when he was received by his townspeople at Hamilton, Mass., he looked toward a group of his disabled men and said simply: "The great honor you do

me belongs to the veterans of the Third Army. I salute them."

The best that we can say is that we are proud that we served under General Patton from the day the Third landed in Normandy, in its wild dash across Europe, until that day, deep in Germany, when we knew the war had ended. Tonight, we salute him.

I assume that Colonel Cheever and Colonel Pester asked me to speak to you this evening because I have recently participated in two meetings where the state of the defenses of western Europe have been considered. In May I attended, with the Secretary of State, Acheson, the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, composed of the Foreign Ministers of the 12 nations which last year signed the North Atlantic Treaty, pledged to the mutual defense of that area. A week ago, I returned from the first meeting of the Council of Deputies, in which the deputies of the Foreign Ministers sit permanently under the leadership of Mr. Charles Spofford, an American, and one charged with the responsibility of building the defenses of the North Atlantic area. I make it clear, however, that I do not speak tonight in any official capacity and that the views that I express are my own. I have prepared and written this speech myself.

Five years ago, when the war had ended, we hoped that peace had come. The American people and the Government have steadily addressed their efforts and resources toward peace. We have pledged ourselves in the United Nations to a policy of collective security and we have faithfully supported that pledge.

The decision of the President to commit our forces in Korea in support of the United Nations is the ultimate proof of our adherence to its purposes.

Soviet Russia undertook the same solemn obligations. As a permanent member of the Security Council, it assumed upon behalf of 59 nations an additional responsibility to prevent aggression and to maintain the peace.

I do not intend to review the events of the last 5 years. It is enough to say that since the signing of the Charter, Soviet Russia has pursued a course of aggression which has brought under its domination 10 of the 20 countries of Europe, the ancient community of China, and almost one-third of the people of the world.

Its course before Korea was one of indirection and subversion. In Korea, it is one of open aggression. This aggression must be defeated to confirm the future of the United Nations, to assure defenseless nations, and to make it clear that no aggressor can succeed against the moral judgment and the determination of the peoples of the world. It is of the greatest importance that the members of the United Nations send forces to Korea quickly for the relief of the military situation and for the historic purpose of establishing a solidarity which will deter other attacks.

Tonight I want to speak to you briefly and as clearly and forcibly as I can, about a single aspect of the threat of Soviet aggression. It is the threat to Europe—the area which you know. It is a threat which places western Europe, the United Kingdom, the United States, and all the countries of the North American Continent in mortal danger and in their greatest peril in history.

I believe a brief review of the European situation will set the stage for several proposals that I am going to advance for your consideration. Since the armistice in Europe, the Soviet Union has maintained a huge military force. This vast army has been overhauled and completely modernized. The estimates of its size vary. Three weeks ago I heard Mr. Shinwell, Minister of Defense of the United Kingdom, speak to the House of Commons. He stated, and was corroborated by Mr. Churchill, that British Intelligence believes that 2,800,000 Russians are under arms in 175 divisions, one-third of which are mechanized. Mr. Churchill estimated that 80 divisions might be readily at hand for a European offensive, and that a proportionate number of the Soviet's 40,000 tanks and 19,000 planes, along with other supporting arms, are also available.

Facing this massive force is a comparatively minute combination of American, British, French, Dutch, and Belgian troops amounting to slightly more than 12 divisions, serving without unified command.

The danger implicit in this disparity in armed strength is appalling. Under present conditions, the Soviet forces could overrun Europe at any time. If the present disparity is allowed to continue, the futility of opposing Soviet aims in western Europe will become more and more apparent to Europeans. The hopelessness of their position in the face of Soviet aggression will inevitably sap their determination to resist and Europe could in time fall by default.

This possibility of actual Soviet conquest or indirect absorption of Europe strikes at our own security.

Where would America stand if Europe should fall before an attack? The Ruhr, the Saar and the other great industrial centers of western Europe, the scientists, and the manpower of the west would be in the domain of the Kremlin. If Great Britain should then fall under the weight of rockets and atomic weapons, the American Continent would be isolated and surrounded by foes. We would be compelled to rearm at a war scale and stay armed. The economic strain of maintaining a state of seige would be severe and continuous. We would face progressively lower standards of living and a long night of trial and suffering.

Europe is a vital element in the American strategy of security. The defense of Europe is inseparable from the defense of the United States.

The United States has done much to assist the free nations of western Europe to build the means and the will to resist aggression. In part, the aim of the Marshall plan was to rebuild an economy that would provide the resources to defend against open aggression and at the same time to raise the standard of living, and the economic and social conditions of their peoples so that they would not fall before subversion.

The North Atlantic Treaty established a defensive alliance for that area. It announced that henceforth, an attack against one was an attack against all. The pact also laid the groundwork for an integrated defense of the North Altantic area and established the Atlantic Council to organize such a defense.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Program of the United States provides needed military equipment and assistance to members of the pact for the construction of their defenses.

Let me make clear that these measures do not mean that the United States has abandoned the idea of peace and collective security through the United Nations. Regional agreements such as the North Atlantic treaty are explicitly permitted by section 52 of the Charter. The right of self-defense is recognized in article 51 of the Charter. Our action has been made neecssary by the failure of Soviet Russia to cooperate in the maintenance of peace, and because it has itself breached the peace. Our action is proof that we observe the spirit as well as the form of the charter.

The bare-faced aggression of the North Korean forces, undoubtedly directed by Moscow, makes it clear that these efforts are insufficient to meet the danger. For the first time, in Korea, the Soviet resorted to direct military action. Obviously, if it will sponsor an armed attack in Korea, we must consider the possibility of similar action upon a far more important objective—western Europe.

It is academic to speculate now why the Soviet has not employed its preponderance of strength to move in Europe before this time. Perhaps the superiority of the United States in atomic weapons was part of the reason. It may be that they have feared that their resources could not support or win a long war—a fear which is justified. Perhaps the Soviet knows that if it cannot trust in time of peace the people of its own country and its satellites, it could not trust them in war.

These speculations do not meet the issue. Recriminations over delays and the past do not meet the danger. It is a time for decision, and for action.

What is necessary to be done to deter a Russian attack, to make its failure so inevitable that any plans for it will be discarded, and at the worst, if it should come, to defend against it?

We have reached the time when a decision must be made whether or not Europe will be defended. This decision must be made by the countries of western Europe and by the United States.

First, the countries of western Europe must commit themselves to the very limit for their own defense, in terms of military production and of armed forces. We recognize their difficult economic conditions, and know the material and psychological wounds that two wars have brought them—wounds that we have not experienced—but their homelands are at stake and they must make the supreme effort to defend them. That effort is not being made at this time. After the United States had sent its troops to Korea under the United Nations' flag, had increased its military budget by $10,000,000,000, and doubled its Armed Forces, other members of the North Atlantic Treaty organization have made statements respecting the additional defense efforts that they will undertake.

They must be welcomed as encouraging in that they establish the principle of increased efforts. Nevertheless, measured by the present requirements for troops, weapons, and equipment for defense, I must say flatly and plainly that their action is inadequate and cautious. Emergencies call for emergency action, and decisions regarding survival cannot be made upon the basis of whether or not economic and social programs might be disturbed. As was stated in an article in the London Times during the recent meeting of the Council of Deputies in London, you cannot have arms without tears.

There is needed in Europe a great initiative in the spirit of the President's action in Korea, his speeding of our defenses, and in the spirit of the Schuman plan. The full program indispensable for defense must be launched. We must give unmistakable notice to the aggressor that western Europe, the United Kingdom, and the countries of the American Continent are determined to defend themselves.

The bold decision of France to activate 15 divisions is a sample of the spirit that is necessary. But, with the exception of France, there is little indication in the response of the other members of a determination to create the forces that are needed.

Our increased aid is urgently required. We authorized in 1949, $1,200,000,000 for arms to Europe and in 1950 an additional $1,300,000,000. Today a bill is before the Congress which would increase these amounts by $4,000,000,000. It should be passed by the Congress quickly. Today Europe is incapable of meeting aggression alone. The United States cannot defend Europe alone. But for a time it will be necessary

for us to carry a large part of the burden of supply until military production in Europe gets under way. On a smaller scale our aid now must be compared to lend-lease, by which we helped sustain Europe in the early years of the last war. But, in this instance, there is an added factor; we sustain and defend ourselves; we act to deter war and not to make war.

But I point out, and this most forcibly, that even though Europe and the United Kingdom greately increase their efforts, and though our aid is enlarged, it will be ineffective unless three very definite steps are taken by the members of the North Atlantic Pact organization.

The first is that the defense staff should immediately complete and the member governments approve a defense plan for western Europe which will assign the tasks and missions of the members and specify the needed forces. Only when this is done will it be possible to measure the willingness of each country, including our own, to supply the men, the equipment, and the money that are needed. If the nations of western Europe, the United Kingdom, and ourselves will not make this effort it is better to know it now. Without such a plan and its acceptance, the aid that we furnish will be misdirected, and in part wasted. The entire effort may repeat the familiar too-little too-late pattern.

The second requirement is that there must be established a unified command—with authority and responsibility to implement and execute the defense plans, and to assume the command function if needed.

There are many other difficulties. Among them are the speeding up of military production in Europe, arrangements for the transfer of arms through trade barriers, and the provision of economic and financial arrangements to cushion the shift from consumer to military production. But if the basic decisions are made to defend Europe, to complete the plan for its defense, and to establish a unified command, these mechanisms can be worked out. These are some of the tasks of the new Council of Deputies, under the leadership of the American deputy, Mr. Charles Spofford. At its first meeting it gave hopeful evidence that it would act vigorously to solve these problems.

I have not named the problem of Germany, in the list of necessary actions. The steps that I have named must be started if there is to be established an integrated system of security, larger than any one nation, in which Germany can play its part.

It is inevitable and moral that Germany shall be given the opportunity to defend itself. I do not attempt to define the method, but it would seem reasonable that the European countries, including Germany, know the proper way. In Strasbourg, in the past few days, in the Council of Europe, their leaders have called for the establishment of a European army, of which Germany would be a part. It is a decision which must be made and quickly to protect against another Korea.

There are important decisions that the United States must make.

The first is—do we really intend to join in the defense of Europe? I know that it will be said that we have committed ourselves to mutual defense by the North Atlantic Pact. But there is a vast difference between the statement of a commitment made in the best of faith, and in providing the means to make the commitment effective. The Korean experience emphasizes the difficulty and time necessary to transport men and equipment after an assault has commenced. However good our intentions, it is doubtful that we would be able to transport men and equipment to Europe in time, once an assault has started. The people of Europe have suffered one occupation. They know that a Soviet occupation would stamp out the elements of resistance and thus civilization. Consequently their interest in a second liberation is slight. Their interests focus on an effective defense.

These considerations lead me to believe that there will be no effective preparation of the defense of Europe until the United States makes clear that it will join in the defense of Europe in the initial stages of assault, should it come. This means that the United States and Great Britain must commit men and equipment before such an assault begins, either in an occupied zone, or elsewhere in Europe. I do not propose that we should undertake single-handed to defend Europe, or that we should immediately dispose troops, but only under a completed plan and upon a reciprocal basis, as European countries increase their forces. It is essential that Great Britain should also participate in this expansion. This is the third step essential to the defense of Europe.

You may say to me that if we do these things, we will take great risks. You are correct. It is a risk but the alternative is a greater risk—the risk of our isolation on this continent and gradual strangulation.

Aside from the consideration of our own security, it is unbelievable that Europe will not be defended and protected. It is the center of our civilization. It forms with us, with our friends in South America, and with other peace-desiring nations in the world, the core around which the free peoples of the world must rally in the long struggle ahead.

Will these decisions provoke an attack? I do not know, and no one knows. I would prefer to believe that if the United States and the members of the North Atlantic Pact make it known to Soviet Russia, to the United Nations, and to the world, that these are defense efforts, and the measure of our determination to defend ourselves, it will be the best chance of peace. If Russia then attacks, it would be clear that she is willing to risk the moral condemnation, and the resistance and the dogged fight of free peoples throughout the world.

I emphasize that these decisions must be made quickly. They are not the responsibility of the executive branch alone, but of the Congress as well. The executive branch cannot move without the full support of Congress. We stand in utmost peril. Interparty recrimination will not meet this danger. It must be met by action.

Finally, whatever we do, we must have the support of the people. I know that they do not like half-measures. I have always believed that if they know the facts and the objectives, they will make the necessary sacrifices. Every fact not denied by security must be made available to them.

Tonight, on this first reunion of the Third Army, I would have liked to speak in a happier, reminiscent vein. But I know your spirit, your mettle, and your legend. It is the spirit of your commander.

It was reported in the press that a few days before he died, General Patton wired President Truman in answer to the President's message of encouragement, that he expected to return. He said in the message: "I have never failed in my duty to my country. I will not fail now."

There were many tributes which moved us at his death. Most of them spoke of the past. The one I like to remember is that of a cartoon in the Chicago Sun. It was a picture of a familiar figure wading out into waters stretching limitlessly before him. He was moving away, knee-deep in the waters; but the shining helmet, the two pistols, and the erect figure were those of General Patton. It was unmistakable, that he would never turn back, and that he was looking forward. The only caption was: "Toward New Horizons."

In closing, I would like to make it clear that I do not consider the proposals I have made to constitute a rounded and complete policy. They are obviously not a substitute for our continued efforts within and without the United Nations to find some basis for a true peace. That peace can never be one of surrender or appeasement.

Neither do I consider the program one which standing alone can win the hearts and minds of neutral and undeveloped peoples of the world. It is a program for security and for survival, without which no larger program or policy will have the opportunity of accomplishment.

It seems certain that a new program and policy must embrace concepts larger than the aims of one nation. It must join the resources, the skills, the spirit of free nations, and perhaps free nations organically, in union in which democratic spirit and power can be reborn.

In this aim, we can move "Toward New Horizons."

The Anti-Communist Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Anti-Communist Bills," published in the New York Times of August 22, 1950. I hope every Member of the United States Senate will read this important editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ANTI-COMMUNIST BILLS

The Senate now has before it three distinct and rival measures dealing with subversive activities of Communists and their sympathizers. These are: the Mundt-Ferguson bill (S. 2311), the McCarran omnibus bill (S. 4037), and the administration bill (S. 4061). The first two differ fundamentally from the third in that the former impose general sanctions against Communists and Communist-fronters, while the latter, correcting some specific defects of existing law, reflects the view that sweeping legislation would be unnecessary, ineffective, and dangerous. We are inclined to think that, on the whole, the administration viewpoint is the correct one at the present time. We believe that close scrutiny of the Mundt-Ferguson and McCarran bills will show why this is so.

These measures have as one of their two principal joint features a provision making it a crime to conspire to perform any act that would "substantially contribute" to formation in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control. This language is so vague that it seems to us it could be used to impose restraints on freedom such as the American people have not known in 150 years. In any case it would seem advisable before passing legislation of this type at least to await the final decision of the Supreme Court on the Smith Act, which prohibits conspiracy to advocate the

forcible overthrow of the Government, and which has already been used to convict 11 leaders of the Communist Party.

The other principal joint feature of the Mundt-Ferguson and McCarran bills is the registration requirement they would impose on all Communists and on Communist-front organizations. The danger here is that the registration provisions might be used to destroy incipient political parties or even existing organizations advocating unpopular causes which may or may not be on the Communist fringe. This in our opinion approaches too closely to a possible regimentation of the American political structure along more or less orthodox party lines.

The primary objective of this legislation, and one with which we emphatically agree, is to render the Communists harmless, to destroy whatever potentialities they might have of forcibly overthrowing the American Government. But would these registration provisions accomplish that purpose? Those Communists and Communist sympathizers who would register are already known to the authorities and those who are not would doubtless remain underground. It is quite possible, in fact, that the whole party would be driven underground by this legislation, in which case it might become considerably more dangerous than it is at present.

In addition to the provisions already discussed, the McCarran bill contains in entirety a drastic and senseless immigration measure that has already passed the Senate (S. 1832), but which, as we have said before, is fundamentally antidemocratic. It contains other sections of lesser importance, some of which are, in fact, included in the administration bill. These involve a tightening of espionage, registration, military security, and deportation laws.

In considering all of this anti-Communist legislation it must be remembered that the primary Communist danger to the United States comes from an imperialist aggressive world power—Soviet Russia. A secondary danger comes from agents of that power who may be found principally, but by no means exclusively, within the American Communist Party and its controlled organizations. There is virtually no danger from the Communists as a domestic political party. In what Justice Holmes has called the competition of the market, the Communists have been able to win virtually no office of national importance. It is in the area of espionage, sabotage, and subversion that we have to fear the Communists inside this country. But it is precisely in these fields that we have ample legislation (subject to minor improvement) such as the treason, espionage, sabotage, naturalization, and registration laws, as well as the loyalty program for Government employees, and various administrative regulations to boot.

Is it wise, then, to adopt legislation which is couched in language so broad that it could seriously infringe upon individual liberty, which could set a precedent for interference with the traditional freedom of political parties or political organization, which as a practical matter might defeat its own purpose, and which at the present time is not necessary for the defense of our institutions? The freedoms of the American political system have cost too much in centuries of blood, sweat, and tears to be discarded, or even endangered, just because we want to take action against a contemptible and puny band of misguided zealots within our borders. When and if they become a threat to public order, then will be the time to move against them. Meanwhile, we urge the American people not to strike out in blind fear or fury, thereby undermining, as President Truman has said, "the very internal security they seek to protect." To do so might give us an emotional satisfaction. But there would not be one Communist less in the country.

We Are Still Arming Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Are Still Arming Russia," published in the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of August 19.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE STILL ARMING RUSSIA

Last week an editorial in this column, titled "Vital Goods to Russia," told how Representative LAWRENCE SMITH of Wisconsin had presented figures in the lower House of Congress showing that western European countries in 1949 sold more than a billion dollars worth of goods to Russia, including iron, steel, machine tools, and machinery. These sales were made to the Soviet by nations which had received much of the material in question from the United States, under the Marshall plan—and could be and would be used against us if we ever should get into a war with Russia.

It seems that credit for first bringing these figures to the attention of Congress and the American people should in reality have been given to Senator JAMES P. KEM, of Missouri, rather than to Mr. SMITH. At least 2 weeks before Representative SMITH's speech in the House, Senator KEM brought the figures to the attention of the Senate in support of his proposal to reduce the amount of the appropriation for the Economic Cooperation Administration. Following that address the Washington Times-Herald made this editorial comment, under the heading: "We are still arming Russia":

"Marshall-plan countries are still shipping American materials into Russia and her satellite countries. Senator KEM, Republican, of Missouri, told the Senate that he has been informed by Commerce Department officials that Britain, for example, shipped approximately $1,000,000 in machine tools to Russia in the first 4 months of this year. This is 10 times the amount sent to Russia by Britain in the first 4 months of 1949. Belgium and Italy have also followed Britain's lead and sent iron and steel into Russia.

"Therefore KEM yesterday proposed a substantial cut in ECA funds. During debate on the multi-billion-dollar appropriation bill, he urged his colleagues to save the country $718,000,000 by limiting ECA appropriations in the bill to $1,950,000,000 and eliminating $276,000,000 carried over from last year's appropriation.

"KEM, who has consistently voted for all appropriations for our Military Establishments, points out that the slash he proposes would affect only the economic aid to western Europe. It would not touch appropriations for Korea or the military-aid program.

"In support of his proposal also, he argues that due to the Korean war this country will soon suffer a severe strain on its resources since it will bear the brunt of the fighting. But in the face of the shortages in this country ECA plans to give away more than $200,000,000 in industrial materials next year to Marshall-aid countries.

"We agree absolutely with the Missouri Senator. It is utter foolishness for us to give away critical material at a time when we are winding up to a point where we will not have enough to meet our own demands. But we believe KEM's revelation that Marshall-plan countries are passing along the material we give them to Russia and her satellites is a much stronger argument against the administration's free-handed give aways.

"As KEM also pointed out, it is entirely possible that these materials have been used to make the guns and tanks that are now killing Americans in Korea."

While most of us are convinced the United States must continue to help western European nations, mighty few will refuse to condemn giving them our essential materials that are in short supply and, particularly, permitting our western European allies who receive them to pass them on to Russia for possible if not probable use against us in some future war. Surely, such practice is not merely foolish. It is asinine almost to the point of criminality.

Registration and Control of Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, yesterday, when it appeared that we were to vote on the so-called Mundt-Ferguson bill as an amendment to the civilian production control bill, the national commander of AMVETS, Mr. Harold Russell, gave me a letter to read to the Senate. Since it was arranged to vote on the Communist-control measure which was introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Russell's letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II,
Washington, D. C., August 21, 1950.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: I have been informed of the intention of the United States Senate to consider on August 21, 1950, the amendment to the Maybank civilian-control bill by attaching to it the provisions of S. 2311, the Communist registration and control bill, and, therefore, wish to advise you of the strong support offered by AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), the only congressionally chartered World War II veterans' organization, to the provisions of the bill S. 2311.

AMVETS, at its 1949 national convention, adopted a resolution urging the registration of all Communists, Communist-front organizations, and all other peoples or groups advocating the overthrow of the United States by force or subversion. A study of the Mundt-Ferguson bill by AMVETS indicates that it substantially corresponds with the above-mentioned mandate of our organization and further provides the necessary mechanical features of due process in equitably carrying out said bill's intention.

It is claimed that passage of the Mundt-Ferguson bill would compel said Communist and Communist-front organizations to go underground, making it more difficult to detect their operation, but a review of the last few years' history proves that permitting the Communists' conspiracy to

operate aboveground has not facilitated our detection or defense of its subversive tendency. With the actual contact between the American forces and Communist forces in Korea, AMVETS believe that new and more stringent techniques should be used to control the spread of communism. It is our conviction that the war to combat communism should commence at home within our own continental limits and that a projection of our fighting resources outside the country without adequate vigilance at home might well dissipate the energy so essential to maintain our American way of life.

I would appreciate your cooperation in making the sentiments of AMVETS known to your colleagues of the United States Senate.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD RUSSELL,
National Commander.

Merger Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, an editorial in this morning's Washington Post with reference to H. R. 2734, generally known as the antimonopoly bill, sets forth the purpose of, and the sound reasoning behind, the proposed legislation most clearly and concisely.

Now on the Senate Calendar, H. R. 2734 will, I hope, be brought to the Senate floor for consideration and decision shortly. In the conviction that today's editorial will help to clarify the issues involved, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERGER CONTROL

Under the Clayton Act a company is prohibited from acquiring the stock of another company, if the acquisition would substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly; but the prohibition does not extend to outright purchases of a company's physical assets. For a quarter of a century the Federal Trade Commission has been vainly urging Congress to plug this loophole in the law which has hampered its efforts to check the growing concentration of economic power via the merger route. A year ago the House passed such a loophole-plugging amendment to the Clayton Act; last May the Senate Judiciary Committee approved the House bill; and a few days ago Senator LUCAS, speaking for the Democratic Policy Committee, informed the Senate that there is a possibility of considering the bill at this session.

In recent years the outstanding characteristic of the merger movement has been the buying out of small companies by large concerns. Over a 7-year period, more than 70 percent of the firms acquired have been taken over by corporations with assets of more than $5,000,000, while at least 93 percent of the firms absorbed had assets of less than a million dollars. To be sure, mergers often result in gains in efficiency, and not all of them involve threats to free competitive enterprise. However, the current trend emphasizes the need for strengthening the antitrust laws to enable the FTC to arrest a cumulative process of acquisition that in many cases gives large and rapidly expanding corporations undue competitive advantages.

The bill passed by the House does not prevent all mergers, but only those that fail to meet the prescribed tests of legality. As a matter of fact, it is less restrictive than the present law in case of mergers effected by sales of stock. There is nothing in the legislation that would impede production for defense purposes, since the bill is not retroactive. Furthermore, it would not prevent a company from purchasing the assets of a bankrupt corporation or one that is about to fail. Nor would it prohibit small companies from merging in order to compete more effectively with large concerns. It applies only to those types of mergers and acquisitions—vertical, horizontal, and conglomerate—the effect of which may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly.

The discretionary power that the proposed legislation would give the FTC to deal with mergers brought about by acquisition of assets as well as stock purchases is vaguely defined. But as the Senate Judiciary Committee states: "A requirement of certainty and actuality of injury to competition is incompatible with any effort to supplement the Sherman Act by reaching incipient restraints." Since it is the purpose of the bill to prevent restraints of trade that might lead to suppression of competition, it is neither practicable nor desirable for Congress to lay down hard and fast rules by which to determine when intervention is necessary.

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding the war in Korea, written by Joseph E. Ray, editor of the Blackfoot Bulletin, of Blackfoot, Idaho.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Blackfoot (Idaho) Bulletin of August 14, 1950]

WHAT D'YA KNOW, JOE

Well, Stalin, how goes the Korean war?

Over here in Blackfoot all we know is what we read in the Daily Bulletin. It says there have been about a thousand Americans killed so far in the world's newest war and several thousand wounded and missing.

When you crawl into bed at night do you go right to sleep or do you like to savor the peepul's triumphs a little? How does it feel to have the world by the tail, anyway?

How does it seem to have miserable little creatures who pass as men in the sight of God mouth your evil designs in the capitals of the world? Who roll over, sit up, or play dead when you snap your fingers in the Kremlin 10,000 miles away. Does it give you a kick to fire off a cable to Malik at Lake Success and order him to further obstruct and harass and delay and scold and ridicule and make a mockery of the efforts of decent men to shape some kind of a peace in this world?

How does it seem to hold the fate of millions in your grasping hands, already sticky with the blood of so many innocent people? How does a dictator operate, anyway? Do you have a desk pad on which are noted purges to be launched, revolutions to be incited in far-off places? Or does the puppet Molotov remind you of these matters?

How does it feel to be an arch traitor to the cause of humanity, posing six scant years ago as an ally and a comrade in the common fight against the Nazis and now proving to be a viler menace?

How goes the sly world revolution, anyway? Are we capitalist boobs still falling foolishly for your clever ruses, being drawn into a skirmish here and a skirmish there? You are a clever one, Joe. You have achieved immortality—of a sort. The world spawns many like you, but most get their heads stepped on before they do much damage.

We'll take care of you, too, in time, unless you mend your ways. But here again we indulge in the undying hope of the little men who have to fight the wars. Another weakness of ours, eh, Joe? Fools we are to hope and pray and trust in God. Fools to think you, Stalin, might miraculously become a decent, peace-loving citizen. But even fools weary of treachery and rise up in righteous fury to destroy the tyrant. Hark well the lessons of history, Joe.

Outstanding Religious Books of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was glad to note the selections of the Religious Books Round Table of the American Library Association for this year. Among the 50 top religious books of all faiths selected by an outstanding committee of leading American representatives of the great faiths of our country, were two books issued by the Bruce Publishing Co., of Milwaukee.

We of Wisconsin are indeed proud of this outstanding publishing company whose very name has become a hallmark of quality and public service—a great center for spiritual literature and for educational leadership.

We are proud of America's religious press, which symbolizes the fact that man does not live by bread alone. I am glad, therefore, to call attention to the outstanding religious books of the year. I feel that perhaps in doing so I may help by that small bit at least to focus the attention of our people on the need for consulting the great religious volumes published by companies such as the Bruce Publishing Co. of Milwaukee.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on this theme published in the Saturday, August 19, Milwaukee Journal, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO OF BRUCE CO. BOOKS CLASSED AS OUTSTANDING—WIN PLACES AMONG 50 OF FOREMOST VOLUMES IN RELIGIOUS FIELD, PICKED BY LIBRARY GROUP

Two books issued by the Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee book firm, are among the

50 outstanding religious books of the year selected this month by the Religious Books Round Table of the American Library Association. They are: St. Ignatius of Loyola, a biographical study by Paul Dudon, S. J., a Belgian scholar, and translated by William Young, S. J.; and The Catholic Reformation, by Pierre Janelle, professor in the arts faculty at Clermont-Ferrand University, France. Both books deal with approximately the same period, the late fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries, according to Paul Gratke, chief of the education, philosophy, and religion department of the Milwaukee public library. Gratke was chairman of the selection committee, which chose the 50 from books published in the United States from May 1, 1949, until last May.

"Together," he said, "the books bring a scholarly analysis of an era in Roman Catholic religious history."

PART OF CULTURE SERIES

Both books are part of the science and culture series issued by the publishing firm. The general editor of this series is Father Joseph Husslein, S. J., Milwaukee born Jesuit who is now professor of social work at St. Louis University.

Other members of the selection committee for the Religious Books Roundtable are: Dr. Henry Sloan Coffin, president emeritus of Union Theological Seminary, New York City; Msgr. Harry C. Koenig, librarian of St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, Ill.; Rabbi Jonah Bondi Wise, of Central Synagogue, New York City; Dr. Edwin Lewis, professor of systematic theology at Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J., and Dr. David Elton Trueblood, professor of philosophy at Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.

The books were selected after careful study, Gratke declared.

"The committee," he said, "has made no attempt to evaluate any religion or religious group or to interpret the merits of religious points of view or respective doctrines."

BASIS OF SELECTION

The selection was based on the criteria of objective scholarship, original thinking, stimulating analyses of religious leaders and movements, inspirational witness to religious conviction and clarifying editorship in presenting an established work.

For the first time in the years the selection has been made, a book on Mohammedanism is included. It is The Commentary on the Creed of Islam by Mas'udibn'-Umar, translated by Earl Edgar Elder. It is a compendium of Islamic theology. Four books from the Upanishads, the principal literature of Hinduism, edited by Nikhililananda, also are included in the list.

Two books were unanimously chosen by all committee members for inclusion in the list, Gratke said. They are, The Prophetic Faith by Martin Buber, professor of Old Testament theology at Hebrew University, Jerusalem, and The Jews, by Louis Finkelstein. The latter is a symposium on the culture, history, religion, and nationalism of the Jews.

LIST IS GIVEN

Following is the list of the 50 best (excluding those mentioned above):

Esab, Otto Justice, The Theology of the Old Testament; Bett, Henry, Reality of the Religious Life; Blau, Joseph Leon, Cornerstones of Religious Freedom in America; Brunner, Emil, Christian Doctrine of God, Dogmatics, volume I; Butterfield, Herbert, Christianity and History; Church, Leslie, The Early Methodist People.

Clark, Elmer Talmadge, The Small Sects in America; Dawson, Christopher, Religion and the Rise of Western Culture; Dibelius, Martin, Jesus; Ferre, Nels, Christianity and Society; Flight John, The Drama of Ancient Israel; Fosdick, Harry Emerson, The Man From Nazareth; Gilson, Etienne, Dante, the Philosopher; Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson, The Apostolic Fathers.

Hamilton, Edith, Spokesmen for God; Hersey, John, The Wall; Inge, William Ralph, The End of an Age and Other Essays; Kayser, Rudolf, The Life and Times of Jehudah Halevi; Kepler, Thomas Samuel, Contemporary Thinking About Paul; Knox, John, Chapters in the Life of Paul.

OTHERS ON LIST

Kramer, Herbert George, Crucified With Christ; Lofts, Norah, Women in the Old Testament; Male, Emile, Religious Art; Marshall, Peter, Mr. Jones Meet the Master; Martensen, Hans, Jacob Boehme; Moe, Olaf, The Apostle Paul; Morgenstern, Julien, As a Mighty Stream; Nixon, Justin Wroe, Responsible Christianity; Norris, Herbert, Church Vestments; Oursler, Fulton and Will, Father Flanagan of Boys' Town.

Overstreet, Harry Allen, The Mature Mind; Pegis, Anton Charles, The Wisdom of Catholicism; Pfeiffer, Robert Henry, History of New Testament Times; Pope, Hugh, St. Augustine of Hippo; Pratt, James Bissett, Eternal Values in Religion; Roberts, David, Psychotherapy and a Christian View of Man; Robertson, Archie, That Old-Time Religion; Sayers, Dorothy Leigh, The Man Born To Be King; Sheean, Vincent, Lead, Kindly Light; Steere, Douglas, Time To Spare; Talbot, Francis Xavier, Saint Among the Hurons; Aquinas, Thomas, Of God and His Creatures, translated by Joseph Rickaby, S. J.; Trapp, Maria, The Story of the Trapp Family Singers; Weizsacker, Carl Frederick, The History of Nature.

Special mention was given to several series of books now in the process of production or translation by various publishers: Ancient Christian Writers, the works of the apostolic fathers, published by Newman; the Yale Judaica Series, by the Yale University Press; the Works of John Calvin, by Eerdmans; the Works of John Henry Newman, published by Longmans. An English Bible, designed by Bruce Rogers and put out by the World Publishing Co., was described as the "outstanding printing achievement of the year."

Broadcast in Honor of 55 Members of the Japanese Diet Visiting the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the manuscript of a broadcast entitled "The Good Road," which originated with the Columbia Broadcasting System on August 6, 1950, in Los Angeles, Calif. The broadcast was monitored by Chancelor von Kleinsmid, of the University of Southern California; and it was in honor of 55 members of the Japanese Diet and other distinguished leaders of government, industry, labor, and finance who were visiting in the United States.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. RUFUS VON KLEINSMID, chancelor of the University of Southern California. Upon this occasion it is a great honor to entertain in this city of Los Angeles the delegation, 55 strong, which comes to us directly from the world conference at Caux, in behalf of the principles of the Moral Re-Armament movement. It is a privilege to introduce to you as the first speaker the mayor of the city of Los Angeles. Every great city should have a great mayor, and Los Angeles fulfills those specifications.

Mayor FLETCHER BOWRON, mayor of Los Angeles. As chief executive of the city of Los Angeles, it is a privilege to welcome these distinguished Japanese visitors who are our guests here this evening. They are the chosen democratic leaders of their country. It is especially significant that among them are the mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and that they are with us as messengers of good will and friendship on the fifth anniversary of the dropping of the first atom bomb.

Their presence here this evening is evidence of a power which can turn enemies into friends, and bring unity in place of division. They come at a time when their country has been thrust into the forefront of the world-wide struggle for freedom and democracy.

Recent events in Korea have shown the lengths to which a destructive ideology is prepared to go in its bid to dominate the world. The aggressors who strike for communism have compelled us again to rearm physically to meet the challenge. With even greater importance for the future of civilization and freedom we are rearming morally to meet the ideological challenge which confronts the free nations of the world. It is all important to find the fighting democratic faith with which to arm the millions in those countries whose protection destiny has committed to our hands. It is to find such a faith for their own country that these chosen leaders have traveled across the world and almost back again.

But it is not only these front-line countries which need a fighting faith. We need it mightily right here at home among our own American people. The burst of buying and hoarding which followed the outbreak of fighting in Korea has shown that selfish materialism is not absent from the hearts of Americans. Only a faith based on absolute moral standards and lived out in the daily life of every citizen can give us as a Nation the strength and the right to lead the world in its struggle for freedom.

That is why it is a special privilege to greet you in this building, the world headquarters for Moral Re-Armament. We are proud to have it known throughout our Nation and in every other nation that Los Angeles is the world headquarters of Moral Re-Armament.

I believe that the positive dynamic program which it represents is serving both to strengthen the life of our own community and to combat the insidious influences of destructive ideologies among the peoples of various nationalities throughout the world. It is a program which can unite east and west in the common struggle for a free and peaceful world.

Dr. RUFUS VON KLEINSMID. Great States should have great governors, and California has one. Governor Earl Warren would gladly have been here in person tonight but for the press of important business of state. He has, however, recorded his message to us and we shall now be privileged to listen to him, and I present Governor Warren.

Gov. EARL WARREN, Governor of the State of California. Mayor Bowron, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. As Governor of California I join the citizens of Los Angeles in welcoming these distinguished Japanese visitors to our State. The friendly visit they are making to our country and the cordial welcome they have received throughout our land are striking examples of what can happen when people's minds and objectives are turned to peace. I am sure their visit to California will be as heartily received. Exactly 5 years ago our country and Japan were engaged in mortal combat, but when the war ended, both nations devoted themselves to peace. The democratic concept of humanity as applied by America

was the inspiration for a new and understanding leadership in Japan. Under this new leadership there has been promoted a cooperative spirit which again makes us friends. It is bringing us closer to the day when we can wipe out entirely the nightmare of the past and complete the building of a world at peace, based on morality, justice, and brotherhood. Gentlemen, I trust your visit to California will be an enjoyable one.

Dr. RUFUS VON KLEINSMID. Our very effective and progressive press has given wide notice of the visit to our city of this distinguished delegation. It should not have been our privilege to have met so many Japanese ladies and gentlemen except for the visit to Japan (among others) of Mr. Kenaston Twitchell. You know him as Ken Twitchell. He is no stranger to Los Angeles. We welcome his return enthusiastically, and I present him to you.

Mr. H. K. TWITCHELL. Here with us tonight are representatives of the life of modern Japan. There are members of the Japanese Diet officially appointed by their parties to come on this trip. There are governors of seven of the most important prefectures, mayors of the cities of Kobe and Nagano, as well as Hiroshima and Nagasaki. There are leaders of industry and labor unions. These representatives of Japan flew across Asia to Europe to the Moral Re-Armament Assembly at Caux, Switzerland, now proceeding under the leadership of Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman. Our first speaker from the delegation is Mrs. Yukika Sohma. Many of you will remember the visit a few weeks ago of the elder statesman of Japan, Yukio Osaki, 92-year-old member of the Diet since its first session in 1890, and the man who gave the cherry trees to Washington when he was mayor of Tokyo in 1905. Mrs. Sohma, who is here with her husband, is the mother of four children, and like her father is a fighter for the new Japan.

Mrs. YUKIKA SOHMA. This Japanese delegation consists of leaders from all social phases of the nation. I feel that the significance of this delegation is that it left Japan primarily to find the ideology for democracy—the ideology based on moral standards which we have come to feel is essential in working out a real democracy. At Caux we met representative leaders of 47 countries. It was a conference of answers, of results—results that only need multiplication to bring a solid cure to world affairs. There we saw a family of nations actually at work where differences of race, class, point of view were superseded by a greater uniting ideology. There we have seen and experienced reconciliation of hearts which can and is affecting the nations. We saw human nature change. We saw French and Germans lose their hatred for each other, which is so essential to the working out of the Schuman plan.

We saw management and labor unite in a common battle for a world of abundance where everybody cares enough and everybody shares enough and therefore everybody has enough. We saw men trained for 25 years in the leadership of the Communist Party find a greater ideology than communism, and begin to fight with a greater passion for the life of the free world. We saw good but passive men become revolutionary fighters for the remaking of the world under the guidance of God. Military leaders told us they had discovered at Caux the secret of morale and ideological training for the new armies of western Europe. We saw the four standards of moral rearmament—absolute honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love—become the cornerstones of a new world order. We saw that with this new spirit Japan can be reborn and become a nation loved by the rest of the world. We saw and experienced that human nature is the same whether it be in the east or in the west, and that change for everyone—not just for the other person nor just for myself—but for everyone—worked on a personal as well as national and international level.

We saw that if we sincerely desire to bring unity where disunity prevails, love where hatred prevails, justice where injustice prevails, we must pay the price in our own lives. We saw the fundamental truths of democracy interpreted to meet the needs of today by each person taking the responsibility for the whole. It is only when each person begins to live the standards which everyone wants the other person or the leaders of nations to live, are we helping to achieve the ideal state of peace in the world.

I feel that this program is bringing to the world the heart of the American heritage and democracy's inspired ideology. The world is looking to America's leadership. They do not look to America only for material aid, but also for spiritual leadership with the greatest confidence that in her heritage she has the answers to bring unity to the now divided world.

May I say one word on behalf of the women of Japan. * * * Under the new constitution we have been given freedom and equality, but very many of us have been trained to serve in the homes for many centuries and have not been able to find the right way in which to utilize this freedom and equality that have been given us. As women we naturally pray for the establishment of real peace. But often we do not see how we can help to do this, because we feel that we are hopelessly inefficient; but here we have found that there is a way, even in our homes or wherever we are. We have found that peace is not just an idea we talk about, but it is something we can achieve when people become different.

We are so grateful to you for bringing Moral Re-Armament to Japan. It is interpreting your greatest American heritage in making democracy work in a way that anybody in Japan can understand. We women of Japan wish to bring this spirit to Japan and through her change to the world. Because we believe this is the only expression of restitution for her past wrongs and with this ideology we can build a new world.

Mr. TWITCHELL. Some months ago Basil Entwistle and I stood on the T bridge in Hiroshima which was the pin-point target of the atom bomb. We looked out upon the scene of devastation unprecedented in the history of man. Three men are here with us tonight who have worked for the reconstruction of Hiroshima. Governor Kusunose of the Hiroshima Prefecture; Speaker Selichi Kawamoto of the city council; and Shinso Hamai, mayor of Hiroshima City. Mr. Hamai.

Mr. HAMAI. On behalf of the citizens of Hiroshima I wish to take this opportunity to express our heartfelt gratitude for the sympathy and the material and moral support that have been extended to us by you of America ever since the destruction of our city. This day commemorates that fateful day. It is uniquely significant that I can commemorate this day with you people in the United States exactly 5 years later. I can still remember that day with stark reality. It was like a nightmare. This nightmare has continued in my mind for the past 5 years and will probably continue for many years to come. Not only were more than 100,000 lives snuffed out but also the lucky survivors are facing almost insurmountable difficulties daily. Even at the present speed of reconstruction it will probably take more than 30 years to complete our rehabilitation. This is a sample of what atomic warfare might be.

But we people of Hiroshima hold no bitterness toward anyone, because we have realized that this is a tragedy naturally to be expected from war. The only thing we ask of the world is that everybody becomes strongly aware of what happened in Hiroshima, how it happened, and why it happened, and to exert every effort to see to it that it will not have to happen again in any other place.

Of course, it is not for me to say whether the atom bomb should be used or not. That is for others to decide, and I have the utmost confidence in the decision of the United States. But I am sure that the only way that we can keep this from happening again is to attain conditions where war will not take place.

I know that there are many complicated problems that must be solved before we can finally attain a world truly at peace. But I am also sure that unless each and every one of us devote ourselves day by day to solving these problems, no matter how complicated and difficult they may be, peace will never come. And our efforts to this end must not be based on the philosophy of hatred, bitterness, or conflict, but must be guided in the direction of cooperation and unity crystallized by sincerity and the spirit of brotherhood. We need to remove the boundary lines we have willfully drawn in our hearts—the lines of race, nationality, and class. Those lines are the result of hallucinations of mind, and they can be removed by a change of heart. Division and strife only aggravate bitterness and lead eventually to war and the suicide of the human race. We learned this painfully and clearly in our experience 5 years ago.

A no more serious, no more urgent problem exists today than the critical need at this moment for each one of us to live through together these days of crisis divested of all human barriers.

Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, whom I met at the World Moral Re-Armament Assembly at Caux, Switzerland, has said, "Peace is people becoming different." This hits the nail on the head. I, for one, intend to start this effort from Hiroshima. The one dream and hope left to the surviving citizens of Hiroshima is to reestablish the city as a pattern of peace, both in humans and in things, regardless of how difficult a struggle the road may be.

At the same time we are looking to America for guidance in this direction. For America is not just one nation in a group of nations in the world. America is the father and big brother of all democratic countries and the repository of the world's hopes. If America shows true moral leadership with a great transcending love, the world will follow.

Mr. TWITCHELL. After Caux the Japanese delegation visited the countries of western Europe. Members of the delegation were received in special audience by the Pope. They met with Chancelor Adenauer of the West German Republic and were told by him that MRA has become a household word in Germany today, that men are learning the great truth that each one of us must begin with ourselves. They flew to Berlin. They conferred with members of the cabinet in Bonn and were received by United States High Commissioner McCloy. In France and Britain they met national leaders and heard of the fight for reconstruction and unity springing from the efforts of the free nations to come closer together and from the renaissance that is born at Caux.

In America Ambassador Warren Austin welcomed them to the United Nations and expressed the hope that Japan might soon again take her place in the world family.

Historic days were awaiting them in Washington. Both Senate and House adjourned to welcome the members of the Japanese Diet onto the floor of their respective assemblies. In the House of Representatives, the delegates were reminded by the majority leader that it was the first time in history that a foreign delegation was to be received in this way. In both House and Senate prolonged applause greeted the remarks of their spokesmen.

We will now hear from Mr. Chojiro Kuriyama, an official representative of the Prime Minister's Liberal Party which holds the controlling majority of seats in the Diet. Mr. Kuriyama.

Mr. KURIYAMA. I would like to express deepest gratitude for the warm welcome and courtesy with which the American Government and people have surrounded us during our unforgettable visit in this country. I would also like to say a special word of thanks to our hosts of Moral Re-Armament who have made us so completely at home in every country we have visited. We have traveled through Europe and America in the true MRA spirit, "the whole world is my neighbor."

May I say that it is our sincere regret that Japan has broken an almost century-old friendship between our two countries. In spite of this big mistake on our part, the magnanimous forgiveness and generosity of this country have not only allowed Japan to survive, but are helping her recovery. By so doing, she is practicing Christianity in international relations. In recent days our delegation has had an opportunity to study the true heritage of great America. We know that the leadership of America is rooted in Christianity. It will be a great source of happiness to the people of Japan if we can rebuild and reconstruct our nation on the same principles that you in America, together with George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and other leaders, have followed.

We are this time on an ideological mission. Just before we left Tokyo for this trip, our Prime Minister, Mr. Yoshida, expressed his hope that as the first Japanese industrial mission of 1870 brought back to Japan the industrial techniques of the west, so our present mission can bring back to our country the positive ideology which will answer communism. We found this answer clearly exemplified at the world assembly in Caux, Switzerland.

There we met that great American, Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, the pioneer of this uniting ideology which is bringing hope to millions in Europe and the Far East. We want to thank America for what she has given to the world through Dr. Buchman.

In our discussions with cabinet ministers of France, Italy, Germany, and Britain, we found it very encouraging that they are all fully aware that peace is much more than the mere ending of armed conflict; that to build peace we need the same passion and force to unite with people and other nations as we need to fight against them when we make war; that love for democracy can be a passion; that moral rearmament can be a force.

Now lawless aggression in Korea is again involving America in terrible sacrifices. We Japanese wholeheartedly support the action taken by the United Nations, and if you will permit us to do so, we pay highest respect to your President, Mr. Truman, in this matter.

But the Korean war is also a symptom of a world-wide ideological struggle. Ideological action throughout the free world must parallel the military action which America has so courageously undertaken. It is here perhaps that we Japanese can make our most effective contribution.

Throughout non-Communist Asia today there is an ideological vacuum which weakens our people within and encourages aggression without. The Soviet advances in the Orient because she aims first of all to fill that vacuum. The Soviet Government understands the art of ideological war. It fights for the minds of men. We appeal to the governments and peoples of the west to do the same.

The millions in the Far East must be presented with a philosophy and way of life so appealing that totalitarianism of right or left will not attract them. We look especially to America, which has given and is giving so generously in economic and military aid, to give us also the ideology which can liberate our minds and hearts, and make us strong and free.

Mr. TWITCHELL. It is something more than military action that is called for in the Far East. We can win back the territory that has been taken by aggression. But can we win the minds and hearts of the people who live there to the kind of democracy that lasts? Can we give them an ideology for democracy that calls out more daring and sacrifice and passion than communism? This is an ideological age, and the conflict of ideologies challenges us in America to rethink our own basic faith. Above all this hour of decision challenges us to fight for the regeneration of our own inner life as a nation, so that we match material rearmament with moral rearmament, fight for straight living under the guidance of God.

Does Crime Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in America every child is taught that crime does not pay. It is part of our democratic and humane beliefs and way of life that we do not sanction violation of legal, ethical, and moral codes of human behavior. That is why, in this country, we punish those who violate the moral attributes of mankind.

Thousands of monstrous crimes were committed by Germans only a few years ago. Most of them are still unpunished. The Germans violated the laws of humanity. They burned, looted, and mutilated a whole continent for 5 years. They violated the dignity of man. They enslaved and degraded the very notion of humanity. They flaunted all tenets of international law.

Five years ago the democracies announced to the world that the criminals who violated the norms of civilization will be held accountable to civilization. An international tribunal was established to pass judgment upon those who committed crimes against humanity. The International Tribunal decided to reestablish the principles of international justice.

What was the nature of these crimes? Let me cite one instance from the official report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, October 13, 1949, titled "Malmedy Massacre Investigation":

> The atrocities which were committed at 12 places throughout Belgium, consisted, according to different witnesses, of the killing of approximately 350 unarmed American prisoners of war after they had surrendered, and 100 Belgian civilians. It was one of the few cases where substantial numbers of Americans were murdered en masse.

What happened to those who perpetrated these unspeakable crimes? Seventy-three German members of the SS organization were found guilty, and 43 were given the death penalty by an American military tribunal. Among those convicted were three German generals, one an outstanding SS general, as well as officers of lesser rank who were combat leaders. However, no sooner had the verdicts been announced than pro-German organizations in this country, headed by the National Council for the Prevention of War, began their nefarious work to frustrate justice. Senator Baldwin's report dwells at length about the activities of this organization and says:

> The subcommittee, through outside investigation, has determined that the National Council for the Prevention of War and other organizations have maintained a constant correspondence with certain people in Germany and other persons interested in these cases. Through these efforts, most of the allegations made in this case have become accepted as fact and our prestige in Germany thereby adversely affected. * * * The subcommittee is convinced that the activities of this organization in this matter, which go far beyond the Malmedy case, have been most damaging to the national interest of our country and to the cause of peace.

The Baldwin subcommittee therefore recommended that this pro-German organization be investigated.

Mr. Speaker, not only has this recommendation not been carried out, but instead, thanks largely to the activities of the National Council for the Prevention of War, the Germans succeeded in having 37 death sentences commuted. In addition, numerous attempts have been made by these un-American elements to discredit the whole principle of war crimes trials by making false charges as to the bona fide character of the Malmedy trials. As a result, the findings of the Baldwin subcommittee, which upheld the essential guilt of the German war criminals and concluded that these attacks against the Malmedy trials were unfair and unwarranted, have not been acted upon.

Prior to the publication of the subcommittee's report, General Clay commuted the death sentences of 37 of the 43 who had originally been condemned.

The six remaining criminals did not receive such commutations. Yet their sentences, up to this very moment, have not been carried out. Five and a half years have passed since the fateful event of the Malmedy Massacre; 13 investigations have been made regarding this case, and, in spite of the fact that these investigations recognized the guilt of these war criminals, the vast majority of them have escaped just punishment.

Outraged at the failure to enforce the verdicts of the American Military Tribunal, numerous patriotic organizations, including war veterans, have petitioned High Commissioner McCloy to uphold the authority of our courts. These pleas fall, it appears, upon deaf ears. On January 5, 1950, the General Counsel of the High Commissioner's Office stated that—

> Investigation, trial, review, and subsequent action in this case (Malmedy) have been, and continue to be, within the sole jurisdiction of the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is not the case. The President's Executive Order No. 10062, dated June 6, 1949, explicitly says that—

> The United States High Commissioner for Germany, hereinafter referred to as the High

Commissioner, shall be the supreme United States authority for Germany.

Under the same Executive order, the United States High Commissioner for Germany was designated also as "the United States Military Governor with all the powers thereby including those vested in the United States Military Government over all international agreements." Moreover, the charter for the Allied High Commission for Germany, published in the State Department Bulletin July 11, 1948, stipulates that the individual responsibilities of the High Commissioners, included—

(a) the disposition of war criminals;
(b) administration of justice in cases falling within the jurisdiction of allied courts;
(c) control of the care and treatment in German prisons of persons judged before or sentenced by the courts or tribunals of the occupation authorities over the carrying out of sentences imposed on them and over questions of amnesty, pardon, or release, in relation to them.

Mr. Speaker, if this language makes any sense at all, it means that the powers of the High Commissioner are clear and explicit as to his responsibilities with regard to the German war crimes cases, including the Malmedy case, and the carrying out of the sentences thereof. As a matter of fact, Mr. McCloy has used these very same powers when he granted a paro'e to George Von Schnitzler—a major war criminal.

How long must justice wait? Why didn't Mr. McCloy carry out the sentences as he was pledged to do under the authority granted to him? How long will Mr. McCloy continue to flaunt the will of the American people and the United States Congress?

The Malmedy massacre case is bad enough. But take the case of General of the SS Otto Ohlendorf. On April 10, 1948, Ohlendorf, who confessed to the murder of 90,000 men, women, and children, and 13 of his codefendants in the Einsatzgruppen case, were sentenced to be hanged.

I now quote from the final report to the Secretary of the Army by Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor, August 1949, page 180:

The Einsatzgruppen were special units of the SS that accompanied the German army with the special mission of ensuring political security in the occupied areas. As conceived and executed by the SS, this mission involved the immediate and outright slaughter of all Jews in the occupied areas. It was established that approximately one million Jews and others were liquidated in Russia by the Einsatzgruppen. The 24 defendants and their trial was, not unnaturally, widely publicized as "the biggest murder trial in history."

On November 3, 1947, sentences were passed down in the so-called Oswald Pohl case. Pohl and three other defendants were sentenced to hanging for crimes committed against inmates of concentration camps. So far, not one single sentence was carried out.

This miscarriage of justice was duly recognized in the Congress of the United States. A Senate subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator CLYDE HOEY, investigated all matters connected with these trials. On January 27, 1950, Senator CLYDE HOEY told the New York Post that he saw no justification for further delay in the implementation of the sentences in the Pohl and Ohlendorf cases.

Here is his own language:

The staff of my committee has given me its report on the Nuremberg trials of these 16 men. There were no irregularities, as the report demonstrates. The defendants had all their legal rights.

Consequently, Senator HOEY informed the Post that he did not think there was any justification "to interfere in this case and to ask any delay in these executions."

Following this statement, several American organizations again petitioned High Commissioner McCloy to carry out the long delayed sentences. Months went by without an answer. Recently, Mr. McCloy announced that the delay in the Pohl and Ohlendorf cases is due to the petition for habeas corpus by certain of these defendants in United States courts. Mr. McCloy also mentioned that—

Representatives of committees acting under the authority of Congress or the Department of the Army * * * have indicated that in certain instances the exercise of clemency might be warranted.

I might add that the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled against Federal Court jurisdiction in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that Congress be informed who these mysterious interceders are. Were these committees legally constituted? If so, may I ask by whom and under what authority? Or could it be that the un-American organizations which did so much harm in the Malmedy massacre case, as conclusively proved by the Baldwin subcommittee, are behind the moves to frustrate American justice? Certainly it could not be the Baldwin committee that asked for clemency since it did not include in its final report any suggestion that clemency might be warranted. Furthermore, Senator HOEY admitted that he saw no justification in the delay of the carrying out of the sentences imposed on the war criminals. Or could it be that we have come to such a pass where personal opinions of some anonymous representatives can nullify the verdicts of the legally constituted courts?

Take a look at the case of Von Weiszaecker. The Tribunal found him guilty of participating in the unlawful invasion and occupation of Bohemia and Moravia and of complicity in the deportation of Jews from several European countries to enslavement and extermination in concentration camps such as Auschwitz. On April 14, 1949, Weiszaecker and 14 other criminals were sentenced to prison terms from 4 to 25 years. On April 3, 1950, Mr. McCloy stated that the case is being reviewed. Is McCloy now going to let that criminal go scot free?

Take the case of Emil Puhl, who was a director of Hitler's Reichsbank. In cooperation with the Reichsbank, Puhl turned into cash the gold teeth and jewelry from slaughtered concentration camp inmates and gas-chamber victims. For this, he was convicted of atrocities against civilian populations. Emil Puhl was paroled by Mr. McCloy some 6 months ago.

On June 23, 1950, General Handy granted clemency to six German war criminals who had been convicted of crimes against the Allies in China during the war. These 6 belong to a group of 21 Germans convicted by the United States Military Commissioner in China in January 1947 for having engaged in intelligence activities in that country against the United States, after Germany's surrender. Yet General Handy saw fit to grant clemency to six of these war criminals.

In a dispatch the AP reported from Frankfurt that—

Sentences of three Germans convicted as war criminals for atrocities committed at Dachau concentration camp were reduced by the United States Army today (June 26).

One of these criminals had his sentence reduced from life imprisonment to 15 years, another from 60 years to 10, and the third from 50 years to 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is time that this miscarriage of justice stop, for it is not a question of being hard or soft with the German criminals. It is a question of justice, morality, and the protection of America's prestige at home and abroad. Failure to carry out justice against the convicted war criminals damages the moral as well as the international prestige of the United States. I sincerely believe that in view of the findings of the congressional committees, the American people and the millions of GI's throughout the United States, are entitled to expect that the high commissioner shall carry out forthwith the just verdicts rendered by the American and international tribunals. Further delay would not only be playing into the hands of the unregenerate Nazi forces in Germany, but would also be breaking faith with the sacred memory of our fallen heroes in the Battle of the Bulge.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the last person on earth to deny leniency to a person who deserves it. But granting leniency to the above-mentioned war criminals will only please nationalistic and unregenerate elements in Germany. It will also have a demoralizing effect on our most reliable friends in Europe and will play into the hands of extremist propaganda which alleges that American policy in Europe is designed to favor the enemies of civilization at the expense of those who fought for it. Should we fail in our duty, the inevitable result will be that the Germans will come to the conclusion that crime does pay.

I therefore call upon Congress to express its firm determination to see to it that Commissioner McCloy shall not nullify the sentences imposed upon the German war criminals but execute them in accordance with the verdict of the courts.

In conclusion, I should like to insert a short but provocative statement published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, 515 Madison Avenue, New York City, in the summer issue of its magazine, Prevent World War III, entitled "Does Crime Pay?":

DOES CRIME PAY?

In his opening address before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg

concerning German crimes against peace, Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson noted: "The refuge of the defendants can be only their hope that international law will lag so far behind the moral sense of mankind that conduct which is crime in the moral sense must be regarded as innocent in law."

Despite Justice Jackson's misgivings, international law managed to keep up with the moral sense of mankind and a set of juridical principles infused with a profound moral purpose was established. But this grand edifice of justice is crumbling under the disintegrating and pernicious influence of policy. Policy remains as it was—untouched by the elementary standards which must be the binding force of the fabric we call civilization.

International law condemned German crimes against humanity.

International law condemned the burnings, the lootings, and the destruction of a whole continent by a people whose raison d'être was the cult of conquest.

International law upheld the rights and dignity of man against violence, mass enslavement, and degradation.

International law announced to the world that criminals who violate the norms of civilization will and must be held accountable to civilization.

But policy continues as in the past to condone the crimes which have been condemned by international law.

Policy coddles, frees, and protects the worst German criminals.

Policy dumps billions of the taxpayers' money into Germany while it refuses to adequately compensate the peoples overrun by the German invader.

Policy returns Germany's war arsenal, the Ruhr, to its former masters, who made and supported Hitler.

Policy permits the Germans to impose their schemes on the free world and rehabilitates the former enemy at the expense of the security and economic well-being of its victims.

Policy places the Germans on a special pedestal paving the way for the revival of German economic mastery over Europe and with it the disruption of international trade and commerce.

What must the Germans think of international law which condemns crime condoned by policy?

What good can be expected from policy which is intrinsically evil?

It is only natural that most Germans should regard the developments of the past 5 years as proof that the great crusade for justice and freedom was an Allied fraud.

Can the Germans doubt that policy ultimately rewards crime?

Proposed Arming of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial dealing with the arming of Germany, written by R. S. Tofflemire, editor of the Twin Falls Times-News of Twin Falls, Idaho, and published in that newspaper.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN'T AFFORD TO BE ASLEEP

Germany is the Korea of Europe, divided in control between east and west. And Europeans, watching Korea, wonder about Germany's fate should Russia decide to strike there.

Time was when Europe took great assurance from the 150,000 American soldiers in west Germany. No one believed such a force could stand off an attacking Russian army, but it was felt America would swing in quickly with tremendous power if her troops were fired upon.

United States withdrawals in the Far East altered the outlook sharply. In revealing America's unpreparedness for even a little war, they have shaken the faith of all Europeans who are depending on us in event Moscow marches.

Germany of course is the richest prize Russia could possibly grab outside of the United States. With the industrial Ruhr in the Soviet fist, she would soon be master of all Europe.

The United States and the west can't allow this to happen. But it's doubtful we're doing enough to prevent it.

Present United States mobilization plans certainly go beyond anticipated needs of the Korean war. It is clear American purpose to create a sizable armed force able to move into new trouble spots when and if the Soviet Union strikes again.

But most official thinking, assumes Moscow won't do anything for a while at least that would involve her own soldiers. The belief is Soviet satellites, like the North Koreans, would be asked to do the dirty work.

Yet this kind of reasoning could be as foolish as our notion that the South Koreans, equipped only for internal police action, could beat off a well-armed North Korean force. The seasoned statesmen of Europe are looking beyond the satellites to Russia herself; we ought to be doing the same.

President Truman's proposal to seek vastly bigger funds for arming western Europe is a vital step toward real defense against the might of Russia proper. But it's only a starter.

Another move that must be considered promptly is whether to include west German forces in an over-all European defense plan. Right now we're stalling on this. Soviet-controlled east Germany has a 100,000-man police force that is an army in all but name; meantime, our occupation officials talk of possibly permitting a special force up to 12,000.

We can't ride along on the glib assumption Russia has no early designs on Germany, and then quickly whip a German force into shape if she does act. Soviet action there certainly would mean Russian troops as well as east German police.

A Russian move in Germany would undoubtedly bring America's strategic air force into action, with the atom bomb its biggest threat. But we couldn't drop the bomb on the cities of western Europe, including west Germany. For there live the peoples whose help we need, whom we are trying to keep on the side of freedom.

Only great military manpower thrown against the Russians could save these lands from being swiftly overrun. There is no excuse for delaying the critical decisions as to where we shall get that manpower.

If we really want German forces included, the time to settle the point is now. If we don't then we should get on to other arrangements. A sound defense plan for Europe, one good enough to give the Russians pause, is the greatest military challenge now facing the free countries of the west.

The United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for pure political reasons the Republicans are using statements which are obviously not borne out by facts. Not only that, but they willfully misstate facts and the truth when they charged President Roosevelt with being responsible for a Second World War and now President Truman as being responsible for conditions that confront us presently in Korea and other parts of the world.

I for one have maintained that it was not the wisest policy for President Truman to follow when, under the pretense of nonpartisan cooperation, he requested the advice and counsel of Mr. Herbert Hoover, Mr. John F. Dulles, and other leaders from the Republican Party.

I read an excellent editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times under date of August 18, 1950, which explains this situation in greater detail. Of course, the explanation is perhaps not as direct as I would prefer it to be, however, for the information of the American people I shall ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial in the Congressional RECORD. It shows the extents to which the Republicans will go and how short their memories are when they feel that they can gain a little advantage.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the attacks that were made by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge against the League of Nations, notwithstanding that up to that time his party agreed with President Wilson for such a body. The only objection that the Senator had was that Great Britain would have four votes in that body. Not having any genuine issue with which to go before the American people, the Republicans used the League of Nations as their issue. That was one of the greatest mistakes in the history of the world, for nearly every student of international law and history will agree that had we entered the League of Nations the Second World War would and could have been averted and the loss of millions of lives and the destruction of billions of dollars worth of property would have been saved; perhaps, too, the danger which confronts us today would not be with us.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Republicans, giving lip service to the United Nations, are giving comfort to the profiteers and the professional brass hats who are the beneficiaries of war regardless of the cost in terms of life and property. Today, these same groups are trying to destroy the United Nations instead of strengthening it. The article afore-mentioned follows:

GOP AND UNITED NATIONS

Five top-flight Republicans in the United States Senate say they won't sleep peacefully "until the free nations of the world, each

contributing its fair share, realistically join together through the United Nations to establish peace in a free world."

The five Republicans are members of the key Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and they have the general agreement of the Senator from Michigan.

Clearly, the situation these key Republicans require for peaceful slumber is precisely what the Truman administration is seeking. The American people support such a program, so these Republicans "wholeheartedly pledge unpartisan cooperation" to accomplish it.

Other Republicans lie awake nights fearing any program that is accomplished through the United Nations will endanger our sovereignty, but the five Republican Senators are for it.

But on what basis? "On the basis," they say, "of honest recognition of past errors."

That is their way of saying that Democrats are responsible for all past mistakes, for they say the Democrats "failed to understand Soviet Russia" and from this failure our present critical problems flow.

The loss of eastern Europe and China, the partition of Germany, the Berlin corridor, the enslavement of Poles, Balts, Albanians, Czechoslovaks, Rumanians, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Outer Mongolia, and North Korea—all were produced—the Republicans say—by Democratic blindness. All are "the disastrous consequences of Yalta and Potsdam," where, the Republicans say, two stupid, blind Democratic Presidents represented America.

Accept this honest recognition of the past, say the five GOP Senators, and we will cooperate to save the future. Naturally, in this time of crisis, there is no room for politics. So the Democrats, if they are patriots, shouldn't dispute the Republicans' "honest" history, the Republicans insist.

The Democrats no doubt will recall that at Yalta the Red Army was deep in the job of liberating eastern Europe, where it was in full occupation by the time of Potsdam. Are the GOP Senators suggesting that the country would have supported a war against the Russians in 1945?

If so, would they have taken the Nazis as our allies?

The Democrats also will refuse to take the full blame of our rapid demobilization in 1945. Were the Republicans in 1945 urging American wives and mothers to insist that their men remain in service? Were they telling our men they must stay in uniform to liberate eastern Europe and save Outer Mongolia?

And at Yalta, would the Republicans have spurned Russian aid against Japan and turned a cold shoulder to Stalin's hard bargain? What of the hundred thousand American lives Generals Marshall and MacArthur said would be saved by prompt Soviet action against Japan?

The atom bomb, remember, was still a theory at the time of the Yalta Conference early in February 1945. Military men were not sure it would work until the first one was exploded in New Mexico on July 16, 1945.

Democrats also are charged with responsibility for the veto in the UN. There were outstanding Republicans who insisted on a strong veto to preserve our sovereignty. Were they only kidding?

The Democrats also are charged with having "betrayed China * * * suddenly in 1945." Any connection to the demoralization within Nationalist China is coincidental. The Democrats did it all alone—through their "failure and refusal * * * to recognize the true aims and methods of * * * Russia."

From all of this we are asked to believe that Republicans, on the other hand, always knew the answer to the Soviet riddle within an enigma. Only their modesty kept them from telling their countrymen the solution. An "honest recognition" of Democratic errors and Republican wisdom, suggest the GOP Senators, will save the country and the world in November.

So we see that in mid-August the 1950 campaign for control of Congress is under way. Senator WILEY is from Wisconsin, Senator HICKENLOOPER is from Iowa, Senator VANDENBERG is from Michigan. These GOP statesmen are from the Midwest. In spite of all the talk that the Midwest is cold on the United Nations, these three midwesterners are revealing an old Republican habit.

They are saying they can take Franklin Roosevelt's UN and do better with it than Mr. Truman and the Democrats.

What do you think? You'll have a chance to tell what you think on election day, November 7.

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, typical of the letters I have been receiving since the vote on the bill to restore the postal service is one I received this morning from Mr. W. H. Logan, of Orlando, Fla. He says:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just completed reading an editorial in today's Orlando Sentinel quoting extracts from your statement in reference to your opposition to the bill for restoring twice-a-day mail deliveries, etc. It pleased me very much. It was a commendable and courageous stand to take.

You ask: "Have the people at home changed in these few weeks? Have they decided now that they do not want economy?" In my opinion the people at home have not changed. In my opinion the passing of this economy measure to reduce expenses in our Post Office Department was one of the most heartening things Congress has done in recent months. They felt that, at long last, the people's Representatives in Washington were starting to give the people at home a break. It was a bit of sunshine in an otherwise rather murky sky. They became hopeful of the future of our country. In a small measure they were regaining faith in the men and women in Washington representing them. The folks in Washington must not let the people at home entirely lose their hope for the future of their country or their faith in the men elected to represent them. When the House voted to restore city mail service to twice a day and wipe out other post office economies—they recognized this action for exactly what it was, "political hokum." Once again the people at home had been sold out. Causes for economies have not diminished. With the unparalleled crisis facing our country causes for governmental economies have increased tremendously. The people at home are confused, fearful, and growing bitter. It is difficult for them to understand how any man in public office can place loyalty to party ahead of loyalty to country. It is difficult for them to understand just how such men can place political expediency first and let the duty they owe their Government (the people at home) follow as best it can. I have heard not a single complaint from any individual because we now have but one mail delivery a day. For that matter we very seldom got but one delivery when we were supposed to have two.

I think you are doing a tremendously important thing in taking the people back home into your confidence in explaining your stand on the various issues coming before the House for your consideration. I hope you will continue to do so.

Yours sincerely,

W. H. LOGAN.

Mr. Speaker, when are we going to wake up to the fact that the people at home really mean what they say when they ask for economy?

Story of the Stockholm Petition—A Communist Device To Turn Opinion Against the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, following my brief remarks on this subject, I am pleased to submit for reading and consideration by Members of Congress the text of a report as it appeared in the New York Times Sunday, August 13, 1950.

May I say that, since it is generally agreed and understood that guns and powder by themselves will not win enduring world peace, and since it is well known that a powerful portion of the program of Soviet Russia, in its vigorous attempt to capture the minds and hearts of the people of the world, is by the propaganda route, it would appear as clear as crystal that the United States should immediately, vigilantly, and vigorously counter such false propaganda with the truth about the happiness, the health, the security, the opportunities, the privileges, the freedoms, the advancements—and all other blessings which are available to the people of our great Nation, as contrasted to those who live under the heel of totalitarianism, whether in Soviet Russia or her satellites or the thinking and action of any aggressor nation, by whatever name it is called.

These days the papers and magazines, as well as some Members of Congress, speak out loudly for more support of the Voice of America. While I have voted for that from the beginning, I am not unmindful of the previous lack of wisdom on the part of some Members who previously opposed the expenditures of moneys to broadcast or disseminate from the Voice of America or to disseminate adequately the ideas of the American way of life. Ignorance never begets substantial progress. And progress cannot be had unless there is accurate and unbiased information freely available. This applies to masses of people as well as to individuals.

In the presence of the Korean war it is amply demonstrated that we of America must not only say we are proud of our own great Nation and the difference of living in America as contrasted with living in an aggressor state, we must live our democracy and we must be willing to spend money to give other peoples an opportunity to know what we

have here in America. And time is running on—time is of the essence for America to wake up.

J. Edgar Hoover recently wrote that—

The orbit of Communist control has extended from one-seventh of the world's population in 1917 to one-third of the world's population at the present time. The intensification of communism and underground activity in the United States has increased proportionately. We must not forget that the United States and our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere stand as the last bulwark against Communist domination.

And he also said:

To continue, the Communist Party is not a bona fide political party. It is a highly organized, militant, and disciplined conspiratorial group following the whims and dictates of international communism. That was proved in the New York case which recently concluded with the conviction of 11 members of the executive board of the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, the present economic world is engaged in an immediate and intense struggle for existence between two diametrically opposed political systems. Ours is the American way of life or the freedom system, as I like to call it. The other is the Communist way. It is the Communist doctrine which preaches and practices dictatorship and aggressive control of all peoples and all property.

We who are born and raised and have prospered and have had magnificent opportunities under the American way, in my judgment, have not yet measured up to the opportunity which is ours to vigorously and patriotically uphold and sustain this way. I am sure you will agree with me.

On the other hand, the propaganda and the powder spread all over the world by Communist Russia and her satellites should shock us into a common purpose and accord of effectively countering aggressive communism with an aggressive Americanism.

I heard John Foster Dulles here in Washington a few months ago say that if the free world fails to rally to the support of one of its stricken members—referring to Korea—then, one by one, others would be struck down. Concurring with this great American, who has again been recently appointed by President Truman to represent the United States in the heavy obligation and responsibility at the United Nations Conference, I point out that, in this intimate world in which we live, the freedom and liberties and happiness and health of the peoples of one nation involve the same freedom, liberties, happiness, and health of the other nations of the world.

And, in asking for ways and means by which our Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the able direction of J. Edgar Hoover, felt the people of America could best coordinate and cooperate to combat subversive espionage, sabotage, and aggressive communism, I received the following as a statement by J. Edgar Hoover:

The internal security of the United States can be assured with the cooperation, aid, and assistance of every law-abiding person in our Nation. The President of the United States in restating the responsibilities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has called upon all law-enforcement officers, patriotic organizations, and individuals to report information pertaining to espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities to the FBI. Plans have already been made and are in operation whereby the law-enforcement agencies of the Nation are working in close cooperation with the FBI.

The following suggestions are being made to assist patriotic organizations and individuals in complying with the President's request:

1. The FBI is as near to you as your telephone. The first page of every telephone book in the country lists the nearest office of the FBI. You can communicate with the FBI by telephone, letter, or call at our nearest office.

2. Feel free to furnish all facts in your possession. Many times a small bit of information might furnish the data we are seeking. If you have any information on sabotage, espionage, or subversive activities, contact the FBI.

3. The FBI is interested in receiving facts; we are not interested in what a person thinks but in what he does which undermines our internal security. Avoid reporting malicious gossip or idle rumors.

4. Do not circulate rumors about subversive activities, or draw conclusions from information you furnish the FBI. The data you possess might be incomplete or only partially accurate. By drawing conclusions based on insufficient evidence, grave injustices might result to innocent persons.

5. Once you have reported your information to the FBI do not endeavor to make private investigations. This can best be done by trained investigators who have access to data acquired over the years on individuals engaged in subversive activities. Hysteria, witchhunts, and vigilantes weaken internal security. Investigations involving internal security require care and painstaking effort. We all can contribute to our internal security by protecting the innocent as well as by identifying the enemies within our midst. In cases involving espionage, it is more important to identify spies, their contacts, sources of information, and methods of communications than to make immediate arrests.

6. Be alert. The greatest defenders against sabotage are the loyal American workmen who are producing the materials and weapons for our defense. They can be the "watch dogs" of defense in every walk of life.

7. The forces which are most anxious to weaken our internal security are not always easy to identify. Communists have been trained in deceit and secretly work toward the day when they hope to replace our American way of life with a Communist dictatorship. They utilize cleverly camouflaged movements, such as some peace groups and civil rights organizations, to achieve their sinister purposes. While they as individuals are difficult to identify, the Communist Party line is clear. Its first concern is the advancement of Soviet Russia and the godless Communist cause. It is important to learn to know the enemies of the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, we must tell the truth to the peoples of the world about ourselves. Frank admission is good for the soul of a Nation as well as for the spirit of an individual. We must, therefore, recognize our faults and vigorously and promptly correct them. We must recognize our weaknesses and replace them with strength. We must habitually practice what we preach.

But these are human frailities, and a Nation is only made up of human beings. We must recognize human values in whatever color of skin they reside. We must increasingly have grounds for living pride and for willingness to speak out strongly for the American way of life. We adult Americans must so speak and so live and have our being each day that our children and youth shall live in an atmosphere daily of pride and possession in having the privilege of being born and raised in the United States of America.

Our schools, both public and private, must initiate and carry on courses of citizenship in such a manner that, increasingly, the children and youth of American have the intellectual knowledge and attainments about their country which qualifies them to meet the ridiculous, absurd, and untrue claims of aggressive communism.

Mr. Speaker, we have been and are in a war of words and ideas as well as with airplanes, submarines, and bazookas. This Stockholm petition is but another evidence of that fact. I vigorously urge that no one sign that petition. I also strenuously advise all patriotic Americans to withhold their names from so-called petitions for peace, and so forth, until they first check up to see the origin thereof. Here follows the splendid history of the Stockholm petition as set forth in the New York Times:

For two weeks last March a meeting of the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress or "Peace Partisans" was held in Stockholm. Chairman of the committee was Frederic Joliot-Curie, the French Communist, who was removed as French High Commissioner for Atomic Energy.

The meeting was the culmination of a series of international conferences. The first was a "World Congress of Intellectuals" held at Wroclaw, Poland, in 1948. In 1949 there were a "Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace," held at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York, and a "Congress of Partisans of Peace," held in Paris. At all these gatherings the theme was "peace." The participants were Communists or extreme left-wingers.

Stockholm was the grand finale. At the meeting a peace petition was adopted. Preparations were made to obtain signatures to the petition throughout the world.

TEXT OF THE APPEAL

This document is headed: "Your Hand Can Stop Atomic War. Sign for Peace."

This is the text:

"WORLD PEACE APPEAL

"We demand the outlawing of atomic weapons as instruments of intimidation and mass murder of peoples. We demand strict international control to enforce this measure.

"We believe that any government which first uses atomic weapons against any other country whatsoever will be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal.

"We call on all men and women of good will through the world to sign this appeal."

Accompanying the text of this petition—now being distributed in the United States—is a statement to the effect that millions of people of all faiths, creeds, and races are signing and that "if we, the people, say 'no' to war there will be peace." Quotations from a number of prominent persons in support of peace are appended.

The World Peace Appeal of the Peace Partisans has become a major weapon of Russian propaganda against the west. In Moscow the official party journal, Pravda, laid down the dictum that anyone in any country who refused to sign the petition automatically exposed himself as "an accomplice and henchman of the warmongers."

The Communist Parties on all the continents have made extraordinary efforts to obtain signatures to the petition. Left-wing labor groups, idealists, and people whose hatred of war exceeds their knowledge of Soviet tactics have been marshalled to roll up the peace vote.

Last week the first comprehensive results of this immense effort were disclosed. In Paris M. Joliot-Curie, the committee chairman, announced that the Stockholm peace petition had been signed by 273,470,566 persons. This is one-eighth of the human race.

TABULATION BY COUNTRIES

Analysis of where the bulk of the claimed vote comes from reveals some interesting facts. One is that the vast majority of the signers live in countries behind the iron curtain. The ratio between populations and signers of the peace petition in some of the principal countries is shown in these figures:

	Population	Signers
U. S. S. R.	193,000,000	115,275,000
Poland	24,500,000	18,000,000
Czechoslovakia	12,500,000	9,500,000
Hungary	9,200,000	7,500,000
Bulgaria	7,200,000	5,801,346
Korea (North)	9,000,000	5,680,000
China	463,000,000	44,000,000
East Germany	18,500,000	17,046,000
West Germany	49,700,000	2,000,000
France	41,200,000	12,000,000
Italy	46,000,000	14,631,523
Great Britain	50,500,000	790,277
India	347,000,000	127,389
Japan	83,000,000	1,345,000
United States	150,000,000	1,350,000

The complete list of national totals is an indication of how and where most of the signatures were obtained. These are some side lights:

1. Of the world total, 235,000,000, of 86 percent, came from Communist-dominated countries—Russia, China, eastern Germany, and the various Soviet satellites. The Soviet Union alone is said to have rolled up 100,000,000 signatures in a 2-week period. This was after the Supreme Soviet had made it plain that signing was the thing to do by giving the petition its own unanimous endorsement.

2. Some of the Soviet satellites did even better at signing up than the U. S. S. R. In east Germany, for example, the announced total of signatures equals over 92 percent of the whole population, infants included.

3. Western Europe contributed 32,000,000 signatures. Italy and France, which together contain only a third of western Europe's people but have strong Communist parties, supplied 80 percent of the west European total. No signatures were reported from Spain or Portugal. Yugoslavia didn't furnish any, either.

4. The non-Communist countries of Asia provided 2,868,000 signatures, most of them from Japan and Burma. Only 1 person out of every 2,700 in India signed. The African total calls for examination. Some light is thrown on the question by the size of the poll in the various areas.

Persons who make it their business to sample public opinion note that the United States total of 1,350,000 signatures far exceeds the estimated number of Communists and fellow travelers in this country. They believe that many of the signers are idealistic people who are horrified by the thought of atomic war but who haven't thought much beyond that. In addition, there are a certain number of people in any community who will sign virtually anything they are asked to sign, without close examination.

Abroad, there are other factors at work as well as these. In Europe and Asia millions of confused, war-weary people dread the prospect of an atomic conflict in which their own lands would be battlefields. There is suspicion, exploited by the Communists, that the United States and the Soviet Union are engaged in a struggle to the death for world domination. Many of the signers of the petition want, above all things, to be neutral in the war they foresee. Communists are doing all they can to further this idea.

These general interpretations of west European reactions are borne out by on-the-spot observations by correspondents of the New York Times.

WHAT IS RUSSIA'S MOTIVE?

Why has the Soviet Union gone to such lengths to circulate its "peace appeal" and publicize the claimed results? Why has so much effort been expended to befuddle world opinion?

Two suppositions are advanced to answer the questions. One is that the Kremlin, realizing the depth of the fears and uncertainties aroused throughout the free world by the present international situation and awful threat of atomic conflict, is seeking to weaken the resolution of its adversaries by the same "upside down" arguments it has advanced in the Security Council debate over the Korean war. Millions of people hate war and want peace; if the United States can be pictured as a warmonger eager to use the A-bomb, potential allies will be alienated and discord will be sown in the United States itself.

The other supposition is that the Russians greatly fear the American lead in the atomic field. Winston Churchill has said that the United States stock pile of A-bombs is the only thing that has prevented a full-scale Soviet invasion of Europe. If the Russians could somehow muster sufficient world opinion to weaken America's determination to use its chief present defense against Soviet aggression, the Kremlin's ambitions might be more easily realized. And Russia itself would escape the dire penalty of its actions.

Panama Offers Aid in the Korean Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, later in the current week, consideration will be given to the bill, H. R. 8677, which was designed to place the Panama Canal operations on a businesslike basis. The measure has received most careful study by members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Those of us who have studied the affairs of the Panama Canal are very much aware of the unusual relationship between our Government and the Republic of Panama. We recognize clearly that, without a cordial and neighborly relationship between us, the operation of the canal might be seriously jeopardized.

About a year ago, while visiting the Panama Canal, I had the honor of addressing the Panamanian Assembly. I was very much impressed with the cordiality and friendliness with which I was received, and I came away feeling that our future relationship was destined to continue on the same friendly basis.

This morning, I read with great pleasure in the Panama Star and Herald the message of President Arnulfo Aria, of Panama, to his people on the subject of the Korean conflict and the attitude of his government toward it. The President's statement is of such timely interest and so reassuring to those of us who are particularly interested in the Panama Canal that I am constrained to place the entire text of the message in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

PANAMA TO FULFILL HER DEMOCRATIC DUTY—ARIAS

Text of President Arnulfo Arias' message to the Nation yesterday on his government's all-out offer of aid to the United Nations on the Korean conflict follows:

"Fellow citizens, you have just heard the Cabinet declaration which was read over this microphone by the secretary general of the Presidencia.

"That document embodies the decision at which the Government has arrived, impelled by its determination to provide effective moral and material cooperation with the United Nations, of which Panama is one of the charter members—in its arduous struggle for the defense of democracy, in mortal peril from international tyranny seeking to grab the entire world.

"It is also a categoric reaffirmation that Panama, true to its pledges in bilateral treaties with the United States of America and the Continental Defense Pact signed in Rio de Janeiro, is ready, as always, to contribute within her means to the defense of the Canal, that is, the defense of her own sovereignty, to which it cannot renounce. It is also conclusive proof of American solidarity, of which the Republic has given ample evidence on many occasions since her foundation.

"Reasons of internal and external security which our country must not and cannot ignore without failing its binding obligations and its deep democratic faith, have therefore impelled the Government which I have the honor of presiding to take the measures which it considers to be of immediate necessity in the face of the critical world situation."

ASKS FOR COOPERATION

"Because of the threat that hovers over our country and over democracy, we call upon you earnestly to cooperate with the Government as good patriots and Americans. To that end, there is no better contribution on your part than the will to work and to keep order in order to help saving our Christian civilization, the pride of democratic countries.

"We are convinced that this appeal will be answered. This conviction stems from the tradition of our people dating from the time when our soil already served as a bridge between the Maya civilization of the north and the Inca civilization of the south. It has been confirmed by our colonial and postcolonial history and it is reaffirmed by contemporary history. Panama has never hesitated to fulfill its destiny: It made the extreme sacrifice of giving of her own soil that the whole world should benefit.

"We Isthmians have become convinced that the soil we tread has a deep world significance. For, despite the continued and repeated onsets of powerful and crushing foreign influences, we have been able to keep the intrinsic Panamanian essence in our love for our own things and have adapted our life to those moralities which can be of benefit to our nationality.

"But if we have been doing this instinctively, almost without realizing it, it is time that we acquire full conscience of our mission as the center of the Americas and as the Bridge of the World, where a spiritual force that will spread slowly over the world is developing as a result of the fusion of races, languages and ideas around us.

"The great Bolivar's words were profoundly significant:

" 'How fine it would be that the Isthmus of Panama were, for us, what Corinth was for the Greeks. Let us hope that some day we shall have the good fortune of installing there an august congress of representatives of republics, empires and kingdoms to discuss the high interests of peace and war with the nations of the other three parts of the world. That magnificent position between two great seas may become, with time, the center of the universe. Its canals will shorten world distances, will link closer the commercial ties of Europe, America and Asia. . . Perhaps only there will be the site of the capital of the earth, as Constantin would have made Byzantium in the old hemisphere.'

"And as he prophesied, we hope that the great centers of Pan-Americanism will converge here and that their material moral and spiritual influence will spread from here. We Panamanians have the great responsibility of having to be prepared to offer the world a home of brotherhood and peace for the development of the future American civilization.

"Panamanians: I call upon you to ponder on the seriousness of the present time; to set aside petty quarrels in order to unite our forces and our wills in the service of the country and of the democratic ideal which it fosters; to live in harmony, seeking only the happiness of our beloved country and the solidarity of all the nations of America and showing to the world that we keep solid faith with the United Nations, the hope of freedom—and justice-loving countries."

Text of other documents released in connection with the President's broadcast follows:

"The Secretary General of the Presidencia announces that the Cabinet Council, at a special meeting held August 2, decided unanimously to offer to the United Nations the following:

"1. Bases for training military contingents of the United Nations.

"2. Free transit over our highways for the troops of the United Nations.

"3. A contingent of Panamanian volunteers.

"4. The use of the national merchant marine for the transportation of materials and troops.

"5. Farming lands to help in supplying the troops."

My Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, to take advantage of the privilege extended to me as a Member of Congress to protect myself against distortion of my voting record as a Member of this Congress.

I have been compelled to do this because of numerous advertisements appearing in daily and weekly newspapers in my district which distort my congressional voting record.

Probably the most flagrant distortion is the attempt being made to create the impression that I am opposed to the dairy interests of my district and that I have voted in favor of the oleomargarine interests. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The facts are that in March of 1949 I appeared before the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives and argued against the passage of H. R. 3, which was a bill repealing all taxes and Federal restrictions upon the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. Further, that prior to the vote, I took the floor on March 31, 1949, and argued against its passage. On April 1, 1949, I voted against the bill. That is the record and it cannot be disputed.

Because of my forthright position against colored oleomargarine and in favor of our great dairy industry, I have been publicly commended by farm groups throughout the United States.

Now, so that there will be no misunderstanding, I want to cite to the citizens of the Third Congressional District and point to the fact that the interests spreading this false propaganda, these malicious half-truths, are the interests that have always fought the things that we liberals have stood for. In order to implement and to obtain their objectives these special interests, under the guise of operating as a voluntary committee, with unlimited financial backing, have in every campaign to date used these same miserable and unwarranted tactics.

The above-mentioned ads containing half-truths and malicious inferences now being carried in the newspapers are put there to try to confuse the public and are costing the "fat boys" thousands of dollars. I leave it to you to answer the question—"Why are they doing it?"

You can be sure that the Old Guard which now is in complete control of the voluntary committee of the party always makes certain that the candidate they endorse will be subservient to them.

In our congressional district, this voluntary committee held a caucus at Richland Center at which they handpicked a candidate.

These attempts to distort and misrepresent my record shall not deter me in my determination to continue, as I have in the past, to give real representation to the people of my congressional district and to continue to support our great dairy industry.

Throughout my legislative career, I have supported wholeheartedly rural electrification, soil conservation, and adequate farm credits. I have untiringly worked in conjunction with farm leaders to formulate a long range, constructive farm program; that during the interim I have contended that full parity price supports must be maintained. I have consistently supported measures which have been of benefit to the farmers, the workers and the veterans of my district.

In this present emergency—an undeclared war—it has been my contention that we should adopt a pay-as-you-go tax policy as far as it is practicable and, further, that we should adopt a tax policy that would take the excess profits out of this undeclared war. If the boys are to be called upon to make these extreme sacrifices, surely no individual or group of individuals should be permitted to make exorbitant profits through the furnishing of the implements of war.

Make no mistake, the above mentioned activities on my part are the real issue and the real reason they are distorting my voting record.

I have a profound respect for the Republican Party and the principles as advocated by Abraham Lincoln and I feel that the overwhelming majority of the people who constitute the Republican Party are loyal, God-fearing citizens who believe in good government. However, I have nothing but the utmost contempt for this coterie of individuals who are attempting to prey upon this Grand Old Party to use it to serve their own selfish, special interests.

Let us keep the record straight. We must bend every effort to preserve the primary election law in the State of Wisconsin so that men, providing they can properly qualify, can have the right of free men to seek public office. The voluntary caucus system which handpicks candidates, is a direct violation of the spirit of the primary election law and is conceived so as to circumvent it. The voluntary caucus system is the entering wedge for the repeal of the State primary election law.

Your Land and Mine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the remarks of Henry J. Taylor, distinguished author and commentator, over the ABC network last evening:

YOUR LAND AND MINE
(By Henry J. Taylor)

Mr. TAYLOR. A military plan did exist in event of Red aggression against South Korea. We're not seeing it. For by the plan our men would not be in South Korea tonight at all.

But when President Truman retired on the night of the third day of the aggression and suddenly made up his mind to order American ground forces into South Korea this order scrapped the plan—although I do not believe it has ever before been revealed.

Yet every home in your land and mine is affected. And what goes on behind the scenes is our concern; for it is not true that a basic military plan never existed. It existed. But it was scrapped by that sudden order. So, here is the simple truth.

Now, when the news of the flagrant Stalin aggression struck, the original problem was not whether the United States must intercede. That was an elementary decision. America had to take action against the North Korean aggressor. If we did not intercede we could lose any hope of stabilizing anti-Communist interests throughout the Far East.

No; the real problem was how to intercede and punish the aggressor—what method would be best, how best to employ our facilities to our best advantage, what would be the wisest fundamental policy for the President to adopt.

Just to take action would contain great peril. The decision as to method would require long-headedness. The decision would

set a pattern. In short, we were entitled to choose what poison we would hand the other fellow to drink.

There may be other aggressors to punish in a dozen distant places where Stalin can push his Soviet stooges forward, feed us natives to fight, in North Korean style—bleeding us savagely wherever Russia wants us to bleed, at no loss to Russia herself * * * China, Indochina, Burma, the Philippines and elsewhere.

The plan the President scrapped sought to avoid setting this savage ground pattern by which Stalin could retain the strategic initiative by, in his own sweet time, pushing forward one satellite group of natives after another for us to fight—North Koreans today, vast hordes of others tomorrow.

For Russia's trump card in most of her wars has been to draw the enemy into nature's punishment—distance, or climate or manpower as nature's punishment.

The plan realized that no draft calls out of our homes and factories—a hundred thousand one month, another hundred thousand another month— can ever be big enough to supply American inductees to fight with guns and bayonets wherever Stalin dictates throughout the vast, tangled land-mass of Asia, trapping American troops in the jungles, rice-paddies, mountains and rivers of areas from which we can have a surface military victory if we spend enough, but from which there can be no return in respect to long-term world peace or American security; with Stalin sitting in the Kremlin saying "Now, let me see. Where will I trap their soldiers next?"

Accordingly, the plan to avoid this had pointed out that if we intervened on the ground in enough such places as South Korea, and for long enough years, the ability of the United States to defeat the Soviet Union itself would be clearly imperiled. And that's what interests Stalin. No wonder a plan existed with all our fundamental values at stake.

The plan to avoid these traps had taken a cold, hard look at the potential populations of peoples and races at Stalin's disposal for fanatical and savage warfare against our inductees on the ground: Malaya five million, Indochina—where the French are bogged down—twenty-five million, Thailand seventeen million, Burma another seventeen million, Iran eighteen million, Red China four hundred and fifty million, and so forth. The plan insisted we should not allow our pattern for commitments to exceed our powers. We should use a method of intervention against the Korean aggression that would exploit our American advantages, not the enemy's Asiatic advantages.

ANNOUNCER. And now, Mr. Taylor, what was this plan which fell by the wayside?

Mr. TAYLOR. Why Mr. Truman ordered our ground troops into South Korea and thus scrapped the plan I do not know, and neither do many of our military leaders, but here are the facts:

The fundamental of the plan was to keep our intervention in Korea, our chastisement of the North Koreans by our forces, off the ground—keep our intervention off the ground—and especially off the ground in South Korea, the homeland of our friends.

It was proposed by important military planners that:

1. We serve an ultimatum on the North Korean Red aggressors, through the UN, directing them to withdraw their aggressor troops north of the thirty-eighth parallel within 24 hours.

2. That the North Koreans submit to the UN for judgment the issues with South Korea which they say caused them to resort to military force.

3. That on North Korea's failure to comply in accord with the Charter of the United Nations the air and sea forces of the United States and the United Nations would instantly declare a naval blockade around Korea and at the same time bomb all communications and industry in North Korea—and only North Korea. The plan would have left South Korea, the homeland of our friends, untouched by our forces in the intervention. For not a bomb would drop there nor a foot soldier be landed.

4. We would keep up this bombing of North Korea—and only North Korea—indefinitely, if necessary. From our bases on Guam and Japan we would bomb the North Korean ports—Najiin, Changjin, Kanan, Wonsan, Chinnampo, the capital and every railroad and factory; but never—never—put an American foot soldier in South Korea. And certainly the achievement of our objective could not take longer than to fight our way on the ground all the way up to the peninsula, mountain by mountain, town by town.

In short, we would have made life miserable, made aggression miserable, for the Soviet satellite that marches when Stalin says to march; made life miserable from the air in its own territory—North Korea—and only North Korea, and not been party to the destruction of the South Korean homeland.

For, regardless of our international motives, it's difficult today for a South Korean native to see how he and his family is being protected when his own countryside is made a battlefield by Americans from far away; and when actually, because we have soldiers on the ground, our bombers have bombed more targets in South Korea in support of our troops than they have bombed in North Korea, although both North and South have been set on fire.

If you or I were the average South Korean native, of which there are about 20,000,000, we would look up and see an American plane overhead, and the next thing our home is blown up—and the American Government announces that the result is excellent. Or we see a cluster of American GI's in our village, and the next thing, artillery fire—and our houses are knocked down, our livestock is dead, we're homeless, and more American jeeps and guns pass us by on the roads to win battles we do not thoroughly understand.

For what we are doing now is like fighting across New York State and displacing all the people in New York State. Five hundred thousand people live in Taegu alone. In fact, we have already put over a million and a half South Koreans on relief.

What this can eventually mean to us is not hard to imagine.

Instead of this, the plan that was scrapped also had in mind that if we did intervene in South Korea on the ground, when we get all through, we Americans would have to rebuild South Korea all over again.

Further, by the plan which fell by the wayside, we would have been exploiting our technological advantage—airplanes—over our opponent—North Korea—instead of fighting the enemy on its own terms, best suited to the enemy's greatest and only fitness, namely, unlimited ground troops to throw against us without regard for human life, theirs or our own.

It would have avoided our becoming involved up a dead-end street in mass land battles against barbarians who do have unlimited manpower behind them—can pin us down in their guerrrilla-infested mountains and valleys and—once we are in—bleed our American ground troops; bleed us in a pattern of attrition that Stalin can duplicate elsewhere to the long-term peril of our country, for there is a limit to the number of mistakes which our country can absorb.

Instead, all our ground forces would remain intact and secure for other possible missions—not trapped with savages in Korea and other places from which there is no return.

But when President Truman ordered our ground soldiers into South Korea and they struggled to the front on the 4th of July, the die was cast.

This scrapped the plan. His order substituted a method the expanded outcome of which no man can foresee.

There you have the facts. And here we are.

Suppression of Communist Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM B. FUGATE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution which was received on August 21, 1950, from Mr. John O. Youell, chairman, John Fox, Jr., Post, No. 5715, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Big Stone Gap, Va.

I concur wholeheartedly and unreservedly in the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, as expressed in the resolution adopted by the John Fox, Jr., Post, No. 5715.

Never in the history of America has there been a greater threat to individual freedom and government by law, and to the institutions of democracy by the forces of atheism, as presently existing in the Kremlin of Soviet Russia.

Legislation should be enacted forthwith to require all Communists in the United States to register and declare their affiliation. They should be required to obtain a license before they would be allowed to circulate in the mails communistic propaganda. Should we become engaged in war with Russia, all known Communists should be immediately apprehended and incarcerated. Those resisting should be dealt with summarily.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the John Fox, Jr., Post, No. 5715, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is an organization of men who have defended the principles of freedom and democracy on the land, on the sea, and in the air, outside the continental limits of the United States; and

Whereas these men are now cognizant of the threat of communism to the ideals for which they have offered themselves, soul, mind, and body; and

Whereas the members of this post realize that the whole aim of communism is world conquest and the immediate ultimate aim of communism is the conquest of the United States, since the United States represents the real threat to Communist domination of the world, due to the freedom-loving spirit of the citizens of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the John Fox, Jr., Post, No. 5715, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That all Communists, who are registered as such, be subjected to trial in the Federal courts of the United States, as traitors to the American way of life and if found guilty of such, be deported immediately to the United Soviet Socialist Republic of Russia, where they can enjoy the so-called ideals for which they so readily and dogmatically offer their services and efforts; and be it further

Resolved, That the Associated Press, the United Press, NBC, MBC, CBC, and other news gathering agencies, including various newspapers and radio publicity agencies, which give national publicity to organizations that are known to be communistically inclined, be requested to ignore or identify the actions taken by such subversive organizations, so that the citizens of the United States, who are true citizens of the United States, will not be confused and misled by the high sounding titles of such Communist dominated organizations; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this post will be on the alert for any Communist activity of any type within their immediate vicinity; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the national and State headquarters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, our Senators and Congressmen from Virginia, our State senators and delegates, the Associated Press, the United Press, the National, Mutual, and Columbia Broadcasting Systems.

Resolution passed unanimously.

Signed by Resolution Committee:

JOHN O. YOUELL, *Chairman.*
W. ED STEWART,
HOBART SHORT.

National Groups in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include the following article by Keith Wheeler which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of August 21, 1950, regarding national groups in the United States:

CHICAGO PROFILE SEES NO PERIL TO MELTING POT—CHARLES ROZMAREK DEFENDS NATIONAL GROUPS IN UNITED STATES

(By Keith Wheeler)

Once upon a time, somebody asked Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance, whether he didn't consider it deleterious to the American melting pot that Polish-Americans have retained a certain national cohesiveness within the United States.

Rozmarek, a large, bland man with a slow though frequent smile, leaned back in his chair and started a résumé of English history.

He dwelt upon the military-occupational nature of the Roman conquest of the British Isles, pointing out how little of Roman culture had been implanted among the rude denizens of England. He dwelt for a time upon the Saxon invasions, making the point that these Teutonic warriors had for centuries made the language of Britain a German dialect.

He progressed to the Norman invasion of 1066 and went on to explain how William the Conqueror's personal greed came to infuse the principle of escheat into the body of British common law.

He finally got around to Chaucer in the midfourteenth century, and there he made his point.

It had taken more than three centuries to evolve the written English language out of the polyglot tongues of the Celts, Romans, Angles, Saxons, and Norman French. The evolutionary process of amalgamating Polish and other national groups into an essentially American culture is a lot further along after only four generations, he pointed out.

"Such national groups as ours are anything but bad for America," he said. "Instead they make sure that America is enriched by the best we have to give."

The answer was characteristic of the man who heads the 321,000-member PNA and concurrently stands as titular leader of 6,000,000 Polish-Americans through his presidency of the Polish American Congress.

Son of a Pennsylvania coal miner, Rozmarek has become a man of considerable cultural attainment. He speaks Polish, which he got at home. His English is the product of school and study. Spanish came by trading lessons with a Mexican political refugee in the coal mines. He taught himself German to the point of fluency and an exhaustive acquaintance with German poetry.

Rozmarek is a suave, carefully spoken man who apparently relishes his acquaintance with the past and his facile ability to apply its events to the present.

On matters of current history, his expressions tend toward the florid, as when he describes Poland as "the bulwark and outpost" of the western Christian world against the repeated incursions of Asiatic "hordes." There is, he says, a crystal-clear parallel between the feat of Jan Sobieski, who saved Christianity from the Moslems at Vienna in 1683, and the time in August 1920, when an infant Polish Government stopped the westward expansion of bolshevism at Warsaw.

Outside of their influence upon American policy, both the PNA and the Polish-American Congress exert a considerable influence upon the cultural, social, and economic lives of their members.

The PNA, which this year is celebrating the seventieth anniversary of its founding, has become largely a social group and simultaneously one of the country's largest fraternal insurance organizations, ranking fifth in the Nation in both policyholders and total insurance in force.

It was formed in 1880 with the dual purpose of lending the influence of American Poles toward the eventual independence of Poland and assisting in the amalgamation and Americanization of the tremendous waves of Polish immigrants, just then getting started.

The Polish-American Congress, which embraces various Polish social and church groups in a loose federation, was formed in 1944.

Rozmarek, born in the mining town of Wilkes-Barre, became the PNA's first American-born president in 1939. At that time he was a practicing lawyer in Wilkes-Barre after a varied career as laborer, Spanish interpreter, Government munitions inspector, and bank clerk.

Rozmarek has two daughters, Elaine, 20, who majored in Romance languages at the University of Illinois, and Marilyn, 18, a history major at Northwestern.

Universal Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Universal Training," published in the Harrisburg Evening News on August 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL TRAINING

President Truman and universal military training are creating an enigma. One day he sends a message to Congress urging immediate consideration, if not operation, of this highly effective form of national defense. Next day he is reported willing to let the whole thing go over until the next Congress.

Everybody is aware that universal military training in these abnormal times is not feasible. Neither the time, the money, nor the human material is available. Korea and other danger spots have first call. Nothing, even debate in Congress, should be allowed to interfere with national defense.

But as a project, universal military training is a necessity. The Nation cannot look forward with confidence to its security unless some such program is adopted. Such training has been opposed by Communists, pacifists, and some others with their fist tightly clinched around the tax penny.

For all these folks, military training has good and sufficient answers and, as today's cartoon indicates, the Nation and the world would be less jittery today had this country adopted universal military training at the end of the last war.

If between battle-front dispatches there is time to consider measures like universal military training, let Congress get to work on it instead of shelving it for a later day. That is the curse laid on the Nation now. It didn't think it needed adequate forces in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, and universal military training. Putting such matters on the shelf is stupidity in high gear.

Tribute to Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick at the UNESCO tribute dinner to the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] held on April 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD BARRETT, Assistant Secretary of State. A couple of weeks ago in Washington there was in the State Department what seems to be known as a high-level conference. In that conference, the discussions and arguments were getting pretty hot. People got around to citing authorities. Somebody said, "Well, don't forget what the President said 6 months ago, and what the Secretary said only about 2 months ago." Somebody else across the table piped up and said, "Yes, but did you read what Anne O'Hare McCormick wrote last week?" So you can see that Mrs. McCormick is held in about the same esteem in official Washington as she is in informed quarters in New York. She has worked with BILL BENTON on UNESCO matters on at least one international delegation, and I know, because he told me, has helped with innumerable ideas and suggestions. I think all of you know her as a distinguished foreign news analyst and

columnist in the New York Times, and now you will all know her as one of the many friends of BILL BENTON. Mrs. McCormick.

Mrs. ANNE O'HARE MCCORMICK. Senator BENTON, ladies, and gentlemen, you know, there is just one thing that I know of that BILL BENTON has not been, and that's a newspaperman. He was never a newspaperman, but from a long experience in meeting foreign ministers and senators and governors and assorted V. I. P.'s, including dictators, who are about the V. I. P.'est of all, I have come to the conclusion that they all came up from the press box, and I must say that newspapermen—I don't think that they—it seems to me that they didn't take very long before they cooled off, because newspapermen in office don't seem to like free-wheeling reporting or criticism any better than any other officials, and the present state of the world does not suggest, I think, that they are particularly brilliant in the job of public relations. Anyway, our honored guest this evening, neither he nor we of the press, can boast that he rose from the ranks, but I am here to testify, speaking for the press, that no one in public life believes in and talks and works so hard for the freedom of the press as BILL BENTON. He has said on more than one occasion, public and private, that the principal motive of his existence is a deep conviction that communication is the most important, the noblest, and the most human of all the interests of mankind. Mr. Ruml has said that he's never stuck to anything, but this is one thing that he's stuck to through all his various reincarnations, and I think he's never forgotten that. And those of us who know something of his activities know that he is a true crusader in this field. A kind of personified Voice of America that none of our enemies abroad, nor our indifferent Congressman at home, can really muzzle. He seems to me, and I have followed his work in many fields in national and international UNESCO conferences, as Assistant Secretary of State, as chairman of the American Delegation to the United Nations Conference on Freedom of the Press, and as a one-man campaigner—which hasn't been mentioned tonight, Bill, I'm surprised—for a world radio network even, he says, if it costs as much as a battleship, and now as a Member of the Senate. For his first act a month ago, as you have heard this evening, was to introduce a six-point resolution calling upon this country to organize a campaign for men's minds and loyalties commensurate with the needs and stakes involved. In all these posts he has manifested his devotion, indeed, his dedication, to the fight against the danger that seems to him, as it seems to me, far greater than the danger of the atomic bomb, or its monstrous progeny, and that danger, ladies and gentlemen, is the spread of hate, more poisonous to the mind and more shriveling to the soul than radioactivity is to the body, and also the spread of darkness, which deprives millions of our fellowmen of the facts of which they can judge intelligently and act rationally. From their point of view I believe the Czech Communists are right in closing our information centers and liquidating the personnel, because in such regimes truth is treason, the most subversive of all the forces they have to deal with. Fortunately we have on our side a priceless asset, and now I am quoting Mr. BENTON, which, he said in his first speech in the Senate, "We do not have to lie." What we have to do, as the President said today, is to step up the campaign of truth, and I think this speech is probably the greatest tribute BILL BENTON has received, in spite of all the wonderful tributes that have come at this dinner, because that for the first time the President of the United States has adopted his program. We have to battle with all our resources and all our power to extend freedom of information. The Czechs have learned that without a free press there cannot be a free people, and we have learned in the testing period in which we have lived in the last few years, we have learned that a free press is the very soul and the very guaranty of freedom. Today I watched in this room some beautiful cavalcades of Greek fashions that were brought here by our eloquent friend, Mrs. Grady, and I could have wept as I watched, because it seemed to me there passed before us like a great frieze, the history of our civilization. And, you know, to see the splendor and the antiquity of this thing we call western civilization is very moving to all westerners who believe in it, and then I could have wept for another reason, because I remember a year ago the agony of the Greeks and that out of this agony they produced this beauty, and it seemed to me as I watched that anything is possible to a free people, because freedom is hope, and freedom is creative energy, and freedom is life. The great general of the cold war is a man who keeps hammering on the walls of Jericho for the right of all men to know the facts on which their destiny depends. BILL BENTON is such a warrior, and I am sure he will never stop hammering at those walls until they fall, as I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, they inevitably will. And if we don't have that message of hope tonight when we are in the presence of people who believe in it so deeply that it means more to them than anything else, then we have no right to live, we have no promise in prospect. I am proud and happy to salute my friend, Bill, on behalf of the press. We of the press are glad he is in the Senate. Among many ex-newspapermen who do not know the value of newspapers as well as he does, maybe it's because he's never been on one, but we are grateful for what he has done, and for what he will do. If there was ever the right man in the right place at the right time, it is our friend Mr. BENTON, because this is the time when the future hangs on the victory not of arms but of ideas, on the victory of truth over lies, and so in the voice of the press I thank you, Bill, and say more power to you in the battle that is the life and death battle of us all.

A Citizen Speaks Up for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Frank D. Bianco, a veteran of two wars:

LEGAL DEPARTMENT,
Des Moines, Iowa, August 19, 1950.

Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: I have been wanting to write you a letter for quite some time and in view of the present situation of our country, I can't delay any further. I do not know whether or not you are receiving the volume of mail you should be in the present crisis, but I assure you from the comments and conversations I have had with our local people, the thoughts that I now express are the general consensus of opinion.

First, in regard to the position of Russia in the United Nations. I do not know what power, if any, Congress can assert on the matter of policies of our country in the United Nations Assembly, but in view of the history of the operation of the Organization since it was organized, it cannot act successfully as a governing body with the presence of Russia in that body. So far as I can remember, Russia is the only nation that has exercised its veto powers and has done so between 40 and 50 times already. Its obstructionist tactics to prevent the world working at peace is so evident it is beyond argument. If there is any way that Congress can bring pressure to bear upon our State Department to bring about the ousting of Russia from the United Nations, it must be done now. I know the argument is made that if Russia is ousted it will wreck the United Nations. This is pure "bosh" and "bunkum." The United Nations with Russia in it is not a functioning body and is wrecked even now. If Russia were expelled from the United Nations it would lose the most potent weapon it has to spread communism and unrest and corruption throughout the world. In view of the Korean crisis this is the opportune time and the God-given time to accomplish this fact. Oust Russia from the United Nations. Korea may be our Pearl Harbor of world war III.

With regard to our own economy in view of the crisis, politics as usual seems to be the theme of the present administration. I do not believe that business favors such a policy. I believe the people are ready and willing to assume the controls and sacrifices necessary to prepare our country for the coming emergency. It must be done on as nearly a pay-as-you-go basis as it is possible to do so if we intend to save our economy.

As an example of the unrealistic position we have been placed in, I wish to cite one incident at the end of the National Guard camp of the Thirty-fourth Division. Mind you, we had been at war with Korea since June 25, and the camp ended August 13. The railroad companies involved knew months ahead of the movements of troops necessary in and out of these camps and, of course, were confronted with the movements of troops to Korea, but this item was negligible inasmuch as the troops now in Korea were on the west coast. But, nevertheless, with all this time on their hands, the railroad companies did not have the cars available to move out the small number of troops of the Thirty-fourth Division at the end of their camp and were scurrying up and down the highways hunting for cars on the day they were to move out. It involved only a matter of six trains and yet cars were not available.

This is an example of the business-as-usual policy of our administration in the face of the present crisis. I know that our people are awakened to the dangers that we face, but we are not getting the leadership from the administration that the people are entitled to and it is up to those of us who can to make our voices heard that the inefficient and incompetent be turned out of Congress and the executive bodies of the administration. The hour is late; it will not brook of any delay.

If our country is to survive as a free and independent Nation all of its planning, until this threat of aggression is over and completely stifled, must be with the thought in view of the protection of our land. All unnecessary and unrelated expenditures that do not enhance the defense of the Nation should be absolutely curtailed. All expenditures should be directed in this direction, such as highways for fast transportation, railroad cars, and any related subjects that will aid in building up the defenses of our country. These expenditures not only aid in the defense of the country, but are an asset to it. I am sure you will appreciate what I am trying to say. Boondoggling and pork barreling expenditures must be completely stopped.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK D. BIANCO.

Civilian Defense Too Long Delayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the preparation for civilian defense on the Federal level in the United States has been neglected and postponed too long. Our defense of the civil population should have been prepared long ago even if the Korean war had not occurred in view of the knowledge we already have of the tremendous destructive possibilities of the atom and hydrogen bomb. The neglect of adequate civilian defense is only another indication of the inefficiency and lack of foresight by the administration.

No longer can we afford to delay effective measures which will result in a maximum protection for the civil population if this Nation is attacked. We know that in the event of any future war we must expect attacks upon our centers of population, and we must have adequate shelters and centralized supply stations for first aid and medical treatment.

We need a coordinated Nation-wide defense plan which will utilize all of our facilities for civil defense. We also must carry on specialized research to develop new and more effective methods of protection for our citizens from the effects of regular bombing attack as well as attack by atomic weapons.

Unless measures are taken immediately to build up with all possible speed the civilian defenses of America, if war should strike our unpreparedness would be paid for in the lives of countless men, women and children, helpless victims to the inexcusable indifference of the administration.

I have introduced H. R. 9485 to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish and conduct an effective program of research and development to increase the effectiveness of the measures for the protection of the civil population of the United States in the event of military attack. This bill, if approved by the Congress, would place the civil-defense plan on the Federal level and would provide for the necessary scientific research and development of more effective methods for defense.

It would further establish within the Department of Defense a central agency which would be directly responsible for civilian defense.

Through the central agency standards to guide public officers of the United States who are charged with the responsibility for the planning, organization and administration of civil defense in the selection of appropriate measures, methods, techniques, and equipment would be developed.

The central agency would disseminate such information and standards to those in charge of civil defense and would assist them in the effective and economical discharge of their duties.

The central agency would also assist in planning with officers of the several States and Territories for appropriate methods, techniques, equipment, and organization for civil defense.

The following are the provisions of H. R. 9485 which, in my opinion, should receive consideration without further delay for the protection of the lives of American men, women, and children who today have no adequate defense against the horrors of modern war:

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish and conduct an effective program of research and development to increase the effectiveness of the measures for the protection of the civil population of the United States in the event of military attack, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the National Civilian Defense Act. It is the purpose of this act to provide for the establishment within the Department of Defense of a central agency directly responsible for (a) the initiation, conduct, and coordination of such scientific and other research and development as may be necessary for the identification, study, and solution of the problems incident to the protection of the civil population of the United States in time of hostilities; (b) the collection and analysis of all information necessary for the preparation of sound solutions to such problems; (c) the preparation of standards to guide public officers of the United States who are charged with responsibility for the planning, organization, and administration of civil defense in the selection of appropriate measures, methods, techniques, and equipment; and (d) the dissemination of such information and standards to such officers to assist them in the effective and economical discharge of their duties and for their use in planning with officers of the several States and Territories appropriate methods, techniques, equipment, and organization for civil defense.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense, is authorized and directed to initiate and conduct an adequate and effective program of scientific and other research and development for the identification, study, and solution of all problems arising in connection with the protection of the civil population of the United States in time of hostilities. Such program shall include—

(1) technical research and development required with respect to rescue methods and equipment; fire-fighting methods and equipment; first aid for casualties; evacuation and postaid care of personnel; shelter design and materials for protective construction; protective masks and clothing; methods and matériel specific to the protection of personnel and facilities of industrial plants; and such other technical research as may give promise of minimizing the effects of modern warfare upon the civil population;

(2) operational research with respect to the effects of the employment of new and improved weapons upon civilian communities; the identification of probable target areas to provide a basis for local planning; and such other operational research as may be required to obtain information necessary for increased effectiveness in the selection and training of volunteer civil-defense personnel and for a better understanding of methods which can be employed to prevent panic and to sustain civilian morale in time of emergency; and

(3) such other research and development as may be required for the development of techniques and procedures necessary for the effective protection and relief of the civil population in time of hostilities.

(b) Upon the basis of information assembled and analyzed pursuant to this section, the Secretary, acting through the Board, shall prepare and make available to public officers of the United States who are responsible for the planning, organization, and administration of civil defense such information and standards as may assist them to discharge such responsibilities with maximum effectiveness and economy and be of value for their use in planning with officers of the several States and Territories appropriate methods, techniques, equipment, and organization for civil defense.

SEC. 3. (a) To promote the effectiveness of all research conducted pursuant to this act, the Secretary shall take such action as may be required (1) to obtain the coordinated and continuous service of such technicians, natural and social scientists, and representatives of other professions capable of making essential contributions in the solution of the problems incident to civil defense, and (2) to insure that activity in civil-defense research and development pursuant to this act will be the major responsibility of each person selected for such service.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized and directed to—

(1) detail for service pursuant to this act, for such periods as he shall deem necessary, such number of persons on active duty in any of the Armed Forces of the United States as he shall deem necessary, but not more than 50 such persons shall be so detailed at any time;

(2) relieve from active duty, or prohibit the ordering into active duty, in the Armed Forces of the United States of any member of any Reserve component of any such force whose service is determined by the Secretary to be required in any civilian capacity pursuant to this act, but not more than 50 persons shall be relieved from active duty or retained in civilian status at any time pursuant to this paragraph:

(3) to employ the services of any civilian employee of the Department of Defense, and, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the executive branch of the Government, the services of any employee of any such other department or agency;

(4) to obtain, with or without compensation, the services of such part-time advisory personnel as he shall deem necessary to carry out his duties under this act. Persons appointed for such service may receive such compensation as the Secretary shall prescribe, and shall be entitled to reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses incurred by them for travel incident to the performance of their duties under this act, or to a mileage allowance and a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence, as determined by the Secretary, for all such travel performed by them; and

(5) to obtain by contract the services of any individual, firm, organization, or educational institution required for the performance of the duties imposed upon the Secretary by this act.

(c) In carrying out his duties under this act, the Secretary shall—

(1) to the greatest practicable extent employ personnel, equipment, space, and facilities available to the Department of Defense for military research and development; and

(2) to the extent that research and development for the solution of civil defense problems are not identical with, or logical extensions of, any program for military research and development, procure such supplemental personnel, equipment, space, and facilities as he shall determine to be necessary.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be expended by the Department of Defense, at the direction of the President, out of any

appropriation heretofore or hereafter made to such Department or to the Executive Office of the President, such sums, not to exceed $10,000,000 in the aggregate, to be available for obligation or disbursement during the three fiscal years beginning July 1, 1950, as may be required for the performance of the duties imposed by this act: *Provided,* That no funds allocated pursuant to this act shall be employed for any purpose described in paragraph (1) of section 3 (c) of this act.

Politics Versus Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT SUTTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from one of the local newspapers, entitled "Politics Versus Statesmanship."

In view of the extreme necessity to materially reduce nondefense spending, I am of the opinion that the following editorial is most timely and should be thoroughly analyzed and favorably considered. The editorial follows:

POLITICS VERSUS STATESMANSHIP

Chairman MURRAY, of the House Post Office Committee, used appropriately strong language to describe the bill through which the House hopes to cancel Postmaster General Donaldson's wise and reasonable economy program. An outrageous concession to political expediency was the estimate of the measure made by Mr. MURRAY, a Democrat from Tennessee. He was not speaking without facts. He must have made some Members squirm when he told the House that many of his colleagues frankly had admitted they secretly favored the mail-service curtailment order but felt it would be politically dangerous to say so openly. They were thinking of next November and the threat of opposition from powerful postal employee groups.

During the debate a supporter of the bill asserted that 50,000,000 tired taxpayers have been hit in the mail box by Mr. Donaldson's reduction in mail service. These same taxpayers, however, have been hit in the pocketbook by the House's overwhelming vote against the savings planned by the Postmaster General. The Post Office Department has been running up half-billion-dollar deficits each year. These deficits are being paid out of taxes. When Congress refused to increase postal rates to cut this year's deficit and, on top of that, cut the postal rock-bottom budget below what Mr. Donaldson believed to be the operational minimum, the Postmaster General ordered mail deliveries reduced from two to one a day. He estimated this would save the Department up to $70,000,000 a year. No great hardship has been inflicted on the American people by the delivery curtailment. More than 85 percent of the mail was handled on the morning delivery, anyway, so that elimination of the second round has had relatively little effect on mail service. The probability is that most tired taxpayers would prefer the $70,000,000 savings to an extra mail delivery that is not essential.

The House majority that voted for the bill muffed an excellent chance to show real statesmanship at a critical time, when the need for reduction of nondefense spending is extremely acute. The opportunity now passes to the Senate, whose Post Office Committee already has endorsed the cancellation measure. If the Senate, too, should succumb to political expediency, President Truman would be justified in vetoing the legislation, which is wholly without merit.

Takes Time To Build Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a carefully prepared and informative article written by Lester Allen and appearing in the Boston Post of August 20, 1950:

TAKES TIME TO BUILD FORCES—UNITED STATES IS NOW FURTHER AHEAD THAN IT WAS AT START OF LAST WAR—HAS SOME FACILITIES READY

(By Lester Allen)

Amid the snap and crackle of political partisans seeking to place the blame for the deteriorated state of the Nation's defenses, required reading today should be the National Military Establishment bill enacted by the Eightieth Congress, the composition of which is important in determining who is blameworthy.

In that bill the common mission of the Armed Forces was set forth in plain language, specifically directed by Congress. Individual citizens can determine whether the directive of the Eightieth Congress was obeyed, who flouted the expressed will of the people, and why the will of the people was not obeyed.

PLAIN LANGUAGE

Here is the language of the bill: "The common missions of the Armed Forces are: To support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic; to maintain, by timely and effective military action, the security of the United States, its possessions and areas vital to its interest; to uphold and advance the national policies and interests of the United States; to safeguard the internal security of the United States as directed by higher authority; to conduct integrated operations on the land, on the sea, and in the air necessary for these purposes."

The bill was signed into law by President Truman, July 26, 1947—but it is important to see what had happened by then to the Army, the Navy, and Air Force. They were being peeled down to the bone, and were quarreling over the bone.

In 3 years the bone has been so thoroughly gnawed that there is very little marrow left in it. This is no guesswork. The figures can speak for themselves. In 1947 the United States had a scheduled strength of 1,070,000 in the Army. The Soviet Union had 4,100,000. The United States Navy had 729 ships in commission, a fraction of its tonnage, and a scheduled strength of 670,000, including the marines. The Soviet Union had 300 ships and 487,000 men. The United States Air Force had a scheduled strength of 475,000 men and 5,500 to 7,000 operating military aircraft. The Soviet Air Force had 37,000 planes and 700,000 men.

Only 2 years before that the United States had an Army at peak strength of 8,291,336 and over 65 percent of those were deployed overseas. In less than a year this magnificent army had shrunk to less than 1,600,000 and its used equipment was being scattered to the four winds, hawked for sale as surplus and dumped to rust out in jungles and dock areas.

DIDN'T KNOW

Now, all this dispersion of military strength was not accomplished against the will of the American people. They had fought a victorious war—or so they thought. They saw no need for maintaining immense armaments because they could not know, any more than the so-called higher authority could know, that within 5 years there would be a frantic scramble to reassemble those finely trained and resolutely disciplined fighting organizations.

The second guessers and Monday morning quarterbacks can scream vituperation and make accusations, but the plain truth is that the American people believed they were completely victorious, and all the treatment of the armed services thereafter was tinged with their reluctance to maintain huge standing fighting forces or to take the bullying position of coercing weaker nations by a show of armed strength.

The common missions of the Armed Forces must now be carried out and it will be infinitely more difficult because armies, air forces, and fleets are not created overnight. It will be at least a year before anything that faintly resembles an integrated fighting force capable of dealing with even a modest conflict can be welded together.

Most common is an odd delusion that persists among a vast majority of people that by a stroke of the pen President Truman can cause armed legions to spring out of the ground and advance upon the enemy. Why not call up the National Guard? Why not call up the Reserve divisions? Why not take the fleet out of mothballs? Why not call the Air Force reservists back on the job and get the planes flying? The fact is that such a project must be taken a step at a time.

Call up National Guard and Reserve divisions today and there would not be adequate shelter for them, supply problems would leave the armies, squadrons, and fleets starving and without ammunition or equipment. Step by step these things have to be done so that each step dovetails in the footprint of the last step. These are not Minute Men dashing up gun in hand to take a position behind a stone wall—more's the pity.

TAKES TIME

Even basic training—once accomplished in about 13 weeks—now requires twice as long. A reserve pilot faced with a new jet plane of a type he had never flown would be about as much at home in the cockpit of such an aircraft as a man from Mars. To teach an infantryman to fire one of the new recoilless field weapons with any degree of accuracy requires weeks and weeks of intensive drilling—even if there were enough recoilless guns and enough ammunition, which there aren't.

Where would the Navy find enough trained men to handle guided missiles if we had enough and if there were guided missile ships enough? The best estimate of time required to train a crew of men to handle a guided missile is about 8 months.

The handful of men fighting the United Nations' fight in Korea are stalling for time—a few weeks in which reserves can be brought into position to bolster a beachhead—and most strategists feel we will be fortunate if we can hold even a beachhead in Korea.

All in the picture is not as dark as this may make it seem. Fate smiled upon the United States when the Soviet Union made the overt move in Korea. The sudden lightning flash illumined the problem facing the American people as the chief bulwark of the democracies. If 10 years had passed

since the end of hostilities on VJ-day a lot of priceless skills would have been lost to the Nation.

As it is, a tremendous backlog of trained men are waiting in civilian life today for a call to apply their knowledge to the Nation's grave need. World War II taught a lot to the United States about mobilization, procurement, research, supply, transport, and all the other basic needs for giving power to a fighting force. Trial and error need not hamper the effort.

TO BE FASTER

A pitifully few harassed senior officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force nagged, cajoled, and threatened enough money to keep industry interested in developing weapons and keeping posted on industrial mobilization. Cadres of men capable to being expanded into fighting units were kept together by extraordinary efforts. The first 600,000 will be taught more rapidly than the first 600,000 were in 1940.

There are stand-by plants for war production in many critical fields—tanks, guns, ammunition, synthetic rubber, chemicals—and while much of the labor force that manned the plants has been reshuffled into new jobs, it will not take as long to get the plants running full blast as it did in 1941 when the plants had to be built and workers trained.

Many GI's who served in Germany recall with what astonishment the Germans learned that the United States and Britain did not plan to sweep right on across Europe and route the exhausted Red armies before they had a chance to get their breath. At the time the GI's thought it a most monstrous villiany, proof of the depraved militarism of the German people. In the light of the developments of the past 5 years it now appears that the Germans were political realists who faced a necessity, however repugnant it might seem.

Knowing what we do today, there would still be some doubt whether such a course would have been followed. But that is vain speculation and has no part in the job that must be done today. The first requisite of the big task is patience—and patience is difficult when American men are sacrificing their lives, desperate for immediate assistance.

USELESS TO PONDER

The monumental task will be completed quicker, however, and we make haste slowly, as some master of garbled aphorism said. Thousands of families are frantic with anxiety over sons in Korea and they are impatient for immediate complete mobilization. It is sad but true that immediate full mobilization wouldn't get reinforcements there faster, but probably would foul up all the carefully considered plans and make the loss of a beachhead in Korea almost certain.

If we hadn't been in such a tearing rush to get back to normalcy—a normalcy that could never again bring back the "good old days"—we wouldn't be in the mess we are in today, but, again, it is useless to ponder on what might have been.

Politicians who seek to make political capital of the failure to maintain the Armed Forces at full strength should look back over their shoulders at the Eightieth Congress and remember that it wrote a bill that was bipartisan to plan the Nation's defense.

It is to be hoped that the objectives on a political and international level are made clear to all who must do the fighting, and that men old enough and intelligent enough to go out and fight the Nation's battles aren't slathered with gooey bunk about fighting so that they can get back home for a piece of mother's blueberry pie.

There was too much of that kind of morale building in World War II and too little discussion with grown men soldiering about the realities.

Turkey Price Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizen of the congressional district which I represent, Mr. Arlo Turner, of Modesto, Calif., has prepared for me a memorandum in regard to turkey price ceilings which I feel will be of immense interest to every Member of Congress in whose district turkeys are raised.

Mr. Turner finances the raising of a very large number of turkeys and is recognized nationally as one of the country's foremost authorities on turkey raising and marketing.

The memorandum is printed below:

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY ARLO V. TURNER FOR CONGRESSMAN CECIL WHITE

SUBJECT: TURKEY CEILINGS

If turkey ceilings have to come, whether we want them or not, what does the turkey industry need, and what is fair.

Expecting that the Defense Act will empower the President to appoint agencies to fix ceilings when and if necessary and that, if established, the Department of Agriculture will consult the Poultry Branch and ask either it or some other agency to draw up regulations and fix prices. I have been endeavoring to obtain the ideas of folks in turkey production and others who are in close touch with turkey producers across the Nation.

This memorandum will discuss only the ceiling which should be established for turkeys, live-weight, at the farm, which move through commercial processing and distribution channels. Those producers near large population centers who prepare and retail their own birds can be protected as processors or retailers and should not be limited to the ceiling established in commercial production. Neither should their costs or expenses be used in determining what is a fair maximum price to producers for commercial distribution.

Let us not forget that ceilings are a maximum beyond which a profit is unreasonable. We are not discussing supports, or markets. We are only discussing the limit beyond which a producer of turkeys cannot go in selling them into commercial channels. He will have good years and bad years. His ceiling should be higher than a fair average price, because he will not obtain a fair price each year.

HISTORICAL

In 1945, the ceiling live-weight for turkeys was 33.6 cents. Parity ratio was 170. Parity was 24.6 cents. At the end of OPA the turkey ceiling was 135 percent plus, of parity. At that time, turkey producers were not receiving a profit on their investment and operation equal to that received by producers of many other specialty crops.

PARITY

Parity is an index obtained by adding the cost of the things a farmer buys, a selected, constant list of commodities, to obtain a parity ratio, which in 1909–1914 was 100 percent. The last ratio published by BAE was 256 percent. In 1909–14, turkeys were not an article of commerce. They were a pin money crop sold in nearby population centers. The only market quotations available to BAE in computing a base period parity for turkeys were quotations during October, November, December and January on the New York and Philadelphia markets during those five years, and in some of those twenty months quotations were not available from those markets. Those sketchy figures produced a base parity for turkeys of 14.4 cents per pound, live-weight, farm. Multiplying 14.4 cents the base period parity established for turkeys, by 256 reflects a parity of 36.86 cents per pound. The BAE's official parity for turkeys for last month is 36.9 cents per pound.

Some farm commodities were not, in 1914, but became free-moving articles of commerce later, such as soybeans. BAE worked out a base parity for those commodities, endeavoring to reflect their cost of production in true relation to the cost of production of other old-time crops. If that were done for turkeys the base parity would be higher than 14.4 cents. With a parity ratio of 256, each 1-cent-per-pound increase in the base parity would mean 2.56 cents per pound in true parity, or 51.2 cents per bird.

I have been informed by economists who have computed the difference for me that if turkey parity were figured like soybeans the base increase would be 2.8 cents per pound, which would add, at today's parity ratio, approximately 7¼ cents per pound to current parity.

Every time a discussion of prices arises in the trade or Government, in connection with supports, ceilings, etc., we have this stumbling block to overcome in the minds of Congressmen who cannot be expected to be familiar with all farm commodities. It is usually presumed that parity for turkeys reflects a true price relationship to parity for things like wheat, corn, soybeans, etc. Since it appears that we may have 5, 10, or more years of semiwar or war economy, it is important that BAE establish, as they did with soybeans, a fair base parity for turkeys.

COST OF PRODUCTION

A commercial producer of turkeys can do most of the labor, growing 5,000 birds. Estimates across the Nation indicate that commercial production requires an investment cost per bird of $5 to $7 for a farm with an ordinary five-room dwelling, a brooder house, range, equipment, vehicles, etc., a total investment of $25,000 to $35,000. The equipment has a short life and soon becomes competitively obsolete. The brooder house should be depreciated rapidly. To investment cost carrying charge, depreciation, etc., must be added feed, poult, fuel, litter, electricity, mortality, and other operation costs.

In figuring parity only 10.1 percent weighted average is allowed for feed. Of the costs in producing turkey meat, feed (for parents and the market bird) represents about 75 percent of cost of production. Suppose 10 commodities were used in determining the parity ratio, each of which, in 1909–14, cost 10 cents, one of them feed. Suppose that today the other nine cost 20 cents each and feed 30 cents. In that case parity for turkeys would be much less than cost of production. The facts are not quite as bad as that would be, but price-supported turkey-feed ingredients are so high, relatively, that turkey parity is not in fair relation to costs. Nor does it even approximate what it should be to give the same net return to producers as does parity for corn, wheat, potatoes, soybeans, etc.

If interest on the investment, taxes, insurance, maintenance, and depreciation, plus factory wages, are added to operating costs of production, commercial turkey production has been estimated by turkey men across the Nation, within the last 30 days, at between 32½ and 36 cents per pound. My guess is about 34½ cents per pound. A number of Government people have asked me why folks go on raising turkeys if they didn't make money last year. That's their chosen business, their life work, their trade. They have a heavy investment. Most of them

will not quit until they are broke. They can't quit.

AREA CEILINGS

Some turkeys in large population centers bring a higher price than those in commercial production. For instance, New Jersey producers, surrounded by large population centers, received last year at least $2 per bird more for the few turkeys they raised than those produced in Oregon.

Some national distributors of turkeys make contracts with large retail outlets and chainstores, to supply the turkeys needed by those retail outlets, less freight differential, priced at the New York market on the date of delivery of each shipment. Consequently, in commercial turkey distribution, turkey buyers endeavor to base paying prices on the New York market, less freight, and national distributors endeavor to buy their turkeys where they can buy them on the New York market, less processing, freight, and a profit.

Some people in Government and the trade feel very strongly that turkey ceilings should be different in one area than in another, and that the ceiling on the Pacific coast should be lower than that on the east coast. Checking across the Nation, I find the cost of producing a pound of turkey meat about the same in all commercial production districts.

The California Turkey Federation has a committee which, since January, has stimulated sales of turkeys in California, has spent approximately $20,000 and has done an excellent job. This committee has just been enlarged, is endeavoring to raise an additional $100,000, of which approximately $75,000 is assured. Their intention is to endeavor to make turkeys, whole or cut up, available in all of the butcher shops in the State. If they succeed, California people will eat its turkey crop. I am sure the people of the Pacific coast, in fact everyone west of the Mississippi, who produce turkeys for commercial channels, will feel that the price they are allowed to charge for their birds should not be less than a producer on the east coast is allowed to charge for his. If California or any other area is unable to consume all of its turkeys, the surplus will have to move to another area and, if it does, it will have to sell under the destination area ceiling enough to cover the cost of transportation to destination. We are discussing the limit which a producer should be allowed to charge for his product, and an unfair price in any area is identical with an unfair price to the producer, at the same cost, anywhere in the United States. Live turkey farm ceilings should be equal everywhere in the Nation.

In 1938, I produced 11,000 turkeys. Since then, the company, of which I am president, has financed production of over 9,000,000, supervised production and computed costs of production on every flock. I think I know what it cost to produce turkeys. The checks for those 9,000,000 turkeys were issued in our offices, after deduction of most of the operation costs, usually including poult cost. Continued, efficient turkey production requires, in good years, more than wages plus a small profit, if production facilities are to be maintained and new ones built as consumption requires them. A ceiling should be high enough to return a man his total production cost plus enough profit to keep an efficient producer in business, plus enough in good years to return his losses in poor years. Poor years occur approximately one in three.

Ceilings for processors, retailers and distributors are not commented on herein because honest, reliable, and informed local and national distributors are the people who should supply that information to Congress and the agency appointed to determine those mark-ups.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE ECONOMICS

No one questions the care with which these men endeavor to compute cost, crops, markets, and so forth. However, they have not had sufficient funds to obtain, therefore have not had complete factual information about commercial turkey production. Much of their information comes from State agencies which do not have the funds to thoroughly survey and classify. For instance, because of lack of funds, BAE does not always secure prices received by turkey producers who sell their birds through retail channels as against those who sell them in the general commercial market. Their figures, based on the only information they have, reflect prices received by producers, in certain areas in the United States, which no large processor or distributor could afford to pay and remain solvent.

The costs of field surveys to collect such information would be small. The bulk of the turkeys which move in commercial channels are processed by relatively few concerns and individuals, are financed by a very limited number of concerns. The turkey industry needs this information not now available to BAE, because BAE is looked to by the Department of Agriculture, by Production and Marketing Administration, and the trade, for facts which they do not have money enough to obtain.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Personnel of the Poultry Branch of the Department of Agriculture fortunately includes a number of career men who are conversant with the problems of the turkey industry in all its branches. Higher administrative officials in Production and Marketing Administration are producer-minded and, if given an opportunity to do so, both the branch and the higher officials can, and I am sure would, competently review costs throughout the industry, consult with informed people, and work out a ceiling program for the turkey industry, if it becomes necessary, which is fair to the producer and which will provide turkeys for the consumer at a reasonable price.

Since you asked me to furnish further information, I have been in contact with people from coast to coast who know turkey production, leaders in the industry, men whom I trust and who know the turkey producers' problems and costs. I have wanted to be sure that this summary would be reliable for your use in presenting the turkey man's problems, to which you have so assiduously and intelligently given your attention in Congress.

I believe, Cecil, that you can take these statements at par, with complete assurance that, if you convey them to your many friends in Congress, you and they will find them reliable. I have done my best in the 2 weeks available, to bring them up to date and check their accuracy.

Respectfully,

ARLO V. TURNER.

Ninety Percent Farm Parity Will Prevent a Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, our most important domestic problem in the United States is to maintain a sound, workable farm program. Agriculture is the foundation upon which the economy of our Nation rests. If you wreck the foundation of a building, it will crash to the ground. If you wreck the foundation of the economy of our country, which is agriculture, you cannot escape wrecking the economy of the Nation.

In fact, upon the foundation of agriculture rests full employment, business activity, the success of industry, the future prosperity of the Nation in the years ahead, and the size of the national income.

I do not claim to know all the answers to the problem of agriculture. I have made some study of it since helping to organize the first farm bureau in Marion County 34 years ago, of which I am still a member. From that time to this, as a newspaper publisher and having owned and operated farms, I devoted quite a bit of study through my lifetime to agriculture in an effort to keep abreast with soil conservation improvement and its general problems. For the past 7 years in Congress, I have studied the problem more intensely than ever before and have come to the following definite conclusions.

I am firmly convinced that a sound and prosperous agriculture will continue prosperity and full employment for labor, prosperity for manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and business generally.

I am convinced a prosperous agriculture will insure us against another depression in the future, if the Government in Washington will make a real effort to economize and reduce governmental expense.

Many commentators and newspaper writers who know little of the relation of agriculture to the economy of our Nation, write much about the farmers being subsidized. In fact, they have found it easy to criticize farm legislation and try to blame the farmer for the high cost of living. They do not point out the difference between what the farmer gets and the amount the consumer pays.

Of course, some mistakes have been made in administering the farm program. However, in considering the whole problem, the Congress has been right in protecting the interest of the farmers with a floor or support price of around 90 percent of parity, which has helped to continue prosperity for all of the people. I think potatoes and some other highly perishable vegetables should not have the benefit of any support prices.

WHAT FARMERS THINK

Mr. Speaker, the American farmers are well posted on our agricultural problems. Their combined judgment is helpful as a guide to the facts.

In order to get the benefit of their judgment, I wrote a letter to 10 of the most successful farmers in a number of townships in various counties, asking whether they would prefer retaining our present farm-parity law, or whether they would prefer the Brannan plan. I was pleased to learn that out of 528 replies, 500 favored retaining the present law, and only 28 favored changing to the Brannan plan.

I have learned to have a good deal of confidence in the collective judgment of experienced farmers who throughout the years, by using their brain and muscle, have made a success of farming.

THE BRANNAN PLAN

I am convinced that the Brannan plan is too expensive, too difficult to administer; would regiment, control, and penalize the farmer and wreck agriculture.

THE PRESENT PLAN

Mr. Speaker, the present Agricultural Act under which, with little change, we have been operating for several years, is the result of over 20 years of study, research, and thinking of the ablest men in agriculture of the Nation. It has had searching study by the ablest Members of the Congress as well from every conceivable source that would throw light on the farm problem.

Our present farm program has the support of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and 18 other farm organizations. The facts show it has worked exceedingly well.

An overwhelming number of the Members of Congress who have studied the results and improved the law under its application by trial and error, along with a great majority of the grass-root farmers, agree that we should continue the parity policy of a floor under farm products and build our future farm program on the present law, making such changes as time proves necessary.

You hear much criticism of the billions of dollars Congress has voted to support farm prices. These billions were responsible for the continued prosperity we have had since the farm program became operative, and have not been lost.

LOANS AND RESALE PROFITS

Mr. Speaker, let me give you the amazing facts which show how little the Government has really lost. On loans and purchasing of surplus farm products to the extent of over $8,000,000,000 by the Government during the past 17 years, the balance sheet furnished me by the Government up to April 30, 1950, shows a total net loss of only $212,858,871.

You will say, "That can't be right; we lost more than that on potatoes and eggs last year." That is true, and bad administration caused most of the loss; but on the purchases made on wheat, tobacco, oats, corn, rice, flax, and cotton which amounts to over 85 percent of total loans, the Government made on these enough profit to bring the total net loss down to the above figure. This administration gave Greece five times that much.

If these prices had not been supported, farm income would have dropped, national income would have dropped, business would have dropped, millions of men would have been out of work, a depression would have followed and the Government would have lost billions of dollars in income.

The best investment the Government has made in 20 years was the billions authorized by Congress and handled through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

ONE DOLLAR MAKES $6 MORE

It has been determined, after years of research and study, that every dollar's worth of income produced and sold off of the farm generates or adds $6 more to the income of our country. Let me illustrate:

One dollar's worth of wheat, oats, or fruit sold by the farmer is transported by rail or truck to processing plants, and by the time it makes the rounds through transportation and the processing plants, and comes back to the consumer in bread, wheaties, instant oats, or canned fruit, in this cycle of distribution that dollar has generated an additional $6 of income.

One dollar's worth of cotton produced by the southern farmer, by the time it goes through a cotton gin, to the weavers, and comes back to the merchant's shelf, and is sold in clothing, has produced an average of $6 more.

The same is true of livestock, and all other farm products. Thus, you see that the total income of the farmer is the gear wheel that controls the total national income of the Nation. If the income of the farmer is low, the national income of the Nation is low, the production of our manufacturing plants is low, and millions of men are out of work.

The following table of figures will best prove these facts. By a study of this table you will note that the total national income of the Nation will average about seven times the gross farm income. Where there is a discrepancy, it is caused by the lag of several months, but in the main the 20-year average proves that every dollar of gross farm income generates about six other dollars in the economy of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, practically all of the new wealth of our Nation comes from farm products and minerals out of the earth. They add the new wealth to the economic blood stream of the economy of the country.

You will remember that 1929 was the last prosperous year before the depression. You will note, reading from the following table, that when farm income went down, national income went down. You will note that the gross farm income reached its low point in 1932, while the national income reached its low point a year later in 1933. This lag results from the time required to carry products of the farm to the ultimate consumer.

Farm production and national income

[These statistics furnished by U. S. Department of Agriculture]

Year	Gross farm income	National income
1929	$13,000,000,000	$87,300,000,000
1930	10,500,000,000	75,000,000,000
1931	7,600,000,000	58,800,000,000
1932	5,700,000,000	41,700,000,000
1933	6,400,000,000	39,600,000,000
1934	7,800,000,000	48,600,000,000
1935	9,000,000,000	56,800,000,000
1936	10,000,000,000	66,900,000,000
1937	10,600,000,000	73,600,000,000
1938	9,400,000,000	67,200,000,000
1939	9,900,000,000	72,500,000,000
Average 1930–39: $8,600,000,000×7=$60,000,000,000		
1940	$10,300,000,000	$81,300,000,000
1941	13,100,00,000	103,800,000,000
1942	17,700,000,000	136,400,000,000
1943	23,000,000,000	168,200,000,000
1944	23,600,000,000	182,200,000,000
1945	24,000,000,000	182,800,000,000
1946	27,100,000,000	178,300,000,000
1947	33,000,000,000	202,500,000,000
1948	32,500,000,000	226,500,000,000
1949	30,500,000,000	221,000,000,000

You will note for the first 10 years from 1930 to 1939, gross farm income averaged $8,600,000,000 a year. This multiplied by 7 gives approximately $60,000,000,000 annual national income.

Taking the second 10 years, from 1940 to 1949, by adding total gross farm income figures you get $234,800,000,000. This multiplied by 7 gives a national income of $1,643,600,000,000 which proves that each farm dollar generates $6 more in national income.

Due to the lag from one year to the other, as farm crops go on the market, you will find that if you multiply each year by 7 the national income will be up or down a little, but when you multiply the yearly average for the first 10 years, $8,600,000,000 by 7 you get almost $60,000,000,000 annual income. If you multiply each year of the second 10 years shown on the chart you have the same up and down ratio due to the lag of marketing crops. But when you add the left column of gross farm income and multiply the total by 7 you get very near, in the right-hand column, 7 times the gross farm income.

The small difference in gross national income to farm income shown in the second 10-year chart is due to farm prices being held down by OFA controls and consumer subsidies paid during the war era. Even with that the total national income over the 10-year period balances out almost seven times gross farm income.

You will note in 1929 we had farm prices that brought a national income of $87,300,000,000. That was a year of great prosperity with full employment.

As farm prices continued to drop due to the depression the national income dropped in proportion. In the 10 years from 1929 to 1939, handling about the same percentage of farm production, but because of low farm prices, instead of generating $87,300,000,000 a year as we did in 1929, we generated an average of only $60,000,000,000 a year for that 10-year period.

As a result, in the 10-year period from 1929 to 1939, we lost $27,300,000,000 a year, or a total of $273,000,000,000 in that 10-year period.

It was the loss of this income which made it impossible for us to exchange our goods, rather than any surplus of farm products.

During these 10 years you will remember that we had 12,000,000 men in 1933 out of work. You will remember we established the WPA and spent some $25,000,000,000, which was added to the national debt in priming the pump to try to defeat the depression.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are, had we been operating under the farm program in 1929, which we now have, the depression could not have happened, and we would not have lost approximately $27,000,000,000 a year in national income, or $270,000,000,000 during that 10 years.

We are worrying about our national debt of $260,000,000,000. We lost just about that in national income during the 10 years from 1929 to 1939, as I have shown you by the table, because of low farm income which forced a low national income.

Assume we now remove farm price supports, and our gross farm income drops back, and our national income drops back to the 1939 level of $72,500,000,000—or, in other words, if we drop back to 1939 price levels, our income will be one-third of what it is at present. What will happen to our bonds, employment, business, and where will we get the over $40,000,000,000 in taxes with which to run the Government this year, or in the future.

These figures are authentic and are taken from Government statistics in Washington. If you will study and restudy this table, and note the explanation I have tried to make clear, I think you will agree with me that we must support farm prices at a level high enough so our annual income will pay the cost of operating our Nation on a solvent basis, and begin to retire the national debt.

Yes, we had better keep the present farm program, improve it, and keep prosperity for everyone.

Strengthening the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor of the Indianapolis Star written by Mrs. Walton G. Wilson, United Nations chairman of the League of Women Voters of Indianapolis:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF INDIANAPOLIS,
Indianapolis, Ind., August 14, 1950.

To the EDITOR OF THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR:

Public interest in the United Nations seems to be quite aroused at present.

The League of Women Voters is committed to the policy of strengthening the United Nations by developing its effectiveness under the present Charter. The UN study committee of the league recognizes that the Charter has provisions within it for correcting its weaknesses without altering its structure or essential usefulness. It is for that reason that we inform ourselves about the workings of the various commissions and branches other than the Security Council. The committee considers it a public service at this time to make our findings available to the community.

We are aware of the dangers of totalitarian rule wherever it presents itself or under what guise. When we support the commissions in the UN which are aimed at assisting the backward peoples to achieve independence and dignity, we believe we are doing it in the spirit of the American tradition. Such activities as the FAO, ILO, etc., are free of the taint of imperialism since their services are rendered where needed on behalf of member nations. By taking advantage of the opportunity offered under the Charter for them to use their experience of freedom in backing these commissions the democracies could, we believe, counteract the appeal of totalitarian regimes.

Most informed observers advise that Asia suspects any large power, including Russia, of imperialistic intentions when such powers undertake any large-scale unilateral action. Senator ROBERT TAFT addressing the Republican editors of Ohio last week showed his awareness of the situation in the Orient when he told them the United Nations would have to make the peace terms when the military operations in Korea came to an end. The United States is committed before the world legally, politically, and militarily to the United Nations. It seems like dangerous trifling to subject United Nations officials and representatives to serious charges without supporting evidence which would stand up in court.

The United Nations study group of the League of Women Voters has stated what procedures we are for on a rather broad front. We do not share the belief that friendly governments have left us holding the sack or that we can assume an isolated position in the world solely on the basis of what we are against.

If we are to coexist in the atomic age with nations and peoples whose concepts of peace, freedom and democracy differ radically from our own, we need to carry our eggs in more than one basket. The League of Women Voters considers a study of the available facts about these people and the structure and functions of the UN as much of a duty as voting in the elections. Mr. Malik has chosen propaganda as his weapon and the United Nations as the arena with the whole world as his audience. The people of the United States need to know the truth and see that Mr. Malik and the nations are confronted with it.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. WALTON G. WILSON,
United Nations Chairman of the League of Women Voters of Indianapolis.

Conveyances for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion some hours ago sent two circular letters to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Veterans' Administration.

The letters are as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1950.

Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILLIPS: There is now pending before your subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations House Joint Resolution 473, introduced by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, the purpose of which is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue providing automobiles and other conveyances for certain disabled veterans and to provide funds therefor.

For your ready reference, I enclose copy of Resolution No. 85, adopted at the Miami, 1948, National Convention of the American Legion, which is self-explanatory.

As I understand the situation, under legislation now in effect, these benefits were to expire on June 30, 1950, but unfortunately the funds allocated thereto were exhausted on or about April 30, 1950. As you know, there still are hundreds of disabled veterans in hospitals as result of their wartime service, and in addition thereto, there are also hundreds of cases of veterans whose claims have not as yet been adjudicated in order to determine their entitlement to an automobile or other conveyance of the type in question. Actually, there are numerous cases in which the veteran's entitlement has been established but unfortunately, due to the lack of funds, they have been unable to avail themselves of the benefits intended by this legislation.

Hundreds of these men will not be discharged from their respective hospitals until after July 1, 1950, and as you can well appreciate, until they shall have been discharged and their claims adjudicated, they are not in position to apply, through channels, for these automobiles, etc.

In other words, we respectfully submit that a veteran should not be denied the opportunity to obtain an automobile or other conveyance due to the fact that he was not fortunate enough to be discharged or have his entitlement established prior to either June 30, 1950 (the date of expiration of the current legislation), or prior to April 30, 1950 (the date on which we understand the fund became exhausted).

In view of the foregoing, and on behalf of the national organization of the American Legion, may I respectfully request your favorable consideration of House Joint Resolution 473.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation in this matter, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY, *Director.*

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Portsmouth, Va., August 15, 1950.

CHIEF LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR,
The American Legion National Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a member of the American Legion, Post 37, Portsmouth, Va. I am writing to you in relation to Public Law 663, of the Seventy-ninth Congress. This law, as amended, provided that combat wounded veterans who had lost or lost the use of a leg should be eligible for a grant from the Government of $1,600 toward the purchase of a new automobile or other conveyance. The law was designed to help those who, due to their injuries, were unable to make use of normal public transportation.

Last October this law was again amended to provide for its extension until June 30, 1950, but at the same time it was decided that no further funds would be provided for use. In other words, the law was to expire on June 30, 1950, or sooner, if funds ran out.

I am a paraplegic, and was retired from the Army on April 30 of this year. Immediately upon my retirement, I made a claim for this assistance. My claim was approved before June 30, but by that time, funds were no longer available. I understand that the only recourse that I and the many others who were forced, through the severity of their wounds to undergo a lengthy hospitalization, have, is to try to get another law such as this passed. We need this help. Without an automobile, we cannot get around. Others, many of whom suffered less debilitating wounds should have, and did receive the help. The law would have been self-terminating, because one had to be a combat wounded veteran to be eligible.

Can you advise me as to whether or not there is any effort being made to secure passage of another similar bill, or if there is any way in which I and the others like me can appeal this decision? We did not ask for, nor write the original bill, but through the years in the hospital (almost 6, in my own case), we have been counting on the help it would give us. Can you help us?

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. KIRBY.

Nothing To Worry About?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are making superhuman efforts to unify the countries of western Europe, our High Commissioner in Germany, Mr. McCloy, it would appear, assures the American people that the situation in Germany is well in hand and that we are guiding German attitudes and that the Germans are receptive to this guidance.

There are unmistakable signs, however, that Germany's neighbors do not share Mr. McCloy's optimism and that they are beginning to fear the resurgence of German industrial and military might. What is the truth about the German attitudes? Are the Germans really receptive to our democratic ideals? What are the Germans receptive to?

The Society for the Prevention of World War III, a nonprofit educational organization, 515 Madison Avenue, New York City, which for a number of years has been studying the German problem in all of its ramifications, in its just published summer issue, 1950, presents a bill of particulars, cogently and tersely, about the real present German attitudes. Under the heading "Nothing to worry about?" the society's magazine No. 35 clearly demonstrates that the American people have sufficient cause, indeed, to worry about our German policy. The article follows:

NOTHING TO WORRY ABOUT?

"This is a critical period for Germany and one which finds the Germans, in general, receptive. It is a period in which we should redouble our efforts to guide German public attitudes in the direction of the free western world." (John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner, to Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, in his First Quarterly Report on Germany.)

The American people will now be able to breathe a sigh of relief as they read the resolute words of the United States High Commissioner. Henceforth they need not fret about such insignificant occurrences as they read in the press daily:

The Chancelor of the West German Republic leading a German rally to the tune of Deutschland Ueber Alles.

The growing defiance of allied policy and personnel by Germans of all stripes and colors.

The ever-increasing influence of neo-Nazi politicians and their political parties.

The training of ex-Nazi diplomats to take over where they left off under Hitler.

The reestablishment of the German civil service as it was under Hitler and staffed with pro-Nazi bigwigs.

The return to power of the industrial war lords of the Ruhr who provided the guns and tanks for the Hitler war machine.

The rising clamor of the Germans for the freedom of the top Nazi war criminals.

The hounding and persecution of genuine anti-Nazis for participating in the Allied denazification program.

The resurgence of the German cartel network which aims at strangling the economies of her neighbors.

The reemergence of the I. G. Farben octopus, spearhead of past German aggressions.

The spending of American funds on unnecessary luxuries, while making no effort to cope with the unemployment problem—as revealed by the ECA.

The deliberate falsification of statistical data by the Germans in order to mislead the Allies as to the true state of Germany's economic revival.

The conspiracy of German industrialists to grab hold of the markets in Communist China, and the secret deals they are making with the iron-curtain countries.

The undermining of all agricultural reforms by the Germans, despite the hundreds of thousands of farmers who are landless, though close to 2,000,000 acres are available.

The sabotage of the reparations program which has now resulted in the retaining of most of the Hermann Goering steel works—a basic component of the Nazi war potential.

The smuggling into Germany during the year 1949 of $1,000,000,000 worth of goods, chiefly coffee, cigarettes, chocolate, and nylon.

The deliberate attempt by German politicians to aggravate the financial crisis by providing tax windfalls for the industrial war lords—another device to squeeze more money out of American taxpayers.

The German threats and insults against the west over the Saar Treaty.

The boasts by members of the German General Staff that they are in constant contact with some 4,000 generals and high officers who held key positions in Hitler's Reich.

This is but a partial list. There is much more to be told, but should we bother when the American people are now assured by the United States High Commissioner that the situation is well in hand, that "we" are "guiding German attitudes" and that the Germans "are receptive"?

Why should the American people pay any attention to eight prominent Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, GILLETTE, HENDRICKSON, IVES, LEHMAN, KILGORE, DOUGLAS, CHAVEZ, PEPPER, who have expressed alarm over developments in Germany? Why should the people become excited when they are assured that the Germans are meek lambs who are being "guided" and are "receptive" to the standards of free communities?

These Senators have asked President Truman to appoint a commission to investigate all matters pertaining to Germany. Do they really believe that there is something intrinsically wrong with our German policy? Or have they been taken in by the hysteria of fanatical diehards who believe what they read in the newspapers?

In this connection the New York Times recently carried a story bearing the headline: "U. S. Expert Defends Employment of Former Nazis in German Jobs." This anonymous high official in the Office of the High Commissioner told the press that it was a "misinterpretation" of the facts to assert that the denazification program had failed because many former Nazis had been returned to their jobs or had obtained new positions.

Should we listen to such experts because they possess a certain kind of logic which is above the heads of the common man? The common man just can't understand that putting the Nazis back into power is really a subtle way of denazifying Germany. As reported by the Times this high official said, when we put them back into office, they are less "vulnerable to neo-Nazi schemers."

This is our method of fooling the Nazis. If this doesn't make sense to the common man, let him at least retain his faith in the wisdom of the American High Commissioner. Is it not high time that the American people ignored the ravings of alarmists who cannot perceive the enormous good that is coming out of Germany day after day?

Don't we realize that they will be faithful friends of the democracies whom they despise as a matter of fact, and as long as our taxpayers' billions will flow to them, they surely will not make open alliance with their eastern neighbors?

Therefore, all we must do is to show some tolerance and understanding to a misled but essentially dynamic and democratic people.

Ten Major Jewish Agencies Denounce Stockholm Peace Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement released by the National Community Relations Council. It gives me special pleasure to insert this statement in the RECORD, because some organs of public intelligence, perhaps innocently or accidentally and perhaps maliciously, have given undue prominence to so-called Jewish names in connection with espionage arrests.

I have said over and over, and I repeat, that the members of the Jewish community are utterly loyal to the Government, the institutions, and the noble traditions of the United States, and more intelligently loyal than some of the groups who sneer. There are fewer individuals of Jewish faith among those who are disloyal, and a higher ratio of Jews in the armed services than in the general population.

NEWS FROM THE NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL, NEW YORK, N. Y.

(For release Friday morning, August 18, 1950)

Ten major Jewish organizatiaons today denounced the Stockholm appeal and characterized as a "despicable divide-and-conquer tactic" the circulation of a version of the pro-Communist petition directed specifically to Jewish groups.

In a statement released today, the Jewish organizations called upon "all who wish to serve the peace of the world and the preservation of freedom to reject, with calm and common sense, the Stockholm appeal." The organizations charged that "those who assist the unscrupulous Communist aggressors in advancing this instrument of their destructive purposes make use of every device of confusion and distortion."

Organizations which signed the statement were: American Jewish Committee; American Jewish Congress; Anti-Defamation League; Association of Jewish Chaplains in the Armed Forces; B'nai B'rith; Jewish Labor Committee; Jewish War Veterans of U. S. A.; National Community Relations Advisory Council; National Council of Jewish Women; and Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Declaring that the fraudulence of the appeal directed to Jews is transparent, the statement pointed out that the endorsements contained therein "obviously come from pro-Communists, from those behind the iron curtain who had no choice, or from innocents who have been duped by the spurious appeal, if indeed the endorsements are authentic."

Pointing out that circulation of the Stockholm appeal has, in some instances,

provoked groups to violence, the statement said:

"American democracy can and must be preserved not by abrogating the cherished principles of civil liberties but by confident reliance upon lawful processes and the appropriate governmental agencies."

STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION TO THE STOCKHOLM APPEAL AUGUST 17, 1950

At the very time when the peace of the world has been shattered by Communist aggression in Korea, a spurious peace petition, the appeal of the World Congress of Partisans of Peace, generally known as the Stockholm appeal, is being circulated by Communist and pro-Communist groups. The falsity of this misleading petition has been exposed by President Truman, by Secretary of State Acheson, and repeatedly by religious, labor and other organizations genuinely devoted to world peace, including the undersigned organizations. On August 2, the officers of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Synagogue Council of America joined in a denunciation of the deceptive Stockholm appeal, and correctly designated it "a camouflage designed to confuse the free societies."

Those who assist the unscrupulous Communist aggressors in advancing this instrument of their destructive purposes make use of every device of confusion and distortion. In this connection, our attention has been called to the issuance and circulation among Jewish groups of copies of the petition containing alleged endorsements of some religious leaders and public figures in European countries and Israel. It is a well-known Communist technique to make special and divisive appeals to the various religious, nationality and racial groups in the United States. We resent this despicable divide and conquer tactic. The falsity of the version of the Stockholm Appeal directed toward Jews is transparent; the endorsements obviously come from pro-Communists, from those behind the iron curtain who had no choice, or from innocents who have been duped by the spurious appeal, if, indeed, the endorsements are authentic.

We, the undersigned organizations, hereby denounce all versions of the false petition, and call upon all who wish to serve the peace of the world and the preservation of freedom to reject, with calm and common sense, the Stockholm appeal.

The presentation of the deceptive Stockholm appeal has in some instances provoked groups to violence directed against those who would deceive them. By circulating the Stockholm appeal, the Communists are attempting to provoke the American people to violence, threat of violence, mob action and disruptive disturbances. We urge the American people to avoid this trap. American democracy can and must be preserved not by abrogating the cherished principles of civil liberties but by confident reliance upon lawful processes and the appropriate governmental agencies.

Jacob Blaustein, President, American Jewish Committee; Rabbi Irving Miller, President, American Jewish Congress; Meier Steinbrink, Chairman, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer, President, Association of Jewish Chaplains in the Armed Forces; Frank Goldman, President, B'nai B'rith; Adolph Held, Chairman, Jewish Labor Committee; Ben Kaufman, Executive Director, Jewish War Veterans of the United States; Irving Kane, Chairman, National Community Relations Advisory Council; Mrs. Irving M. Engel, President, National Council of Jewish Women; Maurice N. Eisendrath, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

CVA and Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "CVA and Defense Production," by Assistant Secretary of the Interior C. Girard Davidson at the chamber of commerce forum luncheon, Pendleton, Oreg., Monday, July 31, 1950:

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR C. GIRARD DAVIDSON AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FORUM LUNCHEON, PENDLETON, OREG., MONDAY, JULY 31, 1950

CVA AND DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Regardless of what subjects we talk about these days, our thoughts are always skipping back to what is now happening across the Pacific in Korea.

We are all proud of the United States for the leadership which it is giving to the free nations of the world in resisting unprovoked aggression and in defending the independence of sovereign countries. All of us were stirred by the speed and courage with which President Truman moved to array the forces of our country behind the United Nations and to make the American position in defense of freedom known throughout the world.

We are all hopeful that we can bring the Korean battle to a successful and speedy close. We are hopeful that our determined stand in Korea will prove a deterrent to aggression elsewhere in the world. Our preparations, however, must take into consideration the possibility that our hopes will not be as speedily achieved as we might wish.

President Truman has reported to the Congress the measures which must necessarily be taken to protect us both abroad and at home. In his recent economic report, he has further outlined what the Korean emergency—and the threat of similar emergencies elsewhere—means to our economy.

It is obvious that our military effort and our diplomatic negotiations are dependent to a great extent on the strength of our domestic economy. Knowing that, we can see more clearly what Korea means to us at home.

It means that we must expand production of the things which our armed forces need. We must have not only enough to restore peace to Korea, but also enough to be ready to quell, in cooperation with other members of the United Nations, any future aggression anywhere.

It means that we must divert production of some factories from civilian goods to military goods.

It also means, of course, that we must tighten our belts. We must spend less on consumer goods and more on military procurement, which means higher taxes. Only in that way can we prevent run-away inflation and keep our Nation's fiscal affairs on a sound basis.

But the emergency does not mean that we have to abandon all peacetime production. Certainly it does not mean that we must hold our economy to a static level. Quite the contrary. We must expand industrial production to provide enough for both military and civilian needs.

Fortunately, ours is a large and rich country. Bigger and better is an American tradition. No one doubts that we are able to and know how to expand our economy to do the job ahead.

The President pointed out that private business need have no fear that emergency expansion would result in more productive capacity than this Nation would need when the present emergency is over.

Our industrial machine is now running at top speed and it still cannot meet current civilian demands. As our population continues to grow, as all of us aspire to a higher standard of living, these civilian demands increase year after year. It is not merely a military emergency that forces us to expand industrial production. We shall continue to need this new industrial capacity after the emergency is over.

Expansion means more steel, more aluminum, more fabricated goods, more cheap electric power. It means more of all the thousands and thousands of manufactured products this Nation uses.

And the President made it plain that the Government must do its part in working for an expanded economy in the future. We cannot abandon our growing program of resource development—and that means human resources as well as natural resources—if we are to have the kind of Nation we all want when the peace is finally won.

We can achieve these things, acting with characteristic American energy and teamwork, but we know that the job will not be an easy one.

Faced with such pressing problems, we shall have no time for foolishness. This is not the time for private wars which divide and dissipate our energies.

For that reason, I can find little patience for the current propaganda campaign of the private electric companies. It is disconcerting to note that, just this month, this campaign has invaded the pages of the widely read Reader's Digest magazine.

The article to which I have reference is entitled "Prime Example of Creeping Socialism: The Columbia Valley Authority." It is signed by the distinguished ex-Governor of Wyoming, the Honorable Leslie A. Miller. But it might well have been written by one of the paid propagandists of the electric companies.

We might speculate about this. Governor Miller has admitted to the papers that he did not write parts of it. The Reader's Digest has confirmed this.

The magazine editors admitted that they added to the article what they euphemistically call summarizing phrases. The public is led to believe, however, that Governor Miller is responsible for the contents of the entire article.

It should be noted that this article, which purports to inform the public about CVA, hardly mentions CVA. Here this widely circulated magazine had an opportunity to give the people some basic facts on an important question of public policy. All the facts on the CVA question should be broadly disseminated so that the people can make up their own minds as to its merits and demerits. Unfortunately, Reader's Digest overlooked this opportunity for performing a useful public service.

It was this same magazine which, only a few months ago, printed an earlier rabid attack on the CVA. At that time, many people wrote to the Reader's Digest and suggested that the magazine print in a succeeding issue an article stating the pro-CVA side of the story.

When I saw the August issue, I was astounded that the magazine should be publishing another anti-CVA article without offering an opportunity for rebuttal. I was further disturbed to find that this anti-CVA article was commissioned by the magazine. Thus it could not be considered an accident, a case of the editors happening upon a good piece in the morning mail.

These two articles, and particularly the references to "socialism," which the editors admit to inserting, must have given great

pleasure to the private electric companies. By labeling the CVA "creeping socialism," the Reader's Digest falls right in with the latest directive of the electric companies advertising program.

I wish all of you could see and read this booklet entitled "The Public and You," which the electric companies advertising program has distributed privately to the executives of private electric utilities. The booklet gives the results of a public opinion poll and has an interesting commentary on the results.

"This is a shocker," the booklet comments. "Sixty-three percent of the people approve TVA. Are they Socialists? Liberals? Fuzzy-thinkers? Low-income folks?"

"Apparently not," the booklet replies. For the poll revealed that 65 percent of the upper-income people approve TVA, that 83 percent of the editors and educators, people who read and get around and think, approve TVA. Even more horrible for the utilities executives are these facts brought out by the poll: 55 percent of the Republicans approve TVA, 53 percent of the free enterprisers approve TVA, and 45 percent of the private electric companies own employees approve TVA.

Furthermore, the survey shows that 63 percent think that TVA's in other parts of the country would be a good idea. Evidently, Pacific Northwest residents had their say in this public-opinion poll.

Unable to understand why so many people approve TVA, the survey further asked whether it was known that TVA does not pay the same taxes as business concerns. Most of the people said they knew that. Nonetheless, of the people who knew it, 66 percent still approved TVA and 65 percent favored more TVA's.

Then the pollsters took a new tack and asked, "Would socialism be a good thing or a bad thing for the United States?" Naturally 69 percent of the people said it would be a bad thing.

These facts led the electric company advertising experts to the following conclusion, which I quote from their booklet.

"From the preceding charts, it is apparent that to link our fight to the TVA question would run us into a lot of opposition, most of it based on lack of knowledge. But to link our fight to socialism is something else again. The people do not want socialism.

"We're on favorable ground there. The electric companies advertising program in magazines and on radio will stress the fight against the socialistic state more in the future. It should be stressed, too, on the local level * * * in speeches, radio talks, interviews, and other public expressions of management opinion."

Doesn't it seem to you, after hearing what the electric companies propose to do, that the Reader's Digest is following the line of the power trust? "Don't argue the facts," the line says. "Instead, pin the nasty label on CVA. Call it 'creeping socialism'."

Now let us leave this propaganda to the electric companies and get back to the facts on CVA.

The CVA was proposed to meet a specific problem, the existence of which no one has successfully questioned. Almost everyone knows that there is something wrong with the present system of handling the Federal Government's responsibility in river basin development in the Pacific Northwest.

There are too many cooks stirring the broth. Three Federal agencies are trying to handle the control of a single river system. Twenty or more Federal agencies are concerned with other aspects of our lands and water resources in a single river basin. The results are everywhere apparent in delays, in confusion, sometimes in open conflict. This is not the fault of the Federal agencies, but of the congressional acts under which they must operate.

Now that defense needs begin to press on us, the delays in the Federal river development program in the Northwest become even more apparent—and more dangerous.

As an example, let us look at a few facts about aluminum.

Currently we are making about 700,000 tons of aluminum a year. We should be making at least 1,200,000 tons, as we did during World War II. This is a minimum figure, but it will serve us for this discussion.

Why aren't aluminum plants expanding? It is not because they don't want to. For the last 2 years they have said they could use a whole lot more aluminum just to fill civilian orders. They have money for plant expansion, too, and they want to spend it.

But aluminum plants can't expand production at present prices unless they get more low-cost power. It was low-cost power that brought 50 percent of the aluminum industry to the Northwest in the beginning. Naturally the industry looks to the Northwest for further expansion, because the Nation's greatest reserve of low-cost hydropower is in this region. But today we have a power shortage here which, according to present schedules, will continue until at least 1958. New industries needing large blocks of power can't get it.

In order to get the minimum 1,200,000 tons of aluminum we need, we must have more power dams in the Northwest in a hurry.

If we don't get those dams, the alternatives are grim.

One of the alternatives is to cut the civilian use of electric power. The additional power needed is equivalent to the electricity requirements of about 30 normal suburban nonindustrial cities averaging 90,000 population. No one wants to cut off power for 30 such cities, for 2,700,000 people.

Another alternative is to use high-cost power. This would raise the price of aluminum. Today aluminum made with 2-mill power costs about 16½ cents a pound. But the cheapest power now available for aluminum expansion averages 6 mills. This would raise the price of aluminum about 4 cents a pound, to 20½ cents. The total added cost to the consumer each year would be about $96,000,000. That $96,000,000 out of the consumers' pockets might better be invested in a hydro-power dam in the Pacific Northwest. It would buy about 150,000 kilowatts of capacity.

As I said, we are short of aluminum because our dams in the Northwest are behind schedule.

A primary reason for the delay is the difficulty which the three Federal water and power agencies have had in reaching agreements on which dams are to be built, which agencies are to build them, and in what order they are to be constructed.

Obviously this would be avoided if the three agencies were combined into one, as provided by the CVA legislation.

A second reason for delay has been the absence of continuing construction funds. Each year the Federal agencies must wait for congressional action to see how much of a dam they can build. At the same time, the returns from the dams already built are going back to the Treasury without contributing to continued growth of the Pacific Northwest. In 1949 alone, the Bonneville Power Administration turned back to the Treasury, out of power revenues from the two dams now operating, over $10,000,000 in excess of operating expenses and of repayment requirements.

CVA would be authorized to use this money to speed construction of dams once they had been authorized by Congress.

A third reason for delay is to be found in the operations of the Congress. It is natural that the Congress would be hesitant about moving ahead on these dams as long as there is conflict among the agencies. As a result, the Northwest program proceeds piecemeal. You all know that the dams to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers were authorized in the rivers and harbors act of this year, but that the equally important dams to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation were left out of the act.

Among the projects omitted was Hells Canyon Dam, one of the most important units. The schedule for bringing the Northwest out of the power shortage by 1958 requires that construction on Hells Canyon Dam start this month. This is now obviously impossible.

In its action on 1951 appropriations Congress further demonstrated the ineffectiveness of this divided system of administration. Funds for the Corps of Engineers projects in the Northwest were uniformly increased by the Senate committee over the House committee recommendations. On the other hand, funds for Bonneville and Reclamation projects were decreased. For example, the Senate committee gave a more than $5,000,000 increase for the Engineers' Lookout Point Reservoir, and more than $7,000,000 for the Engineers' Detroit Reservoir. On the other hand, the Senate committee decreased Reclamation's Columbia Basin project by $4,000,000 and Reclamation's Hungry Horse Dam by $1,000,000. Bonneville Power Administration construction funds were cut $2,000,000 and its contract authority one and three-quarter million dollars.

If the river-development program for the Pacific Northwest came to the Congress in a single, comprehensive package it is unlikely that we would continue to have these unbalanced enactments of only half a plan. By presenting to the Congress a single, comprehensive program for dam construction for the region CVA would make it possible for the Congress to move more sure-footedly.

We must not forget these facts in any discussion of the CVA question. We are not doing as well as we might, and these days in the light of defense needs, as well as we must.

Regardless of the form and details of any proposal for improvement, it must be obvious that these three principles must be followed in order to do the job better.

First of all, we must pull together the numerous Federal agencies now working on natural-resources development in the Pacific Northwest. This is an obvious way to gain efficiency and save money. The river system is one job and it should be handled by one agency. We should have a single program, comprehending the needs of the entire region and all the natural resources, as well as a single schedule for accomplishing it.

In the second place, we should take the Federal operation out of Washington, D. C., and bring it 3,000 miles across the country to the Pacific Northwest where the job is to be done. We need on-the-ground grassroots management of our Federal operations. We need Federal officials in the region responsible for getting the job done. We need Federal officials in the region responsive to the problems of the region and to the needs of the people. We need an effective partnership between the Federal operation and State and local governments and private individuals.

In the third place, we need businesslike management of the Federal resource operations. It seems to me entirely logical that the enterprises of the Federal Government should make use of all the new and efficient management methods which the American private corporation has developed. The Hoover Commission recommended that these business-type procedures be followed in financing, budgeting, and accounting for

Federal water and power developments. A method for doing this is already established under the Government Corporation Controls Act, which provides both for business-type management of Government corporations and the strictest accountability to the Congress.

The current CVA proposal follows all these principles for improvement of the Federal resource operation in the Pacific Northwest.

If details in the legislation need refining, that can be done in congressional hearings in the field. These three basic prinicples, however, must be a part of any CVA legislation which finally becomes law.

Today the residents of the Pacific Northwest, together with people all over the country, are ready and anxious to make the maximum contribution to the defense of our national security. But as workmen, we are only as good as our tools. We do not now have the tools we need to make our maximum contribution. We are not tooled up to realize the power potentialities of this region and to make possible the necessary expansion in aluminum and in other metals and minerals.

This tooling up cannot be deferred much longer. Better to have enough and have it on time, rather than too little and too late.

Disposal of Surplus Perishable Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly plain that there is a great need for a rearrangement of our whole policy with respect to Government-owned agricultural products. These products have been bought in great quantities by the Commodity Credit Corporation in price-support operations. They have been held in storage warehouses when they should have been used as food by needy persons and by institutions and agencies who care for indigent persons.

The purpose of this bill is to broaden the scope of the present law so as to facilitate the disposal in a useful manner of perishable agricultural commodities held by the Government. At the present time the Department of Agriculture has millions of dollars invested in butter, cheese, dried milk, eggs, and numerous other kinds of products. They are in storage and serving no useful purpose. At the same time, Government and non-Government associations of a nonprofit character, such as hospitals, mental institutions, homes for children, the aged, and numerous types of welfare organizations that care for the poor and the handicapped in life are in need of these various commodities being held by the Government. It does not make sense.

Last evening I was startled to learn from the radio report of a news commentator that our Government had spent upward of $400,000,000 to buy up potatoes in its price-support program at a price of $1.68 per 100 pounds and then resold them at 1 cent per 100 pounds to make alcohol or fertilizer. In other instances they were treated with an acid preparation and discolored so they could not be used for human consumption. At other times they were destroyed by pouring oil over them and setting fire to them. At the same time, our War Department is paying $2.95 per hundredweight for potatoes with which to feed our soldiers.

These conditions must not be permitted to continue. Although there has been some improvement in latter days, yet there is more that can and must be done. The legislation now before the House, it is promised, will provide a ready means of getting these perishable agricultural products into channels where human need will be served.

I give my support to the bill.

Liberal Party Calls for Total Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE,
New York, N. Y., August 18, 1950.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLEIN: The Liberal Party of New York State is convinced that the emergency confronting our Nation is not just that of a little war in Korea, but a comprehensive emergency which will continue from now on until the Soviet Union is genuinely ready to leave the world at peace. Until then, we must be ready for instant action if the Soviet Union precipitates broad-scale war.

Upon the basis of this conviction, we believe that there must be set up now the entire machinery for activation of total economic mobilization on a moment's notice.

The enclosed series of recommendations on the national mobilization program, just passed by the State committee of the Liberal Party, aims at the complete preparedness which our Nation needs now.

We hope you will give these recommendations serious consideration in working on legislation for the national mobilization program.

Sincerely yours,

BEN DAVIDSON,
Executive Director.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON NATIONAL ECONOMIC MOBILIZATION MADE BY STATE COMMITTEE, LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE

We regard the present emergency as being not merely the Korean war alone. The emergency includes the potentiality of the Korean conflict for a third world war, precipitated by the Soviet Union either by bite-by-bite action upon vulnerable points or by sudden general attack. Whether the Soviet opens general attack with her own forces or sacrifices the people of her satellites first upon the altar of Soviet expansionism, the peril to the United States and the entire free democratic world is now acute.

It is the height of folly and of danger to regard the Korean conflict as an isolated and self-contained emergency. The attack of Soviet sponsored and directed North Korea upon United Nations sponsored South Korea, the persistence of that attack in defiance of the United Nations directives, the continuance of the attack in the face of United Nations military involvement, the refusal of the Soviet to stop the conflict, which she can do with a single word to North Korea—all this must be understood as part of the entire Soviet plan for world conquest. The Soviet will attack whenever and wherever she considers the opportunity ripe. She will not await our convenience.

Therefore, the United States and, with it, the entire free democratic world must be totally prepared for total attack at any moment from now on. The emergency confronting our country is not momentary in Korea, but a comprehensive and continuing emergency regardless of what happens in Korea.

We have seen time and again that an aggressor with expansionist aims is encouraged to act by the military weakness of his opponents. A third world war, therefore, cannot be averted by speaking softly and wielding a toothpick. Aggressors respect only strength. And it is only complete readiness to oppose force with strength—with full strength—that can deter the Soviet Union from throwing the world into flame. Complete preparedness is the only hope for averting a third world war.

It is upon the basis of our conviction that the emergency is total now and will continue to be total until the Soviet Union shows itself concretely prepared to permit the world to be at peace—it is upon this conviction that we base our over-all recommendation that the national preparedness program be pointed toward total mobilization. This does not mean that all the resources of the country—human, natural and industrial—be completely mobilized at once. It does mean immediate establishment of the entire machinery for activation of full mobilization the moment this becomes necessary. It means that Congress must provide the President immediately with all necessary control powers. It means that the President must set up all complete stand-by machinery now for exercise of those controls and must maintain that machinery on instant-action alert. This will obviate the hazardous, piecemeal, patchwork, scurry approach to mobilization for total war if and when it comes.

Toward this end, we recommend the following:

1. PRIORITIES, ALLOCATIONS, REQUISITION

The President should be granted immediately not only the power to set priorities and allocate materials but also the power to requisition plants or entire industries which engage in "hold-out" action in order to force the Government to grant their profit-making terms. In fact, any plant or industry which violates the mobilization program should be subject to requisition by the Government. There should be no policy of pampering industry.

The war effort must get first priority. But our war needs must not be permitted to serve as a pretext for a reactionary assault on our social services. Insofar as the war effort remains limited to the Korean conflict and to relatively gradual mobilization against other and larger eventualities and permits allocation of materials to civil needs, there should be a secondary "must" priority accorded first to housing for the low- and middle-income groups, to hospitals, to schools—in other words, to the basic social needs of the people. No materials at all should be allocated to luxury enterprises.

2. PRICE CONTROL

Price-control powers granted to the President should be broad enough to cover all goods and services and all prices from source to consumer, from raw materials through manufacture to the sale and resale. The "squeeze" upon the price-controlled retailer

by uncontrolled wholesale and manufacturing prices should be obviated. The squeeze upon the Government and its rearmament program by industrial profiteers should be crushed at once. (According to Air Force officials, industry has hiked the cost of the Air Force procurement program as high as 90 percent in the few weeks since the start of the Korean war.)

While it may not be necessary at present to place price ceilings on goods in ample supply—unless hoarding, panic buying, black-market creation of artificial shortages make ceilings necessary—price ceilings, along with priority and allocation controls, should be placed at once on all goods in short supply and especially on all materials and goods going into military production.

Prices should be rolled back immediately to May-June levels. And that includes prices of goods produced for the Armed Forces.

Complete machinery for rationing should be set up at once to be available for quick action.

3. RENT CONTROL

The gradual increase in rental housing during the past few years—which has stimulated premature decontrol for various areas of the country—will necessarily be retarded by our military production program. At the same time, the need for housing will be accelerated by our war measures, as experience in all previous wars has shown. Therefore, it is vital that strong rent-control powers be made available to the President. These should include the power to place rent controls anywhere at any time, including those areas presently decontrolled.

4. WAGE CONTROLS

Our entire program of recommendations under this heading is based upon the principle of equal responsibility and equal sacrifice for labor and industry. To freeze wages while industry piles up huge profits would be flying in the face of all justice. The inflationary danger at present lies in the actuality of skyrocketing prices, not in the potentiality of rapidly rising wages. The fact is that, even before the Korean war, there was an imbalance between wages and prices. The precipitate price rises since June 25 have only served to throw wages still further out of line in relation to the cost of living.

We are therefore opposed to any wage freeze at this time.

Whatever controls may ultimately be established over wages should be subject to the satisfaction of the following conditions:

(1) Roll-back of prices to the May-June level and such wage readjustments as will bring wages into balance with the increase in living costs which developed before the Korean war.

(2) Provision for wage improvement in trades operating under substandard labor conditions.

(3) Imposition of excess-profits taxes at the very same time as taxes upon individual income.

5. FINANCE

As much of the mobilization program as possible should be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis. We recommend that taxes be raised both in order to finance the mobilization program and to halt inflation. Increased taxes must apply—and apply equitably—both to individuals and to business and industry. Taxes upon industry should be such as to prevent inordinate profit-making. People of low income should receive special consideration.

We also recommend for further exploration the following possibility: Increase in income taxes would have the double function of financing the war effort and of stemming inflation. In the case of incomes under $10,000 a year, it is suggested that that part of the tax which represents the anti-inflationary function be set aside by the Government in war bonds to be repaid to the taxpayer in 10 years (in effect, compulsory savings).

We recommend that the President be given power to control all avenues of credit for all purposes and that the exercise of those controls be left to his discretion. Bowing to the interests of one field, like real estate, raises the question of equitability of credit controls in other fields.

A war contract system should be devised to prevent the making of huge profits.

6. SMALL BUSINESS

Wherever possible without detriment to the war effort, it is essential that small business be given full opportunity both to participate in and to advance the mobilization program. War mobilization increases the possibility of concentration of production in big industry to the detriment of small business. This threat should be realized and countered.

7. BLACK MARKETS

Heavy penalties should be established for black marketeering all the way from source materials to consumer. Our experience during the last war showed that measures taken then against black marketeering were far from effective. Black marketeering should be made a costly and perilous crime.

8. CIVIL RIGHTS—CIVIL LIBERTIES

Throughout the entire mobilization program and under all controls, no matter how drastic they may have to be, there must be no abrogation of the civil liberties and civil rights of free citizens in a free democracy. Measures for national security must be taken; spies, saboteurs, fifth columnists of both Communist and Fascist movements must be dug out, immobilized, and punished. But this urgently necessary action must not be permitted to infringe upon the democratic rights of our American people. Democracy is flexible enough to be able safely to maintain needed controls at the same time that it safeguards inalienable rights.

Continued discrimination in employment will retard the mobilization program. With the need for additional manpower in the present emergency, it becomes nothing short of sabotage of the mobilization program to deprive the country's production of the skills and efforts of workers because of their color, creed, or ancestry. Congress should act in this session to wipe out discrimination in employment. All war contracts should contain a provision prohibiting discrimination in employment on Government production. Segregation in the armed services should be eliminated.

9. UNIFICATION OF MOBILIZATION PROGRAM

We urge strongly that fragmentation of the direction of the mobilization program be avoided. If we are to have the maximum concentration of effort we must have the maximum of coordination all the way down the line. Splitting up mobilization program functions among various cabinet offices and special Government agencies is hardly conducive toward such coordination.

We therefore recommend that there be a single over-all Federal agency, appointed by and responsible to the President, which will be in complete charge of the national mobilization program—other than military—and which will handle the job right through planning, coordination, operation, controls and all other phases of the program. Labor, industry, agriculture, and the consumer public should all be equally represented on this board.

Under the jurisdiction of this agency, but appointed by and responsible ultimately to the President, there should be an Administrator for each mobilization function—priorities and allocations, requisition, price control, rent control, rationing, credit control, etc. Such an agency will not only have a unified structure, but will be the unifying force in the entire national mobilization program. The unified Military Defense Establishment will thus be paralleled by a unified economic mobilization establishment.

10. MORALE

The national-mobilization program cannot achieve its highest effectiveness unless the morale of the people is mobilized behind it. Only if the Government—and that includes Congress as well as the Executive Department—will fully alert the people to the gravity of the situation, the urgency for action and the inevitable need for sacrifices on the part of everyone—only then will the Nation be fully prepared to meet the dangerous days ahead. Mobilization must be three-pronged—mobilization of manpower, matériel, and morale.

At the same time it is essential for the morale of our Armed Forces that their military preparation be accompanied by a thorough briefing on the perils confronting our Nation and the world, on the values of free and democratic life which are at stake, on the objectives of their fighting. This should be matched by intensive education of the people at home on the very same score.

Now is not the time for petty or partisan politices by any group or individual. Unity at home against a common foe is another essential both for the morale of our troops and for the successful prosecution of the national program.

Appropriations for Extensions of Remarks

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana with a great deal of reluctance. Certainly it was no reflection upon the gentleman from Indiana, or his record in the Congress, or any remarks that he wished to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD. I registered my objection in the first place because $1,000 is a lot of money. Every local government in my district weighs and weighs very heavily the consideration of the appropriation of each and every thousand dollars. My taxpayers are helping to pay this bill the same as everybody else's taxpayers. If we throw away $1,000 here and there, ill-advised, and without much forethought, by stuffing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we are going to have to do some explaining to our taxpayers when we go home.

I question seriously, and I shall read the article inserted and try to determine, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, whether or not we should appropriate $1,000 for this matter and similar matters for stuffing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, nothing new in the fact that the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has been under continual attack in some quarters for our efforts in seeking to bring out into the light of day the activities of groups and organizations seeking to influence national policy in these critical times.

The right of any individual or any group to do its utmost in seeking to influence public policy is, of course, beyond challenge, and neither I, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, nor any member of that committee has any disposition to restrict in any fashion the right of petition, the right of political action, the right of free speech, or of free press. Anything of that nature would be foreign to our characters and our own fundamental beliefs in the processes of democracy.

Although there is nothing new in the fact that we have been under attack in this committee for seeking to bring all lobbying out into the open, that is, to make the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 clear in its application and effective in its operation some of the forms of these attacks upon us are somewhat puzzling to me.

Recently I called to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, an editorial in Life magazine which had represented this committee as being out to "get" business and antiadministration groups for expressing their point of view on legislative and national issues. I think I was able to show clearly in that presentation to the House that the editors of Life magazine, to say the least, had prepared their editorial attack upon us hastily and without bothering to check the actual facts.

I carefully avoided making any charge or accusation that Life magazine had deliberately attempted to mislead their readers in furtherance of any sort of plot or conspiracy against this committee and its objectives. But I did say that Life magazine obviously had been played for a sucker, had been taken in by the Committee for Constitutional Government, which has been conducting an all-out war against the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities.

Perhaps I should not have been surprised, Mr. Speaker, to find in the August 19, 1950, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, on page 10, in their lead editorial of that issue, a discussion of the work of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, which in tenor and tone is remarkably similar to the previous editorial in Life magazine. Nevertheless, I was greatly surprised. I was surprised chiefly by the fact that the inaccuracies of the Life editorial were not only repeated but expanded in the Saturday Evening Post editorial.

As in the case of Life magazine, the editors of the Saturday Evening Post, in preparing their editorial, ignored the first principle of responsible journalism by failing to make any effort to check the facts on which they were basing their editorial. That I just cannot understand.

Complaints against the work of this committee have been made from time to time by groups and individuals whom we have had under investigation and these complaints have been carried in the newspapers in some detail and have been relayed across the country by the wire services. Each of the wire services and every responsible newspaper correspondent in Washington reporting these complaints or attacks have always been careful to check the facts, to get an explanation if one was forthcoming, and they have tried to balance their stories so that both sides are presented.

Under those circumstances there could be absolutely no legitimate basis upon which I could complain. That is responsible journalism and good journalism. The wire services practice this policy scrupulously and we have come to expect it from all responsible reporters in Washington.

With all their resources, and with the excellent staff people I know they employ in Washington and elsewhere, I am utterly amazed at this failure first of Life magazine and now of the Saturday Evening Post, in preparing editorials, to make even a cursory check into the facts before proceeding with unsupportable editorials.

I would like to take this editorial in the Saturday Evening Post of August 19 point by point and show the truly amazing extent of its misinformation. As in the case of Life magazine, I do not think this is a deliberate attempt to mislead; I think it is just sloppy reporting, lazy reporting, inept reporting, and I am very sorry to see such an outstanding magazine revealed as being so careless in its fact finding and reporting.

The editorial is entitled "We Can't Salvage Free Enterprise Without a Battle."

It starts out this way:

> The late Professor Schumpeter of Harvard used to contend that the most serious threat to capitalism was the ineptitude of the capitalists.

I am sure there is a lot of truth in that.

The editorial then continues:

> As a current example you could take the weak response of too many businessmen and capitalists to the threat of the Buchanan lobbying committee which is engaged in a counteroffensive against the few conservatives who have waged effective war against the Socialist drift of the Truman Fair Deal.

By the weak response of businessmen and capitalists to the threat of the Buchanan Lobbying Committee, I assume the Saturday Evening Post has reference to the fact that scores of business corporations in this counrty have straightforwardly turned over to this committee without any hesitation whatsoever information we had requested from them on the funds they spent for the perfectly legitimate and perfectly legal and perfectly proper effort on their part of seeking to influence the action of Congress on legislation intimately affecting those businesses.

I presume that is what they had reference to in this editorial. The remainder of the editorial, of course, will bear that out.

But taking this first statement of the editorial by itself, the Saturday Evening Post is voicing concern that business corporations have nothing to hide and no reason to hide it are being weak enough in their defense of the capitalist system as to turn over to a congressional investigating committee the simple facts about their perfectly proper activities in the field of influencing legislation, a field in which they have every right to engage in.

But let us take the rest of that paragraph:

> The Buchanan Lobbying Committee, which is engaged in a counteroffensive against the few conservatives who have waged effective war against the Socialist drift of the Truman Fair Deal.

This is completely false. If the editors of the Saturday Evening Post have not any better idea than that of the purposes of this investigation and of what we are trying to do, then they must not have read a single story of the many which have appeared in the New York Times and the Christian Science Monitor and many other outstanding newspapers of the country explaining the completely objective basis under which the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has been working both sides of the street in our investigations into any area of lobbying activity or legislative interest we have gone. This policy was laid down at the very first meeting of the membership of this committee last October. It has been scrupulously adhered to. Our hearings will show that. Our hearings will show that we have set out to find out how lobbying operates, who is doing it, how they do it. In every area that we have covered we have taken typical proadministration lobbyists and typical antiadministration lobbyists and we have alternated from one side of the street to the other, and the sort of information we demanded from the one type of lobby on the one side of an issue, we were just as insistent in demanding from its counterpart lobby on the other side of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, if any committee of the Congress, particularly any investigating committee, has been more insistent on an objective approach and a nonpolitical approach than we have in trying to get to the bottom of the problem of making our lobbying act effective, I do not know what committee it could have been. This statement, therefore, that we are engaged in a counteroffensive against conservatives and antiadministration elements is completely false.

The word counteroffensive implies an attack to repel and attack. In our committee we have avoided and ruled out of

order and discussion of the merits of the legislative issues which the various lobbying groups before us have supported or opposed. Our record shows that. Although some groups appearing before us have sought to make our hearings into a forum or a sounding board on their own point of view on legislative issues, we have avoided these discussions and halted them and ruled out debates between members of the committee and the witnesses whether a proposed legislative course of action is good or bad, whether it is in the public interest or against the public interest. I will admit this was difficult to achieve. All seven members of our committee, the four Democrats and the three Republicans, are extremely active in the legislative battles in the Congress. We are all loyal to our respective political parties. The lobbying areas that we have gone into are areas of extreme political controversy and it is very difficult to keep seven Members of Congress from rising to the challenge of a good political argument. But by and large I think we accomplished our goal of keeping the merits of these issues out of our discussions.

To get on with this editorial, the second paragraph states:

> The Buchanan committee has haled before it several groups which are engaged in propaganda in opposition to socialism.

To interrupt, at that point, I will say that this is perfectly true. We have haled before us several groups engaged in propaganda in opposition to what is described here as socialism. We have also had before us at the same time and in the same series of hearings other organizations taking the exact opposite position on various legislative issues as these groups referred to as being against socialism.

In other words, we had the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Association of Home Builders, and the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, all of which are engaged in a continual battle against what they call socialized housing, that is, public housing. And in the same hearing series, we had the CIO Housing Committee, the National Housing Conference, Inc., and the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the Federal Government, all of which were vigorously promoting the public housing bill.

We had the National Economic Council and the Committee for Constitutional Government in other series; also, in that same series, we had Americans for Democratic Action and the Civil Rights Congress.

Similarly, when we called the Foundation for Economic Education, which publishes pamphlets on economic research tending to show that the proposals of this administration are leading us to socialism and disaster, we had already had before us the Public Affairs Institute, supported largely by railroad labor and other unions, which publishes pamphlets on economic research tending to show the need for the enactment of many administration proposals.

So, while it is true that this committee has haled before it groups propagandizing in opposition to what they call socialism, a fair statement in this editorial would have had to say that this committee has haled before it a variety of organizations engaged in propaganda for and against administration measures. It did not say that; and that was sloppy reporting, to say the least. But to continue with the second paragraph of this editorial:

> One of these groups is Frank Gannett's Committee for Constitutional Government, which is not charged with lobbying in Washington, but does print paper-covered editions of various books, including John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead, for distribution to the public.

I am completely at a loss to understand this reference to the fact that the Committee for Constitutional Government "is not charged with lobbying in Washington." The Committee for Constitutional Government lobbies in Washington and all over the country. It is registered under the Lobbying Act. It reports its receipts and expenditures under the Lobbying Act. The reporting is not complete; up until this year, it had never reported the name of a single contributor under the act. But it has given the Congress the figures on its total receipts and on each expenditure of $10 or more. These figures show that among all the organizations reporting to the Congress under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, the Committee for Constitutional Government is the second largest spender, second only to the American Medical Association campaign against compulsory health insurance.

Here then is a lobby which admittedly lobbies and which has accepted the application of a Federal law applying to lobbying. We have not "charged" them with lobbying in Washington because there is no question about it; they do lobby, and they have every right to. The use of this word "charged" in reference to lobbying is perhaps unfortunate, because it implies that anyone engaged in lobbying is doing something improper. Our whole objective here is to bring home to the American people and particularly to the organizations subject to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act that lobbying—that is, in its broadest sense, the effort to influence legislation—is a perfectly proper and usually helpful activity in a democracy; that it is in fact a necessary activity in representative self-government.

The Saturday Evening Post, however, in this editorial makes this totally uninformed statement that we have called before us the Committee for Constitutional Government not because they are engaged in lobbying—you notice these words, that the CCG "is not charged with lobbying in Washington"—but because they distribute books to the public.

A mere reading of the New York Times story on that hearing or a look at our record, which has been open to inspection, or a telephone call to me from Philadelphia, could have set the editors of the Saturday Evening Post straight on why the Committee for Constitutional Government was called before us for hearings. We are investigating lobbying; we are investigating lobbying groups which engage in widespread propaganda activity; we are investigating them not because we object to these activities or seek to prohibit or restrict them in any fashion, but to find out whether or not they are adequately covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act or whether that act needs improvement or clarification to keep activities out in the open where they belong. There is not a word in the Saturday Evening Post editorial about the objectives of this committee or the assignment given this committee by the House of Representatives, all matters of public record and easily ascertained by any cub reporter.

Let us proceed with this editorial. Amplifying this reference to CCG's distribution of The Road Ahead, the editorial continues as follows:

> Now comes the Buchanan committee and demands a full account of this operation, with a list of all those who have paid for bulk orders of The Road Ahead. The justification of this procedure, as attempted by Representative BUCHANAN, is that Congress is influenced by public opinion; therefore, it is necessary to investigate bodies which influence public opinion. For the moment the committee seems to be concerned mainly with certain unpopular individuals and with large corporations. But if the Lobbying Act is to be stretched out of its commonly accepted interpretation to include efforts to persuade the people as a whole, what becomes of freedom of press and opinion?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take this paragraph apart. The Buchanan committee has asked for the names of those who have given the Committee for Constitutional Government as much as $1,000 for any purpose whatsoever, including but not limited to payments for the mass distribution of books. We have asked for this information because the Committee for Constitutional Government has never reported to Congress on the sources of its income, until this year when one contributor was identified by name.

The Lobbying Act requires that organizations subject to it must report each quarter on the names and addresses of all those who make contributions of $500 or more. Now what is a contribution? The act defines a contribution as including "a gift, subscription, loan, or advance, or deposit of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution." Section 305 of the act requires that organizations subject to it file with the Clerk of the House quarterly "the name and address of each person who has made a contribution of $500 or more."

The House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has gone on record time and again that we are not policing this act, we are not a grand jury seeking to ferret out violations of this act for purposes of prosecution. We have taken a hastily drawn piece of legislation which has not operated completely successfully and we are trying to find out what is wrong with the legislation, if anything.

The Committee for Constitutional Government has followed a policy of concealing the names of its contributors. I

do not say that as an accusation. In saying that I am only reporting what Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the CCG, has forthrightly told this committee of the House of Representatives. He said they do not want the names of their contributors made public. He said they are afraid if the names of their contributors are made public, these contributors will be subject to political or economic or other retribution from opponents of the organization. He said that when the Lobbying Act was passed in 1946, the Committee for Constitutional Government immediately sat down to devise a technique of keeping secret the names of those who provide the organization with funds.

Whether the CCG is violating the act is not our concern. That is the concern of the Department of Justice. But if this act is not operating to bring out into the open the names of individuals or corporations or unions or any other sources providing the funds for lobbying organizations to enable them to carry on their lobbying work, then Mr. Speaker, that is our concern and very seriously so and it is up to us to find out what to do about it.

The Congress has said that this information must be made a matter of public record. If the act is not accomplishing that purpose because of violations, that is one thing; that is the Department of Justice's responsibility. But if it is failing in that objective because of loopholes in the act, that is our responsibility.

We have asked the Committee for Constitutional Government to give us this information and they have refused. They have flooded the country, and particularly all newspapers and magazines, including, I would imagine, the Saturday Evening Post, with press releases attacking the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities for having the effrontery and the arrogance to ask them where they get their money from—where a lobbying organization subject to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, spending a half million dollars or more a year to influence national legislation, gets its money from.

We have asked for this information—and we have received it—from virtually every other organization, whether subject to the Lobbying Act or not, whether reporting under the Lobbying Act or not, that we have investigated. We have gotten it from all of the groups in the housing lobby that we approached. We got it from the National Economic Council and Americans for Democratic Action. We got it from the Public Affairs Institute and the Foundation for Economic Education, neither one of which appears presently to be covered by the Lobbying Act. But they gave it to us. We got it from a wide variety of other organizations, registered and unregistered under the act, that we investigated—many groups interested in repeal of excise taxes, groups interested in the enactment of basing-point legislation, groups active in minimum-wage legislation.

But we have not gotten it from the Committee for Constitutional Government and guess who else we did not get it from—the Communist-led Civil Rights Congress.

Editorial complete in Saturday Evening Post of August 19, 1950, follows:

WE CAN'T SALVAGE FREE ENTERPRISE WITHOUT A BATTLE

The late Professor Schumpeter, of Harvard, used to contend that the most serious threat to capitalism was the ineptitude of the capitalists. As a current example you could take the weak response of too many businessmen and capitalists to the threat of the Buchanan Lobbying Committee, which is engaged in a counteroffensive against the few conservatives who have waged effective war against the socialist drift of the Truman Fair Deal.

The Buchanan committee has haled before it several groups which are engaged in propaganda in opposition to socialism. One of these groups is Frank Gannett's Committee for Constitutional Government, which is not charged with lobbying in Washington, but does print paper-covered editions of various books, including John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead, for distribution to the public.

Now comes the Buchanan committee and demands a full account of this operation, with a list of all those who have paid for bulk orders of The Road Ahead. The justification of this procedure as, attempted by Representative BUCHANAN, is that Congress is influenced by public opinion, therefore it is necessary to investigate bodies which influence public opinion. For the moment, the committee seems to be concerned mainly with certain unpopular individuals and with large corporations. But if the Lobbying Act is to be stretched out of its commonly accepted interpretation to include efforts to persuade the people as a whole, what becomes of freedom of press and opinion?

Opposition to the machinations of the Buchanan committee has usually taken the form of refusal to produce the information demanded by the committee. Inasmuch as a committee of Congress can compel the surrender of almost any information it wants, this is likely to be futile. Unaccompanied by adequate explanation, it also creates the impression that the individuals subpenaed are trying to conceal something.

President W. C. Mullendore, of the Southern California Edison Co., did go to the bat with vigor on what he called the effort of the committee to "use intimidation in limiting the exercise of the right of free speech in opposing or supporting proposed legislation"; and the Committee for Constitutional Government took the ground that the Buchanan committee was interfering with its constitutional right as a publisher to immunity from unreasonable search and seizure. These were justified defenses, but more is required.

What is lacking is an offensive, more or less like that suggested by Frank Chodorov in Human Events. He quotes the Buchanan committee's statement that the Committee for Constitutional Government spent $1,571,240.72, or an average of $40,000 a month for the 38 months studied. Says Mr. Chodorov:

"Peanuts and fiddlesticks. Every hour of the day the agencies of the Government spend more than that monthly average to influence legislation, and the legislation they plug is to lengthen their tenure, increase their appropriations, better their emoluments, strengthen their hold on the public purse. * * * The biggest, most pernicious, most unscrupulous, and entirely selfish lobby in Washington is the Government. * * * Its list of contributors includes every man, woman, and child in the United States. And yet it has the effrontery to point the finger of scorn at an organization that digs up a piddling $40,000 a month for printing and distribution of literature * * *."

Let somebody add to the conventional lawyers' defense against the aggressions of the Buchanan committee something like this: "We challenge your authority under the Constitution, but we are not embarrassed or ashamed of what we are doing. John Flynn's The Road Ahead is an angry book, with here and there an excess of zeal, but it does expose the socialist nature of the Fair Deal program, an analysis already accepted by the British Labor Party. If there is any restriction in America on the right of persons, including corporations, to challenge the pretensions of a political group in this country, it hasn't yet been put in the form of law. Until freedom of speech has been outlawed by Congress, we intend to support our ideas by whatever authorities seem to us likely to arouse the people to their danger."

The only way the battle for a free economy will be won is by forthright resistance in terms that can be understood, not exclusively by demurrers and legal responses and applications for injunctions, important as these are. If the fight can be staged in an arena where people can see what punches are being thrown, free enterprise may have a chance. It certainly has none if its protagonists always make themselves look like bad boys talking their way out of something sly and discreditable.

BUCHANAN'S reply to editorial follows in letter form:

The EDITOR,
Saturday Evening Post,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: Several errors of fact mar your August 19 editorial on the work of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

You endorse the argument of the Committee for Constitutional Government that our efforts to secure information from it interfered with its "constitutional right as a publisher to immunity from unreasonable search and seizure." As a publisher, however, you should have been able to distinguish between yourself and such groups as the Committee for Constitutional Government. A regular publisher takes the normal risks of operating a private business. He expects to pay income taxes on his receipts and does not seek tax-exemption, as does the Committee for Constitutional Government. He is in business for profit and is not primarily an advocate, grinding out printed matter which presents only one side of the subject. The ordinary publisher does not incessantly appeal to the public to bring pressure to bear on Members of Congress. It need not register and report under the Federal Lobbying Act as the Committee for Constitutional Government does. We have not charged that the Committee for Constitutional Government is engaged in lobbying; they have admitted it. As Edward A. Rumely, the group's executive secretary, told us: "We don't deny that." The issue should not be confused by the efforts of such organizations to conceal their objectives, their activities, and their backers from public scrutiny—particularly when they themselves claim to have exercised "decisive influence" on many pieces of legislation.

Not freedom of the press but simple honesty is at stake here. All that we ask is that those who seek to influence legislation stand up and be counted. Where there is nothing to hide, there is nothing to fear from full public knowledge of the facts.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK BUCHANAN,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities.

The "Communist-led" Civil Rights Congress, an organization labeled as subversive by the Attorney General, takes a position so remarkably similar to that of the Committee for Constitutional

Government as to make it appear they are actually allies in this attack. I am sure they are not. Nevertheless, after the Committee for Constitutional Government had protested that it was a violation of their constitutional rights for us to ask them where they got their money and from whom—that is, large sums of $500 or more or totals of $1,000 or more—the Civil Rights Congress came in here and said it was a violation of their constitutional rights to ask them for the same information.

Rumely of the CCG said his contributor would be harassed if their names were made public. Patterson of the Civil Rights Congress said the contributors to his organization would be harassed and persecuted if their names were made public. Rumely is afraid the Communists might try to smear contributors to the CCG; Patterson is afraid organizations like the CCG will smear the contributors to the Communist-led Civil Rights Congress.

It is an interesting situation. Because each of these groups fear extremists on the other side, they have independently decided that the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States have no right to information now required to be made public under the Lobbying Act, or information which an effective and clearcut Lobbying Act should require to be made public.

Other organizations engaged in mass pamphleteering propaganda on legislative issues have not felt that making public a list of their contributors would destroy the effectiveness of their organization or harm the reputations of their contributors. In other words, they are not ashamed of the causes they espouse and do not feel they have to conceal the sources of their funds. In our democracy where every citizen has the right to espouse any point of view he desires, there is inevitably an aura of suspicion surrounding concealment of this sort.

Continuing with an analysis of this paragraph in the Saturday Evening Post editorial, the editorial says that the justification of this procedure in asking CCG for the names of their contributors, the "justification" as "attempted" by me is that since Congress is influenced by public opinion, "therefore it is necessary to investigate bodies which influence public opinion."

I hope that is a little bit more than a justification. I hope it might also be regarded as something of an explanation. I would call the attention of the Saturday Evening Post editorial writers to the first public hearing ever held by the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities on March 27, 1950. Printed copies of these hearings have been available for some months. They have been widely distributed to the press and others.

Our very first witness was a distinguished professor at Princeton University, Dr. Hadley Cantril. He is a psychologist. His field is the psychology of public opinion. He was our opening witness. He was called to tell us about psychology of public opinion formation, how public opinion is formed and how it is measured. He was called on the theory that the factors which influence public opinion generally are very definitely factors which influence the legislative process. Members of Congress try to keep informed on the opinions of their constitutents and frequently are guided by those wants and desires and views. A concerted mass effort to influence opinion in a Congressman's district is a definite influence on legislation. That is basic.

This was not just my view. The ranking minority member of our committee, Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana, majority leader of the House in the Eightieth Congress, had this to say in reference to Dr. Cantrill's testimony and its relevancy to our investigation:

> I have always felt that a Congressman down here is in a kind of a dual position. He is charged first with exercising his own best judgment in the national interest, and, secondly, he should be constantly tempering that judgment with what he can conceive the majority sentiment of the people he represents. Now, in that consideration, of course, it is important that he be able to find out what the majority sentiment is, and, of course, insofar as majority sentiment may motivate his actions, then clearly the processes by which sentiment is created, the processes by which people believe one way or another, as you have pointed them out here, are important, so it seems to me, in any consideration that a committee like this might give to the over-all problem.

The Lobbying Act, Mr. Speaker, applies to organizations or individuals engaged in efforts to influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. There are, of course, many statutory exemptions. Again, however, we are not engaged in uncovering violations of this act; we are engaged in trying to find out whether the act is adequate. To know that, we must know what is being done in this field of indirect lobbying, not for purposes of regulating it, because we are not interested in regulating lobbying, but for purposes of making the act effective in keeping paid lobbying and organized, paid efforts to influence legislation out in the open where their sponsorship can be seen. And so it is true we are investigating bodies—lobbying organizations of one sort or another—which seek to influence public opinion.

But when the Saturday Evening Post says that our committee seems to be concerned mainly with certain unpopular individuals and with large corporations, that is not supported by the facts. That is completely off base. Again it represents sloppy research or no research at all. Certain unpopular individuals, if we can place Rumely and an individual who is now in jail, a Joseph P. Kamp, in that category, have defied this committee and refused to provide information to it and have protested that they have been singled out for persecution by this committee, and an executive of the Communist-led Civil Rights Congress has done and said the same, but numerous other individuals, popular or unpopular as the case may be, have appeared before us and not felt that they were singled out at all. Mr. Francis Biddle, former Attorney General of the United States who is now the chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, was subjected to the same sort of questioning and asked to provide the identical sort of information as all the other witnesses. Dr. Dewey Anderson, of the Public Affairs Institute, a liberal economist supporting administration programs was questioned in the same fashion. For every lobbyist or lobby which we have investigated on one side of the political avenue, we have investigated a counterpart lobbyist or lobby on the other; both were asked the same sort of questions; both were asked to provide the full financial detail on the organization; both were questioned as to techniques of influencing legislation; both were treated the same. So I cannot see how any reasonable observer could conscientiously say that for the moment, or at any time in our work, this committee has been concerned mainly with certain unpopular individuals and with large corporations.

The same sort of questionnaires which went to business corporations went to labor groups and farm groups. Virtually every national trade association has been asked for information about its legislative activities. We have had exhaustive investigations made into the activities of certain Government agencies accused of the improper or illegal expenditure of Federal funds for lobbying purposes. The Federal Security Administrator was personally summoned as a witness and subjected to a searching cross-examination of several hours, much of it very critical.

How then it could be said honestly that we are concerned mainly with "unpopular individuals and with large corporations" I do not know. We have been concerned mainly and exclusively with only one thing: lobbying activity.

The editorial continues in that same paragraph with a statement about stretching the Lobbying Act "out of its commonly accepted interpretation" to include efforts to persuade the people as a whole and asks what then becomes of freedom of press and opinion.

As a matter of fact the greatest difficulty this committee encounters is to get any reliable and forthright interpretation of the Lobbying Act as it is now written. The "commonly accepted interpretation" this editorial speaks of has been a very difficult one for us to discover. We are trying to make this act so clear that there will be more than a commonly accepted interpretation; we want it to be specific, clear and unmistakable in its actual meaning. In this reference the Saturday Evening Post has further demonstrated complete ignorance of our investigative problem.

And when it asks what becomes of freedom of press and opinion, the Saturday Evening Post asks a foolish question, because there is nothing in the Lobbying Act and there is nothing seriously proposed for insertion in the Lobbying Act to prevent the free expression by anyone—not just newspapers and magazines—from expressing views or lobbying or carrying on propaganda activities of any nature. Newspapers and other periodicals are specifically exempt from the act; the radio is not but in my opinion should be. We have no de-

sire to restrict the full freedom of public discussion by anyone, including, of course, newspapers and magazines which are guaranteed that freedom by the Constitution.

So this argument boils down to a fallacy. In asking a lobbying organization where it gets its funds, we are not doing anything to restrict that organization from doing anything it cares to with those funds. The Committee for Constitutional Government and the Civil Rights Congress, however, maintain that the disclosure of their sources of support will destroy their effectiveness or restrict or hamper their freedom of action.

Can any truly American organization make such a claim and remain American in concept?

The next paragraph in the Saturday Evening Post editorial is interesting in that connection. It says:

> Opposition to the machinations of the Buchanan committee has usuallly taken the form of refusal to produce the information demanded by the committee. Inasmuch as a committee of Congress can compel the surrender of almost any information it wants, this is likely to be futile. Unaccompanied by adequate explanation, it also creates the impression that the individuals subpenaed are trying to conceal something.

When the Saturday Evening Post speaks of the opposition to the machinations of this committee, of my committee, as having usually taken the form of refusal to produce the information demanded the magazine should have pointed out, perhaps that this usual form of opposition is the form which has been used by three organizations: The Committee for Constitutional Government, the Constitutional Educational League, and the Civil Rights Congress. The editorial should have, perhaps, pointed out that all three followed this pattern for identical reasons, a pathological obsession against revealing their completely concealed sources of income. The obsession in each case is the result of fear—fear that disclosure of their sources of support will destroy them. The Saturday Evening Post editorial says that "unaccompanied by adequate explanation" this refusal to provide the information "creates the impression that the individuals subpenaed are trying to conceal something."

As a matter of plain fact, each of those three organizations has given what it regards as an adequate explanation for its refusal. And in each instance, as a matter of plain fact the explanation was forthright to this effect. They are trying to conceal something; they feel they must conceal. They have said so.

Now the Saturday Evening Post Editorial turns to a new direction. The next paragraph reads as follows:

> President W. C. Mullendore, of the Southern California Edison Co., did go to the bat with vigor on what he called the effort of the committee to use intimidation in limiting the exercise of the right of free speech in opposing or supporting proposed legislation—

I want to interrupt there. Mr. Mullendore was one of about 170 or 175 corporation executives to receive the questionnaire from us asking for information on the money they spent for influencing legislation. Mr. Mullendore considered this intimidation and an effort on our part to limit the right of his company in the exercise of free speech. Mr. Mullendore's letter of protest which he released to the press—as he had every right to do—was picked up by the Committee for Constitutional Government and reprinted and distributed by them throughout the country as evidence in support of the CCG's position that it should not give us the names of its contributors. As I told the House earlier in connection with Life magazine's use of this same incident in an editorial, there was no connection between the CCG investigation and the questionnaire distributed to business executives, although the CCG was one of a number of organizations specifically mentioned in that questionnaire. Mr. Mullendore shot from the hip in that letter, accusing us of seeking to limit his exercise of free speech merely by asking him what funds were spent by the Southern California Edison Co. in an effort to influence legislation. Mr. Mullendore has been very active personally in the Foundation for Economic Education. His company can contribute all the money it wants to to that or any other organization engaged in trying to influence legislative decision. But I do maintain that a committee of Congress investigating the extent of lobbying activity has a right to know about such expenditures, whether by business corporations, labor unions, professional organizations or Federal agencies. And Mr. Mullendore, it will be noted, was one of only three or four corporation executives throughout the country receiving our questionnaire who felt that the information requested was unwarranted.

The Saturday Evening Post does not say anything about the more than 150 corporations which gave us the information without any hesitation whatsoever.

But to continue with the editorial which I interrupted in the midst of a paragraph:

> and the Committee for Constitutional Government took the ground that the Buchanan committee was interfering with its constitutional right as a publisher from unreasonable search and seizure. These were justified defenses, but more is required.

If it is justified for the Committee for Constitutional Government to claim, as a "publisher" that it is immune against giving us information bearing on its lobbying activities—and remember this is an organization registered under the Lobbying Act as a lobbying organization—then it seems to me that the Saturday Evening Post has developed a novel theory about the limits of the powers of congressional investigating committees or else it has innocently swallowed a purely phony story planted—deliberately and assiduously planted—by this lobbying organization.

How any reputable newspaper or magazine could regard the Committee for Constitutional Government as a "simon pure" publisher is beyond me. The CCG was established exclusively for the purpose of influencing legislation. Its whole operation is designed to influence national policy. It is not a commercial operation; it is a nonprofit organization. It publishes books and pamphlets just as the Communist Party publishes books and pamphlets and for exactly the same reason—to sell a political viewpoint to the American people and to influence national policy. It is so close to being a political organization that I imagine it is on the border line of being subject to the Corrupt Practices Act, if not already subject to it.

I am amazed that the Saturday Evening Post would regard it as justified for such an organization to refuse to give a congressional committee the facts about its financial sources, the names of those who finance its operations. I am particularly amazed that the Saturday Evening Post would seek to so cheapen the philosophy of the first amendment to the Constitution as to wrap it like a cloak around an organization which publishes books and pamphlets as a means of spreading a political viewpoint, and to say that any activities of this organization are immune from investigation—immune from investigation, I emphasize, not just immune from any law restricting its freedom of expression or operation—but immune from investigation by Congress merely because it publishes some books. Carrying that philosophy to its ultimate, any newspaper or magazine could carry on any activity under the sun, including dope smuggling, and claim immunity from investigation under the first amendment. That is artificial and ridiculous.

The editorial continues:

> What is lacking is an offensive, more or less like that suggested by Frank Chodorov in Human Events. He quotes the Buchanan committee's statement that the Committee for Constitutional Government spent $1,571,240.72, or an average of $40,000 a month for the 38 months studied. Says Mr. Chodorov:
>
> "Peanuts and fiddlesticks. Every hour of the day the agencies of the Government spend more than that monthly average to influence legislation, and the legislation they plug is to lengthen their tenure, increase their appropriations, better their emoluments, strengthen their hold on the public purse. * * * The biggest, most pernicious, most unscrupulous and entirely selfish lobby in Washington is the Government. * * * Its lists of contributors includes every man, woman and child in the United States. And yet it has the effrontery to point the finger of scorn at an organization that digs up a piddling $40,000 a month for printing and distribution of literature."

I gather from these two paragraphs of the editorial that the offensive suggested by Mr. Chodorov and by the Saturday Evening Post is to prove that it is not necessary to investigate lobbying by private groups because the Government, or Government officials or employees also engage in efforts to influence legislation; that it is not necessary to have a law requiring that lobbyists operate in the open because Government agencies or Government officials also seek to influence legislation.

This committee is aware of the fact that Government agencies and Government employees spend a great deal of time seeking to influence legislation. Not only that, we have been investigating some of these efforts and some of these operations. There is a criminal law prohibiting the use, except under certain circumstances, of Federal funds for the purpose of seeking to influence Congress.

We have been investigating alleged specific violations of that law. We have been investigating also the so-called proper type of lobbying by Government agencies, for we on this committee recognize not only that Government agencies have a right to express views to Congress, but that in fact they have a duty to give the Congress the benefits of their experience and views on current legislative issues. In a broad sense that is lobbying and it is similar to private lobbying of the kind that we have investigated.

But what does all this have to do with an offensive against the purposes of this committee in seeking to find out how lobbying operates? For one thing the editorial is downright dishonest, or at least clearly uninformed, in stating that the Government, presumably meaning this committee of Congress, has had the effrontery to point the finger of scorn at an organization for having collected $40,000 a month for lobbying purposes. The scorn has been reserved for the refusal of the Committee for Constitutional Government to stand up like an American organization, rather than hide like an underground movement, stand up and show us all where their money comes from and who contributes that money. It is interesting that the Communists have the same reluctance to comply with the American tradition of operating in the open.

Now let us continue again with the Saturday Evening Post editorial:

> Let somebody add to the conventional lawyers' defense against the aggressions of the Buchanan committee something like this: "We challenge your authority under the Constitution, but we are not embarrassed or ashamed of what we are doing"—

Outside of that reference to aggressions of the Buchanan committee, so far that sounds interesting, so let us continue with the Saturday Evening Post's proposed draft of a statement for the Committee for Constitutional Government to address to us:

> "John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead"—

The editorial continues—

> "is an angry book, with here and there an excess of zeal, but it does expose the Socialist nature of the Fair Deal program, an analysis already accepted by the British Labor Party. If there is any restriction in America on the right of persons, including corporations, to challenge the pretensions of a political group in this country, it hasn't yet been put in the form of law. Until freedom of speech has been outlawed by Congress, we intend to support our ideas by whatever authorities seem to us likely to arouse the people to their danger."

That statement is the Saturday Evening Post's idea of what an effective rejoinder by the Committee for Constitutional Government to this committee would have said. Strangely enough, it happens to be much along the lines of the constant barrage of statements out of the Committee for Constitutional Government about this committee of the House and our demand for pertinent, relevant information about their lobbying activities and sources of funds.

It follows the CCG line in insisting that, by asking where the organization gets the funds it uses for mass distribution of its one-sided literature, we are trying to suppress the distribution of these books. How does that follow?

The fact is that the CCG itself fears that disclosure, that publicity about this operation, will ruin its effectiveness and kill the market for its publications. No other lobbying organization which came before us, except the Communist-led Civil Rights Congress, took such a dim view of the repercussions from having the public know where its money comes from.

Would people refuse to buy the Flynn book and distribute it if they knew this whole operation was a big-business front, for instance? Or because some very prominent industrialists put up a lion's share of CCG's funds?

I cannot answer that question. I do not know the answer. Obviously, however, the Committee for Constitutional Government fears any "exposure" about its supporters for the obvious reason that it believes such disclosure will dry up the sources of its support.

The Foundation for Economic Education, supported largely by contributions from leading American industries, was willing to give us the names and amounts of these contributions. It takes the position that the material it puts out is useful and honest; it is not ashamed of its work. It feels that even though people know that General Motors or United States Steel or some other industrial giant has subsidized some of its publications, people will nonetheless read these pamphlets for the information they contain or the expositions they make.

Similarly, the Public Affairs Institute, supported largely by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and with funds also from other unions, has no hesitation about allowing these facts to be known to the people who read the institute's pamphlets on point 4 or on labor relations or on anything else.

But the Committee for Constitutional Government and the Civil Rights Congress flock together in refusing to reveal this information to a committee of Congress for fear of what disclosure will do to its effectiveness.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we on the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities are not concerned how many thousands or millions of copies of any pamphlet or book the Committee for Constitutional Government put out into the channels of public discussion. All we want to know is: who pays for them?

There is no law that says that corporations cannot engage in lobbying activity. There is a law which says that corporations cannot spend corporate funds in political campaigns. The same applies to unions. Some of this so-called lobbying activity, on both sides of the street, is getting awfully close to the poltical expenditure border line, but that is an enforcement problem for enforcement agencies, not for us. We have looked into it only for the purpose of educating ourselves to the realities of modern-day lobbying techniques.

But how it can be said honestly that we are in any fashion whatsoever violating the right of freedom of speech or transgressing on it, by asking these lobbying organizations where they get their funds is a question which I cannot answer, although the CCG has tried valiantly to raise the issue and to answer it also. And the Saturday Evening Post unknowingly, I hope—I hope it was unknowingly—seems to have fallen for that "plant."

The concluding paragraph of the editorial charts a proposed course of action, as follows:

> The only way the battle for a free economy will be won is by forthright resistance in terms that can be understood, not exclusively by demurrers and legal responses and applications for injunctions, important as these are. If the fight can be staged in an arena where people can see what punches are being thrown, free enterprise may have a chance. It certainly has none if its protagonists always make themselves look like bad boys talking their way out of something sly and discreditable.

That ends the Saturday Evening Post editorial on this subject on how free enterprise can remain free only if it gets behind an organization like the Committee for Constitutional Government and supports that organization in refusing to tell a committee of Congress where its funds come from. I certainly disagree with that thesis, and I think most businessmen and free enterprisers would join me in disagreeing with it. The Congress has a right to know what forces are operating in America and how they operate to influence national policy. We have a right and a duty to know what the Communists are doing. We have a right and a duty to know what extremists on the other side are doing. And we have a right and a duty to know what middle-of-the-roaders organized into mass pressure campaigns for in most cases wholly commendable purposes are also doing and how they do it.

The Saturday Evening Post in this editorial I have just cited has, I believe, unwittingly struck a deep and damaging blow at the cardinal American principle of forthright and honest discussion of national affairs, of open-and-above-board political and economic debate and discussion of full disclosure of the interests behind mass movements of all kinds. We cannot have free and open discussions and debate and free choice of opinion and view if our people are unable to find out the names of those sponsoring the distribution of opinion-forming material, and thus assess the motives behind those views.

The full disclosure required in principle by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act is one of our best devices for increasing rather than decreasing public interest in national affairs. Instead of being skeptical or suspicious of the views of organized pressure groups because they do not know who is behind them, the people can see for themselves now that many lobbying groups whom they otherwise might suspect of selfish interest are supported largely by groups and individuals with no selfish ax to grind, with no special-interest ambition.

Pressure groups which hide, which operate in the dark, cannot help but breed suspicion about their motives. They deserve suspicion.

The Saturday Evening Post, I am afraid, has come to the defense of such groups by advising them to stay hidden,

keep concealed, go underground, and to tell the Congress, and through us, the American people, to go jump in the lake when we inquire about their make-up and structure.

That is not the sort of reaction I would expect from a magazine which enjoys such tremendous mass acceptance in America, a magazine which has been built to its present eminence by a publisher who years ago led a crusade against the false advertising of patent medicines and similar nostrums. Much of the credit for the passage of the Food and Drug Act belonged to Cyrus H. K. Curtis. He crusaded through his publications for an end to the untrammeled right of quacks and crooks to offer adulterated or misbranded or dangerous remedies to the American people in medicine bottles. He crusaded against the false advertising which promoted sales of these nostrums by fooling, and eventually killing, the people who bought them.

That is a proud heritage for a magazine. In this instance, however, the Saturday Evening Post has allowed itself to be used by fake nostrum peddlers in a campaign to avoid disclosure of the true facts about their so-called remedies—in this case, where the money comes from to put out these political patent medicines.

The Saturday Evening Post, in its last sentence, said that free enterprise supporters have been fighting us with legal means. Actually, we had one legal action against us: from the Committee for Constitutional Government. It was thrown out of court. Free enterprise, in my book, is not synonymous with the Committee for Constitutional Government. The quicker free enterprisers find out that this outfit is strictly an underground movement intent on remaining hidden and concealed, the more intelligently free enterprise, so-called, can defend its legitimate interests in the realm of national policy.

Foreign Policy on Imports Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the clumsy, bumbling acts of the Truman administration with its lack of a foreign policy, and particularly lack of a foreign-trade policy, were spotlighted by three developments last week.

The longshoremen union in New York City and later in Boston refused to handle and unload shipments of canned Russian crabmeat that are known to be the products of slave and forced labor. Later a shipment of Russian furs were likewise embargoed. As a Member of Congress, I cannot support a violation of a Federal law, but so far as I know the union did not violate any Federal statute—but rather sought to enforce one that has been on the books for over 20 years. There is in the Tariff Act of 1930 a clear prohibition against the entry into any port of the United States any product of slave or forced labor. The Secretary of the Treasury and his Chief of the Bureau of Customs have had the situation called to their attention. It has also been called to the attention of the State Department, whose Assistant Secretary had testified at Lake Success that there were known instances of slave and forced labor in all of the Communist countries. But, while the Treasury promised to investigate last March, the State Department fell back on the excuse that apparently there existed a market for foreign-canned crabmeat in the United States.

It is my firm belief that the longshoremen union or any other group should not make nor determine our foreign policy nor assume the enforcement of Federal laws. But why do we permit Federal officials charged with enforcement of the laws to shirk and avoid their duty, brazenly and openly defying Congress, sometimes resorting to legalistic interpretations to justify their inaction.

It is clear that Russia is endeavoring to build up her war potential and is buying critical materials and supplies wherever she can. The skyrocketing prices of rubber and tin are two instances of their activities. The dollars earned by imports of furs, crabmeat, and other luxuries are being used for just this purpose. The action of the Commerce Department last week in requiring export licenses on over a thousand items of a critical nature is complete confirmation.

The Wall Street Journal last Friday carried a report from their correspondent in Frankfurt, Germany, stating that Allied occupation officials had ordered a drastic crackdown on shipments of strategic and industrial goods from western Germany to Russia and her satellites. It is obvious that the decision and the action had the approval of the Truman administration and the State Department.

It would appear that the Truman administration has had another change in policy—but has it? The direct action would call for the cutting off of imports from Red Russia and her Red satellites. Stop the dollar-earning imports and you will practically wipe out the trade in critical raw materials and supplies not only here but in western Europe and throughout the world. Such action is possible through the enforcement of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 banning imports of slave and forced labor. Just why does the Truman administration, its State Department, and its Treasury Department refuse to enforce the law?

Concerning the embargo on shipment of western Germany goods behind the iron curtain while the Allied Council permits other western powers to ship goods behind the iron curtain, the Wall Street Journal, on August 18, 1950, carried the following interesting dispatch:

EMBARGO GERMAN EXPORTS

(By Edward Hughes)

FRANKFURT.—Allied occupation authorities here have ordered a new and drastic crackdown on shipments of strategic and industrial goods from west Germany to Russia's eastern European satellites.

This may be the first important step in a coordinated United States-western Europe drive to keep such goods out of Russian hands.

In Paris, a study is under way to set up a universal list of restricted items. The United States and western Europe—presumably including west Germany—would be expected to abide by this list.

If this goes through, it will amount to economic sanctions against the Communist part of the world.

NEW ORDER COMING

In the last few days, the American-British-French control group in Frankfurt has issued a confidential order bluntly canceling the practically unlimited authority the German federal government was granted over exports of ball bearings and synthetic rubber compounds 3 months ago. The Germans don't know it yet but the Allied High Commission is also planning to issue another order further restricting the Bonn government's control over the export of strategic commodities, including nonferrous metals and products and possibly scrap iron and steel.

Allied officials are angry at the Bonn government. In the past 90 days it has permitted a flood of ball bearings, machinery, rubber compounds, and metals to pour eastward to Russian controlled Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

This is considered a bald violation of instructions issued when Allied controls were relaxed May 10. Until that date German exporters and manufacturers were required to submit requests for the export of strategic war potential goods to an Allied export control working party for screening before actual shipment. This board imposed tight restrictions on shipments to east Europe.

Commodities on a small secret list must still get Allied approval before export, but the shipment of a large number of items of lesser strategic importance was removed from Allied prior scrutiny and turned over to Bonn for screening. Under this May 10 directive, Bonn is required to see to it that shipment of these items eastward is not substantial in quantity.

WANTED TIGHT CONTROL

"We had hoped the German Government would take this job off our hands and keep a tight control on eastern exports," says an allied official. He adds dryly: "This hope has not borne fruit." That's why Allied High Commission officials decided secretly to take over the control of many of these items after a series of meetings here 2 weeks ago.

German officials who have learned of the Allied orders are highly vexed. They charge discrimination in such matters will cripple the German economy. The Germans point to the fact that many of these restricted items can be purchased by eastern European countries at will in Britain and France.

"Why should we lose this business to the victorious Allies?" the Germans ask.

Allied officials admit it's unjust. They contend, however, the discrimination against Germany will soon be removed when the United States-western Europe superlist of restricted items now being worked out in Paris is completed.

At any rate, the increase in west Germany's east-bound exports of potential war materials—as they're classified by the Allies—has been astounding.

"In the first 21 days after the export-control authority was handed over to the Germans," says a High Commission official, "more ball bearings and rubber compounds were shipped to east Europe than in the entire previous 5 months when the control was in Allied hands."

SHIPMENTS UP TENFOLD

No figures are yet available for July and it is difficult to find comparable figures for the earlier part of this year. But some June statistics show the trend. According to the German Government's own figures, the shipment of ball bearings and roller bearings to five satellites during June increased tenfold over the May exports from west Germany. June shipments were valued at $101,000, compared with $9,000 worth in May. The bulk of the June shipments went to Hungary, which got $94,000 worth of west German ball bearings and roller bearings. It had gotten none at all in the previous 12 months, officials say.

Look at the rubber compounds. Bulgaria received $61,000 worth in June this year after getting none in May or in the previous year. The total west German rubber compound shipments to five Eastern European puppets in June was $120,000 worth, which is double the May figure.

Carbon black, important rubber compound chemical agent, was shipped out of West Bulgaria and Rumania during June to the tune of $38,000, with most of it going to Hungary and a bit to Czechoslovakia. In May just $1,000 worth of carbon black went to these nations. In the entire previous year, none at all was shipped to them.

Barium compound, lead compound, sodium compound and nickel compound moved in this West-East pattern in the amount of $52,000 during May. This more than doubled in June to $127,000. Crude iron and pig iron and semi-finished iron goods increased from $430,000 in May to $664,000 in value in June. The comparable figures for April are not available, but officials say shipments in that month were much lower than in either May or June.

MORE INCREASES

In June shipments of these products to the Czechs trebled its May volume, those to the Rumanians doubled. The June shipments of steel pipe to Hungary were five times the May level, while electrical equipment exports to the same satellites increased seven times.

Allied officials are not sure yet how tight they'll pull the knot on German exports to the East, but they plan to send their second restrictive order to Bonn in the next week or two. Under this expected order, as well as under the terms of the first order sent a few days ago, all applications for shipments of restricted items must again be sent to the High Commission before approval and shipment. The Allies will reject a large number of these applications, it's said.

The problem facing officials is how to set a hard and fast rule governing the shipments. What makes a commodity strategic? "I can't tell you, and neither can anyone else," says an official who'll have to deal with the applications. The instructions to Bonn were to prevent shipments of the items on the secret restricted list in substantial quantity. "What is substantial quantity depends on the time and place," this official explains cryptically.

He makes it clear, however, that shipments permitted by Bonn in the past 90 days have definitely been substantial. He further alleges the German Government has indulged in a skulduggery to conceal the size of some individual orders from the High Commission's prying eyes. The High Commission recently discovered one application for a very large shipment to the East had been broken down into several small applications and approved by the German Government.

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON.—The Commerce Department's export-control program has been "under review," since the Korean crisis, to decide whether it is working satisfactorily, and whether any products should be added to, or subtracted from, the control lists. But officials insist "no broad shift in policy is contemplated at this time."

From the end of the war until March 1, 1948, export controls were used exclusively to "protect the domestic economy." Many things were scarce in this country, and the export restrictions were used to prevent these from being shipped abroad.

But in March 1948 there was a shift in the policy. A ban was placed on shipping strategic goods to unfriendly countries, specifically Russia and her satellites.

This ban is carried out as follows: Items deemed having strategic importance are placed on the Commerce Department's "positive" list. This means that a license must be obtained for any goods on the list.

For the hottest items on the "positive" list there are two further classifications: The "R" list and the "RO" list. The "R" list includes all items which cannot be shipped outside the Western Hemisphere. The "RO" list covers items which can only be shipped to Canada.

The Defense Department controls all shipments of military matériels and the Atomic Energy Commission all atomic items. Commerce Department is only in control of commercial goods.

The Commerce Department screens all materials for potential strategic importance. For example, most foodstuffs and textiles can be shipped without a license because it is considered they have no immediate strategic value. But parachute cloth can only be exported with a license, and, although most tires can be shipped freely, restrictions are maintained on bulletproof tires and tires that could be used on military vehicles.

Children's Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for publication in the RECORD the attached article, entitled "In Behalf of Children," which appeared in the August 13 issue of the St. Clare Bulletin, edited by Rev. P. L. Colgan, O. S. A., pastor of St. Clare Parish, Grosse Pointe Park, Mich., which is my home parish. The article follows:

IN BEHALF OF CHILDREN

Parents and those in charge of children would do well to ponder a statement recently issued by the New York Youth Commission. The statement contains a Children's Bill of Rights, as follows:

1. The right to the affection and intelligent guidance of understanding parents.

2. The right to be raised in a decent home in which he or she is adequately clothed and sheltered.

3. The right to the benefits of religious guidance and training.

4. The right to a school program which, in addition to sound academic training, offers maximum opportunity for individual development.

5. The right to receive constructive discipline for the proper development of good character, conduct and habits.

6. The right to be secure in his or her community against all influences detrimental to wholesome development.

7. The right to individual selection of free and wholesome recreation.

8. The right to live in a community in which adults practice the belief that the welfare of their children is of primary importance.

9. The right to receive adult good example.

10. The right to a job, commensurate with his or her ability, training and experience, and protection against physical or moral employment hazards which adversely affect wholesome development.

11. The right to early diagnosis and treatment of physical handicaps and mental and social maladjustments at public expense, whenever necessary.

To which we might add this conclusion: Those in charge of children who, deliberately failing in their responsibilities, transgress these rights, will have a frightening account to render to the God who said: "Suffer the little children to come to Me."

MacArthur Not Consulted on Korea Before Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article refutes the innuendo that the debacle in Korea is General MacArthur's responsibility. I am including the article as part of my remarks. It appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Sunday, August 20:

MACARTHUR HAD NO SAY IN KOREA BEFORE WAR—STATE DEPARTMENT ASSUMED COMPLETE CONTROL OF OUR INTERESTS, SAYS STAFF OFFICER

The following is a quote from a letter by a member of General MacArthur's staff in Tokyo. It reveals that the State Department assumed complete control over American interests in Korea and did not keep the far eastern commander informed of any developments before hostilities started. The letter was released to the Times-Herald yesterday by its recipient, a man of high repute in Washington:

"Prior to the President's decision to intervene militarily, General MacArthur had no more responsibility or authority as to Korea than did Drew Pearson.

"Even before the inauguration of the republic, the State Department assumed complete control over American interests and responsibilities in that area, it being excluded from this theater's strategic and administrative responsibilities.

"Thereafter the military advisory group which remained to assist in the organization, equipping and training of the South Korean forces came under the American Ambassador at Seoul, without operational, administrative, or even liaison channels to General MacArthur's headquarters.

"The basic policy of the United States against undertaking military operations in Korea, as was the decision to restrict the type of arms and equipment to be supplied the Korean forces to the requirements of internal order, was made in Washington, without the slightest references here as to either.

"The order to commit American air and naval forces, while most fully supported by the general as providing a dramatic base for the enunciation of a positive American policy against further Communist expansion in Asia, was received without the slightest prior consultation. Nor did the general send in any prior views or recommendations on the Korean situation.

"There is not the slightest truth in Pearson's statements, and they are undoubtedly but a continuation of the efforts to undermine public confidence in the general, which has been the aim of the radical fringe in the United States for so many years. Senator KNOWLAND touched upon this question of responsibility in answering Ickes' charges in the New Republic, and I am sending a copy of his comments taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in case you failed to note them."

What To Do About Communists and Fellow Travelers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of August 22, 1950:

THE ANTI-COMMUNIST BILLS

The Senate now has before it three distinct and rival measures dealing with subversive activities of Communists and their sympathizers. These are: The Mundt-Ferguson bill (S. 2311), the McCarran omnibus bill (S. 4037), and the administration bill (S. 4061). The first two differ fundamentally from the third in that the former impose general sanctions against Communists and Communist fronters, while the latter, correcting some specific defects of existing law, reflects the view that sweeping legislation would be "unnecessary, ineffective, and dangerous." We are inclined to think that, on the whole, the administration viewpoint is the correct one at the present time. We believe that close scrutiny of the Mundt-Ferguson and McCarran bills will show why this is so.

These measures have as one of their two principal joint features a provision making it a crime to conspire to perform any act that would "substantially contribute" to formation in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control. This language is so vague that it seems to us it could be used to impose restraints on freedom such as the American people have not known in 150 years. In any case, it would seem advisable before passing legislation of this type at least to await the final decision of the Supreme Court on the Smith Act, which prohibits conspiracy to advocate the forcible overthrow of the Government, and which has already been used to convict 11 leaders of the Communist Party.

The other principal joint feature of the Mundt-Ferguson and McCarran bills is the registration requirement they would impose on all Communists and on Communist-front organizations. The danger here is that the registration provisions might be used to destroy incipient political parties or even existing organizations advocating unpopular causes which may or may not be on the Communist fringe. This in our opinion approaches too closely to a possible regimentation of the American political structure along more or less orthodox party lines.

The primary objective of this legislation, and one with which we emphatically agree, is to render the Communists harmless, to destroy whatever potentialities they might have of forcibly overthrowing the American Government. But would these registration provisions accomplish that purpose? Those Communists and Communist sympathizers who would register are already known to the authorities and those who are not would doubtless remain underground. It is quite possible, in fact, that the whole party would be driven underground by this legislation, in which case it might become considerably more dangerous than it is at present.

In addition to the provisions already discussed, the McCarran bill contains in entirety a drastic and senseless immigration measure that has already passed the Senate (S. 1832) but which, as we have said before, is fundamentally antidemocratic. It contains other sections of lesser importance, some of which are, in fact, included in the administration bill. These involve a tightening of espionage, registration, military security, and deportation laws.

In considering all of this anti-Communist legislation it must be remembered that the primary Communist danger to the United States comes from an imperialist aggressive world power—Soviet Russia. A secondary danger comes from agents of that power who may be found principally (but by no means exclusively) within the American Communist Party and its controlled organizations. There is virtually no danger from the Communists as a domestic political party. In what Justice Holmes has called the competition of the market, the Communists have been able to win virtually no office of national importance. It is in the area of espionage, sabotage, and subversion that we have to fear the Communists inside this country. But it is precisely in these fields that we have ample legislation (subject to minor improvement) such as the treason, espionage, sabotage, naturalization, and registration laws, as well as the loyalty program for Government employees and various administrative regulations to boot.

Is it wise, then, to adopt legislation which is couched in language so broad that it could seriously infringe upon individual liberty, which could set a precedent for interference with the traditional freedom of political parties or political organization, which as a practical matter might defeat its own purpose, and which at the present time is not necessary for the defense of our institutions? The freedoms of the American political system have cost too much in centuries of blood, sweat, and tears to be discarded or even endangered just because we want to take action against a contemptible and puny band of misguided zealots within our borders. When and if they become a threat to public order, then will be the time to move against them. Meanwhile, we urge the American people not to strike out in blind fear or fury, thereby undermining, as President Truman has said, the very internal security they seek to protect. To do so might give us an emotional satisfaction. But there would not be one Communist less in the country.

School Housing Problem, Moon Township School District, Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

CORAOPOLIS, PA.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support of S. 2317 in House and shall appreciate advice as to action taken by House. Our wartime defense-housing project increases our school enrollment by an average of 485 pupils. The Federal Government built one six-room building to take care of these children. Our district's legal bonding power is insufficient to provide the funds for the building we need and have planned. S. 2317 is designed to aid districts such as ours.

MOON TOWNSHIP SCHOOL DISTRICT,
J. R. ALLARD.

Women of America Oppose Socialism and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, less than 5 years since terrible World War II we find our Nation again in war largely the result of misguided policies on the part of our national leaders who lost the peace at Yalta and Potsdam through their appeasement of Russia. Lost the peace at the close of the war that had cost the lives of 332,000 of our finest American young men with 1,000,000 wounded.

At the conference of Yalta near the close of the war, the then President, assisted by Alger Hiss of the State Department and others, permitted Russia to be put in the driver's seat in western Europe, and given control of Manchuria and the northern half of Korea which has spread the iron curtain of communism over 300,000,000 people of China.

Notwithstanding the Congress appropriated $85,000,000,000 for defense since the close of the war, the administration has little to show for the money spent. We were caught unprepared in Korea causing the loss of the lives of many of our soldiers. Today our heroic soldiers are fighting desperately with their backs to the ocean against 60,000 well-equipped Korean Communists who are making a desperate attempt to annihilate or capture them.

Regardless of the blundering mistakes that have brought this situation about, every resource of our Government must be placed behind the war effort to protect as far as possible the American soldiers who are doing the fighting, many of whom will continue to sacrifice their lives in the defense of our country.

In every effort to prosecute the war the Members of Congress and the people must and will support every military effort of the Government, till victory is won.

On the home front the Congress must cut out every unnecessary Government expense in an effort to keep our Nation in a sound financial condition, so that those who return will have as sound a government as possible to come back to, where they can again engage in peacetime pursuits.

While our soldiers are fighting communism abroad we must win the fight against socialism and communism at

home. The women and mothers of American soldiers have become aroused at the ease with which Communists infiltrate and secure employment in the Federal Government, where they have stolen our atomic secrets, passed them on to Russia, making it possible for them to produce the atomic bomb and hasten world war III.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately the women of America are becoming aroused against the encroachment of socialism as well as communism.

They see socialistic political forces at work that would invade the American home, lower the standard of living, threaten the health of her family and, through higher prices and heavier taxes, dissipate the life savings she and her husband have provided for the future.

While we regret to see our women provoked to anger, it may help to preserve the American way of life and protect the American home. Because, when the women become sufficiently aroused, they will wield their political brooms and do something about it.

Hundreds of women from all types of homes, and the officers of various women's clubs have written me expressing their opposition to certain proposed legislation. I am glad to see the women taking a greater interest in Government and politics. Their help is needed today as never before to stop the creeping paralysis of socialism. They will decide the result of the coming election.

Mr. Speaker, the women have a very great stake in our Government, which places upon them a great responsibility. They are willing, capable and ready to assume that responsibility.

Women outnumber the men in voting strength. Women own outright, or are beneficiaries of 75 percent of all the stocks in the corporations of this country. They are the beneficiaries of 80 percent of all life insurance in America. They purchase 75 percent of all the consumers goods purchased in the Nation.

They are the strongest and most powerful influence to resist the left-wing, socialistic and communistic forces that today threaten to destroy this Republic.

The influence and power of the women who direct their homes, take a keen interest in the schools and the education of their children, and make such a great contribution through their church organizations for the moral uplift of their communities, are building our citizens of the future.

They are opposed to certain proposed legislation and policies of government that threaten the Nation.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Socialized medicine, which would increase the cost of medical care and lower the type of medical service rendered, is a threat to her children and the members of her family. She will resist that threat at the ballot box. The welfare and health of her children and members of her family come first.

Mr. Speaker, many of us here in Congress who have seen the purchasing power of the dollar, since 1940 to the present time, reduced to 58 cents because of the waste, taxing, and spending of this administration, welcome the help of the women in this campaign.

Women throughout the Nation realize that their life insurance and securities which were bought from the family savings to protect the widows and children are now worth only 58 cents on the dollar in purchasing power.

They want to see the value of their savings and securities restored to their 100 percent purchasing power. They realize that the high cost of living and inflation has been brought about by the Government spending billions more each year than it collects in revenue to run the Government.

The women of America whose sons are being called to fight to stop communism abroad, demand that this administration drive Communists out of the Federal Government, and at long last really do something constructive to stop the spread of communism in this country.

They demand that the constant drifting of this country down the road to socialism be stopped before it is too late. We who have led the fight against communism and socialism in the Congress welcome the timely and effective support of the women in this crusade to save the American way of life.

The women realize, as well as the men, that we must stop spending more than we take in, stop mortgaging the future and opportunity of our young people, and try to maintain the financial solvency of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Parent Teachers Association, Daughters of the American Revolution, women's auxiliaries of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, and various other women's organizations have passed resolutions condemning compulsory health insurance, or socialized medicine, is an evidence of the determination of the women of America to exert a greater influence in the coming election than possibly ever before.

Transcript of Proceedings in Case of Alice Heroux Versus Harold Heroux

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcript of proceedings in the circuit court of the State of Oregon for the county of Multnomah:

ALICE HEROUX, PLAINTIFF, VERSUS HAROLD HEROUX, DEFENDANT

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 2, 1950.*

Before the Honorable Donald E. Long, Judge.

Appearances: Mr. Irving Goodman, attorney for the plaintiff; Miss Grace Bottler, deputy district attorney.

The plaintiff herein being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Mr. GOODMAN. May I have an order of default, your Honor, please?

The COURT. You may take the order of default.

Question. (By Mr. GOODMAN). State your name.

Answer. Alice Heroux.

Question. You are the plaintiff in this case?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What is your husband's name?

Answer. Harold Heroux.

Question. Where were you married?

Answer. Vancouver, Wash.

Question. On the 29th day of November, 1944?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Have you been husband and wife ever since that date?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Have you been a continuous and bona fide resident and inhabitant of the State of Oregon all of your life?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you lived in Multnomah County when this case was filed?

Answer. Yes.

Question. There were two children born in issue of this marriage?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What are their names and ages?

Answer. Lester, 5; and Garry, 4.

Question. Are the children with you in Portland, Oreg., at this time?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If the Court awards you a decree of divorce, do you desire to have their care, custody, and control?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you ask for $75 a month for their support?

Answer. Yes.

Question. You charge your husband with cruelty; you are now getting aid for dependent children, are you not?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How long have you been getting that?

Answer. Almost ever since I left him.

Question. Do you know where your husband is now?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. You and your husband have been separated for about 2 years?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Has he ever struck you?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Where did he strike you?

Answer. In the face.

Question. Did it cause you discoloration?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And he has called you vile names?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Has he associated with other women?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you know that for a fact?

Answer. Yes.

Question. You have given this divorce a lot of thought, have you?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Are you satisfied that you cannot live with him as husband and wife?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Has he caused you nervousness, loss of sleep, and mental anguish?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And made you unhappy in this marriage?

Answer. Yes.

The COURT. Any questions?

Miss BOTTLER. No questions.

Question (by the Court). Where are you taking care of the children?

Answer. I have them. I live on the east side.

Question. How much are you receiving on A. D. C.?

Answer. One hundred and nine dollars a month.

Question. When was the last time you saw your husband, the father of these children?

Answer. About 2 months ago, he was over at my mother's.

Question. Has he been working?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Do you know where he is now?

Answer. No, I don't. He travels from California to Portland so much, I don't know where he is.

Question. What does he do when he is employed?

Answer. A painter.

Question. How old is he?

Answer. Twenty-six.

Question. And in good health?

Answer. No, I don't think he is in very good health.

Question. But he is able to work?

Answer. Yes.

Question. When is the last time he provided for the children?

Answer. He never did, really. When I left him, he has never supported them, since I left him.

Question. He has never paid anything towards their support?

Answer. No.

Question. But he had an income and could have supported them during the past 2 years, had he wanted to?

Answer. Yes.

The COURT. You may take your decree of divorce, the care, custody, and control of the minor children and the defendant will be directed to pay $75 a month toward the support of the children until the further order of the court, and I will have an extra copy of the transcript of the testimony in this case sent to Congressman JACOBS, of Indiana, the House Office Building, Washington, D. C., who has a bill in Congress now before the committee, to control that and get deserting fathers to support their children. If the bill is passed, we can follow the fathers wherever we find them and not only require fathers to assume their responsibilities toward their children, but undoubtedly save millions of dollars now given to the support of children by these States.

Certified: A true transcript.

FRED M. ROSE,
Official Reporter.

The Freedom To Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I wish to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-challenging paper by a prairie political philosopher, Mr. B. M. Maunders, of Virgil, S. Dak.

Mr. Maunders is a frequent contributor to the readers' columns of our South Dakota papers and his writings are widely read. In telling me how he came to write the following article, he said:

I am really an independent voter who was misled by a fireside chat reference to Andrew Jackson which said "What Jackson started has not yet been finished," but who got off the New Deal bandwagon when, after observing certain financial manipulations early in New Deal days, I concluded I had been listening to double talk.

"In stepping out from the New Deal," Mr. Maunders writes, "while not leaving any political job, I exercised the same right 'to take a walk' that has been used by Al Smith, James Farley, and some others."

Mr. Maunders' article written "In Remembrance of 1776" on the Fourth of July 1950, follows:

IN REMEMBRANCE OF 1776

The text in this instance is taken from the pen of the man who wrote The Crisis. As stated: "Man has no property in man, neither has any generation a property in the generations which are to follow."

This writing therefore, is done because of quite frequent specious reference to the common man, and is offered as material for study by anyone whom, for reasons which of necessity may have been beyond his or her control, might be misled thereby.

For a long time preceding our noteworthy 1776, it may have been customary to use the "common man" designation through a popular belief in a lower strata of humanity. This belief, however, was upset with the epochal first draft of the Declaration of Independence appearing in a Philadelphia newspaper under the title "A Serious Thought" and over the name of "An Englishman."

PAINE AND JEFFERSON

Then, with Thomas Jefferson being the generally accepted author of the writ ratified under the title "The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America," the question arose as to who actually wrote that memorable set of principles. But the question evidently was answered by the person who stated that: "Whosoever wrote it, Thomas Paine was its author."

Who wrote what however, is of little importance to anyone familiar with the humanitarian persuasions of both Paine and Jefferson. What seems of greater consequence is the fact that those persuasions were written in, and "A Serious Thought" had reached full expression in what afterwards became known as the Declaration of Independence.

Upon the basis of all this, it is not out of line to assume that the conclusions of both Paine and Jefferson were written into that Declaration wherein "all men" became the "common" denominator.

Paine—to whom the term "common man" might have been applied, and Jefferson, the aristocratic sage of Monticello, who later feeling that something was amiss in the Constitution, fathered the Bill of Rights incorporated in that instrument.

The conclusion within our text, along with the American trinity, the right to life, the right to liberty, and the right to the pursuit of happiness, is the foundation upon which the institution known as the United States of America was built, all of which proclaims the right of each man to live by his work as a free moral agent, and in that status enjoy the fruits of his work.

Jefferson, whose settled belief was: "That government is best that governs least," enumerated the forms of government existing among men as:

"Societies exist under three forms sufficiently distinguishable. 1. Without government, as among our Indians. 2. Under governments wherein the will of everyone has a just influence, as in the case of England in a slight degree, and in our States in a greater one. 3. Under governments by force; as in the case of all other monarchies and in most of the other republics. It is a problem, not clear in my mind, that the first is not the best. But I believe it to be inconsistent with any great degree of population."

MANNA FROM ON HIGH

Today we have the great degree of population and two schools of thought on parade as to the merits and demerits of government using a tax lever as means of showing how Uncle Sam can obligate himself out of debt, and in one time and two motions make the recipient of a Federal hand-out believe it is manna from on high.

It has been written that: "The mother of the useful arts is want; the mother of the fine arts is plenty." And proof thereof is found in the Gothic period (1150–1450), of which Prof. Rene Thevenin, eminent French scientist stated:

"After 6 centuries of misery and horror came the expansion of the three glorious centuries of the Middle Ages, one of the greatest periods of art and faith in the history of humanity, accompanied by the building of marvelous cathedrals, rivaling the greatest masterpieces of all time and all countries. This magnificent development carried the mind of man to heights which it has not often attained in history."

Within every human being is the urge to self-expression. That is self-interest, the economic driving force, further recognized as justified egoism. Then there is selflessness, or self-interested devotion to the rights of others in all matters of a public nature; the gateway to spiritual attainment and satisfaction after material wants are satisfied. These are the God-given motors of life—the basis of morals in a free society.

However, we have selfishness also to consider—unbalanced regards for me—without respect to the rights of others; a border line case of creed, or gumming up of the motors of life which, primarly, is responsible for too many being forced to forever have hand on the throttle, eye on the rail, shoulder to the wheel, and nose on the grindstone, in an effort to keep body and soul together without recourse to adhesive tape or safety pins—and at the expense of "spiritual attainment and satisfaction."

Such a situation may reasonably be assumed as one of the foremost factors lending truth to a statement by Representative FRANCIS CASE in a talk at Huron almost a year ago on the loss of moral values.

At this point, let's reexamine the statement anent the right of each man to live by his work as a free moral agent, and in that status enjoy the fruits of his work.

Briefly, to a thoroughgoing American, life without liberty is a rather meaningless setup.

For liberty involves the right to choose the vocation for which one is best fitted in exercise of that economic driving force toward satisfaction of material wants. And the pursuit of happiness, the gateway to spiritual attainment and satisfaction after material wants are satisfied, is impossible without the two rights first named in the American Trinity.

AN INDIAN ASKS A QUESTION

Louis Fischer, author, lecturer, and outstanding authority on international politics, had this to say during a lecture on September 6, 1942:

"I returned exactly a month ago from a 28,000-mile trip by air to India and the Middle East and back again to America. I spent 8 weeks in India. Indians often discuss the President's "four freedoms" and ask, 'Do the "four freedoms" include the freedom to be free?' "

At another point in his lecture, Mr. Fischer stated: "The question is not whether the 'four freedoms' are enough or whether we ought to have a few more thrown in for good measure. In fact, two are perhaps enough. For if we have freedom from fear, we have freedom of worship and freedom of speech. The real important freedoms are freedom from fear and freedom from want. Freedom from fear means democracy and peace for all, and freedom from want means economic security and comfort for you, for me, and for the Chinese coolie."

The Uncle Toms whom Lincoln freed had life and social security after a fashion. They

were fed, clothed, and housed. And sickness involved a process like unto a farmer of today calling in a veterinarian for medical attention to a sick animal in which he has a dollars-and-cents interest. But that was not the kind of arrangement the great emancipator eulogized at Gettysburg when he said: "* * * That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

However, those words spoken by Lincoln cannot, by any logical reasoning process, be construed as meaning centralized Federal authorities—such as TVA, for instance, with its red-ink accounts, and which might have been avoided had the admonition of Thomas Edison been heeded. And it takes something beside a financial contribution at a Jefferson Day celebration to prove a belief in "that government is best that governs least."

"Of the people, by the people, for the people" is something beside mere implication of the right of every citizen of every State in the United States to a say-so at the polls.

A social and economic set-up by Federal authority as in vogue today means more and more governmental appointees and political job hand-outs, which, in turn, involves the necessity of said appointee keeping his trap shut regardless of what he may learn of what the founding fathers thought or did in suiting action to words, until we finally arrive at the point where free elections are a thing of the past.

SOCIALISM OF THE CHAIR

During a pro and con study of socialism many years ago this writer learned therefrom of a kind identified as Socialism of the Chair, which, as separated from other forms, means simply rule from the top down. And that again in no way parallels the kind endorsed by Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln. What do you think?

Marx and Bismarck or Bismarck and Marx. Each representing individual ideologies antithetical to Jefferson's; combined they are synonymous of infamy. And for sake of convenience here we shall give it the label of "Bismarxianism."

While a complete treatise of this particular and peculiar kind of doctrine and its workings to date is, because of length prohibited here, its identity as a plan outlined by one of the foremost social and economic writers is given as: "The program was a recrudescence of one which was old when it was introduced by the Gracchi in ancient Rome and eventually destroyed the Empire. It was given to Bismarck largely by Prof. Adolph Wagner, who was reputedly an ancestor of our Senator Robert F. Wagner."

Bismarxianism therefore, had its origin with Prince Otto Von Bismarck, whose mottoes "Blood and steel" and "Might makes right," and whose contempt for the so-called common man are too well known among well-informed students of world economy to need any special mention here. It was born when Bismarck saw in the social security, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and health insurance planks in the Socialist program, the means of gaining his own end. And the string of names among much-publicized American proponents of the program is a long one.

The appeal in a petition by German industrialists in 1929 that the intervention of the state should be restricted and should only extend to such branches as cannot be served by private enterprise was disregarded by the government in that time. Now, under the sing-song of "democracy," the program is under way in other countries, not to democratize them but to demoralize them. And this program of which nazism, Hitler, and World War II were an interlude, has been brought on a gilded platter to the front door of these United States—a hangover from Tory ideologies dead in 1776 but not yet delivered to the undertaker.

Recalling our text now, and upon the basis of the foregoing in order thereafter, the question arises as to just how we may attain anything like the much talked of social security or welfare state as presently advocated, through process of borrowing ourselves out of a debt status which, in the last analysis, is property in man as well as property in the generations which are to follow.

Think of the freedom to be free.

Statement No. 2: Examining Congressman Poulson's Recent Extension of Remarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, continuing my commentary on the extension of remarks by Congressman POULSON found in the Appendix of the RECORD for August 17, I wish now to refer to some of the other points in his seven-point discussion of that date. In my first commentary found in my extension of remarks located on page A5975, I touched on two of the points which Congressman POULSON made in his presentation of California's attitude toward the proposal to divert water from the Columbia River into California. Reviewing for sake of connection—point 1 of Mr. POULSON'S statement was that nobody in California wanted to bring water from the Columbia River into that State, a point which I questioned after referring to the record of 1947. The second point of his statement was that California could not afford to finance a project of such magnitude, and with that I fully and thoroughly agreed, because such projects should be built by the Nation.

Going now to the third point of Congressman POULSON'S statement, I will quote him in full:

> Third. California would never call upon the taxpayers of the Nation to pay for such a project, as Arizona has done in the case of the proposed central Arizona project, which Secretary Chapman says would cost the Nation's taxpayers more than $2,000,000,000 in interest alone.

Perhaps Congressman POULSON intended to say: "California would never again call upon the taxpayers of the Nation, and so forth," for surely he knows that California has already called upon the taxpayers of the Nation to construct great projects like the Central Valley and the Imperial Valley in California, both of which were built by Uncle Sam at the request of California and both of which were more complex and more expensive than the proposed Columbia River diversion would probably be. I am afraid my friend from California is conveniently overlooking what California has already asked the American taxpayer to do for her in the realm of reclamation. I am not criticizing this work done by the Nation for California, for as I have said before, in general I favor it.

Would the cost of bringing water from the mouth of the Columbia River into California be less expensive and less of an engineering feat than the conquest of the Imperial Valley or the completed improvement of the great Central Valley of California? I think so—but in the absence of such information as Chairman WELCH of the Public Lands Committee sought in 1947, we can only guess about comparative costs, but my guess is that the diversion proposed by Chairman WELCH from the Columbia, although a Herculean task, would be less difficult and less expensive than either of the two great existing projects built in California with Federal aid. Already the Central Valley in California has received a Federal investment of about $400,000,000 and it will cost many times the present investment when completed with its 40 dams and reservoirs and many more miles of canals which should be built. Its final construction costs may run to three or four billions of dollars. I have voted and worked for it.

What about the cost of the great Imperial Valley development in California? To figure its cost properly we should include not merely the cost of the All-American Canal, both divisions, but also the cost of the Imperial diversion dam, and undoubtedly the cost of the Hoover Dam also. Of course, the farmers in the Imperial Valley are not repaying the cost of Hoover Dam, but the present facilities and development for irrigation in the Imperial Valley could not exist without Hoover Dam. It is fortunate that the dam can pay for itself by producing hydroelectric power, but just the same, without that great reservoir to store and regulate the water and to detain the silt, it would have been impossible for Imperial Valley to have the All-American Canal, which California begged for in 1928. The Swing-Johnson bill, which was sponsored by two California Members in Congress, resulted in the congressional act known as the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, which gives southern California a great dam and canal—exactly what Arizona now asks for in the Central Arizona project—a similar dam and canal in Arizona. Therefore, in considering the money put up by American taxpayers at the request of California to make possible the present Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley, we must consider that California asked the American taxpayers for several hundred million dollars to build Hoover Dam and the All-American Canal, with all their appurtenances.

Mind you, I am not complaining of that cost to the Nation, for this was one of the best investments that Uncle Sam ever made, and which will pay out. I simply want to remind my friends in California that they have not hesitated in the past to ask for huge blocks of Federal aid for their water developments. When I say this, I am not including the three-quarter billion dollars asked for to

be used for flood control in the State of California—none of which is repayable to the Government.

As for the other part of the third item concerning the so-called interest cost of the central Arizona project, I need make no comment other than what I said in an extension of my own in the Appendix of the RECORD on August 8. I said then regarding the two billion in interest problem, that it would be just as logical to say the Secretary of the Interior claims that Jefferson imposed on the American taxpayers an interest cost of $5,250,000,000 to date in his purchase of Louisiana. Both assertions would make about the same sense—or lack of it.

Under the fourth point of his statement Congressman POULSON says: "Our State engineer has said that California's water supplies are sufficient, and that the State does not have to go beyond its boundaries for more water. The Colorado River water awarded to southern California in Federal Government contracts, and other available supplies, are sufficient to meet the foreseeable needs of that area." The second quoted sentence gives me a lot of comfort and must give the citizens of Los Angeles and the inhabitants of southern California a lot of assurance. I think the first quoted sentence, standing alone, is substantially correct and that the State engineer is right about California's water supply being sufficient; especially is that true of southern California. However, that calls for a fuller discussion which I want to make in a later extension in the RECORD.

If you will let me change one word in the Congressman's last quoted sentence, I will agree with him fully and with the California State engineer that the statement is entirely correct. Let us change the word "contracts" to the word "laws", thus making the sentence read: "The Colorado River water awarded to southern California in Federal Government laws, and other available supplies, are sufficient to meet the foreseeable needs of that area." Let me repeat, I am convinced that southern California with all of her other water resources and water rights, together with that volume of Colorado River water furnished southern California by undisputed law, is sufficient for all present needs and for any foreseeable future. We have on the record expert engineering testimony and data to prove the truth of my last statement.

Why suggest changing the word "contracts" in the foregoing to the word "laws"? Well surely it occurs to anyone that California's water rights under laws are more secure than her rights under contracts, for if the contracts are not in conformity with law they are defective. Now, what is the difference in amounts under each of the two terms? If a Californian familiar with the subject should be asked: "What is the total of California's contract rights to Colorado River water?" He would probably answer: "The amount is 5,362,000 acre-feet annually, which is the total of the several contracts which the water agencies of southern California have with the Government, signed by Ray Lyman Wilbur, the Secretary of the Interior in 1932." If I am asked: "What are California's rights under law to water from the Colorado River?" I would reply: "The law of the river establishes the amount not to exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of water apportioned under subsection (a) of article III of the Colorado River Compact, plus one-half of the undivided surplus to which no firm contract can attach prior to the year 1963."

How much difference is there between these two amounts? We cannot specify the exact difference in acre-feet by merely subtracting 4,400,000 from 5,362,000 because there is that indefinite 50 percent of surplus. I am thoroughly convinced that that indefinite "plus one-half" is nowhere like as much for California as the numerical difference of 962,000 would indicate for California.

The contracts which Mr. POULSON speaks of are not firm contracts but the Californians speak of them as such and are trying to firm them up through a fantastic and questionable private interpretation of the law. Therefore, the exact amount, I am convinced, which California may take from the Colorado will be nearer 4,400,000 acre-feet than 5,362,000 acre-feet annually. The law is clear enough to any disinterested layman's mind, but since Los Angeles' lawyers say it is something else probably only the highest court of the land can determine it authoritatively. That is what I am anxious to have done in such a way as it can actually be decided quickly by the Supreme Court, because time is of the essence, or more than 1,000,000 acre-feet will be lost to Arizona and to the United States.

There were seven points in Congressman POULSON's statement of August 17, and I have commented on only four in my two statements of yesterday and today. Permission granted, I shall discuss the other points in a future extension to round out the discussion to the full. This editorial debate is not entered into for any other purpose than to bring out all or nearly all of the pertinent facts of a complicated situation in the controversy between Arizona and California which is so vital to the entire Nation.

North American Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARRETT L. WITHERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, I desire to have an address by Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, delivered to the Canadian Manufacturers Association, in Toronto, on May 25, 1950, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

General McNaughton was appointed Chief of the General Staff, National Defense Headquarters, Ottawa; adviser, Canadian Delegation to Imperial Conference, London, England; member of Committee on Civil Aviation; adviser, Canadian Delegation to Conference for Limitation of Armaments, Geneva, Switzerland; member of Committee on Trans-Atlantic Air Service, Imperial Economic Conference, Ottawa, Ontario; president, National Research Council. He was appointed chairman, Canadian section, Canada-United States Permanent Joint Board on Defense. Appointed Canadian representative, United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. President, Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada. Permanent delegate of Canada to the United Nations, and the representative of Canada on the Security Council, and is now Commissioner, Canadian section, International Joint Commission. General McNaughton has held numerous places of honor and distinction, and I hope that his speech will be read by many of the Senators.

The Public Printer advises me that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately 3 pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $246.

In this address General McNaughton advises closer cooperation and coordination between Canada and the United States for their mutual defense. For that reason I believe the address to have national importance. I have faith enough in what is contained in it to believe it will be worth printing, and I ask that, in spite of the cost, it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

I count it a great honor as well as a great pleasure to have the privilege of addressing the members of this group of leaders of the business world of the United States and of Canada. The subject on which I am to speak is North American Security, and I welcome this opportunity to make a few observations on a question which is of fundamental importance to the peoples of both our countries. In doing so I will endeavor to bring before you some of the basic considerations which need to be taken into account in the present international situation, and I hope that in the course of my remarks I may indicate not only the very substantial progress which has been achieved between Canada and the United States within the wider grouping of the North Atlantic Treaty in translating ideas and sentiments into specific arrangements, but also that I may bring before you some aspects of these matters on which we have not as yet been able to arrive at arrangements which will provide that measure of effective cooperation which clearly is required.

At the present time the need for North American security arises from one cause only, and that is the clear evidence that unless we make adequate defense preparations the masters of the Soviet Union will continue to hold to their purpose of eventual world conquest and, whenever they deem the situation propitious for their purpose, will turn to war as a means of achieving their ends. This being so, it becomes most important for the nations who are threatened to bring themselves into close association so that, through mutual cooperation, they may create a deterrent which will check the evil designs of those who plan the disruptive policy of the Soviet Union.

In the circumstances which exist the initiative for war must continue to lie with the Soviets, for, by reason of our adherence to the principles of democracy, we cannot even contemplate a so-called preventive war for

which a date might be set in advance to simplify planning and conserve resources. On the contrary, we must take our guidance from the wise old saying that "The strong man who continues to be armed keepeth the peace." As a consequence, and not having a point in time on which to focus, our preparations for defense must of necessity be at a level which we are physically capable of sustaining year in and year out. For that very reason, if our preparations are to prove effective in the brief time of warning likely to be available, our preparatory arrangements must be more comprehensive and costly than the preparations of those who plan to a specific date; and our effort may have to be long-continued.

Thus the capacity for endurance has become a prime consideration, and we must be very careful to guard against overstrain, whether it be in our military organization or in our social, economic, or industrial fabric.

It is a happy circumstance that Canada and the United States, as two countries of North America, have come to realize the great interests which they hold in common; after the experience of two world wars, our peoples have learned the necessity for close cooperation in defense. We have learned also that the habit of cooperation is one which grows in intimacy with practice and so today, as we look out at a deeply troubled world, we can say not only do we understand one another's assessment of the dangers, but our views are in close accord as to how the various contingencies should be provided for.

Most fortunately, I think, the leaders of our Governments, and of public opinion, both in Canada and in the United States, have clearly recognized that an insular military defense, even if continental in scope and however elaborate, is by itself not enough to make us safe. On the contrary, to be effective our military plans must be supported in the economic, the social, and the moral spheres, and all these measures must be amplified by association with like-minded nations elsewhere who believe with us in the fundamental principles of democracy and in the freedom of the individual in contradistinction to the pagan tenets of Soviet communism which have submerged so many fine peoples under the crushing heel of totalitarian despotism.

Every nation which has gone down before the onset of Soviet communism is not only a loss to us but a gain to the dark forces which oppose us. In consequence, not the least of our endeavors, in our own interest as well as that of common charity must be to put an end to this process of engulfment of peoples. It is only by generous help to others in distress and in need and by the extension of our own endeavors that we can hope to solve the problems of our own defense and gain that enduring security we seek.

In the study of military defense it is most important to realize the very remarkable progress which has come about, particularly since the close of World War I in the application of science and engineering to war. Today, for those who are suitably prepared and equipped, distance has largely lost its former attenuating effect on the conduct of military operations. We must remember not only that continents are now within aircraft range of one another, but that with every new development, already shrunken space continues to shrink still further. Thus we have now become closer to Europe, both in terms of the reinforcements we can give to our friends, and also in relation to the repercussions on this continent which would be the consequence of any enemy success there. We have become closer to Europe both in terms of the magnitude on which military operations might be conducted, and also as regards the reduction of the time elements involved.

We have to contemplate the possibility of aircraft at supersonic speed and intercontinental radius of action, of guided missiles of great range; of the application of virulent bacteriological and chemical poisons; and most important, of uranium and perhaps of hydrogen atomic bombs of catastrophic power. We must realize that already these forms of bombardment may be rapidly followed up by considerable forces; airborne or seaborne in special types of vessels capable of landing on beaches without the use of established ports. Moreover, these airborne and seaborne forces will be capable of operating with great speed and effectiveness on the ground, even in the face of widespread destruction and contamination which will have resulted from the long-range high explosive, bacteriological, chemical, or atomic bombardment.

With the increased range of action and of rapidity in transit of modern military forces, continents today have already become the smallest geographical units on the basis of which questions of defense can properly be studied; consequently, effective arrangements for the defense of the territory of one nation have become matters of vital concern to all other nations of that continent. Further, the particular anxieties which concern us as a result of present policies behind the iron curtain have necessitated an extension of association in defense beyond the continent of North America to include both the nations of North America and of western Europe in order that we may create an adequate balance or counterpoise.

Perhaps I might refer to this matter first because, within the last year, the answer to these problems has been given in most convincing fashion in the Atlantic Treaty through which Canada and the United States are being brought into association with other nations of the North Atlantic community in western Europe.

Through the organization which this treaty provides we may expect that the democratic countries of western Europe and of North America combined will be able to muster an overwhelming preponderance in military, economic, and moral resources in opposition to any aggressor, and we may reasonably hope that, by the manifest intention of all concerned to make proper preparation for the discharge of the responsibilities they have assumed, there will be created an effective deterrent to any nation or group of nations which might be tempted to launch an armed attack against any of the treaty signatories.

As the Prime Minister of Canada has said:

"This treaty is to preserve the peace of the world by making it clear to any aggressor that if he were so unwise as to resort to war, he would be apt to finish with the Kaiser and Hitler and Mussolini."

And to quote Mr. Pearson, our Secretary of State for External Affairs:

"For the people of the North Atlantic community the treaty is a new beginning. It carries the promise of a greater security and fuller cooperation amongst the nations."

Such is the nature of the plan which has been made in order to chart a course of action for Canada and the United States which associates us in defense with like-minded peoples overseas so that, all together, we may be so strong that our freedom will not be challenged—so strong that the leaders of those who may have contemplated aggressive action by armed force will be induced to turn, while yet they may, to cooperation in the great objectives for the benefit of all peoples, their own included, which may be achieved through the United Nations.

For the peoples of North America, arrangements in relation to defense collaboration with western Europe, however comprehensive, are in themselves not enough. From the very nature of the contingencies which may have to be dealt with and by reason of the locations of our resources in raw materials, manpower, economic facilities and manufacturing capacity, this North American Continent has become literally the arsenal of democracy. It would present therefore a prize objective to attack, should the possibility for this be left open—and we are no longer immune by reason of distance from other continents.

Not only, therefore, is it necessary for us to join in defense arrangements for the protection of the North Atlantic community as a whole but, in view of our special problems in North America, it is also necessary to continue the intimate cooperation which presently exists between the United States and Canada in matters pertaining to the local defense of this continent; and if this cooperation is to be efficient—as it must be—it requires that we work closely together in all defense matters from the elementary planning for civil defense through the development of weapons and resources; in standardization and manufacture of equipments; in organization and training, on land, at sea and in the air—it calls for intimate association in all these matters right up to and including the employment of our forces in war, if that unhappy eventuality should come.

Such, then, is the vista of close collaboration between Canada and the United States of America in defense at home and overseas which extends before us, and I think you may be particularly interested in some account of the methods which have been evolved by which we, in Canada, a relatively small nation, are enabled to make our due and proper contribution to the security of this continent without any sense of being overwhelmed or dominated by the circumstance that, in numbers and in the physical measure of defense resources, we stand to our mighty neighbor in a ratio no greater than perhaps of 1 in 12.

The post World War I period was marked by two very important transitions in Canada. The first was the transition from a state of colonial dependency in defense and international affairs to national responsibility under which we have assumed complete authority for the conduct of our affairs. It is one of the remarkable achievements of the age that this change has come about without any impairment of our association with the other nations of the commonwealth.

The second transition was from an attitude toward the United States which I can only characterize as one of some anxiety, developing to that full measure of mutual confidence which now exists. Today in Canada there are very few who will question that in seeking the security of our homeland we need to give first place to a continuance of friendly relations with the United States.

As far as I can determine, the transition from the negative conception of Canada and the United States as two nations whose interests were separated by a frontier to a recognition of a need for positive association in defense was first expressed publicly in Mr. Roosevelt's declaration in August 1938 that "the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened," and in Mr. King's reply that "We, too, have our obligations as a good, friendly neighbor and one of them is to see that, at our own insistence, our country is made as immune from attack or possible invasion as we can reasonably be expected to make it, and that, should the occasion ever arise, enemy forces should not be able to pursue their way, either by land, sea, or air, to the United States across Canadian territory."

As the former Prime Minister of Canada has said, these statements marked the first public recognition by both countries of their reciprocity in defense based on mutual interest in one another's security.

This being the situation, when war broke out with Germany in 1939 there was no occasion for any anxiety as to the attitude of the

United States in the event of an attack on Canada and we could base our arrangements on the confident expectation that we would receive, as we did, every possible measure of help that it was open to the United States of America to give.

Again in 1939, as in 1914, Canada went to war when the United Kingdom became involved in the European conflagration. In 1914 the British declaration of war was sufficient to embrace all the Dominions and dependencies of the Empire. In 1939 the situation was different. Our own declaration of war was made of our own volition as the result of action by our own Parliament. While the procedure was different the effect was the same, and in each case, in a matter of weeks, a division, together with other units, was embarked for overseas to be followed by others in fairly rapid succession. In 1939, in addition to the Army, very large naval and air programs were undertaken. During the war the total enlistment in all armed forces, men and women, was 1,087,000 out of a population of about 12,000,000.

In supplement to the great effort of the armed forces there were many tens of thousands of men and women who were engaged on the farms, in the forests and mines, and in industry. It is very satisfactory in reviewing these matters in retrospect to realize from the record that the arduous work of our civil population was marked by that same high spirit of grim determination and devotion as that which characterized our armed services, and in the result and despite the recruitment of personnel, the volume of production of all kinds was markedly increased. For example, Canadian war industry, which was organized and controlled by a department of the Canadian Government, produced over twice as much for our allies as for ourselves, and its output embraced most of the articles and materials, raw and manufactured, which were wanted in quantity over the whole range of the requirements of the armed forces. Our Canadian war industry was distinguished by the excellence of the product, by the improvement in weapons, explosives, motor transport, tanks, and other equipment introduced, and by the low costs in man-hours of labor which were achieved. This immense effort was organized and financed by Canada herself and the product was made available to our allies in such a manner as to contribute most effectively to winning the war. Under our Mutual Aid Act, which was the Canadian equivalent of United States lend-lease, strategical necessity was the guiding consideration and no payment was required.

Canadian industrial performance in World War II stands out in marked contrast to World War I where the output mostly took the form of raw materials or of such simple articles as shells and ammunition to sealed patterns designed elsewhere. Not a single gun or novel major piece of military equipment was made in Canada in World War I, and the whole of the industrial organization which was then set up was under the direction of the Imperial Munitions Board, an organization directed and financed from London.

In World War II it was shown conclusively that we need not doubt our ability to invent, develop, and produce any article of war short of the larger battlecraft which were, in size, beyond the capacity of our plants. We did not undertake to make everything, because this would have been uneconomic in the case of supplies of satisfactory types otherwise available in sufficient quantities.

We are in no doubt that we must again endeavor to balance our industrial efforts with those of our other allies and particularly with the United States in order to gain the best over-all advantage. This, as you know, is a matter which is under discussion between the countries.

I should now like to turn for a moment to the Canada-United States Permanent Joint Board on Defense, the body set up by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada in August 1940, with terms of reference to undertake studies relating in the broad sense to the defense of the north half of the Western Hemisphere in order to insure the continued safety of our two countries.

The Permanent Joint Board is not a combined staff, and likewise, in its national sections, it is not a rival to the military staffs in Washington or in Ottawa. Its strength for its special task lies in the fact that it has not been clothed with any executive responsibility. The board's procedure provides for the comprehensive interchange of information and its free discussion, and the board has the duty constantly to review the situation, and if any of its suggestions have not been acted upon it can draw this situation to the attention of the President and the Prime Minister. In practice this has proved to be ample authority.

During the war it was under the auspices of the Permanent Joint Board that the basic plans for the defense of Canada and Alaska were drawn up and that arrangements were made for such important defense undertakings as the Alaska Highway, the Northwest Staging Route for ferrying aircraft to Russia and China, the Crimson Route across Hudson Bay, Baffin Land, Greenland, etc., to Europe, etc.

It was at the instance of the board also that toward the end of the war in the immediate and postwar period, steps were taken to transform the international character of the various installations of these joint undertakings to insure that full ownership and clear title to all establishments in Canadian territory should vest in Canada. Large sums were, of course, paid by Canada to the United States in this process of liquidation.

Since then the Board has concerned itself with the future. At an early meeting the Board recognized the need for wider interchange of officers and specialists, including those concerned with the design of new weapons, with a view to eventual standardization; for joint tests of new equipment and methods; and for the interchange of observers on military exercises, etc.

The result of these discussions was made known in a statement given simultaneously on February 13, 1948, in Ottawa to Parliament by the Prime Minister, and in Washington by the Secretary of State. This statement defined the measure of agreement which had been reached for cooperation in our defense policies and I think that everything which is essential for the closest military cooperation was included; thus, through this declaration, there is provided a comprehensive basis on which either country may bring forward any defense matters which it may wish.

I think that it is particularly advantageous to Canada that we are enabled to make the very significant contribution of which I believe our engineers and scientists are capable in the fields of weapon development and research. It has been our concern to insure that in this section of the nucleus of our war organization we are specially well-equipped and staffed and, in addition, we have available also the great facilities and experience of our National Research Council.

At the present time, as has been announced by Mr. Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Defense, in major items of equipment the attention of our technical staffs has been concentrated on naval craft for antisubmarine duties, on the Canadian high power turbo-jet aircraft engine for military purposes and on a new all-weather fighter which will have our new engine, and which has been especially designed to meet the conditions of air defense in our northern territories, or anywhere that a long-distance interceptor of high performance is required. These undertakings, in all of which Canada has had a long background of related experiences, are turning out very satisfactorily and, as a result, important items of new defense equipment are reaching the stage where we think that, in addition to meeting our own requirements, we can with advantage also supply the needs of our allies in exchange for items of war equipment of their manufacture which we need and which, having regard to the characteristics of mass production industry, they are able to produce more economically.

The next step in the orderly development of defense arrangements between Canada and the United States was announced on April 12, 1949, with the setting up of a Joint United States-Canada Industrial Mobilization Planning Committee whose duty it is to exchange information and work toward the coordination of the views of the two governments in connection with planning for industrial mobilization in the event of an emergency.

This is an aspect of cooperation, the principles of which were thoroughly worked out during the last war between the Canadian Mutual Aid Board and the United States Lend-Lease Administration, and, as a result, Canada was able to make many scores of millions of dollars' worth of equipment available to the armed forces of the allies.

In both Canada and the United States what needs to be done now to regain this facility is well understood, and we are beginning to evolve procedures which we may expect will operate practically under peacetime conditions.

As is well known, Canada buys on ordinary account very much more from the United States than the United States buys from Canada. We have to make up the difference from our favorable balances with other countries or by making restrictions on the freedom of our people to travel in the United States or to purchase from there other than essential commodities. Even at the best of times the stability of these arrangements is precarious and it certainly would not be practicable to superimpose any large program of military items on the top of our ordinary Canadian purchases.

Leaders of thought in Canada in government and industry have already emphasized the advantage of a renewal of something like the Hyde Park arrangements under which we would contemplate balancing the trade in arms between Canada and the United States outside our trade on ordinary account. As matters stand in the dangerous situation which exists it would not be sensible to consider trade in arms from the point of view of revenue. Rather we must look at it primarily for the purpose of promptly providing both of our countries and also our allies with the most modern, standardized weapons of the highest efficiency. Having regard to this and to the mutually advantageous result which is sought as a contribution to the security of North America and of the other countries of the North Atlantic community, it seems to me that it is not unreasonable to expect the removal of legislative restrictions which introduce other considerations and so stand in the way of efficient organization and procedures. At least it would seem sensible that these restrictions should be confined in their incidence to our trade on ordinary account.

Until recently experience has shown that the principal barriers to progress toward making our defense arrangements has been of the character I have indicated and it is of the first importance that the situation should be corrected, or otherwise we, in Canada, would be compelled to spread our resources over the whole field of our requirements for weapons rather than that we should concentrate on those items which we can best produce, and use our surplus to exchange for equipments which can be produced more advantageously in the United

States or by our allies in Europe. Once the difficulties of the moment are widely understood it would seem only reasonable to expect that appropriate remedial legislative action would be taken without delay. With the present widespread discussion of these matters I think we have reason to hope for early correction.

In this connection I would like to refer to the hopeful statement made by Mr. Claxton, Minister of National Defense, on May 19, when he announced a beginning of trade in military equipment between Canada and the United States on a reciprocal basis which is expected to amount this year to somewhere between fifteen and twenty-five million dollars. This is a promising beginning of great value, as Mr. Claxton has said, not only to the defense potential of this continent but also to the over-all defense arrangements under the North Atlantic Treaty.

There are two other factors in industrial preparedness for defense which may be more difficult to correct because of the long time required for translation of needs into plans, and of plans into the finished work or facility. The facilities which fall into this category, which require conceptions and effective plans which may have to be a decade or more ahead of the current needs of industry are, first and foremost, transportation. We need to foresee the immense requirement for the movement of bulk commodities within North America for processing, and of finished military and other supplies for export. In an emergency these movements must be capable of taking place immediately, as required, and with a high degree of speed. Also, we must foresee and prepare against the increased menace of the submarine so that we may not repeat our unfortunate experiences of the last war on the Atlantic seaboard.

The preparation for the early delivery of large blacks of electric power additional to the ordinary demands of industry is also an essential.

Equally essential is the advancement of preparations so that we can be certain of meeting our vast war requirements for iron ore. It seems to me that all these important categories of requirements show the best promise of timely satisfaction through the St. Lawrence project for power and for navigation and through the new power developments envisaged at Niagara, which are embodied in treaties which now await ratification.

Here again it would seem reasonable to expect that, when the vast portent of these treaties in their relation to the immediate needs of Canada and the United States, particularly for power and vital defense requirements, is widely understood by the peoples of North America, we may expect that they will insist on completion and prompt implementation.

The factors which make for military strength have varied from country to country and from age to age. Sometimes it has been possession and skill in the use of a particular weapon, sometimes an advantage in movement or in communications; sometimes, though not often in history, it has been sheer numbers that have given advantage.

Today the military strength of North America rests on very special circumstances which exist on a scale presently unmatched elsewhere throughout the world.

Our young people, on whom the future depends, are most highly educated; they have been familiar since their earliest years with mechanism in all its forms and uses; they have shown inventive abilities of the highest order, and capabilities in research which are unexcelled; there is discipline when the occasion requires, and courage in action and capacity to endure adversity that have been proved beyond dispute.

Behind these priceless human and moral resources which are notable characteristics of the people of the Atlantic region, the United States and Canada between them in North America possess the most comprehensive mass production industry in the world. We are particularly fortunate that, if we have to meet an emergency, we start from the satisfactory position that in the standards, in the methods, and in the techniques of industry there is wide interchangeability between us. We have, or can have, ample supplies of most key materials required for peace, or for war; and, for any potential shortages, there is capacity to develop acceptable substitutes; capacity, too, for perfecting and rapidly producing the newer and better weapons of war as the occasion may require them for purposes of defense.

It is not on numbers in the Armed Forces that we in the North Atlantic community depend for defense against any possible aggression, though these must be sufficient. We depend in fact on the more highly skilled and perfectly equipped forces by sea and land and in the air which our special advantages make possible—hard-hitting forces which can be mobile, far reaching, long enduring, and as matters stand, decisive in their power against any aggressor.

It is clear that if we are ever attacked, it is on quality forces and on quality weapons and equipment that we should place reliance. It is important that this be well remembered down the years and particularly by those who have to do with the planning and conduct of industrial mobilization.

I think that in the period between World War I and World War II, both in Canada and in the United States, we learned the bitter lesson that unilateral disarmament is a delusion—a very expensive delusion that brought us very near to disaster and that cost us very dear in the lives of our young people. Just such a bitter delusion would be the surrender of any of the special weapons of great power, with which I include those based on atomic energy, until we have acceptable assurance through mutually applicable safeguards and an effective international system of inspection and control which carries our confidence that they, or their like, will not be used against us.

On the contrary, as the situation stands, it is of the first importance that we give our closest attention and maximum effort to extending the margin of superiority which we now possess in these special weapons and in facilities for their manufacture and in insuring that we shall be able to use them effectively should the occasion require.

In these matters, the advantage of safeguards now possessed by the people of North America and indeed by the whole of the free world is not something which we could retain if we ceased to progress; if we allowed our high capacity for invention and our industrial efficiencies to decline, then most certainly we would soon be overtaken and surpassed. The best protection for the countries of North America and western Europe, as well as for the rest of the world, would be an effective universal organization of security under the United Nations but, until this can be brought about, the continued production and further improvement of all our weapons and the maintenance of industrial efficiency and preparedness are vital to the prevention of aggression by making impossible any prospect of its success.

I conclude these remarks on North American security by saying that, until we secure the effective disarmament which we seek, and until the aspirations of all nations can be harmonized by peaceful means, we will continue to need our Armed Forces and all the resources which our industry can provide both as a deterrent to attack against ourselves and as an assurance to the nations of western Europe and to all other peace-loving nations, who think with us, that the peoples of North America remain strong and well able to help them.

Address by Representative Wesley A. D'Ewart Before the Republican State Convention at Helena, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representative in Congress from the Second District of Montana, before the Republican State convention at Helena on August 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE WESLEY A. D'EWART, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SECOND DISTRICT, MONTANA, BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN STAIE CONVENTION HELD AT HELENA

Republican friends, as we gather here today to take part in one of the basic functions on our republican form of government, we find that once again our men are fighting and dying on foreign battlefields to protect and preserve the American way of life.

As we address ourselves to these duties of citizenship, let us firmly resolve, as individuals and as members of the Republican Party, that we will guard vigilantly here at home the freedoms and liberties for which these men are fighting overseas. It is our duty and our obligation as citizens and as members of the minority party to make certain this Nation does not succumb to totalitarianism at home while our soldiers are fighting communism in strange and far-away lands.

Further than that, let us reaffirm that our every effort will be devoted to the support of our fighting men. We shall insist that they are promptly and properly armed and supplied with the best we can produce. We shall support every possible measure to guard their health, to sustain their morale, to care for the wounded, the widows and orphans and dependents. And most of all, as I have said, we shall preserve for their return the kind of America for which they fight.

Their sacrifices shall spur our unending efforts to find a lasting and durable peace with honor.

The war in Korea, and the threats of future conflict, have increased the responsibilities of the Republican Party.

The events of the past 2 months have tragically demonstrated that the present Democrat administration is morally and intellectually unfit to lead the United States of America.

As in 1916 and in 1940 the Democratic Party in 1948 appealed to the voters on a platform of peace—of keeping us out of war. As in 1918 and in 1944, the Democratic Party in 1950 seeks reelection on the slogan, "Don't change horses in the middle of the stream." Three times in our lifetime the Democratic Party has taken this Nation into war. Each time there has been this campaign to confuse the voters into thinking that support of the administration is the same as support of the war effort. It becomes our duty to demonstrate the cynical duplicity of such an appeal. It is our duty and our obligation to do everything in our power to make certain that the mistakes which brought us into this crisis are not repeated in the future on an even larger scale.

WHO LOST THE PEACE?

Why is it that within 5 years after the end of hostilities in World War II, the peace has been lost in new warfare?

Why is it that thousands of our men have been killed and wounded in battles they were unequipped and unprepared to fight?

Who is responsible for the set-backs our men have suffered in Korea? If we are going to fight this war through to victory, as we most certainly are, the American people must have the answers to these questions. They must have the assurance that the future of our country will be in wiser and better hands.

Where did we lose the peace? Who lost it?

It was not the GI of World War II who fought so valiantly all over the world. He didn't even know what was going on. The American people did not know what was going on. The Republican Party did not know what was going on, for not one of our leaders was invited to the conferences at Yalta, at Tehran, and at Potsdam, where secret agreements paved the way for Communist conquest of eastern Europe and Asia.

While the American forces were still fighting the enemy, their Commander in Chief had agreed to Russian proposals which made it possible for communism to take over the little nations of eastern Europe, to take over eastern Germany, to cage us in Berlin without a road to get in or out, to harass Greece, Turkey, Iran, India, and Burma, to arm the North Koreans, to complete the Communist conquest of China. All of these things—all of them adding to the inevitability of yet another conflict—were secretly and silently agreed to, in defiance of the American tradition of open covenants openly arrived at, while our men were still fighting to win the Second World War.

The victories of our soldiers on the field of battle were thrown away by our diplomats at the conference table.

Even then we might have been able to save the peace.

MORE APPEASEMENT

It was not too late in 1946 to end the policy of appeasement and to take decisive action which might have prevented new conflicts.

In two of the world's trouble spots—in Greece and in Berlin—we stood firm. In these two spots the Communist aggression was halted.

Had we shown similar firmness in Asia, the present fighting might have been prevented. Instead, our Asia policy, which the President has now completely reversed, has made the present conflict inevitable.

It was bad enough to turn our back on the Government of China—our wartime ally—and secretly, without even letting the Chinese know, to agree to Russian domination of Manchuria, of North Korea, and of strategic offshore islands. These agreements constituted the same kind of duplicity we deplore when the Russians break faith with their friends.

But we failed even more miserably when the administration not only refused to assist the Chinese Government against the Communist aggressors but actually sent emissaries from the President to insist that the Chinese Government embrace these traitors and make them a part of the Government.

Our diplomats pointed out to us the dangers in European nations when Communists entered the cabinet. Yet they demanded that China follow the same suicidal policy.

INVITATION TO KOREA

The State Department said we would not take part in a civil war in China.

The State Department said we would not defend Formosa.

The State Department said the American line of defense was to be based upon Japan, the Philippines, and Okinawa, but not Korea or Formosa.

The State Department would not permit shipments of arms to South Korea, for fear the South Koreans would attack the North.

The State Department said we would wait for the dust to settle in Asia.

Is it any wonder, then, that the Russians and the North Koreans thought that we would not defend Korea, that we would not intervene in a civil war in Korea, and that they could overrun the country, could kick up a little more Asiatic dust, without fear of opposition?

Thus the peace was lost, and the administration who lost it did not even see it go. Just 5 days before Korea exploded, Mr. Truman thought, or said that he thought, peace was nearer at hand than ever before. Just 5 days before the Truman policy was completely discredited by its author, in one of the most complete reversals we have ever witnessed.

The President's own action is proof enough that the Democratic administration's pro-Soviet fellow travelers, for the past 18 years, have been leading the people from one sell-out to another, from one catastrophe to another, behind false slogans, false programs, and false promises, down the road of secret diplomacy and appeasement to the battlefields of Korea.

THE REPUBLICAN POSITION

The position of the Republican Party throughout these trying years has been completely vindicated. As soon as we learned of the terms of Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam we denounced them. From that moment on we demanded that the secret agreements be revealed, that the appeasement policy be repudiated, that sound steps be taken to insure the maintenance of friendly regimes in strategic lands, particularly in the Asiatic heartland, China.

President Truman scoffed when Senator TAFT pointed out the strategic importance of Formosa. He said it was of no importance. Had he followed the Senator's advice, Formosa now would be safe. Instead he waited for months, until the Communist Chinese are in the most advantageous position for attack, before declaring that our fleet would defend the island.

Though it may be some comfort to have the administration admitting now that we were right in the first place, it is small comfort indeed when men must fight and die because of the political short-sightness that dictated this policy and its sudden reversal.

The record shows the Republican position has been right. The people know that only in the Republican Party can there be hope of honest, clear-cut, straightforward policy which can in the long run bring true peace to our Nation and the world.

SUBVERSIVES IN GOVERNMENT

The people know that the Republican Party would not even tolerate the kind of traitors and fellow travelers to whom the Fair Deal administration has looked for advice.

We have no Communists in our party. We never will have.

A Republican President would not have taken Alger Hiss half across the globe as his most trusted adviser in international affairs.

No Republican administration would appoint to the Cabinet the kind of man whose friendship to a convicted spy and traitor outweighs his loyalty to his job.

The cynical Owen Lattimore, whose far-eastern policy and political philosophy is best summed up in his advice on Korea—"let Korea fall, but don't let it look like we pushed her"—would never have been relied upon in a State Department our party administered.

We have none of the Coplons, Wadleighs, Marzanis, and Remingtons—the subversives and the perverts numbered in the hundreds—which this administration recruited, raised to high places, and shielded, and refused to prosecute long after their treachery became known to all of the world.

The American people are fed up with this boring from within, this pampering of "pinks" and "pansies." They know they will not be afflicted with such people in the Republican Party. They can look to us for leadership with confidence and safety.

WHY WERE WE UNPREPARED?

Now, how about preparedness? Are we prepared for the present conflict—following upon the heels of these mistakes in foreign policy?

The South Koreans were not prepared because the foreign-policy experts refused to permit expenditure of the millions Congress appropriated for giving them arms and munitions.

Our own Defense Department was not prepared because up until the 25th day of June they had been assured that Korea was not a part of our defense position.

Beyond that how well prepared are we for the possible extensions of the conflict which has followed upon the President's decisions?

The Air Force is ordering swiftly as many new planes as American plants are capable of producing. The wraps are off and we are going to have a 70-group Air Force. The American people may remember that this 70-group Air Force was authorized several years ago and funds appropriated to begin it by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Why, then, do we have fewer planes than ever before? Simply because the President, in defiance of the expressed will of the elected representatives of the people in Congress, impounded the money we provide for 70 air groups and directed that the force be reduced even below the levels of 1947–48. We enter the present conflict with a skeleton Air Force, and another decision of the President's must be reversed.

What about the Marines? We here in Montana are acutely aware of the speed with which the Marines have been rebuilding their forces. Another policy of the executive departments is being reversed. The Eightieth Congress saved the Marines from destruction—destruction which was proposed in the administration unification bill—and we made it clear that a large, strong, and active Marine Corps was a fundamental part of our Armed Forces. But despite this clear expression, and once again in defiance of the Congress, the Defense Department has whittled away at the Marines—reducing the effectiveness of the very arm of defense which has traditionally been called upon to handle emergencies such as the Korean crisis.

With the Navy the executive department has a similar record. Construction is now beginning again on a new aircraft carrier. Congress authorized the construction years ago, and appropriated money for it. The carrier actually was started. Then an executive edict stopped construction, impounded the money, and left us in this branch of the service, as in others, unprepared. Republicans in the Eighty-first Congress called attention to the administration's undermining of the Navy, and you will remember that long hearings were conducted after which the administration was whitewashed and the men who had dared to speak their minds—speak the truth—were dismissed from the service.

The Army has fared little better. In all, the President and his Secretary of Defense refused to spend nearly two billion dollars appropriated for specific defense projects which would have been of inestimable value now. They have spent $95,000,000,000 in the past 5 years, however, with what effectiveness all of us now can judge.

How little might have been the dislocation of our economy had the administration followed the sensible program of maintaining an alert and prepared defense force.

How much more will it cost now, both in dollars and in hardship, to build with the emergency already upon us.

How much confidence can the American people have in leaders whose foreign and security policies have led us to this sorry plight?

The American people are united to fight this war to victory. All of us are going to work at it and fight at it to the limit of our strength. But this does not mean that we must accept the continued leadership of those who have failed us in the past, who have, in fact, brought about our calamity. Unity requires that the people have all the facts, that the bewilderment and confusion produced by this betrayal be replaced by confidence that under honest and courageous leadership, the leadership the Republican Party can and will provide, the mistakes of the past will not be repeated.

I have dealt thus at length with the problems of foreign policy and security which are of such great importance to us.

GUARD LIBERTY AT HOME

It is exceedingly important, and I want to emphasize this, that we guard and preserve on the home front the freedom and liberty, the principles of self-reliance, initiative and individual responsibility which are the cornerstones of the American system.

All of us are familiar with the aims of the present administration for the future of America.

The same sympathizers with foreign ideologies who have been so largely responsible for our betrayal in world affairs, are responsible for the domestic policies of the Truman administration.

Many of us have read the book, The Road Ahead. It discusses in some detail the method of the Fabian Socialists in Great Britain who, under other names, by infiltration of an existing party, and ultimately by using the late war itself as an instrument for their political aims have turned Great Britain into a Socialist nation with hardly a mention of the word socialism.

The President's message opening the Eighty-first Congress set forth a complete program for the socialization of the United States. Never once was the word used. Never once was the relationship explained between the various programs he endorsed and urged upon us. But a listing of them shows, as you well know, that their enactment would spell the end of the American system of free enterprise.

It was hoped that the President would withdraw his demands for these programs during the present war emergency. If he is truly interested in a unified nation, he will do so. However, he has not done so, but has in fact reiterated his demands.

He has not ceased to press for the socialization of medicine.

He has not ceased to press for authority regimentation over our natural resources in the Columbia and Missouri Basins.

He has not revised his reciprocal trade policy of permitting foreign nations to undersell American labor, industry, and agriculture.

He has not withdrawn his requests for billions of dollars of spending programs not connected with the war effort.

He has, in fact, boldly demanded under the guise of the war effort new and greater powers than any President of the United States ever enjoyed in peace or war.

These new powers were requested on the heels of his deceptive message to the American people July 19, wherein he gave no intimation of his intention to make himself the economic dictator of our land.

THE FAIR DEAL AT WAR

The President asked for power to requisition any factory, farm, tool, machine, automobile, or anything else he believes is necessary for the war, other programs, or, mind you, for our foreign policy objectives. Who can say what limits there may be on such a request, when nobody, least of all the President, knows what our foreign policy objectives may be for the next 24 hours, or what is involved in other programs.

Further than that, he wanted the power to set up Government corporations to buy or sell any minerals, metals, or raw materials, and the power to build any kind of factory he feels may be necessary to augment the production of private enterprise plants.

The bill he presented is the Spence bill of peacetime, drawn by the same men who seek to foist socialism upon us under some other name—Fair Deal, New Deal, raw deal—it matters not.

To grant such powers to any American President, no matter how honest and well-intentioned he might be, would be to abdicate the rightful powers of the people of the United States, reserved to themselves and to their representatives in Congress, under our Constitution.

To grant them to an administration which has shielded under its wing General Vaughan and his deep freezers, little Johnny Maragon, who was convicted for his intrigue, the Pendergast machines, the Pauleys, the Curleys, and all of the others, would be to invite disaster.

To grant them to an administration which has had the avowed intention of socializing this Nation would be simple folly.

The House last week refused to grant this blank-check authority.

We debated the President's bill and substitute proposals for more than a week. As a result of repeated Republican demands, we passed a measure much more nearly in line with the needs of the emergency. The Republican Members supported fully the priorities and allocations necessary to the war effort, but made it clear that they would not approve unlimited executive powers. We are going to insist that the controls we grant are properly administered. We promise the American people that we will get rid of wartime controls and allocations just as soon as the necessity for them has ceased to exist.

THE REPUBLICAN PLEDGE

The American people may accept that pledge with full assurance that it will be made good. The records show our past performance. We said that we would get rid of the controls of World War II and in the Republican Eightieth Congress we did.

The point is that the administration now in power, to advance its socialistic designs, wants and must have these controls and allocations all of the time—in peace or war—and if kept in control of the Congress it may succeed as the British Socialists have in making war powers permanent.

The Republican Party will insist upon revision of the tax structure to provide a more fair and equitable distribution of the load, and we will insist that the costs of this conflict be paid for currently to the greatest extent possible. This means higher taxes, and they cannot be avoided.

The administration wants to increase them for war, and keep them increased in peace. The Republicans, however, pledge that they will be reduced as quickly as a sound fiscal policy will permit.

Again the American people may rely completely upon this pledge. We promised to decrease taxes after the last war, and we did so, over the veto of the President, giving the greatest relief to those in the low-income brackets.

The war also will require that the budget will be unbalanced until we can end hostilities and have better assurance of peace. But the administration believes in unbalanced budgets in peacetime as in wartime. They cannot carry out their wasteful spending policies except with deficit spending.

We will balance the budget at the earliest possible moment after we get out of this war, and on the basis of our past performance, the American people may have complete assurance that this pledge, too, will be fulfilled. In the Eightieth Congress the Republicans balanced the budget for the only time since the first New Deal administration entered office, 20 years ago.

THE ISSUE IN 1950

To my mind, the issue in 1950 is clear.

On the one hand we have the Truman administration, harboring in high places a motley crew of Communists, fellow travelers, cynical politicians, and incompetents, responsible solely and completely for plunging us again into war, for the fact that we are unprepared for war, and endeavoring in war as in peace to bring a foreign socialism to our shores in place of our present form of government.

On the other we offer the honest, sincere, enlightened leadership of the Republican Party, true to the ideals of the American system, the only resource of a people who search for confidence and integrity in their leaders, for strength in world affairs, for victory in this conflict, and for enduring peace.

In Montana and in the Nation we can begin the hard task of restoring American leadership in 1950 by electing a Republican majority in the National Congress and in the State legislature. We can be certain that the honest and efficient men and women on the Republican ticket, for county, State, and national office recognize the needs of the hour and are prepared to meet them.

In this fight we will have the support, I am confident, of many Democrats who recognize that the name of their party has been stolen by a gang which has no conception of or faith in the teachings of Thomas Jefferson, the traditional founder of that party.

We will also have the support of many unaffiliated voters who recognize that they cannot go along with a political machine that destroys independent thought and action and that has no claim on their confidence.

We will have the support of young men and women who must recognize now more than ever before that the future of the country they are inheriting depends upon their active and intelligent participation in political affairs.

We have a great work to do here in Montana as in all the States of the Union. The safe, sound, and sure future of the Nation depends upon the Republican Party. Let us seize this opportunity as such and every one of us do our part to place our country on the road to a sound, stable, honest government that will guide us to a lasting peace.

Duty of Banks to Depositors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Tell Your Depositors," delivered by Orval W. Adams, executive vice president of the Utah First National Bank, of Salt Lake City, before the annual district conference of the fifth district of the National Association of Supervisors of State Funds, held in Salt Lake City, June 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELL YOUR DEPOSITORS

In a normal world your concern and the concern of the banker would be the same—to see that the bank remains in position to

return to its depositors on demand the moneys deposited by them with it.

In this abnormal world you gentlemen have ably performed the duties entrusted to you. Under your supervision the ability of a bank to return the number of dollars deposited with it is taken for granted.

But the banker is, or should be, concerned as well in seeing to it that the dollars you make sure he can return to his depositor are dollars of equal value with those deposited.

It is indeed fortunate that you gentlemen have so ably performed the duties entrusted to you and have ensured the return of the number of dollars deposited for when we look to the other side of the equation, to the value of the dollars deposited, the story is quite different.

NO SUCH THING AS GOVERNMENT MONEY

There is no such thing as "Government money." Until that statement has become part of our subconsciousness, a premise upon which we act and react instinctively, it will be possible for those in control of Government to perpetuate themselves in office by returning some of the money they take from us and labeling it "Government money."

Until it is so understood, that every dollar spent by government comes from the taxpayers and might otherwise have been spent by them as they elected and without the overhead cost of the millions employed by Government to spend the taxpayers' moneys, it will remain true, as our last president, Heber J. Grant, said some years ago, that "you can't beat Santa Claus." Pull off the old gentleman's whiskers, and you will find the wolf revealed.

The necessary functions of government benefit all of us, and we rightly and willingly contribute to their cost, but, strange as it may seem, bureaucracies have a tendency to grow and to perpetuate themselves; functions initially exercised for proper reasons are continued for improper reasons, and their cost increases.

Let me illustrate by directing your attention to the matter of subsidies:

Subsidies start by taking from Peter to pay Paul. They are continued to rob Peter in order to bribe Paul.

During the war, and for a period thereafter, in order to insure the production of necessary commodities, and to minimize inflation, it was necessary to pay subsidies, and such subsidies were rightly paid.

To pay a subsidy to get needed production of an essential commodity is one thing; to pay a subsidy to get unneeded production of something when produced must be destroyed is quite another thing.

Today the farmer is in the spotlight; he is getting back more than he contributes to government. He is expected to pay for this with his vote; to sell his liberty for some temporary financial advantage.

But not all farmers are fooled; both as individuals and in their organizations they are calling for justice and not favoritism. They recognize that unwarranted subsidies may mean the death of needed subsidies. And they know that tomorrow some other group will be in the spotlight, and that they will be footing the bill.

I believe that we, as individual bankers, have a responsibility and an obligation to inform citizens and our depositors to the best of our ability in regard to money, credit, and the elements of sound public finance upon which rests to so great a degree the banking structure and consequently the safety and earning power of the funds entrusted to our care.

OUR FIRST DUTY IS TO OUR DEPOSITORS

Our first duty is to our depositors. Upon this we will all agree. But just what is the extent of this duty? Is our obligation to our depositors fulfilled by merely so managing our banks as in the ordinary course of events to insure the return to them of the moneys deposited by them, or do we not owe a further duty? Are we not charged with the responsibility of doing what we can to make their deposits worth having, to see that they earn something substantial, and to see to it that when repaid they are repaid in dollars of real value?

The depositor is the very backbone of this Nation—the man who is self-supporting, who saves, who bears the brunt of taxation, who supports the people and the Government. Without him life would be primitive indeed. Without him the man on relief would soon find himself in the position of being obliged to rely upon his own efforts for a livelihood. This is so obviously true that one wonders there should be resentment among these classes of the community when a word is said in defense of the depositor, a word which in effect means no more than a warning to these interests not to kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

Today a word uttered in defense of the depositor is often met with the cry of partisanship, and I am just a bit afraid that in attempting to avoid any feeling or appearance of partisanship we, as bankers, may have unwittingly become partisans in the very worst sense. You cannot avoid partisanship by keeping silent when one party desires that you keep silent, and partisanship in disregard of your duty, to the injury and peril of your depositor, is the worst sort of partisanship.

MUST NOT KEEP SILENT ON PRINCIPLES

We cannot be justified in keeping silent when it is our duty to speak, by any plea that we must avoid partisanship.

First. We must manage our own banks. Our depositors are entitled to know in whom is vested the management of the institutions in which they deposit their funds. If we are obliged to surrender the management of our banks in whole or in part to some other person, persons, or agencies, I believe it is our duty to inform our depositors of that fact.

Second. It is our duty to manage our banks in the light of experience, and to the best of our ability, with a view to safeguarding the funds entrusted to us. If we are obliged to abandon practices which in the past have proven necessary to the security of our institutions and our depositors, we should inform our depositors of that fact. Diversification in investments and loans, limitation in the amounts of loans, insistence upon the self-liquidating character of loans accepted by us, the preservation of liquidity, all these must be continued or our depositors be informed that we propose to venture their funds in disregard of some one or more of these principles.

Third. It is our duty to use our best efforts to insure to our depositors a fair return on the funds entrusted to us, and when such a return is rendered increasingly impossible by reason of conditions beyond our immediate control, to inform our depositors of such facts in order that they may intelligently act for their own protection.

Fourth. It is our duty to do everything in our power to make it possible for us to return to our depositors when demanded by them dollars not depreciated by Government fiat or by excessive Government borrowing. Merely to give back the same number of counters would be to fulfill but a legal, not a moral, obligation. When we observe forces beyond our control tending to render impossible the return of sound dollars to our depositors, it again is our duty to inform them of such facts in order that they may act in their own protection.

We know that the politician will do all in his power to prevent the people becoming tax conscious, that he will do this by borrowing instead of paying as we go, by raising revenues through indirect taxes whenever possible instead of through direct taxes. We know that the continuance of the present spending and borrowing policies of Government can lead to but one end, the destruction of the savings of our depositors. It is our duty to do what we can to make the people tax conscious, to show our depositors that visible taxes are but a trifling portion of the real tax burden, to show them not only the extent to which invisible taxes cut into their earnings and their savings, but also to show them how they are further taxed as truly as though such impositions were called taxes by the low interest policies of Government and by competition of Government with banks.

Have we made it clear to our depositors that the reduction of more than one-half in the returns paid on their savings deposits has necessarily and directly resulted from the low-interest policies of Government, together with the fact that Government is today the chief customer for the accumulated funds of our depositors? The average depositor should know that the Government has become the banker's main customer as a result of the accumulated effects of the experimental policies of the administration, of continued threats to industry, and of the consequent destruction of confidence in the future.

Does the average depositor understand that continued borrowing and continued unbalanced budgets lead to the one inevitable end of uncontrolled inflation? Do our depositors understand that they are the creditors and the banks the debtors? Do they understand that when the Government reduces its own debts by inflating the currency, it also reduces the debts of the banks to the depositors, renders impossible return by the banks to the depositors of such dollars as were entrusted by the depositors to the banks, destroys not only the earning value of the deposits but destroys also in large part the principal of the deposits?

Do our depositors understand that the seemingly plump and wholesome condition of the banks does not reflect health but bloat, that excess reserves represent in principal part the purchase of the obligations of Government and the credits created in favor of Government upon such purchases?

They do not, and it is our duty to endeavor to the best of our ability to make these facts clear to them. We banks have failed in that duty.

Does the average depositor understand that by insuring deposits in the FDIC, what the Government has really done is tantamount to insuring itself against threatened lack of funds, to discourage the depositors of America from resorting to the old practice of hiding their savings in a wool sock, to coax out this money from its hiding place and bring it into the vaults of the banks where it can be made easily accessible to the Federal Government? The FDIC cannot insure against loss of earnings through unavoidable reductions in interest rates, nor against loss of principal through inflation.

Does the average depositor realize that with increased centralization of power has come a loss of the proper sense of responsibility for spending the moneys of the people; that history is repeating itself and a group securing control of a one-time democracy are entrenching themselves in power by subsidizing a portion of the electorate?

Does the average depositor realize that the administration is steadily engaged in making permanent that which was originated to meet a war and depression emergency, and that instead of reducing expenses or balancing budgets or encouraging a revival of industry, further and greater charges are placed upon industry?

Some things we can do. We can go to our depositors with the facts. We have their names and addresses, many of them we know personally. We can and should give them the whole story. Why don't we and why haven't we told them that the Federal Government has been enabled to indulge in its wild orgy

of spending, because the bankers of America have loaned it the money that was placed with us for safety and sound investment by the wage earners, the professional men, the clerks, the widows, the domestics, the farmers, and all others who live within their means and save? Why don't we and why haven't we told them that the Federal Government came direct to us and got the money and got it upon the Government's own terms? Why didn't we remind them that it wasn't the banker's money but the peoples' money? Why didn't we explain to them our reasons for making such loans?

You need not be told that private enterprise cannot compete with tax supported governmental agencies; that the existence of such agencies restricts the field for private enterprise; that you cannot loan money in competition with Government.

A BALANCED BUDGET AND RESTORATION OF THE GOLD STANDARD

We know today that only in a balanced budget and the restoration of the gold standard lies the possibility of a true recovery. But do our depositors appreciate this? Can we not help them to a correct understanding of this basic truth?

With the banks stuffed with the obligations of government, with their operations fortified by the resources of the Federal Reserve banks, which in turn are likewise loaded with such obligations, with their deposits insured by the FDIC the resources of which consist almost entirely of obligations of the Government, is not the situation one which should be brought to the knowledge of the man who must foot the bill? Can we justify danger, can we even excuse ourselves for delaying in using every faculty and every power at our command to bring these facts to the knowledge of our depositors? To my mind there can be but one answer.

Fundamentally, this country is sound. Our troubles are self-made. We are simply off balance. We are ignoring the balances set up by the Constitution. We are ignoring the balance that comes from free interplay of ideas and independent action in business. We are substituting for all this the ideas of a small group of men to whom are entrusted the powers heretofore exercised by the many.

This is what is called "planned economy," perhaps the oldest thing in government, and the escape from which has been the boast of English-speaking peoples, and particularly of Americans.

Those in authority in government assume today that a part is greater than the whole, that some few men can better direct the affairs of the whole people that can the whole people. They assume that the lessons of history are meaningless or else misleading. They are convinced that initiative is vicious, except when exhibited by an elected officer or an appointed bureaucrat.

They affirm day by day that the very idea of local self-government, whether in public or private affairs was wrong. They affirm that organization should be from the top down and not from the bottom up. They believe that nothing can be too big or too powerful provided it be conceived and controlled by the Federal Government, but that otherwise size is vicious, growth must be prevented. Today they are trying to do two things. They are trying to restore industry, to get business functioning normally and employing the usual percentage of the people and at the same time they are trying to bring about what they call reforms.

They are demanding that business exhibit confidence in the future, assume further obligations, employ more men, and so "relieve" the Federal Government. At the same time they are adding to the numbers on the public payroll, wrapping more and more red tape about industry, demanding more and more that it be guided not by trained management, but by public officials.

CONCENTRATION OF POWER ALWAYS DANGEROUS

Experience demonstrated that in private life, as in public life, too great a concentration of power was dangerous to individual freedom of action, and consequently there were enacted laws imposing necessary regulations and restrictions upon large aggregations of capital.

So far back as history records, those in control of government credited themselves with a superior wisdom and endeavored to regulate the affairs of the people. The further back you go in history the greater this control, the greater "planned economy." The history of the English-speaking peoples is the story of the fight to escape from this control and to render impossible its recurrence, to permit the individual the fullest possible freedom of action to develop himself. Experience taught our ancestors that you could not have this independence if you had too great a concentration of powers in government. That is what brought about the division of the powers of government between the executive, legislative and judicial. That is what brought about the separation of church and state.

Experience also taught our ancestors that effective organization, organization which served the people and which did not dominate the people, had to come from the bottom up and not from the top down. That is what established our local governments, our State governments, and our Federal Government. The Federal Government did not set up the States, the counties, the cities, the towns; on the contrary, the people established these units, restricting and limiting the powers entrusted to them as they progressed, from the smallest to the largest, and leaving to the latter, or believing that they had left to the latter, only those matters of true national concern.

Now, whatever we may think of all this, we cannot avoid recognizing that it worked better than any planned economy ever worked. It brought about a standard of living higher than had ever been known upon this earth before. It made possible to the common man comforts of life unknown to the rulers of kingdoms of but a few generations ago.

If banking is to become a government monopoly let it be because we have determined that that is best for the country. Do not let it happen because we shut our eyes to the successive steps taken by certain men in the government to bring about this result. Let us clearly recognize that just as State rights are being destroyed by encroachments of the Federal Government, by what amounts to coercion and by unjustifiable gratuities, just so are the foundations of independent banking being sapped by the successive encroachments of government upon the functions of the banker and the increasing control by the Federal Government of the operations of the banks.

Let us not forget that when the borrower dictates the policies of the lender the business of the lender will be conducted in the interests of the borrower and not in the interests of the lender.

We know that it is not too late to act. The power to shape our course, to put an end to the evils that beset us, still lies with the depositors of America. They are our finest citizens and constitute the strength and backbone of our country. Give them the facts, and you may trust to the soundness of their heads and hearts.

Opportunity for unusual service comes only in great crises. Leadership at such times calls for both wisdom and courage. Not in our lifetime has there been such opportunity for service by we bankers as now exists. The danger is grave and imminent, yet the people can be trusted to act rightly in their own interests if we give them the facts.

Let us not make it possible for history to record that in this supreme hour the bankers of America, out of silence induced by fear of reprisals, failed both their depositors and their country. When the future of the Nation and the welfare of its people are involved, mere party politics sink into insignificance. The issue is no longer one of mere partisanship, but of simple honesty and patriotism.

The ballot box is the last best hope of our commonwealth. Use it to save what's left.

The Position of Labor in Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and interesting discussion of the position of labor in our economy. This discussion was inspired by an article in a recent issue of the American magazine, entitled "Is Labor Riding for a Fall?" and was held over the American Forum of the Air, under the direction of Theodore Granik, its founder, at the NBC Theater in Washington, D. C., Saturday, August 12, 1950.

This discussion was participated in by the well-know industrialist, James F. Lincoln, president of the Lincoln Electric Co.; and Mr. James B. Carey, one of America's foremost leaders of labor and secretary-treasurer of the CIO.

I am advised by the Public Printer that this material is estimated to make 2⅔ pages in the RECORD at a cost of $218.68.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS LABOR RIDING FOR A FALL?

ANNOUNCER. What is ahead for labor? How can labor hold its gains? Is labor riding for a fall?

The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik, and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the NBC Theater in Washington, D. C.

Now, here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. There has been a great deal of discussion in business and labor circles concerning a vital article which appeared in a recent issue of American Magazine, entitled, "Is Labor Riding for a Fall?" Its authority, James F. Lincoln, president of the Lincoln Electric Co., poses this important question, and I quote:

"Can labor hold its place in the sun during the second half of the century, or will working folk gradually lose the great gains they have made and slip back toward the conditions from which they rose—back toward poverty, wage serfdom, slavery?"

Then his article continues:

"That is perhaps the most important question of our times, but it is one which no one can answer but labor itself."

So the American Forum of the Air has invited one of the Nation's foremost labor leaders, James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, to give us the answer; and we are equally happy to have Mr. Lincoln here today to give us his views.

Now, Mr. Carey, is labor riding for a fall?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Granik, in my opinion the answer is "no." Mr. Lincoln seems to have a fear about the future of our Nation. It is important that we maintain strength on the part of the people in order to maintain the strength of our Nation, but we have the most productive Nation in the world. It is a Nation that has developed work habits among the people that produced beyond anything imagined by any other group, and if labor can bring the employers to realize that the sales of their products depend on the consuming power of all of the people, and can share the profits of employers with the consumers and workers, this Nation will continue to gain in strength.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Lincoln?

Mr. LINCOLN. Mr. Carey overlooks one fundamental fact in his statement, and that is that the cost of product, which is the thing that determines how much of it will be sold, depends upon the efficiency of manufacture. That, at the present time, is at a very low ebb, in spite of the fact that labor-saving machinery has gone way beyond anything we have ever seen before in the history of the world, and yet the manufacturing efficiencies are very low, largely because of the interference of the labor union and labor leadership with the functions of management.

Chairman GRANIK. How about that interference?

Mr. CAREY. We are both electrical workers, and we come from the electrical industry, and let us discuss specifically the industry that we are most familiar with.

The largest corporation has been very productive, it is very profitable, and in fact, from a report just recently issued, the president of that corporation—and I won't tell you the name, and for the purpose of discussion we will just call it the "Generous Electric Co."—the largest producer in the entire industry, and he said:

"In the 6 months ended June 30, General Electric and its consolidated affiliates earned a net profit of $77,445,000, an increase of 66 percent over the $46,553,000 earned in the corresponding period of a year ago."

Now, let me remind you, the period of a year ago was the highest, most profitable year in the history of that concern, and now this year, the first half is 66 percent higher. And what does that do? In the second quarter of this year, the consolidated earnings totaled $40,587,000, compared with $19,850,000 earned in the corresponding quarter of 1949.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Lincoln?

Mr. LINCOLN. It is perfectly obvious that every manufacturing organization is bound to make money. If they don't, they go out of business. Obviously, again, the price that they must charge is a price in which they will make a profit.

The point I make, and which it seems to me is the most important, is this, that the cost of the product is the important thing, and it will be the determining factor as to how much of the product is going to be sold over a long period of time. It is true at the present time that manufactured products in general are selling for about three times what they were a matter of 12 years ago. That is because of the fact that the efficiency of production has gone steadily down, when every effort that management can make has been to increase the efficiency of production by better producing tools. In spite of that, there has been a continual reduction in the efficiency of production.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Lincoln, let us talk facts, now.

Mr. LINCOLN. That is fact.

Mr. CAREY. In the first 6 months of this year, the Generous Electric Co. produced $881,000,000 worth of goods. That is 10 percent more than the first half of last year. For the quarter ending June 30, sales amounted to $402,600,000, an increase of 19 percent over the second quarter of 1949, and they did it with fewer workers.

Now, Mr. Lincoln, if you can produce more goods with fewer workers, does that mean that the productivity is going down, or does it mean that the productivity is going up?

Mr. LINCOLN. The unfortunate thing about your figures, Mr. Carey, is this: that if you double the price, you will double the number of dollars for the same amount of material, the same amount of product. The point I have made now twice is the fact that the price has gone up, and gone up rapidly, because of the continual reduction in the efficiency of the operation. Obviously, if they were to double the price again, they would have twice as much product as they had.

Mr. CAREY. Who doubles the price, Mr. Lincoln, the labor unions? And here is the profit. Mr. Lincoln, I asked you a question.

Mr. LINCOLN. The labor union doubles the price.

Mr. CAREY. The question is: Does the labor union have control of the price policy?

Mr. LINCOLN. Of course they do.

Mr. CAREY. Well, now, these figures that you question are the figures of the president of the corporation, and I assume that they are truthful.

Mr. LINCOLN. I haven't questioned the figures.

Mr. CAREY. This company contends that they have reduced the prices, and I think in this respect the company is correct. They should have reduced the prices far beyond anything that they did, and they should share this tremendous profit. It amounts, in the first half of 1950, to 30 percent; that is 30 percent profit on the invested capital in that corporation.

Mr. LINCOLN. What has that got to do with it? Again I say if you have to double the price of a product in order to make up for the inefficiency of manufacture, you will increase the dollars of output, but the point I have made, and made all along, is the one fact that the efficiency of production has gone steadily down.

Chairman GRANIK. Let me ask a question. In your article you say your workers produce as much as they can and are paid accordingly. Suppose there is a decline in orders, then what happens?

Mr. LINCOLN. That is perfectly simple. In the first place, what would occur would be this: First, we would reduce hours, and because of that the amount of output would be reduced in accordance with the hours, the efficiency remaining the same.

We have over the last 20 years—and that goes back to 1932 when there was a very great reduction in business generally—we have been able to keep all of the people in the organization employed. It is true, in shorter hours, at certain times, but they have all been employed.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Lincoln, when you reduce the hours of the workers, does that reduce their income?

Mr. LINCOLN. Would it reduce their income?

Mr. CAREY. Yes.

Mr. LINCOLN. I would guess it would.

Mr. CAREY. Wouldn't it be proper to say that the first thing you do is cut the pay, the earnings of workers? And that is one of the important questions that we have. If the workers get enough money, they can buy back the products that they make in such abundance, and when the workers don't get enough money, due to the corporation's taking off such exorbitant profits, then, of course, the workers have worked themselves out of jobs.

Now here we have a corporation, the Generous Electric Corp., that not only took these exorbitant profits but, according to a statement on the part of its president, they increased the number of plants in recent years from 61 plants to 115 plants. They increase, of course, their productivity, and they expand their plants, and the company's net worth is more than double what it was; and in addition to that, they paid profits to the stockholders double what they did. The salaries of the executives are double. And during that same period, the workers lost the profit-sharing arrangement that that corporation had in operation at one time, and they didn't take it all the way out——

Mr. LINCOLN. What has this to do with what we are talking about?

Mr. CAREY. "Is labor heading for a fall?"

Mr. LINCOLN. Fine.

Mr. CAREY. And we are talking about: Is labor more productive today than it ever has been; and we are talking about: Are employers willing to share?

Chairman GRANIK. May I ask a question?

Mr. LINCOLN. What has that got to do with it?

Mr. CAREY. If employers don't share the increased productivity of workers, then we are not going to have sufficient consuming power to keep these tremendous plants in operation. It is not just the plants we had in operation, but the many expanded plants that we built.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Carey, are labor unions for or against the use of profit-sharing and incentive plans?

Mr. CAREY. Certainly.

Mr. LINCOLN. Certainly what?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Lincoln, in your article——

Mr. LINCOLN. What do you mean, certainly what? Are they for or against it?

Mr. CAREY. We asked this particular company just last week to reinstitute the profit-sharing plan that they had in operation. And sure, we are in favor of sharing profits with the workers, Mr. Lincoln.

Mr. LINCOLN. Will you talk to the rest of your labor leaders? They say that they are not in favor of it?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Lincoln, we are very much in favor of sharing the profits.

Mr. LINCOLN. Will you let the rest of the people in the labor leadership know about that?

Mr. CAREY. Yes; through the medium of Ted Granik's broadcast, we say to the employers, and to the workers, that the labor leaders are in favor of sharing the profits that the employers take in large quantities to themselves.

Chairman GRANIK. How do they feel about piecework systems?

Mr. CAREY. This piecework system generally is one method of providing rewards. There are some complicated piecework systems that the workers cannot understand, and I doubt if some managements understand, that are merely made complicated to disguise that management wants increased efforts and increased production without increased earnings going to the workers.

Any system that provides for increased pay for increased efforts is a good system, unless there are some complications or gimmicks in it in which case it is merely another way of fooling the working people.

Mr. LINCOLN. May I ask the question: Is the labor leadership for piecework, yes or no?

Mr. CAREY. In some cases, yes; and in other cases, no. It is according to the piecework system. And now, let us speak specifically.

Mr. LINCOLN. It is according to the labor leader, because there are a number of labor leaders who say they are not for piecework.

Mr. CAREY. There may be some labor leaders who are not for some kinds of piecework.

Mr. LINCOLN. It isn't "some kind of piecework." They say definitely that they are not for piecework.

Mr. CAREY. Well, we asked in General Electric just last week—pardon me, the Generous Electric Company—just last week——

Mr. LINCOLN. That is the same one that you are speaking about all of the time?

Chairman GRANIK. You have been a pioneer in incentive pay for workers. Would you care to discuss your plan?

Mr. LINCOLN. I should be very glad to. It illustrates, too, the mistake in the thinking that Mr. Carey has regarding this whole matter.

Fundamentally, don't forget that labor is paid, not by management and not by the company; labor is paid by the consumer. The consumer pays every dollar of wages, of taxes, of the profit, and everything else that the manufacturer gets.

Now, with this plan that we have, we go to the worker and say this: "Our job is to build a better product at a lower price. If we do that, the consumer will be very grateful and he will be very glad, indeed, to pay you larger for that." Because of that, we have been able to increase enormously the cooperation between labor and management, because labor and management are the same, and we have been able to increase enormously the efficiency of our operation. Over the last 17 years we have reduced the number of man-hours to produce a product, or to produce our product, by more than 85 percent. During that time, the consumer has been so grateful that he has increased the average earnings of the hourly worker to over $6,500 a year. Try that on your labor union.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. Let us try it now. How many employees do you have, Mr. Lincoln?

Mr. LINCOLN. About one thousand.

Mr. CAREY. Did a labor union oppose the system you put into operation?

Mr. LINCOLN. Some of your leaders do. One of them, for instance, is this man at General Motors.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Lincoln, I happen to be president of the union in your industry, and now speak specifically, Mr. Lincoln.

Mr. LINCOLN. I am talking of one who does object to it.

Mr. CAREY. In our industry, Mr. Lincoln?

Mr. LINCOLN. What industry do you mean?

Mr. CAREY. The electrical industry, the industry you are a part of. Did a union ever condemn or oppose your particular system?

Mr. LINCOLN. The union has always been very quickly kicked out when they came into our set-up.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Lincoln, I don't think the union in our industry is particularly concerned about whether they get kicked out or whether they don't. They are awfully persistent.

Mr. LINCOLN. I just don't know. I am trying to answer your question.

Mr. CAREY. I am the chairman of that union, Mr. Lincoln, and did you ever hear any remarks of criticism or did you ever kick our union out of your plant?

Mr. LINCOLN. I never kicked any union out of any plant. That was taken care of by our men.

Mr. CAREY. Now, Mr. Lincoln, if the workers wanted to have a union in your plant, would you deal with them according to the law?

Mr. LINCOLN. Well, wouldn't you have to?

Mr. CAREY. I think so.

Mr. LINCOLN. Yes, that is my understanding, too.

Chairman GRANIK. Shall we take a question from the audience? Do you have a question, please?

Mr. MCCLAIR. I am Howard McClair, of the American Institute of Cooperation, and this question is for Mr. Lincoln. Is the cost-of-living formula a sound basis of wage determination?

Mr. LINCOLN. In our estimation it is. We use it and have used it over the last 15 years. As the cost of living changes, the wage rates themselves change in the same proportion. It has worked out very successfully. Now, remember that is entirely aside from the bonus which over the last 10 years has been more than wages.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. We asked this General Electric Co. if they would agree to reinstitute the cost-of-living bonus that they put into operation and then took out, and their answer was "No." They contend that it is not a proper way. Now, as the spokesman of American industry here, especially for the electrical industry, who has said that some labor unions influence the worker, I ask Mr. Lincoln: Mr. Lincoln, do you think that you can have any influence on an associate of yours, the General Electric Co., to reinstitute some of these things that you advocate here?

Mr. LINCOLN. You understand that the General Electric Co. is a bitter opponent of ours, and while I resent the idea of your calling it the "Generous Electric Co.," I still say that we are competitors, and as such would fight to the death.

Mr. CAREY Do you mean there are warfares and jurisdictional disputes going on in American industry?

Mr. LINCOLN. Haven't you heard of them?

Mr. CAREY. I have; but I haven't read about them in Westbrook Pegler's column. You only read about disputes within the ranks of labor. and there is nothing in your article, Mr. Lincoln, about these patent disputes and these other kinds of disputes that go on with American employers.

Mr. LINCOLN. What has that got to do with the subject?

Mr. CAREY. The subject is, "Is labor riding for a fall?"

Chairman GRANIK. Let me see if a gentleman in the audience has a question pertaining to that question?

Mr. KAUFMAN. My name is Joseph W. Kaufman, counsel to the House Small Business Committee, headed by WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. We receive a lot of complaints from small business organizations that labor isn't giving small business a fair break. Some of them say it is. I would like to ask Mr. Carey whether he thinks labor unions are giving small business a fair break, and if they are not, whether that may contribute to the downfall of labor?

Mr. CAREY. Well, labor is primarily concerned with those corporations that determine the wage scales for all workers. Leading concerns like General Electric and Westinghouse include the United Statees Steel and Bethlehem, International Harvester, and the others. If labor has a purpose to serve in the interests of the whole community, it will serve the purpose of the small-business man by requiring these corporations, these large corporations, to share their tremendous profits with the consumers, and with the workers, as well as with management and with the stockholders. It is important that labor render that service to our whole society because if the General Electric Corp. can expand from having the few plants it had a few years ago, 66 in number, to one hundred and some in number today, and gain these great profits and not reduce prices and not increase wages, then the General Electric Corp. can gobble up the Lincoln Electric Co. and all of the other concerns in the industry.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Lincoln.

Mr. LINCOLN. Please don't say things like that, because you know it isn't the truth. And in the second place, if it were true, that is one of the things which the present laws on the statute books covering such matters would take care of. Now then, as a matter of fact, small business is going forward more rapidly now than large business proportionately, and please don't say over and over again that these are enormous profits. Because remember you people in the labor unions have been able to so far reduce the efficiency of labor that you have more than doubled the cost of the products which they produce.

Mr. CAREY. Is that true in the electrical industry?

Mr. LINCOLN. Wait a minute. And because of that it is necessary to run the price up on the consuming public, including yourselves, to a point where your dollar is worth less than half of what it was worth some 15 years ago. And that is going on and on and on, and that is one of the things which you are going to be held accountable for by the fellow who pays the wages and pays these profits and also pays the taxes.

Mr. CAREY. Do I understand you, Mr. Lincoln, to say that you don't have concern about these large corporations gobbling up small business, that the latter is going ahead faster than it ever has?

Mr. LINCOLN. It is going ahead at the present time faster than it ever has because of the fact that we had a war, because of the fact that there are shortages which that war caused; but as far as the actual proportions of small to large business, it is greater now both in number and in productivity than was true 15 or 20 or 30 or 40 years ago.

Mr. CAREY. If small business is going ahead greater than it ever did and if large business is going ahead greater than it ever did, and if labor unions are more influential today than they have ever been, I would say that that might be a splendid answer to the question that is raised. Then the labor unions growing in strength result in having the small businessmen grow in strength and prosperity and the large business interests as well. Now, all we ask, Mr. Lincoln, is this: Wouldn't you agree that these large corporations should reduce the prices that they have been requiring for their products, and share these tremendous profits with their consumers and their workers? Now, General Electric for the——

Chairman GRANIK. Let him answer the question.

Mr. CAREY. I ask this specifically. They have made profits which if they were shared with their consumers they could reduce prices by 10 percent, and they could give every worker 18 cents an hour more in wages, and have the highest profits that they have ever had in the entire history of their concern?

Chairman GRANIK. Let him answer the question.

Mr. LINCOLN. In the first place, you are talking about something that isn't true; and in the second place, you are forgetting and you are overlooking this fact, that because of the inflation which the present program has forced on the country, you have to have profits twice as large in dollars to have the same amount of profit, and you also have to have them three times as large in order to build these plants that you are talking about in order to give work to those people. Now, don't forget this also, that you are entirely overlooking the fact that the fellow that pays these wages, that pays these profits, that is the fellow that we as management and also as labor have to look out for—the consumer. He is the fellow that is being legislated against.

CHAIRMAN GRANIK. Can I take a question?

Mr. JAQUET. My name is George Jaquet. I happen to be a management analyst and I would like to ask this question of you, Mr. Lincoln, if you will. This refers to the worker. How does the so-called Lincoln plan that you have developed, and that you advocate, differ in its benefits to the worker from the plan employed by Jack and Heintz during the last war where very liberal bonuses and other striking advantages were enjoyed by the employees?

Mr. LINCOLN. The differences between the two—and please remember that I am not completely advised as to this Jack & Heintz program—but I think that I can safely say the difference comes from this: That in our case the man earns the money he gets. In the case of Jack & Heintz it certainly was true in some cases that he got money that he didn't earn. Now, the great difference between the two is the fact that in our case the man feels the responsibility to his boss, the consumer, and in the case of Jack & Heintz I don't think that he did to the same extent. I do know that Jack & Heintz have been in trouble since the last war stopped, financially.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. I don't care particularly to comment on that question, but I am still trying to get from Mr. Lincoln an answer to the question: Shouldn't the American employers where they can as in the case of General Electric, reduce the prices of their product to the consumer and raise the wages and take only enough profits to make it possible for them to expand and pay their investors a reasonable return on their investment?

Mr. LINCOLN. That is all that they are doing at the present time. The only place you can get money is from the profit of the company at the present time. Therefore, if you are going to expand you must do it by the profit that you make.

Chairman GRANIK. It is time for summaries. Mr. Carey, your summary, please.

Mr. CAREY. I don't think labor is heading for a fall. If you look upon labor as an important part of America, there may be someone who would like to see labor head for a fall, but as long as labor adopts policies and carries out programs in the interests of the whole country labor is not heading for a fall. It may be true that we have shortcomings within the ranks of labor. I am certain that we have. We may have shortcomings among labor leaders. But today the policies of the labor movement are to help strengthen our Nation. We advocate supporting our Government in its foreign policy, and we advocate stopping the Communists in their tracks and removing the cause of communism. We advocate reducing prices, increasing the consuming power of the purchasers, and we ask that employers adopt similar policies, to stop the gouging of the public with their exorbitant prices, and to share their profits with their consumers and their workers, and we will continue to build a strong Nation, a model for the rest of the world.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. And your summary, Mr. Lincoln.

Mr. LINCOLN. The thing that we have missed here entirely is the fact of the definite responsibility that labor and management both have to the consumer. There is no war, there can be no war such as has been set up between labor and management. They are both responsible to the consumer, because the consumer is the man who hires them. Every dollar that everybody gets in this industry, both labor and the management, comes from the consumer. We have entirely overlooked that. We think that labor should fight and continue to fight with management to get more money out of management. The only money that management has is what it has to take from the consumer, and the only way that labor can get more money is by taking it from the consumer. It is that which is causing the resentment in the minds of the consumer, and which will, if continued, mean that labor is riding for a fall. That would be the most terrible thing that could happen to the economy, but happen it will unless we change.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you.

Lack of Preparation by the United States for the War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the August 18, 1950, column of David Lawrence presents a serious analysis that is worthy of consideration by all of us. I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY UNITED STATES NOT BETTER PREPARED FOR WAR—TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, August 18.—Unwittingly the headlines in American newspapers in the last 48 hours have told why America hasn't been better prepared to fight the war in Korea.

The dramatic story of the mass flight of B–29's which dropped 850 tons of bombs over a 26-square-mile area in Korea was immediately given here the same kind of acceptance that has heretofore caused strategic bombing to dominate the whole American defense program.

It reads persuasively now, as it did to Congress these last 4 years. It appears now, as it did then, to many superficial observers to be the simple, inexpensive way to defeat an enemy—just drop tons upon tons of bombs from miles up, no matter where they hit and not matter how indiscriminate the operation necessarily must be from high altitudes—and there will not be much need of a ground Army or a Navy.

But this actual demonstration is being conducted at a time when the dispatches must necessarily tell what happened the next day. It is no disparagement of the B–29's or of the decision to send them on this mission to point out that this was a supplementary and psychological operation and by no means a primary role for the heavy bombers.

The B–29's undoubtedly had a terrorizing effect and probably were very much more useful in striking at army concentrations than in combing over the relatively few targets for strategic bombing operations in North Korea. Yet the mission must be judged by what its immediate and direct effects on enemy operations really were. The next day's dispatches from the United Press correspondent in the war zone said:

"The strength of the sudden Communist push from the north indicated that the North Koreans may have shifted some of the four to six divisions they had massed on the west bank of the Naktong River northwest of Waegwan to the northern sector before American B–29's dropped 850 tons of bombs on the west bank yesterday.

"Reconnaissance planes which flew over the blasted and burning 26-square-mile target area northwest of Waegwan today could find no sign of the 40,000 to 60,000 troops believed there."

Then came from the Associated Press correspondent in the same zone a dispatch a little later telling of a drive by 30,000 North Koreans and adding:

"The Communists poured out of the area hit by B–29 bombers west of the Naktong River. They jumped off from an area between Waegwan and Kunwi."

What this means, of course, is that high-level bombing did not disorganize the troops of the enemy or prevent them from realigning their divisions in time to make a concentrated attack the next day.

Strategic bombers were never designed to do such a job. What the United States needed this week on the central Korean front was several units of low-level bombers, the kind that dive close to the target and really see what they are aiming at. These units, often called "tactical aviation," are very scarce nowadays in the United States Army because most of the money and the manpower has been used to develop a program of high-level bombing for use in Europe. The idea that planes could fly across oceans and attack with atom bombs was sold to the American people as an inexpensive substitute for almost everything else, though top-level commanders will deny they intended any such thing. Yet a re-reading now of the publicity given strategic bombing these last few years will confirm the impression that the three armed services were not treated as co-ordinate branches and each given a chance to build up what it needed. That kind of autonomy was lost in the passion for "unification" which has turned out to be an allocation of most of the money to a single concept of strategy—the high-flying bombers of the United States Air Force—while the Navy was largely put aside and the Army was deprived of men and equipment, tanks and planes.

In the last 24 hours the American people were told that there has been moved across the Pacific by the Navy since the Korean invasion started a total of 40,000 American Army, Air Force, Marines, and Navy men; 2,000,000 barrels of petroleum, 1,500,000 tons of cargo. In addition a big Navy carrier ferried across, on its broad deck, 170 planes for the United States Air Force and, below deck, 1,000 Air Force personnel and 1,000 tons of necessary cargo.

The strategic bombers of the United States Air Force are vital, the Army foot soldier is vital, tactical aviation is vital, the Marines are vital, and the Navy is vital. The wonder is that anyone in top command—civilian or military—was ever able to say that navies were obsolete, carriers should not be modernized because they were going in mothballs anyway, and that the Marines—with the only trained units of tactical aviation in support of ground troops—should be deprived of their identity, and reduced in size, and that tanks and ground armies were secondary. But that's what has happened within 18 months, beginning in January 1949—and mostly because strategic bombing is exciting, spectacular and theoretically destructive enough to win a war. It hasn't happened that way in Korea.

Tariffs Can Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD L. LEAHY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Tariffs Can Wait" from the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of August 19.

The editorial is well reasoned and its tone is such as to appeal to fair-minded persons. Far from attacking the principle of reciprocal trade agreements, it assumes the soundness of the system. It gives well-merited praise to my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], for his suggestion that the Reciprocal Tariff Conference scheduled for next month at Torquay, England, be postponed or canceled. The editorial states the issue with great clarity and correctly concludes that my colleague has performed a public service by his suggestion for postponement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TARIFFS CAN WAIT

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN's conviction that this is no time to readjust reciprocal tariffs is soundly based. His suggestion that the scheduled September conference for this purpose at Torquay, England,

should be either postponed or canceled should be heeded.

Even as late as 1947, when the Geneva international agreement on reciprocal tariff policy was adopted and the first negotiations between the signatory governments were begun, there was strong hope that the trade world would soon achieve a substantial measure of stability. If it did not, the concessions and counterconcessions on which the workability of the reiprocal trade program rests could easily lose their justification.

By last year, when representatives of the signatory governments met at Annecy, France, to negotiate on additional items for which reciprocal treatment might be granted, the strong hope of 1947 for stability had markedly dimmed. Among various delegations there was a noticeable loss of enthusiasm to offer concessions by the countries they represented. Nevertheless, despite the growing concern regarding lack of stability in international economic relationships, conspicuously apparent in foreign exchange complicated by dollar shortages, American leadership prodded the conference into making a substantial number of new reciprocal concessions.

Today, however, the situation is vastly changed. There is no telling whether such concessions as any government might consider feasible in September would have any economic justification a year later, or perhaps sooner. The Korean war and related events have made even day-to-day international commercial transactions often risky at best. When the economic world is in this degree of flux, it would be foolhardy to attempt to make fixed commitments for an indefinite and highly uncertain future.

The fact that such conditions exist, however, should not be regarded in any quarter as invalidating the sound principle on which the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act rests. When international economic circumstances are more propitious, the task of making specific agreements can be resumed. Meanwhile Senator GREEN, himself a stanch advocate of the reciprocal system, has rendered a public service in asking for suspension of further effort toward new agreements. Tariff tinkering now simply does not make sense.

Fortified Villages of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial entitled "Fortified Villages of North Dakota." This appeared in the Washington Evening Star newspaper, August 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTIFIED VILLAGES OF NORTH DAKOTA

The Smithsonian Institution has announced that a party of archeologists under the leadership of G. Ellis Burcaw is excavating an earth lodge village site at the Garrison Reservoir in North Dakota. There were a fairly large number of such settlements in pre-Columbian times, and examination of them should add greatly to modern knowledge of the Indians of the Missouri Valley. The standard pattern of the communities was peculiar. Most of the villages were fortified. They also were encircled by water. In effect, they were moated.

This means that the men who designed and built them had engineering skill. Only rarely, if at all, did they take advantage of a natural island and rest content with the protection which the river itself afforded. They dug their own trenches. Further, they constructed stockades on packed earth walls for defensive purposes. In these fortifications they set up watchtowers at frequent intervals. The Smithsonian authorities say: "They are strikingly similar * * * to European fortified villages of the Middle Ages."

But the moat-surrounded villages of North Dakota likewise resemble far older devices. They have much in common with the stone circles of ancient Britain. Stonehenge stood—indeed still stands—above an encircling ditch which was made by human enterprise. The notion that it was a temple in prehistoric days is contradicted by the obvious evidence that it was intended to withstand siege. More probably it was a parliamentary center, a seat of government, subject to attack by enemies intending its capture and despoilment.

The same logic is manifest at Garrison Reservoir. Whatever tribe or nation created the earth lodge village now being uncovered there had property to guard, a civilization to preserve. To the best of its group-capacity it prepared to survive potential disaster. Five hundred or a thousand years later we are attempting the same defense of what is precious to us. But moats and stockades will not serve our need. We require a more dynamic system of security. Failing to achieve it, we must pass, as the North Dakota Indians did, and be merely a riddle for the archeologists of another age.

Molly Yard Wins Meade Apology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Molly Yard Wins Meade Apology," which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin of Wednesday, July 26, 1950, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOLLY YARD WINS MEADE APOLOGY—EX-CHAIRMAN RETRACTS CHARGE OF COMMUNISM

Mrs. Molly Yard Garrett has accepted a settlement of $1,000 out of court in her libel suit against William F. Meade and the Republican city committee for calling her a Communist.

She also won a public retraction from Meade, who as GOP city chairman made the charges during last fall's county election campaign.

The settlement was announced this afternoon in the offices of Abraham L. Freedman, Mrs. Garrett's attorney, in the Packard Building. Mrs. Garrett, who flew here from California for the settlement, was present.

STATEMENT BY MEADE

Meade's retraction, as released by Freedman said:

"During the 1949 political campaign for row offices in Philadelphia, I made certain statements on the radio regarding Molly Yard. I called her a Communist and this charge was rebroadcast on the radio and received wide publicity ir the press.

"I made the charge on the basis of information which I thought at the time was reliable. It now turns out that there was no evidence to justify the charge.

"I regret that in the heat of a political campaign I was led to make the charge. Since it was unfounded, I hope that all those who heard it will now learn of this, my public retraction."

WIFE OF TEACHER

Mrs. Garrett is the wife of Sylvester Garrett, who was chairman of the Third Regional War Labor Board here and now is a law professor at Stanford University.

She filed suit for $25,000 about two weeks after Meade made his charge in an attack on the Americans for Democratic Action, of which she was a founding member in this city. Meade said the ADA was Communist-infiltrated.

He referred to Mrs. Garrett as a bustling little Communist worker who got around.

Today, as she smilingly accepted the award, Mrs. Garrett said:

REPREHENSIBLE

"I undertook the unpleasant job of suing Meade because he had done a reprehensible thing.

"I feel very strongly that free elections following free discussion of public issues is the basic foundation of our democratic form of government. Meade debased the democratic process of free elections by making the fear-inspiring charge of communism.

"I feel the best answer to the whole thing was the election. And, boy, was I proud of the Northeast, where I helped do the organizing."

Belated Awakening—Is It Real?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is a real and apparent need for legislation to curb the activities of subversives in this country. For too long, until just recently, has the House Committee on Un-American Activities been the whipping boy for the self-styled liberals of this country. Too many people in too high places have referred to the efforts to root subversives out of the Government as "red herrings."

Three weeks ago 14 of my colleagues and I issued a joint statement in which we said:

Communists should be required to register at once, and the Government authorized to place restrictions upon their movements. Increased penalties for sabotage and espionage should be immediately enacted into law. It is folly of the highest order to draft Americans for combat against communism abroad and at the same time to permit Communists unlimited freedom of action at home.

Legislation should be enacted immediately by Congress which will insure adequate public knowledge of Communists and their activities.

The President has sent us a message on this subject which will perhaps now, at this late hour, cause administration leaders to bestir themselves. So far their efforts have definitely been on the "milk toast and water" side. They seem to want to make it appear that they are presenting a Mundt-Nixon bill without actually doing so. I doubt if the American people will be fooled. Certainly Ray Hansen, editor of the Daily Jefferson County Union, published at Fort Atkinson, Wis., has not been fooled, and neither has Wheeler McMiller, writing in the current issue of Pathfinder magazine. Their editorials are well worth reading:

OUR ANTI-ANTI-COMMUNISTS

It is no longer fashionable in some circles to be either outright anti-American or pro-Soviet. A new species is developing—an insidious species because it dwells in the shadow-gray between the forthright pro and con.

The anti-anti-Communists call witch-hunting and Red-baiting any attempts by serious Americans to safeguard strategic Government agencies from Communist infiltration. They make spectacular peace gestures, as if our country were guilty in any controversy, hot or cold. They believe our country should always give in on such issues as the blockade of Berlin, Russian boycott of the United Nations, Russian demands to seat Red China.

They consider anyone openly opposed to communism as lacking in objectivity or a little hysterical. They represent communism as a good idea gone wrong but a trend of the future.

They look upon the bright side, ignoring the oppressiveness, of the Soviet satellite regimes in Europe and the Far East. They play down the hostility of such regimes to the United States. Their influence is to be reckoned with. Not being outright pros and cons, they are well protected by their enmeshment of fallacy and half-truth. Their viewpoint is entrenched in some very respectable places. Republicans believe it is always fashionable to be an American.

UNWASHED POLITICS

(By Wheeler McMillen)

The common sense of Americans has long recognized that every Communist inside the United States contemplates treason. At every opportunity the people have expressed their alarm at the Government's softness toward these agents of alien interests.

Public pressure has built increasing support for the Mundt-Ferguson bill. Developed over a period of 2 years, the Mundt-Ferguson bill supplies the Government with adequate powers to identify and restrain those guilty of espionage and anti-American activities and to punish those found guilty. It gives the Federal Bureau of Investigation a legal basis for dealing with Communists. Senator FERGUSON, an outstanding lawyer, has taken pains to make certain that the purposes may be attained without violating constitutional rights of citizens.

Several weeks ago, when it was becoming clear that the people were demanding this measure, the Senate's Democratic policy committee considered it. Their decision was that to permit so important and popular a bill to be enacted with Republican Senators' names on it would be bad politics. Upon hearing of this decision, Senator MUNDT and Senator FERGUSON offered to withdraw their names and to permit Democratic Senators to sponsor the legislation. This offer was spurned, perhaps as not being sufficiently deceptive.

Last week the President demanded legislation to bring the internal activities of hostile spies under control. In no important detail did he call for accomplishing anything not covered in the Mundt-Ferguson bill. Some generalities on civil rights were set forth, though most persons consider such rights fully protected in the bill already before the Senate.

In other words, the President has been pushed by public opinion into acknowledging that Communist agents must be watched and made punishable. He admits that stronger legislation must be adopted. But he wants it passed under a Democratic label. Few will be deceived by this maneuver. The public will recognize in it a familiar brand of unwashed politics.

Some gratification, however, may be derived from the fact that the same President who called the Alger Hiss affair a "Red herring" now admits that many of these queer fish are actually dangerous snakes in the American grass. The recognition comes late, however, to an administration that has tolerated Communists and their left-wing assistants in the Government itself.

One must expect, even in times of crisis, that men in political office will play a certain amount of politics. The people have a right to expect, nevertheless, that occasionally a man in high office will rise above politics.

For political gain, the Truman administration and its predecessor have appeased the left-wing elements in the country. They have been too kind to Communists, and to those who have played the Communist tunes.

This is not a left-wing country. Despite confusion and faltering by parts of the public when deceived by unscrupulous leaders, the great majority wants to preserve the American fundamentals of individual freedom and personal responsibility. Yet, because enough have been confused by the strident leftish voices, it has been politically profitable to cater to the confused groups. Both parties have been guilty.

The primary elections this summer have booted a fair number of the leftish Members of Congress into retirement. Perhaps these events will signal the preference of most people for plain Americans. Voters will have another chance at the Congressional elections in November to say that they do not want either safety of the Nation or the integrity of American principles subjected to cheap political treatment.

What party designation is attached to a law to bring treasonable communism under control makes little difference. When the Nation needs fighters to risk their lives, no one asks the boys who are being drafted what party they belong to.

United Nations Watchdog Commissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, one of the most sensible and timely editorials I have read in a long while appeared in the Bismarck Tribune, published at Bismarck, N. Dak., under date of August 15, 1950. The editorial is entitled "Watchdogs To Spot Aggressor."

I take particular pleasure in asking for its insertion in the RECORD since it is written by my former administrative assistant, John O. Hjelle, who is now editor of the Bismarck Tribune.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATCHDOGS TO SPOT AGGRESSOR

The United Nations could wisely adopt a proposal by a church group that watchdog commissions be placed in trouble spots all around the world.

The suggestion comes from the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs. Its leadership includes John Foster Dulles, Republican adviser to the State Department; Francis B. Sayre, United States delegate to the UN Trusteeship Council; Arnold Toynbee, British historian; Charles Malik, Lebanon minister to the United States, and several other prominent figures.

It's perhaps doubtful whether such watchdog commissions would act, as the group declares, as a "deterrent to aggression and a third world war." After all, a UN observer commission was in Korea June 24 and before, but it didn't stop the North Koreans from marching.

But such commissions can perform one vital service: carefully assessing the political and military situation in each of the critical areas, and establishing the truth about aggression if and when it occurs.

We need only listen to the prattling of Russia's representative on the UN Security Council, Jacob Malik, to realize that any aggressive move anywhere by Russia or her satellites will be twisted into a peaceful gesture if the world's observers are not there to prove otherwise.

According to Moscow's version, it was the South Koreans who started things in Korea. The North Koreans are merely counter-attacking. And of course the United States, too, is held to be guilty of aggression against the Korean people.

But thanks to the UN Korean Commission, the world knows exactly what the facts were when the invasion began. By that date, the North Koreans already had sliced across the thirty-eighth parallel bordering South Korea at several points. These salients, designed to give the northerners tactical advantage, were never wiped out by the defenders.

Furthermore, authenticated reports made clear that the North Koreans were massing men and armor and were clearing civilians out of the border zones from which an attack would be launched.

In contrast, the South Korean constabulary army was doing little or nothing. Not only was it not deploying for an assault, it wasn't even placing itself wisely for defense. More than that, as we now know all too well, it wasn't equipped for more than internal police action.

All these facts are documented and in the UN's hands because a commission was on the scene to establish them quickly. The information actually was in the UN's possession when the Security Council met to try to end the aggression.

Russia being what it is, we will get this same fantastic inversion of the truth everywhere she threatens. Perhaps many millions of westerners, including Americans, have long since discounted anything the Soviet propagandists say. But we have to remember that in Asia and some other places the west is trusted little more than the Russians.

So it's important to unity of world action against aggression that the real facts be known to all nations beyond any shadow of doubt. Let's put watchdogs in Indochina, Malaya, Iran, Turkey, Yugoslavia, and Germany.

Refugees: Pawn of German Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, Americans have always shown sympathy for the problems and sufferings of the refugees and the homeless. This sympathy has gone out to all peoples regardless of national origin.

For the past 5 years, tremendous efforts have been made by the United States to alleviate the lot of these homeless people and rightly so, too. But must the problem of the German expellees who became refugees in western Germany become a political football?

Evidence available shows that the German authorities not only exaggerated the figures regarding the number of their refugees but that they have also been trying to make political capital of their expellee problem.

According to the London Economist, the unemployment situation in Germany is being exploited by the Germans "as a political lever against the Western Powers." The Economist goes so far as to say that the Bonn government "does not object to having a pool of unemployment at present."

I submit that it is in the American tradition to do our best to help these refugees, but that we have a right to expect the Germans to make every effort to help themselves. In a recent article published by the Society for the Prevention of world war III, dealing with the agricultural problem in Germany, it was pointed out that the proper land reform could go a long way not only toward the resettling of refugee Germans, but also toward solving the German food situation. It is patently clear that had the land reform, as originally planned by the Allied authorities, been carried out by the Germans, about 2,000,000 German expellees could have been resettled and taken care of.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Germans should not be encouraged to play power politics with human misery. That this has been the case is amply demonstrated in the article published in the magazine, Prevent World War III, summer issue, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, 515 Madison Avenue, New York City, entitled "Refugees: Pawn of German Politics." The article follows:

REFUGEES: PAWN OF GERMAN POLITICS

Ever since the end of the war, the Germans have displayed a singular talent as propagandists. To some extent, their present success can be traced back to the falling out among the victorious Allies. In addition, it should be borne in mind that the Goebbels school of propaganda has made a deep imprint on German methods in dealing with their neighbors.

It will be recalled that immediately following the cessation of hostilities, a great hue and cry went up about the starving Germans. The noise was intended to drown out the pleas of those who were starving in the lands ravaged by the German war machine. The food-for-Germany campaign built on a tissue of distortion and half truths, cracked the common front of the Allied peoples and was the wedge through which the deliberate undermining of Allied power was initiated. Since then, the Germans have continued their tactic of grabbing on to an issue and exploiting it for all that it is worth. In 1945 it was food. In 1947 it was reparations. Today it appears to be the refugee problem.

The refugee problem is being played up by the Germans in every possible way. It is being used to assault every remaining safeguard against the resurgence of pan-Germanism and neo-nazism. It is employed as a weapon to discredit and injure Allied prestige. It is manipulated as a lightning rod to shift the responsibility of the present unemployment situation in Germany onto the backs of the Allied Powers; and last but certainly not least, the refugee problem is utilized to bolster Germany's case for the rebuilding of her industrial might far above prewar levels. It is, therefore, a very potent and dangerous weapon which can easily fool the gullible and pervert whatever needs to be done to resolve the problem of the refugees in western Germany.

Recently the London Economist published a penetrating article in the German refugee problem and its relation to unemployment in Germany. In speaking about the number of refugees in western Germany, the Economist revealed that:

"Varied and exaggerated figures regarding the number of expelled Germans are bandied about in public speeches. In the rather more objective columns of the official statistical returns, the total is given as 7,750,000. Guesswork places the number who have come from Soviet Germany as 1,000,000. The total population is said to have risen from 39,300,000 in 1936 to 47,700,000 today. There has, however, been no census since 1946."

Thus, the Germans are not only confusing the picture by exaggerations and guesswork designed for political purposes, but there has been no official counting of the population in western Germany for the last 4 years. Therefore, how can we talk intelligently about a problem which has been turned into a political football by the Germans?

From the evidence presented by the London Economist it appears that the Germans are not very anxious to get at the elemental facts.

On the contrary, they are building up the problem of the refugees as though it were the cause for every ill afflicting the Germans today. They have declared that the refugees are creating unemployment, and have blamed the Allied Powers. But as the London Economist declares, the unemployment situation is being used by the Germans as a political lever against the western powers. For these reasons, German statistical assertions are likely to be unreliable.

Undoubtedly there is a refugee problem in western Germany. It is also true that unemployment has been increased by the influx of these Germans from the East. But are the German bigwigs really and truly anxious to tackle it? Let the facts speak for themselves.

It is well-known that hundreds of thousands of these refugees are efficient farmers but they are landless because the German officials have sabotaged all land reforms with the tacit approval and in some cases active collaboration of the Allied authorities.

In the United States zone alone, 1,235,000 acres are owned by 700 individuals and organizations. This huge territory was supposed to be broken up under the land reform law passed more than 3 years ago. But as of April 1949, only 71,000 acres were redistributed.

But that is not all. In the spring of this year the Allies abandoned all direct intervention in land reform and turned the entire program over to the Germans. The land reform law was originally intended to make room for German refugees, rationalize agricultural production and diminish the economic and political power of the landed nobility in the West. It was estimated that 2,000,000 German refugees could be resettled and taken care of economically on the available lands. Now the program is turned over to the very same people who have in the first place blocked its implementation since 1946.

The importance of land to these German refugees is not exaggerated. Indeed, when it was announced that the Allies had given up this program, many of these refugees announced that they would take matters in their own hands. One group wired John J. McCloy that they were considering the seizure of farm land without authority and added, "Don't force us to follow the example of the Italian agricultural workers."

If the German officials were so anxious to help these refugees, they would see to it that German agriculture was democratized. The London Economist however, reveals that the Germans are not very anxious to help their brothers from the east. They weep for them in public but privately they have uttered contempt for them.

This is also indirectly implied by Mr. Guy J. Swope, Chief of the Displaced Population Division in the Office of the American High Commissioner. Writing in the March 1950 issue of Information Bulletin, published by the High Commissioner's office, Mr. Swope noted that:

"If the German leadership resolutely took the position that the refugees, who are, it must be remembered, of German blood, and therefore should be easily assimilable on that score, can be converted into a strong asset through establishing conditions under which they can add to the German production, it would be an indication of sound and sensible planning."

The Bonn politicians have other ideas. They regard these refugees as pawns in their long range policies which have nothing in common with security or a peacetime German economy. But why do Allied officials continue to play along?

Speaking about the unemployment situation in Germany which is supposed to be aggravated by the refugees, the London Economist declares that the Bonn Government "does not object to having a pool of unemployment at present. * * *" Why? Because this pool keeps wages low and therefore enables German exporters to undercut competition on the world market. German industrialists are not enthusiastic about creating new jobs because, according to the London Economist, home industries "reduce the volume of credit available for financing the present boom in imports and trade in consumer goods."

On the other hand, the Bonn Government argues that to employ these refugees and hundreds of thousands of other unemployed would endanger the currency. Why? Because as the London Economist says, "If the unemployed were given jobs * * * they would spend more."

A pool of unemployment increased by the refusal to solve the German refugee problem is viewed by the Germans as a very effective economic weapon against their competitors. Furthermore, these refugees are regarded by the Bonn Government as reliable reserves for future eventualities. The character of many of these German refugees is described by the London Economist as follows: "The worst factors are rather that the refugees became penniless and that many of them are

officials of the Nazi state or party and dispossessed farmers for whom no jobs can be found. These are the men who represent a dangerous hotbed of nationalist ideas."

The refugee problem and unemployment in Germany cannot be attributed to the disinterestedness of the Allies who have poured billions into Germany since the end of the war. It is true that we have failed to take firm action and have allowed the Germans to block every decent program to alleviate the distress.

But the facts also show that the Germans have no intention of solving this problem. Just as they engineered inflation after World War II to avoid reparations payments, so they are now employing the refugee and unemployment situation as an economic and political instrument to extort more and more concessions from the American taxpayer.

Marion Donhoff, political editor of the German newspaper, Die Zeit, writing in Foreign Affairs, April 1950, gives a frank estimate of the extortion which may be expected. Miss Donhoff calculated that if these unemployed, including the German refugees, were put to work, "about $2,000 must be invested in order to employ one worker productively."

Multiply $2,000 by her own estimate of 9,000,000 refugees and it becomes clear that the Germans are waiting for a couple of more billion dollars to add to the jackpot they have already extracted from the United States Treasury. This is how the refugee and unemployment problem is shaping up in Germany today.

The American taxpayers would be more than justified in insisting that no more funds be handed over to the Germans until there is a proper allied accounting of what the Germans have done to date on their own. The aid we have given Germany is unprecedented in the annals of history. We have handed over billions to a former enemy who ravaged a substantial part of the continent of Europe and who would have destroyed us too if they could.

We have given those billions as though the taxpayers were obliged to do so without auditing Germany's reserves to find what they themselves could achieve without handouts from abroad.

No other country in the world has received such a blank check from the United States. How long will the American taxpayers be willing to put up with this scandal?

American Medical Association Called To Task for Killing Bill To Help Medical Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, as most of you know, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recently tabled Federal aid to medical education legislation. I have repeatedly emphasized the importance of that legislation. Now that the bill has been scuttled by the blind, stubborn, selfish opposition of the American Medical Association, a good many others are beginning to understand just how important Federal aid to medical education is to our national health and security.

I attach two important pieces of evidence, both from distinguished, independent newspapers. The first is an article from the New York Times of August 20 in which Brig. Gen. James S. Simmons, retired, dean of the Harvard University School of Public Health, is reported as protesting the tabling action as a tragic mistake. I call to your special attention this paragraph from his telegram to President Truman:

I am confident that if the American people realized what a crippling blow this negative action has dealt to the Nation's military and civil preparedness program they would demand that the tragic mistake be rectified. Health of American fighting men and industrial workers must be conserved by a strong national program of public health and military preventative medicine to guard against diseases as deadly and disabling as bombs and bullets.

The second is an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of August 19, which concludes significantly:

If the AMA stubbornly keeps trying to sit on the lid, there is bound to be an explosion.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times of August 20, 1950]

MEDICAL BILL LOSS IS TERMED TRAGIC—HARVARD HEALTH SCHOOL HEAD TELLS TRUMAN HOUSE UNIT'S ACTION HURTS DEFENSE

BOSTON, August 19.—President Truman today was told that the House Commerce Committee's tabling of the bill for Federal aid to medical and public health schools has dealt a crippling blow to the preparedness program.

In a telegram to the President, Brig. Gen. James S. Simmons, retired, dean of the Harvard University School of Public Health, termed the action "a tragic mistake." General Simmons was Chief of Preventive Medicine for the Army during World War II and is president of the Association of Schools of Public Health.

He said the bill is endorsed by the deans of all 10 accredited schools of public health in this country and by about 75 percent of the deans of medical schools.

AMA IS BLAMED

Proponents of the measure blame opposition of the American Medical Association for failure to pass the bill. The bill sponsored by Representative ANDREW BIEMILLER, Democrat of Wisconsin, would provide $250,000,000 in Federal funds to pay student tuition and to expand training facilities of schools of medicine, public health, dentistry, and nursing.

It was passed by the Senate and the President has termed it "the most vital health legislation before Congress." President Truman insisted on action after the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had deferred the bill. It was reviewed by the committee, which tabled it August 16 by a 9 to 8 vote.

The 10 accredited public health schools urging the bill are at Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, Columbia, University of North Carolina, University of Michigan, University of California, University of Minnesota, Tulane University, and University of Puerto Rico.

In his telegram to the President, General Simmons said:

"The shocking news that the House Commerce Committee has tabled the bill for Federal aid to medical and public-health schools moves me as president of the Association of Schools of Public Health to appeal directly to you.

"I am confident that if the American people realized what a crippling blow this negative action has dealt to the Nation's military and civil preparedness program they would demand that the tragic mistake be rectified. Health of American fighting men and industrial workers must be conserved by a strong national program of public health and military preventative medicine to guard against diseases as deadly and disabling as bombs and bullets.

CITES NEEDS OF SPECIALISTS

Many highly trained specialists will be required. Their postgraduate training is available only in the 10 accredited schools of public health in this country. The financial plight of the 10 schools is such that their total output of specialists is now only one-fifth of the number needed to operate the Nation's peacetime health program. Surely the Korean crisis and threat of another global war must make it evident to all that an already critical situation has now become more perilous.

Without added funds the schools are helpless to fulfill their obligation to the Nation. It is obvious that they need emergency financial aid. This is the kind of aid that would be provided by the Federal aid to medical education bill already passed by the Senate and now tabled in the House Committee.

I am convinced that one of the most important responsibilities now facing the Congress and the country is to act immediately to insure the training of an adequate and continuing supply of experts in the prevention of disease and conservation of health among our workers and military forces.

It is my earnest belief that the need for swift passage of the bill for Federal aid to medical education is imperative. Its cost compared to enormous outlays necessary for armaments is relatively minor, yet the need it would serve is of major importance to the maintenance of our national strength.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of August 19, 1950]

DEANS JAB AT THE AMA

For a long time the American Medical Association has been denying that there is any real doctor shortage in the United States. The AMA jumped on anyone, medical men included, who dared say that there was such a shortage.

The AMA has come up with its own figures which are supposed to provide that there is an ample supply of doctors and that medical schools are providing all the necessary replacements. On that premise, the AMA has been steadfastly opposing the Biemiller bill to extend Federal aid to medical schools so that they can train more physicians.

Deans of leading medical schools, who should know something about the real demand and supply situation, met in Washington the other day and swung some real "haymakers" at the AMA. The deans are convinced that there is a critical doctor shortage, more acute as many physicians are called again for military service.

The deans believe that the medical schools must be allowed to train more doctors. Because medical education is so expensive, the deans look with much more favor, therefore, on Federal aid in providing for expansion of staff, plant, and student bodies.

Even the dean who is the chairman of the AMA committee on medical education, according to news dispatches, took a crack at the AMA for its attitude.

Whether the AMA wants to admit it or not, millions of people who want medical services believe that more doctors are needed, particularly in the poorer and more remote communities. Whether the AMA likes it or not, there is a growing public demand for the training of more doctors.

If the AMA stubbornly keeps trying to sit on the lid, there is bound to be an explosion.

Wanted: A Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, in the August 25 issue of United States News and World Report has written a thought-provoking editorial which I commend to the Members of this body:

WANTED: A MILITARY POLICY
(By David Lawrence)

The American people have been surprised at the setbacks in Korea—surprised at our lack of preparation. They have been, moreover, surprised at the seeming unawareness of our top planners or policy makers that the Pacific Ocean could be a trouble area where a sizable fleet in being should be stationed, together with marines ready for instant action.

We may go further and say that everyone throughout the world who has really studied military and naval history is likewise surprised. For the lessons of history have taught that it is not only necessary to have a mobile force in being but to have it stationed close to the area where hostilities may break out.

Back in 1887, Alfred Thayer Mahan, of the United States Navy—a great prophet—started lecturing and writing on naval strategy and the influence of sea power. He was for years unappreciated in his own country, but later was accepted in all countries as the foremost authority on world strategy. His books and lectures of a half-century ago read today as if they were written yesterday.

One principle that Mahan taught is that, to understand naval strategy, it is vital to study land strategy, and that, to understand military policy, it is essential to examine political policy. Significant, for example, is this passage from a 1909 lecture:

"In the Seven Years' War the strength of the British action lay in the fact that one great man, the elder Pitt, controlled the naval, military, and diplomatic factors. The several conditions were thus weighed, and were harmonized into a common action, to which all contributed their utmost influence in mutual support. The desirability of the result must fix our eyes upon the fact that in our country it will never be attained through one man, but only by the cooperation of several. Those several will be statesmen, military men, and naval men; and, in order that their cooperation may be adequate, each must understand the conditions by which the others are controlled. * * *

"The often failure of conjoint military and naval operations has been due less to mean jealousy than to lack of such mutual understanding; and for a due grasp of preparation for war, and for planning war, military men of both services need to be imbued with knowledge of international relations."

We thought in America that by establishing a National Security Council we were reaching for just such a unification of planning. We thought in setting up a Defense Department we were unifying the operations of the three armed services. But the Security Council has existed mostly on paper, being composed of officials preoccupied with other tasks. They rarely met. The Defense Department disregarded the lessons of history and the international factors that make it desirable to have a Navy in being and an Army in being, as well as an Air Force in being.

For the United States today has no fleet. This is the first time since the Republic was founded that we have virtually abolished the fleet in being—and this at a time when global responsibilities impose upon us problems of transportation as well as the need for adequate seapower on the seven seas.

Who abolished the fleet in being? Who abolished the Army in being? Who told Congress it could fight wars cheaply with an Air Force in being—a few intercontinental bombers carrying the atom bomb? These decisions stemmed from misguided policy makers and their organs of publicity controlled and directed by our own Defense Department. These blunders have unwittingly brought us to the brink of disaster.

Small wonder that the Nation would like to see new faces in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Small wonder that the Nation looks askance at President Truman's unexplained failure to set up the National Security Council on a proper basis until the Korean war.

Small wonder that the American people feel so helpless and frustrated now as they look back at the spectacle of selfish politicians giving casual attention to defense problems and concentrating on domestic issues of far less importance to our ultimate survival. Nobody can say there was no warning. The testimony before the House Armed Services Committee in 1949 foretold the tragedy of 1950.

We need now what we have lacked—a national military policy. We cannot depend on the United Nations alone, for it is a loose federation of governments with conflicting interests. We cannot depend on air power or atom bombs alone. We must have armies with armored divisions and tactical aviation of their own. We must have a fleet in being—big enough to care for contingencies in both the Pacific and the Atlantic as well as in the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf.

We must apply the draft law so that we can have a standing supply of manpower for all services and introduce military training as a supplement.

But, above all, we must coordinate our diplomatic policies with our military preparation. It is time to recognize the lessons of history.

Communism Versus Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a very timely radio address by the Reverend Clay A. Cooper, Spokane's radio pastor.

Reverend Cooper is one of a group who feels that we should have a day of prayer for victory over communism here in the Nation's Capital. Certainly the facts pointed out in Reverend Cooper's radio address are very much to the point. If we are ever to win this world-wide fight with communism, we must recognize that the ethics and morals which have made this Nation great are founded in Christianity.

COMMUNISM VERSUS CHRISTIANITY

"Communists in every country have only one flag, that is the Red flag," states Mr. William Foster, No. 1 American Communist. The hammer and sickle insignia knows no national boundaries. It is the rallying banner for the foreign-flavored, materialistic atheism which is sweeping across the world. It is the ensign of the anti-God, anti-Christ, anti-Christian, anti-Bible, anti-morals, antihome band of ruthless, international brigands who seek primarily the overthrow of the Christian and the democratic way of life.

"Religion is an opiate of the people," avers the Christless Kremlin crowd, "and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices." The church of Christ in general, and the believer in Christ in particular must be annihilated. The Calvary, blood-stained banner must be hauled down from the masthead as the emblem of Communism continues to unfurl. There you have in a nutshell the philosophy and the aims of the giant Red octopus whose deadly tentacles in less than a generation, have encircled the globe.

Christianity and communism, each diametrically opposed to the other, are making a bid for a world of individuals. One is divine, the other is demonic. The first sets forth the dignity of the individual, the other holds that man is a vassal of the state. One preaches the sanctity of the home, the other maintains "the hallowed corelationship of parent and child is 'claptrap' and disgusting." Family loyalties must be abolished and children "transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labor." The former teaches the immortality of the soul, the fact of God, the Saviourhood of Christ, the authenticity of the Bible—the latter cries out against the "treacherous influences of such myths and illusions." One stands for morality, the other boasts, "we expose all fables about morality." One proclaims spiritual regeneration and forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ's atoning death, the other counters, "a change of heart is but the substitution of one set of illusions for another." One advocates respect for the Lord's day and the Lord's house, the other disregards Sundays and warns that "people who get married in church or maintain religious beliefs will either soon get rid of them or be put out of the party." One dates its time (A. D., Anno Domini) the year of our Lord, the calendar of the other starts with the Red revolution. The salute of the one is a bent knee and of the other a clenched first raised heavenward. The one worshipfully sings, "The light of the world is Jesus," the other blatantly blasphemes in parody, "The blight of the world is Jesus." Says J. Edgar Hoover, "The Godless, truthless way of life that Communists would force on America can mean only tryranny and oppression if they succeed. It is a movement of terror, debauchery, corruption, and barbarity."

The choice of the individual is the casting of the die. As go individuals, so go nations and so goes the world. The choice is just as real and just as personal as when Pilate faced the dilemma of choosing between Christ and Barabbas. Fate hung in the balance. The most eventful question of his life was (as is ours), "What shall I do with Jesus?" Failure on the part of any person to radically ally himself to Jesus Christ is to automatically takes sides with mankind's enemy number one. No honest person can be neutral. Businessmen, to whom merchandise alone has meaning; legislators primarily concerned with social security, wages, and hours; industrialists who eat, sleep, and drink iron, steel, uranium, stocks, and bonds; these all are unconsciously falling into the trap of Red materialism and are helping set the stage philosophically, psychologically for a communstic coup in this Nation.

It's high time we get back to the faith of our fathers, to the God of our mothers, and to the Saviour-Christ-Redeemer of the

old-fashioned home with prayer at its family altar, worship in its family pew, grace at its family table, and a Christian atmosphere around its family fireside. Spiritual values must be restored if we are to survive the horrible monstrosity of materialism of the twentieth century. "Christ or Communism" is no mere rabble-rousing couplet. He is the individual's only Saviour, and in consequence, America's and the world's only hope.

Address of Hon. John M. Vorys, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected Members of this House, a most constructive member of the minority and a leader in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is my Ohio colleague JOHN VORYS, who has ably represented the Twelfth District these many years.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include therein a speech made by him before the State convention of the Minnesota Young Republican League on May 20, 1950:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. VORYS, OF OHIO, BEFORE STATE CONVENTION OF MINNESOTA YOUNG REPUBLICAN LEAGUE

Fellow taxpayers, I appreciate the opportunity of taking part in your convention. I have heard of the aggressive and progressive Young Republican League of Minnesota, of your enthusiasm and your clear thinking. Coming as I do from the weary, dreary, and confused atmosphere of Fair Deal Washington, my visit here is an inspiration to me, and I realize I shall take from this meeting more than I can possibly give to it.

Minneapolis, however, is a long way from Washington. I came here because I was asked by your Congressman, Honorable WALTER H. JUDD, my great friend, and a statesman of national and international stature. His farseeing statesmanship for Asia has had great support among the people and in Congress, and failure to follow the course he urged has resulted in the disaster he foretold.

In Congress, WALTER JUDD occupies a unique position of distinction. A profound student, an effective speaker, high minded, and hard working in committee and on the floor, a fearless fighter for high Republican principles, he is a tower of strength to our party, but nevertheless commands the respect and affection of both parties. He is now on an important international mission at Geneva, appointed by this administration. In announcing this appointment, Judge KEE, the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, said of Dr. JUDD, author of the original World Health Organization law, "The selection of Dr. JUDD to serve as a congressional adviser at the Third World Health Assembly is of particular advantage to the United States because in addition to being thoroughly familiar with the objectives of the organization, he brings to this assignment an outstanding background of combined legislative and medical experience."

I come from Washington to talk to you with a deep sense of humility. As I think about what is going on there, I realize the older generation has made sort of a mess of things.

THE NEED FOR TWO-PARTY GOVERNMENT

One thing is clear: Two party government is necessary to protect the freedom of the individual all over the world. One party government will not do it and having a lot of parties will not work. Effective opposition to power is necessary to prevent the abuse of power.

The trend in this country under the Democratic Party is toward one-party government. They have it in the South, and in their great city strongholds in the North. They have been in power in the national administration longer than any party in our history. They like this and will never get out voluntarily. They must be thrown out by the voters or they will stay in power forever.

WHAT IS A POLITICAL PARTY?

The Communist Party all over the world is an exclusive minority organization with limited membership and strict discipline. In this country the two historic parties are voluntary organizations of free people. They are inclusive, rather than exclusive. Since our system is based on majority rule, both parties are constantly seeking more members and seeking the votes of nonmembers.

You cannot always tell what a party is by what it officially says about itself. Henry Wallace's party, early in 1948, adopted the slogan "Peace and prosperity." Both the Republicans and the Democrats came along later and said, "Me, too, but we can do it better." At present, the most promising party is the Democratic Party; they promise anything and everything, to anybody and everybody. In President Truman's speeches on his nonpolitical trip across the country, he promised everything for everybody, then wound up in Chicago by daring the Republicans to come out for something he hadn't promised. He said, "They can't be against everything." What the people need to realize is that the Fair Deal can't be for everything.

They not only promise everything; they take credit for everything. The President in his Chicago speech painted a picture of the present temporary prosperity of the country and, of course, took complete credit for it. Then he gave a long list of the police state measures he has advocated since the fall of 1945, which have not been enacted and which he wants to use as a campaign platform for the Eighty-second Congress next fall. The plain facts are that the country's present prosperity was achieved without these measures and because of, not in spite of, the obstruction of these measures by the Republicans and a few Democrats.

Thus we find the Democrats proclaiming, in addition to whatever else they proclaim, that they seek the same goals that the Republicans seek, a higher standard of living, greater freedom for the individual, and expanding private enterprise. In view of some of the other things they stand for, they either don't understand it or don't mean it when they say these things, but it is a tribute to the fundamental unity of the American people that their political parties make similar claims in seeking their support. In weighing the validity of party promises, the American people, however, will have to be smart; they will have to remember that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; they will need to bear in mind that President Truman follows Lincoln two-thirds of the way and then stops. Truman says you can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, and that is all the Fair Deal needs to win an election.

BIPARTISANSHIP

We have in action, however, a number of bipartisan policies. For instance, reclamation is a bipartisan policy founded by Republicans, in spite of the President's attempt to appropriate it as he rededicated projects through the West. The National Science Foundation bill was a bipartisan product. The increase in the minimum wage to 75 cents, the public-housing program, and the hospital-construction program were put through the Eighty-first Congress because the Republican leadership supported them. Our present farm price support legislation had bipartisan support, although its maladministration is obviously the responsibility of the Executive.

We hear a good deal of talk about a bipartisan foreign policy, whether we have one or ought to have one. The Republican Eightieth Congress passed the Greek-Turkish law, launched the ECA legislation, initiated the idea of the Atlantic Pact, and passed laws strengthening our support of the United Nations. These have been bipartisan foreign policies. The shameful agreements at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and the disastrous China defeat, which have resulted in placing over half a billion of the people of the world under the Soviets, and which have made the cold war what it is, are strictly Democratic policies. Republicans had no part in their inception and have no responsibility for their failure. We have had a bipartisan China policy on Capitol Hill since 1947, and it is written into law in the China Aid Act of 1948, largely through the work of your Congressman JUDD, and that act is still the law, but it has not been carried out by the Executive. Instead, it has been evaded and misconstrued and action delayed by those charged with making it effective.

We need a world-wide review and reform of our foreign policy. We need unity, but in this perilous period between peace and war, it is more important for our country to be right than to be united. History is strewn with the wrecks of nations whose people were united in the wrong course. In order to have a bipartisan foreign policy on which we can safely unite, we will need reform in some policies and politics here at home. Politics must stop at the water's edge, not only in the spring when bills are on Capitol Hill, but in the fall during presidential and congressional campaigns. This will require three things:

1. Bipartisan consultation before the policy is determined and the country committed;
2. Cooperation during the committee and floor consideration of legislation; and
3. Proper credit given both parties for the formulation and implementation of the policies.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PARTIES

In spite of apparent similarity in goals, in spite of bipartisan action on some of our foreign and domestic problems, there is a wide and real difference between the parties, based on principles, personalities, and practices. President Hoover said recently that the difference was based on a world-wide division of people between the right and the left. In this struggle we are on the right and in the right. Your Republican national and congressional committees have boiled these differences down to a 90-word program, as follows:

DIGEST OF STATEMENT OF REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES, FEBRUARY 6, 1950, SUPPLEMENTING 1948 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

The Republican Party stands for:

1. Reducing taxes.
2. Balancing budget.
3. Eliminating Government waste, especially along lines of Hoover Commission reports.
4. Fighting communism here instead of condoning it.
5. Providing fair market prices on farm products aided by price supports—cooperative

marketing, soil conservation, reclamation, rural electrification—no Brannan plan.

6. Continuing and improving Taft-Hartley law to protect public from excessive power of labor and management.

7. Developing an adequate social-security system that does not limit opportunity nor discourage initiative and saving.

8. Protecting rights of veterans and minorities.

9. Developing a united American foreign policy for peace—world trade without undermining American living standards.

10. Safeguarding liberty against socialism.

The New Jersey Republican convention adopted this as their creed: "America can be saved from Communists and bankruptcy. America's problems can be solved by her great people without loss of their liberties. We dedicate ourselves to this purpose."

Young Republicans are doubtless adopting a platform which presents your statement of this difference. I think the key to the difference between the parties now is this: The Democrats are in and want to stay in; they are the old party of the status quo; they are so far to the left that no further reform can come from that direction. Any shift to the left of the Fair Deal would be revolution, not reform. We, the Republicans, are now the party of reform; we stand for reform from the right. Reform is a job for young people. Here is where you come in—as Republican reformers.

REPUBLICAN REFORMS

Here are some of the reforms we should carry out:

1. We are for reform in bureaucracy. The creaking, sprawling machinery of the Federal Government, with its 1,815 separate agencies and 2,000,000 employees, must be overhauled and streamlined for modern efficiency, under the principles laid down by the Hoover Commission, created by the Republican Eightieth Congress. The bureaucrats are fighting a skillful rear-guard delaying action against these plans; the President gives lip service, but sends down to Congress one reorganization after another, to further his own pet political theories, while postponing the painful recommendations that will mean cutting the payroll. For efficiency in Government, Republicans are needed to carry out these Republican-sponsored reforms.

2. We are for reform in Federal spending. We know that deficit spending is causing inflation, constantly rising prices that no spiral of wage increases can keep up with very long. A 60-cent dollar robs those who work, and robs doubly those who try to live on saved-up dollars.

Here is what is happening. We have a budget of $43,000,000,000, a tax take of $37,000,000,000. But let's not talk of billions. Let's divide by 10,000,000. Suppose a family has an income of $3,700 a year, and wants to spend $4,300. Where will they get the $600? Why, they will borrow it. But suppose they already owe $25,600. What will happen when they try to borrow $600 this year, and next year, for running expenses? They will find out about family inflation in a hurry. Suppose they say "We only owe it to ourselves," and try to borrow from each other? How much will their I O U's be worth among themselves? Some of them will say "How are we going to pay ourselves back if we keep this up?"

President Truman talks about an average family income of $4,000 in 5 years. That will be easy under the present deficit spending system, but what will the $4,000 buy? In China just before their collapse, coolies were earning $4,000 a day. In Germany in 1923, a worker got a basket of marks for a day's work, but it took all of the marks to pay for the basket. We Republicans want an increase in family income that comes from increased production, not inflation, an increase that will buy something after the family gets it.

The President wants the Brannan plan to cost $5,000,000,000 more and socialized medicine to cost $6,000,000,000 on top of that. Where will that $11,000,000,000 come from? Why, from more borrowing or more taxes. Then he wants the Spence bill, to control prices, wages, everything—but remember, even in a dictatorship, inflation breeds controls, and controls breed more inflation.

The Fair Deal wants to raise taxes to soak the rich corporations. Well, generally speaking, they have to pass those taxes on or go out of business. That is why there is about a 20-percent tax load on everything you buy, in addition to the excise taxes on train rides, telephone calls, baby oils, etc.

We Republicans know that freedom to spend your own money and get value received for it is a very precious freedom. We know that the hand-out state is also the hand-in state. We want to lower taxes, cut the budget, cut the national debt. The only time this has happened for 20 years was under the Republican Eightieth Congress. We have learned this year that a minority of Republicans cannot do this in the face of a spending administration. We are for welfare programs, but they must be soundly financed. This Republic needs fiscal reform, spending reform, and it will take another Republican Congress to do it.

3. We are for labor-law reform. The Republican Party sponsored the Sherman anti-trust laws to regulate big business in the public interest. We believe that big unions and labor-management disputes should not be above the law, or outside the law, but should be regulated under law in the public interest.

4. We are for foreign-policy reform. I have spoken of this. Even though we develop a united bipartisan reformed foreign policy, those who execute it at home and abroad will need to be unswervingly loyal to our country and to its policies before we can win the peace.

"What about McCARTHY and his charges?" Here are my answers to the questions people are asking, "Why don't you Republicans make Senator McCARTHY be more tactful or more skillful or more quiet?"

The Republican Party is a voluntary organization, and no one has the right to make Senator McCARTHY do or say anything.

"What about Communists and fellow travelers in Government?"

We don't know. After the Hiss case, and the Amerasia case, and some other cases that were hushed up, clearance by people inside the administration doesn't mean much. A callous red-herring attitude toward such cases, calling McCARTHY an asset of the Kremlin, does not inspire confidence. This is still a hot issue. Where there was so much fire, there is bound to be smoke.

"Why don't you Republicans investigate and settle it?"

We are not in control of the investigating machinery on Capitol Hill or in the executive departments. The danger now is another Pearl Harbor whitewash which President Truman wound up by saying: "The country is as much to blame as any individual."

"Why do you do anything such an administration asks?"

We have got to help keep the Republic going, in a perilous period, based on the best information we can get from all sources, but what we need is reform in foreign policy and policy makers.

5. We are for moral reform. We have got to revive in the public conscience a capacity for moral indignation which has been lost. When our first citizen has publicly defended Tom Pendergast after his conviction, when his Department of Justice quietly lets the time go by to prosecute vote frauds and ballot stealing in Kansas City, when his official family accepts gifts from John Maragon, the friend of Harry Vaughan, in return for favors, when he publicly curses Vaughan's critics, when his Bureau of Internal Revenue makes contributions to Democratic political rallies tax-free—when these things can happen in America, there has been a moral let-down from the top down.

The people have grown cynical and indifferent, or perhaps they feel "The king can do no wrong." Last Sunday this Democratic ad appeared in a Chicago paper: "For the biggest Sunday of your life, see and hear Vice President BARKLEY." This caused Rev. H. R. Anderson, chaplain of the 1944 Democratic Convention, to thunder from his pulpit, "God gave us that day and told us to keep it holy—when the State becomes a god, morals go." He said, President Truman should "quit playing with the truth." We must lead in moral reform, in private conscience and public conduct.

In this Republic the people not only have to be smart to keep free; they have to be good to deserve to be free; they have to demand goodness from their public servants, to keep them from becoming their masters; the alternative to state control is self-control.

The good future for this Republic lies in the hands of the Republicans, and particularly you young Republicans. The struggle will be hard. The vested political interests are against us. Our own money, tax money, will be used against us, and crass appeals to mob selfishness. But no Patrick Henry ever said "Give me security or give me death." The vital issue is freedom—liberty under law. A dazzling future of unbelievable riches in human values, material and spiritual, lies ahead, if only we can behave ourselves, and lead. We must here highly resolve that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom. We must say to our Republic, "Reform—and forward march."

Report to the District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives I have made regular reports to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, which I represent. A weekly Letter from Washington is sent to the newspapers in the district and is regularly printed by more than 20 of them. During this term of Congress I have also participated in a discussion program which has been broadcast each week by most of the radio stations in the district. As I have done before at the conclusion of a term of Congress, I have prepared a summary or report on the Eighty-first Congress, including a statement of my own activities, which I now present to the House and which I shall circulate as widely as possible in the congressional district which I represent.

THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

This Congress has been controlled in both the House and the Senate by the same political party which controls the

executive branch of our Government. In the House of Representatives, with a total membership of 435, the Democratic Party has a majority of 90. That party names the chairmen of all committees and effectively controls the legislative program of the House. The program under these conditions is spelled out for Congress by the President in his State of the Union message—required by the Constitution—by his budget message, and by other messages sent to Congress from time to time.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

In his messages to Congress the President has urged continuation of our program of foreign aid at a high level. He has demanded the repeal of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1946—the Taft-Hartley law—the expansion of a socialized public-housing program, production payments to farmers—the Brannan farm plan—establish socialized medicine—compulsory health insurance—Federal aid to education, establish great and powerful valley authorities, and he asked for authority to build and operate steel mills. He also gave approval to the so-called Spence economic-control bill which was nothing more nor less than the old OPA. He urged that Congress make no deep cuts in spending. Then he submitted a budget asking for appropriations which would create a deficit of five billions or more per year.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

A majority of the Members of this Congress refused to approve more than a small part of the President's program which they thought pointed dangerously toward total Government control or what is generally called socialism. The so-called Brannan farm plan was rejected. The Taft-Hartley law was not repealed but the Administration succeeded in blocking the passage of needed amendments which were approved by labor. Socialized medicine was not considered. Aid to education became tangled up in committee. The Columbia Valley Authority bill was given only brief hearings in committee. The Spence economic-control bill and the request for authority to build Government-owned and operated steel mills were not considered.

Foreign aid was continued practically as requested, including world-wide aid to industry known as the point 4 program. Federal housing was approved in the first session, supposedly as an emergency measure to relieve the national shortage of houses, but no houses were built or even started during the first 12 months after the Housing Act was passed. Meanwhile people have built a record-breaking number of homes for themselves.

MISCELLANEOUS LEGISLATION

More than 12,000 different pieces of legislation, bills and resolutions, have been introduced in the Eighty-first Congress. Several hundred have come to the floor of the House for action.

As each bill, resolution, or motion is presented for consideration and action I study it carefully and vote as my best judgment dictates. I strive to vote for the good of the country and all the people, regardless of the threats or pleadings of special groups or interests which seek legislation favorable only to themselves.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY MESS

As the result of amazing military ability, production and financial strength displayed in World War II, the United States emerged as undisputed world leader. We became the hope, the rallying point and the strength of the free peoples of the world. We could have enforced peace on the earth. We could have enlarged the territorial boundaries of freedom.

Instead our President and our State Department committed us clandestinely to the unmoral contract known as the Yalta agreement. Later, as if the betrayal of freedom and our friends at Yalta were not enough our officials supinely stepped into the Potsdam agreement bear trap.

Directly and indirectly as the result of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements 600,000,000 people have lost what freedom they had and are now under the heel of the Russian Communist dictator. At the end of World War II the Russian Government controlled less than 200,000,000 people. Now it controls 800,000,000.

Instead of peace the blundering administration which controls the foreign policy of the United States, and so the destiny of all free people, has brought us again to war.

In voicing these harsh opinions of the manner in which the Truman administration has conducted the foreign policy of our country I do so with considerable knowledge of the record and the facts. I am convinced that future written history of the past 5 years will more than bear out the comments I make here.

KOREA

Whatever the outcome of present United Nations military operations in Korea—of which we are carrying almost the entire load—the action represents something positive and determined. We have shown the Russian Government and the free world that we will sacrifice and fight to prevent further Communist aggression against weak countries in accordance with our United Nations pledge. We have thus served notice that we will vacate no more seats in the Russian theater of world conquest. We will not back away when the Russian wants to move in. The Truman administration has been retreating from this decision for 5 years. The retreat has been horribly costly. It has multiplied the cost of stopping the march of Soviet dictatorship—if indeed we now have the power in the UN to stop it.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Eightieth Congress enacted the legislation creating the now famous Hoover Commission. Its purpose was to study the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Federal Government and make recommendations for reorganization to gain greater efficiency and economy. The report of the Commission and its recommendations came before the Eighty-first Congress early in 1949. Legislation authorizing the President to prepare and submit reorganization plans was promptly passed. This act provided that plans submitted to Congress become effective within 60 days unless disapproved by one House of Ccngress. It was specified that such disapproval must be voted by a majority of the total membership in either House.

The President has submitted a total of 35 reorganization plans. Of them nine have been disapproved. The remainder are in effect. Most of those plans rejected by Congress were plans which did not in fact carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Less than one-third of the improvement in the operation of the executive branch of the Government envisioned by the Hoover Commission report has been accomplished.

MY PERSONAL ACTIVITIES

The ensuing paragraphs of this report will detail some of my individual work as Representative in Congress of the Fourth District of Oregon.

APPROPRIATIONS

The Federal Government is engaged in many activities in the Fourth District. Ours is an area of great natural resources. More than one-half of our area is owned by the Federal Government. Funds are required to develop and protect these lands and resources. Our long coast line has several harbors requiring development and maintenance. Our rivers are available for recreation, power, and irrigation. I believe that the investment of Federal money in western Oregon not only creates additional wealth for all the people of the country, but many such appropriations, particularly those for forest roads, fire protection, power, and research are actually yielding cash returns to the Federal Treasury to an extent that will show a substantial profit from them in the years to come. I appear each year before the Appropriations Committee subcommittees and present information for their use in consideration of Federal expenditures to be made in Oregon. I am pleased to report that Oregon's needs have generally received fair and reasonable treatment.

FEDERAL ACTIVITIES IN DISTRICT

In addition to Federal Government activity which is State-wide in nature, such as forest-fire protection, pest control, research, and cooperation in highway building, certain specific activities and projects are in progress in each of the seven counties of the Fourth Congressional District.

In Linn County the Bureau of Mines laboratory is an important institution. The Willamette Valley flood-control project is of vital importance to Linn County with construction on the Detroit Dam going ahead rapidly. Other dams on the Santiam are in the planning stage.

In Lane County the Cottage Grove, Dorena, and Fern Ridge Dams of the Willamette Valley project have been completed and the Meridian or Lookout Point Dam is under construction. Funds have also been appropriated for the Amazon flood-control project in the

Eugene area. The alcohol plant at Springfield is an important wood-utilization project.

In Douglas County flood-control surveys are being made for all of the Umpqua watershed and flood-control work has been done on the lower Umpqua. The harbor project at the mouth of the Umpqua has had one portion brought almost to completion, and other work is planned. The Veterans' Administration hospital in Roseburg is operating to capacity, and I am hoping that an expansion of that facility will ultimately be approved.

The Coos Bay harbor project which will provide a 30-foot inner harbor channel with a depth of 40 feet on the bar, and which was authorized during my second term in Congress, is nearing completion. The harbor at Bandon has received attention and flood control work on the Coquille River has been surveyed and some work already completed. Bonneville power lines have been extended to the coastal areas of Lane, Coos, and Curry Counties.

In Josephine and Jackson Counties a comprehensive flood control, power, and irrigation survey has been completed and is awaiting final action by the Secretary of Interior. The fine Army hospital at Camp White near Medford has been converted into a permanent domiciliary home for veterans.

Most of the work mentioned has either been started or substantially carried forward during the time I have represented the Fourth Congressional District. I am especially pleased to be able to list the following recent developments for which I have been responsible insofar as the approval of the House of Representatives is concerned:

Willamette Valley flood control: During this Congress this project has received approximately $50,000,000.

Charleston Inlet: Authorization of this project provides for a protected moorage basin and a channel for small boats. Funds are now available for construction of this project this year.

Grants Pass irrigation district: Loan funds for building a permanent river crossing for the Northwest Unit Pipeline were secured last year.

Spruce budworm control: In recent years this pest has become perhaps the most serious threat to our forests. An emergency appropriation for fighting that pest by means of dusting from the air during the summer months of this year was passed early in this session.

Chetco River: A project providing for a small boat harbor by the construction of jetties and dredging has been authorized.

Rogue River: The Army engineers are completing a survey report on a proposed harbor development at the mouth of the Rogue River. I have also requested the development of a project for providing a 3-foot boat channel from the mouth of the Rogue to Agness.

BONNEVILLE POWER LINES

The passage by the House of my motion to restore appropriations for Bonneville power lines in an appropriations bill after they had been stricken from the bill by House conferees was a pleasing personal victory in a floor battle. My motion was opposed by the entire Appropriations Committee but carried by a roll call vote of 182 to 186. Since that time obtaining appropriations for the completion of the Bonneville system have not been so difficult to obtain. The result of that successful effort was the extension of high power transmission lines from Eugene to the coast, down the coast to Coos Bay and ultimately on south through Curry County.

MINING AND MINERAL DEVELOPMENT

Mining is a very important industry in the Northwest and is far more important in the Fourth Congressional District than most people realize. Nearly 3,000,000 acres of land are now available for mineral entry and exploration with the passage of my bill early in this Congress which opened the O. & C. land-grant lands to prospecting and mining.

I am proud to have had a very active part in the establishment of the great electrometallurgical laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Albany. I have continued to support the passage of appropriations necessary to its operation. The laboratory not only does analysis work and performs other services vital to the prospectors and miners but is engaged in some research projects important to national defense.

It is worth noting, I think, that a large-scale pilot plant at the Albany laboratory is actually manufacturing an important rare metal for the Atomic Energy Commission. The saving to the Government as the result of obtaining this needed metal from the laboratory will ultimately amount to more than the cost of operating the institution.

FORESTRY

The first speech I made in the House was during World War II, and was made for the purpose of informing the Congress that alcohol, a scarce commodity much needed for war, could be obtained from sawdust and other wood waste. Finally, I was able to attract so much attention to the idea that the War Production Board built a plant at Springfield to produce alcohol from sawdust. The plant was not completed in time to produce for that war. It is now being operated, however, and will doubtless soon begin to serve the purpose for which the Government built it.

At my request the Granger subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture recently held hearings on the bill to authorize appropriations for access forest roads. I have repeatedly urged action on this bill. I testified at some length in calling the attention of the committee to the need for an adequate access road program to carry out a proper forest conservation and sustained yield program.

As a matter of fact, I have appeared numerous times before Appropriations Subcommittees urging adequate forest road money and adequate fire protection and pest-control funds.

CAMP WHITE HOSPITAL

When the Veterans' Administration definitely refused to make use of the splendid Army hospital at Camp White—near Medford—I introduced a bill in the House to direct the VA to use the hospital as a domiciliary center. The bill was incorporated with a similar Senate bill which included a hospital in Iowa. The bill was passed and the Camp White Domiciliary Center is in operation. The occupancy of that facility should be increased from 500 to 1,000 members. I am endeavoring to have that done, and am hopeful that the increase will be made in the near future because the additional beds are badly needed by veterans who are in need of domiciliary care.

FREIGHT-CAR SHORTAGE

The whole country is now suffering from one of the most severe car shortages ever experienced in railroad history. A car shortage is nothing new in our area. I am well aware of the fact that periods of car shortage have been doing serious damage to employment and industry in Oregon for many years.

Since the disastrous shortage in 1948 I have been working on this problem but the truth is that the Government does not now actually have much power to prevent a car shortage. In January of this year I succeeded in prevailing upon the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hold hearings on the problem. This was done, with the result that the committee heard the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and others state that the total number of cars owned by the railroads is not enough to meet the peak or emergency transportation needs of the country.

The Bureau of Service of the ICC has the power to order railroads to improve their service. I appealed to the ICC and the Bureau only to learn that it did not have inspectors and other manpower enough to do the job. This meant they need more money so I then appealed to the Appropriations Committee to provide necessary funds.

We have been plagued by the car-shortage problem for 40 years. It must be solved permanently. Accordingly I have introduced a bill in Congress which when passed will permit the Government to build and own a small fleet of freight cars. These cars can be fed into the transportation system by the ICC only for emergency relief. When so assigned to the railroads they will pay rent for the use of the cars. I think there is possibility of favorable action on the bill next year. I am certain that when that bill becomes law and goes into operation there never will be a freight-car shortage in any section of the country again.

TARIFF PROBLEMS

There is a decided tendency in this big Government of ours to discriminate against small producing industries of the West when it comes to making tariff agreements with foreign countries. Nut growers, bulb growers, fruit, plywood and other producers have been hurt. Under the present reciprocal trade agreement law about the only thing we can do is fight and talk. I have been

doing a lot of that, having made appearances before the Committee on Reciprocity Information in behalf of our western producers.

OTHER LEGISLATION SPONSORED

I have introduced a number of other bills in Congress in addition to those heretofore mentioned. Several of them have been passed. Others are pending.

My bill to provide for the orderly reduction of surplus Federal employees, to improve Federal hiring procedure, and to do away with the current practice of hiring an army of new inexperienced employees at one door while at the same time releasing experienced people through another, has not yet had consideration.

For years I fought to correct certain injustices suffered by officers of the Regular Army under then existing removal procedure. After numerous hearings and the introduction of several bills, a substantial part of the corrections I sought were incorporated in a retirement bill which became law—Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress.

Minor bills include the deeding of some land from the Bureau of Mines property in Albany to the city so a street could be straightened; and a bill to establish a regular term of Federal circuit court in Eugene. A number of private bills or claims for damages against the Government have been passed. All such claims from residents of the Fourth Congressional District have been cleared to date.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

After serving on numerous minor committees I finally won assignment to the powerful House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have served on that committee 4 years and am now a senior member of it. The committee handles legislation pertaining to transportation, communications, public health, inland waterways, aviation, Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Commerce.

At the beginning of this Congress I was elected by the members from the Pacific Northwest to represent the States of Oregon and Washington on the Republican policy committee of the House.

I have made three trips abroad with congressional committees. The first was in 1944 when buzz bombs were still falling in London. I was there when the deadly V-2 rocket bombing began. The second was in 1947 to study the European situation leading to the adoption of the Marshall plan. The third was in 1949 when our committee made a thorough study of European socialized medicine plans.

OREGON DELEGATION TEAMWORK

The Oregon delegation in Congress, two Senators and four Representatives, vote independently on legislation but we work together in closest cooperation on any problems directly concerning Oregon. In this report I have mentioned many things beneficial to our congressional district which have been accomplished since I have been its Representative. Obviously a Congressman does not do things single-handed and all by himself. Our two Senators have been unfailing in their instant response to any appeal for help or cooperation I have ever made. We four Members of the House of Representatives from Oregon have always worked together as a unit on all Oregon problems. In serving as a member of the Oregon delegation I feel that I am a member of a friendly, hard-working and effective team.

CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE SERVICE

My office, 1631 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., is well-staffed and well-equipped. I realize that the people of the Fourth District are 3,000 miles from Washington but nevertheless have many problems which can only be settled in the Nation's Capital. I am glad to be of service in any and every way possible. I welcome letters commenting upon legislation and expressing opinions. It is my policy to reply to all communications promptly.

East Says They Have Enough Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am very pleased to include a most interesting and timely editorial from the August 10 edition of the Wenatchee Daily World. It follows:

EAST SAYS THEY HAVE ENOUGH POWER

John P. Callahan, New York Times expert on utilities and power development, says: "On the basis of current demand figures, the electric utilities industry has a comfortable margin or more than 15 percent in reserve capacity—a condition that has been improving since World War II."

The Times writer then goes on to tell us that "the last war was the major impetus to the private power and light companies and it has increased kilowatt capacity by more than 40 percent since 1944." This is reassuring for we've heard so much on how the Federal Government's power policy had socialized the power industry. We had heard that private firms couldn't secure risk capital to expand their operations.

But then the Times writer talks about our Northwest and the Federal Government's program for power development. "Almost every region of the country shows heavy additions of new generating capacity. An exception is the Northwest, where the Federal Government's power facilities dominate the electric supply situation."

Strange as it may seem, Callahan is quite right. That's why today Bonneville Administration could use a total of 540,000 kilowatt-hours extra to supply 26 firms whose application for firm power has either been turned down or deferred indefinitely until power becomes available.

We have a power deficit here and there's no comfortable 15 percent reserve such as Callahan shows in his survey of the national utilities generating capacity. We need more power for aluminum, ferro-metals, Hanford Works, and aircraft building, to say nothing about the demands of expanding present industries and new business firms seeking location here in the Northwest.

Let's not worry about securing too much power from the Columbia River. It's worth remembering, we think, that it takes 50,239 kilowatt-hours per year per production worker in our State. That's an increase of 160 percent over 1939. And it's also worth remembering that "the output of 1,000,000 kilowatts means a foundation for a population base capable of supporting 1,000,000 residents."

The authority for the above statement is the Federal Power Commission.

In other words, Chief Joseph Dam when completed in December 1956, with 1,728,000 kilowatts, second largest power dam in the world, will provide 172,800 new jobs in industrial plants using power from this one dam. So let's make up our power deficit and do just what the private utilities have done since the war—inventory needs and expand by 41 percent. "Last year alone," Callahan wrote, "the private utilities spent $3,160,000,000 to produce generating plants in anticipation of increasing power demands." Hardly socialism, we think.

As to Pin-Pointing Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and interesting editorial from the Evening Sun of Baltimore, as of August 18, 1950. In view of the wide public interest, not only in world conditions today, but also in the foreign policy of the United States Government, I believe this editorial will serve as a complete answer to many of the questions raised in respect to that policy. The editorial follows:

AS TO PIN-POINTING POLICY

You often hear it said these days that the American people have a right to know what is the foreign policy of their Government. That statement is fair enough if by the term "policy" is meant the general line of action which a nation intends to follow. Those who use such words usually mean, however, that every foreseeable decision ought to be spelled out in advance by the Government and that the people ought to be told what those decisions are.

A call for this kind of pin-point diplomacy was sounded in the House a few days ago by Mr. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR. While Mr. COUDERT's proposal goes far beyond any other that we have seen, his views are shared by many people and they are therefore deserving of careful study.

He declared that the administration should spell out what it would do in a detailed list of contingencies with respect to almost every country on the globe. He asked, "Is it the policy of the United States to go to war with the 450,000,000 people of Communist China in support of Formosa, Indochina, or any other Asiatic country?" He wanted to know what the United States would do "if (a) Soviet satellite forces or (b) Russians forces attack a North Atlantic pact nation" and also whether it is "intended to make unlimited commitments of American ground forces in defense of Atlantic pact nations."

He wanted to know what we would do if Russian Communists should gain control of Yugoslavia by internal revolution and what we would do if Russian forces succeeded in

conquering Pakistan, and he asked a number of other questions, demanding that the administration supply the answers, and proposing that if the administration did not supply them Congress itself undertake to spell out all the answers for America and the world to see.

This kind of proposal reflects a very superficial knowledge of international affairs. Our general policy is one of steady resistance to Russian aggression or to Communist infiltration in all quarters, but for us to say in advance what we would do in certain contingencies in Pakistan, Hong Kong, Finland, Thailand, Burma, India, and so on would be the height of stupidity. Nations do not and cannot prejudge situations in advance in any such fashion.

Take the question which was quoted as to whether we intend to go to war with Communist China in support of Formosa, Indochina, or in support of any other Asiatic country. For us to answer that question with a broad "Yes" would be to undertake commitments the extent of which cannot be foreseen by any intelligent man. On the other hand, if we should answer the question with a general "No," that in itself would be a sort of come-on signal to Russia. Again, if we should answer "Yes" to Formosa and "No" as to Indochina and other Asiatic countries, we would be inviting aggression everywhere except in Formosa.

Even as to Formosa alone it is much better to stand on President Truman's statement of June 27 that he has "ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa." That does not mean we will go to war with Communist China over Formosa but it does cover what we will do in the case of a Communist attack on Formosa under present conditions. Anything more general would involve us in commitments of immeasurable magnitude.

Again look at the question about unlimited commitment of American ground forces in defense of Atlantic Pact nations. We have a treaty with Atlantic Pact nations which imposes on us as on all other signatories certain obligations. By that treaty we have agreed to consider an attack against any other of the signatories as an attack against all of them and we have further agreed to assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith individually and in concert with the other parties such action as we deem necessary, including the use of armed force to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

These sentences cover the obligation which our Government thought it wise to assume when the treaty was signed. They cover the obligation accepted by all the other signatories. For us now to answer Mr. COUDERT'S question by a formal declaration for or against unlimited commitment of our ground forces would be equivalent to an amendment of the treaty by unilateral action.

The fact is that one of the first requirements of foreign policy in a period of this kind is that we do not undertake to spell everything out over the whole face of the earth. It is sometimes dangerous even to spell things out for a limited period. In his Press Club speech last January, Secretary Acheson drew a definite security line for the United States in the Pacific area. He said that our "defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and to the Ryukyus," and that it then ran to the Philippines. In the light of recent happenings, it appears that his failure to include Korea inside this line was a terrible mistake.

This instance shows how dangerous it is to draw hard-and-fast boundaries and to say what we will do within those boundaries. If we could get into so much trouble by attempting to draw a specific line in this limited area, how much more trouble would we encounter if we tried to say specifically in advance what we should do in all the contingencies stated by Mr. COUDERT. Wise men in Congress and in the administration as well will shy away from any such attempt.

One other point should be kept clearly in mind. It is that in formulating our foreign policy we must take careful account of our resources, both military and economic. We cannot scatter commitments to do this or to do that without counting the cost. Mr. COUDERT and those who share his views seem to ignore this point. They propose to declare commitments, as it were, in a vacuum.

We need to rethink and refine our foreign policy. But the starting point for this task is the understanding that a policy is a general line of action and not a rigid and detailed plan. Discussion of many of the points which Mr. COUDERT raises is desirable as a means of illuminating the general international problem which we face. But it would be dangerous in the extreme for us to draw a map and mark on it exactly what we propose to do in every country in which any difficulty is likely to arise.

One for All—All for One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted in the RECORD the address of President Arnulfo Arias, of Panama, delivered to his nation on August 3. The following day the address was the subject of an important editorial in the Panama Star and Herald. The editorial reflects the attitude of the thinking people who live in our sister republic of Panama.

In these trying day, when the democratic nations of the world face such critical problems, it is encouraging and refreshing to read such expressions as the editorial which follows:

[From the Panama Star and Herald of August 4, 1950]

ONE FOR ALL—ALL FOR ONE

It was an historic message that the President of the Republic, Dr. Arnulfo Arias M., addressed to the nation last night declaring the Republic of Panama as definitely lined up on the side of the world's democracies in the struggle between the United Nations and arrogant communism that seeks the domination of the world for the masters of the Kremlin.

Dr. Arias minced no words in declaring the nation's readiness for all-out cooperation and collaboration with the United Nations now faced with the dangerous defiance of the Communists in North Korea and harassed with the cynical efforts the Russian archpriests of communism, who once more are trying to disfigure the truth so as to make it appear that the victim of aggression is in fact the aggressor.

There were no equivocations in the words of President Arias. His was a straightforward assertion that Panama places at the disposal of the United Nations any portion of her territory which the unified command of the World Organization may consider necessary or convenient for use as bases, or for the extensive production of such elements as may be needed by the UN's war machine which the possibilities of the Isthmus may be found capable of producing. And he also places at the dispostal of the United Nations troops, the use of the highways and byways of the Republic for such activities as the war effort may demand.

And above all, His Excellency offers not only the material potentials which the Republic may contribute to the common effort of the 52 non-Communist members of the United Nations to make the decisions of the UN respected and obeyed, but he offers as well, the blood of Panamanian citizens in the form of a corps of volunteers who may enlist for active duty at the fighting front.

Dr. Arias thus implements the recent actions taken against the spread of communism as an organized and militant body in this country. His placing the Republic definitely and wholeheartedly behind the cause of the United Nations, commits every citizen to anticommunism, because the Communists are today the enemies of the World Organization which was created in 1945 precisely to prevent wars such as international communism has now organized and launched on the world in Korea.

Dr. Arias upholds the democratic tradition of the Panamanian people, which has been always democratic liberalism as practiced by the great majority of the people until the contamination of the Red fungus—brought to the Isthmus from foreign shores by emigrees who sought our traditional hospitality—began to make its appearance in our political life and to contaminate certain sectors of our population.

Today, then, Panama stands squarely behind the commitments of the United Nations to beat down the defiance of international communism which has started fires which could easily spread to become the third world war with which Russian has so consistently threatened the western civilized world since 1945. Today the Panamanians are definitely identified with the struggle to preserve the democratic traditions of freedom cherished by every state which came into being under the pressure of the undeniable urge for freedom that all men of all races and all creeds experience.

Today Panama gives concrete meaning to the hemispheric motto of: One for all—all for one.

We Move in New Directions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following News Bulletin for August 21, 1950:

WE MOVE IN NEW DIRECTIONS
(By Paul O. Peters)

Reports that Federal Government spending in the fiscal year 1951 will approach or be more than $57,000,000,000, and that income and excess profits taxes will have to be raised again next year in order to bridge at least part of the gap between Federal income and Federal spending is something for every American, especially the businessman to consider.

Operating, as we still do, under the capitalistic free enterprise system, the proposed spending by the Federal Government will accelerate the inflationary trend, and the new taxes, although possibly punitive to small business, will be only a partial brake on the inflation.

The base of America's economic power, rests fundamentally on the profit system. It is the activator that motivates all human endeavor. The search for reward in the

shape of profit lends vigor to industry, and adventure to business.

In authoritarian states the profit system long since has ceased to function. Business is conducted under absolute, peremptory, tyrannical, and oppressive conditions. In the Communist states there are no profits per se. Everything goes to the state, which dishes out rewards only to the faithful, and death or imprisonment to dissenters from the philosophy.

The question naturally arises—how long can the free enterprise system and the profit system continue to function when government at Federal, State, and local levels each year takes an increasing share of the profits of industry, yet assumes none of the risks incident to the operation of a free enterprise economy?

Businessmen seldom if ever run a business for fun. Neither do men work long hours just for the glory of their sweat.

Added new taxes at this time will narrow the gap between a free economy and the authoritarian system. Some economy in Federal spending possibly can and should be effected. The balanced budget will be nearer and the need for new taxes lessened. In the trying days which lie ahead, our congressional leaders need reminding that we can further deplete our critical and strategic minerals, further exhaust our soil resources, and greatly weaken our future economic power.

In spending as much as $57,000,000,000 a year, our Government moves in a new direction. It is down the road to a regimented economy and the hand-out state.

St. Lawrence Seaway Lags

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Denver Post of August 18, written by Roscoe Fleming, and entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway Lags."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GREEDY FEW KILL GOOD BET FOR UNITED STATES—ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY LAGS

(By Roscoe Fleming)

On looking back at the brief interval of uneasy peace after World War II, historians may decide that one of our major mistakes was in not building the St. Lawrence seaway while we could. This failure is a prize symbol of the breaking down of national unity and morale, and the concerted rush for the pork barrel, that characterized the period.

When World War II came along, we had unknowingly prepared for it better than we knew. The instant need was for power, huge power—and there stood TVA and the Grand Coulee, built against the opposition of the pessimists, and of the private Power Trust, ready with power in huge amounts.

Suppose we had first had to build the power capacity necessary for the atomics program? Power is the muscle of the modern industrial world, and war is an industrial process.

Had we failed to have big power ready in time, that failure might have prolonged the war by 6 months. It might even have lost it.

Where are the TVA's and the Grand Coulees that we shall need for war III—and is it perhaps later than we think?

Suppose, for example, we need a million kilowatts in one piece for the hydrogen bomb, or for something else. Does the main project wait until we can build the power plant? It would have to.

The private Power Trust, the pessimists, and the pork-barrel politicians started doing business at the same old stand as soon as War II was over, and so far they have prevented starting the St. Lawrence project.

Its very virtues have meant its defeat. There lie 1,600,000 unused kilowatts of the cheapest power left on the continent, running uselessly to waste; there lies undug a mighty channel which could make the Great Lakes part of the ocean highway around the world; open the iron mines of Nova Scotia and Venezuela to the steel mills of Chicago and Pittsburgh, spread useful and perhaps vital industry up through a great unused segment of our country and Canada—some of that decentralization the need of which everyone testifies to so loudly.

Not the least beneficiaries would be the farmers and other dwellers in the great plains clear to Colorado. Beside much more than paying for itself in national defense, this project would come nearer paying for itself in dollars than any now planned. It is the Panama Canal of the future.

Blockade of this great project is a symptom of the soul-sickness which possessed us between wars—the fear that someone else would gain, the dog-in-the-manger attitude that demanded we get ours first, that we keep what we have, and the country's welfare could go hang.

In other words, the coal barons, the railroads, the possessors of present seaports, the pessimists, the timid, the private power lads, all joined up in a fear bloc, and, with the pork-barrel, vote-trading politicians, they managed to kill it off.

The trouble with the St. Lawrence project is that it is too good—it promises too many benefits to two nations, looks as if it would upset too many present applecarts, hasn't enough pork in it. Let us hope that the blood on the hands of those who have so far strangled it may not prove to be our country's blood.

Make Voice of America Roar Instead of Whisper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 21, 1950:

MAKE VOICE OF AMERICA ROAR INSTEAD OF WHISPER

When 28 Senators, members of both parties, urged in a letter to President Truman that American propaganda facilities be greatly enlarged for "a psychological and spiritual offensive against the Kremlin," they prodded at one of the most serious weaknesses in our national policies.

We don't get our story—the American story, the story of freedom and democracy—to the peoples of the world. At a most critical time we do not speak with a powerful voice to millions of Asiatics who are having dinned into their ears the Communist lie that the United States is the aggressor in Korea.

Pennsylvania's Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, in a speech at Harrisburg Saturday, declared that we must turn the Voice of America "from a whisper into a roar." The suggestion tersely expresses the unfavorable condition of American propaganda against a foe who is blaring unconscionable falsehoods about our aims, ideals, and acts to millions all over the earth.

United States Delegate Warren R. Austin, in the Security Council of the United Nations, last week stated our Government's aims in Korea to be simply the preservation of that country's freedom and independence under democratic processes. How well is that being told to the people of Korea and to other peoples in Asia? Not well, we may be sure.

On the other hand, Moscow employs a vast network, using specially trained native Communists, to get its anti-American charges transmitted by every device, including word-of-mouth among the vast numbers of illiterates in Asia.

The Red propaganda reaches out among the masses, many of whom never hear what American has to say. From authentic reports it is unhappily effective.

If United States information services abroad are inadequately staffed, that must be overcome. Voice of America methods, programs and messages must be lifted to become the "roar" Mr. MYERS proposes.

Russia, according to Andrew C. Geer of the Christian Science Monitor, takes 4,000 Asiatics to Moscow annually for education and indoctrination. Mr. Geer's suggestion that the United States bring at least 6,000 to this country each year to let them see what American democracy is and how it operates for the good of all the people deserves serious consideration.

One thing is certain: The United States must organize, without delay, a tremendous campaign to backfire the propaganda pouring from Russia, and to get the truth about America told and believed everywhere, including Russia itself.

Can United States Policy Win in Asia?—Dorothy Thompson Says "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks, an article that appeared in the Chicago Daily News on August 14, 1950, by Miss Dorothy Thompson. It points out that we are pursuing a policy which cannot win for this country. I do not agree with all that she says about our policy but it is important enough to provoke considerable interest. I recommend it to all Members of the House. It follows:

CAN UNITED STATES POLICY WIN IN ASIA?

Those of us who believe that American foreign policy is leading us straight into catastrophe are effectively disfranchised. There is only one party, and it is a war party. There is no patriotic leadership that challenges the course on which we have embarked, or has the brains or courage to chart another.

The present course is to offer ourselves as the policeman of the world, to enforce, by the sacrifice of American lives and fortune,

the court orders (as it were) of UN countries who will not or cannot themselves fight to enforce them, and to put down aggression wherever it may raise its head.

The "law against aggression," which Mr. Truman, the generals, and the majority of Republicans have committed us to "police," is no law. There is no impartial judgment to which it can be referred. The judges include the charged aggressors or their partisans. There is no international police force to execute judgment.

The United Nations, divided into two factions, sharing no common notions of civilization is, as an institution to "enforce peace," pure fiction. It is, in fact, an arena for power politics.

Stalin and company, who know this, use it for what it is and play the game supremely well, while our vacant-minded leaders appoint the American people to liberate all victims of aggression—whether they want to be liberated or not. Since the process involves the destruction of the countries liberated, enthusiasm is notably lacking. That is the lesson of Korea.

I submit that if the United States irrevocably commits herself to fighting for all who won't or can't fight for themselves, while Russia pours into the fray only her allies' resources while reserving her own, there can be but one outcome. The west will be utterly exhausted and unable to defend itself on its own ground.

Stalin's game is to involve this country in war with China. It is a war we cannot win. We cannot win it morally because no Asiatic trusts the foreign devil, no matter what banner he carries.

We cannot win it politically because we have not one ally in Asia. A policy which commands the British to get out of India and the Dutch out of Indonesia, and then decides to support the French in Indochina—which refuses to support Chiang in China, and then decides to support him in Formosa—is not a policy.

We cannot win a war involving China militarily. If there is any general who can tell us how to accomplish what Asiatic Japan could not, let that genius arise and tell us how.

We have already lost Asia. It is a loss we can acknowledge and sustain. For Stalin has not yet won Asia. He wants us to win it for him, by a war with China.

And if there is a statesman in this country with courage to lead this Nation away from certain disaster, he will be elected President. Despite the sales talk, the people are hostile and alarmed.

Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. SECREST
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the chairman, adopted unanimously by the executive committee of the National-Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, August 15, 1950:

The outbreak of hostilities in Korea on June 25 of this year precipitated far-reaching measures of political and military action and set in motion economic changes the full magnitude and effects of which are not yet visible.

The national and international economic implications of our military preparation and defense effort can at this time only be perceived in dim and tentative outlines. No one can foresee the extent of military operations necessary for the attainment of our objectives and no one can know how far we must go in order to fulfill our international political commitments and responsibilities.

Great changes in the course of international trade are implicit in the program that has already been launched in response to the Korean crisis. Already the dollar-gap question has lost its urgency as one of the great problems facing the world. Quite conceivably the trade-balance of the United States may be reversed in the course of the next few years. In any case, it is not known to what extent and in exactly what quarters our imports and exports will be affected.

As a step toward elimination of the dollar-gap and for other purposes, the Department of State some months before the Korean outbreak announced the opening of multilateral negotiations on September 28, 1950, in Torquay, England, to carry out a third round of tariff reductions under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

To that end public hearings were held during May on a long list of items which were to be considered for concessions. Hundreds of witnesses, speaking for the many and various industries and groups affected, appeared at these hearings to protest any further duty reductions at this time. The effects of previous concessions, particularly those made in Geneva in 1947, had only begun during the past year to make themselves felt. The war-torn countries were regaining their productive powers and the period of postwar shortages in this country had reached its end in many lines of production.

This combination of imports and growing surpluses within this country bade fair a year ago to precipitate a dangerous recession. The problem of deflation and of unemployment loomed with a growing menace on the horizon. Yet quite definitely the total potential impact of previous duty reductions upon the domestic economy had not yet delivered its total force when another round of trade agreements was announced.

Now, between the preparations for the Torquay Conference and its actual assemblage has arisen this overriding emergency, neither the end nor consequences of which are yet clearly visible. Once more normal international trade will be disrupted. Once more our domestic economy will be subject to controls. Many peacetime projects are being abandoned and others will undoubtedly be set aside. The public has given early evidence of its readiness to abandon "business as usual"—all to the end that we may be most effective in meeting our national and international responsibilities.

This Council has no desire to raise above first consideration of our country any question that is and should be subordinate thereto. We have felt constrained because of the troubled international conditions now prevailing to withhold various representations and to subordinate our interests to national considerations. The State Department should under present circumstances relinquish its own pursuits in a field where, because of vastly changed conditions in course, it has no possible way of measuring the most probable peacetime consequences of its action.

It will be recalled that this Council was formed only a few months ago in response to widespread alarm felt over the course of foreign competition in this country. The Council does not now, and did not in the beginning, object to imports if they are placed on competitive parity in this country. It is fully cognizant of, and recognizes, the function of imports in our economy. This country needs imports, it needs them in large volume, but it is not necessary that such imports should disrupt our wage standards, our employment, and our price structure in a buyer's market. It is neither necessary nor desirable that the smaller miscellaneous industries in this country be put in jeopardy as a means of maintaining an abnormal level of exports.

Convening of a tariff-cutting conference under the present circumstances cannot be justified on any ground other than the theoretical one that tariff reduction is, of itself and quite exclusive of other considerations, a desirable consummation. Business is not as usual today in the United States and it is unseasonable to treat our international trade as being as usual under such conditions. Postponement of the Torquay Conference until the present international crisis has passed would permit future consideration of the tariff at a time when more sound and accurate estimates could be made of the wisdom of particular concessions.

The full time and energies of the State Department should be devoted at this time to a solution of the international emergency.

This Council should urge the President of the United States to bring about a postponement of the Torquay Conference. It is not likely that adverse international repercussions would ensue since such action would conform closely with the dictates of universal common sense.

Respectfully submitted.

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman.

Fighting Marines Baffle Unification Brainstormers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ivan H. Peterman from the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 22, 1950:

FIGHTING MARINES BAFFLE UNIFICATION BRAINSTORMERS

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

During the Naktong bridgehead reduction at Changnyong, which already classifies as the first major American victory in Korea, old-fashioned interservice rivalry is credited with helping our side. The first marines were there, and so were the Army doughs. Also the Army and Navy airmen.

Now sweet unification was supposed to have eliminated such rivalries, as one of the many wonders wrought in Washington, D. C., these days. But they persist, and as correspondents report from Changnyong, no unit was willing to let any other surpass its job on the North Korean aggressors. In their admirable zeal, they seem to have wiped out a whole Red division and shattered some of Uncle Joe's immediate plans.

Such factors may seem obscure to some citizens in our present unobtrusive mobilization, but the Korean campaign is demonstrating the good and the bad as well as the mediocrities under our new combined military system. Quite plainly, some of the good stems from red hot rivalries still existent among the services, and the retention—at least by the swashbuckling leathernecks—of proven methods. One is close air support which the Marines, in their desperate battle to survive (despite Secretary Louis Johnson's indifference to whether we kept the Marines or not), insisted on preserving. At Changnyong close air support wrecked the Commies.

I bring up these things because the First Marine Reserve 155-millimeter howitzer battalion is packing gear for camp on August 28. This is the outfit which helped blast the Japs off Guadalcanal. It is commanded now by Maj. James Coady, Philadelphia, and has been based at the Philadelphia Navy Yard, waiting word to follow the Marine Infantry Reserves into training. They are now under training at New River, N. C.

There are about 600 of the artillery reservists, including some 35 officers, and if you wonder why battalions depart separately and not as National Guard or Regular Army divisions, it's because the Marines form their reserves as battalions, mounting up regiments and divisions as they proceed toward combat areas. Unfortunately we have very few marines for the amount of population of the country, and the vastly increased spots they're supposed to guard.

Does it occur to Washington's brain trust that, with the assumption of global responsibility by the United States, the Marines actually should be tripled instead of reduced? We need more marines. But try and drill that into the current defense set-up.

Anyway, off they go, undermanned, underequipped as today's battle requirements go, but full of the old marine grit and confidence. Instead of their fourth encampment at Quantico the howitzer unit will probably land near some embarkation point out West, ready for quick integration with the Second Marine Division. It's forming up. With plenty of veterans who know their way around.

Down at the yard, where since the end of their campaigns against the Japs, the Reservists have been taking the prescribed peacetime training, there has been only exasperation at the delay, according to First Lt. John J. Maguire, Jr., reconnaissance officer with A Battery, who is also assistant executive. Jack went through Villanova learning to be an artillery officer, after a brisk session in Uncle Sam's prep school on Guadalcanal.

For the United States Marines, ever stubborn, sloughed off some of the unification stuff, and have kept the old teamwork which has never lost a battle. They still have their own fliers, own artillery, own infantry, and own hell-for-leather morale. They still dress like marines, and there was no long bleat that the officers and men must all look alike, as arose in the Army from the usual cry-baby pinkoes.

The fact is in combat everyone dresses alike except for identification. In peacetime if you want discipline—and the marines still prefer it—you require insignia and proper uniform. American service leaders generally have fallen for a lot of soft-headed guff since the Second World War, but not the United States Marines.

Unification at the top, in the supply departments, and other purchasing and spending departments was important and necessary, but unification had some senseless by-products which don't help in wartime.

The sly campaign to blunt discipline by promoting the idea the general and his corporal should "shine their boots together" has no place in a major-league Nation. There was a lot of this sloppy, sentimental, half-subversive thinking during the period we should have been preparing. We fretted over rank and uniforms, but forgot to build decent tanks. But we'll catch up to it all, and the perpetrators in due time.

So the marines and the Twenty-fourth Infantry GI's gave the Gooks a rousing wallop at Changnyong, and the winners are saying the other fellow did well. That's the best news yet from Korea. It will start more clamor from the Reserve marines: "What's keeping us out of it? Is this a private war, or can anybody get in?"

The Spirit of the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding newspapermen and commentators in Texas is Mr. Paul Bolton, of Austin, Tex. His rare and acute perception of the public thinking makes Mr. Bolton's broadcasts a daily family habit in central Texas.

Recently, Mr. Bolton devoted two broadcasts to public thinking about the Korean situation and about problems of mobilization. I believe these broadcasts, while they represent only the sentiment in one American community, can be read profitably by all of us. They show clearly how fully the people perceive the nature of the great challenge now facing us and the sentiments in these broadcasts are inspiring evidence of the public willingness to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to destroy the threat of communism. They follow:

[From the KTBC Newsroom of July 26, 1950]

In Washington today, Elder Statesman Bernard Baruch made the recommendation that everybody has been anticipating and dreading. What Baruch said was this: The situation is sufficiently grave to warrant an over-all ceiling across the entire economy. Over-all prices, wages, rents, fees, and high enough taxes to prevent profiteering.

This was much stronger than the request made by the President. To get the reaction of Austin people to this proposal, we contacted a number of representative citizens in representative businesses, and asked their reactions. Here are their statements, unadorned.

Mayor Taylor Glass, who runs an ice cream company, said he was in hope that we wouldn't have to do it this time. It's certainly the last thing he wants. In his own business, sugar is a basic commodity, and some shortage has developed locally due to scare buying; but he said he'd been telephoning elsewhere in Texas and found no shortage.

Ed Wroe, the president of Austin's American National Bank, commented on Baruch's statement like this:

"That's the correct way to do it. We have to have that to win. And if we are too slow, it could be too bad for us."

The manager of a radio station, J. C. Kellam, was equally brief: We have to do it, and we should do it as of the day before the Korean war.

The manager of a large builders' supply company, Bill Drake, who also is a city councilman, reacted in this manner: "I can't say that I think a ceiling would be wrong. It does look like there's no end to advancing prices. In our business prices advance because the supply people have to protect themselves. * * * Then on the subject of taxes, Drake added: "I'd hate to see an excess-profits tax slapped on so quickly, as it would disrupt many corporate businesses. I do believe that sort of tax should go on military contracts; and I think we must have taxes to pay for it; we can't continue to add to our deficit."

Here's a labor viewpoint: Paul Sparks, the executive secretary of the State federation of labor, reacted like this: Certainly we're susceptible to freezing wages, if they'll go all the way through. The transition period we had after the last war, I think, came about because we got the job only half done during the other war. We saw other people chiseling, and it's human nature to say, "if he can do it, I can do it."

The operator of a string of restaurants, Harry Akin, had this to say: "I hope Mr. Baruch is unduly alarmed, and that it's not necessary." But if it is necessary, everything ought to be clamped on at once. And the stronger demonstration we can make of our purpose to defeat communism, the less chance that we'll be involved in another world-wide war. If controls are the best judgment of the best people, let's have them all; let's not mess around and compromise and favor one group or another. * * * "It is," Akin said, "late. People had better start thinking about it."

The vice-president of the University of Texas, James E. Dolley, who is also a professor of banking, had this to say: "The situation is extremely grave, and I have thought so for several years * * * offhand," Dr. Dolley went on, I'd say two things should be done at once: The first is to reinstate the old Regulation W—that's the one which limits installment buying and controls credit. That would shut off the abnormal purchases of motorcars, refrigerators and the like. Then there should be an immediate crackdown on Government subsidy of new housing. This would accomplish several objectives. It would release the labor situation noticeably." * * * Dr. Dolley explained, "If we go on into war, there's going to be a considerable demand for workers in war plants. In 1941, we had a big backlog of unemployed. But if now we superimpose the war plant demand on an all-time peak production, the situation will be serious" * * * and finally, the university expert said, "Whether it's necessary at this time to revive the old OPA—well, offhand, I'm inclined to think it's a little soon for that."

The president of the Steck Co., Ernest Jackson, had this to say: "If we're ready to start being an aggressor for freedom and start to pushing the Russians instead of trying to contain them, I'm for controls; but not so long as we try to placate everybody with our foreign policy, including the pinks in this country."

Perhaps the man-on-the-street reaction was expressed by Wick G. Fowler, a war correspondent during World War II. He said, "I don't see why people are worried about sugar and bedsheets. Why in the Thirty-sixth Division in Italy, if an infantryman had one blanket he was living in luxury. I've heard too many people worrying about the economic supply instead of the blood supply. I'll bet if one of those GI's in Korea had a million dollars, he'd willingly give it all just to get a half mile further back from the front line."

And speaking of Fowler, he's now trying to make arrangements to return to the war fronts. Fowler was correspondent with the Thirty-sixth Division for the Dallas News during World War II; and this time he's attempting to work out a syndicate arrangement to represent several Texas newspapers.

That labor case which we told you about last night, which District Judge J. Harris Gardner decided, will be appealed to the civil appeals courts by the labor union.

[From the KTBC Newsroom of July 28, 1950]

He who tries to sense the spirit of the people is indeed brave. A day or so ago, I asked a number of men to express their opinion on the recommendations of Bernard Baruch for immediate mobilization. One who responded with a brief comment was Ernest Jackson, president of a large printing supply company. Then, because we have long been friends, he sent me the typescript on an article he has written—I don't know whether it's destined for publication; obviously it was done as a mental catharsis for

himself. And in it he attributes to the people a great driving purpose.

Let me read you his statement in part. "So many times," he says, "I've heard the story of our power to produce material things—bathtubs, radios, automobiles, television—that I have feared for America. I have feared America was approaching the state of mind of the rich man who stored great wealth and then said, 'Soul, take thine ease.' On that day, his soul was required of him. We as a nation will experience our spiritual death—and our physical death—if our only reason for existence is to have more bathtubs, more automobiles, more radios."

Then Mr. Jackson continues, "We have been a nation without great driving purpose. For generations, we have had no great, unifying cause worth dying for. Men won't die for more bathtubs—nor willingly for the privilege of crowding a few more automobiles on the highways. Yet it seems that the justification for our own existence has been these material things. We have forgotten that force which brought our Nation into being—that Revolution is our father and freedom our mother. Until we again become conscious of our mission to take freedom to all the earth, we will be half convinced that what our enemies say of us is true.

"Those enemies say our aims are material and sordid. That material greed is the inspiration for our efforts, the source of our power. They accuse us of imperialism. But they know they lie. The only imperialism we profess is the imperialism of freedom. And freedom ultimately will rule men's minds and souls throughout the earth. This is what Stalin fears. Because of this fear he will not let free people communicate with those behind the iron curtain. Stalin hates us because he fears we will be faithful to our heritage.

"No man ever committed suicide," Mr. Jackson continues, "who had a worth-while purpose in life. But without a sublime mission, the daily frustrations make the struggle seem hardly worth while. At times I have thought we as a nation are behaving like one contemplating suicide. Nationally, we have our minor frustrations, injustices, and inequities, discriminations. But they are petty compared with those in lands behind the iron curtain. More heartening, our revolutionary society holds the seeds for correcting every injustice. And we have a great purpose: To plant our revolutionary society in all the earth. When we see our mission clearly, our frustrations will appear in their true proportion.

"We have," he says, "done much vacillating the last 5 years, between the decision to suicide, or shoulder responsibility for our sublime mission. But thanks be to God, America is getting religion. It is the evangelical religion of freedom.

"Our forefathers risked their lives, their fortunes in the cause of freedom. Now the time has come for us to pledge our lives, our fortune, our sacred honor for an even greater cause of securing liberty for millions now in slavery."

And then Mr. Jackson makes his boldest statement: "Ours," he says, "is not a passive mission; it is militant. Ours is the task of taking to the enslaved of the earth the revolution of freedom. We are not going to contain communism. We are going to crush it. We are not going to just keep the Kremlin from going further. We are going to push it back. We are out to liberate Poland, and Czechoslovakia, and Albania—and the citizen slaves of the Russian tyrant. No longer are we fighting to be let alone. We are aggressors for freedom.

"America has hesitated in the past only because she hasn't been given the vision of a great cause. Her leaders have talked of radios, and bathtubs * * * when America wanted to champion the cause of freedom. At last it seems our leadership is coming to know our soils * * * and perhaps find their own. God pity any who attempt to turn to their selfish material or political advantage this fervent dedication of a great people."

And there—abbreviated only slightly—is the attempt by one man to sense the spirit of the people.

Water in Our World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herewith the remarks of United States Commissioner of Reclamation Michael W. Straus, made before the Denver Rotary Club on the occasion of the dedication of the Reclamation Engineering Center at Denver, Colo., on July 20, 1950. Reclamation has played a vivid and vital roll in the building of our great country, and I am sure the pertinent remarks of Commissioner Straus will be of interest to Members of Congress and others having the opportunity to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Commissioner Straus' remarks follow:

WATER IN OUR WORLD

This day we pause just long enough in our ceaseless use of this Reclamation Engineering Center for a dedication that gives us a chance to lean back from our labors far enough to take stock of what we are doing here in Denver, and why.

This group of second-hand buildings—erected a decade ago to speed to victory a wasteful war of global destruction and salvaged to become a center of man's efforts through construction to build a better world in which to live—is no mere engineering office. While by law able technicians under the brilliant leadership of Reclamation's Chief Engineer, L. N. McClellan, here serve the needs of 17 arid Western States, far more flows from the drafting boards and design shops under these roofs than the plans, blueprints, and contract specifications of the giant reclamation dams on our streams which have unveiled new vistas to the West and commanded the attention of the world.

Of all the works Reclamation has brought into being history may record this center as the most important. Although Boulder conquered the Colorado and the deserts of the Southwest, Shasta preserved and expanded California's rich agricultural life, and Grand Coulee kilowatts created the industrial empire of the Pacific Northwest, it is to and from this center that ebbs and floods a tide of talent, ideas, and knowledge that spreads over this country and throughout the world, changing the way we live and helping to save and enrich our civilization.

Here to Denver have come quietly men who in their distant homelands are normally topped by turbans, fezes, or felts—all planners and builders of our future. Here have come those who walk in sabots, shoes, or sandals who are not tourists merely satisfying curiosity as to what Reclamation has built. I have talked to them by the score as they come through Washington and have seen them by the hundreds out on the jobs, so I know they are of the brotherhood who would put to use the scarce sweet water in our world. Here, though they be yellow, white, or black of complexion, or customarily clad in pants, jodhpurs, kilts, or kimonos, they have been sent by the governments of 54 nations as selected technicians to seek Reclamation's knowledge. And when they go home they leave some of their own knowledge behind here. Often they are followed by our own reclamation men back to the far places on this planet. And all this comes to pass with a very definite purpose.

Last night half the people of the world went to bed hungry. It was nothing new to them—some starvation is normal over half the world.

This morning, 55,000 new mouths—the children born during the preceding 24 hours—showed up for breakfast throughout the world. Tomorrow there will be another 55,000—and the next day and the day after as the number increases until stopped by famine, pestilence, or war. And while these mouths cry out for food, there still remain uncounted millions of fertile acres that are sterile now for lack of fresh water, which is wasting unused to the sea, that could help feed a hungry world.

The problem exists virtually all over the globe. It is not even entirely absent in this Nation, which has the highest standard of living attained anywhere at any time. Here, where fewer are hungry and we are but half done with our task of irrigation that is limited by the water supply and not the land, we must not be fooled by a few collapses in our food distribution mechanisms. Let not today's handful of surpluses of some agricultural commodities in certain areas blind us to the fact that America's population can stay ahead of hunger only so long as we plan and develop our resources ahead of our needs.

Cold statistics warn us that we cannot feed and clothe our own growing population a quarter of a century hence unless our harvests are increased and our industrial plant expanded. To increase that plant, we must have new and nonexhaustible energy—the energy of the hydroelectrical kilowatt that is the modern byproduct of Reclamation with which the whole world seeks to lighten its labors so that today's children may not be doomed to perpetual toil.

We have no monopoly on reclamation achievement in the United States. Irrigation engineering dates back to Biblical days. Many thriving civilizations have been built upon it. Many have fallen for neglect of their water resources development. Today, the United States, which profited from all prior experience, stands in fourth place among the nations in the total amount of irrigated land, and even lower in proportion of irrigated land to total area.

But our contributions are especially geared to modern needs and modern times—to applying the knowledge men have gained over the ages. In an era of machinery, our engineers here have made the utmost use of machines and, hence, can do in 20 years or less what used to take a century. Only through the mechanization that American industry has made famous can the world-wide reclamation effort move fast enough to meet the pressing urgency of modern needs, or develop to its fullest stature the resources available in the world's rivers and streams.

Through our mechanization, our wealth, and our tradition of freedom and enterprise; through our democratically responsive institutions, which make the resources of our Government available to meet the needs and problems of the people, as here in this Reclamation Center, we have been able to conceive and to carry out projects which were beyond imagination but a few decades ago.

Here in Denver were drawn the plans for Grand Coulee, up in the State of Washington, where we have built the mightiest concrete structure ever conceived by man—a dam four-fifths of a mile long whose spill-

way is twice as high as Niagara. Here also were drawn the first plans for the Ichang Gorge Dam on the Yangtze River, intended to produce twice as much power as Grand Coulee and to help industrialize a free China.

On the border between Arizona and Nevada, we have built, from Denver plans, Boulder—the highest dam in the world, one-seventh of a mile high, holding back enough of the Colorado River flow to put New York State under a foot of water. Here also we are checking the plans for Kosi Dam in India which will rise still higher.

In California's Central Valley, we are moving irrigation water on a large scale 500 miles—farther than man has ever before attempted mass movement of such great quantities of water. Egyptians have come to Denver for aid in working out their plans for harnessing the Nile over still longer stretches.

Here above Denver we have pierced the backbone of the Continental Divide with the world's longest irrigation tunnel, to divert water from the Pacific watershed to the Atlantic watershed. Even as we prepare to repeat that process on the Gunnison-Arkansas Project just south of here, South American engineers are likewise planning to hole through the Andes and are seeking our advice.

Grander than any of these accomplishments is the scope of the Missouri River Basin Project—the greatest reclamation development ever attempted—that spreads over one-sixth of the United States. Plans from this center for the Missouri watershed will win us 6,000,000 acres plus 3,330,000 million kilowatts of electric generating capacity. Those producing acres, gained forever by the arts of peace, are acres we have won for ourselves without robbing anyone else. In contrast to the type of expansion represented by Tojo's coprosperity sphere or Hitler's Lebensraum which leaves only ruin and desolation in its wake, the American type of conquest enriches all mankind.

We are using machinery such as the world has never seen before. We are installing the world's greatest pumps, its greatest generators, its mightiest power plants. But today's achievements are only a preview of this center's plans for tomorrow, as yesterday's were of today's.

Brigham Young began modern irrigation in America when he dug a short ditch to water his Mormon settlers' first potato patch a century ago in what is now Salt Lake City.

We get a glimpse of tomorrow in the United Western Investigations, in which we are studying the possibility of bringing surplus waters across the country a thousand miles, over valleys and mountains, from the Columbia River region, near Canada, to the Southwest regions on Mexico's border, where the growing season lasts the year round and where current civil strife is merely a symptom showing that the available nearer water is approaching exhaustion.

But, strange to say, while all this goes on, the whole United States has been rather slow to recognize these facts nationally throughout this very big and powerful country. We have a reclamation program that is the focus of world attention, but we have not yet achieved a recognizable national water policy. The engineers build dams and hurry on to build still greater ones with scarcely a pause to see what repercussions their achievements leave behind them on the economy and sociology of a community, area, of whole region or to see whether their dam was really justified in the first place. The technicians of this center, enjoying the freedom we grant scientists, have outstripped the statesmen, economists, politicians, sociologists, lawyers, and legislators to whom we deny freedom from perpetual challenge. The latter must justify to a properly inquisitive public why the engineers should be left to and financed in their expensive tasks. But in some spots we have not yet convinced the dwellers in humid areas of the value of reclamation. Perhaps, the engineers should be required to halt long enough to study, themselves, the resulting economic and sociological reverberations of their construction and then they could undertake to teach the value of reclamation to others.

The fact is, our task includes establishing that reclamation is not merely spending other people's money but is transforming it into new and more useful productive wealth.

In the 17 Western States alone—where Uncle Sam's reclamation activities provide but a quarter of the irrigation and much more is provided by non-Federal enterprise that this center also serves—a $2,000,000,000 Federal investment over a half century is now yielding (for the fourth consecutive year) over half a billion dollars each 12 months in additional crop values, plus some $32,000,000 in cash power revenues. As a taxpayer myself, I call that a good return on a taxpayer's dollar. This is not only more food and more power but new national wealth that, in turn, is taxed to bring far more back into the National Treasury than it drew out in the first place.

Towns and cities have arisen on spots which, without reclamation, would still be wasteland. Stable, thriving, producing, buying farm areas exist where formerly we had abandoned homes, deserting populations, and relief rolls that were greater than the voting register. Through the past half century of experience and progress, we have proven that in reclamation we have a tremendous instrument for meeting the needs of both the present and the future. But don't be misled by that word "future." The needs of the future are the problems of today.

Our population is growing at the rate of about a million a year. The great bulk of this increase is in the West, which this decennial census shows is growing at a phenomenal rate—much faster than the rest of the country. In 20 years, we will have about 20,000,000 more of our own citizens to feed. Even allowing for further advances in food production through more scientific agriculture, we will need many more millions of acres of farm land. We will find many of them in the West, whose arid and semiarid reaches comprise a great reservoir of unused land resources. We will need them just as fast as we can build the reclamation projects to irrigate the thirsty acres. Nowhere in the West today are we yet meeting the demands for more water and more power.

We will need not only the land and the food—we will need the power from Reclamation power for farms, homes, and industries—power that means greater production, lower costs, and better living.

The American people will find ways to obtain what they need. They always have. I believe they always will. In fact, many of our leading men believe that within our own lifetime, our standard of living can be made double what it is today.

To meet such demands and to achieve such goals, we shall need far more intensive development of our western water resources than we have ever before attempted.

We will need to put every last drop of water to work. We shall have to work it over and over again—work it as it falls through the dam; work it as it tumbles down the mountains; work it when we turn it on our fields; rework it after it runs through the faucets and sewers of our cities; and then recapture it and work it through the cycle once more, in another region, as it flows on to the sea.

This means work for this center building dams—storage dams and diversion dams and great, complex multiple-purpose dams. It means building canals and dikes, pumps and siphons, tunnels and gates and desilting beds and aqueducts and drainage systems. It means power plants, transmission lines, switchyards, and transformer stations.

It means working in mountains and canyons, on the slopes and in the deserts. It means the kind of planning and designing for this center that can coordinate a dam built in Montana in 1950 with an irrigation system still to be built in Kansas in 1965, and with all the other structures on all the streams through all the years between, so they will work together as a perfectly fitted team in opening new wealth throughout an entire river basin.

It is a challenge to every person in America—to the local people, the electric cooperatives and the water users' organizations, the farmers, and the people in the towns; to the local governments, the States, and the Federal agencies; to builders and planners and technical men and legislators.

Perhaps, most of all, it is a challenge to the engineers who are going out of the social security of the technician's ivory tower in Denver to meet the problems in the field where the citizens can have at them (and, as some of our field staffs say, "decontaminate" them from contact with Denver's perfectionists by exposing them to the practical and realistic requirements of water users). Out in the field they can teach their political, economic, legal, and legislative coworkers to use for the common good the new tools that science has fashioned.

For we're engaged in a race, and it's a more important race than any you read about in the sport pages. A reclamation project takes time. We're still working at Hoover Dam after two hot and one cold world wars, and on the expanded Yakima project after 45 years. Next year we will be near the finish of the first phase of the Central Valley project, on which construction began 13 years ago, but which has been California's dream for half a century. Further phases of that project may take another 25 years or more. Colorado-Big Thompson, right here in your own back yard, has been under way for 14 years now. And in the Missouri River Basin no person or Congress has yet dared fix a schedule on which the work should be finished.

The race is to determine whether our engineers in the field and our statesmen and legislators in their offices can keep the development of our water resources abreast of the pressing, ever-growing, ever-accelerating demands of our people for the use of those resources.

Its outcome will help to decide how well we and our children will live; whether our boasted American standard of living can be maintained and can continue to grow as it always has in this Nation of continuing dynamic expansion.

Before it is over the engineers in this Reclamation center and their colleagues in other Reclamation offices throughout the West will have done and learned things new in man's experience. And other nations, further behind in their water resource development work and facing an even more desperate race than we, will be watching what we do, and looking to us for technical help.

Following the passage by the Congress of various laws which made it national policy for this Government to cooperate with foreign nations in the exchange of various technical data and information, Reclamation was requested to cooperate in the program and was supplied with funds for this purpose. Already we have had between 300 to 800 professional visitors from abroad each year studying our irrigation practice and learning how American technology could benefit their own lands. These officials come from some 54 different countries. Last year 47 brilliant young men from 9 different countries were placed with Reclamation for prolonged training. Frequently our alumni from other lands rise to important places

in their own countries. One is Minister of Public Works for Afghanistan. Another has become chairman of the Central Water Power Irrigation and Navigation Commission of India, and still another is chief designing engineer in that country.

A couple of years ago the Government of Thailand—which we used to call Siam—sent 30 young engineers for a year of in-service training with the Bureau of Reclamation to form the nucleus of an irrigation service. Now every one of those 30 is serving in the royal irrigation department of his country, applying the lessons he learned from the American reclamation program, and right among you now are another half dozen—a splendid sample of Siam's man with a future.

Fifteen governments have asked the Bureau to send experts to advise and plan with them for more and better irrigation, while 19 others have asked for and received special forms of assistance, for which foreign engineers send us up to 300 inquiries a month.

Each year we send overseas thousands of copies of technical documents, the working tools of modern technology—specifications, technical papers, manuals of practice, and so forth. Some of these have been translated by foreign governments into their own languages and some editions have sold in the multiple-thousand copies. There is a constant return flow of technical information from abroad which is put to immediate use here.

Arrangements for such help usually are made through the Department of State, the United Nations, or the ECA, and the costs are not paid for from Reclamation appropriations. As a direct result of such contacts, foreign agencies place millions of more dollars each year in order for American construction equipment for reclamation works in their own lands to be built, frequently, by Reclamation-trained American contractors.

Reclamation experts have helped to plan a project in Ceylon aimed at revitalizing the economy of that new nation. In the Near East they have helped to survey the economic rehabilitation of Mesopotamia and the Euphrates Basin. In southern Rhodesia they have helped to build earth dams; in Japan and Venezuela, to reconstruct canal systems; in Greece, to help plan an American-style, multipurpose dam and power plant. And a party of six Reclamation men in South Korea, planning the development of power sites in that land to substitute for power cut off from North Korea, got out last month just one jump ahead of the Communists.

Here in Denver the specialized knowledge acquired in designing dams to meet earthquake conditions makes it possible for us to perform the extremely complex tests for building an earthquakeproof dam in the Himalayan Mountains in far-off Nepal. Other specialized studies have been made for irrigation projects in New Zealand, Guam, Portugal, and Greece. And my own third prior predecessor, the late great Commissioner Elwood Mead, helped design the water supply system that permitted the continent of Australia to establish its capital at Canberra.

Under President Truman's point 4 program, such assistance to other lands can be increased and can be linked with technical assistance in other fields to bring American scientific skill wherever it is needed. In fact, in this Reclamation Center you behold point 4 already in operation. It has been for some years and we in America are safer and richer for it.

Naturally, our reclamation program must serve our own domestic needs first, but looking abroad we cannot successfully preach the blessings of freedom and democracy to hungry bellies. Director General Norris Dodd, of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, says that lack of food is back of most of the trouble in the Far East. Prof. E. A. Hooten, of Harvard, says that apart from competition and stupidity, the basic cause of warfare is human breeding beyond limited food resources. And Sir John Orr, former Director General of the FAO and winner of the last Nobel peace prize, has called starvation and want in the midst of potential plenty the fatal weakness of our civilization, a root cause of war.

But Lord Orr adds a word of hope. A tough and canny Scotchman who has toured the world to study how its people make their livings, he tells us flatly that there can be food for all without war; and he makes the institution of great irrigation and flood-control programs in undeveloped countries one of the fundamental means of accomplishing this end.

America has knowledge and the skill to offer. And no small part of that knowledge and skill, that know-how and show-how, arises in this engineering center we are dedicating today.

It is one of the foremost instruments of our American leadership in the free world. It helps preserve and enhance our own western strength, our domestic prosperity, and our national future; and it enables us to make decisive, constructive contributions to other free lands throughout the world.

It is truly one of the bulwarks of our freedom and of human civilization and it is dedicated to the development of water for the service of mankind.

Statement No. 3: Examining Congressman Poulson's Recent Extension of Remarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in continuing my commentary on the extension of remarks by Congressman POULSON, found in the RECORD of August 17, I wish to touch upon the last three points covered. In my extensions of August 21 and August 22, I have commented on the first four of the seven points which he listed.

The first sentence under the fifth point of Congressman POULSON's statement of August 17, to the effect that this proposed Columbia River diversion is brought forward at this time by the Department of the Interior as an aid to the Central Arizona project, should be revised in the light of the statements made by me and others on the floor of the House yesterday in answer to the speech of Congressman HOLIFIELD. House Resolution 244 in the Eightieth Congress was voted by the Public Lands Committee on July 1, 1947, without a single "nay" vote, although the committee record of July 1, 1947, does show that some Members withheld their votes. If this issue of bringing Columbia River water to California is to be revived, or if the Bureau of Reclamation is now honoring the formal action of July 1, 1947, of the House Public Lands Committee, it is unfortunate that the official transcripts of June 23 and July 1, 1947, have not been printed so that the full sentiment of the committee could be more readily seen.

As for the remaining part of the fifth division of Congressman POULSON's extension, I totally disagree with him. Of course, there is no nefarious scheme to rob California of Colorado River water and divert the same into Arizona. However, I am watching what could be a nefarious scheme to rob lands in California and throughout all other Colorado basin States of Colorado River water in order to send such water to Mexico. If Arizona does not get her rightful share of that water, that is what will happen to it.

The sixth point in this extension by Congressman POULSON consists of only two sentences and for purposes of comment must be quoted in full. Here they are:

> Southern California has always paid its own way. The people of southern California have obligated themselves for more than half a billion dollars for water projects, and they are paying these debts with unvarying regularity.

When the statement is made that southern California has always paid its own way, that must mean with regard to all her water problems. According to my best information, the remark is true of one great feature of their water development, the Metropolitan Aqueduct from the Colorado River, but I question it with respect to another great feature, the All-American Canal and Imperial Valley development. Although there are some minor water developments in California, such as the Palo Verde Diversion and the Coachella Diversion, which no doubt are paying their own way, the main features I refer to for examination are, first, the Metropolitan Aqueduct from Lake Havasu on the Colorado River to the west coast cities, and secondly, the All-American Canal from the Imperial diversion dam on the Colorado River into Imperial Valley. Let us examine each of these to see if both have been paid for currently as the California Congressman indicates.

The Metropolitan Aqueduct is one of the greatest pieces of construction of its kind on this planet. It is a physical work in which an engineer could take the greatest pride. It is nearly 400 miles long and has a total of 91 miles of tunnel—the longest being about 13 miles. It literally has to be lifted over the mountains and every drop of water it carries westward from the Colorado River has to be pumped a total vertical lift of more than 1,600 feet. Although built to carry 1,100,000 acre-feet of water annually, this aqueduct has the usual engineering provision for an overload, and it is said to be capable of carrying 1,200,000 acre-feet yearly. It cost upward of $200,000,000. But with all this, in a sense it is a white elephant.

However, the bondholders are assured of their investment even though the aqueduct to date has not been paying its cost and upkeep. The taxpayers of Los Angeles and the Metropolitan Water District are obligated to finance the investment in that aqueduct regardless of how little water is carried through it. The sale of water during the more than 10 years of its life has not gone very far toward paying the cost. Yet it is true that southern California is paying for this great water development. Some

Californians would like to center our whole attention upon that one feature to the neglect of others.

But—let us look at another part of the picture. The second phase of California's take out of the Colorado River is through the All American Canal, which includes, of course, the Imperial Diversion Dam and should rightfully include the Hoover Dam and all appurtenances. Congressman POULSON must have had in mind all the items just named—that is, the All-American Canal, Imperial Dam, and Hoover Dam—when he spoke of more than a half billion dollar investment in those water projects. Did he mean to include the Hoover Dam, and if so, did he mean to say that southern California has obligated itself to pay for the Hoover Dam? That part I question. Let us take a closer look at this so-called obligation. Would it be correct for me to say that because I occasionally ride from Washington to New York City on the Pennsylvania Railroad, that I am under obligation to pay the cost of building the Pennsylvania Railroad from Washington to New York? Certainly not, but such is very similar to what is being claimed by southern California about Hoover Dam. What exactly is southern California's obligation for the cost of Hoover Dam?

They have contracted for power, at a certain very reasonable rate, which is generated there by falling water. However, if Hoover Dam should be destroyed within an hour, nobody in southern California is obligated to pay Uncle Sam the unpaid balance of the cost in constructing that dam. A resident of Los Angeles would be no more under obligation to make up to the United States Treasury the unpaid cost, in such an event, than would be a resident of Baltimore. Californians have a queer way of talking about their half-billion dollar "obligation" which they say they are repaying currently. That part of their arithmetic is just about on a par with some of the other samples of bookkeeping which they have applied to projects they do not like. The irrigation now being carried on in Imperial Valley would not be possible without Hoover Dam, but irrigators are not paying for that dam. Power users are paying for Hoover Dam and equipment, and thousands of those users live in Arizona.

Does Congressman POULSON mean to say that the total payments on this half-billion-dollar California investment are being currently made by those who receive the lion's share of the benefits? I cannot figure it that way. The indispensable benefits of water and silt control to the Imperial irrigation district are not having their costs paid for by that district. The power users in three States are paying the total costs, but even so, they are merely purchasing hydroelectric power, a commodity which their modern life demands. Therefore, concerning the Imperial irrigation district's flood-control and silt-control benefits, it would be more correct to say such are being paid for by the power users in the three States of Arizona, California, and Nevada. I do not object to this, but merely allude to it as a fact.

Does Congressman POULSON mean to tell us that the cost of the All-American Canal, built by Uncle Sam to the tune of nearly $100,000,000, is currently being paid for by the Imperial Irrigation District? Well, perhaps that depends upon a technicality as to what is meant by "current repayment." True the Imperial irrigation district has a repayment contract with the Government signed by Secretary Ray Lyman Wilbur in 1932 providing for repayment on certain conditions. I think the terms of that contract are not wise. It is my understanding that under the terms of the contract no repayment of costs on the All-American Canal have been made by the Imperial irrigation district. Yet, in the last 10 years or so, many millions of acre-feet of water have been carried in that canal into that great garden spot known as the Imperial Valley in California, by use of which water hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of crops have been produced. Under the terms of the All-American Canal contract the repayments may be said to be current, technically, because none are due, even after 10 or more years of valuable use.

In the seventh point, as in the first, Congressman POULSON wants it known that he does not favor the idea of diverting water from the Columbia River into California. In a colloquy on the floor of the House, as I was closing my speech on August 22 and also later when he obtained the floor, it was brought out that he had some question in his mind about Chairman Welch's proposal even when it was before the committee on July 1, 1947. I can understand that he does not want to give Arizona any comfort or hope to get more Colorado River water because southern California might get water from the Columbia River. Yet, as other California Members pointed out, there is more to California than southern California south of the Tehachapi Mountains. However, it is only southern California that has any claim upon the Colorado River, which claim is in the name of the State of California.

I think it can be conclusively shown that as to water southern California is amply provided for, considering the local resources and the High Sierras, with all present and future needs of Colorado River water by the amount assigned her by law from the water apportioned by subsection (a) of article III of the Colorado River compact. That indisputable amount of "apportioned" water is a gross of 4,400,000 acre-feet annually. I believe it can be conclusively shown that with that amount of water from the Colorado, plus the Los Angeles water resources in the Owens Valley and Mono Basin area, plus the water resources of the south coastal basin of which the Los Angeles area is a part, that the Los Angeles area has ample water supply for any foreseeable future need.

I want to protect the great city of Los Angeles in her three groups of legal water rights. I am also anxious to protect the remaining part of southern California in its legal water rights for agricultural purposes. Certainly I want to protect Arizona's water rights, too, but in the absence of an authorization act such as S. 75, giving the Supreme Court jurisdiction, we are all going to lose, and nobody gains.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, it looks as if this may be the best opportunity I shall have to discuss our farm problems with every farmer in the Fourteenth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. I shall address this to each one personally and ask you to give me the benefit of your thinking. The quality of the work of a Congressman seems to vary directly with the extent to which he is able to learn and understand the problems and aspirations of the people in his district.

The Federal farm price support and production adjustment program was inaugurated in 1933 when farmers all over the country were in dire economic distress. It helped to pull them and the Nation out of the depression. During World War II the support program provided a price assurance to farmers that allowed them to make a wartime production record which helped to win the war and to feed a world faced with famine in the early postwar years. Supports also helped bridge the economic gap between war and peace and were probably of considerable importance in preventing the slight recession of 1949 from becoming a postwar depression.

The Eightieth Congress enacted a farm price support program called the Agricultural Act of 1948. Title II of this law was to take effect on January 1, 1950, and would have drastically lowered the levels of support for most commodities and removed from mandatory support many of the most important farm commodities produced in northern Ohio. These are commodities that are among those that have the greatest importance to the national defense effort in time of emergency.

The Eighty-first Congress—the one now in session—took cognizance of farmers' objections to the Agricultural Act of 1948 and enacted some rather important changes. Among those changes was the provision for mandatory price supports for milk, butter, and their products. This is a change of real importance to farmers in northern Ohio. This is the law under which the Department of Agriculture is currently operating. But we must now consider this legislation in light of our present mobilization effort.

Our Nation and the free world probably face at least three more generations of an ideological struggle between democracy and totalitarianism. The particular brand of totalitarianism against which we are now struggling is one which preaches, but does not practice, a glittering and attractive sort of materialism which undoubtedly has considerable appeal to disadvantaged peoples both within the United States and in the free world. The two sides in this ideological struggle are currently engaged in a partial resort to arms as a

part of the struggle that may be a prelude to full-scale global war. Democracy can defeat Russian communism, if those believing in democracy have the will to win. But to gain a real victory and lasting peace, we must win both the military struggle for area supremacy and the ideological struggle for men's minds.

While making the United States and the free world strong militarily, we must also demonstrate that democracy, even under forced draft, provides the best opportunity for disadvantaged people, in the United States and in the free world, to improve their material, as well as their spiritual, lot in the world.

In a period such as the one that may be ahead of us for a great many years, there are two different kinds of farm commodity price problems for which we must have solutions. The first of these is concerned with price supports. Even in periods of limited or even full-scale mobilization, the prices of farm commodities can quickly drop below a level that is fair to farmers; witness eggs and potatoes during World War II. For this reason, price support assurances to farmers provide the economic climate within which farmers can increase their production of scarce items with assurance that temporary conditions at harvest time will not result in a disastrous drop in farm income in the midst of a rise in the prices of things farmers must buy. The second group of problems is concerned with issues related to food price ceilings and rationing.

PRICE-SUPPORT ISSUES

Some of the price-support issues are:

First. The old parity formula that has been in use since 1933 is based upon the idea of maintaining the purchasing power of individual farm commodities such as wheat, or corn, or butter at the same level in terms of things that farmers buy as it was in the period 1909 to 1914. It has been suggested by several farm organizations, and by the Secretary of Agriculture, that a more nearly current farm family purchasing power formula should be substituted for the commodity purchasing power formula.

Second. The second issue is that of the appropriate or proper level at which farm prices or farmers' incomes should be supported.

(a) Some, a minority, oppose the whole idea of a support program for farmers.

(b) Others say that such support programs should act as a protection against the loss of out-of-pocket production costs—this would be a level of between 55 and 70 percent of parity.

(c) Another group favors supports ranging between 75 and 90 percent of parity, with minimums in years of large supply close to the 75-percent level. Such a level would help prevent complete bankruptcy of those farmers who had sufficient reserves to tide themselves over several bad years in succession.

(d) Still others urge that the best interest of the entire Nation, including that of farmers, demands that farmers' incomes be maintained from year to year at a level not too far below that of immediately past years.

Third. Closely associated with the previous question is the one of what commodities should be provided with price supports.

(a) There is, of course, the sincere group that says "none."

(b) Another group would restrict price-support operations to the so-called basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts.

(c) Others would extend the list to include important perishable commodities such as milk, butterfat, the meat animals, hogs and cattle, eggs, and farm chickens.

(d) Still others would urge the inclusion of important fruits and vegetables.

(e) While others would cover all bona fide farm products.

Fourth. A fourth issue is the question of the method of support. There are basically two major methods of supporting farmers' returns on the commodities they sell. One of these is the purchase method by which the Government, through direct purchase or a loan program, takes enough of the supply of the commodity off the market to bring the market price up to the support level. The other method is the payment method, whereby farmers sell their entire supply into the market, at regular supply and demand prices, and, if the resulting average market prices are below the support level, the difference would be covered in a production payment from the Government to the farmer.

The loan-and-purchase-agreement method of support seems to have worked relatively well for storable commodities and for purchases of the processed products of perishable commodities where definite outlets and use as a safety reserve are available. This has not worked a hardship upon consumers because the so-called surplus production that is taken off the market 1 year by the Government can be safely and economically stored for use in a later season or in a later year. It is only good sense to maintain an adequate safety reserve against poor weather, low yields, or other national emergency and for welfare purposes.

But for the bulk of perishables, there are a great many people who feel that the production payment method of support would be preferable. If not used within a short period after harvest, perishable farm commodities must be destroyed or stored at a very heavy expense. Provision has already been made by law to use as much as possible of such commodities in the school-lunch program, in public and private welfare agencies both in this country and abroad. Further provision should be made for emergency stockpiles of storable processed products in areas near urban centers. Yet Government-owned inventories of such products as potatoes, eggs, and milk products continue to pile up in expensive storage well beyond the need for a reasonable safety reserve.

The need for a farm price-support program grows out of the fact that the individual farm family is unable to protect itself from the fluctuations of the rest of the economy. Farmers make up the large majority of our free competitive enterprisers. In an economy where farmers are required to sell at the giving price in an unprotected market and buy at the asking price in a protected market they operate at a disadvantage. This disadvantage is measured in terms of lower farm incomes. These conditions may become particularly severe at times during periods of national mobilization.

PRICE CONTROL AND RATIONING ISSUES

Some of the major issues relating to price control and rationing of food products are:

First. How far should the price of food be allowed to rise before special efforts are made to prevent any further rise?

(a) There is a minority who say that the red tape and regimentation involved in price control and rationing are so great that we should have no price control and rationing no matter how high the prices of food become. These people say that, if food prices are allowed to rise, this will make farming more profitable, thus encouraging farmers to increase production. The increased production will in turn hold food prices lower than they might otherwise have been.

(b) Another point of view is that prices of food should be allowed to rise at least high enough to return parity prices to farmers before any special steps are taken to prevent further rise.

(c) Still other groups insist that food prices should be rolled back to some level below parity.

Second. A second issue revolves around whether rationing of food is a necessary procedure to accompany the control of food prices. If the total supply of food is smaller than the amount that people would be willing to buy at ceiling prices, is there a danger large quantities of food will find their way into illegal channels of distribution if no rationing system is in effect?

Third. A third series of problems arises when the farmers' cost of producing food commodities in the quantity needed exceeds the established ceiling price. If a condition arises where farmers cannot afford to increase production at the ceiling price, how shall the increased production be secured? Two different methods are available.

(a) The ceiling price can be raised, thus meeting farmers' increased production costs by requiring the consumer to pay higher prices.

(b) Farmers' increased production costs can be met through a system of consumer subsidies, in the form of direct payments to farmers who agree to increase their production of scarce commodities. Under this system the grocery-store ceiling price to consumers would not need to be raised; funds needed to make the consumer subsidy payments to farmers would come out of the general revenues of the Government just as would the remainder of the defense expenditures.

A Day in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a new documentary film—16-millimeter, black and white with sound—all original photography, portraying Congress in action.

Starring Members of Congress and the page boys whose daily chores keep the wheels turning on Capitol Hill, this film interprets by the documentary media the processes of legislation in the representative two-party Congress freely elected by secret ballot by the citizens of our Republic.

It presents a realistic picture of the environment in which the Congress of the United States carries on its work: Members of Congress at work in their offices and conferring with their constituents, committee sessions, the American free press in action, page boys on the job and at classes in their school, and the President speaking before a joint session of both Houses, are all portrayed in this intimate, personalized story of a day in Congress.

Designed to further understanding at home and abroad of the processes of representative government, this film will fill a need in the current struggle between the totalitarian concept of foreign one-party dictatorship and the American free democracy which it typifies.

Produced by Hullinger Productions, Washington, D. C., and released by Instructional Films, Inc., New York City, a Day in Congress is intended primarily for exhibition in television and in the schools of the Nation. It is an ideal film for private and civic groups to use in their efforts to promote widespread appreciation of the American form of government and the freedom enjoyed by all citizens living under it.

The Atom Bomb and the Fire Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Volunteer Firemen of Central Pennsylvania are now in the midst of their fifty-eighth annual convention, which is being held this week at Bellefonte, Pa.

These men come from all walks of life and serve their respective communities voluntarily. It is impossible to fully evaluate the great contribution they make to the community, State, and Nation in the saving of life and the protection of property.

I was highly honored by being given the opportunity of addressing the opening session, August 23, 1950, on the subject, The Atom Bomb and the Fire Fighter.

My address follows:

THE ATOM BOMB AND THE FIRE FIGHTER

(Speech delivered by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, Twenty-second District of Pennsylvania, at the fifty-eighth annual convention of the Central District Volunteer Firemen's Association, August 23, 1950, Bellefonte, Pa.)

Mr. Chairman and delegates, it is a happy privilege for me to make a hurried trip from Washington to Bellefonte for the purpose of discussing a subject of mutual interest and one that has caused the peoples of the world to focus their eyes on the United States of America.

When I have concluded my discussion on the subject of atomic energy, I hope to fly back to Washington, as a plane is waiting for me at the Bellefonte airport. We have important legislation on the floor of the House of Representatives this afternoon and for that reason it is impossible for me to stay and visit with you.

I have brought with me a sound, technicolored film entitled "Operation Crossroads" which will give you some idea of the power of the atomic bomb and the valuable lessons we learned from those tests far out in the Pacific at Bikini. Primarily, we wanted to know what an A-bomb would do to warships. So, one was exploded over the Bikini lagoon where a fleet was anchored. The other set off under the water.

The experts say that for general use, the most efficient way to use an A-bomb is to set it off about 2,000 feet above the target. It seems reasonable to expect, then, that if atomic warfare ever came to us here in central Pennsylvania, an enemy would aim at an air burst. This action would be directed at targets such as Pittsburgh, Altoona, State College, Bellefonte, DuBois, Johnstown, Lewistown, and many other communities.

Being faced with the possibility of an atomic war, I want to discuss briefly three aspects of defense against atomic warfare:

1. What can one do to protect himself?
2. What special problems will face the firefighter?
3. What can all of us do to assist in defense preparations. The more we know and understand, the less danger there is of blind fear and panic.

Let me assure you that I am not posing as an expert in these matters. But as a Member of Congress and likewise a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Committee on Armed Services, I have lived with the subject of atomic energy since my return to Congress from World War II. Therefore, I can truthfully say that I have first-hand knowledge of the subject.

I am sure you have heard over the radio or read in your newspapers about this book I have in my hand here. It is called Effects of Atomic Weapons and has just been published by the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Department of Defense.

It is not a popular book intended for general reading. It is filled with graphs, equations, and charts that only a person with some technical knowledge could understand.

Since the Atomic Energy Commission serves the Office of Civilian Defense as a technical adviser, this volume presents for the civil-defense people all that can be told about atom bombs without giving valuable information to our enemies. It tells what makes up the bomb, something about how it works, the kinds of damage it does, and some things that can be done to help cut down the toll of destruction and human casualties should it be used against us.

Perhaps most of you know that, at the instant of explosion, three kinds of waves shoot out from an atom bomb. They travel at terrific speeds, varying between that of sound and light. The kind that do the most damage are the shock waves. These produce the blast that in the bomb used over Japan was equal to the explosion of 20,000 tons of TNT. By comparison, it was estimated that all the bombs dropped by the 100 B–29 bombers in the saturation of an area on the Naktong front in Korea last week was equal to only one-twentieth of an "old-fashioned" atom bomb.

The second kind of death-dealing waves are heat. They start out with temperature approaching that of the sun itself but cool rapidly. However, with the blast, these two types of waves account for a major portion of the damage and injuries.

The third type of waves are the nuclear radiations, namely, the neutron, beta and gamma rays. We have heard so much about these that it may come as a surprise to many to learn that radiation alone caused only between 15 and 20 percent of the deaths at Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

In the area right under the bomb burst, which is called the lost zone, death and damage will be fearfully high. But—and please take note of this—it is possible to survive, especially if some warning is available and if there are adequate shelters.

One expert estimates that a person lying on his side in a 4-foot-deep slit trench probably would survive even in the lost zone.

That zone—for the early model bombs—is an area within about a half mile of the target point.

We have increased the efficiency of the bomb since 1945, but if you have a bomb twice as powerful as the Hiroshima weapon, it does not mean that the lost area is twice as great.

The experts figure this first zone—the area of almost total destruction—would increase only from one-half mile to eight-tenths of a mile from the spot directly under the bomb burst. That spot is called the zero point.

Then comes successive zones where the damage decreases as the distance from the zero point increases. I will not attempt here to define each of these areas. They will doubtless be figured out for each community as local defense plans are made.

At the instant of a bomb burst, none of us is going to be able to figure out in the first second or two how far he is from that zero or target point.

Well, then, what should we do? Some answers that may save your life and mine are given in this Atomic Energy Commission book titled "Effects of Atomic Weapons."

There was an excellent summary written by Wade Jones of the NEA Syndicate which appeared in many papers. You may have read it, but I think it is worth repeating here. And I am quoting:

"A plan of action for the first second after an atom bomb explodes near you could save your life.

"A blinding light will signal an explosion. But don't look toward it. It could destroy your sight, if only for a few hours or days.

"If you are in the open, drop to the ground. Curl up and try to shield the exposed parts of your body, such as hands, neck and face. Lie with your back to the blast, pull your coat collar up around your neck and fold your hands over your stomach. All this will help reduce flash burns and injury from the blast.

"Stay in your curled-up position for at least 10 seconds. By then, the immediate danger is over and it's safe to stand up.

"If you are outside and within a step or two of some protection such as a doorway, a tree or corner of a building, get behind it quick. If the shelter is more than a few

steps away, don't try to make it. Just drop and curl up as described above, facing away from the bright light.

"After 10 seconds, stand up and try to get under something which will give protection from flying glass and falling objects.

"If you are at home, or in your office, drop to the floor, back to windows. Better yet, get under a table, desk or counter. The safest places inside a building are alongside interior partitions.

"Remember, do what you're going to do—fast. You'll only have 1 or 2 seconds."

This concludes the advice given by Wade Jones in his syndicated article.

Now that business of standing up in 10 seconds may make you wonder:

1. What about those terrible radiations—those neutrons, gamma and other kinds of death-dealing rays?

I told you the answer earlier—that deaths due solely to these rays are only a small portion of the total casualties. In an air burst, most of the radiation danger passes quickly.

We also know that prompt treatment—especially to prevent infection of wounds or getting these rays inside your body—will go a long way toward reducing the deaths from radiation sickness.

There is a great deal more about this phase of atomic defense in the weapons effects book that I do not have time to discuss here today. Much depends on the over-all defensive and recovery measures that are put into effect immediately.

And that brings us to the emergency services of the many kinds of units that will be called into action if an atomic attack hits us. You men will be most interested in the problems faced by the firefighter.

Let me say first that the experts tell us that there are no special aspects of fires resulting from an A-bomb explosion. They say, and I quote:

"In principle, as regards fire and blast, the same result might be achieved by the use of conventional high explosives and incendiary bombs."

For example, it is figured that the same amount of damage could have been inflicted on Hiroshima by the use of about 325 tons of high explosive and 1,000 tons of incendiary bombs. What makes the atom bomb unique is the overwhelming nature of its destructiveness. This is especially true where incendiary effects are concerned.

The intense heat waves I mentioned earlier can cause fires. Remember how we put up those black-out curtains in air-raid drills during the last war? Well, in Japan, the heat radiation from the bomb caused thin, dark cotton cloth such as used for block-out curtains to catch fire up to six-tenths of a mile from the zero point. Some thin paper and dry-rotted wood also began to blaze at this distance.

On the whole, however, it is believed that relatively few of the large and numerous fires that left much of the two Japanese cities in ashes were caused by the heat waves.

In fact, there is evidence that close to the explosion, the terrific blast waves following a few seconds behind the heat radiation actually may have snuffed out some of the fires started by the heat waves.

What seems more probable is that most of the fires started from other or secondary causes. These would include upsetting of stoves, electrical short circuits, broken gas lines, and so forth. In several cases in Japan, industrial plants were set ablaze when the blast overturned furnaces and boilers.

Once these major fires have started, several things help it spread and fast. The blast breaks windows, collapses roofs and walls, blows in fire shutters, thus making all types of structures vulnerable to the spread of fire and to starting of blazes inside fire-resistant buildings. Burning brands from nearby buildings enter through these openings.

Firebreaks were of little avail in the two Japanese cities except around the edges of the "lost area." One trouble was that fires started at once on both sides of the firebreaks. Combustible material frequently was blown across the firebreaks by the blast of the explosion.

But there were some cases where firebreaks did help. The weapons effects people say that if the breaks had been wider—say a hundred feet or more—fewer buildings might have been destroyed by fire.

There are some ways in which an atomic blast actually hinders the development of fires. For example, when frame houses are completely collapsed and blown down, they do not burn as rapidly. Noncombustible debris sometimes covered material that would have ignited easily.

There are two serious problems to be faced by the fire fighter.

One is the loss of men and equipment and the second is failure of water supply.

In Hiroshima, some 70 percent of the fire-fighting equipment was crushed in collapse of fire houses. Four out of every five firemen were unable to go into action.

I think we have better dispersal of equipment in most of our cities, but this dispersal certainly is a factor to be considered in planning future preparations against possible atomic warfare.

In both of the Japanese cities, the water supply failed. This was not because many underground mains were broken or because the pumping stations were hit.

The pressure went out rapidly because most water lines above ground were broken by collapsing buildings and by heat from fires which melted the pipes.

Water lines crossing a bridge in the "lost zone" also are in great danger of being broken as the bridge is distorted or collapsed.

Another problem which perhaps can be tackled more efficiently in most American cities is clearing paths through the debris to permit fire companies to get to their targets.

We know now, that in an overhead burst, it is reasonably safe for the fireman and his equipment to push in right after the explosion.

We do not have to worry too much about radiation. But at Nagasaki, one fire company from an area that escaped destruction was not able to get within a mile and a quarter of the target point because of debris that piled up in the streets.

We know a good deal more now about what is called fire storms. About 20 minutes after the bomb went off over Hiroshima, a wind began blowing toward the burning area and reached a velocity of from 30 to 40 miles an hour.

This kept up for 2 or 3 hours, decreasing to light or moderate winds varying in direction about 6 hours later. This wind was accompanied by intermittent rain over the center of Hiroshima.

Now, because of this strong inward draft at ground level, the fire storm proved to be a decisive factor in confining the fire to the area where fires had broken out immediately following the bomb burst.

Within that area, however, virtually everything that could burn, did burn.

Similar fire storms have been reported after incendiary bomb attacks in both Germany and Japan and in large fires in the United States.

However, these fire storms depend on conditions existing at the time the bomb is exploded. There was no definite storm over Nagasaki, which was much more hilly than Hiroshima.

There the fire tended to rush up valleys, aided by a 35-mile wind which developed about 2 hours after the blast.

The experts figure that the small number of houses exposed in the long, narrow valley running through Nagasaki probably did not furnish sufficient fuel to whip up a fire storm.

In all this discussion of fire effects, it must have become plain to you that many of the casualties from atomic bomb explosions are going to be flame burns, the same kind of burns that would be received in any ordinary fire and flash burns from the heat waves.

In an atomic attack the number of casualties may be far greater than in any disaster that we have had to cope with in our country.

It is believed that burns, both from the immediate intense heat waves and the fires that developed were responsible for more than half of the fatal casualties at Hiroshima and Nagasaki and perhaps three out of every four of all casualties.

The magnitude of this problem points to the urgent necessity for making plans to deal with thousands of burned patients in event of an emergency.

And that leads me to the third point I wish to stress here today—your responsibility as a citizen.

First, it is evident that volunteering for civil-defense work is an absolute necessity.

Secondly, it is of prime importance that such volunteers become skilled at first-aid work by taking refresher courses.

Third, every possible assistance should be given in encouraging the Red Cross blood-bank program.

And finally, we should learn all we can about atomic energy in its various phases.

I have been talking about the A-bomb and its potentialities. Whether or not you realize it, some of our scientists could accuse me of talking about a puny bomb and about a civilian defense program that may become obsolete overnight. It is not my intention to alarm you, but I feel that before I conclude, I should tell you that if the scientist's calculations are correct, almost every measure taken to protect a city against an A-bomb of conventional type would be useless against a hydrogen bomb.

Most scientists figure that an H-bomb will be almost 1,000 times as powerful as an A-bomb.

This type of bomb would have an explosive effect of 20,000,000 tons of TNT.

To explode the H-bomb it will require 1,000,000° of heat, and flash burns from this type of bomb might be expected within a radius up to 20 miles from the point of explosion.

As I said, it is not my intention to alarm you about the H-bomb, but such a bomb is in the making, for experts are working on it as fast as possible.

In conclusion, nearly 100 scientists, technicians, editors, and reviewers, when they had finished putting their data together, looked back over the 450 pages of this book and then wrote:

"It will be evident that adequate protection against the effects of an atomic bomb will require very comprehensive and detailed planning. Such planning will be necessary to avoid panic.

"Mass hysteria could convert a minor incident into a major disaster * * * the organization, preparation, and techniques designed to deal with these situations * * * are * * * beyond the scope of this book.

"Their precise nature depends upon many factors which must be evaluated nationally. Their application will vary with the pattern of regional and community development."

It is stated on the basis of our experience at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, should a single atomic bomb be released over Pittsburgh, it

seems highly unrealistic to prepare for less than forty to fifty thousand casualties.

The Atomic Energy Commission has estimated that the ideal treatment for just 1 severely burned victim of the atomic bomb would demand 42 tanks of oxygen, 3 nurses, nearly 3 miles of bandages, and nearly 40 pints of whole blood.

Therefore, gentlemen, it behooves us to learn all we can about atomic energy, because the A-bomb is a new weapon of great destructive power, and knowledge of an atomic explosion is of vital importance to all of us.

Views of a Constituent Concerning the Critical War Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in line with a request heretofore granted by the House I am including the contents of a letter from a constituent in my district. This letter is from an outstanding, responsible citizen. He is a businessman; he is also an educator. He commands the respect of the people in the community where he lives.

The writer of the letter gave permission to publish his statement. He did not ask that his name be withheld, but to include his name would serve no purpose. I believe the membership will be interested in the expression of his views.

JULY 26, 1950.

Hon. EDWARD REES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

This communication is going to be somewhat different from some you have received from me. I am angry, disappointed, disgusted, and simply furious at Congress. And it seems to me there is good justification for this attitude. There may be a critical situation which makes it necessary for Congress to say to the boys who have enlisted during the last 2 years "no matter what your agreement may have been at the time you enlisted we are going to tell you how long you are to serve." The situation may be that serious. If it is then the boys can take it. However, if the situation is that serious it is time that Congress get serious about some other matters. Why not say to the leaches, bloodsuckers, and parasites who are making money out of this situation that you are not going to get rich while these boys are rendering such service to their Government. There are only two reasons why Congress does not immediately freeze prices and wages. One of these is that some Congressmen fear that it might cost them a few votes. The other is that some Congressmen have financial interests from which they will profit by a rapid upsurge in prices.

In the long run it will be the very boys who have been frozen in military service who will pay the cost of the increased prices about which Congress does not seem to be concerned. After these boys have served 4 or 5 years some of them may get back to civilian life. When they do they will find prices out of all reason and a debt created by the purchase of military supplies at greatly increased prices about which Congress was not concerned and they will pay the bill. That is they will pay part of it and pass the rest on to their children. Yet the bill to freeze these enlisted men in the service was passed without anyone raising the question about excess profits and inflated prices. No wonder Stalin looks upon America as being weak.

This communication does not require an answer. In fact, I hope you do not answer it because to try to explain such attitude on the part of Congress would increase my contempt at Congress which is more concerned about partisan politics than it is about the welfare of America in a time of crisis.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

Los Angeles County Leads the Way to Expose Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors of which I was a member for 11 years before being elected to Congress has taken a bold and patriotic step to expose communism by passing an ordinance requiring all Communists in the county to register with the sheriff or suffer the penalty of a $500 fine or imprisonment or both.

Los Angeles with a population of more than 4,000,000 does not propose to allow the Communists to operate underground to demoralize its citizens with its un-American schemes and deception to overthrow our form of government without knowing who they are, where they live, and where they work.

I am proud of my former colleagues. They are the kind of good, sound, fearless American public officials that all of us can be proud of. The action they have taken should, and I hope will, stimulate other city, county, and State officials throughout the United States to take similar action against Communists in their communities.

I further hope that this action by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors will encourage and stimulate action by the Congress to speed up approval of similar legislation on the Federal level which has been reported by the un-American Activities Committee.

We must come to the sharp realization that the Communists are playing for keeps and are using every constitutional right under our form of government to take this Government over by force and violence if necessary just as they are now trying to do in Korea.

I am proud to represent a part of Los Angeles County, and I am confident that the city of Los Angeles and the other cities in the county will soon adopt a similar ordinance to expose and reveal all Communists.

Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at San Juan, P. R., on July 4, 1950:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY DR. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF PUERTO RICO, IN SAN JUAN, P. R., ON JULY 4, 1950

Last May 21 marked the fiftieth anniversary of civil government under the United States flag in Puerto Rico. Today, therefore, marks the passing of half a century since we first celebrated the glorious date of the Fourth of July in Puerto Rico under American civil government. I have deliberately chosen the term "American civil government," because Puerto Rico had civil government before 1900. Until the time when the military government of occupation took over in 1898, Puerto Rico had a civil government as a Province of the Spanish Monarchy.

And in the last year of the most critical period of our history—the 30-year period from 1868 to 1898—the Spanish Province of Puerto Rico had a civil government under an autonomous regime, an autonomous civil government within the framework of the political system of which it was a part.

However, it is my historical interpretation that, in the course of time, the guiding lines of that autonomous regime would necessarily have led to a final separation of Puerto Rico from the system in which we originated. Puerto Rico was destined, regardless of the Spanish-American War, to be wholly integrated into the political and social world of America as inexorably benefits our geographic position and our ideological position. Puerto Rico is a part of America; America signifies a new era in the world, a new way of life in the progressive evolution of humanity by way of liberty and justice.

Thus, for 50 years July 4 has been celebrated in Puerto Rico as its own. Fifty years ago Puerto Rico entered rightfully into the social and political life of America, from which up to that time it had been isolated. The historical process which was inevitable, our separation from Europe, was realized suddenly by the Spanish-American War. Since then Puerto Rico has been adjusting itself to its new position as a clearly and definitely American people.

Historical events are not improvised. The development of America, of Christian civilization in America, of human freedom in America, have not been the result of a spontaneous and sudden explosion, without antecedents or determining causes. There has been no event which surprised us as if it had been controlled by the fiat of a superhuman power.

History is like a tree, it develops from the seed; like a river which flows through mountain canyons, which thunderingly disgorges itself in cataracts over the rocks, which splashes down the cliffs to find the levels of the sea; then flows serenely and ripplingly across the coastlands to the sea. It emerges from the deep recesses of the mountain whence it came, as a tree rises from a seed to extend its branches to the sky. There is a subterranean relationship among all trees; they feed from the same soil; their roots interlace in the subsoil and absorb together

the nourishment of mother earth. There is a heavenly relationship among all rivers; they spring from the same earth; in the same sky the clouds soar which, turning into rain, penetrate to the subsoil, and there unite again and come to the surface to swell the rivers.

The people established in America have their roots in the same European historical base; they receive their ideological inspiration from the sky of America. They warm themselves under the same sun of freedom and arrive eventually in the course of time at the same free and constitutional life.

If trees celebrated anniversaries, they would celebrate the anniversary of the first seed. If rivers were to celebrate anniversaries, they would celebrate the anniversary of the first rain. The people of America celebrate together the 12th of October, the date on which Columbus planted the seed of western civilization in the New World. Together they celebrate and should celebrate the Fourth of July, when the bell at Philadelphia announced the enjoyment of the first rain of liberty on American soil.

Because of that event, the regime of civil government in Puerto Rico had to be free, republican, democratic, American. Today we can celebrate this fiftieth anniversary in Puerto Rico as one of the glorious resonances which, within the limits of America, has followed the ringing of its bell at Philadelphia when it announced the first rain of liberty. Our civil government had to be American. It had to originate, not in sovereign grant, but in the recognition of the principles enunciated on July 4, 1776. That was the mother document. From Philadelphia the peal of the bell expanded in the waves of the air until it was repeated 20 times throughout the enormous continental expanse south of the Rio Grande. In fact, the ideas expressed in the document signed on July 4, 1776, had repercussions not only throughout the New World, but in truth throughout the universe. Recently, in San Francisco, in solemn convention, representatives of all the people of the globe came together again to reaffirm the declaration proposed by the United States of America, signed by all the other nations of the world, and found in chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations. Chapter XI of the Charter says:

"Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and to this end:

"a. To insure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses; and

"b. To develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement."

Thus there was not a corner of the world where the influence of the fundamental document whose adoption we are celebrating did not reach.

Civil government in Puerto Rico had to be rooted in July 4, 1776. And from today it will represent with greater spirit the principles enunciated in Philadelphia and reaffirmed in San Francisco. The historical roots of the nations of the south have been nourished for more than a century by the same nourishment as those of the north. The people of Puerto Rico, in spite of the ocean which separates us, have found a way of entwining their roots with the great Nation of the continent where the liberty of America originated.

We call this date of July 4, generally, the Day of Independence of the United States. But, I ask if this so brief qualification adequately describes the significance of that day. To be sure, on July 4, 1776, the end of England's authority over the Thirteen Colonies was proclaimed. To be sure, the Thirteen Colonies from that day on ceased to depend on the authority of England. But this is only one aspect of the event. The Thirteen Colonies ceased to depend on England, but not in order to languish in a political vacuum. Ceasing to depend is but one condition for the affirmative, positive work which was to be initiated. Involved here was not only a separation for the sake of separation, and nothing but a separation.

History is full of separations, pacific or violent, voluntary or forced, which settle a conflict or create a bigger one; which liberate a nation or a civilization, or cripple a nation or a civilization; which permit a healthy development of the people or suck the lifeblood of the people. Separation was not the only significance of July 4, 1776. More than anything else it was the date on which it was stated that only that government is legitimate which derives from the consent of the governed; that all men are free; that man and the authority of man is the source of the legitimate authority of governments. That is the great affirmative significance of July 4, 1776.

On the basis of these affirmations, 13 Colonies were converted into 13 free States—13 States composed of freemen. Thirteen nations broke their political relations with a government to which they had not given their consent to be governed; with a government which had attempted to function against the consent of the people it governed. The independence of the Thirteen Colonies from England was, then, nothing but a necessity, a necessary condition in order to make possible the establishment of the principle of government based upon the consent of the people.

If England had recognized the right of the Thirteen Colonies to their own government; if England had recognized the principle of government by consent; if England had listened to the conciliatory and eloquent words of her own Burke in the British Parliament, and to the temperate words of the colonists in their long, unheeded claims, separation would have been neither necessary nor desirable. It would have been possible to develop some media of mutual understanding and harmony within the traditional and historical union of the English peoples.

Having learned by experience, England has long understood this, and has created forms for living in freedom and partnership with other peoples. Today, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand form with Great Britain a great federation of free nations. No doubt, the course of history would have been different if, at that earlier time, instead of Lord North there had been at the head of the British Government a man inspired by the principles which it was vital to maintain in the trials of a long war; at Bunker Hill, at Valley Forge, and at Yorktown.

Once the separation was consummated, the fundamental affirmative work began. Each of the Thirteen Colonies was converted into a society of free men and into a sovereign state. Each adopted immediately, for itself, its own written constitution, affirming and preserving the principle of legitimate government with the consent of the governed.

Those who have visited Monticello, the gracious home of the author of the Declaration of Independence of the United States, the home of Thomas Jefferson, have seen to the right of the road which leads to the top of the hill, the tomb of that illustrious sage. His epitaph written by him, reads: "Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence of the United States, author of the Declaration of Religious Freedom in the Constitution of Virginia, founder of the University of Virginia."

There is a deep philosophical lesson in that epitaph. When Jefferson inscribed it shortly before his death, he had already been Governor of Virginia, Minister to France, Secretary of State of the United States, Vice President, President of the United States. But, so far as he was concerned, the offices which he had held in the service of his country were not the most important thing in his life. The real measure of the magnitude of his services to his country, the matter of real significance for him, was that he had taken part in eliminating the obstacles which stood in the way of the freedom of the people; that he wrote for America its democratic charter; that he had written, for his people of Virginia, in their fundamental document, the affirmation that the people gave themselves their religious freedom and, moreover, that under a government thus created by the consent of the people of Virginia, there could be established, and was established, a center of knowledge, education and culture, the basis of civilization, the foundation of spiritual liberty. In these aspects of the life of Jefferson are embraced the basic factors of the life of freedom. Elimination of obstacles to freedom, affirmation of the principle of government based on the consent of the people, spiritual liberty. For the enjoyment of this freedom, for the expansion and liberation of the spirit—the university.

Liberty lives neither within itself nor in an atmosphere of abstractions. It must live in the reality of the hearts of men. Man must conserve and defend it against all odds. Liberty has at all times been menaced by tyranny, on the one hand, and by demagoguery and anarchy, on the other. Only in a constitutional democracy is liberty secure. If each of the 13 small republics, because of provincial spirit, had buried itself in local and hermetically sealed individualism; if the Catholic of Maryland had not been willing to live with the Puritan of Massachusetts, with the Episcopalian of Virginia, with the Quaker of Pennsylvania; if, in order to justify this local spirit, the differences of social organization in each of these 13 republics had been emphasized instead of the common interests of these republics; if the petty ambitions of their people had caused them to insist not only on separation from England in order to remove obstacles to liberty, but on remaining separated from each other in the name of liberty, they would have endangered their liberty and not protected it. Their liberty would not have been surrounded by security, but they would have been exposed to the grave danger of losing it. They would never have been able to achieve the present greatness of their liberty, of our liberty.

England from Canada, France from Louisiana, Spain from Florida, would have been able to make easy prey, political or economic of these fragile republics. Russia, years later, began her advance along the Pacific coast and managed to begin establishments in California.

What did the great men of those small republics do? Were they fearful of the perils of liberty? They were not afraid. Expose liberty to weakness? They did not expose it. Create an authority superior to the people, which under the pretext of protecting liberty would have been able to destroy it, resulting in a dictatorship? They did not sow the seed of dictatorship. They appealed to reason and common sense. They appealed to the federative idea, to the principle of local govern-

ment within a general solidarity. In addition to a constitution for each State they adopted a Constitution for the common welfare of all the States.

They tried articles of confederation. Based on the experience thus acquired they took another step forward and created the Union of States and a Federal Government of the 13 States. They then adopted the wonderful document which is called the Constitution of the United States of America.

They did not copy federative forms of any of the other countries; they did not don a suit which was not made to their specific measurements. They adopted that formula which suited their own particular circumstances. They did this with all wisdom. In the normal expansion of population toward the territory of the West, till then uninhabited, the human societies which were being born—the daughters of the 13 original States—were forming additional States, all with the same individual and general rights.

Thus, the work of colonization in the northern region of the New World, which was begun by the Pilgrims of the Mayflower and continued under Penn and Lord Calvert, was continued after the separation from England. The federation of the States was extending its democratic institutions in equal step with the colonization of those virgin territories. From the original 13 States the Union grew to 48. Besides, Alaska and Hawaii have been formed and await statehood recognition. The colonizing process of the pioneers was not stopped by the ice or snow of the North or by the waters of the sea. It continued to the Bering Straits and the islands of the Pacific.

In meeting here today to commemorate the anniversary of important events in the history of mankind, let us, the people of Puerto Rico, see what lessons these events have for us. We may discover how in the course of history the roots of our civilization are linked with those events, and how these principles are embedded in the spirit of our people. We may see in what form these events have affected our ordered and peaceful progress.

The separation of our people, like the separation of the 13 Colonies from the respective European nations in which we had our origin, was written in the Book of prophecies, in the book of the things that were bound to happen. Betances saw this, as did Ruiz Belvis and Hostos. But there was written—and they saw it also—the necessity for the integration of these peoples into a greater unit in America.

Hostos and Betances visualized the entry of Puerto Rico into an Antilles confederation which would strengthen the international political life of the weak people of this chain of Caribbean Islands. Before them, Bolivar, of broader vision, aspired to no less than a hemispheric federation. The history of the New World, and above all, the history of the Spanish-American countries, would have been different if the dream of Bolivar had come true. Bolivar died believing that he had plowed in the sea. Indeed, his dream did not come true in his lifetime, but the idea has remained. Today, enlightened men of the North and enlightened men of the South have joined in the organization of the American states, and thus have started a gradual progress toward the political integration of democracy throughout America. In Puerto Rico, after its separation from its country of origin (an ancient nation which still struggles to find its way towards democratic life), there is no doubt that we have found channels to make possible our democratic development and our integration with America. Since 1900, these channels have been offered us in ever increasing width. Therefore, now, at the end of a half century of gradual progress, not only are we commemorating here that half century of progress, not only are we commemorating the anniversary of the great independence of the United States of which we are a part, but we are commemorating another event which is of vital importance in the life of our people, so recent that it could be said that it is taking place at this very moment.

Today, before the statue of Victory, which symbolizes our contribution to the defense of democracy during World War I, the veterans of former days take part in this celebration and see and hear us together, with the veterans of World War II, in which, with the same objective as before, the Puerto Ricans also participated. Young people hear us, for whom it may be necessary for a third time with the same or greater enthusiasm to offer their lives so that democracy may not perish from this earth.

Therefore, before this statue of Victory, before this symbol of our dedication to the cause of democracy, with the veterans of the past and future, we are celebrating today not only the proclamation of the principle of government by the consent of the 13 colonies, not only the extension of that principle to the rest of the continent, not only our entrance into the civil life of America, but also the fact that 4 days ago the Congress of the United States passed a law extending to the people of Puerto Rico that same right, that same principle, that government has to come from the consent of the governed. Yesterday July 3, 1950, the President of the United States approved this bill.

Indeed it is no longer a bill, it is an effective law. Puerto Rico is today, as we gather here, authorized to set up itself as it wishes, its own constitution freely established. The system of civil government of Puerto Rico is rooted definitively in the Fourth of July 1776, and is nourished from the same waters which run beneath the surface of the land of America; laws made fertile and blessed by the rain of liberty with the declaration made in Philadelphia, 174 years ago. In peace, in happiness, in the spirit of fraternity, our people will now determine whether it will have a government of its own creation; whether it wishes likewise to write a constitution which will give form to its political and social life; whether it wishes as did the people of Virginia, to write into it as should be written into it, a guaranty for freedom of spirit. And this with the profound satisfaction of the people who wrote the Declaration of July 4, 1776, who in 1898 accelerated the course of the history of Puerto Rico for our more rapid integration into the life of America, and who this last week accelerated their own legislative proceedings so that on this day we could celebrate in Puerto Rico the recognition of this basic principle of political liberty.

The attitude of the people of the United States toward Puerto Rico was expressed by the House Committee on Public Lands, United States Congress, in its report in connection with the bill relating to constitutional government. It says, among other things:

"By permitting the people of Puerto Rico to formulate, and by its own initiative and decision, to adopt a constitution, the bill would implement to the highest degree the principle of self-government established by the Congress as the cornerstone, as the fundamental policy, which governs the relationship of the United States toward the territories under its jurisdiction.

"Furthermore, it would fulfill in the most outstanding form our obligations with respect to Puerto Rico under chapter XI of the charter of the United Nations relative to the administration of territories which have no government of their own."

Here the report quotes the text of the Charter of the United Nations, to which I have just referred and which thus has been incorporated specifically in our political history. I wish to repeat the words in order that they may penetrate our minds:

"To develop its own government, duly taking into account the political aspirations of the people and to aid them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, in accord with the particular circumstances of each territory and of its people and its various stages of development."

It has been clearly stated by the Congress of the United States that it recognizes its obligations as trustee with respect to Puerto Rico. It has evidenced its willingness to listen to the voice of Puerto Rico, concerning its political aspirations. It has proclaimed its readiness to aid us in the progressive development of our democratic institutions, taking into account the particular circumstances of Puerto Rico. This without forcing or imposing formulas upon us; least of all, if they are anachronisms, or not adaptable to our present circumstances, if they might jeopardize the very progress made or place obligations which are beyond the strength of our people.

Eloquent proof of the fact that Congress listens to our voice and takes into account our political aspirations is the approval of the bill which establishes in Puerto Rico a government by consent when and as presented to the Congress by the Representative of Puerto Rico, who was elected by the voters of Puerto Rico and who spoke in that Congress in the name of Puerto Rico. He went before the Congress to endorse the bill, with the indisputable support given to him by the highest leader of our people, Mr. Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico by the vote of the people; elected by the people to serve them. He proclaimed this principle of democratic government within this federative formula for Puerto Rico on another Fourth of July, as on this one, on July 4, 1948.

Without sacrifice on our part and with sacrifice on theirs, in 1898 the United States eliminated from our path the ancient obstacles to our democracy. That was the moment of our separation from Spain, as 1776 was the moment that the 13 colonies separated from England. For us it was free from the grief of violent battle such as the people of the United States had to endure during their struggle for emancipation. Puerto Rico after its period of adjustment, now enters into the democratic constitutional life of America, as gallant and pure as a youth entering the temple to take his first communion. It is the communion of liberty in the temple of American solidarity.

The period of separation is behind us. We are now in the era of integration. To enter this stage, instead of receiving the bullets which the American people received at Bunker Hill, cordial hearings were held by the Committees of the Congress. We did not have to suffer the inclemency of a winter at Valley Forge; the bill progressed rapidly through the legislative process which all bills must undergo. It sped through with extraordinary speed.

Instead of a surrender at Yorktown and bitterness and resentment, the air is filled with the echo of the applause which expresses the gratitude of Puerto Rico to its noble friends in the Congress, some of whom are present here with us, and share our joy with us. To the Government officials, and to all the people of the United States we express our thanks also. Today more than ever echoes in the bosoms of the Puerto Ricans the feeling of solidarity, of the union between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States, within the patriotic solidarity of our common citizenship.

In consideration of all foregoing, who can have doubt about the future? Puerto Rico will go forward, uphill, along the road of

liberty and democracy, along the road of progress and civilization, into the American community, enlightened at all times by the spirit of dedication to human rights, freedom of man, and self-determination; in harmony, in agreement, in accord, under a compact which makes us part of the great independency of America, of the freedom of man all over this earth. For the first time since its foundation—for the first time in the 442 years which have passed since Ponce de León began the history of Puerto Rico with the founding of this noble city of San Juan—our people will be living under a government which they have given to themselves; under a government of their own creation, under a government democratic not only in form but also in origin. Instead of living under a government they will live with a government, with their own government, created to serve them.

The Congress says: "By this law you are invited to assume full authority over yourself. Until now you have been told how to govern yourself. But from today, although the Federal Government will remain in charge of the functions which are entrusted to it by the Union, you may create your own local domestic government as though you were a State in the Union. You may create your local and interior government as though you were an independent republic. This, provided you do it in a democratic and republican way."

As to local and domestic government their is not, nor need there be, any difference between a republican State, member of a federation, and an independent State with a republican government. Note that the Independentista and the advocate of statehood, apparently such opposites, find a common denominator, the common denominator of the constitution, republican in form as provided by the law. This constitution will be of the same nature as the constitution of a State of the federation; of the same nature as the constitution of an independent State.

First of all, when deciding upon one or the other, the independent or the federated State, if we had to go into the one or the other, on the basis of the present organic act, we would have had to begin by adopting a constitution of republican character like that for the government of a State or the government of a separate republic.

A State of the Union is a republic united with other republics, all grouped around a federal government of their own creation. An independent republic is a state which has not united with other states to create a federal government. By the adoption of this constitution, Puerto Rico will not have become a member State of the federation, within the Union of States. Nor will it have become an independent State, separate from the other States. Instead, it will exist as if it were a State or as if it were a Republic, linked to the Union by citizenship and having a relationship to the Federal Government as prescribed by the statute of relations in a form suited to its circumstances. Puerto Rico will not have assumed the responsibilities of the unfortunate international life of our day. Nor will it participate in the Federal Government to a greater extent than at present. But with the same obligations toward the Federal Government it has today, it will acquire the attributes of a free and democratic people within the great democratic and free systems of the freest and most democratic nation on earth.

Considering the just attitude of the Congress and the people of the United States toward us, who would be willing to reject this law, and why?

Let those few, who still sleep in a hammock suspended for 50 years from the stump of isolated independence on one side and the stump of unattainable statehood on the other, let them awake and see that it is not these stumps which are sprouting today as yet. I invite them to hang their hammock under the shade of the tree which sprouts into this new concept of a life of liberty in confederation. In its shade they may hope, if they wish, that one of these days one of the two stumps may sprout if this should be our desire. Let those recall this who unpremeditatedly have declared themselves against the law, as if it would deprive them of something, as if it did not mean much to them. Let those think about it who have opposed the law for party pettiness.

Let me say to the people of Puerto Rico, in this solemn moment of our lives, that we must not believe that today there are either victorious or defeated parties in Puerto Rico. Nor do I want to claim any personal triumph of any sort in this story of civilization. I am saying, rather, that the advocates of statehood for Puerto Rico, although in a minority, are partially triumphant because with this law half of their program—the Republican Constitution of the State—has been realized through men of the majority. Let me say also that he who aspires to independence, though in a minority, is also triumphant in part because he sees half of his program realized through men of the majority—the Democratic Constitution of Puerto Rico. It is clear that it was not necessary to resort to the independent Republic of Puerto Rico in order to have a Republican Constitution of Puerto Rico.

Neither of the two has gained everything. Neither has lost anything.

There is a great victory in all of this. It is not a victory of parties. It is the victory of the people, of all the people of Puerto Rico—of the people who have overcome their blindness of generations, the mistakes of many years' standing. Prevented for years from going forward by the disputes among those who had pulled in opposite directions, the people have found the middle road leading to the north along which we can advance together. If we who have shown the way deserve any credit, it is this; the fact of showing the way; of having seen the way and having dared to travel it first. Let us all march along the road together.

Who knows if at the end of that journey the changes, which are today going on in the world structure in general and in the hemispheric structure in particular, and above all, the natural evolution of this new federative formula, will have made the old dilemma disappear from the minds of all, as unrealistic. On earth, events may occur which are just as portentous as those which occur in the sky. Things may occur on earth as if its north star and the southern cross were united in the heavens and joined into one constellation.

Let us all march uphill together. We have already made great headway uphill. There are still some who resist. These resist, because they do not wish to rise up by walking, they wish to rise up by jumping or flying. Let them consider whether they have the strength to leap; let them consider whether they have the wings to fly.

But, because there are impatient people or because there are obsessed people; because there are those who cannot fly and will not walk, and those that, if they cannot jump, prefer to remain still. Do not stay still. Do not knock your heads against the wall. Do not fall flat on your face.

The people will continue uphill, their minds filled with the light of understanding; in their breasts the dignity of freemen: in their hands, fashioned by their hands, their own constitution.

Why Has the United States Air Force Chosen the Los Angeles Area as a Potential Military Target?

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are engaged in a war with Russia through the backdoor by way of Korea, the United States Air Force has released for publication in the metropolitan newspapers of Los Angeles an aerial photograph which clearly identifies the major potential military targets in the Los Angeles-San Fernando Valley area.

Why was release of this vital military information permitted by President Truman as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces? Why has Secretary of Defense Johnson permitted release of this graphic survey of Los Angeles?

The photograph of the Los Angeles area appeared in the papers described as "believed to be the highest aerial photograph ever taken from a reconnaissance" and "was taken from the Nation's newest camera plane."

Well if the Russians do not have the plane or photographic equipment capable of duplicating the work of our Air Force, they need have no regrets. With release of this picture no Russian plane is necessary for reconnaissance over the Los Angeles area. The American Air Force has done the work and in spite of the present hostilities has failed to exercise the most elementary security precaution to prevent material of military value from falling into the hands of a potential enemy of the United States.

I have demanded a full report from the Air Force. The people of Los Angeles are entitled to an explanation, and I am going to see that they get it.

With the constant threat of Communist aggression poised over our land, a threat which would never have grown to such alarming proportions if the administration had not bungled our foreign policy continually since the end of World War II, and if President Truman had not insisted upon placing and keeping men in the highest positions of our Government, in charge of our foreign policy and our national defense, for personal and political motives rather than in the best interests of the future welfare of our Nation.

If the United States is to be preserved, we certainly must have a change in administrative policy and have it now. We cannot afford to present potential enemies of our country with vital information whether through lack of proper security measures in our Armed Forces or through the employment of subversives like Alger Hiss in our Government agencies and departments.

Publication of the aerial photograph of Los Angeles released by the Air Force

is just one of too many incidents which have occurred and continue to occur which threaten the security of all our citizens because of inefficiency and indifference of the administration.

Panama Canal Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, since long before coming to Congress in January of this year, I have been greatly concerned with the problem of revitalizing the United States merchant marine and the maritime industry as a whole. I have addressed this House at length on some aspects of the problem and have been working in committee and as an individual Congressman, in every way possible, to develop a program which will insure that we do maintain a shipping industry capable of supporting a proportionate segment of our economy at all times, and, of meeting the water transport needs of the Nation in any emergency which may confront us.

In order for the industry to be in that position we must not only have a fleet for use in overseas water traffic but also, and of almost equal importance, ships, facilities, and personnel for operations in coastal, intercoastal, and inland waters to handle our domestic traffic. In considering H. R. 8677 we have an opportunity to take action which will not only promote realization of that objective, but which will also react favorably on all segments of industry and agriculture which now make use of, or can make use of, over-water transportation passing through the Panama Canal. Passage of H. R. 8677 will also act to insure redevelopment of west coast shipping operations, now deplorably lacking by stimulating shipments originating in west coast ports, and passing through the Canal bound for the east coast and other points, and also of shipments terminating on the west coast. This stimulation must be provided if we are to have a maritime industry with its facilities and personnel properly distributed geographically to serve all possible needs.

The shipping industry has been hampered in competing for cargoes destined for transcontinental points by the burdensome effect on costs of the tolls charged for Canal passage. The burden has been made unduly great by virtue of inclusion of operational and defense costs not fairly chargeable to commercial shipping. These tolls must be passed on, either to the producer or to the consumer of the goods shipped. The effect has been to remove shippers' incentives to use water shipping by reducing rate spreads already extremely narrow. This can be illustrated by the fact that prior to the war 172 ships were engaged in intercoastal shipping and we now have only 52 ships in that trade.

The industry asks only that it be required to bear, through payment of Canal tolls, its equitable share of the costs of construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canal. Under the present organization and administration of the Canal and its subsidiary operations, including the National Defense Establishment, there is no systematic accounting procedure by which such an equitable share can be determined. There has been no proper determination of what portions of the total cost of Canal Zone operations are correctly chargeable to commercial shipping, and of what portions should be charged off to other interests, principally governmental. As a result of this situation the commercial water-borne shipping industry has been saddled with a tolls system under which they have been forced to add to their costs a toll rate established, within limitations, on a largely arbitrary basis, and bearing no necessary relationship to the actual costs of operations benefiting it. The inevitable result has been to discourage use of water transit by producers and consumers in favor of other means of transportation. Our domestic shipping industry has, accordingly, been unable to recover its competitive position and to take full advantage of the economic factors which normally operate to induce use of water-borne shipping.

In urging passage of H. R. 8677 the industry is not asking for a subsidy. It simply asks that the operations of the Canal and the toll setting functions be so organized as to make possible a fair and systematic determination of equitable tolls which the industry and its customers in all branches of industry should be required to pay for services rendered. I believe that H. R. 8677 will accomplish that purpose. By the separation of commercial and civil functions incident to Canal Zone operations which the bill provides two important results can be achieved: First, more efficient administration of both types of operation will be possible. This should result in a lowering of costs with a consequent toll-rate reduction. Second, the separation of functions will permit establishment of accounting procedures by which an accurate determination can be made of costs directly or indirectly chargeable to commercial shipping. Thus, in setting tolls, a fair share of total costs can be apportioned to be borne by commercial traffic, and suitable offsets for operations not fairly chargeable to such traffic can be established.

It is not possible now to accurately estimate what the final effect on tolls will be. We can be assured, however, that the tolls charged will accurately reflect the actual costs of the service which commercial shipping received. This is not the case at the present time. It is fair to assume that when the reorganization provided for in the bill is accomplished reduced tolls will be possible. More efficient operation and the eliminations of costs not properly associated with commercial shipping should have this effect. In any event, the effect of passage of H. R. 8677 will be to resolve conflicts which have existed for 30 years or more as to the proper basis for the operation of the Canal with regard to its commercial shipping aspects and to the civil government and defense functions. It will resolve these conflicts in a manner which will add no undue burden to the taxpayer and will, at the same time, effectively settle the question of what share of costs should be borne by the Government for the defense value of the Canal.

Any formula for determining the exact share of Canal costs which should be charged to the Federal Government as an offset to compensate for the Canal's value for national-defense purposes must, of necessity, be purely arbitrary. The factors involved are largely intangible. After hearing a considerable amount of testimony on this subject the Merchant Marine Committee determined to eliminate interest charges during the period of construction, for purposes of determining the amount of capital investment on which interest payments must be made by the Panama Canal Corporation from revenues. These interest charges, compounded, amount to approximately $129,000,000 out of a total of $522,000,000 invested. While admittedly arbitrary, I feel that this represents an equitable arrangement for removing from shippers a charge which has been extorted from them since 1932, when this interest was first included by administrative determination to absorb some of the profit then accruing from Canal operations. Removal of these interest charges, together with provision for payment of offset of tolls on governmental vessels, now toll-free and comprising approximately 10 percent of total shipping through the Canal, should do much to permit tolls reductions to private shipping. It is, however, not certain that a reduction will result from the reorganization at first. Present tolls are fixed at 90 cents per ton. In order to prevent the drastic effects on shipping which would result if, through unforeseen changes in conditions, tolls had to be raised greatly to meet the costs set up in the bill, a proviso has been added limiting tolls under the reorganization to $1 per ton. This safety feature is necessary as insurance against disruption of vital shipping services. All indications are that the limitation will not have to be put in effect, but I strongly feel that it should be included to preclude possible disaster to the intercoastal trade.

Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I emphatically urge passage of H. R. 8677 as a needed measure to place intercoastal shipping on a fair competitive basis with other forms of transportation and thus permit its fullest development. I urge passage because the Nation must have shipping facilities at the fullest possible stage of development in this and future emergencies. Proper development must include flourishing domestic shipping facilities as well as those for foreign trade. These

facilities must be available on both Atlantic and Pacific coasts and on the Gulf. The Pacific coast has suffered a tremendous set-back because of decay of the intercoastal trade. To revive that trade is a matter of urgency, not only to the coast economically, but to the Nation as a whole, for defense purposes. H. R. 8677 is designed to aid in such a revival, and its passage will be a first step in the program to bring back American shipping to the point where it can effectively perform the services expected of it in time of need.

The Silver Lining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig for August 20, 1950:

THE SILVER LINING

Now that the first shock of Russia's unprecedented behavior in the United Nations has passed, something like a dispassionate appraisal of the situation is possible. No reasonable justification for the tactics of Jacob Malik is possible. The result has been to tie the security council in tighter knots than the frequent use of the veto by Russia was able to do. But there is a silver lining even to this dark cloud of international disagreement.

Although August will go down as a month marking time in the council, the period will not have been wholly wasted. True, nothing tangible can be accomplished with Mr. Malik in the chairman's place, but a great deal can be done in the tremendous task of pleading the cause of the freedom of man.

More citizens, in America at least, have learned more about the United Nations and of Russia's policies during the current deadlock than in the five previous years of the life of the world organization. Perhaps millions have heard or seen the Council in action by radio or have read about the sessions.

This is a long-range hopeful condition. It promises more intelligent thinking on world problems even if it currently heightens the international tension. This is not to say that the deadlock is to be welcomed. It is not. But there is a certain amount of valuable salvage possible.

Almost everyone has been able to contrast the smoothness with which the Council operated during the half year when Russia was absent with the confusion since her return to the Council table.

Mr. Malik, by his unconscionable falsehoods, has brought out the best efforts of the West. Certainly his crude exaggerations suffer by comparison with the logical discourses by America's Warren Austin, Britain's Gladwyn Jebb, the Norwegian, Indian, Chinese, and other delegates. The western peoples know now why we are in Korea. They know the depth of Communist perfidy. They know the need for strong defenses and they should have a better understanding of democracy. Under the western system, the people are the real bosses and it is important that they concern themselves with the issues.

Whatever Malik's effect on Asiatic peoples, his propaganda has backfired in America and western Europe. The people know now what manner of men rule from the Kremlin. This knowledge may be most important in the months and years ahead.

Perhaps no other incident since World War II has so firmly united the American people as has the policy of Mr. Malik. The Russian has plainly shown the necessity for cooperation of the world's free peoples.

What will happen after Britain's Jebb takes over the Council chair from Malik at the beginning of September? At least parliamentary procedure will be followed. The Council will have opportunities to vote on issues. But that is all. Mr. Malik will use the veto power as did Mr. Molotov. No real action can be expected from the Council so long as Russian policy remains as it has been from the beginning of the UN. Moscow knows now that her big mistake was in absenting herself from the Council. Had she been present the Korean action could not have been taken by the UN.

It is apparent that so long as Russia remains, the UN Council will be mainly a debating society and that any necessary action will have to be unilateral, with Russia bypassed. It is a difficult situation, but not entirely hopeless.

Ending Segregation in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, reports received thus far from military bases and camps where segregation and discrimination are gradually being eliminated indicate that all such efforts are proving successful and that no trouble is being encountered. At a time when our democratic system is on the defensive, the elimination of racial segregation in our Armed Forces is a very encouraging factor. It is the best reply to Communist hypocrisy and double talk. Nations throughout the world cannot fail to realize that as a Nation we stand united, in peace or war. They, likewise, will realize that the rights of minority people and human rights for all are best respected and defended in countries which practice true democracy.

For the benefit of those who may still be skeptical about the results obtained in the efforts to end segregation, I am placing in the RECORD an Associated Press report published in the New York Herald Tribune of August 20 on the subject and commend it to my colleagues:

ARMY UNIT ENDS SEGREGATION, FINDS IT WORKS—TROOPS IN FOURTH DIVISION MIX IN TRAINING AND LEISURE; TEXAN PRAISES PROGRAM

FORT ORD, CALIF., August 19.—The Fourth Infantry Division has been pioneering in ending all segregation—and finds that it works well.

Separation of colored and white soldiers in different units has been completely eliminated. All the men sleep in the same barracks, eat in the same messes, and sweat out their rugged training together on the drill fields. There is no coddling. And no trouble.

The results obtained have been more than a little surprising to some of the officers who during World War II served with units where Negroes were segregated in companies, battalions, or regiments. Inevitably, these men resented being set apart because of their color.

Now, in the Army's progressive plan to eliminate the race issue throughout its widespread operations, the Fourth Division perhaps has gone a step farther than any other unit.

There are many units where Negroes are serving with white troops, but usually the Negro soldiers are placed together in regiments and battalions. Some such units are fighting today in Korea.

Negroes assigned to the Fourth, which now is engaged in its most expansive training program since World War II, find they are treated exactly the same as white men. If they don't maintain the same standards they are told to snap out of it. And when they make good, they are promoted.

The Fourth is turning out colored noncommissioned officers in increasing numbers, and they are doing a good job.

Officers believe the incentive for a man to stand on his own feet, competitively in a sense, is the main reason this antisegregation program is bringing such surprising results.

One of the unforeseen developments has been to foster friendships between white and Negro soldiers. Instead of the pairing off of Negro with Negro and white with white, so commonplace in other activities, there is a very evident tendency for the men to mix freely in training and in their leisure time.

One white field-grade officer who had considerable duty with Negro troops in Italy during the last war says, "The quicker the entire Army adopts this policy the better."

Another, a Texan, who has been training these mixed companies for many months, swears that it is the only solution. He emphasizes that absolute impartiality is necessary, however.

There still remain a couple of vital questions as to what will follow when these trainees, and the draftees who soon will follow them, are sent out as combat soldiers to man line outfits.

Officers would like to see them assigned in the same manner as they are in the Fourth Division. They feel that if Negro troops, after training with notable success in units where there is no discrimination, are suddenly thrown into solid Negro regiments or batteries they may be sorely let down.

What will be done about this is a matter for high-level Army policy to decide.

A second question is how well Negro noncommissioned officers will function if and when they find themselves handling white soldiers. The best guess in the Fourth is that they will do a bang-up job, provided they are not stymied by some psychological factor.

But, as far as officers at Fort Ord and in the Fourth Division are concerned, they are sure this training policy will succeed.

Hunger as Democracy's Foe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter

to the editor of the New York Times, published on August 18, 1950:

HUNGER AS DEMOCRACY'S FOE—ACCEPTANCE OF COMMUNISM LINKED TO SUBSTANDARD LIVING CONDITIONS

NEW YORK, *August 16, 1950.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Once again our country is being forced to divert a large part of its resources for military purposes. With arms and force we are trying to bulwark the freedoms we hold precious. Yet we fail to understand the basic problem that undermines those freedoms throughout the world—the simple fact of hunger that makes so many people easy prey to other philosophies.

To people who are not sure of tomorrow's meal the democracy and political freedoms we feel are fundamental can have no meaning. They must devote all of their energies to maintaining life. Too frequently they are unsuccessful in that struggle, as the recurring mass famines in the East testify.

As executive director of CARE, I have had an opportunity during the past 4 years to visit more than 50 countries. I am convinced that the world cannot have peace and security while people are hungry. The continuous craving for food that has been the daily lot of millions of our fellow human beings in many parts of the world is something that most of us have never experienced.

SPREAD OF DOCTRINES

But until we are able to understand what that means we cannot understand why people accept political and economic doctrines that seem completely wrong and false to us. Nor will we be able to stop the spread of those doctrines. You cannot feed empty stomachs on ideals.

Two years ago a peasant in an eastern country told me that he had one bowl of rice a day and that the Communists promised him two bowls a day. He was shrewd enough to realize that the promise might be no more than words. But he said: "If they give me an extra bowl a week it is better than I have. Why should I fight them?" That concern for another bowl of rice guides millions of people. It is one of the basic factors that the Soviet propagandists use so effectively in gaining adherents.

In India, a few months ago, I was told by a Government official that in 100 years no one would starve in that country. But what of the people who are hungry today? As I write this, stories in Indian newspapers report famine conditions in many sections of the country. In the northeastern Province of Bihar, entire villages are reduced to eating leaves and grass. Numerous deaths have been reported. An estimated 30 percent of India's people do not get enough to eat in normal times.

Nor can these be considered normal days. Both India and its neighbor Pakistan are beset by the problem of providing homes and jobs and food for some 12,000,000 refugees—about equally divided between the two countries—who were uprooted in the bitterness between Hindu and Moslem. Their plight can be clearly seen when it is realized that even the employed Pakistani has a struggle to stay alive. Prices of staple foods in Pakistan have shot up 100 percent since partition, but wages have increased only half as much. The majority of Pakistani dip a wheat flour pancake into weak mutton gravy—if they can afford mutton—and consider themselves fed.

Still looking toward the east, where so much of the world's future hangs in the balance, every hour 15 persons in Japan die of tuberculosis, the disease that goes hand in hand with substandard diets. The Japanese tuberculosis rate is 5 times that of the United States.

But Europe, too, has its continually hungry, despite the progress toward recovery that has been made. In Italy, alone, according to United Nations figures, there are 4,000,000 unemployed—4,000,000 persons, and their dependents, who cannot count on their next meal.

WAREHOUSE SURPLUSES

At a time when so many people throughout the world need food, we have stored in this country millions of pounds of farm surplus. Some of it is already spoiled. More will spoil unless it is used. And every day it remains in the warehouses this surplus—eggs, butter, cheese, dried milk, poultry, and other life-giving products—rolls up a storage bill of $237,000 for the United States taxpayers.

Twice recently I have testified before the House Agricultural Committee and urged that these surpluses, after we use what we can for school lunches and relief here at home, be made available to American private relief agencies for use overseas.

Two weeks ago a bill was reported out by the committee—but the appropriations authorization to cover shipments to ports in this country from the point of storage and to cover ocean freight to those countries unable to pay for it was deleted. So the bill serves no purpose. Warehouses here will remain full, while stomachs remain empty in the countries we seek to convince of the benefits of our way of life.

Until we come to understand the widespread basic human need for food we are going to find that millions of people in other lands cannot understand the word "democracy." It is not that communism is more successful at winning converts. Rather, we are losing potential friends by our failure to use the most effective weapon at our command.

PAUL COMLY FRENCH.

Javits for Mayor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune, which pays a fine tribute to our colleague the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS]:

JAVITS FOR MAYOR—READER CITES NEW YORKER'S RECORD IN RENT CONTROL

NEW YORK, *August 22, 1950.*

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The action of Ed Flynn, of the Bronx, in engineering the deal which kicked O'Dwyer upstairs, necessitating a mayoralty election in a gubernatorial year, may well be considered a political masterstroke. On the other hand, it may well prove a boomerang. This it will be if the Republican Party will seize the opportunity presented and will nominate a man who will capture the imagination and the votes of the overwhelmingly large majority of the independent voters of the city. Such a man is Congressman JACOB K. JAVITS—a true Republican, but a forward-looking Republican, who has become a leader among the group of Republicans who are truly progressive and who are seeking to free the Republican Party from such references as conservative, reactionary, and the like.

In the very nature of things, there cannot be complete agreement with everything that Mr. JAVITS or any other Congressman does. Whether we agree with him in toto, however, there can be no disagreement with JAVITS' continued and zealous support of the rights of, and his interest in, the problems of tenants, displaced persons, racial and religious minorities and persons of the working class in general.

As an illustration of his activity, I refer to the establishment of Javits Rent Clinics throughout his congressional district. Such clinics rendered valuable assistance to many thousands of tenants both within and without his congressional district. They did such effective work that the Republican Party in the county of New York, ably assisted by Mr. JAVITS, expanded them so that they are now in operation in every assembly district in the county and are continuing to render inestimable service to many more thousands of tenants throughout the entire city of New York.

I also would like to call attention to the fact that the present emergency State housing rent control law, passed by a Republican legislature and signed by a Republican governor, incorporates a provision known as the "Javits amendment," which, in substance, provides that any landlord who obtains an increase in rent because of increased facilities must stipulate in writing to continue those facilities throughout the tenancy, thereby preventing landlords from obtaining such increases upon that ground and thereafter depriving tenants of the benefits of such facilities.

Congressman JAVITS is a proven vote-getter. In 1946 he was elected in a district which for many years had been carried overwhelmingly by Democratic candidates. In 1948 he was reelected, over an opponent who had been indorsed by both the Democratic Party and the American Labor Party.

We need JACK JAVITTS as our candidate. We need him as our mayor. Besides, his nomination will strengthen the Republican State ticket more than that of any other candidate. I strongly urge his nomination by the Republican Party.

SIDNEY FORSCHER.

Today's Challenge to Our Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address entitled "Today's Challenge to Our Freedoms," which I delivered before the thirty-third annual convention of the International Association of Lions Clubs in Chicago on July 18.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE TO OUR FREEDOMS

(By KARL E. MUNDT)

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for that encouraging and friendly introduction. Good morning, fellow Americans and fellow Lions around the world who are associated with Lions International. I salute you all.

It looks sort of homelike to look down in the first two or three rows here and see a South Dakota banner flying there and the sun-kissed cheeks of South Dakota citizens sitting proudly under the fair name of my home State.

I am surprised and pleased to find so many people here so early on a hot July morning in Chicago, and had I needed any further corroboration, which I do not, of the fact that the people who belong to Lions are a superior type of citizenry in the respective country or state to which they belong, that corroboration would be afforded me this morning by seeing so many of you here for a morning session of a convention which is already several days long.

I recall one time addressing the Los Angeles Breakfast Club out in California, and I saw across the head of the breakfast table as I came down the aisle to address those sons of the Golden West, this rather appropriate statement, which I think is fitting to you. On the sign it said, "Any old bum can stay up all night, but it takes a thoroughbred to get up in the morning." So I know you are a group of thoroughbreds.

And if it is necessary to make the analogy any more complete, I must confess that I feel a little bit like a bum, due to the fact that the exigencies of your program, the cancellation which preceded my appearance on the program, and my own schedule necessitated that I stay up all night last night to get here by plane just a little bit before I appear on the program.

I think I should say in all fairness, due to the reading of the telegram that just preceded my introduction, that while I have known Dean Acheson for a long time since he has been serving in the field of foreign affairs from the administrative angle in Washington just about exactly the same number of years that I have been serving in the field of foreign affairs from the legislative angle, I think in all fairness to Dean Acheson, I should say that in all probability anything which I say this morning which remotely resembles anything that Dean Acheson might have told you will be just a coincidence, because we approach the situation from a somewhat different angle.

We approach it differently, perhaps, because of our background. I don't know. Perhaps we approach it differently because of our alma maters in which we attended college. I don't know. Perhaps we approach it differently because one of us is working as best he can in the administrative branch of Government, which necessarily has a different viewpoint from the legislative branch, the branch of Government in which I work. Or perhaps we approach the problem differently, I don't know, because the Secretary of State pretty well limits his contacts to diplomatic people and people high in positions of Government, whereas a Member of the Senate of the United States must expand his contacts to include in large measure the good people such as are represented at a convention of this kind, just the ordinary people of the world.

So I am going to have to talk to you as a friend, in pinch-hitting for Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and a neighbor, and a fellow member of a service club, and just an ordinary American looking at this problem along with the rest of you, with considerable disturbance and with a great amount of alarm.

You know, when one has been down in Washington as long as either the Secretary of State or the Senator from South Dakota, unless he watches himself carefully, after some 12 or 14 years of sojourning in that great Capital City, he is inclined to believe his press notices and begin concluding he is a mighty important individual; and when men decide that they are as important as the headline writers indicate they are, when they say something that the local editor approves and consequently he banners it across the front page of a newspaper, that is the time when they are apt to make their most serious blunders.

WASHINGTON IMPORTANCE

Washington is an important town. I suppose it is the most important capital city of the world these days. It is a beautiful city. Lying down there, as it does, on the wrong side of the Potomac River, nestled in the District of Columbia, I think that Washington has become today the focal point, the exchequer, the financier, the leader of all the forces fighting against tyranny in the world today. And so, because it has become such an important metropolitan capital of so many people, undoubtedly those of us living there are inclined to feel that we should reflect somehow the importance and the significance and the power of that great Capital.

Ask any taxicab driver when you come to Washington any number of problems that you care to interrogate him about, and as he takes you for a 30-cent drive from the Union Station in Washington, D. C., to any destination in the first zone that you may select, if you are asking questions about domestic policy, about Federal spending, about how to solve the problem of taxation, or about the international situation, he will answer your questions promptly and firmly and boldly and directly. You can get a college education in Washington for a 30-cent taxicab ride.

He is an important individual down in Washington, the cab driver. I grant, his answer may be wrong, but he is never in doubt; he gives it to you, at least, at the drop of your hat. He never dodges your questions.

Other people in Washington are important, and the House of Representatives is filled with 435 important men, representing you and your lives and your freedoms and your fortunes in the greatest legislative body in the world. And almost every Congressman assumes that sooner or later he is going to become a candidate for the United States Senate, so that in itself makes him a mighty important individual as he sits there and contemplates that most expensive and most difficult and most dangerous highway in the world, the 575 feet leading from the House of Representatives to the inner Chamber of the United States Senate.

And then we have a United States Senate in Washington, and certainly that is comprised of important people. Every Member of the Senate and and every member of the President's Cabinet believes that he is a potential candidate for President, and certainly that makes him an important individual, and he goes around pompously preening himself, and looking in the mirror, and listening to the echo of his own voice, waiting for the magic call that says "You must lead the people of America in their hour of need."

Then you have some other people down in Washington. Of late, you know, we have people occupying the White House who assume that everyone who gets there ought to have a lifetime lease on the White House, and that makes them important people, too. And it occurs to me as I stand here and have the high and happy privilege of thinking out loud with you as one common, ordinary, garden variety American to others, that one of the things that is wrong in the world today is that there are too many people, in too many capitals, of too many countries of the world, who feel that they have gotten too important as compared to the rest of the people in those countries.

THE SITUATION TODAY

So we need folks like you; we need folks like you and organizations like yours, to keep men like me in jobs like mine, and in jobs like that of the President, and the Secretary of State cut down to knee-pants size once in awhile; to let us realize that the people in America were originally conceived to be its rulers, not to be ruled by the politicians. It is well for us to go back occasionally to those words of the founding fathers of this Republic, and that is that they were placing in the hands of the people in their several States, rights and opportunities and privileges to be enjoyed, and to be explored, and to be exemplified and, above all, to be exercised, because if we don't exercise those privileges, they perish through disuse and lethargy.

Now, look at the situation in which we find ourselves today. As Americans, I want to think out loud with you for a while, man to man, straight from the shoulder, just talking off the cuff and from the heart. You know, whenever you can get a man in public life to talk to you without a manuscript or without notes, you may get the truth once in a while, because he doesn't have any opportunity to cover up his convictions and to substitute polished phrases for points of fact. He just has to say the things he actually believes. He doesn't have to get a ghost writer to write it out if he is not going to use it. There is no chance to take out the things that you ought to be told and to stick in the things that he thinks you ought to become confused about. All he can do is to try to recite the story of our times in the language of America, the way we talk about it when we are sitting around a table in a restaurant, or waiting for the fish to bite in a fishing boat on a Minnesota or a South Dakota lake. This morning, I want to discuss with you in that capacity and in that way, free from all polished phrases and mental reservations and careful, cautious diplomatic doubletalk, the situation in which the world is, and in which you are, and in which I am, as we meet here on this melancholy day of July 1950, coming down close to the time when we shall have been in an undeclared shooting, blood-letting war for more than a month, in a country 6,000 miles away. The last man I talked to when I left home said to me, "Karl, my boy is in Korea, and I haven't heard from him now for 5 days. What can you tell me about where all this is going to lead?"

THE FUTURE UNCERTAIN

Well, if we could have had the Secretary of State there, that would have been a legitimate question to ask him. And as we listen to the President's message tomorrow night over the radio, that certainly is a ligtimate question to put to him. It is an equally legitimate question to put to a Member of the United States Senate and, while I cannot answer it categorically or prophetically or positively this morning in Chicago, I can assure you that had the Secretary of State been here, he could not have answered it any more positively, or any more categorically, or any more directly than I, because, unhappily and unfortunately, as we shall discover when we listen to the President tomorrow night, he also cannot tell us where all this is going to lead. This unsavory situation exists because you and I, as Americans, and you and I as members of a great service-luncheon fraternity of Lions International, with its clubs in so many quarters of this earth, you and I have lost the initiative in foreign policy as we have lost the initiative for the time being in the military program, and so the only people that can tell you positively today where all this is going to lead is Joe Stalin and those 13 associates of his in the Kremlin, who belong to the Politburo in Moscow. If you could induce them to come and address your convention, they could tell you. Nobody in America knows. That is one of the great tragedies of our times.

Oh, we can trace back the steps, I suppose, how we got where we are. We can argue as intelligent, freedom-loving, self-governing human beings about how to solve the problem from here on out. We can hope, and we should pray, but nobody in America or in Whitehall in London or in Paris or in South America, nobody outside the Kremlin today knows where all this is going to lead. The free world has permitted itself to lose the initiative. That is always dangerous.

MUST BACK OUR FIGHTING FORCES

We would better be pretty serious about it, you and I, because there are certain things that we can do and certain things that we cannot do and certain things which, unless we do them, are probably going to help determine the issue permanently insofar as freedom is concerned. But insofar as Korea is concerned and our war there, we simply must rally around the flag and get behind the fighting forces of America and those who will join with us, we hope, in the ground fighting with the blood-letting activities in that United Nations effort. We have got to support them, of course, until we win a determination satisfactory and successful to the cause of freedom. That, we admit. That, we stoutly adhere to. But just nobody can tell us yet what the target in Korea actually is, other than that we want the Americans and southern Koreans to quit marching south and to start marching north again victoriously. That, we know. That, we know, and that, we are going to do, come what may. But beyond that, we are stymied, confused, uncertain, and in the dark.

Nobody in Washington can tell you whether that march northward is supposed to stop at the thirty-eighth parallel, at the boundary line of northern Korea, at the gates of Vladivostok, or at the Red Square in Moscow. Nobody knows at the moment where that march is supposed to stop, but we are going to start going north pretty soon in Korea; we are pretty sure of that.

I don't think it serves the public interest too directly to discuss the paths by which we arrived at a fighting war in Korea, 6,000 miles from home, illy prepared and poorly equipped. On the other hand, if we don't learn from experience in a world as wicked and as dangerous as this one, things such as have occurred in Korea can be repeated in so many areas of the world that we can lose our freedom without even being given a fair chance to fight for it.

As intelligent human beings, therefore, we not only should look ahead and plan a course of action, but we should look back and try to figure out how we got into that difficulty, so we can avoid having the same men make the same blunders again in another dangerous proposition. And, because I wouldn't consider, certainly, sitting up all night in an airplane for the happy privilege of talking Pollyanna pleasantries and meaningless nothingness to an intelligent group like Lions International, I want to discuss just very briefly some of the things so we can be sure that that type of difficulty doesn't happen in Iran or perhaps in Turkey or in Berlin or in Finland or in India or in Indochina or in Formosa or in Japan or the Philippines, or any one of another half dozen places where, if we permit policies to be fabricated and pursued such as led to these calamitous decisions in Korea, it can destroy freedom at its greatest bastion, in America. Even a rich country like Uncle Sam's can't simultaneously maintain forces of conflict fighting in half a dozen different corners of the world, such as we are now compelled to arm and support; we cannot do it indefinitely.

LOOKING BACK

Everybody knows hindsight is better than foresight, but it isn't any better unless you use it. Hindsight isn't any good unless you can profit by looking backward to see what you can do when you next move ahead. A good motorist on a crowded highway, before he pulls out of the line to go around the car ahead of him, looks in the rear-view mirror to see what is behind. A lot of Americans would be better getting ready for some tough movements ahead, and in order to be sure that the movements we take ahead are right, we better take a serious look in the rear-view mirror to see what has been going on behind. If we are honest about that, as most Americans are, if you want the facts, as most Americans do, if you put patriotism above partisanship, as all Americans must, we recognize that the difficulties began, insofar as the war in Korea is concerned, at the conferences preceding, and immediately following Yalta, when we made some very serious blunders in diplomatic policy. When we, at Yalta, arrived at certain conclusions, as the freedom-loving leaders of the world, which led our then leaders to believe that we could get along happily and safely with a Godless tyranny like communism in Russia if we simply would permit it to grow by piecemeal methods until it tripled its present size, we planted the seeds of disaster. We gave them at Yalta, gave to the Communists at Yalta, the portions of Poland east of the Curzon line, and they continued to take the western portions of Poland and all of eastern Germany. We gave the Russians domination in the Balkans, which they now control. We told them at Yalta that they could have Manchuria, and they took it, and they liked it so well that they moved in and took the rest of China, and we did nothing to stop them. And we told the Communists at Yalta and at Potsdam that we were going to draw a line across Korea and call it the thirty-eighth parallel and divide up the Korean cake between the Communists and the freedom-loving people of Korea; and we agreed at Yalta and at Potsdam, among other things, in the occupation of Berlin, to permit the Russian Army, to permit the Red Army of Godless communism, to put its armed forces entirely around the American military occupation forces of Berlin. We didn't even ask for exit and entrance privileges. Consequently, we had the recent airlift that you know about.

PAST ERRORS

Now, those were blunders; those were errors; those were miscalculations; those were based on the concept that by appeasing communism, you can live with it. And we have found out now that by appeasing communism, you die with American boys facing 60-ton tanks in Korea, and we have to learn to avoid mistakes like that if we are going to have freedom in America.

I am not interested this morning in assessing blame or assessing responsibility. I am interested in having Americans, who are supposed to be governing themselves, be positive that they know what the situation is we are in, so we don't get into a like difficulty some place else. Members of Lions International are certainly as intelligent, on the average, as Members of the United States Senate, so I don't have to gloss over anything to you or attempt to conceal the facts and the evidence. How else can you contribute to self-government wisely?

I don't know how much or how little may have been contributed to all these melancholy decisions at Yalta, because the young man who served there as confidential adviser to the Big Three at the time the decisions were made behind closed doors was a fellow by name of Alger Hiss, who has been found guilty of what is tantamount to perjury to conceal treason by a Federal court in New York. But I know Hiss was there and I would have felt a whole lot better if Hiss had been at home, and a good American, believing in the cause of freedom, had been there, I'll tell you that, I don't know how much Hiss and the Communist cells in the State Department contributed to the cause and the creation of the war in Korea and the appeasement policies which led to it and the collapse of our American foreign policy in Asia, which has resulted in the beginning of a military program which is not going to collapse. I don't even know how tremendously much Alger Hiss alone contributed to that, because 2 weeks before the State Department people met at Yalta, 2 weeks, even, before the President arrived with the Secretary of State, a mission of American State Department planners met at Malta, an island on the road to Yalta, and at Malta, for 2 weeks, this little coterie of four important State Department appointees wrote out the decisions and mapped out the plans and set up the briefs that our President and our Secretary of State were supposed to propose and defend. And the most articulate spokesman of the group that connived and schemed for 2 weeks at Malta, by the record, is the same Alger Hiss who ought to be in jail for his infamy right now.

BYRNES—A FINE AMERICAN

I know there are some who say, "Oh, we don't think he had much to say about the whole thing."

This is not the place to argue that. All I know is that Hiss was there, and that Ed. Stettinius and Jimmy Byrnes, that great statesman from down in Dixie, that Dixiecrat—well, I hear some Rebels yelling out there and I want to tell you that as I have observed Dixiecrats down in Washington for the last 12 years, I have decided that they are not such a bad class of folks after all. I think a Dixiecrat is simply a Democrat with his two eyes open, knowing where he is going and deciding to get rid of the past. A Dixiecrat is a fellow believing in the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson, and some of the great Democratic leaders of the past. You know, I am impressed a bit by the fact that when you spell "Democrat," there isn't an "i" in the term; and when you spell "Dixiecraft" there are two "i's" in it with an "x" in between, and if the two "i's" can just use their "x" courageously they can go back and have a good Democratic Party once again.

Jimmy Byrnes, I consider a fine American, and that is what I started out to say—and that is poor business of course for a Republican to start doing, eulogizing a Democratic rebel from South Carolina, but Jimmy Byrnes I think is just as good an American as anybody we have on the Republican team, and better than some. Jimmy Byrnes wrote a book in which he told what Alger Hiss was doing at Yalta. Henry Stimson also told what was going on over there. So did Ed. Stettinius.

CAN'T "LET THE DUST SETTLE"

I simply want to point out to you, as we measure up to the challenge of the hour, as we must, that surely we must never again permit in American history at any time, such a sorry appeasement policy in foreign affairs to be enunciated to the world as our American foreign policy. For example, I hope we never have a foreign policy toward the Republic of Turkey, lying in the danger zone, as it does, such as we have had enunciated toward the Republic of China, lying in its particular danger zone, because the last full-blown expression of American foreign policy toward China was, "We're going to let the dust settle for a while in China." I hope we never adopt that as a foreign policy for Turkey, because I am afraid if we decide that we are going to let the dust settle for a while in Turkey, and let the dust settle for a while in Iran, and let the dust settle for a while in the Philippines, and in Hawaii, and Formosa, the same dust is going to be turned

into red mud by the same spilling of American blood as we have found happening in Korea, where the dust didn't settle as the State Department so naively hoped it would.

So we, as Americans, have to start trying to discover some way in which to establish a force, and influence, a positive movement for directing the "dust" so it settles where it belongs and not in the eyes of freedom-loving people all over the world.

And now, moving from there to the world as a whole, it seems to me that the situation in Korea, and the battle being fought in Korea, is the battle of Britain, and it is the battle of France, it is the battle of Italy, it is the battle of every South American republic, and it is the battle of the United States in this trying hour.

THE PRESENT ISSUE

What we have to decide in Korea is the thing that freemen have to decide and place they have the right to be free: Are we going to surrender freedom to dictatorial human beings determined to push us around for the rest of our lives? That is the issue. That is the issue at home and abroad.

You say "No" here this morning, and I hope you are right, but as one who has served down in Washington for 12 years and has watched this thing unfold, I am not too sanguine this morning that we are going to be able to activate the forces of the free soon enough, and hard enough, and deliberately enough to get them well enough organized to defeat the highly activated forces of tyranny and communism.

Let me point out something to you from the record that you may not have thought about. With only one or two exceptions, all around the globe, for 20 long years, the areas of human freedom all around the globe have been growing increasingly smaller. Have you ever taken a look at the geography to figure that out? Twenty years, 20 consecutive years of history, and in that time a considerably small number of human beings are free than were free 20 years ago, or 30 years ago, or 40 years ago. Civilization is moving in the wrong direction.

Have you ever stopped to realize that it was the year 1848 when the first Mein Kampf was written by the first German tyrant to scheme out a diabolical idea of world conquest 100 years ahead of Hitler? Two fellows by the name of Karl Marx and Dr. Engels wrote a book called Das Kapital, and then wrote an interpretation called the Manifesto to Communism and launched what the world thought was a crackpot idea and nobody paid any attention to their Mein Kampf, any more than they paid attention to Hitler's Mein Kampf 100 years after, but Hitler, a would-be dictator growing up from the German soil, meant what he said and tried to get the job done. So did Marx and Engels.

While we have been busy, as necessarily we have been busy, fighting the forces of nazism and fascism, the forces of this earlier scheme of German dictatorship, this earlier ideology which was trying to establish a world collectivism, the scheme of the Communists, has been growing, growing, growing, growing up until this hour as I address you in the city of Chicago.

LION'S RESPONSIBILITY

Have you measured up to that challenge as Lions? Have you recognized that, as members of Lions International, you have a stake in that? And it isn't going to be the boys dying in Korea that is going to determine the outcome of that fight. What is going to determine it is what you do as an individual citizen.

I never had the happy fortune to be a member of Lions International but I served as one of the national and international officers of Kiwanis International for a while and they are all-out fighters, just like Lions. If you are a young man, you either join Lions International or Kiwanis. If you are an old man, they wheel you up to the table in a wheel chair and you become a Rotarian.

But we all, Rotarians and Exchangers and Lions and Kiwanians, have a responsibility which I confess to you that far too small a percentage of us measure up to. If we can't increase the percentage, all they can do to turn the forces of tyranny back in Korea is to hold them for a while, defeat them in a military venture, build some beautiful new cemeteries and sit back with melancholy expectation that we are going to continue to lose the global battle for free human souls, as we have been losing it for 20 or 30 years.

I wonder how many of you have stopped to realize that in 100 years, communism, pagan, collectivistic, materialistic, aggressive, cruel philosophy that it is, an international conspiracy built on the premise that men should rule men, that the state is supreme, that folks like you and me are not the proper kind of individuals to have the ballot or the power of decision or the power of free speech or free movement or free enterprise—I wonder how many measure up to the fact that that kind of a villainous philosophy in 100 years has come to control the destinies and influence the activities of as many human beings today as Christianity in all its forms has been able to do in nearly 2,000 years? In 20 times as long, we who worship God, as Catholic or Jew or Protestant, around the world are fewer in number today than those controlled and directed by a group of 14 political mad men in the Kremlin in Moscow. It is a fact, from the record, that lions should chew on between the piece de resistance and the dessert course everytime you have your luncheons, because only Lions and folks like Lions, businessmen, doctors, dentists, farmers, clerks, free enterprisers all, only men and women such as are gathered in Chicago today can save the world from collapse.

You can save it only by doing those things that you ought to have done so long ago and doing them now by your freedom, meeting the big problems of the community and the country and the world, even though you can't devote quite as much time temporarily to the smaller problems of your own immediate success financially or politically or socially.

COMMUNISM A WORLD THREAT

We heard last week in the United States Senate, and you read it in the newspapers, you heard it on the radio, that 72 percent of the current Federal budget is being spent because there is loose in the world today a force called communism.

Have you ever tried this interesting little parlor game? If you have an opportunity sometime, call in your neighbors and contemplate for a while what a wonderfully happy world we would all be living in today, with our great victory in World War II, with Hitler sent to perdition where he so rightfully belongs, with Mussolini hung in the public square at Milan, with Japan brought to its knees—what a gloriously happy world if only there were not rampant today that evil force of communism, both abroad and at home. It is weren't for that.

MUNDT-NIXON BILL

And most of us have never taken time, have we, to be honest with ourselves, to establish a working definition of communism? Well, I happen to be one of the Senators who joined with others who have been working for a long time on a very simple piece of legislation, sometimes called the Mundt-Nixon bill, as referred to by the gentleman who introduced me, now called in the United States the so-called Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill, a bill to require Communists to do primarily five things, perhaps. First, require Communists to register their names and come out in the open like Republicans and Democrats and Dixiecrats do.

No. 2. Require the Communists to label all their literature with the imprimatur of the party, like the United States Congress has correctly insisted Republicans and Democrats have to do when we go out campaigning. No anonymous campaign literature. You have got to put your name on it and speak out behind it and before it.

No. 3. Require the Communists to do what the Democrats and Republicans have to do, make a financial report to the Government, where they get their money and how they spend it.

No. 4. Require the Communists, when they make a radio program, to identify it as coming from a Communist source.

No. 5. Require the Communists to identify by name all of the front organizations and kindred creeds which they support.

Primarily, that is the bill. You would think we were trying to assassinate every Communist—and that might not be such a bad idea, either—but you would think we were trying to do that from the hue and cry that is raised against the bill. In other words, the Communists and the synthetic liberals and the pseudo-progressives whose minds are controlled or contaminated by the Communists say, "We would like to continue to let the Communists be the only organization with a cyclone cellar which is moving around trying to influence public affairs; the only one that doesn't have to sign its name; the only one that doesn't have to make a financial report; the only one that doesn't have to register its members openly, that doesn't have to identify its supporters."

THE "ANTI-ANTI-COMMUNIST"

Certainly, I see no reason, just because a few people want to get a few votes from some Communists and some people who think communism is just a nice agrarian policy, like the State Department once thought it was in China, I see no reason why the rest of us have to risk sabotage in the dark of our war effort, that we are fighting at the moment, to give those Communists this special consideration, and so I am against it 100 percent. But there is a great and happy aggregation of quick thinkers and fast talkers in America that has been referred to quite correctly recently by an American author as "the anti-anti-Communists." An "anti-anti-Communist" is a fellow who can give the toughest speech in the world against communism, especially just before November when he is looking for votes. Oh, he can be tough against communism then. He can get up and he can condemn it, he can criticize it, he can cuss it out; but when you try to get him to stand up and vote for a measure to do anything effective to stop it, he is always off fishing some place, or he hasn't the time to consider it, or never finds legislation which just quite satisfies him.

Anti-anti-Communists. They want to do everything against communism except to insult it to the point where it and its organizations which are controlled by it cease going along with their votes when they are needed in a close election.

And then there are other people who oppose the legislation because they say, "Well, after all, the Communists are a political party."

Actually, they are not, but if they were, I would like one of those apologists for communism tell me why the Communists should have advantages as a political party that are denied to Republicans and Democrats. That is what they have now. That is what they want to keep. And when you write your United States Senator, as I hope you do—and if people like you are not interested enough in protecting the home front

to do something about getting legislation on our books now to curtail, identify, and expose communism here, then I think the jig is up. I think then the jig is up, because if we can't get people of your type interested in doing a simple thing like that, I don't think the boys with their bazookas against 60-ton tanks in Korea can do the job alone.

COMMUNISTS IN UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Now, we do two other things in the bill. I am going to be honest about it. Oh, we offend a lot of people on this one. We put in the Mundt-Nixon bill, or the Mundt-Ferguson bill, or S. 2311, whatever you want to call it, we put in this tremendously anti-liberal, antiprogressive, police-state type of thing that the Communist Daily Worker talks about in every issue that you see—and in Chicago you can find it in some other Communist papers published in Chicago, and if you look at them, you will see as of today they are attacking the bill and they will probably have the place picketed by the time I leave this noon.

We do another thing in this bill, and I want you to know what it is. We offend those people by saying if this law passes, it will not be permissible by law for a Communist to hold a job in the Federal Government; and if he gets it, he goes to jail, along with the fellow who gave him the job. Do you want it?

Oh, if the optimism, the well-known, world-wide, globally heralded optimism of Lions is so great that you think we can win these conflicts abroad diplomatically and militarily while the Communists continue to be permitted to operate inside the Government, you are bigger optimists than this Senator is. I think we have got to weed it out now, while we are free, instead of trying to do it like they did in Czechoslovakia, after the Communists had moved in.

The main reason why they come out, as they do, in their literature every day—and I think I brought a copy of the Communist Daily Worker along with me to show you—the main reason they do oppose the legislation in that connection is that if you make them go to jail instead of letting them sneak their way into a job, they lose their influence to help pervert American foreign policy and they lose their power to sabotage and spy from within.

I am not going to insult the intelligence of a great group of Lions like you or take advantage of the fact that I was willing to come and talk to you straight out from the shoulder, man to man, on a subject which your scheduled speaker was unable to come to Chicago to discuss. I don't want to take advantage of that fact, but I do want you to know certain things. I am not going to talk about Communists that might have been in the Government, but I spent nearly 10 years of my life as a member of House committees finding out Communists who were in Government and trading and trafficking in disloyalty. I guess we can mention Alger Hiss all right. He has been convicted. I guess we can mention Carl Marbani all right. He is in the Federal penitentiary. The last job he had was in the American State Department helping to figure out the policy in China. We caught up with that Communist and he is in jail.

I guess one can mention Henry Julian Wadleigh all right, because he has confessed. He was in the State Department and he confessed to the fact that over half a thousand times he had taken State Department documents and delivered them to Russian agents, and he went to court in New York and turned State's evidence and testified against his colleague and associate, Alger Hiss. Then he syndicated his confessions to the newspapers and made $5,000, and to this day he has never spent a day in jail for selling America out like Benedict Arnold did. I guess a fellow can mention him all right, can't he? He confessed 15 minutes after we told him in our Committee on Un-American Activities the silly old statute of limitations had run out on his crimes. The statute of limitations makes you immune to such crimes in 3 years, so he felt perfectly free to confess.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

That is why one other clause of this so-called Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon bill provides that the statute of limitations will not run out for 10 years on crimes against the Government on the part of traitors. And I was ambitious enough to make it lifetime but the lawyers cut it out!

Oh, I guess a man can mention Judy Coplon all right. She has been convicted and sentenced for her part as a Communist agent in the Government. I guess we can mention her.

I guess we can mention Noel Field. He skipped the country as we were moving in on him.

I guess we can mention Gerhardt Eisler. We let him operate in this country for 14 years and caught him and let him get away in a Polish ship, and Gerhardt Eisler is now the propaganda minister in east Berlin for the Communists.

I guess we can mention the people who have gone to jail, who have confessed, who have been convicted, who have fled the country.

LIONS AGAINST COMMUNISM

I think it ought to be fair to quote the State Department figure that might or might not have appeared in the written remarks of the very illustrious scheduled speaker for your occasion, this morning had he come, but it is a statement that they gave to me, anyhow. As I concluded my work on the House Committee on Un-American Activities to become a United States Senator, I had a letter from Jack Puerifoy, a fine young South Carolina Democrat who is Assistant Secretary of State, recently appointed Ambassador to Greece. I had said, "Jack, what have we done?" It had been a tough job. A lot of indifferent Americans won't support you; all of the off-color Americans oppose you and scurrilously attack you, and just a few valiant forces like the American Legion and Knights of Columbus and a few others get behind you and try to actually do something organizationwise to fight communism.

And may I again interpolate here, lest I forget, that through the representations of that great American, your president of 11 years ago, Alex Wells, Lions International has joined a new all-American crusade against communism to do something except grumble about the forces of sedition that have attacked you. I salute you. I salute you as the first service club in America to join up. Since then, three others have followed suit. That is exemplifying the type of freedom that you enjoy as Lions and that you cannot enjoy in any totalitarian country of the world.

Well, I was talking about the letter I got from Jack Peurifoy. Let me quote from the letter that Jack Peurifoy sent back when he said, "We don't believe there is much cause for alarm any more because of communism in the State Department since we have been able since Yalta"—remember the location and the date of that nefarious conference—"we have been able since Yalta to get rid of 204 disloyal agents from the State Department."

Two hundred four. Their count, not mine.

Two hundred four from the Secretary of State's report, not mine.

Two hundred four, according to a letter written by the Department to me, not by me to them. Two hundred four disloyal agents have been fired since Yalta. Keep that fact in mind.

Well, the State Department thought that sounded kind of bad after they had dictated it, so they put in a second paragraph and they said, "Dear Senator: It is not as bad as it sounds, because about half of these people were not Communists; they were simply homosexuals or sex perverts, that is all."

So they put that cut as a sort of a recommendation for the kind of people that they had had in the Department.

ANY NUMBER A DANGER

Now, I don't know whether it is mental corruption or moral laxity of that kind if you are a disloyal suspect, but I am willing to take their word for it, because I am a fair-minded fellow. That leaves 100 Communist agents by their own count, that they have kicked out of the State Department since Yalta.

All I want to say to you is this, as one ordinary American to another, that if you don't think 100 Communists or even 10 Communists, or Alger and Julian and Noel and a few of the rest of them can cause any trouble in our State Department, then I would just like to have the chance to put 100 American GI's in Joe Stalin's office in the Kremlin for 90 days. I would guarantee in that time to have old Joe walking around singing Yankee Doodle Dandy.

Here is the Daily Worker, and here is my picture looking about like the way I feel after being up all last night, sitting there with my head in my hands, listening to the testimony, and it says, "The Target Is You," and the whole issue is devoted to an effort to raise $1,000,000 and get 100,000 influenced Americans motivated by Communist ideology and Communist charms to write their two United States Senators saying, "Defeat this bill." "Defeat MUNDT's efforts to pass a bill requiring Communists to register and denying them Federal jobs."

Now our bill does one other thing. It also provides, if you please, that no American Communist can get a passport to travel abroad. They can't go over and fill their dynamos with energy and come back for the purpose of better corrupting America. Mind you, we don't say, as the Russians say, "You cannot leave without exit privileges." We do nothing like that in our bill, I am positive about that; I wrote it very carefully in that connection; we do nothing which would deny an American Communist the right to leave. We just make it impossible for him to come back, because he can't get an American passport.

COMMUNISTS IN YOUR STATE

Take a look at it. And take a look at Look magazine that I read on the plane coming in this morning. I have forgotten whether it is the current issue or the one before that, because sometimes these magazines you get on an airplane or in a barber shop are not exactly up to date, but it is not too old, anyhow, and there you will see, in the current issue of Look or the one just preceding the current issue, a map of the United States in which J. Edgar Hoover tells you how many Communists you have in your State. He won't tell you who they are, because he hasn't any authority to do so in the law, because communism is not illegal. Consequently, we think we ought to have legislation so we can find out who they are. We have got 30 of them in South Dakota. They tell us that in the map. If we had 30 Communists in South Dakota who were known as Communists in South Dakota, you wouldn't need any FBI to take care of that problem out there. I'll tell you that. That could be taken care

of at home, and the FBI could be figuring out who is trying to sabotage the railroads or the harbors, and who is trying to destroy the home front by preaching a doctrine of disunity, as they do, urging people to sign petitions to keep their hands off of Korea, urging our boys to come home. For what? So that the Communists can take Korea and Formosa and Japan and the Philippines, and, after a while, maybe Florida and the rest of the States. That is the Communist line.

Let me urge you, then, first, if you concur with me, that the hour is tragically past, with the fight nearing its fourth week in Korea, when we ought to do something on the home front to compel the Communists in our own midst at least to register and expose themselves and come out in the open. And if they won't do that, let's klink them into jail, where they belong!

This is not a project, it seems to me, about which the convention should resolve, but it is a project, it seems to me, on which good, red-corpuscled, callous-handed, hairy-chested Lions can do something today and tomorrow. You can wire your two Senators and write to them and say, "We want your public, active, aggressive, open, courageous support now in favor of a Communist control bill protecting the home front. And don't kid us along, Mr. Senator, with a lot of 'Yes-No's, and a lot of if's, but's, and anti-anti-Communist stuff.' Are you for the bill or against it? You can answer me in words of either three letters or two." Because it is important now that we stand up, I think, and divide the men from those who are occupying the seats where men ought to be in the United States Senate if we are going to continue to stay free.

LIONS FIRST TO AID

So much for the recommendation.

Now, just one thing more and then I'll conclude. I am proud of men like Everett Dirksen, my former colleague in the House of Representatives; I am proud of C. W. "Runt" Bishop, from some place down in Little Egypt in Illinois; I am proud of the fact that Lions International was the first rather than the second or third or the last American service club that said, "Show us a program to do something about communism, and we'll join up and be part of it." You made your place with one of the vice presidents of the All-American Conference against Communism, headed by a great American churchman, Reverend Dan Polling, of New York, and with the honorary chairman, a great American Hoosier by the name of George Craig, the great national commander of the American Legion, joining together the forces of what we hope are going to be 50,000,000 Americans. For what purpose? Simply to tell the Communists, "You can't take over here. We are going to defend freedom at home."

Oh, you probably will find in the local library and in the school this slick-paper Communist publication put out by the Soviet Embassy, because in most of our American communities today the Communists at this moment are doing a more aggressive job of promoting communism than you and I are doing of promoting freedom.

ORGANIZE TO FIGHT COMMUNISTS

May I say, and with this I stop, just as a parting request to those of you who are still awake, as I am about to leave and go to sleep in the plane going back to Washington, I wish you would just be honest with yourself. You men, tonight or tomorrow morning, when you try to erase the 5 o'clock shadow, or when you shave that ugly-looking physiognomy that in moments of great pride you call a face, you get some time to think, because the only time we have to think now is in the shave and in the bath, we are so busy doing nothing and getting nowhere, but we are awful busy at it—will you ask yourself this question: "What have I, as a Lion, actually done to help protect my fine family, my job, my church, my country, and my system of freedom from the attacks of Communists at home and abroad? What have I done except grumble and gripe?"

If you can't answer it, make a resolution to do something while you have time, because, as they learned in Czechoslovakia, if you don't do it while you still have time, it is too late.

And you ladies, as you sit on that spindly piece of furniture trying on that specimen of feminine haberdashery that you sometimes call a hat, and that we men wonder what it is, or as you spend the 15 customary minutes compelling your husband to wait for an appointment for which you are already late, while you put some little red and white come-hither all over your face, will you ask yourselves a question now, in front of the mirror in your boudoir, "What have I done, as a mother or as a housewife, actually now, except complain, to help promote the cause of freedom in an era when it finds itself outnumbered by Communist-controlled individuals?"

And if you can't answer that constructively, write a letter to your Senator or send him a wire before you go to bed, or form a little organization at home to explain to the people of your community that communism is not a political party, it is not an economic theory; it is an international godless conspiracy trying to take over the world.

And then all of you ask yourselves, "Since communism thrives because a small group of men in the capital city of each country have control of too many people and push too many people around, what can I do, as an American, to prevent a small group of people in my Capital City, in my country, from getting enough control and taking enough of the public resource and spending enough of the individual income and exercising enough of the decisions of the doctors and the farmers and the businessmen and the laborers so that ultimately here, too, too few people will control too many individuals for too long a time?"

The formula has some similarity there. If we are smart enough to analyze and understand; once we realize that it was the technique of getting the people's money away from them and taking the powers of decision away from them that enabled Hitler and Mussolini and Stalin to come into power, that there are no great differences between them, because nazism, fascism, communism, national socialism, and the planned economy all have much more similarity than they have differences among them, then we can start effectively defending freedom. They are all operated in the same way. Each is a politician's paradise—and becomes a people's poorhouse.

It has been good to be here. You are a great gang, good enough to be Kiwanians, good enough, all of you, to be sitting down there under the South Dakota banners with those fellow citizens of mine. I am happy to have had a chance to come and talk to you straight from the heart and off the cuff. I am sorry that I couldn't do it with a Harvard accent, so you would get at least something of the original, but I have done the best I could with the Midwestern accent that I have. And, anyhow, I am one of those fellows who thinks perhaps we have been paying pretty high taxes for a long time now in this country because we have been listening to a Harvard accent for far too long a time.

Radio Addresses by Hon. Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of a radio speech I delivered over Utah radio stations during the week of August 13, 1950, and a radio speech I made over Utah radio stations during the week of August 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[A weekly radio feature over Utah stations, week of August 13, 1950]

SENATOR WATKINS REPORTS—WHAT OUR BLUNDERING FOREIGN POLICY HAS DONE TO AMERICA

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, this is your Washington reporter bringing you a 15-minute program featuring your United States Senator, ARTHUR V. WATKINS. Senator WATKINS appears weekly on these programs entitled The Senator Reports which come to you transcribed from Washington as a public service by this radio station.

And now, Senator WATKINS.

Senator WATKINS. Hello, Utahans. An honest report from Washington these days cannot be entirely cheerful. There is small cause for immediate cheering, and that is true even though we do have the greatest country in the world, outstripping as it does every other country in production. The fight against godless tyranny must go on despite our present weakness in preparation.

But immediate problems have to do with taxes—with increased taxes, a complete reversal of what we thought earlier was going to be the news about taxes. Controls of all kinds are again in the Congressional mill. Rationing in the immediate future becomes a distinct possibility. Allocations of scarce materials and particularly those needed in the war effort are almost a certainty. A complete change in policy in other fields is also in the making.

A wave of public sentiment in favor of strict controls comes largely as a consequence of hysterical buying and hoarding by the public. As a result, stand-by powers for the President in all these fields are almost certain to be authorized by Congress. Laws providing for them may be on the books when this broadcast reaches you.

The men who have been overseas in the last war and who had reason to believe that they had won the great battle against dictatorships, now find that the job is not completed. A far more powerful dictatorship than those destroyed now challenges the existence of the free world.

Letters to Members of Congress from many of these veterans reveal their bitterness.

In many respects we are right back where we were at the beginning of World War II except that we do not now have the resources and other strong nations as allies to help us win the present contest. Some of our former allies are now enemies and our allies have grown weaker. As a matter of comparative danger, we now face the most deadly peril that America has faced in its 174 years of history.

I would be only too glad to bring all good news in this report. To be sure, there are sound things in our economy. We do have a great people who have accomplished modern day miracles. But an analysis of our present perilous position convinces me that Americans as a rule have placed too much confidence and power in their leaders. They have taken too many things for granted. Things have come too easy. Inflation on the early upswing is easy to take. It is difficult to believe we have been living in a fool's paradise. The Korean episode with all its revelations has brought us to our senses with a rude shock.

There is now serious questioning of our leaders. It comes not only from men who are now facing a second long period away from home in the Armed Services, but from every nook and corner of the United States and from all classes of people.

Official Washington is in on it, not only asking questions but is being required to answer them. One Senator who spent a few days at home declared that in the Middle West the home folks have very little confidence in Washington officials.

Dorothy Thompson, famous columnist, declares that we are now on the road to total conscription and total control of everything—life, labor, capital and income, by the state. "Accompanying this development," says Miss Thompson, "will be the old demand for 'unity,' the protest 'don't rock the boat,' and the urge to 'trust our leaders.' To raise disagreeable questions will soon become tantamount to 'conspiring with the enemy.'

"Before this state of affairs is achieved, and we are reduced to the condition described in the late George Orwell's '1984,' let us then raise a few questions.

"Why should we trust our leaders?

"Have the policies they have hitherto pursued brought us peace, stability, and international security, or have they brought us war, inflation, and international chaos?

"We have had a continuing administration in office since 1933, or at least have one now, which has defended all the international acts of its predecessors backed up by some bipartisan Republicans. Many of the persons who advised these acts are still advising. It is now apparent that they did not know for what purpose they were leading us in the last war; that they were afflicted with an almost incredible blindness to geographical, political and social realities; that, for the sake of world peace they vested the security of the United States in an international organization incapable, because of its composition and structure, of framing, let alone enforcing, international law, and that now, via that body, we are again engaged in war for the purpose of 'enforcing peace.'"

One need not agree in whole with Miss Thompson in her conclusions. She, however, has put her finger on one of the real causes of our difficulties.

There isn't any doubt that the prime obstacle to peace in the world today is Soviet Russia and communism. But an additional reason, and without which Russia wouldn't have been the menace she is today, was the misguided, bungling, blundering foreign policy of the United States of recent times and specifically since the shooting ended and the cold war began.

In the recent book entitled "The Great Mistakes of the War," by Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times staff, and perhaps this country's most penetrating military writer, the broad question of our mistakes in diplomacy and in military affairs are pointed up with embarrassing realism.

Baldwin's emphatic criticisms are full of meaning for the present and the future as well as the past; and these mistakes of diplomacy do have a tremendous influence upon the domestic affairs of this country and the lives of every man, woman, and child in it.

Mr. Baldwin pointed out that there are forces at work in international politics that are but the continuation of wars, and wars in turn are but the continuation of the peacetime forces of international politics. These forces are not frozen during a so-called peacetime era. Wise statesmen take account of all of these forces and so plan the permanent policy of their countries to the ultimate preservation of the interests and ideals of those countries.

Peace, of course, is the great desire of all peoples, and peace is planned for on the terms most favorable to the point of view in a nation. It is not enough to excuse our makers of foreign policy during the period in discussion, to say that there was no evidence of Communist purposes before the Second World War began; history has shown that that is not a fact. The Communist purposes were known before the advent of World War II. But our planners brushed aside the wise suggestions of Churchill, and our wartime President and his military high command staked all upon the military expediency of defeating the Japanese and German alliance and without looking beyond it to the ominous and already apparent dangers of communism.

One of their great mistakes that came largely as a result of mistaken foreign policy was the recognition of Russia. This gave Russia great power and influence in the world. This move was made, notwithstanding Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover had denied it.

Our policy made us unready in the Philippines when World War II was initiated.

We refused to adopt Churchill's "soft underbelly" strategy—that is, we refused to attack through the Balkans instead of over the west front. If we had followed Churchill, Russia would have been pinned largely within her own boundaries.

We demanded unconditional surrender of the Axis forces, thus signing the death knell of the underground forces or of any responsible governments with which we could sign treaties of peace.

We adopted the Morgenthau plan which meant the destruction of the industries upon which the peoples of the Axis countries must live. We are now in a weak way trying to restore some of those industries and as time goes on, the error of that policy is becoming more painfully apparent.

Then there was the pause in World War II before Berlin, Prague, and Vienna, when we should have been marching into those cities with Eisenhower's advance forces. Our holding back allowed Russia to take possession.

Another grave mistake was the agreement which permitted Russia to encircle Berlin and left us without a right-of-way into the west section of that city which was awarded us by the same agreement. The costly Berlin blockade and the airlift came as a result of this blunder.

And then there was the much disputed bombing of Japanese cities with the atomic bomb.

The crowning error of all was the capitulation to the Russians at Yalta. At that very moment we should have done everything possible within our power to keep Russia out of the Japanese war. By that act we set Russia up as the dominant power in Eastern Europe and in the Balkans, and made the Communist conquest of China almost inevitable. Events since that time have helped Russian efforts to consolidate the big victories won at Yalta.

We did have an opportunity, however, to rectify part of the damage done at Yalta. We could and should have supported the Nationalists in China in their fight against the Communists before it was too late. Acting under the policy of the State Department to appease Communists in Asia, in contrast to its policy of fighting it in Europe, we tried to force the Nationalist government to accept Communists in its councils, and then, in high dudgeon when it wouldn't do that, we pulled out of China and said "plague on both your houses."

One of the secondary errors was the wanton destruction of German and Japanese industry under the direction of theoretical social reformers and military people who knew not what they were doing. We have been paying large sums for the support of both the Germans and the Japanese largely because we left them with very little with which to earn their own living, and now that we are in great danger, it has become painfully apparent that sooner or later we shall have to rearm these same Germans and Japanese to help fight the teeming hordes of Communists. And to help them defend themselves as well as us we may soon be rebuilding their industries we have dismantled.

Then last of all has been the Acheson policy of Asia, which has permitted to a large extent the consolidation of Communist gains made at Yalta. It is generally conceded here in Washington and most of the allied capitals that our policy in Asia as revealed to the world through Acheson's speeches and his directions to State Department employees throughout Asia, was an invitation to the Communists to move into South Korea. It should be remembered that we announced that Korea was not defensible from a military point of view and that our line of defense was through Alaska, the Aleutians, Japan, Okinawa and the Philippines.

The record will show that pointing out all of these errors is not all second guessing. That record is too long to detail here, but the proof exists and I believe most of you will remember it.

Let me repeat our foreign policy concerns intimately and acutely every living person in this country. That should never be forgotten, but most Americans don't realize it.

Consider for a moment some of the following:

Our heavy expenditures under the Marshall program put the United States in direct competition with its own citizens for scarce goods. That raised high prices higher. It was inflation. Not only that, but we had to pay higher taxes to get the money to send to the Marshall-plan countries.

The recognition of Russia by this country made her strong. It gave her credit and standing in the world. We are now expending billions more in dollars to help offset that strength.

Our military appropriations are all affected by that recognition. We refused to attack Germany through the Balkans as Churchill argued. We are confronted with strong Russian forces in east Germany and in Austria. We are paying immense sums to offset that strength. We have had to keep a larger defense force in Germany and Austria to meet it.

We demanded unconditional surrender. As a result we have had to set up our own military government in Germany and Austria and in Japan. Our occupation costs have been running at $2,000,000,000 a year since the war ended.

Our errors at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam contributed heavily to the present strength of Russia. Every dollar we are required to expend in preparing to defend against that great power was made necessary to some extent by these errors.

And from a practical every-day point of view, it may be worth while to remember that because of their blunders we have been

paying higher prices for everything. You will be required to pay higher taxes. Many needed public works projects in the United States will have to be cancelled or postponed indefinitely. Great reclamation projects in the West which could easily have been built out of the money given Europe—some $35,000,000,000 since the war ended—this money could have built nearly all these projects. Many desirable reforms in this country will have to be postponed because of the foreign situation.

In this land of ours we have relied on the two-party system throughout history to help us correct our mistakes. But the effort is now being made to shut the mouths of critics on the plea that there must be unity—there must be 100-percent support of the Commander in Chief. Even the Constitution is waived to one side. Let me remind you that if the Constitution had been followed—if the Senate had been given the right to consider the executive agreements at Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and elsewhere, these agreements—in effect, treaties—might never have been ratified—might never have gone into effect.

Foreign policies do affect the lives of every American, and those who have made the monumental blunders which have contributed so heavily to our present perils should be called to account. Not only that, but they must not be continued in places of high responsibility where they can get us into more trouble.

[A weekly radio feature over Utah stations, week of August 20, 1950]

SENATOR WATKINS REPORTS—HAS THERE REALLY BEEN A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY?

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, this is your Washington reporter bringing you transcribed the Senate Reports, a 15-minute program featuring your United States Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS. Senator WATKINS' weekly program is brought to listeners as a public service by this radio station. And now, Senator WATKINS.

Senator WATKINS. Hello, Utah. In this week's report I want to talk to you frankly and straight from the shoulder on a number of questions that are being repeatedly put to me as well as to other Members of the Congress.

First and foremost in everyone's mind these days is the war in Korea and the possibility of World War III. People are justly apprehensive; young people who are just starting out in life, establishing homes, are having their plans completely upset; young men in college are wondering if they will ever be able to finish their course; boys in high school face the prospect, if the universal military training bill passes, of immediately being called to take at least 6 months training, and I could go on at length on this topic.

I am sure, Mr. Reporter, that we have had a number of questions on the Korean war sent in by mail and otherwise which require answers. Let's proceed with some of these questions.

ANNOUNCER. Senator WATKINS, judging from our correspondence and discussion in the public press, it appears many Americans do not understand just what is meant by the so-called bipartisan foreign policy. This question has been brought to the front again through public statements issued by Senator LODGE and other Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee in which they attack the foreign policy record of the administration.

Will you explain how this so-called bipartisan policy has worked in the past?

Senator WATKINS. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding on the meaning of the bipartisan foreign policy. The public has been sold on the idea that this policy is worked out in complete agreement between Republicans and Democrats, and as a result, all Members of Congress are bound to follow it. Anyone who disagrees is a dissenter, or to use a real smear word, he is an isolationist. Here is how it has actually worked as far as the Senate is concerned in the past.

The President and his Secretary of State are, under the Constitution, charged with the initiation of foreign policy and determining what it shall finally be. The Secretary of State discusses the proposed policy with the Foreign Relations Committee in secret sessions. Republican members of the committee hear these discussions. If the discussions in the committee are not sufficient, he has in the past discussed the proposals individually with Republican members. But the Republican members, even though they may have taken part in the formation of the policy, have not discussed the proposals with all other members of the Republican Party in the Senate. Those of us not on the Foreign Relations Committee have been to a large extent left in the dark. We do not know what the policy agreed upon is to be until we read about it in the newspapers or until the President sends a message to Congress.

ANNOUNCER. Senator WATKINS, has there ever really been a bipartisan action in the formation of foreign policy as a matter of practical operation?

Senator WATKINS. No; there hasn't been, except in a limited way. Senator VANDENBERG, who has been given credit for initiating such a policy, has said very emphatically that he never had claimed that it was bipartisan; that he personally never had the right to speak for the rest of the Republicans.

Last December, when I returned to Washington, there was some discussion in the public press whether there would be a continuation of the bipartisan foreign policy. I, and other Senators who had never been consulted about any of these matters in advance of being made public, said in press interviews that there hadn't been any real bipartisan policy and that we were very much opposed to having it called a bipartisan policy or having Republicans bound by what was done.

Senator VANDENBERG, noting the press statements, wrote me a letter under date of December 28, 1949, on this subject. I quote from this letter:

"DEAR ARTHUR: Since the 'pangs' of my convalescence still keeps me 'under wraps' a good deal of the time, this is my first chance to tell you that I liked your interview in the Washington Post following my press conference upon my return to the Capitol. I am writing because I enjoy emphasizing our agreements instead of our occasional disagreements.

"I totally agree with you—as you yourself were kind enough to indicate—that I have no warrant to speak for the Republican Party in determining foreign policy, and I think I have categorically disclaimed any such mandate in every speech I have ever made on the subject. Any pretense to the contrary—as too often implied in the press—has always been a source of embarrassment to me and, I would think, to my Republican colleagues. You cannot say it too often to suit me. I should like to have total acquittal from any such presumption. I have no authority—and never have had or never will claim it—to commit my Republican colleagues in the Senate to anything.

"What I do have is the responsibility of leading the discussions and the explorations in respect to foreign policy, and this responsibility comes to me on the direct orders of my colleagues when they approve my designation as ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee.

"Again, I totally agree with you when you say that the two-party system (which I consider indispensable) cannot function 'unless we of the opposition party debate the (foreign policy) issues thoroughly upon the floor'; and when you say that 'the time for a waters' edge unity is after the decision has been reached.' There can be no effective, ultimate unity except as free minds meet in free debate. I also mean that from the bottom of my heart."

Senator VANDENBERG's position, in my opinion, is absolutely sound. I believe his letter clears up a basic misunderstanding of just what is meant by our bipartisan foreign policy.

ANNOUNCER. Senator WATKINS, you mentioned a moment ago that if we had any bipartisan foreign policy at all that it was a limited one. Just what did you mean by that?

Senator WATKINS. In the first place, I meant that what has been described by the press as a bipartisan foreign policy is in effect limited to a few Republican Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee and not to the entire party. As a matter of fact, there has never been more than a mention of foreign policy in our Senate Republican conferences where matters of policy are usually discussed. I have been present at all of them, and I know there has been a studied effort to keep away from consideration of this subject.

In the second place, the so-called bipartisan policy has been limited to matters of policy with respect to our relations in Europe and defense of the Atlantic community countries. In this field, Senator VANDENBERG has been consulted. In fact, he has initiated some of the policies, such as the Atlantic Pact and the so-called Vandenberg resolution. He also initiated the Rio Pact wherein the United States and other American Republics join forces.

When its comes to our Asiatic and Pacific policies, Senator VANDENBERG declares that he has never been consulted. He is corroborated in this by other Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee. The first the Republican members of this committee would hear about Asiatic or Pacific policies would be when they were announced in the press or when the President sent a message to the Congress. Certainly no Republican, even in a limited way, could be bound by such conduct of foreign affairs with respect to Asia and the Pacific.

That is why even Senator VANDENBERG was willing to join in approving the substance of the Lodge-Smith-Wiley-Hickenlooper statement which the Democrats have been denouncing so bitterly for the last 10 days.

ANNOUNCER. Why do you think the Republicans were not consulted in initiating our policies for Asia and the Pacific, Senator WATKINS?

Senator WATKINS. I can't read the minds of the President and his advisers, but as you know, the President usually takes the advice of the State Department on matters of this kind. For some reason, Secretary Acheson particularly did not want to consult the Republicans in the formation of our Asiatic policy. Our policy for Asia and the Pacific has, until the Korean incident, been largely an appeasement of Russia. We practically sold China out at Yalta. China fell because of our lack of support of the Nationalists, and the Russians, no doubt, felt Korea would be easy picking because the State Department announced we didn't intend to defend that country.

ANNOUNCER. Senator WATKINS, what is likely to be the practical effect of the division in the Foreign Relations Committee on the question of our foreign policy? Do you think this break will seriously affect the security of the United States?

Senator WATKINS. I don't think it will. In fact, I believe that had the Republicans been more critical at an earlier stage in the development of our Asiatic and Pacific policies, there might have been a reversal by the President a long time before the Korean

episode happened; had such a reversal come earlier, the free nations would not have lost China and we would not now be fighting in Korea.

Also, I believe it is a good thing to have an opposition party which would subject the various proposals made on foreign policy to a critical analysis. In fact, I think it is the duty of the opposition party to do just that, because that is our only protection.

ANNOUNCER. Senator WATKINS, there has been considerable discussion in the press on this very question, hasn't there? Could you give us an example?

Senator WATKINS. Let me call your attention to an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune which is a strong internationalist paper. Let me quote from this editorial, published August 15:

"In bringing Korea into current political discussion the Republicans have raised anew the old question of the proper role of an opposition party under the American constitutional system. It has been easy for the Democrats to act shocked and grieved, as if it were a crime to focus attention upon past errors of the administration. Less politically minded citizens have questioned whether raising issues of foreign policy may not create dangerous divisions among us. Yet the fact remains that constitutional government, as the free peoples understand it, requires criticism and dissent—in short, an organized opposition. We are a two-party Nation, and if the Republicans do not act as the opposition, no other group can. As for eliminating from the political forum all questions of defense and foreign policy, that would be tantamount to saying that a free people can discuss secondary matters, but that it must fall silent and acquiescent where the great issues are involved that affect its liberty and its very life."

ANNOUNCER. That sounds like a sensible statement, Senator WATKINS. Have you been able to apply it in your activities with respect to the foreign policy?

Senator WATKINS. I am in full accord with the Herald Tribune editorial. I have asked many questions about our foreign relations and I have been critical at times of policies proposed. As soon as they have been adopted by Congress, in a few instances over my opposition, I have proceeded to support these policies because they have been established by both the President and the Congress. I will continue to support them unless I am convinced that they are utterly dangerous for the country. In that event, of course, I will follow my conscience and call them to the attention of the proper officials and to the people of the country if necessary.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you, Senator WATKINS.

Curtailment of Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "A Proper Mail Service," published in the Cincinnati Times-Star on August 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROPER MAIL SERVICE

By a margin big enough to override a threatened Presidential veto, the House has passed and sent to the Senate a bill to restore the cuts in mail service ordered last April by Postmaster General Donaldson.

This was a proper move and a deserved rebuke to the Postmaster General and to the President who backed him up in a picayunish but costly gesture of economy. The cut in mail deliveries, it is said, will save the taxpayers $70,000,000 a year. Maybe it will. But it has caused a serious inconvenience, especially in suburban areas, to taxpayers who will continue to shell out not millions but billions for administration ventures that benefit only specially favored groups.

If the administration had tried, and failed, to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for real economies in the postal service, it might have been morally justified in backing the Donaldson order as a second-best economy move. But it has given only lip service, and not much of that, to the Hoover proposals. And it has effectively opposed all efforts by Senator DOUGLAS and others for cutting down the swollen nonmilitary budget. In the circumstances, the cry for economy from the White House has a hollow ring.

If the Senate gets a chance to vote on this bill it will undoubtedly back up the House, and probably with a safe margin to overcome a veto. The danger is that the Senate won't be allowed to vote on it. Administration lieutenants threaten to hold up the measure in the crowded session.

Congress has many things to do before the planned recess in early September. National defense is, of course, the paramount concern. But in view of all the weeks that were wasted in opposition to efforts for real economy, and remembering our prospective $3,000,000,000 deficit before Korea, the public should demand as of right a proper mail service.

The Role of the Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Role of the Opposition," published in the New York Herald Tribune on August 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE OPPOSITION

In bringing Korea into current political discussion the Republicans have raised anew the old question of the proper role of an opposition party under the American constitutional system. It has been easy for the Democrats to act shocked and grieved, as if it were a crime of lese-majesty to focus attention upon past errors of the administration. Less politically minded citizens have questioned whether raising issues of foreign policy may not create dangerous divisions among us. Yet the fact remains that constitutional government, as the free peoples understand it, requires criticism and dissent—in short, an organized opposition. We are a two-party Nation, and if the Republicans do not act as the opposition, no other group can. As for eliminating from the political forum all questions of defense and foreign policy, that would be tantamount to saying that a free people can discuss secondary matters, but that it must fall silent and acquiescent where the great issues are involved that affect its liberty and its very life.

In the present situation, it is suggested that the Republicans do not have the right to criticize the Democrats for past mistakes except insofar as they were invariably right and farsighted themselves. It would be agreeable to be able to maintain that the Republicans always had been right, but this is neither necessary nor, in the circumstances, possible. By the nature of the constitutional system, the opposition in the United States is lacking in leadership as well as in defined responsibility. It inevitably gives rise to diverse and conflicting views. To the extent that Republicans in the Congress and elsewhere have, during these years out of power, failed to avert errors or have proposed false views of their own, they make their role as the opposition party the more hazardous and difficult. But they are not relieved thereby of their duty to oppose. The Democrats have possessed day-to-day control of our affairs, with the enormous power, both direct and indirect, with which the Constitution endows the Presidential office. The responsibility has been theirs, and in the end they must be called to account.

The fact that the Republicans must play, and are beginning to play very effectively, the part of the opposition does not mean that there are no limits upon their conduct. It is inconceivable that they should jeopardize the national interest for the sake of the partisan advantage. The major statements which have been made on foreign affairs thus far—the manifesto of the four Republican Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee and the speech last evening by Mr. Stassen—have both been distinguished by an awareness that frank criticism does not make cooperation impossible or forestall the re-creation of a sounder and more firmly based bipartisanship. It is this search for an ultimate agreement which lifts these criticisms above what Senator CONNALLY called quarrelsome and pettifogging attacks, placing them on the high level where our historic controversies have been fought out and settled.

Rearming Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Rearming the Germans," written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, and published in this morning's Washington Post. The article is particularly descriptive of the situation in Germany.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—REARMING THE GERMANS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Enough has already been said in public about rearming the western Germans to enable us to define the first big issue which

has to be decided. We have to choose between two very different conceptions. One is that the west Germans should be armed specifically in order to deal with the east German forces. The other and very different view is that they should be armed in order to become the hard core of the ground forces alined against the armies of the Soviet orbit.

The discussion has shown, it seems to me, that it is necessary and that it is feasible to proceed at once to prepare west German forces capable of defeating aggression, in the North Korean style, by the east Germans. The discussions have also shown, it seems to me, that the idea of recruiting the Germans as the shock troops of a European or an Atlantic army raises problems which, even if they are not insoluble, are certainly not soluble soon.

It seems to me reasonably clear that unless we deal first with the question of German internal security against civil war, we shall create only confusion. To authorize and help equip a west German militia strong enough not to be overcome by the east Germans is a limited but an attainable objective. To treat west Germany as a reserve of military manpower which can be drawn upon by the Atlantic nations is an unlimited objective. Under no conceivable circumstances could even 20 west German divisions be recalled, retrained, and reequipped quickly for international war.

The prudent and practical thing to do is not to bite off more than anyone can chew, and to approach the momentous question of German rearmament as statesmen concerned with the future of the German Nation and state, not in the manner of recruiting sergeants drumming up enlistments.

Dr. Adenauer told us the other day that before western Germany could safely rearm the United States would have to establish a "protective curtain" of at least 10 United States armored divisions. The Germans say that they must be defended while they are preparing to defend themselves. If we analyze this German argument, what we find is that they want us to be near a total mobilization with—for us—a large army already in Europe, before they mobilize.

This is very different from the fantasy of the wishful thinkers in Whitehall and in the Pentagon that the Germans have just what we lack—namely lots of infantry aching and itching to put on a uniform and to start marching again. Dr. Adenauer's comment on this mirage is that first we should mobilize our own infantry and place it between the Elbe and the Rhine.

Dr. Adenauer has not yet spoken publicly, unless I have missed it, on the other German objections. It is that a German army of any size worth talking about can be recruited only by conscription. Not even the Germans, the most martial of the civilized nations, ever recruited their infantry by volunteering. What is more, no large German army can be raised, can be trained, and can be commanded except by German officers and a German general staff.

To raise an army by conscription is very near to being the ultimate exercise of sovereignty. We must not deceive ourselves into thinking that the government in Bonn, which lacks almost all the attributes of sovereignty, can or will recreate the German army before it has recovered full and equal sovereignty, including the recognition that Germany is a great European power with a foreign policy which is made in Germany.

My own view is that all this is going to happen. But it is going to happen, not in order to provide troops for a hypothetical war in 1952–54, but in the course of the natural revival of the German nation and its return as a principal power in Europe.

We should encourage the revival of Germany particularly in close alliance with France. But we should not look upon the Germans, whom we have defeated and disarmed, as a reserve of military manpower upon which we can now draw.

The self-respecting and the practical thing to do is to arm the Germans for their own internal security. Until they have recovered full sovereignty, a greater military effort than that should not be asked of them nor can it be expected. For the time being we can leave it at that. Yet if only we could do that much, and do it effectively, it would add immeasurably, perhaps decisively, to the security of all of western Europe. For the greatest danger of a general war is the outbreak of a German civil war. All of us would quickly be sucked into a German civil war.

If the western allies could agree clearly and firmly on this limited objective, they could then, I think, take a salutary and constructive action. They could reconvene the Council of Foreign Ministers and they could tell Mr. Vishinsky that they have decided to authorize and to equip forces in western Germany similar to those in eastern Germany though, of course, three times as large since western German has about three times as many people who need to be policed and protected. Since this would be following the precedent established by the U. S. S. R. in its zone, the western allies could say to Mr. Vishinsky that they know he will regard their decision as conforming to the Potsdam agreement.

They should, however, add that since the existence of two German military forces is a danger to the peace of Germany and of the world, they would be glad to consider proposals for German internal security which recognized the principle that the German police and militia in all parts of Germany should be in proportion to the population.

Governmental Mistakes Leading to Hostilities in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Mistakes of the Future," published in the September 1950 issue of the Farm Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISTAKES OF THE FUTURE

The mess in Korea high-lights grievous mistakes in recent American statesmanship. That this Asiatic peninsula, with no strategic military importance to the United States, must be the scene of a bloody struggle, proves once again that all mistakes must be paid for. The price for governmental errors always comes high.

In order that future mistakes may be fewer, those of the past should not be dismissed. They should be studied.

The route to Korean bloodshed began back in 1933, when our Government recognized Soviet Russia. Much has been lost by the appeasement policies which the administrations since then have followed. We gave the Soviets generously of lend-lease materials, with little in return. We yielded to Stalin by making the second front in Normandy. Had that attack been made from the Mediterranean, Russia would not today be solidly installed in half of Europe. We stopped our advancing armies so that Russians could be first to enter Berlin—an error that cost millions for the airlift later, and that may yet cost far more to protect western Europe.

We suspended the war with no plans for winning the peace. At Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta concessions were made to Stalin which set the Communists up in business in China, Korea, and elsewhere in the Orient.

Then our confused and infested State Department faltered year after year over China. Bemused by attempting to mix into the economic affairs of half the world, it failed miserably to head off the Communist control which now holds China in iron grip.

Meanwhile, a 1948 campaign money raiser was made Secretary of Defense. Recommendations for defense expenditures were whittled, while nondefense spending mounted to unprecedented figures. The Navy was weakened, the Air Forces throttled down, and the Army limited, while the illusion of adequate preparedness was fostered in the public mind.

The Voice of America was held to an ill-managed whisper, while Russian propaganda against the United States blanketed the earth.

Soft methods have enabled Communists and their helpers to penetrate deeply into American industry. Should world war be resumed, American action could be crippled in countless ways by Communist sabotage from within.

The Nation has been weakened internally by governmental borrowing, which has cut down the value of savings.

Bad examples in high places have impaired moral standards and have weakened another great source of strength.

This is a gloomy record. We regret that it can be recited. America deserves more glorious history than this.

The mistakes which have been made cannot be reversed. They can only be paid for in the high currency of blood and treasure. We are the people and cannot escape the cost.

If the courage, character, and good sense of the people will rise this autumn to choose patriotic, Nation-minded representatives for Congress, the United States may begin again to make history with more triumphs and fewer errors.

Speculation in Rubber Trading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article entitled "Large Possible Profits in Trading in Rubber Bring New Margin," written by Thomas P. Swift and published in the New York Times of August 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LARGE POSSIBLE PROFITS IN TRADING IN RUBBER BRING NEW MARGIN—COMMODITY EXCHANGE HERE, SEEKING TO CURB RUN-AWAY SPECULATION, SETS $5,000 FIGURE—940 PERCENT RETURN IN FEW MONTHS CITED

(By Thomas P. Swift)

Washington officials complained vehemently last week about the unwarranted speculation in commodities since the Communist attack on South Korea and decried the high profits—ranging from 100 to 400

percent—which speculators had extracted as a result of booming prices in such items as lard, cottonseed oil, soybeans, cotton, and wheat.

They overlooked the prize commodity of them all—natural crude rubber.

Run-away markets in this important war item have created a situation where profits have run as high as 940 percent. A speculator who put up the required margin of $800 to purchase one contract of rubber on the commodity exchange in the early part of this year would show a profit of some $7,500 at the closing price on Friday, assuming he had the financial acumen to stay with his original purchase contract.

As the exchange closed on Friday, the nearby September delivery of a rubber futures contract sold at 54.30 cents a pound bid, with few offerings in sight. The low price for the September contract was 17.20 cents a pound—providing a differential of 37.10 cents a pound or, as measured by exchange dealings, 3,710 points. Each point in a rubber futures contract (22,400 pounds) is equivalent to $2.24. To be exact, a September contract is now worth $8,310.40.

However, whether Washington can do anything about the situation—other than to accelerate the reactivation of this Nation's synthetic rubber plants—remains to be seen. Several of our synthetic rubber plants—which proved a salvation in World War II are being pushed into production once again, but time is of the essence in the stockpiling of such a strategic commodity. Meanwhile, prices are skyrocketing as Russia is actively buying rubber by the shipload and speculators are reaping a harvest in the primary markets at Singapore and London.

Realizing the gravity of the situation, the board of governors of the Commodity Exchange at a special meeting late on Friday took drastic action to preserve the exchange's normal economic function as a meeting place for buyers and sellers. Margins were jumped to $5,000 a contract, effective at the opening of business tomorrow. This margin boost, the third within a month, lifted the level of funds required to buy one rubber contract to nearly 50 percent of the contract's current value. One short month ago $800 would have been sufficient to turn such a deal.

Until World War I, rubber was solely a natural vegetable product produced principally from a tree known as hevea braziliensis. The dense jungles of the Amazon, careless marketing, and production difficulties greatly restricted the supply of rubber until the hevea tree was successfully transplanted to the Far East. The unique properties of rubber were first recognized by the English who succeeded in germinating the seeds of the hevea tree which had been taken from Brazil to London.

Successful plantings of these seedlings were made in the far-eastern colonies of Great Britain at the end of the nineteenth century. From there the cultivation of rubber trees spread successively throughout Ceylon, India, British Malaya, the Netherlands East Indies, British Borneo, Sarawak, Siam, Burma, and French Indochina. Until the beginning of the twentieth century, world production of rubber did not exceed 40,000 tons a year. By the time World War II got under way, world production totaled some 1,600,000 tons, virtually all of which was accounted for by plantations established in the Far East. The Japanese soon ended that supply.

During the First World War, Germany developed and produced in limited quantities a synthetic product having rubber-like qualities. As World War II loomed, Germany had improved the quality and increased its capacity for this substitute for natural rubber with the result that she was entirely independent of sources of the natural product.

In the United States, prior to World War II, special-purpose synthetic rubber had been produced only in small quantities, principally for its oil-resistant features. Shortly after Pearl Harbor this country was cut off from the source of 97 percent of the supply of natural rubber.

Within a span of 2 years, the United States Government, in collaboration with the rubber manufacturing industry and the petroleum industry, designed and constructed plants capable of producing over 1,000,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year. This capacity, which currently is undergoing hurried reactivation, relieves us of the sole dependency on the natural product.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Act Now To Pass Stand-by UMT Law," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACT NOW TO PASS STAND-BY UMT LAW

Demand by nine members of the Senate Armed Services Committee that Congress stay in session until it passes a universal military training bill is based, not on the requirements of the Korean war, but on the lessons we should learn from it.

Establishment of an orderly system of training the young men who would be called upon to fight in another major war would not relieve the shortage of manpower which has been one of the biggest handicaps in the drive to turn back Communist aggression in Korea.

That shortage must be relieved by other means—calling up reserves, transfer of forces now on active duty, and the draft. Great strides have been taken to build up the American forces in Korea to the point where they have been able to stall the Red offensive. Greater ones may be required to get to the front forces strong enough to smash the North Korean Communists.

But it is vitally important that the public—and Congress—understand that the inability of UMT to solve the manpower problems of the Korean war is no reason why the training program should not be put on the books. The Korean war furnishes ample proof that systematic training, to furnish combat forces if they are needed, is imperative.

It is beyond argument that the United States would have been in much better position to stop aggression in Korea if a universal military training program had been put into effect in 1945 or 1946, as many military and civilian leaders urged. It is likely that our losses would have been considerably less, if we had been able to send large numbers of trained men the minute the Korean Reds started their attack.

That lesson ought to be applied to the future. If we can't start a genuine training program in time to help out in the Korean war, we should be all the more eager to start one in time to prevent another costly series of setbacks if another emergency should arise.

That seems to be the attitude of the nine Senators who endorsed Defense Secretary Louis Johnson's request for UMT legislation. But it is not yet the attitude of all Congressmen, and particularly of the administration's legislative leaders.

While the nine Senators and others who subscribe to their views urge Congress to stay on the job until a training measure is passed, Speaker SAM RAYBURN apparently voices the administration view when he urges that Congress finish up quickly and go home. This, he says, would show the world that the Korean war "is not a major operation."

The Korean war may not be a major operation, although it is a bigger, tougher fight than some Government officials will admit. But it is a clear warning that major operations could develop with paralyzing suddenness, and that this Nation ought to do everything it can now to prevent them.

Realistic facing of facts demands that we admit, as Gen. Omar Bradley told the Senators, that the world faces a long period of international tensions. It demands that our leaders stop trying to sweep the implications of the Korean crisis under the rug, out of fear of alarming the people, or out of a desire to postpone vital decisions until after election.

The best way to keep those tensions from erupting into something far worse is to let the world know that we're not going to be caught short on military manpower again, as we were in Korea. It is a costly process t train our youth, and a disruptive one, but it is less costly and disruptive than entering another war unprepared.

A universal military training system could not be started at this time without interfering with efforts to defeat the Communist aggressors in Korea. But plans could be made now to be put into operation later when the Korean crisis is resolved, leaving in its wake future crises to be dealth with.

This Nation and its Congress have a habit of forgetting the lessons of the past. Now, while the lessons of manpower shortage in Korea are fresh in our minds, Congress should show that it recognizes the kind of world we're living in by enacting a stand-by universal military training law.

Appointments to the Federal Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am grateful for the splendid response of the Nation's press to my appeal for a greater balance in appointments to the Federal Judiciary. Some of the Nation's outstanding newspapers have commented on the appalling unbalance now existing—the terrible overloading of members of one political party on the bench.

As an indication of the sentiment in my own State, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of three editorials. The first was published in the Janesville Gazette of Friday, August 18, and is entitled "Truman Response Was a Grim Joke." The second was printed in the Stevens Point Journal of August 15 and is entitled "Unbalanced Bench." The third was printed in the Oshkosh Northwestern of August 16 and is entitled "Need Nonpartisan Judiciary."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Janesville Daily Gazette of August 18, 1950]

TRUMAN RESPONSE WAS A GRIM JOKE

In a recent letter to the President, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY asked him to correct "the terrible overloading of Democratic judges on the Federal court of the United States." He was renewing a fight of several years in an attempt to secure a balance on the Federal judiciary.

In 17 years of the New Deal, 192 Presidential appointments to the bench included 184 Democrats and only 8 Republicans. As Senator WILEY declares, "such lopsided unbalance makes a farce of our judicial system."

Both President Roosevelt and President Truman have followed the old Jackson philosophy, "to the victor belongs the spoils." Senator WILEY was fair enough to declare that "if a series of Republican Presidents were guilty of the same poor judgment," he would say the same thing.

President Truman's response might be funny if it were not that the lives of all Americans are directly affected by the appointment of judges to Federal courts. He tossed off the Senator's complaint with gaiety and nonchalance that has been typical of Truman strategy.

"It has always been my policy," the President wrote, "to be very careful in the selection of men who sit on the Federal bench and I am very glad to have your endorsement of that policy."

If the Chief Executive considers appointments to the Federal bench in that vein, the American people can expect little more than party patronage as usual even during a war.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 8, Senator WILEY quotes his second letter to the President on this subject:

"1. Never before have the courts been so important. They are taking up today more momentous issues affecting more people than ever before in American history.

"2. Never before have there been so many court positions and such disproportionate overloading of these positions by members of one political party."

[From the Stevens Point Journal of August 15, 1950]

UNBALANCED BENCH

Senator WILEY points out that of 192 Federal judicial appointments since 1933, all but eight have gone to Democrats. When Mr. Roosevelt became President there were six Republicans and three Democrats on the Supreme Court. Now there is only one Republican. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman have shown equal partisanship in making appointments to the circuit and district courts.

Senator WILEY, in a letter to President Truman, urges him to correct the terrible overloading of Democrats as Federal judges. Mr. WILEY's demand for a balanced Federal judiciary is reasonable. An overwhelming preponderance of judges representing, theoretically at least, one political philosophy is not wholesome in a country where national unity must be forged from diverse viewpoints.

Perhaps the element of reward for political service can never be wholly divorced from these appointments, but it could be lessened by a more equitable distribution among the two major parties.

[From the Oshkosh Northwestern of August 16, 1950]

NEED NONPARTISAN JUDICIARY

Reports from Washington are that Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has received some hearty support among Members of Congress for his suggestion to President Truman to the effect that the President appoint some outstanding Republican judges or lawyers to the vacancies existing on the Federal bench.

The proposal by the Wisconsin Senator, who is up for renomination in the September primary for the November election, is based on the practical and fair contention that this plan would strongly reinforce the nonpartisan character that the Federal judiciary ought to have. Unfortunately, there was little of that nonpartisan and nonpolitical characteristic to be seen in Federal bench selections in the past.

During the recent hearings on the appointment of Sherman Minton to the Supreme Court, it was brought out that of 192 Federal judges appointed from 1933 onward, all but 8 have been Democrats.

The Chicago Daily News is so firmly in favor of the Wiley suggestion for the judiciary that it declares the recommendation is "so sensible that it is almost sure to be rejected" by the President. And that newspaper adds:

"In the months ahead, President Truman is going to make many appeals for bipartisan support. He could earn some by a more nonpartisan treatment of the judiciary."

Broadcast by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to the People of Pennsylvania

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a broadcast by me, No. 33 in my biweekly series, carried over the Pennsylvania radio stations on the week end of August 18–20, inclusive.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The word "propaganda" is often lightly or loosely used here in America. This is readily understandable because it is impossible for us to imagine our kind of America existing without the freedoms of speech and press.

Yet these two essential freedoms are relatively newcomers to history, so far as whole nations of people are concerned. It was the young United States which took the lead among nations in demonstrating the importance of freedom of speech and press to the operation of democracy and it was our own Bill of Rights which, for the first time in history, spelled these freedoms out as unqualified guaranties to our whole Nation.

Since the late 1700's, other nations, though few in number, have followed our lead. Nonetheless, we are confronted with the unavoidable fact that freedom of speech and press is virtually meaningless for at least two-thirds of the people in the world.

Hundreds of millions of people in the world — illiterate and unlearned — have neither newspapers to read nor radios to hear. They know nothing of democratic processes because they have never lived under them; nor have they been presented with any chance to read or hear about democracy.

Other hundreds of millions have access to newspapers and do have radios to listen to, but they, too, are as deaf to the voice of democracy as are those who lack both radio and newspaper. These millions hear nothing of democracy because their own despotic governments have throttled the air waves and harnessed the press.

In Russia itself the people are fed a steady diet of propaganda handed down from the Kremlin through such organs as Pravda, Izvestia, and a completely censored radio network. But the people of Russia are not the only victims of this continuing lie. It is precisely this diet which is prepared and handed out to the satellites within the Communist orbit. Behind the iron curtain truth is treason.

Terrible as it is that the people who dwell behind the curtain are without any chance to learn the truth, the poison of Communist propaganda is being spread in tremendous volume into the countries which lie outside the curtain.

It is obvious that the Communists regard propaganda as a goal of world conquest which ranks equally with divisions of armed men. Korea itself affords us with a heart-breaking example of what Communist lies can do to an entire nation of people. In that country the Communist forces are overwhelmingly composed of Korean people. We do have, of course, conclusive proof that there are some Russians fighting with the Korean Reds, but the fact nonetheless remains that Communist propaganda has, in the period of 5 years, managed to whip up the feelings of millions of the Korean people to the point that they believe they are fighting for a just cause in making their ruthless attack upon South Korea. The facts will permit us to draw no other conclusion.

Let me give you some illustrations of the kind of propaganda which the Communists have spread through Korea. Many Koreans are, as you know, unable to read, and the Russians have relied heavily on cartoons and comic books to spread their evil gossip. Samples of this Red propaganda show Uncle Sam with a belt composed of dollar signs standing as a giant figure in the background egging the South Koreans forward to shoot at their innocent North Korean neighbors. Other messages have been addressed to the farmers of South Korea that depict Uncle Sam stealing the food which the farmers have raised—and one of these cartoons is labeled "Farmers, don't be robbed of even one grain which you have harvested with your bloody perspiration."

Russian propaganda has taught the Koreans to believe that America is a warmonger that is blocking unification of the country in order that the United States may bleed the people of their wealth.

One might wonder how the Russians have explained away the fact that the United States has spent nearly half a billion dollars in South Korea to assist in the economic recovery of the country. The Communist simply says that this aid is a form of capitalistic imperialism which intends to make slaves of the people.

But the Communists have not been content to confine their propaganda to comic books and cartoons. Captured documents include handbooks to be used by Communist agents, instructing them on the fine points of falsehood. One of these handbooks is entitled "Propaganda Material for the Compulsory Education of Primary School Children."

In the field of radio, a giant 50,000-watt station located in the North Korean capital city of Pyongyang is on the air 24 hours a day, filling the air waves of North Korea and South Korea alike with hatred and lies. And that station has been on the air for a long time.

The effectiveness of the Communist-controlled press and radio is amply borne out by the mighty machine of war which has been fashioned with the support of the North Korean people.

But the falsehoods about democracy and the hatred stirred up against America have not been confined to Korea. The Russians have used this technique in virtually every language on the globe.

I would like to digress for a moment here to observe that in recent weeks, most Americans have directed careful attention to comparisons between the armed might of the free world and that of Russia and her satellites. Those comparisons demonstrate beyond doubt that the mobilization steps that are being taken by America and by the other free nations are imperative if we are to halt the march of Red aggression.

What, as a Nation, I believe we have failed to do is to make similar comparisons between the Voice of America and the Communist propaganda machine. Those of us who, over the years, have urged that the message of democracy be carried with much greater force as a counteroffensive to Red lies have been shouted down by economy-minded Members of Congress who believed the Voice of America was already spending too much money.

Yet here are the facts: In a week's time, Russia and her satellites broadcast a total of more than 800 hours of propaganda in countless languages. The Voice of America is on the air less than 200 hours a week in some 25 languages and dialects. In other words, the Red lie is uttered more than four times for each utterance of the democratic truth.

When the Red radio in North Korea announced that students were being taken to Moscow for training in groups of 200 at one time, we could only counter this with the observation that perhaps 20 South Korean students had come to the United States to attend our universities.

The world-wide struggle in which we are engaged boils down to deciding whether the minds of men will be free or captive. The ultimate answer will simply determine whether men will be permitted to get all the facts and decide their destiny by exercise of their own conscience—or whether men will sell their freedom to tyrants who will dictate their thinking, their beliefs, and their conduct. It is as simple as this.

Where the press is censored—and when the radio merely echoes the demands of a dictator—the people have no opportunity to hear the truth. Where men are unable to learn otherwise, there can be no other answer as to the outcome: dictatorship will prevail over democracy in such a fashion that only untold force can dislodge tyranny and replace it with freedom.

The Voice of America program was established by Congress in 1945, and since that time has done an unbelievably effective job when you consider the small funds it has had on which to operate against the unlimited resources which the Communists have poured into their propaganda campaign.

You may recall having noticed in the papers some months ago that the Russians were jamming the radio programs beamed into the Soviet Union by the Voice of America. The fact that the Communists were sufficiently worried to spend the millions of dollars they did in order to drown out the message of democracy is a good indication that the Voice was shaking the faith of those forced to subsist on a diet of lies.

The jamming technique consists of broadcasting a powerful noise signal on the same frequency used for the Voice stations, with the result that the broadcast cannot be heard. Jamming can be overcome, but it is expensive to do because it requires many more stations on different frequencies.

It is, of course, evident that the Voice of America cannot be confined to radio. If we are to put across the truth about democracy, we must rely upon every information method conceivable.

So, in addition to radio, we must include books, magazines, pamphlets, and even television is not too young a medium to be neglected. We must also widen greatly our programs which bring foreign students and visitors to see America and to learn how democracy works in action.

You know—and I know—that Americans are warmongers. You know—and I know—that we do not have imperialistic designs on anyone. We know what is in our hearts, and we know that the democracy which means so much to us must be allowed to grow in the world if our own way of life is to survive.

But there are hundreds of millions of others who do not know what is in the American heart, and who, instead of learning the truth about us, are being fed the big lie of communism.

For what it would cost us to build two battleships, the voice of democracy can be raised above its present whisper, and turned into a roar of truth that will be heard above the barrage of falsehoods that the Soviets are maintaining.

Up to this time, a majority of Congress has failed to recognize the importance of this job. Some of us have fought against this blind stinginess, and have found fighting with us such men as President Truman, Gen. George Marshall, Ambassador John Foster Dulles, Bernard M. Baruch, and Gen. Bedell Smith who until recently was our Ambassador to Russia. I am forced to admit, however, that it has taken the Korean invasion to open the eyes of enough others to the need for an expanded Voice of America program. It was only when we were confronted with the unalterable fact that 15 or more divisions of native Koreans, well trained and bent on victory, had been the fruit of Soviet propaganda that the need for a greatly enlarged Voice of America program became clear to many people.

As is so often the case, the prophets who warned us that the truth about the free world must be spread to offset the Communist lie will not in all likelihood be honored in their own day. But we have been warned of this all along by such men as Elmer Davis, who served as Director of the Office of War Information during World War II, and there were other prophets such as Gen. David Sarnoff, board chairman of RCA and the great radio pioneer, who for a dozen years has relentlessly sought to encourage a vast program of truth for the darkened areas of the world. Great credit is also due men like Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, who was the first director of the Voice of America program. And there were many, many others from public and private life, who, drawing from their own experience in the dark lands where falsehood reigns, saw that only through a vigorous campaign could the truth be brought to suffering people.

I earnestly hope that within a short time, the Congress will vote funds necessary to counter the Communist lie. These funds must be adequate not only for Korea, but they should permit us to reach out to two-thirds or more of the people in the world with the story of democracy. It is obvious that money alone will not accomplish this. The combined efforts of private individuals and groups have done much to spread the message through programs which have sponsored foreign students in our educational institutions. Other private accomplishments have been made by Americans themselves in their visits abroad, where each has gone as an ambassador, presenting to others through himself, an insight into America and the American people.

Our goal is understanding among men—the kind of understanding so necessary if peace and freedom are to survive and grow in the world. Military might—imperative though it is—cannot do the job alone. Nor can economic aid to tottering nations—important though it is—accomplish the miracle of democracy all by itself. As I have already mentioned, the Reds have managed to explain away our military and economic aid to free nations by attacking us as warmongers and imperialists. There is an answer to that charge which is found in telling the truth. And we must give the world that answer so that all may hear.

This is your United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS. I hope you will listen in again on this station in 2 weeks.

The Saturday Sermon: This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, our Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, following the wake of eminent predecessors, is taking over the Saturday Sermon section of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. The Bulletin's selection of Dr. Harris for this column is a recognition, not only of the worth and the ability of our Chaplain, but is a recognition of the position he holds and the duty he performs for the United States. The Bulletin selected for one of Dr. Harris' first columns a review concerning a book of the Senator now speaking. I ask unanimous consent that the reprint from the Philadelphia Bulletin of July 29, 1950, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SATURDAY SERMON: THIS NATION UNDER GOD

(By Frederick Brown Harris)

This Nation is today the most significant factor in all the tangled and tragic skein of human affairs. This Nation holds in its hands the power to determine the destiny of this planet for generations to come—perhaps, forever—whether it shall be the blessing or the curse, life or death.

This Nation is today the greatest reservoir of material resources and spiritual idealism on the face of the earth. This Nation is the only serious challenge to the bid for world domination by a sinister slave system which already holds untold millions in the despotism of its iron grasp. This Nation in the providence of God has come to the kingdom for such a time as this.

All this means that to be true to America at its best is to share an awe-inspiring role in the unfolding of the divine purpose. Rather than any American should sap his Nation's strength by his own moral treason, betray her by his treachery or exploit her by his greed, it were better for him that a millstone be hanged about his neck and that he be drowned in the depths of the sea. No one can be a worthy partner in a democracy unless he helps sustain the moral and spiritual roots. If democracy withers, it will never be destroyed by suspected Reds, but by neglected roots.

The surest way to cause the fair flowers of freedom to fade is to cut the roots reaching into rich, ancestral soil in which they have been nourished, and from which, fed by springs of living water, has come their help and health. A cut flower is a doomed

flower. Its beauty cannot endure because its roots have been severed. For a democracy which has fruits without roots, the undertaker called Time is already at the door.

In this frightening day it is dawning upon America as with a fresh and startling revelation that only religious faith can undergird democracy, and that when this is withdrawn some form of coercive totalitarianism, lifting an almighty state into God's throne, comes in like a flood.

PROPHETIC INSIGHT

An honored Member of the United States Senate, a national leader with a rich working background in religious, labor, educational, and international affairs, Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah, has recently published a volume tingling with intense conviction and shot through with prophetic insight. In scintillating chapters he writes the title "This Nation Under God" in letters of fire across our national sky. To this perplexed day the distinguished Senator declares: "Everything for which democracy stands is based on religious faith. Neither enlightened self-interest nor practical ethics can make an effective substitute."

The Senator's credo is set down simply, but profoundly, as he bears witness: "To me the basic fact about our faith in God's power and our destiny is that He has blessed us with the opportunity to provide abundance for ourselves, all of us, and to share the abundance with the world—that our destiny is to hold high the flaming torch of liberty for all, and to rule over none."

WILSON'S WARNING

In this volume there is impressively pictured the unanimous procession of the American Presidents as each in his own words witnesses to the spiritual roots of America. The ultimate truth about this Nation under God has never been put more succinctly than by Woodrow Wilson, to whose world Senator THOMAS devotes a chapter. Significantly Wilson's warning sentence is from his The Road Away From Revolution. Hear it, O America.

"The sum of the whole matter is this: Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it is redeemed spiritually. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead."

A fable tells of a spider that once slid down a single silky thread from the lofty rafter of a barn and set up an elaborate domain on a lower level. There he spread his acquisitive net, caught flies, grew slick, and prospered. One day, wandering proudly about his opulent premises, he saw the thread that stretched up into the unseen above him. What is the use of that? he cynically blurted, and snapped at it. And his filmy palace collapsed.

God forbid that a collapsed silken web should be a portent of the fate of this Nation.

Speculation in Rubber Trading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Booming Rubber Price Trend Halted," published in the New York Journal of Commerce of August 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOMING RUBBER PRICE TREND HALTED—FUTURES SKID 600 POINTS AS TRADE SEES BETTER SUPPLY, LIGHTER DEMAND

Liquidation in the nearby contracts and speculative selling in the more distant positions plunged rubber futures 600 to 560 points lower for the week's trading on the commodity exchange.

The sharp reversal in the rubber price trend followed several reports during the week of stepped-up synthetic and natural rubber production and rumors of possible restrictions on crude consumption.

BUYERS WITHDRAW

Few participants on the exchange would buy contracts during the week, although offers to sell were numerous. Limit declines were registered during the last four trading sessions after the recent boom in prices stalled at 58.30 cents for September in early trading Tuesday. September closed at 48.30 cents Friday.

Trade sources said that the market's backbone was broken Tuesday when several groups of short interests were able to cover their commitments. From that point onward, buyers were as rare as "hen's teeth," according to one dealer, and sales volume fell off sharply.

SUPPLY IMPROVEMENT SEEN

Estimates that Malayan natural rubber production this year will exceed the 685,000 long-ton figure predicted by the International Rubber Study Group in May, and expectation that the Indonesian output will total about 650,000 long tons, created a great deal of bearish sentiment in trade circles.

Furthermore, John L. Collyer, president and chairman of the board, B. F. Goodrich Co., declared Friday, that "the rate of rubber production in the United States will probably approximate 740,000 tons by the end of the year and should increase steadily during the early months of 1951 when additional facilities recently ordered by the Government to be reactivated are in operation."

Factory buying of natural rubber was withdrawn to a great extent both here and in the primary markets last week.

Meanwhile, liquidation and covering has been reducing the open interest on rubber futures dratically. Open contracts totaled 742 lots as of August 10, while on July 6 they stood at 1,079.

HIGH MARGINS CUT SPECULATION

The high margin requirements that the Commodity Exchange board of governors has placed on rubber futures contracts has effectively reduced speculative action in the market, trade sources pointed out. Rubber futures margins had been raised on three occasions during the recent run-away rubber price trend.

Futures declined the limit of 200 points again Friday as sales volume was limited to 66 contracts. There were 18 sales in September, 40 in December, 7 in March, and 1 in May delivery month.

Washington News Letter by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my Washington News Letter of August 17, 1950, a personal report to the people of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Bad public officials are not elected by bad citizens, but by good citizens who fail to vote" is a wise analysis of democratic government. Yet 1 out of every 4 eligible Pennsylvanians aren't registered and won't be able to vote in the general elections November 7 unless they register before September 16. So even if you're properly registered—and fully intend to vote—you can help democracy work better by urging your family and friends to do the same.

Many who have voted in the past need to register again—either because they haven't voted in the past 2 years, or because they've moved to a new voting district since last registering. Remember: If you didn't vote November 2, 1948—and haven't voted since—your registration has lapsed, even though you were properly registered before.

Too few Americans vote, despite the vital importance of citizen participation in our representative, democratic form of government. Here are some eye-opening examples:

Two out of every five eligible Pennsylvanians failed to participate in the 1948 Presidential election.

Only half of the voters turn out for non-Presidential general elections such as the one coming up this fall—yet on November 7, we choose a United States Senator, a governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of internal affairs, justice of the supreme court, a judge of the superior court, and Representatives to Congress and the State legislature.

Primary elections, where party candidates are selected, usually produce about half as many votes as are cast in general elections, so party candidates are chosen by a quarter to one-third of the total eligible to vote.

Men outnumber women as registered voters by almost 300,000 in Pennsylvania, although populationwise their numbers are about equal and women have had voting rights for about 30 years.

Getting registered isn't difficult, and it assures you the right to exercise the highest privilege of citizenship. It will take only a few moments at your county courthouse on any day up to Sepembter 16, or if you haven't time for that, inquire about the special booths for registration that will be open in your neighborhood for an evening or two before registration closes.

If you're doubtful about your eligibility to vote, check yourself off on the list below:

You must be 21 years of age on or before November 8, 1950.

A citizen of the United States for at least 1 month.

A resident of Pennsylvania for at least 1 year. However, former Pennsylvanians who have moved away and come back need only 6 months of residence, provided they were previously registered, or were born in the State.

A resident for 2 months in your voting district—election district, precinct, or division. In other words, if you move on or bebefore September 7, you are eligible to vote in your new district.

And if you meet those requirements, you must be properly registered to vote.

You may register as a partisan or a nonpartisan voter. The advantage in partisan registration is found in the fact that you may vote in the primaries to select candidates for the party you have named. But partisan registration is meaningless in general elections: You may vote for Democratic candidates as a registered Republican, or vice versa, in general elections.

So I urge you once more to vote this fall, and to encourage members of your family and friends to do so as well. In the present critical times there is a duty on all of us to be as fully informed as possible, and to determine, with the best judgment we can

muster, our choice of elected representatives in terms of their stands on the important issues of the day. Throughout the world democracy is on trial, and we measure the strength of our democracy in terms of interest, understanding, and participation of all our people in helping to shape the course of our future destiny.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Louis Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address delivered by Hon. Howard Starling, of Parkersburg, W. Va., and Washington, D. C., former president of the West Virginia Society, at the society's picnic at Glen Echo on August 22.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This occasion is ideal, fellow West Virginians, to discuss the career of West Virginia's greatest native son in the public life of our United States Government, namely, Louis Johnson, of Clarksburg, Secretary of Defense, the man who really and finally unified our Armed Forces.

You know and I know that Louis Johnson has been under fire recently on account of the war in Korea. Louis Johnson has faced all his critics unflinchingly, because all through life he has been a man of rare courage and forthrightness.

I say here tonight, and I shall continue to say, that the record of our own Louis Johnson as Secretary of Defense needs no defense. That being the case, why am I talking about it? I bring up his record at this time because we as West Virginians, as fellow citizens and friends of Louis Johnson, are not going to sit idly and supinely by and let critics crucify a great leader for the sake of political expediency and for the sake of creating disunity among the American people at the most crucial moment in their history.

The critics of Louis Johnson have no foundation for their case and therefore there it rests upon sands that will rapidly shift from under them.

The people of the United States have an everlasting debt to Louis Johnson, one that can never be paid. Let us go back to those trying and dangerous days before Pearl Harbor when Louis was Assistant Secretary of War. It was in that capacity that he fathered and fought through the industrial plant mobilization that saved us from defeat in the Second World War. The debt of America to Louis Johnson for that service is a matter of record, something that no critic, no matter how untruthful, no matter how venomous, can take away from him.

Now let's come to the postwar period in which our distinguished West Virginia friend has become Secretary of Defense. This is the period since VJ-day when the American people in rising crescendo demanded that our fighting men be brought back home and that we return quickly, almost immediately, to a peacetime economy.

We all know what happened as a result of that demand of the people—a demand transmitted so strongly to Congress that our national lawmakers went down the line for demobilization, for economy, for stripping our Armed Forces to a mere shadow of their former selves, for abandoning ammunition and weapons wherever they were or dumping them into the Pacific Ocean.

Undoubtedly some of you have been reading the writings of that great war correspondent of World War II, Jim Lucas of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, who was a marine in the last war, and who after VJ-day wrote a stirring article in which he put the finger on the decline of our defense forces. Jim Lucas said that the little people of the United States always had the idea that it was the high brass and the diplomats who got us into wars as a result of military ambition and as a result of failure at the round tables of diplomacy. Jim Lucas debunked that whole business and put the finger on the little people and said it was they who were responsible to the United States for keeping us so weak defensively that a predatory enemy chooses to attack us and make us fight. Jim Lucas has no use for pacifists. And Jim wrote that it was mother and the preacher and the teacher who by demanding peace at any price—the return of our boys from the war zones, the return to peacetime economy, and by the preaching of pacifism—had so weakened the United States that attack has come. The Scripps-Howard newspapers recently reprinted that famous article by Jim Lucas, and I cannot help but refer to it here tonight. Jim Lucas is right. We know he is right, and that proves all the more that lack of justice in the attacks upon our friend Louis Johnson.

Much has been said—entirely too much—about the economizing of Louis Johnson in the budget of the Defense Department. What Secretary Johnson has done is to cut away the fat from the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, his chief cuts having been made in the top heavy civilian establishment. We know, at least those of us who studied the situation in the past, that the Armed Forces had entirely too many civilians doing too little to justify their being on the payroll at the expense of the United States taxpayers.

To show you the progress that has been made in the spending of defense dollars for more defense, I cite you these official figures. For the 1947 fiscal year, only 6 cents—and I repeat that—only 6 cents of the military budget dollar went for weapons of all kinds, for guns and ammunition, for tanks and ships and planes. There was reason for that, namely the cost of liquidating the defense establishment after the last year and the unnecessarily heavy civilian overhead.

It will interest you to know that in the fiscal year that ended June 30 this year, a total of 19½ cents out of every defense dollar went for weapons and ammunition, tanks and ships and planes, and that out of the new money asked for by President Truman, 59 cents out of every dollar will go for hardware that will be thrown at the enemy.

The new defense money coming up also will go heavily for fighting men. It will give the United States 2,100,000 men in the Army, the Navy and the Air Forces. There will be an increase of 90 percent in the personnel of the Marine Corps. The money will be used to activate more Reserve and National Guard units.

The people and Congress called for the drastic cuts of the past in the budgets of the Armed Forces, and it was Louis Johnson who had to do the best with the money that was left. He has done his best with it, and the Nation has been maintained in as high a state of preparedness as possible under the financial circumstances.

And while Louis Johnson has been doing his best with the defense budget, he has made unification work—the unification of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force under a single command. I firmly believe that Louis Johnson was the ideal man for this assignment, that it required a man of rare courage and fortitude—just plain guts, if you please, to go into the high ranks of the Armed Forces and bang heads together until the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force were willing to be unified and unified peacefully for the good of the common cause.

That, my friends, is another great debt that this Nation owes Louis Johnson.

At this time, I cannot help but refer to a great friend of Secretary Johnson, Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, who on several recent occasions has taken the floor of the House to speak well of our great West Virginian. I am going to quote here from a speech of Mr. BOYKIN. He said:

"There is no one within or without the sound of my voice that would dare deny the fact that Louis Johnson, immediately upon assuming the job as Secretary of Defense, instituted action programs that have saved upward of $1,000,000,000 in these last 14 months to the taxpayers of the United States.

"These savings were through reductions in waste, elimination of unnecessary duplications and extravagant overheads, the money so saved was not transferred as cash back to the United States Treasury but it was used to increase the combat effectiveness of our forces in being.

"Savings effected by the closing of establishments—which were nothing but 'fat'—were transferred in such a way as to more completely bring combat units up to fighting strength. The technique was used by the Secretary of Defense equally throughout the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to improve combat effectiveness.

"As an example, on January 1, 1950, the Army had 4,000 more men in combat units than it had in such units 6 months earlier. This was achieved by the discharge of civilians, closing of facilities, and the use of funds thus saved to pay for troops in the field. Similarly, the Navy combat effectiveness improved during that same selected period."

That ends part of Mr. BOYKIN'S quotes about Louis Johnson. The Congressman had much more to say; here are some more quotes:

"Fourteen months ago when Louis Johnson assumed office, in addition to the cries that we heard about waste and extravagance in the armed services, the membership of this House was loudly bewailing the fact that no real unification of the Armed Forces in these United States had been accomplished—despite the passage of the National Security Act in 1947.

"The criticism was then as loud against the failure of the late James Forrestal to effect unification of the services as it has been in the last 48 hours against Louis Johnson.

"Fourteen months have now passed since Louis Johnson took office. Who is there in this House that now argues that the unification of the armed services, so long desired by this House, is not now a reality?"

Congressman BOYKIN went on to ask this question:

"Who in this House now has occasion to raise his voice to find fault either with Louis Johnson or with President Truman with respect to lack of unification in the Armed Forces?"

Let's listen to Mr. BOYKIN just a little bit more. He also said:

"The breath of life has been breathed into the United Nations. The Atlantic Defense Pact binding all nations which border on the North Atlantic Ocean to our military aid and assistance is now an accomplished fact.

"Here again, Secretary Johnson exhibited his foresight in developing international unification of military strength and he did so against the bitter opposition of most of his avowed critics who long stood in the way of national military unification. Military assistance is strengthening the fighting force of the European nations. The flag of the United Nations is flying beside the Stars and Stripes in far-off Korea."

That is all that I shall quote from Congressman BOYKIN who has been doing a fine job of plain speaking on national defense and our friend Louis Johnson on the floor of the House. I do think it appropriate here, however, to quote Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who, in a message to President Truman on July 20, said:

"I do not believe that history records a comparable operation which excelled the speed and precision with which the Eighth Army, the Far East Air Force, and the Seventh Fleet have been deployed to a distant land for immediate commitment to major operations. It merits the highest commendation for the commanders, staffs, and units concerned and attests to their superior training and high state of readiness to meet any eventuality. This finds added emphasis in the fact that the Far East Command, until the President's great pronouncement to support the epochal action of the United Nations, had no slightest responsibility for the defense of the free Republic of Korea. With the President's decision, it assumed a completely new and added mission."

That is what General MacArthur had to say about our state of preparedness for Korea.

My friends, in conclusion, I shall make a prediction; and that is, that this unfair and unwarranted criticism of a great man and a great American—a great West Virginian, Louis Johnson—will soon be forgotten and that time will prove again that the people of the United States owe him a great debt for public service; and, when all is said and done, he will have a great place and a secure place in American history.

We of West Virginia back Louis Johnson to the hilt. We are with him come what may, and we are going to continue to speak out as need be to stop this crucifixion of a great man. In unity there is strength, and in strength there is security and peace. That is the way Louis Johnson is pointing us.

Protection of the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Philip S. Ehrlich on the question of protecting our free-enterprise system, and a suggestion that the President appoint a special commission to study the whole question of the American economy, and ways and means of protecting it from various influences that seek to destroy or weaken our capitalistic system.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 12, 1950.*

In re proposal for revision of antitrust laws.

Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have acquired, as a result of many years of experience in litigation involving antitrust laws, the profound conviction that if the American system of free enterprise is to survive, there must be a complete revision of these laws.

The Sherman and Clayton Acts were sound pieces of legislation but their original meaning, purpose, and intent have disappeared as a result of misinterpretation. The Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act is, as objective lawyers and economists will admit, a hodgepodge, and has been so interpreted and applied by the agency in charge of its enforcement as to eliminate the healthy competition which is the basis of our economy. The Federal Trade Commission Act is a vague and ambiguous statute and if not administered with self discipline by the agency in charge of its enforcement, it can be used for oppressive ends, and by and large it has not been applied to safeguard the public interest but only to eliminate true competition.

The revision which I propose be made of the antitrust laws would have as its goal two objectives. One of the objectives would be to protect the American people from abuses of economic power which some segments of American industry have engaged in continuously during the past 60 years. The other objective would be to protect from bureaucratic interference and nationalization by administrative fiat the greatest industrial machine ever created and to permit it to survive in order that our present standard of living cannot only be maintained at the highest level the world has ever experienced, but continuously increased. To some, these would seem conflicting objectives. I do not believe that they are. I do believe, however, that it is essential and of critical importance that it be demonstrated by a proper revision of the antitrust laws that this conflict does not exist.

American business is today confronted by a continuous attack by the Federal Trade Commission, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, Congress, and the Government generally. This may ultimately lead to nationalization of industry, that is to say, socialism to a greater or lesser extent. This menace to our economic system results from misinterpretations of our sound statutes and amendments made and proposed to these statutes which would perpetuate and enlarge the scope of these misinterpretations.

The attack on the free-enterprise system can be said to have begun in 1934 with the National Industrial Recovery Act which sanctioned price fixing in direct violation of the Sherman Act. The next step in this attack was the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act which was used to preserve some of the worst features of NIRA. This has been followed by the activities of the TNEC and the investigations of the Celler committee. Throughout this period, however, the most disturbing and sinister feature of the attack on business has been the campaign against bigness conducted by the agencies in charge of enforcing the antitrust laws, and the victories achieved by these agencies in persuading the courts to accept the doctrine of implied conspiracy and the outlawing of the basing-point system of prices, and, last but most important, the erosion of procedural due process by these agencies and the courts.

As a lawyer, I am deeply concerned by the constant denial to businessmen and business enterprises of that open, fair, and impartial hearing which is the heart and soul of the procedural due process guaranteed by the fifth amendment to the Constitution. This has been achieved principally by attributing to courts and administrative tribunals an expertness in the field of economics which in fact they do not possess.

I do not believe that the socialistic system which is being imposed upon us, not by the will of the people but by bureaucratic intrigue, is compatible with the guaranties embodied in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. For this reason, it is my opinion that a clear-cut, constructive, and fair antitrust program designed to preserve our capitalistic system must be evolved at the earliest possible moment in order to protect our American society and free enterprise. The basic objectives of this program should be defined clearly and adhered to strictly.

I respectfully suggest for the purpose of this program that you recommend to the President and to Congress that Congress create a commission, the members of which should be appointed by the President. This commission should represent every essential element of the American economy, and its members should not be chosen along partisan lines. It should have full investigatory powers with the right to subpena witnesses and employ counsel and experts. It should be adequately financed by congressional appropriations. It should be required to report its findings and recommendations at the end of a reasonable period to the President and to Congress.

Congress has passed legislation creating similar commissions in the past, and the President has appointed its members.

It is my feeling that such a commission, adequately financed and staffed, could present the facts and a constructive solution to these problems confronting the economy of America. It would be necessary for this commission to take into consideration not only our immediate economic needs but what is to be the economic destiny of our democratic form of government over the next 50 or 100 years.

It is my further belief that unless the problems are given proper consideration and study, and a constructive program enacted into legislation, there is grave and acute danger that legislation, and court and administrative misinterpretations may ultimately result in the nationalization of industry and a socialistic state.

Respectfully submitted.

PHILIP S. EHRLICH.

Hon. Frances P. Bolton's Recollections of Moscow on VJ-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on August 14, 1950, the fifth anniversary of the Japanese surrender following World War II, our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, made a statement here which some of the Members may have missed. She described what she saw in Moscow 5 years ago today, a portent of the Communist gains in Asia to come in the intervening years.

As you all know, Mrs. BOLTON has for many years served on the all-important Committee on Foreign Affairs. We have indeed been fortunate to have the benefit of her first-hand experience and wide knowledge, especially of that problem which is the most important of our times—the nature of the world Communist conspiracy and how to deal with it.

Among other trips to Europe and the Near East made by Mrs. BOLTON in connection with committee activities, she is the first women Member of the Congress ever to be selected to head an official congressional mission abroad for the

study of conditions bearing on the foreign assistance programs of our country.

It is most significant that Mrs. BOLTON should have been in Moscow on the date of the Japanese capitulation, and in her remarks she vividly recalls events of that historic day, relating the marked contrast between the Soviet standard of living and our own American way of life, and tying in those events of 5 years ago with what is happening today in Korea.

The remarks of Mrs. BOLTON, to which I refer, appear on page 12468 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 14, 1950. They deserve careful reading by everyone.

Employ the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith present a resolution passed by the Disabled American Veterans, Bellaire Chapter, No. 117, Bellaire, Ohio, which I think is worthy of the consideration of the Congress. The resolution follows:

Whereas the President of the United States and the Federal Government have served notice on industry that in the event of a general draft for the Armed Forces, deferments will be kept at a minimum; and

Whereas the United States Government must assist in this procedure by abiding by the limited deferments in its selection or retention of Government employees; and

Whereas there is is a sufficiently large manpower pool among disabled war veterans of both great conflicts to fill adequately the employment gap of both industry and Government caused by the drafting of physically fit employees; and

Whereas the record of the physically handicapped in industry during World War II is one of highest standard of production, lowest in absenteeism, and most faithful in attention to duty; and

Whereas members of the Armed Forces who have been rendered physically handicapped by virtue of their sacrifices in the two great wars by this sacrifice already have shown their readiness to contribute in the extreme to the welfare of their Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Bellaire Chapter, No. 117, Disabled American Veterans, urge the Federal Government adopt a rigid policy, in the event of a general draft, of replacing physically fit and eligible employees in Government with disabled veterans and other physically handicapped persons, and that this same procedure be presented by the Government to industry as a pattern for employment in order that the needs of the Armed Forces be adequately served without inflicting disadvantages on industrial production.

The Bellaire Chapter, No. 117, Disabled American Veterans, located in Bellaire, Ohio, at their regular meeting held in the council chamber of the City Building, Bellaire, Ohio, August 8, 1950, passed the foregoing resolution.

FRANK WELKOVICH,
Commander.
PAUL WORKMAN,
Adjutant.

How Wars Are Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, all Americans should be vitally concerned about the question of obtaining a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar appropriated and spent to support an adequate Armed Force. Congressman JACK Z. ANDERSON, of California, has attempted to bring same semblance of order and efficiency to the supply system for the Department of the Defense and last year had introduced H. R. 321 which is "A bill to promote more economical and efficient use of the Nation's resources by providing for a single supply catalogue system for the National Military Establishment."

Mr. Speaker, with the increased budget request for the armed services, we need more than ever before, a single supply catalogue system which Congressman ANDERSON of California has proposed. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared recently in the Washington Times-Herald entitled "How Wars Are Lost." It follows:

HOW WARS ARE LOST

Here is a little Associated Press item from the war front that should interest families of United States citizens now being killed in Korea. It also has a meaning to citizens whose money is being wasted there and elsewhere.

LOST WITHOUT A STRUGGLE

Three American tanks, manufactured at great cost, were shipped to Korea at further panic rates of expense.

But they never fired a shot, and it is the best hope of our commanders in the field that they were blown to bits by United States forces to keep them out of Communist hands. It appears that the tanks were shipped without fan belts and so were useless. Two emergency air shipments followed, as the Army's quartermaster department tried to overtake its own errors.

The first box opened at the front contained fan belts, all right, but wrong size. Second box, flown in peril of the plane crew's lives to Chinju, contained—pistols.

Last Friday the Times-Herald had an editorial which explained in advance how such things happen. The title of the editorial was How to Save Another $5,000,000,000, and it reported on the failure of the Defense Department to carry out a plain and pressing mission of duty.

FAILURE OF A MISSION

This mission, made obvious by World War II and spelled out in detail by the Hoover report on reorganization of the executive bureaucracy, calls for a single catalog of Government supplies.

The idea, the commission properly declared, is by no means new. It has been kicking around the Government since World War I. Presidents and Cabinet officers have repeatedly and consistently come out for it. But the results have not followed. The Hoover Commission said it could think of but three possible reasons for the failure:

1. "Stubborn resistance" from officials in the various supply organizations, simply because change would upset their preconceived work formulas.

2. "The absence of glamor and front-page news qualities" in such prosaic but vital business as property inventory, so that the high brass fails to stick to its own job of pushing reform to a finish.

3. "Inability or unwillingness of the several interested agencies and their technical staffs to reach decisions and to agree on the basic elements."

These observations are so eloquent as to need no further elaboration.

A single catalog system of handling supplies throughout the civil and military agencies of the Federal Government would save, according to educated judgment, some $5,000,000,000 a year. That's exactly the amount Mr. Truman wants in fresh taxes.

COURTS MARTIAL ARE IN ORDER

Last year, Representative JACK ANDERSON (Republican, of California) introduced a House Resolution 321, to make the single catalog the law of the land. The bureaucrats went up to Capitol Hill and persuaded Representative CARL VINSON, Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, that the law is unnecessary "because we are making great progress."

That is the same old song and dance they have been using for a generation and a half, to smother the system that would end their useless and wasteful duplication and misplacement of supply work.

Now the story of the three tanks in Korea give a dramatic example of the consequences.

We are entering a new war, and without an efficient supply system. Courts martial are in order. So is a law that will force the Hoover Commission's single-catalog system, designated officially as "of crucial importance to national defense."

The Access Road Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Access Road Bill," published in the International Woodworker, of Portland, Oreg., to which I say "Amen."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) International Woodworker of July 12, 1950]

THE ACCESS ROAD BILL

It becomes increasingly more difficult to stand by and impotently watch while the little that is left of one of the world's finest natural resources is shamelessly and ruthlessly depleted. The west coast's incomparable and irreplaceable forests are face to face with destruction.

It is doubly hard when one stops to think—there goes our jobs—there goes our living—and there goes this entire region's God-given protection against the ravages of erosion and flood.

Already we have many millions of acres of wasteland cluttering up our tax rolls. It's useless for farming. It's useless for grazing. It's priceless for the growing of timber. You see it's timberland. It was forest until the timber barons began their old cry of inexhaustible forests and with the greediness of

irresponsible children ripped the most valuable trees out of the forests so violently that nothing was left standing and far more timber was left to rot on the ground than was ever taken out.

In their eagerness to grasp all within sight they took no heed of fire and millions upon millions of acres of virgin timber, more precious than gold, went up in flames. These acres today are wastelands. They afford no watershed. They afford the soil no protection from erosion. Only here and there in the older burns is life beginning to stir once more.

And so now we can see the end of our virgin timber. Almost in desperation we are fighting to protect the little we have left, only to find that we are more or less fighting windmills. Everyone agrees that we must stop these wasteful ways. Everyone agrees that we must have scientific forest management, but somehow nothing ever quite seems to be done about it.

For instance—access roads. There is every reason under the sun to build access roads into our Federal timber, which is about all the standing timber we have left these days that isn't owned outright by a few of the bigger timber barons.

Without access roads we can't fight fires and we cannot have proper logging methods for the development and harvesting of these forests. Why don't we get them?

Well, don't look now, but there is a nasty rumor that some of our more powerful timber barons don't want access roads built—because if there were access roads into the forests any lumberman, not just a baron with the capital to build miles of private road, could buy and log patches of Federal timber as it ripens and is ready to harvest.

But these big shots in the lumber industry want that timber left right where it is and just as inaccessible as it is, so that when they get their private holdings logged off (and the land back on the counties for nonpayment of taxes) that Federal timber will be waiting for them.

However, on the surface almost everyone is for these access roads. A bill providing for them even passed the Senate—Senate bill No. 24. The bill is at present peacefully sleeping in the House Committee on Agriculture, and unless we can succeed in building a fire under it, the Congress is apt to adjourn without passing the bill.

So once again we urge all of you who depend upon the lumber industry for a living to write your Congressman urging that he do all he can to get WAYNE MORSE's Senate bill No. 24, the access-roads bill, out of committee and passed by the House.

Why Not an Excess-Profits Tax Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 16, 1950:

WHY NOT AN EXCESS-PROFITS TAX NOW?

One major justification for the economic-control legislation—including authority to put ceilings on prices and wages—now on its way through Congress is the indisputable need to hold the line against the soaring cost of living in a manner equitable to everyone.

In view of that need, the refusal of the Senate Finance Committee to consider immediate imposition of an excess-profits tax is a breach of faith with the American people.

The whole country is in the fight to prevent Korean war costs and the huge spending involved in a rearmament program from driving the cost of living up to a point where the entire economy is endangered. We don't know what the final costs will be, but we do know that they can climb out of sight unless firm efforts are made to control them.

Congress already is preparing to pass severe economic controls. It is ready to boost the income taxes paid by individuals, and the normal taxes paid by corporations. But the Senate Committee has put off until next year—or perhaps later—a tax on excess profits directly attributable to the Nation's efforts to rearm itself against the Communist menace.

It's time all Congressmen realized that the country is willing to make sacrifices in order to keep the cost of living—and the cost of rearmament—within bounds. Americans will accept cheerfully the restrictions and the additional tax load, if the principle of equity is preserved.

But it isn't fair and equitable to slap taxes on some, and let others, who make quick extra profits because of defense demands, slide by. It isn't reasonable to continue to provide loopholes from just taxation for a few favored groups, and at the same time ask all others to shoulder a bigger burden.

Congress has been curiously reluctant to close up one big loophole by which some oil producers have been ble to pile up millions while paying little or no taxes. A move to cut down the depletion allowances these producers charge against taxes was smothered under a blanket of sectional politics last spring.

It sounds fine for Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, to vote now for an excess-profits tax—one of the two committee members who did. But it would sound a lot better to hear CONNALLY come out and demand that some of these get-rich-quick oil millionaires from his own and neighboring States hand over part of their profits to the Federal Government, especially now that oil has become a defense necessity.

Aren't these people rich enough, without having others continue to bear their share of the load? If Connally is against one kind of excess profits, why not all kinds?

The Senate committee decision indicates once more that Congress is lagging behind the American people in measures to meet the new obligations thrust upon us by the Red invasion of Korea.

The majority of Americans are aware that the $16,500,000,000 in additional armament spending asked by President Truman may be only the beginning. They know that every gun, every tank, every plane will cost more if pressures on prices are not reduced. They know that heavier taxes both help pay for arms and keep their cost of living down.

But they are not ready to accept the theory that profiteers can keep their gains while our men are dying in Korea. They won't approve of any congressional juggling which means that individuals start paying higher taxes on October 1, and corporations keep their extra, war-connected profits until some indefinite date in the future.

The excess-profits tax law in effect during the last war may not have been perfect. Such a law is extremely difficult to draft without involving some hardships. But at least the law worked, and offers a model for new legislation to be passed promptly. Then, if it seems desirable, the Senate committee could undertake the study it now offers as its excuse for side-stepping action.

This newspaper believes firmly that equity, in economic controls, in defense measures, and in tax laws is essential to our national strength. For that reason, an excess-profits tax should be passed without further delay.

Community Recreation Guides Youthful Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to take this opportunity to commend most highly the civic spirit of the many men and women in our small American communities who devote much of their own leisure time to providing suitable and constructive recreation for the boys and girls of America. It is this wise guidance of youthful energy which helps our young people to learn the importance of friendly cooperation; the success of joint endeavor; the pleasure in the accomplishment of the group. It is what is known as learning by doing and is perhaps one of the outstanding factors in helping our young people to develop into useful citizens and to be thoughtful men and women—the spirit and backbone of our American way of life.

In this world today, when the free nations are banding together to stamp out the threat of communism within their own borders and to prevent its further spread throughout the world, the strength of America lies of necessity in its youth. A few years ago many of us became seriously alarmed by the increase of juvenile delinquency here in the United States. In an effort to provide a suitable outlet for the youthful energy which in most instances was the cause of juvenile delinquency—I often think of it as mischief carried to a dangerous degree—many civic-social organizations came into being. These are all fine, patriotic groups whose members give a large part of their personal leisure to help the young people of their communities.

A typical example of such an organization is the Happy Hour Social and Athletic Club of Maple Shade, N. J. This organization sponsors a fine softball team which is assured a place in the league play-offs this year; its boys' baseball team holds first place in the junior baseball league. In the fall the club encourages a local football team and in the winter there is basketball. The Happy Hour Social and Athletic Club cooperates with other local civic organizations in Maple Shade to make the Fourth of July and Christmas celebrations highly successful. Because of the interest which televised boxing bouts have aroused among young and old, this club recently has sponsored a new athletic show for the people of the community. They have constructed an outdoor boxing ring at their clubhouse and every

other Thursday evening provide an outdoor boxing show. In the bouts which will be held tonight there are five Maple Shade youths participating: Timmy Morton, Al Gibson, Al Pike, Jack Thiel, and Tony DiMezza. They will box an all-Philadelphia team sponsored by the Philadelphia Police Athletic League (PAL), which is well known everywhere for its successful work with boys and young men.

Maple Shade's Happy Hour Club is but one outstanding example of the many, many fine civic organizations in my district which are contributing so much to the future of America by teaching our boys and girls good sportsmanship and respect for the rights of others—the firm foundations upon which good American citizenship must be built.

Hawaii's Sons on the Korea Firing Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, of Honolulu, T. H., of date August 18, 1950, as follows:

HAWAII'S SONS ON THE KOREAN FIRING LINE

During World War II, Hawaii soldiers were in the thick of battle in both the European and the Pacific theaters. Their glorious combat record is now a bright page in our Nation's history.

Today, in the blood-soaked mountain passes of Korea, Hawaii's young men are writing another stirring page in history.

In larger numbers, proportionately, than fighting men from the States, they have been locked with the enemy in some of the bitterest fighting of the Korean campaign.

From the casualty lists of the Fifth Regimental Combat Team and the Twenty-fourth Division (originally the Hawaiian Division, with the taro leaf shoulder insignia) we get a picture of the cross section of island youth engaged in the fighting.

Here are some of the names, taken at random from the list of killed, wounded, and missing: Arakawa, Nakama, Bourdreau, Keanoanoa, Nakasato, Birch, Chun, Lishman, Patacsil, Perry, Santiago, Kim, Lee, and Ladao—Americans all.

By ancestry Irishmen, Germans, French, English, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans, Hawaiians—but Americans all.

These men and their comrades in arms are fighting to preserve the American democracy they love, which they and their parents have helped to establish in Hawaii. There names are the names which have appeared on the sugar and pineapple plantation payrolls, in the business tax records, and on the rosters of civic organizations.

Behind the lines, Hawaii itself is stirring into new action as a port of call for men and material bound for the front. It is growing once more into a major staging base for an advance operation.

Symbolic of this renewed recognition of Hawaii's strategic importance in the Pacific basin is revival of Pearl Harbor's World War II slogan: "We Keep the Ships Fit to Fight."

And although the sound of exploding shells has yet to disturb Hawaii's gentle breezes, civilian defense preparations are well advanced, far ahead of planning in most mainland cities equally vulnerable to enemy attach.

Plans are going forward for the organization of a counterpart of the wartime USO to fill a growing need brought about by the Korean war.

The sum of these things is that Hawaii is again demonstrating that it is a forward bulwark of the nation, quick to rise to each new emergency, generous in its response to every call.

Hawaii is proving again that it cannot be written off the strategists' maps, that it is and will remain an outpost of foremost importance.

And its two dead, 22 wounded and 25 missing in the Korean fighting are mute evidence that Hawaii once again is on the firing line of democracy. But politically, Hawaii remains relegated to the back seat of territorial status.

We're American enough to operate a productive group of islands and contribute vastly to the national revenues.

We're American enough to send young men of skill and valor to the battlefield—and they're American enough to fight with complete courage and loyalty.

But we're not American enough to join the family of States.

What travesty.

Refusal of United States To Make Peace Deal With Russia Will Strengthen UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herewith an editorial appearing in the White Haven Record entitled "Refusal of United States To Make Peace Deal With Russia Will Strengthen United Nations." The editorial follows:

REFUSAL OF UNITED STATES TO MAKE PEACE DEAL WITH RUSSIA WILL STRENGTHEN UN

The United States, in a note from Secretary of State Acheson to Prime Minister Nehru, of India, replied this week to the Soviet Union's statement that to grant Nationalist China's seat on the UN Security Council to Communist China is the only term on which peace can be secured in Korea.

Although the details of Secretary Acheson's reply to the Russian proposal were not made known, it is known that his note stated bluntly that the United States is in no position to make such a compromise and that any settlement and the terms for the same must come from the United Nations, not from an individual member. Our reply also made it clear that the UN has specified that no settlement will be attempted until North Korean Communist troops have withdrawn from South Korea—or have been forced out of that Republic and we have emphatically pointed out that we mean to adhere to that decision.

This reply to the Soviet peace proposal is one of the most heartening developments of the war, for it means that the United States as a loyal member of the UN, has refused to enter into any form of private "deal" merely to achieve peace. It has notified the whole world that we are not interested in "peace at any price," and that final settlement of the Korean issue is not a matter that can be settled on a narrow, nationalistic footing. We have made it clear that our stand to back the UN in its support of the invaded Republic of South Korea was taken in the interests of the world community and with sincere belief in the principles upon which the United Nations is founded.

This is probably one of the greatest boosts to the United Nations organization since its inception. Coupled with the United States decision to help provide military support in an effort to enable the UN to enforce its decision in Korea.

A Test for 20/20 Hindsight Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the columnist, Marquis Childs, in his column day before yesterday in the Washington Post, has some interesting comments on some of the legislators who have developed 20/20 hindsight vision since the beginning of the Korean war. Those who criticize what happened should be able to answer two questions: First, did they oppose the policies followed in the 5 years since the war ended? Secondly, if they did, what constructive proposal did they put forward to take the place of the policies which they now contend led to or abetted our present difficulties. There are very few who can meet that test. I think Marquis Childs' column is interesting in its comment on some who cannot. Mr. Childs' column follows:

RESULTS OF DEMOBILIZING—WHERRY'S POISON
(By Marquis Childs)

If the poison exuded on the Senate floor by Senator KENNETH WHERRY of Nebraska is a sample of Republican campaign oratory, then the country is in for a bad time this fall. All hope of unity will be destroyed in a savage dog-eat-dog attack that will leave victory a pretty empty thing.

The psychologist says that a sense of guilt produces a desire to find a scapegoat; to hit out at someone else with a blind anger. It's about time to face up to the fact that for the tragedy of Korea and for our present defenselessness there is more than enough blame to go around.

The fifth anniversary of VJ-day has come and gone as though it had never been. Perhaps we preferred to forget that mood of exaltation and the aftermath in which the clamor to bring the boys home drowned out everything else.

America had in being on VJ-day military power of overwhelming weight everywhere in the world. That power was dismantled with a speed that was fantastically destructive. If you want to go back to original sin to explain our present plight, there it is.

A brief glance at the record will show that almost every politician, both Republican and Democrat, joined in that cry to bring the boys home. Wasn't the war over?

Gen. George C. Marshall, who was Chief of Staff of the Army until November of 1945, realized how destructive and costly this immediate dismantling would be. So did some others who understood what a power vacuum would be left if American force in being was

taken apart while Russia kept her legions armed and strategically placed.

But these were the brass hats. They wanted to keep the boys in service so they could retain their wartime rank. Why, if you let 'em, they'd take the country over. So went the political cry.

A few men in political life spoke up for what they believed to be the truth about the dismantling that was proceeding at disastrous speed. One was Representative JAMES WADSWORTH of New York, who is now retiring after 30 years of distinguished and honorable service in the Senate and the House. A little later WADSWORTH was one of the few Republicans to work actively for adoption of universal military training when President Truman recommended it following a report by a special commission of inquiry.

President Truman, who placed great faith in General Marshall's advice, made some effort to stem the dismantling tide. A revealing incident comes to mind out of this period.

One of the nationally broadcast commentators was working the "bring the boys home" theme as hard as possible. He personally directed the collecting and signing of GI petitions to come home.

At the end of a press conference he sought to present these petitions to Truman. This was the signal for the President to let loose some earthy Missouri language to the effect that he didn't want any of the blankety-blank petitions.

There is some evidence that the "bring the boys home" drive was egged on by Communists. But very little inspiration was needed, since it fitted the temper of the time. We all wanted our sons back to get them into college, into the family business, into jobs. Wasn't the war over?

Some Republicans in 1946 went so far as to hint that the Truman administration wanted to keep the boys overseas because it would be harder for them to cast a ballot against the party in power. In the election that fall, the party out of power captured control of both Senate and House. Undoubtedly, one reason was because the Republicans had capitalized successfully on the discontents growing out of demobilization and the aftermath of a terrible war.

This dismantling process in 1945 and 1946 is estimated to have cost $48,000,000. How much of that could have been saved if it had been done more cautiously and slowly, no one can say. Part of the savings would have been in war material bulldozed into dump heaps or thrown into the sea because no ships were available to send it back to storage while manpower to carry on a salvage operation was melting away.

Perhaps the very fact that the Democrats are in and the Republicans are out adds up to political responsibility. But this does not alter the record. Nor does it justify wild and reckless and divisive talk about guilt for the blood that is being shed by young Americans in the Korean war.

Help for the Policemen, Firemen, and School Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the President's action in signing the police bill providing for a 5-day workweek. We, the Members of Congress, serving in the capacity of City Councilmen for the District of Columbia, have made progress in matters pertaining to wages, hours, and retirement of school teachers, firemen and policemen, but we have not gone far enough, according to my views, to make of the Nation's Capital the shining example and the model that it should be in order to attract the attention and emulation of other cities.

Washington, the great capital city of the richest, most powerful Nation in the world should have the best paid school teachers, policemen, and firemen if it wants to attract the intelligent, honest, and dependable employees necessary to maintain the highest standards of education and safety. In addition to the best pay, we should provide a shorter work week and healthful conditions of employment, a sound, permanent, and liberal retirement system, with dependency allowances, and a special lump-sum or annuity provision where death results from performance of hazardous duty. This applies particularly to policemen and firemen who daily risk their lives in the line of duty. If we will follow up now with the necessary appropriations our duty will have been discharged and we will, moreover, render exemplary service which will aid the teachers, policemen, and firemen of our own communities, because public sentiment will force the hands of local city councils to maintain the honor and prestige of the old home town.

The church provides moral and religious strength, but if you want to secure for the citizen a progressive, strong, and permanent democracy, our schools and our teaching staffs must be enlarged and encouraged to plan for future intellectual expansion, and our policemen and firemen to provide for our physical safety. These privileges cost but little compared to the happiness, security, and satisfaction they bring. It is our own insurance for tomorrow.

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan Speaks at Carlisle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. NOLAND

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture, Charles Brannan, honored the farm people of Carlisle, Sullivan County, and the Seventh District by addressing a gathering at the Sullivan County Fair on August 21. Secretary Brannan directed his speech to the role of our farmers in a changing world.

Mr. Brannan was welcomed by the many hundreds who attended this meeting and his remarks were received with great interest. For this reason I think his speech which follows should be of general interest to all of those interested in the welfare of the American farmer. It follows:

FARMERS IN A CHANGING WORLD

(By Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan)

Ten years ago the Department of Agriculture published a yearbook titled "Farmers in a Changing World."

Here is one of the sentences from that book: "The year 1940 marks the end of a decade that has seen more swift and far-reaching changes in agricultural viewpoints and policy than perhaps any other decade in the history of the United States."

Looking back now after another 10 years, we might well feel that prior to 1940 we hadn't seen anything. For the changes of this past decade have been so much faster—so much more far reaching—that there hardly seems any basis at all for comparison.

"Farmers in a changing world": That was an appropriate theme in 1940—but it is much more appropriate in 1950.

What kind of world is it?

First, it is a world of breath-taking swiftness. On Saturday, June 24, all seemed quiet in Korea. The next morning the thirty-eighth parallel was a blazing military front. Except for our intervention as a member of the United Nations the Red armies would have conquered many weeks ago.

A second characteristic of today's world is its terrible power of destruction. Five years ago this month one atom bomb was exploded 2,000 feet above Hiroshima—and the casualties in dead, injured, and missing have been estimated at 130,000 persons.

One bomb—and a primitive type of atom bomb at that.

Another characteristic of the modern world is its interdependence—it is one world. Aggression or threats of aggression in Korea—or in Germany—or in the Balkans—affect freedom and security everywhere. We learned a bitter lesson from Hitler—but thank God, learn it we did—we learned that one act of aggression, unchecked, inevitably leads to another, until the whole free world either goes down in submission—or stands up and fights.

That is why American young men and American guns and armor and planes and ships are standing valiantly against greedy and power-mad forces in Korea today.

This changing world, finally, is a world of conflict. As President Truman recently said: "The attack upon the Republic of Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that the international Communist movement is prepared to use armed invasion to conquer independent nations. * * * The free world has made it clear, through the United Nations, that lawless aggression will be met with force."

Our national policy has been made very plain for all the nations to see.

We are determined to maintain and defend world peace. We shall do this by repelling aggression.

We shall do it by restoring peace through joint action with other members of the United Nations.

We shall do it by providing a shield behind which a free and lawful world society can live and prosper.

That is our national policy. To carry it out this Nation has work to do on two broad fronts. On the military front we have the job of repelling actual aggression, as in Korea, and of preparing defenses against potential aggression, as in western Europe and elsewhere.

But there is a second front upon which we must fight. As effectively as we know how, we must wage a war of ideas—a war of good deeds based upon ideals—a war of works founded on faith.

In this struggle of ideas, we have made a solid beginning. The Voice of America short

waves the story of democracy all around the globe. The European recovery program backs up our words with deeds and dollars. The point 4 program will bring to underdeveloped countries a type of economic cooperation that has been operating with excellent results between ourselves and Latin America for more than 10 years.

The Food and Agriculture Organization is tackling the broad problem of world hunger. Other international agencies are hard at work on other fundamental tasks concerned with raising world standards of living.

In all these fields, the free people of the world are on the march. But we must march even faster. Every day hunger is breeding discontent. Every day people who suffer from malnutrition, lack of shelter, and insufficient clothing become easier targets for communism.

In this struggle for peace which now engages us, our agriculture is a vital element.

At the base of our strength—supporting not only our Armed Forces but our industry as well—is the land and its products. From the land come food and fiber, lumber and oil, the raw materials out of which men build and by which they live.

From our agriculture must also come many of the valuable techniques of food and fiber production which can be transferred to the farmers of other lands.

In such ways as these does a strong and prosperous agriculture contribute to peace and security.

But there are still other ways.

It is only because of the increasing productivity of our farms that so many millions of men and women have been released from the necessity of tilling the soil and made available for industry. A little more than a century ago, one farm worker, on the average, provided food and fiber for less than five persons. Now a person engaged in agriculture provides, on the average, for 15 persons.

This process was accelerated during the decade just ended. While the nonfarm population of our country grew by about 20,000,000 persons, the number of people on farms decreased by nearly 3,000,000. Yet our farms have been producing about 40 percent more than the 1935–39 average—and using about the same number of acres. In 8 of the past 10 years, in fact, farm output of crops and livestock has equalled or surpassed the greatest production of any previous year.

This agricultural strength is one of the fundamentals upon which the vitality of our whole economy rests. Without raw materials from the farms, much of our industry would be crippled; a large part of our labor force would be idle.

The same relationship holds between agriculture and the health and vigor of our people. Milk, meat, eggs, and other protective foods are translated into millions of additional man-hours of labor.

One of the most important battles of World War II was the battle of food—and a big segment of that battle was won on the farms of the United States. The farm people of the United States have every reason to take pride in their accomplishment. They did a terrific job. And you of this great producing State of Indiana contributed immeasurably to the victory.

We do not know at this time exactly how far the Nation will have to go in mobilizing its military might. But there is one thing upon which all farmers—from Maine to California—are ready to assure their fellow Americans. They are ready to assure the Nation that whatever the demands may be for food and fiber, they will come through with the required production.

Right now we are in very fine shape. Our food production resources are far and away the greatest in the world. American farmers have the know-how that it takes. And they have been plowing back into their business the gains of relative prosperity, making farming more highly efficient than ever before. Another year of very large farm output is in prospect. Even allowing for increases in military food requirements, we expect to have enough food so that civilians can continue consuming as much as in the past 2 years.

We have big reserves of wheat and other grains.

We have lots of cotton and other fibers out of which to supply agricultural raw materials to industry.

And, what is more, big as our production is now, we can boost it a good deal higher if we should have to. Research is steadily producing better plant varieties, new hybrid seeds, improved bug and weed killers, and more efficient uses of fertilizers. We have more farm machinery and electric power than ever before. It all adds up to a constantly widening productive capacity.

Many of our Department specialists believe that, great as the advances of the past have been, science has no more than made a good start in advancing the agriculture of the United States. The big harvest, in other words, is not behind but ahead of us.

Much of the progress already achieved, and much that will be achieved, owes a great deal to the valuable farm programs developed over the past two decades. These programs did not come into being automatically. Farm people with determination and ideas made known the needs of agriculture in this changing world. They have led in developing the measures that are needed, and they have been public spirited enough to handle the jobs of local administration. In many cases, they have developed in their ranks a leadership that has reached beyond local to State, National, and international levels. It is significant that the new Under Secretary of Agriculture is a Hoosier farmer who has had long and successful experience in farm-program development and administration. I am sure that Indiana is proud—and I know it is a satisfaction to me—to have Clarence J. McCormick as the new Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Here in Indiana, when the Rural Electrification Administration was established in 1935, less than 12 percent of your farms had central-station electric service. Now, more than 98 percent—I want to repeat that—over 98 percent of your farms are served. You know what that has meant in terms of increased production.

I am very happy to say that this nearly perfect record for the State of Indiana is a wonderful tribute to a man who has done a truly great job for agriculture and for REA—our good friend Claude Wickard.

Under new authority recently given to REA, the improvement of telephone service is also under way. In 1945 less than three Indiana farms out of five had telephone service. One loan for providing new or improved telephone service to rural subscribers in Indiana has already been approved and six other applications have been received.

About half of Indiana's farms and farm land are in soil-conservation districts, and 60 percent of your farms cooperated in the 1949 agricultural conservation program. You know the importance of conservation to continued farm abundance.

You have benefited by research on forage and cereal crops and the diseases which attack them. Several new corn hybrids, with greater resistance to the corn borer, were released for 1950 plantings. The new bacterial wilt-resistant varieties of alfalfa—Buffalo and Ranger—are now widely used and even better varieties are under test. Also in wide use are new grain storage plans designed by agricultural engineers to provide better handling and storage at reduced cost.

Work is also going ahead here in Indiana to improve the milking qualities of your cows and at the same time develop a good quality meat animal which will produce a good steer.

You all know the benefits of our farm credit programs and of the price support and production adjustment programs.

All of this progress in electrification, conservation, credit, research, and price support has been reflected, and will continue to be reflected, in larger output per acre and per animal.

From the production angle, therefore, we're in fine shape.

Although I want to emphasize again that our future requirements are not yet fully known, we should be able—given adequate labor, equipment, and supplies—to turn out all the food and fiber we'll need for the foreseeable future.

Meantime, farmers want the answers to a few questions. There is a lot of talk these days about allocations, price controls, rationing and various other regulations. All of us recognize that circumstances have and could again arise in which such devices are necessary to the protection of our economy. In fact, there are now indications that allocations may be needed for certain nonagricultural commodities most directly related to the military effort.

Agricultural supplies, on the other hand, are large, and the ability of farmers to maintain abundant supplies is such that we can all hope it will be possible to postpone the use of regultory measures for a considerable period, and even avoid using them at all unless the emergency becomes much worse.

American farmers have the opportunity to help postpone or avoid such regulations by simply following their natural desires to produce efficiently and abundantly. I am sure they will do what is necessary to make food regulations unnecessary for as long a period as possible in their own interest and in the interest of all the people.

Right now the big task for farmers is to maintain production by keeping tooled up for abundance. You can make sure your machinery and buildings are in condition for productive use.

You can make a special point of getting rid of fire hazards and accident booby traps.

You can make a more intensive effort to control insects, rodents, and diseases.

You can step up your endeavors to improve your land and your livestock. You can doublecheck whether you are getting the most out of your pastures.

You can see to it that you have storage and handling facilities for the crops now growing in your fields.

There's a lot that every farm family can do to meet the requirements of this changing world.

Farmers also want to know what to expect in the matter of prices, storage, materials, and labor.

I want to assure you that the Department will do all that it can to keep farmers supplied with up-to-date information related to the farm production job and to keep our programs geared to actual conditions.

Wheat producers already have the guidance of wheat acreage allotments. Other acreage allotments will, of course, be announced as far in advance of planting seasons as possible, and, if production goals seem likely to be useful for commodities on which we do not have acreage allotments, goals will be announced.

Price-support announcements will serve as further guides.

We intend to keep a close watch on the developing corn crop so that, in case of a soft-corn problem, advance preparations can be organized for the most advantageous use of drying equipment.

We will also keep in close touch with the farm equipment and supplies situation.

Never before has our agricultural production depended so heavily upon adequate amounts of gasoline, tires, repair parts, fertilizer, and lime. We now have twice as many tractors on American farms as we had at the end of 1941—3,500,000. American farmers use four times as much lime as in the 1935–39 period, and twice as much fertilizer.

With respect to conservation activities, present plans call for continuing the agricultural conservation program and aid through the Soil Conservation Service in 1951 at the same level as in 1950.

I hope what I have said will answer some of the questions in your minds. We will have more information for you as time goes on.

In conclusion, I want to talk just a little while about one more question that I know you have in your minds as you consider the world situation and the responsibilities of agriculture.

We have seen that agriculture has great productive resources. Agriculture is strong. But we must be very certain that we can keep our production geared to actual requirements.

We need the kind of agriculture in this changing world that is able to shift its production gears quickly and efficiently. To do that, farmers need reasonable and fair price-support protection. And the whole Nation needs a program that will give the people the full benefit of abundant production.

I want to say now, as I have often said before: The present price-support program has many excellent features. It is better than the Agricultural Act of 1948. I do not advocate discarding the present program where it is working satisfactorily—but I most certainly do urge that it be improved where it is weak, and expanded to cover effectively the important perishable commodities which bring in the greater part of total farm income.

So far, I have made no reference to the recommendations made by the Department of Agriculture for improving the price-support program. I would be perfectly satisfied to have the present circumstances studied and assessed without reference to the recommendations that have been made in the past. But I do say that we must keep on trying to improve our farm program so that it meets our actual needs.

In saying this, I hope you will not misunderstand me. In my opinion, the recommendations made by the Department are even more pertinent than ever. I believe in them fully. All I am saying is that I do not wish to use the present situation or wave the flag as an argument for my past position. I simply suggest that we think constructively about our present needs and what we should do now.

As matters now stand, we are in need of a program which solidly protects farm prices in case of sudden slackening of demand. We are in need of a program that puts an abundance of milk, eggs, and other perishables in the hands of consumers at attractive prices. We are in need of a program that is able to bring about efficiently the production adjustments that may be required.

The program we now have is no more adequate for current conditions than it was for the conditions existing a few months ago. Its deficiencies may not stand out so clearly at the moment, perhaps, because the downward trend of farm prices has been reversed—but it is still the same program with the same fundamental weaknesses. It fails to assure support on some of our most important commodities, and it offers farmers no incentive for making necessary shifts in production.

Moreover, we are still faced with the sliding scale of supports; the provision that as supplies go up, supports should go down. At the very time when farmers may need supports most—that is, when supplies are biggest—the support level will be lowest.

Maybe that makes sense to some people—it doesn't make a bit of sense to me.

Nor does it make sense that we should depend on the sliding scale as a mechanism for adjusting farm production.

The way to get production adjustments quickly is not by starving farm families out of producing. It is by encouraging farm families to produce what is needed through programs which will give them reasonable assurance of fair prices and fair incomes.

It is only proper to point out that the present price legislation does not rely on the sliding scale to bring about desirable adjustments in really critical times. The law provides that when the national security or national welfare is formally found to require increases in production, the Secretary of Agriculture may set price supports at the levels he considers necessary, regardless of the other provisions of the law.

This, you will note, is very much like the wartime Steagall amendment—the law which gave agriculture assurance of price supports at 90 percent of parity on many commodities until a period after the end of the war.

By and large, the Steagall amendment worked very well. It helped to call forth year after year of record-breaking farm production—and production of the specific foods and fibers most needed for victory. So long as demand was equal to, and even greater than, supplies, no particular problems of waste developed.

But the Steagall amendment had a big weakness—a weakness that exists also in the present legislation. It began to stand out, and to hurt, as soon as supplies outran demand at the support-price level.

The weakness was this: We did not—and we still do not—have an effective method for supporting the prices of important perishables like milk, meat, and eggs, and at the same time letting the people have the full benefit of abundant production.

For want of such a method, we now have in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation more butter, cheese, eggs, and milk than we know what to do with.

That's why the Government, during and since the recent war, has been forced to pay out half a billion dollars to take potatoes off the market.

In critical times like these we cannot afford to let milk, meat, butter, cheese, eggs, and potatoes go to waste. For these foods, therefore, we need authority to apply support not only through purchases but also through direct payments to producers. This does not mean that we should discontinue purchases of perishables for which we have adequate outlets through the school-lunch and other desirable programs. It does mean that the purchase method should not be our only recourse in supporting such commodities as meat, milk, and eggs.

Under the direct payment method, cattle and calves, sheep and lambs, hogs, milk, chickens, and eggs would be allowed generally to find demand-and-supply prices. If the price should fall below a fair return, producers would then receive a direct payment from the Government—a payment amounting to the difference between the support price and the average market price.

Take note, please, of that word average. It means that if any producer turns out a better product, or is a better bargainer, and is thereby able to command a higher-than-market price, he would still get a payment based on the difference between the average selling price and the support level. He would get the same payment as those who sold for less. Initiative and better quality would bring him greater income, just as under any other free market conditions.

We should continue the prevailing method of support for storable crops. Under this method the Nation has built up valuable reserves of wheat, corn, and cotton.

But, in terms of farm income, the nonstorables are far more important than the storables.

Here in Indiana last year the value of your hog production exceeded the value of your corn. The value of your cattle and calves far surpassed the value of your wheat production. For the Nation as a whole, meat, milk, and eggs bring in over half of the total receipts from farm commodities.

These same foods pretty much determine the adequacy of our diets. Most times if the diet is deficient, it is not for lack of bread or potatoes, but for lack of meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and leafy green and yellow vegetables.

Why, then, should we continue to maintain perishables at artificially high prices—while we accumulate wasteful surpluses—and while we keep consumers from access to part of our supplies?

Why should we continue this wasteful process of trying to store excessive stocks of food that are not easily storable? When we try to dispose of these foods in ways that will not affect market prices, the Government cannot even give them away, without paying freight and packaging costs as well.

Again I say, maybe that makes sense to some people—but it doesn't make a bit of sense to me.

These are some of the thoughts that occur to me as, in accordance with my responsibilities as Secretary, I consider the role of farmers in a changing world.

I have complete confidence in the ability, and the will, of American farmers to do their job on the home front as brilliantly and as resolutely as American boys are doing their job in Korea.

Now, in this changing world we who believe in the principles of our Declaration of Independence—in the God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—have perhaps as great an opportunity, and as great a responsibility, as was ever given to men.

This Nation stands before the world as the defender of human freedom.

It is not the first time we have worn that mantle. We shall continue to wear it, God willing, until freedom-loving nations have no longer anything to fear from the greed of totalitarian aggressors.

To this end, let us all strive to make our agriculture as strong and secure as it needs to be. For whatever we do to render farmers better able to play their role in this changing world will help the entire Nation to final victory in its struggle for peace and security.

Oil Imports and United States Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the ESPA magazine of July 1950.

OIL IMPORTS AND UNITED STATES SECURITY

For the past 18 months, thousands of dollars have been spent and millions of words written on the problem of oil imports. The term "general welfare" has been bandied about until only the acutest mind could sense the true meaning of the word, for those who opposed imports would have had Congress and the people of the United States believe that it was inimical to our very "way

of life" to permit the continued flow of products into the country.

It has taken the threat of war, and the "police" action in Korea by the United States Armed Forces under the banner of the United Nations, to bring the situation into its proper perspective. As we have often said, the need for petroleum to run the wheels of war, and to maintain our essential civilian economy, makes any effort to reduce our supply, by imposing restrictions or tariff barriers, run counter to national policy. And with the rearrangement of the picture, the real proponents of the Nation's welfare and security come into view. It becomes clear that the importing companies were right when they contended that imports were vital to the long-range preservation of the national security, the welfare of the American consumer, and the domestic industry, and the sound growth of international trade.

Events have proved right. Those industry spokesmen who saw in any curtailment of the flow of crude and residual oil into the country a danger to the smooth operation of our economy should a national emergency arise. Figures on reserve petroleum stocks indicate that we are not in as favorable position as we would like to meet current civilian demand. And these figures do not even mirror the tremendous drain on those reserves, and the increased pressure for greater production, and refining, that military requirements will bring.

Latest figures on refinery capacity indicate that the petroleum industry is running at top speed now, and with the increased military demand, it becomes evident that we will have to continue to look to other areas in the Western Hemisphere to supplement our own petroleum reserves. We may be able to cut back on consumption of some civilian goods, but ours is a Nation which runs on oil, and to cut back on civilian consumption of oil products would seriously hamper our economy.

It is for these reasons that we applaud the successful efforts of the importing companies to prevent the disastrous restrictions on oil imports, and caution certain elements in the industry to refrain, in the future, from putting their own selfish interests before the welfare of the Nation.

Gov. K. C. Wu, of Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, K. C. Wu, who presently is the Governor of Formosa, is a graduate of Grinnell College in Iowa. Recently after Time magazine used his picture on its front cover, the Grinnell (Iowa) Herald-Register carried a very interesting editorial mentioning some of the facts about K. C. Wu when he was in school in the United States. Because of my personal acquaintance with Governor Wu, I was especially interested both in the Time article and the editorial in the Grinnell paper, and I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the Herald-Register editorial of August 10, 1950:

A SON OF GRINNELL

When we glanced at the cover of last week's Time magazine we stopped and looked again, for there looking out at us were the more or less familiar features of K. C. Wu, Grinnell college graduate who has won high rank as an administrator in China and now holds the crucial post of Governor of embattled Formosa, the last stronghold of Chiang Kai-shek's nationalist government. Naturally we read the accompanying sketch with unusual interest, for here is a Grinnell graduate who is playing an important part in the events of today's troubled world.

Incidentally, the magazine mentions that Wu attended Grinnell College. Here, says Time, the only course in which Wu, later to be mayor of three cities, including sprawling Shanghai, did not get an A was, oddly enough, municipal government.

When Wu left to study for his doctorate in political science at Princeton in 1926 he faced the formidable Dean Andrew Fleming West, who personally interviewed all graduate students seeking admission. Time tells it this way. "'Young man,' said West, after contemplating the round, boyish face of the applicant, 'you are immature.' 'Sir,' replied Wu, 'to judge maturity by the criterion of age is an immature thought in itself.'"

They let him in.

Wu's whole life has been a demonstration of that saying. He entered Grinnell when he was only 17, but he proved himself intellectually as mature as older students and more mature than many

Returning to China Wu first attracted public notice as a tax collector. Contrary to precedent in China he balanced the Hankow municipal budget in 6 months. Ordinarily, in China, the tax collectors didn't work that way. They balanced their own budgets.

Recognizing that here was a rare bird, Chiang Kai-shek appointed him as mayor of Hankow. Later on he became mayor of Chungking when it was the seat of Chiang's government, and later of Shanghai. Now he is Governor of Formosa.

Wu's policies have always been forward-looking. He is a phenomenon found all too rarely in Chinese public life. He is honest and progressive. In every post which he has held he has instituted reforms.

We feel that here is one Grinnell graduate who in his daily life and in all his activities exemplifies the motto on the college seal, "Christo Duce."

We read one statement by K. C. Wu which we believe might well be pondered by President Truman, the State Department, and officialdom in Washington generally. "The only force in this part of the world with a sizable anti-Communist army," said Wu, "with a leadership that has a popular following and with the will to fight, is the Nationalist Government."

Ultimately, Wu believes, the United States Government will come to realize that fact. He has never lost faith.

Baring Bill Would Prevent Run-Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, the following is an excerpt from the August 18, 1950, issue of Pay Dirt, an Arizona publication devoted to the interests of the small-mine operators, which I should like to have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BARING BILL WOULD PREVENT RUN-AROUND

Now is the time to revive the bill by Representative BARING, of Nevada, to establish the Office of Mineral Coordinator. This suggestion is made in spite of the statement by the Interior Department that "It is not apparent to this Department that the enactment of H. R. 6082 would serve any useful purpose." Were the bill enacted, Interior would soon sing a different tune—a more useful one than it has heretofore—and the Secretary probably knows it and so dislikes the bill.

Actually, H. R. 6082 arises out of a suggestion in a National Security Resources Board report and should be welcomed by Symington with open arms. Aside from the fact that the bill would bring order out of the present administrative chaos in the minerals and metals field, it sets up for the first time a policy of procurement priorities in this language: "The Coordinator shall integrate, insofar as is practicable, through his foreign section, the mineral wealth of the rest of the world with that of the United States so that our industrial complexes will benefit: *Provided*, That preference shall be given to development of sources of minerals and metals in the following geographical order: (1) Within the United States, its Territories, and possessions; (2) within the rest of the Western Hemisphere; (3) within the Eastern Hemisphere."

It is probably the unerring logic of this section which the Government detests as much as any part of the bill. If the mining industry understood what the enactment of H. R. 6082 would mean to them there would be a clamor for it from border to border and coast to coast, especially at a time when Congress is about to abdicate in the President's favor without giving any specific instructions as to the treatment of the industry in the emergency planning. Without H. R. 6082 it will be the same old run-around.

Controls on the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial taken from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

I think everyone is pleased that both the Senate and the House have passed an economic controls bill. It is hopeful that the conferees will iron out their differences so the final bill will be more satisfactory. After this is done and if the President approves this measure, he will be given the most extensive authority ever granted a Chief Executive in this country, to regulate our Nation's economy.

If the reports are true that our Nation's productive powers are sufficiently great enough to satisfy our military requirements and our civilian needs, we all hope the President will not be forced to put into effect price and wage controls. We all can still recall the OPA days and the many inequities it brought to the consuming public. The way some commodities have spiralled, since the outbreak of the Korean war, is ridiculous and unjustified. It is hopeful that our

large producers will recognize the unfairness in grabbing this opportunity for personal benefits. Everyone should do his best to keep prices to a reasonable level so the President will not be forced through pressure groups, to put this legislation into effect. The leveling-off process is already bringing some prices down and I have every reason to feel that they will continue to go down if we, the public, will only purchase what we need and stop hoarding. The New York Herald Tribune editorial follows:

CONTROLS ON THE WAY

At long last a bill to provide the limited controls needed to stem inflation and speed rearmament has reached the final stages of congressional deliberation. The Senate has sent into joint conference with House delegates a measure which has greater strengths than weaknesses. It contains most of the limited controls needed at the moment, and it provides for fuller stand-by controls to be invoked by the President as need may dictate. The conference must reconcile the Senate and House versions of a control statute. If it uses the Senate bill as a standard and removes some of its defects, we shall have a very adequate controls measure indeed.

The main difference between the Senate and House versions is that the Senate decided against giving the President power to adopt price controls on a selective basis. This makes control authority less flexible than the President would like to have it, but we believe the Senate was correct. Controlling some prices and not others is like squeezing a balloon in one's hands. Press in at one point and the balloon bubbles out at another. If the inflation balloon should become so big that great restraint is needed, a combination of over-all price and wage controls, plus additional taxation to let out some of the air—purchasing power—should do the job.

If a bill is finally passed without selective controls, and we hope it will be, great pressure will be placed upon the President to use his limited mobilization powers with vigor. He will be under pressure, too, to supplement the limited controls over industry with thoroughgoing employment of all the monetary powers at the administration's disposal. This is as it should be. None of us wants full controls if they are avoidable. They may be avoidable if the President uses his powers wisely, if he mobilizes the Treasury, Federal Reserve Board, and other monetary and credit agencies into a cooperating team, and if Congress provides the new taxes needed to reduce general inflationary pressure.

Because we wish limited controls to be given the best possible chance, we regret the Senate's failure to create checks on private credit over existing real estate properties. Unfortunate also is the Senate's peculiar assignment of powers over allocations and priorities to the Secretary of Commerce. If it wished to assure unified administration, it should have provided for a single agency to handle all controls. In any case, the responsibility should go directly to the President, not to one of his appointees. Finally, the provision requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to watch the commodity markets with a view to discouraging excessive speculation must fail to satisfy either those who believe that such speculation must be firmly restrained or those who are disturbed to see unnecessary regimentation. The Secretary is not given enough power to prevent abuses, but he is given enough to encumber the markets. Let us hope that the conference committee will retain the worth-while features of the Senate bill while making the changes necessary to add to them.

New England's War Record and Potential For War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter and report that I have received from Mr. Dudley Harmon, executive vice president, the New England Council, Boston, Mass.:

AUGUST 22, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: I am sending you herewith, for your information, two copies of a memorandum, "New England's War Record and Potential for War Production," prepared by Mr. Ray M. Hudson, manager of our industrial department. In the event that greatly expanded production for the purposes of national defense becomes necessary, we hope you will take advantage of every opportunity to call attention in Washington to the facts and figures contained therein.

With kindest regards, I am
Cordially yours,

DUDLEY HARMON,
Executive Vice President.

NEW ENGLAND'S WAR RECORD AND POTENTIAL FOR WAR PRODUCTION

(By Ray M. Hudson)

New England's contribution to war production during World War II, and some aspects of the region's capacities which indicate it should receive a high priority in plans for increasing production to meet the needs of the present emergency, were recently set forth in a letter to the National Security Resources Board. Pertinent sections of that letter are presented herewith:

THE RECORD IN WORLD WAR II

"In World War II, our war output totaled more than $17,700,000,000 as follows:

	Amount	Percent
Aircraft	$4,467,000,000	25.2
Ordnance	3,835,000,000	21.6
Ships	3,173,000,000	17.8
Textiles and apparel	2,575,000,000	14.5
Machinery and metals	1,350,000,000	7.6
Communication equipment	910,000,000	5.1
Miscellaneous	1,450,000,000	8.2
New England total	17,760,000,000	100.0

"Altogether, New England was awarded more than 9 percent of all the war contracts, impressive evidence, we believe, of its capacity and efficiency.

"Connecticut led the other New England States in the production of war supplies with approximately 45 percent of the regional total. Massachusetts was second with 38 percent, Rhode Island and Maine each had about 7 percent, New Hampshire 2 percent, and Vermont a little over 1 percent of the supply contracts let in the region.

"Our smaller plants were important cogs in New England's war production. Many of them were able to go right into the production of war specialties. Others were aided by the Smaller War Plants Corporation in adapting plant and equipment from nonwar products to war supplies. Over 5,000 of New England's smaller plants registered with the Corporation received contracts for about $600,000,000 for the production of war matériel.

"New England's construction industry was among those hardest hit by the war, the value of construction for all types of buildings dropping from $440,000,000 in 1941 to about $89,000,000 in 1944. Since expansion of war industries in New England took place generally in well-established areas, war housing and new-plant construction was well below that in many other parts of the country where expansion often took place in relatively nonindustrial areas. Nonmilitary facility contracts in New England amounted to roughly $780,000,000, only about 4.5 percent of the national total.

"Nearly $150,000,000, or about 20 percent of the total for nonmilitary facilities, was allocated for the construction of housing units to provide homes for war workers. About 30,000 permanent family units and 17,000 temporary and dormitory units were built with public funds, and an additional 17,000 units were developed by private capital under the war-housing program in New England."

THE REGION'S POTENTIAL

For new-plant sites

"If new defense plants are to be built, some of them should be located in New England. Our hills and valleys afford natural shelter; our networks of railroads, power lines, highways, and our abundant sources of fresh water are factors not easily disrupted. Even if they were, the disruption could be quickly localized and bypassed, or duplicate facilities quickly opened up."

For production

"The flexibility of our industrial structure, with its thousands of small suppliers, makes it ideal for subcontracting, while our ample, highly skilled and well-educated labor force is, in itself, a great source of strength. We have the least labor trouble here of any section in the country."

For regional action

"The New England Council provides an exceptional facility for assisting in the coordination of regional efforts for national defense. Its 25 years of achievement in uniting New England for constructive purposes proves this."

Control for the Love of Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when it appears necessary to take action to control the economy of our country, due to the situation we face, I think it timely that we take note of the views expressed in an editorial in the Herald-News, a weekly newspaper in Hamilton, Tex., located in my congressional district.

Many of you are familiar with the Biblical quotation, "What profiteth a man if he gains the whole world, and loseth his own soul." Economically, I wonder how long we can support half the world with our money and goods and fight the other half and remain free. I certainly think we should have bright red warning lights along the path we are taking in order not to go too far, but more especially, to be sure we can return

on the same road down which we have already traveled some distance.

I commend this editorial to you as something to bear in mind in this time of pressure and demand:

CONTROL FOR THE LOVE OF CONTROL

How does socialism come to a country? A vivid and historically accurate answer to that question has been supplied by Dr. Franklin Bliss Snyder, president emeritus of Northwestern University, in a recent speech.

"Socialism lays its chilling hand on a nation the way old age overtakes us human beings," he said. "No nation, so far as I know, ever said, 'Go to it; after next Thursday we will all be Socialists.' No; the affliction comes gradually, and usually without discomfort in its early stages. But the ultimate result is unhappiness, national destitution, and slavery. The only way to fend it off is to be alert to the symptoms and take proper measures to eliminate them. In this way socialism can be kept at bay, for, though old age is inevitable, socialism is not.

Anthony Eden put the case against socialism well when he said last summer: "The Socialist Party is far too much given to control for the love of control. * * * In restricting liberty in small matters, they are playing into the hands of those who would suppress liberty in the greater things of life. The more we are conditioned to control the weaker becomes that sense of personal responsibility that in the past has been our strength as a nation."

"Control for the love of control" is a characteristic of all the "isms"—socialism, communism, nazism, or what have you. The appetites of those who seek ever-increasing power over others is insatiable. The ideals of sincere men are perverted to the use of the tyrant. Classical socialism stands for the maintenance of individual liberty—yet never in history has that been possible as a practical matter, as weary England has demonstrated. We must nip socialism in the bud or it will engulf us.

Canada's New Iron Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members and the country will read the article which I include from the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N. Y. It proves how extremely necessary the St. Lawrence seaway and power development is for our country. I think the people are studying this question more and more and the whole great project is gaining supporters every day. The St. Lawrence seaway and power development is badly needed, especially under present conditions. We should have started it years ago. I ask my colleagues to read this article carefully:

CANADA'S NEW IRON TREASURY—RAILWAY TO ORE FIELDS IN LABRADOR EXPECTED TO START THIS AUTUMN

(By Ken W. MacTaggart)

BURNT CREEK, QUEBEC, August 12.—Unless the economic equilibrium of this continent becomes seriously disturbed, there appears to be a new mining empire in the making in this rocky wilderness—plus a powerful argument for deepening the St. Lawrence waterways.

Here, right on the Labrador-Quebec boundary, has been located one of the biggest iron deposits ever discovered. To date, sufficient ore has been found, and probed as to volume and values, to produce annual shipments of 10,000,000 tons until probably the end of this century. And they're still finding more.

To illustrate just how much there is, here is a recent incident:

Sampling of the deposits is being done by churn drills, the name describing just what the drill is and does. It churns down into the rock, the displaced material is washed up by water and collected for analysis.

SHRINKING UNITED STATES RESERVES

One of the drills out in the bush broke down and was hauled into camp here for repairs. When the salvaging task was completed, the drill was lugged out beside the camp cookery for a test. The drill struck one of the richest deposits to date, unknown till then. That shows how much iron there is here, there and everywhere.

The importance to Canada of this discovery has been described by many authorities as one of the greatest in mining history. With reserves of high-grade iron being depleted rapidly in the ranges of Minnesota, the United States steel industry has been casting around for new sources.

This new iron treasury is the reason why this frontier camp, 320 air miles from the nearest port and further than that from any railhead, can some day be a bustling city, consuming Canadian-made products and supporting thousands of people.

RAIL ROUTE FOUND

After the railway comes in, that is the big, next step. Survey gangs have been working in the area south from here to Seven Islands on the St. Lawrence and have blazed a route only 347 miles long.

Pessimists originally predicted that the air distance of 320 miles would mean a much longer rail route because of mountains, muskegs, and roaring rivers. But Engineer D. A. Livingstone, now on the job here, has found the highest point would be only 1,900 feet, despite 3,500-foot mountains.

D. J. A. Retty, one of Canada's best-known geologists, came in here in 1936 to begin his search of this hitherto little-known area. He has been here ever since and is now chief geologist of the set-up of many big companies involved in the exploration of the area.

TARGET DATE IS 1961

Labrador Mining & Exploration started the search, Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines came into the picture later, and now Iron Ore Co. of Canada unites the parent companies and six of the biggest iron consumers of the United States.

The latter are providing $15,000,000 for exploration on the basis that if ore is produced they will receive their requirements before sales to others.

Thus co-operation has been achieved between Canadian originator of the project and American consumer of the product. Big-name United States engineers are familiar people around here, and executive aircraft of all types pop in regularly with loads of men whose names are constantly in the news.

They expect to know what is here by the end of 1951. Then development would begin. This would justify a railway to cost many millions ending at Seven Islands at the mouth of the St. Lawrence which would become thereby a big port.

Talk here is that the railway will get under way this fall. This would look as if the big steel companies have made their decision, half way through the 3-year period of testing to take up subleases.

ORE-WHEAT TRANSACTIONS

Well-founded rumor is that President Truman, worried about United States steel future, has given a nod to the big companies that they ought to protect their position. Officials here estimate that 10,000,000 tons of ore a year would justify the cost of a railway, the mining of the ore and operation of carriers from Cleveland to Seven Islands.

Which brings up the St. Lawrence waterway angle. Ore carriers are among the biggest ships on the Great Lakes, but they can't come down to the sea because of the St. Lawrence bottleneck. With deepening of the bottleneck, these ships could steam right to Seven Islands.

Supporters of the idea even add this suggestion: The ships could haul ore to Cleveland and return with wheat from Canada's prairies. Some visionaries here foresee Seven Islands as a port soon with huge terminal elevators where ocean carriers would accept their cargoes of wheat for foreign lands.

TOWN AWAITS CIVILIZATION

In the meantime, deep into some of the most rugged country Canada offers, there are hundreds of men working at uncovering tremendous ridges of iron. From the air a cruise of the territory shows an incredible network of roads—147 miles of them—dug out of the wilderness, connecting many small camps to the major camp here.

Along these roads roll enormous trucks; deep in the bush big power shovels strip away overburden on ridges and in gulches. And strung along the 347 miles of surface down to the St. Lawrence, engineers and their crews are planting stakes that mark where they hope a railway will pass some day.

Belief is that when the first load of steel rails leave the factory for Seven Islands the tip will come that this new mining empire has been proved. It will mean that the United States firms want this ore and have said so. The railway will be needed.

The Thirty-eighth Parallel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, August 23, 1950:

FOR A UNIFIED KOREA

What happens when United Nations forces in Korea reach the thirty-eighth parallel?

To raise this question assumes a victory, either military or diplomatic, for which only the first solid footings have begun to be laid. It assumes that no fresh aggression breaks out in another part of the world to demand attention.

Yet the question is being asked by a number of Americans and perhaps residents of other nations.

Though this is too early for the non-Communist world to lay down a binding course of action, it is not too early to begin thinking through some of the issues which will become concrete and pressing once South Korea is reoccupied. For then the nations will face a question which already deeply concerns Koreans, and that is, "What kind of government or governments shall exist throughout Korea, South and North?"

Koreans for generations, even centuries, have yearned for independence. They have never been significantly divided among themselves along any geographical lines, but have sought independence in terms of unity.

Unification of Korea now, as a result of the tragedy that has occurred, would seem as natural as the aspiration to independence itself.

Possibly the make-up of the United Nations contains the elements for accomplishing that unification and correcting an arbitrary and improvised division of the country.

Sir Benegal N. Rau, UN delegate from India, suggested as much when he told newsmen that the Security Council subcommittee he proposed might, among other things, draw up a picture of a postwar unified Korea.

American Delegate Warren Austin pointed out on August 17 that the UN General Assembly for 3 years has sought the establishment of "a free, unified, and independent nation" for the Korean people, and has urged that free and fair elections should be held for this purpose throughout the length of their peninsula.

Those declarations by the Assembly would seem to govern the necessary war aims of the United Nations, including the United States.

One further consideration is pertinent, too. The aggressor must be rolled back far enough to discourage any further aggression.

If the crime of breaking and entering a man's house bore no further penalty than that the burglar should get out of the house and give back the silverware he had stolen, how effective would be the law enforcement against burglary? There must be some punishment, something forfeited, for the breaking and entering, whether it be a person's house or his country.

What would be more reasonable in this case than that Soviet Russia, the principal in the crime, be required to give up its police-state hold over the territory used as its base for aggression and over the people dragged into fighting its war?

These are some of the considerations which must carry weight when the time comes for a decision as to whether United Nations forces should, or can, stop at the thirty-eighth parallel.

Chile Offers Bolivia Seaport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article entitled "Chile Offers Bolivia Seaport; Truman Said To Back Proposal" which appeared in the New York Times, Thursday, July 13, 1950:

CHILE OFFERS BOLIVIA SEAPORT; TRUMAN SAID TO BACK PROPOSAL—OUTLET WOULD BE BETWEEN ARICA AND PERU BORDER—NO COMPENSATION SOUGHT

(By Milton Bracker)

LA PAZ, BOLIVIA, July 12.—Chile is willing to give Bolivia an outlet to the sea between Arica and the Peruvian border and President Truman has given enthusiastic approval of the plan, President Mamerto Urriolagoitia said in an interview here today.

The project, which would in effect change the map of South America and revitalize Bolivian economy, has been delayed by the lack of a constitutional government in Peru, President Urriolagoitia added.

He declared that it was unquestionably a tripartite question among Chile, Bolivia, and Peru, and once Gen. Manuel Odria was sworn in as the elected President and the Peruvian Congress convenes July 28, he said he felt that the matter could be abvanced in practical terms.

President Truman was understood to have approved the matter when President Gabriel Gonzalez Videla, of Chile, broached it to him during a recent United States trip. The implication was that the United States would help to finance the construction of the port and the building of a spur northward from the existing La Paz-Arica Railroad northward to the new city.

Naturally no such commitment is regarded as firm until the political aspect of the matter has been worked out. Assistant Secretary Miller on a trip last winter during which he invited Gonzalez Videla, also assured President Urriolagoitia that the United States favored the plan, the Bolivian President said.

NO COMPENSATION SOUGHT

Bolivia's lack of a Pacific port dates to the loss of Antofagasta in 1879. President Urriolagoitia emphasized gratefully that President Gonzales Videla's proposal involved no compensation from Bolivia.

In effect the plan would alter the map of South America. It would also shorten the distance over which Bolivian tin and other minerals have to be shipped to the United States. Most of these now go through Antofagasta.

Peru is obviously involved because the proposed corridor would border on Peru's southern frontier—which long figured in the celebrated Tacna-Arica dispute.

The subject stirred wide interest here this morning because of articles in a Chilean weekly that evoked a declaration in Santiago from Horacio Walker, Chile's Foreign Minister, that Chile was disposed to start conversations on the matter with Bolivia.

In the same bullet-scarred palace from the balcony of which Dictator Villaroel was thrown 4 years ago this month, President Urriolagoitia also revealed an unprecedented plan for implementing the work of the United Nations Technical Assistance Commission here.

The President said that a law would be proposed permitting the assignment here on a long-range basis of international experts who would effectively take jobs in various ministries with a view to cleaning up and coordinating the inefficient administration that has long plagued the country.

Care would be taken so as not to have all, or a majority, from the United States for in that case enemies of the regime might capitalize on the issue of imperialism.

Rather, the experts would be truly international—a sort of extension of the present mission whose 14 members represent 11 nations. It was understood that approval of this plan by the technical assistance board of the United Nations was what Mr. Keenleyside, chief of the mission, had sought and obtained in Geneva.

America's Summons To Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Sunday Register of August 13, 1950:

AMERICA'S SUMMONS TO GREATNESS

In the current Saturday Review of Literature, Editor Norman Cousins projects himself into the year 1960 and "looks back" upon two alternative developments which he considers possible during the present decade.

The first "retrospection" pictures a world in which the human race has been three-fourths destroyed—and its remainder reduced to primitivism—by the atomic bomb. The second, more optimistic résumé describes the evolution of a world government at least, through the courage and vision of the president of the United States and the American people.

This comes about, in Mr. Cousins' imagination, when the American president acknowledges the futility of a world organization which is only a debating society, and decides to appeal to the decent nations for a United Nations which instead is truly a world government.

Mr. Cousins has the president say in giving new instructions to our UN delegates:

"Briefly stated, (my) instructions direct the American delegates * * * to propose at once a Revision Conference of the United Nations under Articles 108 and 109. These articles provide that a conference may be called for the purpose of altering the structure of the United Nations if two-thirds of the nations wish to do so. Such a call is not subject to the veto.

"The American purpose in proposing such a Conference is to give the greatest possible strength to the United Nations in the shortest possible time.

"By all possible strength, I am thinking of the power of world law. This would most certainly include law-making, law-enforcing, and law-interpreting agencies.

"It would mean that the United Nations would have at its disposal a police force or army of substantial numbers.

"It is no secret that the aggressor in modern warfare possesses a tremendous advantage. He can choose the time and place of attack, counting on surprise to attain the objective before the victim can defend himself or rally support.

"No one nation can be expected to police the entire world against this type of aggression. The threat is against the world, and the world must organize to defend itself. * * *

"But let there be no mistake about it. There are benefits but there are also obligations and responsibilities. * * *

"Unlimited national sovereignty cannot be retained—if we sincerely want peace.

"No nation can be a law unto itself in the common affairs of the world community—if we sincerely want peace.

"No nation can expect to retain sole jurisdiction over the size and nature of its arsenals—if we sincerely want peace.

"Any nation sincerely interested in security, any nation that does not covet other territory, should have no hesitation in accepting these duties as a member of the world community. * * *

"I am proposing that the delegates from each nation be elected by popular vote. This will make the United Nations a truly representative body of the world's peoples. The method of elections and the size of the various representations should be left to the determination of the Revision Conference.

"Participation in the building of such a responsible world body is the greatest challenge and privilege for America in its history. It is a summons to greatness. * * *"

That is Norman Cousins' thesis.

It is one which, as our older friends know, The Register has espoused a thousand times in the past 35 years.

Events year after year simply prove the more conclusively that there cannot be law and order without government, and that world political institutions—however embellished with fine documents—are not really world government unless they are (1) responsible to the people, and (2) given the authority and power to act.

Intervention in Foreign Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Telegram News, Lynn, Mass., Monday, August 21, 1950:

FOURTH KOREAN WAR FOR UNITED STATES

The fighting in Korea represents the fourth time American forces have intervened in that far-eastern nation with armed forces without a formal declaration of war. Prior interventions were in 1871, 1888, and 1894. They were small-scale and of short duration.

Nor does the action in Korea represent the first time the United States has participated in an international army while ostensibly at peace.

Curiously enough, American forces once fought shoulder to shoulder with Russian troops less than 700 miles from where GI's are now battling Russian-trained Communists.

This was in 1900–01, during the Boxer rebellion in China, when President William McKinley sent 5,000 troops to help relieve the siege of foreign quarters in Peking by Chinese rebels. The American troops were joined by Russians, British, French, German, and Japanese armed forces.

The United States has participated in at least five international armies during peacetime. In addition to the Boxer rebellion, the United States acted in conjunction with the British in 1854 during a Chinese civil war, intervened in Uruguay with other powers in 1858, bombarded the Japanese in 1864 with British, French, and Netherlands forces, and acted jointly with Germany and Great Britain in Samoa in 1888.

This is the first time, however, that an American commander, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, has headed an international army except in time of war.

According to one historian, American Armed Forces, largely marines, have intervened in the affairs of other nations more than 180 times.

In the earlier, lusty days of the Republic, American Armed Forces didn't hesitate to intervene at the drop of a hat, sometimes without the prior authorization of the President, much less Congress.

American Armed Forces first saw action in Korea in 1871, when a six-ship naval squadron was fired upon while investigating a Korean attack on a United States merchant vessel.

The squadron fired back, silencing two shore batteries, but withdrew when a warship struck a rock. Ten days later, the expedition returned. The Marines stormed the Korean forts and killed 250 Koreans. American losses were three killed and nine wounded.

In 1888, American forces sent to Seoul to protect American residents whose lives were endangered by a threatened outbreak. From 1894 to 1896, a Marine guard was kept at the American legation there to protect American lives and property during and following the Sino-Japanese war.

Intervention in foreign nations without a declaration of war or the consent of Congress has been a frequent occurrence in American history. Indicative of this is the impressive list of countries which American Armed Forces have entered.

They include: Dominican Republic, Egypt, Tripoli, Spanish Florida, Cuba, Greece, Falkland Islands, Sumatra, Argentina, Peru, Fiji Islands, Portuguese West Africa, Formosa, Mexico, Haiti, Chile, Brazil, Syria, Ethiopia, Morocco, Honduras, Turkey, Russia, and Iceland.

The major conflicts in which the United States engaged without the formality of declaring war included the naval war with France in 1798, the attacks upon the Barbary pirates of Tripoli (1801–05) and Algiers (1815), the bombardment and capture of Vera Cruz, Mexico (April 21–November 23, 1914), Gen. John J. Pershing's punitive expedition into Mexico against Pancho Villa in 1916, and a similar search for the Nicaraguan outlaw Sandino some years later.

Furthermore, 5,100 American troops occupied Russian territory around Archangel in 1918–19 to protect the port and surrounding area from the Bolshevists. From August 1918 to April 1, 1920, some 9,000 American troops helped protect Vladivostok, Siberia, and railways westward for hundreds of miles from the Bolshevists.

In 1941, while the United States was still officially at peace, President Roosevelt ordered Greenland and Iceland, then dependencies of German-occupied Denmark, "protected" by American troops to guard them against a possible Nazi seizure.

Letter to Hon. Yacov Malik, United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following letter written to the Honorable Yacov Malik, United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y., by the Reverend Jule Ayers, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

GOVERNORS ISLAND, N. Y.,
August 13, 1950.

Hon. YACOV MALIK,
United Nations,
Lake Success, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MALIK: I am sure that there are not many of us in the world who envy you in the position of great power and responsibility which you have today. Yours is the task of representing the Soviet Union, which Union has had a very determining influence on the events of the twentieth century.

In recent years, we in the United States, have known your countrymen as brave and respected allies. Your people and our people are both young in nationhood, virile, industrially minded, concerned to raise the standard of living, and impelled by a sense of mission of world-wide importance.

It would be grand if the people of our countries might know each other better. I am sure that I lack understanding and appreciation of the country you represent. You will recognize, I know, my enthusiasm for America. I want you to feel that—for it is important that you do.

In company with many others, I feel that our Nation was founded as an experiment in liberty. Our institutions reflect the fundamental conviction that human origin and destiny, as well as human rights and duties have their source and meaning in Almighty God. Millions have come here from other lands to find, develop, and extend opportunities to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness free from ecclesiastical, economic, and political tyranny. This is the clue to, and the goal of, our national life.

To be sure, we are very much aware of our personal and collective shortcomings. In many respects our professions outdo our practice. We acknowledge that we have not yet given democracy its full or proper expression in race relations, economic welfare, and educational opportunities. But democracy here has not ceased to grow. We know the direction we must go. We are progressing and we shall continue along that course. Yes, we have been vindictive at times toward former enemies, suspicious toward recent allies, complacent toward the suffering of people who need desperately not a United States dole but peace treaties and access to raw materials and markets in order to survive. Granted that, in the midst of temptations that overwhelming power has placed in our hands, we have been all too smug, comfort-loving and pleasure-seeking, and materialistically minded, yet this is only a fraction of the true picture.

You are certainly aware of the fact that citizens of the United States, through private and public sources, during the past 5 years have made great efforts to answer the cry of mankind's sickness, misery, and starvation. The objective has been to express humanitarian compassion and to help people to help themselves. Conscious that dollars and cents, and even food, clothing, and medical supplies, can never express the indebtedness we feel to one another as nations, yet I dare say that never before has history recorded such a consistent, determined and cooperative endeavor to advance, in so limited a time, the well-being of multitudes of men, women, and children in distant and diverse countries.

The point 4 legislation of our Government, providing economic aid in areas of the world where it is most needed and welcome, follows the spirit and basic intent humanitarian aspects of the Marshall plan. Insofar as that plan has furthered resistance to communism, it has accomplished this through alleviating and overcoming chaotic conditions and promoting social health and welfare. It is true that our recent policies have included military preparedness for ourselves and the willingness to give such assistance to certain others upon request. Some of us have sought to have this curtailed. Nevertheless this has been accepted by most of our people as a buttress of the policies of our administration, not so much for our own sake alone, but for the sake of those who were receiving our cooperation and assistance in economic reconstruction and national rehabilitation.

If the policies our Nation has followed in Europe and Asia have aroused fear and anxiety among your people, the action of Communist Parties in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Greece, Yugoslavia, and other parts of the world, have had a similar effect in this country. This action usually has involved treachery, lying, cruelty and the use of force, to further purposes which, under the guise of liberation, have been inimical to the values of democracy and freedom, dear to the people of the United States. It is clear to me that the continuation in the modern world of feudalism, colonialism, and imperialism makes peace perilous. But likewise the policy of undermining governments in authority, of violent revolution, and of promising a bright future for the human race under communism is a threat to peace of major proportions.

I believe that the way to peace with justice and benevolent concern for all people, including those who agree and disagree with us on matters of politics and economics, lies in a different direction. As a citizen of the United States, I have had the chance to grow up in a community where I came to believe in God. I am convinced

that He is my Heavenly Father, and the Father of all mankind. He has made men in His image and likeness, and intends that they live as brothers. God is the author and preserver of both natural law and moral law. It is His Will that men obey the principles revealed in the Holy Bible, and that there be "peace on earth and goodwill toward men." The purpose of our human existence is for us and all men to come to know God through a personal response to the message, spirit, and leadership of His Son, Jesus Christ. The peace God brings, and seeks for the world, comes among, and works through, those of every race, class, and nation, who serve Him unreservedly, in their allotted time and place on earth, as they share in building His Kingdom, and extending His sovereignty over the minds and souls of His children.

It has been the source of regret to many of us in the United States that the youth of the Soviet Union have lived in an environment in which the expression of vital Christian experience and activity has been discouraged officially. This has been tragic, to our way of thinking, because the fruits of peace, justice, and the common welfare cannot grow without rootage in a fundamental spiritual loyalty. Granted that churches can be handmaidens of superstition, magic, and the worst features of the status quo, yet commitment to the principles and person of Jesus Christ provides the only basis for justice, security, decency and peace in the world. There can be no honesty, integrity, respect for the written or spoken word, or sensitivity to the rights and point-of-view of people who differ from us, unless there is acknowledged One, above all nations, all expediences, all advantages of time, circumstance, and position, to Whom all are acknowledged responsible and accountable.

Servants of Jesus Christ have carried on their mission while living under every form of government. They bear their testimony today in the western democracies, eastern Germany, Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, the Near East, Africa, India, Japan, and China—as well as in the Soviet Union and the United States. They are not seeking primarily to further one or another system of government. Where religious freedom is guaranteed, they make a more apparent impact. Nevertheless they remember that their Lord, while on the earth in human form, set out to change men's hearts (their motives, attitudes, and relationships) and not to further a military revolt. Hence they seek to: Discover good wherever they can in every constructive movement, encourage and expect the best from existing leadership, and trust God more fully each day—remembering that since He is Creator and Ruler of the universe and mankind, He knows what He is doing, or allowing men to do, and His ways are mysterious, and too often misunderstood by His children.

My American citizenship, you can see Mr. Malik, placed me in an environment where the Christian faith was transmitted to me. The reason for my living, and the sole purpose of my life, is to pass it on to others. I want to pass it on to my family. I want to see it transmitted through the world-wide fellowship of those who accept His purpose and live by His power.

During World War II, I served as a chaplain in the United States Air Force. I saw something of the reality of war in the twentieth century, and its aftermath in the United States. I am sure, however, that any experiences that may have been ours here scarcely compare with the physical, material, economic, and spiritual loss which your people suffered from 1939 to 1945. Out of the sorrow and tragedy of those years, there arose the will to form and establish a United Nations Organization. How the rank-and-file people of our land, and of other lands, including your own I am sure, took heart when the UN Charter was adopted.

The early years of the UN have brought strains and difficulties, but a succession of important accomplishments. The record of the UN in preventing widespread war through peaceful negotiation, moral force, and reasonable compromise in Israel, India, and Indonesia stirred our hopes. The helping of dependent peoples toward self-government through the Trusteeship Council, the economic assistance and aid given to refugees and DP's, the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the progress made in the fields of health, nutrition, agriculture, labor, education, child welfare, and finance and trade, bear witness to significant achievements, and overshadow differences in the Security Council on procedure and policies, and on the control of atomic energy.

The Christian people of America, and I think of many other lands, have come to feel that the United Nations is an instrument through which sovereign nations can meet and work for the protection and well-being of the community of nations. In that regard, the United Nations, acting through the Security Council by overwhelming votes, has made, of late, some fateful decisions. More are yet to be made. You and your government are needed to help make them, and to share in the common responsibility of seeing that they are enforced.

I wonder if you have any idea how many people are interested in, and concerned about, the United Nations. I assure you that a large number of them are profoundly disturbed lest the UN be used by the United States, the Soviet Union, or any other nation as a tool of a particular national interest, a means of coercive domination by any one nation, or a place where parliamentary processes are obstructed in the interest of a small minority. The UN should be the town meeting of the world, and the instrument for the maintenance and extension of peace, justice, brotherhood, and cooperation among all nations. Up to this point the UN has made efforts to be that, and to stand for that. Let us hope, let us work, let us relinquish the desire and need always to have our own way, let us see situations in their fullest perspective and implications, let us sacrifice even a measure of our "face," our pride, our assurance that we alone are right—much that is dearest to us, and let us pray to Almighty God, in order that the peoples and governments of the twentieth century may experience world cooperation and world order on a basis hitherto unknown in human history.

Mr. Malik, you note that I said, "let us pray to Almighty God." That is exactly what I mean. I believe that more things are wrought by prayer and sincere Christian living than this world recognizes or imagines. In these troublous days many people the world over are praying for you, your countrymen, your government, and Mr. Stalin. They are also praying for the United States, Mr. Austin, Mr. Truman, and the United Nations, with all its personnel, agencies, and purposes. We who are among those who are praying thus, feel we are in fellowship with people of like spirit and intent the world over. We believe that such prayers help provide the atmosphere and conditions whereby any and all of us, yourself included, can be used of God whereby, in consequence, things may be accomplished which otherwise would seem impracticable, foolish, impossible. We are praying for peace based on justice and benevolent concern for all people; for the acknowledgment of our common accountability to God and the relevance of the principles, message, and spirit of Christianity for our basic needs; and for the patience, courage, and wisdom to be given us, to you, and to all government and peoples, to measure up acceptably to the dangers and opportunities of the hour.

In your hands, and in ours, and in the United Nations, is placed a tremendous power and responsibility. The conscience of humanity pleads that this power may be so used now that the foundations of a richer and fuller life for ourselves and all people may be laid—as we acknowledge our relationship to Him and to His purpose for the world, revealed in Jesus Christ.

Respectfully yours,

Rev. JULE AYERS,
Minister, First Presbyterian Church.

Lessons of the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, for Friday, August 11, 1950:

KOREAN 6 WEEKS SHOWS THAT WARS ARE WON BY BALANCED FORCES, NOT "PRUSSIAN" STAFFS

Weeks of fighting in Korea have brought home to Americans a number of stern lessons in twentieth century warfare, but perhaps none so important or far-reaching as the emphasis on the need for a balanced fighting force along traditional American lines.

Only last October the Nation was rocked with the repercussions of the ill-famed interservice squabble, in which the Navy and Air Force figuratively threw brickbats at each other in hearings before the House Armed Services Committee. From those hearings the Navy appeared to emerge a discredited second in the interservice battle and was condemned as the villain of a plot to disrupt service unity.

Now, just over 9 months later, battle reports and expert military analyses of the Korean situation read like a rehash of some of the Navy arguments before Congress last fall. Let us refresh our memories with a look at the record of the October hearings.

Navy witnesses at the hearings testified that the "push-button theory" of an "atomic blitz war," to be won by heavy strategic bombers and the atom bomb was fallacious. They cried out against the slashing of the Navy air arm and the strength of the Marine Corps in the name of economy.

On the other hand, General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and most influential spokesman for the Air Force-Army point of view, shook the country with his blast at Navy witnesses and said, among other things, that strategic air bombardment was the "first and quickest way the United States could strike back" in case of Russian aggression, and that Navy officers were "still preoccupied with past island-hopping campaigns" and showed "no conception of the kind of continental operations which a war with Russia would involve."

A conflict growing out of Russian-backed aggression has now come, and the United States is deeply involved. And what do we find? It is the kind of war for which the Air Force-Army critics of Navy forethought had not planned.

So far the effectiveness of strategic bombing has been—to say the least—minor in Korea. On the other hand, tactical air support is vital, and until such time as ground

bases in quantity can be set up, equipped, and manned on the Korean mainland, tactical support has been in very large measure up to the Navy's carrier-based planes. Furthermore, the need for a "minuteman" fighting force such as the Marine Corps has once again been heavily emphasized.

In short, we have come clearly to see that the push-button war is still a long way off and that we need a balanced fighting force to preserve our national security.

Let it be clearly understood that we do not advocate that the Navy be made the dominant voice in our Armed Forces council. We do loudly cry out the imperative necessity for having no one service dominant in our councils. Single-service or two-service domination can lead only to one end: the establishment of a Prussian-type supreme general staff, the discredited concept of the military-minded Germany which followed this plan to defeat in two World Wars.

Instead, America should stand fast by the successful American concept of the balanced force, which has brought us ultimate victory in those same two conflicts. Certainly it would be unsound to discard a system proved successful for one which was employed by our defeated enemies.

Let us hope that the lessons being learned in Korea may be blessings in disguise, saving us from serious error which might otherwise have led us toward future disaster in some all-out big war.

Ambassador Walter Thurston, A Distinguished Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, one of America's most capable and experienced diplomats is the Honorable Walter Thurston, the American Ambassador to Mexico. He has spent many years in Mexico, as well as other Latin American countries. His years of residence in Mexico prior to and since he became United States Ambassador to Mexico has given him an intimate knowledge of the Mexican people, their language and their customs. To a Foreign Service often criticized for the lack of career diplomats, he brought rare abilities for diplomatic service, which over the years he has made more valuable with training and experience. It is regrettable that the appointment of Mayor O'Dwyer as Ambassador to Mexico, whatever its merits, will cause the loss of Walter Thurston's outstanding ability and training to the Foreign Service. Our relations with Mexico have been so cordial that, as those of our northern neighbor, they have been taken for granted. That happy state of affairs is due in no small part to the splendid work of Ambassador Walter Thurston. He is one of the finest examples of the career diplomat. He has served his country with ability, patience, and distinction, and it will be a sad loss indeed to the State Department and to this Nation if there is not some way to make use of his unusual abilities in the Western Hemisphere, where his understanding of the political and economic affairs of the Latin American countries can continue to benefit the American people.

Resolutions of Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

VIGILANCE AND ACTION AGAINST COMMUNISM

Whereas the eighty-fourth annual sessions, Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America in the city of Easton, Pa., on this the 23d day of August 1950 being thoroughly cognizant of the imminent dangers of the ideology of communism; and

Whereas it is apparent that the ideology of communism is spreading rapidly throughout the world under the direction of the Politburo of Russia and as such ideology is directed toward the destruction of the free governments of the world and religion; and

Whereas it is apparent that the forces of communism have gained many recruits in the United States, who are active in the various phases of the life of our Nation, including the governmental economic and educational life of our Nation; and

Whereas the success of communism in recent years in many of the presently designated communistic satellite nations of the world has caused such nations to lose their freedoms and to become pawns of the communistic government of Russia; and

Whereas the loss of their freedoms has been established largely by infiltration tactics generally used by the communistic forces of Russia in overthrowing the established governments of such free nations; and

Whereas the infiltration tactics of the communistic party have also been used in gaining a voice in the direction of educational institutions of the free nations of the world which have proven to be a grave danger to the concept of democracy and Christianity in the nations where such infiltration has been accomplished: Therefore, be it hereby

Resolved by the officers and delegates attending the eighty-fourth annual State convention of the Pennsylvania State Camp of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, That we do hereby strongly condemn communism and the treacherous methods used by the leaders and followers of communism in seeking to destroy the freedom of the free peoples of the world and to distort the minds of the youth of the free nations of the world as to the everlasting values of freedom and Christianity; and be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States and the governments of the several States of the Nation, and the directing agencies of the educational institutions of the Nation be congratulated upon their courageous efforts to expel all persons belonging to the Communistic Party or who sympathize with the Communist ideology of government from employment by such governments or from such educational institutions and that rigid safeguards be set up where they do not now exist by such governments or educational institutions to prevent such infiltration and resultant danger to our Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will require the immediate registration of all Communist Party members residing in the United States and its Territories with adequate penalties to be provided for failure to comply therewith—and be it further resolved that we do hereby endorse all legislation introduced into the United States Congress for the purpose of restricting and controlling the Communist Party and Communist Party members and activity in the United States.

SUPPORT AND EDUCATION FOR UNITED NATIONS PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATION

Be it hereby resolved by the Eighty-fourth Annual State Convention of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, convened in Easton, Pa., this 23d day of August 1950, That—

Whereas the United Nations is now engaged in a world-wide effort to establish its value as an international organization designed to preserve peace in the world and to protect the several nations of the world from aggression; and

Whereas the United Nations Headquarters is located in the United States and as the United States is the most powerful of the free nations of the world, which is supporting the United Nations in its noble efforts to attain to the high principle heretofore set forth; and

Whereas many of the citizens of the United States are not familiar with the high purposes and values to civilization of the United Nations; and

Whereas such understanding would result in greater public support for this international organization of which our Nation is a member: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved by the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, That we do hereby commend the 53 free member nations of the United Nations which are now by their collective strength and influence seeking to bring peace to the world and to attain freedom through lawful means for the masses of humanity, many of whom have their freedoms still denied to them; and

We do hereby further recommend that each subordinate camp of the Patriotic Order Sons of America in Pennsylvania hold periodic United Nations programs in their several camps for the enlightenment of the members and the general public of the community in which such camps are located concerning the United Nations and its high purposes and actions in the cause of establishing peace and world freedom for the masses of civilization.

ADEQUATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Be it hereby resolved by the Patriotic Order Sons of America of Pennsylvania in their eighty-fourth annual State convention in the city of Easton, Pa., on this the 23d day of August 1950, That—

Whereas there has been a general complacency throughout the Nation since the close of World War II concerning national defense; and

Whereas the present United Nations action in which the United States Armed Forces are participating has suddenly caused the people of our Nation to recognize the urgency of attaining adequate national defense within the briefest period of time without disastrous effect upon the national economy; and

Whereas it is apparent that the people of the United States desire the Government of the United States to immediately take such steps as may be necessary to provide immediately adequate national defense; and

Whereas it is apparent that the Congress of these United States has sensed the desire of the people of the Nation for legislation to provide immediate, adequate national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved by the officers and delegates attending this convention, That we do hereby urge the Congress of the United States to immediately enact such legislation that may be necessary to provide for immediate adequate defense with proper provisions therein to safeguard the inherent rights of the people under the Constitution of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby urge the members of our order and all good American citizens to immediately realize the grave issues confronting our Nation and that we do hereby further urge the citizens of the United States to awaken from their complacency and become active as vigilant patriotic citizens in the preservation of our country and the liberty of our people through loyal cooperation with our Government in fighting the forces which would disrupt our national unity and destroy our efforts to adequately defend our Nation and to preserve the liberty of our people.

CONDEMNATION OF HOARDING AND ITS DAMAGE TO OUR ECONOMY

Be it hereby resolved by the officers and delegates attending the eighty-fourth annual convention of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, That—

Whereas immediately following the unwarranted attack by the armed forces of North Korea against the free nation of South Korea and the immediate intervention by the United Nations forces to aid the government of South Korea against the forces of North Korea, that throughout the United States in many communities that certain citizens of the United States immediately began scare buying and hoarding of commodities which they thought might become scarce and later rationed when such commodities are in great abundance in the Nation: and

Whereas such hoarding by American citizens is unpatriotic and injurious to the welfare of our Nation; and

Whereas such hoarding is directly contributing aid to the Communist enemies of our Nation by creating unnecessary shortage of such commodities; and

Whereas such hoarding is an indication of extreme selfishness and lack of patriotism on the part of such citizens who have or are engaging in such scare buying or hoarding: Be it therefore

Resolved by the officers and delegates attending the convention, That we do hereby condemn as unpatriotic and unworthy such citizens who hoard commodities in this time of grave international crisis and that we do hereby urge the several camps of our order in Pennsylvania to publicly denounce unpatriotic hoarding and to join with other patriotic and civic groups in urging the citizens of their several communities to purchase only their normal needs and thereby not endanger the economic life of our Nation by hoarding.

COMMENDING THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR ITS ACTION IN KOREA

Be it hereby resolved that the officers and delegates attending the eighty-fourth annual convention of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America in the city of Easton, Pa., That—

Whereas the Communist Government of North Korea without provocation attacked the nation of South Korea with its armed forces on June 25, 1950; and

Whereas the President and Government of the United States immediately intervened with 52 other free nations of the world, under the direction of the Security Council of the United Nations, to protect and defend South Korea from the unwarranted acts of aggression of North Korea; and

Whereas this intervention by the armed forces of certain member nations, the United Nations was prompted by the Government of the United States in seeking to preserve the liberty of the people of South Korea and to restrain the Communist forces of North Korea in their uncivilized attack upon the people of the free nation of South Korea: therefore be it hereby

Resolved, That we do hereby commend the Government of the United States and the governments of other free nations of the United Nations which have joined with the United States in fighting the forces of communism which are seeking to enslave the people of South Korea and to destroy their right of free government and the liberty which has been guaranteed to them by the United Nations, which created the government of South Korea following the close of World War II.

URGING APPROVAL FOR INCREASED FUNDS FOR VOICE OF AMERICA BROADCASTS

Be it hereby resolved that the officers and delegates attending the eighty-fourth annual convention of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America in the city of Easton, Pa., That—

Whereas the Government of the United States is seeking by the radio Voice of America to penetrate the iron curtain which has been thrown around the Communist nations of the world by the Politburo of Russia; and

Whereas the effectiveness of such programs has become apparent by the jamming of the air by Russian radio stations to prevent the programs from reaching the citizens of the Communist nations; and

Whereas the Russian Government has recently increased its series of programs to the people of the Communist nations of the world for the purpose of discrediting the United States and the other free nations of the world: Therefore, be it hereby

Resolved by this convention, That we hereby urge the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds to adequately present to the people of the world by radio and other mediums programs designed to set forth the true value of democracy and the lasting benefits of free governments to the people of the world, that such programs be presented in areas where the Communist governments of the world are located and which are seeking to embitter the minds of the people under Soviet domination against the free nations of the world, and particularly the Government of the United States.

Be it hereby resolved by the officers and delegates attending the eighty-fourth annual State convention of the Pennsylvania State Camp of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, in Easton, Pa., on this the 23d day of August 1950, That—

Whereas the representatives of the various nations who attended the international Genocide Convention signed the convention proposal to outlaw the crime and un-Christian act of genocide; and

Whereas all nations with signatory representatives at the Genocide Convention have ratified the convention with the exception of approximately six nations including Russia: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved, That we do hereby recommend that the governments of all nations which were represented at the convention and which have not ratified the Genocide Convention do so at the earliest possible time in order to attain the high Christian purpose of the convention.

A Fight for Democracy Still Alive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, because so many of us have of recent date expressed or heard infelicitous attitudes toward the downtrodden people suffering under the yoke of the Soviet rulers in satellite countries, it is heartening to learn that the spirit and willingness to fight for democracy is evident in many instances.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the letter of Jerzy J. Lerski, vice chairman of the Polish Freedom Movement for Independence and Democracy, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, August 20, 1950. The letter should correct the concept some of us have toward the peoples of the satellite countries. It dispels to a degree the prevalent fatalistic attitude of the future of these countries.

Mr. Kazimierz Puzak, of whom Lerski writes as an outstanding representative of Polish democracy, was indeed a champion of the freedoms in his native Poland. He gave unselfishly of his time and effort to better the conditions in his land. It can be said that he gave his very life for the cause of freedom in a subjected, Soviet controlled and influenced nation. Although he died in May of this year, his passing was kept secret until recently because the regime in power realized his popularity with the rank and file. He has spent much of his life in prison because of his political activities. No doubt, contrary to common belief, there are many of his type in the subjected countries, striving against tremendous odds, and with little help fighting the cause of freedom.

Too often we are unaware and not duly apprised of their efforts. Too often we are critical without thorough knowledge and due consideration for those who are giving their all in the struggle for the very freedoms and democracy that we wish them to have.

It is because I believe that the memorial to Puzak points up the fight that is still active in underground movements in satellite countries that I commend the following letter to the attention of my colleagues:

KAZIMIERZ PUZAK

It was with deep sorrow that I read in your August 12 issue about the death of the great Polish leader Kazimierz Puzak in a Communist prison in Warsaw. That outstanding representative of Polish democracy became a symbol of unconquerable spiritual resistance to any totalitarian regime.

Puzak was for many years one of the most prominent members of the Polish Parliament and the chief organizer of Polish workers. He took a very active part in our struggle with Nazi Germany, being among the first to organize the strong European underground movement. He became later the chairman of the clandestine "Council of National Unity" (Polish Underground Parliament) and it was in that capacity that I saw him last in my humble role of the secret

courier between London allied headquarters and Warsaw underground leaders.

Puzak was chosen by all Polish political parties as their designate for Polish Presidency. At our secret meeting held at the Powazki Cemetery in Warsaw he told me bluntly that he was not going to accept this proposition, since he did not want to go to London, because he wanted to stay with the Polish working masses.

Puzak was one of the civil leaders of the 63-day heroic Warsaw uprising led by General Bor-Komorowski. But after the tragic end of that insurrection he remained in the Warsaw area and was arrested by Soviet military authorities and tried in the shameful Moscow trial of the 16 Polish underground leaders. Released after a few years, he returned to Warsaw, where he was rearrested by Communist authorities who were anxious about his great popularity among Polish workers and peasants.

Tried again in Warsaw in December 1948, he rebuked the oppressors in the best possible way. When tired and exhausted, after many months of investigation, he was asked publicly by his prosecutors for a declaration of guilt. Puzak answered slowly but firmly and without hesitation: "I will not answer any of your questions because you are not the genuine court of the Free Republic of Poland. You are just puppets of Moscow."

JERZY J. LERSKI.

Mr. Speaker, should God grant that Poland some day will be liberated and numbered among the family of free nations of this world, I am sure that the person in the above quoted letter will be given adequate and due recognition for the historical role he played in the struggles of Poland's freedom. His heroic replies to accusations at his trials in Moscow and Warsaw, particularly his reply—

Even if at the threshold of my grave it is unthinkable that I should change my attitude and opinion (you are not the genuine court of the free Republic of Poland—you are just puppets of Moscow).

Spoken on the occasion of his last trial when demanded to repudiate his prior trial statements, portray the determination and diligence to the cause.

New Record for Extravagance and Waste in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following News Bulletin of August 22, 1950:

NEW RECORD FOR EXTRAVAGANCE AND WASTE IN GOVERNMENT

(By Paul O. Peters)

It is just beginning to dawn upon the American people that the Truman administration is the most expensive, the most extravagant, and the most wasteful in the entire history of the Republic.

A careful check of governmental expenditures by all Presidents from the beginning of the Republic down through the first 8 years of Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration the total expenditures amounted to $181,026,726,687.

This total included the cost of all wars and the emergency relief spending just prior to our entrance into World War II.

During the four war years, fiscal 1942 through fiscal 1945, our governmental expenditures were $309,951,167,642.

Under President Truman's administration the spending is progressing at a rate only one-third below the wartime average. The bureaus and agencies of government are being maintained at wartime levels, and actual governmental practices belie the preachments for economy.

Between July 1, 1945 and August 15, 1950 the spending was as follows:

Fiscal year 1946	$63, 713, 969, 417
Fiscal year 1947	42, 505, 045, 529
Fiscal year 1948	39, 326, 072, 233
Fiscal year 1949	40, 057, 107, 857
Fiscal year 1950	40, 166, 835, 914
Fiscal 1951 to August 15	4, 230, 515, 900
Total spending	229, 999, 546, 850

In 1945, the purchasing power of the dollar stood at 77.4 cents. Today it averages about 55.0 cents. Government deficit spending speeds the inflationary trend, and the political parties may do well this fall to acquaint the voting population with some of the facts of our economic life, other than give more lip service to administration promises of government hand-outs in the form of social security, and cradle-to-grave care for all.

Julius Epstein Letter in the Washington Evening Star Regarding the Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A5744, there was inserted by the distinguished Congressman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] a letter written by Mr. Julius Epstein in which letter Mr. Epstein charged the Voice of America with having not explained properly the Katyn massacre and at the same time there appeared in the letter a more serious charge wherein Mr. Epstein was alleged to have been told that the reason a certain position was not taken was that "it would create too much hatred of Stalin among the Poles."

A short time after Mr. Epstein's letter was inserted in the RECORD, Mr. Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the Voice of America and other International Information and Educational Exchange Programs, appeared before a subcommittee of which I am chairman. Mr. Barrett was questioned about Mr. Epstein's charges. We advised Mr. Barrett that the charges made by Mr. Epstein were of such a serious nature that we felt that some explanation should be forthcoming.

I recently received a copy of a letter dated August 16, addressed by Mr. Barrett to Mr. DONDERO, and attached to that letter was a memorandum prepared by Mr. Charles M. Hulten, general manager of the International Information and Educational Exchange Programs, explaining the Epstein charges. In order that the record may be straight on this matter I ask unanimous consent to insert herewith a copy of the letter Mr. Barrett addressed to Mr. DONDERO and a copy of the memorandum prepared by Mr. Hulten on this same subject:

WASHINGTON, *August 16, 1950.*

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 9, 1950, on page A5744, you had inserted the letter by Julius Epstein appearing 2 days earlier in the columns of the Evening Star of Washington.

Because of the serious nature of the charges made by Mr. Epstein, I have had a complete and thorough investigation made to determine whether they have any factual basis to support them. I am sure that you will want to have the results of that investigation, which are contained in the attached memorandum to me from Charles M. Hulten, general manager, International Information and Educational Exchange Programs.

Several other Members of Congress have inquired about the Epstein letter and I am furnishing them with copies of this letter and of the memorandum.

It is the policy of the Department to investigate thoroughly any serious criticisms of this nature. I would appreciate it if you would be so good as to let me know of any which you receive so that I can look into them.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

Enclosure, from Mr. Hulten, dated August 16, 1950.

MEMORANDUM

AUGUST 16, 1950.

To: Mr. Edward W. Barrett.
From: Charles M. Hulten.
Subject: Julius Epstein letter in the Washington Star re the Voice of America.

At your instruction I have made a thorough investigation of the charges appearing in the letter of Julius Epstein to the Washington Evening Star, August 7. This letter was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2 days later by Congressman Dondero of Michigan.

Mr. Epstein's first allegation was that Count Joseph Czapski was advised to omit any mention of Katyn from the draft which he submitted to the New York office of our broadcasting division. The facts concerning this incident are that when Mr. Czapski came to the United States last January, he visited Mr. Gidynski, the Chief of the Polish Desk of the Voice of America, and suggested that excerpts from his book, which had been published in Polish and French under the title "The Inhuman Land" and an English edition of which was to appear this winter, be broadcast to Poland. Mr. Gidynski explained to him that lack of air time precluded use of this book in its entirety, but that he would be willing to prepare a series of five scripts on his volume. As an act of courtesy to the author, Mr. Gidynski suggested that he personally write the first script, explaining the title of his book in terms of his experiences described in it. Mr. Czapski asked Mr. Gidynski about our attitude toward Katyn and was told that the Voice of America played every hard news item about Katyn; for example, the news of the formation of the American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre, and the deposition by Judge Gunther before one of the congressional committees. Mr. Czapski inserted a few sentences about Katyn into his script. Mr.

Gidynski eliminated them with the consent of Mr. Czapski on the ground that it would not be wise to deal with so serious a subject as the Katyn massacre in a few brief sentences. The series of reviews of Mr. Czapski's book was broadcast on the following dates: May 24, 27, 29, 30, and June 14, 1950. All scripts were read by regular Voice of America staff announcers.

The second allegation by Mr. Epstein was that the Voice of America refused to broadcast certain material prepared for the American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Masscre, Inc., for which Mr. Epstein acted as publicity man. He alleges that he was told it would create too much hatred of Stalin among the Poles.

It is a fact that Mr. Epstein talked with several officers of the Department and urged them to give extensive coverage to a press conference announcing the formation of the above-named committee. The best evidence of what Mr. Epstein was told at that time is contained in a letter, dated November 14, 1949, from Foy D. Kohler, Chief of our International Broadcasting Division. This letter follows in its entirety:

"DEAR MR. EPSTEIN: This will acknowledge the receipt officially of your recent letters addressed to Mr. Lehrbas of OII (Office of International Information), as well as to a number of individual members of IBD (International Broadcasting Division) including myself with regard to the press conference to be held by the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane on Monday, November 21 at 4 p. m. at the Waldorf Astoria.

"As you were informed in our conversation on Wednesday last, the Voice of America will be glad to have a representative at this press conference and appreciates your invitation. However, as we also pointed out in our conversation, the usefulness of the work of the proposed committee to the Voice will depend largely on the seriousness and objectivity of its approach to the Katyn investigation and to the production thereby of new factual information and hard news."

In other words, Mr. Epstein was told that the Voice of America was prepared to carry any material developed by the committee as a result of its investigation. We refused to permit Mr. Epstein to say in his press release that the Voice of America was carrying anything specific about the press conference, just as we avoid advance commitments on all press conferences. A member of the VOA News Desk did cover the conference. The coverage given to that event in our broadcasts was roughly commensurate with that of the New York Times and the Herald Tribune. When Mr. Epstein called later to ask why more attention was not given to the story, he was told again that we were prepared factually to cover material developed by the committee. The memorandum on file indicates that he was ill-tempered and rude because we had not gone all out to help him in his promotional activities. The correctness of the decision by our editors may be judged from the fact that the investigation promised at the press conference was never carried out.

The Voice of America has had a consistent policy that when it tackles such serious matters as the Katyn massacre it does so with well marshalled facts and not in a flashy, superficial way. We would have been in a serious position had we made a great play of the formation of the committee and then had been unable to follow up with anything substantial to add to what had already been known about Katyn.

A careful checking of persons who talked to Mr. Epstein would lead me to believe that his quotation about causing "hatred of Stalin" is an unmitigated falsehood. Mr. Kohler's letter cites the reason given Mr. Epstein for our decision.

Mr. Epstein makes still another point. He asserts that there are too many of the employees of the Office of War Information still with the Voice of America and that this has led to a distortion of its output. Our records show that Mr. Epstein was employed by OWI as a German language editor from August 1942 to December 1944. At that time he was involuntarily separated from that organization by reason of a "reduction in force." Since that time Mr. Epstein has sought reemployment with our broadcasting division. His letter-writing attacks on the Voice include a letter in the New York Times of March 14, 1949, and another in the Washington Post on November 3, 1949.

As for the VOA personnel, Mr. Epstein's employment history is illustrative of the amount of screening, weeding out, and careful selection that has gone on. For example, a total of 849 wartime information employees were transferred to the Department in 1946 to conduct all phases of its international broadcasting operations; but as a result of various cutbacks, normal turnover, and new recruitment, there were only 134 of these employees among the total of 619 persons on the payroll of the International Broadcasting Division as of June 1950.

You will remember that, because of an appropriation cut, the entire International Broadcasting staff was reduced in March 1948 to 234 employees. The cutback was made only after the most careful screening process. All employees retained, and all who have been hired for the expanded operation since, have been subjected to full field investigations by the FBI, as required by section 1001 of Public Law 402, under which we operate. Our present staff is one which has been selected with extraordinary care. It represents the only collection of trained, experienced, professional international broadcasters in the United States, except for a small group working with the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation in Boston.

Johnson Won't Buy From Brannan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture is selling surplus potatoes for 1 cent per hundred pounds for fertilizer. At the same time the Department of Defense is buying potatoes for Korea in the open market for $2.95 per hundred pounds. This is a typical, everyday example of the bungling and incompetence which characterize Federal administration in Washington today. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson work only 2 miles apart. One holds millions of bushels of surplus potatoes and the other needs thousands of bushels of potatoes for next week's food in the Army. Yet Johnson will not buy from Brannan.

Brannan uses up about $75,000,000 of taxpayers' money to induce farmers to raise these potatoes. He destroys them to make them scarce and keep the price up. Johnson spends another $75,000,000 buying potatoes and other surplus products in the open market. Yet Johnson will not buy from Brannan.

Secretary Brannan recently told the House Agriculture Committee, "Potatoes are being offered to all takers at the country shipping point. After supplying institutions, welfare organizations, school lunch and all other practical diversion outlets—free—the remainder is then sold back to farmers for livestock feed or fertilizer at 1 cent per hundredweight."

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, said:

> The Department of Agriculture has been buying U. S. No. 1 potatoes from the farmers in North Carolina at an average cost of $1.68 per hundredweight, and then immediately reselling them to the same farmers for 1 cent a bag, to be dumped as fertilizer or in the hog lots.

Of course, the farmers do not dump them all. Some they resell to the public.

> At the same time the Armed Forces needed 23,500,000 pounds of potatoes. They paid $2.95 per hundredweight.

Thus the taxpayers pay for potatoes twice—once to get them raised and destroyed, and once when the Armed Forces buy potatoes in the open market.

Secretary Brannan reviewed the mid-July inventory of Commodity Credit Corporation for the House committee:

> At present the CCC owns approximately 192,000,000 pounds of butter, and is accumulating more at the average rate of about 9,000,000 pounds a week.

Some of it is spoiling and wasted. This butter was purchased at 60 cents a pound. In a 4-week period the Armed Forces purchased 4,131,022 pounds in the open market at 60.7 cents a pound. So again the taxpayers pay twice.

Brannan also listed 80,000,000 pounds of cheese on hand, acquired at 31 cents a pound. The Armed Forces were buying 954,664 pounds at 34.8 cents.

In eggs, it is the same story. Brannan has 321,000,000 dozen in powdered form, at 32 cents. Yet Johnson will not buy from Brannan. He buys 4,910,350 dozen at 40 cents in the open market and forces prices up.

Senator WILLIAMS said these few items "represent an unnecessary expenditure during the past 4 weeks by the Armed Forces of approximately $6,000,000—every dime of which could have been saved to the taxpayers had the administration complied with the clear intent of the law."

The Delaware Senator estimated the withholding of food and fiber from the people at approximately $4,000,000,000. All this is to force prices higher. "Instead of accumulating additional inventories at this time, the Government should reverse its policy and begin unloading upon the market their huge inventories." This would bring prices down and stop pressure for the false remedy of price controls.

Last week I could not swallow the hypocrisy of a new price-control law proposing to give the President unlimited power to fix and control prices of food on the pretense that he would keep prices down. How could I do so while watching

the President's Secretary of Defense and his Secretary of Agriculture double kick the prices up beyond the reach of millions of consumers?

Tribute to Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, United States Ambassador to Denmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is again with great personal satisfaction and a feeling of distinct privilege that I bring to the attention of the Senate another article paying tribute to the splendid services being performed by my very good friend and former associate, Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, our Ambassador to Denmark. I know that I speak for the people of Minnesota when I say again we are proud of her record, her accomplishments, and the recognition which she is now receiving.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the magazine This Week, for August 13, be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAMA IS AN AMBASSADOR—WHEN WE SENT OUR FIRST WOMAN AMBASSADOR, THE DANES EXPECTED A PLAYGIRL; INSTEAD THEY GOT A HOUSEWIFE—NOW SHE AND HER FAMILY ARE THE MOST POPULAR OF THOUSANDS OF ANDERSONS IN DENMARK

(By Stephen White)

COPENHAGEN.—The Kingdom of Denmark is well fixed for Andersens, Andersons, Anderssens, and all other variations that tickle the ear the same way. In sheer numbers, the Andersons are superseded only by the Jensens and the Petersens. The telephone books and the street directories are so full of them, you'd think one more wouldn't make much difference. But she has.

Mrs. Eugenie M. Anderson, the first woman ever to be appointed a United States Ambassador, arrived in Denmark on December 20, 1949, and proceeded to capture the hearts of the Danes, who enjoy having their hearts captured but don't yield very often to the temptation.

A week after Mrs. Anderson arrived in Copenhagen and took a tentative look around, she was the most popular foreigner in Denmark. A month later she was the most popular Anderson. Today it's a fair guess that a popularity contest would find her near the head of any list you might choose to submit—not counting, to be polite, kings, queens and other assorted royalty. "Everybody," said a young Danish workingman, "wants to go up and shake her hand."

She has reached the acme of popularity in western Europe. In spite of the fact that she represents the United States, even the local Communist press denies itself the luxury of making personal attacks upon her. They printed one before she arrived but have held their tongues ever since.

Mrs. Anderson has achieved all this by adopting a very simple technique, which is no technique at all. A Red Wing, Minn., housewife when President Truman appointed her Ambassador, she has remained a Minnesota housewife. Although at receptions, everyone dresses formally and the bowing and the scraping can be heard a block away, she always manages to give the impression that Minnesota isn't far off. When you come right down to it and forget the climate and the ocean, Minnesota and Denmark are a good deal alike. So Mrs. Anderson manages to have a casual fellow feeling for the Danes, and the Danes share it.

Mrs. Anderson is the fourth woman to be appointed to a high American diplomatic post. The first, Ruth Bryan Owen, also came to Denmark. The second was Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, in Norway, and the third, Perle Mesta, in Luxemburg. But these appointments were ministers; Mrs. Anderson is the first to hold the higher, ambassadorial rank.

THE DANES WERE WORRIED

When the news first leaked out, more than a year ago, that they were to have a woman ambassador, the Danes weren't happy. They feared the post would fall to Mrs. Mesta, and their press made it clear that they did not feel Mrs. Mesta was taken seriously enough at home to fill so important a post.

Even after the Anderson appointment was announced, the Danish press printed an open letter in English, telling Mrs. Anderson that the Danes didn't want a playgirl.

"To you, Madame," the letter said, "is entrusted a great task. For the first time in our history, the United States and Denmark are allies. It sounds a little pompous. It may not mean much to the average American. But it is deadly serious to all Danes."

That same day the Danes got their first look at their new Ambassador. They saw a small woman who looked, at first glance, just about the way any man would like his wife to look when the children were entering their teens. A woman with brown hair and gray eyes and a warm look in her face—just good-looking enough to make most other women envious and not so good looking as to make them catty. They noticed that when she smiled—and she smiled often—she seemed to be smiling inside as well as out. They saw a well-behaved daughter and a well-behaved younger son, and a handsome, quiet husband.

And so the Andersons moved into the splendid house that had been made ready for them in suburban Copenhagen, overlooking the Oresund separating Denmark from Sweden. A few weeks later, she gave her first party in "Rydhave," as the house is called. The guests were 80 Danish workmen and their wives; the painters and masons and carpenters and decorators who had made her home ready for her.

TWO-INSTALLMENT PARTY

Next, the Ambassadress made plans for her first formal cocktail party. When she discovered that more people had to be invited than her home would hold, she calmly decided upon two parties on successive days and invited people whose last names began with the letters A to L to the first party, and the rest to the second.

The parties took place in the formality of the first floor, but Mrs. Anderson set up housekeeping in what is practically a separate apartment on the second floor, where she can really be at home with her family. She started on Danish lessons and plunged into the work at the Embassy. Daughter Johanna, 16, and son Hans, 11, were sent to a nearby Danish public school.

Mrs. Anderson began to accept invitations to address Danish gatherings and each time startled her listeners with a frank, down-to-earth account of some phase of American or Danish-American life.

She spoke to a group of Danish heroes of the resistance with a 3-hour summary of the relationship between American politics and American foreign policy, explaining why the American Government can't always do the things it seems so obvious it should do.

ADVICE TO WOMEN

She advised young ladies of a Danish students' league on how to rise to high public office: "Use your brains, but don't forget you have one great advantage over the men—your personal feminine charm."

Then, almost accidentally, she won the sweepstakes. She was asked to make a radio address on Mother's Day. A few days before the broadcast, she learned to her horror that she was expected to talk in Danish. "Well, a bargain is a bargain," said Mrs. Anderson.

Now, Danish is no ordinary language. Even the Danes have trouble with it.

But the American Ambassador closeted herself with her Danish teacher. Hour after hour she rehearsed her speech in Danish, and played it back on a recording machine to hear how it sounded. When Mother's Day came, Mrs. Anderson stepped to the microphone and delivered her address in—well, not exactly flawless—but at least understandable Danish.

The next day she could have run for president, if Denmark had a president.

All the time, Mrs. Anderson was working a 10-hour day at the Embassy, where the staff feels she is doing a good job, though her only previous officeholding experience was as a member of the school board in Red Wing.

She has not left Denmark since her arrival, and when she finally takes a vacation, she plans to go to Norway and Sweden, rather than to any of the fashionable resorts available to relaxing ambassadors, because she feels she should know the Scandinavians better.

Since our earlier distaff diplomats have all been widows, Mrs. Anderson is the first to take over her post accompanied by a husband. This creates complications—surmountable only because the Anderson family is what it is.

John Anderson is a handsome, quiet man who had the good fortune to be son and heir of the man who invented puffed rice and puffed wheat. His prime interest is his family; after that, modern art. In Minnesota, he did three-dimensional paintings in which he combined glass, metal, and wood with pigment.

A PARSON'S DAUGHTER

It was a common interest in the arts that drew him to Helen Eugenie Moore, the daughter of a country parson. They were married in 1930, at the end of her junior year in Carleton College. The first 2 years of their marriage they spent in New York, where she studied at the Juilliard School of Music. Then they returned to the comfortable Anderson family home in Red Wing.

When Eugenie became interested in politics in 1944, and set herself the task of helping revitalize the Democratic Party in Minnesota, Mr. Anderson was a source of encouragement. When her work led to an appointment to the national committee in 1948, and to an embassy in 1949, he took it all as a matter of course. He chose to remain an artist—in Copenhagen as in Red Wing.

There was some difficulty about protocol. Where, after all, does the husband of the Ambassador sit at formal dinners? Some of the more natural solutions would have placed him between two men; others would have had the effect of arbitrarily raising Mrs. Anderson's rank higher than her seniority in the diplomatic corps warranted.

A LADY ON EACH SIDE

The final solution gave her a rank directly behind the last male ambassador to present credentials, and Mr. Anderson became a "distinguished foreigner" and enjoys a lady on each side of him.

But most of the time, Mr. Anderson leads his own quiet life, avoiding all official functions where his absence will not be considered deplorable, and presiding over his family during its domestic hours when Mrs. Anderson cooks dinner and the two children show off their rapidly acquired fluency in the Danish language.

They plan to stay in Denmark for a while. And afterward? A more important embassy? "Good heavens, don't talk about that," says the Ambassador. "I'm still learning this job. Anyway, I'm not looking that far ahead."

But the charmed Danes may be. A high-ranking member of the Danish Government said to a United States official recently, "You tell President Truman that if he has any more women like Mrs. Anderson over there, he can send them right over here."

The Heritage of Greed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following condensation of the remarks of James F. Byrnes to the Conference of Southern Governors.

James F. Byrnes was Secretary of State, Supreme Court Justice, and very interested and involved in all the undertakings of this New Deal-Fair Deal-raw deal administration. Evidently he has seen the error of his ways, and had a change of heart. It is too bad he was not able to stop this administration but instead withdrew to his home in South Carolina. To me his words today seem to be words of wisdom.

THE HERITAGE OF GREED

(The following is a condensation of the remarks of James F. Byrnes to the Conference of Southern Governors this week at Biloxi, Miss.)

This week it was stated in Europe that our first line of defense is the River Elbe. I disagree. Our first line of defense is not the Elbe or the Rhine; it is a sound, solvent American economy. And that economy is now threatened.

The people who settled this country did not come here to establish a government. They were seeking liberty, not security. They were seeking an opportunity to enjoy freedom, the freedom of being let alone.

They believed that every human being possessed certain inherent and inalienable rights by the grace of God and not by the grant of any government. To secure those rights, the people were willing to endure hardships and, if necessary, sacrifice their lives. It is not surprising that when their numbers increased and it became necessary to establish some form of government they grudgingly yielded powers—even to local governments. They realized that if an individual lost his freedom, to him it was not material whether it was taken from him by an individual despot or by a temporary majority. History had shown that despots at times were beneficent, but mobs always were cruel.

But today is another day. The spirit of self-reliance that animated the early settlers and for more than a century inspired our people to exercise their initiative and develop this country, while preserving their independence, is unfortunately departing from the people.

Too many people are asking the Federal Government to perform the functions of State governments. Too many people want to lean upon the Government, forgetting that the Government must lean upon the people. Too many people are thinking of security instead of opportunity. They seem more afraid of life than of death.

We are engaged in a cold war with the Soviet Republic. It is a clash between two ideologies—our system of free enterprise and Russia's communism.

You cannot convince people who are inclined to communism of the superiority of our system of free enterprise merely by talking about a high standard of living. In this world there are millions of people who are more interested in liberty than in luxuries.

We must emphasize the freedom of the individual who by his initiative has made America prosperous. And we cannot very well boast of freedom under the American system if we are going to change that system and force the people to surrender more liberties to a centralized government.

When we see the states of western Europe and Great Britain, which have embraced socialism, unable to stand on their own feet and the very existence of their governments dependent upon the taxpayers of the United States, it would seem prudent for us to hold fast to our system of government that has proved efficient in war and in peace, and put our financial house in order.

Instead of that, we are threatened with the concentration in Washington of the powers of local governments, including police powers, and with the imposition of creeping, but ever-advancing socialistic programs. To pay for these costly programs we are going to borrow more money. It is well to remember that if we but stumble there is no lend-lease or Marshall aid for us.

Many people are disturbed. But those who look with fear upon the trend of political thinking, may as well be realistic. They should realize that if a proposal for the spending of money is authorized by the Congress as promoting the general welfare, the probability is that under the decisions interpreting the general-welfare clause of the Constitution, it will be sustained by the Court. Therefore, those who wish to preserve people's rights and prevent the gradual absorption of local governments by a big government in Washington, with resulting restrictions upon our liberties, should look to the people.

It will serve no useful purpose to argue to them about the repeal of Federal-aid laws which are in operation and to which operation the States have adjusted their budgets. But we can oppose their expansion until our budget permits it. And we can oppose the adoption of new and costly programs that other governments have tried and now wish to abandon. It will serve no useful purpose to spend one's time in criticizing the political parties or individuals responsible for the growth of the Federal-aid system. No party or individual is entitled to a monopoly of the blame or credit.

We would not have an over-expanding Government if the people were conscious of the taxes they are paying to the Federal Government. When the Government required employers to withhold income taxes from employees, the Government put the worker to sleep.

Ask any wage earner the amount of the wage he earns and he will tell you the amount he receives in his envelope or pay check, and not the amount his employer actually pays for his services before taxes are deducted for the Federal Government. The excise taxes are so well hidden that their burden is not appreciated by the average taxpayer. Not realizing that they are paying the bill, they are easily misled into clamoring for more Federal laws and more Federal aids. They are misled into regarding the United States Treasury as a Christmas tree, with the President and the Members of Congress playing the role of Santa Claus.

In the last fiscal year in peacetime, the Federal Government collected $38,000,000,000 in taxes. The Government did not live within its income. We spent $40,000,000,000 and had to borrow $2,000,000,000 to pay our current bills.

We are continuing to spend more than our income. Without adopting any of the various new programs urged by those in power, it is conservatively estimated that during the fiscal year, which will end June 30, 1950, we will spend $5,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000 more than our income. If Congress adopts those new programs no man can tell exactly how much we will have to borrow, or from whom we will borrow it. We do know the next generation must pay it. All of us should think more of the next generation and less of the next election.

What a heritage we will bequeath to the children of this day. Our greed for welfare and security will deny to them the opportunities we enjoy. Instead of fighting freely for the future of their children, they will be forced to pay for the folly of their fathers.

The spenders, while deploring deficit spending, assert as an excuse that there was deficit spending during the Roosevelt administration. That would not necessarily make it right. But who can forget that in 1933 the banks of the Nation were closed, farmers whose mortgages were foreclosed were deserting the farms, factories were idle and the unemployed walked the streets hungry?

Only a spender with no sense of responsibility could fail to see the difference. Today the banks have more money on deposit than ever before in peacetime history. Farmers are reasonably prosperous. Few factories are idle. More men are employed than ever before and the people are better fed and better clothed. It is rightly said we have "unexampled prosperity." If our Government cannot now live within its income, what will it do should we have a serious recession in business?

To justify spending more than our income, some persons speak of what the Government is doing for the little fellow. Let me show you what the Federal Government is doing to the little fellow. The United States Government is making the small man smaller every day.

If the "little fellow" sends a message by telephone or telegraph he pays a tax. If he travels by railroad or bus he pays a tax. If he buys an automobile, the sale price includes a tax. When he buys gasoline or oil he pays a tax. If he buys cigarettes, he pays a tax. If he goes to a football game or baseball game, he pays a tax. If his wife buys a pocketbook or cosmetics, she pays a tax, and if his children go to a movie, they pay a tax.

The average workingman must work 47 days a year to earn the money necessary to pay his taxes to the Federal Government. This is almost one day out of every week. If the new programs now seriously proposed should be adopted he will have to pay in taxes the equivalent of his wages for an ad-

ditional 20 days, making 67 days he will work each year for the Government instead of for himself and his family. That is what the Federal Government is doing to the little fellow.

If the spenders really want to help the little fellow, they should allow him to keep more of the money he gets for his labor to spend as he pleases, instead of having it taken from him and sent to Washington, to let bureaucrats spend as they think it should please him.

Men intoxicated with power will never voluntarily surrender the power to spend the money of other people. Human nature does not change. The Government will not repeal a single war tax now being collected unless forced to do so by public sentiment.

Preventing Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of August 23, 1950:

PREVENTING SABOTAGE

One virtue of the President's message to Congress on internal security is that it put first things first and concentrated on real and imminent as distinct from imaginary and potential dangers. In our view, the most pressing of the problems on which the President asked for legislative action is the protection of national defense installations from sabotage. These installations are so vital to national security and so obviously enticing a target to enemy agents that the utmost care in safeguarding them must be reckoned the first order of business in promoting the country's safety.

What the President seeks in this connection is a law similar to one which was in effect during the war but which expired in 1947. It would authorize the Secretary of Defense to promulgate, with the President's approval, regulations for the protection of airports, harbors, bases, laboratories, and other property or places in the custody of the National Military Establishment against the dangers of injury by accident or sabotage. In case of war or national emergency such regulations could be extended to all property and places designated by the President in the interest of national security and would govern, among other things, admission or exclusion of persons. Violation of these regulations would be punishable under the terms of the Magnuson bill, introduced to carry out the President's security message, by a $5,000 fine or a year's imprisonment, or both.

Such regulations make no intrusion upon personal liberties. They are aimed only at the prevention of overt acts inimical to the country's safety. There is no objection to them so far as we know, from any responsible source; authorization to issue them is provided in the McCarran bill as well as in the Magnuson bill. Since they constitute an elementary precaution about which there is no controversy, it would be wise, in our opinion, to deal with them in a separate piece of legislation which can be enacted speedily without the conflict bound to rage over other features of the McCarran and Magnuson bills.

The outposts of American defense are perhaps especially in need of the most rigorous security precautions. For it is these that an enemy would be most eager to cripple by sabotage before launching any frontal attack. They constitute at once the perimeter of protection for the country and at the same time the primary sources of the counteroffensive with which the United States would respond to any attack. No rational safeguard of these ramparts should be neglected. Congress should respond at least to this facet of the President's appeal without hesitation or delay.

Letter From a Potential Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting herewith a letter from a young South Dakotan addressed to the United States Congress. In it he gives his feeling of frustration about the war in Korea and expresses the hope that sacrifice will help to achieve peace. It is a beautiful and moving letter and should make the Members of this body realize the vast import and far-reaching effects of the legislation which they pass concerning the national defense. The letter follows:

EDGEMONT, S. DAK.,
July 30, 1950.

To the Congressmen of the United States:

GENTLEMEN: As I write this letter to you, young American warriors are dying in the conflict of battle. Young men like myself are laying down their lives for their country. Torn away from their homes, their loved ones, their peaceful environment, they are giving their all for an ungrateful public. Those who will return will find a spirit of indifference prevailing, and in many instances even open hostility. It is true now—there is no reason to believe it will be different hereafter. The maimed and injured are denied proper care because of snarling regulations and plain inefficiency. Those who fought on the battle front must now return to fight the home front.

Pearl Harbor, congressional investigations, talk, time, nothing accomplished. Now Korea. Green, hardly trained, inexperienced troops sent into battle to be shot down like diseased dogs. Who was to blame for the surprise move of the North Koreans? Who is going to give a satisfactory explanation—any explanation, to the mother who grieves for her dead boy?

Officers in the combat area from MacArthur down. Orders, commands, and more telegrams. One man speaks in error, a hundred men die for his words. What consolation.

These thoughts, gentlemen, and countless more pass through my mind and the minds of thousands of young men throughout our country.

Young men who will be drafted to serve, to die, to sacrifice immeasurably for what? To keep America free, to protect our homes and our loved ones from a more ruthless aggressor that we have ever known. Yes, for all this and more we will go to war. But for many, a simple cross will mark the end of the strife. And as the tears of those they left behind wash over it, a question arises. What is the net value of a human life, expendable as it is? The hopes and aspirations of youth lie in tattered ruins.

Thoughtful deliberate legislation inspired by an infinite trust in the Master will help make things easier for all concerned and will bring a speedier end to our frightful world conditions.

Each man who falls in battle must be directly connected with some particular goal. A life lost needlessly is a life lost nonetheless. Another boy who won't return to America. Each man wants to feel inwardly that his life means a step in the achievement of the ultimate goal—peace to his family—peace to his country—peace to the world.

Your humble servant and patriot,
REUBEN VALADES.

Ceremony at Acceptance of Offer of 5,000 Philippine Combat Troops for Service in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Tuesday, August 22, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, acting in behalf of the United States and the United Nations, formally accepted an offer by the Philippine Republic to provide 5,000 combat troops to serve in Korea under the United Nations flag. The Philippine Embassy has issued a brief description of the ceremony. I ask unanimous consent to insert this description in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

PHILIPPINE EMBASSY, *August 23, 1950.*

In a simple ceremony this morning, August 23, 1950, at 9:30 o'clock, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Johnson in behalf of the United States and of the United Nations tendered formal acceptance of the offer of troops by the Government of the Philippines consisting of one Regimental Combat Team, including a Field Artillery Battalion, of about 5,000 officers and men, to Ambassador J. M. Elizalde in representation of President Quirino, of the Philippines.

The Philippine Government will shoulder the expenses for these troops. They are fully trained and completely equipped.

The first contingent of approximately 1,200 officers and men are now ready for immediate departure to the battle area. Most of the officers and men are veterans and have seen service under General MacArthur in World War II.

In reply to Secretary Johnson's speech expressing the appreciation of the United States Government and the United Nations for the Philippine contribution, Ambassador Elizalde stated: "We hope that our boys will do a great service as they have before when they fought shoulder to shoulder with American soldiers. The loyalty, devotion, and courage of these Philippine troops in defense of freedom have already been tested in the last war and are not unknown to General MacArthur."

Conceived in Villainy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the author and moving spirit of the United Nations was Alger Hiss, the convicted traitor. It is evident that his fertile communistic brain realized fully the advantage that would inure to Russia by promoting the United Nations. All that United Nations has done has been to furnish a forum where the nations could assemble to call each other names. This does not make for peace and why our leaders surrendered their intelligence to the propaganda that this organization would promote peace is beyond my comprehension. There is no doubt that this organization was conceived not in the interests of peace but as an agency which could drag us into war whenever the nations which adhered to the United Nations decided to use our resources and our manpower to engage in their armed conflicts.

The bloody war in Korea, where our boys are fighting under a foreign flag, is an example of one of the many wars into which the United States will be catapulted unless the people in their wisdom divorce themselves from this menace to the peace of the world.

I am inserting as a part of my remarks, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, an editorial which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald under date of August 25, 1950:

CONCEIVED IN VILLAINY

Day by day, the futility of the United Nations as an agency of peace is being demonstrated at Lake Success. The orators continue to speak of UN as the best or the only hope of peace, but nobody who knows the origins of this outfit will be fooled by this hypocrisy.

UN is and always was a villainous fraud. Mr. Roosevelt, who thought he was smarter than George Washington, was swayed by two of the passionate attachments against which Washington warned in the Farewell Address. The nations which Mr. Roosevelt adored were Britain and Russia and for them he sent 300,000 American men and boys to their deaths.

Obviously, Mr. Roosevelt could not go to the American people and say, "I want you to give the lives of your husbands and sons for the salvation of Britain and Russia." That was the real purpose, but to have stated it openly would have defeated it. Instead, he introduced Russian sympathizers and outright Communists into the State Department and, at the Atlantic Conference, schemed with Churchill to get into the war by way of the Pacific.

To conceal his purpose and give it an appearance of nobility, the Atlantic Charter was issued, foreshadowing the United Nations. The Russians showed no enthusiasm for this bit of camouflage. Mr. Roosevelt had to pay a price for their adherence and it was a fantastic one.

In Europe they got Poland, Hungary, the Baltic States, the Balkans, and Eastern Germany. In Asia they got Manchuria, the Kurile Islands, Sakhalin, and the northern half of Korea; and, with this much to start with, they had no great difficulty in gaining control of China, particularly with the help that the State Department gave in undermining the Chinese Nationalist regime. As if all this were not enough, Stalin also got three votes in the UN assembly for no better reason than that he asked for them.

WHY UN EXISTS

UN exists, therefore, because Mr. Roosevelt and his successor had to have a plausible, though thoroughly fraudulent, excuse for demanding enormous sacrifices of the American people in a war from which they could gain nothing. An organization so conceived could be and has been of no service to the cause of peace. In fact, if Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman had not bribed Russia to join, there would be no war today in Korea because the Russians would have had no foothold in the country from which to operate.

UN has become a forum for making angry men angrier and for stimulating all that is bellicose in human behavior. It gives Asiatic, saturnine Malik the opportunity he craves to needle old man Austin, and it gives Austin the chance to retaliate as best he can.

This doesn't make for peace. It can stir up a new world war. The road to peace lies in abolishing an organization that was conceived in villainy.

Address by Governor Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by Governor Dewey at the luncheon of the Central Canada Exhibition Association, held in Ottawa, Canada, on August 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great experience to see this magnificent exposition and I am very happy that I have been able to accept your gracious invitation. While this is my first visit to Canada as Governor of New York, it is just the most recent of many visits going back over nearly half a century.

Those visits were prompted by the presence of uncles, aunts, great-aunts, great-uncles, cousins and other relatives in almost every part of Canada. The began about 46 years ago and I still have a dim recollection of the earlier ones that leads me to believe that I must have left an indelible impression. For example, there is a great house at 95 Ridout Street, South, in London, Ontario. I am sure that back in the early days of this century—before even the First World War—I dug up with my little shovel almost the entire backyard there during at least two or possibly three summers.

Having been born and raised in Michigan led to an ease and frequency of visits, so it is not unnatural that I feel entirely at home in the midst of your customary gracious and warm-hearted hospitality.

Certainly one of the most wonderful things about the relationship between our respective countries is the most trite—our historic 3,000 miles of undefended border. It is a truism to refer to it but it is unique in the world today when most nations find it necessary to be armed to the teeth at all border points.

Our border has been undefended because neither your country nor mine has ever been an aggressor nation. Neither of us has designs on the other, nor, for that matter, upon the peace or safety of any nation anywhere in the world.

As we jointly developed this great North American Continent, our common ideals and concepts of human dignity and freedom remained the same. The border is an invisible line, physically. It is also invisible spiritually and ideologically. The real reason our border is undefended is that neither of us has a reason for defending an invisible line which separates differences which themselves are almost invisible.

There is today a more modern reason why our border is undefended. This undefended border is actually indefensible. Under conditions of modern warfare it would be impossible to maintain a line of defense 3,000 miles long against any aggressor on this continent—if one existed. There can be no such physical defense over such great spaces and such varied terrain against either land or air attack.

In another and subtler way such a border is also indefensible because today the flight of ideas around the world is faster than the speed of sound. Ideas pass on the radio through the ether, and destructive ideologies can be as dangerous as force of arms.

As a result, where airtight borders used to exist in most other portions of the world, there is today no such thing as an airtight border. Not even iron curtains can protect people from the influx of ideas and ideals of freedom. And, on the other hand, from behind the iron curtain there is spewed forth a daily diatribe of hate and destruction over all the free world.

It is an ideology which is first seductive and undermining and then conquering. It is combined with great military power and places all the world in deadly peril.

In the face of the menace to the peace of the world which threatens all of us today, there is, in a military sense, no border at all between your country and mine. Any nation that attacks either the United States or Canada attacks both. We are by geographic circumstances and by loyalty to common ideals a single defense unit in a perilous world.

This hateful thing we know as communism is, of course, nothing but a new guise for the most ancient and cruel Oriental despotism. It differs only in technique. Its advance agents are dressed up today in idealistic garments. It is the face of the devil concealed by the mask of benevolence. It is a coiled reptile which has been feeding off the 200,000,000 people of Russia for 30 years, developing its strength to spring on all the world. It has now overrun 800,000,000 people, or one-third of the globe.

It has already succeeded in creating divisions among us of the western world. It has succeeded with the most devilish skill in turning the peoples of the Orient against the west.

You only have to talk for 5 minutes with anyone who has escaped from behind the iron curtain to know again—if you ever had any doubt—that we are imperiled by a system of savagery with modern skills the like of which the world has not seen in a thousand years.

It is well established that the Soviet leaders have purposely murdered some 20 to 30 million of their own people. It is now reliably reported that it is their fiendish plan to have the Chinese Communist government liquidate some 200 million Chinese for the purpose of having a supportable and thoroughly disciplined Communist society in China.

I have no special knowledge of the Soviet plans today; I am probably the last person in North America to whom the Kremlin

would confide its program. But it is well known that the Soviet now has some 200 divisions in the Soviet Union alone. These 200 divisions compare with 20 to 30 divisions which might be opposed to them today by the west.

Since the Communists are doing so well for themselves without war, many of us wonder why they should bother with waging either their little wars or a big war. They have conquered much of the world very fast and are undermining the rest of it very successfully.

But dictators grow old and they grow impatient. Oppressed peoples are hard to hold in oppression, and a dictator must always move forward or else he moves backward. Then he dies. So he must press forward, he thinks, to conquer—and to stay alive.

With vast military power and unlimited slave manpower in central Europe and Asia, nothing holds the Soviet back today but fear of atomic reprisal. How long our atomic superiority will last, and therefore how long this deterrent will last, no one can know.

Since I hold no official position in the National Government of my country, I can speak entirely freely. A great many people are going around asking whether there will be a world war III. This is an entirely pointless question.

It is time we stopped living in a dream world and recognized the facts of life. One of the facts of life is perfectly clear—we are being warred against by the undeclared world war III of world communism. We are not at war in the traditional sense. But we are being warred against as surely as though the Soviet Union had declared war, unfurled its banners, blown its trumpets, and marched its troops off across all its borders.

It is equally clear that the desperate struggle in Korea is to the Soviets only a current and rather minor aspect of the Communist offensive. It is not difficult to forecast that Formosa is on the schedule. This threat to Formosa is peculiarly serious, and we should recognize it and get it right out on the table.

Because Great Britain and India have recognized the Communist government in China, this may imply recognition of Communist claims to Formosa. On the other hand, my own Government is committed to the defense of Formosa.

What will happen, therefore, when the Communist offensive is launched against Formosa? Will the Communists then have succeeded in splitting us apart? Will the councils of the free peoples in the United Nations then be divided? The oriental mind of our persecutors will delight to see the western diplomats engaged in the most difficult of decisions concerning United Nations action for the defense of Formosa.

The United States does not want one square inch of Formosa. We insist, however, that no other nation shall take that island by force of arms. We seek peace and peaceful solutions. This problem should be settled at the peace-treaty conference or, like all other points of tension, at the United Nations.

I say to you, with the knowledge that I am right, that it is Soviet Russia's clear purpose to divide the English-speaking people. They have proved this purpose, time and time again, at conference after conference. It is a standard part of their propaganda. Formosa is one of the biggest weapons in that arsenal it should be our common purpose to blunt and destroy that weapon. We can only blunt and destroy that weapon by finding some common agreement based upon our mutual necessities and our mutual purposes.

We must stop waiting for catastrophes to happen and then rushing in to the United Nations and to our own inadequate defenses, else we shall not live through many more crises. We should act now—all of us who have this common urge to save the cause of human freedom. We should not wait until Formosa is attacked and then find out whether we are united or divided. We should forthwith take the problem of Formosa before the United Nations or to the peace treaty council and find out where the free world stands.

I repeat the impending attack on Formosa is a dangerous and powerful weapon of our enemies. We should blunt and destroy it now, in public, before it becomes an effective weapon to disunite and destroy us.

Still more invasions resulting in more divisions between our not-too-united nations of the Western World are plotted. These include the stepped-up warfare in Indochina as an embarrassment to France. They include accelerated Communist trouble in Indonesia as an embarrassment to our friends of the Netherlands. They include continued and accelerated difficulties in Europe designed to contain and wear down British troops. They include accelerating the Huk campaign in the Philippines where the United States has great responsibilities and interests.

An invasion of Iran and then Iraq, through Israel to the Mediterranean, is also clearly on the Soviet agenda. This would cost Europe her absolutely essential supply of oil.

We are all in this leaky ship together. We are in the most acute danger the children of freedom have ever encountered. It seems to me too obvious for discussion that we should draw closer and closer together and do so at a greatly accelerated rate. This ideal must be practical, down to earth and, I am sorry to say, it will be very expensive. But there is no price tag on freedom and there must never be.

I have already pointed out that Canada and the United States are a single defense area. The threat of Soviet communism is directed against all North America at once, against our great agriculture, our mighty industries, our mines, our Great Lakes and our transportation. Elementary prudence requires that our plans for our military defense should be united. Our civil defense should also be jointly planned and jointly executed.

You, in Canada, are on the great circle air route over which Red bombers are presently able to attack, not only your country, but most of mine. We would be equally imperiled by a successful invasion of Alaska. Our interests are totally joined and I trust that our steps for joint protection will be closely developed and without delay.

Out of the dangers and misfortunes of this period, we are drawn closer than ever before. The scheming monsters whose design it is to separate us, will, I am confident, end up by bringing us closer together.

If we are to confound the other schemes of our enemies, we need a new and mutual understanding of the precise nature of the tactics being used against us. Today, it is Malik who is a symbol of hate spewn all over the world from the rostrum of the United Nations. He is the symbol of human degradation of whom everyone speaks, one who seems to combine all the evil and untruth in the world into one man. But it would be a fatal error to think in terms of personalities. Malik is only one of a long line of professional and highly skilled liars. He is just the current actor out of a stable which includes Molotov, Gromyko, Vishinsky, and many more to come.

It is essential to our action in a time of crisis, that we gain a strong and clear understanding that the Soviet program is bent solely on enslavement and murder. Whatever the Soviet does is conceived in evil and dedicated to human slavery; every Soviet attack must serve further to unite us.

The Malik propaganda line of the moment is that the defense of the Republic of Korea is a private adventure by the United States. The world knows this as another example of the great lie. One thrilling answer has been given by Canada. Already three Canadian destroyers are operating in Korean waters for the United Nations. Your Parliament is not in session and under your Constitution you cannot send troops without an act of Parliament. But already the call has gone out for volunteers. More than 2,500 have volunteered and it is expected that more than 6,000 will soon be ready. Canada has given a typical Canadian answer to the propaganda of the big lie that the defense of Korea is the private adventure of a single nation.

Canada has always given that kind of an answer and history has recorded in glittering pages the sacrifices of Canadians in defense of freedom. History has most recently recorded that in Lend Lease, both during World War II and in similar contributions to Great Britain afterward, Canada has been more generous of her substance compared with her national wealth than any other nation.

It is also worth mentioning that of all the nations in the world, Canada stands far ahead of all others in its alertness and skill in detecting the Communist spy ring while too many other countries were refusing to take the blinders off their eyes during the last war. For all of these achievements, every citizen of my country should be proud to be a neighbor of Canada.

As a member of a family of many Canadians, I speak bluntly of our common crisis here today, as I have often, through the years, spoken at home.

Our North American family has been large and close. But it is much larger today. Onrushing events have forged the whole free world into one family and nothing should be allowed to prevent us from acting as one.

Once we have faced and recognized the deadly nature and the colossal extent of the peril we are in, once we have organized our military and civil defense and taken stout action in the United Nations to bring effective working unity at the future peril ponits before they happen and not afterward, we still have two more great tasks ahead.

In the final analysis, a conquering dictator is held back only by overwhelming force. It is my hope that all of us will proceed speedily to build within the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty, the overwhelming military and productive force by which we can preserve the good that God has put upon this earth. To build and maintain such force will place a strain upon us all such as we have never faced before.

The final struggle is, therefore, political and economic. It requires high courage on the part of political leaders and all the people. It requires a willingness to surrender minor objectives, political advantages, and petty national differences. All these are engulfed in a struggle for survival which may continue throughout our lifetime.

We can win this fight for survival, but only if we bring the best we have to bear on these, the most difficult problems we have ever faced.

Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a telegram

that I have received from one of the leading citizens in my congressional district, which I think reflects the opinion of a great many of our people. It appears to all of us that every dilatory tactic in the book has been used to prevent the deportation of Harry Bridges. I for one sincerely regret the decision of the justices of the United States Court of Appeals, and I am satisfied that Mr. Donovan, the sender of this wire, knows whereof he speaks since he is an able and capable attorney with many years of experience in the courts of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and one who has served with honor and distinction in the public life of this city and State.

CHELSEA, MASS.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The decision of two judges of the United States Court of Appeals to free Harry Bridges is a pronounced disgrace to the United States in view of the record in the case. It is further evidence of the weak compromising namby-pamby attitude of judges and officials in high places in our Government. It is a blow at the morale of the thousands of heroic troops now fighting in Korea and the thousands of others being readied for that engagement. It is about time that officials and judges became realistic instead of stupidly idealistic. If the established law can protect individuals like Harry Bridges then it is high time for Congress to change that law. I join with counsel for the Government who exclaimed when the decision was announced: "God help America."

JOHN F. DONOVAN,
Chelsea, Mass.

The Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as our country passes through the present critical times, it is well to keep the record of events straight.

The Wheeling Intelligencer, of Wheeling, W. Va., carried an editorial on August 19, 1950, on current affairs, which contributes to an accurate record, and therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

IS IT CONTEMPTIBLE?

President Truman and Senator KENNETH WHERRY, of Nebraska, Republican minority leader in the Senate, have kicked up something of a national rumpus in their sharp exchange of comment over the fitness or unfitness of Secretary of State Dean Acheson to continue in office. The incident serves to dramatize one of the major issues to be fought out during the coming political campaign over the complexion of the next Congress. Only a truly great nation could wage a war in distant Korea and at one and the same time be engaged in heated political broils at home.

A truly bipartisan foreign policy long has been advocated by this newspaper, but when the administration in power refuses to participate in a bipartisan foreign policy—as was so lamentably the case in matters relating to Asia—there is little else the rebuffed party can do but to state its own position as clearly as possible.

This Senator WHERRY did in unmistakably clear language. The Senator said: "The blood of our boys in Korea is on his (Acheson's) shoulders, and no one else." Mr. Truman retorted, the next day, by declaring "it [WHERRY'S] was a contemptible statement and beneath comment."

The matter, apparently, will not die there. Mr. Acheson long ago forfeited public confidence when he exclaimed "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss," after the latter had been convicted of traitorous conduct in the transmission of documents to a Communist spy network in Washington. This shocked the Nation as nothing else has since Pearl Harbor.

One of Mr. Truman's greatest faults is his stubborn refusal, on various occasions, to give way when some appointee is shown up as incompetent, or worse. On the other hand, as in the case of Henry A. Wallace, he sometimes acts with swiftness, as he did in kicking Wallace out of his Cabinet for exhibiting Russophile tendencies. Mr. Truman should long since have done the same thing with Acheson, for the same reason.

A nation cannot fight a war successfully when the people have no confidence in the Government's foreign policy The removal of Acheson would do more to restore confidence in United States foreign policy than any other possible action.

When Acheson charged off Korea in his last January speech he virtually gave an invitation for the Red invasion of Korea. That fact can scarcely be disputed. When the invasion came, Mr. Truman overnight reversed the Acheson policy. So much is history.

Far from being contemptible, we believe Senator WHERRY's statement, however, disagreeable it may be to the White House, hits the nail squarely on the head.

Address by Former Representative Lloyd Thurston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on August 7, 1950, at Sioux City, Iowa, the Honorable Lloyd Thurston made an address before the annual convention of the Iowa Department of the American Legion. Mr. Thurston served in the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and World War I. He was a member of the Iowa Senate for 4 years and served as a Representative from Iowa for 14 years. He is a member of the United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, and the Veterans for Foreign Wars. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

It is a high honor for an individual to convey the compliments of one veteran group to a great veterans' organization. The Iowa Department of the United Spanish War Veterans, through its commander, greets the veterans of two world wars with the knowledge that history concedes the two conflicts mentioned were more extensive in every respect than any prior military contest among nations. The American forces alone in World War I numbered four and one-fourth millions, and four times that number in World War II, making an aggregate of more than 20,000,000 serving under our flag in these two great wars.

The Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the China Expedition, called out about 400,000, or one-tenth of those engaged in World War I, and one-fortieth of those mustered into the Second World War.

The Spanish American War resulted in liberating the oppressed peoples in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. Improvements in tropical medicine brought about sanitation and virtually eliminated yellow fever and malaria from the warm climates, which had claimed hundreds of thousands of victims annually. This conflict brought our Nation more into contact with world affairs, and it seems that world problems have multiplied since that time.

The Spanish War veteran salutes the service men and women of World Wars I and II. Words can not add to the glorious victories they won throughout the world. On every continent and on countless islands many of their comrades lie interred as mute evidence of their sacrifices. History does not record more bitter conflicts or greater victories. They fought for a free world.

The American citizen is proud of the unbroken chain of victories of our Armed Forces from the Revolution through the War of 1812, the Mexican, Civil, and Spanish Wars, and World Wars I and II, all being based upon the premises that freedom is the highest concept of man.

It was claimed that World War I was fought to save democracy; that World War II was fought to stamp out totalitarianism in Germany, Italy, and Japan. In most instances, royal families were routed out of political control; but the European philosophy of centralized power replaced royalty with bloodthirsty ursurpers, who had the same objectives in view: the enslavement of the people. Little, if anything, was gained to promote freedom.

The so-called Atlantic Charter was supposed to be an organic act of freedom for small nations. In reading, it sounded well, but the same individuals who conceived this altruistic declaration, at Yalta, betrayed these principles and thereby created the blackest pages in world history. A chain of events were set in motion in China which will envelop all of Asia, and may cause slavery and misery for generations. The Russians now have their Asiatic rear covered by their Red allies in China, who likely will do their fighting in that part of the world. Their satellite states in eastern Europe will act as war buffers in front. Our world dreamers planned it that way.

Have you taken time to consider the situation that has developed in our National Capital? Do you not recall that during the past few months when Alger Hiss, one of the principal advisers at Yalta, was on trial for perjury in connection with looting secret documents from the State Department, that the ranking member of the Cabinet, Acheson, took the stand in the trial, and later said, "I stand behind Hiss." That two members of the United States Supreme Court

also testified in behalf of this person, who was convicted. If more members of the court had followed the precedent of the two members, obviously, Hiss upon appeal to that Court could not have been convicted. Do you favor retaining the highest appointive officials in our Government who support pinks and subversive fellow travelers?

Some of you may want to stand behind Mr. Acheson, who stands behind Mr. Hiss; a few of you may approve of the conduct of the two Supreme Court Justices. As for me, I prefer to stand behind the doughboys and the tars who have fought and who are now fighting to save this country of ours.

You will remember that the Congress passed an act to exempt the cooky pushers of the State Department and the foreign service from military duty. While you boys were in the trenches in France or in the jungles of the Pacific isles, these favored pansies lolled about the embassies of the world. Would not you and I like to have the entire State Department in the front line trenches in Korea?

We all have faith in the American veteran. Why not have a joint meeting of the representatives of the great service organizations, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the American Veterans, the Disabled Veterans, and the United Spanish War Veterans, and let them pass upon the loyalty or lack of loyalty of high officials who appear to be above public censure? The leading farm, labor, industrial groups, join for concerted action in seeking legislation or betterments; why not veterans?

May I inquire, what is the matter with America? Have we been unfair to the other nations of the world? Why are we always called upon for funds and help? We let the nations of Europe have about $25,000,000,000 after World War I, and they repudiated their obligations. Since World War II, we have donated about $40,000,000,000, or a total of sixty or seventy billions, to purchase good will. Strange, but other nations do not make gifts to us, or worry about our good will.

Why not base our policy toward other nations upon their vote in the United Nations to support our Government in Korea? I say no Korea support from them, no more support from us.

This beautiful, bountiful America of ours is the finest heritage ever handed down to a people. America's position in the world did not just happen; it was attained through the toil and sacrifice, yes, the sweat and blood, of thousands of men and women who were determined to prove that human agencies, through Divine guidance, could create and maintain a form of government which would provide free institutions for a Nation with the highest concepts known to man. It would seem that the results of their efforts would be patent to all, and it is almost unbelievable that in our midst traitors, some in public office, would destroy this Government which you and I love. Because public officials have been more interested in votes than the welfare of their land, real Americans must now stand on guard.

The speaker has traveled through Manchuria, and almost the length of Korea, and in a small degree can understand the tremendous barriers and uncertain terrain which our troops now face. We fervently hope and pray that sufficient men and supplies can reach the battlefront, to save our boys from a threatened Dunkirk. We want every last ounce of our national strength made available to them now.

The great American Legion is one of the principal pillars in the foundation of our Nation; its collective views, its counsel and judgment can do much in time of national peril. It is to be hoped that your committee on resolutions will have the courage to meet the facts and to suggest a course of action which will bring our ship of state back to the course of fearless, sound government.

A Masterpiece of Ambiguity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Masterpiece of Ambiguity," published in the Journal of Commerce on August 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

A MASTERPIECE OF AMBIGUITY

The firm of Brannan & Gillette is not easily discouraged.

For years Mr. Brannan has been trying to muzzle the country's commodity futures exchanges without getting Congress to go along with his ideas. Even the dodge of using the Korean war emergency as an alibi for slipping stricter commodity exchange curbs on the statute books did not work. First the House and then the Senate Banking Committee threw out the administration's request for Government margin powers over the commodity exchanges.

That should have been enough. But it wasn't. Blocked at the front door, Mr. Brannan, this time aided by Senator GILLETTE, tried the back door.

Senator GILLETTE, during the final voting rush on the Senate floor, succeeded in writing an amendment into the Defense Production Act which tries to accomplish by indirection what Congress repeatedly refused to do openly.

We are talking about the so-called Gillette amendment to the Defense Production Act, added to the bill as section 606.

At first glance, this amendment seems so full of sweet reasonableness that it appears quite harmless. But to take that view would be a dangerous self-deception on the part of the commodity exchanges. The Gillette amendment is dangerous to the point of viciousness. Make no mistake about that.

What the amendment purports to do is to prevent excessive speculation by charging the commodity exchanges themselves with this task. That sounds reasonable enough, particularly if it is remembered that the administration originally wanted to do this policing job itself, with the club of margin control.

The rub in the Gillette amendment lies in the fact that it would be one of the prerogatives of the Secretary of Agriculture to say when, in his opinion, excessive speculation exists or threatens. After he makes such a declaration the exchanges would have the choice of either doing the Secretary's bidding or getting involved in long-drawn-out court battles with the Department.

In such a fight the cards would be heavily stacked against any exchange or exchange official not seeing eye to eye with the Secretary of Agriculture, particularly since the amendment carries real teeth in the form of a possible $5,000 fine or a year in prison, or both, for any willful violation of the amendment. This threat may be enough to disrupt the functioning of any commodity exchange, and that, of course, is exactly what Senator GILLETTE and Secretary Brannan hope to accomplish in one way or the other.

For years economists have tried to define what "excessive speculation" is. Nobody has succeeded in writing such a definition. But that obviously does not daunt the good Senator from Iowa.

He came up with a definition of excessive speculation that is a real honey. He defines it as (1) speculative trading in a volume in excess of the volume reasonably necessary to absorb hedging trades, or (2) speculative trading of a character which causes or tends to cause unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in price.

To a tired Senate that was rushing through a flood of some 40 or 50 amendments before the final vote on the Defense Production Act last Tuesday, these words must have sounded very sweet and reasonable indeed. The trouble with them is that they are absolutely meaningless. They are so vaguely drawn that it would take long court controversies to define them properly and by the time such clarifications could be obtained the war emergency probably would long be over.

So here again it is quite obvious that the war is being used merely as an excuse and that what the administration and some of its friends are really after is the permanent crippling of the commodity exchanges.

Senator GILLETTE failed to say what he considers as a trading volume "reasonably necessary" to absorb hedging trades. Put any commodity expert on the witness stand and he will tell you that the trouble with the commodity exchanges today is not excessive speculation but not enough speculation. There is no way of arbitrarily fixing a percentage relationship between hedging and speculative transactions.

There is no doubt, however, that the broader the futures markets are, the better they will fulfill their functions. Moreover, price fluctuations in an active market usually are smaller, and not larger, than in a narrower market.

That is elementary economics, but obviously this is one of the economic laws Secretary Brannan and Senator GILLETTE have suspended—for political reasons. Commodities in which no organized futures markets exist frequently show sharped price fluctuations and more speculation than the ones with futures markets because the price-making process in the futures markets is being conducted in full view of everybody.

The Gillette amendment, to be quite charitable about it, is ill-conceived and poorly written. It would be useless in the fight against wartime inflation—but it would be extremely harmful to the continued functioning of the commodity exchanges. It should be eliminated from the Defense Production Act by the Senate-House conferees.

Disaffection in Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Disaffection in Red China,"

written by Rodney Gilbert, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, August 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

DISAFFECTION IN RED CHINA—GROWING DISCONTENT PRESENTS POSSIBILITY OF BLOW-UP IN MOSCOW'S FACE WITHIN A YEAR

(By Rodney Gilbert)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA.—It has been frequently reported, both from Stalinist China, via Hong Kong, and from Japan, that an army of something like 200,000 Manchurian troops has been assembled near the Korean border, ready to go into action in support of the North Koreans whenever Moscow gives the word. Since the Peking regime claims authority over all of Red China's armed forces, such action would commit Mao Tse-tung and company to open warfare against the United Nations and more specifically against those nations which are contributing men, ships, and planes to the effort to check the progress of the Stalinist Koreans. This would be such a serious commitment that, if it is really contemplated, Mr. Malik is simply throwing dust in the eyes of those who watch his forensic antics in the Security Council.

It would be a serious commitment because if Chinese soldiery were shooting at American ground forces and British ships in Korea, there could be no pretense that Chinese armed forces elsewhere were not at war with the British in Hong Kong, for example, or with the American Seventh Fleet and its planes in the Formosa channel. But there is no reason to believe that the Chinese Communist government in Peking would hesitate to obey Russian orders that would involve China in war with the civilized world as deeply as North Korea is now involved. The shelling of British and other ships at the approaches to Hong Kong harbor is a gesture in contempt of the consequences of such an involvement. So was the recent machine-gunning of an American patrol plane by Chinese Communist planes, if correctly reported.

There are many reasons for thinking, moreover, that bringing China into open conflict with the non-Communist world would seem highly desirable to Moscow. Great hordes of Chinese soldiery could be poured into Korea. Great weight of numbers would force the United States to do one of two things: to get out, with great loss of "face" and confidence throughout Asia, or to throw great weight into it at great expense. This would divert so much strength to the Far East that, to be prepared for an "emergency" in Europe and for home defense as well, the whole economy of the United States would have to be put on a war footing.

Feints at Formosa, Hong Kong, and Indochina, with submarine play off of the Japanese and Philippine coasts, would invite further diversions of strength to the East and more exhausting efforts to be ready for emergencies in Europe. All of this would be designed to promote the economic prostration of the capitalist world, at no extraordinary cost to Soviet Russia, and at no great risk of war.

The one great risk to the Soviet Union is that some important satellite would have a revulsion of feeling against this game and refuse to play its part. This is nowhere likelier to happen than in China. It is not because any top Communist has the will or the power to lead a counterrevolution that is likely to happen there; but simply because the revulsion of feeling among all classes is growing faster than the all-important police system.

There is much talk here of going back to the continent within a year that is based upon nothing but wishful thinking. But there is also a belief here, founded on real information, that China will blow up in Moscow's face within a year for the reason that discontent is growing at such a pace that it cannot be policed. Considering what a tremendous advantage in the cold war the Stalinist conquest of continental China seems to have given the Kremlin, the chance that the Chinese masses may be all but ready to wreck the whole Soviet establishment in the Far East should be a possibility of the greatest importance to the non-Communist world.

Mao Tse-tung said some weeks ago that there were still 400,000 guerrillas to be mopped up in China. The word for guerrilla in Chinese is unsatisfactory and misleading In the military terminology of 30 years ago it was used to describe regular army units functioning as flying columns. That usage is forgotten; and the word "yu chi tui" now describes a body of armed men with some organization and discipline, in revolt against authority. That is probably what Mao had in mind; for, when the Nationalist armies were retreating they left behind, throughout north, central, and south China, as many men, under officers and with their arms, as could find local cover from which to operate. There is constant communication between some of these bodies and a central command on this island, and occasional communication with nearly all of them. This chain of units extends from Manchuria to Hainan and as deep into the hinterland as eastern Hunan and Honan. These are what might be called the official guerrillas and their number is estimated at 300,000. But more or less loosely attached to these in all the same territories are bodies of outlawed farmers who have risen in revolt against excessive taxation and grain levies, deserters from the Red armies, usually trying to get back to their native places, and runaways from the cities who have run foul of Communist regimentation.

Mao's estimate of 400,000 would probably account for all of these in the eastern provinces. But in the western parts, notably in western Hunan, Kueichow, and Szechuan, there are still small armies of defeated soldiery, holding their own under no particular authority and making common cause with native bandits and rebel farmers, who are keeping big areas in chaos. About these no one here has as much information as the Communists, who advertise them by denouncing them. In Kansu most of the defeated Moslems, who were militiamen, have gone back to their farms, but from Communist publicity one learns that bands of these tough fellows are still harassing the conquerors. Even in Sinkiang a rebel element survives and in Inner Mongolia the same Prince Teh, who outlawed himself by submitting to the Japanese, is now operating against the Reds with a very effective little force.

All these are known as guerrillas in popular parlance; and nobody estimates the total number of armed men who have not submitted to the Communists as low as a million.

But that is not the end of it, for not only have Mao's beloved peasantry turned against the regime, but the workers whom Li Li-san came back to organize into the dictatorial proletariat are more bitterly disillusioned than the peasantry. Their exploitation is along classical Stalinist lines. Hours are longer, wages lower, and the speed-up is whooped along by labor heroes. When factories are moved, the workers are rounded up and herded along with the machinery, without any provision for the movement and housing of their families. To top this off there is very serious unemployment in every industrial center—with no slave labor camps as yet to take care of it.

Now Chinese labor has had just enough experience in organization to organize revolt—taking the form mostly of slow motion and scientific sabotage. This underground labor organization, which spread very slowly at first from Shanghai, is now reaching into every industrial community and, since it is less demonstrative where discipline is the best, "the fire is hottest under the Communists where they smell the least smoke," as one visitor to this island from Shanghai recently said to me.

That same condition is equally true too of concealed rebellion in the Communist armies. Where it is best prepared there is no evidence of disaffection. A regiment stationed in the town of Meihsien in Kuangtung, under Communist officers, was secretly pledged to the counterrevolution. But, being moved to wrath by the conduct of local Red officials, it held a lynching party, declared itself for the Nationalist Government and took to the hills.

This was a deplorable development because one such unit acting alone achieves nothing but the relief of the Reds from the cost of its keep, while 20, acting on a given signal at the right time, might seize a province and wipe out the whole Red set-up. But now there is a coordinating force of experts at work which is trying to bring every element in actual revolt, every underground force and all the potential rebels—all known as guerrillas in popular parlance now—under some sort of direction.

Several months ago Mr. Christopher Rand, writing from Hong Kong, told of the spread of disillusionment and discontent in Red China, but expressed the belief that the Communist bureaucracy was loyal. The indoctrinated fanatics are loyal; but the Communists took over such enormous administrative responsibilities in so short a time that the indoctrinated fanatics make up a trifling minority within the great body of technicians, administrators, clerks, and what-not whom they had to recruit from the middle class and the rural gentry—the elements in the population which they are systematically ruining.

Great numbers of their recruits, indeed, joined them for the very reason that their families or their employers were ruined and that they had to serve the Communists to eat. They attend all the indoctrination classes and become masters of the Marxist jargon; but bales of smuggled letters come through Hong Kong to this place to prove that the most intense haters of the Stalinist system are among the employees in its administrative system.

And then for the police system, upon which Stalinist regimes elsewhere rely for survival—that's really the worm at the core of the big Red apple.

Internal Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of August 25, 1950, entitled "Internal Security."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNAL SECURITY

Senator MCCARRAN's bill on which the Senate is about to begin fateful deliberations

is titled "A bill to protect the internal security of the United States, and for other purposes." Because protection of the country's internal security is now a matter of crucial importance, the bill deserves sober consideration in the light, first, of its contribution to this paramount purpose and, second, in relation to its other unstated purposes.

The McCarran bill is an omnibus measure dealing wih three distinct and essentially different problems: (1) The problem of espionage and sabotage; (2) the problem of seditious or subversive utterances and associations; (3) the problem of hostile alien infiltration. Respecting the first of these problems, the McCarran bill carries out, in much the same manner as the security bill introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, the President's recommendations for tightening the laws against spies and saboteurs. To this extent, it directly serves the purpose of protecting the country's internal security. In our judgment, however, the two other problems dealt with in the McCarran bill are not directly related to internal security, whatever may be their pertinence to the "other purposes" Senator MCCARRAN had in view.

The McCarran bill proposes to deal with the problem of subversive opinions through the complicated mechanism previously proposed by Senators MUNDT and FERGUSON; indeed, it takes over their subversive activities control bill in all its essentials. This is to say, in brief, that it would require the registrations of all Communists and Communist sympathizers as designated by an administrative board, it would substantially cripple their ability to spread their ideas, and it would make criminal "any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship * * * under the domination or control of any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual." This is a definition so vague that we think it seriously threatens the freedom of expression guaranteed by the first amendment of the Constitution.

The premise on which this sweeping proposal rests is that ideas are dangerous to the internal security of the United States. But it has been a fundamental American premise for a century and a half—ever since the unfortunate Sedition Act of 1798 was allowed to lapse in 1800—that unhealthy ideas are best countered by healthy ones and that the gravest danger to the sources of national strength lies in the suppression of opinion.

The opinions of the Communists are odious. But they are not, as opinions, dangerous. There is no sign that they are contagious or that they have infected more than a tiny handful of sick Americans. Communists are nuisances. But they are not, as Communists, threats to internal security. They threaten security only if they engage in espionage or sabotage. And this is why it is wise to strengthen the statutory provisions against spies and saboteurs, as the President has recommended. The subversive control provisions of the McCarran bill would not contribute in the smallest degree to the detection and frustration of spies and saboteurs. They would not protect internal security. They would serve only the other purposes of the bill—particularly the dangerous and essentially totalitarian purpose of punishing men for the holding or expression of disloyal thoughts.

We have dealt in an earlier editorial with the immigration and naturalization features of the McCarran bill. These, too, are punitive rather than preventive. Insofar as they are addressed at all to the protection of internal security, they embrace the totalitarian technique of quarantining hostile ideas, of shutting this country off from contact with the outside world. We need to strive, of course, to keep outside our borders the agents of communism who would attempt to injure our military defenses. But it is craven folly, peculiarly Communist in character, to bar all who disagree with us.

Security is not promoted by panicky fears; it calls for rational precautions. The bulk of the McCarran bill is aimed at shadows and serves purposes which have nothing to do with security. Yet in the name of security it threatens freedoms which have been the historical sources of American strength.

The Responsibility and Duty of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the New York Times yesterday carried an article by Mr. Arthur Krock, which makes sound observations on the responsibility and duty of Congress.

It is with the thought that Mr. Krock's observations should be preserved in official form that I ask unanimous consent for insertion of the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—THE SENATE PROVES IT LEARNED A LESSON

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, August 23.—Until the House and Senate conferees on the defense production bill (the economic controls measure) have reported an agreement to the two branches of Congress, and this agreement has been approved, the legislation will remain unfinished business. But the form in which the bill passed the Senate contained two provisions which proclaim the fact that this branch at least has learned a lesson from the recent past.

The lesson is that temporary loans of power by Congress to the Executive are very difficult to recall if the President wants to keep them longer than Congress thinks the situation of the country requires. It was brought home to Congress by experience during the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Then also it was discovered by the legislators that, even if Congress put a terminal date on loans of authority, Executive influence could operate to have that extended if the President were made a part of the terminating process.

SENATOR AIKEN'S PROPOSAL

When, therefore, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee began consideration of the defense production bill as passed by the House, certain members determined to profit by that experience. After private discussions in which Senators ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and AIKEN, of Vermont were prominent, the latter proposed in committee that at any time Congress could withdraw the full delegation of emergency powers to the President by concurrent resolution. Unlike a joint resolution, this legislative process is completed wholly by congressional action; the President is not a part of it and against it he cannot apply the veto.

Advocates of the method pointed out to the committee that the proposed delegation of powers was vast, that they were to be loaned in a situation far short of full mobilization and without careful study and full hearings. It might well develop, they said, that some of the loans were unwise and would do more harm than good. Therefore, they argued, it was only fair to the people and to the President to arrange that they could be terminated before June 30, 1952, the date of their expiration — by Congress through concurrent resolution or by the President's own decision that he did not need them any longer.

THE PARTIAL REPEAL PLAN

The force of this argument, as applied to the specific legislation, combined with memories of the congressional experience previously referred to, was sufficient to persuade the committee to include the concurrent resolution feature in its original draft. Then came a discussion of what safeguards should be furnished for the body of the bill if a section or sections were held unconstitutional. The usual proposal was made that the legislation should explicitly state that judicial invalidation of any part of it would not affect the remainder, to which there was no dissent.

But this set Senator ROBERTSON to thinking that the same safeguard could be erected for the body of the bill in the event any section or sections turned out to be unwise or unworkable. Accordingly, he suggested that Congress, by concurrent resolution, might also at any time repeal any part of the legislation. Once again Republican members of the committee were available as sponsors, and the original draft was amended to include this equally important provision.

A SALUTARY ACTION

With these two reservations on the loans of authority, the bill passed the Senate, 85 to 3. If they are retained in the final draft that goes to the President, and if he signs that, Congress will have taken a very salutary action. It will have protected its domain under the Constitution and the popular interest while at the same time delegating powers to the Executive which it believes the emergency requires. It will have assured that the terminal point fixed for the loan of power cannot be exceeded and may be shortened, and by these provisions the Senate also made it possible for Congress to retain its function as a full partner in the triune Government of the United States.

BALANCING VETO POWER

These vital considerations were often neglected by Congress throughout the Roosevelt administrations. Beginning with the emergency laws of 1933 to combat the depression, Congress developed the practice of surrendering vast authority to the Executive which the Constitution had reserved to the legislative branch without protecting itself from the Presidential veto power in case Congress should want to reclaim what it had delegated. It takes a two-thirds majority in both branches to override a Presidential veto; a strong President can usually prevent that from forming; and Congress, unless it takes the precautions it did in writing the defense-production bill, often has found that this is the history of surrendered authority.

From the viewpoint of the constitutional division of powers, the safeguards written into the defense-production bill are equally as important as the Senate's approval of the Wherry-Bricker amendment. This linked wage with price controls and required the dual application to the entire economic structure instead of selected parts of it, for, as Senator WHERRY said by way of example, to control meat prices the system must be extended to corn, wheat, cereals, and poultry—must "go clear across the board to be effective."

Counterrevolution in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Counterrevolution in China." written by Rodney Gilbert, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, August 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTERREVOLUTION IN CHINA—TIME LEFT TO REST OF WORLD TO FORESTALL REDS AND TAKE ACTION MAY BE VERY SHORT

(By Rodney Gilbert)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA.—In yesterday's contribution from "this island bastion of liberty and democracy," as my Chinese friends here describe Formosa when on a rhetorical flight in English, I had a good deal to say about the way in which a mass Chinese revolt against Soviet tutelage could and might spike the Kremlin's cold-war guns. I said that many well-informed persons here felt that this could happen within a year. This writer probably gave the impression that he thought so, too; and he does, conditionally. If all the different kinds of guerrilla and underground movements could be coordinated, and if a high-pressure propaganda campaign were to exploit the growing revulsion of feeling against communism in practice and against the subservience of the Chinese Red dictatorship to the Stalinist dictatorship, there could be a genuine mass rising which the armies would first refuse to suppress and would then support.

Whether these conditions can be quickly met or not, this writer is not sure. With adequate financing, some help with organization and international encouragement, they could be met in a hurry. But whether it will be quickly realized in Washington and elsewhere that such relatively cheap encouragement and help could be far more disconcerting to the Soviet Union than massive American rearmament is at this long range an unanswerable question. Yet, if there is to be succesful Chinese counterrevolution, it is exceedingly important that it should get going in a hurry. This is because of the psychology of the Chinese soldier—maybe any soldier's psychology.

It used to be a common saying among the Chinese military chiefs of the civil-war era that, though the average recruit joins the army to eat, and though he is true to his salt ("favors those whom he eats," literally), an army must have a "t'i-mo." In literary parlance this means the theme of an essay. In this connection it means a motive for fighting, a cause. The "theme" may be wholly specious, and a defeated army may find it so in retrospect, as several millions of Hitler's former soldiers now profess to find the Nazi theme. But when an army is rolling into action it is not inclined to examine its theme with a critical eye; and in that exciting hour not 1 soldier in 10,000 is receptive to an enemy propagandist's suggestion that its theme is phony.

Except for the heavily indoctrinated little nucleus of about a hundred thousand effectives which Mao Tse-tung and Chu Teh controlled at the end of World War II, the millions of "grain eaters" who subsequently conquered the Chinese mainland were recruited like any other Chinese army in history. Like every other Chinese army, they were recruited from the poor peasantry who overman the land. They joined to eat. But the Communists then supplied them with plenty of themes. The theoretical Marxist appeal was to a trifling minority, of course. The major theme was that of liberating China from the ruthless, exploiting dictatorship of the fat bourgeoisie.

An important corollary to this was that this bourgeoisie was traitorous to China because it had sold exploitation rights to the American imperialists. Even while this last line was being worked to the limit, the Nationalist armies were denied any theme at all by General Marshall's peace-making teams, because it was esteemed that anti-Communist political education among the Nationalist soldiery would overheat their passions and make it difficult for the opposing forces to be brought into a coalition.

Well, while the Red armies were rolling, the themes supplied by the Stalinist stooges did the trick. But once the northern hordes settled down in South China to what is to them a most uncongenial peace environment, they began to examine the themes and found them phony. Being peasants, they did not like what was being done to the peasants in their own northern home districts, and they did not like what was being done to the people among whom they were quartered. They might be "straw-sandaled southern barbarians," speaking an atrocious travesty on the Chinese language. Their food might be an abomination, and their country might be a foul malarial swamp; but still they are poor, undernourished Chinese farmers, subject still to rapacious official exploitation—under whatever doctrinal authority.

And as for the war having been a holy one for China's liberation from American imperialism, where was it, and where is it? And who are these arrogant Russians from whom the officers take orders with more or less grace and to whom the political commissars are so abjectly deferential? Isn't it probably true, they wonder, that they have been cajoled by traitors into winning China for the Red Russian empire?

Now that is the state of doubt that is known to prevail in many Chinese Red units, and the line of suggestion that is influencing the thinking of some of their highest officers at this moment. If mass discontent were at this writing to start one or another army rolling northward, with the expulsion of the Russians and the extermination of traitors as its theme, it could become a tidal movement and the great propaganda machinery of the Stalinist regime would be powerless against it. But if Moscow can first get a substantial Chinese force into action against the United Nations forces in Korea, and get that army in action to shouting for the obliteration of the American imperialists, the army theme throughout China, from the hour of actual conflict, may only too readily be the expulsion of the Americans from the East. Then it would be next to impossible to get a hearing for the actual fact that China, the satellite, was fighting Soviet despotism's war against civilization and democracy.

Once the existing armies were set on the wrong course and engaged in conflict at any point, it would be easy for the Kremlin's agents in Peking to raise as big additional armies as Russia could equip and train. Eighteen months ago this writer tried to contribute an article to a magazine with a Nation-wide circulation on the uses that Russia could make of China's enormous manpower if the Stalinist conquest of that country were not checked. This was rejected as a gross exaggeration of the possibilities.

A little over 2 months ago few occidental military authorities would have believed that masses of Orientals could be trained and disciplined to fight as the Northern Koreans have fought for a wholly unworthy cause—the enslavement of their whole nation to the Kremlin. But though they may not have taken much stock in the theme supplied them when they started rolling—the liberation of Korea from the agents of American imperialism—no effort to persuade them that their southern kinsmen were fighting for a worthier cause has had the slightest effect on their fighting spirit.

So it would be with an equally well equipped, well disciplined and well found Chinese force; and if Soviet Russia saw fit to equip and train 10,000,000 men, the 10,000,000 men could be recruited; and with an antiforeign theme the 10,000,000 would fight. And under those conditions the masses would be cowed and docile, even though the maintenance of the 10,000,000 meant grinding poverty for 100,000,000.

There is no reason to think that Moscow contemplates any such gigantic effort to set Red China on an anti-American course. It could not be organized in time to anticipate a tidal anti-Russian movement, if such a movement were to start in the near future. But no such effort would be needed to start a greater mass of well-equipped Chinese soldiers than the whole Northern Korean army on the anti-American warpath and have millions chanting the anti-American theme song in a very short time.

So the time left to the rest of the world to forestall such action and supply fuel to a counterrevolution may be very short indeed.

America Can Win the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the July 1 edition of the Saturday Review of Literature, a very responsible and stimulating publication, contains an article entitled "America Can Win the Peace," by Mr. Louis Fischer. This article was called to my attention by Mr. S. Spencer Scott, president of Harcourt Brace & Co., Inc.

The article is so well-written and so timely that I ask unanimous consent to insert it in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA CAN WIN THE PEACE

(By Louis Fischer)

The other night, following a lecture, a member of my audience asked if anyone really understood our foreign policy. There were so many contradictions in the things we said and the things we did, we went on, that he had given up the attempts to comprehend America's purpose in the field of foreign affairs.

Another questioner at the same lecture wanted to know why it was that so few books were available which attempted to explain to the responsible American citizen what our foreign policy was or should be. Back in the thirties, he said, scarcely a month passed without the publication of several important books interpreting or analyzing America's world role. Yet today, when the stakes are infinitely larger, there are few

books which contribute to an informed American public opinion on our foreign policy.

Both these questions, it seems to me, reflect a general confusion and uncertainty in America today over our relationship to the rest of the world and our responsibility in meeting the threats to the peace. This article is an effort to examine the foundations of an American foreign policy. It is also an effort—perhaps presumptuous—to present in rough outline some ideas that might go into dealing with this general subject.

What should be the purpose of the foreign policy of the United States?

Should it be anticommunism? We combat Stalin and bolster Tito. Both are Communists.

Should it be procapitalism? We subsidize capitalist countries and we also reinforce the Socialist governments of Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Burma.

Should it be prodemocracy? We support many democracies as well as the dictatorships in Portugal and Yugoslavia. Some of those who bridle at American aid to Tito would help Franco, whose one-party tyranny is as tough as Tito's.

American foreign policy today is thus pro- and anti-Communist, pro and anti-capitalist, pro- and anti-democracy. Does this mean that the right hand of the State Department does not know what its left hand is doing? Does this reflect confusion in Washington?

I think not.

American foreign policy is attuned to national security rather than to class interests and ideology. The only situation which could drag the United States into war or endanger its safety is Soviet aggression, and the State Department, therefore, devotes its major effort to the frustration of Moscow's expansionist tendencies. It does this, at the moment, by strengthening all those countries that lie athwart the path of a possible Soviet push. The nations strengthened may have different social systems and political ideologies but if they form a barrier to Soviet imperialism they make a contribution to world peace and thereby earn Washington's blessing and bounty.

Individual Americans, including men high in the Truman administration, may shrink from the idea of pouring American money into the exchequers of Socialist or not-too-democratic States. But they know that if for want of American dollars the Laborite and reactionary regimes of non-Soviet Europe collapsed, Russia would have Europe and a Russo-American war would become inevitable.

The United States went into the First and Second World Wars and England fought Napoleon, the Kaiser, and Hitler for the same reason: to prevent one nation from dominating Europe. If today the Soviet Union threatened to conquer Europe (which in present circumstances would mean Asia, too) the national defense of America would be menaced and the United States would feel compelled to go to war with Stalin as it did twice with Germany.

To build a wall against Soviet expansion is thus to stop a third world war. But it is not always possible to choose one's building materials; you accept what is available. Some stones are pink, some red, some gray, some black. The question is whether the stones can be integrated into a bulwark.

Everybody agrees that the Second World War started when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931. The great powers should have resisted Japan, it is now said. But in 1931 Manchuria was ruled by Chian Sueh-liang, a ruthless dictator. Yet the defense of China might have stopped Japan and thereby stopped the landslide which led to the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Similarly, Abyssinia was a backward, slave-holding kingdom when Mussolini assailed it in 1935. Yet democratic action on behalf of Abyssinia would have checked the forces that made the Second World War.

To abandon an area to totalitarian aggression because it has little or no freedom is to condemn it to protracted slavery and, in addition, to hasten the coming of war. Irrespective of the nature of a regime, therefore, it must be shielded from a foreign assault. The marked victim of aggression, however, should not only be saved; it should be led toward freedom. The two processes are related, for democracy is relaxation (dictatorship is tension) and relaxation comes with peace. In Greece and Turkey the alchemy of Truman's gold-transfusions is converting reactionary systems to liberalism; the trend in Greece began after the civil war was ended; it could not have started during the fighting or when the country expected the struggle. Likewise in Turkey American subsidies have given the population an inner confidence in the face of undisguised Soviet designs. And aid from the big Atlantic democracy creates a democratic noblesse oblige.

Thus a foreign policy dedicated to antiaggression and peace promotes democracy and undermines communism. On the other hand, a policy vociferously avowing its anti-communism may defeat itself and for this reason:

When the United States declares that it is engaged in an ideological battle to stem world communism it conveys the impression abroad that this is an American struggle for the survival of private capitalism. Europeans and Asians often draw the conclusions that they can be neutral in this contest, which is primarily, they gather, a clash between the class philosophies of Bolshevik Russia and conservative America.

Emphasis on anticommunism suggests to the outside world that America has launched a crusade to exterminate an enemy of the economic status quo. That theme is then expertly embellished by the Communists to prove that Wall Street is on the warpath against the Kremlin and wants Europe and Asia to pull its ideological chestnuts out of the cold-war fire.

But if the stress of Washington's propaganda were on American detestation of aggression because it leads to war the people of the Eastern Hemisphere would quickly and easily see that this is their fight, for they will be the first targets of a Soviet attack. They would also see that in opposing Russia America is helping them, not using them. This would allay widespread suspicion of and hostility to the United States in countries which have received hundreds of millions of dollars from the United States Government and from generous American individuals.

Neither the past nor present conduct of the masters of Europe and Asia has taught those continents to believe that any government behaves unselfishly; they are accordingly easy converts to the facile Communist thesis that America is building them up for slaughter in another war to be waged for the preservation of American capitalism.

Yet the truth is that in reinvigorating the nations imperiled by Soviet imperialism the United States is saving those nations from death while at the same time legitimately safeguarding its own security and preventing the third world war.

Europe and Asia and part of Africa have known war at its bloodiest and the word peace exercises a potent magic over them. The Communists have captured the word and misshaped it into a mask to conceal the expansionist proclivities and activities of the Russian State and its foreign Communist puppets.

The facts, properly explained, would make America the synonym of peace. But the strident anti-Communist Voice of America gives the Communists and their collaborators a golden opportunity to say that America refuses, because it is capitalist, to live amicably with the Communist third of humanity. The stigma of belligerence is thus pinned on America instead of on Stalin's breast, where it belongs.

The hand helping numerous nations threatened by Russia is the hand of peace but the voice can be misinterpreted to sound like a call for war.

The anti-Communist Voice, moreover, can, if beamed homeward too shrilly, become a cry against domestic civil liberties. In this way anticommunism blunts the weapon that will defeat communism, for the best antidote to dictatorship is liberty.

There are actually indications that Moscow is pleased by the anti-Communist furore in the non-Soviet world. The Cominform, which means the Kremlin, has been prodding the Communist parties of all continents to be more militant and violent and to undertake political campaigns in the national interests of Russia (such as strikes to hamper the landing of American munitions in France and Italy) even though they hurt those Communist parties. On numerous occasions since the Comintern was established in 1919 the Soviet authorities have sacrificed foreign Communist parties to what they thought were Russia's needs, and today Stalin appears to favor the suppression of the Communist movements outside the Soviet Empire because in the illegal underground his agents could control them more effectively and exploit them more completely for the greater glory of Russia uber alles.

Above all, anticommunism, which may be a completely convincing slogan in the United States, is negative and ineffective in many other countries. It has no appeal for Tito or for the numerous Communist-nationalists in the Soviet Empire to whom Muscovite imperialism is irritatingly irksome. Among the hundreds of millions inhabiting the old colonial areas around the Indian and Pacific Oceans, the existing economic order is identified with hunger, while communism, if they have ever heard of it, comes as a promise of an additional bowl of rice per day. Communism does not give them the instantaneous shock of horror it evokes in most Americans. Even in western Europe, at least among the working people and the intellectuals, capitalism would run communism a close race for the unpopularity prize.

American policy makers should understand that not every country has had the fortunate experiences of the United States, where capitalism stands for an extremely high standard of living and considerable personal freedom. Capitalism in Asia, for instance, is reminiscent of foreign rule. It is the bleak past and the black present. It stands for slumps, misery, usury, illiteracy, disease, and domination by a thin upper crust of business barons and political bullies. Anticommunism in the mouth of capitalist America, therefore, arouses little enthusiasm; on the contrary, it arouses the fear of an alliance between the mighty capitalist system of the United States and the unenlightened, predatory, unimaginative domestic class of loan sharks, feudal landlords, and sweat-shop employers. Meanwhile the Communists proclaim themselves the wave of the bright future and paint Russia as the underdog's paradise. As a result Moscow, though totally counter-revolutionary itself, benefits from the revolutionary mood of the East.

Similarly, Russia, though aggressively imperalistic itself, benefits from the widespread anti-imperialist mood. The rise of Slav imperialism is not fully realized in many areas of the globe. After its birth in November 1917 the Bolshevik Revolution anathemized Czarist land grabs; Port Arthur and Dairen were restored to China; Poland and the Baltic states were granted independence; the absolute monarchy's designs on the Turkish Straits, the North Persian oil fields, and Manchuria were renounced and denounced. At the same time Lenin and his lieutenants attacked British imperialism in India and

Burma, Dutch imperialism in Indonesia, and all European and American imperialistic adventures.

Today the British are out of India and Burma, the Dutch are out of Indonesia, the United States no longer lands Marines in Latin America, whereas Russia is back in Port Arthur, Dairen, Manchuria, Poland, and the Baltic countries, and has revived Czarist strivings toward the Dardanelles and Iran.

Nevertheless, millions of minds, especially in Asia and even in India and Burma, do not understand this epochal reversal of roles; they still think England and America imperialistic and the Soviets anti-imperialistic. The memory of Lenin's anti-imperialistic renunciations survives all of Stalin's robberies.

Material to support charges of Soviet imperialism is close at hand and will win credence in China and eastern Europe because of the obvious resemblance between Stalin and his political ancestors, the Czars of Moscovy. The Kremlin's sizzling hate and remorseless persecution of any Yugoslav or Pole or Czech who puts his country's interests above those of Russia (this is the chief reason for all the purges and trials in the Cominform colonies) would make the picture of Soviet domination of subject peoples unmistakably clear were it not for the blurring effect of another image or mirage: America's wish to spread its own type of economic system The focus, therefore, must be on Russian imperialism and on all other imperialisms. Asia, Africa, and Europe would then be less inclined to believe the anti-Americanisms of the Communists.

Except as opposition to Stalin's new imperialism, American hostility to Russia is unintelligible to many outside observers. Literate persons everywhere recall without difficulty the wartime alliance between capitalist United States and the Soviet Union. America, they remember, sent more than $11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease material to Stalin's Communist dictatorship. This gift, unprecedented for size and made without conditions or strings, helped to save the Communist dictatorship from destruction. It also helped the democracies win the war, but it was not pure expediency. Although the Kremlin in May 1939 had dismissed Maxim Litvinov, the champion of collective security and peace, and signed the Nazi pact and immediately thereafter launched on its present career of imperialism, the democracies did not yet realize the scope and intensity of Moscow's expansionist drive. Until the Soviet-Nazi pact of August 1939, in fact, Soviet Russia had annexed no territory. The subsequent annexations, by arrangement with Hitler, in Poland, the Baltic region, and Rumania, were not universally recognized as the foundation stones of the New Soviet Empire. "We couldn't forsesee," Vice President BARKLEY said recently, "that one of our partners in that war * * * would become so selfish and so domineering. * * *"

It was only in 1945 that some heads of democratic states commenced to see the danger of a bear roaming wild in the vacuum created by the defeat of Germany, Italy, and Japan, and by the weakness of France and England. Nevertheless, with a purblindness unmatched in the annals even of modern diplomacy, the west continued to appease Stalin. Not until 1947 did Washington, London, and Paris become adequately alarmed by the mounting ambition of the Moscow dictator.

Then began the cold war of resistance to further Soviet expansion. The expansion is the reason for western resistance to Russia. The expansion threatens world peace and human freedom. It is a much more convincing argument in Europe, Asia, and Africa than anticommunism.

Today, especially in Europe and some parts of Asia, American materialism and class consciousness are equaled by Soviet materialism and class consciousness. A number of politicians and intellectuals in those areas accordingly favor a third or neutral position. But if they were made to see that Russian expansion is the enemy and that it menaces them more than it does the United States they would recognize America as their protector and Russia as the warmonger. They would not fall into the Communist trap of neutrality.

America can win the peace. The cold war can be won and the hot war prevented by rallying the largest number of people to our side. This should be the purpose of American foreign policy and from the purely practical point of view it would be well to realize that more of the 2,300,000,000 people on this earth will respond to the call of peace and anti-imperialism than to any other banner.

The conflict between dictatorship and democracy is undeniable; so is the conflict between communism on the one hand and capitalism and the British Labor type of social democracy on the other. But wars and rumors of war help communism (the Bolshevik Revolution was the child of the First World War and the Red regimes in Eastern Europe and China sprang from the Second) whereas peace, plenty for the lowly, progress, and national freedom create a climate in which the poison plant of communism must wither and die.

Dilemmas and Solutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, while a student at Furman University in my home city of Greenville, S. C., not too many years ago, I met a young fellow student by the name of William C. DeVane. I well remember young DeVane because, like me, he had to earn his own way. We had adjoining newspaper routes. Through the years which have came and gone, William has continued to take advantage of every opportunity and now, for some years he has been dean of Yale College. This is but another example of the fact that there are still oppportunities in this great country for those who are willing to work.

Attached hereto is a copy of Dr. DeVane's address delivered at the recent Furman University commencement exercise:

DILEMMAS AND SOLUTIONS

To anyone connected with American education, this pleasant month of June provides all the necessary materials for a nightmare. Especially is this so if one is put in the unenviable position of being a speaker at a commencement exercise, or perhaps the even more painful position of having to listen to the speaker. Two weeks ago as I lay abed with a fever, I had such a nightmare—induced, no doubt, by my effort to provide a speech that would be worthy of the honor which you have done me in inviting me to be your speaker on this occasion. In my heated dream I seemed to see the whole breadth and length of our sunlit country, and in every city, village, hamlet, and whistle stop, speakers were haranguing with eloquence and gesture our innocent and defenseless youth. The noise was appalling. Elderly gentlemen with upraised arms were making fervid appeals, shaggy-haired statesmen were beating their breasts, and now and again I heard ministers at prayer informing the Lord in passionate terms of what was happening at that time in that place. In my fever, I am sure I heard echoes of the speeches we used to make when we were young—Spartacus to the Gladiators, The Cross of Gold, and I am not sure I did not hear faint echoes of Casey at the Bat. Before a blessed and complete unconsciousness overtook me. I was granted a view of the victims of all this—those who had to listen—and to my astonishment they seemed utterly unmoved—not surprised, but stolid, peaceful, unmoved, even cheerful and enduring, but almost completely unaffected. They had the air of knowing that the storm would blow over, that soon the clamor would cease, the sun would shine again, the seasons would march in their accustomed round, and they would go about the familiar business of the world in the way their fathers and mothers had gone before them—earning their daily bread, raising their families, suffering and rejoicing, failing and aspiring again, in short, living the life of our passionate kind as it is given to us to live.

Now I submit that it is not propitious for a speaker at commencement to have such visions and dream a short time before he is to perform. But it has its good side. It certainly undermines the speaker's confidence in the effect he is to have, but it also tends to shorten his speech. If there is something ludicrous in the sight of all the commencement speakers across the land at this season—as the French cynic remarks, "Old men like to give good advice when they can no longer set a bad example"—there is also something pathetic in the situation. For behind all the speaking and the gestures, and behind the well-deserved congratulations there is a valiant attempt to pass on to our youngsters the wisdom that life has taught us. There is the noble desire to save them, if possible, some of the mistakes and pains that we have blundered into. There is the real yearning to prepare you as you set out for the rough journey you are about to undertake. It is of this love and care of the generations, each for each, that makes our civilization permanent and strong. Blest be the tie that binds.

It is customary on occasions like this for the speaker to say something weighty and of public importance, and to this end I shall address myself. I want to speak for a little while of some of the dilemmas that confront us at this time as individuals and as a Nation, and I want to offer (as my good advice) a solution. Since the world in our time is compelled by its problems to think so persistently in international, political, and economic terms, I must step out of my character as a literary scholar and attempt for the occasion to speak in those terms, though my solutions, as you will see, will be primarily moral solutions, offered in literary terms.

For rather more than two decades the leaders of thought and action in our country have divided into two great and opposed parties—parties which have little relation to our formal political designations as Democrats and Republicans. These groups habitually think of themselves as idealists, on one hand, and realists, on the other. Each group is passionate in its opinions, and utterly convinced that it, and it only, has the answer. Between them we are constantly being asked to make a choice—to choose this or that horn of the dilemma. The unicorn, we are informed, had only one horn, but cows and dilemmas have two. Back in the thirties in our economic and political distress we were told by these groups very sternly and very persistently that we had to choose—the road had only two forks—we had to be Communists or we had to be Fascists. We know now, with the hindsight

of history, that the choice was a false one—that we had to be neither, that we had a good road of our own that only needed recognition, care, and improvement. Nationally, we had the good sense to refuse both horns, and take our own way, though many of our impassioned and injudicious individuals went this way and that, even to the point of conspiracy and betrayal. Our way was and is the way of democracy—of majority rule and minority concurrence, of a constant striving for more economic and social justice, and an abhorrence of violence. Let us take to heart the lesson which that time of stress provided for us.

But now again our idealists and our realists, to grant them the titles which they think they merit, are presenting us with a fictitious dilemma which is not less dangerous for being false. The idealistic schemes for world peace insist that we must either achieve world government now or resign ourselves to an inevitable third world war—that is, we must in some way reach an understanding with the Soviets or face a global war. Our realists have become convinced that we cannot attain a world government or even reach a working understanding with the Russians. They accept the fact that a war with the Russians is inevitable, and move immediately to the logical idea of a preventive war. Their reasoning is that if we must fight the Soviets why should we not choose the time that suits us best.

Now these matters are of such absolute and final importance to us that we must look with the utmost care at the alternatives we are offered, and we must cast about to see if there are not other possibilities. Does history teach us that events are inevitable? Has human will abdicated to the point where it is ready to accept a doctrine of historical destiny as its final answer? Can we give up our judgments and our responsibility in the stress of crisis? I cannot believe it. We are not wise enough to know, nor strong enough to control, the forces which operate in any particular historical event. Nor can we predict what will happen if we start so tremendous an action. We must be very deliberate indeed in accepting any idea of inevitability, and we must take twice as long, at least, before we move from the notion of the inevitability of war to the idea of a preventive war. I need hardly remind you that the next war, if it comes, will be total and atomic. Even the wiser of our military men have abandoned the idea that modern war can give us anything but destruction and death. That way, more than madness lies.

On the other side, let us look at the expectancies of the idealists who believe that we must have a world government or reach a working agreement with the Russians or a world war will be inevitable. To anyone who has studied profoundly the Communist doctrines from Marx to Lenin and Stalin it ought to be clear that the Soviet oligarchy will never come into a world government that the rest of us could tolerate, for such a world government would have to be a democracy implying majority rule and minority concurrence. The United Nations has already met this fact. Moreover, in the Communist logic of history—to which their minds are prisoners—a war between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Nor shall we appease the Russians by soft words and promises or by failing to prepare ourselves for the worst—in their logic these will be taken as signs of our decay and weakness.

Some of our idealists think we can allay the fears of Russia by practicing more liberty and equality here at home. That is a good cause in itself and should be done for its own sake and also because it will make some of the wavering nations trust us more and may cause them to aline themselves with us. But it is idle to think that such moderate actions would impress the Politburo. Only their own revolution will satisfy them.

The simple truth is that the idealist cannot bring himself to believe in the reality of the evil which we face in the fanatic creed of communism. What we confront is a political religion so consistent in its dogmatism that it is able to discount in advance any approach which varies from its doctrine. The hope of peace of the whole world is thwarted by this evil. But there it is, and we will serve no good or useful purpose by blinding ourselves to it with sentimental hopes and illusions.

Must we then come to the Communist conclusion that war is inevitable? I think not. We cannot change the minds of the Politburo, but we do not need to do so. We need only to convince the nations of Europe and Asia which are wavering. If we can contain the Russians we shall be strong enough to frighten them from aggression. Such a moral defeat will not change their minds, but their doctrine will be greatly sapped of its virulence. Tito's rebellion in Yugoslavia against the religious and political authority of the Kremlin has already had a great effect. Will Stalin be forever able to hide the fierce Russian will to power in the false panacea of orthodox Marxism?

In searching for a historical analogy to communism, that wise man, Reinhold Niebuhr, finds it in Mohammedanism. Like communism, the Mohammedan dogma was both political and religious, and the head of Mohammedanism was both sultan and caliph—like Stalin, dictator and high priest. Taking advantage of dissensions in Spain and in the Near East, the great crescent swept into France in the west and to Vienna in the east. In time the tide receded. The creed did not change; the Mohammedans still believe in a holy war, but Mohammedanism does not believe in itself enough today to challenge the world. Must we, then following the historical analogy, fight centuries of bloody wars to contain and drive back communism?

If necessary, yes, but it is not inevitable that we shall have to do so. Communism will certainly use military force to maintain its positions, but its subtler weapons are political revolution and conspiracy. These have been so successful so far that there is no immediate necessity for the Russians to resort to arms. Political penetration is safer and more successful, since it captures a country undestroyed. To meet this subtle war, our defense must be moral, economic, and political. Unless we become desperate we may never have to fight with arms. Our weapons are justice and understanding, economic help, and political wisdom in Asia and Africa as well as in Europe. The idealist must realize that nothing but a superiority of ready power in the non-Communist world can preserve peace in our time; and the realist must realize that our greatest power in this struggle lies in the unity and the moral and economic health of ourselves and our friends. We need not succumb to illusion on one hand, or desperation on the other.

But now, with your permission, I wish to move away from this huge national and international dilemma to one that has particular reference to the South—a dilemma that is not yet clearly seen as a problem of choice by most of us. A person coming back home to Carolina after living elsewhere for a third of a century is struck by the change which has taken place in his absence. I first saw Greenville in the summer of 1913, and I think I saw it for what it was, and without illusions. It was a pleasant little city with very friendly people. It had enough home-owned industry on its margins to keep it alive economically, and enough children to make it happy. Its roots were deep in the country, and one knew that the rivers and the mountains were not far away. There was occasional violence on Saturday night, and there were reported to be one or two wealthy families. The relative poverty of the city did not trouble us much, nor for a while did the great agonies of the nations in the First World War. The little city, like a hundred others in the South was largely home-minded and self-contained. To the boy's mind it was a fine place to grow up in, and he hardly saw the anxiety and poverty, material and cultural, which lay so close below the surface. If people had little to get along with they got along with that little as cheerfully as possible. If the meagreness of life was cramping to our elders, as it must have been, they could and did lull themselves with illusory and romantic talks of ancient grandeur before the War Between the States had destroyed the South. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the old dream of former greatness had paralyzed the will of almost all of the South for present and future action. Our whole society was the helpless and hypnotized victim of the soporific illusion and dream. It was the easy way to lay all our social and material short-comings to the charge of the tragedy which overtook us in the War Between the States and its ghastly aftermath. But the growing youngster saw little of the poverty, the shiftlessness, and casual injustices of that world; what he saw, and remembers with nostalgia, was the easy-going kindliness of the people, the leisure of moonlit summer evenings, and the graces and comforts of home.

But now a change has come over many of the cities of the South. They are no longer small, and they are no longer languid and sleepy. They boast of their progress and their energy; they bustle and bristle with industry and commerce. They are full of enterprise. They begin to be prosperous and wealthy. They cut the trees down to make through streets, they crowd the past out of of their way in the name of progress. The violence and injustice still are very near the surface, but the old friendliness and leisure seem to have disappeared from our ways. Our cities have no character of their own, with a few exceptions, but do their best to imitate New York, Chicago, Detroit, and Pittsburgh. They will succeed only in imitating some of the ghastly, and now almost ghostly, towns of New England—Fall River, Lowell, and Lawrence.

Now to what end is all this? Is it to make life happier? Is the South so hungry for material goods after a long starvation that it must sell its soul?

Here are the two horns of this dilemma: The sleepy, impoverished South of half a century ago; and the aggressive, noisy, and ugly country which we seem to be creating. The first horn has already slipped from our grasp; but we do not need to be impaled upon the second. Here as in the other dilemmas which I have posed there is another way—a way between the sentimental idealism of the past and the fierce and short-sighed realism before us.

But to refuse to embrace either, and to choose and make our own way requires awareness, brains, character, restraint, integrity, courage, and indeed all the virtues that make us an individual and different society. It is for you young men and women to make the South of the future. Take the best of the old and the new. Remember your gracious heritage, and know that you have a way of life which is unique. In keeping life gracious and beautiful and leisurely, there is no objection to using your brains, and even your muscles. There is no command or destiny that condemns you to poverty. Wisdom and conscience demand that you be intelligent, restrained, and just. This, then, is a plea that once again we reject both horns of the dilemma, and find a way for ourselves. None of us would wish

back the pinched and narrow life of the old days; and few of us would desire the crude and ruthless society which has overwhelmed certain other parts of America. The South has something to teach the rest of this country about the good life. It will be a tragedy for the country if the South should lose its own character, and have nothing to say of its very own in the shaping of our national life.

At the beginning of this speech I threatened you with good advice. It is now delivered. Like most good advice it may be reduced to some very threadbare platitudes: "To your own self be true"; "Keep your shirt on, but your sleeves rolled up"; "Use your heads and your hearts"; and "Don't take any wooden nickels"—and since I now come from Connecticut you might add "Don't buy any wooden nutmegs." All this prudential advice makes me feel like Polonius giving counsel to his son. I need not add that beyond prudence are wisdom and justice—austere virtues which are nonetheless the best terrestrial guides we have.

It will be less than gracious to end on the bitter pill of good advice, however well intended. These young men and women graduating today have earned and deserved our congratulations—and with the congratulations go best wishes for a long, prosperous, and happy life. A hopeful country looks to you for better days than we have yet seen in this much-loved country. Those days will come if you will only be true to your best selves.

The Foresight and Unselfishness of Kentucky Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

On several occasions I have placed in the RECORD editorials from newspapers published in the Second District of Kentucky, because I believed the statements therein were food for thought and would be of some benefit to those who might read the RECORD. As a young Member, for the standpoint of service, I have yet to attempt to speak on any subject with the intent of trying to influence Members of the House to vote for or against any legislation, and I shall never be so presumptuous unless I sincerely believe that I can give my colleagues food for thought.

In 1946 I walked into the office of the Congressman who at that time had the honor to represent the same district that I have the honor of representing today, Governor Earle Clements, of the Second District of Kentucky. After passing pleasantries, Earle handed me a letter from Elkton, Todd County, Ky., which is in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky. It was signed by 28 ladies of Elkton who were asking Earle to vote for national military training. Most of these ladies I had the pleasure and privilege of knowing personally. The first signer of that letter was a good woman by the name of Mrs. Louie Weathers, who had lost her son just a short time before. He was a pilot in the United States Army Air Corps. I was so proud to know that in our district there are patriotic, sacrificing citizens who, regardless of their personal losses, had the foresight of what the policy of our national administration should be at that time.

I do not know how our foreign policy is formulated; I do not know how the State Department gages public opinion. I do know that public opinion is something everyone wants and wants it to be favorable. Of one thing I am certain, public opinion is that which even Russia, Stalin, and the Soviet Government seeks to formulate in the world today. I am also convinced that certain persons and organizations and political parties would like to know how to gage and formulate and mold public opinion. All that one has to do is to read the advertisements in the newspapers, and read the mail with the elaborate brochures and pamphlets sent out under every conceivable name, listen to the radio—public opinion is a very precious thing.

As I said before, I believe that what few remarks I have the privilege of making and placing in the RECORD should be food for thought for those who might read the RECORD. I am certain of one thing with reference to Washington and those who operate from an official standpoint, Congressmen up, that the old adage which has often been heard is very applicable, that is, "We can't see the woods for the trees." I do not believe that there is a leader, Republican or Democrat, in the House of Representatives, in the United States Senate, in the State Department, or in the Pentagon, or in, as some of my colleagues at times have sneeringly, unwisely referred, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, now or at any other time, who did not, or now does not, from the bottom of his heart want to do everything he can to bring about the peace of the world, and that any mistakes made by these leaders are of the head and not of the heart, and that there is nothing they personally would not sacrifice to bring about peace.

My colleagues, it is so easy to criticize, so easy to point out the errors of just yesterday. It is easy to stand back and see errors after having time to look here and there, and when we listen for constructive criticism oft times we are given an answer which is cheap, political demagoguery, blaming this person and that person and the other person for apparent mistakes that they made. The true test in my mind that each man who occupies a position of trust can give to himself and receive his own answer—just what have I done, just what help have I tried to give? Have you offered to give any advice or counsel? Have you written and used a 3-cent postage stamp to those who have to make the decisions? Would you envy the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, or our President, our President, yours and mine, when they make decisions whereby if these decisions are wrong, the youth of our country shed blood and die? It would be so easy to just write a note and say, "I know in a small way the burden that is on you to make these decisions, and you forget personalities, and you forget politics, and just let me tell you that I pray for your success and I wish that your every decision shall be correct, because I love my country and I too wish peace for the world."

I received a letter this morning from the best congressional district in the United States of America—a letter which was signed by 100 women of Morganfield, Ky., in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, and I am asking the privilege of placing it in the RECORD in order that those who read the RECORD may see that mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters of men who have served their country in times of war are farsighted enough patriotic enough, and sacrificing enough, to offer the most precious thing which they possess, their sons, their husbands, their brothers, their fathers. As true Kentuckians they offer that precious thing because of the love of their country and for the peace of the world:

AUGUST 17, 1950.

MY DEAR MR. WHITAKER: The 100 members of Griggs-Alvey Unit, No. 48, of the American Legion Auxiliary, believing that a prepared nation is the best insured nation, respectfully urge—when the bill for universal military training comes up, that you please vote "Yes."

We sincerely believe that now, while the dangers of unpreparedness are so evident, is the time to begin the foundations of an orderly reserve training program.

As mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters of men who have served their country in times of war, we ask your support of this bill.

Very truly yours,

MRS. W. F. GREENWELL,
Legislative Chairman, Griggs-Alvey Unit, No. 48.

Bacteria for Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND W. KARST
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the following article taken from the August issue of the Butcher Workman. Under no circumstances should we attempt to economize where the welfare and health of our American people could be placed in jeopardy. I wholeheartedly support these expressions:

BACTERIA FOR SALE

Again, in House bill 7786, an outrageous effort is being made to reduce the number of Federal inspectors in meat-packing plants through a cut in appropriations for this health-guarding governmental agency. The laws providing for Federal meat inspection, along with the Food and Drug Act of 1906, are among the greatest congressional acts in the history of our Nation. Bacteria attacks animal flesh perhaps more quickly than any other substance. Without rigid Federal inspection of meat, it is very probable that

death would be the reward of hundreds of innocent victims in consuming it. We need only to look at the record to review the slime and filth which prevailed in meat-slaughtering plants prior to Federal inspection.

An inadequate force of Government agents carefully examining animal carcasses before and after slaughter would be almost as bad as no inspection at all. There still exists in the sale of meat to the public some very shameful and shocking practices. While such practices may be isolated, they, nevertheless, do exist, and we can prove it. We make the open charge that in some meat-packing plants without Federal inspection animals which are either diseased or dead in the pens are still being processed by disreputable owners and sold to an innocent buying public. In some areas badly crippled animals which could not possibly pass Federal inspection are bootlegged even across State lines by blackguards who should be driven out of the industry.

Instead of the law being weakened, as House bill 7786, if enacted, will do, the whole process of inspection of meat for human consumption should be strengthened. The Senators or Congressmen who vote for a cut in appropriations for Federal meat inspection, which would automatically reduce the number of inspectors necessary, should be driven out of Congress by their constituents back home.

Let's keep our Nation's meat-packing plants clean. Federal inspection has accomplished this. Let's not destroy it.

The Awful Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to an editorial appearing in the Independent Review, of Litchfield, Minn. This editorial says clearly the very things that need to be said today. It fixes the responsibility for the present international crisis squarely where it belongs—on the shoulders of each of us. Peace is not the work of any one man; it is a responsibility that we must share in common.

THE AWFUL RESPONSIBILITY

How many of Meeker County's 19,000 people have done anything during the last 5 years to help prevent the present Korean conflict?

The war is now striking at the lives of each and every one of us as more men are being called up, more names appear on the casualty lists and war hysteria grips us and we begin to fear the relatively petty discomforts of higher taxes, shortages, and economic controls. It is all very distasteful to us. The last thing we want to see is another full-scale war. And yet, if you and I have done nothing to help prevent it, we have very little complaint coming.

It's hard to see the relationship between Meeker County and the world affairs. The natural tendency is to feel that the United States Government is beyond our individual lives and that our thoughts and actions can have no bearing on what our country does in international situations. It is so easy and natural for us to have that attitude that probably 9 out of 10 of us are in that condition of mental stagnation.

And yet, that attitude is defeatist in a land where defeatism is scorned and it is undemocratic in a country filled with political critics of undemocratic and un-American actions.

It is defeatism because it says, "I can't." It is undemocratic because the very essence of our democratic constitution is that each citizen shall have a voice in the Government.

What could you and I have done to help prevent the outbreak of conflict against communism? We could have used our tremendous advantages as citizens of the strongest and most influential country in the world to exert some influence toward true world peace. That sounds like a big order. But it was no bigger, perhaps, than that facing the Thirteen Colonies in 1776 when they set out to win their independence from Great Britain. That job took optimism against overwhelming odds. It took action from individuals like you and I to gain from the several colonies the united action that was needed to bring the strength of public opinion to bear.

Since 1945 there has been a United Nations organization set up for the purpose of keeping world peace. The United States has been one of the main driving forces behind the United Nations. But our Government's policies, inside and outside the group, have not been backed up by informed public opinion. United States foreign policy has been either nonexistent or inconsistent.

Further, it was obvious that the UN never has had the strength needed to back up its decisions. We all knew this, but only a small percentage of Americans have tried to do anything about it. One group that tried to arouse public opinion in a democratic manner is the United World Federalists who called for a UN police force and some lessening of national sovereignties to the world organization. But UWF efforts fell mostly on deaf ears. People regarded such pleas as "idealistic" and "unrealistic." There was defeatism and an apparent loss in faith in the democratic manner of winning action. Everything was left to the leaders of the country, and most of us withdrew into our own small lives, trying not to notice the troubles of the world and trying not to notice the finger of responsibility that was pointing at us.

We failed to face the fact that it was up to America. While we realized that Europe had lost her power and prestige we didn't see that in the eyes of the world we had taken Europe's place as a leader. The Norwegian farm woman in 1947, the French newspaperman in 1948, and the west German school boy in 1949 all looked to America for leadership through the troubled waters of international confusion. They looked with searching eyes at their American visitors, wondering if there was the wisdom needed to act as world leaders. America was the country with enough power to exert some world influence.

The way it's turning out we haven't been wise enough. We are like a small girl holding a rifle while a big smart guy tries to sneak up behind and take the rifle away. We failed to provide the stimulus to our elected representatives to carry out a wise and consistent program of world leadership.

If the Korean war develops into a major conflict, then it has been too late. But if the Korean trouble is settled and we are given a pause to take another look at our world situation, America will have another chance to lead the ideological fight to a successful, peaceful conclusion, and the people of Minnesota, along with the rest of America will have a chance to unite behind a policy of wise internationalist action.

Under the Sheepskin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., Thursday, August 24, 1950.

UNDER THE SHEEPSKIN

We have in the United States today a state of things forecast by the late swamp-water Mussolini, Senator Huey Pierce Long, of Louisiana. Long was a shrewd exploiter of human credulity and one of his greatest talents was that of recognizing a brother from afar.

HE KNEW HIS KIND

That is why he was so quick to identify the motives and practices of F. D. Roosevelt in the presidency and to tangle with him for control of the Democratic Party, the New Deal and the economic and political vitals of the United States.

Long was not in Washington for many years. He came here with the November 1930 election. He was erased by assassination, still not to this day fully explained, on September 8, 1935, as he walked with bodyguards along a corridor of the Louisiana State capitol.

But while he was here, he devoted himself so wholeheartedly and efficiently to wrestling for power with Roosevelt that none could have regretted his passing less.

You get an insight into Long's understanding of political behavior in our time from his famous statement that "when fascism comes to the United States it will come as anti-fascism."

The essential character of fascism was its socialism. Indeed, its inventor, Benito Mussolini, was a Socialist Party hack in Italy who saw the necessity of switching labels in order to sell his poison to a people already onto the corrupt character of socialism, formally identified.

He did this so cleverly that an Austrian paper hanger named Hitler imitated him in Germany with fearful success, but without even concealing the source of his inspiration. "Nazi," is just a contraction of "National Socialist Party" in German.

THE NATURE OF THE BEAST

In the same year that Hitler rose to power, 1933, so did Roosevelt. In the United States as in Germany and Italy, the central idea of socialism was that government should run everything, and that whoever objected to that would get his lumps.

In Germany and Italy, the lumps were delivered simply and forthrightly at the precinct station house. In the United States, the torture was more silent and clever.

First, it was called "NRA," then, "antitrust law," which latter, under the administration of Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, caused the criminal prosecution of numerous highly respected and invaluable American industrial geniuses.

In all cases, the object was the same: to make the citizen bow his neck in the presence of the flunkey sent by government to command him in his conduct and the use of his private property.

Now, you may ask wherein that differs from communism. Is not Truman denouncing Stalin in the same language that Roosevelt used on Hitler and Mussolini?

Secretary of State Acheson bristles his mustache at the Communists' "slave-labor

camps." Mr. Roosevelt's pliant tool in office, Cordell Hull, used to maunder on with the same language, but lacking the stagy thunders, about the same monstrosities in Germany. The only change that need be made is to insert "Russia," where we used to read "Germany." Or "Italy." Or "Japan."

COMMUNISM COMING AS ANTI-COMMUNISM

Thus it is that the American people have absolute need to be wary of communism coming to this country under the guise of anti-communism.

Let us look well and carefully for the wolf under the sheep's skin, friends.

For what is discovered by Truman, Acheson & Co., respecting communism that has not always been so? Socialist Mussolini and Socialist Hitler looked to the United Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia in the 1920's for their handy guide to organization of human society.

They professed to be great anti-Communists, but communism was their real goal.

Now comes Truman demanding that the United States give up the last vestiges of its character, allegedly to withstand communism in Europe and Asia.

We are to accept here without murmur rising war and taxes, price control, production control, consumption control, wage control, and finally, absolute, unquestioning obedience to the dictates of men in office.

The political watchword is that we must keep America strong by screwing down ever tighter socialistic restraints on peaceful private usage of wealth.

That is the device by which masses of citizens all over the world have been persuaded in this century to hand to politicians the keys to the kingdom. None has yet safely delivered the people involved anything better than war and ruin.

Now we are getting it all here with a vengeance, as communism is thrust upon America in the disguise of anticommunism.

If Huey could see us now.

My Friend, Mary Norton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to add my bit to the many fine tributes which have been paid to our illustrious colleague, Mrs. MARY NORTON, of New Jersey. We in New Jersey have long been conscious of the fact that our entire State is honored by the outstanding representation of this great legislator. Mrs. NORTON has been for many years my personal good friend and the good friend in need of the people of New Jersey. In our State anyone with a problem knew that he could turn to Mrs. NORTON and his cause would be met with sympathetic understanding and helpful consideration. Mrs. NORTON has a rare combination of fine qualities; she has the forceful and effective determination of a great statesman, combined with the sympathetic understanding of a gracious woman. It has been an honor for me to serve in the same Congress with MARY NORTON and it is with profound regret that we now accept her decision to retire to the quiet and leisure of private life, which has been so well earned.

I wish to insert here an editorial from the Trentonian, published in Trenton, N. J., expressing the high regard in which the people of New Jersey hold MARY NORTON. The editorial follows:

FLOWERS FOR THE LIVING

Retirement of that grand old lady of Congress, Representative MARY T. NORTON, Jersey City, at the end of the current session will leave her fellow-lawmakers and attachés of the House, regardless of their political affiliations, genuinely saddened. Leaving the familiar scenes where she has worked for 26 years as an honest, courageous, and fair legislator also will tug at the heartstrings of this gracious lady now facing the sunset of a useful life.

Three Congressmen, one of them a Republican, this week paid an unscheduled tribute to Mrs. NORTON, who was moved to tears by the sincere words of those members. Representative E. E. COX, Democrat, Georgia, called her "a faithful and diligent public servant." A Republican, Representative K. M. LECOMPTE, Iowa, said, "the House has been honored by Mrs. NORTON's long service."

An even finer tribute was offered by Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts, Democratic leader, who said Mrs. NORTON was "one of the outstanding persons of either sex that I have ever met." Surely they were deserved bouquets for one who has served her constituents well.

MARY NORTON has received many honors and some "firsts." At one time because of a committee chairmanship, she was for several years, the unofficial "mayor" of Washington, D. C.

Early in her career Mrs. NORTON was the first Democratic woman to be elected to the Hudson County Board of Freeholders. She also was the first woman in the East to be elected to Congress and the first Democrat of her sex to be elected from the entire country. She was the first woman to be appointed chairman of a House committee, the Committee of the District of Columbia.

In her own native State, Mrs. NORTON was the first woman to be elected Chairman of the Democratic State Committee. Here in Trenton, Rider College, in August 1937, awarded her an honorary degree, making her the first of her sex to be so honored by that institution.

MARY NORTON could have continued to be reelected to Congress. It is true her health has not been too good, but that did not cause her to take a "I do not choose to run" attitude. Her reasons, and we respect them, go much deeper. Republicans and Democrats alike will join in wishing her many more years of health and happiness.

The Late Frank Phillips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DIXIE GILMER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. GILMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of a great Oklahoman, a genuine American, Frank Phillips, retired president of the Phillips Petroleum Co., of Bartlesville, Okla., who passed away August 23, 1950, at the age of 76.

A narrative of the rise of Frank Phillips from an obscure beginning as a farm boy, then barber and banker, to a position of fame and fortune is like the pages from a story book, and his achievements in the boom days of the flush oil fields of Oklahoma are a chapter in the saga of the oil business which has become one of the Nation's greatest industries almost entirely within his lifetime. He saw the industry advance from doodlebug and pure hunch wildcatting, with coal oil as the principal product of oil refineries, to its present position where almost every form of scientific knowledge is employed in the many phases of the industry. He knew the excitement of the gamble in buying oil leases and experienced the disappointment that comes from drilling a dry hole when the last dollar has been staked on the venture. When at last success crowned his efforts he expanded his interests to practically every oil field in the two Americas, and the Phillips Petroleum Co., which he organized, has become the world's greatest independent petroleum company, and its products are known throughout the world.

From the great wealth he accumulated he made generous philanthropic contributions to youth movements, particularly the Boy Scouts of America, in which he was greatly interested. He gave liberally of his wealth to churches of all denominations and to many Oklahoma civic organizations. He was particularly active in preserving the Indian, pioneer, and natural history of Oklahoma. The Woolaroc Museum and Wildlife Preserve at Bartlesville, founded for this purpose, is one of the show places of Oklahoma. He gave more than a million and a half dollars to the Frank Philipps Foundation, Inc., to enable it to carry out a charitable and educational program.

The great multitude, from every walk and position of life, who mourn the passing of Frank Phillips are consoled in their grief with the knowledge that his was a full life, rich in the receipt and disbursement of many blessings, and that his extensive contributions to the economic, cultural, and spiritual betterment of his fellowmen make the world a better place because of his having lived.

Shipment of Strategic Materials to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams and news item:

GREENVILLE, S. C., *August 24, 1950.*
Congressman JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Just read in paper of war material shipped to Russia. Think responsible party should be shot for treason. If lawmakers don't stop it think they are guilty of same. Fast losing confidence in our Government.

E. L. LANDRETH.

AUGUST 25, 1950.

Mr. E. L. LANDRETH,
Greenville, S. C.

Re tel: Doing utmost to prevent disgraceful dealings with Russia and punish those who do.

JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS IN BANNED UNITED STATES METAL SLIPPED TO REDS IN BRITISH PORT

A shipment of more than $100,000 worth of strategic molybdenum from the United States was transferred to a Russian ship in a British port on July 1, officials reported today.

Commerce and State Department officials said they were investigating fully to determine responsibility for transshipment of the steel-hardening material, which is banned from direct export to the Soviet Union.

A State Department official said this Government wants to make sure that this sort of thing does not happen again.

It was understood that the first report of the transshipment to reach American officials came from British sources. It could not be learned exactly how the British found out about it.

Officials said investigation so far had determined that the molybdenum cargo did not go through British customs and therefore did not require a British export license. The British ban export of such strategic materials to Russia.

The cargo was reported to have been shipped from the United States in May after an export license had been issued to an American firm, presumably to send the molybdenum to Britain. But it was reported transshipped to the Soviet vessel steamship *Beloostrov* in a British port on July 1.

Men For High Office Should Be Chosen for Their Ability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, these are trying days for the democracies and the democratic system of government. The world is eagerly watching every step we take in the direction of safeguarding the principles of human dignity and free government according to the wishes of the people. At this time we must set an example to the world at large, the free nations as well as those suffering under the yoke of iron curtain dictatorships, by showing that we are practicing good government for the welfare of the people.

I am deeply concerned over the current development in the political situation in New York State where the major parties are giving undue consideration to the selection of so-called balanced tickets based on religion, national origin and geography, instead of choosing the men best fitted for office. Loyalty, ability, and character should be the criteria for high office, otherwise we lower our standards of good government. By resorting to religious or racial balancing of our political tickets we set dangerous precedents which some day may result in widespread corruption and deterioration of our true democratic system of government.

Several years ago the Democratic Party of New York State nominated HERBERT H. LEHMAN for Governor, and Irving Lehman for chief judge of the court of appeals—both of them members of the Jewish faith—and no one raised the question of a "balanced" ticket. On numerous other occasions the State ticket had two or more Irish Catholics. The Democrats won State-wide elections with an Italian on the ticket and at other times lost with one on their ticket. No one used their racial background for or against them. They were Americans who were selected on the basis of competence and unquestioned character. We should continue that practice today. That is the American and the democratic way.

The following editorial from the New York Times of August 23 is very much to the point:

THE PARTY CHAIRMAN AT WORK

Because of the sudden rush of events that adds an election of a New York City mayor to the November calendar, the chairmen of the political parties are seized with a greater responsibility than usual, it seems to us, in the naming of slates. The great majority of our citizens can take no direct part, at this preliminary stage, in choosing the candidates for major city and State offices.

The field in both major parties for the offices of governor, United States Senator, and mayor of New York seems to be fairly wide open, except as to the Republican candidate for governor and the Democratic candidate for Senator. Many possibilities are mentioned. This is all to the good. Too early a foreclosure of choice is detrimental. Delay can do no harm. It may even make its contribution to good government, which is, after all, the citizen's goal in the democratic process, whatever the politician's aim is.

The Republicans have a fresh and unexpected opportunity thrust upon them, with the withdrawal of Mayor O'Dwyer from office. We might have expected that this would be received with rejoicing. On the contrary, if we read the signs correctly, the event seems to have spread something very much like dejection. Yet this picture might be changed almost overnight, we would surmise, if the right man could be brought forward to run for mayor. There appears to be a Republican tendency to avoid alliance with the Liberal Party on the city race, and yet one need only look back at the figures of the 1949 election to be newly reminded how essential such alliance is for success against a Tammany candidate.

Newbold Morris received 570,713 votes on the Republican line at the last election; he had 373,287 on the Liberal line. Mayor O'Dwyer polled 1,266,512 as a Democrat. Vito Marcantonio of the American Labor party received 356,626 votes. It is obvious that only a fusion of the Republican, Liberal, and other independent elements can win the coming election for mayor, if the office is to be taken away from the Democratic Party, and it would appear to us to be lesson No. 1 in the political primer to look for a candidate who would encourage the Liberal Party to turn in the Republican direction. To fail to do so is to write off New York City automatically and to place a heavy liability against Republican chances for carrying the State as well.

As firm believers in the two-party political system we can only view with concern an attitude of resignation or defeatism this year that would tend to confirm New York City as almost permanently in the Democratic column. If the prospect at the moment is for only a half-hearted effort by Republicans to win the city election, it must be deplored by all those who are interested in good government. We hope that the present appearance of apathy is deceptive, and that with the final choice of a candidate and the defining of issues a constructive, two-sided contest will emerge. The independent voter would then have a real choice.

There are various aspects of the current situation that must cause concern in those whose only desire is to see fitness for the office as the criterion for choice of candidate. Among these is the frequently mentioned necessity, as the Democrats particularly seem to see it, of picking a "balanced" ticket. This means that the choice places must be nicely rationed out, to avoid hurting anybody's feelings, as to religion, race, and borough. It means that if the best three men for Governor, Senator, and mayor all happened to be of one faith, that wouldn't do at all. It means that we would have to go down into second and third best, if necessary, to be sure that Protestant, Irish Catholic, Italian Catholic, and the Jewish faith were somehow taken care of. But even that would not be enough, because Brooklyn, Manhattan, the Bronx, and Queens must also have their cut in the political pie. If this seems, to the layman, to make the game of New York politics a little complicated, the assumption is correct. There is no indication, however, that it makes for better government.

A Citizen Speaks Her Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, in these trying days it is extremely helpful for a Representative to have the benefit of the thinking of the people back home. Altogether too few of our people take the time and the trouble to express themselves by writing their Representatives It is encouraging to note the increase in the number of letters from those who are thinking seriously concerning the course their Government is taking. It has been my privilege to receive this week a communication from a constituent I know personally, who expresses with clarity a feeling typical of the reaction of many with whom I have been corresponding recently. Her views, as a housewife and as a citizen, are worthy of the attention of every Member of the House of Representatives. Under permission granted by the House, I am including the text of her letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It reads as follows:

AUGUST 18, 1950.

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
Paris, Ill.

DEAR MR. JENISON: I know that you are only one of the many lawmakers we have at Washington, but since you are from our own fair city, I would like to express my views about the excessive amount of spending that is going on in Washington. I know that it requires a lot of money to operate a Government such as ours, but I cannot help but feel that it should be operated on the same basis that we as individuals have to use to balance our budgets. We cannot just go out and secure extra money for the things we all want but are not within our reach, and I do

not feel that our Government should do this either.

I hope the time will come, in the very near future, that when a vacancy occurs among the Federal civilian employees, that, if at all possible, someone else take over some of the duties of that person, and start eliminating as many as possible of these jobs.

I also hope that something can be done about a reorganization of our postal system.

I would like to live to see the time that Government employees will receive only 2 weeks vacation with pay, and their sick leave with pay be eliminated, like the majority of the average American family have to do.

I know that you agree wholeheartedly with me that the United States Government should live within its means, just as we all try to do. I realize all of the benefits they are trying to make available to us would be grand, but if we cannot afford them, let's just pass them by.

Anything that you might say or do in Washington to promote these views of mine would be greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

LOUISE SPROULS (Mrs. D. L.).

Bethlehem Is Opposed to Internationalization of Jerusalem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that many of my colleagues will be very much interested in reading an account of present conditions in the ancient city of Bethlehem, the cradle of Christianity, and the current thinking of its inhabitants. This account was published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 29, 1950.

Several points stand out in this report from Bethlehem: First, that its people are opposed to internationalization of Jerusalem and the immediate vicinity, including Bethlehem; second, that the people of this ancient city realize that they cannot survive economically if they are separated from Israel and from the Jordan hinterland; third; that as Christians they seem to feel closer to Israel upon whom they depend for straightforward news of the world, for their electric current and other needs. The problem of Jerusalem's future is scheduled to come up before the United Nations Assembly meeting in September. Delegates of the various member-nations should be informed of the Bethlehem situation, as well as other considerations, and should reject outright all internationalization schemes for the Jerusalem area.

The article from the Christian Science Monitor of July 29, 1950, is as follows:

BEWILDERED BETHLEHEM GROPES FOR A LEAD

(By Ray Alan)

BETHLEHEM.—Alongside the main Jerusalem-Bethlehem highway stand notices in red Hebrew characters before which Biblical travelers along this ancient route would have shaken their heads in bewilderment. The austere elegant script is older than Christendom—its idiom distressingly twentieth century: Danger minefields.

The Israel Army lifted most of the mines last December to allow Christians to make their annual pilgrimage to the Saviour's birthplace, but it is still unwise to stray into the gardens and olive groves bordering the route.

Israel holds the first 3 miles of the road and King Abdullah's Arab Legion the remaining five as well as Bethlehem itself. The town's normal contact with Arab-held Old Jerusalem and the rest of Abdullah's kingdom is now by way of a rough emergency road.

Five times as long as the main road, it passes through wild country in which armed hold-ups are frequent, especially at night. Some of the bandits are former Arab League mercenaries and pro-Mufti irregulars abandoned, since their defeat, by their commander, Fawzi el-Kawukji, who is now enjoying considerable, if somewhat mysterious, wealth in Damascus. Others are refugees and local peasants, resentful, in their poverty, of the opulence of the Jordan merchants and officials who flash daily along the road in glittering American cars.

The farmers of eastern Palestine and Jordan have suffered almost as much as the refugees from their leaders' war on Israel, since they are now unable to export their produce to Jewish New Jerusalem and the coastal towns.

Like every other Arab town in Palestine, Bethlehem has its share of depression, lawlessness and refugees; yet, somehow, it stands out, as ever, different from the rest. Its unique significance seems to have blessed both place and people with a happy individuality.

Ninety percent of its 12,000 permanent inhabitants are Christians. Its mayor is the only Christian mayor in the country. A major part of the town's revenue comes from emigrants in America and, in normal times, Christian tourists. Its women are among the most nearly emancipated in the Arab lands.

"By a strange chance," wrote Kinglake, over a century ago, "alone of all places in the land this Bethlehem escaped the moral yoke of the Mussulmans and heard again, after centuries of dull oppression, the cheering clatter of social freedom and the voices of laughing girls. * * *"

There is less laughter in the town today and some Bethlehemites fear that with King Abdullah the Mussulman yoke may return. But Bethlehem has preserved its individuality by losing its traditional status as a political backwater.

The Egyptians were the first to occupy the town after the British withdrawal in May 1948, but when the Jews defeated the Egyptian army, the Egyptian area commander, Wakid Bey, informed the mayor of Bethlehem off the record that his troops could not be relied upon to maintain order.

Mayor Issa (Jesus) Bandak, although hitherto anti-Abdullah, went at once to the Jordan monarch's winter palace at Shuneh and invited him to take over Bethlehem. Arab legion troops poured into the town the following morning. After months of bickering, that reached its climax when Egyptian bombs were dropped near Abdullah's winter palace, the Egyptians were frozen out of Bethlehem.

Consequently, both Egyptian and Arab League circles are hostile to Mayor Bandak; his life has been threatened. But the townsfolk give him credit for taking Christ's birthplace out of the war. King Abdullah has shown his appreciation by overlooking the mayor's political past and by entrusting him with missions to Rome and Athens aimed at persuading the Vatican and the Greek-Orthodox hierarchy to oppose internationalization of Jerusalem.

Mr. Bandak's negotiations were not completed until after the United Nations vote on Jerusalem had been taken. He found the Vatican cautious but not unwilling to negotiate with Abdullah if events at UN did not go according to plan. In Greece, on the other hand, Mr. Bandak succeeded in persuading both Foreign Minister Tsaldaris and Archbishop Spiridon to reverse their support of internationalization at the earliest opportunity.

The townsfolk appear to have been won over to his and the King's views, though many of them admit their dislike of Abdullah and their distaste at being governed from that dirty village, Amman, Jordan's capital. Ideally, the Christian population of Bethlehem would like to see the town administered directly by some western power, preferably France—popular mainly as a result of the activities of the French hospital and charitable missions there—or the United States. Britain is not yet forgiven for abandoning the country to chaos and war.

But the Christians realize that economically Bethlehem could never survive separation from the Israel coastal plain and the Jordan hinterland, a compelling argument against internationalization, too. Union with Jordan appears, therefore, the only path open, though Arab League and Communist sympathizers unite in explaining to the cafe crowds that this is equivalent to a return to British rule.

There are now 12,000 refugees in Bethlehem, not all from battle zones. Many are Hebronites who have transferred their entire households, afraid the Jews may one day attack their district and take reprisals for the hideous 1929 pogrom there which destroyed one of the oldest Jewish communities in Palestine.

The poor of Bethlehem are angry that they too are not eligible for relief, but there have been no incidents such as I have witnessed in Lebanon where Red Cross stores have been attacked and supplies stolen by local villagers. The wealthy of the town are still wealthy, their main annoyance being the lack of electric lighting: The power came from Jerusalem. The Israel authorities are willing to "export" current to Jordan-held areas, but Arab peasants and merchants have cut down all the power cables for sale as fencing, and in a dozen different roles.

From dawn to dusk cafes are packed with idle crowds of men playing "triktrak" to while away the hours between news bulletins from every medium-wave radio station within reach. Cairo, Damascus, and Jordan-controlled Ramalla (the former mandatory broadcasting service) spend much of their time abusing and contradicting each other, and Bethlehemites say they often have to rely on Israel's powerful Arabic service to straighten out their impressions of the news.

The visitor who comes here to ask these people their views is himself surrounded by questioners. The bewildered hordes around the loudspeakers seem, vaguely, to be groping for a lead—without knowing where to look.

New Dwelling Units Started in July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper release prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the

United States Department of Labor titled "One Hundred and Forty-four Thousand New Dwelling Units Started in July":

July was the best home-building month in history, according to the United States Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics. Preliminary BLS estimates indicate that 144,000 new permanent nonfarm dwelling units were started in July, bringing the total for the first 7 months of 1950 to almost 839,000. Each month this year home builders have broken records for comparable months of previous years. By the end of July new housing activity was 54 percent above last year's January-July volume, as measured by new dwelling units begun.

Included in the first 7 months' total for 1950 are 13,100 publicly owned dwelling units. For the same period in 1949, public housing totaled 25,800 units.

Complete reports for April boosted the figure for that month to 133,400, a gain of 7,400 over the Bureau's preliminary estimate. Although rental housing (units in two-or-more family structures) showed a gain of 32 percent when the first 4 months of 1949 and 1950 are compared, the 1950 volume of single-family starts was greater by 68 percent.

Reports from the Bureau's regional offices indicate that the housing boom has been sustained in part by builders' efforts to get scheduled construction under way before any further rise in prices and before pressure on building materials supply becomes more severe. The immediate impact is increased housing starts. The delayed effect may be a more-than-seasonal downtrend in later months of the year. Despite peak production of building materials, price indexes have been climbing steadily. Lumber prices reached an all-time high in June, pushing the wholesale price index of all building materials to 202.2, 6 percent above the June 1949 figure. By August 8 the wholesale price index of all building materials had risen to 212.7.

On the basis of preliminary reports of local building permits issued during July for new residential construction, some leveling off appeared in the western and most northern sections of the country. However, substantial gains occurred in southern regions. Among the cities showing marked increases in the number of new dwelling units authorized were San Diego, Calif.; Miami Beach, Fla.; New Orleans and Shreveport, La.; Tulsa, Okla.; and Memphis, Tenn.

Number of new nonfarm dwelling units started, 1948, 1949, and 1950

1948	931,600
January	53,500
February	50,100
March	76,400
April	99,500
May	100,300
June	97,800
July	95,000
August	86,700
September	82,300
October	73,400
November	63,700
December	52,900
1949	1,025,100
January	50,000
February	50,400
March	69,400
April	88,300
May	95,400
June	95,500
July	96,100
August	99,000
September	102,900
October	104,300
November	95,500
December	78,300

Number of new nonfarm dwelling units started, 1948, 1949, and 1950—Con.

1950:	
January	78,700
February	82,900
March	117,300
April	[1] 133,400
May	[2] 140,000
June	[2] 142,000
July	[2] 144,000

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary.

Brooklyn Boy Awarded Highest Honors in Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn is very proud these days of its newest war hero, Pfc Marvin Koppelman. This lad was recently awarded the Silver Star for knocking out two enemy roadblocks in the Korean fighting, and he has now been cited a second time with an oak leaf cluster for another act of bravery against the North Korean Communists. These are the highest honors yet to be awarded in the Korean war.

I am particularly proud that a boy from my home borough has proven himself to be such a gallant fighter for democracy. Those who are prone to reach hasty conclusions regarding the merits or demerits of so-called minority groups, who together make up the entire population of this country, should realize that these boys know what they are fighting for. There are many more like him on the fields of battle.

I urge all my colleagues to read the following editorial from the Brooklyn Daily Eagle of August 24, 1950:

A BROOKLYN WAR HERO

Brooklyn may well be proud of another of its sons whose fighting courage and high determination in the face of overwhelming odds have brought honor to himself, the United States Army, and his native borough. Although only a private first class, Bazookaman Marvin Koppelman has already won the Silver Star, highest honor yet awarded in the Korean war, and, further, has been cited for an oak leaf cluster, by which the Army signifies a second award of that high honor.

Private First Class Koppleman, whose home is at 513 Christopher Avenue, won his first Silver Star for knocking out two enemy roadblocks with a light bazooka. Now he has been cited for the second award for equally effective and even more daring action. His unit almost overrun, he took a 3.5 rocket launcher and held off the enemy until his comrades pulled out. Knocked down a mountainside by a mortar explosion, he recovered in time to lead the men of a surrounded battery to an ambulance which he drove to safety despite heavy machine-gun fire.

Men like Marvin Koppelman, unconquerable even in the face of overpowering attack, have kept this country's democracy safe in the past. Now they are proving again that while a dictator's slave soldiers may win the first battles, they can't win the final, all-important one.

Fat Fees to Lobbyists Contingent on Passage of Certain Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, of which I am chairman, has just mailed to all Members of Congress copies of part 3 of our hearings entitled "Contingent Fee Lobbying."

In contrast to the 1,411-page volume we issued recently on the housing lobby—a virtual encyclopedia of organizations, methods, techniques and financing involved in the effort to influence Congress on housing, rent control and related legislation—our printed record on Contingent Fee Lobbying is quite tiny, only 39 pages.

It is, nevertheless, a most valuable document from the standpoint of the morals and ethics of this particular lobbying practice, and some of the material it contains will, I believe, come as a surprise to some Members of Congress.

CONTINGENT FEES INVOLVE PRIVATE REWARDS FOR CONGRESSIONAL DECISIONS

There are more than 2,000 registered lobbyists, not all of them active in each quarter, but most of them take a continuing interest in legislative issues involving their employers. Most of them work on a salary basis, or on a retainer, in the case of lawyers. For many, if not most, of them, lobbying is just one of several duties. It may be their most important duty, but if they are officials of trade associations or of unions or of other organizations having representation down here, they are not engaged exclusively in lobbying activity. They are paid according to their value to the organization, or by some such standards, and they receive, generally speaking, the same income whether the legislation they support is enacted into law or not. Of course if they roll up a good record of success in getting their proposals enacted, I imagine their salary or retainer would rise accordingly.

However, a lobbyist working on a contingent arrangement has an altogether different situation. A contingent fee is one based upon the lobbyist's effectiveness in having a course of action adopted by Congress.

We are all familiar with these arrangements where they involve private claims against the Government. Every private bill which is introduced carries a clause to the effect that no more than 10 percent of the award of money made by the bill shall be paid to any lawyer or agent for services in having the legislation prepared, introduced and passed. So that kind of fee is recognized in all claim cases and when we pass a private bill making an award of money we know that up to 10 percent of that award will go, probably, to an attorney.

It is on public bills, public laws, involving questions of national policy,

where contingent fees may be dangerous. Usually they are not generally known about by Members of Congress in voting on the legislation involved.

Under those circumstances it will frequently come as a surprise to a Member of Congress to learn that his vote in favor of a particular bill has resulted in the payment to a contingent fee lobbyist of a fat fee.

SOME EXAMPLES OF CONTINGENT FEES

For instance, in connection with the excise tax bill passed earlier this year by the House, there is a provision exempting reconditioned, repaired and rebuilt automotive parts from the 5 percent excise tax. This amendment was proposed by the Committee To Remove Discriminatory Automotive Excise Tax. This committee has as its registered lobbyist a Chicago attorney, Mr. Harold T. Halfpenny. When he registered as a lobbyist on April 14, 1949, he said his fee, including expenses, would not exceed 10 percent of the actual tax paid for this purpose during 1947, and that he would receive this fee if the tax on reconditioned, repaired, and rebuilt automotive parts were removed. Passage of the act, as approved by the House of Representatives, could, it is estimated, bring Mr. Halfpenny a total fee of as much as a half million dollars.

The Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee has a lobbyist registered as their agent, one Samuel P. Haines. He received a retainer of $10,000 when he was engaged early in 1948. He was also given an expense allowance of $15,000 for the purpose of helping him call to the attention of Congress the need for reduction or repeal of the 20 percent tax on cabarets or dine and dance establishments. The moment a bill was introduced to repeal or reduce this tax, Mr. Haines was to receive an additional $25,000 for expenses. He has thus received altogether about $50,000.

If the tax were reduced from 20 to 10 percent, Mr. Haines would be paid a bonus of $35,000. If the tax were reduced to the prewar level of 5 percent, Mr. Haines' fee would be $50,000 instead of $35,000, making a total return to him of $100,000.

The national fur industry tax committee engaged Mr. Paul A. O'Bryan as its Washington representative during most of 1949. He was paid an annual retainer fee of $12,000. However, if the 20-percent excise tax on furs were reduced 10 percent, he was to receive a bonus of $10,000, and if the tax were removed entirely, his bonus would be $25,000 rather than $10,000.

The associated fur coat and trimming manufacturers engaged Mr. Thomas J. Downs as a lobbyist in the Eightieth Congress. He was to be paid $10,000 as a retainer as Washington counsel on all matters affecting the fur industry plus a fee of $15,000 in the event the excise tax on furs were cut from 20 percent to 10 percent. If the entire tax on furs were repealed, and if this were done on or before July 1, 1948, he would have received an additional fee of $25,000.

There is pending now before the Congress a bill to limit the number of taxicabs in Washington. A Baltimore judge, Joseph M. Wyatt, was engaged by about seven different cab companies in Washington to represent them in having this bill passed. Judge Wyatt was advanced $1,500 for expenses. If the bill to limit the number of taxicabs in Washington is enacted, Judge Wyatt will thereupon receive a fee of $16,000.

ARE ARRANGEMENTS OF THIS SORT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

There is nothing illegal under present law about any of the arrangements cited above. In conformance with the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, these and similar contingent fee lobbying contracts have been reported to the Clerk of the House. Presumably all of the committees of Congress dealing with legislation in which these lobbyists were interested knew of these contingent fee arrangements. I say presumably, because that is the theory of the Lobbying Act—that is, the act requires that these arrangements with lobbyists be reported to Congress and the presumption is that Congress would inform itself about them from the public records. Actually, however, I do not believe that these arrangements were generally known by the committees handling the legislation.

For instance, following a hearing by the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities on May 18, 1950, on the subject of contingent fees for lobbyists, the House Ways and Means Committee on June 2 reversed an earlier action and rewrote the excise tax bill. This action, if ratified by the Congress, would deny Samuel P. Haines the bonus for which he had been working for several years.

Haines appeared before us at our hearing on May 18 and the deal under which he was to receive either $35,000 or $50,000 as a bonus, depending upon whether the excise tax on cabaret bills was reduced to 10 or to 5 percent, was widely publicized. This arrangement had been written up before and presumably was well known—particularly since Haines himself had reported it to the Clerk of the House earlier in 1948—but after our hearing on this matter, many Members of Congress expressed amazement and concern over the Haines contract. The House Ways and Means Committee had already voted to reduce the cabaret tax from 20 to 10 percent. This would have meant a $35,000 fee to Haines if the bill had become law in that form. However, at its meeting on June 2 the Ways and Means Committee reconsidered its action on the cabaret tax and voted to make it 15 percent. Haines thus would get no bonus.

I am not prepared to say or to claim that our publicizing of Haines fee arrangement was the major factor in persuading the Ways and Means Committee to revise this section of the excise-tax bill and make the tax 15 percent instead of 10 percent. But I do believe and I am personally convinced that the action of the House Ways and Means Committee was influenced by a reluctance on the part of the members of the Ways and Means Committee to follow a course of action which would automatically result in the collection of a fat contingent fee by a lobbyist.

THE DANGERS INVOLVED IN CONTINGENT FEES

A lobbyist whose pay depends upon delivery by Congress of a specific legislative proposal certainly has an incentive to go to any lengths to earn his fee. Lobbying in America today is not, generally speaking, the sinister and corrupt force it used to be. It cannot succeed through bribery. We know that. We know that the Congress of the United States cannot be purchased. But a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, do not know that. Finding it sometimes fairly easy to bribe some local officials, some of our citizens mistakenly have the idea that politics and government in the United States rest on the same corrupt principles as we know they have in some other countries. Even some otherwise intelligent businessmen in America believe that money strategically used can buy legislative or governmental decisions. Wherever that has occurred it has been truly scandalous because it is so rare.

But when a lobbyist is engaged to seek to influence congressional action, and when he offers to make his fee contingent upon the successful carrying out of his assignment—that is the passage of the law—and where the fee is sizable and the expense is sizable, the employer of that lobbyist would, I am almost certain, be under the impression that money talks in lobbying as it does in so many things.

Now as a matter of fact, the Congress of the United States passes the laws it does because a majority of the Members of that Congress sincerely believe that those laws are in the public interest.

We know that, but a surprisingly large number of Americans do not know it. Therefore, when lobbyists receive fat fees resulting from the passage of certain legislation the inference must be for a great many Americans that the lobbyist is being paid for using his influence on Members of Congress or perhaps even for bribing Members of Congress. It is a bad thing, I believe, for lobbying to have this taint. It is bad in a representative form of government for the Congress to be under the unjustified suspicions resulting from this kind of lobbying arrangement.

It is my own personal feeling that contingent fee arrangements for lobbyists should be prohibited.

MOST STATES WITH LOBBYING LAWS PROHIBIT CONTINGENT FEES

In our volume on contingent fee lobbying which has been distributed to the Members of Congress appears the verbatim provisions of all State laws prohibiting contingent fee lobbying. There are 21 such States. The printed hearings also contain a great deal of legal background on the issue, much of it supplied by the Legislative Reference Service. I think all of this material can be most useful to us.

Mr. Haines, the contingent-fee lobbyist for the Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, testifying in defense of the contract under which he has been working, made an interesting point which may be quite valid, even though I personally believe contingent fee arrangements should be prohibited in lobbying.

He said, on page 15 of our printed hearings:

I would say that if the law strictly prohibited a contingency fee it probably would be done on the side anyway and the Government would never know about it; but where it is completely disclosed, and where the people have nothing to hide, operating for a committee such as I am operating for, a very legitimate business, for people all across the country, the committee would stand, and the Congress would stand, to find out more about the operations of a lobby if they permitted a contingency, but required that it be filed in detail, such as we have done.

Mr. Haines may possibly be right. With all of the State statutory provisions against contingency fee lobbying, the fact remains that there have been very, very few prosecutions and convictions under these State acts. I think Mr. Haines and the other lobbyists who acknowledge their contingent fee arrangements when they registered were very forthright and aboveboard in doing so. I think our reporting form should perhaps be revised to ask specifically about contingent fees.

But in any event, whether these fees are prohibited or not, I think it is obvious to the Congress that such fees have their dangers. I don't think the Congress likes to be put in the position of having someone collect a fat fee as a result of a congressional decision. Congress acts in its wisdom and in its judgment, and it is poor policy, it is damaging to the prestige of representative Government, to have lobbyists collect on the basis of that judgment. Frequently the lobbyist who receives a contingent fee might have been totally lacking in any influence upon the Congress; he may have had absolutely nothing to do with persuading Congress to take a particular step. But when he collects his fee his employer may not know that; his employer may believe that the large sums of money paid to this lobbyist may actually have been the factors involved in the decision made by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of Members of the Congress this hearing booklet we have issued entitled "Contingent Fee Lobbying," which is part 3 of the hearings of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities.

Spoon-Feeding Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sunday Oregonian of August 6, 1950:

SPOON-FEEDING EUROPE

This is to accuse the administration of having permitted the American people to drift into a position of greater jeopardy than they ever before have known.

It is not new for America to be in danger. Our people could have suffered defeat in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, or either World War. They could have been fragmented by the Civil War. But no fundamentally comparable hazard has existed in these past troubles—not even in World War II. In the past there always have been modifying conditions. We have been too remote for ultimate conquest, and until World War II our opponents were never so far away from our thinking that we were compelled to look on defeat as identical with cultural annihilation.

Now, however, science and human organization have made war truly universal. And this coincides with the rise of Russia as the challenging force—a country which would restore all of civilization to dictatorship and which disavows the Christian principles of decency—which looks on the individual as a lost dot in the formation of the state, with the state devoted to those who operate it.

If it can be agreed that the penalties of defeat would be far beyond anything they ever could have been in the past, let us examine our proposition that we have been allowed to drift into a situation where we could suffer these penalties.

Most important of all—and little observed—is the fact that the great powers of west-European civilization—France, Britain, Germany, Italy, and latterly Japan—have now virtually washed their hands of responsibility for world developments.

This of course is readily recognizable in regard to Germany, Japan, and Italy, where the tentative peace conditions fix the picture. But few people seem to have observed the degree to which Britain and France have abandoned their roles in history. France makes no pretense whatever of having military forces capable of importance in the military future of Europe—an astonishing situation for the land of Napoleon. And we should not blind ourselves to the reality that Britain under socialism is making convenient use of pacifism. It costs less to be pacifistic, and a domestic program is involved. Britain is definitely doing the minimum in regard to the Korean war and in regard to the defense of Europe.

So here we are. The great and decisive nations of the history books have abandoned the field to an America which did not want the responsibility in the first place and which is miserably unprepared for it.

What are we doing with the responsibility? And that is where the pinch comes. This page feels that except for the Marshall plan—a plan which itself was more or less accidental—the administration of our country has fallen tragically short of meeting the problems which confront it. The Communist sweep of China and the threatened debacle in Korea have forced us to face our failure in Asia, but we are still generally unaware of how exposed we are in Europe.

Consider this from the London Times of a few days ago:

"The message given in the House of Commons by both the Defense Minister, Mr. Shinwell, and Mr. Churchill, was that, apart from the atom bomb, western Europe has almost no immediate defense against Russian attack. The only time left to the west is that between now and the moment when the aggressor may himself have large numbers of atom bombs."

The purpose is to emphasize this recognition by Europe's best-informed and most influential newspaper that, from the practical standpoint, the formerly great powers of western Europe have done little to prepare against the ground threat of Russia. And of course the American occupational forces in Germany are little more than a token force.

It boils down to the reality that western Europe lies virtually helpless before the huge Russian armies of Russia, if these can operate without destruction by American atomic bombs.

That is a situation which is ridiculously unfair and which those directing our country never should have permitted. The United States does not owe prosperity to western Europe so much as western Europe owes military service to our common future. France, for example, is quite capable of again becoming a great military power, equal or even superior to the Russians. What did it lose in the late war except moral stamina? Yet here we have the factual picture of formerly decisive France relinquishing western Europe to whichever opposing force may happen to get there first with the most.

Probably the accurate answer is that a moral sickness lies on western Europe. The frustrations of the two World Wars, and the shift of power from France, Germany, and Britain to the United States and Russia, have created an atmosphere which one cannot judge by reading history.

Western Europe remains the center of much of the earth's material resources, and its trained manpower. But western Europe seems to have lost its will power. It is just taking what comes.

And in the face of this most complicated world problem, we have a not-too-smart American administration trying to get along.

Obviously, it hasn't done too well. The dimensions of its failures in Asia remain to be written. China was lost; and in Korea, whether or not our troops are driven from the peninsula, our humiliation has been extreme. In the rest of the continent the Communists are certainly on the offensive. And in Europe, where the final test is likely, we have got ourselves into a decidedly thin situation, with little help from the formerly important states. These now leave it all up to us.

Under the circumstances, this page can only suggest that the administration reform itself, and soon. Overnight, perhaps.

The United States has been expending and exhausting its resources to rebuild the Western World. Let the Western World begin some sacrifices of its own to protect what we are trying to build for them. There is one thing certain, that we do not have the manpower to police the earth.

Resolution of Mature Americans, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present herewith a resolution passed by Mature Americans, Inc., of Washington, D. C. This organization has for its purpose the insuring of greater economic, physical, psychological, and social security for retired men and women, and the conservation of their capabilities, intelligence, and judgment. This organization is trying to break down the barrier of age that excludes many able Americans from obtaining employment. Today, after the age of 60, an applicant finds all employment books closed to him.

The fact remains that there are literally thousands of people beyond the age of 60 who could fill many necessary positions as well as they ever could, and an artificial limit to age is a pretty hard blow to the 17,000,000 people in the United States over the age of 60. All of them are voters and it is evident that this organization of Mature Americans

is not speaking for a limited few but an almost overwhelming body of the voters in this country.

In this resolution the Mature Americans are merely asking Congress to take into consideration the ever-changing costs of living that make inadequate tomorrow the funds which help them exist today. If the whole business world wants to cast from work all citizens who have reached the age of 60, the Federal, State, and municipal governments have a much greater burden to bear. I am glad to include this resolution with my remarks and I intend to follow it up with continued efforts to bring justice to the aged of this country. They not only have the right to life but to live above a condition of beggary. The resolution follows:

Whereas world conditions indicate that the American people are face to face with a situation which will cause a sharp new spiral of commodity price increases which will raise the cost of living in America; and

Whereas it is recognized by all authorities that payments to the aged and unemployed under the present and currently proposed social-security laws are woefully inadequate for healthful and dignified living: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is urged to amend the social-security laws to the end that payments in the future, under the law, be tied to the cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor of the United States Government, or to some other designated, flexible index, so that as the prices of the necessities of living increase during the years to come the beneficiaries of this act shall be assured of at least that minimum of financial assistance which it was intended they should have by the Congress when the law was given approval. It is further resolved that copies of this resolution be put into the hands of all Members of Congress of the United States, to the press, and that it be reproduced in the next issue of the bulletin issued by Mature Americans, Inc.

Resolved unanimously by the officers and members of Chapter No. 1, Mature Americans, Inc., at a regular meeting of the organization in the District of Columbia, August 3, 1950.

Mrs. CLEONIE COONLEY,
President.
SIEGFRIED SCHMALBACH,
Secretary.

Letter of Art Watson, of White Sulphur Springs, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter to the editor of the Meagher County News, White Sulphur Springs, Mont., by Mr. Art Watson, a cattle rancher of that town whom I have known as a friend for many years.

Mr. Watson's letter attracted so much favorable comment that it has been reprinted in pamphlet form by the editor of the newspaper, Mr. Fred Ward, and has received wide circulation in Montana.

The letter follows:

DEAR FRED: Many times you and I have gone across the street and, over a cup of coffee, cussed and discussed conditions of the Nation, State, and politics. Again, with 1,250 miles between us, and minus the coffee, I want to talk with you.

I am fast becoming a man without a party. A study of the deceptionist spineless Democrats and gutless go-along Republicans leaves them no attraction for me. That leaves only the Communists. One outstanding feature of the Communists is, we know what they are trying to do. Their avowed objective is the destruction of our way of life and form of government. While the Democrats and the Republicans are preaching democracy and freedom they are in reality marching us into socialism, communism, or what have you, faster than "Good Old Joe" or the "Ghost of Lenin" ever dreamed it could be done.

When government sinks to the low level of taking the majority of your money away from you, then offers you half of it back in exchange for your vote, then takes half of that back in order to complete the vicious circle, I am wondering what a definition of communism that would emanate from Washington could read like.

Workers are docked a percentage of their wages for a social-security fund and the deception that is held out to him is a life of ease with plenty in his or her old age. If you attain old age (65) you have a meager income that would not buy your soup, but wait a minute. The reward is only for those in a bee colony who would be called the drones. If you still have some pride and a little ambition and through a combination of both earn over $14.99 per month, you are a plutocrat and not entitled to any compensation. Now, what becomes of this enormous social-security fund? Is it set aside for God's chosen people who can qualify for it? Oh, no! It is dumped into the general slush fund and used for any one of the million legerdemain, financial schemes that have become so numerous and complex that even the eagle on a dollar, after 1 hour of circulation through the New Deal, Fair Deal, vote buying, sausage grinding machine, never again finds its nest.

Instead of the money being left in the social security till, it is thus pilfered out and a bond inserted in lieu thereof. I am informed that we have commitments for over $8,000,000,000 against this fund and slightly over sixty million with which to meet it. Oh, well! That's easy. Under this sleight-of-hand financing we'll just write another check and throw in another bond. Another headache for our posterity if they aren't bled to death before birth.

A party told me the other day that he thought the Brannan plan for agriculture was the most workable and simple plan yet devised. I told him I agreed as to the simple part, but what amazed me was to think we had anybody in our midst who could be so simple as to think it up.

We are told that the budget must be over $40,000,000,000 per year, mostly on account of national defense. Yet our bigwigs tell us and continually warn us that we are wholly unprepared. Have we become so simple that we dare not know the truth? It appears that little effort is being made to keep the Russians from knowing the facts, so why is it so necessary for us to remain in ignorance? I'll admit that ignorance is of vast importance if we are going to stand on the deck smiling while the ship sinks.

I am afraid, Fred, that I will be labeled a reactionary. I am somewhat hazy as to the meaning of that word. Is a man a reactionary who believes in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights? Who believes in free enterprise and the principle that the majority of the fruits of a man's labor belongs to him? Who believes in a government of the people and not a people of the government? Who believes that the principle of charity to your more unfortunate neighbor is your inherent responsibility and cannot be usurped by government without serious injury to the concept and standard of Americanism?

Who believes that the officers of government are servants of the people and not their dictators? Who believes that anyone or any group who advocates the overthrow or abolition of our way of life is a traitor and should be so dealt with?

Who believes that deception by legislation is the greatest type of anarchy? Who believes that children should be taught from the cradle that the right to vote and the duty of guarding that right and the duty of exercising it is the guardian angel of freedom?

Who believes that man prospers by the sweat of his brow and not by the decadent dust of his idleness? Who believes that economic stability of our Nation is vastly more important than the political expediency of our party?

If a firm belief in the return to these principles brands me a reactionary, then I am proud to be the greatest reactionary of our time.

May God Almighty in His infinite wisdom awaken the American people to what is being done to them.

Sincerely,

ART WATSON.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—This letter written by Art Watson, a cattle rancher in the lower valley of Smith River in Meagher County, has created wide interest. Many calls have come in for copies of the issue of the Meagher County News of March 29 which cannot be supplied. For that reason the letter is reprinted in pamphlet form, in the hope that its thoughtful message may reach a wider circle than the limited circulation of this country newspaper.

FRED WARD, *Editor.*

Only by Locating and Appraising the Errors of the Past Can Responsibility Be Fixed, Public Opinion Informed, and a Sound Course Charted for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the country are very much aroused and concerned over what is going on in Korea. Call it what we will, it is war, and our military is doing its utmost to carry out the policy of the administration.

The average citizen does not know what that policy is; in fact, I doubt if there is anyone in the Congress who can succinctly state what the administration's foreign policy in the Far East has been and is at the moment. In these circumstances, politics should not be charged every time a question is asked or a criticism is offered of so vague a thing as our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an editorial in the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram which is well worth reading. This is an independent newspaper and certainly cannot be accused of Republican partisanship. The editorial reads as follows:

DEMOCRACY AT WORK

Before the four active Republicans of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued their manifesto, it was evident that American foreign policy toward Asia was apt to be an issue in the congressional election campaign. The manifesto made foreign policy the major campaign issue. For the statement of the four Republicans, approved by Senator VANDENBERG, who was unable to be present, holds the administration responsible for having left the way open for Communist forces to invade South Korea.

With America fighting a war and needing to present a united front, there is a natural disposition to deplore a partisan battle over foreign policy. This disposition is the stronger because so much has been said and written these last few years about bipartisanship in foreign affairs. But the Republican statement cites the United Nations, the Greek-Turkish aid program, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Pact as achievements of strong bipartisan leadership and cooperation. It contrasts these achievements with what has happened in China, Korea, and elsewhere in Asia. There, it declares, the policy followed has been purely administration policy.

Sharp retorts have come from the Democratic side. Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, declared the Republicans are making a "petty-fogging attack." Senator MCMAHON says they are trying to get votes by claiming a share of the credit where policies have succeeded, and disavowing responsibility where policies have failed.

But the Democrats cannot brush aside the fact that foreign policy toward Asia is strictly a Democratic product. Only for Europe has American foreign policy been a bipartisan product. The administration has reserved for itself the making and carrying out of American policy toward the Far East.

Three years ago Senator VANDENBERG declared that bipartisanship in foreign affairs was confined to quite narrow limits. He declared that it applied to the United Nations and to the peace treaties in Europe. Then he added, "I have had nothing to do with China policies, or Pan-American policies, except within the United Nations." And in subsequent statements he made clear his position that the Republicans could not be held responsible for far eastern policies because the Democrats had refused to permit them to share the responsibility for drafting them.

America's policy toward Asia has never been bipartisan. Therefore, there is no break with the concept of bipartisanship in what the four Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee have said. As a matter of fact, President Truman in the 1948 campaign minimized the Republican contribution to foreign policy. He proceeded to break off bipartisanship almost as soon as the election returns were in. Meanwhile things went from bad to worse in China. Early this year the President began trying to bring about more bipartisanship. John Foster Dulles was brought into the State Department. But the administration moves were late and too little. They left the uncomfortable feeling that they were dictated not by statesmanship but by partisan political reasons.

They were the moves of a politician of the ward level, not those of a world statesman. Mr. Truman owes his political career to the fact the he was elected to the Senate by the help of a political machine efficient in ward-level politics. Thus we have as President a politician of obscure qualities in a position that requires vision, leadership and a vast degree of selflessness.

To what extent our far eastern policies might have been different if the Republicans had helped to fashion them nobody can say. But certainly they would have been different. For with both parties fashioning them they would have been examined critically. But this was not done. Now the policies will be debated in a congressional campaign.

This can lead to highly constructive results. The chief defect in our far eastern policy has been that it was never clearly defined. It has been negative in character, twisted and changed to counter new developments. It is not too late to salvage something from the mistakes and errors. But this can only be done if the country is fully informed as to where the policy was weak and why.

Only by locating and appraising the errors of the past, can responsibility be fixed, public opinion informed and a sound course chartered for the future. Thus in the debate we shall have an outstanding example of American democracy at work.

Hon. J. Hardin Peterson, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present when my colleagues joined in tribute on the floor of the House to the Honorable J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, who is retiring. It has been my happy privilege to serve on the Committee on Public Lands with Mr. PETERSON since coming to the Congress. I most heartily wish to join with my colleagues on the committee and in the House in expressing admiration for Mr. PETERSON and in voicing appreciation of his outstanding record as a Member of Congress and a member of the Public Lands Committee and especially as the efficient and accommodating chairman of that committee.

Although I can appreciate his viewpoint and I realize that he has earned the right to retire and be closer to his family than is possible here, I regret very keenly his leaving his activities here. It is men like J. HARDIN PETERSON that our country cannot afford to lose when statesmanship is so needed in Congress. He has made a great chairman of the Public Lands Committee. He has been patient, considerate, understanding, and always helpful. Although the Public Lands Committee handled a great number of bills, some of them of great importance, such as the statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska, reclamation projects, and mining legislation, he gave each subject personal attention and was helpful to the members regardless of which side of the committee they belonged.

Yes; the committee and Congress are going to sorely miss him but I want to say to my friend, PETE, that we all wish him well and our hope is that he and Mrs. Peterson will enjoy relaxation from strenuous duty to the full. He must know that we will cherish in our hearts an abiding affection and a deep respect for him. Our good wishes go with him.

Get Ready To Back It Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal of August 20, 1950, entitled "Get Ready To Back It Up."

GET READY TO BACK IT UP

Harold Stassen made a very interesting proposition the other night when he suggested that the United States notify Soviet Russia that the next act of aggression on the part of a Soviet satellite would bring war to the territory of the Soviet Union.

It is a proposition that, if we could carry it out, would bring an end to the cold war and insure peace for a considerable length of time. It is a proposition that we imagine most citizens of the United States would like to see put into action.

It is, however, a proposition that we are in no position to employ. The war in Korea has demonstrated the sad fact of our unpreparedness to back up any such statement of intentions. If we served notice on Soviet Russia today that the next aggressive act by a Soviet satellite would bring an invasion of Russian territory or the dropping of a bomb within her borders, she would only laugh at us.

The Russians know as well as we do that we have our hands full with so insignificant an opponent as the North Koreans, and that we could never in our present state challenge so huge and well-equipped a nation as Russia herself.

The Russians know that most of our assertions of intentions to defend the free world against aggression have been bluster similar to the ridiculous assertions of Secretary of Defense Johnson. Once, years ago, it was the policy of the United States to speak softly and carry a big stick; now we blurt loudly about what we are going to do, but have only a popgun to back it up.

We should like to see Mr. Stassen's suggestions put into operation. It would save the world from the threatened war. But before we can put anything like it into effect we have to be prepared to back it up.

We should start now doing what Secretary Johnson and the Truman administration should have been doing all these years since the end of World War II. That is, building a strong Defense Establishment that will be able to take care of itself.

We had better put politics aside, forget about the November election and the effect preparation wil have on it, and go all out for military preparedness. We had better begin doing something about building the Defense Establishment Secretary Johnson told us we had.

Then, when we have the power to back up our statements, we can tell Russia we mean business and not have her laugh in our face. Then, and only then, can we expect to have our words carry force and bring about results for the good of the world.

Concurrent Resolution To Seek the Establishment of a United Nations International Contingent Under an Autonomous United Nations Police Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, out of suffering and evil many of man's noblest institutions have been born. The tragedy in Korea underscores the fact that the independence, the safety, the very survival of the free nations of the world depends upon collective action. It emphasizes what has been true for some time: that a threat to freedom in Poland, in Hungary, in Italy, in Korea constitutes a threat to our freedom here in America. As Benjamin Franklin remarked:

If we do not hang together then we shall hang separately.

The Korean war has pointed up the necessity for effective international efforts to preserve the peace and to protect freedom.

Establishment of a United Nations military contingent would be a tremendously heartening step forward in man's effort to achieve a world based on law rather than on force. Even though limited in size and scope this force would give dynamic backing to the persuasive principles on which the United Nations was founded. It could well be the beginning of an international police force of such power and influence as to deter future aggression. The important thing now is to establish the practicability of such a contingent as a nucleus for further expansion. A real international police force, functioning on an accepted and unquestioned basis and acting with national armed forces under a joint high command, can create world conditions favorable for the establishment of a dependable peace with freedom.

Editorial Tributes to Hon. Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under extension of remarks, I am glad to submit herewith the following editorials from the Jersey Journal and Jersey Observer, both published in Hudson County, N. J., eulogizing Hon. MARY T. NORTON and referring to the tributes paid her on the floor of the House a few days ago. The editorials follow:

[From the Jersey Journal]

NEW TRIBUTES FOR RETIRING MRS. NORTON

Not so long ago Mrs. MARY T. NORTON, who will close 26 years of continuous service as a Member of Congress when the present session shortly adjourns, was honored on the floor of the House of Representatives, where women Members presented Mrs. NORTON with a gold and diamond bracelet and men Members, regardless of party, extolled her.

Yesterday afternoon there came a new and unexpected ovation when Jersey City's woman Representative, while busy handling bills for the House Administration Committee, was suddenly interrupted by new tributes that emanated from various Members of the House and that touched Mrs. NORTON so deeply that she was soon in tears.

What the Republicans and Democrats said about Mrs. NORTON yesterday afternoon was but an echo of the sentiments of New Jersey voters who have marked with pride for a quarter of a century the outstanding record of New Jersey's woman Member in the House of Representatives.

[From the Jersey Observer]

A FEW WORDS ABOUT AN ELDERLY LADY

A few days ago in the House of Representatives in Washington there was a scene so unusual that it deserves to be set aside in the memory as one of the things to recall, even to repeat to grandchildren.

Representative MARY T. NORTON, of Jersey City, had obtained the floor to introduce several bills approved by the committee of which she is chairman. After she had performed this duty, another of the Members of Congress, a Republican, asked and received permission to speak to the membership.

He said that he realized that this session of Congress is nearing its end, and that he and others had known of Mrs. NORTON's illness recently, and of the fact that she is not seeking reelection to the House after 25 years of service. He thought, he said, that it was fitting to pay tribute to Mrs. NORTON, since it was possible that the Members might not see her on the floor of the House again.

Of course no sooner had the Republican spoken than a Democratic Member sought also to speak of his party's gratitude to the 75-year-old Jersey City woman Member. After that the heartfelt tributes came thick and fast.

Representative NORTON was deeply affected. She soon made no pretense of hiding her feelings. She wept openly in the presence of all of these friends, with great sincere tears rolling down her cheeks, as a lady may when she feels that a good cry is best. In words she said some simple thing, like, "I thank you sincerely." But it is to be noted that the House of Representatives probably never before witnessed tears so genuine, and probably it will be many years ere they are privileged to witness the like.

It is vividly impressed to observe a collection of ambitious and vigorous young men and a few women, many of whom most likely fought tooth and nail against Mrs. NORTON at one time or another, so completely captive at such a time.

We are so happy to know that in the House of Representatives, variously described in heated debates of their own making as a place most unlikely to harbor any humane feelings, that the Members can be wholly gentle and well bred when the chips are down. We are perhaps too ready to think of Congress (Senate and House) in terms of a thundering Daniel Webster, a horse-trading "Little Matty" Van Buren, a bulging-browed Borah.

Of course, in all soberness, we shall not have lost the services of Mrs. MARY NORTON. She might fold her hands now, and still her work would go on for several generations. Such services as she gave, such examples as she set, do not end abruptly. They have an aftermath of men and women trying out her footsteps long years after.

How can a congressional tribute be supplemented? Words seem so inadequate when they are required to be heroic. But we are glad there is a heaven. If there were not, we should have to create one for MARY NORTON.

The Politics of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stewart Alsop:

MATTER OF FACT—THE POLITICS OF PRICE CONTROL

(By Stewart Alsop)

The level of hypocrisy is rarely low in Washington, but it is now reaching a new high watermark. This is best illustrated by the current wrangling between Congress and the administration in the matter of economic controls. All concerned are aware that rigorous and painful controls are going to be necessary. And all concerned are chiefly interested in unloading any unpleasant political consequences on the opposition.

On the one hand, the Truman administration is, as usual, talking out of both sides of its mouth. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson has now said publicly what he has been saying privately—that defense costs will go up to the $50,000,000,000 level in the near future. This Johnson policy means something like total mobilization. And no sensible man has the slightest doubt that if defense spending really goes up to this level total economic controls, including rationing and price and wage controls, will be absolutely essential.

Yet, while Johnson is attempting to conceal the tragic consequences of his economy program by outbidding everybody else on rearmament, the official administration line on rationing, price and wage controls still is that "the President doesn't want them." Thus, the Johnson policy on defense spending and the Truman policy on economic controls neatly cancel each other out.

This is precisely the sort of messy nonsense which has been causing the political stock of the administration to slump steadily ever since Korea. In the meantime, the conservative coalition in Congress is also indulging in sly political shenanigans. For example, the Wherry-Bricker amendment to the defense production bill is quite obviously designed to put Truman on the spot by handing him totally unworkable legislation.

This amendment provides that if the administration wants to control anything, it will have to control everything. If it becomes desirable to hold meat or steel prices in line, for example, it will also be necessary to freeze the price of morris chairs or the wages of beanpickers. In the meantime, no administrative machinery is provided to enforce this legislation, which goes further than OPA ever did in wartime.

The explanation of this sudden apparent thirst for controls in men like WHERRY and BRICKER is really very simple. The administration is to be confronted with the alternative of attempting to enforce the unenforceable, or of having no controls at all. The latter is, of course, the real objective of many who voted for the amendment. But these statesmen will then be able to answer the anguished protest of the hard-pressed voters by saying, "We voted for controls, but Truman won't use them."

This kind of petty political maneuvering is nothing less than tragic in these times.

And the tragedy is compounded by the fact that, in the view of those best qualified to judge, this country, is perfectly capable of supporting a very high level of defense spending for a very long period, without wrenching the whole economy out of shape.

Even before Korea the national economy was moving rapidly toward the level of output of $300,000,000,000 projected for 1954 by Chairman of the Economic Advisers Leon Keyserling. Indeed, the expansion has been so rapid that the economic advisers have now raised their sights to a fantastic $350,000,000,000 level by 1955.

This means that the astonishing fecundity of the national economy should supply enough for all, even with a high percentage of the national product going into guns instead of butter, tanks instead of automobiles. The best estimate of sensible men, who, unlike Johnson, do not have to cover up frantically for past errors, is that defense spending can be held to a level of about $35,000,000,000 a year. This is only about 13 percent even of the present national product of $270,000,000,000.

This sort of spending need by no means spell economic disaster. About 40 percent of the national output was going to the military during the last war, and the real standard of living actually improved. This miracle cannot be repeated, of course, without a sensible control program. To prevent a ruinous inflation, painful measures will be necessary—very high taxes, tough allocation, commodity credit and farm price measures, almost certainly some selective price, wage, and rationing controls, for which stand-by administrative machinery should be authorized immediately.

With a sensible control program, the garrison state which this country must now become can be that apparent contradiction in terms—a reasonably prosperous and comfortable garrison state. But if the Truman administration continues indefinitely to talk out of both sides of its mouth, while the opposition in Congress slyly maneuvers for political advantage, the economy will go smash, and our garrison state will be very far from comfortable. This now seems rather likely to be our well-deserved fate.

Why Are We in This Mess?—Editorial No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that the memory of the American people be refreshed as to the tragic consequences resulting from our arming Japan. It will be recalled that we furnished the scrap iron and oil and gas and much armament to enable Japan first to butcher the Chinese and later to kill and maim our boys. This furnishing of war materials to Japan finally resulted in Pearl Harbor. It is a well-known fact that at the present time we are furnishing war materials to foreign countries, which we call our allies, and which are now transshipping these war materials to Russia. There is little doubt, if any, that much of this material is now enabling the North Koreans, under Russian leadership, to murder and maim our poorly equipped boys fighting in South Korea. It would almost seem as though the policy which has been pursued over a long period of time by the administration has been the result of communistic influences within our own Government. The facts seem to point unerringly to this conclusion.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled "Why Are We in This Mess?":

WHY ARE WE IN THIS MESS?

Five years ago Japan surrendered, ending the biggest war in history, and the world entered upon an era of peace, or so everyone believed. The United Nations had been organized, it would deal promptly with any future aggression and war was to be a thing of the past.

What has happened in five crowded years to bring the world to the brink of another war, one which promises to be more terrible and destructive than the last one and which threatens the very existence of modern civilization? People everywhere are asking themselves this question as they watch the war news from Korea and wonder what will happen next.

The obvious answer is that the United States has lacked the kind of leadership it needed to cope with the ruthless Soviet dictatorship wnose objective is to subjugate the world. But there is more to it than that. Even the wisest of leaders would have been hard pressed to find a solution to the problems which arose as a result of decisions made at Tehran, Yalta, and other conferences during the war.

The Plain Dealer believes the real explanation for the state in which the world now finds itself goes back to 1940 when Franklin Delano Roosevelt maneuvered himself into another Presidential nomination and broke the third-term tradition. For if there had been no third term, there would have been no fourth, no Tehran and no Yalta.

The idolatrous worshipers of Roosevelt will be quick to condemn this conclusion, to denounce it as the desecration of the memory of a dead man. Let those who criticize ask themselves whether they have any regard for the memories of the dead at Pearl Harbor and Bataan, at Kasserine Pass and Mount Cassino, Guadalcanal and the Normandy beaches and the hundreds of other battlefields of World War II. What about the memories of those who are presently dying in Korea and those who may be called upon to give their lives on some other far-flung battlefront of world war III?

No one can say what would have happened if Roosevelt had not insisted on breaking the third-term tradition in 1940. Whether Wilkie or some Democrat designated by Roosevelt had succeeded to the presidency, it is unlikely that the United States could have kept out of the war in Europe. But the circumstances of our entering the war might have been different. It is scarcely possible that a new President and a new set of advisers would have hit upon the device of inciting the Japanese to attack us by laying down conditions which we knew the Japanese militarists could not and would not accept.

It may be argued with some plausibility that the world might be in a worse mess than it is today if Roosevelt had not been elected to a third and fourth term. But another President might not have hit upon the unconditional surrender slogan which prolonged the war and made victory more difficult, or have adopted the program of reducing Germany to an agrarian economy, which multiplied postwar problems. And Communists might not have found the Government such a happy hunting ground under some other chief executive.

But it was at Yalta that Roosevelt gave Stalin what he wanted and made the secret agreements that have plagued the postwar world, brushing aside the uneasy forebodings of Winston Churchill. And we know now that Roosevelt was not in good health at the time of the Yalta conference. Some other President might have gone to Yalta, too, but there is a good chance he would not have taken Alger Hiss along as one of his principal advisers. And there is a good chance that a President who was mentally and physically vigorous and alert might have listened to Churchill's warnings.

If there is any point in raking over the dead past, it is this: That the American people must be on their guard against any future leader, be he politician or statesman, whose overweening ambition and conceit beguile him into the belief that he is the indispensable man.

Why Are We In This Mess?—Editorial No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the mere fact that we are at war is no excuse whatever for not criticizing the events which have led to this debacle. This might not be true if the administration had shown any inclination to correct its errors and had adopted a sound foreign policy for the future. Much of the difficulty might have been avoided had the President cooperated with the American public in ridding the Government of its Communists instead of crying out red herring whenever an attempt was made to drive the Communists out of key positions in this Government. This failure on the part of the administration to formulate a sound foreign policy is inimical to the future security of this Republic. It is only by reviewing of the mistakes of the administration that the public can take a firm hand in correcting what if continued will greatly weaken if not destroy our form of government.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled "Why Are We In This Mess?" This is editorial No. 2:

WHY ARE WE IN THIS MESS?

In a preceding editorial the Plain Dealer attributed much of the blame for the plight in which the United States now finds itself to events which took place in the latter years of the Roosevelt administration. We pointed out that when Roosevelt broke the third-term tradition in 1940 he paved the way for the fourth term and the disastrous appeasement policy which has made Russia a major threat to world peace.

But while we are convinced that Roosevelt's failure to appraise correctly the motives and objectives of the Soviet Union, or his conceited notion that he could handle Stalin, laid the foundation for the expansion and strengthening of the Communist dictatorship, the mistakes of his successor cannot be overlooked.

As we have said, President Truman inherited many of his problems. He was not responsible for the concessions made to Stalin at Yalta by a sick man, nor for the Communists and Communist sympathizers who were in the Government when he took office and who undoubtedly influenced some of the Government's policies.

But the fact is that Truman did not have a consistent foreign policy, nor did he provide the Nation with the kind of leadership that inspires confidence. He was slow to become aware of the menace of communism. He appears not to have recognized it until March 1947, when he asked Congress for military aid for Greece and Turkey. Since then we have had the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact, and the military aid program, all designed primarily to check Communist expansion and forestall Russian aggression in western Europe.

In Asia, however, the President appears not to have recognized that there was any danger in Communist expansion. His administration had no policy for combating communism in that part of the world; on the contrary, such policy as there was actually aided the Communists to take over China and practically invited them to take over all of Korea and Formosa.

To begin with, the President sent General Marshall on the abortive mission to Nanking, with instructions to persuade Chiang Kai-shek to form a coalition government with the Communists. This mission was doomed to failure, as the State Department must have known. It gave the Chinese Communists the opportunity they needed all through 1946 to regroup and restrain and to obtain captured Japanese military supplies from the Russians.

When the plan to form a coalition government was finally recognized as impossible, the Truman administration then withdrew military aid from the Nationalist government, which paved the way for its downfall. Another mission headed by General Wedemeyer resulted in recommendations which could have saved China from the Communists, but the Truman administration rejected them and suppressed the Wedemeyer report.

Did Truman do all these things personally and deliberately? We make no such accusation. But the fact remains they were done by his administration, for which he was responsible.

As for Korea, we knew in 1946 that the Russians were training a North Korean army. But we withdrew our forces from South Korea in 1949, leaving an inadequately armed South Korean defensive force. Our policy there coincided with the recommendation of Owen Lattimore that "the thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not to let it look as though we pushed it."

At home the President was apparently oblivious for a long time to the Communist menance and even hostile to attempts to expose it. During the 1948 campaign he charged that the investigation of Alger Hiss by the House Un-American Activities Committee was a red herring to distract the attention of the voters from other issues. When the Hiss case was before the grand jury he ridiculed the committee and suggested it should be abolished. And in June 1949 when the trials of Hiss, Judith Coplon, and the 11 leaders of the Communist Party were in progress, and Harry Bridges had just been indicted for perjury, the President described the spy trials and loyalty investigations as a form of typical postwar hysteria which eventually would die down.

At one time the House Un-American Activities Committee filed a report accusing the President of obstructing its investigations. And this was long before Senator JOE MCCARTHY got into the act.

Thus, prior to the Korean incident, the administration's policy was to resist communism in Europe, to help it along, or at least to do nothing to impede its progress in Asia, and to belittle efforts to expose the Communist menace in the United States.

Why Are We in This Mess?—Editorial No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know that the people of this Nation must be nct only startled but stunned by the disclosure that more than $50,000,000,000 had been appropriated for a Defense Establishment only to find that our Armed Forces of young, inexperienced, and almost untrained men had to face the North Korean Russian-led Communists in what will prove to be one of the bloodiest battles in recent history. In view of this situation it may be well to remind the American people of the extent to which they have been misled as to the true situation regarding our national defense and security.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled "Why Are We in This Mess?" This is editorial No. 3:

WHY ARE WE IN THIS MESS?

Before South Korea was invaded the cold war had been going on for 4 years. During that period we spent $50,000,000,000 on our Defense Establishment. We not only had a right to believe we were getting our money's worth, and adequate defense, but we were assured by the Truman administration that such was the case.

Last February 2 Defense Secretary Johnson said: "There is one nation in the world that would start a war. We seek to have a Military Establishment sufficient to deter that aggressor and to lick hell out of her if she doesn't stay deterred."

Again Johnson said: "Joe Stalin will know that if he starts something at 4 a. m., the fighting power of the United States will be on the job at 5 a. m."

On March 2 President Truman said that never in the history of the United States had its defenses been in such good shape except when actually at war.

Testifying before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on March 13, Johnson said that the Army was stronger then and the Air Force was in the highest state of combat readiness since the end of the war.

On May 5 the President told his news conference the cold-war situation was better now than it was in 1946 and that he was not alarmed over the possibility of a shooting war with Russia. He backed up this optimism with the disclosure that next year's defense budget would be smaller than the current one.

And on June 1 the President said that the world is closer now to permanent peace than at any time in the past 5 years.

We know now how poorly prepared we were to meet the crisis of a little war in Korea, much less the possibility of warfare on the global scale. It is apparent now that the vast sum we spent for defense in the past 4 years did not purchase us the security we had been led to believe we had.

During this 4 years the administration has been hell bent on spending more money for its civilian, domestic, and give-away programs. In the current year it is proposing to spend $5,000,000,000 more for nonmilitary purposes than it spent in 1948. That is one reason for the neglect of the military establishment.

For example, the Air Policy Commission appointed by President Truman reported in 1947 that a 70-group Air Force was an absolute necessity to provide the United States with adequate defense. But the President rejected the findings of his own Commission. He first called for the 55-group Air Force, later one of 48 groups. Even when Congress authorized more money for the Air Force, he ordered it not to be spent. The country couldn't afford it. But the administration had plenty of money for its various socialistic experiments.

On January 11, 1949, the Plain Dealer said editorially: "If the reports by Secretary Symington and the President's Air Force Policy Commission are to be believed, the only conclusion that can be reached is that the administration is playing fast and loose with the national security. Congress might properly inquire whether service jealousies and the desire of the administration to embark on a program of social welfare expansion will result in the Nation being ill prepared to defend itself against any possible attack in the future."

Thus, one reason for the plight we are in is that the Government did not maintain an adequate Defense Establishment. Another is the strange course we pursued in the Far East. Take the case of Formosa. A State Department bulletin dated June 3, 1945, stated that "with the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position."

But on December 23, 1949, the Department circulated a secret memorandum explaining that the United States has no interest in Formosa and that it was of no strategic importance. When Senator TAFT urged that we send a fleet to the Formosa Strait to prevent a Chinese Communist invasion of the island, the suggestion was ridiculed by Dean Acheson and President Truman and another State Department bulletin was issued stating that "the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to the Chinese forces on Formosa." This, coupled with Acheson's omission of South Korea and Formosa from what he announced was the America line of defense in the Far East, gave the North Koreans all the information they needed to justify the expectation that we would not intervene if they invaded South Korea.

The record, then, is one of bungling, indecision, contradiction, carelessness, and misrepresentation, either deliberate or inadvertent.

The administration is now trying to rectify its past mistakes. The effort to do so deserves the support of all of us. We hope there is still time.

Why Are We in This Mess?—Conclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the last editorial in a series of editorials which appeared in the Cleveland Plain

Dealer entitled "Why Are We in This Mess?" I feel that every American should know these facts to enable all right-thinking citizens to act accordingly to preserve the greatest heritage of freedom ever bequeathed to a people:

WHY ARE WE IN THIS MESS?

President Truman's decision to use armed intervention when the Communists invaded the Republic of South Korea marked a turning point in American foreign affairs and a complete reversal of the policy previously promoted in the Far East by his administration.

The administration had made it clear it was not interested in what happened in Korea or Formosa. The State Department had anticipated the fall of Formosa to the Chinese Communists and Secretary Acheson had stated publicly the United States would not use the veto to prevent the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. Congress appropriated $10,500,000 for military aid to South Korea on October 28, 1949, but 8 months later only $200 worth of signal equipment had been delivered. The South Koreans had only the arms which the American occupation forces left behind, just enough to enable them to deal with border raids and to preserve internal security.

In the harsh words uttered by Senator MCCARRAN Monday, the course we pursued in the Far East was "statesmanship at the level of the psychopatic ward." The Communists must have been greatly surprised when Truman reversed both himself and Acheson by sending American forces to Korea and ordering an American fleet to prevent the invasion of Formosa.

Why did he do it? There were two reasons. One was that the administration came to a belated realization that the Communists were willing to use armed force to attain their ends, and that if they once got away with it, no place on earth would be safe from similar aggression. The other was that the Republic of South Korea had been established under the authority and guidance of the United Nations. If we had allowed South Korea to become a victim of Communist conquest, the United Nations would have lost all prestige and it might as well have disbanded.

Besides these reasons, the United States had a special responsibility for South Korea, since it was at this Government's suggestion that the United Nations undertook to supervise the establishment of the South Korean Republic after it became apparent that the Communists would not permit free elections in North Korea.

Accordingly, when the North Koreans invaded South Korea, the first action taken by the United States was to secure the adoption in the Security Council of the United Nations of a resolution calling upon members of the United Nations to aid South Korea. The Russians could not veto this resolution because they were boycotting the United Nations at the time.

The Truman administration responded to this call by giving air and naval support to South Korea, followed by ground forces. This action met with overwhelming approval in Congress and out, even thought its legality was questioned.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT pointed out that section 6 of the act to implement the United Nations Charter provides that agreements with the Security Council for the use of American Armed Forces "shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution."

In a speech on the floor of the Senate on June 28, just 3 days after the invasion of South Korea, TAFT pointed out that no such act or resolution had been submitted, and that the sending of troops to Korea seemed to him to be "a complete usurpation by the President of authority to use the Armed Forces of this country."

TAFT said he felt this subject should be discussed because "if the incident is permitted to go by without protest, at least from this body, we would have finally terminated for all time the right of Congress to declare war, which is granted to Congress alone by the Constitution of the United States."

In the same speech, however, TAFT said that "if a joint resolution were introduced asking for approval of the use of our Armed Forces already sent to Korea and full support of them in their present venture, I would vote in favor of it. * * *

"I feel that we must back up our troops * * * with unstinted support. Whether the President chose the right time for his new policy, or the right place, can be discussed in the future. I suggest, however, that any Secretary of State who has been so reversed by his superiors and whose policies have precipitated the danger of war, had better resign and let someone else administer the program to which he was, and perhaps still is, so violently opposed."

We think a great many people will agree with TAFT. The consequences of Tehran and Yalta, the failure to appraise Russian objectives correctly, and the inconsistencies and bungling in our foreign policy made a showdown with Russia inevitable. Perhaps Korea was not as favorable a location for it as we would have wished, but we had no choice in the matter. Perhaps the President did exceed his authority by using the Armed Forces without congressional approval, but time was running out. These issues, and the charge that the administration failed to maintain an adequate defense force, can be debated later. The important thing now is to do everything that is necessary and possible to back up the fighting men in Korea and to strengthen our defense forces elsewhere and those of our allies.

H. R. 4281: Taxis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following timely editorial warranting the attention of the Members, which appeared in the Times-Herald Saturday, August 26, in connection with H. R. 4281, scheduled for consideration on the floor on Monday, August 28:

TAXICAB LIMITATION?—NUTS

The present attempt to limit the number of taxicabs in Washington has defeated its purpose. If the so-called limitation bill now before Congress is passed there will be more cabs in Washington than ever before.

FARE BOOST IS REAL GOAL

Therefore we believe it is silly for Congress to waste any more time on this perennial will-o'-the-wisp. The Senate District Committee has postponed action on the proposal indefinitely and the House should do likewise. The idea is un-American. There is no more fairness in limiting the number of cabs than there would be to limiting the number of grocery stores or shoeshine parlors. The real goal is to increase fares.

Washington is a unique taxi town. No other city depends on taxicabs for such a large amount of mass transportation. People who use the cabs in Washington walk or ride subways, elevated trains or busses in other cities. As a result the number of cabs driven by full time and part time drivers has grown to meet this good market.

Meters were ruled out in the early thirties in favor of zone rates to give drivers and riders a better break for their money. Group riding has been a boom to Government employees going to and from work in rush hours.

Gradually the system has settled on the basis of supply and demand where there is no more than the expected number of complaints from the public against overcharging and inability to get cabs in rainstorms or other emergencies.

On the other hand there has always been a continuous pressure from organized drivers and some independents to cut down the number of cabs in the city so the ones remaining in the business could make more money. Call it greed or good business, back of the drive to limit the cabs has also been an undercurrent to increase rates.

The original bills introduced in the Senate and the House this session to bring about limitation were basically the same. They authorized the public utilities commission to fix a flexible ceiling on the number of cabs that can be operated in the city. It is made flexible by providing that after the PUC determines what that number should be it can at its discretion change it to meet any new condition such as a sudden increase in population.

The bill also puts a safeguard around those who now have licenses providing that their licenses cannot be revoked or their renewal denied unless they violate the law to such an extent that they are considered unfit to drive a cab.

That means that should the PUC, under the proposed law, decide there were too many cabs in the city and set a number below those in operation, it would take years before the limit would mean anything. They would have to wait until enough drivers died or voluntarily gave up their licenses to leave the city or go to another job before the limit could be reached.

Now that is the way it would have operated under the bill as it first went to Congress. But the House District Committee put on two amendments which make the measure even more unworkable.

RUSH IS ON

First the committee wrote in language which would allow drivers to transfer their licenses. So if a driver was getting out of business he could sell or give his license to someone to fill his place.

Such a loophole would certainly keep the number of cabs always near the same level.

Secondly the House committee voted that the law would not go into effect until January 1, 1951. That would mean that between the date of passage and the effective date everyone and his uncle interested in driving a cab or getting a license to sell or give away would rush the PUC and flood the town with thousands of cab licenses. Licenses which would remain in effect no matter what limit was decided upon.

A month ago when hearings were held on the bill there were 7,967 licenses in effect. Thursday morning this week the PUC reported the number had jumped to 8,580. From July 10 to August 9, 579 applications were received. Normally the applications run from 10 to 15 a day but with the possibility that a limitation bill might be passed the rush has reached as high as 53 in one day.

From these figures it is plain to see that if the bill passed there would be a minimum of 10,000 licenses on the books when it went into effect.

What kind of limitation is that?

Korean War Is Different

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, few realize that we are engaged in a type war which we have not experienced before.

The following editorial by James DeLaurier, publisher of the Hammond (Ind.) Times, reveals the true situation which confronts our military forces:

TWO KINDS OF WAR

The tragedy in Korea has demonstrated a fact that many of us, including highly placed military men, had tended to forget—that there can be two kinds of war.

Up to the time that North Korea sent her troops pouring across the thirty-eighth parallel, we had been thinking in terms of the "big" intercontinental war. This, if it came, was to be war on an unprecedented scale and of an unprecedented type. It was to be a war of amazing machines which would wreak death and destruction on a huge scale and at vast distances. A button would be pushed, and an atom bomb or a guided missile would be on its way toward the target. It would be a war of science and technology. Some thought it might be a war in which a decision would be reached without any ground action at all, and without opposing troops coming face to face.

No one can say that these concepts are wrong—they might hold true in that "big" war the world now fears. But it is clear that they do not apply in Korea.

In Korea we have a war in which the traditional, relatively simple weapons are all-important. The man with a gun in his hand must do the fighting. It is the most difficult and dismal sort of war imaginable. Great troop movements of the sort that took place in Europe in the last war are impossible. Everything is based upon the small unit—the battalion, the company, the platoon, even the squad. The importance of the individual soldier is supreme—if one man fails, disaster to many may follow. In this, the war is comparable to the jungle operations against the Japanese during the island-hopping period that preceded the Empire's surrender.

We are fighting an enemy whose habits and thoughts are incomprehensible to the western mind. The cruel fanaticism of the Orient finds its perfect reflection in the Korean soldier. Human life is worthless, death but an incident. No matter how many are killed, more come on. North Korea casualties have been infinitely greater than ours. But the offensives have been pushed in spite of them.

The Koreans have proven themselves extraordinarily adept at infiltration, and at guerrilla activity. This, in the first weeks, was one of the worst problems faced by the Americans. The enemy seemed to be everywhere, and foe and friend looked alike. The Korean soldier accepts the greatest of hardships with apparent equanimity—he has known little but privation all his life. He can sleep anywhere. A handful of the coarsest food sustains him. Supply, as we know it in the American Army, is unknown to him.

Worst of all, it is clear, we had not planned for this war. Our eyes were elsewhere—on Formosa, Iran, Europe—even as our minds were considering the other kind of war. And so, in every way, we were completely surprised.

The lesson we have learned is a grim one. We must be prepared for any kind of war—and for war almost anywhere. We have never faced a harder task.

Premature Release of German War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times:

FOR GOOD CONDUCT

Although good conduct is generally accepted as a cogent reason to cut a criminal's stay behind bars, it is unlikely that the people of Europe will readily understand our sanguine attitude in shortening the prison terms of Friedrich Flick and several other war criminals. Tried before a meticulously fair United States military tribunal at Nuremberg between 1947 and 1949, Herr Flick, Otto Dietrich, Richard Walter Darre, and others were convicted of war crimes ranging from spoliation of Nazi-occupied countries to furthering a program that resulted in the deaths of 6,000,000 Jews.

The release of such people is bound to alienate democratic-minded men and women in precisely those areas where their friendship is most vital to us. The Communists will naturally make the most of it. One must hope that a weather eye be kept on the future activities of Herr Flick & Co. to see that their freedom is marked by the same standard of behavior that brought about their untimely pardon.

Huk Organization in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the August 1950 issue of the Columbia, the monthly publication of the Knights of Columbus:

RED DRIVE IN THE PHILIPPINES
(By James F. Kearney)

To those familiar with the methods employed for the Red conquest of China the whole Huk propaganda in the Philippines has a familiar ring. "Don't you realize that in every country the Reds always start by pretending to help the poor?" I protested to a veteran of Bataan who was inclined to sympathize with Huks as friends of the downtrodden. "If they get into power here, the people will see after it is too late, that they have been duped and are now helpless captives," He was not impressed.

The name of the Hukbalahaps, a wartime "People's Army Against Japan," has been changed to the "People's Liberation Army," the very same title the Chinese Communists adopted during their fight against Chiang Kai-shek. The Huk organization was founded in 1942. The military chief seems to be Luis Taruc, the political leaders Communists Guillermo Capadocia and Mariano Balgos, former labor leaders in Manila. Taruc has about him that mysterious something which captivates the imagination of his followers. According to one of his former schoolmates, he is a deceptively meek-looking person, 5½ feet tall, and weighing only about 120 pounds. He is as elusive as a shadow, has evaded snare after snare laid for him by the military police and the Philippine constabulary. He speaks with a soft, almost effeminate politeness that comes as a shock to those who had expected to meet in him a blustering bully.

He has been pronounced dead time and again, once even by the President, but the average man in the street still considers him very much alive. When Taruc was named on the wanted list by the Government back in 1946, he immediately disappeared into the mountains. After being hunted vainly by thousands for 2 years, he emerged honorably from the shadows in 1948 when an amnesty was offered him by the authorities. He came to Manila in a Government plane, was lodged in an annex to the President's residence, and protected by Government guards.

THE OLD FAMILIAR ANSWER

In an interview at that time, he answered the blunt question: "How permeated with communism is the Huk movement?" with the statement familiar to anyone who has followed the Chinese Red movement, "The Hukbalahap is not a Communist army and is not fighting for communism." We mustn't forget that according to explicit directions in the Communist Manifesto, all Red movements are supposed to start out as national movements; they become openly internationalized only after their civil war has proved successful. Only then do the Russians take over. Taruc, after denying any hook-up with Moscow, immediately launched into a eulogy of the Russian Soviet army, until one of his lieutenants suggested that he stop. He then switched back to what is now known as Titoism, declaring that "the Huks are in fact an army of liberation imbued with principles of nationalism, peace and democracy. We are not dictated to by Moscow, as claimed by Red baiters," he finished emphatically. These words may prove highly encouraging for those American officials who may still nourish the naive hope of making Titos out of Mao Tse-tung and other oriental Reds.

"The rich hate and despise the poor and look upon us as carabaos," complain the Huk propagandists here in language suited to capture the sympathy of the underprivileged. "They are robbing the common people. The people are the real owners of all this land and these big houses. They should arise and assert their collective rights." Here we have the traditional agrarian reform program with which Reds and pinks in the States deceived so many Americans who wondered whether Mao Tse-tung and his friends were or were not real Communists. So successful has this "agrarian" battlecry proved again and again, that the Huks see no reason for changing it. When they struck violently and almost simultaneously in four places on March 29, the eighth anniversary of their founding, the local president launched his antidissident campaign on a big scale.

One of the first Huk attacks was at the well-known summering place, Los Banos. The watchman of a large enclosure there told me this was what happened to him. At 2:30 a. m., he was awakened with a noisy, "Hello! Come out!" He obeyed, and saw three or four young fellows in uniform, with a larger group standing back in the shadows.

"We want your gun," they said, politely.

"But I need it to keep robbers away."

"They won't bother you," was the reply. "We know them all."

After giving up his fine rifle reluctantly, he asked, "Do you want anything else—money, whisky?"

"No. We're not allowed to take that. All we wanted is your gun. Goodbye!"

He seemed pleased that they had treated him so gently. "The Government will find it very hard to defeat the Huks," he said, "for these fellows know every mountain trail through the jungle. The soldiers don't, and can be easily ambushed."

RAIDS REVEAL HUK SYSTEM

The raid on San Pablo reveals the Huk system more thoroughly. News reports stated that long before it took place dissidents had entered the town as bare-footed peasants. Afterward the inhabitants remarked that the movie houses had been overcrowded, while purchases in the markets had registered an extraordinary rise. The innocent-looking Huks had mingled with the populace, carrying baskets to give them the appearance of rustic barrio traders. But when the attack took place, they appeared like veteran campaigners, though many of them were only youths ranging from 15 to 20 years old. As they attacked the city hall and the enlisted men's barracks, many of them sang and encouraged one another, but at other times they observed strict silence to avoid detection. Several groups of attackers were commanded by young women, and bystanders heard them being addressed as Esther, Cinderella, etc. Commander Cinderella's group forced its way into the city jail, seized two prisoners, and executed them, allegedly because they had made anti-Huk confessions to the constabulary. We pause to remark here that young women also played an important role in the night raids by Red China's guerrillas.

The Huks' first assault on the business section developed when a Chinese store owner refused to open his door and was fired upon. They looted the place, and many changed their old clothes then and there for new ones. Next day the town of San Pablo was found virtually littered with propaganda papers and other printed documents attacking the Government and blaming it for all the hardships and injustices of the people. A red flag was seen hoisted to a pole.

In another night raid at the beginning of May, Huks landed on the coast of Alabat Island, ransacked the houses of the mayor and other officials, set the city hall afire, looted the Chinese stores and private residences, hauling to the wharf an estimated 5 tons of merchandise. Then they addressed the assembled male residents whom they had rounded up at the wharf, bitterly assailing the present administration for its widespread graft and corruption. They appealed to the people to open their eyes to the goings-on in the Government and to rally to the rebel cause.

A lady eyewitness reports a Huk raid in Mauban in the heart of the dissident area in Quezon Province, telling how the daughter of her landlady urged her to peep through a half-closed window one night. "There, right below, were about 50 long-haired individuals in fatigues and denims and armed to the teeth. They were en route to the center of the town, where smoke was rapidly rising from the top of a building the Huks had set afire. They had entered the town from four different directions without opposition. As the fire grew bigger, panic spread among the inhabitants. They saw with horror the military barracks and the bus company garage go up in flames. Then shots rang out. It was a signal for civilians to keep out of harm's way; and the Huks touched neither hide nor hair of them, though they were looting Chinese stores for supplies.

"The following day the inhabitants started evacuating. At night some Huks kept vigil, scaring the wits out of fake Huks who were extorting money and rice from civilians. Ten days after the raid, the dissidents set up a loudspeaker to broadcast: 'The masses are the victim of injustice. While they toil, corrupt officials cheat them of their money. * * * This year and last, numerous scandals involving big fry have been exposed. The rich hoard their wealth which they should share with the poor. If this were done, social discontent would vanish. The Communist system is better. At one stroke it would solve the countless problems that beset the people of the Philippines.' * * * "Though reputed to be barbarians," concludes this lady witness, "the Huks treated the people almost gingerly. Their conduct at Mauban left very little to desire. Perhaps the Government troops, never a model in that respect, should think seriously about this."

MAKE INITIAL GOOD IMPRESSION

In the above we see the habitual Communist method of making an initial good impression on the masses to win them to their side in their violent attempt to overthrow the Government. All these instances confirm the statement read in the United States House of Representatives on June 27, 1947, entitled, "As I Saw the Huks," prepared by W. P. Reeves, of the United States War Department, who spent the year 1946 in the Philippines. "Unlike the Communists in America," it said in part, "the Huks do not hesitate to resort to armed violence. They make unreasonable demands for money, food, rice, etc. If their demand is denied, they murder the owner and burn his home. In the provinces I saw many houses which had been burned or broken into bits by Huks. * * * Captured Huks have admitted they were taught the principles of Lenin. They were taught that the solution of their ills, poverty, and hardships is the overthrow of the Philippine Government and the establishment of a Communist dictatorship. Angeles David, Governor of the Province of Pampange, stated, 'The Huk organization recognizes no law but anarchy and lawlessness, and has no love of country because it advocates communistic principles, using the Red flag in its demonstrations and celebrating November 7, the birth of the Third Internationale'." Evidently the real Huks are doing today as they have done from the beginning.

Their strategy for the future is, of course, a matter for conjecture. In areas under their complete control they have already set up a government of their own, where they collect taxes, celebrate marriages, impose penalties, and operate their own schools, one of which is named Stalin University. The Philippines Fress Press, for April 22 of this year, affirms that the one spot in Asia which had been peaceful and progressive was the Philippines under American tutelage. It was, therefore, a standing denial of everything Stalin wants Asiatic peoples to believe. As long as it remained comparatively happy and peaceful he could not convince the hungry millions of Asia that their only hope was in turning to the Russian way of life. Therefore, disturbances had to be created in the Philippines so that Russian propaganda could shout, "At last the exploited masses of the Philippines, ground down under the heel of American capitalistic teachings, have rebelled and are fighting for liberation."

This was a clever move, not only to discredit America in the Far East, but to remove one of the real obstables that lay in the path of an Asia-wide "People's revolution for freedom." Yet, though the Huks have frequently shown themselves as anti-American, they will probably not permit any overt act from abroad which might give the United States justification for directly intervening in the country to help the Government restore peace and order. The Philippine-American treaty of March 14, 1947, authorizes negotiations with a view to insuring the Territorial integrity of the Philippines, the mutual protection of the Philippines, and the United States, and the maintenance of peace in the Pacific.

Dean Archeson has said that an attack on the Philippines by a foreign power would not be tolerated by the United States. The Communists would, therefore, in keeping with past performances, doubtless want this to appear to be a non-Moscow revolution by the Filipinio people, and the violence they are able to stir up will have all the appearances of a purely internal and domestic problem. There will thus be no apparent question of foreign aggression or of violation by an outside Soviet power of the islands' Territorial integrity. In fact, the arrival of American reinforcements could then be denounced by the "patriotic" Huks as unwarranted Yankee imperialism. Even if Formosa should fall, there would thus be no direct invasion of the Philippines from there, according to this theory. The islands would be taken from within, with, of course, plenty of secret support from without.

And that brings up the question that is bothering local government authorities: the Chinese question. The Huk raids, as reported above, frequently concentrate on Chinese stores. The reason is that many of the Chinese merchants are unpopular in the Philippines because of their business methods. Attacks on them, to the exclusion of the Filipino merchants, seem to have been another attempt in the approved Red style to gain the sympathy of the Filipino masses. But fear has been expressed in government circles—and they show evidence for it—that an important part of the Red plan to take over the islands is centered about the large Chinese colony here. Specially trained persuaders will, it is claimed, try to convince wealthy Chinese that it is wise for them to back the Huks financially if they want to be on the winning side. Should the merchants be hard to persuade, their relatives in China will be made to suffer; and if this doesn't work, here and there a wealthy Chinese will be found brutally murdered. On May 29, the corpse of just such a merchant was discovered in an air raid shelter in Quezon City, his legs chained, his head bashed in, and marks of torture found in different parts. Was it a warning to others?

Frequent reports also state that Red Chinese are being smuggled into the islands as refugee Nationalists. But when Congressman TITO V. TIZON, chairman of the House Committee on Un-Filipino Activities, declared that "90 percent of the more than 600,000 Chinese Nationalists now residing in the Philippines are potential Reds," the secretary general of the Chinese Nationalist Party in the islands issued a formal protest, declaring that it was both inexact and insulting, since the total number of Chinese residing in the country was, according to both Filipino Immigration and Chinese Consular statistics, only 200,000—not 600,000. "A great majority of Chinese here are as loyal as ever to the National Government of China. * * * We Chinese, being actually engaged in a war against the Reds while other nations are merely doing lip service, are no moral cowards. To say that we might bow to the Red tyrants on the mainland is false and defamatory. * * * Irresponsible remarks can only serve the purposes of the Communists." By which he apparently means that, should Formosa fall, local Chinese Nationalists, with no government of their own left, might be tempted to poin the Huks. The whole question seems fraught with such danger to the islands that it seems difficult to see how American authorities were able to state calmly for so long that it made no difference to American defenses whether Formosa stood

or not. The repercussions would be tremendous, not only in the Philippines, but in the Chinatowns of San Francisco, New York, and elsewhere.

Representative Tizon speaks with authority on the Huk question, saying: "What started as a legitimate movement for agrarian reform has now been converted through the clever manipulation of the Communists into an armed revolutionary struggle, whose aim is no longer social amelioration but the overthrow of the government. This armed and psychological struggle is a culmination of over 20 years of Communist agitation and propaganda, which is not of a domestic origin but of foreign instigation." He goes on to say that the Huk cry of land for the landless is not in keeping with the economic realities of this country which call not for more land but for the cultivation of unoccupied soil. "There are no less than 6,505,025 hectares of virgin arable land all over the country still eagerly awaiting the pioneering hands of Filipinos. * * * No less than 60,000,000 individuals, approximately three times the present population, can be comfortably supported from the total agricultural land area alone."

Public lands have already been set aside in Mindanao and Mindoro for Huks who will lay down their arms and agree to live peaceably. But they do not want land; they want to overthrow the government. "Imbued with a messianic complex, they believe that only when the Communist Party gets into power will graft and corruption be forever abolished in this country. To prevent the Communists from using for their subversive purposes the government's own house-cleaning program, I maintain," he concludes, "that the accusations of corruption must not be generalized but must be localized to individual cases. * * * We should be able to outthink, out-write, out-talk, and out-fight the Communists every inch of the way in the ideological and armed struggles which have been forced upon our country."

What is the attitude of the Catholic Church here at the present time? Naturally she does not favor the Huk Communist movement. On the other hand, she has made it perfectly clear that she stands on the side of the poor in their present cry for justice. His Excellency Egidio Vagnozzi, D. D., Apostolic Delegate to the Philippines, in a powerful address to the Knights of Columbus on November 30, 1949, at Manila, pleaded with them as Knights to draw their swords in defense of justice, in defense of the widow, the orphan, the poor. "Do not be blind; if you insist on exploiting God's poor for the fattest profit you can get today, you are going to lose everything tomorrow, your capital, your business, your profits, probably your very life. In the storm that will break around you, you will sacrifice your family and the future of your children. These children of yours, if they will not be wiped out by the whirlwind of social upheaval, will be the prize and the spoils of a regime of tyranny and terror. This will be the vengeance of God for your egoism and greed."

With the fate of Nationalist China before everyone's eyes, the rational solution for the Philippines would seem to be the thorough cleansing, not the overthrow, of the present regime. Criticism, if pitiless, should be constructive at this hour of crisis in the Far East. The promises of communism have proved illusory everywhere else; it is childish to hope they will be less so here. The workers will not be better off under the Huks, if the latter take over, but worse off. There will not be the present freedom to write or speak against the Government. The fine Filipino family life will be destroyed, with wife turned against husband and with children spying on their parents. Catholic schools will be forced to teach atheistic communism and, when the Russians move in to take control, the beautiful May processions in the barrios might soon have to carry the picture of Stalin instead of the Blessed Virgin.

The Huks are already saying, as the Chinese Communists said before them: "Communism cannot possibly be worse than the present regime." But it can be. A Chinese friend of mine, a Hong Kong businessman, wrote recently, "Little did we think that the Reds would be so much worse than the National Government." Yet people who had lived under China's Reds for years had tried to warn them over and over again what the Reds were like. It is to be devoutly hoped that the inhabitants of this Catholic land won't have to learn that lesson the hard way.

Rights of Servicemen During Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DIXIE GILMER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. GILMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a portion of the Journal of the Oklahoma Bar Association under date of August 19, 1950.

The following is a digest of the rights of servicemen, during military service, as to—

First. Obligations to pay mortgages on homestead.

Second. Installment contracts on household goods, automobiles, personal property.

Third. Protection on commercial insurance policies.

Fourth. Dependents of servicemen against eviction.

Fifth. Rights of servicemen to reemployment.

This digest has been prepared by competent experts, who are attorneys and members of the Oklahoma State Bar Association:

RIGHTS OF SERVICEMEN DURING MILITARY SERVICE AS TO OBLIGATIONS TO PA MORTGAGES ON HOMESTEAD

(By Tom W. Garrett)

We recommend that all men entering the military service should first do everything that they can to pay the monthly installments on their home, as they will find it difficult to catch up on any unpaid installments upon their return from the military service. The rights of all men entering into the military service are fully protected by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 as amended. This does not mean that anyone is entitled to purchase property just because he expects to be called into the military service, and wants to obtain relief as provided by the Civil Service Relief Act, as you cannot compel the sale of property to any persons.

Those who wish to keep their homes for their immediate family, or to rent it to others so that they will have a home when they return, should not write a letter to the VA or to the lending agency, but should go to the place where they are making their monthly payments and give them full information of any changes of income or obligation, the name of the person who will be in charge of the property, and do whatever they can to work out an agreement while in the military service as to how much they can pay.

When we use the term "agency," we mean to include the RFC and other Government lending agencies, as well as life insurance and other loan companies. You will find that some of these agencies may be reluctant to make any extension or concession on account of the GI guaranty or the FHA insurance. The attention of these agencies is called to the fact that the FHA does not require notice of default until the borrower has defaulted his third monthly payment, and that the agency has 12 months to liquidate the loan in order to be protected. We find that under the present FHA regulations, interest starts on the debentures from the time of default instead of the commencement of foreclosure, and that they expect a regulation to be out in a few days authorizing them to waive any reasonable requirement as to loans where the man is called into the military service.

That under GI insured loans, regulation 36.4313, et seq., the holder of such loan does not have to give the VA notice until the loan has been in default for 3 months, and the agency is required to give an additional 30 days' notice, at such time as it may desire, of its intention to commence foreclosure proceedings. That under the regulations, the agency does not have to commence foreclosure at the end of 105 days, and if good faith is shown, the serviceman may continue to be in default as much as 3 months without the VA making a requirement to foreclose.

In the event that the serviceman is unable to work out a deal with the lending agency, or the agency is unable to protect its GI guaranty or FHA insurance, and commences foreclosure, such serviceman at that time would be entitled to the full benefits of the Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, which is found in title 50, United States Code, sections 501 to 590, inclusive. The Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Co., of Rochester, N. Y., has published a one-volume American Law of Veterans, with a 1949 supplement, which also discusses the questions involved.

From these sources it appears that where a serviceman is able to show that his ability to pay his mortgage loan has been materially affected by reason of his military service and is sued on such mortgage indebtedness, such serviceman is entitled to a stay of the enforcement of such obligation where he gives notice to the lending agency and presents the necessary evidence to the court to justify such stay. The court may require the serviceman to make certain payments or to do certain things, or a receivership might be had of the property and the rents be applied upon the payment of the loan where same is not occupied by the veteran's immediate family. The act provides that the installments under a contract to buy or under a mortgage may be postponed in such a way that the loan will be extended for the period equal to the period in the military service. There is nothing in this section that authorizes the extension of the loan for more than 25 years, so that at the end of 25 years the guaranty might not be enforceable, but for practical purposes such guaranty would not be needed due to the fact that the property at that time would be worth more than the balance due on the loan.

We are of the opinion that where the lending agency notifies the VA that the serviceman has been called into the military service, and the lending agency is of the opinion that such serviceman can only pay the interest, insurance, and taxes on the property, so is in fact in default on the payment of his loan, and such agency does not notify the VA of its intention to commence foreclosure proceedings, that until the VA requires the commencement of foreclosure, it would remain liable on its GI guaranty. In

this regard, I would suggest that two notices be given. The first notice to be given at the time of entering the military service, and the second notice to be given when the principal is in arrears for 3 months.

We find that this question has been passed on by at least one court. The case of *Morris Plan Industrial Bank* v. *Petluck* ((1946) 187 Misc. 87, 60 N. Y. S. 2d, 162), a stay for a period of time equivalent to the duration of military service, namely, 34 months, was granted, upon condition of payment of arrears of interest, principal, and taxes periodically over such period. Upon final satisfaction of the conditions, the parties were directed to be restored to their normal status.

If the serviceman is compelled to sell his home, he should see a member of his local bar association, who will advise him as to his rights, liabilities, and the expenses he will be out in making such sale, and will assure that the serviceman is fully protected until such time that he can dispose of such property.

RIGHTS OF SERVICEMEN AS TO INSTALLMENT CONTRACTS ON HOUSEHOLD GOODS, AUTOMOBILES, AND PERSONAL PROPERTY

(By Eugene P. Ledbetter)

We recommend that if the person in the military service has purchased personal property under an installment contract, he should:

1. Make the payments as provided in the contract if reasonably possible.

2. Upon induction, go promptly to the creditor, mortgagee, or security holder and, if possible, work out an agreement in writing with him as to the adjustment of the payments, modification of the contract, or surrender of the property upon the payment to him of the reasonable value of his equity.

3. Examine his rights under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act if the property is essential to the maintenance or comfort of his dependents and he is unable to work out a suitable agreement with the owner of the indebtedness.

The Soldiers and Sailor's Civil Relief Act provides that after a deposit or at least one installment has been paid upon an installment contract by a person who, thereafter enters military service, the owner of the indebtedness may not exercise any of the rights under the contract to terminate or forfeit it or resume possession of the personal property for nonpayment of any installment or breach of the other terms occurring during the period of military service, except by action in a court of competent jurisdiction (50 U. S. C., sec. 531 (1)).

When such action is brought, the court may, as a condition to the termination of the contract, order a repayment of the prior installments or deposits. Upon the other hand, the court may in its own discretion, on its own motion, and must, on application to it by a person in the military service or someone in his behalf, order a stay of the proceedings as provided in the act, unless in its opinion the ability of the purchaser to comply with the terms of the contract is not materially affected by reason of such service; or the court may make such disposition of the case as is equitable to conserve the interests of all parties (50 U. S. C., sec. 531 (3)).

Where a proceeding to foreclose a mortgage upon or to resume possession of personal property, or to rescind or terminate a contract for the purchase thereof, has been stayed as provided in the act, the court may, unless in its opinion, an undue hardship would result to the dependents of the person in military service, appoint three disinterested parties to appraise the property and, based upon the report of the appraisers, order such sum, if any, as may be just, paid to the person in military service or his dependent, as a condition of foreclosing the mortgage, resuming possession of the property, or ending the contract (50 U. S. C. sec. 533).

The act also provides that in any action brought before or after a person enters military service, the court may in its discretion, on its own motion or on application to it by such person, or someone in his behalf, stay the execution of any judgment, and vacate or stay any attachment or garnishment, unless the court finds that military service will not materially affect the ability of the serviceman to comply with the judgment or order. The attachment or garnishment may be stayed whether it is before or after judgment (50 U. S. C. sec. 523).

Any stay of proceedings ordered by any court under the provisions of the act may be for the period of military service and 3 months thereafter, or any part of such period, and subject to such terms of payment and time as may be just (50 U. S. C. sec. 524).

It should be noted that whenever in the act, the right to stay proceedings is granted, the court may in its discretion, grant a like right to those secondarily liable on the installment paper. (50 U. S. C. sec. 513). Further, the act extends its benefits to dependents of persons in military service unless, in the opinion of the court, the ability of such dependents to comply with the terms of the installment contract has not been materially impaired by reason of the military service of the persons upon whom they are dependent (50 U. S. C. sec. 536).

Since the underlying purpose of the act is to protect the property interest of persons in military service and to remove every obstacle to their full devotion to their assigned tasks, the courts are vested with wide discretion in adjusting the terms of installment contracts. However, under the act the stay of proceedings to enforce an installment contract is not an absolute right, but is dependent upon whether or not military service materially impairs the ability to pay, and whether or not the property is essential to the maintenance and comfort of the dependents of the serviceman.

RIGHTS OF SERVICEMEN TO PROTECTION ON COMMERCIAL INSURANCE POLICIES

(By Jack High)

If a serviceman desires to be protected on a commercial insurance policy while in the military service, he must make application therefor. The application must be in writing and signed by the insured serviceman. Such application must identify the policy and the insurance company and should state that the serviceman agrees that his rights under the policy are subject to and modified by the provisions of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended. In case the serviceman is outside the continental United States (excluding Alaska and Panama Canal Zone), a beneficiary under the policy may make the written application described above. The original of such application should be sent to the insurance company and a copy thereof to the Veterans' Administration. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will determine whether the policy of insurance is entitled to protection and shall notify the insured and the insurance company of such finding. Such protection shall only be afforded on the life of one insured serviceman on a commercial life-insurance policy, or policies, up to $10,000. Any policy found by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be entitled to protection shall not subsequent to date of application and during the period of military service of the insured or during 2 years after the expiration of such service lapse or otherwise terminate or be forfeited for the nonpayment of a premium becoming due and payable, or the nonpayment of any indebtedness or interest.

The amount paid by the United States to an insurance company on account of applications by insured servicemen shall become a debt due to the United States by the serviceman on whose account payment was made, and such amount may be collected by the United States either by deduction from any amount due said insured by the United States or as otherwise authorized by law.

The above statement is offered only as a guide and is not to be taken as a full statement of the law. The full text of the law is found in the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C. Annotated, title 50, War and National Defense Appendix, secs. 540 through 548).

RIGHTS OF THE DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN AGAINST EVICTION

(By Jack High)

The dependents of a person in the military service cannot be evicted from premises occupied by them principally as a dwelling where the rent does not exceed $80 per month, unless leave of court is obtained upon application therefor. Where such an application is made by the landlord, the court will not grant said dependents any relief if it finds that the ability of the tenant to pay the agreed rent is not materially affected by reason of such military service. On the other hand, should the court find that the ability of the tenant to pay the agreed rent has been materially affected by reason of such military service, it will, on its own motion, and shall, on application, stay the proceedings for not longer than 3 months, or it may make such other orders as may be just.

At the termination of the stay period, if granted, a tenant may not be evicted because he does not pay all the rent, including the rent accruing during the period in which its collection was stayed. He need only pay or tender the current month's rent.

The above statement is offered as a guide and is not to be taken as a full statement of the law. In support of the above, we cite the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 and the amendments thereto, United States Code Annotated, title 50, War and National Defense—appendix, section 530, and the case of *Jonda Realty Corporation* v. *Marabatto* (178 Misc. 393, 34 N. Y., sec. 301).

RIGHTS OF SERVICEMEN TO REEMPLOYMENT

(By Charles E. Earnheart)

Veterans' reemployment rights are provided by acts of Congress known as the Selective Service Act of 1940 and amendments thereto, and the new Selective Service Act of 1948. These laws will be found in United States Code Annotated, title 50, War and National Defense—Appendix, section 308, paragraph (b), section 357, paragraphs (a) and (b), and section 459, paragraphs (a) through (h), and Public Laws 572 and 599 of the Eighty-first Congress.

Reemployment statutes in effect prior to June 24, 1948, conferred reemployment rights on persons (principally veterans of World War II) who entered military service subsequent to May 1, 1950. The new Selective Service Act became effective June 24, 1948. This act does not repeal prior legislation covering reemployment rights of persons who served in the Armed Forces prior to June 24, 1948, or were in the Armed Forces on that date. A person having reemployment rights under either the old or new law is entitled to reinstatement in his former position, or a position of like seniority, status, and pay, and is entitled to be consdered as having been on furlough or leave of absence from his old job during his period of military service.

I. UNDER EXISTING LAW A VETERAN HAS A RIGHT TO HIS OLD JOB

If he can meet the following requirements:

(a) If the position was in the employ of a private employer, the United States Government, its Territories or possesions, or political subdivisions thereof, or the District of Columbia. (The 1948 act extends

reemployment rights to employees of the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government in addition to employees of the executive branch.)

(b) If the position was other than a temporary position.

(c) If he left the position to enter upon active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service.

(d) If he satisfactorily completed his period of training and service or period of active duty and received a certificate to that effect.

(e) If he is still qualified to perform the duties of the position. Under the Selective Service Act of 1948 an employee who is disabled in service and unable to perform the duties of his old position is entitled to be restored to another position.

(f) If he applies for reemployment within 90 days after he is relieved from military training and service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year.

(g) If such position was in the employ of a private employer, the employer's circumstances have not so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to reinstate the veteran to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

II. PERSONS WHO ENTERED SERVICE PRIOR TO JUNE 24, 1948, ARE QUALIFIED FOR REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

If the conditions described in paragraph I apply, any of the following have legal rights to jobs:

(a) All persons inducted for military training and service under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

(b) Members of any Reserve component of the land or naval forces who were on active duty on August 27, 1940, or who were called to active duty after that date.

(c) All persons who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, have entered upon active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States, including the women's components thereof.

(d) Reserve officers of the United States Public Health Service who were called to active duty after November 11, 1943.

III. WHAT PERSONS ARE QUALIFIED FOR REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE NEW LAW WHICH BECAME EFFECTIVE JUNE 24, 1948?

If the conditions described in paragraph I apply, any of the following have legal rights to jobs:

(a) All persons inducted for military training and service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948.

(b) All Reservists who entered upon active duty (as distinguished from active duty for training only) in the Armed Forces of the United States, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service subsequent to June 24, 1948, and prior to July 9, 1951, if relieved from active duty not later than 3 years after entering upon such active duty, or as soon thereafter as orders may be obtained relieving them from active duty.

(c) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, and prior to July 9, 1951, enlisted in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Coast Guard, for not more than 3 years, if such enlistment is his first enlistment in the Armed Forces or the Coast Guard subsequent to June 24, 1948.

(d) By applying for reemployment within 90 days after being relieved from active duty.

IV. NOTIFICATION TO EMPLOYER

While it is not legally necessary to notify the employer that a serviceman is leaving his job to enter the Armed Forces, it will avoid misunderstanding and facilitate reemployment if such a notice is given in writing.

Paragraph (d) of section 459 provides the remedy for failure of the employer to comply with the provisions of the act; vests jurisdiction in the district court of the United States and provides that the United States district attorney shall act for the claimant.

Numerous decisions have been handed down by the Federal courts interpreting the 1940 act and amendments thereto.

The United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, Washington, D. C., and Department of Labor, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, 1114 Commerce Street, Dallas, Tex., have pamphlets and booklets relative to the question of reemployment.

The Enemy Within Our Gates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, while drafting men to fight the Communists in Korea and perhaps in the future on a half dozen other fronts, there are those here in America who not only favor permitting the Communists' representative, Jacob A. Malik, to have a voice and a vote in the Security Council of United Nations, but endorse his demand that another representative of the Reds—this time from China—shall be seated where he may assist Russia's representative.

To me that position seems not only unsound but absurd.

What I believe is a sound, constructive argument which should be given consideration when we determine our future course is an editorial from the pen of Mark Haines, publisher and editor of the Sturgis Daily Journal, published at Sturgis, Mich., and which appeared in the August 19, 1950, issue of that paper. The editorial is as follows:

OUR CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST

Owners of television sets are having the doubtful pleasure this month of seeing the inscrutable mug of Jacob A. Malik as he presides over the deliberations of the Security Council of the United Nations at Lake Success. It is a humiliating spectacle.

As the American people watch and listen to this puppet of the Soviet Union respond to the strings pulled in Moscow, it would be interesting if an inquiring reporter could interview them and report their reactions.

Here before their very eyes, and assaulting their ears with scurrilous insults, is an accredited representative of a nation dedicated with fanatic zeal to the enterprise of sovietizing the world.

Here is a 1950 Machiavelli, ruthless and unscrupulous, being permitted to use every parliamentary device to thwart the essential purposes for which the United Nations was formed. He stares insolently at his unseen audience as he contemptuously imposes the will of his masters on practically the entire civilized world.

Of the 59 nations represented on the Security Council 53 have voted approval of the current effort to preserve the liberties of the South Korean Republic against the vicious aggression of the Communists. Malik has not had the consistent support of any other delegates, yet by virtue of the fact that he is a presiding officer, he is able to nullify the almost unanimous will of the Council.

It is little wonder that the people of the United States, as they watch and read about this travesty are bewildered, and wonder how such a situation can exist in this proud and intelligent Nation.

The answer is obvious. It goes back to a fundamental error committed at the time the United Nations was formed in San Francisco. In order to get Russia into the United Nations, our representatives, along with those of other nations, made the fatal mistake of giving the Soviet Union autocratic power to veto any action of the UN of which it did not approve.

Stalin's stooges were, in the end, given everything that they asked for including a free hand in China, North Korea, Manchuria, the Kurile Islands, Poland, Hungary, the Baltic states, and the Balkans. For good measure we threw in billions of dollars worth of lend-lease goods.

Now we are paying a terrific price for this incredible blunder of Roosevelt diplomacy. We were outthought and outmaneuvered and finally put in the futile position of becoming a member of an organization incapable of doing anything to preserve world peace unless it had the approval of Joe Stalin.

And as the American people listen in helpless rage to Malik's mouthings, another question will occur to them. Just how did it happen that Russia was permitted to occupy and sovietize the people of North Korea. By what right did they move in and take over the government of one-half of a nation that had been conquered and occupied by Japan.

Who defeated Japan and delivered the subjugated people of Korea from the grip of that Asiatic tyrant? Was it Russia?

Not by so much as the sacrifice of a single soldier or the expenditure of a ruble of wealth did Russia contribute to our conquest of Japan. It was not until a United States plane dropped an atom bomb on Hiroshima and practically obliterated the city that Russia saw her chance to garner the fruits of our victory without having to fight for them.

The atom bomb which made Japan's defeat certain was dropped on Sunday, August 5, 1945. Four days later Russia declared war on Japan and the next day received Tokyo's offer of surrender. It was without doubt the shortest war on record. Oddly enough, it was this same Malik, who is now ranting and raving at Lake Success, who presented the declaration of war and accepted Japan's surrender.

For this gesture, after the war, to all intents and purposes had been won and the Japs were incapable of further resistance, Russia demanded and received permission to occupy North Korea and other areas of strategic importance for which she had not expended a blow.

That is why American boys are fighting and dying today in a savage war to preserve alleged republican government in an improvised and tribal nation that will not be ready for self-government for another hundred years, if ever.

You ask, who is to blame for this?

Who was the President of the United States that sold his country down the river at Tehran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam?

Our chickens have certainly come home to roost.

Cotton Linters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to place in the Appendix of the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD a letter in regard to cotton linters:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
LEGISLATIVE LIAISON,
Washington, D. C., August 24, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This letter makes reference to your note on my letter of August 5, as well as our subsequent telephone conversation relative to the procurement of cotton linters for use of the armed services.

I have discussed this matter at some length with officials of the Department of the Army, as well as other interested agencies of the Government, and I find that early in August the Chairman, Munitions Board, requested that certain quantities of essential commodities be held as a temporary reserve for the purpose of national security. Chemical grade cotton linters used in the manufacture of gunpowder and propellants is one of the items on this list. The Commodity Credit Corporation instructed their Dallas and San Francisco installations, which are responsible for the sale of this item, to withhold further disposals.

To facilitate this arrangement, the CCC is making available to the Munitions Board on a monthly basis a statement of its inventories which it proposes to sell unless requested to retain them for national defense.

As these inventories are received from the CCC they will be circulated to the three military departments inviting comments. At this time, also, information will be circulated to the three departments as to commodities being held by the CCC at the request of the Department of Defense.

In the event that any military supply organization can foresee the probability of a serious shortage of any material that the CCC is proposing to sell, the recommendation may be made to the Munitions Board that this commodity be retained for the present by the CCC.

It is to be recognized that this is an interim cooperative arrangement to prevent dissipation of essential stocks of critical materials. It is not intended to set a pattern for future operation. Further, arrangements of the services for cotton linters will be governed to a great extent by international developments and until such time as long-range planning can be clearly defined or appropriate legislation enacted, the action cited herein is considered sufficient to insure availability of stocks of essential items to meet current and foreseeable needs of the services.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to develop this information for you. In the event I can be of further service in this connection, please feel free to call upon me at any time.

Sincerely yours,

C. G. BLAKENEY,
Colonel, GSC Office,
Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Report to the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, among the numerous duties of a Congressman, I believe, is a comprehensive report to the people of an account and record of his efforts and votes on the legislation considered by the greatest law-making body on this earth—the United States Congress. By news letters, radio reports, and periodical vists to the district, from my very first week in Congress, I have conscientiously tried to apprise the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin of my activities in Congress. It was my intention to send a report and record of my vote on every roll call of this session of Congress. However, the international crisis and present conditions necessitate action on legislation for a time longer than the constituency can wait upon such a complete report to pass judgment on the record made by their Congressman.

I sincerely believe, as long as the crisis shall exist, our place is in Washington—regardless of the election contests that may exist in our districts. I, for one, want Congress ever ready for action to cope with the present and any threatening challenges that may be awaiting us in the future.

Therefore, with a personal report impossible, I have prepared a summary of the issues and record of the Eighty-first Congress, including a record of my own activities and votes, which I shall present and circulate as widely as feasible for the scrutiny and judgment of the people in the congressional district which I represent.

MOMENTOUS DECISIONS

As the Eighty-first Congress draws to a close, dramatic world events so overshadow the affairs of us all that, to many of us who have had the honor of serving in the House of Representatives, it, indeed, appears that our task has just begun. On June 25, 1950, before the radios blared forth the tragic news of the Red Kremlin's bloodthirsty decision to change its mode of aggression from stealthy subversion to open armed conflict, Congress was prepared to adjourn. But the Communist decision to strike completely changed the decision of Congress to adjourn. We have a task ahead of us so great, particularly if the crisis should remain unchanged, that it is imperative that we stay here to meet the challenges that may await us.

There are momentous decisions that confront and will confront us—the armament of Germany and Japan; the extension of our ground forces, our Air Force, our Coast Guard, Marine Corps, and Navy; the adequate provision for families of those in our Armed Forces who are repelling our enemy; universal military training, the extension of selective service, and the federalization of the National Guard; the strengthening of the United Nations. Shall we have guns and butter, or just guns? Should we impose an excess-profit tax now or later? How can our freedoms and democracy be protected in a world beset with saboteurs who would use our cherished freedom to destroy us? What will we expect of our allies, and how shall we assist them—with guns, with food, with moral strength? These are problems paramount at the moment, and they affect the lives of us all. In this crisis, we must authorize the allocation of materials, so that guns shall be made instead of automobiles. If we do, how will we prevent competition among buyers for the fewer automobiles to be built? Price controls, and even rationing, are the answer. Should the barbarous masters of the Kremlin decide that this tragic, undeclared war should spread, we must be prepared for atomic attack. And, when the guns are silenced at last, we will face the problem of restoring to sanity a world which since 1917 has been at major war three times, in addition to innumerable lesser conflicts. It will not be easy to restore sane thinking and to provide democratic safeguards and conditions to people who have been at each other's throats for so much of the time since 1917.

This stark picture of things to come is, indeed, an odd way to preface a report on what has happened in Congress during the past 2 years. But we should all be realistic; it is impossible now to talk of the past, except in terms of the future. The problems before us must be viewed in the light of what has passed. From the very first day, on January 1, 1949, when I first entered into the Halls of Congress, till the present, truly, much has happened.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S PROGRAM

The Eighty-first Congress was presented with the President's program—a program with which President Truman had won a startling and impressive victory at the polls; and a program with which he had stumped the country, pleading for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, for civil rights legislation, and for a housing program. He had asked for welfare legislation, a better standard of living for the hungry millions in other countries to enable them to buy American goods. His victory confounded his critics who had so maligned the little man from Missouri in the Eightieth Congress. He was given a Democratic Eighty-first Congress. On January 1, 1949, both Houses had a Democratic majority. In the Eightieth Congress, the Senate had a slight Democratic majority; and the Republicans dominated the House of Representatives.

POLITICAL COMPLEXION OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

But it was not long before I realized that, just as in Madison, where it was my pleasure to serve as State Senator, party labels on occasion did not mean too much. Firstly, there were many problems which were noncontroversial party-wise; secondly, there were sectional interests which, to men of both parties, transcended party views; and, thirdly, there were some Democrats who acted like Republicans, and some Republicans who acted like Democrats were supposed to act. All the legislative antics were apparent in Washington, just as they had been in Madison—log rolling, filibustering, delay, personal anger and vilification, politics pure and simple—and then there came out of this mill of controversy the miracle of accomplishment, actual results representing a compromise—the end result of our system of checks and balances—the will of the majority, the greatest good for the greatest number. Looking back, I am amazed that so much happened—that the Congress met and faced so many great and complicated problems. True, not enough was accomplished in some fields—too much in others. But this, the Eighty-first Congress, was not a do-nothing Congress;

it acted, and it acted courageously and resolutely on many issues. Time and space do not permit me to go into detail on all the accomplishments and shortcomings of the Eighty-first Congress. In looking over the past, there are evident clues for the future—clues which will indicate how Congress will react to the problems of the future.

Legislation acted upon by Congress can be divided into four basic fields: International affairs, national defense and internal security, human welfare, and Government administration.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

As your elected Representative in Congress, I have had the honor of serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee. It was my privilege to observe what goes on behind the iron curtain, and, after one look at Hungary and eastern Germany, and taking into consideration reports from the satellite countries, the Near East, and the Pacific, I knew that America had to bend every effort to strengthen our allies abroad, and to give them moral strength, financial aid, and military help. Although many of the minority party fought, opposed, and attempted to cripple and slash the efforts in international affairs and policy, the isolationists were unsuccessful in blemishing the record of the Eighty-first Congress. The North Atlantic Pact, the European recovery program, Point 4—the program for international development, the Displaced Persons Act, Mutual Defense Assistance Act, and the far eastern economic assistance program were enacted. The latter legislation, in the light of the present crisis, demands close scrutiny of the record of certain Congressmen. The first vote on this issue in the House of Representatives was deplorable. One hundred and ninety-three new-type isolationists, including seven Congressmen from Wisconsin, voted against aid to Korea. Let us be thankful that this ill-advised vote was finally reversed and that aid to Korea was voted despite the opposition. Further, in our foreign program, I was an early supporter of the mutual defense program, and have voted for all legislation which put into effect this "actions speak louder than words" rearmament program for our allies. It is my contention that the Point 4 program is one of the great cornerstones of future peace, and, therefore, I supported it. Under its provisions the underdeveloped nations of the world will be helped to lift themselves up by their democratic bootstraps through the acquisition of American technical skill and know-how. In the field of foreign affairs the Eighty-first Congress made, fortunately, due in no small measure to some bipartisan efforts, an enviable record. My record on foreign-affairs legislation is a clue as to how your Congressman will vote to help solve such problems in the future.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

In the field of national defense, the strong right arm of our national security, the Eighty-first Congress can boast of the following legislative program: Reorganization of the Armed Forces; additional military installations; extension of the Rubber Resources Act of 1948 to 1952; extended enlistments, and the Selective Service Act; the increase in composition and authorized strength of the Armed Forces of the United States; benefits to servicemen and to their dependents; strategic and critical material programs continued and expanded; controls on subversives enacted; authorization given to the President to regulate and, if necessary, seize any foreign-flag vessel within the territorial limits of the United States if the national security is endangered, and to take necessary measures to prevent sabotage in American ports. The Eighty-first Congress effected a uniform code of justice. I have voted for all appropriations which would strengthen our military forces in all branches. What I saw in Europe convinced me of the need for an armed force second to none—and the sooner the better. And simultaneously with providing for a multigroup air force and land force, the Eighty-first Congress provided for the adequate pay for the young men and women who, in time of peace or war, aid their country by serving in the Armed Forces. Legislation was passed to revise service pay upward; and bills to better house America's fighting men at home, in Alaska, and overseas were enacted. These again are clues as to how your present Congressman will help resolve the issues of the future in the field of national defense.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Eighty-first Congress passed legislation extending old-age and survivors insurance to 10,000,000 additional people. Benefits were increased to all eligible recipients from at 50 to 100 per cent, with the smaller beneficiaries receiving the highest percentage increases. Future beneficiaries shall receive monthly retirement benefits about 100 percent higher than present benefits. Eligibility requirements for future beneficiaries were greatly liberalized, and various new types of benefits were provided. The amount which insured persons may earn without loss of benefits was increased from $15 to $50 per month. Federal contributions and grants to State public-assistance programs were considerably increased.

This legislation received my support and goes far to improve the lot of our senior citizens, and of those who may someday be unemployed. Perhaps the bill could be still better; but social security is a changing thing, and as time goes by, it will be even further improved. It is my contention that such improvements must be forthcoming.

LABOR LEGISLATION

In the field of labor legislation, the Eighty-first Congress failed to repeal or make more equitable the Taft-Hartley Act. This act, which follows the pattern of the original Smith-Connally Act and other acts designed to hinder free collective bargaining, has proven to be inequitable in many respects. My record indicates that my vote was in the interest of the workingman and for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

HUMAN WELFARE

In the field of human welfare, the Eighty-first Congress could have done more. Believing that we should have passed the civil rights proposals set forth by the President, I so voted. Unfortunately, this issue became a political football; and it will have to be worked for, once again, in the Eighty-second Congress. Ultimately, adequate legislation will pass; and then we will take away from the Communists one of their greatest propaganda weapons—the political capital they continue to make the world over on the lack of civil rights in the United States of America. I believe it is a matter of common decency that all our citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed, be entitled to the same rights and privileges.

The Eighty-first Congress enacted, and I have supported, measures for low-rent housing, for slum clearance, for aid to farm housing, and for housing research. The House should have supported legislation to enlarge our medical schools, as passed by the Senate; our medical colleges are in need of funds to make possible the education of additional physicians and nurses so greatly needed. The extension of rent controls in March 1949, received my approbation; and if rents should continue to go up, if new housing construction again should be halted by the tempo of world affairs, and if the present rapid rise in prices should continue, I would again support such legislation. It is the people of this Nation who will, in the final outcome, determine the need for the application of regulatory measures. I sincerely hope that business and consumers will voluntarily avoid conditions which would demand the application of extensive Federal controls.

In the field of education, I voted for the National Science Foundation, and will support nondiscriminatory Federal aid to education.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

In the field of Government administration, I have favored Government economy that will not lessen the service of the Government itself. The determination should be and was for waste elimination, but not for government by erasure. There were 35 reorganization measures, based on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, before Congress. All of them have received my support; 26 received congressional approbation. Feeling that in periods of national prosperity there should be no national deficit, I have favored taxes in an amount sufficient to reduce the national debt. With that as a clue, it will be seen that your Congressman will favor measures to take all profit out of war, and to impose real excess-profits taxes in the face of huge armament expenditures.

Since the duty of a Congressman, no less than the duty of the man in uniform, requires that he be at his post, I have tried by this report to put before you as clearly and sincerely as possible my views of present problems, a summary of my stewardship as your Congressman during the last 2 years, and some indication of the problems ahead.

My record is an open book. Thousands of letters which you have been good enough to write, expressing your views and opinions, aided in keeping me

apprised and abreast with the "pulse" of the people in my district on the problems of the ship of state. Before important votes, I made it my business to return to Milwaukee to talk to as many citizens as possible to get their views. It was with these views in mind that I formulated my opinion on specific legislation which came before Congress.

I was pleased to have your views, but we should bear in mind that it is a privilege to give expression of views and opinions on governmental affairs—an opportunity not afforded and granted by nondemocratic nations.

America is a country expecting sacrifice and homage from every one of us. The aggressors overseas are countries demanding blind obedience from every citizen. Our free way of life is again meeting trial by fire. We will win that fight. We will win it because we have that inner dignity of the spirit which moves each and every one of us to consider our actions truly in the light of what is best for the common good. We make those decisions; they are not made for us. Fitting into this process of making decisions is Congress and your Congressman. For Congress is your voice; and, make no mistake about it, your voice is always heard. Each 2 years at the polls, you have the opportunity to record your approval or disapproval of the kind of representation your voice has had in the National Legislature during the preceding period. Do not fail to avail yourself of the opportunity of approval or disapproval of your voice in Congress.

I humbly submit the following record to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, whom it was a pleasure to represent in Congress, and invite their reactions and suggestions:

Voting record, 81st Cong.

	Issue
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
Favored	North Atlantic Pact.
Voted for	European Recovery Act (ECA).
Voted for	Reciprocal Trade Agreements extension.
Voted for	Mutual Defense Act.
Voted for	United Nations Participation Act.
Voted for	International Children's Emergency Fund.
Voted for	Amending Displaced Persons Act, eliminating discrimination.
Favored	International Trade Organization charter.
Favored	Point 4 program.
Favored	Strengthening of United Nations to become World Federation (sponsor).
Favored	Recognition of Spain.
Voted for	Korean aid bill.
Favored	Pacific Pact (sponsor).
	ECONOMIC POLICY
Favored	Strengthening antitrust legislation.
Favored	As far as possible, a pay-as-you-go policy.
Opposed	Weakening Natural Gas Act.
Opposed	Barring United States rate regulation on natural gas (so-called Kerr bill).
Voted for	Repeal of certain oleomargarine taxes.
Opposed	So-called basing-point system of pricing amendments.
Opposed	Potato subsidy.
Opposed	Public works, rivers and harbors subsidy, a billion and one-half dollar "pork barrel" bill.
Opposed	Cotton and peanut subsidy.
Voted for	Reduction of wartime excise taxes (sponsor).
Favored	Curtailment of national expenditures to only the essential military demands in the interest of defense and security.
Voted for	Stand-by economic controls
Favored	Excess-profits tax now.

Voting record, 81st Con.—Continued

	Issue
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY
Voted for	Extension of the Selective Service Act.
Voted for	Unification of armed services.
Voted for	Central Intelligence Agency improvements.
Voted for	Military pay increases.
Favored	St. Lawrence seaway project and development.
Voted for	All military preparedness legislation.
Voted for	Safeguards against espionage and sedition.
Favored	Subversive control and registration legislation.
Voted for	Uniform code of military justice.
Voted for	Deportation of subversives.
Voted for	Bill prohibiting the picketing of courts.
Voted for	Extension of control over strategic and critical materials.
Voted for	Funds for Un-American Activities Committee.
Favored	Universal military training program.
	HUMAN WELFARE
Voted for	Extension of Housing and Rent Act.
Voted for	Public housing and slum clearance.
Voted for	REA loans for rural electrification and telephones.
Voted for	Social security—old-age survivor insurance expansion of coverage and increase in benefits.
Voted for	Anti-poll-tax legislation.
Voted for	Financial assistance extension of hospital survey and construction.
Voted for	National Science Foundation Act.
Opposed to	Compulsory socialized medicine.
Favored	Federal aid for State health programs and Federal Health Insurance.
Favored	Atomic energy research for peacetime use.
Favored	Equitable Federal aid to education for all children.
	LABOR
Voted for	Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act.
Voted for	Minimum wage increase.
Voted for	Equalization of benefits in the postal field service.
Voted for	Fair employment practices bill prohibiting discrimination.
	GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION
Voted for	Amending House rules eliminating "pigeonhole" powers.
Voted for	Reorganization of Government agencies' authority.
Voted for	All Government reorganization recommendations based on Hoover Commission reports.
Voted for	Equitable readjustment and increase of postal rates.
Voted for	Amendments to the Hatch Act.
Opposed	Arbitrary percentage cuts for governmental services and departments.
Opposed	So-called Jensen amendment limiting 10-percent personnel replacements.
Voted for	So-called Gossett-Lodge amendment providing for constitutional change of electoral college in choosing President and Vice President.
	VETERANS
Voted for	Liberalization of requirements for pension benefits for World Wars I and II veterans, their widows and children.
Voted for	Increase in compensation for World War I service-connected cases.
Voted for	Promotion credits in postal service for World War II veterans.
Voted for	Legislation revising GI tuition payments to land-grant colleges.

	Roll-call votes, 81st Cong.			Quorum calls, 81st Cong.	
	Voted	Paired	Not voting[1]	Present	Absent[2]
1st session	109	2	10	89	26
2d session[3]	110	3	11	112	19

[1] General pair arranged.
[2] Absence on quorum call does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.
[3] Up to and including Aug. 26, 1950.

Total roll calls: 1st session, 236; 2d session (up to and including Aug. 26, 1950), 255.

The Capstone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, during the commencement exercises of the University of Alabama, on the evening of June 5, 1950, the pleasure was mine of speaking to the alumni banquet. Several of those who were present have asked me to try to recall what was said and put it into the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE CAPSTONE

Mr. President, officers, faculty, fellow alumni, and distinguished guests, we who love our alma mater, glory in the challenging name given her by Dr. Denny; not as bosast, but as prayer. It was true, as history, while as prophecy of a goal to be won by endless struggle up the slope, it was even more inspiring.

The great chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Judge Hatton Sumners, loved to call himself a "God fan." He elucidates his philosophy of living somewhat like this: "If God had wanted us on top of the hill, He would have put us there. But that would have made fools of us, and denied us the privilege of growth by the struggle to climb. We'll never get on top; that's God's place, from which He helps all who try."

Dr. Peter Marshall, the late pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Washington, and Chaplain of the United States Senate, made famous this saying: "One who is an enthusiastic follower of any sport is called a 'fan.' He takes pride in being a 'fan' and in being called one. 'Fan' is a good word as applied to every enthusiasm save religion, but when one becomes enthusiastic about his religion he is called a 'fanatic.'"

What this world needs more than anything else is more "God fans," the best kind of fanatics, and the crowning glory of the capstone should be to produce them.

President James A. Garfield, when asked What does it take to make a great university? replied: "Mark Hopkins on one end of a log with a boy on the other."

This definition caused Arthur Guiterman to write:

EDUCATION

"Mark Hopkins sat on one end of a log
And a farm boy sat on the other
Mark Hopkins came as a pedagogue
And taught as an elder brother.
I don't care what Mark Hopkins taught—
If his Latin was small and his Greek was naught—
For the farmer's boy he thought, thought he,
All through lecture time and quiz,
'The kind of a man I mean to be
Is the kind of a man Mark Hopkins is.'
Philosophy, languages, medicine, law,
Are peacock feathers to deck the daw,
If the boys who come from your splendid schools
Are well-trained sharpers or flippant fools,
You may brag of your age and your ivied walls,
Your great endowments, your noble halls
And all your modern features,
Your vast curriculum's scope and reach
And the multifarious things you teach—
But how about the teachers?
Are they men who will stand in a father's place,
Who are paid, best paid, by the ardent face

When boyhood gives, as boyhood can,
Its love and faith to a fine, true man?
No printed page nor spoken plea
May teach young hearts what men should be—
Not all the books on all the shelves,
But what the teachers are themselves.
For education is: Making men;
So is it now, so was it when
Mark Hopkins sat on one end of a log
And a farm boy sat on the other."

Our forefathers came to this new land seeking God, not gold. They dedicated themselves and their colony to God. The golden threads of religion have strengthened the warp and woof of the fabric of our national character.

Dr. Daniel L. Marsh has made this clear in his excellent book The American Canon.

The seven constituent elements:

I. The Genesis of American democracy: The Mayflower compact.

II. Our Exodus: The Declaration of Independence.

III. Our Book of the Law: The Constitution of the United States.

IV. Our Major Prophecy: Washington's Farewell Address.

V. A Psalm of America: The Star-Spangled Banner.

VI. Our Gospel of Americanism: Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address.

VII. An Epistle to the Americans: Woodrow Wilson's Road Away From Revolution.

All of the major prophets of today voice the same old appeal; the only modern challenge. These are a few of them:

Frank Laubach, the apostle of literacy.

Eric Johnston, who cites Chiang Kai-shek, losing with war; while Ghandi won by practicing peace.

Sir Carl Berendsen, faith is the victory.

Billy Graham, 70,000 crowd Boston Common to hear him. The first evangelist invited to speak to Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, declaration of conscience: "It is high time that we stopped thinking politically as Republicans and Democrats about elections and started thinking patriotically as Americans about national security based on individual freedom. It is high time that we all stopped being tools and victims of totalitarian techniques—techniques that, if continued unchecked, will surely end what we have come to cherish as the American way of life."

Gen. George C. Marshall, on Memorial Day, 1950, at the Amphitheater in Arlington Cemetery and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the World War II Chief of Staff, and later Secretary of State, after pleading for continuation of the Marshall plan, enjoined a listening world: "But material assistance alone is not sufficient. The most important thing for the world today, in my opinion, is a spiritual regeneration which would restore a feeling of good faith and good will among men generally."

With the voices of the major prophets of today still ringing in our ears and hearts, there is a voice of yesterday still vibrant and strong as he gives us the same message, in his last written word. Woodow Wilson also spoke for today: "That supreme task, which is nothing less than the salvation of civilization now faces democracy, insistent, imperative.

"The sum of the whole mater is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead."

So, the grandeur of our alma mater has been and will continue to be builded by the profound scholarship plus the inspiring character of the leaders who have here invested their lives, fully appreciating the chief end of education.

We Need an American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD at the conclusion of today's business.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are deeply disturbed by the disastrous failure of the foreign policy heretofore pursued by their Government and are apprehensive lest future blundering jeopardize their very national existence.

Mr. Speaker, the American people demand an end to secret commitments and decisions made on a day-to-day and crisis-to-crisis basis. They demand an openly arrived at American foreign policy they can support and understand.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have the right to know what is the foreign policy of their Government. And they have a right to assess that policy before they are called upon to shed their blood and exhaust their treasure in war.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of our Government today is not a policy which has the confidence of the people. Nor is it a policy which the people understand. In truth, it is not a policy which the Members of this Congress understand, for we know far too little of its content.

Mr. Speaker, on August 25, I introduced in this body House Joint Resolution 526, which has as its purpose the immediate formation of a Select Committee of the House and the Senate. It will be the duty of this committee to consider and recommend a foreign policy designed to meet the pressing problems of the American people in their relations with the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the immediate consideration of my resolution.

Repair of Reserve Fleet Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy in the action which the House has just taken to provide for the repair and activation of vessels of the reserve fleet. It is long overdue.

Over a year ago a similar request for $25,000,000 to cover essential repairs for 134 vessels, representing an initial investment of $800,000,000, was defeated in conference due to the lack of a favorable budget recommendation from the President.

At that time the Joint Chiefs of Staff in endorsing the expenditure had pointed out that the ability of the United States to meet the demands of shipping in the event of war is largely dependent upon the material condition of the merchant shipping held in the inactive reserve; that many of the ships in the reserve were inoperable due to need of repairs and that from the military point of view it was highly desirable to accomplish the minimum essential repairs of all these vessels as rapidly as possible.

I supported the proposal last summer, calling for the expenditure of $25,000,000. Some time ago, I introduced a bill calling for the action just approved by the House, and authorizing an appropriation not exceeding $50,000,000.

The repair work is important with a view to an adequate reserve fleet which can be utilized immediately in case of need. It is vital from the standpoint of the preservation of our essential shipyards and our forces of skilled workers at those yards, who have proved themselves to be so invaluable in time of war.

The situation in our ship construction yards is becoming deplorable. Employment has been deteriorating rapidly. Skilled workers who have given the best years of their lives to ship construction are confronted by the possibility of unemployment. Under present conditions there will be only one merchant ship under construction in the Atlantic yards after Decemoer 1951. Under present conditions there will be little or no naval construction before 1952.

Those at the yards see once again the specter of conditions prevailing between 1922–37.

And, Mr. Speaker, when they turn their eyes toward Washington, they see the so-called long range construction program blocked by the President through the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department. They see the failure of the administration to offer any constructive substitute for this legislation. They know that the repair program just approved has been blocked by the President for more than a year through the Bureau of the Budget, and they know that this House on yesterday afternoon voted to limit the number of ship subsidy contracts in this time of mobilization to 263 or only three more than actually in effect 8 months ago on January 1, 1950. It is disheartening.

The action of the House if approved by the Senate and the President will provide for the repair and activation of 135 vessels and for the repair and return to the reserve fleet of 46 vessels, a total of 181 vessels at a cost of some $27,000,000.

Eighteen million dollars is provided here—$9,000,000 will be provided by the Military Sea Transportation Service.

I congratulate the House on the action which it has taken.

More Power for the B–36

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks I include an editorial taken from the Washington Star of August 25, 1950, entitled "More Power for the B–36." It is well worth reading:

MORE POWER FOR THE B–36

The distinctive characteristics of the Korean war have produced a kind of publicity eclipse for the B–36. It is not the kind of war for which the Air Force's intercontinental bomber was designed. The smaller bombers—B–29's and B–50's—operating from bases in Japan have ample range to reach any target in North Korea, and, consequently, there has been no reason to send the biggest of all bombers into action. This, naturally enough, has evoked some caustic criticism from those who have never had much faith in the B–36 and even less understanding of what it is supposed to do.

But this does not mean that the experience in Korea has in any way depreciated the importance of the giant bomber. If anything, the Korean war has rather tended to emphasize and enlarge our dependence on the B–36.

The fighting qualities of the North Korean puppet troops, Russian-trained and Russian-equipped, should have thoroughly dissipated any wishful thinking as to our prospects in a conventional ground war with the Russians and their allies and puppets. We simply cannot undertake to fight that kind of war with any hope of success. American ground forces will be needed, of course, for certain operations, as will the Navy. But we would be doomed in advance if we should try to conduct against the Russians the kind of war that Hitler waged.

Despite the detractors of strategic air power, a war with Russia in the foreseeable future will be, to a very large degree, an air war. We will have to look to our long-range bombers, and any other means of effective attack over great distances, to go in and destroy the Russian centers of war production. If that can be done, there would be some reasonable prospect of dealing with the Soviet ground forces which, meanwhile, will have swept into Europe. If that cannot be done, if we cannot knock out the vital centers of Russian power in Russia, then we will surely discover that there is very little we can do anywhere.

It is against this background that the announcement of the delivery to the Air Force of its first jet-equipped B–36 assumes special interest. This is a project that has been long in the making, and there were skeptics who said it could not be done. But it has been done. The remodeled plane, in addition to its six reciprocating engines, has four jet engines mounted under the outer wing panels. This means greater power and greater speed, especially over target areas, where speed and altitude can be the difference between success and failure.

With all of our B–36's scheduled for similar renovation, the strategic bomber fleet should be both a more effective deterrent to war and a more effective striking weapon if war with Russia should come. In any event, this latest announcement is gratifying evidence of the effort being made to improve this cardinal weapon in our armory.

Director of Central Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Admiral Hillenkoetter has done a superb job as Director of Central Intelligence, and as he now returns to active sea duty with the Navy, I wish to add my words of commendation for his performance as the Director of Central Intelligence. Admiral Hillenkoetter has had a long career in intelligence; first as naval attaché in France, then as Admiral Nimitz's intelligence chief in the Pacific, and finally as head of the Central Intelligence Agency. No witness who has appeared before our committees in recent years has been more frank and open in answering questions, or more informative on the world situation. We will all miss him and wish him the very best of luck in his new assignment.

Section 2 of H. R. 9158 Would Frustrate Intention of Previous Congress and Makes Possible Further Abuses of the Multiple Seizure Device

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the less apparent but nevertheless considerable evils of H. R. 9158 is contained in section 2 of the bill, which provides:

The Federal Security Administrator or, under his direction and supervision, such officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency as he designates, shall execute his functions under this part.

No such provision is contained in the present law. The practical effect of this section would be to permit the Federal Security Administrator to delegate his powers and functions under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to any of his subordinates or employees of the Agency. While this would appear to be relatively innocuous on its face, it is believed that such a provision in the bill would frustrate and scuttle the intention of the Congress in enacting certain provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. This is particularly so in regard to the multiple seizure provisions found in section 154 of H. R. 9158 (which is substantially identical with the present provisions of section 304 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938). The long legislative history of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 shows that it was the specific intention of the Congress to authorize probable cause determinations, which normally are conditions precedent to multiple seizures, to be made only by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

CONGRESSIONAL INTENT IGNORED AND FLOUTED BY THE ADMINISTRATOR

Experience has shown that the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency has ignored the obvious intent of the Congress to permit multiple seizure determinations to be made only by the Administrator. At least in one known instance, the Administrator has permitted subordinate employees of the Agency, in direct violation of the provisions of section 304 (a) of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, to make probable cause determinations authorizing multiple seizures. Since this one known instance involves several of my constituents I am quite conversant with the circumstances surrounding it. Between October 1948, and January 1949, 11 seizure actions were filed against a mutiple vitamin and mineral product known as Nutrilite and distributed by Mytinger and Casselberry, Inc., of Long Beach, Calif. These seizure actions were instituted in far-flung jurisdictions throughout the United States—i. e., Belleville, N. J.; New York, N. Y.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Hastings, Nebr.; Spokane, Wash.; Seattle, Wash.; Clarkfield, Minn.; St. Petersburg, Fla.; and Chicago, Ill.—without giving Mytinger and Casselberry, Inc., any notice or an opportunity to be heard. In December 1948, this firm filed suit in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia seeking to enjoin officials of the Federal Security Agency from making further seizures of the product Nutrilite. Upon a filing of a motion to dismiss by the defendant officials in that action, it was discovered for the first time that the probable cause determinations authorizing the multiple seizures of Nutrilite were made not by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency but rather by Charles W. Crawford, Associate Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Paul B. Dunbar, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, and George P. Larrick, Associate Commissioner of Food and Drugs. On January 24, 1949, Judge David A. Pine of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia held that the failure of the Administrator himself to make the determinations authorizing multiple seizures violated the Act. Judge Pine held that since the multiple seizure provisions were so drastic and harsh, the Congress intended that the important decision to make them was to be made by the Administrator personally and further, that the legislative history clearly shows that this duty was not to be delegated to any subordinate of the Administrator.

In holding that the defendant officials had failed to comply with the Act which required the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to make the determinations of probable cause, Judge Pine stated as follows:

The COURT. * * * I am of the view that when Congress gives the authority contained in the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act which permits him to make multiple seizures when the Administrator has

probable cause to believe from facts found with or without a hearing, by him or any officer or employee of the agency, that the misbranded article would be in a material respect misleading to the injury and damage of the purchaser or consumer, that the provisions of the statute should be strictly followed. They have not been strictly followed here because the Administrator, as administrator, has not stated he had probable cause to believe these things * * * I cannot grant the relief sought by the administrator at this time because I feel there has not been a strict and literal compliance with the statute and that there should be one when such a drastic and harsh provision of law permits the acts contemplated.

It is obvious that the ruling of Judge Pine in the case of Mytinger and Casselberry against Ewing and others, properly emphasized the fact that the Congress, being completely cognizant of the drastic nature of the multiple seizure device, had vested the power to authorize and recommend such action only in the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, for it was obvious that only those having the highest degree of responsibility should be authorized to bring into play such a course of action having such serious consequences on a business.

I do not know whether section 2 of H. R. 9158 was proposed by the Federal Security Agency or the Food and Drug Administration as a result of Judge Pine's ruling. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the section is diametrically opposed to the intention of the Congress and would apparently authorize a minor irresponsible official or employee of the Federal Security Agency to unleash a multiple-seizure campaign which could destroy a beneficial and legitimate business before there was any opportunity to be heard on the claims alleged against a product or its labeling. Every effort should be made to limit possible abuses of the multiple-seizure device. Yet the effect of section 2 of H. R. 9158 would be to increase substantially the possibilities of abuse of that power. Congress originally decided that this tremendous power should only be in the Administrator and that is where it should remain if it is to exist at all. I have introduced H. R. 6466 to change this great uncontrolled power by amending the present act and those amendments are explained in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A5924.

THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE MULTIPLE SEIZURE PROVISIONS GRAPHICALLY DISCLOSES THE CONGRESSIONAL INTENT THAT ONLY THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY COULD MAKE PROBABLE CAUSE DETERMINATIONS AUTHORIZING MULTIPLE SEIZURES

The history of the various bills which ultimately become the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 discloses beyond any doubt that the Congress in providing in section 304 (a) of that act that multiple seizures could be made when the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency has probable cause to believe that certain facts exist intended that the Administrator and only the Administrator should have this power. The multiple seizure provisions were of major interest to the Congress and received detailed consideration and study. In 1933 Senator Royal S. Copeland of New York introduced S. 1944 into the Senate of the United States—Seventy-third Congress, first session. This bill represented the initial congressional effort to amend the Food and Drug Act. One of the greatest difficulties encountered in the congressional consideration of the bill was the multiple seizure provisions. Section 16 (a) of S. 1944 introduced by Senator Copeland provided that adulterated or misbranded foods, drugs and cosmetics should be liable to seizure by, first, process pursuant to libel, or second, if a chief of station or other officer of the Food and Drug Administration, duly designated by the Secretary, has probable cause to believe that the article is so adulterated as to be imminently dangerous to health, then, and in such case only, by order of such officer, issued under his oath of office, particularly describing the article to be seized, the place where located, and the officer and employee to make the seizure. Thus it will be observed that the original bill contains specific authority for chiefs of stations or other officers if duly designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, under whose jurisdiction the Food and Drug Act was then placed by law, to make probable cause determinations necessary for seizure.

Subsequent to the introduction of S. 1944, S. 2000 and S. 2800 were introduced by Senator Copeland as substitutes and revisions of S. 1944. Neither S. 2000 nor S. 2800 contained any changes to section 16 (a), S. 1944, as quoted above. In Senate Report No. 493 dated March 15, 1934, and which accompanied S. 2800 to the floor of the Senate, the Senate committee specifically recognized that officials other than the Secretary could act where the public health demanded but the report notes that the Secretary was specifically to designate the officials who could act under this section. S. 2800 was not, however, enacted by the Senate. During the Seventy-fourth Congress, Senator Copeland again introduced a bill known as S. 5 in which section 711 (a) embodied the provisions of section 16 (a) of S. 1944, S. 2000, and S. 2800 which authorize probable cause determinations to be made by chiefs of station or other employees duly designated by the Secretary. Section 711 (a) of S. 5 also required that the facts upon which the seizure was based be duly reported to the Secretary.

The next development in the Senate occurred on April 8, 1935, when the so-called Bailey amendment to section 711 (a) was accepted. This amendment provided in part as follows:

Provided, however, That no more than one seizure action shall be instituted in cases of alleged misbranding, except upon order to show cause, and then upon a showing by the Secretary that such article is misbranded in manner or degree as to render such article imminently dangerous to health, or that such alleged misbranding has been the basis of a prior judgment in favor of the United States in a criminal prosecution or libel for condemnation proceeding respecting such article under this act: *And provided further,* That said single seizure action shall, on motion, be removed for trial to a jurisdiction of reasonable proximity to the residence of the claimant of such article.

The above amendment clearly rejected the idea that "chiefs of stations" or "employees" could have probable cause and instead placed upon the Secretary the duty of making "a showing that the article is misbranded."

The next development in the Senate was highly significant in that it discloses the protective cloak by which the Congress had always intended the multiple seizure provisions of the present act to be surrounded. On May 28, 1935, S. 5 was enacted by the Senate, with still a further change in section 711 (a). As passed by the Senate, this section now reads as follows:

Any article of food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded when introduced into or while in interstate commerce, or that has been manufactured, processed, or packed in a factory or establishment, the operator of which did not, at the time of manufacture, processing or packing, hold an unsuspended valid permit, if so required by regulations under section 305, shall be liable to be proceeded against while in interstate commerce or at any time thereafter on libel of information and condemned in any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the article is found, provided, however, that not more than one seizure shall be instituted in cases of alleged misbranding, except when the Secretary has probable cause to believe from facts found by him that such article is so misbranded as to render it imminently dangerous to health, or when such alleged misbranding has been the basis of a prior judgment in favor of the United States in a criminal prosecution or libel for condemnation proceding under this act respecting such article, and provided further, that said single seizure action shall, on motion, be removed for trial to the jurisdiction of the claimant's residence.

The Senate therefore said that the Secretary must not only have the probable cause but must also find the facts, and rejected the previous thoughts that chiefs of stations or other employees could have the probable cause, or even that the Secretary must make a showing.

S. 5 then went to the House of Representatives, where the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce offered an amendment to section 711 (a), renumbering it 709 (a), and making certain textual changes not of pertinence here. They did not, however, alter in any manner the emphasized language in the above quotation. On June 19, 1936, S. 5 passed the House of Representatives as reported to it, and the bill went to a conference committee of the Senate and House where the bill died, the conferees being unable to agree on who or what agency was to enforce the act.

Again, in the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, on January 6, 1937, Senator Copeland reintroduced, as S. 5, his measure. In this version, section 6 (a), as introduced, was identical with section 709 (a) which had been advanced by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the previous session of Congress, except in one respect. The word "imminently" was omitted.

The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, and on February 15, 1937, a favorable report was rendered, the word "imminently" being

reinserted, and the second proviso being shortened to read as follows:

When the Secretary has probable cause to believe from facts found by him that such misbranding of the article renders it imminently dangerous to health.

Senate Report 91, which accompanied S. 5, stated as follows:

This bill permits multiple seizures of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated. It permits multiple seizures for misbranding when the misbranding has been the basis of a prior judgment in favor of the Government, or when the Secretary of Agriculture has probable cause to believe, from facts found by him, that the misbranding renders the article dangerous to health.

The only limitation is that misbranding which does not render an article dangerous to health, shall not be handled by multiple seizures made at the will of enforcement officers. That has been the declared policy of the Food and Drug Administration in enforcing the existing law. The bill therefore does no more than write into the law what is declared to be the policy of the Administration. But it is important that that policy be written into the bill because it is the proper policy, and because succeeding administrations should be held to that policy.

Senate Report No. 91, from which the above quotation is taken was, however, withdrawn, and Senate Report No. 152 replaced it. In Senate Report 152 the following statement with reference to multiple seizures was made:

This bill permits multiple seizures of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated. It permits multiple seizures for misbranding when the misbranding has been the basis of a prior judgment in favor of the Government or when the Secretary of Agriculture has probable cause to believe, from facts found by him, that the misbranding renders the article actually dangerous to health.

The only limitation is that misbranding which does not render an article actually dangerous to health or is, in a material respect, false and fraudulent, shall not be handled by multiple seizures made at the will of enforcement officers.

While this actually does impose a limitation on seizure of food, drugs, and cosmetics it does confer, in the opinion of the committee, sufficient power for adequate public protection.

Still, the Congress believed that the Secretary was the one who should not only have the probable cause, but who should actually find the facts.

S. 5 was enacted by the Senate on March 9, 1937. Following Senate passage, the bill went to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and a subcommittee was appointed to study the bill. This subcommittee recommended no change in section 6 (a) as passed by the Senate, except in its numerical designation, making it 304 (a). The full committee, however, made the most significant change thus far when it eliminated the words "from facts found by him." This omission clearly supports the conclusion that the intent was to require the Secretary to have the probable cause, but that he need not find the facts necessary to sustain the probable cause. This conclusion is inescapable when the language of previous measures considered by Congress is compared with that used by the committee.

S. 5 passed the House on June 1, 1938, and immediately thereafter a conference committee was appointed to reconcile the differences in the House and Senate versions of the bill. This conference committee met and submitted a report which contained the present language of section 304 (a) of the act. The report was accepted by both Houses of Congress, and S. 5 became the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

It is obvious from the foregoing that the Congress certainly intended for the Secretary to be the individual who determines whether or not multiple seizures would be made. First, they required him to designate those officials who could have the probable cause; then they added to that the further requirement that the facts be reported to him; then they placed upon the Secretary the burden of not only having the probable cause but also of finding the facts; and, then, finally, left to him the duty of having the probable cause, based upon the fact-finding activities of other officials, thereby cutting down somewhat upon the personal duties formerly thought necessary to impose upon the Secretary. The Secretary's role in the multiple-seizure device is, therefore, a matter of clear legislative intent.

In this connection, it should be noted that by the reorganization plan of 1940, the functions and duties of the Food and Drug Administration were transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Federal Security Agency. The Federal Security Administrator, therefore, succeeded to the duties and responsibilities theretofore in the Secretary of Agriculture. Certainly Mr. Ewing, the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, is not as important as the Secretary of Agriculture who is a Cabinet officer. The reorganization plan of 1940 thus in effect placed the multiple seizure power in a person of lesser responsibility. Section 2 of H. R. 9158 would whittle away still further the intent of Congress to place the multiple seizure power in those having a high degree of responsibilit .

CONCLUSION

I respectfully submit that section 2 of H. R. 9158 should be deleted from the proposed bill. If it is deemed advisable to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to delegate certain functions, I believe that these should be spelled out specifically. I strongly reject any delegation of power concerning the authority to make determinations of probable cause in regard to multiple seizures. We must not cast aside in a moment of carelessness so fundamental a principle which was resolved by the Congress after years of study and consideration.

On August 17, 1950, I offered for your information, proposed amendments to the existing Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938 as amended, and made a statement appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on pages A5824–A5927, explaining the amendments.

Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the Members of the House heard with interest Friday night of the President's appointment of Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith as the new Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the assignment of Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, the present Director, to the command of a cruiser division.

Those of us who have known the admiral, have realized that for many months—long before the outbreak of the Korean crisis—he had been desirous of returning to sea duty. Those of us who have heard him testify on various occasions before congressional committees, realize that he is one of the outstanding public servants in the Government, and his position will be a difficult one to fill. His frankness and honesty in his appearances before our committees have made a universally fine impression. His performance as Director of Central Intelligence merits from all of us a hearty well done.

Report on Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, it is a long time since I have read an article about Alaska which so captured the flavor and vastness of the country as that written by Jessie Ash Arndt, woman's editor of the Christian Science Monitor, and which appeared in the Monitor of August 23. Believing this article will convey a truer understanding of Alaska, I take pleasure in presenting it here:

RESOURCES AMAZE VISITOR IN BRIEF TOUR OF TERRITORY

(By Jessie Ash Arndt)

Alaska, it could be said, begins in the attractive little town of Ketchikan. That is where I boarded the 58-foot motor launch *Forester*, flagship of the United States Forest Service, for a journey through the inside passage to Juneau on a trip that was to take me to the Bering Sea.

Ketchikan, like other towns in southeastern Alaska, which planted themselves against the edge of the Tongass National Forest, reaches a short distance back into it and stretches along about 17 miles of forest. That's all. If you look at the map you will find Ketchikan is written in large, black letters like Chicago or Tulsa or Seattle. But it has only about 6,000 population.

Our host aboard was Chester M. Archbold, the forester who is in charge of 6,000,000 of the 16,000,000 acres of the Tongass; Mrs. Archbold was our hostess. The skipper was

Art Thompson, also of the Forest Service, who once had been a deep-sea diver.

It was reassuring to have two men who knew both the forest and the sea in charge of our little ship. Four hours over smooth water, which constantly reflected in color the variegated mountains, brought us to the piling of an old cannery dock. The cannery had burned, and because the trend now is toward larger canning operations, had not been rebuilt.

PROFOUND RESPONSE

We tied up for the night in a wilderness of mountains, forest, and water that made the visitor understand, early in his journey, the best description of Alaska—this section or any other—of which I know. A Negro from the United States, when asked his impression of Alaska, pondered and then replied: "Well, it's just miles and miles of miles and miles."

The next day we headed for Wrangell via Ann Creek. At this point the Forest Service has marked a trail from the shore into the forest. Maybe 200 persons get there in a year, Mr. Archbold told us. That morning we learned what Longfellow meant by "the forest primeval." Ancient, moss grown, and moss draped, it seemed unreal; yet there we were, with tremendous spruce and hemlock towering overhead; twisted trunks and roots about us; and the ground dogwood, fern, and myriad other forest plants beneath our feet sunk in spongy muskeg centuries old.

We stood above rapids up which thousands of pink and silver salmon were struggling to their spawning ground and watched a great black bear lumbering up the opposite trail and shaking the fish he held in his mouth. A bald eagle on a rock, in the quieter water above the rapids, was awaiting his chance for a similar catch.

So we went on, from Ketchikan to Wrangell, a little fishing village noted for its totem poles; Wrangell to Petersburg, which was like a bit of Norway transplanted in Alaska. Nothing but air and water connect these small towns and cities of southern Alaska, for there are no roads or other connecting links by land. From Petersburg we moved up s enic Tracy Arm to the Sawyer Glacier, retraced our way to Stephens Passage, and continued to Juneau, the Territorial capital.

Juneau brought the Baranof Hotel with elevators and porters in uniform, an impressive Federal building, but a population of less than 6,000.

PART OF TODAY'S WORLD

While one is tempted, in describing the stupendous scenery of Alaska, to be lazy and employ the meaningless phrase, "Its out of this world," one does not do so. Alaska is very much a part of today's world. Juneau brought us down to earth.

We found Alaskans listening to the radio and watching the headlines, but not talking much about the war in Korea. "They say some of the people down in the States have the war jitters," more than one person observed.

The radio news programs I heard gave me an intimate glimpse of the people: About a salmon derby, a railroaders' picnic in Wasilla, an old-timer who tried to shoo a black bear away with a cane and had a little trouble. One of the broadcasts brought wry smiles from Alaskans listening. The commentator named a couple of major matters which had been put aside for the adjournment of Congress and then added, "and other matters of secondary importance including statehood for Alaska."

There are various reasons why statehood is not of secondary importance either to Alaska or to the rest of the States.

To be sure, opinion is divided, even there, on this question. But men in a position to know most about Alaska's needs appear heartily in favor of it.

MORE PEOPLE NEEDED

"First, American citizenship is the most precious possession in the world, and we want it in full measure," said Gov. Ernest Gruening, when I interviewed him in Juneau. "We pay all the Federal taxes there are, and yet we have no voice in making them. The Alaska Delegate is voteless even in committee—a situation whcih has led to discrimination and retarded development of every kind. A Territorial government, at best, is defective, because it is administered at long range."

Alaska has 130,000 population, said the Governor, which is substantially more than most States had when they were admitted to the Union, and can show an 80-percent increase in the last decade. "But we need more people. We have 586,000 square miles, one-fifth the area of the United States, which is 4 or 5 miles to every person."

RED TAPE ASSAILED

Incidentally Governor Gruening says red tape is the most serious Red menace within Alaska. Until recently the Territorial legislature has been dominated by absentee interests which have fought any Territorial tax program. This is now beginning. At the last session the battle was won when permissive legislation was passed for a city sales tax. One-half of the estimated yield will go to schools and the rest to health and welfare. Each town may now vote its own local sales tax.

A day came when we left taxes behind us and flew over the clouds from Juneau to Anchorage. Here we returned to roads and roads that connected with highways.

Beyond Anchorage, along Glenn Highway, we found the Matanuska Valley, where the people of Anchorage and Fort Richardson get their fresh produce, milk, and butter. This valley, to which colonists were sent by the Federal Government in the thirties is well known—by name. I had expected to see many miles of well-cultivated farms. But this, like other preconceived notions of Alaska, was wrong. There were several farms of good size and with house and barn such as one might see in Kansas or Wisconsin. But these were few. Others were still being developed, from log cabins or cottages instead of from large farmhouses.

LABOR AND MATERIALS

The major reasons can be reduced, perhaps, to two. Labor costs and building materials are both much higher than those in any State in the Union, and the growing season is short.

Below Anchorage, from Seward, there is a railroad which goes all the way to Fairbanks. This is another link through the interior. It has blue cars with yellow trimmings and draws a gay line along the landscape. A round trip between Anchorage and Fairbanks is made three times a week. You start about 8 a. m. and arrive about 11 p. m. I flew in 2 hours instead, so I can't personally vouch for the statement that if a passenger sees wild flowers he wants, the train stops so he can pick them.

But things are like that in Alaska. A man who was on the plane with us from Anchorage to Bethel on the Kuskokwim River intended to continue by bush plane to Nunivak Island in the Bering Sea to watch the reindeer round-up. "I'm eager to get over there," he said, with a little impatience at the low-hanging clouds.

ALWAYS TOMORROW

"Nobody's ever eager in Alaska," the bush pilot told him, "the weather will clear maybe tomorrow, maybe the next day, and we can get over." It was the day after "the next day" that they went.

When we boarded a Douglas aircraft of Northern Consolidated Airlines at Anchorage for the little village of Bethel—90 percent Eskimo—our seats were on one side of the plane and roped securely on the other was the cargo. The plane carried a young steward instead of a stewardess to give a lift with the freight.

We flew with eggs, oranges, paint, soup, and other necessities for Bethel and outlying villages, scientific instruments for a research project at Kotzebue, and luggage and a baby carriage of a couple with two children who were getting off at Fairwell, our first stop.

Fairwell is a flag stop for the Douglas, just a landing strip to be used when a passenger or cargo has to be picked up or delivered. A man met the plane to pick up two suits he had sent to the cleaners in Anchorage last week. They weren't ready. Try the next flight, he was told.

MAIN STREET LANDING

From Fairwell, we went to McGrath, where we landed on the main street, which is the Civil Aeronautics Administration airfield. The plane sounds its horn and people keep off the runway when it is coming in. It comes down over the Kuskokwin River and hits the runway just on the opposite bank. We taxied up in front of the roadhouse, which Northern Consolidated now operates, and Marie Christian, the hostess, welcomed us for lunch.

Before taking off for Bethel we walked over to the Northern Commercial Co. store, one of which is in practically every Alaskan village. Alaskans quip that the Russians could never take Alaska because the NC stores would not give them credit. We also looked at the old river boat which was on one of its two visits a year to the village. It is a wood-burning stern-wheeler and serves to bring in the heaviest freight. Its visits are still important along the Kuskokwim and Yukon but not as vital as they were before the days of the airlines.

The pilot of our aircraft, Oscar Underhill, has been flying up in Alaska since 1939. Shortly after we landed at the airfield across the river from Bethel, he was ready to take the Douglas on its run back to Anchorage.

For days Northern Consolidated had been busy hauling fishermen and cannery workers back from Bristol Bay, where the salmon season was over, and returning the natives either by bush plane or boat to their villages. The "fish haul," they call it.

This portion of Alaska and the far North present a curious contrast with the most advanced modes of travel and communication of modern civilization serving primitive peoples. The bush pilots are among the Eskimos' best friends.

WINGED CONTACT

Above the Arctic Circle, where Wien-Alaska Airlines operates, a dozen or more Eskimo mothers have named their sons "Sigwien" after their good friend Sig Wien, the coming of whose plane in the remote, snowbound villages means supplies, contact with the world outside, and winged aid in emergencies.

Most of the air routes in Alaska follow those of the dog teams which used to carry the mail in winter, while it came by boat in the summer. In the 1930's the bush pilots began bidding against the dogs as mail carriers. In those days flying was often dependent on two factors locally referred to as "WP and PW"—"weather permitting and pilot willing." Now the flights are scheduled, and the airlines perform a service that falls somewhere between that of a rural mail carrier and a local bus line, but seems more specialized than either.

DC-3 SERVICE

For example, Northern Consolidated Airlines, which marked its third anniversary this year, has three DC-3's which fly to points out of Anchorage and Fairbanks and connect with bush planes, nine of which service Eskimo villages and even individuals living in remote spots, who have no other link with civilization except the radio. Anything from

window shades to toothpaste may be needed by people in these far-off places, either white or Eskimo, and no request is too small to be filled. "You name it, we fly it," say Northern Consolidated officials.

By using the DC-3's for the long jumps and connecting with the bush planes which reach areas where a larger craft could not land, the service is speeded up and greater safety insured. Typical of bush-plane service are the eight mail stops within 90 miles of Bethel.

Not only is the cost of gasoline much higher—57 cents a gallon on some routes against less than half that in the States, he explained, but the haul in Alaska is typically one way, whereas in the States you can't justify a run with less than a 65- or 70-percent load.

PRODUCE FLOWN IN

Before the days of scheduled air transportation, people in this region received their produce and eggs by boat in June and August. The produce was not too fresh after 14 days aboard, and the eggs often failed to last through the winter, even when they were carefully put down in waterglass.

The meat flown in is all frozen. Flour, canned goods, and other heavy staples are still brought by boat.

Incidentally, it was a bush plane that enabled me to hold $35,000 worth of platinum in my hands. This was in a leather poke, smaller than a large bag of popcorn, but it was so heavy I could hardly hold it.

When officials of the Good News Bay platinum mine on Kuskokwim Bay of the Bering Sea were asked how they ship their platinum their answer is: "By registered air mail." Unless you know more about platinum than I did, when we went from Bethel 150 miles by bush plane to see the platinum operations, you may have thought it was shipped by carload. After watching the tremendous bucket dredge, standing in golden brown water and biting out tons of earth in search of the precious metal, such a conclusion would not seem unreasonable. Nevertheless, platinum does not come out in heavy or large pieces, though it is much heavier than gold.

TOWNS CONTRASTED

Mr. and Mrs. F. O. Tompkins, who manage the Platinum roadhouse, took us in their truck over the gravel road which has been built across the barren tundra from Platinum to Good News Bay, to see the mine.

It is hard to realize the contrast between the tiny village of Platinum—a handful of Eskimo huts, the little store, the radio shack, the roadhouse, then vast, flat tundra and the Bering Sea—and the modern little mining community which exists seven or eight months of the year at Good News Bay, then is closed for the winter.

There are white frame houses with modern conveniences, a bowling alley with Alaska murals on the walls, and a record player for dances in the room adjoining. The bowling alley is really the community center. There is the company office, with a modern apartment above, which is the home of two young men of the staff—an apartment such as one might find in New York or San Francisco, but would hardly expect in this isolated spot.

We also visited the cook shack where we were invited to help ourselves to some of the wonderful coffee cake the night cook, Mrs. Charlotte Anderson had just taken out of the oven. Any time, day or night, men off duty may go to the cook shack for a snack. The long, low building is immaculate, blooming plants are in the windows, and Mrs. Anderson or one of the other capable cooks is cheerily at work on the next meal—men on three shifts must be fed three times a day.

WEATHER FINALLY CLEARS

It was mid-afternoon the next day before the weather cleared at Platinum enough for us to return by bush plane to Bethel. I borrowed a typewriter at the radio shack.

While I worked, the radio operator prepared his dinner in his living quarters adjoining. Occasional messages came over the radio. Would Tosch come first for the passengers waiting at Platinum or take the fishermen to Coos Bay and then come over? He would land the fishermen at Coos Bay first and then fly to Platinum for the three passengers. That meant us. He would be there in a couple of hours.

That evening, when we returned, we learned there was to be an Eskimo dance at Max Lieb's Tundra Shack. When we arrived at the shack it already was filled with Eskimos of all ages, the older women seated on the benches around the wall of the big room where there is a soda fountain. The Tundra Shack serves as a community center for Bethel's Eskimo teen agers.

An old Eskimo, wearing fur trousers and kneeling on the floor, held a drum, with a long handle, high in front of him and beat it rhythmically with a long, slender stick. Two other Eskimo men with fur masks on their faces held what looked like shepherds' pipes with two short knobs on them into which were stuck stiff grasses or quills—three in each—and at the end of which bobbed white rabbit tails. The men kept the rhythm with these bobbing sticks. (The younger generation, sitting in a circle on the floor, kept time with bubble gum.)

DRUMMER JOINS IN

Presently one of the women felt moved to come out and dance. She donned a feather headdress and some beads but added no other costume to her blue rayon dress, which perhaps came from Sears, Roebuck. She went through the movements of the dance as the drummer called them, movements which resembled those of the Hawaiian dance, although they were more with the arms than the feet.

Other Eskimo women and men took their turns or danced at the same time, and then the drummer, with the agility of a man a third his age, himself performed a hunting dance.

On another day, Ken McRoberts, as everyone knows him, went with us on the little motorboat which Max Lieb runs to the Moravian Children's Home above Kwithluk, a 3-hour trip from Bethel on the Kuskokwim River.

ADVENTUROUS CAREER

He is much beloved by the Eskimos and the white people of the area, including the Moravian missionaries whose work in this region is a story in itself. The day of our trip to the Children's Home was chilly and rainy. The marshal stood on the deck of the boat with the hood of his windbreaker thrown back disclosing iron-gray hair above a ruddy, pleasant face and steady eyes, unmindful of the chill rain and wind.

His service in Alaska under the Department of Justice has been hazardous and fraught with adventure more often because of the weather than because of the persons with whom he has to deal.

"The Eskimos are good honest people," he told me. "Most crimes derive from drinking. If it were not for that we should have none. When there were liquor stores in Bethel the jail was packed, but now there are only one or two ever in it. Much credit for this is due the Moravians. If it had not been for the Moravians," he added, "I do not know what would have happened to our natives when there was a large Army camp across from Bethel. As it is, they stood up against the outside influences better than most whites."

A yen for adventure which has led many men to Alaska, brought Ken McRoberts here in 1935. He came from his home in Napa, Idaho, to Anchorage and first did surveying on the Matanuska project and then worked on the railroad. In 1936, he ran the Colony Barbershop in Anchorage for a couple of months, sold it, and went to Takotna on the Kuskokwim, which was having a boom because of a gold strike.

There he ran the Kusko Times for 2 years, serving the 135 white people who had come there. After that he did freighting on the Takotna River and then shipped in a truck and did trucking from the river to mining camps. For a period he prospected for gold. Then came World War II. He was above the age for service but became United States marshal to do his part in that capacity, and he has served since.

ABRUPT DEPARTURE

His home in Bethel is one of those with a a little greenhouse beside it in which a few fresh vegetables grow in the summer.

Our departure from the boat and the friendly people aboard was abrupt. We had left the Children's Home and were tying up at the village of Kwithluk when our pontoon plane landed in the river to take us aboard.

From Anchorage we flew to Fairbanks, about 90 miles from the Arctic Circle. There trucks and motorcars testified to the connecting highways, and the 8 floater planes I counted in the Chena River, along the bank opposite my hotel window, indicated that the airlines were also well-traveled.

We arrived in Fairbanks after midnight, and it was then almost dark, but, by the time I had settled down for some sleep, it was daylight again. Sweet peas growing as high as my head, gorgeous nasturtiums, almost any other flower you could name, and a sunflower 16 feet high, were some of the results of the round-the-clock daylight of summertime in this section.

TOMORROW'S FRONTIER

But beneath the topsoil the ground remains frozen, and this, plus the frosts which come in late August above ground, makes it impossible to have perennials here. Seed must be planted annually and usually started inside, then put into the ground after June 1.

At Bethel I heard a comment that seemed apropos of the people's feelings about Alaska in whatever part, Ketchikan to Bethel to Fairbanks: Once people adjust to Alaska, they never want to live outside again.

After a few weeks there one can understand. Those who have come and stayed have met obstacles and overcome them. They have earned the heritage the country promises for them. It is theirs because they have put so much into it. It is America's frontier of today and tomorrow. They are the pioneers.

How Red My Herring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK FELLOWS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Reginald Wright Kauffman, which appeared in the Bangor (Maine) Daily News on August 14, 1950:

HOW RED MY HERRING

Soviet diplomacy is devilish, and devilishly clever. Broadly, it envisages a series of distant, far-scattered and separately minor wars to involve America until America

is bled white, whereupon a death blow can be safely dealt us. Narrowly, the Soviets have achieved, in Korea, a position from which they will temporarily profit, no matter what its military issue. If we lose, it will seem—however erroneously—that communism can worst us in fair fight; if we win, we will—however falsely—be pilloried as exploiters of backward peoples.

Nevertheless, it is now of paramount importance that we win. So it is of paramount importance that we unitedly support our Government. And so it is of paramount importance that we have a Government which we can support confidently.

At the present moment, we haven't such a Government. This is what the voters must keep in mind at the coming congressional elections.

We need a congressional majority that will guide the man whom the radio boys call the President of the United States—with fervent emphasis (heaven knows why) on their preposition—a Congress that, at the very least, in the matter of security, will save Mr. Truman from his perilous complacency:

Red herrings. "The allusion," Dr. Brewer explains, "is to trailing a red herring on the ground, to destroy the scent and set the (hunting) dogs at fault." What ghostwriter, Clark Clifford or Judge Rosenman, supplied the phrase? Lattimore, perhaps, when proving that China's Reds were simple agrarians? Every domestic and most foreign Communist dangers were red herrings all. Conscience-stricken Elizabeth Bentley. Wretched Alger Hiss. The prospects for peace were better than at any time during the past 5 years—a few brief days before Korea exploded. How red was my herring.

Proceed thence, from fish to birds, from the ichthyology of Mr. Truman to the ornithology of his party.

The traditional emblem of the Democrats was a patient donkey; its present symbol is an ostrich. For, though zoologists aver that this ratita has no gall bladder, he does possess a very muscular gizzard; though he can run 60 miles in an hour, he runs ever in a circle. And how wrote learned Anoetos of Kos? "When pursued, the ostrich buries his head in the sand, thinking that, forsooth, if he cannot see his enemies, his enemies cannot see him." Result: plumes for knight's helmets, for their ladies' fans—but dead ostriches.

Only eyes buried? Ears also. The Democrat administration, the Democrat majority in Congress were alike deaf to Hurley's cautions, MacArthur's appeals. Merely a desperate minimum of assistance was voted South Korea, and almost none of that assistance actually delivered. In January, this smug announcement: "The United States will not provide military aid or (even) advice to Chinese forces on Formosa; * * * the resources on Formosa are adequate * * * for defense." Washington asked the Chinese Nationalist air force to cease operations against the Chinese Communists, and, for a fateful month, the Chinese Nationalist air force obeyed, while thousands of veterans in the Red Chinese army were transferred to North Korea.

These are facts that cannot be denied. These are the reasons why a handful of raw and insufficiently armed American boys had to be sent for massacre by trained masses of well-armed Korean Communist soldiers. Why our tanks were inferior to the enemy's Russian tanks, our medical corps miserably understaffed, our military intelligence a bewildered butt for ridicule. This is why, while American courage was never higher, we Americans—who once boasted one of us could whip 10 Germans—had to find out the hard way that 10 Reds sometimes make a bit of progress against one American.

And there, too, lies a most cogent reason why the coming Congress should be predominatingly Republican. Not change horses while crossing a stream? It all depends, as Roland Eaton says, on the sort of horses involved.

Into this mess it was the Democrat Party that brought us. We have good reason to hope a change to Republican influences will be a change for the better. We have no reason to hope that the Democrats now in Congress will improve so long as they remain there. They have had their chance, and they have murdered it. Of course, we must support this war; so we should of course seek at least a legislative branch of Government capable of commanding confident support. No more talk of red herrings; no more suicidal ostriches:

"If you don't win this war," says Eisenhower, "you can't win anywhere."

Controls To Prevent Run-Away Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, my efforts to get the immediate imposition of price, rent, wage, and profits controls are well known in the House since I took a definite stand in a speech made even before Mr. Baruch's ideas were made public. Moreover, I fought for every amendment to the recent control measure that would have imposed a roll-back of prices to pre-Korean days and for the imposition of controls immediately.

As an illustration of the necessity for controls, especially in the building industry, I am including herewith a letter from Mr. R. G. Wilkerson, a prominent builder from my home city of Rome, Ga.

Again I urge that some action be taken immediately to control run-away inflation.

ROME, GA., *August 26, 1950.*
Hon. HENDERSON L. LANHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: During the last few days we have been receiving price schedules showing quite an increase in price of various items and materials which go into effect on certain dates. These prices are effective at certain times and apply on that which will be shipped on these certain dates.

Since we had our orders in before the increase in prices we should have some protection on prices since we will not be able to increase our prices to our customers.

It seems we are going to have to have price controls, allocations and possibly rationing to keep things in line. If such is in the making it seems that the proper thing to do would be to go back to the beginning of the Korean war and fix prices at the level at which they were at that time.

Most of the manufacturers seem to feel that prices would be fixed at the prevailing prices around 30 days before regulations and they all want new prices in effect for 30 days before these regulations go into effect. There is really no sense in these increases and some measures should be passed to set all prices of materials and labor to the beginning of the war.

Those who have contracts on a large number of jobs signed up some time ago are not going to stay in business unless given some assistance. New work is not going to be let at the higher prices and workmen will be loafing.

Contracts for some of the new schools being let here in the last few days are around one-third higher than those let 30 days ago. Something must be done to relieve the situation.

Yours very truly,

R. G. WILKERSON.

White Urges Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, Government reorganization for greater economy and greater efficiency has become a watchword of the American people. They want Uncle Sam to put his house in order. This demand for economy and efficiency in Government has become intensified since the outbreak of war in Korea. Because we must now raise billions of dollars to supply our boys with the necessary equipment to bring about victory, we must make every effort to save in every other department of Government.

The American people, as taxpayers, want the Government to be well-run. They demand that modern, businesslike techniques of management be applied. They insist that the structure of Government be simplified and that lines of authority be clearly drawn, so that we can hold our public servants fully accountable for their actions.

In other words, they want an all-out attack on inefficiency, waste, and red tape in their Government. Beset with heavy taxes and a national budget deficit, the American people are right in making these demands. There is no excuse for a Government structure that is too sprawling and cumbersome to be well-managed. There is no excuse for wasteful duplication of agencies and activities.

FOLLOW HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Some shortsighted people would effect these economies by making a percentage cut straight across the board in all Government departments. Anyone should know that this would not work, as has been so aptly pointed out by President Truman in recent statements on the subject. All Government departments are not necessarily overstaffed because some of them are. As a matter of fact some Government departments, in view of developments resulting from the Korean war, are understaffed.

Let us rely upon the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. They have studied this problem long and hard. It is true that no commission is infallible but the Hoover Commission recommendations should certainly be safer than a percentagewise reduction straight across the board as is recommended by some Members of Congress.

WORK TOWARD BUSINESS EFFICIENCY IN GOVERNMENT

I am glad to report, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress is alert to the problem. Without fanfare, without headlines, we are moving steadily forward in reorganizing the executive branch of the Government under the guiding hand of the Hoover Commission recommendations. Uncle Sam is taking firm steps to put his house in order. Mr. Hoover himself recently testified before a Senate committee that astonishing progress has been made. Experts say that we have accomplished more in the past year than in any like period in our history.

WHITE BILL TO SAVE $250,000,000 YEARLY

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which, if it becomes law, will save the taxpayers of the Nation $250,000,000 annually, according to authorities who have made a study of Government reorganization.

I refer to my bill, H. R. 8663, to consolidate the Bureau of Reclamation and the civil functions of the United States Army Corps of Engineers. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has paid me the high compliment of introducing a companion bill in the United States Senate.

The Hoover Commission itself recommended the consolidation of these two Government agencies as proposed in my bill. It is a shame and a disgrace, Mr. Speaker, to have these two agencies competing to see which shall build the dams on our mountain streams. The Hoover Commission report pointed out how these two agencies, by fighting each other for the right to build Pine Flat Dam in California, have, through the conniving of some selfish interests, delayed the building of Pine Flat Dam for 10 years.

In the interest of economy and good Government, Mr. Speaker, these two agencies must be consolidated, and I urge one and all to support the bill I have introduced for this purpose.

GOVERNMENT MUST BE OVERHAULED TO ATOMIC-AGE EFFICIENCY

Speaking as a legislator, as well as a businessman with 25 years of successful experience, and as an individual citizen who wants his Government to be sound and strong and prepared to meet the problems of the atomic age, I sincerely believe that thoroughgoing Government reorganization along the lines proposed by the Hoover Commission ranks as one of the most important matters confronting the Nation today. We must solve it; we will solve it, as our progress demonstrates. In so doing, we must rise above narrow partisan or private interest; good government comes first.

Those of us who are concerned about our country's welfare realize how important is the need for overhauling the machinery of government. We cannot travel the modern highway to peace and prosperity with a vehicle handed down from the horse-and-buggy days.

TO PRESERVE DEMOCRACY GOVERNMENT NEEDS STREAMLINING

Democracy faces the challenge of a totalitarian ideology. To resist it successfully, our Government must be streamlined and organized to render efficient service. Every ounce of fat must be trimmed off. Its muscles and sinews must be strong.

We want the most security and the most service we can get for each tax dollar; but we do not want our security to be weakened, nor the essential services of Government to be curtailed.

THREE TO FOUR BILLION DOLLARS YEARLY SAVINGS ARE POSSIBLE

When our work of Government reorganization — now near the halfway mark—comes close to fulfillment, the experts say that possibly three or four billion dollars in yearly savings will result. This, so say the experts, will do away with a substantial part of the budget deficit. It should help us to prosecute the war in Korea and prepare our defenses against further aggression. More than that, it should mean a better Government and a healthier democracy.

I am pledged to the task of eliminating the waste and inefficiency in our Federal Government. I have voted in support of every one of the Hoover Commission recommendations which have been presented to the Congress. In addition, I have introduced the far-reaching bill to consolidate the Bureau of Reclamation and the civil functions of the Army engineers. I have taken definite and positive action to streamline our Government, to save money, and to make for greater efficiency.

I predict that over 90 percent of the Hoover Commission recommendations will be found worthy of acceptance and the economies resulting therefrom will make it easier to finance the war in which we are now engaged, build our defenses, and make the tax burden of our people easier to bear.

Fair-Traded Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a statement sent to me by the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, Dr. John W. Dargavel, chairman. It is very revealing and is self-explanatory:

TELEGRAPHIC SURVEY OF PRICE BEHAVIOR OF FAIR-TRADED PRODUCTS SINCE KOREA

In order to ascertain the price behavior of fair-traded products since the outbreak of war in Korea, the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade conducted a telegraphic survey of 300 manufacturers, selected at random in fields in which fair trade is prevalent.

The following telegram was sent to these manufacturers on August 2 by Dr. John W. Dargavel, chairman of the bureau and executive secretary of the National Association of Retail Druggists:

"BUREAU OF EDUCATION ON FAIR TRADE,
"New York, N. Y.

"In World War II fair-trade prices showed remarkable resistance to inflation. Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, therefore, is assembling data on behavior of fair-trade prices in current war crisis. You and other leading manufacturers in fields where fair trade is prevalent are being polled to find out what has happened to fair-trade prices or what is likely to happen to them in foreseeable future. Have your fair-trade prices remained unchanged? Are they likely to be pushed up because of war conditions? We do not expect specific statistics but would appreciate indications of trends. All company names will be kept confidential in publicizing results of poll. Your information will simply be correlated with other data in a general summary. Your immediate cooperation will be appreciated.

"JOHN W. DARGAVEL,
"Chairman."

As of August 17, 1950, responses both by telegram and letter had been received from 125 manufacturers, or 42 percent of the total queried.

Of the 125 manufacturers responding to date 84, or 67 percent, sell some or all of their products under fair trade. Forty-one, or 33 percent, do not fair trade their products.

The 84 manufacturers on fair trade who have responded represent these 12 fields: Proprietary drugs, cosmetics, and toiletries, 16; electrical appliances and household products, 10; cameras and photo supplies, 5; books, 9; tobacco products, 4; hardware, 7; automobile accessories, 7; office supplies and equipment, 6; jewelry, silverware, and optical goods, 6; household furnishing and utensils, 6; radio, television, and phonographs, 2; packaged and canned-food products, 6.

A breakdown of the responses from the 84 fair-trading manufacturers shows: Have not raised prices and do not expect to do so in foreseeable future, 73 firms, or 87 percent; have not raised prices but expect to do, so in near future, 6 firms, or 7 percent; small price increases already made, 5 firms, or 6 percent.

The generality of comment running through the responses of the 73 manufacturers who have not raised their fair-trade prices is that they will make every effort to maintain these prices at present levels. At the same time, a number noted that price increases might become necessary if the cost of materials and labor were to rise substantially.

The resolve of manufacturers to avoid raising their fair trade prices is reflected in the following comments culled from their responses to the Bureau's survey:

"You're entirely correct in saying that in World War II fair-trade prices showed remarkable resistance to inflation. At least that statement holds true insofar as our own products are concerned * * * our principal lines have not changed at all in price during the period from 1937 to date * * * our prices structure today is essentially the same as it was before World War II * * *."—By a maker of men's pipes.

"So far as we can determine at the present time, we do not anticipate increasing our fair-trade minimum prices on any of our models * * *."—By a producer of electric shavers.

"We will make every effort to keep our prices at the present level throughout the present situation, which we have every hope will not reach any such proportions as during the years 1942 through 9[illegible]."—By an automobile-accessories manufacturer.

"Our fair-trade prices have remained unchanged in face of present crisis. We will resist any pressure trying to push them upward. We are firmly convinced that any changes in price structure of whole economy at this time or in predictable future will act to bring on dreaded Government regulation."—By a maker of pen-and-pencil sets.

"It is our firm resolve to hold the present price level, but this can be done only if the printers, binders, manufacturers of paper, boards, glue, cloth, etc., are willing to do their part * * * we firmly believe that the best interest of all would be served if every price was held at the level existing June 1, 1950 * * *."—By a book publisher.

"Consistent with our policy of the last several years, we do not intend to change our prices or fair-trade minimums on proprietary drug items, unless forced to do so by excessive inflation * * *."—By a proprietary drug producer.

"We did not raise prices during the last World War and our fair-trade prices have remained unchanged since the war with a few minor exceptions. We do not plan any general price advances due to present war situation unless conditions brought about by advances in supplies and materials would force us to make minor adjustments on a few exceptional items. But we do not plan any general price advances."—By a cosmetics manufacturer.

"Our fair-trade prices have remained unchanged, nor do we see any changes in immediate future. We agree with experience that fair-trade prices show remarkable resistance to inflation, whereas some other lines of our manufacture have had recent prices increases."—By a manufacturer of brass products.

"In spite of increased material and labor costs, have not considered raise in price of deep-freeze units * * *."—By a household appliances producer.

"Definitely, fair-traded (brand name) will not be priced on the basis of what the traffic will bear * * *."—By a carpet-sweeper manufacturer.

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear that fair-trade prices, to date, have remained at pre-Korean levels despite the price rises noted in the press in many other items. As of August 17, 94 percent of the fair-trading manufacturers who responded to the Bureau's survey had not increased prices; of this, 87 percent do not expect to raise their fair-trade prices in the foreseeable future, while 7 percent do expect to do so. Only 5 of the 84 fair-trading manufacturers included in this study had raised their fair-trade prices since Korea, and even these 5 said their price increases were small.

It is, perhaps, also interesting that a random selection of 300 manufacturers in fields in which fair trade is practiced discloses that two out of every three manufacturers in these fields choose to sell their products under fair trade in order to protect the property values of their nationally known and advertised trade-marks.

OBSERVATIONS

At this time it would appear that fair-trade prices will hold the line against inflationary pressures far better than non-fair-trade prices. This should come as no surprise, since fair-trade prices have in the past demonstrated their stability.

Other studies conducted over the past decade have demonstrated that fair-trade prices, while the lowest at which the efficient retailer can sell and still earn an honest living, do resist inflation. Results of these other studies:

Pre-World War II: Fair-trade prices of 50 leading drug products in 1939 were down 1 percent from prefair trade depression prices. These statistics come from the University of Minnesota's School of Business Administration.

The war and postwar period: From 1939 to 1947 the prices of 7,334 fair-traded drug products rose only 3.1 percent, while Bureau of Labor figures showed food prices soaring 93 percent and the over-all cost of living 59.3 percent. This study was made by the National Association of Chain Drug Stores.

The immediate past—July to December 1949: The fair-trade prices of 26 nationally known drug products, over-all, were less than the prices for the same items in the non-fair-trade areas. The American consumer paid one-tenth of a cent less for them, under fair trade, on the basis of a composite weighted average. A product-by-product analysis showed that 17 out of the 26 items sold for less under fair trade. The maximum price difference between the fair-trade and non-fair-trade areas is slightly over 3 cents. Only 3 products out of the 26 show this much difference. Two sold for 3 cents less under fair trade. Yet these famous brands of dentifrices, headache remedies, laxatives, shampooes, and shaving creams were typically used as "loss leaders" by predatory price cutters in non-fair-trade areas. They are the products on which lower prices could be expected in non-fair-trade areas if such lower prices really existed.

This study, by an independent research agency through the Bureau's Research Advisory Committee, was a scientific analysis of prices in 770 selected drug stores—700 in the fair-trade area and 70 in the non-fair-trade—to keep the proportion between the size of the two areas. Independent and chain stores in rural and urban areas were included. In arriving at the final figures similar types of stores were compared and prices weighted, according to sales volume.

All these findings show that consumers cannot expect to pay less without fair trade, and that in many cases they would pay more. This is a tribute to the integrity of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers operating under voluntary fair trade.

Discharge of Civil Service Personnel at Marietta (Ga.) Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks now I have been urging that Secretary of National Defense Louis Johnson be asked to resign. I have done this, not only because of his bungling and his apparent lack of ability, but because I think he has in many cases deliberately misled the people, among them many Congressmen. For instance, in the famous conference held at the Pentagon when Mr. Johnson announced that he was cutting thirty thousand from the payroll, he announced that approximately 100 civil-service personnel were being discharged from the Marietta Air Force Base at Marietta, Ga. Later I found that Secretary Johnson had permitted the Air Force to employ a corporation to do the same work the civil-service employees had been doing. Practically all of the civil-service employees were then discharged and then employed by this corporation.

I wrote Secretary Johnson at the time, protesting this sort of skullduggery, but never got a satisfactory answer from him.

I am now, with leave first obtained, extending in the RECORD with my own statement a letter which is startling in its disclosure of things that are said to be happening at this same Air Force base in connection with this contract and subsequent ones made with the Air Force officials. This is a small contract, it is true, but I am afraid it is typical of what is happening on a much larger scale in our armed services and the procurement of services and supplies.

I am withholding the name of the person who gave me this information, as to disclose it would, no doubt cause him to lose his job. He is to be commended for his patriotism for putting the facts before us.

It seems to me that the Armed Services Committee should immediately begin an investigation of this whole problem, or in the event the standing committee is too busy with other matters then committees similar to the famed Truman committee, which was set up during World War II to track down corruption and bribery in the conduct of the procurement of supplies and equipment for our armed services, should make such an investigation.

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM,
Representative From Georgia,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to submit the following facts for your information and I believe they demand an immediate investigation. Please do not use my name in connection with the matter, as I am employed by civil service and could suffer, if the wrong parties discovered the author of the following data:

The Tumpane Co., Inc., is a "fly by night" corporation, organized to milk money from United States Air Force. They depend upon the inside pull of their secretary, Jack Lepre, a former Air Force colonel, and money placed in the proper hands at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, for their business. They were awarded a contract to load and unload freight at Government aircraft plant No. 6, Marietta, Ga., in January 1949. The contract was let, even though the service was not needed. Sufficient civil-service personnel was available to do all of the work. The contract called for a certain number of cars to be loaded and unloaded, during a 6 months' period. The Air Force knew that this number would never be reached. Jack Lepre and John Tumpane announced that they cared nothing for this small contract ($35,000) but they were after big game. In other words, they knew 9 months in advance that the plant would be let out on a service contract, which was done on September 21, 1949, after the Louis Johnson economy policy was announced.

The buyer of this contract (loading and unloading) was a civilian at Wright Field named Miller. When the contract expired, John Tumpane was prepared to sign a release on the deal but Miller told him not to do so; that he could collect about $19,000 for work called for in the contract but which the Government had been unable to furnish. The settlement is still pending.

Then, in September 1949, the large contract was awarded for plant operation. All civil-service personnel was discharged from the Government to comply with the orders of Louis Johnson and rehired by Tumpane at a higher salary. However, Tumpane knew that he must make a good showing on this first big contract and he did manage to fire enough production workers to offset the large salaries paid to the officers of his company and by this procedure his actual cost of operation was no more than the Government operation. He was able to do this by not doing any work. The contracting officer for the Air Force, at Marietta, was told that he would remain at this base as long as he caused Tumpane no trouble. He did not wish to be transferred, so he caused no trouble. In fact, he spent his vacation at Daytona Beach, Fla., with John Tumpane during March 1950.

The first service contract expired June 31, 1950. Then, another service contract was let, to run until December 1952. Naturally, Tumpane was given this contract, too. It was awarded by J. B. Straley, at Wright Field. Tumpane knew that he would also be given this job. Straley had taken care of that. Any other bidders figured to have a chance, were disqualified, for one reason or another. Some

were refused an invitation to bid, because they were not financially able to perform the contract, yet all of Tumpane's payments are assigned to a bank. They borrow money from week to week to meet the payrolls and other expense.

With the award of the latest contract, salaries really shot upward. John Tumpane advanced his salary from $200 to $300 per week. Other salaries range from $250 per week, downward. Several girls earn $70 per week, as they are favored by the company.

Last week Tumpane decided to put himself in the transportation business. A shipment of jeeps consigned to Warner Robins, were loaded on his trucks. He requested a Government bill of lading to cover the movement. The officer in charge decided this was too much like General Meyers' own actions and refused to issue the bills. Tumpane became very angry but he finally made a deal with Smith Transfer Co., in East Point, Ga., to use their name on the bill and give him the revenue for hauling. There is also on the records at this plant the evidence that in November 1949 Mr. Tumpane ordered a truckload of lumber delivered to his home in Marietta, but there is no record in the salvage office that he ever purchased any lumber. These, and many other incidents are a matter of record. Use this information as you see fit, but please do not use my name for reasons I have already explained.

I will keep you informed as to future happenings.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

Giuseppe Garibaldi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, Giuseppe Garibaldi was not only a great Italian patriot but an inspired humanitarian. So much was he admired for his sterling military virtues that Abraham Lincoln offered him a commission as a general officer in the Union Army. In the Italian liberator's letter to Lincoln after the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation it is said that Garibaldi originated the name of Great Emancipator by which Lincoln has been since known.

In July 1850 Garibaldi came to Staten Island and resided there 3 years. In observance of the one hundredth anniversary of his visit, I am pleased to include in my remarks a sketch of the great liberator's life by Daniel Santoro, as follows:

GARIBALDI

(By Daniel Santoro)

"There is around the name of Garibaldi a halo which nothing can extinguish; a whole life devoted to one subject—his country: a name consecrated by the deeds of honor, first abroad and then at home; honor and constancy more than admirable, simplicity of life and manner which recalls the men of antiquity; all the mournful trials and losses manfully endured; glory and poverty. Every particular referring to such a man is precious."—Giuseppe Mazzini, Italia del Popolo, 1850.

Giuseppe Garibaldi was born at Nice on July 4, 1807. His humble but devout parents brought him up in the strictest principles. Young Giuseppe did not mingle easily with other boys, he was a quiet sort of boy preferring the out-of-doors and a life of solitude. How well suited to his personality the recluse life of an exile at Caprera was to be.

He loved and conversed with nature, and the life at sea where he was sent to earn his living in a fisherman's craft did not distract him from his studies. He was conversant with many languages and literatures.

As a boy he had shown great admiration for the Eternal City: her monuments, her ruins, and the glory of the past held a certain charm for him. But more than anything else Rome's loss of independence left an indelible mark in his mind, and from that time he dedicated himself to principles of liberty.

Early in life he had made voyages to the Black Sea, and on one of these voyages aboard the brig *Cortese* he was second in command. Pirates were not uncommon in those days, and Garibaldi, observing the lawlessness on the high seas and the tyranny of the despotic nations of the east, was fired with an inordinate love of liberty. Having refused to carry out his father's wish to become a priest, Giuseppe had embarked on a life of adventure.

In 1834 another great leader, Giuseppe Mazzini, was organizing a society called Giovine Italia (Young Italy), which was rapidly expanding among the Italian patriots. Garibaldi, fired with patriotic enthusiasm, joined the movement, enlisting at the same time in the Sardinian Navy.

With a number of companions aboard the frigate *Euridice*, Garibaldi plotted the seizure of the vessel first, and then to take the arsenal at Genoa at the same time that Mazzini's expedition would enter Savoy. The plot was discovered, and Garibaldi was in danger of being arrested. Condemned to death by default on June 3, 1834, he escaped to South America, where he was given letters of marque by the State of Rio Grande which was in revolt against Brazil. After a series of victorious engagements, Garibaldi was taken prisoner and subjected to severe torture, resulting in the dislocation of his limbs. Regaining his liberty, he renewed the war against Brazil and captured Port Allegro.

It was in Rio that he met Anita Riberas. They fell in love and were married on board the ship *Rio Pardo*. On March 26, 1842, the marriage vows were renewed in the Church of St. Francisco d' Assise, since a religious ceremony was the only one recognized by the government. Anita, who was to be his devoted companion for many years to come, was as brave as her husband, fearing neither the battlefield nor the dangerous adventures. They sailed away and spent their honeymoon in warfare along the coast and in the battlefields, experiencing the hardships of camp life and wandering over the sea and wilderness. Anita bore her husband three children: Menotti, Ricciotti, and Teresita.

Garibaldi next passed into the service of Uruguay and was sent to Corrientes with a small flotilla. Having exhausted his ammunition, and seeing himself being overtaken by Admiral Brown, against whose fleet he had fought for three days, Garibaldi burned his ships and escaped.

Returning to Montevideo, Garibaldi organized the Italian Legion. It was the first considerable body of his countrymen which he commanded on land. Most of them were political exiles, and they wore the famous red shirt. They enlisted with the idea of fighting for the liberty of Montevideo in return for shelter it had given them, but the real reason was to prepare for the big struggle, the unification of Italy, which Garibaldi had never forgotten even in the depths of the American forests.

This Italian Legion saved Montevideo when it was hard pressed by its enemies in 1843 and 1846. Garibaldi was loved by all the inhabitants of the city.

In the meantime Garibaldi had been in constant touch with "Young Italy" at home, and when in 1847 news of the political disturbances in Europe reached him, he first sent his family to Genoa, and then in 1848 crossed the Atlantic with about 25 fighting companies.

On June 24, 1848 the "Speranza" arrived at Nice. News reached Garibaldi that Palermo, Milan, Venice, and many other cities had started on the momentous revolution, that the Austrian Army was in retreat and that all Italy was arming. The whole city rallied with joy 'round Garibaldi.

He was then, and remained throughout his life a Republican, ready to fight for popular government in any form. Garibaldi offered his sword to Charles Albert (Italy's first king), but the latter refused the offer of the rebel of 1834, and Garibaldi took a commission under the incompetent provisional government of Milan, who sent him with badly armed and ill-chosen men to Bergamo, where he had no opportunity to prevent the disaster of the main army at Custoza.

But the Garibaldians who had come from Montevideo were not content to lay down their arms after the famous armistice was signed between Piedmont and Austria, and carried on a republican campaign against Austria in the Alps. The little campaign was waged, however, for 2 or 3 weeks in the mountain villages of Lake Maggiore and Varese, and by the end of August Garibaldi was driven across the Swiss border, demonstrating on the way his genius in guerrilla warfare while the Austrians recovered all the Lombard and Alpine territory.

Returning from Switzerland, Garibaldi decided to carry the people's war to Sicily against Ferdinand II, King of Naples and of Sicily.

In October 1848 he sailed from Genoa accompanied by some 70 companies mostly from Montevideo. When they arrived at Filigare on November 9, they found their entrance into the Papal States blocked by 400 Swiss guards. In this critical juncture of his career the people of Bologna came to his rescue and permitted him to enter the city and a few days later sent for his men from Filigare. In the meantime political events in Rome took the attention of the whole country and allowed Garibaldi to push his enlistment problem so rapidly that at the end of November the First Italian Legion could leave Ravenna with 500 men.

On the 30th of April the French advanced on Rome with about 6,000 infantry and a complete equipment of field guns marching straight for the summit of the Vatican hill to the Porta Pertusa by which they were to enter Rome.

Garibaldi placed himself at the head of his men, stormed through the gardens fighting with bayonets. After a fierce struggle the French were put to flight.

He was "of middle stature, deep chested and wide shouldered, his frame was cast in an iron mold, combining agility with strength. There was something statuesque in the appearance of his head, with its broad brow, straight features, and long, flowing hair blending with a beard of the same golden hue. His countenance, expressive of resolution, gave character to his features rather striking than handsome. In his dress he consulted the picturesque. He wore at that time a cap of scarlet cloth, ornamented with gold lace; a tunic, or blouse, with rich red; and besides his sword he carried a dagger in his belt. In his movements Garibaldi displayed ease and grace, mingled with that sober and stately dignity acquired by those who had exercised authority over the descendants of the Spaniards in the Western World." The quotation is from Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly of May 1882.

That night Rome celebrated the victory, and Garibaldi secured his position he so well deserved in the imagination of his countrymen.

While the French were temporarily quiet and awaiting reinforcements Mazzini had to made his plans to prevent his enemies at home, King Ferdinand and the Neapolitan army, from reaching Rome. He, therefore, instructed Garibaldi to cross the Campagna to keep the invaders in check.

Garibaldi left with 2,500 troops on May 4, and taking the road south from Rome to Naples took up his headquarters at Palestrina. One engagement followed another, until on May 9 with a small force he defeated the Neapolitan army. The expedition had succeeded in preventing the further advance of King Ferdinand's army, and Garibaldi was recalled to Rome.

The destiny of the Roman Republic had now reached its most critical point Mazzini was at the head of the government; Roselli was the commander in chief, and the defense of the city was entrusted to Garibaldi, who clearly saw the error of the treaty which had been signed with France. During the following weeks one engagement followed another, and the fate of Rome was sealed.

Rome fell, and Garibaldi was accompanied by an army of 4,000 volunteers which headed toward Venice with the idea of joining the defenders of that city. Thus he embarked on that magnificent retreat through central Italy pursued by the armies of France, Austria, Spain, and Naples.

By his consummate generalship and the matchless endurance of his men, Garibaldi reached the Republic of San Marino. With his wife and a handful of followers, he vainly attempted to get through to Venice, where the tricolor was still flying, and he took refuge in the pine forests of Ravenna.

Anita, who had undergone great sufferings during her voyage, was dying. Garibaldi sought shelter in a nearby cottage, and she expired in her husband's arms.

Afflicted by so great a loss, pursued by the Austrians, Garibaldi, assisted by all classes of people, fled to Gibraltar, proceeding to Liverpool, and on June 27 left for New York.

Horace Greeley's newspaper, the New York Tribune, recorded the arrival on July 30, 1850. "The ship *Waterloo* arrived from Liverpool this morning with Garibaldi, known the world over as the hero of Montevideo and the defender of the Roman Republic. He will be received by all who know him in a befitting manner as a man of character, and for his service in behalf of liberty."

Garibaldi arrived at the quarantine, then located in Tompkinsville, Staten Island, at 10 a. m. on July 30, 1850, and proceeded to the Pavilion Hotel on Richmond Terrace, St. George, Staten Island, where he stayed. In New York he found many friends. He did not have to work for his living. Garibaldi was proud in a humble way and he was determined to earn his own living. He led a tranquil life, avoiding the honors of the New York society, which would have wanted to lionize him. Instead he preferred the peace and quiet of State Island, where on October 1850 he went to live with Antonio Meucci—who was working on his invention of the telephone—far from the insatiable curiosity of the metropolis.

Garibaldi occupied the room at the northeast corner of the modest cottage. The furniture was very simple, consisting chiefly of an iron bed with three mattresses, three chairs, a small table, a wooden "toilette," a closet on which rested a wax skull, and a small mirror hanging on the wall before which Garibaldi often "tormented" his blond beard with the scissors.

He had placed a parrot in the entrance hall who had been taught the famous words: "Hurrah for Italy * * * Banish the foreigners" (Viva l'Italia! Fuori lo straniero!), and whenever anyone appeared at the entrance the bird would shout the refrain to the delight and astonishment of those present.

Life was simple but happy in the tiny Garibaldian colony, which soon became the center of reunions for the Italian exiles and political refugees of every nationality. On Sunday the visitors were numerous, among them Foresti, Filoparti, Pastacaldi, Co. Forbes and the poet, Daniel Pelton.

But funds were running low in spite of the careful economy of the household. The idea of setting up a candle factory came to Garibaldi, and with Meucci they established a small factory. One, however, should keep in mind that Garibaldi's work was voluntary. He himself tells in his Memorie, "at the Meuccis I could work if I wanted to." His main diversions consisted of going fishing and hunting in the woods.

Life was pleasant in the tiny village of Clifton, but Italy was up in arms once more, and Garibaldi prepared to return. Parting was difficult, "Good-by," he said to his friend Meucci, leaving him his red shirt as a souvenir (now in the Museum in Rome), "never forget the foreman of the candle factory; he will never forget you."

And with that Garibaldi left for Italy in 1854 never to return to America. He purchased the Island of Caprera, and there he built his home.

In the War of 1859 he was given command of the Alpine infantry. Defeating the Austrians at Casale on May 8, crossing the Ticino on the 23d of May after a series of victorious battles, he liberated the Alpine territory as far as the Tyrol frontier. The Armistice of Villafranca prevented him from advancing into Austrian territory.

Returning to Como, he married Countess Raimondi, who had aided him during the campaign. But the duty to his country was by far stronger than the duty to his wife, and Garibaldi set out for central Italy.

Forbidden to invade Romagna, he returned indignantly to Caprera, where with Crispi and Bertami he planned the invasion of Sicily. Assured of the sympathy of England by Sir James Hudson, he began preparations for the expedition of Marsala.

In revolt against the Bourbon tyranny, Sicily looked to Garibaldi as her redeemer. On May 11, 1860, while Cavour shut his eyes to the affair, Garibaldi landed at Marsala. Within a few days he had defeated the enemy at Calatafimi. Having outwitted the strong garrison at Palermo, he effected an entry into that city on May 30. His victory at Milazzo about a month later established him as dictator in Victor Emmanuel's name, though the King had not given his official sanction.

Instead of crossing to Calabria, Garibaldi secretly departed for Aranci Bay in Sardinia, where Bertami was fitting out an expedition against the Papal States. Cavour, however, obliged the expedition to sail for Palermo.

Returning to Messina, he found a letter from King Victor Emmanuel II dissuading him from invading the kingdom of Naples. Garibaldi, in his reply, asked for permission to disobey, and the following day crossed the strait to Calabria, where he won the Battle of Reggio on the 21st of August. At San Giovanni 9,000 Neapolitan troops capitulated, and on October 1 he routed the remaining 40,000 Bourbon soldiers on the Volturno. The Italian troops had now occupied Le Marche, Umbria, and Abruzzi.

The presence of the Italian troops, however, put an end to the plan for the invasion of the Papal States, and Garibaldi unwillingly issued a plebiscite which was to sanction the incorporation of the two Sicilies into the Italian realm. Disbanding his volunteers, Garibaldi returned to Caprera.

Cavour could not escape from his old pledge of Plombieres to cede Savoy and Nice to France, and Garibaldi became highly indignant. Returning to political life, he became a deputy in 1861 and raised a bitter and violent voice against Cavour. Bixio attempted reconciliation, but the publication by Cialdini of a letter against Garibaldi provoked hostilities which but for the intervention of the king would have led to a duel between the two.

Returning to Caprera, Garibaldi awaited events. Cavour's successor, Ricasoli, enrolled the Garibaldians in the regular army. Rattazzi, who succeeded Ricasoli, urged Garibaldi to undertake an expedition in the aid of the Hungarians, but finding his followers ill-disposed to the plan, he decided to turn his army toward Rome.

Proclaiming a state of siege in Sicily, he sent the fleet to Messina and instructed Cialdini to oppose Garibaldi.

Circumventing the Italian troops, Garibaldi entered Catania, crossed Milito with 3,000 men on August 25, but having been wounded by Cialdini's forces at Aspromonte, Garibaldi was taken prisoner. Liberated by amnesty, he returned to Caprera.

This was not Garibaldi's last adventure; the excellence of his generalship, the magnanimity of his heart were to play many other roles, which, however, are not within the scope of this treatise. Garibaldi died on June 2, 1882. The world, remembering freedom's greatest soldier, paid its reverend tribute at the bier of the simple citizen of the world.

The year 1950 marks the centenary of Garibaldi's arrival at Staten Island. To commemorate the event, the author has prepared this article, dedicating it to the memory of the hero of two worlds. The Garibaldi House (1) in Rosebank not only has been neglected but points a finger of shame to the Italian colony in America. The Staten Island Historical Society has plans for restoring the cottage to a safe and attractive site so that it may serve the world and generations to come as a symbol of human ideals which the general cherished and for which he fought so valiantly to the last breath of his life.

The original is in Italian. Translation by Daniel Santoro, June 1950. The inscription on the tablet placed in front of the house by some friends reads as follows:

"Here lived in exile Giuseppe Garibaldi, the hero of two worlds, 1851–1853."

It erroneously stated that Garibaldi lived in Staten Island from 1851–1853. The dates should be 1850–1853. The Pantheon was dedicated on July 4, 1919.

Triple Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of August 27, 1950:

TRIPLE REVERSE

The House, alert to the welfare of the so-called lower animals, has appropriated funds for a new roof for the elephant house at the Zoo. This means that the elephants, the giraffs, two species of rhinoceros, a hippopotamus, and other creatures who use the elephant house, will be adequately sheltered from wind, snow, and rain.

In a remarkable series of flip-flops, however, the House has refused to permit the people of Washington to do anything worthy of mention to protect themselves against the danger of an atom-bomb attack. A request for $290,000 for civilian defense had been submitted to the House—all of the money to come from District tax revenues. The

Appropriations Committee cut it down to $30,000. Then a group of members of the House District Committee, on Friday, persuaded the House to restore the full amount. But yesterday, in a third reverse, the House went back to the $30,000 figure.

This means that for the foreseeable future there will be no adequate defense preparation for the people of Washington against an atom-bomb attack. To say the least, a sorry example has been set for other cities, many of which do not even have zoos to which their residents might flee when disaster strikes.

Message From the Management to Everyone in the La Salle National Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter from the La Salle National Bank, of Chicago, to its employees and the public dealing with their credit policy in view of the inflationary situation, and also dealing with the question of the younger men called up for service. It is such a thoroughly public-spirited letter that I believe it is well worth printing in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO EVERYONE IN LA SALLE NATIONAL

Things are changing so fast that we thought it might be a good idea to tell you some of the thoughts that are in our mind.

Korea was—and is—a shock to all of us. We don't know anyone whose outlook and plans are not affected—anyone who is not shaken at realizing that after all the sacrifices and hardships of World War II, here we are again—in combat.

How long the conflict may last—how far it may spread—none of us can tell. It seems certain that we are in for a long period of intense rearming, enlarged military service, heavy taxation, and, above all—uncertainty. Anything can happen—at any time.

The people who will weather this period best, we believe, are those who can live calmly and courageously in that uncertainty. (Some people dread suspense more than they dread the positive knowledge that the worst is about to happen.)

One way of easing that suspense is to face the fact that some things are beyond our control, and concentrate on the things that we can influence.

For instance, we have had loan applications from people who saw a chance to profit by buying up things outside their regular business which they believed would be in short supply. These loans would have been paid off, in our opinion, and we would have made money on them. But we thought it would be a disservice to the country to make those loans, so we said no. On the other hand, if someone is converting part of his plant's production to military goods, and needs banking help, that would interest us very much. Thousands of people need financial help because this Korean conflict changes all their plans; we want to aid as many of them as we can.

To the younger men, particularly: a lot of you are wondering if—and when—you will be called into service. That's part of the big uncertainty. But you can be sure that when you are wanted, you will be told. Meanwhile, we are not doing badly if we can honestly say: "My family and I didn't load up on food or anything else when hoarding was on. We're saving money. When I see customers or relatives or friends, I don't give them jitters because I haven't got them myself. I'm tending to my job at the bank, and the bank is trying to do its job toward the country."

If you have personal problems that you'd like to talk over with either of us, don't hesitate a minute to come in and unburden yourself. Here at La Salle, we have always worked together closely; this unity means more than ever today.

SAMUEL ARMOUR,
Chairman of the Board.
J. C. WRIGHT,
President.

Keep the Heat On

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, before this session closes I want to again express my opposition to the proposed compulsory health-insurance or socialized-medicine legislation before the Congress and the people.

I want to warn the doctors and dentists of the Nation, the various hospital organizations, the nurses and hospital attendants, and the people who are opposed to socialized medicine, that there is an attempt being made on the part of some Democratic candidates and the administration to lull them and the people interested into the thought that those who favor socialized medicine are, to some extent, abandoning their pressure for this legislation. They only want it to cool off till after the election.

This is a political trick in the hope that the doctors and dentists and the people generally may be deceived by such action and slow down their opposition to Democrat candidates for the House and Senate at this time.

KEEP THE HEAT ON

My advice to the medical and dental profession and others is "Be not deceived. Keep the heat turned on."

The administration will preserve this legislation in the deep freezers here in Washington made popular by General Vaughan. When the election is over they will again bring it to the front and demand its passage in the next Congress.

In Illinois, and some other States, Democrat candidates who favored socialized medicine, and who proudly wear the yoke of the administration and the labor bosses, are now playing it down. In some instances they now boldly state they are opposed to compulsory health insurance or socialized medicine. Some of them who said they were for it are now singing a different song. Again I say, "Be not deceived."

IT'S A PART OF LABOR'S TICKET

The left wingers of the Nation, fellow travelers, big labor bosses in the CIO, and other powerful labor organizations who largely control this administration are more interested in fastening compulsory health insurance or socialized medicine on the people of this Nation than they are in the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, or any other piece of legislation.

Labor will carry on the fight for it in the next session of Congress with renewed vigor. They are soft-pedaling now to get you to turn off the heat, hoping to elect candidates they have endorsed whom they know they can and will control if they are elected.

Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association, which was smeared, slandered, and persecuted when it started this fight to protect the health of the people, is not likely to be fooled by this move on the part of the administration for political expediency. The dental profession and hospital organizations throughout the Nation will likewise not likely be deceived.

Those organizations which have opposed this socialistic, communistic scheme, along with the great majority of the people who realize that it would cost billions of dollars and lower the type of medical and dental service to the people, rather than slow down, should increase their efforts to elect Members of the House and Senate who have fought against this threat to the health of our people, Members who they know will meet the challenge and continue to fight against it when it comes before the Congress next January, as it surely will.

Mr. Speaker, the President has twice recommended the enactment of this legislation. He will recommend its enactment again in the coming Eighty-second Congress. When the House is organized, if the Democrats have a majority and elect the Speaker, he and his party will be committed to the passage of this legislation. The power of the President will be put behind it.

On the other hand, if a majority of Republicans are elected to Congress they will elect the Speaker of the House who, along with the Republican Members who are elected with him, are committed to be against compulsory health insurance or socialized medicine. If the Republicans control the House of Representatives such a bill will not pass, and no other socialistic or communistic legislation will be written on the statute books during the coming 2 years.

IT IS UN-AMERICAN

Mr. Speaker, compulsory health insurance or socialized medicine is un-American and does not spring from the American people. It is a mixture of Socialist and Communist ideology. It has failed in every European country where it has been tried.

The great white father of socialized medicine is Communist Russia. Listen to the words of Lenin, the founder of communism in Russia. Here is what he said, "Socialized medicine is the keystone of the arch of the socialistic state."

That ought to settle the question so far as the American people are concerned.

We have already adopted too many Socialist and Communist schemes of the Communist Russian state during the past number of years. If we should be forced to adopt this one it would be the greatest step toward socialism and communism taken in America in the past 25 years.

THE PEOPLE WOULD SUFFER

The bill proposed by this administration is against the interest of the citizen.

It would regiment the patient and all health activities. It would provide a political and socialized medical-care program. It would be expensive, wasteful, and time consuming. It would provide a form of regimentation of medical services administered from the national level. Such a program could not be administered in a manner pleasing either to the patient or the physician.

The quality of medical service, to the patient would be strained and inferior in the beginning, and would rapidly deteriorate. Medical research would be curtailed. Medical education would be static, and medical progress in general would be set back many years.

Mr. Speaker, the practice of medicine involves a personal contact between physician and patient. The people want a personal service with sympathy, cheerfulness, and confidence in their doctor.

The United States has the finest hospitals, medical equipment, techniques, and its physicians practice the best medicine in all the world. Why revolutionize medical practice, medical schools, hospitals, and technical research when they are doing such a good job?

This national health bill would place all medical problems under a Federal system controlled by salaried bureaucrats.

The medical student and physician would be offered a regimented practice, federally supervised and controlled.

It would be impossible under this bill for the physicians, the hospitals, and other medical services to give to the people the type and quality of medical care to which they are accustomed.

POLITICAL MEDICAL BOSS

If the proposed legislation is enacted, there is little doubt but that Oscar R. Ewing, the present Federal Security Administrator, who is not a medical man but a very active politician, will head the administration and provide the rules and regulations under which the practice of medicine and the care of the sick will be carried out.

It would place the finest medical and hospital system in the world under the direction of a politician, and if the bill were enacted, the politicians throughout the Nation in charge of boards in every county and State would stand between the doctor and the patient.

It is too dangerous to take any chances on its passage. Those leaders of the medical and dental professions and the people who are generally against this type of legislation, rather than slow down their efforts, should turn on the heat between now and November.

This Socialist step against the welfare of our Nation and the health of our people is too dangerous to take chances with. We must prepare in November to stop it in the future. We must press the fight against it at the present.

Availability of Electric Power for American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on August 13, 1950, Mr. James W. Parker, president of the Detroit-Edison Co.—the same company of which former Senator Prentiss M. Brown is chairman of the board—issued a statement in relation to electric power. He expressed his opinion that the interconnected power systems of the United States were well prepared to cope with added defense loads. He said:

The light and power industry has made tremendous strides since the end of World War II. The national power situation is good—and don't let anyone tell you otherwise.

There has been a great deal said about the amount of power we have in this country, and I think it is well worth while that Members of Congress read the opinion expressed by Mr. James W. Parker.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"There is plenty of electric power available here in Michigan's industrial heart to carry out the area's full share of the Nation's new defense production program," Detroit Edison president, James W. Parker, said today.

There is available as much power as can be used when industrial plants take up their allotted share of the defense production loads, he said. In most instances, manpower will be the limiting factor. With every employable person in the area on the job, there will be enough electric horsepower to go around.

Parker declared there would be—just as during the last war—enough power to take care of the defense program without curbing either residential or farm use of electricity. He said the electric industry as a whole will have power to meet the country's needs, provided no governmental restrictions are imposed which would retard the construction program now under way.

"Even though new peaks of demand have been reached during 1950," the Edison president said, "our capacity is advancing well ahead of use."

Present capacity of the Edison Co. is about 1,500,000 kilowatts—roughly 2,000,000 horsepower. This includes the 200,000 kilowatts added recently at Trenton Channel. Two new turbo-generators which will go into service at Conners Creek within a year will bring capacity to 1,750,000 kilowatts.

Also important are the interconnections with others. Between Consumers Power and the Edison Co. the interconnections have been tripled to strengthen Michigan's overall electric supply system.

Parker also announced that construction will soon start on a project to add another 250,000 kilowatts. Originally scheduled in part at an existing plant, this addition may, in view of recent events, require the building of a new plant.

The company's revised expansion plan will enable it to keep longer in service three older generators which were slated for retirement before the outbreak of trouble in Korea, Parker explained.

"I hope present stepped-up expansion of the Nation's electric power will not be interrupted," Parker said. "It is vital that the Government should cooperate in private power company expansion plans."

The present Edison expansion target is 1,850,000 kilowatts by 1953 or before. This represents an increase of more than 750,000 kilowatts since 1945.

Parker said this goal has been set with an eye to maintaining year-round, around-the-clock industrial production—either for armament or for whatever the Nation calls upon the Detroit area to build.

Commenting on Nation-wide power adequacy, Parker said reports of the entire electric industry show that power supply in most parts of the country is geared to keep well ahead of both industrial and civilian needs. This takes the defense production program, as now known to the industry, fully into account.

Electric generating capability today is nearly double that of 1941, totaling 66,000,000 kilowatts. Since World War II, 16,500,000 kilowatts have been added. Another 18,000,000 kilowatts at least will be available by the end of 1953, according to present estimates.

At present, 80 percent of the Nation's electric power is being generated by investor-owned companies, whose systems have been built entirely with private capital.

Parker reiterated his hope that Government limitations would not halt scheduled expansions. Most electric companies' expansion programs have been speeded up since the United Nations undertook the task of driving the Communists out of South Korea.

Confidence was again expressed by Parker that the interconnected power systems of the United States are well prepared to cope with added defense loads. "The light and power industry has made tremendous strides since the end of World War II," he said. "The national power situation is good—and don't let anyone tell you otherwise."

Tools Back in Spotlight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Tools Back in Spotlight," that appeared in the Steel magazine of July 24, 1950. It is quite apparent that the present situation in Korea is such that very shortly there must be a large demand for machine tools and it is too bad that this industry is not receiving the consideration it should. The article follows:

TOOLS BACK IN SPOTLIGHT—MACHINE BUILDERS STILL DOING BUSINESS WITH REGULAR CUSTOMERS DESPITE DEFENSE RUMORS

Machine tools are an area of speculation and wonder again. After a long period

when machine tools were in surplus supply, users are beginning to worry about availability.

A lot of the rumors about what is going on in machine tools have no foundation. Reports are going the rounds about military buying for instance. They are true only in a qualified sense. The Armed Forces are buying machines but not at any greater rate than before.

DEPENDS ON MACHINE

Some companies are wisely trying to get their houses in order by replacing obsolete equipment. Whether they have to wait very long for delivery depends on the machine purchased. Some standard items, like lathes, can be purchased from stock, as they have not shared in improved business that special machinery builders have enjoyed since the start of this year. As the result of deals being closed for modernization purposes the whole machine tool industry is doing better. Earlier this year, though the National Machine Tool Builders' Association's index was up, some standard machine builders weren't benefiting.

A few companies are dusting off escalator clauses because materials costs are rising. Here too it depends on what machine is ordered and how long it will be until it is shipped. In many cases it represents no change from a policy in effect since the end of World War II.

MUSCLES WITHERED

Relative strength of the machine tool industry, as measured by its ability to produce equipment, in some respects is below 1941. From 1936 to 1939 plants were building tools for Europe. The defense preparations starting in 1940 showed up a lot of bottlenecks. In 1942 shipments were $1,300,000,000, an all-time peak.

They have declined every year since then, and industry employment is down to about 36,000. Although some companies have larger plants, parts of them cannot be considered machine tool capacity because they are devoted to making other equipment.

What Can We Americans Do To Start a Marshall Plan of Ideas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an advertisement by the Toledo (Ohio) Blade in the Paris edition of the Herald Tribune, which advertisement asks that Americans abroad report on what they find to be the general opinion as to the effect of the Marshall plan, the reputation in which the United States is held by the people among whom they travel, and similar matters.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CAN WE AMERICANS DO TO START A MARSHALL PLAN OF IDEAS?

To Americans Abroad:

Men who know the world situation say America is losing the war of ideas. President Truman, Secretary Acheson, Eisenhower, Marshall, Clay, Dulles, and others have warned repeatedly that we must step up a thousandfold our efforts to tell the American story to people of other lands.

Now a stateside newspaper wants to know what it can do—and what its readers can do—to help the United States wage this vigorous campaign of truth.

Perhaps you, being on the scene, have some practical suggestions as to what we at home can do. Perhaps there are even ways in which you, too, can help right now while you are in Europe, and which other Americans who will follow may carry on.

One authority has said, "The world must hear what America is about, what America believes, what freedom is, what it has done for many, what it can do for all. We must use every means we know to communicate the value of freedom to the four corners of the earth. Our message must go out a hundred different ways. It will carry conviction because it comes not out of the Government alone but out of the hearts and souls of the people of the United States. Because it is the authentic Voice of America, freedom will ring around the world."

President Truman has asked Congress for $125,000,000 for a vastly expanded campaign of truth. This, of course, would finance the United States Government's official program.

But aren't there other ways for men and women and even the children of America, and for newspapers like the Toledo Blade, to help win this terribly urgent war of ideas?

We think there are. We think you might have some suggestions as to how Americans abroad and at home might now participate personally.

Perhaps you have an opinion on present or possible international information activities.

For instance, do the people of countries you have visited believe the United States acted defensively in Korea, or has Russian propaganda succeeded in its effort to label us the aggressor?

Would it be worth while to stimulate a campaign of letters to the world similar to the letters to Italy campaign, which originated in Toledo?

Can you suggest ways to make the Voice of America broadcasts more effective?

Could the public help substantially to counteract communist propaganda by sending quantities of newspapers and magazines to the some 150 United States Information Service libraries abroad?

How can American newspapers and industries best help in getting America's story to a world audience?

Can you suggest any methods of encouraging men and women here to personally support with all their vigor a Marshall plan of ideas?

This is an invitation for you to send us such ideas as you might have. We will acknowledge them and send you a copy of the issue that contains anything you contribute. Air mail your suggestions, please (if possible in letters under 500 words so we may publish them), to Michael Bradshaw, editor.

Aggressor's Blueprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, August 27. At a time like this when we have one high Government official, Mr. Jessup, our Ambassador at Large, speaking apparently for the Department of State, opposing our starting a war, while another high Government official, Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Matthews, expresses the view that the United States should be willing to start a war if necessary to compel cooperation for peace, I think it is well to read Mr. Sullivan's article and give some thought to Mr. Stassen's suggestion:

AGGRESSOR'S BLUEPRINT — MARK SULLIVAN TELLS HOW RUSSIA PLANS TO SCATTER POWER OF UNITED STATES

(By Mark Sullivan)

Our people watch Korea, concentrating their attention on the battles there. Unconsciously or wishfully they assume that sooner or later we will triumph there, and that this will be the end of the chapter. It could be the end of the chapter but only the beginning of the book. This ought to be clear from the preparation we are making for a prolonged and major war, and is crystal clear to those who think through. Thinking through is only approximately possible even to the best informed. For not all the information is available to anyone; much of it exists only in the minds of the Russian Communist heads, their intentions and plans.

One who has thought through with thoroughness and clarity is former Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, now president of the University of Pennsylvania. He concludes that Russian communism aims to overcome the United States by definite methods, carefully planned. One method, major in importance, is, in Mr. Stassen's words: "The continuous embroiling of * * * the United States in minor wars at distant, difficult points to tire and weaken us and bleed us white."

The present example of this is Korea. Belief held in thoroughly informed quarters is that Russian communism plans aggressions similar to the Korean one in from five to eight other places distantly separated from each other. The aggressions will be opposed by the United States; we have committed ourselves to it.

Consider now the military strength that is already in existence and available for service overseas. A large part of this was already in use before Korea, as occupation forces in Japan and Germany. A percentage of our remaining available strength is now being used in Korea. How much this percentage is cannot be estimated with any accuracy; it is almost certainly a large percentage, for undoubtedly we are making use in Korea of everything we can spare of men, material and the other factors that enter into military strength.

Imagine now that Russian communism makes another aggression while the Korean one is still on; in Formosa, for example. This would call for an additional percentage of our military strength, probably at least as much as in Korea. Yet another aggression in any of the places where aggression is apprehended would demand an additional percentage of our strength. Some of the anticipated or feared aggressions, as in Europe, would demand large percentages.

Add up all these percentages, and the sum is more than we have. This is a grim conclusion. To escape it or minimize it, we turn to possible counteracting factors. We consider that possibly Russian communism may not make the new aggressions soon, but we may have time to increase our strength. But to assume that Russian communism will withhold further aggressions until we build up our strength is to assume that it will forego an immense advantage which it has

planned for and in use of which it has made a beginning in Korea. Similarly vain for the same reason is any assumption that the aggressions will not go on simultaneously. To assume that is to assume that Russian communism will not use this method of overcoming us.

One counteracting factor which has substance is that we will have help from the other countries which are with us in resisting the Korean aggression, as called for by the United Nations. But willing though the other nations have been to come forward, limitations upon what they can do are suggested by the amount they have been able to contribute, so far. Besides, some of these countries are directly in the line of expected aggressions, and they must build up and maintain their home defenses.

The sum of all is that Russian communism is in the way of overcoming us by a method of warfare it devised, in which it has the initiative and in which we are on the defensive, obliged to adjust ourselves to the moves that Russian communism makes. The one advantage we have, commonly believed to be decisive if we use it, is the atomic bomb. But here is part of the ingenuity of the method of warfare Russian communism is practicing. It assumes that while we might use the atomic bomb against an attack made upon us by Russia directly, we will hesitate to use it against aggression that Russian communism inspires in small countries.

This condition has led to several suggestions. One by Mr. Stassen is especially concrete. He would have us, and the United Nations, serve formal notice on the Kremlin that we will hold it responsible—that if the Communist leaders do in fact start world war III by aggression through their satellites and puppets, we and our associates in the United Nations intend to finish it, in due time, against the Kremlin itself.

Use of Waters of Belly and Waterton Rivers, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make reference again to the problem of beneficial use in the United States of the waters of the Belly and Waterton Rivers, which arise in Montana and flow north into Canada.

The International Joint Commission has been studying this problem for many months, and we understand that the Commission's field committee, composed of engineers from Canada and the United States, has failed to reach an agreement as to plans for mutual development of this resource.

It is understood that a meeting of the International Joint Commission will be held in Ottawa in October, and it is hoped that the Commission will make some substantial progress to overcome the present disagreement and reach an agreement respecting the division and use of the waters before that date.

The matter has been pending for some 5 years, and further delay is extremely irritating to residents of Montana, who note that in the meantime Canada is completing various reservoirs and canals which involves the potential use of water that does not belong to that country.

As an example of the feeling in Montana, I include as part of my remarks an editorial on the subject from the Lewistown Daily News. It follows:

AS WE SEE IT—WATERTON AND BELLY RIVERS—TESTS IN UNITED STATES AND CANADA CO-OPERATION

It is almost a month now since the cool waters of the Waterton and Belly Rivers caused hot debate on both sides of the United States-Canadian line, in hearings before the International Joint Commission.

So there has been time for cooler contemplation over the demands made by both countries for these waters, which rise largely in the United States but flow north into Canada.

Alberta and Saskatchewan wanted all the waters from these rivers for irrigation projects north of the international line.

Montana wanted its fair share to irrigate parched lands in between Havre, Shelby, Cut Bank, and the Canadian line.

WE HAVE SLUMBERED

In fairness to the Canadians, it must be admitted that we have slumbered for years so far as these waters are concerned, giving them the idea that they might be able to use all the water from the Waterton and Belly Rivers.

In fairness to the United States, these rivers rise largely in Glacier National Park, on the Montana side of the border, so the water is originally ours.

We have even talked of cutting a tunnel through the mountains, and taking all of the water for ourselves if the two countries don't get together on a fair distribution. This can be done, too, if we don't pay much attention to costs, and a bill has been introduced in Congress that would make the project possible. But we would dislike seeing such action.

However, a new element has entered into the discussion that may help effect a compromise—this spring's tragic flood in the Red River Valley, which put much of Winnipeg under water, and the entire area from the Manitoba capitol to the North Dakota-Minnesota line.

EIGHT HUNDRED MILES TOGETHER

It is almost 800 miles from this point on the plains to the Waterton and Belly Rivers, high in the Rockies, but they are definitely related in the over-all picture.

Canada needs the cooperation of the United States in preventing or controlling such floods in the future. And this cooperation seems forthcoming. So, if the two nations work together in one point on the international line, it seems logical that they should do the same at other points.

On the Red River, it is a problem of "turning the water off," and up in the high Alberta and Montana plains, it is a case of "turning on" the waters of the Waterton and Belly Rivers. But the principle of international cooperation is the same.

Canada's members of the international Commission have already been criticized on the floor of the House of Commons in Ottawa for what some members consider delay in acting on flood problems. The record is in the official report for May 1, 1950.

ON THE SPOT

The Honorable J. A. Ross, House of Commons member from Souris, Manitoba, criticized the Canadian members of the Commission as follows:

"May I say that so far as the Canadian appointments to the International Joint Commission on Water Rights are concerned, many people consider this a lucrative pension scheme to certain people for past faithful service. * * * There is great dissatisfaction in this regard among people well acquainted with these flood problems. In fact, the engineers' association has publicly protested this method of appointment."

We are unable to enter into this argument, but must say that we were most impressed with the two Canadian members of the Commission who appeared at Havre at the June 17 hearing. G. S. Spence, of Saskatchewan, is one of Canada's grand old men in service and ability. Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton is Canada's Gen. George Marshall. So there is no question that our friends from north of the border sent big leaguers of great prestige and talent to the Waterton-Belly hearings—men who must also act on the Red River flood-control problem.

NO COMMENT

But, as to Canadian charges that the Commission has delayed in acting on flood control, we are unfamiliar with this, and cannot comment.

In asking action, Mr. Ross said: "It is obvious that the people of the United States are trying to do something about this recurring situation."

The Honorable Rene N. Jutras, of Provencher, however, preceded Mr. Ross in urging the Commission to do something.

"I ask the Government to press the international joint commission to speed up its engineering report on the control of floods in the area," Mr. Justras said, "to try to get some action, and to explore further to see whether, if they cannot be wholly controlled, they may be partly controlled."

So the Canadian members of the Commission are on the spot so far as flood water agreements are concerned.

Whether this is also true regarding a settlement of the Waterton-Belly controversy is concerned, we do not know.

DELAYED ACTION?

There is a feeling that General McNaughton is fighting a delayed action—that he wishes to stall settlement just as long as possible so more and more of the water will already be put into use by Canadian farmers, on the theory that once in use it won't be taken away from them.

This feeling may be entirely unfair to the General, who is certainly one of Canada's greatest men, but it does exist. Time and action will either confirm or refute it.

Anyway, division of the waters of the Waterton-Belly Rivers has become a mooted and much booted question recently on both sides of the international border.

That there is need for international cooperation on river problems is certainly plain to the Canadians in the Red River valley. And if this is true there, it is also the case 800 miles to the west, where the Waterton and Belly Rivers flow from the Montana into Alberta.

So the decision of the International Joint Commission will be awaited with much interest.

It is hoped that it will be released soon.

Unemployment Claims in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the latest report of the Employment Security Division of the Department of Labor, State of Connecticut, lists unemployment claims at 21,715. In order to give the

complete picture as it is indicated for the State of Connecticut by this report, I ask that it be printed in its entirety so that my colleagues from beyond the State of Connecticut who continue to make inquiry about the unemployment status may be informed of the over-all picture, which includes 30,350 exhaustions of claims since January 1, 1950. It follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT CLAIMS DOWN TO 21,715

The number of unemployment claims in Connecticut dropped to 21,715 during the week ended August 19 from 24,849 for the previous week. Last week's figures included 2,884 claims for vacation shutdowns where employees did not receive vacation pay and filed jobless claims.

The above totals include 10,242 women who made up 47.8 percent of the total.

During the corresponding week a year ago, there were 76,999 filing claims of whom 34.6 percent were women.

INITIAL CLAIMS DECLINE

Initial claims under the Connecticut law numbered 1,702 last week, 2,327 the previous week and 4,399 2 weeks ago.

EXHAUSTIONS

Those exhausting their benefits last week numbered 500, making the total 30,350 since January 1, 1950.

BRIDGEPORT HIGHEST

Bridgeport led the State in claims with 3,946 followed by Hartford 3,534, New Haven 2,395 and Waterbury 1,809.

Next were New Britain 1,424, Stamford 1,098 and Meriden 1,040. Under 1,000 each were Norwich 837, Ansonia 690, New London 687, Norwalk 674, Middletown 648, Thompsonville 587, Bristol 532, Danbury 529, Torrington 435, Danielson 352, Manchester 328, and Williamantic 170.

HIRINGS AND LAY-OFFS

No lay-offs were reported last week by the field offices.

The following hirings were noted: razors 70, vacuum cleaners 60, brass 50, garment 50, bearings 45, mercantile 40, timepieces 30, springs 30, oil burners 30, transportation equipment 30 and boxes 15.

HIRINGS BY AREA

In the Bristol area a timepiece manufacturer rehired 30 and a maker of small metal parts rehired 30.

The Stamford office reported the following rehirings: razors 70, vacuum cleaners 60, and oil burners 30.

In the Torrington area, a new mercantile store hired about 40 and a parts manufacturer hired 30.

The Waterbury office reported the following rehirings: brass 50, garment 50, and boxes 15.

National Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

JOINT STATEMENT ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY LEGISLATION NOW PENDING BEFORE THE CONGRESS, ISSUED BY THE NATIONAL CIVIL LIBERTIES CLEARING HOUSE

The undersigned officers of organizations, conscious of the need for adequate internal security measures, united in their opposition to all totalitarian political movements, and committed to the preservation of the democratic way of life at home and abroad, are unalterably opposed to the McCarran (S. 4037), Mundt-Ferguson (S. 2311) and Wood (H. R. 9490) bills pending before the Congress. We urge that legislation in the spirit of the President's message of August 8 on national security be substituted for these measures. The Magnuson and Celler bills (S. 4061 and H. R. 9502) are such an approach to the problem and although some of the undersigned have objections to some of their provisions, we consider them clearly preferable to the McCarran and Mundt-Ferguson proposals.

The McCarran, Mundt-Ferguson, and Wood bills are indiscriminately repressive measures, ostensibly written to meet the Communist threat to our national security, but they will not do that job. They jeopardize the rights of individuals and of organizations which not only are not subversive but are dedicated in principles and program to the fight against Communism. They represent a hysterical approach to a serious national problem which can only be met through an understanding of the nature of the Communist movement in this country and a faithful adherence to the basic principles of the Bill of Rights.

The Magnuson and Celler bills would be more adequate to protect the country against threats while maintaining conformity to traditional American guaranties of individual freedom. We most earnestly hope that the Congress will not endorse totalitarian methods to fight totalitarian dangers.

Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary, American Association of University Professors; Ernest Angell, Chairman of the Board, and Patrick Murphy Malin, Director, American Civil Liberties Union; James Loeb, Jr., Executive Secretary, Americans for Democratic Action; John Slawson, Executive Director, American Jewish Committee; Issac Toubin, Acting Director, American Jewish Congress; Elmer W. Henderson, Director, American Council on Human Rights; Dr. Merrill E. Bush, American Unitarian Association; Michael Straight, Chairman, American Veterans Committee; Benjamin R. Epstein, Executive Director, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Jack Wasserman, Legislative Representative, Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers; Frank S. Ketcham, Counsel, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches; Wallace J. Campbell, Director, Washington Office, Cooperative League of the United States of America; Jacob Patt, Executive Director, Jewish Labor Committee; Ben Kaufman, Executive Director, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; E. Raymond Wilson, Executive Director, Friends Committee on National Legislation; A. J. Hayes, International President, International Association of Machinists; H. L. Mitchell, President, National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L.; Isaiah M. Minkoff, Executive Director, National Community Relations Advisory Council; Mrs. Joseph L. Willen, Chairman, Committee on Education and Social Welfare, National Council of Jewish Women; Emanuel Berlatsky, President, National Association of Jewish Center Workers; Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel, Chairman, Department of Christian Social Relations, United Council of Church Women; Maurice N. Eisendrath, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Time of Great Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial from the Hennepin County Review, a weekly newspaper in my district—the Third—at Hopkins, Minn., written August 24, 1950, entitled, "Time of Great Peril."

I submit this editorial because of its relationship to the huge expenditure of moneys we have just set up in our $54,000,000,000 appropriations legislation.

The editorial is as follows:

TIME OF GREAT PERIL

Our decision to defend Formosa against the Chinese Communist army, single-handedly—it will be remembered that the United Nations did not go along with us on that decision—has met with a cold, universal and fearful reaction in the world capitals. If we are compelled by the turn of events to make good on this commitment, we shall be on our own, on the other side of the earth, tortured by a 5,000-mile supply line, and fighting 450,000,000 Chinese, to the extreme delight of Russia, the apprehension of our Western allies, and the disgust of all Asiatics.

In such a war, India might well find herself alined against us—that is to say, forced into an alliance with Russia and China. In India today the suspicion against America is increasing alarmingly. India's Nehru is bitterly disappointed over Washington's stubborn refusal, to date, to get off the Formosa hook if the expression may be employed in dealing with a subject so grave.

Our position respecting Formosa constitutes the most alarming phase of our foreign relations. In its gravity it transcends the immediate war picture in Korea by many times. All of our so-called Western European friends are sweating it out, praying that we transfer the problem to the United Nations while there is yet time—before an invasion move by the Red army of China precipitates a duel of guns between MacArthur and Mao Tsing. Meanwhile, Mr. Joseph Stalin no doubt wants nothing at the moment more than to see Mao Tsing give the order that will mean a Chinese-American war.

With 40 percent of the world's people already under Russian control, one trembles in contemplation of a war against China. It could very well be in the beginning of a war between the colored and white races of the earth. In the world today there are three colored citizens for every single white. We have now taught the colored man to shoot. In Korea he has convinced himself he can shoot pretty well, that there is no valid ground for an inferiority complex when he comes to grips with the white man on the battlefield.

Why have the world's leaders in four decades allowed affairs to reach such a tragic state? Why must the civilized peoples of the world devote themselves continually to war, to the insane business of shooting one another down? Why cannot the world's peoples live in peace?

The answers lie in the sinful refusal of too many of the governments of the world to live and let live. Millions on millions of the world's unfortunate little people have been kept to heel by the colonial powers for hundreds and hundreds of years. The profits of their labor have gone to the exploiters, while

they themselves have lived on animal levels or worse, much of the time on the verge of starvation.

These little people long since have decided they prefer death to continual destitution. They propose henceforth to eat, or else to shoot it out to the death if that be their only alternative. There is a world revolution in progress. We have failed, in the United States, to catch hold of this basic fact. Everywhere we have been dealing with governments unconcerned with their peoples' welfare—concerned only with their own selfish and corrupt financial and political ends.

In South Korea, for example, the government of Sigmund Rhee has been as corrupt as was the government of Chiang Kai-shek in his heyday on the mainland of China. Rhee ruled a police state and kept his countrymen in daily terror. He refused to give the people land, although the land, seized from the Japanese at the end of World War II, belonged to the people. The list of his crimes against his people classifies him beyond question as a small-time Fascist of the Hitler-Franco-Mussolini pattern. We supported Sigmund Rhee. We sent the proper diplomatic congratulations to him the other day on the anniversary of South Korean independence. The people of South Korea loathe and hate him as a deadly enemy.

So it has been most everywhere. In Greece we supported a dictator government. In Indochina we assist the French government as they shoot down the people there who want nothing but their independence, and a chance to eat, as did our own American forefathers in 1776; in the Philippines we support a corrupt government whose hard core is comprised of men who were infamous collaborators with the Japanese during World War II.

Recently we loaned the dictator Peron of Argentina $125,000,000. Scarcely before Peron had put that money into circulation he was damning the capitalist countries with the vehemence he usually reserves for Communist countries. Our Congress only a few days ago passed a law ordering the Export-Import Bank to loan $100,000,000 to Franco, the gangster of Spain, the old pal of Hitler, the one remaining Fascist tyrant of the Hitler-Mussolini school and fraternity. Everywhere, it seems, we support governments conducted by this breed of ruler. Is it any wonder the small people around the world wonder? Is it any wonder that they believe Stalin when his propaganda agencies screech out the charge that we are imperialists and money grubbers—that we are out to exploit half the world, now that England's star of empire has fallen?

The American people do not believe in their hearts that their American Government should support evil governments, but they are loyal, and they will support their Government and their country, right or wrong. The American people themselves do not wish to exploit other unfortunates of other lands. When America is looked upon as an imperialist nation, an exploiter, as Stalin has convinced so many we are, it is unjust to the people of the United States. We are not that kind of people, even though our Government has made it appear we are.

Our Voice of America has not been getting through to these people across and around the earth. They do not know us. They hear and hear that our Government has been supporting, always and always, those rulers and those governments who have been against the people. They hear this from Stalin and that is almost all they hear. Thus they convict us as imperialists. Convicted, we are without friends and under suspicion.

So there we are, in the eyes of the world, as we stand perilously near a war with China, a single-handed and lonesome war, in which we shall find ourselves without friends or allies.

There we are, as Stalin cunningly pulls his diplomatic strings from the Kremlin, the strings designed to get us into trouble, and keep us there, until we descend to the status of a second-rate power.

There we are, as the ferment of a war between the races bubbles and bubbles, ever more ominously.

The United States sits today on a hot seat in the troubled world arena. Never have we confronted a crisis so grave and menacing. Inspired leadership, calm thinking, a steady hand at the helm, and the grace of God are what we must have. Without them, and especially the latter, we stand as a Nation and a people in deadly peril.

Weak and Uncertain Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include and have printed in the RECORD an editorial written by Gordon Morrow, the editor of the Wellston Sentinel, a very influential newspaper in my congressional district. Mr. Morrow served long and faithfully in World War II and is always well posted on all public questions. I compliment him on his forthright statement:

OUTPOST—NOTES AND COMMENTS

As Wellston's life is increasingly disrupted by the recall to active duty of more and more reservists necessitated by our complete unpreparedness for the Korean war, the finger points at two men directly responsible.

They are Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson.

It was Acheson's failure of a concrete foreign policy in the Far East which gave the North Korean Reds the opportunity to sweep to the south, and it was Johnson's failure to have an adequate Defense Establishment built up to resist successfully (without calling reservists) such a sweep to the south.

Johnson was the guy who said we could lick Russia (and presumably her satellites) with one hand tied behind our backs. He hamstrung the Navy, cut down the Air Force, and all but obliterated the Marine Corps.

Who did MacArthur want when the going got tough in Korea? The Marine Corps. To whom did President Truman give the first defense order? The United States Seventh Fleet.

In the period following World War I, Washington crucified the messiah of airpower, Gen. Billy Mitchell, and in the period following World War II, Washington crucified the messiah of defense, the late Secretary James Forrestal.

In 1947 and in 1948, Forrestal pointed the way. He was so opposed and ridiculed that he collapsed, and later took his own life. Subsequent events proved he was right.

In the late 1940's Forrestal predicted that Russia or her satellites would move when the Reds got the A-bomb. We were at war then, he said, not a shooting war, but a political war. In 1947 he said:

"* * * start now to build up other forms of military power to balance the threat of Soviet armies when the atom can't protect us any longer."

Forrestal meant: giving arms to our European friends, create a reserve of ready-to-fight ground troops here in the United States, plus tactical air power; step up the Navy anti-submarine program; and build up the air defense of our home territory.

He said that historically, the balance of power is a pretty good means of keeping the peace. He showed us the way to maintain a balance of power. If we had taken his advice in 1948, we would have had a year's start on Russia. But the Reds exploded their first A-bomb a year ago, and we again were caught with our defenses down.

It will cost us heavily in the next few years, for in war, time is the most precious of all commodities. It can only be repurchased at the price of blood. And that is what we are doing now.

Ohio's Water Policies in Accord With California's Stand Against Fantastic Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues a statement of water policy of the State of Ohio, prepared by the Ohio Water Resources Board.

Especially I call attention of the House Members to the Ohio board's recommendations with regard to reclamation. It follows:

With regard to reclamation it is this board's opinion that a moratorium should be declared on further irrigation projects in view of the burdensome agricultural surpluses on hand. Present irrigation projects are not self-paying and involve huge Federal subsidies. It would be to the national interest to spend such funds in areas of heavy population for needed water resources developments where they will contribute substantially to industrial production.

On page A5358 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a statement of mine in which I recommended that Congress put in mothballs unnecessary and costly reclamation plans which would burden the Nation's war effort. I cited as an example of a totally fantastic and unfeasible proposed development, the central Arizona project, which would cost more than a billion dollars to construct, and would mean an additional loss in interest to the Nation's taxpayers of more than $2,000,000,000.

The proposed Arizona project would increase greatly the burdensome agricultural surpluses on hand. It would grow crops which are already heavily subsidized. This would be done at enormous cost to the Federal Treasury. Thus, the taxpayers of each State would not only have to pay the cost and the interest losses, but would have to pay more subsidies for crops already in great surplus.

Let me point up another important paragraph in the State of Ohio recommendations. It follows:

The board does not believe in the further indiscriminate development of water resources for any purpose unless each specific

project serves a need that can be demonstrated, and that the benefits to be derived substantially exceed the cost. It is the opinion of the board that a substantial contribution should be made by the localities who receive the major benefit.

Here, again, the proposed central Arizona project is an excellent illustration for the views of the Ohio board.

For instance, under the Arizona project plan the irrigators who would benefit would pay less than the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements, and therefore would pay no part of the construction cost allocated to irrigation. Nor would the Arizona irrigators pay for any part of their water distribution or drainage works. No other Bureau of Reclamation project has been authorized where such a situation would exist, and it is in violation of section 9 (d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The State of Ohio believes that a substantial contribution should be made by localities who benefit from a reclamation project. The Arizona localities which would benefit under the proposed central Arizona project would receive the project benefits as a gift from the people of other States, and Ohio's share of the contribution would be immense.

Conservation of the diminishing water resources of our Nation is one of our most vital internal problems. Every State is involved, and I suggest that the Members of the House read the opinions of the Ohio board.

The complete statement follows:

STATEMENT OF WATER POLICY

(This statement represents the opinion of the Ohio Water Resources Board after a hearing attended by representatives of public and private agencies interested in water policy and is respectfully submitted to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission.)

The proper development of the Nation's water resources is of profound importance to our economy and well-being. The water resources available for development are limited, and therefore great thought and care must be given to the development of those that remain. It is estimated that one-half of the total water resources in the United States have already been developed.

Complete development will require large capital outlays which by the nature of the investment requiring long periods for repayment and amortization must be made by Government. The amount of available public capital is not unlimited, which indicates a further need for careful analysis of any water-resources project.

The board does not believe in the further indiscriminate development of water resources for any purpose unless each specific project serves a need that can be demonstrated and that the benefits to be derived substantially exceed the cost. It is the opinion of the board that a substantial contribution should be made by the localities who receive the major benefit.

Successful development of water resources requires a complete knowledge of all phases of the hydrologic cycle, which can only be obtained by a continuing inventory and research. We believe the cooperative program of the States and United States Geological Survey is an effective means of obtaining these important data.

The board believes in an adequate system of flood control for the security and protection of our people from floods. Flood-control spending might well be geared to the state of the Nation's economy and not be pursued with a break-neck pace when other demands are putting severe pressure on the Nation's economy. It could well be used as a backlog of useful public works when the economy needs stimulation. Any flood-control project should show economic benefits substantially greater than the cost.

This board is opposed to regional or valley authorities, which permit a minimum of local autonomy or control. It is believed the conservancy method which has been successfully used in Ohio points the way toward a democratic type of organization for development of the water resources and that with Federal financial assistance and guidance this could result in more economical first cost and operation of water-resources projects.

This board favors a program of soil conservation not only to save our soil resources but to preserve our water resources by reducing siltation and increasing infiltration. Further research and on-site farm assistance is recommended in cooperation with State and local governments. This can best be accomplished by separating farm-subsidy programs from the soil and water-conservation programs.

This board is of the opinion that where hydroelectric power can be developed in conjunction with flood-control or irrigation projects that such power should be generated and sold wholesale to those in the business of distributing electricity. It also believes that where steam auxiliaries are necessary to firm up such power such installation should be by private utilities and not by the Federal Government.

With regard to reclamation it is this board's opinion that a moratorium should be declared on further irrigation projects in view of the burdensome agricultural surpluses on hand. Present irrigation projects are not self-repaying and involve huge Federal subsidies. It would be to the national interest to spend such funds in areas of heavy population for needed water resources developments where they will contribute substantially to industrial production.

In the board's deliberation the thought arose as to why there had been created a President's Water Resources Policy Commission and these reasons seemed most compelling:

1. We have a confused national water policy and program at present. It wasn't planned that way but like Topsy it just grew.

2. That except in rare instances there has not been a broad basin-wide, regional, or national viewpoint in selecting projects. They have been selected through log-rolling and pressure-group methods.

3. That the pace at which water projects are being built outstrips the available knowledge of stream regimen and other hydrologic occurrences, and that we should greatly accellerate a program of hydrologic investigation prior to such construction.

4. That the allocation of cost between the Federal Government and local beneficiaries is confused, and local beneficiaries do not pay their proper share of the cost. If such a proper cost allocation were insisted upon it would tend to decelerate the unwise and hasty building of projects.

5. That many claimed benefits are nebulous or nonexistent. Conversely only belatedly have other benefits been recognized (i. e., sanitation benefits due to low-flow regulation).

6. That possibly a reason for some of this lack of wisdom is that agencies which perform design and construction also pass on economic justification and feasibility.

7. A paramount conclusion is that there is a need for a permanent Federal water resources policy commission.

The board considered what the organization and functions of such a permanent body should be and these were suggested:

a. It should be an independent commission similar to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

b. It should have the power to determine whether any water resources project should be included in the Federal budget.

c. It should set up criteria for economic justification of water resources projects which shall apply everywhere in the United States.

d. It should set up water resources projects in the order of their cost-benefit ratios, those having the most favorable ratios to be constructed first.

e. It should set up formulas for allocating funds to States for water resources development based on their population, contribution to the Federal income, and their present and potential water needs.

f. It should promote a program of expanded hydrologic inventory and research.

g. The commission should be staffed by the most competent hydrologic and economic experts of the Nation.

C. V. YOUNGQUIST,
Chief, Division of Water, Ohio Department of Natural Resources.
A. W. MARION,
Chairman, Ohio Water Resources Board, and Director, Ohio Department of Natural Resources.

American Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have sought over my many years' service in Congress to always cast a vote that would strengthen and not weaken this Republic. I believe that I have a record of economy as shown by my votes that is unsurpassed by any other Member of the House of Representatives.

The most valuable heritage which I can leave to the members of my family, to my friends and constituents is our form of government unimpaired financially, spiritually, with all of its traditions and ideals intact, as bequeathed to a freedom-loving people.

I know that the great mass of the people who constitute the population of these United States feel just as I do with regard to our glorious heritage. There is only one group of people who can preserve this great Republic of ours, and that group constitutes the sovereign citizens who are clothed with the power to select by their votes at the polls the men who are to control the purse strings of the Government.

I have received a letter from a constituent which I believe comes from the brain and heart of a true American, and I, therefore, under unanimous consent, make it a part of my remarks. I am omitting the name of the author of this letter for the reason that under present conditions it might subject her to communistic reprisal:

Some reflections of one native-born voter who has earned her own living since she was 17:

1. On economy: The first thing done by any individual worth his salt when confronted with abnormal expenses which must

be met is to curtail his normal spending by every dollar, yes, every dime possible, regardless of the fact that such curtailment means real hardship to him and his. The individual who does not do that, goes down under the weight of his additional burdens and is never his own man again.

Distressing as it is to think about, our Government is definitely faced with abnormal expenses for expanding military mobilization throughout all of the presently foreseeable future; and one of the most important steps that can be taken is for our national Government to economize rigidly, right now, on ordinary expenditures of all kinds, beginning with paper, pencils, and rubber bands, and carrying all the way through even to funds made available to other countries.

2. On communistic controls: My constitutional rights and civil liberties are precious to me. I have never been knowingly guilty of anything even remotely disloyal to my country. If there are in my life any associations which unknown to me are alining me with anything that savors of such disloyalty, I want to have that fact made known to me by the FBI, Senator McCarthy, or anybody; and I feel very secure in the knowledge that if I did in ignorance become associated with any questionable group, I would come under FBI surveillance, for I can think of no safer method of protection for a truly loyal American who forms questionable associations without realizing their nature. In these dangerous days, I have no patience with the American citizen who refuses to give a straightforward answer under any and all circumstances to questions pertaining to associations which might involve loyalty to his country.

True, my home is my castle and I should be secure and unquestioned in its occupancy at my will; however, if a nest of vipers has gained entrance to some part of my premises, it might well be necessary that I temporarily give up the privilege of occupying the place in its entirety in order to be assured that the vipers have been cleaned out.

3. Delegates to the United Nations Security Council: If a delegate for either Soviet China or North Korea should be seated in the Security Council as a result of Russian pressure, our Nation would stand before the world a self-confessed weakling, too soft to hold our own against the ruthless bully even in the very hours when Americans are losing their lives in Korea because of the tactics of that bully. We, too, have the power to veto in the Security Council; and if the question of seating such a delegate comes before the Council, we should use the veto. Any other course would be an abject surrender to Russia pressure tactics.

I do not know where else to register this opinion and have it even read. This is one opinion that I should like very much to have placed before whoever is the right person.

4. On interference by the United States of America in the affairs of other nations: If I give money to a man who needs warm clothes and stout boots to enable him to earn his living more comfortably, it seems to me that it is my business if he spends that money for patent medicines and magic plasters; and that it becomes increasingly my business if he turns to me for more money because medicines and plasters prove inadequate for his needs.

My Government operates on my money, both at home and abroad; therefore, when funds from my country are made available to any other country, I am entitled to a voice in how that other country spends the money taken from me and given or loaned them. To mention just one example—if the English people insist on having a socialist state, let them pay for it; stop making me contribute to a form of government I abhor.

Russian Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record and include extraneous material, I publish herewith an editorial against imports of Russian canned crab from the Aberdeen Daily World, of Aberdeen, Wash., and a resolution against further importation of Russian canned crab that was adopted by the State convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Washington State.

The editorial from the Aberdeen World follows:

Russian Crab

The action of New York and Boston longshoremen in refusing to unload Russian-packed canned crabs wins approval. The crabs came to this country from Great Britain, which got them in trade from Russia for British products and then shipped them to the United States to get American dollars. At least, that has been the way with a considerable amount of our trade with Britain. We are quite ready to take British goods, but not Russian goods coming through British agents.

In fact, why do we trade with Russia at all? Congressman Mack, who has turned the spotlight on the imports of Russian crab, reports that during the first 5 months of this year we bought Russian goods to the amount of $17,049,488 and sold Russia only $514,050 worth of American goods. That is a balance of trade of 34 to 1 in Russia's favor. Why, in all conscience, should we coddle Russia to any such tune, or to any tune at all? Why, in fact, should we trade with Russia? Why should we help her in any way? Why, also, should we send goods or dollars to any European country under the Marshall aid plan, that will find their way to Russia? Why not tell these countries that are getting our help that the help will be canceled if they send our supplies to Russia?

We sent scrap iron and oil to Japan during the years Japan was preparing for war on us, and got back the scrap and junk in shells on our troops, while our oil supplied the fuel for Jap planes. Voices were raised against that trade, our own among them, and we well remember the threats of reprisals in the cancellation of advertising contracts and other ways, if we continued our objection to the traffic.

Russia is our potential enemy, the only one we have in the world in fact, and it occupies now the same position that Japan occupied in the days before Pearl Harbor. We should not trade with it either directly or in a roundabout way. "Why," asks Frank Kerins, shop steward of the New York longshoremen, "should we help Russia make money in this country?" Can there be any answer but one to that pertinent question?

AGAINST RUSSIAN IMPORTS

The resolution by the State convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the State of Washington reads:

Resolution

Whereas the markets of the United States are being flooded by the importation of Russian crab meat, the importation into the United States from Siberia in the single month of February 1950 having reached the alarming proportions of 59,000 cases, and the Russians are now believed to be packing about 500,000 cases of crab meat annually, most of which pack may be dumped into the markets of the United States; and

Whereas the prosperity of the people in the coastal areas of Washington, Oregon, California, and Alaska depends to a large extent on the fishing industry in those areas; and

Whereas United States citizens in said areas have over a period of years developed a thriving fishing industry involving an investment of millions of dollars in boats, gear, dock, and wharf facilities, and furnishing employment to thousands; and

Whereas the importation of Russian crab meat and other fish products from foreign nations threatens to ruin the fishing industry of the entire Pacific coast: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department of Washington, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at the Thirtieth Annual Encampment, in Bellingham, as follows:

1. That we vigorously protest the importation of Russian crab meat and other fish products from foreign nations into the United States unless the citizens engaged in the fishing industry are adequately protected from the ruinous effects of such importations by the imposition of adequate tariffs; and

2. That the Congress and President of the United States be strongly urged to provide adequate protection to citizens of the United States engaged in the fishing industry from ruinous foreign competition, either by prohibiting such importations entirely or by the imposition of adequate tariffs.

Household Hints for Hoarders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the many useful and delightful citizens to come out of the South is the able writer David L. Cohn. His Household Hints for Hoarders should have as wide distribution as possible and I am therefore inserting it in the Congressional Record:

Household Hints for Hoarders

(By David L. Cohn)

(Hoarders are on the run for goods. Panic buying, in full stride despite warnings, is pushing United States toward rationing. Sugar, soaps, nylons, are being snatched from store shelves. Hoarding is creating artificial shortages, forcing prices up.—United States News and World Report, July 28, 1950.)

Get in there and shove, Mama.
Push the others out of the way, Sis.
Strip the shelves to the bare boards
Where lie the tiny droppings of midnight mice.
Buy anything and everything.
Clean out the store.
Then run to the wrapping counter
Pursued by the barehanded
As barnyard hens pursue the lucky one that has a choice bit of offal in its mouth.
This still being a free country
Every citizen has certain inalienable rights.
Among them the right—especially dear when the Nation's life is at stake—
To be a hog; or, if that sounds offensive, a buzzard.
Buy tea, coffee, spices, canned goods—anything.
Store it, hide it, bury it.

You'll agree with me that there's no sweeter fat than sticks to your own bones.
Ignore the President. Give him the razz-matazz.
You're no Godless Communist trying to destroy this country; a blind but destructive termite.
On the contrary, you're a church-going, taxpaying, God-fearing patriot, with a passionate interest in yourself; your illimitable, eternal, inexhaustibly fascinating, infinitely precious self.
They do you wrong who, noting your behavior, vainly wish for retrospective contraception.
So think now, as men die for you,
Of your Gut.
Of your dear, precious, well-beloved Gut,
Of the whole two hundred twenty-eight feet of it
Coiled in your abdomen.
In time of peril men instinctively think of what is most precious to them:
Soldiers die for an inch of ground.
But don't revere them for it. That's easy.
For, as simple arithmetic reveals,
You must stand guard over two thousand seven hundred thirty-six inches of Gut.
Well-larded, coiled, greedy peristaltic Gut.
The ancients believed that the soul resided in the bladder.
But we know better, don't we?
It lies in the Gut.
In the well-larded, coiled, greedy, peristaltic Gut.
Be sure to store plenty of sugar.
If your neighbor can't get any, that's his fault.
For, as the Good Book says,
Where there's no vision the people perish.
(—And soap. You remember the song?
"Soap and water will surely wash you clean.")
Sugar's good in time of war.
Its sweetness cuts the gall-bitter taste of defeat which, to the palate, is as the stinkingness to the nose of the pus-running wounds of soldiers.
Beforehanded with sugar, you can have your cake and eat it, too,
One layer blood-red in memory of the war dead,
In tender token of your patriotism,
And example to your children.
Grab all the nylons you can.
Grab 'em, lady, before they become parachutes.
Lucifer, you know, thrown from Heaven's battlements,
Fell from dawn until dewy eve.
Well, by God, there's nothing he did that a GI—your own son perhaps—can't do.
In short—this is my final advice—
Buy everything that isn't nailed down.
Go the whole Hog, as we say.
And if the worst comes to the worst,
If the Bomb gets you,
You will die with larder overflowing,
History recording that you were caught napping,
But not—praise the Lord—caught short.

The Forgotten Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in 1940 the late Harry Barfield, of Atlanta, Ga., printed a pamphlet regarding the origin of the Civilian Conservation Corps, entitled "The Forgotten Man."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this article herewith:

THE FORGOTTEN MAN—THE REAL STORY OF THE CCC

(By Harry Barfield)

[From the Atlanta Journal of January 29, 1940]

"TRENDS OF THE TIMES

"The year 1933 opened with a great American army on the retreat. The army consisted of a multitude of young men—and some women—on the highways thumbing rides from here to there. Life had no place for them. There were no jobs. If they had parents, they were a burden to them. The army struggled forth living skimpily on the country as it moved.

"For these youths the Civilian Conservation Corps, the CCC, was formed. The army vanished from the roads. A monument will some day be raised to the inspirer, if he can be identified, of that plan.

"Since 1933, 2,600,000 youths have been taken from the highways, housed comfortably in camps, and put to work improving the Nation's production plants. They have built conservation dams, planted forests, done the thousand and one things needful to conserve the forests and save the soil.

"With the work went study. Education and industry, a great partnership, moved in step. The CCC saved men and it saved the resources by which men live.

"In seven years $2,000,000,000 have been spent in this work. The saving of 2,000,000 young men and unnumbered acres of timber and soil has cost the price of 30 first-rate battleships. Enough work remains to keep 1,500 CCC camps busy for another 50 years, says the director of the CCC.

"The life of the CCC expires, unless Congress meanwhile extends it, on June 30, 1943. Can private industry by that time catch the secret of making private work for all who want to work? If not, it is CCC extension or youth again out on the roads.

"WALTER LOCKE."

(The reprint above was part of an article appearing on the editorial page of the Atlanta Journal, on Monday, January 29, 1940. And written by Walter Locke, editor of the Dayton (Ohio) News. That part of the article which definitely states a monument will some day be raised to the inspirer (of the CCC plan) if he can be identified, is identical to the part of another promise, that was responsible for the plan's creation, but, as yet unfulfilled. I publish this, so the creator of that plan may be definitely identified and with the hope that America will take some steps to fulfill some of its promises.)

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

He was dubbed the forgotten man number one, by one of the local news broadcasters. You know, one of those fellows who seek the human interest side of events as they are recorded in the daily paper and afterwards flower it up with pathos or humor as the story warrants. Even before I heard Bill Key's broadcast on the afternoon of July 28, 1933, over radio station WGST in Atlanta, I knew the full story up to that date, of the conception of the plan that gave to America the CCC and the heartbreaks and struggle for recognition that came to its creator. I don't know why he ever came to me and chose me to be a confidant for his troubles; perhaps it was because I am in the printing business and he wanted to have his idea copyrighted and he couldn't do so until the manuscript was printed. I glanced over the typewritten pages and informed him it would cost quite a sum of money to print even the few copies he wanted and that my price was cash, in advance. I couldn't afford to have my money tied up in a lot of type which I could never use again except to melt it up for the metal. Too many printers were going under doing that and I didn't want to be one of them. Anyway, he left the article with me, and having a fairly good idea what it was all about, I chose a time when I had plenty of leisure to read it and get a thorough conception of what he had worked out. Until I read that article, I had always looked upon the man as a sort of crackpot with a lot of wild ideas. He would take some problems that confronted mankind and attempt to solve them in his own way. The fact that engineers with scientific data available had failed for years to find a solution, probably never crossed his mind or if it did he ignored this fact. The net result was that he spent a lot of time creating things that never worked, or if they did, they died for lack of financial support.

I remember once it was a gadget that was going to help pilots overcome the earlier tendency to pull into a spin while flying blind. He had a large ball with mercury inside and a lot of small lights on top. When he sat it on my desk, it worked perfectly, a little tilt in any direction would cause one bulb to light, further tilting would cause others to light, you could tell at a glance at what degree the instrument was tilted. But he didn't know that if you put the gadget in a plane centrifugal force would keep the mercury on the bottom of the ball and the lights wouldn't work. I tell you this so that you may get an idea of just what kind of fellow this Joe Wilson is.

Secretly, I laughed when I heard he was attempting to help solve the unemployed problem, and when he came into my shop that day with his first draft of his solution, which was in the form of a letter he intended to mail to Governor Roosevelt, I was somewhat annoyed with him. But, having nothing better to do, I read the letter. Any intelligent man who would read it would have readily admitted it contained merit. I am a confirmed believer in the law of averages—a man who tries often enough is bound to make a strike eventually, and it looked like this Joe Wilson had finally hit the jack pot.

There naturally arose several questions that my mind groped for the answers. He had been in to see me every day for several months before he brought in the letter. He was an ardent follower of the famous and widely read columnist, the late Arthur Brisbane. To him can be attributed the inspiration that started Joe Wilson seeking the solution of our unemployment problem. He, like most columnists, believed our unemployment problem would be solved when the master minds really began to work on a solution. He constantly urged his readers to think, assuring them that rich rewards awaited those who were not afraid to think.

Joe Wilson lapped up these editorials like a cat does milk. Ten minutes after the paper hit the street, he could almost quote verbatim Mr. Brisbane's entire column. One day he came in flushed with excitement and announced that he had it. Then followed a period of almost a week before I saw him again. That was the day he came in with the letter. The next day he was back again and I plied him with the questions whose answers I had been unable to find.

I had no doubt but that his idea would prove helpful in a part solution of our problem and events proved my reasoning correct. "But how," I asked him, "do you contemplate collecting on this idea?" In reply he asked me a question.

"Harry, do you remember reading an editorial the other day that stated—'To the genius, who will devise some plan that will aid in putting any large number of these (speaking about the then acknowledged 13,000,000 unemployed) people to work, America will ever be grateful. He will be showered with all the luxuries of life as long

as he lives and his memory will be perpetuated even beyond the grave.'" I remembered reading the piece and was sure he was quoting it exactly as it was written. But, I reminded him that that was only the expressed idea of some editorial writer. Congress or no authorized Government agency was offering any such reward.

"Look, Harry," he said, "don't you believe that any man who comes along and creates something that will put millions to work would be entitled to see that prophecy fulfilled?"

"Yes," I agreed, "he certainly would. But how do you figure you will collect even if they use your idea and it proves successful?"

"Your approval," he said, "of the thoughts expressed in that editorial indirectly makes you a party to that contract and the millions that read it and concur in the statements it contains are also parties. As you know, I am virtually one of those 13,000,000 unemployed and not being able to obtain work at my trade, I am taking what part-time work I can get, which is about 1 day a week. If there was any employment agency that could obtain regular employment for me for a period of a few months, I would gladly pay them $10 for their services. There are millions like me and I have an inherent belief in the fairness of the American people. It wouldn't be necessary for them to donate any such sum as $10 to see that prophecy fulfilled. This plan is going to put millions to work if I can get it into the proper hands and maneuver it just right. As for the monument, I don't want any; all I would expect for my efforts is to know that I have provided a measure of security for myself and family.

"There is still another angle to this thing. There is hardly a business in America that isn't going to reap some benefit from this. Take Ford, for instance, if he had a man in his organization, a sales manager or someone that could promote any idea that would sell thousands of cars and trucks for him, don't you think he would be handsomely rewarded?"

I agreed he would be. You would have, too. This took place in the early part of 1932 and in order that you may get a full, comprehensive picture of the hopeless mess we were in it may be necessary for you to read some of the pathetic appeals that were carried by the daily papers of that time. However, I remind you that unemployment then exceeded today's figure and there were no PWA, doles, relief, or surplus food distributing agencies. If the same condition existed today with radicalism as it now is, revolution could not be avoided.

There is no way for me in so short an article to give you a complete picture of the immeasurable and valued service this man rendered the Nation. The documents upon which this story is based were left with me one by one. They are but a minor part of the whole. I shall quote from them piece by piece in verification of the story as I know it actually happened.

I first became acquainted with the man at a lodge meeting. Some months afterward he came to me with one of his gadgets and wanted me to finance it. It was true that I had some capital invested in different enterprises on which the returns were questionable, and one more or less wouldn't have made a great deal of difference to me. As I only had little to speculate with on any enterprise, my loss could not have been great. I had no doubt but that this particular one would do all he claimed for it. It was by nature a protective device against bank holdups. When installed the deliberate tripping of a foot bar would lock specially constructed revolving doors so that ingress or egress was impossible. I considered it from the public's point of view. If the bank where I made my deposit installed this device I would withdraw my account. I would take no chance on being locked in the confines of a bank with a mob of gangsters with machine guns and I didn't think the general public would either. Therefore, I turned him down. He came again and again with some gadget or other and each time I turned him down because I couldn't see the practicability of the device. So, I wasn't surprised even though I was amused when he set out to solve the unemployment situation.

It was in the early part of 1932 when he first told me he was working on the idea. It was the latter part of May or the first of June when he came in with the first draft of the plan. Believing he had something of merit, I encouraged him by telling him so.

Encouragement to a man of that type is like food to a hungry dog and once you give it you will have him hounding your footsteps for more.

This letter he was sending to Governor Roosevelt was a copy of one he was sending to H. L. Mencken, who was the editor of the American Mercury. He mailed them both the same day and received an invitation from Mr. Mencken, who must have recognized the merit of his plan, to put it in the form of an article. He was elated with this invitation but worried about what Governor Roosevelt's attitude would be. I advised patience as Governor Roosevelt was at that time a very busy man. He was ardently seeking and afterward obtained the Democratic nomination. Upon Governor Roosevelt's return to Albany, he answered Joe Wilson's letter, seeking further information and inquiring how Mr. Mencken regarded the plan.

To say that Wilson was pleased with the way things were going would be putting it mildly. He showed his letter and Roosevelt's reply to everyone who would take the time to read it. Among these was the editorial editor of the Atlanta Journal, who asked Wilson's permission to print the letter on the editorial page. And on July 21, 1932, there appeared the first published piece on which our present CCC plan is predicated. Captioned, "Open Army Enlistments To Provide Employment," the publication verified the editor's belief of merit because on Sunday, July 24, 1932, there appeared a news item stating that the plan received wide praise and the publication of the names of some of those wrote in about it. Any reasonable man would acknowledge that here was a solution for part of our troubles. But, unlike the columnist's prediction of the rich rewards that were to come to the man who created this solution, his troubles began to multiply. Wilson wrote the article for Mencken and as the full plan was contained therein, he fulfilled his promise to Roosevelt and mailed him a copy. He received a rejection slip from Mr. Mencken. But, from Governor Roosevelt, he received a letter of thanks and deepest appreciation and most important of all the assurance the plan would be given every consideration. This assurance coming from the Democratic nominee who was almost assured of election was the biggest item of all. It meant the chance for the plan's adoption and if successful the plaudits of a Nation to its creator. And as Wilson believed, the reward of financial security. America had never welshed on a debt yet and he didn't believe they would this time.

Roosevelt was elected. He drafted his aides and set about putting his New Deal for the forgotten man into a reality. Months of anxiety followed for Wilson. He wondered why, if the President intended to use the plan, he wasn't called into consultation. It being his brain child, he knew or should know more about it and its ramifications than anyone else. He had spent months figuring the answers to every problem that could arise, and the midnight oil he had burned was fruitful in producing solutions. There was no question about it, he knew the answers.

When it became evident he was to be the real forgotten man, he did what any normal man, who had been robbed of credit due him, would do. He wrote letters to the President. His first letters were in an humble tone, but as these availed him nothing they became bitter with the grievance his heart carried. These sacrifices which he made at his family's expense became symbols of injustice which he now set about to correct. I think I should relate one or two of these that a better understanding of this bitterness may be had. The money that Wilson spent for stamps and telegrams to communicate this plan to those who might use it actually took bread from the man's table. Then there came the day when an offer of publication came to him. The offer carried with it an assured fee of several hundred dollars. But it came at a time when the Senate investigating committee was debating the plan's fate. When a hostile section of the press was referring to the plan as reactionary, unorthodox, impractical, and visionary. At the time Miss Frances Perkins was winning fame and being crowned as the plan's originator by her witty answers to that hard-boiled committee (see the Literary Digest of April 15, 1933).

I advised him to accept this offer, but he pointed out to me to do so might place the plan in jeopardy as should its humble origin become generally known it would really give the unfavorable element, something to ridicule.

"Although I desperately need that money," he said, "what is a few hundred dollars compared to that promise of, 'All the luxuries of life as long as he lives'? No, Harry; I am playing for higher stakes. That plan is going to be a success and the American people are not going to let me down."

When Wilson became certain that he was to be ignored, he sought outside aid. He carried his story to the local papers with proof enough to convince any man. But Roosevelt was at the height of his popularity. They wouldn't touch it. Wilson went to Florida in an effort to find work and while there induced the Democratic paper of Governor Cox, the Miami Daily News, to print a small piece about it on July 3, 1933.

He returned to Atlanta, where his next break came when Bill Key aired the story in his newcast. The fact became known to Georgia's Governor, Eugene Talmadge, who owned and edited his own paper, the Statesman. His paper on August 5, 1933, tells of Wilson's predicament and, under the caption "Another war debt unpaid," had this to say:

"Mr. J. D. Wilson, Atlanta truck driver extraordinary, is a case in point.

"This gentleman is, beyond question, the originator of the national reforestation plan. He has a letter from the President, written when he was Governor of New York, acknowledging receipt of the details of the plan. Mr. Wilson also has letters from the editor of the American Mercury, leading publishers in several States, and official correspondence which proves unquestionably his right to the claim as originator of one of the most important phases of the New Deal. And that is all. He, too, has become a forgotten man. As one of our local radio broadcasters remarked recently, 'Something ought to be done about it.'"

Walter Winchell, whose championing of the underdog has won him more friends and readers than his newsy scoops, on August 17 wrote of the paradoxical position occupied by Wilson; that of putting a legion of men to work through his idea while remaining unemployed himself. He agreed that something ought to be done about it. Wilson obtained another part-time job of driving a truck to New York. When he reached Washington the next day after Winchell's publication, he called at the office of the Washington Herald with his correspondence with Roosevelt regarding the plan. The morning paper

carried the story and a picture of Wilson, stating he was there to see the President. Even with this advance notice and the undeniable proof of Wilson's claim, he was refused an audience with the man from whose shoulders he had lifted at least two major problems. Further explanation on this later.

When Wilson reached New York he called at the office of Walter Winchell to thank him for his kindness and to inform him of his unsuccessful call at the White House. There he met Miss Ruth Cambridge, who promised to see if Winchell wouldn't air the story. Some weeks later he did. But with all these appeals Wilson still remained the forgotten man. As the story became more locally known friends of Wilson began to write their Representatives in Washington in an effort to have justice done. Some communicated directly with the Democratic National Committee. And typical of many is the reply I now quote. It is addressed to a well-known Atlanta doctor and is signed by the chairman, James A. Farley, in the now famous green ink. It reads:

"Thank you for your letter of August 31 in which you indicate your interest in Mr. J. D. Wilson.

"I want you to know that Mr. Wilson's case is receiving consideration, and your letter has been placed in his file for reference in connection therewith.

"Thank you for writing."

After many attempts, Wilson finally got a letter of credit due from the White House. But its stinted generosity (I shall have more to say of this later and cite a comparison) robbed it of value. Had Wilson received this when he first sought it, it would have lifted him from obscurity and enabled him by his own merit to earn that promised reward. But it came a year too late. From it I quote:

"MY DEAR MR. WILSON: I have shown your latest letter to the President. He asks me to tell you again as he wrote you on September 12, 1932, that he was glad to have the benefit of your views. He asks me to tell you further that you were undoubtedly one of those who originally conceived the idea of putting the unemployed to work on public improvements, and especially the idea of using people on conservation work with a base pay of a dollar a day. However, it is fair to say that a good many other people were arriving at the same thought in other parts of the country at about the same time. There would seem to be plenty of credit due to all of those who were thinking along the same line at that time, and, of course, as one of those you also deserve credit.

"Very sincerely yours,

"M. A. LEHAND,
"Private Secretary."

Even with this letter Wilson remained unemployed although the Government was passing out jobs by the millions and he applied to every agency. Furthermore, his friends in an effort to see justice done constantly besieged Congressmen, Senators, and responsible agents in an effort to have some measure of a reward, if only a job, given to him.

I had watched this fight for justice proceed through almost 3 years of the administration's regime. I saw the stubborn determination of this man turn to understandable bitterness. Some of this must have caught the imagination of Tarleton Collier, the South's foremost columnist, who has won a wide reputation for his accuracy and the tenacity of adhering to and reporting provable facts only. Mr. Collier on March 28, 1936, wrote as follows:

"Now that Washington has given assurance that the CCC will be maintained, thus responding to an outcry that arose at suggestions that drastic reduction in the service was contemplated and thus establishing a public estimate of its high value, many Atlantans recall the case of J. D. Wilson (long unemployed) who back in 1932 proposed the identical plan as a solution of the unemployment problem.

"Details of the plan which Mr. Wilson submitted to Franklin D. Roosevelt after the latter's nomination appeared later in the projects undertaken when the New Deal set about to remedy conditions of unemployment and need by public works—enlistment of men in an organization which afterward became the Civilian Conservation Corps, reforestation, drainage, and mosquito control projects, irrigation, dredging, canal cutting, and practically all the others now in operation.

"The validity of Mr. Wilson's suggestion was hailed and his right to authorship was defended in many a column of commentators and editorial writers over the country, but the reward to which he feels he was entitled is still to come. Ironically, he remains himself unemployed, and he is filled with a grievance that is deep-seated."

"Filled with a grievance that is deep-seated!" Well, it must have exploded when he received this letter from his Congressman, under the date of April 13, 1936. From it I quote:

" 'As much as I regret to do so, I must tell you that I am at a loss as to what further I might do in your case. As you know, I have had this matter up with the national committee on various occasions, and also with the Director of the Conservation Corps, the Forest Service, and other agencies of the Government.

" 'I have been greatly disappointed that my efforts in your behalf have not been successful, but frankly I do not know what else could be done.

" 'If you have anything to suggest, I would be delighted to follow your suggestion because I assure you that I am anxious to do anything possible for you.

" 'With best wishes, I am,

" 'Sincerely yours,

" 'ROBERT RAMSPECK'."

When such efforts of a Congressman fail to correct a piece of injustice, it looks hopeless for a humble citizen to continue the fight. And I personally know that Bob Ramspeck did everything in his power to help. But Joe Wilson was not beaten. He tried to force the issue in court but the administration with wise dexterity side-stepped an issue that would have landed Mr. Wilson in prison for criminal libel if he, like myself here, didn't possess documentary proof of his every statement. When he failed to make a court issue of it, I thought he would give up the fight, but early in October he came to me and said:

"Harry, people tell me that before I can get anywhere with this I have to make front-page headlines." His eyes were filled with that old-time enthusiasm that had been missing for months, and when I asked him how he was going to accomplish this miraculous feat, all he said was: "Wait and see. You will read all about it."

For some reason it worried me. Then, on the morning of October 7, 1936, I read where he had gone to the White House and slashed his wrists in a fit of despondency. But I knew better. He had made front-page headlines. But, as I feared, it availed him nothing but a lot of additional trouble. Through friends his release from St. Elizabeths Hospital, where he was held for observation (I question this reason for his detention), was effected. Upon his return to Atlanta, I secured him a job and for more than 2 years he made a valued employee. For 14 months he studied law at night and on his second trial successfully passed the Georgia bar examination. Any man who can accomplish this isn't even remotely crazy. It was my knowledge of his case and this feat that makes me question the reason for his detention.

That's the story with the exceptions of the explanations I promised. For these it is necessary that I quote most of his letter that contained his original draft of his plan. The letter that was mailed to Roosevelt, and afterward printed in the Atlanta Journal. This letter alone will prove beyond all doubt that the President's letter of credit due was steeped in stinted generosity and that he did solve two major problems for which Roosevelt received unwarranted praise.

The letter:

[From the Atlanta Journal of July 21, 1932]

"OPEN ARMY ENLISTMENTS TO PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT

"EDITOR THE JOURNAL:

"Many editorials have been written on the question, 'How to End the Depression.' However, there remains one probable remedy that, to the writer's knowledge, has not been touched upon editorially.

"Why not ask the Government to throw open the doors of the enlistment bureaus and allow every man, of reasonably sound health, who wishes to enlist, the opportunity? Give him the rudiments of a military training (the ex-service man, who already has this training, could be placed at once), then place these men at work on such projects as building levees, draining the Everglades of Florida, the Okefenokee swamps of Georgia, the marshlands of Louisiana and Mississippi, cutting the proposed canal across northern Florida to connect the Atlantic Ocean with the Gulf of Mexico, building dams to irrigate the fertile, but arid, lands of the Southwest, dredging rivers and harbors that now menace navigation.

"These are but a few of the many great projects that will eventually be undertaken anyway. They are too large for private development; therefore, it would not be a question of the Government entering competitive businesses with established concerns. These projects, when completed, would make this country a better place in which to live by destroying billions of mosquitoes and other vermin, removing the fear of floods that now haunts those who have suffered from this menace in the past, and bring into use millions of acres of land that now lie idle. The Government could retain the possession of this reclaimed land and sell it to individuals for farming purposes, thereby defraying in part some of the expense incurred. The canal would be an investment that in the future would return many times its cost, as the writer is led to believe it would not be necessary to build locks similar to those in use in the Panama Canal.

"Not only would this plan give work to many, many thousands, relieving in part the distress of today, but it would lessen materially the expense of the future by placing many thousands of partially trained men upon which the Government could rely in case of future trouble. (Which is as inevitable as the coming snows of winter.)

"Under this plan the initial period of enlistment would be 2 years, with the first 4 months spent in military training. Thereafter 2 hours each day of training and 6 hours of labor on the projects undertaken. You must realize that such a plan would purge the streets of the class that needs employment most and that there is no industry that would not benefit by the move. Think what it would mean to all transportation companies, cement manufacturers, building materials, supply houses, truck manufacturers, clothing manufacturers, food-supplying agencies, and on down the line.

"Such a plan would remove all doubt whether the veterans encamped at Washington are in earnest in their demand for work or whether they are merely looking for a meal ticket for the remainder of their lives. When such a plan is offered and they

refuse work you may be sure that public sentiment now in their favor will be withdrawn.

"I could continue on and on, but I realize your time does not permit, and in closing I wish to thank you for your kind indulgence, and only hope I have given you the germ of an idea for a great editorial.

"Respectfully yours,

"J. D. WILSON.

"JULY 20, 1932."

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—Mr. Wilson is author of Are We Americans Fools?)

WILSON SOLVED TROUBLESOME BEF PROBLEM FOR ROOSEVELT

When Roosevelt was faced with this same problem, what did he do? He followed that procedure, he offered the members of the Bonus Expeditionary Forces an opportunity to enlist in the CCC and for this stroke of genius won the admiration of a nation, that rightfully belonged to Wilson. The Literary Digest of June 3, 1933, had this to say, under the caption, "F. D. R.'s Victory Over the BEF."

"We are whipped, and we have to hand it to that smart fellow at the White House.

"So said a leader of the 'die-hard' bonus marchers as he quit Washington with 350 others, leaving behind 2,600 veterans who had accepted the President's offer of enrollment in the reforestation army.

"For the 'die-hards' the President provided transportation to their homes.

"Thus Mr. Roosevelt checks up another victory, and again wins wide praise. It is interesting to sketch the history of the second BEF and to note how the President, in the midst of tremendous problems, cleared up this difficult situation.

"When several hundreds of the veterans reached Washington for a bonus-forcing convention provision was promptly made for feeding and lodging them at Fort Hunt, Va., a move that has been contrasted to the efforts of last year, when after some time the BEF was driven out by force. For a time one group of veterans, known as the 'right wingers,' refused to join the Fort Hunt contingent, because that group suspected communistic connections. There was, however, a recession from that some time after the 'right wingers' had spent several nights in the rain.

"As soon as the ex-soldiers were lodged at the camp President Roosevelt played another card from the New Deal. He issued an order offering the men a dollar a day, food, clothing, and shelter at the Civilian Conservation Corps, working in State and national forests. This was hailed as a wise move to test the sincerity of the unemployed veterans. Thus, it seems to the Detroit Free Press, appears 'something of the President's talent for dealing with refractory human beings.'

"And how was the offer received? 'A dollar a day, not for mine' seems to sum up the initial reaction at Fort Hunt. An Associated Press dispatch to the Baltimore Sun tells us more of the same:

"Satirical remarks were heard repeatedly among the crowd.

"Albert G. Sellers, a field organizer of the Fort Hunt fraction, expressed a hope that the majority of the men will have spirit enough to demand a living wage.

"Joseph Bose, when asked as to his attitude toward the President's offer of a job in the forests, replied:

"'Not for me. It is literally selling yourself into slavery.'

"Bose formerly did clerical work and said he had been out of work for some time.

"E. W. Leach, of Cleveland, expressed the belief that members of the bonus army would be 'fools to sign up (in the forest corps) for a dollar a day.'"

"But as that was the first reaction, it wasn't long before many of the veterans began to see the wisdom of seizing the President's offer. They began to enroll by hundreds. In the final accounting 2,600 were in the corps, leaving only 350 die-hards.

"The President," says the Washington Evening Star, "has followed a policy in dealing with the bonus seekers that by its sincerity and fairness has left them completely disarmed."

"At no time have threats or hints of compulsion been brought to bear in influencing their action. They have been honored by a visit from the First Lady and their leaders cordially received at the White House by the President.

"The President and his advisers knew that such a policy was uncertain. They were following a course that had not been followed before. There may have been doubts, on their part, whether the plan would work or whether the belligerent attitude of some of the professional agitators would be transmitted to the men in the ranks, with resulting trouble and disorder.

"The bonus marchers have removed these fears by their own response to fair and considerate treatment. They have not only vindicated the President's good judgment, but themselves as well."

Do you recall the fate of those veterans? Many were sent to Matecumbie Key, where a hurricane killed most of them.

Hoover was faced with this same problem and the veterans were driven from Anacostia flats by gas. It must have afforded Roosevelt smug satisfaction to watch his adversary in a coming election make such a grave error knowing should he be faced with that problem an unknown had already thought up and given to him the solution.

I now ask you, What salient part of this magnificent program did Wilson fail to cover? I call your attention to that sentence of the letter of credit due from the White House that reads:

"He asks me to tell you further that you were undoubtedly one of those who originally conceived the idea of putting the unemployed to work on public improvements, and especially the idea of using people on conservation work with a base pay of a dollar a day."

This shows that not only was Wilson's first draft used but this article was thoroughly digested for further ideas because nowhere in his original letter was the dollar a day base pay mentioned. But his article did contain this requisite to the plan as well as other things that show conclusively it was his idea and his alone. I am one of the small-business men upon whom the New Deal has taken compassion. In modern conception of commerce, I may be considered only a speck on the apple since my modest printing establishment only employs 11 people. I have read of similar claims like Wilson's, but I have yet to see one substantiated by documentary proof. I will place on deposit $100 in any national bank for any person who can establish such a claim by newspaper clippings or other documentary evidence of publication that antedates Mr. Wilson's claims.

It is possible for two men to have a similar idea at about the same time, even though they are remotely removed from each other. But for them to communicate them to the same individual and receive an acknowledgment and request for additional information is something the law of averages admit can only happen once in a million years, so I know my century note is safe.

This is not an indictment of the Democratic Party or its leaders. I am a Democrat myself, by birth, inheritance, choice, and belief. Born in Georgia of Democratic parents, whose parents were old-line Democrats, I can never be anything else. This story is merely a statement of provable facts wherein justice miscarried.

Address by Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, Before American Legion Convention at Charleston, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Hon. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, before the commanders banquet, the American Legion Convention, Department of West Virginia, in Charleston, W. Va., on Saturday, August 26, 1950.

There being objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY LOUIS JOHNSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE THE COMMANDERS BANQUET, THE AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION, DEPARTMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA, CHARLESTON, W. VA., SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1950

It is always good to be in West Virginia. I am happy for the opportunity of being here in Charleston tonight, to break bread with my friends in the American Legion. I am glad to meet with my comrades who have served our country in two World Wars. Association with you both under arms and in time of peace or semipeace has always been inspiring. Continuously from the early days of 1919 when the American Legion was born and I had the honor of representing West Virginia as your national executive committeeman, I have enjoyed this association. Working with you and with our comrades from every part of America, and with other patriotic American citizens, all dedicated to the cause of world peace and the task of maintaining world peace by making our Nation stronger, has been and is one of the great satisfactions of my life. I am particularly glad, therefore, to be able to be with you tonight, at this critical moment in American history.

At the outset of my remarks, I want to pay tribute to our soldiers and marines, and especially the troops in the combat units. They have borne the brunt of the Nation's battles from Bunker Hill in Massachusetts to the Naktong River in Korea—usually with insufficient strength at the outset. Despite these initial disadvantages they have taken their losses and won their battles while they traded their lives for time. No more difficult combat task falls to the lot of a military man yet these courageous, gallant young men from American farms, mills, offices, and homes who are now fighting in Korea, ably assisted by the men of the Air Force and the Navy, have proved themselves worthy of their forefathers in arms.

I know of no better tribute to our fighting men than the words of General MacArthur, who, in a recent message to President Truman said:

"The skill and valor * * * displayed in successive holding actions by the ground forces * * *, brilliantly supported in complete coordination by air and naval elements, forced the enemy into continued deployments, costly frontal attacks and confused logistics, which so slowed his advance and blunted his drive that we have bought the precious time necessary to build a secure base.

"I do not believe that history records a comparable operation which excelled the

speed and precision with which the Eighth Army, the Far East Air Force and the Seventh Fleet have been deployed to a distant land for immediate commitment to major operations * * *."

With your permission, I should like to devote much of my time this evening to a discussion of two related matters: First, some of the implications of the ebb and flow of the battle in Korea; and second, our need for universal training legislation.

At the request of the United Nations, armed forces of the United States are in Korea today in order to repel Communist aggression. By our actions, we are proving that the United States intends to adhere with more than mere lip service to the great goal of world peace. All of our efforts in Korea, and all of our efforts elsewhere in the Western Pacific—in common with the measures we are taking throughout the world—will continue to be addressed to establishing and maintaining peace.

The Communists of North Korea invaded the Republic of Korea in the early morning hours of June 25. Twenty-four hours after the invasion occurred, the Security Council of the United Nations, armed with a prompt and up-to-date report from its own Commission in Korea—a Commission which consisted of representatives of Australia, China, El Salvador, France, India, the Philippines, and Turkey—concluded that the Communists of North Korea were guilty of acts of aggression. Having ascertained the facts from its seven-nation Commission, the Security Council, by a unanimous vote of all members present and voting, called on all members of the United Nations to assist in the restoration of law and order in Korea. Together with the other nations which share our aspirations for a peaceful world, we responded to that call.

Subsequently, when it became apparent that the Communists of North Korea had no intention of ceasing their lawless aggression, the Security Council of the United Nations adopted two more resolutions. The first of these resolutions was a request for the use of armed force to repel the North Korean aggression, and the second of these resolutions authorized the United States to designate a military commander to head the forces of the United Nations in their encounter with the forces of aggression—a position to which President Truman promptly named Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Bitter as it is to all Americans to have to be fighting again 5 years after VJ-day, it is nevertheless true that this entire episode may well prove to be a turning point in the long history of man's quest for peace. The prompt action of the United Nations, and the response to this action by free peoples all over the world, may prove to be the decisive event marking the transition from the rule of force in international relations to the rule of law.

The fighting in Korea has been hard and bloody. The brilliant delaying action of the forces under General MacArthur's leadership, however, has succeeded in preventing North Korea from making a fait accompli out of its adventure in chaos—and this fact, coupled with the fact that the forces of many nations are now pledged to fight side by side to repel aggression, spells out in terms that all men can understand the fact that the free world intends to remain free.

The world now knows that the lesson which the democracies failed to learn during the thirties—namely, that appeasement leads only to war—this lesson has been learned, and will not be forgotten, in the fifties. Whatever the military situation in Korea may be today, and whatever it may be in the hard days immediately ahead, the clearly defined intentions of the free world constitute the fact of transcendent importance.

For the free world has made it clear, through the United Nations, that acts of aggression, whether by outlaw bands or by maverick nations, will be met with force.

The event which I have just been describing is an event which transcends in importance any event of recent years. I refer, of course, to the coalescing of the forces of the free world, and the clear knowledge that now exists throughout the world that these forces—both the armed forces which are now in existence and the forces which we are capable of mobilizing—will be used to maintain world peace.

The decisions that have been made were vital to the maintenance of our national security. The national security, in broad terms, is the proper balance of the strength—political, economic, psychological, moral, and military—that the United States, our allies, and the other peace-loving nations must maintain in order to meet the two-pronged threat of world communism.

That threat is two-fold because Soviet Russia seeks to conquer the free world either by military aggression or by psychological, political, and economic pressure. This second route of conquest would combine subversion within the United States with constant threat from without, maintained over the years in the hope that the cost of idle maintenance of large military forces would eventually bankrupt our economy and our free institutions. Consequently the elements of our strength must be adjusted to meet and overcome the Soviet threat as the situation develops.

The national security must, by its very nature, be relative. Absolute security is no more possible of attainment for nations than it is for you and me as individuals. Relative security is governed by the nature and degree of the Soviet threat. It is attained through the willingness and determination of the public and the Congress to make the necessary adjustments, in accordance with our continuing estimate of Soviet capabilities, to our military strength and national economy.

The policy by which we strive to maintain relative security was outlined in a speech I made in New York last December—more than 6 months before the Communist invastion of Korea. At that time I said: "The watch word must be military security first; economy second. And if we are realistic, we must face the fact that our military requirements are not static, but flexible. They are bound to be affected by major shifts in the international situation and new developments in science and warfare * * *. This means," and I am still quoting from my December speech, "that our military organization must be adequate, efficient and readily adaptable to change; our planning must look to the future as well as the present. We must have an up-to-date fighting force in being, rapidly enlargeable in wartime, capable, in concert with our allies, of defeating any potential enemy. The maintenance of that kind of fighting force, backed up by a sound economy and high public morale, will give us relative security."

The United States is now embarked on a program of major increases in the size and effectiveness of our own Armed Forces. We are also embarked on a program designed to assist our allies to increase the size and effectiveness of their armed forces. President Truman has submitted to the Congress recommendations for increased appropriations for our Armed Forces in the amount of $11,500,000,000, together with an additional $4,000,000,000 to provide additional military equipment for our allies. In order to round out the picture, there remains only one vital action which we must now take—and that is the enactment of legislation providing for universal training for the youth of America.

Let me review with you, for a moment, some of the things which President Truman has said and done, in the five years since VJ Day, in his effort to secure the enactment of this vitally needed legislation.

In President Truman's first address to a joint session of Congress after VJ-day—on October 23, 1945—he stressed the need for universal training. On that occasion, President Truman said:

"In the present hour of triumph, we must not forget our anguish during the days of Bataan. We must not forget the anxiety of the days of Guadalcanal. In our desire to leave the tragedy of war behind us, we must not make the same mistake that we made after the First World War when we quickly sank back into helplessness * * *. In order to provide this general reserve (of trained manpower), I recommend to the Congress the adoption of a plan for universal military training."

Again in March 1948, in addressing a joint session, President Truman strongly urged that the Congress enact the necessary legislation. In his 1948 address, the President said:

"I recommend prompt enactment of universal training legislation * * *. I believe that we have learned the importance of maintaining military strength as a means of preventing war * * *. Aggressors in the past, relying on our apparent lack of military force, have unwisely precipitated war. Although they have been led to destruction by their misconception of our strength, we have paid a terrible price for our unpreparedness. Universal training is the only feasible means by which the civilian components of our Armed Forces can be built up to the strength required if we are to be prepared for emergencies."

In addition to his personal appearances before the Congress in 1945 and 1948, from which I have just quoted, President Truman has submitted written recommendations for universal training to each session of Congress.

My predecessor and friend, Secretary of Defense Forrestal, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in support of universal training legislation in March of 1948, and said:

"We require more manpower than we have today. The comfortable assurance of a push-button war is an illusion. The enormous complication of the machinery of total warfare of today rests upon manpower—not in the mass, but diffused through thousands of specialties * * *. Reserve forces in readiness are a necessary component of our military strength. In this component (which includes the National Guard and the Reserve Corps) we are now seriously deficient. The Reserve component in time of war will take its place alongside the Regular forces in our defensive and offensive effort."

Between the time of Secretary Forrestal's testimony, from which I have just quoted, and the time of the Communist invasion of Korea, we did build up the strength of our forces, both Regular and Reserve—a very substantial build-up, as the record will show. The combat potential of our regular forces increased materially between March of 1948 and June of 1950. In addition, the strength of the ready Reserve forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, including the National Guard, increased by almost 100 percent during this 2-year period. The total number of National Guard and Reserve personnel in a drill-pay status in all of the services—which stood at 435,000 on March 31, 1948—stood at 834,000 on June 30, 1950.

But this increase, even though it approaches a strength increase of 100 percent, is not enough. We need to expand our Reserve and National Guard forces to an even greater extent, and, in addition, we must recognize that much of the increase between 1948 and 1950 was made possible because of the patriotic response of the veterans of World War II.

Our force in being must be sufficient to meet the immediate threat that we face at any given time. But it will avail us nothing unless the materials—manpower as well as munitions—are ready for speedy mobilization to back up that force in being. In global war our manpower has been, and in the future would be, mobilized according to democratic principles. That means selective service, under which the individual's abilities are applied where they will best serve the Nation's needs. The only sound democratic base for such a democratic system of mobilization is universal training.

Furthermore, from the standpoint of the individual, the young man who will be called into military service in war has an inalienable right to training for service before the occasion is upon him. It is not sufficient that some Americans are ready for the threat of war. It is essential that all should be in such readiness.

Such readiness to assume the greatest obligation of citizenship would strengthen our mobilization base as no other form of citizen-militia can ever do. Furthermore, such readiness on the part of American citizenship—not merely a part of our citizenship, but the total thereof—together with strong forces in being, will encourage our allies as no other form of insurance against aggression can ever do. The strength of American industrial might is stupendous. But it can only make itself felt as a force for world peace if American manpower is ready to carry the arms that American industry produces.

Universal training is the certificate of readiness of the American citizen to answer any threat to world peace and to the family of free nations. It is a certificate that will never fall below par among our friends of the free nations.

When the Compton Commission made its unanimous recommendations to the President, after many months of careful study, it offered six essentials of an integrated national security program. Those six essentials are the same today as they were then and probably will continue to be valid throughout the predictable future. These were the essentials of an integrated program, in the opinion of the Commission:

1. A strong, united, healthy, educated, and informed population.
2. A coordinated intelligence service.
3. A program of scientific research and development.
4. Industrial mobilization and stock-piling.
5. Regular Armed Forces—a mobile striking force, relying heavily on air power, together with adequate strength for Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines.
6. A program of universal training for all young men in our Nation.

Just as democracy is everybody's job, so it is that the Compton Commission's program is everybody's job. Every American wants to help his country become stronger, healthier, more united, educated, and informed. Every American wants to defend his country. But desire to defend one's country is not enough. The conditions of modern war, which have telescoped time and space, demand that every qualified American be trained and ready to fight when the need arises.

If President Truman's advice with respect to universal training had been followed in 1945, how different would be our situation today. Even if President Truman's renewed plea for universal training had been heeded in 1948, how much stronger would we be, in the Reserve and National Guard forces which constitute the backbone of our military effort in time of mobilization.

But all of that is past and gone; we cannot turn back the clock and accomplish, yesterday, the things which we should have done yesterday. But we can accomplish, today, the things that we failed to do yesterday—and, in my opinion, universal training stands at the head of the list in this respect.

Earlier this week, I testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee, in support of universal-training legislation. Your own national commander, George Craig, also testified most persuasively and effectively. General Omar Bradley, who occupies an almost unrivaled place in the esteem and affection of all Americans, testified to the same effect.

It is my hope that both the Senate and the House of Representatives will, in the near future, adopt universal-training legislation—in order that we may have on the books, subject to taking effect at such time as the President may feel that international circumstances so warrant, the universal-training legislation we have so long needed, and which President Truman, members of his Administration, and the American Legion, and other patriotic veterans' organizations, have so long advocated.

If we take this action now—together, with the other measures we are taking to increase the strength of the free world—I believe we will, with God's blessing, achieve the peace which all Americans so devoutly seek.

The Antarctic Continent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present herewith a letter and very enlightening article of the Antarctic Continent by Miss Kendall, of Washington. It is now well established that Antarctica is not a string of islands, as was once considered, but a continent twice the size of the United States and although we have spent public money in exploring that area we have never made any claim to that territory. It seems Russia has her eye on this continent for as late as this year she has demanded representation in any conference which may be held to discuss the various claims to that territory.

This splendid article will advise the people of the United States about the magnitude of this continent, and through Congress as representatives of the people some action will be taken to have our rights recognized. The letter and article follow:

ARLINGTON VA., *August 26, 1950.*

Hon. USHER BURDICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: It was very good of you to give a former North Dakotan a little time the other day. Together with the fact that Antarctica is fascinating, there is the point that some of my tax money has gone into recent expeditions and some of my great grandfather's tax money probably went into Wilkes' tax-supported voyage.

For your interest I have set out below a brief chronological list of United States activities in Antarctica. You will note a great gap between 1840 and 1928, which is surprising, but we probably were busy growing as a Nation. There is another gap between 1948 and today that is astounding in the light of our wealth and technological advancement.

I have merely mentioned the activities of other countries, although they have kept at it through the years, with the United Kingdom and Norway seemingly in the lead. Their brave work cannot be minimized; after all, each expedition profits by the successes and failures of the ones who have gone before.

Our work has been wonderful, but why do we halt it? The apathy of our people and Government is amazing. At this particular point in history let us dust off the cobwebs and polish up a United States policy regarding Antarctica that will reflect our capabilities and our faith in a better world even here on this old planet—let us be at least constructive while we are here.

Sincerely yours,

MISS E. A. KENDALL.

The United States does not own one single square inch of Antarctica, the six-million-square-mile South Polar continent. Other nations do have claims.

It would seem that by neglecting our Antarctic rights the Congress is neglecting its constitutional duty to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Perhaps the question of United States claims in the Antarctic should enter into every debate in Congress covering economics, taxes, defense, unemployment, conservation of natural resources, stockpiling of rare materials, and like matters.

The Antarctic Continent is only a little smaller than South America and abounds in mountain chains and probably in minerals; outcroppings of iron, copper, coal, nickel, gold, and silver, at least, have been found to date. The location is of great importance in weather studies and cosmic ray investigations and, of course, the whole continent has many interests for scientists. Antarctica is valuable as a training ground for Arctic workers. Another point is that its northern peninsula reaches toward Cape Horn and it would seem that the protection of Cape Horn and the whole Western Hemisphere might include attention to this Palmer Peninsula, as it is only a little over an hour's ride by jet plane from South America. Not quite all the coastline of Antarctica has been photographed and not even nearly all has been adequately mapped and the greater part of the continent has not yet been seen by man. But we do know the scenery is grand.

Below I have outlined United States activities to date, but first I might mention a few reasons why the United States may well give attention without delay to her rights.

1. There are today no inhabitants and no industrial installations. No imperialism involved.

2. There are several nations claiming great sectors at least on paper and some have tiny permanent settlements; and some maps, atlases, geography books, histories, political essays and dictionaries show these claims as apparently authentic. (Usually, the claims of Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, France, Norway, Argentina, and Chili are shown, some overlapping.) The British alone have seven bases on Palmer Land. How penetration in the Western Hemisphere has continued I do not understand, inasmuch as we have the Monroe Doctrine. In 1908 Britain established the Falkland Islands. Dependencies actually including parts of South America, but the Letters Patent of 1917 modified this claim and now the British claim only islands and a great sector of Antarctica in the Western Hemisphere. Argentina has bases and claims dating from 1904 (see Antárdida Argentina Islas Oceanicus Mar Argentino, revised by command of the Naval Operations of the Marine Ministry in June 1948). Chili has island bases also. The French have an expedition on the continent now. The 1949–52 joint

Norwegian-Swedish-British expedition is busy with scientific work and exploration now. The United States has no expedition now.

There remains only one sector (sometimes called the American or Pacific) with no claimants and it may be gobbled up at any moment, as there is no reason why not, and several nations interested for years in whaling are now eyeing the continent proper. The Soviets, for example, have mentioned lately that any conferences on Antarctic claims must include them or they would not honor any decisions made; I believe their latest diplomatic note was delivered to our State Department on June 9, 1950.

3. The United States, while making no claims to territory, has excellent rights and, in some cases, prior and superior rights to other claimants, both historically and factually, and by the latter is meant our explorers have actually seen with their eyes great tracts and our expeditions have done some of the most valuable experimental and scientific work and our number of men and dollars has been greater than that of other nations, much of the money being taxes—in other words, our investment as a whole on the continent proper probably has been greater than that of any other country, and still we refrain from making our rightful claims. Possible internationalization has been proposed by the United States State Department (1948) but other nations did not approve the idea and the plan has fallen through, whatever its merits may have been.

I would not minimize the bravery and sacrifices of the exploring heroes of other lands, but neither would I minimize the glorious achievements of our own Antarctic explorers and scientists, and the present United States policy in regard to the Antarctic seems to do just that.

In 1820, Nathaniel B. Palmer, captain of a sealing ship out of Stonington, Conn., sighted the mainland of the Antarctic Continent, he being the first man of record to do so. Col. Lawrence Martin, former head of the Map Division of the Library of Congress, has studied Captain Palmer's log books extensively and his manuscript maps, now in the possession of the American Geographical Society in New York, and in October 1940, the Geographical Review carried a monograph by Colonel Martin on Captain Palmer. Captain Palmer sighted land near 60°10′ W., 63°45′ S. The Russian Admiral Bellingshausen was on an Antarctic expedition sponsored by the Czar and the two navigators met shortly thereafter in that vicinity. Baron Bellingshausen was perhaps the first to use the name Palmers Land—1821 or a little later—and the British and French map makers and writers used it a little later and since 1912 all United States Federal maps and charts use the term.

In 1830, Dr. James Eights of Albany, N. Y., on a trip to Antarctic regions deduced the existence of 480 miles of the littoral of what is known today as Ellsworth Land, west of Palmers Land, although he made the mistake of thinking he saw a string of islands.

In 1840, Charles Wilkes in command of the United States exploring expedition skirted between 1,500 and 1,800 miles of shore line and sighted mountain peaks in what is now known as Wilkes Land, in the Eastern Hemisphere, proving there was a continent and not just a group of islands. This voyage was authorized by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the United States House of Representatives in 1828, partly at the behest of J. N. Reynolds who had been to Palmers Land and who made a report to the Secretary of the Navy in 1828 (23d Cong., 2d sess., H. Doc. 105, 1835). By 1836 the Congress had appropriated $300,000. The boats left in 1838 and returned in 1842.

Norwegians were the first men to set foot on the continent proper (1895).

The dash to the South Pole occupied the aspirations of men in the early part of the twentieth century. In 1911 Amundsen, of Norway reached the Pole, in 1912 Scott of England did so but died on the return journey, and in 1929 Byrd of the United States reached the Pole by air.

In 1928, Sir Hubert Wilkins, the famed Australian explorer, aided by United States citizens' funds in part, was the first person to see Antarctica from an airplane. He has made other trips since. He now assists the United States Army.

In 1928–30, Richard E. Byrd, of Virginia, headed his own first expedition, a private one; he reached the Pole and also established his base known as Little America on the ice of the Ross Sea.

In 1933–35, he led another private expedition with which many are familiar through his writings.

In 1935, Lincoln Ellsworth and Sir Hubert Wilkins, traversed by plane a great tract. Ellsworth dropped the United States flag where the plane crossed the 80° W. longitude meridian, and he raised the United States flag near 104°10′ W., 79°12′ S. This trip and other Ellsworth trips through 1939 were privately financed. When he came home Congress took formal account of his work by giving him a gold medal under the act of June 16, 1936, for his claiming for us 250,000 square miles of territory between 80° and 120° W. This does not mean Congress claimed the land, but just that Congress gave a medal to Ellsworth. He is now a resident of New York City.

In 1939, Ellsworth discovered and claimed for the United States about 75,000 square miles inland on around the continent west of Wilkes Land.

In 1939–41, Admiral Byrd led an official United States expedition, financed from public tax funds mainly. On this trip he reestablished his west base at Little America and an east base in Palmer Land and he flew over a great deal of the Ellsworth Land tract, some of which was covered by sledge also from the east base, Richard B. Black in command. Byrd land covers the sector from 120° to 150° W. which is "claimed publicly by Byrd as a private United States citizen," to quote Colonel Martin in his chapter found in New Compass of the World (1949).

In 1947, Admiral Byrd had charge of another official United States expedition. On this "Operation High Jump" about 310,000 square miles were discovered, rather than reexplored, including what Wilkes had seen in 1840. Admiral Byrd maintains offices in Washington and Boston.

In 1947–48, Finn Ronne led a small private expedition with some aid from the United States Government. He established his base at Stonington Island, the former east base, and made field trips from there, claiming for the United States hundreds of thousands of newly explored land, the boundaries of which he filed officially with the State Department. Commander Ronne proved definitely that the Palmer Peninsula is an integral part of the continent proper. Members of Congress may care to note, in studying United States rights, Commander Ronne's account of his contacts with the British near his base, especially the two letters, as given in his book Antarctic Conquest (1949). It is of interest to United States citizens that Edith M. Ronne, wife of the commander, is one of the first two women ever to winter in the Antarctic, and possibly the first woman to set foot on the continent. Commander and Mrs. Ronne reside in Silver Spring, Md.

In 1949, a United States Navy expedition which was preparing to sail for the Antarctic was called off by Government officials on the grounds of economy.

In 1949 and in 1950 a few United States patriotic societies went on record with resolutions favoring requesting foreign nations receiving United States taxpayers' assistance to cede lands or grant royalties on their claims in the Antarctic.

In 1950, as mentioned before, the Soviets demanded representation at any Antarctic conference.

In August 1950, 130 years after Palmer's discovery, the United States still remained silent regarding official claims to Antarctic territory rightfully hers, although she does claim to be the most technologically advanced nation and thereby would seem to have the means and the will to lead in development of the world's most difficult continent.

Presentation of the X–1 by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, during ceremonies at Logan Airport, in my home city of Boston, Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg presented to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institute the Bell X–1 supersonic research plane in which man first crossed the sonic barrier and successfully flew faster than the speed of sound.

The air age was born in the United States 47 years ago when Orville and Wilbur Wright successfully sustained a heavier-than-air plane in flight at Kitty Hawk, N. C. The first great period of the air age came to an end, and the second began 3 years ago when Capt. Charles Yeager, of the United States Air Force, successfully flew the X–1 through the sonic barrier.

The X–1 is not a military plane. It was an instrument of research and the sturdiest airplane ever built. It passes into the possession of the Smithsonian Institute in our National Capital to an honored place beside the plane of the Wright brothers, the plane in which Lindbergh flew across the Atlantic, and other famous aircraft, as a lasting memorial of the technical superiority of American genius, and as evidence of our ability to discover and control the forces of nature.

The remarks of General Vandenberg in making the presentation are a concise statement of the history of this plane, and of its use in developing principles of design which will be embodied in other X–1's. I think that, to complete the story of a plane that has figured so often—and so dramatically—in the public news, the General's felicitous remarks may well find preservation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The general spoke simply and effectively and concluded his remarks with a tribute to the American people who can accomplish so much through the combination of engineering, scientific, and military talent. Such a combination of talents has brought us our present prosperity, and on such a combination of talents we must depend

for our present and our continued security. General Vandenberg's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY GEN. HOYT S. VANDENBERG, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, UPON PRESENTATION OF THE BELL X–1 SUPERSONIC RESEARCH PLANE TO THE NATIONAL AIR MUSEUM, DURING CEREMONIES AT LOGAN AIRPORT, BOSTON, MASS., SATURDAY, AUGUST 27, 1950

Forty-seven years ago no man had ever flown. No man really knew that flight was possible. Then the Wright brothers built a flying machine. In a few seconds it was proved that man could fly, and the age of flight was born.

Three years ago no man had ever flown faster than the speed of sound. No man knew that it was possible to fly at such a speed. Many experts believed that it was not possible. But on October 14, 1947, an airplane flew faster than the speed of sound. That flight demolished the so-called sonic barrier which many had believed impossible to penetrate. It marked the end of the first great period of the air age, and the beginning of the second. In a few moments the subsonic period became history and the supersonic period was born.

That event occurred almost 44 years after the first flight at Kitty Hawk. But the second epoch making flight, like the first, was an American achievement. The X–1 was conceived, designed, and constructed through the collaboration of the Bell Aircraft Co., the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the United States Air Force. It was first flown at supersonic speed by a pilot of the Air Force. These facts mean that our country has maintained the air leadership won for us by the genius of the Wright brothers half a century ago.

Scientific and technical leadership, like all leadership, is expensive. It brings responsibilities and burdens. In recent months we Americans have become acutely aware of burdens. But let us make no mistake. Either we maintain our scientific and technical leadership, whatever the cost, or we submit to the domination of others. The people of the United States are but a small minority among the peoples of the earth. Although we do not stand alone, we must recognize that our most dependable allies have no masses of manpower to send to our aid.

We will never coerce or enslave other peoples to fill our needs. Yet we are challenged today by ruthless forces ready to sacrifice great masses of slaves and puppets in their efforts to destroy us. Our survival depends upon our superior ability to understand, control, and employ the laws and the forces of nature.

I consider the X–1 the most convincing evidence of our ability to discover and control the forces of nature since the original Wright airplane. Although it was sponsored by the Air Force, it was not designed as an implement of war. It was an instrument of research. Although we were then at war, the Air Force asked the Bell Co. to study the possible design of a supersonic airplane in 1944.

One year later the X–1 was completed. Even then many influential people urged abandonment of the project because they considered supersonic flight to be impossible. But somebody had to take that leap into the unknown. Several planes and pilots had been lost when mysterious forces seized them as they approached the speed of sound.

The mysterious forces were so violent and so destructive that very little was learned from those tragic experiences. The conviction grew that there existed a shock-wave barrier—at something less than the speed of sound—which no plane or pilot could penetrate and survive.

The X–1 was the sturdiest airplane ever built. The Bell Aircraft Co. and the NACA believed that it would withstand the unpredictable buffetings of the transsonic speed range. The Air Force wanted to know and Captain Yeager was anxious to find out.

After careful tests and many experimental flights the attempt was made. We are here today because the attempt was a success. It is especially true that neither the X–1 nor Captain Yeager would be here if the experiment had failed.

For several months the achievement remained the greatest secret in the history of aeronautics. Meanwhile, more flights were made, and more data accumulated. After the facts became known, the President of the United States—on the forty-fifth anniversary of the first of all flights—awarded the Collier Trophy for outstanding achievement in aeronautics to Lawrence Bell, John Stack, and Captain Yeager.

Today we honor these men again and all the others of the Bell Co., the NACA, and the Air Force whose faith-inspired efforts made supersonic flight a reality, and an American achievement.

After the Collier trophy award Captain Yeager dispensed with the B–29 launching and flew the X–1 from the ground for the first time. He reached 23,000 feet in 100 seconds. During the flight he had to depend entirely on instruments, because the climb was so steep that the horizon was far beneath his view. But after this ceremony, the X–1 will not again climb to new horizons.

Other X–1's will carry on the research which is so vital to us today. Other planes now being built, will embody, in their design and their performance, all the lessons the X–1 has taught us. And the first supersonic plane goes to occupy a place of honor in the National Air Museum.

I have the honor to present to the National Air Museum the Air Force X–1. It could have no more appropriate resting place. The X–1 has flown many times at great altitudes and unprecedented speeds, but it remains exactly as it was first built 5 years ago. Its design was a stroke of genius, for it has met every requirement and every test without a single modification. Fortune has smiled upon it, for it has suffered no damage.

I am sure that in the National Air Museum the X–1 will serve as a reminder that new frontiers still challenge us. It will be an example of what can be accomplished through the combination of American engineering, scientific, and military talent. It will show how we can use the forces of nature to add to our prosperity and our security when we make the effort. And it must help to insure that the great effort necessary to guarantee our confirmed security will be made now.

Dr. Wetmore, the X–1 is yours. I know you will be just as proud of it as the Air Force has been.

Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Peggy Lord, of Cuero, Tex., recently won a $1,000 award contributed by the Disabled American Veterans, Inc., in the national essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, of which Vice Admiral Ross T. McIntire (MC) U. S. Navy, retired, is chairman. In her essay Miss Lord has so captured the basic philosophy on employment of the handicapped that I wish to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that others may read it. The essay follows:

HIRE THE HANDICAPPED, IT'S GOOD BUSINESS

(By Peggy Lord)

The young man stumped slowly down the street, his crippled leg dragging slightly as he walked, but his eyes had the light of hope in them, and surrounding him was an air of good will and expectant joy which caused all who approached him to glance at him with a smile; not a pitying smile directed at his lame leg, but a smile which reflected his own happiness.

As the boy walked along the sidewalk he watched the addresses on the buildings. His thoughts turned, unbidden to the day almost exactly 2 years ago when the threshing machine had borne down upon him. Then came disconnected pictures of the hospital where he nearly lost the leg; home where he fumed helplessly because he was so useless; and finally, the office of the vocational rehabilitation division, where he learned how to treat his leg, and was taught the trade of bookkeeping.

He was so glad he had applied for assistance—but he would pay it back. His reflections were broken by the appearance of the proper house number. Taking a deep breath, he entered the building.

When the boy explained to the receptionist, with just a trace of nervousness, that he was the new bookkeeper, she smiled professionally and directed, "Your office is down the hall."

His office. He beamed his thanks, and haltingly stepped down the hall. On the threshold of the indicated office he met his new boss, who greeted him with a genial wave of the hand and a businesslike nod.

"You're on time. Good. I always say that the tardy worker is a more costly embezzler than the one who just takes cash."

With this auspicious beginning, the boy was emboldened to ask the one thing which had been bothering him. "Sir," he faltered, "I couldn't help but wonder—did you want to hire me for the work I do and not just because of—how I am? I want to work. I couldn't accept charity." He drew himself up proudly.

His employer stared at him. "What!" he boomed. "You surely don't think—come on over and sit down. I'll tell you." As they seated themselves, he continued in a quieter tone, "You're the bookkeeper, and are entitled to know this, anyway, because money is involved. You see, we make money by employed the handicapped." Noticing the repulsed horror on the boy's face, the employer continued, "No, I don't mean that we exploit the handicapped. It's just on the principle of a penny saved, a penny earned; and the disabled help us to save pennies through their sense of responsibility and loyalty to the job."

"Oh, do you mean that there are several handicapped people working for you?"

"Yes, by all means. Didn't you notice the receptionist at the desk? That's a wheelchair she's sitting in. She's paralyzed from the waist down, but the best worker I ever had. Then, there are several others who do office work, and the janitor."

"And they save you money?" the boy pursued.

"I'll say they save me money. The money they save me in taxes alone would persuade me to hire handicapped workers even if they didn't have such outstanding characteris-

tics. Why, until a short time ago, I didn't know that it cost less to rehabilitate an injured worker than it does to support him."

"You're right, sir. It costs only $300 to rehabilitate a worker, and the Government has to pay from $300 to $500 to an injured worker who is not being rehabilitated." [1]

"And not only that, boy, but the worker pays taxes after he gets a job. Why, he pays $10 in taxes for every $1 expended on him during rehabilitation.[2] That sure does save my pocketbook. After all, I'm one of the Americans who has to help pay that $3,000,000,000 [3] which is spent each year on employable workers without jobs. Think of the saving that both the businesses and the Government would have if these were employed."

"But aren't there other ways that you save?" the boy asked.

"Definitely. It's good business to hire one of those disabled fellows. They have many good characteristics, and almost invariably make a better employee than the unimpaired."

"What are the other ways?" he persisted.

The man cast a sympathetic glance at the lad and explained. "The average handicapped worker has a feeling of—well, gratitude. They're so glad that they can really support themselves again that they do much better and more conscientious work than their unhandicapped brothers. It's a case of 'you never miss the water until the well runs dry.'

"They are less restless than unimpaired workers. They don't change jobs often, which minimizes the trouble and expense of frequently initiating new workers, and makes any business run more efficiently. They are time savers: It's very seldom that a disabled employee lags on the job, or unnecessarily misses work, or is tardy. These all save time, and in business time is money.

"They are so pleased with their opportunities that they are more loyal, less likely to strike. An impaired employee wants to justify his employment, so he tries to surpass the record of the worker who came before him. He knows that he must constantly prove himself, because any mistake or poor work is blamed on his disability. Their production is therefore excellent."

"Yes, sir. I read a recent survey which stated that impaired workers produce 3.6 [4] percent more for every hour worked than do their unimpaired coworkers. Their output is better, and as a rule, the disabled worker is more careful, and thus less apt to be hurt while at work."

"Have you noticed that those who have been rehabilitated are happier in their jobs and have a better record in all ways than those who haven't?"

"Oh, yes; that's true," answered the boy, "although I did know a girl named Jane who trained and treated herself and is now an excellent and well-loved teacher. And I know several others who have surmounted the obstacle alone."

"And some of those who don't seek the help of the Texas Employment Commission have difficulty getting jobs, because there are so many employers who are prejudiced against the handicapped."

"I was, once, but I've come to my senses. If others could only see the list of the general characteristics of an average handicapped employee which I've compiled, they would capitulate, too. Handicapped workers are credited with being determined to make good, responsible, independent, always on time, good workers, loyal, and usually highly skilled."

"Of course, there are some jobs disabled workers can't perform, but there are others which are not affected, and still other jobs for which nature's compensation makes handicaped workers ideal. For example, the blind can feel better than other people, and the crippled are skilled with their fingers.[5]

"Really all in all, I think the handicapped worker is the best that can be had."

"I'm glad to hear you say that."

"I'm glad to be able to say it. Rest assured, if any worker meets the usual handicapped employee's standards, he is doing wonderfully."

[1] Austin American Employ Handicapped Week Slated To Start Here Sunday, October 1, 1948.

[2] Austin American The Handicapped Would Pay Own Way If Employed, September 30, 1949.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] United States Department of Labor, Impaired Workers in Industry, United States Government Printing Office, January 1946.

[5] U. S. Employment Service and U. S. Department of Labor. Memo to all supervisers.

Speech of Secretary of the Air Force, Hon. Thomas K. Finletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the end of last week the city of Boston enjoyed the privilege of entertaining the fourth annual convention of the Air Force Association. I am quite sure that all who attended that convention enjoyed the hospitality for which Boston and Massachusetts are famous. I know that I can speak for my constituents in saying that they welcomed the opportunity to hear the distinguished speakers who appeared before this convention of an organization established to preserve and foster the spirit of fellowship among former and present members of the United States Air Force.

I was particularly struck by the thoughtful speech of the scholarly Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter. It was, to be sure, exactly the sort of speech to be expected from one who had already distinguished himself for the efficient but quiet job he is doing in directing the Department of the Air Force. It proved, however, to be more than a report on the Air Force, and what that service is doing in the Korean war. It was a sober analysis of the significance of Communist aggression in Korea, and of the action taken by the United Nations to stop it. It was likewise a reasoned admonition of the course we must follow in our devotion to the cause of peace.

Mr. Finletter, though Secretary of a military department, recognizes that Communist aggression in Korea has a special significance beyond its military significance. It is the great test of the United Nations—and may well prove the action that will strengthen the United Nations for the prime task for which it was organized—the enforcement of peace. But in pointing this out, Mr. Finletter uttered the sober warning—

Nothing but the highest wisdom, character and willingness to envisage new solutions of a kind which the nations have never embarked upon before can give us any real assurance that the possibility of a world of permanent and enforced peace can be attained.

Mr. Finletter paid tribute to the courage and fighting quality of our associates of the Korean Republic, and to the performance of our own Air Force and Navy's carrier-based planes that have assured our overwhelming air superiority. This tribute is also accompanied by a warning.

We must not be misled by the specialized events of the Korean aggression—

So Mr. Finletter warns—

into wrong ideas as to the nature of the Defense Establishment we need to carry out our basic strategy.

An orderly and agreed procedure has been established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for building up our strength now, both for use in the Korean war and for our strategy in the event of total war. What this procedure is, what form our combined effort must take, and what the responsibility of Congress is, is clearly and forcibly set forth in Mr. Finletter's adroit presentation, which I ask leave to insert in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

REMARKS BY THOMAS K. FINLETTER, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AT THE FOURTH ANNUAL AIRPOWER BANQUET OF THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION, HOTEL STATLER, BOSTON, MASS., SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1950

Most, if not all, of you are Air Force veterans of World War II. Your courage, sacrifice, and skill were essential factors in achieving a great military victory. Your success established the United States Air Force as a major element in our defense structure. It is particularly appropriate, therefore, that I talk to you tonight about our present position—of the events in Korea and of the effect which the Korean war has had on our Defense Department.

Communist aggression in Korea, of course, has great significance for our Defense Establishment and therefore for air power. But the special significance is not military. The controlling point about this Communist aggression in the Far East is that it is the great test of the United Nations. It is the first time that the United Nations has stood up as a body to oppose its force to the force of aggressors.

This is a hopeful thing; for in a United Nations, backed by adequate strength, lies our hope for peace. Terrible as all war is—and this one is no exception—the Korean aggression does have possibilities for good in it. For it may be that if we of the free world act with sufficient determination and wisdom we may have started the long-needed strengthening of the United Nations for the great task for which it is intended—the enforcement of peace.

It is important to understand the nature of the American decision to play our part along with other United Nations in resisting the Communist aggression in Korea. This decision was not a United States decision alone. The United States resolutely and actively joined with other countries of the United Nations in determining not to put up with this latest attack on free peoples by misguided armies acting under the direction of authoritarian breakers of the peace.

The United Nations has a special responsibility with respect to Korea. The Republic of Korea, limited to that part south of the thirty-eighth parallel because of Soviet refusal to permit a free election north of that parallel, had been born under the auspices of the United Nations General Assembly. It was established as a sovereign government by the free vote of the people of that area, in an election which was supervised by a United Nations Commission. That Commission was not permitted by the Russians to enter the territory which they were occupying north of the thirty-eighth parallel. The Republic of Korea has been recognized by the majority of the free nations of the world and by the United Nations as the only legitimate government for the area. In accordance with a United Nations resolution American troops were withdrawn from Korea, and their withdrawal was observed and verified by the United Nations Commission on the spot. The same resolution provided for the withdrawal of Russian forces but the United Nations Commission was not permitted to verify the withdrawal. To help train the forces of the Republic of Korea in the defense of their country the United States set up a military advisory group and this Government has furnished about $500,000,000 worth of military and economic aid to the Republic of Korea to enable them to strengthen their economy and prepare themselves for defense.

The question must immediately rise in your mind: "Why then were the Communists so successful in their attack on the Army of the Korean Republic?" The answer is that the invaders, aided by matériel and training from the outside, prepared themselves well for their act of violence. It seems to be the rule that it is difficult for those who wish to live in peace to prepare themselves for war, but that those who are bent on murdering their neighbors prepare themselves quite effectively for the event. This is what happened in Korea. The so-called Peoples Army of North Korea was splendidly equipped with Russian and Japanese matériel which had been captured by the Russians. The invading army was exceptionally well trained—especially for night operations. When the Red aggressors started over the thirty-eighth parallel their army was vastly superior in power to anything that stood to resist them in the Republic of Korea.

Across the straits, about 400 miles away, stood the American occupation forces. I emphasize the term occupation forces. The American troops in Japan were not intended for a land battle against aggression in China or Korea. The American forces in and about Japan were intended to carry out the duties of occupation and to defend a disarmed Japan against attack by air or sea.

This was a correct disposition of military power. While recognizing our treaty obligations and that areas of special strategic importance exist, it was not and it must not be the purpose of the Defense Department to dispose of forces in being—especially ground forces—capable of resisting aggression at all parts of the world. Any such military concept would be absurd; it could not possibly be carried out.

This point bears also on the original American determination to support fully the decision of the United Nations to resist authoritarian attack on the Korean Republic. The decision of the United States Government to do its share in resisting this aggression was not made because of the presence of the American forces in Japan or because the forces we had offered a chance of easy success. The decision was on a much higher ground. It was on the higher principle and the higher aspiration that the free peoples in the United Nations had determined that only through resistance would they be able to put an end to the recurring jabs and irritations of those who use war to further their own imperialistic and subversive purposes.

We are now paying the price for our determination to fight for the cause of peace.

It is of the highest importance that the United Nations continue its support of the Korean operations and that as many troops of as many nations as possible get into the defense against the northern aggression. In the nature of things, the American troops, being on the spot, have had to carry, with their allies of the Korean Republic, the burden of the fighting. But other nations have participated in the United Nations defense on the sea and in the air and ground troops are coming. We can look forward dimly through the haze to the world of peace which may evolve from this united strength of the free world.

Let us not, though, underestimate the difficulties of the campaign. The aggressors are fighting close to the lines of supply of those who are furnishing them with the materials of war. They are in a position to obtain additional manpower from regions close to them. We of the United Nations on the other hand have to transport our men and supplies across thousands of miles of land, sea, and air.

I must mention at this point the highly favorable reports that have come to us as to the courage and fighting quality of our associates of the Korean Republic. The Korean Republic's troops have recovered from the original assault and are fighting with determination, skill, courage and success.

It has not been pleasant to read of the steady advance of the Communist forces. But if we realize the vastness of the preparations of the aggressor and the small numbers of American troops who were available in the early days, we must have a sense of admiration for the skillful delaying action which the smaller numbers of American and Republic troops have carried out.

But the number of miles per division which the United Nations forces have to defend is still large and the reserves on the spot are not what we would like them to be. Nevertheless, we can look with pride on the improvised but heroic defense which the United Nations troops have put up.

Naturally you will be interested in the role which air power has played in the Korean conflict. The Air Force planes in Japan, in accordance with the purpose for which they were intended, were a mixture of jet intercepter planes of the F–80 type, a light bomber group equipped with B–26s and three fighter bomber groups equipped with F–80s. The F–80 is not the ultimate in fighter bombers but it has proved itself an effective interim weapon. All objective reports from Korea support the fact that this conclusion, based upon peacetime tests, has been confirmed fully by the greater test of war. The range of the F–80s was extended by improvising large wing tanks so that the F–80s could remain over the battlefield for a substantial period of time—even close to the ground where the highest consumption of jet fuel takes place. The F–80s drove the enemy planes from the air, and the United Nations have had from the beginning practically total air superiority. The Communist forces did use at the outset some piston-engine Yak planes but the presence of the F–80s has driven them from the air with insignificant resistance on their part.

Other planes too have been used. Because of the complete air superiority assured by our jet fighters we have been able to use some older types of aircraft also. The World War II piston-engined F–51 and the twin Mustang F–82 have also played important roles as ground attack and fighter bomber by night as well as day. Navy and Marine planes too have been effective in close support.

The medium bombers, the B–29s, have also been used in the land battle. At the outset we had two-thirds of a group of B–29s on Guam and these were brought to Okinawa. The Air Force augmented this force by 4 groups of B–29s which since then have bombed the rear areas of the Communist army to carry out the fundamental strategic purpose of denying the sources of supply to the fighting enemy at the front. The B–29s have even been brought into the tactical effort and on occasions have bombed concentrations of troops, bridges, and other military targets close to the battle area.

You may be interested in some of the hasty comments that have been made relative to the capacity of the jet F–80 as contrasted with slower conventional fighters such as the World War II F–51s. It has been suggested that the F–80 is so fast that it cannot hit its target as well as the slower F–51. I don't know what conclusion should be drawn from this statement but I suppose the conclusion would be that the Air Force should reduce its emphasis on jets and should substitute the slower piston engine planes for them.

Any such policy would be disastrous. The first task of an air force is to get air superiority and this can be done only by having airplanes which are fast enough and have fire power enough to drive the enemy from the skies. In tactical warfare only the modern jets can achieve this air superiority. The slower piston engine planes of World War II would not last long against a force of fast jets. If the enemy were to make the mistake of putting in jet planes to contest our superiority we would soon find out the importance of the F–80s in unmistakable terms.

I do not mean to suggest that there must not be specialization in the types of planes with which the Air Force will be equipped—especially in the tactical field. Even though, as I have said, planes are adaptable and can be used for purposes other than their primary mission, the kind of Air Force we need will have to be equipped with specialized planes, some designed for interception, others for close support, others for deeper-in attack bombing and strafing, and others for night fighting and for bad weather conditions. The characteristics needed for each of these functions of course varies. There may well be, with an Air Force of sufficient size to permit such degree of specialization, a role for slower planes for certain purposes. But any suggestion that the jet will not be heavily relied on in the future is incorrect.

One further point. The overwhelming air superiority which we possess in Korea has meant not only that the Air Force and the Navy's carrier-based planes have destroyed the basic supplies which feed the enemy army, such as the gasoline and oil located in tank farms, but we have also knocked out substantially completely the main lines of communication from the rear of the enemy's lines to the front. The railroad lines have been seriously interfered with, the bridges are down, vehicles have been destroyed, modern communications from the rear to the front have almost ceased to exist. This is paying dividends and will continue to pay dividends. We are all looking to the time when the cumulative effect of this attrition of supplies will play a decisive and perhaps overwhelming role in the defeat and destruction of the invading army.

Now we must not be misled by the specialized events of the Korean aggression into wrong ideas as to the nature of the Defense Establishment we need to carry out our basic strategy.

As I see it, we must know what out strategy would be in the event of total war before we can calculate the kind of Defense Establish-

ment that we must have. We must first examine the tasks we have to perform before we can pretend to determine the kind of force we want to have.

As I see it our fundamental tasks are the following:

First, the United States must have in being a force which is capable of defending our own country against strategic air attack by the enemy.

We must build up our radar techniques and installations and our intercepting forces and our specialized missiles which will, to the greatest extent possible, blunt the attack of the enemy's strategic bombing force.

In this role, as in most of the roles which our Defense Department will have to play, the combined operations of the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy (including the marines) will be required.

Second, we must have in being a force of unmistakable power which will destroy the enemy's capacity to fight in the event that he makes the mistake of starting an aggressive war against our free world. I refer of course to the strategic Air Force, aided to the maximum extent possible, as in all tasks, by the Army and the Navy. This strategic Air Force must be unmistakably good. No effort must be spared to see to it that this strategic Air Force constitutes a defensive countermeasure of such violence that it will make it clear to anyone who thinks of attacking us or the society of which we are a part that it will be a most mistaken thing to do.

I know that all of you are fully aware of the importance of this strategic air arm, but I must lay special emphasis on it, even before you who understand it so well. Winston Churchill said recently that it was this force which was defending the peace of Europe and of the world. This was no overstatement. It is a curious thing this preparation of violence in the interests of peace, but that is the way it is. The more violent the potentiality of our air arm the greater is the hope that it will never be used.

The next task of our strategy is to maintain the lines of sea communications as free as possible from enemy attack. For the defense of this free world, centering as it does in large measure around the North Atlantic Treaty arrangements, is indispensible in the kind of society which we think right is to survive in the world of today.

The arrangements for the defense of the free world, and in particular for the defense of the West, are mixed military and political matters into which I will not go in any detail tonight. I will say only that it requires a combined determination of the major powers of the free world, each to do his share and to take seriously the matter of defending our common society even at the cost of heavy sacrifice.

The United States, I think, stands ready to play its part. The recent recommendations for substantial military defense-assistance programs—the recommendation for an increase of $4,000,000,000 over the present amount of one and one-quarter billions for the current fiscal year—shows, I think, the temper of the United States and its willingness to do its part.

But the effort must be a combined one. It must be one in which all of us, preferring liberty and decency to authoritarian rule, will be willing to make serious sacrifices. For I believe that the determination to resist the aggressive forces let loose in the world contains at least the hope that aggression may be banished. If we combine the determination not to be destroyed by aggression with the willingness to go far in agreeing to new ideas which will make aggression impossible, or at least improbable, we can have the hope that world war III will be avoided and that a regime of peace which will control these awful modern weapons of destruction will be established.

I am, as you see, cautious in my statement of hope, for I believe that nothing but the highest wisdom, character, and willingness to envisage new solutions of a kind which the nations have never embarked upon before can give us any real assurance that the possibility of a world of permanent and enforced peace can be attained.

I would like to make a few remarks about the way in which we are building our increased defense forces. The aggressor's strike at the Republic of Korea brought in vivid terms to the American people and their Government the necessity for a stronger Defense Establishment. It therefore became necessary to lay the plans quickly for this build-up in our military force. I am glad to be able to say that the plans for this build-up were formulated sensibly, in accordance with commonly agreed plans, and with complete harmony among the three services. This came about in the following way.

For months the Joint Chiefs of Staff had been studying the kind of military forces which they believed to be necessary to meet the responsibilities of the United States in the world of today. Their conclusions had been just about made final by the time the Communist attack took place in Korea. A few days after that attack occurred, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were able to make an agreed recommendation as to the build-up of the Army, Navy, and Air Force which in their opinion was necessary. In the case of the Air Force, as you know, the build-up was to be 58 groups as a result of additional appropriations over the normal appropriations in the fiscal year 1951, with a target program of 69 groups. Corresponding increases in the Army and Navy and a supplemental appropriation for the Navy to buy reserve planes for their carriers, all approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were agreed upon.

These recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were approved by the Joint Secretaries, the new organization composed of the Secretaries of the Army, of the Navy, and of the Air Force which is doing, I think, an important work in helping achieve the unification of our services. They were then submitted to the Secretary of Defense, approved by him, relayed to the President of the United States, and made the basis of his recommendation for increased military appropriations totaling about eleven and a half billion dollars of additional appropriations for fiscal 1951 over the basic budget of about $13,000,000,000.

Now the point about this, and it is a very important point indeed, is that an orderly and agreed procedure has been established, and I hope is here to stay, for the determination of the military needs of the country. If this precedent is maintained—and every effort must be made to see that it is maintained—the size and striking power of our Defense Establishment will be determined by orderly processes by those charged with the duties of making these determinations. We can, I hope, count in the future on expert advice as to what the country needs for its military purposes. To be sure, these statements of those who have the responsibility for the defense forces must always meet with the approval of the civilian authorities whose responsibility it is to make the final determination. But the importance of this orderly arrangement within the Defense Establishment itself is a happy augur for the future.

Under this arrangement, the build-up of the Air Force will be, in my opinion, satisfactory. This is not to say that there are not many things which have to be done to strengthen our air arm. The heavy reliance which the country, and indeed all of the free world, places on our Air Force in being is such that we must spare no effort to see to it that this force is right. We will therefore move on urgently to strengthen our air arm. We will seek to build those installations, acquire the equipment and make the planes and missiles which will make our Air Force capable, within the limits of present applied science, of carrying out its task. I am sure that the American people expect nothing less.

I will not say that I am satisfied with our air arm as it now stands. It is good. Under the able leadership of my predecessor, Stuart Symington, and the present Chief of Staff, General Vandenberg, the Air Force has been made into something of which the country may be proud.

But I assure you that we are not complacent or self-satisfied about our Air Force—even at the 69-group level. We are searching out and will continue to search out every possible deficiency in our air power—in our bases, our installations, our planes, the training of the men and everything else that goes to make up a fighting Air Force. We will remedy deficiencies as we find them. We intend to have the kind of Air Force the country needs in the air age. I pledge you we will leave nothing undone which can lead us to this end.

Primer for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the September 12, 1950, issue of Look magazine:

PRIMER FOR AMERICANS

What is Americanism? What do we stand for? What are the simple rock-bottom, down-to-earth American principles?

Nearly everyone has an answer—but rarely do two answers agree. Lacking agreement, how can we teach our children the principles of Americanism? How can we explain to the world what we stand for?

How can we recapture for ourselves the confidence, the enthusiasm, the shining faith in our country and in our way of doing things that earlier generations of Americans had * * * and that we now must have if we are to meet, and match, and beat the fanatic fervor of those who would change Americanism for isms of another sort?

What follows is not the Book of America. It is at most a Primer—a try at stating our American principles clearly, simply, in primer fashion so that anyone, child or adult, American or foreigner, can understand them.

For if we can agree upon our basic American beliefs, then we can grasp them, hold fast to them, and make them once again an exciting, active, guiding force in our lives, in our country, and in the world.

The principles of America are these:

1. Each person is of importance and value as an individual. This is the cornerstone—the foundation of all our other beliefs in the individual's right to live his own life, to speak for himself, to choose and change his leaders.

From it comes our hatred of those isms under which the individual has no value or importance as an individual, but is only one of many faceless beings in a voiceless herd called "the people."

Coming directly from that first principle are two other principles—two basic beliefs that are also part of the foundations of Americanism.

2. We believe that all men should enjoy personal freedom.

3. We believe that all men are created equal. It is worth noting that the Declaration of Independence expressed the belief that all men are created equal. It did not state or imply a belief that men develop equally or have equal ability, or that they should ever be forced to an exact equality of thought, speech, or material possessions.

That would be equality without freedom. Americans have always believed the two should go together.

From the days of the Declaration of Independence and the writing of the Constitution, Americans have been wise enough to know that even though life, liberty, and other unalienable rights are granted to man by his Creator, they require some protection by man, himself.

So, in our Constitution, and in other laws of our land, there are set down principles to protect the rights and freedoms and equality of individuals. And these, also, are part of the foundations of America.

4. The right to freedom of speech. This includes freedom of the press, of radio, of motion pictures, of every means by which man may express his thoughts on any subject.

5. The right to freedom of assembly. As we believe in the right of individual action, so we believe that individuals should be free to act together for the benefit of all. This is democracy.

6. The right to freedom of worship. Not only is the individual free to worship as he will, but religions themselves are free and equal—regardless of their size or their beliefs.

7. The right to security of person and property. Not just one, but three amendments to the Constitution (fourth, fifth, and fourteenth) protect against illegal search and seizure, or loss of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.

8. The right to equal protection before the law. As individuals are equally important, so laws must apply equally to all, without special privileges for any particular individuals or groups.

9. The right to freedom from slavery. This includes the right to quit, for no individual may be forced to work for another.

10. The right to petition the Government. The legally guaranteed right of the individual to petition the Government for redress of grievances is evidence of the American belief that government is the servant, not the master, of the people.

11. The right to vote for the person of your choice. This is the individual's most potent weapon in the protection of his rights and freedoms * * * a weapon that to be effective must be constantly and wisely used.

The principles of Americanism hold that every man has—

12. The right to a good education.

13. The right to live where he pleases.

14. The right to work where he wants to.

15. The right to join and belong to an organization.

16. The right to own property.

17. The right to start his own business.

18. The right to manage his own affairs.

19. The right to make a profit or to fail, depending on his own ability. There are other, similar rights of individual action which are Principles of America, but all of these individual rights may be combined in these two broad principles.

20. Every man is entitled to freedom and equality of opportunity.

21. Every man may earn his living when, where, and how he wants to.

There are also limiting principles. Principles of individual freedom sometimes clash with those of individual equality. Therefore our rights as individuals must be limited, and those limitations are themselves principles.

22. The rights of any individual shall not interfere with the equal rights of other individuals. Your right to swing your arms stops where the other fellow's nose starts.

23. The rights of any individual shall not interfere with the welfare of the people as a whole. Freedom of speech does not give the individual the right to shout "fire" in a crowded theater.

24. Every individual owes obedience to the laws under which he lives. The individual has the right to talk against a law, to work and vote to change that law, but not to disobey that law.

Principles that are patterns of behavior. Many of our principles of individual freedom and equality are guaranteed to us by law.

But we have other beliefs, other general rules of action and conduct that have grown to the status of principles. They have stood the test of time. They have worked. They have become a basic part of the way we live and of the way we look at things.

These principles, too, are foundations of Americanism. They are as true, if not more true, today than they were in 1850 or in 1750.

If America stays free, they will still hold true in 2050.

25. Every man shall be judged by his own record. A man's family background, his racial or religious group, is not as important as what that man himself can do, for Americans believe a man must stand on his own feet.

26. Every man is free to achieve as much as he can. We believe that where the laborer's boy may become President, where any man may achieve greatness, there is the greatest incentive for every man to do his best.

27. To achieve anything a man should be willing to work. Americans have always known that "you don't get something for nothing," that to get anything takes a willingness to work and to work hard.

28. Achievement also depends upon the ability to do a good job. Add to "willingness to work" the ability to produce results and the combination is the basis for most individual achievement in our country.

29. Every man has the right to a fair share of the results of his work and his ability. Because of this belief, America has not only produced more goods, but they have been more fairly and more widely shared by more people than in any other country.

30. Security is the ability of a man to provide for himself. The only true security for any individual is the opportunity, the ability, and the determination to work and plan and save for his own present and future. Self-reliance is vital to individual independence and personal freedom. No man can be "proud and free" who depends on others for his security.

31. When an individual cannot provide his own security, the responsibility should be assumed by others. We believe that no one should starve, or be without adequate clothing and shelter, so those who have more than their basic needs share the responsibility of providing the essentials of security for those who need help.

32. Every individual must deal fairly with other individuals. Honesty, fairness, and personal integrity are virtues that help free and independent individuals get along with each other without losing their independence.

33. Fair and free competition is a good thing. Americans have always believed that competition among individuals or groups encourages greater effort which in turn brings greater benefits to all.

34. Cooperation among individuals is vitally important. General Eisenhower has said: "The freedom to compete vigorously accompanied by a readiness to cooperate wholeheartedly for the performance of community and national functions, together make our system the most productive on earth."

Principles of individual responsibility. Freedom for individuals carries with it an equal responsibility to use that freedom wisely. Therefore, if we wish to remain free, we must faithfully fulfill our responsibilities as free men.

35. The individual is responsible for himself and his family. He must protect them and provide for their present and future well-being.

36. The individual has responsibilities to the groups of which he is a part. He must give of his best to his community, his church, his employer, his union, and to every group in which individuals cooperate for their mutual benefit.

37. The individual has responsibilities to his country. He must be an active citizen, interesting himself in local, State, and National government, voting wisely, thinking and speaking and acting to preserve and strengthen freedom, equality, and opportunity for every individual.

38. The individual has responsibilities to the world. Man's horizons have expanded. What happens in the world affects him, and his actions can affect the world. Today, therefore, each man has a responsibility to act—and to encourage his country to act—so that freedom and cooperation will be encouraged among the people and the nations of the world.

FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

Most of us are still confident of ourselves and of our country. We do not claim perfection. But we have faith in our ability to move forward, to improve, to grow, to provide more and more free, equal, individuals with more and more of everything they want and need in life.

If we, the people of the United States, want to have more material benefits, we must believe in and follow these two principles.

39. The only way we can have more is to produce more; and

40. As we produce more, we must make it possible for more and more people to enjoy that which we produce—if we, the people of the United States, want to have a better life, spiritually as well as materially.

41. We must stand firmly for our beliefs, our rights, our principles. Walt Whitman, writing nearly 100 years ago, put it this way:

"There is no week, nor day, nor hour when tyranny may not enter upon this country if the people lose their supreme confidence in themselves."

There are those who would chip away our confidence so that their special brand of tyranny might creep into America. They must not succeed. So, let us ask of every plan, or act, or idea: Is it with or against the principles of America?

Is History Repeating Itself on Shipping Legislation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, current deplorable conditions in the American shipping and ship construction industries deserve the attention of thoughtful citizens everywhere. Strenuous efforts have been made during the present Congress to impress upon legislators and citizens alike the need for a well-considered program to rehabilitate the two industries which are essential alike to American prosperity and to American security.

There is striking similarity between present efforts and similar efforts to rehabilitate the shipping industry which were initiated during the Sixty-seventh Congress. A review of these previous activities is interestingly presented in an article entitled "Is History Repeating Itself on Shipping Legislation?" published by the Association of American Shipowners.

In view of the vital need now for constructive action in this important field, I ask unanimous consent that the attached necessarily abbreviated copy of the article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF ON SHIPPING LEGISLATION?

Quietly gathering dust in Senate and House libraries is a very fat volume of hearings held before the Joint Senate and House Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress. The volume, which is about 6 inches thick and is titled "To Amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1920," contains 2,508 pages of testimony taken from April 4 to May 19, 1922, on a comprehensive bill to aid the United States merchant marine.

The bill, H. R. 10644 and S. 3217, was drafted by the United States Shipping Board and advocated by President Harding in a special message to Congress. It was the fruit of a careful study by the Shipping Board as to what was necessary and the best methods to utilize in an effort to revive American-flag shipping in foreign trade, which then was practically defunct as far as private operations were concerned. Debate on the legislation in the House and Senate filled hundreds of pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and continued intermittently until February 28, 1923, when the bill died in the final hours of the Sixty-seventh Congress.

There are two sharp differences between these dusty records of maritime legislation 28 years ago in the Sixty-seventh Congress and what is happening to shipping legislation currently in the Eighty-first Congress:

1. The 1922 bill proposed a number of both direct and indirect aids which were to be available equally to all American-flag vessels serving the foreign trade of the United States. Shipping bills in the Eighty-first Congress, while they sought to broaden the availability of aids to American shipping, restricted under the 1936 act to the few companies subsidized to operate on essential routes, were not nearly so comprehensive in their application as the 1922 proposal.

2. The 1922 legislation was proposed and supported vigorously by the Republican administration then in power and was supported by the majority of Republicans in Congress, while the opposition of the Democratic minority to any kind of subsidy for shipping, direct or indirect, finally killed it. The 1936 act, on the other hand, received its impetus from the Democratic administration then in power. In 1950, the opposition of the present administration to any broadening of subsidies, combined with apparent apathy of congressional leaders in Congress toward the maritime bills, has so far prevented their passage even though they had strong bipartisan support in both House and Senate committees.

Similarities between what happened in 1922 and is happening today on maritime legislation are as revealing as the differences:

1. Then, as now, the legislation had the almost unanimous support of the entire maritime industry, as well as the support of the overwhelming majority of the business community.

2. Then, as now, relatively substantial profits made by the shipping industry during the recent war made it an easy and popular target of attack, furnishing opponents of legislation with effective ammunition, even though the current, peacetime problems of the industry were critical.

3. Then, as now, the industry suffered because of its relatively small size and the fact that it had relatively few Members of Congress who could or would spend the time and energy necessary to understand its problems thoroughly and advocate vigorously their solution.

4. Then, as now, for the reason cited above, other legislative business took precedence over maritime problems. Attendance of House Members at hearings was fair, but not more than one or two Senators would find time to attend them.

5. Then, as may happen again, legislation which was the result of many months of effort by the industry, Government bureaus and the congressional committees, reached the floor of Congress only to fail of final enactment.

World War I caught this country completely unprepared insofar as shipping was concerned, and throughout the war we had to rely primarily on our Allies to transport our troops and supplies while we invested huge sums in developing almost from scratch a shipbuilding and shipping industry. Few of the hundreds of ships built here during World War I were finished in time to carry any cargo in that war. The situation was somewhat better in World War II which found us with the nucleus of a shipbuilding industry which, given time, was capable, at a huge expense, of expansion into a tremendous production industry.

Who can guess how much stronger we would have been when World War II struck us if the legislation proposed in 1922 had been enacted then, and how much could have been saved in the cost of providing the ships that were necessary? Failure then to recognize the necessity of a strong merchant marine to our changed obligations in the world undoubtedly both weakened us and increased heavily the cost of World War II.

In that respect, our situation today is analogous to 1922. While we do have today a much stronger merchant marine than we had in 1922, we also have tremendously greater world-wide commitments which can in turn be fulfilled only if our strength on the high seas is relatively far greater than we needed in 1922. In spite of our stronger maritime situation today, the Government had to dip heavily into the reserve fleets almost immediately to meet the shipping demands of a relatively small war in Korea. And Korea is only one of many commitments we have undertaken as part of our foreign policy, all of which, by their very nature, demand a much stronger active merchant marine than we now possess. An observer may be forgiven for wondering how many wars it will take before the American people and Congress finally awaken to the vital importance of the American merchant marine to our security and prosperity.

The story of the 1922–23 effort to strengthen the United States merchant marine is worth recounting briefly, first, because it was a far more comprehensive effort than any that has been made since, and second, because the bill which came so near passage was the result not only of lengthy hearings before congressional committees, more extensive even than those in 1949–50, but also of a careful study made by the United States Shipping Board with the full support of the executive branch of Government.

Major emphasis in H. R. 10644 was on indirect aids to American-flag shipping, and the bill's provisions may be summarized under three headings—indirect aids, direct aids, and general, as follows:

INDIRECT AIDS

1. Earnings of United States-flag vessels in foreign trade would be exempt completely from Federal income taxes for a period of 10 years after enactment of the proposed bill, providing that owners of such vessels set aside for investment in construction of new vessels in American shipyards an amount equal to double the amount of income taxes so forgiven.

2. Capital gains realized from the sale of United States-flag ships would not be taxed if placed in a fund to be invested in construction of new vessels in American shipyards.

3. The United States Shipping Board, in cooperation with the Treasury Department, would draft the depreciation rules to be applied to American-flag vessels in foreign trade, with a directive to permit an accelerated write-off during the 5 years 1922–26 of the excessive depreciation of ship values after World War I.

4. Any person or corporation importing or exporting goods in an American-flag vessel would be permitted to deduct 5 percent of all freights paid for such transportation from the Federal income tax otherwise payable by such person or corporation. (Note that the deduction of 5 percent of freights paid is from the tax payable, not the net income.)

5. Any direct aid received from the Federal Government would be excluded from gross income of a ship operator in determining income for tax purposes.

6. At least 50 percent of all immigrants to the United States would be required to travel to this country in American-flag ships, and detailed rules for carrying out this provision through immigration visas, country by country, were set forth.

7. All employees or officials of the United States traveling abroad and all Federal Government supplies shipped abroad would be required to go in United States-flag ships. (Administration witnesses placed considerable emphasis on this provision in their testimony, insisting that the United States merchant marine lost prestige when its own Government did not use it exclusively and asserting that all other maritime nations did utilize their own merchant marine exclusively for Government transportation.)

8. The Armed Forces, wherever practicable, would be required to utilize privately owned American-flag shipping to transport personnel and supplies abroad.

DIRECT AIDS

1. The United States Shipping Board was authorized to sell ships it owned at the world market price for tonnage. Sales generally were to be made on advertised bids, but the Board was authorized to sell ships without bids on vote of five of its seven members. Interest on unpaid balances was to be charged at 4 percent.

2. Proceeds of ship sales would go into a $125,000,000 revolving fund from which the Shipping Board would be authorized to make loans for new ship construction in United States shipyards up to two-thirds of the total cost of the new ships, charging interest at 2 percent or more on the loans.

3. Any United States-flag vessel of 1,500 gross tons or more serving the foreign trade of the United States (including vessels in cross trades if they touched a continental United States port once each year and also industrial carriers if they were open to carry cargo other than that consigned to the owner company) would be entitled to direct aid from the United States Shipping Board ranging from ½ cent to 2.6 cents per gross ton per 100 nautical miles steamed in foreign trade. The aid would be graduated according to the speed of the vessel, beginning with

½ cent at 13 knots and with a top of 2.6 cents at 23 knots.

The Board would be authorized to increase the direct aid payable to any vessel in a particular service up to double the amounts specified in the bill if the Board found such increase necessary to assure an essential service. The Board also could decrease aid where it found the full amount was not needed.

Recipients of this direct aid would be required to (a) permit the United States to take such vessels for national defense or public need at any time, paying fair value; (b) make repairs to vessels in United States shipyards whenever possible; (c) carry United States mails (but not parcel post) abroad free; and (d) carry crews at least two-thirds of whom were United States citizens and the rest eligible for citizenship.

If profits of any shipping company receiving such direct aid exceeded 10 percent on the capital employed in the business, 50 percent of excess profits above the 10 percent would be repayable to the Shipping Board up to the full amount of aid paid.

The direct aid would be paid from a revolving merchant marine fund established under control of the Shipping Board, into which would be paid: (a) all recaptures of aid under the 10 percent profit limitation clause; (b) all tonnage and port fees paid by vessels under United States laws, which would be increased 100 percent by the bill; (c) 10 percent of all tariff duties collected on imports to the United States; and (d) all amounts which the Post Office Department otherwise would pay for carrying foreign mail.

GENERAL

1. A Naval Merchant Marine Reserve would be established, to be recruited from officers and seamen in the merchant marine, each member to receive ansually one month's pay of the equivalent United States Navy rating.

2. The Shipping Board and Interstate Commerce Commission would be directed to develop jointly rules affecting both rail and water transport and railroads would be permitted to own competing water transportation facilities.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which did most of the committee work on the bill, developed two new versions of the bill, the second one of which, H. R. 12817, was passed by the House that fall and reported favorably by the Senate Merchant Marine Committee on December 9, 1922.

The major changes made in the original draft of H. R. 10644 by H. R. 12817 were as follows:

The Shipping Board was directed to maintain its service to major shipping areas of the United States, defined as the North Atlantic, South Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific coast areas, which then were being served by Government-owned vessels operated under general agency contracts, until it was satisfied that private operators could maintain adequate service to such areas. For the first 2 years, the Board could not sell vessels serving such areas without the approval and support of the domestic communities in such areas. (This emphasis on then existing services and major shipping areas grew out of demands made at the hearings and was the forerunner of the so-called essential route concept written into the 1936 act.)

The provisions for free carriage of foreign mail by ships receiving direct aid, and for payment into the Merchant Marine Fund of amounts which the Post Office Department otherwise would pay for such mail carriage, were eliminated. Main reason given for this change was the fear that inequities might result if some vessels were required to carry much larger volumes of mail than others receiving the same amount of direct aid.

The provision permitting industrial carriers to receive direct aid was eliminated from the bill.

The section establishing a Naval Merchant Marine Reserve was stricken from the bill. (Union representatives opposed this section bitterly in the hearings.)

The provision for joint rule making by the Shipping Board and the ICC was struck out, although the clause permitting railroads to own competing water carriers remained in the bill.

The provision for a revolving Merchant Marine Fund was struck out, and the direct aids payable made subject to annual congressional control by requiring appropriations each year.

All of these changes represented concessions to the Democratic minority opposing the bill, and the Republican majority made it clear that it believed some of them unwise, particularly the elimination of the revolving fund and the denial of direct aid to industrial carriers. The majority argued that to encourage the flow of private capital into shipping an assured continuity of aid was essential, which could not be obtained if aid was subject to congressional approval of appropriations each year. The majority also felt it was a mistake to deny benefits of direct aid to industrial carriers, since many of these already were being operated under foreign flags and it would be very desirable to have them under the American flag.

Page after page of statistics to show the difference in operating costs between American-flag and foreign-flag ships were placed in the record at the hearings. Then, as now, the big differential was in wages, with the difference in wage costs per month between American and British ships placed at various figures from $800 to more than $2,000 for an 8,000-ton freighter, depending on the wage and manning scales used. The average differential in operating costs cited in the hearings, covering both wages, was slightly over $1,300 per month, as compared to a current difference of more than $400 per day estimated by the Maritime Administration.

All operator groups in the maritime industry strongly supported the bill at the hearings, as did all the organizations of licensed officers. The late Andrew Furuseth, on the other hand, testifying for the International Seamen's Union, opposed any form of subsidy and devoted several days of testimony to attacking various features of the bill. The American Federation of Labor also opposed the measure on the general proposition that it opposed subsidies of any kind.

The National Grange opposed the bill because it opposed any form of subsidy, while the American Farm Bureau was both for and against it. The Farm Bureau representative said that his organiaztion opposed subsidies as a matter of principle, but also was strongly aware of the need of a strong merchant marine and therefore inclined to favor the bill if the subsidy features could be made temporary.

Hundreds of chambers of commerce and similar business organizations from virtually every State in the Union supported the bill, either by direct testimony or through telegrams, letters, or statements printed in the record. Representatives of these associations, particularly from the Gulf, Midwest, and Pacific coast areas, were the first to raise the question of preserving the existing shipping services to various geographical areas then being served by shipping board fleets in any new legislation. Fears were expressed that New York and the Atlantic coast might monopolize the benefits of the bill unless additional safeguards were written into it. As might be expected, their plea met a very sympathetic response from the committee.

Hostility of most minority committee members to the whole concept of the bill became evident very early in the hearings, and every proponent of the bill was cross-examined by them at considerable length. Representatives Rufus Hardy, of Texas, and Edward L. Davis, of Tennessee, were particularly dogged in their cross-examination of administration witnesses, outdoing the other members in that respect.

The controversy continued through executive consideration of the bill, which took place first in the House committee. There, the modifications noted above were made in two successive drafts of the bill offered by the committee and in floor amendments adopted before final passage by the House after several days of floor debate. The concessions did not mollify the minority. Democrats voted almost solidly against the bill and were joined by enough Republicans to cut the majority to only 24 votes on its final passage by the House.

Once the bill, now H. R. 12817, had been passed by the House, the Senate committee moved rapidly and reported it with only minor amendments to the Senate floor on December 9, 1922. Five Democrats—Senators Fletcher of Florida, Sheppard of Texas, Dial of South Carolina, Simmons of North Carolina, and Caraway of Arkansas—signed a blistering minority report opposing the bill in toto.

Senator Jones, Republican, of Washington, and chairman of the Senate committee, opened debate on the bill December 11. From then on until February 28, 1923, the bill was debated continuously in the Senate except for time taken out to pass appropriation and other essential bills. On the latter date, just a few days before the Sixty-seventh Congress was due to expire on March 4, the Senate voted on a motion to recommit the bill made by Senator Robinson of Arkansas, leader of the minority. The motion lost, 48 to 36, on almost a straight party vote.

By its sponsorship of the so-called long-range shipping bill in the current Congress, the maritime industry has indicated its unanimous belief that there are serious deficiencies in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. But a review of what happened in 1922–23, when shipping legislation had stronger support in Congress and the administration than it apparently has today, warns that a considerable task may require early accomplishment to educate not only the public and Congress, but also the executive branch of Government on both the value and needs of a strong American merchant marine. Otherwise we may again encounter dangerous and costly delays before we can provide ships and shipbuilding facilities suitable and necessary for our security and for our economy.

The War and Wool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article titled "The War and Wool" from the Wyoming Wool Grower of August 17, 1950.

This article reviews the wool situation for approximately the past year and clearly indicates that had the Munitions Board of the Government started their wool-purchasing program many months ago when the Subcommittee on Stockpiling of the Armed Services Committee

suggested they do so millions of dollars would have been saved by our Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR AND WOOL

Naturally everyone is wondering what effect the Korean war is going to have on wool. Up to date, of course, the principal effect has been an advancing wool market throughout the world.

Long before there was any idea of war in Korea our Senator HUNT repeatedly urged the Munitions Board to stockpile wool and to increase their stockpile of other strategic material. Later Senator HUNT was appointed chairman of the Stockpiling Committee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, in which position he continued to emphasize the importance of stockpiling wool.

At the time Senator HUNT urged that wool be stockpiled, there was considerably more wool available in this country and throughout the world than is available at present.

Some of us can remember that about 15 months ago, when the woolen mills lacked business and were closing down, we suggested to the defense authorities that they place orders for their woolen requirements in order not only to create a stockpile of goods, but also the help the woolen mills over the hump. The defense authorities paid just as much attention to our suggestions as they have to the suggestions of Senator HUNT. Had they followed our suggestions in the spring of 1949 and placed orders for the Army's requirements, they would have saved the Government untold millions of dollars because there was ample wool available and the mills needed business and would have taken the business, practically on a cost basis. Had the authorities taken heed of Senator HUNT'S request when it was first made, when there was wool available throughout the world, which was selling at a much lower price than it is today, it would have saved the Government millions of dollars.

We mention these facts of background because it was recently announced in Washington that the Quartermaster General was preparing invitations for bids to seven mills making 10,000 yards each of uniform cloth containing 70 percent wool and not more than 30 percent synthetic fibers.

This is to be a trial order and the goods containing the synthetics, when manufactured, will be subjected to severe field tests.

We believe the people of the country generally and, of course, the wool growers in particular, will object to the use of synthetic fibers in soldiers' uniforms.

We do not believe the specifications for uniforms should be changed from the present all virgin wool requirement so long as an adequate supply of wool is available, and on the basis of the orders now being placed for delivery until April 1 of next year there would seem to be ample wool to take care of the Army requirements.

Senators HUNT and O'MAHONEY vigorously protested against the use of synthetics in Army uniform cloth, both Senators pointing out that if the Government would stock pile wool, the use of synthetics in uniform cloth would not be necessary.

Senator O'MAHONEY, who is always alert to protect not only the wool grower, but the soldiers of the country, when Major General Feldman, Quartermaster General of the Army, was testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee, asked General Feldman concerning the use of synthetic fibers in uniform cloth and General Feldman is reported to have replied that he did not favor the use of synthetics in uniform cloth and preferred to use the proverbial "all wool" in all Army uniforms.

General Feldman, in writing a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on August 8, said, "This office, however, has not and does not intend to take any action to change our standard textile fabrics so long as wool supplies are available."

It is our opinion that there is no necessity for using synthetic fibers in uniform cloth. Our members will recall that during World War II there was a great drive on to require the mandatory blending of synthetic fibers with wool in all civilian fabrics. Wool growers, manufacturers, and others resisted this movement and pointed out there was still plenty of wool for all Army requirements, and while the supplies of woolens and worsteds for civilian use were somewhat restricted, those who desired to purchase virgin wool garments were usually able to do so.

We assume that the same people, who were pressing so hard for mandatory blending during World War II, are those who are insisting that the Army authorities use synthetics in uniform cloth.

Recently it was announced that the Quartermaster General had requested the Munitions Board to take steps to create a stockpile of 130,000,000 pounds of wool. While the wool growers have always insisted that any stockpile should be in the form first of cloth and uniforms, next of yarn, and next of wool tops, and lastly of wool, we believe the wool growers would not object to the wool stockpile of 130,000,000 if the stockpile were converted into cloth.

Press reports indicate that the authorities in Washington are attempting to negotiate with the Government of Australia for the purchase of wool in that country, when the new clip comes onto the market at the auctions starting the last of this month.

It will be remembered that during the past year Russia has taken considerable wool from Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and South America. When Russia wanted wool, they bid up the price until they secured wool. It is reported that the Russians have recently used the same tactics in South America and have purchased considerable wool there.

Fairly reliable statistics indicate that the total purchases of wool for the Russian account in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and London during the past marketing year was approximately 100,000,000 pounds, but it was always noticeable that whenever the Russians were in the market, they secured the wool by bidding higher prices.

There is another matter that the Army authorities could profitably study instead of thinking about the use of synthetics. They could change their specifications to permit the use of lower count wools in all of the Army requirements. Everyone knows that there is a world shortage of fine wool and if the Army specifications were lowered so that the medium wools could be used, it would make much larger stocks of wool available for Army use. This has been suggested to the Army authorities for the past couple of years and while they have made some changes, they have not, in our opinion, gone far enough.

In the recent invitation to bid on 3,300,000 yards of Army serge, they used the official standard of the Quartermaster Corps for wool tops. This wool top is understood to be slightly lower in grade than the top used a year or two ago. In the past, when the Army called for the use of a 60s top, it was generally agreed in the trade that the top would be 62s rather than 60s and apparently the top to be used in the serge contracts is what would be known of as commercial 60s. However, they recently issued invitations to bid on 3,300,000 yards of 18-ounce olive-drab serge. They received offers on something over 4,844,500 yards of this serge at prices ranging from $4.792 to $6.02. Most of the bids were in the range of $4.792 to $5.23.

It is interesting to note that on the last order for 18-ounce Air Force serge last May the low price was $3.74 per yard. During World War II, when wool prices were fixed by the OPA, the prices of 18-ounce serge ran from $2.83 to $3.14 per yard.

Everyone is waiting to see what form the control legislation will take and many people are fearful of a roll-back in prices.

So far as textiles are concerned, both Senate and House bills have provisions that would protect them, providing that no ceiling shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity below the parity price for such commodity, or an average price received between May 24 and June 24 this year. So it would seem that if a roll-back is used it will be limited.

Secretary Jones, of the National Wool Growers Association, has been in Washington for about 10 days and we assume will report fully in the next issue of the National Wool Grower. We are of the opinion that until control legislation is finally passed and approved and the authorities start issuing the regulations under such control legislation, it is going to be difficult, if not impossible, to make any forecasts.

We are attempting to keep in close touch with the situation in Washington through Senators HUNT and O'MAHONEY and Congressman BARRETT as well as other sources, and we will advise our members just as quickly as possible after any important steps are taken.

In the meantime you may be sure that any reports regarding roll-backs, etc., are entirely without foundation.

Senators HUNT and O'MAHONEY are following this matter very closely and can be depended upon not only to keep us fully advised but to protect our interests.

Let the Church Speak Up for Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the Reader's Digest for September 1950, there is an article by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale entitled "Let the Church Speak Up for Capitalism."

Dr. Peale is one of America's foremost Protestant ministers and for 18 years he has been minister of the Marble Collegiate Church in New York City.

As the title indicates, Dr. Peale is making an appeal for the church to face the whole issue of capitalism and the attacks made upon it and his remarks are of such importance that I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET THE CHURCH SPEAK UP FOR CAPITALISM

(By Norman Vincent Peale)

Recently a successful businessman not a member of my church came to my office.

"I am an active church member," he said. "I have been loyal to my church and supported it with time and money. Now, however, my loyalty has had a severe shaking."

As he laid an unfamiliar magazine on my desk, opened to a marked page, he said, "The other evening my 18-year-old son asked how

I reconciled being a capitalist with being a Christian. I told him I didn't see anything inconsistent in that: it seemed to me possible to try to be both. That, my son, said, is not the way the church looks at it, and he handed me this magazine."

I picked it up and read: "In the first half of the twentieth century, capitalistic totalitarianism was Christianity's greatest enemy. * * *" There was much more in the same vein.

"That magazine," said my visitor, "is an official publication of my church, published for circulation among college-age people. This particular article was written by the magazine's editor as a midcentury message to the young people of my denomination."

He handed me half a dozen other recent issues. They pictured America as an almost total economic and social paganism. That there had been any important American progress in human betterment was hardly hinted at. Let me quote a few samples:

"Communism proposes that something drastic be done about the economic situation. The American position is by and large that the status quo should continue; that it is the duty of the United States to protect its standard of living, to hold on to what it has even if it should take atomic bombs and diabolical poisons to do it."

"The god of the machine has so deadened the social conscience that it is really an open question whether the wiping out of our present mechanized civilization would not be the most direct way to the establishment of God's kingdom on earth.

"The freedom of the people, the workers, everybody, is our Christian goal and that is hardly attained by what many mean by 'free enterprise.'

"So long as the United States of America, in her anxiety to suppress communism, supports reactionary and Fascist elements * * * so long as she refuses to do justice to her minorities, she loses her moral right to leadership in the modern world."

I understood why, for the first time in his life, this Christian layman was in doubt about his church. In recent months I have met many other church members of numerous denominations who are similarly disturbed. They have asked:

"Is there any place for me, a businessman, in a church which promotes the idea that our American business system is inherently un-Christian? Does it make sense that I should continue to contribute from my earnings from capitalism to those who use my gifts to undermine it? What am I to think of the honesty of church leaders who, believing that capitalism is un-Christian, solicit my capitalist-produced contributions?"

I have urged these laymen to continue to support the church. I have known many of our church leaders for years. I do not know any Communists among them. I know a great many rank-and-file ministers. Most of them believe it is their business to help people to find God, to help them to get along better with themselves, their families, their associates, to encourage them to begin where they are to build a better world after Christ's pattern. Most of the preachers I know work hard and devotedly at their calling.

Yet there is evidently a determined minority whose aims, if their words mean anything, are not the aims of the church. They have maneuvered themselves into positions in our theological schools, on our church publications, on the boards of ecclesiastical organizations and into the pastorates of some of our great churches. They are not the church. But they use the church as a means through which, in the name of religion, they misrepresent and discredit America and the American economic system.

If the Protestant church believes that the American economic system is unchristian and a failure, it should say so, openly and without doubletalk. If the facts indicate that that system is and increasingly can be productive of Christian values, the church should forthrightly say that and discontinue the coddling of its pink minority.

Recently a well-known professor in one of our leading theological schools made a statement to the effect that Christianity has no stake in the survival of capitalism. I do not know how the professor got the authority to deliver Christianity's vote against capitalism. As a Christian minister, I am not voting against it. I believe that Christianity has a considerable stake in the survival of capitalism. I intend to vote for it until I see a system more favorable to Christian progress.

I believe that Christianity grows when the church does. That is why I want the kind of society which encourages the growth of all churches.

In a Fascist or Communist society, the church is suppressed or enslaved. Under Socialism it declines. The reasons, in each case, are the same. To the Christian church the supremely important value is the individual. Its great concern is his redemption and his freedom and growth. Fascism, communism, socialism, each in its own way, put the state where Christianity puts the person. The state is everything, does everything. As the state enlarges, the church inevitably diminishes.

Let us see what is happening to the church in capitalist America. Today 55 percent of all the people belong to some church. That is not enough, to be sure. But 70 years ago only 20 percent were church members; 30 years ago, only 40 percent. In the last 10 years members of the 15 leading Protestant denominations have more than doubled their giving to Christian causes. Gains for Catholics and Jews were also great. In addition, American Protestants this year have planned or are building a record number of new churches at a cost of more than $1,000,000,000.

Religion is enjoying the biggest boom it has ever had in our country—a boom made possible by an amazing upsurge of Christian devotion and generosity. That it is happening in capitalist America proves something about capitalism.

I can hear the foes of our economy say: "Sure, it proves that America is the richest country on earth." I am not ashamed of the fact that America is. I rejoice in it. In the parable of the talents, Jesus did not condemn the five-talent man for having so much or bless the one-talent man merely because he had so little. The five-talent man put his talents to good use and was commended. The one-talent man buried his talent and was condemned as a "wicked and slothful servant." The little he had was taken away and given to the servant who already had a great deal, but had proved he knew how to use it.

There seems to be a popular notion that America has become rich solely because, with the natural resources available, we couldn't avoid it. If that were true, a good many other countries, rich in natural resources, would be further along than they are. The promise of America is being fulfilled because something different took place here.

The founders of this Republic put their faith in the Christian idea that man, under God, should be his own master. They said that he is endowed by his Creator with certain unalienable rights. The securing of those rights is what they meant by freedom. Thus, the church and the social order were not divided in America—the one set against the other. On the contrary, the social order was fashioned to express the belief, preached by the church, of man's importance and his unlimited capacities.

There resulted, politically, a successful democracy. And there has been an equally notable economic success. The economic promise of our resources is being fulfilled because free men, in our free system, have worked on them. That is not only a vindication of our system. It is a vindication of Christianity.

Mankind is indebted to American capitalism. So is the church. The Christian minister should be the first to admit it.

Of course, our prayers and appeals would not bear much monetary fruit if capitalist America did not believe that religion is worth supporting. That it does so believe is largely due to the fact that the roots of our system are religious and we have expected it to produce religiously worth-while consequences. John Wesley, the founder of methodism, expressed this idea of an economic system in league with Christianity when he told his followers: "Gain all you can, save all you can, give all you can."

"Within the last 5 years," quotes the Christian Science Monitor, "the American people have performed acts of international generosity which cynics would have judged impossible for any nation." I believe this was possible for us not chiefly because we had the means but because of the strength of the idea among us that our means should be put to uses which, essentially, are Christian. As an article in Fortune points out, it is a distinctive quality of our economy that the gospel of production has never crowded out the gospel of service. I have seldom heard an American businessman speak of dollars-and-cents success as though that were an end in itself. There is great pride in the extent to which that success has been translated into increased well-being for more and more people.

The convictions one hears increasingly from business leaders were recently summed up before a meeting of Harvard Business School alumni by the head of a large corporation: "The human problems of industry are the big problems. I believe that business leadership is nothing less than a public trust, that it must offer a message of courage and hope to all people, that it can help an economically strong America lead other nations to lasting prosperity, freedom and peace."

The preacher could hardly ask for more than that. If the men who write the resolutions for some of our church assemblies would face all the facts, their expressions of social concern would include an ungrudging tribute to our system for the extent to which it has proved to be an effective instrument for human betterment.

I have read many attacks on our system. But no one attacks the standard of living which that system—helped by our Christian beliefs—has made possible. The system's enemies seem to want to persuade us to move out of this capitalist society into something which they imagine would be a Socialist paradise. But I gather they would insist on taking the fruits of capitalism with them: the highest wages, shortest hours, greatest security, and most widely shared abundance of good things, from automobiles to college educations and homes of our own. Without these capitalist fruits, socialism, even to the Socialists, would not be paradise.

As a Christian minister I want to do all I can to make capitalism more Christian. But before I join the advocates of some other system, I want to know how large a place the church and its teachings would have and how well our Christian idea of man and our hope for his progress would fare.

If, in human terms, capitalism sometimes falls short, so does the Christian church. Both are human institutions. Both, therefore, suffer from the same trouble: people. And people—not economics, politics, or social philosophy—are my first business in the Christian ministry. They were Jesus' first business.

I am not going to quit the church because I know there is some hypocrisy in it. I know there is much more that is good in it. To reduce the hypocrisy I am going to work on the hypocrites. I am not going to make

war on capitalism because I know there is some paganism in it. To reduce the paganism I am going to work on the pagans.

No one claims that we have yet made America an earthly paradise. But let the church rejoice at how far, under our system, we have come. Let it rejoice at the men and women—many of whom sit in its pews on Sunday—who aim, through that system, to help us further forward. Let the minister rejoice that his is a calling to raise up more of their kind.

The Constitution of South Korea and Government Structure of South Korea—Explained by Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Hon. Stanley Mosk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, knowing that the Honorable Stanley Mosk, judge of superior court, Los Angeles County, was collecting copies of the written constitutions of the new nations given birth and created since the close of World War II, I am pleased to herewith present for your information the treatment of this timely and important subject by this distinguished jurist. The judge informed me that the document itself had been sent to him by the Minister of Justice at Seoul several months ago, by cooperation through our own State Department.

Mr. Speaker, I know you and my colleagues and all who read will appreciate this timely information from the judge who graciously allows me to give it to you. It follows:

Outbreak of the Korean war, and American-United Nations intervention, caught most Americans in a state of abysmal ignorance of the little peninsula, its life, traditions and institutions. Subsequently the press and radio have brought some information about the area, the people and their leaders.

But what of the governmental structure, the fundamental law? Since the nation was conceived by the Allies, released by the United States, and nurtured by United Nations, what manner of government has it been?

On July 12, 1948, the constitution of the democratic Republic of Korea (now popularly known as South Korea) was proclaimed in the National Assembly, composed of duly elected representatives. The basic document consists of 10 chapters containing a total of 103 articles.

According to the preamble of the constitution, the people of Korea are determined "to consolidate national unity by justice, humanity, brotherly love and the elimination of all kinds of social evils, to offer equal opportunities to every person, to provide for the fullest development of the equality of each individual in all fields of political, economic, social, and cultural life, and to promote the welfare of the people, to maintain permanent international peace, and thereby to assure security, liberty, and happiness of ourselves and our posterity."

Like our American form of government, Korea has a system of checks and balances, with executive, legislative, and judicial departments of government.

The legislative power is exercised by the National Assembly, which is composed of members "elected for 4-year terms by universal, direct, equal, and secret votes."

The executive branch of the Government consists of a President and Vice President elected by the National Assembly by secret ballot. Both are limited to two consecutive 4-year terms.

The President in turn designates the Prime Minister, with the consent of the National Assembly and the State Council, consisting of between 8 and 15 ministers.

The judicial power of the Government is vested in courts, the highest of which is the supreme court. The chief justice of the supreme court is appointed by the President with the consent of the National Assembly. The other judges, and their qualifications, and the organization of inferior courts are not prescribed in the constitution, but are left to be determined by law. The constitution does limit the tenure of judges to 10 years, but states that they "may be reappointed in accordance with the law."

An analysis of the terms of the constitution relating to social and economic problems indicates clearly that the governmental structure of South Korea is progressive and, in terms of many points of view in America, actually radical. Certainly the document cannot be said to illustrate charges of reaction and decadence hurled by North Korea Communists.

Written into the constitution is the generalization that "the principle of the economic order of the Korean Republic shall be to realize social justice, to meet the basic demands of all citizens, and to encourage the development of a balanced economy."

The following article, No. 85, provides that "mines and other important mineral resources, marine resources, water power, and other natural powers which may be utilized economically, shall be owned by the state."

In addition, farm land is required to be distributed to self-tilling farmers, the nature and manner of distribution being left to the legislative body to determine.

Article 87 of the constitution provides that "important transportation and communication enterprises, financial and insurance institutions, electricity, irrigation, water supply, gas, and any enterprises having public character shall be managed by the Government."

The Korean Constitution also provides basic civil liberties for its people, guaranteeing freedom of religion and conscience, the independence of politics from religion, freedom from unlawful search and seizure, privacy of correspondence, freedom of science and art, and due process.

The constitution further provides for equal opportunity for education, and free compulsory schooling for at least elementary education.

Article 18 maintains the right of freedom of association and collective bargaining by labor. Article 19 guarantees the right of aged and incapacitated persons to protection by the state.

Poland: The Great Betrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by William Henry Chamberlin, in the last issue of Human Events giving the history of the betrayal of Poland. This is appropriate as on September 1 the eleventh anniversary of the invasion of Poland will be marked.

This is a black mark against our country and one that it would be well for us to remember, so that those guilty of this betrayal may be known to the American people, and not whitewashed and forgotten. The article follows:

POLAND—THE GREAT BETRAYAL
(By William Henry Chamberlin)

There is a relentless unbroken line of connection between the appeasement of Stalin which was a cardinal policy of the Roosevelt administration and the commitment of American troops to battle in Korea, under unfavorable logistical and geographical conditions, in 1950.

The most glaring example of this appeasement was Anglo-American acquiescence in the destruction of Poland's independence and territorial integrity at the Tehran and Yalta conferences and in the many intermediate diplomatic steps which made Tehran and Yalta possible. Now, as the eleventh anniversary of the beginning of World War II approaches, we should remember that the global conflict started with a German-Russian invasion of Poland.

One wonders what would have happened if the British Government, when it offered its guaranty against aggression to Poland in the spring of 1939, had added this warning:

"You must understand that this guaranty is valid only against Germany. If the Soviet Government proposes to take almost half of your territory and to impose a Communist-dominated government on what is left of Poland you cannot count on our help. On the contrary, we will make no serious effort to prevent the Soviet Government from accomplishing these designs and will even support its case against yours.

One may also speculate as to how the Yugoslav Government of 1941, pushed and prodded by the Roosevelt administration into entering an unequal struggle against Germany, would have reacted if some candid and far-sighted American diplomat had said:

"Your country will experience all the sufferings of foreign occupation. More than that, there will be a savage civil war. In this war the Moscow-trained Communist Josip Broz Tito will win the support of America and Great Britain. You and other Yugoslav non-Communist patriots will be lucky if you save your lives in exile or in obscurity at home."

And it would be interesting to know how the American people would have felt if some forthright spokesman for the administration or the State Department in 1941 had said:

"Our policy of inflexible support for Chiang Kai-shek's regime in China will almost certainly lead to war with Japan. This war will be prosecuted to the ruin of Japan and its destruction as a great power. But we will not worry about Soviet and Communist aggression against China. In fact we will bribe Stalin, at China's expense, to join in our crusade against Japan. As late as 1945 high State Department officials will be giving Communist sympathizers access to confidential information. The upshot of all this will be that China will fall under the domination of Communists, disciples of Moscow, who will show the bitterest hostility to this country."

Such things were not said by people in positions of influence in the years of decision about America's entrance into the war. But they are a faithful record of what has happened, of what a reasonably intelligent student of foreign affairs might have expected to happen.

II

The betrayal of Poland was the greatest and most flagrant of the three, because the Second World War began ostensibly over the issue of Poland's independence and territorial integrity.

The Soviet Government, in fullest agreement and complicity with the Nazi dictatorship, set out to blot Poland forever from the map of Europe. The record on this point is unmistakably clear. The Soviet-German so-called nonaggression pact of August 1939 was really a pact of mutual aggression against Poland. Its secret clauses, providing for a partition of Poland and for the inclusion of the Baltic republics in the Soviet share of the spoils, are now well known.

Molotov made the Soviet attitude plain when he declared at a session of the Soviet parliament on October 31, 1939: "Two swift blows to Poland, one from the German Army, the other from the Red Army, and nothing remained of the ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty."

Annexing and incorporating into the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Republics almost half of Poland's territory, inhabited by about one-third of the Polish population, the Soviet Government tried to insure its position by familiar totalitarian methods. About a million and a quarter people were deported to the Soviet Union, the majority being sent to slave labor camps. When the Polish Government was able to investigate what had happened to these deportees, during the period of Soviet-Polish rapprochement which followed Hitler's invasion of Russia, it reached the conclusion that about a quarter had perished of hunger and maltreatment.

Especially sinister was the mysterious disappearance of some 10,000 Polish officer war prisoners. Letters from these men ceased abruptly in the spring of 1940. For almost two years Polish diplomatic representatives in Russia, furnished with detailed lists of names, sought vainly for information about what had become of these prisoners.

The case was repeatedly taken up with the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and was brought to the attention of Stalin himself. At no time was it stated that the prison camp in which the officers were confined had been overrun and captured by the Germans. Only evasive and general replies were given.

This matter came to a head when the German radio announced that thousands of bodies of Polish officers had been discovered in the Katyn forest, near Smolensk, in western Russia. The Polish request that the matter be investigated by the International Red Cross was seized on by the Soviet Government as an excuse for breaking off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government. The virtual certainty that the Soviet authorities were responsible for this massacre of war prisoners was confirmed when the International Tribunal at Nuremberg, certainly not lenient in its attitude toward alleged war criminals, did not find Germans guilty of this atrocity.

III

From the time when relations were broken off with the generally recognized Polish Government in exile in London, the Kremlin stepped up its pursuit of its two main objectives in Poland. The first was to retain almost all the Polish territory which had been acquired as a result of Stalin's deal with Hitler. The second was to prepare for the new Poland, mutilated in the east, artificially enlarged in the west by the addition of regions which were overwhelmingly German in ethnic composition, a made-in-Moscow government.

Both objectives were achieved with the acquiescence or, at most, the very weak opposition of Washington and London. When Anthony Eden, as British Foreign Minister, went to Moscow in December 1941 he found Stalin inclined to demand the recognition of the annexation of eastern Poland as the price of signing an Anglo-Soviet treaty of alliance. A firmly negative attitude on the part of the American State Department blocked acceptance of this demand at that time.

But the American attitude weakened, curiously enough, as the American military position grew stronger. Less is known about the Tehran Conference, held at the end of November 1943, than about Yalta. But the comment of a Polish diplomat of long experience in the United States holds true: "Our territorial integrity was sacrificed at Tehran, our national independence at Yalta."

Certainly Churchill launched a vigorous campaign, in parliamentary speeches and in private communications to the Polish Government in exile, upholding Stalin's claim to the so-called Curzon line frontier. The factually absurd argument was used that Russia had twice been invaded by Germany through Poland and was therefore entitled to security. This overlooked the historical truth that at the time of the First World War most of Poland was part of the Russian Empire, while at the time of the Second World War, Poland's territory had been partitioned between Stalin and Hitler. In neither case was Poland in the slightest degree a partner in the German invasion of Russia.

IV

The Yalta Conference, held in February 1945, placed the final seal on the betrayal of Poland. No representative of Poland was present at this meeting. The Polish Government-in-exile, the successor of the regime with which Great Britain had concluded a treaty of alliance, was treated as nonexistent.

Stalin's territorial demands were accepted after one or two faint and unavailing pleas from Roosevelt and Churchill that the city of Lwow, culturally and ethnically Polish, and the oil wells of East Galicia should be left to Poland. The face-saving verbal assurances about free, unfettered elections and about reorganization of the Communist-dominated puppet government which entered Poland in the baggage trains of the Red army were proved empty frauds by the subsequent course of events, which led to the steady clamping down of a routine Communist dictatorship.

Apologists for the policy of appeasing Stalin which reached its climax at Yalta adopt two lines of argument. Some contend, like the late Edward Stettinius, that Yalta was really a great western victory, because Stalin made a number of promises which he broke before the ink on the Yalta documents was dry. This is about as convincing as suggesting that a man achieved a great financial triumph by accepting a large sum in worthless checks.

Somewhat more intellectually respectable is the argument that America and Britain needed Soviet military aid and could not effectively restrain Stalin's moves in eastern Europe. This line of reasoning, however, overlooks the fact that the Soviet Union was more dependent for its own security on maintaining the coalition than was the United States. There was certainly no valid moral or political reason why the United States and Great Britain should have actively cooperated in the territorial mutilation of Poland and in recognizing a government that was a complete negation of Atlantic Charter principles and violently hostile to the West.

Today's headlines from Korea furnish eloquent, decisive proof that the wartime appeasement of Stalin was a practical failure as well as a confession of moral bankruptcy.

More About Republican Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Moley, in Newsweek, issue of July 31, 1950, has an enlightening discussion regarding the so-called Republican advance movement. It is entitled "Republican Advance and the ADA" and should be read by all Members of Congress, and especially those who fell for Russell Davenport's efforts to destroy the two-party system of government. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include Raymond Moley's article:

REPUBLICAN ADVANCE AND THE ADA

(By Raymond Moley)

The belief prevails in the minds of several sharp political observers in Washington that the so-called Republican advance is a part of a general plan inspired by the left-wing Americans for Democratic Action to infiltrate both major parties with promoters of more and more Government and less and less personal liberty.

Coincidences favoring this theory were pointed out as early as last April by Frank C. Hanighen in his shrewd weekly newsletter titled "Not Merely Gossip." He noted that at the very moment when the ADA was meeting in Washington early in April, several members of and sympathizers with that group broke out with a rash of articles telling the Republican Party what it must do to be saved. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Marquis Childs, and Herbert Agar were mentioned. Later there appeared Eleanor Roosevelt's piece, If I were a Republican Today, probably written in April.

The ADA, meanwhile, adopted a platform affirming its political independence and promising to work for candidates of whatever party, so long as they agreed with the ADA.

Meanwhile, Robert S. Allen, another good reporter, spotted and published an account of a private get-together of liberal Republicans in Washington, of which Russell Davenport was the chief mover. Allen reported that Davenport was intent upon a Republican ADA. Senator MORSE sounded off on his favorite theme of maverickism, which is political anarchy—everyone for himself rather than the party.

All this offers some relieving humor for dark days. Here are people who have devoted most of their lives to discrediting the Republican Party and to perpetuating the Federal machine role of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Can they really want the Republican Party to succeed? Yes; on their own terms. But since the Republican Party is still the refuge of sincere conservatives, it is clear that it never can win on those terms. Hence, the conclusion is inescapable that the end of this strategy would be Republican frustration. Then the Nation would be dominated by a Democratic Federal administration.

After some preliminaries in Rhode Island and other States, the Davenport efforts brought together in Philadelphia a group of Republicans from 10 States. The name selected for the group was the "Republican Advance," and on July 1 a long and windy document appeared.

Almost every real issue is buried in generalities. But specifically, civil rights were stressed. The terms used on this issue could serve for an ADA or Truman declaration.

The Republican Advance editorially is against the Truman-Ewing plan for Government medicine. But it carefully sidesteps the Taft alternative for Federal aid to States for medical aid. It therefore endorses the Flanders-Ives bill, under which the Federal Government would subsidize and probably finally absorb voluntary plans as the Blue Cross and Blue Shield. This is merely seeking a back door for Government invasion of private and cooperative medicine.

Davenport's willingness to serve as a Republican Moses is a wry piece of humor. When he was associated with the late Wendell Willkie, the inference could be drawn that he, like Willkie himself, was acting as the official opposition to the Republican Party. In 1944 he was the moving spirit of Republicans for Roosevelt.

The present movement would hardly be notable, except for the strange editorial sympathy of a few newspapers and the approval of the Advance principles by a handful of Republican Senators and Congressmen. Perhaps, being politicians, the latter are willing to approve anything ambiguous. Certainly, they have not considered what this sort of thing might do to their party.

For while Davenport and his associates may be sincere visionaries, their proposal is inimical to the maintenance of a party that, despite defeats, can still stand for conservative principles. If the Advance should succeed, which fortunately is impossible, it could well kill the Republican Party. A party, like a person, is just as dead when it is the victim of a sincere blunder as when it is blasted by its enemies.

Prize Winning Essay by California Young Democrat Is Entitled "Why I Am a Young Democrat"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following essay was prize winner in a recent national contest sponsored by the two major political parties. The author of this essay, Darrell P. McCrory, is 27 years old; a member of the Los Angeles Council of Young Democrats and an assistant city attorney of Los Angeles City.

As it speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker, I just wish to observe that it cannot but be invigorating to both political parties, Democratic and Republican, to have these younger men and women in our various States, compete on such topics. I have not yet observed the one written by the young Republican but I look forward to doing so.

For, Mr. Speaker, these younger people are far more important than those of us who are twice or thrice as old. Why? Because they have so much more time than we have in terms of years, to learn in and to serve our great Nation in.

Whether Democrat or Republican the splendid development of these essay contests is apparent and their results to analytical, sound, vigilant thinking and decision is clear-cut and determination for soundness and security in our national experience. The prize essay follows:

I am a Young Democrat because I want to play a part in the forces which will affect the destinies of my generation. More today than ever before, our governments, State and National, play an important part in shaping our lives. Basically, the political parties formulate the policies which become government policy. By taking an active part in a political party I can help to shape the governmental policies which will have such a great influence on the lives of all of us.

I have chosen to work within the Democratic Party because that party is not dedicated to any doctrine, whether laissez-faire or collectivism, as an end in itself. Instead it has sought to advocate such programs and policies which will insure the highest degree of freedom and security for the American people. Performance has been the sole test. In the major segments of our economy, the Democratic Party maintained and encouraged our great system of free enterprise. This system has given many of us the highest standard of living in the world.

FOSTERED SOCIAL SECURITY

However, the Democratic Party has felt free to turn elsewhere in those segments of our economy where a policy of free enterprise has not been entirely successful. The Democratic Party has given us a Government-supported farm program to replace the Republican laissez-faire program of agriculture which wrecked the rural economy in the 1920's and early 1930's.

The Democratic Party recognized that a free-enterprise economy alone could not provide our workers with a high degree of economic security. It fostered the social-security program, a program of unemployment compensation, and labor legislation which has done much to remove the feeling of insecurity from those who must work in our factories and shops to make a living. The Democratic Party has recognized that free enterprise has not been able to adequately house all of our people, nor has it been able to adequately distribute medical care to all those who are in need of it. Therefore, it is advocating governmental programs to alleviate these shortcomings.

OPPOSES ISOLATION

In the field of foreign affairs the Democratic Party has always fostered a program of international cooperation. From its inception it has advocated a low tariff policy; it put into effect the reciprocal-trade program. These policies have sought to foster economic well-being in the world as a whole. More recently, the European economic recovery plan and the Atlantic Pact, fostered by the present Democratic administration, are evidence to the world that we as a Nation have abandoned isolationism and that we are accepting a position of world leadership. Based on its record, the Democratic Party will eventually lead us toward a limited form of world government.

All vital Government programs must first be political programs put forward by a political party. It is because I want to have a part in molding the program of Government that will affect me that I have become a Young Democrat.

Lindsay C. Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very splendid article appearing in the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., on Sunday, August 27, 1950, relating to the Comptroller General of the United States, Lindsay C. Warren.

Mr. Warren formerly served for many years as a Member of the House of Representatives and obtained great distinction as the Representative from the First District of North Carolina. Since his appointment as Comptroller General he has added to his high reputation for patriotic devotion to his country and has rendered outstanding service in this important capacity. He officially represents an agency which is the arm of the Congress and therefore I think it is most appropriate to have inserted in the RECORD this tribute to him.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAR HEEL OF THE WEEK—LINDSAY C. WARREN
(By Jack Riley)

Profiteers who made millions filching the Government during World War II will not do it during another war. A beetle-browed North Carolinian with a foghorn voice stands between them and the United States Treasury.

He is Lindsay Carter Warren, 60-year-old former Congressman now serving as Comptroller General of the United States. He has richly earned the more common title "watchdog of Federal spending."

A writer once described him thus: "Warren is tough. His speech smarts. Spray salts his face. Memories of Blackbeard the Pirate light his eyes. He's a lusty skipper straight from the stormy banks of North Carolina."

The reference to Blackbeard was apt; for Warren has uncovered present-day pirates in the guise of patriots who make Blackbeard look like a piker. His 10 years' bossing the General Accounting Office—biggest auditing office in the World—have tracked down and returned over $700,000,000 to the United States Treasury.

ALSO PROTECTS CITIZENS

His job also demands protecting citizens who deal with Uncle Sam. Each year he settles a half million such claims. Some are fantastic. Once, for instance, a rural lady wrote: "I wish to file claim against the Government for personal injuries received when a defective privy, constructed by the WPA under Government supervision, relapsed with me." She was answered firmly but kindly.

Such claimants worry him far less than the big boys who filch the Government through legal loopholes. With thunder in his booming voice and power behind his 200-pound bulk, big Lindsay Warren wades into them, fighting what he likes to consider the individual taxpayer's battle against thieves. He has been doing public battle ever since he got out of law school as a youngster and turned to politics.

The taxpayers love him for it, too, especially in the First Congressional District which he served for 16 years.

HEADS BACK HOME

Nothing pleases him more than to grab a 10-year-old fishing hat and flee from the clatter of calculating machines. He invariably heads for home and fishing jaunts between Currituck and Oracoke. His fishing partners are Marine Gen. Hal Turnage, United States Marshal Ford Worthy, and Col. George Combs of the Baltimore Sun.

Warren knows every nook and cranny of the outer banks, as well as their history and legend. He knows most of the people and they know him. He holes up frequently at

Nags Head, where his fishing trips are like fiestas. Friends and neighbors flock in to see him. Every lighthouse keeper is his crony. Coast Guard boys rank him second only to God. God takes care of them at sea, and Warren on land.

His passion for fishing is rivaled by his love for football. He will rise early and drive hundreds of miles to see Carolina play.

Fish is his favorite food and he says Maryland terrapin is "the only sea food north of the Potomac worth eating," and that comes from North Carolina.

He avoids the Washington social whirl in favor of quiet evenings with close friends at his home in Chevy Chase, Md. He is the center of a closely knit family. Sons Lindsay, Jr., and Charles are following in his footsteps at Carolina Law School. He has one daughter, Mrs. Emily Warren Jones of Lynchburg, Va., and a 2-year-old granddaughter, Diana. Mrs. Warren is the former Emily Harris. They were married January 28, 1916.

LOVES HOME

Life in Washington, D. C., never dimmed his urge to return to Washington, N. C., where he was born December 16, 1889. His home faces the mile-wide Pamlico River and that remains his favorite anchorage.

As a boy he roamed the river as city youngsters today roam the street. He lived with boats and fishing tackle, and the sound of the waves was soothing to his soul. He quickly learned to take care of himself in foul weather.

At 13 he shoved off for Bingham Academy in Asheville, where half the boys were Texans. He finished Bingham in 1906 and attended the University of North Carolina for the next two years. He didn't graduate. His father died, money ran low and Lindsay Warren left school to work in a bank.

RICH ANCESTRY

But barrister corpuscles pulsed through his blueblood veins. One of his great grandfathers signed the Constitution. Another uncle was an early Governor of Tennessee. A forebear of 1776 was a great judge. His grandfather Edward J. Warren was one of North Carolina's outstanding judges. His father, Charles F. Warren, was a distinguished lawyer, helped to organize the North Carolina Bar Association and became its second president. It was natural that Warren used his bank job to finance an education in law. He returned to the university in 1911–12 to study law and was admitted to the bar in 1912. Thirty-four years later, University of North Carolina conferred an LL. D. on him.

Law led to politics and Warren was elected county attorney of Beaufort County as a comparative youngster. His career moved swiftly thereafter. He served as president pro tempore of the State senate, keynoter of the Democratic State convention, delegate to a Democratic National Convention, trustee of the university, member of the constitutional commission.

With a term in the House and two in the State Senate to his credit, he ran for Congress in 1924 and won the Democratic nomination hands down against four opponents. For the next 16 years, he had no opposition whatever. The explanation as one old associate put it: "Lindsay conducted politics on personal contacts, not issues. He knew every voter by his first name. Every chance he gets he rushes back home to North Carolina."

OTHER CALLS

Occupied with a distinguished career in the House, Warren turned a deaf ear to the ceaseless drum beat at home. It went, Warren for Governor, Warren for Senator, Warren for anything.

Warren arrived in Washington while Texan John Nance Garner's star was ascending. They became fast friends and when Garner became Speaker, Warren became a potent member of the kitchen cabinet. Garner's favorite reference was: "That boy will stand hitched. If I were going to rob a bank, I would want Lindsay Warren at my side, for I would know he would never run away from me." After Garner moved to the Senate as Vice President, Warren was one of a few who ran the House under Senators Byrnes and Bankhead.

Twice he was elected Speaker pro tempore and served a week at the time twice while Speaker Bankhead was ill. He presided over more important legislation than any 50 Members, including establishment of the FEC. He demonstrated ability as a parliamentarian and his decisions still are cited in the House as precedents.

REMEMBERED OWN DISTRICT

He never forgot his First North Carolina District, and every county in it today can see his handiwork. Small pleas were never brushed aside. He sponsored the Roanoke Colony memorial coin, the Virginia Dare postage stamp, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park, the Wright Memorial at Kitty Hawk and so much seagoing legislation he won the sobriquet, "Admiral of the Coast Guard."

President Roosevelt rewrote Warren's reorganization bill so as to lather the General Accounting Office for the razor. The GAO had been regarded as a habitual stumblebum which had called down the ax upon itself. But Warren said, "No."

He told the President: "If GAO is cut out, the bill will never become law."

His stand stayed execution of GAO, but the agency continued to flounder, moving ineptly along, first brusque and then timid. Warren's fight for it perhaps accounts for his presence as its director today. He tried to avoid the job. He refused it in 1936, again in 1938, and four times in 1940. He was getting accustomed to say "No" to the President of the United States.

FINALLY ACCEPTED

"I'm not an auditor, nor an accountant. In fact, I'm utterly unqualified," he would mutter. Roosevelt persisted. To his fifth appeal in 1940, Warren mumbled a gutteral assent.

The Senate paid him an unusual tribute by instantly confirming his appointment in glowing terms without the usual reference of the nomination to a committee.

Confirmed July 31, 1940, he remained in the House until he took the oath as Comptroller General on November 1. Meanwhile his friend Speaker Bankhead died, and Warren was appointed acting majority leader. Had he remained in Congress, he undoubtedly would have been elected to that position. Life magazine picked him as one of the 10 ablest Members of the House.

The Office of Comptroller General began with George Washington's administration and carries the longest term of any governmental officer outside the judiciary. He is appointed for 15 years and cannot be reappointed. To recent suggestions that he be made eligible for reappointment, Warren said he would oppose it.

Both Presidents Hoover and Roosevelt had tried to abolish GAO.

His appointment was a signal that President Roosevelt had abandoned his fight to destroy the GAO. With characteristic vigor, Warren set about to make the office click. He made Frank Yates his assistant, opened windows swept out dust and introduced incentive. Where he discovered unused brains, he put them to work.

NEW LIFE INJECTED

Wellington Brink wrote for Hollands magazine in 1946. "The massive red brick sepulcher at Fifth and F Streets began to glow as it hadn't since the old gay days before Taft, when it had been a regular scene of inaugural balls. Warren began to note happily, 'There's right much humanity in this office'."

Right much efficiency went with that humanity.

Warren weeded out hidebound and antiquated methods. Appointed by the President but responsible only to Congress, he is the most independent official in Washington. His office is nonpartisan and nonpolitical. He has never inquired as to the political affiliation of one of the 7,500 persons in the department.

His independence and his duty to watch every Federal expenditure easily could make him the loneliest man in Washington, but his jovial good nature and forthright honesty prevent it. He doesn't pretend to be always right, but when he takes up an issue, he makes it stick.

STOOD HOOVER DOWN

For instance, when the Hoover Commission overstepped its assignment to study the executive branch and recommended transfer of GAO to the Treasury Department, Warren started swinging. Last February, he and Hoover appeared before the Senate Committee on Expenditures.

The Hoover-Warren head-on collision was a corker. Hoover made his stock argument that no agent of Congress should hold the power vested in the Comptroller General. Warren tossed aside his prepared statement and answered the former President word for word. Overwhelmed by his argument, the committee voted unanimously with Warren.

Warren's point was easy to understand. In 10 years, GAO has detected, collected, and turned back to the United States Treasury $700,000,000 that had been either illegally or erroneously paid out.

Warren despises procurement officers who allow themselves to be entertained by war contractors. He holds himself aloof from the faintest suspicion of favor or privilege.

One Christmas, 10 good friends in GAO took up a collection to buy him a deep-freeze unit for his catches of fish. When it arrived at his Chevy Chase home, Mrs. Warren held it up until she telephoned her husband. The wires fairly melted as Warren denounced the gift. Later he dressed down the ringleader in classic phrases. The refrigerator went back, and the chastened ringleader returned the money collected for it.

When Congress summons Warren to the Hill, he usually drives his own car rather than cost the Government a 30-cent taxi fare.

He has ceaselessly campaigned against what he calls the mumbo-jumbo of Government language. His own language is short, sharp, and to the point. He strongly supported the recently enacted Federal Records Management Act to stop creation of needless records, dispose of useless ones and make sensible use of those which are needed.

One of his greatest battles was to improve and modernize Government accounting and financial reporting. Three years ago, the Comptroller General sat down with John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, and James E. Webb, then Director of the Budget, to write what then was called the joint accounting program. It took months of arguing and knocking heads together to enact it, but now the results are taking. Warren spearheaded the act and testified before committees. The House passed it in 2 hours and the Senate unanimously passed it.

"Only Lindsay Warren could get a bill like this through the House without an opposing vote," said one Member. It gave the

Old Eagle Eye much more power, strengthening his hand against waste.

His own office sets an example against waste. During the war it mushroomed to 15,000 employees. Warren has voluntarily cut it back to 7,800. When the 1951 omnibus appropriation bill was before the Senate committee, Warren appeared and asked them to cut the GAO appropriation $2,000,000 below the House figure. He said not to get the idea he had overestimated his need but that since the House action, he had effected economies to save that much. Senators gaped in amazement. Such things as voluntary budget cuts just didn't happen.

Expenditures policed by the Comptroller General range from a $42,000,000,000 item by the Army down to a mere pittance. All get withering scrutiny, but Warren doesn't tolerate picayunishness. Spending $100 to audit $25 items is out. Contrarily, he never turns back once he smells a rat.

Rats were plentiful during the war, great big, pot-bellied rats robbing the United States Treasury under the guise of war contractors. Good-natured Warren exploded:

"Certain contracting officers are dishing out and giving away the property and money of the United States with careless abandon. Some are capable and efficient; some are highly inept and inefficient; and some have been found to be plain crooks and thieves." He called the cost-plus method of contracting "the greatest device ever invented for pumping money out of the Treasury."

APPALLING DISCOVERIES

His discoveries were appalling. One aircraft manufacturer used parts already purchased by the Government from another contractor for $10,000,000 but neglected to credit the Government with that amount. Another company charged the Government over $1,000,000 it already had been paid. One bill was overpaid by $135,000, another by $222,000 and still another for $20,000 was paid twice. The Comptroller General got these moneys back.

Waste and incompetence is so widespread and flagrant, Warren says, that finding examples is child's play. At random, he cites a few:

Failure of a Chicago agency to collect rent for Government property used by a contractor for a cafeteria, $6,019; commission paid to a dealer for a canceled sale, $1,647; one division paid a bill twice, $20,250, and the same division did the same stunt again for $1,078; carelessness of a Government inspector who accepted what was supposed to be a 25-ton crane but later was found to be an 11-ton crane, $6,534; paid for tires that were smaller than the kind billed, $2,160; neglect to collect on land-purchase program, $15,264; failure to deduct cost of transportation included in contract price, $1,110.

There is a story that Warren is so watchful he once cut the fixed fee of the contractor for the atomic bomb from the $1 called for in the contract to 67 cents because the bomb was completed in 2 years rather than the specified 3.

Literally tens of thousands of instances of unbelievable waste and carelessness are turned up. In Alaska, for instance, the War Department paid $2,619 for the rental, for 5 months, of two tractors that cost $500 each when brand new. The owners collected $1,619 more than the cost of the tractors, and still owned them.

These are things Warren deals with every day. A weaker man might surrender in utter disgust.

He appeared before countless committees during the war to warn that independent audit of proposed billion-dollar war-contract settlements was essential to prevent millions in loss. A gimmick in the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, however, hamstrung the GAO into virtual impotence against war crooks. His efforts, however, should prevent a recurrence of such losses.

"I am not a reformer nor a crusader," he says, "but I have insisted that we use just a little ordinary common decency in the expenditure of these vast sums of money."

His reign over the largest auditing house in the world will end in 1955. Lindsay Warren has proved its vital importance beyond question. Apparently he will be glad to retire.

His favorite expression is: "If I can serve out my term, I am going back home and will then sign a bond never to come north of the Potomac River again."

America Is Challenged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a provocative address made last evening by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff before the national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago. General Sarnoff's speech dealt generally with the challenge which world events today present to America, and specifically with the need for more effective selling of our country to the people of the world. I do not agree with some of his recommendations, particularly those with respect to universal military training, nor do I have much confidence in the present-day efficacy of the Voice of America, for the simple reason that there are relatively few receiving sets of the right kind in the areas in which we are most anxious that our message be heard. If we could bypass the masters in the Kremlin by means of adequate receiving sets in Soviet Russia and the iron curtain countries, the United States might do a terrific job of selling America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA IS CHALLENGED

(By Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff)

The patriotism, the high ideals, and the fine spirit of fraternity that characterize the Veterans of Foreign Wars make it a great pleasure to join you in your Fifty-first National Encampment.

In these days of international crisis, it is fitting that this organization should renew its pledge "to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies, whomsoever."

At no time in our history have we been so gravely challenged, as we are today, to safeguard the traditions and principles of human freedom that have made our Nation great. This is a time for clear analysis and calm appraisal, for careful planning and for positive action.

The time has passed for treading softly in fear of offending the Politburo; for protocol or compromise. The days of diplomatic pussyfooting are over. The sands of patience in the American hour glass are running low.

Communism is spreading its insidious propaganda relentlessly over many parts of an anxious world. Red fascism threatens destruction to life and liberty, and an end to human progress.

I need not tell you, as veterans who have served your country in either, or both, of two world wars, that our Nation and freedom-loving people everywhere are imperiled by this threat. Our salvation as a nation, the preservation of the American way of life and the progress of civilization are now dependent on our power to curb aggression and to stem the tide of international communism.

To quote an illustrious President of the United States—Grover Cleveland—we have a condition before us, not a theory.

Day by day, since the end of World War II, we have witnessed events which, in their bold and devastating aims, have made it clear that the time has come for the concentrated development of our resources—spiritual, industrial, and military. Scattered and unplanned effort will not be effective enough to meet the challenge.

The leaders of the Kremlin have left no doubt that they intend to impose their will on all mankind; not through peaceful persuasion, but by lying, intrigue, infiltration, sabotage, and force. In such a crisis, it is foolish to parry the thrusts of the aggressor with our fingers. Thus we only injure our fingers and do not hurt the enemy. Should it later become necessary to fight with our fists, the injured fingers would make our fists impotent. We must courageously formulate and pursue bold policies on a global scale. In psychological, as in military warfare, defensive strategy alone rarely leads to victory.

The tactics of the Kremlin—the heart of Communist aggression—are clear. They are based on the old slogan, "divide and conquer." By diverting our forces first to one pressure point and then to another, they hope to scatter our strength into ineffectiveness.

The major question is: What next?

Some seem to believe the answer can come only from the Kremlin. I do not believe that. We have picked up the challenge in Korea, and while you and I deplore the loss of life and the general destruction that is now taking place in that unfortunate country, we may thank Providence for a timely awakening to the imminent danger. The stark realism of the Communist aggression has stirred us from an almost suicidal complacency.

America has never stood before the world as a military nation. It is part of the fundamental character of our people to love peace, to be optimistic, to hope for the best, to want to live and to let live. Witness the extent to which we have permited American Communists to spread their evil doctrines among our own people, to advocate openly the same poisonous ideas that have brought strife and misery to other sections of the globe.

Until Communist armies shocked the world by the invasion of South Korea 2 months ago, communism had made its conquests chiefly through political terror. Korea today is proof that the Red leaders are prepared to use military force where their political action fails to achieve their ends. But for Korea, we, as a nation, would have remembered too late that "forewarned is forearmed."

The Communists smother the truth with their falsehoods. Through radio and television, the motion picture and the printed word, we have a great opportunity to reveal the truth to the rest of the world. We must

expose the lies and spike the false propaganda that come from behind the iron curtain.

We have worked out a new formula against the big lie invented by Hitler, practiced by Goebbels, and now employed by Stalin and Malik. Our formula is the big truth. As I said the other day at the University of Chicago Round Table Conference, we must tell the big truth about the big lie.

If truth is incapable of overtaking the lie, then there is something seriously wrong with our whole structure of life. But we can reassure ourselves: the truth will prevail; it must prevail. It is the foundation of democracy, and it is the basis of our belief.

Communist propaganda exploits hunger and misery to advance its evil crusade. It promises fulfillment of the legitimate aspirations of the masses. But, what has it brought them instead? Purges and executions; forced labor and police terror; civil war and starvation. Communism makes a mockery of freedom and justice, enslaves its victims and destroys their hopes.

We must expose and denounce the dictators and masters of these betrayed people. At the same time, we should bring them a clear message of hope. We must help these victims to unshackle their chains of slavery and to achieve their own liberation. We must speak to them as people, as man to man—and as good neighbors across a garden fence—not in a weak voice across the hemispheres.

Effective propaganda is inseparable from effective national policy. The Voice of America can state but it cannot create the policies of America. The mind must guide the tongue. If our national policies are hesitant and confused, they can only convey a sense of weakness and uncertainty. Any life line that is offered must be made of stronger stuff.

In a world that is far from settled, where peace is a hope but not yet a reality, our policies and plans must be made and remade to fit the fluid situation. This calls for national unity at home if we are to reflect it abroad. Now is the time for a moratorium on politics. I do not mean that we should stop constructive criticism, for it is a necessary element in any free society. It can aid our Government and our leaders in all fields of endeavor. It can aid the whole world.

What we need is a closer and a stronger link between the brains of America and the brawn of America. The best brains in our country, regardless of political affiliations, are needed to help solve the pressing problems in this time of trouble and to defeat the cunning of the enemy in a cold war or a hot war. Today, as you are well aware, the cold war is rapidly warming up.

Let us not worry at this crucial moment about the dangers of a brain trust. A democracy can deal with it when necessary. But it cannot cope with the perils to the Nation that can come from a brain rust or a brain bust.

If another world war should come, we know that the enemy will be Russia, seat of international communism, of dictatorship and ruthless power politics. Since World War II, Russia has built up a vast military force of men and machines, compelling obedience under the cloak of internal political action upon one satellite nation after another. This is Russia's record at a time when all the rest of the world looked hopefully toward peace.

The record is clear that world conquest is the aim of Russian communism. We have but to recall the tragic subjugation of the Baltic countries; of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria in Europe; and of China in the Far East. At this very moment our own soldiers, sailors, and airmen, under the banner of the United Nations, are waging a bitter war in Korea to save another free people from the ever-widening circle of conquests by the Reds.

Under these circumstances, our sudden awakening to the danger that lurks behind the Iron Curtain is a reassuring fact. Another fact, and one that should inspire us with confidence for the future, is the constantly expanding industrial might of the United States. It is beyond comparison with that of any other nation.

It is heartening to know that in this moment of peril our economy has reached heights undreamed of even in the peak of production during World War II. If there is anything that should give pause to would-be aggressors it is America's capacity to produce—and to fight. Kaiser Wilhelm, Fuehrer Hitler and Il Duce Mussolini, learned their lessons too late. Marshal Stalin is wasting his time in studying a new syllabus on philology; he should study military history.

The ambitious Russian program is based upon resources that do not begin to compare with those of the United States. The history of Russia is marked by political, agricultural and industrial ineptitude. Until recent years, she was a backward nation in all three categories and is still far behind the United States in science, in agriculture and in industry. Even with the help of her satellites, Russia does not grow enough food to meet her own requirements.

Until lately, the industrial development of Russia was almost negligible compared with that of England, France, Germany, and the United States. The leaders of the Kremlin have followed one 5-year-plan wtih another in the last three decades, but so far there is no proof that the Soviets have achieved any leadership in industrial capacity; nor have they ever been noted for scientific achievement or technological "know-how." Most of their major industries have been built up largely through the help of experts from other nations. The world knows how Russia obtained the secrets of the atom bomb.

To support her industry, Russia has a relatively small transportation system. Vast though her land area is, the Soviet railroad mileage is only about one-third that of the United States. Moreover, Russia has no great web of motor highways.

Nevertheless, it would be hazardous for us to underestimate the Soviet military potential. It is believed that Russia is presently able to put about 200 divisions on the field of battle. Since the end of World War II, her ability to equip and supply these divisions has been greatly increased by control of the satellite industrial nations of eastern Europe. Moreover, there is no reason to doubt that Russia is producing the atom bomb.

When you add to these factors their devilish cunning in the political arena, their disregard for international law, their distortion and disavowal of agreements, and the likelihood of striking the first blow, when they are ready to do so, the present Soviet leaders represent the greatest threat ever faced by freemen.

We can take courage, however, when we appraise our own strength—both as a great agricultural and industrial power and as a people imbued with the spirit of democracy and individual human dignity. The vast resources of the United States, if handled wisely, should be capable of meeting the challenge we face.

Let us look at our own picture. The agricultural economy of the United States has been developed to a point where we can meet the requirements of our own population and help our friends abroad. From this agrarian activity has sprung the largest food processing industry in the world.

The country's output of goods and services is now running at the staggering rate of $270,000,000,000 a year—an all-time record for America's industrial supremacy.

The electrical industry has reached a generating capacity of 68,000,000 kilowatts per hour—nearly twice the total we had only 10 years ago.

Our steel production is greater today than that of all the rest of the world combined, including Russia.

In the automotive field no other country approaches our capacity to produce 9,000,000 motor vehicles a year.

Substantially the same story can be told about radio, aviation, rubber, textiles, chemicals, and other major components of our industrial economy.

Alined with these vast enterprises are unmatched systems of transportation and communication.

The American industrial machine, already huge, underwent enormous expansion during World War II. Existing plants were enlarged and new ones built. To such war implements as ships, airplanes, tanks, and guns the United States applied the techniques of mass production. Never before were such tremendous quantities of equipment manufactured in so short a time. We supplied not only our own Armed Forces, but those of our allies as well.

In the 5 years since that war our industrial capacity has continued to expand. At the same time, scientific research has been widely extended and new laboratory facilities have been provided.

We learned during World War II that no nation can remain strong if it slackens even for an instant its interest in science. Progress in this field has put America at the forefront and has tremendously strengthened our national defense.

The electronics industry is an outstanding example of the part research plays in our national security. American scientists have pioneered in this field for more than 30 years. Today more than 90 percent of homes in the United States are equipped with one or more broadcast receivers, and radio has become one of the Nation's major industries.

Aside from communications, the electron tube has added immeasurably to the speed and efficiency of America's industrial machine. While serving the Nation in peace, the radio-electronics industry was aware of its vital importance in time of war. With the rapid advance of the airplane, tanks, and other motorized vehicles, only radio and electronics could provide the communications necessary for the strategy and tactics of modern warfare.

You may recall the outstanding contribution to victory made by radar, the proximity fuze, and the infrared "eyes" that could see in the dark. There were under-water sound detectors and long-range navigational devices. When the war ended, radio-controlled flying missiles equipped with television "eyes" were making their appearance on the battle fronts.

Radar, rated second only to the atom bomb as the greatest scientific development during World War II, is the strongest evidence of the value of a major peacetime industry to a nation at war. About $4,000,000,000 worth of radar equipment was supplied to the United States Government during the war.

The expansion of radio and electronic activities during and since the war has been phenomenal. The number of manufacturers in this industry in 1940 was 425. Today, it is 1,200. The value of the industry's peacetime products was a half billion dollars in 1939 compared with the present peacetime rate of two and one-half billion dollars. This is an increase in production of 500 percent.

Most of the electronic industry's postwar expansion has occurred under the impetus

of television's remarkable growth. By the end of this year, there will be approximately 10,000,000 television receivers in as many American homes. This means a potential daily audience of between 35,000,000 and 40,000,000 persons. Most of these people live in the great population centers of the Nation. Through television, they form a powerful nucleus for concerted action in time of emergency; for television is one of our greatest mediums for the dissemination of information, instruction, and training.

If we had international television today—and I believe we shall have it within the next 5 years—the Voice of America would be the Voice and Vision of America. What a powerful weapon of propaganda that would give us. For then the whole world would see what millions of American televiewers saw—the wonder of the UN sessions at Lake Success—and the arrogant filibuster of President Malik would have been its own most effective antidote for the Russian propaganda.

Should war come, television will be a vital factor in communications on land sea, and in the air. No matter where a battle is waged, it can be under the eyes of television and may be viewed by the military strategists even across the sea. It is within the range of possibility that the public will watch the action on battlefields while sitting at home in front of television sets.

American industry—of which radio and electronics are a part—represents a great force for peace and a mighty power in war. At this moment our Nation is being alerted. Should the need arise for full-scale war production, you may be sure that our industries know how to convert their products into the necessary weapons of war. American industry and labor will respond in the future as they have in the past, with patriotism and skill.

The story I have been telling you is a part of the big truth about America. It is the story of unmatched agricultural, scientific, and industrial achievement; of opportunities for individual initiative that develop under the free-enterprise system; of national teamwork; of social and economic progress.

But this is not the whole story. The spiritual part of America is even more important. Our freedoms to worship as we please, to think and to speak, to listen and to look, to work and to live where we choose, are precious privileges of our peaceful way of life. All these now are threatened by the enemies of freedom.

Experience has proven that our people want to know the facts and are not afraid to learn the truth. Americans expect their Government to lead the Nation and the world in this time of peril; to formulate sound policies and to prepare practical plans to meet the political, military, and industrial requirements of a menacing situation—a situation that may compel us to wage war on a global scale.

Our foreign policy, I suggest, should provide that subject to suitable controls and practical safeguards, Japan and west Germany will be permitted and assisted to rearm, to the extent that these two countries fit into the over-all plan of resisting Russian aggression.

On the home front, I would urge that we establish immediately universal military training.

Further, we should put high on the list of priorities, a thorough protection against sabotage, which could prove worse than a battle lost.

We must develop promptly a comprehensive system of civilian defense. Public knowledge that such protection exists will allay fear and keep us fit to do our job.

The challenge America now faces makes it imperative that the policies we formulate and the plans we develop shall provide adequate preparedness, in time to be effective. Not by words, but by actions, can we establish our security.

Americans, now as always, will respond to the Nation's call. When its freedom is endangered, America, springing to action, is unbeatable.

Russia Has Our Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Russians still have our ships and they have been continuously using them since May 8, 1945, to make themselves strong in their march to force communism on the rest of the world. I am including a news item from the Fremont News-Messenger, of Fremont, Ohio:

WEICHEL CHARGES SOVIET USING UNITED STATES SHIPS TO SUPPLY KOREANS—SANDUSKIAN REITERATES DEMAND THAT RUSSIANS RETURN LOANED CRAFT

WASHINGTON, August 11.—Representative WEICHEL, of Ohio, Thirteenth District Congressman, said today that Russia is using American ships borrowed during World War II to carry military supplies to North Korea.

The Sanduskian added that he is renewing his demands for more energetic efforts to recover hundreds of United States warships and merchant vessels from the Soviet Union.

"They are using the merchant ships to haul cargo that is being used against our forces fighting in Korea," WEICHEL told a reporter. "There is plenty of evidence of that.

"We don't know how they are using the warships. The Navy recently said it had heard a fleet of about 800 large and small Soviet vessels was in Asiatic waters—a pretty menacing thing to my mind—and I just wonder how many of them belong to us."

GOT HIS REPORT

Russia's delay in returning the loaned ships is an old sore spot with WEICHEL. He had a House Merchant Marine Committee subpena served on the then Secretary of State, George Marshall, in 1948, contending the State Department had withheld information he asked about the ships. He got the requested report.

"As far as I can learn," WEICHEL said today, "the Russians still have nearly 100 of our merchant ships and more than 300 of our naval vessels, some of them large ones."

WEICHEL said he would detail his contentions in a statement to the House next week, and "I'm preparing a letter to the State Department now."

The Ohioan said "every one" of the cargo ships has made one or more trips to United States ports under a Russian flag to pick up American cargo.

WANTS ANSWER

"I'm demanding to know why they were not seized then, and how we contemplate getting them back now," he added.

He said he has information that one of the vessels "just a few days ago, while loading in Genoa, Italy, got hurry-up orders from the Kremlin to proceed to another port, probably to feed cargo to the North Koreans."

WEICHEL said the House Merchant Marine Committee, of which he is a member, has information that the Russian merchant fleet consists of about 500 ships, "about a fifth of them the ones they borrowed from us and never returned."

"We hear that the fleet has been very active in carrying cargo to ports feeding the Orient, thus relieving the Russians' Siberia railway so it can carry more troops and munitions," he said.

Connecticut Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, among the membership of the House there are many colleagues who many times stress the fact that they represent so-called farm districts. An editorial appearing in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Herald of August 27, 1950, will, I feel, be of particular interest to such Members because it stresses the pride that my district, the great State of Connecticut, can also boast when telling of the incomparable products that the agriculturalists of Connecticut produce. The editorial follows:

TELL ALL THE WORLD NOTHING TOPS CONNECTICUT BRAND FARM PRODUCTS

There's been a suggestion made that the State set up standards for our best farm products, establish a "Connecticut Brand" and tout them far and wide. The suggestion is in the Democrats' platform, and doubtless they hope to get some votes with it.

But here is only one truly nonpartisan plank: Palates know no politics but all palates should know the products of our farms and gardens and orchards.

This is a perfect season to sell Connecticut families on Connecticut farm products.

Time has snatched away our strawberries. We had spent weeks buying them from hothouses and hothouse lands; then ours were here, and we ate them desperately fast, knowing that time was short and such rich flavor would soon be gone for another 48 weeks.

Now the housewife, having hocked the family jewels through the late winter and spring months to buy tomatoes from the fabulous gardens of Texas and California, triumphantly puts natives on the table; and all the family again knows what a tomato should taste like.

Corn, fresh from Connecticut gardens, has come into its butter-drenched glory. Peas and beans, squash and cukes, beets and carrots, again taste as they should. Now the housewife can buy lettuce that hasn't grown limp and drab, that still has the green goodness in it. Even cabbages and kings may sit down together, when they are native cabbages.

Our potatoes are smaller than those they grow in Idaho but that is their only inferiority, and who can put a whole potato in his mouth, even a small Connecticut potato? Our onions aren't loud and boastful, neither are they wan weaklings: They are onions.

Cantaloupes and their kin are pearls which fare better than most fruits on long trips from far lands. But who will give them a second thought when he splits open our own heavy-meated melons and comes upon the sweet succulence within? Yes, and sing of the watermelons of the South; but keep them there. Our own are better.

And then, when summer is past, fruited fall arrives and a man may bite clean and ringing into a Connecticut apple, firm and juicy and tangy with a touch of tartness mingled in the sweet, who would exchange a single one for a whole crate of polished and pretty fruit imported dudes of the orchard?

Yes, by all means, let's have a Connecticut Brand. Let's advertise it far and wide, let's sell to all. We'll help Connecticut farmers, no doubt. More than that, we'll transform the edge of our dining tables into the perimeter of paradise.

Evil Things Can Happen to the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to submit the following brief, but concise and thought-provoking essay written by a young boy in his teens from Hub, Miss., Dennis Barber.

Dennis Barber is just a farm boy in south Mississippi where there are many hundreds of other boys who live on farms, but Dennis Barber is not just a farm boy living on a farm. He is a boy who works his mind as well as his hands.

Several months ago the American Plant Food Council, of which our former distinguished colleague, Hon. Clifton A. Woodrum, is president, sponsored a contest on "Soil Fertility and the Nation's Future." This contest was for the purpose of stimulating the interest of the youth of this country in its greatest heritage, its soil. Prizes were offered for the best essays on this subject. The contest was open to the boys and girls throughout the Nation who live on farms. More than 20,000 boys and girls competed in this essay contest. It is interesting to note that, while the first prize went to a splendid young lad from the sturdy State of Vermont, the second place winner was this fine young boy from south Mississippi, Dennis Barber. The prizes were awarded in person to George and Dennis at Hot Springs, Va., a few weeks ago, where they were the guests of the American Plant Food Council. I am sure that all who love the soil join me in saluting these fine, outstanding young Americans.

The essay of Dennis Barber, my splendid young constituent, is as follows:

The normal geologic erosion that has gone on for ages under natural conditions is a part of the whole complex soil-making process. But when man steps in and cultivates the land he creates conditions that may result in an enormous acceleration of erosion. Under certain conditions this accelerated erosion is the most dramatic and disastrous of the evil things that can happen to the soil.

It is of two familiar types, water erosion and wind erosion. Water erosion occurs chiefly on sloping land removing the soil in sheets or cutting it with many small streamlets or gashing out deep gullies. The steepness of the slope, the soil type, the intensity of the rainfall, and the land use all affect the character and rapidity of this process. Wind erosion occurs on both sloping and level land and it too is affected by soil type. One factor is common to both kinds of accelerated erosion; they both depend upon removal of the natural vegetative cover which includes its complex underground roots and its residue of organic matter on and in the soil. For example, some experiments show that a cover of dense vegetation is 300 times more effective in retaining rainfall than clean tilled crops on the same kind of land. Moreover, the rate of erosion increases as the upper layers of soil are successively removed.

In regions where there is sufficient rainfall, which includes nearly half the United States, forests must be considered the first line of defense against erosion where permanent and certain protection is required on steep slopes, on deep erodible soil subject to gullying, and on abandoned farm land permanently removed from cultivation. To take an example among many; during a storm in northern Mississippi land under forest cover lost 75 pounds of soil per acre while nearby land under cultivation lost 68,000 pounds per acre.

The use of grass and other close-growing vegetation is other great natural methods of controlling erosion and conserving water. Contour furrowing or plowing and planting across the slope instead of running the furrows up and down the hills has long been practiced by intelligent farmers. Strip cropping has proved to be one of the simplest most effective methods of controlling erosion. Terracing, gully control, and crop rotation are also effective means of soil-erosion control. Most of the above control measures are used by most of the farmers in Hub Community through cooperation of the Soil Conservation Service. Over one-half our land is level to nearly level, moist cut over long leaf pine land and we are finding it is more suited to the growing of pine timber and permanent pastures. Therefore, our soil-erosion problem is not as great as where the land is more rolling and more is in cultivation.

Among soil deficiencies that affect productiveness, those of organic matter, nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium are of special importance.

In general, the fertility of virgin soils is associated with the continuous supply of organic matter they receive from native vegetation, which is in balance with other factors. The mere act of cultivation tends to reduce the supply in many soils. Since agricultural crops are generally removed instead of being left to decay, not enough raw material is added to the soil each year to maintain the natural balance. This rapid reduction of soil fertility may occur even without erosion, but it is true that most cases speed up erosion. One result is a serious loss of nitrogen which is largely stored in organic matter and released by decay. Nitrogen is a fundamental element in the building of protein, the staff of life. Thus, we can see if we only give nature a chance the productivity of our soils will be maintained and our Nation's future secured.

Radio Address by Hon. Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Thirty-eight Parallel and Beyond," which I made over Station WGN, Chicago, on August 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THIRTY-EIGHTH PARALLEL AND BEYOND

Thank you. Good evening, fellow citizens of the Midwest.

My primary purpose this evening is to call attention to the one weapon that is in shortest supply for the war in Korea: a positive program for Korea when the war has ended.

We and the world know what we are fighting against in Korea: armed Communist aggression. But so far, nobody, neither ourselves, nor our allies, nor the neutrals, nor our enemies know what we are fighting for.

Neither the United States Government nor any of the United Nations associated with it in this peace-enforcement enterprise has yet come forth with even a general statement of aims, let alone a point-by-point program to be followed when military victory is won. Yet the war is over 2 months old—9 weeks to be exact.

All energy has been concentrated up to now—necessarily I think—on the desperate struggle to prevent the defending forces from being driven into the sea by the superior mass of invading North Koreans.

Yet, without a statement of peace aims that is both lofty in conception and simple for anyone to understand, without an adequate plan for Korea when the Communist invasion has been crushed—all that is gained through military success can be lost through political failure. The peoples of Asia—of all the world—are watching us in Korea; and by our actions, far more than by our words, they are judging where their interest lies. The Asiatic peoples are making up their minds whether alliance with us, submission to communism, or neutrality in the world conflict is the course for them to follow. If the wavering Asiatic nations, among whom Soviet propaganda is daily sowing doubt and suspicion of America's purpose, can be shown by our actions in Korea that alliance with us is the road to independence and higher standards of living, then we will have gained far more by the fight in Korea than merely the stopping of Communist aggression. If, however, action to halt Communist aggression in a country is to mean only slaughter and devastation, followed by years of misery and foreign occupation, the rest of Asia may draw the conclusion that they want nothing more to do with us, and will turn away to neutrality or even to hostility and communism.

Military victory itself may be far more difficult to obtain—if the Korean people and the soldiers in the southern and northern Korean armies do not know clearly what the end of fighting will bring for them. Finally, our own hard-fighting troops and our people here at home need and deserve a higher goal to believe in and fight for, than simply the dogged fulfillment of a UN Security Council directive to repel armed invasion.

The onrush of the attacker is beginning to slow, and, barring new unforeseeable catastrophe, will be stopped in its tracks before long. The process of building our strength in men and equipment for the counter-offensive toward the north is already under way. Unless heavy reinforcements for the North Koreans suddenly arrived from another Communist satellite or from the Soviet Union itself, or unless the deadlock in negotiation at the UN is unexpectedly broken soon, the American troops and those of the other UN members now being sent to join them will, sometime this fall and winter, commence the great drive to sweep the Communists back to the thirty-eighth parallel.

Already people are beginning to ask: Should the UN forces pursue the Communists beyond that thirty-eighth parallel, the artificial dividing line separating North and South Korea, and go on into Communist territory right up to the Manchurian border and along the northeastern seacoast strip that reaches to the Siberian border a few miles below the strategic Russian port of Vladivostok?

The Security Council's order called on the North Koreans to cease hostilities and withdraw behind the thirty-eighth parallel. If, seeing themselves ultimately threatened with defeat, the Communists should now or a few months hence choose to obey that original directive, will that satisfy the members of the Security Council, or will they feel, as the American delegate, Mr. Austin, has already hinted the United States Government feels, that ending the breach of peace in Korea also requires ending the possibility of its being breached again? And if the UN authorizes its forces to cross into North Korea and occupy that part of the country, what will the Russians do? Might they not decide, then and there, to bar the way with Soviet troops, and confront us with the fatal choice of either going no farther north or of entering openly into the first phase of the third world war?

These are questions that are worrying your Government and the other members of the United Nations. These are questions that we all will be required to think through in the weeks ahead.

I do not see how we can justify the agony and sacrifice of our men in Korea by agreeing to stop at the thirty-eighth parallel, and thus restore the very conditions which have just led to this outbreak of armed invasion. Until new facts are presented to me, and until the Russians have given some clear sign of what they will do, I can only say, on the basis of what I know now, that the United Nations must decide to end the division of Korea once and for all, and the United States must press for this decision at the UN meetings. This is the time to unite Korea, as the UN General Assembly has been urging for three long years, under one democratically elected government, in a republic that is independent of all great-power domination, whether American, Russian, Chinese, or any other. If the Russians understand in time that this is to be the UN's decision, they may think twice before moving in their troops to reoccupy the northern half of Korea.

Once we decide the question of the thirty-eighth parallel, we will have decided our over-all political aim in the Korean war: reunification, under UN auspices, of the two parts of the country, reintegration of the industrial northern half and the agricultural southern half, reestablishment of an all-Korean, self-government, viable state of 30,000,000 Koreans.

But I do not for a moment believe that this is enough. After all, unification by itself would have been at least one of the results of a successful Communist conquest from the north. On the matter of unification, oddly enough, all Koreans are probably agreed. The differences among them lie in what kind of a state that united Korea shall be.

Therefore, to the extent that we can spell out now—and by "we" I mean the United Nations as well as the United States—what sort of Korea we intend to bring into being when the war ends, we shall succeed in stating the purposes for which this war is being fought.

I want to propose some basic principles that I believe must govern our program for Korea, principles that should lie behind every political and diplomatic pronouncement on Korea that we make henceforth and that we should guide every military, and nonmilitary action in Korea that we take.

If we adopt these principles we may find to our own surprise that there in Korea lies open to our grasp the great opportunity for which we have been prayerfully and hopefully waiting: The opportunity to seize the initiative in the world from the Russians. By what we do to settle the Korean conflict, the world will know whether we have shifted from a negative program of sheer anticommunism to a positive program for the independence and prosperity of peoples everywhere. We can set the pattern for all Asia, and even offer the first glimmer of promise to the subjugated peoples of the Soviet Union itself.

Starting with the fundamental objective of a united Korea, the UN program for Korea should provide for the achievement of—at the very least—the following political, economic, and social aims:

First. It goes without saying that immediate relief and complete rehabilitation will be vital. A rebuilt Korea is the primary test of UN effectiveness. If liberation from communism is to mean devastation of one's country so terrible that repairs take a generation, the lesson others may draw will be disastrous for us. We should state flatly, at once, that all physical damage to public or private property, whether done by the Communists or by the UN forces, will be speedily and wholly repaired.

Second. We must guarantee the Korean people liberty, including independence from all outside control.

We must make it crystal clear that we don't want Korea as a military base, and that we shall not permit Russia to use it as such. The UN must guarantee that no great power will exercise direct or indirect control over the united Korean republic. And while UN forces are still in Korea, basic steps must be taken to assure individual freedom in a society based on the fundamental rights of the human being.

Third. We must guarantee the Koreans security. The function of security is to defend liberty. It must mean security against both external aggression and internal totalitarian revolt. The UN must guarantee the frontiers of united Korea, perhaps by neutralizing a strip 10 to 30 miles deep, along the land borders, into which no Korean troops and no troops of big powers can enter, to be guarded and patrolled by a strong UN police composed of elements from smaller, preferably Asiatic UN countries. Thus sealed off from penetration or attack, Korea would be as secure as a nation can be in the present permanent world crisis. At the same time, the Russians would be assured that Korea is not to be a jumping-off place for any non-Soviet power against Vladivostok and the Siberian east.

Korea's internal security problem will be what to do with the thousands of defeated Communist troops and guerrillas who do not escape across the borders. Can the UN permit them to be shot en masse? Or can they be held in special camps in Korea or on some Pacific island and undergo a stiff course of reindoctrination and reorientation before being paroled on good behavior? If the war is to be shortened, North Korea's soldiers must be offered some choice but death—but their leaders and war criminals must be told they face trial before an international tribunal.

Fourth, the UN economic program for united Korea must demonstrate what we can do in an area once the Communists are driven out. This means we must stimulate prosperity wherever poverty now prevails, raise standards of living, increase productivity of land and factory, encourage capital investment, train people in technical skills, assure trading possibilities abroad, expand enormously the exchange of students to admit thousands of Koreans for training here and in Europe. Korean prosperity will make that area the envy and model of Asia.

Finally, our fifth guiding principle must be to help the Koreans in all ways possible to build themselves a society of opportunity for all the people—education, fruitful employment, ownership of the land they till, a better future for youth than the oldsters have had.

All these are essential parts, briefly outlined in the short time I have, of the positive program for Korea that we must have as our peace aim when the fighting has stopped over there. This is the weapon we need most to win and secure the victory.

Damage to American Workers and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the free and easy use of favored foreign trade agreements has done much to hurt American workers and industry. It is having its effects in northwestern Ohio and I have introduced legislation covering this matter and I am including a news item from the August 27, 1950, Cleveland Plain Dealer, of Cleveland, Ohio:

OHIO INDUSTRIES HURT BY EASY IMPORTS, WEICHEL SAYS

(By Edward Kernan)

WASHINGTON, August 26.—Northwestern Ohio industries are being severely damaged by the administration's free and easy use of favored foreign trade agreements, Representative ALVIN F. WEICHEL (Republican, Sandusky) charged today.

Calling for passage of his measure demanding that the President take immediate steps to halt the flow of low-tariff products from foreign countries, many of which are controlled by Communists, Weichel cited industries in Tiffin, Fremont, and Sandusky as being particularly hard hit by present trade policies.

In addition, he said other industries throughout Ohio are being hurt, directly or indirectly, by the importation of cheaply made foreign goods, which not only cuts at the industries, but strikes at the American workman by destroying his job.

TIFFIN GLASS HIT

"The hand glass industry at Tiffin has been affected by these imports, especially those coming from Czechoslovakia," WEICHEL said. "These agreements were consummated even after Czechoslovakia was overrun by Russian communism."

"Then there is the cutlery industry, with a principal center at Fremont, which makes shears, scissors, and surgical instruments. It has been greatly affected by our trade-agreement policy."

WEICHEL said that the paperboard and strawboard industry at Sandusky and elsewhere has already felt the bite from low-tariff imports.

"Then there is the refractory products industry, pertinent to the manufacture of steel, centered in the limestone region of Sandusky and Seneca Counties where imports again affect not only hundreds in the immediate area but others throughout the United States."

Greetings to the Loyal Order of Moose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a message of greeting sent by 14 Members of the Senate to the sixty-second annual international convention, Loyal Order of Moose.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 18, 1950.*
Hon. MALCOLM R. GILES,
Director General, Chicago, Ill.:

To the sixty-second annual international convention, Loyal Order of Moose, we send our warmest fraternal greetings and our sincerest fraternal regards. We hope that the convention will be preeminently profitable and enjoyable to all who participate in it, and that its deliberation and actions will encourage a great increase in Moose membership and result in a corresponding expansion of the order's service to the little children at Mooseheart and to the aged at Moosehaven.

With unlimited appreciation of the unsurpassable, patriotic service the Moose are rendering their country, and with equal gratitude for the humanitarian service they are rendering the young who are underprivileged and the old who are overburdened with misfortune, we are, with every good wish and the kindest of regards, always, fraternally and faithfully yours,

FRANCIS J. MYERS,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
CLAUDE PEPPER,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
WAYNE MORSE,
LESTER C. HUNT,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
WILLIAM LANGER,
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
MATTHEW M. NEELY.

Building a UN Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on June 29, during the debate on the arms-aid bill, I urged the formation of an international police force to handle the Korean outbreak and similar situations that may arise. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the current New Leader, entitled "How To Build a UN Police Force," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The New Leader is a well-known anti-Communist weekly published in New York by persons whom I understand are affiliated with the Social Democratic Federation. While I am not necessarily in accord with the viewpoint of this magazine on many subjects, I regard this editorial as a sound contribution to American thinking on the Korean crisis as it relates to the United Nations. The New Leader's proposal suggests one way in which an international police force might be formed, now.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO BUILD A UN POLICE FORCE

The war in Korea has laid bare a fundamental shortcoming of the United Nations: It cannot halt or prevent aggression, even when it displays the will to do so, because it does not possess the physical power to enforce its will.

The United Nations is not only itself unable to stop aggression, but must rely upon others to do so. Its complete dependence upon individual member states was underscored by the fact that the Security Council, having issued a cease-fire order to the North Koreans, then had to call upon its member states to enforce it.

Further: Of the 44 nations which have offered to aid South Korea, the UN is most dependent upon the United States, for it alone can supply aid in a decisive degree. Britain and France, overtaxed by prior commitments, cannot render much more than token help; and the smaller nations are scarcely able to match even that. In the last analysis, then, the ability of the United Nations to maintain peace rests—at least in the case of Korea—upon the power of one Nation: The United States.

The issue, however, goes far beyond Korea. Threats to peace exist in many areas: Formosa, Indochina, Yugoslavia, Berlin. * * * In the event of aggression in these or other areas, what will the UN do? Will it, in each instance, call upon the United States to act as its policeman? But this will signify complete and permanent abdication of its basic functions to a single nation. Under such circumstances, the UN might as well close up shop and let the United States, in name as well as in fact, carry on as the leader of a formally organized league of non-Communist states.

An international organization of nations which cannot enforce law and order in the world community has no raison d'être. The League of Nations was afflicted with just this disability and inevitably expired. Since the UN, however, unlike the League, has demonstrated in the no uncertain language of the Security Council's three resolutions on Korea that it seriously means to fulfill its functions, it must take the next step and create the armed forces it absolutely requires to make good its intentions.

The UN can, accordingly, act on two levels:

1. The Security Council should dust off the blueprints for a UN naval, air, and military establishment which were long ago drawn up by its Military Staff Committee—but were pigeonholed as a result of Soviet machinations—and enact them into law. If this were done, the UN could arm itself in a relatively short period.

2. Pending the creation of a permanent, full-fledged police force, the United Nations can exercise limited effectiveness in the Korean crisis—and possibly in other crises soon to come—by creating at once an international volunteer army. Exercising its moral hold upon humanity, the UN should issue a clarion call to freemen everywhere to volunteer to serve under a UN-appointed command now.

If the UN broadcast such a global appeal, the chances are that a great many thousands would flock to the colors of the first truly international army in history, an army that would represent more races, creeds, and faiths than any ever before assembled.

In the west alone substantial contingents could thus be raised, for here there are countless men and women whose devotion to peace and freedom would impel them to join an army formed under UN auspices. Such an army would have special meaning for veterans of the wartime anti-Nazi resistance movements and of the Spanish Civil War, who would also bring to the UN army a wealth of experience and training in the art of fighting aggression and tyranny which might prove invaluable in guerrilla operations.

A UN appeal for volunteers would be answered by people in Asia who, unwilling to choose between communism and imperialism (or imperialist puppets), would react positively to an agency not motivated by power interests.

By far the most single fruitful source of UN manpower could be the multitude of refugees from communism who languish in internment camps in western Europe. The 100,000 Soviet officers and soldiers who have defected to the west since the war's end could alone form the hard core for a UN army.

Just as the era of nation-states is past, so is the day of national armies. The cold war is international, the hot war in Korea has international ramifications, the forces now fighting in Korea—on both sides—are international in character, the crises brewing elsewhere in Asia and in Europe are international crises. It is beyond the power of any nation to resolve the problems facing the world. But imagine the impact if, in response to a UN appeal launched across national, racial, and cultural barriers, hundreds of thousands of citizens from all over the globe volunteered to act as policemen to keep the peace.

At once the stock of the United Nations would rise to new heights and people would admiringly exclaim: "Why, the family of nations really does mean business."

The little man, long frustrated because his power of decision has been snatched from him by superforces of all kinds, would at last have a chance to really participate in the events molding his future.

Would-be aggressors, faced with the prospect of having to fight an international army, would think twice before attacking others.

World government, hitherto an impractical dream, would, predicated now upon the existence of effective fighting forces, come nearer reality.

Naturally, there are many obstacles in the way both of building a permanent international police force, and a temporary volunteer army. But if they are not built, there will be no obstacles in the way of the UN's path to oblivion. We call upon the Security Council to proceed at once to the business at hand: the creation of the means by which the United Nations can defend itself.

For a Sound Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the

Appendix of the RECORD a very sane article headed "For a sound economy," which appeared yesterday in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A SOUND ECONOMY

(A statement by Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, underwriters and brokers, New York)

As an American, you have the interest of your country at heart but you may be confused by the various proposals for meeting the country's economic problems.

You are perfectly willing to pay your share of higher taxes to strengthen the military power of the country to combat communism. Yes, you are ready to pay even higher taxes than many in Washington think. But you hope the Government will get your money's worth and you hope, along with every hard-working American, that your savings will not go up in the smoke of inflation.

Price controls? Wage controls? Consumer credit controls? Excess-profits taxes? Nobody wants any of them in normal times, but—do we need any or all of them at present?

When our Government spends more money than it collects in taxes, it must sell bonds to make up the difference. If these bonds are sold to the commercial banks, as happened in the last war, new deposits (additional purchasing power) are created. This is inflationary deficit financing and no amount of controls can permanently hold in check the pressure of the constantly increasing money supply. For the years 1943 and 1944 inflation was held in check by rigid price and wage controls, but once the controls were eased, the effect of the huge increase in the money supply was felt. Price controls do not strike at the underlying illness of inflation, they merely hide it temporarily.

Inflation is an invisible tax that harms everyone. Rising costs for the necessities of life squeeze the workingman's standard of living while the farmer has to pay more and more for manufactured products.

In the last war, we introduced a mild excess-profits tax in 1940, made it tougher as time went on. Experience proved that a severe excess-profits tax destroys incentives for management to control costs. Remember some of the wasteful hijinks by the less strictly managed companies? You can remember when questionable and unnecessary expenditures were viewed as costing only 15 cents on the dollar. The same companies found it difficult after the war ended to regain financial discipline. Excess-profits taxes are hard to administer; they are full of inequities. They impose hardship on new companies and limit incentive for growth and the development of new products by dynamic companies. Some of the best minds in Washington know this.

Price controls without wage controls in the last war pinched profits margins with the result that some manufacturers stopped making certain products, cut quality and sought out more profitable but less useful items. This compounded our shortages. Price controls and rationing led to black markets and tax avoidance, costing the Government millions of dollars.

What policies would be most advisable now?

Several steps should be taken immediately:

1. Cut out all Government expenditures not absolutely necessary. Purpose: Reduce deficit financing to a minimum—most important of all.

2. Cut out all public works not absolutely necessary. Purpose: Prevent unnecessary demands for materials and men at a time when there are not enough of either to go around; provide an ace in the hole if it is later necessary to stimulate the economy.

3. Use strict controls over consumer credit and real-estate credit as the primary means of reducing current abnormal demands for autos, appliances, and houses. Purpose: (a) Release materials and men for necessary armament work. (b) Stimulate saving to permit purchase of Government securities by individuals. (c) Restore competition by getting abnormal demand in line with somewhat reduced supply.

4. Substitute a combination of normal and surtax rates for excess-profits taxes, and complement such higher rates with renegotiation to take unreasonable profits out of rearmament. Balance renegotiation with production and cost incentives. Purpose: Although not ringing with the same political appeal as excess-profits taxes, such an arrangement would retain incentives for corporate managements to control costs and prevent waste and inflation.

5. Use price controls and wage controls later (a) if the above measures fail after an honest effort, and (b) if we step up armament production beyond that now estimated. There should be no piecemeal price controls, and price controls should be tied in directly with wage controls right from the start.

6. Raise personal income-tax rates. Purpose: (a) To help defray armament expenditures and reduce need for deficit financing. (b) Siphon off purchasing power in the hands of individuals. (c) Reduce the demand for commodities in short supply.

A healthy economy is as important today as military strength.

Blame for Unpreparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, some time ago there were reported in the press a statement and sentiments on the part of high Government officials who sought to place the blame upon the American people for the condition in which we now find ourselves, both from a financial standpoint, and certainly as far as the defenses of the country are concerned.

The people generally have a way of finding out where the blame should be placed. An editorial appeared in the Daily Oklahoman of August 25, 1950, entitled "You Are to Blame." This editorial points out so very vividly some things that I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where it may be preserved, and where all may read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU ARE TO BLAME

As an average American you will be interested in knowing that administration apologists on the radio, in the press, and in speeches, now say that "the American people are to blame for the fact that we now find ourselves unprepared."

The people, say these spokesmen, wouldn't let Congress appropriate the money that was needed for vital defense equipment. By the same token the people are to blame for wasting money and diverting it to useless projects and material instead of investing in tanks, planes, guns, and ships.

This puts a dread burden on you, the average citizen—so great that only a tiny fraction of your sins can be mentioned. However, so you may know the enormity of your misdeeds in this respect, here are some of the items in the indictment:

Out of each $7 of defense appropriations, only $1 was spent for equipment since VJ-day. The rest went for "housekeeping." You did that. You were to blame for putting hundreds of ships and thousands of planes "in mothballs," instead of keeping them in serviceable condition, in Teddy Roosevelt fashion. You ordered a huge aircraft carrier scrapped after construction was under way. You ordered the tearing down of an Army camp in Alaska, at a cost of $16,000,000, then ordered it shipped to Seattle; then you had the ships turn around and haul the material back to Alaska, at a point within 10 miles of where it had been.

You asked for 910 family houses in Alaska to shelter Army personnel, at a cost of $58,350 a house. You ordered $108,290,859 worth of tropical worsted uniforms—$129 each for every enlisted man in the Army. You asked for money to modernize 102 more M–26 tanks than the Army has. (By the way, have those tanks appeared in Korea?) You fired a great admiral because he had the courage to differ with some of the Navy bosses on policies, thus putting a muzzle on that freedom of speech which is absolutely essential to efficient and economical administration.

Then, in a wave of false economy, you took another tack and resorted to frantic slashes. You compelled Government stenographers in Washington to get along with only 3.6 typewriters apiece. You left millions of people off the Federal payrolls who could have been there. You pestered the Army engineers so they reduced their askings for big dams and such—past, present, and future—to a paltry $56,000,000,000. In your Pendergastian parsimony, you spent only $191,081,394,191 in the years of 1946–49, inclusive, whereas the 32 Presidents, from Washington to F. D. Roosevelt (up to 1941), spent almost as much, or $179,620,113,645.

You were so niggardly that you got the country into the pitifully small debt of $256,000,000,000, whereas it might have been a trillion. For tobacco to feed the starving Europeans you only allowed a measly little $258,000,000.

Your reckless pinchpenny false economy went so far as to harass the underprivileged hillbillies of Aroostook County, some of whom got only $100,000 a year in potato subsidies, and had to sell their yachts and discharge their chauffeurs and second maids. That was during the shameful year of 1948, when you gave away only $200,000,000 for potatoes, and, then, grinding the faces of the poor, you extorted 3 cents a bushel for the same potatoes for which they had been paid $2, so they could use them for livestock feed. You took over only 2,000,000,000 eggs and comparable quantities of butter, wheat, and other commodities, under your tightwad policy.

Remember, these are only a few typical examples. The whole story is such as to cause infinite distress to the brave bureaucrats who vainly tried to deter you from taking your mad course.

Aren't you ashamed of yourself?

Hon. William M. Whittington, of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last the voters of that splendid section of Mississippi known as the Delta, held their primary election to nominate a successor to the Honorable WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, the able Congressman from that district. This serves to remind us that the few remaining weeks of this session of the Eighty-first Congress will mark the termination of the long, distinguished, and efficient service of this noble son of Mississippi in the Halls of the American Congress.

Two years ago this outstanding Mississippian announced that he would not be a candidate for relection, after having served for 24 years with distinction and ability. The shock of this announcement was so great for his many friends and admirers that even though several distinguished sons of that section of the State announced their candidacy, the people of the Third Congressional District demanded that WILL WHITTINGTON again offer himself as a candidate for reelection and return to Congress. His popularity and efficiency were so well recognized that the prospective candidates announced their withdrawal upon condition that Congressman WHITTINGTON would reconsider and become a candidate, an incident, no doubt, without parallel in the political history of Mississippi. Battling between conflicting emotions of the desire to withdraw from public life on the one hand and the pressing obligation of duty, he reluctantly reconsidered the decision and was reelected to the Eighty-first Congress without opposition.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the former announcement of my personal friend and colleague's retirement from the Halls of this Congress, I paid my humble tribute to this distinguished Mississippian and able American, and inserted in the RECORD in connection with my remarks a number of select editorials lamenting Congressman WHITTINGTON'S decision to retire and praising his service to his State and country—Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 9, pages A1372 and A1373.

Mr. Speaker, when the statement of the final and irrevocable decision of our colleague to retire was publicized, the press of our section of the country again eulogized this distinguished public servant. A number of them are submitted herewith for posterity. These spontaneous and unselfish tributes are truly deserved. The record made by WILL WHITTINGTON in the Congress and the fruits of his service will long stand as an enduring monument to a great Mississippian and an outstanding statesman. The editorials follow:

[From the Greenwood (Miss.) Morning Star of January 21, 1950]

THE DISTRICT NEEDS WHITTINGTON IN CONGRESS

We read with regret that Congressman WILL WHITTINGTON has decided he will not be a candidate for reelection. It is our humble opinion the district and our great State need Mr. WHITTINGTON in Congress. We therefore wish to go on record as favoring a draft WHITTINGTON movement.

It is not our intention to cast any reflection upon State Senator Frank Smith, or any other person who might seek the vacant seat. We have a high regard for Senator Smith, as is shown by our publication of his fine column in our Sunday Star.

The point we want to get across is that no new man could represent this district on so many vitally important committees and in other capacities in Washington, as does Congressman WHITTINGTON. He is one of the most influential and capable men on Capitol Hill.

While the vast flood-control program is yet incomplete, and while controversies rage over roads and highways, Congressman WHITTINGTON is in a key position to render invaluable service to the people of this district and to the entire Nation. He is chairman of these two very important committees.

Congressman WHITTINGTON is perhaps the best-informed man in Congress on the Nation's flood-control program. Certainly none is his peer in this respect. It follows easily that the Delta needs him in Congress.

We are familiar with Congressman WHITTINGTON'S long expressed desire of retiring. We are also familiar with the fact that he was drafted 2 years ago, after announcing his retirement. We believe he is absolutely sincere and that it will require the combined voices of voters all over the district in an earnest appeal before he will give consideration. It is highly possible that he will turn a deaf ear to even the most persuasive overtures.

The Biblical quotation which refers to a prophet being without honor in his home town, applies in the case of men such as Congressman WHITTINGTON. I'm sure we here in Leflore County and area do not fully realize the great service Mr. WHITTINGTON has rendered and is in position to continue, if he remains in the Halls of Congress.

[From the Greenwood (Miss.) Commonwealth of January 22, 1950]

CONGRESSMAN WHITTINGTON

The announcement of Congressman WILL M. WHITTINGTON not to seek reelection as Representative of the Third Congressional District at the end of his term meets with genuine regret throughout the Delta and the State of Mississippi.

Mississippi will lose one of the most notable Representatives in Washington and the whole Mississippi Valley its stanchest leader for flood control. He has been the No. 1 champion and fighter for flood control in all efforts to keep the Mississippi River and its tributaries behind safe and sound levees.

His retirement is a tremendous loss to the country's river valleys and all navigation interests.

He served as chairman of the old House Flood Control Committee and its at present chairman of the Public Works Committee, which authorizes flood control and rivers and harbors projects. In his long tenure of office he has not only served his congressional district but the State and Nation and we are all under obligations to his leadership and sound thinking. He has always been fair in serving where urgency of flood control was needed and did not allow any party affiliation to swerve his actions.

Mr. WHITTINGTON has served for 26 years and on May 4 this year will be 74 years old. All of us know that this long service has been trying and at times vexing, but, despite any circumstance that may have arisen, Mr. WHITTINGTON has always kept his composure and his motives never questioned. He has the valuable asset of thinking matters through, no matter how much voluminous detail is involved. He is today one of our most valued public servants.

The counties in Mr. WHITTINGTON'S district have long depended upon him for information in national affairs and he always found time to give his best thoughts and attention to them. Nothing was trivial to him when it came to serving his constituents. He is noted for replying to the most trivial matter and no matter what station in life a man might occupy, he obtained the best service from his Congressman.

Greenwood is going to miss his valuable service most of all. It is through him that the city enjoys many Federal agencies and benefits, especially in regard to flood-control projects. It was nice to have a Congressman live in your midst where his advice and counsel could be obtained any time. We owe him a debt of gratitude we can never fully repay. His decision to retire is a matter of regret to everybody.

Replacing Mr. WHITTINGTON for the important place he has so long occupied is going to call for much thinking on the part of the voters. Good men who have been serving like Mr. WHITTINGTON will be hard to replace. He has set an example of what the public learns to expect and respect. His successor will have a big place to fill because he has placed his service on a national scale instead of a congressional district.

In Mr. WHITTINGTON'S retirement, it does not mean he will lose any interest in his community or Nation and he will be ready to advise and help in any way possible, as he has always done. And in these troublesome times advice of men like him will be most helpful.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of January 22, 1950]

WHITTINGTON'S DECISION

No one who knows anything about American flood control policies, projects and progress would deny to Representative WILL WHITTINGTON the rest he intends to seek through retirement from the House. Nevertheless, his retirement will be a tremendous loss to the country's river valleys and to its navigation interests.

As chairman of the old House Flood Control Committee and as present chairman of the Public Works Committee which authorizes flood control and rivers and harbors projects, Judge WHITTINGTON has served the whole country as well as his Mississippi constituents in splendid manner and both owe his efforts much indeed.

He has been a Member of the House for 26 years. When he sought to retire 2 years ago his State's political leaders and his constituents persuaded him to delay. They should defer to his wishes now. Judge WHITTINGTON'S long handling of flood control legislation has been marked by unswerving adamancy in requiring establishment of economic justification of proposed projects. If that was lacking, the project was not approved. In that respect, Judge WHITTINGTON has been every taxpayer's representative.

A flooding Mississippi concurrent with his decision to retire is a sharp reminder of the importance of control works. A few years ago, the present flood could have been a

great disaster. That it is not is due to the works for which Judge WHITTINGTON provided authorizing leadership.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger of January 22, 1950]

MR. WHITTINGTON'S RETIREMENT A BLOW TO THE LOWER VALLEY

Like thousands of other Mississippians, we received without surprise but with deep and genuine regret Congressman WILL M. WHITTINGTON'S announcement that he will retire from office January 1, after representing the Third Mississippi Congressional District for 26 years; that he has "definitely decided not to be a candidate for reelection."

Mr. WHITTINGTON'S colleagues in the House share the regret that Mississippians feel over his announcement. So do the officials and civic and business leaders of all the Mississippi Valley States. They realize, as do most Mississippians, that WILL WHITTINGTON'S services have been of great value to the whole Valley—to the Nation.

He is recognized in Washington not only as a most able Representative but also as a statesman and as probably the foremost congressional or national authority on flood-control problems and rivers and harbors development.

As all Washington news reports of his retirement announcement emphasized, "Lower Valley Congressmen said the distinguished Mississippian's retirement would be a sharp blow to the entire Valley."

The heaviest loss, however, is Mississippi's and the Third District's.

Nobody can deny that the veteran Representative has earned the rest and rewards of retirement. None can criticize his decision. He is, as he reminds, approaching his seventy-second birthday. He wanted to retire 2 years ago, but yielded to public pleas and insistence that he accept one more term without opposition.

The timing of his announcement reveals a courtesy and consideration typical of the Delta statesman. He announced his coming retirement nearly a year in advance of the expiration of his current term "to give ample time for the nomination and election of my successor." That consideration doubtless is appreciated by announced and prospective candidates.

Whoever is elected to succeed Representative WHITTINGTON will have some "big shoes to fill," an inheritance to challenge the best that is within him.

Meantime, with a great many other Mississippians, we hope Mr. WHITTINGTON derives the maximum pleasure and satisfaction out of his final year of congressional service and approaches his well-earned retirement hale and hearty and filled with the zest of living.

[From the Natchez (Miss.) Times of May 23, 1950]

WILL WHITTINGTON AND THE ROAD BILL

We have said before, and we repeat, when Hon. W. M. WHITTINGTON retires from Congress next year, not only Mississippi but the Nation will have lost one of the most able Congressmen to ever sit in the Halls of our National Congress.

His work in connection with flood control is as well known in Maine and Oregon as it is in Mississippi. He has been the recognized head, and the authority, in matters pertaining to flood control for the past 15 years.

But his work in connection with the construction of America's magnificent system of highways is strangely enough little known. It has been one of his major efforts.

Recognizing that transportation was the major problem of a growing nation, he worked with a will to create State aid from the Federal funds to build thousands of miles of Federal-aid highways. These are admittedly the finest highways in the world.

The House of Representatives has just passed the Whittington highways bill by a vote of 246 to 34. It appropriates $570,000,000 for the next 2 years with which to match State funds in the building of highways in the several States. Of this amount, Mississippi will receive for each of the two ensuing years, in final passage of the law, $8,512,000. Matched by State funds, which it will be, this gives us a $34,000,000 highway program for 1951 and 1952.

This is important because it means the development of rural areas in this State. Following the construction of highways in 1936–44, the rural development increased crop production about 100 percent. Farmers were able to move back on farms formerly abandoned, and produce dairy, poultry, and meat products, and produce and get their crops to market regardless of weather. It put in cultivation a half million acres of land, and the increased wealth has far more than offset the cost, and we still have the highways.

The same thing will happen again. Thousands of farmers will now live on and cultivate lands which were believed inaccessible to market. The program will pay for itself over and over again.

WILL WHITTINGTON spark-plugged this effort in Congress. The law now in Congress is the most far-reaching, comprehensive, and constructive of any such law ever enacted in Congress. It is a great monument to a man who has devoted 26 years of his life to championing the development of the Nation, regardless of geographical location.

We hope he lives many years; but when he passes on we people of Mississippi should build a monument to him as a recognition of his great service.

[From the Jackson, (Miss.) Clarion Ledger of August 7, 1950]

HE'LL GIVE THE JOB HIS BEST UNTIL THE DAY HE RETIRES

"Most Congressmen would be inclined to take things easy in their last few months in office, once they had decided to retire," the Delta Democrat-Times observes. "It is human and understandable to slack off when retirement lies just ahead.

"But WILL WHITTINGTON continues to comport himself in behalf of his constituents just as if he had set his heart on serving another 20 years and was fighting off a dozen strong competitors. Greenville is especially obligated to him for his major contribution toward securing the newly authorized Federal judicial district, and for his continuing efforts in respect to activating the air base.

"All of which makes it more difficult to be resigned to his retirement."

This tribute doubtless was appreciated by many of Representative WILL WHITTINGTON'S friends, but nothing in it surprised anybody at all familiar with WILL WHITTINGTON'S character and habits.

He has throughout all the many years of his service in the House conducted himself as if "he had set his heart on serving another 20 years and was fighting off a dozen strong competitors."

That's why he served many more than 20 years, and could have continued to serve as long as his health held out and he asked for or would accept reelection.

That also is why he frequently had no competitors at all, much less 20 strong ones.

It isn't surprising that WILL WHITTINGTON, facing retirement after so many years in the House, should keep on working just as hard for his constituents and district as if he was seeking reelection. That is his character. He will give the job the best that is within him until the day he leaves it. And that's another reason why Editor Carter is not the only citizen of that district who finds it "difficult to be resigned to his retirement." Thousands of Mississippians who live and vote in other districts but who know the value of Mr. WHITTINGTON'S services, share that difficulty.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of yesterday, one from the Pittsburgh Press of last Sunday, and one from the Daily News of Philadelphia of August 23, all supporting universal military training.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette]

FOR THE LONG HAUL ONLY

Americans must plan and act on the assumption that they may have to live in a divided and hostile world for the next 10 to 20 years. In the light of such a prospect this newspaper pointed out a few days ago that some systematic program to provide a continuing and adequate flow of trained fighting men is both indispensable and inescapable.

But the specific program which has come to be known as UMT (universal military training) should be carefully weighed against serious alternatives.

At least 13 of the 14 members of the Senate Armed Services Committee reportedly favor immediate enactment of UMT—if only on a stand-by basis. Other advocates of the program are said to believe that only under the impetus of some such crisis as Korea would Congress dare enact so sweeping a measure. We would accept such a verdict regretfully. But if it should be correct as a matter of legislative strategy, then the citizen should understand clearly what UMT (apart from some of the problems of education and moral safeguards which it raises) can and cannot do.

There is no doubt that quick passage of UMT or any comprehensive military training program would have immense psychological value throughout the world. It would serve notice on the Kremlin that the United States is willing to "sweat it out," no matter how long it may take.

But UMT would supply no men either for Korea or for precautionary mobilization. None of the trainees would be available for military service for 6 months, and those who did not then choose to enlist could not be called for another year. It is doubtful that sufficient training personnel could be spared to put UMT into operation until the Korean war is disposed of and mobilization to meet foreseeable perils is complete. UMT, therefore, is no substitute for selective service or

for calling the National Guard and the several reserves.

Nevertheless, and in the face of all these limitations, we are forced back to our original thesis: The United States must move immediately toward some established, systematic means of providing military manpower for the long pull ahead.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of August 27, 1950]

DON'T DELAY UMT

The alarming weaknesses in our defense establishment, as revealed by the Korean war, demanded and continue to demand emergency measures.

Though the highest priority must be granted to the needs of our troops now engaged in battle, it is scarcely less urgent that we begin to build the fighting forces we will need to insure our security as long as the threat of Soviet aggression continues.

A system of universal military training is the first essential in such a program. It should go into operation just as soon as the service personnel can be spared to direct it.

Only compulsory training will provide the men needed to fill the gaps in the ranks of the National Guard and the organized reserves, the two civilian forces which must reinforce the Regular Army in any national crisis.

We dare not wait for an enemy attack to begin training our men. We must have trained troops in readiness to meet on a moment's notice the enemy's trained troops.

It was a national disgrace that we had to send raw recruits into the field against the veteran troops of the North Korean Reds. It was unfair to the men, because they didn't know how to protect themselves.

It was unfair to their families, because many lives were sacrificed when green troops were thrown against an enemy who was their superior in training and equipment, as well as in numbers.

None of those deficiencies would have existed if we had been properly prepared to meet such an emergency.

This shouldn't happened again.

Congress can prevent it from happening again, by adopting the measures and voting the money now to create the military organization needed to defend this country.

We went into both world wars without being being ready to fight.

Our allies had to hold the line for us while we trained our troops.

We cannot depend upon anyone to hold the line for us if there is a next time.

Most of our prospective allies are looking to us to defend them. We will be in the front line on the first day of the war, if there is a world war III. We cannot escape that, because Russia regards us as enemy No. 1.

Russia has 2,900,000 trained men in uniform today. Her satellites have another million or more. Together they have millions more in reserve.

We need not match that professional army, man for man.

But we should have the trained reserves to meet our requirements in an emergency. And since plans call for training only 850,000 men a year, the training program can begin none too soon.

[From the Philadelphia Daily News of August 23, 1950]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Further delay in the enactment of a universal military training law under which America's youth would be prepared to serve their country as the need might arise is merely procrastinating on one of the most vital issues the Nation has to face. The past five years, since the end of the Second World War, have shown that unless America reveals it is ready and willing to defend, not only its own liberty, but freedom everywhere, aggression will sap and destroy that freedom.

Indications in Washington are that the opinions of Gen. Omar Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Defense Secretary Louis Johnson in favor of UMT has swung many dubious Members of Congress toward early enactment. Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland Democrat and chairman of the Senate's Armed Services Committee, has pointed out that "if we do not do it now, we may never do it." And that would be tragic in that it would deprive the Nation of adequate defense.

Experiments at Fort Knox have shown UMT actually is beneficial to America's young men, even if they never are called to fire a shot. The mental and physical development, the instruction and trades they acquire and the self-confidence in their own ability that is engendered in them will stand them in good stead throughout their lives.

In addition, the creation of a reservoir of intelligently trained men, ready to answer their country's call at a moment's notice, can be one of the greatest incentives for world peace. No aggressor, who knows he faces a prepared America, will be foolish enough to strike against the common good. It is only when he believes he can act swiftly and before the United States can train its huge resources of manpower and industry that he is willing to take a chance on a quick victory.

UMT is a national necessity today. There should be no more stalling on its enactment and enforcement.

Democracy Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Chester C. Diettert, principal of the Kankakee Township School of Tefft, Ind., entitled "Democracy Begins at Home." It was published in the School Board Journal for August 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY BEGINS AT HOME

(By Chester C. Diettert)

When we throw justice out the window with even a minor injustice to one of our fellow men, democracy has been hurt and we have become its enemy. When we use Gestapo methods in leveling general accusations against some of our citizens without giving consideration to their rights, privileges, immunities, and conditions, we are putting them into mental concentration camps just as surely as the Russians and Nazis placed people into physical concentration camps without due process of law. When, in our deliberative boards or policy-making groups, we permit a minority or even a single dictatorial talker to cudgel other members into conformity, we are setting up a little Hitler or a little Stalin and are throwing democracy out the window. Nothing could be more un-American. It is on these local community levels that the danger of communism and fascism begins, not on the usually supposed national level.

When we lack mercy in dealing with our fellow men, even though we may be able to hide behind the cloak of legality, we cannot right the wrong. There is no better formula for the solution of our community problems than mercy, forgiveness, and cooperation. There is no substitute for these that will work democratically.

When we show lack of appreciation for the services of our fellow men to our community, we are slapping down the ideal of service and are encouraging an attitude of "everyone for himself," or "let everyone look out for his own affairs, it's no concern of ours." "Am I my brother's keeper?" This attitude is the beginning of the breakdown of democracy and community cooperation and improvement.

Democracy has always emphasized the individual—his rights, privileges, duties, and immunities. When we disregard these fundamental ideals in our community activities we have started on the road to totalitarianism. And the little Hitlers and little Stalins in the local community who insist by word and deed that they are the interpreters of the popular will and who assume that they know what is best for the individuals in the community, are in reality the enemies of the improvement of the community upon a democratic basis. They are the leaders in the break for totalitarianism, whether communistic or fascistic in nature. Such individuals, when members of our community committees or policy-making boards, will violate legal procedures to secure their ends. Legal protection of the individual stands in their way, and they will avoid it or ignore it even if it is called to their attention. They do not consider a situation upon the basis of merits nor will they counsel with open minds. Consequently, their conclusions and decisions will not be without prejudice, and may even be tinged with malice, or political advantage.

We need to guard democracy at home, at the community level. We need to emphasize the protection of the individual against local usurpers or dictators.

Brief Our Soldiers in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Globe, Boston, Mass., August 27, 1950:

WHY AMERICANS BATTLE IN KOREA—WE SHOULD TELL OUR MEN WHO ARE FACING DEATH AND TELL ALL THE WORLD THAT WE ARE NOT CRUSADING FOR DEMOCRACY OR ANY ECONOMIC SYSTEM BUT FOR A PEACE BUILT ON THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(By James Morgan)

Reports from the battle front have told us over and over again that the Americans don't know why they are fighting in Korea. Many of them may never have heard of the place until they were ordered there.

Why not tell our men who are risking their lives and why not proclaim to all the war-sick peoples of the earth the simple easily understood reason for our being in Korea? We are battling on that little peninsula on

the other side of the globe for the same cause that drew us into two world wars to repel an attack on the peace of the world, which necessarily involves the peace of the United States.

When Napoleon said that the moral is as 3 to 1 in comparison with the material element in warfare, he confirmed Shakespeare's line, "Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just." Since the GI's have no quarrel with the North Koreans, it is vitally important that they should know why they are killing them and being killed. It is three times more important than guns and tanks and dollars that our people and all the peoples everywhere should understand why we have taken up arms in what may be the greatest and longest struggle in our history.

LOOKING GIFT HORSE IN THE MOUTH

Our purpose in opposing Russia is grossly misrepresented by our antagonists and woefully misunderstood even by those who must be our friends, if we are to win. The recipients of our lend-lease in the war, the Marshall plan aid in peace, and our assistance in rearmament of the Atlantic Pact countries are looking those gift horses in the mouth and uneasily wondering if they are of the Trojan breed.

The world cannot get it in its head that for the first time a great power has risen which needs nothing but to be allowed to prosper in peace, asking for no lands or special privileges. If we say we are fighting for democracy, that word means little outside the United States, the commonwealth of nations and a little fringe of western Europe.

Is our objective freedom? Yes, but that is a far-off hope. There is no bill of rights east of the Rhine, nor south from Pyrenees to the Cape of Good Hope. Our ideal of the dignity of the individual is unknown in central and eastern Europe and clear across Asia. It is even less known from the Mediterranean to the bottom of Africa.

We Americans view communism with such alarm that our more or less socialistic allies across the Atlantic are questioning if there could be some grain of truth in the Russian propaganda that this is a war for Wall Street and American capitalism. A great majority of the people of Asia and Africa, perhaps a majority of humanity as a whole are propertyless, with no land or house and with no freedom to risk, with little else than the rags on their backs. That vast ocean of misery is a perfect fishing ground for the Reds with their slogan, You have nothing to lose but your chains.

The economic system of another country is none of our business. Our legitimate objection to Russian communism is that it is a thinner and thinner disguise for world domination by a barbaric police state. We were just as much against that kind of rule when Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese military clique had the backing of capitalism, and Stalin was on our team. The difficulty of our opposition to imperialism is that Asia and Africa notice that the imperialist powers are on our side.

FOR PEACE BASED ON LAW

We should seek and choose and stick to the largest common denominator of our aims. I venture to say that our central purpose is the building of a peace on a foundation of international law. The policy makers in Washington never were wiser than when they invoked the sponsorship of the United Nations for our intervention in Korea.

Of the 59 members of that organization, 47 definitely lined up behind us, with 6 Arab nations more or less evasive and only 6 others voting "No" on the resolution calling for an enforcement of the peace. If some governments are slow to send merely token reinforcements for the battlefront, we must remember that it will take time to develop the habit of such cooperation. To obtain that time, we are in Korea to save the United Nations.

Had we stood aside while the Kremlin moved its North Korean pawns into the Republic of South Korea, established by the United Nations, that organization would have been doomed to go the way of the League of Nations. The League failed when the European powers turned a deaf ear to Secretary Stimson's appeal for joint action to halt the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931. That was the go ahead signal for Mussolini to pounce on Ethiopia. Next Hitler was allowed to parade unopposed into Austria and then into Czechoslovakia.

All the while the great powers were peeping at the day of wrong through the little hole of appeasement. Just as the GI's are asking why they are being killed in Korea. the French asked in 1938, "Why die for Danzig?" And the British Prime Minister dismissed Czechoslovakia, the Korea of that situation, as a remote, almost unknown country.

PLAYED OUT GAME

In simpler days, a war could be localized and confined to two belligerents, with little injury to others. Nations now are so closely tied together in bonds of trade and communication, that a conflict anywhere breaks the peace of the world and becomes general. War has played itself out in our time. It is a hangover, as much of a delusion as witchcraft ever was.

The last war that apparently, only apparently, paid for itself out of the indemnity extorted from the loser was the Franco-Prussian War, 80 years ago. The Allies in the First World War thought they could make Germany pay the bill. They were going to demand shilling for shilling, ship for ship, and hang the Kaiser. But they abandoned reparations when they found that they would have to lend the Germans the money with which to pay them.

By the time of the Second World War, the victors had learned their lesson, and they have been paying Germany and Japan for losing. No sooner had they knocked out those enemies than they helped them to get on their feet, and the victors have spent millions to repair what they had damaged.

Granted that a warless world is an old dream, modern war has become a nightmare since 1914. In the course of those 36 years it has bankrupted all the great nations, except the United States. A third such catastrophe would make the ruin universal.

If we would stop all this confusing talk about subordinate questions and raise our banner against war itself we would have an appeal to the heart of every father, mother, lover on the planet. Even the Kremlin pays peace the tribute of lip service in its effort to pin the label of warmonger on the United States. Here is the great issue, on which no one would dare openly to meet us, and it is all-inclusive.

With peace, democracy, liberty and higher living standards inevitably would spread abroad. Without peace, democracy would be impossible even here in America and civilization would relapse into chaos.

WANTED: A SPOKESMAN

Calling Malik a liar is a waste of breath in shouting an undisputed thing. Let the State Department, our delegate at Lake Success, and the Voice of America keep the emphasis on world law and peace. This past week 28 Senators, Republicans and Democrats, under the leadership of Senator FLANDERS of Vermont, called for "a psychological and spiritual offensive against the Kremlin" and an effort "to bring the Russian and American people into contact and into relations of brotherhood."

Woodrow Wilson's voice penetrated the "iron curtain" of the German Kaiser, and that was before the radio. His messages and speeches were smuggled over the border by spies and airplanes. Enemy soldiers and peoples were forbidden, under the penalty of treason, to pick them up. But they passed from hand to hand, from mouth to mouth, and sometimes were hidden under the hearthstones of the peasantry, who treasured them as a new gospel of deliverance from war. Finally, it was not to the armies but to the President of the United States that the German and Austrian emperors came with their first offers of surrender.

Where is there a Wilson today? If the West has no such spokesman, the East has in the Prime Minister of India. Pandit Nehru is qualified to become the tongue of the silent masses of a war-stricken world.

Eavesdroppers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Eavesdroppers," which appears in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAVESDROPPERS

Enough has been adduced in the Senate investigation of wiretapping to show that Police Lt. Joseph Shimon was a very busy man prior to and during the Hughes-Brewster controversy in 1947. Whether or not Senator BREWSTER was formally mixed up in the attempts to eavesdrop on the telephone conversations of Howard Hughes and of Attorney Hugh Fulton—and Mr. BREWSTER's explanations so far have not been exactly convincing—it is apparent that a great deal of promiscuous wiretapping was going on. The disclosures fully warrant the spotlight the Senate District Committee is giving them. The Police Department has taken no action against Lieutenant Shimon, and the Department of Justice report of a year or so ago apparently was flubbed by the United States attorney. Even though a Federal grand jury earlier this month declined to indict Lieutenant Shimon before the statute of limitations expired, it is imperative for Congress and the public to know just what has been going on. Incidentally, in our opinion, there also is plenty of ground for police trial board action against Lieutenant Shimon.

The fact is that there is no legal basis for wiretapping of this sort, and even the wiretapping engaged in by the FBI in espionage and kidnapping cases rests on shadowy ground. The Federal Communications Act states flatly: "No person, not being authorized by the sender, shall intercept any communication and divulge * * * the contents." A letter from President Roosevelt in 1941 commenting on another piece of proposed legislation is used by the Attorney General to authorize wiretapping in criminal cases. But the Communications Act has not been changed, and the Supreme Court has interpreted the act to mean that there shall be no tapping and divulgence even if the divulgence is only to another person in a law-enforcement agency. The water has been muddied, to be sure, by a later mischievous decision by District Judge Holtzoff. But, in any case, as a private hired agent Lieutenant

Shimon could hardly have tapped wires for any purpose except to divulge the information he obtained.

What all this points to is the need for clarification of the law by Congress. It is obvious that a great deal of wiretapping is practiced, not only by law-enforcement bodies, but also by Federal agencies having little relation to law enforcement and by individuals such as Lieutenant Shimon, acting in a private capacity. The reason is that there now is no middle ground between an absolute ban on wiretapping and the flagrant evasion of the law by private busybodies. What is necessary is legal recognition that there is a need for wiretapping in extremely serious crimes but that it must be conducted within the search and seizure provisions of the fourth amendment. In other words, wiretapping ought to be permitted only when law-enforcement agencies obtain what is tantmount to a court warrant.

Chairman NEELY of the Senate District Committee has indicated that a bill to control wiretapping will be offered this week. Reportedly, it will be modeled on the New York law, which authorizes wiretapping by law-enforcement agencies but only with the assent of a judge in each specific instance. Such a law would not, of course, sanction the kind of private snooping for hire that Lieutenant Shimon has engaged in. We hope that Congress will take up the matter and that it will make whatever clarification it decides upon applicable not only to the District but to the Nation at large. A law which limited wiretapping to certain types of cases with specific court approval would both meet a need and make it easier to crack down on illegal wiretapping. There already has been far too much of this indiscriminate invasion of telephone communication by private ears, and Congress ought to slap stiff criminal penalties on those who take the law into their own hands.

Baltimore Chapter of American Jewish Committee Condemns Tactics of Russian Representative in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Chapter of the American Jewish Committee, through its chapter chairman, Mr. Shakman Katz, has made public its policy of denunciation of the tactics of the Russian representative to the United Nations, Delegate Jacob A. Malik. This message was sent to committee members in 500 cities throughout the United States.

I would like to recommend that the Voice of America use it in penetrating the iron curtain.

It might be well here to call attention to the opening paragraph of the Constitution of the United States:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States.

So begins the Constitution with a statement of purpose. A purpose which if we are to remain a democracy and the peoples of the world are to remain free, we must keep before us.

The gentile and Jewish people—all have banded together, gentiles in the various churches, Catholics, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Mormans have spoken. It makes no difference, the theme is unity and the purpose is to obtain peace. We are all Americans, and as Americans we support the United Nations drive to obtain for all citizens the individual dignity which liberty assures now and forever.

Only an informed public can combat the untruths and obstructionist tactics for those who work and speak for Russia. We believe in God and His omnipotent power. The Communists do not. We believe in peace. The United Nations is an instrument of all peace-loving nations.

The American Jewish Committee, through the national president, Mr. Jacob Blaustein, has enunciated the following:

[From the Baltimore Sun of August 27, 1950]

JEWISH GROUP ATTACKS REDS—SEEKS TO EXPOSE DISTORTIONS IN UN DISCUSSIONS

Exposure of Communist distortions of facts in United Nations discussions has been a major objective of the Baltimore chapter of the American Jewish Committee, Shakman Katz, chapter chairman, announced yesterday.

The declaration of policy of the local unit follows a denunciation of the tactics of Soviet Delegate Jakob A. Malik by Jacob Blaustein, national president of the committee.

In a special message to committee members in 500 cities, Mr. Blaustein warned that only an informed public opinion can prevent the obstructionist tactics of the Russian delegate from succeeding.

"There is a danger that a large segment of the world's population is being swayed by false statements issuing from Communist sources, and particularly from the rostrum of the United Nations, where Jakob Malik has abused the privileges of his office and has misused the hopes for peace of the free nations of the world," Mr. Blaustein said.

"Therefore, I ask that you at once use your own channels of communication * * * to encourage confidence in the United Nations despite the fact that it is possible for one nation to so subvert and abuse temporarily the instrumentalities of the world organizations."

It is a statement that all creeds have adhered to generally with the same devotion to enlightenment.

The Baltimore chapter of the American Jewish Committee is to be congratulated upon its courageous stand and statement, which indicates the awareness of its membership to the dangers inherent in men and philosophies representing the Communist ideology.

Elks Convention at Scranton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Scranton Times relative to the forty-fourth annual convention of the Pennsylvania State Association of Elks held at Scranton, Pa.:

FIFTEEN HUNDRED AT PROGRAM MARKING OPENING OF ELKS CONCLAVE—ADDRESSES AT TEMPLE STRESS AMERICANISM AND TENETS OF ELKDOM—SOCIAL ACTIVITIES SCHEDULED TODAY—OFFICIAL RECEPTION PLANNED TONIGHT

Social activities at the forty-fourth annual convention of the Pennsylvania State Association of Elks continued today in this city following a colorful convention-opening program last night in Masonic Temple attended by about 1,500 Elks and their guests.

The Masonic Temple program keynoted addresses that stressed Americanism and the tenets of Elkdom in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

This morning was devoted to a tour of inspection by delegates and their guests of the giant Murray Corp. plant in South Scranton.

This afternoon is reserved for a theater party and shopping by the ladies and also a visit to the dental clinic for indigent children established by Scranton Lodge 123, convention host.

A ritualistic competition and golf tournament also are booked this afternoon with five lodges competing in the former event in the lodge home. Attorney William Farrel is chairman of the golf tourney at the Country Club of Scranton.

The ritualistic competition centers around teams of officers from the Clearfield, Pottstown, Phillipsburg, Allegheny, and Charleroi lodges.

Tonight, from 6 to 10, delegates and their wives, and grand lodge and State officials will be honored at an official reception in Hotel Jermyn. A buffet lunch will be served, presentations will be made and dancing will follow.

Four anthracite coal souvenir clocks will be presented at the reception to Joseph B. Kyle, Gary, Ind., grand exalted ruler; J. Edgar Masters, grand secretary; Charles H. Grakelow, past grand exalted ruler, and John H. Bennett, Renovo, resident of the State association. The presentations will be made by Mayor James T. Hanlon, Judge M. J. Eagen, District Attorney Carlon M. O'Malley, and Exalted Ruler Ralph Mastriani of the host lodge, respectively.

At the same time award-of-merit plaques will be presented to 66 State association officials by Postmaster Joseph F. Conrad, chairman of the convention committee. Fifty-one similar plaques will be awarded by John Dennebaum, cochairman of the convention committee, to the 1950 convention committee.

BAND CONCERT LISTED

A concert by Cetta's Band will be presented at 8:15 p. m. at the court of honor in front of the Central High School, Vine Street. This will be followed by an official party for grand exalted rulers at 10 p. m. in the Elks Club.

James A. Veras, past exalted ruler of the host lodge, is officer of the day for today's social activities, he is being assisted by Mr. P. Dennebaum, William S. Gould, Exalted Ruler Mastriani, Aaron D. Goodman, and Leo Creegan.

Convention business opens tomorrow at 10 a. m. in Hotel Casey, convention headquarters. Postmaster Joseph F. Conrad, chairman of the convention committee; Mayor James T. Hanlon, Judge M. J. Eagen, and Exalted Ruler Mastriani will welcome the delegates. Scholarship awards will be presented under the direction of the State association.

Visiting women will be entertained tomorrow at 11:30 a. m. at a fashion parade in Hotel Jermyn. Also booked tomorrow is a golf competition at 2 p. m., and banquets of eight division associations in Hotel Casey and

Hotel Jermyn. Drill team competitions and a band concert will be presented starting at 8 p. m. at the court of honor.

WARNS OF ALIEN FORCES

Principal address at the opening program last night in Masonic Temple was by George I. Hall, Lyndbrook, N. Y., past grand exalted ruler, who warned of alien forces undermining the American form of government.

The prelude was by the philharmonic orchestra under the baton of Madea Cetta. Postmaster Conrad introduced the members of his general convention committee, and Exalted Ruler Mastriani presided. Seated on the stage and introduced by Mr. Mastriani were lodge officers. National and Elks colors were posted by the color guard of Koch-Conley Post, American Legion, while Boy Scouts massed the flags of the United Nations. Rev. Leo F. Duerr, Sunbury, State chaplain, asked invocation and Mr. Mastriani led in the allegiance pledge.

Following the pledge, the audience sang the Star-Spangled Banner led by the Schubert Club, directed by Gounod Evans. Entertainment was by the Schubert Club and Gloria McNally Haines, soloist. Marilyn N. Bennett was accompanist.

Mayor James T. Hanlon, member of Scranton Lodge, gave the address of welcome and Rev. Martin H. King, of Georgia, chaplain of the grand lodge, offered benediction.

Mr. Hall at the outset of his address paid tribute to the State association which, he said, shows the "leadership and carries the banner of Elkdom" in the entire association.

He explained what Elkdom is and said that the members of the organization number over 1,000,000 who are concerned principally with Americanism.

"The BPOE is composed of red-blooded Americans of all walks of life who are desirous and determined to preserve American institutions," he declared.

"Nowhere else in the world can man have the freedom of action and expression that we have in America," he said.

"Never forget that this Nation was achieved in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal and created by God and not the State," he said.

AFTER THE PINKS

Charging that the United States has been plagued for years by communism, he declared that "unless we awaken to the fact that we have a fifth column in every city and hamlet in America they are going to take everything away from us that we hold dear, and they are doing it fast."

"The ones I'm after," he said, "are the pinks—they are the ones who are too yellow to admit they are Reds and they stand behind the Constitution of the United States of America.

"They are the ones who wave the flag when they are caught and stand on their constitutional rights," he declared.

Mr. Hall said this type of citizen "should be sent back to the country they claim to love and then sink the boat on the way over."

The speaker asserted that Elks always maintain that the State exists only to serve man. "Wars," he said, "are not acts of God. Wars are made by man and I believe that wars can be done away with—we can do it by sensible thinking—by remembering that man is made by God."

Mr. Hall added that "we must build in the minds of youth the highest regard for their birthright and the deepest desire to preserve the American way of life. We must strengthen the teaching of what democratic principles means and that is free enterprise."

The speaker concluded by charging that pople who don't like our way of life "should be thrown out of the country."

Judge Eagen, who holds the distinction of being the only exalted ruler of Scranton lodge to be elected to two terms, declared in his address that "there is only one 'ism' in the lives of our members and that is Americanism."

JUDGE EAGEN SPEAKS

Judge Eagen's talk on Elkdom in this community follows:

"I hope you won't mind if I delve into a bit of history. The story of Elkdom in Scranton is truly one of the highlights in the life story of this fine, progressive, and friendly city.

"The county of Lackawanna, of which Scranton is the seat, is the youngest of the entire 67 counties in this great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"It was carved out of Luzerne County, April 17, 1878. The cornerstone of the courthouse was laid May 25, 1882.

"Scranton was incorporated as a city April 23, 1866.

"And it was in Scranton on November 1, 1886, that the first electric streetcar was operated.

"Just 3 years later, May 2, 1889, the Scranton Lodge of Elks was founded and chartered at the historic Wyoming House on Wyoming Avenue.

"The lodge had 16 charter members. The last of the group was Judge M. F. Sando, who died a few years ago. He served in the Orphans Court for nearly 50 years.

"The cornerstone of the Elks clubhouse was laid Thanksgiving Day, 1914. During its existence it has been served by 61 different exalted rulers, 30 of whom still survive. Upon these different occasions, 1908, 1922, and 1950, it has had the honor of serving as host lodge to the State convention.

"The watchwords of the great Order of Elks are charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity. Humanity is the key of the order.

"There are the foundations upon which the order is based. These are the magic words which, in the short period of 83 years, have made the Elks the greatest society of its kind in the world. I am proud of my Elks membership. I am proud to be a part of the Elks lodge.

"During its existence the Scranton lodge has proved itself worthy of its affiliation, worthy of its name. Its men are in the forefront of all civil and community endeavors. The names of its members are closely related with the programs and life of this locality.

"A true Elk believes in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Scranton Elks are living examples of what we should all be in this regard.

"This section of God's green earth is known for its friendliness and humane people. Here if one has a joy it is also his neighbor's joy. If one has a sorrow, that, too, is shared by those close by. If one needs help it need only to be known to be answered.

"In short, 'love thy neighbor,' is something more than mere words here. In this section, too, we find very little prejudice and intolerance. Race and creed are considered relevantly unimportant. Race or nationality is taken for what it is—an accident. One's creed it left to a man's discretion.

"It has well been proved that the Scranton lodge has been a potent factor in the bringing about of these happy situations. We have taught our friends and neighbors by examples that we care not whether a man is a Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant.

"All we decree is that he be a human being and 100 percent American. We not only preach charity, we practice it and live it."

ONE ISM IN LIVES

"We are Americans and we love our country. We would die if necessary to protect and serve it. There is only one ism in our lives and that is Americanism. God bless America and God bless the great Order of Elks," Judge Eagen concluded.

The jurist in his address listed the following acts as examples of the part Elks take in welfare here:

Contributed $8,200 for the equipment and maintenance of the Elks nonsectarian clinic at the Catholic Youth Center.

Contributed $2,000 for the equipment and maintenance of youth playgrounds in the city.

Annually spend $3,500 at a Christmas charity party where approximately 250 boys and girls are clothed from head to foot.

Contributed $500 to the Boy Scouts of America for the purchase of movie projector, screen, and films.

Contributed $1,000 to the LIFE campaign.

Have purchased artificial legs and chairs for crippled children.

Have made substantial contributions to the annual Red Cross campaign, infantile paralysis fund, heart campaign, cancer drive, and all other charitable activities.

Make annual visits to the Jewish Home, Home of the Friendless, Friendship House, and Maloney Home on Mother's Day with flowers, and smokes for the men on Father's Day.

PARADE IN RAIN

The Scranton lodge's preconvention parade Saturday night was held as scheduled through central Scranton streets despite a heavy rain that drenched paraders and spectators alike but failed to dampen the spirits of either.

Thousands of spectators including small children held aloft in parents arms braved the rain to watch the 30-minute procession. They sought whatever protection was available, umbrellas, doorways, marquees, etc., but the paraders were less fortunate and just "had to take it."

The inclement weather made the staging of the street demonstration doubtful throughout the afternon and early night and it was not until 8:15 p. m. that the decision was made to hold the parade. This came in order not to disappoint the thousands of spectators.

Max L. Silverman, past exalted ruler and officer of the day, gave the signal for the parade to start and 10 minutes later the marchers, who were marking time waiting for the order, were organized and the parade moved off from the starting point, Wyoming Avenue and Vine Street. It had no sooner started than the rains came again and continued for 15 minutes drenching the marchers and practically all others braving the elements.

Included in the procession were the Scranton lodge's marching club, decorated automobiles, musical organizations. Postmaster Conrad, chairman of convention arrangements, was marshal. John Dennebaum and Sam Druck, cochairmen, and Mr. Silverman were his aides. Among the musical organizations were Madea Cetta's band, which entertained at the Elk's clubhouse prior to the parade; Kemp Post, American Legion, Stroudsburg, drum and bugle corps, which drilled in intricate maneuvers and cadence; Electric City Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, drum corps; Dalton high school band; Waymart drum corps; Raymond Henry Post, American Legion band Olyphant.

Guests and Elk officers, and finalists in the convention beauty show rode in decorated cars.

Earlier Saturdav evening, a "scrap heap dinner" was served in the Elks home in honor of the lodge's past exalted rulers. They were presented plaques in tribute to their services to the association. Past and present State officers and grand lodge officers attended.

Immediately following the parade, Mr. Silverman officially opened the court of honor on Vine Street. He said the court was temporarily closed 28 years ago and "reoponed tonight under a rather dismal setting resulting from the rain."

Judging of parade competitions was made from the court of honors, and prizes were awarded as follows: Crystal Band, East Scranton, $100; Waymart Drum and Bugle Corps, $50; and Kemp Post, American Legion, $25. Erwin Cunningham, Scranton, was awarded a $25 prize for the best decorated automobile.

Judges were Gounod Evans, Harold H. Harrison, Central High School, and Horace Gregory, West Scranton High School.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roger W. Babson:

BABSON DISCUSSES OUR FOREIGN POLICY
(By Roger W. Babson)

GLOUCESTER, MASS.—The country is disappointed by setbacks in Korea and alarmed at the possible prospect of a third world war less than 5 years after the second. Even if we do succeed in Korea, it will not cause enthusiasm among us—only relief. For all thinking Americans know by now that the Russian objective is subjection of the whole world. So, of course, any peaceful solution of the Korean problem can only be temporary. For Russia's policy is to divert America's attention from her strategy, disperse and scatter United States troops as thinly as possible over the globe, and to attack all soft spots everywhere from without and/or within.

PAST STUPIDITY

We may be our own worst enemies. We have been blind and foolish and some among us have even committed treason. Who on behalf of the United States consented at Yalta to the cutting in half of Korea, with Russia given control of the best developed industrial part of the country? Who withdrew United States aid to Nationalist China because Chiang Kai-shek refused to take Communists into the government? China would have been a bulwark against tyranny in the Orient. Who denied the military importance of Korea and Formosa only a few months ago?

Who ordered State Department files stripped of "derogatory" information on employees as early as 4 years ago? Who put Alger Hiss in high position at the formation of the UN and at the world-dividing conference at Yalta? Who partitioned Germany so that the United States, Britain, and France had no access to its main city and capital except by grace of the Russians? Who withdrew our forces from Korea months ago? Who failed to deliver what the non-Communist government asked in military supplies? It doesn't look to me as if our Government has been operating for us. It's actions have encouraged the spread of communism, caused us anxiety of mind, and a lien on our pocketbook.

PRESENT POLITICAL TRENDS

Months ago Senators TAFT, KNOWLAND, and MCCARTHY, among others, called attention to the danger in the Orient and the need for protective action. Today the President still appears loath to reorganize the Government on a nonpartisan basis. There is still a failure to appoint the best brains and ability in the country to the most important administrative positions. Also, there is a general feeling in Congress that all of Russia's friends have not been cleaned out of Government departments.

If a real emergency develops in the near future, we have reason to believe that price, wage, and material controls will go into effect immediately. Yet, it looks as if necessary action would be delayed if possible until after the coming congressional elections. If controls come again, we should let our Congressmen know that we want good judgment and restraint on the President's appointees to control jobs. The American people know now that they were pushed around by quite a few political crackpots of questionable loyalty during World War II.

OUTLOOK FOR COMMODITIES AND HOUSES

The transportation of foodstuffs great distances and possible losses of food-carrying vessels is always to be anticipated under war conditions. Therefore, no curtailing of crop production need be expected in the next year. A sharp crackdown on civilian consumption can be expected before the summer is over. Now may be a good time to buy an automobile; but there is no reason for now hoarding foods, clothing, or shoes. There will be some inventory accumulation in business; but not on a large scale.

The Korean war will tend to make prices fairly firm for the present. This applies especially to foods and livestock. The latter may drop in late summer or early fall. Grains will tend to drop too unless weather or war developments interfere. Industrial materials will rise moderately. This applies to metals, textiles, and building materials. Real estate, especially residential, could have an earlier slump than now anticipated because of an expectation among younger men of being drafted. This could curtail home purchases. All of these are of necessity short-term price trends, subject to the risk of war. If great amounts are now thrown into defense, our Government must cut civilian spending. If not, we are in for more inflation. We all know how dangerous that is.

Hoban Urges Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Scranton Tribune, dated August 24, 1950, which includes remarks by Judge T. Linus Hoban, forty-fourth annual convention of the Pennsylvania State Association of Elks:

HOBAN URGES PREPAREDNESS—CIVILIAN SACRIFICE NEEDED, JUDGE SAYS

The Communist drive for world domination is deadly serious business and a do-or-die proposition for the democracies, President Judge T. Linus Hoban, a brigadier general and deputy commander of the Twenty-eighth Infantry Division, told the Elks Club convention committee Thursday night.

The Elks, as a patriotic organization, must help to lead the civilian population in all-out mobilization of all resources for a fight—military or otherwise—for peace, he said.

The Nation now is facing its most critical period since the War of 1812, when British troops captured the city of Washington, the Judge said, although few people realize they face a greater threat now than ever before in history.

The jurist-soldier reminded the group that communism is the philosophy of a group of nations who feel they must destroy any nation whose ideas conflict with theirs—who must eliminate everything that stands in their path.

"There's no use kidding ourselves," he continued. "They're bent on destroying us. And they'll do that," he said, "unless we react will all the means at our command."

Americans, Judge Hoban said, seem to think they can have all their peacetime comforts and still avoid the impact of this terrible force. "We can't do it," the judge declared, adding "that it is imperative that the Nation immediately mobilize every bit of its resources and manpower."

As a military man, he told his listeners, he will be putting a group of young men through the strictest kind of training—for battle. It may be, he pointed out, that they will be back in 6 months without firing a shot, but we can't bank on that.

With these young men making sacrifice of their time, and preparing to sacrifice their lives if necessary, civilians must be prepared to give up things they think desirable and to support with all their hearts the sacrifices the soldiers are going to make.

"The civilian population," said Judge Hoban, "must acknowledge that we may be hit."

"We must move fast," he said "against that danger."

He reminded them that atomic attack might strike Scranton. And if it should come to other cities first, this city might be forced to care for thousands of refugees.

"All citizens," he continued, "must realize the necessity of preparation—which involves sacrifice."

"And the Elks," he concluded, "must lead in the effort to support the total mobilization of the civilian and military resources of their community."

Labor—As Seen By Victor Riesel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Buffalo Courier-Express of August 22, 1950:

LABOR—AS SEEN BY VICTOR RIESEL

Daily glee in the Daily Worker over the screaming death of our GI's in blood-reddened rice paddies of Korea has so aroused our Federal Security police agencies that it may be only a matter of weeks before leaders of the American Communist Party, editors of the Stalinist sheets and party purveyors of "peace" are indicted for treason.

Even as this is being written, the best legal brains in the Department of Justice are at work trying to develop an airtight treason case against the Communists in this country on charges of giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

Every edition of the Daily Worker, every peace resolution passed by pro-Communist unions, every call issued by those responsible for peace riots on our city streets, every argument used by Communist agents urging slowdowns in our key factories, are being scanned right this minute inside the Justice Department.

Our security police and the Department of Justice have before them the cases of Tokyo Rose, Axis Sally, and Traitor Robert Best, all of whom have been tried and convicted. The burden of their sirupy broadcasts was not to attack the United States but to undermine the morale of our lads and urge them to go home. These air-wave warblings thus gave aid and comfort to the enemy.

Now comes the Daily Worker with actual attacks on our commander in the Orient, on our Air Force, and on our country, in addition to urging that our troops leave the Korean front.

In the Communist press there is real satisfaction over enemy successes, even though these mean the death of our GI's. Lest we forget the stuff the Daily Worker has been printing, I put it on the record, so you can see it as the Justice Department sees it now.

On August 11, the Daily Worker reported with apparent glee that "Korean people supply their army at night." And then followed this headline which says, of course, that the Korean people and not Soviet-trained armies are fighting us, with a Communist China news agency report that the people work day and night to frustrate our B–29's.

Nearly always using Communist news reports, the Daily Worker issues headlines like these across its pages: "Korean civilians slaughtered by MacArthur's bombs * * * MacArthur's secret tactic—slaughter of Korean civilians."

Just as closely scanned by the Justice Department prosecutors are the numerous appeals to labor by such Communist coordinators as Moscow-trained Marcel Scherer, peace petition chief, who constantly showers factory workers in key electronic plants with leaflets and letters smearing our ally, the South Korean government, as being guilty of the bloodiest crimes against the Korean trade-union movement."

The Commies sure are making the most of the liberty we give them here to spread venom against our allies, hatred for our Army, and disdain for our cause.

If this isn't treason, just what is it, as Soviet-Korean shrapnel tears into our men?

Communism Denounced at Elks' Business Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Scranton Times dated August 22, 1950, concerning an address by Joseph B. Kyle, Gary, Ind., grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks, forty-fourth annual convention of the Pennsylvania State Association of Elks held at Scranton, Pa.:

COMMUNISM DENOUNCED AT ELKS BUSINESS SESSION—CALLED POISONOUS CORRUPTION IN BLOODSTREAM OF CIVILIZATION BY GRAND EXALTED RULER—KITTANNING MAN IS ELECTED TO THE PRESIDENCY

Communism is now recognized for what it is and what it always will be—a poisonous corruption in the bloodstream of civilization.

Joseph B. Kyle, Gary, Ind., grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks, so stated today at the first business session of the Pennsylvania State Association of Elks in annual convention in Hotel Casey here.

Mr. Kyle charged in his address that our Nation is fighting a religious war against a godless enemy—communism.

"Elkdom always has been, and always will be, the implacable foe of communism's evil nature and evil designs upon the liberties of men and the peace of the world," he said.

Francis T. Benson, Kittanning, vice president of the State association, was elected to the presidency at today's session, succeeding John H. Bennett, Renovo, who is presiding.

Other officers elected are: H. Earl Pitzer, Biglerville, vice president; William S. Gould, this city, secretary for his thirty-sixth consecutive term, and Charles H. Brown, Allegheny, treasurer for his sixth term.

Otto Grotofend, New Kensington, was elected a trustee for a 5-year term. Marvin A. Swagert, Red Lion, was elected a trustee for 1 year to fill the unexpired term of Mr. Pitzer who was named vice president of the State association.

DELEGATES WELCOMED

The first business session of the forty-forth annual State convention opened with recognition being paid to past presidents and officers of the State association.

Some 450 delegates were welcomed officially by Postmaster Joseph F. Conrad, general chairman of convention arrangements; Mayor James T. Hanlon, Judge M. J. Eagen, and Attorney Ralph G. Mastriani, exalted ruler of Scranton Lodge 123, convention host.

Grand Exalter Ruler Kyle confined his opening remarks to a discussion of Elkdom during which he stated that "fundamentally and positively we need more of the old-time religion in Elkdom."

"Old-time religion," he said, "is the basis of American democracy which is more than a mere form of government. It is a philosophy of life consonant with the natural law and illuminated by divine revelation."

The second phase of his address revolved around world conditions, in which he said:

POISONOUS CORRUPTION

"In the early years of its rise to power in Russia communism's propaganda succeeded in convincing some people, who should have known better, that it was a liberating force that was destined to bring peace and happiness to millions. Recent history has stripped this mask of communism, and today most of those wishful thinkers of a few years ago now recognize communism for what it was, what it is, and what it always will be—a poisonous corruption in the bloodstream of civilization.

"Nevertheless, there are some who are so stupid, or venal, or ambitious that they are willing to sell their country to Moscow. We are in a fight for everything that decent people value, and with the stakes so high we cannot afford to be tolerant of traitors. They must be sought relentlessly, exposed, and punished like any other enemy of society. Neither can we afford to tolerate those who are still so blind that they cannot see communism for what it has proved itself to be. Anyone who persists in collaborating with Communist organizations or in parroting Communist propaganda should not be surprised to find his fellow men united against him.

"Elkdom will continue to be a militant, dynamic force that lives, preaches, and teaches the glory of our Republic. The revolutionary spirit that proclaimed men's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness flames today in the hearts of more than 1,000,000 Elks. It lights the star of fidelity that blazes above the altars of 1,568 Elk lodges throughout America. It is the spirit that urges us to go neither right nor left, but to go ahead."

PLEDGES COOPERATION

"I declare that so great is our devotion to country and its way of life we are all determined, as one, that while there is an Elk left on this earth our country shall never run the slightest risk of prostration beneath the trampling feet of communism or any foreign foe. To that we cooperatively pledge."

MAKES PLEA FOR SECURITY

"Certainly one of the most vital services that any Elks' lodge can render to its community is to make sure that that community is made secure against attempts by subversive groups to weaken and destroy our American way of life.

"Today our order has a greater challenge than during any period of its existence. With the powerful influence of our 1,000,000 members, we can and we must assist in keeping America strong.

"War clouds are hovering over the world again, and in all likelihood our subordinate lodges again will be called upon to assume leadership of the local and national activities wherein they performed such patriotic and unselfish service during two former great armed conflicts.

"Our Nation is fighting a religious war against a godless enemy—communism.

"Elkdom always has been, and will always be, the implacable foe of communism's evil nature and evil designs upon the liberties of men and the peace of the world."

Remarks also were made this morning by J. Edgar Masters, Chicago, past grand exalted ruler and grand secretary; Howard R. Davis, Williamsport, grand trustee; and Charles H. Grakelow, Philadelphia, past grand exalted ruler.

Grand Exalted Ruler Kyle this afternoon had luncheon in Hotel Casey with his eight Pennsylvania district deputy exalted rulers who were appointed recently. They are: Victory C. Diehm, Hazleton; C. H. Ellis, Connellsville; Mark W. Williams, Bellefonte; Meryl Klinesmith, Grove City; Henry C. Carpenter, Lancaster; John Bozette, Coatesville; James Yuengert, Reynoldsville, and Walter Urben, Charleroi. Also present were Lee Donaldson, Pittsburgh, past State president, and a member of the grand lodge activities committee; Mr. Masters and F. J. Schraeder, Pittsburgh, assistant grand secretary.

The district deputies received instructions at the luncheon on the national Elks' new leadership training program.

At this afternoon's business session, scholarship awards were presented by the student aid committee of the State association. The committee comprises Charles H. Grakelow, Philadelphia, chairman; Howard R. Davis, Williamsport; F. J. Schraeder, Pittsburgh; Grover Shoemaker, Bloomsburg; and Dr. Charles V. Hogan, Pottsville.

National foundation scholarship awards were presented to eight Pennsylvania students and State association awards were conferred upon a similar number of students who are selected for these scholastic standing and extra curricular school activities. Each award is $300.

In addition to the national and State scholastic awards, four north central district awards, each for $200, were made.

National foundation student-aid awards of $300 each went to: Adolph J. Yates, Butler; Charles E. Hollerman, Turtle Creek; William Englert, Kittanning; Paul A. McGarry, Warren; Grover E. Shoemaker, Bloomsburg; Theodore B. Moutersz, Harrisburg; Jay F. Sharbaugh, Easton; and James J. Kase, Reading.

State association student-aid awards in the same amount were presented to: Robert Georges, Coraopolis; William J. Hendrixson, Shamokin; Michael Fitzpatrick, McKees Rocks; Blaine Gutermuth, Connellsville; Joseph F. Dienst, Philadelphia; Ruth Jean Diehl, McKnightstown; Jerome M. Creedon, Waverly, N. Y., and Samuel Gilkerson, Bristol.

North central district student-aid awards of $200 each were conferred upon: Charles T. Leasure, Altoona; Beverly Buss, Milton; Mary L. Forbini, Renova; and Marceau C. Myers, Lock Haven.

Other district student-aid awards will be presented in the respective districts of the State association.

Recipients of student awards and their parent-escorts were guests of the student-aid committee at luncheon in Hotel Casey.

Visiting women were entertained at a luncheon and fashion show in Hotel Jermyn. Visiting Elks this afternoon competed in a golf tournament at Country Club of Scranton.

Tonight at 8:30 there will be a drill team competition at the court of honor and this will be preceded by a band concert at 8 p. m. Drill competition today will be by Jersey Shore, Pottstown, Erie, and Carlisle lodges.

The second business session of the 5-day parley will be tomorrow from 10 to noon and will be marked by a memorial program. At noon, delegates and guests will go to Rocky Glen for an outdoor picnic featured by choral competition, athletic events, band concert, circus acts, barbershop quartet singing, games, and finals of the beauty contest. A box luncheon will be served.

Tomorrow night at 8:15 a band concert will be presented at the court of honor, Vine Street, by the Elks Boys Band of Lodge 15, Washington, D. C. A chorus of 50 male voices and a dance group of 35 young men from York Lodge 213, directed by Ralph Whooley will appear. Francis G. Smallbrook is York lodge exalted ruler.

Charles Lebowitz will be officer of the day tomorrow. His aides will be John P. Dennebaum, Patrick J. Manley, Sam Druck, Aaron D. Goodman, and Leo J. Creegan.

Some 450 Elks and their guests assembled last night at a grand exalted rulers' reception in Hotel Jermyn at which grand lodge State and local officials were honored. Recognition for outstanding service was accorded in the presentation of scrolls and certificates of merit.

Anthracite souvenir clocks were given to Joseph B. Kyle, Gary, Ind., grand exalted ruler; J. Edgar Masters, Chicago, past grand secretary; Charles H. Grakelow, past grand exalted ruler, and Mr. Bennett, State president. The presentations were made by Mayor Hanlon, Judge Eagen, District Attorney Carlon M. O'Malley, and Exalted Ruler Mastriani.

PLAQUES PRESENTED

Plaques were given 66 State and national executives and 51 convention committee members. Past Exalted Ruler Dennebaum made the latter presentation.

Postmaster Joseph F. Conrad, convention committee chairman, presented awards of merit to the members of the honorary convention committee: E. J. Lynett, editor and publisher of the Times; M. L. Goodman, co-publisher of the Tribune and Scrantonian; Brig. Gen. T. Linus Hoban, Mayor Hanlon, Judge Eagen, Orphans Court Judge James F. Brady, Congressman Harry P. O'Neill and District Attorney O'Malley.

The Schubert Chorus, directed by Gounod Evans, entertained. Dancing followed. James A. Veras was officer of the day, assisted by Aaron Goodman, Mr. Creegan, Mr. Dennebaum, Secretary Gould, and Exalted Ruler Mastriani.

Scranton has been listed as tops in sociability by Larry Collins, Burbank, Cal., master of ceremonies at performances presented by Scranton Lodge for the entertainment of visiting Elks each night in the Elks Club.

The convention also is serving as the seventeenth reunion of Mr. and Mrs. Orrie Kline, Bellefonte, and Mr. and Mrs. Harry Tompkins, Braddock. They first became acquainted at the State convention in 1933 in Bethlehem and have been meeting at conclaves since then.

Address of Hon. Glenn R. Davis, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, August 26, our beloved colleague, the Honorable GLENN R. DAVIS, of Wisconsin, addressed the Northern Michigan Republican Association assembled in convention at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. His forthright address received the great acclaim of those assembled and I am inserting it in the RECORD for the edification of the Members of Congress. The address follows:

I am glad to be here in the neighboring State of Michigan. Sometimes I have doubted Michigan's neighborly feelings or intentions on the gridiron, but I do recognize in Michigan's furnishing us with our fine football coach at Madison, Ivan Williamson, a neighborly act.

This part of Michigan I know only through the tall tales told me by JOHN BENNETT and CHARLIE POTTER. I regret that John could not join us tonight, but with Charlie here, Michigan's Republican House delegation has a capable spokesman.

In all sincerity, I recognize CHARLIE POTTER, as I know you do, as one of the finest Republicans in Congress. He thinks and talks like a Republican, and when the chips are down he has the guts to vote like a Republican—to vote for what is right for his country even when it hurts. In these days of powerfully organized pressure groups, in these days of shameless raids on the Federal Treasury, it takes more than ordinary determination to vote the way that CHARLIE POTTER has voted in the 3 years that he has been in the House of Representatives. He is my able and helpful coworker. He is your able and helpful Representative in Washington. He is our good friend.

Before going further, I certainly want to pay my respects to your great and nationally known team of Republican Senators—ARTHUR VANDENBERG and HOMER FERGUSON. Not only Michigan, but the entire Nation is fortunate that we need not risk a continuation of the services of either of them this fall. We need them in these troubled days.

These days are indeed troublesome and worrisome. Americans everywhere are bewildered over the state of affairs which finds us for the second time within a decade hovering on the brink of a world conflict. People are looking to Washington for some of the answers. In their letters they write—how did we get into this mess? Why are we so pitifully unprepared? Where did our defense money go? What are we going to have to do now?

It is foolish and dangerous to minimize the threat we face. We are in grave danger from Communist aggression. Let us face that truth, however hard it may be, and whatever sacrifices the truth may require.

It is proper, to begin with, to try to find out how and why we got into this mess—to examine the mistakes we have made which are responsible for our dilemma, so that we may avoid their repetition. The Democrats don't like to have us examine the record of the recent past—to put the finger on the mistakes that were made—because they were their mistakes, and their fair-haired fumble boys who made them. They would like to pass it off by saying "what's the use of crying over spilled milk?" But as Roosevelt the first, Theodore that is, said—we should cry over spilled milk, because only in that way will we make sure that we don't spill it again.

The 5 years of mistakes which led to Korea began at Yalta in 1945. There the ailing President Roosevelt, with Alger Hiss at his side, sold China, the traditional friend of the United States in Asia, down the river. The traditional policy of supporting a sovereign and independent China was secretly abandoned. This betrayal of our Asiatic friend, China, to appease, and, yes, even bribe, our new Euro-Asiatic ally, Communist Russia, was confirmed at Potsdam by President Truman in August of 1945. From then on, to Harry Truman at least, it was good old Joe Stalin but bad old Chiang Kai-shek. A few months later, all aid to the Chinese Government was abruptly halted—no more lend-lease, no more planes, no more ammunition. A loan that had been authorized and earmarked was side-tracked. And why? Why did we pull the rug out from under Chiang Kai-shek? President Truman announced this beautifully wrapped present to Joe Stalin just before Christmas of 1945—we did it because the Nationalist Government refused to admit the Communists, or, as the fuzzy thinkers called them, the Chinese agrarians, into the high councils of its government.

Thus was established a policy for China that in order to get our help the Government must take the Communists in. This was in direct contrast, even though the two later existed side by side, with our policy in Europe of denying Marshall plan aid to governments which let the Communists in.

The fate of China was sealed. If the Communists were admitted they eventually, by sabotage or deception, would take over a government that already had been weakened by 12 years of war. If the Communists were not admitted, then the Nationalist Government would get no more American aid, and could not possibly cope with the Russian-trained, Russian-armed Communists from the north.

With China, the Asiatic heartland, the palm of the Asiatic hand, handed to the Communists by default, it was plain that the pressure would next be directed to the thumb of Asia, the Korean peninsula. When Haberdasher Harry sold the shirt off China's back, he tossed in the necktie for Korea's throat for good measure.

Not only did Truman and his State Department thus assure the isolation and pressurizing of Korea, they cut the small nation in two arbitrarily at the thirty-eighth parallel in September of 1945 and invited the Russians to come into the northern half and take over as masters. Instead of an isolated country, the Republic of Korea became an isolated half-country. From the very first North Korea became a Soviet state, indoctrinated and militarized. With Russian pressure mounting at the thirty-eighth parallel you would have thought that we would have strengthened our position there. Quite the contrary was true. Over the protest of General MacArthur, General Hodge, and his 40,000 American troops were withdrawn, leaving only 500 American technical advisers to aid the South Koreans. The responsibility for this decision, according to the testimony of Secretary of Defense Johnson in recent weeks, rests with the White House and the State Department. The State Department was evidently acting on the advice of Owen Lattimore, who had prepared a memo on this question at the request of Philip Jessup. Lattimore's advice was this: "The thing to do was to let South Korea fall but not to let it look as though we pushed it."

Events since then have fit into that pattern. In September 1949, $10,250,000 was earmarked for military assistance to Korea. Of that, $200 worth was permitted to trickle through until the time of the invasion on June 25. As Syngman Rhee, President of the

South Korean Republic said: "I asked for antitank guns. I did not get antitank guns. I asked for antiaircraft guns. I got none. I asked for ammunition for what few rifles we had. I got no ammunition."

On January 19 of this year, after a delay of 6 months in bringing it to the floor of the House, the much publicized Korean-aid bill was brought to a vote. This is the bill which the national headquarters of the CIO and the Democratic National Committee are attempting to use as a smoke screen to cover the obvious inadequacies of the Democratic administration. I suspect that you have heard some of their parroting minions pointing the finger at CHARLIE POTTER and saying "CHARLIE POTTER voted against Korean aid. CHARLIE POTTER is responsible for the Korean war."

The Democratic National Committee were not the first to use the propaganda of telling a big lie and telling it often enough in order to get some people to believe it. There was not a single antitank gun, not a single antiaircraft gun, not a single round of ammunition in that bill. Instead it provided for funds for power plants, for insecticides, for fertilizer. All the aid was purely economic. None of it was military. The Republican members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in the minority report, correctly and truthfully said: "Unless this Nation is prepared to meet force with comparable force, economic assistance cannot of itself insure the safety or the integrity of South Korea. To the contrary, there is every reason to believe that the lending of economic assistance at this time would only enhance the prize to be taken by force of arms and internal intrigue. Our forces, with the exception of an advisory mission, have been withdrawn from South Korea at the very instant when logic and common sense both demanded no retreat."

To cover the disorder of the retreat, the Democratic leaders chose to maintain a bold front. Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, the Democratic leader of the House, said, "We established the Korean Republic * * * it is capable of resisting any aggression from North Korea." Democratic Representative JOHN KEE, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee said, "The testimony before our committee was that the Republic of South Korea is today in a condition where it has the power and ability to take care of that situation insofar as invasion from any country north of it is concerned."

The shame and the hypocrisy of this squirt-gun Korean aid measure was exposed by Republican Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, who spent 10 years as a medical missionary in China. In the debate on the House floor, Mr. JUDD said: "There is no question but that there are people in the State Department who think South Korea is doomed as a result in no small degree of our own Government's blunders in this whole area which they want to cover up. They ask us to put up this money now so that if and when the day comes that Korea goes, they will have their alibi already prepared. They can then issue a white paper on Korea and say, 'Well, we did everything we could, and Congress appropriated plenty of money, but the Government of Korea was just so incompetent and inefficient and undemocratic and corrupt, that it failed to hold the support of the people and so collapsed before the Communists.' "

"To those people this bill never was a bona fide effort to save Korea. It is a phony—an attempt to shift blame from themselves to the Communists for the Communist conquest of Korea which they expect. If we make the money available, they can blame the Koreans; if we were not to pass the bill they could blame the Congress. In any case the primary aim to them is to get themselves off the hook in Asia to get an excuse for their failure to save Korea all fixed up in advance."

On June 25 that expected blow fell. The North Koreans invaded all along the thirty-eight parallel. In a swift change of policy, completely reversing the Acheson-Jessup-Lattimore policy, the President ordered our Armed Forces into Korea and ordered the Seventh Fleet to defend Formosa. This at least was action and most Americans applauded it. Besides, it was to be only a police action. The Democratic leaders had convinced themselves and each other that the South Koreans wouldn't need much help. On June 13, 12 days before the invasion, William C. Foster, the Deputy Administrator for the Economic Cooperative Administration testified that, "A rigorous training program has built up a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers, one that is prepared to meet any challenge of the North Korean forces."

Gen. William L. Roberts, the head of the United States Military Commission to Korea testified after the invasion that, "South Koreans were not adequately armed because our leaders feared they would attack North Koreans and thereby embarrass the United States. To prevent them from attacking we gave them no combat air force, no tanks, and no heavy artillery.

These self-satisfied administration leaders had the assurance of Louis Johnson, their colleague who was head of the Defense Department that, "Joe Stalin will know that if he starts something at 4 a. m. the fighting power of the United States will be on the job at 5 a. m."

Americans had a right to believe that we were prepared aside from Louis Johnson's blustering remarks. We had spent $50,000,000,000 from June 1946 to June 1950, the most that any nation has ever spent in times other than actual war. This was for the maintenance of our Defense Establishment. It did not include the billions for assistance to other nations.

Our demonstrated unpreparedness compels us to ask: Where did all the money go? Where are the arms we thought we were buying? The pity of it is that those to whom we have entrusted that responsibility simply do not know.

Some things we have been able to find out. For instance we know that only $1 out of every $7 that we spent for defense has gone for actual arms. That $2 out of every $3 has gone for what the armed services call housekeeping. That we have spent more for civilian employees of the armed services than we have for all our weapons, planes and equipment. That our acquisitions of combat equipment has been less than enough to replace wornout items. Not a single new tank was added to our armament.

What happened to the 25,000 tanks that we had at the end of World War II? Many of them were sold at less than 10 percent of value as surplus. Ten thousand of them simply disappeared into thin air. The Hoover Commission's national security task force uncovered that. Of the 25,000 postwar tanks, in 1948 the Army records accounted for 15,000. The task force reported that the Army was unable to state what had become of the others.

The story of the disintegration and decline of the other branches of the armed services is too familiar to require repetition. The Air Force was reduced to 38 groups in 1946. The Republican Eightieth Congress added $822,000,000 beyond the President's request in order to rebuild the Air Force to a respectable strength. Of that, President Truman impounded $753,000,000. Later Secretary Johnson withheld $243,000,000 more. Thus nearly a billion dollars of additional funds for rebuilding the Air Force were arbitrarily impounded by the President and his Secretary of Defense. Again in April of this year, the Republicans took the leadership in adding $350,000,000 for the Air Force. Until the time of the Korean invasion, none of that money had been used.

The scuttling of our Navy, the cancellation of the carrier *United States*, without previous notice to Admiral Denfeld, the abuse of Admiral Denfeld and his subsequent forced resignation because he dared to speak out before a congressional committee, is indeed a sordid tale. It was the same with the Marine Corps. Secretary Johnson had the Marine Corps headed for oblivion. The corps was permitted to sink to 71,000 men, all of whom, except for a few embassy guards, were kept in the continental United States. The Eightieth Congress saved the integrity of the Marine Corps, but at the time of the Korean invasion it was only at 65 percent of its authorized strength. And so while Acheson flustered and Johnson blustered, ill-equipped and badly outnumbered American men were sent into combat in Korea.

It falls to us once again as Republicans and as Americans to bail out the boat we are in. This has often been our Republican lot in recent times. It's a cinch we can't bail out with the lame excuses of the Democrats. The Truman cronies have soft-pedaled and minimized the "police action" in Korea. Surely no reasonable man can discount the possibility that the conflict in Korea may be the forerunner of world war III. Since that is true, we must prepare for any eventuality. If we prepare and war does not come, we will have been put to the inconvenience and the expense of unnecessary mobilization. If we fail to prepare and the Communists strike at other critical portions of the globe, we shall risk defeat for our country and enslavement of men everywhere. An informed American public, under the leadership of men and women who are not afraid to tell the truth, will be ready to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to assure security.

We must rebuild the military strength which the Democrat leaders have frittered away in the last 5 years. The Marine Corps' maximum effective readiness must be established and its integrity maintained. There must be a remobilized defense establishment that counts its power in fighting men and effective weapons instead of blustering sounds and sounding brass. The badly neglected and deliberately discouraged reserve components of the armed services must be expanded, trained and equipped, and then retained in that status.

Such necessary programs will cost money. American citizens will have to tighten their belts and bear a heavy load. The cost of this security program must be met currently. This action is dictated by our responsibility to future generations and by the need to combat the forces of inflation. Taxes today are already at an abnormal rate and consequently first emphasis must be placed upon the diversion of present nondefense spending to meet defense needs. Spending for activities of government that in ordinary times may be desirable must give way to the greater and immediate needs of the national security. This requires the elimination of all spending not essential for our basic and defense needs.

Thanks to Truman mismanagement and petty bickering among his cronies, the cities, towns, and villages of America today stand almost defenseless in the face of serious threat. This is a matter of urgent necessity and yet our Federal Government has lagged behind. Such progress as has been made thus far can be attributed largely to the initiative, the ingenuity and determination of our local civic leaders.

Each passing day brings us closer to a program of controlled prices, wages, profits,

and credits. Disgraceful hoarding, new strikes and wage demands, unconscionable profiteering are forcing the American people closer and closer to that distasteful necessity. As Republicans, our responsibility will be to insist upon the fair administration of such a program and, most important, to see to it that such controls are revoked once the emergency period is over.

The American people cannot be expected to cooperatively bear these heavy burdens unless they have confidence in the top officials of our Government. They do not have such confidence in the two top officials of the Truman Cabinet. Whether they are self-made scapegoats or Truman-made scapegoats is immaterial. The necessity for restoring public confidence demands the resignation of Dean Acheson and Louis Johnson—now.

It is folly to mobilize Americans for combat against communism abroad, if we fail to take effective action against communism here at home. So far the Truman Democrats have used nothing stronger than pious words and a whitewash brush. The tide is now beginning to turn. No thanks to any of the administration leaders, but thanks to the dogged determination of Republican Members of the Senate and the House, a Communist control bill will probably pass before this session of Congress adjourns. The Ferguson-Mundt-Nixon bill to control subversive activities will reach the floor of the House on Monday. Favorable action not later than Tuesday is assured. Meantime, Senators FERGUSON and MUNDT have wrested a promise from the Senate majority leader that a similar measure will be brought to the floor of the Senate before adjournment.

Of course laws alone will not control communism. We need public officials who are dedicated to the enforcement of those laws—public officials who will not turn their back on Communists, not for the reason given by Dean Acheson in refusing to turn his back on Alger Hiss, but because they want to watch their every move. Too many of our public officials have turned their back on Communists only because they didn't want to see them at their nefarious work.

Fellow Republicans, there are many mistakes of the last 5 years that need to be corrected. Our responsibility now has been well set forth by Dr. Kenneth W. Colegrove of the political science department of Northwestern University. He said, "The best that we can do now is to rally under our President and fight the war to a finish." I agree with that. I also agree with the second part of his statement in which he said, "being sure, however, to replace him in the Presidential election of 1952." To that we will all add a second and more immediate objective that we must elect a Republican Congress in November of 1950. The issue this fall is the same as it has been for several years. Whether we shall continue to follow the policy of vacillation and weakness with regard to communism at home or abroad or whether we shall adhere to the Republican policy of strength and constancy in that opposition.

The world cries and aches for peace. Such a peace we thought we had won 5 years ago. Five years of Truman mistakes have frittered that peace away, spent it, wasted it, lost it. The Truman administration, waist-deep in its own failures, cannot be expected to provide the weapons, the ideas, or the men for the mobilization of American manpower, material, and morale that is our grave need. For the sake of America, for the sake of America's friends throughout the world, we Republicans must fight for and accept the responsibilities of leadership this November. A Republican victory in November will be a victory for freemen everywhere.

Addition to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. Plant at Sunbury, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., through its president, Charles E. Oakes, has announced another large addition to its expanding operations.

It is just another chapter in this progressive company's forward program.

The following newspaper article from the Mahanoy City Record-American gives in detail the program of this fine organization. It follows:

PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT CO. PLANS ADDITION TO BIG SUNBURY PLANT

Pennsylvania Power & Light President Charles E. Oakes today announced another large addition to the company's big Sunbury plant is in the making. As part of the company's long-range plans for meeting any future needs of this important industrial area an additional 125,000 kilowatts of generating capacity has been ordered for Sunbury plant, the added generation to be in service by 1953. The big addition was included as part of the original design of Sunbury plant; fuel, railroad, and other supplementary facilities to serve this increased capacity are already built.

In a press conference today, the utility president stated that Pennsylvania Power & Light will continue to have adequate electric power ready and waiting regardless of how heavily the Nation may call upon central eastern Pennsylvania industry for all-out production. "Powerwise, this area is far stronger today than at the outset of World War II. The present Sunbury plant, together with the additions under way will alone nearly equal the company's total generating capacity in 1941. With electric power the driving force of all industrial production, I believe it important that the public be fully aware of our preparedness for any all-out effort."

Electric power, he said, was in unusually good supply, not only in central eastern Pennsylvania, but all over America. In the Pennsylvania Power & Light service area adequate electric power is available for military as well as civilian needs. Industry, of all types, will have plenty of electricity—and no curbs whatsoever will be required on residential and farm use.

Since the close of World War II, P. P. & L. has added 150,000 kilowatts of capacity, will have 100,000 more ready for early 1951, and expects to have the additional 125,000 kilowatts announced today in service during 1953. These substantial additions will make it possible to take care of customer requirements at least one-third greater than the present record level, and still maintain adequate capacity reserves.

Over the Nation, by the year end, the electric industry will have added seventeen and one-half million kilowatts to the fifty million total capacity at the end of World War II, and by 1953 will have increased its postwar additions by 38,000,000 kilowatts, * * * a total of 88,000,000 kilowatts and an increase of 75 percent over VJ-day. America already has nearly double the electric capacity in service that it had at the outset of World War II, and is producing as much electric power as the rest of the world combined. He also said northeastern United States alone was producing nearly as much electricity as all of Russia.

BIG NEED IS MANPOWER

Asked whether America's electric power resources were adequate for an immediate all-out war effort, Mr. Oakes gave an emphatic "Yes." The limiting factor to greater industrial production, he said, was the number of American workers available, not industrial plants or the supply of electric power to move industry's production lines. "Now employed in American manufacturing, mining, and construction industries are almost seventeen and one-half million people * * * they are presently supplied by the electric industry with nearly 131,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

"Presently unemployed, but available, are about 3,100,000 people. With the total number of workers available determining how much America can produce, the practical approach to immediate higher production is for industry to employ all available workers. Then, as conditions require, work the Nation's industrial plants over longer hours by more two- and three-shift operation, and step up the present 39½-hour workweek. Maximum workweek of World War II was an average of 45½ hours a week.

TO MEET PRODUCTION NEEDS

When industry increases production by going to two- and three-shift operation, the same power plants that supplied the one shift can work on through 24 hours and supply electricity for three-shift operation. If full-scale war production becomes necessary, and the number of workers and work hours are moved up to World War II top levels, industrial electric power consumption would step up from its present 131,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours yearly to 176,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. This increased use of 45,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, is obtainable simply by operating present electric generating plants more hours.

"With all available industrial workers of the Nation thereby accounted for, any furthur war production potential must come, as it did in World War II, from big cut-backs in civilian production. Simultaneously, electric power, presently used for civilian production, would be transferred to war use with no new demands on existing electric generating capacity.

"Full-scale war production also will ultimately require new industrial plants for specialized manufacture of war materials for which existing plants are not adaptable. For this, too, the electric industry has ample capacity * * * better than 50,000,000,000 additional kilowatt-hours are already available for this purpose. It is quite apparent that the electric power supply of the Nation is in excellent shape. America's big problem is to develop sufficient manpower.

"This total of 95,000,000,000 additional kilowatt-hours per year means the present use of electricity by America's major industries can be nearly doubled with no increased electric capacity being required, and without cut-backs in home and farm use."

Mr. Oakes said that in his company's service area the power supply paralleled the excellent national picture.

"From the standpoint of all-out war production," Mr. Oakes said, "the big difference between today and the beginning of World War II, is that in 1940 and 1941, while there were substantial electric reserves over and above the country's requirements of that period, the Nation's total industrial plant was not then operating at full scale, nor was America's productive potential nearly as big as it is today. Now the Nation's industrial capacity is the greatest in history, and while it is already operating at near-ceiling levels on a peacetime basis there are substantial

electric reserves above industry's requirements even though full-scale wartime operations be put into effect around the clock."

Central eastern Pennsylvania was pointed out by the utility president as a strategic location for new industry. At one and the same time it offers, geographically, ready access to our major eastern seaports as well as the defensive advantage of lying inland among a protective series of hills. Among the other advantages are the many means of transportation to and from the area, the wide diversity of industry in so many of the communities served, and the large numbers of skilled workers available.

"The local area," he said, "had a good supply of skilled workers available, and that central eastern Pennsylvania with its large reserves of electric power could quickly return to its wartime responsibility as one of the major arsenals of the Nation."

Scranton Tops in Sociability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Scranton Tribune, dated August 22, 1950:

ELKS ENTERTAINER WHO TRAVELED THE WORLD LISTS CITY AS ABSOLUTELY TOPS IN SOCIABILITY

Hearty plugs for Scranton's friendliness are registered by Larry Collins, Burbank, Calif., master of ceremonies at the performances presented by the Scranton Lodge of Elks for the entertainment of delegates to the 44th annual State convention, friends and visitors.

Mr. Collins runs into superlatives in praising the sociability of Scrantonians, a segment of the world population he never contacted until a few days ago.

And Mr. Collins has been places, many places. He entertained with the USO in the ETO and Pacific during World War II. He moved through Europe, Asia and Africa with name bands in peacetime. He wound his way through all the States in the United States and Canadian provinces. And he even had the honor of being expelled from Nazi Germany during Hitler's heyday.

With all this geography for contrasts he places Scranton as the No. 1 area for enjoyment and a center where "a fellow is made to feel at home in an instant."

"There's something here. I don't know whether the atmosphere has an influence or not. But there's an air of friendliness in the people. It's contagious. It permeates visitors. They are always at home. It appears as though there are no strangers. That quality of sociability premeates everybody. It was inculcated into my person within an hour after I came to Scranton," he declared.

"The Elks stress brotherhood of man. That characteristic is right here in Scranton. It's not only noticeable, it's inescapable," Mr. Collins added.

Mr. Collins said he is a native and resident of Burbank, Calif. He stated he never entertained for the Elks until the last Christmas season at Burbank and he enrolled at that time.

Mr. Collins was with Fred Waring's, Paul Whiteman's and Russ Morgan's Bands. Mr. Morgan is a native of West Scranton.

Participation in the Korean War by Members of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who believes that the best if not the only way to preserve freedom in this troubled world is through the United Nations, I am pleased that the members of this vital Organization are beginning to actively participate in the Korean war. Through the press and radio, we hear of men and material arriving daily at the battle front.

It is not surprising that many of our citizens have been inquiring as to whether or not the United Nations was a name only. This query is natural since at first we were actually furnishing practically all of the troops and fighting equipment.

I am pleased to attach hereto a letter addressed to me under date of August 26, 1950, by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, giving a detailed list of what the several members of the United Nations are doing toward winning the Korean War. The letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., August 26, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: In reply to your letter of August 12, I am enclosing for your information a recent tabulation of the nature and extent of the offers of assistance which other nations of the United Nations have made for use in Korea.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

TABULATION OF MATERIAL ASSISTANCE OFFERED THROUGH THE SECRETARY GENERAL TO THE UNIFIED COMMAND IN KOREA

In response to communications from the Secretary General of the United Nations immediately following the action of the Security Council of June 25 and June 27 on Korea, and again on July 14, at which time information regarding possible additional assistance to the Unified Command, including combat forces, was requested, members of the United Nations have suffered the following assistance:

1. MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Australia: Ground troops; Australian infantry force in Japan to be built up to full war establishment so it can be used at earliest possible date.

Bolivia: Thirty officers of the regular army.

Canada: Recruitment of special infantry brigade.

China: Thirty-three thousand troops.

Costa Rica: Offer of volunteers for preliminary training in the United States.

Netherlands: Company of marines, army company (volunteer basis).

New Zealand: Special combat unit.

Philippines: Regimental combat team of 5,000 officers and men.

Thailand: Combat team of 4,000 officers and men.

Turkey: Forty-five hundred troops.

United Kingdom: Self-contained force of troops.

2. NAVAL ASSISTANCE

Australia: Two ships; 1 destroyer.

Canada: Three destroyers.

France: 1 sloop.

Netherlands: One destroyer.

New Zealand: Two frigates.

Norway: Merchant tonnage.

United Kingdom: Naval forces in Japanese waters.

3. AIR ASSISTANCE

Australia: One RAAF fighter squadron.

Belgium: Aid in air transport from United States to Korea.

Canada: One long-range squadron, including ground crews; complete passenger facilities of Canadian commercial air service between Vancouver and Tokyo on two flights weekly west-bound and equivalent one flight weekly east-bound.

China: Twenty C–45 transports.

Greece: Six transport Dakota aircraft.

Union of South Africa: One fighter squadron.

4. MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

Denmark: Medicaments; Red Cross ambulance detachment.

Ethiopia: Ten thousand Ethiopian dollars for medical supplies.

India: Field ambulance unit; small surgical unit, if needed.

Israel: Medical assistance (certain drugs).

Philippines: Certain vaccines.

Sweden: Field hospital at Swedish expense, manned by Swedish personnel.

5. OTHER ASSISTANCE

Chile: Copper, saltpeter, other strategic materials.

Costa Rica: Adequate sites for air or sea bases and troop quarters or stations in Costa Rica.

Cuba: Essential articles.

Ecuador: Economic support within means.

Lebanon: $50,000 for relief of Korea war victims, particularly wounded UN combatants.

Liberia: Ten thousand dollars in natural rubber.

Nicaragua: Foodstuffs; raw materials such as rubber, personnel (unspecified).

Panama: Use of bases and merchant marine for UN forces; farm land use for assistance in provisioning forces.

Philippines: Copra, cocoanut oil, rice, soap; 17 Sherman tanks, 1 tank destroyer.

Thailand: Foodstuffs, such as rice.

Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, and Venezuela have indicated their willingness to consult with the United Command (USG) with respect to the type of assistance which they might usefully offer. In addition, a number of other states which supported the Security Council action in Korea have informed the Secretary General of their desire to provide assistance within the limits of their resources and have consulted informally with the United States to this end.

Radio Reports From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter

received from a radio broadcasting station:

RADIO STATION KUIN,
Grants Pass, Oreg., August 19, 1950.
Hon. HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ELLSWORTH: Regarding your note to us about your just-concluded Report From Congress series, I'd just like to pass the word on to you that the program was well received in this area. I have had personal contact with many listeners in this area who voluntarily commented on the program. In their opinion, the show was a valuable insight into the goings on back in Washington. In judging the listener reaction to the show, I believe the average person felt a lot closer to the National scheme of things, and gained a little more faith in Government after hearing the show. After all, by the time a story goes through the mill of AP or UP, and gets down to the local level, much of the punch has been lost.

As for my personal comment, I think the whole country would be a lot better off if more of you guys would do the same kind of off-the-cuff broadcast and present them to the folks back home. It would go a long way toward dispelling the idea in people's minds that Government is some kind of an impersonal machine which they are helpless to control, instead of what it is—the voice and will of the people.

Sincerely,

JACK SIVERT,
Program Director.

Anybody Want To Wager Money on Louis Johnson?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, Robert C. Ruark has a faculty for putting more meat in his column, cutting through sentimentality, than any other of our present-day columnists. I wish to insert his article which appeared in the Washington News of August 28:

ANYBODY WANT TO WAGER MONEY ON LOUIS JOHNSON?
(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK.—A "no" bettor, in crap shooting, is a guy who bets against the roller.

When it comes to Mr. Louis Johnson, our Secretary of Defense, I am strictly a no-bettor. Looie Defense said the Korean war will last only 6 to 8 months. I would love to believe it, but Looie said it, and I got to bet no. Looie has an almost perfect record of being wrong.

Looie told us we were in great shape, militarily. He said also we would be in big war business an hour after somebody hit us. He was instrumental in paring the muscle off our Armed Forces. He scrapped a carrier after the keel was laid without mentioning it to the Navy.

Looie passed through Korea with a confident grin. A few days later they threw up a new war. Looie put his faith in gimmick weapons, but forgot bows and arrows for the present Injun skirmish. No, I am not overladen with faith in Uncle Lou. His record is worse than mine at the race tracks.

My faith in politicians of all sorts has shriveled in the last few months. Our Fuehrer, after a steady diet of red herring, suddenly discovers the presence of spies, and sets up a clamor for inner security. Our cloak-and-dagger department seemingly got scooped on the Korean thing, so we installed Walter Bedell Smith as boss.

Henry Wallace shattered my dreams when he offered to grow two bales of cotton to the acre, where three bales grew without his help.

Now Henry has quit his Progressive Party and has even declared war on Korea, and has even come out tacitly for the A-bomb. This is the man who babbled of brotherhood with Russia. It occurs now that even Henry realizes he was wrong. Perhaps we may almost see Paul Robeson stumping for the Republicans.

There was a time when I was absolutely convinced that anybody who could play a musical instrument was impossible to defeat at the polls. But Senator GLEN TAYLOR got licked, even though he sings and plays and uses his family as a prop. This bodes ill for the guitar and has shaken my trust in the voters.

I believed Washington implicitly when they won a paper war with long-distance airplane and a push board full of electronic wonders; now that the bayonet is back and the GI's got it I am muddled. The cootie has come into his own again.

It is just getting tougher and tougher to dump your childish faith into the lap of any one soothsayer. I don't believe Louis Johnson knows much more about when the Korean war will end than you and I—or if it will ever end. I believe everybody is just about as uncertain and as fallible as the next fellow.

I bet "no" on all predictions, and so far the percentage has been against the roller.

Colorado's Mountain Beauty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the popularity of the famous Rocky Mountain National Park which lies in the Second District of Colorado is again recognized by the people of the country.

I am greatly pleased to include with these remarks which I have been granted to extend in the RECORD, a newspaper clipping from the Denver Post of August 24, showing that the one millionth visitor has enjoyed the magnificence of the park this summer and from all indications an all-time attendance record will be set.

For relaxation, for beauty unexcelled, and for the genuine pride that rises in the breasts of all Americans in their great country, it is a privilege for me to add here that Colorado and the West boast proudly of its unsurpassed majestic beauty and extend the famous western welcome to everyone to come to Colorado and see for yourself.

The newspaper clipping follows:

PARK'S VISITORS PASS MILLION

ESTES PARK, COLO., August 24.—Rocky Mountain National Park has passed the million tourist mark.

Park officials said Thursday that the one-millionth visitor of 1950 went through the park's gates Wednesday. She was Mrs. Max Euell, of Mount Morris, Ill. She and her party were given free dinners and boat rides at Grand Lake by park officials who now believe a new all-time visitor record will be rung up this season.

The MacArthur Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's New York Times:

THE MACARTHUR INCIDENT

Following repudiation of Navy Secretary Matthews' reckless advocacy of a "war of aggression" in the name of peace, President Truman is now compelled to deal with an even graver conflict of opinion within his chain of command involving a seemingly growing split between our military and our diplomatic authorities. This conflict, which again imperils the bipartisan character of our foreign policy and exposes it to further assaults by Communist propaganda, has long been brewing. It has, however, assumed unwarranted proportions as a result of the unnecessarily pointed statement issued by General MacArthur on Formosa and the not exactly happy attempt of Mr. Truman to suppress it by ordering the General to withdraw it. General MacArthur obeyed, of course. But the statement had already reached the public, and the Republicans made certain of the widest publicity for it by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is, of course, axiomatic, irrespective of the merits of the controversy over Formosa, that as the White House emphasizes, there can be only one voice in stating the position of the United States in the field of foreign relations, and that voice must be the voice of the President. To determine the foreign policy of the United States and to give expression to it is both his constitutional prerogative and his duty, subject to such congressional limitations as the Constitution may provide. In view of this he may also require that all Government officials, in their own public expressions, stay within the framework of the policy he has laid down.

This applies with special force to our military leaders, who under the Constitution are subordinated to the President as Commander in Chief and are traditionally under civilian control. Any other course could only impair the consistency and continuity of our foreign policy and create a state of confusion which would defeat its effectiveness. President Truman is therefore quite right in repudiating divergencies from his policies within his chain of command, though it may be doubted that the method he chose in the case of General MacArthur was really the best available under the circumstances.

At the same time, while the statement of Secretary Matthews may be set down as a case of bad judgment, the MacArthur incident has far deeper roots which go to the heart of both the world situation we face and Mr. Truman's own conduct of our foreign relations. There can be little quarrel with General MacArthur's view that from a purely military standpoint it would be better that Formosa should remain in friendly hands, lest it become an unsinkable aircraft carrier

and a submarine base for an enemy who from it could endanger the center of our whole defense perimeter in the Pacific and pose a new threat to peace. But in that matter we do not stand alone but are rather dependent upon the suport of other free nations and the United Nations who are not of one mind regarding it.

For that reason, what is militarily expedient and desirable is not necessarily politically wise or possible. The exigencies of military expediency have sometimes ruined nations, and it is still a good rule that generals may propose but that the political authorities must dispose. In that respect Mr. Truman's letter to Ambassador Austin reiterating that the security of the United Nations forces in Korea requires the impartial neutralization of Formosa, but that we have no designs on Formosa and welcome a United Nations investigation of our actions there, goes as far as it is politically possible to go at this time. General MacArthur's tribute to Mr. Truman's action regarding Formosa demonstrates that, as far as it goes, he is in agreement with it.

But there is another factor in the situation, and that is that to a far larger extent than most Presidents in the past Mr. Truman has delegated the conduct and exposition of our foreign policies to his Secretary of State and the State Department without proper coordination of the political and military points of view. The split between them was therefore an inevitable consequence, and General MacArthur's sharp denunciation of appeasement and defeatism which he sees deluding "so many people distant from the scene" is an obvious effort to bring the military viewpoint forcefully to the attention of both the President and the public.

In that respect he may have exceeded his competence. President Truman has in general been right in his foreign policy decisions and courageous in their execution. But it is nonetheless true that he could increase his service to the Nation by taking more active charge of our foreign policy and by doing more in expounding it to both the public and his subordinates, so all would know wither we are going and by what route.

A Solemn Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, a most illuminating article by Columnist David Lawrence, concerning the recent speech by Secretary of the Navy Matthews. I well realize that Secretary Matthews' statement has stirred up considerable controversy and has been officially disavowed, but I also personally feel that Mr. Lawrence is absolutely correct when he states:

Mr. Matthews has involuntarily given everybody, however, a solemn warning.

I feel equally certain that in some respects the real issue before the democracies today is not being met in as forthright manner as is to be desired. The real aggressor at this time must be designated to the world, and unless such is accomplished in all channels, including the United Nations, the sacrifices of those on the battle front may ultimately prove to be in vain. Our course is inescapable, and let us therefore weigh carefully those vital decisions so necessary to the preservation of civilization.

Mr. Lawrence's column reads as follows:

A SOLEMN WARNING
(By David Lawrence)

What Secretary of the Navy Matthews said in his Boston speech about anticipating aggression by counterattack cannot be poohpooed as just irrelevant or indiscreet. For even though he spoke out of turn and has been reprimanded for it in the statement of disavowal issued by the State Department the issue he raised is fundamental and inescapable.

The issue is simply this: Would the American people be willing to see New York or Detroit or any other American cities suddenly destroyed without warning by atom bombs by an aggressor state and then only begin to retaliate by dropping our own atom bombs over the aggressor country?

Must the age-old forms of waiting for a declaration of war by an enemy still be accepted and thus let the aggressor state always possess the horrifying advantage of being able to tell exactly when and where the first blow will be struck?

REALISTIC PHASE OF ISSUE

This is not a new controversy in history and the apprehension it has stirred probably has led to the outbreak of war in cases that might have yielded to peaceful negotiation but it is a realistic phase of international relations which in an atomic era at least cannot be brushed aside as inapplicable to democracies.

The principal criticism that will be made of Mr. Matthews' speech is that he gave the Soviet propaganda bureau ammunition to call us "warmongers." For he said that the time may come when the United States may have to "institute a war to compel cooperation" for peace, adding that while this might be new for a democracy we might have to play a new role—"aggressors for peace."

Although the speech was not cleared through the State Department or White House and should never have been made because it does not jibe with American foreign policy, nevertheless now that the words have been expressed it probably is a good thing to have the Russian press and the Russian people know that the American people are not sitting idly by while a group of evil men in the Kremlin are considering more aggression in different parts of the world. It may be salutary for the Russians to learn that a democracy is debating countermeasures against allowing an aggressor to take the initiative.

THE RIGHT TO INTERVENE

In principle, Mr. Matthews is really saying what the American policy proposals on the international control of atomic energy have advocted, namely that when international inspection is agreed to there should be a right to go into any country and put a stop at once to any intended use of atomic energy for purposes of making war. In the absence of such international control, what shall be the role of democracy?

This correspondent has differed in the past with Mr. Matthews' handling of the Navy Department and has said that a man of different experience should be heading that department but it could well happen that Mr. Matthews' greatest service to his country will some day be recorded as having been performed by speaking out plainly as he did in Boston last week.

The issue is too real and means too much to the lives of many Americans to be softpedaled or ignored. George Craig, national commander of the American Legion, last Saturday raised the same question.

GAZING AT CRYSTAL BALL

It all boils down to the fact that the United States while preparing to defend its cities and its allies is failing to come to grips with the basic question of a sudden attack by the Soivet. Instead all the democracies are doing is gazing into a crystal ball, trying to guess what the Communists may do.

The aggression in North Korea was the turning point in a war against the democracies which began 4 years ago. It's a war that has deprived many countries of their independence, has deprived nationals of other countries of their rights and has infiltrated by devilish means inside free nations, interfering with their governmental processes.

What Mr. Matthews might better have said is that Russia now has started a shooting war of aggression in North Korea and the question before the democracies is whether they will let the true aggressor escape or whether they will sit around the United Nations table treating him as an equal when his hands are covered with the blood of allied soldiers. Mr. Matthews might well have asked when America and her allies will begin formally to name Russia as the aggressor and take military steps if necessary, to bring about the withdrawal of her armies from Germany and other sovereign countries and from areas which Red troops are not entitled to occupy. But even so, it was and is the duty of the President and the Secretary of State to say such things—if they are to be said at all. Mr. Matthews has involuntarily given everybody, however, a solemn warning.

Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, today, in the city of Shelbyville, in the district which I have the privilege to represent, the Fifth District of Tennessee, there begins the Twelfth Annual Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration. This is an event of outstanding and major importance and interest not only in my own State of Tennessee, but for lovers of purebred horses in many foreign countries. The celebration at Shelbyville, which will attract around 30,000 guests and visitors—all of whom are bound together in the close fraternity of a common love of fine horses—will last for a period of 5 days, being climaxed with the crowning of the grand champion by the Honorable Gordon Browning, Governor of Tennessee.

The fine old city of Shelbyville, Tenn.—situated in the heart of the Tennessee bluegrass section—is known—and correctly so—as the walking horse capital of the world. Through the enterprise of the fine citizens of Shelbyville, this national horse show and celebration was started some 12 years ago, attracting the breeders and lovers of the superb Tennessee walking horse.

Since the first celebration 12 years ago, this annual event has grown with remarkable swiftness in scope and interest. However, I want to explain that the beginnings of the celebration were never humble. Even the initial celebration attracted some 4,000 visitors to Shelbyville—the county seat of Bedford County—and scores of fine specimens of the Tennessee walking horse. As I have said, some 30,000 visitors today are converging on Shelbyville and the show which will be held at the beautiful civic stadium will feature more than 1,000 horses from all over the United States, from Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee walking horse—correctly known as the world's greatest pleasure and show horse—originated in middle Tennessee more than 100 years ago. Today its home knows no boundaries. In the past 15 years since the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders Association of America was founded—with headquarters in Lewisburg, Marshall County, also in the Fifth District of Tennessee—more than 20,000 of the breed have been registered. The walking horse is listed by the Department of Agriculture among breeds of light horses—a distinction of high merit since only recognized breeds may be so listed.

The distinctive history of this fine horse goes back for generations when it first began to be developed among the plantation owners of middle Tennessee for several purposes—as a plantation horse—with an easy, ambling gait and straight canter—for pleasure riding—it is the most intelligent, gentlest, and most easily handled of all pleasure horses, and for light farm work. The universal popularity of the Tennessee walking horse lies in those three characteristics—characteristics which make for versatility and interest.

It has been my custom for many years to join with the fine people of Shelbyville and Bedford County, Tenn., in attending this annual celebration and horse show and I had hoped to be able to do so again this year. Since it has turned out to be impossible for me to be present this year, I nevertheless wanted to add these few remarks in the RECORD by way of bringing to the attention of the Members of the House the advent of this great celebration and extending my own greetings to the enterprising citizens of Shelbyville who have promoted this great annual and successful Tennessee walking horse national celebration.

Gen. Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson Should Be Elected to the Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the United Daughters of the Confederacy are seeking to have the name of Gen. Stonewall Jackson placed in the hall of fame at New York University. He has long been and will always remain in the "hall of fame" of universal public opinion, North and South, American and European. Formally listing him with the other great men of America would only be the recognition of this fact, and would add more glory to the judges than to the general.

Gen. Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson owes his fame to his military genius; and probably no other man ever won such enduring renown in so short a time. In April 1861 he was comparatively unknown; in May 1863 he died a world figure, so that paper boys in Europe shouted "Stonewall Jackson is dead." He became famous in only 2 years by doing the things which seemed so impossible that some of his associates at first thought him insane. He was "crazy like a fox," and his men were soon proud to follow him anywhere.

Orphaned in childhood, he was early inured to hardship. He entered West Point with less than the usual education, but by characteristic perseverance worked up from near the bottom to graduate seventeenth in a class of 59—a class which included G. B. McClellan, A. P. Hill, and others who later became distinguished. In the Mexican War he accompanied General Scott to Mexico City and was repeatedly promoted for fighting with distinction.

In 1851 he accepted a teaching position at the Virginia Military Institute and soon afterward resigned from the Army. After about 10 years of mediocre teaching, Jackson entered heartily into the War Between the States, fighting for what he considered essential freedoms.

Fame first came to him at the first battle of Bull Run, where it was remarked that he and his brigade were standing like a stone wall, while others were giving ground. There and then he became Stonewall Jackson. Then came his Shenandoah Valley campaign, which has been summarized thus:

> At the beginning of 1862 McClellan planned a double invasion of Virginia. He was to lead an attack in person on the peninsula, and three armies were to concentrate in the Shenandoah Valley, sweep the region of Confederates, and approach Richmond from the west. Jackson had 17,000 men; four scattered armies opposing him had a total of 64,000. He attacked Milroy at McDowell, defeated him and pursued him northward. Next he fell upon Banks at Winchester and drove him beyond the Potomac. Fremont from the west and Shields from the east, each with more men than Jackson had, and each 20 miles from Strasburg, moved toward that place, hoping to unite and intercept Jackson on his retreat. Jackson was 65 miles from Strasburg; but with his gallant "foot cavalry" he reached Strasburg first, defeated Fremont at Cross Keys and Shields at Front Royal, spread dismay in the National Capital and caused more military damage to the Federals than a defeat before Richmond would have accomplished.

Jackson's further career is briefly related by the same biographer:

> He next moved his men by rail to join Lee at Richmond, and falling upon McClellan's left, helped to force the retreat of the Federal Army from within sight of the Confederate Capital. Then moving rapidly northward, he interposed his Army between Pope and Washington, at Manassas Junction. Second Bull Run, due mainly to Jackson's maneuver, was a greater blow to the Federals than the first battle. It was the same at Fredericksburg, Harper's Ferry, Antietam, and Chancellorsville. His genius impressed itself on every campaign, and he was recognized as the greatest commander that the war had developed. His mere presence struck terror to his foes. It has been estimated by high military authority that his being in command of an army added 50 percent to its effective strength.

Another biographer states that many critics regard the valley campaign of 1862 as the most remarkable display of strategic science, based on accurate reasoning, correct anticipation of the enemy's plans, rapid marches, and judicious disposition of an inferior force in all American military history.

The same writer continues—

> In any list of the half-dozen greatest American soldiers, Jackson is included by virtually all critics.

Dr. Hunter McGuire, Medical Director in Jackson's army, talked, in the years following the War, with some outstanding British military leaders, and he reported:

> I recently heard some of the first soldiers and military students of England declare that within the past 200 years the English-speaking race has produced but five soldiers of the first rank—Marlborough, Washington, Wellington, Robert Lee, and Stonewall Jackson. I heard them declare that Jackson's campaign in the Shenandoah Valley was the finest specimen of strategy and tactics of which the world has any record; that in this series of marches and battles there was never a blunder committed by Jackson; that this campaign in the valley was superior to either of those made by Napoleon in Italy. One British officer, who teaches strategy in a great European college, told me that he used this campaign as a model of strategy and tactics and dwelt upon it for several months in his lectures; that it was taught for months of each session in the schools of Germany; and that Von Moltke, the greatest strategist, declared it was without a rival in the world's history. This same British officer told me that he had ridden on horseback over the battlefields of the valley and carefully studied the strategy and tactics there displayed by Jackson. He has followed him to Richmond, where he joined with Lee in the campaign against McClellan in 1862; that he had followed his detour around Pope; his management of his troops at Manassas; that he had studied his environment of Harper's Ferry and its capture; his part of the fight at Sharpsburg, and his flank movement around Hooker, and that he had never blundered. "Indeed," he added, "Jackson seemed to me * * * inspired."

The English were quick to recognize General Jackson's greatness. In 1875 they sent a bronze statue of the General to the State of Virginia; and the General's leading biographer is the British Professor of Military Art and History, Lt. Col. G. F. R. Henderson. This English military authority compares Jackson with the great Duke of Wellington, and not to the disparagement of Jackson. An English Earl is quoted as saying, "Jackson was in some respects the greatest man America ever produced." Surely we Americans ought not to fall behind those of other countries in our appreciation of this great man.

It is a satisfaction to know that Stonewall Jackson's fame as a military leader

is augmented by his character as a Christian gentleman. His faith in God controlled his life and made him great. Few men in active life have ever come so near to the literal fulfillment of the Apostolic injunction to pray without ceasing. He was so temperate that he generally avoided all stimulants, not only liquor and tobacco, but even tea and coffee. He paid a tithe of his income for religious and charitable purposes. He joined others in Lexington, Va., in teaching a Sunday school for Negro children, and against considerable opposition taught them to read and write. He was faithful as a deacon in the Presbyterian Church.

Yet, although he was so zealous in religion, he was not narrow or bigoted. On a rapid march in which baggage was made as light as possible, tents were to be left behind. But when a Catholic priest said he needed the privacy of a tent in order to perform the duties of his office, the General ordered that the priest should retain his tent, though no one else in the corps had one. He once described an Army service approvingly: "We had a Presbyterian sermon, introduced by Baptist services, under the direction of a Methodist chaplain, in an Episcopal Church." He did not believe that the appointment of chaplains should depend on their denomination, but on their Christianity. Of course we could not ask that the General should be elected to the hall of fame because of his moral excellence, but such nobility of soul is so often lacking in world-renowned military leaders, as for instance Napoleon Bonaparte, to whom Jackson has often been compared, that it is good to know that "Old Jack," as his men lovingly called him, was a Christian gentleman.

Stonewall Jackson's special genius has been thus described and analyzed:

These were the elements which shaped Jackson's distinctive characteristics as a soldier and commander which may be most concisely stated; a natural genius for the art of war, without which no professional training will ever develop the highest order of military talent; a power of abstraction and self-concentration which enabled him to determine every proper combination and disposition of his forces, without the slightest mental confusion—even in those supreme moments when his face and form underwent a sort of transfiguration amid the flame and thunder of battle; a conviction of the moral superiority of aggressive over defensive warfare in elevating the courage of his own men and in depressing that of the enemy; an almost intuitive insight into the plans of the enemy, and an immediate perception of the time to strike the most stunning blow, from the most unlooked-for quarter; a conviction of the necessity of following every such blow with another, and more terrible, so as to make every success a victory, and every victory so complete as to compel the speedy termination of the war.

"His schemes of war were sudden, unforeseen—
Inexplicable both to friend and foe;
It seems as if some momentary spleen
Inspired the project and compelled the blow,
And most his fortune and success were seen—
With means the most inadequate and low;
Most master of himself and least encumbered,
When overmatched, entangled and outnumbered."

Stonewall Jackson was shot by mistake by his own men at the battle of Chancellorsville, and died of pneumonia a few days later. His death may have been a decisive factor in the great struggle. Lee declared that he could have won the battle of Gettysburg if Jackson had been with him. The greatness of his genius is beautifully implied in the prayer of the veteran Father Hubert at the dedication of a Jackson monument in New Orleans:

God, when thou didst decree that the Confederacy should not succeed, Thou hadst first to take Thy servant, Stonewall Jackson.

Mrs. Ina Dillard Russell—An Outstanding American Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently read one of the most beautiful tributes to American motherhood that it has ever been my pleasure to read.

This article, written by James C. Derieux, entitled "Cheaper by the Baker's Dozen" appeared in a recent issue of Collier's magazine.

It tells of Mrs. Ina Dillard Russell, who last May was selected as Georgia's mother of the year. To read the story of Mrs. Russell's devotion to her family and her community, one cannot help but be filled with humility and gratitude to this great woman who has given so much to mankind. Mrs. Russell, who is now 82 years old, is the mother of 13 children, all of whom have in their own right made sizable contributions to their State and Nation.

Somehow, to read of Mrs. Russell's life is to be reminded of the great sacrifices which women have made throughout history in order that their children might live a more worth while and decent life. I highly commend this article to all of you in the knowledge that you will be inspired by it just as I have been. The article follows:

CHEAPER BY THE BAKER'S DOZEN
(By James C. Derieux)

Ina Dillard Russell, the youngest of 13 children and herself the mother of 13, is a frail little lady of 82 who must spend most of her time in bed. But her mind is merry, her heart gay, and the colors of her sunset are as bright as the flowers she loves. All her children are grown now, and doing well. There no longer is need for her to make the rounds on blustery nights to be sure they are covered; no need to sew by the light of an oil lamp until past midnight to stay abreast of their needs for rompers and blouses and shirts and skirts and underthings. The day when seven of them had whooping cough at the same time is far away and long ago, remembered only as one of the inevitable adventures and one of the victories along the road of family life.

Last May 11 the town of Winder, Ga., near which Mrs. Russell lives, declared a holiday in her honor. Twelve of her children (all but the Army officer, who was on foreign duty), most of her 33 grandchildren, several of her 7 great-grandchildren, uncensused nephews, nieces, cousins, Herman Talmadge, the Governor of her State, and thousands of others were on hand to celebrate the choice of this great woman as Georgia's mother of the year. It was a wonderful day of speeches, receptions, a parade with floats representing the careers of her sons, and handsome presents of silver. When the day was over, she still was smiling as her anxious children stood around and urged her to rest.

"I'm rested," she said. "I'm having a wonderful time. I did not know my neighbors cared for me like this. I never was able to do anything much for them, except maybe take care of them when they needed me. I had to give so much time to my own children that I never could do all I wanted to do for others. But I have loved them, and it is so good to know that they love me."

The children, to whom she gave so much of her time before her health broke, have rewarded her efforts and her faith.

Her oldest son, RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, named for his father, is now in the United States Senate. Before that he had been Georgia's youngest Governor. Her second son, Robert, is a justice of the United States Court of Appeals, which is next highest to the Supreme Court. Walter is a major in the United States Army. William is a farmer and manager of the old home place. Fielding is head of the English department at the Georgia Teachers College, Statesboro. (William and Fielding are twins.) Edward is pastor of the Trinity Presbyterian Church in Montgomery, Ala.; and Alex is a doctor with a general practice in and around Winder, a small county seat between Athens and Atlanta.

The six daughters all have had a turn at school-teaching. Mary is Mrs. S. Gordon Green, of Alexandria, Va., whose husband is an inventor and small-arms expert employed by the United States Department of Defense; Ina, an attorney, is Mrs. J. K. Stacy, of Washington, D. C., whose husband is an official of Colonial Airlines; Marguerite is Mrs. James H. Bowden of Atlanta, wife of an officer in the Federal Reserve Bank there; Harriett is Mrs. S. Ralph Sharpton of Falls Church, Va., whose husband is with the Maritime Administration; Patience is Mrs. Hugh Peterson of Ailey, Ga., and Washington, D. C., whose husband was for 12 years a member of the Congress and is now in private practice as an attorney; and Carolyn, the youngest of the 13, is Mrs. Raymond L. Nelson, wife of the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Stuttgart, Ark.

The Senator, his brother William and William's capable wife, live at the Russell home, a big white house amidst a grove of pecans, mimosas and numerous flowering shrubs. Robert and Alex live within a few hundred yards in handsome homes of their own. Grandson Bob and his family live in "Newlywed Cottage" on the home place, where a number of other young couples in the family have lived while getting under way. All the children wherever they may be, come home whenever they can to be with the great lady who made the family what it is. She is never lonely. Evenings, now if there is no special family gathering, she enjoys television, including wrestling matches. "I don't approve of wrestlers," she says. "They seem to be so rough. But I will look at them."

The father of this notable family, Richard Brevard Russell, was himself a distinguished man, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia at the time of his death in 1938. But for many years he served on lower benches, and at much less pay than the $7,000 a year he drew in his final years. His family did most of its growing up while he was drawing 3 or 4 thousand a year. For a time, when seven of his children were in college, he left the bench, practiced law privately until he paid his debts, then went back to his robes.

The old judge took little part in the details of rearing his family. His wife was the genius in that field. Usually she had a cook to help, but not always. For a stretch of time she prepared all the meals herself in order to save money and apply it to the building of what is now the family homestead. The judge ordered groceries at wholesale in Atlanta for his own family and for other families living on his cotton farm. His wife kept the accounts, and the old day book shows some interesting notations. For example, it discloses that in the spring of 1912 she personally made 184 garments. Another spring she began to count the buttonholes, but gave up at 190 when something happened to divert her attention.

Through these busy years of sewing, cleaning, cooking, managing, she occasionally found time to hold school classes in her own home. Robert and several of the other children got their primary-school training from their mother.

On Sunday afternoons she played the piano as her family gathered around and sang hymns. Every child had to know the shorter catechism and at the Sunday gatherings each one was called on to recite verses from the Bible. Both the mother and the old judge were generous in praise, and as generous as they could be in other rewards for the children who did best.

Today Senator RUSSELL remembers that, as a child, he did not know mothers had to sleep. His own was up and busy when he went to bed and again when he awoke in the morning. If he became cold in the night, she covered him. If he was sick, she was beside him. "I was nearly 10 years old," he says, "before I saw her asleep. I still recall how shocked I was."

All through the growing-up years Mrs. Russell wrote frequently to children who were away at school, or at work; and many of these letters have been treasured and kept. They are good, long reports on events around the home, with nice touches that doubtless stirred nostalgic memories, or stimulated determination. To a child who was wavering about something she wrote: "We can stand a great deal in this world and stand it well if we have enough grit in our gizzards. You must decide for yourself."

And to one of her sons who had gone away for the first time: "How I do want to see you, but how proud I am that you are sticking it out and not coming home."

To a daughter: "As you know, in growing flowers I never have hothouse plants. I love the kind that can stand anything that comes along. And I love to think of my '13 varieties' growing and thriving and sending out fragrance, beautifying the world."

She thought of her family as a cooperating unit. Many of her letters began: "I have a plan to lay before you," or "What do you think of this?"

In her efforts to have each child develop according to his own gifts and desires, she avoided giving specific directions, but there were many broad hints and principles, such as:

"Take good care of your little sister, but don't worry her with too much watching. * * * My child, cultivate a sweet disposition and practice kindness and gentleness in all things. If you do, you will give genuine pleasure to all you are thrown with. Study and be smart, too. * * * Do your part. * * * Just make others happy and you will be happy. * * * Make people love you. * * * I must say goodby now and make the fires, for it is getting cold. * * * I am constantly thinking of my darling children. * * * You have been a fortunate girl, born with a good little body, a fair amount of good looks and a bright mind. Also you found a fond father and a loving mother awaiting you. * * * You young people can't realize how much you are loved. * * * You must have a place to fill or you would not have been sent into this world. * * * Now don't say 'poor Mama' to me. I do have such a good time."

To a daughter who had written home that she was blue: "And how much exercise on the hoof do you take per day? Walk, walk. There is nothing like it. And your complexion will stay good and you will not be so fat either, when you grow older. Drink, drink water."

And to one who had said she was so tired of being poor: "Oh, my child, that hurt me. You are not poor, unless it is in your soul and heart * * *."

As the children grew up and had children of their own, Mrs. Russell continued to write to them, her letters characterized by the same affirmative attitude toward life. Whenever word came of a new grandchild she responded with as much enthusiasm as if there had been none before. "We are overjoyed," she wrote Mrs. Bowden when a son was born. "We are thrilled. You should have seen Doscia (the cook) when I told her. She picked up a chair and went running around the dining room table, said she had to hug somebody, and as I was seated she hugged my head and I hugged her legs. Daddy was so happy, and Rob and Sybil (Rob's wife), Carolyn, and Dick. It's a great privilege we women have to bring forth human beings. I'm proud and thankful for all of mine."

Notwithstanding all the children, the innumerable visitors, the difficulties of living in a house without central heat, where many fires had to be made every winter day, and where all cooking was done on a wood-burning stove, life in the Russell home was orderly. Every older child was responsible for a younger one. The three oldest were girls, and to this day they point with pride to one brother or another, and say, "You know, he's my boy. I raised him."

IN A SPIRIT OF HELPFULNESS

As older sisters and brothers finished college and began working, they sent money home to younger members of the family to help them along with their schooling. All but one have college degrees. Household tasks were passed down the line, too; the milking from Dick to Bob to Walter and so on to Alex, who was stuck with it because there was no boy younger than he.

Mother Russell set the example for her children by her own strict attention even to the little proprieties. No sloppy—or casual—dressing was allowed at breakfast, or at any meal. Even when she did her own cooking she "fixed up" before coming to the table. The children were required to be punctual, or lose out on whatever was taking place. When, in their reading, they came to words they did not understand, she insisted they make notes of them and look them up before the day was done.

"I made them mind, too," says Mother Russell. "I had to. My goodness, how could I raise 13 if they didn't mind."

In the course of their schooling several of the children lived with relatives in the places where their schools were located, but each time Mrs. Russell sent one off to a sister or an aunt, she told her to "send him back the first time he disobeys."

Judge Russell commuted by train to Atlanta, about 50 miles away, much of the time he was on the bench, and always on the afternoons that he was coming home, whether on the vestibule to Winder or the local to his own flag stop of Russell, the children were bathed and freshly dressed to greet him. He was the honored member of the family. He sat on his wife's right at meals. He always made a nice talk at the table whenever the family was celebrating a birthday; and every year he stood before the Christmas tree and spoke of the meaning of the holiday before distributing the gifts.

Mrs. Russell did not hold back from switching her boys when she thought they needed it. William teases her now by relating that they had plenty of blackberries but no peaches when he was a child because of his mother's demand for peach twigs. But she had other disciplinary methods. A child might be required to sit utterly still and quiet in the clothes closet for half an hour or an hour, depending on the gravity of the crime. Once she taught Fielding, her teacher son, a lesson when he left his tricycle in the hall near the back door. She said nothing about it until dark, but neither did she move it. Then without making a light she told Fielding to go close that door. He started, but fell whammy over his own tricycle.

The Senator, when a small boy, was exceedingly fond of sausage, and often said he never did get enough. After a number of such comments, his mother asked him how much sausage would be enough, and he said he wanted a pound all to himself at one meal. At the next meal he was given a pound and directed to eat all of it. About halfway through he began to weaken, but his mother urged him on until he could stand no more.

Rob made a similar slip about wanting a dozen bananas at a sitting, and Mary, forgetting the experiences of her brothers, said she wanted a whole fried chicken. Mrs. Russell rocks back and forth in bed as she laughs at these disciplinary adventures of long ago. Daily around her bedside there is merry talk of the ways she managed to bring up all of her children. All the Russells are good and lively talkers.

The daughters tease her by insisting she always sides with the men against the women, regardless of the merits of a case, and they tell a story to illustrate what they mean. Once an enraged tenant on the Russell place struck his wife with a kerosene lamp, shattering the glass and spilling the oil. Mrs. Russell heard of the argument and went to the tenant's home to see what she might do. The women was not badly hurt, and after some minor attentions Mrs. Russell admonished her: "You should not have made your husband mad enough to do a thing like that."

Incidentally, the daughters say their mother invariably sides with their husbands even against them, and she cheerfully declares, "Well, the men usually are right."

The doors of the white frame house that is the Russell home have always been open to guests, strangers or not. Visiting preachers more often than not had their Sunday dinners there. Every summer there were house parties when sons or daughters had their school friends in for a week or two. The family jokes now about how their mother could always find more hominy grits for the big pot, and somehow thin the gravy so it would go around; and William, the family's chief jester, says they had signals to indicate the state of the food supply. When someone said, "F-H-B," that meant "family hold back." All of which Mrs. Russell denies, but greatly enjoys.

A HOBO AS OVERNIGHT GUEST

In the first quarter of this century, when hobos and tramps were numerous, the children were convinced that mysterious mark-ings on local railroad water tanks guided itinerants straight to their door. Mrs. Russell gave each one food, and talked with him about his family, and whether or not he ever went to church. Once she horrified her daughters by inviting a hobo to spend the night. They protested. "Mother! You aren't going to let that bum stay here?"

"I certainly am," she said calmly.

So the hobo spent the night, went on his way refreshed and with the knowledge, if he had any moral perception left, that at least one person still had faith in him, and hoped he would do better.

She told these knights of the crossties, as she told her own children, that every person born into this world is here for a useful purpose; and she thinks it is possible that some

of them may have done better after a visit to her home. "Who knows?"

Deeply religious herself, Mrs. Russell often prayed that one of her sons would enter the ministry, but she did not urge any one of them to take that course. "I never tried to influence any of my children to do any particular kind of work," she says. "I just taught each one to find why he is here, and to do the very best he can." So, when Henry Edward Russell became a minister, the decision was his, but the deepest delight was hers. "Edward will be ordained into the ministry tonight," she wrote to an absent child. "It is as thrilling to me as Dick's inauguration as governor."

Another of her great thrills, she says, was when her twins, William and Fielding, were born. "That was the proudest moment of my life up to that time."

Mrs. Russell was born at Farm Hill, Georgia, February 18, 1868, and was teaching school at Athens when she met her husband. She will tell you now that her life from that time on has been peaceful, even calm, and "Oh, so happy!"

She recalls only a few occasions when she was terrified. Once was when Dick had pneumonia. Another was when she thought she had cancer and wondered what would happen to her little children. The time when Mary swallowed her Sunday-school penny, when the horse bit Dick, and Marguerite had to run a mile for the doctor, are but incidents. Of course, such things—like measles—happen in any large family.

Even the summer of 1911, when her husband, the old judge, ran against Hoke Smith and Joe Brown for governor, seems now to have been a peaceful season. She says she did not have time to help her husband much—except by writing several hundred letters—because so many of the children were small then; and that she was not disappointed—except for him—when he was defeated. "I didn't want to take all my little girls to the Capitol in Atlanta in gingham aprons," she explains.

The smaller children were eagerly interested in that political contest. When they heard their father was in a race with Hoke Smith, a rather rotund man, and Joe Brown, who was frail and small, they imagined it a foot race, maybe right down the big road in front of home, and they were sure their father would win because he had such long legs.

That race did not come off the way they hoped it would, but they saw the judge win many other foot races with the morning train to Atlanta. The Seaboard Railroad runs perhaps a hundred yards in front of the Russell home, and to accommodate its frequent and distinguished passenger, a flag stop was made where his lane crossed the rails. There was no agent, and the only way to know when the train was coming was to see it or hear it. So, each morning when the judge was going away a child would be posted at the track to look a mile down the line to a big curve.

When the locomotive came charging in sight the sentry would yell, "Train around the curve," and the assistant sentry would make a dash for the house to warn papa to hurry. Mrs. Russell would look him over to see that he had on all his clothes; Laura or somebody would have a cup of coffee at the front door which he would grab and drink, then light out full speed for the station where three or four or five or six excited, dancing, waving children flagged the train down.

The judge was a devoted and indulgent father, and an adoring husband with the happy habit of expressing his feelings. A letter he wrote to Mrs. Russell after they had been married 39 years begins, "My precious little sweetheart," and ends, "With a sense of love and gratitude that is overpowering, I can only say God bless you, idol of my heart."

His rare ability to express his affection in words is a characteristic of many members of the Russell family. They are a deeply and articulately devoted family.

The old judge never realized either of his great ambitions—to be Governor of Georgia, or United States Senator, but he lived to swear in 33-year-old Dick as Governor in 1931, and see him take his seat in the United States Senate in 1933. He and Mrs. Russell lived with Dick, who was and still is unmarried, in the Governor's Mansion in Atlanta. She was confident at the end of the first year there that her boy was a good governor, but she wanted to be positive beyond any possibility of doubt. So, she went to the one man whose unbiased judgment she trusted completely—her husband and Dick's father.

"I knew he would know," she says, "and I knew he could not tell anything but the truth. When I asked him about Dick he thought a while in silence, to be sure of his answer. Then he said, 'Honey, I have studied the history of Georgia, and I tell you positively that Dick is the best governor this State ever had.' I was so glad to know that. But not surprised."

On the afternoon of December 3, 1938, the old judge, then 77 years old, returned to his home, tired. He said he believed he would lie down a while, and Mrs. Russell went to get some letters just in from several of their children to read to him. But she never finished the letters, for the judge seemed to have fallen asleep. When she went to him, she saw that he had "gone away."

All the children were absent that afternoon, and when they heard the news they feared for their mother. But when they reached home they found her composed—and it was she who comforted them. Her religious faith, that had stood so many other tests, stood this one, too.

She is confident that she and the judge will be reunited, and to one of her sons she has confided that, when she gets there, she hopes to be given the task of caring for babies.

Her faith is absolute and affirmative. There is not a gloomy note in the song of her heart, and rarely if ever a gloomy thought in her mind. To be alive is to her a great privilege; to see the dawn of each day a new and nice adventure.

"Somebody gave me one of those black bands to tie over my eyes and shut out the morning light," she says, "but I never used it. Shut out the dawn. What for? It means another day to get something done."

So, this great lady looks both to the future and the past at 82, and finds both pleasing. She is watched over now by her children, even as she watched over them. The ties that bind them to her are stronger by far than apron strings. They are the ties of admiration, obligation, and love.

Her son, Judge Russell, summed up her influence over her children like this: "She never gave us a chance to fail."

Conditions in the Philippine Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Gerald Wilkinson, a businessman in the Philippines, and vice president of the Philippine association which is seeking to promote Philippine-American relations, made a speech before the Rotary Club of Honolulu, on July 18, describing current developments in the Philippines and the present status of the Philippine economy.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, before coming to the purpose of this address I would like to thank Mr. Trent for his remarks. Our organization in the Philippines has done its best to build up a pattern of industry and trade that may be of lasting value to the Philippine Republic as well as a source of fair profits to stockholders. But as far as my personal hand in this is concerned, nothing I have done would have been possible without the constant support and understanding that we have received at all times from my chief and chairman, Mr. John E. Russell, and from his associates in the leading houses of this city. A man starts with more than good fortune when he represents such a group.

Coming now to the broad purpose of this occasion I indeed appreciate an invitation to speak in Honolulu about the Philippine situation, because few territories can have demonstrated better than has Hawaii, the capacity for living in harmony with other nations and races, and it is humanity of this calibre that is required for a just appraisal of Philippine problems today.

As you no doubt know, the Philippine Islands were revealed to the west in 1521, by Magellan and were named after his master, King Philip II of Spain. For nearly 400 years thereafter, with a brief interruption by my fellow countrymen, the islands lay under Spain's proud hand. This period seems to have brought no striking material advancement to the Philippine people, but it brought one influence of profound and permeating power, Christianity and the Catholic Church. The majority of the Philippine people are Catholic today and I know of no other nation, in the great sweep of Asia and the Indies, where Christianity is the personal faith of so dominant a percentage of the people. As the shadow of an anti-Christian creed darkens the globe, let us not overlook this Christian element in Philippine life.

On the eve of this century, the Spanish-American War resulted in America replacing Spain as the governing power in the islands. Seldom, if ever, can there have been a more beneficial conqueror. The Americans brought in their train, not guns and regimentation, but teachers, the concept of man's liberty, and the encouragement of material development. In the light of present adverse publicity, it is worth remembering that even then many thousands of Filipino insurrectos vehemently resisted the new government and were not brought into the paths of peace for several years.

In 1935 the Philippines entered upon a 10-year transition period with commonwealth status as a preliminary to full independence—a program rudely shattered by Japanese attack. During the 3½ years that followed, the country, bled white by the enemy, was so devastated that when peace came great agricultural areas were found to be abandoned to jungle grass; work animals slaughtered; factories, railroads, and docks burned, bombed, and looted; and major cities unbelievably destroyed.

During the prewar American incumbency of the Philippines, the islands' export production had expanded and almost without exception the Philippine trade produced an annual balance in her favor. Under Japanese hands, all trade perished and when the infant Philippine Republic entered upon full independence on July 4, 1946, in honored fulfillment of America's pledge, she found

herself decapitalized, as well as devastated, with shelves empty save for the surplus arms and military equipment left in great bulk by her liberators, a legacy which, however well-intentioned, has proved a scanty blessing to peace, order, and moral integrity in this, as in certain other countries.

What happened then to the Philippine economy? Very much what would happen to you and me if we were suddenly released from years of suffering to find ourselves on Broadway with cash in our pockets. The Filipino people bought everything in sight from lipsticks to radios, from necklaces to automobiles, from refrigerators to canned beans, and the limited capital construction goods that oversold American manufacturers could supply for distant shipping dates against rising prices.

Since the war, I have heard men, a very few men, say that absolute austerity and rigid import controls should have been immediately imposed by the Philippine Government in 1946, as was the earlier case in Britain. Gentlemen, the example is not a parallel. England, for all her gallant suffering, was not occupied and ravished by an invader. The Philippines were. And any man who, in the maturity of hindsight and a full stomach, states that restrictions should have been applied in 1946 would have been flung from office.

So a spending spree ensued, inflated by hundreds of millions of dollars of United States Army and Navy pay rolls in the Philippines, most of which went out for consumer goods to fill those empty shelves and to replace those tattered clothes. Gentlemen, can you or I presume to judge this?

And so the country's trade, annihilated by war, was resurrected with an import boom coinciding with negligible exports, since the rate of revival of exports cannot be faster than the rate of restoration of fields, the seasons of agriculture, the organization of finance, the construction of damaged factories and homes, roads and bridges, docks, and railroads. Thus the Philippine Republic has registered a gravely adverse balance of trade, reducing her previously ample reserves of dollars and gold to a point at which, at the end of 1949, exchange and import controls became necessary, as they have in many other countries. These controls have necessitated grave cuts in the imports of all goods, cuts ranging up to 90 percent of previous annual averages in certain unessential lines. From the quotas left, a 20- to 30-percent reserve is deducted from foreign importers in many lines of merchandise, under a recent and controversial law, in order that this percentage of quotas may be assigned to new Filipino importers. It is my personal belief that this form of nationalistic expropriation was unwise in timing and impracticable in execution, since while any government can legislate one group out of business with a stroke of the pen and thereby accelerate unemployment while disrupting trade connections, it cannot legislate new groups into business with equal speed and integrity.

But if such legislation is proven by experience to be mistaken, I, for one, look to the good sense of Philippine legislators to correct the position in due time. But it is obvious that this is unlikely to occur soon. For the urge to develop national ownership and to expand national participation in trade is understandable, and it is a deep-seated urge in any people whose independence is recent, and who have not yet had the time to appreciate that foreign capital and foreign management can immeasurably enrich the Filipino people and Filipino capitalists, without impairment of sovereign rights. It is up to us to demonstrate our value and our sincerity in this regard.

Meanwhile, the drastic reduction of imports has caused the unemployment of thousands of Filipinos and foreigners, and many Americans of long standing are now leaving the Philippines for good. Such men, and their families, are unquestionably rendering the gravest possible account of the Philippine situation to their friends in the United States, including reports to Washington. And visiting newsmen, ever alert for an easy-selling simile to the collapse of Nationalist China, are quick to assemble these tales of woe, to combine them with stories of political and war-surplus scandals, and to publicize a ruinous portrait of the Philippine Republic to readers overseas.

Many of these scandals and tales of corruption are true. They are a blot upon the national honor. But which among us shall cast the first stone? Have the western nations perpetrated no abuses upon their own peoples during their painful evolution? Were there no outlaws and no corruption during the early years of American independence? Were there no munitions-contracts scandals in more recent times? Shall we join the stone throwers, or shall we pause and look again at this Philippine scene?

I think that we might look again. For it is well to be fair to one's neighbor, when one's neighbor in Manila in this twentieth century lives nearer to Honolulu in terms of travel and communication than did a neighbor in Hilo when Honolulu's leading firms were founded. A fair review by a mere businessman may not rate an article in the Reader's Digest, but it will disclose some vital points:

For example, we shall find that most of the scandals printed overseas were first uncovered and published in the Philippines by Philippine-owned and edited newspapers of great vigor and independence. Would we prefer an uncritical or silenced press? There is a vigorous and vocal political opposition party in the Philippine Senate and Congress, an opposition that is no more Communist than I am. Do we not applaud such a system in our own countries?

As regards the Huks, to read the papers overseas, one would think that the Philippines was populated by outlaws and that production was at a standstill. This is a gross exaggeration. There are probably 8,000 to 9,000 fairly well-organized Huks, of which the majority are armed, and of which the majority are probably well trained in the concepts of communism. But the population of the Philippines is some 20,000,000 people, and while the problem of internal security requires the closest possible attention, it is not true to state that the government is in risk of early overthrow by force.

As regards economics, the adverse balance of visible trade, while sharply reduced by controls, is likely to continue to be adverse through 1951, although less so than in 1950.

As regards invisible payments, a decline of some 175,000,000 United States dollars in receipts from war-damage compensation and payments to veterans during 1951, by comparison with 1950, will exert grave pressure upon the Republic's dollar reserves, and upon the peso, unless further war-damage compensation or early aid results from the American Economic Mission, a group of the most able and earnest character that is now visiting the Philippines.

But is a neighbor dying because he is sick? Let us see how sick this neighbor really is.

Total Philippine agricultural production rose from slightly over 3,000,000 metric tons in 1946 to just under 6,000,000 metric tons in 1949. Total 1949 production was greater than the production in 1938. The largest single item is rice. In 1946 total Philippine rice production amounted to 1,623,330 metric tons. Last year it had increased to approximately 2,500,000 metric tons. This was also greater than in 1938 but it has not yet overtaken the rapid increase in population, which is rising at the rate of 2.2 percent per annum.

In sugar the total production of the country was less than 85,000 short tons in 1946–47. In 1948–49 it had risen to over 700,000 short tons, and we estimate that the next crop will be not less than 900,000 short tons.

Pineapple exports were at a standstill in 1946, but by 1948 production exceeded 33,000,000 pounds, rising to over 89,000,000 pounds last year, or more than double the output of 1940.

In lumber the monthly average production during 1946 was under 10,000,000 board feet. This production was more than tripled during 1949, when the annual lumber production substantially exceeded the production of 1937.

In aviation the Philippine Airlines, owned and financed within the Philippines, flew approximately 7,750,000 air-miles during 1949. And so far in 1950 this company, with all respect to Pan American's pioneering services, has been the most punctual passenger carrier between Manila and Honolulu. In the total of more than 20,000,000 air-miles of interisland and international service that the company has flown during the past 3 years, only one accident has occurred involving loss of life. There is reason to believe that this accident was caused by factors other than engine defect or incompetence of personnel.

Gentlemen, the foregoing is only a part of the progress I can quote to you. Is this the progress of a dying economy?

So much for the economic tide. There is another tide of equal moment to mankind, the tide that governs the hearts of men. How is our neighbor's heart?

On April 15, 1948, President Manuel Roxas of the Philippine Republic, a few hours before he died, made the following statement in a public speech:

"But if war should come, if God in His supreme wisdom shall will it that the scourge of war again visit the bewildered peoples of this earth, I am certain of one thing, probably the only thing about which I can be certain, and it is this, that in case of a new war waged by the aggressor against the forces of freedom and liberty, Americans and Filipinos will be found on the same side and American and Filipino soldiers will again fight side by side in the same trenches or in the air in the defense of justice, of freedom, and the other principles which we both love and cherish."

Gentlemen, how many other nations in Asia or the west Pacific have said as much to the United States?

And in the light of today's conditions there is another utterance that is remembered in the Philippines. On January 14, 1950, the American Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs stated in Washington:

"Our relations, our defensive relations with the Philippines are contained in agreements between us. Those agreements are being loyally carried out and will be loyally carried out.

"Both peoples have learned by bitter experience the vital connections between our mutual defense requirements. We are in no doubt about that, and it is hardly necessary for me to say that an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States."

The gravity of that pledge to the Philippines, and the generosity that inspired it, are of deep significance. Indeed it is difficult to think of the United States today, in relation to the world, without recalling those lines from Longfellow with which we must all be familiar:

> "Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
> Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
> Humanity with all its fears,
> With all its hopes of future years,
> Is hanging breathless on thy fate!"

Can these lines ever have been more applicable to America in the eyes of the world than they are today? But you will also remember that later in the same poem there comes the following passage which I suggest

might be applied to our thoughts of the Philippine Republic today:

"In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith, triumphant o'er all with thee!"

Gentlemen, if every man who has dealings with the Philippines will be governed, not merely in his words but in his heart, by the spirit of these lines, I believe that he will find an unfailing response in the hearts of the Filipino people.

The Case of Bishop Lajos Ordass, Leader of the Lutheran Church in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, the Lutheran Bishop of Hungary, Dr. Lajos Ordass, was arrested on September 9, 1948, by the Hungarian police. According to press reports, Bishop Ordass and the two high-ranking officials of the Lutheran Church in Hungary were imprisoned on charges of "currency abuses" involving $500,000 in United States currency, which was raised by the United States Committee of the Lutheran World Federation for church relief and rehabilitation in Hungary. It was alleged that Bishop Ordass and his associates had received funds from this country without reporting them to the Hungarian National Bank as a foreign asset, "and it was further claimed that the Lutheran Church in Hungary intended to keep $88,000 of the money in the United States." The government's disclosure of the arrest alleged finally that Bishop Ordass and his associates had "disposed of several hundred thousand dollars without the permission of the national bank and had sold foreign currency on the black market." In addition to these unproven and baseless charges, the government-controlled press also accused Bishop Ordass of having taken a decidedly "anti-democratic political stand" against the government's various democratic measures. In addition he was deemed to be "most unsympathetic toward the blessings of democracy." The Minister of Information, Ernest Mihalyfi, stated that Bishop Ordass had resisted "the humanism which liberated the oppressed and instituted Christ-like equality" in Hungary. Still another drummed-up charge against the bishop was that he "joined Roman Catholics in opposing the present regime."

Late in September Bishop Ordass and the Reverend Alexander Vargas, the general secretary of the Lutheran Church in Hungary, appeared before a Hungarian Workers' Court. At the trial both were formally accused of "foreign currency manipulation," and found guilty. Bishop Ordass was sentenced to 2 years in prison, deprived of his civil rights for a period of 5 years and fined a sum equal to about $255. The Reverend Varga was sentenced to 3 years in prison.

In April of this year the leaders of the so-called "reformed" and "reorganized" Lutheran Church removed him from office, and then asked the Government to "exercise clemency." On May 30 the Bishop was released, after an imprisonment of about 20 months. At the time it was reported that his only desire "at the moment is to retire completely and rest." It was further reported that Bishop Ordass will not be allowed to "resume any work in the Hungarian church."

PROTESTS AND APPEALS IN BEHALF OF BISHOP ORDASS

Very little is known of the circumstances which brought about the release of Bishop Ordass. No explanation is at hand except the request made by the new Lutheran leaders to the Government to "exercise clemency." The Government acceded to a request coming from Lutheran leaders in Hungary, having ignored all previous appeals emanating from official and unofficial quarters in the West. The reason for this attitude is that the new leaders of the Lutheran Church in Hungary are simply government's own creatures, and therefore the Government, in acceding to their request, was actually doing what it wished.

As soon as the arrest of Bishop Ordass was made public by the Hungarian Government, protests and appeals were made in his behalf. The first of these came from the president of the Lutheran World Federation, Prof. Anders Nygren, of Lund, Sweden. In his cabled protest Professor Nygren expressed "great concern" for the safety of Bishop Ordass and declared that "we must learn as quickly as possible what the official reasons are for the detention of this bishop, respected and loved by Christians throughout the world." The United Lutheran Church in America at its sixteenth biennial convention—held in Philadelphia in October of 1948—passed a resolution of protest. At that convention the United States Committee for the Lutheran World Federation was asked to continue its efforts to establish the true facts of the final transactions involved in the charges against Bishop Ordass. The conference expressed the hope that in the light of these facts "the Government of Hungary might be persuaded to review the case and rectify the injustice done to the leaders of the Lutheran Church in Hungary." At about the same time "a strong protest" was sent to the Government of Hungary by the Norwegian National Committee of the Lutheran World Federation. Finally in July of 1949 the executive committee of the Lutheran World Federation, meeting at Oxford, England, adopted a resolution condemning the arrest and imprisonment of Bishop Ordass.

None of these protests, appeals, and resolutions, however, elicited an encouraging response from the Government of Hungary. Even protests and appeals made by our Government and the Government of Great Britain were ineffective. On March 29, 1949, the State Department and the British Foreign Office dispatched vigorous notes to Hungary, charging that country with "repeated, continuing, and notorious violations of peace-treaty guaranties of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms." In this connection special mention was made of the imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Ordass. "By arbitrary and unjustified proceedings against religious leaders on fabricated grounds," read our note of protest, "the Hungarian Government has attempted to force the submission of independent church leaders and to bring about their replacement with collaborators subservient to the Communist Party and its program. Such measures constitute violations of the freedom of religious worship guaranteed by the treaty of peace." In this same note the United States Government called upon the Hungarian Government "to adopt prompt, remedial measures in respect to the violations referred to above." The Government of Hungary not only failed to comply with our request, but on the contrary it intensified persecution of religious leaders, and began to arrest, to keep incommunicado, and to imprison United States citizens.

In 1944 the Red army of Soviet Russia marched into this country, avowedly to liberate it. Communist apostles and reformers rose, attained power, and under the protection of Soviet soldiers, gradually ousted the rightful government of the country. Then the Communists set themselves up as the only and true representative leaders in the so-called people's democracy which they hoped to create.

In this task of establishing a people's democracy in Hungary, Communist leaders knew that they would meet strong opposition on the part of all traditionally established churches, both Protestant and Catholic. Of all the innumerable obstacles which seemed to hinder the creation of a people's democratic state, the effective spiritual influence which the church exercised over the cultural and intellectual life of Hungary appeared to be the most powerful one. But Communists, having once gained control of the Government, in May 1947, drunk with power and reforming zeal, set about their task of communizing Hungary relentlessly and systematically. Their tactics were first to divide the Catholic church and the Protestant churches, and then to set one Protestant sect against another, thereby facilitating the realization of their evil designs. They preached the separation of church and state, but actually what they were after was the subjugation of the church and the enslavement of its leaders. By means of intimidations, arrests, trials, and prison terms they hoped to discredit and to liquidate the church leadership. By installing new leaders into church offices and by expropriating church property, all the effective opposition to the new government was to be eliminated. For these reasons the arrest, conviction, and imprisonment of the Lutheran bishop, Dr. Ordass, of the Catholic primate of Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty, and the Calvinist bishop, Dr. Laszlo Ravasz, became celebrated cases in and out of Hungary.

In this struggle between the forces of good and evil, that of freedom of conscience versus total suppression of freedom, Cardinal Mindszenty appeared to be the most formidable foe of the government. However Bishop Ordass proved to be no less an opponent.

He and his flock did not yield to the blandishments and threats of the government. As has been stated before, Lutheran leaders, knowing that the foe was bent on destroying the free church, offered splendid resistance. "They, more than the leaders of any other Protestant group behind the iron curtain, saved the honor of the Protestant church. As atheistic tempests from the Bolshevist steppes swept over eastern Europe, leaders of some Protestant groups bowed, without glory or spiritual grandeur, eliminating themselves from the roll of high honor handed down from century to century, but the foremost Lutheran leader in Hungary preferred prison and calumny to surrender." In this break with the traditional "Lutheran doctrine of submission to temporal authority, Bishop Ordass proved unexpectedly refractory." When his resignation was demanded by government emissaries, he told them that he would "rather burn in hell" than desert his flock. The Lutheran lay leaders acted in a similar manner. They explained to the government negotiators that only the Evangelical Synod was competent to pass judgment on the nationalization of the Lutheran schools and that no action could be taken prior to the convocation of this supreme governing body of the church. This stand of the Lutheran leaders—their refusal to accept the government's decision to nationalize the schools—rather than the fabricated charge of "foreign currency manipulation" was the real reason for the arrest of Bishop Ordass, Superintendent Radvanszky and Secretary General the Reverend Varga. Incidentally this is another aspect of Communist tactics, that of covering up the real charge against their adversaries and introducing instead false charges. In this connection another factual account of "foreign currency manipulation," is given by the executive director of the National Lutheran Council, Mr. Paul C. Empie, in the Christian Century for May 11, 1949. It is worth summarizing here.

In the spring of 1947 Bishop Ordass came to this country for a 7 week's visit. At that time the council was raising money for church relief and rehabilitation in Hungary. Close to $300,000 was raised, and the whole amount was cabled from New York directly to the National Bank of Hungary. Hungarian Government officials were completely informed about the entire transaction. But the money which Bishop Ordass and his associates were to have had at their disposal in Hungary has never reached them. The Lutheran church leaders in Hungary never received the benefit of this sum sent from here, because by that time the Hungarian Government had already confiscated the Hungarian church's entire financial records, and there is reason to believe that the money cabled to the National Bank of Hungary was also confiscated. Mr. Empie declares that documents in his possession prove that repeated offers were made to Bishop Ordass by the Hungarian Government to drop all charges of financial irregularity if he would endorse the Government's school policy. It was easy for the Government to make this proposal for the foreign currency manipulation story was its own creation. Why then has the Communist government of Hungary brought such a preposterous charge against these most honorable church leaders? The reason is simple. The Hungarian Communists were resolved to ruin these church leaders both physically and morally. One of the most effective methods of discrediting church dignitaries in any society is to bring charges of embezzlement and currency manipulation against them. This is the explanation for the preposterous and fortunately unproven charge against the worthy church leaders of Hungary.

No concessions and compromises are feasible in dealing with the Communists. Concessions, when made, bring forth no benefits because our adversary is out to enslave us spiritually; it is our souls that he wants and not just our physical possessions. And in these days wherever the battle for one's soul is raging the Communist enemy is giving no quarter. Those who indulge in a soft-hearted humanitarian generosity are regarded and despised by Communists as weaklings and feeble souls.

Americans of the Jewish, Catholic and Protestant faiths are united in their respect and affection for this great churchman. All join in the fervent prayer that communism will be crushed in Hungary and that the beloved bishop will soon take his rightful place among his fellow countrymen.

New York Times Correspondent Reports No Large-Scale Communism in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many Members of this House will recall the dire warnings about 2 years ago when the State of Israel was established that the Jewish state would be a hot-bed of communism. Not only was this threat spread far and wide by Arab propagandists in the Middle East, but some of our own officials in the State Department were beginning to believe it.

Now, more than 2 years since the state has been created, we learn from informed correspondents that there are no indications of large-scale Communist efforts in Israel similar to those in other countries and that "Israel's bulwark against communism is simply Zionism." That last observation, incidentally, is also the best reply to those who maintain the gross falsehood that communism and zionism are interrelated or synonymous.

The New York Times of last Sunday, August 27, published an interesting article on the subject from its correspondent in Tel Aviv, Gene Currivan. Mr. Currivan's article Communist Gains Are Few in Israel, is as follows:

COMMUNIST GAINS ARE FEW IN ISRAEL—BUCHAREST-DIRECTED EFFORTS MEET STRONG OPPOSITION IN TENETS OF ZIONISM

(By Gene Currivan)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, August 26.—There is an incipient threat of communism in Israel, but it has not reached the stage where the state fathers are worried. One of the principal barriers against it is that communism is basically anti-Zionist.

The Communist Party itself apparently receives its orders through Bucharest, and it has been apparent that these orders are often delayed to the point of embarrassment.

CROSSED SIGNALS

For example, when Russia declared herself in favor of the partition of Palestine the Communist Party here was violently opposed to partition. On the same day when Andrei A. Gromyko espoused the cause in the United Nations the local Communist newspaper Kol Haam had a story denouncing such a step in the most emphatic terms.

Similarly, when Russia favored the internationalization of Jerusalem, no one had bothered to inform the local Communist Party, and it had demonstrators in the Jerusalem streets denouncing the "imperialistic trick."

Russia has since opposed the internationalization, throwing her local satellites farther afield. When they pull themselves together, there is little left for them to do but try to keep Israel off balance by unemployment demonstrations, insidious propaganda and preying on current discontent among newly arrived immigrants.

HELP FROM MAPAM

Communism is helped considerably by Mapam, the opposition party. To a certain extent the Communists here feel they have a friend in Mapam, but this alleged friendship appears only on the surface.

Mapam is not directed from Moscow and, while the organization has definite leftist and eastward leanings, these are based primarily on idealistic inclinations rather than on a practical Marxian view of things.

Mapam believes that the present government of Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion under Mapai leadership has forsaken its averred neutrality and is swayed completely by the Western Powers.

At the same time, Mapam does not conform to the Communist party line, although it favors an extreme socialism far beyond that admitted by the Ben-Gurion Government, which momentarily is trying to define its own line of the demarcation between primary socialism and democracy as it is known in the United States.

OPPOSING PRINCIPLES

Kipling's phrase, "Never the twain shall meet," may be applied here, as there is little likelihood that Communist Russia can ever become reconciled with the fundamental principles of Zionism as expounded and practiced by the leaders of Israel.

There have been recent instances where Mapam settlements have expelled Communists from their midst because of dissemination of Soviet propaganda considered inimical to the interests of the settlements.

A Communist delegation of three, including one Arab in the Knesset (Parliament), has been ineffectual, although it invariably votes along with Mapam on economic and budgetary problems. On foreign affairs the Communists follow the line dictated from Moscow, while Mapam hesitates but insists on abandonment of the so-called neutrality on the part of the Government and a further leaning toward the East.

NO REAL DANGER

The Communists are being closely watched, especially those among incoming immigrant groups; but so far they have not constituted a real danger. Wherever cells form they are broken up and not allowed to propagate.

There have been so-called Communist demonstrations because of unemployment and there have been agitators who wrecked movie screens because Korean fighting films were shown. But it has rarely been proved that these sporadic uprisings were anything more than the work of over-zealous youngsters who were intent on creating trouble.

There have been no indications of large-scale, organized efforts similar to those that have been made in other countries.

Israel's bulwark against communism is simply Zionism.

The Stake of the Philippines in the Battle for Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very fine statement made on August 3 by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Secretary of Foreign Affairs, before a committee of the Philippine Congress.

This article sets forth the policy of the Philippine Government with regard to Korea and with regard to the decision by the Philippine Government to send troops to Korea as part of the United Nations forces there.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the question of the sending of troops to Korea, His Excellency, the President, has stated the administration's stand in his message to Congress which he read before you yesterday. I, therefore, will not comment on that question. I wish, however, to take advantage of this opportunity to answer what I believe is the query in the minds of our people today: What is the stake of the Philippines in the battle for Korea?

A good approach to an answer would be to consider the larger question: What is at stake in the battle for Korea? The question may be answered on two levels. On the level of international morality, mankind has been called upon to decide whether it is to permit any nation to challenge willfully and by force of arms the measures which the appropriate organs of the United Nations have taken in order to maintain international peace and security. On the level of ideological interest, we of the free world have been called upon to decide whether we are willing to allow any further encroachment by aggressive totalitarian forces upon the free areas of the world. The answer to both questions is "No," and it has been decided to back up that answer, welling out of the aroused conscience of mankind with more than words. The free world has decided to meet force with force.

Our constitution affirms that the Philippines renounces war as an instrument of national policy and adopts the generally accepted principles of international law as part of the law of the nation. As I have stated on more than one occasion, this provision of our fundamental law is a significant milestone in the annals of constitution making. It was the first full and candid statement of a principle that has since become the cornerstone of the modern law of nations.

But the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy meant only that resort to aggressive war would be abandoned in favor of the peaceful alternatives to war. It did not rule out necessary measures of self-defense nor did it prescribe such measures, including the use of armed force, which the international community may take in the common interest to preserve the peace.

The incorporation "of the generally accepted principles of international law as part of the law of the Nation" was an enlightened act. It is, nevertheless, somewhat vitiated by the prevailing vagueness of international law and the long-standing debate as to what are the principles thereof that are generally accepted. For our present purpose, it is only necessary to state that the principle of traditional international law which once sanctioned the resort to force as a necessary concomitant of the concept of absolute sovereignty has yielded, in modern times, to the principle which enjoins the pacific settlement of disputes and the legal regulation of war by international action as a consequence of the newer doctrine of limited national sovereignty. The acceptance of our people of this newer and more enlightened principle of international law is thus implicit in the provision of the Philippine Constitution just cited.

By the terms, therefore, of our own fundamental law, we have a vital stake in the battle for Korea. It is a decisive struggle against the vicious concept of aggressive war as a prerogative of the sovereign state and in favor of the humane principle of the avoidance of war through peaceful conciliation as a primary obligation of the state in the developing system of international organization.

The Republic of Korea is one of the three states (Israel and Indonesia being the two others) in whose birth the United Nations played an active part. The United Nations, therefore, is involved in the fate of Korea by this act of participation. As a faithful member of the United Nations the Philippines shares in the common responsibility which flows from that act. But the Philippines, as a neighbor of Korea, has a special reason to feel concerned. Our country has been represented on the United Nations Commission on Korea from the beginning and it was among the first to extend full recognition to Korea as an independent state. Our support of the United Nations effort to preserve the integrity and independence of the Republic of Korea thus springs indirectly from our membership in the United Nations as well as directly from the intimate relations of sympathy and assistance which our Government has maintained with the government of that unhappy country.

An examination of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter resolves all doubt as to the reason and nature of our country's involvement. Article 2 of the Charter sets forth in the plainest possible terms the basic principles of what has been called the modern law of nations, the seminal doctrines underlying the new system of international organization. It enjoins all member states to fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter and imposes upon them the primary obligation to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered. It requires member states to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. It obliges them to give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and conversely, to refrain from giving any assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action. Further, the entire United Nations organization has the obligation, under this article, to ensure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security. Finally, paragraph 7 of article 2, while expressly prohibiting any intervention by the United Nations in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state, nevertheless exempts from such prohibition any action which may be required to prevent or to cope with actual threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression.

Nonintervention in Korea may not, therefore, be defended on the ground that Korea is not a member of the United Nations nor on the allegation that the fighting there is a civil war. It falls squarely under, and it is the first such case to require the application of the military enforcement provisions of chapter 7 of the Charter.

In further implementation of the obligations which members of the United Nations have assumed under the Charter, the General Assembly unanimously approved on December 13, a resolution affirming the principles defined as crimes against peace the planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of the foregoing.

These are binding principles of international law which our country has accepted by virtue of an express provision of our Constitution and by virtue of our signature on the Charter of the United Nations. They form part of the overriding rules of law to which we are irrevocably committed and to which we owe unswerving obedience.

The final act of the Baguio Conference of 1950 reaffirms the belief of the participating states "in the purposes and principles of the United Nations" and, in particular, in "the need for closer cooperation in an atmosphere of freedom" and "for people to live together in peace and friendship." The Philippine Government at whose instance the Baguio Conference was convened, has a special responsibility in helping to assure the fulfillment in good faith of the principles that were reaffirmed by that conference.

I have so far discussed the battle for Korea as a logical and necessary consequence of our self-imposed obligations under our own Constitution and of our acquired obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. I have dealt with it from a national, international, and regional point of view. We have a stake in that struggle by virtue of our membership in the international community.

But our stake rests upon a more intimate and, in a sense, a more compelling consideration. It was inevitable that the United States of America, in its role as leader of the free world, would assume the major responsibility in the field for any enforcement measures that may be taken in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Our country is similarly bound as a member of the United Nations to offer such assistance to these measures as lies in our power to give. But, our special relations with the United States, which have sprung from a common law of liberty, a shared allegiance to democracy, and a battle-tested comradeship, contribute an element of urgency to our obligation. Pervasive and powerful in peace, these relations exert an even more

potent influence in time of war. And while the spirit animating them need not have required express statement in a diplomatic instrument, it has nevertheless been embodied in at least two formal treaties entered into between the United States and the Philippines: The agreement concerning military bases and the agreement concerning military assistance to the Philippines.

Under the terms of the first-mentioned treaty, the two countries recognized that mutuality of interest in matters relating to the defense of their respective territories "demands that the governments of the two countries take the necessary measures to promote their mutual security and to defend their territories and areas," and accordingly affirmed their desire to cooperate" in the common defense of their two countries through arrangements consonant with the procedures and objectives of the United Nations." In the second agreement, it is stated that "in view of the mutual interest of the two governments in matters of common defense, the President of the United States of America has authorized the rendering of military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines toward establishing and maintaining national security and toward forming a basis for participation by that government in such defensive military preparations as the future may require."

Nobody will deny that the Korean crisis directly impinges upon the security of the Philippines either through the possibility, however remote it may seem at this time, of a physical extension of the area of the struggle or through the other possibility which seems more likely, of a chain reaction of subversive activities in the other countries of the region which might result from the failure of the United Nations effort in Korea. To the extent, therefore, that the security of the Philippines would be threatened by such a failure in Korea, the obligations that are implied in these two agreements would come into force and they would define in stark and naked fashion the nature of our stake in the battle for Korea.

In the meantime, it is well for our people to recognize that our stake in Korea is clearly defined by the basic instruments by which we have established ourselves as an independent nation, as a loyal member of the United Nations, and as a faithful ally of the United States. No compulsion, legal or moral, can be greater than that which flows from these.

Yet, in a larger sense, our obligations spring from a much deeper source. It has become a truism in the modern world that no nation can live by and for itself alone. No event of any importance that happens anywhere leaves the rest of mankind untouched. To paraphrase the seventeenth century English poet, John Donne: "No country is an island by itself but a part of the main; all the nations are involved in one another, and the fate of one influences the fortunes of all the rest. Under the canopy of heaven all nations are kin."

This would be true if what has happened in Korea had happened 10,000 miles away in a remote corner of the globe. But Korea is next door to us and the outcome of the struggle there will have an immediate and unavoidable influence, for good or evil, upon our country. What has happened in Korea can happen here. What we do to help the United Nations effort in Korea is the first premium we pay on the insurance we now must take against the risk of aggression and the threat of force by an implacable enemy.

Gentlemen, these are my views which I have given to you at your request as the policy-formulating body of our Republic, in the hope that they will help guide you in making the decision that you deem best for our people.

The Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown:

CHICAGO, *August 29, 1950.*

Secretary of State Dean Acheson has become a millstone around the neck of every Democratic candidate for Senate and House in this year's elections.

He is the No. 1 political liability of the Truman administration as it faces defeat in so many pivotal States in November as to endanger its control of Congress and perhaps the renomination of the President for a third term in 1952.

As Acheson's reputation as a statesman has dropped below the vanishing point, that of Gen. Douglas MacArthur has risen both as a statesman and a soldier in every State whose political situation has recently been studied by this correspondent.

An inevitable comparison is being made between the man whose policies are held responsible for our bloody misadventure in Korea, with that of the only man able to cope with the sudden war precipitated by blundering in the State Department.

If drafted for the Presidency, this writer believes that General MacArthur could carry every one of these States without making a campaign save the campaign he is now conducting against our enemy in Asia.

Judging by the strong anti-Acheson sentiment encountered in every State surveyed since the middle of July, not only among Republicans, but among Democrats as well, the President must be under heavy pressure from his own party leaders to get another Secretary of State before the November elections.

Republican candidates everywhere are hammering away at him and they are finding the public responsive to their attacks.

Alger Hiss has become almost a political slogan, and the Secretary's unfortunate remark that he would not turn his back upon him is being coupled with the corollary that the President will not turn his back upon Dean Acheson.

The President appears to be in this dilemma: either he must retract his recent news conference statement, to the effect that Acheson would remain Secretary of State as long as he remained in the White House, and accept his resignation, or he must take to the stump in the closing month of the congressional campaign, and defend Acheson and his policies.

Most Democratic politicians would prefer the President to follow the first course, and quietly ease Mr. Acheson out of office.

If Acheson remains, then State Department policy in Korea, China, and Formosa must be defended by the President to give much needed support and encouragement to hard-pressed Democratic candidates who are in the same boat with the Washington administration and can find no way to get out.

In Idaho Herman Welker is making slashing attacks on Acheson, and in large part owes the fact that he won the Republican senatorial nomination in the August 8 primary to this line of criticism.

In Washington State Al Canwell, one of the five candidates there for the Republican senatorial nomination, is demanding Acheson's removal.

In California the State American Legion, 170,000 strong, at its recent reunion at Sacramento, demanded Acheson's impeachment.

The Arizona Legion at its recent convention at Kingman demanded that the State's delegation in Congress work for the immediate dismissal of Secretary of State Acheson, or if necessary, his impeachment.

This action was in sharp rebuff to Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, who had pleaded in person with the Legionaires to forget our past mistakes.

This is the Fair Deal's last line of defense. The Arizona Legion ignored it.

These are only a few straws showing the direction of the political wind.

Meanwhile the Pacific Coast and Mountain States, closest to the war, look to MacArthur as their only hope, finding none in Washington.

The Shortage of Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article entitled "The Shortage of Doctors," by Jean Begeman, which appeared in the New Republic of August 28, 1950:

THE SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

(By Jean Begeman)

The obduracy of the American Medical Association, which for 4 years has deprived the Nation of Federal health insurance, will jeopardize the care of our Armed Forces and the health of all civilians if the present war emergency grows.

President Truman has repeatedly pointed out that the United States needs about 20 percent more doctors and vastly more health technicians, even in peacetime. In spite of numerous requests from the President for Federal aid for medical education and hospital construction, Congress has chosen to listen to organized medicine and its allied lobbies against these measures. A bill sponsored by Representative ANDREW BIEMILLER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, to provide a 5-year program of Federal grants to medical schools to meet the cost of instruction and equipment has been blocked for 2 years by what BIEMILLER has termed "the stalling, twisting, turning, conniving tactics of the American Medical Association." As a result, even the crisis in Korea is straining our supply of trained doctors and nurses.

The Surgeon General of the Army reports that it has been impossible to obtain the 354 doctors for the Army or the 400 doctors for the Navy that were needed immediately following the Korean outbreak. The Army sent 3,000 letters to medical reservists urging them to volunteer for active duty. Twenty-eight hundred ignored the appeal entirely. Out of the 200 who replied, a mere 15 volunteered.

The drain on our medical resources which will take place if the Korean war continues will be staggering. In World War II, many areas already suffering from a shortage of doctors were completely deprived of regular medical service. The Army alone took from civilian practice 46,362 doctors, 14,620 dentists, 57,446 nurses, and 26,305 medical technicians. Our need for medical care in the event of another general war would, of course, make even these numbers insignificant.

Dr. P. J. Carroll, dean of the school of medicine of Creighton University, at Omaha, Nebr., in urging passage of BIEMILLER's bill has pointed out that—

"In the event of another world war, we shall not be able to leave the civilian population without adequate medical services as was done during the last war. There was no conflict or even a threat of conflict within our borders. The next war will be different. Our large cities will be enemy targets and a large part of the population will be evacuated. It will be necessary to disperse our civilian population in small concentrations away from military installations. * * * The greater the dispersion of our people the greater will be the need for more physicians."

Certainly military and civilian needs cannot both be met if some of the privately owned schools, which comprise 42 of the 78 medical schools in the whole country, are allowed to close their doors for lack of funds.

The minimum program which this Congress has before it would provide about $5,000,000 annually for construction of medical-school buildings and equipment, and a sliding scale of grants to schools, for student training, from $39,000,000 the first year to $54,000,000 the fifth. It would make a Federal contribution of up to $500 for each medical student already enrolled and up to $1,000 for each new student. Today a student's tuition pays for just one-fourth of the cost.

Until now, the AMA has been able to block this program without stirring up any vast amount of public indignation. The general public and the average doctor-member of the AMA both accept the fact that the country needs more doctors, more nurses, and more hospitals. But the manipulators of organized medicine have shaped their propaganda without heeding that attitude. On specific legislation, according to insiders in Congress, the AMA has a notorious record of "compromise and then oppose the compromise."

Almost the only organized support for medical preparedness has come from the Committee for the Nation's Health, a small group of independent doctors and citizens who have stood behind all phases of the administration's health program. But the committee is a puny David beside the AMA Goliath—it is able to raise and spend less than a penny for each AMA dollar used to lobby against the health program. "Organized medicine," the committee reports, "last year budgeted over $2,000,000 against the President's program and distributed 55,000,000 pieces of propaganda during those 12 months."

The Association of American Medical Colleges found, on polling its membership, that most of them not only do not agree with the AMA's position but feel a great urgency for Federal aid to the medical schools. Returns from 63 schools showed 47 favorable to such legislation and only 16 opposed. Of 26 State-owned schools covered, 14 favored and 12 opposed. Of the 35 private institutions whose plight is the most critical, 31 were favorable, only 4 opposed.

In its agitation against Federal health protection, the AMA has had the help of the formidable insurance and housing lobbies and the United States Chamber of Commerce, all three of which have spent heavily and distributed in large amounts anti-health-insurance and anti-medical-aid literature.

Crack Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

CRACK DOWN

Just as the purpose of government is to govern, so the business of a President is to lead and to brook no trespass upon his prerogative. Under our system he is the only representative of all the people. Mr. Truman has reaffirmed his role in his crackdown, first on Secretary Matthews and now on General MacArthur, and in so doing has cleared the air both at home and abroad. General MacArthur was creating bewilderment at home and a growing dismay in the United Nations. He was giving the impression that he was a law unto himself. He got away with it in the Roosevelt Administration, but Mr. Truman has shown that he is made of sterner stuff that Mr. Roosevelt, and the people, whose institutions rest upon the principle of civilian supremacy, have reason to be grateful that he is.

Voices have been raised on Capitol Hill that the President has imposed a gag. The publication of the MacArthur speech alongside the news of the Truman action disposes of the charge in this particular matter. This was a Presidential gesture, and a gesture which had to be made before and not after the event, for any ex post facto statement from the White House would have served no purpose except to emphasize that General MacArthur was on his own. This would have been an intolerable situation. What the President has done is to reestablish discipline. Without a doubt the views of General MacArthur are worthy of consideration, but he is out of order in interpreting the policy which he is administering in a way that does violence, whether wittingly or not, to the Presidential intent. He has mistaken his proconsular role as that of first consul, and we have confidence that the American people will see it that way.

Wherein lay the error of General MacArthur? On June 27 the President ordered the Seventh Fleet to neutralize Formosa—by preventing a Communist attack on Formosa and, as a corollary, by preventing a Nationalist attack on the Chinese mainland. He said nothing about defending Formosa. Yet the emphasis in Tokyo has been on defense, and, that being so, a near-alliance has been rapidly growing up with Chiang Kai-shek. It was celebrated by the highly publicized MacArthur visit to Chiang Kai-shek. The mission, and the theatrics attendant upon it, made the policy makers in Washington swallow hard, though, for the sake of appearances, they tried to make out that everything was hunky-dory. Then General MacArthur went too far in a flamboyant speech for delivery to the Veterans of Foreign Wars which he never bothered to clear with the Defense Department and which went out a week ahead of the event. Having already forced the pace on the President, General MacArthur spoke about the defense of Formosa at greater length, warmed up the close relations he had established with Chiang Kai-shek by his hostile reference to the Chinese Communist (though without mentioning either) and told the veterans how the Orientals loved an aggressive policy. There was not a word in the speech about the United Nations, though the policy had been reported to the United Nations and its investigation and consideration invited in furthering the policy.

The difference between the President and General MacArthur is the whole width of the Formosa Straits. Yet there is bland wonderment in Tokyo about the President's attitude. All he has done is to remind General MacArthur who's the boss, get the Truman policy back on the beam so as to remove all the misunderstanding, and stop MacArthur from boxing him in. That is all, and it is about time. What the United States is trying to do in Formosa is to keep the island out of war, not to push it in. It is a most delicate operation, but it was not being helped by the slant that General MacArthur was spectacularly giving to it. The incident is again a reminder of a tendency familiar in our history of forgetting policy when policy has entered a military area.

Let the GOP Show a Positive Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as a great deal of time on the floor of the House is given over to the voicing of political recriminations by members of each party against the other and it appears to many Members of the House and to a great segment of the population of our country that this is not only a waste of valuable time but also a possible advantage to our opposition throughout the world, I believe that an editorial which recently appeared in the Denver Post, a newspaper of national and international influence, is not only interesting but timely. I am pleased to place such editorial in the RECORD in order that each Member of Congress may have the opportunity to read and study this meaningful statement.

LET THE GOP SHOW A POSITIVE POLICY

Washington has the jitters these days. The most casual visitor cannot help but notice it, and shudder at the stupendous confusion that seems to surround our Nation's Capital like a shroud.

The great decision of our time has not been made—the decision of total mobilization or policy of business as usual but with higher taxes and more defense, or partial mobilization.

That decision is most difficult. Unless events force it, the decision will certainly be stalled until after November, for the Truman administration has a great desire not to take strong action unless absolutely necessary until after the ticklish elections.

In the midst of such confusion the Republicans are doing their country small service in the peculiar kind of attacks they are waging on the Democratic administration.

Bitter attack on the Government's foreign policy does not make a great deal of sense when it is remembered that some of the most vital acts in the foreign policy drama were played under the Republican dominated Eightieth Congress in 1947 and 1948.

Republican attacks on foreign policy and our lack of preparedness are made without mention of the loud Republican yapping about continued expenditure for defense after VJ-day. The Republicans now posing as the potential saviors of our Nation, forget that their platform of 1948 contained no criticism of our defense policy, that the most recent Republican statement of policy, made shortly before the Korean affair said absolutely nothing about defense.

The Republicans, we know, were just like the rest of us. They did not know how badly prepared we were, and they did not think to investigate and cry out.

This is no defense of Secretary Johnson's loud-mouthed blundering. It lends no semblance of excuse for our naïveté in believing that we could hope for peace without backing our hopes with force of arms. We must remember though, that this was national naïveté, encompassing the Republicans as well as the Democrats.

When the Republicans scream about inflation, we must remember who killed OPA—the Republican Eigtheth Congress. We must always remember who has shouted for more and more normalcy and less and less foreign spending. We must remember the isolationism, past and present, of Senator TAFT.

The Republicans, as a group, seem little better or worse than the Democrats. The GOP has most certainly failed to fulfill its duties as a loyal opposition, if it could have shown that our defense preparations were inadequate and did no more than it has done about them.

Even Harold Stassen has risen from his political grave to denounce Democratic policies and to try to come alive again as a Republican leader. But Stassen must always be remembered as the man who equated socialism and communism, and in debate with Governor Dewey in Oregon said we should withhold aid from countries that went socialist. Had his policies been followed we would be much nearer war today, at least.

In the specific question of Korea, Americans cannot ever forget that on January 19, 1950, the House of Representatives rejected a bill authorizing $60,000,000 for Korea. On that issue, the Republicans voted overwhelmingly to prevent Korea aid, 130 to 21, while the Democrats voted overwhelmingly for Korean aid, 170 to 61. How does the GOP explain that?

On sober reflection it becomes obvious that this is no time for the kind of recrimination the Republicans are hurling with shotgun and shovel. It is a time for the most extensive effort to aid our Nation and resolve the many problems facing us.

Certainly the administration has been wrong on many issues. So have the Republicans. We suggest that instead of charging the Democrats with all the wrongs, the Republicans discuss a few specific constructive actions they would take if they are returned in force next fall.

Aren't You Grown-Ups Ashamed for What You Are Doing to Me?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, Earl Browder, former head of the Communist Party in America, recently stated that state capitalism in the United States leaped forward to a new high in the decade of 1939–49 and that state capitalism in substance if not in formal aspects has progressed further in America than in Great Britain under the Labor government. The Communist leaders also have predicted that the United States will eventually spend itself into collapse.

Communists are aware of the dangers faced by America due to deficit financing, overspending, and excessive taxation. But what of the American people? Do they realize it? And, if so, what's to be done?

The average American seems oblivious of the fact that a dirty trick is being played on the children of the United States—every one of them—because it is the young people who must assume eventually the obligation of unpaid debt now accumulating because of the policies of the tax-and-spend boys who constantly have their hands out for more and more public funds for various pet projects and schemes at home and abroad.

The tremendous burdens being heaped on the shoulders of the children of America is being dramatized in a campaign inaugurated by the Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois in June. The campaign, which has received Nation-wide attention from the press and the pulpit, as well as business and industry, is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress, for we, too, must recognize our share of the responsibility for placing a mortgage on the future of every American child.

The federation's program has been built around an average American child called Susie, who poses a number of questions to her parents—and indirectly to all of us here in Congress—stressing this point:

"Aren't you grown-ups ashamed for what you are doing to me?"

How many parents, editors, educators, ministers, lawmakers, and other public officials realize exactly what is being done to our children?

The Taxpayers' Federation points out that the approximate 3,600,000 births in America in 1949, including 185,593 in my own State of Illinois, constitutes a vast army of future taxpayers who will have to pay for our fiscal follies. Each of these babies owes $2,670.68 right now as his share of the national debt. With at least 25 cents out of every dollar going for taxes, and the purchasing power of the future dollar uncertain, just realize how much more difficult it is for the parents of the State and Nation to put something aside for education of their children, to say nothing of their own future security and pensions.

Our Federal Government spent, during the past prosperous fiscal year ending June 30, billions of dollars more than its income. Our babies are going to have to pay for that. Now, war spending means billions piled on billions of increased debt. The total debt of our Federal Government is now in excess of a quarter of a trillion dollars and still growing. Our babies are going to have to pay that debt.

If our Federal Government cannot balance its budget and live within its income today, when we are already paying exorbitant taxes, what does the future hold for our babies?

Still higher taxes?

Still higher prices?

Still more controls and less opportunity?

There is some moral justification in asking our babies to help pay the debt created by the cost of the wars to preserve our country and theirs. But there is no moral justification for us to saddle on our babies the total cost of those wars. We too should pay off part of that debt instead of adding to it year after year.

It is completely immoral and unjustifiable to allow our Government to continue to pile debt on the backs of our babies by pouring billions of their dollars down the multitudinous ratholes uncovered by the Hoover Commission report.

The federation explains that a married man with one child earning $60 weekly gets only $55.70 because of Federal taxes, amounting to $223.60 annually, but in addition to that he must also pay State and local taxes and must absorb various hidden taxes on all merchandise.

Hidden taxes account for 5 cents of the price of a loaf of bread, which includes 151 different taxes; they account for 11 cents of a 20 cent package of cigarettes and for at least $355 of the price of a new car. The price of every single thing we buy includes taxes to pay the high cost of government.

The federation argues that we teach our children in our homes and in our schools and in our churches that it is neither good business nor good morals to spend more than we earn. No mother ever teaches her child to be a spendthrift, or idler, or agitator.

Is it not equally immoral for the Nation to do so?

The Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois is a citizen-supported, State-wide organization working to get our money's worth from Government. The executive secretary, George E. Mahin, of Springfield, who directed the recent campaign in behalf of "Susie" and all other American children, has raised arguments that should alert thousands of Americans to the seriousness of the situation confronting all of us.

Unless we achieve economy in our private lives, and particularly in government, the future of our Nation and its citizens is at stake.

The Mundt-Nixon-Wood Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a well-earned and high tribute to the members of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House for the great, good, and patriotic service they have rendered America after long hearings and deliberations, in bringing many subversive persons and Communists in our midst to the bar of justice, and for bringing this Mundt-Nixon-Wood bill to the floor of the House.

I am sorry, indeed, that the original Mundt-Nixon bill, which was adopted by this body during the Eightieth Congress, was pigeonholed by the other body at the request of President Truman. Had the bill become law at that time, many more of these Red rascals still running at large would have been silenced long ago, and above all, fine American boys would not be shedding their blood on foreign soil today.

The gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] has proven himself to be one of the greatest patriots in all American history, along with other members of this great committee.

Mr. Speaker, again I say we had best stop these Communists and fellow travelers within our own shores, with legislation, before we find it absolutely necessary to stop the Red rascal with bullets and bayonets, and that time is fast approaching. Under present conditions that is a certainty for the American people are fast loosing their tolerance and patience with this un-American, ungodly outfit.

I hope the bill will pass the House by a unanimous vote.

Expression of a Disturbed American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by a patriotic and disturbed American, and published by the Fort Wayne News Sentinel. In taking this action, I am glad to comply with the request of several of my constituents.

Some of the statements in this letter are a matter of considerable discussion and controversy today, but I feel that such expressions symbolize some of the existing feeling at this time. Surely it is for those of us in positions of leadership to weigh carefully those vital decisions which we are called upon to make at this time. The letter reads as follows:

What I am about to write probably will bring me criticism and unfavorable publicity because, once the Armed Forces of the Nation are committed, the patriot is supposed to forget personal views and principles and get behind the administration at whatever cost.

In defense of my patriotism, my husband and my father fought in World War I. Even now, at 80, my father is Arizona Director of Selective Service and Adjutant General of the National Guard—also, incidentally, a lifelong Democrat. My son was a fighter pilot and my son-in-law an ensign in World War II. We all stand ready to serve again to the best of our abilities.

My son and son-in-law are just 25, so theirs will again be active service—which brings me to the reason for this letter.

If my boys have to give up promising careers and again go to war, I want them to have the benefit of support from leadership of unquestioned loyalty and outstanding ability.

To that end and as a beginning, I want to see a general overhauling of the State Department.

There is no need to cite examples of the present Department's mistakes. The results of these men's judgment—whether deliberately traitorous, or just plain stupid—are clear for all to see. We came out of the last war the strongest nation on earth. Today our boys are dying in a situation strikingly like Bataan. We have little more than a toehold in Asia. Russia is calling the plays.

If the views of MacArthur and General Wedemeyer had prevailed, Manchuria would have been placed under a UN trusteeship, China would not have been lost, and Korea would not now be under attack. Washington was warned more than 3 years ago that the Reds were organizing an army to invade South Korea. But the native troops we trained there were not, according to Gen. William L. Roberts, head of our military mission in Korea, allowed any offensive weapons such as tanks—this on order of our State Department.

MacArthur has had nothing to do with Korea or its defense program for 2 years. But when Truman suddenly reversed the Acheson policy, MacArthur was given only a few hours to meet an attack the Reds had been preparing for 3 years.

Now MacArthur and boys like my sons are heroically trying to salvage a situation for which our diplomats and politicians are wholly to blame.

There is no less pain for a mother who loses her son, or a wife her husband, whether she be Republican or Democrat. Should not Republicans and Democrats all insist that the Achesons, Lattimores, Jessups, Services, et al., be routed from their positions of influence? To replace them there are Democrats and Republicans of unimpeachable honor and ability to choose from.

When our President asks us for the sacrifices necessary to carry this conflict to a successful conclusion, he should show his own sincerity of purpose by acknowledging and correcting the tragic mistakes of his administration. Immediate action on his part is vital.

There are others in high places who share the blame for the agony of our outnumbered and poorly equipped men in Korea, but let's take first things first and start with the State Department. While our boys are winning battles on far-flung battlefields, the American way of life may be lost in Washington.

Mrs. A. D. LANGE,
New Augusta, Ind.

Release on Bail of Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the actions of a majority—two out of three—of the justices of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in overruling the trial judge and releasing Harry B. Bridges, convicted of perjury, to bail is most unusual, and difficult to understand.

In view of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (rule 46 (a) (2)), as well as decided cases, as set forth in the memorandum included herein, it would appear that not only the Federal Rules of Procedure were given scant attention—"The court or the judge or justice allowing bail may at any time revoke the order admitting the defendant to bail," but the public welfare element stressed in the case of *United States* v. *St. John* ((C. C. A. 7) 254 Fed. 794), seems to have been ignored or given scant consideration.

The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure were adopted pursuant to the act of February 24, 1933 (47 Stat. 904) as amended by the act of March 8, 1934 (48 Stat. 399), and were formally promulgated on March 21, 1946.

Rule 46 (A) (2) provides as follows:

Bail may be allowed pending appeal or certiorari only if it appears that the case involves a substantial question which should be determined by the appellate court. Bail may be allowed by the trial judge or by the appellate court or by any judge thereof or by the circuit justice. *The court or the judge or justice allowing bail may at any time revoke the order admitting the defendant to bail.* [Italics added.]

In the case of the *United States* v. *St. John* (C. C. A. 7, 254 Fed. 794) the defendant with other members of the IWW was convicted of conspiracy to violate the Espionage Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 231). He applied for bail pending his appeal and was refused by the trial judge and the Circuit Court of Appeals sustained the trial judge's refusal on the ground that the "public welfare" among other elements should be considered. The circuit court in its opinion of the above case said in part:

The statement [of the trial judge] shows that acts were committed and a policy pursued by many members of an organization known and referred to as the IWW that were wholly at variance with the policy of this Government during the war and equally hostile to the welfare of the people and industries * * *. Certainly members of the organization known as the IWW are not in an enviable position to urge the impairment of their property rights now in view of their attitude towards property during the past year. I conclude the request for bail should be and is hereby denied.

United States v. *Schuermann* (79 Fed. Supp. 250) in denying bail pending appeal held that the "defendant's attitude appeared to be one of defiance of the law with which he apparently was not in agreement since the defendant was continuing and intended to continue, perpetrating acts in conflict with the law of the State."

In denying bail pending appeal in the case of *United States* v. *Delaney* ((D. C. N. J.) Fed. Supp. 224), Judge Clark said:

A sound balance between speed of punishment and certainty of guilt, between accusing society and the individual accused depends, we think, first upon the probabilities of reversal of his conviction, second, upon his personal circumstances and third, *upon his personal attitude toward society as organized in Government.* [Italics added.]

Mr. Justice Cardozo, in the case of *Snyder* v. *The Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (291 U. S. 97, at 122), said:

Consideration should be given, after conviction, and in the exercise of the authority vested in the Court, Judge or Justice allowing bail to revoke the same at any time, to the likelihood that the defendant would, if enlarged on bail, continue the course of unlawful conduct which had brought about his conviction.

See also *United States ex rel. Estabrook* v. *Otis* ((C. C. A. 8) 18 Fed. (2) 689) and *Parmagini* v. *United States* (42 Fed. (2) 721).

In the case of *Harry Benton Bridges et al.* v. *United States of America* (No. 12597 C. C. A. 9, filed August 10, 1950), the record of proceedings in the district court was such that the court might reasonably conclude and did in effect conclude that—

(A) Appellant Bridges as the jury found, was a member of the Communist Party of the United States and had falsely denied such membership under oath in his naturalization proceedings in the Superior Court of California.

(B) That appellant Bridges is probably one of the most potent figures in the Communist Party of America today.

(C) That appellant Bridges is now president whether honorary or otherwise, of the Maritime Federation of Trade-Unions, which is international and is controlled and dominated by Communists.

(D) That this international Communist-controlled organization has called on all its affiliates to take all immediate and indispensable action to defeat the diabolical plans of the American war mongers with regard to the present armed conflict in Korea.

(E) That appellant Bridges is in a position on the water front of San Francisco to exert substantial influence and serious detriment to the Armed Forces of the United States of America now engaged in hostilities in Korea.

(F) That since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea appellant Bridges has appeared and obstructed measures to promote national security and aid the Armed Forces of the United States in the Korean struggle by endeavoring to sidetrack a resolution by which longshoremen would have agreed to load any and all cargoes destined for the war areas.

(G) That appellant Bridges is an agent dedicated to execute the Communist program both national and international.

(H) That in the activities of the appellant Bridges heretofore mentioned he was acting in the interest and at the behest of the Communist Party of the United States, etc.

(I) That appellant Bridges is in a position to work detriment to the interests of the United States by studied, subtle means and adroit Communist tactics and practices.

(J) That the conduct of appellant Bridges since his release on bail is opposed to the welfare of the United States in this period of crisis and emergency.

The foregoing from A to J is contained in the Government's brief field in this case.

Mr. Justice Healy, writing the majority opinion for the circuit court in the case (Bridges against United States) which was rendered on August 24, 1950, quotes the case of *D'Aquino* v. *United States* (180 Fed. 2d 271), in which Mr. Justice Douglas observed, "The test of the right to bail is as set out in rule 46 (A) (2) of the Criminal Procedure Rules, namely, whether the case involves a substantial question which should be determined by the appellate court."

Mr. Justice Mathews, who wrote the dissenting opinion in this case, very wisely calls attention to the following fact. He states on page 15 of the decision:

The power conferred by the first two provisions of rule 46 (A) (2), the power to allow bail pending appeal, is limited to cases which appear to involve a substantial question which should be determined by the appellate court. The power conferred by the final provision of rule 46 (A) (2)—the power to revoke an order admitting a defendant to bail pending appeal—is not so limited. That power may be exercised at any time, regardless of whether the case involves or does not involve a substantial question which should be determined by the appellate court. I, therefore, deem it unnecessary to express and do not express any opinion as to whether this case does or does not involve such a question. I have found no case nor have my associates cited any case holding that an order admitting a defendant to bail pending appeal may not be revoked if the case involves a substantial question which should be determined by the appellate court.

Commenting further on the judge's right to revoke bail pending appeal, Mr. Justice Mathews says:

The power to revoke an order admitting the defendant to bail pending an appeal is a discretionary power. Hence the Government's motion to revoke the order admitting Harry Renton Bridges to bail pending appeal was addressed to Judge Harris' discretion. Unless in revoking that order Judge Harris abused his discretion, the order of revocation should not be vacated. I cannot say that Judge Harris abused his discretion. Instead, I believe that he exercised it wisely and properly.

Why Not Use Farm Surpluses in War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, has demonstrated by his public statements that he has a very great interest in and an extremely sound conception of agricultural problems in general, and especially those relating to food surpluses.

In various parts of the country Senator WILLIAMS is continuing to gain added recognition because of his keen analysis of the problems faced by farmers and of the sensible constructive solutions which he has offered.

I have now had brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, an editorial from a recent issue of the Evening Tribune of San Diego, Calif. This editorial not only commends Senator WILLIAMS on the position he has taken with respect to farm surpluses, but serves to direct further attention to the urgent need for a remedial course of action with respect to this problem.

Therefore, I include as a part of my remarks the editorial which appeared in the San Diego Evening Tribune:

[Editorial appearing in the Evening Tribune of San Diego, Calif.]

WHY NOT USE FARM SURPLUSES IN WAR?

This is the time when farm surpluses should be an asset to the Nation, but are they? Senator WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, says they are not, and he demands to know why.

The Government has in storage 300,000,000 dozen eggs which cost 32 cents a dozen, the Senator reported to his colleagues. Yet the Armed Forces are buying 4,910,050 dozen at 40 cents. Butter amounting to 165,000,000 pounds, costing 60 cents a pound, is in storage, but the military has gone into the open market to buy 4,131,022 pounds at a total cost of $2,508,267. Our stored cheese surplus, amounting to 63,000,000 pounds, cost 31 cents a pound and we are buying 15,000,000 pounds more a month for storage. Yet the Government is buying 954,664 pounds at a total cost of $331,727 for the men in uniform.

Government buying of these commodities has forced prices up and Senator WILLIAMS believes that this is unnecessary and unwise. He advocates the release of these surpluses into the civilian market as a check against inflation, and there doubtless are many who will agree with his position.

Public Law 434 specifically authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to release surplus foods and commodities, which are in good condition, to the armed services. The provision was incorporated into the law in the belief that it would save the taxpayer money, and yet it isn't working out that way.

"The Government, instead of continuously condemning the American people as hoarders, should put an immediate stop to its own policy of hoarding huge quantities of food products," Senator WILLIAMS said, making a point which seems unassailable.

Harnessing the Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Harnessing the Missouri," published in the August 29 issue of The Reporter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARNESSING THE MISSOURI

For 20 years, the Missouri Basin has been a national problem. In the 1930's, drought, dust storms, and crop failures depleted the valley's resources. Some 300,000 people moved away to greener fields. To support those who remained, the Federal Government spent $1,200,000,000 in relief and emergency aid.

In the 1940's there was plenty of rain—so much, in fact, that destructive floods repeatedly swept down the valley. In one year alone, the value of the topsoil scoured off three States was estimated at $491,000,000. After a hundred years of exploitation, the region's resources need replenishment and conservation. That is the goal of an engineering enterprise that is now building more dams, levees, revetments, irrigation ditches, and power plants than have ever before been used in a single project. Congress has appropriated more than a billion dollars to date, and the final tab will undoubtedly run above ten billion. If this seems costly, it should be remembered what the social subsidies which opened the territory did to create wealth, employment, and private investment. If the subsidized exploitation of resources paid dividends, then possibly the subsidized conservation of them may do likewise.

That such development can provide the seedbed for private capital and generate wider economic opportunity has been demonstrated in the Tennessee Valley. Since the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority, per capita income in that watershed rose from 40 percent of the national average in 1933 to 60 percent in 1947. More than 2,100 new factories began operation during this period. Employment increased 123 percent while it was increasing 73 percent in the Nation as a whole. Possibly some of these gains would have taken place without TVA, but it is hard to imagine that TVA had nothing to do with them.

The Missouri Valley counts on a comparable improvement. Already there has been substantial new private investment in recreation facilities—a byproduct of the new lakes being formed behind the dams. Food

processors expect to move in as irrigation in the upper basin shifts crop emphasis from grain and pasture to vegetables and dairying. Cheap power should stimulate the food-freezing industry, as it did in the Tennessee Valley. In the Dakotas it is hoped that cheap power and navigation, coupled with private investment, may unlock deposits of lignite and other marginal minerals. Judging by TVA experience, the basin may also prove attractive to small manufacturing enterprises related to local resources. Nobody expects new Pittsburghs to rise in the basin, but a basic improvement of the region's farm economy will spread throughout its area, from the marketing towns back to the wholesaling cities and the distribution centers.

Within the Missouri watershed lies one-sixth of the Nation's area and one-fourth of its cropland. Congress has undertaken to irrigate 5,000,000 acres of land, to build 2,000,000 kilowatts of electric-generating capacity, to hold down the soil against wind and rain, to render a restless, dangerous river system navigable and manageable.

But Congress has yet to face the question of whether these things are being done in the most efficient way. By launching a vast expenditure with only a makeshift plan and no clear lines of responsibility, Congress runs the risk of a gigantic boondoggle.

Some people regard as a boondoggle much of the engineering work so far done along the river. The Army Engineers have been trying, by fits and starts, since 1912, to establish a stable channel for the use of barge shipping. There is a romantic plausibility about river navigation, perhaps because it evokes memories of the days when the river was the valley's only highway. But the brutal truth is that after the dikes and revetments have all been built the volume of barge traffic will probably remain absurdly small.

Nevertheless the Army engineers have seldom met serious difficulty in obtaining appropriations. They have the backing of Congressmen, Senators, and the most important business interests of the valley cities. A Missouri Valley businessman can breathe fire about "creeping socialism" one day and ask Congress for a subsidized ship channel the next. He dreams of busy barge lines opening up new markets, providing cheap haulage for raw materials, and, above all, compelling the railroads to reduce their rates.

Drought in the 1930's and floods in the 1940's convinced both the natives and Congress that the valley, in any case, needed more than a navigable channel. A downstream clamor for flood control and an upstream clamor for irrigation set two Government agencies to work—as usual, somewhat at cross purposes.

The Army engineers prepared a blueprint primarily for navigation and flood control. This was the Pick plan, named for Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, now chief of Army engineers, the colorful and persuasive technician who built the Ledo Road across Burma.

The Bureau of Reclamation, in the Department of the Interior, drew up its own plan, primarily for power and irrigation. This was the Sloan plan, named for W. G. Sloan, the Bureau's field chief in Montana. The Bureau had long been projecting an eastward push from arid into semiarid territory. For those who worried about the stepping up of farm production by one agency, at a time when other agencies were saddled with crop surpluses, the Bureau had several answers. It argued that in spite of present distribution problems an expanding economy would soon need more food production. It pointed out that irrigation would stabilize farm production in the valley, channel it into more useful forms, and make the best use of resources now partly wasted. It said its program would provide a living for 53,000 new farm families, while the accompanying power development would attract new industries, open untapped mineral resources, and help diversify the regional economy.

That the two plans would conflict was inevitable from the outset. Irrigation demands full reservoirs during the hot, dry months; flood control demands empty reservoirs whenever possible. Irrigation demands many tributary reservoirs for the thirsty land of the upper valley; navigation demands big dams on the main stream. These facts, plus the bureaucratic rivalry of two powerful agencies, the competition of the irrigation lobby with the navigation lobby, and the entrenched power of Congressmen devoted to one side or the other, all seemed to make for a classic struggle in American group pressures. The sounds of battle grew louder until the sudden emergence of a third disputant enforced a hasty truce.

The third force was an idea—the idea of a Missouri Valley Authority. Politically weak but logically and emotionally potent, the idea of a regional agency, organized as a public corporation on the model of TVA, offered a ready answer to the feud between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. If the river had to be parceled out, unitary management of multipurpose reservoirs seemed indispensable. If Pick and Sloan could not agree, why not turn over the show to some Great Plains Lilienthal? The public-corporation form of management would remove control from bickering bureaucrats in Washington and lodge it in a directorate located in the valley itself. TVA's successful struggle to stay out of the toils of Senator MCKELLAR had shown that a regional authority could achieve greater independence from predatory political forces than the established agencies in Washington and still work directly with the people of the region. So Senator MURRAY of Montana introduced an MVA bill, and such New Dealers as were left in the age of Truman rallied round.

Enthusiasm was less marked in the region itself. Usually most of the valley votes Republican. The CIO was strong for MVA, but weak in the valley. National newspapers like the New York Times and the Washington Post came out for MVA, but in the valley only the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and Star-Times took up the cause. Jim Patton's small Farmers' Union enlisted for MVA, but the massive Farm Bureau Federation and the powerful irrigators' junta either stood mute or took the other side.

The agitation for MVA had one result. It forced a shotgun marriage between the Pick and Sloan factions. The Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau set up an advisory committee representing all the Federal agencies concerned and 10 State governments. Dams which had been furiously denounced as engineering monstrosities were now quietly approved. Where one water use conflicted with another, the new Pick-Sloan coalition proposed to build enough facilities for all of them, and decided to trust in God to provide sufficient water.

This may not have been the best engineering, but it was good politics. Congress came through with enough appropriations for work to begin on about 40 percent of the projected installations. In the Dakotas three of the five dams which will convert the Missouri into a series of lakes are under construction, with a hundred others, large and small, to come. The Army engineers are building flood levees and navigation works on the lower river, and are already talking of extending the head of navigation almost to the mouth of the Yellowstone. The Reclamation Bureau is building tributary dams and irrigation ditches in the upper valley, with a view to doubling the basin's irrigated acreage. In the two fiscal years 1949 and 1950 Congress appropriated $519,000,000 for the basin. Pick and Sloan want appropriations of $2,958,000,000 during the 5 years 1951 to 1956. Estimated needs after fiscal 1955 are placed at $5,000,000,000.

To date most of the emphasis has been on big physical structures, but these alone cannot solve all the valley's problems. Floods begin where heavy rains wash topsoil into the upland creeks. Conservationists point out that if this priceless asset is to be saved it must be saved on the uplands. This is where the Department of Agriculture and its Soil Conservation Service come in. Their job is to teach the art of saving soil—a field in which TVA has done some of its most effective work. Yet it appears to be easier to get an appropriation for a dam to hold water than for an antierosion project to prevent the reservoir from silting up. So far, the Army engineers have come away with the biggest share of the congressional appropriations.

As construction proceeds, the valley is uneasily aware that a better way of managing the project must be found. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers say they have agreed on over-all policies for operation of the dams and reservoirs, but it is clear that there will be trouble when the two agencies actually come to the point of deciding whether to release water for irrigation or hold it for navigation. The Hoover Commission bitterly condemned the Pick-Sloan team for having caused "needless delay, confusion, and gross waste of the taxpayers' money." Even the interagency committee shows signs of realizing that some form of unified management will eventually have to be devised. The MVA bill remains locked up in an unfriendly Senate committee, but it casts a long shadow up the valley.

ROBERT LASCH.

The Price of Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extract from Hanson's Latin-American Letter for August 25, 1950, relating to the subject of coffee.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE SLAPS DOWN STATE DEPARTMENT

As we forecast last week, the full Senate Agriculture Committee this week gave Senator GILLETTE and his subcommittee what amounted to a vote of confidence and shattered the State Department's hope of discrediting the subcommittee. The plan of the State Department was to discredit the subcommittee by causing withdrawal of the Gillette report and then to draft a new version which would bring coffee up to at least $1 per pound. The Senate Agriculture Committee, in an unusually well-attended meeting, rejected the State Department's plea that the subject be dropped without a report if the committee were unwilling to use a State Department version. Even Senator LUCAS did not dare bring out a report that would assure $1 a pound coffee for his Illinois constituents who are already reconciling themselves to his retirement from the Senate after election day. Nor did he dare to bury the

Gillette report which alone held out any promise of relief for the American consumer.

THE NEW VERSION OF THE GILLETTE REPORT

The language of the Gillette report has been polished, but practically all the substantive recommendations remain. (a) with respect to the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, the recommendations for definition of a contract that will not lend itself to manipulation of the market, for institution of adequate margins for trading, and for placing trading in coffee under the Commodity Exchange Act, have been retained. (b) The recommendation to subject foreign speculators' gains to United States taxation has been retained. (c) The recommendation that foreign interests, including the Colombian Coffee Federation, be compelled to cease undesirable sales and storage practices, has been reworded so that it is even more promising of good results. Justice Department is instructed to investigate specifically the practices of the Federation and other entities, and if current legislation does not provide suitable protection against them, members of the Agriculture Committee will be able to introduce suitable legislation. (d) The recommendation that United States representation at the Inter-American Economic and Social Council Coffee Commission be strengthened has been reworded, but the substance of the recommendation is not altered. (e) The recommendation for adequate crop reporting remains. (f) Where previously the report had recommended that our lending agencies take proper cognizance of the precarious basis of coffee under its artificial price level, the new version provides that all United States agencies concerned with economic matters shall take cognizance of what is taking place in the coffee market. This means that the United States director at the World Bank which is not theoretically a United States lending agency must also take cognizance of the situation. (f) The recommendation for giving technical assistance to all nations willing to expand production now specifically spells out Latin America as well as nonhemisphere countries, but essentially this does not alter the original recommendation. (g) The recommendation that consumers follow the lower-consumption suggestions of the Department of Agriculture is retained. This means that those coffee associations which have been trying to get Agriculture Department to abstain from any consumer activity that would discourage wasteful consumption have been defeated. Their position will be on the record for the next investigation, however, and individual members of the association will be asked for their particular views on that position.

(h) There was no change in the recommendation concerning George Robbins of the General Foods Corp.

(i) You will notice that the recommendation that ECA abstain from allocating dollars for coffee has been deleted. Do not misinterpret this deletion. The committee found that under the legislative directives that bind ECA, it is obligated to take due cognizance of commodity supply situations in this country and of any special demand and supply factors relating to consumption in this country before it proceeds with allocation of dollars for competitive purchases by European countries. Accordingly, the Gillette recommendation had merely reiterated what is already a basic policy. The committee thus deleted the recommendation and decided that when ECA appropriations are discussed in the Senate, this basic directive relating to supply-demand market positions could be hammered home again.

(j) The recommendation that roasters and retailers return to the same per pound profit basis as they had in early 1949 was deleted. This throws the onus completely on the foreign interests and is thus a further slap at the State Department.

AFTER THE NEW GILLETTE REPORT

The State Department still has hopes of being able to bull coffee by issuing a report of its own. It stands discredited, however, and in no position to wield the influence when war-control measures develop that it might otherwise have enjoyed. One thing that apparently startled both the Senate Agriculture Committee and some State Department officials was the enormous volume of mail to the committee and the enormous demand for copies of the Gillette report which reflected genuine consumer interest. The Senate committee had immense support from radio commentators like the ace A. F. of L. commentator and Earl Godwin, a Washington commentator with a wide audience.

Even the influential Washington Post, which has supported the State Department in the attempts to bull coffee consistently, noted this week that "something very strange has gone on in coffee prices * * * something more than a subnormal crop may be responsible for keeping prices up."

POLITICAL FEASIBILITY OF NEW HEARINGS ON COFFEE

From the viewpoint of the consumer, the best thing that can happen now is for the Latin American speculators to continue to bull coffee. This will bring a hurried call for a new investigation based on the Justice Department findings, on certain new evidence regarding market manipulation that has developed since the previous hearings closed, on new evidence regarding consumption, and on a detailed analysis of press and trade association releases. Nothing could be more desirable, politically, than hearings on coffee before the election. It is a foreign commodity with little domestic support except from a handful of manipulative interests in New York. And public resentment at the rise in the cost of living could easily be channeled into such a focal point as the price of coffee. A 100-percent rise in coffee prices is extremely conspicuous, perhaps more so than anything else that has occurred this past year in the cost of living.

COFFEE INDUSTRY LIAISON IN WASHINGTON

Finally, a suggestion to our friends in the coffee trade. Most industries are organizing for the task of Washington liaison in the war-control activity which is slowly getting under way. The Senate Agriculture Committee has now spoken out in unmistakable tones. The trade should get itself some representation that will include members of the industry who do not already stand condemned as a result of their testimony before the committee, and as much as possible use a liaison organization that is not associated with either the 1946 OPA-death fight or the 1949–50 fight to protect speculators. Don't send into Washington any man or group that tried to blacken the name of Senator GILLETTE or other members of the Gillette committee. The friends of coffee speculators in the State Department are now themselves seriously exposed and of little use to the industry.

Electric Energy Adequate in Detroit, Mich., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the statement of the president of the Detroit Edison Co., with headquarters at Detroit, Mich., showing its ability to provide as much power as will be needed in this highly industrial area during the war period and at the same time to care for civilian needs.

"There is plenty of electric power available here in Michigan's industrial heart to carry out the area's full share of the Nation's new defense production program," Detroit Edison president, James W. Parker, said today.

There is available as much power as can be used when industrial plants take up their allotted share of the defense production loads, he said. In most instances, manpower will be the limiting factor. With every employable person in the area on the job, there will be enough electric horsepower to go around.

Parker declared there would be—just as during the last war—enough power to take care of the defense program without curbing either residential or farm use of electricity. He said the electric industry as a whole will have power to meet the country's needs provided no governmental restrictions are imposed which would retard the contruction program now under way.

"Even though new peaks of demand have been reached during 1950," the Edison president said, "our capacity is advancing well ahead of use."

Present capacity of the Edison Co. is about 1,500,000 kilowatts—roughly 2,000,000 horsepower. This includes the 200,000 kilowatts added recently at Trenton Channel. Two new turbo-generators which will go into service at Conners Creek within a year will bring capacity to 1,750,000 kilowatts.

Also important are the interconnections with others. Between Consumers Power and the Edison Co. the interconnections have been tripled to strengthen Michigan's overall electric supply system.

Parker also announced that construction will soon start on a project to add another 250,000 kilowatts. Originally scheduled in part at an existing plant, this addition may, in view of recent events, require the building of a new plant.

The company's revised expansion plan will enable it to keep longer in service three older generators which were slated for retirement before the outbreak of trouble in Korea, Parker explained.

"I hope present stepped-up expansion of the Nation's electric power will not be interrupted," Parker said. "It is vital that the Government should cooperate in private power company expansion plans."

The present Edison expansion target is 1,850,000 kilowatts by 1953 or before. This represents an increase of more than 750,000 kilowatts since 1945.

Parker said this goal has been set with an eye to maintaining year-round, around-the-clock industrial production—either for armament or for whatever the Nation calls upon the Detroit area to build.

Commenting on Nation-wide power adequacy, Parker said reports of the entire electric industry show that power supply in most parts of the country is geared to keep well ahead of both industrial and civilian needs. This takes the defense production program, as now known to the industry, fully into account.

Electric generating capability today is nearly double that of 1941, totaling 66,000,000 kilowatts. Since World War II 16,500,000 kilowatts have been added. Another 18,000,000 kilowatts at least will be available by the end of 1953, according to present estimates.

At present, 80 percent of the Nation's electric power is being generated by investor-owned companies, whose systems have been built entirely with private capital.

Parker reiterated his hope that Government limitations would not halt scheduled expansions. Most electric companies' expansion programs have been speeded up since

the United Nations undertook the task of driving the Communists out of South Korea.

Confidence was again expressed by Parker that the interconnected power systems of the United States are well prepared to cope with added defense loads. "The light and power industry has made tremendous strides since the end of World War II," he said. "The national power situation is good—and don't let anyone tell you otherwise."

"We in the Security of Our Homeland Should Never Lose Sight of the Reason This War Is Being Fought—Those Heroic Men in Korea Tonight Are Fighting for the Same Principles as Our Forefathers Did at the Birth of the Republic; To Free Men From Tyranny"—John Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago in addressing this House I told of a telecast program which I regarded as one of the most progressive and important news events that had taken place in years. That program which now bids fair to become one of the most interesting of all NBC telecasts is entitled, "Battle Reports From Washington," was projected by the Honorable John Steelman, assistant to President Truman.

Mr. Steelman's purpose in conducting this series of Sunday evening talks was to give millions of Americans an opportunity both to see and to hear top-flight Federal officials here in Washington addressing themselves to subjects on which they could talk with authority that were of vital and current interest.

As I stated 2 weeks ago the program is planned to follow somewhat after the type of White House meetings conducted for some time past and which were attended exclusively by leaders of labor and industry. Battle Reports From Washington will on the other hand comprehend all subjects of general current and domestic interest to the American people.

Last week we heard heads of the Government intimately and factually discuss the problems of the conflict in Korea—and this week we hear from members of the State Department talking on the same subject. The speakers are Warren G. Austin, American representative to the United Nations Assembly, and others best able to factually discuss the diplomatic aspects of the Asiatic problem in general and the Korean situation in particular.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress know John Steelman as a wise, sagacious, prudent, hard-headed realist * * * a man whose feet are planted firmly on the ground.

With the multitude of assignments given him by President Truman it is commendable that he has undertaken this difficult task of officially reporting news of vital import virtually from the White House to the peoples themselves.

The entire program is being telecasted through the voice of Robert J. McCormick, a news commentator and reporter well and favorably known to all in this Chamber under the direction of Mr. Ted Ayers, ace production manager of the National Broadcasting Co.

American citizens everywhere have reason to be grateful to Dr. Steelman and to the National Broadcasting Co. for this program. The information that it conveys—emanating from such an important source commends its close perusal and study by all Members of both Houses of the Nation's Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein Sunday night's production of Battle Reports From Washington.

Mr. MCCORMICK. On this, the ninth Sunday of the war, the bombs that burst in Korea are being echoed by mounting action in Washington. That you may be informed of what our leaders are doing to meet the threat to world peace, NBC presents its second weekly teledocumentary report from the Nation's Capital.

Washington is the executive end of a battlefront a continent and an ocean away where perhaps a boy from your block is staking his life.

Contributing their own specialized kind of action to back up the battle of men and guns, that of "waging the peace", is our State Department, some of whose top officials are here to report to you today. But first let me present to this great American audience the Assistant to the President of the United States, Dr. John Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is the second telecast in a series which we hope will make you feel closer to your Government in Washington. Tonight, like every other night since June 25, 1950, all eyes are on the military struggle in Korea. Brave men, our own sons and brothers, are fighting and dying in the heat and dust of a foreign land, thousands of miles from their homes. We are with them in spirit, rejoicing with them in victory, and always praying for their safety.

And we, in the security of our homeland, should never lose sight of the reason this war is being fought. Those heroic men in Korea tonight are fighting our battles—they are fighting for the same principles as our forefathers did at the birth of the Republic, to free men from tyranny.

These men are not alone in the battle to keep men free. Tonight I want to present another department in Government which is waging eternal war against the forces of tyranny—that is the Department of State. The role they play, and the importance of it, is not generally recognized.

In order that you may better understand how the battle of diplomacy is being waged, tonight I want you to visit with me the Under Secretary of State, two Assistant Secretaries of State, and Ambassador Warren Austin, United States Representative on the Security Council of the United Nations. These men are in the front lines of the diplomatic battle which is being waged all over the world.

Their role is not always a dramatic one, but it goes on 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, every week in the year. The lives of the men you will see tonight, and the staff of our great Department of State, in Washington and wherever they serve throughout the world, are dedicated to peace. They are working to prevent death and destruction from armed conflict. They are working to build a world at peace, a world without fear, in which all men everywhere can find happiness.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Here are some of the latest scenes from the past week on the war front, America, taken for you by NBC's own cameraman in Korea, the Jones brothers. This was the Communist beachhead on the Naktong, where 60,000 Reds were gathered for an all-out strike. American superfortresses hurled against them the greatest blow upon ground troops since the Normandy invasion, turning a 26-quare-mile rectangle of Korea, as one GI put it, "Into a cemetery." All this happened in the recently acquired domain of Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. While we may watch Korea, he must keep a weather eye on the entire Far East; alerted to Korea's impact on its neighboring countries, where who knows what new danger may arise.

For a report on this critical area, already ablaze, we turn to Dean Rusk.

Mr. DEAN RUSK. The American people have been following the superb performance of American and allied troops in Korea with great pride and are determined to back them in every possible way. I know, however, that questions arise in many of our minds which deserve an answer.

Why are we using force to meet the aggression in Korea? Not because of any narrow strategic interest of the United States nor because the diplomats got tired of talking about Korea at the conference table.

The issue in Korea is cold, cynical, flagrant aggression. No amount of propaganda, no repetition of the big lie, can change the facts. The jury of the world has brought in a verdict of guilty and the organized world is acting against the aggressor. To leave this attack unopposed would mean acts of aggression in other places and would almost certainly mean general war. To prevent a general war it was essential that those who are flirting with the idea of aggression be told immediately that they would encounter the organized resistance of the entire world. The issue in Korea is world peace. The sacrifices being made in Korea by United Nations forces are to prevent much greater sacrifices which will have to be made if an aggressor is left with the idea that he can get away with his criminal act.

I know you are asking why the ground forces of other UN members are not already fighting in Korea. There are several reasons. The attack had to be met quickly or it could not be met at all. South Korean and American forces were the only ones immediately available. A number of our friends have their slender military forces heavily committed in the struggle against communism in such places as Indochina and Malaya. Time and space factors mean that some delay is inevitable in bringing forces from great distances. We are encouraged by action now being taken by a number of other governments to send troops quickly. These will be welcomed and will contribute greatly to victory. We should recall that allied air and naval forces joined us immediately in Korea and are giving an excellent account of themselves.

Perhaps you want to know what our peace plan is. Actually, it is very simple. We want a man named Joseph Stalin to pick up a telephone and tell the North Koreans to stop this aggression. Maybe it won't happen that way. Beyond that, our peace plan is the plan of the United Nations. The UN has demanded that the North Koreans cease hostilities; that they withdraw behind the thirty-eighth parallel, that UN members assist the Republic of Korea to repel the invasion and to restore peace and security in that area. The Security Council must decide

upon the measures which must be taken to restore peace in the area—and I know that its members are working on this problem. We are in Korea to stop an aggression. We shall not leave Korea until the aggression is stopped and the peace is secured.

I know the American people are deeply distressed by the damage which is being done to Korea in the course of the fighting. When the fighting is over, the United Nations will face a heavy job of reconstruction. The Korean people will need the sympathetic interest and assistance of the rest of the world. Considerable work is now going on so that we can be ready for that part of the job. We know that the aggression must be repulsed not only on the battlefield but in the minds and lives of the men and women of Korea who have aspired for so long to a free and unified nation.

Mr. MCCORMICK. At the front in Korea, still the prime hot spot of the Far East, Dean Rusk reports on, outnumbered American soldiers continue to fall back before the enemy in a delaying action awaiting the help they know must soon come. This film, showing some of the general retreat movement, men being transported to the rear, others evading enemy snipers, was taken just within the past week by NBC's own cameramen, and rushed here for Battle Report, Washington. But while we may be forced to retreat in Korea, on another war front, the war of truth against dishonesty, fact against falsehood, we are on the attack throughout the whole world.

To tell you about it, here is Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Edward W. Barrett, the voice behind the Voice of America.

(At this point a Soviet film was telecasted to the audience, after which Mr. Barrett spoke as follows:)

Mr. BARRETT. The Kremlin is today spending hundreds of millions to tell the world that America is imperialistic, untrustworthy, and filled with slavery and misery. That was part of a film which the Soviet has been showing to iron-curtain audiences. The words you heard were an exact translation superimposed on the Soviet sound track. The Kremlin says "This is the United States."

Well, that film hasn't worked exactly as intended. The slums looked pretty good to iron-curtain audiences. And now even Henry Wallace has turned against them.

But it is a quick picture of what we are up against. Russia has a great program of lies, distortions, half-truths, myths, labels, and exaggerations. To combat these, the United States Government has a campaign of truth. To illustrate this, we'll show you later excerpts of a United States Government film completed in record time and now being shown around the world in 26 languages.

America's campaign of truth utilizes radio, the Voice of America, press and publications material, films like the one we'll show you, exchange of persons, the enormously effective system for letting key foreigners see this Nation for themselves, and overseas libraries, which have become the arsenals of ideas for those fighting for freedom.

It's a campaign that is paying off. We have stacks of evidence like this to prove it. But it's not big enough. We are spending less than one-tenth what the international Communists are spending.

Take the Voice of America. We use transmitters in this country—and at key points in Europe—and in the far Pacific. They are good transmitters but they aren't enough.

We plan, with Congress' consent, to build a network of vast new supertransmitters that will blast through anywhere. Meanwhile, we are stepping up the campaign of truth. I can announce that even tonight we are starting a new program to Korea and one more to China.

Whatever you hear, we haven't lost the propaganda war. We now have 53 nations on our side. The Soviet has nine. With added funds and added skilled manpower, we can and will win through with America's campaign of truth.

Mr. MCCORMICK. As the Voice of America continues to broadcast the truth as to who is the aggressor in Korea, the see-saw battle for the port of Pohang, above Pusan, continued throughout the past week. Pohang's vital airstrip, 8 miles to the southeast, was threatened when South Korean troops suddenly came down from the mountains, entered the city, and sent a spearhead against the field. American troops were left behind to defend it, for its loss would help deprive United Nations' forces of a necessary supply port and our most valuable Korean airbase. But the struggle for freedom is not in Korea alone. Throughout the world, behind the iron curtain and before it, other Americans are working in other ways to secure world peace and order. That you may know something of who these men are, and what are their tasks, we now point our cameras at Under Secretary of State Jim Webb.

Mr. WEBB. Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard Dean Rusk and Ed Barrett talk about some particular problems we are facing in these dangerous times. I'd like to be more general and tell you briefly something about the work of the Department of State.

Just as the Defense Department provides the military counsel needed for the development of foreign policy, so the State Department provides the political counsel needed for the development of military strategy. While our brave fighting men are engaging the enemy at this moment in Korea, in other parts of the world we are using economic, political, and diplomatic means in a less dramatic but equally vital struggle to save the free world from total war.

The beachheads of our diplomacy are the 285 posts we maintain throughout the world. Each post is the United States of America, speaking for you and me and all of us, in the country in which it is located. Each post, working closely with headquarters here in Washington, toils round the clock to make sure the aims and desires of the American people are faithfully represented in these grave days.

Let me introduce you to the sort of men we have in our key posts overseas.

In Indochina, under heavy Communist pressure, our Minister is Donald Heath, from Topeka, Kans. He learned the hard way how to deal with Communist aggression, when he represented us in Bulgaria.

In India we have one of our most distinguished officers, Ambassador Loy Henderson, who comes from the little town of Rogers, Ark.

In Iran we have Henry Grady, a brilliant California businessman who did an outstanding job for his country in putting the Greek aid program over the top.

No better example of the kind of men who serve you abroad could be found than in John J. Muccio, our Ambassador to Korea. He was born in Italy, grew up in Providence, R. I., and has served the United States in the Foreign Service for nearly 30 years. The President has just commended him for his magnificent work in evacuating Americans under Communist fire.

These are the sort of trained men you find on hand in places like Korea when trouble breaks. But that is only part of their work.

You see, there are literally hundreds of subjects on which agreements with other nations have to be maintained, public health, aviation, agriculture, atomic energy, and trade of all sorts. Even though other agencies of the Government are vitally concerned in these matters, by law, the State Department must coordinate all negotiation with other governments. So, in order to do a first-class job for you and the country, the State Department is manned by specialists in matters which must be threshed out with other nations.

As an example, 10 days from today foreign relations experts from Great Britain and France will convene here in Washington with our experts to lay the groundwork for another meeting of the Foreign Ministers of those three countries. When Mr. Bevin, Mr. Schuman, and Mr. Acheson meet in New York on September 12, the major international problems facing us will have to be thoroughly canvassed. They can be acted on without delay. The decisions of these three men will have great significance because they represent the combined power of nearly 250,000,000 people. Immediately following, on September 15, the Foreign Ministers of all 12 North Atlantic Treaty nations, representing nearly 350,000,000 people, will meet to make important decisions. And 4 days later will come the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Cooperation between peoples and nations is the way to a better world and a peaceful world. Your State Department is this country's instrument for spearheading that cooperation.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Concrete cooperation between nations is today in evidence in Korea, and reinforcements are arriving or destined to arrive from the four corners of the world. Forces of Great Britain and Australia are now fighting side by side with American troops. These pictures were made of American reinforcements arriving last week to join the Second Infantry and First Marines, of our strategic reserve, already in Korea. Representing the United States at the fountain head of this aid is Warren Austin, chief of the United States delegation to the United Nations. For the past few weeks, Ambassador Austin, along with his fellow delegates, has been subjected by the Soviet representative to a certain type of behavior that an old Russian proverb describes as "the devil shelling peas in your face."

To tell us what goes on here, to answer some of the mail that has come to him as a result, and perhaps to shell a few peas of his own, here is Ambassador Warren Austin. * * *

Mr. AUSTIN. For the past 3 weeks, the American people have had an unprecedented opportunity, thanks to television and radio, to see and hear the way that spokesmen of governments conduct themselves at an international council table. The people's reaction exceeds anything that I have experienced in 25 years of public life. Telegrams and even long-distance telephone calls reach us at Lake Success. Thousands of letters are coming into the United States Mission every day. They come from those ruling circles of the United States of America about which you hear in the discussion by the present President of the Security Council. There are 151,000,000 of these ruling circles in the United States of America; quite a contrast to one ruling circle. I want to thank all of you for these messages, including the critical ones, and I want to thank particularly those who say they are remembering us in their prayers. You give us strength. All of your letters will be answered as rapidly as we can do so.

Tonight I would like to take this opportunity to answer questions which your letters indicate and most often are being asked. Here's a letter from Gertrude Taylor of Washington, D. C. She says: "DEAR SIR: Won't you with other countries expell Jacob Malik from the United Nations? Russia has violated everything the United Nations stands for with its prolonged argument." But let me answer you this way, Gertrude, and so answer many thousands of others who have written to me. Our objective is peace. We do not find peace by throwing out the person with whom we must make the peace. We must be firm in our principles, we must be strong in our statement of them, but also,

we must be patient. In the United Nations, we must keep trying to convince Mr. Malik and his government of the error of their way and of our peaceful intentions. Through the United Nations we can reach the peoples of the Soviet Union and of other countries. It is not the people, it is the ruling circle that we must convince. That creates a force of public opinion backed by moral authority that opposes aggression and even the Soviet dictator then cannot ignore such force. It is a strain, of course, for us to listen to the deceit that the Russian spokesman holds out, but truth will prevail ultimately. Meanwhile, it is better for diplomats to get nervous indigestion than for young men to get shot.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Well, now we will see condensed excerpts from the film Mr. Barrett promised to show us. Within only 11 days after the war, the full version of this film was put into 26 languages by the State Department and speedily distributed throughout the world. Purpose: To counterattack with truth the persistent Soviet propaganda unfortunately making headway in some poorly informed countries, that South Korea had started the war on American orders. For our official answer to that—look and listen.

Thus the Nation, America, as top State Department officials have come before you to report, moves to meet the threat to our security. And the headlines, still warm, that tonight reflect the eighth week of action.

Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another teledocumentary this, then, against the background of battle front Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your second Battle Report, Washington.

Production, Ted Ayers.
Script, Lou Hazam.
Commentary, Robert McCormick.
Film, NBC, State Department, and Department of Defense.
Technical director, Sherman Hildreth.
Scenery and sets, Edward Camp.
Graphic work, Joseph Ferrier.

Our Foreign Policy Consistently Inconsistent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have been told almost every day that Russia is our real enemy. If that is the fact it is difficult to understand why our allies in western Europe and the Truman administration continue to do business with Stalin's gang.

Recently I presented tables, Mr. Speaker, to show that American dollars furnished to the ECA countries are being used to furnish war potentials to the Soviet and its satellites. The amount of such business last year was in excess of $1,000,000,000. And our own country is guilty of the same charge for we did more than $200,000,000 of business with our enemies. What kind of inconsistency is this? The people of this country want to know. They have not forgotten how Mr. Roosevelt refused to embargo shipments of oil and scrap iron to Japan and how this war potential was used to kill our boys in the South Pacific. This appeasement of Russia must stop. If it does not those who are responsible should be impeached.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including three news items:

BRITAIN AIDING RUSS—CHURCHILL

LONDON, August 26.—Winston Churchill charged tonight that the Labor government for the past 2 years has permitted British factories to make tools for the Soviet Union's war machine.

The wartime Prime Minister declared that Russian inspectors were allowed inside workshops where secret production is under way for the British Army. He also said machine tools have been sent to Communist Poland as well as Russia. The tools, Churchill said, were used in the manufacture and repair of tanks.

Churchill put forth those allegations, plus a charge of tardiness in getting British troops to Korea, in a 20-minute national radio broadcast in which he called on the people to kick out the "feeble" Socialist government as inept in time of crisis.

The Conservative Party leader reiterated his belief that only American predominance in atomic weapons is holding back "an aggressive Communist invasion" of Europe and that an attempt still should be made to "have a personal talk on a high level with the leaders of the Soviet Government."

Speaking from his country home in Kent, Churchill opened up with an attack on Prime Minister Clement Attlee for refusing to call Parliament into session at once, but he developed the speech into an over-all assault on the Government's defense policy. He gave the matter of the machine tools as an example.

BRITISH COMPANY TO SHIP MACHINE TOOLS TO RUSSIA

LONDON, August 28.—A British engineering firm, preparing to begin shipping £1,000,000 ($2,800,000) worth of machine tools to Russia Saturday, said today the British Labor government should withdraw the firm's export license for the materials.

The firm will go ahead with the shipment unless Prime Minister Attlee acts, its chairman, Joseph Greenwood, told reporters. He is the head of Craven Bros., a large toolmaking concern.

Winston Churchill, wartime Prime Minister and now leader of the Conservative opposition, charged last Saturday in a radio address that British firms were filling Russian orders, some of which were for tools "of a class required for the manufacture and repair of tanks."

ORDERS ADMITTED

The Ministry of Supply conceded that several British machine-tool makers were filling such contracts for Russia and that Russian inspectors are permitted in the factories.

Arthur Bottomley, the Labor government's Secretary for Overseas Trade, said, however, that "in supplying goods to Russia, Britain has been careful to withhold any commodities which come into the category of strategic priority." He added that Britain has obtained essential supplies from Russia, including grain and timber, "and in return we have had to make payment."

Greenwood announced that his firm was ready to make a shipment and then added:

"In view of international conditions I think the export license for these tools should be temporarily withdrawn by the Government. It is up to Mr. Attlee."

NOW IN SCOTLAND

Attlee is now on a vacation tour of Scotland.

Greenwood said the first installment of the tool order for Russia, £20,000 ($56,000) worth, is packed and ready to go.

"We should complete £1,000,000 order by the end of 1951," he said. "But we could sell these tools quite easily to British buyers. We are quoting them a 3-year delivery date for tools of the type we are sending to Russia next Saturday."

OFFICIALS HERE BLAME BRITAIN IN MOLYBDENUM LEAK TO REDS—LONDON EFFORT TO CREDIT ERROR TO UNITED STATES PROTESTED BY COMMERCE SPOKESMAN

(By Philip Warden)

The Commerce Department yesterday took sharp issue with British Board of Trade officials who implied that the United States was responsible for an American shipment of molybdenum to Britain being transshipped from Britain to Russia.

A Department spokesman said the Department would have no official comment to make on the case until an investigation can be completed. He made it clear, however, that all the facts uncovered so far show that the United States was not at fault. Press statements from Britain Friday quoted British officials in such a way as to imply America alone was responsible.

CONCEDE NO LAW BROKEN

The spokesman agreed with the British officials that the indications are that "no law was broken" in the deal that gave a big shipment of this scarce and vital war material, intended for British steel mills, to the Reds. Molybdenum is a steel-hardening agent essential to the production of virtually all munitions.

"These facts are known," the Commerce official said. "An American firm was issued a license to ship a cargo of molybdenum to a firm in England. Naturally we would not license a shipment of this material to Russia. But Britain is a friendly power, and this shipment was approved.

"Our license applications require the exporter to state who will be the recipient of the shipment, and its final destination. In this case, it was a British firm and the final destination was listed as England.

FIFTY TONS SLIP TO RUSSIA

"The molybdenum was shipped from here in May. It was transshipped from Britain in June or July. Investigation shows that approximately 50 tons of molybdenum, having a total value of approximately $45,000, went to Russia."

The Commerce official said that "once the shipment of a war material gets to Britain, it is Britain's responsibility and subject to their export controls, if any." The molybdenum was stored in British warehouses before being loaded on a Russian freighter.

Trade sources reported that Britain did not have any export controls on molybdenum at the time the shipment was made, although she does now. The Commerce Department officials observed that if this were true, then British Board of Trade officials are correct in their contention that no laws were broken. He refused comment on whether Britain lacked such export controls over molybdenum.

Matthews' Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by

David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 28, 1950, entitled "Matthews' Speech Is Realistic if Not in Line With Policy," as follows:

MATTHEWS' SPEECH IS REALISTIC IF NOT IN LINE WITH POLICY—ISSUE IS TOO REAL TO BE SOFT-PEDALED OR IGNORED LONGER

(By David Lawrence)

What Secretary of the Navy Matthews said in his Boston speech about anticipating aggression by counterattack cannot be poo-pooed as just irrelevant or indiscreet. For even though he spoke out of turn and has been reprimanded for it in the statement of disavowal issued by the State Department the issue he raised is fundamental and inescapable.

The issue is simply this: Would the American people be willing to see New York or Detroit or any other American cities suddenly destroyed without warning by atom bombs by an aggressor state and then only begin to retaliate by dropping our own atom bombs over the aggressor country?

Must the age-old forms of waiting for a declaration of war by an enemy still be accepted and thus let the aggressor state always possess the horrifying advantage of being able to tell exactly when and where the first blow will be struck?

REALISTIC PHASE OF ISSUE

This is not a new controversy in history and the apprehension of it has stirred probably has led to the outbreak of war in cases that might have yielded to peaceful negotiation, but it is a realistic phase of international relations which in an atomic era at least cannot be brushed aside as inapplicable to democracies.

The principal criticism that will be made of Mr. Matthews' speech is that he gave the Soviet propaganda bureau ammunition to call us warmongers. For he said that the time may come when the United States may have to "institute a war to compel cooperation" for peace, adding that while this might be new for a democracy, we might have to play a new role—"aggressors for peace."

Although the speech was not cleared through the State Department or White House and should never have been made because it does not jibe with American foreign policy, nevertheless now that the words have been expressed it probably is a good thing to have the Russian press and the Russian people know that the American people are not sitting idly by while a group of evil men in the Kremlin are considering more aggression in different parts of the world. It may be salutary for the Russians to learn that a democracy is debating counter measures against allowing an aggressor to take the initiative.

THE RIGHT TO INTERVENE

In principle, Mr. Matthews is really saying what the American policy proposals on the international control of atomic energy have advocated, namely, that when international inspection is agreed to there should be a right to go into any country and put a stop at once to any intended use of atomic energy for purposes of making war. In the absence of such international control, what shall be the role of a democracy?

This correspondent has differed in the past with Mr. Matthews' handling of the Navy Department and has said that a man of different experience should be heading that Department but it could well happen that Mr. Matthews' greatest service to his country will some day be recorded as having been performed by speaking out plainly as he did in Boston last week.

The issue is too real and means too much to the lives of many Americans to be soft-pedaled or ignored. George Craig, national Commander of the American Legion, last Saturday raised the same question.

GAZING AT CRYSTAL BALL

It all boils down to the fact that the United States while preparing to defend its cities and its allies is failing to come to grips with the basic question of a sudden attack by the Soviet. Instead all the democracies are doing is gazing into a crystal ball, trying to guess what the Communists may do.

The aggression in North Korea was the turning point in a war against the democracies which began 4 years ago. It's a war that has deprived many countries of their independence, has deprived nationals of other countries of their rights and has infiltrated by devilish means inside free nations, interfering with their governmental processes.

What Mr. Matthews might better have said is that Russia now has started a shooting war of aggression in North Korea and the question before the democracies is whether they will let the true aggressor escape or whether they will sit around the United Nations' table treating him as an equal when his hands are covered with the blood of Allied soldiers. Mr. Matthews might well have asked when America and her allies will begin formally to name Russia as the aggressor and take military steps if necessary, to bring about the withdrawal of her armies from Germany and other sovereign countries and from areas which Red troops are not entitled to occupy. But even so, it was and is the duty of the President and the Secretary of State to say such things—if they are to be said at all. Mr. Matthews has involuntarily given everybody, however, a solemn warning.

Universal Military Training Now Too Little and Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, it would seem almost unnecessary for me to again talk in favor of universal military training, which is a subject I have discussed favorably and at great length for 16 years. I have tried to emphasize the fact that it should not be either necessary or desirable for us to maintain an enormous permanent standing army, for I believe that our real defense will always be the citizen soldier. This involves the fact that training is more essential than ever before. Over and over again I have heard military experts say that a year is required for full training.

Those who opposed universal military training forget that human lives are at stake as well as military efficiency. They have not learned that our experience proves that untrained troops suffer enormously greater proportions of casualties than those trained. General Eisenhower said:

In terms of the larger issue of victory or defeat, comparison is not possible, because in modern war it is not possible to win without training. But in the more personal matter of the individual's chances for survival, I should say that the trained combat soldier has at least three times the chances of the untrained to live to become a veteran.

Heretofore we have had some borrowed time in which to train soldiers—time borrowed of our Allies. There will be no such borrowed time next time. No one can exactly foresee the precise form of any attack which may be made upon us in the future, near or far, but we may be assured it will not be ill-planned, will be effective, and will be awful. While some citizens will be undertaking to laugh off the possibility of an attack by Russia, the atomic bombs they have in large numbers and the guided missiles they are manufacturing more rapidly than we, will be let loose upon us some night and without warning and without a declaration of war. New York, Washington, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Chicago, and San Francisco will be destroyed. Hampton Roads will be nothing but a memory. Transportation will be paralyzed and even while the continental United States will still be in existence and probably a great many millions will be left alive, the price we will pay for our unpreparedness will cost us our place in the sun.

When Mr. X lands to reap the advantage of his atomic coup we will need organized ground forces on the beaches to confine his parachutists when they descend from the air. We will require very wide dispersal of troops and material. We will need trained men in large numbers.

It was not so long ago that Bernard Baruch, testifying before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in favor of scientific research, said:

However, scientific research by itself is only a piece of what is needed. I stress that because the atomic bomb, radar, and other war inventions have been so spectacular the public seems to have gotten the idea that nothing but scientific advance is needed for national safety. If the American people fall victim to any such notion, they will be inviting a terrible calamity.

Vital as it is, scientific research is not a substitute for universal training for war. It is not a substitute for a modernized industrial mobilization which will convert our Nation in quickest order to the conditions of any possible future war.

When Germany and Japan plunged the world into war, they gambled on American unpreparedness. They thought they could defeat our brave allies before American might could be mobilized.

Preparedness does not mean an armed camp nor a defense program that would beggar us and be dropped after a few years. Ours must be a permanent preparedness. It must be set at a level that will be continued year after year. At no future time must political aggressors be tempted to gamble on a blitzkrieg that would seek to overwhelm us with new or old weapons before the mobilization of our manpower, industry, agriculture, and science could be made complete and effective.

Quite probably, I shall not have occasion again to say to the Congress and to the people with respect to universal military training that we may wake up one morning as Belgium and Holland and Denmark and Norway did to find the enemy at our gates, to find atomic bombs have destroyed American cities. The war will be on with no declaration of war and we will have no such period of grace as we have had heretofore. There will be no time then to set up a Se-

lective Service System, build camps, find officers, induct trainees, and get them ready for whatever operations may be necessary, and there will be no other nations to bear the brunt of the attack or to shield us while we are getting ready. We will be the first target, but not the last.

Let me quote General Eisenhower again who said to my committee:

We must have a trained force large enough to make our resources and weapons instantly available for our needs.

Such training must be given in time of peace.

Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1950—Radio Commentator for Cooperative League of the United States Urges Immediate Action on Sparkman-Patman Bill—States Small Business Usually Bypassed in Defense Plans—Small Business Legislation Needed To Protect Freedom and Competition and To Step Up Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wallace J. Campbell, director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, in a Nation-wide broadcast on Monday, August 7, 1950, devoted a great deal of his comment to the companion bills S. 3978 and H. R. 9243 to create a Small Defense Plants Corporation. As you know, the Senate bill was introduced on July 26 by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, while I introduced an identical bill in the House.

Mr. Campbell spoke of the national organizations representing 16,000,000 Americans who, together with their families, account for 60,000,000 of our 150,000,000 population, which are backing the Sparkman-Patman bill. Surely, this support would be impressive in any cause. In support of small business, it is doubly impressive, not only because of the numerical support represented by these fine organizations but because the group is a complete cross section of America representing, as it does, small business, labor, farmers, and consumers. The organizations referred to by Mr. Campbell are a part of the small business antimonopoly conference which has made many splendid contributions to the cause of small business during the past year. Mr. Campbell's remarks follow:

Good evening. It is getting harder and harder to follow the congressional merry-go-round as defense and mobilization measures are debated in the Congress. Unfortunately it is almost impossible to separate the political motives which affect the Congress in this election year and the sincere differences of opinion which grow out of any normal legislative battle.

A distinguished Congressman told us this noon that a great deal of the scrapping in the Congress has been very insincere. I am afraid that's a true appraisal.

As of the present moment it would be extremely difficult to predict what forms the legislation on allocations, priorities, price and wage controls, taxation, and other matters will take. It is possible, however, to give you an illustration or two of what is involved in these decisions on Capitol Hill.

Last week we warned that monopoly was rearing its ugly head in a provision in the Defense Production Act which would have wiped out the antitrust laws. This week, it is fairly safe to predict that this provision, section 508, will be amended to provide fairly adequate safeguards against the roughshod destruction of the antitrust laws. Senator SPARKMAN and Congressman CELLER have introduced amendments which should clarify that section.

SMALL-BUSINESS DEFENSE PLANTS ACT OF 1950

In World War II the concentration of economic controls in the hands of a few corporations was speeded by the failure of the Congress to provide protection early enough for small, competitive industries. Already a group of congressional leaders is moving toward the creation of a Small Defense Plants Corporation which could facilitate the use of smaller business organizations, firms, partnerships, and cooperatives which could increase national production and decentralize industry.

Representatives of 15 national organizations in the field of small business, farm, labor, and cooperative enterprise met with Senator SPARKMAN and Congressman PATMAN this week to map strategy for the creation of such a corporation.

Represented in the coalition are about 16,000,000 Americans. These people, together with their families, make up more than 60,000,000 of America's 150,000,000 people.

The purpose of this small-business legislation is twofold: First, to protect freedom and competition within industry, and second, to step up national production by making use of the manpower, initiative, and facilities of the majority of American businesses which are usually bypassed in defense production when speed seems to call for the use of only the biggest of big business.

Within the next few weeks contracts will be placed for nearly $15,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. This is nearly half as much money as the American economy handled in the depression year of 1932.

Seventy-five percent of these war contracts, if they follow the pattern of the last war, will be let by negotiation, and only 25 percent by competitive bid.

If there is no adequate machinery for directing this tremendous flow of business into the smaller enterprises we will wind up with 75 or 100 businesses doing 90 percent of all war and defense production.

It is easy to understand why small business as such is interested in a proposed small-business defense corporation. The interest of labor, agriculture, and cooperatives is less obvious.

REASONS WHY LABOR, FARMERS, AND CONSUMERS SUPPORT H. R. 9243

The representative of the International Association of Machinists, America's largest independent trade union, put a finger on part of the answer when he said the lion's share of his union's contracts are with small businesses. They are so small that they cannot afford to send a man to Washington to look for Government contracts. They are likely to be "gobbled up" if the process of merger is intensified. The long-run life of his union is, therefore, identified with the continuation of small and competitive business.

There are bigger issues at stake, however. Doctor Adams of Michigan State University put it to the group this way. "The values we are fighting for are democratic values. Unless the battle is joined and the battle is won now, you may not have an opportunity to fight again." Doctor Adams pointed out that the giants in the steel industry are buying up the small fabricating plants, creating a greater monopoly situation in steel. He then quoted Judge Learned Hand as saying, "The Sherman Act was not passed to condone good trusts or to condemn bad trusts, but to outlaw all trusts."

A representative of the Independent Tire Dealers told the congressional leaders a story which illustrates the situation that faces us. During the last war when the need for rubber became critical, a group of tire dealers went to the Army's procurement division and offered their facilities in recapping and retreading tires. The Army official said that while he was interested in small business, it would be impossible for the Army to deal with a large number of independent enterprises, and that they would automatically have to ask the major tire companies to handle retreading and recapping.

The small tire dealer representative then pointed out that 85 percent of the facilities for recapping and retreading were in the hands of small dealers, that the tire industry had discouraged retreading tires because that cut into their market, and that the big rubber companies would find it impossible to do the job.

The Army, faced with these facts, changed its mind and more than 95 percent of the retreading and recapping was done by small, independent businessmen.

Our cooperatives had a similar situation during the last war. The big oil companies frowned on reprocessing lubricating oil. They apparently were afraid that American consumers would find out that reprocessed oil is almost as good, and in some cases better than, the original lubricating oil. The co-op refinery at Coffeyville, Kans., offered to undertake the job, and before the war was over, reprocessed millions of gallons of lube oil for training planes.

If the present crisis turns into a full-blown war, and the enemy resorts to the use of atom bombs, it might be possible to wipe out a large section of concentrated industry. If that happened, our defense production would have to be handled by decentralized plants. It might be wise national policy to build up those enterprises now.

Doctor Mund of the University of Wisconsin, analyzing the Small Defense Plants Corporation bill for the group, pointed to the great need for channeling a substantial part of defense business through small business enterprises so that there will be small business left when the war is over. If this is not done, we may wind up the present international crisis with nothing but monopolistic big business on our hands.

If I may quote Dr. Mund again, he cited the Romans as saying, "In time of war the laws are silent. Monopoly trends grow with impunity."

THE ISSUES CONFRONTING THE CONGRESS

On Capitol Hill there seems to be terrific demand for both wage and price controls. These, if they are to be enacted, ought to be tied in with an excess-profits tax which would wipe out entirely any profits made out of the war above the prewar profit level. That is the only kind of an excess-profits tax which will be equal to a freeze of either prices or wages. There seems to be no sentiment, however, to go quite that far. In fact, there has been a great deal of coolness in responsible circles to the excess-profits tax proposal.

If profits were cut off at their present level there would be no reason for complaint on

the part of business and industry. The Associated Press reported last week that 450 corporations in virtually every field of business showed profits averaging 43 percent higher in the second quarter of 1950 than in the same period of last year.

Measured in dollars, the profit of these corporations for the first 6 months of 1950 was $2,860,000,000. All this money was earned before the Korean war started.

Senator O'MAHONEY has been pushing hard for an excess-profits tax. He told the committee last week that corporations' profits are running at an all-time high and are rapidly increasing.

"Passage of the military spending bills will open the floodgates of inflation unless we take immediate steps to control the deluge of dollars by new taxes which will prevent private purchasing power from competing with newly created Government purchasing power."

Concluding his testimony, the Wyoming Senator said, "Obviously, corporate profits throughout World War II could have made a much larger contribution to the current cost of the war than they were called upon to do."

As you can see, the issues which are being settled on Capitol Hill this week involve more than whether or not there shall be adequate controls and adequate taxation. The decisions as to how the job of defense is carried forward may well determine what sort of an economy we have when this period of crisis is over.

Subversive Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this so-called subversive control bill (H. R. 9490) now under consideration. I will not attempt to discuss each and every unsound provision in this measure, because the bill itself is unsound starting with its enacting clause and ending with the last period.

H. R. 9490, like its predecessor, the Mundt-Nixon bill, is a vicious and repressive measure. Under the pretext of fighting communism, this bill would give to a Government bureau the power of life and death over all organizations. It provides that any organization shall be judged, not on the basis of the acts of its membership, but on their alleged beliefs in accordance with the whims of a Government board.

This bill suffers from every constitutional defect in the book. It is vague and indefinite. It would violate the principles of free speech, free press, free thought, and free association. It undermines the legal doctrine of due process, and it substitutes guilt by association for the historic American doctrine of personal guilt. Offered in an atmosphere of hysteria, this gruesome and un-American measure is an effort to destroy democracy in the name of anticommunism.

The purpose of the authors of this bill is clearly to close all legal avenues of expression by which the American people can effect political and social reform in this country. For it can be used, and if passed it will in due time be used, to harass and destroy labor unions and all types of liberal and progressive organizations. Hitler engineered his Reichstag fire and then used it to destroy the remaining vestiges of democracy in Germany. This bill is a legislative version of the Reichstag fire.

I am going to vote against this dangerous piece of legislation, and I am able to say here that every liberal organization in the country is hoping that a majority of the House will do likewise. The Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor are against this bill. The AVC, the ADA, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Farmers Union, and many other great national organizations are opposed to its passage. The United States Department of Justice has voiced its opposition.

Here I will quote from statements made by a few of the many prominent Americans who have testified against this bill or similar legislation:

Mr. Clarence Mitchell, of the NAACP, had this to say:

This bill purports to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities. It is impossible to see how proposals of this kind can do anything other than undermine the basic freedoms of our country.

The powers vested in the three-man loyalty board, which this bill would establish, are so sweeping that almost any organization might be affected, ranging from a college fraternity which holds secret meetings to a labor union which refuses to divulge a list of its members.

The net effect of such a law would be to replace the supposed menace of communism with a concentration camp atmosphere in which all persons who seek to promote social progress would be suspected of activities against the best interests of the United States. Many of them would be unjustly harassed under this law.

This bill would be likened to an effort to jail persons who are the victims of cancer instead of seeking the cause and cure of cancer.

Mrs. Alexander Stewart, of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, stated in part:

We oppose this bill because it is an attempt at direct thought control. It has the effect of undermining the right of free speech, free thought, and peaceful action and assembly of people who have committed no crime against the Government but who, as members of a proscribed organization, are subject to intimidation, persecution, and loss of livelihood.

Mr. James Patton, President of the National Farmers Union, stated:

The National Farmers Union always has regarded this legislation as unconstitutional and that it authorizes invasions of individual liberties which are repugnant to the basic character of our national existence. Denial of the fundamental guaranties of individual liberties contained in the Bill of Rights and elsewhere in the Constitution cannot but weaken that magnificent document as a whole.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, came out against all legislation of this type when he wrote the Committee on Un-American Activities:

After giving careful consideration to the bill and to the analysis made by our legal department, I concluded that there did not seem to be any good reason why such a bill as H. R. 7595 should be passed by the Congress of the United States. We can deal with the Communist question which H. R. 7595 seeks to deal with in a satisfactory way without resorting to the enactment of legislation such as is included in H. R. 7595.

Bishop John Wesley Lord of the Methodist Church, Boston Area, stated:

I am opposed to the Nixon bill because it * * * if passed, would abrogate America's long-cherished freedom. I sincerely believe, as a churchman seeking to perpetuate the spiritual principles upon which this Nation is founded, that legislation of this pattern is more in accord with police-state governments than it is with democratic governments, and ultimately will destroy the rights of a free people.

Here I wish to insert a large section of the statement of Mr. Thomas E. Harris, Assistant General Counsel of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, before the Un-American Activities Committee, in opposition to the Mundt-Nixon and Wood bills, because it sets forth my own views and because it represents the views of a large and important segment of the American labor movement. Mr. Harris stated:

THE NIXON AND WOOD BILLS INFRINGE CIVIL RIGHTS

We would like to call the attention of this committee to the specific provisions of the Nixon and Wood bills which, in our judgment, violate constitutional rights of due process, freedom of speech, press and assembly.

1. THE BILLS REGULATE OPINION, NOT CONDUCT

A very basic objection to both of these bills is that their purpose is to police and regulate not action or conduct, but thought and expression. Under these bills, organizations and individuals are punished, restrained, and regimented solely on the basis of political opinions, rather than on the basis of overt acts of disloyalty.

It has been traditional in this country, and in other democratic countries, to allow the widest possible freedom of thought and expression. Belief and speech hostile to the existing system of government is not only tolerated, but is protected by our Constitution, unless it takes the form of advocating some course of conduct in circumstances such as to make it probable that unlawful action will in fact ensue. In the language used by Mr. Justice Holmes in first enunciating what has since been known as the clear and present danger test, freedom of speech can be restricted only if "the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils the Congress has a right to prevent." *Schenck* v. *United States* (249 U. S. 47, 52). More recently, in *Bridges* v. *California* (314 U. S. 252), the Supreme Court said (p. 263):

"What finally emerges from the 'clear and present danger' cases is a working principle that the substantive evil must be extremely serious and the degree of imminence extremely high before utterances can be punished."

And still more recently, in *Thomas* v. *Collins* (323 U. S. 516, 530):

"Only the gravest abuses, endangering paramount interests, give occasion for permissible limitation."

In the Eightieth Congress, the sponsors of the Mundt-Nixon bill sought to justify its restriction of freedom of thought, speech, and assembly on the ground, among others, that the bill proceeded only against organizations, and did not prevent individuals from maintaining or advocating abstract views concerning the subjects dealt with in the bill. But if freedom of thought and freedom

of speech has any meaning, particularly in the political field, it must necessarily include the right to create and work through organizations. For, under the political systems which have developed in the democratic countries, effective political action means group action—action through political parties, labor unions, and other associations.

The right to create, to solicit others to join, and to act through such organizations is, therefore, protected by the Bill of Rights. It is the form which the freedom of assembly of earlier times takes in a more populous country and a more complicated society. Such groups often afford the only effective vehicle for the exercise of free speech. The Supreme Court has specifically held that the right to solicit others to join organizations is protected by the first amendment. It said:

"It was not by accident or coincidence that the rights to freedom in speech and press were coupled in a single guaranty with the rights of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition for redress of grievances. All these, though not identical, are inseparable. They are cognate rights * * * and therefore are united in the first article's assurance." (*Thomas* v. *Collins* (323 U. S. 516, 530).)

If, therefore, the restrictions which this bill places upon freedom of thought, speech and assembly can be justified under our Constitution, or reconciled with democratic principles, it cannot be on the basis that organizations rather than individuals are regulated. The only justification would be some overwhelming necessity for the legislation. We submit that no such necessity exists.

2. THE BILLS THREATEN THE EXISTENCE OF ALL PROGRESSIVE ORGANIZATIONS

The Nixon bill deals with two types of organizations: "Communist political organizations" and "Communist-front organizations."

A "Communist political organization" is defined in section 3 (3) as having "some, but not necessarily all, of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party," and which (a) is controlled by the foreign government or organization controlling the world Communist movement, and (b) operates primarily to advance the objectives of that movement. However, we are at a loss as to why this definition is included in the bill, since it does not seem to be controlling for any purpose.

For section 13 (a) of the bill creates a Subversive Activities Control Board, which is to determine whether an organization is a "Communist political organization." In making this determination, the Board is not referred to the definition in section 3 (3), but is to take into consideration a long list of factors enumerated in section 14 (e). These include the extent to which the organization's policies are formulated to effectuate the policies of the foreign government or organization controlling the world Communist movement; the extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign movement or organization; the extent to which it sends members to any foreign country for instruction in the principles of the world Communist movement; the extent to which it fails to disclose or resists efforts to obtain lists of its members; and so on and so on. There are eight numbered paragraphs enumerating considerations of this type. One of the paragraphs has numerous subdivisions. The Board is directed to take all of these factors into consideration, but is not told what weight it shall give to any particular factor, or even that it must find the existence of a certain number of these factors before concluding that an organization is a Communist political organization. It is, therefore, apparent that an organization may be labeled as a "Communist political organization" solely on the basis of ideas and opinions, rather than on the basis of illegal acts.

The provision in the bill that resistance to efforts to obtain membership lists is a hallmark of a Communist political organization is particularly objectionable to labor organizations, which have learned through long experience that the submission of such lists is the first step to a blacklist through which an organization may be completely destroyed.

A "Communist-front organization" is defined in section 3 (4) as any organization which is either under the control of a "Communist political organization," or is primarily operated for the purpose of giving support to a "Communist political organization," a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement. This definition also seems to be meaningless, since the Subversive Activities Control Board is again, in section 14 (f), furnished with a list of entirely different criteria which it is "to take into consideration" in determining whether any organization is a "Communist-front organization."

These criteria are the identity of the persons active in the management of the organization "whether or not holding office therein"; the sources of its support, financial and otherwise; the uses made by it of its resources and personnel; and the extent to which the position taken by the organization from time to time on matters of policy does not deviate from the position taken by any Communist political organization. Here again, the Commission does not have to find that all or any stated number of these factors exist.

Thus, under this bill, if a few Communists are active in connection with a labor organization, even though they do not hold office, that fact alone could furnish the basis for a finding of the Subversive Activities Commission that the organization is a "Communist-front organization."

The proposed bill could very easily condemn an organization as illegal solely because its policies happen to coincide with those of the Communist Party. Thus, support by a labor organization of objectives also supported by Communists, such as the abolition of the poll tax, enactment of an adequate housing program, and the protection of civil rights, could, under the standards proposed by the bill, furnish the basis for the conclusion that the organization is a "Communist-front."

Under these provisions, not only labor organizations but other progressive organizations could be branded as subversive and destroyed. The CIO is familiar with the indiscriminate use of such terminology by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Both CIO and CIO-PAC have been repeatedly and wrongfully denounced as "Communist," "Communist-front," and "totalitarian" organizations. In its 1944 report, the House Un-American Activities Committee denounced CIO-PAC as representing "a subversive Communist campaign to subvert the Congress of the United States by its totalitarian program." There is no particular reason to suppose that the Subversive Activities Control Board set up in this bill would be any more responsible or any less reactionary than this congressional committee has been.

The Nixon bill is not just another routine measure. This bill is in fundamental conflict with our constitutional form of government and with the premises of a democratic society.

If the Nixon bill shows an indifference to civil rights, the Wood bill flaunts them even more callously. It would give the Attorney General the power, by fiat, without a hearing, and subject to no review whatever, to destroy any organization. For the Wood bill would make it a crime for any Federal employee, or any individual in private industry employed in connection with the performance of any national defense contract, to be a member of or to support any organization designated as subversive by the Attorney General. That an organization so designated by the Attorney General could not survive under the bill is a point which scarcely needs to be labored.

The Wood bill thus gives the Attorney General absolute power to determine what organizations may exist. We have no hesitation in stating that that proposal is nakedly totalitarian.

We think it is bad enough that the Attorney General now lists organizations as subversive without any sort of hearing or any opportunity to the organization to disprove the charge. We hope that the Supreme Court will supply this deficiency by holding that an organization listed as subversive is entitled to judicial review.

But what the Wood bill would do would be much worse. At the present time, membership in organizations on the Attorney General's list is treated as evidence pointing to possible disloyalty, but as evidence which may be rebutted. As the Department of Justice has correctly pointed out, there is a vast difference between that and making mere membership a crime.

There is, we think, no question whatever but that the Wood bill would be held unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has squarely held that mere membership in the Communist Party may not be punished. *DeJonge* v. *Oregon* (299 U. S. 353).

3. THE PENALTY PROVISIONS OF THE NIXON BILL ARE VAGUE, OPPRESSIVE, AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The Nixon bill requires "Communist political organizations" and "Communist-front organizations" to register as such, and to file certain information with the Attorney General. The bill requires both types of organizations to file a list of all officers and full financial statements of receipts and expenditures. In addition, "Communist political organizations" are required to submit a full list of members, and any member whose name is not submitted is required to register himself. All of this data is to be available for public inspection.

Both "Communist political organizations" and "Communist-front organizations" are required by the bill to label all mail intended for more than one person as: "Disseminated by _____, a Communist organization." They are also required to initiate all radio broadcasts which they sponsor with this announcement: "The followly program is sponsored by _____, a Communist organization."

An additional disability which is imposed upon "Communist political organizations" and "Communist-front organizations" is the loss of tax exemptions which they would otherwise enjoy.

Where an organization is ordered to file and register, and fails to do so, a fine from $2,000 to $5,000 may be imposed. Where the failure is due to the decision of a particular executive officer, the prescribed punishment for such an officer is a fine of from $2,000 to $5,000 or imprisonment from 2 to 5 years, or both. Each day of failure to register constitutes a separate offense.

In the Eightieth Congress the sponsors of the Mundt-Nixon bill, which was the predecessor of this bill, argued that it was a mild measure because it did not outlaw organizations labeled as "Communist political organizations" or "Communist-front organizations." Such a claim is completely misleading. There can be no question that the registration requirements amount to destruction. This is so for the obvious reason that organizations which are made to register are subject by legislative fiat to the stigma of disloyalty. Any claim that this bill does not destroy or outlaw these organizations reduces itself to the assertion that

the bill compels them to commit suicide, rather than destroys them outright.

Of course it is obvious that if these organizations enjoy a right under the Constitution to exist and to carry on their activities through the exercise of civil rights, then that right may not be impaired even by a registration requirement, not to speak of the mail and tax disabilities which are likewise written into the bill. In *Thomas* v. *Collins* (323 U. S. 516, 539), the Supreme Court said: "As a matter of principle a requirement of registration in order to make a public speech would seem generally incompatible with the exercise of free speech and free assembly."

The blacklist which would result from registration would in itself be sufficient to destroy an organization. For there can be no question but that persons listed as members of Communist political organizations would thereafter be unable to secure jobs. Indeed, the labeling last year of certain Hollywood writers as Communists led their employers to breach written employment contracts. Such a blacklist would likewise be possible in the case of a Communist-front organization, even though such organizations are not required to submit membership lists, since they are required to disclose the sources of their funds, and that information would serve to identify contributors to the organization.

The bill carries certain additional penalties specifically directed against members of the condemned organizations. Thus, under the bill, it is unlawful for any member of a Communist political organization to hold any nonelective office or employment with the Federal Government or apply for a passport. Any Government official who appoints or employs any such individual, or who issues a passport to such an individual, is likewise guilty of a violation of the law. Penalties for violation of these provisions are a fine of not less than $2,000 or more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not less than 2 or more than 5 years, or both.

Section 4 of the bill appears to apply both to organizations and individuals. This section of the bill makes it illegal for any person, defined elsewhere as either an individual or organization, knowingly to conspire with any other person to perform any act which would substantially facilitate the establishment in this country of a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign domination. A violation of this section is punishable by fines up to $10,000, imprisonment up to 10 years, or both.

One objection to this provision of the bill is that it does not require that the action which would aid the Communist movement be undertaken for that purpose or with that intention, but only that it be done knowingly. "Knowingly" in criminal statutes has sometimes been interpreted as requiring only a conscious act, and under the strictest construction means only that the defendant contemplated, or should have contemplated, the consequences of his acts.

Suppose, for example, that the United Steelworkers of America, in bargaining collectively with the United States Steel Corp., requests a reasonable wage increase, one needed by the workers to maintain a decent standard of living, and the directors of the corporation reject the request. Certainly it could be said that the rejection of such a request would substantially facilitate the establishment of a Communist regime in this country by depriving the workers of a decent standard of living, and creating hostility between labor and capital. The directors of the United States Steel Corp. could thus be indicted and sent to jail under this provision for rejecting the union's demand. On the other hand, the union could just as well be convicted under the bill for putting forward a demand which might tend to create industrial strife and thus aid the Communist Party.

Section 4 of the Nixon bill is not aimed at acts or conduct, which are capable of precise definition. Rather it is the intention of this section to punish as a crime mere advocacy, argument, or persuasion, whether or not calculated in the circumstances to lead to the immediate commission of overt illegal acts. As we have already stressed, the Supreme Court has consistently ruled that mere advocacy of ideas, however odious, cannot, under our Constitution, be restrained or punished.

4. THE NIXON BILL'S PROCEDURES IGNORE COMMON LAW SAFEGUARDS

One would expect that a bill which imposes such drastic penalties upon organizations and individuals would scrupulously adhere to the time-honored procedural protections which are the boasts of the Anglo-American legal and constitutional systems. This would include provision for fair trial on the issues before a judge and jury and the application of the usual rule that a defendant in a criminal case is presumed innocent until proven guilty and must be convicted upon evidence establishing guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. If an organization refuses to accept the brand or stigma which the bill would stamp upon it, certain procedural requirements are laid down to permit the Attorney General, not through a criminal proceeding, but through an administrative proceeding, to impose the bill's brand on them. Under these administrative procedures the Subversive Activities Control Board is authorized to make an administrative finding, after a hearing, that the organization involved is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

The Commission's hearing, like all administrative hearings, is without jury and wholly lacking in those protections to the defendant which would obtain in a criminal trial. The hearing itself is not before a judge but before a Federal board.

It should also be borne in mind that the Attorney General does not merely prosecute the accused organization, he likewise is charged with the task of investigating the organization. In so doing, he is authorized by the law to subpena the books and records of the organization and to compel testimony. Such a provision would, of course, permit the Attorney General a virtually unlimited power of search over the internal affairs and membership lists of such organizations as labor unions.

The bill provides that the findings of the Subversive Activities Commission that an organization is illegal, within the meaning of the bill, may be appealed to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia within 60 days. Such a review, of course, would consider only questions of law.

The legislative findings upon which the statutes rests, the trial procedure and the review procedure make mockery of our constitutional guaranties which have been developed for the protection of defendants in criminal cases.

5. SUMMARY

The Nixon bill is a serious threat to our most cherished constitutional safeguards.

It imposes penalties upon association and opinion rather than upon overt actions.

The bill is so loosely drawn that it could impose a black-out upon the civil rights of thousands of individuals who would be driven from progressive organizations out of fear that that the vague provisions might be made applicable to them.

Penalties and disabilities are imposed upon individuals, not as a result of unlawful activities but merely upon the basis of affiliation or association. Moreover, the operation of various provisions would permit the creation of a blacklist, so obnoxious to our traditions.

The bill wipes out the fundamental protections for defendants in criminal cases. It substitutes administrative procedure for due process of law.

The definitions of the bill would make it possible for the Attorney General to proceed against labor organizations, and the vague character of the bill's standards would make possible a tremendous expansion of its scope.

At best, the vagueness of the bill affords no security to the fair use of the opportunity for free political discussion. The bill is strewn with terms which have no precise legal meaning and which will force reasonable men to act at their peril. In *Stromberg* v. *California* (283 U. S. 359, 369) the Supreme Court stated:

"The maintenance of the opportunity for free political discussion to the end that government may be responsive to the will of the people and that changes may be obtained by lawful means, an opportunity essential to the security of the Republic is a fundamental principle of our constitutional system. A statute which upon its face, and as authoritatively construed, is so vague and indefinite as to permit the punishment of the fair use of this opportunity is repugnant to the guaranty of liberty contained in the fourteenth amendment."

More recently, in *Winters* v. *New York* (333 U. S. 507), the Supreme Court held:

"A failure of a statute limiting freedom of expression to give fair notice of what acts will be punished and such statute's inclusion of prohibitions against expressions, protected by the principles of the first amendment, violates an accused's rights under procedural due process and freedom of speech or press."

There can be no question that the Nixon Bill is so pervasively vague as to impose broad pressures and restraints upon the exercise of rights of political expression. Moreover, as the Supreme Court has repeatedly pointed out, vagueness in a statute involving civil rights lays the basis for discriminatory and unfair application. Such discrimination is easily directed against minority groups, who, more than other groups, need the shield of constitutional protection.

CONCLUSION

That this country should be considering legislation so repressive of political and civil rights at a time when it is in no real danger from the Communist movement in America, is surely little to our credit. Our fears, and the lengths to which it is suggested we should go to soothe them, present an unflattering contrast to the recent conduct of France and Italy. In those nations, which have no such tradition of continuous democratic government as we have, the local Communist Parties possess real strength, or did a short time ago. The Russian armies were and are close indeed to the borders of those nations. Yet neither France nor Italy resorted to any such extreme measure as outlawing the Communist Party or passing repressive legislation. Today the democratic forces in those countries, with the aid of ECA, have gained greatly in strength, while the local Communist movements have lost adherents. If those countries, gravely threatened, could show such devotion to democracy, surely it is not necessary for this nation, of all countries the most secure from any internal threat, to turn away from its democratic tradition.

Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a broadcast by Mr. George Sokolsky on August 20 over radio station WJZ, New York. His comments on the China situation are most pertinent and I commend them to all members of the House.

FACE

The Chinese have a word for it—"mien tze." Translated, that means "face." If a man has lost face, he has lost what we call character, position, dignity. He is just nothing and nobody.

This concept of personal dignity, of pride, of "face" is so fundamental in the oriental nature that it can never be ignored. Those who have lived in far eastern countries understand this and are very careful about it. No one can make a Chinese or Japanese lose "face" who does not expect repercussions.

Now, I am not devoting this evening to a discussion of oriental psychology, although that would, I am sure, be interesting. Instead, I want to apply this characteristic of "face" to the effort, including war, that Soviet Russia is making to force the United Nations to accept Soviet China as a member.

Mao Tse-tung, the head of Soviet China, has "lost face" with the Chinese people. Assisted by Soviet Russia, he has been able to conquer China, but he has not been able to get a seat in the United Nations. Without that seat, he and his government have no position in international relations. Mao sits in Peiping, but it is Chiang Kai-shek's representative who speaks in the United Nations.

Soviet Russia must have lots of trouble with Mao Tse-tung over this question. Naturally, I know nothing about that and can only surmise what goes on from my general understanding of the Chinese concept of "face."

Mao undoubtedly put it up to Stalin to get him that seat in the United Nations. Maybe that is why Molotov has been spending so much time in China. Mao Tse-tung has also been egging on the British and the Indians to get him that seat.

The principal British firm in China is Jardine Matheson which has enormous holdings there. Its manager for China is John Keswick whom I know well. He is situated in Shanghai. From information that I receive from old friends in China, the Communists there refuse to permit him to leave the country. Other British and American businessmen are unable to leave. The British are trying to salvage Mao's "face" in the hope that Mao Tse-tung will not confiscate their properties.

Of course, this is nonsense, because it is inherent in the Marxist ideology that all means of production, distribution, and exchange shall be government-owned. Once Mao Tse-tung has been given his seat in the United Nations, he will be so much stronger in China, that he will follow the entire Communist line uncompromisingly.

The Russians understand this situation much more clearly than the British do. They understand Mao Tse-tung's problem more clearly than Dean Acheson does. The Russians are by race and training not Europeans but Orientals. Stalin is even a Georgian, an Asiatic.

Therefore, they must realize that if they cannot get that coveted seat in the United Nations for Mao Tse-tung, he will, sooner or later, feel that they have let him down. He might even go the way of Tito and set up a schismatic Marxist power. The Russians would then either have to get rid of him or lose the value of the Soviet victory in China.

Therefore, they started the Korean war. Therefore, Jacob Malik acts as he does in the United Nations. Therefore, they are sending Vishinsky and Gromyko to Lake Success.

They must save Tao Tse-tung's face and, for that matter, their own.

If that is what they must do, is it to the interest of the United States to help them?

What do we want?

We want peace. But we also want that no one nation should master the human race. We desire that each people, great or small, former friend or former foe, shall be independent with the right to govern itself according to its own traditions and choice.

In fact, that is why we entered World War II. In the Atlantic Charter, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill said that "* * * they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. * * *"

But we see that some 15 countries have been conquered by Soviet Russia in whole or in part. In Asia, Mongolia, China, and most of Korea have been conquered. Pressure is being put on French Indochina, Afghanistan, Kashmir, and Pakistan. Any one of these countries could be conquered out of China, Mongolia, and Siberia whenever Russia chooses. They cannot defend themselves. French Indochina can be defended by France and the United States. The other countries are defenseless.

India realizes the plight of these countries and is frightened. That is why Pandit Nehru, the head of the Indian Government, is trying to act as a middleman between the United States and Soviet Russia, between the United Nations and Mao Tse-tung. Maybe if Mao Tse-tung's face can be saved, he will not invade India. There might even be a bargain about it.

But if this kind of scheming can succeed, then Soviet Russia can win an enormous victory. For it can be established by this one fact that Stalin is the master of the world, that the United Nations must obey him, that the United States amounts to nothing. Stalin will have proved to every Asiatic nation and to many European nations that their soundest course whether they like it or not, will be to obey him.

Such an enhancement of his power will destroy the United Nations and will isolate the United States. Even Great Britain will have to reconsider its position because of its commercial interests in China and India, which, under such circumstances, they could salvage only with Stalin's consent.

It is clearly logical that if Mao Tse-tung's representatives are seated in the United Nations, Stalin has won his biggest victory and the United States has suffered a supreme defeat.

What should we do?

The course seems pretty clear. The entire question of who represents China in the United Nations should be postponed until after the Korean war is over. If the Russians insist upon bringing this question before the United Nations now, then the United States should employ the veto.

If Soviet Russia proposes that Soviet China be seated in the United Nations, the United States should vote, veto.

If Soviet Russia proposes that Soviet Korea be seated in the United Nations, the United States should vote, veto.

If Soviet Russia boycotts the United Nations, let her stay away. She boycotted that body from January 13 until a couple of weeks ago and then had to come back to try to save Mao Tse-tung's face. Stalin cannot save Mao's face by boycotting the United Nations again.

Let Soviet Russia try what she will, if we keep Mao out of the United Nations, we weaken Stalin's position in Asia, strengthen respect for the United States and give hope to those countries that want to be independent.

There is one further point I wish to make.

This is not propaganda for my good friend, Chiang Kai-shek. We have known each other for more than 30 years and his wife is one of my closest friends.

Such matters are personal and can never be considered when the welfare of the United States is at stake. We Americans must learn not to be pro-British or pro-French or pro-Chinese or pro-Russian. Nor should we be anti- any of these or other countries.

We should be pro-American.

What is good for the United States of America should be our only thought. Nothing else matters. No other yardstick can be truly of value to us.

It is to America's interest that Mao Tse-tung should continue to lose face. That is our strongest weapon against Stalin's imperialism.

Therefore, America should veto Soviet China. We should use the veto. Our people should demand of its Government that the veto be used against Soviet China.

The United Nations Charter gives to five nations, the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Russia, France, and China, the right to use the veto in the Security Council.

This was written into the Charter of the United Nations to prevent a majority of the small nations from ganging up on the large ones. It was an American proposal and one upon which we insisted.

Thus far, only Soviet Russia has used the veto and very freely. It is now time for the United States to use the veto to save itself and the free world. This is the only course that is to our advantage.

Thank you. This is George Sokolsky. Good night.

MacArthur Statement on Formosa Completely in Accord With President Truman's Own Statement of June 27, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington News of August 29, 1950:

AN ARTIFICIAL ISSUE

(By Ludwell Denny)

The President's suppression of General MacArthur's Formosan statement is a case of politics and personalities creating an artificial issue where none exists in fact.

In his statement prepared for the Veterans of Foreign Wars the general merely explained the military reasons behind the President's pronouncement of June 27 that "the occupation of Formosa by Communist forces would

be a direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to United States forces performing their lawful and necessary functions in that area."

That is not only the truth, it is also the official policy of the United States. As such, it presumably cannot be repeated too often, as a warning to aggressors and as an assurance to free nations that the United States recognizes the threat.

Why then did the President see fit to ban a MacArthur statement which not only supported, but extravagantly praised, his own decision of June 27?

No specific answer is forthcoming from the White House. But the aides there say it should be clear from a comparison of the MacArthur statement and the President's letter to Warren Austin, United States delegate to the United Nations. That letter—which requotes approvingly Austin's explanation of the American position to the UN—concerns the future status of Formosa.

General MacArthur's statement did not touch directly on that subject. Therefore it could not conflict with the excellent Truman doctrine that the island's future must be determined internationally by the Japanese treaty or by the UN.

By inference, however, General MacArthur's statement supports this policy because it praises the Truman decision of June 27 and reaffirms our nonaggressive purpose.

MacArthur condemns the threadbare argument by those who advocate appeasement and defeatism in the Pacific that if we defend Formosa we alienate continental Asia. But the earlier Truman-Acheson policy of not defending Formosa was reversed by the President himself on June 27—not by General MacArthur.

The general as an an American and United Nations commander would exceed his authority, and be subject to reprimand, if he tried to make political policy. His suppressed statement does not do so.

He does not feed the fears of some of our allies, as alleged, that the United States intends to help Chiang Kai-shek recapture the China mainland. The general says: "It envisions no attack against anyone nor does it provide the bastions essential for offensive operations, but properly maintained would be an invincible defense against aggression."

MacArthur's misfortune is to be treated by the Democratic administration and its Republican critics in a campaign year as a political figure, and to have meanings read into his statements which he has not put there. This democratic political feud in turn influences Allied governments and the UN to look for partisan implications when he speaks.

In the past the general occasionally has shown political inclinations and thus invited criticism. But in this case he has been functioning as a great commander and patriot.

Drive on Religion in Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, if further evidence is required of the well-known fact that wherever Communists gain control religion and religious institutions are among its first victims, the report on the relentless campaign against Christian missions in China by the Communists is another verification of this fact. In its issue of August 27, 1950, the New York Herald Tribune published a brief article on the matter which is as follows:

REDS STRANGLE MISSIONS—CATHOLICS' INSTITUTIONS IN CHINA FEEL SLOW BUT RELENTLESS DRIVE

(By Barrett McGurn)

ROME.—Slow but relentless progress which Communists have been making in eliminating Catholic missioners in China, Manchuria, and Mongolia is indicated by reports reaching the Vatican's Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The congregation's news agency, a group staffed largely by priests, sums up the reports as follows:

1. Fourteen thousand native and foreign priests, sisters, and brothers are still inside China as missionaries, but in many cases have had to take jobs as manual laborers, farmers, shepherds, clerks, merchants, or traveling medical aid personnel.

2. Treatment of missionaries has varied widely from the northern Manchurian open countryside, where missionary work is possible only on a clandestine basis, to southeast China, where activities continue without much difficulty except for limitations on the movement of missionaries and except for "adaptions," which have been necessary in missionary schools because of the changed circumstances."

3. Catholic universities, high schools, and elementary schools still are operating in various parts of China, but it is not far from accurate to say that many are no longer Catholic except in name; school programs now include obligatory instruction in atheism, Marxism, and materialism given by specially appointed teachers, and school administration is entirely in the hands of committees of professors, students, and employees who serve as government instruments, almost always obeying directives from above.

4. Many churches, especially in north and central China, were destroyed on one pretext or another before 1948. Since then various surviving structures have been turned into meeting halls, theaters, offices, or granaries or have been closed.

5. Despite the requisitioning of some church property, religious ceremonies in general still are permitted, especially in the large cities. In some cases the faithful are intimidated, however, by police taking names at ceremonies and in other cases names, ages, and professions of persons planning to attend services are demanded in advance.

6. Industrial schools under missionary auspices such as those in Peking, Wuhu, and Anking are generally functioning well, although those in Shanghai and Suchow for some time have encountered obstacles. Missionary pharmaceutical dispensaries have increased their work a hundredfold, but hospitals, orphanages, and institutions for the care of children are facing steadily mounting difficulties because of high prices and taxes.

"The general tendency is ever more toward a total strangulation of religious life," the congregation's news agency concluded.

Congressman Rodino Praised by Zionist Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to draw attention to kind words about a deserving colleague; and it gives me double pleasure to be able to place before the House the words of praise for the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of the Tenth District, written by my friend, Elihu D. Stone of the American Zionist Council, because of my deep personal interest in Zionism and the Republic of Israel.

That Mr. RODINO is a warm personal friend as well as a colleague adds further to my pleasure. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that in the gentleman's relatively brief service in the House of Representatives he has shown himself worthy of the honor bestowed by his constituents. He has proved himself alert, well-informed, devoted to humanitarian legislation of merit, and dedicated to the noblest aims of representative government, while never stultifying his record or his personality by pedantry—in other words, he is able, energetic, decisive, but never a "stuffed shirt."

I am very happy to include in the RECORD, under leave, as part of my remarks, the letter addressed to the gentleman by Mr. Stone on June 20, to which I have already referred.

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
WASHINGTON BUREAU,
June 20, 1950.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RODINO: The joint declaration by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, relative to the Near East, which was made public by the President on May 25, is a significant document which may lead to the establishment of peaceful relationship between Israel and its Arab neighbors if honestly carried out.

Your kind and effective cooperation in urging our State Department to take action for the purpose of promoting peace and tranquillity in the Near East is deeply appreciated.

The said declaration as I analyze it contains the following points:

1. For the first time in modern history the Big Three—the United States, England, and France—agreed on concerted and coordinated action in that sensitive region of the world—the Near East. It is a wholesome substitute for the pursuit of the hitherto policy of unilateral action resulting very often in conflicting action. It imposes collective responsibility.

2. The calling for a pledge on the Arab countries and Israel to refrain from any and every aggressive or warlike action against one another as a condition precedent to the future delivery of arms should serve to discourage the Arab warmongers.

3. The pledge by the Big Three to place Israel in a condition of equality and parity with the Arab states with reference to delivery of arms, and the establishment of a balance of arms between them, if honestly carried out, should serve as an encouragement toward establishment of permanent peace between the Arab states and Israel.

4. The unequivocal declaration by the Big Three of their "opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab States and Israel" implies a policy of vigilant watchfulness obligating the big three to stop the shipment of arms whenever the threat of such an arms race manifests itself.

5. The Big Three pledged themselves to take immediate and joint action whenever and wherever a threat to peace in that section of the world may appear. They agreed to take such joint action "within and outside the United Nations." The term "outside" is

most decisive. It implies speedy and prompt action by the Big Three to prevent a threat of aggression from being converted into actual aggression.

Like any other similar documents this declaration will not execute itself. It is as strong as the reliability of its authors and no more.

We assume and we must assume that the Big Three—the United States, England, and France—acted and will continue to act in good faith.

However, in the light of past sad experiences and disappointments, we must rely upon the vigilance of the friends of Israel like your good self to see to it that the Department of State carries out honestly the terms of the said Big Three declaration.

As you well know, the past record of the Near East Division of our Department of State is one of unfriendliness to Israel. The "Bevin" line dominated.

Your noble services to the cause of Israel will always be remembered. The Jewish people are a grateful people; they never forget their friends.

You, dear Congressman, have proven yourself to be a true and tested friend.

With kindest regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

ELIHU D. STONE.

Letter From Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPPESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, points up once again the appalling stupidity and selfishness of the American Medical Association in preventing legislation deplorably needed to breach the gap in medical facilities.

Those supporting the AMA position of depriving the Veterans' Administration of adequate medical staff may well search their consciences as well as their judgment in joining the multi-million-dollar opposition—the AMA—which has refused to consider the broad interests of our national defense and the welfare of the people. The letter follows:

I am informed that your committee now has under active consideration the so-called medical education bill (H. R. 8886) which is similar in purpose to a bill (S. 1453) which passed the Senate last fall.

While the Veterans' Administration would not be charged with administering this proposal, we are deeply interested in its underlying purpose, which is to create an increased supply of qualified medical, dental, and related personnel.

This Administration is now operating 138 hospitals. In the balance of this calendar year we will open 12 new hospitals. Other hospitals scheduled to be opened at later dates will provide a hospital plant of some 131,000 beds. This is the largest number of hospitals operated as a group in the world.

Securing an adequate medical staff is already developing into a serious problem because of the general shortage of qualified personnel. With the opening of additional hospitals, the problem will become intensified.

Only 6,000 doctors are currently being graduated into the medical profession each year. To maintain adequate staff, we require such a large proportion of these that it is at present impossible to secure a sufficient number. The medical team which cares for the needs of veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration now includes 6,500 full-time doctors (including residents), 12,500 nurses and nearly 1,000 dentists. In addition to these, we utilize the services of numbers of consultants and visiting physicians. Outside of the hospitals, we have agreements with 75,000 physicians and 55,000 dentists for veterans' "home-town treatment."

Because of the general shortage of qualified personnel, the problem of staffing our hospitals to provide for the growing load will no doubt become increasingly serious as time goes on. In addition to this we are faced with possible losses of doctors should the present crisis in international affairs assume widespread proportions, as 55 percent of our doctors and 60 percent of our dentists hold reserve commissions and are currently subject to call.

Should H. R. 8886 receive favorable consideration and become law, it is believed that it would furnish material assistance to the Veterans' Administration by making it less difficult to staff its new hospitals and by providing a more assured flow of medical personnel into this service.

Because of these considerations, I am in strong accord with the underlying purposes of this and similar legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator.

Los Angeles Central Labor Council to Forefront in Opposing Communist Dictatorship and Complimenting President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE FOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under recent date I received from W. J. Barrett, the secretary of the Los Angeles Central Labor Council, a certified copy of resolution dated July 27, 1950, relating to the world situation and including the pledge of the thousands of members of this organized labor group to the United States Government, and to President Truman.

The resolution speaks out clearly and vibrantly. I commend these craftsmen for this forward-looking and timely action. The resolution follows:

Whereas since the end of World War II a serious conflict has existed between Soviet Russia and the democratic nations in the reorganization of national governments throughout the world; and

Whereas Soviet Russia through the pressure of a cold war has continuously attempted to impose communism and satellite dictatorship on small and defenseless nations; and

Whereas the United States, by means of the Marshall plan and with the assistance of the United Nations, has assisted many nations in recovering their economic independence, thereby preserving democracy and the right of the people to form a government of their own selection; and

Whereas the activities of the United States has made it impossible for Soviet Russia to impose Communist dictatorship on millions of people in these nations; and

Whereas Soviet Russia has now inspired the Communist dictatorship of North Korea to openly attack the South Korean democracy; and

Whereas President Truman displayed valiant courage in immediately ordering the assistance of the United States Government by supplying materials and armed forces to combat this unwarranted attack; and

Whereas most of the governments belonging to the United Nations have followed President's Truman's leadership and are now extending assistance for the preservation of democracy in South Korea: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles Central Labor Council in regular session Monday, July 17, 1950, does hereby highly commend President Truman and the United States Government for the forthright and determined actions to stop the Communist aggression; and be it further

Resolved, That the council condemn Soviet Russia for inspiring and supplying arms to this conflict which may easily develop into another world war; and be it further

Resolved, That the delegates to this council pledge their full support to President Truman and the United States Government to stop the armed aggression of Communist dictatorship in Korea, or any other nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each affiliated union requesting that they take similar action.

Adopted in regulation session of the Los Angeles Central Labor Council, July 17, 1950.

W. J. BASSETT,
Secretary.

This resolution concurred in and adopted by local lodge, No. 92, of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, A. F. of L., in regular meeting assembled on July 27, 1950.

E. V. BLACKWELL,
Secretary.

Bring Back the Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 11, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1950, I called upon the President to bring back into the Government those genuine experts, particularly on communism and on the Far East, who understood the facts of life regarding the threat to our survival and were rewarded for their foresight by being let out of the Government. America needs them now. An editorial from the New Leader of August 26, 1950, points out the same urgent need. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial:

AT LAST

There was heartening news last week for the anxious peoples of the world. A distinguished group of United States Senators—12 Democrats and 16 Republicans, headed by Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont—appealed to President Truman to launch a "psychological and spiritual offensive against the Kremlin." The aim of the offensive: to establish "relations of brotherhood" with the Russian people in order to

"soften and erode the foundations of the Politburo."

Translated into blunt language, the senatorial proposal means encouraging the Russians to overthrow the present aggressive totalitarian regime. Translated into action (without which words are useless) it means giving the Russians the American support they require to accomplish that objective and thus spare mankind the ravages of world war III.

The Senate appeal to the President emphasizes that to get across our great message to the Russians "we need a new vigor, a new imagination, a new directness of speech. We need the message to be continuously, indefinitely, reiterated. We need to use new means and old, thought of, and unthought of, traditional, and revolutionary."

Even more heartening is the news that the President is wholly in sympathy with the aims set forth in the senatorial appeal. Senator FLANDERS quotes President Truman as saying: "You would be surprised to know how far we have gone along in this sort of planning."

The next step is to create the proper general staff, responsible to the President, to direct the political offensive against the Kremlin "in relations of brotherhood" with the Russian people. The urgent necessity of creating such a general staff, free of departmental domination, was pointed out recently by such eminent citizens as Dwight D. Eisenhower and Bernard Baruch.

But no program of action, however noble its intentions, can be better than the men responsible for its execution. The success of the bold new course proposed by the Senate group will depend on the intellectual and moral caliber of its directors. In breaking with the defeatist past that began at Yalta and ended in Korea; in finally abandoning the un-American doctrine that we can live in lasting peace and friendship with a savage tyranny, unmindful of the fate of its worst victims; in jettisoning our hollow fears, reminiscent of Munich, that by fighting despots we invite disaster (by "provoking" them to more terrible deeds than they already commit or plan); in burying the residue of appeasement and static "containment" in favor of a return to our deeper tradition as a world champion of freedom for all—we must make quite certain that the men chosen to steer this great course do not themselves belong in yesterday's camp of fear, defeatism, and slow surrender. The designers of our past failures in Europe, in Asia, and in Russia itself, cannot become the architects of our emerging policy of peace and victory through freedom for all.

Leadership must go to men who understood in 1943 and 1944 where the United States would find both its truest friends and its irreconcilable enemy. Fortunately for this Nation, for the Russians, and for all mankind, there is no shortage of such Americans. To lead this fight, they would gladly return to the Government.

Congressional Library Outlines Reapportionment of the United States House of Representatives for Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the subject of reapportionment of the United States for purposes of fixing congressional districts is certainly timely and is of real moment to all the people of our land.

As to the people of my native State of California, the recent census indicates there will be from six to eight additional Members of this House of Representatives from California in your midst after the 1952 elections. Hence it is that I became very much interested to learn more about the subject of reapportionment.

The following data and comments from our Library of Congress furnished me upon request, appears so valuable to all the Members of Congress and to others as well, that I herewith place it at your disposal:

MAJOR FRACTIONS VERSUS EQUAL PROPORTIONS: REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 2, SECTION 2A AND UNITED STATES CODE, SUPPLEMENT V, TITLE 2, SECTIONS 2A AND 2B

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The first time a President of the United States exercised the right of veto was in 1792, when George Washington vetoed an apportionment bill enacted by the Congress. His reason for so doing is stated in the following language:[1]

"There is no one proportion or divisor which, applied to the respective number of the States, will yield the number and allotment proposed by the bill."

From that time on down mathematicians and scientists have tried to provide some fair, equitable method of apportionment. After the veto by the President in 1792, Congress adopted a ratio of 33,000. On that basis, 141 Members of the House resulted. The same general method was followed down to 1830, and between 1830 and 1840, two States were admitted—Arkansas and Michigan, Arkansas in 1836 and Michigan in 1837. Daniel Webster criticized severely the method then used, and as a direct result of his criticism in 1842 the House enacted an apportionment law adopting as the ratio 76,000 persons for each Member of Congress, and in that act we find the following language:

"One additional Member for each State having a fraction greater than one moiety of said ratio."

In other words, if a State had a greater fraction than one-half of the ration of 76,000, it got an additional Congressman. It was obvious under this method there was no possibility of regulating the size of the Congress. So in 1850 a new method was adopted known as the Vinton method, named after Sam Vinton, of Ohio, a member of the census committee. That method was followed from 1850 to 1900. That method secured 233 Members in the House. It divided the population of the country by 233, and that fixed the number of Representatives that each State was entitled to under this ratio, and then if you had any Members left over of this 233, it gave them to States in order of the size of the fractions. This proved to be inequitable and you could not regulate the size of the House by this method. So in 1911 a new Apportionment Act was passed by the Congress and the size of the House was fixed at 433 Members, but it was provided that in the event Arizona and New Mexico should be admitted to the Union, each of them should have 1 Representative. They both came into the Union as States in 1912 and added 2 Members to the House. Thereby and thereafter the membership of the House became 435, and that is the membership we have retained since that time.

Last year the Census Committee took up this question of apportionment. Because of the lame-duck amendment, the twentieth amendment of the Constitution, a hiatus was created under which no apportionment could be had. So we were simply confronted with the problem of curing, if you please, this hiatus left by the lame-duck amendment. At that the same five different methods were discussed. We were shown by experts and scientists who came before the committee that in 1910 there was no difference between the major-fractions and equal-proportions methods; that under either theory every State would have received the number of Members that it did receive. We were further shown that in 1930 there was no difference between equal proportions and major fractions. Both were identical. Since we were simply trying to cure a hiatus, the majority of the committee felt that we should not then go into the intricate mathematical and geometrical formulas necessary to understand these various methods. We were confronted with the proposition that the two leading methods, major fractions and equal proportions, were both provided for in the act of 1929 and would both be provided for in the act of 1940. We knew that the Congress, if it developed that one method was substantially preferable to the other, could elect as between the two.

II. THE FIVE MATHEMATICAL METHODS

For a detailed explanation in simple language of all five mathematical methods which have been advanced by various authorities see: *Edward* v. *Huntington*, Methods of Apportionment in Congress, United States Senate Document No. 304, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session (Document Series, vol. No. 10469).

III. UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 2, SECTION 2A

These provisions were introduced in the United States Senate as Senate bill No. 312, Seventy-first Congress. The question of major fractions versus equal proportions was discussed in great detail and appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 71, pages 1324, 1333, 1335–1336, 1610–1611, 1612, 1842–1845, 2071–2072, 2074, 2076–2077, 2275–2276, 2278, 2293–2299, 2360, 2615–2616, and 2715.

Pages 2293–2299 contain a rather lengthy list of references compiled by the Library of Congress on the subject Apportionment of Members of the House of Representatives.

This bill as finally enacted into law required the President to report to Congress at the beginning of the Seventy-seventh Congress and every fifth Congress thereafter, the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed, as indicated by the 16th and each subsequent decennial census.

The President was also required to report to Congress the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled under an opportionment of the then existing number of Representatives by each of the three following manners:

1. The method used in the last preceding apportionment;
2. The method of major fractions; and
3. The method of equal proportions.

The act provided further that if Congress had not enacted a reapportionment law within 60 days of receipt of the foregoing statement, the States would be entitled to the number of Representatives shown in the statement based on the method used in the last preceding apportionment.

The President filed the required statement with the Congress; see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at pages 51, 70, and 81. The Seventy-seventh Congress, under the rule that one Congress cannot bind another future Congress, did not

[1] Remarks of Congressman Cossett, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 1, p. 1072, 77th Cong., 1st sess.

enact a reapportionment law within the 60-day period.

IV. UNITED STATES CODE, SUPPLEMENT V, TITLE 2, SECTIONS 2A AND 2B

The provisions of these Code sections were introduced in the United States House of Representatives as House bill No. 2665. This bill being specifically to change the method of calculation from major fractions to equal proportions, the relative merits of the two methods were discussed in great detail. The discussion appears in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 87, at pages 1071, 1072–1074, 1077, 1080–1089, 1123–1129, 8050–8059, and 8076–8088.

This act was enacted long after the 60-day period expired and provided that each State was to have that number of Representatives in the Seventy-eighth and subsequent Congresses, until a new apportionment, as was indicated by the method of equal proportions: If any notices had been sent to the States under the prior act (major practices), they were to be recalled and new certificates issued.

The act further provided that the President would transmit to the Eighty-second Congress a statement on the population and the number of Representatives each State would have under the method of equal proportions. The other methods were dropped.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON LEGISLATIVE AND CONGRESSIONAL APPORTIONMENT

A. BOOKS AND PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

California State Library, Apportionment of Members of State Legislatures (Sacramento, California State Printing Office, 1922).

Council of State Governments, Proposals for Legislative Reorganization (Chicago, Council of State Governments, September 1939).

Graves, W. Brooks, American State Government (Boston, D. C. Heath & Co., 1936), pages 171–187.

Huntington, Edward V., Methods of Apportionment in Congress (Senate Document 304, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (1940)).

Page, William Tyler, Regulations of the Legislatures of Certain States Prescribing Congressional Districts (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1931).

Schmeckebier, Congressional Apportionment (Washington, the Brookings Institution, 1941).

United States House of Representatives Committee on the Census

Hearings and Report on the Apportionment of Representatives, June 27–29, 1921 (67th Cong., 1st sess.).

Hearings on the Apportionment of Representatives, February 14, 15, 20, and 21, 1928 (70th Cong., 1st sess.).

Hearings on the Apportionment of Representatives in Congress, February 27–29, March 1 and 5, 1940 (76th Cong., 3d sess.).

B. LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE MANUSCRIPTS

Blachly, Margaret G. B., A Brief Chronological Summary of Congressional Activity Relative to Apportionment of Representatives (May 13, 1925).

Horne, Frank B., Re Authority of the United States Government To Establish Congressional Districts (July 24, 1941).

Welland, Jennis, Basis for Apportionment of State Legislatures (July 23, 1941).

C. PERIODICALS

Christian Science Monitor, February 21, 1941, page 2, "Shift in Congress Make-up To Be Foolproof."

Congressional Digest, August-September 1932, page 201, "Changes in the House Due To Reapportionment."

Congressional Record, April 28, 1941, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, pages A2053 and A2054, "Congressional Apportionment."

Nation, February 1, 1941, pages 127 and 128, "Our Gerrymandered States."

National Municipal Review, February 1941, pages 73–79, "Reapportionment: A Chronic Problem."

Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, June 1935, pages 58–68, "Problems of Congressional Reapportionment."

(Richard Loeb, November 15, 1941.)

Accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding accomplishments of this Eighty-first Congress is the passage of a bill expanding and bringing up to date our social-security system. This bill is a landmark in the field of social legislation. Ever since this bill passed the House last October, there has been widespread interest wherever I have traveled, in the provisions of the new law. Now that the bill has been signed into law by President Truman, I think it will be helpful to set forth the changes in the social-security system brought about by the new law.

MAJOR CHANGES SUMMARIZED

Summarized in a few sentences, the major changes are:

First. Larger benefits: The 56,000 Washingtonians now receiving social security payments will find that in the checks to be mailed out October 3, their benefits will be, on the average, roughly 75 percent greater than they have been. Second, for those who will retire after June 1952, benefits will be twice what they are now, on the average.

Second. Broader coverage: On January 1, 1951, nearly 150,000 people in the State of Washington, who up to now have not been covered by social security, will come under the system. For the first time the nonfarm self-employed, small-business men who own their own businesses—grocery store, retail store or gas station owners—will have social-security privileges.

Third. Easier eligibility: In general, it will take less years of social security "coverage" before you are eligible to draw benefits. Specifically, persons who are now 65 or over, and who have had six quarter-years (a year and a half) of social-security "coverage" can and should apply immediately for benefits. Any retired worker as well as survivors and dependents, will be able to earn $50 a month—as against the present limit of $15—without losing their benefit payments.

Here, in more detail, are the answers to questions I think will be of most general interest:

HOW MUCH LARGER BENEFITS?

First. How much larger will benefits be under the new law? Benefit increases will go to two main groups of people: (a) those who are currently receiving benefits, or who will begin receiving them before 1952; and (b) those who will reach retirement age after June 1952—these are called "new starts." Let me explain more fully how the new bill affects each of these groups.

IMMEDIATE INCREASES AVERAGE SEVENTY-SEVEN AND ONE-HALF PERCENT

There are about 56,000 people in the State of Washington who are now receiving social-security benefits. In the checks which they will receive early in October (their September payment) they will find that their payments will be, on the average, 77½ percent greater than they have been up to now.

The table below shows what the increases will be for an insured wage earner without any dependents, and for a married couple:

Retired wage earner without dependents		Retired wage earner and wife	
Now	New law	Now	New law
$10	$20.00	$15.00	$30.00
$11	22.00	$16.50	33.00
$12	24.00	$18.00	36.00
$13	26.00	$19.50	39.00
$14	28.00	$21.00	42.00
$15	30.00	$22.50	45.00
$16	31.70	$24.00	47.55
$17	33.20	$25.50	49.80
$18	34.50	$27.00	51.75
$19	35.70	$28.50	53.55
$20	37.00	$30.00	56.50
$21	38.50	$31.50	57.75
$22	40.20	$33.00	60.30
$23	42.20	$34.50	63.30
$24	44.50	$36.00	66.75
$25	46.50	$37.50	69.75
$26	48.30	$39.00	72.45
$27	50.00	$40.50	75.00
$28	51.50	$42.00	77.25
$29	52.80	$43.50	79.20
$30	54.00	$45.00	81.00
$31	55.10	$46.50	82.65
$32	56.20	$48.00	84.30
$33	57.20	$49.50	85.80
$34	58.20	$51.00	87.30
$35	59.20	$52.50	88.80
$36	60.20	$54.00	90.30
$37	61.20	$55.50	91.80
$38	62.20	$57.00	93.30
$39	63.10	$58.50	94.65
$40	64.00	$60.00	96.00
$41	64.90	$61.50	97.35
$42	65.80	$63.00	98.70
$43	66.70	$64.50	100.05
$44	67.60	$66.00	101.40
$45	68.50	$67.50	102.75
$46	68.50	$69.00	102.75

These same increases apply to anyone who retires before June 1952.

The following table shows the benefits that will appear in the September check of a widow with 2 children who is currently receiving benefits:

Widow with two children

Present benefit: $20; new benefit: $40.
Present benefit: $25, new benefit: $46.
Present benefit: $30; new benefit: $53.
Present benefit: $35; new benefit: $59.
Present benefit: $40; new benefit: $67.
Present benefit: $45; new benefit: $76.
Present benefit: $50; new benefit: $92.
Present benefit: $55; new benefit: $110.
Present benefit: $60; new benefit: $117.
Present benefit: $65; new benefit: $122.
Present benefit: $70; new benefit: $128.
Present benefit: $75; new benefit: $133.

INCREASES SENT AUTOMATICALLY

You do not have to apply for the increases—they will be sent to you automatically. If, for any reason, the increase fails to show up in your October

check, it will show up very soon, in full. Recipients are asked not to start writing in for information because the more letters that have to be answered, the slower the program will be in getting under way.

BENEFITS DOUBLED IN 1952

For anyone who retires after June 1952, a new formula may be used to compute benefits which will yield roughly twice the benefits now being received. You can begin to use this new formula just as soon as you have worked for 6 quarter-years—or a full year and a half—under the social-security system after January 1, 1951.

The following table shows roughly how much the benefits will be, according to this new formula:

Average monthly wage	Single	Married
$50	$25	$38
$100	50	75
$150	58	86
$200	65	98
$250	72	109
$300	80	120

The minimum primary benefit has been raised from $10 to $25, in most cases, and the maximum family benefit has been raised from $85 to $150. These changes are long overdue in bringing our social-security system into line with high living costs.

WHO WILL BE COVERED NOW?

Second. What new people will be covered under the new law? On January 1, 1951, over 150,000 people in the State of Washington—nearly 10,000,000 in the Nation as a whole—will come under the social-security system for the first time.

THE NONFARM SELF-EMPLOYED

The largest and most important group to come under the system are the nonfarm self-employed—numbering about 94,000 in Washington State. For the first time, the druggist, the grocer, the gas-station owner, and thousands of other small-business men who are in business for themselves, will be covered by social security, and will be able to draw benefits when they reach the retirement age of 65. This does not include the farmers, nor does it include many professional people, such as doctors and lawyers.

ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS MUCH SOONER

At this point, I should emphasize, for the benefit of these businessmen—as well as all those who will come under the social-security system now—it will be much easier for you to become eligible for benefits under the new law. If you are 62 or over on January 1, 1951, and begin your coverage on that date, you will need only a year and a half of coverage in order to begin drawing benefits. That means that you will begin to draw benefits just as soon as you reach the retirement age of 65.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Some 20,000 agricultural workers in Washington State will come under the social-security program on January 1. This includes not only persons who regularly work on farms, but also the so-called "borderline" agricultural workers—those engaged in processing agricultural products off the farm. Employees of farmer cooperatives, as well as of commercial handlers of fruits and vegetables are included in this group.

DOMESTIC WORKERS

About 9,000 Washington domestic workers in nonfarm homes will join the system next January, provided they work 24 days for one employer and receive cash wages of at least $50 during each quarter-year.

VOLUNTARY COVERAGE FOR STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

Roughly 37,500 employees of the State, and of cities, towns, or counties in Washington State may come under the system if a voluntary agreement is reached between the State and the Federal Government. In order that no existing retirement system will be hampered, no one covered by a State or local retirement system when the agreement is reached will be covered.

Employees of the Federal Government not presently covered by a Federal retirement system will be included under social security.

EMPLOYEES OF NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

Employees of nonprofit institutions—hospitals, churches, schools, and the like—will be covered only if the employer agrees to pay his share of the tax contribution and if two-thirds or more of the employees favor social-security coverage.

Ministers and members of religious orders will continue to be excluded.

SALESMEN AND TRUCK DRIVERS INCLUDED

The new bill will also include all full-time life-insurance salesmen, certain full-time traveling salesmen—other than house-to-house—many delivery-truck drivers and home industrial workers who satisfy certain conditions.

HOW LONG TO QUALIFY?

Third. How long will you have to work under social security before you can start drawing benefits? One of the greatest advantages of the new social-security law is that in the future you will not have to work under the social-security system nearly as long before you can retire and begin to draw benefits.

The retirement age is still the same—age 65—but under the new law, you will only have to be in "covered employment"—that is, employment under the social-security system—for half of the time elapsed since January 1, 1951. "Coverage" prior to that date can be used to fulfill this requirement. The present law requires "coverage" for half of the time since January 1, 1937.

In all cases, at least six quarter-years, or a year and a half, of coverage will be required. Under the old law, 27 quarter-years—nearly 7 full years—of coverage would be required for a person now 65 years of age who wants to retire.

These new provisions mean three things:

MANY AGED 65 CAN GET BENEFITS IMMEDIATELY

First. Any insured worker who is now 65 or over and who has had six quarter-years—of a full year and a half—of social-security coverage, can draw benefits immediately. He should apply for them at the nearest Old-Age and Survivors Insurance office. In my district, these offices are located in Bellingham, at room 321, Herald Building, 1143 State Street; in Everett at room 513, Commerce Building, 1803 Hewitt Avenue, and in Seattle in room 125, Federal Building, 909 First Avenue.

Second. Any worker who is 62 or over on January 1, 1951, even if he only starts his social security coverage next year, will be eligible to begin drawing benefits just as soon as he reaches the retirement age of 65, if he has had six quarter-years—a year and a half—of coverage.

ELIGIBILITY MUCH EASIER FOR THE NEWLY COVERED

Third. And most important to the thousands who will become eligible to join the social security system next year—it will be possible to begin drawing benefits upon retirement (at age 65) with much less coverage than now.

The following table shows how many quarter-years of coverage you will have to have under the old and new law. Simply look at the figure next to your age on January 1, 1951:

Quarters of coverage required to be fully insured

Age reached in first half of 1951	Present law	New law
76 or over	6	6
75	8	6
74	10	6
73	12	6
72	14	6
71	16	6
70	18	6
69	20	6
68	22	6
67	24	6
66	26	6
65	28	6
64	30	6
63	32	6
62	34	6
61	36	8
60	38	10
59	40	12
58	40	14
57	40	16
56	40	18
55	40	20
50	40	30
45 or under	40	40

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS

Fourth. How much will dependents and survivors receive under the new law? The primary benefit is the payment made to an insured wage earner who has no dependents. Generally speaking, dependents and survivors will receive the same part of the primary as at present. This means that their benefits will also be about 75 percent higher than at present, up until 1952, and double the present levels after that.

MAJOR CHANGES LISTED

The major changes in dependents and survivors' benefits are:

(a) A retired worker's wife who is under 65 can receive benefits if she has a child in her care.

(b) The benefit for a dependent parent has been raised to three-quarters of the primary benefit of the wage earner—it has been one-half.

(c) Lump-sum death payments, though reduced to three times the primary benefit of the wage earner, are now payable to the family of every insured worker. Formerly these payments were made only when no other member of the family was entitled to survivors' benefits at the time of the wage earner's death.

(d) Retired workers, survivors, or dependents may now earn $50 a month—as against $14.99 under the present law—without losing their benefit privileges.

This social-security bill marks a milestone in the field of social legislation. Its great advances are long overdue. Since 1945, I have introduced in the Congress bills to liberalize and improve our social-security system. Many of the features of my bills are included in the new law. I hope that soon the Congress will enact further improvements, such as including an insurance system for the permanently and totally disabled, and lowering the retirement age to 60—both of which I have long recommended.

As it stands, though, the new social-security law is a great step forward—a step of which I believe the Congress and the people can well be proud.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me yesterday to the people of Pennsylvania on Happenings in Washington, being program No. 32 in my series of broadcasts.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—PROGRAM NO. 32

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

In just a few days our boys of Pennsylvania's famous Twenty-eighth Division will leave to join the Federal fighting forces at Camp Atterbury, Ind.

Other Pennsylvania units of the Army Reserves have been called into active service. More Reserve units will leave in the near future.

Once more the sons of Pennsylvania are upholding its historic tradition of loyalty and patriotism.

This new call to arms is felt in every community in the State. It brings the Korean war closer to thousands of homes. Thousands of mothers, fathers, wives, and other relatives of these boys, as well as those who served with the gallant Twenty-eighth in prior wars, are deeply stirred.

Three weeks ago, at Indiantown Gap, it was my great privilege to witness the Twenty-eighth Division in its final review before answering the call into Federal service. It was a magnificent spectacle. It made me feel prouder than ever before of Pennsylvania's outstanding part in our Nation's defense.

There was deep and solemn inspiration as those fine young men passed in review with flags and battle streamers waiving beautifully in the sunlight.

There were tears in the eyes of many strong men as they watched the guardsmen march.

It recalled the grim realities of war and its tragic toll in suffering and sacrifice.

The review was also a stern reminder that every American must be alerted to do his full duty on the home front.

We are facing a time when the highest patriotic principles must be called forth in defense of our country and our way of life.

In the situation confronting us selfishness is sabotage. This is no time to think about increased profits. It is no time to demand wage increases. It is no time for business as usual or pleasure as usual.

It is a time for willing sacrifice in the service of our flag and our Republic. It is a time for Americans to practice 100-percent Americanism 100 percent of the time.

As the review came to an end I could not help but say to myself that never again must our country be caught as unprepared as we have been in the present emergency.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, I speak to you now not only as your United States Senator. I am talking as a soldier who fought in his country's wars and who commanded this same Twenty-eighth Division at the beginning of the Second World War, training it for combat against the Nazis.

I speak also as one who had fought unceasingly for a strong, well-armed America, adequately prepared to defend freedom against the menace of communism.

For many years I have favored universal military training. From my experience as a soldier covering almost half a century I know that a well trained reserve of manpower is one of the strongest elements in defense.

I know that military strength is a potent factor in preserving peace.

And let me tell you that a soldier trained to take care of himself in battle has more chance than one without that training. It may be the difference between life and death.

Long before I came to Washington I advocated the adoption of universal military training.

In 1947, I spoke in several parts of the country in favor of universal training. In an address at the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Veterans of Foreign Wars I said:

"I know this is unpopular with many mothers. I know that some are opposed to military training because of religious convictions. I know that it is also unpopular with some of my fellow Members of Congress and with many politicians. The politicians tell me that advocating such a course loses votes. But I have yet to see the day when political expedience will turn me away from what I believe is best for my country.

"I know that properly trained manpower is the best defense this country can have—today—tomorrow—or any other time in the future. * * *

"Trained manpower is a potent factor for peace."

My fellow Pennsylvanians—Korea today is proving the truth of that statement.

Everything that has happened on the front lines in Korea proves the great need for universal military training.

But down here in Washington this vital matter has become involved in so much confusion that it is impossible for me to tell you what is going to happen.

President Truman recommended universal military training in his message to Congress at the beginning of this session. Later he stated that he would not press for its adoption at this session.

Then, 10 days ago Secretary of Defense Johnson sent a letter to the chairmen of the House and Senate Armed Service Committees urging prompt action by Congress to approve universal military training for youths from 17 to 20 years of age.

Secretary Johnson stated that the letter had been authorized by President Truman.

One paragraph of the letter reads as follows:

"In my opinion the recent events in Korea have only served to emphasize the fact that universal military training is an essential element of an integrated and balanced system of national security."

The letter further stated and again I quote:

"Universal training is the only means of providing, on a continuous basis, sufficient number of men for the Reserve forces."

This was most encouraging to all of us who had been consistently advocating military training.

But it came as a great shock to learn that the very next day President Truman pushed Secretary Johnson's proposal into the discard.

The President told his press conference that he saw no sense in cluttering up Congress with such a controversial matter when it was already so badly cluttered.

Does the President have to be reminded that we have an extremely serious controversy with communistic aggression in Korea?

Must we avoid controversy in Congress when the future of our Nation is at stake?

The President's statement is hard to understand when at the same press conference he urged immediate consideration of the District of Columbia home-rule bill, which has been in controversy for many years.

Surely there is nothing in the District of Columbia bill that would contribute, even remotely, to national defense.

This, I regret to say, is another example of the uncertainty and confusion that still prevails here in Washington.

Had we adopted universal military training 4 years ago each year would have made available 850,000 trained young men. When the Korean attack occurred our potential strength of men ready for service would have been between 3 and 4 million.

Let me impress upon you, my fellow Pennsylvanians, that there is no political consideration in what I have said.

This is neither a Democratic war nor a Republican war. They didn't ask our boys of the Twenty-eighth Division whether they are Democrats or Republicans before sending them off to train at Camp Atterbury.

And no one will ask about their politics if they should be shipped overseas to fight in Korea or on some other far-off battlefield.

Let me assure you that I will continue to fight for universal military training legislation. In my opinion it would be dangerous for Congress to adjourn without enacting this vital part of our military defense program.

To our people back home let me say, one of the important things you can do for our boys of the Twenty-eighth Division and for our entire Nation is to speak up and tell your representatives in Congress that you want a universal military training law—now—not next year when it may be too late.

A few days ago the Senate passed the defense production bill.

This bill would place in the hands of the President tremendous wartime control over the Nation's economy.

It will enable the executive branch of the Government to mobilize the productive capacity of the United States for national defense.

This is the bill under which the President is given authority to fix prices and wages and to control consumer credit as a barrier against inflation.

It vests in the President the power to establish priorities and allocations of critical materials; to requisition equipment, supplies and materials needed for national defense and to expand the productive capacity of our industrial plant.

The bill passed by the Senate differs in some respects from the bill previously passed by the House of Representatives. It will now go to a conference committee made up of Members of the House and Senate. It is expected that they will reach an agreement upon the differences that exist in the two bills.

The conference agreement will then be submitted to each House of Congress for final approval.

I hope that the President will use the powers granted in this bill immediately.

Everyone knows that prices are constantly moving upward. With increased Government spending for defense they will rush even higher. Labor is already demanding wage increases to meet the rising cost of living. Artificial shortages have been created by some unscrupulous business men to extort higher profits from the public.

Unless controls are put into effect at once, clear across the board, we will have a race between prices and wages that will mean a dangerous inflation.

Let me say that we cannot have wage control without price control. Neither can you have effective price control without wage control. They must go together.

The Senate is now discussing a new tax bill for 1950. The bill, which will be passed by the Senate in the next few days, will add approximately $5,000,000,000 to the Nation's tax bill.

Let me warn you that this is only the beginning. We must prepare to pay drastically increased taxes.

We must pay for as much as the cost of war as is humanly possible out of current revenues. That is the only way we can remain financially solvent and preserve our individual freedom.

I am confident that the American people will make any sacrifice in order to stamp out Communist aggression in the world.

We must be willing to assume these sacrifices and the increased burden of taxation.

It would be cowardly to pass these obligations on to our children and future generations and require them to pay for the mistakes and folly of our own time.

I know that the American people have the courage and the patriotism to face the facts if presented honestly and fully.

And, my fellow Pennsylvanians, here are the facts as I see them through the confused and foggy atmosphere here at Washington.

We are fighting with the odds stacked against us.

We are miserably unprepared.

We have no adequate plan for total military or industrial mobilization.

We have no adequate reserve of trained manpower.

We must act on the assumption that Red Russia's drive to conquer the world has been launched.

We are facing a war for survival. Time is running out.

Our enemy is well trained, well equipped and well prepared for cruel and ruthless aggression in any part of the free world.

With this situation confronting us, I ask you, my fellow Pennsylvanians:

What are we waiting for?

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Whom Do the People Trust—MacArthur or Truman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald under date of August 30, 1950, entitled "MacArthur on Formosa":

MACARTHUR ON FORMOSA

Gen. Douglas MacArthur transmitted a message to be read before the Veterans of Foreign Wars in convention in Chicago this week.

He proclaimed the island of Formosa vital to the defense of the United States and asserted that it must be prevented at all costs from falling into the hands of a hostile power.

By that he meant Soviet communism and the Chinese Communists as agents of the Soviet Union in particular.

STRANGE MIX-UP

On the eve of the VFW convention, General MacArthur informed the national commander that he had been directed to withdraw the statement. The White House subsequently admitted the order came from Mr. Truman.

Meanwhile, however, David Lawrence's weekly United States News and World Report had entered the mails carrying the full text of the statement. General MacArthur's headquarters then stated that, in conformity with usual practice, other publications need not be restrained from printing news already published and circulated.

This curious mix-up derived from the conflict between the position of the United States acting as a member of the United Nations and the United States acting as an independent nation in the interests of its security.

The position has been further complicated by the fact that, in ordering Formosa taken under American Fleet protection against any Red incursion, Mr. Truman acted independently of UN.

When the President on June 26 ordered General MacArthur to provide military support to South Korea against the North Korean Communists, he had no trouble obtaining UN approval of his intervention after the fact.

BRITISH OBJECT

But when, in the same order, he directed that Formosa be protected against attack, he acted unilaterally and his action was not approved by the UN. On the contrary, objections were raised by some of the member states, such as Britain, which were anxious not to alienate the Chinese Communists.

General MacArthur later flew to Formosa and conferred with Chiang Kai-shek, leader of the old Nationalist Government of China, who had installed himself in the island with a large force after the Communists had conquered the mainland.

The visit occasioned an outcry in Britain that MacArthur's activities might cause the conflict to spread in the Far East.

Britain viewed this possibility with concern, because it had already recognized the Communist regime in China in the hope of winning favor and preserving its large China investment, its trade with China, and the imperial outpost at Hong Kong.

In fact, General MacArthur on this visit was simply executing orders laid down by Mr. Truman for the protection of Formosa, and the White House approved his trip. In his statement to the VFW, the general was only justifying the policy already put into effect by Mr. Truman.

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR OBEYED ORDERS

The ambiguity arose solely out of the fact that, in Korea, the United States and General MacArthur are nominally acting as agents for UN, with approval of the whole non-Communist membership, including Britain, whereas in Formosa the United States is acting in its own behalf and MacArthur is acting as a general of the United States Army, not as supreme UN commander in the Korean pacification.

As a consequence of the VFW mix-up, Mr. Truman has sent a message to Warren Austin, American spokesman on the UN Security Council, reiterating the American position on Formosa stated by Austin on August 25.

This statement tries to reconcile the American action with reference to the island with UN objections to the President's unilateral action.

Mr. Truman denies that the United States has permanent designs on Formosa as a base and states that its legal status cannot be determined until there is international action to determine its future as conquered territory of the former Japanese empire.

The President here is in disagreement with General MacArthur, who plainly states the need to hold Formosa in the American defense perimeter as a means of keeping any future Pacific war 5,000 miles off the coasts of the American Continent.

The general's statement is realistic militarily, the President's is an attempt to relegate the interests of American military security to secondary status in order to affirm the paramountcy of a conflicting international authority.

WE ARE IN A TANGLE

This conflict between America's responsibilities to itself and to UN will undoubtedly be sharpened by the Chinese Communist complaint to UN that we have been guilty of aggression against Formosa. The Communist refer to the island as the territory of "the people's Republic of China" and affirm their determination to "liberate" it.

Formosa may well turn into a hotter issue than Korea.

If the Reds should send out a few junks, which our fleet then sank, we might even find ourselves at war with Communist China, without allies, while our forces were already committed to a UN war in Korea. UN, for which we are acting as military agent in Korea, would have none of us in any such war over Formosa.

Our Navy will be useful in keeping Chinese Communist divisions out of Formosa where they might fight Chiang's army, but they can walk into Korea to fight us.

In view of these possibilities, it is difficult to see what good UN and the concept of collective security are to the United States.

Mr. Truman has jockeyed himself into the position where we are the agent of UN in one nasty war while UN stands to disavow us in another even nastier.

Inside in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Inside in Washington," written by May Craig and published in the Portland Press-Herald of August 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE IN WASHINGTON

(By May Craig)

WASHINGTON, August 27.—Political leaders are feeling their way toward the proper handling of the war, in their campaigns. We do not know how the Korean war is going to progress, what the situation will be in November, so politicians are a little cautious in their approach. It may seem ghoulish to involve the war in politics, but many people, in each party, honestly and earnestly believe that their party could handle the national security best. They will undoubtedly tell this to the voters.

Republicans are split as to how to handle the war in the campaign. The leaders of Republicans in Congress are all conservatives, and the policy they are carving out is beginning to be plain. They are attacking the conduct of the war, the events that led up to it, as far back as Roosevelt. They even go farther back, by implication at least, and blame Wilson for the First World War.

Senator BREWSTER of Maine is chairman of the Senate Republican senatorial campaign committee, so what he says and does can be taken as party policy, however much liberal Republicans kick against it—and they do. Senator TAFT of Ohio is chairman of the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate; MILLIKIN, of Colorado, is chairman of the Republican conference; WHERRY of Nebraska is floor leader. They are all conservatives. Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts is House Republican floor leader; HALLECK of Indiana and ARENDS of Illinois are his assistants; they are all conservatives. Guy Gabrielson of New Jersey is chairman of the Republican National Committee and the choice of the Republican conservatives.

The Republican leaders have been attacking Secretary of State Acheson, saying he should be fired. Many are also attacking Secretary of Defense Johnson, but not so much. Acheson is tied to the Republican-McCarthy charge of communism in the Government, put there and kept there by Democrats, they say. This is going to be an issue in the Republican campaign, so Acheson is a double target.

Senator BREWSTER does not attack Johnson as much as he does Acheson. This may be because of his personal friendship with Johnson, or because Acheson is doubly vulnerable; faulty foreign policy and communism.

At any rate, if Republican policy is to be judged by BREWSTER, then the speech he made recently to the Republican State Executive Committee in Charleston, W. Va., is important, because in that the Maine Senator stated flatly: "Acheson must go." He devoted a great portion of his speech to Acheson and the Democratic foreign policy in itself and as it relates to the war. This was a party speech to a party gathering and undoubtedly reflects party strategy.

Although BREWSTER did not precisely blame the Democrats for the war, past and present, he did so by implication. He reproached me, after a similar speech last June in Atlantic City, the night before the Korean attack, for saying that he blamed the Democrats for war. He said he was only stating facts. I said I could only draw one inference from what he said and that is that he blames the Democrats for getting us into war, over the years. Otherwise why the juxtaposition of statements? To be fair, I will quote some of what the Maine Senator said in Charleston. It may be true that the Democrats got us into war. But if so, the Republicans ought to come right out with their charge, so it can be combatted if possible.

This is what the Maine Senator said in Charleston:

"In 50 years, we have had 24 years of Republican administrations and no wars, and 26 years of Democratic administrations and three wars.

"I repeat what I said June 24 at Atlantic City, the night before the Korean attack. The Democrats seem unlucky. Under Wilson, it was 5 years to the First World War. Under Roosevelt, it was 9 years to the Second World War. Under Truman, it is 5 years to Korea and all that may entail.

"Yet 2 months ago, President Truman said we were nearer to peace than at any time in the past 5 years.

"I do not say the Democrats planned or wished the war. I do not even say the Republicans could have done any better. I simply say they could not have done any worse."

The Brewster speech is important because there is truly great uncertainty whether we should change our Secretaries of State and Defense. There comes a time when a public servant, justly or unjustly, has lost his value because of loss of public confidence. Then the Chief Executive must decide whether to replace him or not. The decision should be made in the public interest. There is some danger involved in changing horses in the middle of the war—the question is: Which is worse, to continue or to change?

Certainly we have suffered tragic losses in the Far East. Where the blame rests is matter for history to unravel. Democrats say there is no use wasting time with the past. Republicans say that we cannot entrust the future to those who have proven themselves unable to take care of this country's interests.

Senator BREWSTER spoke straight out, in the West Virginia speech, about the foreign situation. He said that, of course, both parties will give full cooperation to the war in Korea. But, he said:

"The American people want to know, and are entitled to know, how we got into this war. * * * Here is the most glaring ineptitude in our diplomacy. The record of the utter failure of our diplomacy in the Orient is clear to all. * * *

"Stalin was given the green light to take over Korea by Secretary Acheson. At the thirteenth hour, the signals were changed and MacArthur was ordered to enter the fight without previous warning of any kind that such action might be contemplated."

The Senator takes Republicans out from under responsibility—though the Democrats blame Republicans—for failure of the Far East policy. BREWSTER said, "In the Orient, there was no bipartisan policy. At no stage in this unfolding tragedy in the Orient in the last 5 years were Republican leaders consulted as to what our policy should be." This is absolutely true—Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, ranking Republican on Foreign Relations, complained of this, during the years. The worst aspect of this is that Acheson has to face the charge that not only was he mistaken but that he was either the dupe or the accomplice of Communists and pro-Communists, in the State Department and out, who planned our ruin in the Orient, and the victory of the Reds in the Far East. Dupe or accomplice, Republicans say with BREWSTER: "The American people can no longer have confidence in his conduct of our foreign affairs."

Activities of the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by myself in regard to the activities of the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Affairs.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR, OF MARYLAND

It has been announced that the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Affairs is now terminating the work for which the special staff was engaged. The conclusion of this special activity is noteworthy because the undertaking was of greatest concern to a large segment of our people and which has become of increasing importance under international difficulties. The rehabilitation of the American Merchant Marine and the American shipbuilding industry is of such urgent nature that it demands the favorable attention of the Congress.

In our efforts in this direction I am happy to acclaim the leadership and the unswerving devotion to the cause evidenced by my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Affairs Senator MAGNUSON not only displayed a wide and thorough grasp of the many complex questions involved, but his enthusiasm and his consistent attention to the problem were a source of generous inspiration to us and to the very capable group of loyal Americans, leaders in the shipping and ship-construction fields, who gave us their utmost support.

Throughout our lengthy hearings Senator MAGNUSON was unflagging in his efforts to arouse our people to the necessities of these vital industries, and he, likewise, left nothing undone that could further the progress of the various legislative proposals introduced in connection with our efforts. The many thousands of owners, seamen, and shipyard workers are indebted to Senator MAGNUSON for his unselfish efforts in their behalf.

If our Nation, unfortunately, should be forced into a conflict of large dimensions, as well might happen, the wisdom of Senator MAGNUSON's stand and the worth of his efforts for the merchant marine and shipbuilding industries will be all the more apparent. Now that the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Affairs is concluding its work for the session, I would be

remiss in my appreciation of the distinguished Senator's work if I did not publicly attest to my admiration and regard for his constructive leadership.

No Rigor Mortis in Bradgate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from Life magazine. In its August 28, 1950, issue it has several pages of pictures and text under the heading "An Iowa Town Dies a Slow Death." That article prompted me to write the following letter to my long-time friend, Rev. Joe Share, whose picture appeared in the magazine. The letter follows:

AUGUST 30, 1950.

Rev. JOSEPH SHARE,
Bradgate, Iowa.

DEAR REVEREND JOE: The issue of Life magazine dated August 28 contains an article about Bradgate. It calls Bradgate a dying community—"An Iowa town dies a slow death."

I don't know who the reporter and photographer were who prepared that derogatory spread in Life magazine. But certainly they did not have an understanding of Bradgate and thousands of other small towns, and the relationship they bear to the entire country.

The fact is that Bradgate is not dead, nor is there any immediate prospect of rigor mortis. Situated as it is in the heart of the greatest agricultural State in the world, Bradgate will be alive and healthy when the huge and overcrowded cities—whence presumably the article originated—have been destroyed by atomic bombing. No aggressor will drop his bombs on Bradgate. Perchance if bombs are dropped, some of our unctuous and cynical friends in the city will be glad to find refuge in Bradgate or one of its thousands of counterparts across this country.

Because I daresay, for the vast majority of Americans, life in small towns like Bradgate is much more typical and much more wholesome than life in the palaces and slums of the great cities. Indeed, were it not for the smaller communities to furnish transfusions of new blood into the life of cities, long ago the great centers of population would have become even more corrupt and slum ridden and boss-plagued than they now are. Iowa communities in the Sixth Iowa District, such as Bradgate, have furnished some of our outstanding leaders. For example, the presidents of both the University of Iowa and the University of Michigan are products of small towns in the Sixth Iowa District.

In Bradgate people know each other. They go to school together as children. They attend church together. Their social life is not based upon caviar and cocktails but upon the community picnic or the family gathering. For me, I'll take fried chicken and sweet corn any time in preference to the elaborate feasts of the Waldorf Astoria.

The country can far better get along without the city than the city can get along without the country. If food were not provided from the farms and country towns the city people would starve within a few weeks.

For me, I'll take Bradgate and the country around it and the people who live in it. When they say Bradgate's dying, they don't know what they're talking about.

All good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES I. DOLLIVER.

Responsibility of News and Radio Reporters

REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the New York Times, Robert Trumbull reports that "anti-United States feeling in India has never been so widespread as it is now." Part of this feeling undoubtedly arises from the destruction of Korean towns and villages by the United States troops and from the fact that Americans are killing Asiatics in the present United Nations action in Korea. These are facts of war which we must accept. Part of the antipathy is the result of anti-European and anti-American attitudes and racial prejudices which have been deliberately aroused against us. Part of it is the result of our own failings, of our failure to try to understand the Asiatic or to try still lose the battle for Asia. We must realize that, even though we win the ultimate military victory in Korea, we may still lose the battle for Asia. We must not forget that along with the military war, we are engaged in a world-wide war of ideologies. Victories and defeats on this level are every bit as important to our success as are victories in the field. The Communists are sharply aware of this and are quick to capitalize on each of our failings, on every weakness in our ideological armor.

In a recently published book, The God That Failed, Richard Crossman, a member of the British Parliament warns:

> Whatever its failures in the west, communism still comes as a liberating force among the colored peoples who make up the great majority of mankind. * * * For them, western democracy still means quite simply white ascendancy.

Certainly this describes the Communist propaganda line in Asia today. We must be most careful to defend ourselves against this. We must be zealous to remove from our own thinking the false thesis of racial superiority, zealous to eliminate from our own culture the institutions and practices which rest on this false thesis. We must remember that every careless act or word on our part serves to strengthen the Communist propaganda efforts. Every lapse on our part plays into the hands of the enemy. One such lapse, and one which has been recurring with regrettable frequency, is the use in the Nation's press of the word "gook" in referring to the North Koreans.

It is reported that the word "gook" was first applied to the American soldiers, but that it has since been turned back and applied to the Koreans. It has taken on an overtone of disparagement which will quickly be exploited against us. It is not surprising, or even particularly distressing, that men in battle should apply disparaging terms to the enemy or fix derogatory labels upon them. "Destroy the infidel" was the battle cry of the Crusaders. The Germans were Huns in World War I. In the wars with Mexico we were gringos. Fighting men under pressure develop many words and phrases to express annoyance, impatience, or to provide outlet for the fears and frustrations born of battle.

My censure is not directed at the fighting men who use the term, but at the newspapermen and radio reporters who have exploited it. The first news story using the term "gook" involved an interview with a soldier on the Korean front. Since then it has appeared in headlines, in stories, in the comments of popular syndicated columnists, and in the reports of the radio commentators. Undoubtedly the men responsible for such usage think that the term lends local color or a ring of authenticity to what would otherwise be an ordinary news report. Even if this were the case, such literary value is poor exchange for the potential harm in the use of the term. No one holds that the press has the right to make indiscriminate use of the entire military vocabulary in order to create an on-the-scene illusion for the Nation's readers. No one questions the desirability of restraints on behalf of accepted conventions of decency. Certainly the press should not object to restraint and self-discipline for the sake of better relations between the peoples of America and Asia.

The responsible section of the American press has disciplined itself to eliminate the use of derogatory terms that have too often been applied to religious, national, or racial minorities in our own country. It should do the same in its references to peoples outside the United States.

Fundamentally this is a most important matter. It involves the very basic issue of the dignity of the human person, regardless of nationality, religion, or race. This practice of labeling is both undemocratic and un-Christian. It flouts truth because of its inaccuracy. It flouts justice for the same reason, and it flouts charity as well. Once a nation or a race—or its members—is checked and filed by means of a label, every individual subject to that label is done for as a person. It is difficult, often impossible, for them to return to their former dignity—either in their own minds or in the minds of others. True, great personalities or strong nations and peoples may, by concerted and almost superhuman effort, throw off the effect of the label. The ordinary people and the weaker nations, however, can be utterly destroyed by it. These are the people who are the concern of democracy and of Christianity. These are they who are exploited by totalitarianism.

I call upon the press to exercise the responsibility which is the condition of its freedom. To submit to self-discipline in the interests of truth and of peace is essential to the preservation of that freedom and a final, lasting victory in the war of ideologies now raging throughout the world.

A Way To Prevent Further Armed Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include excerpts from Frank Edwards' broadcast, Mutual Eroadcasting System, on July 24, 1950:

All over the world tonight there is just one big question: Is this the beginning of world war III?

To a large extent, no doubt, the answer to that question will depend upon our own policies and actions in the months ahead. There are but two great forces on earth at the present time, ourselves and the Soviet Union. War or peace, then, must necessarily hinge upon the actions of these two powers.

At this time I would like to submit to you a potential plan for utilizing our own strength to the utmost to prevent further conflict. I say a potential plan because it is one which each of you should consider in the light of your own reasoning.

As matters stand right now, we are engaged in a war thousands of miles from our own land; a conflict into which we are pouring American resources and American lives to stop armed aggression against a peaceful nation.

We could be bled white by a series of these little wars. And wherever they occurred we would either have to fight and die or else permit the ideology of brute strength to overrun the world.

It does not require a great deal of vision to see what is happening to us. Our potential adversary is sitting back, smugly awaiting the day when we shall be so enfeebled by these endless wars that we would no longer be able to successfully face a major power. We cannot fight all the sparring partners and still win the main event. When that day comes Russia could call the shots against us. For by then they would have equality in atomic bombs and overwhelming superiority in military equipment and manpower.

Is it necessary for us to play the game as our opponents prepare it for us? Is there no other alternative but for America to dance to the Russian fiddling? Must we squander our priceless resources fighting these little wars until Russia is ready to strike us herself?

Personally, I see no reason why the United States of America should take orders from any other nation on earth. I see no reason why we should permit world peace, which means our own, to be jeopardized by the deliberate and calculated actions of the enemy.

We have within our arsenal the most powerful weapon ever devised and we have more of them than all the rest of the world combined. The atomic bomb is not a defensive device—but it can be a decisive factor in stopping aggression.

Suppose that the United Nations notified the world that after a certain date in the very near future there must be no more armed aggression, or the aggressor would be subjected to atomic bombing for having deliberately endangered the peace of the world. That warning would be clear enough.

Then, after that date, any aggressor could be given 72 hours' notice by the United Nations—72 hours in which to cease firing and submit the trouble to peaceful mediation through the machinery of the United Nations—or if they persisted in fighting, to be prepared for an atomic bombing anytime after that 72-hour period had expired.

The loss of civilian life could be minimized by notifying them by radio to get out of the aggressors principal cities—clogging his roads and thoroughfares—reducing the cities to empty shells awaiting the bombing. Facilities, not people, are the real objectives.

The clear, unmistakeable warning of an atomic bombing in reprisal for illegal aggression would make the stooge nations think twice before they embarked upon such dangerous ventures as that in Korea. Russia could not guarantee them protection, because to do so would mean inviting atomic attack upon herself. The stooges would not dare to provoke an assault which would utterly destroy themselves.

It seems to me that with our predominance in the field of atomic warfare we should make our position plain to the other nations—that if they persist in endangering us by their acts of aggression—we will stop them by the quickest means at our command. That if they deliberately choose to involve us in war—it is going to be war on our terms—for a change.

It's something to think about—and high time we did some thinking.

As Mr. Edwards says, this is "something to think about," and it is time we did some thinking on this subject.

Potato Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Potato Scandal," published in the Portland Press-Herald of August 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTATO SCANDAL

Maine is bound to be interested in a Collier's magazine article, the Great Potato Scandal. Briefly stated, the argument of the article is anti-Democratic, antiadministration. It is that last year we raised such a surplus of potatoes under the price-boosting policy (that cost the taxpayers $100,000,000) that the Department of Agriculture had to buy and destroy 78,000,000 bushels. Yet, at the same time we allowed to be imported 14,000,000 bushels of potatoes from Canada growers who never had it so good. On the contrary, Maine's Aroostook County has more people out of work than at any time since 1933, while its farm income has dropped 50 percent in 2 years.

The Collier's article makes the point that it has been possible to shut off the flow of Canadian potatoes; that the State Department, under an escape clause of the reciprocal trade agreement, could have revised import quotas of the commodity, and that the Secretary of Agriculture also could have acted. That is what Senator BREWSTER urged all along. To be sure, a mere 14,000,000 bushels was relatively a small part of the problem; yet it was nothing short of infuriating to read that Maine's market in some areas was seriously impaired while Canadian potatoes were flowing over the border. A New Brunswick potato dealer, asked what he thought of the administration's price support and low potato tariff policy replied, "They're wonderful; they make me rich."

One has to wonder of how many other commodities this has been true: That the price supports and low tariffs hit the taxpayers hard and the industries, and advantage the nationals of other countries. Maine knows all about it, not only in the matter of potatoes but also in that of fisheries. Only recently has the Government acted to keep foreign fishermen from availing themselves of the loophole in the tariff acts which permitted dumping in the market.

All this merely confirms Maine people in the Republican faith, and is likely to help swing the coming election, now barely 2 weeks away.

Resolution of Army and Navy Legion of Valor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed at the sixtieth annual reunion of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor, held at Boston, Mass., on August 9, 1950.

Although this organization of American heroes was disappointed that the bill referred to in the resolution was not given the consideration that similar legislation has been given in other countries, their resolution demonstrates to a high degree the Americanism and patriotism within their breasts. The resolution follows:

Whereas the Army and Navy Legion of Valor has had before the Congress of the United States, H. R. 3263 since 1948; and

Whereas H. R. 3263 is a proposed amendment to the act of 1916, granting special pensions to highly decorated veterans; and

Whereas even today we feel that in view of the very special pensions being granted by foreign countries to their highly decorated veterans, as evidenced by letters in the hands of the House Veterans Affairs Committee Members, furnished by us, that our great Nation should do at least as much for its own highly decorated veterans; and

Whereas our decorations are proof enough that we value our American way of life and all it means more than life itself; and

Whereas our Nation is now facing a most dangerous threat to our ideals and way of living, with our service men and women once again locked in an all-out struggle with people who would destroy our much cherished freedom; and

Whereas the additional expense of this present national emergency is going to cost

tremendous sums of moneys, thereby necessitating the placing of larger financial burdens on our people: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Army and Navy Legion of Valor request the Hon. LANSDALE G. SASSCER, Member of Congress from the State of Maryland, who introduced H. R. 3263 into the Congress, to request the Congress of the United States and the House Veterans Affairs Committee to take no further action on this bill (H. R. 3263) until the present national emergency has been passed and our fighting forces once more returned to their homes and loved ones.

ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR,
JOS. F. MANNION, DSC,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Unanimously approved, Boston, Mass., August 9, 1950.

Port of Embarkation's New Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of August 29, 1950:

PORT OF EMBARKATION'S NEW CHIEF

The appointment of Brig. Gen. Edward H. Lastayo as commander of the New York Port of Embarkation, including the Brooklyn Army Base at the foot of Fifty-eighth Street, brings back here a familiar and well-liked figure. For he served as Deputy Port Commander and Chief of Staff from February 1946 to June 1949.

General Lastayo has had a distinguished career in the Army Transportation Corps. In the last war in the North African invasion he commanded the port of Oran and, after other important assignments, he became chief of transportation of the Mediterranean theater of operations.

It is highly appropriate that a man of General Lastayo's ability and experience should take over the Brooklyn post, for it is the largest single installation of the Army Transportation Corps.

Renegotiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Renegotiation," published in the Portland Press-Herald of August 28, 1950. The editorial seems to me to be a most important one.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENEGOTIATION

With action on an excess-profits tax evidently postponed to 1951, renegotiation of war contracts may be used as an interim method of taking the profits out of war. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has said: "Some device to prevent undue war profits will be adopted through a tax bill or the renegotiation process."

The House Ways and Means Committee is considering a bill setting up new renegotiation authority. This measure, if enacted, would probably shunt aside the Tydings bill, supported by the present War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, to liquidate that Board.

An excess-profits tax in itself will neither curb inflation nor take profits out of war production, according to Bernard M. Baruch. "Excess-profits taxes—standing alone—have no effect whatever in checking inflation," he told the War Policies Commission many years ago. "Their only effect is to increase it * * * there is more incentive to increase prices—and therefore profits—under an 80 percent excess-profits tax than there is without it."

The Sixth Supplement Defense Appropriation Act of April 28, 1942, provided for renegotiation of war contracts over $100,000 to recover "excessive profits." The measure established penalties ranging up to a $10,000 fine to 2 years' imprisonment for withholding financial data or furnishing misleading information.

Within 5 months the Navy Department reported that renegotiation of contracts under the act had saved the Government some $2,000,000,000 on naval contract prices. Cash recoveries of $7,700,000 had been sent to the Treasury.

In 1943 the Truman committee of the Senate estimated that 80 percent of all savings effected through renegotiation would have been recaptured through taxation of excess profits. While renegotiation could "hardly be justified as a revenue measure," the committee said, it served to "put pressure on contractors to avoid waste of materials and manpower by reducing costs." A 1943 amendment to the 1942 act classified war brokers as "subcontractors" and subjected their fees to possible reduction if payments totaled more than $25,000 a year.

The Revenue Act of 1944, passed over President Roosevelt's veto, raised the floor of contracts not subject to renegotiation from $100,000 to $500,000. It created a six-member War Contracts Price Adjustment Board for purposes of review. It also permitted appeals in most cases to the United States Tax Court.

In explaining his veto, Mr. Roosevelt pointed out that the measure limited renegotiation authority to December 31, 1944. Actually the act gave the President authority to extend renegotiations for 6 months, which he used. And in 1945 Congress extended the termination date to December 31, 1945.

Renegotiation, in the 4 years the act was in effect, brought $10,195,698,000 to the Treasury in recoveries. An estimated $3,058,709,000 of that amount, the Brewster committee (successor to the Truman committee) reported in 1948, would not have been recovered in war taxation. It now seems certain that we will hear more about renegotiation in the near future.

Textile Tariff Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOLEN AND WORSTED OVERSEERS,
Holyoke, Mass., August 22, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At our recent semiannual meeting our association unanimously voted to send you this letter protesting against any further cuts in the textile tariff rates because we honestly believe that they threaten the future of our industry and our jobs as well as those of the help under us in the textile mills of the country.

In this connection, we would like to give you an outstanding example in corroboration of our fears. If you will remember, Mr. President, after World War I the Japanese textile economy became highly developed. As a consequence, and because of its low wage scale and longer hours of work Japan was able to undersell the world in textiles. The influx of Japanese wool and cotton goods into this country became so serious that the cotton industry of the South sent a commission to Japan to ask the Japanese textilists to not only stop increasing their sales of textiles to this country but to reduce them if possible. Our textile industry simply could not meet the ruinous prices of the Japanese under the tariff rates that then existed even with our modernized equipment in place. And this was before there was as much reduction in textile rates as now exists.

Moreover, what Japan did to the textile industry of this country and to other high wage textile nations at that time, other low-wage textile countries were able to duplicate like, for instance, Czechoslovakia, which undersold us on shoes, linens, and other textile items. So we ask you, Mr. President, in all sincerity how much worse will the situation become if the textile tariff rates are given a further cut that will enable the low-wage textile countries to sell their goods on our markets easier than before in competition with our textile industry operating under the highest wage scale in the world?

Multiply the examples of Japanese and Czechoslovakian potentialities with that of other low-wage textile nations out to sell us under still more attractive textile tariff rates and perhaps you can then understand our fears for our industry and our jobs.

For your own information the National Association of Woolen Worsted Overseers, established in 1885, is the largest organization of its kind in the world reaching into every mill in the wool-manufacturing industry. It is the parent organization of all the overseer group organizations that recently sent you a combined letter of protest against any further cuts in the textile tariff. The letter was headed by the Pennsylvania Textile Executives Association and we, as a body, voted to unanimously subscribe to its contents.

For your further information there are over 900 wool-manufacturing plants in the United States in which more than 4,700 production executives are employed. Under the direction of these men there are anywhere from 40 to 100 employees in each department of a textile plant so that you can visualize that our association is one of high standing, influence, and authority in the production end of the textile industry.

Trusting that you will weigh as carefully as you can our strong reasons for asking that there be no further cuts in the textile tariff, we are,

Respectfully yours,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOLEN AND WORSTED OVERSEERS,
CHARLES AULERICH, *President.*
JAMES J. BURNS, *Secretary.*

P. S.—To you—a Member of Congress from the textile States to whom we are sending a copy of this letter to President Truman—we ask that you add your unqualified appeal to the President and the State Department not to cut the textile tariff rates any further if we are to preserve our industry and our jobs

from ruinous low-price foreign competition. A note from you placing yourself on record will be most appreciated.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 30, 1950.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOLEN AND WORSTED OVERSEERS,
Holyoke, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: I have just received your letter of August 22 regarding the oncoming conference soon to be held at Torquay, England, for possible further lowering of tariffs on foreign textiles.

We have a few woolen or worsted plants in our section and I, of course, am interested in their well-being. My principal interest, however, is in cotton textiles. In order that you may know my position more fully, I am sending you herewith two statements I have made lately.

I am fighting this threat to our way of life with all might and main.

Very respectfully,

JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

Hon. James W. Wadsworth, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost authorities in the Congress on national security and military operations is our distinguished colleague from New York, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, whose entire service in the Senate and the House, covering a period of 35 years, has been identified with legislative problems of a military nature. All of us have looked to him for guidance and counsel. He has been steadfast and sound in his judgment, ofttimes displaying a vision far beyond the capacity of many of us to share.

Recently the Reserve Officers Association of the United States adopted a resolution concerning Mr. WADSWORTH which I am pleased to include as part of my remarks, together with the letter of transmittal from the executive director, Gen. E. A. Evans, in order that the Nation may be apprised of this well-merited commendation. The letter and resolution follow:

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., August 9, 1950.

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WADSWORTH: It gives me a feeling of extreme satisfaction to present to you the enclosed resolution. This resolution was unanimously adopted by the delegates in attendance at the twenty-fourth annual convention of the Reserve Officers Association held in Washington, D. C., June 28–July 1, inclusive.

I can assure you, Mr. Congressman, that the thoughts expressed in this resolution are most sincere and emanate from a sense of appreciation of your job well done.

Yours most sincerely,

E. A. EVANS,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TWENTY-FOURTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 28–JULY 1, 1950

Whereas the Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Congressman from the Forty-first Congressional District of New York, has announced his voluntary retirement from public life; and

Whereas the object of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States is to support a military policy that will provide adequate national security and to assist in the development and execution thereof; and

Whereas the record of Mr. WADSWORTH as a statesman shows supreme devotion to that object, in that, while serving as a United States Senator from 1915 to 1927 and as a United States Congressman from 1933 to the present day, he has, among other things, presided as chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs from 1919 to 1927, authored the National Defense Act of 1920 and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, successfully championed extension of draft service in the critical prewar days of 1941, zealously advocated peacetime citizen military training after both World Wars and earned a reputation as an authority on defense legislation; and

Whereas Mr. WADSWORTH is one of a long line of patriots who have borne arms in the defense of the Republic; and

Whereas his achievements merit specific recognition by this associations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the opinion of this association Mr. WADSWORTH deserves the gratitude of the Republic; and be it further

Resolved, That this association hopes that his days may be long in the land; and be it further

Resolved, That this association trusts that the torch he has borne will in the future be in no less worthy hands; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary be, and is hereby, directed to transmit a copy of these resolutions to Mr. WADSWORTH as the sentiments of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in convention assembled.

Attest:

E. A. EVANS,
Executive Director.

Address of Hon. George A. Smathers, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which my colleague from the Fourth District of Florida, the Honorable GEORGE SMATHERS, delivered at the State convention of the Junior Chamber of Commerce in my city of Orlando, Saturday night August 12, 1950.

The people of my district approved and applauded the sentiments which were expressed in this speech, and I think that those things which our colleague, a Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said at that time should be a matter of record. Mr. SMATHERS' speech follows:

I wish it were possible to bring you good news. It is always nice to do so—always popular to be the bearer of good news—but it is not always honest to bring good news, for news is not always good. The news from Washington could not be classified as good tonight, for at this moment we find ourselves, as a Nation, in great and grave difficulties.

Some measure of our present difficulty can be traced to the fact that for several years back too many of us wanted to hear only good news. We wanted our officials to tell us that which made the future seem bright and hopeful. We wanted, naturally, to be free to live our lives as individuals, and even as a nation, as we wanted to live them—without irritations from outside, without interference or control. We resented those who told us that taxes would not be lighter for a long time to come. We were irritated with those who, right after World War II, told us it was a mistake to demobilize as rapidly as we were doing. We turned our backs on those few voices who several years ago warned of the threat of a new tyranny on the march and asked us to get prepared. We ignored them even though we saw communism reaching its fingers out into all parts of the world, grasping in more and more of the bewildered and shocked peoples of Europe and Asia.

There were even those who contributed to our complacency and delusion by preaching that the men in the Kremlin didn't want war; that they were taking over 11 countries of eastern Europe only to build a wall to defend themselves against an attack from an impoverished and obviously impotent Western Europe. There were even those who thought they saw some connection between communism and the cause of liberalism here in America. They shouted that those who opposed the advance of these new "people's democracies" were "against the little people" and were "reactionaries."

Why, I remember even as late as 6 months ago that there were many who said it was unpopular to warn of the threat of communism, for people were tired of hearing about it. They wanted to hear of good things, joy to happen.

Well, it's different today. As of June 24 when, without warning, without provocation, the forces of communism in North Korea cynically and brutally attacked across the thirty-eighth parallel—with tanks, flame throwers, and machine guns—the independent Republic of South Korea, created by the United Nations; as of that date, doubt was removed, opinions crystallized, and the madness of the men of Moscow was revealed to a shocked and frightened world.

The men of the Kremlin acknowledged by that act that they were willing to risk total war in order to satisfy their lust for world conquest.

June 24, 1950, now appears as one of the saddest days in the history of the world, but it could prove to be otherwise. For with all Russia's preparation and planning with the North Koreans, one little fact was forgotten, a fateful fact which may change the course of world affairs. Several weeks before the attack on South Korea, the Soviet Union had withdrawn from the Security Council of the United Nations, because the Security Council would not recognize and seat the Communist government of China. And so it was that on June 25 the Security Council was able to meet, and without Russian obstruction and veto estimate the situation and quickly and unanimously condemn the Communist attack in Korea for what it really was—open, inexcusable, cynical aggression. Without that Russian veto to hamstring the Security Council, it was able to call upon all member nations of the United Nations to join together and resist this Communist attack.

It was a soul-searching question the leaders of the United States had to decide. What should our reaction be to this call of the United Nations? They knew of the difficulty of fighting in Korea. They knew of the ineffectiveness of our few and untrained

troops. They knew of the obstacles of a 5,000-mile supply line.

But weighed against those difficulties was the stabbing realization that if the authority of the United Nations were so grossly flaunted, it would cease to exist as an effective instrument for peace; it would, like its forerunner, the League of Nations, go down for the third and final time.

Then, too, at the moment of decision it was realized that if the United States failed to act, the remaining democratic countries of the world, who look to us for leadership, would feel so deserted and become so frightened and demoralized that the Communist elements within them might easily stampede them into quick agreement and surrender. Such a development would have left the United States the sole remaining citadel of democracy and freedom in the world—without friends and without the necessary outside resources with which to wage war. We would have been left a single island surrounded by a sea of communism—and those waves would have soon begun to wash heavily against our shores.

Then, too, I think that those who had this monumental decision to make must have remembered the hundreds of thousands of young men who fought and died on foreign soil in World Wars I and II. They remembered those men who had sacrificed for the ideal of freedom, individual liberty, and lasting peace. Had we—America—not stood firm somewhere along the line in defense of those ideals for which they gave so much, we would have made of their sacrifice a useless, hollow mockery.

And so we made a choice. It was not a happy one, nor will it be a popular one for a long time. It was not an easy decision, but it was a brave decision. For the road over which we must travel is rough and rocky. It has in its make-up many heartaches, many sacrifices, many tragedies. It's too bad that we can't run upstairs and pull the cover over our heads and imagine it's all a bad dream. But in our own self-interest and the interest of our children we can't do that. Our days and nights will be grave and fearful. They will be black and long and bloodstained. None in this great coliseum tonight, none who read or hear these words, will escape the burden which will blanket our Nation. For if we lose we must remember there will be no second try.

Bernard Baruch said that America is in the most critical period of its long and illustrious history. And when we look at the facts we can well understand that statement. In 1940 the democracies had the balance of power. On our side were a strong France, a healthy England, and the great country of China. Today France is militarily prostrate; England is willing but weak; and China with its vast manpower is on the other side.

My friends, we are in a battle for survival and the price of survival will be high. But who is the man who will measure his freedom against his wealth; a human life against dollars and cents; the right to worship God against money? Tonight young men, Florida's young men, are dying in the rice paddies of Korea. This is no talking matter with them. They face the grim horror of enemy bullets and bombs and a life painfully and suddenly ended. They send back to us at home one clear cold message, a message written in grim tears, a message which as Americans we cannot ignore, a message that tells us this is no time for business as usual, pleasure as usual, or politics as usual. It is instead a time for ruthless realism.

We must get ourselves militarily prepared. The Russians have for 5 years been talking in upside down language about peace, while all the time planning for war. Today they have 175 well-equipped divisions against our 6. They have 25 armored divisions as against our 2. They have airplanes that outnumber ours by a ratio of 6 to 1. They have 50,000 tanks against our 6,000. And they have submarines in greater numbers and more deadly than Hitler's. Furthermore, they have stolen from us the secrets of the A-bomb which they now have. Therefore, to survive we must quickly build back our fighting strength which died on the false hopes of a United Nations with a veto, a unification plan, and a program of false economy. We must not only ready ourselves, but we must assist those other countries who will join in this effort with us. We must train the Japanese to defend Japan; we must train Germans to defend Germany.

This military preparation will obviously unbalance our home economy somewhat. It will require sacrifice and a firm resolve, but let's remember those who are doing the fighting. Three weeks ago, with a full realization of the distaste the American people have for governmental regulations, I advocated on the floor of Congress complete mobilization of our industry, manpower, and wealth. There should be no special privilege for any person, any business, or any group in this time of national emergency. We must adopt legislation to take profit out of war. Some men should not be permitted to grow rich out of the bloodshed of others. It seems inexcusably selfish and shortsighted for certain concerns to raise prices at this time, regardless of the reason or excuse, knowing full well that in sneaking a little extra profit now, they injure many others and bring rationing and controls for all.

I believe the time has come when we must give serious, dispassionate consideration to those admitted Communists and fellow travelers here at home. It doesn't make sense to be fighting Communists 5,000 miles away while permitting those here who care nothing for the land of their birth to operate freely. It doesn't make sense to say we will pick them up within 12 hours after Russia strikes if she strikes. That may be too late. It takes a long time to rebuild a defense plant or repair a power unit. An immediate and effective surveillance should be undertaken on all known Communists and confirmed fellow travelers. Sensible laws should be quickly adopted to enable us to defend ourselves from within as well as without.

Such an example of all-out firmness and determination to see this problem through, an exampe of realistic mobilization on our part could accomplish several things:

First, such a cause presents the only hope at this time for lasting peace. If the mad men of Moscow have not already made up their minds to start the wheels of world war III in motion—then this evidence of our willingness to lay aside our pleasures, and to sacrifice for the survival of our way of life may change their minds. They have heretofore looked upon the United States as a decaying democracy. They have believed we would not fight until it was too late to do so. All-out effort on our part now might impress them, might frighten them, and might dissuade them. If not, if they have already started the little fires leading to the conflagration which will mean world war III, then every effort we make now places us in a better position to meet the hardships which lie ahead.

Secondly, such an example of realistic mobilization on our part will encourage the other countries of Europe and the world to take hope. They will see that they are not to be abandoned to aggression. They will, under our leadership and prodding, begin to ready themselves, realizing that their efforts are joint efforts with ours for the protection of all. And let's never forget that, outnumbered as we are in this present situation, we need them.

All of us here tonight recall vividly with what high hopes we as a Nation subscribed to the purposes of the United Nations Charter. It envisioned for a world wary of war an international organization for peace—an organization fortified with a police force—a force capable of meeting and stopping any and all aggression—a force made up of soldiers from all the countries of the world.

Then we all remember late in the fall of 1945 when the big nations of the world failed to put the full pound of sovereignty into the common pot of peace—and retained the right of veto to all the member countries of the Security Council. In the intervening years we painfully recall some 30 Russian vetoes that have stranged and all but choked the life out of the United Nations.

And yet this past June when freed for just a moment from the stricture of Russian veto, the United Nations blossomed forth and fulfilled a part of the faith that the freemen of the world had in it. Without the obstructionism of the Communists, the United Nations acted quickly and in a manner for which it was set up. It condemned aggression and force, and it rallied some 46 countries to join together in opposing this Communist act of tyranny.

However, Russia soon realized her mistake in abstaining from the United Nations and so last week sent Mr. Jacob Malik back into the Security Council where for two solid weeks he has raped honesty, ravished the truth, and raised the hand of monumental deception and subterfuge. His studied course of obstruction and attack has made it impossible to even set an agenda for the Security Council—and once again the United Nations is sick with Russian stomach cramps.

In view of all this, it may now be the moment for the nations of the free world to consider taking the final step of reshaping the United Nations Organization without the Soviet Union. Many sincere students of world affairs have shied away from this thought, believing that as long as the Soviet Union stayed in the United Nations there was hope for a peaceful solution. But it appears Russia has made up her mind what she wants, and it is not world cooperation for peace, and therefore Russia will continue to use the United Nations only as a soundingboard for her propaganda and to cover up her evil purposes. A reorganized United Nations can still become a vital force for peace.

We have learned that a permanent United Nations Commission empowered to inquire into aggression, threatened or real, direct or indirect, wherever it may be, with the weight of 51 countries behind it, and backed by their joint military might, a force now being born in Korea—such a Commission, such an organization, could well be a great force for peace. We have learned that justice without force is powerless.

When the Communist leadership fully understands that any aggression—direct or indirect—will be met by force, a force supplied by the peace-loving people of the world and a force large enough and strong enough to do the job, then the initiative can be taken away from the Communists and a real peace offensive gotten under way. Already progress has been made along this line. By our action in Korea under the auspices of the United Nations the aggressors of the world are on notice that no longer will peace-loving people stand idly by and permit little people and little countries to be overrun by tyranny and dictatorship.

In addition to building a strong military force for ourselves and assisting other democracies to do likewise, we must go one step further. A quick review of history shows that while military might can win battles and wars, it cannot win the hearts and minds of people, and therefore cannot win lasting peace. The United States has won two world wars, but we have yet to win a lasting peace. We obviously need something in addition to a military machine. Today we must understand that we are fighting to capture not only the bodies of men but the minds of men as well. The vast majority of the pecple of Europe and Asia are looking for something better than that

lot in life to which they were born, or that which they now have. The Communists are exploiting through propaganda all the misery and disappointment that comes to the average Asiatic and European. They have waged a great offensive in this war of ideas and have pretended to supply the answer to a better and fuller life.

They have made many converts all over the world. And we must remember that these converts are fanatic. They do not think of themselves as Americans or Frenchmen or white man or Negro, or rich man or poor man—they think of themselves only as Communists. They recognize no higher law than communism. They recognize no closer kinship than the kinship of Communists. That's why a Communist will sacrifice his brother, his wife or his child for its cause. The Mohammedans of centuries ago were taught that if they died fighting an infidel they would go to a happy hunting ground with everlasting life, and so they lined up to die for Mohammedanism. Today the small-fry Communist has been sold the idea that "comes the revolution" he will get all that he has wanted and that his tormentors of the past will become his slaves. Having such a dream of the future, is there any wonder why he will go to any extreme to attain it? Well, we in America know that that philosophy is so much hogwash. We know that every tyrant who has come to power did so by building a military machine based on a trick philosophy of helping the little man, and we know that once he came to power, he exploited and abused the little man with more cruelty and brutality than ever before.

Because we are the most literate nation in the world we know that human society doesn't work the Communist way. We know that where men are free to govern themselves, they achieve more happiness, more worldly goods and more freedom than under any other system of government. We know all this, but millions of people don't know it—and they are the millions that the Communists are trying to take over so as to turn them against us.

I'm chairman of a subcommittee which is now looking into what we as a nation are doing to sell the advantages of democracy over communism to the bewildered people of the world. We've discovered that the Russians are spending more money and making more effort to sell communism in the city of Berlin alone than we are spending in selling democracy all over Europe. The Russians, as nearly as it can be estimated, are spending about 15 times as much money, using 15 times more men and effort in selling communism. Britain spends 50 percent more of its income attempting to win the minds of men to the cause of freedom than we do. As the greatest salesmen in the world we have sold everything but ourselves, our system of government, our democracy. Well, the time has now arrived when we must take the offensive in this propaganda war to win people's minds. The time has come to lop 35,000 persons off the rolls of existing Government agencies and put them into programs selling America. Like the disciples of old, we must make the masses see that underlying all the shooting, all the propaganda, all the maneuvering, there is a basic battle: Christianity versus paganism, spiritualism versus materialism, freedom versus slavery. We must convince them that free men under God are better off than slave men under Stalin.

America stands in peril today. It's a battle for our survival. The price of survival is high, and the question is, will we pay the price in sweat and tears and sacrifice? In traveling around the State in recent weeks, I have found hope in the attitude of the American people, for I find in them that irrepressible American spirit which is willing to accept the challenge, believing as we do in freedom and democracy.

Holifield Asks Expulsion of Soviet Russia From the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, American soldiers, sailors, and marines are fighting today in Korea as an American unit of the United Nations.

We are proud that our military action to repel the aggressor in that battle-torn land has the overwhelming support of the free nations of the world. We rejoice in the clear and decisive stand taken not only by the United States, but by the United Nations. The flag of the United Nations flies side by side with our own. General MacArthur commands not only our own military forces but those contributed by other members of the United Nations.

Let us be frank to recognize, however, that only a curious twist of circumstance has made possible this collective action of the United Nations to repel aggression in Korea. The Soviet member of the United Nations Security Council has been absent from his Council seat for several months. Had he been present, the Soviet veto would have prevented the Security Council from taking positive action in Korea. We would have been in there fighting alone, convinced of the rightness of our cause, but lacking the moral support and prestige that stems from the collective judgment of the free nations of the world.

This twist of circumstance which removed the Soviet obstruction worked in our favor. We cannot expect such a circumstance to continue. The Soviet delegate resumed his seat on the Security Council August 1. He assumed the presidency of the Council as of that date. Under the alphabetical rotation system designating the presidency, Mr. Malik was entitled to claim this office August 1.

It must be recalled that Mr. Malik walked out of the Council on January of this year because the Council refused to unseat the delegate from Nationalist China, Dr. Tsiang. At that time, Mr. Malik stated that the U. S. S. R. would boycott the Security Council until Dr. Tsiang was removed. Dr. Tsiang still retains his seat in the Security Council, so we must expore the reason for this change of Soviet policy which they claimed involved a vital principle.

Almost since the establishment of the United Nations, the U. S. S. R. has harassed and blocked the function of the Security Council by arbitrary use of the veto. In almost every major policy decision, the U. S. S. R. found its one vote arrayed against the other four votes of the permanent members of the Security Council. By this single-member veto, the U. S. S. R. had created a complete state of frustration in the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of hindsight is useful only as it points the way to wise actions in the future. For several years, thoughtful observers have anticipated the problem before us today and have emphasized the need to modify the veto privilege which allows the Soviet Union to make a shambles of the United Nations.

In July 1947 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 116 of the Eightieth Congress, requesting the President to use his initiative in calling a general conference of the United Nations to consider amendment to the Charter of that body. Among other things, that resolution pointed to the necessity of establishing, without delay, an international police force as originally contemplated by the United Nations Charter, and of eliminating the veto provision of the Charter.

At the same time, in July 1947, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 117, which would have served notice to the world of our willingness to waive the right of veto at such time as other nations relinquished the same right.

In May of 1948, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 194 which restated, in more comprehensive terms, the urgency of amending the United Nations Charter to make it a working instrument of world peace. In calling again for the establishment of a world police force and the elimination of the veto, I recognized full well the likelihood that Soviet Russia would not approve such revisions of the Charter, and therefore my resolution proposed in that event that like-minded nations, without the participation of the abstaining states, proceed to establish a more effective international organization for mutual defense on the basis of the revised United Nations Charter.

I regret to say that no action was taken by the Congress on these resolutions. Had we, in those days, addressed ourselves earnestly to ways and means of improving the United Nations and of giving it the military arm to put down aggression, our task in Korea today might not have been so difficult and so costly in terms of human lives.

In embryo, my resolution of May 1948 contemplated a possible United Nations Organization without Soviet Russia—a situation that we are compelled, by the brute force of events, to consider seriously today.

We must remember that the recent prompt and decisive action of the Security Council in, first, condemning the aggression of the North Korean Government; and, second, calling on the member nations to mobilize military aid for the South Korean Republic was made possible only because the Soviet delegate had voluntarily absented himself and was not present to veto the Council's actions. No responsible person would doubt for a minute that the veto would have been used against Korean intervention had Mr. Malik been present.

So we must conclude that the action of the Security Council came about only because of a fortuitous, a wholly accidental situation in the Security Council. With the flip-flop in Soviet policy evidenced by Mr. Malik's return, will the Security Council now fall back into the state of frustration and impotence previously experienced under the threat and use of the single member veto?

The answer is "Yes."

What will this mean in terms of future Security Council action on developments in Korea?

What will it mean if aggressive military action starts against Formosa, Iran, Yugoslavia, or west Germany?

Only a foolish man would predict that the Soviet would refrain from using the veto to block United Nations' action to resist aggression.

Some may think that the General Assembly could be called upon to fulfill the duties of suppression of breaches of the peace in case of U. S. S. R. veto in the Security Council. I do not believe such an argument can be sustained in the light of Charter provisions and limitations. Such provisions assign to the General Assembly the duties of hearings, recommendations, and investigations only; and even in this field the Assembly is limited from taking action on certain matters which have been considered by the Council.

We therefore must come reluctantly to the conclusion that in the field of military action by the UN to suppress breaches of the peace, the single member veto of a permanent member of the Security Council can prevent the United Nations from taking action, such as it did recently in Korea.

The potential danger of further aggressive action is clear. Intervention in behalf of world peace by the United Nations may be impossible without the acquiescence of the U. S. S. R.

What is the answer to this dilemma? Amending the United Nations Charter to eliminate the veto could itself be defeated by a Soviet veto. If this be true, and I believe it is, we must find a way to preserve the peace of the world by the cooperative action of 85 percent of the United Nations members who have consistently tried to live up to the principles and purposes of the Charter.

Two methods of achieving the goal of a continuous and successfully functioning international organization seem indicated:

First. The formation of a new international organization with all of the provisions of the present Charter except the single-member veto provisions; the Soviet Union and its satellites would remain outside this new organization unless and until they were prepared to accept its terms; and

Second. The expulsion of the Soviet Union from the present United Nations and the subsequent elimination of the veto provision by amendment.

The first proposal, in my opinion, is possible and may be highly desirable as an alternative to continued frustration in the immediate and dangerous future. A conference of delegates of the member nations, as requested in my resolution, could have prepared the way for such action.

The second proposal stems from the fact that Article 6 of the present UN Charter provides that a member of the United Nations which has consistently violated the principles of the United Nations Charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

The record is replete with Soviet violations of the principles and purposes of the UN Charter, and it has been fully documented by our State Department.

We regard the action of the Security Council on the Korean intervention as being valid in view of Russia's willful absence from the Council and in view of Article 28, which provides that the Security Council shall be continuous in its operation.

I therefore urge that in the same way action was taken on the Korean matter, the Security Council should take action to expel the Soviets the first time that they willfully absent themselves from the Council's deliberations. The working members of the Council can recommend to the General Assembly that Soviet Russia be expelled as a persistent violator of the principles of the UN Charter. I have no doubt that the necessary two-thirds of the voting members of the General Assembly would support this recommendation for Soviet expulsion.

No individual has the right to endanger the common society in which he lives, and no nation has the right to expose the citizens of every nation in the world to the horrors of a world war III.

Time and events have clearly shown that the U. S. S. R. has refused to cooperate in the spirit which was envisaged by the UN Charter. She has refused to adapt or modify her relations to the procedures and practices of the great majority of the member nations.

In the Security Council and the General Assembly, Soviet Russia has pursued guerrilla parliamentary tactics. She has tried to cripple, not cure, every important world problem. She has refused to participate and cooperate with the auxiliary agencies and commissions designed to solve social and economic problems which prevent the easier interchange of goods, knowledge, and ideals.

The Soviet Government has trained and encouraged through diplomacy, economics, and armaments, the Communist forces throughout Europe and Asia. Behind the front of invective against free nations and peace propaganda to the credulous, she has established herself as the great pariah outside the family of nations.

We have not isolated her; she has built her own wall of isolation, not only by dropping the iron curtain at the outside border of every Soviet satellite but by showing at every contact point with the free nations in the United Nations, that the ideological iron curtain is more real than the national border iron curtain.

I therefore call for a realistic reevaluation of our attempts to solve the age-long problem of international peace.

The one world ideal has been murdered by deliberate Soviet design. Let us stop now following the beautiful but shattered dream of one world harmony and build that which is still possible, a functioning, international organization of free nations and free peoples dedicated to pool our collective strength to attain the strongest and safest position possible in this dangerous atomic age.

That Children May Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESEN' ATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appears in the New York Times today, August 30, 1950:

THAT CHILDREN MAY LIVE

The number of times within the past few years that near-knockout blows have been dealt to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund approaches the fantastic. The record of this agency is one of the proudest and most heroic in UN's—and United States—annals. Since the end of the Second World War, the Children's Fund, with strong American support, has gone into the far-flung corners of the world with food, milk, and cod-liver oil for children on the ba-is of need. It has sponsored, with American approval, medical and antituberculosis programs which averted epidemics in critical areas. It has done all this while desperately short of contributions from governments who praised its efforts and achievements to the skies and defaulted on the hard cash that made broader programs possible. Periodically, it has been forced to go, hat in hand as it were, to governments to match the American contributions in order that American funds might be released.

Because of this matching formula—which many have believed hindered the operations of the Fund—$25,000,000 of American money authorized last year but never appropriated was lost to the fund. Several months ago a new authorization of $12,500,000 was voted for the fund, but never acted on. Yet so certain was this Government of support for the fund that only 2 weeks ago, when the Economic and Social Council met in Geneva, the United States delegation cosponsored a resolution making the fund a permanent UN agency for the continuing needs of children.

Now, in one callous action, both the House and Senate have struck the entire $12,500,000 from the omnibus appropriations bill. It is, of course, unthinkable that the Children's Fund should be written off in this way.

Surely Congress cannot deprive the refugee children of Korea of supplies that the Children's Fund has been rushing in. Surely it cannot end its life-sustaining programs in the Middle East, in Greece, in Yugoslavia, in Italy, where millions of children depend crucially—in some cases wholly—on Children's Fund help. In honor and in pure humanity we are called upon to continue this aid to millions of innocent, unfortunate and helpless children the whole world over.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Henry Wallace was properly repudiated when, as Secretary of Commerce in 1946, he publicly disagreed on foreign policy with Secretary of State James Byrnes.

There were cries of censorship by those who agreed with Wallace, even as today those who idolize MacArthur cry censorship.

Why? Because General MacArthur is addressing himself to political rather than military matters. It is a known fact that the General has for many years aspired to the Presidency by even permitting himself to be voted upon while he remained abroad and retained his commission as a high general. And this despite the fact that the founding fathers provided no man shall be eligible to the presidency "who shall not have been 14 years a resident within the United States."

I do not seek to detract from General MacArthur as a soldier. However, it would be well for him to capture for himself the spirit of General Sherman thusly expressed:

I will not accept if nominated, and will not serve if elected.

It was widely understood that General Sherman was unyielding in his viewpoint that the military should not interfere with the civil government. He thus carried that viewpoint to the personal extreme that he would disdain the honors of civil office.

History records how Gen. John C. Fremont tried, during the Civil War, to exercise the Presidential prerogatives by issuing an emancipation proclamation, which President Lincoln promptly and properly repudiated.

In a learned work entitled "A History of the Great War," Mr. Cruttwell has this to say:

The dividing line between politics and strategy in history has always been blurred. * * * Ministers were apt to find themselves at the mercy of the idols which they had created. * * * In Germany the Centre Party of the Reichstag actually went so far as to pass a formal resolution calling upon the Chancelor to be guided principally in the conduct of the war by the views of the general staff (October 1916).

And, incidentally, history records that Mr. Lincoln was confronted with the same presumptuous conduct by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Cruttwell continues:

Even in France and Great Britain, where ministers held the reins with a far firmer hand, we have seen how great was their difficulty in controlling or dismissing generals in whom they had lost confidence earlier than the public.

This morning's Washington Post has an excellent editorial upon this subject though, unfortunately, it does not delve into the historical experience. It is the teachings of the past that make it imperative that the military perform its function in executing the task assigned to it by the civilian government, and not attempt to dictate to, nor embarrass, that government.

Stockpiling of Critical Minerals and Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, having just obtained permission to extend my remarks and include an item from the Washington Post for August 30, 1950, entitled "Precious War Metals," by Marquis Childs, I want to make a brief introductory statement of my own. I feel that this timely statement is quite important, and it sums up my thinking on the subject.

In a brief space it would be impossible to indicate what the House Committee on Mines and Mining has done and has attempted to do toward stockpiling of critical and strategic minerals and metals during the past 14 years, but there have been many efforts, and I had some part in those efforts, beginning with my first term in Congress.

On May 18, 1937, when the Faddis bill was before the Military Affairs Committee, I appeared as a witness, suggesting an amendment in the interest of the buy-American provision. At that time I felt that we could not hope to get anything from abroad in the way of manganese and the like in payment of war debts, and I so stated. That particular bill was amended, but even so I felt then—and I still feel—that far too little has been done to promote domestic mining. To keep the record straight, I would like to quote three paragraphs from my statement before the House Military Affairs Committee on May 18, 1937, as follows:

[Excerpt from hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs, May 18, 1937]

My impression is that manganese is found in Russia, in Brazil, and certain other countries, but in those two particularly. I cannot understand, gentlemen, how we could get much from Brazil in payment of the world war debt; nor can I understand how we could get much manganese from Russia in payment of a world war debt. The Czar's government obtained a lot of money from us during the world war, but that government has gone to oblivion and the debt has been repudiated. I think we could not get anything from the present Soviet Government, manganese, or what not, in payment of that debt.

I am opposed, gentlemen, to having this country depend on foreign countries for these necessary materials, especially when we have them in such abundant supplies right here in our own country—the testimony in these hearings to the contrary notwithstanding. In several Western States, including my own State of Arizona, there are known deposits of manganese, such as at Artillery Peak, in Mohave County. I mention that particularly. All around the neighborhood of Boulder Dam there are deposits. I believe it is estimated there are 60,000,000 tons of manganese in sight at Artillery Peak, in Mohave County, Ariz. It may be actually twice that amount. That would be about one hundred and ninety-some-odd miles from Boulder Dam, about 25 miles east of the Colorado River, and perhaps within 5 miles of the Bill Williams River and within less than 30 miles of a railroad. It is easily reached by highway and automobile roads. This is rather high-grade, fairly high-grade manganese. * * *

I want to call your attention to this fact, that Boulder Dam is now finished and producing power. Eighteen percent of this electric power has been assigned to Arizona and 18 percent to Nevada. New processes have been developed whereby low-grade manganese can be prepared for the market by the electrolytic process, and it seems to me the sheerest folly to depend upon a foreign supply when there is so much available in our own country. * * *

The article by Marquis Childs is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 30, 1950]

PRECIOUS WAR METALS—DOMESTIC MANGANESE IS VITAL

(By Marquis Childs)

There is one precious metal of which America has an overflowing store. In the vaults at Fort Knox, Ky., gold bars are piled rank on rank, probably the greatest treasure in the history of mankind.

But gold is a soft metal. It cannot be used in airplane motors, to line gun barrels or to harden steel. The metals for these purposes are manganese, chrome, vanadium, tungsten. These precious metals are in tragic deficiency in the so-called stockpiles ordered to be built up 4 years ago.

Manganese may well be the most vital of these minerals since it must go into every scrap of steel that is made. In this space recently was a dicussion of the difficulties encountered by engineer-promoters seeking to develop domestic sources of manganese ore. Virtually all of America's manganese has been imported from Russia, Africa, Brazil, and India.

As a result of that column a worried stockholder of the United States Steel Corp. wrote a letter of inquiry to Irving S. Olds, chairman of the board. Mr. Olds has been kind enough to send me a copy of his reply. In it he says:

"Everyone connected with the American steel industry would be delighted to see developed any worthwhile manganese ore deposits in this country, which are capable of being developed in a sound and economic manner. Heretofore, most of the few known manganese ore deposits in the United States have been of such low quality, or of such small tonnage, as not to be capable of producing manganese ore in competition with better manganese ore obtainable from abroad.

"I have no personal knowledge about the extent of the stockpile of manganese ore which may have been built up by the Government. We have on hand in United States Steel a satisfactory supply for our own immediate use. But this does not mean that we are not vitally concerned with the maintenance, both by the Government and by industry, of an adequate supply of good manganese ore for the future."

In March of 1948, R. M. Lloyd, assistant to the vice president of the United States

Steel Corp., testified before a House committee as to the company's position on manganese. Summing up, he said:

"At this time, because of the current high rate of demand for manganese, substantially all available domestic production and importations are required for consumption and, consequently, any large quantity of ore to be used for stockpiling necessarily must come from other than present sources. Such supplementary sources, if they could be developed to some extent domestically, would provide stockpile tonnages, and result at the same time in approaching domestic self-sufficiency with regard to manganese in the United States for the long-range future."

In other words, there was no available manganese for stockpiles. It was all going into the steel being fabricated for automobiles and washing machines. Domestic consumption of steel went to new high levels in the all-out boom this year, so that there would have been even less manganese available than at the time of Lloyd's testimony.

New mining and processing developments were not encouraged. They appear in some instances to have been deliberately discouraged.

Alexander C. Barker, then vice president and director of H. A. Brassert & Co., for over 50 years consulting engineers to the iron and steel industry, outlined before a congressional committee a plan to develop an electrolytic process to produce manganese from low grade ores. The company had private capital for the development. They were only asking that stockpiling authorities agree to buy a part of the output. They got nowhere and the project was abandoned.

Other independent promoters and developers, some with a long record of experience, have had the same kind of frustrating response from Government. Certain of these independents believe one reason is the pressure of business-as-usual from the big companies that dominate supplies of critical metals. Chairman Olds says this is not true that in fact "there have been numerous discussions for many months past between men in the steel industry, and representatives in the Government, about the need for the development of new or increased supplies of manganese ores from sources other than Russia, especially as there are no known deposits of high grade manganese ore in the United States of any considerable size which do not require beneficiation."

If there were differences between the independents and the big companies over this question in the past, they should be ended. All sections of the industry must work with the Government, which must be stirred out of its lethargy and incompetence to obtain the metal far more precious than gold.

Report on My Efforts To Amend the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the Eighty-first Congress scheduled for early adjournment I want to express my keen disappointment over the fact that no action has been taken with respect to increasing benefits and liberalizing the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Since the Eighty-first Congress convened in January of 1949, I have constantly been active in trying to get action not only on the 2 bills I introduced but on the 45 bills sponsored by other Members of Congress. At no time have I limited my efforts to my own bills but I endeavored to obtain general hearings on the subject of liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act.

In addition to introducing legislation and talking to Chairman CROSSER and members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have been in touch with members of the Railroad Retirement Board, representatives of the railway brotherhoods and the A. F. of L. and the CIO.

The purpose of my contacting the Railroad Retirement Board and labor organizations was to, not only keep abreast of developments, but to encourage them to assist me in securing congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I have left no stone unturned in my efforts to get action on the Railroad Retirement Act because I live in a railroad community and I know the retired railroader or his widow is suffering because of the high cost of living.

In addition, those who are still actively employed are also anxious that the Railroad Retirement Act be liberalized. In view of the recent action of Congress in liberalizing social-security benefits, it is difficult to explain why Congress has not taken similar action with respect to the Railroad Retirement Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of Congress who has been more diligent than I have been in trying to obtain action on railroad-retirement legislation. For an illustration, shortly after the Eighty-first Congress convened in January 1949 I contacted Chairman William J. Kennedy, of the Railroad Retirement Board, as well as representatives of the railway brotherhoods, regarding legislation I drafted to increase present benefits, reduce the age limit and years of service, and aid the widows by liberalizing the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

While some changes were suggested in my proposed bill, I was definitely informed from the very beginning that I was wasting time and that the railroad-retirement fund would not stand any liberalization of benefits.

Regardless of this attitude on the part of the Railroad Retirement Board, the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the railway brotherhoods, on February 21, 1949, I introduced H. R. 2898, a bill designed to provide for a 20-percent increase in survivor annuities and lump sums payable under the Railroad Retirement Act.

After introducing H. R. 2898, I was informed that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would give no consideration to any amendments of the Railroad Retirement Act until a Board of Actuaries, studying the financial structure of the railroad retirement fund, made its report.

During the spring of 1949 I was in touch with the late Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and, after his death, with his successor, president W. P. Kennedy. As the result of an exchange of views, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen agreed with me that the Railroad Retirement Act should be liberalized, and we continued to exchange correspondence regarding a bill I had drafted to provide a 20-percent increase in present benefits.

On July 28, 1949, Mr. John F. Collins, administrative assistant to Chairman W. J. Kennedy, of the Railroad Retirement Board, informed me by letter that—

> An actuarial study of the railroad retirement account is now under way in accordance with section 15 (d) of the Railroad Retirement Act. The report on this study will not be completed for several months.

Upon receipt of this information I conferred with Chairman ROBERT CROSSER, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction over all legislation pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act. Chairman CROSSER informed me that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would take no action until the board of actuaries had completed its study.

On September 27, 1949, I asked Chairman William J. Kennedy, of the Railroad Retirement Board, for an estimate of the cost of my bill, H. R. 2898, and also the cost of the several proposed bills that I had drafted and which I was about to introduce in Congress.

When I experienced a delay in obtaining a reply to my request, I contacted the Washington office of the Railroad Retirement Board, and as a result Chairman Kennedy, accompanied by a representative of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, called in person at my Washington office. They told me it would be unwise for Congress to take any legislative action at that time and that we should wait until the board of actuaries submitted its report. It was not until late January 1950 that the report was made available to Congress.

After studying the actuarial report, I found myself faced with the fact that it stated:

> Under the present method of financing, no major increase in present benefits is possible without an increase in payroll-tax rates.

Upon completion of my study of the Actuarial Report, I conferred again with representatives of the railway brotherhoods and with Chairman ROBERT CROSSER, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, only to be informed that no legislation would be considered because the railroad retirement fund could not stand the expense. It was suggested that I should wait until after the Social Security Act was amended, but I replied that I failed to see what effect that would have on the question of amending the Railroad Retirement Act.

In early March of 1950, I again approached the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and was informed that a liberalization of the Railroad Retirement Act including a slight increase in benefits was possible without increasing the payroll tax. Therefore, on March 13, 1950, I introduced H. R. 7671 to increase the annuities paid to retired employees

by providing an increase of $15 monthly to retired employees and widows.

When I contacted Chairman CROSSER, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and requested hearings on H. R. 7671, he informed me there was still no plans for hearings on railroad retirement legislation during this session of Congress. He repeated the assertion of the Board of Actuaries that liberalization of the Railroad Retirement Act was impossible unless payroll taxes were increased. From March 15, 1950, to June 30, 1950, I made repeated requests by letter and in person for action on railroad retirement legislation. My efforts include an exchange of correspondence with the Railroad Retirement Board, railway brotherhoods, and Chairman ROBERT CROSSER, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with whom I had talked on numerous occasions. As a matter of fact, I had talked so often to Chairman CROSSER and members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that their patience with me had reached the breaking point.

Yet, on June 30, 1950, when I realized that liberalization of the Social Security Act was about to become a reality, I launched a determined effort to secure action on railroad retirement legislation since I realized Congress would adjourn in early September and there was little time left to obtain any action.

Between June 30 and July 12, 1950, I wrote personal letters to not only chairman ROBERT CROSSER, but to every member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In addition, I wrote to the following persons requesting their assistance and the aid of their organizations in my effort to secure action on railroad retirement legislation:

W. P. Kennedy, president, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

A. E. Lyon, executive secretary, Railway Labor Executive Association.

John Corbett, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

William Green, president, American Federation of Labor.

Robert Walkinshaw, regional director, United Railroad Workers of America, Altoona, Pa.

Philip Murray, president, CIO.

Elton J. Layton, chief clerk of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Finally, on August 23, 1950, I wrote to Chairman CROSSER again pointing out that since social-security benefits are being liberalized, it would be difficult to explain to the retired railroader or his widow why benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act have not been increased.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat again that I have diligently sought action on amendments that would increase benefits and liberalize the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

I think that any fair-minded person will admit that it is easy to make glittering promises about amending the Railroad Retirement Act, but it is a mark of insincerity to do so when you realize the difficulty of getting congressional action even on the reasonable provisions contained in the amendments that I sponsored.

My purpose in speaking to you on the subject is to point out the sincere efforts I have made to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and to convince recipients of railroad retirement benefits that we face a difficult task in obtaining congressional action on such legislation and that no amount of demagoguery can hide that fact.

Laboring Men Are Tired of Being Kidded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, since the CIO officials and some other labor bosses have put the success of the Democratic Party first and the interest of labor they are supposed to represent second, it is time that labor understands just what they are doing.

They support every measure the administration wants whether or not it is in the interest of labor. They then tell you that those who oppose the administration's program voted against labor. They made the charge some months ago that I voted 12 times against labor in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. There was not a word of truth in what they said. They will later make the same sort of charge against my record in this Congress. Again, they will not state the truth.

I have not in this Congress or the last Congress supported legislation that would be unfair and unjust to labor. I have voted favorably on many bills seeking to be helpful to labor.

It is about time the clear-thinking Democrats in the ranks of labor, and it is about time the Republicans in the ranks of labor resent being kidded and used as a political cat's-paw to gratify the ego of the labor bosses here in Washington who are attempting to deliver your votes to this administration.

I shall analyze a few of the charges made against me by the CIO to show just how silly and false they are.

Their deception starts with listing in the CIO News magazine on January 2, 12 bills when, in fact, only 3 affect labor. They know that by charging I voted 12 times against labor it will sound much more than 3 times. In fact, my vote on these 3 bills was in the best interest of labor. They were just 100 percent wrong, as I will explain by analyzing each bill.

First, I will explain the nine bills they threw in to make my record look bad. This will expose their deception.

1. MILITARY AID PROGRAM

I voted against giving $1,500,000,000 in aid to the European countries because I thought it was entirely too much. Certainly that was not a labor bill. They list that vote as wrong. Is it wrong to try to protect you as a taxpayer? They have to take a part of that money out of your pocket.

2. ADDITIONAL ECA FUNDS

It was proposed in this bill to give over $4,500,000,000 in Marshall plan funds to European countries. An amendment was offered to reduce it by $150,000,000. I voted to save this $150,000,000. It would have saved some taxes for labor and everyone else; yet, it was not a labor bill. To prove I was right ECA had over $150,000,000 left over at the end of the year.

3. TRADE AGREEMENTS

This bill gave the President the power to further reduce import duties or tariffs and increase the flood of foreign-made goods into this country that to date has thrown hundreds of thousands of men and women out of jobs.

I voted against lowering these tariffs to protect the workers of our country. They say that vote was against labor. Do you agree that it was? Of course, you do not.

Let me give you one of hundreds of instances where men are thrown out of work by these heavy imports.

The Waltham Watch Co. of Massachusetts closed down and 3,000 watch workers lost their jobs. The international president of the union pleaded with the Congress and President Truman to raise the import duty on watches pointing out that with cheaper labor Switzerland is now furnishing 85 percent of watches sold in the United States. Over 100,000 glass and pottery workers in Ohio are now out of employment for the same reason; thousands of men in glass and other industries in West Virginia are now losing their jobs because of this flood of imports. Shoe and oil workers in my district, and all over the Nation are urging us to try to raise the import, or tariff duties because they are losing their jobs.

I have a letter from Earl W. Jimerson, president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters of Chicago, stating that millions of pounds of imported meat are reaching our country for sale from Poland which is now behind the iron curtain. He says:

> Our international executive board representing 200,000 meat packing employees recently went on record to support Senate bill 3055 introduced by Senator GILLETTE. We will appreciate your support of this measure when it reaches the House.

This is to increase tariff duties, which I tried to do. Yet the CIO says my vote was against labor.

4. RULES COMMITTEE CHANGES

This bill has nothing to do with labor, except when they changed the rules in the Eighty-first Congress it made possible the passage of unnecessary legislation increasing the cost of Government over $500,000,000 each year which adds to the taxes labor and all of us must pay.

5. NATURAL GAS ACT

It is a silly deception to list this as a labor bill.

This bill had the backing of the administration and the sanction of the President. If it had not been agreeable to him, his leaders in the House and in the Senate, namely Senator LUCAS,

Speaker RAYBURN, and Congressman MCCORMACK, who always confer with the President on what bills shall come before the Congress, it would never have been offered in the Senate, or the House. It was passed also in the Senate.

Congressman RAYBURN spoke for the bill and pointed out that it would not raise the price of gas 1 cent to anyone in the Nation. And it will not. This was not a labor bill. The CIO leaders later got the President to favor them with a political veto.

6. ANTIMONOPOLY—CELLER BILL

This bill has nothing whatsoever to do with labor. It is not really worth explaining.

7. HOUSING—REES AMENDMENT

This was a public-housing bill, to put the Federal Government into the building of houses and the renting of them to the low-income group at what they could afford to pay in rent. The balance of their rent to be paid out of the Federal Treasury, taxing all of the other people of the Nation to help pay a part of their rent bill.

The bill will cost the Government probably $15,000,000,000. I voted against it. Again, this is not a labor bill but it will cost the laboring man and everybody who has built their own homes and are now having to pay heavy taxes, to be taxed a little more to help pay the rent of those who are only paying a part of the rent they should pay. I think you will agree I voted right.

8. RENT CONTROL—WILLIAMS AMENDMENT

Representative WILLIAMS offered an amendment to permit local government units, cities, counties, States to decontrol rents in their own communities. It would seem the local people should have a chance to run their own business rather than leave it up to bureaucrats here in Washington. The bill passed a few weeks ago, voted for by all of the labor crowd in the House, contains that same provision. Yet they say my vote was wrong.

Real labor bills. Now I will take up the three bills in which labor is justly interested.

1. SOCIAL SECURITY—RECOMMITAL MOTION

In considering the social-security bill in the House, I voted to recommit the bill and bring it back in such form that it would increase social-security payments for those in the lower wage brackets earning up to $3,000. These increases were in the interest of labor and the Senate bill has recently made such increases proving I was right. I then voted for the social-security bill.

They bring in this recommital vote, hoping to deceive you into believing I voted against social security when, in fact, I voted for and spoke in favor of the bill on the final House passage.

In this second session of Congress, when the Senate and House agreed upon a social-security bill that would increase social-security benefits from 50 to 85 percent which is regarded as the finest piece of social-security legislation ever offered, I spoke and voted for the passage of this legislation. Yet, these political top labor leaders will tell you that I did not support the passage of this fine piece of social-security legislation.

2. MINIMUM WAGE—LUCAS BILL

I voted for the Lucas, of Texas, amendment, the purpose of which was to more clearly define the law as to who should come under the act. I then voted for the 75-cent minimum wage law that is now on the statute books, yet, they say my vote was wrong. In other words, in their report, they would have you believe that I voted against minimum wage and social security when, in fact, I supported both bills and spoke in favor of them. They just do not tell you the truth.

3. THE WOOD BILL

In discussing the Wood bill or the Taft-Hartley Act, I should like to point out that when the Taft-Hartley law was written all railway workers were exempted from any control by this law. The railway men were exempted because they work under the Railway Labor Act. The proposed Wood bill granted them the same exemption.

In an attempt to meet the objections of labor to the Taft-Hartley bill so far as we could and yet write a sound bill fair for labor, business, and everyone, we wrote the Wood bill. In the Taft-Hartley bill, after a 2-year trial, we found that in 20 instances we could amend the law as requested by labor.

We did this and wrote a fair and just bill which could not fail to be acceptable to the rank and file of labor, and to business as well.

The big labor bosses and the President, who wanted to keep the Taft-Hartley law on the statute books to use in this campaign, realized if the Wood bill was passed, we Republicans, aided by a few Democrats in the House, would get credit for writing an acceptable new bill and settling this question. They knew that it would swing a big labor vote our way with the election of a Republican Congress this November if they were unable to defeat our efforts.

After 3 days of intense pressure led by the President, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Boyle, and by the big labor leaders who were playing the game with them, they were able to recommit the bill by only three votes.

They refused to bring another bill out of the committee. The administration and the big labor bosses kept the Taft-Hartley bill on the statute books. They did not want it repealed. They prevented the great rank and file of labor from having a better bill.

They wanted to keep this bill as a bug-a-boo so they could call upon the laboring men to kick millions into the campaign. They wanted more millions from the pockets of labor.

Mr. Speaker, the gradual increase in employment, higher wages, better contracts for the working men and the prosperity of labor which has come about during the past 3 years is proof that has finally convinced the laboring men and women that they are in better shape today than ever before.

It has proved to them that the big labor bosses, for political purposes, have been attempting to deceive the rank and file of labor throughout this time when they have assailed the Taft-Hartley Act, and other labor legislation as measures that would enslave labor.

Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, bargaining across the table under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act with the great General Motors Corp., and without any strike or serious threat of strike, under this law, a few weeks ago signed a contract with General Motors giving greater benefits to the laboring men than any contract in the history of this country or the world.

Mr. Reuther, when the contract was signed, said:

The total gains for the workers during the life of this agreement would exceed $1,000,000,000, and in the fifth year alone will add $700 to the income of the average General Motors worker's family.

Mr. Reuther said:

It was a historic agreement regarded by the union as the most significant development in labor relations since the mass production industries were organized in 1936 and 1937.

Mr. Speaker, there is but one instance of hundreds of contracts written between labor and management during the past 3 years, every one of which is a better contract than they have ever been able to obtain in the past. It belies the false charges of the labor bosses.

What the laboring man and all of us need now is to stop this inflation and reduce the high cost of living. To do that we need a new administration in Washington that will quit deliberately feeding the fires of inflation and driving the cost of living higher, through the waste and reckless unnecessary spending of the taxpayers' money that is and has been the policy of this administration.

They have spent billions of dollars more than they have taken in every year. This is extremely inflationary and works a hardship on the laboring men and women and on all the people.

I have fought against increasing taxes on the laboring men and all of our people and wasting their money to the tune of billions of dollars a year.

If enough of the Members of Congress would vote as I do, to quit wasting the taxpayers' money, we could stop increasing the Federal debt and reduce the cost of living. That is a wage rise that will really do labor some good.

World Peace Without Honor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Sun Coast News of August 16, 1950:

WORLD PEACE WITHOUT HONOR?

The people of the United States, looking on at this war that has begun in Korea, appear to view it with about equal parts of

fury, incredulity, confusion, and frustration. It's a war we don't want and have tried in every way to avoid. Two world wars would seem to be enough. Now we have a third.

But we do have it, and unless we win it we shall lose it—and if we lose it the earth, including the United States, will be governed from Moscow. The worst thing we can do at this moment is to take it for granted that we shall win. We can win only if we use our heads and hold nothing back, for the Russians have the jump on us. They are so confident that they hope not to have to fight us at all, but to run us ragged with minor engagements fought by stooges all around their periphery till we are worn out and can put up only guerilla resistance when taken over.

Part of our confusion and frustration are caused by the fact that we have never been in a war like this one. This is not the first time our forces have been mauled at the beginning, but it is the first time when our enemies looked forward with confidence to the long pull. If we let it go that way, this war may last the rest of our lives, even the lives of those who are young. Russia counts on growing constantly stronger during the next 30 years. If we are harried by minor campaigns all over the world our economy and our morale are going to be subjected to such strains as they have never known. We shall have to put on stringent controls and we are going to have to do without a lot of the things we've been used to if we're to produce the quantities of munitions and train the numbers of men needed for the almost predictable series of emergencies.

The action in Korea shows us what would happen to us in the Pacific if Russia were to send her own forces against us. We could not hold Korea, we could not hold Japan, we could not hold the Philippines, we probably could not hold Alaska and perhaps not Hawaii. A recent discussion in the House of Commons exposed very frankly what would happen to Europe if Russia decided to march west. Eighty Russian divisions and four or five thousand tanks are mobilized and ready. Nothing could stop them before they reached the English Channel. There is only one reason why Russia has not already annexed our Pacific holdings and western Europe. She is afraid that if she makes open war on us we will drop atomic bombs. And we probably would. The world has no other reply to the enormous military machine Russia is holding over our heads.

There are many honest men who are wondering whether anything we could win by a war would be worth the immense and prolonged sacrifices a war will certainly demand of us. But one steady look at the Politburo makes it obvious to any American that he could not endure existence in that vast concentration camp which is Russia and her satellites. We know democracy is not perfect; it is only a political system which tries to give all its citizens a fair chance under rules of fair play. It's not perfect, but it's the best men have had so far and the Communist slave state is probably the worst. There are conditions under which life is not worth living, and those are the exact conditions now offered by Russia to the rest of the earth. Living in a democracy we are prejudiced against violence and try to avoid trouble when we can, but the men of violence are marching their slaves against us again. We cannot accept what they offer. Weary of war though we are, it's better to fight.

Ultimately we shall win. The atom bomb is still ours and is holding the Russians at their borders. Invention and thought, which are dead in Russia, are very much alive among us, and they will begin to find ways to defeat the massed power of slaves and steel. Every soldier in our armies is a potential leader, every working brain is a potential leader of thought. We shall fight our way out of this trap, no matter how long it takes.

But from now on, let us make no mistake about it: The war is on, the chips are down. Those among us who defend Russia or communism are enemies of freedom and traitors to the United Nations and the United States. American soldiers are dying in a battle against slavery, against Russia's attempt to enslave mankind. Every man's house will be in a target area before this thing ends, whether we like it or not. The United Nations is on our side because Russia is at war with every nation that insists on being free. Fortunately President Truman has seen the Russian danger, and he knows as well as Churchill how boldly and rapidly we must act if we, as a nation, are to come out of this conflict alive. He will make very heavy demands on us, and very soon. He will have to make them, and we shall have to give everything we have to defend our liberty. Well, let us give it, and let us give ourselves, till Russia too has been taught that our free world is more than a match for the world of Genghis Khan.

Hon. Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Dominion News, Morgantown, W. Va., of August 25, 1950:

IT MAY INTEREST YOU

(By Bill Hart)

More than 2 years ago—it is now 3—I first saw him. He came into the office with that boyish grin, a lilting laugh in his voice and his step was quick and firm, but he had country about him for all his assurances and city clothes. We knew him then as a stanch worker in his own home county, a chap who had won his own way, been chosen by ballot to office and now he was saying: "I'm thinking about running for Congress. Are you people going to have any candidate for the nomination from Monongalia?" The negative answer was forthcoming and thus we knew that HARLEY STAGGERS was thinking about seeking the Democratic nomination for Congress from the Second Congressional District of which Monongalia is the pivotal area from several standpoints including population as well as having the only Democratic daily newspaper in all of the congressional district.

How well he would campaign we didn't know even after he emerged with a solid victory in the Democratic primary with several opponents all of whom made more noise and breathed a great deal more confidence than our friend who throughout the general as in the primary just kept working away, going to see people and telling them in his frank, open-face sincere way that if he went to Congress he would work as hard as he knew how to represent them as he knew they'd want him to represent 'em—looking after his district after playing whatever role fate might cast him in as the national affairs cycle rolls along the corridors of the halls of Congress. The people heard, they believed, and they sent him to Congress—and now, the time comes to see if he will be returned.

What has this Congressman—this HARLEY STAGGERS been doing since the people took him at his word and elected him to Congress? Probably no man has ever gone to Congress who has tried harder and few have worked harder. The day has not been too long, the night not too dark for STAGGERS not to be out pitchin' at his job of being a Congressman and no person has written him who didn't get an answer and a helping hand, if possible. The truth is that many people knowing how much he is capable of doing have imposed upon him trivial things that they should have performed themselves or better still never thought about. But of such is the life of a Congressman who is never in conference and whose door stands open, whose hand is outstretched and his heart is sympathetic to any worthy cause.

Thusly, we are now moving into a campaign to determine whether this man of the people is to remain in the Halls of Congress or to be turned out in favor of another gentleman whose backers have unlimited funds and will undoubtedly strive with might and main to send him to the seat now held by STAGGERS. Against this money and the admitted talents of the Republician nominee; against this great force, STAGGERS must depend almost entirely upon his record the past 2 years, his sincerity, his honesty, his frankness, his warm handclasp, his infectious grin, his ability to get around to a lot of places a lot of the time. He has a tough battle for talent and money combined are not easily beaten and the Republican nominee for Congress has both. STAGGERS has the talents, talents plus, but he has no financial angel. He has no slush fund, he has nothing save his friends and all of them are poor.

In Monongalia County—where politics are meat and fiber for many throughout all of the days of the year—the Democratic workers are finding legions of their Republican friends who are saying to each other: "STAGGERS is a worker; he's our friend; he is always around when we need him; he's winning his fight for the synthetic liquid fuels laboratory—the greatest boost Morgantown and West Virginia University will have ever had if it comes about—we're for him and we're going to ask our friends to vote for him." Yes; more and more people every day are saying in words or effect the foregoing. They are saying those words with the best of feelings for the Republican nominee who is a fine gentleman with a good war record. STAGGERS' war record, too, stands out, but like his Republican opponent, he boasts not of it. Both did their wartime jobs and well.

Labor Day, STAGGERS comes here to once again be amongst some of his warmest friends for here in Monongalia where we usually accept people slowly and with reservations STAGGERS has come to number his friends by the hundreds and hundreds and he is the living example of the time-tested principle that any person who looks for friends and wishes to be a friend to people usually realizes that ambition. STAGGERS will be among friends here Labor Day. Let us hope that on election day his friends will remember the great record he has compiled. STAGGERS must rely on his friends. He is poor, he has no great financial angel.

Medical Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following letter from James Stevens Simmons, M. D., brigadier general, United States Army, retired; president, Association of Schools of Public Health:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Boston, Mass., August 21, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: The present critical military situation in Korea and the imminent threat of another global war places new emphasis on the need to provide for the Nation adequate facilities for the postgraduate training of specialized experts in public health and military preventive medicine. This need for training is essential to the development and operation of a fully effective wartime health conservation program both for the civil population and armed services. The direct practical relationship between the preventive techniques of public health and the conservation of national manpower is now well recognized. Our experience in World War II leaves no doubt that an aggressive all-out program of military preventive medicine is just as necessary to the success of a modern army as are modern equipment and weapons.

With this fact in mind, it is of urgent importance to take stock of all the facilities now available in the country with which to meet this emergency need for trained specialists in public health and preventive medicine and to make sound plans for whatever the future may bring. In view of recent action deferring the passage of H. R. 8886, which would provide a portion of the emergency financial assistance needed to enable the schools of public health, the schools of medicine, and the allied professions to meet their expanding responsibilities to the Nation, I am writing as president of the Association of Schools of Public Health to earnestly request reconsideration and early passage of this bill.

The Health Resources Division of the National Security Resources Board has responded to the association's request for an early conference at which the Government would outline for the schools of public health the additional training demands that will be made on them in the military and civil preparedness effort. Arrangements are under way for such a conference. Obviously, the success of any program adopted will depend on adequate financial support. Without additional funds, the schools will be helpless in fulfilling their obligation to the Nation.

Detailed statements showing the present unsatisfactory financial situation of the 10 schools and departments of public health, now engaged in the post-graduate training of public health and preventive medicine, have been presented to the Congress during the last year at hearings on H. R. 5940, and therefore need not be repeated here. These statements show that the schools of public health not only lack the financial support required for peacetime operation but that their total output of post-graduate trained specialists is about one-fifth of the number needed to properly operate the country's peacetime health programs. If the present Korean situation results in an all-out war, the additional demand of the armed services for such highly trained specialists will make this already critical situation hazardous.

This letter is written as spokesman for the association. However, I should like to add that from my 30 years of experience in military preventive medicine while on active duty in the Army, and especially from my observations as Chief of the Preventive Medicine Services in the Office of the Surgeon General throughout World War II, I am convinced that one of the most important responsibilities which now faces the Congress and the country is to take immediate steps to insure the training of an adequate and continuing supply of experts, to insure the prevention of disease and the conservation of health among our workers and our fighting men. It is my sincere belief that the need for early passage of H. R. 8886 is imperative. Its cost compared to the enormous outlays necessary for armaments, is relatively minor. Yet the need it would serve is of major importance to the maintenance of the Nation's strength.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,
JAMES STEVENS SIMMONS, M. D.,
Brigadier General, United States Army (Retired), President, Association of Schools of Public Health.

Labor Leaders Again Fight Mundt-Nixon-Wood Bill, H. R. 9490, Aimed To Protect the United States Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, blind labor leaders are again resisting the efforts of this Congress to write reasonable legislation that would curb the un-American activities of Communists, traitors, and fellow travelers. Yet it was only yesterday that Lee Pressman testified that he was a member, for 1 year, of the Communist Party. From 1935 until 1948 Pressman has been a top-flight labor leader. He was attorney for Philip Murray and the CIO during the time when labor moguls were fighting the Taft-Hartley law and the Mundt-Nixon bills in the Eightieth Congress. Since enactment of the Taft law, labor has really started to clear their ranks of Communists but until that time and even now, they have resisted every move to expel the "Red rats" from their ranks. Except for vigorous action by Congress who knows but that this Government might have been overthrown by the radicals in this time of emergency. A heavy hand rests upon the sane labor leaders in this country. The rank-and-file union member is far ahead of his leader. Most union members are loyal and patriotic and they oppose the Communists in their ranks.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9490 is another piece of legislation that comes from the House Un-American Activities Committee. It is a testimonial to the wisdom of this House in establishing that Committee on a permanent basis in the Seventy-ninth Congress. The American people should be grateful to those who voted to continue the committee. Alger Hiss and his comrades of the Communist Party would still be spewing their poison in this country if the committee had not been established.

Mr. Speaker, if I thought for one moment that this bill would give power to thwart the liberty and freedom of any group I would oppose it most violently. I am satisfied that it does not. It aims to compel the registration of Communist and fellow-traveler organizations to register the names of their members. Is there any loss of liberty there when we consider that we are presently in a war against communism in Korea? The answer is obvious: The charge that it goes so far as to control thought has no basis in fact. It is a specious argument designed to be sensational for public consumption. Constitutional safeguards are in no way impinged by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this measure comes to us for consideration by a unanimous report of the committee so it is strictly nonpartisan. Mr. WOOD, the chairman, and the other members of the committee have spent hours listening to testimony and in writing the bill. Great credit is due them and especially the able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON]. We have been informed that only three organizations appeared against the measure, the American Federation of Labor, the CIO, and the Communist Party. In support of it are all the patriotic organizations in this country.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 9490 will pass this House by an overwhelming majority. I shall vote for it.

Speech of Hon. Paul V. McNutt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. NOLAND
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Paul V. McNutt, a great American, who has served his country well in war and peace addressed the American Legion at a dedication of their National Headquarters Building in Indianapolis on August 20. A past national commander of the Legion, Paul McNutt has been governor of Indiana, High Commissioner to the Philippines, Federal Security Administrator, head of the War Manpower Commission, and Ambassador to the Philippines. His address on the position of the United States in international affairs is quite noteworthy. It follows:

For God and country we of the American Legion have associated ourselves together and we dedicate this national headquarters building to the service of the same high purpose. We are profoundly grateful to the people of the State of Indiana for making it available.

It has been our lot to see more history made than we read in the books during the days of our youth. It has been our privilege to serve our country in two world wars and to help in the solution of the difficult problems which are the inevitable aftermath of armed conflict.

Through the years the American Legion has kept the faith—with community, State, and Nation, with the disabled, the orphans, and the widows, with our comrades, without

way of life. It has been a living force for good, a great stabilizing agency in the successive and mounting crises which have beset us since the day of the Legion's birth. Never was such a force, never was such an agency more needed than today as we face the greatest crisis of our time.

For those of us who are now in middle age, virtually the whole of our adult lives has been spent amidst the disturbances, the threats, and the dangers of crises. There were a few years, say from 1924 to 1929, when it seemed that the earthquake of 1914 was over, that the ground beneath our feet had ceased to tremble, and that in our Western World at least the destruction was being repaired, the wounds were healing, and men had resumed the works of peace. We now know that this was an illusion, that there was only a temporary lull, and that then there came upon us convulsions greater than any for which we were prepared.

Thus for more than 35 years, with only short intervals of comparative calm in which to catch our breath and compose our spirits, we have lived in the storm and stress of immense and incalculable events. Not every generation goes through an ordeal of this kind. Our fathers had their troubles. In the Nineties they had to work their way through panics and acute economic disorders. But only two other generations of Americans, those who made the Republic between 1776 and say 1810, and those who held it together between 1861 and 1880, have really known what it meant to have to defend the very foundation of civilized living against a breakdown into the anarchy of separated, quarreling groups. It is difficult, I think, to overestimate the nervous strain to which responsible men and women, those who, as the Quakers say, have had a concern of mankind, have been subjected in those years. Think back to 1914 and then realize how tremendous have been the demands upon human energy, the constant peril and the terrible anxiety first of World War I and its huge miseries, then of the peacemaking and the enormous complication of high ambitions and violent passions, then of the revolutions which overthrew all the empires of continental Europe, then of the first reconstruction in the Twenties, in which men had to fight every foot of the way for small instalments of reason against the fierce resistance of terrorized and shell-shocked masses of people, then the break-down in 1929 and all the panics, and the revolutions which have swept mankind. Then this was followed by catastrophic World War II, which all but destroyed civilization. Its implications we do not realize, its consequences we cannot know. Any man who has lived through these tremendous years and has tried as a responsible leader or as a conscientious citizen to do his part, to rise to the occasion, to contribute what he had in him, has endured anxieties, has drawn upon his reserves of moral force, to a point where at times it seems inhuman to ask any more of him. We need not be astonished that statesmen have become confused, that the peoples have again and again acted as if they were more than a little mad. The generation which has been passing through the ordeal of this crisis is shocked and weary and nervously spent. It has been frightened by blow after blow for which it was unprepared, bewildered by events which it could not understand, disappointed as one fair hope and one fair promise after another have been dashed to pieces. In the considered opinion of many students of contemporary history, we face today a greater test of our devotion to American principles than we have at any time in the past.

The great war through which we passed from 1941 to 1945 was a challenge to everything we believed in—to all our principles and even to our national survival. Today we face a challenge not only to our survival as a nation but to the very existence of mankind in the state we now know. It is not only the challenge of resurgent totalitarianism. It is a challenge to the basic truths of modern civilization. We thought we had firmly established those truths by our victory in 1945. We know today that we have not. What we accomplished was merely the defeat of one particular group of forces which arose to threaten modern civilization. We find today that there are other challenges more sinister and more forbidding than any in the recorded history of man.

We thought we had established beyond all question and doubt the concept of "one world," the concept of the indivisibility of peace and of the brotherhood of man. We thought we had fixed beyond challenge the truth of the statement that human, individual rights and the dignity of the human spirit were to be recognized above all other values. We thought we had firmly established the fact that governments are instituted among men to protect and preserve their inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments exist only by the consent of the governed, under justice and law.

Today, 5 years after the end of hostilities, we find these truths again challenged. We find one nation arrogating to itself the right to determine the fate of others and the right to rule others.

Such action is the antithesis of democracy. One of the great purposes of the American Legion is to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy. Justice and freedom define themselves. Democracy is the unrestricted right of the people to choose or change their form of government. The important thing is freedom to choose or change. Many of us have hoped with all our hearts for a world in which all would be free to make such choice or change and, being free, would sit around the table to settle differences as people of good will have always done. We desire to live in peace and do our part as a member of a community of nations. It would seem sensible to have a single community, one world, as some have put it. The League of Nations was and the United Nations is such an organization. Fragile as it may be and feeble as its efforts seem, it is a step in the right direction, the ultimate method of achieving universal peace. It deserves and is receiving our wholehearted support. An overwhelming majority of the nations and the peoples of the world believe in it. They can, if they will, give it the strength to keep the peace and to maintain a system of ordered liberty. To borrow an expression from our Navy—"Make it stow."

However, events of our lifetime, I trust, have made us realists. Therefore, if, for the time being, in the nature of men and things, there cannot be one world then let there be two or more. We do not seek to impose our way of life upon any other peoples. By the same token we will not tolerate the efforts of others to impose their way of life upon us. We join with all others of like mind to preserve freedom for all of us in that world to which we belong.

For the record, it is well to point out on this memorable occasion, that, from the day of its birth, the American Legion has carried the unceasing fight against communism, fascism, and totalitarianism in any form. Its members were the martyrs of the unforgettable Centralia massacre. Its action blocked the plan for an American revolution which envisioned enlisting large members of ex-servicemen under the Red standard. Its voice has been the vigilant voice of warning as to the enemy in our midst. Its hand has been raised to maintain law and order in every emergency or disaster. Its leadership has been steadfast in promoting an understanding of and devotion to American democracy, a program which we have seen fit to call our Americanism program.

No organization has more consistently supported and urged an adequate national defense. For this stand Legionnaires have been the target of all manner of silly epithets, jingoists, sabre-rattlers, war mongers, and superpatriots. Neither name-calling nor well-financed, skillfully directed opposition has changed the stand of the American Legion. And now, at long last, the American people and the responsible officers of Government have recognized the absolute necessity of preparedness. The American Legion is not in the least concerned with the fact that for 30 years it was a voice crying in the wilderness. It is vitally concerned with what is done about national defense now—right now.

The American Legion is for universal military training.

The American Legion is for the mobilization of all of our resources.

Never again must be learn the bitter lesson of too little and too late.

Americans love freedom with such a passion that they instinctively resent any move which smacks of regimentation. If I am any judge of their temper at the moment it would seem that, after mature consideration rather than emotional judgment, they are ready to submit themselves to such controls as are necessary during, but only during, the period of national danger.

That this is a period of grave national danger is apparent to all.

We thought that we were born in an age of reason, of truth, of enlightenment, that the shadows at the beginning of the century were the shortening shadows of the dawn of a better day. To our great dismay we have found ourselves constantly fighting unreason, untruth, and ignorance and that an iron curtain cuts off all light.

Three years ago an oriental of high standing and great influence said to me that the only thing which gains and holds respect in this day and age is superior force. I replied that I had never listened to such cynicism. The East has seen centuries of man's inhumanity to man and I have come to understand that he was quoting from the book of experience.

If, as it would seem, we face the threat of another of the dark ages it behooves us to carry a sword in one hand and the torch of liberty in the other. We must be the superior force in order to keep alight the torch of liberty which illumines the path to a better day.

It is not enough that we be strong for our own sakes. We have earned a position of world leadership. All freedom-loving nations and peoples look to us. We are ready to support and befriend our allies and to cooperate with movements designed to isolate totalitarianism and tyranny. We have acknowledged and accepted our responsibilities. In a world crisis of such magnitude, such violence and such complexity, it is for us to take whatever steps are necessary to maintain peace.

In the stress and strain of the moment we must not forget those who, through the years, have been our steadfast friends. Yonder is the last flag to fly over the Philippines as an American possession. It is the flag which was lowered in honor and glory on July 4, 1946. Its stars were made and sewed by loving hands from every province of the Philippines. The Indiana War Memorial was selected as its sanctuary by the President of the United States.

On a comparative basis the Philippines suffered more damage than any similar area in the war zones. The Filipino people had more casualties in proportion to population

than any other peoples in World War II. Manila's destruction was greater than that of any war capital with the possible exception of Warsaw. It is still the city of missing faces and missing places. One other fact must never be forgotten. The Philippines was the only one of the possessions or colonies of the Allied Nations to stand fast from the beginning to the end. The Filipinos fought with unsurpassed bravery from the first day to the last. Our conduct in the islands for half a century and our prompt fulfillment of the promise of independence give the lie to the statements of the Soviet member of the Security Council. The offer from the Philippines of 5,000 troops is no idle gesture in reply.

The Republic of the Philippines is our experiment in democracy in the Far East. The islands are a very important part of our western defense line. The present economic troubles of the Filipinos are due, for the most part, to the war. They need substantial help now. For our own sake as well as for theirs, we must not delay. I cit this as a primary example of what must be done outside the borders of our country.

A new flag bravely flies on the battlefields of Korea. For the first time it flies over this memorial plaza. It is the emblem of the United Nations. To me it symbolizes a familiar phrase in the preamble of the Legion's constitution: "To make right the master of might." It is an expression of the continuing hope of men of good will and good sense everywhere that world wars can be averted, that the forces of order in this world are still more powerful than the forces of chaos.

I am glad the two flags fly together. Freemen in all parts of the world are our fellows in this great adventure of man's history. Freedom now fights back. It has awakened to the challenge. It is aware of the grave danger, which is twofold: externally through powerful military aggression; internally through infiltration on the one hand and certain failures of the free system to meet man's needs on the other. The free must meet the danger in both of its aspects.

The United Nation's peace forces, manned largely by the United States, have their backs against the sea in the Korean bridgehead. Dangers of similar military onslaughts exist in half a dozen other soft spots throughout the world. It is the crafty strategy of the Soviet totalitarians to strain the resources of freemen to exhaustion without exposing their own forces directly. They have made cat's-paws of their slaves, who are victims of police-state thinking, children of fear, born of ignorance.

In reality we fight for their freedom as well as our own. We must teach them the fruitful footsteps toward individual-based society. The achievement of the free system is not merely a higher standard of living but the opportunity it affords to God's individual man.

This is no time for fear or frustration. If we stand firm, the day will come when the democracies of the world will be able to say, as Pitt said: "We have saved ourselves by our own exertions, and the world by our example."

When the curtains of this night are pinned together with a star, may that star be the star of Bethlehem. He who was born under that star said: "I am come that they may have life and that they may have it more abundantly." The words of the Master, who is the Prince of Peace, must be the pattern of the peace.

In that spirit, as we dedicate this building, we rededicate ourselves to God and country. May God give us the vision to see the path and the courage to follow it. With divine help we will not fail.

Concurrent Resolution With Regard To Armed Aggressions by Russia or Satellite Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Congressmen HALE, of Maine; HERTER, of Massachusetts; and JUDD, of Minnesota, today filed a concurrent resolution in the House of Representatives in effect holding the Government of the U. S. S. R. responsible for any new outbreak of war which might occur as a result of an armed attack against any nation by a Russian satellite or by Russian-occupied Germany. In filing this resolution they made the following statement:

"For a few weeks after the attack by North Korea on South Korea it was the policy of our Government never to mention Soviet Russia as being in any way responsible for or connected with this attack, although all the evidence available to the United Nations or to the United States pointed directly to the contrary. Presumably our policy was motivated by the wish to give the Soviet Union an opportunity to disavow the action of North Korea. Its failure to do so has given every indication that the Soviet Union believes it can make use of its satellites in order to launch attacks on noncommunistic countries and escape direct responsibility for the consequences. The resolution which we have filed is intended to make it absolutely clear that, insofar as the Congress is concerned, Soviet Russia can no longer inspire its satellites to aggressive action without being held accountable for such action through the appropriate agency, namely, the Security Council of the United Nations. We believe that a forthright statement of this kind, concurred in by the Senate and the House, would serve in some measure as a deterrent to further acts of aggression of the type initiated by the North Koreans, and would clear the atmosphere with respect to accountability, should such further acts occur.

"We further believe it important to point up to the satellite nations that we have no illusions as to their foreign policy and their military activities. Obviously they are under the direct control of the Kremlin."

The text of the resolution follows:

"Whereas the action by the government of North Korea on June 25, 1950, characterized by 53 nations as an act of unprovoked aggression, has clearly received the approval of the government of the U. S. S. R.; and

"Whereas this action of the government of North Korea comes as a sequel to repeated acts on the part of the government of the U. S. S. R., clearly evidencing its unwillingness to cooperate in maintaining international peace; and

"Whereas the government of the U. S. S. R. has armed, equipped, and trained nationals of countries contiguous to it or occupied by its army: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (the Senate concurring)*, That (1) it is the sense of the Congress that any armed attack by the governments of the U. S. S. R., Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Russian-occupied Germany, Albania, or Communist China, or by any one or more of such governments, upon the peoples of any nation must be regarded by the Congress of the United States as a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression on the part of the U. S. S. R. itself. Such attack, as in the case of North Korea, must be deemed to call for appropriate action by the Security Council of the United Nations for the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security.

"(2) Upon the adoption of this resolution, the President of the United States is respectfully requested to communicate its terms to the Security Council of the United Nations."

Aid and Comfort for the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. NOLAND
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial from the Bloomington (Ind.) Star-Courier, which is one of the finest newspapers in the entire Nation.

This analytical editorial demonstrates that the people of America are able to see through the clouds of confusion stirred up by the partisan maneuvering of certain politicians. The editorial follows:

AID AND COMFORT FOR THE ENEMY

The Communist movement is a world-wide menace which must be met with such strong and determined actions as we have taken in Korea. But, right here in our own country there is another immediate and dangerous situation which must be headed off before it causes irreparable harm.

This growing danger in our midst is the violent stand which some unscrupulous Republican politicians have taken against the administration's pursuit of the war effort. Within the last few weeks these thoughtless politicians have seized upon the Korean situation as the long awaited excuse for a campaign issue. Their bombastic oratory, at times, has bordered on the subversive. Moscow could not do a better job of attempting to undermine the faith of the American people in their government than is being done by these political opportunists.

Indeed, there are times when one cannot help but believe that these politicians in their misguided zeal for a campaign issue would welcome the defeat of the Allied forces in Korea in order to lay the bloody corpse at the feet of the American people and declare: "This is the fault of a Democratic administration."

It is the right and the duty of the minority to criticize the party in power, but when that criticism borders on the sabotaging of a nation, it is going too far for political purposes.

While American boys are dying on the Korean front, these politicians are taking the opportunity to confuse the people at home and thus hinder the nation's war effort. Here is a real and immediate danger for all of us.

In the midst of this new surge of political oratory and opposition to the administration are three Hoosiers: Senators CAPEHART and JENNER and Representative HALLECK. These three Hoosier congressmen, who consistently voted against every effort of Congress to stem the tide of communism in Europe, now would blame the war in Korea on the President and a Democratic administration. CAPEHART, JENNER and HALLECK were lined up with the isolationist wing in Congress that opposed the Marshall plan aid for Europe. Fortunately, we were able

to pass the aid bills despite the hamstringing tactics of the isolationists. And, it has been the Marshall plan aid which has helped to save Europe up to now from being completely overrun by communism.

Our aid to Greece and Turkey helped to save those countries. The Red forces were repulsed in Greece. Turkey was saved as a buffer against any Russian movement into the Near East, which would mean the loss of the vital Iranian oil fields. In Italy, in France, in western Germany and in the Low Countries the forces of democracy have been triumphant over communism. Yet in the Congress of the United States, Senators CAPEHART and JENNER and Representative HALLECK were against economic aid for the democratic forces in Europe.

Now along comes war in the Far East. What about our policy in the Far East? Why did the war break out in Korea? Was our State Department remiss in its handling of the Far East relations?

We don't think so. We believe that every effort within our power was made to give the people in the Far East reason to oppose communism. But, the Far East is unlike Europe. Culturally and industrially the teeming millions of Asia are far behind the rest of the world. There was nothing to begin with, and it was recognized that all the great wealth of this Nation could not hope to bolster an economy that had no foundation. Aid for the Chiang Kai-shek regime in China was abandoned after we had poured millions of dollars into the country only to see it disappear into the pockets of the greedy war lords surrounding Chiang. In South Korea we fostered a democratic regime and gave the people food and arms, but apparently it was not enough. Yet, it was all that economy-minded Congressmen in both parties saw fit to give.

The Democratic administration in Washington is accused of negligence by these political-minded men and of spreading our aid too thin. Let us not forget that it was many of these same politicians who now criticize the administration for failing to be ready for the Korean emergency who fought the hardest to cut all appropriations. If they had had their way we would now be facing the Communist hordes in Europe as well as in Asia.

Our memory takes us back only a few short weeks when the cry of these same politicians was economy, economy, and more economy. They wanted economy where there was no place to economize except in our appropriations for defense which then were taking some 70 percent of the annual national budget.

We are now engaged in a bitter war in Korea. It is a war which will test the strength of a democratic world as opposed to the Communist ideology. It is going to take a united front here and in all democratic nations of the world to win.

The Capeharts, the Jenners, and the Hallecks who are creating dissension in the ranks are aiding the Russian cause. They are unwittingly providing aid and comfort for the enemy.

James M. Mead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a very interesting biographical sketch of our former colleague and able Senator from New York, Mr. James M. Mead.

The article describes the broad experience of Jim Mead, and shows how devotion to his duties and a brilliant and active mind have led him up the ladder of success. The friends of former Senator Mead will read this article with much interest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Enginemen's Magazine of July 1950]

UNCLE SAM'S CHIEF COP--FROM WATER BOY ON LACKAWANNA TO CHAIRMAN OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION: JIM MEAD'S GREAT RECORD

(By Ruben Levin)

Back in 1910, a tall, handsome, genial youngster, with a remarkably winning personality, was appointed to the Capitol Police force. For a year he served as a cop in and around the Legislative Halls of Congress.

Today, that youngster—now graying at the temples, but with the same charm and persuasiveness—is Uncle Sam's chief cop. His job is to see that business goes straight and to crack down on monopoly.

Railroaders hardly need to be told that this man is James Michael Mead, the one-time water boy on the Lackawanna, whose rise to fame and influence is a typical American saga.

Last fall Jim Mead was appointed by President Truman to membership on the Federal Trade Commission, the agency which has the responsibility of policing business and curbing monopoly.

Late in May, Truman moved Jim up to the chairmanship of the Commission. That job is now a particularly important one because, under a reorganization plan approved by Congress, extensive new powers are vested in the Chairman. He becomes the top cop in reality, as well as in name.

Behind him is an extraordinary career, with which old-timers on the "iron horse" are already familiar, but this is a good time to retell it for the newer generation on the rails.

Jim was literally born into railroading. His father and mother both worked on the railroads. Jim and all his four brothers did the same. So did scores of relatives. At one time it was possible to count a hundred members of the Mead and related families who held jobs on the "iron horse." They toiled in almost every craft and belonged to almost every union on the rails. There were enough of them to run a fair-sized railroad, all by themselves.

Jim's father was a maintenance-of-way worker on the old Pittsburg & Shawmut. His mother, Mary Jane Kelley, herself the daughter of a railroader, was employed in railroad station restaurants at Hornell and Canaseraga, N. Y. Mary's sisters and brothers also labored on the railroads all the livelong day.

As Jim recalls it, those were the days before diners were common on the rails. Trains stopped long enough for passengers to hop off and grab a bite at the depots.

"Many young girls of the countryside found jobs in these depot restaurants very attractive," Jim Mead said. "They didn't stay long—for a very simple reason: The engineers, the firemen, the trainmen, and others who ate in those restaurants married the belles."

That was how Jim's father, Thomas Mead, met and married Mary Jane Kelley. They moved into a little rough shack by the side of the tracks on the Lackawanna at Mount Morris, N. Y. Tom Mead was then a foreman and he was provided by the railroad with that shack so he could readily be picked up at any time of the day or night in case of a wreck or other emergency.

It was in that little home that Jim first saw the light of day back in December 1885, and where he spent his earliest years. Jim has a photo of that hut on the walls of his office now. "When the trails rolled by, it rattled like an accordion," he remembers.

While Jim was still a young boy the family moved to Buffalo. The family grew and the youngsters had to seek work at an early age to help make ends meet. Jim had to quit school at 12. His first job was that of water boy on the Lackawanna, carrying buckets of water to thirsty section hands.

Soon he was promoted to lamplighter, taking care of switch lamps; then to a maintenance-of-way worker. The waymen weren't organized then, but about that time the carmen on his road struck for higher pay. When strikebreakers tried to use the section shanty for their tools, he threw them out and chalked up a sign: "No Scabs Permitted Here." For that he was fired, ending his career as a track worker.

Then he got a job with the Pullman Co., working on car dynamos, and joined the electrical workers.

When the opportunity arose to become a cop at the Capitol in Washington, he grabbed it. On the side, he spent all possible spare time studying law, boning far into the night.

When he resigned to return to Buffalo, he told his fellow cops lightly: "I'll be back in 10 years as a Member of Congress."

In Buffalo, he went to work for the Erie as a switch tender and became active in the switchmen's union. Three years later lodge 226 elected him as president. His brothers were similarly active in unionism. One was president of a local lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, another was a member of the railway clerks, a third of the trainmen, and a fourth was a dispatcher, later killed in line of duty.

The year 1913 marked his first entry into politics. He ran for the Erie County board of supervisors and made it. He launched an immediate fight for reforms.

Then he tried for the legislature in 1915 and won. He was elected an assemblyman for four successive terms, each time with larger pluralities. He made a great record there as a champion of workers and the public welfare. For example, he led successful battles for a full crew law, for a semimonthly pay bill, for a cab safety act, and many other progressive measures. A Democrat in a Republican-controlled legislature, he developed a reputation as a legislator who got things done.

His big test came in 1918. At the urging of organized labor and liberal forces, he ran for Congress, and triumphed in the race. He came to Washington as a Congressman at the age of 33—in 2 years' less time than the prediction he had made to his fellow "cops" in 1910.

For 20 years thereafter he served in the House, winning reelection each time, even during Republican landslides. Assigned to the House Post Office Committee, he became one of the ablest champions of postal workers in Congress, scoring many gains for them.

He was an outstanding supporter, too, of all rail labor legislation, as well as every other measure in the interest of those who toil for a living. He helped put through the Railway Labor Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and many other progressive laws.

When the late Senator Royal S. Copeland died in 1938, Mead was unanimously chosen by the Democratic State convention to run

for the post. He was elected by a thumping majority then—and again in 1940, when he ran for the full 6-year term. In 1946 he was persuaded to run for Governor of New York State, and was defeated—for the first time in his career.

His record in the House and Senate is unparalleled. Not only did he have a perfect score from labor's standpoint, but he never ducked a vote. There were no misses, no absences in his box score. He was always at hand to register his stand, and to fight for what he believed was right.

Mead served on many outstanding committees. He was active on several that dealt with the problems of small business. He was also a member of the famous Temporary National Economic Committee, which probed the evils of monopoly and big business.

During World War II he served side by side with Harry Truman, later to become President, on the famous Senate War Investigating Committee, and when Truman became Vice President in 1944, Mead succeeded to the chairmanship of the committee.

He did a superb job. Like Truman, he turned the spotlight on war contract swindlers, on makers of defective war materials, on other abuses in the war production program. Quite a number of crooks were sent to jail, due to Mead's efforts. Equally important, he saved the taxpayers hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars, in war contract expenditures.

How does he react to his present position—is it the most interesting and challenging he has held? This writer put that question to him.

"No, I would demur to that," he replied. "It is a very important task. But I still believe that to be a Member of the House of Representatives from any State is as interesting, exciting, and constructive a position as anyone can hope to aspire to in the public service. I would say the same of Senators, except that those from the big and populous States do not have sufficiently adequate staffs to prepare themselves as thoroughly as they would like to for the big debates and issues up before Congress."

Mead's experience in Congress with the problems of small and big business, and his administrative experience as chairman of important committees, have come in good stead. Under his leadership, the Commission has been injected with new life and energy.

Many reforms have been instituted to expedite action on cases involving monopolistic practices and flagrant abuses in business. John Carson, another newer member of the Commission, has also played a major role in this "transfusion." Like Mead, Carson is a veteran of many battles for progressive causes and a former leader in cooperative and consumer movements.

One of the most unusual developments is that for the first time in years, the Commission has cleaned up all cases which are ready for decisions, and it is now current in its work. To achieve that objective has meant much toil on Sundays, holidays, and nights for Mead and his associates.

Mead stressed, however, that the aim of the Commission is not just quantity of cases, but real protection of the consumer as well as small business—and, above all, maintenance of an honest American system of competition.

One final point: Jim Mead has been a member of many organizations, but one of his greatest prides is the life membership he holds in the Switchmen's Union of North America. It was unanimously conferred on him by the 1927 convention of the Switchmen in recognition of his great service to workers on the rails and his championship of the people's welfare. In his office is a silver plaque, emblematic of that membership, and it holds a high place there in a case full of mementos of a long and valiant career.

Speech of Assistant Secretary of Defense, Marx Leva, at Veterans of Foreign Wars National Encampment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished speakers at the Fifty-first Annual Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Chicago this week, was Mr. Marx Leva, Assistant Secretary of Defense. It was appropriate that Mr. Leva, as a representative of the Department of Defense, should have made the chief subject of his address a report on the first 3 years of unification, with a further report on how the successful working of the unification of the armed services is affecting the course of our operations in Korea. I say successful because, as Mr. Leva pointed out, we can truthfully say that—

> Today we have in Korea more men and more arms than we sent to the invasion of north Africa in November of 1942, 11 months after Pearl Harbor.

The streamlined defense establishment that we now have seems made to order to meet the situation that confronts us. There is no reason to believe that it will not prove equally efficient if a different situation should arise.

Unification has not only brought the three military services under one civilian head, and together operationally under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has produced more efficient shipping, more economical procurement, and a uniform code of military justice. It has permitted an economy in administration that has directly affected the combat readiness of the services. To quote only one of Mr. Leva's illustrations:

> At the time of the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, in March of 1948, only 28 percent of the Army's manpower was in combat units. By the time of the Communist invasion of Korea in June of 1950, this figure had grown to 43 percent.

Mr. Leva did not confine his remarks, however, to a report on actions taken within the Department of Defense. He paid tribute to things the President and the Congress have done in recent years which have helped the free world to make progress in rehabilitating itself from the hunger, fear, and despair that followed in the wake of World War II. Such actions have considerably strengthened hope of peace, and therefore the security of the United States. These actions have indeed given such encouragement to the hope of the free world for an enduring peace, that it is not surprising that the masters of the Kremlin should have instigated aggression in Korea, to reverse the flow of the tide.

If blame for the Korean situation is to be placed on anyone, it must be placed on the Communist aggressors who broke the peace. Instead of blaming our own administrators for it, we will—if we are honest and wise—place the blame where the blame belongs, but be grateful that in our own country we had, even before Korea, built up strength that permits us to withstand the attack.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I insert Mr. Leva's able and encouraging report in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

I am very glad to have this opportunity to be with you today, at this fifty-first encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Since I spent 26 months on sea duty on one of the Navy's LST's during World War II, I believe I am eligible for membership in your fine organization—but because of the fact that I have been working for the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Defense continuously since the close of World War II, it has been my feeling that, at least while I continue to hold public office, I should refrain from joining any of our great and patriotic veterans' groups.

I have, however, watched with much interest the work which you have been doing—especially in the legislative field, which happens to be one of my responsibilities within the Department of Defense. The strong support you have always given to legislation necessary for our national defense—the most recent example being Mr. Ketchum's very excellent letter of last week, on universal military training—has been greatly heartening to those of us within the Department of Defense who have responsibility for the defense portion of President Truman's legislative program.

I should like to discuss with you, this morning, some of the highlights of the first 3 years of unification—together with some of the implications of the ebb and flow of the battle in Korea.

Unification of the Armed Forces will be 3 years old in the very near future—on September 17, 1950, to be exact. On September 17, 1947, James Forrestal took the oath of office as our first Secretary of Defense. His successor, Louis Johnson, became Secretary of Defense on March 28, 1949. The first 3 years, therefore, reflect 18 months tenure by Secretary Forrestal, and 18 months tenure by Secretary Johnson. I have had the great privilege of working with both the Secretaries throughout the entire 3 years. In discussing some of the highlights of unification with you, I shall not attempt to break the subject down and say "Secretary Forrestal did this" or "Secretary Johnson did that." In the first place, the work of the two men has been too closely interrelated to permit of such a breakdown—and in the second place, it is the job that is important, and not the man. But, since I have worked closely with both men throughout their tenure in office, I do want to express my personal opinion at the outset of my remarks—and it is my opinion that both Secretaries of Defense have made great and lasting contributions to our national security. It is the nature of those contributions, and how they were achieved in spite of great obstacles, that I want to discuss with you this morning.

As most of you are aware, the old War Department strongly favored unification—and the old Navy Department was somewhat less enthusiastic. I have been fond of saying that unification represented a marriage of the Army and Navy, and that, in this marriage, the Army was an overardent bridegroom, and the Navy was a most reluctant bride. Gordon Gray, when he was Secretary of the Army, added this additional thought: He described the Air Force as the in-law who moved in with the newly married couple on the day of the ceremony—thereby adding somewhat to the marital turmoil.

So, you see, the problems with which we have been dealing have not been simple ones.

Nor would I want you to think that all our problems have been solved. Many have been solved—and I will mention several of them in a moment—but many remain to be solved.

Today, in Korea, unification is undergoing its "ordeal by fire"—and how well or how badly we have solved our problems can be judged to some degree by the way in which the Department of Defense has responded to the Korean crisis.

In this connection, I believe that you will be interested in the following excerpt from a recent message from General MacArthur to President Truman—and I quote:

"The skill and valor * * * displayed in successive holding actions by the ground forces * * * brilliantly supported in complete coordination by air and naval elements forced the enemy into continued deployments, costly frontal attacks, and confused logistics, which so slowed his advance and blunted his drive that we have bought the precious time necessary to build a secure base.

"I do not believe that history records a comparable operation which excelled the speed and precision with which the Eighth Army, the Far East Air Force, and the Seventh Fleet have been deployed to a distant land for immediate commitment to major operations."

I believe you will also be interested in what the August 21 issue of Time magazine had to say on the subject. Time—which has often been extremely critical of the administration—said this about the fighting in Korea—and I quote:

"The American effort and the American soldier in Korea are magnificent. Doubtless we could and should have been better prepared. But the more important fact is that never before in all our history have we been so nearly prepared at the start of any war as we were at the start of this one. Today we have in Korea more men and more arms than we sent to the invasion of north Africa in November of 1942, 11 months after Pearl Harbor.

"Already, though still outnumbered, we have the greater weight of arms, on the ground and in the air and at sea. We know how to use and coordinate the arms, as we did not know for many months after the start of World War II. It is a wonderful and thrilling thing to see * * * infantry in action with the support of fighters from the Air Force, bombers from a naval carrier, and, if the field commander had wanted it, bombardment from warships standing off shore * * *. The buildup of American power has been achieved at a pace and on a scale that would never before have been possible so early in a war so far from home."

Now, both of the statements from which I have just quoted—General MacArthur's, and Time magazine's—deal in generalities. Accordingly, in order to back up these general statements, I will give you a few specific illustrations of what has been accomplished. Among the illustrations that I would enumerate in this connection are the following:

1. The phenomenal record that is being made by the consolidated shipping line which the Navy is operating—a shipping line which, through unification, has replaced the competing fleets which the Army and the Navy formerly operated. In a few short weeks, the consolidated line tremendously stepped up its weekly trans-Pacific tonnage. The speedy and orderly way in which merchant vessels have been taken out of mothballs to supply our forces in Korea is without parallel in the history of warfare.

2. The teamwork of the services—a matter to which General MacArthur has referred again and again in the most glowing terms, including the quotation from his message to President Truman, which I read earlier. A perfect example of the sort of teamwork referred to by General MacArthur was the record crossing of the Pacific by the U. S. S. *Boxer*—an aircraft carrier which crossed the Pacific in 8 days with a load of 147 planes for the Air Force, large numbers of Air Force personnel, Army personnel, and Navy personnel, and a very heavy general cargo to help support the Korean fighting strength of all three services.

3. The ability which our Army forces have shown—in the words used by General Collins in reporting to the President, "to convert quickly from the peaceful duties of occupation to the grim duties of war," and the ability of our Navy, Air Force, and Marine planes to assist the Army and Marine forces on the ground in every possible way. A good example of the speed of reinforcement is the fact that one infantry regimental combat team arrived on the field of battle on the other side of the world 19 days after it was alerted in this country. An example of Air Force mobility is the successful completion of a mission directed at targets in northern Korea within 8 days from the time the units were alerted in the United States.

4. The speed with which newly developed weapons have been brought into action—for example, the new Army antitank rocket had been developed in research during the spring of 1950 and production had been started on it only 15 days before the Communist invasion of Korea. Yet, through fast staff action and the whole-hearted cooperation of the Military Air Transport Command, a supply of the rockets, together with the necessary launchers and personnel trained in their use, reached the troops in Korea on the 18th of July. Twenty-five days after the invasion the new rocket had knocked out several Red tanks.

5. The prompt action of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in acting on General MacArthur's requests—for example, requests are frequently received, acted upon, approved by the Secretary of Defense and the President, and implemented, all in the same day. If it had not been for this record of speed and decision, and if it had not been for the brilliant delaying action of the Army, Marine, and South Korean ground forces under General MacArthur's inspired leadership, we would not now be in a position where—very shortly, we hope—our forces, joined by forces of other members of the United Nations, will soon be able to take the offensive in order to reestablish peace in Korea.

You will recall that, as my first illustration, I referred to the job that is being done by our consolidated shipping line. Prior to unification, the Army operated several hundred oceangoing vessels. We have now consolidated this entire operation under the Navy—and the Navy handles oceangoing shipping for itself, for the Army, and for the Air Force. This consolidation took place well in advance of the Korean crisis, so that, when the Communist invasion of Korea occurred, we were ready to meet our shipping needs in a prompt and orderly manner.

The same sort of consolidation has also taken place in the field of air transport. As many of you know, during World War II the Navy operated its own airline—the Naval Air Transport Service—and the Air Force operated its own airline—the Air Transport Command. One of the first consolidations put into effect by Secretary Forrestal was the consolidation of these two airlines—and the consolidated airline—now known as MATS, the Military Air Transport Service—furnishes air transportation for all three services. It was this consolidated airline which did such an outstanding job; in behalf of our national security, at the time of the Berlin blockade. The fruits of unification in the field of air and sea transportation are paying dividends in Korea today, just as MATS paid dividends at the time of the Berlin airlift.

I note from your program that you heard from Father Cavanaugh, of Notre Dame, on Sunday night, and that fact reminds me that I really should tell you of a major unification step for which Father Cavanaugh was largely responsible. More than 2 years ago, we set up an all-civilian advisory commission to review for us the field of military pay. Father Cavanaugh was the vice chairman of the group. Father Cavanaugh and his associates spent almost a year in studying military pay, and out of their study came the Career Compensation Act of 1949, enacted by Congress just about a year ago, and a very major contribution to the unification of the services. This legislation, which represented the first comprehensive overhaul military pay scales since 1908, put the three services on a more nearly uniform basis and gave us a modern pay structure. It is typical of the innumerable steps toward unification which have been taken during the past 3 years.

A similar illustration, which will be of primary interest to your commander in chief, Mr. Lewis, and the other members of the VFW who are lawyers, is the Uniform Code of Military Justice. This code replaces the old Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and gives us a code that is uniform for all the personnel in all three services, regardless of which service an individual is in, and regardless of what his rank may be. When we first looked into the subject of military justice, we found that the Articles of War had been revised somewhat after World War I, and the Articles for the Government of the Navy had not been revised very materially since the Republic was established. Indeed, there were those who said that the Articles for the Government of the Navy went back unchanged to the time of Cromwell's Navy—but in any event, Congress has now enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which represents a tremendous stride forward in the unification of the services.

Mention should also be made of the work that has been done in the field of coordinated procurement. When unification first began, we could have abolished the purchasing that was being done in the Army and the Navy and we could have said: "We will centralize all purchasing in one place, and we will set up a Ministry of Supply on the British pattern"—but we had existing purchasing organizations in the Army and in the Navy, and the nucleus of a very excellent purchasing agency in the Air Force, and we therefore proceeded in a quite different manner.

The manner in which we proceeded came to this: We assigned to one or the other of the military departments the procurement responsibility for a given commodity, and that department then procured the item for all three military departments. For example, the Air Force was assigned responsibility for handling all purchases of photographic equipment for itself, and for the Army and for the Navy. The Navy was assigned responsibility for buying all hand tools—all hammers and saws, for example—for all three services. The Army was assigned the responsibility for buying all basic foods for all three, and all automotive equipment as well.

Some other procurement was handled in a different manner. We had to set up a central purchasing agency for handling our purchases of petroleum because that item loomed so large in the total picture. We also set up an office to buy all medical supplies jointly.

In any event, the entire program of coordinated procurement has proceeded to a point where approximately 85 percent of the total dollar value of military procurement is now handled on a coordinated basis. You can readily see the value which we derive from this coordinated procurement system, at a time like the present, when the volume of our purchases is expanding by leaps and bounds.

Mention should also be made of the unified command set up under unification. Unified command now exists in all overseas theaters in which we have major troop elements. The unified commander—regardless of the color of his own uniform—has under him the forces of all three services. Examples of this are the Alaskan theater, under Air Force command; the Caribbean theater, under Army command; the Pacific theater, under Navy command; and the Far Eastern theater, which, as you all know, is under the command of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

In this general connection, mention should also be made of the strenuous effort, begun by Secretary Forrestal and continued by Secretary Johnson, to get more defense for each defense dollar. One example of this is the constantly increasing percentage of Army personnel who are in combat units. At the time of the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, in March of 1948, only 28 percent of the Army's manpower was in combat units. By the time of the Communist invasion of Korea, in June of 1950, this figure had grown to 43 percent.

The same general condition prevailed in the Navy. In March of 1948, there were 177 vessels in the Navy's active fleet that were so undermanned that they could not get under way and fight. When the Republic of Korea was invaded on June 25, 1950, every ship in the active fleet was capable of moving into action.

The manpower strength of the Air Force increased materially during this same 2-year period. In addition, the number of Air Force groups operationally ready for action increased by almost 50 percent, while at the same time the number of planes per bombardment group was raised considerably.

During this same 2-year period—from March 1948, to June 1950—the number of Reserves and National Guard men in a drill pay status in all three services increased by almost 100 percent—from 435,000 in March of 1948 to 834,000 in June of 1950.

Further in this same connection, it is worth noting that the percentage of the total military budget that goes to pay for hardware—planes, ships, tanks, and other weapons—has increased from a low of 6 percent for fiscal 1947 to a high of 19½ percent for the fiscal year that ended on June 30, 1950. It is also worthy of note that "hardware" accounts for 65 percent of the President's recently recommended supplemental budget of $11,500,000,000.

Time will not permit the sort of detailed list of accomplishments that I would like to present to you—so I will close this part of my remarks with one further illustration. We made a survey of the different forms and sizes of officers' commissions, and we found that there were a total of 45 different forms, sizes, and shapes—ranging from a great big parchment for admirals and generals down to a very small piece of paper, indeed, for ensigns and second lieutenants—so we solved that one by unifying everybody's down to the size of the ensign's.

Everything that I have said up to this point has been addressed primarily to the things that we have been doing, within the Department of Defense. Before concluding I would like to broaden my remarks somewhat by discussing briefly some of the things which the President and the Congress have done in recent years which, in my opinion, deserve far more thought than they are currently receiving.

I mention this because of my own strong feeling that the free world in the past several years has made tremendous progress in rehabilitating itself from the hunger, fear, and despair that followed in the wake of World War II. The people of the United States have ample cause to be proud of the part they have played in causing this progress to be achieved. Anyone who visited abroad between 1946 and 1948 knows from his personal experience the almost utter hopelessness which confronted us on all sides in the immediate postwar years. Today, in the place of hopelessness and despair, we see throughout the world constantly increasing evidence of the courage of free people who are determining to band themselves together and with us in the interest of the collective security of the free world.

The Greek-Turkish aid program which the Congress of the United States enacted in the spring of 1947 marked the turning point from a world of increasing chaos to a world of increasing hope. The Marshall plan which Congress enacted in early 1948 was a major step along the road, as was also the Vandenberg resolution of the same year. The North Atlantic Pact and the Mutual Defense Assistance Act were logical and heartening developments of the same pattern. Simultaneously with these developments, there were events elsewhere in the world which brought a new surge of pride to free men everywhere—events of transcendent importance such as the emergence of the free and independent nations of India, Pakistan, Israel, Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, and the Philippine Republic. Between 1948 and 1950 the tide of hope was running strong in the free world—so strong in fact, that the Communist masters who thrive on misery and chaos sought to put a halt to the resurgence of freedom by launching their unprovoked aggression against the Republic of Korea. But like King Canute, the masters of communism will find that the power of the tide cannot be repressed simply because they have ordered the waters to stand still.

A few days ago this same thought was expressed far better than I have been able to express it, by Chairman MAHON of the Armed Forces Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Speaking on the floor of the House of Representatives, Chairman MAHON said:

"Some people have been so busy blaming the situation on the complacency of the American people, or the Department of Defense, Department of State, or Congress, that they seem to have overlooked the fact that the disturbers of world peace, the Communist aggressors, and they alone, are responsible for the Korean situation. Let us get a clear perspective of the picture and put the blame where the blame belongs."

A cartoonist for one of our Washington newspapers put it even better, in a cartoon in which he showed Stalin sitting down, with Molotov by his side, both of them rocking with laughter. Stalin was reading a paper which said "Democrats blame GOP for Korean war" and Molotov was reading a paper which said "Republicans blame Democrats for Korean war." As the Chinese say, one picture is worth 10,000 words—and I wish I had an enlarged picture of that cartoon to show you, for it would convey to you, far better than any mere words, the thought I would like to leave with you this morning.

Celebration of One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Boston Naval Shipyard

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Secretary of the Navy, Francis P. Matthews, at the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Boston Naval Shipyard on Friday, August 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Tobin, Governor Dever, Mayor Hynes, members of the Armed Forces, ladies and gentlemen, an historic occasion has transpired in Boston today. The recording of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Boston Naval Shipyard is an event pregnant with significance for every American. That is true because of the profound effect that the event which we commemorate here had upon the existence of the present day United States Navy. Without the contribution which the Boston Naval Shipyard has made to the current character of our modern Navy, we would not have the most powerful Navy in the world today. Without such a Navy and its glorious accomplishments of more than a century and a half, America could not have become the leading power in the family of nations. Without our Navy's and its Marines' triumphs on the sea, in the air and on the ground, the rare privilege of American citizenship would lose much of its luster and appeal.

The Navy has done much to make freedom and liberty realities for every American citizen in a world threatened by despotism and tyranny. The Boston Naval Shipyard's part in that accomplishment of the Navy is worthy of the anniversary tribute with which we salute its record this evening. I am grateful for the opportunity of joining with you, as Secretary of the Navy, in tendering that salute.

Tonight, the world as it was in 1800 when the Boston Naval Shipyard was established, is interesting to contemplate. John Adams was then President of the United States. The Republic had just been started on its road to Destiny. Liberty and freedom, through the American Revolution, had acquired a new meaning and significance in the minds and hearts of men.

The establishment of a safe home for liberty in a world which had been dominated by governments existing without regard for the choice of the people, and without the consent of those whom they governed, was an epoch-making event in the experience of mankind. It was the culmination of an expenditure of blood and treasure, and an exemplification of sublime and patriotic heroism such as has never been surpassed in the historical record of the average man's ceaseless struggle to elevate himself from subjugation and serfdom to the exalted stature of a free man.

The American Colonies had been the theater of that struggle. Massachusetts and Boston had been the stage on which some of its most vital scenes had transpired. Its benign results were, even then, beginning to blossom in all their fragrant promise.

It had not been a pretty struggle. It involved bitter and brutal war. Men had left home and business and wife and children, and had died to make their families and their neighbor's families free. They paid the supreme sacrifice to make it possible for the children of men to live in dignity and self-respect, as the Divine Creator whom they worshipped, each in his own way, had decreed was their inalienable right and privilege.

They had launched their fight for that blessing by starting a war with the mother country. They became aggressors for freedom. It was their powder and bullets, fired from the protecting ramparts bordering the roadways leading to Concord and Lexington, that started the fight that was to make them

free. As the firers of the first shot to reverberate around the world, they were the aggressors in the Revolutionary War, but they violated the peace of their time in a most holy cause.

They sought liberty for mankind. They battled to make men free. They gave the world the ideal of man living in the majesty of his individual independence, and enjoying personal sovereignty over the destiny of his own soul.

It grips our hearts as we contemplate the enormity of the issue which their struggle embraced. Until they flew the banner of their cause, the world was mostly unaware of the goal which they espoused. Men's minds and bodies and souls were in chains, forged by despotic rulers who denied the principle that natural and unalienable rights exist for equal enjoyment by every human being. It was in a world universally joining in the rejection of that philosophy that they pursued their cause to victory.

The fruits of that victory have illumined the course of human experience in every generation and in every land throughout the intervening years. We, and our predecessors as Americans, have endured and flourished because of them.

They strengthen and make vibrant our system of government. They are reflected in the assurance which characterizes the relations of the citizen of this Nation with his Government. They are embodied in the confidence with which Americans regard their national future. They touch every home in the land, and they color and shade the social texture of our national family life.

If the battles of the Revolutionary War had been lost; if defeat had been the outcome instead of victory, the United States of America would never have been born. The history of the world could now well be a bleak and dismal record to review. If men had not had the will and the courage to fight and sacrifice and suffer and die at Concord and Lexington, at Bunker Hill, at Ticonderoga, at Brandywine, at Philadelphia, at Valley Forge, at Yorktown and on many other battlefields of the Revolution there would be no Fourth of July to celebrate, no Liberty Bell to revere, no Washington Monument or Lincoln Memorial to cherish, nor any other of our many inspiring national traditions to stir our souls and animate our patriotic emotions.

Nor would there be many of the blessings which distinguish our favored American way of life from the common lot of the average citizen under every other government in the world.

We of this generation must be brought to realize that those blessings and our favored position as a nation did not just come naturally.

They are the precious fruit of pain and suffering. They are the product of bravery and courage. They were won through the grimmest of self-sacrifice. They were possible because, as pilgrims and pioneers, the colonists of that day were hardened and trained by rigid self-denial for the test in mind and soul and body that the struggle for the freedom they craved involved. They realized the cost they would have to pay to attain their cherished goal. They measured the price that would be exacted in blood and tears and treasure to achieve the priceless possession and the unfettered enjoyment of the sacred privileges of liberty and freedom with which, through their God-fearing philosophy, they knew all men are endowed by their Creator.

We live in America today as their descendants and their successors. We are the most favored beneficiaries of their unselfishness, of their intrepid fortitude, of their penetrating foresight, of their sublimely inspired vision. The heritage of the accumulated blessings flowing from the cost they expended to vindicate their concept of human life, and the nature of man's unalienable rights in its enjoyment, have been bestowed upon us with lavish unrestraint.

We are the trustees of this sacred inheritance.

The perpetuation of their victory, and the survival of the doctrine that governments are instituted among men to secure the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to mankind, will depend upon our individual worthiness to be citizens of the Nation they founded under God.

The test which confronts us, my fellow Americans, is no less than that. It is as grave as the issue which made the Colonists aggressors for liberty at Concord and Lexington, and sustained them through the ordeal which culminated in their immortal triumph at Yorktown.

The question which each of us individually must answer in the privacy of our own consciences, and which collectively as a nation we must answer before the world is: Are we worthy of the sacred trust that has been imparted to us?

Will we preserve inviolate the precious charter of individual liberty that is America, and ours to enjoy as her people?

We have become the custodians of the Holy Grail from which emanates the inspiration of the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence.

We are the repository of the Ark of the Covenant, in which are enshrined the imperishable hopes of man to live in peace and freedom.

Will we prove worthy of that trust? Will we prove true to our sacred mission? Will we survive the test?

I believe we shall. I am convinced we will because valiant and brave men from the homes and families of America are dying in Korea today in vindication of our national character and in fulfillment of the sacred mission that is ours.

Those men, in life, had but one desire in their hearts: Like all Americans, they craved peace. They hated nobody. They coveted nothing from anybody or any other nation. They knew of nothing any other nation could give them or our Nation that we did not have except peace—peace with freedom and honor.

Their sacrifice is our challenge. Let each one of us ask ourselves in our secret hearts, are we worthy of the price they are pouring out on the altar of peace and freedom. In our national consciousness let us inquire, as this Nation's citizens, are we collectively worthy of their last full measure of devotion?

It behooves each one of us to get right with himself if we are not already in line on that issue. There is nothing that we can give our country in its present grave need that can surpass the price delivered at her shrine by our soldier dead who have died in Korea.

The Boston Naval Shipyard, in all its 150 years of observations and memories, can find no more exalted patriotism to extol than their contribution to our country and the world represents.

The greatest challenge of our national life confronts us. It is for us in our generation to decide if it is ever again to be possible for men to live in freedom and peace. That is the struggle of the Revolution over again, not to acquire liberty and freedom, but to preserve them for ourselves, for the whole of mankind and its posterity.

Only an affirmative and vigorous national policy will make that possible. A true democracy ordinarily does not seek international accord through resort to violence. For 163 years, the United States has settled its international differences through peaceful negotiation. Never have we drawn the sword unless first attacked and so compelled to fight in self-defense. It is possible that we shall be forced to alter that pacific policy.

Self-preservation in the present world can be purchased only by those who are capable of resisting successfully a violation of their rights. We have no choice other than to build our military power to the strength which will make it impossible for any enemy to overcome us. To reach that position, all the resources of the Nation should be dedicated.

We should first get ready to ward off any possible attack, and, reversing the traditional attitude of a democracy, we should boldly proclaim our undeniable objective to be a world at peace. To have peace we should be willing, and declare our intention to pay any price, even the price of instituting a war to compel cooperation for peace.

Only the forces who do not want peace would oppose our efforts to transform the hostile nations embroiled in the present international conflicts into a tranquil world. They would brand our program as imperialistic aggression. We could accept that slander with complacency, for in the implementation of a strong, affirmative, peace-seeking policy, though it cast us in a character new to a true democracy, an initiator of a war of aggression, it would win for us a proud and popular title; we would become the first aggressors for peace.

It is a role which, in my opinion, we cannot escape. It is a cause to which we shall be compelled to dedicate our total and ultimate resources. From no other course can there be effected the salvation of the free world.

The X-Ray Grab by Omaha and Milwaukee Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the reading public of our Nation was horrified to learn lately that certain doctors of our Republic, in our present hour of great peril, had used their medical knowledge and equipment to unduly enrich themselves, while others—their fellow Americans—were making great sacrifices in the Republic's behalf and some of our service men were doing the "heroic sublime"—giving their very lives for their country.

I am extremely sorry that the city of Omaha, Nebr., the largest city in the State, was compelled to suffer disgrace by reason of the greedy activities of Dr. Roy W. Fouts and that the honor of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., was also besmirched by the similar activities of one, Dr. Irving Cowan. I do not know what political faith Dr. Cowan professes but I do know that Dr. Fouts is a most reactionary Republican and was the big bell-weather of the American Medical Association in preventing the consideration and passage of the National Compulsory Health Insurance bill which in addition to providing for Compulsory Health Insurance on a National scale, but also contained chapters relating to the education and training of additional doctors, aid to medical schools and hospitals and other most necessary and important legislation in the light of what is right now happening today.

Both Dr. Fouts and Dr. Cowan were paid a total of $5 for each X-ray of the

chest of selective service candidates and a reading thereof.

No effort was made by the Army men to ask for bids. If they had done so, I am advised by a competent X-ray doctor of Omaha, Nebr., that he would have done this work for a total fee of $2. The wholesale cost of each X-ray film of the type used is 70 cents, thus leaving $1.30 for interpretation of the film, which is perhaps the only real work any doctor would do in such a situation. I say this because I have knowledge of the fact that technicians do the X-ray work exclusively. A competent doctor can read X-ray films very rapidly as will be disclosed hereafter by the great volume of work each of these doctors performed daily.

I wish that the proper authorities, military and otherwise, would investigate this matter fully and learn if there is any truth to the rumor going the Omaha medical rounds that Dr. Fouts has in the past entertained almost royally the United States medical men and has an absolute "in" on United States medical services in the Omaha, Nebr., area. Let us have the facts as to whether entertainment was all which has been put out by Dr. Fouts.

In order that these men who have used the occasion of X-raying candidates for the selective service as an opportunity to garner in the gold, may be properly publicized and evaluated in the eyes of their friends and neighbors and the whole Nation as well as the entire world, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, certain newspaper articles which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald in reference to this matter and in order that the seriousness of the situation might be fully appreciated, I wish to advise my readers in advance that the Omaha World-Herald is the most reactionary newspaper in the United States, west of the Chicago Tribune. The Omaha World-Herald articles follow:

DOCTOR GETS $1,125 DAILY—MILWAUKEE PHYSICIAN CHECKS X-RAYS

A Milwaukee physician has averaged $1,125 per working day so far this month, examining X-rays of men processed through an Army induction center there, the Associated Press reported Thursday afternoon.

The physician is Dr. Irving Cowan, who is paid $5 for each X-ray checked, said Capt. Thomas Appleby, Jr., public relations officer at the induction center. The X-ray machine is owned by the Army, and Dr. Cowan pays two technicians $1.50 per hour each for making the pictures.

This report came out after the United Press had reported from Chicago that an Omaha physician—later identified as Dr. Roy W. Fouts—had grossed about $10,000 already this month, taking and interpreting X-rays of draftees and volunteers here.

From Des Moines, the United Press reported that Iowa draftees and recruits are sent to hospitals for X-rays. Iowa Methodist Hospital handles most of the examinations at $2.50 each.

ARMY X-RAY BILL IS HIGH—OMAHAN GETS ABOUT $10,000 IN MONTH

One Omaha physician has grossed approximately $10,000 this month taking and interpreting chest X-rays for the Army.

This was revealed Thursday by a Fifth Army spokesman in Chicago to a United Press reporter.

While the name of the doctor was not revealed, it was found to be Dr. Roy W. Fouts.

Dr. Fouts said he did not consider the situation a matter for comment.

The Army's spokesman here, Col. Hardin C. Sweeney, said the Nebraska Military District had contacted all available X-ray specialists before awarding the business, but no other doctor seemed interested.

NEVER APPROACHED

But at least one other X-ray specialist said his office never had been approached by the military.

The United Press story from Chicago quoted a Fifth Army spokesman as saying: "There is nothing we can do about the situation * * * Colonel Sweeney told me that if he didn't have that one man, he'd have to shut down enlistment operations."

The spokesman gave this background:

An Army Department circular has set a price ceiling of $5 each for 14 by 17-inch chest X-rays, including interpretation.

HAD 177 IN 1 DAY

The Omaha doctor X-rayed 177 men in 1 day, fewer men in other days so far this month.

The war in Korea caught us napping without Army X-ray equipment and technicians, so the only way to get X-rays was to deal with private physicians.

Colonel Sweeney said that through August 21 the Nebraska Military District has sent 1,897 draftees and volunteers, plus an uncertain number of Reserve officers, to the physician for chest X-rays. All were at the $5 rate. The total number of cases is right at 2,000.

WOULD WELCOME OTHERS

He asserted that "we looked all over for someone to handle the business. If any other doctor in town now thinks he can handle some of it, I wish he would get in touch with me."

He said he had sought to have Army X-ray specialists assigned here to handle the work, but none is available.

Dr. Fouts said:

"They asked us if we would take it and, though it interferes with our regular route, we will continue to do it as long as it is satisfactory. War is an expensive business."

If the objective of the Chicago story "is to show Army extravagance," he said, "then no one is in a position to dispute that it is an expensive proposition. Let it go at that."

X-RAY PROFITS TO BE CHECKED—LARGE FEES GROSSED BY TWO DOCTORS

Two agencies in Washington said Friday they would investigate the profitable business of taking X-rays for the Army.

Fifth Army spokesmen in Chicago Thursday revealed that one Omaha physician has grossed about $10,000 so far this month, and a Fox Point, Wis., physician has been averaging $1,125 a day this month in the business of X-raying draftees and volunteers. The Omahan is Dr. Roy W. Fouts; the Milwaukee physician is Dr. Irving Cowan.

BACK IN TAXES

Representative VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said his committee would investigate these findings.

"Of course," he told the Associated Press, "the Government will get a lot of that back in income taxes."

Figures from other sources Friday indicated that with a mass operation allowing full utilization of a X-ray machine, the cost of producing a 14 by 17-inch negative is about $1.35. The Army pays the physicians $5 for producing and interpreting such a negative. Private X-ray charges usually are much higher.

PAYS 10 CENTS

But at the Chicago recruiting station the Army takes and develops the negatives, then pays three civilian doctors an average of only 10 cents per negative for interpretation.

The United Press quoted Dr. Burt R. Shurly, president of the Detroit Tuberculosis Sanatorium, as saying that establishment has been taking and interpreting X-rays for the Army at $2 each.

That price "covers the cost of the whole operation," Dr. Shurly said. The institution agreed to take the business at that rate "as a patriotic gesture" when Army equipment broke down, he said.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY DOCTORS GIVE FREE DRAFT EXAMS

One hundred and twenty Nebraska physicians serve without pay in making preliminary examinations of some potential draftees, Lt. Col. Frank B. O'Connell, deputy director of State selective service, said Friday.

Colonel O'Connell said the doctors work with the State's 96 draft boards. They examine men with physical defects so obvious that there is a serious question whether they need even be sent to an induction center for examination.

SMALLER X-RAY FILMS PROPOSED

LINCOLN.—State Health Director Dr. Frank Ryder suggested Friday the Army might use small 4- by 5-inch negatives for X-rays and save money.

He said 55 cents a negative might be a fair estimate of cost. The small negatives are used by the State in giving free chest X-rays. The small negatives are viewed through an enlarger for study and then, if necessary, a larger 14- by 17-inch picture is recommended.

At Omaha the Army is paying $5 for each large picture. No small ones are taken.

SIX MORE X-RAY MACHINES HERE—NONE SO HANDY, CHEAP AS DR. FOUTS'

There are six Government-owned X-ray machines in the Omaha area which might help share the job of examining draftees and volunteers for the Army.

But none is available to do the job as handily or at lower cost than Dr. Roy W. Fouts is doing it for the Army, Col. Hardin C. Sweeney said Saturday.

A Fifth Army spokesman in Chicago recently revealed that Dr. Fouts grossed about $10,000 in the first 21 days of August, taking and interpreting chest X-rays of Army recruits at $5 per man. Other information indicated that the actual cost of this work would be between $1.35 and $2 per man.

WHERE MACHINES ARE

These are the Government-owned machines here:

Three new ones at the new Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fortieth and Center Streets.

One at the Veterans' Administration clinic in the Federal Building, Fifteenth and Dodge Streets.

One at Offutt Air Force Base, 10 miles south of downtown Omaha.

One broken-down one—left over from World War II—at Fort Omaha, Thirtieth and Fort Streets.

The Veterans' Administration has not yet hired anyone to operate the new hospital or its equipment. Colonel Sweeney has said he has not been able to obtain X-ray technicians from the Army, even if he had a machine to use.

VA CHARGES $10

The VA charges the Army $10 a plate for pictures taken by the machine at the Federal Building, Colonel Sweeney said. Dr. H. W. McFadden, head of the VA clinic and acting manager of the VA here, flatly refused to give a reporter any information about the use of the machine or the price charged the Army.

"You'll have to talk to Carl Gray in Washington about that," Dr. McFadden declared.

Mr. Gray is the Veterans' Administrator. The World-Herald Washington Bureau found VA offices there closed Saturday.

SAC MACHINE USED DAILY

A Strategic Air Command spokesman said the machine there is being used daily in connection with Air Force physical exams. SAC technicians are doing X-ray diagnostic work and handling blood tests for the Army, but are not doing routine chest X-rays.

Taking recruits to Offutt Base for X-rays would slow the processing of draftees, the SAC spokesman said.

The machine at Fort Omaha was used for processing draftees during World War II, Colonel Sweeney said, but was turned over to the Navy as surplus when the Army gave up the fort. It is now broken down and would cost several thousand dollars and about a month's time to repair, he said.

In Lincoln, State Health Director Dr. Frank Ryder suggested the Army could save money by using 4 by 5 inch negatives instead of the big 14 by 17 it now uses.

The smaller negatives cost about 55 cents each. The State uses them for its free tuberculosis X-ray program, then recommends a larger X-ray if bad signs show up.

It Was Later Than They Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, eagerness for a recess or adjournment of this long session would be natural even if it were not an election year. But if the majority leadership sends us home while our young men are dying in Korea and our people are apprehensive as to the future, I think the homecoming may not be as pleasant as would normally be the case.

The rank and file of our citizens are deeply disturbed at the way in which we have been losing the peace since VJ-day. They have closed ranks to meet the threats from abroad as good Americans always do, but they are filled with foreboding and frustration. They are shocked by the casualty lists, and fear, with some justification, that they are even heavier than yet announced.

They want a stop put to indecision, fumbling, and extravagance. Parents are demanding to know why, only 5 years after a complete victory in World War II, their sons must be sacrificed again in strange and far-off lands, with the odds so often against them.

Every American, past middle age, has a right to be sick of the old phrase "too little and too late." He has been paying enough taxes and, in most cases, has fought or sacrificed enough in one or more wars to have earned a respite from that old curse.

No, Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want Congress to adjourn while there is a stone left unturned that might aid our men in Korea, and that is not all. They want us to stay on the job until we have a national policy and the ship of state is following a consistent course.

There is every reason they should feel that way. The present administration, by the smear attacks on the Eightieth Congress, has encouraged the people to hold Congress to blame for every thing unpleasant. It is hard for many to understand that our current difficulties stem from other causes, and the principal errors lie on other doorsteps.

Our people are apprehensive and disillusioned. They are shocked to find that the brave talk, emanating from high places, that we were ready at the "drop of a hat" was based on wishful thinking; that the "red herrings" had swum away with our atomic bomb and other top secrets; that Korea was important, after all; and that we have some interest in Formosa, but are not sure just what. General MacArthur has been chastised for saying what its military importance is to us.

The fact that foreign policy is a responsibility of the administration, not the Congress, does not alter the over-all duty of the Congress to be alert to every danger from either within or without. It is not enough to name various watchdog committees—Congress must be ever on watch. It should be especially alert just now. We have in the last few days appropriated many billions—even as we did in preceding years—to build up our defenses. We have learned to our sorrow that only one defense dollar out of seven of the last fifty billion was spent on arms and the tools of war. We have known all along that the Department of Defense had overruled the demand of Congress for a 70-group Air Force, even after we provided the necessary funds.

Here, Mr. Speaker, are just a few of the questions to which the American people are entitled to answers and with which the Members of Congress should be supplied when they return to their districts and are called upon to explain to constituents.

Do we intend to have UMT as soon as instructors are available, or when we return to a peacetime footing, or is it just talk?

What do we intend to do when our GI's fight their way back to the thirty-eighth parallel? Do we stop or go into North Korea?

What are we going to do about Formosa? Shall we stand inactive while east Germany arms to invade west Germany? Will we resist Red China's admission to the UN? What is our new policy toward Nationalist China? Should we secure bases in Spain?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we should have answers to these questions and many others. True, Congress does not formulate the answers but certainly we have the right to be advised in a general way what our President and State Department have decided as to national policy. We are entitled to know, and the national safety requires, that we have one that is consistent on all fronts. This we have lacked in the past. Our people are rightly concerned over the bungling that has continued since Yalta. They remember that the same hands are at the helm of the ship of state as when Henry Wallace was fired as Secretary of Commerce for making a speech that had been approved a few days earlier. They realize that we are under the same management that described the Chinese Communists as harmless agrarian reformers; that denounced the investigation of Alger Hiss as a red herring, that declined to carry out the program for which large sums were appropriated in 1946 for the National Guard and Organized Reserves and in 1948 and 1949 for a 70-group Air Force.

Mr. Truman only last January 5 announced that the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa, and on June 1, he told a news conference that the world was closer to peace than at any time in 5 years. South Korea was invaded 24 days later. We cannot afford many more slips like that. Until we chart the course or have a new pilot, Congress better stay on deck.

Once again our defenders are feeling the pinch of too little. Let us hope and pray we can avoid the epitaph "too late." Recent events have proven to our leaders that it is later than they thought.

Strengthen Our Espionage Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following timely article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., of Monday, August 28, 1950:

STRONGER SPY LAWS NEEDED

As is usually the case with legislation destined to ride through Congress in some form or other, no matter what, because of its vital nature, all sorts of hitch-hikers tried to climb aboard the defense production bill.

Most persistent of the would-be free passengers was the Mundt-Ferguson amendment for control of the Communists. Like most of the seventy-odd other hopefuls, it wound up walking.

The free-ride tradition is a political form of lobbying based on the philosophy of scratch my back and I'll scratch yours. Many times it is the only way measures detoured by a lot of fence-straddling can get back on the road to passage.

There could have been no argument for straddling, however, even among the most vote-conscious Congressmen, in the bill for defense production. The public was ready for some form of economic control when the lawmakers on the Potomac first began hemming and hawing.

Such a measure certainly deserved to be driven home by itself, without the confusion of a lot of sudden stowaways.

By the same reasoning, any bill for the control of subversives, whether their luggage is labeled Communist or any other form of potential treason, is far too important to America's future to be tossed into the same legislative baggage compartment with other measures.

Nobody doubts that communism started war rolling in Korea. Nobody—not even Malik and his back-seat drivers in Moscow—has any illusions about what Russian communism is trying to achieve in the UN.

Here at home the American politbureau, convicted of conspiracy to overthrow our form of government, is at large on bail awaiting appeal. At home also, we have just nabbed the eighth person in recent months

to be charged with giving away our atomic secrets to Russia.

We have no idea how many others got away. But what has happened so far is a clear sign that we must strengthen our espionage laws. It must be done without hysteria—legislation that neither grabs a free ride nor carries any other free riders on its tailboard.

Otherwise we are likely to backtrack to the witch-burning days of Salem while the sell-outs ride off with the secrets of Los Alamos.

The Honorable William T. Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our country has suffered a great loss. A brilliant jurist, a brave soldier, a good American, has been called to eternal rest. Supreme Court Justice William T. Powers, a veteran of both World Wars, a former Republican leader of my assembly district, died of a heart attack at the age of 53.

Born in Manhattan on February 12, 1897, he was left motherless at the age of two, and brought up in Brooklyn by his father's family. He was working as an office boy at the time he took his examination for West Point. He finished at the top of the list and was then appointed to the Military Academy, from which he was graduated in 1918 with honors.

In World War I he served with distinction and remained with the Army until 1920, at which time he took up the study of law and was admitted to the New York Bar in 1924. He subsequently was admitted to the United States Supreme Court and to the California Bar. His legal activities were not only Statewide, but national and even international. For more than 25 years he was active politically in Republican circles in my district, county, city, and the Nation. In all those years while actively participating as a Republican leader, and many times as a candidate, he made friends of those politically opposed to him. No matter how bitter a campaign was he never had a harsh word for any one.

Between the World Wars, Justice Powers served with distinction in the New York National Guard. He returned to the Army in World War II and served overseas in various areas throughout the Pacific with outstanding courage and devotion. He was elected to the New York State supreme court in 1946. A devout Catholic, he found time to devote himself to every worthy civic and charitable endeavor in our community, participating in Protestant and Jewish charities as well as those of his own faith.

He rendered invaluable service to the cause of Israel when he accompanied me in 1947 to the State of Israel after the untimely death of our good friend, the late Col. David (Mickey) Marcus.

To his beloved widow, Mrs. Anita L. Powers, and his devoted children, Catherine and William, Jr., we extend our heartfelt condolences. We join them in mourning a very grievous loss.

Too Many Cooks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of August 29, 1950:

TOO MANY COOKS

We seem to be reentering a phase in public discussion of foreign policy and allied subjects by men high in Government that led President Roosevelt, in World War II, to take positive action.

Because of the number and often conflicting statements to the public emanating from members of his own official family, Mr. Roosevelt finally approved machinery through which such statements were cleared before they were delivered. Such clearances became one of the functions of the Office of War Information.

The MacArthur episode, coming on the heels of Navy Secretary Matthews' private adventure in the public discussion of foreign policy, poses the same sort of question to Mr. Truman. He was represented yesterday as saying that both incidents are now closed. He was also represented as believing that there can be but one voice on American foreign policy and that voice must be the President's.

He is right, of course. The conduct of our foreign policy is assigned to the President by the Constitution. In its discussion by men highly placed in Government, he must either approve in advance what is to be said or run the risk of finding himself and his State Department embarrassed in the development of foreign policy by various versions of what it is, some of them lending themselves to the ready interpretation of hostile propaganda. If Mr. Truman does not insist now on the same sort of procedure that his predecessor in office found necessary, he may be forced to do so eventually.

General MacArthur's undelivered statement to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which had been too thoroughly distributed in advance to be killed by the President's request that it be withheld, should have been submitted to the President, if only as a matter of official courtesy. In this case the President may have objected to General MacArthur's own oversimplified version of the "fallacious" and "threadbare" arguments of those who oppose defending Formosa for fear of alienating continental Asia. That is not the whole story, of course. But whatever may have been the soundness of the arguments against intercession in Formosa before the beginning of aggression by the North Koreans, the arguments were abandoned by the President from that date onward.

For the most part, however, General MacArthur's explanation of the strategic importance of Korea undoubtedly expressed the same cold, hard, and entirely logical reasoning which prompted President Truman, on June 27, to announce that he had "ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa." Nor is there any substantial difference between the President's letter to Ambassador Austin, underscoring by repetition Mr. Austin's recent statement to the Security Council outlining our Formosan policy, and General MacArthur's statement on the same subject. What difference there is screens from General MacArthur's blunt emphasis on the interests of the United States as contrasted with Ambassador Austin's more diplomatic references to the United Nations and his use of such terms as "neutralizing action" to describe the use of our armed forces.

The President's objection to both the MacArthur and the Matthews statements is based on other considerations than the substance of what they had to say.

In the case of Mr. Matthews' suggestion that we might be forced into a war of aggression in order to "compel cooperation for peace," the Navy Secretary was not advocating any such step. He was merely presenting the point of view, frequently discussed in Washington and other parts of the country, of "preventive war" in which we would seize the advantages of the initiative, in the belief that war is inevitable, instead of leaving such advantages to a known aggressor. Mr. Matthews tried to make it plain that he spoke as an individual. As long as he is Secretary of the Navy, he cannot speak as an individual. What he says assumes importance, not because Mr. Matthews said it but because the Secretary of the Navy said it. And when the Secretary of the Navy discusses, no matter how objectively, the theory of preventive war he tends to nullify the Secretary of State's discussion of the same subject, in which the theory was ruled out as contradicting the principles which support our foreign policy.

General MacArthur's role as a military commander is to execute but not to promulgate foreign policy. It would be more becoming for a man who has won such distinction in his own field to stick to it.

Do Russia and Its Satellite Nations Get Strategic and Critical Material From United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed with a radio news report that I heard delivered by Frank Edwards over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Monday evening, August 28, 1950. Mr. Edwards is sponsored by the American Federation of Labor. In his report he informed his audience, reaching from coast to coast, of a matter that should claim the attention of every American. It is a matter of such importance that in my opinion it should have congressional attention. The report to which I refer was as follows:

EXCERPT FROM FRANK EDWARDS' BROADCAST, AUGUST 28, 1950, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

For days I have been trying to learn the name of the American outfit that shipped a load of molybdenum to Britain, where it was transferred to a Russian vessel for shipment to the Soviet Union. There in Russia, the precious molybdenum is to be used in hardening steel, possibly armor steel for tanks.

The Commerce Department told me flatly that the name of that outfit which sold the molybdenum to be used in Russian steel mills is not public property—unless Congress started an investigation.

I encountered the same rebuff in trying to find out which American oil companies were shipping oil to North Korea and Communist China as late as 60 days ago. I was similarly rebuffed in trying to find out who had the export licenses for the cotton, used in making high explosives, which the Isbrandsen boats were trying to deliver to the Chinese Commies when the Nationalists fired on them.

It would take a congressional investigation to pry that information from the files of the Commerce Department so I am told—and the more I think of it—the stronger becomes my conviction that a congressional investigation of this operation would be well worth it.

To me it seems only fair that the mothers and fathers and wives of this country have a right to know who supplied the enemy with the oil for his tanks, the guncotton for his artillery and the molybdenum for his armor. If our people are going to supply the sons to die in front of enemy weapons, then our people are entitled to know who among us supplied the enemy with those weapons.

A congressional investigation of the export licenses by which some American companies make profits selling war materials to the enemy is in order. And while they are about it, the Congressmen might also inquire into the transactions by which stainless steel is shipped to Sweden and from there to Russia.

Why doesn't Congress open this scheme to public gaze—and let the people of America get a look at these characters who are making profits today selling disaster for tomorrow.

One hundred and fifty American furriers spending $50,000,000 in Russia for furs to make coats for the women of America—and bullets for their husbands and brothers.

In New York today a group of union dock workers refused to unload a cargo of hides, glassware, and 32 tons of ham from Czechoslovakia. Union shop steward Pat Riley said, "Let the owners handle the stuff themselves. Some of us have kids in Korea."

In addition to the above there has also come to my attention a news bulletin issued by Paul O. Peters, editor, of Washington, D. C., dated Thursday, August 24, 1950. It is entitled "Foreign Transactions of the United States With Iron Curtain Countries." It likewise contains information that is startling and supports the criticism made by Frank Edwards in his news report to which I have referred. The news bulletin of Mr. Peters, reads as follows:

FOREIGN TRANSACTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES WITH IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES

The revelation today that a $100,000 shipment of molybdenum, licensed for export to Great Britain, was transshipped to Russia is having serious repercussions in high governmental circles.

Molybdenum, a highly critical and strategic material used in alloying steel is currently quoted at $2.60 to $3 a pound. Export licenses for strategic materials are issued in the Office of International Trade of the Commerce Department, subject to the approval of the State Department.

The Washington Daily News reports "Officials have been unable thus far to give the name of the firm which obtained the license for the molybdenum shipment." This is a confession of a weakness in our export licensing system. The names of all parties involved in the transaction should promptly be made public. Those responsible for any intentional violation of our laws should be punished, and Government employees who participated in the transaction should be transferred to positions where they no longer can favor Russia and her satellites.

Summary of foreign grants and credits to iron-curtain countries (July 1, 1945 to Mar. 31, 1950)

	Grants	Credits	Total
Albania	$20,000,000		$20,000,000
Czechoslovakia	183,000,000	$30,000,000	213,000,000
Poland	365,000,000	78,000,000	443,000,000
Yugoslavia	299,000,000	6,000,000	305,000,000
Hungary	2,000,000	16,000,000	18,000,000
U. S. S. R.	243,000,000	223,000,000	465,000,000
Total	1,112,000,000	353,000,000	1,465,000,000

The Office of International Trade reported that during 1947 our export trade with Russia reached a volume of $149,129,000 while our imports were but $77,078,000. During 1947, we shipped the Russians $23,428,000 of machine tools; $19,992,000 of electrical machinery and $17,794,000 of mining, well, and pump machinery. We imported from Russia that year $41,000,000 of undressed furs and about $18,000,000 of manganese and chrome ores, and platinum ingots.

One item the Russians seem to buy with alacrity is books and maps of the United States; the imports of which totaled $660,000 in 1947.

The present Korean conflict and the stalemate in the United Nations Security Council should be ample warning to our State Department appeasers that the friendship of Russia cannot be bought with grants and credits, or through international trade.

The information contained in the radio report of Mr. Edwards and the News Bulletin of Mr. Peters reveals a situation that calls for immediate consideration by Congress. The American people should know the why and wherefor of a policy that permits strategic and critical materials to be shipped either directly or indirectly to the countries that are the enemies of democracy. Why should our boys be called upon to fight communism and at the same time our Government grant licenses to export materials that can be used in producing and operating weapons of war against them? There is no justification for such a course. It is time it was stopped.

I have introduced House Resolution 831 to create a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine the extent to which materials and instruments of war have been or are being exported from the United States, either directly or through other countries, to countries whose possession of such materials and instruments of war is inimical to the national defense and security of the United States.

The committee would be required to report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

This resolution has been referred to the Rules Committee and awaits its action.

In order that there might be the quickest possible hearing of the matter, and inquiry made as to who is responsible for the policy, and the extent to which export licenses have been issued, to whom and for what materials, I have also brought the matter to the attention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. That committee by action taken this morning has directed that hearings shall be held immediately.

A special committee has been appointed to conduct the inquiry consisting of Messrs. ROBERT CROSSER, chairman, Democrat, Ohio; LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Democrat, Texas; J. PERCY PRIEST, Democrat, Tennessee; OREN HARRIS, Democrat, Arkansas; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, New Jersey; CARL HINSHAW, Republican, California; LEONARD W. HALL, Republican, New York, and JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Republican, Minnesota.

1950 Resolutions of Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, meeting this month in Minneapolis for its Grand Aerie Convention, passed resolutions on seven subjects of great importance today.

I have been a member of this fine organization for 28 years and feel that these 1950 resolutions will be of interest not only to my colleagues in the Congress, but to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I commend the officers and members of the Eagles for the true American spirit reflected in the resolutions that follow:

ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

Whereas the All-American Conference to Combat Communism represents the determined opposition to communism of over 50 of the fraternal, veterans, civic and educational and religious organizations of our Nation; and

Whereas the All-American Conference to Combat Communism seeks to strengthen the workings of democracy, to support the strengthening of the military defenses of America and its allies, and to demonstrate the moral and economic superiority of democracy to communism, fascism or any other totalitarian tyranny; and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles became a charter member of the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, recognizing the Communist Party of America as not a political organization for political purposes, but a conspiracy of secret agents of a foreign power, directed and under the strict discipline of the Kremlin rulers in Moscow; and

Whereas the ideals and principles of a fraternal organization, and the ideals and principles of a democratic Nation, are incompatible with the aims and objectives of a Communist Party, which rejects the rule of the majority and rights of the minority, functions as a one-party dictatorship, uses secret

police and a rule of fear to eliminate opposition, seeks to destroy freedom of religious worship, uses the cloak of democratic liberties to destroy liberty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles, its delegates in convention assembled, recognizing Communist subversion as a clear and present danger to democratic institutions, pledges its full support to the All-American Conference to Combat Communism in its crusade to strengthen American democracy, to develop awareness of our American heritage and to control and expose subversive activities of emissaries of the Kremlin in our land; and be it further

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles go on record as favoring the quarantining of known and revealed members of the Communist Party, barring them from positions in industry, labor or Government where they can sabotage or undermine the security of our Nation, thus meeting the menace of subversion without subverting the basic framework of essential freedoms for which we fight.

FRATERNAL MOBILIZATION FOR CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Whereas the development of new and powerful weapons of mass destruction makes vulnerable the home cities of America and Canada, in the event of another global war; and

Whereas civilian defense precautions require the organization and training of volunteer defense workers to work with the established agencies of local government in minimizing the effects of atomic, chemical, and biological warfare; and

Whereas fraternal and civic organizations can aid in the recruitment of volunteers for emergency service, as well as training citizens generally to protect themselves from fire and blast damage in the event of enemy air raids; and

Whereas fraternal and civic organizations can add muscles, hours and determination to the full mobilization of community resources for the common defense which, in addition to limiting the effect of enemy attack, includes full production, inflation control, emergency housing, labor supply, plant utilization, blood bank reserves, war bond sales, and services to servicemen: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles, its delegates in convention assembled, pledge the whole-hearted support and strength of this order to the National Defense Program, our every member pledged to the defense of our cities, our way of life and the great freedoms which are our heritage; and be it further

Resolved, That the Eagles urge the establishment of Civilian Mobilization Councils, to be composed of representatives of civic organizations and social agencies, to assure effective cooperation between public defense agencies and community organizations for the common defense; and be it further

Resolved, That the grand worthy president be directed to appoint an Eagle War Services Board of five members to develop programs for aerie support of established defense agencies and convert the Eagle program for community action to all-out participation in the national defense and preparedness program.

FELLOWSHIP BETWEEN FREE PEOPLES

Whereas one of the significant and hopeful postwar developments has been the widespread growth of people-to-people movements in international affairs, strengthening relationships between governments of the free world by acts of individual and group helpfulness and fellowship; and

Whereas thousands of American churches, schools, fraternal lodges, communities, individuals, and organized groups have extended aid to persons in war-ravaged countries and furthered international understanding by cultural exchanges, interchange of students, exchange of correspondence and ideas; and

Whereas many American and Canadian organizations have extended their services and influence to free nations of the world, with labor groups in the forefront of the fight for democracy through the new federation of non-Communist labor unions and service clubs establishing units in all free nations, the world around; and

Whereas fraternal societies in America need to expand and broaden their concept of fraternal brotherhood among men, meeting their measure of responsibility for world leadership from the democratic influences in our society; and

Whereas the tremendous support given by local lodges of the Fraternal Order of Eagles to Project Berlin, the sending of food and needed supplies to the eastern outpost of the free world on the eve of the threatened Communist demonstrations in that city, demonstrates Eagle awareness of the need for fraternal participation in the worldwide struggle for human freedom: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles, through its delegates in convention assembled, strengthen the bonds of fraternal goodwill and international cooperation among the free peoples of the world by support of established overseas relief agencies, by individual acts of fellowship and helpfulness, by aiding the needy and bringing to the people of the free world a better understanding of the fraternal spirit and fellowship objectives of America; and be it further

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles become a truly international fraternal organization by establishing Eagle units in foreign nations, authorizing the board of grand trustees to establish the provisions under which such outposts of fraternalism shall operate, linking such Eagle units in other lands with Aeries and members in the United States and Canada by the bonds of fraternal brotherhood, shared ideals and acts of helpful fellowship.

STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS

Whereas strengthening the United Nations would develop world wide support for international law and order, creating an agency for restraining acts of aggression and building peace, with the honor and integrity of nations insured; and

Whereas specialized agencies of the United Nations have shown the possibility of effective international cooperation in providing food and essential supplies for children and war refugees in devastated countries, in lessening the ravages of malaria, tuberculosis, and cholera in the postwar world, and in providing loans and assistance for reconstruction and development purposes; and

Whereas the flag of the United Nations flies alongside the flag of the United States as troops in Korea, under the command of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, fight the aggression of tyranny in our world; and

Whereas within or outside of the framework of the United Nations, it is imperative that the free and non-Communist nations of the world pool and integrate their military, economic, and moral force, standing together in a resolute defense of their right to be free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles, its delegates in convention assembled, urge the strengthening of the United Nations, the elimination of the veto power in the Security Council, the creation of an international police force to discourage breaches of peace, so that, with or without the presence of Soviet Russia and its satellite nations, the United States can be the great force for peace and progress in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the Eagles urge that the international police force of the United Nations be known as the United Nations Legion, to be recruited on a volunteer basis from citizens of participating nations, to fly the flag of the United Nations alongside the various national colors, to be organized and equipped and located so as to effectively resist acts of direct aggression against nations.

TELLING THE STORY OF DEMOCRACY

Whereas the ideological conflict of our divided world is represented not only in the massing of armies and armaments, but in the struggle for the support and loyalties of peoples; and

Whereas the Voice of America broadcasts, the radio medium used to promote a better understanding of life in the United States to peoples on both sides of the iron curtain, has blasted the false propaganda picturing America as a land of millionaires, gangsters and oppressed workers; and

Whereas the Crusade for Freedom broadcasts, operating a powerful radio station on the edge of the iron curtain and planning a network of such freedom stations, portrays to the peoples of the world the true American aims for friendship and fellowship with all nations; and

Whereas these and other broadcasts, beamed at the satellite nation peoples, surrounded by barbed wire and the rule of fear, represent our only way of bringing the message of democracy to the Kremlin-dominated parts of the world; and

Whereas the time and huge sums of money spent by Kremlin rulers in seeking to jam these freedom broadcasts, and their propaganda barrage to separate our Nation from its allies by arousing distrust of American aims and objectives, demonstrate the Kremlin fear of the weapon that makes men free—the truth; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles, by its delegates in convention assembled, endorse the Voice of America program of our State Department, the new Crusade for Freedom radio programs, and all ways of piercing the iron curtain to bring the independent voice of a free America to the prisoner peoples of the enslaved nations, and to our friends and allies in the ranks of the plain people of the world.

ALASKA, HAWAII, AND GUAM

Whereas recent developments in Asia high light the importance of the western links in the chain of American defenses, and the people of these outposts of American democracy face great responsibilities in preserving our free way of life; and

Whereas the Territory of Alaska is our first line of defense in the Northwest, from which our planes can rise to repel airborne invaders, and the people of Alaska, as good citizens and good soldiers, have won the rights to full status as an integral part of the Union; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii, larger in area and greater in population than several of our States, is a vital stronghold of America in the mid-Pacific, and its people have demonstrated their loyalty and capacity for self-government; and

Whereas the island of Guam was a bastion of the free world in the recent war and is an important base for American defense forces, and its people have won the right to citizenship by a record of patriotism and service second to none: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles, through its delegates in convention assembled, urge the Congress of the United States to admit to full statehood the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and endorse the granting of Territorial status and full citizenship to the people of the island of Guam.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Whereas a deep water ship channel from the Atlantic Ocean to the Great Lakes region, where a large share of the American armaments are produced, would be of great value to the national defense program; and

Whereas the availability of high-grade ore deposits in Labrador and Quebec, combined with a deepened St. Lawrence waterway, would assure full-scale operation of the Central States' steel industry; and

Whereas an inland highway of commerce from the Atlantic Ocean to the ports of the Great Lakes would provide direct access by sea to the ports of the world for the industrial and agricultural heart of America and Canada; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence power development would generate millions of kilowatts of electrical energy to stimulate the industrial development and economic welfare of the Northeastern States of the United States and the eastern provinces of the Dominion of Canada; and

Whereas the building of canals, locks, and dams around the unnavigable sections of the St. Lawrence River would expand and develop the national economies of the United States of America and Canada, thus benefiting all sections of the continent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles urge the Congress of the United States to approve the development, jointly with the Dominion of Canada, of the St. Lawrence waterway project.

Academy of Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 5, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is as important to our national welfare that our country have well trained and competent State Department personnel to work to keep the Nation out of war as that the Nation have well trained and competent military personnel to win a war when our Nation gets into one.

We, now, have, at Annapolis and West Point, academies to train young men to provide leadership for our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to win wars. We ought to have an academy, organized and operated somewhat after the fashion of West Point and Annapolis, to train and educate young men to a state of competency and understanding of diplomacy that will lessen the chances of our Nation becoming involved in wars.

I am introducing into the House of Representatives tomorrow a bill authorizing the establishment of such an academy to be known as the United States Academy of Foreign Service. The main purpose of my bill is to provide a well trained, nonpartisan personnel of outstanding quality for the State Department.

It is no secret that in the past and present too many of our State Department executive personnel, the personnel on whose decision often depends our foreign policy and whether or not we shall get into or keep out of war, is chosen not primarily for fitness but because of wealth or political pull in the right places. The existence of this kind of ill-trained personnel in our Department of State is conducive to the kind of blunders most likely to get the Nation involved in war.

The bill which I will introduce tomorrow provides that cadets to be eligible to enter the United States Academy of Foreign Service must be between the ages of 21 and 25 and must have had at least 2 years of college education prior to entering the Academy.

Appointments of cadets to the Academy would be made by Members of the Senate and House, with each Member having "not less than one appointee" in the Academy at any one time. This would provide for an initial enrollment of about 500. This could be expanded from time to time, if deemed necessary, by increasing the number of positions each Congressman is entitled to be filled.

All candidates for admission would be required to pass such qualifying examinations as the Academy management might determine.

In order to prevent the State Department, as now constituted, from dominating the staffing or training of the Foreign Service Academy which my bill would establish, the bill provides that the Academy shall be governed by a board of five trustees. It provides that this board shall consist of the Secretary of State and of two Members of the Senate and two of the House. It provides that the Vice President shall appoint the two Senate Members and the Speaker the two House Members. The Senate and House appointees, in both cases, must come from opposing parties, thereby assuring a nonpartisan board of trustees as far as possible.

The bill provides that the Board of Trustees would employ a president for the Academy at a salary not to exceed $20,000 a year.

Members of the Academy's faculty, under the terms of my bill, would be selected by the Academy's president with and by the consent of a committee on faculty. This committee on faculty, the bill provides, shall be appointed one from each of the Nation's 12 Federal Reserve districts and from lists of names of prominent educators submitted by the governors of the several States. Members of the committee on faculty shall serve without salary but shall be entitled to travel and per diem expenses.

The cost of operating a United States Academy of Foreign Service will not be burdensomely large. The cost of operating the Naval Academy during the coming year is estimated at $5,666,000 and that of operating the Army Academy at West Point at $5,708,000. The cost of operating a United States Academy of Foreign Service should be somewhat less than in the case of these two military schools since the enrollment in the Academy of Foreign Service, at least during its beginning years, would be much smaller. The establishment of such an Academy, as my bill proposes, would, in my opinion, be one of the best investments our Government could make toward the preservation of peace for the American people.

While I have no idea that legislation of this nature can be enacted at this late date in the session, I believe the wisdom of establishing a United States Academy of Foreign Service should be thoroughly investigated and studied at the earliest opportunity by the appropriate committees of the House.

I am convinced that the establishment of such an Academy along the lines suggested by my bill will be a great step toward avoiding future wars and maintaining the peace which is so ardently desired by all Americans.

How Communists Operate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. WOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview with J. Edgar Hoover, published in United States News and World Report:

HOW COMMUNISTS OPERATE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What should a citizen know about subversive activities? What should he do? Is there any danger to the United States in the mild-mannered acquaintance who insists that Russia is the only true democracy? President Truman recently asked that organizations and individuals report to the FBI all information relating to espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities. To get an inside view of some of the problems which the President's request raised, United States News and World Report put a series of questions to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI. The questions and his replies follow. J. Edgar Hoover has headed the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 26 of his 55 years. Study at night won him two law degrees by 1917, in his native Washington, D. C.; then the Justice Department hired him. He rounded up alien subversives after World War I, and in 1921 was appointed Assistant Chief of the FBI by Harlan Stone, then Attorney General and later Chief Justice. He became Director in 1924. In World War II, espionage and sabotage were special FBI targets, and after the war the Communist infiltration. Also there was the loyalty check on 2,500,000 United States employees, plus the 120 major laws under the FBI's specific guard.)

Question. Do you think, Mr. Hoover, that Communists are basically agents of a foreign country, or do you draw a distinction between those who are philosophical Communists and those who are tools of the Communist spy rings?

Answer. The teachings of communism are directed toward one final result—world revolution and the triumph of international communism. The achievement of this aim would mean the violent and complete destruction of the American Government. Any person who subscribes to these teachings, regardless of his reason, is working against American democracy and for the benefit of international communism's chief leader, Soviet Russia. The philosophical Communist who advocates Marxism-Leninism might just as well be working as an agent of a foreign power because he is aiding its cause. He is, in fact, however, being played for a sucker by the Communists, who consider him a dupe, a person not to be

trusted but only to be used and then discarded.

Question. Do your investigations show that the basic allegiance of a Communist is to a foreign government rather than our own Government?

Answer. Most emphatically. As I mentioned in my previous answer, the ultimate loyalty of fully indoctrinated Communist Party members is to Moscow. Stalin is represented as the foremost leader of international communism, the omnipotent oracle from whom all wisdom flows. The Communist Party is today a Trojan horse of disloyalty, coiled like a serpent in the very heart of America.

It may mouth sweet words of peace, democracy, equality, and flourish gay slogans of international solidarity and brotherhood of men, but its body and feet are from the Russian bear. Wherever the Trojan horse of Communist fifth columns has walked, the indelible footprints of Russian imperialism remain behind.

Question. How do the Communist cells operate? Are these the training units out of which larger numbers of Communists are recruited?

Answer. The basic unit of the Communist Party is the club. These clubs may be shop or industrial clubs; that is, Communist units within a special manufacturing or industrial plant, or neighborhood clubs, drawing members from residential areas. These clubs are coordinated through an elaborate apparatus, from ward, city, county, State, and district organizations to national headquarters in New York City. Because of security reasons, they have now been divided into small groups consisting of three to five members. In these clubs the Communist Party conducts its basic and fundamental activities—instruction in Marxism-Leninism; organization of pressure campaigns; the passing out of leaflets and handbills, the circulation of petitions. Here Communist literature is sold, dues collected, instructions received from higher officials disseminated. The club is the basic operating unit of the Communist Party. Through the club, of course, new members are recruited and indoctrinated.

Question. Do your studies of the Communist techniques over the years show that the Communists are trained to lie about their status?

Answer. The basic premise of communism is deceit and hyprocrisy. The Communist philosophy teaches that every available means must be utilized to achieve the final end—world revolution. For this reason the Communist will lie, cheat, and resort to any tactics which will gain his end. He will advocate today exactly what he denounced yesterday. And with a straight face. Has he lied? No; he will say, he's only carrying out party policy. The concept of morality and fair play, as practiced in our democracy, is alien and repugnant to him. Moreover, the Communists employ a purposive double talk, roundabout style, known as Aesopian language, in their literature and speeches, designed to deceive and evade, to clothe their true thoughts. This technique, utilized by Lenin, is the very epitome of deceit.

Question. What does membership in the Communist Party really mean? Does it mean a formal joining or does it mean informal adherence?

Answer. When an individual joins the Communist Party he agrees to accept in full the principles of Marxism-Leninism. I mentioned previously that to accept these teachings means, in the final analysis, working for world revolution—in the boots of Russian imperialism—and the destruction of American democracy.

There is no halfway point: The individual accepts fully these obligations or he does not become a member. If later he refuses to abide by these rules—as defined by the party hierarchy—he is "expelled." This is no "informal adherence." You are either a full member or an enemy.

NO MORE PARTY CARDS

Question. Do Communist members carry cards any more? Did they previously carry cards?

Answer. As a security measure no Communist Party membership cards were issued in 1949. In previous years, with certain exceptions, they were issued. I might mention, in this connection, that the open maintenance of membership records has been discontinued. Today the Communist Party is becoming more and more deceitful and underhanded in its operations.

Question. Are there any sections of the country which are relatively free from Communists?

Answer. Communists may be found in most sections of the United States. Of course, in some areas the Communists are more thickly located than in others. But, as a general rule, the Communists are less strong in agricultural areas. And there is a reason for this.

Question. In what centers do Communists tend to congregate?

Answer. The Communists are strongest today in the industrial areas of the United States—in States such as New York, California, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan. Of course, these States, being heavily populated, you would expect more members there than in the less populated States. But that is not the entire reason. The Communists, as a basic principle of infiltration, are interested in possessing strength in heavy industry, that is, coal, steel, rubber, automobile, etc. It is here that, in event of an emergency, they can do their greatest harm to the country's economy.

Moreover, in these industries one Communist Party member located in a strategic job can wreak damage completely out of proportion to his own strength. Through this "heavy-industry concentration policy" the Communists are able to exercise a power far in excess of their numbers. In fact, one of the highest ranking leaders of communism in the United States has openly admitted:

"The Communist Party bases its work directly upon the mills, mines, and factories. Its principle is to make every shop a fortress for communism. * * * It concentrates its work upon the heavy industries and those of a war character."

That is one of the potential sabotage dangers facing America today.

WHY CONVICTIONS ARE DIFFICULT

Question. Are there many suspected Communists or suspected agents of foreign governments who could not be successfully prosecuted even though you have considerable suspicion about them?

Answer. The matter of prosecution, of course, is the exclusive responsibility of the Department of Justice. However, to successfully sustain a prosecution, legal evidence is necessary. Our laws regarding espionage are technical, requiring legal evidence, which is often most difficult to obtain because spies do not carry on their activities in the presence of witnesses but under a cover of stealth, because party members trained in deceit either decline to furnish information or misrepresent the facts in an attempt to conceal the acts of their associates.

Question. Is this because you need corroborative evidence and this is not always possible to attain, or is it because the laws at present are not clear concerning the unlawfulness of Communist activities?

Answer. We have had frequent cases in the past where we have developed the full facts, but, due to the passage of time, the fleeing of witnesses from the United States, and other matters beyond our control, the development of corroborative evidence is physically impossible. As to the adequacy of existing laws, this is a matter not within the province of the FBI.

Question. Have you suggested from time to time to Congress any principles that might be embodied in legislation concerning Communists?

Answer. The FBI is not a policy-making organization and the advocacy of specific legislation is not within the scope of its authority. The FBI, however, has furnished, from time to time, its observations to the Attorney General on ways to strengthen its activities.

Question. Does the FBI have adequate means for the detection of Communists who are foreign agents or saboteurs?

Answer. The Communists, foreign agents and saboteurs operate behind a smoke screen of stealth and deception. There must be a starting point in every investigation. The FBI has the means of detection if it receives sufficient information on which to predicate an investigation.

EVERY ONE A POTENTIAL SPY

Question. Is the FBI interested in knowing of the detection of any Communists, or is it interested only in those who are connected with espionage rings or possible sabotage?

Answer. The FBI is primarily interested in those members of the Communist Party who might be engaged in espionage, sabotage, or who constitute a potential threat to the internal security of the United States. Increasingly, however, with the development of the outward manifestations of a revolutionary movement in the Communist Party, the FBI is interested in knowing the identity of all Communists in the United States, as any Communist, properly qualified, might be recruited into espionage. He may today be circulating peace petitions or selling Communist literature. Tomorrow he may be sabotaging American industry or serving as an espionage courier. We are interested in identifying, therefore, every member of this international conspiracy in our midst, because every Communist is a potential saboteur and espionage agent.

Question. Would you, for instance, have an actual list of 55,000 Communists, or is this an estimate?

Answer. When the figure of 55,000 Communists in the United States was made public, there was considerable speculation in party circles as to the accuracy of the figures. Later, when detailed tabulations by States were made public, the Communists in various districts manifested great concern as to where we obtained our figures.

Question. Are there many Communists who have confessed and turned in valuable evidence to the FBI?

Answer. An individual who has seen the error of his ways and has been converted from the ensnaring tentacles of communism can be as reliable as any other type of witness. Many former members of the Communist Party have been of invaluable assistance in our investigations.

Question. What motivates these Communists to confess their relationships with espionage, etc.?

Answer. What motivates one person might be a minor factor for another individual. Many influences affect these individuals, causing them to seek the truth. However, from an over-all point of view, one factor emerges crystal clear: These individuals have realized that communism was a falsehood and a perversion of the truth.

MANY DISILLUSIONED

Question. Do you believe there are many people who formerly were Communists and who now have changed their views?

Answer. Many individuals associated with the Communist movement—even some of those in high places—have become disillusioned with this godless conspiracy and have

renounced their allegiance. They have tasted of communism and found the taste bitter and repugnant. Many of these men and women hoped, through joining the Communist Party, to work for a "bright new world," for peace and improved democracy. But these hopes became shattered—for some quickly; for others more slowly.

Once inside the Communist world they could see with their own eyes the hypocrisy, deceit, and terror which is the essence of Marxism-Leninism. They recognized communism for what it is—brutal tyranny coated with false hopes and promises. For them there was only one course; to renounce communism.

The fact, however, that they have seen the errors of their ways and renounced communism does not entirely excuse their wrongs. The alibi that every person was radical in his youth or was a Communist sympathizer in the 1930's is a malicious falsehood. The great masses of Americans never fell for the schemes of the Communist swindlers.

Question. Do you generally find that confessed Communists or confessed espionage agents are reliable in their testimony—that is, where you have been able to verify or check upon their statements with one or more witnesses?

Answer. The testimony of any person must be judged on the basis of that individual's knowledge of the truth, his ability to know of what he speaks, and, from a practical standpoint in any type of case, the value of his testimony must be interpreted by corroboration. In each case we endeavor to verify information furnished us. In some instances the very nature of the information makes verification impossible, such as a meeting of two people. But, if one of the individuals traveled extensively, or stayed in the locale, these facts, subject to verification, can lend credence to his story. Weight must be given to the witness whose recital of facts can be verified by proof.

Question. Does the FBI determine who shall or shall not be prosecuted, or is the function of the FBI solely to collect the information and transmit it to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice?

Answer. The FBI is the investigative arm of the United States Department of Justice, charged with the duty of investigating violations of the laws of the United States, collecting evidence in cases in which the United States is or may be a party in interest, and performing other duties imposed by law. The FBI's function is solely and exclusively that of investigation, to obtain the complete and accurate facts. The FBI does not, at any time, evaluate, make recommendations or draw conclusions from the results of its investigations. That is the responsibility of the Criminal Division and the United States attorneys.

Question. Do you believe that pitiless publicity will be helpful in running down Communists?

Answer. Absolutely. The Communists, by their very nature, are conspiratorial. They operate under a cloak of deceit. Communism can be defeated by an alert and aroused public opinion, conscious of the evils of Marxist-Leninist chicanery. The newspapers and magazines, the radio and television, by informing the Nation of the true character of communism, are rendering invaluable services.

I would never fear communism in America if all Communists were out in the open, peddling their wares in the market place of free speech and thought. But they are not. We cannot meet them on an even basis. They are working behind the masquerade of hypocrisy. For this reason America must be vigilant to recognize communism for what it actually is—a malicious evil which would destroy this Nation.

Question. Do you believe that public exposures through congressional committees, when properly safeguarded to avoid implication of innocent parties, could be helpful in drawing public attention to instances and episodes involving espionage and other Communist activity?

Answer. With the laws of libel and slander militantly used by subversives, exposures under oath, with safeguards to protect the innocent, are necessary. A private citizen or even a great metropolitan daily paper does not have the facilities to make the investigations. Hence, many exposures can be made only through an official investigating committee possessing the power of subpena with persuasive facilities such as laws covering perjury and the power to cite for contempt.

Question. Are there any suggestions you can make as to how the public can detect Communists and report them to the FBI?

Answer. A Communist is not always easy to identify. He is trained in deceit and uses cleverly camouflaged movements to conceal his real purposes. But he may frequently be detected by certain common characteristics. He will always espouse the cause of Soviet Russia over that of the United States. His viewpoint and position will shift with each change in the Communist Party line. He will utilize a language of double talk—referring to the Soviet-dominated countries as democracies and complain that the United States is imperialistic. He will attempt to infiltrate and gain control of organizations and subvert them to the use of the party.

My advice to the public is this:

Be alert to the dangers of communism. Report your information immediately and fully to the FBI. Avoid reporting malicious gossip or idle rumor. The FBI is interested in receiving facts. Don't attempt to make private investigations. Leave that to trained investigators. Don't circulate rumors about subversive activities or draw conclusions from information you furnish to the FBI.

Be Sure It's Love Before You Take 'Em Fishin'

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a humorous article from the Brooks-Scanlon Pine Echoes for June 1950, edited by my good friend, Paul Hosmer, and published by the Brooks-Scanlon Lumber Co., of Bend, Oreg.

Sports fishermen and hunters say that central Oregon is too good to be true. Awaiting your lure there, in more than 200 lakes in Deschutes County in the district I represent in Oregon, are big fighting rainbow trout, eastern brook, Loch Leven, and Dolly Varden which are an answer to a fisherman's prayer. Hunters may drive direct to good game areas and often see deer, antelope, elk or bear at the roadside. Bird hunters bag pheasants, quail, ducks, and geese in this enchanting outdoor land which varies from towering mountains and western plains to deep forest and open ranges.

To my friends and colleagues in the House and Senate, who often boast about the good fishing in their States, and who also like a bit of humor, I commend the following article:

BE SURE IT'S LOVE BEFORE YOU TAKE 'EM FISHIN'

We are looking out the window of the public library where we go to dodge a rainstorm, when we see a couple of tourist cars go by on their way to Paulina Lake for the opening of the fishing season. This reminds us of a guy from California who comes up here last year to take his new wife fishing on their honeymoon. We run across these love birds up at Elk Lake and we get Albert's side of the story one night at his campfire while his wife is over at the lodge trying to buy a bottle of Djer Kiss 50 miles from the nearest town. Albert, just to keep the records straight, is the bridegroom.

Her name, we learn, is Dotty and she is very agreeable to the eye, although after we get to know her better her name is still Dotty as far as we are concerned. She is dressed in a bright green shirt and a pair of Hollywood riding pants and looks as if she is poured into them and forgets to say "When." She is a menace for looks, although she is no great shakes for brains, but with her sex appeal they are only an incumbrance anyway. Albert is a fisherman of the deepest dye and Dotty is going to show her husband that she likes to live in the woods like a trapper and catch fish. Albert gives her a $40 fly rod as a wedding present and she breaks the tip trying to spear a mosquito the first night out. Albert is a good scout and loves his little wife, but when we see him he is walking on his heels. Love is supposed to be tender, but so is a two-bit T-bone. Albert has been on a thousand fishing trips, but he confides in us—what a helluva difference one wife makes.

Albert and Dotty, taking turns, drive all the way from Frisco in a night and a day, so they get here on the opening. Albert is very anxious to get camped before dark, but Dotty refuses to make up her mind as to just where she wants to camp. All she knows is the places Albert points out are terrible. All the campsites Albert likes are (1) too close to the lake; (2) too far from the lake; (3) too many people; (4) too rough; (5) too much shade; (6) not enough shade; (7) too wet; (8) too dry; (9) not enough people; (10) too many mosquitoes. This too-many-mosquitoes place is the last one Albert can drive to so they start back to look the camping places over again.

Albert explains that there are no mosquitoes at Elk Lake at this time of year and that the one that bites Dotty has been buzzing around in the car ever since they left Redding, Calif. Dotty says she knows that, but as soon as he stops here it bit her and that proves there is something about this place that puts them in a fighting mood.

Albert drives back almost to Deschutes Bridge and decides on the camping spot Dotty thinks is too rough. It is getting pretty dark so you don't see the bumps well, and it strikes Dotty as about right. Albert gets out his $75 umbrella tent and dumps it in the only spot a tent can be pitched. Albert says he is not going to pitch the tent here, he is going to pitch it over by those willows. Dotty says he is not, he is going to pitch it right here. Albert whispers to us on the side to remember this bit of strategy—we may need it sometime.

Dotty gives him a whole history of Daniel Boone while he is setting up the camp. She wishes to know if it wouldn't be best to put up the tent with the door to the east so if there is a west wind it won't blow into the tent. She wants to know did he bring the butter. She wants to know if he isn't doing things backward by driving the pegs before setting up the tentpole. She claims the

marshmallows are tough. She says they ought to have the fishing season in the winter when they don't have any mosquitoes. She remembers she forgets the coffee. She suggests eight different places where Albert should build a campfire.

By 10 p. m. Albert is slightly nuts, but has all the household furniture unpacked and a swell cooking fire going. Dotty sits on a jackpine stump and cooks marshmallows on a stick. Albert encourages her by saying there is nothing like a good square meal of marshmallows on a camping trip and—Albert tells us this privately—you can't talk much with your mouth full of marshmallows.

Presently Dotty disposes of the last marshmallows and complains that the smoke all comes her way. She maintains that Albert built the fire on purpose that way. The smoke drifts back over Albert and Dotty says it serves him right. Albert says that when he is a Boy Scout he learns how to build a campfire so the smoke goes straight up, but he has forgotten how he did it.

Albert cooks up a pretty good supper of steaks, potatoes and some coffee he had put in the grub box himself, and finally they go to bed. There is a bump under her side of the air mattress Albert buys for the trip. Albert wonders about this as he knows there are no bumps under an air mattress, but he gets up and changes sides with her and then it develops there is a bump under the other side, too. So they get up again while Albert moves the bed to the other end of the tent.

Dotty decides there isn't enough air in the mattress and unscrews the cap to blow it up a bit. While she is trying to figure out how to blow air into the thing, all the air leaks out and when Albert gets into bed he finds a bump the size of an anvil under him. So he spends all his remaining breath blowing up the mattress and falls over backwards in a dead faint. Dotty is a little peeved about things. She figures she married the guy for life and then finds out he hasn't any.

In the morning Albert rolls out and makes some coffee and when the sun is up, so is Dotty. Albert has the rods all rigged and decides the water is too cold for flies. He digs out a 6-inch nightcrawler and hands it to Dotty. Dotty tells him to take the boa constrictor away. Albert explains that this is not a boa constrictor; it is the kind of overgrown angleworm the big fish will bite on at this time of year. Dotty says she does not want a big fish as they object too much. So Albert puts on a smaller worm and Dotty stands and looks helplessly at the river. She complains that the river comes too far up on the banks and she can't get close enough to fish. She finally decides she will fish off Deschutes Bridge because she sees on a map where the river runs under it. Albert is to go where he damn pleases up and down the bank and Dotty will catch the fish when he scares them under the bridge.

Dotty drops her line over the railing and doesn't even bother to see where it lands. There are 40 or more snags under Deschutes Bridge that will grab Albert's hook before it even reaches the water, but none of them touches Dotty's. Hers drifts quietly through all of them and into a quiet eddy near the bank. Wham! Just like that, a rainbow about 18 inches long hits it. If it's anybody else in the world the fish will dive into the snags, but Dotty doesn't give him a chance. She lays her pole down on the bridge, kneels on it, and drags him in hand over hand, like a monkey going up a rope. Izaak Walton rolls over four times in his grave.

Albert is all excited and yells up to ask why she don't come down on the bank where she can use her landing net. Dotty replies that she is using it—she has her lunch in it. Albert shudders groggily and staggers off down the river to do a little real fishing all by himself and show his wife up. He wades into a hole and gets his boots full of water, he works and sweats and at the end of 3 hours he has three trout measuring 6¼ inches wet. When he gets back to the bridge, Dotty is still there and has two more big ones lying beside her. Also she has lost her hook. Albert sees an opening and remarks that she has finally found one of the snags. Dotty says she doesn't hook a snag; on her last cast she catches a Dodge on the back cast, and on the time before that she hooks a Pontiac on the way past, but it came off. She wants to know why all the cars in central Oregon have to go over Deschutes Bridge while she is trying to catch a fish.

Albert finally persuades her to follow him upstream and just for variety he rigs her up a minnow outfit and baits it. Dotty looks at the minnow like it was some kind of a yellow fever germ. She wants to know why, if Albert is going to be funny, he doesn't put on a fish big enough to be legal. Albert explains patiently that this is merely bait and that the big fish eat them. Dotty wants to know why if the big fish eat the little fish before they can grow to be big fish, how can there be any little fish grow up to be big fish to eat the little fish. This is getting pretty complicated and Albert explains they only eat part of them. Dotty wants to know what part. This goes on for several minutes and suddenly Albert hears his wife give a yelp. Albert looks back and sees his frau is hooked onto a big one. Just some more of her "damphool" luck, he thinks. Dotty is pretty excited, for a female like her, and says she wishes she was over on the other bank. Albert wants to know why and Dotty says because that's where the fish wants to go. Albert yells to work downstream with him because the water is too fast and she's liable to break the line. Dotty yells back that the water is just as fast down there and looks around her wildly. Suddenly she gets an idea or something. If Albert ever tries this trick on a half pound mud turtle he is going to lose all his outfit except maybe his tent and sleeping bag.

The big fish stays on while Dotty manhandles him upstream a couple of hundred yards and finally keel-hauls him into the only drydock in 6 miles. She puts her rod on the ground, kneels on it, and hauls the fish in hand over hand, as usual. Dotty is so excited, but not enough to forget to remind her husband that there are some things he tells her she still remembers. One of them she says, is to always ease a big one into a quiet eddy to land him. She demands to know where there is a quieter spot on the whole Deschutes River than this one. Albert goes into a sort of coma while Dotty takes the big trout out—and there is her lunch soaking wet in the bottom of the net. Albert sees she is daring him to say something funny, but while Albert is brave he is not brave to the point of recklessness. He does not so much as crack a chuckle.

Well, Albert and Dotty fish all day and just before quitting time the score stands six to six in Dotty's favor. Albert is a little peeved, but is still trying to be the ideal sportsman husband. Just as he is ready to give up and go back to camp he hooks onto the grandfather of all rainbows in the Deschutes. The strike almost tears his pants off and Albert sees he is in for a struggle. He keeps his rod well up and braces himself to wear the baby out. He holds on for half a dozen wild plunges and just then Dotty catches up with him. Dotty is in a slightly sarcastic mood. Aloud she voices the hope that Albert loses him. Albert pays no attention. He is a little surly anyway, due to the fact that his line has hooked itself around the button on his right hip pocket and is causing some trouble. Dotty wants to know if she should climb up the rod and stab the fish for him. Albert says if she does she will find herself right out there in the river with the fish and the hell with her, but if she really wants to do something for her country she can come down and unhook the line from his rear pocket button. Dotty slides down off the bank and takes a look at the tangle. Then she unsheathes the Kit Carson hunting knife Albert gives her on her wedding day, and cuts the line.

Albert's stomach goes down with a dull thud like an express elevator makes when it snaps a cable and lands in the basement. The line runs out, the fish goes down the river and Albert counts 10 slowly. Then he counts 20. It still is not safe for him to say anything so he counts to 12,527. Then he just shoulders his rod and starts back for camp. Dotty trails along behind him and is very sorrowful. She explains that cutting the line is the first thing she thinks of, that if she doesn't cut it Albert probably breaks his $125 rod. Albert says the hell with it and let's go back to camp. Just then Dotty spies the bridge and gets another one of her ideas. She is going to try one more cast off the bridge just to see what might happen. Wearily, Albert says go to it, you can't always be lucky. You can't always miss those snags.

Well, Dotty drops her hook in and it catches on a snag the first thing. She looks at Albert sort of expectantly and waits. Albert at first pretends he doesn't see this phenomenon, but then he begins to think that if he doesn't get this hook loose pretty soon he is liable to be out all night. So he wades out and unhooks the bait. Just as it swings free a huge German Brown hits it in the neighborhood of Albert's shirt tail. Albert becomes somewhat dazed and figures the more wrong a woman fisherman is, the more right she probably is.

Dotty begins reeling in like she was dragging in a grand piano and when it gets to within hailing distance she gives a large heave. With anybody else, of course, the tackle will break and everything go to hell in general. But nothing breaks, the fish goes forty feet up in the air and wraps itself 12 times around the Forest Service telephone wire which runs into Elk Lake whenever Myron Symons can remember to come down and fix it. Dotty looks at Albert and says so get him down, smarty.

Well, Albert is no Einstein, but he has an idea. He takes his hunting knife out of its sheath and he makes a slash with it. He cuts the line, grabs Dotty's net, and waits hopefully for the fish to drop. If the wind hadn't changed, he'd have made it.

All this is a week before we meet up with Albert and Dotty in this camp on Elk Lake and Dotty has not spoken to her husband for 6 days. Albert is pretty discouraged about the future. He wishes us to write a letter to Dotty and explain that he did not deliberately let this fish get away. Albert wonders if friends will write in and tell Dotty that he wouldn't be mean enough to do a thing like that on purpose. Albert wishes us to write a note to Dotty telling her that we've always found him honest. He wishes us to tell her that he did the best he could on that fish.

As a last and rather gasping request, he asks us to tell Dotty just to speak to him again.

Stalin Versus Confucius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, some years ago there was a fad in this country where all sorts of wise and omniscient sayings were ascribed to the ancient

Chinese sage Confucius, who lived about twenty-five centuries ago. These sayings would all begin with the introductory words: "Confucius say * * *."

Confucius is today anathema for Stalin's Russia and Mao Tse-tung's China because of his teachings and philosophical views on human relationship. In Formosa, however, the Chinese celebrated a few days ago the anniversary of Confucius' birth. I have no doubt that the burning of the works of Confucius by the Chinese Communists will not eradicate the name of this old and venerated Chinese philosopher from the history of the Chinese people, just as the burning of books by Hitler did not erase from our civilization the more modern philosophers, writers, and scientists. In the language of the fad: Confucius say when Stalin and Mao Tse-tung are long forgotten or at best are a mere memory of a weird nightmare, Confucius will still be a subject of fruitful study and pleasant reading for the people of China.

My thoughts on the matter are the result of a brief editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of August 30, which follows:

CONFUCIUS: COUNTERREVOLUTIONIST

On Sunday, Formosa put out flags and commemorated the 2,501st anniversary of the birth of Confucius, with Chiang Kai-shek presiding at the ceremony in the Chinese Nationalist administration offices in Taipeh. The sage could not—officially, at least—be honored on the mainland, for Mao Tse-tung had this spring ordered the burning of the works of Confucius, terming them "reactionary and antipeople." However, we have a strong notion that Confucius has not been so easily erased from the past and present of China by a fiery Red decree.

The sententious sayings proved and adopted by men embody racial experience. And racial experience, in the continuity of human nature, can be much the same, whether it is sounded in a pithy phrase in a Vermont general store or remains in teachings both a mandarin and a coolie have tested and found true. Confucius, for instance, taught a lot about human relationships. These, he said, "were continually being violated by the passions of men." This statement, of course, sets Confucius up as a dangerous counterrevolutionist in the eyes of Moscow's followers, with whom such violations, either individual or national, have long been old stuff.

Mao Tse-tung may have burned the works of Confucius, but we will bet him any mandarin's best melon rind cap that for another 2,500 years the sage will be read in China, where a century is but a Kremlin day. For wisdom is like that. Fortunately for mankind, it is a phoenix which survives many historic ashes and many puppet rulers. a bit about any Communist banning of his eternal ideograms.

Facts Behind the Present Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of Members of Congress to a recent and excellent statement made by Ed. Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. Wimmer's statement sets forth some truisms which cannot be denied, painful though they may be to some people who insist that the only danger to this great Republic is external.

Mr. Speaker, the world has produced many idealists and practical men, but comparatively few practical idealists. Ed. Wimmer, in my opinion, is one of the few. As an idealist, he believes with unlimited zeal that small business is the backbone of free enterprise in this country and that little people everywhere are the backbone of civilization. As a practical thinker and businessman himself, he backs up his ideals with concrete suggestions for building a better America and a better world.

Mr. Wimmer's statement follows:

KEEP AMERICA INDEPENDENT

(By Ed. Wimmer)

The real war that is going on today (and it is world-wide) is not a conflict to determine the military supremacy of the nations involved, but instead is a war between two ideas. The Russian idea and the American idea. Only one of these two ideas will survive. Which idea, is the most momentous question that now confronts thinking people everywhere. What most people fail to understand, is that the answer will not be found on the battlefields of blood and guns, but on the battlefields of the minds of men.

Let us consider the facts supporting this statement.

To begin with, suppose you put yourself in the boots of the Kremlinites and look at the present situation from their vantage point. They know as well as you that an all-out war with the United States would result in great damage to Russian cities and Russian industry, even if Russian planes were successful in knocking out 50 percent of our civilian and war industries with one blow. They know that before Russian troops could be landed on American soil that Russia herself would be a shambles.

Consider now for a moment the long time belief of the Russian leaders that "capitalism will eventually destroy itself". Top Reds are unquestionably convinced that the social, economic and political chaos which would follow the distintegration of our system of free enterprise and free government would result in a Communist victory without their firing a single shot. If I were a Kremlinite I would hold to this view and do everything possible to build more and more fear in the United States, and await the day until my American comrades could take over. All indications point to the fact that the Kremlinites believe they can cause us to forfeit our freedoms and bankrupt ourselves—financially and intellectually.

On the other hand there has been a deep feeling among great numbers of Americans (and I am one of these Americans) that the Russian people themselves will liquidate the Kremlinites and destroy communism if they are given time to learn the facts of life and if we, here in America, are able to make our economic system function according to the fundamental principles laid down by the founding fathers. The godlessness of communism will generate its own destruction, for there is a divine something in the souls of men and women that no earthly power can hold back for long.

Speaking as a layman, and without any pretense of being an expert in national or international affairs, my opinion is that a knockout war with Russia would cost us whatever we have left of our system of free enterprise and free governm:nt, and leave us with some form of totalitarian control that neither we nor our children would be able to throw off. This should be clear because a war between two such mighty forces as Russia and America would involve the whole world and would climax itself in such chaos as to make a world dictatorship inevitable.

Our great debt has already placed us in a dangerous position, and failure to solve our own social, economic and political problems (as well as our failure to establish free institutions in those countries which we have liberated from naziism and fascism) has left us with a weak family of nations that would be dependent on us for almost everything. It would seem, therefore, that victory for the Russian idea would have to come from the breakdown of economic forces in America, and that victory for the American idea is possible only if we prevent such a breakdown. In other words, we must prove that the American system of free, competitive, private enterprise is capable of meeting the needs of America on both the home front and the battlefront.

If this kind of reasoning is reasonably correct, then the hour calls for the utmost statesmanship on the part of all of our Government officials, and calls for the utmost statesmanship from the leaders in agriculture, industry, finance, labor and all other fields. It means that no one dares to ignore the fact that the best defense we can possibly develop is a strong economy, free of monopolistic powers and as free as possible from bureaucratic controls.

No one is more aware than I that present trends are in the opposite direction—in that statesmanship has been lacking in most of our internal and international affairs. That agriculture has been losing its independence through subsidies, controls and the building of giant combines of farm cooperatives. That trends to giant chains and holding companies have been liquidating thousands upon thousands of individual enterprises. That bigger and bigger government has gone far toward making us a completely dependent people.

To halt or curb these trends under present conditions would seem to be a colossal if not impossible undertaking, but if marked success along this line is not achieved, the American system of free, competitive, capitalistic, private enterprise is doomed—war or no war.

To minimize further trouble with the Russians, I would let them understand and prove to them that if they knocked out 75 percent of our industry in one lightning blow—that within hours fleets of planes would take off with enough atomic bombs and poison gases to erase them from the face of the earth.

So far as control of inflation is concerned, Congress should have the power to investigate any sign of unreasonable profiteering or hoarding, and the Department of Justice should be empowered to prosecute and jail offenders so long as the emergency exists. Control by bureaus are too dangerous. Housing controls, for example, means a halting of building, which means higher rents, which means more drastic rent controls, which means political strangulation of our economic system. Steel, wool, rubber, cotton, grains, refrigerators, automobiles and most other needed products are in surplus or in near normal supply. Before World War II, we were out of everything, and a highly accelerated consumer purchasing power, plus speculation and hoarding, made rigid price and rent controls inevitable.

These facts should be carefully weighed before any drastic steps are taken to put controls on production or distribution. Too many controls will be the death knell of hundreds of thousands of small businesses. One million closed their doors in the last war.

My further recommendations would be that Congress and the President stop talking an

all-out war and start selling American ideals as set forth by the founding fathers; which ideals are not understood by any foreign nation; have not been a pattern for legislation, and have not been understood or pursued by American people generally. I say this because no one can disprove the contention that the American Republic was founded on the idea that, "no free society can be built on any other foundation than one which guarantees a maximum of individual enterprise and a minimum of power in the hands of the few." Our experts are unanimously agreed that widespread, independent ownership of farm, home and other enterprise (with local control over local affairs) is the only antidote to private monopoly; the only antidote to labor monopoly; the only antidote to the spread of socialism in this country, and the only antidote to the spread of communism—anywhere in the world.

Every successful person is an advertisement for capitalism, and the only way to increase the number of successful persons and still enjoy freedom is to expand independent enterprise, which results in a wider choice of job opportunities and a greater degree of independence for the working classes. During the past 20 years we have made a lot of successful people through Government spending, war, and after-war prosperity, but in doing so we have actually weakened the fabric of independent enterprise, economic self-reliance, and free government.

I think that if we had not been a monopoly ridden nation at the end of the war, we could have taken a position in Germany, England, Italy, France—and every other nation needing our help—to the effect that those nations use our assistance to develop a free, competitive economy, with local control over local affairs. Such insistence would have resulted in our loans being used to rehabilitate farms, factories, and stores, so that the people could be put to work to rebuild their own communities and work out their own community problems.

Is it too late now for us to start such a program? Have we gone so far in the direction of giant labor unions, giant industries, giant banking systems, and giant government that we cannot stop and turn back? My answer is, "No," and I would begin by proclaiming at once that the distempered economic thinking and distempered political planning of the past will be ended; that while we are preparing ourselves on the military front we are going to develop an economy that will be a pattern for freemen to follow for centuries to come.

Restoration of economic and political freedom in this country calls for no radical or harmful measures. A simple amendment to the Public Utility Holding Company Act, which Congress passed as a measure to unscramble the utility holding company combines, can be applied to all holding companies doing an interstate business; companies such as the du Ponts, A & P, Sears, Roebuck, General Mills, Aviation Corp. of America, etc. This would mean that the Maxwell House Coffee Co. would be separated from General Foods and become an independent enterprise completely free of control by any such holding company octopus as General Foods. General Motors, as another example, should be separated from du Pont control. General Motors is far too big a corporation to be controlled by another corporation and I would ask that Frigidaire in turn be separated frm General Motors, along with other corporations not directly related to the production of automobiles. Carried out in every field, a decentralization program such as this would put ownership and control of banks, hotels, factories, processing plants, wholesalers, and yes, the retail business into a new framework of genuine free enterprise, which would automatically unwind big labor and big government.

Any study of the years preceding the crash of 1929 reveals that they were years of chain-store expansion and years of merger and consolidation—even on the agricultural front. The depression years which followed the crash of 1929 carried us to the very brink of disaster, from which we were snatched by Dr. Roosevelt and his New Deal. During the 5 years that followed we witnessed a greater transfusion of public funds from Government to governed than had ever been spent by any elected official or king in world history. By 1938, however, we were diving into another depression, from which we were snatched by the defense boom of 1939—and in 1941, the bombing of Pearl Harbor put us in clover.

Nine years have gone by. Three hundred thousand American boys have died. Another 100,000 are in hospitals. We have a $260,000,000,000 debt and a tax bill of $60,000,000,000 annually, and at this writing we are advocating that our former enemies be re-armed and rehabilitated at our expense so they can help us fight our former ally—Russia.

Do you think we would have gotten into this mess if we had taken God into our economic and political life, and if we had held to the fundamental principles of free enterprise and free government? The answer, of course, is an emphatic "no"—and if we will take God into our hearts now and come forth with a program that little people of all nations can understand, this generation of Americans may yet become the beginners of a new era of peace, prosperity, and the pursuit of happiness.

Lenin said, "Germany will arm itself out of existence. Britain will expand itself out of existence. America will spend itself out of existence."

Two of his predictions have come true. Will he be right on the third?

The answer is "Yes"—unless we mend our ways.

Lovre Farm Plan Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer for the RECORD an analysis and explanation of the self-financing, full-parity, farmer-managed farm program which I have introduced. I call the attention of the Members particularly to the provision which provides specific protection in farm planning for the family sized farmer. This plan provides the full 100 percent of parity for the farmer without doles and grants.

This legislation has been introduced as H. R. 8509 and hearings have been held before the House Committee on Agriculture.

It should first of all be recognized that the farm problem is a price problem and that unless agricultural production exceeds demand there is seldom a problem. When that happens, prices are severely depressed, working a hardship on the farmer and nonfarmer alike. The crazy-quilt economic pattern of booms and busts in America proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that national income is always at least seven times gross farm income. In the event that it becomes necessary to assure farm prices the Lovre "Grass Roots" plan strikes at the root of the evil by providing for the orderly marketing of farm produce.

Its objectives are:

1. A farmer-controlled plan: The program would operate from the bottom up rather than from the top down as at present. Farmers themselves would manage the program through elected county committees and State and national boards. The program would become operative only after a two-thirds affirmative vote in a national referendum.

2. Self-financing: Marketing quotas allocated on over-all normal United States domestic requirements would regulate sales instead of acreage controls regulating production. In the even of surplus, the producer thereof could sell it only after purchase of additional marketing certificates from his county committee. Proceeds from sales of additional marketing quota certificates would finance disposal of surplus and the administration of the program. The self-financing feature assures an agriculture that stands on its own feet with its head high without dependence upon Government doles or subsidies. Savings to taxpayers and recovery of money invested in surplus crops would be sufficient to balance the national budget this year and save billions in the future.

3. Full parity to farmers: The plan recognizes that less than full parity for the farmer means loss in gross farm income and a resulting seven-times drop in national income. Producers would be assured of full parity on their share of normal domestic consumption. The National Board would maintain price through purchases and loans financed by sale of surplus marketing quota certificates.

4. Protection for the consumer: The consumer's grocery bill would not skyrocket bcause the bill authorizes the National Board to sell on the domestic market when prices reach 105 percent of parity.

5. Two-price system: The plan would be based on the same principle used in every business today (sell bulk at parity price; dispose of surplus at sale price). The farmer would receive one price (full parity) for his share of domestic consumption at the market place. If he produced surplus and decided to dispose of it he would net a lower price on that part of production. The price differential would be used to finance disposal of surplus.

6. Orderly disposal of surpluses: With money collected from the sale of surplus marketing quota certificates, the National Board would dispose of surpluses by: (1) A food stamp or school lunch plan; (2) exports consistent with United States commitments (United States might trade food to foreign nations for strategic materials such as rubber, uranium, magnesium, and so forth); (3) development of new chemurgic uses for farm products such as plastics, medicine, fuels (this field has hardly been explored).

7. Protection for family-sized farmer: The Lovre plan recognizes that 6,000,000 out of the 10,000,000 business units in America are independently owned and operated farms. Thus, any long-range program must be based around the family-sized farmer. In the prosperity of the small operator, the backbone of America's productive and consumptive capacity, rests this Nation's strength or weakness. One section of the bill spells out protection for the family-type farmer.

8. Coordinated soil-conservation program: Recognizing that soil conservation is vital to progressive prosperous agriculture, the Lovre plan contemplates a comprehensive, Government-encouraged program to protect the Nation's most valuable resource—the fertility of the top soil.

EXPLANATION OF OPERATION

Farmers would choose their own organization by electing county committees and State and National boards to direct the program from the appropriate level. The national board would work with the Secretary of Agriculture who would decide each year normal domestic demand of each farm product. When production exceeded demand, quotas based upon the latter would be established and divided among farmers who would, through operations of the national board, receive full parity on this portion of production. If a farmer produced more than his quota and wanted to sell it, he could buy additional marketing quota certificates, paying enough for them to finance food stamp or school lunch programs, exports, and new nonfood commercial uses of products. The individual farmer would control production. Those who created surplus would take a loss.

The Lovre plan would operate under the same sound principle as a country merchant uses to sell house dresses, for example. He sells bulk at parity price and the carry-over he saves for the following season or sells at a discount. Assume the parity price of wheat is $2. One farmer has a quota for 10,000 bushels for which he is guaranteed full parity. He produces 11,000 bushels and wants to sell the extra 1,000 bushels rather than store them. He must purchase extra marketing quotas at, say $1 per bushel, to market this grain. The sale price to him on the market is still $2 (or he could get a full parity loan on it), but the difference would go to the national board which might issue food stamps good for perhaps 75 cents on the product of a bushel of wheat. Or it might export wheat for $1.50 per bushel. The board might also subsidize plants finding new uses for wheat at $1 per bushel. Anything left over from these operations would be returned to the farmer. Thus, the farmer would net $2 (full parity) on his 10,000 bushels (his quota) and anything from $1 up on his surplus. It would depend upon the cost of disposing of it. The farmer would not be subjected to governmental acreage controls; he would regulate his own production because the net he would realize from the surplus would, from year to year, decrease to the point where he would voluntarily reduce the amount of his production.

Selling surplus or calling loans when parity was exceeded would protect the consumer. While the consumer who could afford it would pay full parity for his food (the same as he expects to pay for his automobile or furniture), persons of low income would participate in a food-stamp plan to increase their dietary requirements.

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF H. R. 8509, THE LOVRE GRASS-ROOTS FARM BILL

I. Commodities covered: A. Cotton; B. Potatoes; C. Tobacco; D. Food-feed: 1. The term "food-feed group" means corn, wheat, barley, oats, rye, grain sorghums, hay, grass, and other products normally used for livestock feeding, and hogs, cattle, sheep, poultry, chicken eggs, and dairy products. 2. All items in this group are treated as one. 3. Parity quotas, marketing quota certificates, surplus certificates, disposal fees and refunds in this group shall be computed and expressed in terms of comparative units. (a) "Comparative unit" means that quantity of a commodity in the food-feed group the value of which at the parity price for that commodity equals the value of 10 bushels of corn at parity price.

FULL PARITY PLAN

II. Parity quota: A. Parity is defined as parity price determined in accordance with provisions of section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949. B. The Commodity Credit Corporation, under direction of the National Board is authorized and directed, by making purchases of such commodity in the open market from time to time during such marketing year to remove from domestic market channels such quantities of the commodity as may be necessary to insure that the current market price does not fall below its parity price.

III. National Farmers Council: A. Independent agency of the executive branch. B. Consists of: 1. National Board: (a) Composed of Secretary of Agriculture and six members: (1) Members elected by members of State boards annually. 2. State board for each State: (a) Composed of five members: (1) Members elected by county committee annually. 3. County and local committees: (a) Established under section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

TWO-PRICE SYSTEM

IV. National parity quota: A. Annually the National Board shall proclaim: 1. Quantity of each commodity that will be consumed within the United States. 2. Quantity that will be available. B. In the food-feed group the proclamation shall be limited only to each feed commodity that will be consumed or available for consumption in the United States by human beings, livestock and poultry. 1. "Feed commodity" means any commodity in the food-feed group except hogs, cattle, sheep, poultry, eggs, and dairy products. C. The quantity proclaimed for consumption plus a carry-over (not in excess of 50 percent shall be the national parity quota).

VOLUNTARY ADOPTION

V. Referendum: A. Within 30 days after the proclamation the National Board shall hold an election if it finds: 1. That the quantity of a crop available for sale will exceed the amount to be consumed. B. After the program has been in effect for any commodities, 15 percent of those who voted in the last referendum can petition the National Board to hold an election. C. Only those producers of feed commodities in the food-feed group can vote or sign a petition. D. Two-thirds of those voting must vote for the program before it goes into effect.

SELF-FINANCING

VI. Apportionment of parity quotas: A. National Board apportions the national parity quota among States. B. State board apportions the State parity quota among counties. C. County committee apportions the county parity quota among producers. 1. In the food-feed group quotas to be given only to producers of a feed commodity. 2. Family sized farms are to be protected and encouraged.

REGULATES MARKETING

VII. Marketing certificates: A. After a parity quota is issued to a producer he shall be furnished with a marketing certificate entitling him to market a quantity of the commodity equal to the quota apportioned to him. 1. It is unlawful for any person to sell, offer for sale, or purchase any quantity of a commodity located in the United States, produced, or imported by him, in excess of the quantity he is entitled to market. B. When there is a sale of a feed commodity for feed purposes to producers of hogs, cattle, sheep, poultry, eggs, or dairy products the purchaser shall be given a marketing certificate that entitles him to market a number of comparative units of the food-feed group equal to the number of comparative units of the commodity so sold. C. Surplus marketing certificates will be issued upon payment by the producer of a disposal fee. 1. This provision is applicable to all importers. 2. Disposal fee to be high enough to finance the differential between parity and what the National Board can dispose of the surplus for, including administrative costs. (a) Refund excess to producers.

MECHANICS

VIII. Commodity Credit Corporation: A. Under direction of National Board. B. Make loans of 100 percent of parity. 1. Only on nonperishable feed commodities. 2. Only on so much of the production of any producer as does not exceed his parity quota plus the quantity as to which he has paid a surplus disposal fee on. C. Authorizes study for insuring loans made by private persons under same terms and conditions, and report to Congress by the National Board. D. Farm storage to be used and using existing facilities whenever practicable. E. Authorizes purchases in open market in order to insure current market prices from falling below parity.

SURPLUS TO USEFUL PURPOSE

IX. Disposal of surplus: A. Export at such prices and in such quantities as will not be inconsistent with international

food and agricultural agreements to which the United States is a party. B. Distribution thereof at low prices (approved by the National Board) under programs designed to safeguard health, improve the diets of low-income groups, or encourage the consumption by school children of nutritional agricultural commodities. C. Distribution thereof, at prices approved by the National Board, under programs designed to develop new scientific, chemical, and technical uses for agricultural commodities and products and byproducts thereof. D. Selling the commodity in the domestic market at the current market price therefor if the current market price is higher than 105 percent of the parity price for the commodity, except that selling begun under this paragraph may, with the approval of the National Board, be continued so long as the current market price of the commodity remains above the parity price therefor.

SOIL CONSERVATION

X. Conservation and development of agricultural resources: A. Directs National Board to report to Congress recmendations for Government-encouraged program for development and conservation of Nation's agricultural resources. B. Recognizes that research, education, technical operations, and material assistance, financial and otherwise, are necessary and distinct elements in soil conservation and development of land and water resources.

Franco and Free Enterprise—Article From the New Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the current issue of the anti-Communist publication, the New Leader, published in New York State, carries an article entitled "Franco and Free Enterprise," written by two Spaniards who, too, are anti-Communists, and are associated with the government in exile of the Basque Republic.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCO AND FREE ENTERPRISE—THE DICTATOR OUR SENATE WANTS TO AID IS PRESIDING OVER THE SYSTEMATIC EXTERMINATION OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY IN SPAIN

(By Jaume Miravitlles, frequent New Leader contributor, represented the exiled Government of Catalonia in the United States; and Jesus de Galindez is the representative of the exiled Basque Government in this country)

An American loan to Franco may supply the final push needed to make Spain's economy completely totalitarian. It is ironical that this loan—if voted by Congress—will be extended in the name of preserving free enterprise. Actually it would result in drastic curtailment of private industry and the increased power of government monopoly.

While most American proponents of aid to Franco are familiar with the political arguments against a United States loan (the weakness and unpopularity of his regime, his previous support of Hitler, etc.), few of them realize fully the economic implications of American aid. The fact that Franco is a poor risk for a loan is generally known; but the planned destruction of private enterprise which would accompany an American loan has not been noted by either proponents or opponents of United States aid. The plan, named after the ruler of Spain's economic destiny, is called the Suances plan.

Suances, according to Sam Pope Brewer (New York Times, May 15), "got the idea from seeing the colossal enterprise grouped in Germany under the name of Hermann Goering Works." The consequence of this journey and the deep impression which it left on Suances, was the creation in Spain of INI (Instituto Nacional de Industrias) in 1941. INI is the instrument for introducing economic totalitarianism to Spain.

When Franco named Suances Minister of Economy several years later, he was in position to control foreign trade and, through the Spanish Foreign Exchange Office, to regulate foreign exchange. At the same time, Suances retained his position as head of INI. Thus Suances is a Goering, Todt, Funk, and Schacht, all rolled in one.

RUIN RESULTS

Suances' first idea was to convert Spain from a "flower garden and pantry" into a manufacturing and industrial country. The first part of the plan was fulfilled; that is, Spain ceased being an agricultural country. Before Suances, Spain produced 4.2 million tons of wheat a year; only 2.6 million tons of wheat have been produced annually since his advent. From 660,000 cubic meters, oil production sank to 270,000 cubic meters.

But this had been foreseen by the Suances plan. The deficit was to be overcome by means of a planned integration of the Spanish and Argentine economies. In this way, the Franco-Peron protocol was born. In exchange for wheat, fats and Argentine beef, Spain was to send manufactured products.

The Franco-Peron protocol, said the two principal protagonists, Suances for Franco and Miranda for Peron, would give the world a lesson in economic integration more far-reaching than the Marshall plan. The port of Cadiz would be converted into the bridgehead of America in Europe. The two Spanish-speaking countries would give the materialistic and near-sighted Anglo-Saxon world a valuable lesson in political morality.

But the collapse of Spanish agriculture was accompanied by a collapse in industry. Steel production fell from 1,000,000 tons to 700,000. Argentina lived up to her end of the "Procotol," and sent wheat, meat, and the raw materials. But Senor Suances could not deliver the manufactured goods, whereupon we witnessed the denunciation of the "Procotol" by Argentina, and the resignation and exile of its principal defender, Senor Miranda.

Despite this fiasco, Suance's influence on Franco and his personal intervention in the economic problems of the country have increased.

INI was converted into a state economic monopoly, competing dangerously with private interests in the economy. Nothing could be done in Spain without Suances' approval. Purchase of raw materials broad, capital investments at home, decisions regarding the new business, were determined, not by private enterprise or by the necessities of the country, but by the arbitrary fiat of the new economic czar.

ONCE QUIT

One incident in 1941 made the grave conflict between private enterprise and INI explode. On May 19, the Cabinet discussed the distribution of properties belonging to the Allgemeine Elektrische Gesselschaft. Two groups of private industrialists and financiers from Bilbao and Barcelona, the two largest economic centers in Spain, presented justified demands which were supported by the Ministry of Finance and its minister, Senor Benjumea. Suances asked that AEG be absorbed by the state through his INI. Franco's entire Cabinet opposed Suances. Franco himself remained silent when Suances tendered his resignation.

The news of the resignation of Goering's disciple was received, according to Arno Dosch Fluerot, of the Christian Science Monitor, "with open rejoicing, especially in the business cities of Bilbao and Barcelona. One of the biggest industrialists of Spain put it: 'We were all ready to hoist our banners and celebrate our liberation.'"

Franco's silence regarding Suances' resignation and his speech delivered at the opening of the Madrid Agricultural Fair 7 days afterward, in which he stated that "Spain had to return to its traditional economy," made it look as though Suances' hour had finally come.

But the illusion was short-lived. A few days later, on June 3, Franco attended the closing of the national engineering congress, also held in Madrid, and emphatically announced that "economic liberalism had been the cause of Spain's decadence" and that the country needed a planned economy.

After the speech, which constituted a declaration of solidarity with Suances' totalitarian ideas, the latter's influence increased considerably in Spain.

Here are a few examples of how INI is systematically destroying private enterprise in Spanish industry.

A private automobile factory, the property of the Catalan industrialist, Eugenio Cortes (Eucort), announced its bankruptcy in Barcelona and the loss of 30,000,000 pesetas. At the same time, the creation of a new automobile factory in Madrid, subsidized by INI with an initial capital of 600,000,000 pesetas, was announced.

The private bank, Tusquets, a traditional institution in the Catalan economy, announced the closing of its doors, due to the state's failure to help out in the crisis produced by the government-decreed deflation of credits.

The Banco-Hispano-Colonial, Catalonia's commercial bank, was absorbed by the Banco Central, one of the big five in Spain.

INI subsidized the creation of the cotton industry in the Andalusian zone of Malaga and created internal revenues for the shipment of almonds to the Catalan manufacturing center of Reus—two mortal blows dealt to two branches of production entirely in the hands of private enterprise.

Regarding the Basque section of the country, another large production center, Sam Pope Brewer writes (the New York Times, June 10):

"The present steel industry in the Basque country of northern Spain will suffer because the new project (INI steel factories in the Asturias), like any other that is controlled by the INI, will get preferential treatment and that, though uneconomic itself, will force out the existing prosperous companies."

This implies that Suances practices a policy of "industrialization" which really consists of deindustrialization as far as Catalonia and Euzkadi are concerned.

Why? Because these two centers, the decided champions of liberal economy and

political democracy, are the two principal obstacles to Suances' totalitarian plan, and of his principal supporter, Generalissimo Franco. For this reason, with the help of the Germans, Catalonia's President Luis Companys was shot. For this reason, Franco prohibits the profoundly Christian Basque country from using its own language in their prayers and on their tombstones.

The Catalan and the Basque private economies—and their political demands for decentralization and democracy—are now the two principal obstacles on the road to the totalitarian and parasitical industrialization of Spain. American aid to Franco would only speed the march toward economic statism.

Propaganda Is Franked: Public Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of a newspaper published in the interests of cooperatives, there appeared a very timely article which I think the people of the State of Nebraska and the other States of the Union may be interested extremely in reading.

This article deals with certain matters relating to the activities of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, to uncover abuses of the franking privileges of Congressmen by reactionary lobbying organizations, and specifically calls attention to the fact that the ultimate objectives of this lobbying probe were ninefold.

By way of introduction to the article itself there appeared a cartoon styled "Sh-h-h! No fair asking questions" and it pictured seated in a small chair with improvised stumpy legs and arms, a giant money bag tied tightly, puckerstring wise, at the top. On the lighted face of this money bag was a huge dollar sign and underneath this dollar sign were the large capitalized words "Propaganda Funds" and immediately beneath these words were two closely set eyes resembling those of a pig, an indented nose, a fish-like mouth, and a stubby index finger placed at right angles with the center of the mouth, which was meant to indicate that silence was demanded on the part of a member of the Lobby Committee who faced this brutish monster and held in his hand a large sign upon which appeared the words "Investigation of Lobbying Activities."

In the past it has been bombastically asserted, in high, low, and intermediate places alike, throughout America that to ask these lobbying groups or their personnel any questions about their entire lobby-business activities was an invasion of their constitutional rights. The persons who make these assertions in my opinion, do not know any more about constitutional law than a hog does about a clean shirt.

Just why such a legally besmirched character as Edward A. Rumely is so sacrosanct that he cannot be questioned about his full lobbying activities, or the doings of his organization, is difficult for any sane person in our land to understand. Just why such personages as Mr. Rumely and his ilk cannot be asked questions by means of a questionnaire, which they may answer or not answer as they see fit, could be determined to be a violation of any constitutional rights, as one high church dignitary recently claimed, is still harder to understand, unless one is willing to state as a fact that the mere asking of a question by mail of any person is also invading a constitutional right. I feel that good, practical common sense, dictates that no constitutional right whatsoever was violated by Mr. Buchanan's committee in sending out their letter of inquiry, and I am sure that no person with even the faintest comprehension of rights guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States would or could so claim.

The article which I have reference to is as follows:

PROPAGANDA IS FRANKED: PUBLIC PAYS—LOBBY COMMITTEE UNCOVERS HUGE MAILINGS BY CCG—4-YEAR COST: $300,000

You foot the bill for distributing the propaganda of the Committee for Constitutional Government whether you like it or not, according to evidence uncovered by the House committee investigating lobbying in Washington. This is how it works.

Congressmen elected and paid by the taxpayers to carry on the Nation's business are given the privilege to mail free: copies of their speeches, the Congressional Record or any part of it, all public documents published by order of Congress, and official correspondence. The name of the Senator or Representative appears on the envelope together with the word "Free."

At least five Members of Congress have turned their mail-franking privilege over to CCG for free mailing of its propaganda. In the past 4 years, free mailing for this one lobby, according to committee evidence, has cost the American taxpayers between $240,000 and $300,000.

ON LOBBY PAYROLLS

Investigation by Benedict F. FitzGerald, chief counsel for the committee, shows that a Congressman not only allows CCG to use his franking privileges but also is on its payroll. He is paid $350 a month for a regular column, according to Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of CCG. The column is then mailed free under his frank.

Rumely, who was convicted as a German agent in World War I and later pardoned, testified that during the past 4 years CCG has sent out 8 to 10 million pieces of mail under the free mailing privileges of Senators and Representatives.

The House lobby investigating committee began hearings in January in an attempt to ferret out pressure groups of all kinds. To make lobbying just as public as fish in a glass bowl, the committee created shortly before Congress adjourned in 1949, is inquiring about:

OBJECTS OF PROBE

1. Lobbying activities by unregistered persons or organizations.
2. Undisclosed receipts or expenditures by lobbyists and lobby organizations.
3. Undisclosed interests behind lobbyists and lobby organizations.
4. Methods of soliciting or obtaining funds for lobby activities.
5. Methods of expending funds for lobby activities.
6. Practices and abuses of lobbyists and lobby organizations.
7. Specific lobbyists and lobby organizations whose activities warrant detailed study and investigation.
8. Practices and abuses of Government officers or employees in regard to lobbying.
9. Specific Government departments, agencies, officers, or employes whose lobbying activities warrant detailed study and investigation.

Zionists Honor President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to attend at the White House today with Mr. Benjamin G. Browdy, the president of the Zionist Organization of America and a noted industrialist from my home Borough of Brooklyn. The occasion was the presentation to President Truman of the annual award of the Zionist Organization of America, as directed by a resolution unanimously approved at its fifty-third national convention, held in Chicago, July 1–4, 1950.

The award was given to President Truman in recognition of his contribution to human welfare, his untiring efforts for democracy and peace, his fight for the cause of civil rights, and his historic role in founding the State of Israel and the aid he has given Israel since it was established more than 2 years ago. For all his efforts and zeal for these causes President Truman has truly earned for himself the title "The first citizen of the world."

Needless to add, that the President was very pleased to receive this award. In accepting it, the President reiterated his profund belief in the eventual establishment of a truly permanent world-wide peace, toward which he will continue to exert his every effort. Since Mr. Browdy is leaving for a short trip to Israel on Friday of this week, the President asked him to pay his respects to President Chaim Weizmann and Prime Minister David Ben Gurion of Israel.

The award is in the form of a large silver plaque, beautifully inscribed. The text is as follows:

THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA
presents this award to
HARRY S. TRUMAN
President of the United States

in grateful recognition and heartfelt appreciation of his invaluable contribution to human welfare . . . his untiring efforts to advance the ideals and traditions of democracy everywhere . . . his incomparable leadership in resisting aggression everywhere throughout the world . . . his zealous and never-ending work for permanent world-wide peace . . . his unyielding devotion to the cause of Civil Rights in America and of equality of opportunity to all, regardless of race, color, and creed . . . his never-to-be-forgotten part in founding the State of Israel,

in its prompt recognition as a member of the family of nations, and in laying the cornerstone of its political and economic security . . . by all of which he has earned for himself, according to our deepest conviction, the title of

The First Citizen of the World

in testimony whereof we have affixed our signatures, by order of the Executive Committee and the National Administrative Council, this 30th day of August 1950.

BENJAMIN G. BROWDY, *President.*

Neither the Rich nor the Corporations Spare Their Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the July 1950 issue of the magazine named "UAW-CIO Ammunition," published by the International Union of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, of which Walter P. Reuther is the president, contained an article which is a sort of a miniature who's who in fascism in the United States, and which article I feel is of great importance to the people of the State of Nebraska and every other State in the Union.

This is especially true when one stops to consider that there is to be elected this fall, from all of the States of the United States, 435 Members of the House of Representatives, and in many of the States, candidates for the Senate will be elected also.

Since about 84 percent of the press of the United States, as I have been reliably informed may be properly listed in the Reactionary column, and no chance is afforded the voters in many instances to learn about some things which the reactionary Press of the Nation do not wish to have publicized, I feel that it would be in the interest of the people of this Republic to be given the information in part, at least, as disclosed in the article appearing on pages 7 to 12 of the aforementioned magazine.

It is my earnest hope that this information may be brought to the attention of every voter in the Union because it is so important that they know and evaluate properly, some of the forces which are endeavoring to influence the voters in the next national election. I feel that the Democratic Congressional losses in several of the States were due entirely to the fact that the personal history of the men running the Fascist propaganda mills of the nation which took part in those elections, were not brought directly to the attention of the people, and it is my earnest hope that some means may be devised by the liberals who work for reactionary newspapers, which I understand are about 90 percent of the employees, may find a way to get this information and other information into the proper channels where the voters may have full and free access to it.

The article I have reference to is as follows:

NEITHER THE RICH NOR THE CORPORATIONS SPARE THEIR TAX EXEMPTIONS

America's future: One of the subsidiary propaganda organizations of Mervin Hart's Committee for Constitutional Government. It sponsors a radio program called Americans Speak Up, which is carried as a "public service" by 80 radio stations in 30 States and the District of Columbia. A fund-raising telegram for this organization started since America First went berserk.

Robert Lund, Listerine millionaire and sachem in the NAM, who has been associated with almost every Fascist organization started since America First went berserk.

Ragnar Hummell, Texas cement manufacturer.

J. Howard Pew, Pennsylvania oil millionaire and shipbuilder, who is the financial mainstay of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania and contributor to election campaigns on the side of reaction in places like Florida, North and South Dakota, and anywhere else money can tip over a liberal.

Charles R. Hook, steel company executive.

Edward F. Hutton, Wall Street broker, also on the directing board of most Fascist organizations, and leading figure in the Freedom Foundation, which has Valley Forge as its address and which awards prizes each year for the best "free enterprise" propaganda.

Lammot DuPont, one of the oldest and weirdest DuPont brothers.

American Medical Association: The closed-shop union of doctors in the United States, which assesses doctors $25 a year to lobby against a national-health program for the American people. As part of its campaign it is working with the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Committee for Constitutional Government, and similar organizations. It cooperated with these organizations in forming the National Committee to Limit Federal Taxing Powers. Edward Rumely, testifying before the House Lobbying Committee, declared that several State medical associations had bought copies of the John T. Flynn book, The Road Ahead, and distributed it. Marquis Childs, quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, declared the AMA had distributed 1,000,000 copies of this book. The AMA, which reported lobbying expenditures of $1,500,000 in 1949, now operates the biggest lobby slush fund in the United States.

Barger, Harry: Washington lobbyist for the National Economic Council (one of the organizations run by Mervin K. Hart, self-confessed Fascist and letter-writing crony of two of the oldest and wierdest DuPonts). At the same time Barger was a paid lobbyist for the National Economic Council he was employed by Republican Representatives.

Benson, George: A "doctor" who is president of a nonaccredited "college" at Searcy, Ark. With funds contributed by Allis-Chalmers, General Motors, and other big corporations, Harding College produces movies, turnover talks, and radio programs in Hollywood that emphasize how harmful it is for workers to get wage increases, how health insurance is communistic, and how the Fair Deal, the British Labor Government, and Russian communism are identical. Through a tie-up with the big movie companies the films are shown as shorts in many theaters. Radio stations broadcast the radio programs as public service presentations. GM, Allis-Chalmers, and other corporations force their workers to listen to the turn-over talk presentations. A speech by Benson was run into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and reprinted and franked around the country by the Committee for Constitutional Government. The speech made the point that the more education people have, the more crime and the more communism you have. Benson opposes Federal aid to education.

Books: Books distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government include:

Why the Taft-Hartley Law, by Irving G. McCann.

Compulsory Medical Care, by Melchior Palyi.

The Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn.

Constitution of the United States, by Thomas James Norton.

Hunter's Revolution.

Labor Monopolies or Freedom, by John Scoville.

Book sales by the Committee for Constitutional Government have fallen off substantially since the committee's activities have had some light put on them.

Committee for Constitutional Government: Now being investigated by the House Lobbying Committee. According to congressional reports it spent more money for lobbying than any other United States organization except the American Medical Association. It spent $620,632 in 1949 against AMA's $1,500,000. Has spent $5,500,000 in 7 years. Irenee du Pont gave the organization $11,000 in 1949. Other contributors included J. Howard Pew and Edward F. Hutton, Wall Street broker and America Firster. Claims people we have inspired helped defeat in the last elections a Florida and North Carolina Senator. Distributed 60,000 copies of John T. Flynn book, The Road Ahead, in North Carolina during campaign.

Two basic techniques: (1) to publish anti-labor, probig business books, and persuade rich men and corporations to buy them and distribute them to schools, libraries, churches, and newspapers throughout the country (Rumely, acting head of the outfit, gets 4 percent commission on every book sold; field agents of the outfit get up to 10 percent on every book sold).

(2) To get reactionary Congressmen to read speeches it prepares into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and then to get reprints from the RECORD and mail them out by the freight carload free over the signatures of the Congressmen.

Dresser, R. B.: National Republican Committeeman from Rhode Island, power in National Association of Manufacturers decisions, who asked Edward Rumely what the NAM ought to do to pass the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution to lower taxes on the rich. Rumely told him to keep the NAM out of sight. In November 1948, Dresser prodded Rumely to get the Committee for Constitutional Government working harder against reenactment of a rent-control law. Besides Dresser's coordinating activity, other evidence which reveals the NAM tie-up with the Committee for Constitutional Government (in addition to the interlocking officers and powers) is the distribution by NAM of the Flynn book, The Road Ahead.

Du Pont, Irénée and Lammot: Two of the oldest and weirdest members of the du Pont family, whose private empire included substantial holdings in the General Motors Corp., the du Pont Co., United States Rubber, Remington Rand, and substantial chunks of the rest of America.

Irénée and Lammot are the chief financial backers of both the Committee for Constitutional Government and the National Economic Council, through the letters in the possession of the House Lobby Committee seem to indicate that the brothers du Pont are under the hypnotic sway of Mervin K. Hart, of the National Economic Council, at the moment.

Records show up $24,000 they gave to the National Economic Council in 1945-47. In 1948-49, Irénée put up $22,000 more.

Lammot, when asked to solicit 100 to 200 leading American corporations for the National Economic Council, refused, because, "I cannot individually solicit contributions from corporations when I well know that the

company with which I have spent most of my working life, namely, the du Pont Co., in all probability will not comply."

Irénée's letters to Mervin Hart did not show such sensitivity. They dealt with the details of getting tax exemptions. In one case, when Irénée thoughtlessly made a contribution which could not be deducted, he got into a long correspondence that ended up with Hart agreeing to falsify his records to make the tax saving for Irénée.

Flynn, John T.: Former New Republic editor, who once wrote brilliant articles and books demonstrating the necessity of most of the legislation for which the Fair Deal stands today. Originally sincerely opposed to war, he took a violent dislike to President Roosevelt, and gradually shifted over to become a violent Roosevelt hater.

He began his journey toward the Fascist madness by joining America First, and as each of his books attacking Roosevelt has come out, he has moved farther and farther away from his first principles.

His the Road Ahead, which has now become the most effective publication of the propaganda cartel, has been distributed in the millions of copies by the extremely rabid rich.

Franking privilege: United States Representatives and Senators under the law may send letters through the mail free if the letters carry their signatures in the upper right-hand corner. This franking privilege is supposed to be used only to send out mail in connection with the Congressmen's official duties.

The Committee for Constitutional Government, the National Economic Council, and the other organizations in the propaganda cartel, get Congressmen to send out cartel propaganda over their franks.

In 1949 the Committee for Constitutional Government admitted that it sent out 2,853,000 pieces of mail free, with 2,450,000 pieces going out over the frank.

Over 4 years the eight to ten million pieces of free mail admitted to have been sent over congressional franks have cost taxpayers between $240,000 and $300,000. Actually House Lobbying Committee investigators believe more than 50,000,000 pieces of mail have been sent out.

The free-mail racket was discovered when CIO Housing Committee Director Leo Goodman lost his way in the basement of the Capitol one night and stumbled on enough of the franked free mail to fill a freight car.

Fruehauf, Harvey: Of the Fruehauf Trailer Co., long-time antiunion employer, many-time violator of the National Labor Relations law, who sent out a money appeal on behalf of the Committee for Constitutional Government, in which he said the Committee for Constitutional Government "was second only to the National Association of Manufacturers in getting what it wanted from Congress."

Gannett, Frank: Millionaire publisher of a string of 21 newspaper and farm magazine, who put up the money for the Committee for Constitutional Government when it was formed in 1937 as the National Committee To Uphold the Constitution. Testified before a House of Representatives committee in 1944 that the Committee for Constitutional Government was spending $300,000 a year to protect free enterprise and to smear the New Deal. Told the House of Representatives committee that up until 1944 the Committee for Constitutional Government had put out 80,000,000 pieces of literature opposing the New Deal.

Hart, Mervin K.: President of the National Economic Council. A self-confessed Fascist, he also has a grade label from the Americanism committee of the Illinois American Legion, which called him a native Fascist.

He's a key guy because of his intimate relationship with Irénée and Lammot du Pont, which assures him almost unlimited funds, and which at the same time enables him to hit up other millionaires in the country with the Du Pont seal of approval.

In 1940, he declared that, "I wonder sometimes if one of the causes of our trouble today does not arise from the fact that we have been overdrilled into believing we are a democracy."

He told the House Lobby Committee that the Supreme Court should be abolished because the Justices are all Socialists and that they should be barred from holding judicial office.

A powerful money raiser, his letters to the Du Ponts show how he operates. First, he promoted dough from Lammot du Pont. On the strength of that he hit up Irénée du Pont. Then with the Du Ponts in the bag, he got them to write letters to their pals asking them to contribute. As contributions came in, he wrote to the Du Ponts about them to see if he couldn't promote some extra change by exciting their sense of competition.

To give them something to contribute for, he

1. Showed the Du Ponts how they could contribute and pay for their contributions out of their taxes.

2. Changed the records of his organization to enable Irénée du Pont to take a tax deduction Hart's records showed he wasn't entitled to.

3. Proposed that Irénée du Pont finance additional lobbying in Washington.

4. Suggested the Du Ponts pay an organizer to set up Fascist Fives, committees of five men in each community, to work on school boards, churches, colleges. They will serve as a nucleus around which perhaps a score or two of men can presently be gathered to fight for things that are American.

5. Hoped that the Du Ponts pay for canned editorial service to go to country papers, for a speakers' bureau, and for a service which would help people write letters to newspapers.

Besides milking the Du Ponts, Hart runs the half dozen or so organizations connected with the National Economic Council.

Interlocking directorate: The American Medical Association and the real-estate lobby are new recruits to the propaganda cartel that has grown up out of the night soil of America First, the National Economic Council, and the Committee for Constitutional Government.

Now all these organizations are linked together in the National Committee to Limit Federal Taxing Powers. But before the new recruits came in the propaganda cartel outfits were closely linked up with the National Association of Manufacturers and with each other.

Three directors of the Committee for Constitutional Government are also directors of the National Economic Council.

Their personnel are woven back and forth through these organizations (among others):

American Enterprise Association.

America's Future.

Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation.

Foundation for Economic Education.

Fighters for Freedom.

Public Affairs Institute (not the Public Affairs Committee, which is legitimately concerned with public affairs).

Spiritual Mobilization.

National Council of Profit-Sharing Industries.

How and why they operate is explained by Lammot du Pont, one of the weirdest and oldest Du Ponts, who wrote to C. O. Hodges, vice president of the American Cast Iron Pipe, of Birmingham, Ala., on February 7, 1949 (and sent a copy of the letter to Mervin K. Hart: "To do anything in the way of public education, sound views have to be put in a form that the public will read more or less inadvertently * * * that is one of the reasons why a multiplicity of organizations, such as Spiritual Mobilization, the Foundation for Economic Education, and the National Council of Profit-Sharing Industries is effective, rather than wasteful. Each one appeals to a certain area, but no one appeals to all of them. I think the National Economic Council has a certain audience * * * it acts as a catalyst on the other organizations and people."

Kamp, Joseph: Executive vice president of the Constitutional Educational League, who has been in the hate racket since 1919. He is now serving a 4-month jail sentence for refusing to give any facts about his organization to another congressional committee that was conducting an investigation of propaganda activities 6 years ago. The Supreme Court just refused to hear his appeal.

Kamp has also refused to answer questions for the Buchanan committee.

Kamp's materials, which are anti-Semitic and anti-Negro, used to turn up every time wage earners tried to organize in unions. Now they circulate chiefly in the South during union campaigns.

King, Willford I.: Chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Government, a retired New York University economics professor, who for many years has appeared before congressional committees to testify against minimum wage laws, unions, taxes on the rich, rent controls. In an article which appeared in the Sentinel, a newsletter of the Committee for Constitutional Government, he declared that the country should "sacrifice the privilege of knowing how our Representatives vote." What is needed, he said, is an "electric machine that would record the total and nothing else." By this method, he said, it would be possible to get a Congress that would vote against unemployment compensation.

Millionaires: Prized possession of the Committee for Constitutional Government is a list of 10,171 millionaires to whom it sends fundraising letters, sometimes over the signatures of people like two of the oldest and weirdest Du Ponts, Irénée and Lammot. The committee also has another list of 8,000 persons who have from $500,000 to a million bucks in their bank accounts.

National Committee To Limit Federal Taxing Powers: A superlobby which includes the National Associatiaon of Real Estate Boards, National Republican Roundup Committee, Southern States Industrial Council, American Retail Federation, National Tax Equality League (phony small-business organization, financed by big business, which the lobbying committee showed propagandizes against cooperatives), Conference on American Small Business Organizations, Optimists International, and the American Medical Association.

This organization was formed to pass the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution, which would reduce the taxes of the rich and cripple the Government. The amendment was originally dreamed up by the Committee for Constitutional Government. The promise of lower taxes in this amendment was used as sucker bait to get the rich to support the Committee for Constitutional Government. Important organization because it shows how the AMA, the Real Estate Lobby, and the crack-brain propaganda cartel all work together.

Lobbying law: Propaganda cartels conceal their activities in many ways.

Some important methods:

1. Under the Federal law applying to lobbies, they must report all contributions of $500 or more. To get around this, the Committee for Constitutional Government asks that contributors give it $490. Then no names are filed.

2. Supporters of these organizations kick in dough by buying the publications of the organizations and giving them away. Sales don't have to be reported, contributions do.

3. By organizing stooge organizations, the propaganda cartels make it possible for some of their organizations to operate without any Government supervision. Thus the Foundation for Economic Education supplies distortions to the National Economic Council, the real-estate lobby, and the entire network. But since it does no lobbying, and operates as a nonprofit research organization, it can set itself up so that donations to it are tax-exempt and so that no report to Congress need be made of its income. The Foundation for Economic Education has a $300,000 annual budget which is supplied to if by Chrysler, Du Pont, Ford, General Motors, Libby-Owens-Ford, GE, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Champion Spark Plug, Auto-Lite, Nash-Kelvinator, and similar companies, including many so-called charity foundations.

National Economic Council: Mervin K. Hart's propaganda meal tickets, the coordinating center for a half dozen other reactionary propaganda mills.

The National Economic Council:

1. Supplies speeches to reactionary persons.

2. Agitates the very rich about the dangers of socialism, communism, and the handout state.

3. Gets them in a state of mind where they cooperate in the legislative programs of the corporation personalities who stand behind these activities.

4. Prepares and distributes misleading reactionary materials and news letters to schools, key community people, newspapers, magazines, and radio.

5. Acts as a central clearing house for all the specialized propaganda centers (which operate masked as research organizations, tax organizations, religious organizations, and so on).

In 4 years the National Economic Council collected and spent $500,000 that it reported. Among the contributors to it have been the Du Ponts; General Robert Wood, of Sears-Roebuck; Donaldson Brown, vice president of GM; and the Judge Armstrong Foundation (the Texas oil millionaire's foundation which tried to give a small Mississippi college millions of dollars if it would dedicate itself to anti-Semitic and anti-Negro principles—the college refused).

Other recent contributors have been the Bucyrus Erie Co., J. I. Case, Carter Carburetor, and Joseph Grundy, of the Pennsylvania Republican Party and the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association.

Two special contributors: a charity, no less, which operates tax free, the Volker Charities Fund, of Kansas City, Kans.

The other contributor, Beech Aircraft, of Wichita, Kans., which gave $5,998.65, 1 cent for each share of stock outstanding. Across the face of the check was written: "Payment for work in opposing socialism and communism in America, and for the maintenance and strengthening of American private enterprise, private property, and individual initiative."

It is worth noting that the country outside the United States where the National Economic Council's publications are circulated widely, is the Union of South Africa, where racial tensions are more dangerous than anywhere in the world and a kind of semi-Nazi government is in power.

Nelson, Herbert U.: Twenty-five thousand dollars a year executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Probably the man who is due most of the discredit for crippling public housing, eliminating the section of the last housing law which would have enabled self-supporting people to buy decent homes; for hooking up pipelines into the Federal Treasury to enrich real estate racketeers, and for watering down rent control.

In a letter to H. T. Maenner, of Omaha, Nebr., on May 31, 1949, he described his activities and his principles, "I do not believe in democracy. I think it stinks."

Spark plug in the new National Committee to Limit Federal Taxing Powers, he has long worked intimately with the NAM and the prcpaganda cartel.

In the letter to Maenner, for example, he said: "* * * favors we have had from other great associations, especially the NAM, are matters which cannot be discussed but which have built up our organization in many intangible ways."

Peale, Norman Vincent: Former secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, who still free-lances down the same side of the street. When the American Guard was organized in Anderson, Ind., by key personnel in the General Motors Delco-Remy and Guide Lamp plants for the purpose of taking over both the Democratic and Republican Parties, Peale was invited in to speak to American Guard meetings. The American Guard is also a pumping station for John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead.

Questionnaire: To get information for its investigation into lobbying, the House Lobbying Committee sent questionnaires asking for basic information about lobbying activities to 166 American corporations that were known to have engaged in lobbying, to the CIO, the AFL, and to Edward Rumely's Committee for Constitutional Government, Mervin K. Hart's National Economic Council, and Joseph Kamp's Constitutional and Educational League.

The CIO, the AFL, and most of the 166 corporations replied promptly, but two corporations, Inland Steel and Southern California Edison, have refused to supply information.

Rumely and Kamp have also refused to comply with the House committee request. Hart has answered some questions, balked at others.

The Colonel McCormick newspaper combine also displayed alarm that something damaging might be uncovered. Both the Chicago Tribune and the New York Daily News trumpeted for help in shutting off the light that is being thrown on the propaganda cartel's activities.

Reader's Digest: Key publication in the propaganda cartel. When The Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn, was summarized in the Reader's Digest, the Committee for Constitutional Government sent out 4,000,000 post cards urging people to be sure and read it. It supplied additional reprints in the millions for distribution by corporations and rich men.

Organizations slandered in the book, attempting to reply to the false charges in The Road Ahead, were brushed off and not given space to reply by Reader's Digest.

In the same way, the National Association of Real Estate Boards got the Reader's Digest to print a dishonest attack on rent control called No Vacancies. Then a stooge organization of the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Foundation for Economic Freedom, had 5,000,000 copies of this article run off as a reprint from the Reader's Digest and mailed them all over the United States. The article was also reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In advertising the Flynn book, The Road Ahead, Reader's Digest quoted the New York Times as saying, "One of the two most important books about the contemporary scene that we will have this year." But it left out the rest of the Times' statement, which went on to say the two books were important because "they are the latest and most extreme manifestation of an endemic hysteria presently affecting a considerable segment of our population."

Rumely, Edward A.: Twenty-five thousand a year executive vice president of the Committee for Constitutional Government. Jailed during First World War as agent of German Government. Given $1,000,000 by German Government to buy New York paper to spread German propaganda. Closely associated with Ku Klux Klan.

Schools and colleges: Particular target of the propaganda cartel has been the school system.

Writing to Irénée du Pont on June 3, 1947, Mervin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council, said:

"We are having a list prepared of all the colleges, universities, and public libraries and Protestant churches in the United States."

The college, school, and Protestant church list served a double purpose. It propagandized very important community leaders and at the same time it enabled the propaganda cartel to be financed at the expense of the United States Treasury.

If, instead of making a direct contribution, the Du Ponts purchased books from the propaganda cartel and gave them to schools, the cost of the books could then be deducted from their taxes.

The propaganda cartel officials got a profit off the propaganda, which financed their activities. The schools and churches were propagandized. The Du Ponts, among others, paid for these activities out of their tax deductions.

In this way the Committee for Constitutional Government sent 10,000 copies of its book on the Constitution of the United States to Fordham University, 3,500 to Notre Dame, 2,700 to Georgetown, 2,200 to Yale, 6,000 to the University of Miami in Florida, and 4,000 to the Lincoln Memorial University in Tennessee. Five thousand copies of this book were distributed through the parochial schools in Detroit.

On January 16, 1948, Lammot du Pont approved a list of libraries, colleges, and churches to which he had ordered National Economic Council publications sent.

On March 7, 1949, Constance Grier, librarian of the University City Public Library in Missouri, wrote to Mervin K. Hart to thank him for the National Economic Council publications. The complacency of people toward socialism, she said, is distressing. To overcome it, she was displaying the publications on the magazine rack of the library.

Scoville, John: Former chief economist for Chrysler, now dead, who began working for the Committee for Constitutional Government in 1937. His book, Labor Monopolies or Freedom, calling for the destruction of labor unions, has been widely distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government. Hanging the snide phrase, labor monopoly, on unions is supposed to have been his idea. He is also supposed to have invented the phrase, court-packing, as a trick to fight President Roosevelt's proposal that the Supreme Court be brought up to date. Of the union movement he said, "the evil thing must be rooted out."

Tax evasions and possible frauds: On January 12, 1949, Mervin K. Hart, of the National Economic Council, wrote to Irenee DuPont, "* * * we have altered our records to conform to what we know was your desire, namely, that the proceeds of the Phillips Petroleum stock, as well as the $2,000 for which you sent your check, were intended to purchase subscriptions."

The alteration probably saved Irenee DuPont in income taxes very nearly the amount of his contribution.

If he paid considerably less than the price for which the Phillips Petroleum stock was sold, he saved more than the amount of the contribution, so that he actually made money over his donation (at the expense of the Federal Government).

Stock manipulations offer the rich many possibilities for tax evasions, but in the propaganda cartel there are activities which would bring people less rich very near one of Uncle Sam's stone mansions.

1. Contributions to the phony foundations sponsored by the National Economic Council are checked off by the rich on their income taxes as contributions to educational and charitable organizations. Essentially these activities, however, are neither educational nor charitable (where is the charity in a propaganda and lobbying campaign for race hatred and tax exemptions for the rich?).

2. The support of organizations like the Committee for Constitutional Government and the National Economic Council by buying books from them and giving the books to educational institutions (that never asked for them) enables the rich to avoid paying income taxes.

3. To make a narrow point—the cost of printing and distributing John Flynn's book The Road Ahead, is being paid for by taxpayers through tax avoidance.

This book says the Fair Deal is more dangerous than communism, and that the Federal Council of Churches is Communist for all practical purposes.

SLITHERING SEQUENCE OF FUNDS AND FRANKS

Here is how General Motors ($50,000 contribution), Chrysler ($40,000), the du Pont Co. ($40,000), and the phony tax-evading foundations set up by Sloan ($20,000), Kresge ($15,000), and the other big rich operate the Foundation for Economic Education (also tax exempt).

In September 1946, two college professors were hired by the foundation to do a job on rent control.

They prepared a pamphlet called "Roofs or Ceilings," which made the argument that rent ceilings created the housing shortage.

These pamphlets were distributed by the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Then John Scoville, of the Committee for Constitutional Government (and former chief economist at Chrysler), took the material and rewrote it.

The Scoville edition was handed to a former president of the NAM by the Committee for Constitutional Government Washington representative.

The next time the Scoville piece appeared was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Then 500,000 reprints from the RECORD were made and sent out all over the country free (at your expense).

Twenty-second amendment to the Constitution: The Committee for Constitutional Government proposal that would limit Federal taxes to 15 percent of the aggregate annual individual incomes in the United States. Effect of the law would be to reduce the taxes of the rich and to cripple the Federal Government. Endorsements of this amendment were slipped through 17 State legislatures before anyone woke up to what was happening. Then five States rescinded their action. Now the National Committee to Limit Federal Taxing Powers has been formed to push the amendment again. The AMA is interested because the amendment would make the passage of a national health program impossible.

UXYZ: The information in this alphabet comes chiefly from the hearings conducted by the House Lobbying Committee. Other sources were speeches of Representatives.

Essentially this information reveals that special interests which profit from monopolizing some particular economic activity (real estate, cement, medical care) have combined with the National Association of Manufacturers and the huge corporations to form a super propaganda cartel.

They are self-confessed opponents of democracy and do not scruple to conspire to subvert the Government.

Like the Communists who held up Russian Government treasury trains to finance their revolution, these conspirators use money they chisel from the United States Government by tax evasion and franking abuses to carry on their reactionary revolution.

Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address by Gov. Okey L. Patteson, of West Virginia, at the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week meeting in Washington, D. C., August 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and friends, it is a real inspiration to meet with you today, and to witness your enthusiasm and interest in this most worthwhile work. You are rendering one of the finest and most valuable services humanity has ever found in its heart to give—that of helping the handicapped to become taxpayers instead of tax consumers. I am deeply and vitally interested in the physically handicapped, and am always anxious to cooperate in every phase of this program.

The appeal to employ the physically handicapped should not be considered an emotional one. It is really sound business, because "ability" and not "disability" counts on a job; and business and labor surveys show that the handicapped worker is just as productive and dependable in his work habits and attendance record.

In view of my deep interest in the handicapped, I have worked very closely with the various departments and agencies which have charge of this program in my State. Therefore, I want to talk to you today about the past accomplishments and future plans for the expansion of this much-needed and most worthwhile program in West Virginia. I can assure you that I am very proud indeed of the physically handicapped record in our State.

Quite naturally, I do not in any way consider myself an authority on the subject of rehabilitation and selective placement work. However, I do know some of the problems, and attitudes of the men and women who have met with disabling accidents, and many of you present here today have actually experienced that first terrible shock—that feeling of doubt and uncertainty about the future. If this program had no other value than the fact that it fills so many of our citizens with hope for the future, then it would be priceless.

The rehabilitation of a man's outlook is just as important as rehabilitating his physical handicap. I shall never forget an experience which I had some years ago. I was called to a hospital to see a man of middle age who had lost both legs in a mine accident. He was the breadwinner of a large family, and had become very despondent because he felt that he could no longer support his family, and that he himself would be a liability to his wife and children. He felt that his family would be better off if he were out of the way. That thought preyed on his mind to such an extent that he actually attempted to commit suicide.

A visit and a heart-to-heart talk with this individual, convinced him that all he needed was the will power and determination to help himself, because, with the aid of rehabilitation he could again become the self-supporting head of his family. I am happy to report that today that man is a self-respecting, independent merchant, educating and supporting his family far better than he could have done as a day laborer, which he was before the loss of his legs.

We need to remember at all times that hope and confidence are most important. The disabled must be lifted from a state of despair to a hope-filled world. We must not measure our rehabilitation program in terms of tax returns and increased production alone. Most certainly these are important, and need to be emphasized, but human values are much more important. Please do not misunderstand me, because I do not advocate giving sympathy to the handicapped. In fact, the handicapped himself does not want sympathy. He just wants an opportunity to make an honest living for himself and his family, but, of course, he does need understanding and intelligent help.

That, then, brings us to the need for selective placement. Trained interviewers and counselors assure the employer that he will interview only the man who can do the job which is available. Selective placement permits us to do a dollar-and-cents job for the employers and the State, and at the same time help the individual in a material and humanitarian way. When the disabled veteran is as well qualified as a nonveteran, he receives preference, which, of course, is the established policy throughout the country. During the past 5 years, almost 10,000 West Virginians have been placed through the efforts of the West Virginia State Employment Service and the veterans' employment representative. Many of these persons were prepared for employment by the Veterans' Administration and the State rehabilitation division. The average number of rehabilitations per hundred thousand population is 39 for the Nation, and the number for West Virginia is 81, which proves that our State is doing an outstanding job in this field. Furthermore, over 50 percent of the handicapped who have been employed during the past 5 years, have been disabled veterans.

This represents a sizable placement job in West Virginia, but actually gives only a partial picture of the result of the rehabilitation and placement program. It omits entirely the large number of persons who were hired by employers through their own efforts, and not through any of our public employment offices. Many employers hired the handicapped workers because of the fine educational campaign which was so ably carried on by each of you in this work.

The success of the national-employ-the-physically-handicapped program in West Virginia is due in a large measure to cooperation at the community level. Our Statewide efforts have been to stimulate the work of our local committees. One method which was used most effectively has been the building of keen competition for two annual awards—one, a large loving cup which is presented to the city with the best placement record; and the other a copper plaque presented for the best information program.

Some communities arouse interest by having what they term "kick off" banquets, which are held in cooperation with local industry, veterans, service clubs, civic leaders, public officials, management, and labor. The citations made to employers indicate increasing cooperation between labor and management in connection with the employment of the handicapped. Also, the cooperation between our rehabilitation service and the miners' welfare fund to help the severely disabled miner is most effective.

Another successful method employed in our State, which is also used by many other States, is the distribution of booklets listing qualifications and availability of the rehabilitated for employment. Also, the rehabilitated man is invited to civic club luncheons or dinners. Quite naturally, he is just introduced as a guest, but at the same time prospective employers are aware of the

fact that he is available for employment. Some of our cities have staged national-employ-the-physicallly-handicapped parades, with bands and floats, which is found to be most effective in certain rural areas.

The American Legion awards an annual citation, which has been of invaluable aid in the over-all program. In addition thereto, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the AMVETS are now planning to sponsor various awards to spur the placement of disabled veterans. Quite naturally, it is important that the State government itself set an example in hiring the handicapped, and I have urged upon all my department heads the great importance of offering employment to the physically handicapped, whenever such person is qualified to fill a job that is vacant. A check of our personnel records reveals that there are a large number of physically handcapped now employed by our State government.

Added interest has been manifested in the national essay contest, due to the fact that the local employers have added worthwhile State prizes to the national prizes which were contributed by the Machinists' Union and Disabled American Veterans. We in West Virginia were quite proud last year when one of our boys, Howard Kite, won third prize in the national contest. Interest in this contest has more than doubled, as evidenced by some 200 entries which were submitted in 1950 by 40 high schools. This year, one employer in West Virginia sponsored a banquet for the presentation of awards to our State winners in the contest. This contest, together with our program of awards to outstanding employers, has aided materially in bringing about a year-round program in West Virginia. It is always hard to sustain the interest of the newspaper and radio in the same type of publicity, but the variety of news injected by the contest and awards, do help to keep the national employ and physically handicapped program before the public 52 weeks a year, instead of just concentrating on publicity for a week or so during each year.

Our West Virginia Rehabilitation Division has attracted national attention through expert rehabilitation services provided for a number of special groups, among which are the coal miners, the mentally handicapped, and the tubercular. Vocational rehabilit tion, without doubt, is one of the major public services which ministers to the needs of the citizens of our State.

We are all quite proud of the work of the national employ the physically handicapped program in West Virginia. The 1949 record is indeed outstanding. However, there are many thousands more in our State who need to be rehabilitated, and many of the rehabilitated need jobs. Yes, there is much for us to do in our State, just as there is in yours.

If I were asked to give a formula to a State committee for success in the national employ the physically handicapped program, I believe I would suggest that you "direct more attention to the local community program, by helping to establish working committees of labor, management, veterans, public and civic leaders." If this program is working at the crossroads you will have no worries about it up here on Constitution Avenue.

Without doubt, one of the noblest things any person can do for his fellowman is to aid the unfortunate to help himself. We all know that we are never happier than when we render services to others. We cannot do a good deed for another, without becoming a better man—a happier man—a more contented man.

As I said, this program is of vital interest to me. I can assure you that some of the greatest thrills I have ever had in my life have come from helping those who have lost a limb, or are handicapped in some manner. To help a disabled person to obtain a job and become self-supporting and self-respecting brings happiness that I would not trade for anything else in the world.

I take my hat off to the industrial leaders who are beginning to recognize that this great reserve of partially disabled manpower can render invaluable service. If total war comes, our Nation will need every rehabilitated man and woman in America, and Uncle Sam will find them willing and able and eager to do their part to help keep and preserve the traditions of the greatest country on the face of God's green earth.

Tribute to James H. Ely by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement regarding a testimonial dinner on August 26, 1950, honoring James H. Ely, of Waynesburg, Pa., upon his retirement as grand master of Pennsylvania, Independent Order of Odd Fellows.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MARTIN spoke at a testimonial dinner on August 26, 1950, honoring James H. Ely, of Waynesburg, upon his retirement as grand master of Pennsylvania Independent Order of Odd Fellows. Mr. Ely once served under Senator MARTIN as a member of the famous Twenty-eighth Division, which the Senator later commanded as major general.

In the course of his remarks, Senator MARTIN said:

"No matter how high the cost may be in suffering and sacrifice, the people of the United States must be ready to pay the price of victory if peace is to be restored on a lasting basis.

"Are we awake to the dangers?

"Are we aroused to the vital need of complete and total mobilization of all our strength in the cause of our flag and our Republic?

"Do our people understand that we may be plunged into another world war that could last for 20 years?

"Do they realize that babies born today may reach selective-service age before the menace of communism is crushed and defeated?

"Unfortunately, there has been a disposition in some quarters, official and otherwise, to regard the conflict in Korea as a small matter—just a border incident that will soon be over.

"But every casualty list from the blazing battle front proves how wrong they were.

"There is a tendency among some of our people to think that we can continue Government spending as usual, business as usual, and pleasure as usual.

"But I am convinced that such thinking is dangerous folly. I am convinced that the preservation of individual freedom in the United States and the future of the world depends upon American strength, American patriotism, and American sacrifice.

"We are facing a time when the highest patriotic principles must be called forth in defense of our country and our way of life.

"The Odd Fellows, for more than a century and a quarter, have preached and practiced 100-percent Americanism.

"Now is the time to intensify that patriotic activity. As an organization and as individuals you can wield powerful influence to alert every American to his full duty.

"I would like to offer some suggestions which, in my judgment, should be part of an American program:

"1. We should support universal military training to provide a well-trained reservoir of manpower for our armed services. If we are to preserve our Republic its wars must be fought by the people.

"2. We must have total mobilization of all our resources—labor, industry, agriculture and finance, and all our moral and spiritual strength.

"3. We must fight inflation by restricting credit and by placing controls on prices and on salaries and wages at the same time.

"4. All critical materials in short supply, needed for war production, should be placed on a rigid system of priorities and allocations.

"5. All Government spending, Federal, State, and local, not directly connected with national defense, should be reduced to the lowest possible level.

"6. As far as possible the cost of war should be paid out of current revenue. Otherwise we may lose our freedom of the individual, even though we win the war.

"7. We must stamp out law evasion, racketeering, black markets and profiteering.

"8. We must constantly teach the meaning of the American way of life.

"9. Those who prefer communism to Americanism should be deported if they are not citizens of the United States. If naturalized, their citizenship should be revoked. Native-born Communists should be placed where they cannot sabotage our military effort, our war production, or our schools and churches.

"10. We should work for a great spiritual awakening, based on the eternal truths of the Holy Bible. We must recognize that God stands at the portal of destiny.

"If all of us whole-heartedly support such a program it will serve notice on Joe Stalin that we really mean business. In my opinion that is the only way total war can be averted. Complete mobilization may persuade Russia to back down. Weakness is an invitation to further aggression.

"God-fearing, law-abiding Americans pray for Divine help and guidance. Communism denies God. It worships the State.

"We believe in the Fatherhood of God. In that faith lies our hope for lasting peace in the world."

An Era of Decision on Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter I wrote for the Labor Day edition of the Advance, published by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, September 1, 1950; the subject An Era of Decision on Civil Liberties.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ERA OF DECISION ON CIVIL LIBERTIES—INDUSTRY'S AIMS THREATENED RIGHT OF LABOR TO ORGANIZE AND BARGAIN

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS)

When I came to the Senate in 1933, I was appointed to two very important committees,

both of which gave me, as a freshman Senator, a remarkable insight into many things connected with our political and industrial life.

I was made a member of the subcommittee that brought to an end what were called the Huey Long hearings in Louisiana. They were in reality hearings on the Overton election. The experience in these hearings resulted in my hearing at first hand many incidents of political life which Americans generally condemn.

Incidentally, at those hearings radio was used for the first time in a Senate hearing and I, myself, believe that from the use of the radio much information was gotten out to the people generally which influenced greatly the acceptance of the report of our committee.

Another committee assignment which resulted in gaining an insight into our industry-laden life in America, was to be made one of a committee of three to hold hearings for the Committee on Education and Labor, to decide whether further hearings were justifiable in regard to the infringement of civil rights in relation to American labor's attempt to organize.

As we made our preliminary report the Committee on Education and Labor decided to continue the hearings and those hearings became what are now known as the La-Follette-Thomas civil liberty hearings. The hearings lasted for nearly 6 years and the committee was kept in existence for that time. It was deemed wise to continue the committee on the theory that a committee in being, to which abuses could be referred, tended toward overcoming those abuses.

I had had experience in troubled industry-labor relations. My biggest experience was in the coal and railway strikes of 1922 when I represented my governor; when the coal mines in Utah were put under martial law.

I learned much from those experiences; much which has caused me to give my best energies and thought to attempting to correct abuses and to advance the cause of the working man and for the benefit of the employer; to clear his fear of the resort to a strike.

Many things have come from the experiences of our Civil Liberty Committee. I do not have to recall for you the efforts which were made by certain employers and employer organizations to prevent labor's right to organize and to stop, if possible, labor and industry from bargaining collectively.

The hearings ran into over 76 big volumes. The strikes reviewed were some of the "sit-down" strikes, the Republic Steel and coal strikes, especially in Harlan County, Ky.

From the hearings came the impetus to present to the Senate the National Labor Relations Act and, in due course, after the National Labor Relations Act became law, to bring into existence what is now known as the Fair Labor Standards Act. The first, to protect labor; the second, to protect the workers in those fields which were not completely organized.

The Fair Labor Standards Act put a ceiling on hours and a floor under wages, and from that act comes now our national theory in regard to labor's rights as to maximum hours of employment and to minimum wages.

To persons whose experience does not go back before 1933, it is hard to understand the great struggles incident to bringing about what we call today "better conditions for working people" and "better mehods for industry." Out of it all has come social security, social security pensions, and now a great series of pension arrangements, private contracts, entered into between employers and employees.

America in 1950, especially in the theory and in the facts of industry-labor relations and labor's rights, is in reality a different country than it was in 1933. And the gains which have been made by labor are gains which have contributed greatly to our higher standard of living, enjoyed by all of the people of our country, and also to our better methods of living and working together.

All problems have not been solved, all problems will not be solved; but more and more the fundamental rights which have grown out of a recognition of man's civil liberties, have all been to the good and no one regrets them as far as Congress and the national laws are concerned.

In 1933 there was a great constitutional question as to whether the Federal Government should get into industry-labor relations. It was argued that that phase of our life was a phase which should be controlled by the separate States alone.

Railway labor had, of course, been recognized as being under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government because of the interstate commerce clause. Labor law in Congress was developed by two committees instead of just by one, as it is today.

All of the railway labor law, for example, was reported by a Labor Committee on Interstate Commerce, while other laws came out of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Now the Senate has seen fit to put all labor with which the Federal Government has to deal in the jurisdiction of but one committee, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the committee over which I now preside, as I did years ago over the Committee on Education and Labor.

The gains which have been made are great, indeed, but they are merely starters because as labor learns to develop its own resources and as management learns to develop its own resources and as management learns to understand that happy labor conditions develop greater production, and constant labor employment produces greater consumption, much happier communities and much more prosperous stores, trucking firms, manufacturers, and all sorts of business follow.

In the wake of the National Labor Relations Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Social Security Act, has followed, just as naturally as night follows day, the Full Employment Act.

Before 1933 the philosophy of the American people was pretty much a philosophy based upon the theory that men had to take care of themselves. That is a good philosophy in times that are good, when a man is able to take care of himself, able to get a job, and so forth.

In addition to that we heard that there was plenty of room at the top. That, too, is good philosophy, because no man succeeds in life if he lacks an initiative to do better and if he does not want to become an independent person, have a bank account, own a little bit of property and ultimately a home.

Those are the things that should characterize a real American citizen. The right to have and to hold is a good right, and the notion of being able to say, "this is mine," and to have respect for something which is someone else's, is the basis for our American private property and dollar democracy. We like them both and we want to preserve them, but we are sure that they can be preserved better if we can keep fully employed and if we can keep our country prosperous through full employment.

Therefore, since 1933, despite the fact that many said all that we were going to do was unconstitutional; and despite the fact that these laws have been tested in our courts, they have all been sustained.

We are now working on a new foundation and a new outlook. We have had half a generation with this new foundation and this new outlook and I believe that most of the people of America call what has been done, good. It all has to be developed. It isn't perfect by any means, but we are on the right track and the things which we are doing are based on good law, good economics, and good practice.

I look forward to the future with more firm belief in the basic characteristics of our Government and the full success of American democracy now that we have gotten rid of many of the abuses Americans had to face in the disastrous labor relations before 1933.

I trust that our outlook will be ever forward and that our accomplishments will be ever onward.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an address I was scheduled to make today before the National Federation of Republican Women's Clubs in Cleveland, Ohio, but which I was unable to deliver because of the importance of the legislation before the Senate. The address has been released and read to the members of the federation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam Chairman, members of the National Federation of Republican Women's Clubs, first of all I wish to bring you a hands across the continent greeting from the Republicans of California to those of our other 47 States. I am convinced that the people of California are going to reelect Governor Earl Warren and will send Congressman RICHARD NIXON to the Senate this November.

It is also with a great deal of pleasure that I come to the State of two of my friends and colleagues, ROBERT A. TAFT and JOHN BRICKER.

There is no job which is more important this year than the reelection of BOB TAFT. Wherever political courage and intellectual integrity are admired the service of ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, is acclaimed. Men and women throughout the Nation do not have to agree with him on every issue to know that his retention in the Senate is of great importance to the maintenance of the legislative arm of our Government as an independent legislative body free from political domination or intimidation from either the administration in power or from powerful forces on the outside.

Today I wish to speak frankly about the grave international situation we now face. All Americans, regardless of their partisan affiliation, must put their shoulders to the wheel in order to win the battle of Korea. The success we achieve may determine whether or not we are to have a free world of freemen. One of the reasons why so many people around the world admire Winston Churchill is that during "Britain's darkest hour" he dealt frankly with the people of his country. He treated them as adults and they responded as such, as free people always do if they have confidence in their leadership and their leadership has confidence in them.

Within the last year, two catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development (as announced by the President of the United States, September 23, 1949) and the establishment of the Soviet Communist regime in China.

Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the

most far-reaching influence. Both have set off chain reactions that have not yet run their full course.

Fifty years of friendly interest on the part of our Government and our people in a free and independent China and the overwhelming contribution made by our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Pacific during World War II gave us the opportunity for constructive action no nation had ever before possessed. We could have pioneered in exporting the ideals that inspired men who loved freedom everywhere following our own break away from colonial status.

This opportunity has been largely frittered away by a willful group of men in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department who had the backing of their superiors.

No such bankrupt policy could have been followed without the approval of the Secretary of State and no Secretary of State could have continued such a policy without the support of the President. Under the Constitution there can be no escape from the fact that ultimate responsibility rest there.

Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. It is no less destructive in China or Korea than it is in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, or Bulgaria. The pattern may differ slightly.

In Poland the opposition leader, Mikolajcazyk, was forced to flee. In Bulgaria, Petkov was hanged. In Rumania, the king was given a 2-hour ultimatum to change the government regardless of the constitution. In Czechoslovakia, Masaryk's life was forfeited when it became apparent that coalition with communism would not work.

In Europe, we have had a policy, bi-partisan in character, which the Congress and the country could understand.

In the formulation of the United Nations, the creation of the North Atlantic Pact and its implementation, in the development of the Economic Cooperation Administration legislation, Republicans and Democrats contributed to the working out of the policies involved. Basically, our aim was to help in the rehabilitation of a war-torn Europe, to restore strength to their economies and stability to their systems. It was to help the nations of Europe to live as free men in a free world.

There has been a considerable measure of success in our efforts and though some of the nations we seek to help have been slow in carrying their full share of the burden of mutual defense, the objective is a good one and its ultimate success is essential if the free way of life is to continue.

In the Far East there has been no such bi-partisan policy. The Republicans have not been consulted in the major decisions which led to the debacle which has taken place in that area of the world.

Our historic policy in support of a free and independent China (which means a non-Communist China) was first compromised at Yalta. That agreement was a violation of the "open door" policy of John Hay and of Woodrow Wilson's concept of "open covenants openly arrived at."

The Yalta agreement made Soviet domination of Manchuria and other border provinces inevitable. It made possible Chinese Communist domination of the balance of continental China and has opened the door to bringing the entire continent of Asia, with more than a billion people and vast resources into the orbit of international communism.

Following VJ-day, the representatives of our Department of State persistently tried to get the government of the Republic of China to form a coalition with the Communists.

One prominent Chinese official put it to me in Chungking last November in this way: "Senator, there can be no coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the beast."

When the Republic of China refused to take Communists into their government, we placed an embargo against the shipments of any arms or ammunition to the legal government of the country. While during those same months, the Soviet army of occupation, in Manchuria as the result of the Yalta agreement, was turning over to the Communist forces large amounts of captured Japanese war stocks.

The State Department on August 6, 1949, released the China white paper. All the blame was placed on the National Government, then with its back to the wall. It was apparently issued with the hope that our own part and share of responsibility might be overlooked.

That the National Government of China made mistakes, has had more than their share of Benedict Arnolds, and men who betrayed their trust needed no underscoring from us in the way and at the time it was done.

Our own history also has examples of men who have betrayed their trust from Cabinet Members down to ward bosses. We have also been plagued with racketeers, highwaymen, and five-percenters at various times.

The basic objective the United States should have kept constantly in mind was to preserve a free, independent, united non-Communist China. In the postwar illness of that nation, we prescribed that the strychnine of communism be taken.

In a very well written article in the January 7 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Joseph Alsop has this to say about State Department excuses as contained in the China white paper:

"But there is also one carefully concealed defect in the State Department argument. If you have kicked a drowning friend briskly in the face as he sank for the second and third times, you cannot later explain that he was doomed anyway because he was such a bad swimmer.

"The question that must be answered is not whether the Chinese did their best to save themselves, which they most certainly did not, the question is whether we did our best to save China.

"The answer to this question is contained in the strange, still secret inner history of our China policy. And this true history, for which the State Department could find no room in all the 1054 pages of the white paper, may be simply, if grimly, summarized.

"Throughout the fateful years in China, the American representatives there actively favored the Chinese Communists. They also contributed to the weakness, both political and military, of the National Government, and in the end they came close to offering China up to the Communists, like a trussed bird on a platter, over 4 years before the eventual Communist triumph."

There are strong indications that our State Department did nothing to discourage the British recognition which was finally given to the Chinese Communists on January 6, 1950.

On August 5, 1949, the State Department, by direction of Secretary Acheson, issued the China white paper, which had been compiled under the direction of Mr. Philip Jessup. At that time, the Republic of China held all of the country south of the Yangtze River. The publication of this document, at the time and in the manner that it was done, was the greatest blow to a friendly power ever given by this Nation. Its effect was to sabotage morale of the non-Communist Chinese, both military and civilian, in a way that international communism, with all its cleverness, had not been able to do. It undid in one ill-considered blow what more than 50 years of friendly interest by this Government and the American people had sought to build.

As long as the non-Communist Republic of China held the southern provinces of their country, there was no way for the Communists of southeast Asia to get resupplied in men and munitions from the Chinese Communist forces of Mao Tse-tung. When south China fell to the Communists, all of southeast Asia was placed in jeopardy. How long are the American people expected to tolerate the same fuzzy thinking that was exemplified by allowing Berlin and Vienna to be islands in a Russian area or territory?

Although the State Department was prepared to let the Republic of China go down the drain in August of 1949, the Congress of the United States was not. When the Arms Implementation Bill passed the Senate on September 23 last year, an amount of $75,000,000 was provided for the general area of China. The amount was arrived at by the combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, based on competent testimony that that sum would be needed in our effort to give effective aid to the Republic of China. Up until the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, not a single penny of this sum had been expended to rearm the forces of the Republic of China on the island of Formosa.

There had been allocations to help other nations in the general area of China. The record is clear that the Congress had provided the authorization of the funds. The responsibility for action or inaction in the supply of arms rests solely with the executive branch of the Government. Up until hostilities broke out in Korea on June 25 of this year, only $200 had been spent out of the approximate $10,000,000 allocated for Korea. The balance was on order or unobligated. For the Republic of China, nothing had been spent or allocated out of the funds provided by the Congress.

For a long time, the Pacific flank of our defenses has been undernourished. In the arms-implementation bill of 1949, providing for $1,314,010,000 less than 8 percent of the amount was provided for the Far East. This amount was placed in the bill over the early and strenuous opposition by the administration, and had this amendment not been placed in the bill by the Congress, the amount of arms implementation aid to the Far East would have been less than 1½ percent of the total—this despite the fact that our responsible commander in the Far East had constantly pointed out over a period of years the dangers inherent in the overwhelming of China by communism and the urgent need for strengthening our defenses in Japan and the Far East.

The Department of State, in its bulletin of June 3, 1945, volume 12, No. 310, had this to say about Formosa:

"Strategic factors greatly influence the problem of Formosa. With the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position. Formosa is separated from the continent of Asia by 100 miles; from the main island of the Philippines by 200 miles; and from Kyushu, the nearest home island of Japan, by 700 miles. Flying distance from military airports in Formosa is 559 miles to Manila, 410 miles to Canton, 428 miles to Shanghai, 1,290 miles to Tokyo. Formosa, larger than the State of Maryland, stands in a strategic relation to the China coast comparable for the United States to an imaginary island of such size 100 miles off the coast of North Carolina, 400 miles from New York City.

"Every point on the entire coast of China falls within a radius of 1,100 miles. A radius of 2,000 miles includes Burma, Singapore, Borneo, Guam, and Japan, including Hokkaido.

"Formosa has two important ports: Takao and Heelung. The main naval base is located in the Pescadores at Balo, which, in the hands of the Japanese, has been the most important base for Japanese aggression in the Southwest Pacific and for preparation of the present war."

Despite this prior recognition by the State Department itself and despite the fact that our responsible military commander in the Far East had made clear that Formosa's falling into unfriendly hands would jeopardize the defense line of Japan-Okinawa-Philip-

pines, which views were concurred in by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the following amazing and disturbing news story was published on January 3, 1950:

"TOKYO.—The United States State Department has notified its attachés that the loss of Formosa, island redoubt of the Chinese Nationalists, to the Communists was to be anticipated."

"The Department said the public must be sold on the idea that the island is of no strategic value in order to prevent the loss of prestige at home and abroad.

"A document containing the Department's instructions on how to erase the false impressions of those pro-Nationalists interested in a save-Formosa drive has been circulated here, it can be disclosed today.

"The document was prepared by the State Department's Public Affairs Area Policy Advisory Staff, and was dated December 23. The word was sent to members of the Department and of some other Government offices.

"The document said there are pro-Nationalists [principally in the United States] who consider Formosa a redoubt in which the Government could survive, and who tend to create an impression that the United States is delinquent if it fails to save Formosa.

"It said there are groups in the United States 'who are inclined to be critical of the United States for failure to act to prevent the loss of the island to the Communists.' This is 'largely because of a mistaken popular conception of its strategic importance to United States defense in the Pacific.'"

It is apparent that the Secretary of State on December 23, 1949, had determined to write off Formosa in the same way that the China white paper had attempted to write off the mainland of China.

It was State Department policy to prepare the American public for the movement of international communism off the Asiatic land mass out into the Pacific Ocean. This despite the fact that the State Department and the President had military advice to the contrary which showed that Formosa in unfriendly hands—there can be no doubt that the control by Communist forces would be unfriendly hands—would be detrimental to the security of this Nation.

Yet, this continued to be the stated policy of the President and the State Department until after the overt aggression against Korea on June 24 our time, June 25 Korea time.

The text of the President's statement of June 27 contains the following language:

"In these circumstances the occupation of Formosa by Communist forces would be a direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to United States forces performing their lawful and necessary functions in that area.

"Accordingly I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa.

"As a corollary of this action, I am calling upon the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. The Seventh Fleet will see that this is done. The determination of the future status of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan, or consideration by the United Nations."

Members of Congress, as well as the public, have been disturbed by the obvious movements that were being made both before and since the Korean invasion to accept the Communist regime of China as a permanent member of the Security Council. This has been one of the Russian demands. In order to force her views upon the other members of the United Nations the Soviet Union walked out of the deliberations of the Security Council and the other United Nations agencies in an attempt to force the Soviet will on other member states. The Soviet Union continued its walk-out in the Security Council until, under the utterly unrealistic alphabetical rotation system, the Soviet's turn to preside arrived on August 1 at a critical point in the world's history.

The Soviet Union ordered their delegate back to the Security Council in order to preside so that he could obstruct the action of the law-abiding nations in resisting overt aggression. So that the Soviet Union and international communism would have a propaganda sounding board; in order to attempt once again to force the seating of the Communist regime of China in place of the representative of the Republic of China. In addition, the Soviet Union may be preparing for aggression elsewhere and may want to be in position to veto Security Council action.

Yet with the clear record before us that appeasement is but surrender on the installment plan, the State Department has continued to take a weak attitude—in regard to the question of the representation of China in the United Nations.

At this very moment our position is that while our own representative will vote against the unseating of the representative of the Republic of China and the subsequent seating of the Communist representative, we will not make any all-out attempt to influence others to support our position and we will not use our veto.

What is needed now more than anything else is a clarification of the issues.

As to China, we should make it clear that we have no intention of recognizing the Communist regime in that country.

It is equally important that we support the representative of the Republic of China in the United Nations.

The Government of the Republic is temporarily on the island of Formosa. The Government of the Republic is friendly to the United States and is a strong supporter of the Charter of the United Nations, and the action taken by the Security Council against the Communist aggression in Korea. The Republic of China's representative has voted 100 percent for effective United Nations action in Korea, and has consistently opposed the obstructionist tactics of Malik, the Soviet representative. The Republic of China was the first nation outside of the United States to offer ground troops and to date has offered the largest number, some 30,000. The fact that we have not accepted the offer does not lessen this substantial support for collective security against aggression.

Under the United Nations Charter seven votes are required to pass a resolution. Had it not been for the vote of the Republic of China on the Security Council the prompt United Nations action which was so vital to success would have been delayed at a time when 1 day might have been the difference between ultimate victory and defeat.

Is all this to be ignored to give Malik and the Soviet Union another obstructionist on the Security Council? Under the rotation system, will Mao Tse-tung as well as Stalin have a saboteur at the very heart of the world's collective security system? Instead of one arsonist heading the fire department, are we to double the number?

On August 7, at Peterborough, N. H., Owen Lattimore said that a Communist China delegation should be seated in the United Nations. Does this far-eastern expert still advise our State Department? Do we check communism in Asia by surrendering to it?

In contrast to the support given to the UN Korean position by the Republic of China let us examine the record of India. I have a high regard for Nehru and wish the people of that great country well in the multitudinous problems they face. Let us look at the facts.

India, on December 30, 1949, recognized the Communist regime as the government of China. It was the first large power to give Mao Tse-tung such prestige.

There have been a number of crucial votes in the Security Council since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. These were:

First, June 25, 1950, called for immediate cessation of hostilities, for North Korean forces to immediately withdraw north of the thirty-eighth parallel, and for members of the United Nations to support the world organization and to refrain from giving assistance to the Communist North Korean aggressors. The vote was 9 to 0, with the Soviet Union absent and Yugoslavia abstaining. Those voting for the first resolution were: The United States, Great Britain, France, the Republic of China, India, Egypt, Ecuador, Cuba, and Norway.

Second, June 27, 1950, resolution called for member states of United Nations to oppose aggression in Korea. The vote was 7 to 1. The Soviet Union was absent. India and Egypt abstained. Yugoslavia voted in opposition. The minimum majority needed in order for the resolution to pass on this date was furnished by the United States, Great Britain, France, the Republic of China, Ecuador, Cuba, and Norway.

Third, August 1, 1950, Soviet Representative Malik returned to the Security Council as presiding officer under rotation system. He ruled that the representative of the Republic of China did not represent China and could not take part in deliberations. Malik was overruled by a vote of 8 to 3.

For Malik's ruling: Soviet Union, India, and Yugoslavia. Against his ruling: The United States, Great Britain, France, the Republic of China, Ecuador, Egypt, Cuba, and Norway.

Fourth, August 3, 1950, Malik resolution to place American resolution against Korean aggression in last place on the agenda. Vote was 7 to 2 against Malik. Egypt and Yugoslavia abstained. For Malik's ruling were the Soviet Union and India. Against his ruling were the United States, Great Britain, France, the Republic of China, Ecuador, Cuba, and Norway.

Fifth, the second vote on this date was to place the complaint of aggression upon the Republic of Korea at the top of the agenda.

The vote was 8 to 1. On this vote India and Yugoslavia abstained. The Soviet Union voted "no." Voting in favor of this action were the United States, Great Britain, France, the Republic of China, Ecuador, Cuba, Egypt, and Norway.

Sixth, the third vote was to remove from the agenda the Soviet Union's proposal to discuss the admission of Communist China. The vote was 5 to 5, with Egypt abstaining. Supporting the Malik position were the Soviet Union, India, Yugoslavia, Great Britain, and Norway. Opposing the Soviet position were the United States, France, the Republic of China, Cuba, and Ecuador.

Seventh, the fourth and final vote on this day was on the Soviet propaganda resolution entitled "Peaceful settlement of the Korean question."

The vote was 7 to 3 against. Yugoslavia abstained. For the Soviet resolution were the Soviet Union, India, and Egypt. Against were the United States, France, the Republic of China, Cuba, Ecuador, Great Britain, and Norway.

Mr. President, the record clearly shows that on seven crucial votes since the Korean invasion India has voted with the free nations on the roll call once, has abstained twice, and has voted with the Soviet Union four times. I submit that this is not a good batting average. To the contrary, the Republic of China has voted with the free nations of the world 100 percent of the time.

International communism will not be stopped in Europe, in the Far East, in the Middle East, or at the gates of India by passive resistance; nor will the appeasement of the Soviet Union in the United Nations at the expense of the Republic of China assure the peace any more than did Munich. As I have

said before, appeasement, then and now, is but surrender on the installment plan.

Yet, despite the mounting evidence of the fact that we are dealing with a potential twentieth-century Genghis Khan, there are those who would put off until another day the facing of the realities of the present.

Our Pacific flank is no less vital to our security than is the European flank to ourselves and our North Atlantic allies. They must recognize that what jeopardizes our national security weakens them as well.

It is never profitable to abandon your friends to please your enemies when the record is clear that your enemies have announced that your world and theirs cannot exist on the same planet. It is no more profitable to do it, in my opinion, to kowtow the fence straddlers who by attempting to please both sides generally end up by pleasing neither.

Now is the time for the President of the United States, in my judgment, to make clear to the free people of the world that while the Soviet stockpile of atomic weapons can do considerable damage today, their potential will be catastrophic 2 or 3 years from now.

We should not delay in giving the defenders of Formosa the tools with which to defend themselves, because, as we have pointed out before today, it is the judgment of our responsible commanders that if the island of Formosa falls into unfriendly hands—and Communist hands are unfriendly—it breaks the American defense position from Japan to Okinawa to the Philippines and throws the defense of the United States back on the Coast States, California, Oregon, and Washington, with perhaps a triangle at Hawaii.

It was the lack of such equipment in the hands of the Republic of Korea which encouraged the aggression by the Communist forces.

The mistake of too little and too late which we saw in Korea, should not be repeated on the island of Formosa.

We should make it clear that the choice of widening the conflict is in their hands and not in ours. We want no war but we will not shirk from accepting it if that be the choice of the Soviet Union directly or through its satellites in Asia or in Europe.

We are determined to restore the moral leadership we lost at Yalta and, to that end, in view of the Soviet violations of their agreements we should forthwith denounce that product of the Crimean Conference of 1945.

My reason for stressing Yalta is that it seems to me that it was at Yalta that we abandoned our moral leadership of the world. We surrendered to the Soviet Government things which were not ours to surrender. In effect we betrayed a wartime ally, the Republic of China, which had been a long-time friend and ally of the United States. In effect we did much to permit Poland to go behind the iron curtain, and it will perhaps be a long time before they will see freedom again. It seems to me that is the starting point for us to reassert our moral leadership by denouncing the Yalta agreement.

It should be made clear that aggression is not profitable and the forces of the United Nations will clear not only all the areas south of the thirty-eighth parallel of Communist aggressors but that the combined forces of law and order will redeem the pledges of the great powers made at the Cairo Conference and subsequent conferences, and the United Nations that all of Korea will be free and independent. To that end the United Nations forces should occupy Korea clear up to the Manchurian border and will stay there until free and democratic elections can be held in all parts of the Republic of Korea and internal security provided. Any other potential aggressor will be on notice.

Let us stop allowing the agent of the Kremlin to stay in a position where he can sabotage and obstruct the first, and perhaps last, chance the world has had for the law-abiding nations to protect themselves from overt aggression.

When peace has finally been established under a system of international law and order, let us, as Americans, determine to follow the Theodore Roosevelt doctrine of "speak softly and carry a big stick" rather than later concepts of speaking loudly while carrying a feather duster.

Had the United States Congress or the American people known about the betrayal of China at Yalta I do not believe they would have sanctioned that agreement; had they been informed of the Wedemeyer report of September 19, 1947 on China, I believe that they would have insisted that steps be taken to prevent that vast and important country from going behind the iron curtain; of historic interest is the fact that this 1947 report was not made available to either the Congress or the American people until the China white paper was published on August 5, 1949, almost 2 years later; if the Wedemeyer report on Korea, made at the same time as the one on China had been made available the Congress and the country would have insisted that steps be taken to augment the constabulary force we provided for the Republic of Korea.

Copies of this report have not been released even though they have been requested by Members of the Senate. The climax of this whole effort to suppress the facts and to bolster the State Department's bankrupt policy in China came to a head last Monday when the administration "gagged" Gen. Douglas MacArthur relative to his views on the importance of Formosa.

Action by the administration in directing General MacArthur to withdraw his message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars relative to the importance of Formosa strongly indicates that Secretary of State Acheson and Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, are now preparing for another Munich, with the Republic of China and the island of Formosa as the pawns.

For the past several years our responsible military men have been required by the administration to support budget requests before the Congress which their professional training warned them were not adequate to the safety of this Nation.

Now once again the administration is "gagging" a patriotic soldier who sees the danger facing our Nation in the Far East and wants to warn our people before it is too late.

It now appears that the only way in which the truth will be known is for the American people to elect a Congress that will make some real investigations without fear or favor and will be prepared to recommend impeachment proceedings where the facts justify.

It is now obvious that those who have a vested interest in our past mistakes and bankrupt far eastern policy intend to pursue their way as far as they are allowed to by the Congress and the citizens of this country. A solemn referendum by the American people on our Far Eastern policy—past, present, and future—is now an urgent necessity.

This Congress must provide whatever is necessary in the way of economic legislation or military appropriations. But when, to quote the Declaration of Independence, "with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor" to bring this effort to a successful conclusion, let us also determine that never again will we permit our diplomats to lose what our fighting men have won.

Program for the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by William A. Boyle, president of district 27 of the United Mine Workers of America and assistant to President John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers of America, at the fifth biennial convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, in the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., on August 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

UMWA LEADER CALLS FOR IMPROVED PROGRAM FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, members of this great humanitarian organization, the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, it is, indeed, an honor and privilege to have the opportunity to appear here today representing the United Mine Workers of America. I extend to you the warm and fraternal greetings of our international President John L. Lewis, Vice President Thomas Kennedy, and Secretary-Treasurer John Owens, and the membership of our great union.

The United Mine Workers of America, like you, have experienced the problems, the fears, and heartaches that confront the physically handicapped, and, therefore, pay tribute to your worthy purposes and splendid accomplishments.

The coal industry is the basic industry of the American economy and the industry upon which every sector of our economy is dependent. As you know, coal mining has long been recognized as the most hazardous occupation with the highest toll of deaths and accidents, occupational sickness, and disease of any group of workers in the Nation.

It long ago became apparent that only through collective action could the coal miners of America curtail the number of deaths and accidents in the mining industry and better the lot of the workers. As a result of a bitter struggle with all odds against them, the coal miners finally succeeded in organizing themselves into a strong and aggressive union, which is now 60 years old, and is dedicated to the one objective of serving its membership.

The United Mine Workers pays special tribute to the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped. You have faced your problems with a constructive program. You have not given up hope and, instead, tackled your problems in the good old American way. You did what the mine workers did. You went out and organized yourselves.

The mine workers know your problems. We know that there are 28,000,000 American citizens who are physically handicapped. We know that included in this vast group are thousands upon thousands of coal miners.

I want at this point to pay special honor to Mr. Paul A. Strachan, your able president, who despite his own handicap, has persevered in his determination to bring justice, opportunity, and equal rights to all those with physical impairments.

Since you were founded 9 years ago you have done, through your organized efforts—

and only through your organized efforts, as a voluntary association of human beings—what would have been impossible to accomplish working as individuals.

I have learned from your president and from reading your dynamic and persuasive literature of the improved conditions and benefits that have accrued to you through your united efforts.

You have succeeded in bringing to the attention of the American people the one all-important fact: A physically handicapped person is able and willing to work and he is a good reliable worker.

This is an undeniable fact proven by statistics. Employers all over this great Nation of ours are being convinced of this fact as a result of the untiring work of your organization. Your job has only begun but you have already helped to overcome the prejudice that exists in the minds of many employers. This prejudice was, to a great extent, based on what the employers regarded as a practical business viewpoint and an ignorance of the fact that physically handicapped persons were good workers.

From our own long and bitter struggle, the United Mine Workers know what prejudice and misunderstanding can mean. We know that the endless task of bringing better lives to our members can sometimes seem hopeless. But through organization we are fighting just as you physically handicapped are battling for improved conditions.

The efforts of your organization are particularly noteworthy insofar as you have succeeded in causing the United States Congress and the President to declare that the employment of the physically handicapped, rather than charity to them, is a matter of public policy.

You have succeeded in directing the attention of the American public to your problems.

The mine workers' organization has been in the front lines in all the battles for social advancement down through the years. They have been in the forefront not only in behalf of their own membership; but by their very leadership, they have been the shock troops in the cause of a better life for all Americans who work for a living.

We are intensely proud of our accomplishments in the welfare field in the past few years.

To quote our president, John L. Lewis, "There was a time, as a matter of fact for some hundred of years, both in our country and in Europe, when little attention was paid to the social welfare requirements affecting the coal mines."

Mr. Lewis has noted that "during all this period, the productive years of the coal miners were utilized until their energy and life blood was taken by the industry."

"While they became disabled through the illnesses incident to their calling or the hazards of their occupations or from the ravages of old age, their services were dispensed with, their income cut off, and they could live or die according to the circumstances which attended them."

Hundreds of thousands of coal miners have died premature deaths by violence in the mines, or from injuries, sickness, and maiming as a result of underground accidents.

Those who were able to eke out a bare existence did so under circumstances of appalling poverty and tragedy.

Who was to take responsibility for these men? Society seemed content to accept their services and the products of their labor and forget the obligations they owed these men.

The coal operators gave lip service to the promotion of safety, but then maintained it was not their responsibility to care for the sick and injured. These men were no longer employees of the industry, the coal operators said.

These conditions did not change until the United Mine Workers of America, through aggressive organization, became strong enough to compel some attention to these problems. One of the great advances pioneered by our union was in 1946, when the first welfare and retirement fund was established by contract by the United Mine Workers.

Just as your promotion of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was a declaration of principle and public policy, so was the establishment of the first miners' welfare fund a declaration of principle and policy.

The 1946 wage agreement between the union and the United States Government which was then in legal control of the coal mines, stated in unequivocal language that the employers in the coal industry owed an obligation to the men who go down into the pits.

The principle, stated in simple human terms, was that the coal miners no longer may be used up, crippled beyond repair, and then thrown on a human scrap heap to live or die subject to the charity of the community or the inadequate contributions of the State.

In one of the most important statements of policy ever made by our organization, President Lewis said:

"The United Mine Workers of America has assumed over the years that the cost of caring for the human equity in the coal industry is inherently as valid as the cost of replacement of mining machinery, or the cost of paying taxes, or the cost of paying interest indebtedness, or the cost of any other factor incident to the production of a ton of coal for consumers' bins."

In your work in behalf of the physically handicapped, we could extend that principle to apply to all disabled persons. In other words, as a matter of basic American philosophy, industry has an obligation to all the people of this great country of ours. By the fact that the American people encourage industry to prosper under our free-enterprise system, so in turn American industry has a basic social obligation to all the American people. That obligation most certainly extends to the physically handicapped. And through the good works of your organization, American industry is beginning to realize this obligation.

Your organization has adopted this principle through your promotion of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. You are promoting the principle that physically handicapped persons do not want to and must not become community liabilities and social burdens. You do not want to be charges of the state.

You know that productive work is the best therapy for a handicapped person. American industry must realize that productive work for all the people is this Nation's best insurance against communism or any other form of statism.

In the traditional American way, the Government must aid and encourage. In the case of the handicapped, the Government has the obligation of giving practical and adequate aid to rehibilitation.

The United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund cannot be expected to assume the whole burden of rehabilitation. Our fund can and does care for the medical, health, and hospitalization needs of injured coal miners. It takes care of much of the tremendous financial burden that suddenly descends on these disabled men.

But then it is the duty and obligation of the Government to provide an adequate rehabilitation program. This program must be designed to train the disabled for new and productive jobs that they are capable of handling. A paraplegic coal miner obviously cannot work in the mines again. But he can work. Unless he is to become a burden on society, he must be trained and given the opportunity to work.

There is, however, opposition to the attainment of this objective of rehabilitation and productive work for the disabled. There are those who claim that such a program will mean a heavier tax burden and that the increased taxes will curtail business.

This contention has no economic basis. Certainly, an adequate rehabilitation program, with the Federal Government, the States, industry and business, the labor movement and such groups as yours working together, will cost money. But it has been proved statistically time and time again that over the years a disabled worker, who has been rehabilitated and engages in productive work, returns to the economic system many times over the cost of his rehabilitation.

We know that there is not enough money or sufficient personnel, at the present time, to do the job that must be done. We know workmen's compensation and rehabilitation legislation is inadequate both from the standpoint of benefits and from the basic approach of this legislation to the whole problem we are discussing.

We must first raise the necessary money and the additional required personnel and then, most important of all, endeavor to coordinate workmen's compensation and rehabilitation.

Although the workmen's compensation benefits are assumed to be adequate, little is gained if the disabled person receiving compensation remains a charge of the community. We must then rehabilitate that disabled person, teach him a new and productive job, and then assist him in getting a job. He will do the rest. He will do a good job. He will produce. He will become a whole human being and an asset to society again.

This is the goal for which your organization must strive. It will not be an easy task to accomplish. We will be confronted with many obstacles as well as selfish motives and misunderstanding. But through the cooperative efforts of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped and the United Mine Workers of America and other groups who are vitally interested in the problems of the physically handicapped, we shall accomplish our objective.

Although I have told you something of the welfare and retirement fund of the United Mine Workers of America, I would like to state further that the fund was first established by a contract between the Federal Government and the union. This was because the coal operators in contract negotiations of 1945 and 1946 absolutely refused to accept the basic principle that industry owes an obligation to its employees. After prolonged negotiations, the members of the United Mine Workers of America took the only step open to union men who face a stone wall of resistance. The coal miners laid down their tools and left the pits. The coal operators continued their resistance to our humane proposals. The Government then intervened and the union sat down at the bargaining table with the Government and the matter was settled insofar as the basic principle was concerned.

We had just begun to fight. We had succeeded in formulating the basic principle but the problem of implementing the principle had yet to be solved. The following year in 1947 the welfare fund was still being hamstrung by technicalities, with opposition of the operators and the legal mumbo-jumbo of their corps of high-priced lawyers, the union again bargained with the operators on the matter of a welfare fund. Let me say that it was not an easy fight. We persevered and were victorious. Finally in the 1947 National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement, we succeeded in getting the coal operators to accept the basic principle of the welfare fund. They agreed to pay into the fund a sum of 10 cents on each ton of

bituminous coal mined. The agreement with the Government had provided for only 5 cents a ton which was insufficient to satisfy the financial obligations coincident to the alleviation of the distress and suffering of the coal miners. But 5 cents was better than nothing.

In 1948 the mine workers again triumphed and the operators agreed to pay a sum of 20 cents a ton into the welfare fund. At the present time a 10 months' battle that started in May 1949 and ended March 1950, we are for the first time since the welfare fund was established in 1946, in a relatively stabilized position. We receive 30 cents a ton for each ton of coal mined, and we now engage in the tremendous task of caring for the aged, the sick, the disabled, and the injured of America's basic industry.

Thus, just as it will be a problem to inaugurate the program of compensation and rehabilitation, it was also a problem to obtain our welfare fund. First the principle has to be established and secondly, the means of financing the program must be devised.

Under the new wage agreement the United Mine Workers have resumed payments of pension to aged coal miners. We have resumed our medical, health, and hospitalization program to care for the disabled victims of this most hazardous of all industries.

Briefly, this is the administrative set-up of our program: The welfare fund is under the supervision of a three-man board of trustees consisting of Mr. Lewis, chairman and representative of the union, Mr. Charles Owen, who represents the coal operators, and Miss Josephine Roche, director of the fund and the third trustee.

Under Miss Roche's direction the various services of the fund, such as pension service and the medical, health, and hospitalization service are once again working on the human problems of the coal industry.

The medical, health, and hospitalization service has 10 area medical offices situated in strategic cities in the more than 25 coal-mining States in America. The chief medical officer and the man in charge of these 10 offices is Dr. Warren Draper, former Deputy Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and a major general in World War II in charge of the public-health branch at Allied headquarters in Europe.

Each of these ten area medical offices of the welfare fund is under the direction of a doctor especially trained in public health work. It is his duty to see that the medical, health, and hospitalization work of the welfare fund functions smoothly and effectively in his geographic area.

The fund does not employ its own doctors nor does it have its own hospitals. On these matters the area medical officer works in cooperation with local doctors, medical societies and hospitals.

The local unions of the United Mine Workers of America serve as the local representatives or agents of the welfare fund. That is to say, the locals have their own welfare officers who are employed full time in the mines. These local union welfare officers handle the routine work of accepting and processing applications for aid from the welfare fund. This assures an expeditious manner of assuring proper care for disabled and injured brothers. Incidentally, because the members of the local unions perform this work on a voluntary basis, the fund has been able to keep its administrative costs at a minimum. The money is used for what it was intended—to care for the sick and the aged and injured of the coal industry.

The fund makes arrangements with hospitals throughout the United States to care for the specialized needs of such victims of the industry as the paraplegics, and those suffering from arthritis and silicosis.

I might point out right here that the medical program for silicotic coal miners in the anthracite, or hard coal fields of eastern Pennsylvania, has, for the first time, given the medical profession the opportunity and the money to carry on adequte research for treatment and cure of the hard coal miners' crippling disease—anthracosilicosis or miner's asthma. The anthracite health and welfare fund, a companion fund to the bituminous coal miners' welfare and retirement fund, has allocated well over a half million dollars for this work.

Twenty-five percent of the anthracite coal miners of this country are victims of this disease. No cure has yet been discovered, but we have a treatment that enables these men to continue working at productive jobs, instead of slowly choking to death from the effects of the silica rock with which they must come in contact each day of their working lives.

Even in the light of the development of these terrific advances in medical treatment which were fostered by the United Mine Workers of America, there is considerable progress to be made. From 1930—just 20 years ago—to 1947, 23,295 men lost their lives in coal-mine accidents. And the appalling total of 1,145,786 men were injured. The odds that a coal miner will survive his occupation are horrifying, for the record clearly reveals that every man who works in a coal mine will be statistically killed or injured every 6 years.

Just a month or two ago the Federal Bureau of Mines reported that only 23 of the Nation's coal mines were found free last year of violations of the Federal Mine Safety Code—23 mines out of 7,000 coal mines operating in America.

The fight for mine safety is a never-ending battle that the union must wage. We have repeatedly advocated the passage of Federal legislation which would give the Federal inspectors enforcement powers, that is, legislation that would make coal operators liable for conditions in their mines. The United Mine Workers has not succeeded completely in the passage of Federal legislation. However, we will continue to concentrate on this fight and, even when we succeed, in the passage of legislation, we will continue to fight for its enforcement.

Meanwhile, through cooperation with such groups as the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, the United Mine Workers of America will continue its struggle for the assurance of adequate care for not only the disabled in its own ranks but all disabled and physically handicapped persons.

I think it's time that we reminded the Congress of its own position on this matter.

Let me quote to you the official position of the Seventy-eighth Congress in the Senate and House committee reports which preceded enactment of the Barden-La Follette amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920.

This is what the Congress said and it certainly fits right in with our position:

"From the long-range point of view there is no question but that the problem of disability is a problem which can be met only by large expenditures of public money. The very fact that a person who is normally a breadwinner is disabled often raises a relief problem as to him and his dependents.

"From the viewpoint of both Federal and State treasuries, and of the disabled persons themselves, experience has demonstrated that the best as well as the most economical approach for meeting the situation is an appropriate program of vocational rehabilitation.

"Where a disabled person may be made fit for employment, through rehabilitation, and become a tax producer rather than a tax consumer, it would seem poor economy to deny him these necessary services. This is the dollars-and-cents justification of the program."

So let's make our next goal the achievement of a coordinated compensation and rehabilitation program for all physically handicapped Americans.

Expansion of Overseas Educational Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, about a week ago, in response to a radio broadcast I had made concerning the Voice of America, I received a letter from Mr. Carl K. Dellmuth, of Harrisburg, Pa. This letter, Mr. President, not only expresses wholehearted approval and support for a louder Voice of America, but also outlines in considerable detail methods by which more effective use can be made of the program. Mr. Dellmuth has traveled extensively in Europe and his thoughts about this very vital program come from actual experience with peoples of other nations.

After reading the letter I believed that it should be inserted into the Appendix of the RECORD, and I asked Mr. Dellmuth's permission to do so. This permission has been granted, and I now ask unanimous consent that this very fine letter be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Harrisburg, Pa., August 22, 1950.

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: May I take this opportunity of supporting your recent utterances on the need for expanding our overseas educational program through the Voice of America. Nothing in my judgment could be a more timely project at this moment of unbelievable international misunderstanding. In fact we should have measured the problem more accurately years ago.

Last summer I returned home after a year of overseas travel with my family during which period we lived and visited in parts of 17 countries on five continents. As a consequence we harbor certain definite feelings on this subject, a few of which I would like to record for what they may be worth to those of you who are guiding the destiny of this gigantic project.

1. Do you agree that the label educational program carries a more palatable connotation than propaganda or psychological warfare?

2. The anti-Communist approach, however plausible, seems defensive in character. Let us not forget the pro-American angle to our story. Thus like a good football team a good offense becomes our best defense. We must sell America with an even greater force than we expose the weakness of communism.

3. Aim the educational efforts at the man on the street. So far we have touched scarcely more than the top brass.

4. Don't forget to further interpret America to our nominal allies. In the present struggle of ideologies those nations who choose to follow our leadership must first

comprehend the American way of life. Without this understanding and respect their support will be superficial and restrained rather than sincere and enthusiastic.

5. In a material way we are the richest of all nations. Wealth seldom breeds respect. It often leads to jealousy. Merely to say or to imply that we are rich is to overlook the more engaging fact of how we have acquired our riches.

6. Let us try to correct the prevalent overseas impression that most Americans are gangsters, Hollywood artists, or millionaires. Project the American story from "Crossroads USA" rather than from Times Square.

7. Our story must be told with a sincere undercurrent of humility. It should be aimed at winning friends in a simple and interesting way.

8. Among foreigners the impression is all too widespread that Americans are braggarts who consider their way the only way. Try to draw parallels between the American way and the traditions of those nations whose support we are cultivating. For example, we are very like the Greeks because we each pay a high premium on individualism. Australians and Americans get on together because of the similarity of our early histories and because our senses of humor are practically identical, etc.

9. Prepare for a sustained educational program. To date we have made only sporadic and poorly conceived attempts at improving our relations with overseas neighbors. This time the program must be long range and sustained if it is to be lasting in its effect.

10. In one sense we will get little support without sympathetic understanding. Cultivate, therefore, a certain amount of sympathy. Let the other fellow hear about some of our problems. He will like us the better for it.

11. Let us get down to brass tacks and develop a sound public relations policy for our United States Government offices abroad. Likewise we sorely need qualified public relations personnel in each of the foreign countries.

12. Consider a plan for briefing the thousands of Americans who are traveling abroad. The indiscretion of a single tourist may neutralize the constructive efforts of a hundred others.

At a time when we are spending so much of our energy and wealth to defend the American way of life it seems entirely logical that we should consider investing a fraction more to interpret America to those who allegedly are our friends but who in reality wonder what we really are. Good luck in your endeavors.

Sincerely,

CARL K. DELLMUTH.

A Practical Approach to Local Long-Range Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an important address dealing with the subject of local long range community planning, delivered by Mr. Bertram M. Gross before the Virginia Citizens Planning Association, Natural Bridge, Va., August 5, 1950.

At a time when so much public attention is necessarily centered upon national and international events, it is important that we should not overlook the needs of planning programs at the local community level. The address of Mr. Gross contains some valuable suggestions on this subject.

I am advised by the Public Printer that this material will make 2⅓ pages in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $191.34.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO LOCAL LONG-RANGE PLANNING

(By Bertram M. Gross, member of the Arlington County Planning Commission and chairman of the commission's committee on the 6-year plan; member of the Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission and chairman of the commission's committee on long-term planning; executive secretary of the President's Council of Economic Advisers)

Many things have happened since those free and easy days a few months ago when a group of far-sighted Virginia citizens first came together to organize this association and lay plans for this meeting.

Since then the Republic of Korea has been invaded, American troops, planes, and ships have gone into battle, and steps have been taken on the home front to expand productive capacity and defense production, cut down on less essential activities, and prevent a run-away inflation.

The eyes of America are now focused upon the battle front across the seas and upon the leaders in the Nation's Capital.

In one town and county after another where citizens have joined together to plan the future of their local communities the question is being asked, "Shall we continue as usual at a time when, because of military necessity, so much must be decided through Federal planning in Washington? Is there still any place for local planning?"

As one man's answer, I humbly submit that we must not continue our planning activities as usual. I suggest that under the new and emerging circumstances the role of local planning is tenfold what it was 6 months ago. We must now put more effort, more time, more initiative, and more courage into local planning activities than ever before.

A few weeks ago I was over at the Institute of Public Affairs at Charlottesville and there I heard a hard-headed University of Virginia professor suggest that we could not win the war against communism in Asia by military operations alone; that we could lose the cold war unless we learned how to operate at the level of village life in China, India, the Malayan Peninsula, and the other underdeveloped regions of the world and give the villagers and peasants a vision of a better way of life.

Now if it is true that we can gain strength through winning friends in the villages of Asia, it is also true that we can strengthen our economy, our political institutions, and our moral fiber by sound planning in the townships, counties, and cities of America.

Local planning is no longer a hothouse flower remote from the realities of the world around us. It is no longer a process by which a handful of architects or engineers sit in an ivory tower drawing fancy maps that no one pays much attention to and few can understand.

Local planning is a way of getting some of the things we need as a foundation for business enterprise and as an underpinning for the American home and family life. It is a way of recognizing that we can never get everything we want as fast as we want it, of deciding between the more urgent and the less urgent, and of doing these things without allowing the limitations of today to blind us to the emerging needs of the future.

Local planning holds forth the last best hope for reviving the Jeffersonian spirit of local initiative. Through it we can strengthen local self-government, render undue concentration of power in State government unnecessary, and facilitate the more efficient functioning of State government in its proper sphere.

Through it we can avoid excessive reliance on Washington, thereby developing conditions under which necessary Federal activities can be more efficiently and more economically performed.

Above all, local planning is a way of giving the plain people of the country a chance to participate in matters affecting their destiny. Through it, homeowners and tenants, merchants and professional people, manual workers and white-collar workers can widen their horizons and make a valued contribution to the America of the future.

America is too vast a country to be run, if anyone should ever so desire, by some centralized bureaucracy. Many of our great economic problems are so vast that when viewed nationally they almost defy diagnosis. When they are viewed locally as well, it becomes possible to think both of diagnosis and therapy.

But they can be viewed locally in a constructive fashion only by long-term local planning. A perfect example of this is to be found in the area of civil defense. We learned during World War II that the functions of civil defense could be handled properly only through local action. I believe we are learning now that local civil-defense activities can be properly developed only if based upon a strong underpinning of local long-term planning.

With these things in mind, therefore, I should like to talk briefly about how long-term planning has come into being in one Virginia community, list eight points that will serve to describe this process in detail, and say a few words about the virtue of making mistakes and having disagreements.

HOW THE ARLINGTON 6-YEAR PLAN CAME INTO BEING

Some people still think of Arlington as little more than a place where the Unknown Soldier is buried or where a few suburban dwellings have grown up on the far side of the Pentagon.

Actually, Arlington is one of the major urban communities in the South. With its present population of 135,000, it is the third largest in Virginia—second only to Richmond and Norfolk. It has a larger population than such well-known cities as Albany, Austin, Chattanooga, or Savannah. While it is still called a county, if you insert it in a list of cities graded in order of population size you will find that it is the fifteenth largest in the entire South.

This growth has come with astonishing rapidity. In 1930 the population was only 26,000. In 1940 it was only 57,000. While much of this growth resulted from the concentration of war-time activities around Washington, those who predicted that the end of the war would mean a downturn in population were soon proved sadly mistaken. In the 5 years since the end of World War II the population increment has been more than 35,000.

This rapid increase in population created growing shortages of essential public facilities and services. Problems of community growth arose so fast that by the time one problem was clearly identified still another problem developed to complicate the picture.

Many of Arlington's civic leaders came to feel that one of the best ways to make progress was to concentrate on the most

pressing of all problems, the shortage of adequate school facilities. Accordingly, the provisions of better schools very properly became a focal point of attention. An energetic school movement developed under the statesmanlike leadership of the Citizens Committee for School Improvement and with the full backing of Arlington's large array of neighborhood associations, women's organizations and other important groups. Arlington has now develped a school plan which has proved itself in experience and has received Nation-wide acclaim.

As progress was made on the school front, however, it became increasingly apparent that a school plan could be not good enough unless it were geared to a community plan. It became increasingly apparent that there were many other crucial aspects of community life that also needed attention in their own right. Interest began to grow in the idea of developing an over-all plan.

The leadership in this new movement has been so widespread that it becomes impossible to locate it at any one point. Members of the school board and the Citizens Committee for School Improvement were among the first to underscore the need for over-all planning. The Civic Federation, which serves as a central coordinating body for neighborhood groups, played a vital part. The Junior Chamber of Commerce demonstrated a remarkable degree of vision and initiative on the question. The members of the Planning Commission were an inseparable part of the picture. And on all sides it was felt that over-all planning should be done with full participation by citizens themselves and that it should be handled in a manner that brought into face-to-face relationships representatives of all the diverse groups in the community.

This sentiment for over-all planning was crystallized in March of this year by Arlington's governing body, the County Board. At that time the chairman of the County Board proposed, and by unanimous vote of the board adopted, an historic resolution on long-range planning.

The heart of this county board resolution reads as follows:

1. It is the policy of the Arlington County board to initiate a survey of Arlington's needs over the next 6 years.

2. It is the further policy of the Arlington County Board to promote the widest possible participation by neighborhood and business organizations and other civic groups both in the appraisal of long-term needs and the development of practical plans to meet such needs.

3. The county manager is hereby directed to obtain from the heads of the appropriate departments of the Arlington County government and the Arlington County school board preliminary estimates of essential public facilities and services needed over the next 6 years and to submit such preliminary estimates in unrevised form to the county board no later than July 1, 1950 so that the county board may then have such estimates carefully reviewed, consolidated, and adjusted by the county planning commission and may take step to promote active participation in the planning process by neighborhood and business organizations and other civic groups.

THE KEY POINTS

It is not possible at this time to give a definitive description of long-term planning in Arlington. The planning process is still in its early stages. As it progresses, it will certainly change.

Moreover, various participants in this process will naturally see it from various viewpoints. What is crucial to one person may seem incidental to another.

It is therefore with some trepidation, based upon the realization that many eagle-eyed Arlingtonians will probably find that I have missed some points and misstated others that I offer the following eight points.

1. The plan is broad in coverage

First of all, the plan deals with the need for capital improvements—such as parks, water and sewage facilities, schools, libraries, fire-fighting equipment, bus facilities, etc.

But it also deals with the need for essential public services—such as school instruction, health and welfare services, police protection, etc.

It is not limited to county government operations alone. It deals with all essential public facilities and services—whether provided by the county, the State, Federal agencies or regional agencies.

As work on the plan progresses it will sooner or later include facilities and services that can or should be provided under private auspices, such as more industrial enterprises in Arlington, redevelopment of blighted areas, private health and welfare services, private schools, etc.

2. The planning process is closely related to the work of official county agencies

In some communities, I have been told, planners are off in a little room somewhere, out of touch with the great wealth of experience and practical know-how of the officials and employees in the various departments and divisions.

We hope to avoid this. We have rejected the idea that planning is planning and operations are operations and that never the twain shall meet. In Arlington they are meeting right at the very beginning.

In fact, one of the basic first steps in the development of Arlington planning had been the preparation of preliminary estimates of needs by the departments of the Arlington County government and the Arlington County School Board. These estimates have been compiled and released in a public document entitled "Six-Year Improvement Plan—Preliminary Departmental Proposals."

It should be understood that these preliminary estimates are not official in any sense. They have not been accepted by the planning commission, the citizens' advisory committee, or by the county board. They have not even been adjusted by the county manager. The job of review, consolidation, and adjustment is now being undertaken by the county planning commission. The great value of the departmental proposals is that they give a concrete starting point from which to work, or, as some have put it, a target at which to shoot.

3. The primary emphasis is upon studying local needs

We make a sharp distinction between needs and specific action programs aimed to meet needs in full or in part.

We have no intention to jump prematurely into specific action programs.

It is our aim to develop a full analysis of local needs based upon—

(a) A uniform underlying estimate of population growth;

(b) The needs of the population based on recognized standards established by professional organizations in all cases where such professional standards exist and adjusted to the local situation;

(c) Conformance with all legal standards enacted by the county or the State to protect the health and safety of the population.

(d) Adjustments to meet those situations where the needs of Arlingtonians can best be met by facilities or services in neighboring areas and where the needs of people in neighboring areas can best be met in Arlington;

(e) Catching up on the backlog of needs now existing in the county as well as making provision for the expected population growth; and

(f) An indication, in any cases where it may be judged that optimum needs cannot be met over a 6-year period, of how many more years may be required.

In some fields it is impossible to find recognized standards established by professional organizations. An illustration of this is found in the case of sewers. On this point the planning commission now has a special staff expert trying to fill the gap by developing new methods of measuring the need for sewers. Out of this effort may yet evolve a set of nationally accepted criteria that can be used by other communities as well.

4. The orientation is a long-term one

It takes time to do important things. It takes a long-term look to give the perspective needed to appraise the relative importance of various projects and the interrelations between them.

We have called our plan a 6-year plan. By this we mean that when we present a program to the county board in the spring of 1951 we expect that it will deal with specific action to be taken during the 6-year period from July 1, 1951, to July 1, 1957 (fiscal years 1952 to 1958).

In a sense, however, it is much more than a 6-year plan. In many cases both estimates of needs and specific action programs will necessarily go beyond a 6-year period.

5. It is a moving, flexible plan

At the end of the first year the plan will not then become a 5-year plan. It will not in 2 years become a 4-year plan.

Toward the end of the first year, rather, the plan will be reviewed, will certainly be revised, and will then be extended for the next 6 years. In other words, it will be a moving 6-year plan. And I feel safe in predicting that it will always be more specific in detail with respect to the first 3 years and more general with respect to the last 3 years.

We believe this is more realistic than trying to establish a rigid blueprint to be followed point by point over an entire 6-year period. New conditions and new problems that cannot be readily foreseen are always bound to develop.

One such contingency relates to the shortage of building materials that would inevitably result if, because of the international situation, a substantial part of our country's resources should be devoted to armaments. If this should occur, it is obvious that any part of the 6-year plan relating to construction activities would necessarily have to be modified.

If such a contingency develops, the essence of local long-term planning might well become: (1) cutting down on all but the most essential construction activities; (2) going in for large-scale land purchases for future parks, playgrounds, schools, and other public facilities; and (3) using any excess local revenues to invest in Government bonds and build up a fund for use in construction activities when building supplies again become more available.

6. The local plan is being related to a broader planning structure

Our local planning is inseparably connected with the future of the northern Virginia region, the metropolitan area of the Nation's Capital and the State of Virginia.

Insofar as the region is concerned, we have a regional planning commission composed of three representatives of the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, and Prince William, the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church and the town of Manassas. This commission has recently set up a long-term planning committee which will promote long-term plans in each of the political subdivisions in the area and will serve as a clearinghouse among them. The regional long-term planning work will also be inseparably tied up with civil-defense activities, which we hope will also be organized on a regional basis. At

least half of all the many things that must be done to have a good civil-defense program will advance the general cause of community planning. At the same time more than half of what we do to plan for more adequate facilities in the field of transportation, utilities, fire protection, and health will be needed to provide a foundation for adequate civil defense.

Insofar as the metropolitan area of Washington is concerned, legislation is now pending in Congress to strengthen and broaden the work of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Under this legislation, already passed by the Senate, the Commission would itself initiate a 6-year public works program for the District of Columbia. It is expected that this legislation will also provide for representation from the northern Virginia area on the revamped Commission.

Insofar as the State is concerned, the advisory council on the Virginia economy has a large group of research committees at work on aspects of State-wide planning. Unfortunately, not one resident of the northern Virginia area is yet a member of this important advisory council and very few are on the research committees. I believe this matter is now under study in Richmond and that steps may soon be taken to provide a closer working relationship.

7. A citizens' advisory committee has been brought in on the ground floor

"In a multitude of counselors there is safety," reads the old Biblical proverb. "Where no counsel is the people fall" (Prov. XI, 14).

We believe that a good plan cannot be developed and transformed into reality without the advice and assistance of a multitude of counsellors.

One of the first steps of the planning commission has been to set up a citizens' advisory committee to help obtain citizen participation in the planning process. This committee consists of community leaders chosen from all the various sectors of the community and representing all shades of opinion. It includes businessmen, home owners, and Government workers, conservatives and liberals, old-timers and newcomers. Its purpose is to advise the planning commission with respect to county planning activities and on methods of enlisting the widest possible citizen participation in planning.

The first assignment of the advisory committee has been to assist the planning commission in evaluating the long-term needs of the county, in developing programs for meeting these needs, and in reporting public reaction as the plans are developed.

Other civic groups—particularly neighborhood, women's, business, and professional organizations—also have a place in the development of the 6-year plan. At the appropriate time they will all be asked for their views. The civic federation has already presented to the planning commission a comprehensive memorandum suggesting the major points of emphasis in the 6-year plan. One neighborhood association has already voted to develop on its own, for submission to the commission, a comprehensive neighborhood plan. It is my hope that all these groups will play an increasingly large part in the process.

8. It is an operation goldfish bowl

The people of a community have a legitimate right to be kept regularly informed about planning activities.

And by "people" I don't mean merely the leaders of organizations—or even the rank-and-file members of organizations. I mean the people of the community whether or not they belong to organized groups. I mean the individuals whose participation in community activities may be strictly limited to the use of public facilities and services and the payment of direct and indirect taxes.

In communities with a low degree of group organization the provision of information to individuals is fundamental. But it cannot be overlooked in communities which, like Arlington, can boast of an extremely high degree of organized group activities.

Accordingly, we are doing our best to keep people informed. The preliminary departmental estimates, for example, have been made publicly available. The Planning Commission, with the help of its advisory committee, is now putting the finishing touches on a first report to the people of Arlington. This report will try to deal in simple language with the following three questions:

1. What is the 6-year plan?
2. What is the role of the Arlington County Planning Commission?
3. How will citizens of Arlington participate in the development of the plan?

Additional public reports will presumably be made from time to time.

Consideration is also being given to the holding of public forums on various aspects of the plan. These could be of tremendous educational value.

Finally, while the Commission does not conceive its function as one of engaging in propaganda, it will cooperate with the press and the radio in their work of keeping the public informed.

MISTAKES AND DISAGREEMENTS

Let no one say that we in Arlington can be found guilty of either perfection or unanimity.

I'm sure we have already made some mistakes. I only wish we could spot them all.

We hope to rectify these mistakes as we go along and to profit by them. We take it for granted that our list of mistakes will grow but that by self-examination and self-criticism we can discover them before it is too late, avoid mutual recriminations and keep our eyes always on doing better in the future.

We have also had minor disagreements on methods of initial procedure. We will probably have more interesting disagreements in the future. But we take it for granted that intelligent people will have differing ideas. We approach the problem of disagreement by always looking first at the area of agreement and trying to make firm progress within this area. We then focus upon points of diversity and disagreement without allowing that diversity to floor us.

After all, diversity is the essence of democracy. It becomes a threat only when conflict becomes too sharp or when any one group becomes too powerful and tries to impose its own conception of the common weal upon everyone else. The strength of democracy lies in our ability to work together with people who will not agree with everything we want and who will not fight to the last drop of blood in their veins for everything they want. It lies in our ability to make mutual adjustments and compromises between conflicting conceptions of the public welfare.

The importance of local long-term planning—and in this perhaps lies its greatest contribution to the democratic way of life—is that it provides a vantage point for looking beyond the petty bickerings of the present and obtaining a broader perspective. We regard it as a method of fashioning adjustments that are not merely patchwork, log-rolling bargains between a few interest groups but rather represent a balanced effort to meet the true interests of the community as a whole. We value it as a process whereby through cooperative learning and mutual adjustment we can bring people together in building the future.

Antisubversive Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hold On, Senators," from the Thursday, August 24, issue of the Raleigh Register, Beckley, W. Va.; also an editorial entitled "Caution Needed," from the Thursday, August 31, issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register of August 24, 1950]

HOLD ON, SENATORS

With administration leaders in the Senate finally agreeing to consider Communist "control" bills, thinking Americans have focused attention on this knotty problem.

Whether controls will reach the extreme of outlawing Communists is not known, but the matter nonetheless deserves the attention of Americans everywhere, for it hits at the bedrock of our democratic principles.

It is hoped that when Congress finally tackles the question mature consideration and not emotional judgment will govern the action of Senators and Representatives.

The freedom of assembly, speech, and press, guaranteed by the Constitution, do not mean merely freedom for those with whom we agree. On the other hand, these freedoms do not guarantee freedom to commit or promote sabotage, sedition, or the overthrow of the government by violence.

The dissenters and the unorthodox are granted the right to disagree with established principles, and, if they desire, to advocate changes in the political and economic structure through the ballot.

If we try to outlaw the Communists, we attempt by statute to forbid the harboring of ideas, and no law can do this. If we try to control the Communists, we will send them and their dangerous ideas underground where they can work unseen toward the eventual overthrow of democracy.

By attempting to legislate against the Communist Party, we leave the impression with all the world that democracy as a way of life is not strong enough to withstand onslaughts.

The founding fathers realized that political ideas inimical to our form of government would in time be conceived and would endanger our governmental structure, but they believed that democracy would stand supreme if given the opportunity to compete openly in the vast court of world opinion.

It would be the wisest course, The Register believes, for control legislation against communism to be deferred. The laws of the land are sufficient to cope with extremists in the Communist Party. Let us not allow the Reds to provoke us into ill-conceived political action as they have constricting military action.

[From the New York Times of August 31, 1950]

CAUTION NEEDED

Now that the House has passed its own antisubversive bill (H. R. 9490), the Senate

has for its consideration this week no less than four distinct measures dealing with this highly controversial subject. Maneuverings of both Democrats and Republicans to snare the credit for whatever legislation of this type is enacted may obscure—but cannot lessen—the urgent necessity of examining such proposals with the greatest care.

We have already expressed our opinion regarding the three major Senate bills on anti-subversive activities: the Mundt-Ferguson bill (S. 2311), the McCarran omnibus bill (S. 4037), and the administration bill (S. 4061). We have explained why we think the first two, going far beyond the proper and laudable aim of making the Communists harmless, represent a potentially serious threat to American civil liberties. The bill which the House passed on Tuesday is a modified version of the Mundt-Ferguson measure; but it still contains such drastic registration provisions, it leaves such great power in the hands of an administrative board and it is couched in such broad language that we feel that it, too, is more far-reaching than necessary or advisable. By and large, the law as it now stands appears adequate to protect us against the Communist menace, so far as any law as such can protect us. In fact, between the upper millstone of present legislation and the nether millstone of the American voters' common sense, communism is not getting very far in the United States. But improvement in existing law can certainly be made, and this the administration bill, generally speaking, would do.

It is natural in these times that there should be a demand for anti-Communist legislation; but it is imperative that in our haste to pass such legislation we do not endanger the freedom of thought and speech that is a vital part of the American tradition and is, in fact, essential for the proper functioning of democratic government.

Federal, State, and Local Governmental Spending in 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Federal, State, and Local Governmental Spending in 1951 Expected To Be More Than One-Third of National Income," published in the News Bulletin of August 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governmental spending at Federal, State, and local levels combined during 1951 are expected to be more than one-third of the national income.

For the fiscal year 1951, ending next June 30, the proposed Federal spending will total $59,482,000,000. State spending which ran up to $11,782,000,000 in 1949, is expected to run about $11,600,000,000 in 1951. Local governmental spending will probably run around $9,868,000,000.

THE NATIONAL INCOME IN 1950

The President's Council of Economic Advisers estimates the National income for the first half of 1950 as follows:

	Annual rate
First quarter	$217,200,000,000
Second quarter	223,600,000,000
Our estimate full year	229,100,000,000

On the basis of our own studies, we conclude that total spending for all governmental purposes (including foreign aid, military assistance, and relief during the fiscal year 1951 for the Federal Government, and the calendar year 1951 for State and local governments will be as follows:

Federal governmental spending, fiscal 1951	$59,482,000,000
State governmental spending, calendar 1951	11,600,000,000
Local governmental spending, calendar 1951	9,868,000,000
Total	80,950,000,000

Figures on local government expenditures are estimated from the progressive increase in spending since 1945 considering also the increased cost of labor and materials entering into construction of highways, sewers, school facilities, waterworks, and other necessary local improvements.

If governmental spending proceeds according to our estimates approximately 35 percent of the national income in 1951 will be spent by governmental agencies. Since it appears impossible at this time to levy taxes equal to 35 percent of the total national income, it appears that government at all levels will generally engage in deficit financing, thus further inflating the economy, and depreciating the purchasing power of the dollar.

Twin-Hull Flying Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, many of our most competent engineers are convinced that the designs for a twin-hull flying ship is not only feasible from an engineering standpoint but would be invaluable to our national defense, particularly in antisubmarine warfare.

The Disabled American Veterans have undertaken to sponsor a movement for the building of such a ship. I appealed to the Committee on Armed Services to hold hearings to explore the feasibility of such a ship.

Following is a resolution passed at the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans and also a letter to Secretary of Defense Johnson citing their interest in this project. The resolution and letter follow:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., August 18, 1950.—In the interest of saving the lives and limbs of America's defenders, the Disabled American Veterans, at its twenty-ninth annual convention here, today unanimously adopted a resolution strongly recommending that the National Military Establishment immediately construct "one or more seaworthy twin-hull ships capable of flight," according to patents and designs recently proffered to the National Military Establishment by the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, the incorporated trusteeship for the DAV. The resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas the Disabled American Veterans is composed of America's war-wounded and disabled veterans who have learned, through personal experience, the shocking loss of human lives and limbs caused by America's inadequate preparedness in the past; and

"Whereas the treachery, intrigue, and aggression of Communist countries have made it obvious that world peace can be established only by full military preparedness: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans, in national convention assembled in San Francisco, Calif., this 18th day of August 1950, That we do hereby officially endorse the proffer, by the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, to the National Military Establishment, of the right, without royalty obligation, to use all of the pertinent patents and designs for the construction, for national defense purposes, of one or more seaworthy twin-hull ships capable of flight for the safe and speedy delivery of troops and munitions anywhere in the world; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President of the United States, the United States Congress, and the National Military Establishment be urged speedily to arrange for the construction of such fighting flying ships with multiple military capabilities to conserve the lives of America's youths, in defense of our American way of life."

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS
SERVICE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1950.

HON. LOUIS A. JOHNSON,
Secretary of Defense, National Military Establishment, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A multiple-purpose, seaworthy, flying ship, which could speedily (within a few hours) deliver troops and munitions needed for any military emergency, is available for construction by the National Military Establishment.

If our Government had had a few of these vessels when the Communists began their invasion of South Korea, emergency troops, munitions, and matériel probably could have been delivered in time to stop the enemy north of Seoul.

Possessing full rights and authority relating to this seaworthy flying craft, with its diversified capabilities, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation hereby proffers, to the National Military Establishment, the right to use all of the pertinent patents and designs for the construction of one or more such twin-hull flying ships, without any royalty obligation.

This seaworthy flying craft is capable of serving Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in combat missions of land, sea, and air. No other vehicle, vessel, or aircraft has this combination of abilities. It concerns, therefore, all of the branches of the National Military Establishment. Very fittingly, this offer should be considered by a top-level unifying committee of the National Military Establishment for integration and coordination under its unification program.

DESCRIPTION

This ocean surface vessel, with flight capabilities (see illustrations), is designed on the proved twin-hull catamaran principle of stability.

Its wing, with a gull-like upward sweep at each end, is so mounted in relation to the twin-hulls that it cannot be engulfed by

waves in any ocean. There are 3 decks. The third deck—the largest—is located within the wing and extends between and on both sides of each hull.

In the smallest size recommended, this twin-hull flying ship has a 300-foot wing span. Its flying weight is 150 gross tons; its water-borne capacity is 200 gross tons. Three of its seven power units are located on the wing between the two hulls, with two more mounted on the wing on the outboard side of each hull.

MILITARY EQUIPMENT

This twin-hull flying ship could be equipped with—

1. Four cannon of a larger caliber and longer range than any usable by other aircraft;
2. Twelve or more anti-aircraft guns;
3. Guided missiles launching machine;
4. Two or more torpedo discharging tubes;
5. Facilities for launching and retrieving jet planes;
6. Bomb racks;
7. Depth charge racks;
8. Radar and sonar;
9. Dual flying controls, located about 60 feet apart;
10. Two retractable, elevated observation tops, permitting lookout to discover enemy while the twin-hull flying ship remains concealed below the horizon.

DIVERSIFIED CAPABILITIES

The twin-hull flying ship could:

1. Track down by sonar, bracket and sink submarines. (The flying ship, with its horizontal sonar rudder, has the ability to accurately locate a submarine and simultaneously drop two depth charges, 200 feet apart, and escape damage from the explosion. The latest Russian submarines are known to be extremely maneuverable under water; this combined with their relatively higher speed and greater strength to resist depth charges makes it necessary for the Navy to use new methods, such as the flying ship affords, to locate and destroy submarines.)
2. Deliver troops, with artillery, munitions and matériel, speedily and safely, to any place in the world. (Seventy percent of the earth's surface is water. Even on the land there are more alighting places for this twin-hull ship—lakes, rivers and shores—than there are bomber alighting fields.)
3. Drop bombs with accuracy, anywhere in the world, whether on land or water. (This is the only flying craft which could carry bombs as heavy as the hydrogen bomb.)
4. Provide better launching accuracy for guided missiles and a steadier gun platform than any other ocean vessel, because of its catamaran stability in rough ocean waves. (It rolls and pitches less than half as much as other types of ocean craft. Refueling at sea is comparatively easy and safe.)
5. Avoid battleship-range and air bombs, by virtue of its extreme maneuverability.
6. Bomb "overocean" objectives better than any other known craft, because of its ability to conserve flying gas for combat purposes.
7. Choose its own time and place for battle: rendezvous on the ocean for surprise attack.
8. Travel on the ocean's surface at least twice as fast as any other vessel, in any condition of wind and sea, and up to 100 miles an hour under favorable conditions; in the air it can travel up to 340 miles an hour.
9. Travel 3,000 miles on the ocean's surface, while conserving its entire load of flying gas, namely, fuel for 3,700 miles of flight; no other flying craft can make any distance without expending flying gas.
10. Launch and retrieve jet planes safely at higher velocity than by any other method.
11. Launch torpedoes.
12. Effectively attack forts, factories and other military objectives of any first-class power. (It is the only ocean surface craft capable of doing this.)
13. Carry and fire larger caliber guns than any other seaworthy craft which can remain afloat in the face of torpedoing and bombing. (The twin-hull flying ship is not vulnerable to torpedoing because of its shallow draft—5 feet when loaded for flight, and 6 feet when loaded for both ocean surface and air navigation—and it cannot be bombed effectively due to its high maneuverability on the ocean surface.)
14. Ride safely under the worst conditions of wind and waves on the ocean. (Ocean waves of 600 feet length and 50 feet height between crest and trough can be successfully negotiated only by the twin-hull flying ship. Other types of flying craft do not have the necessary catamaran support and buoyancy to be seaworthy.)
15. Take-off and fly whenever safety and speed dictate.
16. Conceal its position or distance from other surface or sub-surface craft, because it has no water propeller to propagate sound.
17. Protect itself from pursuit planes by firing a barrage of greater range than that of pursuit planes.
18. Replace all other craft as a United Nations patrol for world peace.
19. Perform practically all Coast Guard functions, both in war and in peace.

One of these flying ships, in the 300-foot span, 150-ton size now projected, would cost approximately the same as a B–36 bomber, and probably not more than a million dollars in line production. Construction time would be 9 months for the prototype model, assuming engineering completed and materials assembled at shipyard. In production, one flying ship could be taken off the line every week.

The flying ship, as now projected, is the smallest size recommended for immediate construction. Larger sizes can follow at an early date. It is so constructed that it can be converted readily from military to peacetime use.

Some of the world's leading authorities on sea craft and air craft have stated that the twin-hull flying ship is long overdue and is now the surest hope for military domination of both sea and air.

Speaking of the submarine menace in World War II, Mr. Winston Churchill and General Eisenhower declared that the Battle of the Atlantic constituted the allies' greatest problem.

Losses of allied ships and cargoes due to submarine attack in World War II were so huge that the losses of a single day would more than pay for the entire cost of the development and testing of the twin-hull flying ship.

Addressing Parliament, Prime Minister Churchill said: "One heavily escorted convoy of 14 cargo vessels, attempting to take supplies to Malta, arrived there with only three of the supply ships still afloat. Of those one was sunk at the dock."

We ask that this matter be given early attention so that our board of trustees can include your response in its report to the thirtieth annual convention of the Disabled American Veterans, to be held in San Francisco during the week of August 13, 1950.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS SERVICE FOUNDATION,
MILES H. DRAPER,
Chairman, Board of Trustees.
IRVING J. PHILLIPSON,
Major General, United States Army, Retired, Chairman, Finance and Budget Committee.
MILLARD W. RICE,
Executive Secretary.

Chicago Joins in the Centennial Celebration of the Birth of a Great American, Samuel Gompers, on Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, January 27, 1950, marked the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Gompers, the founder and first president of the American Federation of Labor. On this Labor Day in 1950 all Chicago will celebrate Gompers Centennial Labor Day. It will be one of the greatest civic events in the city's history. Soldier's Field will be the scene of a gigantic assemblage of labor and labor's friends to do honor to this peerless leader.

Mr. William L. McFetridge, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, has this to say about the celebration:

I urge every member of the Chicago Federation of Labor to attend this great Labor Day celebration honoring Samuel Gompers. It will be a most impressive sight to see organized labor and the friends of organized labor assembled to pay tribute to the founder of the American Federation of Labor. It will be a family day, a day of entertainment and good will—a great personal tribute to the wisdom of Samuel Gompers.

Mr. William A. Lee, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, issued the following statement:

We feel that the Samuel Gompers centennial celebration will do a great deal to keep the memory of Gompers forever fresh in our minds. We must never forget that Samuel Gompers was not only the founder of the American Federation of Labor, but a great crusader for good in this country. On Labor Day we pay tribute to him not only as a great member of organized labor but as a great American.

Mr. William Cleary, secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor, stated:

We are staging our Labor Day celebration honoring Samuel Gompers in a way that we believe Gompers would like. It will be for the family, for the children, for organized labor and its friends. I am sure Mr. Gompers would be very pleased to have these families together on Labor Day to honor his centennial.

And Mr. Stephen Bailey, vice president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, had this to say:

The Chicago Federation of Labor serves in many ways as a civic body in this city. For that reason, we urge Chicagoans to attend our Labor Day celebration honoring Samuel Gompers. The work that Gompers did is reflected in the day-to-day living of every American. We all owe him a great debt of gratitude. The Samuel Gompers Centennial Celebration with its entertainment, circus acts, auto races will be the concrete tribute of organized labor to a great American.

The steering committee for the Gompers celebration consists of the following:

Morris Bialis, manager, Chicago Joint Board, International Ladies Garment Workers' Union; Frank Brown, president, Teamsters Joint Council, 25; Thomas Burke, president, Building Service Employees Local, 25; Byron Dalton, business manager, Plasterers Union Local, 5; William C. Kowalski, Musicians Union Local, 10; William L. McFetridge, president, Building Service Employees International Union, and Patrick F. Sullivan, president, Building Trades Council; Charles Youngblood, business representative, Painters Union Local 147; Michael F. Delaney, Pipe Fitters Local, 597; Thomas J. Haggerty, secretary-treasurer, Milk Wagon Drivers Local, 753; R. N. Hickson, secretary, Printing Pressmen Local, 3; George L. Knott, president, Laundry Drivers Union Local, 712; William A. Lee, president, Chicago Federation of Labor; Daniel J. McNamara, secretary, Street Carmen Division, 241; Stephen M. Bailey, business manager, Plumbers Union Local, 130; William F. Cleary, secretary, Chicago Federation of Labor; and Maurice Lynch, financial secretary, Chicago Federation of Labor.

It is my great privilege to join with these outstanding leaders of labor in Chicago in urging members of the A. F. of L. to bring their families to Soldiers Field on this eventful occasion for the hours of enjoyment planned for all, and in this pleasant atmosphere pay humble tribute to the man who devoted his lifetime to the upbuilding and strengthening of labor's dynamic role in the progress and development of our great land—Sam Gompers. He gave his all for the welfare of the men who toils. He is deserving of the undying gratitude of those enrolled today in the legion of toilers.

Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to have known Mr. Gompers intimately and to have worked with him in many of his accomplishments for the improvement of labor conditions in this country.

On January 29, 1950, all American workers and industrialists alike did honor and paid their respects to Samuel Gompers on the occasion of the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of this distinguished American whose works and efforts gave substance and life to the destiny of a great and powerful America. This centennial observance is being brought to a real climax in the thoughtful and appreciative city of Chicago on this Labor Day, September 4.

I had the happy privilege of knowing intimately and well Sam Gompers, who, during his lifetime, in an era of grim foreboding and discouragement for the success of the labor movement and the welfare of the worker and the toiler, had to arm himself with patience, breadth of understanding, vigor, and patriotic leadership in order to realize his goal of betterment of conditions for the working class.

Here, in the life and works of Samuel Gompers, is an outstanding example of one who becomes a distinguished American, rising from humble beginnings to high and exalted position in American industrial, political, and social life.

Here, in the career of Samuel Gompers, born in London of Dutch-Jewish stock, is found a striking example of what millions of immigrants before and after him have accomplished, namely, infusing into American life the energy and spirit of industry, honesty, and thrift which have made America the most formidable Nation in power and prestige in the world.

I like to dwell on this point because there exists too strongly in many quarters and sections of our country a tense feeling and prejudice against our newcomers, immigrants who, like Gompers—little schooled, dissatisfied with conditions in their homeland, seeing no future there for themselves or their offspring—sought liberty and freedom in our country, and at the same time advance the interests of their adopted country. Like Gompers, they worked 6 days a week, from 12 to 14 hours daily, at their trade or employment, plodded their weary way home, and in recent years read their paper or listened to their favorite programs, and except for one night out either on Saturday or Sunday, retiring to their rest to be prepared for the next day and next week's battles, extending into the years. Thus did they build up a backlog of simple but firm, honest endeavor and accomplishment, which went into the sinews and lifeblood of the Nation which gave them succor and aid. And if these contributions were not enough, they and their children further acted to repay the debt of asylum given them, when in large, yes, overwhelming, numbers, they rushed to the aid of the Nation in time of two devastating wars and wrote distinguished feats of valor and sacrifice in illustrious pages of history, for Americans of future years to emulate and revere.

My friend Sam Gompers came from a so-called minority group. As a true American, he would not and did not permit wholesale or mass mistreatment of the human race. He fought with all his might the totalitarian way of life exemplified by Kaiser Wilhelm, who sought to make slaves and serfs of free men and women. Gompers labored in the vineyard of human rights and freedom. He fought to protect the minorities regardless of race, religion, or class.

In America we find many minorities so-called, which makes up the greatest melting pot of all races, creeds, and colors on the face of the globe. America is great because the virtues of patriotism, liberty, and justice abide with resolute heart among her people. There are, however, though fortunately small in number but nevertheless vocally strong, those who sound notes of hate and discord against these minority groups, attempting to set minorities against each other.

This hatemongering which begets prejudice, bigotry, and discrimination must be met and overcome by means of education and by law.

Samuel Gompers did just that. He built up a sound and enduring trade unionism, first as a hard-working official in his Cigarmakers International Union, composed of all sorts and conditions of men. Later he organized the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, which, together with the printers, the iron and steel workers, the granite cutters and other lesser craft unions, united about 1881 to sow the seed which later brought forth the American Federation of Labor.

I am aware of the organization called the Knights of Labor which, although it claimed at one time over 700,000 members, moved like a meteor along the sky and fell just as quickly to earth leaving practically no concrete or beneficial results from its existence.

Neither time nor space permit me to set forth in detail the complete record of the activities of Samuel Gompers. To do so would fill volumes. It is sufficient to point out a few which demonstrate that he was a pioneer in a field which called for sound, constructive, and forward-looking leadership. The labor movement in the eighties was in a critical period. The Knights of Labor had failed because of inefficient leadership.

Slowly but soundly, the great organizer, leading exponent of craft unionism, Gompers welded together an organization with his small group of trade unionists as the nucleus and then moved forward regardless of the great obstacles confronting him on all sides which big business set up. He succeeded in keeping his organization intact, whether in time of adversity or good fortune. Gradually he became the spokesman for labor and oftentimes the spokesman for the large army of unorganized labor.

SOUND PHILOSOPHY

I believe it can be correctly stated that as president of the American Federation of Labor Mr. Gompers had no special or particular philosophy as to the aims of the labor movement. In the years before World War I his program called for better wages, shorter hours, healthier, and safer working conditions.

These aims, he felt, could be furthered by pursuing or following business-union procedures and working within the framework of the existing order which he always upheld, supported and, protected. For a time he took the position that labor did not aspire to share with the employer or take over control of the industry.

EXPANSION OF LABOR UNION AIMS

After the war, however, Mr. Gompers was forced to adopt a different or expanded position, namely, that viewing wages and hours as its concern and collective bargaining as its sole aim, was not the only program of the American Federation of Labor; that it included also the bidding for a progressive share in the proceeds of industry and a voice in industrial management. The union, he urged, would become responsible for the workers in industry. Along with this new statement of principles, he held strongly to the laissez faire doctrine of individualism—voluntarism, he called it.

He was strongly insistent that industry organize itself to govern itself, to impose tasks and rules and bring order into its own house. Thus it came about that in 1923 the American Federation of Labor recorded itself against the antitrust laws.

I remember in my friendly and close association with this sublime spirit whom we now honor, many instances of greatness. One, however, has always stood forth in my mind, namely, the deep and profound patriotism of my friend. The period was that of the First World War. America and Americans were debating the issues of participation by our country in the great war then being waged abroad. The country and our people were in the throes of a great debate. Indecision and vacillation were riding the crest when firm action and resolution should have been in command. The workers, like other groups, were uncertain as to whether our participation was necessary or justified. Many of the union locals opposed our entry into the war.

GOMPERS LEADS THE A. F. OF L. TO A GREAT TRIUMPH

It was at this psychological moment that Samuel Gompers as president of that great labor organization, the American Federation of Labor, took hold. Here again the exceptional qualities of leadership asserted themselves. He readily realized the dangers of isolationism, its dangers not only to his own group but most important of all its danger to his adopted and beloved country. To work he went. No man ever waged a more relentless and soul-stirring fight against Kaiser Wilhelm and his type of totalitarianism than did Sam Gompers. Although ill, almost 70 years old, he traveled from one end of the country to the other, addressing meeting after meeting and exhorting the union members, and the unorganized workers, to action. Then, biding his time, he prepared the course of the American Federation of Labor and at its convention in November, 1917, at Buffalo, N. Y., he invited President Wilson to address the delegates. As Mr. Wilson entered the hall, every delegate stood up and gave support and approval to the President's position, "to make the world safe for democracy." This was one of the greatest triumphs in the life of Gompers and the American Federation of Labor. The force and influence of this great body of American workers did much to dissipate and scatter the power and influence of the pacifists and isolationists. It had the effect of clearing the atmosphere of doubt and indecision for those deluded but sincere Americans, as well as casting aside the specious and untenable arguments of the Germanophiles and traitors. Gompers had more than established himself as a labor statesman.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S CONFIDENCE IN GOMPERS

Wilson showed his confidence in Samuel Gompers in October 1915 when he named him one of the five members on the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense. His was the job to make ready the forces of labor for the battle ahead. His colleagues on the board were Daniel Willard, Julius Rosenwald, Bernard M. Baruch, Dr. Hollis Godfrey, and Dr. Franklin Martin. How well he did his part is best demonstrated by the great part labor played in producing the implements and material of war in 1917–18, just as in 1941–45 the laboring groups did the same spectacular job a second time.

President Wilson again called on him when he appointed Mr. Gompers on the Commission of International Labor Legislation in 1919. This Commission, composed of two representatives from each of the five Great Powers at the Peace Conference, were to act on matters affecting labor and work within the League of Nations for common action on conditions of employment. Although not fully satisfied with the work of the Draft Convention, he accepted it, as did the American Federation of Labor.

OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM

His opposition to communism and socialism manifested itself in strong, unmistakable language. He warned that—

Communism can only be successful if it succeeds in tying itself to the masses by directing its appeals in language of jingoistic sentiment, by aggravating and exploiting every manifestation or display of discord or discontent.

Not, for example, in our day, the Communist parades and pickets for civil rights, better housing, and so forth. He knew that communism profits from the political mistakes of political parties, since these errors permit the Communists to proclaim themselves as the sole and only defenders of the national welfare and the country's traditions. Gompers kept the Communists in the labor movement on the defensive and never permitted them to take the initiative.

COMMUNISM, A THREAT TO UNION AUTONOMY

Sam Gompers fought communism because it constituted a distinct threat to union autonomy. To him, it meant absorption of the union by the totalitarian state and thus becoming a mere cog within the framework and machinery of politics.

He knew and recognized early in life as a union leader that when Communists win control of a union, not only do they change the personnel but also the objectives and functions of the union. In addition they form and organize opposition to the parent body. It becomes a tool, an ally of the Communist regime and loses its character as a trade-union.

He saw New York as a maelstrom of revolutionary groups and many different national extractions. He saw in these formative years, the actions of the extremists and the anarchists and soon came to the conclusion, how little organized labor would gain if it joined or cooperated with these groups.

Hence, he was attacked by the leaders of Bolshevism, Lenin and Trotsky, who called him an enemy of the proletariat. Communists accused him of being a bourgeois and labor faker. Lenin spoke in glowing terms of Daniel De Leon often referred to as the pope of the Socialist Party. De Leon was an arch enemy of Gompers in the labor movement.

It was at this time that Communists had infiltrated into a few trade-unions such as the needle trades in the State of New York and New England, into textile, miners, and steelworkers unions. There developed consequently an aggressive left-wing movement in the American Federation of Labor which constantly attacked the conservative program of Gompers, continually demanding the immediate recognition of Soviet Russia.

OPPOSITION TO SOCIALISM

Mr. Gompers had studied the principles of socialism in his youth. He soon learned to oppose it. Socialism to him meant the overthrow of free enterprise and the existing order to be replaced by socialism. Then, too, the Socialists were pacifists and opposed the war. He was viciously attacked by them because he stood for and promoted private enterprise which was and is today anathema to Socialists whose program is that of nationalization of industry. Led by Gompers, the American labor movement accepted the concept of private property as a necessary agency for securing opportunity for individual independence and resourcefulness.

FEUDAL BARONS OF WEALTH DENY RECOGNITION TO LABOR

Mr. Speaker, the enemies of labor and trade-unions with whom Samuel Gompers had to contend in the early days of their development and growth were powerful indeed. One look at the imposing list of those who opposed and fought incessantly and with every unfair weapon at their command, serves only in increasing my admiration and regard for the man we honor:

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who had acquired his wealth, as did some of the others I name, at the expense of low wages paid the workers. He refused to recognize the union miners of Colorado.

Andrew Carnegie, who with Henry Frick in 1892 opposed better conditions for labor and fought the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers in the Homestead strike with Pinkertons and help from unconscionable quarters, thereby almost crushing the cause of labor.

George Pullman, of the Pullman Palace Car Co., at Pullman, Ill., who advocated wage reduction and whose action resulted in the Pullman strike, producing hard and heavy burdens on the laboring man and his family.

Jay Gould, an industrial tycoon of his day, a ruthless individualist, who, drunk with financial and economic power, believed that progress meant accumulation of great private fortunes at the expense of the worker paid starvation wages.

James Fisk, who used his resources to beat down labor, ably seconded and abetted by another arch foe of labor, Judge Elbert H. Gary, of the United States Steel Corp., whose sense of economic justice set a new low even in those

early days of high-handed action against labor-union unionism.

John P. Morgan, along with Carnegie, Rockefeller, and E. J. Harriman, were among those who, at the beginning of the twentieth century, built up and developed powerful systems of high finance, great monopolies in trade and railroad industries—all by the sweat of labor, but denying the laborer just compensation.

Take the case of miners forced always to strike for a living wage to keep out of peonage. Never given the opportunity to work the number of days of other industries, the miners were forced to put up with seasonable fluctuation in production.

Forced to trade for their food supplies in the company stores owned by the coal barons because of lack of funds, unable to obtain or afford decent living conditions or housing facilities for their families, the miners lived in squalid surroundings near the mines. Always in debt to the coal barons who held them in servitude, with no safety appliances and working hundreds of feet below the ground under perilous conditions, the plight of these workers has always been a desperate one.

However, Mr. Speaker, they found a champion in Gompers, encouraged by men such as William Green, who fought successfully to improve these disgraceful conditions in slave wages and galley-slave working situations imposed by the autocrats of the coal industry. Truly does history repeat itself.

Strange to say, these men have their exact counterparts today—ruthless men in their self-same positions in the trusts, monopolies, holding companies, who vote themselves large pensions upon retirement notwithstanding the high salaries they receive as an official of the corporation for many years. Yet these self-same men deny pensions and security to those who made possible their millions, who as they are about to complete their span of life, seek in a manner of attempted appeasement to their complaining conscience, to distribute small sums proportionately to their wealth, to worth-while purposes such as endowments for educational institutions, libraries, medical and economic research.

But I say to them—too little and too late for they have robbed the worker and his family of the just and equitable share of the fruits of his honest and productive labor. Well did the apostle of a new era, another of my admired friends, William Jennings Bryan, phrase it in his Cross of Gold speech which I had the high privilege of hearing at the Democratic National Convention in 1896 at Chicago:

> You shall not press down upon the head of labor this crown of thorns,
> You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.

GOMPERS WAGES GIGANTIC FIGHT FOR LABOR'S LEGAL RIGHTS

The Sherman Act passed in 1890. Labor unions' activities were not included in the act. But the United States Supreme Court in the *Danbury Hatters case* (308 U. S. 774) declared the act did apply to labor unions. Then came the Clayton Act of 1914, for which I had the honor of voting, signed by President Wilson, declaring that "the labor of a human being was not a commodity or article of commerce." This act was called by Gompers the Magna Carta of labor, and made the lawful existence of labor organizations which feared that the Government might start dissolution suits against labor unions such as those successfully prosecuted by the Government in 1911 against the Standard Oil Co. and Tobacco Trusts.

Another provision of the Clayton Act prohibited the granting of injunctions by Federal courts against certain specific labor activities such as peaceful picketing. But the interests keep up their opposition to the Clayton Act and the United States Supreme Court in the *Duplex Printing Co. case* (254 U. S. 443) stated that the Clayton Act did not give any blanket immunity to labor. In this and other decisions the Supreme Court read into the work unreasonable restraint of trade and commerce, the so-called rule of reason into the Sherman Act passed by the Supreme Court in 1911.

Another act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932, which I also supported, made it an absolute prohibition for any Federal court to issue an injunction in almost any case involving a labor controversy. Labor held that this act which was interpreted by Justice Frankfurter in the *Hutcheson case* (312 U. S. 219) in 1941 makes labor injunctions forbidden.

Today we find efforts made by the enemies of labor to overrule these protections and safeguards properly given to labor on the ground, they say, and without authority and reason, that labor unions are seeking to monopolize the supply of labor either on a large or limited scale in restraint of trade. Those opponents of labor falsely charge and urge today that labor controls of production and the fixed prices by union action in commodities or services essential to the public welfare require that labor unions come under the restraint of trade provisions of the Sherman Act. In Gompers' day, he met up with William Howard Taft whom he fought step by step as an injunction judge, and later as a Presidential candidate; as President, and later as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Gompers opposed him. Taft contended that labor sought class legislation of the most vicious sort. Gompers replied that all legislation is class legislation and that organization of labor having their origin in human need should be exempted from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law. President Wilson accepted this viewpoint of labor notwithstanding the fact that Gompers had opposed him in 1912 as against my friend Champ Clark, Speaker of the House in 1910, whom Gompers called "a more intrepid friend of labor never occupied that position."

POLITICAL ACTION FORCED UPON LABOR

From 1906 to 1912 Gompers took up political action through necessity of self-preservation of the labor movement. He had always believed that the courts under the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 had gone far beyond the use of their equitable jurisdiction and had rendered strikes ineffectual by unfair restrictions on picketing, free press.

These injunctive measures destroyed the rights of the union members because the workingmen when deprived of their most effectual means of protection—namely, the right to refuse to work unless justly rewarded for their labor—are placed under a serious handicap. Thus, faced with injunctions obtained by employers based on flimsy evidence, untrue and false testimony, Gompers and his organization had no other alternative and determined to "reward our friends and punish our enemies. Elect those who support anti-injunction bills in legislative halls." He made it clear, however, that this action did not mean the formation of a labor party. Gompers always fought those who advocated a labor party. In fact he feared it.

After World War I we find Mr. Gompers changing and modifying his views on political action. He was forced to the conclusion that economic action and nonpartisan political activity could not obtain the benefits union labor was now seeking. For labor now insisted on a share in the control of industry. A great struggle was raging between labor and capital. I saw that struggle in progress here in the House. The United States Steel Corp. and all big business making use of the injunction also either controlled or had great influence in the Republican Party. A few members of the Democratic Party were at times too much influenced by these predatory business groups. Something had to be done. Hence, much against his former views, Gompers took labor out into the political arena. The National Association of Manufacturers was already there. Big business had been there for many years.

The opposition was firmly entrenched in politics. It had men like Penrose, Root in the Senate and others in the House who placed every obstacle in the path of labor's progress. Here is an illustration of this. If you will pardon the personal allusion, Mr. Speaker, I remember well that in the first session of the Sixtieth Congress, I introduced the first bill in the House—H. R. 21962—which embodied the principles of workmen's compensation. The Republican majority, influenced by the large railroad interests, refused to consider same. They said it was unconstitutional and too costly, that it would seriously impair the financial structure of the railroad industry. History records otherwise.

For 10 years we had endeavored to pass the Employer's Liability Act abolishing the barbaric doctrines of assumed risk, contributory negligence, and the doctrine of fellow servant. No sooner

had we passed this act than the railroad interests began to agitate for repeal. And on March 1, 1913, in the closing hours of the session the Republican-controlled House railroaded through the House with only 40 minutes' debate and over 100 amendments to be acted upon, a measure—S. 5382—which practically repealed the small benefits in the then extant law. This legislation favored the great railroads and corporations of the country, was a railroad measure to the *n*th degree and against the laboring men of the Nation.

On this eventful occasion, my thoughts and memories revert to those memorable days in my early career as a Member of Congress, when labor was fighting for its very life and for a rightful place in our social, economic, and political life. Its champion was Gompers, and a braver, more spirited and able fighter and leader never lived. His opposition came from both within and without. He traded blow for blow and he fought his way to the top amid a morass of confused thinking with no compass to chart the course, and dissension to quell in his own ranks.

The enemies of labor saw in him a distinct threat to their stronghold and control of the worker—control to time, wages, and the general welfare of their workers whom they kept in serfdom. He raised their status to that of free men. He protected the rights of the union, forced the employer to collective bargaining and bettered the working conditions of the laboring men and women. Samuel Gompers, Mr. Speaker, represented a dynamic force in American life and left a record of rectitude, sincerity, and altruism which brought about a labor movement in America which is stronger, more inclusive, and more united and compact than in any other nation in the world.

Today the American Federation of Labor reflects the aims, hopes, and aspirations of Samuel Gompers for the welfare of the worker and the Nation of which that worthy organization is an integral and necessary part.

Although departed from our midst almost a quarter of a century ago, the spirit of Samuel Gompers lives in that great organization whose objects he furthered and in whose behalf he dedicated and consecrated his entire life.

One of his admirers aptly summed up his place in American history:

> America was his world. * * * Every spot and every country outside of his American horizon was merely subsidiary and suburban. As a matter of fact, Samuel Gompers was the American American, although born in Whitechapel of his time. What he lacked in greatness of soul or brain, he made up in loyalty of untarnished rectitude.

Mr. Speaker, the whole world respects and reveres the memory of my close friend, Samuel Gompers and the exalted Americanism of a great American whose last words were so typical of a patriot:

> God bless our American institutions. May they grow better day by day.

Danger to United States in Silencing Defense Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article entitled "Danger to United States Seen in Silencing Experts on Defense Problems," written by the well-known writer David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star on August 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGER TO UNITED STATES SEEN IN SILENCING EXPERTS ON DEFENSE PROBLEMS—MACARTHUR DECLARATION ON FORMOSA IS MILITARY THEORY AT ITS BEST

(By David Lawrence)

Conceding that this week was an inopportune occasion for the discussion of the strategic importance of Formosa, the fact remains that an unhealthy attitude is developing in the National Capital toward the revelation of truth to the American people by military men concerning problems of defense.

The United States Armed Forces are today in Korea and blood is being spilled because the defense of an outpost in the Far East was not thoroughly discussed in advance and the opinion of our highest military men solicited on the subject.

Why was the defense of Korea, for instance, considered of no interest to the people of the United States last January? Who made the decision to suppress the facts about Korea's strategic importance? Since it was not the military men, how can the American people learn what their views really were? It does not seem plausible that American military opinion would regard the possession of Korea by a hostile power as a matter of indifference to us, especially when the Japan-Okinawa-Philippines line is supposed to be our prime defense. For if Korea were to become a base for Soviet air power and submarines, the future of Japan as a possible ally of the United States would become perilous. Korea geographically is a knife projected against a peaceful Japan.

TOO MUCH "HUSH-HUSH"

The argument will be made that to discuss anything of this sort is to invade "foreign policy." There was a time—in the days of isolationism—when American frontiers were on our own Pacific and Atlantic coasts. Today, however, America's frontiers are on the Elbe River in Europe and in Korea as well as Formosa. To insist that everything going on abroad can be commented on unofficially only by one department is to carry the hush-hush idea too far.

The outline of American defense strategy which General MacArthur has given is exactly the outline which the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff would express if they were permitted to speak their minds as to defense problems outside the continental United States. There were one or two sentences in the MacArthur statement which might better have been omitted by the general, as they referred to the views of opponents of the policy he was advocating. Outside of these brief phrases, the declaration can stand as an expression of American military theory at its best.

The danger to America in suppressing expert discussion of defense problems is growing. Back in 1940, when Admiral Taussig was testifying before a Senate committee, he advocated that the United States enter into naval arrangements immediately with other nations, including the Netherlands Government, for the protection of our far-eastern interests. He was reprimanded by the late President Roosevelt, but the advice he gave, if accepted, would have saved many thousands of American lives and might have thwarted Japan's naval sortie to the south in 1941 and 1942.

EXPERTS INTIMIDATED

Only last October Admiral Louis Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations, in answer to the questions of the House Armed Services Committee, expressed himself frankly and conscientiously on what defense weapons and strategy should be used. Had his advice been taken, America would today be better able to cope with the Korean war. But he was publicly reprimanded and removed from office. Immediately all expert opinion was intimidated and today it's an open secret that congressional committees cannot get completely independent views from high military chiefs.

One wonders how far toward the totalitarianism of communism and fascism Americans have drifted in their zeal for suppression of truth, especially when it is sought from experts in their particular fields. If the State Department alone can discuss defense of areas in different parts of the world where our forces are stationed, then the value of a Defense Department as an instrument of military advice may be questioned. If there are, as reported, major differences of opinion today between the State Department and the Defense Department, it must be because each is not permitted freedom of expression. There is no reason why the Defense Department shouldn't say what it thinks is a necessary defense program from the standpoint of national safety, and there is no reason why the State Department should not, if it wishes, argue against the wisdom of employing American forces in defense of those same areas—looking at it from a diplomatic standpoint.

The American people could then get all the facts and all the expert advice. But apparently there are some Americans who believe that everybody hereabouts should accept goose-stepping discipline and that even the press should refrain from printing news giving the statements of important persons if such statements do not conform to State Department policy.

Inexcusable Blunder Made by Justice Burton, of the Supreme Court of the United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inexcusable blunders ever committed by an official of this Government was that committed by Justice Burton, of the Supreme Court of the United States,

in his insult to the people of Mississippi a few days ago, when, without rhyme or reason, he issued a stay of execution in the case of Willie McGee, a Negro, who has been convicted three times of one of the most horrible, brutal, and beastly crimes ever committed by a human being.

We all realize the dangers of the Frankfurter cabal, and the damages its far-reaching tentacles have done, and are still doing. When I read this order issued by Justice Burton a few days ago, at the behest of a bunch of Communists, it made me wonder how far the influence of this cabal had gone in controlling the courts of the land.

Thomas Jefferson once said that if this Government was ever destroyed, it would be destroyed by the courts.

Now here are the facts in the Willie McGee case. Willie McGee was convicted of raping a white woman on November 2, 1945—almost 5 years ago. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court of Mississippi on the ground that public sentiment against that vicious outrage was so high that McGee could not get a fair trial in the county in which he committed the crime. The supreme court reversed the case and granted a change of venue. He was tried again before an impartial jury in another county, convicted, and sentenced to death. An appeal was taken to the supreme court of Mississippi again on the ground that there were no Negroes on the jury. The case was reversed, Negroes were placed on the jury, and the defendant was again unanimously convicted.

His case was again appealed to the Supreme Court of Mississippi and affirmed by that tribunal.

A petition for a stay of execution was then filed with the Supreme Court of the United States by a couple of New York lawyers, named Samuel Rosenwein and Arthur G. Silverman, who represent a Communist-front organization known as the Civil Rights Congress. The Supreme Court denied the petition for a stay of execution.

They then filed with the Supreme Court of the United States a petition for a writ of certiorari to have the case reviewed by that tribunal. That petition was denied, and the writ of certiorari refused.

Then after the Supreme Court had adjourned, a Communist lawyer from New York, named Bella S. Abzug, representing the so-called Civil Rights Congress—which was branded by the Attorney General of the United States as "subversive and Communist" and by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as being "dedicated to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party," this Bella S. Abzug, attorney for this Communist organization, filed with Justice Burton a petition asking for a stay of execution and a writ of certiorari, rehashing the same lying contention the Communists have been using throughout this long drawn-out proceeding.

Justice Burton simply went out of his way to issue this stay of execution at the request of this Communist-front organization—thereby doing the law abiding Negroes, as well as the white people, of Mississippi infinite harm.

These Communists are whining because this is a Negro that was convicted of raping a white woman. If he had been a white man and had been convicted of such a crime, he would have been executed long ago.

These Reds do not give a tinker's damn about the Negroes. They are just trying to stir up strife wherever they can.

Thomas Jefferson may have been right when he said that if this Government was ever destroyed it would be destroyed by the courts.

Moscow Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD relative to the Moscow peace petition, I include the following:

THE MOSCOW PEACE PETITION

A striking cartoon appearing recently in a morning paper—Washington Post, July 14—depicted a Soviet-type tank grinding over the body of a South Korean. A grinning officer leaned from the tank, dangling a scroll before his agonized victim. "By the way," he says, "have you signed our petition to outlaw new weapons?"

That cartoon is only a slight exaggeration of the truth. And the petition is no joke. It is part of an unparalleled Moscow propaganda offensive.

Over half the people of Korea are said to have signed that petition before the Red puppet forces unleashed their unprovoked attack on the Republic of Korea. That should satisfy anybody's mind as to how much peace there really is in the petition.

The same petition is being circulated all over the world, and America is no exception. There's a large-scale campaign going on here too. It's not by any means confined to Reds or fellow travelers. It is aimed at average, decent people in your town and mine.

That petition is made in Moscow. It has no other purpose on earth than to stir up confusion in the ranks of democracy, and to hide the infamous march of Red legions behind a smoke screen of peaceful protestations. It is an integral part of the Communist tactic of preaching peace and practicing war.

While most of us have been told about the true nature of the petition, or can see through it without too much trouble, a lot of Americans will be taken in by it unless they are warned.

I think that this peace petition ought to be publicized in every possible way, to assure that more innocent people will not be duped into aiding and abetting the Communist effort to conquer the world. We should let the American people know that every signature on that petition is a knife in the back of an American soldier in Korea.

I think moreover that the United States should take a stronger and more dynamic course in publicizing the ideals and the way of life which we are championing. It is worse than tragic to let the Communists steal and distort to their own ends such words as peace, liberty and democracy. It is a grave error to let the impression grow among oppressed peoples that the Soviet Union is the real proponent of peace, and more specifically, of international controls for atomic energy.

A brief look at the Soviet peace petition and the over-all propaganda program of which it is a part will indicate the serious nature of the offensive, and will point to ways of combating it.

Designed to weaken the free peoples' will to resist conquest by force or by subversion, the Moscow peace offensive works in these main ways:

It excites European fears that the rearmament program of the western powers will result in a lowering of living standards only now recovering from the war, that food and clothing will become increasingly hard to get, and that taxes will go sky-high. This attack of course is meant to reduce support for the joint defense effort in western Europe.

It stirs the universal fear of war, and particularly seeks to convince Europeans that western rearmament will provoke a war which will destroy Europe.

It preys upon the universal desire of people to end the nerve-wracking international tension.

Now let us consider the Moscow petition. The original copy was fabricated in Stockholm last March at the Red-dominated Congress of Partisans of Peace. It has become broadly known as the "Stockholm Petition," despite the bitter and disgusted objections of the Swedes. I think that out of courtesy to the Swedes and a simple desire for accuracy, Americans should clearly label this petition as the "Moscow Petition" from now on.

The petition calls for three things.

First, the unconditional abolition of atomic weapons;

Second, the institution of strict international controls;

Third, establishing that any government which first uses the atomic weapon against another shall be considered guilty of war crimes against humanity.

Translated into simple English, that petition reads: "Disruption, duplicity, and double-dealing." While it should be no surprise that the Communists engage in such practices, this simply worded petition has a surface innocence which belies its real meaning. Let us look a little closer.

Now everybody who reads the papers knows that the United States has been trying for 5 years to promote an effective international system of atomic control. We offered to give up all our tremendous advantage in the atomic field if nations would work out a fool-proof set-up of controls and inspection. We even developed a pilot plan. The UN took it over, improved it, and worked out an

international plan which was approved by most of the nations of the world.

Among all the nations of the world, only the Soviet Union and four of its satellites vetoed against the plan.

Why did they reject the UN plan? We can guess. The UN plan would have made it impossible to build atom bombs in secret. It would have taken the ownership of atomic plants and materials out of the hands of individual nations, and so would have limited each nation's development of atomic energy. Finally, it would have allowed international teams free access to any country at any time. An international searchlight would have been thrown into all the dark corners of the Soviet regime.

So much for the demand of the Moscow petition for international control of atomic energy. Men in nations where information is uncensored, and those in slave states who are able to listen to the Voice of America or the UN radio will know who is the real opponent of international control of the atom. Communism is the opponent.

Now, what about the demand of the petition for the unconditional abolition of atomic weapons?

This is the standard Soviet counterproposal to the UN plan for atomic control. The line is that the Soviet Union cannot afford to become enmeshed in a world control system, undergo inspection, and so on, until the United States has given up its stockpile of bombs. The Soviets suggest, therefore, that all bombs be destroyed, the thoroughness of the job to be checked by the UN, and that after that has been done will be the proper time to negotiate an international plan. They are very vague about controls or inspection. They believe that control and policing of the atom should in the main be the responsibility of each nation—the Communist honor system, in other words.

The proposal for the total abolition of weapons as a condition to setting up a control system seems fairly obvious as to purpose. It is a demand impossible of fulfillment, since the free world cannot deprive itself of its major weapon without real reciprocity. It follows that the Soviet rulers do not now want a real control system. They block it by their proposal, and at the same time try to put the United States in the unflattering light of an aggressive and war-mongering nation.

The suggestion of the petition that the first nation to use an atomic weapon be considered a war criminal against humanity also has obvious implications.

From the Red standpoint the main fact about atomic energy today is that the United States has a lot more of it than the Soviet Union does. Our stockpiles of atomic weapons are probably the only thing preventing the launching of a flood of Red death around the world.

The Soviets have always hoped to neutralize this one military advantage of the democratic world. They have tried to do it by their counterproposals in the UN. They are trying to do it now with their propaganda campaign. If they could, for example, extract a statement that the United States will never drop the first bomb, they would win a great strategic victory. With the great deterrent effect of American atomic power neutralized, the Soviets or their satellites could mount conventional military attacks at will—Korea again all over the world. There would be almost nothing to stop them. Meanwhile, they would be doing their best to catch up with us in the development of atomic weapons.

Summing it up, here is what the Soviets probably hope to accomplish through this peace petition of theirs:

As mentioned, they would like to neutralize the advantage of the bomb by making its use indefensible in the view of world opinion.

They want to associate the idea of aggression with the atomic weapon, and to disassociate it from the real acts of aggression being carried on by the Communists.

They may want to build up a basis for claiming popular support for their atomic policy proposals to the UN.

They want to channelize non-Communist peace sentiment into the Partisans of Peace movement.

By these means they seek to contribute to over-all disruption—to turn democratic peoples against their own governments and policies; to encourage mutual distrust among free governments and peoples; and to trick non-Communists into abetting their efforts to sabotage western security measures through slow-ups, strikes and the like.

Now we have very good authority for the sabotage aspect of the Red petition. I cite an article from the Soviet newspaper Pravda by the Communist writer Leonid Sobelev. The article makes it clear that the phony peace appeal has purposes other than simply to outlaw the atom bomb.

Concerning the real implications of signing the petition, Mr. Sobelev had this to say:

> I vote against war—and this is not merely a matter of words. It means that I shall do my utmost to prevent war. I shall stop the trains; I shall refuse to unload the ships carrying war materials; I shall not supply fuel for the planes; I shall seize the arms of the mercenaries; I shall not allow my son or my husband to go to war; I shall deprive the ministers of food, drink, telephones, transport, and coal. Let those who are dragging us into the war do the fighting themselves.

That petition is a call to treason. The interpretation placed on the petition by the Kremlin, and being made known to Communists in other countries, is that it is a call for the creation of fifth columns in all free countries to sabotage both their economies and their defense preparations.

Further evidence as to the Moscow interpretation of the peace petition appears in a New York Times story of July 21. Needless to say, American Communists are not talking in public about the Kremlin interpretation of the phony peace petition. It would be very healthy if all Americans could read Mr. Sobelev's words.

The Moscow "petitions of peace" campaign is big and well ordered. Its goal is to gather three to four hundred million signatures. That is a lot of signatures, even figuring in the subjugated people who sign what they are told to sign. It adds up to a major and very effective propaganda stroke.

The campaign is about completed in North Korea and in eastern Europe, with over 60,000,000 signatures claimed. The Soviet Union claims over 90,000,000 names in its campaign at home. A campaign in Viet Nam and China has just got under way. In western Europe over 15,000,000 signatures are claimed. The most active campaigns are in France, 5,000,000 gathered to date, and Italy. These nations, as is well known, are particularly concerned with postwar problems and troubled by tough Communist minorities. Interestingly, Yugoslavia has been excluded from the "partisans of peace" group and is not taking part in the campaign. The Latin-American, African, and non-Communist Asian programs are just under way.

The Communist goal in the United States is 5,000,000 signatures. Estimated Communists and fellow travelers in the United States number about 500,000. That means that the Communists and their conscious friends hope to rope in about four and a half million unsuspecting Americans of unquestionable loyalty.

Although the Daily Worker and other Communist publications are promoting the propaganda drive, the Soviet Union is trying to camouflage its direction and the exclusively communistic nature of the campaign. However, the Communists here in the United States seem to be forced to work pretty much in the open with the aid of transparent Communist-front organizations.

Among these are the Peace Information Bureau in New York, the American Slav Congress, the National Labor Peace Conference connected with the international Partisans of Peace group, and the United States Youth Sponsoring Committee, World Peace Appeal, in New York. These groups have been most active in soliciting signatures around Philadelphia, New York City, and the west coast, though they have circulated petitions right here in Washington.

The United States campaign will conclude with a National Peace Congress in September at New York under the aegis of the American Slav Congress. Then a number of events are being lined up to dignify the later stages of the global campaign. A special jury will meet in August to study the nominations for three international awards for artistic works considered most effective in promoting world peace. The whole show will be rounded off by a gala World Peace Congress in the late fall, at which the Red propaganda effort will probably achieve new heights of activity.

With this information in hand, it is difficult not to see the possible gravity of the propaganda drive. In Berlin, where the citizens have perhaps a more intimate understanding of the meaning of communism than most of us here, the Communists distributing these petitions do so at the risk of life and limb. Here in America we should be looking for effective ways to counteract the Communist appeal.

Both a positive and a negative approach to the challenge are needed.

On the negative side, we must find ways of limiting directly the effectiveness of the campaign by exposing its real nature and purposes, and by giving it broad and unfavorable publicity.

We must brand it as a product of Moscow.

There is much we can do. For example, the big, well-organized Red signature drive in the United States obviously must cost a lot of money. Just where is that money coming from? That is a question which an alert Congress might be asking at this time. It might not be a bad idea to find out just who is sustaining this Communist drive at home at the same time that other Americans are sustaining with their lives an anti-Communist drive in Korea.

While the negative, debunking job is necessary, it should not be the main job. Why in the world must we and the other western democracies always be on the defensive in the battle of ideas and words with the Communists? Certainly, we are at a temporary disadvantage in having to fight cleanly and honestly against an unprincipled opponent. That does not mean that we have to fight with pillows, and with our eyes closed. The truth and the right are on the side of the democracies, and they must be used effectively.

We must fight hard and heads up, beating the Communists to the jump. We must push them on the defensive in this conflict of words—of truth against lies.

We cannot expect to succeed in beating the Communists at their own game if we refuse to invest time, money, and effort in our instruments for informing the world about our beliefs and activities. We cannot fight them effectively if we remain constantly on the defensive, able only to counterpunch against absurd, yet telling, accusations.

We must fight the big lie with the big truth.

Paying for the War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter published in the Pierce County (Nebr.) Leader for July 27, 1950:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT HARRY TRUMAN, SENATOR HUGH BUTLER, AND CONGRESSMAN KARL STEFAN AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: A week ago Wednesday the majority of the families in this county gathered around their radios to hear the words of the President as he told of the seriousness of the communistic threat to the world and of the actions of the United States to meet this threat in Korea.

Now, a full week has gone by and folks have all had a chance to think over carefully the seriousness of that talk.

The general opinion of the residents in this county is wholehearted support of the "policing" decision in Korea. This decision is not a "flag-waving decision," but the result of careful consideration of the threat to the American way of life.

The people here in this county realize that this new war, or "policing," as you may want to call it, is going to bring tears and lifelong sorrows to many who will feel the loss of loved ones.

It is thoroughly understood that the Korean situation is not just a skirmish but a dreadful battle that will last 6 to 9 months or perhaps a year.

The people of Pierce County are ready and willing to do their part. The job that falls upon this county is furnishing manpower in forming an army and navy to serve our country. Probably the second largest contribution by the county will be the raising of foodstuffs. For this job the county is well equipped and fully experienced.

Perhaps some of our folks will enter defense plants, move their families to larger communities, and aid in the building of tanks, airplanes, and other implements of war.

There is one other part that the citizens of Pierce County will be called upon to do to win this war—that is, to help pay our share of the financial burden.

The President, in his radio talk, mentioned the tremendous cost of armament and preparedness. Perhaps we may grumble somewhat, but if by digging deeper into our pockets we can better equip our soldiers and perhaps speed up the day of final victory, we will be proud to furnish our dollars.

Veterans of World Wars I and II have carefully explained the needs of good clothing and good food and good armament to build a good army. Do not spare any expense in making our Armed Forces the best equipped in this world today.

There is one small request we would like to make of our President, Mr. Truman, and of Mr. BUTLER and Mr. STEFAN. You three gentlemen are the voice in Washington for Pierce County, and with the power of that voice will you see that the dollars sent from Pierce County are spent wisely? Furnish our Armed Forces with everything they need or can use, but for the duration of this warlike unrest, let's curtail drastically or eliminate entirely all the many Federal projects that take so many tax dollars today.

We are expecting a heavy tax burden that is going to hurt, but this pain will amount to little or nothing if we know these dollars will shorten the war and save lives of the men and boys in our Armed Forces.

A new post-office building or two, or perhaps a new Federal building, can easily be postponed until after this war. We agree slum clearances are fine things, but put these plans in the bottom drawer of your desks until peace once more is here.

Perhaps a new river dike or a new bridge needs Federal assistance—just let it wait until the war is over. We know we will have to postpone many of our personal plans during this emergency, and as our representatives in Washington we sincerely ask that you make the same plans to postpone Federal projects that can wait.

When this Nation is at war politics is an issue that should be forgotten. Hammer the lid tight on that well-known pork barrel and direct our dollars to where they will do the most good.

Through excellent equipment may the lives of many American men be spared. With the efforts of Pierce County citizens and with our financial assistance may this war be a short one. With your help in Washington to see our dollars well directed may the day of peace and the ceasing of bloodshed be hastened.

BILL COX.

Hon. William J. Green, Jr., of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it affords me a great deal of pleasure to say a few kind words about my good friend and colleague, and to place before the House the words of praise for the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., of the Fifth District, written by my friend, Elihu D. Stone, of the American Zionist Council, because of my deep personal interest in Zionism and the Republic of Israel.

That Mr. GREEN is a warm personal friend, as well as a colleague, adds further to my pleasure. Mr. Speaker, we all know that in the gentleman's service in the House of Representatives he has shown himself worthy of the honor bestowed by his constituents. He has proved himself alert, well informed, devoted to humanitarian legislation of merit, and dedicated to the noblest aims of representative government, while never stultifying his record or his personality by being ostentatious—in other words, he is able, energetic, decisive, but never a "stuffed shirt." He is a man among men, a man who has strong convictions and who has the courage to stand up for them.

I am very happy to include in the RECORD, under leave, as part of my remarks, the letter addressed to the gentleman by Mr. Stone on June 20, to which I have already referred:

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
WASHINGTON BUREAU.

Hon. WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: The joint declaration by the Government of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, relative to the Near East, which was made public by the President on May 25, is a significant document which may lead to the establishment of peaceful relationship between Israel and its Arab neighbors if honestly carried out.

Your kind and effective cooperation in urging our State Department to take action for the purpose of promoting peace and tranquillity in the Near East is deeply appreciated.

The said declaration as I analyze it contains the following points:

1. For the first time in modern history the Big Three—the United States, England, and France—agreed on concerted and coordinated action in that sensitive region of the world—the Near East. It is a wholesome substitute for the pursuit of the hitherto policy of unilateral action resulting very often in conflicting action. It imposes collective responsibility.

2. The calling for a pledge on the Arab countries and Israel to refrain from any and every aggressive or warlike action against one another as a condition precedent to the future delivery of arms should serve to discourage the Arab warmongers.

3. The pledge by the Big Three to place Israel in a condition of equality and parity

with the Arab States with reference to delivery of arms, and the establishment of a balance of arms between them, if honestly carried out, should serve as an encouragement toward establishment of permanent peace between the Arab States and Israel.

4. The unequivocal declaration by the Big Three of their opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab States and Israel implies a policy of vigilant watchfulness obligating the Big Three to stop the shipment of arms whenever the threat of such an arms race manifests itself.

5. The Big Three pledged themselves to take immediate and joint action whenever and wherever a threat to peace in that section of the world may appear. They agreed to take such joint action within and outside the United Nations. The term "outside" is most decisive. It implies speedy and prompt action by the Big Three to prevent a threat of aggression from being converted into actual aggression.

Like any other similar document this declaration will not execute itself. It is as strong as the reliability of its authors and no more.

We assume and we must assume that the Big Three—the United States, England, and France—acted and will continue to act in good faith.

However, in the light of past sad experiences and disappointments, we must rely upon the vigilance of the friends of Israel like your good self to see to it that the Department of State carries out honestly the terms of the said Big Three declaration.

As you well know, the past record of the Near East Division of our Department of State is one of unfriendliness to Israel. The "Bevin" line dominated.

Your noble services to the cause of Israel will always be remembered. The Jewish people are a grateful people; they never forget their friends.

You, dear Congressman, have proven yourself to be a true and tested friend.

With kindest regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

ELIHU D. STONE.

Lee Pressman Is Hard Pressed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] called attention this morning to the fact that the American people are entitled to know how it came about that Mr. Lee Pressman and other avowed one-time Communists, obtained high positions in the Federal service. I think the American people suspect the answer.

Be that as it may, the Sun, of Baltimore, in an editorial contained in its edition of yesterday, sets forth some of the results that have followed the activities of men of this stamp while in the employ of our Federal Government.

Under leave, the editorial follows:

THOSE EARLY NEW DEAL AGRARIANS WHO LEARNED FARMING FROM K. MARX

Ever since the New Dealers first arrived in Washington there has been a partiality among them for the asphalt-concrete type of farm expert. Men who did their farming in penthouse window boxes, and their farm thinking in Park Avenue cocktail parties were numerous in all the early New Deal farm offices. Among them, Mr. Lee Pressman now tells us, was a high concentration of farmers whose agricultural lore consisted largely of what they had picked up from Karl Marx.

To men of this stripe, the Abts, the Kramers, the Witts, and the Pressmans, the American farmer was a peasant in thrall to finance capital. His salvation lay in putting him in thrall as soon as possible to the sidewalk-and-asphalt farmers who were working up farm plans at the Washington cocktail parties. In small brick houses in Georgetown and in the air-cooled offices of the Agriculture and other Departments, these Marxoid agrarians mapped out little-pig massacres, plow-under deals, support-price programs, all with an eye cocked as much on harvesting votes as on harvesting comestibles.

It has taken just under 20 years for Mr. Pressman to work out from under these delusions (taking him at his word that he really has done so at last). Let us remember that Mr. Wallace, under whose secretaryship of agriculture these Marxoid infestations first began, has himself only just announced that he now sees through Stalin's tricks. In all Mr. Wallace's public life there has never been a whisper of graft in the sense of political corruption. But the efforts in Mr. Wallace's tenure to graft red communism onto the sturdy plant of American agriculture will rank as one of the big farm busts of all time.

The Need Is for Effective Security Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REVA BECK BOSONE
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 31, 1950:

THE NEED IS FOR EFFECTIVE SECURITY LAWS

The United States Government, and specifically the branch principally concerned, the FBI, should have at its command every legislative tool that is needed to cope with the Communists and other subversives.

To that end the President and Congress should join in securing new and amended laws that would plug up existing loopholes in our security set-up.

But emphatically not wanted are laws that would handicap instead of help; laws that would be ineffective; laws that would prove unconstitutional; laws that would impose police state measures contrary to democratic principles.

There is grave danger that in its haste to establish new curbs on espionage Congress may overstep the bounds both of practicality and constitutionality.

President Truman did not help the situation when he submitted to Congress a program to combat subversive activity that obviously fell short of the need. As a result the House quickly framed a much more stringent set of laws which have now been passed by an overwhelming majority and sent to the Senate.

The over-all objective of this bill is good, but the means of attaining it are open to question.

The bill pins its hope of controlling subversive activity mainly upon a new requirement for the registration of all members of the Communist Party and of so-called Communist-front organizations.

Being required to register may impose some inconvenience upon card-carrying members of the Communist Party, but it cannot make them any less Communists or restrict their activities on behalf of Communist aims.

And it leaves untouched the large number of persons who are not members of the party but who follow its line and do its bidding as part of its underground forces and as Communist sympathizers.

It is said on behalf of the proposed regulation that it would help identify Communists and thus make them more easily subject to surveillance. But those who would register are already known as Communists. They are members of the out-in-the-open group already, and whether they register or not, they are easily recognized as Communists.

The proposed bill will not affect the great bulk of the pro-Communist force in this country, who deny they are party members, who mask their activities and affiliations and who would continue to work just as zealously against this Nation after the new measure is passed.

In addition, the law would require Communists to register as agents of what it terms an outright international conspiracy to overthrow democracy throughout the world. This provision bears all the earmarks of self-incrimination and on that basis is likely to label the bill as unconstitutional when and if it gets before the courts.

Back of the proposed measure is an old fallacy concerning Communists—that identifying them and removing them from membership in the party will make them any less Communists.

Some of the provisions of the House-approved bill are sound, including those that would establish stiffer punishments for Government employees who seek to give Government information to foreign agents, and extend the time in which espionage prosecution may be started.

But reliance on Communist registration as a curb on anti-American activity is a mistake.

The Senate should look into this subject more closely than the House has done. It should call before it representatives of the Department of Justice and particularly J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, and ask them to present the problem of subversives and to say what is needed to cope with it.

Handling Communists and pro-Communists and their threat to national security is an FBI responsibility. Whatever that agency wants in new legislation and new authority should be granted immediately. But it is folly to pass laws that are ineffective, unworkable, and unconstitutional.

Adjournment of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge the membership against even considering recess or adjournment at this time. There are many questions that must first be considered. I shall not list them all because I think it should suffice to mention only two—the consideration of an excess-profits tax and full military preparedness, among others. We should stay in session.

Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown, from the Washington Times-Herald for August 30, 1950:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

General MacArthur, now wearing the gag of the civilian bureaucracy in Washington, has nonetheless, by a happy accident, been able to reveal to the American people the peril inherent in further adherence to Truman-Acheson defeatism in Formosa.

Like a good soldier the great general who is directing the war in Korea obeyed his Commander in Chief.

He withdrew his message of solemn warning of national danger addressed to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago.

The accident which prevented this danger signal from being suppressed and kept from public knowledge was the fact that this message, prematurely printed in a national magazine, was in the mails on a Sunday, when it was too late to stop its distribution.

On such narrow chances do the fates of kingdoms sometimes depend. Man proposes, and God disposes.

On January 2 of this year former President Hoover and Senator TAFT demanded that the United States protect Formosa, by force if necessary. They still could speak out the truth.

But our high command has been silenced, intimidated and reduced in rank for daring to differ with State Department policy.

MacArthur's rift in the curtain of secrecy came at an opportune time.

From now on it will be impossible to deceive the American people as to the true American policy in Asia. They now know that their lives and their safety depend upon backing MacArthur's opinion to the hilt.

Since this apparently is not the administration's intent it devolves upon Congress as a vital responsibility to see to it that MacArthur's views must be carried out.

General MacArthur's message to the veterans is a message to everybody, East and West.

But there is a sentence in his concluding remarks about the necessity of preventing Formosa from falling into enemy hands which is a matter of life and death to the Pacific coast and the Mountain States, where sentiment for MacArthur, already soaring, will be swept to new heights of esteem and confidence. He said:

"It (to lose Formosa) would shift any future battle area 5,000 miles eastward to the coasts of our American continent, our own home coast."

The easterner, whether civilian or serving in Congress, is apt to think of national security from Communist attack in terms of certain big cities, New York, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, and Washington.

It is not until the traveler from the eastern seaboard reaches our west coast that he realizes fully how near the war in Korea really is, what little stands between that exposed and vulnerable part of our country, and hostile planes and fleets of submarines.

In driving home this thought with all the prestige of our greatest living military genius behind it, MacArthur has rendered one of the most signal services of his brilliant career.

He has made it clear to the dullest mind that if the fatal Acheson-Lattimore policy, involving the writing off of Formosa and its surrender to communism were adhered to, the next stage of world war III would be fought on the coasts of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and California.

Our task then wold be, not a police action to drive a few bandits back up to the Korean peninsula—which we have not yet been able to do—but to repel an invasion of our own mainland.

In this western region, so much more acutely aware of the proximity of the war which the Kremlin is waging against us than is the eastern section, eight States will elect nine United States Senators in November and a great number of Representatives in Congress.

MacArthur may be gagged. But any attempt to discipline him would be the signal for the defeat of every Democratic candidate from Senator down to town constable in every one of these States, to say nothing of the rest of the country.

The Washington bureaucracy may bare its fangs at Douglas MacArthur, but it will not dare to bite.

MacArthur and Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of August 30, 1950:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—MACARTHUR AND FORMOSA

(By Walter Lippmann)

With the Seventh Fleet under orders from the President to prevent any attack on Formosa, just what is it that has aroused General MacArthur? What has caused him to decide that it is "in the public interest" that he should at this time make a public issue of Formosa between himself and the President of the United States? That is an unusual thing for a general to do. In fact, it is very unusual indeed.

General MacArthur, quite plainly, is not satisfied with the President's decision of June 27 to prevent "the occupation of Formosa by Communist forces" and to let "the determination of the future status of Formosa * * * await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peaceful settlement with Japan, or consideration by the United Nations."

General MacArthur wants to do more than to prevent the occupation of Formosa by Communist forces. He wants to have the future of Formosa determined now, and to have it determined by this country unilaterally, and to have it determined in a way which calls for a reversal of the pledges given by the President of the United States to the United Nations.

On June 27 the Security Council received a formal statement from the President which said:

"In order that there may be no doubt in any quarter about our intentions regarding Formosa, I wish to state that the United States has no territorial ambitions whatever concerning that island, nor do we seek for ourselves any special position or privilege on Formosa.

"The present military neutralization of Formosa is without prejudice to political questions affecting that island. Our desire is that Formosa not become embroiled in hostilities disturbing to the peace of the Pacific and that all questions affecting Formosa be settled by peaceful means as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations."

This pledge of our intentions was repeated and amplified on August 25 in a letter by Mr. Austin to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

General MacArthur's statement is directed against the President's promise that we have no territorial ambitions whatever concerning Formosa and that we do not "seek for ourselves any special position or privilege on Formosa." General MacArthur wants a very special position on Formosa. He wants nothing less in fact than the permanent use of Formosa as an American air base. Formosa is an essential link, he argues in language designed to make us beloved by all mankind, in an "island chain" from which "we can dominate with air power every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore." General MacArthur is demanding that we establish a military protectorate over Formosa and that the island should be incorporated into a permanent American strategic system embracing the entire Pacific Ocean "to the shore of Asia."

This, then, is the issue which General MacArthur has chosen to raise between himself and the President, that we demand Formosa for ourselves—repudiating and reversing the Cairo declaration and our formal statement of purposes made when the United Nations voted the resolutions under which we are acting in Korea. General MacArthur does not say what we should do when the Security Council reminds us of our pledges.

General MacArthur's strategic argument itself, even when it is stripped—as he strips it—of all moral and political considerations, is not clear to me. The General says, first, that in our hands we can from Formosa and the island chain dominate with air power every Asiatic port from Vladivostock to Singapore. Obviously he must have meant to say that we can "dominate" every Asiatic port if we dominate the air between the island chain and the Asiatic ports. But suppose we do not have complete air supremacy at all times and everywhere. That could be. What then? Then Formosa might be dominated from the mainland and Formosa might be knocked out and Okinawa might be knocked out and Japan might be knocked out if that is also to be part of the island chain.

If American planes can fly from Formosa and Okinawa to Asiatic ports, then Asiatic planes can fly from Asiatic fields to Formosa and Okinawa. In our hands these advanced islands would be a strategic asset if we had certain control of the air. They would be a strategic liability if the local air defenses could be knocked out.

All that part of General MacArthur's argument which is devoted to showing the advantages of our holding these advanced bases rests on the assumption that there will be no powerful air force on the mainland of Asia. That is surely true. Formosa can be defended from the mainland if there is no strong air force on the mainland. Thus the Seventh Fleet can probably prevent the seizure of Formosa as long as the Chinese Communists do not have a strong air force. If they had one and were willing to use it, the position of the Seventh Fleet would be exceedingly uncomfortable.

Yet when General MacArthur turns to the disadvantages of letting Formosa fall to the Communists, he reverses his assumption and shows what they could do from Formosa if they had a powerful air force based on Formosa. What puzzles me in his argument is why we should suppose that they would

have no air force if we held Formosa, but that they would have a big air force if they held Formosa. Surely, if they had the air force to knock out friendly installations in the Philippines from Formosa, then they have the air force to knock out friendly installations on Formosa.

Is not Formosa much nearer to China than the Philippines are to Formosa? Why, then, does the General think we can defend Formosa more securely than we can defend the Philippines?

Speech of Hon. Rush D. Holt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SPEECH OF SENATOR RUSH D. HOLT BEFORE THE WEST VIRGINIA STATE REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE, CHARLESTON, AUGUST 12, 1950

I believe in the two party system and party responsibility. I recognize the necessity of party organization to discharge that responsibility. I propose to work with the State and national organizations of the Republican Party—as just one member of a patriotic team—in stopping the determined effort of the Washington bureaucrats to take America further down the road to socialism and ruin.

While I am a firm believer in these principles, I want to make it clear that I do not believe any man should surrender his personal convictions to the extent that he blindly and sheepishly follows any party leadership, especially when he is convinced that the policies of such leadership threaten the destruction of our country and the freedom of the individual citizen. If I had been willing to surrender these convictions I would not be here today. Instead I would be wearing the meaningless label of the Democratic Party marching down the destructive road of national socialism and blundering incompetence.

Taunts as to party change will not deter me from my obligation. With the best judgment I know, and after searching my soul, I changed my registration. I apologize to no one for doing what my conscience told me to be right.

Never in our history has there been such a challenge in government as there is today with so little ability in Washington to solve it.

America was not built by men who stood at the free lunch counter. She grew and prospered because our fathers and mothers were willing to work and had faith. They recognized that progress comes when thrift, labor and initiative are respected and rewarded.

Political promises are a dime a dozen in Washington, but we have reached a crisis where America must have more than promises. The boys in Korea were sent over there with a promise—and that's all. They found that promises would not meet the Communist tanks. American people are promised that in the next century we are going to see everyone happy and wealthy. This is a noble objective but few of us see the logic of giving up what we have today for the glibly made promise of the future.

We know the record of the promisers. We know that confusion and jealousy seep from every agency, board, department, bureau, and commission. We know that the bureaucratic method of doing a job the hard way in the wrong direction has not delivered. We have watched the placing of men who have been failures in private ventures telling successful men how to run their businesses. We have seen business stifled with red tape and regulation. We know that we are overtaxed, overregulated, and overgoverned. We know their promises mean little or nothing.

They overwork the word "security" and fail to tell the people that they want their liberties as a price of security. If one is interested only in security and does not care the price he pays for it, he should enter a penitentiary where he has free food, free rent, free medicine, free clothes, security at a maximum, but at what a price.

We favor security but we know that our free enterprise system has brought more security to more people in less time than any economic system devised by man. We know our progress has not been at the expense of our liberty but that with it came greater liberty. This we must keep.

The plans of the schemers were divulged when they started to put over socialized medicine. They grasped for the right to control the doctor. We cannot fail this challenge and we must stand up for the men of medicine, who have given us brilliant medical achievements, who have prolonged our lives, who have made our living healthier and happier, and not allow these to be supplanted by political medicine men. We will join with the physicians as they work toward more and better medical care. We do not intend to have every illness a happy hunting ground for a government snooper nor do we intend to keep our physicians from practicing medicine while they fill out forms for Oscar Ewing in his grandiose political scheme.

The cost of living has doubled and in many cases trebled. Hidden in that cost of living is the high cost of government, resultant from an overstuffed payroll. To reduce the cost of living, we should reduce the cost of government.

We will not make regulated puppets and criminals out of our farmers under the Brannan plan.

The planners through their reciprocal-trade agreement program have thrown our West Virginia miners out of their jobs, idled our glass factories, caused unemployment in the pottery industry. Even when they were advised of the damage done, they made nice speeches about interest in these men but did nothing to correct the situation. They knew that such "winking" was of no value but they felt it would deceive those injured. Let us be protectionists, not alone for the jobs of our workingmen, but for their freedom.

Our domestic confusion is bad enough but when it is coupled with stupidity and the appeasing of communism in our foreign affairs, it is time for a change.

We must have a national administration more interested in GI Joe than in being friendly to "good Old Joe." The Korean tragedy where our boys are being killed and wounded is just another incident in pitiful handling of our interests. We recall Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran. We cannot fail to remember that our Asiatic policy was influenced by Owen Lattimore. We cannot overlook the desertion of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and many other lands. We cannot forget the sell-out of China to the Reds. Men who do those things do not deserve our confidence.

While communism marches in the open in Europe and Asia, it slyly and effectively infiltrates to weaken us here. We see a congressional committee search for ways to defend the Communist infiltration rather than expose it. We must quit coddling communism and Communist fellow travelers.

All clear thinking citizens must join in the cause of saving America, here and abroad. These issues are beyond parties. They call for the best in all of us.

The Republican Party is the minority party in West Virginia. Its success will depend upon the independent vote. Our hope of success rests upon proving to the people that we will be sound and progressive. The Republican Party must not shy from that word progressive because it has been misused by crackpots and political shysters.

We will favor a decent assistance program, freed from the control of ward heelers. We will favor social security in its full meaning not as a scheme to get votes. We will accept our responsibilities for social and economic gains as honorable men and women not as cheap politicians. Our progressivism will give the most for the day without destroying the seed corn for the future. The people want us to be, and we will be, forward looking—based upon the sound precepts and lessons of the past.

Let us not hedge. Let us not dodge. Let us not be cowardly. Let us stand up and be counted for America against these revolutionaries who want not a new order but a return to the discarded bureaucratic mess of old Rome.

Many Democrats have not crossed the Rubicon, but they are ready to do so. This is their country, and they love it. They cannot long remain with those who have destroyed their once great party by making it an instrument of corrupt political machines, of power-crazed bureaucrats, of pinks and reds, of inept political hacks. Their party has been kidnaped. They do not like the security of our country being held up until the administration tries to get Mon Walgren, the champion pool player, from behind the eight ball. They cannot stand the perfumed smell of Johnny Maragon. They cannot escape the chill of the "deep freeze" of the bemedaled Harry Vaughn. The best way for real Democrats to regain their party is to repudiate those who have misused it.

I have two wonderful children. They deserve the opportunities and liberties I have been given. These bright-eyed youngsters cannot defend themselves. We cannot mortgage their future and the future of all children by deficit financing and reckless spending. I owe it to them as a parent and as an American to enlist in the cause of saving this country. To do less is cowardly.

We must win for America. We must not pussyfoot nor conduct a me-too campaign. We cannot outpromise the promisers. We cannot outdeal the experienced dealers in Washington. We have the greatest cause in the world, the preservation of the greatest country in the world. Let's stand with thousands of independents and save our country from communism, corruption, and confusion.

Our founding fathers had confidence in America and faith in God. As they closed the Declaration of Independence they wrote: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." May God guide us in our solemn duty and to the solution of our affairs. I pledge myself to such a cause.

Who Is Propagandizing Whom (From the United Nations Forum)?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, a

portion of a broadcast by Henry J. Taylor, a noted economist, author and journalist, sponsored by General Motors, in which he has answered certain questions propounded to him.

ANNOUNCER. Mr. Taylor, where do we stand now in the UN?

Mr. TAYLOR. Very badly, I think. It does seem, too, that we ought to do something about it.

Once more we are looking at our surface victories, instead of our deeper defeats. Certainly, there is a limit to the number of mistakes we can afford.

I went out to the Security Council meeting last week.

You should sit there and see Malik, as president of the Security Council, flicking specks off his soft gray sleeve, doodling with his pencil at the Council table under the klieg lights, and tying up the whle UN all the while—as did Molotov, as did Vishinsky. You should see them strut to their slick limousines, moving with their swarms of bulging Russian MVD guards—and filling our country with spies all the while.

Then you would wonder how insulted and outwitted we have to be—and for how long—before we come to our senses.

We are told that all this voting performance has been a big victory for us. But I don't see it.

MALIK'S AUDIENCE

Speaking from the UN platform to the world—in all languages and in blazing words—Russia calls the United States the foreign aggressor against the natives in Korea. She repeats it meeting after meeting, hour after hour.

Yet not once have we had nerve enough even to name the Soviet Union as involved. Nor have we ever called Russia the real aggressor, although everyone in the UN knows that is true.

But, remember, Malik was not talking to us or for us. He was, and is, talking for natives of Asia, where the majority of the people in this world somehow dwell—and for many people in Europe as well.

The night after the North Korean attack, when the degree of resistance by South Koreans was the question, I attempted to point this out: "All over the world we will have to learn that we can put a gun on the shoulder of a Korean, a Chinese, a Philippine, or what have you. But the gun will not be used effectively to resist communism unless the man with the American gun on his shoulder understands why the gun is there, and believes that it is better for him to die than to be under Communist control."

While Stalin fights us in the field with stooges tonight, Malik in the UN serves to decrease the effective anti-Communist will to fight in large bodies of people in other vast areas of the world—no matter how many arms we supply them.

All this is of direct military importance, and that's what Stalin has his eye on. Malik is putting mud in the nozzles of guns we gave others in Korea, in Formosa, the Philippines, Burma, Siam, and many places in Europe.

ANOTHER ACT OF AGGRESSION

The Soviet Union was thrown out, expelled as an aggressor from the League of Nations on December 14, 1939, for its shameful attack on little Finland.

If the Korean situation is important enough to be officially recognized by 53 of the UN as an act of aggression, then Russia should be thrown out of the UN too, as an aggressor against Korea. Further, all her satellite stooges should be thrown out with her—and the sooner, the better.

AN INCONGRUOUS SET-UP

Having Russia inside the UN, with her delegate, Malik, the President of the UN Security Council, is like having Earl Browder or Harry Bridges on the Board of Directors of the FBI.

Nothing will be accomplished toward peace or toward effective unity among anti-Communist nations in the UN so long as Russia is in the UN—using it as Russia has always used it, for Russia's own purposes.

The UN is the one best hope we have for international collaboration. But the UN, as a body striving effectively for security in the world, can really function only if it consists of an association of nations whose objectives are truly the same.

When you mix with the pigs you get your hands dirty. Our hands will be dirty, our positions will be inconsistent, our policies will be confused and ineffective, so long as we mix with the Stalin stooges in the UN.

The same thing holds true for the whole UN. For Stalinist membership is at war with the declared purposes of the entire organization.

On such questions as the recognition of Communist China, for example, the Soviet can use the UN to tie us up in a knot—or to split us and force us to quarrel with allies—while Stalin sits back and laughs all the while.

They're devils, these people. The UN flag is tainted by the red sickle.

Fifty-three free anti-Communist countries have stood up and been counted as against the aggression in Korea. Let them now stand up and throw out the aggressor.

This would have nothing whatever to do with Russia going to war or not going to war. Stalin will proceed to general war or not, depending entirely on whether he thinks he can win in world battle and bust the United States.

RED MOCKERY

The name Security Council is a mockery. For it offers no security with Russia in it.

Even the name United Nations is a mockery. For they are not united, and cannot be united as it is.

To pull this UN platform from under this propagandizing aggressor, throw him out, is the one last hope for effective unity and stability among those left in—the anti-Communist nations truly interested in cooperation and peace. For together they stand and divided they fall.

We have nothing to lose and everything to gain by lifting the UN to a truly moral level for the anti-Communist unity of the world.

Lincoln Never Said That

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from Harper's magazine of May 1950, regarding certain quotations which are attributed to Lincoln. The author, Albert A. Woldman, is director of industrial relations of the State of Ohio and a noted authority on Abraham Lincoln.

LINCOLN NEVER SAID THAT

(By Albert A. Woldman)

(As author of Lawyer Lincoln, Albert Woldman is frequently called on to answer questions about Lincoln. He has a scholar's zeal for getting at the truth.)

Abraham Lincoln, who gave the world the Gettysburg and inaugural addresses, the Bixby letter, and many other, equally familiar masterpieces of rhetoric and wisdom, never had a ghost writer while he was alive. But in the 85 years since his assassination, self-appointed ghost writers by the score have been improving his messages to suit their own purposes, revising or paraphrasing what he did say or even putting new, made-to-order sentiments in his mouth.

So universal has the fame of the prairie philosopher-President become that whenever the protagonist of a controversial issue can support his views with a pointed saying of Lincoln's he considers his case just about clinched. Like the Scriptures, Lincoln's words are quoted to prove or disprove almost every political, economic and social issue of the day. The only difficulty is, a lot of the words aren't Lincoln's.

When, recently, Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, rose in the House of Representatives to invoke Abraham Lincoln as an opponent of the welfare state, and Look magazine subsequently reprinted as an editorial the Lincoln "quotations" she used, better informed readers sharply called both the Congresswoman and Look to task and the story found its way into the pages of Time. Lincoln never said:

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

"You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

"You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.

"You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

"You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.

"You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

"You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.

"You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

There was no reason for Lincoln to say any of these things in his time, and, as Congresswoman BOLTON and Look might have realized, the words do not ring true. They were made to order for present-day consumption.

The history of these quotations is a good example of how new Lincolnisms come into being, are repeated and accepted as authentic. Congresswoman BOLTON inserted them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after Galen Drake, the radio broacaster, used them in one of his programs last November. Drake got them from the house organ of a New Jersey manufacturing company where the editor had printed them without checking their authenticity.

Had any one of these three checked carefully, they would have found that the Reverend Mr. William J. H. Boetcker, a clergyman now residing in Erie, Pa., and not Abraham Lincoln, was the author of the lines. In 1916, more than a half century after Lincoln's death, Boetcker, who had given up his pulpit to lecture on industrial relations, published a booklet entitled Inside Maxims which contained these gold nuggets:

We cannot strengthen the weak
By weakening the strong.
We cannot help the poor
By kicking the rich.

In a subsequent pamphlet (1st edition 1917, 2d edition 1945) Boetcker wrote The Industrial Decalogue: Ten Don'ts. Among the don'ts were the maxims:

"You cannot help men prudently by doing for them what they should and could do for themselves.

"You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income nor can you establish sound security on borrowed money.

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by spreading class hatred and preach the gospel of management's hatred against labor."

In still a third pamphlet, published in 1938, Boetcker added such sentiments as:

"We cannot help small men by keeping big men down.

"We cannot help the wage earner by holding the wage payer down."

A few years ago the Committee for Constitutional Government, with headquarters in New York City, distributed by the hundred thousands a leaflet captioned "Lincoln on Limitations." One side of the leaflet carried an authentic Lincoln statement; on the reverse side were Boetcker's 10 points. A footnote credited the 10 points to the inspiration of William J. H. Boetcker. However, the publication of Lincoln's and Boetcker's words together caused someone—erroneously or through wishful thinking—to attribute Boetcker's maxims to Lincoln. Once started, the fake Lincolnisms joined the great flood of other, equally spurious quotations.

Speaking at an American Federation of Labor dinner in honor of the late Samuel Gompers, Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY not long ago remarked that Gompers clearly believed with all his heart in Abraham Lincoln's dictum that "All that serves labor serves the Nation."

The Vice President was quoting the first sentence of an often repeated Lincoln declaration on labor which contains these un-Lincoln-like lines:

"All that harms labor is treason to America. No line can be drawn between these two. If any man tells you he loves America, yet hates labor, he is a liar. If any man tells you he trusts America, yet fears labor, he is a fool. There is no America without labor, and to fleece the one is to rob the other."

This alleged Lincoln statement was featured in full in the February 1943 issue of a labor journal which published the words on its cover, below a picture of the Great Emancipator. But Lincoln never said that, either. He never used the words "liar" and "fool" in referring to people who disagreed with him. No better proof of the phoniness of this quotation can be offered than Lincoln's actual words about labor on two separate occasions.

In a speech at New Haven on March 6, 1860, alluding to the strike of the shoe-factory workers of Lynn, Mass., Lincoln said:

"I am glad to see that a system of labor prevails in New England under which laborers can strike when they want to, where they are not obliged to work under all circumstances, and are not tied down and obliged to labor whether you pay them or not. I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to, and wish it might prevail everywhere."

In a message to Congress in 1861, he expressed his views on the relationships between employers and employees in these words:

"Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Nor it is denied that there is and probably always will be a relation between labor and capital producing mutual benefits."

A widely circulated, completely fabricated Lincoln "quotation" is a vicious anti-Catholic diatribe which bigots like to repeat for propaganda purposes. During a recent resurgence of religious hatred it was printed on a pamphlet embellished with a pen-and-ink sketch of the Civil War President and entitled "Lincoln's Warning":

"I do not pretend to be a prophet. But though not a prophet, I see a very dark cloud on our horizon. That dark cloud is coming from Rome. It is filled with tears of blood. It will rise and increase till its flanks will be torn by a flash of lightning, followed by a fearful peal of thunder. Then a cyclone such as the world has never seen will pass over the country, spreading ruin and desolation from north to south. After it is over, there will be long days of peace and prosperity; for Popery with its Jesuits and merciless Inquisition will have been forever swept away from our country. Neither I nor you, but our children, will see these things."

This passage was originally copied from a book by Charles Chiniquy, a recusant Catholic priest, expelled from the church. Lincoln as a lawyer once defended Chiniquy against a slander charge. From this chance acquaintanceship Chiniquy years later—at the height of Lincoln's fame—boasted of intimate friendship with him and wrote a fantastic account of how Lincoln confided to him in the most unreserved fashion his views on religion. Brazenly Chiniquy wrote that on a visit to the White House, the President had said to him, "You are almost the only one with whom I speak freely on the subject." The Lincoln quotation expressing fear of the Catholic Church is a similar figment of Chiniquy's imagination.

Back in June 1844, Lincoln wrote a resolution protesting the bigotry of the Know-Nothing movement, in which he declared:

"The guarantee of the right of conscience as found in the Constitution is most sacred and inviolable and one that belongs no less to the Catholic than to the Protestant. * * *. All attempts to abridge or interfere with those rights directly or indirectly, have our decided disapprobation and shall have our most effective opposition."

And on another occasion he said, "Let us remember that all American citizens are brothers in a common country and should dwell together in the bonds of fraternal feeling."

Perhaps the most often cited of all the spurious Lincoln quotations—repeated again and again whenever the issue of monopolistic corporations is discussed—is the statement that Lincoln is supposed to have made as the Civil War was coming to an end:

"I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working on the prejudices of the people until the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of war. God grant that my suspicion may prove groundless."

This supposed expression of Lincoln's fear over the impending crisis first came to light nearly a third of a century after his death, in a book entitled, "A Gold Conspiracy," written by Stephen Nicollette in 1896. People who held the same views as those stated in the quotation readily accepted it as authentic, and it found its way into numerous speeches and publications. In December 1931 Congressman Louis T. McFadden, of Pennsylvania, delivered a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives in which he referred to President Lincoln's statement about the crisis created by "the money power of the country." And this speech was duly recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, December 15, 1931. There is no evidence whatsoever that Lincoln wrote or spoke the quoted words.

While Lincoln was still a young man he joined the Washington Temperance Society and became a leading exponent of total abstinence. In lectures he spoke feelingly about the twin evils of slavery and drink and dreamed of the day "when there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on the earth."

When the notification committee came to his home in Springfield to inform him officially of his nomination to the Presidency, Lincoln served his visitors glasses of cold water. He explained later, "Having kept house 16 years, and having never held the 'cup' to the lips of my friends then, my judgment was that I should not, in my new position, change my habit in this respect."

Despite this known attitude of Lincoln's toward liquor, the liquor interests have claimed him as their friend and Prohibition's foe. They recall that Lincoln was a partner with William Berry in a saloon enterprise in New Salem in 1833, and that Lincoln himself sold liquor. On the walls of many bars throughout the United States hang enlarged, photostatic copies of "The Abraham Lincoln Saloon License."

Again and again during wet-dry campaigns—on a National, State, or local level—Lincoln has been named as an opponent of Prohibition.

According to a freely repeated quotation, Lincoln said:

"Prohibition will work great injury to the cause of temperance. It is a species of intemperance itself for it goes beyond the bounds of reason in that it attempts to control man's appetite by legislation in making crimes out of things which are not crimes. A prohibitory law strikes a blow at the very principles on which our Government was founded. I have always been found laboring to protect the weaker classes from the stronger and I can never give my consent to such a law as you propose to enact. Until my tongue be silenced in death I will continue to fight for the rights of man."

Lincoln never said that. It is a statement which was concocted by a leader of the anti-Prohibition forces of Atlanta, Georgia, to influence Negro voters to vote wet during a local option campaign in 1887.

Some months ago, at a meeting of the Republican Governors of the United States, the question of States' rights arose. One speaker declared emphatically that Abraham Lincoln had expressed his views on the subject in these words:

"The Nation must control whatever concerns the Nation. The States or any minor political community must control whatever exclusively concerns them. The individual shall control whatever exclusively concerns him. That is real popular sovereignty."

Lincoln never said that. What he did say was:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Frequently speakers or writers who presumably know better will cite, for propaganda purposes, only a portion of a statement by Lincoln to support their views, when the entire quotation may convey an entirely different meaning. For example, Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party—1 of the 11 Communists recently convicted—endeavored to rebut the charge that the Communist Party is part of a fifth column by declaring: "We subscribe fully to Lincoln's declaration that, 'The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations and tongues and kindreds'."

This quotation is from Lincoln's reply to a committee from the Workingmen's Association of New York on March 21, 1864. But the Communist leader failed to point out

that the very next sentences of Lincoln's statement contained this admonition:

"Nor should this lead to a war upon property, or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus, by example, assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

One of the most frequently quoted epigrams traditionally attributed to Lincoln—and one which Time used as a true quotation to conclude its discussion of Look's false ones—is: "You can fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time."

Did Lincoln actually say this? If he did, there is no documentary proof. He is supposed to have said it in his address before the people of Clinton, Ill., on September 8, 1858, during the famous senatorial campaign of that year. However, the editor of the Bloomington Pantagraph, in his reported account of the speech, failed to cite the clever catch phrase. Nor is it found in any of Lincoln's printed addresses.

Col. Alexander K. McClure, in his Lincoln's Yarns and Stories, writes that President Lincoln in a discussion with a White House caller on the virtue of dealing honestly with the people observed: "It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time; but you can't fool all of the people all the time."

In 1905—nearly half a century after Lincoln's Clinton speech—the Chicago Tribune and the Brooklyn Eagle made an effort to prove Lincoln's authorship of the statement. Several witnesses, all past 70 years of age, were interviewed. They expressed the belief that Lincoln gave utterance to the sentiment if not the exact words of the quotation. One elderly gentleman said that the statement referred to fooling the people about slavery. And despite the absence of documentary evidence, this epigram will probably continue to be generally accepted as genuine simply because it is so Lincolnesque.

There are many other so-called Lincoln quotations in the same category, such as:

"I don't know who my grandfather was, and I am much more concerned to know what his grandson will be.

"Teach economy, that is one of the first virtues. It begins with saving money.

"I am not bound to win but I am bound be true.

"I believe a man should be proud of the city in which he lives, and that he should so live that his city will be proud that he lives in it.

"If ever this free people—if this government itself is ever utterly demoralized, it will come from this incessant human wriggle and struggle for office, which is but a way to live without work.

"I will get ready and study and then the chance will come.

"If I ever get a chance to hit that thing [slavery] I'll hit it hard."

These and numerous other trite sayings—including hundreds of anecdotes—are commonly attributed to Lincoln because they sound Lincolnesque. Actually they are based on mere hearsay.

The list of Lincoln "quotations" grows larger from year to year. Lincoln of all Americans is all things to all men. They will undoubtedly continue to quote—and misquote—him as long as his fame endures.

One Voice On Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent controversy over the President's request that General MacArthur withhold and withdraw a speech intended for the VFW convention has received wide attention by Members of this body as well as criticism by certain newspapers in this country.

There is no doubt in my mind that General MacArthur is a great military strategist and that his recent venture into foreign policy was with honorable intentions, as was no doubt the venture of our Secretary of the Navy, Francis Matthews' recent speech. But, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is charged by our Constitution and he alone is empowered to conduct the foreign policy of our Nation.

I, therefore, commend to my colleagues the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, August 29, 1950, which forcefully points out the implications and repercussions of the failure to recognize this well-established constitutional principle:

ONE VOICE ON FOREIGN POLICY

The foreign policy of the United States can be proclaimed precisely by the President of the United States and those whom he delegates to speak for him—and by no others. That, in effect, is what it says in the Constitution.

The founding fathers realized that any other arrangement would not work. To have more than one voice making the final announcements as to national foreign policy would bring only confusion in that field.

Twice in the last week, important governmental figures have violated this fundamental: The first was the Secretary of the Navy, Francis Matthews, with his reckless advocacy of "preventive war" against Russia. The second was Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur, with his public message to the VFW convention advocating a different policy in regard to Formosa.

President Truman has acted properly, and within his powers, in making it clear to the country and the world that neither Matthews nor General MacArthur was speaking for this Government. In one case, he chided a member of his personal Cabinet. In the other, he acted as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to compel a military officer to withdraw an offensive statement.

We do not have, it must be understood, a situation in which these men have had no chance to make their views known on the policy-making level. Matthews has sat in the weekly Cabinet sessions. MacArthur has had the opportunity to make his views known through the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There is, in fact, nothing new about General MacArthur's believing this country should control Formosa. What is new is that he has now challenged the official foreign policy of the Nation in that respect by a public statement. This is an attempt on the part of a military leader to invade a civilian field, to shape foreign policy, and to challenge a stated policy of his Government.

The damage, of course, has now been done. No matter what President Truman or Secretary Acheson say in disavowing the Matthews and MacArthur statements the Communists will gleefully broadcast them to the world as evidences of American warmongering. For months and years to come we will hear it drummed into the ears of the whole world that the American Secretary of Navy proposed starting a war to compel cooperation for peace and that the Nation's leading military figure demanded that we occupy Formosa, and maintain it as an unsinkable aircraft carrier from which we can bomb Russian and Asiatic ports.

Furthermore, another divisive issue is thrown into a political campaign that already threatens the national unity. The Republicans, yearning for victory in November, will flaunt the delicate Formosan issue, and the charge of gagging MacArthur no matter what damage it may do us in the United Nations, in Asia, or in the world propaganda war. Such is the way of politics.

The Republican campaigners will ignore the fact that, whatever have been the Administration mistakes on foreign policy, the GOP record is generally worse. Many of the Republicans now seeking to exploit the issue are those who have opposed steps that might have strengthened us in Asia.

Certainly the Matthews and MacArthur incidents point up sharply the need for the American people to keep their heads in these confusing days. It is no time for hysteria. We are committed to a difficult course in world affairs. It calls for working in the United Nations with the free peoples of the world. It calls for strengthening ourselves and our allies in an all-out attempt to prevent aggression and war. It does not call for aggressive war. It does not call for the seizure of land belonging to other peoples.

It would help greatly in this trying period if there were more clear leadership from Washington. However that may be, we cannot have various and opposing official voices seeming to state our foreign policy.

Automobiles for Legless Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are over 150 remaining applicants for automobiles for legless veterans.

I also understand there is no money to purchase these automobiles and that there cannot be any appropriation of money until there has been authorizing legislation.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has a bill to authorize an appropriation, not only for the 150 remaining applicants, but also for an anticipated 500 servicemen and women who will be eligible.

I have discussed this matter with members of the Appropriations Committee and I am satisfied that committee will appropriate money once the legislation has been authorized.

I urge imediate authorization so that the Appropriations Committee may be able to act.

The New Social Security Law Contains Many Republican Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that on August 28 the President signed H. R. 6000, the social-security bill. This news is most welcome to me and other Republicans who are truly interested in the improvement of our social-security laws. I had no doubt that if the President had vetoed this bill, as he threatened, the House would have overridden it, but this will now not be necessary, and the increased-benefit checks for the month of September will now be mailed on October 3.

All Republicans can be proud of the part we have played in framing and securing the passage of this law. As finally enacted, the bill is primarily a Republican bill, embodying many of the Republican recommendations for extending and improving our social-security system. Just because the Republicans played such a major part in writing this legislation was certainly no reason for the President to veto it, and I am glad that he finally recognized this fact.

As it passed the House, H. R. 6000 contained many provisions which we Republicans vigorously opposed, and for this reason we introduced our own social-security bill. Although the Republican bill was not adopted by the House, most of the provisions in it were finally incorporated in the new law. Moreover, most of the inequitable and discriminatory provisions to which we objected in the Democratic bill have been eliminated, and as a result there will be a more uniform increase in benefit payments and a broader extension of coverage.

I am particularly proud of the fight I waged on behalf of the Republicans to protect all our teachers, firemen, policemen—State, county, municipal; and many other groups who are already covered under their own retirement and pension systems from having their own systems destroyed. The Democratic majority were bent on jeopardizing these existing retirement systems, but the Republican position prevailed, and as a result teachers, firemen, policemen—State, county, municipal; and other groups already covered under their own retirement and pension systems, are directly excluded from coverage in the new law.

Another provision in the original House bill which the Republican minority vigorously opposed was the Democratic definition of employee. If the Democratic definition had been permitted to remain many small businesses would have been disrupted, thousands of persons would have had no way of determining their social-security-tax liability, endless costly litigation would have resulted, and the whole system would have become one of executive department whim and not congressional law. We Republicans maintained that Congress should not surrender to the executive departments the right of defining who is an employee for social-security purposes, and as a result of our efforts the new law contains a carefully defined definition rather than a vague test which would have brought untold confusion and hardship.

We Republicans also favored a more equitable benefit formula than that contained in the Democratic bill, and the final law is in accordance with our recommendations on this point. Because of the so-called increment factor used in computing the amount of a person's benefit, the Democratic bill would have discriminated against older persons first entering the system, and against workers who do not have continuous employment. It would also have postponed the payment of the full rate of benefits for many years, resulting in a higher tax rate and increasing the cost by $1,000,000,000 a year. This provision has been eliminated in the new law.

One of the basic principles recommended by the Republicans has always been that the insurance system of our social-security law be strengthened and improved so that the public-assistance programs may be diminished and the proper relationship between the two programs be established. We therefore recommended making it easier for persons to become eligible for benefits under the insurance program and our recommendation is contained in the new law as the result of the "new start" provision. As the result of this provision, any person who is now 62 or over will be entitled to receive benefits at age 65 if he has acquired only six quarters of coverage and these quarters of coverage may have been acquired at any time since 1937. Approximately 700,000 persons who are not now eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits will now become immediately eligible. Moreover, it will be much easier for a person to qualify for benefits in the future.

We Republicans have consistently recommended that benefit payments be increased and this is provided for in the new law at an average increase of 77 percent.

In addition to these points the new law does the following: (a) Extends coverage to approximately 10,000,000 persons; (b) raises the wage base to $3,600; (c) increases the amount a person may earn without losing his benefits from $15 to $50 a month, and eliminates any limitation when a person becomes 75; and (d) provides wage credits of $160 for each month of military service in World War II.

In the field of public assistance we Republican urged that the Federal Government share in the payments made by the States to needy permanently and totally disabled persons, and this is contained in the new law. In addition the new law carries increased authorization for appropriations to our maternal and child-health programs, the crippled-children programs, and it provides that the Federal Government will contribute to payments made by the States for the relative with whom a dependent child is living.

Inasmuch as I was one of the original authors of the legislation providing for assistance payments to the blind, I am particularly glad that the new law also provides that the blind can earn up to $50 a month without losing their assistance payments.

Mr. Speaker, as one member of the Republican Party I will continue to work for the perfecting of a sound social-security system and the elimination of the inequities which still exist under the present program. We Republicans will not tolerate any attempt to defeat our aims through threats of a Presidential veto.

Nationalist China as Ally of Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Charles O'Connor, Chariton, Iowa, a sagacious student of foreign affairs, in a recent letter to the editor of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register gives his views on Formosa and the far-eastern problem. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therein Father O'Connor's letter:

NATIONALIST CHINA AS ALLY OF OURS

Secretary Acheson assures that we will not assent to the admission of Red China into the United Nations in order to end hostilities in Korea. Why did not the UN rush to the aid of Chiang Kai-shek as it did to the aid of Syngman Rhee. It is hardly enough to say that Korea is a sort of protégé of the UN. Nationalist China was and is a member of the UN. The Charter says: "To maintain international peace and security * * * all members shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter." Not the least of these obligations is "to ensure to all (members) the rights and benefits resulting from membership."

Seating Red China would change the permanent membership of Security Council to two Communists, two others members (England and France) with blood of the Karl Marx type, and ourselves. Dean Acheson knows this. Yet he says that later on he might favor voting the Reds in. Senator MCCARTHY comes to mind uninvited.

AGGRESSOR IN KOREA

Russia is considered the real aggressor in Korea. So she was in China. Will not she require Mao Tze-tung to grant her easy access to the 4,500 miles of China's coast? That would expose Australia, and make it difficult to guard Japan and our oil interests near the Persian gulf. And Alaska, once Russia, is only 40 miles from Siberia, but many miles from the United States.

Formosa belongs to China. If the Communists are taken into the UN they will want both Formosa and the person of Chiang. And will not they charge us with abetting a rebel?

By devious strategy Russia has gained control of Europe as far west as Mid-Berlin. In all the present feverish rearmament no

word is said about the rescue of these territories. If giving China over to Russia is not too high a price for peace in Asia, would giving over Eastern Germany and the Balkans be too high a price for peace in Europe? And how can Russia be prevented from integrating both China and Middle Europe into the Soviet Union?

CHIANG CALLED A PATRIOT

Propaganda has been hard at work to blacken Chiang Kai-shek. But in the eyes of the Chinese and of the world he is a proven soldier and patriot. He is said to have nearly a million men at his disposal. With liberal aid from the UN he could harass Russia and, probably, recover China, and relieve pressure upon Europe. Since Chiang was our ally in the late war, perhaps, many American boys would go gladly to his aid. Not many European boys are volunteering to aid us in Korea. Russia makes other peoples work for her? Why not get Nationalist China to work for herself and us too?

(Rev.) CHARLES O'CONNOR,
Chariton, Iowa.

Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of an excellent speech on Alaska by Col. Niels Poulsen, of Derby, Conn., former military governor of Alaska, which was published in the New Haven (Conn.) Register, of August 27, 1950.

This speech brings out most forcefully the great strategic importance of Alaska and calls to mind the words of the late Gen. Billy Mitchell, the apostle of United States air power, that—

He who holds Alaska, holds the world.

It emphasizes once again the urgent need for immediate Senate action on the Alaskan statehood bill. Colonel Poulsen's speech follows:

ALASKA: ONLY PART OF NORTH AMERICA INVADED IN WORLD WAR II IS 5 MINUTES FROM RUSSIA BY AIR, DERBY'S COL. NIELS POULSEN WARNED 4 MONTHS AGO

Alaska was the only part of the North American Continent to feel the tread of enemy boots in World War II.

On June 3, 1942, the Japanese bombed Dutch Harbor from the air, and soon after occupied the undefended islands of Attu, Kiska, and Agattu. The sole inhabitants in the occupied area were on Attu, and were approximately 45 Aleuts and Mr. and Mrs. C. Foster Jones, both Government school teachers. All of these were either captured or killed. This occurrence got many Americans to thinking for the first time. For the majority, it was realized that Alaska was of military importance to our remote northern frontier.

As war progressed, the Japanese were forced out of the Aleutians. American troops landed on Attu in May of 1943 and after 3 weeks of bitter fighting, the Japs were wiped out. In August, American and Canadian troops landed on Kiska but met with no resistance as the Japs, realizing the hopelessness of their position, evacuated and escaped under cover of fog.

Since then, the continued developments in long-range aviation and the unsettled condition of the postwar world have combined to increase still more our awareness of Alaska's importance.

SHORTEST UNITED STATES ROUTE

Because airplanes now fly several thousand miles nonstop, new and short routes between nations can be traveled. A plane can fly in a straight line over areas where ships never have been able to travel. The shortest air routes between many cities of the United States and important centers in Europe and Asia pass within, or near the Arctic Circle.

The Arctic region, therefore, takes on a new importance in international relations. Both in peace and war, our northern frontier, Alaska, will play a vital part in maintaining the security of the United States.

Its military importance alone deserves our careful study. It would probably be one of the important points from which to begin countermoves against attack on the United States.

We had few military installations in Alaska before 1938, when extensive defense construction was begun. The airfield system was improved, a program of radio and weather service was established and the Navy began constructing sea and air bases at Dutch Harbor, Sitka, and Kodiak Island.

Today many of the wartime installations have been abandoned or put on a stand-by basis. Ground, air, and naval forces in the Territory are presently commanded by an Air Force officer. His chief of staff is a ground officer, and his communications chief is a Navy officer. A three-service petroleum-procurement system has been set up under Navy direction: Army and Navy hospitals have eliminated duplication.

OPERATION FRIGID

To insure the readiness of our northern frontier in case of war, ground, air, and sea forces have conducted many experimental operations to train personnel and to develop clothing, personal equipment, aircraft, vehicles, fuels, lubricants, weapons, and other material that will function in the subzero cold of the Arctic. Out of these experiments has come a vast amount of valuable information that could be obtained in no other way.

Alaska has been recently called our weakest link in defense. A surprise airborne attack could hit Alaska 5 minutes after launching from Russian soil.

General Eisenhower has made recommendations that each major airfield needs adequate defense in the Fairbanks-Anchorage area with a radar screen of modern radio devices and stations.

Only 40 miles of water separates Alaska from Siberia at the Bering Strait. Attu is only 380 miles from Kamchatka. It is common knowledge that Russia regrets having ever sold Alaska to the United States.

It is also certain that Russia knows far more about the Polar-Artic region than any other nation.

RUSSIA'S EARLY INTEREST

In the early 1600's, Russian merchant adventurers already were sailing east from the Murmansk and Archangel areas to the mouths of the Ob and Yenisei Rivers. In 1724, Peter the Great employed Vitus Bering, a Danish sailor, to explore the northern coast. It was then believed by many that Siberia and America were joined at some unknown point. Before he died 17 years later, on the island and in the sea named for him, Bering had proved that the continents are separated.

Development of Siberia was encouraged by the completion in 1905 of the Trans-Siberian Railroad. This reduced the travel time from Moscow to Vladivostok from about 1 year to 3 weeks. Soon, peasants began emigrating to the vast farm lands east of the Urals.

Russian efforts to develop an Arctic seaway were renewed by the Soviet Government following World War I. In 1920 alone 23 expeditions were busy exploring and studying the Arctic. Commercial voyages from Murmansk to the Ob, Yenisei, and Lena Rivers became routine. By 1946, the Russians were operating 72 meteorological stations in Arctic areas. Since 1935, they have used aircraft as reconnaissance patrols to aid sea navigation as well as for exploration of the Polar region.

In 1937, four Soviet explorers were landed in large transport aircraft on an ice floe near the Pole. The party stayed on the drifting ice until February 1938, when they were picked up near Jan Mayren off the east coast of Greenland. Besides gathering information on weather, the movement of ice floes, and the effects of Arctic electronics on radio communication, this party discovered the ocean depth near the Pole to be 14,075 feet.

UNITED STATES NOW INTERESTED

Just the other day there was an item in the newspaper to the effect that the Tenth Rescue Squadron landed on the ice cap about 100 miles north of Barter Island. This was announced as quite an accomplishment and it is an indication that the United States Air Force is taking a serious interest in that region.

Twelve years ago, in June of 1938, a Soviet aircraft manned by three officers of the Red Air Force landed in the State of Washington. It had left Moscow 2 days before. Most people in the United States considered the flight a lucky stunt, unlikely to be repeated. A month later, three other Soviet flyers in another plane landed at San Jacinto, Calif., after a 62-hour flight from Moscow across the North Pole. This was a new distance record, almost 6,300 miles. It stood until 1946, when the United States Navy's *Pacusan Dreamboat* flew nearly 9,500 miles from Hawaii to Cairo.

Just as Lindbergh, in 1927, proved that the Atlantic could be flown, the Soviet airmen proved that air travel across the top of the world was possible. The meaning of their flight is well expressed on a marker at San Jacinto: "They found the world of transportation of cylinder. They left it a sphere."

Gen. Carl Spaatz once emphasized its importance by saying: "The United States is wide open at the top."

THE POLE AS A STRATEGIC CENTER

The much-discussed polar concept of warfare is based on the reasonable assumption that in a future war aircraft would seek their targets by the most direct routes. A few minutes' study of the globe or polar projection map makes it clear that such routes, between most nations in the Northern Hemisphere, cross the polar or Arctic regions.

Thus it hardly can be overemphasized that scientific advances have removed the last barrier (and its cushion of time and distance) which, until recently, had protected the continental United States throughout its history. The increased range and destructive power of modern bombers, probably more than any other factor, have made the Arctic one of the keys to our security. This region still provides no easy highway for overland attack upon North America. Ground operations against any Arctic areas vital to our security could be contained with minimum organized resistance.

The strategic importance of the Arctic is based primarily upon its status as a possible avenue of air power. It is this alone which shapes the possible future missions of the Army, and of all our forces, in that region.

An air effort against the continental United States, at least in the near future, would be hampered considerably unless the aggressor first obtained stepping stones, such as Spitz-

bergen, Iceland, Greenland, or localities in the Canadian Archipelago. However, air strategists might well consider such an effort worth while even without additional bases.

Attacks on our isolated weather and radar stations, establishment of similar outposts of their on on this side of the Pole, or even attempts to seize our principal bases, are well within present capabilities of a possible enemy. Recent evidence of Soviet progress in the atomic field is a further reason to consider the strategic meaning of the Arctic and the possibility of its becoming a theater of operations.

Details of plans for the employment of United States forces understandably are kept highly classified. We can assume, however, that these plans include the necessary measures to counter the known capabilities of a potential aggressor, and to project adequate counter offensives of our own.

Alaska is our most northern stepping stone and must be watched.

Outlawing Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include therein a letter written me by the Daytona Beach Post, No. 50, of the American Legion, Daytona Beach, Fla., together with resolution attached to the letter requesting that action be taken to immediately enact legislation outlawing the Communist Party. The letter and resolution follow:

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA., *August 18, 1950.*
Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: In behalf of Daytona Beach Post, No. 50, and in furthering the national defense program of the American Legion, I am enclosing a resolution adopted by our post at our last regular meeting.

We sincerely hope you may be in a position to urge speedy action on the several Communist-curbing proposals now under consideration by the House and the Senate Un-American Activities Committees.

Very sincerely yours,
DAYTONA BEACH POST, No. 50,
A. A. KINTZ, *Adjutant.*

RESOLUTION

Whereas the membership of Daytona Beach Post, No. 50, the American Legion, Department of Florida, is most vitally interested in the welfare of the people of these United States; and

Whereas there exists in this great Republic a political conspiracy which ultimately advocates the overthrow of the United States Government—namely, the Communist Party; and

Whereas the Communist Party has been named subversive by the Department of Justice and party members convicted of subversive activities in fair jury trial by our Federal courts; and

Whereas American blood has been shed on the battlefields of Korea to defend the fundamental rights of free people; and

Whereas communism recognizes no national boundaries, but rather has proven beyond question that subjugation of peace-loving people throughout the world is a foremost objective; and

Whereas the time has come when all loyal Americans for mutual self-protection must keep America strong and undivided from within; and

Whereas there is no place for communism in this, the greatest country in the world: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this post in official meeting assembled does most urgently call upon the National Congress to immediately enact legislation outlawing the Communist Party; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Congressmen representing the great State of Florida, and a copy be spread upon the minutes of this meeting for permanent record.

It Is Still Necessary To Repeal or Reduce Theater Admissions Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, during the years that I have served in the Congress, I have had many contacts with the theater operators of my district on excise taxes, theater admission tax, and other matters of interest and concern to the motion picture exhibitors.

As this Eighty-first Congress nears adjournment, I desire to make a report to these businessmen—a report patterned after the familiar "Report to the People" by the President. The report deals with some of the legislation of the Eighty-first Congress that is of special interest to the theater operators.

One of the first bills that I introduced in the Eighty-first Congress was H. R. 1361, providing for the termination of the war tax rates on admissions to theaters, fairs, and so forth. The bill was introduced on January 13, 1949, and was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. This is how the bill in part read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in the case of the tax imposed by section 1700 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on admissions) the rate of tax applicable with respect to any period after June 30, 1949, shall be determined without regard to the war tax rate of 1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof specified in section 1650 of such code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes).

(b) In the case of the tax imposed by section 1700 (b) of such code (tax on permanent use or lease of boxes or seats), and of the tax imposed by section 1700 (c) of such code (tax on sales outside box office) the rate of tax applicable with respect to any period after June 30, 1949, shall be determined without regard to the war tax rate of 20 percent specified in section 1650 of such code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes).

The war situation in Korea has of course had great bearing on revenue and tax measures. However, I am definitely opposed to the theory of changing the Revenue Act of 1950 from a revenue-reduction measure to one of revenue-raising. With the Korean situation in mind, I would recommend changing the admission taxes from 20 percent down to 10 percent with the understanding that they would be completely removed at the earliest feasible moment after the conclusion of the war.

I believe that the continuance of wartime excise taxes in peacetime constitutes a drastic intrusion of Government into the regulation of business. This is not consistent with our free-enterprise system.

The present rates on admissions are having a serious effect on small-theater owners and other amusement operators throughout the country. So far we have not been able to get action or cooperation from the Democratic leadership and this administration relative to my bill and other similar measures which would provide for a reduction or elimination of the special tax on theater admissions.

If I should be again chosen by the people to represent the Ninth District of Minnesota and return to Washington next January, I want the theater owners of my district to feel confident that I will continue to fight the admission tax burden. It is a tax that hits unfairly where it hurts the hardest—the pocketbook of the average American family.

Red Crabs and Slave Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury protesting that during the preceding month 59,000 cases of canned crabmeat—the product of Russian slave labor—had been imported into this country, and that several hundred thousand additional cases were being offered. In the letter it was pointed out that—

> This type of dumping operation is a serious threat to our entire fishing industry and particularly the crab-fishing industry located in New England, Maryland, and the Pacific coast.

Nothing seemed to be accomplished by this protest and I did not even get an answer, although one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], who has ably and tenaciously kept after this matter, did finally receive an acknowledgment of our joint communication. He has been advised from time to time that studies are being made by the Labor Department and the Treasury as to whether or not the Russian canned crabmeat is a product of slave labor. Such studies would seem futile indeed, in view of the statements publicly made by the President and Secretary of State. But our bureaucracy does not seem to know obvious facts, well recognized by high officials and the rank and file of American citizens. Nothing has been done about it and the investigation goes on over the months.

Section 1307, title 19—the 1930 Tariff Act—of the code provides:

All goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor or/and forced labor or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited.

So what are we waiting for?

It was the longshoremen at New York and Boston and a shipping company in Baltimore that have come to the rescue. As pointed out in the following editorial which appeared in yesterday's Sun, of Baltimore, in Maryland we want blue crabs, not the Red ones:

NO RED CRAB MEAT, PLEASE, IN THE HOME OF THE BLUE CRAB

In New York, recently, the stevedores flatly refused to unload a consignment of 80 tons of canned Russian crab meat brought in by a British liner. "Why help Russia make money in this country?" said the stevedores.

The shipping company, after murmuring a little, accepted the decision of the stevedores. So the Red crab meat went back across the Atlantic to the British Government, which had originally acquired the crab meat, not too willingly, in a barter deal with Soviet Russia.

It turns out that some Red crab meat has been coming into Baltimore, too. A shipment arrived several weeks ago. And another shipment of more than 2,000 cases arrived on the *American Builder* Monday. We hasten to say that it was not unloaded. The shipping company, as a matter of fact, didn't even try to get it unloaded, but classified it for customs purposes, as "inaccessible." It, too, goes back to Britain.

No doubt the shipping company took this tactful course out of deference to the feeling of our local stevedores, which are not different from those of their colleagues in New York. But we like to think that an even more delicate sentiment played a part in the decision.

More crab meat is consumed per capita in Baltimore, probably, than in any other major city of the United States—in crab cakes, crab salads, crab ravigotte, imperial crab, crab soup, crab cocktail, fried crabs, and in many other styles, not forgetting the most important style of all, namely, steamed.

But the crabs we eat are Blue crabs, not Red crabs. The Chesapeake Bay, in fact, is the very home and principal breeding ground of the Blue crab. To unload Red crab meat in the port of Baltimore would be enough to make every lover of Blue crabs see red. One trembles at the nature of the uprising that it would probably cause. Many years ago they had a tea party in Boston. Let anyone try to flood Baltimore's crab market with the meat of the Red crab and we predict a crab party that would make the Boston Tea Party seem as innocuous as a church social.

Setting the Record Straight on Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the statement was made on the floor of the House that the membership of this body needs a psychiatrist. The gentleman who made that statement made it in connection with the then pending legislation to dispose of surplus perishable commodities held by the Government which are in danger of spoiling.

It is amazing, sometimes, how short is the memory of man and it appears that this may very well apply to the gentleman who made the statement I have just mentioned. I have checked the vote and the proceedings in the House of Representatives on the day that the so-called Steagall amendment was passed on June 26, 1941. The record shows that the Steagall amendment passed the House of Representatives by a voice vote, and nowhere in the proceedings is there any protest recorded by the usually vociferous and extremely articulate gentleman who made the aforementioned statement. It will be recalled that the Steagall amendment was passed by Congress as an amendment to the basic agricultural law of the Nation in order to create price supports on and increase the production of the particular commodities which we were writing legislation to dispose of, when the gentleman made the statement that the House of Representatives needs a psychiatrist.

The Steagall amendment was passed when we were preparing for World War II, as an emergency act, to encourage the production of food supplies for the armies of our Nation, and our subsequent allies who were at that time engaged in war. At that time, if you will recall, we were referred to as the arsenal of democracy and the Government was making loans to industry to increase production. Naturally enough, since we had to expand the production of these foodstuffs for war purposes, large surpluses accumulated when the war ended and the heavy wartime demand subsided. Any sane person would, of course, expect that we would accumulate these commodities in the postwar readjustment period, as is always the case following a war. And what has been the cost of this postwar agricultural adjustment? The cost has been approximately $500,000,000, about 80 percent of which went for potatoes alone. But what about the cost of readjustment in other lines of industry outside of agriculture? If you will check the record you will find that postwar readjustment for industry in general, outside of agriculture, cost the Federal Government approximately $6,000,000,000, or 12 times the readjustment cost of agriculture. Furthermore, since approximately 80 percent of the cost of agricultural adjustment went to cover losses in potatoes, it is only fair to point out that the party of the gentleman who made the psychiatrist statement opposed efforts in the other body of the Congress to discontinue the potato program. The key vote on this issue was taken in the other body on February 24, 1950, when an amendment to discontinue potato price supports was considered in that body, and the majority party voted 2 to 1 to discontinue the program while the minority party voted 4 to 1 to carry on that wasteful and ridiculous potato program.

These observations are made, ladies and gentlemen of the House, not with any intent to be unkind to the gentleman who made the statement heretofore referred to, or to embarrass him, but in view of the wide publicity his remarks apparently received, I have made this statement to set the record straight.

Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, the "Soldier's General," Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, today in Third Army headquarters, Atlanta, Ga., one of the United States Army's outstanding leaders brings to a close a long and distinguished career of almost 41 years devoted to his country.

This is the day, Mr. Speaker, when Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., wartime commander of the Thirteenth Corps and since June 1947 commander of the Third Army, retires because he has reached the statutory age limit.

I would not want this occasion to pass by without some tribute on my part to this influential public servant, for during part of World War II I had the pleasure and privilege of serving under this man, who is widely known as the "soldier's general."

In expressing my esteem for General Gillem, I know that I am also reflecting the opinion of countless thousands who have had the honor of associating with him during his extensive career.

The State of Delaware is proud of the fact that the home station for headquarters, Thirteenth Corps, before the unit went overseas, was Fort DuPont, near Delaware City. Many of the men from my State served with this unit, and we in Delaware like to consider headquarters, Thirteenth Corps and General Gillem as our own. Thus I am proud to pay tribute to Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., on this occasion of his retirement from the United States Army.

As a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I also want to include an article and an editorial from the publication entitled "Control News." This periodical is published in the interest of the many thousands of troops who comprised the Thirteenth Corps during World War II. The name of this publication, Control News, is derived from the fact that during its operations in Europe the Thirteenth Corps was known by the code designation Control.

The article entitled "Gillem Retires" and the editorial captioned "XIII Salutes Gillem" follow:

GILLEM RETIRES

Forty years and 8 months service devoted to his country—from private to lieutenant general—that is a record probably unequaled in the annals of the United States Army. Having reached the statutory age limit of 62 in August 1950, Alvan Cullem Gillem, Jr., retires from the Army the end

of this month having left his mark on history and the lives of countless thousands, both military and civilian, who had the pleasure and privilege of serving or associating with him during his long military career.

Born on August 8, 1888, of a family who for two previous generations had served in the Army, Van Gillem followed in the steps of his forefathers when he entered the Army, enlisting as a private in January 1910. He was not destined to remain long in that grade, however, for his leadership qualities were soon recognized. He advanced rapidly and did the impossible in a year, being commissioned a second lieutenant in February 1911.

It is interesting to note that the soldiers' general was quite an athlete in his own right and some of the generalship qualities exhibited on the field of battle in World War II were aptly presented when in college on the football field. It was the wartime commander of the XIII Corps who played end and later quarterbacked the famous Sewanee team of 1909 to the football championship of the South.

Experiences of almost 41 years service condensed into a few pages, no, such an article cannot do him justice, for Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., has soldiered throughout the world during that time. His life story would read like a novel if space would permit its telling. Philippines, Mexico, Hawaii, Siberia, Africa, Europe, China, those areas are well known to him.

Shortly after gaining his gold bars, he went to the Philippines with the historic Twelfth Infantry, later returning to the Presidio of Monterey, Calif., with his outfit. In June 1914 he left with Blackjack Pershing's brigade for Mexican-border duty. It was while on this duty that a very important and romantic chapter was written in his life for he met Virginia Harrison, of Nogales, Ariz., who, in 1916, became Mrs. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr.

The Sixty-second Infantry at the Presidio of San Francisco gained Capt. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., in late spring of 1917. With the advent of World War I he was on the high road to command responsibility when he organized and commanded the Twenty-third Machine Gun Battalion. During that war he rose to rank of temporary lieutenant colonel.

Soon followed a tour of duty with the American Expeditionary Forces in Siberia, thence to the Philippines again and Hawaii. In June 1922 he completed his foreign service and (permanent grade) Major Gillem was selected for the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth. Upon graduation he had another tour on the Mexican border. The Army continued its recognition of his capabilities when he was sent to the Army War College in Washington, D. C., and upon graduation in 1926 he was assigned as G–3 of the Third Corps Area Headquarters in Baltimore, Md. It is significant that Major Gillem, who was to become one of the leaders of the Armored Force during World War II, even at this early date clearly demonstrated his armored ability, for he was a member of the Army board which drew up the original plans for the American Armored Forces.

From 1930 to 1935 he served as professor of military science and tactics at the University of Maryland, remaining on this assignment until 1935, during which period he developed an outstanding ROTC unit. In June 1935 Lieutenant Colonel Gillem became an instructor in tactics at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga. Many of our World War II commanders were thankful that they had a course in tactics under Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., during the 4½ years he was in that position.

January 1940 saw another turning point in this doughboy's career, for at that time the Army's only infantry light tank regiment, the Sixty-sixth, was reactivated at Fort Benning. It was not by chance that Col. Alvan C. Gillem was appointed its commanding officer, for even then he was recognized as one of the outstanding armored force men in the United States. In February 1941 Brigadier General Gillem assumed command of the Second Armored Brigade, a unit of the Second Armored Division, and in April of the same year he activated and assumed command of the Third Armored Division, receiving his "second star" while in command of that unit in July 1941. Members of that division will tell you that it was largely the training received under his guidance that later made the unit famous in Europe as the "spearhead division." In January 1942 Major General Gillem activated and assumed command of the Second Armored Corps.

While the II Armored Corps was participating in the maneuvers in Carolina during early summer, 1942, General Gillem was selected as commander of the new desert training center, Indio, Calif. He moved the corps headquarters to Camp Young, Calif., and planned and directed the first large-scale desert maneuvers held in the history of the United States Army, where most of the troops that later fought in Africa received their training under his direction. It was on his recommendation that the desert training center was subsequently organized as a theater of operations training area. In November 1942, the corps headquarters moved to San Jose, Calif., where it functioned as a separate corps and supervised the training of units on the west coast and prepared alerted units for overseas duty in the Pacific area.

On May 14, 1943, General Gillem was appointed chief of the armored force, succeeding Lt. Gen. Jacob L. Devers, with headquarters at Fort Knox, Ky. Thus Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., became responsible for the Army's armored units just about 3 years after he had assumed command of the Army's tank regiment and just a little over a decade after he had served as a member of the board that established original plans for the Army's armored force.

It was on Thanksgiving Day 1943, that Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., was notified of his assignment to command the XIII Corps, succeeding Maj. Gen. Emil F. Reinhardt, with headquarters at Fort Du Pont, Del. In this assignment he now commanded a corps headquarters on the east coast which served as a separate corps and performed a mission similar to the one he had commanded on the west coast.

General Gillem's ability as an administrator, instructor, planner, and trainer were well recognized and in July 1944 he was given the opportunity to show that he could practice what he preached for that month the corps headquarters moved overseas. The headquarters remained in England until September 1944, processing troops to the Continent, when it went to France.

On November 8, 1944 XIII Corps became operational in Holland and the 180 days of combat history it gathered from then until VE-day is well known to all. General Gillem's brilliance as a tactician was vividly demonstrated; he was as clear and logical in calling plays on the field of battle as he had been playing quarterback in his college days. The crashing of the Siegfried Line in November 1944—the assault across the Roer River on February 23, 1945, and the resultant 10-day spectacular dash to the Rhine—the crossing of the Rhine on March 31—that relentless drive eastward which culminated in the corps' spearhead reaching the Elbe on April 12 near Tangermunde, just 50 miles from Berlin—yes, those are the days that troops of the XIII Corps will never forget. And Operation Kaput, our Battle of Klotze, when we virtually destroyed the entire Nazi crack Von Clausewitz Armored Division, well, that battle has been termed by military experts as a perfect military operation. Yes; those under Gillem knew they were guided by a master tactician.

It was just shortly after VE-day that his mighty fighting force finished its World War II history, for then, began redeployment. It was logical that General Gillem was selected for an important role in the Pacific area, and it was in June '45, while he was waiting at the port of Le Havre with his headquarters, that a well-earned reward arrived—news of that third star falling to his shoulders.

Headquarters XIII Corps was in a west coast staging area when hostilities ceased in Japan, and the corps was inactivated September 25, 1945. Just prior to this time, however, General Gillem relieved General Collins as commanding general of the VII Corps and in so doing he became the only American general of World War II to command three different corps.

He was not to remain in the States, however, for a very long period. In January 1946, General Marshall, while serving as the President's special envoy in China, requested General Gillem as his executive. During General Marshall's absence on a return to the States, General Gillem directed this important mission in China. Later he assumed command of the United States Forces, China Theater, and from October 1946 to April 1947 he served in Peiping as United States Commissioner and also commanding general Peiping Headquarters Group.

In June 1947, General Gillem returned to the States and was appointed commanding general Third Army with headquarters at Fort McPherson, Ga., which command he will relinquish this month. There is an unusual point about his present station, for this is not the first time he has served at Fort McPherson. It is unique that in 1910 Private Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., marched guard post in front of the house where Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem now lives. That is definitely a record unduplicated in the history of the Army. During his service as commanding general of the Third Army, Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., as usual, has performed his duties in a distinguished manner, and the military forces and civilian population of the Southeast will be sorry to see him go.

The name of Gillem will long be remembered in the military history of these United States; his grandfather was a Union general in the War Between the States, his father a colonel of cavalry, and his son Alvan C. Gillem II is a colonel in the Air Force. General and Mrs. Gillem also have another son Richard D., age 16, and a daughter, Mrs. Robert C. Daly.

The following list of medals and decorations he has received are just a slight recognition of the years General Gillem has devoted to his country: United States—Distinguished Service Medal (with Oak Leaf Cluster), Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Mexican Service, Victory WW–I, National Defense, American Theater, European Theater (three Battle Stars), Asiatic Theater, Victory WW–II, German Occupation WW–II; Foreign—Brazil: Medal for Merit (Commander's Degree); France: Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palm; Netherlands: Order of Orange Nassau (Grand Officer); Russia: Order of Red Banner, First Class (three times); Belgium: Order of Leopold and Croix de Guerre; China: Grand Cordon, Cloud and Banner. Probably the greatest decoration, however, is the fact that as he leaves the service, he goes knowing that synonymous with Gillem will be the statement "a job well done," a man who has never made an enemy but is blessed with friends wherever he goes who would welcome the opportunity of serving under or associating with Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., again.

Thus on August 31, 1950, a brilliant military career will be brought to a close as Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., and his family drive through the gates of Fort McPherson

and head west for San Jose, Calif., their new home. However, doffing the Army uniform for a civilian suit does not bring an end to the story of "Van" Gillem. On the contrary, only another chapter is ended and a new one started. All eyes will be focused on the service he will continue to render to his country as a civilian. There are still many pages to be read in the book on the career of Alvan Cullem Gillem, Jr.

XIII CORPS SALUTES GILLEM

TO ALVAN CULLEM GILLEM, JR.:

Those of us who served in the units that comprised the XIII Corps feel that in speaking for ourselves, we also echo the voice of countless thousands, when we extend our warmest greetings to you and yours on the eve of your retirement. We wish for your continued success in your new venture—civilian life. Although you may be retiring from active military life, we know that your stimulating influence will be felt in the civilian community as well as it has been in the military, for Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., is more than a leader of soldiers, he is a leader of men.

To express our feelings about you in a few lines is impossible, not even pages would suffice to let you know of the esteem we hold for you. But we do not have to extoll your merits, your record speaks for itself, and we know this new chapter in your career will be equally outstanding. To have been associated with you in the past was a distinct honor and you may be assured that we will still be behind you in the future.

Tactician, leader, counselor, humanitarian, friend—yes, these and many more characteristics, add up to one—Alvan Cullem Gillem, Jr.

Always yours,

ALL CONTROLLERS.

Fort Ruckman, Nahant, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from the general counsel of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

This is of special interest to all the people in the town of Nahant, Mass.

It reflects the long and successful efforts of the townspeople to secure the return of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation to the community.

The Fort Ruckman property, no longer needed by the military, will provide Nahant with space to expand. It will enable the town to proceed with a program of public improvements.

This letter is evidence of the wholehearted teamwork that made possible this happy result:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
Washington, D. C., August 14, 1950.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: I noted that on July 26, 1950, Public Law 623 was signed by the President of the United States; this legislation transferred Fort Ruckman to the town of Nahant, Mass. I know that this successful conclusion to your very meritorious efforts in this regard must be most pleasing to you. I suppose that very few ever think about the amount of work, the many conferences, the staff discussions, checking and rechecking that underlie the passage of an act of this nature.

Having worked closely with you on this project which you found very necessary for your district, I am pleased to be able to commend you on the industry and perseverance that marked your work in seeking this legislation. It cannot be gainsaid that but for your efforts—and at many times it appeared most difficult—Fort Ruckman would not have been transferred to the town of Nahant.

Nahant is to be congratulated, also, on their public awareness in seeking this type of legislation and actively enlisting your aid. In this mutual collaboration we see the legislation which resulted in Public Law 623.

Public Law 623 and the many other worthwhile legislative measures you have sponsored have demonstrated the high caliber of representation in Congress enjoyed by your district.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. KENNEDY.

Charles Pinckney, Constitution Maker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been giving special study to the lives and contributions of our founding fathers, with particular reference to South Carolina's native sons. I now invite your attention to Charles Pinckney, who probably supplied more original work in making the Constitution than did any other individual.

When Charles Pinckney presented his strangely obscure plan of government to the Constitutional Convention, he did not offer a hastily contrived scheme. This brilliant student of the art and science of politics had long been painfully aware that if his country were not to die in embryo, stronger bonds of union had to be forged. He was one of the first men in America, if not the very first, to realize the general futility of the Articles of Confederation. He was to labor unceasingly to improve or remove this feeble compact.

Born in 1757 in Charlestown (Charleston), S. C., Pinckney from his earliest years enjoyed the advantages of breeding, wealth, and leisure. He made the most of them. While still in his teens he was admitted to the South Carolina Bar. In 1779 he was elected to the South Carolina House of Representatives. Five years later he became a delegate to the Congress of the Confederation, and was reelected in 1785 and 1786. In the Congress, Pinckney at once became a recognized champion of stronger government. When New Jersey, in October of 1785, threatened to desert the Confederation, Congress delegated a committee of three, including the youthful South Carolinian, to plead before the New Jersey Legislature the cause of cohesion.

Significantly, Pickney was chosen spokesman for the emissaries; and on March 13, 1786, he delivered an address, pregnant with evidence of political genius and foreshadowing the general structure of the Constitution, before the northern legislature. He pointed out that—

When these States united, convinced of the inability of each to support a separate system and that their protection and existence depended on their union, policy as well as prudence dictated the necessity of forming one general and efficient government, which, while it protected and secured the whole, left to the several States those rights of internal sovereignty which it was not necessary to delegate and which could be exercised without injury to the Federal authority. If New Jersey conceives herself oppressed under the present confederation, let her through her delegates in Congress, state to them the oppression she complains of, and urge the calling of a general convention of the States for the purpose of increasing the powers of the Federal Government and rendering it more adequate for the ends for which it was instituted; in this constitutional mode of application there can be no doubt of her meeting with all the support and attention she can wish. I have long been of opinion that it is the only true and radical remedy for our public defects, and shall with pleasure assent to and support any measure of that kind which may be introduced while I continue a member of that body.

The patent cogency of these remarks dissipated all disaffection, and thus a South Carolinian precluded a northern rebellion. The Federal compact, for the time at least, remained intact.

Two months later Pinckney again sounded the call for a virile union. He asserted before the Congress that—

It is necessary to inform the States of our condition. Congress must be invested with greater powers, or the Federal Government must fall. It is, therefore, necessary for Congress either to appoint a convention for that purpose, or by requisition to call on the States for such powers as are necessary to enable it to administer the Federal Government.

It is generally conceded that as a delegate to the Continental Congress Pinckney was the most resourceful and courageous member of that group in the struggle to strengthen the Union.

On May 29, shortly after the Constitutional Convention had commenced official operations, and immediately after the introduction of the Virginia Resolutions, Charles Pinckney submitted his own plan of union. It was at once referred to the Committee of the Whole House. On July 24 the young statesman's propositions were discharged from consideration by the Committee of the Whole and referred to the Committee of Detail.

The Pinckney plan was not debated on the floor of the Convention, nor was it discussed in the Committee of the Whole. It was evidently considered, however, by the Committee of Detail: Professors Jameson and McLaughlin in the early 1900's discovered documents supporting the latter view. At no time during the

Convention did any member save Pinckney allude to the South Carolinian's plan. It is altogether possible that this strange silence stemmed from a general feeling of resentment that one so young as Pinckney should be presumptuous enough to submit a plan of government in competition with the offerings of the more mature and better-known delegates.

Curiously enough, little interest centered about the Pinckney plan until 1818, when John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, discovered, while collecting Convention documents for his edition of the Journal of Convention proceedings, that the Pinckney plan was missing. Adams thereupon requested Pinckney, still alive in South Carolina, to furnish him with a copy of the latter's scheme. Pinckney replied immediately, asserting that he had in his possession four or five rough drafts of his plan, and although he was not certain which was a true copy, he would send the one he believed to be such. When Adams published this draft as representing the original plan, a controversy that has yet to be stilled was born.

Some scholars accepted without question the authenticity of the Adams' draft; a few others immediately entertained grave doubts. James Madison, for one, asserted positively that the draft submitted by Pinckney to Adams was not a copy of the plan presented by the former to the Federal Convention. In the Adams' draft, election to the House of Representatives was to be by vote of the people. Pinckney, however, while a member of the Convention, strongly supported election by the State legislatures. Further, and conclusive, proof that the two drafts were not identical in content may be found in a letter Pinckney wrote to Madison on March 28, 1789, wherein the former inquired:

> Are you not abundantly convinced that the theoretic nonsense of an election of the Members of Congress by the people, in the first instance, is clearly and practically wrong; * * * and that the legislatures are the only proper judges of who ought to be elected?

Further proof that the passage of 30 years has dulled Pinckney's memory lies in the fact that both the alleged plan and the transmittal letter furnished Adams in 1818 were written upon paper watermarked Russel & Co., 1797. The purported draft was apparently a copy of the report of the Committee of Detail submitted on August 6, 1787, albeit somewhat altered and embellished. Then, too, Professors Jameson and McLaughlin, shortly after the turn of the century, found among the James Wilson Papers extracts from, and outline of, the original Pinckney plan. The ideas expressed in these documents were almost totally at variance with the 1818 draft.

Despite the loss of the plan, it has been ascertained, from available authentic documents, that Pinckney's scheme was to form a considerable part of the Constitution, and that he proposed not mere amendments to the Articles of Confederation, but the establishment of a real government and one, at least in some particulars, endowed with powers and authority.

Professor Jameson proved that 19 or 20 of the provisions contained in the Pinckney plan which were not embodied in the Virginia Resolutions as adopted were to be found in the definitive report of the Committee of Detail. "Taken together," he states, "they constitute a noteworthy contribution." Upon McLaughlin's discovery of an authentic outline of the Pinckney plan, the number of provisions in the Constitution directly traceable to Pinckney was increased to 31 or 32. McLaughlin cautioned that—

> It must not be assumed that we know all that Pinckney thus contributed to the fabric of the Constitution. We know very definitely the nature of his recommendations, we know that some of them found formulation in the Continental Congress, and we know that many of them were finally embedded in the Constitution; but there were doubtless some other propositions that likewise found permanence in the work of the Convention. If mere assertion based on analogy and general probability were worth while, other portions on the Constitution might be pointed to as coming from the ingenious and confident young statesman from South Carolina.

In 1911 Max Farrand, noted constitutional authority, printed a reconstruction of Pinckney's plan, based upon the afore-mentioned documents. Some of the more important provisions of the project are the following:

> The Stile of this government shall be The United States of America, and the legislative, executive and judiciary powers shall be separate and distinct.
>
> The Legislature shall consist of two distinct Branches—a Senate and a House of Delegates, each of which shall have a Negative on the other, and shall be stiled the U. S. in Congress assembled.
>
> The House of Delegates to be elected by the State Legislatures, and to consist of one Member for every ——— thousand inhabitants, 3/5 of Blacks included.
>
> The Members of S. & H. D. shall each have one Vote, and shall be paid out of the common Treasury * * *.
>
> Each House shall appoint its own Speaker and other Officers, and settle its own Rules of Proceedings; but neither the Senate nor H. D. shall have the power to adjourn for more than ——— Days without the Consent of both * * *.
>
> It shall be his (the President's) Duty to inform the Legislature (at every session) of the condition of the United States, so far as may respect his Department—to recommend Matters to their Consideration (such as shall appear to him to concern their good government, welfare and prosperity) * * * to attend to the execution of the Laws of the U. S. * * *.
>
> He shall, by Virtue of his Office, be Commander in chief of the Land Forces of U. S. and Admiral of their Navy.
>
> He shall have Power to convene the Legislature on extraordinary occasions—to prorogue them, (when they cannot agree as to the time of their adjournment) * * *.
>
> Each State retains its Rights not expressly delegated * * *.
>
> The S. & H. D. in C. Assembled shall have the exclusive power of rating and causing public Taxes to be levied * * *.

These provisions, it is readily apparent, constituted one of the "most useful documents" used in the fashioning of America's great charter. Pinckney's contribution, moreover, was not limited to the supplying of such basic pillars of the Constitution. On June 25, 1787, he delivered one of the most memorable speeches of the entire Convention. "With the exception of those by Madison and Wilson, no such powerful, eloquent, and brilliant contribution had been made." Whereas the debates up to this time had been centered on provincial issues, Pinckney injected a ringing note of Americanism. He spoke of " 'a new extensive country containing within itself the materials of forming a Government capable of extending to its citizens all the blessings of civil and religious liberty, capable of making them happy at home.' " It was this that comprised " 'the great end of a Republican form of Government.' "

Until now, it had been painfully true that—

> whenever a delegate had thought it necessary to support an opinion by historical examples, he had referred to the republics and confederacies of earlier times, or to the British Government. Pinckney brought the mind of the convention back to America and emphasized the unique situation of its people. He would not break with the past, yet would found a government adopted to the wants of a new country and a new nation. Nearly all the members of the convention became identified later with the administration of the national government, the plan of which they were now forming, but to them there was no American history in the sense in which these words are now understood. The government they were forming would be an experiment, and the people were yet to prove it administrable. Pinckney's speech was, therefore, the more remarkable because of its American tone. It is usual to speak of Hamilton's speech to the convention as one that raised the minds of its members to a clearer concept of the unique situation of the American people, and to the conclusion that a government should be formed adapted to such a country as ours. Hamilton not only believed that the British Constitution was the best in existence, but he wished it copied as closely as possible in America. Pinckney acknowledged its excellence, but showed with larger wisdom that it was not adapted to the American people. From the time Pinckney spoke, and only a fragment of his speech is preserved, the members must have been persuaded, if any were yet in doubt that the Constitution which they were making must be American in character.

To one biographer of Pinckney it would seem, in summing up his role as an author of America's basic law, "not improbable that he (Pinckney) had a larger share than any other individual in the determination of the form and content of the finished Constitution." Constitutionalist Charles Warren, while not quite so fulsome in his praise, asserted unequivocably that Pinckney was one of the "ten men who stood out as chiefly responsible for the form which the Constitution finally took."

No one has ever questioned Pinckney's talents. Warren considered him a man of "extreme ability." Bethea declared that "it is doubtful whether South Carolina has ever produced a statesman who held so many offices of honor and trust, or one who filled them with more credit and satisfaction to the State." Delegate to the Continental Congress, member of the Constitutional Convention, Governor of his State several times over, United States Senator as well as Representative, Pinckney's record as a public servant is

one of the most distinguished in the annals of this Nation. Yet his contributions, especially those rendered in the drafting of the Constitution, have remained generally obscured. Why, we may ask, has not his part as Constitution-maker been trumpeted down the corridors of time? There are a number of likely reasons.

First, Pinckney was one of the very youngest members of the Federal Convention. His elders might well have been so repelled by the brilliance and aggressiveness of the youthful statesman that they deliberately belittled his achievements. Secondly, he thought and worked independently; in fashioning his plan he did not collaborate with his fellow delegates. In the third place, he presented his draft, not in the name of his State (as did Edmund Randolph with the Virginia Resolutions), but as his own exclusive contribution, as it was.

There are yet other possible explanations. The records of the Convention were imperfectly kept; of particular importance is the fact that the disposition of his plan by the Committee of Detail remains a mystery. Moreover, the original draft of the Pinckney plan has never been found. A sixth factor in the general ignorance is found in the bias and jealousy of many so-called authorities. Finally, while South Carolina has been making history, she has let other States write it.

For many years, there was some confusion as to where Charles Pinckney was buried. All doubt has now been removed as to the resting place of this distinguished South Carolinian. Recently, through the generosity of Dr. Thornwell Jacobs, a memorial tablet was unveiled at the tomb of Charles Pinckney in St. Philip's Churchyard, Charleston, S. C.

The Negro Question Without Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered at Amerika Haus, Berlin, Germany, June 29, 1950, by George Schuyler, editor of the Pittsburgh Courier:

THE NEGRO QUESTION WITHOUT PROPAGANDA

In the vicious propaganda campaign of lies and distortions to which ungrateful totalitarian slave states have subjected the United States of America (which saved them from Hitler), the treatment of its Negro citizens has been held up as a horrible illustration of the weakness and failure of democracy.

The prostitute press and radio of the Communist camorra have presented a picture of Negro existence in America so fantastic, so false, so contrary to the facts of his everyday life in the 48 States as to be unrecognizable by anyone familiar with the Nation. This stereotype is so grotesque as to be at once amusing and deplorable. One must question the intelligence and integrity of those who so readily believe it.

Actually, the progressive improvement of interracial relations in the United States is the most flattering of the many examples of the superiority of the free American civilization over the soul-shackling reactionism of totalitarian regimes. It is this capacity for change and adjustment inherent in the system of individual initiative and decentralized authority to which we must attribute the unprecedented economic, social, and educational progress of the Negroes of the United States.

The chattel slave system, or any slave system, is not inherent in capitalism which for growth directly depends upon pleasing the consumer and increasing his purchasing power: whatever its flaws, the history of capitalism is one of constant mass improvement that everyone can see.

During America's 225 years of legalized chattel slavery, 10,000,000 Africans were brought to the plantations of the Western Hemisphere. Because they represented economic value to their masters, every effort was made to preserve their health and productivity as long as possible. This should be contrasted with the slave system of Soviet Russia which from 1930 onward continually has held from fifteen to twenty million victims in servitude under conditions so savage and heartless that millions have died from mistreatment. Having no indiyidual economic value, these unfortunates have been and are being worked to death with calculated ruthlessness. Whereas today the slave system of Soviet Russia has become so essential to its economy that it grows more extensive year by year, the chattel slave system of capitalism has been long since abolished. Soviet Russia after 30 years has twice as many slaves as were brought to all the Americas in 225 years. Even war prisoners have been forced into slavery and so many have died in Soviet labor camps that 1,000,000 Germans and 400,000 Japanese are "missing"; and up to date the Soviet Government, unable to produce them, has been forced into the ridiculous denial that they ever existed! By contrast, the United States has repatriated all of its war prisoners and the prisons of America contain only 141,000 inmates—among them no political prisoners.

From 1861 to 1865 the United States fought a bloody civil war in which 200,000 Negroes joined to settle the issue of chattel slavery. By the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, 5,000,000 Negro slaves were emancipated. By the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, they became full-fledged citizens of the Republic, along with the half-million already free. During the Civil War, there was no uprising of the Negro slaves nor molestation of the white women and children left behind by their men. One can well imagine what conditions would be in Soviet Russia and its satellites if their enslaved millions were suddenly freed.

In 1865 over 90 percent of the Negroes were totally illiterate. Today practically all can read and write except in remote rural areas. In some places, like New York City, the percentage of Negro literates is higher than that of the whites.

In 1865, not over a score of Negroes had graduated from colleges and universities. Today over 7,000 Negroes graduate from colleges and universities each year. The total graduated since 1912 is 80,000. The total which has attended college is 650,000.

All of the private institutions of higher learning for Negroes in the States of the former Confederacy were established by white people who taught in them and financially supported them. Alongside these are the colleges and universities controlled and supported by public taxation. It is inconceivable that this could have happened in the South if the racial hatred which has been represented as characteristic there had obtained in any marked degree.

Today there are 70,000 Negroes in American colleges, or proportionately a greater number than in the United Kingdom which has 82,500 out of a population of 50,000,000.

Fifty years ago it was almost hopefully prophesied that the American Negro would soon become extinct because of disease. In 1950 the life expectancy is 60 years, or only 7 years less than the whites. This amazing health progress would not have been possible had race hatred been as prevalent as reported.

During the 1930's the Federal Government constructed 150,000 dwelling units; and although Negroes were only 10 percent of the population, they got 50,000 of these units.

In 1900 only 17 percent of Negro nonfarm homes were owned. In 1947, the figure was over 34 percent. In 1940, Negroes dwelling in cities (half their population) owned over 500,000 homes. In 1930 these homes had a median value of $6,377.

Over 2,500 Negro-owned dwellings in New York, Chicago, and Washington alone were worth from $10,000 to $15,000; while 850 were valued from $15,000 to $20,000 or over. Such well-being could scarcely obtain in an atmosphere of terror.

Evidence of the eagerness of the American Nation to bring the Negro population up to the national level of enlightenment was the establishment in 1867 of the Freedman's Burea which soon had 623 schools with 15,248 Negro pupils. By 1900, there were 1,539,507 Negro pupils in public elementary schools—51.4 percent of the total Negro population of school age. By 1920, this enrollment was 2,000,000, and today it is two and one-quarter million.

In 1910 there were 5,000 Negro high-school students; in 1950 there are 300,000, and the annual total of Negro high-school graduates is 40,000. In 1910 there were 42 public high schools in the South and by 1950 this had grown to 2,500.

In 1900, the daily attendance was 33 percent, whereas today it is 80 percent.

A Jewish philanthropist, Julius Rosenwald, established the Julius Rosenwald Fund in 1912. By 1932 this fund had spent a total of $28,500,000 and helped erect 5,000 school buildings in the South. Negroes themselves contributed $4,725,871.

The total value of Negro school property in the South was, in 1940, $79,250. The total value in 1948 was $129,000,000.

In 1900 the total expenditure per pupil was $4.50 for whites and $1.50 for Negroes; in 1948 it was $139.49 for whites and $76.45 for Negroes. In 1904 for each dollar whites received, Negroes got 50 cents. In 1948 for each dollar whites received, Negroes got 71 cents.

While southern Negro teachers generally do not get as much pay as southern white teachers, salaries have been equalized in very many States and communities, thanks to legal action on the part of the Negroes and to the unprejudiced attitude of the courts.

In 1947 13 percent of all Negroes in the United States had completed secondary school while 5 percent or 650,000 had attended college.

Much of the stimulus for the drive to educate the American Negro came from white capitalists like the aforementioned Julius Rosenwald. Following the end of the Civil War there were few Negroes capable of teaching school so northern white missionaries and officers of the victorious Union Army set up schools and did the teaching.

The Slater Fund was established by capitalists and from 1910 to 1930 contributed $250,000 for salaries for teachers in county training schools in the Southern States. This fund was administered by James H. Dillard, a Southern white man.

The Jeannes Fund was established by American capitalists and was also used to pay Negro teachers in Southern rural areas

beginning in 1908. It was also aided by a Southern white man, Dr. Jackson Davis of Virginia. This pattern of rural education was later copied for white rural schools and for similar schools in foreign lands. There are now 500 Jeannes teachers in as many counties. Since 1908, a total of 12,407 Jeannes teachers have served in 803 counties. In 1937 these teachers started a fund as an expression of appreciation to Miss Virginia Randolph, the first Jeannes teacher. It now totals $50,000. Here, too, we see evidence of the progressive liberalism of America in the fact that in 1912 the Jeannes Fund paid 92 percent of the Jeannes teachers whereas 95 percent are now paid out of the public treasuries.

Further evidence of the interest of muchmaligned whites in aiding these backward people, was the establishment in 1898 of the Conference for Education in the South. Then in 1902 the Rockefellers set up the General Education Board which has expended 40 percent of its money to advance Negro education.

Following that, in 1915 to 1916, came the Phelps-Stokes Fund headed by Thomas Jesse Jones. Many other organizations have been extremely helpful, such as the Southern Sociological Congress, the Southern University Race Commission, the Carnegie Corporation which provides libraries, the YMCA and YWCA, and for the last quarter century the United States Office of Education. Without the help of all these groups, it would not have been possible for us to make the progress that has been made in Negro education.

The stereotype of the poverty-stricken American Negro is also paraded by the totalitarian propagandists as an illustration of the failure of democracy. The facts are so at variance with this fiction as to be laughable. There are, it is true, millions of poor Negroes as there are millions of poor whites, but what is regarded as poverty in the United States is called prosperity by workers elsewhere. Steadily, for the last 50 years, the educational, cultural, and economic gulf between the Negroes and whites has been narrowing. While white Americans generally have greater income than their colored brethren, it is cause for reflection that 12.9 percent of whites and 14 percent of Negroes make from $1,000 to $1,500 a year; that 1.1 percent of the whites and 0.2 percent of the Negroes make from $5,000 to $6,000 a year, while only 0.8 percent of the whites and 0.2 percent of the Negroes make from $6,000 to $10,000 annually. It is not only a tribute to the Negroes that they have in such a short space of time achieved such economic well-being but it also indicates a willingness on the part of the white majority to enable them to do so. Compared to the economic condition of minorities elsewhere in the world, that of the American Negro is enviable. It is worth noting that over 1,000,000 are members of American labor unions, receive identical wages, allowances, work conditions, job security, and paid vacations with their white fellow workers, depending on skill and seniority. Two-thirds of the American Negroes being agricultural and domestic workers, this is a very high percentage of Negro workers in industry. It is lamentably true that a score of prominent labor unions in the United States still exclude Negroes or in several ways discriminate against them. However, it is also true that in the last 3 years six of these unions have adjusted their attitude and admit colored workers to their membership. This is just another example of the growing racial liberalism.

Wherever Negro and white workers belong to the same unions, they meet together, strike together, whether North or South, and this occasions no surprise whatever to those familiar with American life. Many of these unions, predominantly white, have elected Negro officers. This could scarcely happen in an atmosphere of terror and repression. Parenthetically, only in democratic countries are labor unions free. Despite the horrors to which workers in the Soviet Union are subjected no one ever hears of a strike there nor even a public disagreement, which is certainly ominous.

American Negroes own 13 banks, 74 credit unions, and scores of cooperative societies. They own over 50,000 retail business establishments, 20 savings and loan associations, and 204 insurance companies. In 1947 the 52 leading Negro insurance companies had total assets of $94,639,376 and $1,000,000,000 worth of insurances in force in 27 States and the District of Columbia.

In addition to this, American Negroes (mostly in the Southern States where the overwhelming majority resides) own 12,336,794 acres of farm land which represents 19,000 square miles, or an area much larger than the Netherlands. There are 189,215 Negro farm owners; the farms averaging 78.3 acres. Last year some Negro farmers in the South grossed as much as $175,000.

As of today, American Negroes own nearly 800,000 homes and this proportion of home owners approximates that of the American whites. Indeed, American Negroes themselves through their own builders, architects, and financial institutions have erected over 25,000 housing units.

In a free federation such as the United States, with 48 separate and independent sovereignties, communication and travel have been so easy that the population has been extremely mobile. The mobility of the Negroes has equaled that of the whites, and today the Negro population is scattered over the entire country, although 77 percent still live in the 16 Southern States. It is commentary on the reported terrorism prevailing in the South that the proportion of the Negro population living there has undergone no change.

There is no desire to minimize the segregational and discriminatory laws in the Southern States which are indeed a disgrace to American civilization. However, the Negroes have always been free to move where they chose and without asking anyone's permission. Thus between 1930 and 1940 the Negro population increased 15.8 percent in the North, 41.8 percent in the West, and 5.8 percent in the South. The figures on white mobility are similar.

Because of this ability to move from one State to another within the Nation, no Negroes have emigrated from the United States to nearby lands. As a matter of fact, there are more Negroes in the South than ever, although there are less in the rural areas than in the cities, which is also true of the whites.

A commentary on the American system and what the Negroes think of it is the fact that they have borne arms in every war in which the Nation has been engaged. There were nearly 4,000 Negroes serving in the War for Independence, and in World War II over 1,150,000 enrolled. One-fourth of a million served in the Civil War and one-half a million in World War I. There is no evidence that any of these men or women ever deserted to the enemy or were convicted of treason. This is in contrast to the desertion of the whole First Ukrainian Army under General Vlasov, to the Germans, plus the wholesale desertion from numerous other units of the Russian armies. The attitude of the Negroes in this regard is conclusive evidence that they do not regard America as the propagandists would have us to believe.

The changes that have taken place in the structure of the American armed forces is further evidence of the progressive improvement of race relations. Where 20 years ago complete racial segregation prevailed in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, successive orders from above and their implementation resulted in wide-spread mixing of Negro and white personnel in all branches, notably the United States Navy and to a lesser extent the Air Corps. Today, Negroes are serving in all branches of the American Armed Forces and the remaining segregation is being rapidly broken down.

Contrary to the propaganda from totalitarian slave states, American Negroes not only move freely, worship freely, and work freely, but they also speak freely. For example, where there is only one Jewish newspaper in Russia and that one controlled by the government, the Negro minority in the United States operates over 200 newspapers and has boasted a press since 1827. The majority of these newspapers are published in the "terror-stricken" South. They are individually owned; they have a combined weekly circulation of 3,000,000 copies and the value of their printing plants runs into the millions of dollars. It is largely through these newspapers and the organizations which they support and publicize that the Negro population has been welded into a militant force against reactionary racism. Not a single Negro newspaper has been suppressed, North or South, although they have been unsparing in their criticism of the Jim Crow system. Obviously such a press could only exist in an atmosphere of freedom.

Similarly, the Negro church whose 40,000 structures serve as meeting places for the colored people could not have carried on or grown except in a tolerant environment. Serving nearly one-half of the Negro population, the total value of these church properties is around $250,000,000. It spends well over $30,000,000 annually. There are few instances in modern times of Negroes having been prevented from asserting their spiritual rights even in the most backward rural areas. These churches have been in the forefront of all movements for the economic, political, and social benefit of their people, especially in the support of the racially radical programs for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The memberships of certain individual Negro churches are the largest in the United States. Many have thousands of members and budgets ranging from $25,000 to $60,000 a year. Clearly no such extensive organization could exist except in a free country. This is in contrast to the treatment of the church behind the iron curtain.

All fair-minded Americans admit that the disenfranchisement of the Negroes in the South was a crime. For 10 years, the Negro minority in the Southern States, protected by the bayonets of the Union Army, exercised full rights of citizenship including the ballot, but progressively from 1876 onward they were disenfranchised by various legal devices and by force until by 1900 they had almost completely lost the right to vote. It might be added, however, that Negroes have voted since the Civil War in the 33 States outside the South, and in some places they voted even before the Civil War. In many of these States today, Negroes are an increasingly important factor in elections.

But the greatest development which illustrates the ability of a free society to change is evidenced by the increasing number of Negro voters in the South in the last decade. In many Southern States, where 10 years ago a Negro did not dare to approach the polls, they are now voting in the scores of thousands, and soon will be voting in the hundreds of thousands. This remarkable change has been brought about solely

through legal action and instances in which force has been used to prevent the exercise of the right to vote have been rare. There is no single State in the South today where some Negroes are not voting, and less than one-half of these States require payment of poll tax as a qualification to exercise the right of suffrage.

Of course, the greatest blots on the American record have been mob murder, usually called lynching and race riots. The record is most grim, and yet inexcusable though these crimes be, it is gratifying to point out that the problem has been practically solved. Whereas in 1900 there were 115 lynchings, in 1949 there were 3; and this was more than in the two previous years. From 1934 to 1949, inclusive, the total number of mob murders was less than in the single year of 1900. Along with this decrease in lynchings, there has been a marked increase in the alertness of police which prevented these crimes. There was a time when so-called officers of the law rarely interfered, but today it is quite different.

This gratifying evidence of increasing law and order in the United States simply indicates that the country which was still largely frontier 50 years ago and had only recently emerged from a long and sanguinary Civil War over the Negro is becoming more settled and tolerant.

In essence the Negro problem (which has been as much white as Negro) has been one of integrating a previously enslaved and ostracized group of divergent color and culture into the national social structure with due respect for, and with the acquiescence of, the white majority and in accordance with the principles of American federalism, local sovereignty, and majority rule. The speed with which this revolution developed was too slow for some and too fast for many more; too fast indeed, for the southern States where the white majority was smallest, and where there were deep-seated fears, tensions, and resentments on both sides arising from slavery and its aftermath. The intrasectional racial adjustment was attended often by physical violence and repression, social ostracism and legal proscription which still obtain, although markedly lessening. The record of these inhumanities, while deplorable and regrettable, is amazing not by virtue of these occurrences but because, in spite of them there has been such unprecedented progress toward social homogeneity and justice in every direction, and within the memory of living man.

Progressively the color bar has been lowered here and there, either voluntarily by general agreement in the localities or through legal action in the courts. Although much maligned by malicious propaganda, these American courts have almost invariably decided in favor of full citizenship rights for Negro citizens in education, housing, transportation, suffrage, and legal defense; but always and necessarily with due respect for the principles of American republicanism as laid down in the Federal Constitution. Overruling lagging justice within the 48 sovereign States, the Supreme Court of the Nation has removed one obstacle after another from the Negro's path.

The cumulative effect of these broad, continued, and statesmanlike efforts has been improvement of racial relations in geometrical progression. Thus the gains in the past 10 years have far surpassed those made in the previous thirties. This explains not only the social, economic, and educational well-being of the colored minority, but the latter's continued and unsurpassed loyalty. American Negroes understand, far better than Soviet propagandists, that in the American system lies the hope of all submerged peoples who have the ability and determination to rise to the full stature of free men.

The United World Federalists Resolution on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution on Korea adopted by the United World Federalists. The Members of the Senate know this to be the largest American organization working exclusively in the field of foreign policy. The position of that organization on Korea, therefore, represents an important segment of American public opinion and should be respected. The resolution was adopted on August 27 by the national executive council of the United World Federalists meeting in New York City. I also ask unanimous consent that the names of the members of the council be incorporated in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON KOREA PASSED BY NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC., AUGUST 27, 1950

The National Executive Council of the United World Federalists, Inc., reiterates the organization's firm support of the action of the United Nations in combating Communist aggression in Korea. Military aggression against any nation is a threat to the whole world community.

We believe that there may be an opportunity in the Korean crisis which is equal to the danger. If we grasp this opportunity, Korea may mark the beginning of the end of war.

We believe that the United States must take four steps in response to this challenge:

1. The total military effort of the UN must be sustained until the aggression is repulsed. Military and economic preparedness must proceed as long as the actuality or potentiality of aggression exists anywhere.

2. The United States should at once proclaim that a goal of its foreign policy is to give the UN the real power it needs to prevent any future aggression and to secure and enforce universal disarmament. The ability of the UN to act against aggression in Korea depended on the absence of one nation, the Soviet Union. We cannot reasonably expect the same situation in the event of future aggression. The United States Government should at once seek the cooperation of all other nations in an effort to secure the widest possible agreement for a call of a charter revision conference to give the UN the limited legislature, judicial, and police powers that are required to prevent aggression. Only when the United States has declared that its goal is peace with honor under world government will we have adopted a position of moral and political leadership in keeping with our heritage, our traditions, and our responsibilities.

3. The United States, in its own interest, should pledge to contribute substantial sums to a world fund to be administered by the UN where possible, for the economic development of underdeveloped areas. The people of Asia may be expected to resist more vigorously the force and fraud of communism when it is clear that the UN has a plan for relief of their economic misery.

4. The United States must put into action a bold and imaginative plan for proclaiming its program for peace to the world. The Voice of America must have a message that will stir the hearts and minds of men everywhere. Our plan for giving the UN real power to outlaw war and our pledge to contribute substantially to the world's welfare is that message.

America is presently preoccupied with the immediate task of winning military victory. But we must recognize that reliance on military power alone cannot bring peace and secufity to this nation and the world.

National Executive Council, United World Federalists, Inc.:

Philip W. Amram, attorney, Washington, D. C.; Paul Shipman Andrews, dean of the College of Law, Syracuse University, New York; Mrs. Margretta Stroup Austin, representative of the District of Columbia Branch; Dr. Marie Finger Bale, representative of the Wisconsin State Branch; F. Woods Beckman, representative of the Tennessee State Branch; R. L. Biesele, representative of the Texas State Branch; Mrs. Mildred Riorden Blake, advertising writer (on leave), Young & Rubicam, New York; Mrs. Raymond Bloch, representative of the Pennsylvania State Branch; Dean Henry Brandis, Jr., representative of the North Carolina State Branch; Mrs. W. W. Bray, civic leader, Ohio; Edgar H. Brenner, student at Carleton College, Minnesota; James B. Burns, student at Princeton University, Pennsylvania; Henry B. Cabot, civic leader, attorney, Massachusetts; Cass Canfield, chairman of the board, Harper & Bros., New York; William E. Clark, representative of the Maine State Branch; Randolph P. Compton, limited partner, Kidder, Peabody & Co., New York; Norman Cousins, editor, Saturday Review of Literature, Connecticut; Deane C. Davis, representative of the Vermont State Branch; Edison Dick, director, A. B. Dick Co., Illinois; Upshur Evans, assistant to the chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, Ohio; Jonathan Fine, student at Roxbury Latin School, Massachusetts; John Fischer, contributing editor, Harper's magazine, New York.

Ralph Fleming, student at Duke University, North Carolina; Murray Frank, student at New York University, New York; Lawrence Fuchs, student at New York University, New York; Charles Gray, representative of the Colorado State branch; Alan Green, advertising executive, Green-Brodie, Connecticut; Rev. Donald Harrington, minister, Community Church, New York; Joseph Harrison, representative of the New Jersey State branch; George C. Holt, former director, World Government Institute at Rollins College, Connecticut; L. D. Lacy, representative at the Oklahoma State branch; Samuel R. Levering, orchardist, chairman of Friends Peace Board, Virginia; George Lewis II, representative of the Florida State branch; Ralph G. Lindstrom, attorney, California; Thomas H. Mahony, attorney, chairman of Catholic Association for International Peace, Massachusetts; John D. McCutcheon, representative of the Missouri State branch; C. A. McElvain, representative of the Illinois State branch; Mrs. Ronald C. McLaughlin, representative of the Minnesota State branch; Cord Meyer, Jr., author, Lowell fellow at Harvard University, Massachusetts; J. A. Migel, former vice president, American Silk Spinning Co., New York; W. A. C. Miller III, representative of the Ohio State branch; Walter P. Miller, Jr., president, Walter P. Miller Co., Pennsylvania; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, newspaper columnist, author, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Charles C. Price, head of department of chemistry, University of Notre Dame, Indiana.

A. J. G. Priest, attorney, New Jersey; Oliver A. Quayle III, public relations, Theodore Swanson & Co., New York; Robert Redfield, dean of division of social sciences, University of Chicago, Illinois; Paul Saunier, Jr., representative of the Virginia State branch; Mrs. Allen M. Schauffler, representative of the New York State branch; Alan Robert Scott, partner, Scott Advertising, New York; Mrs. George M. Sidenberg, Jr., representative of the California State branch; Alexander Standish, chairman of the board, Minute Maid Corp., New York; C. M. Stanley, partner, Stanley Engineering Co., Iowa; David M. Stanley, representative of the Iowa State branch; William C. Starkweather, representative of the Connecticut State branch; Emerson Thatcher, representative of the Washington State branch; Jerry Voorhis, executive secretary, Cooperative League of the United States of America, Illinois; Theodore Waller, New York; Emmanuel Wallerstein, student at Columbia University, New York; James P. Warburg, author, economist, New York; Stanley A. Weigel, attorney, California; Mrs. Patrick Westfeldt, civic leader, Colorado; Mrs. Lora Standish Weston, representative of the Massachusetts State branch; Robert Wheelwright, representative of the Delaware State branch; Abraham Wilson, attorney, New York; Raymond Wittcoff, vice president, Caradine Hat Co., Missouri; Anna Wharton Wright, student of University of Chicago, Illinois.

Proposed Investigation of Federal Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not approve the resolution reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary a few days ago authorizing an all-out investigation of all Federal judges. Those against whom charges are made should be investigated, but I fear that the kind of investigation envisioned by the Judiciary Committee resolution would have a detrimental effect on the independence of the Judiciary and upon the justified confidence in which our people hold the members of the Federal bench.

These reasons are well set forth in an editorial appearing in the Evening Star of August 30, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A THREAT TO THE JUDGES

Threats to our freedom—against ourselves and by ourselves—may be much closer than we think.

Last week Judges William Orr and William Healy of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decreed that Harry Bridges, suspected Communist and convicted perjurer, should be freed on bail pending his appeal.

Senator LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota took the floor in the Senate and said:

"If the facts in the Bridges case are as they have been stated to me, Judges William Orr and William Healy should be impeached and thrown out of office. If, on the other hand, the facts are otherwise, those judges should be retained."

Senator LANGER said he wants to know whether any Federal judges are Communists or Communist sympathizers, or members of subversive organizations, and whether they are still fit because of age or otherwise to perform their duties. Yesterday, hard as it is to believe, the Senate Judiciary Committee endorsed Senator LANGER'S resolution and called for an investigation of the "competence, fitness and legal qualifications" of all Federal judges.

It is important to bear in mind that this is not to be merely an investigation of any complaints, substantial or otherwise, which Senator LANGER may or may not have received against Judges Orr and Healy. If finally authorized, it will be an investigation of all Federal judges, even though they have already been investigated and confirmed by the Senate. And, most ominous of all, it evidently will be an investigation inspired by fear that Communists have infiltrated the Federal judiciary.

We in America had better pause and take stock of where we are going. What is one to think when two highly placed judges become suspect because they vote to admit an accused Communist to bail? Is Chief Judge Learned Hand, highly respected member of the second circuit, to become equally suspect because he favored bail for the 11 Communist leaders convicted in New York? Are these men, and others like them, to be subjected to a Senate investigation for discharging their judicial duties as their consciences may dictate? If so, if the Senate goes along with the action of its Judiciary Committee, there will be ample reason to fear that the independence of the Federal judiciary—a cardinal guaranty of freedom as we know it now—is seriously threatened.

The people of this country should never forget that the Federal courts, in times of emotional stress, are the surest bulwarks of the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution. And anything that impairs or tends to impair the independence of the courts is a direct and immediate threat to the liberties of the people. It is one thing for the Senate to investigate specific charges against individual judges with a view to impeachment. That is the Senate's right and duty. But it is quite a different thing to propose an investigation of all judges because, or at least primarily because, a decision by one court happens to run counter to the popular mood. The Star does not think that the Federal judges will be intimidated by any such move as this. But if they should be, that fact alone will do far more damage to out way of life than anything that conceivably might be done by a thousand Harry Bridges.

First Poland, Now Korea—The Aggressors Change Their Names, Not Their Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, just 11 years ago tomorrow, on September 1, 1939, Adolf Hitler unleashed his Nazi hordes in a blitzkrieg against hapless Poland. It was the beginning of a conflict which was eventually to involve almost every important country in the world, was to last for almost six torturing years, and was to cause untold bloodshed and damage throughout the world. Today, only 5 years after VE- and VJ-days, the United Nations, including the United States, are again engaged in a military struggle as a result of ruthless aggression. I refer, of course, to Korea.

There are certain notable common elements that may be observed in the Nazi onslaught against Poland and the Communist aggression against Korea. Perhaps the most striking of these is that in both instances it was the Kremlin which made aggression possible, in the case of Poland, by the surprise signature on August 23, 1939, of the nonaggression pact with the Nazis, and, in the case of Korea, by arming, training, and then ordering the North Koreans to cross the thirty-eighth parallel in an armed invasion of the southern Republic.

Furthermore, the Korean war, like the Polish war, is not just a local conflict of limited significance; like the Polish struggle it is merely one phase of a much vaster attempt to win the entire world. Hitler's ambitions did not stop at Danzig or the Polish Corridor; he wanted whole continents of lebensraum for the German people. Likewise, Stalin's aims are not merely to advance communism to the southern terminus of the Korean peninsula; he wants eventually to win the whole world for his totalitarian ideology. It is for this reason that the western nations were compelled to oppose with military force Hitler's aggression in 1939 and that the United Nations must at the present day use armed police action to thwart Stalin's ambitions.

To carry the comparison further, both Korea and Poland were innocent victims who had neither harmed nor provoked their attackers. Poland was a member of the League of Nations and was attacked by a country which so condemned what the League stood for that it had withdrawn from that organization in 1933. Although the Republic of Korea's admission into the United Nations has been blocked by the veto of the Soviet Union, it should be emphasized that the Southern Korean Republic is, nevertheless, a ward of the United Nations because the latter has sponsored and approved the elections which established the Korean Government.

The U. S. S. R. has manifested its profound contempt for the United Nations, just as Hitler displayed his contempt for the principles of the League, by sending its puppet troops against the very government which the UN has endorsed.

Thus in both of these cases of aggression—Poland in 1939 and Southern Korea in 1950—there are similarities that bear a lesson for us. Aggressors act everywhere pretty much the same—Jacob Malik, for instance, in the UN Security Council makes preposterous charges of South Korean aggression just as Hitler accused Poland of attacking Germany—so that we can recognize them when they begin to show their true colors. After our experience with Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini we would be blind indeed not to perceive that Stalin is of the same ilk. But the master of the Kremlin is far more dangerous than the

Axis leaders ever were, for he possesses a fifth column throughout the world that constantly and traitorously works for the benefit and advantage of the Soviet Union.

Stalin already has enslaved more than a third of the world's population; the freedom-loving United Nations cannot afford permitting the Communist aggressor to expand further. Poland was the point where the democratic nations in 1939 had to cast the die for armed resistance to aggression.

Korea is the point where the United Nations in 1950 must step in with military power to checkmate the Soviet Union. But here, we hope, the comparison will end—for we do not want Korea to be the prologue of world war III—as Poland was the opening curtain for World War II. Nor need it be, provided the United Nations carries the Korean war to a successful issue with courage and dispatch.

The Position of Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the New York Times for August 29 on the position of Prime Minister Nehru with respect to the present international situation be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSITION OF NEHRU

The struggle for Asia conceivably could be won or lost in the mind of one man—Jawaharlal Nehru, poliitical and spiritual leader of more than 330,000,000 of the people of India. It is vital that we should try to understand him. Whatever one may think of his opinions—and most of us have been rather unhappy about some of those opinions—no one can deny that is the the most influential non-Communist voice in Asia. He is in a sense the counterweight on the democratic side to Mao Tze-tung on the Communist side. To have Pandit Nehru as an ally in the struggle for Asiatic support is worth many divisions; to have him as an opponent or even a critic could jeopardize the position of western democracy throughout Asia.

He is not a man to be bought with any sort of offer or flattery. His strength and influence are due in part to his anti-imperialist record and his unquestioned integrity. When he takes a stand it is from moral conviction. This does not mean that he will have the same idea of what is moral or right as an American would. Thus he condemns the North Koreans as aggressors but is not willing to follow his condemnation through to what we consider to be the logical conclusions. He is a powerful anti-Communist at home but does not fight communism elsewhere in Asia. He can be philosophical about China, but gets highly emotional and rigid about the problem of Kashmir, which is on his own doorstep.

It took courage to condemn the Korean invasion when to most politically conscious Indians any United States or British intervention for whatever reason is ipso facto aggression. The Prime Minister cannot help sharing the ineradicable suspicion of all Indians of the motives of the white races in Asia. Now that he has to bear the white man's burden himself, so to speak, he might be more understanding.

Perhaps understanding is the principal missing component in our mutual relations. There should be a greater effort to understand on both sides. Americans, for their part, can safely start from the premise that in Jawaharlal Nehru they have a friend whose instincts, training, and position in the world all impel him to take the side of freedom and democracy against the Communists. So long as Pandit Nehru and his present associates rule India there is no fear of that great country going over to the Communist camp. Neither we nor the Indians should fear criticism or differences of opinion. The real dangers lie in misunderstanding and mistrust—two evils that are unnecessary and even inexcusable in present circumstances.

Suspension of Copper Import Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Finance Committee has voted 9 to 4 against further consideration of the continued suspension of the copper import tax. By this action, the gentlemen who oppose the extension of the tax suspension are striking a blow which does definite harm to our foreign relations with copper-producing friends. The damage also extends to our own consumers, who will be forced to pay higher prices for products using copper. And labor is feeling the pinch by being restricted to a shorter workweek because domestic mines cannot supply the demand.

I cite a paragraph of a letter I have received from Mr. R. P. Winberg, vice president of the Revere Copper & Brass Co., Rome, N. Y.:

Failure up to this point to continue the suspension has created an extremely serious situation. The growing shortage of copper has already forced us to curtail operations from a 6- to a 5-day working week in spite of very high demand from the trade. Favorable action on H. R. 5327 carrying the McMahon amendment would contribute materially to clarifying the whole copper picture.

I also submit the following news story from the New York Herald Tribune of August 15, 1950:

REFINED COPPER DELIVERIES OFF TO LOW IN JULY—INDUSTRY STOCKS DOWN FOR ELEVENTH MONTH IN A ROW

Deliveries of refined copper to consumers in the United States dipped sharply to a low for the year in July, production declined and industry stocks of the metal declined for the eleventh consecutive month to a 6-year low, according to the monthly report by the Copper Institute, issued yesterday.

In countries outside of the United States, not including Russia, production, deliveries, and stocks all showed increases during July, according to the report.

Deliveries of refined copper to domestic fabricators dropped to 95,983 tons in July from 126,047 in June. The July daily rate of deliveries was 3,096 tons compared with 4,202 daily in June, 3,703 daily over the first 7 months of 1950, and 2,826 a day for all of 1949.

Primary, or mine production of copper in July amounted to 76,640 tons or 2,472 daily against 78,926 or 2,623 daily in June, a 7-month average of 2,494 and a 1949 average of 2,118 tons. Secondary or scrap production of copper from domestic sources dropped to 8,675 tons in July from 17,792 the month before, making a 7-month total of 77,137 tons.

Refined copper production for July of 96,734 tons compared with 113,961 tons in June and brought the total for the first 7 months of 1950 to 729,081. Refined output for all of 1949 was 1,056,463 tons.

The difference in the June and July figures in the above story can be traced directly to the fact that the 2-cents-per-pound tax on imported copper was resumed on July 1, 1950.

Let those nine Senators who voted against further consideration of the copper-tax suspension bill know that they voted to hurt foreign relations, American consumers, and both workers and management in the copper business, not to mention the most important of all—our defense program.

The Union Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Boston, Mass., August 30, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: Pending before you shortly will be a favorable report of the House Education and Labor Committee on House 7789 amending the Railway Labor Act to permit the so-called union shop.

As you well know, the union shop has long been recognized as an accepted practice in labor-management relations. It has acted as a stabilizing factor in creating responsibility on both sides of the collective-bargaining table. In the interests of producing a greater degree of industrial peace, the union shop should be legalized for the Nation's carriers. Under House 7789 it would be permissible and possible for the railroad brotherhoods and the carriers to negotiate for inclusion of a union-shop provision in their collective-bargaining agreement.

There are over 21,000 railroad employees in Massachusetts, many of whom belong to railroad brotherhood unions, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. On their

behalf as well as the entire membership of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor, I urgently and sincerely hope that you will vote for the inclusion of the union-shop principle in the Railway Labor Act when this legislation comes before you. I sincerely hope that the discrimination against railroad workers in this respect will be corrected during this present session.

Respectfully yours,

KENNETH J. KELLEY,
Secretary-Treasurer-Legislative Agent.

Writing Off Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

WRITING OFF STATEHOOD

Majority Leader LUCAS' desire to complete Senate business by September 9 so that he can go back to Illinois and campaign for reelection is understandable. What is not so understandable is the way in which members of the Democratic policy committee have gone along in the shelving of the Hawaii and Alaska statehood bills. The Democratic platform of 1948 reads: "We urge immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska." This is one of the very few uses of "immediate" in that document. To write statehood off now, on the eve of attainment, is to abandon the pledge with a cynicism which the Republicans ought to be quick to note.

As a practical matter, unless the statehood bills are passed now, it means that the whole tedious business must be done over again in another Congress, for the approval of the two bills by the House will not carry over. That would involve more hearings and investigations, of which there has already been a plethora. In view of the repeated emphasis placed on the measures by President Truman, and in view of the fact that a bipartisan majority for both bills seems reasonably assured if they are brought to the floor, a special responsibility devolves upon Senator LUCAS. He is reported to have promised privately that he would do his best to bring them up after the tax bill. One can only conclude, in light of his evident lack of vigor, that his best is not very good. But surely there ought to be enough interest among other Senators who have pledged themselves to these measures of overdue justice and national defense importance to persuade Mr. LUCAS to change his mind.

On the broader question of whether Congress should formally adjourn or merely recess, we think the Senate position in favor of a recess is wise. To be sure, all Members of the House and one-third of the Members of the Senate are anxious to return to the hustings, and it is important that they have some time to do so. Perhaps the distinction between recess and adjournment is academic. But it seems to us that formal adjournment of Congress in this time of crisis would have a bad psychological effect both on voters here and on allies abroad—something the British Parliament has already found. The same thing could be accomplished by a recess which left it up to congressional leaders, rather than the President, to recall legislators to emergency duty.

Military and Economic Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include certain excerpts from an address I delivered to the second annual alumni banquet of the New York State Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences, at Utica, N. Y., August 12, 1950:

I believe that we should take the lead among the free peoples of the world in mobilizing—not only military mobilization but total mobilization in every respect. We should completely mobilize our Nation as quickly and as efficiently as possible, both militarily and economically. The economic phase is of special importance. For how can we ask the millions of men who fought World War II to leave the place which they are trying to hew out for themselves, take up arms for the second time in a decade and leave their families and loved ones behind to fight for a soldier's pay when it is common knowledge that many fortunes were made here at home during the last war?

* * * * *

"Not only should the wealth be mobilized, but the industrial facilities of our country, which comprise our biggest asset in war, should be drafted too. This should include not only Government controls on industries and wages and agriculture, but a high and strict excess profits tax which will take the profit motive out of wartime production.

"While we are on profit motives, let me say that I am in favor of the most stringent, tough, and airtight law against black marketeers of all kinds. Some of these despicable characters made fortunes during the last war; when we adopt rationing and price control there will be those who will try it again. Therefore, our new ration law should make absolutely certain that any violator, from the corner grocer to the broker in the commodity exchange, shall be slapped with not only a stiff fine, but a long and hard prison term.

We must have price control to protect the consumer and the rationing of certain goods to assure each one of us of our fair share. I see no reason why rationing should mean smaller supplies of most commodities. In the case of many goods, the ration would be no less than the average person buys now. But we must protect our people from the small, stupid minority who create artificial shortages and higher prices by the scare buying of a full years' supply of say, sugar, at one time.

* * * * *

The price scale should be rolled back to the level of June 15. The ration of any item which might be in short supply should be as large as possible, while still maintaining a stockpile for emergency and giving the Armed Forces all they need.

In addition to our own complete mobilization, we should take the lead in mobilizing the entire world outside the Soviet sphere of influence. Every country—Great Britain, France, Italy, the Scandinavian countries, Low Countries should be mobilized industrially, agriculturally, and last but not least, militarily. Without a moment's further hesitation Japan and West Germany should be turned into an armed camp to help us contain the Red menace. There is no reason why the rest of the world should not help to bear the burden of maintaining peace. And there is no reason why Germany and Japan should not supply manpower to ward off the threat of the Reds who themselves have built up a large armed force in East Germany.

* * * * *

It would be a great step forward for the mobilization of the free world if the United States could take the initiative in the arming and training of the troops of our other allies. This is especially true of some of the smaller nations such as Turkey and the Scandinavian nations. Our international friends have, in most cases, many men for use in the armed forces. Such nations are often handicapped by the production problem, however, and therefore their armies are small or poorly equipped, or both.

With our tremendous industrial and financial strength, there is no reason why we cannot serve as the main manufacturing headquarters for the arming of our allies. An important phase of this would be adoption of an international set of standards in measurements and engineering so that the problem of interchangeability of parts could be solved.

Along with this armament program, we should provide large numbers of officers and men who are well versed in all phases of modern warfare. These men, formed into instructor teams and spread liberally throughout the armies of our allies could carry on the teaching of the use of our weapons and, incidentally, serve as powerful force for better understanding between the American people and those of other nations.

All of these moves should be carried out through a strengthened UN to preserve the spirit of international cooperation. * * *

During this period there would be snags and pitfalls. They are inevitable in an international proposition of this kind. But we would have one great asset which we have lacked in recent years. We would be able to make commitments and have the power and the means with which to back them up. This has not been true in several cases in the past. It is especially not true in Korea, where we are committed to the task of driving the Reds out of South Korea, and yet we are obviously not rich enough in men and equipment at this time. There is also another advantage. During the build-up period our foreign policy should be realistic and hard-headed, not sentimental or benevolent. Those nations which would help us in our common struggle would get our full cooperation now and in the future. If any nation showed a marked lack of enthusiasm, she could forget about aid of any sort from the United States at any time, and she should be told so in no uncertain terms.

* * * * *

We must end the war of attrition and make ourselves and the rest of the world so strong that we can make the decision as to the time, place, and conditions of attack, if necessary.

Statehood Bills Could Pass Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed interesting to learn from a poll conducted by AMVETS that if the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills were called up in the Senate they would be passed by substantial majorities. This is disclosed in a press release from AMVETS

national headquarters which has just been issued and which follows:

The statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska should pass the United States Senate by a substantial majority when they reach the floor of the upper chamber, an AMVETS poll of the Senate shows.

The poll was made during the month of August to determine sentiment for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska in the light of the Far Eastern crisis, which has focused public attention on the strategic importance of the two American territories.

Over 60 Senators replied to the query, according to Harold Russell, national commander of the Nation's largest World War II veterans' organization.

Thirty-four Senators wrote that they were in favor of statehood now for the two Territories. Twenty-four Senators indicated a sympathetic understanding of the legislation. Many are known to be supporters of one or the other of the two statehood bills.

Only six Senators reported they would oppose the statehood bills.

AMVETS is one of a number of national organizations which has endorsed statehood for Alaska and Hawaii and has worked actively for passage of legislation granting statehood.

"We feel," Commander Russell says, "that in the ideological warfare going on today, the granting of statehood to Hawaii and Alaska will be both in the national and international interest."

Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland, said, along this line, "I have taken occasion to stress the claim for recognition of these Territories and of benefits from a militaristic standpoint to the United States. You have my assurance that I will continue to give support to their claims for statehood."

Senator EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota, wrote "I am in favor of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, not only because I believe these Territories are ready for statehood, but also because I think the citizens in those areas are entitled to the same rights and privileges as are enjoyed by citizens of the present 48 States. In addition, the strategic importance of Hawaii and Alaska makes imperative their full development as sovereign States of the Union."

Support from New England is exemplified by Senator WILLIAM BENTON'S remarks, "Alaska and Hawaii have long been important members of the American family. I shall certainly support legislation to bring about their statehood should it reach the floor of the Senate during this session of Congress.

As a representative of the West, Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS says, "I wish to advise that I am wholeheartedly in favor of granting statehood to both Hawaii and Alaska at the earliest possible dates. I believe that troubled conditions in the Far East have greatly emphasized the need for taking this step immediately."

The AMVETS poll of 34 positive votes in favor of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii covers 26 different States and represents all geographical areas of the Nation.

Letters to GI's in Korea Are Appreciated—Keep It Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, a few days ago, carried a news article concerning a most commendable service rendered by Mrs. Elsie B. Pearce, of Collingswood, N. J., to our boys at the front in Korea. It exhibited a deep understanding of the loneliness that comes to a GI in a far-off land. It was a happy thought that prompted her to write a letter addressed for a soldier at the front who has not received mail. The news article to which I refer reads as follows:

LETTERLESS GI'S FIND A FRIEND HERE—YOUNG HOUSEWIFE SENDS NOTE TO SOLDIER AT FRONT AND GETS EIGHT IN RETURN

COLLINGSWOOD, N. J., August 28.—Mrs. Elsie B. Pearce, a young Collingswood housewife, is thankful for the impulse that led her to mail a letter 2 weeks ago addressed "for a soldier at the front who has not received mail."

Mrs. Pearce said today that she had received eight letters so far from soldiers on the Korean battle front showing how avid the GI's were for a friendly message from home.

A corporal wrote, "It helps to know that someone cares about our loneliness over here."

Another noncom expressed the hope that more persons "would take the interest in some of these boys that you have, because some of them are so young that they hadn't been away from home before they joined the Army and now they seem lost without news from anybody."

A reply from a spokesman for the men of the Twenty-fourth Infantry Division said her letter had raised their morale 100 percent.

The young housewife had enclosed a photograph of herself in her letter and had written, "This letter is something like putting a note in a bottle and sending it out to sea."

The letter didn't vanish at sea. Her picture and written message found their journey's end on a bulletin board at Army headquarters in Korea. In the letter Mrs. Pearce said she would deliver messages for the men and that she wanted them to consider her their friend.

The soldier answered, "I am glad there are people in the world like you."

Mrs. Pearce holds to the belief that universal love is a power always available. She lives here at 482 King Avenue with her husband, a veteran of World War II, and her 7-year-old son.

I am hopeful that the publicity that has been given to this understanding and kindly act, performed by Mrs. Pearce, will incline others to do likewise. It is of a kind that deserves the recognition and emulation of all who think in terms of the welfare of our soldiers.

Registration Farce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of August 31, 1950:

REGISTRATION FARCE

The Subversive Activities Control and Communist Registration Act adopted by the House of Representatives on Tuesday ignores the real dangers of espionage and sabotage confronting this Nation and aims instead at something shadowy, to wit, subversion. Its stated purpose is "to protect the United States." Yet it affords none of the protections against espionage and sabotage recommended by the President; it makes no provision for the safeguarding of military installations and bases, nor even for the supervision of deportable aliens. It is based on the assumption that Communist ideas and Communist propaganda are likely to turn the devotion of Americans from their own traditions, institutions, and values. Proceeding on this assumption, the bill provides for an elaborate arrangement—essentially the same as that previously establisned by the Mundt-Nixon bill—under which an administrative tribunal would designate organizations as "Communist action" groups and "Communist front" groups; these groups and all their members would be registered with the Government and subjected to a number of disabilities; and any publicity emanting from them would have to be labeled as coming from "a Communist organization."

These are limitations on the freedom of association and freedom of expression which Americans have traditionally enjoyed. If they genuinely served to protect internal security, they might well be warranted. But their contribution to security is precisely nil. As Attorney General J. Howard McGrath put it in a letter to Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS commenting on similar provisions of the McCarran bill, they will be "completely ineffective to accomplish their purpose." Indeed they are extremely likely to frustrate that purpose by driving the whole network of Communist groups underground.

One trouble with trying to compile a handy official roster of all Communist groups and their members is that a satisfactory definition of terms is impossible. The definitions presented in the bill passed by the House are so vague that they might easily be applied to many organizations guilty of nothing more than a loyal opposition to Government policies or to prevailing popular opinion. Moreover, the character of any group, as well as its membership, is liable to constant change. The attempt to require any group to register as Communist would involve interminable administrative hearings and litigation. Mr. McGrath was quite right in pointing out that "when, finally, an organization is required to register, it will in all probability dissolve itself, then reappear with a new name and new officers." The official list would be perpetually out of date—quite apart from the danger that it would inflict serious injuries on innocent groups and individuals.

Insofar as the bill can be credited with keeping registered Communists out of Government positions and defense production plants, it merely duplicates safeguards that are already in force. Communists and Communist sympathizers are currently excluded from Federal employment and from factories handling vital defense contracts by the loyalty program and the security risk system; they are also denied passports; and their organizations no longer enjoy tax exemption benefits. Registration is simply a more complex, clumsy, and inequitable way to achieve the same results.

The United States is not in danger from Communist ideas. Those who fear that the American people will be subverted by the party's propaganda in favor of a despotic alien system are men who have themselves lost faith in the good sense of the people and in the vitality of American institutions. Espionage and sabotage are real dangers, to be dealt with through realistic precautions. Subversion is a neurotic nightmare—as evidenced by the puny and steadily diminishing size of the Communist Party. Internal security can be best achieved by distinguishing between substance and shadows.

The Story of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the mess in Korea could have been avoided if there had been wise leadership in our foreign affairs. The story is one of bungling and errors which the American people are not soon likely to forget. The price for governmental errors always comes high, and today our American boys are dying in the mud of Korea because of our weak and vacillating foreign policy in the Far East and our constant appeasement of the Russians.

In the first instance, it must be remembered that the Congress itself has nothing to do with formulating the foreign policy of this country. That is entirely within the province of the President and the State Department.

The route to Korean bloodshed began back in 1933 when our Government recognized Soviet Russia. This was done over the vigorous protest of the American Legion and other veteran and patriotic groups. Then the policy of appeasement began. We gave the Soviets generously of lend-lease materials, getting very little in return. In fact, even today, Russia has a large number of our shipping vessels which up to now she has refused to return. We yielded to Stalin by making the second front in Normandy during the Second World War. Had the attack been made from the Mediterranean through the Balkans as urged by Winston Churchill, Russia would not today be solidly installed in half of Europe. When our victorious armies were marching toward Berlin under Eisenhower and Patton, word came from the White House directing that the Russians should be permitted to enter Berlin first. This was an error that cost millions for the the airlift later and no doubt is one of the main reasons why we are in such an uncomfortable position in Germany today.

The story of what later happened at Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam is a tragic one. At these conferences, concessions were made to Stalin which set the Communists up in business in China, Korea, and elsewhere in the Orient. Present at Cairo were Churchill, Roosevelt, and Chiang Kai-shek. With Russia not yet in the war with Japan, Stalin was absent. Here Chiang Kai-shek was promised by Churchill and Roosevelt that if China would keep on fighting in the war against Japan, she would be given Manchuria, control of the Trans-Siberian Railway, and that other Japanese-captured provinces would be restored to the Chinese Republic.

Then came Yalta, where the convicted traitor, Alger Hiss, was one of the chief advisers. Chiang Kai-shek was not present, since China was not in the war against Germany. Churchill and Roosevelt there promised Stalin that if he would get into the war with Japan, Russia would be given, among other concessions, Manchuria, which had already been promised to China at Cairo. Russia was also to have South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands—both dangerous daggers pointing at Japan. Thus, China was sold down the river and Russia got the vast stores of iron and steel, together with the industries of Manchuria, the very things she needed to wage a war against the United States.

Now things moved fast. After the conquest of Japan and after the Soviets had taken over Manchuria with its fabulous resources in her pocket, we withdrew our troops from China, gave up bases at Shanghai and Tsingtao, left millions of dollars of supplies for the Communists to take over, and brought the Marines back to the United States.

It must not be forgotten that the State Department, through its spokesmen Hiss, Acheson, Lattimore, and others, said that the Chinese situation was just a revolt of Chinese agrarians or farmers who were rising up against the corrupt and wicked Chiang Kai-shek. It was said that those revolting were a different and harmless sort of Communists. Then it was decreed that we should start pussyfooting with the Chinese Communists. President Truman sent General Marshall to China to force Chiang Kai-shek to take Communists into his government. Chiang refused, well knowing this would mean the end of his Nationalist government. Marshall returned to the United States with his mission unfulfilled, and was thereafter made Secretary of State. All military aid to China was stopped, and all of China fell to the Reds.

Shortly after the fall of Japan, it is a mystery just when, it was agreed that Russia should enter North Korea to accept the surrender of the Japanese north of the thirty-eighth parallel. Entering the war only a few days before the Japanese surrender, Russia had contributed practically nothing to the victory. The United States was to take the surrender of the Japanese south of the thirty-eighth parallel, and this arrangement was all confirmed by President Truman at Potsdam.

The Russians settled down in North Korea, built up a nation of stooges and an army, equipping it well. When the United Nations Commission sought to hold an election throughout Korea to determine its independence, the Russians refused to permit such an election in North Korea. Then came the sudden attack on South Korea on June 25, 1950.

The record will show that it was the Republicans in the Congress who stood for a strong Far Eastern policy, but Secretary Acheson told us we should keep hands off until the dust settled in Asia. He also stated categorically that the United States was not interested in the defense of Korea and that only Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines were in the perimeter of our defense set-up. We were told by Democratic spokesmen that South Korea could not be defended if attacked and that it had no military or strategic value. So we withdrew our troops, leaving over $125,000,000 worth of military supplies, such as light jeeps, trucks, light arms, ammunition, clothing, and food. From that time on, Korea was no longer under General MacArthur's Far East command. The State Department and the United Nations took over. If this did not pretty much constitute a hand-engraved invitation to the Communists to take over in South Korea, I would not know how to draw up such an invitation.

In December 1949 the State Department decreed that military aid to Formosa would be useless and that its loss was a foregone conclusion. On January 5, 1950, President Truman said that the United States would not pursue a course which would lead to involvement in China and that we would not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces in Formosa. On January 12, 1950, in a news release President Truman still maintained we would give no aid to Formosa. But on June 27, 1950, President Truman suddenly changed his mind and ordered the Seventh Fleet to defend Formosa while ordering air and naval operations in support of South Korea.

Throughout all this the American people have been given a lot of loose talk about our national defense. We were told that the South Korean forces were strong and that they could repel an invasion from the north. We were told repeatedly by Secretary of Defense Johnson that if they were attacked at 4 o'clock in the morning we would be ready to answer at 5 o'clock. President Truman himself only a few days before the invasion by the North Koreans said we were closer to peace than at any time since the last World War. Now the American people want to know what has been done with the billions of dollars approved for national defense by the Congress since World War II. They are demanding to know how and why we were caught so lamentably unprepared and so unequipped in Korea. After all, we have spent for national defense purposes, in the fiscal years 1946 to 1950, inclusive, the huge sum of $96,400,000,000. Where has the money gone and what have we to show for it? The Administration has sent our boys into Korea without adequate arms and ammunition. Our fleet was put in moth balls and the construction of the world's largest airplane carrier was stopped by Secretary Johnson, and the Marine Corps, the heart of our defense forces, was reduced almost to a minimum. Even President Truman resisted the action of the Congress in insisting on a 70-group Air Force. He said a 48-group Air Force was enough. Recommendations for defense expenditures were whittled while nondefense spending mounted to unprecedented figures. The Navy was weakened, the Air Forces throttled down, and the Army limited, while the illusion of adequate preparedness was fostered in the public mind. Who is responsible for that?

Republican Members of Congress are being criticized for refusing to give economic aid to Korea. It is said we are to blame for the debacle in Korea. Nothing could be more stupid or unfair because a school child would know that it would be supreme folly to vote economic aid for Korea without backing it up with military aid. Under the terms of the bill for economic aid, we would have sent fertilizer, seed, and money for the building of roads, dams, and the

construction of hydroelectric plants, and so forth. It would only have been an operation "rat hole," well knowing that the Communists could take over South Korea at will. That was admitted by everyone. We simply would have built up a greater and a richer prize for the Communists to take over. What has actually happened in Korea today confirms our fears at that time. None of the economic aid finally voted in February 1950, ever got there. Although $10,000,000 in military aid was voted for Korea, actually only $200 worth of this aid ever got there. That was some signal wire. It has always been my position that economic aid would be a waste of the taxpayers' money unless we also gave adequate military aid to back up and protect our investments. When the Truman administration wrote off Korea as a liability and said it would not be defended, the sending of economic aid was absolutely indefensible.

The State Department has been running the show. Perhaps the situation is best summed up by the statement of Owen Lattimore, State Department Adviser for the Far East, who said, "The thing to do is let her [Korea] fall but not let it look as though we pushed her." So with South Korea washed out by the State Department and no longer considered of military value and with our Army withdrawn, the Communists for all practical purposes, were invited to move in. Under such circumstances, no sane person can contend that there was any wisdom or logic in spending any more of the American taxpayers' money there unless we could be assured our investments would be protected by our military might.

After all the bungling, errors, miscalculations, and the misrepresentations made to the Congress and the American people, the Administration has completely reversed its foreign policy in the Far East; we have decided to go into Korea, the one spot with its rough terrain, with its foul weather, the most difficult place on earth, to pit our American boys against the ground armies of the Communists who are being aided and abetted by the Russians.

Where do we go from here? No one knows. The mistakes that have been made cannot be reversed. They can only be paid for in the high currency of blood and treasure. We cannot escape the cost but we can demand a plan and a program and a goal with men at the helm who are capable of carrying it out. Unfortunately, those who got us into the Korean mess are still at the helm, and it goes without saying that both the Congress and the people as a whole have lost confidence in them. It will be recalled that Acheson said he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss, and President Truman recently said that Acheson would remain in the Cabinet as long as he was President. So the American people will have to take it and like it.

We have learned the hard way that appeasement does not pay and the American people have been called upon to fight a war they did not want or expect. We are fighting under adverse conditions—a fight that could have been avoided by enlightened diplomacy joined with a national defense based on world realities. Whether this war is the prelude to world war III or not, no one knows. The answer is not here. God alone can and will give us the strength and wisdom to carry on so that some day we may again return to the ways of peace.

Appointment of Small-Business Men to Advisory Committee of National Security Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram addressed to W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Board, by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, objecting to the fact that no small-business men were appointed to the advisory committee of the Board.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., August 9, 1950.

W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Chairman, National Security Board, Washington, D. C.:

Associated Press reports today: "Symington chooses advisory committee." The story continued: "The 12-member committee chosen after conferences with groups representing industry, labor, agriculture, the public generally will advise Mr. Symington on all phases of civil mobilization and defense." Noted industry appointments: Chairman, committee for economic development; president, United States Chamber of Commerce; president, National Association of Manufacturers—all representatives of big business organizations. Why wasn't spokesman for independent small business considered on the committee? Surely with 3,500,000 independent businesses in our Nation are they to be ignored in any policy-forming group in any governmetal agency? Doesn't Federal law, Seventy-ninth or Eightieth Congress make it mandatory that independent small business be given equal representation? In your appointments on labor and agriculture you gave equal representation to large and small segments. Again we ask, why was independent small business ignored? This association, all independent businessmen is officially on record with you offering our services voluntarily. We expect definite answer to this communication.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Impounded Military Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a table which shows the funds impounded or withheld from the Army, Navy, and Air Force during the past five fiscal years by the President or his agents. It represents a recapitulation of figures furnished to the Appropriations Committee by the three branches during the recent hearings on the supplemental appropriations bill at the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]:

Appropriated funds impounded or withheld from the Armed Forces by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, or the Secretary of Defense, 1946–50

[In thousands of dollars]

	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Army		[1] 98,773	[1] 4	[1] 14,943	[1] 61,854 [2] 14,859
Navy [3]	[1] 258,841	[1] 28,414	[1] 63,703	[1] 169,259	[1] 82,649 [2] [4] 152,746
Air Force		[1] 75,000			[4] [5] 772,802
Yearly total	258,841	202,187	63,707	184,202	1,084,910
5-year total					1,793,847

[1] Withheld by Bureau of Budget.
[2] Withheld by Secretary of Defense.
[3] Amounts do not include rescissions.
[4] Net.
[5] Impounded by Secretary of Defense and includes $735,754,000 reserved by direction of President and representing funds appropriated by Congress in contemplation of an increase in size of Air Force.

From hearings before House Appropriations Subcommittee on the supplemental appropriations bill for 1951, pp. 47, 120, 235.

GI Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], in introducing a bill seeking to bring about certain changes in the National Service Life Insurance Act.

Under my bill insurance coverage up to $10,000 would be extended to our servicemen on a gratuitous basis and service-connected disabled veterans would be allowed to purchase Government insurance on discharge from the service.

I believe the present system has worked under great difficulties and I have been reliably informed that it will not be really workable under large-scale mobilization or universal military training if it becomes law. It might be interesting for the House to know that the Hook Commission recommended in the Forrestal Report that National Life Insurance on a gratuitous basis would save tax money if one took into consideration the administrative costs under the present premium payment set-up.

This bill would, therefore, not only be to the benefit of the taxpayer, but also to the serviceman and his family.

I urge the Veterans' Committee to hold hearings and report this measure out this session so that the men and women now entering—or reentering—the military service can be taken care of.

Korea and the Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. WILSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives a very able editorial written by Casey Cohlmia (USMCR) and as published in the Enid Daily Eagle, of Enid, Okla., on August 16, 1950, appears as follows:

KOREA AND THE MARINES

It is extremely unfortunate that the United States had again to engage in actual warfare before the importance, mobility and thorough training of the Marine Corps was recognized and considered vitally essential to the welfare of the national defense.

Echoes of the Second World War had barely died before the Army was fighting to absorb the functions of the marines in ground fighting; the Air Force wanted to take over its aviation; and the Navy balked at protecting its own junior unit for fear such action would bring further wrath upon the ostracized naval service.

There have been strong efforts to reduce or abolish the marines after every major conflict and sometimes between wars. As pointed out by the current issue of U. S. News magazine: "How close the corps came to near extinction in the last attack few people realize. * * * A principal handicap was a censorship imposed by President Truman. Marine officers could not make statements on the subject without submitting them for approval. * * * A budgeting battle followed. The other services, supported by Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, were intent on leaving the marines a very minimum of the defense money. The marines were steadily reduced. But Korea changed it all."

One five-letter word changed the marines from a near-defunct unit to a major factor in the United States fighting forces—Korea. That's how simple it is for Washington to shove into oblivion the intense work, rigid training, untiring efforts of the men and officers who have not only suffered the pangs of conflict on the field of battle but in the political circles of a Pentagon-pressured Congress.

Because of this great and continuous struggle for survival, the marines have been—and will always be—one of the world's most efficient fighting forces. Despite the fact that for most of the 179 years of existence, they have fed upon the crumbs from the tables of the Army and Navy, the United States Marines have learned well the art of warfare and making the most out of their bare, meager equipment. This they have demonstrated ably on countless occasions.

Must then, the very survival of a unit, a strategic force be determined by internal conflict? When will our politician-militarists end the vicious bickering which has endangered the safety of the Nation on two occasions already—Pearl Harbor and Korea? And lastly, how many more Guadalcanals, Tarawas, and Iwo Jimas must the marines fight before they become of legal age as a member of our unified Armed Forces?

Why Not Ask Mr. Hoover?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Grocers' Journal, official publication of the Southern California Retail Grocers' Association. No comment is necessary, but I commend this editorial to Members of Congress who are about to vote new powers to President Truman. The editorial follows:

WHY NOT ASK MR. HOOVER, MR. PRESIDENT?

At this writing, if confusing news reports of an even more confusing controversy can be correctly interpreted, Congress is on the verge of granting President Truman the dictatorial standby powers he has so stubbornly sought. He will have power to impose wage-price ceilings and rationing at his own discretion.

The President is now assured that he can radically alter the entire economic life of the United States when he alone decides that it is either necessary or politically expedient.

The President need not justify the timing of his action.

Meanwhile, the food industry, along with the rest of America, can continue to flounder in confusion until the President either uses his absolute powers or announces some definite course of action concerning their use.

So, it is possible that price controls will be imposed, at some time.

But how broad will be the scope of the controls? The President has already rejected the urgings of Bernard Baruch for over-all controls. It must be presumed that any price controls imposed will be selective in nature.

President Truman has publicly announced that there will be no return of the bungling OPA; that present Government bureaus are capable of administering all controls needed. He did not clarify his statement.

Since the record shows that the President is a very definite man once he has made a decision, it can safely be presumed that he has not as yet formulated any definite plans for imposing price ceilings or for enforcing them.

If a cat can look at a king, as 'tis said, surely a member of the food industry can give advice to a President.

Here is the advice:

Confer with Herbert Hoover, and closely follow his suggestions.

Herbert Hoover has proved himself, long ago, to be the ablest administrator of food controls ever known to the United States. Few can qualify as his equal on the complicated subject of domestic and world economy.

Let's look back 32 years, back to the last months of World War I. For the first time, America was called upon to share its food supply with a stricken world. For the first time, organized steps were taken to curb domestic consumption and prevent war profiteering in foods.

President Wilson wisely selected Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, to serve as National Food Administrator.

How Hoover stepped into the new harness to thoughtfully determine the world's food needs; how he scorned rationing as a useless tool for curbing overbuying and hoarding; how he effectively fed the world by businesslike distribution—these accomplishments are brighter pages in the history of the First World War.

Details of how Hoover administered and enforced price controls will be of interest to everyone in the food industry. Retailers, remembering the utter confusion and arbitrary and unfair police actions of the late OPA, will find Hoover's methods of doing the job almost as unbelievable as they were sensible and effective.

Hoover did not organize a giant, unwieldly government bureau. He did not provide employment that was draftproof to men and women whose only experience in the retailing of groceries was the daily stocking of the family larder from store shelves. He did not set up a forum of confused but police-minded men and give them a whip hand over retail grocers.

Using the common horse sense that was the basis of his genius, Hoover rode roughshod over political-minded advisers to get at the heart of the price-control problem and find a solution.

Selecting leaders in the food industry in each State, city, and town, he appointed them as local administrators of his food conservation and antiprofiteering program. Then he let them alone.

There were meatless days and wheatless days. There was Karo syrup instead of sugar. And the people had faith in the trusted local leaders who urged food conservation under the name of "Hooverizing." And overbuying and hoarding became minimum problems.

(Maladministration of OPA robbed the people of faith, instilled them with cynicism and fear—and hoarding and furtive buying was ever a major and unsolved problem.)

And as for controlling prices at the retail level:

Under Hoover, a grocer was allowed to play on the team. He was regarded in the true light of a citizen-businessman who would honestly and sincerely do his share in keeping prices at the necessary level. He was not, as was too often the case under OPA prejudged as a virtual criminal per se.

Under Hoover no grocer was "called on the carpet" because he had unwittingly and through confusion created by Government master minds, sold a can of beans for a penny or two over the controlled price.

Hoover, knowing the effectiveness of simplicity, placed price ceilings only upon essential foods—flour, butter, eggs, beans, sugar, lard, etc.

(Under OPA a Los Angeles grocer and OPA officials conferred for days over the question of whether caviar was fish or meat—this in order to determine the ceiling price of the nonessential stuff.)

"Hooverizing" retailers were ordered to maintain an exposed blackboard upon which their cost price and the selling price of each controlled item must be listed.

Since retailers were allowed only a prescribed mark-up on controlled items, this simple and inexpensive blackboard method

of control kept all in line—the public being its own best watchdog.

This blackboard method was highly unpopular in certain grocery circles—among those retailers who enjoyed preferred status with wholesalers because of volume buying, and among those who could demand fat rebates to gain advantage over competition.

Hoover's blackboards put all grocers on the same profit-opportunity level—and only those with profiteering hearts yelled about it.

This controlled mark-up and blackboard combination of price control made it unnecessary for grocers to read through reams of official directives written in confusing gobbledook. Grocers were not spending time and effort in continually changing price marks and tags. He priced his controlled items at the allowed mark-up level over wholesale prices—and that was that.

Herbert Hoover's method of determining and enforcing retail price ceilings was, in gist, simple, direct, fair, and effective. It gained the confidence and cooperation of both public and businessmen. It was inexpensive to the taxpayers.

Can President Truman discover a better, less costly, more effective method of administering and enforcing price ceilings—or other necessary wartime controls?

Perhaps, he can.

If he cannot, then we suggest, respectfully: Why not ask Mr. Hoover, Mr. President?

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6000, the social security measure which recently was acted upon by both Houses of Congress, became law with the signature of the President. Although the measure is far from perfect it is a great improvement over the previous law in that it expanded the coverage and increased the benefits. It also liberalized the eligibility requirements. We have been informed that the Ways and Means Committee of the House will during the next year give further study to the whole social security problem with a view to presenting to Congress at some future date an even better, more workable and equitable measure, built on a sound financial basis.

The newly enacted measure adds almost 10,000,000 persons to the 35,000,000 presently covered by Social Security. The following is a breakdown of the new workers covered:

Category:	
Nonfarm self-employed	4,700,000
Agricultural workers	850,000
Borderline employment	(200,000)
Regularly employed on farms	(650,000)
Domestic workers	1,000,000
Employees of nonprofit organizations (voluntary coverage)	600,000
Employees of State and local governments (voluntary coverage)	[1] 1,450,000

[1] Exclusive of a relatively small number of transit workers who would be compulsorily covered.

Category—Continued	
Federal civilian employees not under a retirement system	200,000
Employees outside the United States	150,000
Employment in Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands	400,000
New definition of "employee"	350,000
Total under compulsory coverage	2,050,000
Total under voluntary coverage	7,650,000
Grand total	9,700,000

NOTE.—Figures in parentheses are subtotal figures.

COVERAGE

First. Farm workers are covered under the new law if the worker is employed continuously for 3 months by one employer and works 60 full days and earns at least $50 in wages in the calendar quarters immediately following 3 months of prior continuous employment for the same employer.

Second. Employees of State and local governments—except those who are already covered by an existing retirement system—would be eligible by voluntary decision on their part and through a Federal-State compact agreement.

Third. Employees of nonprofit organizations are covered on an elective basis. In order to obtain coverage the nonprofit organization must certify that it desires to have the old-age and survivors' insurance program extended to the services performed by its employees, and at least two-thirds of the employees must concur in the filing of the certificate. Those employees who do not concur in the filing of the certificate will not be covered, but all employees engaged after the effective date of the certificate will be covered on a compulsory basis. Once an employer has elected coverage concurred in by two-thirds of the employees the employer cannot withdraw the certificate for a minimum period of 10 years. The purpose of the 10-year requirement is to prevent an employer from jeopardizing the opportunity of a worker to achieve a fully insured status.

Fourth. Domestic workers: Coverage is extended to domestic workers in private homes—but not on a farm operated for profit—if the worker is employed 24 days or more in a calendar quarter by one employer and is paid cash wages of at least $50 for services rendered in that quarter.

Fifth. Self-employed, certain Federal employees, public-transportation workers, and other miscellaneous groups are also included in the measure. The largest group affected are the approximately 4,600,000 self-employed persons, including nearly everyone who works for himself except farm owners and tenants and certain professional persons.

DEFINITION OF EMPLOYEE

By redefining the term employee, the amendments extend coverage to approximately 400,000 persons as employees. Newly defined as employees are (1) full-time life-insurance salesmen; (2) full-time traveling or city salesmen—other than house-to-house salesmen—taking orders for their principal for goods for resale or consumption from retailers, hotels, wholesalers, and contractors; (3) agent drivers and commissioned drivers engaged in distributing meat, vegetables, fruit, and bakery products, beverages—other than milk—or laundry or dry-cleaning services; and home workers who earn at least $50 in a calendar quarter if they or their employers are subject to licensing requirements under State law and work in accordance with specifications prescribed by the employer.

BENEFITS INCREASED

The new measure increases the primary benefits paid on an average of 77½ percent. The greatest increases will be paid to those in the lower brackets, while those in higher brackets will receive smaller increases. Examples of increases are to be found in the following table:

Present primary benefit:	*New amount*
$10	$20.00
$15	30.00
$20	37.00
Present primary benefit—Con.	*New amount*
$25	$46.50
$30	54.00
$35	59.20
$40	64.00
$45	68.50
$46	68.50

INCREASED EARNINGS PERMITTED

A most important provision in the legislation is that which permits a beneficiary to earn in covered employment, without loss of benefits, as much as $50 per month, instead of the $14.99 which has heretofore been the limit. Many beneficiaries have in the past complained bitterly about this limitation. The amount of their benefits, plus the $14.99 earned on the side, was not sufficient in many cases to sustain them. The increased earnings permitted will afford a considerable amount of relief.

CREDIT GIVEN EX-GI'S

The social-security measure provides for giving World War II veterans wage credits under the insurance system of $160 per month for the time spent in service. This provision was included at the urging of veterans and veterans' organizations who felt that the men who were taken away from their private employment to fight in the armed services should be given some credit for the time they were away. If the provision had not been included in the legislation, these veterans would have lost several years of wage credits.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS LIBERALIZED

Both Houses accepted the conference report under which further eligibility requirements are greatly liberalized by requiring quarters of coverage for only half of the number of quarters since 1950 instead of since 1936 as under existing law. Quarters of coverage earned before 1950 may be counted toward the requirement. Thus, a person age 62 or over on the effective date of the bill would under the bill be fully insured for benefits at age 65 if he had at least six quarters of coverage acquired at that time. The maximum requirement for fully insured status would remain at 40 quarters of coverage, and the minimum at 6 quarters, as in existing law. Also,

as in existing law a quarter of coverage would be a calendar quarter, during which the insured earned $50 or more in wages.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH, CRIPPLED CHILDREN AND CHILD WELFARE

The measure provides for an increase of $19,500,000 per year for maternal and child health, and child-welfare services. These additional amounts should help crippled children, particularly, and would also help the States meet the problems of run-away and delinquent children.

AID TO THE PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED

The addition of a new category is a major extension under the system of grants-in-aid to States for public assistance. Under it, assistance, financed partly by Federal funds, will become available to an additional group of handicapped persons 18 years of age or older.

Like other assistance programs of the Social Security Act, this program will be State initiated and State administered. Federal funds will be available to each State upon approval of its plan. As in the programs of old-age assistance and aid to the blind, the maximum individual payment in which the Federal Government will participate is $50, and the formula governing the Federal share is the same. The Federal Government will also provide one-half of the administrative expenses.

INFORMATION AVAILABLE

Many of the persons sought to be covered by the new social-security bill will have questions to ask concerning details of the legislation. Information can be had by inquiring at the nearest social-security office, either in person or through correspondence.

New Orleans—Foreign Trade Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the text of an article by Serge Fliegers and Alvaro Perez of the Intercontinental Press which appears in the September 1950 issue of Americas, official magazine of the Pan American Union follows:

A Latin-American businessman visiting New Orleans can scarcely avoid doing business there. For the city realized the importance of a direct economic tie with Latin America and did something about it. It put on a planned and systematic trade drive. Today this initiative has paid off. During the past 3 years, New Orleans enjoyed the biggest trade boom in its history. With its shipping volume past the billion and a quarter mark this year, it is now the Nation's second port. Every third cup of coffee drunk in the United States is brought in through New Orleans, which also handles items ranging from wines, nuts, and toys to textiles and Haitian wood masks.

In 1943, during a sightseeing cruise of the lower Mississippi Delta, the newly appointed manager of the port of New Orleans, E. O. Jewell, overheard a conversation that set him to thinking.

"Qué tal, amigo, this great river is magnificent. In my country, Costa Rica, we do not have such river."

"But, my friend, we don't have them in my country either—Peoria, Ill."

"There are other things we don't have in our country that I'm looking for right now. Electrical equipment, for example. I need a thousand dynamos."

"What a lucky coincidence. I think I can fill that order for you."

The port manager took the story back to a group of New Orleans businessmen, including shipping and life-insurance company officials and a newspaper publisher. "Our port," Jewell pointed out, "is naturally suited to trade with Latin America. It would be nice to stimulate it by using a ship as a trysting place for importers and exporters—but a little impractical, I'm afraid."

Instead, his listeners suggested a spot on terra firma, right off New Orleans' famous Canal Street. William Zetzman, president of a local bottling plant, sent a letter to his more important commercial colleagues: "We want to start something new," he wrote, "something that has never been tried before." He invited them to a meeting, but added, "Don't bother to come unless you have a lot of money to invest in the future of your city."

Zetzman himself put up some thirty thousand dollars and more than 50 of his colleagues brought the minimum contribution—$1,000. They bought an old bank building and refurbished it in record time, decorating it with the flags of the 21 Western Hemisphere nations. Office space, a library, a lobby, and meeting halls were provided. They christened the new trade center "International House."

At first businessmen were apathetic. During the peak 1945 war year, the Port of New Orleans did some three quarters of a billion dollars' worth of trade. After the emergency stimulus had worn off, they felt, New Orleans would again become a sleepy southern town, handling mostly cotton and coffee. Not many of the thousands of manufacturers, distributors, consumers, and farmers in the mid-continent area—the 13 Mississippi Valley States served by New Orleans—had ever done business with Latin America before. "Why should we seek trade abroad?" they asked. "We have no contacts, we don't know the language or the procedure."

International House officials went to work. They sent representatives to Latin America, invited Latin American businessmen to stop over on their way north. Once in New Orleans, they were furnished with a bilingual secretary, a desk, a telephone, and a long list of mid-continent firms they could approach directly. Soon the businessmen of the United States and Latin America saw—like the two who had met on the sightseeing boat—that one manufactured what the other needed.

One firm in Demopolis, Ala., is in the export business solely because of the contacts New Orleans provided. The firm manufactured all types of agricultural equipment and had a surplus stock because of the weakening domestic market. It hesitated to try selling abroad because its officers knew nothing of the export business—what forms to fill out, to whom to write, how to pack and ship, and what technicalities to prepare for.

International House provided a detailed manual and a list of 30 prospective buyers from its files. In just two weeks orders arrived from Venezuela for 3 wagons, 3 trailers, and 50 trucks. Today the Demopolis firm has a flourishing foreign-trade department that is still expanding. During its first two years International House arranged about 30,000 such contacts between buyers and sellers.

But how about the Latin American visitors? More and more of them, stepping out of planes, disembarking from ships, spent a few days in New Orleans. They dropped in at International House, met their United States colleagues, and concluded their business deals. Meanwhile, officials of International House had absorbed some of the Latin spirit of hospitality and began to multiply its services.

One morning staff members found at the door a dejected-looking woman with a 6-month-old child in her arms and seven heavy suitcases. A Panamanian, speaking no English, she was looking for her husband, a United States sailor. She wanted a room, food for the baby, and help in finding her husband, and La Casa Internacional seemed the place to get them. The baby was fed, and a room found for her. Within a matter of days, her husband was located, and there was a touching family reunion.

Another time, a honeymooning couple from Venezuela came to see the historic places of New Orleans, its Cabildo built by Spanish colonists, the French Quarter, and the old cemetery. They stopped off at International House for dinner and a chat in Spanish with one of the Latin advisers. "We would love to see the rest of the United States," the husband remarked, "but we haven't enough money. If I only could sell a consignment of hides I have in my country, we could afford the trip." The same afternoon a United States purchaser was found and papers were signed. A month later a grateful postcard arrived from Niagara Falls.

No request is too large or too small for International House. So far, it has helped export a $4 consignment of toy balloons, and facilitated the purchase, by Argentina, of $3,000,000 worth of ships.

After confidence had been established among the businessmen of the midcontinent area, a new difficulty presented itself. Although products were available, Latin American businessmen could ill afford to travel through 13 Southern and Midwestern States showing their samples or inspecting prospective purchases. Instead, many proceeded farther north to the large manufacturing centers, where great numbers of factories and sales offices were grouped together.

New Orleans' international planners soon found an answer. At a cost of nearly a million and a half dollars, they constructed a trade mart. Again the flags of the 21 Republics were raised; and today, across the street from International House, a huge, modern, windowless building, gleaming white and completely air-conditioned, houses more than 600 different exhibit items. It takes just a couple of hours to sample the products of half the world, without moving farther than half a city block.

Recently a Peruvian purchasing mission arrived in New Orleans. "Just passing through," they said, "as we have a long trip ahead to locate manufacturers of the various items we need." Instead, they were taken on an afternoon's tour of International House and the trade mart. During the next week, without moving from New Orleans, they purchased all they could with their $500,000 budget and saved considerable traveling expense and fatigue into the bargain. The same thing happened to a group of buyers from Colombia, who were able to supply the needs of their country's merchant marine after a few business sessions at the International Trade Mart.

Neither International House nor Trade Mart facilities are restricted to nations of the Western Hemisphere. A visitor wandering through the long aluminum- and glass-lined corridors of the mart can see United

States agricultural machinery, Bohemian glassware, and Costa Rican lumber products exhibited side by side. Except for direct rentals, there is no charge for the unending variety of services offered by the two institutions. They are supported mainly by membership dues levied on New Orleans businessmen and operate on a nonprofit basis.

But for the city itself there is a distinct profit. Director Charles Nutter (who has a long record of successful dealings with Latin America, first as a newspaperman and later as an executive) and New Orleans' Mayor De Lesseps Morrison say that 70 cents of every dollar in the pocketbooks of New Orleans residents comes directly or indirectly from the trade of their port. They expect that trade to pass the billion and a half dollar figure next year, making New Orleans one of the world's largest ports.

There is another development that will help New Orleans become one of the globe's foremost trading centers. Under a law recently enacted, the Foreign Trade Zone Act, sponsored by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, both United States and foreign businessmen will be permitted to exhibit and manufacture goods in all the United States free-trade zones.

The New Orleans trade zone today comprises some 20 acres of excellent storage and warehouse space where foreign goods can be deposited without payment of United States tariffs. The idea of a free-trade zone was first tried by the Hanseatic League in the sixteenth century, but the first American free port was set up in New York as late as 1937; New Orleans created its zone in 1947. A reaction against high tariffs, it permitted the shipper to store his goods, dry them to reduce weight, remove parts that had spoiled or broken during the sea voyage, and sometimes repack or resort them to make use of a lower tariff classification.

For example, 30 cents' duty per gallon is charged on fresh pineapple juice imported by the United States from Cuba. But if, in the free trade zone, some coloring and preservative chemicals are added, the duty is only 8 cents per gallon, which means considerable saving for the United States importer and consumer. Brazil nuts, taxed according to their weight, can remain in the zone until most of their water content has evaporated, reducing their final weight and, consequently, the import duty.

Wines and other liquids can be brought into the New Orleans free trade zone in barrels, there to be repacked into bottles. This avoids possible loss from breakage en route. And Latin American countries that have no facilities for manufacturing the kind of bottles required by United States buyers can now avoid the tedious and costly process of importing the necessary glassware from the States, only to have it shipped back on the next boat.

J. H. Boyd, the zone manager, showed us around the enormous lay-out of the New Orleans free port. It was a far cry from the wooden reshipping platforms constructed 300 years ago by the Hanseatic traders. We saw lumber from Costa Rica, machine parts from Belgium, emeralds from Colombia, and blue, shimmering aquamarines from Brazil. "This is another free port facility," Mr. Boyd explained. "In the case of jewels, for example, a United States importer no longer has to lay out the 10 percent duty on a stone before it is sold. He can keep it here and show it to prospective purchasers. If he makes a sale, he pays the tariff; otherwise he is free to return it abroad."

As far as the United States public is concerned, the free port operation does not mean loss of duty income. According to the zone manager, it offers these advantages: It encourages imports and thus provides dollars for foreign purchasers of United States goods; stimulates the United States transportation business; gives employment to United States personnel in the handling, packaging, and grading of goods; provides a market for the United States manufacturers of packaging materials; and enables the small importer to operate without tying up his capital in tariff payments.

Typical of such small importers was the United States sailor who had used up all his savings to bring precious stones from Latin America. When he returned to the States, he had $7 left, not enough, naturally, to pay for the import duty, and was advised to store his wares in the free trade zone. One by one he sold the jewels and paid the tax. He is now back in Latin America on another buying expedition.

Last year the New Orleans free trade zone received some 50 different types of goods from 28 countries with a total estimated value of $27,101,114. With manufacturing within its area, it will be busier than ever.

The Case Against the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, each year the National University Extension Association issues an annual debate handbook on the national high school debate question, which this year is:

Resolved, That the American people should reject the welfare state.

I have been asked to prepare a typical affirmative case on that question, and I ask permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD at this time my article entitled "The Case Against the Welfare State," which appears in the Twenty-fourth Annual Debate Handbook issued by the National University Extension Association, at page 63.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST THE WELFARE STATE

(By KARL E. MUNDT, United States Senator from South Dakota)

(Prepared for Welfare State: The Twenty-fourth Annual Debate Handbook.)

Because of the many methods by which the so-called welfare state can manifest itself, any short definition of the welfare state is certain to be inadequate. A definition which fits one set of circumstances in a given area or era is sure to be found deficient in some other area or era. Unlike a police state or an absolute monarchy, the welfare state has no established historic principles or outlines which speakers and writers can employ to determine precisely when and where it exists.

On the other hand, some general definition must be agreed upon before one can debate or defend or denounce the welfare state intelligently. Intelligent discussion requires that certain characteristics be accepted as essential factors in a formula of government operating as the welfare state.

Many supporters of the welfare state endeavor to claim for it only its promised pleasantries and accept for it none of the realistic attributes of government essential to its operation. Many opponents of the welfare state, on the other hand, endeavor to identify with the welfare state a wide assortment of evils without giving consideration to the dividends it promises to produce. Neither position is defensible for debaters who desire to get at the hard core of truth in the arguments both pro and con, or to find "an area of agreement" in a definition which will permit them to debate their points of disagreement on the principles and policies involved.

In my opinion the following statement is an objective, unbiased definition of the welfare state, as that term is most generally used and recognized in the United States: The welfare state is a type of government utilizing a planned economy, implemented by strong centralized controls and Federal financial aids and grants, in an effort to provide livelihood, education, security, and full assurance against the hardships resulting from unemployment, ill health, disability, or old age for all its citizens regardless of age, color, capabilities, geographic location, or financial status.

Many will disagree with phases of this definition, as many are certain to disagree with any definition of the welfare state. Some will say the foregoing definition credits the welfare state with too much and fails to point out the loss of human freedoms involved in such a formula of government. Others will hold with equal vehemence that the above definition imposes too many responsibilities upon the state and assumes a larger task than is required. By and large, however, the preceding definition is as fair and factual as a single-sentence definition can be.

The key word in any definition of the welfare state is the term "provide." In setting up our American system of representative government our forefathers wisely used the word in the preamble to our Constitution, "In order to promote the general welfare." Nobody will argue that at the moment our Government is operating this country as a welfare state. Precisely in the degree that Government in this country shifts its emphasis and its efforts from the job of promoting to the task of providing the general welfare, the United States of America shifts from a state operating on the principles of private enterprise and individual initiative to that of one operating on the principles of the welfare state. If we keep this paramount point in mind, we should be able to proceed intelligently and the precise words used in any definition of the term should shrink into comparative unimportance.

OPPORTUNITY STATE VERSUS WELFARE STATE

In the remainder of this article I shall present some of the reasons why the American people should reject the welfare state.

I express my opposition to the welfare state with the concept in mind that the great heritage Americans have always enjoyed is the realization that more than any other country on the globe, the United States has always been recognized as the world's greatest opportunity state. I have often described the success formula of America as expressing our belief that the province of government is to provide a fair chance for a free people.

We do not propose to provide the creature needs for all the people. We propose instead to provide a fair, honest, and just chance for all people who have the desire, the ability, and the perseverance to get ahead.

If the Communists in Russia, the Nazis in Germany, the Fascists in Italy, or the Socialists in Britain actually performed in accordance with their pronouncements and their promises, any one of these countries under

its particular brand of centralized controls could well be considered an ideal laboratory exhibit of the welfare state. Unfortunately for their people—and unfortunately for our purposes of comparison and contrast—none of these systems of government really provide for their people anything remotely resembling their pious and persuasive pronouncements.

To find an actual example of a system in which the promises made are really kept, one has to look to such an institution as a penitentiary, a county poor farm, or a charitable institution for the disabled or the aged. There we see a situation in which the needs of the people—the creature needs upon which welfare staters place so much stress—are provided.

Food, shelter, clothing, medical attention, educational material, security: all are available in such institutions. Opportunity, of course, is highly limited; but that real opportunity is also sharply limited or entirely absent in any country operating under the formula of the welfare state. Thus the issue becomes largely one of security versus opportunity for the individual.

Perhaps the basic reason why our country has become the world's most enlightened and most envied area is that the equilibrium between opportunity and security we have been able to maintain is unique among all the countries of the world. The opportunity state which is America today does not claim to provide security to the individual in the degree that he could find it in a charitable institution or in a penitentiary.

Our great opportunity state makes no pretext of providing the degree of security given the subject of the King under the concept of socialism being slowly but surely advanced in Great Britain, whereby the State itself assumes for each subject the burden and responsibility of providing for his employment, his health, his old age and security against hardships of every type. The British welfare state as it is unfolding is slowly assuming the responsibility for freeing its subjects from hardships of every type; but it is moving much more rapidly to deny its people the opportunities and freedoms which built the mighty British Empire and kept it mistress of the seas for many centuries. In the United States, since the inception of our Government, we have consistently refused to purchase these extra elements of security by curtailing opportunities.

On the other hand, while the United States makes no pretense of providing complete security for everyone against all the exigencies of modern living, neither does it pretend to offer the individual citizens in our midst the maximum in freedom and unregulated opportunity. Human beings seeking the type of opportunity which prevails under the law of the jungle or in semicivilized regions can find greater degrees of unrestricted opportunities in other areas than in the United States. In many backward lands around the world, in semicivilized areas and on isolated islands, man can find the type of uncontrolled and unregulated opportunity that exists where only the rule of the fang and the claw prevails. This is not the type of opportunity that has made the United States the most envied and enviable opportunity state in the history of the world. Here in America our laws, codes of ethics, and accepted rules of behavior require the average citizen to exercise his individual liberty in the way best designed to permit equal freedom and opportunity to his fellow citizens. Our Federal Government exists to provide the prods and punishments essential to stimulate good behavior in industrial, business, professional, farming, and labor groups with the very minimum of governmental interference with political freedoms, private incentives, and individual opportunities.

In our opportunity state the Federal Government rightfully limits its function to establishing regulations which curtail excesses on the part of individuals or groups, to refereeing disputes and controversies among the many elements of our society, and to rectifying injustices brought about by extremes of human selfishness or gross indifference to the public welfare. But our Government does not and must not needlessly interfere with the processes and institutions of economic life. In the long run opportunity pays better dividends for everyone than the creature-need supplying type of security which denies citizens the challenges of individual initiative.

The equilibrium between opportunity and security which our Constitution has enabled us to maintain is both unprecedented and unparalleled in all human history. Such a balance cannot be sustained in a welfare state where individual opportunities are limited to provide a low level of security for everyone; it cannot be maintained in an unorganized society where individual opportunities jeopardize the freedoms and the security of everyone.

Too much emphasis on security sharply reduces and finally destroys individual opportunity just as too much emphasis on individual opportunity sharply reduces and can ultimately destroy security for everyone. Fortunately, both from history and from observation of current experiments in the age-old conflict between opportunity and security we can find abundant proof not only of the failure of the welfare state to promote the general welfare but also of its tendency to destroy existing opportunity, security, and welfare.

HOW DICTATORSHIPS DEVELOP

A careful study of the governments which place greatest stress on the centralized controls essential to the welfare state reveals that the system reduces the dignity, the importance, the freedoms, the opportunities, the security, and the welfare of the individual citizen. Two principles destructive of the opportunity and security of the individual citizen are common to communism in Russia, nazism as it was practiced in Germany, fascism as it was practiced in Italy, national socialism as it is practiced today in Great Britain, and the planned economy or the welfare state as it is proposed for America. The devices by which the welfare state proposes to provide the general welfare need frank analysis. The techniques and tactics necessary to put such a program into motion and sustain it in action should be of interest.

STEP ONE

The first universal tactic observable in the practice of communism, nazism, fascism, or national socialism is the necessity on the part of the state for taking from the individual citizen increasingly greater amounts of his income and his earnings. Sometimes this is done by excessive taxation; sometimes by outright confiscation, sometimes by the condemning of property and compensation with government bonds, sometimes through government competition. Whatever practice is used, the welfare state or any other system of government based on strong centralized controls must somehow get the money from the individual citizens if any of the promised dividends are to flow from the welfare state.

The pleasant and persuasive theory usually advanced by the promoters of the welfare state is that money is taken from the citizens because the government can spend the people's money in their own behalf more effectively and productively than the people who earned it could spend it in their own interests. In no country are the people told that their money helps keep the politicians in office and increases the importance and the luxury of official life. The people are told that their taxes are being increased, their withholding charges expanded, or their property confiscated because the politicians have better judgment about providing for the needs of the people than the earners themselves have.

Even a cursory examination of the techniques employed in all the big governments in history, disclose that the tactic of taking the money from the people is an inevitable part of the pattern of the welfare state.

STEP TWO

The second tactic inevitably found by the careful student of the welfare state is the increasing curtailment of the people's powers of decision and individual judgment. Increasingly, the people are oppressed by regulations, executive decrees, and prohibitive legislation limiting sharply the individual freedom of the citizen by expanding the power of the central government to control profits, working hours, wages, items produced, and standards of competition.

Such insidious and determined invasion of the individual rights of man is always done under the guise of providing for the public welfare. The people are told that only the politicians are wise or honest or unselfish enough to make decisions in the public interest. They are told that selfish interests or rugged individualists or monopolistic trusts among the general public will destroy the general welfare of the country unless the Government is given the right to make mandatory decisions.

At different stages of history, different methods are used in the application of the universal principles. Sometimes the people are deprived of their money by confiscation; sometimes by Government-planned inflation; sometimes by the steady increase of exhausting taxes. Sometimes the people's rights of decision are curtailed by restrictions on the freedom of expression, freedom of the press, freedom of movement, and freedom of religion, as in Russia today; sometimes curtailment comes from denying individuals the opportunity of private practice if they are members of the medical profession; or dictating the kind and amount of produce if they are farmers; or confiscating productive enterprises to be owned and operated only by the Government. In essence, the tactics are the same wherever big government sets out to provide the general welfare. Never, in any era of history, under any system of big government, are the people told "This is being done to perpetuate in power the politicians now in charge." Instead, under each system in each era the people hear the siren song that their property is being taken and their rights of decision reduced in order to assure for them the security they are not wise or unselfish or farseeing enough to assure for themselves.

Great Britain today presents a clear picture of the decline from the opportunity state to the welfare state. In Britain, the planners of the welfare state have advanced their experiment to the point where the government now owns, operates, or controls eight economic enterprises formerly conducted by private initiative. These eight are the Bank of England; the electric industry; the coal mines; the gas industry; the medical and health services; the transportation industry (including the railways, passenger busses, cargo trucks, and inland waterways); civil aviation; and the overseas communication system (including cables and wireless telegraphy).

Parliament has authorized the shift from private enterprise to public domination of a ninth great enterprise—the steel industry—but the recent election in Great Britain which indicated a great wave of public opposition to the welfare state is temporarily holding this transfer in abeyance.

THE LESSON WE SHOULD LEARN FROM BRITAIN

The British experiment is typical of the manner in which the cancer expands. First, the state increases taxes and reduces areas of individual decision in an effort to provide more power and a bigger purse for the politicians in charge of the experiment. The people are told the steps are necessary to provide the promised dividends for the general welfare. Additional drains upon the economic system grow so great that the national treasury runs increasingly into debt. To increase the intake of funds for the promised welfare dividends, the government then must take over and operate productive enterprises to bolster up a weakened national treasury. Other private enterprises, unable to meet such unfair competition, show losses which in turn lessen their taxpaying power and decrease the Government revenue. Eventually the failing private enterprises must be taken over and owned, operated, or controlled by the Government. The inefficiencies and extravagances of bureaucratic control often make impossible the producing of the revenues anticipated and required by the national treasury; thus the vicious circle continues. Ultimately, as in Russia, all enterprises are owned, operated, or controlled by the government.

The important point is that in the development of the welfare state the element of government control is the determining factor, not the element of government ownership or operation. Sometimes the totalitarians insist upon outright ownership and operation of enterprises; sometimes they prefer to continue the myth of private ownership but exercise government controls so complete that all revenues accrue to the government and all basic decisions are made by the politicians.

The inevitable characteristic of the welfare state is the element of control. History fails to record a single example of a welfare state existing even for a short era of experimentation without the element of compulsion. Inherent in the welfare state is the necessity for a planned economy which places in the hands of the politicians the necessary police powers to compel compliance. Without coercions, the welfare state cannot exist. Students desiring to acquaint themselves more fully with the function of control in systems of strong centralized government should read The Road We Are Traveling, by Stuart Chase. The author lists 14 attributes of this type of government and states, "There would not be so much taking over all industries in the old Socialist sense; the government would set up controls without ownership." Mr. Chase is an experienced authority and a careful scholar in the field of economic planning and welfare state proposals; consequently his stress on the point that the essential element in welfare states is control rather than ownership or operation is significant.

Undoubtedly, all who read this article will have read the analysis of the welfare state by John T. Flynn. His best-selling book, The Road Ahead, is must reading for any scholar endeavoring to understand the many factors involved in the welfare state proposal. In The Road Ahead, John T. Flynn points out the steps required in setting up a welfare state for the United States.[1]

Perhaps an even better authority than such scholars as Stuart Chase and John T. Flynn, however, would be a member of the present British Cabinet; for in Britain, under the guise of Fabian Socialism, economic and political planners are now producing a modern welfare state. In his highly informative and illuminating book, How Socialism Works, the Honorable John Strachey, present War Minister of the British Cabinet, points out the inevitable similarity of methods between socialism, communism, the welfare state and other types of political-economic systems operated under the compulsions and controls of a dominant central government. Mr. Strachey is an unusually well informed student of the ideologies of control; formerly a Communist, he wrote several works on the goals and methods of communism before he renounced that aggressive concept for the Socialist welfare state, which he is now assisting to construct.

How Socialism Works was written at the time when Mr. Strachey was a member of the Communist Party and an interpreter of its basic concepts. On page 156 of his treatise, How Socialism Works, John Strachey said:

"We also saw that it is impossible to establish communism as an immediate successor to capitalism. It is, accordingly, proposed to establish socialism as something which we can put in the place of our present decaying capitalism. Hence Communists work for the establishment of socialism as a necessary transition stage on the road to communism."

Inasmuch as the welfare state is simply a variant of the political concept known as socialism, one could well interchange the words "welfare state" and "socialism" in the foregoing quotation from Mr. Strachey's writings without in any way altering the accuracy or veracity of his analysis.

On page 157 of How Socialism Works, John Strachey makes this point additionally clear by the following direct statement:

"It is the function of the socialist system of planned production for use, and distribution according to work done, to establish the prerequisites of this higher form of society, which is communism."

Thus the point is made with additional force that scholars and interpreters of the political phenomena known as socialism, communism, and the welfare state clearly understand that a system of planned production for use is the hard core of similarity which binds them together. The political controls which compel citizens to conform with the system of planned production inevitably mean totalitarianism at the end of the road.

Unfortunately, many students of the subject have forgotten that until 1917 Lenin referred to himself as a Socialist or a Socialist-Democrat. In April of that year he adopted for his adherents the name "The Communist Party." In the so-called April Theses which Lenin published in 1917, he said: "Socialism is bound sooner or later to ripen into communism, whose banner bears the motto 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.'"

One of the best American authorities on the subject of the welfare state is Donald R. Richberg, professor of government at the University of Virginia, during the 1930's Administrator of the NRA. In my opinion, Donald Richberg is an honest liberal; and being an honest liberal is one of the most difficult assignments in America.

Donald Richberg makes the authoritative statement: "In a welfare state the function of all private associations which are engaged in, or affect, production or distribution must be to act as instruments or agents of the government in meeting its assumed responsibility." The concept of compulsion and the devices of government control are again shown to be essential in the establishment or operation of the welfare state.

Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain, said in 1946, "No country in the world, as far as I know, has yet succeeded in carrying through a planned economy without the direction of labor." Great Britain is no exception to that rule. In 1949, the British socialist government announced directives compelling men to remain in mining and agriculture. A planned economy or a welfare state without the elements of compulsion and coercion would be a recipe without ingredients.

THE PLANNED ECONOMY—A POLITICIAN'S PARADISE

From my own observations I might add one anecdote to supplement this point. Not long ago, I was engaged with a prominent member of the administration circle in Washington on the question whether America should adopt the planned economy of the welfare state. My distinguished opponent argued, "Certainly, Mr. MUNDT, you agree that economic planning is essential for an individual family or a business institution. Surely you must believe in economic planning for yourself, for your family, for the possibility of a rainy day, for old age and for the unpredictables which lie ahead. If economic planning is important for one individual family, it must certainly be many times more important for the 40,000,000 families in America. Without economic planning by a central state, how can we be sure that as many automobiles will be produced as are needed and that some companies will not produce automobiles which they are unable to sell? Without economic planning, how can we be sure that there will be teachers for all schools and schoolrooms for every teacher? Without a planned economy and careful central planning, how can we be sure that all of the fabricators who use steel will have steel enough for manufacturing roller skates, razor blades, carpenters' tools, bicycles, as well as farm machinery and railroad equipment? How can we be sure that a few big soulless corporations will not greedily monopolize the entire output of steel and freeze out the little-business man and the small producer entirely?"

My rejoinder was based primarily on the following simple questions: Will you agree with me that the planned economy and economic planning by the state are useless and futile so long as the program remains in the platform of a political party or on a bureaucrat's desk and is not actually put into operation? My opponent necessarily answered in the affirmative. Then I asked, Would you agree with me that putting into operation the program of a planned economy would be futile and would fail to bring about the dividends of which you speak if, after the plan is proclaimed, each individual citizen is still permitted to follow his own inclinations and either accept or reject the plan in accordance with his own desires? Again necessarily, the reply of my opponent was affirmative.

Obviously, my next question was, "Will you then agree with me that the planned economy of the welfare state which you propose must certainly fail to fulfill its promises or carry out its program unless you give to politicians of the Capitol City who make the plans, the police power to compel compliance? Will you agree that the government must have the police power to jail or penalize people who refuse to comply, that without this police power the planners must be ineffective and probably can only compound the chaos rather than produce the efficient program of activity which you desire?"

This time, reluctantly, but again necessarily, my adversary answered in the affirmative.

The imperative necessity of providing government compulsions inevitably destroys the individual initiative, the private enterprise, the political independence which are part

[1] See The Road Ahead (Devin-Adair Co., New York), p. 66. Or see volume II of Welfare State: The Twenty-fourth Annual Debate Handbook.

of our heritage as citizens of the world's greatest opportunity state.

Realistic students and observers analyzing the forms of government available to man in the world today, must keep in mind that in any form of economic or political activity the human equation cannot be eliminated.

Human beings are neither better nor worse, their ideals are neither nobler nor more sordid, because they are engaged in a political rather than an economic activity. Many inequities and injustices exist in our American opportunity state. Human greed, selfishness, disregard for others, and the desire for self-aggrandizement frequently operate against the weak and reward some beyond their merits. Here and there monopolies arise, interlocking directorates reduce the benefits of competition, and the strong sometimes profit from the errors and incapacities of the weak. These consequences flow from the fact that men in economic enterprises are human, heir to all the temptations and weaknesses of humanity. Unfortunately, individuals in politics are no less human and no more virtuous, on the average, than individuals engaged in private enterprise.

BEWARE OF A POLITICAL MONOPOLY

Simply transferring an economic enterprise from the hands of the individual to the control of the all-important state fails to remove it from the frailties and vices which are part of human nature. In fact, placing politicians in control of a nation's economy tends to expand the areas in which human frailties can demonstrate themselves; for all semblance of competition is thus removed, and one great political monopoly evolves.

Even economic monopolies, under our present American system, are subject to legislative regulations, to competition from stubborn independent entrepreneurs, to the pressures of public opinion, and to the fact that if they grow powerful and objectionable enough the state will eventually restore their functions to the hands of competitive enterprises. But against a political monopoly, all these factors are futile. In the final analysis a political monopoly can be broken up only by a revolution of the people; individual enterprises are powerless, public opinion is ineffective, and the political monopolies use their economic power to subjugate the citizen to the state.

Thus the frailties and weaknesses, the ambition and selfishness of human nature find greater opportunity in the welfare state than in any system of private enterprise, political independence, and personal opportunity. The individual citizen in our American opportunity state is protected alike from the excesses of politicians and from industrial giants who may seek our destruction.

Unless America emphatically rejects the welfare state we must lose here the personal opportunities and political privileges which unhappily have already departed from many other areas of the world.

Utopia is an unattainable objective. We must measure our advantages and disadvantages today against the evils or the dividends we would obtain by surrendering our rights as free men to the all-powerful state. Differences in degree at a given era of history may exist between communism, nazism, fascism, national socialism, and the welfare state, but no basic differences or distinctions exist in the direction in which men travel when they relinquish control of their individual destinies to political planners. By no legislative or political legerdemain can citizens hand to their rulers the control over all their affairs and still assure to themselves the right to correct and curb the new evils thus set in motion.

As the record of history is slowly written the prophetic wisdom of our constitutional forefathers becomes increasingly clear. In founding this Republic to promote rather than provide the general welfare, they precluded the concept of the welfare state and put in motion a system of government which has evolved into an unprecedented opportunity state. If we are to keep our privileges, we must avoid heedless tampering with the basic formula of freedom that has made our Nation great and kept it strong: namely, that the opportunities flowing from private enterprise, political independence, and individual choice "to provide a fair chance for a free people" must not be destroyed through the transfer of authority from the hands of the common people to those of the politicians in Washington, D. C. If this were to happen in America, we would gain neither security nor opportunity; we would lose the very elements comprising the general welfare which our people now enjoy. Moreover, having lost the individual powers of self-determination, we would have sacrificed the rights of our people to act according to their own desires. We would be shameful traitors to our great American heritage.

Subversives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress I have been vitally interested in maintaining a free and prosperous America. To maintain a free America I believe it is absolutely necessary to see that subversives are not allowed in the Federal Government. Those there should be removed at once. Furthermore, I believe that we must approach our international dealings with foresight and understanding and in a realistic and positive manner.

For that reason, I have consistently supported appropriations for a strong army, navy and air force, and funds for the FBI so that it could ferret out disloyalty among government workers. I have watched carefully our diplomatic dealings and have been dismayed at the lack of understanding and some of the actions taken by the administration leadership

If you agree with President Truman's decision to send troops to Korea you simply cannot agree with Secretary of State Acheson's "hands off" far eastern foreign policy prior to June 27. When I returned from a visit to Korea and the Orient last fall I warned of the danger of Communist aggression in the Far East. I was not alone in recommending a positive firm foreign policy in that area of the world. Men of foresight of both political parties joined in offering that counsel.

Mr. Speaker, this good advice, much of it made right on this floor, was ignored by administration leaders. As a result, today American men are fighting and dying in the rice paddies of Korea.

In their frantic efforts to absolve the administration of blame in the Korean crisis, some Fair Deal political aspirants are resorting to a smear campaign against those who objected to economic aid to Korea without military aid to back it up. There were a good many Members of this body who felt that way. They were divided among Republicans and Democrats. In fact, I believe the number was 192 in all.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for an accounting by the Truman-Acheson-Johnson administration.

Mr. Speaker, what happened to the 70 group air force which the Congress twice voted?

Mr. Speaker, what happened to the more than $90,000,000,000 which was given to the Defense Department for military preparedness since 1945?

Mr. Speaker, why was the Marine Corps cut to the bone? The Marines have always been our first line of amphibious attack in time of emergency.

Mr. Speaker, why was our Navy curtailed. High ranking Naval officers were muzzled and condemned when they criticized administration policy of scrapping the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, why did our State Department follow the line laid down by Owen Lattimore as regards Korea and the Far East? Remember he recommended that Korea be allowed to fall and that we withdraw from China. Our official State Department policy followed this advice until we virtually lost control of the Orient.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of such a policy we find ourselves now fighting in Korea and our prestige and interests in the Far East threatened.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the policy of the Department of Defense, American men were sent into Korea poorly equipped and poorly trained to meet the Red invaders.

Mr. Speaker, why were Marshall-aid countries who received billions of dollars of American tax money permitted to send strategic war materials to Soviet Russia and her satellites?

Mr. Speaker, why have administration officials in this country bought several million dollars worth of dried eggs from Communist China when American farm wives have had a hard time getting along on the prices they received despite the Government-support program? Such action has helped the Reds and hurt loyal American housewives.

Mr. Speaker, no one has explained yet to American fighting men, their mothers, and sweethearts just why they are today battling in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, Fair Deal administration spokesmen should explain the terrific influence upon our affairs exercised by fellow travelers and Communist sympathizers. I, along with thousands of loyal Americans, was astounded when our Secretary of State refused to turn his back on Alger Hiss after he had been convicted in an American court by an American jury.

Mr. Speaker, the only solution to the problems which face us today is a change of leadership. This change must be made before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, unless we have a different type of thinking in high places the survival of America as a free nation of free people is threatened.

Cleveland Plain Dealer Article on the Speech of Congressman Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, of April 1, 1950, which appeared on the editorial page of that outstanding Ohio newspaper, and which was written by the veteran Washington correspondent, Walker S. Buel. This article was also reprinted in the Martins Ferry (Ohio) Times-Leader, one of the leading newspapers in Congressman HAYS' district.

The great speech of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable WAYNE L. HAYS, is recorded for posterity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I think it is fitting that this tribute from the outstanding Ohio newspaper also be recorded in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This is one of the many instances of fine contributions that our good friend, Congressman HAYS, has made since he has been a Member of this body.

HAYS TELLS OFF MARCANTONIO—ATTACK ON COMMUNISM SUPPORTED BY BOTH SIDES OF HOUSE

(By Walker S. Buel)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, of New York, American Labor Party firebrand who is serving his seventh congressional term and is no slouch as a rabble-rouser, met his match on the floor of the House this week in the person of an Ohio Democratic first-termer.

Aroused by a MARCANTONIO defense of a land-reform plan in Italy, sponsored by a Communist-dominated confederation, Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, of Flushing, uncorked an extemporaneous reply which drew tribute from both sides of the party aisle. Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts, Democratic floor leader, as the debate on assistance to Europe continued, took occasion next day to tell the House:

"The gentleman from Ohio made a great speech yesterday. It was the speech of a man not only of courage but of a man with the mind of a statesman who recognizes the basic issue that is involved."

ANSWERED BACK

Ordinarily, House Democrats do not answer MARCANTONIO, who votes often with them on domestic issues. His party line on foreign policy is well known and often expressed and he is permitted to talk without much challenge. But HAYS, who has been twice in Italy in 2 years, went after him hammer-and-tongs when MARCANTONIO delivered a long denunciation of the Marshall plan as a failure which "has meant exploitation and despair for Italy," and denounced the United States-supported De Gasperi government of Italy.

HAYS, an Ohio Presbyterian, and MCCORMACK, a Boston Catholic, joined in giving an unusual note of religious import to the House debate. HAYS said that the issue in Italy is not land reform, important as that is.

"The issue is whether or not we have a government in Italy which recognized God or whether we have a government which does not recognize God and prohibits the population from recognizing God," he continued.

MCCORMACK told the House:

"This is not a sermon, we are here because of our belief in God. This assembly could not exist in the Soviet Union. These people could not be seated in the gallery and you and I could not meet our constituents, as we do, in our office or at home if it were not that we are citizens in and believers in the spiritual government that democracy stands for."

HOPE FOR PEACE

The Ohioan, member of a select expenditures committee which visited Europe, told of a moment of prayer with the Pope at Rome as he concluded an audience with committee members.

"I have never been a zealously religious person," HAYS said. "I have taken it in stride, like most of us do. I was never tremendously impressed by religion and what it has meant to mankind until I started thinking about that experience. Then I realized that there must be some hope in the world for an orderly solution of our problems: we had just come from the Holy Land and Damascus, where the Prince of Peace, that advocate of tolerance and charity walked, talked, taught, and died. I thought: Yes; we have made some progress in the world in the last few hundred years.

"This thing, you must understand, could not have happened 150 years or so ago, because Catholics and Protestants were spilling each other's blood in religious wars. This little understanding is not a very long stride in point of time, but we have been making it, we are learning, and I believe that is the only solution. You cannot force it on from the top by a gang, like the ungodly Communists who only want to put themselves in power at the expense of the freedom and liberty, the food, the shelter, and the clothing of the masses. That is what we saw all over Communist Europe, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, and in Yugoslavia, behind the iron curtain.

"You hear about these voluntary labor battalions in these Communist countries. They all work voluntarily. The only thing that happens to them if they do not do it, is that their ration card is taken away and they cannot buy any food; their shelter card is taken away from them and they do not have any place in which to live; their clothing card is taken away from them and they do not have anything to wear.

"That, of course, is merely progress according to the definition of the gentleman from New York."

HAYS is a former teacher of history and public speaking. He gave MARCANTONIO quite a lesson.

A Prayer for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in practically every synagogue in the country a prayer is offered up as part of the Sabbath services for the preservation of our country and for its well-being.

My attention has just been directed to a prayer offered by Rabbi Jacob Goldberg in Temple Israel at Lake Peekskill, N. Y. This would be a better country if all of us took time to offer similar prayers.

The prayer is as follows:

A PRAYER FOR AMERICA

Almighty God, bless with health, courage, vision, and high purpose, the President of the United States of America and all the leaders of our country, that they may govern wisely and justly. Grant to the Government of America the will and the power to solve its problems in the democratic manner and to give to each of its inhabitants the opportunity to lead a happy and a useful life. We pray that Thou shalt show the leaders of our country as well as the leaders of all nations, the way to peace, and that Thou wilst not allow another world war, with all its horror and killing, with all its waste and destruction, to engulf Thy humanity. Amen.

Republican Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Post of August 15, 1950:

[From the New York Post of August 15, 1950]

REPUBLICAN FANTASY

It seems that history can be rewritten at home as well as abroad.

Did you know that the leaders of the Republican Party opposed the wartime alliance with Stalin even while they were hailing the defense of Stalingrad? Did you know that they said often and boldly that they would prefer to let thousands of Americans die fighting the Nazis single-handed rather than risk any postwar dealings with Stalin? Did you know that they loudly condemned FDR's efforts to bring Russia into the war against Japan? Were you paying attention when the GOP chieftains valiantly opposed demobilization of American forces after VJ-day? Were you listening when they demanded that all our troops be kept in uniform at overseas stations to block aggressive Soviet moves which they shrewdly foresaw? Have you forgotten that they told the country, bluntly and fearlessly, that demobilization—and all the ways of peace—would have to be indefinitely postponed because Russia would push us around the moment our armies disbanded? Do you remember how the Republican high command denounced the administration for bringing the GI's home too swiftly?

You don't remember all that? Come to think of it, neither do we. During the 1944 campaign, we even thought we heard Thomas E. Dewey accuse the Roosevelt administration of planning "to keep men in the Army when the war is over because it fears there will be no jobs for them in civil life." And Dewey wasn't alone—or so it seemed to us. On November 10, 1945, we thought we saw a Times headline which read: "TAFT asks Ohio division return first from Pacific." In those months the air seemed full of other Republicans—and Democrats—making similar noises.

Now we are told that none of this really could have happened. It says here in a manifesto issued yesterday by Republican mem-

bers of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that any fool would have known better in 1945; that all our present woes are due to "the failure and refusal of American leadership in 1945 to recognize the true aims and methods of the rulers of Soviet Russia." It says here in the same declaration that "to this failure can be traced the disintegration of our Armed Forces in 1945 which would not have occurred if the need for retaining adequate forces had been explained to the American people." The Republican statesmen knew it all the time. They knew it was senseless and suicidal to bring the GI's home while Russians still roamed the world. They knew all that and more; they just forgot to tell the country what they knew, and now they have even forgotten that they forgot.

Elimination of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Dunn's Review for August has a very interesting article styled "How a New England Town Eliminated Large Scale Unemployment" which depicts how Nashua, New Hampshire has within the past two years met, grappled with and substantially conquered the economic disease of unemployment.

Since the district which I have the honor to represent is plagued with the same problem, four of its nine counties having been classified by the United States Department of Commerce as having the most critical unemployment of the entire Southeast, I am including this article as a part of my remarks with the hope that it may prove an inspiration to those who are diligently working to solve the problem of unemployment.

The elements of Nashua's attack on its unemployment appear to be these:

First. Cooperation of business men, employees, unions, townspeople, chamber of commerce and city government to attract, and persuade new industries of the advantages which Nashua had to offer.

Second. An industrial consultant was hired to supervise a survey and propose a plan of action, which, when agreed upon, the cooperating groups gave the necessary momentum to see that it was carried through.

Third. Enlistment of local capital with which to furnish employment in those areas where it could best suit the over-all plan.

Fourth. The groups interested in Nashua's future concentrated on a program of pointing out the outstanding advantages which Nashua had to offer and pursued this objective by direct mail, newspaper advertising, radio and personal contact. Among other things they emphasized that their city was a good place in which to work and live.

Fifth. Each firm, large or small, that expresses an interest in Nashua is given immediate, thorough, and courteous attention.

The article points out that work in these directions is hard, and oftentimes discouraging. Persistence, however, on the part of the people of Nashua is now paying great dividends as it sees its unemployment shrink with each passing month.

This work at Nashua has brought its people closer together and has given them an awareness of their own ability that causes them to dream that their city will be even greater than it was before unemployment came their way.

The article follows:

HOW A NEW ENGLAND TOWN ELIMINATED LARGE SCALE UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Thomas Holton Hoare)

Nearly 2 years have passed since Nashua, the "Gate City" of New Hampshire on the banks of the Merrimack River, containing a population of 35,000 people, found itself in the middle of an industrial controversy that made the headlines of newspapers, magazines, and business papers all over the country.

Textron, Inc., Nashua's largest single employer, had announced the closing of its Nashua mills and the liquidation of its properties there. As a result, many prophesied the end of the great textile industry in New England.

Headlines all over the country tolled the death knell of Nashua. In a few months, they said, it was destined to become a ghost town, casting a shadow that could engulf the entire State and might even affect all of industrial New England. Many read these stories, listened to dire predictions, and, shaking their heads, agreed that this was the end of Nashua and nothing less than a miracle could save the town. This belief was not shared by the people of Nashua and other courageous people in New Hampshire.

When the Nashua Telegraph came off the press late that afternoon of September 13, 1948, its headlines spoke for the New England community that refused to be beaten. They read: "Read for challenge, city swings into action as mills announce plant closing. New industry campaign on: Textron to shut down here." They had sounded the note and the leaders of Nashua, together with its people, began a campaign of concerted action that has resulted today in Nashua being recognized as one of the brightest spots in the New Hampshire employment picture and a place where industries, considering new locations, have shown great interest.

The story of how all this was done in such a short span of time contains no magic words or formulas. It is the story of plain down to earth Yankee ingenuity, clear thinking, and unselfish service on the part of everyone concerned.

Nashua recognized the basic fact that although Textron's decision to move out of the city would put one-third of its industrial workers out of work, the city still had 50 or more diversified industries that were in excellent condition and would continue to provide work. Logically, the next step was to see what could be done for the 3,600 who would lose their jobs on December 31, 1949, the date Textron had set as its deadline.

The night the news of the Textron decision was announced, the chamber of commerce met and immediately formed a committee to study the problem. It asked the mayor to name a committee of three aldermen and three chamber of commerce members. The mayor's committee, spearheaded by then Alderman Hugh Gregg, set to work collecting facts from both Textron officials and the union. A meeting was arranged at which Textron modified the December 31 date and agreed to maintain the Jackson Sheeting Mills "as long as possible." Textron later extended that indefinite period to a full year, thus insuring continued employment for about 1,300 of the 3,600 Textron workers. This was only a temporary solution of the problem, and the people of Nashua wanted action toward a full solution that would stop at nothing less than full and continued employment for all workers.

INDUSTRIAL CONSULTANT HIRED

The next step consisted of the formation of a new citizens' committee of the leading business men of Nashua and called the Nashua Industrial Committee. It raised over a thousand dollars by private subscription to engage the services of an experienced industrial consultant. At the suggestion of the New England Council and the New Hampshire Development Commission, Laurence C. Plowman of Portland, Maine, was brought in to devise a plan of action.

After a preliminary survey, a plan was proposed whereby the Textron holdings might be bought locally and an attempt made to sell or lease the properties as separate units to new industry with the accent on diversification.

Armed with this plan, and determined to see it through, the committee visited officials of the Textron organization and offered to buy all of the company's Nashua properties. After 10 days of discussions and negotiations, during which time hearings by a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee were being held concerning Textron operations, it was agreed that the committee would buy the properties from Textron for the sum of $500,000, of which $100,000 was paid in cash and $400,000 was taken as a mortgage by Textron. In addition, Textron agreed to lease back the Jackson Mills from the group for a period of 10 years and to continue their sheeting operations.

Before the sale agreement and lease agreement were signed, the committee members organized the Nashua-New Hampshire Foundation and engaged Mr. Plowman as manager. Its seven trustees agreed that the purpose of the foundation would be "to promote the public welfare in the city of Nashua, N. H., and especially to work toward a solution of its unemployment problem by a continuous effort to attract and establish a new industrial development for that community."

Under New Hampshire law, the new organization could have been set up as a voluntary nonprofit corporation and, on the basis of its purpose being to promote the public welfare could have requested and undoubtedly been granted permission to become tax free. The foundation ignored this possibility in view of the tax loss that such an agreement would have meant to the city and further provided for any eventual profit from the venture by naming the New Hampshire Society for Crippled Children as the final beneficiary at "such time as all obligations as may hereinafter be incurred in connection with the trust's acquisition of any property from Textron, Inc., shall have been satisfied and establishing new industrial development for Nashua has been accomplished." By this move, it identified itself with a well recognized and approved State-wide project, hence the name "Nashua-New Hampshire Foundation."

Even before the ink was dry on either the trust agreement or the purchase and lease agreements, the men who comprised the nucleus of the new foundation saw the formation of a new enterprise known as the Nashua Textile Co. organized around a group

of Textron workers skilled in the manufacture of such specialized textile products as automobile convertible tops, and shoe and glove linings, products much in demand in today's market. With local funds subscribed by Nashua citizens, a new company was formed with Robert Hamlett, a local lawyer, as president, and James Milliken, a former Textron employee, as general manager.

The Nashua Textile Co. then leased 175,000 square feet of space from the foundation and bought the necessary machinery from Textron on a long-term sales agreement. Since its beginning in late 1948 the company has grown from 175 employees to more than 300. Its products are well made and in demand and the company has become an integral part of the Nashua industrial community.

THE MEN WHO MADE IT POSSIBLE

The foundation is a group of energetic and unselfish men who claim little of the credit for the success of the venture. They quietly share the credit for what has been done in the past year with the citizens of Nashua, their active chamber of commerce, and the New Hampshire State Development Commission. They explain, for example, that at the first news of Textron's decision to leave Nashua, the New Hampshire Development Commission offered its assistance immediately. Since that organization must, of necessity, show no favoritism, Edward Ellingwood, director of the commission, explained that his organization considered the Nashua problem a State-wide problem and an emergency.

The commission had several advertisements scheduled for October release in national newspapers and business papers, outlining the benefits of New Hampshire to new industry. It changed these advertisements to describe Nashua and its possibilities as a place for new industry because of its available ready-made space, and its good location.

The chamber of commerce recognized its primary duty to the city as a whole and realized the potential effect of such a threat to the business of the city. It visualized what might be in store for the merchants when 25 percent of the working population was threatened with a loss of income and consequently would be reluctant to buy anything but the bare necessities, despite the coming fall and Christmas season upon which the merchants rely heavily. To counteract the threat, an advertising program underwritten by the merchants was instituted under the direction of George J. Gordon, chairman of the merchants' division of the chamber of commerce.

It included radio and newspaper advertising designed to attract the people of the surrounding towns, suggesting that they make Nashua their shopping center. The cry was, "We accept the challenge." The results were amazing. Instead of sales falling off, merchants found themselves doing as well as in the previous year and in many cases a good deal better. Thus the merchant group of Nashua maintained its spirit and helped to show the way to the rest of the city.

BIG BUSINESS REPRESENTED

It is interesting to note that most of the members of the board of trustees of the Nashua-New Hampshire Foundation together with the two grantors are members of some of the largest industrial firms in Nashua. Elliott A. Carter, chairman of the foundation, is vice president of the Nashua Gummed and Coated Paper Co.; Francis P. Murphy (former Governor of New Hampshire) is chairman of the board of the J. F. McElwain Shoe Co.; Walter L. Barker is president of the Improved Paper Machinery Corp.; George J. Gordon is president of the Gordon Manufacturing Co.; Hugh Gregg, secretary of the foundation and its prime mover, is secretary-treasurer of Gregg & Sons, sash and door manufacturing company, and is now mayor, having been elected to that office in November 1949. Vasco Nunez, president of the Nashua Gummed and Coated Paper Co., and Robert C. Erb, president of the J. F. McElwain Shoe Co., members of the original Nashua Industrial Committee who acted as grantors in connection with the formation of the foundation, although not at present members of the board of trustees, have continued their interest in the project and have worked closely with foundation trustees.

By their energetic action to bring new industry to the city, these men have disproved the old chestnut often heard in small cities to the effect that old established concerns frequently discourage new industrial development for fear new industries will compete with them to their disadvantage for the existing labor supply. This group has gone to great lengths to help encourage new industry. In several cases where interested parties have expressed an interest in Nashua and, after inspecting the foundation's properties, decided they were not suited to their operations, the trustees have shown them other locations in the city where the new concerns did eventually buy or lease property.

It was the unselfish attitude on the part of everyone concerned that helped to bring Nashua out of the emergency. An example of combined direct action was the case of the Baldwin Lumber and Box Co., a new milling concern which purchased a wood mill and box factory through the efforts of the foundation and the chamber of commerce. Recognizing that the new concern needed more business to put it on a firmer footing, the group who had seen to the sale of the mill went further and helped to secure a contract which resulted in 30 more Nashua workers being assured of employment.

INFLUX OF INDUSTRIAL CONCERNS

To date the records of the Chamber of Commerce of Nashua show that since Textron's announcement on September 13, 1948, 12 new industrial concerns have come to Nashua and 1 company already in Nashua has expanded its operations. Seven of the twelve concerns, including the Jamey Shoe Co., manufacturers of women's shoes, and the Bagshaw Co., makers of industrial needles, have taken space on the foundation's property. Together with the Nashua Textile Co. and five other smaller concerns, they now have over 1,000 workers on their payrolls. Textron's Jackson Mills gives employment to 1,650–1,700 additional workers.

With several new concerns interested in Nashua properties, it is hoped that by the end of 1950, there will be more employment in Nashua than there were when Textron was operating at its peak and nearly as much as during the war period.

In examining the unemployment figures at the local office of the division of employment security, it is evident that the combined efforts of the people of Nashua have prevented any extended unemployment. The charts and graphs of Russell Evans, the local director, show that Nashua had the largest decrease in unemployment of any city in New Hampshire from May 1949 to May 1950. Unemployment decreased 43.3 percent during this period.

SKILLED EMPLOYEES AVAILABLE

Mr. Evans' figures also show that there is a large reservoir of skilled employees living in the surrounding towns who will take factory work when available. This is an important factor considering that at the present rate of incoming industry to Nashua there will be a greater demand for workers than at any time since World War II.

As a result of the successful sale and lease of 1,503,500 square feet of its available space, the Nashua-New Hampshire Foundation has been able to show the people of Nashua that the time will soon come when nearly all industry in Nashua will be privately and locally owned. Their success also enabled the foundation last month to pay off the remaining balance of the $400,000 mortgage, $289,603.80, from the proceeds of sales and rentals of properties.

The space still available for lease or sale through the foundation totals 1,006,250 square feet in buildings whose condition ranges from good to excellent. The foundation is now entertaining the possibility of constructing a new modern, air-conditioned plant for an acceptable manufacturer.

The progress of the whole endeavor is reflected in the attitude found throughout the city and brought sharply ito focus by the support of the last Community Chest campaign, in which the $71,750 goal was oversubscribed by $5,000. In quoting the figures, William J. Barrett, the Community Chest president and a vice president of the Nashua Trust Co. and a trustee of the foundation, explained that this result was doubly amazing, in view of the fact that the goal was the largest it had been in any peacetime year and $7,000 more than in the preceding year, when it fell short by $3,000 even before there was any threat of unemployment.

He attributed one reason for the success to a new spirit of cooperation between management and labor in Nashua that seems to have pervaded the community since the crisis. In one plant alone, he pointed out, the percentage of contributions rose from 60 to 94 percent, along with increased gifts from the employers.

Too much cannot be said for the spirit and determination of the people of Nashua in overcoming the problem that faced the city. However, new industry would not have been created there or brought there by spirit alone. It was the combined efforts of progressive groups that faced the problem squarely and went out and acted positively and wisely.

In seeking new industry, these groups, such as the chamber of commerce and the Nashua-New Hampshire Foundation, working together, concentrated on a program of pointing out the outstanding features Nashua could offer.

A GOOD SALES CAMPAIGN

Using every media possible—direct mail, newspaper advertising, and radio—they pointed to the ideal location near the commercial centers of New England and New York, the excellent available space in well-built and well-equipped buildings, the fine transportation facilities, the abundance of utilities, the quality and availability of skilled labor, and the industrial record Nashua has made for herself over the last century or more. In addition, they showed that the city itself was a good place in which to work and live. They talked and wrote about the fine schools, the absence of any slums, the geographical layout of the city in which the industrial plants are spread out over a wide area and not concentrated at one point.

They extolled the reputation of New Hampshire as a vacation State and as a winter and summer sports center. They pointed out the New Hampshire equitable tax system whereby a threefold tax structure is payable to the city in which the industry is located at the rate determined by the city itself. They further showed that the State has no income tax, corporation tax, or sales tax.

These men in their attempt to give Nashua a new prosperity are bringing these hard facts home to hundreds of businessmen, industrialists, and small factory owners throughout the country by every means of advertising and promotion. Each firm, large or small, that expresses an interest in Nashua is given immediate, thorough, and courteous attention. It's hard work and often discouraging work, but those involved realize that the future of Nashua rests with them.

Their success can make their city an even greater one than it was before trouble came.

Work of this sort is not without its problems. There is large machinery to move, problems in legal conveyance because of the intricate steam and electric lines, roads and fences to be kept in repair, and the problem of seeing how the new tenants can best be served. But the actions and results of the persons participating have shown that they have the necessary faith and ability to overcome problems. The phenomenal success attained since the work began has convinced even the doubters outside of Nashua that Nashua will not become the ghost town predicted, and its crisis has tempered the strength of the city and brought the people closer together and more aware of their own ability and rightful pride born of Yankee common sense and hard work.

A Feasible Method of Desalting Sea Water Is of Great National Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the Public Lands Committee is considering a bill to authorize a study of feasible means of converting sea water to make it fit for potable use, H. R. 3123. Although I have not introduced a similar bill, I do want to speak and act in favor of this measure. I think the proposed legislation has very great meaning. In meeting vital human needs it may have greater potentiality for good than has the splitting of the atom. I am not alone in this appraisal, which amounts almost to a prophecy, because high officials of the Government, including the President himself, are favoring this study. President Truman mentioned it in his first official message to the Eighty-first Congress. It is well known that the Secretary of Interior and several of his assistants are keenly interested in this proposal and anxious to go all out in this effort. What about legislation necessary to lay the ground work?

While I have not myself introduced a bill of this kind, I have said to my colleagues, both in the House and the Senate, that I wanted to do everything in my power to help the move. I know of Senator O'MAHONEY'S great interest in this proposal and have promised to work with him in furthering the legislation. Likewise, I have told my California colleagues—not alone Mr. MCKINNON, but his predecessor and others—that I wanted to join them in this effort and sponsor it, or at least to help in doing so. It seems there has been an inclination on the part of some from California to scoff at this idea of drawing on the sea for usable water. Although I have noticed that fact for the past several years, I have not refrained from taking an active part in this legislative effort because of possible ridicule, coming from Los Angeles, which might be heaped upon it. No doubt, there will be more ridicule, as there has been, coming from that quarter. No, it is not from lack of interest on my part in this proposal but because of the press of other matters that I have been slow about inviting Congressman MCKINNON to appear before my committee.

What other similar bills have been introduced covering the subject in this or other Congresses? Beside H. R. 3123 which we have before us in this Congress, there is a Senate bill, S. 1300, similar to the McKinnon bill. It is to be observed that bills in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses have been introduced by California Congressmen, which I note with interest and understanding.

It is to be especially noted that Congressman MCKINNON represents the great naval base area of San Diego where fresh water is so critically needed.

I recall that Mr. MCKINNON'S predecessor in the Eightieth Congress introduced a bill similar to this, but on which no hearings were held and no action was taken. Thus we see that great interest in the problem of converting sea water into usable form attracts the attention of Members from the San Diego area. However, so far as I can find, no such bill has been introduced by Members of Congress from Los Angeles. It may be easy to explain the reason why the idea is so lightly held in the Los Angeles area. But first let us look at the real reason for this curious legislative-geographic fact as it applies to San Diego.

Certainly if this proposal is feasibly possible, it should be done at San Diego, Calif., because of the critical water shortage there and because of the vital need of good water for human consumption at that great naval port.

The population of San Diego has increased enormously, and San Diego is of increasing importance as a naval base so that it is of national importance for our security that we look well to the fresh water supplies at that place. San Diego has inadequate local water resources and must now depend upon importing water from the Colorado River, which she is doing. In fact, the volume of Colorado River water carried through the metropolitan aqueduct is, for the city of San Diego, in more vitally needed proportion than for Los Angeles. This water is carried long distances through a branch aqueduct, which slender lifeline might be disrupted, leaving the city of San Diego and the port disastrously short of water. San Diego cannot develop local water resources to the point where she can rely entirely on such sources in the event of the disruption of her branch aqueduct. This fact points up the need for the thing for which this legislation calls, so that if it is humanly possible and engineeringly feasible, San Diego may draw upon the blue Pacific even for her drinking water.

In critical water shortage areas in central California—that is, north of the Tehachapi—it would also be highly desirable for us to be able to draw upon the vast Pacific in case of emergency or shortage. If we can discover how to treat seawater to make it potable, even if it is somewhat more expensive than natural supplies, it would be a matter of safety to have some stand-by equipment able to draw upon the sea. Some of the gentleman from central California, grateful no doubt for the generous supply of water furnished by nature in central California, but knowing that it is not equally distributed, have probably been influenced to favor this same legislation.

NEED AND ATTITUDE OF LOS ANGELES

Contrary to the mass of propaganda emanating from Los Angeles that the faucets of her kitchens were likely to go dry if S. 75 were passed, which smoke screen was raised against that Arizona legislation, we have lately heard it said, and I know it to be a fact, that the Los Angeles area has sufficient water by getting what is legally hers from the Colorado River, and therefore there is no need of importing water into the Los Angeles area even by human efforts from the Pacific. That fact is what I have thought all along during the last several years of the Arizona-California water controversy and therefore was not fooled by this fog of propaganda. Perhaps no other Member of Congress was fooled by it.

Even though Los Angeles and surrounding area have adequate water resources right under foot, plus water imported through two immense aqueducts, and therefore is less in need of stand-by water facilities than is San Diego, in my opinion, yet it is none too safe for such a great city to depend entirely upon those two aqueducts for supplemental water. Let it be understood that I would not take away from or keep away from either of these two aqueducts a drop of water, but either or both of them could be disrupted by earthquakes or by man. In fact, the Owens River aqueduct was once dynamited by Californians. Therefore a plant for the conversion of sea water, if we can find that there is such a thing feasible, might be a measure of safety even for Los Angeles in case of trouble.

Luckily, for Los Angeles and the Nation, that great city does not depend completely on imported water through her two aqueducts, because the containing area consisting of 1,400,000 acres of habitable land has good water only a few feet below the surface in an underground storage capacity of 7,000,000 acre-feet, which, according to a statement by California engineers, is capable of furnishing through pumped wells a safe annual yield of 700,000 acre-feet of good water. This tremendous reservoir is kept supplied by an extensive watershed extending along the Pacific coast for 90 miles and extending from the sea into the interior to high mountains an average of 50 miles. The rainfall on the coast is a low average of about 12 inches annually but on the mountain area the precipitation will run as high as 25 or 30 inches annually. The resulting tremendous run-off is carried to the underground reservoir by such streams as the Los Angeles River, the San Gabriel River, the Santa Ana River, and others. Prior to the building of the two aqueducts, Los Angeles and the surrounding cities drew their water supplies entirely from this vast underground storage, and

could do so again to a considerable extent for a long time in case the aqueducts should be disrupted.

In the long drawn out and complex struggle between Arizona and California over the legal division of the waters of the Colorado River, one of the chief arguments Californians paraded before the public was the threat, so-called, to the Los Angeles water supply by such legislation as S. 75. Therefore, it was with much pleasure and understanding that I heard Congressman HOLIFIELD on August 22 in a prepared speech say:

California believes that its legal share of Colorado River, if protected, will be adequate for California's foreseeable needs and California will fight to preserve those legal rights against any attack.

Congressman POULSON has said about the same thing as found in his extension of remarks on August 17, and still other authoritative voices have stated the same satisfying fact. Since I recognize that California has a great volume of water legally coming to her from the Colorado River and of that Los Angeles has a certain legal share of the California quota, which amount I believe can be maintained before the highest court of the land, and which I would like to see done, therefore I am not worried about the vital water supply of Los Angeles.

However, I still think that even with an almost inexhaustible underground supply, and even with the two largest aqueducts in the world to bring the city melted snow from the high Sierra Mountains, and fairly good irrigation water from the Colorado River, I still believe that it would add greatly to the safety of Los Angeles and its vicinity if they had the facilities which we seek for San Diego to take municipal waters from the Pacific Ocean.

The Public Lands Committee received some correspondence from an engineer in San Diego presenting strong arguments for stand-by plants to convert sea water for human consumption. He pointed out the danger of letting any vital water supply depend upon aqueducts to convey water from distant sources. Even if the best process known for desalting sea water should be found to be somewhat more expensive than the cost of municipal water, even so, this engineer feels as I do that stand-by plants should be provided as a step in military safety. I quote from his letter:

We are now facing a very definite threat of war but the aqueduct boys do not recognize any such words as "war," "bombs," "aircraft" or "sabotage." Ask any United States air service officer what a few old-fashioned TNT bombs of World War II vintage would do to our costly aqueducts. They know that Los Angeles would be out of business for the duration. Also San Diego and every other California community dependent upon aqueduct water. In any real war of the future I'll wager our aqueducts would be a thing of the past in exactly the time it would take the enemy to get at them. But, of course, the aqueduct boys never mention any such thing.

San Diego (approximately 400,000 population) is now on a voluntary plan of water rationing and wondering how they're going to get through the summer. The city has no reserves of water whatever and is simply worrying along from day to day with the Colorado River aqueduct supply—against which serious inroads are already being made by the United States defense installations as a result of the trouble in Korea.

I predict that it isn't going to be very long * * * possibly before the end of this summer, when about 1,000,000 housewives in various parts of California will go to the kitchen sinks and find themselves with waterless plumbing. Or some Russian bombs on our aqueducts will produce a far more serious result. Then and then only do I expect to see anything done about getting potable water from ocean sources. We will then probably learn how to do it from some "more progressive country" like Saudi Arabia, Mexico, or Peru.

To California (as just one of many semi-arid areas) fresh water from the ocean would be worth more than all our oil wells, all our mines, all our present agriculture, all our present industry, and all the assessed property valuation of the State.

Why should I, a Congressman from Arizona in the interior of the great West, be so much interested in this study? Well, this proposal if feasible would be good not only for the coast of California but if found to be what we hope for can be a life saver to all parts of the Nation's ocean shore line. On the other side of the world it can be a great help to the ancient Mediterranean lands which were once well watered and fruitful but now barren and desolate. If an inexpensive and feasible way, without using too much of some other natural resource can be found, this idea could have as great a benefit to the human family as does the splitting of the atom.

Let it not be supposed that we in the Rocky Mountain area or throughout the interior of the western region, hundreds of miles from the sea, are not at all interested in desalting water. At the lower edge of every great irrigation project in the Rocky Mountain region, certainly in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Utah, to say nothing of the other States higher up, will be found water so saline as to be unfit for drinking purposes or for irrigation. In fact, the accumulation of salt is one of the major problems of irrigation. At the present time we attempt to flush it out of the land, which requires the use of a lot of water which should be used some other way. Therefore, if this idea has any merit for the sea coast it would have the same merit not only for the Imperial Valley in California, the great Salt Lake Basin in Utah, the enclosed basins in Nevada, but on every other great irrigation project where once fresh river water has become salty through many uses and reuses. I hope this idea of purifying sea water is sound and workable.

The Most Highly Beloved Man I Have Ever Known

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, few columnists possess the rare gift of expressing themselves in homey, down-to-earth language, and at the same time exhibit as keen sense and deep appreciation of the virtues of his fellow men to the degree possessed by Jack Williams, Washington correspondent of the Kansas City Star and one of Capitol Hill's most popular members of the Press Gallery.

Jack Williams' articles are always factual and terse, replete with readers' interest and need no embellishment.

Several weeks ago, Jack Williams wrote a column on my very good friend and the good friend of every Member of Congress, the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, a soldier, statesman, orator, teacher, traveler, and one of the greatest raconteurs that ever set foot in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for 12 years I have served with DEWEY SHORT on what is now the Armed Services Committee of this House. I shall never forget the words that on one occasion were spoken by the Honorable CARL VINSON, Democratic chairman of that committee, in referring to DEWEY SHORT as "the most highly beloved man I have ever known."

Mr. Speaker, I remember also the first occasion on which I enjoyed the distinguished privilege and pleasure of introducing our good friend and colleague, DEWEY SHORT, to an audience.

I had previously asked my secretary to obtain some more or less intimate background details with respect to DEWEY'S experience, family, and other data that would be of interest.

In a very short while my secretary handed me a veritable avalanche of the things that had been accomplished by our friend. One thing, however, stood out above all else in the short biography handed me. It was the written statement that—

In all history there had been no man who had ever served in the Nation's Congress whose mind was so enriched, whose personality was so endowed, and whose humanities were so greatly influenced by formal education than was the mind of the Honorable DEWEY SHORT.

Mr. Speaker, since that day I have never listened to Congressman SHORT speak either in or out of Congress but that I think of the veritable catalog of colleges, universities, and other schools of higher learning that have contributed to enriching the mind of the man we all call our friend—veteran, statesman, and ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee.

Knowing that Jack Williams' article will be of immense interest to DEWEY SHORT'S many friends in and out of Congress, under unanimous consent I insert the same into the RECORD.

The article reads as follows:

DEWEY SHORT SHINES ON GOP RAMPARTS—THE OZARKS ORATOR, SEEKING REELECTION, IS A GRADUATE OF BAKER UNIVERSITY AND HAS ATTENDED BOSTON UNIVERSITY, HEIDELBERG UNIVERSITY, BERLIN UNIVERSITY, OXFORD UNIVERSITY, AND HARVARD

(By Jack Williams)

WASHINGTON.—A large photograph of a span of mules hangs conspicuously in the office of one of the most recalcitrant, undeviating and unsubduable Republicans in Congress.

Of course, elephants too are on the desk and tables of Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Galena, Mo., the only GOP House Member from Missouri. But it was the 4-footed

donkey emblem of the Democratic party which propelled SHORT into stalwart Republicanism.

SHORT, 51 years old, had just mailed his filing fee to Jefferson City to seek his tenth 2-year term in the House, as he pointed to the picture of the mules.

WORKED HARD FOR MONEY

"I shined shoes, sold newspapers, and did odd jobs to buy Jack and Jason and that wagon to which they are hitched," SHORT reminisced. "With them I earned enough by selling ice and hauling to save $1,000 by the time I finished high school in Galena. That was a lot of money in those good old pre-deals days. It started me on my way to getting an education."

SHORT went on from there with the aid of a fellowship and a loan from a cousin to get an education which qualified him for his present title of the "best educated man in the House." He started out to become a preacher, and did preach later, but his flair for oratory plumped him into Congress as the "boy oratorical wonder" back in 1928.

SHORT dug out of a closet a copy of a keynote speech he delivered at the Missouri Republican convention in 1936. He read it aloud. He said he could use the same speech today, that spending and bureaucracy still flourish.

"But I have not given up," he said. "I still believe the theory that the government is the master instead of the servant of the people is wrong. I can continue to wait for a reversal in the trend. So I am seeking another term."

ATTRACTION AS SPEAKER

The youthful-looking Ozark Congressman is perhaps the most colorful figure in the House. When he speaks Democrats as well as Republicans come to the floor to hear his flights of oratory. A sample of his satire was his reply to a criticism of his knowledge of national affairs by rotund Representative O'TOOLE of Brooklyn, Democrat.

"Why, I have been farther back under the barn looking for eggs than you have been from Brooklyn," SHORT shot back.

O'TOOLE grinned and sat down amid the laughter.

Few if any Members of Congress have traveled so far as the man from "deep in the Ozark backwoods." Galena is a town of 507 population which SHORT said was "only a few more than when I was born." He lives in a house across the street from the one where he was born.

After finishing Galena high school, SHORT attended old Marionville College, 2 miles from Galena, for 2 years. It was a Methodist college. He then went to Baker University in Baldwin, Kans., where he was graduated. He entered Boston University School of Theology where he was graduated and won the Frank D. Howard scholarship which sent him to Heidelberg University in Germany, then the University of Berlin and finally to Oxford University in England. He returned to the United States and later spent a year studying law at Harvard University.

A RHODES CANDIDATE

His last school work was financed by lectures on his European travels. At Baker, SHORT was voted a candidate for a Rhodes scholarship but it was awarded to two older students at another school on the theory that they were much older and SHORT would have another chance. He never waited but went on to win the Boston University scholarship.

SHORT believes that a "tragic day of reckoning" lies in wait from the rising national debt. He is the ranking minority member of the Armed Service Committee.

"The first line of defense is a sound economy," he said. "A bankrupt nation never whipped anybody. Government is no different from an individual. Our national debt now is $257,000,000,000, and in spending a record forty-two billion this year we will have to borrow five and one-half billion to meet our bills. The Fair Dealers don't mention that taxes have been increased a hundredfold. There was seven billion in money in circulation in 1940. This has been increased through inflation to twenty-eight and one-half billion at this time.

"The resources of our country are being siphoned to Europe. Our natural resources have been depleted by two World Wars. Oil, lead, zinc, iron, and other commodities upon which this country must look to survive have been depleted."

SHORT is anxious to get back to his district in southwest Missouri to start campaigning. He will be there during the Easter recess of Congress from April 6 to 17.

VOTED FOR UNITED NATIONS

SHORT opposed the League of Nations. He voted for the United Nations.

"I was willing to try it," he said. "We haven't got very far with it. Guess we will have to be patient."

After his long stay away from Missouri getting an education, SHORT returned to the Midwest with degrees in theology and philosophy. He became a philosophy faculty member at Southwestern College in Winfield, Kans., in 1923. After a year there he returned to Harvard for a course in law of 1 year. He never took the bar examination, but returned to Southwestern to remain from 1925 to 1928.

He became a supply pastor at a Springfield, Mo., church during his teaching period. His sermons caused him to be much talked about. In the 1928 campaign, Republicans planned a huge rally in Springfield. They went to SHORT and urged him to make the principal address.

SHORT'S father, long a Republican leader and county chairman, joined in the request, and SHORT accepted. His address won him fame as the "boy wonder" orator, and he jumped headlong into politics, entering the race for Congress from his old home district, then the Fourteenth. Missouri had 14 Members in the House then. Today it has 13, and SHORT is the seventh.

GAIN IN HIS DISTRICT

There is a pretty good chance that Missouri will lose one Member as the result of redistricting after the 1950 census, SHORT said. He added that his own district had grown in population.

SHORT was elected to the House in 1928, defeating the veteran Democrat, the late James F. Fullbright, in the normally Democratic district. In 1930 Fullbright turned the tables and defeated SHORT. In 1932 Missouri congressional candidates ran at large because the State legislature failed to carry out a redistricting.

SHORT that year ran for the Senate nomination but was defeated in the primary by the then mayor of St. Louis, Henry Keil. In 1934 the old Fourteenth District had been redistricted and SHORT'S Ozark region became the Seventh. He was nominated and elected to Congress and has been reelected since that time which makes him the only Representative ever elected from the new Seventh.

UNESCO Supports UN Action in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on July 22 the executive committee of the United States National Commission for UNESCO called for a special meeting of the Executive Board of UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—to consider what action UNESCO should take in support of the UN in Korea and in other areas of possible aggression. The committee's resolution was forwarded to the UNESCO Executive Board by Luther H. Evans, a member of that Board and a member of the National Commission.

Count Stefano Jacini, of Italy, Chairman of the UNESCO Executive Board, subsequently received requests for the special meeting from Board members representing nine other nationalities—from Belgium, Brazil, France, Greece, Lebanon, Norway, the Philippines, Turkey, and Venezuela.

At its meeting, July 22, the United States National Commission also urged a Nation-wide educational campaign in this country on the responsibility of the UN in the current situation. This program now is being planned.

The National Commission is established by law to advise the State Department on UNESCO affairs. It is composed of approximately 100 leaders in the fields of education, science, the arts, business, labor and press, radio and films. The chairman of the Commission is George D. Stoddard, president of the University of Illinois.

I am inserting at this point in my remarks copies of the resolution of the UNESCO Executive Board; the statement of Dr. Evans; and a digest of the original resolution of the Executive Committee of the United States National Commission for UNESCO:

ACTIONS OF THE UNESCO EXECUTIVE BOARD AT A SPECIAL MEETING OPENED IN PARIS AUGUST 26

The UNESCO Executive Board was called into special session in Paris, August 26, 1950, to consider UNESCO's obligations resulting from the attack on the Republic of Korea. Count Stefano Jacini, of Italy, Chairman of the Board, summoned the meeting at the request of Luther H. Evans, United States Librarian of Congress, and members representing nine other nationalities.

Chairman Jacini announced that at a closed session of the Board August 26 members unanimously condemned the aggression against the Republic of South Korea.

Previously, the Board had heard Director General Jaime Torres Bodet, of UNESCO, and Benjamin Cohen, Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations, who presented a letter to UNESCO from Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the UN, asking UNESCO's aid in explaining the responsibilities of the UN in the current situation.

Following are the texts of two resolutions passed by the Executive Board August 28:

"Profoundly moved by the armed attack of which the Republic of Korea has been the victim, and which brought the Security Council of the United Nations to adopt certain measures with a view to reestablishing peace and security, considering that one of the essential aims of UNESCO is, as stated in article 1 of its constitution, 'to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, and for human rights and fundamental freedoms for the peoples of the world.'

"Considering that the general conference at its fifth session reaffirmed that 'all the activities of UNESCO must be directed toward the peace and prosperity of mankind'

and that these 'activities, to be fully effective, imply a truly and sincerely universal outlook excluding all thought of aggression and founded on recognition of the principles of justice and freedom on which the constitution of the organization is based.'

"Considering that, in the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council on July 31, 1950, and August 14, 1950, respectively, the specialized agencies were requested, in accordance with the terms of their agreements with the United Nations to give whatever help the unified command of the United Nations in Korea might request, in order to assist and bring aid to the civilian population in Korea, considering that the Economic and Social Council, in council, in its resolution of August 14, 1950, also stressed the necessity for aid in securing the understanding and the support of the peoples of the world for the action of the United Nations in Korea, and requested the Secretary-General to seek, in the name of the Council, whatever form of cooperation was best adapted to this purpose.

"Taking note of the communications of the Secretary-General of the United Nations concerning the help which UNESCO could give, in accordance with the above-mentioned resolution, assures the population of Korea of its deep and earnest sympathy, renders respectful homage to the soldiers of the United Nations who are fighting on the Korean front in the name of international solidarity, recalls that international peace and security must be based on the respect of the principles of law and the decisions of the competent organs of the United Nations, if force is not to triumph over law, and if justice is to be maintained, expresses its confidence in the program and methods of UNESCO in serving the aims of peace of the United Nations, through the perfecting of international cooperation, through the amelioration of the living conditions of man and through the development of international understanding by means of education, science, and culture.

"Considers, that in order that UNESCO may aid the United Nations in eliminating the dangers of war more effectively, it is particularly urgent, at this moment when human solidarity is under trial and when human rights are in peril, that still wider and more active support should be given to the execution of its mission, by governments and national commissions of member states.

"Decides that within the framework of its competence, UNESCO will give all possible aid and assistance to the action undertaken by the United Nations in Korea and toward this end, instructs the Director-General:

"(1) To relieve the needs of the civilian population in Korea within the fields of education, science, and culture, by means of emergency relief, and, at the appropriate time by a reconstruction project;

"(2) To develop, within the resources at his disposal, including the periodical publications of the organization, the execution of the program resolutions concerning teaching about the United Nations and its specialized agencies, putting particular emphasis on the necessity for collective security, based on respect for law, with the aid of concrete examples and to this end to utilize appropriate documentation provided by the Secretary-General of the United Nations appeals to the governments and national commissions of member states to participate to the extent of the means at their disposal in this action.

"Requests nongovernmental organizations, which participate in the task of UNESCO, men and women whose activities are devoted to education, science, culture, and information, and all those who wish to live in peace with their fellow men, to contribute to the work of UNESCO, in that spirit of liberty which characterizes all of its actions with a view to reinforcing in the minds of men the intellectual and moral defenses of peace through law which the United Nations are responsible for developing and safeguarding."

In implementation of the above resolution, the executive board authorizes the Director-General—

"(1) With a view to providing assistance to the civilian population of Korea:

"(a) To send a mission to Korea, upon the request of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to investigate the needs of the civilian population of Korea, in liaison with the unified command and the appropriate organs of the United Nations responsible for civilian relief;

"(b) To provide, upon request, educational supplies on an emergency basis;

"(c) To prepare in close liaison with the United Nations and the specialized agencies and launch a campaign in cooperation with member states and their national commissions and with nongovernmental organizations, for assistance to the Republic of Korea in the field of educational, scientific, and cultural relief and reconstruction.

"(2) With a view to strengthening through teaching about the United Nations and its specialized agencies, a full understanding of the principles of the United Nations action for peace and security;

"(a) To prepare, in close and constant collaboration with the United Nations, both written and audio-visual materials for use in schools, adult classes, and universities.

"(b) To produce and distribute these to member states in English, French, and Spanish, in sufficient quantities to enable member states to adapt them and diffuse them on a large scale for their own purposes;

"(c) To put at the disposal of the Secretary-General of the United Nations two specialists with instructions to cooperate with the United Nations Secretariat in order to assemble relevant documentation in connection with the United Nations action in Korea."

STATEMENT BY LUTHER H. EVANS, MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF UNESCO, UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION, AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD IN PARIS, AUGUST 28, 1950

The United Nations has called on its member nations to repel the armed attack on the Republic of Korea. In doing this, it has taken an historic step—transforming the hope of outlawing aggression into the determination to defeat such aggression.

Institutions, like men, have a purpose in life, else there is no reason for their existence. The United Nations was created by the peoples of the world for certain purposes proclaimed in the Charter. The preeminent purpose is to strengthen peace and prevent aggression.

When peace was wantonly broken in Korea by the deliberate aggression of armed forces, the United Nations was challenged to justify its existence. It met that critical test by ranging the forces of justice against the aggressor. By that act the United Nations became, in fact as well as in name, the defender of the peace.

The purposes of UNESCO are set forth in its constitution. Foremost among these is the purpose to contribute to peace and security by furthering universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms affirmed for all peoples by the Charter of the United Nations. These are the very principles which the United Nations is fighting to uphold in Korea, a member of UNESCO.

The duty of UNESCO is plain. It must fulfill its obligation to the United Nations by explaining to the peoples of the world, with the help of teachers, scholars, writers, and other leaders in the communication of knowledge and ideas, that the issue in Korea is clearly drawn between the defense of peace and permitting brute aggression to succeed. It must help create throughout the world an understanding of the vital role that the United Nations has assumed in Korea and the responsibilities it faces in other areas of possible aggression. Naturally, UNESCO must also do its full part in rebuilding the shattered life of the Korean nation.

The United Nations has spoken for the conscience of mankind. UNESCO can have no greater task than to uphold the United Nations as the defender of peace. Let us get on with the task!

UNESCO REQUESTED BY UNITED STATES LEADERS TO TAKE ACTION ON KOREAN SITUATION

An immediate session of the executive board of UNESCO to take appropriate and vigorous action with respect to the impact of the Korean situation on the peace of the world and in regard to other areas where acts of aggression may occur," has been requested by the executive committee of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, it was announced today.

The committee transmitted its request to UNESCO headquarters in Paris through Luther H. Evans, Librarian of Congress and vice chairman of UNESCO's executive board, which is composed of leaders of 18 nationalities selected from UNESCO's 59 member nations.

The committee submitted for consideration the following possible courses of action:

"Adoption of a strong statement of support for the action of the United Nations.

"Convening an emergency session of the general conference of UNESCO.

"Concentration of UNESCO's resources and the necessary transfer of funds and personnel to the fullest extent possible for the execution of an emergency program in support of the United Nations.

"Devising and utilizing all available means for the dissemination of the facts concerning the causes of the present situation in Korea and other actions which may threaten the peace in other areas of the world.

"Convening regional conferences for education and information.

"Immediate planning for effective 'relief assistance' and reconstruction in Korea.

"Inviting governments and national commissions to cooperate in the execution of the program authorized by the Board and/or the General Conference."

The committee's action was taken on the premise that UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—has a primary obligation "to promote peace and security" and "to further universal respect for justice and the rule of law". Citing recent actions of the UNESCO General Conference at Florence, Italy, stressing the necessity of "cooperating loyally * * * in the framework of the United Nations" and "to promote respect for human rights throughout all nations" * * * the executive committee reminded the UNESCO Executive Board that:

"* * * the United Nations Security Council has determined 'that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace';

"* * * threats of further aggression may occur in other areas of tension;

"* * * it is the obligation of UNESCO to cooperate with the United Nations for the preservation of peace;

"* * * UNESCO has special resources for education and for disseminating information, including national commissions which give UNESCO access to the people in member states."

The executive committee also adopted the following statement related to the position of United States organizations and citizens:

"On June 25, 1950, the peace of the world was broken by an act of aggression in Korea. Never before had such an act taken place against so complete a background of international collaboration and organization as that represented by the United Nations. Never before were the issues involved in a breach of the peace conditioned so fully by the fundamental consideration that even defensive military action must have as an underlying objective 'the building of the defenses of peace in the minds of men.'

"The United Nations Security Council has determined that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace, and in accord with its Charter the Council has taken direct action to end the conflict. The executive committee of the United States National Commission for UNESCO is in complete support of this decision and the steps that have been taken to carry it out.

"The executive committee of the United States National Commission now calls to the attention of the members of the National Commission and to the people of the United States that UNESCO itself has a vital role to play in the present crisis * * *."

The executive committee therefore requested the National Commission's committee on activities in the United States to make plans for the development of information materials and discussion programs which would help clarify both the immediate and long-range implications of the Korea situation; the responsibility of the UN for taking action in this and other possible areas of aggression; and to solicit the advice of national organizations in preparing such programs.

The United States National Commission was established by law to advise the Department of State on UNESCO affairs and has the major responsibility for UNESCO programs in this country. Composed of 100 members—60 representing national organizations and the others selected as individual leaders from many fields—the Commission is headed by George D. Stoddard, president of the University of Illinois, and three vice-chairmen: Detlev Bronk, president of the Johns Hopkins University; Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor; and Mrs. Henry Potter Russell, San Francisco civic leader.

Members of the executive committee, which took the above actions at a meeting held in Washington, include: Senator William Benton, Mrs. Harvey N. Davis, Frederick S. Dunn, Milton S. Eisenhower, Robert M. Gates, Charles S. Johnson, Waldo G. Leland, Raymond F. McCoy, Earl J. McGrath, C. J. McLanahan, Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Mrs. Raymond Sayre, Alexander J. Stoddard, George F. Zook, Paul H. Sheats, and Dr. Evans. Other National Commission members who took part in the Washington meeting—presided over by Chairman Stoddard—were Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt and Miss Myrna Loy.

Where Do We Go From the Thirty-eighth Parallel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I dare say that nobody in the United States now remains in ignorance of what we are fighting in Korea. We all know that we are fighting armed Communist aggression, set in motion by the bloody tyrant of the Kremlin.

But few of us, indeed, know why we are fighting at this particular time and place, in view of the fact, so often conceded, that Korea is of small military value in the over-all conflict between democracy and communism.

Perhaps nobody knows, even at this late date in the Korean war, what we intend to do after the Communist armies have been defeated, as defeat them we must and most certainly will.

So there you have the two questions which must be answered by the Truman administration before this war is much older. Why are we fighting at this time and place? What shall be our policy with respect to Korea after the fighting has ceased?

The fact that these questions even now have not been answered, is proof enough, it seems to me, that ever since the end of hostilities in World War II, back in 1945, the Truman administration has utterly lacked any real policy at all in its conduct of this Nation's foreign affairs.

It has been pointed out repeatedly, by men who may be better informed than I, that support of the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek, at the time when Congress provided the authority and funds for that support, would have prevented this Korean war. With that help, which the Communist-infiltrated State and Commerce Departments rendered null and void, Chiang could have held a major portion of China. Today there would have been a Chinese Nationalist Army of at least 2,000,000 men, to hold back the Communist hordes in Asia.

With Chiang Kai-shek still dominant in China, we would have had time to prepare; time to correct the monumental blunders whereby we weakened our military power, at a time when violence is the world order of the day.

Even though the completely ill-advised and incredibly stupid policy of announcing that we would not defend Korea had encouraged the Kremlin to order the invasion of the infant Korean Republic, the presence of a tremendously strong and well-equipped Chinese Nationalist Army in the Far East would have doomed that invasion to quick failure. American boys would not now be dying by thousands in the marshes and on the mountains of the Korean Peninsula.

If Chiang Kai-shek had received the arms which it was the intent of Congress that he should have, he would not now be caged up on the island of Formosa. There would have been no reason for the presence of American naval forces in the narrow seas between Formosa and the Chinese mainland. We would not be in the position of alone, and without even United Nations moral support, challenging the millions of Chinese Communist soldiers, well trained and equipped by the Russians.

It is here, in my humble opinion, that the greatest threat to world peace exists. The war in Korea is being fought, nominally at least, as a United Nations war against Communist aggression. The naval activity off Formosa is solely American, the result of a unilateral decision by the President of the United States. In this fact lies the explanation of the President's recent order, which compelled Gen. Douglas MacArthur to withdraw his statement to the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the status of Formosa.

It was easy to get United Nations support for the action in Korea, because nobody's interests, except those of the Koreans, are at stake. But the naval blockade of the Chinese mainland opposite Formosa was, and still remains, a challenge of the Chinese Communist government; and Great Britain has given diplomatic recognition to that government, unrealistically hoping thus to retain the British foothold in Hong Kong, and British investments and trade in China.

Therefore it was obvious that the President sought to make his action with respect to Formosa consistent with his action with respect to Korea. By saying that American policy contemplates no military base on Formosa, and that the status of Formosa must await action by the United Nations, the President accepted the totally unrealistic attitude of the British. Speaking solely as an American commander, and not as the commander of United Nations forces in Korea, MacArthur told the manifest truth, when he said that Formosa must be included in the American perimeter of defense against Russian expansionism. In the end, I predict, MacArthur's policy will prevail.

All of these considerations, I believe, lead only to one conclusion, which is that the Truman administration's foreign policy, thus far since the end of World War II, has been no policy at all. It has been a series of vacillations, of makeshift decisions on the spur of the moment, without either foresight or good judgment—and always subject to the influence of Communist appeasers, to say nothing of pro-Communists and Communist agents hidden away in the Government departments.

Proof of these things is offered by the fact, now glaringly apparent, that the decision to fight in Korea and to blockade the waters between China and Formosa, was a decision of desperation. It constituted a belated recognition of the fact that Truman's policy in the Far East, as formulated by the State Department, was utterly wrong. It was a tacit confession that the Republicans were right, when they tried in every way possible, to force the administration to carry out the will of Congress, in aiding Chiang Kai-shek before it was too late.

White House and State Department opposition to assistance for Chiang, it will be recalled, was based solely upon the contention that the Nationalist Government was corrupt. It ignored the fact that we are less interested in Chinese morals than we are in stemming the tide of communism in Asia. It would seem that the administration wins all the little moral battles, only to lose the big one, which is the battle to keep the world

free. The administration's attitude toward Fascist Spain, it should be added, is identical with its former attitude toward Nationalist China.

On the basis of all I have said here, it is manifest that the reason why we are fighting in Korea at this particular time is in fact solely that the Truman administration is striving desperately, at a high cost in American money and American lives, to rectify its earlier mistakes in the Far East. But we have still to consider what our policy is to be in Korea, after the fighting is ended; if, indeed, it does end and does not lead directly into another world war.

When we have pushed the North Korean Communists back to the thirty-eighth parallel, shall we stop there, or shall we go on to the Manchurian border, thus ending the artificial partition of Korea? Would the United Nations lend support to such a project? I think we should find out about this, although I doubt if the United Nations would act favorably; not so long as the Russians are present to wield the veto.

The Security Council's order called only for the North Koreans to cease hostilities and withdraw behind the thirty-eighth parallel. But in spite of this, Warren Austin has hinted that the United States Government feels that it should go forward. Like most Republicans, I agree with him that only by so doing can a repetition of the present breach of the peace be prevented.

And then, conceding that a unified Korea is thus brought back into being—what then, may I ask, shall we do? Shall we permit our effort to end merely in a long period of occupation, with the wretched Koreans living miserably, as a subject people, in the rubble of their destroyed towns and villages? Or shall we make some practical application of the principles embodied in the Marshall plan? It is plainly manifest that we must give the Koreans something more than a mere promise of freedom from Communist rule. If we offer them only misery under foreign domination, they may well decide that Communist promises of an earthly paradise are preferable. And we must not forget that the other nations of Asia, now wavering between the Communist and democratic ideologies, are watching to see which way to jump.

It is my conviction that the United Nations, which means in effect the United States of America, must guarantee the Koreans, first of all, a rebuilt Korea; secondly, we must guarantee them liberty and freedom from all outside domination, either Communist or non-Communist; thirdly, security against armed aggression, from whatever source; in the fourth place, we must show them how the democratic way is the way to civil peace and both national and individual prosperity. And we must implement this teaching by helping to raise the standards of living, by encouraging capital investment, by training the people in technical skills, and by taking such steps as are possible to assure the Koreans of trading possibilities abroad.

These things should be done, of course, under the sponsorship of the United Nations, if the obstacle of Russian opposition can be overcome. But if not, still the United States should do the job, insofar as American resources permit.

It has been suggested by one of the ablest Members of the United States Senate that the United Nations might guarantee the Koreans against foreign aggression by neutralizing a strip, 10 to 30 miles deep, along the border between Korea and Manchuria. This is a good idea, if it could be brought about in the face of virtually certain opposition by Communist Russia.

In conclusion, I submit that the proposals I have outlined here comprise a proper policy for the American Government with respect to Korea, after the Communists have been driven out. With respect to the situation at Formosa, I agree completely with General MacArthur. Formosa must be kept, come what may, within the perimeter of American defense against the onrush of communism in Asia.

Missouri Farmers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks I include resolutions adopted by the Missouri Farmers' Association at their annual convention held at Columbia, Mo., August 7–8, 1950, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE THIRTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION, MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION, AUGUST 7–8, 1950, COLUMBIA, MO.

FOREWORD

Delegates and members at this, our thirty-second annual convention, are pleased to learn that during the past year the Missouri Farmers Association has made further progress.

Our membership stands at 124,085. At no time in the history of the Missouri Farmers Association have our cooperatives been in a sounder and more prosperous condition. No other class of Missourians can claim to have enjoyed more competent legislative representation both at the State and the Nation's capitals than members of the Missouri Farmers Association.

The Missouri Farmers Association, with the support of more than half the farm families of Missouri, is now able to render more service and effect greater savings than ever before, and of this great organization Missouri farmers can feel justly proud.

1. Foreign policy: The farmers of Missouri pledge their wholehearted support of our Government's foreign policy, believing that our Government and the United Nations had no alternative to the measure taken in Korea. Farmers are not pacifists, as their record in every war since the American Revolution proves. We are peace-loving people, and it is our earnest hope that our Government's search for peace will be unremitting. It is our belief that the chief hope of lasting peace lies in the United Nations, and therefore we urge that the United Nations be gradually strengthened so that eventually an international police force may be able to maintain order throughout the world.

2. Our biggest farm problem: Farmers have numerous problems, many of which cannot be solved except by national legislation. However, there is one problem that looms larger than all the rest, that cannot be solved by national legislation, but which can be solved by the farmers themselves through cooperation with their neighbors. That one, big problem is: Buying at retail and selling at wholesale prices. Historically, farmers have had to do business at that kind of disadvantage, and it is one of the chief reasons why farmers organized the Missouri Farmers Association.

With the exception of a few areas where Missouri Farmers Association cooperatives do not yet exist, farmers of Missouri are no longer compelled to accept whatever price is offered for the products of their sweat and toil and to pay whatever price is asked for the supplies they need on their farms.

Through the ownership of a great cooperative marketing and purchasing system which flies MFA emblem, Misouri farmers are at last in position to market their products and obtain their supplies at cost. Year by year more farmers are using their organization to win for themselves their economic battles. Our total annual volume of business now approaches $225,000,000 on which important annual savings are being made in terms of cash. Important as these cash savings may be, however, the measuring stick MFA cooperatives provide in hundreds of towns throughout the State—which helps keep prices reasonable—has saved Missouri's farm families countless thousands of dollars in years past.

In order to make this cooperative system even more effective in the years ahead only one thing is necessary: Farmers must put more volume through it, must do more business with local MFA exchanges. Volume is the answer to the ancient problem farmers have had for so long, the problem of being compelled to buy at retail and sell at wholesale.

Therefore this convention urges every farm family to do as much business as possible through MFA exchanges and other MFA cooperatives in the coming months and years.

3. The family size farm: Census figures show that ever since 1900 the size of farms has been growing larger and the family size farm has been declining in numbers. Mechanization of agriculture has been the chief factor in this trend. Machinery has enabled one man to operate more land than was the case when horse-drawn equipment was used. The disparity in farm income has made it necessary for the farm family to operate a larger acreage in order to obtain sufficient income for family living.

We of the Missouri Farmers Association view this trend toward larger farms with alarm. Unless it is arrested, the final outcome will be large-corporation farming with much absentee ownership. More and more people will move into industry, taking their places in the mass production lines. A time may come when only two classes of people will exist in the United States—the small minority of owners, and the large mass of workers who own nothing but their personal belongings, but who vote on election day.

There is a way to safeguard the family size farm. Farms can be enlarged by means of vertical farming, without moving the fences. This can be accomplished by the greater use of plant foods and more efficient farming, plus the more thorough use by farmers of the cooperative marketing and purchasing system which is now provided by the Missouri Farmers Association. The standard of living of families living on average sized farms can thus be improved and the family size farm thus be safeguarded.

4. Livestock pasture farming: The Missouri Farmers Association endorses the livestock pasture farming program of the Missouri College of Agriculture. This program

contemplates the increase of livestock numbers and a greater use of pastures, pointing out the fact that it would take 3,300 years for the first 7 inches of top soil in blue grass sod to erode as compared to the other extreme of only 14.9 years where corn is produced continuously. The program points to the need of tripling the use of lime on crop and pasture land, to the need of increasing the use of fertilizer by six or seven times, and to the need of contouring crops and building terraces on a total of 5,000,000 acres in order to insure permanence and prosperity to Missouri agriculture. Such an objective, we believe, should be the common goal of Missouri farmers in order to arrest the alarming decline in soil fertility and to effect a gradual improvement.

5. Farm legislation: The uncertain foreign situation has vastly changed the outlook for agriculture. No one can say at this time what lies ahead for us internationally, except that it seems obvious we must be well prepared in a world where there is unrest and outlawry. Emphasis toward greater production in agriculture which we knew throughout World War II will likely be resumed.

However, farmers must be working on a long-time farm program which will forestall an economic collapse in agriculture such as occurred in the post World War I years. We have not yet had farm legislation, helpful as some of it has been, that seemed adequate to meet the needs of farmers.

Lately we have had price supports without provision for disposing of surpluses, which is unsound. The bipartisan farm bloc has practically disintegrated, and this is a misfortune for agriculture. Farm organizations have disagreed among themselves as to what should be proposed, and this disunity has been reflected in the Congress, as witness the makeshift and temporary farm legislation that body has enacted during recent years.

Briefly, the long-time farm problem consists of two parts: (1) There is a need to restore the bipartisan farm bloc in the Congress; and (2) we must somehow learn how to live with farm surpluses.

In order to restore bipartisan interest and support for sound farm legislation, we propose that a bipartisan commission representing all sections of the United States be established, this commission to have the authority to administer farm legislation. Then we propose that a food stamp plan be adopted which will make surplus foods available to the one-third of the American people who are on the lowest rung of the economic ladder, while at the same time we urge that educational institutions and others accelerate nutritional education with the objective of upgrading the diet of those who have sufficient income to enable them to eat properly.

It is our belief that if all of the American people were financially able to and understood the need of consuming a well-balanced diet of meat, milk, fruits, and vegetables, there would be no farm surpluses. At the same time the American people would be the healthiest and happiest any people have ever been in the world's history.

6. More electric power needed: Electric service must be extended by the various REA-financed cooperatives until the drudging burdens are lifted from the backs of our people and the primitive conditions are eliminated from all farm homes.

We take cognizance of the fact that the REA-financed cooperatives have been hampered by an inadequate supply of power with which to energize new lines and increase the power loads of existing lines. The Missouri Farmers Association will continue to support the REA and the REA-financed cooperatives, as well as the Southwestern Power Administration, to the end that every farmstead in our State becomes electrified.

7. Vote for our friends: This is an election year. There never was a time when it is more important than now for farm men and women to get acquainted with their candidates and to vote only for those who are friendly toward agriculture and farmer cooperatives.

There are enemies abroad in the land who are spreading hate and distrust in the minds of businessmen and other people against farmers and their cooperatives and some of these enemies are allegedly supporting candidates unfriendly to farmers and opposing others who are friendly.

Unless farmers take more interest in elections in the future than they have in the past, we stand to lose many of the gains we have made during the past quarter century or more.

8. School-lunch program: We have supported and will continue to support the school-lunch program which has been of great benefit in improving the nutrition of school children. We call attention to the fact that the State department of education has been hampered in administering the school-lunch program because of lack of funds. For this purpose, the State of Missouri has provided only $20,000 per year which amounts to only eight-tenths of a cent for each Federal dollar handled. Only 1,404 schools out of 4,928 have been taking advantage of the program. More schools should participate, but this will be impossible unless more money is provided for administering the program. Therefore, we recommend that the next general assembly give consideration to this problem which means so much to the school children of our State.

9. Governmental farm agencies: A number of agencies have been provided for the aid and assistance of agriculture by our Federal Government. These agencies include the Agricultural Extension Service, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Production and Marketing Administration, and the Farm Credit Administration. The State of Missouri has established and maintains the State Department of Agriculture.

All of these agricultural farm agencies are serving the Missouri farmers ably, and owing to the growing complexity and enormity of the problems which face agriculture, these agencies will be needed by Missouri farmers even more in the days that lie ahead than in the past.

The Missouri Farmers Association takes this occasion to express its appreciation for the good and fine services being performed by these farm agencies.

10. Approval of CROP: The Christian Rural Overseas Program, otherwise known as CROP, is a relief organization sponsored by Church World Service, Catholic Rural Life, and Lutheran World Relief. It is designed especially for rural people and its purpose is to bring relief through the churches to poverty-stricken people throughout the world. The MFA has cooperated with this organization since it was organized 3 years ago, and urges that farm people in our State support this worth-while cause.

11. The WPFA and JFA: Farming is a family enterprise. It is natural and desirable, therefore, that the entire family should be interested in the Missouri Farmers Association, and that farm women and children should also have their organizations. The Women's Progressive Farmers Association, as well as the Junior Farmers Association, has contributed much to farm-club meetings and farm women and children can exert a tremendous influence upon the Missouri Farmers Association in the years ahead. MFA members should encourage these two splendid organizations.

12. The University of Missouri and others: We hereby express our deep appreciation to the University of Missouri and its personnel, the city of Columbia and all others whose wholehearted cooperation and hospitality have helped to make this convention a success.

13. Officers and employees: We hereby express our thanks and appreciation to the officers and employees of our association and its affiliated agencies for their services and efforts performed over and beyond that called for in regular performance of their duties.

14. Reaffirmation: We reaffirm the policies expressed in resolutions adopted by previous conventions that are now in effect, except insofar as they have been modified or supplemented by the resolutions adopted at this annual convention.

What Are Our Soldiers Fighting for in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, seeking an answer to the question, What are the boys in Korea fighting for? the Saturday Evening Post of September 2 comes up with the following editorial:

OUR AIM IN KOREA HAS TO BE NOT TO GET LICKED LATER ON

Columnist Marquis Childs was disturbed recently by reports from the Korean front that American soldiers didn't know what they were fighting for. He added that a Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Services had been appointed by President Truman and had made a report on morale building to Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, but nothing was done about it. Mr. Childs, who appears to think that the Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Services knows what the boys in Korea are fighting for, urges that the committee come clean and tell them.

This sounds simple, but there are easier assignments than explaining to a young man of 19 why he is expected to slog around in Korea and perhaps be killed. Were the dangers not so imminent, an angry man might be tempted to trace the causes of the crisis back a few years, and preface his "indoctrination" thus:

"At Casablanca on January 24, 1943, Franklin D. Roosevelt announced that our aim in fighting the Germans and Japanese was 'unconditional surrender.' So the Germans and Japanese fought to the last gasp and we were forced to destroy their military and economic power completely. As a result, the two most powerful forces opposed to Russian expansion have been eliminated, and, once again in 10 years, braver and wiser men must repair the damage done by their fatuous predecessors."

An equally despairing note could be struck in this one:

"When the victory over fascism and militarism was almost won—that is to say, in February 1945—a group of American statesmen, including President Roosevelt and Alger Hiss, journeyed to Yalta in the Crimea to settle a few matters with our great democratic ally, Josef Stalin. At that time, Mr. Stalin was so democratic that it was felt that the defeat of undemocratic Japan would not be complete unless Russia entered the war. To persuade Stalin to take this step, which he

had already agreed to take at a Moscow conference a year earlier, we gave Russia about the same rights and privileges in Manchuria which the Japanese were not democratic enough to exercise. Later, when Stalin decided to stop being democratic and to become a 'menace to free peoples everywhere,' he set up arsenals in Mukden, which is in Manchuria. The tanks used by the North Koreans come from there."

Then why are Americans fighting an unequal battle in Korea? The only answer now is that Korea isn't a war, but a battle in a larger war. Perhaps it's only a feint to screen a Red attack somewhere else. Whatever it is, the issue is the same: survival—not merely of something intangible like a way of life, but of individual people in every free nation, including ours.

We cannot defeat Communist aggression by wringing our hands over the imbecility of certain State Department functionaries, although their colossal effrontery in clinging to their jobs makes a study in abnormal psychology. There are occasions when the only immediate war aim is not to get licked. We'll need something better if our cause is to appeal to the world's millions. But we can meet the challenge of world communism only by throwing it back. That is the onerous and tragic assignment of this generation.

Note the conclusion. At the moment, they are fighting "not to get licked."

But the Post is not satisfied with that answer, and adds:

We'll need something better if our cause is to appeal to the world's millions. But we can meet the challenge of world communism only by throwing it back. That is the onerous and tragic assignment of this generation.

At least half of the world's millions do not subscribe to our form of government, to our ways.

Are they, the world's millions, demanding that we throw back communism by an aggressive war against them?

Are our people demanding that we pick up this "onerous and tragic assignment" of fighting wherever on earth a Communist may rear his head?

And let me ask the Saturday Evening Post, can we fulfill that assignment without losing our individual freedom, the security of the Republic?

Will the Saturday Evening Post please answer this very practical question?

Aren't You Ashamed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House will be interested in reading a rather timely editorial that recently appeared in the Wichita Eagle, Wichita, Kans. It is entitled "Aren't You Ashamed?" I think it contains a considerable amount of food for thought. The editorial follows:

AREN'T YOU ASHAMED?

Spokesmen for the administration are busy these days explaining why the Nation was unprepared in a military way when the trouble started in Korea. On the radio, in the press, and from the public platform they are placing the blame for this unhappy situation. Accepting no responsibility themselves, they say the American people are wholly to blame for the Nation's lack of preparedness. This may come as a bit of surprise to the average citizen, who had thought such matters were in the hands of his Government.

These apologists say the people are to blame for the fact that only $1 out of seven of defense appropriations was spent for equipment since VJ-day. The rent went for "housekeeping," for Government payrolls, bureaus, and commissions, which meant votes for the administration rather than national security. You put hundreds of ships in mothballs, instead of keeping them in serviceable condition. You stopped construction of a huge aircraft carrier, tore down an Army camp in Alaska that had cost $16,000,000,000, ordered it shipped to Seattle, and then had the boats turn around and take it back to its original site.

You fired a great admiral for having the courage to warn the administration what was going to happen. You forced Government stenographers to get along with only three typewriters each. You spent $200,000,000 for potatoes, $258,000,000 for tobacco for starving Europeans, and a paltry $56,000,000,000 for dams and ditches in behalf of votes for the do-gooders. These are only a few of the things the people did to keep the patriots in Washington from providing military preparedness. Aren't you ashamed?

Answer Phone Service a Big Help to Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Daily News of August 18, 1950:

ANSWER PHONE SERVICE A BIG HELP TO DOCTORS

(By Vincent Adams)

Marching along with medicine and becoming as important as the stethoscope to the physician is the Brooklyn Telephone Answering Service operated by Samuel S. Schiller.

Last year this service, which has approximately 2,500 clients, handled over 2,000,000 telephone messages at its headquarters, 66 Willoughby Street. More than 1,500,000 calls were for the medical profession, with pediatricians getting the bulk of the business.

Several persons owe their lives to the service; doctors praise its convenience and, with war clouds gathering, it is believed that the company's forty-odd switchboards throughout Brooklyn could step into the breach should normal phone service be disrupted.

Unexpected developments in a prenatal case resulted in an SOS for the attending physician. Calls to his home, office, hospital, and a club were in vain. One operator recalled the doctor raved about a small Italian restaurant he visited twice a year to feast on spaghetti swimming in clam sauce and washed down with red wine.

Sure enough the doc was there. He sped to his patient in time to deliver a 7-pound boy.

EX-SWITCHBOARD OPERATOR

Guiding light behind the enterprise is genial Sam Schiller, 40, former Wall Street runner, truck driver, insurance clerk, salesman, and switchboard operator. This wiry, energetic lightweight looks more like a former pugilist than a successful businessman because of his broken nose, symbol of fights in the tough neighborhood of his youth.

While recovering from pneumonia he learned to operate a switchboard and landed a job in a hospital where he met his wife, Teresa. Even with their combined salaries, the Schillers found tough going. Then Sam dreamed up his idea of a physicians' phone answering service. Starting with one client and a hundred promises he opened a service in 1934 in the Bronx. This flopped. He tried again and failed. Another attempt, another fiasco.

Encouraged by his wife and daughter, Maureen, now 16, he tried again in Brooklyn in 1937. He clicked. At first he worked 19 hours a day. Today, with a large staff manning 10 branches in Flatbush, Boro Park, Bensonhurst, Crown Heights, Brownsville, Kings Highway and Coney Island, Williamsburg, Grand Army Plaza, and Midwood, he takes it easy.

The FBI, Northwest Mounted, and Scotland Yard are slow at getting their man compared with phone answering service girls tracing a physician for an emergency. When a subscriber signs up, the operators, in cooperation with the customer, compile a list of places where he may be reached. This file is kept confidential.

ALWAYS GET THEIR MAN

Whether the customer is playing golf, having a cocktail, or playing canasta at a club, these girls always get their man.

Customers find the service eliminates many headaches. The operators, because of their experience, can cut into a line when the maid is having a long conversation with her boy friend and relay any important message.

The 24-hour-a-day, 7-days-a-week service also handles chores for business offices, finance companies, oil distributors, electricians, TV and radio repair shops, dentists, and fire adjusters.

Recently when operators complained Brooklyn Telephone Answering Service was too much of a mouthful he promised to shorten it soon.

When friends chide him for haunting the office for long hours he cuts them short with: "This may seem dull and tedious to you, but to me it's something I love. The thought of being useful to someone else and possibly saving a life is the greatest thrill in the world."

REA in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I am highly gratified at the fine progress in rural electrification being made in South Dakota. A recent report from REA here indicates that more than 60 percent of South Dakota farms are now receiving central-station electrical service. This represents a jump of 22 percent in the past year.

During the year 13,500 farms were added to the REA system in South Dakota. Today more than 40,000 South Dakota farms are electrified as a result of the efforts of REA, private-power companies, and other distributors. There

are 31,355 farms obtaining service from the 31 REA cooperatives in South Dakota.

The REA operates 25,581 miles of energized line in the State, and under loans already approved by the Rural Electrification Administration here in Washington, the total lineage will be increased to 36,088 miles to serve 58,239 of the State's more than 78,000 farms.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been vitally interested in REA and am pleased with the advances which have been made nationally and in South Dakota. In both the first and second sessions of the Congress I vigorously supported appropriations of funds for REA. I have worked with South Dakota REA groups and especially the directors of the East River Electric Power Cooperative, an organization of 21 REA cooperatives, in their efforts to expand their transmission facilities and secure additional and more dependable power for South Dakota farms.

I know that REA development will continue in South Dakota. The coming of hydroelectric power from Missouri River dams will be of great benefit in bringing lights to every farm home in the State. Every effort of REA and others interested in orderly development of our power resources must be encouraged.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge to you and to the people of South Dakota that I will continue to exert every effort to expand rural electrification through a healthy REA program.

Mr. Speaker, another matter to which I should like to call your attention is the farm problem.

Since I have been in Congress I have devoted a good deal of my time to agricultural legislation. I represent one of the greatest agricultural areas in the United States and some of the best farmers in the Nation live in my district. As their Representative in Congress, I have attempted to deal with their problems.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I believe the farmer deserves full 100 percent of parity for his goods and efforts. I have waged a continuous fight since coming to Washington for this concept in farm legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that upon farm prosperity rests national prosperity. The farmer's economic condition accurately reflects the national financial picture. When the farmer is prosperous, history has shown that all segments of our economy are prosperous. When the farmer is in bad financial condition, we have depressions and bad times.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to deal with this problem through a farm plan which I have introduced in Congress known as H. R. 8509, which I introduced on May 15, 1950. This plan would provide full 100 percent of parity for the family-sized farmer. It would be a farmer-managed program and it would be self-financing. It further recognizes the need for on-the-farm storage of farm crops and the value of good soil conservation practices.

My plan operates on the same sound theory that any business uses in the conduct of its affairs. Surpluses on farms have always been a complexity. Consequently, we must deal with them to solve the over-all problem.

My plan proposes that the farmer select local committees and State and National boards to manage his program. Through these local boards, farmers would be assured of full 100 percent of parity on that part of their farm crops domestically consumed. Each farmer would have a quota upon which he would be assured full parity.

Surpluses would be disposed of by the National Board in exports in accordance with United States commitments abroad. Excesses would also be channeled into new chemurgic uses—a field that has hardly been explored.

My plan also provides that surpluses be used in a food-stamp program or a school-lunch program.

Mr. Speaker, by the orderly disposal of surpluses we arrive at a solution to the farm problem without wasting valuable food. Food produced from God's ground is utilized by God's people as He intended. It would not spoil and rot in caves and warehouses. It would be used.

Fees charges for the disposal of this surplus would finance the program. Thus we get away from the New Deal-Fair Deal philosophy of solving all problems by running to the Federal Treasury. The program is handled in a businesslike manner.

Mr. Speaker, my plan is one which would be managed by the farmers themselves—from the bottom up rather than from the top down as at present. The farmers would have their own program. No bureaucrats would tell them what to plant or how to run their farms.

Mr. Speaker, my plan would also protect the consumer, because prices would be stabilized at parity—which, by definition—is a price fair to both producer and consumer.

Mr. Speaker, my farm plan has made tremendous progress in Congress in its short life. It has already had a hearing by the House Agriculture Committee. The need for stability of farm prices because of the Korean war and the world emergency should be added reason for its early adoption.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue the fight for full parity and a stable farm market which I have begun in this Congress. I promise you and I promise the farmers of South Dakota that I will continue this relentless battle.

Social-Security Improvements—Ten Million More Protected; Benefits Increased 50 to 100 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, although everyone's primary concern is still focused on the battlefields of Korea, and is concerned with the clarification of our completely vague foreign policy, there are, of course, other things of great consequence going forward at the Capitol which affect the lives and security of millions of Americans. Of these current events, one of the most significant was the final enactment into law on August 28 of a greatly improved social-security system.

For those of us who have been continually working toward this end, the present act is a culmination of more than 5 years of persistent effort.

And the present bill is worth waiting for. It is no mere amendment, but practically a complete rewriting of the law. Scores of beneficial changes have been made, protection has been extended to nearly 10,000,000 additional persons, and individual benefits have been increased from 50 to 100 percent.

While this law is not the ultimate answer to a completely adequate security system, and while I still favor the exploration of a true national pension system, nevertheless, the present law is generous and fair beyond our earlier expectations, and goes a very long way toward providing at least minimum security for the majority of the working people of America.

With the addition of the 10,000,000 newly insured workers, about 45,000,000 of our present working force of 64,000,000 may come under the Social Security System. And amongst those still excluded, including farmers, doctors, lawyers, engineers, accountants, and the like, there are many, if not most, who presently do not want coverage under the System.

Among those newly protected are approximately 1,000,000 regularly employed domestic servants, almost that many farm workers, and persons who are partially self-employed such as insurance salesmen, commission drivers, traveling salesmen, and industrial homeworkers.

A major injustice has been removed by covering for the first time the self-employed. Heretofore the small proprietor or contractor, for example, has made a contribution of taxes for his few employees but despite his payments, he himself was not covered. Now he may be.

Another major improvement in which I take great personal pride is the provision allowing war veterans an arbitrary wage credit of $160 per month for all the time they spent in service. It was grossly unfair to penalize the veteran who was involuntarily out of civilian employment for periods up to four years or more, and this provision under the new law, which is of direct benefit to thousands of South Jersey veterans, is the result of the adoption of my own bill, H. R. 69, which I introduced on January 3, 1947, and which I reintroduced January 13, 1949, and which has now been enacted into permanent law.

Death benefits are changed and improved as are payments to survivors. The widow of an insured worker still receives three-quarters of the primary benefit, but there is now three-quarters additional allowance for the first child, and additional benefits for additional

children, so that now a widow with 3 children could get a maximum of $150 per month.

It is unfortunate that the provision contained in the original House bill for permanently or totally disabled persons was cut out by the Senate, but on the other hand, the public assistance program, which matches State funds, is greatly liberalized.

I agree that the adoption of the so-called Knowland amendment in this legislation was of debatable wisdom, but it would have been a tragic mistake to have recommitted this bill for any further corrections. Such a recommittal would have unquestionably killed the bill until next year, and as it is, it goes into immediate effect commencing with September, and payments made in early October will reflect increases granted by the present law.

A couple of examples will clearly show the increased benefits which will be immediately payable: An insured worker earning $200 a month with only 5 years coverage would formerly have been paid a retirement of but $37 per month, now the pension would be $65 per month. A retired man and wife with 30 years coverage would have formerly gotten $78 per month, and now would receive $120 per month.

HOW BENEFITS ARE INCREASED

The following table shows how retirement benefits will be increased under the new social-security law. The new figures are for workers who retire at age 65 after June 30, 1952, with at least six quarter-years of coverage after next December 31:

RETIRED SINGLE MAN
[5 years' coverage]

	Old	New
Average monthly wage:		
$100	$26	$50
$200	37	65
$250	42	72
$300	42	80

RETIRED MAN AND WIFE
[5 years' coverage]

	Old	New
Average monthly wage:		
$100	$39	$75
$200	55	98
$250	63	109
$300	63	120

The following table shows how primary benefits will increase immediately for those now retired or those who may retire before having six quarters of coverage after December 31:

Present	New	Present	New
$10	$20	$35	$59.00
$15	30	$40	64.00
$20	37	$45	68.50
$25	46	$46	68.50
$30	54		

Firemen, policemen, school teachers, and those presently covered by pension funds in New Jersey are, in accordance with the desire expressed by the overwhelming majority of them, excluded from this national system. Most of them preferred their own local pension funds. Other municipal employees may come into the Federal plan. Local offices of the Social Security Board will provide further details.

On the whole, while of course imperfect, this is a good law, and takes a big forward step in providing reasonable minimum security for the American people.

Support UMT Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal for August 20, 1950:

SUPPORT UMT BILL

Memphis Post, No. 1, of the American Legion is asking all local and civic clubs to give active support to efforts on behalf of a universal military training program. A concerted effort is being made by veterans' organizations to have such a program authorized by the Congress at this session. Such a program is regarded as being essential to national survival, is wanted by the Defense Department and should be activated as soon as the Army can spare the men and time to get at it.

The support the Legion wants from local groups and individuals is that of favorable expression by them to Senators MCKELLAR and KEFAUVER and Representative DAVIS. The Legion's suggestion is excellent, and we hope it will be adopted by all our readers regardless of where they live in the mid-South.

A UMT bill has been introduced in the Senate by Chairman TYDINGS (Democrat, Maryland), a war veteran with a very gallant record, who told the Senate the grim truth that we will never again enjoy the time to get ready for war. This Congress and this country cannot get ready for world war III. There is no such thing as getting ready. You simply get ready as best you can.

Because we have not been and are not even now ready for war even on the scale of that in Korea, American elements which were committed to action soon after the Korean War started are still in the line—denied because of lack of replacements the rest periods they should have.

We hope every reader will tell his or her Congressman that they must start building up a tremendous pool of trained manpower through universal military training, and that it must be undertaken this year and not next, when it may be altogether too late.

Tapping of Africa's Rich Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for centuries the developing of the rich resources in Africa have been delayed largely because of the prevalence of disease. Under the ECA's technical assistance program, the United States is attempting to assist in solving the problems of health by the control of disease-carrying insects.

With the control of disease in Africa, it will open up for the world resources which will be very helpful in raising the standard of living of millions of people in the world. The application of modern science and technology to raising the standard of life of all mankind to minimum civilized levels and hence to the achievement of victory over famine, malnutrition, disease, and misery will certainly assist the world in the direction of peace.

As well as developing the social and economic life in Africa, it will also assist the economic life of many of the more developed countries. Many of these more developed countries are dependent upon the importation of many basic minerals and raw materials. In some cases the sources of these minerals and materials are becoming exhausted. It is important to the economy of these countries that new resources be found and developed to the maximum extent. It is important that we call on our American scientists to examine and make reports about these resources. It is important to our economy and national defense that we obtain information concerning these vast resources in advance in order that we may take advantage of the situation politically.

By the direction and utilization of the products in assisting the economy of the African continent, we can materially decrease the monetary assistance contributed by this country in attempting to assist in increasing world trade. In making a survey of the resources of Africa, it would seem desirable to determine particularly the possibility of the production of power, and since many of the countries of the world have made rapid strides in the development and utilization of peat, it would seem desirable to give attention to this important resource. It appears that the United States could supply men who have made a study of these problems to assist in this development. By rendering this assistance, it would not only establish friendly relationships with the people of Africa but could very easily prevent these rich resources from falling into the hands of those who might use them to our disadvantage.

At this time I also wish to call the attention of the House to the expenditure of approximately $1,000,000 allocated to promote industrialization of 340 square miles of Holland now almost entirely devoted to peat cutting. This program will mechanize this industry, thus making it possible for the utilization of these resources. It is by this type of assistance that the United States not only establishes friendly relationships but also is able to build the economy of the world by increasing living standards to promote the ways of peace.

Register and Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a radio broadcast by me on the important subject, Register and Vote.

This is your Congressman, JOHN McGUIRE. I should like to talk to you about the freedom of the ballot box. Voting has been termed the sacred right of every citizen. Voting is more than that; it is a duty. Voting is one of the major foundation stones of our democracy. There is more to voting than merely going to the polls on election day. Many people, millions of people, do not and cannot vote, because they do not register. It is up to you as a thinking citizen to get your name on the registration books, and then vote next November.

When you were in school as a youngster you stood up with the rest of the kids, and took the oath of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America. Don't let that schooltime pledge end your job as a useful citizen. That pledge was to impress upon you your priceless heritage as a free citizen of the United States. Make that pledge come true by exercising your franchise—by registering and then voting in all elections.

It is the sad truth that only half of the eligible voters went to the polls in the 1948 presidential election and cast their ballots. It is also the sad truth that a much smaller percentage of eligible voters voted in 1948 than in 1896.

We have greater problems today than ever before. The survival of a free world is at stake. It is more necessary that the people express their will today than ever before in history. It is more important that the voice of democracy speak today than ever before.

It's your solemn obligation to have your say in the solutions to this and all other problems of government. Americans fought and died just a few years ago and are fighting again today to preserve that heritage of freedom, for which our forefathers fought many generations ago.

By wise decisions at home, and wise choices at the ballot box, we can elect those who represent all the voters and not just a part of the voters. We can preserve our freedom, and create a peaceful world, and a prosperous America. Government is therefore your business. All of the activities of government, national and local, affect you personally, intimately, and directly. They affect your jobs, your homes, the prices you pay, the education and the future of your children.

Inaction settles nothing, and causes trouble. Don't let George do it. Make your action in government positive and effective.

Register. And then vote. The last day you can register in Connecticut is October 21. And if you are not registered by then, you cannot vote in November.

The dates and hours for registering in the towns in the Third Congressional District are as follows:

Bethany at the town hall on the following Saturdays: September 23, October 14, and October 21, from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.

Branford at the town hall, September 22, from 5 p. m. to 8 p. m.; October 14 from 10 a. m. to 6 p. m.; and October 21, from 10 a. m. to 8 p. m.

Cheshire at the town hall on the following Saturdays: September 23, from 9 a. m. to 12 noon; October 14 from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; and October 21 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

East Haven at the town hall on the following Saturdays: September 23 from 9 a. m. to 3 p. m.; October 14 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; and October 21 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

Guilford at the town hall on the following Saturdays: September 23 from 9 a. m. to 12 noon; October 14 from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; October 21 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

Hamden at the town hall on Saturday, October 14 and October 21, from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

Madison at the town hall on the following Saturdays: September 23 from 9 a. m., to 12 noon; October 14 from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; and October 21 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

Meriden at the city hall on Saturday, October 14 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Friday, October 20 from 2 p. m. to 8 p. m. and Saturday, October 21, from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

Milford at the town hall on Tuesday, September 26 from 5 p. m. to 8 p. m.; Saturday, October 14 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Wednesday, October 18, from 1 p. m. to 8 p. m.; and on Saturday, October 21, from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

New Haven at the city hall on Saturday, October 14 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; and Monday, October 16 through Saturday, October 21, from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

North Branford on the following Saturdays, September 23 from 2 p. m. to 5 p. m., at North Branford town hall; October 14 from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m. at Northford Community House; and October 21 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m. at North Branford town hall.

North Haven at the town hall on the following Saturdays: September 23 from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; October 14 from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; and October 21 from 9 a. m. to 8 p .m.

Orange at the town hall on Saturday, September 23 from 1 p. m. to 4 p. m.; Saturday, October 14 from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m. and Saturday, October 21, from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

Wallingford at the town hall on Tuesday, September 19 from 5 p. m. to 8 p. m.; Saturday, October 14 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Thursday, October 19, from 7 p. m. to 9 p. m. at Yalesville town hall, and Saturday, October 21 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

West Haven at the town hall on Friday, September 22 from 5 p. m. to 8 p. m.; Saturday, October 14, from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Saturday, October 21 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

Woodbridge at the town hall on Tuesday, September 19 from 9 a. m. to 12 noon; Saturday, October 14, from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; Saturday, October 21 from 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.

Members of the Armed Forces may register at their town halls any weekday.

Register and play a role in democracy's fight against totalitarianism.

The Eleventh Anniversary of the Nazi Attack on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the eleventh anniversary of the Nazi attack on Poland, beginning World War II and its tragic train of events.

I have a communication from an American citizen friend of Polish extraction who holds that it is particularly appropriate on this day, when our boys are dying in Korea, to remind the world that forces of aggression and imperialism are threatening freedom even as they did in 1939.

My correspondent makes the following points:

1. Poland, a free and democratic Republic, a true friend of the United States, had in 1939 two valid pacts of nonaggression with Germany and Soviet Russia.

2. Poland was a member of the League of Nations and an ally of France and Great Britain.

3. Without provocation and without warning, Hitler's Germany attacked Poland on September 1, 1939, in the same fashion as the Soviet-led troops of North Korea attacked South Korea on June 25, 1950.

4. Hitler's attack on Poland was made possible by Stalin, who on August 25, 1939, approved the Soviet-German Treaty.

5. Acting in connivance with Hitler, Stalin ordered his troops to invade Poland on September 17, 1939, thus preventing Poland's armed forces from further resisting the Nazi invaders.

6. In a subsequent meeting at Moscow, Poland was divided between Nazi Germany and Stalin's Soviet Russia.

7. The pattern of aggression now stretching over an 11-year period has thus been set. Nazi Germany has been liquidated; the other partner, Stalin's Russia, has been permitted to acquire Poland and 12 other independent nations, including China.

8. Neither during the war, nor upon its completion, has the Polish Nation accepted defeat and enslavement. The Polish Army fought at the side of the United States, British, and French troops all through the war, and the Polish Nation is today as unanimously opposed to the Communist rule as it was opposed to the Nazi occupation.

I recall so well that when I returned from a trip to Europe and the Middle East in the fall of 1947 I warned my countrymen that communism was on the march, bent on destroying our way of life. I contended that we should build up our military defenses and halt the sending of war potentials to the Soviet Union. Belatedly, and after a terrific cost, we have begun to do these things.

It is my prayer that those nations associated with our own in protecting freedom and striving for world peace will soon be able to end the present conflict and, by continually focusing the spotlight on aggressors, their techniques and nefarious ends, will cause the entire world to see that peace can only be enjoyed when men are truly free. The Polish people are long-suffering, but justice must be their reward.

Legislative Record of Hon. John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by the former Governor of Connecticut, Hon. James C. Shannon, having reference to our colleague the gentleman from the Fourth District [Mr. LODGE], Republican nominee for Governor of the great Constitution State.

Governor Shannon's statement has great credibility due to his extended experience as counsel for labor, he being an attorney of much ability and good reputation. His high evaluation of Mr. LODGE follows:

I would like to comment on some statements that have been given wide publicity in the past week or so, by certain spokesmen for labor political action organizations, about what they claim to be the record of JOHN LODGE, Republican nominee for Governor, on the basis of his votes as a Member of Congress.

I do not think that I need to discuss these statements in detail, as Congressman LODGE already has done so from Washington, where he is doing his duty as a Congressman and has refuted in every detail the statements intended to support the contention that he is not a friend of the working people.

The statements by the labor spokesmen are false, as the record proves. Not only that, but thousands of Connecticut citizens, who keep informed about what is going on in Congress, know that the statements are false, because they are familiar with Mr. LODGE's record in Congress, which coincides with progressive Republican action and with the Republican platform in recommending and approving legislation which is for the best interests of all of us.

The labor spokesmen have endorsed all of the Democratic candidates, and presumably are determined to attack all of the Republican candidates, although it is quite apparent that they speak only for themselves, and have no proxies for the votes of any other union members.

The members of organized labor in Connecticut are accustomed to doing their own thinking on political as well as on other matters. They will do so in this instance again, because Mr. LODGE has a very liberal and sensible record on labor legislation, which can be easily proven.

The same thing applies to the other statements made against Mr. LODGE, that he voted against aid to Korea, and that he voted against social security. The spokesmen who made these statements surely must have known better, for it is absolutely clear that LODGE voted for aid to Korea, not once, but twice; and he also voted for the amplification of social security, not once, but twice.

Those who utter the misstatements I have referred to are doing a disservice to all of the members of affiliated labor groups. There is no justification for a campaign of bare-faced untruths, and I am sure that labor union members themselves will be quick to resent it.

It is particularly ironical for Mr. LODGE to be thus attacked by labor mouthpieces for the Democratic candidates, because not only is his labor record as good as any candidate now seeking election, but he himself is now and for many years has been a bona fide member of the American Federation of Labor Union.

The MacArthur Episode

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WCSH:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, I shall talk to you this evening about the episode of the MacArthur message, because I consider it extremely important and revealing.

The facts of the situation are these. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, assembled in convention in Chicago, had on August 17 cabled their greetings to General MacArthur, together, I assume, with a complimentary expression of confidence in his leadership. The general replied to this message with a cable, in which he thought fit to give the Veterans of Foreign Wars a statement of the strategic and political considerations applicable to the defense of Formosa. The entire cable occupies approximately two columns in the New York Times. In it, the general states that he believes it in the public interest to state his views about the relationship of Formosa to our strategic potential in the Pacific.

He explains carefully the changes wrought by the last war. Before the war, our western strategic frontier lay on the littoral line of the Americas, with an exposed island salient extending out through Hawaii, Midway, and Guam to the Philippines. Now our strategic frontier embraces the entire Pacific Ocean, which the General says has become a vast moat to protect us as long as we hold it. "If we hold this line," the general says, "we may have peace; lose it, and war is inevitable. The geographic location of Formosa is such that in the hand of a power unfriendly to the United States, it constitutes an enemy salient in the very center of this defensive perimeter, 100 to 150 miles closer to the adjacent friendly segments—Okinawa and the Philippines—than any point in continental Asia." In the hands of a hostile power, Formosa could, he says, "checkmate defensive or counter-offensive operations by friendly forces based on Okinawa and the Philippines."

The last four paragraphs of this message are so significant and are expressed with such force and dignity that I feel compelled to quote them in full.

"Nothing could be more fallacious than the threadbare argument by those who advocate appeasement and defeatism in the Pacific that if we defend Formosa we alienate continental Asia.

"Those who speak thus do not understand the Orient. They do not grant that it is the pattern of the oriental psychology to respect and follow aggressive, resolute, and dynamic leadership—to quickly turn on a leadership characterized by timidity or vacillation—and they underestimate the oriental mentality. Nothing in the last 5 years has so inspired the Far East as the American determination to preserve the bulwarks of our Pacific Ocean strategic position from future encroachment, for few of its people fail accurately to appraise the safeguard such determination brings to their free institutions.

"To pursue any other course would be to turn over the fruits of our Pacific victory to a potential enemy. It would shift any future battle area 5,000 miles eastward to the coasts of the American continents, our own home coast; it would completely expose our friends in Australia and New Zealand, our friends in Indonesia, our friends in Japan, and other areas, to the lustful thrusts of those who stand for slavery against liberty, for atheism as against God.

"The decision of President Truman on June 27 lighted into flame a lamp of hope throughout Asia that was burning dimly toward extinction. It marked for the Far East the focal and turning point in this area's struggle for freedom. It swept aside in one great monumental stroke all of the hyprocrisy and the sophistry which has confused and deluded so many people distant from the actual scene."

Please note that this message contains no criticism by General MacArthur of his military superiors, and implies none. On the contrary, the closing paragraph accords the highest praise to the statesmanship of President Truman, when on June 27 the President "ordered the United States Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack upon Formosa."

Of course, I do not know what considerations induced in General MacArthur the belief that it was in the public interest for for him to state the strategic considerations in the detail which he did. Whether his patience had been tried beyond endurance by having military considerations overruled in the State Department I cannot say. It is possible of course to take the position that a naval or military man should never give any public expression of his ideas about the national welfare. There was a good deal of discussion on this point a year or so ago when Admiral Denfeld gave his testimony before the Committee on Armed Forces. However, this may be, I do not hesitate to express my own opinion that an authoritative statement of the military considerations applicable to the defense of Formosa is very much in the public interest.

No statement could be more dignified and from my point of view no statement could possibly be truer than General MacArthur's. This is the first authoritative military statement that the American people have had on the whole Formosa question. Secretary Johnson said in recent testimony before a House Committee that last winter's decision not to defend Formosa was not a military decision but that it was taken in the top echelons, which means of course by President Truman and Secretary Acheson.

In ordering General MacArthur to retract the statement President Truman exercised what I presume are his undisputed rights as Commander in Chief. However, the practical effect of what the President has done seems to be most unfortunate. Last winter when the discussion first arose about the wisdom of holding Formosa the President never stated the arguments either for or against our aiding the Chinese forces on Formosa. On January 5, he simply said that we would not provide military aid or advice, and Secretary Acheson said that the decision had to do "with the fundamental integrity of the United States and with maintaining in the world the belief that when the United States takes a position it sticks to that position and does not change it by reason of transitory expediency or advantage."

The difficulty with the President's recent message is that it throws new doubt on what we actually are going to do about Formosa. We fought the war to protect the territorial integrity of China. Had we been willing to allow Japan to conquer China, there never would have been an attack on Pearl Harbor. We started at Yalta to reverse this policy of preserving the freedom and independence of China, and inaugurated the policy of allowing China to be dismembered.

In January 1950 President Truman said in effect, if the Chinese Communists can capture Formosa that is okay with us. Then in his statement to the Nation in June President Truman said: "I have ordered the United States Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa, and I have requested the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland."

Now what I want to know, what the American people want to know, what Chiang Kai-shek must want to know, and what I am sure Stalin and the Politburo want to know is whether the United States is going to save Formosa or save the face of Mr. Acheson and the leftist bloc in the State Department. If we are going to save Mr. Acheson's face, then I entertain the most genuine apprehension as to whether we are going to save the United States. Because from the moment that we reversed our policy of aggressively preserving the integrity of China, Secretary Acheson has been uniformly and egregiously wrong. As a result of this uncertainty everybody is confused, not the least Mr. Stalin,

whom in this particular we ought not to be confusing. I do not see how Chiang Kai-shek and his Government can reach any conclusion other than that the Government of the United States is vacillating hopelessly in a situation which it either does not comprehend at all or comprehends only intermittently.

Furthermore, the President's new attitude leads me to wonder whether the pro-Communist group in the State Department is not back in the saddle. If it is, then the Chinese Communist Government is going to be recognized, its delegates are going to be seated in the Security Council, and all hope for using the United Nations as an instrumentality for enforcing world peace is gone.

This is a deplorable situation and only one man can clean it up. That is the President of the United States. Will he clarify the situation or will he confound it even further if indeed greater confusion be possible?

The Fifty-first National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the fifty-first national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have been held at Chicago, Ill., from August 27 to September 1, 1950. The delegates to this convention have all seen service on foreign soil in the defense of our country. They are truly representative American citizens, and they adopted at that convention two resolutions which I feel represent the feeling of the majority of American citizens today.

The first resolution, condemning the policies and procedures of the Department of Defense, was passed by a vote of 3,495 to 5, and the resolution deploring and condemning the present policies of our Department of State was passed by a vote of 3,497 to 3. Those resolutions follow:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Whereas the present events in the early weeks of the Korean campaign clearly revealed that our Department of Defense was completely unprepared to enforce our foreign policy; and

Whereas hundreds and hundreds of poorly equipped and inadequately trained American boys were required to make the supreme sacrifice against a savage and well-armed foe in the mountains and on the plains of Korea; and

Whereas the Congress has appropriated billions of dollars for national defense since the close of World War II with the belief based on repeated assurance from responsible officials of the Department of Defense that our Nation would thereby have a balanced and adequate defense force to support our national policy and to be ready to cope with any emergency short of total war; and

Whereas the first test of armed strength which came in Korea revealed that in spite of repeated assurances by responsible officials of the Department of Defense and the boast that if we were attacked at 4 we would strike back at 5, we did not have adequate armed forces to stop and hurl back the Communist forces of North Korea: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the fifty-first encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in convention assembled in Chicago, Ill., August 27 to September 1, 1950, That the encampment go on record as condemning these disastrous and capricious procedures of the Department of Defense which have brought our Nation's defenses to their present shameful and inadequate condition in the face of the present threat of Communist world-wide aggression and call upon the President of the United States to seek out and appoint new and competent leadership in the Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Whereas the present policy of our State Department has failed to attain the objectives for which the Veterans of World War I and II fought and won to secure permanent peace; and

Whereas the great majority of the employees of the Department of State are honest, patriotic, and hard working, it seems, however, for some time past, the Department has been infiltrated with some persons whose leaning appears to be wholly totalitarian, or who lack necessary ability and good old-fashioned American common sense; and

Whereas in 1939 Stalin had behind the iron curtain 180,000,000 persons and now by reason of the vascillating and appeasing policy pursued by the Department of State, there are 300,000,000 persons back of the iron curtain, and unless a firm and determined policy is adopted by the State Department many millions more will be brought under Communist domination; and

Whereas it appears that our intelligence operation in the Department of State today has been weak and ineffective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the fifty-first annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we deplore the present policy of our Department of State which is endangering the very existence of our beloved country; and be it further

Resolved, That those persons in the employment of our State Department whose misfeasance and nonfeasance has resulted in the failure of diplomatic relations be immediately discharged from Government service and be it further resolved that our foreign intelligence be stressed so that we may be second to none in the world in that field; and be it further

Resolved, That those persons in our State Department whose loyalty to American ideals is questionable shall be forthwith dismissed from the service and the President of the United States is respectfully petitioned to seek out and appoint new patriotic and able persons in the Department of State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmited to the President of the United States and to the presiding officials of the two Houses of Congress, and to the Secretary of State.

A Defendant Who Won't Defend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the people in my district are aroused and angered at what appears to be collusion between the Housing Expediter and certain labor organizations in the matter of decontrol of rents in the city of Los Angeles.

Based upon the facts in my possession, I ask a congressional investigation of the Housing Expediter's conduct in this case, and if the facts are borne out, I demand his removal from office upon the grounds of a deliberate attempt to retard or stop the legal decontrol of the city of Los Angeles as provided for by the Congress of the United States.

Wednesday afternoon, August 30, at a special court of appeals session to hear arguments to restrain the Housing Expediter from doing what this Congress has directed him to do, the Housing Expediter's attorney refused to defend himself. Instead, he in effect sided with a CIO attorney against the city of Los Angeles and the position the city has taken in the matter of local rent decontrol.

Earlier in the week a United States district court judge threw out the case brought by the unions seeking to restrain the Expediter from decontrolling Los Angeles. The city's charges that the court did not have jurisdiction and that the case was brought prematurely before the Expediter had acted on the city's resolution, was sustained by the ruling.

The Los Angeles City Council published notice of public hearing 10 days before the hearing was held July 28 in City Hall. The council adopted the necessary resolution after hearing, as Congress prescribed, by a 10 to 4 vote. One councilman was absent. The resolution, under the city charter, properly certified, was duly forwarded to the Housing Expediter who received it here in Washington August 2. Thus the city fully complied with the law. Then followed an unexplained delay of 10 days. During this time the Expediter made no public statement, to the best of my knowledge. He did nothing although the resolution was in his possession all of that time.

Then for some unknown reason on August 14 Mr. Woods appeared uninvited before the City Council of Los Angeles. He urged the council to reconsider its decontrol action and instead give the property owners a 15 percent rent hike, but keep controls on until December 31. This is known as the Chicago formula. The council voted 10 to 5 against such a proposal. One councilman asked Woods:

Who invited you here? We didn't. We're curious to know.

Woods evaded the question. The mayor issued a statement that he had not asked Woods to come to Los Angeles. I would like to know who did invite him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are affidavits in connection with the case heard in district court to prove that the Housing Expediter's Office supplied the unions with the names of the tenants whose names appear as part of the court action to restrain Woods from issuing the decontrol order.

I should like to quote from an affidavit of one Louis L. Drouet which was filed August 28 in connection with the case heard here in district court:

On the night of August 24, 1950, I attended a meeting held at 5164 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif., at which Mr. Leon

Clifton, public relations counsel for the A. F. of L. Clerks' Union 770, stated that the day that Tighe Woods was in town he had dinner with him after he had spoken in the council chambers and Tighe Woods saw eye to eye with him and would program with him. Mr. Clifton said that their delaying tactics and injunctions have only started, that if this judge failed to issue a restraining order they were going to file a writ of supersideo, and that was a beauty. It would really delay it for a long time, and these delays were always saving the tenants money and that they would keep this thing going and use all the delays possible in the law. At least they may be able to delay it until the recall went through and until a State-wide election was held, and by all means to vote for Jimmy Roosevelt and HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS.

Mr. Speaker, this deliberate attempt by the Housing Expediter to bypass the rent laws approved by this Congress is sufficient evidence to demand his removal from office.

Woods admitted to the council that its procedure was legal and in order. He said he would return to Washington and immediately issue the decontrol order. He also hinted that he knew an injunction was in process. I ask, why did he go to Los Angeles in the first place?

Mr. Speaker, it is significant, to further prove collusion between the Expediter and union officials, that when the Expediter appeared before the city council on August 14 he stated for the first time publicly, to the best of my knowledge, that he would decontrol Los Angeles rents upon his return to Washington. It was the first public acknowledgment that the council's resolution was in order. It is not a mere coincidence that the basis of the complaint for the injunction was predicated upon Woods' threatened intention of decontrolling rents in the city of Los Angeles. The complaint, according to court records was executed August 10, 4 days prior to the time that Woods made his first public statement concerning decontrol of Los Angeles rents.

To show further collusion, Mr. Drouet also stated that he attended another meeting August 16 at 2200 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif., at which Mr. Maxwell Miller was in charge. Mr. Miller stated at this meeting that the hall was donated free. The hall is known as Farber's Park View Manor. Mr. Farber was investigated, Mr. Drouet stated, and found that he advertised daily in the Daily People's World, a Communist-controlled paper, which for the past year had been sponsoring and leading the fight to keep control on real property.

I quote again from Mr. Drouet's statement:

Mr. Maxwell Miller informed the gathering and stated he wanted no money from the people present, that they had $10,000 to recall Councilmen Ed Davenport and Don Allen, but he needs lots of affidavits of many hardship cases to present in Washington, D. C. He stated Tighe Woods was served twice with a summons, once in Washington, D. C., and once in Los Angeles. That Woods had to be served in his place of residence. That they invited Tighe Woods to Los Angeles; that they had 100 attorneys to help all tenants with eviction notices, that the A. F. of L. and CIO attorneys would help them also back in Washington; that the purpose of this fight in Los Angeles was of major importance because if controls were removed in Los Angeles the rest of the large cities would follow suit and a precedent would be established—that as a result of having placed Tighe Woods under the restraining order which had been served on him they were delaying the rent increases and saving the tenants $2,000,000 per month; that this method of delay would enable them to also circulate a referendum petition so they could force an election in the city of Los Angeles. He introduced Leo Goodman, CIO man sent here by Walter Reuther to aid in the fight to continue rent controls. He spoke of the good Congressman and the bad and urged all present to vote for HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS for United States Senator and for Jimmy Roosevelt for governor. After the meeting I stated to Maxwell Miller that he was using Communist-front tactics to delay the decontrol of rents and get crowds out on the pretense of being friends of the tenants but in reality he was campaigning for Jimmy Roosevelt and HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, the answer from Mr. Maxwell Miller being just a sneer.

Wood's general counsel, Mr. Dupree, stated in a sworn deposition that he knew of the injunction action on the morning of the day that it was filed. Woods appeared before the city council at 10 a. m., August 14, Pacific daylight saving time. That would be 1 p. m., Washington time. In other words, when Woods appeared before the city council, he did so in bad faith; because both he and his attorney knew of the existence of the complaint which had been signed on August 10. They were deliberately stalling and interfering with the law they swore to uphold.

When union attorneys met in the judge's chambers here in Washington August 14 about 4:30 p. m., the Expediter's attorney was on hand—as defendant—to expedite service of notice upon himself.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the attorney for the Expediter did not object to the motion for the restraining order, did not and has not up to this moment filed one single paper or offered one objection on behalf of the Government of the United States. This is in spite of the fact that he is charged with administering the rent laws on behalf of the Government.

Hence we have, for the first time in my memory or knowledge, an administrator of a Federal agency as defendant in a law suit restraining him from carrying out his duties, deliberately refusing to defend the laws which this Congress in its wisdom has seen fit to pass. Moreover, conspiring, according to the evidence, to delay the whole lawful decontrol of rents in the city of Los Angeles.

Such malfeasance of office warrants more than a casual scolding. This frivolous handling of a congressional mandate, which I am constrained to believe borders on collusion between the Expediter and others, is sufficient to demand an investigation by this Congress. If such investigation bears out the facts as I know them, I demand his removal from office.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Adams County, Pa., Sesquicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by me at the crowning of the Adams County sesquicentennial queen at Gettysburg, Pa., on August 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I sincerely and deeply appreciate the privilege of participating in these notable exercises.

It is an honor to join the fine citizens of Adams County in this sesquicentennial celebration.

Anniversaries such as this are important milestones in the progress and development of our State and Nation.

It is appropriate on such occasions to review the accomplishments of the past and to plan for greater achievement in the future.

In the pages of history may be found the real meaning of Americanism. The struggle and sacrifice which have built American greatness point the way to patriotic duty and the course by which we may contribute to the greater glory of our flag and our Republic.

It is always an inspiration to return to Gettysburg. Here American valor reached its highest peak in the fiery crucible of war. Here is the shrine of the Union, sacred to every American whose heart is imbued with love of country and devotion to its ideals.

Today our Nation stands again at the crossroads of history. We are facing a crisis just as grave as that decisive moment at the high-water mark of the rebellion when the fate of the Union hung in the balance here at Gettysburg.

Today we are united, fighting to preserve for our land and for the world that concept of freedom which we hold to be God's greatest gift to mankind.

The enemy we fight has long plotted and planned for our destruction. His treacherous aggression in Korea is but the opening gun in a campaign to dominate and enslave the world.

American patriotism is the only power in the world that can save the free nations from being crushed under a cruel and ruthless dictatorship which denies God and would rob humanity of all freedom.

Make no mistake about it; we are facing a war for survival.

The critical situation before us calls for total and complete effort on the part of every citizen, every man and woman who can help build the strength and power of our fighting forces and our home front.

To advance our country's cause we must put aside all selfishness, all thought of gaining advantage through the war, all demands for higher profits or higher wages.

It would be dangerous folly to underestimate the size of the job that we will be called upon to do. It would be equally dangerous to think that we can have business as usual and pleasure as usual.

We must realize that the years ahead will call upon us for sacrifice—and we must be prepared in the patriotic spirit of the Nation's heroes who rest eternally on the Gettysburg battlefield.

As a soldier I have given a great deal of thought to national defense and I am convinced that we should have a system of universal military service. That is the only way we can provide trained manpower ready for action.

Under the American system every able-bodied man should be willing to bear arms in our Nation's defense. That is a fundamental obligation of citizenship in a free country.

There should be harmonious and effective cooperation between labor, agriculture, and industry, combining their full productive capacity for the war effort.

We must determine to bear the cost of war, as far as possible, on a pay-as-you-go basis. Otherwise our individual freedom may be lost under a crushing burden of debt and inflation even after we win the war.

As I said before, higher wages and increased profits should be forgotten when the future of our country is at stake.

And finally we should all work for a great moral and spiritual awakening, mobilizing all the right-thinking, church-going people of every faith into battalions of righteousness for God and country.

We must make it clear to all the world that we fight only that men shall be free.

We seek no conquest or territorial gains.

Our objective is peace and freedom to illuminate the whole world with the eternal light of Gettysburg's Peace Memorial.

Hon. Carl Hayden, of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Out To Repair Fences," written by Doris Fleeson in today's Washington Evening Star, with reference to our colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I have always been a devoted follower of Doris Fleeson. I did not know why; but since she wrote this article with reference to the Senator from Arizona I know why.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUT TO REPAIR FENCES—HAYDEN, SENATE'S "GENERAL MANAGER," ADMITS HAVING PRIMARY TROUBLES

(By Doris Fleeson)

Senators who had watched five of their colleagues bite the dust in the primaries realized it was a hard year for incumbents, but they really panicked this week.

Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, apologized for not being able to stand by on various problems, but said rather diffidently that he was having primary troubles and would have to go home. Senators concede that it's a free country and anybody can run for office who wants to. But their story is that if it can happen to Carl, it can happen to anyone.

Senator HAYDEN is genuinely unique. He is a Senator loved for his personal qualities who has by hard work attained great power and influence, but he has a real passion for anonymity. Only insiders know how effective he is in the work of the Senate.

GENERAL MANAGER

As chairman of Rules, Senator HAYDEN is in a sense the Senate's general manager, with power over the conduct of its business and its physical property. He parcels out the offices, for example, including those prized cubbyholes in the Capitol, so convenient to the Senate floor, so inaccessible to the importunate constituent.

It is hard to believe that anyone with that power can be popular, but Senator HAYDEN, by reason of his consideration and unselfishness, is. A notable example:

When the Republicans expected to take over the Government in 1948, the then Rules chairman, Senator Brooks of Illinois, spent $60,000 fixing up a handsome hideaway in the center of the Capitol, complete with recreational facilities. When the Republicans and Senator Brooks were defeated, Senator HAYDEN fell heir to it.

He promptly put in a call to Senator LUCAS, of Illinois. "I have a present for you," he said. "It's the best office in the Capitol. You're majority leader, and besides it's poetic justice." The delighted Senator LUCAS promptly held open house amid his splendors and told the tale.

RENOWNED FOR WORD

But it is as ranking Democrat on Appropriations, the most powerful committee of all, that Senator HAYDEN does the day-in-day-out work for which he is renowned. Chairman MCKELLAR, for reasons of age and health, can do little, and Senator HAYDEN is the steersman. Appropriations is also the committee which contains the most rampant Republican minority—WHERRY, BRIDGES, FERGUSON, et al.—attempting to sway events through the power of the purse. It is as definitely not a place for softies, which both parties bear in mind when assigning members to it.

Senator HAYDEN's major triumph this year was to produce an Interior Department appropriation bill with which Secretary Chapman not only found no fault but added: "If I can't do a good job next year with that bill, I'm plain incompetent." The bill gave Interior—the most important Department of all to Arizona—what it asked, free of the hampering restrictions with which it has often had to contend. Even public power projects were spared.

The defensive excuse of one Republican: "Carl always gets his stuff on the floor, anyway, and I'm tired of fighting him."

Senator HAYDEN is not a New Dealer; in fact, he is definitely right of center and the southerners count him a civil-rights ally. Nobody ever seems to be angry at him, though.

Communists in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Red Herring Gets Bigger by the Day," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of August 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RED HERRING GETS BIGGER BY THE DAY

Among the public statements that he now wishes he had never made, "red herring" will probably haunt Mr. Truman the longest. The latest to be added to the list of self-confessed or convicted Communists is Attorney Lee Pressman. Mr. Pressman now acknowledges that he was a member of the Communist Party while he was an employee of the New Deal. He also names as fellow members John Abt, formerly a lawyer in the Agricultural Administration; Nathan Witt, an official of the National Labor Relations Board; and Charles Kramer, an employee of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Pressman, a lawyer who represented several Federal agencies and who later became general counsel of the CIO, admits to membership in the Communist Party in 1935. He quit the CIO when that organization opposed the Progressive candidacy of Henry A. Wallace for the Presidency. And, like Mr. Wallace, he too has now broken with the Progressives because of the Korean aggression.

Thus, with each passing day it becomes clearer that the charges of Communist infiltration of the New Deal had basis in fact. To dismiss the whole thing now as a red herring would be an affront to millions of patriotic Americans who are appalled by these revelations. How many more Communists in Government there were, and how many are still there, will probably never be known. Those who are most valuable to the party are never registered or referred to by name. It is a skulking, hole-in-the-corner kind of business at best, and the conspirators are hard to pin down.

And these were tactics that paid off. A single Hiss at Yalta was worth more to the Kremlin than a membership increase of thousands. To have key men in the Agriculture Department, with a National Labor Relations Board, and in the State Department must have given the Kremlin the feeling of holding four aces in its dealings with this country.

To these misguided subversives working in the higher echelons of Government must also be added the motley crew of traitors who are gradually being rounded up by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Nine have been netted in recent weeks and there will probably be more. In his red-herring charges, Mr. Truman was just as wrong as he was in calling the turn of deflation. He was as wrong as he was in seeing "best prospects for peace" just prior to the Korean outbreak. In fact Mr. Truman has been so consistently wrong, that it is a tribute to the innate durability of the country that we are still functioning.

The Grange Program for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Grange Presents an Action Program for Defense," written by

Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, for the editorial page of the September 1950 issue of the National Grange Monthly.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRANGE PRESENTS AN ACTION PROGRAM FOR DEFENSE

(By Albert S. Goss)

This defense program embodies the basic philosophy of the National Grange as set forth in the three Grange guideposts, which are equally sound in war or peace:

1. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth; or anything which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

2. The compensation of each should be based on what he contributes to the general welfare.

3. The prime purpose of government is to protect its citizens from aggression—both physical and economic.

Make no mistake—we are at war. The Korean front is but one phase of a conflict that has been in the making for over 100 years. Communism, with its atheism and cruel materialism, has constantly maintained that it could not live in the same world with capitalism, democracy, and Christianity; that one or the other had to survive; and that its destiny lay in promoting revolution so that communism might rule the world.

Through all the ups and downs from the day of Karl Marx to the present moment, destruction and world conquest have been the goal toward which every move has been directed. Living underground most of its life, it has constantly relied upon intrigue, violence, and destruction to gain its ends. World revolution has been its constant aim, openly preached. The only question has been when.

The tragic agreement at Yalta, followed by intensified subversive infiltration on Russia's part, and by a coddling policy on ours, has brought about a great change in five short years. Then we were the most powerful and influential nation on earth, leading the way to what the world believed would be lasting peace. Today Russia is holding the world in fear of war. She has swept over nearly half of Europe and Asia, and through her policies of infiltration has so weakened much of the uncontrolled area as to make it an easy potential victim of armed force.

As with all aggressors, her purpose has been to go just as far as possible without committing any single act serious enough to arouse nations to war. With the exception of Greece, where our aid caused her to withdraw, her aggression has been largely confined to subversive activities and capturing control of governments through revolution. Statements accredited to responsible officials in Washington that Formosa and Korea would not be defended because they were not necessary to our defense plans, probably prompted the Korean attack. Here for the first time was an attack by a communistic government upon a free nation.

Suddenly it has become unmistakably clear that if nations are to be permitted to live in freedom, Russia's course of world aggression must be stopped. We do not know what her next step will be. If she wins in Korea, it may be the first of many more such attacks throughout the world. If she sees she is about to lose, she may launch other attacks to divide our efforts. She may be testing out to see if the time has come to tackle the world, now weakened by subversive infiltration. In any event the days for hoping that world peace will prevail without the backing of armed might are over. We must be prepared for the worst while working harder than before to keep peace. The peace of the world depends on America's strength—both military and economic strength.

The biggest mistake we can make is to fail to recognize that this is a world war in every sense. Even if the shooting should be confined to Korea, the struggle will go on, both on the ideological and the economic fronts. Witness what communism has done to the church and the Christian leaders of Europe. Witness her flouting the sanctity of treaties and agreements. Witness the horrors of the police state, the slavery and brutality going on behind the iron curtain. Witness Russia's blocking all the United Nations' peace proposals, and her building what is probably the most powerful military machine in history. Make no mistake; we are at war on the military front, the economic front, and the spiritual front, and we must be fully prepared on all three.

1. We must rebuild our power to resist aggression. We must prepare to meet force with even greater force, working in cooperation with the United Nations. We must arm ourselves and help our allies. Our military technicians are unsurpassed and Congress should see that ample funds are available to make full use of their knowledge and skill to assure the best possible protection for our men and our Nation.

2. We need a sound tax system designed to meet the expense of government and war activities as we go, as far as practicable. We have already expanded our credit to a dangerous position. This will require heavier taxes and all should pay their share, meaning personal sacrifice and tightened living standards for all. We must take all profiteering out of war.

3. All unnecessary Government expenditures should be promptly curtailed. We need a real austerity program in Government employment and in the expansion of social services.

4. Critical materials should be allocated. This should be carried out on a voluntary basis as far as possible in cooperation with the National Security Resources Board, but if voluntary allocations fail, compulsory allocations should be used.

5. One of our gravest dangers lies in the field of inflation. This must be attacked at its source by keeping the supply of goods and money in proper relation. We may expect increased purchasing power because of more jobs, complicated by fewer goods to purchase, because of larger diversion to war purposes. Surplus purchasing power should be drained off by (a) increased taxes, (b) curtailed credit for consumer goods, and (c) a campaign for individual purchase of Government bonds. Defense production should be stepped up through more generous credit for production purposes, with purchase or price guaranties, where necessary.

6. Rationing should be used if consumer goods become scarce, to assure that each gets an equitable share. Rationing should not be employed unless voluntary efforts fail. Campaigns against hoarding are our best assurance against rationing.

7. If profiteering occurs, price controls may be necessary. General price controls should not be attempted without rationing unless limited to cases of distinct profiteering. Without rationing, price ceilings serve to increase the purchasing pressure on short supplies, frequently curtail production, and inevitably lead to evasion. If price controls are adopted, prices must be set at levels which will encourage ample production.

8. If price controls are adopted as an anti-inflationary device, control should go straight across the board including wages, and profits so that all may be treated alike. We should not attempt rationing or price control unless we mean business and intend to enforce the law.

The first five steps should be taken at once and ample authority given to bring the other steps into play as needed.

Our future policy should be determined by the Congress itself. It is recognized that in time of emergency, it is often necessary to give the President power to act promptly in matters which will not wait on the slow processes of congressional deliberation. This should not mean the abdication of its constitutional authority by the Congress. It is still our policy- and law-making body, directly representing the people, and should constantly keep control to make sure that its will is carried out. Where special powers are given to the President to act in order to avoid delay, Congress can and should maintain its Constitutional responsibility in two ways. First, every special transfer of power should be individually revokable by the Congress by a simple majority vote of each House. Second, the Congress and the President should work in the closest of harmony on all things. Such close cooperation could be materially advanced by providing a bipartisan liaison committee chosen without regard to seniority for frequent contact with the President. Such a committee could be of inestimable help to the President with the tremendous responsibilities on his shoulders when so many grave decisions have to be made.

Similarly, all matters involving our international relations should be worked out in the closest cooperation with the Congress in order that no commitments may be made which might run counter to the thinking of these representatives of the people. Let us not abandon our belief in Democracy either under stress of war or in the formulation of peace policies. Let us rather strengthen it and develop practical ways of making full use of it so that we can combine the guidance of the representatives of the people with the quick decisiveness of the Executive on detailed operations so frequently necessary.

Finally, we are enjoying the highest living standards and the greatest prosperity of any nation in history. This is primarily due to the basic Christian philosophy of the sacredness of human life, and of integrity and fair dealings with our fellow men. Here is the crux of the age-old struggle. It not only imposes on us the responsibility for protecting all that we believe in but also of making sure that we are living up to the truest concepts of our beliefs.

Whatever the outcome, the time has come to tackle the problem ahead with all our strength. The more we accomplish through voluntary democratic efforts, the fewer controls we will need. There is much for Granges to do. In the uncertain days ahead there will be more, both in the field of individual effort and concerted action. Our twice-a-month meetings provide a wonderful opportunity for service. Let us keep strong and fully prepared to live up to the responsibilities which are ours.

Transoceanic Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

entitled "Our Next Frontier—Transoceanic TV," written by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America and brigadier general, Army of the United States, Active Reserves.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NEXT FRONTIER—TRANSOCEANIC TV

(By David Sarnoff)

Television promises today to open up new horizons far beyond anything yet seen in this new and growing means of communication.

It is within the range of possibility now that events across the seas will one day be visible at the moment they happen to anyone within reach of a television set.

We already know the scientific principles for linking the hemispheres by television. When they are worked out and become a practical reality, we shall be able to see, as well as hear, around the world.

This development will prove to be one of the most revolutionary advances that science has ever offered mankind.

It will make it possible, for example, for the violent reality of distant battlefields to be experienced by people on the home front. Transoceanic TV, too, will make such happenings as international meetings, sports events, and human everyday living in distant places almost a first-hand experience to audiences in all parts of the world.

The prospect promises more for real understanding among all peoples, for making human brotherhood a reality, than perhaps anything since the invention of the printing press.

Aviation is hailed today as one of the most effective means of unifying the world. Thousands of people fly to and from Europe every week in luxurious comfort across an ocean that it used to take days and weeks to cross. The distance between the world's continents has come to be measured, not in the thousands of miles, but in the few fleeting hours it takes to cover the distance.

Yet, great as its contribution is, aviation still caters to a minor fraction of the population, while television, just a few years old, is already a mass means of communication. Over 6,000,000 television receivers have a place in American homes today. Within 2 or 3 years, maybe over 20,000,000 sets will be in use, with a potential audience of 80,000,000. The growth of the television industry exceeds the strides made by any other new industry in a comparable period of time.

The United States, of course, has seen a more intensive development of radio than any other country. But even allowing for other nations trailing us in television, as in radio, the potentialities of the new means of communication on an international scale excite the imagination.

TV CAN SELL DEMOCRACY OVERSEAS

Think, for instance, of the way television, extended across the seas, could sell democracy abroad. In theory, democracy begs for the ear. In action, it challenges the eye. To be believed, the American way of life must be seen as well as heard. Radio can speak about the problems democracy tackles. Television can show the answers.

This means a tremendous opportunity to follow up the great work already being done by the Voice of America in its broadcasts overseas. That service can be expanded to become the voice and vision of America.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, in fact, recently urged congressional action for a vision of America project. He proposed that we help establish a television network in a number of countries in Europe and Asia. The project, he said, would not require the use of individual TV receiving sets but would call for community receivers like those now available and in use here.

A special advantage of such a television network system would be that it could not be easily jammed from remote areas as radio broadcasts are today by Soviet stations.

The range of television signals is at present limited. Therefore a special system would be required for sending television programs across the seas. Several methods for meeting this problem already are known. One is to equip transoceanic planes with microwave radio-relay apparatus which could operate automatically. This would pass the television signal along from one plane to another until it reached its destination. This system might be called a "radio airlift."

Another method would be to provide a coaxial cable across the ocean. Such radio-air lifts or coaxial cables could carry not only television programs but many ordinary telephone conversations, "ultrafax" or high-speed telegraph communications, and similar services. All these could be transmitted simultaneously.

While such services are not yet in existence, I have no doubt about their ultimate practicability.

International television thus is no idle dream. It is nearer than many realize. When Nation-wide radio broadcasting began, it was only 5 years before listeners overseas were picking up the broadcasts. Before long, regular international broadcasts had become an established fact. We may expect that international television will follow much the same pattern of progress.

The reward for such progress will be the greatest opportunity ever given us for creating close ties of understanding among the peoples of the world and for helping to preserve peace.

Franco's Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast delivered by Glen Stadler over radio station KERG, Eugene, Oreg., on Friday, December 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This evening I'm going to talk about one of my pet international peeves. Well, actually, it's much more than that. It's something to which I'm unalterably opposed: Totalitarian dictatorship. In this specific case, the totalitarian dictatorship of General Franco, of Madrid.

However, keeping in mind the state of our bipolarized world of power, I am going to have to point out some political realities involving Franco and Tito.

I have been rather intimately acquainted with Franco's Spain, having lived there in 1943 and 1944 as CBS correspondent. I've seen his spoils system of his Fascist party eating up the economic body of Spain. I've seen many, many Spaniards hacking at the dry, lifeless earth, trying to eke out a bare subsistence. I've seen families—5 years after the end of the Civil War there—huddled in shell-ravaged shacks, living in squalor and fear.

I didn't like what I saw. I didn't like the paradox of the very rich and the very poor. I didn't like the haunted looks on the faces of those whose lives were caught in the echo of secret police boots.

I share this following opinion of Spain: "Franco Spain remains a Fascist dictatorship, denying the basic civil rights. In Spain, there is no real freedom of speech, of religion, of the press, of politics. Franco was put into power by Dictators Hitler and Mussolini and maintains his allegiance to the Fascist-type state."

Those are the words of our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, spoken last May. That, then, is our Government's official attitude toward Franco. Yet, actions speak louder than words. Or, should I say inaction? For, despite our harsh words of denunciation, we haven't done anything to prove to the world that we are serious in the matter.

Our ideological battle cry during the war was "down with Fascist dictatorships." We succeeded in getting rid of Mussolini and Hitler, but their progeny remains, as a symbol for them, as a black mark for us.

Why do we tolerate Franco, even though he is on the United Nations blacklist? There are several reasons, but the primary one is that Spain would be a good ally in the event of conflict with Russia. Spain is very strategically located.

It is separated from the remainder of Europe by high, rugged mountains, which, presumably, would stop the Red army, should Moscow decide to take over Europe. Spain then, would be a base of operations for the recapture of Europe from the Russians.

Presumably, Franco's 2,000,000-man army could be equipped and placed at our disposal—at a price. Franco is noted for his ability to exact a pound of flesh. We'd have to pay for his assistance.

When the question of conflict with Russia arises, and the issue of Spain comes up, another factor arises. That factor is—Tito. Why, in this stage of the cold war, should we be backing Tito, who operates a totalitarian dictatorship quite similar to Franco's—and appear to be opposing Franco?

That, I think, is a hard one for our Government to answer—without cringing. I don't think you'd hear the word "expediency" used by any of our diplomats, although they probably would point out that Tito is actively engaged in undermining Russian communism and therefore is more valuable to our cause. Franco, on the other hand, is not engaged in an active role.

Now, without involving moralities, this question must arise. If Tito has a totalitarian dictatorship, and Franco has a totalitarian dictatorship, and we are opposed to that freedomless form of government, why do we not accord each the same treatment?

If we're going to loan Tito money and send him factories, why, then, should we not do the same for Franco? Why shouldn't we loan Franco the millions he wants, and admit him into the Atlantic Pact, the Marshall plan, and the United Nations? Yugoslavia not only is a UN member, it's on the Security Council.

None of these questions can be answered without the words "cold war" being used or implied. Actually, then, our foreign policy is based on: Preservation and strengthening of our national security, and on our fear of Russia increasing her national security.

Our policy includes expediencies—going along with international blackguards if they serve our purpose. That may be necessary to survive in this atomic era. Right now I'm not arguing the merits of expedience. I am, however, saying that our foreign policy should be made consistent. We shouldn't look at something black and call it white.

As far as Franco is concerned, there might be an "out" for us. The western powers could recognize an exile regime of Spaniards who would be pledged to a United Nations supervised election. Franco could be forced out, if we really wanted to do it. And I don't think we would have to fear that Spain would go Communist. The people are just too individualistic—too proud. I have a great respect and affection for the Spanish people. I, for one, would have no fear for the outcome of a contest between democracy and communism in a free, Franco-less Spain. There's no doubt that democracy would win. Only then—as Ray Swing said the other night—could we be rid of our national shame for tolerating Franco.

Hon. Frank B. Keefe, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great regret that our good friend and colleague, FRANK B. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, has been obliged to retire from the United States Congress.

During his 12 years as a Member of the National House of Representatives he has rendered outstanding service to his State and to the Nation.

For much of that time I have worked shoulder to shoulder with him as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, which carried such a tremendous and such a detailed burden during the war and postwar years.

As chairman of the subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the Labor and Federal Security Departments and as a member of the subcommittee in charge of deficiency appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, he proved himself not only one of the most hard-working and most effective members of the committee but one of the most powerful figures on the floor of the House in my time.

He will be greatly missed by his many friends and coworkers here.

I know we all join in the hope that his health, recently impaired, may be fully restored in the near future.

General Maas and the Presentation of the Marine Corps Plaque

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on the 22d of August of this year the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association, through its distinguished national president, Gen. Melvin J. Maas, presented to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, of which I have the honor to be a member, a Marine Corps plaque, being the symbol of that distinguished fighting organization.

General Maas' words were well chosen and were short. Like all good marines, he was concise and quick to get to the point. So fitting and so representative of the world's greatest fighting organization was his presentation, that I believe the Archives of the Nation should contain his statement.

General Maas served in two world wars with great distinction. Like all marines in time of war, Colonel Maas was at the front with his buddies. He served in the Congress of the United States for 18 years, and I was privileged to serve with him on the old Naval Affairs Committee, under the guidance of the illustrious Carl Vinson, for a great number of years.

General Maas is a real American and a member of a grand and glorious fighting organization whose heroism is reflected in every page of American progress and of history.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a copy of General Maas' statement to our committee on August 22, 1950:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am privileged to represent the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, which is a guild of Reserve officers of the Marine Corps. We are organized for the sole purpose of improving our professional value to national defense. The Marine Corps Reserve is the creation of Congress and more particularly of one of the predecessors of this committee.

The members of our association are deeply grateful to the Congress and this committee for their insistent and understanding sponsorship of the Reserve.

This committee of Congress has never failed to give us a fair hearing and it has always championed the Reserves.

The very nature of our system of government puts the major reliance for defense of our country on the citizen soldiers—civilians in uniform. As civilians with military training, we are doubly conscious of our obligations both as citizens and as part of the military. Our very loyalty to the Marine Corps insures loyalty to our country and its democratic processes, of which the Congress is the very foundation.

This committee has always shown a very deep interest in the Marine Corps and its Reserves. Therefore, as Marine Reserve, we are proud and happy to present to this committee this emblem of one of the members of the team for defense, the Marine Corps. In presenting this emblem, gentlemen, I wish to assure you that we Marine Reserves ask only one thing, that we be permitted to be ready so that we can be there when you need us.

What the Bill of Rights Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this year the Illinois Ogle County Bar Association conducted an inter-high school contest on the subject "What the Bill of Rights Means to Me." The essay committee was composed of Mr. Gerald Garard, of Oregon, Ill.; Mrs. Leo Rutkowski, of Forreston, Ill.; and Mr. Steven Helfer, of Rochelle, Ill. Cirguit Judge Leon A. Zick, of Oregon, Ill., made the award.

This contest was won by Miss Patricia Rumann, of Mount Morris High School, Mount Morris, Ill., who chose as her subject My Insurance Policy. In a thoughtful and searching manner, Miss Rumann developed the importance of the Bill of Rights as an "insurance" to the individual of his rights as an American citizen. Impressed by the clear thinking and sound reasoning of this high-school girl, I thought: "If these things be found in the green tree, for what may we look in the dry," and so long as our young people hold such fundamental truths, our country is safe.

I feel that this essay must commend itself to everyone, and I therefore request permission to insert it in the RECORD:

MY INSURANCE POLICY
(By Patricia Rumann)

Have you paid your latest insurance premium? Surely you have insurance of some kind. Statistics show that more people are purchasing insurances now than ever before. Life insurance, fire insurance, car insurance, unemployment insurance, hospital insurance, burglary insurance, and health insurance are among some of the best-selling policies. People are trying to look ahead, to save for a rainy day. They would not think of absent-mindedly forgetting to pay their premiums. They take the time to carefully fill out page after page of questionnaires to get the insurance. But the majority of American citizens don't give one thought to the greatest insurance policy of all.

Come back with me to the year 1789. The leaders of our Nation were attempting to start a new type of government. They had carefully discussed how the new government should be constructed, making sure that the majority of the people would always have their voice in the rule of our land. But they were not satisfied with this Constitution, which outlined the powers of the officers of the democracy and manifested the right of the majority. They wanted a list which outlined the rights of the individual against oppression by the Government. North Carolina considered the personal rights to be so important that they would not agree to ratification of the Constitution until the Bill of Rights was promised as the first ten amendments. This Bill of Rights restricted Congress from making it unlawful to openly and publicly criticize the Government. It permitted any man the right to bear arms, to be the ruler in his own house, to receive fair treatment at the hands of the law. This Bill of Rights, which those first great statesmen considered to be even more important that a unified democracy, is my insurance policy against the will of the majority. It is the document which gives me the same liberties as the richest millionaire or the poorest begger in the United States.

Privileges are not granted without certain duties and responsibilities being asked in return, however. I am expected to be tolerant, to consider seriously my duty as a citizen of the United States, to be a fitting example to immigrants and foreign visitors, to put careful thought behind my marking of a ballot on election days, to do all in my power to see that the Bill of Rights will always remain the insurance policy of personal liberty.

The Eleventh Anniversary of the Attack on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past months the free world has determinedly embarked on an offensive to preserve the institution of democracy. It is not a new campaign. The United States with her friends has waged a consistent campaign of selling freedom since the end of World War II. As world events move more rapidly, these days, selling of economic freedom has been supplemented with military high pressure power.

The actions of the Communist puppet in China and in Korea have brought the realities of communism a little closer to our everyday lives. The Korean action today reminds the world of a terrible event of 11 years ago, when on September 1, 1939, Communist forces and their evil partners, the Nazi heel-clicking militarists, used the same tactics to invade a democratic Poland. A free Poland which was a member of the League of Nations. Like the nation of Korea and Nationalist China, in the United Nations, Poland was brutally and without warning attacked. The rest is history.

What followed was only to be clearly revealed in the tragic events that are so closely paralleled today. The ghosts of Yalta and Potsdam are only too clearly reflected in every part of the world where communism and its servants are the rulers of the land.

We can see that the pattern of aggression from that date to the present time is the same. The sins of the past are only reminders that the guaranties of major powers are not always kept. We can recall that Britain gave assurances to Poland. They were what one might call first aid to prevent further deterioration in an already bad situation. But for practical purposes it was a policy of opposing bloc against bloc.

If this were recognized only a few months after the invasion of Poland, the action would have been repudiated by everyone. The fact is that it is now accepted, if not in its entirety, at least partially, where the truths remain unblemished.

The fleeting time of history shows us that the scars of the invasion have never healed. The government in control of Poland is truly dominated by Soviet puppets who have been trained and schooled in Marxist ways. The schools where once democracy was taught are now classrooms devoted to totalitarian doctrine. The farm today is a state institution. The incentive for ownership of land and property of any kind is curbed. The church is shackled by ironclad Soviet rules which can be broken at the whim of the commissar. This is the Poland of 1950.

The United States and all the countries which are members of the United Nations must keep before their eyes the sad fate of democracy as it was crushed in Poland.

The shadows which have fallen on the free people of Poland must serve as a warning to all nations to keep themselves strong. Strength which stems from the mind and hands of a freeman is the only recourse. Free people who are determined to live free can gain in strength when they fight an oppressor.

The Pole, wherever he is, is a freeman who will never give up his inherent right of freedom.

As long as there is a spark of democracy existing in this world, the Pole will gain and gain in stature in his fight for freedom and justice.

Analysis of Report of Commodity Credit Corporation for Period Ending June 30, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have made an effort to analyze the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the period ending June 30. This has resulted in certain very significant and startling facts. I find that the inventory figure for cheese alone is 58,902,053 pounds as against 29,475,919 on May 31, an increase of 99.8 percent in 1 month. I find further that butter stocks increased to 161,649,213 pounds. The Government purchased 44,151,250 pounds during the month of June, thereby increasing its inventory over the May 31 figure by 37.6 percent.

This is a very discouraging development as to the increases in carrying charges on these two items alone. The total carrying charges for the fiscal year amounted to $3,167,313.63. Of this amount, $1,937,674.51 accrued after February 2, when proposals were filed here in the House authorizing the distribution of these surplus food items to people who could use them but could not afford to pay for them.

The situation is so disturbing that, although I have not had an opportunity to complete my full study of the report, I have brought these facts to the attention of the President and Secretary Brannan through letters addressed to them. I include copies of these letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A copy of the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the period ending June 30 was sent to my office on August 29.

The analysis which I have been able to make discloses very substantial increases in certain commodities during June. It also discloses a heavy loss incurred through the payment of storage charges.

I think both of these factors will be clear if you will examine the following brief analysis as to quantities of these several food commodities:

	Inventory (pounds), May 31, 1950	Inventory (pounds), June 30, 1950	Increase in June (pounds)
Butter	117,497,963	161,649,213	44,151,250
Cheese	29,475,919	58,902,053	29,426,134
Dried milk	311,065,022	362,931,819	51,866,797
Dried eggs	87,891,563	93,918,525	6,026,962
Dried beans	949,423,400	968,710,200	19,286,800
Dried peas	85,775,300	91,225,900	5,450,600
Rice	392,600	68,996,200	68,603,600
Grain sorghum	3,771,969,200	4,127,422,400	355,453,200

As you know, I have tried to familiarize myself with the amounts of payment made for carrying charges. On June 30 the total amount on 16 food commodities was $38,700,524.59.

You will recall that legislation was proposed in the House on February 2 intended to provide for the distribution of these perishable food commodities to people who need them but cannot afford to buy them. Fortunately, upon the recommendation of the House Committee on Agriculture the House passed H. R. 9313 on August 22. If enacted into law, this will provided essentially the same solution as was suggested on February 2. Secretary Brannan also finally recommended such a solution.

It cannot be disputed that unless some definite action is taken large amounts of these food commodities will inevitably spoil. Under these circumstances I do want to urge that you insist that the situation and the House bill be made the subject of prompt action in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY BRANNAN: A copy of the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the period ending June 30 was sent to my office on August 29.

The analysis which I have been able to make discloses very substantial increases in certain commodities during June. It also discloses a heavy loss incurred through the payment of storage charges.

I think both of these factors will be clear if you will examine the following brief analysis as to quantities of these several food commodities:

	Inventory (pounds), May 31, 1950	Inventory (pounds), June 30, 1950	Increase in June (pounds)
Butter	117,497,963	161,649,213	44,151,250
Cheese	29,475,919	58,902,053	29,426,134
Dried milk	311,065,022	362,931,819	51,866,797
Dried eggs	87,891,563	93,918,525	6,026,962
Dried beans	949,423,400	968,710,200	19,286,800
Dried peas	85,775,300	91,225,900	5,450,600
Rice	392,600	68,996,200	68,603,600
Grain sorghum	3,771,969,200	4,127,422,400	355,453,200

As you know, I have tried to familiarize myself with the amounts of payment made for carrying charges. On June 30, the total amount on 16 food commodities was $38,700,524.59.

You will recall that legislation was proposed in the House on February 2, intended to provide for the distribution of these perishable food commodities to people who need them but cannot afford to buy them. Fortunately, upon the recommendation of the House Committee on Agriculture the House passed H. R. 9313 on August 22. If enacted into law, this will provide essentially the same solution as was suggested on February 2. Of course, this solution did meet with your final approval.

It cannot be disputed that unless some definite action is taken large amounts of these food commodities will inevitably spoil. I hope that you have brought this matter to the attention of the proper parties in the Senate and that you will do everything in your power to urge immediate action.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

Lloyd Lewellyn Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Nation lost one of its outstanding trial judges in the untimely passing of Lloyd L. Black, United States judge for the western district of Washington, at Seattle.

Judge Black was born in Leavenworth, Kans., on March 15, 1889, and came to Everett, Wash., as a child. He was educated in the Everett public schools. He graduated from the University of Washington, with honors, with an A. B. degree in 1910, and received his law degree in 1912. He was elected prosecuting attorney of Snohomish County, Wash., in 1916, the first Democrat to be elected to that office. He was engaged in the private practice of law until his appointment as a judge of the Superior Court of the State of Washington in January 1937. He had an extensive law practice and was considered one of the ablest members of the Washington State bar. In 1939 he was named by President Roosevelt to be United States Federal judge for the western district of Washington. He held that post continuously until his death on August 23, 1950.

It was my good fortune to have been associated with Judge Black. It was a rich experience that I shall always treasure. It was he who gave me my start in the law practice and it was he who, through his wise counsel, assisted me in getting into politics. I shall always be indebted to him for his thoughtful guidance and assistance.

Judge Black was a man of sound judgment. He was a very fair and tolerant man, always considerate of the rights of others no matter how much he might disagree with their views. He was a scholar in all things. He had a way of getting to the truth in a simple, straightforward manner. He was possessed of the best judicial temperament. He never lost his patience. He never lost his interest and desire in making sure that justice was done in all cases coming before his court.

In his passing, I have lost not just a friend but, to me, it is as though one of my own family had passed away.

Military Sea Transportation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of Congress, the United States is now, practically though not technically, in a state of war. At such a time it has been considered almost sacrilegious to make criticisms of the military and its operations. I am mindful of the need for permitting free operation of our military forces in those fields where a free hand is essential for a successful prosecution of the war effort. However, at the present time certain situations and conditions prevail, and certain policies are being effectuated by one branch of the military service which do not merit the sacrosanct cloak of freedom of operations. Indeed, if permitted to continue, these conditions and policies may tend to imperil and slow down our war effort. I believe very strongly that the Members of this House and the public at large should be informed of these facts and the possible consequences if no controls are established to correct the conditions.

As Members of Congress one of the responsibilities which we have implicitly accepted is that of preserving the traditional ideas of American Government. One of the most important of those ideas is that control of the Government should remain in the hands of the civilian arm, that the public interest should be kept paramount, and that the military should be confined to its limited sphere. In these critical times it is of particular importance that we be vigilant against excessive control and unwarranted action by military agencies. We are engaged in a battle against a totalitarian, militaristic government. We are fighting to protect the idea of democratic, civilian forms of government. In World Wars I and II we sacrificed countless lives and huge sums of money to defeat the fascistic and imperial military governments of Germany and Japan. Such militarism now bears the communistic banner, and under the hammer and sickle of Russia, through her vassal state in Korea, has challenged us again. While fighting that ideology abroad we cannot let it creep into our own Government and destroy the concept laid down by the founding fathers.

In my humble thinking that very danger is presented to us by policies laid down and now being carried out by certain highly placed career officers in the Navy Department. I refer to the operations of the Military Sea Transportation Service and the high-handed manner in which its policy makers are bypassing and sidetracking the private merchant marine in the present crisis. The policies they are now following point unmistakably to an intention to perpetuate naval operation of transportation services essentially and traditionally civilian in character. I wish now to publicly and vigorously oppose those policies and to point out my grounds for opposing them.

At the outset of the Korean developments the MSTS was operating four ships of their own. They had no ships under charter. They were engaged in little deep-sea or coastwise transportation. It is true that they were, and still are, handling an excessive amount of harbor movements by barge, and of tug operations, in competition with private enterprise. Despite repeated protests they had improperly built up their business in this respect since World War II. However, when the decision was made to intervene in Korea, and in spite of the availability of the ships and facilities of private shipping operators and large pools of experienced manpower, the MSTS set in motion a program designed to secure for themselves a large portion of the supply transport, and all of the troop-transport operations, incidental to the Korean situation. What motive they can have for this policy except the desire to make use of the pretext afforded by the sudden emergency to entrench themselves for future expansion at the expense of our private merchant marine, I do not know.

The private companies have available a largely untapped reserve of berthing and docking facilities sufficient to handle our present needs. They have behind them years of experience and proven know-how. There is available to them ample manpower, operating under collective bargaining agreements. Many of them have been virtually forced out of business by the cessation of trade with the Orient resulting from the Communist-created upheavals there. In the face of these facts the MSTS has gone into competition with them and is further contributing to their difficulties.

MSTS has taken over large numbers of ships and are attempting to man them with green crews, hired from the streets and placed in temporary civil-service ratings. They do not have the necessary berthing, dock and loading facilities to expeditiously handle the cargoes they are appropriating to themselves. With inexperienced crews and dockside personnel, supplies do not get proper handling. Their ships are lying idle waiting for berths and cargo. All this, with privately owned ships and facilities unused, and with a desperate need for the most efficient possible dispatching of matériel and troops. It seems evident that MSTS has seen fit to begin building up a shipping empire of their own with the intention of perpetuating it.

This is not the whole story: The Navy's Transportation Service has now under charter a large number of foreign ships, operated by foreign crews, and engaged

in logistics operations vital to the security of the United States. I have endeavored for weeks to obtain a satisfactory explanation as to why this policy is being continued. I have been told that they needed ships quickly and that they needed fast ships. This explanation does not tell me why so many foreign Liberty ships, sold at give-away prices by this Government after World War II, are included among those foreign ships on charter. Besides taking needed business and jobs away from our own operators and seamen, this foreign-ship operation has an even more serious side.

Shortly after United Nations intervention in Korea our maritime unions and private operators voluntarilly set up a program for screening every man-jack boarding a ship engaged in military transport in order that Communists and subversives might be weeded out. This was a recognized necessity to protect our ships and supplies and the lives of our men. The program was approved by the Government and is operated by the Coast Guard. What becomes of that program when MSTS turns over whole vital operations to ships manned by foreign crews from countries which may be hotbeds of communism, and where no provisions are made to investigate or screen the personnel? Further, the civil service crews hired from the skidrows of our port cities undergo no screening. They not only lack experience and bungle operations, but there undoubtedly are among them planted spies and saboteurs bent on destroying us. And while this goes on our maritime hiring halls are full of loyal, unemployed Americans who know how to do the job.

The training which our career naval officers get throughout their lifetime naturally inclines them toward military controls and military types of government. That training makes them proficient at operations in the combat line. However, it does not qualify them to control the highly specialized functions of marine transportation and cargo handling or personnel transport. Our maritime industry is built up of organizations remarkably proficient in that field. The people engaged in the industry have made it their life's work. It is the declared national policy to support and foster the industry's continued development. And now, when times are such that the Government can contribute to the industry and, at the same time, serve the Nation's needs, the Navy has taken the play away from the private companies. That is just the sort of tendency which this Nation must guard against and fight against.

I have in my hand a letter from Mr. Harry Lundeberg, president of the Seafarers' International Union of North America, and secretary-treasurer of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, which colorfully and thoroughly explores some of the implications surrounding this attempt by the MSTS to capture control of shipping in this country. It is only one of many such letters which have flooded my office from labor organizations and from private operators in the shipping industry, as well as from individuals and groups concerned with the problem because of its effect on the national welfare. I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, so that all Members, and the people of the United States may have the information it contains:

SAILORS' UNION OF THE PACIFIC,
August 30, 1950.

Hon. JOHN F. SHELLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JACK: I am in receipt of your letter dated August 24 and I appreciate the work you are doing on behalf of the American seamen in regard to the attempts of the Military Sea Transportation Service of bypassing legitimate American seamen.

I have received communications from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Kimball, and from Admiral Callaghan. Their letters, of course, are very friendly and state that it is not the intention of the MSTS to charter any more foreign ships as long as there are enough American ships available. So far so good. However, the MSTS and its head have a long-range program which they don't admit but which I know is a fact. They intend to substitute the civilian American Merchant Marine with their own set-up of so-called civil service employees. They are today operating many more ships than the old Army Transport Service did, and since the Navy took over this setup all their actions indicate they intend to build and build until they really have control of all the ships that carry supplies to the Army, Navy, or any defense posts both outside and in territorial American waters, and it is a crying shame the way they are operating at the present time.

They are advertising in the papers for sailors, firemen, and cooks all the time. They are flying them in here from other towns and they are housing them in the San Francisco YMCA. These people they are recruiting are not steady civil-service employees. Their status is civil service as long as they work for the MSTS. When they are out of work, they don't receive any benefits as a regular civil service employee. They are subject to be fired without any redress. In my opinion, it is one of the biggest threats to organized American seamen I have seen for some time. As you probably know, in order to hire out as a sailor, or a fireman, or a steward under the MSTS you do not need any certificates of efficiency or competency which all other American seamen are required to get from the United States Coast Guard before they can sail in certain ratings in the merchant marine.

For instance, in order for you to be able to sail as an able-bodied seaman you must have a certificate as such from the Coast Guard, and according to their rules and regulations you must have sailed on deck for 3 years before you can apply and then you go through a certain examination. This is what is required of our boys, but not so in the MSTS. Any old greenhorn can get himself a job and at nonunion wages, and if he is a good obedient slave to the Navy brass hats.

You, of course, have read about the recent disaster in the Golden Gate where a collision occurred between a hospital ship, the *Benevolence*, and the *Mary Luckenbach*. This particular Navy hospital ship was manned by these so-called civil-service employees and I know for a fact from one of the men who happened to be aboard that ship that a great number of them were not qualified seamen. Perhaps if and when everything is brought to light in the inquiry about this disaster the finger may point to the incompetency of the personnel on that particular ship. It certainly points that way when it is a known fact that most of the lifeboats were crated and lashed and no attempt was even made to get them out. Also, the one lifeboat which was launched was found capsized.

It seems mighty peculiar to me and to other men who have had experience that if it took the ship 20 minutes, as they say it took, before she sank, that each lifeboat was not lowered and all hands put in them. Can you imagine what would have happened at sea in a little bit of rough weather with no help around? A major disaster would have occurred—particularly, if the vessel had been loaded with wounded soldiers.

It is amazing to me that this particular incident has not received the proper attention. You realize, of course, that had it not been for the towboats and small craft around San Francisco, they would have probably lost about three or four hundred people. Is it any wonder that a disaster occurred when the ship went to the bottom with its engine full ahead? How can you expect to keep a watertight bulkhead strong enough to withhold any kind of pressure under those circumstances?

These are some of the facts regarding the sinking of this ship. Knowing your interest in maritime affairs and having had personal experience in your younger days, I thought you would be interested in knowing a little about this. If you desire, I will keep you informed of what develops because we are keeping someone down at the Coast Guard for the specific purpose of finding out what develops during the inquiry.

Aside from that, the fine hand of the MSTS is now injected in the unemployment picture insofar as seamen are concerned. The latest stunt being pulled by the unemployment bureau here in San Francisco is giving the seamen a slip to go down to the crimp hall of the MSTS, to register for a job and are threatened if they don't do this, of having their unemployment benefits cut off. Now, that is a hell of a state of affairs and, in my opinion, against the ruling of the unemployment bureau.

As I understand the law, a man does not have to take a job where his earning power is less than in the one he quit. This is one case where we are going to fight, by the way, so we expect to get that cleared up. If the unemployment bureau can get by with that, we might as well forget about the hiring hall and union conditions, because through this practice it will throw every American seaman in the hands of the fink halls.

As you know, the MSTS does not pay the union scale of wages or provide men with union conditions. I thought you would want to know these things so that when you put pressure on these people, you will know they are only giving lip service and that it is so much window dressing. They are out definitely to take over the merchant marine lock, stock, and barrel, and, of course, are hiding behind the Korean war, stating that for certain reasons they have to handle so many ships themselves, etc.—secret stuff, which is a lot of hooey. If it is secret stuff, how come they hire every Tom, Dick, and Harry to man their ships and how come that the bureaus in Washington, such as the Department of Labor and Department of Commerce, are so intent on screening American seamen, which we have no objection to? How about the screening of these so-called MSTS ships and how about the personnel sailing into Korea in foreign ships, particularly Panamanian ships, which is the dumping ground of every commie on an international scale. That is a laugh.

I thought you ought to know this, inasmuch as you are on a very important and vital committee and also knowing your interest in the American seamen and the American trade-union movement and the union standard of wages and conditions.

If there is any time that you think I can be of any use in any hearings, I will be glad to come back east.

With best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HARRY LUNDEBERG,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Finally, I call upon the House Armed Services Committee and the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to make a thorough investigation of the practices and policies of the military sea transportation service and their impact on the present and long-term national defense requirements for domestic and overseas water transport, national security, and the economy of the maritime industry. I suggest that these investigations be undertaken without delay in view of the serious consequences should the potentially destructive policies now being followed by the MSTS be continued. I further suggest that these committees make recommendations to correct these conditions, and that Congress act on such recommendations at the earliest practicable date.

Enact Excess-Profits Tax Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have signed a petition being circulated among Members of the House which calls for the imposition of an effective excess-profits tax before final adjournment of this Eighty-first Congress.

I do not like to sign a petition for this purpose and such a petition should not be necessary. But there is every evidence that unless some special action is taken there will be no worth-while legislation of this nature.

In view of the enormous profits that are being rolled up by many large corporations, and the additional billions of dollars that are being funneled into war production, I am amazed that President Truman, as well as some congressional leaders, knowing full well the necessity for additional tax revenues, should temporize for one moment on this issue. In all fairness and decency, there can be no reasonable explanation for continued excise taxes on the necessities of life and additional new taxes that fall heavily on the lower brackets of personal income unless excess profits are siphoned off.

The time for action is now—not next year.

Against a Preventive War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended article by Hanson W. Baldwin, the distinguished military expert of the New York Times, in today's issue, summarizes and makes clear the arguments against a preventive war—a policy which I have long contended against and which I believe to be opposed to the best interests of our country. Under leave to extend, I include the following article:

WAR OF PREVENTION—PERILS IN PROPOSED ATTACK ON SOVIET NOW ARE WEIGHED AGAINST ALLEGED ADVANTAGE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Fresh enemy divisions were reported massing on the Korean front yesterday as the Chinese Communists again complained that our aircraft had violated the Manchurian frontier.

Two deductions can be drawn from these facts. The first, which has needed no concentration of divisions to prove it, is that North Korea still has sizable manpower reserves within her frontiers she can utilize, if necessary, to prosecute the war.

Most of these, it is true, may be hastily conscripted and rapidly trained peasants, but they can be leavened by a hard core of veterans—Koreans, other Asiatic races—who fought in the Chinese, Russian, or Japanese Armies.

In other words, although most of North Korea's best trained units, and probably most of the trained fanatical veterans—already have been committed to the fighting front—there is still available considerable manpower from which more enemy divisions can be organized.

For this and other reasons the threatening Chinese Communist troop movements in Manchuria toward the Korean frontier and the complaints and proclamations of the Peiping government can be viewed at the moment as of more political and diplomatic importance than military significance.

LINKED TO OFFENSIVE IN UNITED NATIONS

The Chinese Communists are making troop dispositions that will enable them to intervene militarily in Korea if they wish. But those troop dispositions and the careful ground work of complaints and proclamations about Korea that Peiping has been issuing also serve as important backing for the Chinese Communists' politico-diplomatic offensive in the United Nations, and perhaps even in Moscow.

Chinese Communist military intervention in Korea may well occur, however, particularly when and if most of the available North Korean manpower has been committed, and when and if United States offensive operations threaten a North Korean defeat.

Such intervention is, therefore, a contingency that must be planned for and, if it occurs, met.

There have been some suggestions—unfortunately from responsible quarters—that, if analyzed, really advocate preventive war against the Soviet Union as a means of meeting Chinese Communist military intervention in Korea or as a counter to the start by Soviet satellites of other hot wars elsewhere in the world.

One of these stemmed not long ago from Harold E. Stassen, a member of the loyal opposition. In quite different words and far more blunt phraseology, Secretary of the Navy Francis P. Matthews, who in his brief regime has been noted more for his political loyalty than for his breadth of vision, advocated an attack upon Russia—a war for peace.

The speech by Mr. Matthews, a man always open to suggestion from his superiors, was clearly a trial balloon; the method of launching it was a favorite one of Mr. Matthews' political boss—Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense—who has been selling the same doctrine of the preventive war in private conversations around Washington.

The Matthews deviation from the public and official party line of the Truman administration was superimposed upon Gen. Douglas MacArthur's unilateral declaration of foreign policy about Formosa.

In one sense, perhaps, these outspoken deviations should be welcome as an indication that a democracy will not build any solidly monolithic government structure in which there is no room for difference of opinion.

BASIC TENET SEEN VIOLATED

But it is to be noted that Mr. Matthews represents a military department, and that General MacArthur wears the uniform, and a basic tenet of United States constitutional philosophy is that in foreign policy the military may propose, but the civilian disposes.

In these instances the declarations of prominent officials have had the effect of dividing the country, confusing its foreign friends, and creating mass propaganda material for the Soviet Union. They have tended to put the military in the position of policy makers rather than policy executors. They accentuate the split between State Department and the Pentagon—and between the differing theories of military preparedness. It is, in the words of the old familiar saying—"a hell of a way to run a railroad."

The preventive war theory is a most heinous and dangerous doctrine—all the more so, since it seems to have won many important recruits, in and out of Government, since the Korean fighting started.

It is basically a doctrine of desperation, frustration, and negation. It puts the cart before the horse; military policy takes primacy over foreign policy. It repeats the same grievous and fundamental error we made in World War II by making victory rather than the peace after victory the aim. It sacrifices the ultimate for the immediate and it extols the expedient at the price of morality.

DANGERS OF WAR FOR PEACE

If it were to be applied specifically against the Soviet Union, in case the Chinese Communists intervene in Korea, it would mean at once the loss of western Europe and of other large areas of the world to Russia. For an attack upon Russia by us, caused by an event in the Far East, could not be localized. The Russians could not oppose us merely in the air and in the Far East and ignore our troops in Europe.

The mere fact that we struck Russia first would cut away the moral ground work of the United Nations support, which now exists in Korea. It probably would put us into war with at best confused and unwilling allies at worst, virtually alone. The Russians would sweep into western Europe and politically and psychologically we would deliver Asia to the Communists.

Nor would such a doctrine be bombing in Korea from medium altitudes—around 15,000 or 16,000 feet—optimum altitude for the type of radar bomb sight we now utilize. There has been no air opposition, very little antiaircraft. We are bombing a peninsula and fly only a few miles over enemy soil.

But the military case for a preventive war against the Soviet Union must be based upon the assumption that we can deliver atomic bombs accurately in two or three figures upon targets hundreds or thousands of miles deep in Russia—targets defended by hundreds of Russian fighters and heavy antiaircraft concentrations, that would force us to high altitudes.

The military case for a preventive war is founded upon the hopes of a quick and easy victory, that glittering and unrealistic goal that would be impossible if the Soviet Union dominated western Europe and much of Asia. A preventive war would really mean a long, hard, and vicious struggle, with no holds barred, in which we would lose, by our own action, moral and psychological backing and political support, not only from the world but from our potential friends and allies among the satellites and dissident minorities in the Soviet Union.

There are scores of other reasons—political, economic, psychological, moral, and military—against this attractive fallacy, but they can be summed up thusly: Preventive war is a course of political bankruptcy and moral frustration that would be militarily ineffective and which would lose for the United States the very values we are trying to defend.

Such ideas, no matter whether advanced by the loyal opposition or the party in power, should be scotched, and quickly.

From the Halls of Montezuma to the Shores of Korea—The Marines Can Win if We Give Them a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received correspondence from my constituents in Los Angeles commenting upon the effective use of the United States Marine Corps in combat and suggesting that in recognition of the service rendered the Nation by the Marines throughout our history, the Marine Corps be granted representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff of our Armed Forces.

This is not a new suggestion, and I am sure many Members of Congress have believed that while the Marines are officially a branch of the Navy, they are indeed entitled to some recognition on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Congressman CARL VINSON, Democrat, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, on March 6 of this year introduced a bill, H. R. 7580, which would make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff but without eligibility to be appointed Chairman, and which would continue the Marine Corps as a branch of the Navy.

I received today a letter from the Commander in Chief of our Armed Services, President Harry Truman, in reply to a letter I wrote on the subject of Marine representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff which I think will be of interest to the Members of Congress as well as to my constituents.

My letter to Mr. Truman and Mr. Truman's reply follow:

AUGUST 21, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The United States Marine Corps has again on the battlefields of Korea demonstrated that it is an effective hard-hitting mobile force which can be depended upon to produce results on the battleground.

Over the past 180 years, the Marine Corps time and again have proved that they are invaluable to the defense of America and to fight the aggressors which threaten American security.

In my opinion, the United States Marine Corps is entitled to full recognition as a major branch of the armed services of the United States, and should have its own representative on the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense. I, therefore, sincerely urge that as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces you will grant the Marine Corps representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Very truly yours,
GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 29, 1950.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDONOUGH: I read with a lot of interest your letter in regard to the Marine Corps. For your information the Marine Corps is the Navy's police force and as long as I am President that is what it will remain. They have a propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's.

Nobody desires to belittle the efforts of the Marine Corps but when the Marine Corps goes into the Army it works with and for the Army and that is the way it should be.

I am more than happy to have your expression of interest in this naval military organization. The Chief of Naval Operations is the Chief of Staff of the Navy of which the Marines are a part.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

I must say that the tone of Mr. Truman's reply was somewhat startling to say the least. I personally am much surprised to learn that our Marine Corps has a propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's. And I dare say many marines will be equally astonished. However, if this can be true, I would certainly suggest now that Mr. Truman utilize this "propaganda machine" in the Voice of America program to penetrate behind the iron curtain in Europe and Asia. Mr. Acheson has from all reports not succeeded too well in this undertaking, and perhaps it is time for the marines to land again.

The only propaganda machine I have ever witnessed in the Marine Corps is the propaganda which was spelled out in the charging olive drab lines on Okinawa, at Wake Island, and today on the shores of Korea.

I know that every American citizen is proud of the record of all branches of our Armed Forces. Each one in the last war distinguished itself magnificently. Because of the increased importance of aerial combat and strategic bombing, the Air Force was created as a separate force, an equal partner on the defense team with the Army and the Navy; and today the Marine Corps in view of its achievements in the last war in which marine casualties numbered 88,144 out of a total strength of 650,000 is entitled to some form of representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff along with the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an excellent editorial on the subject of universal military training written by Mr. Robert Ingalls in the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times of August 17, 1950. It would be well worth the while of every Member to read this editorial. It follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The needs of the operation in Korea have brought many domestic questions into sharper focus. One of these is that of universal military training, which the Department of Defense is again discussing. The usefulness of such a system to the Defense Establishment needs little explanation at this point. It can readily be seen that the Korean situation could have been handled more quickly, with less strain and with less loss of life if there had existed the substantially bigger army and the pool of trained reserves that would result.

It is unfair that some of the boys who fought the last war must unwillingly go again. Many of these men already bear scars of battle on their bodies and all have sacrificed time from their otherwise normal lives. There are many new able-bodied men of military age who should be used in their place. However, because of our lack of a military training program, these new men are not trained.

Actually in the event of an all-out conflict all the Reserves and the men in the draft ages would be eligible for service. How much better it would be for the country if all this vast reserve pool of manpower were already trained. Many people who object to the idea of universal military training do not realize they are adding to the danger of the boys' lives. A trained man has a much better chance of survival in combat than one who has had only rudimentary instruction. Combat men used to say that if a new man lived the first few days, his chances from then on out were pretty good. There is only one way to increase his chances—adequate training.

Consider another viewpoint of the individual liable to military service. In the present situation he lives in constant uncertainty, not knowing when he may be called to duty. He may be taken from the middle of his education or his career, and consequently may have to back-track several years when he returns. Under a universal training program, on the other hand, the young man would know that he would enter military service at a predictable date. His educational scheme could be adjusted to it in advance and his career would not be started.

The greatly increased numbers of Reserves would make possible more detailed advance planning by the Military Establishment, so that the reservist would be able to calculate his chances of future service with greater accuracy. With every eligible man in the Reserves, the need in emergencies to call older men with established jobs and families would be greatly lessened.

It has been argued that universal training would be costly. But it could have been operated from the end of World War II until now for no more than the estimated current year's expenditures in Korea alone. If the training program had been in effect these 5 years, perhaps Korea might not have happened.

This column is now and will be in favor of a sound and intelligent universal military training program until such time as the hopes and prayers of the peoples of the world are answered with a permanent worldwide peace.

Hon. Alfred Lee Bulwinkle, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret the passing of my good friend and our beloved colleague Maj. ALFRED LEE BULWINKLE.

Although I had, of course, known the major ever since I became a Member of Congress, it was my happy privilege to become quite closely acquainted with him while we were fellow patients in 1948 at the United States Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md. He and I had rooms immediately opposite each other and our long and close association at the time gave me an opportunity to fully appreciate his fine Christian character. I then more than ever recognized him as a great American, one who was constantly thinking first of his country and the people he represented and last of himself. During his period of hospitalization I also realized that the strain of his arduous labor was having a detrimental effect upon his health. He did not fully recover from his illness but that did not deter him from returning to his duties here in the House. Because of his continued application to his work on behalf of the people he represented from the Eleventh Congressional District of North Carolina, he has given his life as a servant of the people whom he so proudly served.

The Soviet Union and American Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, there are printed herewith two broadcasts by Robert F. Hurleigh, director of news on radio station WGN, Chicago, one made on August 9, the other on August 10, which should be of compelling interest to all Americans. Those broadcasts are as follows:

BROADCAST OF AUGUST 9, 1950

While the Security Council of the United Nations takes a day off from the regular sessions, which have proved exasperatingly futile, we have the opportunity to consider the delaying tactics of the Soviets in another agency of the United Nations and which have had tragic consequences. The news spotlight has not been turned on the sessions of the Economic and Social Council to reveal the stalling tactics and evasions of the Soviets as publicized these past 10 days by reporters covering the Security Council. Just as we now know the Soviet delegate at the Security Council never intends to abide by any moral code, so have we had proof, time and again, that Moscow will never accede to any decision made by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations which will force Russia to abide by the articles of the UN Charter as it affects forced labor. Although the protests have been made that Russia is not living up to the articles of the UN on slave labor—or corrective labor—the general press, with very few notable exceptions, has given little attention to an appalling situation. Much of Soviet Russia's industry is geared to forced labor, and the product of Soviet slave-labor camps is being sold in this country in competition with the free American worker. This invasion of the American market by Russia results in the weakening of our own economy by destroying domestic employment and undermining prosperity, which is necessary to maintain the heavy financial burden we now carry for the world.

This trade with the cold-war enemy continues even as we have indications that the presently "contained" war in Korea may explode in literally a dozen different areas. It is now apparent that certain officials in Washington have seemed more concerned over maintaining the Soviet Government's exports to this country than in being genuinely worried over the damage these exports are doing to American industries. For the past number of years the fur farmers of this country, many of them disabled ex-GI's who were advised by the Veterans' Administration to get into the business of fur farming, have been trying to convince Washington that the importation of furs from the Soviet Union has been detrimental to the country as well as to their industry. In the first place, American fur imports have tripled since the war—and this year, according to the authoritative trade paper, Women's Wear Daily, American participation in the Russian fur sale, in Leningrad have been above last year—and this at a time when the affairs between this country and Soviet Russia have been deteriorating. Close to 100 American fur buyers were able to obtain visas and journey to Leningrad for the big Russian fur sale of last month and it is probable that $50,000,000 will be deposited to the account of the Soviet Union in New York banks in payment for these Russian furs. Moscow has been willing to sell furs on the American market at almost any price in order to obtain the American dollar—and since all the industry in Russia is controlled by state socialism, the government, and not free individuals, fixes the price in competition with the American fur farmers. And the Soviet Union stands accused by no less an authority than the American Federation of Labor as running slave labor camps where millions of individuals are forced to live under conditions intolerable to freemen.

This allegation that human beings are forced into conditions of slavery is perhaps the gravest charge which could come before the United Nations—and the charge has been made, repeatedly, before the economic and social council of the UN. The protest made by the A. F. of L. underlined the fact that no country in the UN could afford to ignore the growing evidence of appalling widespread use of forced labor in the Soviet Union. For enough information has come through the thick veil of Soviet secrecy to confirm that millions—perhaps as many as 15,000,000—are forced in work camps by the Soviets and the product of their effort is being sold on the American market in competition to free American labor. According to the figures of the Department of Commerce, the imports from Soviet Russia last year totaled almost $42,500,000 while our exports to the U. S. S. R. are valued at only $6,646,000. If you wonder what happens to that dollar difference of $35,000,000 in net earnings in Communist imports, you need only to realize the vast expenditures of the Soviet Union for propaganda and espionage, and for lawyers fees to defend Communists. Fur imports alone have accounted for as much as 40 or 50 million in the years since the war and the buyers who are now on their visit to Leningrad for fur buying may be expected to make this year's purchases of Communist furs just as high as ever. The Soviets are cunning enough to make the most of the American woman's penchant for nice things, and the many furs sold in this country as luxuries are conceivably straight from a fur farm in Siberia maintained by Soviet slave labor. Thus the United States has been unable to bring about any corrections of forced labor through the United Nations, even though the A. F. of L. has made comprehensive surveys of slave labor in the Soviet Union and has demanded that the other nations compel Moscow to live up to the Charter of the UN.

And second, the American fur farmer, including those disabled GIs who went into fur farming on the advice of the Veterans' Administration, find it impossible to compete with the government-controlled forced labor of Russia, and third, the excess American dollars which Soviet Russia obtains are important in financing the subversive activities of Communists in this country. The American people are entitled to know that Communist activities and Soviet slave labor is being supported by the dollars paid for these Russian exports. And the Washington officials responsible cannot claim ignorance of the situation, for the protests have been made in Congress and to the responsible Government departments. The laws of this country, by the way, are emphatic in prohibiting the importation of goods produced by slave or forced labor. Evidence in the hands of the American Federation of Labor—and evidence which has been presented before the economic and social council of the United Nations proves conclusively that slave labor camps are a most important part of the economy of Soviet Russia. The procrastination on the part of Washington officials is certainly part and parcel of the program of those who have fashioned policy during the past number of years which would be favorable to the Soviet Union, even if at the expense of the United States.

That's the top of the news as it looks from here.

BROADCAST OF AUGUST 10, 1950

While the Soviet Union has now made it abundantly clear that it never has had any intention of trying to live within the charter of the United Nations, it is surprising how many people have not understood that the tactics now employed by Mr. Jacob Malik in the Security Council are simply an amplification of the Soviet strategy which has been effective ever since the Russians pressed for the veto when the UN was formed in 1945. Communist and pro-Communist apologists—aided in many instances by officials of our Government who have given them stature and protection—these Communists and pro-Communists have been able to fool many Americans into believing that the United Nations was—or would—accomplish much more than has been accomplished in the past 5 years. The publicists for the United Nations, with millions available for publicity purposes, have been able to advertise the United Nations in a manner that causes the unsuspecting and uninformed to believe that great progress has been made by the UN. But in very few instances—and certainly in no major crisis—has the United Nations been able to make a single decision which might conceivably offend the Soviet Union. What is taking place in the United Nations Security Council is no accident, but is a part of a well-planned program by the men of the Kremlin to implement the Communist program which has the defeat of the United States as its prime objective.

We set forth certain facts last evening which is evidence of the Soviet attempt to

hamstring the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in much the same manner as Jacob Malik is delaying action in the Security Council. The issue, of course, is greater and emotions are higher. But the fact remains that evidence has been available for months which proves the Communist aims as aggressive and pointed toward the wrecking of the United States. One of the best methods Russia has to injure the economy of the United States—to hasten the day of demoralizing depression—one of the methods has been the use of forced labor to produce goods which is sold on the American market to compete with free American labor. Although we have laws to protect American labor and business from precisely this evil, every attempt has been made, and we know of many complaints which have been made by business and labor, every attempt to have the administration or the UN take action has been met with the procrastination and evasion. It is a known fact, and admitted by some Soviet officials, that Russia maintains slave-labor camps, where political prisoners and others who have lost favor with the Communists are forced into every conceivable line of work. Estimates of the number of men and women in these forced labor camps varies from ten to fifteen million. These human beings produce for Soviet Russia and the goods are sold in this country in direct defiance of established laws. Since the government's production cost is nil the Russian export of goods made by this forced labor affords the Kremlin the dollar advantage desired, as well as the furthering the Communist program of bleeding the United States industries and labor. To understand the thinking of officials in our Commerce Department, you need only to look back into the record to see where the chief of the Russian unit in the Commerce Department—Mr. E. C. Ropes testified before a congressional committee concerning the importation of Russian furs shortly after his return from an official visit to Russia in 1947. The subcommittee chairman, Congressman REID MURRAY, of Wisconsin, asked Mr. Ropes if he had been in Russia trying to scare up trade. Mr. Ropes replies that he was in Russia trying to buy—not to sell—and actually said that the United States had nothing to sell Russia.

Mr. Ropes, of the Commerce Department, then eulogized the Communists he met in Russia, saying that he had a very favorable reception and that it was only a question of time before they would be selling as much as they could of what we need in order to buy what they need, and then some. The Commerce Department—and the State Department, too—has never seemed too concerned over the evidence which has been available for years as to forced labor in Soviet Russia competing against American industries which employ free American labor—at least not concerned enough to force a show-down on the issue. The chairman of subcommittee hearing the Commerce Department official felt compelled to refer to his trip to Russia as the second mission to Moscow. Another indication of the administration's evasiveness in dealing with the problem of imports from Russia can be found in the argument offered by officials of the State, Treasury, and Commerce Departments that Soviet fur imports, which make up more than 50 percent of the total Russian goods sold in this country, should continue to be sold because the United States was securing large amounts of manganese from Russia, which might be cut off if the United States would take any action. But in checking later, it was found that Russia has already discontinued her shipments of manganese to the United States. It was evident that the excuses given by the State Department could not be verified—yet the intolerable situation continues even today—for as we pointed out in yesterday's broadcast that the buying of Soviet furs this year will probably be increased over last year. It seems so useless to spend billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in Marshall plan aid and ECA funds to combat communism while we supply Russia with the necessary dollars to finance her organized Communist programs in this country.

Yet, as we have pointed out, the Commerce Department officials and the State Department officials have been very evasive, and have so far avoided taking any action either through our own governmental channels, or through the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. As a matter of fact, the Soviet delegate to the UN Economic and Social Council has been able to hamstring that agency of the world organization this month. Even as Mr. Malik has been doing ever since he took over the Security Council. There is one other most important point. The Russian furs are sold to American fur buyers who went to Leningrad last month to make their purchases—and the Soviet Union, through its controlled economy, sells at a price which undermines the American market because it also controls its labor, and has millions in forced labor. The furs are fashioned in this country by the Fur Workers Union. You might wonder how an American union worker would feel about fashioning furs which conceivably have been farm grown and handled by slave labor. But the Fur Workers Union in this country is Communist infiltrated and Communist dominated. The head of the Fur Workers Union is a Communist. His name is Ben Gold. And the current issue of the Fur Workers paper carries Communist Ben Gold's most recent bold display of impudence. Communist Ben Gold has a page of the paper to insult the American intelligence and to parrot the Communist Party line. That's the top of the news as it looks from here.

AMA's $1,110,000 Ad Program Set for October

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association has turned over $1,110,000 to their high-priced advertising hucksters to buy up newspaper, radio, and other publicity media during the month of October, for one purpose: to kill every legislative measure to advance the Nation's health, safety, and security. Boasting of their projected plans to reach 150,000,000 Americans through newspaper advertising alone, the AMA expects to fortify its campaign by promoting tie-ins which should bring in another $19,000,000 to bolster their barrage of misrepresentation of any health legislation. Their so-called message of freedom will be broadcast at the cost of $300,000 worth of radio time, plus more tie-ins; they have told their advertising agency to spend $250,000 on magazine space. Organized medicine's program of destruction is quoted below from Editor and Publisher, August 26:

AMA'S $1,110,000 AD PROGRAM SET FOR OCTOBER

(By George A. Brandenburg)

CHICAGO.—Advertising's heavy artillery at the national and local level will boom out messages to reaffirm and solidify public faith in American enterprise through endorsement of voluntary health insurance and opposition to state socialism, according to plans announced this week by the American Medical Association.

During 2 weeks in October, the AMA Message of Freedom, together with thousands of tie-in ads, will reach 150,000,000 Americans through the greatest number of newspaper, magazine, and radio ads ever devoted to a single theme.

NEWSPAPERS HEAD LIST

Newspapers will carry the heavy load of AMA and tie-in advertising, with copy scheduled to run during the week of October 8. It was announced by Clem Whitaker and Leone Baxter, delegated to coordinate AMA's national education campaign.

The advertising budget approved by the AMA board of trustees totals $1,110,000, of which $560,000 has been allocated to newspapers, $300,000 to radio, and $250,000 to national magazines. Approximately 144,500 individual doctors, in every community in America, will share the cost of this advertising program through their dues payments to AMA.

"This, without doubt, is the broadest-coverage newspaper advertisement of the year, judged from the standpoint of the number of newspapers included in the schedule," declared Whitaker & Baxter, the husband-and-wife public relations counselors who have prepared the advertising ammunition for this mass appeal.

ELEVEN THOUSAND NEWSPAPERS SCHEDULED

The AMA's schedule will run in approximately 11,000 newspapers, including every bone-fide daily and weekly paper in the 48 States, District of Columbia, and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

Every newspaper on the schedule will receive an insertion order early in September from Lockwood-Shackelford Co., Chicago advertising agency, selected to handle this business for a 70-inch—5 columns by 14 inches—black and white display ad. Full-page ads are also scheduled in Sunday newspaper supplements and national magazines. Sunday magazines are in addition to all dailies and weeklies.

AMA copy will likewise appear in business, professional trade publications 30 days ahead of general schedule to develop tie-in advertising support from allied organizations, business, and industry.

During the second and third weeks of October more than 1,000 radio stations will broadcast spot announcements, covering every State, Hawaii, and Alaska. In addition, 30 national magazines will carry full-page message concurrently.

The AMA advertising schedule is as follows:

Weekly newspapers: The week of October 8.

Daily newspapers: October 11.

Sunday newspaper supplements: October 15.

National magazines: The week of October 8 for weeklies; the November issues of monthlies, distributed in October.

Radio: Second and third weeks of October.

Sunday newspaper supplements will include American Weekly, This Week, Parade and 28 independent Sunday magazine sections, representing an estimated total circulation of over 38,000,000.

SEEK TERRIFIC IMPACT

Commenting on AMA's blanket-coverage policy, Mr. Whitaker told Editor and Publisher: "We want the terrific impact of all media hitting at once. This is a 'grass roots' advertising campaign, directed to all the people of America, whether they live in great cities, small towns, or villages, or on farms.

"Wherever there is a newspaper, there are doctors—and doctors' patients. The AMA advertising program is designed to blanket

every area of medical practice. Consequently, the schedule calls for the use of advertising space in all the newspapers of America. There will be some duplication of circulation, but the added impact of that duplication is desired, so that medicine's story can be hammered home by repetition."

Newspapers will have ample tie-in possibilities, he pointed out. The Whitaker-Baxter team has prepared an advertising kit which will reach newspapers about September 1, outlining in detail 20 or more profitable tie-in promotions at the local level. These include drug stores, all types of merchants and businessmen, manufacturers, insurance companies and agencies, local health plans and hospitals.

BLUE CROSS TO COOPERATE

Local Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans will be provided with material which they can use as a part of their own institutional promotion campaigns to coincide with AMA's advertising program, Lawrence C. Wells, public relations director of Blue Cross and Blue Shield Commissions told E. and P.

These groups will advertise in newspapers, he said, to exploit Blue Cross and Blue Shield prepaid insurance programs from a "brand name" standpoint.

Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans will receive suggested newspaper ads in various sizes, including mats for larger ads up to half-page size.

In addition to specific suggested tie-ins from local business firms of all types, the AMA kit also includes a full-page "freedom roll call" layout that will permit individuals, or their organizations, to be identified with the program.

In order that national advertisers may avail themselves of the opportunity to tie in with the campaign, letters, signed by Dr. Elmer L. Henderson, AMA president, and Dr. Louis H. Bauer, chairman of the AMA board of trustees, are going out this month to the presidents of 25,000 big firms, telling of the campaign's objectives, and why their respective firms should participate.

HAVE NRDGA SUPPORT

Another letter is going to the 7,000 members of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, urging retailers to join in the program at the local level. Whitaker and Baxter also indicated they expect cooperation from unrelated groups, such as the railroads and power companies.

To develop tie-in advertising support from allied organizations and business generally, special AMA copy will be used early in September in business, medical, drug, advertising, and publishing publications. The latter will include Editor and Publisher, Publishers' Auxiliary, American Press, National Publisher, Publishers' Tab, and all State press association publications in United States.

Our Domestic Mineral Resources Should Be Used

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the present grave international situation calls for governmental action in the development of our vast, potential mineral resources in Colorado and the West. The Korean conflict points this up. Our Nation must be self-sufficient. If our supply of strategic materials is cut off, like our supply of rubber was during the last war, the safety of the Nation is jeopardized.

The attitude of the Government toward the development of our basic mineral resources in the past is disgraceful. Instead of helping, it has turned its back on the rich resources lying in the mountains and ground across the country. While discouraging domestic mining development, ultimately closing and ruining many of our mines, on the other hand, it has poured billions into foreign countries for the opening of new mines and industrial activity in direct competition to ours. For example, on August 24 it was reported that the Government was planning a loan of $35,000,000 for mining manganese in Brazil.

I have consistently fought this stupid policy and have urged a progressive domestic program for mining and conserving our natural resources. Last fall I backed a bill to encourage tin mining in the United States, but to no avail. Later when we asked for an appropriation to keep our mines going and to stockpile strategic materials, what happened. The bill was defeated but another appropriation was approved sending millions to Africa and South America for mining projects.

There are approximately 350 useful minerals in Colorado, including molybdenum, essential to industrial and war purposes.

For instance, approximately 75 percent of the world's supply of molybdenum is produced in my State. Is it not imperative that this production be encouraged and protected then?

Tungsten, uranium, vanadium, tin, and fluorospar are other important metals mined in Colorado. They are all essential to the manufacturing of electrical equipment, tools and dies, and aircraft production. Without these minerals no modern nation can survive. Colorado produces 88 percent of the supply of vanadium.

Reliable sources say Colorado has sufficient coal stored in the ground to supply world demands for hundreds of years. An excellent grade of oil can be made from coal shale. Should not our Nation be developing this rich resource? War machinery rolls on oil. Domestic and industrial uses for all are steadily increasing.

Reports say that about $3,000,000,000 worth of precious and industrial metals have been taken from the Rocky Mountains since the gold rush of 1859. There is as much or more still there which can be removed and used. This will mean jobs, an expanding economy, and security for us, if the Government will lend a hand. Today's emergency and common sense call for action in utilizing our mineral resources for the good of the country.

The Truth About Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of the threat of world war III demands that the people of the United States be told the truth about Korea. With the facts, they can force our leaders to adopt corrective measures to prevent future mistakes that might inevitably lead to a world war.

No one should, for political purposes, distort the truth in pinning the blame for our unwise far-eastern policies. We must face the facts. Then we can go about the tough business of strengthening our military effort and save unnecessary loss of blood and treasure in winning the battle for peace.

Despite reports of the Democratic congressional committee the truth is that our military assistance to Korea prior to June 25, 1950, totalled only $57,000,000. This is the official record, according to House Report No. 2495, issued July 11, 1950, under the sponsorship of Representative JOHN KEE, Democrat, of West Virginia, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Of this $57,000,000, the facts are that $56,000,000 was small arms and equipment of constabulary nature left behind by American forces when they were withdrawn from South Korea in 1949. Is it any wonder our boys were fighting powerful Russian tanks with rifles when the Communists invaded below the thirty-eighth parallel? This withdrawal was protested by Republican members of the committee in an official document issued July 26, 1949, as occurring "at the very instant when logic and common sense both demand no retreat from the realities of the situation."

The Democratic congressional committee attempts to argue that the so-called Korean Aid Bill which was rejected by the House January 19, 1950, then passed after revision by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on February 9, 1950, is a measurement of the congressional attitude toward blocking Soviet expansion in Asia.

Let us look at the record. The Republicans for 5 long years have been in total and complete opposition to the policy laid down by the Truman administration appeasing Russia in Asia which resulted in the fall of Manchuria, China, and North Korea without a battle. This appeasement policy dates from the Yalta conference, where Alger Hiss was a State Department adviser, in February 1945, and it continued until June 27, 1950, when Truman reversed the American position. Under this policy, President Truman on December 15, 1945, told China that unless Communists were admitted to the Chinese Government, the United States would supply no further aid.

The administration abandoned Asia to the Russian wolves on January 12, 1950. Secretary of State Acheson declared then that our "defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus," in other words, telling the world we would not intervene to halt Communist aggression in China, Formosa, or Korea, all lying above that perimeter.

One week after Acheson's statement, on January 19, 1950, a majority of the House Republicans joined 61 Democrats in rejecting the so-called Korean-aid bill which contained only economic assistance, warning the administration

that without military aid to Korea and appropriate assistance to other critical areas in Asia, the proposed $150,000,000 in economic aid would not only be useless but would be a prize dangled before the Communist aggressors.

In opposing the appeasement of communism in Asia, the Republicans, both in and out of Congress, protested the policy, which, in the words of Owen Lattimore who helped shape it, provided, not military assistance, but economic assistance so that China and Korea would be allowed "to fall without making it look as if the United States had pushed them."

The people also should know that the Democratic-controlled Eighty-first Congress and the Democratic-controlled House Foreign Affairs Committee approved the so-called Korean-aid bill on July 26, 1949, and the House Rules Committee, also Democratic-controlled, approved it September 27, but it was not called up for House action during the remaining months of the first session. Is it not obvious that the Administration was insincere in wanting to help Korea?

None of the economic assistance voted to South Korea in February of this year had been supplied when she was attacked 4 months later. Of the $10,500,000 made available for military aid last October, only $200 in signal corps wire had reached the Korean forces when the boom fell June 25, 8 months later.

There is the record. Our Government bowed to communism in Asia and deserted helpless South Korea, which our State Department had set up as an independent state after the war.

We must have a foreign policy for the future, not only to "save face" in the Far East, but to show our friends that we are sincerely striving to protect the world and free peoples from aggression and totalitarianism.

Subversive Activities Control and Communist Registration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the measure before us today is as much of a defense measure as any bill we have ever passed to increase the size of our Armed Forces or for appropriations for armament. For years the Members of this House who have seen the insiduous danger of the cancerous Communist ideology creeping through our country have asked the Congress for legislation which would arrest it. Three years ago the House passed such legislation, but it took the impact of a war to bring its need into bold relief. We have sent billions of dollars to Europe to contain communism, and have failed to contain it within our own shores. That is what this legislation is designed to do.

It is no longer 5 minutes of 12. Already the first gong of the hour is being struck in Korea. The danger from an alien-directed force designed to wreck the freedom and liberty we were born to defend is clear and present. I, personally, could not face the sturdy Americans I have the honor to represent if I did not support this bill wholeheartedly.

Let's Save Our Country—John 3: 16 to 21

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Dear Mr. JENSEN: I very much appreciated your nice letter of information a few months ago and the speech enclosures which were to the point.

Very much is my desire to get the enclosed missle as far as it can possibly go. Do I need make another copy and address elsewhere? I trust you will let me know.

Very sincerely,
Mrs. ETHEL IRWIN,
Sidney, Iowa.

TO OUR CONGRESSMAN—MR. JENSEN:

We, as a group of church ladies, professing and believing on the Lord Jesus, the Christ, and the power of His might, send you these lines in His name:

We and our families as life-long residents of this great America feel that we have a right to a better introduction into the great intricate powers of our Government.

Our wonderful country was first settled by those who came a long way for the privilege of the freedom to worship God. If anything is to succeed, it must go ahead. It must progress. It must grow in goodness.

In the estimation of the peoples, where does the one stand who is giver of all?

Ours is the only land which has as its motto: "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Also "that it shall not perish from the earth."

We desire a report on the spending of the millions of dollars that our Government asked for and received in the past 5 years. We realize it takes lots of money to maintain a government, but these unsurmountable amounts?

Every time a crisis arises in some distant land, our boys are sent to face a cruel death. The torture they undergo while on duty, other unknown tortures they receive, the many deaths, and the great number who are sent back to hospitals and other institutions, the endless grief of their loved ones who also must help bear the heavy burden of taxation they must pay to help pay for the essence which robbed the loved ones of their health or life. These healthy boys have a right to life and liberty.

We stand for the right, but did not raise our sons to go to war year after year. They dare not evade the draft call, yet Communist bands are allowed to formulate and carry on in our own county. These and other forms of underhand functioning all around us—watching, learning, and in a few hours carry our great Nation's standing to jealous and war-loving nations.

Where does our money go? What does the Dible say about those with greed as their goal?

On entering office are not anyone and everyone under oath? Do they not vow—under God—"I shall carry on * * * best interests of my country's Government * * *."

Something is wrong. At this rate we will not have a country of freedom very long.

Every form of amusement is patronized to the utmost. Why is it that every Sunday morning finds the greatest number of people at any place but at the church house? Going backward?

A great spiritual awakening is our country's call. Our earnest prayer is that such will invade every hall of our Nation's Capital and that each of us and each one we have elected to our Government force will deeply feel the strength to be gained thereby. Certain officials have the privilege of talking directly to all nations. Encourage this in every address in Congress—every speaker, and pass it on to all nations. Let us save our country. John 3:16–21.

Please, may we hear from you?

CHURCH LADIES OF CHURCH OF CHRIST,
Sidney, Iowa.

Prepared and written by Mrs. Ethel Irwin, Sidney, Iowa.

(Enclosed is a list of ladies' signatures present today and wishing to approve this article:)

Mrs. James H. Brownfield, box 174, Sidney, Iowa; Mrs. Wm. R. Hipson, Sidney, Iowa, box 22; Mrs. M. E. Cannon, Sidney, Iowa; Mrs. Virgil L. Swope, box 74, Sidney, Iowa; Mrs. Cliff James, box 1, Sidney, Iowa; Mrs. W. A. Serimsher, Thurman, Iowa; Mrs. Roy Cannon, Sidney, Iowa; Mrs. Ross Barbour, Sidney, Iowa; Mrs. Vera Taylor, Sidney, Iowa; Miss Lucille Gardner, Sidney, Iowa; Miss Velma Irwin, Iowa; Grace Beedle, Thurman, Iowa.

General Appropriation Act, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., August 30, 1950.

Hon. FREDERICK J. LAWTON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DIRECTOR: The General Appropriation Act for 1951 includes section 1214, which reads:

"Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations, and reauthorizations made by this act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than $550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in section 1211 of this act."

Under the provisions of this section it will be necessary for you, as the official empowered to make apportionments under subsection (d) of section 3679, as amended, to place in reserve and withhold from expenditure not less than $550,000,000 of the amounts provided in the general appropriation bill. In view of the fact that there has been some discussion as to how this reduction would be applied to the various items in the budget it occurs to me that I should call your attention to a few of the considerations in the legislative history of

the act for your guidance in making the fund reserves contemplated.

You will recall that an amendment was offered on the floor of the House by Mr. THOMAS, of Texas, requiring the President to impound $500,000,000 of funds appropriated in the bill with certain restrictions as to the amount by which single items might be reduced and also exempting items related to the national defense. As a substitute Mr. TABER, of New York, offered an amendment to make reductions totaling $600,000,000 and proceeding to specify percentage reductions in the standard budget classifications such as personal services, travel, etc. The proposal of Mr. TABER applied to every item in the budget but specifically reduced those amounts chargeable to budget classifications 1 to 9, inclusive.

Also the House adopted the so-called Jensen amendment which would have frozen 90 percent of the vacancies occurring in Federal employment during the fiscal year excepting certain exempted categories such as law-enforcement officers, hospital personnel, and so forth.

During the consideration of the bill in the Senate the Taber-Thomas and Jensen amendments were stricken from the bill and there was substituted therefor the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment (Senate amendment No. 508) which reduced by 10 percent all appropriations in the bill except certain specified items.

The conference between the Houses was confronted with the Taber-Thomas, Jensen and Byrd-Bridges amendments, all of which were subject to inclusion, in either original or revised form, in the bill or exclusion from the bill by the conferees. After considerable discussion the conferees determined upon the language which now appears in section 1214 of the appropriation act.

I recite all this rather obvious and well-known history for the purpose of demonstrating that it is the clear intent of the Congress that the reduction imposed by section 1214 is intended to apply generally to the items in the Act. Any other interpretation would not be supported by the facts. The specific phraseology of the statute is that reduction shall be accomplished "without impairing national defense." That phrase does not necessarily mean that all items appearing in the national defense chapter of the budget are untouchable. It does mean that any item in either the national defense chapter or any other chapter of the bill which is related to the national defense shall not be reduced to the point where such reduction would impair national defense and, further, that any item in either the national defense or other chapters of the bill which can be reduced must be reduced. Every effort that has been made during the consideration of the bill in both the House and the Senate and in conference has been to obtain general reduction in the nondefense portions of the budget.

Opponents of the theory of section 1214 have stated—and I do not agree with their reasoning—that the Director of the Budget has been granted plenary powers to impose reductions wherever he may please and, in so doing, thwart the will of Congress. The Director of the Budget in discharging his responsibilities under the law is restricted in several ways. He is restricted by the law in two specific provisions. In the first place he is required by section 3679, as amended, to apportion funds in such a manner as to avoid deficiency or supplemental appropriations except in those special cases meeting the tests of other provisions of the law and therefore beyond his control. Secondly, he is required to so apportion the funds as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. He is also very pointedly restricted by the force of circumstances surrounding the adoption of section 1214. It seems obvious that he must give consideration to a general revision of the nondefense portions of the budget. To fail to do so would result in failure to recognize the clear intent of Congress in enacting the legislation as every proposal for a general reduction in the budget applied across the board to every item. The only difference between section 1214 and the Taber-Thomas and Byrd-Bridges and Jensen amendments is to leave to the Director of the Budget a degree of discretion in applying the reduction so as adequately to maintain essential services of the Government. It has also been stated that the Director of the Budget can defeat the purpose of the law by deferring meeting obligations until a later date or by paper savings such as postponement of essential items which will not affect the actual expenditure of funds. To accomplish the reduction in such manner would be such an obvious violation of the spirit of the statute that no responsible official would think of it. I mention it here only because the possibility has been suggested and I want to make it clear that while technically such action might be possible it is entirely without the realm of reason when the legislative history of the law is considered.

There is an important part of the language in section 1214 which has been obscured in the publicity regarding it. The section has been generally stated to be a reduction of $550,000,000 whereas the reduction reads "not less than $550,000,000." I want to particularly call your attention to this phraseology and to point out to you that this wording places the burden on the Director of the Budget to impose reductions above and beyond $550,000,000 to such a degree as is possible without impairing national defense. The clear intent of the section is to secure as large a reduction as possible in nondefense activities and $550,000,000 is only a minimum figure. In view of the radical change in conditions since the original budget was prepared there is no alternative.

In order that the committee may be fully advised in the matter I shall appreciate it if you will send me a report showing the reserves established.

I have known you personally for a number of years and I know your personal integrity and devotion to duty so well that I realize the lack of necessity of writing this letter to you but I thought it well to record the legislative history and atmosphere surrounding the item in order that there may be no misunderstanding in the future.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

Letter From Irwin Koropas, of Grand Rapids, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, I received a letter from a constituent which expressed a point of view that all of us might well pursue in the critical months ahead. The future security of our country is vastly more important than partisanship and I have assured Mr. Koropas that it is my intention to refrain from criticism that can be construed to be on the political level. However, at the same time I strongly believe it important to examine the records of the past and point out our previous errors so that the same mistakes will not reoccur hereafter. For the information of the Members, Mr. Koropas' letter follows:

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
August 26, 1950.

Representative FORD:

First of all let us understand each other—I did not vote for you, for I happen to be a Democrat as far as my political views are concerned, but right now I am burning.

Burning because it does not seem possible, that we have both Democrats and Republicans in Congress who think more of their own political ambitions, selfishness, and greed, over the welfare of our country.

I, as a Navy veteran, think it is downright rotten and think it is about time both the Democrats and Republicans got off their proverbial high horse and got down to the serious business of preserving our great country. I love this country, fought for it, and hope to live in it a few more years until our good Lord feels I have served his purpose and calls me.

No, I am not a religious fanatic, but honestly believe in God and feel that He is doing everything in His power to wake us up to the dangers of communism.

Strange, we always have to learn the hard way, through tears, blood, and sweat, but I think it will be ever thus until we think more of our fellowmen, instead of our own personal gain, political ambitions, selfishness, and greed.

Please read this to Congress if you got the guts, which I think you have.

Sincerely,

IRWIN KOROPAS,
Grand Rapids, Mich.

Petition Calling for Reimposition of the Excess-Profits Tax Before Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, since the outbreak of the Korean crisis I have urged the immediate reimposition of the excess-profits tax which was suspended at the end of World War II. I have made a number of statesments to this body on the economic, fiscal, and moral justification for an excess-profits tax on the tremendous profits realized by corporations since the outbreak of hostilities.

Two days ago I announced that I had drawn up a petition for the reimposition of the excess-profits tax before adjournment. I have been most gratified by the spontaneous reaction of the Members of this body to this petition. I appeal to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. DOUGHTON, and to his outstanding committee, to take under immediate consideration the need for an excess-profits tax now.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this time a copy of the petition which I drew up 2 days ago and the names of the 101 Members who have signed this petition:

We, the undersigned, are unwilling to adjourn until action is taken to reimpose the excess profits tax which was suspended in 1945. The excess profits tax should be applicable to income earned after July 1, 1950.

It should be imposed now for it is now that men are dying on the battlefield; it is now that expenditures for war are being accelerated; it is now that inflationary price increases are reducing the buying power of the dollar; and it is now that unprecedented corporate profits are being realized. To wait until next year would forever relieve these excessive profits accumulated during the last half of calendar 1950 from proper taxation.

The excess profits tax should be imposed now to help prevent inflation and to help pay for the war as we go. We cannot ask the workingman to pay more taxes, to have his real income further diminished by inflation and to refrain from requests for increased wages as long as corporate profits are not curbed by excess profits taxation. Furthermore, the pending tax bill, falling heavily on small and moderate-sized personal incomes, is pitifully inadequate to meet the needs of the day.

We are confident that a workable excess profits tax can be enacted at this time. The technical difficulties of reimposing the excess profits tax now are infinitesimal compared with the difficulties of moving men and material to the battle lines in Korea.

WALTER B. HUBER, Ohio; JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado; CHARLES B. DEANE, North Carolina; HUGO S. SIMS, Jr., South CAROLINA; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, New York; CLARE MAGEE, Missouri; TOM STEED, Oklahoma; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio; JOHN R. MURDOCK, Arizona; CARL ELLIOTT, Alabama; ROBERT L. RAMSAY, West Virginia; CLAIR ENGLE, California; JOHN E. MILES, New Mexico; JOHN J. ROONEY, New York; H. R. GROSS, Iowa; HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; FRANK M. KARSTEN, Missouri; ROBERT T. SECREST, Ohio; HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, California; JOHN F. SHELLEY, California; PETER F. MACK, Jr., Illinois; W. K. GRANGER, Utah; HUGH B. MITCHELL, Washington; EDWARD BREEN, Ohio; MELVIN PRICE, Illinois; CLEMENT, J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin; THOMAS S. GORDON, Illinois; THOMAS H. BURKE, Ohio; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana; FRANCK R. HAVENNER, California; JAMES G. POLK, Ohio; HARRY J. DAVENPORT, Pennsylvania; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland; CHARLES R. HOWELL, New Jersey; REVA BECK BOSONE, Utah; CHESTER A. CHESNEY, Illinois; MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Ohio; CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, West Virginia; JOHN MCSWEENEY, Ohio; GEORGE M. RHODES, Pennsylvania; ANTHONY CAVALCANTE, Pennsylvania; THURMOND C. CROOK, Indiana; COMPTON I. WHITE, Idaho; ISIDORE DOLLINGER, New York; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; EDNA F. KELLY, New York; JACOB J. JAVITS, New York; EDWARD J. HART, New Jersey; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Pennsylvania; EARL CHUDOFF, Pennsylvania; LOUIS B. HELLER, New York; WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; CECIL R. KING, California; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota; GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, Missouri; CHESTER C. GORSKI, New York; A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Missouri; RAYMOND W. KARST, Missouri; BARRATT O'HARA, Illinois; FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota; MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri; PHIL J. WELCH, Missouri; LEONARD IRVING, Missouri; CHARLES E. BENNETT, Florida; CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma; ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, Wisconsin; RAY J. MADDEN, Indiana; JAMES V. BUCKLEY, Illinois; ANDREW JACOBS, Indiana; EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, Nebraska; JOHN C. DAVIES, New York; JOHN KEE, West Virginia; CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Connecticut; FRANK BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania; EARL T. WAGNER, Ohio; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey; PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey; MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana; CECIL F. WHITE, California; HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia; HAROLD A. PATTEN, Arizona; FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts; WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado; HARRY P. O'NEILL, Pennsylvania; M. G. BURNSIDE, West Virginia; JOHN R. WALSH, Indiana; JAMES E. NOLAND, Indiana; RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri; JOHN B. SULLIVAN, Missouri; WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Illinois; E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia; EDWARD H. KRUSE, Jr., Indiana; WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Oklahoma; USHER L. BURDICK, North Dakota; JAMES W. TRIMBLE, Arkansas; CLYDE DOYLE, California.

Communist Rule in Shanghai and Tientsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Abe Schnee, of New York, along with the enclosure he mentions in his letter. I agree with Mr. Schnee that the letter to Lester Shingle should be read by many people.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I thought you would be interested to read the letter attached, copies of which I am sending also to some of your fellow Members.

A. C. SCHNEE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 28, 1950.*

DEAR KIWANIAN: When I read a copy of the attached letter, the realization of what can happen to people under a communistic form of government was so shocking that I felt every person should read it, especially my fellow Kiwanians.

I have had a reprint of the letter made and I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy. I know that I need not tell you we must all do whatever we can individually and as a unit to destroy the communistic threat to our free and democratic existence without which life would not be worth while.

Sincerely,

"ABE" SCHNEE.

TRINITY WORKS,
Manchester, July 25, 1950

Mr. LESTER SHINGLE,
The Shingle Leather Co.,
Camden, N. J.

DEAR MR. LESTER SHINGLE: Yesterday I spent an hour here with an old friend of this company, who represented our interests in the Far East for many years.

He has just returned to England after 2 years' experience of Communist rule in Shanghai and Tientsin.

His story was so cold-bloodedly enthralling and his comments on Korea of sufficient interest that I think you would like to hear the gist of it all.

George Beswick is a typical old school tie Englishman now in his late fifties who has spent 35 years of his life in the Far East, who now finds himself back in England with a life's work confiscated or destroyed looking for a new start. What he had to tell me and his answers to my questions were expressed in the matter of fact way with marked understatement that is typical of his type.

When Communist Chinese soldiery entered into Shanghai they took over the city with orderly discipline that was beyond reproach. Their attitude to everybody was one of cold, formal courtesy. There was no pilferage, no unseemliness, nothing but an awe-inspiring cold efficiency. In so much that for a week or so of wishful thinking European and American business interests in Shanghai thought there was a possibility of trade revival.

During his 18 months he never saw any Russian soldiers except odd parties bent entirely on technical duties.

Within a month, however, thousands of civilian-clad Russian bureaucrats quietly and with ruthless efficiency took command of the life of the city, commerce, and personal freedom.

Every man received his instructions, was told what he could do when and where. There was no appeal, nothing but cold impersonal refusal to discuss anything outside the limits of the directive the state official was enforcing.

The control was so detailed that it was necessary for a citizen to go to any post office and find out which film he was permitted to see, which theaters were open, which places of entertainment he could use.

All children over 4 years of age were directed through their parents to certain schools and within a year the corroding infiltration of Communist doctrine was so instilled into the minds of these young people that they were foreign to their parents.

You can imagine what all this has meant to the highly developed individualism of a freedom-loving Chinaman, who as Beswick repeated, are still dazed under the influence that has settled upon them.

To quote Beswick further, "the gift of speech was no longer necessary. It was sufficient to be able to read and obey without question. There was no one to question and it was most unwise to try and find anybody."

Europeans and American citizens were just ignored at first. Later on their personal bank balances were frozen and they were compelled to make a statement of all their personal property.

Within a few days they were advised of the amount of taxation they had to pay within 3 days. If this was not paid within 3 days—and how could it be with their bank accounts frozen except for a very meager weekly drawing for living expenses—the amount of tax was doubled. At the end of 6 days it was doubled again and so on until the amount of tax was more than the value of the property when it was seized for debt.

It was decided that the use of a motorcar was a dangerous thing in the hands of an ordinary citizen, but there was no seizure. The price of petrol was lifted overnight to a prohibitive figure and simultaneously a car tax imposed equivalent to $50 of your money per week. No further action was necessary.

You will agree with me that the matter of fact statements of such men as Beswick should be widely circulated. As he concluded on this subject, "for 18 months I have been governed by the most evil, insidious and horrible things that man has ever devised with which to punish himself."

Korea came as a great surprise to him. Apparently it was the view of the foreign opinion in Shanghai that an excuse would be trumped up to enable Communist China to invade Indochina and so overrun Burma and eventually Malaya.

His theory is that communism has the effect on a nation that maggots have in a cheese. They burrow under the surface and multiply until by sheer force of numbers and

activity they are forced out into the open and erupt. He thinks North Korea erupted, perhaps even before Moscow was aware. Secondly, as it had erupted it was decided to use it as a test of what the Western World and particularly your country's action would be.

Nevertheless as he continued—"but who knows what is in the mind of Moscow? Even under Hitler you did see a man who occasionally came before the people and addressed them, but under communism nobody knows from whom the order has come or when an order will come—not even members of their own party until the order is in their hands."

After his experience, Beswick is preaching the need for the utmost vigilance even in countries such as mine and yours which we do not think can become breeding grounds for the communistic maggots. He says who knows until the enemy strikes. In every country so far there has been underground growth that has come suddenly to the surface; each man trained and ready to do the job allotted to him.

All this I hope you have found at least interesting.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK.

Texas Youth Recommended for Life-Saving Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Calvert Tribune, Mr. Joe H. Fietsam, has called my attention to a recent incident in his city in which a 21-year-old youth was responsible for saving the life of a 10-month-old child. The latter had been bitten by a large copperhead snake and it was only through the prompt action of this young man that the child's life was saved.

The youth referred to is Mr. John R. Rhodes, of Hearne, Tex., and a recommendation has been forwarded to the American Red Cross that he be considered for a lifesaving award by reason of his heroic action on August 9.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the news article that appeared in the Calvert Tribune on August 17 describing the near-tragic incident which resulted in a typical American youth demonstrating the alert and lifesaving action that we know our young people are capable of. The article follows:

HEARNE YOUTH HELPS PREVENT TRAGEDY

Prompt and efficient first aid, administered by John R. Rhodes, 21-year-old Hearne youth, last week, Wednesday, was the prime factor in saving the life of 10-month-old Mickey Wiley, who had been bitten by a large copperhead snake at the home of his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. A. L. Lander, who live near Calvert on the Bremond highway.

The story, as it was received here, goes something like this: The mother, Mrs. Sue Wiley, was sitting in a chair on the lawn near the flower beds, while her mother, Mrs. A. L. Lander, connected the garden hose and prepared to water the flower beds, passing within 3 feet of the snake, unaware of its presence. The baby, meanwhile, had toddled into the same place, only closer, and stepped on the coiled snake, which bit him on the leg. At his first cry it was thought that he had been stung by a wasp, but on closer examination, the four teeth marks of the reptile were discovered. The ladies picked up the baby and rushed to the highway nearby to flag a passing car, as they were without a car and no telephone handy. About this time J. R. Rhodes happened to be passing by, and sensing that the ladies were in need of help, he stopped. He was asked to give first aid to the baby and with a razor blade he quickly made the incisions and sucked the blood and poison from the wounds.

Noticing the commotion, a neighbor, Frank Mocek, came over and took the ladies and child to Bremond where Dr. Sanders gave further first aid. The baby was then rushed to a Marlin hospital for treatment.

Mr. Wiley came for his family on Friday of last week and took them to their home in Bay City, where the little fellow is recuperating. From reports received this week he is well on the road to recovery.

The unselfish action of the Hearne youth, John R. Rhodes, is very commendable and we cannot praise him too much for his noble deed. It goes to prove that there are many things a person can do when put to the test. He is a son of Mr. and Mrs. C. T. Rhodes, of Hearne.

Eliminating Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, every informed person realizes that the heads of organized labor in America are doing a great work in their effort to curb and eliminate the progress of Communists and communism within their ranks. We realize that the strategy of the Communist is to first infiltrate labor organizations so as to hamper not only production in peacetime, but especially in wartime.

All patriotic Americans owe a debt of gratitude to American labor leaders for their organized campaign against Communists and communism.

The following statement from Philip Murray is very illuminating as to the anti-Communist campaign made by the CIO labor union:

PHILIP MURRAY SAYS TRADE-UNIONS MAKE IT TOUGH GOING FOR REDS

American trade-unionists are devoting a lot of time and effort these days to the task of making democracy work better.

Believe me, it is a big job—a hard, complicated job. There is nothing simple about it.

It would be easy, as some groups have found, to say that democratic ideals are wonderful, that everybody should believe in them—and then let it go at that.

We in the CIO have learned, however, that there are many persons in our country who would like to have a Nation operated by the "chosen few," with the many merely trailing along behind.

Some of these are Communists—men and women who would, if they could, impose on us the same type of totalitarian rule that has abolished freedom and made life miserable for millions in the so-called Soviet satellites.

Free trade-unions have been giving the Communists a rough time at home and abroad. The CIO is now in the midst of a house-cleaning that is rapidly destroying one of the most important bases of operations ever obtained by the Communist Party in the United States.

I have an idea that most Americans by now are aware of the menace of communism, but I am not so sure they are fully aware of other forces which undermine the foundations of our democracy.

One important group which stands in the way of democracy's working as it should is composed of those who fight the expansion of civil rights.

This group, by and large, believes in white supremacy and advocates second-class citizenship for a large segment of our population. It discriminates against men and women because of their race, creed, and color.

The most adamant of those who fight civil rights legislation actually advocate a "master race."

We in the CIO are now fighting vigorously to win Nation-wide recognition of the idea that all men are created equal and that they must be provided equality of opportunity.

We believe that only by providing such equality can we have the type of democracy which will appeal to all men everywhere. To achieve it we must eliminate racial and religious discrimination and do away with voting restrictions which prohibit full use of the ballot.

Occasionally I read newspaper stories quoting politicians who say that labor has learned through experience that the Taft-Hartley Act is not as bad as union leaders pictured it and that the unions really aren't anxious to have Taft-Hartley repealed. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Experience has shown that the Taft-Hartley Act is loaded heavily on the side of those who fight unions, that it is restrictive, that it interferes seriously with the right to organize and bargain collectively, and that it should be abolished and replaced by legislation that is fair to both labor and management.

And, despite what some of the "experts" say, the Taft-Hartley Act will be a real issue in the 1950 congressional elections. That's because we believe that unfair curbs on labor weaken our democracy.

The major segments of American labor are very active this year in the field of political action because unionists want to block efforts to wipe out social and economic gains that have been achieved under the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Our Nation, the world's richest, can well afford to provide its people with greater security against economic hazards, with better educational facilities, with improved health services, and with guaranties against discrimination based on race, creed, and color.

It was because of problems such as those mentioned here that I recently proposed close cooperation among all democratic union groups in the country and the establishment of a committee to help coordinate our efforts and work toward eventual organic unity of the American labor movement.

And it is because of such problems that I urge all Americans to participate fully in this year's elections.

One way to make democracy work better is for all the people to express their views where they count—at the polls.

Reporting on Ninth Fact-Finding Tour of Europe Since Start of World War II—Bruce Thomas Writes Letter for His Congressman's Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, with the permission of the writer thereof, I am privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for your information and guidance of what I termed to be a very valuable factual statement. I say "valuable" because it comes from a distinguished correspondent and a lecturer, Bruce Thomas, who resides in the important city of Compton, Calif., which is in the great Eighteenth Congressional District, which I have now had the honor to represent two terms in this Congress. Knowing that he had a background of many years of experience of foreign correspondence in Europe and Asia, and knowing that he had made approximately a dozen fact-finding tours on his own to Europe since the beginning of World War II in order to study and report on Washington and economic conditions as well as political trends and having personally observed his desire to contribute whatever possible to the progress of our great Nation, I felt it was no imposition upon his unselfish attitude to ask that he send to me as soon as possible upon his return a letter giving me, as his Representative in Congress, his down-to-date observations. So, I am pleased to be able to pass it on to you.

COMPTON, CALIF., *September 1, 1950.*
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLYDE: This letter is written after my return from a 3-month fact-finding tour of nine western European countries; my ninth visit to Europe since the start of World War II.

As a free-lance correspondent and writer, I work on the basis that "facts operate; they do not threaten." I have no ax to grind. I am not paid to say what I am going to say nor do I say it to gain favor with those who want it said. Probably as good an example is the fact that I am a dyed-in-the-wool Republican, but I voted for you in the last election.

If you were one of the 275,000 Americans who were in Europe last summer, you could not help but notice the thousands of examples of "El Marshall Plan" or "Het Marshall Plan" or "Den Marshall" or "Il Plano Marshall" or just plain "The Marshall Plan"—the European Recovery Plan. You would have seen thousands of ERP signs in any one of the sixteen participating western European nations.

They have started the third of the promised 4 years of assistance from the United States. Starting in 1948, to end in 1952, the Marshall plan has given food, clothing, new opportunities, security and hope to millions of human beings. Once again whole communities are on the road to recovery and normal living. No one in western Europe is faced with starvation or freezing this year. Life is worth living again because men are at work. Millions include America and the people of our country in their prayers. I know because I have talked with hundreds of people in all walks of life in those countries. "God Bless America" is the theme song in thousands of homes today.

I have watched the Marshall plan at work for 3 years. I have seen ERP operate in eleven of the sixteen participating European nations, most of which would have come under the hammer and sickle, had we not stepped in and given the necessary and timely life-giving help.

South Ireland, Portugal, Switzerland, Denmark and Sweden, all neutral countries, which were believed to be prosperous because they stayed neutral during the war, actually suffered great economic losses. Imports and exports were curtailed. Tourism, one of their main crops, was nonexistent. They are now finding their way back to normal under the ERP banner. If the above five countries felt the 6 years of conflict without bombs dropping on their cities, imagine what this greatest humanitarian movement of all times meant to England, Netherlands, France, Turkey, Denmark, and Italy.

I have placed Italy last in this group because the Italians were really low men on the European totem pole. This is a country of 48,000,000, people crowded together in an area smaller than the State of California. As our enemy we gave her a thorough going-over from the air, sea, and land. German armies finished the job of devastation in their retreat through Italy to the north. Scores of villages were razed to the ground, thousands of Italian peasants were shot for reasons known only to the Germans. Most bridges, railroad trestles and tunnels were destroyed. Hundreds of miles of railroad right-of-way were torn up and dynamited. Engines and rolling stock of all kinds were damaged beyond repair. Power plants, dams, factories, in fact everything the Germans knew we could use in our occupation were levelled. Thousands of farm buildings were torn up. Practically every horse, cow, sheep, and oxen had disappeared. If not butchered for food, the animals were slaughtered, as part of the German plan of retreat. They did everything but poison the soil. Plows, rakes, harrows, farm equipment of all kinds were either destroyed or taken into Germany. Thousands of acres of land in the Pontine marshes to the south of Rome were inundated. This undid the work of generations.

We have been intelligently selfish in our all-out aid to this poverty-stricken country. The Communists were more sure of taking over Italy as another satellite than you are sure that the red flag will never fly over America. Had Italy disappeared behind the iron curtain, Spain, France, Greece and Turkey without a question of doubt would have followed. Millions were on the political fence in these countries watching Italy as their standard of comparison.

Probably one of the most interesting projects in all of western Europe is now being contemplated on the island of Sardinia. Approximately the same size as Vermont or New Hampshire, this island has laid as a wild barren terrain for more than 3,000 years. Archeologists know that from two to three million people once inhabited this island. Farming was their means of support. It was then a fertile farming country. During the next 5 years, if present plans mature, there will be a migration of over 1,000,000 people transplanted from overcrowded Italy to Sardinia. Thousands of acres of brush and small forest growth will be cleared away. Plans for great pumping plants, drainage canals, and aqueducts are already in the making. Vast arid acres in southern Italy are actually undergoing the same treatment. Eventually millions of people will inhabit these new farm areas. Here is one answer to Italy's serious overpopulation problem.

During the last year it was estimated that interest in communism dropped from 10 percent to as high as 50 percent in some areas. Many feel that if there were to be an election in Italy tomorrow, that more than half the Communist senators would lose their seats.

There are some Americans who feel that we should let these people pull out of their own mess. Let's take an honest, an unbiased look. The Marshall Plan is but 13 percent of your yearly tax total. Isn't that good insurance and a good investment when you consider the following: Had we pulled out of Europe and let these people stew in their own juice, we could have saved an immediate $15,000,000,000. That Spain, France, western Germany, Turkey, Greece, Italy, and other western European countries would be Russian satellites today there is absolutely no doubt. Our isolationists and pacifists would see their dream come true. We would be isolated in our own little Western Hemisphere with the world on fire—good red fire, on both sides of us. And don't ever doubt that we wouldn't be marked as the next in line. And within a few years from now it would take 50 percent of our national income for defense and life wouldn't be worth living in America.

I liken many of us to the man who is out in his back yard fighting a fire in his trash pile with his little water pistol or flit gun. The trash pile is made up of many little hates, now running rampant through America: the colored question, the Jewish problem, the Catholic situation, and "those Protestants, because they are in the majority, think they can run everything" and anti this and anti that. He is so busy with his petty thinking that he can't hear the crackle of red flames nor hear his children screaming for help, trapped on the second floor of his burning home.

God save America. God save the world through America. God save America through us.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE THOMAS.

The General MacArthur Military Faux Pas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that President Truman had stated that General MacArthur's VFW press release had been withdrawn and was now a closed matter, and most noncantankerous persons had fallen into line with the President's pronouncement, yet many noncooperatives, for the past several days now, have been in a high dither about the contents of General MacArthur's statement concerning the importance of Formosa from the standpoint of military strategy, and the military necessity that the United States go all out in the defense of Formosa, and these reactionary Republicans have boldly declared that it is not a closed matter at all—at least not for them.

These reactionary Republicans were never, to my knowledge during my approximately 2 years as a Member of the House of Representatives, more wild-eyed or a more wild-talking group. They were simply communistically frantic in the claim that President Truman, our

Commander in Chief, had gagged or muzzled General MacArthur. Of course, this most manifest political frenzy was intensified when the reactionary Republican press of the Nation applied the journalistic blowtorch to their sensitive bottoms by headlining the whole MacArthur verbal episode with the dumb, unthinking headline words, "Truman's gag on MacArthur is GOP issue."

If I may be permitted to make my own humble observations concerning this matter, I will say that if that is the real GOP issue in the impending campaign, then the GOP—meaning the Gouging Old Party—is terribly at a loss for an issue. Just how one can make a telling issue out of insubordination on the part of a high military official to his Commander in Chief is beyond my understanding.

General MacArthur, it must be remembered, is a member of the military forces of the United States, holding a high position under our Nation and the United Nations in Japan and the Far East. Please remember that he is not only the supreme commander of the armed forces of the United Nations but is also a most high-ranking general of the United States Army and is initially functioning under our Commander in Chief, Harry S. Truman. Such an unthinkable act on the part of General MacArthur to endeavor intentionally or otherwise to usurp the power of his Commander in Chief, the President, and the functions of the State Department and of the United Nations would be a hard thing to make a real issue about. Of course, it must be remembered that every issue that the Republican Party has had for the last 3 years has been a phony one, and I guess we Democrats are expecting perhaps entirely too much now of these old-time unfitted-to-lead group. May I interject here now that I think that it would be difficult for a person to forgive General MacArthur's conduct.

Continuing now the main discussion, I say that if the reactionary Republican Party desires to make a national issue out of the utter thoughtlessness and insubordination of General MacArthur, as they threatened to do, then surely Republicanism as a political institution has hit an all-time low, and the real Americanism to be found in both of the two great major parties will never support, I am sure, such a miserable, dastardly issue.

No, gentleman, lack of amenability to duly constituted authority and vocal insubordination could never be a worthwhile issue to foist upon the present-day thinking and real patriotic citizenship of our land.

It really makes one laugh to see so many reactionary Republicans endeavoring to become patriotic by association. I presume they got this idea of trying to attach themselves to a military star from the old shyster prosecutor's notebook, that people could become guilty by association and therefore great and patriotic by association. This seems to have been the situation, as far as one of my colleagues at least, is concerned. I gather that once upon a time General MacArthur answered one of his letters, and since that time he has run up and down the hills of his district, and every place else he had access to, showing a letter that General MacArthur wrote to him. I cannot vouch for its credibility, but it has been told to me that he has shown that letter to every white-faced bull in the sandhill country. My advice to General MacArthur is not to write to these people any more because they are using his private correspondence only for their own purposes—purposes which will not add to his, General MacArthur's, luster or his glory at all.

Now, the thought might occur that perhaps General MacArthur had not been advised that he could not express himself as an individual citizen and divorce himself from his United States command and his supreme authority as commander of the forces of the United Nations in the East and Far East. Gen. Douglas MacArthur as an old-time tried and true soldier had no right to make an individual expression on any subject which might cause discordance, dissension, and disunity in this or any other hour. He had no right to take over the duties of the Chief Executive or the branch of our Government which has the sole duty to formulate policies in the Far East and elsewhere or the United Nations. He had been advised specifically, I have learned, not to do the very thing which he did—to release his so-called statement as an individual citizen or as a soldier.

I wish to quote the following from the Washington Post of September 1, 1950:

MACARTHUR WAS BRIEFED ON POLICY

(By Drew Pearson)

Here is a play-by-play account of what went on behind the scenes in the now historic rebuke of General MacArthur by President Truman.

First inkling that MacArthur had sent a message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the delicate question of Formosa came on Thursday, August 24, when Carlton Kent of the Chicago Sun-Times queried Roger Tubby, State Department press relations office, as to whether the MacArthur statement had been cleared by the State Department.

Tubby passed the query on to the White House and the Defense Department, found that neither had either seen or heard of the MacArthur statement. It had been sent direct to newspapers in a personal letter on August 21 with a release date of August 28. This was in direct violation of the White House directive laid down during the famous Henry Wallace-Jimmie Byrnes row, after which it was decreed that no statement on foreign policy could be published by any official without clearance.

President Truman himself did not see the MacArthur statement until Saturday, August 26, during a conference scheduled to hear the report of Navy chief, Admiral Forrest Sherman, and Army chief, Gen. Joe Collins, following their return from Tokyo.

At this conference Averell Harriman handed the President a copy of the MacArthur statement. Harriman, who is part owner of Newsweek magazine, had obtained a copy of the press release.

POLICY WAS EXPLAINED

Harriman told Truman that he had carefully explained American policy to MacArthur during his recent visit to Tokyo and that there was no reason for his misunderstanding it. Actually Harriman's trip was largely inspired by MacArthur's urge to occupy Formosa with American troops and his much-publicized hand-kissing visit to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. It was felt that Harriman could diplomatically explain that the United States must work through the United Nations in regard to Formosa and that if the United States got embroiled in any conflict with China the Korean war would then last indefinitely.

Truman read the MacArthur statement and hit the ceiling. Without asking Secretary Acheson or any others present for their opinion, he directed Secretary of Defense Johnson to order MacArthur to withdraw his statement.

The President said that he was charged by the Constitution with the sole responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy, that there can only be one voice of authority in expressing that policy, and that we can't have 2, or 3, or 10 people acting as official spokesmen.

He pointed out that in the case of Formosa we cannot act unilaterally but must continue our efforts through the United Nations.

He warned that if we let the MacArthur message go unchallenged every diplomat throughout the world will believe—despite our denials—that MacArthur was really speaking for the White House and that the diplomats will be convinced we're floating a trial balloon.

CABLE TO MAC ARTHUR

The cable which Secretary Johnson immediately dispatched to MacArthur read pretty much as follows: "The President of the United States directs that you immediately recall your statement addressed to the Veterans of Foreign Wars containing your views regarding Formosa. Your statement is not in accord with the established foreign policy of the United States as enunciated by the President."

Though Secretary Johnson has agreed with MacArthur on Formosa and once worked backstage to overrule the State Department on Formosa, other high military men in the Pentagon Building now take a different view. This holds true of many in both the Army and Navy.

In fact, Navy strategists are now recalling that during 1944 the Navy wanted MacArthur to occupy Formosa as a step toward bombing Japan and that MacArthur was vigorously opposed.

Plans for taking over Formosa were worked out in great detail by Admiral Nimitz in 1944 and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington. But MacArthur, who was determined to liberate his old love, the Philippines, overruled them.

Chief reason, however, that United States military men disagree with MacArthur on Formosa is that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are now among the people in Washington most eager to avoid any conflict which would cause Chinese troops to be sent into Korea.

If Chinese troops stay out of Korea, there seems to be a pretty good chance the war will be over easily this winter. But if the Chinese pour their vast hordes into Korea, the war could last almost indefinitely.

The following articles from the Christian Science Monitor of August 31 last gives a very accurate picture, I am sure, of how this General MacArthur message to the VFW was concealed from the proper sources and by-passed cunningly into the publicity it has received.

It may be said to the great credit of the Christian Science Monitor that unlike some other newspapers of the United States, it refused to publicize in its news columns, this alleged General MacArthur message which most certainly exhibits again the true spirit of journalism and a true patriotism and obedience to proper authority.

These articles are as follows:

MACARTHUR MYSTERY: HOW NOTE TO VFW ELUDED PRESIDENT

IN CAPITAL

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Incredible as it may sound, Gen. Douglas MacArthur's message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars was received at the Pentagon without any official knowing about it several days before the White House knew it existed.

It happened in this manner:

General MacArthur in Tokyo had a choice of sending the personal message he had framed for the VFW gathering in Chicago via private cable or the Army's Signal Corps telecommunications. He chose to use the Army service.

The message first went from Tokyo to San Francisco to Chicago, without passing through the signal center in the Pentagon. It was a service message, a private communication from General MacArthur to Clyde Lewis, VFW commander in chief. At it was directed to Mr. Lewis in Chicago, San Francisco routed it direct to Chicago.

But in Chicago, United States Fifth Army headquarters, which received it, tried to deliver it to Mr. Lewis, only to be told he was not there yet. Then Tokyo was advised that the message was undeliverable.

Sent as private message

The next day, Tokyo repeated the message, but this time sent it to Washington for delivery to Mr. Lewis at VFW headquarters there. It again was sent as a service message—or private letter—from General MacArthur to Mr. Lewis. The signal center in Washington delivered it to VFW headquarters here just as Fifth Army headquarters had done in Chicago without questioning its contents.

It had been sent as a private message, and the signal center at the Pentagon treated it as such. There was no notice preceding, accompanying, or following it asking that its contents be called to the attention of any civilian or military official. Therefore no copies were made of it and sent to responsible authorities.

Meanwhile, General MacArthur's efficient publicity staff in Tokyo saw to it that copies of the speech, with a covering personal letter from the general, went to leading publishers in the United States.

No copy to Truman

But no copy went to President Truman, Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, Army Secretary Frank Pace, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President's personal coordinator of policy, W. Averell Harriman, or to Secretary of State Dean Acheson—all of whom had a vital interest in its contents. In neither the first message via Army signal service telecommunications, which went direct to Chicago, nor the second one that passed through the Pentagon did General MacArthur ask that copies go to anyone. In both cases it was sent and treated as a private personal communication.

One of the most fantastic features of this incident is that while most of the press knew about the message and its contents, responsible officials in Washington knew nothing about it until August 25 and 26.

"New policy" question

President Truman first heard of it the morning of August 26 after a member of the press had asked a member of the White House staff about Washington's new policy on Formosa. Following the morning military briefing at the White House conducted by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President read the copy of the MacArthur message that had been provided by a member of the press. That was the first that General Bradley, Secretary Johnson, or Secretary Acheson had heard of it. It also was unknown before that Saturday to Secretary Pace and Deputy Secretary of Defense Stephen T. Early, according to their subsequent testimony.

After reading it to his startled audience, the President, without asking for advice or reactions, said quietly and evenly to Mr. Johnson: "Louis, I want you to direct General MacArthur to withdraw that statement." The only discussion was whether the general should be notified by telephone or writing. The President decided it should be put in writing.

Technically, then, it can be said that the message did pass through the Pentagon several days before the storm broke. But in that period no one in the Pentagon saw it except the clerk in the signal center who took it off the wire for delivery to VFW headquarters. And to him it was just another private communiqué to be treated as a Western Union office would treat a private telegram.

Messrs. Johnson, Early, Pace, and General Bradley did not sit on it: They had no knowledge that it existed. They did not ignore it, for they did not know of it.

Why General MacArthur took such pains to get the speech circulated among the press, but passed up every opportunity to circulate it among his superiors in Washington, is still unanswered here.

IN CHICAGO

(By Max K. Gilstrap, Chief of the Central News Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor)

CHICAGO.—President Truman's belated knowledge of and action on withholding Gen. Douglas MacArthur's message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars has accentuated interest in the question:

Exactly how long was General MacArthur's message in the hands of the Defense Department before the President knew about it?

The VFW public-relations chief informer reported here on August 28 that the MacArthur message has been received via the Fifth Army at VFW headquarters, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, on August 19.

Received August 22

It is learned now that the message was received on August 22. An original copy of the MacArthur cable examined by this reporter bears no clear date. It was attached to a letter from a Fifth Army lieutenant requesting that the VFW sign a receipt for the cable because "the general has contacted me no less than three times from Tokyo requesting some word on the disposition of subject message."

VFW public-relations officials say the cable was sent directly from Tokyo to the Fifth Army headquarters here. To pinpoint the exact date the MacArthur message was received in Washington, we contacted Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service of the VFW. Mr. Ketchum first heard of the message, he said, "a week from last Tuesday morning" (August 22) at VFW headquarters in Washington.

Received from Pentagon

The Pentagon communications officer, he said, phoned him that morning that a message was coming in from General MacArthur for Clyde A. Lewis, commander in chief of the VFW. Mr. Ketchum was told that he could get the message about 3 p. m. that day after he assured the Pentagon that he was authorized to receive it.

The Pentagon, according to Mr. Ketchum, phoned him again the afternoon of August 22, and told him he could get it the next morning at 9 a. m. at which time he sent a messenger for it. Upon receiving the message, he contacted VFW headquarters at the Sherman Hotel in Chicago. He found that Chicago headquarters already had been notified of the message by the Fifth Army which was supplying the VFW with a copy.

Thus, according to VFW officials, the Defense Department in Washington and Fifth Army headquarters in Chicago had the MacArthur message on the Tuesday morning preceding the Saturday morning President Truman first heard of it.

On receipt of the MacArthur communication from the Fifth Army, the VFW office prepared copies and dispatched them to the wire services and to about 100 newspapers with the stipulation that the release date August 28 be observed.

Should We Let Our Physical Plant Deteriorate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is from the good earth that all wealth must come. To a great degree our future standard of living and the strength of our Nation depends upon the earth and the resources that it holds. Each generation has an obligation to conserve our vital resources for the benefit of those that follow.

To some people the idea of saving our soil, of preventing it from being washed away by ravaging floods constitutes a program that may be desirable at some time when everything is just right. To the victim of a flood it is something different. To the alert student and to the thoughtful citizen such programs are a must. We cannot fulfill our obligations in the world today or in the immediate future if we allow all of our productive facilities to deteriorate. This applies to the soil especially.

In recent months the State of Nebraska has been in the news because of storms of all kinds. Torrential rains have descended in several parts of the State. The lives of our citizens have been taken, homes have been flooded, bridges and highways destroyed, railroads and industrial plants damaged and one of the greatest damages suffered is the loss of our soil. Buildings can be rebuilt but soil erosion is a loss that requires years and years to overcome.

It is my privilege to represent in this Congress the southern part of Nebraska. Nebraska slopes from the northwest to the southeast. There is at least one point in Nebraska which is approximately a mile high, yet the southeast corner of the State is only 850 feet. All of our streams run in that direction. Our underground water moves in that direction. Consequently, the greater share of all the flood damage that has been suffered has occurred in this congressional district.

This year devastating floods have occurred on the Big Nemaha and the Little Nemaha Rivers and all the creeks and streams that flow into them, as well as on Salt Creek in the vicinity of Lincoln, Nebr., and the Little Blue and the Big Blue Rivers and their tributaries. Eleven people lost their lives. Some destructive floods have occurred this year in the much-flooded Republican Valley.

These floods are not just occasional floods. These things have been happening time and time again. A number of floods have been experienced on each of these streams in the last 5 or 10 years, but it goes back much further than that.

In my work here in Congress the past 12 years a considerable portion of my duties have been in connection with the Republican River development program. So many times have we called attention to the flood of 1935, which took 110 lives. I recall that in studying the history of the Republican River I learned that long before the white man came, or about in 1835, a flood equal to the 1935 flood occurred. The residents of the valley have experienced many very severe floods since 1935 during many different years, including the disastrous loss of 13 or 14 lives at Cambridge in 1947.

Today the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have a great program under way in the Republican Valley. As the original sponsor of this program in Washington and the one upon whom the responsibility of getting the legislation and appropriations through the House of Representatives has fallen, I have been very close to the problems involved. It is my opinion that this development in the Republican Valley would have never become a reality if it had not been for the perseverance, faith, stick-to-it-iveness, and dogged persistence of the sturdy men and women living in that valley. Today the Army engineers are building the Harlan County Dam. They have completed local protective works at Bartley and Indianola. The Bureau of Reclamation is building Enders Dam on the Frenchman which flows into the Republican. They have completed the Medicine Creek Dam north of Cambridge. They are building the Bonney Reservoir on the south fork of the Republican on the Kansas-Colorado line and they have recently awarded the contract for the completion of the 1½-mile-long, 145-foot-high Trenton Dam on the main stem of the Republican River near Trenton. The Bureau is also constructing the Bostwick irrigation project, which will take the water from Harlan County Dam.

It has taken a good many years of work to advance this Republican River program. Such projects must start out with surveys and reports from the engineers. Then the Congress must authorize the project. These authorization laws approve the engineers' plans and provide that money may be appropriated. Then at a later time there must be appropriation bills.

In June 1944, after conferring with the local people in regard to their flood problem, I introduced the necessary resolutions which called upon the Army engineers to make an investigation and bring in a report and a plan for flood control for Salt Creek and the Big and Little Nemaha Rivers. These resolutions were approved by the House Committee on flood control on the 21st day of June 1944, and the Army engineers were assigned the job of formulating a flood-control program for these areas.

Pursuant to these resolutions passed by the flood-control committee of the House of Representatives, the Army engineers have made investigations and conducted studies. The investigations on Salt Creek are in progress and are well-advanced. The information that I received from the Army engineers is that their studies are being reexamined in light of the 1950 floods. It is estimated that their report will be submitted late in 1950.

On the Nemaha River, the Army engineers have made their studies and submitted the same to Washington. These plans have not yet been transmitted to Congress. The plans include seven small dams on tributaries of the Nemaha River and levee and channel improvements in four instances. The status of the flood-control plans for the Little Nemaha are the same as for the Nemaha River. These plans include four small dams and reservoirs on the tributaries of the Little Nemaha River and two levee and channel improvements.

The Army engineers have also completed their studies and a plan has been submitted to Congress for local protection work at Hubbell, Nebr., on Rose Creek which flows into the Big Blue River. This is a small project consisting of a levee and channel improvements on Rose Creek.

Likewise, the Army engineers has submitted a plan for local protection work at Beatrice, Nebr., where Indian Creek joins the Big Blue River. The plan calls for levee and channel improvements on the Big Blue River and on Indian Creek and the removal of a low dam on the Big Blue River, which seriously reduces the channel capacity at that point.

Valuable as the work of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers is, their program alone is not a complete answer to the problem. They build the larger reservoirs and water-retarding structures. There is a job to be done with the control of smaller water courses and a job to be done on every farm. It is a soil-saving job.

The soil conservation program is making great strides in Nebraska. The entire State is organized into soil conservation districts. They can do and are doing an excellent piece of work. Their program is enabling the farmer not only to hold the soil and prevent water and wind erosion but to hold the water right where it falls. This work is indispensable.

However, there should not be a gap between the work of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation and the individual work carried on by the farmer in his soil conservation district. These programs should merge. Consequently, I definitely feel that there is a great need for flood control to be carried on by the Department of Agriculture. They are doing that work now. They have had marked success in several watersheds. They construct smaller water-retarding structures. They bring about changes in land use that go beyond the scope and ability of the local soil conservation district. The Department of Agriculture can make a basin-wide approach which the individual soil conservation districts cannot do.

In southern Nebraska we need the flood control that is and will be provided by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, but we also need an agricultural soil conservation and flood-control program.

With this in mind a number of us have for several years advocated an agricultural flood control and soil conservation program for the entire Missouri River Basin. Such a program was formulated in the field and was sent to Washington. It remained in the Department for a number of months. It is now before the Congress as a part of House Document 373 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session. This House document includes recommendations for a great number of things pertaining to agriculture other than flood control and soil saving. Whether or not those other programs should be undertaken constitute questions to be answered by the Congress when a detailed study is made. I do favor an agricultural flood-control program for the Missouri River Basin. We need it in that part of Nebraska which I have the honor to represent.

With these problems in mind and the feeling that an over-all basin-wide program would take considerable time, Congressman STEFAN and I have introduced and secured passage of a resolution by the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Public Works Committee and by the full Public Works Committee which directs the Department of Agriculture to bring in a flood-control program for the Salt Creek-Wahoo Creek basin.

This move was hastened by reason and activity of the organization of the residents of this Salt Creek area under the leadership of Raymond A. McConnell, Jr., and Otto Liebers. Leading citizens have been concerned about the flood problem and they are diligently seeking an answer to it. It is expected that the Department of Agriculture will have their report within 4 or 6 months.

Many thoughtful people are speaking out on this most important problem of conserving our greatest of all resources and protecting the people and their property from floods. I would like to include the following editorial by Raymond A. McConnell, Jr., in the Lincoln Journal, June 13, 1950:

In our continuing discussion and interpretation of Missouri basin development, we have been insisting for a long time on the principle that in an over-all program of water conservation and flood control on river dams and channel improvement alone are not enough, but must be coordinated with a program of conservation on the land—to hold as much water as possible where it falls and to retard damaging runoff at every possible point, beginning on the land and in the smaller upper tributaries.

The program to do this in the Missouri basin as a whole is called the Young plan (it was the Journal that dubbed it that after Gladwin Young of Lincoln who had a large hand in its preparation and the label has caught on). Not yet authorized by Congress, the Young plan proposes to supplement the Pick-Sloan program of work on the rivers which was begun in 1944.

In the Missouri basin as a whole, the Army and Bureau of Reclamation (Pick and Sloan) got started before there was widespread awareness of the broader concept of flood control as part of a larger problem integrally related with the lands of the watershed.

The result is that the Missouri basin project is 6 years and many hundreds of millions of dollars along, on the rivers, and the job

under the Young plan, if and when it can be authorized and appropriated for, will be a mighty one of catching up.

But in our six-county Salt-Wahoo watershed, nothing has been authorized or started by any Federal agency, other than an Army engineers' survey which is still under way and won't be completed until fall.

Our opportunity locally, therefore, is not only to apply the over-all principle of flood control as a job to be planned from the standpoint of the watershed as a whole, but to apply this principle—based on the best of today's knowledge and techniques—virtually from the start. It is an opportunity both to demonstrate the validity of the over-all approach, beginning at the beginning, and to protect ourselves against flood and erosion damages in our area averaging as high as a million dollars annually.

Since the plans of the Army engineers for the Salt and Wahoo Creeks are still in the formative stage, our first problem is to get authorization for an agricultural plan for the watershed, its lands, and upper tributaries, that can be correlated, before work begins, with the Army's plans for the main channels.

There is a job to be done in flood control by the Department of Agriculture in all of the smaller watersheds. On those streams where either the Army engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation are building a major reservoir, the up-stream work of agriculture is very necessary. The holding of the soil above the reservoir prevents silting and determines the life and usefulness of the reservoir. An agricultural flood-control program for the upper portions of Medicine Creek is a case in point. Then there are other streams such as Beaver Creek, emptying into the Republican, where the flood problem is great, yet the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers have not constructed any larger dams. An Agriculture Department program is very much needed in such watersheds as the Beaver Valley.

It must also be borne in mind that while the larger structures are necessary in many instances, they are costly and they take out of production some very fine land. If the flood problem can be handled by the Department of Agriculture in its treatment of the smaller watersheds and the upper tributaries, it is a better conservation program. Leading citizens have pointed out to me that in the case of the recent damaging flood at DeWitt, Nebr., that a huge dam on the Blue River would not have prevented the flood. The great damage was done because of the water coming down Walnut Creek. The Agriculture Department's program is the one that can cope with such a situation. A somewhat similar situation existed also at Crete. An Army engineer's dam on the Blue north of Crete appears not to be the answer and the local people are vigorously opposed to it.

A plan for an agricultural flood-control plan should be carried out for the watershed of the Big Blue River, the Little Blue River, the Big Nemaha River, and the Little Nemaha River and all of their tributaries. Individual farmers through their soil conservation district should first carry out their program; then the Department of Agriculture should be called on to build the small, less expensive dams and reservoirs and the other water-retarding structures in all of these watersheds in southeast Nebraska.

The Department of Agriculture can also bring about programs of land uses. Changes in land management together with the structures that the Department would construct would do a great deal toward preventing flood damages and erosion of the land. In all of these floods, the greatest dollar damage has been to the land. Such a loss is irreplaceable.

The need for protection against floods and the saving of our soil and the utilization of our water for agricultural purposes has long been the theme of Mr. Harry Strunk, editor of the McCook Daily Gazette. I wish to include an editorial written by him and appearing in that paper on July 11, 1950:

The floods in southeast Nebraska tonight are as ridiculous as the third world war in Korea—with lives lost and millions of dollars of our natural resources gone in torrents of waste water rushing down canyons, dry streams, creeks, and rivers—it is unbelievable that such a great State as Nebraska (the white spot) could be so dumb as to permit such a catastrophe.

But it is surely true, hundreds of families are evacuated from their homes, many have lost their savings and earnings stretching over years, and too many have lost their lives, because of what?

Because of a lack of understanding on the part of the people, such things happen. Because of a sense of security of which they never had. Only Mother Nature can tell us when it's going to rain, and how much; only Providence can tell us what the price will be; but good common sense can, or should, guide us on a program of at least self-preservation.

The history of Nebraska does not show that we have used any of these facilities too wisely. We have rested on our oars, trusting that Old Man Time and somebody else would take care of us. They have pretty much up until now * * * and then all hell breaks loose through the best part of the State, with torrential rains, high waters, death and destruction. Certainly, this disaster is no credit to the great State of Nebraska.

There are those in this State of some importance who knew 10 years ago, that the Bureau of Reclamation "had been invited to stay out of the State of Nebraska," but no one could find out definitely just who the fellow was, who had committed Nebraska to such an agreement. As a result, Nebraska is again paying the price—in lives, in loss of property, and destruction.

Southwest Nebraska has seen its share of this sort of folly and has taken some action to see that it never occurs again. The waste waters are being stopped at their source, and utilized for the benefits of the greatest number of people. Never again will the fine community of Cambridge see a 12-foot wall of water rush through its homes and business district and this is merely the beginning of a program which will stop forever such catastrophes as are happening in eastern and southeastern Nebraska today and tonight.

With all this as the background, there can be no logical criticism of either State or Federal agencies, or our representatives—it all comes back home—to a lack of understanding of our own responsibilities and a real appreciation of our firesides and the part we have to play on this great stage of probably the greatest show which has ever been produced—and that, probably is, self-preservation.

Every governmental program must take into account the Korean war situation and the heavy military demands placed upon this Government. This troubled international situation will be a definite factor in determining the timetable of any program undertaken. First things must come first. We should not lose sight of the fact, however, that agriculture, too, will go to war. The President is being given authority to ration food. We must think of our agriculture production potential not only now, but what it will be 5, 10, 50 or more years from now. Efforts to prevent America's physical plant from deteriorating can hardly be described as a welfare-state program. Conservation is always essential.

I always feel highly complimented when someone calls me a conservative. I want to conserve for the people now and for our children and our children's children the good things that have been handed to us. Foremost among those things which we should pass on intact are: the faith of our fathers, our representative Government, a solvent America, and a soil that is a little better and more productive at the close of our generation than it was at the beginning.

Loan to Mexico Is Finally Granted by Export-Import Bank—Justice Prevails at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Export-Import Bank to extend a United States loan of $150,000,000 to Mexico, as announced today by President Miguel Aleman of Mexico, in his annual "State of the Nation" address to the Mexican Congress, brings to a happy conclusion a long and bitterly fought battle against big interests in the United States who have opposed any loan of any kind or character. Justice has finally prevailed.

The effect of this action in promoting good will and a better understanding between our neighbor below the border, and ourselves, cannot be overestimated. The mutual benefits to be derived will have lasting results that will prove highly beneficial to both countries. Nothing could have been done by the Government of the United States that would show more certainly a desire upon our part to be friendly and helpful to a nation that has shown a loyalty to the same principles of democracy for which we stand. I am, likewise, certain that the ties of friendship that have bound us together in the past have been strengthened by this act upon the part of the United States.

The United States loan made by the Export-Import Bank to Mexico's Government Finance Corporation, Nacional Financiera, will be used, according to the announcement by President Aleman,

to develop highways, railways, communications, irrigation, and electric power. Consequently, the loan will free Mexico's own income for other purposes, such as oil development. In this way, the United States will not directly finance the oil program, but will make it possible by freeing other revenues which would otherwise have had to go into road building and other domestic projects if the United States funds had not been made available.

The matter of a loan to Mexico has been a subject that has had considerable attention upon the part of those who have felt that an injustice was being done to Mexico. The delaying tactics that have been utilized by certain persons in our Government gave rise to rumors that it was done in an effort to obtain settlement of the notorious Sabalo claim. The Supreme Court of Mexico recently decided against the validity of the alleged claim and took occasion to refer to certain documents, that had been presented to support the claim, as being of doubtful validity. The impression was left that they might have been forgeries. At any rate, this smelly claim of $200,000,000 to $400,000,000, the exact amount never could be ascertained, nor the names of all the interested parties, was finally disposed of by an adverse decision of the highest court of Mexico.

It is unfortunate that nearly 2 years of valuable time was permitted to pass without direct action being taken upon the loan. It illustrates how powerful were the forces that were arrayed against it. It would take a book, rather than this brief speech, if I attempted to set forth in detail all the devious ways that were pursued by the interests who fought the granting of the loan, and the efforts that were made to make payment of the Sabalo claim a condition precedent to the granting of any loan. But, this is now all passed and there is no need of going into details that otherwise would have been an appropriate subject of inquiry.

The Export-Import Bank, regardless of the collateral issues or circumstances that some interested parties sought to surround the matter with these many months, has rendered a decision that is based upon the purpose and intent of the law that created the bank, and, in full accord with good banking principles. Its decision in effect has set at naught those who for personal reasons sought to preclude favorable action by the bank. The action of the Export-Import Bank not only creates new and additional reasons for confidence in its judgment and good intent, but, also gives assurances of a willingness to do its part in sustaining the effort of President Truman to strengthen the good neighbor policy by rendering financial assistance when justified by the economic condition of the applying nation.

The recognition by the Export-Import Bank that this is a bankable loan, based upon a sound economic condition in Mexico, and, a government that is politically stable, should be a source of gratification to the Mexican Government, and, to its great president, Miguel Aleman, who since he assumed the office of president has worked indefatigably to strengthen the financial and economic structure of his Government and thereby promote its stability as well as the welfare of the people of Mexico.

If time permitted I would be pleased to make detailed reference to the tremendous strides that have been made in Mexico within the last few years, in the expansion of industry, agriculture, manufacturing, and mining, under the leadership of President Aleman and those associated with him.

In no particular has this been more apparent than the almost unbelievable advances that have been made in the petroleum industry, under the administration of Senator Antonio J. Bermudez, director general of Petroleos Mexicanos, a man of the highest integrity, ability, and sincerity of purpose.

In support of my statement as to the progress that has been made, I submit the following letter, dated June 17, 1950, addressed to Export-Import Bank of Washington, by Senator Bermudez, upon payment in advance of the last installment of its $10,000,000 loan from the Export-Import Bank:

JUNE 17, 1950.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON,
Washington 25, D. C.

(Attention: Mr. Herbert Gaston, President.)

GENTLEMEN: We write to express our gratitude for the credit of $10,000,000 which, in May 1944, you kindly granted Petroleos Mexicanos and on which we have today had the pleasure of making the last payment for capital and interest by check delivered to the Nacional Financiera, in the sum of $1,017,944.44.

This final payment was due and payable until August 1, 1950, but we are very pleased to have been able to fully settle this obligation several weeks ahead of its expiration date, as we find no other more practical symbol to acknowledge our gratefulness to the Government of the United States of America and to the Export-Import Bank for their timely cooperation, which enabled us to erect a refinery of 50,000 barrels daily output, in Mexico City, among other purposes, for the manufacture of high-octane aviation fuel.

It will, no doubt, be a source of satisfaction to you to know that the objectives for which this loan was extended have been fulfilled, as the Mexico City refinery supplies, with the highest quality of oil products, the heavily populated and industrialized areas of Central Mexico and practically all national requirements of commercial and military aviation gasoline, formerly 100 percent imported from the United States.

As we assume it will be of interest to you we are giving herein below the following three items of information:

I. The total cost of the Mexico City refinery and necessary complementary installations at the Poza Rico oil field was $32,200,000, the credit of $10,000,000 granted us by the Export-Import Bank, representing, therefore, 31 percent of this total investment.

II. Consumption of oil products in 1943 in the area to be supplied by the projected refinery was 24,000 barrels daily. Today it amounts to 55,000 barrels daily, which has required the construction of an additional refinery at Salamanca, 200 miles northwest of Mexico City, to supply some of the outlying areas, now served from Mexico City, and other additional areas as well. This new installation, commenced in 1945 and now completed in full, has a capacity of 30,000 barrels daily throughout and had a cost including a 280-mile pipeline from the Poza Rica oil field of $30,000,000 which fortunately we were able to provide without outside financing and solely with the income from our daily sales.

III. Simultaneously with the capital outlays necessary to fully settle for the $10,000,000 loan to which this letter principally refers and the more important sums required to supplement this loan in the building of the Mexico City refinery, and to construct the new Salamanca refinery and its pipeline, a still greater capital expenditure had to be defrayed to actively continue drilling operations for the exploration and exploitation of the petroleum resources of Mexico, with the very satisfying result that, within the last 2½ years, production has increased over 60,000 barrels daily and proven reserves have been augmented by 500,000,000 barrels, to a present total, including natural gas, of over 1,500,000 barrels.

With the deep satisfaction of duty accomplished, we write this letter to you in order that you may share our contentment at the results obtained and in which your cooperation has so effectively helped us.

Yours very truly,

PETROLEOS MEXICANOS,
Original signed by:
Senator ANTONIO J. BERMUDEZ.

This letter of Senator Bermudez is evidence of the fidelity and integrity that characterizes the conduct of the present Mexican Government in all of its dealings. It is of a kind that gives confidence in present commitments and their future fulfillment.

On December 31, 1948, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I submitted on behalf of that committee a detailed report of a study made by it of economic conditions prevailing at that time in Mexico. That report with the detailed information it contains, and knowledge of subsequent events, justifies in every particular the favorable action that is now taken by the Export-Import Bank in making a loan of $150,000,000 to Mexico for industrial and agricultural expansion.

I look with confidence into the future. I see the continued development and expansion of Mexico's industry, agriculture, and mining. A land with great natural resources it has the promise of a great future in which the welfare of its people will progress as the Nation progresses.

I rejoice in the knowledge that our two great countries are friends and I trust that the bonds of friendship will grow even stronger with the passing of each succeeding year.

Address by Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, at Vandalia and Hillsboro, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address

delivered by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] at Vandalia, Ill., on August 31, 1950. This address by the distinguished former Secretary of Agriculture pays well-deserved tribute to the work of our illustrious colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. It is a great pleasure to me to join in that tribute to my dear friend and colleague, the Senator from Illinois, SCOTT W. LUCAS.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure being with you today. It is a privilege, first, because it gives me a chance to talk about something I would rather talk about more than anything else—agriculture; and, second, I am happy because I know the vast majority of you are either farmers or closely linked in some way to the good rich earth of the great State of Illinois. We talk the same language.

Because we talk the same language, I would like to discuss with you a bit of what we have been doing in Washington the last few years to try to develop a sound, reasonable, long-range farm program to backstop the farmer without tying him up in the red tape of complicated controls.

No one can make farmers or anyone else automatically prosperous. That is up to their own individual efforts. What we are trying to do is to soften the shock of matters over which the farmers, the workingman, and the businessman have little or no control. For the farmer that means things like the weather, the corn borer, the world market, and so forth.

I have been fortunate in having had pretty good ringside seats in Washington during the past 10 years to watch what was going on from all angles.

I was in the House of Representatives from just before the war until shortly after the surrender in Europe. Then I served as Secretary of Agriculture until I resigned to run for the Senate in 1948. Since then I have been up there in the Senate alongside SCOTT LUCAS.

From these vantage points I have had an exceptionally good opportunity to watch the work of SCOTT LUCAS. He has been on the Agriculture Committee, first in the House and then in the Senate, since shortly after he entered Congress in 1935. His career in Congress seems to be woven through the history of most of the major farm legislation that has been enacted since then.

Few people realize it because he is not a man inclined to toot his own horn, but he was one of the originators of the idea of flexible price supports, the principle which we have at last firmly established in our farm laws.

Back in 1938 SCOTT LUCAS introduced, fought for, and finally won passage of a mandatory corn law with flexible price supports which was the granddaddy of the law that we have today. Ever since then he has been unwavering in support of that principle. That is why he fought so hard during the past year to keep the theory of production payments out of the basic farm law. SCOTT LUCAS knows well that you cannot have a healthy farm economy if you straitjacket farmers with controls.

It was this kind of philosophy which motivated Senator LUCAS in driving for the enactment of farm legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. As majority leader of the Senate and as a high-ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, he probably did more than any other man in Congress to restore balance to the Nation's farm program.

Looking back over the past 2 years, I would say that the Eighty-first Congress under LUCAS' leadership in the Senate enacted six major pieces of farm legislation in addition to a number of other important but less significant measures.

These include the 1949 general price support law, and the measures for crop storage, increase of the Commodity Credit Corporation lending authority, cotton marketing quotas, rural telephones and appropriations.

Senator LUCAS and I would be the last to contend that the 1949 general farm law is a perfect piece of legislation. We were on the firing line together in the conference committee with House Members who were determined to get high rigid supports.

The House conferees originally wanted a bill which called for rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity on virtually all commodities for 5 years. Senator LUCAS and I and some of the others knew that 5 years would either destroy all possibility of our maintaining an agricultural program or would fix 90 percent as a permanent program for years to come.

Well, finally after interminable conferences night and day, we won agreement to a compromise which provided for flexible supports although full application of the flexible provisions will be delayed until 1952. We also won a modernized parity formula, but again had to agree to delay in putting it into full effect. If Senator LUCAS and I had not been able to prevail upon one other Senator to change his vote, the fight would have been lost. It was that close.

However, we got the principle of flexible supports firmly established and that is what counts. Another important matter written into the law was the authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of surplus commodities in danger of spoiling to public and private welfare programs at home and abroad.

I don't have to elaborate on the crop storage measure. The thousands of bins full of corn all over the Illinois landscape tell that story. The Republican Eightieth Congress in 1948, under pressure from the grain interests, eliminated the provision for providing additional storage from the Commodity Credit Corporation charter. Farmers had a big crop in 1948 and no place to put it in order to get crop loans. They had to sell off their surplus, sometimes considerably below the support price, to keep it from rotting. The Democratic Eighty-first Congress took care of that in a hurry and bins rose as if my magic all over the State last year. What a godsend that storage will be if the Nation is forced to take preventive action in many places in order to keep peace in the world. SCOTT LUCAS was one of the original sponsors of the bill to provide adequate crop storage.

Then there was the increase in the lending authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation. A lot of people who haven't bothered with the facts have been railing about the amounts of money the Government has been loaning on crops.

They conveniently forget that even after the war we pushed farmers for increased production to help relieve the suffering in many parts of the world. Today the farm economy has just reached the readjustment point which many other industries reached shortly after the war. The Government spent billions of dollars liquidating war contracts with industry. Is there anything scandalous about spending some funds—a very much smaller amount—to help agriculture adjust itself? Of course not.

Actually less than $500,000,000 have been lost on price-support operations since 1933, with potatoes accounting for $355,000,000 of the amount lost. There was only a $141,000,000 deficit on all the other commodities over the 17 years. Insofar as the basic storable commodities were concerned, the Government actually made money. In all, loans and purchases totaling nearly $10,000,000,000 were made.

As a matter of fact, this question of surpluses has been blown up out of all proportion. Our present supply of corn exceeds a normal supply by only enough to last our population for 67 days.

Our cotton supply exceeds normal by only enough to meet our domestic and export needs for 93 days. Our wheat stocks are above normal by only enough to meet our needs for 112 days.

Reasonable reserves of storable farm commodities are the best insurance consumers can have against shortages and unreasonable prices, because the prices of farm products skyrocket when supplies fall short of needs.

A single year of the kind of weather we had in 1947 would wipe out our present reserve stocks of corn. The short 1947 corn crop caught us without adequate reserves. I am sure that everyone can remember the resulting difficulties. We had a feed conservation program. Even so the production of meat and other livestock products went down and prices went up. We had meatless days and poultryless days in 1948. Both farmers and consumers suffered. This was only two brief years ago. Some people's memories are short, aren't they? Again, I can't help but reiterate how important reserves are as we face the very uncertain future before us.

SCOTT LUCAS, as majority leader, pushed the CCC lending increase bill through the Senate. The final vote came at 1 o'clock in the morning after a 13-hour session. The key vote was on a motion to send it back to committee for further study. It was defeated by a vote of 21 to 30, in which 25 Democrats and 5 Republicans triumphed over 20 Republicans and 1 Democrat. Previously the Democrats had voted down a Republican motion to adjourn at midnight. On the final vote almost all the Republicans climbed on the band wagon. The matter in which the Democrats in the Senate held together, voting down every attempted amendment, was a great tribute to SCOTT LUCAS' leadership.

SCOTT LUCAS was right in there pitching on other farm bills also. Under his leadership, the cotton people agreed to marketing quotas under the same referendum procedures that you know so well. Senator LUCAS emphasized time and again that overproduction of any price-supported crop is a threat to the entire farm program. He fought hard to get marketing quotas similarly on the 1950 potato crop in order to save the taxpayers approximately $60,000,000. He was unsuccessful in this, but his agreement had much to do with the fact that Congress voted that no price supports would be placed on 1951 potatoes if they were not under marketing quotas.

The effect of the cotton legislation certainly showed the wisdom of Senator LUCAS' thinking. Last year's crop was 19,000,000 bales. This year it will be just a little more than half, estimated at about 10,000,000 bales, and already there has been some buying from Government stocks. Illinois corn and wheat farmers concerned with the general health on the farm program can breathe a big sigh of relief that cotton was not allowed to upset the farm price applecart.

The rural telephone bill was another great achievement of the Democratic Eighty-first Congress. SCOTT LUCAS shepherded this, too, through the Senate.

Finally, there was the question of adequate appropriations to carry on the fundamental Government programs for assistance to agriculture. The Eighty-first Congress provided adequate but not extravagant amounts. The 1951 appropriations call for less than was spent in either 1949 or 1950. On the other hand, a far cry from those of 1948 when the farm program was severely threatened by the ruthless attacks of Republican hatchet men in the House.

Let's go back for a minute to 1947 when the Republicans won control of the House and the Senate for the first time in 16 years.

Senator LUCAS' present opponent became chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. He was the leader of the hatchet men. I remember well because I, as Secretary of Agriculture, prepared the budget that he went to work on.

The gentleman from Pekin wielded his meat ax far and wide, but his most flagrant attack was on soil conservation. This was at a time when the soil of farms in Illinois and all throughout America was still heavily depleted from 5 years of the most intensive cultivation stimulated by extraordinary war demands. Farmers had given unstintingly of themselves and their good earth to achieve undreamed of farm production, one of the vital elements in the winning of the war. Despite this, the gentleman from Pekin—who has aptly termed himself a "paved street farmer"—recommended that soil-conservation payments be cut in half for 1947 and eliminated completely in 1948.

He tried to do the same thing with Rural Electrification Administration funds for loans and for salaries and expenses. In testimony before the committee I pointed out that the cut proposed by the gentleman from Pekin in salaries and expenses alone would so cripple the staff of REA that about 135,000 farm families would have to wait an extra year to receive service.

The same kind of slashing was proposed for the funds for agricultural research, for the school-lunch program, for crop insurance, and for other well-recognized programs. The gentleman from Pekin was so persistent and persuasive that he got the House to approve the cuts, but the Senate would not hold still for all of them. The Senators managed to get part of the slash restored. The attempt to wreck soil conservation and hold back REA brought instant reaction from all over the Nation. Republicans realized how false was the kind of economy advocated by the gentleman from Pekin. In 1948 their appropriation bill for 1949 restored the cuts and added some more funds to the agriculture budget. By so doing the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress completely repudiated the unsound and ridiculous economy drive led by the gentleman from Pekin. They hoped the people or America would forget. But the people did not forget. They swept the Republicans out of control of both the House and the Senate in the elections of 1948. The Republicans can thank the gentleman from Pekin for his contribution to their defeat.

What makes the gentleman from Pekin act as he does? I don't know. It has always baffled me. Possibly we can get a clue from something Representative CLARE HOFFMAN of Michigan, one of the most anti-New Deal Republicans in the House, told the gentleman from Pekin during debate over a farm bill back in 1943. Representative HOFFMAN noted there was a big whisky industry in the Peoria area and said:

"You say the price of corn is going up if we adopt this bill, do you not? That makes the distillers in your district pay more for grain. * * * I wish the gentleman would employ his—what shall I call them, superhuman?—talents to aid the actual dirt farmers, even when their interest comes in conflict with that of the distillers." So said Representative CLARE HOFFMAN of Michigan to his Republican colleague the gentleman from Pekin.

Whatever it is that makes that gentleman tick, it isn't only the farmers that feel the effect. I remember very well the campaign he waged his last 8 years in Congress to liquidate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. He wanted to turn back the juicy mortgages to the bankers, and leave the Government holding the bag with those which didn't look so good. I remember clearly because I fought bitterly against his move in the House.

You recall how things were back in 1933, I am sure. Mortgages were being foreclosed at the rate of 1,000 a day throughout the Nation. People just didn't have jobs to keep up the payments on their homes. Well, the Government stepped in, set up HOLC, and literally gave more than 1,000,000 home owners a new lease on life with long-term, low-interest liens. HOLC backed the mortgages on about 70,000 homes right here in Illinois.

In 1941, the gentleman from Pekin, who somewhere along the line acquired a great affinity for the mortgage bankers and building and loan people, began his campaign to liquidate the very agency that had bailed the banks and building and loan associations out of bankruptcy back in 1933. Those groups obviously wanted the cream of the mortgage business back in their hands again. Condemning the proposal made by the gentleman from Pekin, I spoke out on the House floor in 1943. I said:

"Who wants this? Well, there is a trust company in Cleveland that says this ought to be turned back. That very company took $22,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in exchange for bad paper it had. It took $19,000,000 from the HOLC in exchange for additional bad paper. Now, with money in its till, it wants to grab off some of this prime paper that now belongs to the Home Owners Loan Corporation."

Well, history has proven just how wrong the gentleman from Pekin was. He always contended that HOLC was an expensive agency that had outlived its usefulness. Now, the HOLC has just about wound up its operations a little ahead of the schedule called for when it was set up. The 20-year period is about over. Instead of the deficit that the gentleman from Pekin was always predicting, HOLC will close out with a net surplus of several million dollars. It did its job well. It held foreclosures to a minimum and it played fair with the home owners in maintaining the original terms and interest. That is something that could not have been guaranteed under the proposals made by the gentleman from Pekin.

After comparison of the records of these two men, you can easily see why it is that I am here today urging the reelection of SCOTT W. LUCAS to the United States Senate. This is not a partisan matter. The Nation's farm program is above partisan politics.

Farmers all over the Nation as well as you here in Illinois need SCOTT LUCAS' experience and wisdom on agricultural legislation in Washington.

He has been clearly consistent down through the years in his vision of the kind of long-range farm program that the Nation should have to keep the American economy in good balance. He has keyed this to an intelligent world view that recognized from the beginning that the United States must play its part in the family of nations. In his position as majority leader of the United States Senate few men in the country can speak out with greater authority. SCOTT LUCAS stands for peace with honor and for an equitable distribution of some of the good things of life for all, without one iota of surrender of the fine tradition of individual initiative that has made America what it is. I know the people of Illinois will return SCOTT LUCAS to the United States Senate in November.

As 1960 Sees Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the second of two, a very well thought-out editorial from the August 5, 1950, issue of the Saturday Review of Literature, describing how the people of 1960 may look at us.

The first of the features is entitled "The Repudiation of Man." This guess is painfully pessimistic. The second is reasonably hopeful, even heartening. It sets forth a brighter mood in 1960 if we, with courage meet the issues of today. This second editorial is entitled "The Age of Valor."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE AGE OF VALOR

AUGUST 6, 1960.—The world is at peace. It is not a Utopian peace, but at least the world has been made safe for its differences. It will be many years before the peoples of the world develop a true sense of world community or world citizenship, but at least they are moving in that direction.

Democracy and totalitarianism in 1960 vie with each other, as they have for many years. There is, however, this difference: The competition between the two is now kept within bounds. Totalitarianism, deprived of its traditional dynamic and aggressive drives, is changing from within and has not been in the ascendancy for almost 10 years. The world is still beset by economic ills and by the problems of population pressure and conservation of natural resources, but for the first time in human history, a world organization is in being which is attacking these matters and is able to show progress. For the United Nations has undergone a vast development in the past 10 years. Despite too-frequent stumblings and failings, it has been able to operate effectively in the field of a common world security. What its long-range character will be it is too early to tell.

If we survey the history since the end of the Second World War for the single event or turning point which did most to save the peace, we go back 10 years to the late summer and fall of 1950. That was the summer when the world skirted the raw edge of atomic catastrophe. But that was also the year when America came into its own in terms of affirmative and effective world leadership.

The attack on South Korea in 1950 spotlighted a weakness in America that twice before had almost cost this country its freedom. That weakness was that America had been unable to develop a faculty for the anticipation of crisis. Its foreign policy failed to take into account long-range historical forces.

Constitutionally the President was charged with the primary responsibility for shaping foreign policy, but this meant that he should have been able to assess the movement of historical forces years before they asserted themselves. It meant, too, that he would have to go before the country to propose an immediate program to forestall a crisis that might occur 6, 8, or even 10 years later. This meant, too, that the Congress and the people themselves would have to think and act in long-range terms.

The time to have saved the League of Nations was not after Ethiopia was attacked, but in 1920, when the question of participation came before the American people. The time to have faced up to the threat of Pearl Harbor was at least 9 years before December 7, 1941, and the place was in Manchuria. The time to have stopped Nazi Germany was in 1934 and the place was on the Rhine. The time to have met squarely the danger of a third world war was in 1945 and the place was San Francisco.

All this was in the mind of the President when the news of the attack on South Korea was flashed to the White House on June 25,

1950. He realized that American democracy could not once again afford the luxury of a protracted period of waiting and indecision. If the challenge were not met immediately, it would fan out across the world. Decisive action had to be taken. This action might or might not lead to the outbreak of a third world war, but world war most certainly could not be averted without it.

The President summoned his Cabinet officials and a decision was made to commit American forces. Even more important, it was decided to place the issue before the Security Council of the United Nations. This decision was of historic consequence, for it gave the United Nations the type of responsibility it needed if it was to survive as a world body. More important still, it dramatized basic weaknesses in the structure and operation of the United Nations that would have to be repaired if the organization were suddenly to be confronted with a major threat by a major nation. For the United Nations was in the awkward position of having to ask the nations to send volunteers, instead of having an adequate force already at its disposal. Besides, each nation volunteering help could make its own determination as to what that help would be, and the time and circumstances of its delivery. Obviously, modern war could neither be prevented nor waged on such a basis. Yet a symbolic start, at least, toward a world police force had been made by the UN in Korea. The important thing was to build from there.

In the anxious days that followed, the President reviewed in his mind the events since the end of the Second World War. In the light of what was happening in Korea, he found it necessary to reexamine all the aspects of American foreign policy. He went back to 1945 for an inventory of basic facts bearing on the peace.

The first fact about 1945 that now seemed clear pertained to the world's peoples, taken as a whole. All peoples everywhere, regardless of color or political systems, came out of the war linked by the need for adequate representation on a world scale—representation that would be charged with the responsibility for averting war, promoting the general welfare, and enlarging the conditions favorable to human progress.

The second fact about 1945 was that two mighty nations emerged from the Second World War under circumstances which in the past had invariably involved war. More important even than the ideological differences separating the two was the lack of any real security system of which both were a part. This would inevitably lead to a race for strength—and strength was to be measured in many ways: control of other vital territories and peoples; by strategic bases all over the world; by superiority in armaments; by any measures that would weaken the potential enemy.

The third fact was that new weapons of mass extermination had been devised. It could not have been expected that these weapons could be monopolized by any single nation; they were ideally suited to an aggressor's designs and were most effective against countries with concentrated population and industry.

The fourth fact about 1945 was that any new world organization would have to be invested with as much authority beyond that given to the League of Nations as atomic energy went beyond the existing sources of power.

The fifth and final fact that was now clear was that there could be no leisurely timetable by which the United Nations could evolve into an effective organization. Time worked against peace. Time spurred the volatile race for superior arsenals and the command of strategic bases. Each day that passed brought the world closer to the end of the atomic monopoly and the beginning of the atomic stockpiles.

In retrospect it seemed hardly credible that America should have discouraged efforts to invest the United Nations with the powers of government. The President recalled that America supported the veto at San Francisco—and 4 years later was still unwilling to abolish it, not out of concern for the Soviet reaction necessarily, but because it didn't want to surrender sovereignty to a world body.

This reluctance to support the move to strengthen the United Nations into a functioning government now seemed all the more inexplicable in view of the expansionist and infiltration activities of Soviet Russia.

For Russia had been operating on three separate though related levels. The first level was the nationalist one. Her objectives on this level were historical rather than purely ideological, going back to the nationalist aspirations of the Czars: control of the Baltic and the Black Sea; a shock absorber or military cushion running through central Europe, and a senior partnership with China. The second level was that of the Comintern and the Cominform, involving world revolution and infiltration. The third level was that of opportunism and exploitation, waiting for and accelerating and reaping the benefits of depression in the west, or making use of native populations, as in Berlin or Korea, to commit forces of her opponents without committing any of her own.

It was apparent that Russian strategy against the United States was to cut her off from the nonwhite peoples of the world, or the preponderance of mankind. She recognized that no side could win either the war or the peace unless it could attract or control most of the world's 2,000,000,000 people.

This strategy represented a multiedged sword against America.

Economically, it was designed to weaken America by detaching her from vital sources of raw materials, as well as to rob her of her markets and outlets for industrial investments.

Militarily, it was designed to pit her against nations on which the atomic bomb would not be decisive—nations that were predominantly agricultural rather than industrial, and against which all the vaunted American technology would be of little avail without armed manpower that would have to be measured in tens of millions.

Ideologically, it was designed to identify America with feudalism and against long-overdue land reform and social reform. The purpose here was to discredit democracy as a doctrine that could advance and champion rights and aspirations of underprivileged peoples.

The reasons behind Russian strategy seemed clear. The world had become a single geographic unit and was fast becoming a single economic unit. But economics cannot be separated from politics. And Russia could not deny the pulling power of democracy wherever it had actually made itself felt. Hence she lost no time in appropriating the word "democracy" for her own use, even as she concocted opprobricus terms to convince the world that America represented not democracy but reactionary imperialism—a combination of words that held a specially bitter meaning for the world's colonial peoples in general and the people of southeast Asia and the Near East in particular.

So far as the United Nations was concerned, Russian policy was to keep it as weak as possible—just short of killing it, for which she was anxious to avoid responsibility.

In line with this policy, Russia served notice that she would resist all efforts to limit her sovereignty. This was to be expected, for only a strong United Nations could have coped with Russia's trilevel strategical approach to a dominant position in the world. It is possible, too, that Russia realized that it would be difficult for her to remain outside of a truly integrated world community. Hence, she preferred to stay inside a weak UN, using secession as a threat to block efforts at revision. She was anxious to avoid being confronted with the unhappy choice of becoming part of an organization having the powers to block her expansion, or pulling out of the UN and cutting herself off from the rest of the world—thus jeopardizing the three levels of her strategy.

Reviewing and assessing all these facts, the President decided that the time had come for a redefinition of the foreign policy of the United States. It would have to be a long-range policy, one which fully measured up to the challenge and the shaping of historical forces. In keeping with tradition, he presented his views to the American people in the early fall of 1950. It was a speech that gave heart and hope to people everywhere. This is part of what he said:

"I have drawn up new instructions for the American delegates to the United Nations. These instructions I now submit to Congress and to the American people for their approval.

"These instructions have taken into account the happenings in Korea. In a larger sense, they have also taken into account the events of the past 5 years, as well as our hopes and plans for the years ahead.

"Briefly stated, the instructions direct the American delegates to the United Nations to propose at once a Revision Conference of the United Nations under articles 108 and 109. These articles provide that a conference may be called for the purpose of altering the structure of the United Nations if two-thirds of the nations wish to do so. Such a call is not subject to the veto.

"The American purpose in proposing such a conference is to give the greatest possible strength to the United Nations in the shortest possible time.

"By all possible strength, I am thinking of the power of world law. This would most certainly include law-making, law-enforcing, and law-interpreting agencies.

"It would mean that the United Nations would have at its disposal a police force or army of substantial numbers. Such an army would be well equipped and sufficiently large and strategically dispersed in order to prevent aggression, as well as to enforce world law.

"Americans have been deeply shocked by the events in Korea. The struggle to put down aggression in that country has been on a scale that hardly seemed possible only a few months ago. We were deprived of the advantage we had in the First and Second World Wars, when allies held the field until we could mobilize and direct our strength.

"It is no secret that the aggressor in modern warfare possesses a tremendous advantage. He can choose the time and place of attack, counting on surprise to attain the objective before the victim can defend himself or rally support.

"No one nation can be expected to police the entire world against this type of aggression. The threat is against the world, and the world must organize to defend itself.

"I am asking the American delegates to make our proposal in all good faith. We seek nothing from a strengthened United Nations that would not be available to all nations, large and small.

"Here is a chance for the world to wipe the slate clean of the mistakes of the past 5 years. The benefits of participation are equally available to all. And when I say 'all,' I mean 'all.' Any nation sincerely interested in security and the common welfare of the world's peoples should have no hesitation in joining with the rest.

"But let there be no mistake about it. There are benefits but there are also obligations and responsibilities. The durable,

meaningful peace to which humanity is entitled cannot be obtained without sacrifice.

"Unlimited national sovereignty cannot be retained—if we sincerely want peace.

"No nation can be a law unto itself in the common affairs of the world community—if we sincerely want peace.

"No nation can expect to retain sole jurisdiction over the size and nature of its arsenals—if we sincerely want peace.

"These are some of the basic principles which must go into the making of a system of law and order. And, again I say, any nation sincerely interested in security, any nation that does not covet other territory, should have no hesitation in accepting these duties as a member of a world community.

"The aim of such a strengthened United Nations would be universal membership. The conditions for membership can be clearly stated: respect for the rules of the game, respect for the rights of the individual members, prompt fulfillment of obligations, recognition of the fact that the human community enjoys precedence over the national community in those specific matters related to a common world security.

"So much for the form of a workable world organization. The instructions to the American delegates to the United Nations are also concerned with the substance that would go into the making of such a body.

"In spirit, the United Nations must become the protector and spokesman for humanity-at-large. It must transform itself from a forum of the nations into a Congress of the peoples. It must serve a higher purpose than the mere projection of the foreign policies of the individual nations.

"Because of this, the American delegates should be free to consider every issue or question coming before the councils of the United Nations according to this simple test: does it help or harm human welfare?

"I am sure all Americans will agree with me when I say that our delegates can best represent the American people by regarding themselves as representatives of the human community.

"It is inconceivable that there should ever be any real conflict between the general welfare of humanity and the welfare of the American people. If such a conflict does arise, then American democracy will have lost its meaning as we know it.

"We hope our delegates and the delegates of all nations will vote as individuals on each issue according to their consciences and best judgment, and not as members of national blocs.

"I am therefore proposing that the delegates from each nation be elected by popular vote. This will make the United Nations a truly representative body of the world's peoples. The method of elections and the size of the various representations should be left to the determination of the revision conference.

"Participation in the building of such a responsible world body is the greatest challenge and privilege for America in its history. It is a summons to greatness.

"We are called upon to make a complete commitment—moral, physical, spiritual—to the cause of human progress and welfare. We will oppose imperialism to no less an extent than aggression. We will support and associate ourselves with the struggle for freedom and human rights. Humanity is now one and we propose to be at one with humanity.

"No one knows whether this total American commitment to the cause of a strong and just United Nations and to a free world will succeed. No one knows whether it can come in time to prevent world-wide atomic war. But if this madness is to be; if there is nothing that any of us, acting with heart and might, can do to stop it—then at least we can answer to our consciences. At least it can be said we spoke for man.

"Surely, there can be no greater purpose or mission for a democratic people than this, to stand before the world as humanity's champion.

"And even if the war is averted, the years ahead will not be easy. Charting an even course for human destiny will require anguish, disappointment, sacrifice. But it will be known in history as the Age of Valor. No struggle in history will have had a more towering dedication."

National Home Week Starts September 10—Homes Are the Foundations of Our Conduct and Our Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to remind you and my colleagues that Home Week begins September 10. Of course, you at once think of a house, a building, a roof and porch and garden about it, or, a flat; an apartment; a dingy back alley shack; a tumble-down hut. Well, these are but the symbols of where people live. It is the people who make a shack a home. A mansion without folks within it who live with affection and patience and loyalty is still not an honest-to-God home.

But, of course, Mr. Speaker, this week, beginning September 10, is to again remind us and to have us all join in placing the American home on the pinnacle of pride of possession which it deserves.

Individually owned homes add so much more to America's future. Every time I see a huge tenement in our largest cities, it makes me hope and hope and hope, that some day the folks who are now forced to live in crowded quarters, may be blessed with individual roofs over possessed homes and gardens.

Yes, I know it is a dream. But it does me good to dream.

Then, there are the millions of homes being built annually for individual ownership all over America.

And, in my own great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California is a home enterprise I want you and my colleagues to know about. I asked my friend to write me about it briefly so that you might quickly read of this marvelous home enterprise. I give you the telegram which just came to me when I asked about this history-making home-building plan, right in my very own community. It reads:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *September 1, 1950.*
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Am happy to reply to your request by supplying the following facts and comments concerning Lakewood Park. The largest community housing development in history, Lakewood Park lies in the heart of the district with the greatest growth and expansion potential in the Nation. It is situated close to many of the industries which are so important to the national defense program. Lakewood Park, more than 17,000 new homes, will house workers of many of the aircraft factories, steel plants, refineries, and other defense industries in this vital area. Their children will attend new schools, worship in new churches, and play in new parks and playgrounds. Lakewood Park will have 133 miles of paved streets, lined with 5,000 modern street lights, and it is the world's first garbage-free city, for every dwelling is equipped with a garbage pulverator.

On February 24 of this year the first foundation was poured; since then more than 7,000 homes have been completed or are in various stages of completion, with new families moving in at the rate of 50 a day. In less than 2 years Lakewood Park's population is expected to reach between sixty and seventy thousand persons, larger than 76 percent of all United States cities. We see in Lakewood Park, not only the birth of a city, but a graphic example of the healthy growth of our mighty Nation as well. It shows we are building for peace as well as defense. It is only fitting that our Nation place emphasis on the importance of our homes. We can do this by giving our full support to national home week, which starts September 10.

DON ROCHLEN,
Director, Community and Public Relations.

Turning Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Turning Point," written by Frances Spatz and published in the American Weekly of August 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

TURNING POINT—LITTLE THINGS, LIKE A MUDDY ROAD, AN ORATORICAL CONTEST, AND A $10 JOB, WERE STEPPING STONES TO HIGH GOVERNMENT POSTS

(By Frances Spatz)

When they offered him the chairmanship of the money-losing Pawnee County Fair, the young country lawyer thought he was on the right road to success. He charged into his duties like a lion, determined to give Pawnee County the biggest fair Nebraska had ever seen.

He got the United States Cavalry to put on a show, hired animal acts, even lady aerialists. He was all set—and then it rained.

It rained so hard the roads were a quagmire. When he got out of his jalopy to tack the posters to the poles he was ankle deep in mud. The roads became inpassable, and the farmers couldn't come to the fair.

That dripping fiasco was what put the young lawyer, KENNETH WHERRY, in politics. On the platform of better roads he ran for the State legislature and was elected. He went on from there to become United States Senator.

"I guess," the Senator told the American Weekly recently, "that if it hadn't rained and if I had gotten over the roads, I wouldn't

be here today. Odd how little things shape your career."

In a small community in Utah, Reva Beck, tall, stately, with flaming red hair, was asked by a desperate theatrical troupe to fill in for an ill player. The high school girl played the role with artistry. The town was pleased and Reva's future seemed assured. She majored in dramatics at college and, with a successful professional appearance to her credit, Reva thought nothing of entering the college oratorical contest.

Suddenly then Reva realized that this time she had to write her own lines, not just memorize somebody else's. She prepared her talk, choosing temperance as her subject and won. Strangely she found more thrill in having created the subject matter than in delivering the speech so well.

Reva Beck changed her direction, from dramatics to public service. She went to law school, graduated, married, and eventually became judge of traffic court in Salt Lake City. She was especially praised for her work with juvenile delinquents and alcoholics.

From there Mrs. REVA BECK BOSONE went on to become a Member of Congress from Utah.

The turning point in the life of JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader of the House of Representatives, came at the age of 16, he recounted recently. At that time he had the choice of being sent to college with all expenses paid by a group of townspeople or of going to work as a cub reporter at $10 a week. He thought of his hard-working father, his seven brothers and sisters, and he chose work. In 5 years he owned the paper and went into politics. He has been a Congressman since 1924.

Over 50 years ago a 12-year-old boy in Texas heard that a nationally famous orator was to speak at the nearest town. The boy had no chance of going. One of 11 children of a poor farmer, he had to work on the farm.

When the day came, however, so did a downpour. Work on the farm was impossible and his parents permitted him to ride 12 miles through the rain to hear the politician.

Young SAM RAYBURN, spellbound, decided that one day he would enter politics. Today he is Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In contrast to RAYBURN, Richard W. Hoffman was a wealthy and established Chicago businessman when his turning point came. A group of neighbors asked him to help in the job of cleaning up the local school system. He was elected to the school board, became its chairman and then found out the deep satisfaction of public service.

He, too, became a Member of the House of Representatives.

When J. Howard McGrath was 5 years old he heard someone say that a good lawyer could be anything he wanted to be. He doesn't remember who said those words, but he never forgot their import. He became an attorney, then Governor of Rhode Island and eventually Attorney General of the United States.

One of his employees, when a small boy, wanted to be a minister. The boy had to go to work to aid in the support of his mother. The job he found just happened to be in the Library of Congress and the boy became interested in law. He worked his way through law school and got a job with the Department of Justice. Today J. Edgar Hoover is head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Another man who had to change his mind because of finances is John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury. Young Snyder wanted to be an electrical engineer, but had to go to work in his uncle's bank. He found he liked banking and stuck with it.

Twenty years ago Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH was treasurer of a woolen mill in Skowhegan, Maine, and rather proud of her success.

Her employer asked her to do him a favor. He was backing Wallace White for Senator—would she help him put White over? Mrs. SMITH agreed just to be accommodating. From that start in politics she went on to succeed Senator White and is now the only woman United States Senator.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower almost became a sailor. He took competitive exams for both Annapolis and West Point and placed first in the Navy, second in the Army. Then he found that the maximum age limit at Annapolis was 21—and he would be 22 when he entered.

West Point's age limit, however, was 22. The man ahead of Eisenhower became ill and forfeited his place. Thanks to that combination of circumstances, young Eisenhower entered West Point. Only this year the age for both Annapolis and West Point was made the same, 21.

Origin of Labor Day and Its Significance—Congressional Library Gives It to California Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, Monday next is a national holiday. It is Labor Day. All honest labor is dignified and of enduring value. It is appropriate that our great Nation, which is so blessed by a high and patriotic quality of manual workers and craftsmen, should again observe this as a national holiday.

I asked the Congressional Library to give me its report. I am pleased to herewith give it to you for further knowledge.

ORIGIN OF LABOR DAY

Although there has been some controversy in the past as to whether the Knights of Labor in New York City or the New York City Central Labor Union originated Labor Day, it has been confirmed through investigation that the Knights of Labor had nothing to do officially with the declaration of such a holiday. The idea of a day to be set apart for labor was first made public by a resolution offered at a meeting of the Central Labor Union held on May 8, 1882, by Peter J. McGuire, at that time the general secretary of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners and later the vice president of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. McGuire suggested that the first Monday in September be made the day for paying public tribute to American industry, "as it would come at the most pleasant season of the year, nearly midway between the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving, and would fill a wide gap in the chronology of legal holidays."

The resolution was passed and a committee was appointed to prepare for the celebration. However, the first Labor Day observance was held, not on the first Monday, but on Tuesday, September 5, 1882. About 10,000 union members marched up Broadway, after which they and their families and friends spent the rest of the day on the picnic grounds in Elm Park, where all sorts of amusements were provided. From a platform which had been erected on the grounds, the crowds were addressed by numerous labor leaders from 2:30 in the afternoon until nightfall. This first celebration was a great success and led to the establishment of the annual observance of Labor Day by which the American people, in the words of Mr. McGuire, "honor the toilers of the earth, and pay homage to those who from rude nature have delved and carved all the comfort and grandeur we behold."

The second Labor Day was celebrated Wednesday, September 5, 1883, and the parade on that occasion was reported as an "imposing demonstration of the Central Labor Union." In 1884, it was decided by the Central Labor Union to hold the celebration on the first Monday in September, which was the first of the month, and the central labor bodies in other cities were urged to celebrate that day as "a universal holiday for workingmen."

On October 7, 1884, a resolution was unanimously adopted by the American Federation of Labor convention to the effect that "the first Monday in September of each year be set apart as a laborers' national holiday, and we recommend its observance by all wage workers, irrespective of sex, calling, or nationality."

During the next few years, Labor Day became officially recognized in scattered localities through municipal ordinances. State legislative recognition was developed as a result of a campaign conducted by organized labor, and by the end of 1893, 23 States had enacted Labor Day laws. Oregon was the first State to pass such legislation by the enactment of a law in 1887 designating the first Saturday in June as Labor Day. This act was amended in 1893 to conform to the general plan of observing the first Monday in September as Labor Day, which by that time was widely accepted.

The increasing interest in setting aside a day for honoring the workers of America, and the efforts of the American Federation of Labor to get national recognition for such a day resulted in the passage of a bill, known as the Kyle bill, by the Congress of the United States which made Labor Day a legal holiday for public employees. The bill was passed with very little discussion; the only objection raised was that, for the sake of symmetry in national holidays, Labor Day should be fixed for the first day of September instead of the first Monday. However, since the holiday was being created by Congress and not by an event, it was thought better to make it the first Monday to conform to the prevailing practice.

On June 28, 1894, President Cleveland signed the act and it became law. It reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first Monday in September of each year, being the day known and celebrated as labor's holiday, is hereby made a legal public holiday, to all intents and purposes, in the same manner as Christmas, the 1st day of January, the 22d of February, the 30th of May, and the 4th day of July are now by law made public holidays.

The recognition thus accorded Labor Day by the action of the Congress and the Executive added to the significance of the movement and the prestige of the holiday. The act was acclaimed as establishing Labor Day as a national holiday, although it actually applied only to Federal employees.

By 1900 Labor Day had been officially recognized by most of the States, but it was not until February 1923, that the 48th State—Wyoming—fell into line. Most of the States in their original acts set the first Monday in September as the holiday. The following States, however, originally fixed other days, but later changed their laws:

California: First Monday in October (act of May 23, 1893); amended by act of February 23, 1897.

Louisiana: November 25 (act of July 7, 1892, affecting parish of New Orleans only); amended by act of July 8, 1912, and made applicable to State.

North Carolina: First Thursday in September (act of March 6, 1899); amended by act of January 23, 1901.

Oregon: First Saturday in June (act of February 21, 1887); amended by act of February 21, 1893.

Pennsylvania: Originally the first Monday in September was designated by act of April 25, 1889. This was changed to the first Saturday in September by act of May 31, 1893, but by act of June 23, 1897, the original date was restored.

In Wisconsin and Wyoming, Labor Day is set by the governors, but in practice, of course, they designate the first Monday in September for the observance.

There is no source available to indicate why the above States changed their laws, but presumably they were so changed so as to create uniformity in observing legal holidays. A search of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indexes does not disclose that at any time the question of changing the day of observing Labor Day has been raised or discussed in the Congress. Through tradition and practice, the first Monday in September has become the accepted time for acknowledging the part that American workers have played in the economic growth of the Nation. Since this holiday was created by concerted action and not by any fixed event, a change in the day of celebration could be undertaken, but such a change would be complicated by the fact that the Federal law and each individual State law would have to be amended, since each jurisdiction is separately controlled by independent legislation on this subject.

HISTORY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF LABOR DAY

(By Estelle Stewart)

ORIGIN OF HOLIDAY

Labor Day, the holiday dedicated to the American worker, is a comparatively recent achievement of the American labor movement. It grew out of the dream of one of the pioneer trade-unionists, Peter J. McGuire, of New York, to symbolize the industrial spirit—the great, vital force of every nation—in somewhat the same manner as other public holidays symbolize the religious, civil, or military spirit. In 1882, the newly-formed Central Labor Union of New York City voted to translate that dream into action. It appointed a committee to plan a demonstration which, as McGuire pictured it, "would publicly show the strength and esprit de corps of the trade and labor organizations."

The first Labor Day celebration occurred on Tuesday, September 5, 1882, in New York City. As reported in the New York World of September 6, 1882:

"The great labor demonstration and picnic yesterday under the auspices of the Central Labor Union, composed of the various trade and labor organizations of New York City and neighborhood, was very successful."

The idea spread rapidly and by 1885 Labor Day was celebrated in many of the industrial centers of the country.

LABOR DAY LEGISLATION

The first official recognition of Labor Day as a legal holiday came through municipal ordinances that were passed during 1885 and 1886. The first law establishing Labor Day as a State holiday was passed by the Oregon Legislature on February 21, 1887. During that year four other States—Colorado, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York—created the Labor Day holiday by legislative enactment. By the end of the decade Connecticut, Nebraska, and Pennsylvania had joined their ranks. Iowa and Ohio followed in 1890, and Kansas in 1891.

At the 1890 convention of the American Federation of Labor, President Gompers reported that the first Monday in September, the day set apart by several States as Labor Day, had been more generally observed than ever before. He recommended that efforts be made to have all the States enact a similar law.

On June 23, 1894, Congress passed an act making the first Monday in September of each year a legal holiday in the District of Columbia and the Territories. The recognition accorded Labor Day by act of Congress added materially to the growth of the movement and to the prestige of the holiday itself. By 1900 most of the States had recognized Labor Day officially, and the forty-eighth State, Wyoming, fell into line as recently as 1923.

LABOR DAY OBSERVANCES

The form that the observances and celebration of the first Labor Day holiday took—a street parade to exhibit to the public the strength of organized labor, followed by a festival for the recreation and amusement of the workers and their families—became the general pattern for the celebration of Labor Day. Addresses by prominent men were introduced later, as more emphasis was placed upon the economic and civics significance of the holiday. Still later the Sunday preceding Labor Day was adopted as Labor Sunday, dedicated to the spiritual and educational aspects of the labor movement.

In recent years the character of Labor Day celebrations has been undergoing change, especially in large industrial centers where mass displays such as huge parades are impractical. Other more up-to-date methods are used to direct public attention to the workers, their organizations, their aims, ideals, and achievements. Labor Day messages from public officials and men and women prominent in labor and social and civic affairs appear not only in the labor papers but in the general press. Labor Day addresses of leading union officials, industrialists, educators, and clergymen are given a wide hearing over the radio. Many churches devote Labor Sunday to sermons on labor and its problems, and the spokesmen of organized labor not infrequently occupy the pulpits on those occasions.

Antimerger Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very forceful article setting forth the urgent necessity of amending section 7 of the Clayton Act to plug the loophole which is enabling many monopolies to be formed with immunity. The article was written by Edward Wimmer, president, Forward American Publishing Guild, and vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sharon (Ohio) Press of August 25, 1950]

PASS ANTIMERGER BILL NOW—KEEP AMERICA INDEPENDENT

(By Edward Wimmer, president, Forward American Publishing Guild; vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.)

Last week I discussed with you the creation and development of the National Dairy Co., giant of the dairy products industry, and told you how this company had put together some 500 separate enterprises that gave National a virtual monopoly on the sale of milk, butter, cheese (Kraft), and ice cream in hundreds of American towns and cities.

This week I am going to give you some background information on how our Anti-trust Laws have been bypassed, and why such combines as National Dairy Co. have been permitted to take over in many fields of business enterprise.

It was in 1914 that the Congress decided that the practice of buying control of one's competitors to get rid of competition was a practice that could very well lead to disaster. In this thought Congress passed the Clayton Act, forbidding any corporation from buying the stocks of any other corporation wherever such purchase might lessen competition. This proviso was contained in section 7 of the act, but Congress left a loophole in the legislation, in that a corporation was not prohibited from buying up the assets of its competitors. The result was that in a few months the greatest merger movement in the history of the world was gotten under way, and has progressed until today some 113 giant corporations own or control approximately 50 percent of all the assets of all the corporations in the manufacturing field. This same process of liquidation of independent enterprise is taking place in the distribution field, as witnessed on any Main Street in America.

I think it is only fair to state at this time that outstanding Members of both the House and the Senate have made vigorous attempts to plug the loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act, and fine support has come from every President and from such agencies of the Government as the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission.

It was soon after the Clayton Act was passed that Woodrow Wilson described the giants as "economic states," and Herbert

Hoover referred to them as "a building up of a kind of economic autocracy." Franklin D. Roosevelt said, in his famous monopoly message, that our industrial life had come under the domination of a "cluster of collectivisms," and even Wendell Willkie predicted "disaster to our Republic" if no solution to the problem was found.

Space does not permit any elaboration on these provocative statements at this writing, but we will get to that in later columns. What we are interested in right now is passage of an act known as H. R. 2834, the intent of which is to close the loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act and thus curb if not halt any further mergers of competing corporations. H. R. 2734 was originally introduced in the House by Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER (now a distinguished Member of the Senate), and was sponsored in the Senate by Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. Last year, following a stormy debate on the issue, the House Judiciary Committee sent H. R. 2734 to the House for a vote. Under the able sponsorship of Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, the bill was passed by an overwhelming majority.

The next step in the consideration of H. R. 2734 was the hearings held by the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which highly respected HERBERT O'CONOR, of Maryland, was chairman. After extensive hearings (it was my privilege to testify before the House and Senate Judiciary Committees), the committee voted favorably on the measure and it was sent to the Senate where it awaits final action. President Truman's signature to H. R. 2734 is considered a foregone conclusion.

Speaking of the need for adoption of H. R. 2734, Senator O'MAHONEY said, "If we continue to lose our economic independence to giant corporate combines, the loss of political independence is inevitable." Senator KEFAUVER stated emphatically, "If the combines are not stopped, America will not long survive the trends to communism and socialism," and Congressman CELLER declared, "I don't want my children or your children to be confronted with signs which read 'verboten'—forbidden, you can't enter this or that business because there is an oligopoly of a big three or a big four—an absolute control."

Mr. and Mrs. America, it is later than you think.

Defense Procurement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures, I have given a great deal of thought to the problems involved in the greatly enlarged defense procurement program resulting from events in Korea. All Americans remember the important work done during World War II by a Senate committee, whose chairman, Harry S. Truman, is now President of the United States. It is clear that the House has a responsibility to see to it that the vast new appropriations soon to be expended for our defense should be handled in the most efficient and economical fashion. Our committee is assigned such responsibility by the Legislative Reorganization Act.

At first it seemed to me that it might be wise to appoint a special subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to handle this important field. However, after discussion with many Members it seemed to me that a standing subcommittee of the full committee had proved by its work during this Congress its ability to handle the job. I speak of the Subcommittee on Government Operations, whose chairman is the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable PORTER HARDY. This subcommittee has worked very hard during the Eighty-first Congress and has brought about in a workmanlike manner many important improvements in Government operations. This subcommittee has proved by its past actions that its members, both Democrats and Republicans, are interested in getting a job done and not in grabbing headlines. We, therefore, decided that this important assignment would be given to Chairman HARDY and his Subcommittee on Government Operations. The other members of that committee are Congressmen BOLTON of Maryland; BURNSIDE, of West Virginia; BOLLING, of Missouri; SHELLEY, of California; HOFFMAN of Michigan; RIEHLMAN, of New York; and LOVRE, of South Dakota.

We have every confidence that Chairman HARDY and his able subcommittee will accomplish much in the pursuit of this assignment.

Defense Procurement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, Chairman DAWSON has just called to the attention of the House his assignment to my Subcommittee on Government Operations of responsibility to look into the procurement program which will result from the appropriations bills which this Congress has recently passed.

Obviously, when such great amounts of money are to be expended in relatively short periods of time, there is an unusual impact upon the economy of the United States. Additionally, there is an unusual likelihood that wastefulness and extravagance may occur. These considerations make it especially urgent that this subcommittee give its attention to the responsibilities conferred upon it by the Legislative Reorganization Act. I am delighted, therefore, that the chairman of our committee has assigned to me, together with my able colleagues who serve with me on the Government Operations Subcommittee, the responsibility for looking into this program of spending and seeking to achieve maximum returns for the funds spent.

The specific activities which we shall pursue have not yet been determined and we shall decide upon them after careful study of the problems at hand and with due consideration to their relative urgency and importance. We shall not act hastily but with deliberation, and we shall conduct our inquiries in a manner to avoid impeding any procurement activity of the Defense Establishment.

This matter of defense procurement comes within the purview of the Committee on Armed Services also. I have discussed it with Chairman VINSON, of that committee, and can assure the Members of the House that there will be full coordination and collaboration between us in order that there may be no duplication of effort and a maximum of accomplishment. Such coordination will be facilitated because I serve under Mr. VINSON as a member of the Armed Services Committee.

During the Eighty-first Congress the Subcommittee on Government Operations has been an active committee. We have conducted several important inquiries and have issued reports of considerable significance. I believe that we have made something of a record in that every action which has been taken by the subcommittee has been an unanimous action. This is a noteworthy indication of cooperation and whatever has been accomplished by my subcommittee can be attributed to the splendid attitude and the determination to do a job well on the part of every member of my subcommittee. I know that each of those men can be counted upon to carry forward this assignment with credit not only to themselves but to the House and that we will discharge well this specific responsibility which Chairman DAWSON has assigned to us.

Again the Question Is Asked, Why Do We Permit Critical or Strategic Material To Be Exported to Russia and Its Satellites?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced on August 29 of this year a resolution for an investigation to determine the extent to which material and instruments of war have been or are being exported from the United States, either directly or through other countries, to Russia or those countries whose possession of such materials and instruments of war is inimical to the national defense and security of the United States, I have received many encouraging communications from different parts of the country. Likewise, there has been considerable interest displayed by newspapers and radio commentators.

As illustrative of the interest aroused in the subject, I include as part of my

remarks a letter received by me from E. Dean Maitlen, Lafayette, Ind., as follows:

LAFAYETTE, IND., *August 30, 1950.*
Honorable WOLVERTON AND
CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE.

DEAR SIR: It has been called to my attention that this country is allowing the shipment of essential war materials to our enemies directly and indirectly. Is this not an open act of treason? We advocate punishment for those that support and advocate the overthrowing of the Government by force. Is there any difference here? It would appear that the pouring of essential war materials to our enemies would be a direct act of advocating the overthrow of the Government by force.

Upon whose shoulders does this dastardly act fall? Does this action fall upon the shoulders of the State Department or is this the sole responsibility of the Commerce Department? Could this fall upon the shoulders of both Departments?

In behalf of the servicemen who are giving their lives for a cause that is still clouded to most of them, I would demand this act of treason be investigated and the guilty party or parties be subject to maximum punishment for their un-American activities.

An investigation should be carried out to its fullest extent and to obtain all the facts as to who is responsible for this unpardonable act and make public its findings. The committee should not have its hands tied by political pressure or by Big Johnny Dollar. An investigation should be made at the earliest possible moment while the blood still stains the hands of those that are involved in giving aid to our enemies, for the evidence would be much easier to obtain while the hands of those are still stained from wringing the blood from the cash they received in turn for war materials they furnished.

Has Big Johnny Dollar tied the hands of our Commerce and State Departments or is the selling of those war materials done by the Departments of their own free will?

At present we are trying to enact a law to control subversives but are we doing anything to prevent underhanded and dastardly dealings such as this?

It seems to me this act happened in World War II and was anything done about it? "H" no, for Big Johnny Dollar and Big Political Vice had things all tied up as usual. In this war as last war our boys will again trade their blood, brains and guts for Big Johnny Dollar's illicit profits.

Again let me repeat my desire in behalf of our fighting men, let's have a full investigation as soon as possible on the selling of war materials from this country to our enemies directly or indirectly for this is not strictly classified as un-American activity?

Sincerely,

E. DEAN MAITLEN.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The National Guard—America's Minute Men," which I delivered at Camp Haven, near Sheboygan, Wis., on August 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL GUARD—AMERICA'S MINUTE MEN—A PLEA FOR TOTAL PREPAREDNESS, ADEQUATE CIVIL DEFENSE, WEEDING OUT OF POOR LEADERSHIP

It is a profound joy and thrill for me to be here today with your distinguished visitors, with the friends and dear ones of the men in training here at Camp Haven.

I am particularly grateful to have been invited with so renowned a group of Americans, including his excellency, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, commander in chief of the Illinois National Guard, a distinguished veteran and able public executive. I do wish that there might be time to pay well-deserved tribute to men like Major General Smykal, commanding general of the Illinois Guard, and to the other famed officers and civilian leaders who have also been invited to this assemblage. Taken together, these men represent not only a tremendous number of years in the honored uniform of their country, but a vast number of years in public service.

It is an inspiring thing indeed that men who in many instances have fought political wars against one another on both sides of the fence, so to speak, join together in defense of America's soil and liberty, close ranks, unite when the bugle sounds and the drums roll for American patriots to rally as one.

But my heart goes out particularly to you men of the ranks today and to your loved ones. As I anticipated this occasion, I asked myself what I could say by way of sincerest tribute and encouragement to your distinguished officers, to you, the men of the National Guard, and to those who love you who are here today physically or in spirit.

WE PRAY THIRD WAR WILL NOT COME

The answer is truly that there are no words which can measure up to the deeds that you men and your buddies are performing and have performed for your country. In the Book of Books, in Ecclesiastes, we read that there is a time of war and a time of peace. We pray to Almighty God that today is not a time for all-out war. We pray that it may turn out to be a time for enduring peace. But if this should prove a time for war, then we know you will be adequate, and there will be no words in the English or any other language that could express to you the heartfelt gratitude of the great State of Illinois, yes, the States of Kansas or Missouri, or any other State, for the faith that you men have shown in joining up and remaining with your National Guard units, in taking time out from your daily lives to prepare yourself for the emergency which is now at hand.

WE ARE PROUD OF MIDWEST'S RECORD

We of the Middle West are proud of these our sons of the Middle West who are in training today. In both world wars (as in previous conflicts) sons of the midwestern heart of this Nation—principally volunteers—have contributed more than their share of glory to the sagas of American heroism.

THE EAST-WEST BATTLEFIELD IS EVERYWHERE

We have learned that the world battlefield is in a sense one—it is indivisible. Here in the Midwest in Camp Haven is a battlefield, so to speak, because here you men are preparing as earnestly as if you were getting last minute training outside the beleaguered port of Pusan.

At Lake Success, N. Y., where Security Council President Jacob Malik is proving himself to be the master of the Red monkey wrench—that, too, is one critical flank of the battlefield.

All corners of the globe, wherever we are fighting to win the minds and hearts of men, yes, those, too, are almost as much a part of the battlefield as are Taegu and Pohang and the Naktong River. Blood is spilled on the front lines, but victories or defeats can be sealed in the rear as well.

SUMMARY OF MY MAJOR POINTS

I do not want to trespass on time that is all too brief for these days' many features, so let me state my points as these:

1. You are the Minute Men of 1950.
2. You men symbolize here today the real test of an American.
3. The great commanding officer of the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Brigade symbolizes in his own right the best sterling qualities of an American leader.
4. Our statesmen must be as adequate as the men in our Armed Forces have always been.
5. If we must err, we must err on the side of being too well prepared rather than being too little prepared.
6. The total defense of the American continent must be accelerated.

CONGRATULATIONS ON EXCELLENT MARKSMANSHIP

Yes, first, gentlemen, I want to salute you, the Minute Men of 1950. Like the marksmen of colonial times, you have achieved brilliant records. You of the One Hundred and Ninth were rated superior last year and now again in 1950, you have really been blasting the aerial sleeves out of the sky. Congratulations, indeed.

THE ONLY STANDARD: IS A MAN A TRUE AMERICAN?

Second, you men here today symbolize the fact that in our country the only real distinction should be this: Is a man a sincere, true American or is he not? The distinctions should not be: Was a man born in a foreign land, or is he a native blue-blood, or were his parents born abroad; Is a man a Gentile, a Jew, a Negro, or white? A rank-and-file unionist or a manager?

The only real question is: Is he a devoted American or is he not? Is he devoted to the tradition of 175 years of American liberty, the tradition of our constitutional Republic or has he sold his soul to an alien allegiance like the Hisses, the Coplons, Fuchs, etc.?

TRIBUTES TO BRIG. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN FROM MAC ARTHUR AND OTHERS

Now, third, I would be remiss indeed if I allowed this opportunity to pass without paying tribute to the distinguished commanding officer of the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade of the Illinois National Guard, my dear friend, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein. The very mention of his name brings to mind some of the unforgettable tributes which have been paid to him by the outstanding leaders of America's Armed Forces and of civilian life. I wish that there could be time to cite some of these messages which it has been my pleasure to see and hear, because I know that you men are happy to serve under so great a leader. I think, particularly, however, of messages that have come from General Klein's magnificent wartime chief, Gen. Douglas MacArthur in well-justified praise of the many honors that have been bestowed on this citizen-soldier-statesman-journalist. Douglas MacArthur—a Milwaukeean whose illustrious personal and family name will glow throughout the pages of world history—speaks superbly where praise is well justified—as in this instance—speaks boldly where criticism in policy is due. A faithful soldier, loyal to the core, MacArthur will nevertheless not flinch where duty calls him to warn his countrymen. America will heed his counsel, because it recalls its bitter folly when his brilliant warnings were ignored.

Now, friends, the men who have served under General Klein know him as the GI's general, a man who while maintaining the necessary discipline and esprit of his troops, brings to his post a sense of humility, of warm comradeship, of deep personal feeling for every last individual serving with him, that is so befitting the leader of a citizen contingent. In two world wars the general, like his men, has proved not only his military skill and daring but his absolute devotion to the flag of his country. In peacetime, he has received great recognition in his chosen profession of public relations. He is a source of pride to the State of Illinois, to his Nation, to the members of his ancient faith, and to all lovers of freedom. These, I assure you, are not just words, but are more than borne out by the record of service he has compiled as a brigadier general, as a veteran, as the first midwesterner who was elected national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, as a dauntless foe of communism, and in many other capacities.

WE NEED SUPERIOR STATESMANSHIP

Fourth, you men know that in this and all other National Guard units, there is constantly a weeding-out process of men who prove incompetent to hold posts of importance. I say, my friends, that the time is overdue for the Federal Government in Washington to follow a similar policy of weeding out its incompetents. I say that—believe me in a nonpartisan way—to both major political parties. When a man goes into battle he needs and must have officers of proven leadership, men with nerves of steel, men of superior merit. We need the same type of men in Washington—in diplomacy, in administration; yes, in legislation. We have had too many square pegs in round holes. I repeat, I say this not in a partisan way, not in carping criticism, not with anything at heart but the welfare of my beloved country, just as you men are similarly devoted.

Fifth, ladies and gentlemen, it is obvious that we must have total preparedness—in stockpiling strategic materials, in an unbeatable intelligence set-up, in balanced armed services, in peerless military and scientific research, in civil defense.

COLD WAR WILL CONTINUE INDEFINITELY

Korea has taught us that we are in this show with the Russians for keeps. There is no miracle that is going to solve the problems between us overnight or automatically. We are not going to wake up tomorrow morning and blissfully find that we can live happily ever after with Joe Stalin and company. We may wake up tomorrow morning and find that things have grown worse, but the chances are that we will not find that they have grown any better.

The Red strategy is a diabolic long-range plan for the absolute domination of the world. The cold war will be continued indefinitely. We must live as if in a garrison, practically indefinitely. This does not mean that we must be panicked or hysterical or pessimistic or that we must abandon entirely our former traditions. On the contrary, we must maintain that faith which we are told moves mountains, faith that we can avoid war, but we must be sternly realistic.

America's policy has always been to do as little as we could get away with in unpreparedness, to have as few men and as little material in our Army, in our Navy, and in our Air Force. "Give the National Guard boys old armories, obsolete weapons; it'll be O. K." That's been the attitude but now the entire policy of America must be changed. If we must err in the future, let us err on the side of having too many trained men, too much modern material and facilities and too much modern equipment for our regulars, our reservists and our guardsmen. After all, the very life of America will be at stake if a third world war should come and with our life, the entire life of western civilization. We are, in Lincoln's words, "the last best hope of earth."

OUR CIVIL DEFENSE IS A TRAGIC FARCE

The fact that I am addressing an antiaircraft brigade brings to mind this fact: Aside from military defenses, America's civil defense thus far, speaking very objectively, is a terrible dud. It is a farce, a tragic comedy of errors. We have been told that if war came, 50,000,000 Americans in our leading cities could be the possible subject of mass extermination in a matter of days—or hours. Against that fact I must regretably report that civil defense exists principally in a few sugary press releases, a few highly technical booklets, a few hopes and a few fat-chewing round tables. The Russians cannot be very impressed; nor are we. Civil defense delays comprise a shocking situation which could out-Pearl Harbor Pearl Harbor if the worst came to worst. We must act and act now to be adequately prepared.

CONCLUSION

That, then, friends, is my message to you today. I am grateful for your kind attention.

I repeat that if it should be your fate to be called to active duty, I know that you will carry on in the inspiring tradition of the great National Guard record which you have compiled in the past. You are the minute men, and thank God, the minute men who have sprung to America's defense have always been worthy of our faith. Good luck, and Godspeed, to your officers and to you men. And may you and your loved ones know that satisfaction of a job well done, for a peerless country to whom we can never give too much.

May the skies hold for you and for all America not missiles of death and destruction, not enemy aircraft, but wings of peace, or mercy, of prosperity for us and for all mankind.

Thank you.

Origin of the Fourteenth Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very illuminating editorial from Monday's Washington Post on the Origin of the Fourteenth Amendment.

This editorial discusses the conclusive historical findings of both Prof. Stanley Morrison and Prof. Charles Fairman of Stanford University, that the fourteenth amendment was never intended to have, and does not in fact have, any binding effect upon the States with reference to requiring them to enforce the Bill of Rights.

Justice Black, writing a dissenting opinion in Adamson against California, 3 years ago tried to establish this contention on behalf of himself and Justices Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge, but the majority of the Court refused to accept that doctrine and adhered to the established interpretation which has been recognized for the past 80 years. The findings of these historians fully sustain the decision of the Court and rebut the contention of the dissenters.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORIGIN OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

To what extent is the fourteenth amendment a guaranty of civil rights? For more than four score years judges, lawyers, and scholars have been debating this question without bringing forth any complete or definite answer. Because of the importance of the fourteenth amendment in this respect, we may assume that the debate will go on indefinitely. But it is significant that able scholars, digging into the background out of which this amendment grew, are coming up with detailed answers to some of the questions on which judges, writers, and commentators have gone astray in the past.

Nearly 3 years ago four justices of the Supreme Court came out with a flat affirmation, in *Adamson* v. *California*, that a major purpose of the fourteenth amendment was to make the Bill of Rights applicable to the States. One more vote would have made that view the law of the land. And that would have actually undermined our Federal system; for the fourteenth amendment gives Congress sweeping power to make its terms effective by legislation. Presumably Congress would have suddenly acquired power to legislate for the States on any matter covered in the Bill of Rights. The consequences, according to Prof. Stanley Morrison of Stanford University, would have been drastic and would have required a major readjustment in the processes of State government.

In defending the position taken by himself and Justices Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge, Justice Black attached to his dissent a résumé of the history of the amendment. "In my judgment," he wrote, "that history conclusively demonstrates that the language of the first section of the fourteenth amendment, taken as a whole, was thought by those responsible for its submission to the people, and by those who opposed its submission, sufficiently explicit to guarantee that thereafter no State would deprive its citizens of the privileges and protections of the Bill of Rights."

This appeal to history—history which the Supreme Court is accused of having previously ignored for nearly a century—stimulated at least one scholar into action. Charles Fairman, professor of law and political science at Stanford University, examined all the debates on the fourteenth amendment in the House and Senate; the debates on related bills in those two bodies; the debates in the State legislatures which ratified the amendment; and a large number of the speeches made and editorials written about the amendment in 1866–68. He gave the public the benefit of his research in the December 1949 issue of the Stanford Law Review, and the effect was to leave the justices who claimed to have resorted to history with only flimsy shreds of fact to stand on.

The finding that stands out most prominently from Professor Fairman's research is that the people did not know precisely what they were doing when they amended the Constitution to say: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States * * *." At no time was there any agreement as to what those privileges and immunities are. Before Congress accepted the fourteenth amendment it had passed the Civil Rights Act. This act assured to the recently freed slaves the right to contract, to sue, to testify, to buy, hold, and sell property, and to enjoy the full and equal

benefit of the laws for the security of person and property. Many had thought that it was unconstitutional for Congress to pass such an act. Consequently, the debate in the House reiterated, again and again, that the purpose of the fourteenth amendment was to make permanent and secure the rights enumerated in the Civil Rights Act. No one went over the guaranties of the Bill of Rights—freedom of speech and of the press, religious liberty, freedom of assembly, etc.—to claim that they were included among the "privileges and immunities" referred to.

In presenting the resolution to the Senate, Senator Jacob M. Howard did say positively that the phrase was meant to include the "personal rights guaranteed and secured by the first eight amendments of the Constitution." But this attracted little attention and was contrary to what most of the other Senators said. The Senate amended the resolution, and when it went back to the House nothing was said about the Federal Bill of Rights. Some of the opponents of the resolution insisted that it was intended to transfer all power affecting the rights of citizens from the States to the Federal Government, but this was hotly contradicted by the sponsors. The examination of many speeches, articles, and editorials about the amendment, Professor Fairman concludes, also "counts heavily against the theory of incorporation."

Turning to the ratification of the amendment in the State legislatures, Professor Fairman found almost no mention of the Bill of Rights in the messages and debates. On the contrary, several States having in their own constitutions provisions out of line with the Federal Bill of Rights adopted the amendment with no mention of the possibility that it would impinge upon their own basic laws. Five years after passage of the amendment Representative Bingham, its sponsor in the House, did say in the heat of a debate over a bill aimed at klan outrages in the South that the privileges and immunities clause was designed to embrace the Bill of Rights. But this contradicted what he had said when the amendment was under consideration, and a colleagnue reminded him that he could make but could not unmake history.

Professor Fairman concludes from a wealth of detail that history is "overwhelmingly against" Justice Black's thesis, which was supposed to have been based on history, and the professor cites chapter and verse to the extent of 135 pages. Professor Morrison reaches the same conclusion from a survey of court opinions and arguments involving the fourteenth amendment. Regardless of how desirable it might be to have the full Bill of Rights in effect as against State action, there is no justification for misreading history or for changing the meaning of the amendment by judicial action.

Of course, the principles of the first amendment and some other parts of the Bill of Rights are now recognized as binding upon the States by reason of the fourteenth amendment. But this is because the fourteenth amendment prohibits the States from depriving any person of "life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Since the guaranties of the first amendment applicable to the Federal Government are concerned directly with "liberty," they fit neatly into the requirement of the fourteenth amendment that the States shall respect every person's "liberty." But this is a very different matter from saying that the entire Bill of Rights is taken over under the vague "privileges and immunities" clause. Since the lack of historical warrant for that thesis has now been amply demonstrated, the danger of such a distortion of the amendment has probably passed. But it is not a comforting thought that four members of the court were ready to overturn the long-established view of the amendment on historical grounds without a thorough historical analysis.

It Is Time for the United States To Stop Importation of Russian Goods Made by Slave Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most revealing statements concerning the present policy of our Government officials in permitting goods, the product of Russia's concentration labor camps, to enter our country in competition with the free labor of America, was made by Robert F. Kurleigh, over the Mutual Broadcasting System, August 10, 1950. It challenges every American to demand that this official policy be changed. The workers of America see the danger as was evidenced last week when the stevedores union in New York city refused to unload a ship arriving with a cargo of Russian furs.

The statement to which I have referred is as follows:

While the Soviet Union has now made it abundantly clear that it never has had any intention of trying to live within the Charter of the United Nations, it is surprising how many people have not understood that the tactics now employed by Mr. Jacob Malik in the Security Council are simply an amplification of the Soviet strategy which has been effective ever since the Russians pressed for the veto when the UN was formed in 1945. Communist and pro-Communist apologists, aided in many instances by officials of our Government who have given them stature and protection, these Communists and pro-Communists have been able to fool many Americans into believing that the United Nations was or would accomplish much more than has been accomplished in the past 5 years.

The publicists for the United Nations, with millions available for publicity purposes, have been able to advertise the United Nations in a manner that causes the unsuspecting and uninformed to believe that great progress has been made by the UN. But in very few instances, and certainly in no major crisis, has the United Nations been able to make a single decision which might conceivably offend the Soviet Union. What is taking place in the United Nations Security Council is no accident, but is a part of a well-planned program by the men of the Kremlin to implement the Communist program which has the defeat of the United States as its prime objective. We set forth certain facts last evening which is evidence of the Soviet attempt to hamstring the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in much the same manner as Jacob Malik is delaying action in the Security Council. The issue, of course, is greater and emotions are higher. But the fact remains that evidence has been available for months which proves the Communist aims as aggressive and pointed toward the wrecking of the United States.

One of the best methods Russia has to injure the economy of the United States, to hasten the day of a demoralizing depression, one of the methods has been the use of forced labor to produce goods which are sold on the American market to compete with free American labor. Although we have laws to protect American labor and business from precisely this evil, every attempt has been made, and we know of many complaints which have been made by business and labor, every attempt to have the administration or the UN take action has been met with procrastination and evasion.

It is a known fact, and admitted by some Soviet officials, that Russia maintains slave labor camps, where political prisoners and others who have lost favor with the Communists are forced into every conceivable line of work. Estimates of the number of men and women in these forced labor camps varies from ten to fifteen million. These human beings produce for Soviet Russia and the goods are sold in this country in direct defiance of established laws. Since the Government's production cost is nil, the Russian export of goods made by this forced labor affords the Kremlin the dollar advantage desired, as well as the furthering the Communist program of bleeding the United States industries and labor.

To understand the thinking of officials in our Commerce Department you need only to look back into the record to see where the Chief of the Russian Unit in the Commerce Department, Mr. E. C. Ropes, testified before a congressional committee concerning the importation of Russian furs shortly after his return from an official visit to Russia in 1947. The subcommittee chairman, Congressman REID MURRAY of Wisconsin, asked Mr. Ropes if he had been in Russia trying to scare up trade. Mr. Ropes replied that he was in Russia trying to buy—not to sell—and actually said that the United States had nothing to sell Russia. Mr. Ropes, of the Commerce Department, then eulogized the Communists he met in Russia, saying that he had a very favorable reception and that it was only a question of time before they would be selling as much as they could of what we need in order to buy what they need—and then some.

The Commerce Department—and the State Department, too—has never seemed too concerned over the evidence which has been available for years as to forced labor in Soviet Russia competing against American industries which employ free American labor—at least not concerned enough to force a show-down on the issue. The chairman of the subcommittee hearing the Commerce Department official felt compelled to refer to his trip to Russia as the second Mission to Moscow.

Another indication of the administration's evasiveness in dealing with the problem of imports from Russia can be found in the argument offered by officials of the State, Treasury, and Commerce Departments that Soviet fur imports, which make up more than 50 percent of the total Russian goods sold in this country should continue to be sold because the United States was securing large amounts of manganese from Russia, which might be cut off if the United States would take any action. But in checking later it was found that Russia has already discontinued most of her shipments of manganese to the United States. It was evident that the excuses given by the State Department could not be verified—yet the intolerable situation continues even today—for, as we pointed out in yesterday's broadcast, that the buying of Soviet furs this year will probably be increased over last year.

It seems so useless to spend billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in Marshall plan

aid and ECA funds to combat communism while we supply Russia with the necessary dollars to finance her organized Communist programs in this country. Yet, as we have pointed out, the Commerce Department officials and the State Department officials have been very evasive, and have so far avoided taking any action either through our own governmental channels or through the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. As a matter of fact, the Soviet delegate to the UN Economic and Social Council has been able to hamstring that agency of the world organization this month. Even as Mr. Malik has been doing ever since he tock over the Security Council.

There is one other most important point. The Russian furs are sold to American fur buyers who went to Leningrad last month to make their purchases—and the Soviet Union, through its controlled economy, sells at a price which undermines the American market because it also controls its labor—and has millions in forced labor. The furs are fashioned in this country by the Fur Workers Union. You might wonder how an American union worker would feel about fashioning furs which conceivably have been farm grown and handled by slave labor. But the Fur Workers Union in this country is Communist infiltrated and Communist dominated. The head of the Fur Workers Union is a Communist. His name is Ben Gold. And the current issue of the fur workers paper carries Communist Ben Gold's most recent bold display of impudence. Communist Ben Gold has a page of the paper to insult the American intelligence and to parrot the Communist Party line. That's the top of the news as it looks from here.

Manufacture of the Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sometimes 'Too Big' Is Just Right," which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of September 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMETIMES "TOO BIG" IS JUST RIGHT

The Atomic Energy Commission has picked the du Pont Co. for experimentation with and, if possible, manufacture of the hydrogen bomb. The Commission must have thought that du Pont was big enough to tackle such an enormous assignment.

In the meantime, the Government's suit against du Pont, based on the general theory that the company is too big, still stands. The average citizen must ask himself what would have happened if the Government had pushed its suit a little harder, started it a little sooner and perhaps by this time succeeded in splitting du Pont into fractions. Would any of the constituent parts have been big enough to make a hydrogen bomb?

Alleged Socialistic Nature of Columbia Valley Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Is CVA Socialistic?" published in the Olympia (Wash.) Olympian of July 26, 1950; also an editorial entitled "Is CVA Socialistic?" published in the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald of August 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Olympia (Wash.) Olympian of July 26, 1950]

IS CVA SOCIALISTIC?

A recently developed Fair Deal strategy is found in the attempt to rid certain highly controversial proposals of the socialist label. Such schemes as the Columbia Valley Administration, spokesmen argue, aren't really socialistic at all and are so branded only by reactionaries and greedy capitalists.

In a case of this sort, expert opinion is desirable, and on the subject of socialism Norman Thomas, six-time Socialist Party candidate for the office of President, is certainly an expert. Mr. Thomas has come out strongly for CVA, and he obviously regards it as consonant with socialist principle. Years ago, in this connection, Mr. Thomas said that TVA, which forms the basic pattern for all proposed valley authorities, is a fine example of socialism in action.

Mr. Thomas is a highly regarded citizen, and he enjoys the respect of many persons who disagree violently with his views. This is partly true because of his evident ability and sincerity, and also because he does not hide under camouflage. He is a Socialist by conviction and he is proud of it. But what are we to say of lesser men who, pretending to believe in free enterprise, and pretending to be anti-Socialist, are trying to sell the country on measures which represent an extreme of socialism?

As for CVA, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, who is regarded as one of the most liberal of all the Republicans, has said that it presents the danger of bureaucratic paternalism, a "bureaucratic monopolistic policy." He added: "If we are going to keep democracy strong in this country, we must insist that people who are going to be directly affected by the policies of the Government have a voice in making the policies.

CVA would do much to destroy that philosophy.

[From the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald of August 2, 1950]

IS CVA SOCIALISTIC?

F. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, said at Pendleton that the Power Trust is trying to smear the Columbia Valley Administration with a label of socialism instead of arguing the facts.

Mr. Davidson obviously intended to imply that the proposed CVA is not socialistic. It is pretty easy to argue the facts in support of the contention that this program is socialism in disguise. It is in disguise because its sponsors know that the people of the United States are against socialism. The Socialist Party, with even so popular a citizen as Norman Thomas as its standard bearer can poll only about 1,000,000 votes in a national election. But numerous socialistic measures, parading as democratic advances with in the framework of the Constitution, have passed muster.

If the proposed CVA is not a brand of socialism, then so eminent an authority on the subject as Mr. Thomas, six times Socialist candidate for President, does not know what the CVA is or what socialism is. Mr. Thomas described CVA as a splinter—and a very good one—taken by the Democrats from the Socialist platform.

Previously, Socialist Party representatives from Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Washington, meeting in Seattle, said they realized that CVA is a Socialist venture, and then went on record against the pending CVA bill because it provides no adequate safeguards to insure democratic control. In other words, even the Socialists of the Northwest could not swallow it.

Mr. Davidson lays down the usual line in blaming the Power Trust, whereas the biggest Power Trust is the Federal Government itself, with the power of the Federal Treasury and the Federal propaganda machine behind it. Opposition to CVA is not limited to the private power companies, which have a stake in trying to protect themselves, but has enlisted scores of organizations and unnumbered citizens, including the governors of the States affected.

Efforts to avoid the socialism label suggest evasive tactics. It would be more in accord with the realities to accept Norman Thomas' description of CVA as a splinter from the Socialist platform, and go on arguing the facts from there.

Branding Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Branding Russia," which was published in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRANDING RUSSIA

That the time is approaching when a spade will be called a spade is indicated by the issuance of an Army pamphlet on Why We Fight. In this document the enemy is named as "international communism," and this terminology was carried to Capitol Hill by Secretary Johnson in his plea for more military aid for Europe. "Everybody knows by that," says an Army spokesman, "that we mean Russia." Next time the Army sends out anything of the sort, he added, Russia will be spelled out, for the State Department has taken off the camouflage and allowed names to be called by way of identifying the enemy responsible for western rearmament.

So the country is being prepared for the time when Russia will be named before the United Nations in any patent case that arises

of an aggression by proxy which in fact is Russian. This is what Mr. Stassen has been pleading for. It is quite plain, however, that not all hypothetical cases could be so labeled, or that it would be strategically wise so to label them; and Mr. Stassen himself allowed for discretion, even in the kind of action to be taken in coping with any fresh aggression. He simply wanted the country not to pretend in all cases from now on, and his speech, which was rebroadcast throughout the country, carried conviction. What seems to have been in his mind is, say, a Bulgarian aggression on Greece which, it is perfectly obvious from the extension of Russia into Bulgaria, would, in fact, be Russian. The great mistake of the between-war years, according to Lord Vansittart's memoirs, was the unwillingness to call a spade a spade, and Mr. Stassen would not have this country repeat it. He, it seems to us, is basically right. Mr. Stassen ought, incidentally, to have included the kind of resolution which, in the event, he would sponsor before the United Nations.

Before the country gets into this danger zone, however, the Government might give a thought to the exact way the enemy is to be described in our propaganda so as to provide maximum value both to our cause and to our peace aims. "Know thine adversary!" warned Cromwell. Is it Russia? Is it communism? In the former case, we would stand guilty of indicting a nation, as we did in the cases of Germany and Japan, with disastrous results to the peace. If we call communism the enemy, then we virtually foreswear our own propaganda abroad, which is aimed at the conversion of "lost souls," in George F. Kennan's words.

Moreover, if the enemy be described as communism, then the issue is made to look like a war between economic systems, with capitalism in the role of adversary. Is this effective? We think not. For it is not true. It merely helps the Russian propagandists to show their people that the capitalists want to bring them under a system of capitalism which is coequal in the Russian propagandists' terminology with tyranny and which in fact no longer exists anywhere. There is something bloodless in the antithesis, something unreal; for men do not die for a system, especially when they know that the antithesis is inexact. Communists in Russia form a gang—a fraction of the population armed with the power to hold the people by the throat. And these are the terrorized victims of what has been called knouto-tyranny. It is this state of subjection to which our propaganda must be addressed so as to hold out the hope of liberation from a status as cannon fodder and serfdom.

It is thus a most important question that the Army has raised, and one that cannot be answered by simple minds. Perhaps a leaf from the copybook of the Kremlin may not be out of order. The oligarchs and warmongers there don't pillory America or the Americans. Oh, dear, no, Americans are their friends, exploited by "Wall Street warmongers" or "cannibals" or "Fascists." These mythical monsters become real as the tools of propaganda because they are personalized. The Soviet's chiefs seek to create the impression that they are liberators of American men and women oppressed by capitalistic exploiters. They pretend they are just as American as Americans. This, of course, doesn't come off, though a similar appeal does in some other countries, for it carries no connotation of strangeness or apartness, only of fellow-feeling.

The Russian moguls and their publicity agents strive in their propaganda to be fellow Asians in Asia and fellow-Europeans in Europe, even if they cannot quite identify themselves with particular nations. They use a rifle shot technique in their propaganda in the countries they wish to undermine. We must follow suit—at Soviet expense. The Kremlin warmongers are our enemies, not the Russian people, not even the Russian soldiers. It is a nice but extremely important problem to be resolved, this problem of how to call the propaganda shots, and it deserves much study and consideration before we start to repeat the propaganda mistakes of the last experience with an enemy.

General MacArthur and the Democratization of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in July 1946, several Members of the House and Senate, who had attended the independence ceremony in Manila, were privileged also to visit with General MacArthur in Tokyo. We were all most favorably impressed with the success of his work in the rebuilding of Japan. Even at that time it was apparent that he had won the confidence of the people of that nation, as he and his father before him had won the friendship and confidence of the people of the Philippines. A most interesting article concerning the great work of General MacArthur appeared recently in the press of the Nation, and I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 27, 1950]

MAC HAILS DEMOCRATIZATION OF JAPS AS HISTORIC MILESTONE—GENERAL THINKS NIPPONESE WILL MAKE NATION AN OASIS OF HOPE FOR ALL ASIA

(By Bob Considine)

TOKYO, August 26.—General MacArthur believes that historians of the future will regard the democratization of Japan as of more importance and significance than the two world wars which preceded it.

The supreme commander, whose personality and leadership have played decisive roles in the astonishing change in Japan's way of life, has complete confidence in the Japanese people's ability and desire to make their islands an oasis of hope for the enslaved millions of Asiatics surrounding them.

"The Japanese are among the best of orientals," the general told me.

CHEER A WINNER, HATE A LOSER

"And they share one strong oriental trait. They cheer a winner and hate a loser.

"Thus when they lost their first war, they came to despise themselves and the leaders and practices that had brought about their downfall.

"For a short time after their defeat, they hung suspended in a great vacuum. There was not even comfort for them in their deities, for they knew that many of the so-called holy men who stood between them and those deities had long since become tools of the state—the defeated state—and had worked for its preservation against the individual.

"It was a time of great soul searching.

"Into this vacuum walked the Anglo-Saxon influence of our occupation forces, a wholly new experience to a people almost wholly isolated for centuries and accustomed to complete domination of their bodies and spirits.

"The men who brought me back over that bloody 5,000-mile road from Australia have now brought into Japan a civilization and culture founded on what Franklin Roosevelt called democracy and what Pope Pius XII calls the dignity of man. Call it liberty, freedom, or what you wish. It is our bedrock.

"We brought this to the Japanese people in such a way that 1,000 years from now the historian will give scant notice to the two great wars as peaks of significance in the first half of the twentieth century."

NO RETURN TO AUTOCRACY

"In a few paragraphs he will say of those wars that they were the product of a restless, tumultuous period change. But he will say, I am sure, that the truly momentous event of that distant time was the bringing by the vital and wonderful young United States of America of Anglo-Saxon civilization to Asia through Japan."

There was well-controlled emotion in the general's voice when he answered a question about the durability of Japan's new system of life.

"You can search the pages of history in vain and never find an instance when a country which had tasted freedom voluntarily reverted to autocracy or totalitarianism," he declared.

"I stress the word 'voluntarily.' What has happened in Czechoslovakia and Poland and other countries is an evil thing forced upon those peoples.

"The Japanese will never return to the life they knew, where a man is afraid to speak his mind even in the presence of his wife and children, for fear they would feel duty bound to report him to the thought police.

"Nor will they return to the aggressive warriors' role. They are courageous, magnificent fighters, but their wish to rule the world has been crushed forever. They will never return to a system that has brought utter and complete defeat to them."

Anglo-Saxon culture came to the Japanese in small and subtle packages, MacArthur believes, as well as in the mighty directives that were issued back and forth until he felt that the Japanese people were better led than clubbed.

PRAISES CONDUCT OF JAPS

"They were curious as to what sustained the Anglo-Saxon soldier when he first appeared on their shores," MacArthur stated.

"They learned, for instance, that he had built his little place of worship along the victory road often before he built his hospitals.

"They became inquisitive about his God and his inherent decency, and his love of life. They were startled to find him both conqueror against whom they had been warned—yet gentle and generous * * * and good to their children.

"I can think of no finer tribute to their full acceptance of the rights and responsibilities of liberty than their conduct during this difficult war in Korea."

HAS FULL FAITH IN JAPAN

"When I received my orders from the President on June 27 and launched into the war across the sea of Japan, the question arose: 'Now that we must strip our occupation forces, will the Japanese sabotage the work of the past 5 years?'

"I did not deliberate 5 minutes on this, for I knew that the Japanese could be trusted implicitly.

"In short order we were down to one division, occupying a country of 84,000,000, only 5 years removed from a war which they thought would bring them the world.

"My faith in them is such that I am now reshuffling the last division of the occupation forces and sending the majority of its men and equipment to Korea."

AS JAPAN GOES, SO GOES ASIA

"When the time comes I shall have no hesitation about moving my own headquarters into the field in Korea.

"When I was in Japan as a younger man, there was an aphorism which went something like the one about Maine. This one went 'As Japan goes, so goes Asia.'

"And the historian will take that into account, when he looks back upon this time," finished the man who wrought in just 5 years the miracle of which he spoke.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that the burden of important legislative matters should not exclude our consideration of the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills before recess or adjournment of this Congress. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, a letter received from one of my constituents, Kenneth Haskell Mantel, which he addressed to the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATEHOOD BILLS

BROOKLYN, *August 17, 1950.*

To the New York Herald Tribune:

The desperate situation in Korea has turned the eyes of the world toward the Pacific and has brought into sharp focus the necessity of immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Alaska, with its wealth of potential resources, and Hawaii, with its industrious population and important agricultural economy, can become self-sufficient and prosperous States. The statehood bills have the backing of the President, Delegates BARTLETT and FARRINGTON, the majority of the Members of Congress and the people of the respective Territories. These bills have passed the House of Representatives. Despite President Truman's repeated requests that these bills be called up, the Senate leaders have yet to act.

We are today engaged in a great struggle against the driving force of totalitarian communism. In my statement to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I said: "With statehood within reach, the people of Hawaii have increasingly fought against communism in their Territory. I feel very strongly that with statehood granted to Hawaii, the fight against communism will continue. Communism has no hold on Hawaii. I challenge anyone to prove otherwise. I wish to unequivocally state that the greatest defeat which faces the Communists today is statehood for Hawaii."

KENNETH HASKELL MANTEL.

Parents of Boys Fighting in Korea Are Concerned About Present Policy of Our Government That Permits Strategic Material To Get Through to Russia and Its Satellites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter, which I include as part of my remarks, from Philip E. McKenna, Thorofare, N. J., dated August 30, 1950, in which he commends the investigation to be opened on Wednesday next, September 6, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The purpose of the investigation is to inquire into the present policy of the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce in granting licenses for the exportation of strategic material and weapons that ultimately reach Russia or its satellites.

In addition to the inquiry inaugurated by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, I have also introduced House Resolution 831, authorizing the Speaker of the House to appoint a committee of seven Members to make such an investigation. This resolution was referred to the Rules Committee.

There is no justification for our Government officials to grant licenses for the exportation of strategic materials at a time when they do or might reach the enemies of democracy. Our boys fighting in Korea are entitled to better consideration. The letter to which I have referred shows how the parents of these boys feel about the matter. It reads as follows:

THOROFARE, N. J., *August 30, 1950.*

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Member of Congress.

DEAR SIR: I want you to know that I am in heartfelt accord with your proposed action; namely, a congressional investigation to determine who is responsible and to stop the shipment and delivery of materials to foreign countries where these materials eventually fall into the hands of the Communist aggressors who in turn use them to kill our young men.

My son, Phil Jr., age 21, is in the Korean theater with the United States Air Force. Your action gives me great comfort, inasmuch as it may prolong his life and the lives of many other fine young men.

May God give you the strength and the wisdom to see this through to a successful conclusion.

Sincerely,

PHILIP E. MCKENNA.

The Medway Plan for Human Rehabilitation and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Charles R. Joy, entitled "The Medway Plan for Human Rehabilitation and World Peace."

There being no objection, the plan was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RAINBOW OF HOPE

A huge, rusty gun rises above the battered ruins of the old Atlantic wall, the great bastion built by Hitler along the Channel coast of France to prevent an allied invasion. Storm clouds mass behind it, black and threatening. A gust of wind, a rush of rain, and then—the rainbow.

Back again in Strasbourg, this is a vivid memory of a recent visit to a little fishing town in northern France. But it is more than a memory. It is a symbol of our hope. The shattered remnants of the old war remain: guns and walls and mines, widows and orphans, and mutilated children. Now a new conflict in eastern Asia threatens many parts of the world, the dark clouds lowering in the heavens, driving winds and rains beating down upon us in scattered showers, but there, vibrant in glowing colors overreaching all earth's sorrows and its pains, is the rainbow of man's eternal hope. To this rainbow the unique Medway plan adds its bit of light and color. It stretches in beauty from land to land and binds the people together in love and hope.

THE BASIS OF PEACE

Councils and parliaments, charters and treaties, codes of international law and leagues of united nations will never of themselves create a world of peace. These are but the channels through which a river of life must flow; the empty chalice into which the wine of love must be poured. There are many who cry peace today when there is no peace; many who, behind the form of law, conspire to break the law; many who would organize an idea in order to destroy it. Men put their confidence in external things and artificial forms because faith and love are absent from their hearts. But peace is an inward quality. It is born in the mind and in the soul. It is profoundly spiritual and religious.

The world has never sought peace early enough. Peace is usually a frantic, postwar dream. Former enemies meet with all the old hostility in their hearts to sign it. Wartime allies, sometimes with little in common except their hatred of a former foe, meet to organize it. It is obvious that upon such a basis a lasting peace cannot be found or made.

THE LONG VIEW

Jesus looked beyond the present moment. He cherished a dream of a richer world; He preached of a future messianic kingdom. He was not deeply concerned with immediate problems. "Render unto Ceasar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." There in brief compass was his attitude toward present and future. There are temporal things, things of today,

to which we must make our adjustment. But there are things that are of God, eternal in the heavens, and these are the important things. To the divine law, to the future heavenly kingdom, our loyalty is due. In the end the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our God.

THE MEDWAY PLAN

The Medway plan believes that the essential thing is a will to peace which is based on friendship and understanding. It pins its faith upon the spiritual forces that move in the hearts of men—forces which, eventually, will produce a world conscience wherein the cornerstones are honor, human rights, the moral law, and rule by law. Medway plan is not an organization, in the ordinary sense. It asks for no contributions and carries on no financial campaigns. It is what its name suggests, a simple plan for individual action freely offered to all those who would help to build a world at peace, either through their individual efforts or through voluntary cooperation with others. To such as these the Medway plan makes its suggestions and offers its assistance through its voluntary workers, who are known as Medway-plan associates.

THE CHILDREN FIRST

The Medway plan begins with the children. They are the leaders, the educators, and the voters of tomorrow. If the children of one land come to understand the children of other lands they will grow into adult citizens of a world community where war is unthinkable. The Medway plan therefore attempts to bring the children of America into helpful contact with the children of other lands through correspondence and through the gifts of simple essentials of life. It is an exciting thing for a child in a war-torn country to find a new friend in that America which he has always thought of as the wonderland beyond the seas. And little hearts reach out to little hearts, binding friendships are formed, and the future of the world made more secure. It is the business of the Medway plan to facilitate these friendships. It has long lists of names and addresses available. Perhaps the children will lead us into the promised land.

THE ADULTS NEXT

It is the deep conviction of the Medway plan that every individual should make his contribution to the peace of the world. Those who make no such contribution strengthen by act of omission the evil forces that at present dominate the world. The Medway plan has suggestions for those who would like to help but do not know where to begin. It is ready to put Americans in touch with individuals and families abroad who need encouragement and a little help. During the past 3 years many thousands of Americans have found a way into the hearts of stricken families in the war-torn countries by this method of free adoption. This is the final, convincing argument for democracy.

TOWN SPONSORSHIPS

The Medway plan facilitates, also, the adoption of community by community, and many American towns and cities from Maine to California have sponsored sister communities in France, Austria, Italy, England and Germany. This has resulted in bulk shipments of supplies—food, clothing, medicines—to provide immediate relief and, more important still, the establishment of personal friendships. The many letters of gratitude attest to the enduring consequences of this plan. But there are many more such communities that await the evidence of loving concern. The work of building a world of peace has only just begun.

THE RESULTS

More than 200,000 American children and adults are now in regular touch with a corresponding number of persons in Europe. Over 150 American communities have adopted European towns under the Medway plan program. About $2,000,000 worth of relief supplies have been sent abroad to date. Eighty information centers are being established overseas, stocked with material telling the story of a friendly, democratic America. This is a remarkable record of short-time accomplishment by a group of devoted persons working without compensation because of their loyalty to the future peace of the world.

INCEPTION OF MEDWAY PLAN

The Medway plan was founded and developed by Mr. William Montgomery Bennett, of Woodbury, Conn., and Charleston, S. C., a retired industrialist and economist, who is now giving all of his time and work to the promotion of true freedom and world peace. In this he is ably assisted by chapters of Medway plan associates of which Mrs. Gertrude Sanford Legendre is chairman. Mr. Bennett was formerly director of church services for the British War Relief Society and for Bundles for Britain. He founded and directed the Interfaith Group for World Peace Under God, the purpose of which was to secure spiritual representatives as advisers in the organization and development of the United Nations. He also founded and is chairman of the National Religious Council composed of a hundred leaders of the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths. But Mr. Bennett's heart is in the Medway Plan for Human Rehabilitation and World Peace.

THE MEDWAY PLAN INVITES YOUR COOPERATION

This, then, is the Medway plan, a simple, flexible, personalized, integrated program for constructive action. The plan cooperates wholeheartedly with other relief agencies, particularly with the National Medical and Surgical Relief Committee, with the Pestalozzi Foundation of America and with CARE. In turn it invites the cooperation of all men of good will, who want to help and do not know how. Here is a way by which every one, whatever his means, can have a part in building the brave, new world of the future. He can at least write a letter of friendly good will to someone. He can send a CARE package of food or clothing. He can become, perhaps, the Medway plan associate in his community and help organize it for the sponsoring of a town abroad.

St. Francis of Assisi prayed that God might give him strength to leave a bit of love in every place where he found hatred, to leave a little joy wherever he found sadness. That can be the privilege of all those who cooperate through the Medway plan, and a new rainbow will rise above the outmoded symbols of war, a rainbow of faith and hope and love.

Shall Military Men Speak on Military Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the suspension of Maj. Gen. Orvil A. Anderson as head of the Air War College is No. 4 in the rebukes which the national administration has given to men connected with the Defense Establishment who have dared voice their convictions on the subject of national security from a military standpoint.

No. 1, was the treatment accorded Admiral Denfeld.

No. 2, was the disavowal of the speech by Navy Secretary Matthews.

No. 3, was the directive to General MacArthur to withdraw his message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

No. 4, is the suspension of Major General Anderson, of the Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not question or debate the proposition that the President of the United States through the State Department or through his own statements, makes and announces our foreign policy.

To be sure I think the President should consult the appropriate committees of the Congress, because when the President speaks, the world is on notice.

But I do raise the question of the validity of decisions that affect and determine national security if we rule out and deny the right and duty of the top men in the Defense Establishment to speak when they speak—not in the realm of foreign policy—but in the realm of national security from the vantage point of their lifetime careers or special knowledge.

The distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], has stated that the President is the final spokesman on the subject of foreign policy. I readily agree with him, but I raise the question, however, as to whether national welfare is served by putting the silencer on every man high in the national Defense Establishment from voicing his convictions on the subject of national defense.

I understand that Admiral Denfeld is now a candidate for the governorship of Massachusetts. But will anyone say that Denfeld should have kept silent when he risked—when he deliberately sacrificed—his lifetime career in the Navy when he believed the security of this country at stake in his defense of the Navy?

Though I might disagree with Admiral Denfeld on some points, I would for my country's sake want him to speak fully and freely.

Does anyone think that General Groves should not have gone to the President, as he did, before Mr. Truman went to Potsdam to tell him that the atomic bomb was a proven success in order to warn him not to sell Manchuria to the Russians for an unnecessary participation in the closing days of the war against Japan? Of course, the very secrecy of the whole atomic project at that time prevented General Groves from even considering making his convictions public.

Was it not unfortunate that a Presidential decision ignored what General Groves suggested? Would not the whole far-eastern picture be different today had China never been sold out?

And was it not unfortunate that wartime battlefield discipline stopped Gen. George Patton from driving on to Berlin? Stopped him on the basis of a decision dictated by a State Department tender in its sympathies for the feelings of Moscow?

Ah, the picture of world peace would be different today if the forces of Red Russia were all east of Berlin instead of being west of the Elbe where Patton was required to withdraw.

Mr. Speaker, although were I in Mr. Truman's place, I would maintain the responsibility of the Presidency for the final decision, I would not close my mind nor the ears of the American people to the wisdom of a man like Gen. Douglas MacArthur when he spoke on the subject of essentials to security in the Pacific.

And were I MacArthur, fortified in my judgment by his years of experience as a military commander and an observer with high responsibilities in the Orient, I would not hesitate to speak my convictions though it cost me every star on my shoulder.

We are dealing, Mr. Speaker, with issues that go to the very survival of the United States and possibly of western civilization itself.

The latest disturbing thought in this sequence is that now the Air Force is to be silenced. The Air Force, top drawer in our strategic defense.

Major General Anderson, Mr. Speaker, is not a Johnny-come-lately in the field of aeronautics and aviation strategy. He was a pioneer in the Air Force. His courage and his comprehensive grasp of what was ahead were shown when he and the late General Kepner ventured to probe the stratosphere in a balloon November 11, 1935, going to the highest point ever ascended by man up to that time in order to get secrets of the upper atmosphere that were to prove invaluable in the roles he was later called upon to perform.

Anderson was the master planner in the operations of the famous Eighth Air Force over Germany. When he had successfully directed the strategic bombing which drove the Luftwaffe from the skies and destroyed the centers of German concentration and strategic production, he went on to Japan to plan the famous aerial conquest of their home islands. He is no novice in the field wherein he ventured to speak. Shall we lose the genius of Anderson at the Air College, as the price of getting his courageous and experienced convictions? Or, retain his ability at the Air College only by clamping the lid of secrecy on his opinions when national decisions are made by the Republic?

These, Mr. Speaker, are fundamental questions, and the American people are disturbed.

All these efforts to silence outstanding leaders do not quiet fears—they provoke and increase them. They are part of the pattern which denies congressional committees information from the records which Congress should have to make its decisions. They are part of the pattern of governments which do not trust the people to arrive at decisions. They are not consistent with the protestations of the administration, Mr. Speaker, in the confidence of the judgment of the great mass of the American people.

Dr. Townsend's Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received some written statements from Dr. F. E. Townsend that I think will be of interest to my colleagues and to all of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Dr. Townsend is founder and president of the Townsend Plan, Inc. His comments, titled "Foreword" and "Necessity Is Driving Us to a Forced Circulation of Money" follow:

FOREWORD

I am convinced that now is the time for us to strike a blow for peace and freedom that will be more effective against communism than all the contraptions of warfare ever invented. This blow can be a psychological one. It need not cause the loss of a single human being nor a drop of blood, but it would make the whole world of men gasp with amazement at our confidence in ourselves and our ability to create wealth of all kinds and description.

As a nation of confident people we should announce to the world that we expect to expend whatever number of billions of dollars is needed to help put down any warlike uprising anywhere in conjunction with the efforts of other members of the United Nations, but that in addition to such expenditure we are wiping out poverty in America; that we have proved to ourselves that our ability to produce wealth has become so great that, if called upon to do so, we could supply half the world besides ourselves with food and clothing.

We should announce that we do not fear the effects of war upon our economy because our experience in the two great wars of recent years has taught us that, aside from the loss in human lives, we came out of those wars richer than we went in. Those wars taught us that money spent at home among our own people in payment for services rendered gave us an abundant market for everything we could produce. Money circulated freely through the hands of practically all our people enabled them to live on a scale never before known to any people since the dawn of history.

This new lesson impressed upon us by the holocaust of war has not been forgotten by us. We intend to use it in peacetime as well as in war. We intend to see that those who work and produce shall be assured at all times of a fair proportion of the wealth their work produces. We intend to see that those of us who are incapacitated for work by infirmities resulting from accidents, sickness, and old-age shall be supplied with enough money at all times to enable them to live well and to become useful customers for our business world since business produces all the wealth that is created.

By a legislative device which we are now about to put into use we shall establish a flow of money into the channels of trade and commerce that will constantly stimulate the production of goods and services. Poverty will be abolished entirely in our land of the free. So those countries which think that we can be exhausted by a series of petty wars which will make us vulnerable and flaccid had better heed the warning.

As a nation we have learned that our capacity to produce wealth depends entirely upon the capacity we display in distributing it. War is a great distributor, but we abhor war and we are determined to abolish it from the earth. All those who foster and encourage war are our enemies and the enemies of all mankind. We are determined that warmongers shall cease to exist.

Believing as we do that poverty of the masses is the great breeder of war because of the misery it produces, it is our purpose to wage war upon poverty with all our might. As an example to the rest of the world we intend to abolish poverty in America and we stand ready to assist all other nations that are like-minded.

NECESSITY IS DRIVING US TO A FORCED CIRCULATION OF MONEY

The modern ingenuity and inventiveness of the American people today inevitably divides the population into two major groups, the employed and the unemployables. The former group becomes smaller in proportion to the entire population as farm and factory become more and more highly mechanized. Every year sees more small farms merged into big ones and the work done on the big ones handled by one or two men using modern tools with ever-increasing speed and efficiency. The floating farm labor of former years, no longer finding employment on the farms, has drifted to the towns and cities seeking employment where job seekers are already in excess of jobs.

Every year sees more and more automatic machinery introduced into factories. The urge to mechanize is prompted by a double motive; first, it is known that goods can be turned out faster and with greater precision by machines than by hand methods, and second, because machines cut down the cost of payrolls. Machines do not have to be paid wages. They do not eat food nor wear clothing nor demand furniture for the house in which they are installed.

Thus it is seen that a constant reduction in the number of human hands is required in producing the wealth of things our human family demands. Our United States of America family is the most highly mechanized of all others in the world, and yet, the farther we go with mechanization the more the prospect widens for still greater use of automatic machines in producing our national wealth of things.

Workers are still in demand if their bodies are young and supple and the years have not taken too great a toll from them. But as they approach the age of 45, employers look askance at them when they apply for work. Beyond 45 it is almost impossible for the working class to sell skill or muscle. The army of unemployables grows and with increasing momentum.

With a working population confined to the young and vigorous the all-important question arises of what to do with the older population. There are millions of our people above the age of 45, millions of those above the age of 65. The average life span is growing longer, the work period shorter for everybody. How long can the productive, employed group afford to carry the cost of maintaining all the old, the sick, the crippled and the blind, plus all the millions of children—all nonproducers? What will happen to the market when there are three or four times as many nonproducers, as there are producers? Can we sell goods and services to people who cannot work and earn?

What holds the price of goods so high today? Is it scarcity? No. Food stuff and clothing material were never so abundant. Note the immense storage of wheat, corn, potatoes, milk, butter, and eggs. Food in millions of pounds that cannot be sold. Raw apparel material is equally abundant and oversupplied. Wool and cotton glut our warehouses. And all this superabundance going a-begging for want of a market.

Our economists and law makers seek blindly and stupidly abroad for a market for our surpluses. They will find none. The great mass of foreign people have nothing with which to buy from us. We cannot use their money if they had it, but they are penniless, like our own unemployables. We will not buy from them the things of which we have a surplus. Why should we? We can produce better goods and faster than any other nation, and with less actual cost.

There is no market abroad upon which we can depend for our abundance and there never will be. Our market is right here at home, under our very noses—the greatest potential market in the world, if we had the good sense to use it. Why do we not use this market? Because the great army of unemployables have no money with which to buy.

Shall we deny ourselves this magnificent market because of lack of money in the hands of those who are most desirous to buy? If we lacked any other means of getting goods to the people, such as trucks, railroads, ships, or airplanes, would we not hasten to supply these means? Then why in the name of common sense do we not supply these needy, destitute home folks with money? Is money such a sacred thing that we will see millions of our brothers and sisters suffer rather than let them use it?

Obviously, money must be made to circulate freely amongst all our people if our productive capacity is to be maintained and increased. We can no more sell goods to our home folks who have no money than we can to foreigners. We must devise a way to give our home people the use of money with which to supply themselves liberally with our home-made goods or see our surpluses grow in volume until they choke the market to death.

Let us do for our market what we do for our good roads. We make people pay for the use of our roads by a tax on gasoline. Let us also make everyone pay a small tax for the use they make of the market. The use of this great home market of ours is a privilege that all of us should be glad to pay for. A small tax of as little as 3 percent, if collected by the Federal Government every month (just as the social-security tax is collected) on all sales made with intent to profit, would supply enough money that if divided equally and distributed to all the incapacitated adults of our citizenry with injunction to buy with all that is given them, would furnish the market we need. This forced circulation of money would cost the Nation nothing. It would stimulate production in all lines of industry immediately, for the needs of our moneyless people are as varied as the things we produce.

To produce the added goods needed to supply this new market thousands of additional workers would have to be called back to work, thus reducing the oversupply of jobless that curses us today. No money would be lost. All that was used would immediately flow back into the channels of trade. Poverty, the sickness that afflicts all the world, could be wiped out in this country of ours and an example set for all the other nations to follow. We know that we have the means of abolishing poverty. Let us do it before we find ourselves engulfed in the misery which has cursed the world throughout all history. Wages and salaries upon which our economy has depended to keep the wheels of industry turning, are not sufficient today to maintain the market. They must be supplemented by a much wider distribution of money. This we can have through the establishment of a Federal, mutual insurance for all citizens, paid monthly to all citizens who are found to be physically incapacitated for earning a living, and requiring that all recipients of the insurance money be obliged to spend monthly all that they receive in order to become eligible for the next month's payment. This kind of insurance would insure universal prosperity and rapidly reduce ignorance, crime, and disease.

Dr. F. E. TOWNSEND.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER, of Iowa, United States House Representative, before the Teachers' Federation, Fort Dodge, Iowa, September 5, 1950:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By JAMES I. DOLLIVER)

The foreign policy of the United States has journeyed a long and tortuous road since that day more than a century and a half ago when President Washington, bidding farewell to his countrymen, admonished them to have as little political connection as possible with foreign nations. No American would be human if he did not look with some longing upon that vanished day of horse-drawn coaches and powdered periwigs when the detached and distant position of the United States permitted us to have a comfortable neutrality.

However, the rapid growth of the United States itself, the speedy progress of technological civilization, and the increasing vicissitudes and complications of international affairs as the decades passed by, gradually drew our country ever more deeply into world affairs. And now, at last, in our own day, our once isolationist country has been thrust into the role of leader of the entire free world.

This evolution in 150 years of American foreign policy from one extreme to the other may be traced historically under four main headings: (1) the pan-American policy in the Western Hemisphere; (2) the open-door policy in the Far East; (3) American policy in regard to Great Britain and Europe, and (4) finally the new policy of United States leadership dating from World War II. I shall briefly expand upon each of these topics in an endeavor to paint some of the background of the present position of the United States at the midpoint of the twentieth century.

I. PAN-AMERICAN POLICY

The historic message of President James Monroe to the American Congress which in subsequent decades came to be known as the Monroe Doctrine was delivered on December 2, 1823. It foreshadowed that form of inter-American solidarity we refer to as Pan Americanism, and was intended to accomplish several results.

It may be recalled, first of all, that the Spanish and Portuguese colonies to the south of the United States had taken advantage of the Napoleonic wars to sever their allegiance to their mother country in Europe. Following the downfall of Bonaparte the victorious European powers, under the guidance of the Holy Alliance initiated a policy of stern repression of liberal revolution on the European continent. The United States feared that this reactionary policy might be extended to the Americas. It was for this reason that President Monroe gravely warned the Europeans that any attempt to interpose control over the destiny of the new republic would be viewed as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Secondly, President Monroe stressed the ideological angle. The political system of the European monarchies, he asserted, was essentially different from that of America and any attempt to extend the European system to the Western Hemisphere would be regarded by the United States as dangerous to its peace and safety.

Finally, Monroe's statement was directed against the territorial encroachments of the Czar of Russia upon the west coast of North America. (Even in those days there was a Russian menace.) The American Continent, Monroe asserted, was henceforth not to be considered as subject for further colonization by any European power.

It might be added parenthetically that the purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867 was in direct line with the Monroe Doctrine and western hemispheric solidarity.

On the basis of this triple warning by President Monroe, which was designed to protect the integrity of the American continents, the imposing structure of pan-Americanism and hemispheric good neighborliness has since been built.

The system of pan-American cooperation has culminated in our own day in two historic agreements: The Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, signed September 2, 1947, which was framed to maintain continental peace and security; and the Organization of American States, the charter of which was signed by 21 American nations at Bogotá, Colombia, in April 1948. This latter treaty, the capstone of the American continental system, provides for close cooperation of the American states on a permanently organized basis to maintain peace and to provide jointly for economic, social and cultural development.

II. THE OPEN DOOR POLICY IN THE ORIENT

Whereas the policy of the United States in regard to Europe was primarily one of isolation—at least until the First World War—American policy in the Far East was of a different character. The United States made important commercial and cultural contacts in both China and Japan in the course of the nineteenth century. Our sailing ships rounded the Horn for the China trade countless times. The acquisition of the Philippine Islands in 1898 during the McKinley administration, as a byproduct of the Spanish-American War, really fired American interest in the Far East. This interest was rooted in a legitimate desire for free and peaceful trade in that area, particularly with China's millions.

Unfortunately, that vast and sprawling oriental country was in grave danger of being dismembered by the great powers at the turn of the century. If this had occurred, then American prospects of unimpeded trade would have rapidly dwindled.

Faced by this possibility Secretary of State John Hay sent circular notes to the great powers in September 1899, and in July 1900. He stated in those notes the now historic doctrine of the "open door." Briefly defined, this policy sought the preservation of China's territorial and administrative integrity and the safeguarding for the world of the principle of equal and impartial trade with all parts of the Chinese Empire.

To these principles the great powers expressed more or less firm adherence. But in actual practice they were honored by some countries more in the breach than in the observance. This was especially true of that freshly emerged power in the east—Japan. Both the Sino-Japanese War of 1895 and the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–05 resulted in the acquisition by Nippon of important territories and privileges in China. During the First World War it appeared that Tokyo was bent upon a determined campaign to reduce China practically to a state of vassalage.

The notorious 21 demands which Japan presented to China in January 1915 created great indignation in the United States. We straightway proceeded to reaffirm the principle of the open door. In the Lansing-Ishii notes of November 1917 Japan again acknowledged the open door, and the principle was formally written into the Nine Power Treaty negotiated at the Washington conference of 1922.

It was in the spirit of the open door that Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson enunciated in January 1932 his famous doctrine of nonrecognition in regard to the Japanese conquests in Manchuria. It was likewise in the same spirit that the United States endeavored to sustain China's independence and integrity against Japanese aggression before and during World War II.

That independence has now been submerged in the Red tide emanating from Moscow. Nevertheless, the tenets of the open door, even though their application may remain temporarily in abeyance, still ought to remain the basic policy of the United States in the Far East.

One final remark before concluding our consideration of the Far East. It was under the influence of a sentiment closely allied to the open-door policy that the United States granted independence to the Philippines in 1946. This action left a favorable impression upon millions of Asiatics struggling to be freed of foreign domination. It cannot be without favorable effect in the present grim struggle for the minds of men in the Orient.

III. EUROPEAN POLICY

America's policy with respect to Europe, as already has been mentioned, was for many decades one of isolation. America's chief contact in that area of the world was, as might be expected, with Great Britain. England was our mother country, and from her we inherited many of our cherished ideas and institutions. For example, in every State but one of our Union, the English common law is the basis of the legal system. True, there were altercations with Great Britain—the War of 1812 and disputes during the American Civil War over the outfitting of Confederate cruisers in British ports. But the famous settlement of the *Alabama* claims in 1872 inaugurated an era of pacific relations and growing understanding between Great Britain and the United States, which was only briefly marred by the Venezuela boundary dispute.

By 1900 popular sympathy between the two nations was quite marked, and English-speaking peoples began to attach new significance to the phrase, "blood is thicker than water." During all this period there were no major upsets in the balance of power in Europe and we in the United States could comfortably sit secure behind the bastion of the British Isles and the "wooden walls"—later, steel bulkheads—of the British fleet, knowing that there were no vital threats to its existence.

By the time the World War broke out in 1914 there was already a tradition of friendly cooperation between Britain and the United States. This tradition was strained by British violations of American neutral rights on the seas. But these were not serious enough to outweigh the ties of race, and other links, and the sense of outrage at German depredations on American commerce.

To protect its neutral rights against Germany the United States went to war—a war that was soon to take the shape, under the influence of President Wilson, of a crusade to make the world safe for democracy. The effect of Wilson's Fourteen Points upon European and world opinion signified a new role for the United States—a role of international leadership that renounced isolationism and which made its decisions independently. The peace, Wilson proclaimed, was to be consolidated in a League of Nations.

We know the sequel. In the emotional backlash of the termination of the war the American public reverted to its please-leave-me-alone attitude. And Washington was once more willing for Great Britain—and France—to occupy the center of the international stage.

But America's attempt to play the recluse was, after a few years, thwarted by three villains, whose names I won't have to mention, who marched dictatorially upon the international stage and threw the show into turmoil.

From the beginning of World War II American public opinion was overwhelmingly favorable to the cause of Britain and the western allies. After Pearl Harbor there was little question but that the United States, because of its tremendous economic power, would occupy the chief place among the allies and would take a decisive part in molding the peace to come. A new world leader had come to maturity, and had come to stay.

The new era upon which the world embarked with the defeat of the Axis and the end of World War II has not turned out to be the blessed epoch of which so many people dreamed in the victorious flush of 1945. Indeed, despite the downfall of Hitler and his cohorts there has been no peace. A new aggressor, with headquarters in the Kremlin, began to extend his mailed fist even before the last shot against Hitler and Tojo had been fired. Since the end of the war the mushrooming proportions of Communist expansionism and aggression have cast a pall of dread over the entire free world.

This Communist drive for world conquest is the most significant phenomenon of the postwar international political situation. It has caused the world to be deeply driven into jarring segments in place of the brave, one world of the United Nations which had been so hopefully planned by the Allies during the war. It is these two vital factors of the world power picture, the expansion of the U. S. S. R. and the United Nations, that I now wish to examine in greater detail.

In the first place Russian world aggression expansion is nothing new. As far back as the eighteenth century under the reigns of Peter the Great and Catherine the Great the Muscovite realm commenced a march west, south, and east which eventually placed its boundaries beyond Warsaw, on the Black, Baltic, and Caspian Seas, and as far east as the shores of the Pacific Ocean. Peoples of many nationalities were absorbed into Russia by this policy of imperialistic expansion. The Czar's passion for reaching warm water sent him into a long series of wars with the Turks in the Balkans and around the shores of the Black Sea.

Russian expansionist pressure on the "Sick Man" of Europe became so great that Great Britain and France in the middle of the nineteenth century felt compelled to spring to Turkey's aid. Thus was fought the famous Crimean War of 1854–56. Later in the century Russian imperialism collided with Japanese imperialism in the Far East, culminating in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–05. I mention all this in order to emphasize that this problem of containing Russian aggression or expansion is by no means peculiar to our own time. It is a political question which has weighed upon the chanceries of the Western Powers for a long period.

But the question assumed particular acuteness with the accession to power of the Bolsheviks in 1917. These newcomers in the Russian Government brandished in the face of the shocked world an ideology which called for no less than global domination by the Moscow-guided dictatorship of the proletariat.

The objective of global domination appeared clearly in the pronouncements of the Comintern and the Cominform. In the period between the two World Wars respite the fact that Russia was well occupied with a variety of 5-year plans, and other internal building, the Soviet leaders and the Politburo by no means abandoned their goal of world conquest. It was ever in the forefront of the thinking of the highest bosses of communism.

The tremendous political and economic upheavals generated by World War II presented the Kremlin with its long-awaited opportunities. Beginning in 1939 the innocent victims began to disappear down the maw of the Russian bear. The catalog of conquest is a frightening one. By 1940 Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Bessarabia, and northern Bukovina had been annexed to the U. S. S. R. By the end of World War II parts of Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia and East Prussia had been added to the Soviet Union. The Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin Island had also been appropriated.

In the postwar years Communists achieved or consolidated their control over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, Bulgaria, east Germany, and North Korea. Finally, the fattest prize of all—China, with its 450,000,000 people, fell into the Soviet lap.

The extent of Communist aggrandizement can be surveyed at a glance by a comparison of population figures. In 1945 the Soviet Union had a population of about 190,000,000 inhabitants; by 1950 more than 830,000,000 subjects were under Communist control—approximately 35 to 40 percent of the world's population. Truly, this is a record of expansion which any conqueror of history might well envy.

The saddest chapter in the whole story, however, is the fact that the United States and Great Britain, either through lack of foresight, or, as some people think, by sinister design, aided the Soviet Union to carry out its aggressive program. This is the only conclusion that can be drawn from the fiascos of Yalta and Potsdam. As a result of agreements reached at these conferences Europe and the Far East were in effect divided into spheres of influence. Situations were created which enabled Moscow, through faithlessness and treachery, to extend enormously its domination.

At these conferences it was confirmed that Poland, our ally, should surrender a large portion of its territory to the Soviet Union. The agreement on the liberated countries of eastern Europe may have appeared fair on its face. But in considering the facts of political reality it enabled the Soviet Union to install in them through perfidy puppet governments kow-towing to the Kremlin. It was further agreed that the Soviet Union should occupy eastern Germany, thus paving the way for the Communist-dominated government which is now arming itself perhaps for a Korea-type aggression. It was confirmed that the western powers should share in the occupation of Berlin, but by incredible lack of foresight no provision was made for the western nations to have guaranteed access to that city. We paid for that blunder in the Berlin blockade, which, incidentally, can be reimposed at any time. It is interesting to speculate that this Berlin blockade may be a diversion to take our attention off the other actions of the Soviet elsewhere in the world.

But perhaps the most disastrous concessions were those secret clauses on the Far East. Stalin was given the Kurile Islands, which extend north of Japan and approach our Alaskan outpost; southern Sakhalin; and outer Mongolia. Even worse, the Red tyrant was in effect given in Manchuria authorization to take control of the railroads across it, which gave access to the warm-water ports of Dairen and Port Arthur. Those concessions were made despite the fact that 14 months earlier, at Cairo, when Gen. Chiang Kai-shek was present, China was told at Cairo by Great Britain and America, and at

Potsdam by Russia, that Manchuria would be returned to them when Japan was defeated. It is hard to believe, but now, in the light of history, it seems apparent that our Chinese ally was betrayed at Yalta in 1945 when no representative of the Chinese Government was present.

As a matter of fact, our whole contemporary China policy has been one of gross failure. It is a horrid story of appeasement and refusal to formulate firm objectives for the purpose of preserving China from Red thralldom. The administration's China policy is summed up in that weak, helpless, futile phrase of Secretary Acheson, "waiting for the dust to settle." While we waited, the Reds took over.

As the end of World War II approached the State Department insisted that the Communists join the Nationalists in a coalition government. This attitude persisted after VJ-day. At the end of 1945 President Truman dispatched Gen. George C. Marshall to China to carry out a policy of unification and integration of the Kuomintang and the Communist factions. President Truman authorized Marshall to inform Chiang Kai-shek and other Chinese leaders that "a China disunited and torn by civil strife could not be considered realistically as a proper place for American assistance. * * *" In other words what it amounted to was that if the Communists did not choose to cooperate with the Nationalists the United States would withdraw aid from the latter. Thus the United States, whether intentionally or not, played the Communist game. Our policy put it in the hands of the Communists to control the situation and to call the turn so far as American aid was concerned. And, as a matter of fact, the United States, after it became clear that an understanding between Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse-tung could not easily be obtained, did clamp an embargo on military shipments to China in August 1946. Although this embargo was lifted in May 1947, peace between the Kuomintang and the Communists still remained a cornerstone of the administration's policy with the said result we all know. After the disasters of 1948 demonstrated that a coalition government was out of the question and that there was a strong likelihood of a Communist victory, the administration abandoned the Nationalists to their fate.

The administration compounded error upon error; first by considering the Chinese Communists as innocent "agrarian reformers", second, by attempting to amalgamate the Reds into the Nationalist Government; and third, when that failed by finally abandoning the Nationalists.

It is easy to criticize and often difficult to be constructive. But accepting the China situation as it is at the present time, it seems to me that a sound policy for the United States is one based on a historical foundation. We have already seen that the aim of the United States in the Far East has been to safeguard China's independence and integrity.

China now is neither independent, for Mao Tse-tung is dominated by Moscow. Nor in full possession of its sovereign territory, for the Soviet Union has moved in upon the Chinese province of Manchuria. It is to be hoped that these alien encroachments upon China will eventually provoke feelings of deep resentment among the Chinese people.

In the meantime, the United States should make it easy for the Chinese people—as distinct from their rulers—to be friendly toward the United States and difficult for them to be friendly to Moscow. This is sound strategy, for it is thus that the Communist world may possibly be divided and China detached from the Red standard. I honestly believe there is a vast reservoir of good will for America in China. We need the intelligence and the energy to tap and utilize that reservoir.

In speaking of the phenomenon of Russian aggression I have digressed somewhat to treat the problem of America's China policy. Later on I expect to delineate further my views on other facets of American foreign policy. Right now, however, I would like to say something in regard to the principle of collective security, particularly as it has been expressed in the organization of the United Nations.

IV. LEADERSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES

A world organization for collective security is not something new. The League of Nations, we all remember, was established after the First World War in an attempt to forestall outbreaks of fresh wars. That the United States did not go to Geneve has been cited by some people as a major cause of the League's failure. As a practical matter it is idle now to debate the pros and cons of whether the United States should or should not have joined the League. As far as present problems go that is all ancient history. The important fact is that the United States has now become a full-fledged member of the United Nations and is in the forefront of world cooperative efforts to maintain a just peace.

The United Nations was born as a result of joint international effort. At Moscow in October 1943 the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China issued a declaration recognizing the necessity of creating an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. From August to October of 1944 these four nations met at Dumbarton Oaks in Washington, D. C., and drew up preliminary draft proposals for such an organization.

Finally, in April, May, and June of 1945, 50 nations convened in San Francisco and there on the basis of the Dumbarton draft, drew up the Charter of the United Nations. On August 8 of the same year the United States ratified the Charter after the Senate had voted overwhelming approval. On October 24 the Charter came into force after the twenty-ninth nation had deposited its ratification. Today, approximately 5 years later, 59 nations have adhered to the United Nations Charter.

Looking back on a half decade's operation of the United Nations the impartial observer would note both successes and frustrations. The latter for the most part have been caused by that most controversial of all the features of the United Nations—the rule of unanimity or veto. When the UN was established there was no surrender of essential sovereign power to the organization. In other words the UN was an organization of sovereign states, and not a world government. Such being the case, it was thought that there would have to be agreement among those major countries of the world, which in actuality possessed the preponderance of real political and military power in the world, or else the UN would automatically fall apart. Thus, each of the big five nations was recognized as having the right of preventing such concerted action as it did not favor. Such an arrangement obviously assumed good faith and a certain amount of coincidence of outlook among those five nations possessing the veto or else there would be frustration in the UN Security Council.

As we all know the Soviet Union has grossly abused its right of veto in the Security Council in an effort to sidetrack the legitimate functions of that organ. Thus far the U. S. S. R. has cast the large number of 43 vetoes. It is impossible here to describe each one of these vetoes in detail. Suffice it to say that these blocking tactics by the U. S. S. R. led many observers to believe that the Security Council could not be an effective instrument for enforcing the peace in case of an aggression by the Soviet Union itself or by one of its satellites.

Yet, when the first real crisis of this sort arose, the UN Security Council surprised many by the promptness and efficiency with which, due to the absence of the Soviet Union, it met the emergency. I am, of course, referring to the aggression of the North Korean Red puppet government against the United Nations—recognized South Korean Republic. For some inexplicable reason the Soviet Union apparently failed to foresee the consequences of its action when it deserted the Security Council chamber in January of this year. For it was not on hand to veto those resolutions providing for United Nations police action against North Korean forces.

I will not impose on you the sad details of the Korean crisis; you are getting them from your daily newspaper and radio. But I will mention some of the lessons I think it has demonstrated. Perhaps the most important is that it reveals convincingly and in a manner most people can understand the real intentions of the Soviet Union.

World conquest is the Kremlin's goal and Stalin will not hesitate to use armed force to attain this goal if he thinks he can get away with it. Also, it has demonstrated the inefficacy of the defensive arrangements thus far made by the United States and the other free nations. We might thank Heaven that the Soviet Union has thus tipped off its hand and given us warning of what to expect. Having thus been warned we can proceed on a more rational and realistic basis to make our preparations.

In preparing for the future both the Administration and the leaders of both parties should redouble their efforts to see that the policy of the United States is formulated on a national basis. By that I mean that the President and the State Department should take the minority into full confidence when formulating policy and not solicit their bipartisan support only after decisions have been reached and it is very difficult to amend them.

Utilizing this national procedure the United States should continue and even intensify its policy of firmness toward the Soviet Union. In this regard I would like strongly to emphasize one point. It seems to me that up to the present we have been missing out on the moral front.

Communism is a hateful doctrine, destroying individual liberty, destroying private ownership, freedom of speech and of the press, and destroying religion. Communism is the declared enemy of Christianity. It is the utter antithesis of western civilization. If it prevails it will destroy those values that we prize most highly. I repeat again that Communist strategy is to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

But thanks to God, we who believe that there is a difference between right and wrong and that this is a moral universe in which we live, have faith that such a system as Russian communism contains the seeds of its own destruction—that ultimately righteousness and human freedom will triumph.

The struggle in the world today is thus a moral and ideological conflict.

We need to regain the political initiative in this world struggle. By the ineptness of our leadership we have been put into a position where the Communists have the initiative militarily, and they have seized the initiative politically by their recent action in the Council of the United Nations.

We need to make it clear to the world that basically Marxism is an assault upon morality. The doctrine of "any means to an end" is the core of the whole movement. Entire peoples are subjugated by force, infiltration and deception; churches are ruthlessly destroyed and the clergy disposed of; treaties are found worthless, agreements are made for tactical reasons only and cynically broken. Standards of conduct are corrupted on all fronts.

The governments and statesmen of the free half of the world must sooner or later

come to the realization that only by a revival of high moral and spiritual standards can the battle be won. Until they ally themselves completely with the tremendous moral force of Christianity, until they themselves cease sampling the drugs of materialism, until they more closely adhere to the basic commandments of God, then no number of United Nations and Atlantic Pacts can gain a lasting victory.

In such a conflict the Communists are in a bad position because of their extremely black record on adherence to their pledged word. The catalog of the treaties, agreements, and promises shattered unscrupulously by the Soviet Union is of huge proportions. And it is at this weak plate in their armor that we should strike and strike hard—in the open forum of the United Nations along the earth-girdling airways of radio, in other phases of information, and in every way that we can.

To take one pertinent example, Korea. In 1945 the U. S. S. R. subscribed to an international declaration that in due course Korea should be free and independent. But almost immediately the Soviet Union began to welsh on this pledge. The United States and the Soviet Union decided that the surrender of Japanese troops in Korea should be accepted by the Red Army north of the thirty-eighth parallel and that the United States forces should accept it south of that line. But the U. S. S. R. soon made it clear that it considered this arrangement as dividing the country into military occupation zones.

This was the start of the treachery that finally led to puppet aggression. In December 1945 the United States and the Soviet Union formally agreed that a trusteeship should be established over Korea and that a provisional government for the whole country should be formed. But through 1946 and into 1947 the U. S. S. R. obstructed, in a manner now all too familiar, every effort of a joint United States-U. S. S. R. commission to implement this agreement. Thus another Russian pledge was broken.

In the fall of 1947 the United Nations General Assembly took up consideration of the Korean question and eventually decided that the Korean people should create their own provisional government through United Nations-observed elections. But the UN Temporary Commission which arrived in Korea early in 1948 was denied access to the Soviet-occupied north. The U. S. S. R., in other words, refused to cooperate with the United Nations.

In the American-occupied south elections under the observation of the UN Commission were held in May 1948 and a republican government was established. Subsequently the UN General Assembly approved the establishment of this government.

Finally, in June of this year the U. S. S. R. displayed its complete contempt for the United Nations by sending its puppet troops into aggressive action against the very state which the international organization had sponsored.

It is faithlessness like this, examples of which could be multiplied all over the globe, that the United States should trumpet far and wide in order to demonstrate to peoples everywhere the sort of menace which is threatening human freedom. This is potentially one of the most effective weapons against international communism that the United States can muster and we should support vigorously all action along this line.

The United Nations despite its weaknesses is still a potent instrument for peace and the United States should give unstinting support to its principles. However, we should not permit slavish devotion to its formal organisms to prevent us from using the provisions of the United Nations Charter in those instances where the United Nations is prevented from functioning as it should.

To become more specific I would like to point out that articles 51 and 52 of the Charter permit groups of UN members to band together for their own defense. Under this authority the United States and other like-minded countries have already entered into such associations as the Rio Pact and the North Atlantic Alliance for the purpose of improving their collective defenses against possible aggression. However, the danger we face is formidable and it is quite possible that the Rio and Atlantic Treaties may prove to be inadequate.

In such a contingency it may be necessary to constitute, under the terms of the Charter, a broad "western block." Something of what I mean was suggested by Mr. Herbert Hoover in April of this year. He recommended a "new united front," organized by those peoples "who disavow communism, who stand for morals and religion, and who love fredom." He pointed out that such a union would "have many potent moral, spiritual, and even economic weapons at their disposal." It is by such bold strokes that we may have to act if present measures to check the Communist wave do not prove effective.

In conclusion, I would like to mention very briefly a couple of the other responsibilities which the United States have assumed in the postwar world. These lie in the economic field. After the war most of the countries of western Europe were prostrate economically and were rapidly running out of the foreign exchange with which they could purchase needed materials from the dollar area. In a word, western Europe was just about broke and the Communists were capitalizing on this wretched situation in order to spread their hypocritical ideology. There was grave danger that discouraged people, mislead by the false but glowing promises of the Communists, would turn to totalitarianism for their salvation.

If western Europe had made such a choice, the consequences for the security of the United States would have been serious. Therefore, the administration decided, with the concurrence of both major parties, to extend large-scale economic and financial aid to western Europe in order to create those conditions in which democracy could again flourish without handicap. Thus far, the European recovery program has been a substantial success and, on its record, it should be continued on a diminishing scale, proportionate to the genuine needs of the recipient countries.

In many other parts of the world—Africa, Latin America, Asia—there are numerous countries and peoples whose economic backwardness is astonishing in this advanced atomic age. Such areas are ripe targets for Communist propaganda which lyingly promises all things to all men. There has been some anxiety that unless these areas were given some prospect of advancing toward a higher standard of living, they too might hearken to the siren call of the Kremlin. The so-called point 4 program was recently inaugurated to cope with this situation. This program provides for limited schedules of technical assistance to undeveloped areas and for improvement of their economic structure through the medium of private investment. The program does not contemplate large loans and grants of money such as are extended under the European recovery program. For this reason it does not constitute a heavy financial burden, but its potential results are expected to be very fruitful.

In all these various programs of foreign aid the United States has undertaken an unaccustomed responsibility. It is a responsibility which weighs heavily upon the American taxpayer's pocketbook and we certainly would not assume it without grave reason.

But as I have attempted to show in the foregoing, there are momentous and solemn causes for the course the United States is traveling. The threat of international communism is undeniably great. The United States, through historical developments which I have tried to outline, has succeeded to the leadership of the free world. Our country is the only single nation with sufficient power to thwart the Kremlin's ambition. If we are worthy of the traditions evolved by our forefathers and remain true to the role for which destiny has shaped us, we shall exercise that power generously and well.

I bring you no message of bleak despair and hopelessness. Rather I have tried to present the great challenge of the day in which we live. Our free Republic—our representative self-government—has the patriotic devotion of 150,000,000 Americans. We have abundant resources—industrial, financial, and agricultural. We have a design for living that has given our people standards of health, happiness, and prosperity never dreamed of a century ago; the dream of the millions across the seas in every land.

Do not imagine for a moment that our people will lightly relinquish our freedoms and our political institutions. Rather we will continue to improve them to achieve, under God, the kind of society which will by its very attractiveness, beckon to all men everywhere.

Importations From Russia and Its Satellites Are Displacing Our Workers and Providing American Dollars for Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a communication from our colleague, Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST, representing the Fifteenth Congressional District of Ohio, calling my attention to discharge petition No. 34. This petition relates to a most important matter and is entitled to have the support of the membership of the House. I include as part of my remarks the letter of Congressman SECREST to which I have referred. It reads as follows:

AUGUST 28, 1950.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: For the past 2 years the United States has been buying an average of $2,000,000 worth of furs each month from Russia. Last year more than 12,000,000 pieces of glassware were imported, and Czechoslovakia heads the list of those nations sending glass to the United States. Also from Czechoslovakia come shoes and many other items.

The results of imports from Communist-controlled countries are twofold. First, it creates unemployment in the United States. Second, it gives Russia dollars for propaganda purposes and for the purchase, outside of the United States, of vital war materials.

In my opinion, we should not buy anything from Communist-controlled countries that is not absolutely essential to our own security.

On May 15, Congressman RAMSEY introduced a resolution stating that it is the sense of Congress that the President take steps to cancel reciprocal trade agreements with any country found by the State Department to be Communist controlled. I believe this is logical. Certainly the American people do not want to give dollars to Russia when these

same dollars are being used to buy war materials with which to kill our boys in Korea.

I have placed discharge petition No. 34 on the Speaker's desk and I hope you will urge every Member of Congress to sign it.

Sincerely yours,

BOB SECREST.

Equalize the Tax Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I am getting a little weary listening to the pious protestations of the cooperatives and the co-op coddlers who profess it is a mortal sin to suggest that these tax dodgers should pay their Government a little tribute for the privilege of doing business in this country, and who mournfully mouth dire warnings of what will happen if they are required to kick in with their share of taxes like other businesses do.

I refer specifically to an article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A5849, by my colleague EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota. Mr. MCCARTHY suggests that the tax exemption given to farmer co-ops is not enough and says that all efforts to tax their business activities is motivated by self-seeking interests whose objective is to destroy the cooperatives.

I have led the fight in Congress to tax cooperatives, and I have no self-seeking interests. But, Mr. MCCARTHY is right when he says the farmers do not get enough from their co-ops. Karl LOOS, co-op attorney, recently told the Senate Finance Committee that 91.4 percent of them get less than $10 a year in patronage dividends, and that a mere 8.6 percent of co-op members get 76 percent of the profits.

Nor does the Government get enough from the co-ops. After Attorney LOOS loudly proclaimed that the Government would realize a mere $6,000,000 by taxing the earnings of all cooperatives, it must have been embarrassing to him to pick up his newspaper the other morning and read where one cooperative, the Union Equity Cooperative Grain Exchange, of Enid, Okla., was voluntarily offering to pay a tax of nearly $1,000,000 on its business this year. There are tens of thousands of cooperatives in this country—many of them bigger than Union Equity—but here was one of them acknowledging that it had enough profits to toss Uncle Sam a "million-dollar bone." Conscience money, that is what it was.

Mr. Speaker, conservative estimates of the amount of money the Government would realize from taxation of cooperatives totals $350,000,000. Despite all the breast beating and pious proclamations of the tax dodgers that is a terrific amount of money to be obtained through levying the same tax on them as on other corporations. And it will not break the co-ops any more than it breaks businessmen who pay their taxes.

I have a bill, H. R. 5064, that would equalize the tax burden in this country among all those who do business in the market place, and I cannot understand why, when the Government needs every dollar of revenue it can get, something is not done about this bill. As I have said time and again, it is utterly unfair to consider heaping a still greater tax burden on one segment of American business and let another considerable part of it go tax-free. It has been estimated that one-third of the total wealth of America is now owned by tax-free organizations, and they are growing at breakneck speed. Yet the Senate now has the temerity to announce calmly that nothing will be done about taxing the cooperatives—at least not before the November elections—except to make a further study of the case and hold more public hearings.

Mr. Speaker, extensive hearings have already been held on this subject. An overwhelming amount of testimony has been presented to show conclusively the need for taxing the tax exempts. There is no need for further hearings. The Congress has shown utterly indefensible inconsistency by voting to tax certain incomes of charitable and educational institutions and at the same time refusing to touch the sacrosanct co-ops. It is high time we laid this bugaboo to rest.

We are rapidly entering another war economy with all its burdensome restrictions and limitations on profits. Is there any justification in permitting anyone, cooperatives, or whatever other pseudonym you choose to call them, to operate almost completely tax-free? Do you think it fair, Mr. Speaker, that anyone should be permitted to enjoy a tax-free profit in time of war?

National Science Foundation Is Too Important To Be Pushed Aside by Dilatory Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the National Science Foundation bill is too important to be stymied by failure to make an immediate and sufficient appropriation to carry its provisions into effect. The Congress by an overwhelming vote approved the measure on May 10, after several years of study and consideration. It has received the approval of the President. Up to the present time neither the Director nor the Board to direct its affairs, has been appointed, nor, has any appropriation been made. As one of the sponsors of the legislation I am deeply concerned over the lethargy that is being displayed.

An editorial appearing in the Courier-Post, newspaper of Camden, N. J., issue of August 31, 1950, has clearly, concisely and forcibly set forth not only the importance of the National Science Foundation but the extreme necessity of putting it into effect without further delay. The editorial to which I refer reads as follows:

COMMITTEE WOULD NULLIFY SCIENCE FOUNDATION LAW

The House Appropriations Committee is attempting to override the expressed wishes of the majority of Congress, President Truman, and our military leaders by a pigeonhole veto of the National Science Foundation law.

This law was approved May 10, after 5 years of legislative consideration, to establish an agency which would centralize and strengthen our scientific research efforts in both military and nonmilitary fields.

During this time hundreds of witnesses from the executive departments, scientific organizations, and institutions testified that a National Science Foundation was needed to fill a missing link in our security chain. They agreed that such an agency was necessary to coordinate and stimulate basic scientific research in this country, which they testified is falling behind that of other nations.

The law was nonpolitical in nature and received bipartisan support. One of its strongest advocates was Congressman WOLVERTON, who was sponsor of a similar measure in the Eightieth Congress that was vetoed by President Truman because of administrative features he disliked, which were revised in the 1950 bill.

As passed by Congress and signed by the President, the law provides for appointment of 24 citizens as members of the National Science Board, which will guide the Foundation's policies.

President Truman, according to a letter sent Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, by presidential assistant John R. Steelman, "has been preparing to nominate in the very near future 24 outstanding citizens drawn from the field of science, engineering, agriculture, industry, and public affairs to this board.

The President feels, says the letter, that "to fail to activate this very important agency, at this critical juncture as we speed the strengthening of other segments of our defenses, would be to pass over a unique opportunity to improve and strengthen our scientific research efforts which, as you well know, are of vital importance to the preesrvation of our security."

But the House Appropriations Committee is blocking activation of the Foundation by withholding an appropriation of $475,000, because, it says, it "believes that new programs which will not provide early aid to our defense effort should not be initiated at this time."

In other words, to save a tiny drop in the bucket of defense spending, this committee would set up its judgment as superior to that of the whole Congress, the President, and all the others who say the Foundation should be put in operation at once.

This is congressional minority dictation of the worst type, comparable with past actions of the House Rules Committee in refusing to permit legislation favored by a large majority to come to a vote. In a way it is worse, since it would nullify a law that has already been approved by Congress and signed by the President.

Congress will convict itself of impotence and cowardice in the face of a small group's arbitrary attempt to thwart its will unless it insists on passing this appropriation and setting up an agency which all auhorities agree is vital to our defenses.

Address by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida, at Fourth Biennial Convention of Southern Conference for Human Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address delivered by me at the fourth biennial convention of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, held at New Orleans, La., on November 28, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the fourth biennial convention of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, tonight we strike the keynote—freedom road. Each delegate to this convention must carry back home the torch to light freedom road for the South.

The people of the South are at the crossroads—the road to freedom or the path to the unseen wilderness of Republican administration. I fear the hand of republicanism will fall heavily upon the Southland. I fear for her industrial growth and development of her great resources. I fear the decline of southern agricultural production under a Republican regime. I fear that the Republicans will give lip service and ancient shibboleths on civil rights for southerners.

I have a well-grounded fear that certain southern Democrats are inclined to cooperate with the Republicans. I am not alone in my fears.

Let me read to you excerpts from two editorials of a southern newspaper—the News and Courier of Charleston, S. C. On October 13, 1946, the editorial read:

"The Negroes who in South Carolina call themselves 'Progressive Democrats' are more consistent members of the new party founded in 1933 and more loyal followers of its national leaders than are the leaders of the white party in South Carolina. The white leaders oppose the passage of an FEPC law, filibuster against a Federal antilynching bill, and oppose the repeal of poll-tax laws. They oppose other important policies of the new party, and the allegations that they sometimes join the Republicans in voting against administration measures cannot be disputed. By 1948 the white people of South Carolina are pretty sure to find out where they don't belong, where they are unwelcome guests though they are fed with leavings."

On November 14, 1946, the editorial read: "Of the 170 members and senators composing the general assembly of South Carolina, how many are true New Dealers, loyal to the policies and to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt?"—"The News and Courier cannot shut its eyes to signs that some South Carolinians are yielding to the temptation to cooperate with Republicans. Cooperation is one degree removed from coalescence."

The people of the South and its economy are an integral part of these United States. The solution of southern economic, social, and political problems will play a great part in determining our country's ability to meet the challenge of this postwar world.

This solution lies in progressive democracy. It means that the Democratic Party must be led by those who believe in progressive democracy. Real democracy does not look backward in time for the solution of its problems—but looks forward. Hindsight is not the answer—but foresight is.

Progressive democracy does not seek the return to prewar standards like the Republicans. It does not desire to go back to 1932 or even to 1939. We must go far above even the 1939 level to remove economic, social, and political barriers to human happiness and peace.

I tell you that the South is America's economic problem No. 1. But the problems of the South, for the most part, are the problems of the North and the West. The differences are only in degree.

Let's look at the South. Variations in the income of the people in the South from those in the North or West are due to differences in natural resources, capital equipment, and financial resources, and the relative levels of productive training of the population.

As the result of a trend away from dependency upon agriculture to manufacturing there has been a sharp increase of incomes in the South. But they are still very low. Per capita incomes in the South are far below the average for the Nation, and, mind you, this fact is also reflected in State and local revenues.

Per capita incomes in the southern area moved from $371 in 1929 to $340 in 1940 and to $797 in 1945, or from 55 percent of the national per capita average in 1929 to 59 percent in 1940 and 69 percent in 1945. If you line up the 13 Southern States in ascending order of income you find Mississippi, with 59 percent of its workers on farms, in 1940 had a per capita income of $202, and Florida, with the lowest proportion of farm workers, 20 percent, had the highest southern per capita income of $471.

Average annual wages and salaries of workers in industries covered by unemployment-compensation laws in the South are roughly three-fourths of those in the same industries for the entire country. The average annual wage in the South in 1939 in these industries was about $1,016 and in 1944 $1,798. In all industries except mining the wages and salaries of southern industrial workers drew closer to the national average between 1939 and 1944. These averages for the South are overstated because a great proportion of small firms are excluded from the figures. Small firms generally pay lower wages than large ones.

Wages and salaries in the South represented less than 60 percent of the total income of the South in 1929 and in 1940, rose to 66 percent in 1943—because of military wages—and dropped to less than 60 percent in 1945. The rest of the country showed somewhat the same trend, starting at less than 65 percent in 1929, rising to 70 percent in 1940, and dropping back to 66 percent in 1945.

The proportion of wages and salaries paid in the South to the total for the country rose from 14 percent in 1929 to 16 percent in 1940 and 18 percent in 1945, whereas there has been a decline for the rest of the country from 86 percent in 1929 to 82 percent in 1945.

Manufacturing wages and salaries in the South increased from $1,562,000,000 in 1929 or 10 percent of the country total to $1,717,000,000 in 1940, or 11 percent of the national total for manufacturing, and $4,653,000,000, or 12 percent of the total United States manufacturing payrolls. The percentage increase in total southern manufacturing wages and salaries rose 171 percent between 1940 and 1945, and in all other States only 142 percent.

A study of straight-time earnings shows that in 1945 the Southeast had the lowest earnings in each of 23 of 36 industries, and the Southwest was lowest in 12 of 31 industries. Only 1 of the 36 industries in the Southeast had average earnings above the national average for the particular industry, and in the Southwest only 2 out of 31. Wages in lumber, railroads, textiles, building and printing trades, and many other important southern industries were lower in the South than elsewhere.

Per capita State and local revenues in 1938–39 in the United States were $68.61; for California, $99.76; for New York, $113.73; for Georgia, $35.79; for Alabama, $29.01; and for Florida, $53.44.

The South was not made for economic slavery. It has one-third of our Nation's farm lands. It has 60 percent of the Nation's land which has at least 40 inches of rainfall. It has 50 percent of the Nation's crop land with 6 months without frost. Yet there is poverty a plenty in the South. The poor farms and the poor farmer of the South help to pull down southern per capita income.

Although average net farm income per farm in the South rose from $582 in 1940 to $1,708 in 1944, about the same increase as the rest of the country, there was a decrease in the number of farms. Thus larger size farms reaped the harvest.

Farm wages in the South dropped from 4.4 percent of total wages in 1929 to 3.9 percent in 1940 and 3.4 percent of total southern wages and salaries in 1945. For the rest of the country, this relationship was about 2 percent between 1929 and 1945.

About half of the country's farm workers are in the South, but they get only less than 30 percent of the total national farm-wage payments. They got only $319,000,000 in 1929 or about one-fourth of the total United States farm wages in 1929. In 1940, they got 29 percent of the total and in 1945 about 27 percent of the total farm wages. The discrepancy lies not only in lower farm wages in the South than in the rest of the country, but in the large number of unpaid family workers in southern farming.

The Southern States with about one-half of the farm population get less than one-third of the national farm income payments. In 1929, agricultural income was $2,513,000,000 or 36 percent, the total farm income, in 1940 it dropped to $1,906,000,000 or 35 percent of the total farm income, and in 1945, $4,821,000,000 or 32 percent of the total agricultural income.

Agricultural income in the South was 20 percent of its total income in 1929, 15 percent in 1940, and 16 percent in 1945 compared with 6.3 percent, 5.6 percent, in 1940, and 8.4 percent in 1945 for the rest of the country. This shows that the South is more dependent on agriculture than the rest of the country.

Farm wages for the South rose from $21.20 per month to 1939 to $53.20 per month in 1944. This increase of 151 percent for the South can be compared with 156 percent for the country as a whole. The index of farm wage rates for the Nation (1910–1914—100) was 123 in 1939 and 315 in 1944.

As to wages—I know of no greater factor in determining the wealth of a State and its ability to meet human welfare needs than high wages. The South has always been known as a low wage area.

Substandard wages in the South has resulted not only in limited education, but also has placed a heavy toll on all persons with low wages in poor health and health facilities, high mortality, poor housing. Low wages have not meant good business in the South.

The principal industries originally affected by the 40-cent minimum under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 were those which, to a great extent, were in the South, namely: tobacco, lumber, textiles, apparel, and furniture. These were the principal industries with a large percentage of their workers getting under 65 cents an hour in the summer of 1945. This level, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor found necessary

for minimum subsistence. In tobacco, 58 percent earned under 65 cents at that time, 54 percent in lumber, 47 percent in textiles, 38 percent in apparel, and 37 percent in furniture.

Wage differences between the South and the rest of the country for the same kind of work have no economic or social justification. These differentials are not based on any substantial difference in the cost of living between the North and the South. The cost of purchasing, the same standard of living does not vary greatly from one geographical area to another.

The wage differentials between the North and the South in these industries particularly, and within these two regions, vary widely and irrationally from locality to locality. The Fair Labor Standards Act did help to reduce the North-South differentials for such industries as seamless hosiery and fertilizer. It exercised some influence in the equalization of wage rates for the same kind of work.

Studies by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics show that the cost of living differential between a city of 100,000 or more and one of 2,500 persons is probably not more than 10 percent on the average. A given standard of living in five small southern cities was, on the average, only 3.1 percent less than that for five small northern cities of the same size.

In December 1938, the cost of living for an Atlanta family of four was $1,332, for Birmingham $1,277, for Memphis $1,306, for New Orleans $1,261, and for Houston $1,298, for Jacksonville, $1,284, for Norfolk $1,325, for Richmond $1,332, Mobile $1,184, for Hattiesburg (Mississippi) $1,205, Sherman (Tennessee) $1,167, Statesville (North Carolina) $1,315, Sumter (South Carolina) $1,264, Thomasville (Georgia) $1,245.

The December, 1938, cost of living for North Atlantic cities was $1,340, for South Atlantic cities $1,325, North Central cities $1,343, South Central cities $1,243.

Southern city living costs were only 3.9 percent less than that for northern cities of various sizes (ranging from New York and Chicago to Chillicothe, Mo., and Dover, N. H.).

Compare the 1938 figures with $1,352 proposed in 1946 as an annual minimum wage base in 65 cents an hour when the cost of living was over 40 percent higher for low-wage families. In such low-wage cities as Mobile and Memphis, two-thirds of the families were estimated to be living below a minimum subsistance level in comparison with 25 percent in Washington, D. C., and San Francisco.

Living costs in the southern cities range from 88 percent of the cost of equivalent goods, rents, and services for the District of Columbia in March 1945, for Houston, Tex., to 95 percent in Richmond, Va. In eight of the twelve southern cities for which data is available for 1939 and 1945 the costs were 5 to 12 percent lower in the southern cities and 10 to 15 percent lower than the District of Columbia base for 1939.

And southern business and employment have benefited by high minimum wages. The profit experience of the southern lumber industry, a good example, was very satisfactory under the Fair Labor Standards Act and dur- World War II. The southern branch of the industry compares favorably with the northern branch and with the entire industry in the country.

I need not cite all the facts here. You can find it in the reports of the Senate Education and Labor Committee on the 65-cent minimum wage bill.

The full-fashioned hosiery industry expanded very rapidly in the South between 1932 and 1939 when wages in the southern division of the industry rose more rapidly than in the rest of the Nation. The proportion of plants in this industry located in the South rose from 20 percent in 1929 to 35 percent in 1938 and, for seamless hosiery the proportion of southern plants rose from 60 percent in 1934 to over 66 percent in 1941, a period of rising wages.

Under the NRA, employment increased from 46,754 to 55,441 in the men's apparel industry of the South. The South's share in the increase of employment in the paper and pulp industry rose from under 4 percent in 1925 to 7½ percent in 1939 and for furniture from 14.4 percent to 21.5 percent between 1929 and 1939. Although the actual number of persons employed in logging and sawmill operations dropped as much as 45 percent between 1914 and 1938, the southern share of employment in the industry remained constant.

Between 1938 and 1940 manufacturing employment in southern cities increased as much as, if not more than, other cities in the United States. Between 1937 and 1939, the dress-shirt industry in Tennessee doubled its employment. Employment in the southern branch of the men's apparel industry in 1939 was double that for 1931 when no 30-cent minimum was in effect.

The net profits before taxes of the southern division rose from a deficit of $332,000 in 1938 to $3,814,000 in 1939 and to $28,540,000 in 1942.

In October 1939 the minimum wage rate for the cotton-textile industry was set at 32½ cents an hour, in April 1942 at 40 cents an hour, at 50 cents an hour in 1944, and 55 cents in 1945. Net profits before taxes for the cotton-textile industry rose from an average of $33,000,000 in 1936–39 to $71,500,000 in 1940, $378,000,000 in 1942, and $400,000,000 in 1945.

The South not only provides its most productive labor for its own factories and farms, but also contributes substantially to the labor forces of the rest of the country. The fast-growing population of the South confronted with low job standards and low living standards provides the source of labor for many other areas. And our southern veterans, fully aware of this situation, are seeking employment elsewhere. Those who are left behind are, for a good part, the very young, the very old, the less competent in the factory and on the farm.

In 1920–30, the net out migration from the South was about 130,000 a year, during the depression of the 1930's, 100,000 per year and during 1940–45, 300,000 migrants in excess of the number entering the South left it. The 13-State area and every State in it except Florida and Virginia, has continued to lose population to other areas. There is strong evidence to indicate that rural southern migrants went to the North, the West, and to southern cities such as Mobile and Houston.

Data for the 1935–40 period indicate that many of these migrants are in the young, productive age groups. After spending unproductive school years in the South, they moved to other regions which reap the harvest of southern training. Of those who left the South, three-eighths of the 25–34 year age group had a high school education or better and six-sevenths had completed eighth grade or better.

War Department surveys show that in 1944, 15 of every 100 southern soldiers had plans to settle in the North or the West.

The median age of the population in the South in 1940 was 25 years, in contrast with 31 years in the North and the West. Fifty-two percent of the southern workers were under 35 years of age compared with 46 percent in the North and 44 percent in the West.

Similarly, there are more older men in the southern labor force. Forty-eight and five-tenths percent of southern men 65 and over are in the labor forces as compared with 40 percent for the North and 35.5 percent for the South.

A study of States in the last 5 years by Dr. E. J. Eberling, chief of research of the Tennessee Department of Employment Security (Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, South Carolina, and Georgia) shows 515,979 left this area for war jobs elsewhere. Florida gained 226,906 and Mississippi lost 227,599. Many of these are not returning. In the Mississippi Delta, 50 percent of Negro farm labor has gone since the war began.

With the flood of the population to southern cities during the war, the housing shortage became severe, rentals soared, and prices of consumers goods and services rose rapidly. The war workers who flocked to southern cities stayed there even without jobs, in preference to returning to farm life.

Before the war southern agriculture supported 37 percent of the labor, and manufacturing only 17 percent. In May 1945 these figures were 30 and 24 percent, respectively.

Seven of the ten largest cities of the South—Savannah, Jacksonville, New Orleans, Norfolk, Birmingham, Atlanta, and Memphis—showed rises in the cost of consumer goods and services between August 1939 and June 1946 of above the national average of 35.2 percent for 34 large cities. Savannah and Jacksonville were the two highest cities (41.6 and 40.5 percent). Between mid-June 1940 and early 1945 in 13 smaller southern cities, such as Vicksburg, Miss., Gadsden, Ala., Corpus Christi, Tex., Jonesboro, Ark., Chester, S. C., Goldsboro, N. C., Newport News, Va., et al., the cost of living rose more than the national average of 26.2 percent for the 34 largest cities in the same period. The only city which was less was Stillwater, Okla. (25 percent). In such cities as Vicksburg and Newport News the rise was 30 percent or more.

Between July 1, 1940, and September 30, 1945, Mobile and Norfolk increased total dwellings by 45 and 37 percent. In Jacksonville and Savannah 19 and 13 percent of prewar dwellings were added. Atlanta, Houston, and New Orleans also added many new dwellings.

Southern homes reflect their poverty and the poor housing and sanitation facilities which exist there. The lack of electric lighting, running water, private inside privies, mechanical refrigeration, and other facilities is merely a reflection of low incomes and the ensuing conditions of ill health.

The 1940 census shows that the average value of housing in the South was $1,363 in comparison with $2,503 for the average home in the Nation. In fact, the value of farm homes in the South was only $644 on the average against $1,728 for other rural homes. Of the 10 States with the poorest homes, 9 were in the South. In fact, other data reflect the poor housing and sanitation conditions which prevail in the South. The 1940 census shows that the percentage of dwelling units with electric lights was 31.3. In the South Atlantic States 21.8 percent of the dwelling units had electric lights.

	Percent of dwelling units with over 1.5 persons per room per unit	Mechanical refrigeration	Percent of dwelling units	
			Owner occupied	Tenant occupied
United States	9.0	44.1	43.6	56.4
South Atlantic States	14.7	35.3	40.5	59.5

It should be noted that this comparison includes Delaware, Maryland, and Washington, D. C., in the South Atlantic States. If these are excluded, the disparity would be even greater.

Yes; of the 5,500,000 rural homes in the South, less than 3,000,000 have a water supply within 50 feet; 657,799 have no toilet or

privy, and 4,000,000 have only an outside privy.

Of 4,922 southern incorporated communities in the South, 1,928, or 39.5 percent, need a public water supply and 47.2 percent need a sewage system with treatment.

Of southern rural homes in 1940, 13.6 percent were "acceptable" under Federal standards, 27.8 percent repairable, and 58.67 percent nonrepairable, against 52.5 percent acceptable, 31.8 percent repairable, and 24.3 percent nonrepairable for the rest of rural America.

Only 16.4 percent have electricity against 46.7 percent in the Nation. Four and nine-tenths percent had inside toilets and 15 percent none whatsoever.

Malnutrition is common in the South. This is no surprise. We southerners well know the average southern family has a less healthful diet than nonsouthern families. Why? Good diet is largely dependent on decent incomes available for purchasing power.

A study by the Department of Agriculture shows that farm operators in the Southeast have poorer diets than those in the North and in the West. About one-half of Negro farm families have poor diets. Based on national per capita consumption, it is estimated that southern people have an annual shortage of 121,000,000 gallons of milk, 18,500,000 head of purebred cattle, and 70,000,000 dozen eggs.

The South failed to contribute as much of its manpower as the rest of the Nation for its common defense.

About one of every two selective service registrant in 13 Southern States were rejected for physical and mental reasons. Compare this rate with one out of every three for the non-Southern States.

What is more precious to us than our mothers and children. Yet eight of the nine States with the highest mortality among maternity cases in 1943 were Southern States.

Maternity death rates were 3.6 per 1,000 live births in these States and only 2.2 per 1,000 in the non-Southern States. Infant mortality death rates in 13 Southern States were 48.6 per 1,000 live births in comparison with 40.6 for the nonsouthern group.

These facts are easily understood. Only 8 of every 10 mothers receive doctor care in a hospital during maternity. Almost 8 out of every 10 nonsouthern mothers get such care. Furthermore, over 2 out of every 10 southern mothers give birth to children without doctor and hospital care—they get the aid of a midwife. This situation is almost unknown in the non-Southern States.

We know that if the 13 Southern States, for example, had the same maternity and infant mortality rates as Minnesota and Connecticut, the States with the lowest rates in 1943, the lives of 16,304 southern mothers and 1,658 infants would have been saved (over 50 percent of the total lives that could have been saved).

Doctors, dentists, and nurses will not settle in localities where they cannot make a good living. This fact accounts, to a great extent, for the smaller proportion of physicians, dentists, and nurses in the South than in the rest of the Nation.

The number of physicians in the 12 highest per capita income States are 15.1 per 10,000 persons and only 8 per 10,000 in the 12 lowest-income States, which are largely Southern States. How threatening these figures are. For the national minimum standard for health safety is about 10 doctors for each 10,000 persons.

The number of active physicians per 10,000 persons was 9.4 for 13 Southern States in 1940 and 14.9 for the non-Southern States. In 1944 15 southern counties with a population of 3,000 or more had no active physician; 15 more southern counties had over 10,000 persons per active doctor; in 78 others there were 5,000 to 10,000 persons per active physician.

In States like Georgia, Alabama, and Florida 39.2 percent, 38.8 percent, and 44.8 percent of the counties, respectively, had over 3,000 persons per active physician under 65 years of age. Specifically, the 1944 rates for the States were 1,907, 1,213, and 2,185 persons per active doctor under 65.

In the 12 highest-income States there are about 72 dentists per 100,000 persons. In the 12 lowest per capita income States, largely Southern States, there are only 25 per 100,000 people.

In 1940 there were 27.3 male dentists per 100,000 persons in 13 Southern States in comparison with a rate of 64.1 for the rest of the Nation. The 1940 rates for Georgia was 1 dentist to every 3,796 persons, 1 per 4,683 for Alabama, and 1 per 2,657 for Florida. In 1940 there was 1 dentist for every 1,878 persons in the country.

In 1941 there was 1 dentist to every 1,200 persons on the west coast, 1 to every 1,300 in the Middle Atlantic area, 1 to every 3,100 in the West South-Central area, and 1 to every 3,900 in the East South-Central States.

Believe it or not, there are twice as many trained and student nurses in States outside the South as there are in the South. No wonder our maternal and infant mortality rates are high.

In 1940 there were 156 trained and student nurses per 100,000 in Southern States and 315.8 per 100,000 in the non-Southern States. In 1943 the ratio of population to nurses in the South Atlantic States was 993 for each nurse; in the West South-Central States there were 1,359 persons per nurse; in New England the rate was 423 to 1 nurse.

Health and hospital facilities in the South are wholly inadequate. Many of our southern counties do not have a local public health department. Is it any wonder that venereal-disease treatment in the South falls so far behind that of other States?

Is it any wonder that the prevention and care of tuberculosis and other contagious diseases have fallen by the wayside in the South?

Thirty-eight and nine-tenths percent, or 529 counties, in the South have no local health department. Eight hundred and thirty-two others are inadequately staffed. In 1944 about one-thousand-two-hundred-some-odd counties in the Nation had no full-time public-health service.

While the South has almost 30 percent of the country's population, it has only 19 percent of the general hospital beds, 18 percent of the tuberculosis beds, and 18 percent of the mental hospital beds. This disparity is too great for the public good and for the health of the southern people.

In 1940 the 10 States with the least number of hospital beds per 10,000 persons were all southern. The minimum considered to be necessary in 1940 was 4 beds per 1,000 people. Yet the Southern States in that year had only about 2.2 beds per 1,000 people. No Southern State was up to this minimum.

The 12 highest-income States have 4.3 beds per 1,000 persons and the lowest 12 per capita income States have 2.1 per 1,000 persons. The latter, of course, were largely Southern States.

In 1944, 4.5 to 5 general beds was considered a good standard for each 1,000 people. Yet, in States like Georgia and Alabama, the rates were below 2.5 beds per 1,000 persons.

In 1944 we find a rate of 2.5 general and special hospital beds per 1,000 people in the South. The rate for the Northeast was 4.8 and for the Western States 4.1 such beds per each 1,000 individuals.

The wealth of a State also determines hospital occupancy. For example, New York which had 5.4 general and special beds per 1,000 persons in 1944 had an occupancy rate in its hospitals of 74 percent. Mississippi, with 1.8 beds per 1,000 had an occupancy of 57 percent. In New York each patient in a hospital averaged about 1.4 days. Mississippi provided only 0.38 days to each patient despite a record of greater ill health in that State.

Is it any wonder that the South has a lower education level than the rest of the country? Is it any wonder that the wealthy States of the North and the West pay their more unfortunate citizens substantially more than our Southern States? The amounts paid in the South are a pittance on which they can hardly exist.

We find 341,200 selective-service registrants rejected because of the lack of education, as of September 1, 1943. The number of Negroes rejected for this reason was six to seven times the number of white men rejected and equaled over one-half of the total rejections for this cause.

In Georgia, the rejection rates for lack of education were about 15 per 100 registrants and in Alabama 16 per 100 registrants. No wonder—the average 1939 school expenditure per pupil in Georgia was $17 and in Alabama $15. On the other hand, look at New York City or Massachusetts. The rate of rejections for educational deficiencies was less than 1 per 100 in New York City and 1½ per 100 registrants examined in Massachusetts. The city of New York spent $157 for the education of each pupil in 1939 and Massachusetts expended $115 per pupil.

The Southern States, which have a lower per capita income than most other States spend much less on the average for educating its young people. For example, Alabama with a per capita income in 1940 of $782 per person between 5 and 20 years of age spent $22.77 on education for each such person in 1942. Georgia with an income of $950 per school age person spent $24.93 and Florida with $1,708 expended $41.70. The Nation in 1940 got an income of $2,043 per school age person and gave each one in return $55.69 worth of education. New York with $3,592 gave $91.07 and California with $3,575 gave $105.59.

There is no question that the State benefits by giving its young people opportunities for better education. The 1940 census shows that 50 percent of the people who had completed college or beyond had incomes of $5,000 or more per year, 39 percent of those who attended high school had annual incomes at this level. Only 11 percent of those who had 8 years of schooling or less had incomes as high at this.

That proportion of a State's income spent on education is not indicative of neglect of education. States like Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi spend as great (and a greater) proportion of their incomes on education as wealthy States like California, Washington, and New York. But the average school expenditure per average classroom or per pupil is many times higher in the richer States. Of the 10 States with the lowest expenditures for schools per average classroom in 1938–39, 9 were Southern States.

In April 1946, the average old-age assistance payment in the United States was $31.34. The highest paying State was Washington with $53.14. Look at Georgia which doled out $12.67; Alabama, $16.92, and Florida, $30.21. Yes, an aged citizen had to get these meager sums after he underwent a humiliating means test.

The average payment in April 1946, in aid to the blind was $33.85. California and Washington paid as much as $58 a month. The blind person in Georgia received $15.45, $17.56 in Alabama, and $31.41 in Florida.

The average payment in the United States for April 1946 to families with dependent children was $53.82. One hundred dollars, the highest amount, was paid by Washington. Georgia doled out $26.73; Alabama, $28.29, and Florida, $34.12.

Dr. FRANK GRAHAM, one of the great leaders of the southern conference, has proposed a 10-point program as a solution to

many of the economic and social problems of the South. Furthermore, I am heartily in accord with the program for democracy in southern agriculture, which is so competently set forth in the November 1946 issue of the Southern Patriot.

"SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE—TEN-POINT PROGRAM

"(By FRANK GRAHAM)

"1. Elimination of discriminatory freight rates which have for so long been barriers to the development of the South.

"2. Federal and State aid for building hospitals and rural health centers and the expansion of the few remaining State 2-year medical schools into standard 4-year medical schools.

"3. Federal aid to the States for the public schools without Federal control and increased pay and equal pay for teachers of equal competence as steps toward providing equal educational opportunities for all youth.

"4. To help to provide the desperately needed doctors and nurses for the hospitals and rural-health centers.

"5. More and diversified industries in the South and responsible bargaining between organized businesses and organized labor as the foundation for cooperation in fair employment and maximum production for the maintenance of justice and peace in the world.

"6. The 65-cent Federal minimum wage in interstate industries and State minimum wages in intrastate industries, State and public employees to correspond to the Federal minimum.

"7. More diversification of agriculture, promotion of agricultural societies, farm and home ownership and the establishment of a clear and equitable status for farm tenants and share croppers.

"8. Additional State and Federal support of both agriculture and industrial research and fundamental scientific, economic, historical, social and humanistic research as indispensable to southern production and human well-being.

"9. The development of great university and college centers in the South.

"10. State aid for county-wide libraries for adult education, workers education, institute of government, State symphonies and folk government."

The Southern Patriot program for agriculture includes:

1. Governmental purchase of large units of land with resale to farmers and tenants at low rates and expansion of the Farmers Home Administration program.

2. Adequate low-cost credit to farmers for acquisition of land, machinery, livestock, housing and fertilizer. Amendment of the GI bill of rights to provide direct Government loans to veterans.

3. Governmental assistance to farm cooperatives.

4. Granting of certain legal rights to tenants and share croppers.

5. Coverage of farm labor under various labor and social-welfare laws.

6. Expansion of health, housing, education and public-welfare programs for southern rural areas.

7. Removal of poll-tax laws, passage of antilynching laws and outlawing of white primaries.

I have little to add to these splendid programs. I should like to say however, that there should be a basic guiding principle, namely, that the Federal Government must equalize economic and social opportunities throughout the Nation. It is high time that the South shared more equitably in Federal aid for human welfare. The present system of matching Federal moneys with State funds fails to equalize the financial burdens of economic and social welfare throughout the Nation. To assist the low-income States it is necessary that Federal participation recognize differences in the present financial status of each State. States with low per capita income must receive a higher proportion of assistance from the Federal Government than the States with high per capita income.

What is also needed in the South is a well-planned chain of TVA's, a soil-conservation program, a reforestration program and a carefully developed plan to develop our natural resources.

This is a program for economic and social welfare. It is a program which progressive democracy offers for human happiness. On the other hand, what do the Republicans offer the American people. Budget slashes, tax cuts, high prices, food and other shortages, housing shortages. It is a program for the few at the expense of the many. It is a program of scarcity which will lead us to depression and unemployment.

The third phase of the program deals with human liberties. These are grave times for the South. The anti-Democrats are in the saddle. They are riding the southern people like herd—just as they did after the end of the Civil War and World War I. We know about the Columbians of Atlanta, the Talmadges of Georgia, the lynchings in Mississippi, the depredations heaped upon American citizens throughout the South, the "white supremacy" primaries of South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama. Other States, like Arkansas and others, talk of following suit. Therein lies the danger. The fires of racial hatred have been lit in the South. The poison seeds of Hitlerian creeds have been sown.

Shall lovers of liberty and human happiness cringe in fear before these fires, or permit these seeds to grow in the American soil. "No," I say. Americans have never given way to tyranny, despotism, or autocracy. They have resisted until their forces were strong enough to beat down the enemy.

There is a gentle mist settling before the winds blow. It will rise into a storm. The wrath of God will put out these fires and wash away these poisonous embryos.

For in the South today the forces of progressive democracy are behind this gathering storm. With the help of progressive Democrats elsewhere, the Arnalls of Georgia, Folsoms of Alabama, the Perrys of Tennessee, the Grahams of North Carolina will rise to defeat the anti-Democratic forces in this country. There is no place in the Democratic Party for people who have no regard for human welfare and liberty.

All other believers in our program must back up these leaders. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare must take its position in the front lines of the forces of southern democracy to achieve victory. The conference must become the bulwark in the rebirth of the South. It must become the South of Jefferson, of Patrick Henry, of the Georgians at Kings Mountain. It must be the South in which the most immortal of all documents must be given the breath of life again. This is our program. It is your duty to carry on.

A Tribute to Peter J. McGuire as Father of Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that on each succeeding Labor Day, exercises are held in Arlington Cemetery, located near the city of Camden, N. J., to honor Peter J. McGuire, known as the father of Labor Day, who was buried there in 1906, the year he passed on into the Great Beyond.

Mr. McGuire was born in Dublin, Ireland, in 1852. At an early age he came to this country. He identified himself with trade-union activities, and, eventually became general secretary of the Carpenters and Joiners International Union. In his effort to achieve recognition of labor's rights, he advocated the setting aside of a fixed day each year to be known as Labor Day. The day to be observed as a national holiday in tribute to labor and the workingman. In 1881 he prompted New York's Knights of Labor to hold the first Labor Day parade up Fifth Avenue. In 1894 Congress answered his 20-year plea and made Labor Day a national holiday. Since that time Labor Day has become a fixture in our national holidays and each year receives the recognition it is entitled to have. Well may it be said that Peter J. McGuire is the father of Labor Day.

The tribute that is yearly paid to this great man is well deserved. We consider it an honor that he made his home in our city of Camden. He died in our city a poor but respected man. Though poor in earthly goods, he was rich in the honor and respect of his fellow man. His memory has continued through all the years that have intervened as a wholesome influence. His allegiance to the cause of labor is even yet an inspiration to all who believe in the dignity and importance of labor and the rights of workers.

There can be no higher compliment paid to this great man than for each to seek to emulate his character, his high regard for principle, his unswerving belief in the rights of man and his loyalty to America.

A fitting tribute to this great labor leader has been paid by the Courier-Post, of Camden, N. J., in an editorial in the issue of September 1950, entitled "Free Labor, Free America Involve Same Principle." It reads as follows:

FREE LABOR, FREE AMERICA INVOLVE SAME PRINCIPLE

During his term of office as general secretary of the Carpenters and Joiners International Union a young trade-unionist who had come to this country from Dublin at an early age presented a motion to the Central Labor Union of New York City that:

"A day be set aside, a festive day, as a tribute to labor and the workingman; and on this day there should be a parade and a picnic where speeches would be made by trade-unionists and sympathizers."

Peter J. McGuire's motion was adopted, and a huge demonstration was held on September 5, 1882, in New York in which thousands of people took part. It was America's first Labor Day celebration.

Twelve years later, after a long and determined fight against bitter opposition, Congress proclaimed the first Monday in September a national holiday to be known as Labor Day.

Down the years the holiday has been observed and has come to meet universal acceptance as the one on which we pay our respects to the man who works for a living, the man who has literally built this America of ours.

Many of us tend to lose sight of the original objective of this holiday, as we do of others.

We regard it as merely an occasion for frivolity, for plain and fancy loafing. It has become more and more a day for clambakes, political speeches, picnics, and the torture of driving homeward after the last long summer week end at the shore.

Peter J. McGuire wished this to be a festive day, as indeed it should be. But he also wished it to be a serious day, a day for contemplating the advances America and American labor have made under a system which believes in the dignity of labor, labor's right to organize and gain economic security by concerted action, in contrast with the totalitarian systems which have enslaved labor along with management and made both the helpless serfs of a faceless state that denies all human dignity.

Today south Jersey pays its annual tribute to McGuire, who adopted Camden as his home and died at 204 Byron Street in 1906, with a pilgrimage to his grave in Arlington Cemetery, Pennsauken, and memorial services there sponsored by Camden's Central Labor Union.

As we renew our homage to the memory of this great Camden citizen, let us rededicate ourselves to the principles on which he founded Labor Day.

Where labor is free, as it is free in America, the people are free. Where labor is not free the people cannot be free.

Free labor may produce occasional excesses, but they are relatively few. We believe it is better to allow labor to police itself against such excesses, as it does and will, than to adopt police state methods toward labor.

We now are in a crisis that may involve many of us for the rest of our lives. The security of America must be our central aim for a long time to come.

The security of labor's true rights is wrapped up in the security of America. A friend of one is a friend of the other, a foe of one a foe of the other.

Lattimore: Dreyfus or Hiss?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lattimore: Dreyfus or Hiss?" written by Eugene Lyons, and published in the New Leader on September 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATTIMORE: DREYFUS OR HISS?

(By Eugene Lyons)

During the recent inquiry into charges of Communist infiltration of the State Department, Dr. Owen Lattimore made a number of statements to the Tydings committee and the press, flatly denying that he had ever been friendly to communism, let alone an agent or spy as charged by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY and others. Now he has brought together and elaborated these statements into a small book: Ordeal by Slander.

Dr. Lattimore presents his narrative as a black-and-white political morality play. His accusers figure (in his wife's words) as "the powers of darkness," bent on frame-up and not beyond the arts of forgery. His friends and defenders, including several Communists, figure as angels of light, sometimes stubborn but always sincere. For himself he reserves the role of a latter-day Job, the truth-seeking savant afflicted and badgered by hysterical witch hunters.

The book, of course, cannot be considered in a vacuum, on its own merits—as most reviewers have done. A judgment based solely on the author's testimony makes as little sense as the premature judgments of certain jubilant souls after Alger Hiss first testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Guilty or innocent, a Dreyfus or a Hiss, Dr. Lattimore's role in the Asian debacle has been intricately woven into larger affairs: The organized propaganda that "sold" the Chinese Communists to Americans as reformers independent of Moscow; the Amerasia scandal; the Institute of Pacific Relations, infiltrated by key Communists, which during critical years supplied personnel and guidance to Government agencies.

The current American plight in Asia is at least a partial consequence of blundering policies geared to misunderstanding and tolerance of the Chinese Communists, tragic temporizing, calculated appeasements of the Soviet Union and its fifth columns on that continent. Those policies were shaped and nurtured by an array of people, inside and outside the Government, that included—to cite types—Philip Jaffe, Lauchlin Currie, Edgar Snow, Harriet L. Moore, Alger Hiss, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, John K. Fairbank, T. A. Bisson, Edward C. Carter, Philip C. Jessup—and Owen Lattimore.

Against this background, one would suppose that serious newspapers and reviewers would approach a frankly self-defending book by Dr. Lattimore critically. One would expect them, in deference to common sense, to examine the other side of the story, to ask themselves:

"Why, of all the left-wing experts on the Far East, many of them louder and more reckless in riding Stalin's wave of the future, has the scholarly Dr. Lattimore been singled out for the alleged slanders? Even granting the existence of a sinister China lobby, how come that this so-innocent professor was selected as the sacrificial goat? Villains are not necessarily idiots. With so many more vulnerable characters on hand, what prompted them to pick for assassination a character as pure as the one limned in Dr. Lattimore's self-portrait?"

Yet solely on the professor's ex parte account, the initial reviews in the metropolitan press ratify vehemently and without reservation the author's extreme opinions of himself and his detractors. Both the New York Times and Herald Tribune Sunday book sections feature these offhand verdicts on their front pages. The Herald Tribune review, moreover, is done by Dr. Fairbank, who (according to Lattimore, p. 203) sent out telegrams to a long list of Far Eastern experts suggesting that they write to Senator TYDINGS in Lattimore's defense. A more cynically logrolling choice of reviewer can hardly be imagined, short of the author himself. The following morning the daily critics of the same papers concurred.

The nearest these reviewers come to glancing outside the pages of the book is in reference to the exoneration of Dr. Lattimore by the Democrats on the Tydings committee. This they again accept uncritically, although the Tydings investigation was a crudely partisan affair, adjourned before it had explored the edges of its vital assignment.

Ordeal by Slander was put out by Little, Brown, whose editor has been one of the Nation's most eminent fellow travelers for years. It was instantly snapped up by the equally pro-Soviet Book Find Club (the New Leader, October 15, 1949). With no less alacrity it began serial publication in the New York Compass, successor to the late unlamented PM. Its generous advertisements presented enthusiastic endorsements by such impartial judges as William L. Shirer, James P. Warburg, Prof. K. F. Mather, and Edgar Snow.

SLANDER WORKS TWO WAYS

These eulogies are all full of righteous indignation. They cry out against accusation without adequate proof. But they fail to notice that in crediting Lattimore's version at face value they make themselves party to the slanders throughout the book—without a shred of proof—against Louis Budenz, Freda Utley, Alfred Kohlberg, and others who claim that the author has been playing a pernicious Communist game.

Surely they command enough logic to realize that in unreservedly approving this book they are accusing others of the heinous crime of framing an innocent man.

I have stressed the literary reaction to the book because that seems to me deeply pertinent to the current world crisis. It suggests a climate of confusion with respect to communism, and supports the terrifying conclusion that on the intellectual level America today is more dismally unarmed than on the military level.

Recently—too recently to be dealt with in Ordeal by Slander—it was disclosed that Owen Lattimore in September 1949 bought a half interest in a Bethel, Vt., property from Vilhjalmar Stefansson, a forthright pro-Communist, and that jointly they sold it a few months later to an outright Communist, Ordway Southard, the party's 1942 candidate for Governor of Alabama.

Not too recently to be dealt with in the book—but passed over in silence in its pages—it was revealed that Dr. Lattimore is honorary vice president of a Red front, Indusco, for "technical aid" to Communist China, and that his wife is secretary of the organization. Among others involved in the enterprise are such notorious party-liners as Philip Jaffe, Maxwell Stewart, Hugh DeLacy, Rev. S. Harrington Littell. Of its 21 directors, 12 have also been prominently associated with the leading front of the China Communist lobby, the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, identified as subversive by the Attorney General.

For a period of 4 years, 1937–41, Dr. Lattimore served on the editorial board of the Communist mouthpiece Amerasia, edited by Jaffe, who pleaded guilty in the espionage case centered in that periodical. Dr. Lattimore says that since the spy case did not break until 1945, he has nothing to explain. It is not easy to believe, however, that a man of his political perspicacity never caught on that Amerasia was a Communist organ. The fact that nearly all the accused in the spy case were close colleagues of Lattimore, and that two of them were at his home just before their arrest, adds to the mountain of coincidences.

Dr. Lattimore was associated at various times with Red fronts like the National Emergency Conference for Protection of Human Rights, the Washington Committee To Aid China, the American Writers Congress. Although this was widely publicized by his accusers—and long before MCCARTHY came on the scene—the book avoids so much as an allusion to it.

The Soviet purges of the late thirties rightly became a test of the "loyalty" of so-called friends of the Soviets. Dr. Lattimore passed the test with flying colors. In his own magazine, Pacific Affairs, he wrote in 1938 that the Moscow blood trials "sound to me like democracy."

Dr. Lattimore was welcomed to Yenan, Chinese Communist stronghold, in 1937, at a time when only "friendly" investigators were given this privilege. His fellow-travelers included Mr. and Mrs. Jaffe and T. A. Bisson. But the professor, by the testimony of the Amerasia editor in the New Masses, did not limit himself to investigating. "Our visit to Yenan," Jaffe wrote, "was climaxed by a huge mass meeting addressed by Chu

Teh, Bisson, Lattimore, and myself. * * *"

In 1947 Dr. Lattimore was chosen by President Roosevelt to go to China on a mission. The summons was conveyed to him by Lauchlin Currie. "I don't know who suggested my name to Mr. Currie," Dr. Lattimore has testified. Some unkind guessing on the mystery is inescapable when we recall that Mr. Currie has been identified as a prominent cog in the Soviets' Washington "apparatus" by both Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers, whose charges thus far have stood the test of time and probing.

One of the more fantastic episodes in the annals of Communist befuddlement was the junket of Vice President Henry A. Wallace to Magadan, the all-slave forced-labor area in the Soviet Far East. Mr. Wallace talked of freedom and democracy to an audience of convicts and guards under the illusion that they were "pioneers" like those who settled our West. His political expert and mentor on that journey was Dr. Lattimore, who, alas, did not bother to tell his Vice President the facts of Siberian life. And his own report, in the National Geographic of December 1944, describes Magadan admiringly without a word about its forced-labor battalions. It was, as William Henry Chamberlin put it in the New Leader recently, as if an American had described Dachau or Buchenwald gushingly without a hint of the inmates' true condition.

Space does not allow me to continue this inventory of symptomatic data. No one of these facts, standing alone, means much. Even all together they do not prove that Dr. Lattimore was on Stalin's payroll. But I submit, in all conscience, that they do cast doubt on his denials of Communist sympathies and associations. I submit that they cast doubt on the good sense of those who rushed to acclaim the book and blackguard Lattimore's accusers without some elementary research beyond its pages.

WHY NO SUITS?

Dr. Lattimore and his reviewers convey the impression that the author, out in Afghanistan on a UN mission, was surprised and shocked by the Senator's accusations. The truth is that roughly the same charges had been made, in print and verbally, for many years. He makes much of McCARTHY's refusal to give up the protection of congressional immunity. But he does not explain why he did not sue when others, protected by no immunities, made similar accusations in writing.

I have before me a widely circulated letter dated March 18, 1947, in which substantially the McCARTHY charges were set down, though in somewhat more guarded language. Lattimore himself (his alleged surprise in Kabul notwithstanding) says at one point, "These were charges that had been put out for years by Alfred C. Kohlberg." For an educator and writer whose reputation for objectivity is his main capital, Dr. Lattimore was strangely remiss in reacting, especially in view of his present pose of eagerness to sue.

Probably the most impressive single piece of evidence—which the Tydings committee chose not to pursue—was provided by a former Red general, now an American citizen, whom the press identified as Alexander Barmine. Dr. Lattimore's handling of this item seems to me significant through its omissions.

According to reports predating Senator McCARTHY's intrusion, Mr. Barmine apparently claims that his superior in Moscow—not just another general making small talk, mind you, but the Chief of Soviet Military Intelligence, General Berzin, discussing business with a colleague—named two Americans as his agents in the Far East. One of these allegedly was Lattimore. How does ordeal by slander deal with this accusation?

To begin with, the author implies that this was a brand-new witness of whose existence he had not known. In that case, he was about the only one active in Far East and IPR affairs who had not yet heard the Barmine charge, whatever its worth. It was no secret that the story had been told in detail to the FBI long, long ago, and to others since then.

Secondly, Dr. Lattimore sums up the supposed Barmine story as follows: "McCARTHY'S Red general charge was an insinuation that the Institute of Pacific Relations was in 1936 a tool of Soviet intelligence." But in the context of his own case the essence of the story was precisely the part he somehow does not mention: not an insinuation but a specific allegation that he, Lattimore, had been reported by the top Soviet intelligence officer as an agent. Having concealed the real point from his readers, the pages Lattimore then devotes to the question become so much futile flailing of water.

FBI INFORMERS

Dr. Lattimore generously concedes that infiltration of our Government by subversives is a serious problem the American people have a right to solve. Yet he has only angry contempt for Americans, whether repentant former comrades or FBI agents, who help to uncover them. One of the agents, who had given 10 years to gathering information by posing as a Communist, is told off as the ordinarily despised common informer.

In fact, anyone who tells on subversives is labeled "informer" in Lattimore's book. Who but "informers," volunteers or Government plants, are best equipped to unmask infiltrated Communists? Dr. Lattimore doesn't answer that one.

The only ex-Communists for whom he has kind words, indeed, are the two who happen to be ex only in the technical sense that they were expelled from the party, namely, Browder and Bella Dodd. Them he describes as "sincere" and, along with Freddie Field, not the kind of people who would engage in conspiracies.

Bella Dodd, incidentally, was brought into the Lattimore drama, he reveals, by a character who calls himself a labor man, one Wellington Roe. This is one of the most dubious, and to me revealing, incidents in the book. It was Mr. Roe, in his zeal for justice, who on his own dug up the Dodd woman as counterweight to Budenz and delivered her to Lattimore's lawyers. But it happens that this is not the first time Mr. Roe's concern for justice has moved him to act on his own—and always, by coincidence, of course, on the side of the comrades. He had made it his private task previously to "expose" Jan Valtin and Walter Krivitsky.

The "ordeal" part of the book peters out in unconscious comedy. Rarely, it develops, has a Job gotten off so lightly. "No more cruel or unusual punishment can be devised," Dr. Lattimore exclaims, "than allowing a Senator to make charges against individuals that he has not even attempted to substantiate with proof." But the nearest he comes to pointing to social or economic sanctions against himself is the decision of a southern college to return 20 copies of one of his books.

"ORDEAL" LUDICROUS

For the rest, everyone seems to have rallied to his banner. TYDINGS smiles on him. Senator CONNALLY reassures him. Even a uniformed Senate guard whispers encouragement in his ear. Taxi drivers cheer him on. Drew Pearson goes all-out in his defense on the radio. His university faculty stages a triumphal reception for him. The Afghans (as he solemnly records) voice faith in his loyalty. Editorial writers and reporters are on his side. The National Academy of Political and Social Sciences insists that he lecture to them, and the pressure of new lecture and writing assignments grows heavier. Presumably he has put it on a bit thick, but if the half-hearted attempt to look into his record has damaged him irreparably, this book fails to prove it.

Legislative inquiries, like trials, cannot be limited to the demonstrably guilty. Were guilt so clearly known, there would normally be no need for inquiring. Unavoidably the searchlight picks up people who may be innocent or, as one critic said of Lattimore, lacking in discretion. This is a sad by-product of the democratic process which innocent men take in their stride. The Pujo committee, the Teapot Dome investigation, the LaFollette committee all drew in suspects who were ultimately cleared without permanent damage to their lives or hysterical books about their "ordeals."

The anguished wailing and handwringing over his ordeal by the professor and his reviewers are pretty ludicrous, especially in the light of events in Korea and China. Even if his multifarious relations with Communists were merely innocent stupidities (not incompatible with erudition)—even if his influential views just happened to be helpful to the Kremlin—it is well that the facts are now public, as a warning against the man's unfitness as a policy mentor. Actually the Lattimore case, of course, is only in its early stages. Vital facts have been revealed since the book's publication and others seem certain to come out. Those who now weep publicly over his distress may yet be as embarrassed as they were when the Hiss case was clarified.

Color Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by me regarding the decision of the Federal Communications Commission on the controversial color television question, together with a letter I wrote to Chairman Coy, of the Commission, with regard to the matter.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Friday, September 1, the Federal Communications Commission handed down its long-awaited decision on the controversial color television question. This determination is one of the most important ever made by the Communications Commission and, in general, in my opinion reflects much credit upon that body.

In brief, the Commission's decision holds that of the three systems demonstrated to it during its 9 months of penetrating and exhaustive hearings, Columbia Broadcasting System's color television was the most advanced now. The Commission is anxious that the public be protected from early obsolescence of the black-and-white television sets it is now buying and therefore ruled that if manufacturers agree to build new sets capable of receiving Columbia's color pictures, it will not make a final decision for Columbia's color at this time. Thus, if a substantial number of manufacturers notify the Commission within 30 days that they will begin building such sets, the Commission will hold further hearings and witness additional demonstrations of several new

and/or improved color systems beginning December 5 of this year to determine whether or not such color systems come up to the basic minimum standards which the Commission has laid down. If, on the other hand, the manufacturers refuse to build sets on which Columbia's color system may be received, the Commission will issue a final decision ordering commercial operation on the basis of the Columbia system.

It seems to me that by following this practice, the Commission wisely has not closed the door to possible basic improvements in color television now. In addition to RCA and CTI who demonstrated their color systems to the Commission during the hearings, and who now claim major improvements in their systems, there are a number of new systems in the laboratories and on drawing boards for which great claims are made and whose inventors and makers will have an opportunity to present them to the Commission for practical, working tests. If they are only half as good as some of the claims being made for them, the American people are going to have superb color television.

While I have no doubt that the Commission's decision will be criticized, it seems to me that unbiased, fair-minded people will generally agree that the decision was as good a one as could be made now under all the circumstances prevailing and is definitely therefore in the public interest. It is significant that for the most part the decision was unanimous by all seven Commissioners. Three Commissioners differed only as to the implementation of it, two holding that the Commission should have finalized now and picked the Columbia system, while one felt that the final decision should be deferred even longer than the majority held.

Since the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had taken a close and continuing interest in the color television question, I wrote Chairman Wayne Coy, of the Commission, a brief comment last week after the decision was issued.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1950.

HON. WAYNE COY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: I want to take this occasion to congratulate the Federal Communications Commission for having reached a decision on the important color television question. According to reports, none of those intimately affected by the decision is wholly pleased; but this is no reflection on the decision. Rather, it indicates how difficult and complex are the points which had to be resolved.

It is, of course, particularly gratifying to me that the Commission unanimously agreed and emphasized "that color is an important improvement in television broadcasting. It adds both apparent definition and realism in pictures. It opens up whole new fields for effective broadcasting, rendering lifelike and exciting scenes where color is of the essence * * * color is * * * a fundamental improvement in television. * * *" The decision brings very close the day when this great new improvement in the art will serve the American people.

The exhaustive and penetrating hearings which the Commission held are a credit to you and your colleagues. The earnest and painstaking attention which each Commissioner brought to bear upon the very difficult and extremely technical problems involved has been most reassuring to the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who have followed the matter closely.

Leaving the door partly ajar, affording an opportunity to the Johnny-come-latelies, is a challenge to them to produce or step aside. Moreover, it is in the best traditions of American democracy and the free enterprise system since it does not foreclose improvements and advances which I am sure our American electronic science may bring out. I am sure the majority of the Commission will not permit this desirable approach to delay the commercial use of color. This will allay the fears of those who dissent on the grounds that finality now is essential.

My thanks and commendation to you personally and all of your colleagues for a difficult job well done and for the progress made thus far. I know that every effort will be made to push forward rapidly the allocation decisions so that television will be made available to many more millions of our citizens who are waiting impatiently to have television in their homes.

Very sincerely yours,

ED. C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

Why Does the United States Help the Russian Fur Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the present policy of the United States seems to be based upon a desire to help Russia sell their goods in our country even though it is to the detriment of our own workers. This in my opinion is absolutely indefensible particularly when it is known that such goods are produced by forced labor.

This subject was dealt with in a most comprehensive and forceful manner by Robert F. Hurleigh, Mutual Broadcasting System, on Wednesday, August 9, 1950, in a broadcast report at that time. It deserves the attention and the serious consideration of every American, and, in my opinion, the whole subject deserves investigation and remedial action by Congress. The report to which I refer is as follows:

While the Security Council of the United Nations takes a day off from the regular sessions which have proved exasperatingly futile, we have the opportunity to consider the delaying tactics of the Soviets in another agency of the United Nations and which have had tragic consequences. The news spotlight has not been turned on the sessions of the Economic and Social Council to reveal the stalling tactics and evasions of the Soviets as publicized these past 10 days by reporters covering the Security Council. Just as we now know the Soviet delegate at the Security Council never intends to abide by any moral code, so have we had proof, time and again, that Moscow will never accede to any decision made by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations which will force Russia to abide by the articles of the UN Charter as it affects forced labor. Although the protests have been made that Russia is not living up to the articles of the UN on slave labor—or corrective labor—the general press—with very few notable exceptions—has given little attention to an appalling situation. Much of Soviet Russia's industry is geared to forced labor, and the product of Soviet slave-labor camps is being sold in this country in competition with the free American worker. This invasion of the American market by Russia results in the weakening of our own economy by destroying domestic employment and undermining prosperity which is necessary to maintain the heavy financial burden we now carry for the world.

This trade with the cold-war enemy continues even as we have indications that the presently "contained" war in Korea may explode in literally a dozen different areas. It is now apparent that certain officials in Washington have seemed more concerned over maintaining the Soviet Government's exports to this country than in being genuinely worried over the damage these exports are doing to American industries. For the past number of years the fur farmers of this country, many of them disabled ex-GI's who were advised by the Veterans' Administration to get into the business of fur farming, have been trying to convince Washington that the importation of furs from the Soviet Union has been detrimental to the country as well as to their industry.

In the first place, American fur imports have tripled since the war—and this year, according to the authoritative trade paper, Women's Wear Daily, American participation in the Russian fur sales in Leningrad have been above last year—and this at a time when the affairs between this country and Soviet Russia have been deteriorating. Close to 100 American fur buyers were able to obtain visas and journey to Leningrad for the big Russian fur sale of last month and it is probable that $50,000,000 will be deposited to the account of the Soviet Union in New York banks in payment for these Russian furs. Moscow has been willing to sell furs on the American market at almost any price in order to obtain the American dollar—and since all the industry in Russia is controlled by state socialism, the government and not free individuals fixes the price in competition with the American fur farmers. And the Soviet Union stands accused by no less an authority than the American Federation of Labor as running slave-labor camps where millions of individuals are forced to live under conditions intolerable to free men.

This allegation that human beings are forced into conditions of slavery is perhaps the gravest charge which could come before the United Nations—and the charge has been made, repeatedly—before the Economic and Social Council of the UN. The protest made by the A. F. of L. underlined the fact that no country in the UN could afford to ignore the growing evidence of appalling widespread use of forced labor in the Soviet Union. For enough information has come through the thick veil of Soviet secrecy to confirm that millions—perhaps as many as 15,000,000—are forced in work camps by the Soviets and the product of their effort is being sold on the American market in competition to free American labor. According to the figures of the Department of Commerce, the imports from Soviet Russia last year totaled almost $42,500,000 while our exports to the U. S. S. R. are valued at only $6,646,000.

If you wonder what happens to that dollar difference of 35,000,000 in net earnings in Communist imports, you need only to realize the vast expenditures of the Soviet Union for propaganda and espionage—and for lawyers' fees to defend Communists. Fur imports alone have accounted for as much as forty or fifty million in the years since the war and the buyers who are now on their visit to Leningrad for fur buying may be expected to make this year's purchases of Communist furs just as high as ever. The Soviets are cunning enough to make the most of the American woman's penchant for nice things—and the many furs sold in this country as luxuries are conceivably straight from a fur farm in Siberia maintained by Soviet slave labor. Thus, the United States has been unable to bring about any corrections

of forced labor through the United Nations, even though the A. F. of L. has made comprehensive surveys of slave labor in the Soviet Union and has demanded that the other nations compel Moscow to live up to the Charter of the UN.

And second, the American fur farmer, including those disabled GI's who went into fur farming on the advice of the Veterans' Administration, find it impossible to compete with the government-controlled forced labor of Russia, and third, the excess American dollars which Soviet Russia obtains are important in financing the subversive activities of Communists in this country.

The American people are entitled to know that Communist activities and Soviet slave labor is being supported by the dollars paid for these Russian exports. And the Washington officials responsible cannot claim ignorance of the situation, for the protests have been made in Congress and to the responsible Government departments. The laws of this country, by the way, are emphatic in prohibiting the importation of goods produced by slave or forced labor. Evidence in the hands of the American Federation of Labor—and evidence which has been presented before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations—proves conclusively that slave labor camps are a most important part of the economy of Soviet Russia.

The procrastination on the part of Washington officials is certainly part and parcel of program of those who have fashioned policy during the past number of years which would be favorable to the Soviet Union, even if at the expense of the United States.

That's the top of the news as it looks from here.

"From Korea Comes Word of the Daily Wonders Being Worked by Close Air Support of Ground Troops, Teamwork Which Is Fast Making the 'Gravel Crunchers' and the 'Fly-Fly Boys' Brothers Under the Skin"—Battle Report, Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again last Sunday evening, the American people were given a realistic insight into the affairs of their Government in Washington, D. C.—again John Steelman, assistant to the President of the United States, presented the third in the series of teledocumentaries to explain to millions of Americans within the scope of the medium of television, just what the problems are that are confronting the country and just what gave rise to the present international crises.

Mr. Speaker, more important still, in this telecast, Battle Report, Washington, John Steelman and the National Broadcasting Co. are bringing to Americans everywhere a graphic pictorialization of what the top-flight officials of Government as a whole, as well as in part, are doing to meet these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no agency of Government, research institutes, or any other type of private concern in these United States that is making a greater contribution to the vast problem of informing our people as to current affairs than the National Broadcasting Co. is doing in projecting this series of broadcasts.

I am given to understand that the NBC, without a cent of expense to the Government and to produce this program, alone contributes the services of more than 50 NBC employees to work on, build up, and project this half-hour Sunday evening program, averaging 14 hours each day. This is exclusive of the manpower and hours used by the wonderfully cooperative and selfless public officials who appear on the show.

The show is definitely a must for all Americans—completely frank, unbiased, bipartisan, it is a news event broadcasted by Video by Americans and for Americans.

It is written by NBC's top script writer, Lou Hazam, produced by Ted Ayers, NBC's star news broadcaster. Its commentary is by Robert McCormick, favorably known to all of us on the Hill as one of the Nation's top radio and TV commentators.

Add to the skills, scientific, technical, literary, and dramatical ability of these men, the services of their eminent electronic engineers, artists, and directors, and one gets a full realization of the contributions that the National Broadcasting Co. is making to this Nation, become crystal clear.

Mr. Speaker, in projecting this program, Dr. John Steelman is bending over backward to see that the public is fully informed of what must be done, what can be done, and, most of all, just what is being done by the Government and the people in this tense situation.

He appears each week on this program and does so in addition to and in the midst of many other pressing worries, of which the long arduous hours of seemingly endless conferences with respect to the rail strike is but one example.

It is the purpose of Mr. Steelman and the National Broadcasting Co. to call upon all Federal agencies from time to time to contribute their share of information to our people on all pertinent actvities. While the cost to NBC is high, my good friend, Mr. Joseph McConnell, president of the network, is doing the program gratefully because, splendid American that he is, he feels that an informed American public is a victorious American pubic.

The program was as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

(Production, Ted Ayers; script, Lou Hazam; commentary, Robert McCormick; film, NBC, Marine Corps, and Department of Defense; technical director, Sherman Hildreth; scenery and sets, Edward Camp, and graphic work, Joseph Ferrier.)

(Guests: John Steelman, assistant to the President; Sgt. Frank Collins; Dr. Richard Meiling; Maj. Gen. Merwin Silverthorn, United States Marine Corps; Brig. Gen. Jerry Jerome, United States Marine Corps.)

Mr. MCCORMICK. This Sunday in Korea, bombs celebrated the war's 2-month birthday. For a teledocumentary report from the men spearheading our defense, NBC once again turns its cameras upon the Nation's Capitol.

And from Washington comes report from the headquarters of our Army, Navy, and Air Force—whose field of battle in Korea finds Americans holding down a front line 5,000 miles from home.

Waiting to lead off our teledocumentary this ninth Sunday of the Korean conflict is John R. Steelman, who most recently has been engaged with still another conflict at home. To wit, the Nation-wide railroad strike which could easily have brought to a standstill all rail movement of war materials on the continent north of the Rio Grande—remember '47?

For his personal report on where we now stand in this crisis, here is the man who literally struggled hundreds of hours to keep the railroads of this Nation in operation—Dr. John Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good evening ladies and gentlemen. As all of you know, at 4 o'clock this afternoon, eastern standard time, the Government took over the operation of most of the Nation's railroads. I deeply regret this action had to be taken in the public interest and am glad that, in our democracy, such action is a rare occurrence. During the past 3 weeks, I have spent about 125 hours with the representatives of the railroads and the two unions which are involved. In addition, both parties have spent many more hours conferring with their associates. Up to the present time, no agreement has been reached, but, of course, some of these days, one will be—and the railroads will be returned to private operation.

We are grateful that we live in a country where disagreements between workers and employers can be decided at the conference table—where men can meet each other as equals, and in most instances, reach agreement without disruption of production or service. In nations where tyranny rules, such negotiations would be called a waste of time. There would be nothing but a curt order—with prisons or a firing squad awaiting all who did not obey. The freedom and dignity of man is unimportant—the state and the tyrant all suffer. The American way is possible only in a Nation of freemen.

Now to another subject: In spite of the fact that men all over the world hate war and dream of peace, wars will be a constant danger until tyranny disappears from the face of the earth. In our imperfect world, all we can do is to continue to work for peace. But if war comes—as it has come in Korea, we must spare nothing which will make it less tragic.

Tonight I want to take you on still another visit with Government officials from whom you will learn about some of the things your Government is doing to lighten the burden of war. Two general officers of the Marine Corps will tell you how marines are taught to take care of themselves—how they are supplied the best in armament—and the best in food—and what they are doing in Korea. One of the world's outstanding physicians, who directs all the medical activities of the armed services, will tell you how your fighting men are protected from disease under appalling conditions—and how they are restored to health if they are wounded. A fighting GI who is now a patient in Walter Reed Army Hospital will tell you of his personal experiences—and how his life was saved.

All these men are engaged in the battle to preserve your freedom—each in his own sphere. And, back of them, are all the agencies of your Government. For your freedom—the freedom of every citizen is regarded as his most precious possession. With freedom to think—to act—and to do the things each man can do best, we have the

foundation for a world of plenty—and of peace.

Mr. McCORMICK. In sharp contrast with the strike front, Mr. Steelman reports in America, are the wounded now being returned home from the battlefront. Meet Sgt. Frank Collins of New Hampshire.

Sergeant COLLINS. I was hit late in the afternoon somewhere in Korea. I got hit with an automatic weapon of some kind. After I got hit, I sat down in a rice paddy, started hollering for a medic. There was no medic around. I sat there about 20 minutes and one of the boys from the outfit came along and put a torniquet on my arm. After that he helped me back behind the line. He took me back and we picked up a jeep. The jeep took me to the battalion-aid station. Stayed there 15 minutes and they gave me a hypo. After that, an ambulance took us back to the clearing station. Stayed at the clearing station about 3 hours; they gave me a shot of penicillin and another hypo. Took another ambulance to the evacuation station. Stayed there overnight; took a train from there into Pusan. Operated on in Pusan; put a cast on me, and from Pusan took a boat to Fukuoka. Stayed there overnight; gave me penicillin. Took an airplane to Osaka. Stayed there 9 days and they changed casts and gave me a lot more penicillin. After that we took a train to Tokyo General Hospital. Got there at night. They said we would be air-lift to the United States the next day.

Mr. McCORMICK. At Washington's Walter Reed Hospital, medical men are amazed at the fine condition in which the wounded—like Sgt. Frank Collins, are being returned from a battle-front environment said to be about the worst ever encountered by an American fighting force. The secret—speedy air-evacuation of the injured. And waiting before our cameras now is the Defense arm's top director of medical services, the "Father of Air Evac"—Dr. Richard L. Meiling.

Dr. MEILING. These fighting men wounded in Korea are on the road to recovery today because the American people have provided the best military medical care available. One of the most important parts of our medical service is the system of air transportation of patients, which we call "air evacuation."

Helicopters and small planes bring many of the patients to the field hospitals in Korea. Those requiring special treatment are placed aboard planes bound for Japan. For those requiring more than 4 months' hospitalization our largest and most comfortable planes wing them across the Pacific, first for an overnight stop at the big Army hospital in Honolulu and then to the air base at Fairfield, California. From this air base they are then sent to the Army, Navy, and Air Force hospitals throughout the United States.

Our air evacuation system is a true example of American teamwork in action. Secretary of Defense Johnson established this system throughout the Armed Forces last October. Air Force and Navy flight surgeons, nurses and technicians attend the patients while en route. The Military Air Transport Service, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps fly the planes. Army, Navy and Air Force hospitals are used jointly, regardless of the uniform of the patient, both at home and overseas.

Men severely wounded in Korea often are back in the United States within 10 to 12 days. Last week in an Air Force hospital in Texas, I visited a patient who had been wounded in Korea just 7 days before. In spite of his wounds and with almost 8,000 air miles behind him, he was in excellent spirits and making a fine recovery.

Here are the pictures to show you what I mean.

Mr. McCORMICK. Somewhere in Korea—South Koreans spread out the parachute of an American pilot injured as he parachuted to earth, in order to guide a helicopter ambulance signaled by radio.

The pilot is carried out of a rice paddy and placed aboard the heliocopter which flies him to a point behind the lines.

Here the pilot is transferred to a plane which will speed him to prompt medical attention.

Dr. MEILING. That gives you a quick glimpse into the way the air evacuation system operates. Behind the scenes, of course, has been a great deal of planning over a long period of time. As the Chief Air Evacuation Officer in World War II, I learned first hand the multitude of problems which had to be solved to make this system work. As Director of Medical Services today, I have seen these problems overcome and the entire operation modernized. I know from personal experience that, to give this kind of medical support to our fighting forces, many people in the armed services, medical and line, must pull together. Because they did pull together, this air evacuation team was ready when South Korea was invaded.

Incidentally, let's clear up one point regarding casualties in Korea. General MacArthur's Chief Surgeon, Major General Hume, reports that the death rate in military hospitals from battle wounds has been the lowest of any similar military campaign in our Nation's history. You should know, too, that the newest approved drugs and equipment are on hand. Supplementing the blood program of General MacArthur's command, we launched this morning our first regular air shipment of blood to Korea. This blood, donated by patriotic Americans, is collected by hospitals, medical centers and blood banks throughout the country. The American National Red Cross now coordinates the procurement of blood for the Armed Forces and a schedule has been set up for shipping blood to the men in Korea. Maintaining that schedule depends on your donations of blood at the center in your community.

I bring you this brief report tonight to let you know that the men in combat are closely supported by the finest medical service which a grateful Nation can provide.

Mr. McCORMICK. The United States marines—justly famous from the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli. When word came out that the Marines had landed in Korea, one noted cartoonist captured the thrill that ran through the Nation when he drew John Q. Public beaming "I feel better already." (To show you why there is cause for optimism where the marines are concerned.) "Battle Report, Washington" invites two top-notch marines to report to you today. First, Maj. Gen. Merwin H. Silverthorn, Director of the Marine Corps Reserve, formerly Chief of Staff, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, and Third Amphibious Corps, World War II. For the facts then, on the readiness of the marines still at home, and how soon we may expect to see more "leathernecks" in action—here is a sure-fire "leatherneck" himself, General Silverthorn.

General SILVERTHORN. For the fifth time in the 174 years of Marine Corps history, marines have landed in Korea. Once again "leathernecks" all over the world are squaring away their gear and putting on their packs.

We are mobilizing our Organized Reserves. We are authorized to mobilize our Volunteer Reserve. Of our Volunteer reservists we first plan to put all sergeants and below back into uniform. Only 2,650 Volunteer officers will be ordered to active duty at this time—for the most part only captains and below. A limited number of field officers and senior noncommissioned officers in critical specialties will be needed. For those others—all I can say right now is, "Take off your pack for the present, but we may need you later."

One of the most encouraging things we have experienced is the tremendous response we have received from our Organized and Volunteer Reserves. Hundreds of letters have poured into headquarters from reservists requesting immediate active duty—most of them specifically request duty in Korea. Eighty-nine percent of the officers and men in the Organized units were mobilized with their units.

To you parents, wives, and sweethearts, let me say this: It has always been and is today the policy of the Marine Corps not to send marines into combat without thorough and complete training. We have always prided ourselves on the training we give each individual marine; he is trained to be a fighting man—self-reliant, with an ability to take care of himself and his shipmates. It is because of this training that the Marine Corps was and is ready. In Korea our marines are ready with close air support—with their helicopters, their 3½-inch bazookas, their new flame throwers, and their General Pershing tanks—the latest type of equipment—the same equipment that has been used in our peacetime training program. Although our recognized mission is to train marines for amphibious operations, it is to be noted that our training is entirely suitable for normal land warfare as evidenced by the present use of our troops in Korea.

To give you an idea of our readiness, let me give you some figures—figures which I am releasing tonight for the first time. A sampling of the thousands of Organized reservists called to active duty shows 51 percent are available for immediate assignment to combat duty, 28 percent will require only short refresher and reconditioning training, and only 21 percent must be sent to basic recruit training.

In our rapid build-up of marines in Korea, a movement in which our far-flung Fleet Marine Forces were readily concentrated in a threatened area, we owe a great deal to the Navy for its ever-ready ships and to the Military Air Transport Service for flying over key Marine Corps personnel.

The Marine Corps has called in its reserve fire power—but we still need more. Our most urgent problem today is for red-blooded young men who want to be a part of this Marine Corps team.

Mr. McCORMICK. From Korea comes word of the daily wonders being worked by close air support of ground troops, teamwork which is fast making the gravel crunchers and the fly-fly boys—to borrow a phrase from Kipling—brothers under the skin. Blasting a niche in combat history for themselves, in this respect, are the Marine Corsairs at the battle front. And less than an hour ago, it was announced by Marine Corps headquarters here, that an old hand at this sort of game—Brig. Gen. Jerry Jerome—will become director of marine aviation and assistant commandant for air. Because he can tell you how the Marine Cosairs are lending precious close support to our Ground Forces in Korea, we now focus our cameras upon Gen. Jerry Jerome.

General JEROME. The primary mission of Marine Corps aviation is to support the ground units of the Fleet Marine Forces in amphibious operations. One of their most important jobs is therefore, of course, close air support. To do this job, our officer and enlisted pilots are trained and equipped to operate from both aircraft carriers and land bases. Our Marine aircraft are now operating in Korea from Navy aircraft carriers.

I would like to tell you a few things about our pilots in Korea. I know most of the pilots personally from our service together in the South Pacific and Philippines during the past war and at the Marine Corps schools at Quantico, Va., after the war.

Practically every one of those pilots are battle-trained. Since the war they have been continuously schooled, both formally and practically, in working with ground troops of our Fleet Marine Forces. They know the

man on the ground they are working with and what he is up against. Conversely, and very important, is the fact that the man on the ground knows the pilot and what he is capable of. I call it the "Bill and Joe team." Bill on the ground—Joe in the air.

Bill knows that when he is up against a strong position, Joe can take it out for him—or at least beat the enemy down until Bill can get on top of him with his infantry weapons. Joe also knows that he is flying and operating mighty close to Bill. Joe must put his machine gun fire, his bomb, rocket or napalm right on the target or he may do irreparable damage to our own troops. I've referred to this type of flying through the years as pickle-barrel bombing.

By pickle-barrel bombing, I mean that the target is usually relatively small—a tank, mortar position, or artillery piece—in fact it's no larger than a pickle barrel. The object is to put the pickle—be it bomb, rocket, or napalm—squarely in the barrel. If you do, Joe helps Bill. If you don't—it may be disastrous.

I like to quote my very good and admired friend, Gen. Robert E. Eichelberger, United States Army, of the effectiveness of this type support—a statement which he made as a result of our work for him in the Philippines during the past war.

I quote: "Nothing comforts a soldier more, ankle-deep in mud, faced by a roadblock or fortified strongholds, as much as the sight of bombs wreaking havoc on stubborn enemy positions."

Bill and Joe know the game—they have practiced it for years.

Now again in Korea, Bill and Joe are putting their practice to good use—and they are doing it for keeps.

There are a lot of Marine Corps Joes and Bills fighting out there in Korea today. But we still need more—a lot more—to meet our authorized strength. We need young men who can be trained to do Joe's and Bill's jobs tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMICK. Now for a cameraman's eye view of the war.

Seven days ago, for the first time since war erupted in Korea, B-29's were out in mass on a tactical strike. At the signal "bombs away" some 100 Superforts of the Far Eastern Air Force Bomber Command poured 1,000 tons of explosives upon Communist positions west of the Naktong River, near Maegwan. With the precision for which they are famous the bombers saturated an area scarcely larger than 3 by 7 miles, dropping 500-ton bombs like rain. Everything went according to Air Force plan—a bombing pattern that assured one bomb to each 5 acres. The smoke rising from below gave witness to the destruction they reaped—echoing the days the heavies saved the beachhead at Anzio and sparked the break-through at St. Lo. But in spite of it all, within the next 24 hours, the enemy was pressing a new offensive through this very area smashed by the superforts.

You are now on a strafing mission in a fast-zooming jet plane. As the battle front unfurls below you, you go to work on the targets that leap into view. Field installations come in for their share of your poison. Now you "lay to" on the roads winding ahead, going after any moving object that will aid and abet the enemy. Here's a train deep in enemy territory—probably moving men and war material vital to the Reds. You start at one end and go right down the line—giving it everything you've got. Now up and away for a look at the damage you've done. All in a day's work. In the life of a jet pilot in Korea anyway.

Most bitter of the week's stories to come from the war front is the massacre of American soldiers that took place on hill 303. It began when an American platoon mistook North Koreans for South Korean reinforcements they had requested. Forced to surrender to their captors who outnumbered them 10 to 1, the soldiers had their hands bound behind them with their own shoelaces, were then marched to a cemetery and shot down in cold blood. The bodies were discovered and removed by United States troops who later advanced up the slope. There were three survivors; one was Roy Manring, 18, of Chicago, who rubbed blood from his leg onto his face and lay under one of his dead buddies, pretending to be dead himself. When the Communists moved on he made his way to his own troops and later identified some of the Red killers among captured North Koreans. Thirty-three Americans met brutal death in this massacre, and promptly, 2 days later, General MacArthur sent this stern warning to the North Korean Premier: "I shall hold you and your commanders criminally accountable."

Thus the Nation, America—as top defense officials have come before you to report—moves into the ninth week of war in Korea. And the latest headlines that are like the pulsebeat of that war.

Let's Eliminate Aliens From the Count in Reapportioning Congress

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are now realizing what a farce this so-called census has been.

Instead of confining themselves to what the Constitution intended, they undertook to make it a questionnaire that touched everything except the main issue. As a result the census is a farce, especially in certain States.

In Corinth, one of the leading cities in my district, the preliminary survey shows 230 families that were not even consulted.

In Itawamba County where there is not a vacant house, they report the loss of 400 inhabitants. They now propose to take representation away from such States as Mississippi, Pennsylvania, and others, give it to a gang of aliens who are not entitled to vote in this country, many of them here in violation of law, and plotting the overthrow of our Government. I am going to oppose any reapportionment under that so-called census, and I am going to demand that new censuses be taken, and that aliens be eliminated from the count when we reapportion Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Where Is Our Stockpile?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today calling upon the Armed Services Committee to institute an investigation of the lack of American stockpiles of critical minerals and metals.

It is necessary to only read the production and consumption figures on metals in this country to come to the conclusion that we are deficient in some fields and, very likely, have no reserves whatever in others.

What are our reserves today in manganese, in chrome, in lead, in mica, and in many other minerals?

Why are not the low-grade chrome mines in Montana being put into production now? The Government spent $20,000,000 to develop the Mouat and Benbow properties during the war but has done nothing since to maintain production. Why? The manganese reserves in Montana and Arizona are not being worked at anywhere near capacity even though, domestically, we produce only 10 percent of our needs.

Where will our steel mills be if they do not have the chrome and manganese necessary to harden and refine the iron ore? We all know the answer to this, and if these deficiencies are not met by stockpiling, it will mean that both our peace and war economy will be seriously hindered.

In July 1946, Congress passed the Stockpiling Act and stated that the Munitions Board, over a 5-year period, should acquire the necessary critical metals to cover our minimum requirements. In July 1950, 4 years after the act was passed, we had on hand only 38.4 percent of our minimum requirements. The money has been appropriated to fulfill the requirements of the act but the deficiencies have not been met.

I have mentioned, specifically, manganese and chrome because we have the reserves in these metals in my State of Montana and because I know something about them. Private enterprise is unable to develop these deposits because they are low grade in character and can become workable only if the Government will step into the picture and subsidize the working of them. The stake may well be the security of our country and the solution can be found only in a premium-price payment plan or outright Government subsidy.

I am not in favor of Government subsidies, in general, but I know of no other way at this time to fulfill our needs. It is far better to do this than to depend on foreign imports of critical metals which can, in time of war, be shut off by submarine warfare.

With these comments in mind, I am today calling for a congressional investigation by the Armed Forces Committee to find out why we are still deficient in critical metals under the Stockpiling Act.

Twenty-third National Convention of the Fleet Reserve Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix

of the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Samuel Rose, Chief, Central Office Contact Division, before the Twenty-Third National Convention of the Fleet Reserve Association at Long Beach, Calif., Saturday, September 2, 1950. Mr. Rose's ability and consistent helpfulness to many Members of the House is well known, and I therefore heartily commend to my colleagues his address.

In extending sincere greetings to the Fleet Reserve Association on the occasion of your twenty-third national convention, I can assure you that I speak with a feeling of heartfelt warmth.

As official representative of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Carl R. Gray, Jr., I bring to you the assurance of his deep interest in the constructive work your organization is performing for veterans and their dependents. Administrator Gray wants you to know that he regrets that the pressure of official duties makes it impossible for him to attend your convention. He asked me to present his most cordial wishes for a successful get-together.

I bring with me also the pleasant feeling that comes when a person is fortunate enough to be able to revisit old and valued friends.

Mr. La Belle, your able national president, is an old friend of mine. Mr. Lofgren, your national secretary, has brought his good-natured and jovial smile many times to my office in Washington, where I have had the pleasure of working with him in the interests of your shipmates. It's good also to see and to talk with Mr. Pyle, your financial secretary, and Mr. Cronan, your national treasurer.

More than 6 years ago the GI bill became law. During those 6 years about 7,000,000 veterans have, at one time or another, attended school or trained on-the-job or on-the-farm under the GI bill. The cost for tuition, supplies, and subsistence allowances exceeds $10,000,000,000.

During that same 6-year period more than $11,000,000,000 of GI loans were obtained by more than 2,000,000 World War II veterans. The real value of this benefit for veterans during those hectic years of readjustment may be inferred from the fact that 92 percent of those GI loans were for homes.

Incidentally, veteran borrowers have proved beyond the shadow of any doubt that they are good financial risks. Only seven-tenths of 1 percent of GI loans were defaulted to the extent that VA had to make good the guaranteed and insured portions.

GI insurance is another program that testifies to the prudence, the foresight and the stability of veterans. About 6,000,000 national service life insurance policies are now in force. They represent about $36,000,000,000 of protection.

These encouraging facts offer proof that veterans can be trusted to use their opportunities wisely. There can be no doubt, that the welfare of veterans and their families is synonymous with the welfare of our Nation. Our debt to these men can never be repaid. Benefits to them are an investment in a whole generation of Americans. They are an investment in America itself.

I want to leave with you, if I may, one final thought, a most important one in this year of 1950 for all Americans, both veterans and nonveterans.

I have mentioned some of the billions of dollars spent to promote the readjustment of veterans. But money spent to help repair the consequences of war is a mere pittance compared with what we in America shall have to spend, if we permit our Nation to become soft and helpless in the face of deliberate Communist aggression.

Ware have enduring consequences. The VA has just recently closed its books on the War of 1812. VA is still taking care of surviving dependents of the men who fought in the Mexican War—and that war ended more than 100 years ago. More than 3,000,000 compensation and pension checks go out monthly to veterans and dependents on VA rolls.

That's why I ask you to think about this: The money we spend in increasing our industrial output, in making our country too tough and virile for any police state on earth to risk a sneak attack—that's not even properly classed as an expense. It's a gilt-edged investment—a guaranty of democratic freedom, of a just and durable peace.

Now, as never before, America's productive output must be maintained and increased. Now, as never before, every American who's ready and willing to work should be given a job.

Only by working as Americans, for America, can we face a ruthless enemy with the calm assurance that comes from a positive knowledge of our own material and moral strength.

In this task for 1950 and the years ahead it goes without saying, I am sure, that there will be, as always, 100 percent participation by the Fleet Reserve Association. We deeply appreciate your wholehearted cooperation and understanding of the many problems confronting the Veterans' Administration. Thank you.

Townsend Club National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address I made at the Townsend Club national convention, at Denver, Colo., on June 1, 1950:

It is a privilege and pleasure to speak to this fine group of men and women. I appreciate the opportunity which you have so graciously extended to me.

I wish to pay tribute to your leader, our good friend, Dr. Townsend, who has done so much for the older people of this Nation. He has given untiringly of his time and effort in behalf of those who are growing older and facing retirement after long years of active participation in our ever-expanding national life.

Despite hardship and adversity, Dr. Townsend has fought for the security and welfare of our aged citizens. At many times, the path has been dark and obstacles have been purposely thrown in his way. But with determination and courage he has fought on and has had the support and conviction of an ever-growing band of men and women who also have given unstintingly to help in the great cause of pension or insurance for our aged.

In our national history, there have been many leaders like Dr. Townsend who have battled for what seemingly were lost causes. But in the end they have triumphed. Remember the early struggles for free education and the efforts to establish a postal service, both of which we enjoy today. William Lloyd Garrison comes to mind when we think of leaders who faced overwhelming odds to achieve success. Roger Williams is another of our famous countrymen who was subjected to bitter and unrelenting attacks before he finally accomplished the high ideals and purposes which were part of his basic social philosophy, the freedom of religious ideals.

Many of the objectives for which these men fought are now law. This same thing is true concerning pension or insurance plans for our aged. There was a time when Dr. Townsend's proposal was challenged and held up to ridicule, but now we are finding that it is being discussed and accepted as a reasonable and sound method for aiding our Nation's senior citizens. In many instances, it is pointed out as a more beneficial and helpful program than that which has actually been incorporated into the laws of our land. Dr. Townsend, first of all made us pension-conscious. Under our free enterprise system, many of his proposals have been accepted and offered to the public in voluntary programs, like the Blue Cross and similar health and benefit organizations. More clinics are available to care for the public. When our people are ill or infirm, increasing medical aid and care is available because of the force of the Townsend plan proposals and the demand of our people for adequate health facilities.

It occurs to me, that here is an excellent place to utilize the vast stores of surplus foods we have and are accumulating in this Nation, and under the existing farm programs. Why not distribute this food to our needy, either on a give-away basis, or at low cost, to supplement their diet and augment the pensions they are receiving? I have advocated the distribution of this food abroad to the people who are hungry through Christian agencies, such as CARE and CROP, rather than let it go to waste or rot in the bulging storage bins and caves of the Nation. At home let us help replenish the family larders of families in need or pinching out a meager existence on the small pensions doled out by many States.

The Townsend plan offers an insurance program that is designed to help our aged citizens as well as promote business. Instead of it we have the present inadequate hodgepodge social-security program, that is inadequate, incomplete, and discriminatory.

The success of both public and private retirement plans depends on the extent to which such systems can be integrated with old age and survivors insurance. Employees would gain by old age and survivors insurance coverage in that deductions from their pay would be less; they would receive greater benefits for dependents and survivors, and in the event of a change of employers, they would still be covered by a retirement plan if their new employer were under the program. Should they still want their own private plan, to obtain benefits greater than old age and survivors insurance, their plan could be integrated with the Federal system, each plan paying part of the benefits. I am confident that ultimately the battle will be won for a sound national insurance plan within the framework of our American economic system. I know there is no question in your minds about the great wealth and strength of our economic system. It has its weaknesses. But in the long run, a quick comparison with any other nation shows us that we have as yet the best economic system any government has ever developed. That is the reason I am certain we can work out an insurance system for our senior citizens that will work and strengthen our economy.

On the basis of economics, Dr. Townsend's theory of pensions for all and the beneficiaries be required to spend monthly the money they receive strikes me as one of the most important features of the Townsend pension plan. The revolving circle of obtaining an insurance payment adequate to meet the current expenses of the home, and channeling this sum back into the regular markets, means stimulated business, the consumption of foodstuffs, and the utilization of our production machinery at its full capacity. What better program is there for an expanding America?

Instead of restricting these insurance plans, let us make them available for all the aged. This would eliminate the administrative red tape which has enveloped the present program to the extent that it is choking off the benefits intended. This is another important principle in the Townsend plan.

Persons living on pensions are among those hardest hit by inflation and high taxes. The value of the dollar must be sound if these persons are to survive the tidal wave of inflation. An insurance president recently pointed out the blight of cheap money and high taxes on insurance. A paid-up policy for $10,000 in 1940 is now worth only $6,000 to the widow. A typical policyholder now needs 70 percent more insurance to provide the same protection as in 1929. Think what that means to the IOU's for social security payments which the Government has placed in the Treasury against your money it has taken out to run our fiscal affairs.

In closing let me give you this word of warning: Guard against the watering of our American dollar. Hidden taxes and inflation can undermine our security and safety. Jefferson said we must make our choice "between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude." An adequate insurance program for our aged may well be the protecting economic cloak around the shoulders of our Government, which in the end could save us from economic chaos.

And I believe the majority of our people are coming around to the idea and necessity of junking the present Social Security System for a universal pay-as-you-go insurance plan taken out of current tax revenues. All can be accomplished, in my opinion, within the operation of our present economic system. Surely great credit is due our own Dr. Townsend for his untiring efforts in directing the thoughts of our Nation toward a correct and proper solution of this problem.

Place of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a thought which I entertained relating to the prime importance of the House of Representatives has been reduced to print by our esteemed friend, Bruce Barton, who as our former colleague left a record of great service to the people.

In his usual modest way, Mr. Barton sets forth the preeminence of the House of Representatives in a manner which anyone can understand. He rests his case upon proof obtained from the Constitution. Nothing could be more convincing or more easily understood. The article entitled "Place of Honor" appeared in the Washington Star on November 20, 1949.

I deem it worthy of preservation in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, especially so at this time of uncertainty and confusion fostered by the enemies of democracy:

PLACE OF HONOR

(By Bruce Barton)

To my horror, I discovered that a talented young friend, a college graduate, had never in his whole life read the Constitution of the United States.

Is there among my readers a single one similarly afflicted? If so, I beg him to sit down right now and make the acquaintance of what Gladstone described as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

The experience will bring at least one surprise. The Constitution does not start with a discussion of the powers and duties of the President, nor of the Senate, nor the Supreme Court.

Instead, it gives the place of honor to that body which we are apt to call the lower House, the House of Representatives.

Is this something that just happened? Believe me, our ancestors deliberately and solemnly planned it that way.

They mistrusted Presidents, being too painfully mindful of their experience with an English king. Edmund Burke had warned them that "the greater the power the more dangerous the abuse."

They had their doubts about the Senate; it might make itself a dam across the river of progress, like the House of Lords. And they had seen too many people jailed for political or religious beliefs to put their final trust in judges.

So they wrote a Constitution of checks and balances. And they gave to the House two mighty safeguards—control of the purse strings and the sole power of impeachment.

In order to keep the Congressman close to the people, they stipulated that he must go home and submit his record for appraisal, and himself for reelection, every 2 years.

So the House is the common man's own particular part of the Government, yours and mine—the very heart of our democracy. Whoever ignorantly abuses the House, or makes cheap cracks at Congressmen, or writes impatiently against the procedures set up to insure full hearings and adequate debate, is doing a thoughtless and dangerous thing.

Oswald Spengler's Decline of the West, published after the close of the First World War, contained some dire predictions, many of which have already proved terrifyingly true. One prediction was that parliaments everywhere would lose their authority.

In most of Europe parliaments have lost their authority. Only in the United States does the "people's House" hold fast its grip on the purse-strings and—weapon of final mastery—the power to impeach.

So before you throw a rock at Congress, stop and think: The House is your body, set up for your protection. It is the place where the common man can finally turn for relief when he is tired of having bureaucrats push him around. If ever it goes, freedom vanishes.

The 1950 Revenue Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I had assured Mr. Charles F. Wahl, who represents the Pacific Lock Operators Association, Masters, Mates and Pilots, Marine Engineers, Dredge Operators, Truck Drivers and Marine Dispatchers of the Panama Canal, that I would insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the time of the consideration of the tax bill, a statement by him in regard to a certain portion of the tax bill. Inadvertently, I did not have an opportunity to present that statement and request that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I now ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES F. WAHL

The largest group of American citizens gathered together in one place in the Tropics in overseas service is on the Panama Canal. Forty-five hundred of these Americans are employees of the United States Government. These employees have made a career service of employment on the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad and enactment of section 216 subjecting them to income tax is inappropriate, inequitable, and not conducive to the efficient operation of the organization.

Reasons are given as follows:

1. RECUPERATIVE LEAVE

Panama Canal and Panama Railroad employees already are taxed a minimum of $1,000 per year for the privilege of being employed there because of the cost of taking necessary recuperative leave.

Because of the enervating effects of the tropics on the white man, medical authorities advise recuperative leave once a year, or at the least every 2 years.

The average amount of leave accumulated over a period of 2 years is 4 months.

This amount of recuperative leave is not granted because the United States Government is particularly fond of its employees in the Tropics, but because it is considered a minimum amount of time conducive to good health.

The cost of recuperative leave considering an average family of two adults and two children, 13 and 8 years old, traveling an average distance from the Canal Zone to Chicago. Many go to the west coast. Many go to the Southern States, but the average distance has been considered as Chicago.

Ship fare: Minimum employees' rate $40 times three and one-half fares times two for the round trip, plus $40 expenses and tips—$320.

Train fare $84.64 round trip plus $50 for meals and incidentals is $346.24. Total cost of getting employee and family to his home is $666.24. A round figure of $700 would be closer to a real figure and is an absolute minimum. If this family has saved $2,000 for a 4-month recuperative leave, this leaves them $1,300 to spend in 120 days, or approximately $10 per day for four people.

These employees are recruited from the working ranks, and the bulk of them are members of the mechanical crafts. I will use a boilermaker as an example. This man gets $2.16 per hour, or 25 percent over a base pay calculated on an average of nine navy yards, or an annual salary of $4,492. With tropical conditions this pay is not excessive. He would pay around $300 in income tax.

2. CAREER EMPLOYEES

Panama Canal employees are recruited on a career basis which is desirable for efficient operation of the organization.

The cost of recruiting a new employee is based on $1,800. This is the average to bring an employee and his family to the Canal Zone and return him to the United States upon termination of his service. Obviously, the tax measure as provided in section 216 of H. R. 8928 will not offset the cost of recruiting employees to fill the places of those who will find it necessary to completely reestablish themselves under new conditions. Housing conditions on the Isthmus are generally unfavorable. An employee is not permitted to own his home, purchase property or engage in business and when he does

finally leave the Service to come back to the United States it is usually necessary to completely reestablish himself under new conditions. There are a number of conditions faced by these employees which sometimes are not understood by themselves until after long years of service and that is the remoteness from relatives and friends in the employee's home community in the States and from other desirable features of his natural residence.

3. TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT DIFFERENTIAL

Yes, most employees of the Panama Canal and Railroad get a 25-percent differential over moderate rates derived from bases within the continental limits of the United States. This accompanied with application of section 251, Internal Revenue Code, has been considered highly desirable for the attracting of qualified employees.

Always in connection with discussion of income tax for employees on the Panama Canal, the question of the 25-percent differential comes up. When you consider the average annual pay of an average worker, such as the boilermaker mentioned in item 1, it will be noted that even with the 25-percent differential and the partial exemption from income tax, the rates of pay are not excessive. Actually, the 25-percent differential is a restrictive law passed during the early days of construction of the Canal when an investigating commission found that the rates of pay being paid were out of all proportion to those existing for comparable work in the United States. They recommended a limitation of 25 percent. As an inducement to recruiting, many individuals look on this differential as a stimulation for employment. However, when you consider the factors of employment from a total viewpoint, it is impossible under existing law to pay these employees what they are entitled to for this career service in the tropics with the United States Government.

4. HEALTH CONDITIONS

Yes, health conditions are good, only because of the excellent service of the Health Department. Continual warnings are issued requesting employees to report to dispensaries or hospitals at the slightest physical change.

It should be borne in mind that these employees of the United States Government are working practically at sea level and only 9 degrees north of the equator. The tropical climate in the Canal Zone has uniform high temperature, high relative humidity and excessive sunlight. The enervating climate with its depressing effects on the white man, plus the many other ever-present hazards to health, have long been studied and recognized by health authorities. That the climate in Panama, despite the excellent efforts of the Health Department, is a continuing threat to the health of the residents of the Canal Zone, is proven by a statement from the then Surgeon General of the Army in 1934.

The Economy Act of 1932 extended the tour of duty in the tropics of the military services from 2 to 3 years. The resulting illness, insanity, and lowering of morale terminated in a frantic effort in 1934 to restore the 2-year term of duty which had previously been in effect. The then Surgeon General of the Army testified before the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, on S. 3340 and S. 3397, bills to amend the laws relating to the length of tours of duty in the tropics, etc.

This testimony was given on April 30, 1934, and is quoted as follows—page 5:

"General PATTERSON. * * * I have served in Hawaii and I have been in Panama several times, and Puerto Rico, and my own judgment is, from observation of officers and enlisted men, I will say, it is poor economy on the part of the Government to require them to stay more than 2 years except for important reasons in the public interest.

"A man rapidly gets back to his normal condition after 2 years, but the longer you keep him over that period—it just takes that much longer for him to get back his normal efficiency after he returns to the home country, and some of them, especially the older men—I think it takes much longer to get back. Now, there are some circumstances which indicate that when you take the admission rates for all cases, except injuries, that is, for disease only, it shows that the rate over, we will say, in 1931, the rate was higher in Panama than anywhere. It was next higher in China; next higher in the Philippines, and Hawaii, and the United States holds the best health record. Over a period of 10 years in the Surgeon General's report, for 1932, on page 26, there is shown a graph which shows the rate over that period of time and you see that the Philippine Islands and Panama stood away above everything else. That is for disease only. The rate has not been shown for China, because we have only been there relatively a short while, but the rate for China is not quite as bad as Panama, but worse than the Philippines."

5. WAR ZONE

Men fighting in Korea have been exempted from income tax. This is only just. However, the Panama Canal can be a war zone. Thirteen Canal employees were killed on the Zone under war conditions during the last war.

During World War II a naval patrol plane leaving on its morning hunt for submarines off the Atlantic side of the Panama Canal crashed into a Panama Canal tow boat, killing the master of the tug, chief engineer, a Panama Canal pilot, and two Panama Canal seamen. Another incident occurred at the Pacific entrance when a tugboat towing a mud scow through the channel hit a loose mine, killing the master of the tug and seven Panama Canal seamen. These casualties were directly part of the war and there was no extra compensation provided for the families except that granted by existing injury compensation laws. An attempt was made to have legislation passed which would give the families of such employees additional compensation. This legislation failed. A forecast of the future can quite rightly consider the Panama Canal as a war area because any nation considering the contributions made by the Panama Canal toward winning the war in the Pacific will, of necessity, move toward its destruction.

With regard to the two tugs, they were a total loss.

6. CONTRACTORS

Contractors and employees would still get benefit of section 251 with appropriations of $70,000,000 for construction of quarters approved.

The Congress has provided for a $70,000,000 housing construction program to spread out over a period of years. This work, presumably, will be done by contractors. Under section 216 of the bill before Congress, only Government employees who are United States citizens will be required to pay income tax. Section 251 will still apply to contractors and their employees. When the writer was persuading the Treasury Department in 1942 to write a recommendation to the Senate Finance Committee to restore section 251, a similar situation existed and the statement was made by a representative of the Treasury that those are just the people we are trying to get—meaning the contractors and not the working employees of the United States Government.

Coolidge Said Nation Secure When Decisions Are by True Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is approaching one of the most important elections in the history of this Republic. The outcome is a matter of concern to every citizen. Some months ago I expressed the opinion that "the only issues which really matter in 1950 are those which will determine whether the United States itself will survive."

Opinions will differ on issues. How then can we be sure that the right decision will be made? Calvin Coolidge gave us the answer in an address to the Nation on the eve of the national election of November 4, 1924.

TEXT OF THE COOLIDGE ADDRESS

(The then President Coolidge said:)

The institutions of our country rest upon faith in the people. No decision that the people have made in any great crisis has ever shown that faith in them has been misplaced. It is impossible to divorce that faith which we have in others from the faith which we have in ourselves. The right action of all of us is made up of the right action of each one of us. Unless each of us is determined to meet the duty that comes to us, we can have no right to expect that others will meet the duties that come to them. Certainly we cannot expect them so to act as to save us from the consequences of having failed to act.

The immediate and pressing obligation for tomorrow is that each one of us who is qualified shall vote. That is a function which cannot be delegated, which cannot be postponed. The opportunity will never arise again. If the individual fails to discharge that obligation, the whole Nation will suffer a loss from that neglect.

America, more thoroughly than any other country, has adopted a system of self-government. Sometimes we refer to it as the rule of the people. Certainly it is a system under which there is every opportunity for self-government and every encouragement for the people to rule.

Ours has been described as a Government of public opinion. Of course, public opinion functions all the time. It no doubt has its influence on the actions of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, and even though it be imperceptible on any given occasion, it is probably, as time passes, reflected in the courts.

SELF-RULE DEPENDS ON BALLOT BOX

But all the influence of public opinion, all the opportunity for self-government through the rule of the people, depends upon one single factor. That is the ballot box.

If the time comes when our citizens fail to respond to their right and duty, individually and collectively, intelligently and effectively, at the ballot box on election day, I do not know what form of government will be substituted for that which we at present have the opportunity to enjoy, but I do know that it will not be a rule of the people; it will no longer be self-government.

The people of our country are sovereign. If they do not vote they abdicate that sovereignty and they may be entirely sure that if they relinquish it other forces will seize it, and if they fail to govern themselves some other power will rise up to govern them.

The choice is always before them—whether they will be slaves or whether they will be free. The only way to be free is to exercise actively and energetically the privileges and discharge faithfully the duties which make freedom. It is not to be secured by passive resistance. It is the result of energy and action.

To live up to the full measure of citizenship in this Nation requires not only action, but it require intelligent action. It is necessary to secure information and to acquire education. The background of our citizenship is the meeting house and the schoolhouse, the place of religious worship and the place of intellectual training.

But we cannot abandon our education at the schoolhouse door. We have to keep it up through life. A political campaign can be justified only on the ground that it enables the citizens to become informed as to what policies are best for themselves and for their country, in order that they may vote to elect those who from their past record and present professions they know will put such policies into effect.

The purpose of a campaign is to send an intelligent and informed voter to the ballot box. All the speeches, all the literature, all the organization, all the effort, all the time, and all the money, which are not finally registered on election day, are wasted.

"SHALL MINORITY RULE?"

We are always confronted with the question of whether we wish to be ruled by all the people or a part of the people, by the minority or the majority; whether we wish our elections to be dominated by those who have been misled, through the presentation of half truths, into the formation of hasty, illogical and unsound conclusions; or whether we wish those to determine the course of our Government who have through due deliberation and careful consideration of all the factors involved reached a sound and mature conclusion.

We shall always have with us an element of discontent, an element inspired with more zeal and knowledge. They will always be active and energetic, and they seldom fail to vote on election day. But the people at large in this country are not represented by them. They are greatly in the minority. But their number is large enough to be a decisive factor in many elections, unless it is offset by the sober second thought of the people who have something at stake, whether it be earnings from investment or from employment, who are considering not only their own welfare but the welfare of their children and of coming generations.

SECURITY IN TRUE MAJORITY OPINION

Our institutions never contemplated that the conduct of this country, the direction of its affairs, the adoption of its policies, the maintenance of its principles, should be decided by a minority, moved in part by self-interest and prejudice. They were framed on the theory that decisions would be made by the great body of voters inspired by patriotic motives. Faith in the people does not mean in a part of the people. It means faith in all the people. Our country is always safe when decisions are made by a majority of those who are entitled to vote. It is always in peril when decisions are made by a minority.

QUOTES WASHINGTON ON WOMEN

Lately we have added to our voting population the womanhood of the Nation. I do not suppose that George Washington could be counted as one who would have favored placing upon the women of his time the duty and responsibility of taking part in elections. Nevertheless, he had such a deep realization of the importance of their influence upon public affairs at the time when we were adopting our Federal Constitution that he wrote to one of them as follows:

"A spirit of accommodation was happily infused into the leading characters of the continent and the minds of men were gradually prepared, by disappointment, for the reception of a good government. Nor could I rob the fairer sex of their share in the glory of a revolution so honorable to human nature, for, indeed, I think you ladies are in the number of the best patriots America can boast."

The praise of Washington was none too high. Without doubt the intuition of the women of his day was quick to reveal what a high promise the patriotic efforts of Washington and his associates held out for the homes and for the children of our new and unfolding Republic. What was then done by indirect influence is now possible through direct action.

The continuing welfare of the home, the continuing hope of the children, are no longer represented by an expectation. Experience has made them the great reality of America.

If the women of that day were willing to support what was only a vision, a promise, surely in this day they will be willing to go to the ballot box to support what has become an actual and permanent realization of their desires.

But the right to vote is conferred upon our citizens, not only that they may exercise it for their own benefit, but in order that they may exercise it also for the benefit of others.

Persons who have the right to vote are trustees for the benefit of their country and their countrymen. They have no right to say they do not care. They must care. They have no right to say that whatever the result of the election, they can get along. They must remember that their country and their countrymen cannot get along, cannot remain sound, cannot preserve its institutions, cannot protect its citizens, cannot maintain its place in the world, unless those who have the right to vote do sustain and do guide the course of public affairs, by the thoughtful exercise of that right on election day.

They do not hold a mere privilege to be exercised or not, as passing fancy may move them. They are charged with a great trust, one of the most important and most solemn which can be given into the keeping of an American citizen. It should be discharged thoughtfully and seriously, in accordance with its vast importance.

I therefore urge upon all the voters of our country, without reference to party, that they assemble tomorrow at their respective voting places, in the exercise of the high office of American citizenship; that they approach the ballot box in the spirit that they approach a sacrament, and there, disregarding all appeals to passion and prejudice, dedicating themselves truly and wholly to the welfare of their country, they make their choice of public officers solely in the light of their own conscience.

When an election is so held, when a choice is so made, it results in the real rule of the people, it warrants and sustains the belief that the voice of the people is the voice of God.

To my father, who is listening in in my old home in Vermont, and to my other invisible audience I say "Good night."

Boston and Our Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Herald, Boston, Mass.:

BOSTON ONE CITY THAT KEPT WELCOME OUT FOR SERVICEMEN

(By Paul Stevens)

Boston is one city in America that tries to treat the man in uniform right.

With the world situation once more heating up to a critical boil, Boston need not change its spots with a simper: "Welcome, serviceman." The serviceman knows he is welcome whether the world is shaking with war scare ague or not.

Any hint to the contrary brings a rise from Mrs. Thomas E. Cady, executive director of the Bay State Soldiers and Sailors Club on Boston Common. "We're no fair weather friends," she says, with black eyes snapping. "Let's see," she said, thumbing through her files, "last year, long before there was any thought of trouble in Korea, we played host to 239,000 men in uniform."

MAGNIFICENT HOST

The club, any serviceman who has been there will tell you, plays host in a manner that is practically magnificent. Mrs. Cady and her staff arrange for free tickets to ball games and the movies, sew on buttons, wrap packages for mailing, find lodgings, stage nightly dances and make the man in uniform feel appreciated in a score of other ways.

Meanwhile, the Charlestown YMCA at City Square holds daily programs for servicemen. The building has 600 lockers where sailors can keep their civilian clothing. It has 170 dormitory rooms for servicemen, and provides an additional 165 cots for use on week ends. Members of a large girls' service organization serve as hostesses at dances 3 times a week.

All this takes on special significance in view of a recent survey made by This Week Magazine, supplement to the Sunday Herald, which shows that many American communities view the serviceman with indifference and even with open hostility.

"It is a sad commentary on our peacetime Army to note that American soldiers are treated better in foreign lands where they are stationed than they are in their own country," the author of the This Week piece states.

NATURAL MECCA

Mrs. Cady replies to this, "Well, then, Boston must be a foreign land." Without arguing down the author's general findings, she states that the writer couldn't truthfully cite Boston as an example of a community that had left the serviceman outside the door to its heart.

"I would have to remind him of the party at the Hotel Vendome last year for the men of the U. S. S. *Fiske*, and the party for the *Kearsarge's* crew at the Hotel Statler where 500 girls served as hostesses and 100 gallons of punch were served," she said.

Then there was the time when the club ran out of turkey dinners last Christmas and the Hotel Statler saved the day by sending over food from its own kitchens so speedily that the servicemen were not aware of any shortage.

The club, with its television set, snack bar, dance hall, lounges, and game room, is the natural mecca for lonely men away from home as surely as it was during World War II.

SIXTEEN THOUSAND, FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIVE VISITS

Up to last Sunday night, servicemen had made 16,535 visits to the club in August alone. The figure will increase sharply as the draft gains momentum, and the club probably will expand into the adjoining Veterans Rehabilitation Division Building.

As an example of how servicemen are being cold-shouldered elsewhere, This Week tells of how a chaplain at the Brooklyn Navy Yard received a letter from a group aboard a cruiser requesting tickets for a Broadway show. The chaplain asked the management of the theater to reserve tickets—for which full prices would be paid—and got his written request back with the notation: "The war is over."

Contrasting with this, Boston theaters supply free passes to Mrs. Cady for distribution among servicemen. The Boston Braves allot her 250 passes to its ball games played here.

Tonight, the Boston Opera House will be thrown open to servicemen for a special, preview, free performance of the new Olsen and Johnson show, Pardon Our French.

HE IS OUR FRIEND

While Mrs. Cady and her work are sponsored by the public through its contributions to Community Services, this does not end civilian responsibility to the man in uniform. Boston can be proud, but it cannot be complacent, of its treatment of servicemen.

"An Army and Navy abandoned by the clergy, ignored by education, pilloried by the press, and forsaken by the civil community will inevitably degenerate professionally and rot morally," quote, Brig. Gen. Charles T. Lanham, former chief of Army Information and Education Division.

This man in uniform—he is your boy, our friend, our neighbor.

Thad Stevens Versus God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the pertinent parts of the first and the fourteenth amendments of the Constitution of the United States, adopted respectively in 1791 and 1868, are:

The first:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

The fourteenth:

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Vashti McCollum sought mandamus that would order the Champaign Board of Education to—

Adopt and enforce rules and regulations prohibiting all instruction in and teaching of all religious education in all public schools in Champaign District No. 71, * * * and in all public schoolhouses and buildings in said district when occupied by public schools.

The State of Illinois trial court denied her petition. The Supreme Court of Illinois affirmed the trial court's decision. The Supreme Court of the United States reversed and remanded to the State supreme court for proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

On the day that the right to file an application for rehearing in the case of People of the State of Illinois ex rel. Vashti McCollum, appellant, against Board of Education of School District No. 71, Champaign County, Ill., et al., appellees, expired April 2, 1948, the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in that case became the law of the land. In the 25 days immediately preceding, every effort had been made, and proved futile, to get such application filed by someone having that right. For the time being, the door of hope for judicial relief was closed. So resort was had to the Congress, and House Joint Resolution 364, Eightieth Congress, second session, was introduced proposing repeal of the fourteenth amendment.

This decision of the Supreme Court was of such transcendant importance as to shake the very foundations of our Government. Its ultimate dual effects were plain. It not only struck down our system of dual sovereignty, thereby sowing the seed of national destruction, but it also might mean the destruction of every landmark that indicates that ours is a Nation dedicated to God and freedom to worship Him.

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 some 4 months of debate was required to settle the question of how the founding fathers could assure the perpetuity of the Government which they were designing "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty." They were greatly perturbed lest centralization of power should creep in and work its inevitable result—destruction. The certitude of such eventuality was clear as we refresh our memory from their wisdom. They knew full well that there must be created a government of checks and balances, with the powers of government brought as near to the sovereign people as possible, not concentrated in some distant national capital. They foresaw the fruitage of the truth written by Lord Acton: "All power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." They also foresaw the growth and development of the infant Nation they were trying to protect. So they created a government with few essential powers, though enough to supply the deficiencies manifest in the Articles of Confederation. They struck the keynote, however, when they set up the system of dual sovereignty. All power came from the people, so each State was made supreme and omnipotent in its sphere, with only five generic powers entrusted to the National Government. All other powers were reserved to the States or to the people. This included all powers of police save only the single national police power to maintain itself, which, incidentally, carried with it the responsibility of defending every State.

The substance of the fourteenth amendment was first offered in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. It was then and there overwhelmingly rejected.

In 1866 it was proposed and submitted to the States for ratification. It was defeated again, although the Southern States were of course denied representation in the Congress and had no vote. Still they could not get the requisite number of States needed for ratification. But at the points of Federal bayonets and under the reconstruction acts disfranchising practically all native white voters, in 1868 a sufficient number of States ratified to make it a part of the Constitution. So, even in "the tragic era" it took bayonets to write it into our Constitution.

The prime purpose of the fourteenth amendment was, of course, in language attributed to Thad Stevens, "to keep a black heel on every white neck." In the *Slaughterhouse cases* (16 Wall. 81 (1872)) Mr. Justice Miller, speaking for the Supreme Court, not only denied Federal intervention, but wrote:

We doubt very much whether any action of a State not directed by way of discrimination against the Negroes as a race, or on account of their race, will ever be held to come within the purview of this provision.

Again, in *Strauder* v. *West Virginia* (100 U. S. 306), the Court said:

This is one of a series of constitutional provisions having a common purpose, namely, securing to a race recently emancipated * * * all the civil rights that the superior race enjoy.

In his excellent work, The Fourteenth Amendment and the States, by Charles Wallace Collins, he says:

Although this race situation may be said to have been the immediate and proximate cause of the adoption of the amendment, as well as its immediate field of operation, in the mind of the radicals it had a much wider scope. To them it meant the ultimate centralization of power into the hands of the Federal Government. It meant the death knell of the doctrine of States' rights—the ultimate nationalization of all civil rights and the consequent abolition of State control over the private rights and duties of the individual. It meant the passing over of the police power of the State into the police power of the National Government, thereby giving the Congress undefined and unlimited powers whereby it would be enabled to enter fields of legislation from which hitherto it had been barred.

Yet, in spite of the fact that its main objective was so clear, after the first few cases reaching the Supreme Court had been decided little attention has been paid to the main purpose of its adoption and fewer than 5 percent of the cases interpreting the fourteenth amendment have even touched the race problem. Literally hundreds of cases have dealt

exclusively with other matters, practically all, tax or corporated, under the due-process-of-law clause. It is interesting to note also that the States of the Confederacy have long since ceased to be the happy hunting ground at which the gun of the fourteenth amendment has been aimed. For a half century the fourteenth amendment in its prime purpose has been a dead letter.

But, although the fourteenth amendment had become a part of the Constitution of the United States—though unlawfully—the fight for further encroachment upon the power of the States went on. In 1876, in the Hayes-Tilden campaign, James G. Blaine, a leading Republican, offered a resolution proposing an amendment of the Constitution reading as follows:

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 44th Cong., vol. 4, pt. I, p. 5580]

No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under any State. No public property, and no public revenue of, nor any loan of credit by or under the authority of, the United States, or any State, Territory, District, or municipal corporation, shall be appropriated to, or made or used for, the support of any school, educational or other institution, under the control of any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination, or wherein the particular creed or tenets of any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination shall be taught; and no such particular creed or tenets shall be read or taught in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by such revenue or loan of credit; and no such appropriation or loan of credit shall be made to any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination, or to promote its interests or tenets. This article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Bible in any school or institution; and it shall not have the effect to impair rights of property already vested.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to provide for the prevention and punishment of violations of this article.

This was defeated.

The diminution of State power thus prevented, has now been imposed on the States by the decision of the Supreme Court in the McCollum case. The holding is to the effect that the fourteenth amendment had already imposed, in 1868, these very restrictions upon the States, and that the bitter fight of 1876 to submit the Blaine amendment was utterly unnecessary. It is passing strange that such able men as those who vigorously espoused the cause of this amendment of 1876 deemed that amendment absolutely necessary to overcome the absence of authority in the first amendment to prevent State contributions to religious education. They evidently thought it conclusive that the first amendment plus the fourteenth amendment prohibited nothing except laws favoring one religion over others. But more than 75 years after that bitter fight of 1876, where the Blaine resolution was made a national issue in one of the most bitterly-contested national elections ever held, the Supreme Court virtually writes the defeated Blaine amendment into the law of the land.

The *Everson case* (330 U. S. 1) was a 5-to-4 decision, holding:

It appears that these parochial schools met New Jersey's requirements. The State contributes no money to the schools. It does not support them. Its legislation, as applied, does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools.

There were two dissenting opinions by Mr. Justice Jackson and Mr. Justice Rutledge. Mr. Justice Frankfurter joined in both, and Mr. Justice Frankfurter, Mr. Justice Jackson, and Mr. Justice Burton joined in Mr. Justice Rutledge's.

Mr. Justice Black wrote the majority opinion in both the Everson and the McCollum cases. Mr. Justice Reed was the only Justice dissenting in the McCollum case, which was an 8-to-1 decision, though the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson reads more like a dissent. In the majority opinion in the McCollum case, Mr. Justice Black makes liberal use of quotations from the two dissenting opinions in the Everson case.

In both the Everson and the McCollum decisions, of course, the fourteenth amendment is the fundamental basis upon which each decision is grounded, and it is held that the fourteenth amendment made the first amendment obligatory on the States.

However, it is contended by many students of the Constitution that there is nothing in the fourteenth amendment which justifies the imposition of any clause of the first, upon the States; and they join in the further contention that the Everson and the McCollum cases violate the "free exercise" clause of the first. But the two most dangerous expressions in the Everson decision, carried forward into the McCollum, are: That neither the Federal Government nor a State can "aid all religions"; and that "no tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion." In the case of *Nichols* v. *School Directors* (93 Ill. 61) (1879) the Supreme Court of Illinois, notwithstanding the strict provisions of the Illinois Constitution—article II, section 3, and article VIII, section 3—prohibiting appropriation or payment of public money in aid of religion, held: "Religion and religious worship are not so placed under the ban of the Constitution that they may not be allowed to become the recipient of any incidental benefit whatsoever from the public bodies or authorities of the State. That instrument itself contains a provision authorizing the legislature to exempt property used for religious purposes from taxation; and thereby, the same as is complained of here, there might be indirectly imposed upon the taxpayer the burden of increased taxation, and in that manner the indirect supporting of places of worship. In the respect of the possibility of enhanced taxation therefrom, this provision of the Constitution itself is even more obnoxious to objection than this permission given by the school authorities to hold religious meetings in the schoolhouse. There is no pretense that it is in any way in interference with the occupation of the building for school purposes."

Storey, in his Commentaries on the Constitution, fifth edition, 1891, II, section 1872, points out that—

There are a number of ways of creating an establishment of religion by different methods of preferring one over another. Hence, a law respecting an "establishment of religion" might give a preference without imposing a tax. Tax support or, more commonly, tax exemption may be given if no preference is to be made.

Tax exemption is in essence an appropriation, as held by the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts in *Massachusetts General Hospital* v. *Inhabitants of Belmont* (233 Mass. 190, 203; 124 N. E. 21, 25) (1919):

An exemption from taxation is in the nature of an appropriation of public funds, because, to the extent of the exemption, it becomes necessary to increase the rate of taxation upon other properties in order to raise money for the support of government.

Philip Schall, professor of church history in the Union Theological Seminary at New York, in Papers of the American Historical Association, volume II, No. 4; G. P. Putnam Sons, 1888, pages 23–24:

The framers of the Constitution, therefore, had no right and no intention to interfere with the religion of the citizens of any State, or to discriminate between denominations; their only just and wise course was to leave the subject of religion to the several States, to put all churches on an equal footing before the national law, and to secure to them equal protection. Liberty of all is the best guaranty of the liberty of each.

No matter how the Court may interpret the language of the first amendment, as it is to be applied to the Federal Government, which in form it closely controls, the only means of enforcing it against the State of Illinois, or any other State, is by virtue of the fourteenth amendment.

In *Adamson* v. *Calif.* (332 U. S. 46), concerning the decision in that case that the self-crimination clause of the fifth amendment did not bind the States, Mr. Justice Reed, speaking for the Court, said—page 53:

It accords with the constitutional doctrine of federalism by leaving to the States the responsibility of dealing with the privileges and immunities of their citizens except those inherent in national citizenship.

There is no occasion at this late date, 160 years after the formation of our Government, for the Supreme Court of the United States to impose, for the first time, more than equal treatment of religions upon the States. The problem of the extent to which equal aid may be extended to religion has always heretofore been handled on the State level and is extensively treated in the provisions of the constitutions of the several States. This is a problem which has been satisfactorily handled without the intervention of the Supreme Court, and it is difficult to see why the power of that Court should now be asserted. The very fact that its power has never been invoked in the history of our country is, itself, the most persuasive evidence that the power was never intended to be exercised and

is not necessary to the protection of the fundamental rights of citizens, whether as citizens of the States or of the United States.

A contemporaneous, uniform legislative or executive construction of constitutional provisions adopted and acted on with the acquiescence of the people for many years has always been entitled to great weight. *Okanogan Indians* v. *U. S.* (279 U. S. 655, 688 (1929)); *Hanover Fire Ins. Co.* v. *Harding* (327 Ill. 590, 603; 158 N. E. 849, (1927)), and cases cited in note, page 60.

The Everson case is the first case in which it was sought—and there unsuccessfully—to apply the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment to restrain the acts of a State.

The decisions are clear that the fourteenth amendment has not, by a mechanical process, imposed the first eight amendments on the States. *Twining* v. *N. J.* (211 U. S. 78, 91–98); *Hamilton* v. *Regents of the University of Calif.* (293 U. S. 245, 261); *Palko* v. *Connecticut*, (402 U. S. 319, 323, 328); *Betts* v. *Brady* (316 U. S. 445, 461); *Adamson* v. *Calif.* (332 U. S. 46).

It seems clear that the repeal of the fourteenth amendment is not only necessary to restore dual sovereignty and, therefore, the form of our government as designed by the founding fathers, but that the mammoth size to which our national Government has grown has demonstrated to all who have had experience with its incapacity that if we continue centralization of power in Washington, the Federal Government must fall of its own weight.

In a score of cases the Supreme Court has struck the shackles intended to render the States impotent, that were forged and sought to be applied by the fourteenth amendment.

Not only because each of the 10 points made by the President's civil rights committee would be killed by the repeal of the fourteenth amendment, but also, and more especially, because the free exercise of religion, and the dedication of our Nation to God and His worship would so be best given guaranty.

Most of us, if not all, cordially agree with the desperate efforts now being made by our Government to avert war and preserve our Nation. However, there is another question of equal importance: Should we not see to it that our Nation continues to be worth preserving? We have the highest regard for the Supreme Court of the United States and for the ability and integrity of each one of the members of that Court. Undoubtedly they are declaring the law to be what they conceive it. Whether we agree or not, their decisions are the law of the land. The Court and its members would, of course, join cordially in an effort to make sure that the Nation's religious life is safe and that their decisions may not be misunderstood as seeking to weaken "the Power that has made and preserved us a nation."

It was not until 1940 that the Supreme Court clearly enunciated the doctrine that the fourteenth amendment of our Constitution imposed on the States the duty required of Congress by the first amendment. Mr. Justice Roberts, in *Cantwell* v. *Conn.* (310 U. S. 296), held that the words of the first amendment—"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" embraced "two concepts—freedom to believe and freedom to act."

The two latest decisions, however—the Everson and the McCollum cases—go so far beyond all former decisions as to cause the fear, if not the certitude, that the effect will be to destroy every mark that characterizes this a Nation dedicated to God, and the freedom of His worship.

In a renewed effort to safeguard against such an unintended evil, the same repeal resolution—House Joint Resolution 538, Eighty-first Congress, second session, has been introduced and is again pending in the House of Representatives.

Our forefathers came here for the priceless privilege of worshipping God, not for the purpose of ignoring Him; the essence of the religious philosophy of the United States of America has always been the absolute guaranty of freedom of religion, never of freedom from religion.

Our forefathers appointed a committee to design our currency. Jefferson, Franklin, and Adams were the three members of that great committee that labored to give us our sign and seal to display to the world. It was the American eagle. And, in reporting that decision, they referred to the Book of Books where, in Exodus, 19:4, God said:

> Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself.
>
> Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people—for all the earth is mine.

That was the first covenant promise, and our committee chose that to remind us always that on eagles' wings God had borne our forefathers across the flood of the Atlantic, just as He had, through the Red Sea, brought his first chosen people. We sought to claim that promise also for our Nation, dedicated to God and the keeping of that covenant.

Must our American eagle be struck from our currency? Shall we be forced to forget the pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night that were engraved on our first dollar bills, signifying our prayer for God's guidance and leadership? Must we erase "In God We Trust" from our coins? His all-seeing eye from our great seal? Will mandamus or injunction compel us to cease administering oaths to witnesses and parties and in qualifying prospective witnesses of tender years, in our courts of justice—so-called after one of God's attributes? Must the designation of the year as Anno Domini, the observance of Thanksgiving Day for expression of gratitude to God, Sunday and Christmas, all go? Of course, it is even clearer that Chaplains in all our Armed Forces, in both Senate and House, in West Point and Annapolis, and compulsory Church attendance in both Academies are to be prohibited.

Once upon a time, there was in our fair land an omnipotent queen—the States. The whole empire of sovereignty was hers. But in her wisdom she felt the need of a prince consort who could fight her battles, protect, defend, and guard her from foreign foes and serve her constituents in those manly ways ill-befitting a queen. So she created such a prince, joined him to herself by sacred vows in holy wedlock, made him King in the sphere she had allotted him, and with him shared her throne. By their vows he was to be supreme in the field of power she delegated him, she in all else. It was to be a perfect partnership.

He had his scepter—the Army and Navy. She had hers—the army of her intelligent, virtuous voters selected by her, her children in home, school and church, and her law-making, law-interpreting, and law-enforcing servants.

From time to time, as desirability became apparent, she gave him more and more of her power. He kept all of his, and ever grasped and exercised more of hers.

May God grant us of His wisdom, grace, and power, a sufficiency to enable us to deal with the situation that confronts His people. May it not be the answer to repeal the cause of so much of our tribulation and free the States again, as they were for the first century of the life of this Nation, from the shackles of that tyranny from which our system of dual sovereignty was designed to keep them free?

This Nation must have under God a new birth of freedom. It must be kept God's country.

My Father Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on Labor Sunday, September 3, 1950, I had the privilege of attending my own church, the First Baptist Church, of Tallahassee, Fla., and hearing one of the most heart-warming sermons by our pastor, Dr. Harold G. Sanders, who, on that day, Labor Sunday used as his text the seventeenth verse of the fifth chapter of the Book of John, "But Jesus answered them, my Father worketh hitherto, and I work." I ask the privilege of having his stimulating and far-sighted sermon printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY FATHER WORKS

Text, John 5:17: "But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

Religion has about forfeited its right to be called a religion when its leaders deny a stranger's deed of mercy on the Sabbath

day. Such was the case with the Pharisees when Jesus came along "doing good." For some strange reason, Jesus did not seem to remember what day it was when He saw human suffering about which He could do something. That men who professed to represent God, His Father, could not appreciate His nonconformity to the laws of Sabbath observance did not seem to bother Jesus; but He had an answer for them. He had come to "seek and to save that which was lost," including the leaders of the temple—if they would have it so.

Jesus found him, a chronically impotent man who for 38 years had been afflicted, and for long had taken his place in the Holy City by the Pool of Bethesda, hoping to be cured by the angel-stirred waters. "Wilt thou be made whole?" The impotent man said, "Certainly? But, when the angel stirs the waters, I am so slow that another beats me to the pool every time. I need someone to put me into the pool ahead of others." The Lord of Life said firmly, "Rise, take up thy bed, and walk." At once the man was made whole, and he took up his bed and walked—but it was on the Sabbath Day, and he had broken it! The Jews caught him in the act. "Who told you to break the Sabbath by carrying your bed?" The cured man admitted that the one who had healed him had also told him to take up his bed and walk, but his name he did not know. Later, however, Jesus "findeth him in the temple, and said unto him, 'Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee.' The man departed (ungrateful as he was) and told the Jews that it was Jesus which had made him whole." For this cause, therefore, the Jews persecuted Jesus and sought to kill him—because he had healed the man on the Sabbath.

But Jesus was now to commit the greater sin. He told them the reason he healed the man: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." Therefore, the Jews determined to kill Him, because not only had He broken their Sabbath laws but also He had claimed sonship with God.

HE CAME UNTO HIS OWN

Little wonder that the Apostle John, writing later in the Gospel which carries his name, could write these pathetic words: "He came unto His own, but His own received Him not" (1:11). So sure were the leaders of their position with and interpretation of God that they could not even recognize Him when He became flesh in the person of His Son. They could not take his liberal attitude toward ecclesiastical law, and the last straw was his wild claim to be equal with God. Away with Him. But, some received Him, and "to them gave He the power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on His name; * * * (1:12).

LIBERAL LABOR VIEWS OF JESUS

If Labor Day provides no better result than to have the Christian leaders and preachers rethink the attitude of Jesus toward manual labor, it will be worth the observance. Jesus was a worker. A carpenter. And He was proud of it.

He would have been repudiated in almost every Graeco-Roman center for his high opinion of manual labor. Furthermore, they would have denied him the right to speak as an authority simply because he was a carpenter. In the city rich in Periclean culture, He would have run counter to the ideas of Aristotle who was dead-sure that the mechanical arts made freemen unserviceable for the use and exercise of virtue. He would have fared no better in the delta of the Nile where the teachers in the city made famous by Alexander the Great (whose name it bore) taught—as many of the short-sighted of American schools—that a college sheepskin was an insurance protecting one from working with his hands. A manual laborer, in the minds of the teachers and philosophers of all ancient peoples except the Hebrews, was low man on the totem pole of life's occupations. Whether in China or Asia Minor, the same taboo was placed upon labor—a man of that class could not speak with authority. It was just simply out of the question.

Only the Hebrews, and that after a four-century experience in the bondage of Egypt and a seven-decade experience in Babylonia, held a worthy conception of the worker in the manual arts. Perhaps making straw bricks for the Pharaohs—without pay, helped them to see life more fully. By the time of Christ every Hebrew boy had a trade. Even the scholars like Paul might be a tentmaker. Peter, James, and John were fishermen. Matthew was a tax collector. And Jesus was a carpenter.

WOULD JESUS TAKE SIDES TODAY?

Jesus is very much alive today. And He is tremendously interested in the best interests of labor. His father was a worker. He was a carpenter. Most of all, He is interested in the welfare of human beings. His restless, ubiquitous spirit is everywhere today working.

But suppose He were to return in the flesh and come to Detroit or Birmingham when labor troubles were brewing. Would He take sides with labor or management? Would He aline Himself with the labor unions or with big business? He would be very much concerned with the clashes between them, but He would be all too honest and too wise to take sides with either group per se, but I think He would do a lot of mediating—after prayer. He would seek to build men fit for fellowship with each other and His Father, knowing that labor-management relations would have to be settled on a different basis from that used by most mediators. He would seek to bring all parties concerned—labor, capital, and the rest of the world—into cooperative, creative labor for the benefit of all God's children. He would not be lost in the narrow, selfish interests of any particular group seeking a fatter envelope from another group, who do so without stopping to consider what effect such action would have upon (1) their own consciences, (2) future good will between the contracting parties, or (3) the rest of the world. He would help men now, as He did then, to see life whole; to see it through the eyes of God and the eyes of suffering humanity.

WHAT DID JESUS THINK ABOUT LABOR?

The attitude of Jesus today toward labor and money is no different from what it was when He walked in human's sandals on the roads of Palestine. What does the record show? How did he feel about labor, about money?

1. He saw people as people, and loved them all. He was no respecter of persons, but He respected all persons. He loved the poor—and He loved the rich. He disliked ill will and low motive in both. He loved a good workman, one who worked creatively, whether with his muscle, mind, or money. In other words, He saw all men as workers, whatever the vocation, vitally related to each other and to God. He would not criticize the work, only the worker with antisocial attitudes. "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." This was His over-all command to workers all.

2. Jesus, only Son of His working Father, believed in just pay for all workers. Even in the Old Testament, the righteous person was promised that his seed would not beg bread. A righteous man was never a shirker. The New Testament is plain: "The laborer is worthy of his hire." In the parable of the pennies, or the parable of the vineyard, recorded in Matthew 20: 1–16, God is represented as a householder who went into town to hire laborers for his vineyard, contracting with them for a penny a day. Needing more workers, at intervals throughout the day, even up to 5 in the afternoon, he hired all who would work. At 6 o'clock, he paid them all the day's wages as agreed upon. Those who worked longest complained at the generosity of the employer who paid those who worked but an hour the same as they who had borne the burden and heat of the entire day. God is represented as kindly but firmly replying: "Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst thou not agree with me for a penny? * * * Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?" (20: 13–15). What is the obvious inference? That God is interested in two things: (1) getting the work done for the benefit of mankind; and (2) in seeing that every workman has a living wage—no matter the nature of the work.

3. Jesus did not seek to regiment labor and manpower. The parable of the talents (Matthew 25: 14–30) indicates that native abilities are given men in dissimilar quantities—some have five, others two, others one. Men are not to be judged by the number of talents, the amount of ability and education which they have, but by the creative use which they make of all their abilities in relation to the fellow who dispensed the ability. The selfish, antisocial fellow with one talent who did not use his ability for the common good, for his own enrichment, or for the purposes of his master received severe indictment and just punishment.

Realistic as He was, Jesus taught the principle of the strong caring for the weak, the "haves" sharing with the "have nots," and the supreme principle of sacrifice for the good of others.

4. Making a life, not making a living, is the big idea. I have no sympathy with the pious teacher who says that Jeus would not stoop to the level of a discussion of economics or touch the garment of filthy lucre. Jesus said bluntly: "Ye cannot serve God and money." Almost half of His parables dealt with money, material values, stewardship. He had plenty to say about economics. He was not a theorist, but a realist. He would demand labor from all. He would just as firmly demand a living wage for labor. He would tell a servant to serve his master as if that master were God. And, He would remind that master that he was not really a master at all, and, that he himself had a Master—God.

He was interested in a just wage and in a just profit for the worker commonly known as capital or management; but He would warn both management and labor—and all of us who are interested in the welfare of both—that money in abundance is not of itself a passport to heaven, or a promise of brotherhood. He found that abundance, for any person, carried with it its own temptation to do evil, to be unbrotherly. A full pay envelope may turn a worker into a bigot, a drunk, a libertine. American pay envelopes may isolate us from the laborers of India or South Africa—ask a GI who spent some time in Australia or Europe.

The big idea is to make a life, the kind of a life which God lives—a good life, a working life, a creative life, an unselfish life. Jesus promised those who follow Him that if they seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, that all these things—food, drink, clothing—shall be added unto you (Matthew 6: 33).

5. Jesus saw all workers in relation to His working Father. "No man liveth unto himself, or dieth unto himself." Every worker has an obligation to all others. All workers really have the same Boss—the Great Worker who once in history begot an only Son who said, "My Father is working even until now, and I am working too." In the parable of the vineyard, all workers worked for the same employer. The world is a vineyard of

God. Whatever the foreman or the straw boss, God is the employer. He gives abilities and opportunities as He will, but He asks that each laborer work out his salvation with fear and trembling, knowing that not only is he working for God, but, literally, God worketh in you. Jesus came working. And he said, "As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." Out to work, workers together, workers in the vineyard of God.

WHAT IS GOD TRYING TO DO?

Could we stop Jesus for a moment, look straight into His face, and ask him plainly, "What does your Father do, anyway? What kind of worker is He?" Jesus would be patient with us for we are his dull children.

Jesus would tell of the work of creation, how that His Father created the things of earth and sky and sea; and how that He holds the atoms of the world and the planets of the universe in the hollow of His great Hand. Then, he would talk of His work in the interest of His highest creation—His children, the men of earth. He would remind you of John 3:16, how that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life". He would have you read the story of His only life, teachings, vicarious death for sinful men, His exploring and conquering the darkness that is called death, and the continuing work of God and Jesus through the Holy Spirit who is now busy at work in the world—revealing the mind of God by spotlighting the life of Jesus—trying to bring it life, and help it to live peaceably and creatively at work with Himself and all His family.

Then, He would look every inquiring one of us in the eye and say: God is working for you, and wants to work in and through you now.

GOD'S HOPE OF GLORY

In the first century, "God sent forth His Son" to glorify Himself. By that we mean, to reveal his true character, his attitude toward men. Jesus did that completely. He who was the One perfect man completely revealed Him. The record of that revelation is contained in the New Testament. Jesus went back to heaven. Now, God's hope is found in Christians who will work with Him. Even as Paul said, "Christ in you, God's hope of glory". "We are laborers together with God".

God is no selfiish worker. The vast reaches of his working arm are extended not for personal benefit, but for the welfare and salvation of his erring children. No labor is too great, no waiting too long, no difficulty shall steer Him away from His purpose to make people fit for fellowship with Himself and each other. He needs human hands to help him.

Those workers who would work with the Eternal Laborer must share His concern for the needy world, His unselfish spirit, His untiring interest. We must seek to understand the yearning of the heart of God for the poor, the starved, the unfortunate, the sin-shackled. We must share actively with Him. Some of us do. All of us should. Without it, we lose our vision of God.

"I listen to the agony of God—
I who am fed,
Who never yet went hungry for lack of bread—
I see the dead,
The children starved for lack of bread—
I see, and try to pray.

"I listen to the agony of God—
I who am warm,
Who never yet have lacked a sheltering home.
In dull alarm
The dispossessed of hut and farm
Aimless and transient roam.

"I listen to the agony of God—
I who am strong,
With health and love and laughter in my soul.
I see a throng
Of stunted children reared in wrong,
And wish to make them whole.

"I listen to the agony of God,
But know full well
That not until I share their bitter cry—
Earth's pain and hell—
Can God within my spirit dwell,
Or bring His Kingdom nigh."

—Author unknown.

On this Labor Sunday, 1950, we find many dark and demonic forces at work, too. God is not the only worker in this earth. The suffering of humanity in many lands must oppress the Christian conscience almost beyond endurance—and thrust him out to work with God. Any "ill-clad body protests every idle machine. A homeless or poorly housed family pulls at the sinews of every idle hand. A slave worker anywhere jeopardizes the rights of all freemen." A human being engaging in any type of fratricide is an anomaly for one who claims God is his Father. Any person on earth, still bound in his sin, is a monument to the sloth of all Christians who are sin-free because of the working of the Son of God who "bare our sins in His own body on the three."

Under His sovereign dominion, yet in many cases working at variance with God and the good of mankind, the workers of time, death, and sin militate against the purposes of His Christ. God is working for something great and good for every human being, but time, death, and sin let no grass grow under their deadly feet. God needs workers who share His spirit, His compassion, His objectives.

"Time worketh, let me work too.
Time undoeth, O let me do.
As busy as time my work I'll ply,
Till I rest in the rest of eternity.

"Death worketh, let me work too.
Death undoeth, O let me do.
As busy as death my work I'll ply,
Till I rest in the rest of eternity.

"Sin worketh, let me work too.
Sin undoeth, O let me do.
As busy as sin, my work I'll ply,
Till I rest in the rest of eternity.

"Christ worketh, let me work too.
Christ bindeth up, O let me bind too.
As busy as Christ my work I'll ply,
Till I rest in the rest of eternity—but not now."

—Author unknown.

Through the streets of Detroit and Pittsburgh and Vancouver the Great Householder comes seeking workers for His vineyard. Those who want to work will be hired. They will receive just wages in this life, and reap wages for life eternal. Want to work?

You will have great companions: Jesus, Peter, Paul, and the apostolic succession of laborers of every vocation who have caught the secret of life and can say with their Master in a new and true sense, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

Research on Rain—"Let's Do Something About the Weather"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, H. R. 9579, to authorize a research and experimental program in the field of rain-making to be carried on by the Soil Conservation Service and the United States Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture.

The Government is spending hundreds of millions of dollars every year in the field of water conservation and irrigation. It is spending millions of dollars every year to protect and develop our forests. My proposal is that we utilize resources and equipment of the Government and bring together the developing knowledge on the subject of cloud physics and try to develop a practical application of current knowledge and skills in the modifying of clouds.

RELATED TO WATER CONSERVATION

My interest in water conservation, of course, began before I came to Congress and much of the legislation in which I have taken an active interest relates to the conservation and use of water. The so-called Case-Wheeler Act of 1939–40 was designed to aid the construction of small dams.

Numerous flood control studies have been made under resolutions which I have presented to the Committee on Flood Control and Public Works. Many dams, large and small, have been constructed or begun under appropriations which I have proposed and supported. Over 50,000 stock water dams have been built in South Dakota since I was first elected to Congress in 1936 with the slogan "A dam (or live water), some trees, and a watered garden on every farm."

But withal, the conviction persists that the most natural way to use water is in the form of rain, and the best way to get it where you want it is to take it in the form of rain. It is a maxim in water conservation to use water as nearly as possible where it falls, and then use and re-use it as it moves to the sea.

Hence, it has been with more than ordinary interest that I have read various articles on the subject of making rain. Early in July, this year, I read an article in the Country Gentleman, entitled "They Really Do Make It Rain" which convinced me the time had arrived to do something about the weather and not merely talk about it.

So, I suggested to Harry Marshall of the Marshall Flying Service at Rapid City, S. Dak., that if he would undertake a flight or two, I would pay the necessary expenses for some dry ice and operation of the plane to see if there was anything to this talk about getting clouds to shed their moisture.

Mr. Marshall, most interested and cooperative, and O. H. Barnett, of the Fairmont Creamery, supplied dry ice for one of the flights. Members of the local press became interested and E. L. "Paddy" Ingvaldson, managing editor of the Rapid City Daily Journal, flew with Marshall and personally seeded the clouds, using a cup to sprinkle the dry ice.

Jim McKay, of radio station KOTA, and Bob Lee, editor of the Sunday Journal, chartered another plane to follow the rain makers and took pictures of them in their operations.

RESULTS OF OUR AMATEUR EFFORTS

Two flights were made. The first, on July 9, was under what Marshall thought were favorable conditions. The humidity was about 75 percent, high for western South Dakota.

The boys had to go up to 12,000 feet to get above the cloud they selected. Shortly after they started seeding it, the top of the cloud began to puff up and eventually the cloud boiled up light and fluffy to about 18,000 feet, while the lower part got darker.

Eventually the cloud broke loose, about 45 minutes after the seeding started, and rain fell over a strip about 5 miles wide and 15 miles long according to reports turned in later.

The second flight on July 10 had less spectacular results, but possibly contributed as much to our amateur knowledge on the subject. Only a light cloud was found and the humidity this day was only 25 percent.

After this seeding, the boys found themselves in a light snowstorm when they dropped down to the lower part of the cloud. They were inclined to discount this, but reading of the experiments of Dr. Langmuir suggests to me that this was as much to be expected under the conditions prevailing and the techniques used as was the rain of the day before.

Since then, numerous articles have appeared on the subject. Among them:

Precipitation From Cumulus Clouds by Seeding Techniques, by Irving Langmuir, associate director of the General Electric Laboratory, Schenectady, N. Y., in Science, July 14, 1950.

There's Danger in Rain-Making, in Parade, a metropolitan Sunday newspaper supplement for August 27, 1950.

Weather or Not, in the current number of Time magazine, August 28, 1950, which featured Dr. Langmuir on its cover.

Also, in mid-July, the United States Air Force put out a news release on its "project cirrus." This reported on a project conducted by General Electric for the Signal Corps and joined in by naval and Air Force personnel.

An earlier project, Cloud Physics, was conducted by the Weather Bureau, United States Air Force, and the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I learn.

Life magazine recently carried a short feature on the results attained by New York City in refilling its reservoirs. Dry last spring, they are now back to 93 percent of normal.

The Weather Bureau is guarded, if not pessimistic, in its comments on the cloud physics project, but the Air Force is more encouraging in comment on the later cirrus project.

The general tenor of all the articles, however, is that clouds can be modified, hail possibly controlled, and moisture precipitated by the cooling effects of seeding either with dry ice or silver iodide. High humidity helps.

Since these conclusions tallied with those of Harry Marshall in our little experiment in South Dakota, I decided to discuss the matter with A. E. Jones, of the Soil Conservation Service. He, I found, attended a lecture on the subject by Langmuir a couple years ago.

Jones pointed out the great potential values in forest-fire control as well as benefits to marginal crops and grasses. So, we drew up a bill to authorize a research and experimental program to be conducted jointly by Soil Conservation and Forest Services.

I introduced the bill today so that the Government agencies can study it and prepare their reports for the consideration of Congress in January. H. R. 9579 reads as follows:

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research and experiments with respect to methods of controlling and producing precipitation in moisture-deficient areas

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Soil Conservation Service and Foreign Service, shall conduct such research and experiments and shall take such further action as may be necessary to perfect at the earliest possible date methods of causing rain to fall in deficient areas to provide supplemental moisture for production of crops and grasses, prevention of forest fires, protection of municipal water supplies, and other purposes.

SEC. 2. (a) The Department of Commerce and other Federal agencies possessing meteorological and other records and data pertinent to the accomplishment of the purposes of this act shall make such records and data available to the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) Any excess Government property and equipment which the Secretary of Agriculture finds suitable for use and necessary in accomplishing the purposes of this act shall be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture without compensation therefor.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums, as the Congress may from time to time deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

In response to my request, the Library of Congress has prepared a digest of various articles on the subject, which, under permission given, I place in the RECORD at this point:

ARTIFICIAL PRODUCTION OF RAIN

GENERAL STATEMENT

It is not yet possible to scientifically measure the results of the experiments designed to artificially produce rain. Some sources, such as Dr. Irving Langmuir,[1] Nobel prize winner, are optimistic about these results while other sources, particularly the United States Weather Bureau, are pessimistic.

In recent years much effort has been devoted to attempting to solve the problems of controlling weather. The two most important efforts were the cloud physics project and project Cirrus. The cloud physics project was a cooperative effort of the United States Weather Bureau, United States Air Forces, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Project Cirrus was conducted by General Electric Co. scientists under contract with the Signal Corps and the Navy Department with the aid of Air Forces aircraft and personnel. In addition to these tests there are the much publicized rain-making efforts of New York City and numerous other attempts of less significance.

[1] Associate director of the General Electric Research Laboratory and Nobel prize winner in chemistry in 1932.

CLOUD PHYSICS PROJECT

The Air Forces and Weather Bureau issued a joint statement of the results of the cloud physics project which indicated that cloud seeding was unimportant in the production of rain.[2]

The release stated:

"The cloud physics project gathered the information during research flights throughout last winter and also on the cumulus or billowy types of clouds common to central Ohio during the spring and summer months. These experiments indicated that cloud seeding did not normally result in precipitation in amounts of economic importance, and that there was little evidence that cloud seeding will start a storm.

"Perhaps the most important development of the experiments was the discovery that the seeding of clouds by water, dry ice, or chemical agents—such as vapor forms of lead oxide or silver iodide—frequently results in the rapid dissipation of those portions of cumulus clouds exposed to the vapor. In 10 out of 79 tests dissipation was noted. The investigators expressed the opinion that this dissipation rather than new development (or precipitation) was the rule."

PROJECT CIRRUS

The reports thus far concerning the results of Project Cirrus experiments are definitely optimistic. Of one experiment, Dr. Langmuir states: [3]

"It has, for example, been determined, I believe, with certainty that substantially all of the rain from the whole of New Mexico that fell on October 14 and 15, 1948, was the result of the seeding operation near Albuquerque. The odds in favor of this conclusion as compared to the assumption that the rain was due to natural causes are many millions to one."

In speaking of certain operations under way in Honduras for the United Fruit Co., Dr. Langmuir said: [4]

"This year in Honduras the dry season continued during April and May and there were no general rains. However, large clouds rising to 18,000 feet and often much more formed nearby every day along the Great Divide and usually formed also near Pijol Peak and sometimes near Santa Barbara Mountain. These clouds reached far above the freezing level which was usually at above 16,000 feet."

CLOUDS INCREASE IN HEIGHT

"By seeding with single pellets of dry ice at about 18,000 to 20,000 feet, these clouds could be profoundly modified. The largest clouds usually increased greatly in height and gave heavy rain and the cloud base lowered several thousand feet. The smaller clouds gave moderate amounts of rain of a short duration, and part of the cloud above the freezing level often lifted off and separated from the lower part. By water seeding, using several balloons and making passes into the side of the cloud, these clouds could be made to give rain without increasing in height. In this way, the clouds could be prevented from developing into a thunderstorm.

"By the trickler technique it has been possible to detach the upper portions of large cumulus clouds from the lower part and prevent the growth of the cloud and the development of heavy rain."

[2] Joint Air Forces-U. S. Weather Bureau release for Sunday newspapers, November 28, 1948.

[3] General Electric Research Laboratory. Occasional Report No. 24, Project Cirrus. June 1, 1950, p. 2.

[4] General Electric Research Laboratory. Occasional Report No. 25, Project Cirrus. July 1, 1950, page 15.

Dr. Langmuir has described his thoughts on the factors involved in producing rain as follows: [5]

"For many years, I have developed some philosophical ideas in regard to cause and effect relationships in science. The causality that used to be characteristic of classical physics applies strictly only to convergent phenomena which depend upon a large number of separate particles or separate events which converge to a well-defined average. There are, however, in atomic physics, as well as in human affairs and meteorological phenomena, what may be called divergent phenomena where some large important events grow from small beginnings which produce divergent results. Shower formations such as those in arid regions like New Mexico are good examples of divergent phenomena.

"On this basis, the synoptic situation is important only, insofar as it determines the probability that a shower will occur. It does not directly cause the shower to occur at a given time and place.

"The situation is like that of the evaporation of molecules from the surface of a liquid or solid. A rise in temperature increases the probability that a particular molecule on the surface will evaporate, but it is not the direct cause of evaporation of that molecule at that time and place."

SCHAEFER'S EXPERIMENTS SIGNIFICANT

"Laboratory experiments by Vincent Schaefer have proved beyond question, I believe, that ice crystals never form spontaneously in the atmosphere unless foreign sublimation nuclei are present or unless the temperature is lowered below −39° C. and the air is supersaturated with respect to ice.

"I believe that meteorological knowledge and all observations in project Cirrus are in accord with this conclusion.

"Whenever ice crystals form in clouds having temperatures above −39° C., we may be sure that sublimation nuclei are present. Some air masses contain adequate numbers of such nuclei.

"Other times we know that they are not present in quantities sufficient to account for the development of snowstorms, even when the clouds rise to 30,000 feet or more. In the Tropics we see many cases where clouds have no significant number of ice crystals until they reach the temperature of −39° C. If the cloud rises to a height that gives this low temperature, the supercooled water droplets suddenly change to ice crystals and produce a peculiar kind of anvil top usually in the form of a pancake, a very symmetrical and smooth structureless disk. Because of the heat evolved the top floats away as a cirrus streamer, and it may be said that the cloud acts as though it is pumping cirrus. We occasionally see such clouds in New Mexico, but more frequently in the Tropics.

"Schaefer's experiments have proved that in the atmosphere the number of nuclei can vary enormously, sometimes being only a few per cubic meter and in other cases reaching a few per cubic centimeter, the ratio perhaps being 1 to 10.

"A very important point is this: Since the atmosphere nearly always does contain some nuclei, a supercooled cloud of the convective type will contain some ice crystals when its temperature gets down to the point where the nuclei are effective; but unless there is a chain reaction by which these nuclei multiply in number to an unlimited degree, there will be no possibility of producing a heavy rain shower as a thunderstorm."

CHAIN REACTION NECESSARY

"It is just this fact that a heavy shower begins only when a chain reaction sets up the necessary requirements for a self-propagating storm that, I believe, establishes the conditions which make the beginning of a storm an act of probability, rather than a definite relation of cause and effect.

"For these reasons, I propose the following theory which determines the probability that showers will occur under given conditions."

LANGMUIR'S THREE CONDITIONS

"In order that a shower may occur, it is, first, of all, necessary to have nuclei.

"Second, it is necessary to have a synoptic situation such that cumulus clouds form and lift the nuclei up to a level at which they can turn into ice crystals.

"Next, it is essential that the ice crystals either accumulate or in some way multiply to set up a chain reaction and bring about a run-away effect in the cloud, which causes heavy rain to form.

"Now, in general, there are factors that prevent the growth of cumulus clouds.

"In the morning there is stability in the atmosphere; there are cold layers of air down below. When the air becomes heated by the sun and the lapse rate increases and the conditions are favorable for forming cumulus clouds, only with certain factors present will all the conditions arise that are necessary to establish a chain reaction. This will occur in particularly favorable locations where the nuclei concentrations are just right."

NEW YORK CITY'S EXPERIENCE

New York City, because of a serious water shortage last winter, hired Dr. Wallace E. Howell to attempt to produce rain in the watershed areas of its reservoirs. In summing up the results of his efforts Dr. Howell stated, "I have made rain." [6] He added that his experiments probably had produced "very little rain that would not have fallen anyway." During the first 6 months of Dr. Howell's work, rainfall was 6 percent above normal in the Catskill watersheds.[7] On August 22, 1950, the Catskill and Croton reservoirs were 84.3 percent full as compared to 69.3 percent full a year ago.[8]

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

There has been no specific Federal legislation designed to set up Federal research or cooperation in the field of artificial weather controls. Two bills were introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, S. 1796 and H. R. 4623, to provide indemnity for contractors with any agency of the National Military Establishment against claims arising out of contracts for cloud modification research and development, and for other purposes.

SEEDING OF CLOUDS TO DESTROY HAIL

We have no Air Forces reports of research on the seeding of clouds to destroy hail. However, information on many aspects of the work being done to control weather is not available because of military restrictions. Perhaps an indication of the possible results of seeding clouds to destroy hail may be seen in this story from the Kiplinger magazine: [9]

"In the Rogue River Valley of Oregon, hail is one of the greatest problems the pear growers have. In 1948 hail wiped out half the marketable crop. Some of the orchardists heard of man-made weather, pooled $15,000 and hired two ex-Navy pilots, E. K. Kooser and H. M. Brandau, to try to stop the hail before it got started.

"The pilots began experiments early last summer. Every time they saw a thunderhead rising behind the mountains, they took off and seeded the cloud with a substance, the nature of which is still secret. In each case, the cloud melted into rain. It 1948 hail had done nearly $3,000,000 worth of damage to Rogue River pears. In 1949, there was no damage. Naturally the two ex-Navy fliers have been signed up for another season."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we are proposing in H. R. 9579 to enter a very practical field that could mean a great deal to the economy of the country and the welfare of the Nation's resources.

[5] General Electric Research Laboratory. Occasional Report No. 22, Project Cirrus. July 15, 1950, pp. 1–3.

[6] New York Times, August 8, 1950.

[7] New York Times, August 18, 1950.

[8] New York Times, August 23, 1950.

[9] Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine, August 1950, pp. 22–23.

World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by Dr. Hamilton Holt, honorary president of Rollins College, who has long been a worker and an acknowledged leader in the world government movement, and who is a distinguished citizen of Florida, a distinguished citizen of Connecticut, and a distinguished servant in the public interest.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(This is the first public statement issued by Dr. Hamilton Holt, honorary president of Rollins College, since he arrived in Winter Park to spend the winter. He is an acknowledged leader in the world government movement and is one of the few surviving members of the group of pioneer peace workers who organized the League to Enforce Peace before World War I, and were influential in bringing about, through President Wilson, the League of Nations.)

To the EDITOR:

In the great wave of soul-searching discussion that has swept the world since President Truman's brief statement giving the green light signal to go ahead with the so-called hydrogen bomb, little attention has been given, comparatively speaking, to the President's pledge that this and other efforts for developing atomic weapons will be carried on until a satisfactory plan for international control of atomic energy is achieved. We shall also continue to examine all these factors that affect our program for peace and this country's security.

This pledge, far more important than the decision to make the bomb, is momentous in its implications, for it means that the hydrogen bomb is not an end in itself, adequate to insure justice, peace, and security, but a necessary evil that must be developed, supported, and endured, until at least some sort of world organization is established to control or abolish it.

The President has naturally not specified ways and means, for no man who is spokesman for his country in foreign affairs can commit himself in advance to a detailed formula for future action.

Woodrow Wilson once said to a delegation of us from the League to Enforce Peace who waited upon him at the White House to ask him to endorse the League's program, that he approved of it and wished us God-speed, but

if he committed himself to it specifically, his opponents at the coming Versailles Peace Conference would have the advantage of knowing just where he stood, whereas he must be perfectly free to get more or take less than our program without being charged with inconsistency.

Theodore Roosevelt likewise said to me when I urged him to take a certain forward stand in the peace movement, that a man who is or has been President of the United States should not be asked to pioneer at the initial stages of any movement, however good. "Let others sow the seed," he said, "but let him reap the harvest."

But the movement for peace and security has gone far beyond the stage of seed sowing. It is now accepted by most men of understanding and good will throughout the world, that world peace is the outcome of world justice, world justice is the outcome of world law, world law is the outcome of world government, and world government is the outcome of world political organization. This is the logical and inescapable sequence if man's efforts are to bring about peace on earth. So far it has been mostly an ideal that must some day come true by the very laws of evolution. But the atomic bomb and now the hydrogen bomb with terrifying suddenness have transformed this ideal to be worked for, into the most immediate, practical, and pressing problem before mankind.

For the issue is no longer the issue of peace versus war from which nations could recover as it has been throughout the ages—but peace versus the possible if not probable destruction of the human race.

The creation of the hydrogen bomb, while urged in many quarters as a guaranty for peace and security, is in reality not a preparation for peace, but a preparation for war. All expert scientific and military opinion agrees that there is no sure defense against atomic bombs. If follows, therefore, that other nations who fear for their security will be forced to enter the armament race whose logical outcome must be bankruptcy for all save the strongest, and moral bankruptcy at that. Adequate preparedness for all nations is a mathematical, philosophical, and physical impossibility. The fact is, there is no such thing as absolute preparedness. That is why the generals and admirals are never satisfied. All preparedness is relative.

Preparedness will undoubtedly make us better prepared if war comes. But when has preparedness in itself stopped a nation from attacking another, no matter how prepared that nation may be? Of course, making ourselves militarily strong may prevent a small or weak nation from attacking us. But where does history afford an example of even the most powerfully armed nation ever being immune from attack from lesser armed nations when the war lust is aroused? Certainly before both World Wars Germany was the most powerfully armed and militarily trained nation on earth, and yet it did not prevent lesser armed nations from declaring war on her and winning the war. And so, if we become the mightiest military force on earth, that in itself will not make us immune from attack.

The reason why people are often confused over the right and wrong, the wisdom and the unwisdom of preparedness, is that they fail to see the moral implications in the three ways that force can be exerted in international relations and, indeed, in human affairs. First, force may be used for attack, which we call aggression. Second, force may be used to repel attack, which we call defense. Third, force may be used as an agent of law and order, which we call police force.

Force used for aggression is wholly wrong, for it means the aggressor is judge, jury, and executioner in his own cause, and that has long since been outlawed by civilized nations, not only within their own borders but within all political subdivisions within their borders.

Force for defense is either wholly good or a necessary evil, and must exist as long as the possibility of aggression exists. Otherwise a nation courts the tragedy of defeat, dissolution, and enslavement.

Police force is wholly good, for it is the force used to bring the culprit before the law, and law and reason then takes its normal course. Theodore Roosevelt once said, "The function of the battleship is to pound the enemy into insensibility"; and there is no place in that aggressive procedure for reason to play a part. The policeman, on the other hand, uses the minimum, not the maximum, amount of force, not to pound the culprit into insensibility, but to bring him alive before the court and then the court pronounces sentence on the basis of reason and justice.

Let President Truman, therefore, instruct our representatives at the Assembly and Council of the United Nations to urge the calling of a constitutional convention under article 109 of the Charter to revise the charter so that there will be at the earliest possible moment a world government with power to make, interpret, and enforce laws for peace on earth.

A United Nations as now constituted cannot maintain peace for the reason that it is a league of sovereign nations in which each nation is equally sovereign in the same area. It has no world laws and no power to enforce them even if they existed. Its charter is a multilateral treaty signed by 58 separate nations, each one of which by the specific provisions of the charter has the sovereign right at any time of deciding whether it will make war.

If President Truman will now proclaim to the world that the only ultimate way to bring peace on earth is to develop the 58 members of the United Nations from a league of sovereign nations into a world government, then he can say that in view of the pending establishment of such a perfected United Nations we will use the hydrogen bomb if attack comes to us from the aggression of any other nation.

Nearly 100 years ago Victor Hugo prophesied that the day would come when the only battlefield would be the market opening to commerce and the mind opening to new ideas. Nothing will do so much to hasten the coming of that day as for the United States to lead in the establishment of a world government. It is our privilege and duty to do this, not only because it will help to bring us and the world nearer the golden days of peace, but for a higher reason. The supreme issue before the world today is really moral, if not spiritual. It is how to substitute reason for force, right for might, law for war, in the conduct of human affairs. We now have the United Nations, the farthest step yet taken, it is true, by the nations for peace; yet it is but a confederation of sovereign states with no sovereign authority over them.

When our forefathers met at Independence Hall more than a century and a half ago, they took no counsel of cowardice but mutually pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the document they framed. And what happened? The United States of America happened. So now, let us take no counsel of cowardice, but mutually pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to the establishment of a world government. We may have to set it up at first without Russia and her satellites, as our fathers set up the United States before New York, Virginia, South Carolina, and Rhode Island joined.

So away with delay and hesitation. Away with self-delusion that makes excuses for nonaction when the bombs tick louder.

The hour has struck. It is not yet too late, but can it be much later?

HAMILTON HOLT.

WINTER PARK, FLA., *February 13, 1950.*

Wood—Alabama's No. 1 Agricultural Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, 19,000,000 of Alabama's 32,690,000 acres, or 59 percent of its land area, is covered with forests, and therefore devoted to the production of Alabama's No. 1 crop—wood.

Alabama has 33,000,000,000 board feet of saw timber, and 105,000,000 cords of pulpwood, with a stumpage value of more than half a billion dollars. Its harvested value would be several times this amount and its manufactured value many times this amount.

In 1948, Alabama's wood sale values, at the green lumber and raw pulp stages, amounted to $209,000,000. Alabama's cotton and cottonseed, immediately after ginning had a value of $202,000,000. Thus, proof that wood is Alabama's No. 1 crop.

As a part of my remarks, I insert an article by T. D. Stevens and W. K. Livingston, of the Department of Forestry of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, entitled "Wood, Alabama's No. 1 Agricultural Crop," which appeared in the August 1950 issue of the Alabama Lumberman:

WOOD, ALABAMA'S NO. 1 AGRICULTURAL CROP

(By T. D. Stevens and K. W. Livingston, Department of Forestry, Alabama Polytechnic Institute)

Stop for a moment and look around you. The chances are your eye will fall on wood in some form. Wood is man's universal material. We see it in trees, houses, furniture, clothing, paper, plastics and many other items too numerous to mention. In fact wood has a profound influence on our everyday life. Without it life would be very difficult indeed. Despite wood's universality, few people realize the importance of wood to our over-all economy.

Let's consider wood as it relates to Alabama. The total land area of Alabama is approximately 32,690,000 acres. Of this total, almost 19,000,000 are forested. Thus 59 percent or well over half of all the land in Alabama is producing wood. Like cotton, corn, and peanuts, wood is an agricultural crop. The only difference lies in the fact that most agricultural crops can be produced in 1 year, whereas wood to be grown to commercial size usually requires at least a couple of decades.

Wood is Alabama's No. 1 agricultural crop if for no other reason than the fact that it is grown on more acres of land than all other crops combined.

The total wood volume on our commercial forest land is calculated to be 13,620,000,000 cubic feet (table 1). Converting the cubic foot to more common units, we have 33,361,000,000 board feet of saw timber, and in addition, 105,000,000 cords of pulpwood. Based on stumpage value of $10 a thousand board feet and $1.50 a cord, the total stumpage value of the State's forest resource amounts to almost half a billion dollars. Obviously, the harvested value of this resource would be several times, and the manufactured value many times as great.

According to the latest figures available, the annual net growth on Alabama commercial forest land is in the neighborhood of 750,000,000 cubic feet of wood (table 2). On

the other hand, cutting is at the rate of 713,000,000 cubic feet per year. These figures indicate that Alabama's forests are producing more than is being harvested. Unfortunately, however, these figures are not as reassuring as they appear at first glance. Considering only saw timber, the present annual drain just about balances growth. Conversely, a few years ago, under the stress of war, cutting far outstripped growth. In 1944, for example, the drain on saw timber was 45 percent greater than the growth. In an expanding economy such as the Nation is currently enjoying, the threat of overcutting is ever present.

TABLE 1.—*Standing timber in Alabama, 1945*

Species class	Volume [1]	
	Saw timber	All timber [2]
	Million board feet	*Million cubic feet*
Softwood	20,681	6,821
Hardwood	12,680	6,799
All species	33,361	13,620

[1] From U. S. Forest Service Reappraisal, 1945.
[2] Stems of softwoods and stems and branches of hardwoods to a 4-inch minimum diameter inside bark.

TABLE 2.—*Timber growth and drain [1] in Alabama, 1944*

Species class	Saw timber (million board feet)			All timber (million cubic feet)		
	Current annual growth	Current annual drain	Net increment	Current annual growth	Current annual drain	Net increment
Softwood	1,392	1,917	−525	452	426	+26
Hardwood	629	1,013	−384	298	287	+11
All species	2,021	2,930	−909	750	713	+37

[1] From U. S. Forest Service Reappraisal, 1945.

The obvious answer lies in increasing the productiveness of our forest lands. At present cutting in Alabama is in the neighborhood of 2,000,000,000 board feet of lumber a year. The amazing thing about this is that it comes from lands producing less than half of their capacity. Production can best be increased through good silvicultural practices. This means better cutting practices, adequate protection, particularly with reference to wildfire, and artificial reforestation in some instances.

Frequently when comparing the value of wood to other agricultural crops the figures used for wood are those representing the stumpage value of wood removed from farm woodlots. This practice is, of course, erroneous since the true picture cannot be obtained without considering all the wood harvested regardless of land ownership. Furthermore, if comparisons as to value are to be drawn between agricultural crops, they must be made at comparable production levels. For example, one cannot feasibly compare the stumpage value of wood with the ginned value of cotton. If a comparison is to be made with ginned cotton, wood should be evaluated at the green lumber, raw pulp, or similar production stages of other wood products.

Table 3 sets forth the annual values of Alabama wood products at production levels comparable to ginned cotton. As shown in the table, the annual value of these raw products is approximately $209,300,000. In comparison, the annual value of cotton lint and cottonseed produced in Alabama is approximately $202,000,000.

TABLE 3.—*Alabama wood harvest, 1948*

Product	Unit of measure	Amount [1]	Value [2]
		Thousands	*Millions of dollars*
Rough lumber, all	Million feet board measure.	2,145	85.8
Pine	do	1,497	
Hardwood	do	648	
Wood pulp	Ton	[3] 628	95.7
Stump wood	do	137	.7
Fuel wood	Cord	[4] 1,687	13.5
Crude gum	400-pound barrel.	87	1.7
Cross ties	Piece	1,268	2.5
Mine props and ties	do	5,853	5.9
Poles and piles	do	617	2.0
Fence posts	do	[4] 10,000	1.5
Total value			209.3

[1] Except where noted, from State severance tax report, 1948.
[2] Where unit values were not known, they were conservatively estimated from the best information available.
[3] Determined by conversion of the number of cords of pulpwood (941,477) shown in the severance tax report.
[4] Estimated.

Table 4 gives the values at comparable levels of production for wood and other leading agricultural crops. Table 4 clearly illustrates the importance of wood to the agricultural economy of the State. When acres of forest land are considered as well as raw material value, wood is indubitably Alabama's No. 1 agricultural crop.

TABLE 4.—*Comparison of values [1] of Alabama's wood crop and other agricultural raw materials, 1948*

Product	Sale value	
	Millions of dollars	Percent
Wood	209	33.8
Cotton lint and seed	202	32.6
Livestock and products	130	21.0
Peanuts	33	5.3
Corn (sold)	11	1.8
All other crops	34	5.5
Total	619	100.0

[1] The values of all crops except wood were supplied by Mr. Foy Helms, agricultural economist with the extension service, Alabama Polytechnic Institute.

The International Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable LAURIE BATTLE, of Birmingham, Ala., has written a very interesting and thought-provoking article entitled "The International Crisis" which deals with current world problems.

Mr. BATTLE's article appeared in the August 1950 issue of the Merchants Journal. I include the article and commend it to the attention of the House:

THE INTERNATIONAL CRISIS—"WE FACE A LONG-DRAWN-OUT FIGHT FOR OUR EXISTENCE"

(By LAURIE C. BATTLE, Member of Congress from Jefferson County)

As we go about our daily work, thoughts of the international crisis in Korea hang over our heads like an ominous shadow and dominate all of our thinking and activity. It has been over 6 weeks since the Russian-inspired invasion of South Korea, and since the United Nations went into action to repel the invaders.

The safest estimate of this international crisis is that we face a long-drawn-out fight for our existence. Russia is determined to dominate the world one way or another. Her tactics in Korea show the world that she is willing to do it by armed aggression if she cannot accomplish it by insidous infiltration. We face an all-out war if Russia goes much further, or we face the temptation of false security when we win temporary victories. They are equally dangerous and we must be prepared to meet either contingency.

Yet we still believe and pray that the fighting in Korea can be isolated and prevented from spreading into world war III. If this can be done, then we should be capable mentally, spiritually, and physically of bringing about a new era of peace and prosperity because we will have learned that it is necessary to stop aggression before it gets started and threatens the peace and security of the world.

Ever since being in Congress, and particularly since becoming a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee last session, I have suggested and urged that we initiate a stronger policy in the Far East. We did not do so. On the contrary, we gave the Russians an open invitation to go into Korea by stating openly that we would not defend it. Then, of course, they did go into Korea. So we found ourselves faced with the dire prospect of Russia taking over the entire Far East, country by country, as she overran the countries in the west; faced with the reality of Russia getting stronger by the day, while we were becoming more and more impotent. Soon Russia would have been in a position to make a devastating atomic-bomb attack on the United States. We are hopeful that our eyes have been opened in time.

Now for the first time in history, the United Nations' flag is flying over international troops and we, the United States, have been called on to lead this bold venture. It is the first time the Security Council has authorized military action against an aggressor nation. Although America is carrying most of the load now the weight of the other nations on our side will be felt more and more as time goes by. It must be remembered that other fronts are in danger as well as Korea. This action to stop Russia is all the more important when we realize that no single nation can prevent war and preserve peace throughout the world by herself. This action by the United Nations was possible only because of a Russian blunder. When Russia boycotted the Security Council and withheld her usual veto, she made it possible for the Council to take firm, swift, and constructive action in behalf of what is right and honest and decent in the world—in behalf of peace and democracy. Now Russia has realized that blunder, and has returned to the Council tables of the United Nations. It is my deep and sincere hope that she will not be able to block the United Nations' valiant efforts for world peace.

As a result of the tragic invasion of Korea, we should learn the hard lesson that it will be necessary in the future for us to abandon the policy of retaliation and invest our time, money and efforts in a policy of war prevention. Our whole defense is built on the basis of retaliation, on the basis of what we will do after we have been attacked. Our policy has been to wait, to sit back, to take a beating, and then struggle to our feet and whip the offending bully. We have always been saved by time, distance, and strong allies. But we have none of these things between us and the enemy now, and we had better not count on them.

We must first strengthen ourselves, and continue to speed the building up of our Armed Forces so that we will be second to

none in power. We must keep developing our equipment so that it will be second to none, and continue an extensive program of research, especially on the atom and hydrogen bombs, guided missiles, and so forth. The stronger we make ourselves, the more dependable we make our allies. And we are in real need of dependable allies.

On the home front, we must gear our economy for the greatest production to help back up our boys on the fighting front. As we see industrial mobilization coming on, we realize that some controls are going to be necessary to insure stability, protection and fair treatment for all. The main lesson in controls that we learned the hard way in World War II is the interdependence of one economic factor upon another. It is impossible to control one segment of our economy without throwing the whole system out of kelter. For example, a policy of priorities and allocations without price control is an open invitation to inflation and economic disaster. Likewise, the price of pork should not be controlled unless the price of corn which the hogs eat is also controlled, and so on.

As this is being written there is much confusion because the President has insisted on allocation, priorities, and credit control, while there has been a demand throughout the country for price and wage controls. Many groups are strongly in favor of controlling every group except their own. However, some groups have advocated complete overall controls on themselves as well as everybody else on the basis that this is the fairest course and the best method of insuring a quick victory. They feel it is also the best way to insure relief from burdensome controls when they are no longer needed, as everybody will be for the repeal of them at that time.

As I said before, if the successful conclusion of this crisis takes total industrial and military mobilization, then I am for it. Time will tell whether or not Stalin is going to set fire to the houses in other critical areas around the world. If this happens, an all-out economic effort will be absolutely necessary to insure military victory. In such case I believe that every segment of our society should share the burden of controls equally. We are now debating this vital issue in the House, and I hope this body will have sufficient time, courage, and insight to arrive at a workable bill that will do the job. We cannot afford to fall short.

In order to keep our economy sound enough to withstand the strain that is being placed on it, a "pay as we go" policy should be adopted immediately. We have a debt of nearly $264,000,000,000 already, and we must not lose the peace by ruining our economy. This would mean a Communist victory, too. The only chance we have of avoiding an economic disaster is to pay as we go. This will necessitate the raising of taxes to meet the demands. In addition to being the soundest policy, it would not be fair to ask our boys to fight a war and then return home to carry the brunt of the war debt.

And what if we are successful in localizing this Korean war. Suppose we take all the immediate steps I have discussed, strengthen our Armed Forces, mobilize our industry, maintain a sound economy, and whip the Communists in Korea. What can we expect for the future?

The loss of lives in Korea today should indicate to us that our foreign policy has fallen down somewhere, and something should be done about it. The responsibility of shaping the course of democracy in the free world we are striving for is too grave a burden for the Executive alone. Our foreign policy must be built on a broader base which will not only bring trained minds with varying backgrounds into use, but will produce a medium through which the public and Congress will feel a direct participation in the formulation of policies which affect them so directly and which they are later called upon to support. To accomplish this purpose I have introduced a bill calling for the creation of a Foreign Affairs Advisory Commission to advise and consult with the President, and thereby broaden the base on which our policy is formed. The Commission would be composed of 12 members, broadly representative of the public and well-informed in national and international affairs, including representatives of the Congress and the Executive. Through this Commission, responsibility would be broadened, and, I believe, a means provided for giving the public and Congress added confidence in the foreign side of our national policy.

What other steps can we take to advance toward the peaceful world we all long for? Annually we spend billions of dollars on our Armed Forces for defense—including the operation of two great academies, Naval and Military, for preparing our officers for war. Why can't we spend a few pennies, relatively speaking, toward the prevention of these wars? I have introduced a bill in Congress which I feel would make a positive investment in peace by establishing an Academy on World Affairs. I propose that this academy train some of our best people from all walks of life and from every section of the country, in national and international relations, so that they may represent our Government ably in the international field. They should be chosen on a basis of merit through open, competitive examinations. To whatever tasks they set themselves, whether in foreign service or here at home, these experts trained in world affairs would help spread enlightened ideas and make a real contribution to world peace.

Freedom-loving people the world over should press the advantage of our combined peace offensive. When today's fight is won—as it will be—let us not stop short of reorganizing the United Nations to make it capable of preventing war under any conditions. World peace must not depend upon a wrong move or blunder by Russia, or by any other greedy nation. Hitler proved that the waiting, appeasement process is too costly and deadly. World peace must be won and preserved by the right moves of America, the UN, and the freedom-loving countries everywhere. I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 15, calling for the revision of the United Nations Charter to make it capable of preventing war. Otherwise, we are going to find ourselves in a constant struggle for existence, under a progressively higher tax load and in a regimented economy. The UN must be made able to actively take effective police action against aggressor nations. We must equip the UN with a fire alarm system that can detect the smoke of an international clash before it breaks into a four-alarm fire. If we can give the UN a police force—it could serve as the fire department to put out these conflagrations while they are still in the smoldering stage.

There is one very important sphere of action in which we can all take part, which we should not overlook when we are drawing the blueprints for a peaceful world. The idealistic and the best solution to our international difficulties would be a moral reawakening throughout the world. That places a tremendous responsibility upon our religious and political leaders, as well as on each one of us; a responsibility which to date has not been successfully met. Until such time as we are successful in bringing about conditions where nations truly feel that they are their brother's keeper, and until nations will follow the golden rule of "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," it will be necessary for us to stay adequately prepared to stop an aggressor nation before it attacks us, and it will be necessary to create a police force for the United Nations to keep law and order. These things are necessary in the smallest community. They are also necessary in our world community.

With an all-out effort now to localize this present crisis, together with long-range positive steps for peace as I have outlined, namely, reversal of our retaliation policy, strong armed forces and sound economic policies at home, establishment of a Foreign Affairs Advisory Commission, creation of an Academy on World Affairs, strengthening of the United Nations, and the encouragement of a moral reawakening, I believe we can look forward with more assurance to the peaceful world community we all hope and pray for.

Ladies' Auxiliary, Ancient Order of Hibernians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolutions adopted by the Ladies' Auxiliary to the Ancient Order of Hibernians of America, while in convention assembled, Boston, Mass., August 1–4, 1950:

FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION

At the recent sixty-fifth biennial national convention of the Ladies' Auxiliary, Ancient Order of Hibernians of America, held in Boston, Mass., the following resolutions were adopted, which we wish to bring to your attention:

Resolved, That we, the delegates to the national convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, as citizens of the United States of America, interested in our country's independence, honor, and prosperity, whose sons, brothers, sisters, and husbands served in our Nation's Armed Forces in two World Wars, declare anew our allegiance to the Constitution of the United States of America and our confidence in its elected officers; be it further

Resolved, That we, remembering that we protested at another convention of this organization a few years ago, against the recognition and support which our National Government was giving to the godless and tyranical Government of Soviet Russia, renew our denunciation of communism, whether it is in Russia, its satellite states, or under cover in our own beloved country. We deplore the tendency to support the admission of Communist China into the United Nations because of the terrible consequences which will be sure to result from such betrayal of Christian civilization, as we know that communism everywhere is engaged in a war on God, and His sacred law, and is tireless in its efforts to enslave the souls of human beings and destroy all religion; and be it further

Resolved, That we again arraign the Government of England in the court of public opinion, for having arbitrarily dismembered the Ancient Irish Nation by the Partition Act of 1920, and for having set up a puppet government, which it persists in subsidizing and supporting in the six separated counties of northeast Ulster—a government which brazenly proclaims its un-Christian hatred of the Catholic people in that area, and which continues to violate openly those lofty principles to which England's spokesmen gave lip service while the recent war was in progress and the outcome was still in doubt; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our strong and indignant disapproval as citizens and taxpayers of the United States to the pouring uncondtionally of billions of dollars of the

American people's money into the English imperial treasury, while any part of this money is used to bolster up the puppet Government of Northern Ireland, and to prolong the partition of the little island. We demand, as we have a right to do, that financial aid to England be stopped until she abolishes the unnatural boundary in Ireland and restores the six separated counties to the pepole of Ireland and withdraws her garrison from northeast Ulster; and be it further

Resolved, That we request the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to report favorably on the Fogarty resolution (H. Res. No. 270) now under consideration by the committee, and we exhort the Members of the House, as a matter of justice to the people of Ireland (the truest friends of the United States in the world) and in vindication of avowed American principles, to vote for the adoption of the resolution when it is presented to them for their approval.

Resolved, That the national convention of the ladies' auxiliary to the Ancient Order of Hibernians deplore such socialistic tendencies as the system of medical care, commonly called socialized medicine and sincerely hope that proposed legislation to put such a system into effect be rejected by Congress as detrimental to the health and well-being of all citizens of our country; be it further

Resolved, That we pledge support of Federal aid to education, which provides for all children without discrimination; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of pertinent resolutions be sent to the President of these United States, the Vice President, Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Secretary of the United Nations Trygve Lie; ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman; the chairmen of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate; and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and to every Congressman and Senator in these United States.

TERESA L. SCHAAF,
National Secretary.

Wisconsin Convention of Loyal Order of Moose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Saturday night, September 2, it was my great pleasure to deliver an address before the Wisconsin State Association of the Loyal Order of the Moose. As a member of this organization I have always had the highest admiration for the great fraternal and humanitarian endeavors of this fine, renowned group. We of Wisconsin are particularly proud that a native son, Mr. Willis E. Donley, of Menomonie, has served as supreme governor of the Loyal Order in addition to serving in many other capacities in this splendid organization.

The Racine lodge was host to the convention, and I feel that, aided by the fine work of Convention Chairman Alfred E. La France, they really did themselves proud.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of the State officers of the Loyal Order of the Moose in Wisconsin, a list of the officers of the Racine lodge and of their grand auxiliary and, finally, the text of the address which I delivered on September 2.

There being no objection, the address, together with the roster of officers, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOOSE STATE OFFICERS

Dr. H. J. Woods, deputy supreme governor; John Murry, junior past president; George H. Wohlfahrt, president; Franklin Laing, secretary; Andrew Salfar, civic affairs; Fred Buckles, publicity; Arvo Mattson, sports; Franklin Laing, ritualistic; John Manson, Gilbert Hanneman, Charles Osborne, trustees; Harry Meska, first district vice president; Ferdinand Corbielle, second district vice president; John Jambretz, third district vice president; George Holzman, fourth district vice president; Edward Crooks, fifth district vice president; George Kell, sixth district vice president; John Kniefle, seventh district vice president; John Yonshke, eighth district vice president.

OFFICERS, RACINE LODGE, NO. 437

Leonard E. Grimbol, junior past governor; Robert Heck, governor; Warren H. Hamacher, junior governor; William Nelson, prelate; Henry Johnson, secretary; Dominick Pollacci, treasurer; Richard Rannow, sergeant at arms; John Schulz, inner guard; Lawrence Mason, outer guard; Richard Kruppstadt, Hollister O. Dehne, and William H. Wosilait, trustees.

OFFICERS OF WOMEN OF THE MOOSE AUXILIARY, CHAPTER 631

Mrs. Dorothy Benwell, junior graduate regent; Mrs. Esther Andersen, senior regent; Mrs. Alvina Stroschine, junior regent; Mrs. Irene Andersen, chaplain; Mrs. Adeline Christensen, recorder; Mrs. Viola Fine, treasurer; Miss Bessie Lorentsen, sentinel; Mrs. Margaret Kohlman, argus; Mrs. Dorothy Heegeman, guide; Mrs. Jean Clausen, assistant guide.

THE VOLUNTARY STATE VERSUS THE COMPULSORY STATE

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY)

I am profoundly grateful to have the pleasure of being with you today in this critical hour of American history. To be a Moose has always been a source of cherished pride for me; for me to address the Moose is a particular honor.

Once more members of this great organization are going forth to do battle for their country. I want, therefore, at the very outset to express what I know is the prayer of all of this assembled multitude and my own prayer that our Moose members, like our other Americans, return safe and sound from the battle for freedom to which they have gone and to which others will go in the days and months up ahead.

I would, indeed, like to discuss with you today the issues arising out of the tremendous world storm in which we find ourselves. There is, however, so very much in the newspapers and over the radio on this issue that I thought that perhaps we might devote our principal attention instead to the major domestic issues of our time.

However, let me, in passing, just say a brief word concerning the war clouds hovering over the horizon. Naturally every one of us prays that we can prevent the Korean conflict from spreading into a third world war. We know that total war would not really solve any problem. It would only bring new catastrophes of disease, revolution, civil war, and countless other disorders.

WE HAVE NO DESIRE TO DROP ATOMIC BOMBS ON RUSSIA

I have been particularly disturbed at some of the recent loose talk about our taking the initiative and "dropping atomic bombs on Russia," as if that could in a jiffy wipe out all our problems overnight. On the contrary, if we were to take the aggressive, we would not only lose the support of the civilized world but we would let ourselves in for a horrible conflict whose end results no man could see. We would be inviting retaliation bombings of American cities and the mass extermination of millions of our people.

To bomb Russian centers of communism would not eliminate communism from the world. Far from it. Communism, a fanatic, godless crusade, as well as other false isms, would breed on the very conditions of chaos that would result from an American-Russian conflict.

WE MUST HAVE PEACE BASED ON PREPAREDNESS

Our aim, therefore, must continue to be to strive for peace. A peace based on American preparedness, a peace based on the eradication of the Communist menace here at home, a peace based on realistic diplomacy, a peace based on no secret dealings on absolute cooperation with our allies and getting from them willing sacrifices similar to those which we are giving.

Our hearts naturally go out to every American boy fighting in Korea today, and to those allied forces which have already been committed there.

THE SINGLE GREAT DOMESTIC ISSUE

Now, returning to domestic affairs, may I in a nonpartisan and nonpersonal way respectfully submit to you a few facts as I see them on the most important issue facing our people today. I do so with the full recognition that this is an issue which transcends political parties just as the Moose itself is a nonpartisan, nonsectarian, nonpolitical organization. I think, therefore, that regardless of our particular political or religious faith, regardless of our personal backgrounds, you and I can definitely agree that the major issue of our times in the domestic scene is this:

SHALL WE HAVE A VOLUNTARY STATE OR SHALL WE HAVE A COMPULSORY STATE?

Shall we have a state in which individuals can join whatever groups they please, to take actions as they please (so long as they do not harm their neighbors), or shall government decide what the individual should do, where he should work, how much he should earn, where he should worship, if anywhere, what groups he should be associated with, and so forth?

Shall we have a state of "you must" or a state of "you can," a state in which great organizations like the Moose can continue, or shall we have a state in which government presumes that it knows everything and that it can, therefore, eliminate organizations like the Moose? Now, my friends, you and I know the magnificent humanitarian works of this organization. A mere mention of the name house of God or Mooseheart or Mooseheart brings to mind the great civic contributions which have been made by the Moose. You did not take actions in setting up these great centers of humanitarian endeavors at the order of government. You decided to do so in your own individual Moose lodge, and so did your brother Moose across the country. Now, my friends, if the sphere of government is to be expanded indefinitely, then there will be no place in the America of tomorrow for an organization such as this. Then we will have a Government which thinks it knows everything, and which does everything, says everything, decides everything. We will have a one-party state, a one-clique-in-control state.

DICTATORSHIP DANGER IS NO EXAGGERATION

Does that sound fantastic, improbable? No, my friends, it is the whole trend of these times at home and abroad. Call it statism or totalitarianism or what you will, the end results are the same.

I have faith in the individual wisdom of 150,000,000 American citizens. I have faith in the charitableness of their hearts, in their deep humanitarian convictions. I have faith that they will come to the right decision on political, economic, and social issues. I do not, however, have such faith in government if it arrogates unto itself all power. I do not believe that if government is given monopolistic authority that it will come to similar right decisions—on insurance, on health, on one thousand and one other issues.

WE DO NEED SOME GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Now you and I know, my friends, that individuals acting together or in groups cannot entirely meet the problem of old-age assistance, of child welfare, aid to the blind, aid to orphans, and a thousand other social fields. We have come to expect that the Federal, State, and local governments would take an increasing participation in these humanitarian endeavors. But we have firmly resolved that it is infinitely better for individuals and individual groups to handle the needs of our people by themselves to the greatest extent possible rather than to have government horn into everything.

VOTERS OF ALL PARTIES SHOULD THINK THIS ISSUE THROUGH

To a considerable extent, the coming election in November 1950 will be decided on this issue and so will the Presidential election in 1952. Will we have the voluntary state or the compulsory state? The state in which individuals are supreme, individual dignity, individual initiative, individual resourcefulness. Or will we have a state in which the government knows everything, decides everything, judges everything, orders everything? It is your decision to make, my brothers. Think it out, review it carefully, and then go to the polls and act according to your individual conscience.

In recent years, there has come an increasing reliance upon government, particularly the Federal Government. To a certain extent this has been necessary, particularly in time of war. It has been necessary, yes, in times of domestic depression because it took efforts of the Federal Government to help bring us out of the situation where tens of millions of Americans walked the streets unemployed. However, we do not want to work ourselves into a condition where the Federal Government will hog the whole show perpetually. We do not want any individual in Washington or anywhere else to set up conditions so as to make Federal intervention, Federal meddling, Federal snooping perpetual.

The voluntary state means inevitably a friendly state. A state where men can get together on the basis of common interests or common spiritual convictions, to do deeds of good will. Under the compulsory state there would be no room for such actions.

DO BILLS LEAD TO VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY STATE?

And so I want to leave this message to you today. It is more of a challenge than actually a conclusion. I challenge you to think on this paramount issue. I challenge you, whether you be Republican or Democrat, to evaluate bills in your Congress on this basis: Does it contribute to the voluntary state or does it further the trend to the compulsory state?

You know, my friends, there are over 15,000 bills which have been introduced in the Congress thus far. Some of those bills are good, others are very bad indeed. The latter would push Government more and more into the field of private enterprise at a staggering cost to the Treasurer and would push voluntary initiative almost completely out of the picture. This trend toward the compulsory state must be halted. During wartime there is a particular tendency, however, to move in the opposite direction, to move toward complete Government monopoly on everything. We must be wary lest that tendency continue unchecked.

EVALUATING CANDIDATES IN NONPARTISAN WAY

Yes, my friends, when you go to the polls in November, I challenge you to think. Ask yourself in a nonpartisan way: Am I voting for a candidate who is pledged to a compulsory state or a candidate who is pledged to a voluntary state? Mark you, my friends, that a candidate who is pledged for the compulsory state 9 times out of 10 will not indicate that he is for the ultimate elimination of individual enterprise. On the contrary, he will couch his position usually in terms of glittering generalities, in terms of the illusion of temporary benefits; but the end result of his recommendations (whether he realizes it or not) will be the compulsory state. A state in which socialized medicine, socialized farming, socialized business, socialized education—yes, even socialized religion—will exist.

CONCLUSION

I respectfully submit to you that if you evaluate men on the above standards of the tendency of their decisions you will come out with the right conclusion.

It has been a real pleasure to be with you today, and I want to wish you continuing great success in our wonderful Wisconsin Moose organization.

Criticism of the Marine Corps by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 6 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Writer Says Truman Has Committed Worst Blunder in Career," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of September 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRITER SAYS TRUMAN HAS COMMITTED WORST BLUNDER IN CAREER—MARINE CORPS BELITTLED WHILE FIGHTING IN KOREA IN TRADITIONAL MANNER

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman has committed perhaps the worst blunder of his career—one that no other President of the United States ever committed since the foundation of the Republic.

Mr. Truman has belittled the United States Marine Corps. He has done so at a time when the marines are fighting in Korea with a spirit and an efficiency in keeping with their traditions.

For the Commander in Chief of the Armed Services in the midst of active military operations to denounce any branch of the service as possessing a "propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's" is to disregard morale and spirit altogether and accuse that service of deceit, fraud, and distortion of the truth.

For Stalin's propaganda machine, lately exemplified by Yakov Malik, is an object of scorn throughout the world, and to imply that the Marine Corps has been lying about its magnificent record of fighting throughout American history is to insult the tens of thousands of marines who lie buried under white crosses in all parts of the world where they have fought so bravely.

WHOLLY INACCURATE

The President went further—he made a contemptuous and wholly inaccurate statement about the status of the Marine Corps itself. He spoke of it as "the Navy's police force," when the unification law specifically gives the Marine Corps the status of a separate unit of the armed services. To speak of the marines as just policemen who guard the decks of warships or do police duty ashore is to overlook entirely their position or their quality as a mobile fighting force. They happen to be attached to the Navy from a jurisdictional standpoint, but this does not mean they act for the Navy alone.

The Marine Corps was not a mere police force when its members turned the tide of battle at Chateau Thierry in World War I and there wasn't a warship of the Navy within a hundred miles of the place where the critical battle was fought.

The Marine Corps was not a mere police force as its foot soldiers swarmed on the beaches of Iwo Jima in World War II in one of the deadliest battles of all history and raised the flag on Mount Suribachi on February 23, 1945. The picture of this achievement is embedded in the minds of all Americans as one of the most dramatic scenes in the history of the United States.

The Marine Corps was not a mere police force of the Navy as its men unflinchingly moved straight into bullets and artillery fire as they landed on the beaches in waves at Tarawa, Guam, Saipan, and Guadalcanal. Marines dropped by the thousands in their tracks, but their comrades never faltered.

WHAT AROUSED IRE?

What have the Marines done to arouse the ire of President Truman? Nobody here can account for Mr. Truman's outburst of temper—his own office associates say they never saw the communication before it was mailed. It was written in response to a respectful plea from Representative MCDONOUGH, of California, Republican, who urged that the Marine Corps Commandant be added to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Mr. Truman didn't know apparently that this very same proposal had been approved by roll-call vote unanimously on February 28 last by the 31 members of the House Armed Services Committee—Democrats as well as Republicans. The recommendation read as follows:

"The Joint Chiefs of Staff structure, as now constituted, does not insure at all times adequate consideration for the views of all services. The committee will sponsor legislation to require rotation of the position of chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff among the services after a 2-year term, and to add the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a member thereof."

Mr. Truman in his letter to Representative MCDONOUGH made a curious comment to the effect that "when the Marine Corps goes into the Army, it works with and for the Army and that is the way it should be." But there is no provision in law for the Marine Corps to be taken over by the Army. It works with the Army on joint operations, just as the Navy does or the Air Force does, but Congress specified by law that the Marine Corps was not to be absorbed by any other service or lose its identity.

Mr. Truman declares defiantly that as long as he is President the Marine Corps will remain as just the Navy's police force. This

is not the kind of message to be broadcast to the marines now in the fox holes of Korea—nor is it a message to send to the mothers and fathers and relatives of the marines who have died in the service of their country.

Mr. Truman can't impair the glorious record of the Marines. He has only succeeded in impairing his own prestige as Commander in Chief of America's armed services.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a news release of an address I made before the fall meeting of the Pomona Grange, at Washington, Pa.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, PA., September 5.—Controls needed to stabilize the national economy and to prevent inflation in the present war emergency should be made clear across the board, United States Senator MARTIN said here this afternoon.

In an address before the fall meeting of the Pomona Grange of Washington County, Senator MARTIN declared that controls to be effective must be imposed not only on prices but also on wages and profits at the same time.

"We all know that controls are an encroachment upon individual liberty," Senator MARTIN said, "but they must be resorted to as a means of safeguarding the worker and the farmer from the dangers of runaway prices and a shrinking dollar.

"It is a part of patriotism to give up a portion of our freedom in order to help preserve the essential liberties and freedom of the individual which have made us a great nation.

"It is my firm conviction that less liberty is taken away from the people if ceilings are imposed on prices, wages, and profits simultaneously so that the effects will be shared equally by all elements in our Nation.

"At the same time we must be watchful that wartime restrictions are not extended beyond the period of emergency.

"We have been forced by Communist aggression in Korea into a period when all of us must be prepared for willing sacrifice to build our Nation's defensive strength.

"Freedom in the world is facing its supreme test. We must approach the grim task ahead with full realization that we are fighting a war for survival.

"Nothing less than total victory will preserve the Christian ideals upon which our Republic was founded from destruction by the godless forces of tyranny and dictatorship.

"There will be tragic days ahead. There will be times of discouragement and disappointment. We will have to do without many of the things we now enjoy. We will be required to pay drastically increased taxes and Government services will be sharply curtailed.

"One of the great dangers we face here at home is the threat of inflation which shrinks the value of all earnings and places a heavy burden upon every household.

"Congress has given the President broad powers to fix prices and wages and to control credits so as to check the inflationary pressure.

"But to my mind, to be effective, the necessary controls, allocations, and priorities should not be imposed piecemeal but clear across the board. I am hopeful that the President will recognize the wisdom of that method in order that the people may have to give up no more of their precious liberty than is absolutely necessary.

"In the present emergency and in preparation for the future two things should be kept in mind by the people.

"First, we should follow the time-tested military maxim not to divide our forces.

"We must be united, keeping our strength consolidated and working with the same patriotic objective in view.

"Second, we must remember that 90 percent of the strength of an army or a country is morale.

"We are fighting in a righteous cause.

"We are fighting to uphold the doctrine of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as a divine endowment granted by Almighty God to all mankind.

"We are fighting to preserve the dignity and the freedom of the individual and the sacred right of religious freedom.

"What is our duty as individuals and as inheritors of a great patriotic tradition?

"Moral and spiritual strength here at home are just as important as military strength on the battlefield.

"I am proud that the membership of the Grange, more than any other group in the United States, represents clean living, God-fearing, 100-percent Americanism.

"Your organization can wield powerful influence to stamp out profiteering, black markets, and all other forms of racketeering, chiseling, and law evasion.

"You can take a place of leadership for good citizenship, good government, and a deeper appreciation of the blessings of the American way of life.

"With faith in God's goodness and with firm resolve to serve our country, each of us, in his own humble way, can contribute to victory."

Confusion in the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking article entitled "MacArthur and Matthews Statements Reveal Confusion in the Administration," written by Dorothy Thompson, and published in the Washington Evening Star of September 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR AND MATTHEWS STATEMENTS REVEAL CONFUSION IN THE ADMINISTRATION

(By Dorothy Thompson)

General MacArthur's message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the speech of Navy Secretary Matthews, in Boston, revealed the confusion that exists in the inner circles of our Government. General MacArthur had to be told that the White House was running foreign policy, and Mr. Matthews had to be rebuked by the State Department.

General MacArthur seems to think that the war in Korea is fought for the strategic defense of the United States in the Pacific. It is not odd that he should think so, because he recently commanded many Americans who fought World War II in the Pacific, from island to island, on the thesis that those islands were essential to Pacific defense against an American enemy in Asia. That is why they died on them.

If that was true from 1941 to 1945, then General MacArthur seems to think it is still true, since geography is singularly free of ideological prejudices. If it wasn't true from 1941 to 1945, an explanation would seem to be in order as to why we fought World War II at all.

MAC ARTHUR CALLED RIGHT

Of course, General MacArthur is absolutely right—on the thesis of World War II. Formosa, in the hands of a hostile power, would be just what he says it would: "An unsinkable aircraft carrier and submarine tender, ideally located to accomplish offensive strategy and checkmate defensive or counteroffensive operations based on Okinawa and the Philippines."

What the general apparently does not realize is that the United States is not fighting nowaday for its own defense. This time we are fighting against sin, for peace, and for the United Nations. These United Nations (without Russia) want us to defend Korea against aggression, but don't want us to defend Formosa, which belongs to China. It belongs to China, because two men at Cairo took it from the Japanese and gave it to the China of Chiang Kai-shek, and it now belongs to Mao Tse-tung, because he took China from Chiang.

Under no circumstances has the United States, who won control of it by the most bloody sacrifices, any claim to it at all. For the United States has abandoned all claims herself, anywhere, in favor of being a global policeman under order of the UN. We no longer have any initiative of our own.

Apparently, we may not decide to let the people of Formosa determine their own fate and withdraw, if they choose, from both the Chiang and the Mao governments to the status of the Philippines. That would taint us with imperialism, no matter how much it might please Formosans. And anyway the decision lies with UN.

MERCENARY ARMIES

The members of UN who want us to be policemen don't want us to engage ourselves deeply in Asia because tomorrow or next day they will need our services in Europe, or the Middle East, or the Mediterranean, or Africa. For the world's greatest power is now up to furnishing mercenary armies of its citizens to carry out UN orders, with whose approval all wars are noble (and for peace) and without whose approval all wars are evil and aggressive.

Mr. Matthews also doesn't grasp the point. He thinks we should go to war directly against Russia and knock out the spider in the central web. Thereafter we could get another UN—one which would work.

This is logical, too, provided Mr. Matthews has a notion of how to win a war against 800,000,000 people occupying the vast central land mass of Eurasia, and how we could get the approval of the free nations in between, whose territory and populations would be involved. For it is their approval that makes a war good or bad.

Military logic, strategical defense, practical considerations—of calculated risk, and possible victory or defeat—no longer determine American policy. We may not choose, extend, or limit our objectives, because we have abandoned American objectives, in favor of

war for peace—on any ground chosen by the adversary.

That everybody, even in the inner circles of our Government, has not fully grasped the implications of this policy is not astonishing.

We doubt whether the President has grasped them either.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 6 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Lowell Mellett in behalf of the Federal aid to education bill, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, September 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOYS THE COUNTRY HAS FAILED TO EDUCATE CANNOT NOW BE USED

(By Lowell Mellett)

What awful irony there is in the statement of Chairman VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee that intelligence standards may have to be lowered in order to bring our fighting forces up to the number now required. And his further statement that pending such action, because of the immediate need for men, young fathers, and others with dependents may have to give up their exemption or deferment status—those, that is, who can meet the IQ tests of Selective Service. And the intimidation of Major General Hershey, head of Selective Service, that it may be necessary to draft again veterans of World War II. The last group of young citizens presumably have the required intelligence, or education, or they wouldn't be veterans.

SHOULD NOT BE SURPRISE

The irony in this is that some millions of America's underprivileged boys are having forced upon them the privilege of staying out of the war. An unintentional working out of a curious kind of justice, perhaps. The country, having failed to educate them sufficiently, cannot use them as soldiers.

Reports of rejections by draft boards have been truly depressing as they reflect the condition, physical and mental, of the Nation's manpower. In some localities, it is said, 6 out of 10 of those called up have been declared unfit. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, remarked on this in a speech to the American Legion the other day, but didn't indicate that the State he rules intends to do anything about it, although it ranks among the country's tail enders in the matter of education and public-health expenditures.

This state of affairs may be a shock to Congress, but it should not be a surprise. It was revealed by the draft in World War II and Congress has been reminded of it in every session since. It has been the most compelling argument offered in behalf of Federal aid to education legislation and in behalf of various plans to improve the Nation's health. But it hasn't been compelling enough. Other considerations have seemed to outweigh it.

BILL HANGS IN COMMITTEE

So as Congress now prepares to adjourn, there remains in a House committee the one best bill ever offered to meet the problem. It is a bill endorsed not only by the President but by virtually all of the country's educators; a bill passed by the Republican Senate in the Eightieth Congress and by the Democratic Senate in the present Congress, a bill that is completely nonpartisan even in its authorship. It is a bill that would be passed by a resounding majority of the House if it ever reached the floor.

But it hangs high and dry in a committee, whose chairman has contrived to make a religious issue of it. The bill would appropriate $300,000,000 annually to aid State educational systems, largely in proportion to need and almost wholly through the public schools. It would permit those few States that assist parochial schools in such matters as transportation and health services, however, to follow their own laws in that respect. The chairman in question chooses to consider this an infringement on our historic separation of church and state. The dispute, ridiculous as it is, has become so warm that the House leaders have been happy to set it aside for another year.

Even if enacted now, of course, this legislation would not affect the situation faced by Selective Service this year or next year. But we are doing many things now on the theory that we may be in for a long war or, at least, a long period of armed preparedness. For that reason the present stupid stalemate over the education bill should be ended and at once.

Listen, Look, and Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 6 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Listen, Look, and Stop," published in the September 6, 1950, issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LISTEN, LOOK, AND STOP

Proponents of the McCarran antisubversive bill, which the Senate is now debating, are reported to expect that not more than a dozen votes will be cast against it. If this prediction should prove to be true, we can only believe that not many more than a dozen Senators will have read the text of the measure before voting upon it. For it is hard to believe that any thoughtful Member of Congress who loves freedom, liberty, and democracy as much as he hates communism could support this bill once he has a clear understanding of its contents.

The McCarran bill (S. 4037) is only the worst of a number of antisubversive measures now up for consideratoin. It is all-inclusive, embracing as it does the contents of five separate bills (plus a few new proposals) which deal with everything from registration of Communists to establishment of a new Passport and Visa Bureau in the Department of State. To be sure, some of the provisions of this omnibus bill are desirable, strengthening as they do the existing laws against espionage and violation of military security. But it would be a perversion of the legislative process if the need for this additional protection against specific acts were used as a cloak for the introduction of drastic restrictions, as far-reaching as they are unnecessary, on the basic rights of all Americans. And this we believe is what the McCarran bill (and, for that matter, the less-inclusive Mundt-Ferguson and Wood bills) could do, potentially.

The stated objectives of these measures are, of course, the objectives of all of us who want democracy to live and to prosper. In addition to stopping the aggression of Communist imperialism, we want to neutralize the power to do harm of the Communists within our gates. But surely the way to succeed in this purpose is not to impose such curbs of freedom of speech and press and political association as to render suspect all but the most orthodox, the most conformist. That is not the way democracy grew to its present strength and that is not the way democracy will survive.

As we have stated previously, it is our view that the language of these bills is so broad as to be dangerous, the registration provisions self-defeating, the immigration proposals antidemocratic, and the restrictions on foreign diplomats unnecessary. In their desire, which we share, to do everything possible to defend the security of the United States, neither Congress nor the public should automatically approve every measure that is labeled "antisubversive." What is subversion to Senator McCarran may not be subversion to President Truman, FBI Director Hoover, or Attorney General McGrath. Perhaps that is one reason why the Justice Department has opposed the McCarran bill. In any case, Congress owes it to itself and to the Nation not to be frightened into passage of ill-considered, sweeping laws such as S. 4037, which can do deep and permanent injury to our most treasured institutions.

Thinking of Buying a Home?—Plan Carefully Before Applying for Loan, Cautions VA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article appeared in the August 1950 issue of the Gold Star with reference to direct home loans for veterans of World War II, who live in areas of this country where 4-percent financing from private sources is not obtainable. I include the article:

In the face of today's record housing boom and era of easy mortgage financing, Veterans' Administrator Carl R. Gray, Jr., has issued a word of caution to the 13,000,000 World War II veterans who still are eligible for VA-guaranteed home loans under the GI bill.

First and foremost, General Gray emphasizes that veterans should fully understand that a GI loan, like any other loan, must be repaid.

"The VA guaranty, which protects the lender against loss, encourages him to make the loan at a very low interest rate and with only a small or no down payment," Gray states. "But if you fail to make the payments you agree to make, the VA must pay the loss to the lender, and the amount paid by the VA must be repaid by you. Any compensation or pension to which you may be

entitled could be withheld in whole or in part until such debt is satisfied."

The Veterans' Administrator also warns the veteran against taking on an obligation too heavy for him to carry. In addition to the monthly payments of interest and principal, he pointed out that the veteran homeowner also must meet the cost of real estate taxes, insurance, repairs, heat, light, water, and other utilities.

Advising strongly against rushing into what may prove to be an ill-advised purchase, Gray reminded veterans that they have until July 25, 1957, to use their right to a guaranteed loan.

Now that the postwar housing shortage is easing off, the Administrator urged veterans to shop carefully before they buy, to make sure they will be satisfied with the quality and condition of the home and its equipment.

While VA makes every effort to assure that the veteran pays only a reasonable price for the home, taking quality and condition into account, the agency cannot guarantee that he will be satisfied with his purchase, Gray added.

Veterans unfamiliar with home construction should seek the advice of a reliable person who knows construction, and competent advice should be obtained in connection with the signing of sales contracts and other documents, the letter warns. Before making a deposit on a home, they should make sure the paper they sign calls for a refund in the event the GI loan deal falls through.

Areas of the country in which 4-percent mortgage financing is lacking, and in which eligible veterans and unremarried widows may qualify for direct Government mortgage loans as provided by a recent act of Congress, have been designated by the Veterans' Administration.

The eligible areas, virtually all of which are outside metropolitan centers, include about 2,200 of the 3,100 counties in the United States. It is estimated that about 4,000,000 veterans, or 30 percent of those still eligible for GI loan benefits, reside in those areas.

The Housing Act of 1950 made available $150,000,000 for such direct home loans to veterans, effective after July 19, in areas where VA found that 4-percent financing from private sources is not obtainable. In addition to location in such an area, the following conditions must be met:

1. The veteran must not previously have used any part of his GI loan guaranty entitlement;

2. The loan may not exceed $10,000;

3. The veteran must be a satisfactory credit risk, and the monthly payments on his mortgage must bear a proper relationship to his income.

4. He must show that he is unable to obtain 4-percent financing from other sources, including loans from the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of farm housing.

As in the case of other GI loans, the VA direct loan bears 4-percent interest, may be made repayable over periods up to 30 years, and the veteran receives a gratuity credit of 4 percent of the amount which ordinarily would have been guaranteed by VA, up to a maximum of $160.

Most VA offices have at least one county or part of a county designated as an eligible area. However, in eight offices no direct loans were authorized. These offices serve Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, and the greater metropolitan areas of New York City, Philadelphia, and Washington, D. C.

The 67 VA regional offices which administer the GI loan-guaranty program in their respective regions have been furnished a detailed listing of the areas in which veterans may apply for direct loans.

Veterans or eligible widows who wish to apply for a direct home loan should write to the loan-guaranty officer at the nearest VA regional office, stating the location and price of the property and the amount of the loan which will be required to finance the purchase or construction of the home. The VA office will supply an application form.

The areas designated as eligible for direct loans were slected on the basis of records showing the relative unavailability of GI home loans for veterans from private sources, as well as upon the recommendations of the regional loan-guaranty officers who are familiar with current lending activity in their regions.

The VA stresses that the mere submission of an application for a direct loan does not assure that it will be granted, even if the property desired is in a designated area. Both the property and the credit of the veteran will have to meet VA standards.

Each veteran is cautioned not to invest in land or materials or make a deposit on the assumption that he will receive a direct loan. Every applicant should wait until he hears from the VA regional office handling his application.

If time and funds permit, changes in the list of designated areas for direct loans will be made as the availability of private capital improves or falls below acceptable standards.

Of the $150,000,000 made available for direct loans, $100,000,000 has been allocated for use in the designated areas. The balance will be allocated to the areas where the greatest relative need is evident as the program progresses.

H. R. 9176

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. STANLEY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Defense Production Act of 1950, H. R. 9176, I wish to include the following statement, copies of which I sent on August 29, 1950, to the newspapers published in the tobacco-producing counties of the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS B. STANLEY, OF VIRGINIA, CONCERNING PENDING PRICE-CONTROL LEGISLATION

I have not advocated and am not advocating that price ceilings be placed on tobacco. I do not consider price control on this commodity necessary or justifiable in view of the high cost of production and acreage control, which limit the net income of the tobacco grower even under the most favorable marketing conditions.

Recently there was presented to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Banking and Currency a bill, H. R. 9176, under which price ceilings could be imposed on tobacco. The original section of the bill before the House was as follows:

"No ceiling shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity below the higher of the two following prices: (1) The parity price for such commodity, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials), or (2) the price received by producers during the period from May 24, 1950, to June 24."

When I saw that under the proposal there would be no alternative but to fix the price ceiling on flue-cured tobacco at parity—about $50 per hundred pounds—since flue-cured tobacco is not marketed during the base period mentioned, May 24 to June 24, I proposed the following amendment on the floor of the House on August 4:

"or (3) if for the year 1950 a producer normally does not market a commodity during the period May 24 to June 24, 1950, the highest price received by producers during the first 30-day period following May 24, 1950, in which such commodity is normally marketed."

I was very much pleased when the Committee on Banking and Currency accepted my amendment and it was unanimously approved by the House of Representatives and the bill, as passed by the House on August 10, 1950, would, in the event price ceilings are imposed, establish the first 30-day period following May 24, 1950, in which flue-cured tobacco is marketed as the base period. This would permit price ceilings consistent with 1950 prices, and considerably higher than parity.

The Senate did not accept my amendment but passed in lieu thereof what is referred to as the Maybank-Robertson-Chapman amendment, which is as follows:

"In the case of any commodity for which the market was not active during the period May 24 to June 24, 1950, the average price received by producers during the most recent representative period prior to May 24, 1950, in which the market for such commodity was active as determined and adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture to a level in line with the level of prices received by producers for agricultural commodities generally during the period May 24 to June 24, 1950, and adjusted by the Secretary for grade, location, and seasonal differentials, or in the case of fire-cured tobacco a price (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and adjusted for grade differentials) equal to 75 percent of the parity price of Burley tobacco of the corresponding crop, and in the case of dark air-cured tobacco and Virginia sun-cured tobacco, respectively, a price (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and adjusted for grade differentials) equal to 66⅔ percent of the parity price of Burley tobacco of the corresponding crop. No ceilings shall be established or maintained hereunder for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to producers of such agricultural commodity a price for such agricultural commodity equal to the highest price therefor specified above: *Provided*, That in establishing and maintaining ceilings on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing. Whenever a ceiling has been established under this title with respect to any agricultural commodity, or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part therefrom, the President from time to time shall adjust such ceiling in order to make appropriate allowances for substantial reduction in merchantable crop yields, unusual increases in cost of production, and other factors which result from hazards occurring in connection with the production and marketing of such agricultural commodity; and in establishing the ceiling (1) for any agricultural commodity for which the 1950 marketing season commenced prior to the enactment of this act and for which different areas have different periods of marketing during such season or (2) for any agricultural commodity produced for the same general use as a commodity described in (1), the President shall give due consideration to affording equitable treatment to all producers of the commodity for which the ceiling is being established."

I am convinced that, in the event of price ceilings being put into effect, tobacco growers would have adequate protection under

my amendment to the bill as passed the House. I hope they will receive fair treatment under the bill as passed the Senate. Both House and Senate versions of the proposed legislation have been referred to a conference committee for adjustment of House and Senate differences. If price controls are to be applied, I hope very much that the conferees will accept my amendment.

In any event, I sincerely hope the administration will not place price ceilings on tobacco. It does not appear at this time that such action will be taken affecting the 1950 crop.

Appeasement Policies Held To Be Encouraging Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking article entitled "Truman and Congress Seen Not All Clear on Preventive War," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of September 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN AND CONGRESS SEEN NOT ALL CLEAR ON PREVENTIVE WAR—APPEASEMENT POLICIES HELD ENCOURAGING REDS TO PUSH AGGRESSIONS

(By David Lawrence)

There's a vast difference between a "preventive war" and action to prevent war and while the first will be deplored as unwise the second will be accepted as eminently desirable.

The truth, however, is that Congress and the President are not at all clear in their pronouncements as to what is being done or should be done to prevent a large-scale war.

This is one of the reasons why some people have sought to explore just what is meant by "preventive war." Actually no administration would ever propose that the United States initiate a war of any kind against anybody. But there are Americans who are wondering if, when a local war starts that could affect us vitally, the United States should follow the road of appeasement or resistance.

There are Americans, for instance, who say that aggression has already started against the members of the United Nations not only in Europe but in Asia. There are Americans who do not consider Communist China an independent country but a tool of the Soviet just as much as are such countries as Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

DIFFERENCE OF OPINION

To these observers the real question is how long the United Nations has to wait and how many times the members have to be attacked before aggression will be resisted at the real source. Not a few of the proponents of war against Russia feel that the Soviet started the war in North Korea and that the bombers of the United Nations should be permitted to bomb the sources of supply to the North Koreans even if it means attacking beyond the Korean border in Communist territory.

There is a difference of opinion here on this naturally and the President has announced that American forces will not be permitted to carry on any such war operations which means, of course, that the United Nations will not sanction it either.

Yet in the next few months tens of thousands of Communist-trained soldiers will be slowly fed into the Korean Peninsula. The allied troops are going to be worn down and more and more reinforcements will have to be sent into North Korea from the United States and other countries to meet the drain on our manpower.

It is all very well for American officials to talk optimistically about an end to the Korean war in a few months but the United Nations forces will have to be augumented materially as an unlimited number of troops come through Russian and Chinese territory to help the North Koreans. They have started already.

UNITED STATES BLAMED FOR INACTION

The question of what shall be done to get at the source of the infection will become much more pertinent a few weeks from now than it apparently is today. The United Nations has done little else but talk so far. No action has been taken to require that Communist China and Soviet Russia cease giving aid to the North Koreans. Instead, the Communist argument that China should be admitted to the council of the United Nations is seriously considered by various governments inside the UN. Likewise, though more than 2 months has passed since the Communists in both Russia and China began giving aid to the North Koreans, the UN has failed miserably to do anything about it.

The United States Government is mostly to blame for this inaction. Both the President and the Secretary of State have pussyfooted on the issue. They have not reflected the overwhelming indignation of the American people that American boys are being killed or wounded in Korea as a consequence of Russian and Chinese aid. Instead, there has been a tendency to grow timid about such things as keeping the United States Navy on patrol in the Straits of Formosa.

About the only action taken toward Communist China has been to concede that it was a mistake for an American plane to have strafed some of the territory of Communist China. This is an admission that the President and the Secretary of State do not intend to hold Communist China or Russia responsible if their troops are sent into South Korea to kill American soldiers.

As soon as the American people become better informed on what is happening they will voice their protests and it is most regrettable that the Truman administration has put itself in the position of apparently wishing to appease the Communists in the misguided hope that this will influence the Communists to stop their aid to North Korea. It is, rather, the way to encourage them to become bolder in their aggression.

United Nations and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 64, it is my pleasure to extend the following resolution passed by the fifty-eighth annual convention of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor on the United Nations and World Peace:

UNITED NATIONS AND WORLD PEACE

Whereas peace is the fruit of justice, justice is the product of law, and law is rooted in government; and

Whereas conflicting governmental units have always ceased their warring when united in a common government, as evidenced by our own Thirteen Colonies; and

Whereas representative federal government is America's discovery and America's contribution to the society of man and has been adopted in principle by the great majority of nations; and

Whereas labor has long recognized a need for a world united under law such as visualized by Samuel Gompers in 1914 when he called for "a world federation competent to do justice between nations and able to maintain the peace of the world": Therefore be it

Resolved, That a Charter Review Conference of the United Nations should be called as soon as possible for the purpose of building the United Nations into a true federation of nations, with a code of international law, a bill of human rights, adequate international police force, and any other machinery not otherwise inconsistent with the sovereignty of nations but found to be necessary for the maintenance of world law and order; and be it also

Resolved, That, should Russia abstain, our Nation should proceed to unite with other like-minded nations in a partial world federation, thus taking a realistic step toward realizing man's dream of a united world and, at the same time, giving to the democratic nations a strength through unity so great as to deter further Russian armed aggression; and be it also

Resolved, That all affiliated central bodies and local unions of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor be requested to use whatever means are at their disposal, including education, political action, and publicity mediums of radio and newspaper for carrying out the purpose of this resolution so that, in this year of centennial remembrance of Samuel Gompers, we can stride forward to the realization of his goal, freedom and security for all men under world law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution should be sent to the President and the Secretary of State of the United States and to each Member of our United States Congress, and that our parent body, the American Federation of Labor, be urged to take action at its fifty-ninth annual convention similar to that embodied in this resolution.

Address by Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri, Before State Convention of Missouri Department of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Some of the Things We Must Do," which I delivered before the State convention of the Missouri Department of the American Legion, in Kansas City, Mo., on September 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME OF THE THINGS WE MUST DO

(By Senator JAMES P. KEM)

Mr. Commander, comrades of the Legion, members of the auxiliary, ladies and gentlemen:

For the third time in a third of a century American boys are fighting on foreign soil.

Often we hear it said that those in authority should be held to account for their mistakes. We have many unpleasant recollections: the refusal to adopt Churchill's soft underbelly strategy to invade the Balkans which would have prevented Eastern Europe falling an easy prey to Russia; the Morgenthau plan that ruined the industry of Germany so that Germany is no longer able to act as a buffer state against Russia; the holding back of our troops before Berlin until the Russians could enter the city; our consent to the encirclement of Berlin by Russian-held territory; the capitulation to the Russians at Yalta and Potsdam. They bring to mind Will Rogers' famous saying: "The United States has never lost a war, but has never won a conference."

It is not my purpose today to look at the past except as we may profit for the future. You will remember that Patrick Henry said he was guided by one lamp, the lamp of experience. I want to speak to you briefly about four propositions that from this point on should not be overlooked. They are mistakes I hope we shall avoid in the future.

I. NO AMERICAN SHOULD BE SENT INTO BATTLE WHO IS NOT ADEQUATELY EQUIPPED

My first proposition is that no American boy should be sent into battle who is not adequately equipped. It is so fundamental that it is not even a debatable question, especially in view of the vast productive resources of our country. Yet we all know what has happened. In Korea our boys were sent into battle with equipment unequal to that of the enemy they were called upon to meet. The enemy had artillery which outranged ours. His tanks threw off our bullets like paper pellets. At first, air cover was wholly inadequate. And this fundamental lack is in large part responsible for the mounting casualty lists in Korea today.

There might have been some slight excuse for this fearful and fateful shortcoming if we had been caught completely by surprise—but our leaders had been warned—they vacillated—they changed their minds about whether or not we should fight in Korea—they had advance knowledge of the Russian plans for world conquest, and the vast armament program which was going on in North Korea. They did have advance knowledge—they were warned—they did vacillate—they did change their minds at the last moment—and they sent our boys in with inferior equipment, to die a hero's death in the rice paddies and on ragged mountain slopes of South Korea.

David Lawrence, nationally known Washington journalist, was so moved by the inadequacy of our equipment and the blundering of our top officials that he said in his syndicated column of August 7:

"Politeness, personal friendship or sensitivity, or partisanship are criminal excuses if they stand in the way of punishment of the blunderers. No other course will satisfy the mothers of the men who are dying in Korea, nor the mothers of the many more young men about to die as a consequence of these mistakes."

Why was the Army not better prepared? Some would have you believe Congress failed to provide the money. The truth is that Congress granted every request made by the present Administration for money for the national defense. Many Members of Congress are now asking what happened to the $50,000,000,000 spent for the cold war in the last 4 years and why more of it wasn't spent for weapons and combat troops. While we don't yet know all the sorry details of the multitudinous ratholes down which much of this $50,000,000,000 was poured, we do know this: We do know that overhead—often referred to as military housekeeping—took $2 out of every $3 spent. We do know that only $1 in every $7 since the war has been spent on arms of any kind. Out of $50,000,000,000, only $4,000,000,000 was invested in aircraft, only $3,000,000,000 for other equipment. Only 5 cents out of every dollar went for research and development of new weapons, to make sure that the United States wins the guided missiles race.

As a result, the country had but one Army division at full strength—the Eighty-second Airborne. Nine other divisions that it had were undermanned and underequipped. Russia has 175 divisions. Much of our Navy was laid up in mothballs, needing 3 to 18 months to be made ready for combat. And the Marine Corps had been whittled down to a shadow of its former strength.

General MacArthur was forced to improvise a military operation. He had to commit small American units piecemeal to be chewed to bits in the desperate effort to delay the invading army.

II. WE MUST STOP ARMING RUSSIA

My second proposition is: We must stop arming Russia.

Recently I presented to the United States Senate evidence that Marshall-plan countries have been making substantial shipments of war material, including arms, to Russia and her satellites—material which we ourselves have refused to ship to those countries. I obtained the information from official sources, the Department of Commerce of our own Government. Some of my colleagues in the Senate said that the information was startling—but nothing happened. The shipments are continuing as before.

As Mr. Winston Churchill said a few days ago: "Fancy going on like this while everything is getting worse, and when we (the British) are literally begging the United States for aid in every form."

Let us take a look at the unpleasant picture. It won't be a complete look, because I was able to obtain information about only three of the Marshall-plan countries—Great Britain, France, and Belgium. But the information I have will give a pretty good idea of what is going on.

Belgium shipped to Russia and her satellites last year: firearms, iron, cast iron, steel, copper, lead, tin, and zinc. Belgium also sent substantial quantities of electrical machinery—articles for electrotechnical use—and measuring and precision instruments.

Last year the British Socialist Government permitted more than $45,000,000 worth of machinery, including electric generators and machine tools, to be sent behind the iron curtain. Substantial shipments of ball and roller bearings also went into Communist hands. As to the military value of ball bearings, many of you will recall that our efforts to knock out the ball-bearing factories at Schweinfurt, Germany, cost us over 50 planes in a single raid.

On September 2, Prime Minister Attlee, of Great Britain, in a fireside chat to the British people, said that Britain will not allow her sales of machine tools to Russia to damage her own defense needs. But nowhere in his speech did he say that the tool deliveries would be halted.

France has permitted all sorts of war material to go to Russia, and other countries behind the iron curtain.

The export to Eastern Europe from the United States of commodities regarded as having direct or indirect military significance have been severely restricted since March 1, 1948. This policy, says our Office of International Trade, practically brought to a halt the exportation of such industrial equipment as machine tools, electrical machinery, and construction, mining, refining, and conveying machinery, which formerly comprised the bulk of Soviet procurement in the United States.

I submit it is essential to our national security that shipments of war material to the Soviet Union from the Marshall-plan countries be stopped. It is tragically absurd for us to pour into Western Europe vast quantities of war materials under the Marshall Plan and the arms-aid program, only to have our friends export the same materials to Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain.

When the ECA authorization was before the Senate, I proposed an amendment which would have shut off further aid to any Marshall-plan country which continues to funnel war materials behind the iron curtain. However, the amendment was rejected. We were afraid of hurting someone else's feelings. Our boys are being killed and maimed for life. Whose feelings are being hurt now?

During World War II our ships and planes were blasted with scrap iron furnished by us to the Japs. Millions of Americans risked their lives facing it.

And yet, here we are again supplying materials of war to an unfriendly and aggressor nation. We must stop—we must stop now arming Russia.

III. WE SHOULD STOP CODDLING COMMUNISM

My third proposition is that: We should stop coddling communism. You will recall that Abraham Lincoln said, "If this Nation is ever destroyed it will not be from without but from within."

(a) The crime of Yalta

To understand fully what has happened in Korea, and why, we must go back to before the end of World War II—to the Yalta Conference early in 1945. For it was at Yalta that the initial decision was made to divide Korea, giving the Reds the northern half of the country and much of its industry.

It was at Yalta that it was secretly agreed to hand over other important lands to Russia, and to give Stalin certain privileges in China. The deal assured that Manchuria—China's richest Province—would later fall to the Communists. The apologists for Yalta say that was the price we paid for Russia's entry into the war. Nothing could have induced the Russians to keep out. Japan was already defeated. Russia was in the war against Japan 6 days. Our boys fought the Japs 1,341 days.

In the light of what has happened, it is not a mere coincidence that one of the top-ranking State Department advisers at Yalta was the convicted perjurer, the Communist spy, Alger Hiss.

The secret Yalta deal was a go-ahead signal to the Communists in the Far East. On top of Yalta, we tried to force Chiang Kai-shek to take Communists into his confidence. The far-eastern policy makers in the State Department claimed that the Chinese Communists were not really Communists—that they were farmers—just agrarian reformers. The whole world now knows how wrong they were, as many of us had contended all along. Are we not justified in believing that our disastrous China policy was another manifestation of the desire of our State Department to coddle the Communists?

Military aid for China was opposed by the State Department in every step of its progress. The President signed the China-aid bill in April 1948, but, because of the slowness of the Executive Branch, it was December, eight months later, before supply driblets began to reach the Chinese forces. The war in China had then been lost.

(b) Our ships in Russian hands

On July 17 the attention of the United States Senate was called to the fact that a

large number of our ships which we furnished to Russia when she was our ally in World War II are still in the possession of the Soviet. I obtained the information from the State Department. These ships consist of both naval craft and merchant vessels.

We transferred to the Russians 585 naval craft of various types; of these, 459 are still in the hands of Russia and reported to be in operable condition. We have been able to get back only 28 ships.

Russia still has our mine sweepers, submarine chasers, torpedo boats, tugs, and pontoon barges.

At the end of the war Russia had 96 of our merchant ships; 84 of them are still in the hands of the Soviet Union.

Since I called this matter to the attention of the United States Senate there have been reports that the State Department has made a strong demand for the return of the ships. I haven't heard of it getting any more of our ships back. The question arises: "Why did the State Department wait so long?"

(c) Acheson must go

This leads me to say something about the Secretary of State—perhaps the most controversial figure in Washington—Dean Gooderham Acheson.

On February 6, last, I stated publicly that it was my considered judgment that Mr. Acheson should resign as Secretary of State, and on his failure to do so the President of the United States should remove him from office. Nothing that has transpired since has caused me to change my mind in the slightest degree.

This is the man who in 1939, before Alger Hiss did his deeds of shame at Yalta, stated, "Don't investigate Hiss; I will vouch for him completely," and who kept him in top jobs and finally put him at the head of the United Nations Convention in San Francisco.

This is the man who sent Hiss to Yalta, where Hiss, together with Gromyko, drafted the Yalta Agreement. This agreement is described by our American Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, in the following language, "As I glanced over the document I could not believe my eyes. To me, almost every line spoke of a surrender to Stalin."

This is the man who said, "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss," after Hiss was convicted by a jury for perjury in connection with the delivery of State Department secrets to a man named as an espionage agent. There seems to be a logical sequence from "operation pumpkin papers" in the State Department to "operation beachhead" in Korea.

This is also the man who after the Communist victory in China stated, "A new day has dawned in Asia."

I put this question to you: "Do you want Acheson on your payroll?" I hope, my friends, you will join me in saying "Acheson must go."

IV. WE MUST DRAW THE LINE WE MEAN TO DEFEND

My fourth and last proposition is: We must draw the line we mean to defend.

In 1823 President Monroe laid down the famous Monroe Doctrine. He said that the United States would regard as an unfriendly act any attempt on the part of European powers to extend their systems to the Western Hemisphere. For over 125 years the Monroe Doctrine has worked. It has accomplished its purpose, because the Monroe Doctrine drew a line and we stuck to it. It told the nations of the world what we expected of them. And for 125 years no one of them has seen fit to cross that line with hostile intent.

In September 1947 we signed the Rio Pact, committing the United States and other American republics to defend together the Western Hemisphere against aggression. As President Truman said, "We made it clear to any possible aggressor that the American republics are determined to support one another against attacks." In the Western Hemisphere, in clear and unmistakable terms, we drew the line we intended to defend.

In the Far East it was a different story. There our policy makers maintained a hands-off attitude.

Early in 1949 Secretary of State Acheson said that our policy in China was to "wait until the dust settled." We waited, and when the dust had settled the Reds had taken all of China except Formosa.

Then the State Department sent a secret memorandum to its Foreign Service officers saying that it would be useless to send naval units to Formosa and that the loss of the island was widely anticipated.

Last January 5, President Truman declared: "The United States will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa."

On January 12, of this year, Secretary of State Acheson warned against what he called "foolish adventures" in the Far East. He drew a line through Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines and said we would defend them against attack. But he gave no such assurance as to Korea or southern Asia. Mr. Acheson said at that time that the State Department planned to depend on the righteous wrath and anger of the Chinese and other Asiatics to check further Red aggression.

On May 5, Senator CONNALLY, spokesman in the Senate for the Administration's foreign policy, said in an interview that Korea was not an essential part of our defense strategy. Such statements must have been interpreted by Stalin as an invitation to go ahead.

Did the Reds think they had a free pass into South Korea? Stalin evidently was counting on our having adopted—as we evidently did until the invasion actually was under way—the policy advocated by Owen Lattimore. Mr. Lattimore, who has been called the architect of our foreign policy in the Far East, advocated that we let South Korea fall without giving the appearance of having pushed it.

When the Reds made their attack in Korea, the Administration hastily reversed itself. The decision to defend Korea and to send the Navy to protect Formosa represented a complete about face—a complete repudiation of our State Department's program and policy. If we had drawn the line in South Korea and announced that we would defend it, as we are defending it now, we might not be fighting there today.

The boys who are fighting in Korea—their mothers and fathers and friends, all of us—deserve better than that from our State Department.

When President Truman announced his decision to send troops into Korea, I said:

"I intend to support General MacArthur and our military operations in the Far East in every way. It is time for all Americans to close ranks.

"I hope that the Russians will not precipitate a war. Our people desire peace. I am among those who believe, as did a famous British statesman, there is no such thing as an inevitable war. If war comes, it will be from a failure of human wisdom."

While I believe in economy in Government, I have voted for every appropriation presented by the Administration for the armed services. I have said on the floor of the United States Senate that we should not cut down on our own military establishment in order to send billions of dollars as gifts to Western Europe for economic development under the Marshall Plan. I called that putting the cart before the horse. I shall continue to do everything possible to back up our boys in the training camps and on the fighting front.

The war in Korea may be long and costly. It may be only the beginning of a bigger and longer war. But whatever the future holds, we must face the test with courage, determination, and prayer. With God's help, we must win through.

When peace is restored, let us keep it—let us not give it away again.

"Lord God of hosts, be with us yet.
Lest we forget. Lest we forget."

Taxation by Emotion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in today's issue of the New York Times I find an excellent editorial entitled "Taxation by Emotion," which gives full support to the attitude and position taken by the Committee on Finance in opposing the imposition of an excess-profits tax at this time and as part of the tax bill now being considered by Congress. I ask that the excellent editorial be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXATION BY EMOTION

It is high time, it seems to us, that those Members of Congress who are trying to hitch a free political ride on the pending tax bill cease their obstructionist tactics or be accorded the rebuke by their colleagues that these tactics so abundantly warrant. We refer to those who insist on tying an excess-profits tax—and particularly their pet version of such a tax—onto the legislation as the price of their support.

The devotees of the EPT in the Senate got about all the mileage out of this issue, it would seem, that it was possible to expect. In that Chamber some Members wanted to write such a provision into the measure on the floor, but Senator WALTER GEORGE, chief helmsman for the Finance Committee's bill, vigorously opposed the idea. Senator GEORGE is not opposed to the principle of taxing away windfall war profits (nor, for that matter, are many other people), but he pointed out that the proposed amendment, though it rested largely on an appeal to war emotions, was not a true wartime excess-profits tax at all. He would, he said, support an excess-profits tax, but only if it was "one that he could honestly defend" and only after the people who would have to pay the tax had been given an opportunity to be heard. Senator GEORGE then proceeded to give incontestable earnest of his and his associates' good faith in the matter. He agreed to an amendment which directed the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to bring out excess-profits legislation at the next session of Congress (when the second defense revenue bill is scheduled for action) and to make that tax retroactive to October 1, this year.

That certainly should have been all the assurance that any reasonable person could have wished, and the Senate did, indeed, accept it as such, by voting its approval of the bill. Now it appears, however, that certain Members of the House still believe they can squeeze a few drops of political nutriment out of the popular (if thoroughly fictitious) issue of meeting the cost of the defense pro-

gram by "soaking the profiteers." Although President Truman has flatly stated that action on the highly controversial excess-profits tax should be put over until 1951, and although the pending bill, as noted above, carries a directive providing for such a tax on a retroactive basis, Representative EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania has just let it be known that he means to block immediate House action on the $4,508,000,000 bill.

As we have pointed out before, there is no issue here of whether our corporations or anyone else is to be permitted to turn a potential war emergency to his material advantage. Everyone is going to have to pitch in, so far as taxes are concerned, if the present defense effort is to be put on a pay-as-you-go basis. The established, and sensible, practice is for Congress to vote, without unnecessary delay, a general increase in existing taxes. That is exactly what the pending interim measure does, raising taxes on individuals and corporations alike. It then proceeds to a consideration of other possible sources of emergency revenue.

Arguments that it is necessary to attach an excess-profits tax to the pending bill to prevent inflation and profiteering are purely political. In the first place, corporations don't have to raise prices to profit from a boom, whether it is a peacetime or a war phenomenon. The era of the Nation's greatest corporate prosperity, in the twenties, was a period of steadily falling prices. (The post-World War I boom of 1919–20 occurred, incidentally, at a time when an excess-profits tax was still in force.) In the second place corporations that wished to raise prices would not be likely to be seriously deterred by the consideration that this might involve a tax payment at some time in the future. Furthermore, since the economy has not yet felt the impact of the post-Korean rearmament program, there can hardly be any profits directly attributable to the war in the immediate future. And, finally, the legislation now pending provides that any such profits accruing from the first of next month on will be covered by the excess profits provision of the second (1951) defense revenue bill.

We are as intolerant as anyone when it comes to wartime profiteering; in fact, in one respect we are perhaps more intolerant than some. We object to wartime profiteering of any kind, even when it takes the form of political profiteering.

Suggested Permanent Cure for Car Shortage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on August 21 I introduced H. R. 9480. The objective of this bill is a permanent cure of periodic car shortages on American railroads.

Later in my remarks, wherein I include testimony given by me before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a summary of the car-shortage problem is made. Before presenting that testimony, however, I shall briefly explain the bill, H. R. 9480.

The bill directs the Interstate Commerce Commission to conduct a continuing study of car shortages and their causes. The results of this study are to be the basis upon which the ICC makes its decisions regarding the operation of the program outlined in the bill.

Provision is made for the creation of a Government corporation to be known as the Railroad Car Reserve Corporation. This Corporation capitalized for $250,000,000 would, under the direction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, acquire freight cars and hold them in storage.

The bill provides that whenever the Commission finds that the demand for cars exceeds the available supply of cars, it then assigns cars from the storage reserve owned by the Corporation to such railroads and to such parts of the United States as are affected by the car shortage. After the car assignment is made and the shortage emergency met in that manner, the Corporation negotiates a lease with the railroad or railroads to which the cars are assigned. The railroads would, of course, pay a reasonable rental for the use of the cars.

When the emergency for which the Commission has assigned the cars comes to an end, the cars will either be returned to the reserve pool or they may be purchased by the railroads.

The bill simply offers a plan to insure the whole economy of our country against the serious losses and damage caused by periodic shortages of railway freight cars.

Shortly after the bill was introduced, the Subcommittee on Transportation of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce heard testimony on it as a part of the continuing study of transportation being conducted by the committee. I appeared at the hearings and made the following statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH, A REPRESENTATIVE TO CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, AUGUST 29, 1950, ON H. R. 9480

Early in January of this year, in fact, on January 16, I addressed a letter to Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, directing his attention and the attention of the committee to the car supply problem in the United States.

There was not at that time a shortage of cars. Traffic was moving entirely in a normal manner. I suggested that the committee, through its Subcommittee on Transportation, conduct hearings on the question of the car supply, with the thought of developing information for the use of the Committee and the Subcommittee on Transportation.

The further thought I had in mind in asking that a hearing be held was that there certainly was every indication at that time, with the statistics available, that there might be car shortages during this year.

As we all know, a car shortage did develop.

In response to my request, the hearing was conducted by your subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, at which I appeared and at which considerable general testimony was heard, and testimony with particular reference to the car supply problem.

I recall that Colonel Johnson, the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, gave some exceedingly interesting testimony at that time.

As to the present situation, I do not think I need to elaborate on that to any extent. That will be done by others. But the car supply is short all over the United States, apparently, judging by the mail I have received. Only today I received another telegram, and I have before me a file some two inches in height, which represents the telegrams and letters I have received in the last 3 or 4 months from people who are suffering from a lack of freight cars.

Today I received a wire from a sawmill in my congressional district at Glendale, Oreg. The telegram was signed by the Robert Dollar Co. The telegram says:

"Today our plant was forced to curtail production and go on two 5-hour shifts rather than continue operating on two 8-hour shifts. This reduction of production is caused by critical car shortage. Year by year, the situation, now unbearable, has gradually become worse and upsets the economy of our Nation, particularly the lumber industry. There must be some way you can bring pressure to bear to help alleviate the situation."

Time magazine summed up the problem rather well, I thought, in its issue for August 14. For the record, and for the benefit of the committee I would like to read one or two paragraphs:

"With the shortage of cars already pinching some sections of the United States, Iron Age"—that is a publication of the iron and steel industry—"has predicted that the United States faces a serious car shortage, potentially the worst in history. Chief reason: The supply of freight cars has not kept pace with the Nation's growth. Though the gross national product has more than doubled in 10 years, the number of freight cars in service has actually dwindled to 1,605,609 from 1,620,655 at the time of Pearl Harbor."

With reference to the telegram I just read from a constituent, who suggests that there must be some way that I, as a Member of Congress, can put pressure on, I think that you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, know full well that there is not very much that a Member of the Congress can do in the way of putting pressure on that has not already been done.

I will go further to say that, from my contacts and discussions with the chairman and members of the Bureau of Service of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and from my discussions with Mr. Faricy, president of the American Association of Railroads, and Mr. Gass, of the car service division of that organization, I have become convinced that there is no pressure of any kind that can be exerted at this time which will have any bearing whatever upon the immediate car shortage problem.

There are things that can be done which might prevent such a shortage in the future, but as to reaching under a hat and pulling out 50,000 freight cars right now—and that is the only way the situation could be relieved—I do not think that is possible.

I shall be interested, however, in hearing statements from the Association of American Railroads and from the Commission, hoping that they may be able to offer some suggestion for immediate relief.

The situation on the west coast, and particularly in western Oregon, is serious. Lumber production is curtailed now, and it may go down to only 70 percent of normal. That means unquestionably a short supply in lumber over the country.

It doubtless will mean higher prices to all consumers and it certainly means a reduction in employment during the peak of the normal lumber manufacturing season.

I have introduced, as you mention, Mr. Chairman, House Resolution 813, calling for an investigation of the car-shortage problem by this committee. I realize that this committee already is operating under a resolution heretofore passed, calling for a complete and over-all study of transportation. I am well aware of the fact that the committee has done a fine job on that subject.

However, I introduced the resolution for the purpose of again calling the attention of the committee to the one particular phase in transportation on which further study should be made.

In addition to that piece of legislation, I also prepared and introduced H. R. 9480. The title of that bill, I think, tells the story very briefly, but completely. The title of the bill states that it is—

"A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to make provision for an adequate reserve supply of railroad freight cars to supplement the normal supply in time of temporary shortage or national emergency."

I want to discuss that bill very briefly now, Mr. Chairman, if I may, and then at greater length at another time.

First of all, this question of car shortage has been plaguing the area where I live for the last 40 years. I have in my possession a copy of the minutes of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association board of directors for the year 1916, in which a resolution was passed appointing a committee of members of the board to confer with the Southern Pacific Railroad officials to see what could be done about the disastrous car shortage.

That, Mr. Chairman, was in 1916.

I grew up in the lumber industry. My father was a mill superintendent most of my younger life, and I can recall many years when the mills would shut down through lack of cars. That trouble has recurred from time to time on down through the years.

This bill which I have introduced is based on a very broad, very well understood, and long-established theory, and that is that the Government of the United States believes that it is in the interests of all the people to meet certain deficiencies and services in industries that are of a public-utility nature.

I call your attention to the fact that one of the first activities of the Federal Government was the construction of inland canals.

The Government has gone to the rescue of the United States merchant marine because that service is of value to all the people. It is in the interest of all the people to have a strong and working merchant marine. It appeared some years ago that the merchant marine of the United States could not compete on an equal basis with the merchant ships of other countries. So Government subsidies were introduced into that field.

Many railroads throughout the country and especially in the West, were built as the result of land grants by the Federal Government. Granted, of course, that the railroad companies would have built those lines had it been reasonable and possible as a business proposition to do so, it was proven that could not be done, and therefore, the Federal Government said, "It is in the interest of the Government and the people of the United States that such roads be built."

So the land grants were made.

We are all familiar with the airmail subsidy plan.

Power dams owned by the United States have supplemented existing hydroelectric power furnished by privately owned dams and privately owned systems.

I think even the Panama Canal was in this category since it certainly has not repaid its cost and is in a sense a subsidy to water shipping for the benefit of the people.

We have built large pipelines for the transmission of natural gas.

Last year the Congress passed a bill to improve rural telephone service.

Then lastly, but certainly not the least, the rivers and harbors development is a common activity of the Federal Government and it is always on the basis of doing something for the benefit of shipping and transportation, which is deemed to be in the interest of the whole people.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the essence of my bill. It seems, after these many years of experience, that great and fine as the railroad system of the United States is, there come periods of time when the normal car supply of the railroads is not sufficient to meet an emergency or a peak traffic situation. My bill would permit the Government to supplement the car supply in times of shortage or emergency need.

This year, in addition to the fact that the car supply had run down during the war, we had a coal strike; we had a strike of switchmen on the railroads; we had a peak grain crop; and we had a peak production in the lumber industry in the West. All of those things together resulted in the present car shortage.

I submit this as the theory behind my bill: The Government of the United States should recognize, in my opinion, that the railroad system faces occasionally, as the result of a combination of things, a car shortage. Sometimes it may be caused by any one thing, which makes it impossible for the rail system of the country to meet the demand for rail cars.

It seems to me that if it can be shown, as the result of hearings and study, that the losses suffered by the economic system and the people as a whole as the result of car shortages are great enough to warrant the expenditure of Government funds to help alleviate that difficulty, then it should be done.

I am not for a moment advocating that the Federal Government go into the business of supplying the railroads with freight cars. That is not the purpose of my bill, and I am surprised that that interpretation is sometimes put on it.

I regret that in a story which went out on the press wires after the introduction of the bill it was inferred in the story that railroads could go to the Interstate Commerce Commission after this bill went into effect and obtain freight cars. That specifically is not true.

The bill leaves the discretion in the hands of the Commission as to whether or not an emergency exists and as to where and when units from the reserve of freight cars will be assigned. The Corporation which I have outlined in the bill would be capitalized for $250,000,000. In round numbers, that envisions the construction of 50,000 freight cars.

This may be too many, or it may not be enough. That will also have to be developed by hearings.

But that investment does not represent an outright expenditure; it represents plant investment, not unlike the plant investment of our Grand Coulee Dam and other public assets.

The cost to the taxpayers would be the cost of operating the program, which probably would not run to more than 5 percent of the actual capitalization.

I would think that when the program was under operation, the outlay to administer the program and keep the cars on storage in the reserve, as outlined in the bill, would probably not run more than $10,000,000 a year, most of which would be returned to the Government from leases.

In conclusion, this is the problem I place before the committee: Periods of car shortage represent an inherent weakness in our otherwise splendid rail transportation system. Should the United States Government take positive action to remedy this weakness?

The bill is introduced on that theory. I lay it before the committee with the request and the hope that the committee will conduct hearings and will investigate the problem and then come up with the same type of decision that is reached by the Public Works Committee when it passes upon the merits of public works construction in rivers and harbors.

In other words, if the ratio of benefits to cost is high enough to warrant the Federal Government expending public funds, then the program should be enacted.

If it is found that the annual damages and costs to the people of the country are not sufficiently great to warrant a program of this kind, then the bill, of course, should be set aside.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is a subject worthy of study by the committee. I am hopeful that if this bill is not enacted, the principle will be carefully studied and that if some other way of meeting the problem can be developed, that it will be done.

Chairman J. Monroe Johnson, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Commissioner Walter Splawn also presented testimony at that hearing. The Commission had not yet had an opportunity to study and make a formal report on my bill, H. R. 9480, since it had only been available in printed form for a few days. Nevertheless, Commissioner Splawn revealed considerable knowledge of it when in the course of his testimony he made the following comments:

In reading the preamble of Congressman ELLSWORTH'S bill, H. R. 9480, one is impressed by the caution with which the bill approaches this problem and by the declaration that it is intended to maintain the independence of the individual railroad company and the competitive situation between the carriers.

The preamble accurately brings out this recurring crisis in shortages here and there, and it is particularly acute seasonally in the West and also points out how important it is to have enough cars in case of a war or great emergency and then closes with a declaration of policy, the policy merely being that the Federal Government will maintain a reserve car supply.

This bill then is not drawn to put the Federal Government into the transportation business. It is drawn, as I read it, as an insurance against these recurring crises which are so costly to individual shippers and to particular railroads. It is not a bill presupposing the eventual acquisition of railroad properties by the Government, much less their operation by the Government. It is merely a device of insurance against unforeseeable and recurring crises which apparently it is impossible, under the competition we desire to maintain, to prevent, and completely to forestall.

Now, as I understand this bill, it is an insurance proposition as against a recurring calamity or shortage or crisis in the number of cars necessary, the bill modestly starts with 50,000, some may say it generally starts with 50,000, but experience will demonstrate how many more than 50,000 would be needed. The great problem is to safeguard this corporation you set up against pressures to dispose of the cars on easy terms to somebody and have them out of the reach of the Government and of this corporation when a crisis or shortage develops.

If they are to be used as a pool merely to relieve shortages, then they should be called back promptly after the shortage has been overcome and taken out of competition with the privately owned cars. They should not be used by the Government competitively with the cars owned by the railroads and by the private car companies, but merely be used for the purpose contemplated by this bill, in a crisis, to meet an emergency, and immediately that the shortage has been overcome, they should be called back.

It would be an investment by the public in the interest of the public to prevent the greater loss that results from the stalling of the economy in particular areas, either territorially or industrially as the case may be.

I was deeply impressed by the caution with which Congressman ELLSWORTH approached this problem, and the very same statement he made this afternoon, in opening this hearing. As I take it, he does not come with some remedy all worked out that will cure our ills, certainly, but he comes with a proposition as well thought out as, under the circumstances, time would permit, with a bill as carefully drawn as could be done under the circumstances, and invites the committee to study the problem, to deliberate upon it, to permit the carriers and the shippers to express their views after they have studied and analyzed the bill. I think a saner and safer approach to the problem could not be conceived.

I think it is clear from the statement I made to the committee and from the comments of Commissioner Splawn that H. R. 9480 is not intended to cure the present car shortage which for several months has impaired the economy of the United States. My bill offers a method and a means of effecting a permanent cure for the future. I feel that common sense indicates and years of experience prove that each of nearly 400 railroad systems in the United States cannot be expected to maintain an idle reserve fleet of freight cars to be in readiness to meet an emergency or crisis. They could no more be expected to do that than we would attempt to solve the problem of fire protection by insisting that each householder maintain his own fire fighting equipment. My bill proposes that the Government, in the interest of all the people, be prepared to meet car shortage emergencies just as in common practice we collectively maintain fire departments for the protection of individual property owners.

Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News entitled "Genocide."

I do not know whether much attention has been paid to the terms of this treaty or not, but I wish to call attention to the broad and dangerous powers conferred under this treaty.

I cannot conceive of the Senate ratifying this treaty in its present form. The popular idea is that the treaty merely prevents mass murders, but when you see the broad general powers which it confers, it is apparent that the United States is surrendering the right to determine the guilt or innocence of people when only one person is killed, or merely some demonstration of power or force that amounts to the intimidation or threatening of a particular group.

Under article II of the treaty there are five crimes listed where authority would be given to deal with under this treaty, to wit:

First. Killing members of the group.

Second. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group.

Third. Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part.

Fourth. Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group.

Fifth. Complicity in genocide.

It is perfectly manifest that under this broad general definition a riot or any other small disturbance might cause bodily harm, and the denial of a person to membership in a lodge or club, or a decision in any way adverse to the person, could cause mental harm and the offender could be charged with genocide or complicity in genocide and tried by a foreign tribunal.

This treaty would take away from the States the right to exercise police authority in the border of the States and of the Nation. The American people are not willing to surrender this power under the pretense of preventing mass murders, which can be punished under international law, as we have already done in the case of the German war criminals.

This editorial calls attention to a very vital matter.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENOCIDE

We are against genocide just as we are against cannibalism, but we are not in favor of the genocide convention proposed by the United Nations. It has been ratified by 15 nations and needs 5 more. The United States is one of those nations which have not ratified it.

We have three objections to it. First, the definition of genocide is so loosely drawn in the convention as to mean almost anything. Thus it includes "causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group." Would this cover a cartoon ridiculing the Irish or a presentation of The Merchant of Venice or Uncle Tom's Cabin? We don't know but since the convention if ratified would be the supreme law of the land superseding the Constitution of the United States and since it would be interpreted by courts outside our country, we'd rather there should be no room for doubt.

Second, the convention is unnecessary. Genocide is murder of civilians en masse and is punishable as a war crime. Didn't we hang quite a few of the Nazi supermen for it? And if the North Koreans practice genocide on the Christians in their midst, won't we hang their leaders if we win the war and if we can catch them, regardless of whether there is any genocide convention on the books?

Third—and this is our strongest objection—the genocide proposal is a perfect example of getting the cart before the horse. As cannibalism is a byproduct of starvation, genocide is a byproduct of war. If the United Nations can stop war, it will ipso facto stop genocide. If it can't stop war, how is it going to stop genocide? If it can't stop external aggregation, how is it going to stop internal aggression?

It is the business of the United Nations to stop war. That is quite a big enough job for it. It had better stick to its knitting. If it will only reform and strengthen itself so as to make war too dangerous and unprofitable for any aggressor to try it, the world will not have to worry about genocide which is the result of war or a war psychosis.

Free Americans Receive an Exciting Invitation From the Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, many American businessmen—big and small—have long groused and grumbled about the growth of big, expensive, autocratic Government in Washington. Unfortunately, very few of our American business leaders either in our great corporations, our crowded cities, or our smaller communities, have demonstrated the necessary initiative, courage, and resourcefulness to fight back effectively against the Fair Deal schemes to collectivize, socialize, and finally to nationalize the economic system of America.

As a consequence, big government grows bigger and more arrogant while the areas of free enterprise in this country grow smaller and more apologetic.

It is encouraging—positively stimulating—therefore, Mr. President, to be able to include in the RECORD an advertisement appearing in United States News and World Report in which the American Medical Association takes off its gloves, enrolls in the fight to save our American success formula, and invites American businessmen to join in a great national crusade for freedom. America's farmers have already demonstrated they cannot and will not be pushed around by the power-hungry politicians of our Palace City.

Mr. Businessman—it is your next move—unless you are willing to move out of your enterprises in order to let the Fair Deal politicians move in.

Mr. President, this advertisement should receive an enthusiastic response to the invitation it extends. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. BUSINESSMAN: THE DOCTORS OF AMERICA INVITE YOU TO COME ON IN

At a time when Americans are defending freedom from aggressive outside attack, the medical profession believes all business and industry will welcome this opportunity to join in an outspoken defense of freedom on the home front.

Millions of Americans, through more than 10,000 civic organizations, already have voiced emphatically their opposition to socialized medicine, the proven forerunner of a socialized state.

During the week of October 8, American doctors will place a 70-inch advertisement—reaffirming their faith in all American freedoms—in every daily and weekly newspaper of paid general circulation in the country. Ten thousand newspapers, 30 national magazines, and more than 1,000 radio stations will carry the message to all Americans.

CHAIN REACTION—FREEDOM STYLE

The medical profession's $1,000,000 advertising campaign is designed to tell every

American the truth about state socialism and the truth about the achievements of our voluntary medical-care system. The campaign affords a splendid opportunity for business to tell its story, too.

On this strong foundation, all friends of freedom can build an impressive volume of tie-in advertising. Every newspaper will be supplied with mats and suggested copy for appropriate ads. Radio stations will have similar aids in planning the most effective presentation of your message.

Americans who care about America are learning that you don't have to drift with the foreign tide of state socialism. You can buck it.

The doctors of America have proved it. When the threat of socialized medicine became ominous 2 years ago, they took their story direct to the people. The people, by the millions, responded with a grass-roots mandate unprecedented in our history.

Join the freedom roll call—the voluntary way is the American way.

NATIONAL EDUCATION CAMPAIGN,
AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

County Agricultural Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, I introduced bills to provide for participation by the Federal Government in the cost of constructing county agricultural buildings, where offices of many cooperating State and Federal agencies might be maintained. The Government is spending almost $3,000,000 a year for rent in privately owned buildings for these public agencies, and it would be good business to support a program as outlined in my bill, H. R. 402, whereby title in the county buildings would be retained by the county authorities, but facilities would be provided for Federal agencies. I realize that this program should be held in suspense during the emergency but I call the proposed legislation to the attention of the House, because of the need for making some future provision for a building program.

I recently received from Mr. J. V. Highfill, State director of the Farmers Home Administration for Arkansas, a letter describing efforts of county officials of Yell County which resulted in the construction of an agricultural building, as a war memorial, for that county. Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote the following from Mr. Highfill's letter:

> The building, 110 by 40 feet, and costing $14,500, was paid for by the county from reserve funds * * * and was constructed primarily through the efforts of Judge Morris Moore of Dardanelle. The following agencies are housed in the building: Soil Conservation Service, Production, and Marketing Administration, Extension Service, and Farmers Home Administration. The space provided for these agencies is rent free.
>
> * * * Mr. John R. Pledger, our county FHA Supervisor at Danville, worked closely with Judge Moore in bringing to a full realization the facilities now afforded the agricultural agencies. * * *
>
> The building as it exists represents not only a memorial to those patriots who gave their lives in World War II, but it also represents a memorial to the cooperation which can be brought about by careful planning and unselfish devotion to a worth-while project in a rural area.
>
> I know that you have a great appreciation for the thing that has been achieved in Yell County, and the housing of all agricultural agencies in one building. * * * It is my sincere hope that this sort of thing can happen in a great many more counties in Arkansas.

Perishable Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make available an excellent editorial from the Washington Post of Sunday, September 3, summarizing the existing situation with reference to surplus food commodities and urging, as I have previously done, prompt action by the Senate and by the President. The editorial is as follows:

PERISHABLE SURPLUSES

The Senate has not yet acted on a bill adopted by the House last month to facilitate the distribution among hungry people overseas of certain perishable foodstuffs of which the United States has an oversupply. There is no need here to review the problems and policies responsible for these food surpluses. The fact is that they exist here in mounting inventories; and they must be disposed of either by giving them away or by destroying them. At a time when human beings abroad are in desperate need of these commodities, there can scarcely be any question as to which course we should pursue. Moreover, virtue in this situation can be counted upon to bring its own rewards. Hunger, as Secretary Marshall always insisted, is an ally of communism. The relief of it enables people to assert independence and move toward a solution of their problems.

The bill passed by the House would simply amend the Agricultural Act so as to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the costs of packaging perishable surpluses and transporting them within the United States—a cost which the voluntary agencies seeking to distribute them are unable to bear. They would be available first for the relief of needy persons in this country and for nonprofit undertakings such as the school-lunch program; any commodities left over after these needs were met would be donated to governmental, intergovernmental and private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons in non-Communist countries outside the United States.

When it is considered that the current storage of these perishable surpluses involves considerable expense to the Government and that large quantities of them must necessarily suffer spoilage or deliberate destruction before Congress can reconvene, the need for prompt Senate endorsement of the House-enacted bill seems altogether plain. The Senate docket is, of course, an extremely crowded one. But there ought to be a few moments before adjournment in which to pass this sensible, humanitarian, and essentially economic measure.

Statement by Frank A. Hecht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement issued to the press by Frank A. Hecht, president of the Navy League of the United States:

PRESIDENT OF NAVY LEAGUE SAYS MARINE CORPS DOES NOT LIKE BEING COMPARED TO NO. 1 ENEMY OF DEMOCRACY—CALLS PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S STATEMENT ON MARINES GRATUITOUS INSULT FROM COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Frank A. Hecht, president of the Navy League of the United States, commenting on President Truman's statement which said the Marine Corps "have a propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's," today said: "Anyone who served in the Navy has a tremendous respect for marines. All marines ask is that they be in the vanguard of the fighting line as they always have been for the last 150 years. Their deeds speak for themselves. The marines fighting and dying in Korea don't think of themselves as naval cops. Neither do the widows or parents of those who were killed at Guadalcanal, on Iwo Jima, or Okinawa. If the Commander in Chief of all our Armed Forces were familiar with the law, he would know that the Marines are not part of the Navy. They are part of the naval service. He should also know that under the law they are charged with primary responsibility for amphibious warfare, for fleet landings, for securing and holding beachheads and many other functions. Never has there been such a gratuitous insult from the Commander in Chief to one of our fighting forces. The President owes an apology to every marine, to every ex-marine, and to the widows and parents of marines who died fighting for their country. They don't like being compared to the No. 1 enemy of democracy."

Governor Lee, of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Gail Martin for the New Leader publication of July 8, 1950, in answer to several articles appearing in national magazines concerning Governor Lee, of Utah.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEE OF UTAH: CHAMP OR SCAMP
(By Gail Martin)

The State of Utah has been signally honored. Within less than a month, five national magazines have burst forth with long and handsomely illustrated articles on the life and works of its very own Gov. J. Bracken Lee. This effusion represents more

praise and publicity than has been lavished on all Utah chief executives since statehood was won in 1897.

The articles in Time, Life, Newsweek, the American Magazine and the Saturday Evening Post sustain a single note of thanksgiving and joy. At last in the remote and sparsely settled State of Utah, a stalwart, farseeing statesman has been discovered—one who turns a deaf ear to all pressure groups and untiringly spreads the gospel of reduced Government services and spending.

To report that Utah residents are a bit nonplussed by such adulation for their Governor would be an understatement. Many who have smirked at his reckless statements and inept executive acts during the past 15 months are beginning to wonder if they have wronged a great and good man. Independent-thinking Republicans, who had rebelled at the Governor's broken promises and inconsistencies are scurrying back to the party fold.

But discerning students of public affairs are suspicious. Why, they ask, should five powerful weeklies, with a combined circulation running into millions, pool forces to elevate an inexperienced, poorly informed and frequently bungling politician to the dizzy pinnacle of national fame?

Are these articles part of Grand Old Party publicity sounding the overture for the 1950 congressional and 1952 Presidential campaigns? Does Republican strategy call for glorification of some erstwhile businessman like Governor Lee as restorer of the lost ideals of economy and efficiency in government in order to promote big business' aim of smashing the hard-won social benefits of the New and Fair Deals? Is it because Brack Lee's whole political philosophy so closely parallels the Taft-Wherry-McCarthy line that the Utah Governor has been selected as the ideal personality to dramatize the virtues of Republicanism?

No one knows for sure, but the claims made for Governor Lee's administration in the five magazines are so far from its actual accomplishments to date that astute observers are convinced a little snooping would turn up some curious facts. Everyone admits that Brack Lee is a cagey opponent. He tells all his audiences that he is a humble man, bewildered by all the national publicity—he is no politician; he believes only in governmental economy and efficiency. He says all this in such a straightforward, modest, and plausible manner that you can't help believing him—unless of course you chance to remember the Baconian precept that men customarily employ language to conceal, not communicate, thought.

Brack is also no amateur in the use of the McCarthy smear technique. He has a wholesome respect, he tells audiences, for those who openly declare themselves to be members of the Communist Party. But he has no respect for those who deny allegiance to communism, and yet invariably come up with some plan borrowed from communism or socialism whenever they frame a policy for the Government. In one speech in Los Angeles, he out-McCarthied McCARTHY himself when—the chief executive of the State of Utah—he confessed that he feared the Democratic Party more than the Russian Government.

Governor Lee stands for good roads, good schools, good hospitals, old-age pensions—all the good things, in fact—thereby qualifying as a man of good-will to all, even as a do-gooder. The trouble is that he always winds up such touching avowals with the rhetorical question: "But can we afford them?" He boasts proudly that the United States has the best schools, the best roads, the best medical facilities in the world. But the implication of his words always seems to be that such perfection needs no improvement—especially when improvement means more government and more taxes.

The gap between his expressed intentions and his performance is so great that critics have come to the conclusion that Lee's political philosophy calls for reducing governmental functions to the medieval level of merely keeping the peace and enforcing payment of debts. They are convinced he would like to restore to private industry services the Government has supplied for decades and, in general, return to horse-and-buggy economic and political principles in an atomic age.

STATE NEVER INDEBTED

Governor Lee and his publicity brigade talk as if Utah had never had honest, efficient government until he came to office. But a visit to the State treasurer's office reveals that, after 25 years of Democratic administration, Utah is one of the few States with no bonded indebtedness. During the administration of Lee's predecessor, Gov. Herbert B. Maw, more than enough Federal bonds were purchased and deposited in the State sinking fund to liquidate completely the remaining $700,000 of State obligations. When Lee took office January 1, 1949, Utah had an untouched reserve of $5,000,000 in its emergency relief fund and an appropriated but unexpended $4,000,000 in its building fund.

The Democratic-controlled 1949 State legislature sent Governor Lee an appropriation bill for 1950–51 calling for the expenditure of $2,800,000 less than anticipated revenues. The same Democratic legislature passed two measures that will add $1,600,000 in new revenues to the estimated surplus of $2,800,000. Yet Governor Lee deleted a total of $3,800,000 from the appropriation bill by line veto, eliminating or crippling 25 vital State services.

Had kind fate in the form of a district court decision not intervened, the Utah State Agricultural College would have had to withdraw the farm extension service lifeline it had maintained for the Utah farm industry since statehood. Rather than spend $400,000 for continued farm extension service in 1950–51, the Governor was prepared to toss overboard the United States Department of Agriculture grants-in-aid, and wreck a service of inestimable value to the State's agricultural industry.

In pursuing an "economy" policy unequaled by any Utah Governor—Republican or Democrat—Brack has shown himself the consummate politician. He never orders a Government service vital to the people or industry discontinued outright. Rather he will call in a department head and say: "Now I don't want you to discontinue any of these programs, but you can save the necessary funds by cutting out the graft, waste, and duplication in your department."

Following this strategy, he deleted at one fell swoop from the 1950–51 Department of Agriculture budget a $25,000 item for bovine tuberculosis or Bang's disease inspection, which had been carried on for decades in cooperation with the Federal Government. Bovine tuberculosis reduces the calf population and milk production, and decimates range and dairy herds.

But economy-minded Brack, who is death on State services supported by Federal grants-in-aid and evidently cares little about the health of Utah's citizens and the welfare of one of its great industries, whacked off the funds to finance this long-standing program.

For the sake of a few thousand dollars, the program to control chicken pullorum, which wipes out poultry in great numbers, suffered the same fate. So did the soil conservation program, which, for a biennial expenditure of $5,000, safeguards lives and property against disastrous floods. The weed-control program was also bluepenciled at a time when competent agricultural authorities were warning that noxious weeds not only cost the farming industry at least $20,000,000 annually, but if unchecked, may destroy before long the fertility of all Utah farmland.

This is but a partial list of Governor Lee's disastrous "economies." Virtually every sort of socially beneficial Government service—health, education, highways, water conservation, and others—has been stricken by the Lee "efficiency and economy program." Only those budget items affecting the Governor's office have escaped the ax. True, the American magazine ecstatically announced that the first thing "efficiency-and-economy-loving" Brack did, on assuming office, was to lop $27,000 off the appropriation for maintenance of the gubernatorial mansion.

But State records show that Governor Lee, in January 1949, recommended the same $32,500 asked by his predecessor, Governor Maw. The 1949 legislature trimmed his request by $2,500, leaving Brack $30,000 to keep house with. Yet the American magazine would have admiring citizens believe that Brack is maintaining the Governor's mansion out of his own pocket.

When Lee first took office, the daily press approvingly quoted him to the effect that, hencetforth, Utah's Governor would not burden taxpayers by maintaining an expensive Cadillac for his private use. The new chief executive would supply and drive his own car. Forthwith, the Governor's handsome 1946 Cadillac, which had just been overhauled and put in tip-top condition, was sold for $1,500. This price, Democrats charge, was about $1,500 under the market for a used car of that type.

On the heels of the favorable newspaper publicity which naturally followed, the State finance commission received a requisition from the Governor's office for the purchase of a new 1949 Cadillac. The commission, consisting of hold-overs from the Maw administration, sent the purchase order back to Governor Lee with a note stating that the budget did not provide sufficient funds for the purpose. This minor deviation from the widely trumpeted Lee "economy" program received little mention in the press. Neither did the fact that, as soon as he had appointed a new economy-minded finance commission, the Governor purchased a new Cadillac.

LEE'S APPOINTMENTS

Brack Lee doesn't play politics. He says so himself, so it must be true. He also claims that he stoutly resists the influence of all pressure groups—labor, teachers, farm, cultural, social service. Yet no one has ever heard him say that he objected to being pressured by big business. As an opponent of politics, waste, and duplication of effort in Government, he might be expected to show a record studded with brilliant examples of devotion to his lofty principles. Here, for the benefit of posterity—and, particularly, the readers of Time, Life, et al—are a few highlights of what must be accounted a very sorry record, indeed:

1. One of Lee's first official acts was to employ an attorney in the Governor's office at $500 a month during the legislative session. Other governors had limped along with the legal advice of the lower-paid State attorney general's staff, and a messenger to run errands to the legislature. One critic commented sourly afterward: "Any messenger boy could have helped the Governor arrive at decisions as wise as those he reached with the aid of his special attorney."

2. Lee has employed an executive assistant at $500 a month for work that had been always done by the Governor's secretary at $333.

3. He appointed as chairman of the State board of agriculture a man with a business background, who made no pretense of having ever been either a dirt or a gentleman

farmer. When farm groups bitterly protested the appointment, the Governor highmindedly announced that he wanted the board to include representatives of all types of farming—even people who sold machinery and supplies to the farmer.

4. He appointed a State engineer with only 1 year of college engineering background, most of whose experience had consisted of construction work for the State's largest mining corporation. Even Republicans wonder if the Governor could not have found a man better qualified by education and experience to administer the State's water-conservation program, upon whose success will depend Utah's prosperity and growth in the years to come.

5. Appointments to the University of Utah board of regents all consisted of citizens in the higher-income brackets of finance, mining, utilities, and manufacturing. Not one representative of labor has landed a place on this highly important body.

Have 15 months of Lee incumbency produced results as happy as the national magazines would have readers believe? The State's bill for salaries for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1949, was reported in the daily press as $33,000 larger than the year before. The number of employees was smaller, indicating that salary increases were responsible. Brack Lee cannot be wholly blamed for this advance, since he held office for only 6 months of the period. But the new record of expenditures supports the claim of his Democratic opponents that the Lee administration's savings won't amount to peanuts.

Many citizens see in Governor Lee's "courageous assaults on State spending and his rejection of plans to get Federal money for State aid"—to borrow the words of a newspaper editorial writer—something far more insidious and destructive than a drive for economy and efficiency. They see a determined, systematic, and ruthless scheme to undermine faith in the peoples' power to act by the democratic process to improve their lot; and an attempt to smear as wastrels, incompetents, and selfish politicians all Government servants.

A recent article in the Saturday Evening Post reported that Governor Lee has one serious criticism of our social and economic system. "Since the New Deal," Governor Lee is quoted as saying, "it is no longer possible for an honest man to make a million dollars. And I resent that."

This statement explains a good deal about Governor Lee. He truly and sincerely believes in helping the rich get richer. He probably wouldn't have the poor get any poorer, for, as he assures us, he is essentially a man of good will. But all his public acts seem to point one way—to a speedy return to the Dark Ages, when the serfs froze and starved, and the jolly knights and barons lived off the fat of the land.

A Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the eloquent and inspiring address delivered on the 4th of September 1950, by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] at the annual convention of the American Legion, Department of Oklahoma, in Oklahoma City, Okla.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, Commander Dick Warren; Comrades of the American Legion, it is a great pleasure to be here; it is a high honor to address this audience.

I speak to you as a buddy and as a friend. I am, of course, both aware of and grateful for my identity as the junior Senator from Oklahoma. The views I express are, however, my own and are in no wise binding on the Congress.

With this in your minds, I would like to talk with you about the condition of our great country as I see it, and its position and responsibilities in the world in which we live.

The great Roosevelt once said: "The state of this Nation is good; the heart of this Nation is sound; the spirit of this Nation is strong; the faith of this Nation is eternal."

In recent weeks, I have heard and read the views of many who feel otherwise. They are jittery about the unity, security, and preparedness of our Nation. Some even dolefully ask: "Who killed Cock Robin?" I would like to answer all of these fine, but I believe, mistaken people here and now—it is my positive conviction that Cock Robin ain't dead.

In fact, using Cock Robin as the symbol of the mighty power of this, the greatest Nation on the earth, I would say he is about the livest bird I know. I am persuaded that some who indulge in mournful soliloquy and ask: "Who killed Cock Robin?" are in reality more interested in convicting him of a misspent youth than in priming him for a healthy future.

Some people seem to get a limited satisfaction out of pointing a finger of scorn and trying to fix the blame on somebody for something. However, they are much wiser as to what might or should have been, than as to what should be. Knowing so well that my own hindsight is better than my foresight, I am aware that many others are the same.

I believe our country will be better served by a new and fiercer resolve to make her stronger today and tomorrow, than by merely finding fault with some weakness of yesterday.

I would not shield anyone who should be censured. I would not forgive anyone who should be punished. But our first job is to work and build and prepare until we are impregnable. Then, let those who will, devote what time they may, to who did what and when.

During the past 5 years, our country has spent $49,000,000,000 on national defense. This is an all-time record for peacetime expenditures.

This has made it possible for this Nation to have 1,461,000 fighting men in her Armed Forces. I am proud to say to you that they are the best-fed, the best-clothed, and the best-equipped fighting men on the earth. Every American is proud that his Government has provided them with fair pay and the best food, clothing and equipment that money can buy. Twenty of the forty-nine billion dollars has gone for these items alone.

Another $13,000,000,000 has been required for the maintenance and operation of our aircraft, our fleets, and military installations.

Another $8,000,000,000 has been spent in research, development of new weapons, including atomic bomb tests, maintenance of the National Guard and Organized Reserves.

During this 5 years, we have spent nearly $2,000,000,000 each year for additional munitions of war—ships, planes, tanks and guns.

We now realize that we must accelerate our spending; we must double the personnel and we must vastly increase the munitions. This we will do.

Ah, my friends, we know the dangers that confront us. They are real. They are deadly, but they are recognized by all Americans everywhere. The concern of our people is as real as these dangers are.

I think Americans are more alert and more vigilant today than ever before, and I know that an alert and vigilant America is a secure America.

In our generation, the tides of aggression and conquest have overrun many lands and subdued many people. America has been the rock of Gibraltar against which those tides have beaten in vain. They have been thrown against us with all of the fury of hatred, greed and selfish ambition. Each time we have hurled them back in failure and defeat. We have seen our Nation emerge stronger from each impact, stronger by reason of a more vital spirit and greater vigilance in the hearts and minds of our people. Our Nation stands today:

"Like some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale and rides above the storm;
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

But, my comrades, we cannot rest now nor falter here. We face an even sterner task today than those which have already tried us so sorely. Tides of evil propaganda roll against the bulwark of our freedom today. The tides of aggression we knew in yesteryear were physical, and their purpose was to subdue only our material strength. Today's aggressors would use their false propaganda to lull the minds and seduce the will of our people. Then they would unleash their raw and brutal power to make us their slaves.

My comrades, the time has come for the people of this Nation and the world to strip the mask of hypocrisy from the face of the men in the Kremlin.

The premeditated insults to the western world constantly spewing from the mouths of the Molotovs and the Vishinskys are daily reminders of their intense hatred. Lenin and Trotzky and Stalin have declared over and over again that western civilization as we know it must be destroyed. Their avowed purpose is to conquer and dominate the world by revolution from within or conquest from without.

Their record confirms this; their actions prove it.

In 1939, only 17 days after Hitler invaded Poland, Stalin attacked and seized eastern Poland.

In 1943, the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were occupied and taken over.

Czechoslovakia was ravished and forced under Russian control. Albania was grabbed by one sweep of the bear's paw.

In February of 1945, Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt met at Yalta. There are those who blame Roosevelt for what was agreed to at Yalta. But the tragedies that have been complained of, were in violation of that agreement, not in accordance with it. In less than 30 days, and before the ink was dry on the paper, Russia broke her pledged word in her brutal subjection of Rumania and Bulgaria.

In the meanwhile, we had shattered the Japanese in the Pacific. Yet 4 days before the Japs surrendered, Russia declared war on Japan and used this as the excuse to seize Manchuria, march into Korea, and begin the conquest of continental China.

In 1939 Russia controlled about 170,000,000 people. Today she dominates over eight hundred million. In 1939 Russia controlled 8,000,000 square miles of territory. Today

she dominates nearly thirteen million. Today one-fourth of the globe and 32 percent of the world's population are subject to the will of one man—Russian Premier Stalin.

Russia has done this all in 11 years. Eleven years in which she used every trick in the book.

She used the veto power in the United Nations 43 times. Counting only the major offenses, Russia violated her agreements 88 times in 10 different countries.

The roll call of Russian conquest up until June of this year reads like this: Finland, Poland, Rumania, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, eastern Germany, Austria, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, China, Mongolia, and Korea—down to the thirty-eighth parallel.

In most of these instances the Soviet Union's scheme was to establish and control puppet regimes. Deceitfully from behind the iron curtain, she pulled the strings.

But your Government watched these maneuvers like a hawk. Both from within and from without the sounding board of the United Nations, it exposed and denounced each and every move. It did everything possible short of war. A thorough clean-up would have required a full-scale war and the use of unlimited American troops.

But, wherever the Soviet Union, or its puppets, did not possess actual military control, the United States Government has successfully thwarted Russian aggression.

Moscow's plans to master Iran were defeated.

Russia failed in her campaign to force Turkey to cede territory and accept Soviet control of the straits.

She was frustrated in her efforts to conquer Greece through guerrilla activities.

She was denied a foothold in the occupation of Japan.

She was barred from a voice in the control of western Germany, particularly the Ruhr.

We beat her to the draw in her purpose to capitalize on economic weakness and political uncertainty in western Europe.

We stopped her cold both in France and Italy.

Her most dramatic failure was in her all-out effort short of war to blockade the Western Allies out of Berlin. I do not think that any more far-reaching or significant peacetime victory has been won in our lifetime than that of the Air Forces of the United States and her allies in maintaining the Berlin airlift.

Then, my comrades, without warning and without provocation, early on the morning of Sunday, June 25, 1950, strong military forces from behind the iron curtain hurdled the thirty-eighth parallel and invaded the Republic of Korea. This free and independent republic had been established by the United Nations after a free election was held early in 1948. At the very time of the attack the UN Study Commission was right there trying to work out a peaceful solution.

On June 25 that Commission, still in the invaded area, sent its report to the United Nations, which, in the language of President Truman, "made it unmistakably clear that the attack was naked, deliberate, unprovoked aggression without a shadow of justification."

Continuing, the President said: "The attack on the Republic of Korea, therefore, was a clear challenge to the basic principles of the United Nations' Charter and to the specific actions taken by the United Nations in Korea. If this challenge had not been met squarely, the effectiveness of the United Nations would have been all but ended and the hope of mankind that the United Nations would develop into an institution of world order would have been shattered."

Mr. Commander and comrades, the United Nations was faced by the stern proposition that it must either meet and stop that ruthless and bloody aggression or close up shop and go out of business.

The United States of America also faced a critical decision. As the leader of 53 peace-loving nations, and in her own sovereign capacity, she had to meet this challenge. She had to stand up for the peace of the world and the security of her own firesides or back down in abject futility.

Let us make no mistake, my fellow Americans, all of us, as individuals and through our Government, have been working to secure peace ever since the last shot was fired in World War II. We hate war and all of its aids and purposes. We love freedom and liberty. We adore justice and we are dedicated to the achievement of a peace "that will permit all the men in all the lands to live out their lives in freedom from fear and freedom from want."

But we do not seek the peace of the craven or the coward. We spurn the peace of the conquered or the vanquished. We do not want the peace of the sepulcher of our hopes and aims and ideals. We will not accept the peace of the tomb in which we must witness the burial of the American way of life.

We helped create the United Nations. We helped breathe into it the breath of life. We have glorified it with our hopes. We have fortified it with our physical power. We have endowed it with our spiritual resources. We yet believe that it is the best hope for an abiding peace that the mind of man has ever conceived or his hand fashioned.

Mr. Commander, I do not subscribe to the views of those who would bar the doors of the United Nations to Soviet Russia. It is true that her representatives have done all within their power to defeat its purpose. It is true that they have proven themselves so unworthy that, if its sacred premises could be defiled by wicked men, the representatives of Soviet Russia have defiled it.

But we must continue striving to keep Soviet Russia inside the United Nations. Just as surely as the United Nations is the best instrument to achieve the peace, Russia is, in the final analysis, the nation with whom that peace must be made.

Discouraged as we may be with our efforts thus far; certain as we are that heretofore and now, Russia has worked to sabotage peace rather than promote it, I am certain that our efforts must continue. They should be aimed, first, to the people of Russia, and second, to the rulers of Russia. Certainly if we are to do this we must maintain official contact with them.

Our efforts must ever be to prevent war, never to provoke it. To succeed we must wage peace, not conflict. To start a so-called preventive war would be to confess failure and invite disaster.

I declare to you every day that passes in which the United Nations still meet and in which Russia's representatives still participate, means that world war III is prevented at least another day. Each such day is a dual victory. It is another day in which the shedding of American blood has been held to a minimum. It is another day in which we have demonstrated to ourselves and proven to the world that our first and primary objective is to secure an everlasting peace. It is another day in which the western world grows stronger and the slave world becomes comparatively weaker.

Ah, I know that as we watch the strutting and the hypocrisy and the false accusation of a Malik or a Vishinsky, we are tempted to take a lash and a scourge and drive them from this temple dedicated to peace. But I agree with Warren Austin, who said the other day that he would much prefer to see more diplomats with more ulcers than to be saddened by more bullets in more GI's.

I am, therefore, convinced that we must continue to labor for peace in the Council chamber of the United Nations. I am just as positive that we must continue to accelerate our military preparation to meet our duty and commitment to the United Nations. That which we preach in the one instance, we must practice in the other. As we are alert in the forum we must be prepared in the field.

America lives in a present and faces a future different from any she has ever known. At the conclusion of World War II, feeling that we had achieved victory in war and the opportunity for peace, we laid down our arms. We left them rusting on the battlefields around the world. Our fighting men who had marched triumphantly on a hundred fronts marched happily home. Their fondest desire was to again become a part of our civil life and claim its benefits for their own. We believed that our allies either desired or would accept that which we cherished most—peace and good will among men.

We now know that we can no longer proceed on that basis.

We now know that we must reconstruct our concept of what is required of us.

We now know that if there is to be world peace, we, and we alone, have the power and the might and the confidence of others to lead the free peoples of the world into achieving that peace.

We now know that we cannot let Soviet Russia and her satellites gain that leadership by superior force or by cunning or by our default.

We now know that we must rearm until we are the strongest military power in the world.

Ah, I know how men can feel that these days are dark and that these times are stern. There have been dark days in Korea for our fighting men these past weeks. It was on a dark day when the American commander in Korea sent that awful order to tens of thousands of America's finest sons, "Hold the positions you now occupy or die." The Americans who received that order were men and boys from the firesides of Oklahoma and every other State in this land. Each and every one cherished life and home, love and liberty, with a zeal equal to mine or to yours. Each and every one was loved by wife and mother, father or brother, sons and daughters. Few times in the history of this Republic have days been so dark, or the situation so critical, that an American commander was compelled to say to his men, "Stand or die."

You and I have learned, and history will show how well the spirit of that order has been obeyed. But in standing up to it, many Americans have died.

When the Persian hordes invaded Europe in 400 B. C., their drive was irresistible until they met Leonidaes and his gallant Spartans at the Pass of Thermopolae. At the beginning of that fight, Leonidaes gave the same order to his soldiers, "Stand or die." The hordes of Persia were stopped at Thermopolae, but those soldiers of Sparta died in stopping them.

There is an inscription on that battlefield today. It reads: "Stranger, go tell the Lacedaemonians that we lie here, in obedience to their command." That dramatic message has thundered down the centuries. It is cherished wherever courage and heroism are known. It is whispered wherever brave men have been tried.

Mr. Commander, the response of American soldiers who have died and are now dying in Korea is thundering in our ears today. It is beating its message into men's hearts wherever national security is cherished or prayers for peace are offered.

What is our answer? What is the answer of 150,000,000 Americans? Mr. Commander, there can be but one answer. We likewise must hold the positions we occupy or die.

Fifty-three nations—peace-loving nations—march today under the flag of the United Nations. The hundreds of millions of people of those 53 countries must support the United Nations and give it the

power to successfully hold aggression at bay, or the United Nations will disintegrate and fall apart. It must hold the position it occupies or it will die.

It is no easy task which confronts us. It is the biggest job that a peacetime America has ever been called upon to do.

If our fighting men and their comrades can survive in the battle hell in Korea; if they can live in the mud and the muck, in the heat and the grime and the filth of bloody war in a foreign land; if they can march through to glorious victory there—who are we to shrink from the responsibilities that are ours here, or shirk the job that is given us to do at home?

The struggle is fierce and titanic. It is to determine if freedom can be kept by those who have it, and won by others, or if it must be lost by all.

The struggle is to determine whether men shall control their governments or become the puppets and pawns of government. It is to determine whether man can own his property and be protected in that ownership by his government, or whether both he and his property shall become the chattels of that government.

Since Russia respects neither God nor man, this struggle will decide whether man, created in the image and likeness of God, is to have the freedom to worship that God, or be enslaved by those who deny both the existence of God and man's right to worship Him.

It is to determine whether man is to stand erect under the banner of democracy or be shackled by the chains of tryranny.

But, thank God, there is an awful and yet a glorious truth about this struggle. The awful truth about it is that Russia cannot win it, never. The glorious truth about it is that a united and vigilant America cannot lose it, ever.

The Boys in Room 1106

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have a friend in Arkansas. Believe it or not, he is the national Democratic committeeman, Dr. R. B. Robins, for whom I have profound respect and admiration.

Dr. Robins sent me a copy of an article entitled "The Boys in Room 1106," which he has written for the August issue of Medical Economics. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOYS IN ROOM 1106

(By R. B. Robins, M. D., as told to Martin Keeler)

Meeting at midnight last May 15 in a small room of the Hotel Stevens, Chicago, a doubtful quorum of Democratic National Committee members pulled a fast one on the party rank and file. They adopted in the party's name a resolution reaffirming the 1948 Democratic platform, but containing this joker:

"In order to avoid socialized medicine in the United States, we endorse the President's program for broadened Federal activity in the entire field of health and medical care and the adoption of a pay-as-you-go insurance program to put better medical care within the financial reach of all Americans."

Behind these 51 words lies a significant story. It's a story of (a) slick abridgement of party rules, (b) socialist semantics with a two-way stretch, and (c) Machiavellism in medico-politics.

To begin with, the committee's action was unauthorized. The Democratic Party rule book clearly states: "The duties and powers of the national committee are derived from the convention, and no convention has authorized the formulation of proposals which might be construed to be in the nature of platform declarations." This rule book adds: "The Democratic National Committee has no authority, expressed or implied, to prescribe issues for the Democratic rank and file." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 3d sess. of 71st Cong., p. 6616).

The 1948 platform, framed at the party's Philadelphia convention, made no reference whatever to compulsory health insurance. Yet the 1950 platform, framed by the boys in room 1106 at the Hotel Stevens, endorses it.

Or does it? Here we get into the shadowy science of semantics, the pet of the socializers, dealing with word connotations and nuances.

Note, for example, the use of the phrase "pay-as-you-go." It's intended to give the Ewing scheme a coloration of financial soundness and plain American good sense. In truth, of ccurse, the scheme is anything but pay-as-you-go. To support it, billions annually would have to come out of the United States Treasury's general funds—adding appreciably to the Government's yearly operating deficit. That deficit is financed by Government borrowing, a mortgage on the future.

More important, note the phrase "to avoid socialized medicine * * *." That's a semantic sockdolager.

Correctly or incorrectly, compulsory health insurance has been tagged in the public mind as socialized medicine. And in the public nostrils socialized medicine has begun to develop an odor. According to the latest Gallup poll, for example, the Nation's voters oppose the administration's health plan by a 3-to-2 count.

But the socializers' strategem of giving their wilting rose a new name isn't as amateurish as it seems. It involves a high order of political trickery.

Let me tell you what went on at Chicago what led up to the shenanigans there, and how they bear on this fall's congressional elections.

Some weeks before the committee met, it printed and began distributing (at party expense) 200,000 copies of a booklet called Better Medical Care That You Can Afford. I suspect the text was prepared by the Committee for the Nation's Health, a private lobbying group for nationalized medicine; it would not be the first time the Democratic National Committee had distributed CNH literature. But the point is, despite the absence of a compulsory-health-insurance plank in the party platform, this booklet was and is a brochure for compulsory health insurance—bearing the national committee's imprimatur.

It is now clear that a handful of committee brass in Washington had already decided for the committee as a whole that it would go down the line for the Ewing scheme.

The Chicago meeting was called ostensibly as a national Democratic conference and Jefferson jubilee. General sessions were scheduled for Saturday, May 13, at the Blackstone Hotel; a rally was slated for Monday evening, May 15, at Soldiers' Field. At the Saturday morning and afternoon sessions, it was casually announced that a third such session would be held at the Hotel Stevens after the Monday evening rally. Many committeemen missed these announcements because they were attending other special sessions; I was attending the luncheon and panel discussion on welfare legislation.

I had with me five leading authorities on medical economics, whom I wanted to have a hearing. They were Dr. Paul R. Hawley, director of the American College of Surgeons, former Blue Cross-Blue Shield head, and one-time chief medical officer of the VA; Dr. George F. Lull, general manager of the AMA; Frank G. Dickinson, Ph. D., AMA economist; Edward O'Connor of the Insurance Economics Society; and John W. Neal, attorney for the Illinois State Medical Society. But I'm afraid I led them on a wild goose chase.

The welfare panel was beautifully stage-managed. Presiding was Mrs. India Edwards, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. By prearrangement, an enthusiastic foursome—Oscar Ewing, Representative Andrew Biemiller, of Wisconsin, the AFL's Nelson Cruikshank, and Manhattan physician Theodore Sanders—rendered love's old sweet song for compulsory health insurance.

WHO'S AFRAID OF AMA?

Each speaker had 15 minutes. Oscar Ewing took the lead in doing the customary hatchet work on the AMA. Congressman BIEMILLER voiced his amazement at "the circus tactics used by the huckster hirelings of our dignified doctors." After a solid hour of such goings-on, I was given the floor for exactly 5 minutes * * *.

ROBINS. "Well, I must say the members of this panel have done a pretty good promotion job. They're good salesmen for their ideas. And we're all agreed on one thing: We're for insurance. But I'm for voluntary health insurance, not compulsory. I don't like compulsion. I like freedom.

"I know that some of you will be surprised to know this, but I happen to be one of Jack Ewing's physicians."

EWING. "I didn't know it."

ROBINS. "Well—I'll tell you about it, Jack—I'm his endocrinologist. The other night, Jack met my wife and me. He told her, 'You know, Doc keeps my glands of internal secretion working.' "

I went on to challenge the committee's authority in promoting the compulsory program. I expressed my opinion that, if pursued, this policy would cost the Democratic Party control of Congress this fall. I answered the panel speakers' remarks about the AMA lobby fund:

"You know, we Democrats talk about pressure groups. One of the greatest pressure groups in this country today is Jack's agency, the Federal Security Administration. They use tax money—your money and my money—to promote their pet schemes."

I concluded by introducing my five guest experts:

"I hope that, in true democratic fashion, Mrs. Edwards will permit these gentlemen to ask questions. They are willing to answer questions, and I hope that she will permit them to make pertinent comment on any question in order to clarify it. * * *"

Mrs. EDWARDS. "I am afraid your time is up, Dr. Robins. According to the rules, no one may speak except Members of Congress or members of the national committee, and then for 5 minutes only. These distinguished gentlemen (Dr. Hawley, et al.) may have the floor to ask questions. If we may have the same courtesy at an AMA meeting, I will be very glad."

She continued, however, with a little speech of her own in behalf of compulsory health insurance. Thereafter some 15 other committeemen rose to say what they thought of doctors in general and me in particular.

It was Oscar Ewing's hour of glory. Observing from the head table were such other party moguls as W. Stuart Symington, head of the National Security Resources Board; Mrs. Perle Mesta, Minister to Luxemburg; Leon Keyserling, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers; and Cabinet members Oscar Chapman, Maurice Tobin, Jesse Donaldson, and Charles Brannan.

Such was the background for the final coup, the quasi-secret midnight meeting on Monday, at which the health resolution was passed. I'm told that only a handful of committee members were present. The escape clause ("In order to avoid socialized medicine * * *") was introduced by Ed Kelly, Illinois committeeman and former Chicago mayor. He had a special reason: Illinois' SCOTT LUCAS, Democratic floor leader of the United States Senate, up for reelection this fall, wanted to get off the compulsory-health-insurance hook. Now he can state piously that he's dead set against socialized medicine—yet stay mum on the more specific issue.

The Ewing group, of course, immediately recognized the Nation-wide usefulness of the Kelly suggestion. Now any Democratic candidate, before an audience that is anti-compulsion, can take a stand like that of Senator LUCAS; before a procompulsion audience, the same candidate can forget his semantics and plump for Federal medicine by whatever name he chooses.

That, in gist, is the fall campaign strategy of one faction of the Democratic Party. Will it work?

It will not.

PRIMARIES POINT WAY

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER took his trouncing for the Democratic renomination in Florida before the boys in room 1106 came up with their rose-by-another-name stunt; but I'm sure it couldn't have saved him. Florida doctors, working quietly and methodically in behalf of PEPPER'S opponent, Representative GEORGE A. SMATHERS, were not to be denied. Listen to this, from an editorial in the United Mine Workers Journal:

"In 44 years of covering political campaigns, your editor has never witnessed such effective solicitation of votes as demonstrated by Florida doctors, druggists, dentists, hospital staffs, insurance companies, and pharmaceutical representatives, aided and abetted by other professional men."

Private medicine's drive to save itself via the ballot box got under way in September 1949. An election was held in Pennsylvania to fill the congressional vacancy created by the death of Representative Robert L. Coffey, Jr., a Democrat, from the Johnstown district in the western part of the State. Coffey's mother, the Democratic nominee, came out for the Ewing health plan. JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, opposed it. Doctors thereabouts, Democrats and Republicans alike, promptly formed a healing arts committee. It plugged SAYLOR in newspaper ads, radio spots, and publicity releases. SAYLOR won by 8,400 votes, compared with Coffey's 12,000 majority the previous year.

This sort of thing has been gathering momentum. A number of Democratic candidates—e. g., well over half the party's congressional aspirants in Indiana—have openly renounced compulsory health insurance. Many others may soon follow suit.

I sincerely hope so. For I am a Democrat, and I don't like to see Democrats go down to defeat before Republicans. But that's what they're going to do this fall if they persist with this compulsory health insurance business.

Soil Conservation as Exemplified by James G. Sanford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article by one great conservationist about another great conservationist. The article was written by Mr. Tom Wallace, editor emeritus of the Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky., who for a generation has been an outstanding advocate with tongue and pen of the conservation of the soil and other natural resources which constitute the greatest material heritage we can hope to transmit to those who are to come after us in this land we call America.

The subject of this article, Mr. James G. Sanford, is a sterling citizen and excellent farmer of New Castle, Henry County, Ky., whom I have known for the past 30 years as an outstanding example of what a practical, intelligent farmer can accomplish in the field of soil conservation. Mr. Sanford loves the land and appreciates the obligation of his trusteeship to transmit it to future generations richer than when it came into his possession.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times of February 8, 1950]

THE STORY OF JIM, A FARMER DEVOTED TO HIS LAND—WONDERING WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO HIS WELL-CARED-FOR ACRES AFTER HE IS GONE CAUSES HIM TO WORRY

(By Tom Wallace)

My friend, Jim, who is by 7 years my junior, has a deep-seated sorrow. He is not old for his age. His wife has the beauty-from-within that time enhances rather than mars. Her face is framed by silvery hair that seems prematurely grey because it softens lines which hair dye would make harsh. The sort of loveliness that is hers runs through her clan, among the women, and contributes to the pride and happiness of numerous husbands.

Jim has enough worldly goods to satisfy any reasonable man, and he is reasonable. He gives, regularly—declaring it fun—10 percent of his income. He says he could provide for himself and his wife from one-fourth of his farm, devoted to orchard grass and sheep, comfortable livelihood, including winters in Florida. He proves it by figures as to hay, seed, and sheep. So why should he be grieved about anything?

The source of his sorrow may be revealed in six words, the title of a comedy, "You Can't Take It With You."

What will become of his farm when he dies? How will it be treated? They are the questions in Jim's mind, and he is feeling low about the future. A man cannot live always, and someone, sometime, may be treating Jim's farm as a majority of 7,000,000 farms in the United States are treated, despite all that is said orally and in print in behalf of better treatment of land.

Jim's farm lies like a group of seashells laid convex side up. Each natural division is bordered by trees, not as thoughtfully guarded as the fields and meadows they separate—Jim is no forester—but still numerous after nearly a half century of Jim's occupancy of the land and valued by him as old friends. Between the meadows brooks trickle, most of the year, not in dryest weather. Because the brooks are not wholly dependable Jim has made ponds—commuters would say lakes—in several of the meadows. He is proud of the fact that after rains his ponds are clear. That proves that there is no erosion on the watersheds.

Jim agrees with Patrick Henry's profoundest statement: "The greatest patriot is the man who stops the most gullies."

Political speeches are invariably those most widely remembered. Everyone knows Henry's expressed preference for death as against life without liberty, but 999,999 persons in 1,000,000 never heard of the immortal Virginian's observation about gullies.

Jim doesn't think everything in farming depends upon the specialized education which colleges of agriculture present. He believes a good general education worth more. It develops initiative, self-reliance, he says, whereas specialized education develops a tendency to believe the last bulletin the last word; a disposition to try a new variety of tobacco seed each year.

A graduate of Notre Dame, Jim holds that Notre Dame's football successes reflect the thoroughness of a seat of learning.

"If I were educating a son I should have him graduate from a good liberal arts college," says Jim, "and if he then wished to farm he could do so at advantage."

Jim does not believe in fads, one of which in Kentucky, he says, is Kentucky Fescue 31, called the wonder grass.

"It's a soil depleter and you must have a legume in it to make livestock like it. It is easier to get fescue on a farm than to get rid of it, and nobody needs it who has orchard grass, Korean lespedeza, bluegrass and good land. Of course, if you are trying to make a pasture of a bog, that is something else."

Jim and I walked over his farm, among his ewes and lambs, his ponds, his strips of woodland. Often I narrowly missed losing my nose, or mournfully seeing it swell to three times its normal size, when Jim, thrilled by a sweeping view as we entered a new enclosure or crossed the crest of a hill, amplified his gesture of delight with his cane, which he waved in a wide half circle. I hadn't the heart to mention my anxiety. What is a nose, even a bunged nose, compared with a truly great love? Jim loves his farm as Whistler loved his mother.

There are no terraces on Jim's farm. He contends that if rolling land is rightly treated the soil does not run down hill with every rain or any rain. He proves it by, among other things, the size of his tobacco barn, which he has added to until it measures 140 feet long. It would not hold his entire crop last year. He had to hang tobacco in his cattle barn. His tobacco was not grown in the old-fashioned way on new ground, but in the new-fashioned way on old ground.

I have said that Jim loves trees. He will not agree with me that it would pay to fence his woodlands, which are narrow strips along intermittent water courses. Fencing them would require a great deal of wire and many posts, but timber deteriorates where livestock tramp the ground and rub against tree trunks.

Jim laughed away a lumberman who offered him $500 for his walnut trees, saying they were worth $2,000, but that it would cost $1,000 to cut them, and that he and the farm owner would split the other $1,000.

"Let 'em stand," said Jim. "They were here when I came. They will be here when

I go if all I could get for them would be $5 each. The woods looks better with them than it would look without them."

It is not necessary when walking over Jim's farm, dodging his waving walking stick, to ask where his boundaries run. That is plain from the fatness of his nurtured soil. When he is not walking about with his cane scattering every little mound of sheep manure to improve its fertilizer value, he carries a long-handle pointed dirt shovel. If he detects the beginning of erosion in a swag he does a little agricultural surgery with his shovel and the wound in the soil is cured. Where there are gullies in much similar land, there is a mat of bluegrass on Jim's land around which the plowman plows, losing a bit of time but keeping a shield between the soil and storm water.

Jim could sell his farm for five times what it cost him. Not all of that increase reflects passing of time, or improvements in buildings. Most of it reflects the care Jim has devoted to his soil. Thinking about what may be done to his beloved 300 acres after he is gone is something he cannot avoid. If he had a son, or if he had a nephew who wished to be a farmer, he would be relieved of worry.

"If I were 50 years younger, Jim," I said, "I would suggest that you give your farm to me. I'd take care of it. You would get it off c' your mind."

"But as matters stand," said Jim, "the best thing you can do is to preach keeping soil on rolling land by contour plowing and by the gully prevention I practice in pastures. Come here sometime in summer and you can drive all over this farm in a car and not feel a bump. If that were true of every farm in this county, farming would be more profitable. By the way, what are we going to do about sheep-killing dogs? I have lost 11 ewes this winter killed by dogs. One of them we had to shoot. Dogs had torn her up and left her living, but she could not have recovered."

Next to his land, maybe, Jim loves his sheep. He does not have to mow his meadows for weed control. His sheep control the weeds. But a sheep is only a sheep. Land stirs Jim's emotions. I avoid saying "deepest" emotions. Jim's wife, possibly, reads newspapers.

Aiding Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Aiding Russia," published in this morning's Washington Post. More than 2 years ago we stopped the shipping from this country to Russia of machine tools and other tools which would help in the making of war. Certainly the billions of dollars which we are spending in the way of ECA aid and other aid in foreign countries should not be used for the purpose of permitting those countries to send machine tools to Russia, particularly in view of the fact that we have stopped doing so ourselves. I approve heartily of what the editorial says, and I hope the State Department will do everything in its power to stop countries whom we are aiding from sending to Russia and its satellites machine tools and other equipment, with which it would be possible to manufacture weapons of war.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIDING RUSSIA

The unfavorable impression on American public opinion which was created by Mr. Churchill's charge that machine tools suitable for repair of tanks are being shipped to Russia has been heightened by Prime Minister Attlee's maladroit defense of the business. According to Mr. Attlee, exports of machine tools "regarded as of key importance for strategic purposes" were halted a year and a half ago, except in case of contracts already concluded before that date. However, as a spokesman for American machine tool manufacturers explains, "all machine tools of whatever nature, are used in war production * * * the types withheld can be built on the machines received." Moreover, the British are still shipping tools of high strategic value under contracts entered into before April 1948 and they also permit Russian inspectors to enter plants manufacturing these tools for the Soviet Union.

More than 2 years ago the United States stopped shipments of all types of American machine tools to Russia and her satellites. Since then this country has spent billions of dollars to assist the economic recovery of Great Britain and other western European countries, and is preparing to pour out additional billions to strengthen their defenses against Russian aggression. Consequently, when the British use scarce labor and raw materials to manufacture goods having military value for the use of a potential enemy, the United States has a right to protest.

The most alarming aspect of the disclosures in regard to Anglo-Russian trade is the patent reluctance of the Labor Government to put a stop to these shipments for fear of being accused of reneging on its trade agreement with Russia. What an excuse when Russian tanks may be killing British soldiers at this moment in Korea. Russia's reaction certainly can be disregarded in view of the critical international situation. And a country dependent on outside aid to strengthen its defenses should, as a matter of self-interest, either forego exports of strategic materials and equipment or else confine its exports of such goods to friendly nations. Since the Anglo-Russian trade deal was concluded, the world picture has undergone a transformation. Any government that continues to encourage trade expansion in these times for the sake of income, in disregard of political consequences, betrays "infirmity and disconnection of thought and action in shaping defense plans," to quote Mr. Churchill.

No doubt the Labor Government, prodded by American officials and under political attack on the home front, will take steps to halt machine-tool shipments to Russia, possibly by requisitioning them for home use. But that is a minor concession to public clamor, since Great Britain and her colonies export many other products that have high strategic value to Russia and her satellites. Unless trade in all such products ceases Great Britain will unwittingly become an economic ally of the country against which the Atlantic Pact nations are arming for self-defense. What does the North Atlantic Treaty organization mean if the members of it cannot even develop a common policy on trade with aggressive Russia?

Medal Honors Carolina Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 7 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a news dispatch in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer reciting the award of an Oak Leaf Cluster to a gallant and heroic North Carolina soldier, Lt. Logan C. Weathers, who was killed in action on August 2, 1950, in Korea.

It so happens that Lieutenant Weathers is from my home town of Shelby, N. C., and has had a brilliant war record. He won a Distinguished Service Cross for his heroic action in leading a costly assault in desperate fighting on Okinawa in 1945. Now he becomes one of the early death casualties in the Korean war, following his daring and courageous action in seizing a rifle and single-handed knocking out an enemy machine-gun nest. His act is properly described as exhibiting extraordinary heroism and his conduct adds glory to American arms. I feel a personal pride in his achievement, and his home county honors his memory.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDAL HONORS CAROLINA HERO

EIGHTH ARMY HEADQUARTERS IN SOUTH KOREA, September 4.—Lt. Logan C. Weathers of Shelby, N. C., who won a Distinguished Service Cross for leading a costly assault on hill No. 79 on Okinawa in 1945, died a hero's death in Korea and won posthumously an Oak Leaf Cluster to his D. S. C.

Killed in action on August 2 on the southernmost front near Haman, Lieutenant Weathers had been all over the Korean front in an armored car attached to a reconnaissance platoon which worked in conjunction with the Twenty-fourth Division, the first American infantry outfit committed in Korea. On Okinawa he had been a member of the Seventy-seventh Division which cracked the middle of the Sjuri defense line.

Lieutenant Weathers' outfit was spearheading an attack by the Nineteenth Infantry Regiment on enemy positions near Haman when he was killed. An enemy concentration of mortar and bazooka fire included a direct hit upon Lieutenant Weathers' vehicle, in which his arm was partially blown off.

ATTACKS NEST

"At that instant the infantry came under terrific enemy machine-gun fire and, despite his serious wound, Lieutenant Weathers seized a rifle and single-handed, knocked out an enemy machine-gun nest," the citation for his second DSC said. "He silenced the machine-gun nest but during this action he was killed by sniper fire. Extraordinary heroism displayed by Lieutenant Weathers is an inspiration to all and reflects the highest credit on himself and the military service."

Three days prior to his fatal engagement, Lieutenant Weathers had been one of the last to leave Sinju—6 hours after the enemy seized the city—and he brought back word

that three precious American medium tanks, equipped with 90-millimeter guns, had been unable to function because they lacked proper fan belts and voltage regulators. The tanks had to be destroyed because the Army supply service sent the wrong-sized fan belts and mistakenly substituted a box of .45-caliber pistols for the requested voltage regulators.

"One of the Reasons This Nation Has Become Great Is Because We Are All on the Same Team—Labor, Industry, Agriculture, Government—We All Are Working Toward One Goal, a World of Peace in Which All Shall Have Equal Opportunity"—John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I again come to tell of still another Sunday night telecast program of Battle Report—Washington, which each succeeding week seems to become established more and more as a part of the regular function of government. In this case, however, the entire expense is borne by the National Broadcast System and not one cent is paid by the Federal Government.

Battle Report—Washington is, as you all know, a nonpolitical bipartisan program put on each Sunday evening at 8 wherein the Honorable John R. Steelman, Assistant to the President, presents top-flight Federal officials from the executive departments of Government who can and do speak authoritatively on matters of national interest which come under their personal direction and administration.

Last week in a cloak room discussion with respect to the latest telecasts, Democrat and Republican Members alike agreed that it was one of the best constructed and presented programs and certainly the most helpful public service ever projected over the air.

Mr. Speaker, from a friend in New York City I received a news clipping telling of last week's program. The article was written by Mr. John Lester, special feature writer and commentator on national happenings on radio and television.

Let me call upon Mr. Lester to tell my colleagues of the splendid work now being done in behalf of the national interests by Ted Ayers, the director of the program, and all the other splendid members of the NBC staff who, with the aid and assistance of our genial, good, and never-tiring friend, John Steelman, are each week giving to our people this splendid television teledocumentary from the Government here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, there is a vast area of these United States still without television. In order that the libraries, colleges, schools, chambers of commerce, and citizens throughout the land who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may enjoy the benefits of this new news feature, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include therein, first, Mr. Lester's article entitled "Capitol Talent Stars in Video Show"; and second, the NBC Battle Report—Washington.

Mr. Lester's article reads as follows:

RADIO AND TELEVISION—CAPITOL TALENT STARS IN VIDEO NEWS SHOW

There is on NBC television each Sunday at 8 an excellent program titled "Battle Report—Washington."

It's probably the only program of its kind, which, if entirely true, is unfortunate since Americans deserve more of this sort of thing.

In brief, it's an advanced type of news commentary, one that's handled by top-drawer Capitol officials, men who actually make news, and not someone reading copy torn from a newsroom teletype machine.

In addition, Battle Report—Washington, is a direct report to the American people by the same officers and men who advise and confer with the President.

As such, it reaches down to lift each of us right into a White House or congressional conference room, and TV program-wise it ranks with the celebrated UN coverage, Mrs. Roosevelt's famous Sunday evening television teas, Meet the Press, and the Presidential Cabinet's recent report to the public, in the matter of public service and public interest.

Among the Battle Report's guests in the weeks of its brief existence, have been John R. Steelman, who's about as close to President Truman as anyone we know; Steve Early, Presidential secretary, confidante and currently Under Secretary of Defense; Warren Austin, American delegate to the UN; Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, and under secretaries and assistant secretaries of various governmental departments by the dozens.

Scheduled to appear, of course, is Mr. Steelman, who is now a regular on the program, and who sounded its keynote when it began.

He announced that he, together with the program's producers and others who'd speak on it from time to time, believed there's a necessity for letting the American people know what their Government is doing, where their money is going, and why.

He said he felt there was no one better fitted for this task than those in Washington who are actually responsible.

This is, of course, not only true but, at times, painfully true.

Mr. Speaker, what follows is the script of the broadcast with the voice of President Truman introduced by electric transcription and video:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

(Production, Ted Ayers; script, Lou Hazam; commentary, Robert McCormick; film, NBC, United States Navy; technical director, Sherman Hildreth; art, NBC, Joseph Ferrier.)

(The voice of President Truman: "My fellow citizens, tonight I want to talk to you about Korea, about why we are there, and what our objectives are. It is your liberty and mine which is involved. What is at stake is the free way of life.)

ROBERT MCCORMICK. Once again, NBC Television turns its cameras upon Washington, where, just 46 hours ago, President Truman made his report to the Nation on the crisis in Korea. Korea, where the President's eight-point program for peace is reflected in flames. Against the background of the President's speech on Friday, and to amplify with vital detail some of the facts he touched upon then, we bring before you now top Government officials—civilian and defense. But, first, by way of preface to this fourth Battle Report, Washington, here is the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. JOHN R. STEELMAN. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Tomorrow is Labor Day—a day set aside each year to honor those whose labors have brought so much to every American home. In his Labor Day statement, the President said in part: "We have good reason for special observance of this Labor Day. It should be a day of thanksgiving for past accomplishments and present opportunity; but it should also be a day of solemn dedication to the tasks that lie ahead of us. This year, especially, Labor Day symbolizes our facing forward as a nation in the heroic tasks we have assumed, with other free nations of the world, in the cause of peace." To most of us, tomorrow will be a holiday. It will be a day when we can break the routine of our daily lives and seek relaxation in any way we choose. But there will be no holiday for the heroic men in Korea. Their work goes on 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. I hope you will remember them. I hope you will remember that the President has said this day should be one of "solemn dedication," and resolve to do your part to build a world of peace. One of the reasons this Nation has become great is because we are all on the same team—labor, industry, agriculture, Government. We are all working toward one goal—a world of peace in which all shall have equal opportunity. Tonight I want you to visit with me, four men on the team. The Federal Security Administrator will tell you about the new social securty law. Three flag officers of the United States Navy will take us behind the scenes in the Navy building and show us how that branch of the service is carrying on the struggle to keep us free. The shadow of tyranny obscures a large part of the world. These men have dedicated their lives to the task of keeping that shadow from falling upon us, so that we can remain free to speak our own thoughts, to worship God in our own way, to choose our own work. May the days ahead bring us hope and success because we have labored unceasingly toward our goal of peace in the world.

(The voice of President Truman: "We have the ability and the resources to meet the demands which confront us. Our industry and agriculture have never been stronger or more productive. We will use as much of this economic strength as is needed to defend ourselves and establish peace.")

ROBERT MCCORMICK. Vital to the economic strength of which our President speaks, is another and older war in which we are engaged at home. To report to you on this war, our scene shifts to New York City. Here, where he is standing by to address, within the next hour, the National Committee for Labor Israel, our cameras pick out Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing.

OSCAR R. EWING. I want to tell you about American progress in a different kind of war—a war that is so much a part of our own homes that our pay checks, our bank statements, our grocery bills might also be considered battle reports. I mean our fight against want and need and poverty—our fight for a decent living—our fight for what we call security. In democratic America we are winning this war. Social security is a reality here. Communist propaganda says Russia's social security is better than ours. Well, let's compare the two. Last Monday the amendments to our social-security law were approved by President Truman. Three out of four American workers are now covered by the Federal law. In Russia, only two out of four Communist workers are covered. In America persons entitled to benefits can

demand them as a matter of right. This is not true in Russia. There the worker gets no benefits if he leaves his job without permission. Extra benefits are given workers who show high production records. Even maternity benefits vary according to length of service in a single enterprise and according to the output record. What happens when a worker dies? In America his children get monthly payments until they are 18. In Russia payments stop when the child is 5. In America the average monthly payment to the retired worker and his wife under the amended law will be $75 a month. In case of a worker's death his surviving wife and dependent children receive regular monthly benefits. Under the old law 35,000,000 American workers were covered. The new law extends coverage to an additional 10,000,000 Americans—most self-employed persons, such as shop keepers and the like, regularly employed farm workers, regularly employed domestic workers, as well as other large groups. Under the new law a person now 65 needs to have worked only 1½ years to be covered, and this work may have been done at any time after 1936. Dollar for dollar, the United States spends more than twice as much per person for social security and social insurance than the Soviet Union. What does social security mean for the American people? It is a powerful weapon in our war against want and need and poverty. It helps give millions of our people peace of mind—protection that they have earned for themselves in the American way. This is Oscar Ewing, speaking for the Federal Security Agency. I now return you to our Nation's Capital.

(The voice of President Truman: "These United Nations troops are still outnumbered. But their hard and valiant fight is bringing results. We hold a firm base of about 3,500 square miles. For weeks the enemy has been hammering, now at one spot and now at another, sometimes at many points at once. He has been beaten back each time with heavy loss.")

ROBERT MCCORMICK. Yes, beaten back with the help of the United States Navy; and here—only last week returned from the war front (he visited with Admiral Sherman and General Collins)—is Rear Adm. Robert Pierce Briscoe, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations, in charge of our fleet's readiness, with a first-hand report for you.

Admiral BRISCOE. When the North Korean Reds invaded South Korea on June 25 the Navy had 19 combatant ships stationed in far-eastern waters—1 carrier, 2 cruisers, 12 destroyers, and 4 submarines. Today we have more than 150 combat ships in the battle area, and their numbers are being constantly strengthened. These additional forces are required to support the United Nations' effort in Korea and to maintain a neutrality patrol in the Straits of Formosa in accord with the President's order to prevent attack upon Formosa by the Chinese Communists or attack upon the mainland by Nationalist China. While no action has occurred in this area to date, an effective force must be in readiness there, since Korea and Formosa are separated by some 900 miles. For the surface Navy in Korea, two separate and distinct problems are presented. On the west coast the shore line is ragged and treacherous, dotted with hundreds of islands, and honeycombed with coral reefs, shoals, uncharted sand bars, and mud flats. Moreover, the tidal range on this coast is extremely high—varying from 20 to 30 feet—whereas on the east coast the shore line is straight, the land falls abruptly into the sea, and there is deep water right up to the shore with a very small tidal range.

On the west side of Korea, therefore, the problem of our surface vessels in blockading the coast, furnishing gunfire support for our troops, and in bombarding railways, roads, and supply points is complicated by these geographic features. We have solved this problem by an effective liaison between our heavy ships, our coastal craft, patrol airplanes and carrier aircraft. The United Nations naval forces—which consist not only of our own Navy, but vessels from France, England, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the Netherlands, and, of course, South Korea—are everyday drawing the noose tighter and tighter around the enemy's throat to the extent that no enemy waterborne traffic is in existence. On the east coast, the Navy has an ideal, tailor-made job. As I said, on this coast the water is deep and our cruisers and destroyers can get in close and use their big guns with excellent effectiveness. Here the coastal road and railway hugs the shoreline as it runs northward. We have been able to operate off this coast with cruisers and destroyers and to close this artery at will—demolishing tunnels and bridges, and shooting up any troops or convoys that chance to come down it, either day or night. One of the most favorable comments I can give you as the result of my trip to Korea is the splendid coordination that has been worked out between Army units ashore working with our Navy offshore. Four destroyers, you see, have the same fire power as an entire battalion of artillery, and in terms of hot metal they can deliver three times the weight of shells in the same period of time. For example, in the Yondok-Pohang area, the Army units ashore asked for naval gunfire support. Sometimes a naval gun can hit a target that an artillery piece ashore cannot touch. Recently in Pohang the Communist troops were hugging a side of a hill out of range of mortars, where Army artillery couldn't touch them. So the Army control party called for naval gunfire support. We moved in off the beach and were able to splatter the reverse slope with shellfire, and effectively broke up numerous enemy attacks before they got underway. As the tide of of the Korean war eventually turns, this effective, working liaison between our foot soldiers ashore and our United Nations Navy will become stronger and more effective. The war in Korea has been eloquent evidence that American sea power, properly balanced with land and air power, is vital against an enemy which itself has no navy.

(The voice of President Truman: "In less than 8 weeks, five divisions of United States troops have moved into combat, some from bases more than 6,000 miles away. More men are on the way. Fighting in difficult country, under every kind of hardship, American troops have held back overwhelming numbers of Communist invaders. Our naval and air forces have been carrying the attack to military bases and supply lines of the aggressors.")

ROBERT MCCORMICK. But while we are attacking the supply lines of the aggressors, our own supply lines must be kept flowing with equipment by men expert in the art of logistics—men like the Director of Logistic Plans for the Navy—Rear Adm. Harry Thurber.

Rear Admiral THURBER. There is nothing mysterious or new about logistics. We can recall Napoleon's brief description of logistics—an army marches on its belly. Supply of the inner man is only one phase of logistics. It is a sizeable item. For example, ships of the Navy—directed Military Sea Transportation Service have carried to Korea some 10,000 tons of combat rations for our ground forces, including, among other items, 2,000,000 pounds of canned bacon, 3,000,000 pounds of canned beef and gravy, and over 1,000,000 pounds of luncheon meat (or Spam to those who remember). Today, logistics deals with production of weapons and equipment, procurement and storage of matériel, transportation of personnel and supplies, construction of shore facilities to support the military forces, and maintenance of equipment. In short, logistics is the art of supplying the means to win a war.

When Korea was invaded, the Army, Navy, and Air Force had military personnel, tanks, ships, aircraft, and stockpiles of supplies available in the Western Pacific. These were not enough to fight the campaign we faced, but they proved sufficient to delay the onrushing Reds. Additional support for our thin line had to be supplied from the continental United States, 5,000 miles away. For the Korean operation, fighting support of that magnitude had to be carried largely by sea. At the outset a highly praiseworthy airlift speeded personnel and critical items to the battle area, at a rate of over 75 tons a day. Sea transport soon augmented this by over 12,000 tons a day. In the first month, the sea line carried to the Army, Navy, and Air Force over 40,000 personnel; over half a million tons of cargo—from tanks and bulldozers to ammunition for the Navy's devastating shore bombardments, Air Force and Navy bombs and rockets for long-range bombing and machine-gun ammunition; and over 2,000,000 barrels of fuel—aviation gasoline, motor gasoline, Diesel oil, fuel oil, and just plain grease. By way of comparison, the sea line supplied in July the equivalent of a train of 600 coaches, 6,000 boxcars, and 10,000 tank cars, all loaded to capacity. Or, if you want to count fuel alone, sea transport initially carried fuel that would fill the Empire State Building three times. This mammoth logistic task was accomplished by the combined efforts of all hands. During July our supply pipeline to the Far East was large. In August, this pipeline was much greater in size. In September and October it will expand even more. You might ask—what have we got left if another Korea develops, or a widespread war occurs? I can only answer that we are making every effort to meet such a situation. This means that we all, as taxpayers, must contribute to that effort. We all must contribute to our fighting increased military efforts as insurance that we and our children will not be forced to exist their way, but will continue to live our way.

(The voice of President Truman: "We believe the invasion has reached its peak. The task remaining is to crush it. Our men are confident, the United Nations command is confident, that it will be crushed.")

ROBERT MCCORMICK. And a good part of that confidence that we will crush the North Korean invaders is born of havoc wrought upon the enemy by the Navy's air arm. For an informative statement of what we are accomplishing in Korea with our carrier jets and helicopters—as well as some hitherto unrevealed information on Navy air rockets—meet the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air, Vice Adm. John H. (Long John) Cassady.

Vice Admiral CASSADY. The Korean war has demonstrated once again the importance of sea power. Even though North Korea has, relatively, no Navy, it is obvious how impotent we would be in Korea without our Navy. You will remember that one of the greatest sea battles in history—Okinawa—was fought against a Japan which by that time had lost its navy. Every military leader is continually trying to strike a happy medium between new weapons and old weapons. It can be disastrous to cling too long to old weapons and old methods—and it can be equally disastrous to convert too soon to new weapons. We are constantly striving to find that happy medium. It is true that our carrier task forces still cling to those

century-proven old weapons—mobility and surprise—and we cling to our old method of close coordination of air-group attacks. However, built around these timeless axioms of warfare, we have modernized and greatly increased our effective striking power since World War II. First of all, we are now using jet aircraft on our carriers in Korea. Their performance has been amazing. The 600-mile-per-hour Grumman is now proving its mettle. This fighter packs a heavy rocket wallop in addition to its four 20-mm. machine guns. It can carry a sizable bomb load. Launched from carriers operating off the coast of Korea the Panthers are able to spend hours over their targets.

Another innovation since the last war has been the helicopter. These peculiar looking air vehicles are now very much in evidence in Korea, both ashore and with our ships. In addition to their combat missions, such as artillery and ship gunfire spotting, many GI's owe their lives to the timely rescues made by these "windmills." Many a downed airman snatched out of the water or from isolated territory behind the enemy lines prefers to call this contraption "angel." Perhaps the most red hot weapon in use today is the entirely new tank-busting gadget called the "ATAR." Here is a weapon which is a perfect illustration of service unification. Early in the current conflict reports reached the Pentagon that our rockets were bouncing off enemy tanks, doing little or no damage. The experts in the Navy's Bureau of Ordnance had been playing around with some ideas and thought they had a ready answer. The Inyokern workers set up a "made by hand" assembly line and in 7 days produced this rocket. Two days later these rockets were in Japan being used by Air Force pilots against North Korean tanks. The second shipment went to marine pilots on a Navy aircraft carrier off Korea. The first eyewitness report from a marine pilot said that shortly after the rocket hit a Red tank there was an intense explosion from within and the tank burned furiously. I cannot tell you how much armor this rocket penetrates, but more than a foot of steel won't stop it. Needless to say, this rocket is no longer hand made, but it is in mass production. These new developments enable us to do a better job. Our closely knit attacks are getting results by hitting hard at the enemy's air power, his supply lines, his troop concentrations. We now have several aircraft carriers off Korea. They are hitting factories today, bridges tomorrow. They are continually expending strong effort in direct support of ground troops. With the Air Force they are assuring that no enemy aircraft reaches a position from which our forces, our supplies, our communications can be attacked. The marine squadrons operating from carriers and land bases are concentrating almost entirely on the close support of troops. Our land-based and sea-based patrol squadrons are again proving their worth. That scoreboard you have just seen is all that is necessary to point out that your Navy is again on the firing line and doing its part in the defense of your country.

ROBERT MCCORMICK. Thus the Nation, America—as top Navy and civilian officials have come before you to report, moves into the sixty-first day of the war—and this, at the close of a week which only 5 years ago saw the victory that we hoped would bring peace to the Pacific. As our newspapers now regularly list our casualties in Korea, it is fitting that we think upon the final words of our President.

(The voice of President Truman: "The task which has fallen upon our beloved country is a great one. In carrying it out we ask God to purge us of all selfishness and meanness, and to give us strength and courage for the days ahead.")

ROBERT MCCORMICK. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another teledocumentary, this then, against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your fourth Battle Report, Washington.

A Tribute to the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Thursday, August 31, it was my pleasure to attend the practice firing of the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade which was in training at Camp Haven, outside Sheboygan, Wis. Seeing those Illinois boys in action, seeing the only antiaircraft artillery unit which protects Chicago, gave me a tremendous feeling of pride in the guard units of the 48 States.

The One Hundred and Ninth did an outstanding job of marksmanship in blasting away at targets towed by planes of the Michigan National Guard and airplanes of our own dear Wisconsin Air Guard. I ask unanimous consent that the text of a statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MINUTE MEN OF AMERICA

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY)

Mr. President, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A6344 may be found the text of an address which I delivered the previous Thursday night in the Armory at Sheboygan, Wis., before some 3,300 Wisconsinites and members of the Illinois National Guard, their friends and families.

The experiences which I had in beholding the teamwork of the One Hundred and Ninth AAA Brigade will long be remembered. As I peered through the binoculars watching the powerful 90 millimeter antiaircraft guns firing away at aerial targets, and as the ground shook with the tremendous concussion of the firing of these weapons, I felt that I was truly watching America's minute men of 1950. They were in the inspiring tradition of the men who went out from their homes to the battlefields of Concord and Lexington in order to protect all that they held dear.

To me it is almost a miracle that citizens working in a wide variety of occupations practically the entire year can don Army uniforms and within a minimum of time, click in brilliant military precision with modern weapons at guard training.

I want to pay well-deserved tribute to the outstanding commander of the One Hundred and Ninth AAA Brigade, my good friend, a great American, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein. In all my years of observing the handling of military units, I have never seen a general look after the needs of his men so closely, so carefully, and so effectively.

When I came on Thursday, the 31st, the troops had been operating for practically seven continuous days in unusual heavy rains, but in spite of the unfavorable weather conditions, in spite of high winds and mud, the boys really did a great job, and the people of Illinois can well be proud of them.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL MAC ARTHUR

On August 30, General Klein sent a message to his former commanding officer in the Pacific, one of the truly towering figures in all of American history, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I should like to quote from that message at this point:

"SCAP TOKYO, JAPAN.

"GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR: Five years ago today you redeemed your pledge to the American people by accepting the surrender of the Japanese aggressors and erased the shame of Pearl Harbor, Corregidor, and Bataan. We who were privileged to serve with MacArthur, as were many members of my command, will cherish that high accolade forever. The citizen soldiers of the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade salute you today and wish you well. We salute you as our great battle commander, whose military and moral courage mark the most glorious chapter of our history and also as a great statesman. God bless you and permit you to come home soon with victory and honor for a well-deserved rest. A grateful America awaits your coming.

"JULIUS KLEIN,
"Brigadier General."

General MacArthur cabled back: "Thanks and deepest appreciation for your inspiring message."

I know that the response from Tokyo must have been a tremendous thrill to all the officers and members of the One Hundred and Ninth, when one considers the fact that at that very moment United Nations Commander Gen. Douglas MacArthur was engaged in one of the most trying battles of his life in defense of the beachhead around Pusan.

WISCONSIN'S WARM HOSPITALITY

The people of Wisconsin in the surrounding area showed to the visiting Illinois boys the traditional hospitality which has become a hallmark of Wisconsin tradition. The fine newspapers like the Sheboygan Press, the Manitowoc Herald-Times, the Two Rivers Reporter, did an outstanding job of carrying accounts of the Illinois visit, as did of course the great press of Chicago, Ill.

On Thursday evening, the 31st, the troops convoyed into Sheboygan where they were treated to a professional show of wonderfully wholesome entertainment by a cast headed by the famous Willie Shore. This fine comedian highlighted an all-star review which gave to the boys of the One Hundred and Ninth the high type of entertainment which they so well deserved after their gruelling training. This is symbolic of the job done by American show business at the present time and during the First and Second World Wars, in keeping high the morale of our fighting men.

My own address that evening was preceded by comments by General Klein and by those of a great executive of a great State, the Honorable Dwight H. Green, former Governor of Illinois. There were also brief comments by the distinguished chief of staff of the Illinois National Guard troops, Brig. Gen. Kenneth Buchanan, who spoke on behalf of the commanding general, Maj. Gen. Richard Smykal, who had joined with us in observing the training, but who had to return to his State.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

Among other distinguished guests at that day and other days' sessions were an outstanding jurist, Judge Robert Crowe, formerly of the Illinois Supreme Court (whose

own lad, Second Lt. Thomas G. Crowe, is an aide to General Klein); Mr. Benjamin Weintraub, president of the Chicago Motor Coach Co.; and Mr. Allen F. Gellmann, president of the Elgin-American Co., of Elgin, Ill. The last-named leader came to this country as a humble immigrant and his record of achievement in his adopted land—achievement in creating jobs, achievement in giving high-quality goods to the American public, achievement in philanthropic and humanitarian endeavors—is the type of inspiring saga which features American life.

CONCLUSION

I look back to my experience at Camp Haven with deep pride because I recognize that all over America young men and their commanding officers are in training today, ready, prepared, awaiting the call to duty. They are taking time out from their lives in evening training sessions at armories and in summer encampments in order to be prepared for any emergency which may arrive.

I have devoted this much attention in detail to this particular training encampment because I feel that it is emblematic of the very finest in American National Guard life. In paying tribute to General Klein and his boys, I feel that I am also indirectly expressing the gratitude of my heart and the hearts of the American people for every member of the National Guard in Wisconsin and all of the other States. God bless you each and every one, and if you are called into Federal service, may you return safe and sound and with the satisfaction of a job well done.

Tribute to Wilkes County, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter from the president and manager of the Wilkes Chamber of Commerce, North Wilkesboro, N. C., addressed to the editor of the American magazine, New York, with reference to a recent article appearing in the American magazine, entitled "Millions in Moonshine."

This letter is in answer to the many misrepresentations appearing in this magazine article. The author of the article in the magazine ignored the facts and indulged in extravagantly magnifying the production of liquor, evidently for the purpose of making a good story.

This article does a grave injustice to one of the best counties in North Carolina and to one of the finest sections in our whole country. The people of Wilkes County are intelligent, independent, industrious, and self-reliant, and the county has very fine agricultural and industrial resources which have been developed and are now in a flourishing and prosperous condition.

It is unfortunate that writers of articles in magazines would seize upon some incident and magnify it out of all proportion so as to discredit a fine community.

In order to correct these false impressions, I am offering this letter from the officials of the Chamber of Commerce of Wilkes County giving the facts.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILKES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
North Wilkesboro, N. C., September 4, 1950.

Mr. SUMNER BLOSSOM,
Editor, the American Magazine,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In a joint meeting of officers and directors of the Wilkes Chamber of Commerce, along with representatives of the town of North Wilkesboro and the Wilkes County commissioners, we were directed by this group to write you this letter regarding an article appearing in the September 1950 issue of the American magazine, entitled "Millions in Moonshine," by Vance Packard. We note that Mr. Packard is a member of your editorial staff, and presume that he wrote this article under the auspices and direction of the American magazine. Is this true?

It is quite evident from this article that Mr. Packard and the American magazine were not interested in giving a true picture of the type of people and activity of Wilkes County. Instead, it appears that the purpose of this article is to smear Wilkes County, to glorify the work of the ATU agents, and to greatly overplay the liquor business, almost excluding from his article the predominant commercial, industrial, and agricultural activities of the county.

From what source did Mr. Packard get his information, and what concrete evidence does he have to support such condemning, ridiculous, and far-fetched statements as—

1. "The backbone of this woodland county's economy is the manufacture and sale of illicit whisky, which is a multimillion-dollar industry."

2. "You see more bustling prosperity, with fewer visible signs of productive capacity to account for it, than you'll find anywhere else in the United States."

3. That "high-tailed cars" are a trade-mark of Wilkes County.

4. That "there is even an occasional small furniture or coffin factory."

5. That in going over the county you find "an occasional chicken farm, orchard, or sawmill."

6. That it is typical to find the Wilkes County people living in Daniel Boone-type cabins, with luxurious, high-powered cars, with the men counting money running into hundreds of thousands of dollars and planning new distributing outlets for the moonshine, while barefoot women do the plowing.

7. That you can smell fermenting moonshine mash while standing in a churchyard; that by walking from Antioch Church near Wilkesboro in almost any direction you will find a still, or the remains of one, before going a mile.

8. That "much of the backwoods land in Wilkes County is owned by undivided estates or by nice old ladies in Winston-Salem who haven't been in the county for years."

9. That "souping up cars for the moonshine trade is a major industry within itself in the county and keeps many garages busy."

We challenge Mr. Packard, or any other person connected with the American magazine, to come to Wilkes County and show us proof of the statements listed here. Mr. Packard was quite right when he wrote that the chamber of commerce would never admit that the backbone of Wilkes County's economy is the "manufacture and sale of illicit whisky," because, frankly, such a statement is a gross inaccuracy, as the facts in this reply will indicate. Furthermore, since your magazine went to the trouble of sending Mr. Packard to Wilkes County to collect information, apparently almost exclusively from the ATU agents, would your magazine likewise be interested in sending Mr. Packard back to this county so that some of our citizens might show him other phases of our activity, particularly as it applies to the type of people and the agriculture, industry, and commerce carried on by these people. May we now furnish you with a little factual information pertaining to these statements we have enumerated, which either Mr. Packard did not take the trouble to find out about, or did not consider spectacular or dramatic enough to have what he considered the necessary reader appeal?

Pertaining to statements (1), (2), (3), and (4) enumerated in this letter, why did Mr. Packard choose to omit, or to make insignificant, such information about Wilkes County as—

A. The timber and forestry resources and furniture manufacturing: In 1947 approximately 200 sawmills in Wilkes County cut more than 46,000,000 board feet of lumber for commercial purposes and 73,000,000 board feet for all purposes. This county is reported to have led the State that year in the number of sawmills, and is still one of the leading counties in North Carolina from the standpoint of timber resources. In connection with timber, located in the North Wilkesboro area we have 14 manufacturing plants engaged in the manufacture of furniture and building supplies. (This is what Mr. Packard refers to as "an occasional small furniture or coffin factory.") Including the value of Wilkes County's 303,100 acres of woodlands as a timber resource, the return to the timber owners, to the sawmill operators, to the furniture and building material manufacturers and to the hundreds of workers employed in these plants is in actuality a multimillion-dollar business, and, by comparison, makes the liquor business seem infinitesimal.

B. Poultry industry: Wilkes is ranked either the first or second county in North Carolina in the poultry industry, and one of the leading areas of the South. This county produces about 35 to 40 percent of the State's entire poultry supply. This industry, including sale of poultry, eggs, and feed, and the amount of poultry used for home consumption, amounts to about $35,000,000 per year. (This is what Mr. Packard refers to as "an occasional chicken farm.")

C. Fruit growing: The thermal belt which extends through Wilkes County is regarded as one of the finest apple-growing areas in the Nation, and produces some of the finest quality apples from the standpoint of flavor and color that can be found anywhere. Wilkes is the largest producing county of the famous Brushy Mountain area, which in 1948 sold for commercial purposes approximately 850,000 bushels of apples, and which this year is reported to have one of the best and largest crops in its history. (This is what Mr. Packard refers to as "an occasional orchard.")

D. Dairying and livestock: Within the last few years Wilkes County has shown a marked increase in milk production and the raising of livestock. Wilkes is reported to now have more than 7,000 milk cows with an annual production of nearly 30,000,000 pounds of milk. In addition to two other dairy processors (Woodside and Meadow Brook) located in the county, Coble Dairy Products, Inc., one of the largest milk processors in the South, has a modern plant located in Wilkesboro worth approximately $150,000. Mr. Packard completely ignores this phase of our economy, except for the inference that when local farm women call these 7,000 cows, it is usually to warn of the approach of Federal revenuers.

In addition to the timber, poultry, fruit, dairying, and livestock interests of Wilkes County, the records of the Census Bureau, United States Department of Commerce, show that in 1939 there were 30 industries in Wilkes County, and that in 1947 this number had increased to 61—slightly more than 100-percent increase. None of these indus-

tries include the liquor industry referred to in the article, but do include in addition to the manufacture of furniture and building supplies, industries engaged in the manufacture of mirrors, dairy products, soft drinks, textiles, foundry products, mills and mill parts, processed poultry, concrete products, pottery, ice, etc. Statistics from the United States Census Bureau reveal that in 1949 the income from payrolls in Wilkes County was $11,300,000; the value of manufactured products was $15,400,000 for the year ending May 31, 1950; in 1949 the retail and service sales amounted to $21,300,000. The average wholesale sales in the county are about $25,000,000 annually. Although we are proud of our existing industries, commercial and agricultural development, we still have room for a great deal more and will gladly welcome and cooperate with any appropriate, desirable industry which might be brought into this area.

If you will inquire of the officials of the Southern Railway System, we believe they will inform you that their branch line to north Wilkesboro is one of the best branches of the Southern Railway System from the standpoint of freight tonnage. Also, this area is served by some 40 to 50 separate lines of motor truck carriers. You will find by thorough investigation that an insignificant amount of this freight carried by the railroad and these commercial truck carriers is sugar and fruit jars used in making liquor.

Regarding statement No. 5 on page 1, referring to high tailed cars as a trade-mark of Wilkes County is about like finding one bad apple in a barrel of good apples, and labeling the whole barrel rotten. The same goes for Mr. Packard's ballyhoo about souping up cars for the moonshine trade being a major industry within itself.

As to statement No. 6, we don't know how long Mr. Packard visited in Wilkes County, but from the mouths of persons who have lived here for many years, we don't find such conditions at all typical, and, in fact, it is rather difficult to find a situation which, by the wildest imagination, even remotely resembles the one described.

Referring to statement No. 8, the Wilkes County tax supervisor completely refutes this statement, and informs us that the great majority of backwoods land in Wilkes is owned by persons with timber and furniture manufacturing interests, or farmers—not by undivided estates or nice, old ladies in Winston-Salem.

If Mr. Packard and the American magazine wished to present a factual, fair, and complete picture of Wilkes County, they could not have ignored the many fine things being done by our schools, churches, civic organizations, agricultural agencies, chamber of commerce, and others to stimulate and improve the general welfare and standard of living of the people of Wilkes County.

In citing this information, it is not our intent or desire to overlook and ignore the fact that Wilkes County has its weaknesses and some things of which we are not very proud. However, we believe you will find some undesirable conditions prevailing in any county or metropolitan area; yet, we don't believe it is fair to any locality to label it by overplaying and dramatizing such conditions to the almost complete exclusion of progressive and desirable aspects of that locality. We believe that you will find that most of the people of Wilkes County appreciate fair, unbiased publicity portraying the true life of its people as a whole. If the American magazine should be interested in writing a story giving all-round coverage to the industry, commerce, agriculture, and people of Wilkes, the chamber of commerce will be most happy to cooperate with you and will enable you to make a thorough study of the county.

Incidentally, and by coincidence, Collier's (September 9 issue) carries an article about the poultry industry of Gainesville, Ga., entitled "Chickens in the Wind." Will you and your editorial staff please read and reread this article so you may contrast between the objectives of the writer of this article and those of Mr. Packard in his article, Millions in Moonshine. Wilkes County could have appropriately been the scene for such a poultry article.

What does the American magazine propose to do about this biased, unfavorable, and derogatory publicity it has given Wilkes County? Are you willing to retract the false and damaging impression given by your article, Millions in Moonshine, by publishing another article on Wilkes County giving proportionate coverage to the other aspects of our economy?

Very truly yours,

PAUL OSBORNE,
President.
TOM S. JENRETTE,
Manager.

Both Stupid and Dishonest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the situation in China and Korea today is the direct result of the action of Secretary Acheson and his State Department advisors. It is the natural consequence of stubbornly following a mistaken policy in the Far East. Our present debacle in Asia could and should have been anticipated. It was not anticipated because our State Department experts—Acheson, Lattimore, Jessup—deliberately closed their eyes to facts presented to them more than 2 years ago. They refused to listen to the advice given them by such outstanding authorities on Asia as Generals MacArthur, Chennault, and Wedemeyer, men who had had long first-hand experience in connection with the Asiatic situation; Dr. Wellington Koo, Chinese Ambassador to the United States; William C. Bullitt, a former American Ambassador to Russia; and many more that might be named. These men, all with first-hand knowledge of the situation developing in Asia, issued warnings that, if heeded, would have prevented the mess we have in Asia today.

Mr. Speaker, who is responsible for the situation in the State Department? The answer of course is the man who appoints the State Department heads; the man who has the final say-so in all foreign policy matters; the man who has full and complete responsibility for any and all mistakes because he has full authority, and one cannot have full authority and shirk full responsibility.

In the final analysis, therefore, President Harry Truman is responsible for the present debacle in Asia; he is the one who has been making the final decisions to write off Manchuria, China, Korea, Formosa, as not vital or necessary to our defense line in Asia; and then overnight, without a moment's notice, he ordered General MacArthur to send troops to defend South Korea.

This sudden reversal on the part of the President is a confession that he had been wrong in his attitude concerning Asia; that he had been following bad advisers on matters concerning Asia; that he now sees his mistakes and recognizes the fact that they were serious, costly mistakes; and that now he has decided to rectify those mistakes at the cost of thousands of American lives, and billions of tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, as a logical result of this sudden conversion, of his right-about face in Asia, President Truman should now cut loose from the men who have led him astray and select new advisors on Asiatic problems, men who have had long first-hand experience with the problems of the Far East. The American people expect the President to make a change in the State Department very soon, and they hope and pray that the change, when made, will be a wise one.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial taken from the Tulsa Tribune of Saturday, August 26, 1950, entitled "Stupid or Dishonest?" is a very clear exposition of how we got into the mess in Asia and it also places the responsibility upon the proper shoulders. Because I am in full accord with every statement in the editorial, I include the same as a part of my remarks today. It follows:

STUPID OR DISHONEST?

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

A little army of gallant American boys, heavily outnumbered and outgunned, have fought a brilliant action of withdrawal in Korea. True to their American traditions, our soldiers over there have been brave. The reason for our defeats in that foreign and unnecessary war is not the fault of our soldiers. Their military masters have for years made every effort to impress upon our Government in Washington the obvious encroachments made by communistic imperialism in Asia.

Who then is responsible for the series of blunders that have made the Korean campaign disastrous? Disastrous because we now talk of a war over there that will last at least a year. And there are threats of other Asiatic wars being hurled at us like Pearl Harbor surprises.

The American people themselves have blundered into electing a government that is not smart enough to outwit the murder-minded men of Moscow.

Some weeks ago the President of the American people assured us that the prospects for peace were never brighter. What a fool statement.

What kind of a Secretary of Defense have we in Mr. Johnson who so recently boasted that "should Russia attack us at 4 o'clock we would be ready to meet her at 5." Did he lie, or is he that dumb?

What kind of a guardian of our national security is our Secretary of State who overrules our military chiefs of staff and General MacArthur, and who said that Formosa is none of our business? Somehow it becomes some of our serious business when foreign armies explode against us.

What kind of defenders have we who spoke so happily of new and irresistible weapons which were not even in blueprints when they assured us that they had stockpiles of them? Our officials have lied to us.

Are our citizens now alerted enough to be alarmed? Are we ready to be as valiant as citizens as our sons are as soldiers? Our boys are dying because we have listened to political liars.

It is the irrefutable fact that it was our New Deal diplomacy that gave Russia the free

hand in Asia and allowed China to be overrun by communism. And even now the New Deal's fair-haired Asiatic expert, Owen Lattimore, insists we should admit the Communists of China into the councils of the United Nations.

The tragic inadequacy of Mr. Truman, the incompetencies of Mr. Acheson, and the dumbness of Mr. Johnson are only some of the outrages we have voted upon ourselves by putting New Dealism into our National Capitol.

Military unpreparedness and the wanton waste of our taxpayers' money to build up armies to oppose us are only part of the products of our own voting.

The bugles blow and the drums rattle. Hopeful youths, who should be engaged in building self-reliant lives, are on foreign soil. They are being compelled to lay down their life ambitions, lay down life itself, because we voters have not been smart.

It has not been our national leaders who have alerted us. It has been the Communists who awaken us with surprise attack. It is the Communists right here at home, protected by our New Deal leaders. They have placed us in jeopardy.

Who would have guessed 20 years ago that in the Congress of the United States there would arise the need for a Committee on Un-American Activities?

This committee started out with little money and less encouragement to look into a few specific cases that seemed unimportant. But this committee in the House of Representatives has survived ridicule and rebuff. Its labors have grown because the work before it became alarming. By 1939 this Committee on Un-American Activities grew to a position of first rank, and today it is the most discussed of all our congressional activities.

What has happened that in the confines of our own geographic limits, among our own voting citizens, there should be such traces of treason and sedition that we have to be concerned more about our enemies here at home than our enemies abroad?

Why did Franklin Delano Roosevelt, when seeking the Presidency for the fourth time, mark that committee's chairman, Mr. Dies, for purge? Why did the politically aggressive Mrs. Roosevelt mark that committee's secretary, Robert Stripling, for a purge of her own? Why did this President's politically active wife try to get her protégé, Joe Lash, into the naval intelligence when the Navy would not have him because of the record that Mr. Dies' committee had found against that chap? Why was a Hiss defended by two Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States? Where is Hiss now? Enjoying liberty on bail. And the legal machinery of our Nation is more concerned with legal colons and commas than in bringing a betrayer of public trust to the punishment a traitor deserves.

That Judith Coplon. Another running around out on bail. And the mischief which such untrue citizens have done is now killing our boys in Korea and it is threatening the very life of our country.

If we, the people, are so stupid that we allow political charlatans to move us into defenseless positions we are certain to lose all the freedoms that once made us the greatest power on earth. Not until we elected these charlatans to public office have we grown so weak that now we talk of enduring wars. And while our boys are being drafted we have politicians asking for our votes in November to send them to Congress to sustain the New Deal and Fair Deal operators of outrage.

We cannot be impressive abroad when we are no longer impressive here at home. We are a benevolent people by tradition. We have taxed ourselves to feed the starving Hindus. Poor creatures. We have taxed ourselves to give money and materials to the French and to the English to see each in turn trade our gifts to our enemies. We are hated abroad when we should be respected and loved for our generosity. But we cannot be respected abroad if we fail to respect ourselves.

We elected a little man to a big job. He has put little men into big jobs. Our boys are dying in battles that never should have been. They are dying in a war that could have been prevented. By draft we are now draining the youth of the land because we, the people, have not been smart enough to elect honest men who are capable of being leaders. Men honest enough to investigate, repudiate and punish the Pendergast type of ballot-box stuffers and election thieves.

It is no longer a party matter. We are not interested in whether a candidate calls himself a Republican or a Democrat. It is time the people demanded that every candidate who seeks a seat in Congress answer: Are you with us or are you against us? Are you an American or are you an irresponsible apologist for these outrages?

Time was, and not so long ago, when we were self-reliant enough to rid ourselves of our enemies here at home. We have been led into a criminal indifference to our enemies here, and everywhere.

We, the people, have been gullible victims of political charlatans. We have lost our self-reliance. Are we smart enough now to vote our freedoms back?

Crusade for Freedom Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following statement which I made at Holyoke, Mass., on September 6, 1950, and the text of a speech by General Eisenhower, launching the Crusade for Freedom movement:

For several weeks I have been doing everything in my power to obtain the facts about the specious and vicious Communist peace propaganda known as the Stockholm peace petition and have reported those facts in Congress and to my constituents. I have been greatly encouraged by the outstanding action taken by the press and radio of the First District of Massachusetts and of the Nation in advising the public of the full facts. The clear and decisive actions taken by organizations of Americans, including our farm organizations, our labor organizations, our veterans organizations and our civic organization have been most effective.

While I had hoped and have urged that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs take prompt action upon the resolution which I introduced, expressing congressional condemnation of this Stockholm peace petition and alternative constructive action by patriotic Americans who sincerely wish to work for peace in this world, in view of my experience, I am not particularly confident that such action will be taken. I regret that, and shall continue my efforts to provide such a recommendation for the American people.

However, I have read the text of the address by General Eisenhower Monday night in Denver, launching the Crusade for Freedom movement. It contains so much of lasting value not only to all Americans but to all people in the world who are still free that I am making arrangements to have it made available to anyone in the First Congressional District upon request to my office. This Crusade for Freedom is headed by another great American, Gen. Lucius Clay. The plea has been made to each of us in the words of General Eisenhower that "Your dollar or dime will help him (General Clay) provide the means of bringing the truth to a region vital to our welfare." It will make it possible to expand an existing and powerful voice which is now in operation in western Germany, known as Radio Free Europe. General Eisenhower said: "The Crusade For Freedom will provide for the expansion of Radio Free Europe into a network of stations." Then he went on to say—and I am sure this will appeal to everyone in the first district—that "They will be given the simplest, clearest charter in the world: 'Tell the truth.' For it is certain that all the surface-bright but core-rotten promises of communism to the needy, the unhappy, the frustrated, and the down-trodden cannot stand against the proven record of democracy and its day-by-day progress in the betterment of all mankind. The tones of the Freedom Bell, symbol of the crusade, will echo through vast areas now under blackout." I cannot urge too strongly that each of us make this crusade a matter of individual and personal interest. First, we can insure its complete success by making certain that we and all our friends and neighbors sign the freedom scroll. Certainly some of us can volunteer to circulate it throughout our communities. Next, I know that everyone in the first district will welcome the opportunity of giving something toward the program of the Crusade For Freedom. I hope that it can be made a matter of major importance for our veterans organizations, our civic clubs, our farm organizations, our labor organizations, our schools and, in fact, every group in the district. While ample funds are necessary, I am convinced that it is even more important that everyone in the district be given an opportunity to participate and that the pennies of school children are just as important as the dollars of adults.

Finally, this can well be a means of providing a ringing answer to the efforts of those few traitors in our midst who have been sponsoring and circulating the Communist peace petition with the announced purpose of presenting the signatures of millions of Americans to the United Nations on October 24.

TEXT OF GENERAL EISENHOWER'S ADDRESS IN DENVER LAUNCHING THE CRUSADE FOR FREEDOM MOVEMENT

Americans are dying in Korea tonight. They are dying for ideals they have been taught to cherish more than life itself. But it will be written and said tonight in Warsaw, in Prague, in Moscow, that they died for American imperialism.

Unfortunately, millions of people will believe this devilish libel against American soldiers, who have taken up arms in defense of liberty. A second time in a tormented decade. Those millions will hear no other version but a hissing, hating tirade against America. We think it incredible that such poison be swallowed; but those people, behind and beyond the iron curtain, have seen so much political wickedness and cold-blooded betrayal, such godless depravity in government that they find it harder to believe in our peaceful intent and decent motives than in the calculated and clever lies that communism is spreading every hour, every day, through every broadcast and newspaper that it controls.

CAMPAIGN OF HATRED

This slander against our purposes and our men in Korea is merely one example of the campaign of hatred that is being waged against America and freedom around the globe. We face not only ruthless men, but also lies and misconceptions intended to rob us of our resolution and faith within and of our friends throughout the world. Communists teach that America is a vi-

cious enemy of humanity. They have embarked upon an aggressive campaign to destroy free government, as in the young Republic of Korea; because regimentation cannot face the peaceful competition of free enterprise.

The Communists leaders believe that, unless they destroy our system, their own subjects, gradually gaining an understanding of the blessings and opportunities of liberty, will repudiate communism and tear its dictators from their positions of power. They know that free labor and management consistently out-produce communism in the material things that humans need and want, and hold out a superior appeal to man's spiritual aspirations. They know that, for the mass of humanity, America has come to symbolize freedom, opportunity, human happiness. They have a mortal fear that this knowledge will penetrate eventually to their own people and others in the world.

Communistic aggression, inspired by fear, carries with it the venom of those who feel themselves to be inferior. This accounts for the depth of their hatred, and the intensity of their thirst for power.

To destroy human liberty and to control the world, the Communists use every conceivable weapon; subversion, bribery, corruption, military attack. Of all these, none is more insidious than propaganda. Spurred by this threat to our very existence, I speak tonight as another private citizen, not as an officer of the Army, about the Crusade for Freedom. This crusade is a campaign sponsored by private American citizens to fight the big lie with the big truth. It is a program that has been hailed by President Truman, and all others who have heard of it, as an essential step in getting the case for freedom heard by the world's multitudes.

Powerful Communist radio stations incessantly tell the world that we Americans are physically soft and morally corrupt; that we are disunited and confused; that we are selfish and cowardly; that we have nothing to offer the world but imperialism and exploitation.

JAMMING TACTICS

To combat these broadcasts the Government has established a radio program called the Voice of America. But the Communist stations overpower it and outflank it with a daily coverage that neglects no wave length or dialect, no prejudice or local aspiration, weaving a fantastic pattern of lies and twisted fact. They confound the listener into believing that we are warmongers; that America invaded North Korea; that a Russian invented the airplane; that the Soviets, unaided, won World War II; and that the secret police and slave camps of communism offer humanity brighter hope for the future than do self-government and free enterprise.

We need powerful radio stations abroad, operated without Government restrictions, to tell in vivid and convincing form about the decency and essential fairness of democracy. These stations must tell of our aspirations for peace, our hatred of war, and our constant readiness to cooperate with any and all who have these same desires.

Only then can we counteract the Communist deceits that are being spread with every weather, crop, and news report.

One such private station—Radio Free Europe—is now in operation in western Germany. It daily brings a message of hope and encouragement to a small part of the masses of Europe.

The Crusade for Freedom will provide for the expansion of Radio Free Europe into a network of stations. They will be given the simplest, clearest charter in the world: "Tell the truth." For it is certain that all the surface-bright, but core-rotten, promises of communism to the needy, the unhappy, the frustrated, the down-trodden, cannot stand against the proven record of democracy and its day-by-day progress in the betterment of all mankind. The tones of the Freedom Bell, symbol of the crusade, will echo through vast areas now under blackout.

In this battle for truth, you and I have a definite part to play during the crusade. Each of us will have the opportunity to sign the freedom scroll. It bears a declaration of our faith in freedom, and of our belief in the dignity of the individual who derives the right of freedom from God. Each of us, by signing the scroll, pledges to resist aggression and tyranny wherever they appear on earth. Its words express what is in all our hearts, your signature on it will be a blow for liberty.

GENERAL CLAY DIRECTOR

My friend, Gen. Lucius Clay, one of our great Americans, is directing the crusade for freedom. Your dollar, or dime, will help him provide the means of bringing the truth to a region vital to our welfare.

Even we, ourselves, sometimes overlook or forget factors of the utmost importance in the global situation, and which have direct bearing on our own security and prosperity.

Most of us have been enjoying a long week end, terminating in this day dedicated to free American labor. How depressing it is to realize that on this Labor Day, 1950, one-third of the human race works in virtual bondage. In the totalitarian countries, the individual has no right that the state is bound to respect. His occupation is selected by his masters, his livelihood is fixed by decree, at the minimum which will give him strength to work another day. His pleasures and his thoughts are restricted to those of glorifying the bonds that hold him in servitude.

MUST MEET THREAT

Because representative labor leaders of America know the record of communism in beating down labor, they have long been in the forefront of those fighting the spread of this vicious doctrine. But communism goes further than the exploitation of labor. Unless the individual accepts governmental mastery of his life and soul, he can be convicted without trial; he can be executed without right of appeal; he can be banished to live out his life in a slave camp.

The people behind the iron curtain have no conception of a free press, or free discussion, or of our right to go to a church of our own choosing, or any church at all. Their schools and periodicals are little more that propaganda mills. The people know nothing except that which their government says they should know, and the effort to learn more is punished promptly and without mercy.

This is what the Soviet planners contemplate for all the world, including America.

We must meet this threat with courage and firmness. Unless we look, with clear and understanding eyes, at the world situation of today, and unless we meet with dynamic purpose the issues confronting us, then we will lose the American birthright. The system of government established by our forefathers will disappear, the sacrifices of American patriots will have been in vain. The world will go back to the days of master and slave, of darkness, ignorance and savagery. The American record, from Washington to the day of disaster, would be only a blank page in history.

We, American citizens can assure that this will never happen to us if the fervor of our devotion to freedom is equal to the seriousness of the threat. Amid these dangers, personal participation by each in public deliberation and activity is necessary to our safety. Each must make it his responsibility to see that we remain strong morally, intellectually, materially. Our material strength must comprise a healthy, devoted and prosperous population, high productivity, financial stability, and such military power as can meet aggression on respectable terms.

Young and old, business, labor, professional men, 150,000,000 of us must rally as one man behind our country and freedom. America is exactly as strong as the initiative courage, understanding and loyalty of the individual citizen.

The die has been cast in Asia, but we are in no limited conflict. Free Europe, struggling for moral and economic recovery, is still a tempting target for predatory military force. We must give real support to all aspects of the military aid program and reexamine, at once, our troop strengths in critical areas.

SPARTAN FRUGALITY

All this means that we must resolutely tighten our belts, both nationally and individually. We must insist upon facing up to the task of paying for the accomplishment of these vital measures, else the Soviets will take heart from their success in bringing us further inflation and closer to economic ruin.

We must have efficiency and economy in all governmental expenditures; and we must concentrate all our resources to assure victory in this bitter and probably prolonged struggle. Until it is won we must practice Spartan frugality in all nonessential matters, so that we may make the greatest possible contribution to the defense of our way of life. All lesser considerations must wait. We cannot tolerate politics as usual any more than we can tolerate business as usual.

Success in such national crises always requires some temporary and partial surrender of individual freedom. But the surrender must be by our specific decision, and it must be only partial and only temporary. It must be insured that, when the crisis has passed, each of us will then possess every right, every privilege, every responsibility and every authority that now resides in an American citizen. It would do no good to defend our liberties against communistic aggression and lose them to our own greed, ignorance, or shiftless reliance on bureuacracy and the Federal treasury.

In the dangers and trials ahead, our ultimate security lies in the dynamic purpose and unshakable unity of the United States and the free world, a unity that depends upon common understanding of and common veneration of freedom. But these can live only where there is access to the truth. Thus truth becomes our most formidable weapon, a weapon that each of us can help forge through the Crusade for Freedom.

And let us never forget that for those who have lost freedom there is no price or cost or sacrifice that can even faintly reflect its value. But it is still the core of America's boundless heritage. It will remain so for as long as we, plain American citizens, are ever ready to guard it with vigilance and defend it with fortitude and faith.

Symbols of Immortality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, James Patrick McGovern, of Washington, D. C., has written a poem entitled "Symbols of Immortality." In times like these, when spiritual leadership is doubted, when materialism obscures our ideals, and when war and a highly mechanic civilization blind us to the kinship of man

and nature, it is fitting for us to be thoughtful. I ask unanimous consent that this poem be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SYMBOLS OF IMMORTALITY

Our immortality shines on the earth,
Mirrored by the poet, prophet, seer,
And all whose genius makes their vision clear
To marvel at our universe and birth.
As long as nature is the home of man,
And skies are more than dust and light alone,
And human minds reach to the farthest zone
Of thoughts and dreams beyond our finite span—
So long no science chains us to the sod,
So long our earth-born beauty transcends clay.
The joy and sorrow, the faith and hope, which sway
Life are so heartfelt and so true that God
Must be both our creator and our guide,
And in His image we are deified.

—James Patrick McGovern.

Fourteen Unanswered Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, during a recent visit to my district I was beseiged with questions about the conduct of our Government in Washington.

The American people are deeply worried. They are asking questions, but they are not getting answers. I could not answer many of them because I have raised similar questions myself and have never been able to get the answers from the administration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting some examples because they disclose how gravely concerned our people are regarding the world situation and the course of events in Washington. The questions follow:

First. What happened to the $95,000,000,000 spent on national defense since World War II?

Second. Why did only $1 out of every seven defense dollars go for combat equipment between 1946 and 1950?

Third. Why did President Truman limit the Air Force to 48 groups when the Republican Eightieth Congress ordered the Air Force expanded to 70 groups?

Fourth. Why, if communism was a menace in Asia, were there only 6 General Pershing tanks, only 30 propellate (tactical) combat planes, only 1 aircraft carrier, and not a single combat marine in the Japanese area when we entered the Korean conflict?

Fifth. Why did President Truman on December 15, 1945, officially announce that unless our ally, China, admitted Communists to its Government China would get no more American aid?

Sixth. Who was best serving America—the administrations which for 50 years defended the open door in China, or the Truman administration, which abandoned China to Soviet exploitation?

Seventh. Why, when Congress had voted $10,500,000 military aid for South Korea 8 months earlier, had South Korea received only $200 worth of Signal Corps wire when the Communists struck, June 25?

Eighth. Whose advice was the administration following when it asked last year for $150,000,000 in economic aid for South Korea—that of its long-time adviser, Owen Lattimore, who said in July 1949 that "The thing to do is let South Korea fall but not to let it look as though we pushed it—hence the recommendation of a parting grant of $150,000,000"?

Ninth. Why did Secretary of State Acheson virtually invite the Communists to take Korea, Formosa, and the balance of China by announcing January 12, 1950, that they were beyond our "defense perimeter"?

Tenth. On what basis did President Truman declare—only 27 days before ordering American troops into Korea—that we were closer to a permanent peace "than anytime in the last 5 years"?

Eleventh. Which was wiser—the administration's appeasement policy that enabled Russia, in the 5 years after World War II, to extend its domination from 170,000,000 people to 800,000,000 people, or Republican insistence on a firm anti-Communist policy?

Twelfth. After the Korean Communists are pushed back to the thirty-eighth parallel, then what?

Thirteenth. What will the administration do in Asia in the future—return to appeasement?

Fourteenth. What hope can there be for peace under this administration?

Complaints Against the Military Sea Transportation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, supplementing my remarks of September 1 with regard to the manner in which the Military Sea Transportation Service is building up a shipping fleet of its own and manning this fleet with unscreened, inexperienced crews, I want to call the attention of Congress to a letter which I have just received from Mr. Vince Malone, president of the Marine Firemen's Union. Mr. Malone's letter points out the manner in which the offices of the United States Employment Service and the California Unemployment Compensation Insurance Agency are being used to perform the functions of a press gang in obtaining crews for MSTS operated ships. The tactics described by Mr. Malone are certainly a violation of the rights of the seamen so impressed. Such treatment is a poor reward for the wholehearted cooperation given by the maritime unions and their members in this crisis. The preferential treatment of suspected subversives which Mr. Malone mentions is likewise to be condemned. The enactment of the Knowland amendment to the social security bill prevents the Secretary of Labor from dealing with this situation as it should be dealt with. The congressional investigation which I demanded on September 1 is more than ever needed, in view of these facts.

Mr. Malone's reference to the sinking of the *Benevolence*, in connection with Mr. Harry Lundeberg's statements in his letter printed with my September 1 remarks, also merits serious thought. Mr. Malone's letter follows:

MARINE FIREMEN'S UNION,
San Francisco, Calif., August 30, 1950.
Hon. JOHN F. SHELLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have a couple of problems that we would like you to work on.

The first is the question of MSTS bearing down on our men who desire to ship on vessels that are covered by union collective-bargaining agreements.

You are well familiar with the reasons why our men do not want to sail on MSTS ships. There is a difference in conditions, notably the $7.50 per month which is paid on every job by steamship companies to our welfare fund.

Furthermore, our men have been through a very rough period during which, if they did not have unemployment insurance to fall back on, many of them would have starved. They feel that when the crisis is over—which possibly might be by next spring—there will be a mass tie-up of ships, and they will be out on the street again. They want the cushion of unemployment insurance to tide them over.

The situation is that the MSTS employment office here calls the United States Employment Service, stating that they have a number of jobs available in certain categories. Sometimes the number of jobs is specified, and, we understand, at one time they did specify 30 jobs in the engine-room department. The USES, which has no qualified seamen waiting around, then notifies the California unemployment compensation office.

The compensation office then gives the men a referral card to go down to MSTS. This referral card is not a job assignment—merely a referral. In many cases our men tell them where to stick the card, and unemployment insurance checks are stopped as of right now.

When our men go down to 33 Berry Street they stand in line for several hours, are questioned somewhat superciliously, and are told that their qualifications, etc., will be checked, and they will be called on in due course. From 2 to 5 weeks later they may receive a note calling them to report for assignment. If they then turn it down the unemployment-compensation people are notified and they are chopped off unemployment insurance.

In other words, if a man wants to chisel he can accept a referral card and keep on drawing his unemployment compensation for several weeks and then get dropped when he turns a job down.

The victims of this species of blackmail are mainly the members of the Sailors Union of the Pacific and Marine Firemen's Union. The MSTS want no part of anybody from the Marine Cooks and Stewards, so the M. C. and S. swampers go on drawing their unemployment compensation because they are poor security risks, while our guys are given the well-known bird.

We think that with the continual uprise of manning requirements on ships under our agreements we shortly will have to make strenuous efforts to go out and recruit back those men who dropped out of the union be-

cause of poor shipping conditions and who have written in by the hundreds asking for the opportunity to ship.

What is happening is that while we are squawking like hell for ships, stating we have a fine pool of men to draw on, MSTS is trying to press gang our men. Eventually, when we, in turn, need men the MSTS people will raise their hands in holy horror and say, "What the hell were those so-and-sos crying at ut; they have no men to ship."

You know that the average American will cooperate in helping to win the war, but if he is blackjacked around, then he is not so keen to throw in his wholehearted support.

We ourselves are willing to work night and day to rustle up the men to keep our ships moving, but we think it is a bum deal when our men and the sailors are given this rat race while the perks over in the Marine Cooks and Stewards get what is tantamount to preference on unemployment insurance because they are tainted with the label of subversive.

We think you should also stress the necessity for funds to adequately prepare the ships in the reserve fleets. The old adage "penny-wise and pound foolish" was never better exemplified than in the present emergency. Many vessels which have been pulled out from the boneyard have been delayed because of necessary repairs.

The American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. chartered the *Belgium Victory* in New York, and, coming around, she had condenser trouble and had to put in at Norfolk for repairs.

The *Purdue Victory*, chartered by the Chamberlin Co., was taken out in the Gulf. Her economizers went haywire and she had to be escorted back by towboats.

The *Cuba Victory*, of American President Lines, was delayed 3 days in the Canal.

The main trouble on practically all these ships seems to be that some overzealous soul was carried away with the idea of putting consol oil in and on everything. They even filled the boiler feed lines, boilers, etc., with this oil, which meant that it took from 4 to 5 days to steam out the lines and boilers, and even at that there are pockets of oil left which raise hell with the boiler tubes, condensers, etc.

It would appear that when laying these ships up in the future such brain waves should be tossed in the ash can. It should be readily apparent that with the amount of money spent to recondition these ships and the delays, it would have been much wiser to have taken care of this a year or so ago.

Finally, there is the matter of the crash between the *Mary Luckenbach* and the *Benevolence*. The *Mary Luckenbach* is an NMU ship. We have an agreement with the Luckenbach Gulf people, but the NMU have the agreement with the Luckenbach North Atlantic outfit.

Looking at it from a more or less unbiased viewpoint, we wonder what the *Mary Luckenbach* was doing over in the wrong side of the channel, why each ship was going full speed ahead in the fog, and why no fog horns were blasting by each vessel; and why the *Benevolence* failed to get her lifeboats off.

We happened to have one of our men who was a member of the crew of the *Benevolence*. He told us that he was in the engine room at the time of the crash, and when he got up on deck everything was in confusion. Only one lifeboat was lowered, and he lowered it. There was a great deal of confusion and no one around to give orders.

If the ship had been hit several hundred miles offshore, the loss of life would have been terrific. I do not think there is any ship afloat—Navy or merchant ship—that would not have been able to get a flock of lifeboats over and have life rafts, etc., slung in the water to take care of the biggest majority of the people on the ship.

Another puzzle is the delay of an hour and a half in the case of the *Mary Luckenbach* lowering her lifeboats.

It seems to me that some of the gold braid should be yanked off the officers on both vessels. It would do them good to sail in the bilges for a while.

With best wishes.

Yours truly,

V. J. MALONE, *President*.

This Is No Time for Politics as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the sine die adjournment of Congress at this time. I realize to remain in Washington places every Member of Congress at a disadvantage in his campaign for reelection. It gives an opponent a distinct advantage because he has an open field to carry on his campaign. However, no matter what the effect may be it is the duty of Congress to remain at the post of duty ready and willing to do whatever it can to supplement the heroic service being rendered by our boys at the fighting front in Korea. We should not put personal interest above the performance of duty. The boys in Korea cannot adjourn to return home, neither should we do so.

This is no time for politics as usual. The situation is such that all must think and act in terms of the national welfare. We are faced with a situation so serious that it approaches crisis proportions. There is only one course for voters to follow in the coming election. That course requires us to cast aside all thoughts of partisan politics and think seriously of the conditions that now face our Nation. Are we satisfied with those conditions? No. Who could be satisfied when our boys are dying in Korea, outnumbered and ill-equipped, all of which is the result of a bungling, wasteful and extravagant administration. The present administration has spent our tax money to make jobs for faithful party workers instead of weapons and equipment that would give us security against an aggressive communistic movement, and, enable our boys now on the fighting line to have a chance for their lives.

The people are asking why are we short of tanks, aircraft, artillery, weapons and munitions? What has been done with the billions of dollars appropriated by Congress since World War II? Why are a mere handful of courageous boys, inadequately equipped, expected to do the work of what requires an army of well equipped, trained men in numbers sufficient to meet the vast forces that now confront our fighting men? Why didn't the President and his military advisers know the danger that existed and prepare to meet them? It seems unbelievable that our administration leaders did not know of the vast military preparations that were under way in North Korea. The truth is that under the leadership of Hiss, Lattimore, and all the other advisers of that kind, the Administration has not been willing to come to grips with communistic aggression and treat it in a realistic way.

The unparalleled extravagance and profligate waste of the present administration has long been a source of worry to thoughtful citizens. It has now caught up with us. We are in the midst of a great emergency and find ourselves in short supply of everything that we need to maintain our national security and make an aggressive stand against communism.

Furthermore, we find to our sorrow that the coddling attitude of our administration toward communism has encouraged it to raise its ugly head in Korea, and, as a result our boys are dying there in a valiant effort to uphold our principles against great odds. Who is responsible for this sad state of affairs? Think it over. Should any administration guilty of such blundering be kept in control of our Government? The call goes out to the people of this Nation, regardless of political affiliation, to drive Communists, fellow travelers, pinks and Reds out of Government, and, to help in the effort to provide a defense that will give a sense of security to our people.

We must do all within our power to remove from our Government the theory that communism is only a "red herring." We must acknowledge it as the danger it is, and, strike it hard. Realizing that patriotism is not the asset of any one political power the call goes out to all, regardless of party affiliation, Republicans and Democrats alike, to join hands and remove this menace from our midst. Let us show to the world that the spirit of America is not dead but liveth.

Resolutions of the Department of Arkansas, the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Arkansas State Department of the American Legion recently held its State convention in Little Rock, Ark. Many significant and timely resolutions were adopted during the course of the meeting. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the full text of these resolutions:

Whereas the Civil Service Commission's regulations covering section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, provide veterans must be fully qualified to gain precedence over a nonveteran serving under the same type of appointment, the American Legion feels that this fully qualified clause has been overlooked by some Federal agencies and has virtually nullified the

spirit and intent of Congress and the American Legion in providing appropriate preference for veterans in cases of reduction-in-force; and

Whereas the Federal Civil Service Commission has recently slightly modified the fully qualified clause dealing with reduction-in-force regulations, it is the opinion of the American Legion that current regulations are not adequate to protect the interest in the reduction-in-force procedure and should be further strengthened to provide that preference employees who meet the minimum qualification requirements of a position held by a non-veteran employee has the legal right to displace a nonveteran employed in the particular assignment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Arkansas Department, the American Legion, in convention assembled at Little Rock, Ark., August 20–22, 1950, That the Civil Service Commission be requested to further modify its reduction-in-force regulations so as to further comply with the spirit and intent of section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, and that all reduction-in-force appeals filed with the Commission during the period that this fully qualified clause was in the regulations may be either reopened by the veteran or readjudicated by the Commission on the basis of whether the veteran meets the minimum qualifications of the position in question.

Whereas present laws and regulations do not provide for relief or aid to the widow and minor children, or minor children of deceased veterans of World War II, unless such deceased veteran was drawing disability compensation at the time of death; and

Whereas the highly sacrificial nature of the services rendered to this Nation during World War II by veterans thereof requires the Government of this benevolent country to discharge a duty to the widows and minor children of deceased veterans of World War II, and to keep their widows and minor children from hunger and want: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Arkansas Department, the American Legion in convention assembled at Little Rock, August 20–22, 1950, That we memorialize the Congress of these United States to enact laws and provide for regulations by which the widows and minor children of deceased veterans of World War II shall be entitled to assistance from this benevolent Nation in order to keep them from hunger and want in recognition of the high nature of the services rendered as befitting the benevolence of a Nation now enjoying the benefits of the services rendered by those who now sleep in death.

Whereas the regional office of the Veterans' Administration in Little Rock is widely scattered because of inability to obtain enough suitable floor space in any single building, causing added expense in operations and inconvenience to war veterans; and

Whereas consolidation of the Regional Office Medical Division with the VA hospital has been efficient and economical in many cities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Arkansas Department, the American Legion in convention assembled at Little Rock, Ark., August 20–22, 1950, That we do hereby urge the transfer and coordination of the medical division of the Little Rock region office to the new General Medical and Surgical Hospital insofar as it is practical and will work to the best interest of war veterans.

Whereas thousands of veterans who have initiated their training and have been forced to discontinue their training, through no fault of their own, and others who have entered or completed a basic training program, such as prelaw and premedical courses and basic academic courses preparatory to vocational courses, will not as a result of overcrowding of schools be enrolled in the advanced phase of their training as of July 25, 1951; and

Whereas Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, provides that an eligible veteran must have initiated his course of training by July 25, 1951, or four years after the date of his discharge, and contains no requirement, either written or implied, that a veteran must be physically in training on July 25, 1951, or 4 years after the date of his discharge, and remain in continuous training thereafter; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has published a regulation which states that an eligible veteran must have commenced and actually be pursuing his course of education or training on July 25, 1951, or the date 4 years after his discharge, whichever is later; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration regulation is directly contradictory to the language and intent of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress and will prevent thousands of worthy veterans who have initiated their training or completed the preparatory phase of their training from completing training necessary for the attainment of their occupational objective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arkansas Department, the American Legion in convention assembled at Little Rock, August 20–22, 1950, respectfully recommends that the Congress of the United States amend the statutes to clearly express its intent regarding the veteran's right to training after July 25, 1951, to provide that an eligible veteran who has initiated his course of training by July 25, 1951, or 4 years after the date of his discharge, whichever is later, may continue his training continuously or intermittently, full time or part time, until completion of his education or training and attainment of his occupational objective or the exhaustion of his entitlement or until July 25, 1956, whichever is earliest, provided that the veteran's training shall continue to be satisfactory.

Whereas it has been called to our attention that the War Department is closing, or planning to close 18 of our veterans hospitals, and curtail the facilities of many others; and

Whereas, the present facilities cannot adequately care for the veterans who now need hospitalization, as many are on the waiting list who need attention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled at Los Angeles, Calif., October 9 to 12, 1950, go on record as being opposed to the closing of any veterans hospitals, or the curtailment of any existing facilities until the veterans who are now in need can be adequately care for.

Whereas the laws governing military secrets and the protection of the Constitution of the United States of America have become obsolete under the progress of the Nation, and under existing law the Constitution and the construction of the Constitution is permitting its own destruction. Foreign enemies and American citizens under the influence of foreign agents are trying to destroy America and the American way of life and are claiming protection under the Constitution and laws pertaining thereto, while they are destroying the very instrument under which they cry for protection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Arkansas Department of the American Legion in convention assembled at Little Rock, August 20–22, That the national legislative committee of the American Legion be requested to prepare and submit to the Congress of the United States of America bills which would provide in effect that—

1. Any person or persons who shall knowingly and willfully transmit either verbally or in writing, either directly or indirectly any military information to a foreign country, or its representative or agent, shall be guilty of treason and when so found, shall be sentenced to death.

2. Any person or persons who shall aid or abet agents or representatives of any foreign country, either directly or indirectly, against the peace and dignity of the United States of America, if found guilty shall be sentenced to 5 years at hard labor, and fined not less than $5,000.

3. Any person or persons who shall publish or cause to be published any information pertaining to secret military projects, except upon the written authority of the National Security Council, shall be sentenced to not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years, and fined not less than $2,500.

4. Congress enact legislation making all evidence obtained by the FBI through wire tapping or any evidence obtained by dictaphone, admissible as evidence only in cases applying to the above acts and such other acts as the Congress may deem expedient.

Whereas this Nation is again engaged in warfare; and

Whereas the members of our Armed Forces are again subject to the perils and danger of war; and

Whereas it has been the policy of the American Legion to assist all disabled comrades, their widows and dependents; and

Whereas it is only right and proper that since this country is again engaged in warfare and the members of our Armed Forces subject to all the perils and incidents that go with such combat and warfare, that all of our comrades who have been members of the Armed Forces of the United States since the beginning of hostilities with Korea should be accorded all the privileges and benefits of the GI bill of rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled at Los Angeles, Calif., October 9–12, 1950, That the so-called GI bill be amended by an act of Congress to include within the terms of said bill all members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served between the beginning of hostilities with Korea and the cessation of such hostilities.

Whereas unemployment is always a threat to veterans; and

Whereas it is growing increasingly evident that the international situation will bring about increased civilian employment in which Government funds will be expended; and

Whereas the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, does not include the coverage of veterans preference with prime contractors who operate with Federal funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Department, the American Legion assembled in convention at Little Rock, Ark., August 20–22, 1950, That the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, be further amended to the effect to include prime contractors who operate in whole or in part with Federal funds must give preference to all qualified veterans, and that the Congress be requested to give authority to an appropriate Federal agency for the agency for the administration of this preference requirement.

Whereas the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization recommends that veterans' preference in Federal employment be sharply curtailed by dividing applicants for employment in four categories and merely give veterans' preference within the respective categories to which they are assigned; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission further recommends that veterans' preference in cases of reduction in force be further curtailed; and

Whereas the adoption of such a plan would result in the discharge of thousands of vet-

erans, and would also lessen opportunity in the future for the appointment of veterans in Federal service; and

Whereas the present principles of veterans' preference has been in existence for over 70 years and not only have veterans benefited from such preference but also the whole concept of public service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sate Department of the American Legion assembled in convention at Little Rock, Ark., August 20–22, 1950, wish to strongly oppose all recommendations of the Hoover Commission which would either directly or indirectly weaken veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Whereas the present needs for maximum production require the utilization of all our human resources and affords an opportunity for the placement of physically handicapped veterans in Government employment; and

Whereas physically handicapped veterans should have an opportunity to utilize their abilities and at any time earn a livelihood; and

Whereas the provisions of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended, are circumvented in numerous instances, particularly in service-connected disability preference: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Department of the American Legion in convention at Little Rock, Ark., August 20–22, 1950, That we reaffirm our stand on preference in selection of preference eligibles to fill existing openings in all Government jobs; and be it further

Resolved, That adequate congressional action be sought to safeguard the disability preference by requiring that the Civil Service Commission give service-connected disability candidates for civil-service appointment a full explanation in the case of rejection for appointment, and that the Civil Service Commission be granted legal authority to require the protesting Federal agency to employ the veterans passed over, providing a Civil Service Commission deems the specific reason for such passing over inadequate.

Whereas most younger veterans have not yet been able to accumulate sufficient experience and seniority to protect them in lay-offs; and

Whereas age restrictions imposed by many employers present serious obstacles to older veterans now needing employment; and

Whereas for these reasons veterans are suffering severe and stringent economic handicaps more widespread than those incurred by others; and

Whereas veterans and their organizations must now place an even greater reliance and dependence on the Veterans Employment Service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Arkansas Department, the American Legion in convention assembled at Little Rock, August 20–22, 1950, That we urge there be adequate funds provided for the Veterans Employment Service to enable them to provide for unemployed veterans the maximum of job opportunity.

Whereas during World War II many thousands of physically fit men of military age were deferred for occupational reasons while others with families were being inducted into the service; and

Whereas subsequent to World War II several millions of men who were not in the service of their country during World War II have now become of military age; and

Whereas during the World War II numerous men were sent to college at Government expense and did not see active duty because of such training; and

Whereas there are many thousands of veterans of World War II who are disabled and otherwise unfit for military duty; and

Whereas there are others who are physically fit but who now have families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Arkansas Department, the American Legion in convention assembled at Little Rock, August 20–22, 1950, That veterans of World War II are ready and willing to serve their country wherever, whenever, and in whatever capacity they may be needed.

That because of large numbers of men who did not see active duty in the uniform of their country during the past war for reasons set forth above, the said men should be given the first opportunity to serve their country during this emergency.

That proper authorities of the Government should notify all war industries and employers of men in essential occupations that it should be their policy to employ in such categories, first, disabled veterans of World War II, and secondly, other veterans of World War II with families with the view of making available for military service men of military age who have not previously served their country in uniform.

That there should be set up within the Selective Service System and the Department of Defense a system whereby all men who were not in active service during World War II should be called to such service prior to considering the recall or redrafting of any veterans of World War II including those in the inactive reserve.

Whereas there are several million children in the United States who are receiving a substandard educational opportunity; and

Whereas the resulting waste of our human resources at this critical period in our Nation's history is a serious handicap to the preservation of the American way and constitutes a threat to our existence as a free people; and

Whereas since in some States and in many communities it will not be possible to finance an adequate program of education without the participation of Federal Government in the support of schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Arkansas in conventiaon assembled at Little Rock, August 20–22, 1950, That we urge the Congress of the United States to enact at the earliest possible date legislation which will provide Federal aid to education without Federal control and with full preservation of the accepted American principle of the local management of schools.

Whereas Arkansas and Tennessee are the sole joint-owners of the new highway bridge across the Mississippi River at West Memphis; and

Whereas the Legislatures of Arkansas and Tennessee, by joint resolutions of their respective upper and lower houses, have endorsed the name "Memorial Bridge" for the new structure, such joint resolutions having been approved by the Governors of the two States; and

Whereas the American Legion, Department of Arkansas, fifteenth district conventions of said department; the Spanish-American War Veterans of Arkansas and Tennessee; Memphis Chapter, No. 1, American War Mothers; Gold Star Mothers of World Ward II of Memphis, and other patriotic associations and veterans' organizations have approved "Memorial Bridge" as an appropriate name for the new structure in honor of the memory of veterans of all wars from Arkansas and Tennessee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Arkansas Department, the American Legion in convention assembled at Little Rock, August 20–22, Reaffirm its desire that the new bridge across the Mississippi River at West Memphis be named "Memorial Bridge"; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention petition the Governors of Arkansas and Tennessee to issue proclamations simultaneously, officially naming the structure "Memorial Bridge" as the legislatures of the two States by joint resolutions, approved by the Governors, have declared it should be named.

Because of inadequate funds for production loans, approximately 1,100 World War II Veterans in Arkansas failed to get loans for the 1950 crop year through the Farmers Home Administration; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States passed Public Law 499 on May 3, 1950, which authorized the liquidation of the Arkansas Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and which permits the use of the assets of the Corporation by the Farmers Home Administration for making loans to farm veterans; and

Whereas there appears to be undue delay on the part of officials of the FHA in the liquidation of the Corporation and in making of those funds available for loans to both veterans and nonveterans; and

Whereas appropriated funds for loans to both veterans and nonveterans are inadequate again this year: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Arkansas, go on record requesting immediate action on the liquidation of the Corporation in order that the funds may be made available for loans to veterans this fiscal year; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. J. V. Highfill, State director of the Farmers Home Administration in Arkansas, with a request by the department commander that the funds of the Corporation be made available as expeditiously as possible.

H. R. 9623

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today in conjunction with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS, who will introduce a similar bill in the Senate, introducing H. R. 9623, a bill to create, and assign duties to, the Office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a copy of H. R. 9623, which reads as follows:

A bill to create, and assign duties to, the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the Department of the Navy an Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive the same compensation as the other Assistant Secretaries of the Navy.

The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, be charged with the supervision of the United States Marine Corps and the coordination of its activities with other governmental agencies, and, in addition, such other duties as may be assigned to him by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 206 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947 is hereby amended to read as follows: "The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein, and the personnel strength of the Regular Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 300,000."

SEC. 3. The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

On June 30, 1949, I introduced a bill to create the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps and to fix the personnel strength of the corps at not less than 6 percent of the combined personnel strength of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In this effort, I was joined by 55 other Congressmen and 4 Senators.

No action has been taken on this bill but, in the meantime, the House Armed Services Committee in its report on the B–36 investigation, recommended unanimously that the Commandant of the Marine Corps be made a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff so that the type of warfare the Marines were so skilled in—amphibious landings and close infantry-air support—could be given due consideration by all the Armed Forces.

On August 7, 1950, I urged, on the floor of the House, that the Marine Corps have a permanent strength of 300,000 men, which would include 4 combat divisions and 4 air wings and that the Commandant be given a place on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Chairman CARL VINSON, of the Armed Services Committee, on August 28, 1950, stated that he had set a new higher goal for Marine Corps combat strength—four fully equipped war-size divisions and 26 air squadrons.

Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the Committee on Armed Services in its unanimous recommendation that the Commandant of the Marine Corps be made a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am also in full accord with the statement made by the distinguished chairman of that committee that the Marine Corps should have four fully equipped war-size divisions. I do believe, however, that we should go further and enact permanent legislation to this effect and, at the same time, increase Marine air strength to four full-strength air wings. To do this, in my opinion, it is necessary that the personnel strength of the Corps shall be maintained at not less than 300,000.

It is not necessary for me to go into detail concerning the difficulties in which the Marine Corps has found itself since the physical ending of World War II. I do not agree with General Eisenhower's contention, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1949, in which he states:

I therefore recommend that Marine units not exceed a regiment in size.

Neither do I agree with General Spaatz, former commanding general, Army Air Forces, when he wrote:

I recommend, therefore, that the size of the Marine Corps be limited to small, readily available and lightly armed units, no larger than a regiment, to protect United States interests ashore in foreign countries and to provide interior guard of naval ships and naval shore establishments.

General Spaatz changed his mind though, because on July 17, 1950, he wrote in Newsweek as follows:

Two or three Marine divisions, stationed at strategic locations, ready for quick movement to any part of the world, also are essential.

According to the Washington Star of August 13, 1950, the Marines were sent to Korea at the express desire of General MacArthur. It may be well to recall that according to the July 8 issue of Armed Forces, MacArthur, while Chief of Staff or the Army in the early 1930's, was a leading advocate of the consolidation of the Army and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks articles from the Washington Post under date of August 28, 1950, and the Army-Navy-Air Force Register under date of August 12, 1950.

[From the Washington Post of August 28, 1950]

VINSON SETS NEW MARINE GOAL: 4 DIVISIONS, 26 AIR SQUADRONS

Chairman VINSON (Democrat, Georgia), of the House Armed Services Committee, yesterday set a new higher goal for Marine Corps combat strength—4 fully equipped war-size divisions and 26 air squadrons.

We aim to get the money for that force, VINSON said.

The new target is up by two combat divisions and eight air squadrons from an estimate advanced by VINSON only August 6.

He predicted then that Congress will be asked in January for more money for defense, including $500,000,000 for the Marines.

That sum was expected to permit the corps to increase its strength to 174,000 men and to have 2 fully equipped divisions and 18 air squadrons.

It now has two divisions, organizationally. However, both were considerably under battle strength when the Korean war started. The size of Marine divisions fluctuates between a peacetime strength sometimes as low as 8,000 to 10,000 men and the huge units of World War II days when more than 20,000 men were in combat divisions.

The manpower strength of the Marine Corps then was about 65,000 men and 7,000 officers, with about 16 air squadrons.

When Defense officials went to Capitol Hill last month to support their request for an emergency military appropriation, the Marine Corps' portion of the proposed new funds was $128,395,000. This was in addition to the $200,923,000 asked for in the regular 1951 fiscal year budget, or a new total of $329,318,000.

The testimony given at that time indicated a manpower increase of almost 80,000 above the present level, or a new total of about 142,000.

Just what the proposal for two more divisions may do to the 174,000-man enrollment goal mentioned by VINSON August 6 was not made clear. The amount it would cost was not stated.

Along with his report of new plans for the Marine Corps, VINSON disclosed he intends to see President Truman to urge this country to step up its tank production by hundreds of millions of dollars.

He said he has written Mr. Truman, Secretary of Defense Johnson, and top military leaders that the Armed Services Committee is much concerned over the present tank-procurement program.

[From the Army-Navy-Air Force Register of August 12, 1950]

FOUR MARINE DIVISIONS

The calling to active duty this week of Marine Corps volunteer reservists, most of them battle-trained in World War II, to augment the Marine fighting strength should be a lesson to the American people that never again must this famous fighting organization be permitted to be reduced to less than four full divisions plus four Marine air wings.

The Marine Corps mobilization announcement this week marked the eighth anniversary of the corps' first assault landing against the Japanese at Guadalcanal and the first major offensive by American ground troops in World War II. From that time on the Marines and Army troops made their assault landings at Tarawa, Okinawa, and Iwo Jima, all island stepping stones toward the ultimate goal in the Pacific war—Japan.

All elements of the Armed Forces have acquitted themselves with great distinction in the fighting in Korea. It must be noted, however, with a special interest, the role the United States Marine Corps is playing.

The Marines committed to Korea cannot compare numerically with the Army and Air Force units in that theater. However, the Marine team "hit the beach" fully combat-loaded under officers 85 percent of whom had World War II experience. Reports from the Korea fighting indicate that the Marines, within their limitation in force, justified the faith of the American people in this traditional fighting organization of our Armed Forces.

More than 2 years ago the Marines were fighting desperately to defeat a plan that would have limited largest elements in the Marine Corps to a battalion. At that time the Marine Corps pointed out that no comprehensive training or cohesive operation could be carried out under a structure of less than divisional organization. After a strenuous fight they were permitted to retain two divisions and two air wings in a reduced-personnel status.

The Marine theory in this discussion is more than justified.

The Register believes that Marine strength should be brought to, and maintained at, four Marine divisions and four Marine air wings.

Strategic and tactical evaluations indicate that the type of "incident" in Korea may break out at any time in any part of the world. The need for fast, mobile, self-contained units is evident. The cost of maintaining these divisions and air wings would be negligible compared to the risk undertaken in lives and money in not having them available.

The other day in the House of Representatives Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, Montana, told his colleagues that the Marine Corps should be raised to a strength of 300,000 men. He also said that the Commandant of the Marine Corps should be made a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff instead of depending upon Navy representation. Marines are now fighting in Korea, and with the certainty that thousands of other marines will be sent to Korea within the next several months, it seems logical and proper that the Commandant of the Marine Corps should become a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If Marine Corps personnel is to be employed in operations, it is only proper that the Commandant of the corps should have a part in

planning their employment in the national-defense scheme.

A former marine, Representative MANSFIELD declared that "the attempts which have been made to whittle the corps down to a guard unit must be stopped once and for all."

There are a great number of Americans who agree with the former marine from Montana.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Armed Services Committee will give full consideration to the bill introduced by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and myself because we feel that the issue is important and that the Marine Corps be given the recognition and the security it has so justly earned throughout the history of our country.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 10, I delivered some remarks before the House in which I pointed out the great weaknesses and the urgent needs of the American merchant marine and the maritime industry as a whole. Weaknesses in the face of danger—and needs if the industry is to be put in a condition where we may hope that it can effectively serve the Nation in a war emergency.

Since July 10 the situation in Korea has become more critical and the lack of men, material, and supplies, and the means to get them there, more evident. We have begun to take steps—not only in the Armed Forces but also in the merchant marine—to overcome the shortages which hamper effective and victorious action in Korea. The steps so far taken, as far as the maritime industry is concerned, have been only those needed to meet the immediate emergency. It is my purpose here today to impress upon my fellow Members of Congress the vital importance of not stopping with those emergency moves. The very fact that we were unprepared, shipping-wise, to handle the relatively small strain which Korea has so far put upon us, is the strongest evidence needed to prove to ourselves that we could not possibly fulfill the demands created by a full-scale war situation until tragically too late. It is already tragically too late in Korea. We must do what we can now to prevent tragedy on a larger scale. The human harvest which war reaps is too great at best. For us to fail to use the means within our power to minimize that harvest would be criminal.

We cannot now know what lies ahead of us. However, the rumblings of war are too plainly heard to be ignored. How far ahead it may be, or whether it will pass by, we do not know. But, where a look into the future is denied us, a look at the past may often serve. History has lessons for those who read and remember.

For that reason I shall recall the history of our maritime industry through the periods of World War I and World War II and the interwar period. I shall draw some parallels between the experiences of the two wars, and by citing that history I hope to impress upon the Congress the urgent need for taking action now to prevent a third parallel being drawn by some Member of Congress at a future time.

I have here four tables showing, in cold figures, the rise and fall of American merchant-ship construction during the years 1914 to 1950, the rise and fall of tonnage in the American-flag merchant fleet during approximately that same period, the variations in employment in the private shipyards of the United States from 1917 to 1950, and the record of percentages of all of our foreign trade carried in American bottoms from 1910 through early 1950. If charted, those figures would produce a familiar sawtooth pattern. On graphs of commercial activity that sawtooth indicates the comings and goings of depressions and of wars. In the maritime industry it has meant as well, and can mean again, that we ourselves have fashioned a saw which has cut through the life lines of our Armed Forces when engaged in war. I shall refer to these tables from time to time and for that reason ask that they be included in the RECORD at this point.

At the beginning of World War I in 1914 our tonnage registered in foreign trade amounted to a little over a million tons. We carried less than 10 percent of our trade in American vessels. With the disappearance of the German merchant fleet from the seas our tonnage rose through various means, of which new construction was a relatively minor factor, until in 1917 it stood at approximately 2,500,000 tons, and we were carrying 18½ percent of our own trade. All through this period the possibility of our eventual direct involvement in war was plain—yet in 1917 employment in our shipyards stood at only 45,000 men. In 1916, when the lessons of submarine warfare were too plain to be ignored, the United States War Shipping Board was created to advise on methods to increase the merchant marine. Still, from 1916 to 1917 we added only 255,000 tons to our fleet. When the war finally broke upon us in April of 1917 the Emergency Fleet Corporation was hastily organized. Congress appropriated $4,000,000,000, and the Corporation bent all its efforts to turning out steel, wooden, and cement ships. By November of 1918, the end of the war, our shipyards employed 380,000 workmen—but our fleet tonnage had risen to only 3,600,000 tons and we carried only 22 percent of our cargoes. Now, it is true that as a result of our shipbuilding program we did construct a great merchant fleet—but, it did not reach peak tonnage until 1921, 2 or 3 years after the war was over and the immediate need was no longer there. Ten or eleven million tons of shipping which we had in foreign trade in 1920 and 1921 carried from 35 to 43 percent of our trade—but it contributed little to the war effort which was responsible for its existence. Despite sacrifices in quality and speed of ships, made in the interests of getting any kind of ships into the war, we had been able to do little toward hastening the end of the war. Men had died because shipping was not available to supply and reinforce them. To quote Admiral Emory S. Land, speaking in September of 1941, there were delays, confusion, and extravagance attending the shipbuilding expansion of 1917–18. The delays, confusion, and extravagance were made necessary because in 1916 our shipyards were idle, there was no backlog of skilled personnel to man them, there were no plans and no know-how for quick expansion, and there was no nucleus around which we could quickly expand—in short, there was no organized preparation for meeting the demand which arose.

In 1921 we had a merchant fleet of 11,000,000 tons. What happened to it? Remember that during the interwar period, while there was an illusion of peace for a time, there was no peace. The Russian giant was stirring, the Balkans were in constant turmoil, Japan's rising sun threatened China and the entire East, and fascism and nazism gathered their armies and began to march. Despite the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, and the amended version of 1928, our merchant marine went into a decline similar to that which existed prior to War I. In 1927 of $600,000,000 paid out by our shippers, $480,000,000 went to foreign ships according to the Shipping Board. At the same time they reported that for every first-class merchant ship built in the United States since 1921, Great Britain had built 41, Germany 12, Italy 5, and France and Japan 4 each.

By 1936, although our fleet was still second in size only to Great Britain's, it was ranked fourth in speed and last in age of vessels. The fleet was obsolete or obsolescent and we were building few replacements. Our shipyards employed only 36,265 men in both construction and repair in December of 1936. Our tonnage had declined to approximately 4,000,000 tons. We launched only 69 vessels of 111,000 gross tons during that year. We were again in a position where we could not have supplied an army beyond our shores—and the world was reading Mein Kampf, the Japanese had been in China since 1932, and Mussolini was preparing his excursion into Ethiopia.

Fortunately, there were those who remembered World War I and who were able to persuade the Congress to take some measures to prevent a repetition of that experience. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was passed, with the urging of President Roosevelt, and in 1937 the Maritime Commission instituted the long-range program, providing for construction of 50 ships a year. However, by December of 1938 our shipyards employed only 53,519 workers. In the summer of 1939, when there was considerable guessing as to whether or not there was going to be a war, the Commission decided that since it takes a year to build a ship they would accelerate the long-range program. With Presidential approval they launched their acceleration program providing for

100 ships a year. This was in 1939—we were still 2 years away from direct participation in war. In April of this year we had a total of 28 ships in hand or on order in United States private shipyards. Can any of us say now that we are 2 years, or 2 months, away from all-out war?

In January of 1941 we embarked on the emergency construction program providing for 200 additional 10,000-ton cargo ships of a standardized design adopted to avoid the bottlenecks that were developing in engines and electrical machinery. Note the bottlenecks. Again we were forced to sacrifice quality of construction and speed of ships because of lack of preparedness in the industry and its suppliers.

In April of 1941 lease-lend funds were made available to the Maritime Commission. Contracts for 227 additional vessels were let with deliveries to begin approximately a year later. By that time, 1942, we were plunged into war and shipping shortages were acute. But at least we had ships on the ways and on the way. Ship construction was further expanded in August of 1941 through congressional action. All of these programs contemplated adding 1,153 ships of approximately 12,400,000 deadweight tons to the merchant fleet between July 1, 1941 and the end of 1943—a period of 2½ years.

We all remember Pearl Harbor and the events following. The War Shipping Administration assumed the functions of the Maritime Commission in the spring of 1942 and these preparedness programs were reshaped in the light of actual war. In my remarks of July 10 I indicated the extent of the wartime shipbuilding program. We could have used more ships, far faster than we got them. We could have shortened the war had we been better prepared.

My quotations and references to the World War II preparedness program in the preceding statements were taken from a source which I selected for a specific purpose. The source is a progress report issued by Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, on September 3, 1941—3 months before Pearl Harbor. The purpose, to show that at that time we did have a program under way to build up our maritime industry, inadequate though it may have been—to ask, "what progress report can we look to now to determine where we stand?"

In September of 1941 we had 4 years of slow expansion behind us, with plans for acceleration. In September of 1950 we have 4 years of a declining and decaying maritime industry to look back on, with only a record of congressional hearings, administrative reports of practical inactivity of a constructive nature, and complaints from the industry and its workmen of slow death—and we may be, not 3 months, but 3 days from another Pearl Harbor.

That is what I wish to pound home today—and what I shall pound home again and again until something is done. On July 10 I outlined the program which I believe we should immediately embark on. In World War I we had no program calculated to prepare us for the demands of war. In World War II our program was inadequate, and the industry did yeoman work in trying to overcome that inadequacy, despite long years of starvation. For world war III, which may be impending, we again have no program in actual operation—and the time factor is now against us. We may well be the objects of direct attack; we will not then have further years of warning, nor strong allies to soften the first blows and hold off the aggressor. Unless we are prepared to carry the war to foreign shores in vessels of our own making, it will be fought here. We must prepare now, if it is not already too late.

At the present time we are following a familiar course. We are taking only emergency action sufficient unto the day. We must now chart a course sufficient unto tomorrow and what it may bring. What I have been saying here may smack of hindsight. But there were men in the days of World Wars I and II who had the foresight to predict the consequences. They were not listened to, or, at best, token gestures were made to placate them and to provide against the happenings which they predicted. Let us use hindsight now to give us the foresight to take every preparatory measure within our power to guard against repeating the mistakes—the delays, confusion, and extravagance—of those wars. Token gestures will not suffice. The need will be greater; the time will be shorter; the responsibility is ours.

My remarks thus far have been directed at only one phase of the entire problem facing the Nation and its maritime industry. The foreign trade comes most immediately to mind when war threatens. However, our domestic inland, coastal, and intercoastal trade have long been, and are now, a vital part of peacetime and wartime transport. This essential cog in the maritime machinery is beset with problems as well. At present, there is for all practical purposes no Government encouragement of domestic maritime transport. Subsidies, such as they are, are confined to shipping in essential foreign trade routes. The intercoastal trade has been stifled by the burden of excessive tolls through the Panama Canal. An already burdened industry is forced to carry all the costs of this link in our national defense. H. R. 8677, now pending in the other body, should be acted on at once to lessen that burden. The reorganization which it provides should do much to revitalize the intercoastal trade. Serious consideration should be given to the problem of fostering the rehabilitation and continued development of extensive coastal and inland water transport operations, either through subsidies or other means designed to insure against further deterioration.

Not only have American shipping operations on scheduled trade routes and in our own intercoastal and domestic waters suffered serious blows since the end of the war, but our tramp shipping fleet, formerly of major importance, has been practically driven from the seas. A flourishing tramp fleet, operating on flexible schedules between and among domestic and foreign ports, could add much to the solidification of our shipping program. Legislative efforts to provide subsidies for qualified operators in this field have met with failure. While hearings have been held, no action has been taken. Such legislation should be enacted without delay to permit our own lines to compete on a profitable basis with those foreign fleets now monopolizing the tramp trade.

On September 1 I addressed the House and called attention to the manner in which the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service was entering into competition with our private merchant marine. My previous remarks on the condition of our maritime industry have pointed out that it is in sadly weakened state, with shipyards idle and shipping companies being virtually forced out of business. The need for a strong merchant marine has never been questioned, except by a few misguided individuals in and out of government who counsel dependence on the fleets of our friends among foreign nations. And yet, in the face of this need, we find an arm of the Government, the MSTS, following a course of action which can have no other effect than to contribute to the tearing down, rather than the building up, of our merchant marine. The investigation into that situation which I called for on September 1 should be undertaken without delay.

That the maritime industry should not be provincialized and confined to any one section of this country is a self-evident fact. In my remarks of July 10 I referred at some length to the weakened state—in fact, the nonexistent state—of shipbuilding on the Pacific and Gulf coasts. My remarks pointed to the dangers inherent in that state of affairs. A glance at table I, to be printed in the RECORD with these remarks, will show that no ships are being constructed at this time either on the Pacific coast or on the Gulf. Ship repair employment in the yards in those areas is at an all-time low. The Congress should take immediate action directed at correcting that dangerous situation. It is a repetition of the situations prevailing before World Wars I and II, as shown in the table. It was a major factor in delaying effective maritime help to our Armed Forces in those wars. If allowed to continue the condition may well be disastrous to our chances of victory in a future war.

The United States needs ships now and will need infinitely more in time of all-out war. We need fast ships and we do not have them. We need troop transports and we do not have them. We will never have them unless we build them now and keep them in operation or in operating condition at all times. The private American-flag merchant marine, domestic and foreign, is the only agency equipped to build and operate such ships at maximum efficiency. Without a rounded program of Government support, economic conditions do not permit private industry to maintain a fleet to provide for a fraction of our emergency needs. It is up to us to see that such support is provided now. If we close our eyes to that fact today we may open them to defeat tomorrow.

TABLE 1.—*Table showing gross tonnage and numbers of steel self-propelled merchant vessels, by geographical regions, built in the private shipyards of the United States and delivered in the years indicated below*

[Includes only vessels of 2,000 gross tons and over]

Year	East Coast		Great Lakes and rivers		Gulf coast		Pacific coast		Total United States	
	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons
1914	15	83,495	7	34,833			2	12,131	24	130,459
1915	18	101,443	2	4,614			3	14,837	23	120,894
1916	35	194,248	21	82,656			11	72,584	67	349,488
1917	45	272,422	47	178,918			28	177,955	120	629,295
1918	104	531,396	136	316,422			146	824,144	386	1,671,962
1919	327	1,686,236	175	445,442	7	32,760	171	1,025,850	680	3,190,288
1920	246	1,287,524	53	139,674	31	165,084	120	720,376	450	2,312,658
1921	73	590,470	1	2,677	15	90,550	49	354,000	138	1,037,697
1922	12	115,107	3	22,600	1	7,953	2	18,148	18	163,808
1923	8	44,802	9	67,235			2	12,947	19	124,984
1924	5	26,892	6	49,424			1	7,286	12	83,602
1925	4	25,647	7	55,365					11	81,012
1926	6	37,741	2	16,302					8	54,043
1927	10	81,764	9	73,179					19	154,943
1928	4	61,728							5	64,820
1929	4	38,444	2	15,863			1	3,092	7	57,395
1930	15	143,244	1	7,964			1	3,088	16	151,208
1931	14	150,949							14	150,949
1932	15	145,470							15	145,470
1933	4	49,527							4	49,527
1934	2	9,544							2	9,544
1935	2	19,022							2	19,022
1936	8	63,428							8	63,428
1937	14	116,400	1	5,443					15	121,852
1938	20	148,294	6	37,364					26	185,658
1939	28	241,052							28	241,052
1940	46	398,957	1	2,345	4	27,879	2	15,546	53	444,727
1941	63	519,279	1	7,416	5	42,320	26	180,090	95	749,105
1942	259	2,024,189	5	51,470	97	689,004	363	2,628,290	724	5,392,953
1943	571	4,448,969	23	166,925	231	1,718,102	836	6,165,877	1,661	12,499,873
1944	572	4,554,399	28	106,540	287	2,164,248	576	4,579,217	1,463	11,404,404
1945	324	2,533,495	57	210,810	298	1,710,960	388	3,208,097	1,067	7,663,362
1946	31	256,159	1	1,750	40	262,005	16	152,640	[1] 88	672,554
1947	22	124,397			23	117,077	5	44,999	[2] 50	286,473
1948	16	106,869			12	42,254	1	15,359	[3] 29	164,482
1949	32	531,473			2	[4] 7,450			34	538,873

[1] Includes 1 carfloat, 2 dredges, 1 small cargo, and 1 small passenger vessel, 7,360 tons.
[2] Includes 8 dredges, 1 small cargo, and 2 small tankers, 39,053 tons.
[3] Includes 4 small cargo vessels, 4,569 tons.
[4] Includes 1 dredge, 3,100 tons.

NOTE.—33 of 34 vessels constructed in 1949 were tankers: 30 of these tankers are sailing under foreign flags.

Source: American Council of Shipbuilders.

TABLE 2.—*American-flag steam and motor merchant vessels registered in the foreign trade of the United States for the period 1910 to 1950*

[Includes only vessels of 1,000 gross tons or over]

Year	Dead-weight tons
1910	782,517
1914	1,066,288
1915	1,862,714
1916	2,158,008
1917	2,440,776
1918	3,599,213
1919	6,665,376
1920	9,924,694
1921	11,077,000

Year	Freighters		Combination passenger and cargo vessels	
	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons
1923	444	2,290,291	85	744,618
1924	421	2,237,039	78	680,493
1925	308	2,114,367	72	646,154
3-year average	421	2,213,899	78	690,422
1926	395	2,090,323	73	642,807
1927	456	2,372,568	70	642,787
1928	421	2,237,097	74	681,129
1929	466	2,492,348	85	740,270
1930	413	2,225,792	98	816,136
1931	351	1,875,318	95	826,926
1932	247	1,316,875	100	869,021
1933	242	1,281,146	107	903,089
1934	258	1,380,897	111	950,971
1935	253	1,345,942	108	887,795
10-year average	350	1,861,830	92	796,093

TABLE 2.—Continued

Year	Freighters		Combination passenger and cargo vessels	
	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons
1936	250	1,333,110	104	865,424
1937	275	1,462,418	99	849,076
1938	213	1,154,944	76	651,654
1939	193	1,037,627	78	703,184
1940	291	1,586,778	66	609,821
1941	358	1,932,074	43	410,118
1942–47 [1]				
6-year average	263	1,417,825	78	681,546
1948	1,023	7,401,000	41	440,000
1949	807	5,870,000	43	466,000
1950 (as of Mar. 31)	539	3,945,000	44	477,000

[1] Wartime figures not tabulated.

Source: 1910–21, Statistical Abstract, 1940; 1923–50, U. S. Maritime Commission, Bureau of Government Aids, Division of Vessel Utilization and Planning, Shipping Statistics and Analysis Branch.

TABLE 3.—*Blue-collar employees in United States private-ship construction and ship-repair yards*

Year	Number employed		
	New construction	Ship repair	Total
1917			45,000
1918			380,000
1923			[1] 51,000
1925			[1] 50,200
1927			[1] 55,100
1929			[1] 46,000

[1] Approximate.

TABLE 3.—*Blue-collar employees in United States private-ship construction and ship-repair yards*—Continued

Year	Number employed		
	New construction	Ship repair	Total
1931			[1] 45,100
1933			[1] 22,000
1934, Mar. 31	11,569	10,176	21,745
1934, Dec. 31	13,227	8,212	21,439
1935, December	21,751	9,425	31,176
1936, December	25,920	10,345	36,265
1937, December	27,418	11,789	39,207
1938, Dec. 31	25,176	10,812	35,988
1939, Dec. 31	40,148	13,371	53,519
1940, Dec. 31	61,353	29,741	91,094
1941, Dec. 31	208,899	41,530	250,429
1942, Dec. 31	733,246	67,929	801,175
1943, Dec. 31	908,349	98,546	[2] 1,006,895
1944, Dec. 31	737,510	95,736	833,246
1945, Dec. 31	171,713	47,167	218,880
1946, Dec. 31	45,801	49,226	95,027
1947, Dec. 31	28,932	74,513	103,445
1948, Dec. 31	30,267	47,600	77,867
1949, Sept. 30	29,508	25,725	55,233
1949, Dec. 31	27,937	22,157	50,094

[1] Approximate.
[2] Peak.

Source: 1917 and 1918, Landauer's American Economic History; 1925, 1927, and 1931, Bureau of Labor Statistics; all others, A. F. of L. Metal Trades Council.

TABLE 4.—*Percentage of United States imports and exports carried in American-flag vessels*

	Percentage
1910	8.7
1914	9.7
1915	14.3
1916	16.3
1917	18.6
1918	21.9
1919	27.8
1920	43.0
1921	35.7
1925	33.0
1929	33.1
1932	35.6
1935	35.8
1946	59.0
1947	53.9
1948	48.8
1949	45.3
January and February 1950	44.1

1910–35, percentages in terms of total value.
1946–50, percentages in terms of total volume by weight.

Source: 1910–35, Statistical Abstract for 1940; 1946–50, American Bureau of Shipping.

United States and Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include three articles from the Washington Evening Star of July 18; one by David Lawrence on "United States Suffering Defeat Throughout World on Psychological Front;" one by Constantine Brown on "Korean War Far From Police Action; Delay in Mobilization Call Puzzling"; and another by Dorothy Thompson entitled "United States Seen Obligated To Defend Korea; People Must Prepare for Sacrifices," which I wish every American could read because they are most timely

and arresting. The articles follow in order above mentioned:

UNITED STATES SUFFERING DEFEAT THROUGHOUT WORLD ON PSYCHOLOGICAL FRONT—BOLD ACTION NEEDED BY TRUMAN TO ORGANIZE PEACE INFORMATION OFFICE

(By David Lawrence)

Much worse than the setbacks on the Korean front are the defeats being suffered throughout the world on the psychological front both by the United States and the United Nations.

Never, it might be said, in so grave an international situation has there been such a conspicuous lack of imagination and such timidity as is being exhibited by the United States Government in fighting the psychological war.

The Soviet Union has grasped the initiative and has made flank attacks around the United States in the propaganda battles in Asia as well as in Europe.

The lazy answer to this is that the United States hasn't provided the funds—the "Marshall plan of ideas," as Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, calls it. But the truth is that, even if $100,000,000 is appropriated, it would be ineffective if our Government fails to express itself forthrightly in the propaganda field.

THREE WEEKS OF INACTIVITY

More than 3 weeks have passed since the Kremlin put the North Korean Government up to an aggression that has startled the world. The United States and the United Nations responded with military effort, as yet unsuccessful, but at the same time the Soviet triumphantly grasped the initiative on the propaganda side. The Russians accuse the United Nations along with the United States of sanctioning aggression. Peace petitions are being circulated with tens of thousands of signatures by the Communists in a publicity stunt which is not being combated effectively by the western democracies.

In the face of the plain aggression in Korea nobody in our Government or in the UN has officially, formally, and loudly called Moscow the aggressor. The United Nations, moreover, has invited American boys to be killed, but politely hesitates to warn the nations helping to kill American boys that those nations are aggressors, too. While it is obvious that no nation can be asked to supply military help against its will, it is traitorous for any member of the United Nations at the same time to be supplying arms and military power to the country which is fighting the United Nations forces.

Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, has pointed this up in a speech in the Senate in which he demands that the Washington Government request the UN to adopt a resolution warning any nation helping the North Koreans that it will be regarded as a partner in the aggression.

The UN got considerable prestige by adopting a resolution calling for military forces to resist aggression in Korea, but it will rapidly lose that prestige if it stands idly by and lets the Kremlin supply munitions to the North Koreans in an obvious attempt to defeat the United Nations forces, including the United States.

POLICY MAKERS FLOUNDER

The propaganda war is being poorly handled not because there are not enough technicians to do the job or because there are inadequate transmission facilities. It is falling down because nobody in the Truman administration with authority to act has vision enough to realize what a propaganda war means. It doesn't mean just a battery of mimeograph machines and a $7,000,000 building in New York. It means that the men who make policy—men with the courage of their convictions—must call a spade a spade in public. The policy makers are floundering. Three weeks of valuable time have been lost while the American Government cravenly refrains from denouncing the Kremlin leaders as the true aggressors. The answer usually heard is that this might offend the Kremlin—as if appeasement is the way out of Korea.

What is needed is a new executive board or commission of three eminent men to give full time to the work and be responsible directly to the President and not to any Cabinet officer. The head of the Office of War Information was responsible in World War II directly to the President. He must be free again to tell the President what any member of the Cabinet is doing or failing to do that is hurting on the psychological side of warfare. He must be free to speak out in the meetings of the National Security Council, of which he should be a member. The task cannot be performed by a subordinate unit in the State Department. The top-level officers of that institution are too busy writing legal notes in the field of diplomacy and too much steeped in traditions and forms to use the vocabulary of propaganda war.

America is losing on the military side in Korea but not for long. America is losing, however, on the psychological front and there is no sign of any turn in the tide. It will take bold action by the President to organize an Office of Peace Information and to give it the proper instructions to engage in a world-wide crusade of truth.

KOREAN WAR FAR FROM POLICE ACTION; DELAY IN MOBILIZATION CALL PUZZLING

(By Constantine Brown)

The Korean campaign is no more a police action than a forest fire is a Boy Scout camp fire.

This is the consensus of most political and military men who are still wondering what keeps the administration from declaring general mobilization.

News from the battle front continues to be bad. It is not likely to change until we are pushed back to the Pusan beachhead which we expect to hold.

Improvement in military conditions after we reach that beachhead cannot be expected until we dispatch large forces across the Pacific. An offensive to push the Reds back cannot be launched with less than six or eight divisions. At the present moment we do not have anywhere near that strength for any one particular front. Partial mobilization of some units of the National Guard or specialist reserves, as contemplated by the administration, would be only patch work.

NEW EXPLOSION SEEN

The State Department and Pentagon appear convinced that further Moscow-instigated explosions will occur in the next few weeks, after we have become involved to the hilt in the Korean campaign.

While loath to admit publicly that we are now in a full-scale shooting war, many high-ranking officials and Members of Congress are convinced that our best chance of preventing the spread of Communist aggression lies in general military and industrial mobilization. This is the only thing that may make the Kremlin pause and consider the consequences of setting off more explosions throughout the world.

It is by no means certain that mobilization would have such an effect on Stalin and his gang. But it might cause them to think twice about the implications of a full war against America's fully mobilized manpower and industrial strength.

Our mobilization also would steady the shaken nerves of our allies in western Europe. When President Truman announced the American Government's decision to accept the Kremlin challenge in Korea there was a sigh of relief in western Europe. America showed that it was not frightened and refused to be trifled with any longer.

This enthusiasm did not last long in Europe. As our reverses continued the fact that we were outnumbered 10 to 1 was overlooked or ignored. All that the western Europeans, who have been living in fear of a Communist aggression for 3 years, knew was that the Americans were being beaten by a bunch of Asiatics.

PAPERS PLAY UP DEFEATS

Some British newspapers, like Lord Beaverbrook's—once an enthusiastic admirer of America's valor and willingness to fight for his country—played up our defeats in spectacular headlines. Throughout Europe there is a question on the lips of most individuals: "Is America really so weak that it cannot resist an Asiatic army?" And since this seems to be the case, the man in the street in Europe is wondering what we could do for his country in the event of Russian aggression.

Our Government is merely marking time, but that does not give an impression of strength. It creates the feeling that we are careless in the face of danger as the British and French were in the months before Hitler's attack. Peoples who suffered from their own governments' lack of preparedness during World War II are prone to look at the blackest side or the picture, regardless of the assurances of loyalty which their governments are giving Washington.

Pressing demands for more up-to-date tanks, planes and the rest of the vast modern war paraphernalia needed to oppose Soviet aggression are pouring into Washington. Our industry is still geared for civil production.

Korea and the Far East have been given top priority insofar as the sending of war equipment is concerned. The few available combat troops which we have in this country have already been sent or will soon be sailing to the Pacific area. If Russia strikes anywhere in Eastern Asia or Europe at 4 a. m. we will be far from ready to strike back within an hour, despite Defense Secretary Johnson's emphatic and optimistic statement a few months ago.

The fact is that we are relatively less prepared today than we were a few weeks before Pearl Harbor.

UNITED STATES SEEN OBLIGATED TO DEFEND KOREA—PEOPLE MUST PREPARE FOR SACRIFICES

(By Dorothy Thompson)

There is only one thing that we can say to each other in these days. We must keep our nerves, exercise restraint, prepare for great sacrifice, and know without equivocation that there was nothing else that we could do but defend the Korean republic.

There are only three places in Asia where the United States is under positive obligation. These are Japan, Korea, and the Philippines.

In the widest sense it is now irrelevant whether the Korean obligation was wise. It is not irrelevant that we undertook it without making the slightest preparation to defend it. The South Korean Republic and army were American creations. If the North Korean attack took the administration by surprise, it is only because it is so reckless that it does not read its own intelligence reports.

On June 29 the President said (reported by the UP): "The United States is merely obeying a United Nations mandate to drive out a bunch of bandits who have invaded South Korea."

"BANDITS" FOUND FORCE

The "bunch of bandits" turn out to be, like the Red army organized to conquer China, a formidable and disciplined force equipped with Russian tanks so heavily armored that 105 mm. howitzer shells bounce

off them like peanuts; their ground forces well protected by airpower, and aided, as are all Red armies, by ruthless guerrillas in civilian clothes. Our Secretary of Defense, who is formidable in shooting off his mouth, has been caught in South Korea with little else to shoot with. As I write, there is one staggering bit of news, namely, that Gen. Douglas MacArthur, not usually notable for silence, has not said a word. One of these days he will.

Nevertheless, the United States in creating this republic, assumed an obligation for its defense, as it has assumed a positive commitment for the defense of Japan and the Philippines.

The obligation it has assumed in Japan is, of course, staggering. American policy caused to be written into the Japanese constitution that Japan could never again have an army. That means that your son and mine have to endure military service in order to exempt every Japanese from it, for all time, and defend the Japanese islands with our own blood against every aggressor. This is supposed to be punishing the enemy.

Don't ask me what General MacArthur thinks of the political policies he has been ordered to follow out. I hate to think.

OBLIGATION WAS THERE

However, there was the obligation. It rested on nothing whatever, as it turns out, except confidence. If the United States had refused to back up its obligation in Korea, the results would have been certain—confidence in the United States would have collapsed throughout the world, no less in Europe than in Asia. The Kremlin would not have won a battle. It would have won the fruits of a world victory.

It was this test the Russians made. In view of our pusillanimous policy elsewhere in Asia; the terrible weakness of the South Korean position; the problems of distance and lack of preparation, of which they were well aware; the confusion in Washington, where a leaderless Government faces only the opposition of McCarthyism, Russia doubtless counted on our following the policy advocated a year ago by Owen Lattimore—letting South Korea go without giving the appearance of having pushed it. Russian spies have had heartening reports to give their masters.

But what had to be tested was something spies cannot discover in pilfered blueprints and documents—something called an obligation of honor.

We All Admire Courage, Especially Personal Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has again shown the stuff men of courage are made of. His letter to Gen. C. B. Cates, Commandant of the Marine Corps, is a clear indication that the President recognizes an error, and that he is man enough to admit it.

When we think of the tremendous burdens of his office, the decisions he has to make daily, and the great responsibilities which are on his shoulders I feel that, like the marines themselves, we should show Christian understanding. Not only did the President of the United States—our Commander in Chief—write a letter to General Cates but, on yesterday, he also visited the national convention of the Marine Corps League in person and made a speech to the assembled delegates.

General Cates, the highest ranking marine, in introducing President Truman, our Commander in Chief, was undoubtedly thinking of the months Captain Cates of a marine rifle company and Captain Truman of a field artillery battery were comrades in arms in France when he said:

We all admire courage, especially personal courage.

The two old buddies, standing together before the delegates to the Marine Corps League convention, have come through life under great handicaps and in spite of grave obstacles.

We are proud of both of them.

Mr. Speaker, the letter of the President to General Cates follows:

DEAR GENERAL CATES: I sincerely regret the unfortunate choice of language which I used in my letter of August 29 to Congressman MCDONOUGH concerning the Marine Corps.

What I had in mind at the time this letter was written was the specific question raised by Mr. MCDONOUGH, namely, the representation of the Marine Corps on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have been disturbed by the number of communications which have been brought to my attention proposing that the Marine Corps have such representation. I feel that inasmuch as the Marine Corps is by law an integral part of the Department of the Navy, it is already represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the Chief of Naval Operations. That the Congress concurs in this point of view is evidenced by the fact that, in passing the National Security Act of 1947, and again in amending that act in 1949, the Congress considered the question of Marine Corps representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and did not provide for it.

It is my feeling that many of the renewed pleas for such representation are the result of propaganda inspired by individuals who may not be aware of the best interests of our defense establishment as a whole, and it was this feeling which I was expressing to Mr. MCDONOUGH. I am certain that the Marine Corps itself does not indulge in such propaganda.

I am profoundly aware of the magnificent history of the United States Marine Corps, and of the many heroic deeds of the marines since the corps was established in 1775.

I personally learned of the splendid combat spirit of the marines when the Fourth Marine Brigade of the Second Infantry Division fought in France in 1918.

On numerous occasions since I assumed office, I have stated my conviction that the Marine Corps has a vital role in our organization for national security and I will continue to support and maintain its identity.

I regard the Marine Corps as a force available for use in any emergency, wherever or whenever necessary. When I spoke of the Marines as the Navy's police force, I had in mind its immediate readiness, and the provision of the National Security Act which states that "the Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign."

The corps' ability to carry out whatever tasks may be assigned to it has been splendidly demonstrated many times in our history. It has again been shown by the immediate response of the Marine Corps to a call for duty in Korea.

Since Marine ground and air forces have arrived in Korea I have received a daily report of their actions. The country may feel sure that the record of the marines now fighting there will add new laurels to the already illustrious record of the Marine Corps.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The President's letter to Clay Nixon, commandant of the Marine Corps League, follows:

MY DEAR MR. NIXON: I am concerned over the situation which has arisen because of the publishing of my letter of August 29 to Representative MCDONOUGH.

I have this date addressed a letter to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, a copy of which I am enclosing.

I should be happy to have you read my letter to the members of your organization.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

A Letter on Money and the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received an excellent letter from a constituent of mine, Mr. W. C. Dawson, of Lepanto, Ark., on the question of money, credits, profits, Government spending, labor, production, and the relationship that each bears to the economy of the Nation. I have carefully studied Mr. Dawson's treatise on these economic subjects and feel that the Congress and the country should be apprised of the wealth of information contained in this letter. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the full text of Mr. Dawson's letter:

LEPANTO, ARK., *May 27, 1950.*

Hon. E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GATHINGS: I want you to know that I appreciate all you have done or may do in the best interest of our country.

It was the good ideas of our forefathers, put into action, that made this country "click"—made the greatest country in the world in the shortest period of time. Their ideas of freedom, equality, and justice were good. Under those ideas the people have had more freedom, have progressed faster and had the best standard of living while building the greatest country in the world.

What this writer wants to put over to you is his idea of what has caused the loss of freedom, equality, justice, and progress in all the countries of the world up to this moment, and is now eating its way into the vitals of this great land of freedom. What this writer may say is a portion of the conclusions he has reached after 17 years of economic thinking.

From this writer's point of view, high taxes are here to stay unless we change from the

course we are now traveling. We are spreading the gap wider and wider between the selling price of our total production and the amount of buying power that reaches the hands of the consumers. The difference between the total selling price and the amount of buying power that reaches the consumers determines the amount of surplus products we will have. When we have surplus products we all know what happens—unemployment, starvation, and misery are soon in the midst of these surplus products. The cause of this difference between the selling price and the amount of buying power that reaches the hands of the consumers is the core of this discussion.

When anything is produced all costs and all profits are added to the selling price. No matter how many different people have a part in the processing and handling of the product, all these costs and profits are added until the product reaches the ultimate consumer who is obliged to pay the sum total of all costs and all profits. This means that all the buying power must reach the hands of the consumer if he is to buy all the product. Whatever amount the consumers lack of getting all the money, they will lack just that much of being able to buy all of the products. This much of the products will become a surplus. These surpluses will cause unemployment, starvation, and misery in the midst of plenty. All the people who have enough years behind them have seen this very thing happen again and again. Ever since money has been in use this thing has been happening to every country in the world that reached that degree of riches that enabled its people to hoard enough money to cause a sufficient difference between the selling price of that country's products and the buying power that reached the hands of its consumers. The truth that a product cannot sell for less than the costs and profits that accrue against it and that the consumer cannot buy it unless he has that amount of money seems so evident that no one should fail to understand. Yet this thing has been going on all down through the past since money has been in use. All nations that have followed this procedure have met with the same result—failure. If the consumers are to buy all that is produced then they must have the same amount of money that has accrued against the products up to the time when they are offered for sale to the ultimate consumer. The failure to allow the consumers enough money to buy all the products is the core of all economic ills. These principles can be proven by arithmetic but would require more space than we can allot to it here.

Adam Smith observed that history indicated that every nation in the world, when it grew rich, or reached what Mr. Smith termed as its complement of wealth, progress stopped and the country began going backward. He had not observed that at this point in a nation's wealth its people were able to hoard more money and make that difference between the cost of production and the amount that reached its consumers great enough to leave such a large surplus that producers were compelled to curtail their production—result, unemployment and starvation in the midst of these surpluses.

Hoarding money forces a curtailment of loans because loans are made on the expectation that the money the borrower invests will return to him and he can liquidate his investment. At this time he is expected to extinguish his loan. If the money is hoarded, it cannot return to the borrower, the borrower cannot extinguish his debt, and the loaning of money becomes hazardous. Curtailing credits is probably one of the biggest ills of hoarding money. It forces losses upon both borrowers and lenders.

To understand our economy we must know what money is, where it comes from, and what it does.

Money is secured credit. Our dictionaries tell us that the instruments by which we transfer this secured credit from one person to another is money. Thus by starting in the middle of a thing and not looking back to see the source from whence it came, and not looking forward to see what finally became of the money, the people of the world have been left in a blank spot where the knowledge of money is concerned. Money, which we have stated is secured credit, comes into existence at the time a credit is secured. The securing of a credit always creates a debt of equal amount. This is why in bookkeeping we always have an equal amount of debits and credits. It is why a bank always has the same amount of resources as liabilities.

As an example of how money, or secured credit, comes into existence, let us suppose that John Doe goes to his bank to borrow $1,000. He gives his note to the bank for $1,000 secured by some eligible property supposed to be worth $2,000 or more. This note shows that John Doe owes the bank $1,000. In turn the bank writes John Doe a deposit slip showing that it owes him $1,000. The exchange of these debts has created a new credit of $1,000. The bank's resources and liabilities both go up $1,000, and its deposits increase in the same amount. The moment before this transaction took place John Doe had no money and he owed no debt. The moment after the transaction was completed he had $1,000 in bank-credit money, but he also owed a debt of the same amount. John Doe secured his credit, and he and the bank created $1,000 in bank-credit money. This is why I say that money is secured credit. If John Doe transfers a portion of his bank credit by check, then his check is money. His check is the instrument of transfer. If he gives the bank his check and receives from the bank paper currency and transfers the paper currency, then the paper currency is money. If he gets silver from his bank and transfers the silver, then the silver is money. These are the instruments of transfer that the dictionary defines as money.

When John Doe repays his loan the bank resources and liabilities will drop $1,000, and his deposit and debt will both drop in the same amount. John Doe and his bank will stand just as they did before they created the $1,000 of bank-credit money. The bank did not loan John Doe any money it already had in the bank. By exchanging debts they created the $1,000 in new credit money. This bank credit money came into existence at the time the loan was made, and went out of existence at the time it was repaid.

Money comes from four different sources: (1) Commodity money, which is chiefly gold; (2) commercial loans; (3) investment loans. These are secured credits. Gold is the security behind the certificates issued against it. Commercial and investment loans are secured by property that is eligible to secure such loans. United States bonds are secured by the implied promise to tax.

Money, from whatever source, always creates a debt in equal amount, thus we have as much debt as we have money. What money one may have is always some one else's debt. If creditors hoard money debtors are doomed, because they cannot repay their debt unless the money they borrowed and invested returns to them. It cannot return to them if it is hoarded. Since debts and money are in equal amounts it takes all the money to repay all the debts. Anything that is secured implies that there is an equal amount on the other side of the equation.

I have shown where money comes from, what it is and where it goes. As a summary, money comes into existence when a credit is secured and goes out of existence when that money is repaid. To describe what it does would require more space than I have to devote to it here.

People secure their credit at the banks because they do not have open credit to buy all the things they want. When their credit is secured it becomes a thing that can be transferred, and we call the instruments by which the transfer of these credits are made money. It is said that different countries have different kinds of money. All good money is secured credits. The difference comes in the instruments by which the transfer of credits are accomplished.

The core of this money question is that it requires a debt to create money, and that debt cannot be repaid unless the money returns to the debtor. It requires all the money to repay all the debts. This is one of the reasons why the hoarding of money gets our economy into trouble.

It is natural for opposites to be equal. Buying and selling must be equal or balance. This is true in barter, which is the first principle of exchange. The parties to the trade receive as much produce or actual wealth as they release. This is natural—a fundamental principle that cannot be violated without throwing our economy out of balance. When one sells his product for money, he has not exchanged his product for other products, nor will he have done so until he has invested the money he received for his product. During the time he holds the money our economy is out of balance in this amount. The holding out or hoarding of this amount of money has caused an equal amount of surplus products. Surplus products provide the cause of unemployment, unemployment causes more surpluses and more unemployment and soon we have a depression.

When we have unemployment, we must resort to deficit spending to breach the gap between the selling price and the amount of buying power in the hands of the consumers. In short, the Government must make up, by deficit spending, the amount that is hoarded. We need more taxes but are able to pay less. Our progress has stopped and we are going backward. The standard of living of our people is less as a whole because we are producing and distributing less. Our Government debt increases because we are compelled to spend more than we are able to pay in taxes. In short, when we violate nature's laws we are heading for trouble.

In all the past centuries that money has been used—used to destroy the economy of every nation that reached that degree of opulence that the people could hoard enough money to cause enough surplus to curtail the business of that country to the extent that it could not progress farther but was compelled to go backward is, it seems to this writer, a sufficient reason to take stock of our economy and correct some first causes.

We have the best economic system and the best country in the world to exploit it, if we only had the good sense to take advantage of the opportunities providence has offered us. The best way to beat communism is to take advantage of our economic opportunities. The world then would see the advantage of our economic system, and we would have the battle won on the economic front, which is the controlling factor in the political front.

Money invested makes more jobs, money hoarded makes more unemployment. There is always enough money provided to pay costs and profits in the production of anything to equal the selling price of that product. Therefore, if all the money reached the consumers they would be able to buy all the products. A balanced economy

would take care of all the products a people might be willing and able to produce. There would be surpluses only when there was more of a particular product than the people were willing to buy. In other words, when there was more of a particular product produced than the people had need for surpluses would exist.

Capital comes from profits. The more the capital per worker the higher the wages of the worker. Labor must earn the profits and they are entitled to have the profits used as capital to create more jobs and at higher wages. Adam Smith says in substance that when there are more laborers than there is capital to employ, the competition between the laborers bidding against each other for jobs will lower wages. This automatically raises profits and when these profits become capital it creates more jobs to employ the surplus labor. Thus it is seen that labor really provides the capital that employs it. When the profits are hoarded and not allowed to become capital labor loses the jobs they have really earned.

When the profits build up more capital than there are laborers to employ, the competition between employers bidding for labor will raise wages, which automatically lowers profits. This reduces profits and likewise the amount of new capital until there are enough workers to employ it. This is nature's way of keeping the balance between labor and capital. If all profits were used as capital the employers would be compelled to pay the highest wages they could afford to pay. This would be true because of the reasons given above.

John Stuart Mill says (p. 260, vol. 2 of his Principles of Political Economy): "Wages depend on the ratio between population and capital; and would do so if all the capital in the world were the property of one association or if the capitalists among whom it is shared maintained each an establishment for the production of every article consumed in the community, exchange of commodities having no existence."

Both Smith and Mill seem to take it for granted that all profits will be invested. They fail to consider the consequences if they were not. Thus we see how important it is to the laborer that the profits he earns for his employer become capital to make more jobs at higher wages.

This writer does not think the matter of taxes and public debt would be so serious if we took the right view and proper action in these matters. When we make a public debt there is no way to repay it except through taxation and we had as well be reconciled to this truth.

When there is but one road leading to a certain destination and that destination is at the dead end of the road, the logical way to return to the place from whence we started is to reverse the direction. Perhaps in reality this road is not much harder to travel in one direction than the other.

When we make a public debt we all pay higher prices because deficit spending is inflationary. Much of this inflationary money goes to pay for war materials and expenses which require much labor but produces nothing to raise our standard of living. On the face of this proposition it should lower our standard of living and would do so if it continued long enough to use up our surplus wealth. The fact is that our wars usually terminated before this factor became too serious. We usually have lavish times while spending what we had accumulated.

When we stop deficit spending and reverse our direction, we are compelled to build back those stocks which have been depleted. Aside from building back these stocks, which means, of course, building back our depleted capital, this writer thinks reversing our direction should not necessarily lower our standard of living. After all is said and done, our standard of living necessarily depends upon how much we produce and distribute.

Let us be realistic. Labor necessarily must earn the capital that employs it. We need enough capital to employ all of our labor, so business must make enough profits to supply this capital. When we have enough capital to employ all of our labor and supply that labor with the best production equipment and with sufficient stocks to work upon we will be able to reach our maximum production and our highest standard of living.

But how about the taxes that must come out of these profits to pay government expenses and our public debt? The more the profits, the more the taxes we can collect. Suppose we permit business to make large profits and take all the taxes the traffic will bear and pay as much as possible of the amount collected on our public debt, then in turn require those who collect their debt to reinvest the money. The money invested by those who collected their debt would make just as much capital as though it had been invested by the one who made the exorbitant profit. Since a raise in capital raises our production and that production is distributed among the same 150,000,000 people, it would raise their standard of living in the same proportion as the increased production and distribution. John Stuart Mill says that wages will be in proportion to population and capital. The fact that the father owns all the property does not change the income of the family.

When we did deficit spending the creditors of the Government passed the money through the hands of the Government, and the Government spent the money in the interest of our country. Now the people must repay the Government through taxes, and the Government must repay its creditors. There is no way to accomplish this except through taxation, and there is no way to collect sufficient taxes to make the repayment unless business makes enough profits to enable them to pay the required amount of taxes.

In the modern library edition of Adam Smith's Wealth of the Nations, page 141, we find the following. I quote: "I shall conclude this long chapter with observing that though anciently it was usual to rate wages, first by general laws extending over the whole kingdom, and afterward by particular order of the justices of peace in every particular county, both these practices have now gone entirely into disuse. 'By the experience of above 400 years,' says Dr. Burn, 'it seems time to lay aside all endeavors to bring under strict regulations, what in its own nature seems incapable of minute limitations; for if all persons in the same kind of work were to receive equal wages, there would be no emulation, and no room left for industry or ingenuity'."

I shall not attempt to tell you what we are doing in regard to this labor question, for you know much better than I. However, I would like to proffer this question to all our elected representatives who have a part in making labor laws. What hope do we have that a thing will now succeed that has always failed in the past, even when it has been tried over a period of 400 years?

This writer's answer to this question is this: If all the money was put through the hands of the consumers there would be no need of any labor laws because in this case there would be enough buying power in the hands of the consumers to buy all we produce. Under this plan all surplus profits would go into capital, which would force employers to bid against each other, for laborers and employers would be compelled to pay the highest prices they could afford. Employers would not have to pay more than they could afford because this would bring a natural balance between capital and labor. Natural laws never require the impossible, human laws do. Anyone can find fault or disagree with everything that is, but to offer a real solution to our problems is another thing. If we complied with first principles we would be relieved of a multitude of secondary causes that come to us as a result of failure to comply with first principles or causes. The gap between the selling price of all our products and the amount of money that reaches the consumers is the first cause of our economic trouble. By thus unbalancing our selling price and buying power, we create surpluses and from these surpluses comes another cause to produce another effect, and this last effect becomes another cause producing another effect and on and on. We can violate nature's laws but we cannot escape the penalty for so doing.

Henry George spent much of his time trying to discover the cause of starvation in the midst of plenty. This writer thinks that Mr. George failed to discover this cause because he did not have some of the facts about money. When a student, I was taught in psychology that if we left out any important fact when considering any proposition we would most likely reach the wrong conclusion. This writer believes that a lack of knowledge of some of the facts has caused about all the errors in economic thinking. This writer has no right to think he will not fall into error because of this same reason. For this and other reasons this writer will send any Senator or Congressman a copy of this letter who will give the writer a comment and some constructive criticism. From the comment the writer hopes to gain some help in marketing a book he plans to publish when finances will permit. From the constructive criticism he hopes to be able to correct some errors. From the study by our representatives he hopes some good may come to our country by starting some thinking in the right direction.

Hoping that this letter may mark the beginning of a new approach to our economy, and with best wishes to you and all who may be concerned, I am

Yours very truly,

W. C. DAWSON.

How We Can Lick Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "How We Can Lick Stalin," by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, United States Army, retired, published in the September 16, 1950, issue of Colliers' magazine.

I have been advised by the Government Printing Office that the article is estimated to be 2¾ pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

HOW WE CAN LICK STALIN

(By Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers)

There is not a moment to lose. The deadline was long ago. The cold war has been lost.

The Korean war caught us dangerously unprepared. General MacArthur's sure touch, coupled with the failure of the Red Korean tanks to exploit early gains, probably will enable our resourceful forces to stabilize the situation. Then, as more reinforcements arrive, we shall be able to turn the tide.

Nevertheless it is disconcerting to contemplate what could happen if hundreds of thousands of the oriental Red army, covered by a Red air force, were to move down into Korea.

Neither the bravery of our GI's nor General MacArthur's genius could overcome the disaster they would face. Even if our boys were to kill 10 or 20 to 1, we would be wiped out by an endless stream of Communists pouring upon us with complete abandon of life.

For many months before the Korean war started General MacArthur had pleaded in vain for stronger forces in his Far East command. The Joint Chiefs of Staff personally had agreed with his views, but, as they explained to him, the civil branch of the Government had final authority.

In South Korea our responsibilities had been assumed March 1949 by the Department of State. In June of that year our troops were relieved. While it was known that North Koreans were being heavily armed, it was decided our aid from that time would be almost entirely economic. Of a $10,000,000 aid authorization by the Congress, only $108 worth of radio wire had been delivered prior to the Communist invasion. Administration leaders had made it clear that Korea was not essential to our strategic position in Asia.

Referring to President Truman's sudden reversal of this policy, General MacArthur said "the Far East command, until the President's great pronouncement to support the epochal action of the United Nations, had no slightest responsibility for the defense of the free Republic of Korea. With the President's decision it assumed a completely new and added mission."

It was a State Department decision to leave the thirty-eighth parallel undefended on the south side. It was a White House decision which suddenly junked this policy in favor of armed intervention—at a time when sufficient military force was not readily available.

One or the other of these decisions was wrong.

In Europe, although there is no fighting there at the moment, our position is potentially far more critical than in Asia. There the State Department, without appreciation of the complexities of modern war and the terrific combat effectiveness of the Red Army, has committed the United States to assist in holding western Europe's frontier. It is my belief that few professional military men of reputation really believe such a program can succeed. Yet the military, subordinated to the civil branch of our Government, has offered no public protest. Our Nation is in imminent peril unless our military leaders, even at the risk of their professional careers, insist that our plans be militarily sound and that the objectives given us by the civil branch of the Government be attainable.

WHY WE MUST AVOID GROUND COMBAT

We cannot win against Russia on the ground. We cannot win in ground combat against Red oriental forces on the Asiatic mainland. These Red forces are too vast numerically, too well equipped, too willing to sacrifice their men, for us to accept full-scale ground combat with them in Europe or Asia. Moreover, the distances and winter factors in Russia give her enormous advantages. Where Napoleon and Hitler failed from nearby bases, we had better not make the plunge from across the ocean.

It would be folly to strike Russia's greatest strength, her ground forces, with what in that war would be the weakest element of our three arms—our ground forces. Russia's hope for a military victory would lie in her ability to throw the full weight of the Red Army against the United Nations forces, which of course would be mainly American. Under no circumstances should we allow Stalin to maneuver us into the position of opposing his strength with our weakness. Rather, we should avoid Russia's incalculable strength and attack her where she is most vulnerable. Russia is weakest at her heart. She is strongest on her periphery. Inside Russia, communism is a miserable failure.

The Russian people never have entirely accepted communism. I am reliably advised that during the 20-year period preceding World War II there were 30 sizable revolts, rebellions, and plots against the Kremlin dictatorship. They were staged by peasants, workers and even by members of the Red Army itself.

When Hitler's forces struck Russia, an important segment of the population greeted the Nazis as liberators. Four million Russian officers and soldiers are reported to have surrendered. Eight hundred thousand troops joined the Nazi forces. Russian General Vlassov set up three Russian divisions to fight Stalin. But Hitler, with his race supremacy complex, looked upon the Russians as inferior. He wanted only the rich Ukraine land, not the people. Confident of victory, he slaughtered the population and the forces which had surrendered to him.

Stalin, sensing his precarious position, somewhat relaxed his despotic control, appealed to the patriotism of the people, and promised postwar relief. The Russian people, faced by an invader whose atrocities exceeded those of Stalin, rallied to the defense of their motherland and fought history's greatest defensive battle.

After the war, hundreds of thousands of Russian nationals refused to return to Russia. They resisted by all possible means, including suicide. Compelled by a wartime agreement to assist in forced repatriation, we played a part in this affair which is a dark chapter in the American record. Purges in the Red Army subdued the military. Desertions were by the thousand.

Today conditions inside Russia are almost unbearable, even for a population accustomed to harsh treatment. There are 15,000,000 Russian prisoners behind barbed wire. I have seen some of these prison camps on my two trans-Siberian trips. About 9,000,000 of these are male political prisoners between the ages of 18 and 58. They comprise 16 percent of the male population between these age limits. There is scarcely a family in Russia which has not lost a member to the barbed-wire prisons. It is evident that the Communist system carries within itself the seeds of self-destruction. The iron curtain is plain evidence the Kremlin does not trust the Russian people. It is afraid for them to have contact with the outside world, to know how other peoples live.

Stalin's problem of control is terrific. Of necessity, if he is to continue in power, he must subject his people to their own military occupation. He must transmute the hatred his people hold for the Kremlin into hatred for their alleged external enemy—the United States.

We should launch immediately a full-scale psychological campaign to drive a wedge between the Kremlin and the Russian people. Psychologically, the enslaved Russians are ripe for revolt. But they have neither the military equipment, nor the leadership and organization to implement their desires. Nevertheless, secret groups exist in Russia dedicated to the overthrow of the Kremlin and the establishment of a liberal government. At least one of these anti-Communist organizations penetrates the iron curtain regularly. It needs help—money, printing presses, paper, radio sending and receiving sets, small planes, small free balloons and various other aids to intensify and expand the underground activities. The cost in relation to military expenditures would be almost negligible.

The Red Army, some reliable observers believe, is saturated with revolutionary ferment, and cannot be relied upon unless Russia is attacked. Yet, in spite of this situation, which might be strengthened immeasurably by a psychological campaign by the United States, our steps to exploit this positive vulnerability are ineffective. The Voice of America, even is increased as contemplated, is a mere whisper. The State Department must always be diplomatic. This precludes success in Russia; for to be effective the psychological campaign must be aimed at the eventual overthrow of the Kremlin. This cannot be achieved merely by radio broadcasts into Russia. It will require the individual initiative of those behind the iron curtain and the integration of their individual efforts into mass action.

ENEMIES WITHIN MENACE THE KREMLIN

No border so vast as that of Russia, and touched in so many places by unhappy vassal states, can be guarded against all penetration. Peasants and others who pass for peasants can move in and out at night. There is bound to be talk between those on one side and those on the other. Our messages can be transmitted by ardent anti-Communist Russians who know just the right word to attract somebody, just the right touch to give verisimilitude to leaflets that might be dropped from balloons, or small Russian-piloted planes. We in our American towns, would know at once whether a message that came to us showed intimate knowledge of our town and our surroundings. Russian fugitives from the brutality of the Kremlin have friends back where they fled from, who will pass the truth around convincingly.

We have the best story in the world to tell. The Kremlin feeds its listeners with distortions of American life, with exceptions to the normal. Our task is to give them the truth. The Reds have done alarmingly well with their lies. Certainly we should be able to do more with our truth. We have a better chance to weaken Russia than we have to strengthen western Europe militarily, at far less cost. By choosing the more practical way we could tip the balance of power heavily to our side.

In Japan our psychological campaign drove a wedge between the Emperor and his people on the one hand, and the militarists on the other. This campaign contributed in a marked degree to Japan's surrender. It was one of the reasons why the Japanese surrendered on the mainland without a fight. What worked against Japan can be made to work against the Kremlin. In this field I speak from experience, for it was my privilege to serve as chief of psychological warfare on General MacArthur's staff while the war was on.

A full-scale campaign to project the truth through the iron curtain to the Russian people should be initiated immediately. We can and must create a situation of unrest in Russia which would make Stalin hesitate to go to war lest his home front turn actively against him. Our military leaders should demand the campaign.

It is obvious that we cannot hold the Red army out of western Europe. As the prospect of combat with Russia closes down upon us, our early lesson in Korea makes crystal-clear what it means for us to engage vast land armies.

Russia could start some 150 to 200 divisions across Europe in a matter of weeks. Within 90 days she could probably have 500 divisions available. She could have a thousand divisions eventually if she needed

them. In the latest war Russia put 11,000,000 troops into action before lend-lease aid was available. She now has some 20,000,000 trained ground troops.

Even if the mutual defense assistance program were completed—which it will not be for several years—the Western World would be able to oppose the Russians with only 50 divisions. Such United States divisions as might possibly be available could scarcely reach Europe before the Red Army reached the Atlantic.

A comparison of Allied with Russian strength near the close of World War II is significant. On the western frontier the United States had 3 airborne, 15 armored and 45 infantry divisions. Great Britain had 12, France 11, and Canada 5—a total of 91. This force, with complete domination of the air, was pushing the Nazis toward Berlin. On the other frontier, Stalin had 502 Red Army divisions pushing the German Army westward across central Europe.

The 91 divisions represented the Allied peak strength in Europe for World War II. The 502 Red Army divisions did not represent Russia's peak strength. She had already lost some 10,000,000 soldiers.

If the United States permits its forces to engage the Red Army in Europe, our losses will be so appalling that the American people will recoil in horror and belatedly examine our leadership. This tragedy must not happen.

Our economic position is such that we can no longer afford any program which is not vital to our existence. Our debt is nearing the $300,000,000,000 mark. Our total taxes will climb to $50,000,000,000 annually. Since the end of the war we have spent $91,000,000,000 for national defense, and yet we have doubtful security. Our foreign aid has amounted to $33,000,000,000.

Since the Korean war began we have embarked upon a new and vast multi-billion-dollar spending program. If it encompasses everything now planned, including the increased military assistance program for Europe. the total spent will mount to some $50,000,000,000.

The European countries have already reached prewar economic levels. Therefore, we should terminate the Marshall plan without delay. The point-4 program, at this time, should not be started. And our domestic economy should be pared to the bone.

The military assistance program, for which we have already earmarked billions of dollars plus vast quantities of surplus equipment, also should be terminated immediately.

We should advise our allies that the equipment we have provided will enable them to preserve internal security and prevent civil war. We should advise them that we are not abandoning them, nor are we welshing on the North Atlantic mutual defense treaty. If war comes, we should propose to lend military assistance by striking Russia from the air, continuing this assault until Russia surrends or is destroyed.

It is far from an acceptable solution to permit the Red Army to occupy Europe. But there is no acceptable solution for our European allies if war comes—merely two sinister alternatives. The lesser of these is occupation. If the Europeans resist the Red Army, they will be slaughtered.

To be sure, the manpower which our allies can provide for military service is impressive. In addition we could also recruit a formidable ground force of anti-Communist Russian and satellite DP's. We might decide to persuade the people of west Germany to form an army. But would Russia remain still and allow the creation of a force sufficiently formidable to hold the Red army out of Europe? And were we to move toward establishing sufficient United States air units in Europe to cover the force, Russia would be almost certain to strike before her enemy became really formidable.

The 1950 defense budget being spent by our European allies—less the negligible budgets of Luxemburg, Portugal, and Iceland—amounts to only $4,000,000,000 annually. There is the equivalent of two American divisions in Germany. France has three occupational divisions, but her best troops, 150,000 of them, are in Indochina, and her second-line troops are in North Africa. There are possibly 200,000 more assorted Allied troops in Europe, but these cannot be said to be on a war footing.

A negligible allied air force is available to cover these meager ground forces.

After considerable pondering, I have reached the unhappy conclusion that we cannot depend on our allies in Europe for military assistance should war come. This is in no way a reflection on the character of these people, nor on their valor or loyalty to us. It is merely recognizing a reality.

Russia probably has the atom bomb and 16,000 combat planes. Stalin will be in position, should war become imminent, to advise our allies to remain neutral and be spared attack. If they elect to give the United States bases in Europe or to cooperate with us in the war, he might try to take their population centers out by atomic assault the first 24 hours of the war. And he might very well succeed, because the Allies would not have sufficient air power in Europe at the outset to neutralize the Red air force. Thus, through no cowardice, the Allies may be driven into neutrality.

It would be interesting to know what Secretary of State Acheson would advise our allies to do under these circumstances. Presumably his policy would take us into war to save western Europe. But their destruction would defeat our war objective in Europe before the war was well under way.

Russia can be defeated—militarily—by the United States only through air assault. We can build an air force superior to the Red air force; we can gain mastery of the air over Russia; then we can force Russia into submission or destroy her. Air power can destroy Russia's war potential. From secret intelligence sources and by air reconnaissance we can learn the sites of her key industries. Our planes can fly the thousands of miles necessary to reach them, and return. We can take out Russia's steel industry, her oil supplies—the sinews and lifeblood of modern war. Air power can take out the bridges over her great rivers and paralyze her communications. With her railways out—there are practically no roads—Russia could not distribute food for the population.

These objectives—destruction of steel, oil, and communications facilities—are attainable. It is within our industrial capacity to build an Air Force to achieve them. We have the genius to build the best Air Force in the world. We have learned from the mistakes of the last war. If we eliminate all wasteful political expenditure we can build such an Air Force within the limits of sound economy.

A decision to knock out Russia's war potential by air assault in no way should imply that only air power is necessary. We must continue to maintain a fleet which can control the seas. It is essential to our survival. So long as the fleet is in existence, Red forces—except relatively small airborne units—cannot invade the Western Hemisphere. But the fleet cannot deliver a knockout blow against Russia, for Russia cannot be blockaded.

The Army and Navy are important as formerly, but against Russia the weight of their roles has changed. They have become supporting arms for the Air Force. Against Russia the Army and Navy would seize, hold, and supply essential overseas bases from which air strikes may be unleashed against the heart of Russia.

BEST SITES FOR OUR AIR BASES

We cannot hold bases in western Europe proper, except perhaps in Spain, but there are potential base sites which we can hold and from which any target in Russia could be destroyed, eventually, by our Air Force. Bases which can be held must have the incidental protection of mountains or deserts or bodies of water or combinations of these natural barriers.

The great Pyrenees Mountains barrier would make Spain a difficult operation for the Red Army. So it would be well to tie Spain into our war strategy.

We may be compelled to consider Africa as a huge north-and-south approach to potential bases in Libya. These bases can be held. To take bases away from us in Libya would require an airborne invasion by the Red Army.

Such an operation is vulnerable to ground defense. In the defense of Crete the British—though eventually overwhelmed—destroyed 80 percent of the German paratroopers.

In the Pacific we must hold the Aleutians, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, and possibly some lesser islands in the chain. If the Reds ever occupy this chain, or any great part of it, we will be denied the ocean approaches to Asia, and also bases from which to bomb important Red Asiatic centers. Possession of these islands from Alaska to the Philippines is vital to our security.

From bases in Africa and in the Orient our long-range bombers can strike any target in Eurasia. The effectiveness of the Red air force interceptors is an unknown factor. Our newest bombers, refuelled in flight, may be fast enough to evade interception, especially at night or in bad weather. But the chances are, if war comes, we shall have to win the battle of the air over Russia first. This will require a long and costly advance of air bases in areas where natural barriers preclude a major engagement with the Red Army.

Our Air Force faces another assignment of magnitude. For the first time since 1812 our population centers will be endangered by a foreign power, if war with Russia comes. Fighter protection must be provided not only for our cities but for entire industrial areas; and the Air Force must help defend Alaska. It is all a vast and costly undertaking.

PROBLEMS OF WORLD POLICING

But war with Russia is not the only threat to us. Our war in Korea could be merely the beginning of a series of critical disturbances. We are committed to lend assistance to certain peoples who oppose the spread of totalitarianism. Have we the means to do this?

Korea already has provided the answer. We simply have not the combat units, the manpower, or the proper transport to police the world. Nor have we the wealth.

The forces we must create to deter Russia from waging war are not suitable for police action, nor can they be committed deeply, lest the real war be kindled.

To handle probable emergencies a United Nations task force should be tailor-made to meet any problem which might arise in Formosa, Japan, and the Philippines and possibly other areas in the Far East vital to the success of our cause. The force should be strong in manpower equipped with small arms, and supported by medium bombers and fighters both land- and sea-based. It should have tanks, cannon, and antitank weapons, all balanced to meet known conditions in given areas. Only a small fraction of the manpower can be recruited from the United States. Friendly Chinese, the Japanese, Filipinos, and others in the Orient to whose protection we commit ourselves have ample volunteer manpower.

In the Middle East there should be created a second and larger United Nations task force, tailored to handle Communist uprisings in those troubled areas which we consider essential to the success of our cause. This Middle East task force could be trained in Libya. The manpower could be recruited from volunteers among displaced Russian nationals, and from German and Allied volunteers. The United States should furnish only a small unit. More than one-half million anti-Communist Russian displaced persons are political refugees in Europe, who will be destroyed if Stalin invades. They dare not return to Russia lest they be purged. Naturally they would be eager to join in what to them might be a crusade to liberate the enslaved Russian population.

These two task forces, with certain elements airborne, would be trouble shooters to quench insurrection and civil war in the Orient and Middle East—in areas which we consider vital to our security. In selecting these vital areas care must be taken not to place ourselves in the role of underwriting European colonial imperialism. Already Communist propaganda is effectively appealing to all Asia by branding us as imperialists.

These selected areas which are capable of being defended must be determined at once. The military should then be instructed to proceed with plans to defend them. If they can't be defended, as is clearly the case in Europe, the military must speak frankly and openly—and fearlessly.

The military preparation for the defense of these areas must be separate and distinct from the military force which we must have to deter Russia from war, and to strike her if war is forced upon us.

Were we to build without delay the best Air Force in the world and create United Nations task forces for the Far East and the Middle East, danger of war with Russia would be far less than now. On the other hand, if we continue to dissipate our means and follow present piecemeal, fuzzy policies, war is inevitable.

OUR TWO MOST POTENT WEAPONS

Total mobilization, universal military training, invocation of a full-scale draft and other related measures will not bluff Stalin. He fears neither our mobilization nor our manpower. He fears and respects only our air power and our power to project the truth through the iron curtain. Yet, we have continued not to build air supremacy, and we are neglecting an effective psychological campaign.

Because of our early reverses in Korea, the cry has already gone up: The airplane is merely an auxiliary weapon; jet planes are too fast for certain types of combat; we can win only with doughboys and more tanks than Stalin can build. The tendency among those charged with planning is to pull the Air Force down to the role of a supporting arm for land and sea forces. Congress seems in a mood to rubber stamp the authorization for the President to spend vast sums at home and abroad, to move into total mobilization, to invoke a full-scale draft, to shape a vast Army to handle local disturbances everywhere and to challenge the Red hordes of Asia as well as the Red army.

This would be precisely what Mr. Stalin wants. His own planners could not improve on the program. If we endeavor to handle local civil wars wherever they break out—as the President has indicated—we shall piecemeal our means and collapse our economy. If we accept combat with vast Red ground forces in Europe and Asia, our losses will mount into the millions and we shall fail.

Planning to keep the peace by force on a global scale is no amateur assignment. There was a time when rifles were our most effective weapon and military matters could be safely entrusted to the guidance of those without professional background. Today, however, with war the most complex phenomenon of our civilization, we continue to adhere to the political tradition of entrusting our national security to those with little or no military background. The President and State Department are making political commitments whose military implications are not only unsound but dangerous.

Of course, we have the Joint Chiefs of Staff to direct the complexities of war preparation, but their professional views have been subordinated to decisions of the White House and State Department. In spite of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the civilian leaders have taken us into one unsound military situation after another. And they are still doing it.

We should no longer allow this arrangement for global planning. To accept Stalin's challenge anywhere and everywhere that a Communist-inspired insurrection breaks out is playing into his hands. It makes us the victim of his cunning.

Stalin realizes far better than we that, if we build air supremacy, our air power can destroy his war potential. Consequently he has invented methods to get around this possibility. By creating ground combat wars about his vast periphery he proposes to bleed us white, while neutral Russia, free from air strikes, continues to produce munitions for her fighting satellites.

While our strength is thus being sapped, a creeping total mobilization program at home could spell disaster. The secret of American progress is free enterprise. Under it we have created abundance. Our liberty and individual freedom, our moral and spiritual aspirations all spring from this solid economic basis. Gradual total mobilization and war will destroy the abundance we have created, and with its destruction we shall lose our freedom.

OPPOSITION PARTY IS NEEDED

War hysteria is already revealing itself in the widespread demand that opposition to all Presidential measures be silenced as a patriotic duty. Nothing, not even defeat in battle, could harm us more. Unless a strong and challenging opposition party exists, the power of the executive branch becomes absolute. Then the administration thinks it has become infallible. When no one dares to oppose them, we are on the road to ruin.

The United States has only 6 percent of the world's population. It is time we took stock of where we are drifting. Unless we do this and create a plan to lift ourselves out of the certain danger which we face in the immediate future, it will be too late to save ourselves

In shaping our Constitution our forefathers rightly subordinated military authority to civil. They had had enough of military conscription and domination in England and on the Continent.

Today, however, we find the civil branch of our Government abusing its power. The military has been subordinated to the extent that our national security is imperiled. Military leaders must be unshackled and permitted to express views freely on the military implications of our commitments.

If the Chief of Naval Operations was fired for expressing his views at a B–36 hearing before a congressional committee—at which he had been promised immunity—what would happen to a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who opposed Mr. Acheson in cooperating on defense proposals to Europe? Nevertheless, if we are to remain free, our military leaders, at the risk of their careers, must oppose measures which imperil our existence. In the final analysis it is the American people to whom they owe their loyalty.

We must have a dynamic strategic concept of how to survive. No longer can we afford to drift without sound, long-range planning and attainable objectives. No longer have we the resources to dole out to this ally or that former enemy. Our position is so precarious that every dollar and every soldier must be made to count. American economic and military aid to any friendly power must implement this over-all strategy. No longer do we dare squander our means for purposes which do not further this strategy.

We need a new dynamic strategy now. Its principal provisions should be:

1. Attainable political objectives backed by commensurate military might, including air supremacy and two United Nations task forces.
2. Improved intelligence agencies—the eyes of our defenses.
3. Assistance programs that further attainable objectives.
4. A sound domestic economy.

All this—and that other element that could be the most effective: weakening the Kremlin dictatorship from within. This is our best chance to avoid war. It will hasten victory if war comes.

What Will Happen to UN Army After Korea War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have known Sigrid Arne. She is not only an accurate reporter but has a keen, penetrating insight into world conditions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of September 3, which I am sure will be informative and helpful to all who read it:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO UN ARMY AFTER KOREA WAR?—QUESTION OF ESTABLISHING PERMANENT WORLD POLICE FORCE IS STILL UNANSWERED

(By Sigrid Arne)

The Communist attack on South Korea has brought into being the very international police force which the Soviets have fought against in the United Nations for 5 years.

But it is only a provisional police force. What will happen to it after the Korean matter is cleaned up is not yet apparent. The question of establishing a permanent force—and the makeup of that force if it is established—is still up in the air, although there is a great deal of unofficial talk about it.

For the first 2 months in Korea the ground battle against the Communists had to be waged by South Koreans and American GIs alone. They had almost immediate support, however, from British and Australian planes and from naval vessels of Australia, Britain, Canada, the Netherlands and New Zealand in addition to United States planes and ships.

By the end of 2 months the United States delegate to the UN, Warren Austin, could tell the UN Security Council that 30,000 troops from nine other UN member nations were pledged to fight in Korea. They were either en route or training for action.

The following nations had pledged troops: Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom and France.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

The following, all told, had pledged naval aid: Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, and the United Kingdom.

The following, all told, had pledged air aid: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Greece, the Union of South Africa.

The Nationalist Chinese Government offered troops and planes, but acceptance was delayed in view of Communist threats to Formosa, where most of the Nationalist forces are stationed.

Offers of medical aid had been made by Denmark, Ethiopia, India, Israel, the Philippines and Sweden.

Offers of economic help had come from Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Lebanon, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, the Philippines and Thailand. A number of other states had talked informally with the United States to discover whether they could help.

Shortly after the fighting started the UN Security Council asked the United States to name a UN commander in Korea, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur was appointed.

Most of the burden still is being carried by the United States. But American policy makers, in both the State and Defense Departments, are satisfied that the Korean Communists will shortly learn, the hard way, that their cause is opposed by the whole non-Communist world, whether white, yellow, or brown.

But what about the long run?

Under the UN Charter it was planned that member nations would place military contingents and bases at the disposal of the Security Council. The Council is responsible for putting down threats to the peace.

Russian action in UN committees blocked establishment of such a force. But, had the plan worked, the UN would have had an army on hand to move immediately to Korea. Or, as some State Department men think, its very existence might have stopped the Korean action before it started.

SEARCH FOR PLAN

How long will the present UN army hold together?

Top United States military men point out that nations pledging aid have done so merely for the Korean campaign, even though at the same time they acknowledge the possibility of further Communist strikes in other parts of the globe.

So far there is no plan to hold together the present UN army, nor to enlarge or use it elsewhere.

But there is much unofficial searching here in Washington for some plan that would give the free nations a permanent and ready weapon against aggression.

One concrete suggestion comes from Senator SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, who has just been appointed an American delegate to the UN. He plans to propose a UN police force made up of paid, volunteer, professional land, sea, and air forces.

The men would be trained and stationed in international zones and in sensitive areas—that is, areas where there is danger of an attack on peace.

These men would enlist directly with UN police headquarters and could come from any nation except the Big Five—the United States, Britain, France, Russia, and China—which would be expected to keep up their armies in any case. Senator SPARKMAN thinks many small nations would drop their armies if there were a dependable UN police.

The force would be maintained by contributions from both UN members and any nonmember nations that wanted to help.

MILITARY DUBIOUS

Mr. SPARKMAN points out his plan is just a start, and no doubt needs changes. But he wants the Senate to request President Truman to instruct the United States delegation at the UN to bring up the plan at the next meeting of the General Assembly, where Russia could not veto it as it could in the Security Council.

Top military men wonder about the difficulties of running such a force. They ask:

Who would be the military commander? In what money would the forces be paid? What nation besides the United States has the capacity to turn out the needed equipment?

Where would the men train? Where would they be stationed? Would Britain, for example, want such an international group stationed on its soil?

In what language would the Army transact business? How to make certain that the volunteers are not Communists?

Some of these United States officers think it might be best for military aid to come from nations as organized units, trained on home soil, paid in home money, and supplied and transported by their own governments.

But what of the many men who have wanted to fight in Korea alongside the GI's, citizens of nations that either have offered no troops or whose armies are too small for them to make offers? The State Department reports "volunteers have literally banged on almost every Embassy door we have abroad."

Could such volunteers be fitted into an American foreign legion, patterned after the French Legion? That idea is being turned over in Washington, but there is no comment on it.

Meanwhile two sets of free-world armies are being fitted together for the long pull for mutual defense—those of the 12 nations in the North Atlantic Pact and those of 16 Latin-American Republics working together with the United States under the Rio Pact.

Can a Cough Mean Cancer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the medical profession has made great strides in its warfare against human destruction by cancer. As a result of these years of effort in research and treatment, it now seems that medicine has determined that one out of every 10 cases of cancer is cancer of the lung. Inasmuch as this is very much a national problem I should like to aid in its solution by having unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD extracts from an article by Dr. J. De Witt Fox, first written for Your Life magazine by Dr. Fox and later reprinted in Life and Health magazine of Washington, D. C., of which Dr. Fox is the editor. The extracts from the article follow:

CAN A COUGH MEAN CANCER?

(By J. DeWitt FOX, M. D.)

SCIENCE HAS MADE GREAT STRIDES IN FIGHTING LUNG CANCER, BUT MUCH OF ITS SUCCESS DEPENDS UPON AN EARLY DIAGNOSIS

A well-dressed, gray-haired gentleman sat in a Chicago doctor's consultation room.

"What is your trouble?" his doctor asked.

"Doctor, this is perhaps a queer complaint, but my cigarettes don't agree with me," the patient replied. "When I smoke, I choke up with a dry, hacking cough. I have a cigarette cough which usually lasts a few days and then promptly disappears. During the past couple of weeks I've changed from one brand of cigarettes to another without relief."

"And you've cut down on your smoking, I suppose," his doctor interrupted.

"Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, this week I stopped smoking altogether. But I still have a cough."

The doctor reasoned to himself that here was a heavy-smoking businessman, now in his fifties—an age group prone to have cancer. He also knew that a cough—even an ordinary cigarette cough—can mean something serious.

An X-ray picture was taken of his chest. The doctor brought it into the darkened consultation room while it was still wet. He snapped on a blue-colored light in the viewing box and hung the X-ray before it.

"This is the pattern of the air passages, and this is lung tissue surfounding them," he explained. "Right here in the middle bronchus or air passage of the right lung is the cause of your so-called cigarette cough."

The doctor pointed to a haziness in the center of the film.

"You have a small tumor which must be removed," he continued cautiously.

Fortunately, this patient's alertness added years to his life. Because he consulted his physician at the first inkling of a chest condition—even though he suspected it to be nothing more serious than a protracted cigarette cough—an accurate diagnosis was made before cancer had gained a foothold. Modern surgery returned him to a happy and useful life after the successful removal of a lung cancer.

Cancer of the lungs is on the increase in the United States. A century ago, only 0.1 percent of primary cancers occurred in the lungs. Today, 1 out of every 10 cases of cancer is a lung cancer. Bronchiogenic or lung cancer is a disease for the man of the house to be aware of—85 percent occur in men. Only occasional cases are reported in women. Men past 40, and especially between 50 and 60 years of age, are the most susceptible.

The exact cause of lung cancer is still a medical mystery. Nevertheless, as in other forms of cancer, certain contributing factors have been discovered, which, if avoided, may reduce the prevalence of this disease. It is well known that chronic irritation predisposes to cancer. Chronic irritation coupled with some as yet unknown "X" factor mysteriously provokes normal body cells to grow wild. Cancer, then, is a disease of chronic irritation. That much we do know.

The respiratory passages of every city dweller are daily bombarded by a variety of noxious vapors: industrial fumes from oil or coal producing plants, abrasive dust such as silica and asbestos, factory smoke, asphalt road tars, and the ubiquitous automobile exhaust on every street and highway. All have been suggested as possible factors contributing to and important in the production of lung cancer. Some authorities feel that excessive smoking is important.

Dr. Alton Ochsner, professor of surgery at the Tulane University School of Medicine and one of the foremost authorities on lung cancer and its surgical treatment, has observed: "The fact that there is a parallelism between the number of cigarettes sold in the United States and the increased incidence of bronchiogenic (lung) cancer is interesting." That women do not smoke as much as men may possibly account for the lower rate of this disease in women.

"Of much more significance than smoking, it seems to me," says Dr. Charles S. Cameron, medical and scientific director of the American Cancer Society, "is the fact of the parallelism between cancer of the lung

and urbanization. While this might be explained on the basis of more readily available diagnosis, one must not overlook the possibility of carcinogens in industrial smoke." Many States require factories to protect their employees from undue exposure to industrial fumes, smokes, and chemical agents known to invoke cancer.

However, at present, the greatest advances in curbing cancer have come in the field of public education. If you and I know the symptoms and quickly consult our physician, we give him a head start in fighting this disease. We should familiarize ourselves with the early signs and symptoms, and report immediately to our doctor should the slightest suggestion of a cancer symptom, whatever its nature, appear.

What are the symptoms of lung cancer? Be on the lookout for cough, sputum, and chest pain. These are the first signs. Later one may notice weight loss, coughing of blood, wheezing, and shortness of breath after exertion such as climbing stairs. An episode of pneumonia or lung infection may be caused by cancer. And contrary to what most people believe, tuberculosis is not the commonest cause of pulmonary hemorrhage. Blood-streaked sputum or frank coughing of fresh blood is much more common to lung cancer.

Cough is a cardinal warning. More often than not, the smoking man assumes it is just a cigarette cough and that he'd better cut down a little. * * * Any cough lasting longer than 3 weeks deserves the study of your doctor.

The cough of lung cancer is usually a chronic dry hack. As sputum appears, it is white and glassy at first but may become yellowish or contain tiny flecks of white tissue. In later stages it may be pink and blood tinged. If you have a chronic expectoration, see your doctor.

Chest pain often accompanies, or follows, the chronic cough of lung cancer. * * * A feeling of tightness, as if one cannot get a full breath, is noted by some patients. And labored breathing on physical exertion—puffing after walking up hill for a short distance—is a sign. Coughing may produce such sharp pain that the patient will hold his chest in an effort to prevent it. * * * Pain usually indicates invasion of a pain-producing structure of the lung or spotty lung infection. Therefore, consult your physician at once if any chest pain appears.

Except for the skillful and detailed examination by your doctor, the X-ray is one of the most reliable single means of diagnosing lung cancer. * * * Bronchoscopy is a relatively new technique. * * * A small tube is passed into the bronchus. A light on the end of the tube makes it possible for the examining doctor to see tumors or irritation of the lining membranes of the air passages. * * * At the same time * * * small bits of tissue may be removed for microscopic examination. * * *

Newest of the techniques for diagnosing lung cancer is the cytologic examination of sputum and bronchial secretions, developed by Dr. George Nicholas Papanicolaou, pathologist of Cornell University School of Medicine. * * * It will be an added safeguard in cases where no tumor is seen by the bronchoscopist. * * *

The outlook for the lung cancer patient is one of hope. Prior to 15 years ago, according to Dr. Ochsner, no patient with bronchiogenic cancer was ever cured. Today, with the advances in diagnosis and modern surgery, patients are being cured and returned to useful lives. * * *

While thoracic surgery offers the best means of curing lung cancer, * * * doctors plead * * * for a chance to attain cures by operating at the optimum time—early.

To summarize what you can do to protect yourself against lung cancer:

1. Curb one of cancer's known causes—chronic irritation. Avoid all bronchial irritants: Industrial fumes and dust, chronic colds, and lung infections. Do not smoke.

2. Utilize all present knowledge in stemming the cancer tide. See your physician at the first symptom: Cough, sputum, chest pain. Beware of the earliest sign of lung cancer—the chronic cough. If you have a chronic cough, see your doctor today.

Government by Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Government by Treaty," delivered by William H. Fitzpatrick, editor, New Orleans States, at the Young Men's Business Club meeting in New Orleans, La., on July 12, 1950, published in the August 1, 1950, issue of Vital Speeches of the Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT BY TREATY—MANY OF OUR FREEDOMS AND RIGHTS WILL BE GIVEN UP

(By William H. Fitzpatrick)

I want to talk to you today about something that appears very far away at the moment, but is really just around the corner off Canal Street.

And that is a new concept of national legislative processes.

You people here have elected EDDIE HÉBERT and HALE BOGGS to Congress from the First and Second Congressional Districts for some years now. But do you know that in Washington today there is a definite legislative approach to domestic problems which, if adopted as its proponents plan, means that our Representatives might as well stay home and go fishing? What I am talking about is government by treaty.

The United States Constitution provides that the President, by and with the consent of the United States Senate, has the power to enter into treaties with foreign nations. If two-thirds of the Senate—present when the treaty comes to a vote, mind you, not necessarily two-thirds of the entire membership—votes to ratify a treaty, that treaty becomes the supreme law of the land, standing four-square with the United States Constitution where it does not conflict and standing equal with legislation passed by the National Congress.

At the same time all treaties supersede State laws, and all State constitutions, and all city and county and municipal law.

This is so, because the United States Constitution provides in article II, section 2, paragraph 2, that—

"He [the President] shall have power by and with the consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur"—

And because article VI, section 2, provides that—

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

In other words, the President and Senate alone can act to repeal any State laws through the device of treaty enactment.

There is at present before the United States Senate such a treaty. It is called the Genocide Convention. If our Senate ratifies this treaty as it is written, it will nullify many State laws. I think all of you will agree that repeal of any State laws passed by State legislatures presumably close to the people they represent, ought not be repealed by means of a treaty conceived in the United Nations, no matter how worthy its conception.

For my part I think that the United States Constitution has provided us with a pretty fair set of governmental processes. Under it there are restraints placed upon the Executive in the form of the Congress; there are restraints placed upon the Congress in the shape of the Supreme Court, and there are restraints placed upon the Supreme Court in the Constitution itself.

The seeds of all our freedoms are in that Constitution. The many safeguards in it make any major changes in governmental processes necessarily slow. That is all to the good. It means that nothing is so immediate, no problems of government so great, that hasty legislation can be embodied in our national law and be assured of staying there to the later detriment, perhaps of all our people. I have in mind President Truman's thoughtless suggestion during 1946, that he be given powers to draft all striking railroad men and union officials into the Army. This bill passed the House unanimously. But to the credit of Senator Taft, the so-called labor baiter, it was held up in the Senate. I think all of us will agree in retrospect that that was hasty legislation, calculated to do the Nation harm, and that even if the Congress had passed it and Mr. Truman signed it that the Supreme Court would have found it unconstitutional.

I think you will agree with me that in this instance, at least, President Truman was very wrong and Senator TAFT was very right. For my part, I have found that distinction between the Democratic and Republican leaders more obvious more often than many others.

The Genocide Convention I mentioned earlier is the outgrowth of an international revulsion at the mass executions perpetrated on helpless people by Hitler.

To understand the problem completely, we must know what is being attempted. Just what is genocide? No one had ever heard the word until comparatively recently. It means race killing.

It goes without saying that no decent person can quarrel with the announced objectives of this convention—the outlawing of mass murder of a racial, religious, or ethnical group. The very word Buchenwald will live forever as a measure of the depths of mankind's degradation. And we might add Hiroshima, too. But let's look at this genocide convention.

Article 1 of the convention says:

"The contracting parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish."

The nations which ratify this convention undertake these solemn duties:

To prevent genocide.

And to punish genocide.

We will be bound to prevent it and to punish it wherever it may appear in the world.

There are no constitutional restrictions on the power and duty of the President in executing this obligation. If it is ratified as a treaty it becomes the law of the land.

Where does this obligation begin and where does it end?

Its proponents say it ends at our own borders.

But spokesmen for the American Bar Association say that it may mean warfare.

Carl Rix—neither States Righter nor Dixiecrat—but a lawyer from Milwaukee, says:

"The prevention is anywhere in the world—the punishment of offenders is in the country of capture or apprehension until an international tribunal is set up for the purpose of consolidation of trials."

We marched into Korea to stop aggression, because we had to. Continued and successful aggression by Russia and her satellites could easily mean all of the world in chains.

As we all know, the Northern Korean Communists attacked without warning and without reason the Republic of South Korea. That is a war between one sovereign nation and a Russian satellite. We have to stop that sort of thing.

But would we be willing to commit American lives to stop a religious war between Shintoists and Buddhists in Korea if it should have occurred? Were you willing to send American troops to India to stop the warfare between Moslem and Hindu? Were you willing to send Americans abroad to stop the race riots in South Africa between natives and Indians? Are we to be committed to release of slave labor in Russia? To action against religious persecution in Russia's satellite countries?

We will be committed to these things should we ratify this Genocide Convention.

Article II reads:

"In the present convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, as such:

(a) Killing members of the group;

(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;

(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Genocide means race killing, and when properly defined it should be outlawed by every moral and legal means possible. But genocide as written in the convention doesn't only mean the killing of thousands or hundreds, for racial, religious, or national objections to groups; it can mean the slaying of one individual. Thus it invades domestic law. It comes into conflict with State homicide law.

And genocide is defined as, among other things, "causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of a group."

Now I am prepared to listen to any argument which can set forth when serious mental harm is serious, when it is harmful and when it is only mental. This seems to me to be not only an invasion of domestic legislation, it seems to me to be an invasion of the misty realms of psychiatry, persecution complexes and psychological fixations.

A year ago last March, the states printed a series of editorials on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. While generally accepted by lawmakers, attorneys, and students of constitutional government as a logical discussion of a serious question, the series was kissed off by emotionalists as inconsequential and a postured peering under the bed.

However, the declaration has now become an authority to be quoted in overthrowing domestic law of the states. When it was signed by our representatives in the United Nations in December 1948, it was characterized by Mrs. Roosevelt, its chief author, as "not a statement of law or of legal obligation."

We warned last year that the declaration, no matter in what guise it was clothed, was dangerous to our Constitution and Bill of Rights. We didn't think it would be used to nullify State law so soon.

But it has happened already in California. In a recent case there, a three-judge district court of appeal has declared the alien land law of California invalid because of the universal declaration of human rights and the United Nations Charter.

The law in question was passed in 1920 and forbade the acquisition of property in California by aliens ineligible for citizens.

The merits or demerits of the alien land law are not our concern. It was a California State statute. But what is of concern to all of us in every State was the reasoning of the three-judge court.

The court held that because we are signatories to the United Nations Charter, the Charter superseded the State law. The court held this opinion despite paragraph 7 of article 2 which plainly states:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter * * *."

But the court reasons that the universal declaration of human rights implements and emphasizes the purposes and aims of the UN and its Charter and that the declaration affirms that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood; everyone is entitled to all of the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration, without distinction of any kind such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political, or other opinion, national or social, origin, property, birth or other status," and that "everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others."

If this decision is affirmed, the effect will be far-reaching more so than any of the critics of the declaration or the Charter ever dreamed. It will furnish a treaty basis without need of any other constitutional sanction for invalidation of State laws.

And since a valid treaty also supersedes existing Federal law, what will happen to our immigration and naturalization laws if this California ruling is upheld by the United States Supreme Court? The declaration says everyone has the right to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution (arts. 13 and 14).

The top 11 Communists were convicted of plotting violent overthrow of the Government in New York last year. What effect will this California ruling have in the future? The California court held that everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration, without distinction of any kind such as * * * political or other opinion.

What happens when that political opinion includes a belief in the right to overthrow the Government by force?

A year ago last March we asked in the series of editorials on the declaration: Where Do We Go?

If the decision of the California court of appeals is upheld by the Supreme Court, the answer will be we're already there.

And that may be world-wide socialism with Uncle Sam paying the bills; nullification of Federal immigration laws and State statutes, and, finally, a totalitarian government which will void the United States Constitution and our cherished Bill of Rights.

And remember, please, that we have not even ratified any such human rights covenant. And despite Mrs. Roosevelt's assurances that it was not a statement of law or legal obligation, the California court so holds it.

In what case will we find ourselves should the Senate ratify the genocide convention?

It not only invades domestic law, it provides for the extradition of Americans for overseas trials should they be accused of having committed genocide in any other country. And proponents of the convention plan an international tribunal to try all Americans overseas, wherever the international court of justice might be sitting, for offenses which might have been committed in his own home. Will the safeguards surrounding accused Americans in this country be found in those trials? Or should we stop and take a long look at these proposals before we accept them as the law of the land?

I am against enactment of State and county and city and town legislation by the United Nations, no matter for what laudable purposes. It violates our legislative processes; it attempts to bypass our structure of government.

As I said before, the Constitution we live under is a wonderful document. It is not a static thing; it is a living, breathing way of life which is flexible enough to keep step with advancement and development of our people, even unto the welfare state or outright totalitarianism. The Constitution provides for changes—provided the people who live under it want changes.

Those of you who read the newspaper I work for will know that we oppose passage of civil rights bills. We oppose them because we think them wrong. But particularly we oppose them because of the manner in which they are being presented.

I think President Truman's FEPC is unconstitutional. But if the people over the Nation want an FEPC, they can get it in a constitutional way.

And that way is to amend the Constitution. Let Mr. Truman have his FEPC passed by the House and Senate as an amendment to the Constitution and then let it be presented to the States for ratification. If three-quarters of the States ratify it, it becomes embodied in the Constitution, and if three-quarters of the States ratify the FEPC, we'll pipe down.

The important decision before us in this Genocide Convention is whether we should not allow the United Nations to write domestic law through international treaties into our State and county laws.

That is the most important question of all.

What is the necessity of electing Representatives to the United States Congress every 2 years if, by action of a President's endorsement, and a two-thirds vote in the Senate, we can derogate or nullify statutes on the books or write new legislation, conceived in the United Nations, decided in the International Court of Justice in The Hague, and enforced in New Orleans?

It is a long step in the path to world government. Do Americans want, or are they ready for, world government?

It may be the only way to peace in the final analysis. But if we embark on that program, the American people ought to know about, and ought to agree to it and not be blindly led into it.

And that is what government by treaty will do, sooner or later. And in the turmoil of compromise, how many of our freedoms and rights will be given up so we can meet upon the common ground of legal, moral, and political mediocrity of so many of the other nations is something no one can foretell. Government by treaty is a dangerous approach, and if we wish to retain our freedom, and maintain our American concept of government, we have got to abandon that approach.

If you are for this approach, why write your Senators and tell them so. But don't tell HÉBERT or BOGGS what you're doing to the House. They might tell you what you're doing to America.

"My First Real Association With Our Great Secretary of Defense Was in the American Legion—To Me He Is the Most Sincere, Honest, and Capable Executive That Can Be Found Any Place in the World—He Has Always Endeavored To Assure Peace Through Armed Strength, Built Within the Capability of the American Economy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the radio, television, and press Monday evening carried news of an address made that day by one of the country's most zealous and capable public officials, a man respected by Democrats and Republicans alike, our hard-working Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Paul Griffith.

Mr. Speaker, I am in hearty agreement with every word that you yourself spoke in that great talk which you made in Texas last Monday.

You and I know that these are political dog days—days when some of those who are among us yap and bark at the heels of their opponents and seemingly would sell their very souls either to gain national publicity or for the benefit of a few dubious votes in their home districts.

As I heretofore stated, the news commentators, press as well as air, in telling of the lucid, factual, and understandable talk made on Korea, emphasized the confidence expressed and strong support which Paul Griffith gave to the work of the Honorable Louis Johnson—in telling of the untold benefits which had been achieved by Louis Johnson in behalf of our national defense.

It was because of the comments which I had heard on Monday night that I contacted the Assistant Secretary's office and asked that they furnish me with a copy of Mr. Griffith's talk and I am gratified indeed that I obtained it.

Mr. Speaker, millions of words have been spoken and written on what has happened and what is happening in Korea—and by some whom we presume to speak informatively and with authority—but I have never seen set down, black on white, such a short, terse, concise, factual, and statistical recitation as to just what it was that gave rise to the presence of our troops in Korea and as to just what had been accomplished by our armed services in these last few weeks against which at times must have seemed unsurmountable odds.

Paul Griffith's address was made on the occasion upon which the American Legion notified Mr. Charles F. Johnson, Jr., nationally known industrialist and philanthropist, citizen and patriot, that he had been awarded the National American Legion Distinguished Service Medal award.

At that ceremony Mr. Griffith spoke in behalf of the national executive committee of the Legion and it was indeed appropriate that in his dual capacity of a past commander of the Legion and a high-ranking official concerned with the Nation's defenses that he should give expression as to the nature of the defense of these United States and, as of this hour both at home and abroad, as well as that time that the troops of the United Nations moved into Korea.

Mr. Speaker, his address was exactly the kind of a talk that you would expect from Paul Griffith. It was fearless, simple, honest, sincere, capable, and marked him well as the trusted public official that he has proven himself to be.

I do not have to tell you, sir, of the tremendous confidence that the great preponderance of the membership of both Houses have in public officials like Paul Griffith and his Defense Chief, Louis Johnson, and that so long as we have men like these in public office I know that our Nation is safe from enemy attack no matter from what quarter our security might be violated.

Mr. Speaker, for some days past we have been hearing some expression of doubt with respect to the adequacy of our defense preparation. I know that it was no accident that Paul Griffith took as his theme for his talk "What Korea Has Taught Us." In that talk, and without fear, he turned the pitiless searchlights of publicity on to the very truth of that subject, and made such a full, candid, and frank statement about the same that all fair, impartial, and judicious minds will continue to afford the moral and political support to our great Secretary of Defense in carrying out the tremendous task that he has in hand.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote but one short paragraph from Mr. Griffith's talk wherein he declared:

> I am proud to be associated at this critical time with our great Secretary of Defense. My first real association with him was in the American Legion, when he was national commander and I was commander of the Department of Pennsylvania. I have been associated with him in many capacities since that time, and I want you to know that he is the most sincere, honest, and capable executive that can be found any place in the world. His plan from the very beginning of his administration has been to assure peace through strength, and he has endeavored to build that strength within the capability of the American economy. He still believes that even in this time of crisis we should not tolerate waste and extravagance. Recently, in his appearance before the Congress, he expressed this idea—and I quote—"this determination to get the maximum return on the defense dollar will continue to govern our activities."

In order that all may have the opportunity to read a great statement on a topic of national interest, made by one great American in which he evaluates another great American who is the driving force in that project, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the speech made by the Honorable Paul Griffith, Assistant Secretary of Defense, at Johnson City, N. Y.

The talk was as follows:

My good friends of Johnson City, I am glad to be back here again. It gives me fresh inspiration to return to this valley of cooperative people. And you are cooperative people. The miracle of industrial relations associated with the name of Endicott-Johnson proves you are cooperative people. I can say this without detracting from the well-known Johnson genius for industrial relationship. I am sure the Johnsons, past and present, would be the first to agree that the relationship existing here between management and employees to the continuing surprise of the industrial world, depends largely upon cooperation.

I likewise am honored by the privilege of participating in your tribute to Mr. Charles F. Johnson, Jr., as the recipient of the national American Legion distinguished service medal award.

On previous visits to Johnson City I came as a representative of the American Legion. It was my privilige to meet Mr. Johnson. I found him an enlightened and unselfish man. I found him more than a stanch advocate of Legion programs for the common welfare. I found him a vigorous worker in their behalf. Indeed, Mr. Johnson has gone still further. He has, in effect, instituted and carried out his own program of cooperation with the American Legion. I am sure you all know how he has spent his own time, energy, and money in behalf of disabled servicemen; that he has sponsored and helped finance the building of three Legion clubhouses; that he has offered training and employment opportunities to returning servicemen and that in a host of other ways has aided the men who have defended this country.

Naturally you are proud that the national executive committee of the American Legion has awarded him its distinguished service medal. So am I. You are here today to let him know that this honor pleases you. I can join you sincerely in saying this world would be a better place to live in if there were more Charles Johnsons here and there.

At any time or on any occasion, I would be happy to be with this vast group of people who have demonstrated that they are cooperative people. But today, I have a special reason for being grateful for this privilege. That is because I have something quite definite and, I believe, quite vital to say about cooperation. I know it will be best understood by you who have demonstrated your willingness and ability to cooperate—you who know the necessity and the value of cooperation.

As you all know, there have been rapid and sinister changes in world affairs in the last 10 weeks. Events have taken place which offer new and more menacing threats to freedom everywhere. They started with an unprovoked Communist attack on the Republic of South Korea the morning of June 24, our time. They continued when the North Korean invaders defied a United Nations demand to withdraw north of the 38th parallel. They took a still graver turn when President Truman thrilled the freedom-loving world by his quick decision to support the United Nations' demand with our Armed Forces.

Since that world-shaking decision we have had every reason to renew our pride and faith in our soldiers, our marines, our airmen, and our sailors. We have had every evidence of their valor and of the soundness of their training.

At the outset of the Korean campaign, troops were desperately needed to slow the invaders of the South Korean Republic. They were so desperately needed that General MacArthur risked committing his forces piecemeal. That was something no commander will ever do if there is any alternative. In this case there was none.

So one battalion of infantry was flown from Japan to South Korea. Our men tumbled

from their planes and engaged the invaders of a free country. This was the beginning of one of the most superb delaying actions in the history of American arms. Our men were reinforced as rapidly as possible. They fought, retired, stood and fought again. Meanwhile the South Koreans put up a terrific and gallant fight. Standing together, the United Nations ground forces—Americans and South Koreans—have accomplished their initial mission. They have prevented South Korea from being overrun in a few days. They have retained the necessary beachhead from which to launch the counteroffensive which eventually will sweep the invading Communists from the territory of free men.

For the men concerned this fight has been as tough as anything Americans have ever tackled. They have stood and fought and died in battles just as fierce, if somewhat less orthodox, than the more celebrated engagements of our history. They have our warmest tribute.

It is sometimes hard to realize that South Korea was invaded only 10 weeks ago. So much has happened in so short a time. Great deeds of valor have been added to our long history of valiant deeds. New sorrows have been mingled with older griefs. New apprehensions throughout the world have been heaped upon older apprehensions.

In fact, so much has happened in so short a time that it has been difficult to follow all these events, understand them all, and give them proper evaluation. In proof of this let me cite the millions upon millions of words which have been written or spoken—often conflicting—to explain what "Korea has taught us." Some of these commentaries have been sane and intelligent. Others have been sad examples of muddled thinking, wide departures from logic, or immature exhibitions of personal dislike. Still others have been nothing more nor less than examples of the great old American game of finding a goat. It's a game that goes like this: in case of tornado, earthquake, flood, prairie fire, infestations of grasshoppers, or armed aggression, quickly find someone to blame. You may elect the political party you don't belong to, or the church you don't attend, your Congressman, or a convenient business rival. Any of these will do.

This game is like neglecting to send for the fire department when your house is burning until you have proved a charge of arson against someone. The worse features of this approach are that you rarely nominate the right victim, and you never solve your problem.

I hope that all of us here today realize that the events of recent weeks have created a situation as grave as any, to say the least, that we have faced in our eventful history. I hope that we all realize, too, that it is a situation that demands the clarity of thought that leads to sane action on the part of all of us.

Now, as in all other fateful times, this situation must be met with unity—unity of thought; unity of action, the unity which multiplies our strength. I am certain that unity and faith in our Government's steps to meet this situation, so greatly needed in times of stress, will be displayed by you men and women who are so familiar with the fruits of unity—or, if you prefer, cooperative action. I am sure that you can be counted upon to inspire the support and confidence of the thousands of others with whom you associate in your ordinary walks of life.

I am sure, too, that you will keep from being engulfed in the whirlpool of confused thinking which so often follows in the wake of fast-moving events of far-reaching importance. This type of thinking leads more often than not to actions or proposals or demands which are unwise if not actually detrimental. It often creates an atmosphere in which many are prone to forget that strength lies in unity; that calm judgment must not be overthrown by hysteria and that tried politics must not be junked for fantastic schemes. It creates an atmosphere in which many forget that faith must be maintained in, and all-out support given to, constituted leadership.

Disunity, ill-considered action, lack of confidence in our Government and its officials, panic—all these are among the conditions and states of mind Communist propagandists have fruitlessly attempted to establish in this country for the past quarter of a century. I want to warn you with all the emphasis at my command that we should guard against creating, ourselves, the very conditions and states of mind the Communists so long have vainly tried to produce by subversive propaganda.

I would like you to join me for a moment or two in a more detailed consideration of recent events so that we can calmly weigh their significance, appraise fairly what we have done about them, and look ahead at what we are preparing to do. To do this, we might start with that somewhat overworked topic, What Korea Has Taught Us, and work out our own impartial conclusions.

One conclusion I would like to state in the words of President Truman. He said, I quote, "The attack upon Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and will now use armed invasion and war. It has defied the orders of the Security Council of the United Nations to preserve international peace and security."

In making it plain beyond a doubt that they are prepared to use armed force to subject free nations, the Communists have resolved a perplexing dilemma; it is a dilemma which has confronted the Department of Defense since its creation; it has confronted the Congress which is constitutionally responsible for the defense of the country, the Commander in Chief, and all the people of the United States.

That dilemma has been, to state it briefly, how much weight should be given to purely military considerations in defense preparedness and how much should be given to economic considerations; or as it was expressed by Chairman GEORGE MAHON in supporting the House Appropriation Committee's recommended military budget for 1950—and I quote—"If war comes soon, we are appropriating too little. If we have miscalculated the dangers, if the threat of war is just a deceptive mirage on the horizon, we are appropriating too much * * *."

By armed aggression, the Communists have resolved the dilemma in favor of military considerations. In view of the actual fighting taking place in Korea, economic considerations have been largely outweighed. As a result, the President has asked for a supplemental appropriation of $11,642,906,000 for the immediate expansion of our Military Establishment. He has asked for an additional $4,000,000,000 for military aid to other free nations.

Of course, some of the requested appropriation is to insure a favorable outcome of the Korean operation. However, the general expansion of our military strength, now rapidly in progress, is in preparation for further acts of armed aggression which the invasion of the Korean Republic indicated may be expected. The President's intention to increase our military strength with considerable rapidity must be regarded as the speeding up of a military policy of strength building which has long been in progress.

Incidentally, I lay no claim to being a prophet. But for the sake of you who may have heard that the strength-building policy of the Department of Defense has not been intentionally flexible—intentionally responsive to current circumstances, I would like to quote a statement I made to an audience many months ago. It goes like this:

"In the Department of Defense we maintain a continuous and unrelenting review of the plans we make and the things we are doing to defend this country. * * * These reviews are the outgrowth of full realization that in this rapidly changing world—rapid in its scientific as well as its political changes—that a good plan or procedure last Tuesday might be more than slightly out of date by next Friday, so to speak."

Before leaving the supplemental budget request, I would like to note that in fiscal 1947, only 6 cents out of every military budget dollar could be spent for tanks, ships, aircraft, weapons, ammunition, and other heavy items. This was due to the burden of liquidation costs of World War II and to heavy overhead. It is worth noting that we were able to use 19.5 cents on the dollar for hardware in the fiscal year that ended in June of this year, in part at least because of a reduction in overhead. About 59 cents out of every dollar asked by the President in the supplemental appropriation will go for this vital hardware.

The appropriation also will provide for a total of 2,100,000 men and women in our Army, Navy and Air Force. In this expansion, the Marines will be increased 90 percent. This money will provide for the calling up of a number of reservists, and the mobilization of needed National Guard units.

It might be well to remember that the appropriations requested are only for the partial mobilization which is deemed advisable at this time by the President and his military advisors. It is easy to see that even partial mobilization will throw a burden upon the country which can be met only through a willingness to sacrifice and a willingness to cooperate.

Returning again to our theme, "What Korea Has Taught Us," I want to draw a second and highly important conclusion. It is that our action in Korea has clearly demonstrated the absolute soundness of the major concepts upon which our military policy has been based since the establishment of the Department of Defense. The truth of this conclusion is too important to our future welfare to let it be obscured by any amount of foggy thinking and lose talking.

These concepts, briefly stated, are:

That we must maintain an armed force in a high state of readiness, prepared to heap dreadful retaliation on any enemy which might attack us.

That we must maintain an armed force capable of quick expansion in time of emergency.

That we must get the greatest amount of defense for every dollar spent.

That unification is a necessary means for achieving these ends.

It is of utmost importance that the public be given a full understanding that these major concepts have been proved sound by the affair in Korea. This understanding is essential inasmuch as it must be the basis of confidence in what already has been done to defend this country, and in the further steps which are now being taken. And it is this calm, studied confidence that will give us the unity we must have.

As to the state of readiness of our forces, let me offer the testimony of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commander of the United Nations forces in Korea. I quote from his message of July 20 to our Commander in Chief:

"I do not believe that history records a comparable operation which excelled the speed and precision with which the Eighth Army, the Far East Air Force, and the Seventh Fleet have been deployed to a distant land for immediate commitment to major operations. It merits the highest commendation for the commanders, staffs and units concerned and attests to their superior training and high state of readiness to meet any eventuality. This finds added emphasis in the fact that the Far East Command, until

the President's great pronouncement to support the epochal action of the United Nations, had no slightest responsibility for the defense of the free Republic of Korea. With the President's decision it assumed a completely new and added mission."

If any further evidence of our state of readiness is needed, we have it from Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the United States Army. I quote from his report to the President after visiting the front:

"Our far eastern forces were organized and equipped primarily to perform peaceful occupation duties in Japan. However, under General MacArthur's magnificent leadership, they have quickly adapted themselves to meet the deliberately planned attack of the North Korean Communist forces, which are well-equipped, well-led, and battle-trained, and which have at times outnumbered our troops by as much as 20 to 1."

In his report to the President, General Collins described the action of our troops as "a splendid tribute to the ability of our Armed Forces to convert quickly from the peaceful duties of occupation to the grim duties of war." The highly skillful fashion in which our garrison troops, with no prior responsibility for the defense of the Republic of Korea, were able to fight this historic delaying action, must be regarded as further tribute to their high state of readiness.

It is true, of course, that nothing about the Korean affair has made it necessary for us to demonstrate our state of readiness to deliver a paralyzing retaliatory blow at any foe who may attack this country. By the same token, there is nothing about the Korean affair to suggest that we cannot deliver such a blow.

Despite this conclusive evidence of our troops' high state of readiness, misunderstanding of the Korean affair still lingers in the public mind. One indication of this is the oft-repeated statement, "we were unprepared for Korea."

It is quite true that we did not have close at hand an armed force of sufficient strength to crush immediately the invasion of South Korea. There is nothing particularly remarkable about this. In fact, it would have been more remarkable if we had. As General MacArthur pointed out, our troops in Japan had no responsibility for the defense of South Korea. Why they were given this emergency assignment which they have so well discharged was made clear by President Truman in his message to the Congress on July 19. I now qoute the President:

"I think it is important that the nature of our military action in Korea be understood. It should be made perfectly clear that the action was undertaken as a matter of basic moral principle. The United States was going to the aid of a nation established and supported by the United Nations and unjustifiably attacked by an aggressor force. Consequently, we were not deterred by the relative immediate superiority of the attacking forces, by the fact that our base of supplies was 5,000 miles away, or by the further fact that we would have to supply our forces through port facilities that are far from satisfactory."

It might be well to observe at this point that stretching diagonally across Asia and Europe for thousands on thousands of miles is a Communist borderland. Along it, inspired acts of armed aggression already have transpired or might be expected at any time the Communists choose. No nation on earth could be prepared to crush quickly any of these actual or potential acts of armed aggression. No single nation could possibly maintain a military establishment strong enough and widely enough dispersed. In the case of Korea, it was fortunate for free nations that the Communists chose as their objective of armed aggression a theater where we had troops close at hand for an entirely different purpose than throwing back armed invaders of a neighboring country. But it must be remembered that whether we had maintained 10 or 100 trained divisions in the United States, our first units would have faced the same necessity of fighting a delaying action until reinforcements could arrive. We are without assurance, too, that maintenance of 100 divisions in continental United States would have deterred the invasion of Korea.

As I said a little while ago, one of the major concepts about which our military policy has been integrated was the need for developing an Armed Force which would be readily and quickly expandable in time of emergency. The proof of our success in this part of our preparedness efforts may be found in the ease with which we have been—for many days now—absorbing new men, individually, and civilian components as units into our forces, and the advanced state of preparedness for procuring additional tanks, aircraft, and other "hardware" needed for our expansion.

It is safe to say that few Americans, if any, doubt the necessity of military expansion at an accelerated rate, regardless of cost. However, it should be a source of pleasure to the taxpayer that the cost in dollars will not be so great as would be the case if we had not, in months past, learned to get the greatest amount of defense for every dollar spent. Indeed, if this emergency had arisen not too long ago, many of the dollars which now can be spent for planes and tanks and guns and ships would have gone into useless overhead. This situation is not accidental. It was brought about by earnest work of Secretary of Defense Johnson.

Incidentally, I am proud to be associated at this critical time with our great Secretary of Defense. My first real association with him was in the American Legion, when he was national commander and I was commander of the Department of Pennsylvania. I have been associated with him in many capacities since that time and I want you to know that he is the most sincere, honest, and capable executive that can be found any place in the world. His plan from the very beginning of his administration has been to assure peace through strength and he has endeavored to build that strength within the capability of the American economy. He still believes that even in this time of crisis we should not tolerate waste and extravagance. Recently in his appearance before the Congress he expressed this idea—and I quote—"this determination to get the maximum return on the defense dollar will continue to govern our activities."

It is possible that many of you here have heard me one time or another advocate the virtues of unification of the Armed Forces. That advocacy no longer is necessary. Unification beyond any previous experience flowered in the Armed Forces with the invasion of Korea.

The action of our land, naval, and air forces under General MacArthur is one example of it. The President's recommendations to the Congress had the complete support and concurrence of all civilian and military leaders in the Defense Department. The benefit of unification in an emergency has been further exemplified by the quick decisions which have been possible in recent weeks to coordinate the combat efforts of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

I'm sure it is apparent that our military policy has been developed around sound concepts; that our Military Establishment has been organized to provide a sound mobilization base in case of war.

Those who recognize these facts will have the firm assurance that never before in time of peace have we been better prepared to defend ourselves. They will have calm assurance that we are moving with a sure, swift tread along the charted path to greater strength. They will readily receive a suggestion I have to make. It is that all of the citizens of the United States become, like the Armed Forces, unified in their determination to support the President's program for greater defense. It is, as he has said, a program by which we hope to avert an all-out war.

Address by Archbishop Cushing to Ancient Order of Hibernians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article from the Boston Pilot of August 5, 1950, concerning an address by his excellency Archbishop Cushing, and containing the text of that address. The address was delivered before the sixty-fifth biennial national convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians on August 3, 1950.

This address by Archbishop Cushing is extremely timely and interesting. The Archbishop has a deep sense of the importance of true Christianity in guiding us through the troubled times in which we find ourselves, and has expressed his thoughts on this subject in a way which I feel sure many of my colleagues will find inspiring.

In his address the archbishop also touched upon several other matters, including the destiny of Ireland, and the so-called Fogarty bill, which denounces the use of Marshall-plan funds to support the Northern Ireland partition government, and with which I believe some of my colleagues may be familiar.

Because of the timeliness and the inspirational quality of Archbishop Cushing's address, I now ask unanimous consent that this article may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYPOCRISY BARS IRELAND FROM UN, CHARGES PRELATE—EXCLUSION OF NATION FROM WORLD ORGANIZATION IS OUTRIGHT FRAUD

Predicting that those of this generation will never again live in a peacetime economy, His Excellency, Archbishop Cushing, addressed the sixty-fifth biennial national convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Auxiliary at a pontificial mass celebrated at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross, marking the opening of the Boston conclave.

Disturbed at the world situation, Archbishop Cushing said: "I do not know whether it will be a cold or bloody war. I cannot forsee. * * * In World War I and in World War II we fought to bring peace to the world. Our expectations have not been fulfilled.

"Paganism is rampant here and elsewhere. In Korea the flower of our manhood is dying in agony."

In lighter vein His Excellency referred to his pilgrimage to Rome and in presenting his impressions of ocean travel quoted from the famous lines from Mr. Dooley. He told the delegates of his plans to continue aboard ship the recitation of the Rosary.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED

Urging the passing of the Fogarty bill, No. 720, which denounces the use of Marshall-plan money to support the Northern Ireland partition government, the resolutions committee submitted proposals which were adopted by the convention.

Among the resolutions passed were those declaring allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and spiritual allegiance to the sovereign pontiff; renewed denunciation of communism not only in Russia and its satellite states but in every place in the world.

The committee warned the State Department of the current danger declaring "the Department seemed to have shown an inclination to support the admission of Communist China into the UN", and reiterated "the terrible consequences which would be sure to result for such a betrayal of Christianity."

MEMORIAL MASS

Rev. Michael J. Houlihan, State chaplain, and pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Watertown, celebrated a mass for deceased members on Wednesday morning at Our Lady of Victories Church, Boston.

Delegates and members of the convention attended a moonlight sail on Wednesday evening. Concluding the sessions was the annual banquet at the Hotel Statler on Thursday evening at which Archbishop Cushing was principal speaker. Serving as toastmaster was Paul E. Tierney and Miss Mary A. Curran was chairman.

ARCHBISHOP'S ADDRESS

His excellency's address follows:

"While I am speaking of prayers, there is another plea that I would like to make to this convention. Last spring at the annual dinner meeting of our Eire Society, a Boston group which has done so much to serve the cultural interests of the Irish everywhere, I spoke of Blessed Oliver Plunket. My remarks were taken up by the Irish press and apparently reproduced wherever there are Irishmen in the world, which means in every corner of the globe. I was particularly pleased to receive a message from the venerable and beloved Primate of All Ireland, the Archbishop of Armagh, who told me that my few words concerning Blessed Plunket had increased the hope that the eventual canonization of the great Irish martyr may be the sooner.

"I certainly rejoice if such be the case. The Archibshop asked me to renew whenever appropriate the plea I made to the Eire Society. I gladly do so at this time.

"IRISH PILGRIMAGE

"Last fall we went to Ireland on a great 'Come Back to Erin' pilgrimage. We visited many beloved spots in the Isle of Saints and Scholars, but none more profoundly moved me than did the modest shrine in great Saint Peter's Church, Drogheda, where the head of Blessed Oliver Plunket is preserved for veneration.

"It is surprising to reflect on how little people outside Ireland appear to appreciate the tremendous stature and historic significance of this great archbishop, patriot, and personality. It would, I think, be most appropriate if the Hibernians would interest itself in the cause of Blessed Plunket.

"My purpose in suggesting such a reawakened interest is not to recall the injustices of the past nor otherwise to inflame partisan or political sentiments in the present. Quite the contrary. It is no longer necessary to rehearse the travesty of justice which was his trial nor the incredible barbarities which accompanied his execution.

"TRUE CHRISTIAN

"My purpose would rather be to present Blessed Oliver Plunket as an outstanding example of what the true Christian should be at all times and as a symbol of the spirit in which the true Irishman seeks the interests of his nation.

"As a Christian, Blessed Plunket was kindly and considerate. He was humble in his great learning. He was assiduous in the fulfillment of the duties of his state in life. He was filled with a holy peace and he saw all events of life in a completely spiritual perspective. Few men in history have accepted injustice and even a brutally unjust death with such magnificent dignity and devout resignation.

"He was a martyr for his faith. So far as we may use the word, he was also a martyr for Ireland. But his love for Ireland, it must be noted, did not make him the enemy of any other land. On the contrary, Blessed Plunket exemplifies the truly Catholic spirit in which differences between nations must always be resolved no matter what the previous history of injustice or of bitterness on either side.

"We in America who have Irish blood in our veins, Irish hearts in our bosoms, whose Christian souls are in bodies with Irish nerves and Irish temperaments, have also much to learn from the Irish example of Blessed Oliver Plunket. We have a lesson to learn from him concerning the spirit of resolute, intrepid blended faith and charity with which we must help America meet her obligations in the international community. The spirit of Blessed Plunket impels us to meditate soberly and prayerfully the wise words with which our Holy Father, the Pope, last week renewed his plea for peaceful methods of settling international disputes so long as such methods are humanly possible.

"WAR FOR PEACE SAKE

"In the spirit of Blessed Plunket we shall continue to abhor war even when it is forced upon us. We shall continue to ask that the arts of peace be employed in the effort to restore or establish order. But we shall not be cowards if traitors at home or abroad compel us instead to practice the science of war. If we be forced to wage war, it will not be war for the sake of that violence which is the Red's objective. It will be war in accordance with the patient principle which alone inspires the Christian when finally he takes up his arms. We go to war, as St. Augustine said, for the sake of peace, to preserve it where it still survives, to restore it where it has been destroyed.

"So, too, we Americans of Irish descent should be guided by the spirit of Blessed Plunket in the sympathetic interest we naturally take in the affairs of old Ireland across the sea.

"SPIRITUAL TIES

"There has never been any question of our dividing civic loyalty between our American fatherland and the motherland of our people. The ties which unite us with Ireland are sentimental and dominantly spiritual. They are entirely consistent with unqualified American patriotism. Our interest in Irish affairs is the interest of kinsmen in the fortunes of their physical and spiritual relatives. It is on the level of affections and prayers, not the level of politics, intrigue, or sabotage. There is no resemblance, for example, between it and the interest of Bundists in the military aspirations of their fatherland. It certainly bears no resemblance whatsoever to the treacherous interest of American fellow-travellers, parlor pinks, and like disloyalists in the affairs of the Soviet. These ladies and gentlemen appear, at least as they reveal themselves in their disloyalty trials or espionage cases, to be thoroughly emancipated from any spiritual values such as constitute the chief tie between the Irish throughout the world and Old Ireland. One finds in them scant trace of the sentiment or the poetry which ties hearts like yours to the lands of your ancestors.

"The love of our people for Hibernia has prompted them to greater, not lesser service to America. Only in song has Ireland ever asked her sons and daughters to "Come Back to Erin." In reality, she has always encouraged them to take their places in the communities which gave them place, retaining for Ireland only the affection of pious hearts and the gratitude of prayerful children.

"MEANING OF RELIGION

"Forty years ago an American writer of our own country as an example of this Irish quality of strengthening with God's grace the land which gives them shelter said: 'This vast continent affords a most striking proof of what religion means to the Irish people. Count the colleges, schools, academies, hospitals, and asylums of charity that have sprung up as if by magic all over the land, and tell me is there anything that speaks more eloquently to the heart than the faith that inspired such unselfish devotion. Religion as a name is useless; it is only precious for what it enables us to be and to do. It is religion that has made the Irish people what they are. It has made them just toward others, lovers of order and progress, firm in the support of just authority, and courageous in resistance to lawless tyranny. No state can thrive without such virtuous citizens, and no country can be hopelessly lost that has the happiness of possessing them.'

"What Ireland's inspiration has brought into American national life, it once brought into the universal life of Christendom. Every scholar knows the part the land of our fathers played in the Dark Ages, when once before the unity of Europe had crumbled under the attack of barbarians and the new glorious unity that was medieval Christendom was being forged by Christian apostles, so many of them Irish by birth. It may well be that once again holy Ireland is destined to play a civilizing and spiritualizing role in our divided and distraught international community, a role like to that which she played centuries ago.

"DESTINY OF IRELAND

"In this connection I recall a prophetic word uttered with regard to the Irish people. Nearly 300 years ago a papal nuncio sent to Ireland by the Pope wrote back to Rome these words: 'Ireland may yet become an outwork of the faith to Europe and its herald to America.' Ladies and gentlemen, you are living in days which have seen this prophecy on the verge of fulfillment. Ireland has become an outwork of the faith to Europe, has been and is its herald to America. The Irish people, wherever they may be, are the champions of Christianity in a world menaced by Asiatic communism; they are foremost among those who, in the Old World and the New, are unswervingly committed to the traditions of western civilization and Catholic Christianity which once gave origin, meaning and purpose to our democracy and which can once again guarantee democracy's survival.

"The enemies of faith and freedom, of democracy and Christianity, well know the devotion of the Irish people to the basic principles of western civilization. That explains their desire to embarrass Ireland whenever possible, to keep Ireland out of the councils of the world, to 'veto' her admittance to international organizations. By such action Ireland's critics pay tribute to her integrity and reveal the malice of their own designs. By their action they confirm our conviction that Ireland, today as of yore, is the champion of light against darkness, of the things of the spirit against those of the flesh.

"INTERNATIONAL CRIME

"It seems profoundly significant, as well as bitterly ironic, that we should have read in the newspapers the other day an announcement concerning a group of volunteers from the Republic of Ireland, a republic excluded from the United Nations, who expressed their desire to fight by the side of American troops under the American flag, the United Nations, or any flag in beating back the Red raiders on Korea—while the same newspapers reported to us the devices and dodges by which nations high in the Councils of the United Nation still seek to avoid their responsibility in helping overcome the violence instigated by the Red regime whose representative is to preside over the deliberations of the United Nations Council this month—and whose representatives consistently and successfully object to the admittance into the United Nations of a genuine democracy, a duly constituted republic, and a Christian nation like Ireland.

"There is no point in attempting to understand the hypocrisy which debars Ireland from her proper place in the international community. I reaffirm my long standing conviction that such action bears witness both to Ireland's integrity and to the fraudulent purposes of nations which unite in outlawing the Irish Republic, while making common cause with the Red regimes in Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, and the Soviet Republics subject to Moscow. The exclusion of Ireland from international organization is a fraud, a fraud which, as events are proving, will redound enormously to Ireland's good name.

"So, too, our sympathetic interest in the fate of our kinsmen impels us to brand as a further fraud the reasons alleged for the continued partition of Ireland. The reasons offered are familiar. I need not rehearse them. Their wording changes according as the hypocrites who profit from the division shift their line to meet the exposure of their fraudulence.

"No one will ever be able to understand why Americans, whose President gave the highest and most authoritative expression to the principle of national self-determination, should be so slow to speak up in behalf of Ireland's national self-determination. No one will ever be able to understand why Americans, who talk so much about the necessity for religious tolerance, should espouse in effect the cause of the Orangemen who hold religious tolerance in unconcealed contempt as against the cause of the Irish whose undeniable record of religious tolerance is by all odds the fairest record of any nation in our day, our own not excepted. There is no Irish Catholic equivalent of the Ku Klux Klan, not even in reprisal. There is no Irish equivalent of the Orangemen nor of organizations like Protestants and others united.

"REPORT OF MINISTERS

"Last week I read in a news magazine a report filed by a group of protestant ministers concerning what they were pleased to call 'violations of religious freedom' in carefully selected areas of the world. I later read that some of their own leaders, lay and clerical, had repudiated the report for the specious 'phoney' that it is. But, nonetheless it is typical of the kind of talk heard whenever one asks why a world so sensitive to discrimination elsewhere is so silent concerning the unparalleled discrimination by which an Irish minority in Ulster is virtually disenfranchised, while the overwhelming majority of the Irish people are denied self-determination of their own nation by the Orange minority in the six counties.

"The fraudulent report of the ministers speaks of Ireland as one place where religious liberty is allegedly denied. For one wild moment it looked as if a truthful phrase had blossomed by chance in their report and that the ministers were referring to northern Ireland, where religious persecution, coupled with economic and social discrimination on a strictly religious basis, has been and is the normal state of affairs.

"But no. Come to find out, the report referred to the Irish Republic—and the protestant government in Ulster was given a clean bill of health.

"Seumas MacManus said the final word on this hypocrisy over 30 years ago when he wrote: 'While such an idea as a Catholic mayor for protestant Derry and protestant Belfast is laughably absurd, such Catholic cities as Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Kilkenny, often honor protestant citizens by making them their first magistrates. And while the idea of a Catholic member of parliament sitting for any of the protestant counties of the northeast is ludicrously laughable, purely Catholic counties in both north and south frequently elect protestants to represent them in parliament.

" 'And finally, and above all, be it remembered that almost every man whom the Irish Catholics chose as their national leader from the days of Robert Emmet to the days of Charles Stuart Parnell, has been Protestant.'

"There is bigotry in Ireland—bigotry of the most intolerant, most rampant, type—but it is almost entirely confined to non-Catholics of the Brito-Irish part of the population.

"The recent report of the ministers reminds us again of the old couplet:

" 'Forgiveness to the injured doth belong,
They ne'er forgive who do the wrong.'

"FRAUDULENT ARGUMENTS

"The other arguments advanced in favor of partition are equally fraudulent. Only a hypocrite would present them; only a fool would believe them. This is so much the case, that I cannot believe partition can endure unless hypocrisy and folly are forever to gain the day. When common sense, common decency, and the voice of Christian conscience are again heard in international affairs, sheer logic will put an end to the farce of partition. No violent words need be spoken; no rebel shot need be fired; no involved diplomatic formulas need be devised or invoked.

"That is why the defenders of partition are the only ones who are talking wildly these days. Our kinsmen, the Irish, are presenting the case against partition with reasoned dignity and Christian calm. The railing, the rudeness, and the vulgarity are all on the other side. Witness the bad-mannered, ill-considered attack of the Christian Science Monitor, for example, on the pronouncement here in Boston and elsewhere of His Excellency, the recently appointed Ambassador of Ireland to the United States. The Monitor departed from its customary pose of impartial objectivity in an attempt to render absurd the statesman-like declaration of Mr. Hearne concerning the determination of the Irish people to achieve their national unity and their determination to achieve it without violence.

" 'National unity is the chief aim of the Irish people,' the ambassador said. 'The whole soil of Ireland is the property and domain of the whole Irish people of today.

" 'Those who will tell you it is a complicated problem and plead for a division are as false as the woman who wanted to solve the problem of ownership of a little child in King Solomon's day by cutting it into two pieces.

" 'We want unity, but we also want peace. We are determined to achieve unity without a civil war.'

"UNITED IRELAND

"That is statesmanlike talk. What is more important, it is also sensible talk. Their kinsmen in America and the lovers of justice everywhere will wish the Irish every blessing in their effort to fulfill the legitimate aspirations of their nation within the framework of a policy inspired by a love for peace and a determination to preserve it.

"So, I express the hope of you all that our generation will see Ireland one day united. The end of partition will bring a breath of hope to enslaved nations everywhere. The moral resistance to partition already sustains such hope: They who struggle for freedom are already free.

"We who love America are naturally interested in the land which taught our people how and why and with what passion we must love this land of liberty. We who know the joy of living in a united Nation—one Nation under God—one Nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all—are under a special obligation to be sympathetic with the aspirations of Old Ireland.

"God bless America. Erin Go bragh. God bless Ireland."

The Statehood Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "The Statehood Bills," published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATEHOOD BILLS

President Truman is right in pressing upon the Senate the urgency of the bills granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. This is obviously the psychological time for their passage. This action would put us in a stronger position in the Pacific when we need all the strength we can muster. It would be, in a very real sense, a closing of our ranks.

The support for these measures, both congressional and public, is widespread. They were adopted in the House by large majorities. It is believed that they can win overwhelming Senate approval if the Democratic policy committee permits them to come to the floor. The reasons for adoption are many and sound. The ground for delay at this point is flimsy and may possibly be unworthy.

It has been suggested that a long Senate debate might be precipitated at a time when some legislators are eager to get home to make political hay. This is not a valid excuse for sidetracking legislation that the country wants and that a majority of the Congress is ready to approve. Behind this suggestion of protracted debate is the more sinister thesis that the long objection will come from a small group of Democrats who fear that legislative representatives of Hawaii and Alaska would support the civil-rights phases of the Truman program. It is certainly no display of statecraft to impede the legislation for Hawaii and Alaska in order to pander to the prejudices of a minority.

The President's appeal should be heeded. The measures should be brought out and adopted before any adjournment.

People Being Blamed in Newest Alibi for Failure in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record straight for the sake of posterity and for the historians, I submit the two following articles, one by David Lawrence and the other by Dorothy Thompson, both of which are excellent articles giving facts which people should not forget:

PEOPLE BEING BLAMED IN NEWEST ALIBI FOR FAILURE IN KOREA—WAVE OF CRITICISM RISES AS TRUMAN REFUSES TO SHAKE UP TOP COMMAND

(By David Lawrence)

There's a new alibi around here—it seems that now the American people are to blame for the failures in Korea. Nobody in Washington presumably had any responsibility—it was just the failure of the people to let Washington spend more money.

This type of argument assumes that the military men in our top command must forget their duty as military advisers and be swerved by political considerations and public opinion's desires about spending. Evidently they must not speak up and tell the country what is really needed for military defense and safety.

But the people will not be fooled by these alibis. They are insistent that something be done about the blunders—no tanks, no aircraft carriers, no marines, no tactical aviation in the Far East when trouble came. The bitterness of feeling against the President is growing. Letters from different parts of the country show that his recent refusal to shake up the top command and the civilians who bungled the job is turning a wave of new criticism against him.

ORDER ISSUED IN 1946

The President's responsibility will be a subject of wide discussion. For it was his Executive order issued in 1946—and reiterated regularly since—which has squelched the military men below the top group of political generals and prevented them from speaking their minds.

The Executive memorandum was referred to in a speech in the House of Representatives on April 5, 1950, by Representative VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, whose courageous demand for an investigation last year brought out a record of facts that tells the story of why there has been failure in Korea. The President's order, dated November 15, 1946, was addressed to the Director of the Budget. It has been the basic policy of his administration ever since. It reads in part:

"I cannot condone the practice of seizing upon any opportunity which presents itself to indicate an opinion, either directly or indirectly, that my estimates are insufficient.

"When you notify the heads of the various departments and agencies of the amounts to be included in the 1948 budget for their activities, I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress."

This created a "yes-man" psychology. Any military man who differed conscientiously and tried to offer an expert opinion was called an insurrectionist. Admiral Denfeld was removed as an example. A rereading of the testimony in those House hearings last year tells what is wrong today. The President picked the wrong advisers—and still keeps them.

When the Navy's battleship *Missouri* ran aground, a fine naval officer was court martialed and his career ruined—but that's the inexorable rule of the Navy.

NOBODY COURT-MARTIALED

Today, when the United States Army is without proper air support for ground troops in Korea or anywhere else, nobody is court martialed.

Today, when the United States Navy has most of its aircraft carriers in mothballs and the Marine Corps has been cut to pieces by the combined votes of General Bradley and General Vandenberg in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, neither the President nor Congress has taken the generals to task.

Only last fall the Marine Corps was fighting for its life—against dismemberment by Generals Bradley and Vandenberg. But the Marine Corps managed somehow, with the help of Congress, to keep some of its integrated combat teams, with their own airplanes. And here is the payoff as told in a dispatch this week from a United Press correspondent at the Korean battlefront:

"The smash down the coast was the acid test for close air support. Two units—one Army, one marines—of the same comparative size jumped off at the same point at the same time against similar enemy concentrations in identical terrain.

"The marines, with close air support, moved 27 miles in 4 days with light casualties. The Army, which had just the usual air coverage, bogged down after suffering heavy casualties."

That's the tragic story of the colossal blunder made by a majority of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff in depriving the United States Army of its own air-support units.

There is too much politics in Washington or else there would be some heads removed, both civilian and military. Softness and political thinking have no place in a wartime setup, as lives are being sacrified. It may take more indignation from the people before they get the changes they want.

FAR EAST ALREADY LOST TO AMERICA BY FAILURE TO CHANGE FOREIGN POLICY

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Those of us who believe that the American foreign policy is utterly reckless and leading us straight into catastrophe are effectively disfranchised. There is only one party, and it is a war party. There is no patriotic leadership that challenges the course on which we have embarked, or has the brains or the courage to chart another.

The present course is to offer ourselves as the policeman of the world, to enforce, by the sacrifice of American lives and fortune, the court orders (as it were) of United Nations countries who will not or cannot themselves fight to enforce them, and to put down aggression wherever it may raise its ugly head, in whatever corner of the globe.

The law against aggression, which Mr. Truman, the generals, and the majority of Republicans have committed us to police is now law. There is not even a definition of aggression in the United Nations Charter. There is no impartial judgment to which it can be referred. The judges include the charged aggressors or their partisans. There is no international police force to execute judgment, nor is any nation required to commit its own forces.

ARENA FOR POWER POLITICS

The United Nations, divided into two factions, sharing no common notions of civilization, law, or order, is, as an institution to enforce peace, pure fiction. It is, in fact, an arena for the great game of power politics. Stalin and company, who know this, use it for what it is and play the game supremely well, while our vacant-minded leaders appoint the American people to be the Galahads of the world, to liberate all victims of aggression—whether they want to be liberated or not. Since the process, once the initial aggression has succeeded, involves the wholesale destruction of the countries and inhabitants to be liberated, enthusiasm is notably lacking. That is the lesson of Korea.

The Russian game is to fight for nobody except Russians. It is to use the armies of its allies to fight Russia's enemies, under the conditions Russia picks.

Now, I submit that if the United States irrevocably commits herself to fighting for all who won't or can't fight for themselves, while Russia pours into the fray only her allies' resources while reserving her own, there can be but one outcome. The final phase of the conflict will find the West utterly exhausted, its forces dispersed, and unable to defend itself on its own ground.

WAR WE CANNOT WIN

Stalin's game is to involve this country in war with China. It is a war we cannot win, morally, politically, or militarily.

We cannot win it morally because no Asiatic trusts the foreign devil, no matter what banner he carries.

We cannot win it politically, because we have not one ally in Asia—having already done our best to extirpate all western influences and sympathetic powers. A policy which commands the British to get out of India and the Dutch out of Indonesia, and then decides to support the French in Indochina—who desperately need their troops to defend France in France; which refuses to support Chiang in China, and then decides to support him in Formosa; and which totally disarms Japan and then decides to defend it, is not a policy. It is a tale told by an idiot. Nehru's recent bitter words about both Russia and America were spoken by a true Asiatic.

We cannot win a war involving China militarily. If there is any general who can tell us how to accomplish what Asiatic Japan could not, or how to overcome by any sort of super-duper weapon the numerical superiority of half a billion Asiatics, fighting on familiar terrain, highly trained in guerrilla tactics and utterly careless of death; or how to blockade a land mass with interior sources of supply that reach from the Yellow Sea to the Elbe in Europe, let that genius arise and tell us how.

We have already lost Asia, chiefly by the great nationalist revolts that the last war let loose, aided by our own past policies.

It is a loss we can acknowledge and sustain.

For Stalin has not yet won Asia. He wants us to win it for him, by a war with China, which will force China into servitude to Russia.

The Lure of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Mrs. Nina DeCamp Cheatham of Pullman, Wash.:

THE LURE OF SOCIALISM

Today socialism is considered a greater menace to our Government than communism. We have been able to put our fingers

on the latter but socialism works through such unsuspected channels, that we are often thrown off guard by its apparent innocent and well meaning mode of action. Working through the unions, industry, professions, churches, and educational institutions it has wormed its way into the very heart of the Government.

The definition for socialism is "the transformation of private, competitive capital into public cooperative capital." Communism stands for public ownership of all wealth. Socialists argue that wealth is absorbed by capital but was created by labor; however, wealth is not shared with labor. For that reason they advocate economic planning, which is to benefit the worker primarily against exploitation. In reality economic planning is a process that squeezes the very lifeblood from the workingman and leaves him crushed under the weight of taxation and limitations of living.

The word "socialism" has meant little to most of us in the United States until recent years. We felt it was no concern of ours that Russia had a totalitarian form of government, where her people were subjected to a tyrannical dictatorship ever since Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin cast black shadows of despair over an already suffering nation. Could we help it if Stalin cracked the whip over Russia's millions of people? Could we help it if the half starved people struggled through a 5-year plan on black bread and cabbage. What could we do about it if they submitted to more years of self-sacrifice and absolute poverty so that Russian economy might be built up for the good of the party?

Until recently we, in the security of our homes here in a democratic country, had little conception of the deplorable living conditions of the worker in Russia—the worker for whom the socialist regime claims it has modeled its government.

Today we know Russian working men and women (women are a big factor in the regimentation of labor) are exploited. They toil but they profit not. So closely are the results of labor calculated that the worker receives barely enough to keep body and soul together. The Government absorbs all the profits.

If the people of the United States were allowed—yes; I say allowed—to spend a month traveling through Russia's industrial and agricultural centers, and allowed, and I mean allowed, to have frank answers to their questions concerning the management of business, the idea of socialism as our form of government here in the United States would be quickly stamped out. They would thank God they could return to their own homes, not government owned; they could buy what and wherever they wished; they could hold jobs of their own choice and leave it if they so desired; their bank account would not be subject to government grab; the large part of their produce not taken by the government; their factories were not told what to produce, how much, and where to sell it; they have freedom from search and seizure; freedom of speech and the right to vote; and freedom of worship.

I speak of Russia because that country is the most classic example of socialism, socialism plus totalitarianism, where all industries are nationalized under government control. Since communism is one step beyond socialism, it takes just one such man as Stalin, Hitler, or Mussolini to become a dictator, who is not content with the suppression of his own people, but works for world domination and enslavement.

The struggle of Russians for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is tragic. They are born to live and die for the glory of their Government. Their liberty is restricted by severe Government rules enforced by the secret police. As for the pursuit of happiness, there is, for instance, the parade of the happy workers where all the men and women in factories and industries march for 5 and 6 hours, losing a day's pay if they do not participate. There are beautiful parks, but no one can sit or walk on the grass. Along the walks in the park are benches where they may sit if they have time for such relaxation.

Russians can enjoy one gratifying thing, and that is the low cost of dying. Do you know that it costs only $1 for cremation in that God-forsaken land? They have something on us there. Then, too, human ashes take very little space. In a country where slave labor, political purges, and half-fed workers exist, the death toll runs high. Why waste wood for coffins, labor for burial, and ground for bones?

Let us now consider England, the next important socialistic state, but it is better to go back into history to get a more accurate picture of the growth of socialism in a monarchial form of government. Fabian socialism originated in England in 1884, and though patterned somewhat after that of Russia, it differed in many ways in that it did not believe in the overthrow of the government by force. It did not believe in nationalization of all industry. The plan was to spread its teachings not by force but by gradual persuasion, so as not to startle a confused people by the sudden introduction of new ideologies. Included in its membership were Ramsay MacDonald, Bernard Shaw, and Sidney and Beatrice Webb, all believing in the fantasy of a heaven on earth.

The Fabian Socialist plan was as follows:

1. To train workers, leaders, writers, and speakers to promote socialism.
2. To plan a welfare state.
3. To abstain from total state ownership of industry and land.
4. To have state ownership of electric power, railroads, basic metals, transportation, and banks.
5. The state was to plan and supervise certain economic affairs left in private ownership.
6. Labor unions were to be under government control.
7. The British Labor Party was to be formed.
8. They were to cooperate with the Liberal Party while strengthening their own power.
9. Schools, writers, and clergymen were to be the sounding boards of public opinion, spreading the socialistic doctrine.

In 1905 the Labor Party, with the labor unions behind it, put its best foot forward when Lloyd George, of the Liberal Party, became the leader in the British Government. England at that time was a leader among strong nations and was at the highest peak of her power in commerce, industry, and manufacturing. That with the wealth pouring into her coffers from her rich colonies in every hemisphere had made England a powerful nation whose mighty fleet was queen of the seas.

The Labor Party was strong enough at this time to dictate as they were now represented in Parliament. They promised political aid to the Liberal Party if the latter would cooperate in putting through legislation advocated by the Labor Party. Thus the Socialist, or the Labor Party, got a strong foothold in the Government.

The Socialist or Labor Party, as it was now known, was represented in Parliament by 1914 and was instrumental in bringing about reforms, which caused the people to turn to it for further aid. By 1918 the Labor Party was strong enough to oppose the Liberal Party. In 1923 Ramsay MacDonald, the Socialist, became England's premier. He was a dreamer of a utopian form of government and did not consider in his plans the weakness of human nature and what evil power and greed can accomplish. During his term of office the Socialists were able to accomplish part of their program of benefits for the laboring class.

In the article, Ramsay MacDonald Socialism, by Edward P. Bell, there is set forth MacDonald's ideas on socialism. Here are a few: "Socialism is an enemy of poverty. It holds that not charity, but social reconstruction, is the reply for poverty." Again, "Socialism is the very antithesis of tyranny." "Socialists want to conserve capital—they want it better used so that income may be better distributed. They want it made servant and not master." "We regard every man first as a man and second as an economic factor." "Socialism is based on the gospels."

How have these ideas worked out? Have these ideologies been carried out successfully in England? Is there not compulsion of labor there? Has not socialism reduced the people to abject poverty through high taxation and high cost of living? Has the Government not absorbed much of capital and private enterprise, and taken land from farmers who do not produce according to Government specifications? I could go on and on showing socialism in England has failed.

Ramsay MacDonald was the first Socialist to hold this office and was elected by the labor vote and the vote of the Liberalists. The stage was at last set for action. The Labor Party had a free hand to carry out many of their socialistic ideas. You will find that the Labor Party catered to the laboring class wherein the party owed its strength. Among the many benefits brought about by the Socialists were the abolition of overtime, an 8-hour workday, a health program, pensions, care of widows and orphans, and social security.

As the power behind the throne changed from one party to another, the Labor Party still held its strangle hold over legislation in Parliament. Eventually the people found that the Government had control of railroads, steel, and coal. Billions of pounds had been spent for social-welfare benefits and when the Second World War came England was unprepared. Her economy had been destroyed by the excessive spending, many of her important colonies were slipping away from her control and her commerce practically ruined. At this time Winston Churchill was made Premier. Owing to his great executive ability and an indomintable will, he guided his ship of state through the most disastrous war in history and made a safe landing. England was in great need when this war ended. Bombed-out factories, public buildings, and millions of homes, meant still greater sacrifices on the part of the people, for these had to be restored. High taxes took half of the workers wages and living costs were exorbitant. The long-suffering people became restless and lost faith in Churchill's conservative plan of rebuilding England's broken economy brought on by two world wars. Through all this upheaval you will find the Socialist Party had never ceased to keep its pot of socialistic propaganda boiling—to paint England red.

In desperation the laboring class turned a deaf ear to the plea of Churchill, and when he called for an election in 1945, the Socialist (Labor Party) won by a great majority and Maj. Clement Attlee became Prime Minister. English people had grasped at straws to keep afloat in a chaotic world, but these straws were socialistic flotsam, and the working class are drifting into a condition of servitude.

Today England wears the yoke of socialism. The party has climbed to the highest rung of the political ladder. With a majority of seats in Parliament, it has been able to nationalize 75 percent of all industry and their goal is to eventually put the rest of the nation's economy under government ownership. Free enterprise is gradually being absorbed by the government, because of strict control by the government and high taxation.

Yes, let me repeat. Socialism is at the height of its power in England, and today

the people groan under the weight of this planned economic system. But I should call it a mere semblance of power, for underneath the pinnacle of apparent success, the British Empire in all its old glory has melted away, and all that is left is a mere shell which at any moment may cave in and destroy both the builders of that pinnacle of false ideologies, and the people who have been worshiping and groveling before it.

The Labor Party has from its beginning brought trouble and grief to the English people, spending the country's wealth on what it calls social welfare and taxing the people to death to pay for being taken care of, and what care do they get.

England has tried socialism at its worst and best and it has proved a fantastic dream. If man was made in the image of God, it does not follow that man's mind reflects that of his Maker. We are given the power to think good or evil and act accordingly. There is too much inherent weakness in human nature. It is not fitting that a few men suffering from the disease of socialism should dictate the destiny of God's people. England is licking her wounds caused by such practices. Do we, a freedom-loving Nation, wish to try her experiment?

Russia, a socialist nation, has set fire to the world with its propaganda and evil deeds. Scarcely a country has not been scorched by her firebrands. A shooting war is in progress in Korea, Communist inspired. American blood is spilling on foreign soil. In the satellite states of Russia the people have become restless under the spiked prod of Russian appointed officials. Germany is seething in discontent in spite of the stupendous amount of money, food, and clothing given them by the United States.

Here are some interesting experiences in socialism. New Zealand tried out socialism in all its ramifications and gave it up as a bad job, after 14 years' struggle. Australia had a fling at socialism and after more than 30 years, socialism had to give up the ghost. Australia had had enough. During that time the government had nationalized the Trans-Australian Airways, competing with the privately owned concerns. In spite of all the political skuldevilry, the government-owned airlane was a complete failure though it was free of taxes and given special gasoline rights. It tried shipping at a loss of $30,000,000,000. The telephone system was under government control, but the cost to the people was so high that few could afford them. Strikes were frequent and the production of coal dropped 6.5 percent while other countries showed a 50-percent gain. It is said that Australia will have to import millions of tons of coal for home consumption.

ECONOMIC PLANNING

The system of economic planning as used in England is the one Socialists would thrust upon us. It is very similar to the Russian plan. Listen to a few of the ideas outlined by the Economic Planning Committee. Do they appeal to you as a way of life? Would you junk our present form of government for their plan that could scuttle our whole national economy? Would you allow our Constitution of the United States to be endangered by a lot of zealots whose ideologies have bankruped Europe?

This is part of the socialistic scheme. For all kinds of industry, farms, factories, shops, and mines, the economic planners decide the production quotas; priorities and quotas of raw materials; it fixes buying and selling prices; it sets labor quotas and wages; it decides who is to receive credit at banks; it determines what industries shall be nationalized (government owned) and what shall be privately owned but under state planning and supervision. To top all this there would be nationalization of railroads, water and electric power, radio, television, cable and mines.

Under this system in England the following are nationalized: Cable and wireless, civil aviation, transportatoin, railroads, buses, cargo transports, and inland waterways, coal mines, electric and gas industry, banks and medical service. According to statistics many of these are running in the red.

With all these controls, the English lack many necessities of life and housing is very inadequate. Could Americans thrive and be happy on 1½ eggs per week, 3 ounces of butter, 6 ounces of margarine, 1 ounce of lard, 1 ounce of cheese, 1 ounce of bacon, 8 ounces of sugar, 6 ounces of meat, 2 ounces of corn beef (which was later changed to 17 oz.) 2 quarts of milk per week? It could happen to us.

England is bankrupt today and she cannot care for her people. With the United States pouring into her hands billions of dollars each year, she is still unable to pay off her huge national debt, or the interest thereof.

As wages have increased for the workingman, so have prices of commodities increased. The worker is in the same predicament as the Italian client who replied to his lawyer when asked what he did for a living. He replied, "I digga da ditch to getta da mon to buya da food to getta da strength to digga da ditch." How true he was!

English people have become restless under the strain of taxation, high cost of living, poor housing, and inadequate medical care. The Government decided now to call a halt to any further nationalization because of this unrest and dissatisfaction.

Sir Stafford Cripps had said, "Our objective is to carry through a planned economy without compulsion of labor."

How would Socialists explain The Control of Engagements Act? It was passed to force all men from the ages of 18 to 50 and all women between the ages of 18 to 40 to work at such jobs as ordered or jobs necessary to further the economics of the country. Punishment was to be meted out for lack of cooperation.

At the dedication of the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., Harold Stassen said "The philosophy of 'let the Government do it' can lead to the downfall of the American way of life."

This is another case of economic planning. The Spence Act would give the President unlimited power to use as he saw fit in certain emergencies. Anyone could see that it may lead to dictatorship.

Then the Brannan Act, too, fits into the Socialist scheme. It advocates subsidies on farm commodities to keep up prices for the farmer. The Government sets prices on certain crops to hold up prices for the farmer. The farmer receives the difference between the Government-set price and the selling price of his crop. The taxes we, the consumers, pay to the Government helps take care of that difference.

Allan B. Kline writes in Collier's magazine May 13, 1950, "The course being charted for us by the Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan, would beeline the farmers of this country in the direction of stabilized poverty." Mr. Kline is president of the American Farm Bureau Federation and represents 1,409,000 United States farm families. He says the answer is high production, reasonable prices, and increasing efficiency in farm production. It has been estimated that this system runs the Government into debt from five to ten billion dollars a year on extra taxes. Housewives struggle with high-priced second rate potatoes while the Government burns or lets rot the cream of the season's crop.

There is scarcely a day passes but what some article appears in magazines and newspapers condemning the Brannan act. These articles are written by men who have the interest of the people at heart and who know where this system will lead our Nation.

Little by little Socialists are trying to push our President to the wall to get legislative measures passed to increase their power. To many the TVA smacks soundly of socialism. The people of Idaho, Montana, Washington, and Oregon are taking a strong stand against Government control of the Columbia Basin Administration, which, with the TVA, would give the Government control of most of the water and electric power of the United States.

In our country we find socialistic and communistic infiltration into Government, industry, religion, educational institutions, the press, and radio. It has reached such dangerous proportions that we have been at last rudely awakened to the Red peril has grown like noxious weeds.

You ask, "What do the Socialists want?" You may as well say everything. They plan to have Government ownership of railroads. transportation of all kinds, banking, radio, press, telephone, television, and industry. Could such things happen in the United States?

Perhaps it is not well known by the public that two officials in the Bonneville Dam Administration are Socialists. Dr. Paul J. Raver has been administrater in the Bonneville Power Administration since 1939. Dr. Carl D. Thompson, formerly research director of the Socialist Party, is also on the staff. Raven represents the Government in the Columbia power pool. His goal is for a program to promote public ownership and acquisition of public utilities. This would be a Government monopoly under the supervision of three men who must conform to the President's orders. This power would give control over all natural resources which would cover land, forests, soil conservation, irrigation, and water rights. So vast would be their powers that they could be at liberty to buy and sell real estate and private utilities to whom they chose, designate the acreage of farms and control lumbering, fishing, and mining.

Socialists are working tooth and nail to put the Columbia Valley Administration bill 1645 through Congress. This would institute a Government monopoly, monopolistic in character, which would be out of the control of the State government of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana. These Northwestern States are also fighting this bill tooth and nail. Some people will be wearing false plates when this controversy is settled and it won't be the valiant citizens of the Columbia Valley. It smacks too loudly of a welfare state such as Russia and England are now enjoying.

THE DEPRESSION AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE

In 1933 depression struck the United States and we were practically a welfare state, in that the Government had to provide for the needy and unemployed. The WPA was set up to aid jobless men and women, the NYA for jobless youths, the CCC camps gave employment for thousands of young men, money was loaned to farmers, practically all the banks were in dire distress and were given assistance by the Government, and last, but not least, the old-age pension was instituted.

Socialists laughed up their sleeves, thinking that capitalism had at last met the fate of Humpty Dumpty who sat on the wall. They thought capitalism could not rise again. They saw no smoke belching from huge factory chimneys in the United States, the railroad service cut down to a minimum for the lack of freight and passengers, crowds of workingmen swarming the streets looking for any kind of a job.

But by 1938 we were on the way to progress again. The dinner-bucket brigades marched to the factories and railroads, eager to work once more. Industry was humming again. While locomotive whistles screeched and bells rang, loaded freight cars pounded

over the miles of tracks from coast to coast, carrying the wherewithal that keeps the heart of the Nation beating. We, a competitive, captalistic nation, were succeeding. We, a capitalistic nation, are now feeding and clothing millions of people on foreign soil who have been reduced to poverty by Socialist ideologies.

In order to beat the depression in Germany, they tried to solve the problem with militarism which absorbed 600,000 men. Factories were set in motion making military supplies and ammunition. German economics were in such a deplorable condition that later Hitler found excellent germinating ground for his devilish schemes of world domination.

Russia's planned economy was operated by the state, while Italy's was taken over by the state and by private owners, the latter under state control. This system later led to dictatorship in each country. Russia only of the two has survived under dictatorship, and then simply because of her army of secret police and spy system. The threat of death is held over each citizen of Soviet Russia for any infraction of the laws. The reason Russia has made the progress she has is because most of her great projects, such as railroads, highways, canals, and mines, are built and operated by prison labor and men and women in concentration camps. The state is out only a little food, because their labor works on starvation diet and without pay. With this cheap manpower—for in Russia life is worth nothing—she has built up her economy. The building of her great projects could be compared to the building of the Great Wall of China. They were built at the expense of human life for the gratification and glorification of inhuman dictators.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Among many of the socialist program failures is the national health program, according to statistics. Listen to this. In 1948 prescriptions were given out by United States doctors at an average of 250 to 100 people, while in England there were 400 prescriptions to 100 people. When you consider that we have three times as many citizens as England, the comparison is unbelievable. It is understood that 14 cents is charged for each prescription while the government foots the rest of the bill.

Rev. Frederick K. Belton, of Lewiston, Idaho, who spent some time in England, has said in an address at Pullman, Wash., that people got prescriptions for aspirin instead of going to a drug store and paying 25 cents for a bottle. The doctors in England are so busy attending patients who complain of minor ailments that they have little time for urgent cases. Doctors have to work late at night to do their book work for they have no time during the day for this. You have all read of how the English hospitals are overcrowded with patients, many with simple ailments, while the hospital beds are desperately needed for serious cases.

Our answer to socialized medicine is that there are organizations in the United States for health insurance. By paying a certain amount each month from the pay envelope, hospital or medical care, or both, are taken care of and, in case of death, the benefits go to the bereaved. In the Reader's Digest, April 1950, Mr. Stassen said, "Congress should create a Federal Health Reinsurance Corporation which should provide that any local Blue Cross or similar plan that meets certain minimum requirements can join by paying 2 percent of its annual premiums. The Government to pay the first $50,000,000 to start the corporation in business and then the funds paid in annually by local Blue Cross plans." He suggested a fixed scale of charges by doctors to prevent padding of bills, and that 12 calls a year be allowed for each patient registering in the plan.

Remember this, dear friends, if you were to have socialized medicine here in the United States, you would pay plenty for it out of high taxation just as they do in England. You would receive poor service in overcrowded hospitals and by overworked doctors and nurses. It has failed in England; it will here.

CAPITALISM AS IT IS TODAY

Capitalism began away back in early history when wandering tribes settled in favorable locations to form communities. Gradually agriculture was developed and sheep raising became an important industry as were handicraft and weaving, fruit raising and shipping. The Crusades were influential in building up civilization owing to new ideas brought back by pilgrims to be used in their communities. Gradually people saw the advantage of concentration in one industry. It would bring them wealth by barter. As God gave to some men a greater capacity for planning and management, they became prosperous, while other men barely made a living and others starved. Those are the conditions that exist today. What right have we to say to a successful businessman, "You have much; I have little. You must share the results of your toil with me"? We each have the right to toil and if we are poor managers or not diligent, whose fault is it that we are hungry or poorly clothed?

With the use of machinery, steam, electric power, and mechandized transportation, employment has been given to millions of workers, and wealth to capitalists. Labor in general is less tedious and more can be accomplished with less physical and mental strain. The living conditions of the average worker are good, and through unions and Government rules, the worker is protected as to hours, wages, and overtime. Of the many advantages to be had by the people of this Nation are the public libraries, night schools, sports, theaters, and clubs. And last but not least, privately owned cars. With vacation on pay, the worker is at liberty to spend that precious time as he pleases without Government permits.

There are conditions that could be remedied in the capitalist system. The Socialists say that labor produces wealth, but receives only small wages as compared to the wealth accrued by the capitalist. Many industries and business concerns pay a bonus under certain conditions of service. Some pay dividends to their employees. These are answers to the question and would encourage workers to use more effort and skill since they themselves would profit thereby.

Working under socialism, people lack initiative because they have to work when and where and at what the government orders them. They are not free to come and go or change jobs as they please. Under government control (or government planning) the industries, railroads, socialized medicine, etc., are run at a great loss. The workers must pay higher prices on everything to make up for government deficits. In England this is the condition that now exists.

Besides, who would do this controlling and regulating? If there is political corruption in government management today, what would happen under socialism? According to the socialist platform, there can be only one political party, namely, the Socialist or Labor Party. That is giving too much power to one group. Two or more political parties tend to keep politics on an even keel; one balances the other and keeps corruption down, for one exposes the fallacies of the other. Workers under capitalism work for advancement and higher pay by maintenance of discipline and doing conscientious work. For fear of penalties and loss of job, they give their best efforts to their work.

Competitive capitalism and free enterprise is what makes the wheels of industry turn. It is the urge for accomplishment. Only because of capitalism has invention and science made such rapid strides. Men were free to think and act, to find better methods to make better products. Had it not been for free enterprise and capitalism we might well be still living in the stone age. Socialists fight capitalism and free enterprise. Why? Can they not see that nations have attained greatness and power because of free men's right to act for themselves? Are we going to end by being another Russia or a small part of Russia's domination.

PREACHERS IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

According to statistics there are 149,354 church congregations with a membership of 27,000,000 people. Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam is chairman of the Federal Council of Churches. Be that as it may, he has been accused of communism. He has acted in various capacities in Communist meetings and his connection with a notorious magazine that lashes at churchmen and churches opposed to communism adds a stigma to this name.

Another famous preacher representing the Federal Council has remarked that, "The Kingdom of God is a land organized according to the ideas of Karl Marx." He gives a biased opinion of Russia making Russia appear to be an ideal place where everybody is happy, which we of America know is a downright falsehood. Mr. Jones makes the rounds of the many churches in his charge spreading his gospel of the "Kingdom of God" at the expense of the churches. He believes in God with communism included. He is quoted as saying, "Russia has got hold of a higher principle—cooperation, and it is working out in higher results than we can work out of a lower competition."

In Sunday school papers such as "The Classmate" and "Lessons for the Intermediate," socialistic articles have been printed for instance "The Story of Stalin" and Socialized Medicine."

Seeing danger ahead, a group of clergymen have organized into the American Council of Christian Churches, the president being Dr. W. O. Garman of Wilkinsburg, Pa. This organization includes 15 Protestant denominations and has a membership of 1,500,000: this includes members of Protestant churches in the United States affiliated in this council.

In 1918 a World Council of Churches was organized at Amsterdam. Bishop Oxnam was made one of its presidents to represent the Western Hemisphere. While the Western Council of Churches was being organized, the International Council of Christian Churches was founded in Amsterdam which represented 29 Protestant Church denominations in 29 countries. The Rev. Carl McIntire was chosen chairman. It is to be hoped that the International Council of Christian Churches will be able to counteract the influence of an organization which steals about contaminating the minds of our youth and undermining our belief in the Constitution of the United States, under the guise of holy men.

Are church members conscious of the fact that socialism is quietly spreading its ideologies by means of preachers wearing sheep's clothing? Do they realize that the teachings of God are being camoflaged in high sounding terms, leading the people on to be sacrificed later at the altar of servitude and corruption? God made this old world for all people. There is plenty of room for all. Through the wonders of nature and science He has provided for all clothing, food, and shelter, if we do our share in developing, producing, and building. There is an old adage that should be drummed into our heads: "The Lord helps those who help themselves." There would be less poverty, less suffering. There would be no need for socialism.

HOW TO FIGHT SOCIALISM

There are many ways to wage war against socialism, some of which are: the lowering of

the cost of living, more and better housing, lowering taxes, less Government spending, trade schools for our youth, lowering cost of medical care, better management of the Veteran's Administration, adequate schools and teachers, encouragement of home ownership through lowered taxes, reforestation, and the conservation of land.

One great trouble is that too many men are looking for white-collar jobs. What the world needs is more builders than pencil pushers and office chair polishers, if you know what I mean. Since a man pays one-third of his salary each year to the Government in taxes, etc., according to Herbert Hoover, something is rotten, not in Denmark, but in the United States Government management.

The average family cannot build up a bank account. The cost of living is all out of proportion to wages. If people were content to live in horse hovels, we could save for emergencies and old age. But we, the people of America, have high ideals, ambitions, and love of freedom. It is our heritage that we should live as an enlightened race of people who have built up a wonderful nation by brain and brawn. We refuse to allow foreign dogmas and ideologies to beat us down to their level. We have the right to vote. It is through this power and the belief that right is might that we will come out triumphant through all the traps and snares the Socialists and all their kin have set for us, to destroy our freedom.

War has absorbed much of our national wealth. We have spent billions to help build up the economies of war-ravished European countries, also China, Japan, and Korea. Not only money has been spent, but millions of American lives, to end war. But with Communists and Socialists stirring up restless, half starved, homeless, jobless people, we seem to be pouring our wealth into foreign sieves. These nations turn a listening ear to siren voices, singing soft inducive music to the Ulysses, who seek a more pleasant way of life, in the end to be dashed against the rocks, unless they stop up their ears and turn away from the glittering promises of socialism.

The President and the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to the President and the Marine Corps, written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of September 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—MERGER OF MARINE CORPS WITH ARMY STILL SEEN AS INTENTION OF PRESIDENT

(By Constantine Brown)

The marines are amazed to find out that according to President Truman they are nothing more than the Navy's "police force and have a propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's."

Such were Mr. Truman's startling observations, made in a letter dated August 29 to Representative MCDONOUGH, Republican, of California.

This explosion by the President was prompted by a letter the Californian wrote suggesting respectfully to him that the Marine Corps be recognized, on the basis of its present services and those during the last 180 years, as a major branch of the American Armed Forces and that it have its own representation in the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

DEEDS BEST PROPAGANDA

The wartime record of the marines needs no publicity. The Leathernecks' deeds are their best propaganda. Before World War II they were pitched in wherever there was a tight spot and where ready fighters were needed. But it was during World War II that they made themselves a corps of special fighters.

Throughout the campaign in the Pacific the reorganized Marine Corps became the most important element in amphibious warfare. Its vital importance was recognized by General MacArthur, who is not a marine. When the Korean war started the commander of all American forces in the Far East cabled almost daily asking for marines as soon as they could be made available. Unfortunately, only a skeleton division was available on the west coast, but it was rushed to the Korean battlefield.

Because of the importance of the Marines, particularly in the far-eastern campaign, the President himself agreed that the corps should be made twice as large as the budget provided for this fiscal year and next.

During the "peace years" which followed VJ-day, the Marine Corps was reduced to a nominal force and there was a definite drive on the part of the Navy's sister services to abolish it altogether. This would have been done by now if the administration had not been compelled to take into account public opinion, which was strongly in favor of our elite corps. It is this factor which unquestionably was in Mr. Truman's mind when he stated that "they (the marines) have a propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's."

Mr. Truman may have intended to be facetious in his letter to the California Congressman. But even so after he and all the rest of the civilized world has denounced Stalin's propaganda as the most vicious, subversive and utterly dishonest in history, his remarks about the Marine Corps are, to say the least, in poor taste and cast unfortunate reflections on a body of men who are fighting and dying on the Korean battlefield as gallantly as any American fighting men.

AMBIGUOUS SENTENCE

Moreover, Mr. Truman's statement—coming at a time when the Marine Corps is being greatly expanded because their fighting role has been fully recognized by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Congress and the President himself—contains one ambiguous sentence.

"Nobody desires," Mr. Truman wrote, "to belittle the efforts of the Marine Corps, but when the Marine Corps goes into the Army it works with and for the Army, and that is the way it should be."

Nobody is quite clear as to what Mr. Truman meant by the words "when the Marine Corps goes into the Army." The Marine brigade now in Korea is, of course, fighting side by side with the Army in the same way as some naval units act as "artillery" for the Army when they bombard North Korea positions. But this does not means that the Navy "goes into the Army."

The battles in Korea are being fought by all the component parts of American Armed Forces, without jealousy and without rivalry. All of them—Ground, Air, and Naval Forces—are putting their shoulders to the wheel for the common good of the country. They are all fighting for the United States and not for a particular branch of the services.

Hence, Mr. Truman's ambiguous sentence is interpreted by many to mean that he still intends, sometime in the distance future when hostilities are ended, to put through the plan, advocated last year, for merging the Marine Corps with the Army.

Mr. Truman asserted once more his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief. After stating that the Marines are no more than the Navy's police force—which strictly interpreted means that they should be used as shore patrols—he added "and as long as I am President that is what it will remain." These will be highly discouraging words for the proud Marines on the Korean battlefield.

Placing the Blame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride whenever I refer to any of my colleagues from Kentucky because Kentucky has, with one exception, a membership in this House composed of real men. In this instance I wish to place in the RECORD for those who read the RECORD an editorial carried in the September 5, 1950, issue of the Lexington Herald, of Lexington, Ky., which was written by THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD, of the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky, which district for the last 24 years, with the exception of one term, has been represented by the now distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the Honorable VIRGIL CHAPMAN. This congressional district is known as the old Ashland district which was represented by the Clays and the Breckinridges, and in comparison with these great statesmen, in my opinion, the district is now represented by a man of equal stature in TOM UNDERWOOD.

The article follows:

PLACING THE BLAME

An effort is being made at the present time to place the blame for the war in Korea and the difficulties that have been incurred by the Armed Forces of the United States upon any American official who can be singled out. No apology is offered here for any of the policies that have been ineffective. Mistakes have been made.

It was a mistake to withdraw the Army from Korea a year ago. It was a mistake not to go head and build a naval aircraft carrier that had been strted. It was a mistake not to have a more complete program of military training. The effort is now being made to prepare a bill for compulsory military training.

It must be borne in mind that the weaknesses of a year ago made it impossible for some of the boys who had already signed up and wanted military training to continue it. However, in blaming Mr. Truman, Dean Acheson, Louis Johnson, General MacArthur, and others, we must bear in mind that they are all top Government officials. The man who is really to blame for the present war in Korea is Joseph Stalin. Soviet Russia has accepted a form of government and political and atheistic beliefs that are absolutely untenable in this country.

Russia is at war against our security and against everything that the people of the United States believe. There is, therefore, some excuse for the mistakes that have been

made that were sincere bad guesses that were made in honest good faith on our side.

Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson is being roundly criticized for taking the steps that were taken by the Hoover Commission and approved and in effect launched under the direction of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report has shown how the steps taken were those recommended by the Hoover Commission. Some of the reductions that were made were a part of the plan for unification of the armed services. Also some of the steps that were taken in cutting down on the defense program and on both military and economic aid for Korea were the result of delays in passing necessary legislation and appropriations.

It is regrettable that a division has arisen between President Truman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur as evidenced by the recall of the statement from General MacArthur to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Washington columnists are today saying that Secretary of State Dean Acheson has aged 10 years, is trying to resign, and they are comparing the situation in which he finds himself with that of the late James Forrestal.

The same columnists are now going back to dig up the statements Forrestal made just before he killed himself and saying he was absolutely right in his predictions about Russia's preparations and the threat of war. In Japan high officials and military leaders who made mistakes developed the fine art of hara-kiri, but it is hoped that the persecution of public men will not persist in this country to the extent that there will seem to remain "only one way out" for those who have attained the highest offices.

Of course, we may be able to make scapegoats out of Louis Johnson, Dean Acheson, General MacArthur, and others, but we had better save a few top generals, admirals, and diplomats, whether we like them or not, because we may need them before the crisis is over.

Mr. Speaker, the truth and the clarity of this editorial which I have read, to me expresses the thoughts into words that I have been thinking for some 2 or 3 weeks. May I ask each Member of this House a question which he himself may answer, and that is, Who would I appoint to fill the places of Johnson and Acheson should I have the power of appointment? When President Truman made these appointments the Senate confirmed them, Johnson unanimously, Acheson 83 to 6. At the time the Senate confirmed these men they were considered to be qualified and men of high caliber.

After they have undergone the slander and the abuse, if you were President, what would your action be? There are things in the President's life that I wish to call to your attention today, and to me these incidents are such that I, for one, admire him. When Thomas Jefferson Pendergast died no one had ever claimed that Harry Truman had anything to do with the cause of Pendergast's conviction, but Pendergast had been Harry Truman's friend, and Harry Truman had the loyalty of a friend and he did the last thing that we can do for a friend—that is to attend his funeral, giving evidence to the world of our loyalty and friendship. When President Roosevelt died and Vice President Truman was notified of the President's death his first words of humility were, "Why could not it have been me?" When notified on Wednesday morning, November 2, 1948, of his definite election, certainly we can all remember the statement he made: "There will be no eating of crow, but we will all work together for peace." On September 7 he walked into the convention hall of the Marines after he had in the letter to General Cates apologized for his "mistaken choice of language." He went to the rostrum—your President and my President—a mere man just like you and just like me. He acknowledged his mistake and said:

When I faced the decision of supporting the United Nations or backing out and surrendering you know what the decision was because I do not think any other way. I hope this organization will support the President of the United States in his effort to secure the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, believe in the President, and especially in the President as a man of humility, and I, for one, believe that there is some way that we all can get together and work with the President of the United States in bringing peace to the world. And if there is the most infinitesimal part that I might give in my small and unworthy way, I pray each night to an understanding God that I be allowed that part to give.

Small Business in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New Republic, August 7, 1950. The article deals with the Small Defense Plants Corporation Act of 1950—H. R. 9243—which was introduced in the House by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. This is a vital piece of legislation deserving of immediate attention by the Congress. Its basic purpose is to utilize fully the productive facilities of small-business men in the defense effort. It is also designed to enable the small-business men—the backbone of our free competitive economy—to survive this period of voluntary allocations and exemptions from the antitrust laws.

SMALL BUSINESS IN THE WAR

As an integral part of President Truman's "partial mobilization" of our manpower, a Small Defense Plants Act of 1950 has been introduced, patterned along the lines of the Smaller War Plants Corporation set up during the last war. In 1940, when World War II defense efforts got under way, it became clear that larger corporations were building up the resources of their own companies with little concern about making full use of the facilities of small business. Between 1940–42 many small business plants lay idle, and the small-business man watched his markets vanish, his supply of materials dry up, and his labor drift away to other plants. The Smaller War Plants Corporation established in 1942 served to keep small business alive as well as to marshal the resources of the country.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, and Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, co-authors of the Small Defense Plants Act, want to prevent a repetition of 1940, when growinlg scarcities of basic materials and their control by large corporations rapidly resulted in (1) the elimination of many small businesses and (2) the subjecting of many others to the dictates of big-business primary contractors. "Today a similar need exists for special legislation," Senator SPARKMAN said, "to insure that small business will have a fair share of available supplies—for defense and essential civilian production—and a fair and equitable system of subcontracting in those cases in which primary contracts are awarded to large concerns."

SPARKMAN points out that there is already a dangerous trend revealed in the plan to grant private industry "exemption from the antitrust laws" in order to permit the voluntary allocation by industry of scarce materials. Small business will suffer under a plan of "voluntary allocation" if big business is allowed to continue its present authority to decide who will get supplies, how much one can secure, and at what prices. Harry Blythe, Munitions Board adviser and chief of industrial mobilization planning, has already advised small-business men "to establish contacts with larger companies immediately with a view toward obtaining subcontracts on Government work" (the New York Times, July 22, 1950).

"A critical problem of partial or complete mobilization arises in the abnormal demands for the basic commodities—such as steel, copper, lead, zinc, aluminum, and chemicals—for use in processing and fabrication," Senator SPARKMAN points out. "The experience of World War II indicated that when basic supplies become scarce large corporations proceed to embark on their own programs of allocation. Ample supplies are channeled to their own subsidiaries, while supplies sold to independents—for civilians and defense uses—are sharply curtailed."

Representative PATMAN, who was one of the creators of the World War II Smaller War Plants Corporation, emphasized that its passage came late, after we had mobilized a large part of our economic and industrial resources. "The present proposal for a Small Defense Plants Corporation is needed to supplement and coordinate the small-business segment of our economy with the Defense Production Act of 1950 now under consideration by Congress," PATMAN said. It is in complete accord with the aims of the act which states: "It is the sense of the Congress that small-business enterprises be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of this act."

PATMAN believes that any plan of mobilization which does not utilize the capacities and skills of small business is incomplete, negligent, and dangerous. "Decentralization and diversification must be based on small-business participation and, therefore, must be made while we have the choice," he said.

The proposed Small Defense Plants Corporation would have authority to make loans and provide credit to small-business concerns and to perform certain special functions relating to procurement and other matters. The Corporation would have a revolving fund of $500,000,000 to carry out its operations which include: loans to finance plant construction or expansion, the purchase of land, equipment, and supplies, entering contracts with the Government for the purpose of furnishing equipment or materials, and arranging such contracts by letting subcontracts to small-business concerns.

Upon introducing the measure last week, SPARKMAN and PATMAN issued a joint statement warning that "Free enterprise and

economic vigor depend upon the maintenance of small-business opportunity. Let us not make the mistake of losing democracy at home while winning the battle against a foreign aggressor. Competition and free enterprise are at the heart of a democratic economic system. Small business is the vital element without which that system cannot function."

Can We Have Freedom Without Justice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of the Members recall with affection one of our former Congressmen, the Honorable J. H. Hoeppel. Mr. Hoeppel is now the editor of a magazine entitled "National Defense." I am pleased to include with my remarks the following article that appeared in that magazine concerning certain discriminations against the aged and disabled retired enlisted men of the armed services, and which was brought to my attention by our former colleague. Included also is a copy of the letter Mr. Hoeppel wrote to the New York Times:

Mr. HANSON W. BALDWIN,
New York Times, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BALDWIN: Your article in today's Los Angeles Times on the subject of universal military training is an American he-man's presentation of self-evident facts, which the average American should approve.

With a continuous experience with the military since 1898, (when I first enlisted) and with over 23 years experience with this periodical, I can definitely say you hit the bull's-eye when you discussed our lowered morale, due to weakness in training, discipline and will to fight.

Your reference to volunteers is also 100 percent perfect. The volunteer who gives the most, however, is the most neglected of veterans.

Please read the enclosed paper, to see how men who have given the most to our Government in combat, are actually now receiving the least. In addition, the present breed of political highbrass has no interest or regard for the men who gave their all in the yesteryears.

Officers who have so little concern for the aged and disabled retired men, never can, and never will, inspire the fighting instinct in today's inductees.

With thanks for your consideration, I am,
Your well-wisher,
J. H. HOEPPEL,
Manager.

CAN WE HAVE FREEDOM WITHOUT JUSTICE?

We respectfully appeal to the Members of Congress and to the editors of American newspapers to read the true statement of facts which are presented in this periodical showing the injustices and discriminations perpetrated against the aged and disabled retired enlisted men of the armed services, virtually all of whom today are 70 and more years of age.

We print on this page a picture of Maj. Samuel Woodfill, who is a veteran of the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II. Because he showed unusual heroism and ability, he was placed on the retired list at a higher rank than the rank at which he retired after 30 years' service—including credit for double time.

Because Comrade Woodfill on account of extraordinary heroism and accomplishment in battle was promoted after retirement, he and approximately 1,000 other aged and disabled former retired enlisted men are denied longevity for their double time at the higher rank they now hold.

Other men served in the ranks as enlisted men side by side with Comrade Woodfill and thus gained double-time credit for retirement, all such enlisted men who never held rank higher than the rank at which they retired—all of them receive longevity pay on the retired list for their double time.

We merely present Major Woodfill as indicative of our group. There are also quite a number of other men who were advanced to commissioned rank because of bravery in combat—they all, like Comrade Woodfill, were double-crossed when Congress, at the behest of the War Department, enacted into law Public Law 351—Eighty-first Congress without authorizing these men "on parity with other men having double time" to receive retired pay for the double time they gained fighting our Nation's battles in Cuba, China, and the Philippines.

SERGEANTS ALSO PENALIZED

There are quite a number of sergeants (enlisted men) who were promoted to the grade of first sergeant on the battlefield because of bravery and extraordinary accomplishments. When these men returned to the United States after World War I (because of the reduction of the Armed Forces at that time), many of them were, through no fault of their own, reduced from the grade of first sergeant (the first grade enlisted man) to the grade of sergeant (the fourth grade enlisted man) and they were therefore forced to retire in such lower grade. If they agree to continue to receive pay as fourth grade enlisted men, then finance officers will pay them longevity pay for their double time. If, however, they choose to receive the retired pay of a first sergeant (the first grade) then the finance officers of the armed services refuse to recognize their double time or to pay them longevity pay for this double time.

The Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the effects of the boxcar shortage upon the small-grain harvest of Montana and neighboring States are becoming more serious daily. Millions of bushels of grain are now piled on the ground in the Northwest. More is being harvested every day. Elevators are blocked, and from every section of the State of Montana we are hearing reports of hundreds of thousands of bushels of grain piled in the open.

We have been blessed this year with a bountiful harvest. We cannot afford to lose it through lack of proper handling. The Association of American Railroads assures me that it has been doing everything possible to get cars to the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, and other northwestern railroads, but it is apparent that this effort is not sufficient. Drastic steps must be taken to divert cars into this area, and at once. I hope that a better solution will be worked out immediately, while there is still time to save the situation.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of a telegram on this subject received today. I have had similar statements from elevator operators in my State.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1950.

Col. J. M. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.:

Dismal picture of hundreds of locked elevators and grain harvest being piled on ground throughout territory was reviewed today in committee meeting. Record shows persistent failure of AAR and ICC efforts to date to build up shockingly low percentages of ownership of boxcars on lines serving Minnesota, Dakotas, and Montana. Somehow it must be brought home that this situation cannot be met without special treatment over other areas because you are dealing with perishable items. As for example flaxseed which simply cannot be put on ground even temporarily or in any ordinary bin and which will have no place to go unless elevators are unblocked. Departure of Canadian cars empty leaves territory in desperate shape and if ever drastic action were justified taking cars away from someone else to give to grain farmers this is the time. Everyone in Northwest including growers, elevators, railroads, and Government agencies agreed the time for talk is past and the occasion for immediate and drastic action is now. Everyone understands the reasons for the trouble and all the background, but the need now is to get some cars to move this harvest. What are you willing to try to do?

NORTHWEST GRAIN TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE,
A. C. REMELE, *Chairman.*

United Nations Should Decide Formosa Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that someday all disputes which may lead to war will be submitted to the United Nations for final settlement.

If we allow ourselves to be drawn into another world conflict, in which atomic and hydrogen bombs are used, civilization is doomed.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the McClatchy newspapers of Fresno, Modesto, and Sacramento, Calif., of September 1, 1950, in which the editor asks that the Formosa problem be submitted to the United Nations. In taking this position the McClatchy newspapers are joined by another highly respected newspaper the Christian Science Monitor. Mr. Speaker, I commend these newspapers for their correct and forthright

position on this important matter in the interest of world peace:

FORMOSA PROBLEM IS ONE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

Secretary of State Dean Acheson told a news conference in Washington Wednesday that the United States, by word and action, is doing her utmost to keep the Chinese Communists on the side lines in the Korean war.

But the very fact the Secretary made this statement with such a show of earnestness indicates the possibility of some startling development ere peace is restored in the Orient.

And who would be the certain gainer should the United States find herself engaged in a death struggle with the hordes of the Chinese Reds?

The roars of gleeful laughter in Moscow could be heard clear around the world.

Yet a clear-sighted realism tells us it is not the Korean war whose sparks might light the fires of a Sino-American conflict, but Formosa.

Even the anything but alarmist and always strongly anti-Communist Christian Science Monitor felt compelled to say editorially last Saturday:

"No American can view the Formosa situation with complacency. The American position there is irregular enough to provide devastating Russian propaganda. It is unneutral enough to risk the animosity of China's millions if not actual war with them."

And what American in his right senses wants any such thing to happen?

The Monitor joins Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and several other prominent Americans in urging that the whole Formosa problem forthwith and immediately be turned over to the United Nations—that the United Nations take the full responsibility for the solution of its involved and controverted status.

Settlement of the Formosa controversy on an international level through the UN conceivably could remove the danger of the Chinese Communists jumping into the Korean war on the pretext that the United States had violated China's territorial rights in Formosa.

Surely, if Korean peace is a United Nations responsibility that of Formosa is much more so because Formosa poses the threat of a conflict beside which that in Korea would be just a mild limbering up exercise.

Below the Belt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Post on September 7, 1950:

BELOW THE BELT

Another mean and shabby hoax in the McCarthy manner has been perpetrated on the Senate of the United States. The author—or at least the instrument—on this occasion was Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas. His target was the Secretary of the Interior. His method—made painfully familiar by Senator MCCARTHY—was to distort wholly innocent acts and impute to them disloyal motives. Fortunately Secretary Chapman will have an opportunity this morning in his appearance before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to show the absurdity of Mr. SCHOEPPEL's allegations. We have no doubt that he will do so with complete credit to himself.

The most sensational portion of Mr. SCHOEPPEL's speech in the Senate on Tuesday was an assertion that Secretary Chapman struck out the loyalty affidavit section of the oath of office when he became Under Secretary of the Interior Department on March 27, 1946. The Senator implied plainly that this represented on Mr. Chapman's part an attempt to conceal subversive affiliations. Of course, it represented nothing of the kind. It is common practice when high officials are sworn into office in the Government to mark the occasion with a ceremony attended by friends and well-wishers. To keep the ceremony from becoming tedious, it is customary to read only the first paragraph of the long affidavit—the portion containing the standard oath of office—and to omit the involved legal language dealing with advocacy of overthrow of the Government by force or violence. In Mr. Chapman's case, the oath was administered by the late Supreme Court Justice Wiley Rutledge; and because, for the simple sake of brevity, he read only the first paragraph, the balance of the affidavit was struck out by a clerk.

If Senator SCHOEPPEL was not familiar with this practice, he could have learned about it—and discovered for himself the simple and innocent explanation of the stricken paragraphs—by calling the Secretary of the Interior on the telephone and asking him a question. The plain fact is that Mr. Chapman, who has served the Interior Department in several capacities for a good many years, has on file there three separate affidavits in which the paragraphs stricken at the time of the formal swearing in ceremony of 1946 are included. Thus his loyalty to the United States is fully attested by oath. It is attested also by a long record of honorable and devoted public service.

Reds Threaten To Liquidate 700,000 Christians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, with the question as to seating representatives of the Chinese Communist Government in the United Nations coming up for decision next week, it is imperative that the Members of the Congress, our Delegate to the UN, and our people generally be fully informed as to the type of government which is seeking the official endorsement of our own country and the other members of the United Nations.

For this reason I would call to the attention of my colleagues an article from Lake Success in the Catholic Standard and Times, Philadelphia, Friday, September 1, concerning a memorandum sent by the Republic of Korea to each of the 57 member nations concerning what it believes to be the "imminent danger" of mass murder facing some 700,000 Christians in South Korean territory but held by the North Korean Communists.

I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS READY TO LIQUIDATE 700,000 KOREAN CHRISTIANS

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., August 25.—The Republic of Korea has sent a memorandum to each of the 57 nation-members of the United Nations, alerting them of the "imminent danger" of mass murder facing some 700,000 Christians in South Korean territory now held by the North Korean Communists.

The memorandum appealed to the governments to ratify the United Nations genocide pact, which would outlaw as an international crime the extermination of racial, religious, and national groups. In the United States the pact is awaiting action by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The South Korean Government contends that the Communist invaders will try, and already are trying, to liquidate some 400,000 Protestants and 300,000 Catholics in the Red-held areas. The memorandum says the Christians have been singled out because they are impliedly opposed to rule by Moscow and because many of the South Korean leaders are Christians. The memorandum also states that the Seoul government was prepared to ratify the genocide pact but was prevented from doing so by the Communist invasion.

Resolution Adopted by Thirty-second Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that the American Legion convention, meeting in Alexandria, Va., on August 19, 1950, adopted a resolution favoring House bill 9099, which I had introduced to allow physicians or dentists to make written statements in support of a veteran's claim for benefits under VA rules and regulations without requiring that the doctor's signature be notarized.

This practice of requiring the signatures to be notarized has caused considerable delay and certainly a great inconvenience to our busy doctors and it would be of considerable benefit to the veteran to be able to get these reports on the doctor's letterhead without requiring the doctor stop his work and find a notary public to witness his signature.

The resolution adopted by the Department of Virginia will be submitted to the national convention to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., and it is my hope that we will eventually be successful in enacting into law the provisions of H. R. 9099. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the resolution

adopted by the American Legion Convention, Department of Virginia:

Whereas a hardship has been experienced by veterans and dependents in obtaining notaized statements from doctors and hospitals; and

Whereas this requirement on presumptive cases by the Veterans' Administration is believed to be the only place in the Federal Government where notarized statements are necessary in establishing proof; and

Whereas House bill 9099 has been introduced, instructing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs not to require that a written statement signed by a physician or dentist be made under oath when submitted for the purpose of establishing an individual's eligibility for any law administered by the Administrator: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Thirty-second Convention of the American Legion, Department of Virginia, go on record as endorsing H. R. 9099; and that this resolution be submitted by the department of Virginia to the national convention held in Los Angeles, Calif., and request that the national convention of the American Legion endorse our action.

I Am Grateful to My Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have just emerged from one of the most savage primary fights in history.

It is a matter of record that as great power as ever to be marshaled for the purpose of crushing a people's Representative was brought to bear against me last August 22.

While the alibi Als have been busy telling the people of my district why it was that they did not win, and have devoted acres of newspaper columns to their excuses, I have remained silent.

In view of these pathetic pantings, however, I feel the time has now come for me to break the silence, and clear the air.

My victory in the Republican primary was due to just one factor. My friends rallied around me as never before. They fought the people's enemies and they became aroused over the terrific campaign of falsehoods and innuendoes thrown about by irresponsibles.

I am grateful to my friends. I am grateful to the Republican committee men and women—and there were many of them—who refused to be turned against me even in the face of threats of retaliation in some cases.

I am grateful to the rank and file of our Republican voters who felt that an incumbency of six terms of productive representation in the interest of all the Americans of my district merited more than a slap-down.

I am grateful to the Townsend organization in my section which dared the wrath of the mighty in their struggle to keep me in Congress. The Townsendites furnished me haven and sanctuary on the platforms of each club in the Triple Cities, from which I could launch the counterattacks that won the victory.

Especially am I grateful to several Townsend leaders who ran a battering ram and effective interference for me when I was beset with a host of designing enemies.

The national Townsend representative from New York State, Mr. Merlin Casterlin, who served as my campaign manager, is personally attributed with keeping a powerful Member of Congress out of my district by his excellent and well-timed attack on this man in my defense. Thus, such formidable opposition was relegated to the sidelines and rendered impotent.

Though the Trojans were numerous, I am happy to say our friends overpowered them and the victory, which the professionals considered impossible, came to our side.

My thanks again to so many loyal, hardworking, devoted, and courageous companions. I have no intention of relinquishing any of them and will start building anew for any and all threats of 1952.

Are Ex-Service Men Subject to Draft?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, inquiries from ex-service men are coming into congressional offices asking whether under present law they are subject to be drafted again. This is a question that is worrying hundreds of thousands of young men who served in World War II and who are now just beginning to establish themselves in civilian and family life.

In view of the Korean war, the uncertainties of the war situation, and especially as to whether Uncle Sam by his action in Korea has already started world war III, the question is a serious one and should be given a direct, definite answer. The following facts secured from Selective Service sources and from the War Department indicate that the question is a major headache for both Selective Service and the War Department:

First. Under present policy, formulated but never officially promulgated, those GI's who saw at least 12 months of active duty in World War II need have no worry over the possibility of being recalled to duty—barring, of course, total mobilization for another world-wide conflagration.

Second. The 1940 Selective Service Act, as amended, provided that all enlisted men when discharged were to be placed in a special reserve, subject to recall at any time within 10 years, if needed. This provision has never been repealed, and is therefore still in force.

Third. The 1948 Selective Service Act provided that ex-service men with at least 12 months active service in World War II are exempt from the draft. It also provides that ex-service men who joined the National Guard or signed up for the Reserves are exempt from the draft. But both the National Guard and the Reserve units are subject to call, and some have already been recalled.

Fourth. In order to avoid confusion over the status of the two Selective Service Acts, we must keep in mind that any new act of Congress supersedes an earlier act. Where their provisions conflict, the conflicting provisions of the earlier act are nullified. But where the provisions of the earlier act do not conflict with the provisions of the later act, they remain in force unless specifically repealed by the later act. Since the 1948 Selective Service Act did not specifically repeal the act of 1940, the provisions of both acts—where they do not conflict—are present law and available to the President.

Mr. Speaker, the whole question is in doubt. The thing is in a terrible mess. If the legal authorities of the Government decide that the provisions of the 1940 act override the present administrative policy that is based upon the 1948 act, then ex-service men would become subject to recall regardless of 12 months of active service. This matter should be cleared up immediately. Conflicting opinions and uncertainties in connection with this question should be settled by new legislation. This could easily be done by a simple bill to repeal that provision of the 1940 Selective Service Act that places the men when discharged into a special reserve for 10 years, subject to call if needed. Congress should act in this matter now before it adjourns.

Need for Pipeline to West Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the West Coast Pipeline Co., of Dallas, Tex., made up of some 50 independent oil operators in the Southwest, proposes to build a 20-inch pipeline of 200,000 barrels daily capacity, to carry crude oil from Texas to the Los Angeles area.

This to me appears to be a national-defense measure and in the best interests of our country, and one that should certainly be seriously considered at the present time when our security and safety is threatened.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "Background Information on Need for Pipeline to West Coast":

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON NEED FOR PIPELINE TO WEST COAST

West Coast Pipeline Co., Dallas, made up of some 50 independent oil operators in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California.

proposes to build a 20-inch pipeline, of 200,000 barrels daily capacity, at cost of $66,000,000, to carry crude oil from Monahans, Tex., to the Los Angeles area. The line would tap the Permian Basin of west Texas and New Mexico.

The officers are: President, R. J. Bradley, Dallas, who is also president of the San Juan Oil Co.; vice presidents, R. L. Foree, Dallas, president of Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners' Association, and Jack Frost, Dallas; and secretary-treasurer, Jay Simmons, Dallas.

The company is made up wholly of independents.

They have been instructed that they do not have to file an application with the Interstate Commerce Commission to build the line, but are to make a report later. The pipeline will be a common carrier. Application for priorities and allocations of steel will be made with the proper Federal agency to be given that authority after the economic controls bill is law.

The company was organized last January and was progressing steadily toward its goal when the Korean war started, making it necessary thereafter to look to the Government for allocations of steel.

The idea to have a pipeline to the west coast started years ago as the Permian Basin became productive. There are ample pipelines going to the Gulf coast and to the East, but none leading to the west coast where oil reserves seem to be playing out. During the last war it became apparent that the only way Uncle Sam's ships could be refueled was by shipping oil from the Southwest and West to California by railroad tank car or tanker.

It was during the last war that Texas independent oil operators began telling the Government to no avail that shipping oil by railroad and tankers through the Panama Canal was putting too much dependence on facilities that might easily be blocked for the remainder of the war by bombing.

The Big Inch and Little Big Inch lines were performing so effectively on the east coast with their deliveries of oil that it was felt this was proof of the logic of the plan for the west coast.

Of this, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on July 28, 1945, had this to say:

"An opportunity to rectify partially the mistake has now been afforded PAW by the sponsors of the proposed pipeline. At their request, a rehearing on the application was held recently before the Transportation Subcommittee of district 3 of the PAW and it is reported to have recommended tentatively a 14-inch line. The final decision is in the hands of PAW Director of Transportation George Wilson and Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator. Mr. Davies in private life, it will be remembered, is vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California and is serving in Washington on leave of absence.

"In view of the rail congestion and the unnecessary expense to the Government which has resulted from the lack of the proposed pipeline, if the permit for it is again refused, as sources close to the administration have forecast, it will be interesting, indeed, to hear Mr. Davies' justification for the action.

"If the pipeline had been authorized last year it could have been completed long before this and would now be delivering 175,000 barrels of this rich west Texas oil, or as much of it as needed, to California refineries. Since it was not built, the quantity which is reaching California is far short of that figure. At the moment, 36,000 barrels are being shipped by rail, and this is to be increased to 56,000 barrels daily if and when additional shipping facilities can be obtained.

"Even the 36,000 barrels now being moved is placing an undue burden on the railroads which are overtaxed with unprecedented troop movements and a staggering load of war freight that can be handled in no other way."

Bradley states these facts in justification of the critical need for such a pipeline:

The east coast has over 110,000 miles of pipeline bringing oil either directly or indirectly to the east coast from the Southwest for the safety of this Nation, plus all inland waterways.

The west coast has not one mile of pipeline from other oil-producing areas, and no waterways other than the Panama Canal. What if something were to happen to it?

There are only two railroads leading from oil areas to the west coast, the Southern Pacific and the Santa Fe.

There are 8,006 miles of United States Pacific coast line which must be defended.

What if a bomb were to be dropped on the west coast refineries?

West Coast Pipe Line Co. proposes not only to pipe oil to the west coast for refining there but in case anything should happen to those refineries, then it will have the pipeline facilities so set up that in a matters of hours it can switch the machinery and be delivering refined oil from Gulf coast refineries to the west coast for our ships and planes. There are already sufficient pipelines to which it could connect which lead from west Texas to the Gulf coast refineries. It would be simple to reverse this process and deliver products.

The Permian Basin of west Texas-New Mexico is the United Nations' only safe and dependable supply of crude oil. This area now has over one-half million barrels of excess oil available daily for this pipeline.

The west coast oil supply is already severely taxed to supply existing civilian demands, to say nothing of the needs of our Armed Forces.

Time is particularly important in the delivery of oil to the war fronts. From Houston to Panama Canal to Los Angeles is 4,406 miles. To Japan from San Francisco is 4,536 miles. From the west coast to Honolulu is 2,041 miles and from Pearl Harbor to Tokyo is approximately 4,300 miles.

Time is the important thing and a pipeline could deliver more oil quicker and cheaper than railroad tank cars.

To deliver 200,000 barrels of oil per day to the Pacific coast, it will take 12,320 railroad tank cars, 140 locomotives and 2,100 men, or 60 ocean tankers and 3,000 men plus convoy or this 20-inch pipeline and 200 men.

This pipeline which is of the utmost importance in the national defense can be constructed in a period from 4 to 6 months from the time the material is made available.

Fuel to the west coast from the United States continental reserves is a must for our national security.

During the last 20 months of World War II, according to PAW chart No. 34, there were 65,000,000 barrels of crude oil shipped by tank car at $2.28 per barrel, or at a cost of $148,000,000. This is about 2½ times the cost of the pipeline to the west coast.

The 20-inch line could deliver 200,000 barrels of oil daily.

Delivering oil by tank car to the west coast involves enormous waste of the taxpayer's money. The pipeline will save $1.78 per barrel.

With 36,000 barrels a day being moved, the waste amounted to $82,080 every time the sun rose and set, or $2,462,000 monthly.

In July 1945, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram said: "If and when facilities can be provided to increase the shipments to the 56,000 barrels a day which PAW has requested, the waste will amount to $127,000 a day, $3,830,400 a month. On this basis, the annual waste will amount to $45,964,800, which is almost equivalent to the cost of the proposed pipeline.

"This makes it appear that the pipeline would have been a good investment even if the Government itself had borne its construction cost. But in this case the cost was to have been borne by private investors and all of the savings the line could have made possible would have been realized by the Government.

"Although $47,000,000 is a lot of money, it is less than half the cost of one battleship —and a pipeline is unsinkable."

Then, too, it is important to give consideration to two other important factors. First, the railroads at the present time inasmuch as most of them are propelled and driven by Diesel engines, will use much more fuel than before and their needs must be supplied.

Second, it is also a matter of common knowledge that with the use of jet planes an even greater demand will have to be supplied.

At present the military says it takes 20 days by Liberty ship from San Francisco to Yokohama and 13 days by a ship making 15 knots. To Pusan this time is lengthened by 1 to 2 days.

To load and unload a cargo ship requires 7 to 8 days.

Therefore, the time it takes to get oil from interior of the United States to the west coast for ship loading should certainly be speeded since so much time will be required for the delivery process after the tanker is loaded.

A pipeline would greatly expedite this time for delivery. Since sea distance is so great, land time for delivery should be cut.

Another thing, railroads should not be taxed. They should be left free to transport men. Here are some figures. To move an armored division, 77 trains are required, 33 freight trains of 70 cars each and 44 passenger trains of 10 cars each. An infantry division requires 73 trains, 23 freight trains of 70 cars each and 50 passenger trains of 10 cars each.

"The operation in Korea," to quote the National Defense Establishment, "is in large measure a war of logistics."

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY GIVEN AT CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS PROVING NEED FOR PIPELINE TO WEST COAST IN NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

"Before a special committee of the United States Senate investigating petroleum resources, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, pursuant to Senate Resolution 36, held November 28, 29, and 30, 1945, factual data was submitted which supports the need for a pipeline. The construction of this pipeline is imperative if we are to be in a position to defend our 8,000-mile Pacific coastline. The true facts are that there is barely enough crude oil produced on the west coast to supply the civilian demand, to say nothing of the growing military demand in the Pacific." (Statement taken from company brief.)

Commander Bradley, who qualified himself as having been in the oil business for approximately 15 years, primarily connected with the Standard Oil Co. of California, in testifying before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations on February 28, 1946, said in part as follows:

"It would be difficult to say to the constituents of you gentlemen that Alaska, No. 4, if developed will guard us against all future requirements of petroleum for war. But there is no place on the west coast today that offers any future hope. I think you know that there have been holes sunk in practically every section of California. Certainly we will get more oil, and we will probably get another billion and a half barrels out of California before it gets right down to bedrock, and we will develop the tar sands at Sisquoc and probably go into greater secondary recovery, and maybe out into the ocean. Wnen I say 'we' I mean the industry. But the fact remains, that California is expected to, in a very few years be unable to meet its peacetime requirements for oil—we said 1955 to be ultraconservative—my personal view is 1949, others in high

positions say even less than that. As a matter of fact, Mr. Collier, chairman of the board of Standard of California, before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee yesterday discussed 1947—there is no question that California has reached a peak if there is an area of which that can be said. Therefore, if we look forward to the future of oil on the west coast, where in time of emergency there simply would not be enough, not only to supply the normal requirements of the area, but where there would not be enough to fight a war at all, we would have nothing to contribute." (P. 1729 of said hearing.)

Further in his testimony, Commander Bradley stated:

"Paradoxically enough, because California is growing, and more people are coming to it, the civilian demand is greater than it was in 1941 by about 14 percent, so that, with California domestic demand increasing, and with the excess capacity gone, it will be partially dependent upon other sources. The point is, of course, that if a war comes along, we do not have an excess capacity to draw upon, an excess capacity that is already developed.

"And now we have arrived at a point, a year after the European war ended and many months after the Japanese war ended where right at this moment, as we sit here, the Navy has ships swinging at anchor in west coast harbors because they have not enough fuel oil to go back and bring the boys home. That is pretty important information. They have not been swinging long, that is true, we manage to get them going, but they are short 47,000 barrels a day of Navy special fuel oil and 23,000 barrels a day of Diesel oil, so that we cannot carry out the program set by you gentlemen right here on the Hill.

"It means the Navy has officers in west coast ports every day trying to get fuel oil, and they have not been able to get enough of it. However, the fact remains, that there is not enough fuel oil in California right today. Where would we be if we were fighting a war?"

L. W. MacNaughton of the firm of DeGolyer & MacNaughton, employed as special consultant to the Secretary of the Navy, appeared in behalf of the same appropriations bill as recorded on page 1732 of the hearings. He said:

"The value of petroleum reserves to the Navy, of course, is greater if it is located within the continental United States. It can be defended much better than if is located outside the continental United States."

Referring to California production, Mr. MacNaughton said:

"They will still be producing oil, but by 1950 they will not be able to meet the total market demand."

Commodore W. G. Greenman, United States Navy, director Naval Petroleum Reserves, also testified in support of such appropriations bill. On page 1935 of such hearings is found this very vital testimony, from this officer who was entirely conversant with the subject matter at hand:

"But when you get out on the west coast and you begin to consider operations in the Pacific on the order of this last war, and you realize that the oil resources of the State of California are going down, you see the importance of having in reserve and available to the armed services a supplemental source of oil.

"During the last war the railroads tried to move to California 50,000 barrels a day to boost up the failing supply but they never got much over 25,000 because the railroads just could not carry it.

"For future emergencies involving the Pacific area we have studied the possibilities of putting in a pipeline comparable to the Big Inch, but then we find even with the railroads and the proposed pipeline operating at maximum capacity we would still be short of oil sufficient to meet war operations in the Pacific on a scale comparable to those of the last war" (p. 1935 of said hearings).

Commodore Greenman also appeared before the Special Committee of the United States Senate investigating petroleum resources. His testimony is found at pages 265–273 of the hearings held by such committee on November 28 through November 30, 1945. Commodore Greenman in part said:

"Mr. Chairman, the military services are primarily responsible for the defense of the Nation in time of war. Petroleum products in ample supply and available wherever needed are absolutely essential to the discharge of their responsibility. In the recent great conflict, approximately 60 percent of the supplies shipped overseas was made up of petroleum products" (pp. 265–266 of said hearings).

Conditions today will verify that the need is even greater now than it was when these statements were made in 1945 and 1946.

The Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, since the new social-security law has gone into effect, I think it is high time that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce review in its entirety the Railroad Retirement Act. Railroad employees are not under the provisions of the general Social Security Act. Several years ago the Congress established for railroad workers an independent retirement system. Contributions are made by both the employees and the railroad. This original act was modified during the Seventy-ninth Congress by what is known as the Crosser amendment. It is my opinion that grave discrepancies exist between the payments made and the benefits received by railroad workers as compared to the 45,000,000 other employees now covered by social security. I do not claim to be an actuary, and I frankly admit that the problem of equalizing these discrepancies is highly complex in nature; however, I am convinced that the proper committee should immediately launch a full-scale and thorough study. This will enable the Congress to pass any corrective legislation that proves necessary. From my own limited knowledge of the subject it is my conviction that it is a discrimination against the railroad worker. I do not believe that his benefits are as generous when compared with his payments as are those of persons covered by social security.

It has been argued that the Railroad Retirement Fund is on a much sounder basis than the Social Security Fund. This I think is true; yet we know from a practical standpoint that social-security obligations will be met as long as the Government of the United States maintains a credit standing. It also seems to be obvious that should the credit of the United States Government collapse the value of the Railroad Retirement Fund would likewise collapse. The Government bond today plays such an important part in our entire financial structure that one cannot live without the other. If the bond goes, the structure will tumble like a house of cards. The Railroad Retirement Fund will be caught in that destruction. It is only fair to the railroad employees to place them on a comparable basis with the employees of other industries.

I trust that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has the legislative jurisdiction over the Railroad Retirement Act, will set up the proper subcommittee to make the study and to report its recommendations to correct any unfairness that may be found. No segment of our society should enjoy any undue privilege. By the same token no segment should be unduly penalized. The railroad workers constitute an important segment of our society, and they should be accorded fair and equitable treatment.

Legislation Should be Enacted to Permit Colonel Mashbir's Return to Regular Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star on August 19, 1950, with reference to Col. Sidney F. Mashbir:

HE QUIT THE ARMY TO SPY ON JAPAN
(By William Hines)

Five years ago today a stocky American officer stood on the apron of Nichols Field, Manila, awaiting the arrival of an airplane. The officer was Col. Sidney Forrester Mashbir, of 4934 Indian Lane NW., and the aircraft he "sweated out" was the peace plane carrying armistice envoys of the imperial Japanese Government to General MacArthur's Philippine headquarters.

In all but legal fact, World War II ended the moment the plane taxied to a halt and the Japanese envoys dismounted. At the same instant, a strange and unprecedented American spy story reached its climax.

Colonel Mashbir had been an American spy in Japan in the years after World War I. He had been pledged to secrecy about his mission by congressional leaders in 1928—secrecy that would last until "after the war with Japan," as one perceptive legislator put it to him.

Even as a junior officer in the Arizona National Guard before the First World War, Sidney Mashbir had been intelligence-conscious. When he joined the Regular Army in 1917, he specialized in military counterintelligence, and after the war, developed a plan for an espionage network in Japan.

In the normal, unimaginative fashion of the Army, Captain Mashbir was posted to Tokyo as an assistant military attaché. Within 24 hours after confidential orders were handed him in Washington, an official of the Japanese Foreign Office in Tokyo queried the American Embassy there, "Who is this Mashbir who has been assigned to your Embassy?" Some one, it was plain, had planted

a Japanese spy in the American War Department.

It became equally plain to the military attaché's staff in Tokyo that if Captain Mashbir were to be of any value as a spy, he must sever his connections with the Army. And, remembering the Japanese agent in the War Department, the break must be a genuine one, and its cause equally authentic.

Colonel Mashbir had been a civil engineer before he joined the Army, and in 1921 the up-and-coming Japanese were screaming for engineers to supervise building projects. He found little difficulty in lining up construction projects which would assure him an income of $60,000 to $80,000 a year. With these commitments, he resigned from the Army, explaining that civilian opportunities offered him more than he could ever hope to make in military life. His resignation was accepted with the subrosa understanding that when his spy mission was completed he could rejoin the Army in his old grade of captain.

Much of his engineering revenue was plowed back into espionage activities which he even now refuses to discuss in detail. The great Japanese earthquake of 1923, however, put him out of business. He sought to rejoin the Army.

By then the Government was in the midst of an economy wave, and he was informed that current policy prevented his being readmitted to the service at a time when other men were being discharged. For nearly 5 years he sought by one means or another—including private legislation in Congress—to get back in service. Then, in 1928, he was asked, "for patriotic reasons," to say no more until after the showdown with Japan.

When war broke out in 1941, Colonel Mashbir returned to active duty as an emergency officer and organized General MacArthur's Allied Translating and Interpreting Service. As a sideline he conducted psychological warfare against the Japanese he knew so well, and counseled General MacArthur as the war neared its end to promise the Japanese that no harm would come to their Emperor.

Finally, in 1947, private bills were introduced in Congress for his reappointment to the Regular Army. Loosely drawn, the bills were opposed by the Army as setting a precedent for other, less justified, appointments.

Colonel Mashbir appears—5 years after his encounter with the Japanese at Nichols Field—to have a good chance for readmission to the Regular Establishment. A new bill, by Delegate FARRINGTON of Hawaii, spells out Colonel Mashbir's peacetime spy services as a preamble to the proposal for his return to the Regular Army as a colonel.

Well-to-do from civilian investments and patents, Colonel Mashbir has had no ax to grind in his 25-year fight to get back into the service. Why has he sought so persistently to rejoin the Regulars?

"There is a place in the Army today for men who are willing to do the kind of work I did in the 1920s," he explains. "Perhaps complete separation from service will be necessary if they are to carry out their missions. I want to establish for them a precedent that will insure them a continuation of their military careers when their secret work is over."

Slave Labor in Russia—Free Labor in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege in the fall of 1945 to be a member of a special congressional committee that was authorized and directed by the House of Representatives to make a study of postwar conditions in Europe and the Near East. We visited England, France, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Germany, Russia, Iran, Egypt, Greece, and Italy. The information we received was not only interesting but in some particulars astounding.

One of the most revealing areas was the Soviet Union. It was surprising to learn, notwithstanding the claim that communism is a system or ideology that is designed to advance the well-being of the workers, yet, in Russia where that ideology is supposed to have full sway, we found that the standard of living of the workers was far, very far, below that in our own country.

I have read with interest an article by Arnold Beichman, AFL News Service, appearing in the Progressive Labor World, a newspaper published in Philadelphia, Pa., issue of August 31, 1950. This article parallels in every particular the information we gained as a result of the study we made as a committee of Congress. In no way is the contrast between communism and democracy, as systems of government, more plainly demonstrated than in the treatment of labor. The article, which I include as part of these remarks, makes plain that under communism in Russia there is a system of what might properly be termed "slave labor," in view of lack of choice of employment. When this is contrasted with the free labor of America it makes crystal clear there is no system of government that provides the dignity and importance to labor, which it is entitled to have, as in America and other countries where the principles of democracy prevail.

The article reads as follows:

HARSH LABOR RULES OF SOVIET EXPOSED TO UNITED NATIONS—AFL MAKES REPORTS ON SLAVE LABOR CONDITIONS FOUND IN RUSSIA—ICFTU DOCUMENT—EXPECT FULL-DRESS DEBATE ON ACCUSATIONS OF LABOR UNIONS

(By Arnold Beichman)

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has submitted to the United Nations Economic and Social Council a document bristling with charges of violations of trade-union and workers' rights by the Soviet Union.

A report of these violations, based on Soviet publications and documents was submitted in Geneva, Switzerland, by Miss Toni Sender, ICFTU representative, to the UN Council. It is expected that a full-dress debate at the next session of the group will occur on the basis of these accusations.

The report just received here by the AFL News Service is a mass of detailed information—with dates, places, and names—about the slave labor conditions extant in the Soviet Union. Here are some of the report's highlights:

Trade-unions in the Soviet Union since 1932 have not called a convention. In 1934, the practice of fixing wage rates and working conditions by collective bargaining was discontinued. Since then, wages in the U. S. S. R. have been determined by Soviet Government agencies.

In 1947 the idea of collective agreements was reintroduced, but in name only, since such currently negotiated agreements in the Soviet Union exclude wages and working conditions.

Trade-unions in the Soviet Union are directly under the thumb of the Communist Party. The ICFTU report quotes a statement from the Soviet magazine, Trud (April 20, 1949), by V. V. Kuznetsov, chairman of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions, that "in all their activities the trade-unions unrelentingly follow the directives of Lenin and Stalin on the role of trade-unions."

The ordinary Soviet laborer is as tied to his machine as if he were chained to it. Surrounded by laws which inhibit free choice of job, hedged about by regulations which bar movement from one job to a better job, he faces drastic penalties for the most trivial offenses.

One decree June 26, 1940, declared that no worker could leave his job or apply for another job without the consent of his employer. A worker found guilty of such offense faces imprisonment up to 4 months. A worker employed in a munitions factory who is found guilty of the same offense can go to prison for as high as 8 years.

The Soviet Government has published a work called Model Rules for Workers. According to section 21, disciplinary penalties are visited upon any worker "who is late in coming to work without valid reason or leaving his work to go to lunch too early or late in returning after lunch time or slacking during working hours." This provision applies only to those less than 20 minutes late. Anybody more than 20 minutes late is liable to criminal prosecution.

There are special regulations regarding "the material liability of workers for damages" and losses of plant property for which they are made responsible. Management has a unilateral right to deduct from wages specific sums as compensation for losses and damages attributed to the workers. This is from the Official Textbook of Soviet Labor Law, pages 284 to 297. Workers have to pay five times the value of the actual loss if any raw materials, partly processed, or manufactured goods, tools, working clothes, and other factory property entrusted to them are lost or damaged because of their negligence.

The individual worker has no control or bargaining power in determining his wage. His foreman decides that, based on an official handbook which classifies various jobs and the corresponding wage category.

"In effect, no diversity," says an official comment in 1947 (No. 8, Trade Union, organ of the Central Council of Soviet Unions), "in the determination of wage systems and levels can be admitted under the conditions of unified national economic planning.

"For this reason wages are regulated in our country in a centralized manner by the Government of the U. S. S. R. through appropriate normative acts (that is, acts having the character of binding legal rule), and not by contract. The inviolability of this principle was emphasized by the decree of the Council of Ministers of the U. S. S. R. of February 4, 1947, according to which it is expressly forbidden to include in collective agreements any system of pay for the work of manual workers, engineers, technicians, and white-collar workers which has not been approved by the Government."

The outgrowth of such literal wage slavery is the widespread use and government-endorsed practices of piece-rate cutting and speed-up. The foreman is assigned the task of revising piece rates and forces him to use "drive" methods.

Another sample of how to enslave workers is the outlawry by the Soviet constitution of a secret ballot in the election of so-called trade-union group organizers.

The group, with a maximum of 20 members, is the lowest unit of the Soviet trade unions. The key person in this group is the group organizer who is the unit's steward and should be the person through whom the workers' sentiments and desires are transmitted. But the group organizer is imposed upon the group and not voted on by the secret ballot.

The ICFTU statement to the UN Council charges that "trade-unions, in the true sense of the word, do not exist in the Soviet Union." It further charges that "wherever the Soviet influence exists the same pattern is applied."

My Voting Record in the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the social-security legislation because it is my considered judgment that this is one of the most democratically progressive bills of the Eighty-first Congress, and is in the best interests of the people. The entire legislative program of the Eighty-first Congress is replete with progressive legislation which is far-reaching in its effect on the people of this country.

In attempting to fulfill my obligation to the people of my district I voted for all major legislative actions of the Eighty-first Congress.

As the Eighty-first Congress draws to its close I deem it appropriate to report briefly on my voting record in that Congress on some of the more important issues.

It is my honest belief that my voting record during this Congress spells out a pattern of true progressive legislation that has been in the best interest of the Nation, my State, Queens County, and, more particularly, the people of the Fourth Congressional District of New York, whom I have been privileged to represent.

The last 2 years unquestionably have been the most eventful peacetime years in our history. As such the issues have been momentous, and while the task is not yet finished, a great deal has been accomplished in these 2 years.

During the past 2 years I have supported continuance of Marshall-plan assistance, low-income housing and slum clearance, revision of social-security regulations, an increase in the minimum wage to 75 cents per hour, economic and military aid for Korea, and a great deal of legislation designed to safeguard national security.

From time to time I have introduced legislation in the House, among others, the following measures: A resolution providing for the return to the United States of ships delivered to Russia under the Lend-Lease Act; a resolution providing for the exercise of the veto to prevent Communist China from becoming a member of the United Nations; a bill removing the limitation on the commencement of prosecutions for offenses arising from espionage and for other purposes, which means that a man is punishable for subversive acts at any time during his life; a bill providing for the construction of a veterans' hospital in Queens County, N. Y.; a bill requiring that a loyalty oath be taken by all officers and employees of the United States Government; several amendments to the social-security regulations, some of which were enacted in H. R. 6000, such as increased monthly payments and including disability benefits; legislation attempting to establish a Federal district in Queens County, including a collector of internal revenue and branches of all Federal agencies; a bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing postal services—I voted for similar legislation when it reached the floor of the House.

I stand on this record and pledge my every effort to continue to support legislation in the best interest of my country and the people of Queens County.

Summary of Principal Provisions of Social Security Act Amendments of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the principal provisions of the Social Security Act amendments of 1950 (H. R. 6000) which was recently passed by Congress and signed by the President. This summary was prepared by Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, technical adviser to the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration. It is an excellent document in easily understood language and clearly presented.

I have been informed that many Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives are interested in obtaining reprints of this document for their constituents or for their own use. The Social Security Administration, however, does not have the funds to supply sufficient copies of the summary to meet the demand. The Government Printing Office has estimated that the document will require three and a quarter pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a total cost of $266.50. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed regardless of the additional cost of printing.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1950 (H. R. 6000) AS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR PROVISIONS

The new law makes 30 major changes in the programs established under the Social Security Act.

FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

There are 21 major changes in the insurance program. They are, as follows:

1. Extension of coverage to self-employed persons other than farmers and certain professional persons.
2. Coverage of regularly employed agricultural workers.
3. Coverage of regularly employed domestic workers.
4. Coverage of State and local government employees not members of retirement systems, through voluntary agreements between the State and the Federal Government, and compulsory coverage of certain employees of certain transit systems taken over by States or local governments after 1936.
5. Provision for voluntary coverage of employees of nonprofit organizations at the option of the employer and the employees.
6. Coverage of certain Federal employees not covered under retirement systems.
7. Coverage of employees and self-employed persons in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.
8. Coverage of certain Americans employed outside the United States.
9. Inclusion of certain additional persons as employees for coverage purposes.
10. A substantial liberalization of the benefit formula for future beneficiaries.
11. Elimination of the increase in benefits for years of contributions to the insurance program.
12. Liberalization of the method of computing average monthly wage for benefit purposes.
13. Increase in the wage base for benefit and contribution purposes from $3,000 to $3,600.
14. A substantial increase in benefits for current beneficiaries, averaging 77½ percent.
15. Liberalization of the eligibility provisions so as to make it easier for persons to qualify for benefits within the next decade.
16. Payment of benefits to dependent husbands and widowers of insured women workers.
17. Liberalization of survivors' insurance benefits with respect to insured married women.
18. Payment of the lump-sum death benefit in all cases of insured deceased workers.
19. Increase in the benefits for dependent parents and for the first child in a family from 50 to 75 percent of the primary insurance benefit.
20. Increase in the amount a beneficiary may earn in covered employment without loss of benefits from $14.99 to $50, and elimination of the retirement test at age 75.
21. Provision of wage credits of $160 for each month of military service during World War II.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

There are five major changes in the assistance program. They are, as follows:

1. Provisions for Federal grants to the States for the needy permanently and totally disabled.
2. Inclusion in aid to dependent children of one adult relative in a family, for Federal matching purposes.
3. Provision for mandatory exemption of $50 earned income for the blind, beginning July 1952.
4. Extension of Federal grants for public assistance to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.
5. Provision for Federal grants to aid-to-the-blind programs in Pennsylvania, Missouri, and Nevada until July 1, 1955.

OTHER PROGRAMS

There are four other major changes, as follows:

1. Increase in Federal grants for maternal and child health from $11,000,000 to $16,500,000 annually (except that for present fiscal year the grant would be $15,000,000); for crippled children, from $7,500,000 to $15,000,000 (for present fiscal year, $12,000,000); and for child welfare services, from $3,500,000 to $10,000,000.
2. Amendment of the child welfare program by adding the following proviso: *"Provided,* That in developing such services for children the facilities and experience of voluntary agencies shall be utilized in accordance with child-care programs and arrangements in the State and local communities as may be authorized by the State."

3. Continuation for two additional years of the George loan fund for State unemployment insurance funds which run low.

4. Provision for review by State courts of administrative decisions by State agencies in certain cases prior to a ruling by the Secretary of Labor on conformity questions under the Federal unemployment insurance law.

The following summary explains in more detail the provisions of the new legislation:

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE (TITLE II)

I. Coverage

The new law extends compulsory coverage under old-age and survivors insurance to about 7,500,000 persons, and voluntary coverage will be available for about 2,000,000 employees of State and local governments and nonprofit organizations. Table 1 shows the number of persons covered in the new groups.

The specific changes in coverage are, as follows:

A. Self-employed: The new law covers approximately 4,750,000 self-employed persons whose annual net income from self-employment is at least $400. It does not cover self-employed farmers, physicians, lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, chiropractors, optometrists, Christian Science practitioners, naturopaths, professional engineers, veterinarians, architects, funeral directors, or certified, registered, licensed, or full-time practicing public accountants.

B. Agricultural workers: The new law covers certain borderline agricultural labor, such as processing workers. In addition, it covers "regularly employed" agricultural workers. A farm worker is "regularly employed" if he has 3 months' continuous service for one employer before coverage starts, and thereafter employment by that employer on a full-time basis for at least 60 days in a calendar quarter with cash wages of at least $50 for services in the quarter.

TABLE 1.—*Extension of coverage under the new law (number in an average week)*

	Number covered
Nonfarm self-employed	4,700,000
Agricultural workers	850,000
Borderline employment	200,000
Regularly employed on farms	650,000
Domestic workers	1,000,000
Employees of nonprofit organizations (voluntary coverage)	600,000
Employees of State and local governments (voluntary coverage)	[1] 1,450,000
Federal civilian employees not under a retirement system	250,000
Employees outside the United States	150,000
Employment in Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands	400,000
New definition of "employee"	400,000
Total under compulsory coverage	7,750,000
Total under voluntary coverage	2,050,000
Grand total	9,800,000

[1] Exclusive of a relatively small number of transit workers who will be compulsorily covered.

C. Domestic workers: The new law covers approximately 1,000,000 domestic workers not in farm homes—those in farm homes would be covered as agricultural workers. A domestic worker is covered if employed by a single employer for at least 24 days in a calendar quarter with cash wages of at least $50 for services in the quarter.

D. Employees of nonprofit organizations: The new legislation contains the following provisions for voluntary coverage of employees of nonprofit organizations:

1. If the employer does not agree to pay his share of the contribution the employees cannot be covered.

2. Even if the employer agrees to pay his share none of the employees can be covered unless two-thirds of them accept coverage.

3. If two-thirds or more of the employees accept coverage those employees who do so, plus any employees hired in the future, will be covered.

4. Coverage must be for an initial period of at least 8 years, and in addition 2 years' advance notice must be given before coverage can be terminated. Thus, the minimum period of coverage is 10 years.

Ministers and members of religious orders will continue to be excluded.

E. Employees of State and local governments: The new law provides voluntary coverage for approximately 1,450,000 State and local government employees through agreements between the States and the Federal Government. Public employees covered under a retirement system on the date when the agreement is made applicable to the governmental unit which employs them cannot be covered under old-age and survivors' insurance. In addition, the new law extends compulsory coverage to employees of transit systems taken over by State or local governments after 1936 unless they are covered by a general retirement system—if the transit system was taken over before 1951 the employees are covered even if under a general retirement system unless that system is protected by the State constitution.

F. Federal civilian employees not under a retirement system: The new law covers employees of the United States Government, or of wholly owned corporations of the United States, who are not covered under any Federal retirement system. This results in covering most short-term Federal employees, including those serving under temporary appointment pending final determination of eligibility for permanent or indefinite appointment. In addition, employees of the following instrumentalities of the Federal Government are covered: national farm-loan associations; production credit associations; Federal credit unions; the Tennessee Valley Authority (if not under the TVA retirement system); post exchanges and similar activities under the National Defense Establishments; State, county, and community committees under the Production and Marketing Administration; and certain employees of the Federal Reserve System.

G. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: The new law extends coverage to employees and the self-employed in the Virgin Islands and (if requested by the Territorial Legislature) in Puerto Rico, on the same basis as in the continental United States.

H. Americans outside the United States: The new law extends coverage to Americans employed outside of the United States by an American employer, and to employees on American aircraft outside of the United States.

I. Definition of employee: The new law defines an employee as "any individual who, under the usual common-law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship, has the status of an employee," and also covers as employees (1) full-time life-insurance salesmen, (2) agent-drivers or commission drivers engaged in distributing meat or bakery products, vegetables or fruit products, beverages (other than milk), or laundry or dry cleaning services, (3) full-time traveling or city salesmen (other than house-to-house salesmen) taking orders from retailers, hotels, wholesalers, jobbers, and contractors, and (4) industrial homeworkers who earn at least $50 in a calendar quarter if they are subject to regulation under State law and work in accordance with specifications prescribed by the employer.

J. Effective date: The effective date for the new coverage will be January 1, 1951.

II. Benefit amounts

A. Current beneficiaries: Under the new law, persons currently receiving benefits will have their benefits increased on the average by about 77½ percent. Increases will range from about 50 percent for the highest benefit groups to about 100 percent for low-benefit groups. The average primary benefit of approximately $26 per month for a retired insured worker will be increased to about $46. Table 2 shows the increased amounts which will be payable.

TABLE 2

Present primary insurance benefit:	*New primary insurance amount*
$10	$20.00
$15	30.00
$20	37.00
$25	46.50
$30	54.00
$35	59.20
$40	64.00
$45	68.50
$46	68.50

B. Future beneficiaries: The new law provides for a new benefit formula for persons retiring in the future. It will be applicable to those who have at least six quarters of coverage after 1950, if it results in a higher benefit than would the use of the old formula plus the increase for present beneficiaries. For persons now under age 22, the new formula will be the only one used.

The new formula is 50 percent of the first $100 of average monthly wage, plus 15 percent of the next $200 (based on a maximum wage base of $3,600 per year). The increase in benefits for years of coverage provided for under the old law has been eliminated although the Social Security Administration had recommended that it be retained.

Under the new law the old minimum primary benefit of $10 is increased to $25, except that for those with wages averaging under $35 per month the minimum may be as low as $20. The old maximum family benefit of $85 is increased to $150 (but not more than 80 percent of the average monthly wage).

Under the new formula, average benefit amounts in the next decade will be about 110 percent higher than under the old law. Table 3 compares the benefits payable under the new formula with those payable under the old law.

TABLE 3.—*Benefit amounts*

Average monthly wage	Previous law [1]	New law [2]
A. BENEFIT FOR A RETIRED SINGLE MAN		
5 years of coverage:		
$100	$26.25	$50.00
$200	36.75	65.00
$250	42.00	72.50
$300	42.00	80.00
$400	42.00	80.00
30 years of coverage:		
100	32.50	50.00
200	45.50	65.00
250	52.00	72.50
300	52.00	80.00
400	52.00	80.00
B. BENEFITS FOR A RETIRED MAN AND WIFE		
5 years of coverage:		
100	39.38	75.00
200	55.13	97.50
250	63.00	108.80
300	63.00	120.00
400	63.00	120.00
30 years of coverage:		
100	48.75	75.00
200	68.25	97.50
250	78.00	108.80
300	78.00	120.00
400	78.00	120.00

[1] 40 percent of the first $50 plus 10 percent of the next $200, increased by 1 percent for each year of coverage.

[2] 50 percent of the first $100 plus 15 percent of the next $200; no increment for years of coverage.

C. Computation of average wage: The new law does not change the basic method of

computing the average monthly wage, but if the individual has six quarters of coverage after 1950 and if a larger benefit will result, his average wage will be computed over the period following 1950 rather than from 1936 on.

III. Eligibility for benefits

Under the new law future eligibility requirements are greatly liberalized by requiring quarters of coverage for only one-half of the number of quarters since 1950, instead of since 1936 as under the old law. Quarters of coverage earned before 1951 may be counted toward the requirement. Thus a person aged 62 or over on January 1, 1950, will be fully insured for benefits at age 65 if he has at least six quarters of coverage acquired at any time. The maximum requirement for fully insured status remains at 40 quarters of coverage, and the minimum at 6 quarters, as in the old law, and a quarter of coverage is a calendar quarter with $50 or more in wages.

This liberalization will enable many people now 65 or over to draw retirement benefits immediately, and also will enable the newly covered groups to qualify much more quickly. About 500,000 additional persons will be paid benefits in the first year of operation.

Table 4 indicates the number of quarters of coverage required by individuals in various age groups.

TABLE 4.—*Quarters of coverage required to be fully insured*

Age attained in first half of 1951	Old law	New law
76 or over	6	6
75	8	6
74	10	6
73	12	6
72	14	6
71	16	6
70	18	6
69	20	6
68	22	6
67	24	6
66	26	6
65	28	6
64	30	6
63	32	6
62	34	6
61	36	8
60	38	10
59	40	12
58	40	14
57	40	16
56	40	18
55	40	20
50	40	30
45 or under	40	40

VIII. Effective date

1. The benefit increases for persons now on the benefit rolls will be effective for the month of September 1950, as will most of the other new benefit provisions.

2. Benefits based on the new benefit formula will first be paid in May 1952. Persons coming on the rolls before that time will have their benefits computed under the present formula with the increases provided for those now receiving benefits.

IX. Financing of old-age and survivors insurance

A. Taxable wage base: The limit on total annual earnings on which benefits are computed and contributions paid has been increased from $3,000 to $3,600.

B. Contribution schedule: Under the new law employers and employees will continue to share equally. The rate on each will be as follows:

Calendar years:	*Rate (percent)*
1950–53	1½
1954–59	2
1960–64	2½
1965–69	3
1970 and thereafter	3¼

The self-employed will pay 1½ times the above rates.

C. Level premium cost: The level premium cost (on an intermediate basis) of the program as amended by the new law is about 6 percent of payroll, as compared with about 4½ percent under the old law.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The major provisions of the new law relating to public assistance are, as follows:

I. Aid to dependent children (title IV)

The Federal share of expenditures will be increased by the inclusion of one adult relative in aid to dependent children families as a recipient for Federal matching purposes.

II. Aid to the blind (title X)

A. Beginning July 1952, all States administering federally approved aid-to-the-blind programs will be required to disregard earned income, up to $50 per month, of recipients of aid to the blind in determining eligibility for and the amount of aid. Prior to July 1952 the exemption of earnings is discretionary with each State.

B. Until July 1, 1955, State aid-to-the-blind plans are to be approved for Federal matching even though they do not conform to the requirements of the Federal law concerning the determination of need.

C. The State plan will be required to provide that, in determining blindness, there shall be an examination by a physician skilled in diseases of the eye or by an optometrist.

III. Aid to the needy permanently and totally disabled (title XIV)

The new law establishes a program of Federal grants-in-aid for a fourth category of assistance—aid to the needy permanently and totally disabled. The matching formula for this category is the same as is provided for old-age assistance and aid to the blind payments; i. e., three-quarters of the first $20 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder, within individual maximums of $50.

IV. Inclusion of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands

The new law extends the four categories of public assistance to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands under the following matching formula: The Federal share, for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the needy permanently and totally disabled, is limited to one-half of the amounts expended under an approved plan up to a maximum payment for any individual of $30 per month. For aid to dependent children the Federal share is limited to one-half of the expenditures under an approved plan up to individual maximums of $18 for the first child and $12 for each additional child in a family. The total Federal share for Puerto Rico for the four programs is limited to $4,250,000 a year, and for the Virgin Islands, to $160,000 a year.

V. Direct payment for medical care

The new law authorizes States to make direct payments to doctors or others furnishing medical care or other remedial care as authorized under State law. Under the old law the Federal Government did not participate in the cost of medical care unless payment for such care was made to the recipient.

VI. Medical institutions

The new law authorizes the Federal Government to share the costs of assistance to needy aged and blind persons in public medical institutions. Previous law limited Federal participation to residents of private institutions.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH, CRIPPLED CHILDREN, AND CHILD WELFARE

The new law increases substantially the Federal grants to States for the service programs provided for in title V of the Social Security Act.

I. Maternal and child-health services (pt. 1 of title V)

The new law increases the authorization for Federal grants for maternal and child-health services from $11,000,000 per year in existing law to $16,500,000 ($15,000,000 in the present fiscal year).

II. Services for crippled children (pt. 2 of title V)

The new law increases the authorization for Federal grants for services for crippled children from the $7,500,000 per year in existing law to $15,000,000 ($12,000,000 in the current fiscal year).

III. Child-welfare services (pt. 3 of title V)

The new law increases the authorization for child welfare services from the $3,500,000 per year authorized in present law to $10,000,000. The law also adds the following amendment to the child-welfare provisions of the act: "*Provided*, That in developing such services for children the facilities and experience of voluntary agencies shall be utilized in accordance with child-care programs and arrangements in the State and local communities as may be authorized by the State."

Table 5 compares the provisions in the old law with those in the new law:

TABLE 5

[Amounts in millions]

Provision in title V	Old law	New law
Maternal and child health	$11.0	[1] $16.5
Crippled children	7.5	[2] 15.0
Child welfare services	3.5	10.0
Total	22.0	41.5

[1] $15,000,000 in current fiscal year.
[2] $12,000,000 in current fiscal year.

GENERAL

Osteopaths

The new law adds to section 1101 of the Social Security Act a definition of the terms "physician," "medical care," and "hospitalization." These terms are defined to include osteopathic practitioners and the services of osteopathic practitioners and hospitals within the scope of their practice as defined by State law. The effect of this definition is to permit the States to utilize the services of the osteopathic profession and its institutions.

Costs of changes in public assistance and service programs to children

Under the new law the additional cost to the Federal Government on a full-year basis for public assistance and child welfare services above the old law will be about $180,000,000 to $220,000,000 annually.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE (TITLE XII)

A. The new law provides for reestablishment and continuation of the George loan fund, which permits advances to State unemployment insurance funds which may run low. The loan fund is continued for the 2 years 1950 and 1951 by amending title XII of the Social Security Act.

B. The new law provides for review by State courts of administrative decisions of State agencies prior to a ruling in certain cases by the Secretary of Labor on compliance questions under the Federal unemployment insurance law and title III of the Social Security Act (Knowland amendment).

Failure of H. T.'s Policy on China Due to Lack of Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan:

[Washington Post of September 10, 1950]
H. T.'s POLICY ON CHINA
(By Mark Sullivan)

South Korea is a tiny country, some 20,000,000 people. To prevent subjection of it to communism we are using the utmost strength we have available and are mobilizing more.

Yet South Korea is only a tiny piece of Asia. And up to 2 years ago an immense part of Asia, China with some 400,000,000 people, was under attempt at subjection to communism—an attempt coming from the same source and in other respects largely identical with the present attempt in South Korea. Against that attempt at communizing China the policy of the Truman administration did not exert resistance. That policy raises a question, expressible in three letters but monumental in its relation to present disaster, "Why?"

An answer made at the time was that we could not afford to exert ourselves in resisting the communizing of China, that our resources did not permit. That answer was plausible, to a considerable degree it had merit. We had begun in 1946 to lay out billions to enable countries of western Europe to resist communism there, the aid that became known as the Marshall plan. The theory was that our resources were not enough to resist communism in both Europe and China, and that of the two it was more immediately important to resist in Europe. The countries in western Europe that we were defending composed, next to the United States itself, the area of the world's greatest productive capacity and economic strength. Fall of them to Russian communism could be directly fatal.

Yet the answer that we had not the resources to resist communizing of China's 400,000,000 becomes a tragic irony when today we are pouring out billions without stint to resist the communizing of South Korea's 20,000,000 people. The irony is increased by what was apparent in advance, that once Russian communism should take over China it would attempt to take over the rest of eastern and southeastern Asia, including Korea.

When the overcoming of China by communism was under way, there was an outpouring of prophecy and warning about the consequences. A typical one came from a military source, Maj. Gen. Clair Chennault (retired), who had been head of our air forces in China during World War II. Writing about the strategy of the Russia Communist leaders he said: "The domination of China is one of the strategical essentials necessary * * * before they can feel safe in making war on the world." In a book entitled "China, the Land and the People," Gerald F. Winfield wrote in 1948: "Our stake in Asia has now become a matter of the survival of our democracy * * * even our very existence as a free people." A report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs said that success by the Communists in taking over China would result in one Soviet-dominated world.

Now that the consequences have begun, with the Communist aggression in South Korea, there is inevitable questioning about the relation of the Truman administration to the Communist overcoming of China when it was under way. The Republicans announce that the actions and policies of the administration will be reviewed completely. In such a review there is one condition, commonly overlooked, but having great weight.

At the time the Communist conquest of China was under way, there was just one organized opposition to it. This was the Nationalist Government of China under Chiang Kai-shek. Either Chiang Kai-shek would resist successfully, or the Communists would triumph; and whichever the outcome it would be the final answer. In simple common sense the interest of the United States lay in giving Chiang Kai-shek every support we could. This the Truman administration conspicuously did not do. That we should not give Chiang Kai-shek large military and economic support was understandable, because of what we were committed to giving western Europe. But we did not give him even moral or political support; on the contrary we conspicuously withheld them. As an example we at one point publicly urged Chiang Kai-shek to take the Communists into a coalition government. This and other actions and attitudes of the Truman administration caused Chiang Kai-shek to lose "face" with the Chinese people. And that loss of face was a major cause of his defeat.

In explanation of the Truman administration's attitude toward Chiang Kai-shek, it was said that his government was weak and inefficient. A frequent word used about him was "reactionary." As if that, whether justified or not, should have weight, considering the stake we had. Among the mistakes and worse of the Truman administration about China, a glaring one was lack of ordinary common sense.

Licking County Voters Must Register in September To Vote in November

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under a recent decision of the Ohio secretary of state—a ruling upheld by the courts—all the voters of Licking County must register in September 1950 in order to vote in November.

Licking County citizens can register at their regular voting places, in their precinct or township, on the following dates: Thursday, September 21; Saturday, September 23; Wednesday, September 27.

Registration can be made at the board of elections, 40 West Main Street, Newark, any day, except Sunday, up to and including September 27.

I urge all to register so they can vote and exercise the right given them under our Constitution.

Register in September.
Vote in November.

Optometrists in our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Missouri Optometrist for July 1950:

OPTOMETRISTS IN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE
(By Hon. Dewey Short, Republican, Member of Congress, Seventh Missouri District, ranking minority member, Committee on Armed Services)

It was my privilege to introduce in Congress the bill to establish an Optometry Corps in the United States Army. This was during World War II and the bill passed both Houses in May 1945. It was vetoed by President Truman upon the representation of the Surgeon General of the Army that they proposed to submit to the Congress a bill to establish a Medical Service Corps in the Army, which would include an optometry section.

When the Eightieth Congress convened, the Reorganization Act had become effective and the old Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committees had been combined to form the Armed Services Committee. Companion bills were introduced to establish a Medical Service Corps in both the Army and the Navy. Following hearings one bill was written to cover both services, and to include an optometry section in the Medical Service Corps. This legislation was passed by both Houses and signed by the President.

Since that time the medical department of the Air Force has been established by Executive order with a Medical Service Corps and an optometry section. There are 18 Reserve officers on active duty in the Air Force Optometry Corps, with Lieutenant Dunn the ranking optometrist.

At the present time Commander Raymond Sullivan, of the Navy Medical Service Corps, is not only head of the optometry section but the ranking optometrist in the armed services. He is on duty in the Office of the Surgeon General of the United States Navy. There are 21 optometrists who are commissioned officers on active duty in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

Maj. John W. Sheridan, on duty at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, is the ranking optometrist in the Army. There are about 20 optometrists in active duty as officers in the Army Medical Service Corps. An optometrist who is a Reserve officer in the Army Medical Service Corps may request 1 year active duty, called a competitive tour. At the end of the year of extended active duty he may apply for a commission in the Regular Army. Several men have completed the competitive tour and will soon join Major Sheridan as officers in the Regular Army. Every 3 months two or three more will be selected for Regular Army, dependent upon the requirements of the optometry section.

The Army still employs many civilian optometrists at various hospitals in the United States and at the Army hospital in Honolulu. These men are given an opportunity to learn eye pathology; help in taking visual fields; study mechanical optics; and shop management. There is also a limited amount of work on industrial vision and various types of research.

In a national defense system which uses aircraft flying at supersonic speeds, guided missiles with speeds many times the speed of sound, and more gadgets and precision instruments than the hound dog has fleas,

vision is of vital importance. It is the function and responsibility of the optometric profession to make certain that all of the men in the armed services have the best possible vision for the particular duty assigned to them, and that where correction is needed it is adequate and comfortable.

The men and women in the factory who are fabricating the material for our national defense are an important part of our national security. Their accuracy of vision is ofttimes as vital as that of the man on the firing line—for a slight error in the fabrication of the missile or of the aircraft may be as disastrous as an error in vision at the front.

The optometrists in the armed services are doing a good job, and I am confident that their civilian brethren will continue to improve their knowledge and skill in this particular field, which means so much to the safety, welfare, and peace of our people.

Immortal Words of Famous Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in this hour of history when our young men are fighting once more for the defense of freedom and the democratic way of life, I think it is appropriate to place in the RECORD some of the immortal words of famous Americans who have inspired us in the past.

In January of 1942, I placed many of these quotations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I received thousands of requests from citizens who wished to refresh their memories on these great statements which have become part of our heritage of freedom. Now we are challenged again by a totalitarian dictatorship, and these words of wisdom and courage should be made available to the people of America.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CREED FOR DEMOCRATS: OUR IDEAL, AS EXPRESSED BY FAMOUS AMERICANS

IN THE BEGINNING

(William Bradford, History of the Plymouth Plantation)

But here I cannot stay and make a pause and stand half amazed at this poor people's present condition. * * * Being thus past the vast ocean and a sea of troubles before in their preparation, they had now no friends to welcome them, nor inns to entertain or refresh their weatherbeaten bodies, no houses or much less towns to repair to, to seek for succor. * * * And for the season, it was winter, and they that know the winters of that country know them to be sharp and violent and subject to cruel and fierce storms, dangerous to travel to known places, much more to search an unknown coast. Besides, what could they see but a hideous and desolate wilderness full of wild beasts and wild men? * * * May not and ought not the children of these fathers rightly say, "Our fathers were Englishmen which came over this great ocean, and were ready to perish in this wilderness"? But they cried unto the Lord, and He heard their voice and looked on their adversity.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

(Roger Williams, The Bloody Tenent of Persecution)

Breach of civil peace may arise when false and idolatrous practices are held forth, and yet no breach of civil peace from the doctrine or practice, or the manner of holding forth, but from that wrong and preposterous way of suppressing, preventing, and extinguishing such doctrines or practices by weapons of wrath and blood. * * * Whereas it is light alone, even light from the bright shining sun of righteousness, which is able, in the souls and consciences of men, to dispel and scatter such fogs and darkness.

"WE MUST FIGHT"

(Patrick Henry, speech in the Continental Congress, 1775)

If we wish to be free; if we wish to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending; if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained, we must fight. An appeal to arms and to the God of hosts is all that is left us.

"WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS—"

(Declaration of Independence)

We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

TIMES THAT TRY MEN'S SOULS

(Tom Paine, The Crisis, 1776)

These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country, but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly; it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated.

AN EARLY CHARTER

(Virginia Bill of Rights, 1776)

That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people; that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them. * * * That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and, therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity toward each other.

THE AMERICAN

(Crévecoeur, Letter From an American Farmer, 1782)

The American is a new man who acts on new principles; he must, therefore, entertain new ideas and form new opinions. From involuntary idleness, service, dependence, penury, and useless labor he has passed to toils of a very different nature, rewarded by ample subsistence.

THREE ESSENTIALS

(The Northwest Ordinance, 1787)

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

"WE THE PEOPLE"

(Preamble of the Constitution)

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

THE FOUR FREEDOMS

(First amendment to the Constitution)

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

INTOLERANCE CONDEMNED

(Jefferson, first inaugural address, 1801)

Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that, having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind has so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions.

THE WORLD'S BEST HOPE

(Jefferson, first inaugural address, 1801)

I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this Government is not strong enough; but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth.

REMEMBER THE ALAMO

(William Barrett Travis, Appeal from the Alamo, 1836)

To the people of Texas and all Americans in the world: Fellow citizens and compatriots: I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Ana. I have sustained a continual bombardment, and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion; otherwise the garrison are to be put to the sword if the fort is taken. I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender nor retreat.

THE BUILDING OF THE SHIP

(Longfellow)

Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!

Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hope, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphs o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee!

THE FIERY TRIAL

(Lincoln, Message to Congress, December 1, 1862)

Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth.

SHALL NOT PERISH

(Lincoln, Gettysburg Address)

It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

SHIP OF DEMOCRACY

(Walt Whitman, from Leaves of Grass)

Sail, sail thy best, Ship of Democracy,
Of value is thy freight, 'tis not the present only,
The past is also stored in thee.
Thou holdest not the venture of thyself, not of the Western Continent alone.
Earth's résumé entire floats on thy keel, O ship, is steadied by thy spars
With thee time voyages in trust, the antecedent nations sink or swim with thee,
With all their ancient struggles, martyrs, heroes, epics, wars, thou bear'st the other continents.
Theirs, theirs as much as thine, the destination port triumphant;
Steer then with good strong hand and wary eye, O helmsman, thou carriest great companions,
Venerable priestly Asia sails this day with thee,
And royal, feudal Europe sails with thee.

IN WAR AND IN PEACE

(Ex parte Milligan, 1886)

The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy and despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false; for the Government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it which are necessary to preserve its existence.

SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY

(Woodrow Wilson)

The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

ETERNAL TRUTHS

(Franklin D. Roosevelt)

If the fires of freedom and civil liberties burn low in other lands, they must be made brighter in our own. If in other lands the press and books and literature of all kinds are censored, we must redouble our efforts here to keep them free. If in other lands the eternal truths of the past are threatened by intolerance, we must provide a safe place for their perpetuation.

LIBERTY UNDER GOD

(Franklin D. Roosevelt)

We are going to win the war and we are going to win the peace that follows. And in the dark hours of this day—and through dark days that may be yet to come—we will know that the vast majority of the members of the human race are on our side. Many of them are fighting with us. All of them are praying for us. For, in representing our cause, we represent theirs as well—our hope and their hope for liberty under God.

(From the New York Times Magazine of January 11, 1942)

Will the Canadian Aluminum Deal Be Repeated?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, subsidy payments and other concessions granted by the Government of the United States during World War II, together with substantial contributions by the Governments of Canada, Great Britain, and Australia, established the Aluminum Co. of Canada as the largest and lowest cost producer of aluminum in the world. The result of this is well indicated by the Government brief filed January 18, 1950, in the Aluminum Co. of America antitrust case, in which the Department of Justice, referring to the Aluminum Co. of Canada as "Alted," made the following statements:

Alted's transportation costs to major markets in the highly industrialized northeastern part of the United States, together with Alted's low cost of production give Alted a very great competitive advantage over Reynolds and Kaiser in supplying pig and ingot to this most important market * * * In the years ahead it can be expected that Alted will become even stronger. It is carrying on a big expansion program, including a very large smelting plant in western Canada. It is enough that Alted exists, that it serves as a barrier to the operations and development of Reynolds and Kaiser in their operations both here and abroad, and that Alted's vast capacity and resources are under stockholder control of the same small group which has stockholder control over Alcoa.

Until 1941 the Aluminum Co. of America, commonly referred to as Alcoa, was the only producer of primary aluminum in the United States. In 1928 Aluminium, Ltd., was organized in Canada to hold the Canadian and certain other foreign properties of the Aluminum Co. of America. The Aluminum Co. of Canada is a subsidiary of Aluminium, Ltd. A small group of Americans own the majority stock in both the Aluminum Co. of Canada and the Aluminum Co. of America. In addition, family, financial, and business ties exist between Alcoa and Alcan. For instance, it is reported that since World War II Alcan sold to Alcoa approximately 80 percent of all primary aluminum, which it sold in the United States. The principal officers of Aluminum Import Corp., the Alcan subsidiary in the United States, are said to be former officials of Alcoa.

In the spring of 1942, the Governments of the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and Australia entered into a series of contracts and agreements to underwrite a huge increase in the production capacity of the Aluminum Co. of Canada. This expansion increased Alcan's annual capacity from 165,000,000 pounds to 1,050,000,000 pounds, more than a sixfold increase.

During World War II the Aluminum Co. of Canada mushroomed from a relatively minor enterprise to the largest and lowest cost producer of aluminum in the world without the investment of additional private capital and at no financial risk to itself. This was accomplished by the following means:

First. The Metals Reserve Company of RFC contracted with Alcan for deliveries of 1,370,000,000 pounds of aluminum during 1941–45.

Second. The extra cost or subsidy paid to Alcan amounted to $49,320,000 on the total quantity delivered. The Surplus Property Board disclosed in its report of September 21, 1945, that—

The actual average cost of the Canadian metal to this country was 18.6 cents as compared with the American price during 1942–45 of 15 cents and 14 cents.

In addition, interest due on advances was waived in the amount of $2,500,000, giving Alcan a total subsidy by the United States Government of $51,820,000.

Third. The Aluminum Co. of Canada obtained from foreign governments loans of approximately $90,000,000, including lines of credit, and advances on purchases of nearly $80,000,000. This assistance included $68,500,000 in advances by the Metals Reserve Company, of RFC, and a $34,000,000 loan from the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Fourth. According to the Surplus Property Board, the Canadian Government allowed a special depreciation rate on Alcan's plant investment for war purposes. Approximately 60 percent of the cost of the power project and all of the cost for production plant and machinery, an amount totaling $164,100,000, was written off against profits during 4½ years.

The Surplus Property Board report to the Congress, dated September 21, 1945, in referring to the expansion program of the Aluminum Co. of Canada, financed by the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Australia, and by generous provisions for accelerated amortization from the Canadian Government, observed that—

All of this assistance including that by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was

equivalent of a drastic subsidy of postwar production of the Canadian Co.

The independent aluminum producers in the United States, as distinguished from Alcoa, have suffered additional setbacks since the end of World War II. The Aluminum Co. of Canada is shown to have disrupted the United States aluminum market by glutting it in periods of low demand, thus causing the independents to curtail production and close certain facilities, and by reducing shipments in periods of high demand. The inadequate tariff on aluminum was further reduced. Approximately 99 percent of all ECA purchases of aluminum have been from the Aluminum Co. of Canada. Only now, when there is a shortage of aluminum for civilian and industrial needs, has the Munitions Board made any move to stockpile aluminum.

The New York Times recently reported that the United States Government is considering a proposal to purchase 440,000,000 pounds of primary aluminum from Canada over a 3-year period at a cost in excess of $75,000,000. Although this report has not been confirmed, to award such a contract to the Aluminum Co. of Canada or to its parent company, Aluminium, Ltd., of Canada, in preference to the independent producers in the United States, would be an unconscionable act, detrimental to the security and economy of the United States.

The independent producers of primary aluminum in the United States stand ready and willing to commence a substantial expansion of production facilities immediately. They have submitted proposals to the Munitions Board for the delivery of several times the amount of aluminum reported to have been proposed by Canadian interests.

The projects proposed by domestic producers would be privately financed and so dispersed as to greatly increase the security of the United States. On the other hand, Canadian production facilities which produce one-fourth of the world's aluminum are concentrated at Arvida, Quebec, an isolated and highly vulnerable target for enemy action. Furthermore, the bauxite required to make aluminum metal at Arvida, Quebec, must be brought in over a long and dangerous water route from foreign sources. It should not be forgotten that early in the last war Germany, which had far less submarines than Russia now has, was able to sink 52 out of 60 special ore boats bringing bauxite from the north coast of South America to the United States.

The New York Times article concerning the Canadian proposal for a long-term aluminum contract further stated "Persons in the aluminum industry who support the proposed deal with Canada point out that the shortage of cheap electric power here militates against immediate expansion of domestic production." There is no substance to this claim. The independent domestic producers of primary aluminum propose projects which can be completed quickly and utilize sources of power that do not exist today.

If any long-term contracts are made by the Government of the United States for the delivery of primary aluminum to the stockpile, they should be awarded to domestic producers. The interest of the national security and economy would demand such action by our Government. Should long-term contracts for primary aluminum be awarded to the Aluminum Co. of Canada or its parent company in preference to domestic producers, a congressional investigation should be commenced immediately to ferret out the responsible parties and determine all facts in the case, including a minute examination of the present and past connections and interests of each responsible official.

Address by Matthew Woll Before American Federation of Teachers Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at the convention of the American Federation of Teachers, in Detroit, by Matthew Woll, vice president and chairman of the committee on education of the American Federation of Labor.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to be at this fine convention.

The American Federation of Teachers, though not among the largest of our A. F. of L. affiliates, is certainly among the most important.

Your importance cannot be measured by numbers alone. There is no more vital function in a democratic society than education. Even in times of war, as we have learned, sound thinking is as essential to our national welfare as steel. And to develop sound thinking is the responsibility of the men and women you represent.

I wish that it were possible to say that the Nation as a whole is fully aware of this responsibility you bear. Unfortunately, any such notion is coldly contradicted by the facts.

There is a great deal of talk about the noble and indispensable mission of the teacher. But all too often this talk is not supported by action, or even by the desire to act.

I am informed that 200,000 teachers in the United States earn less than $35 a week. The records show that many teachers earn barely half that sum.

Not long ago, I read of a teacher who wrote a letter to his county superintendent which said:

"DEAR SIR: I don't think I'll teach any more. I'm now earning $8.25 weekly. I can't get married on that. I reckon I'll go to work on the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad. They pay section hands $7 a day."

That, in a sense, is one of the most shocking letters I have ever seen.

It is shocking not only because of the pitiable underpayment of the teacher involved, but because it reveals a brutal negligence on the part of the community involved in the education and mental development of its young.

Such saying on education is economy of the most destructive sort. It imperils our growth and future as a nation.

Nearly 30 years ago, in addressing a convention of the Workers Education Bureau, I said:

"If we will but briefly review the rise and fall of nations and the historical development of mankind, we will find in all periods of time that those possessed of the greatest amount of knowledge, were those in control of all affairs of man."

This is truer today, I believe, than ever before in history. In our increasingly complex world, education—the ability to absorb and to employ knowledge discriminately—becomes an ever more urgent necessity.

It has frequently been said that an educated people is the most effective bulwark of freedom. But never before has the validity of this been so unmistakably evident.

It is no accident that in all totalitarian nations education, in the true sense, has been warped, perverted, and virtually destroyed.

It has been replaced by a system of propaganda and indoctrination designed not to advance intellectual growth but to stunt it.

Except in narrowly defined channels, totalitarian governments have made the pursuit of knowledge a crime. They know that their vaunted supremacy is a myth that cannot survive objective inspection.

It is obvious to their hard and distorted cunning that free inquiry, which is basic in the educational process, is inimical to their system of government; and so they have wrung an iron curtain down around the minds of the millions they control.

This has been the way every despotism in history has sought to perpetuate itself. Yet it also explains why, in the end, no despotism has been able to withstand the challenge of freedom.

The blind can be driven. But they are no match for those who can see.

Korea will bear witness to that fact. So will the other Koreas to come.

But we, in this country, cannot afford complacence. The qualities of a free and educated people, which are our greatest asset, cannot be permitted to languish. They must be strengthened and made more vigorous. And our schools are the place where this fundamental task is begun.

More than a generation ago Samuel Gompers, founder and first president of the A. F. of L., whose centennial we are commemorating this year, wrote an editorial in the American Federationist which said—I quote:

"The whole problem of progress is fundamentally educational in character. The problems of today and the future will tax the ability of our citizens even though equipped with the best education which our schools can afford. * * * To withhold opportunities for education for the least among our people is a crime committed against our Republic."

This awareness of the crucial role of education has been demonstrated by organized labor in this country since its earliest days.

Campaigns waged by the trade unions in the 1820's and 1830's were largely responsible for the beginning of the public-school system. In 1834 the trade unions of the country met in convention in New York City to urge the adoption of an equal, universal, republican system of education.

Nearly every major advance in public education in this country has resulted, to a very great degree, from labor's efforts.

We—in the American Federation of Labor—have never been content with the semblance of education. We did not accept public schools that were for the poor alone. We do not accept the counterpart of such

schools in any part of the country today. We have wanted, and we have been instrumental in getting, the advanced and more democratic school system we have today. We shall continue to work for a better one tomorrow.

In that better school system, as we recognize, your organizations—the American Federation of Teachers—must have a central importance. For we know that education is more than books and buildings. In the first instance, it is teachers. And teachers, if they are to perform their functions properly, must be free of political hindrances, adequately equipped, and adequately compensated.

That is the objective of your organization. It is an objective I am sure you will achieve in an ever wider scale.

It is an objective, I should add, for which you have the full support of the American Federation of Labor.

Nor is there anything new about this support. It will interest you to know that Samuel Gompers actively assisted in the formation of the first teachers' union in Chicago. And, in 1919, in his annual report to the A. F. of L. convention, he wrote—again I quote:

"To elevate and advance the interests of the teaching profession and to promote popular and democratic education, the right of the teachers to organize and affiliate with the movement of the organized workers must be recognized."

The increase in your membership has not come easily for a variety of reasons. Teachers, along with other white collar workers, have been slow to realize the need for effective union organization. Labor people generally know little of the pressures that can be and frequently are so subtly applied to forestall effective organization of teachers.

I am happy to know that in the hope that your organization program activities would be extended, President Green has assigned two field representatives to work with you in carrying the union message to unorganized teachers.

Gompers, in my judgment, was one of the country's greatest educators. In thousands of speeches and articles, through his vigor of mind and expression, he gave millions of Americans, in and out of the trade-union movement, a new insight into social and economic problems.

But he was a great educator, too, in the sense that he understood, better than most of his contemporaries, the true purpose of education.

Let me read to you from an address he delivered before the National Education Association in 1916. He said:

"The noblest mission of the schools is to teach the worth of a man or woman, to teach the value of an individual and his life. * * * Education must be founded on truths that break down insidious and unjustified distinctions between the kinds of work by which individuals express themselves * * * An education that glorifies the creative ability of the individual—his labor—is injecting a revolutionary idea into all our philosophy of life. Such a plan of education will bring into the spirit of our Nation a force that will make for a larger freedom, for greater progress and effectiveness. It will be in direct opposition to that education which promotes docility, submissiveness, and conformity. It will make possible for each to stamp his life work with all of the artistic imagery of which his nature is capable."

In these words of Gompers you have the educational credo of one of the wisest democratic leaders our Nation has known, a true humanist, and a very great man.

Gompers was not only an educator; he was also an idealist, but his idealism was tempered by a realization that where the livelihood of workers was concerned, neither he nor any other labor leader was justified in sacrificing concrete gains to theory.

He was greatly criticized for this, but today some of his severest critics acknowledge his wisdom.

Those who charged Gompers with a lack of idealism, with an undue concentration on "bread and butter" union issues, underestimated and misunderstood him. To Gompers it was a case of putting first things first. To him a union must have a record of solid, practical accomplishment for its members; it could not be a mere debating society and endure.

That record of practical accomplishment meant for Gompers that the worker would achieve through organization that sense of human dignity and worth that he considered the birthright of all Americans.

To whatever area of human concern one may turn, one finds that Gompers had a passionate concern for the individual, his rights, his privileges, his welfare as a citizen and as a worker.

His attitude to political action and to the role of government in labor relations, greatly misunderstood and criticized, is coming more and more to be appreciated as sound.

The labor leaders of the thirties, the forties, and the fifties have repeated, altogether too frequently after bitter experience, the conclusion that Gompers had reached in 1909 when he said:

"We must be partisan for a principle and not for a party, but we must make manifest the fact that we have political power and that we intend to use it; otherwise, the ballot will become an impotent weapon. Our members and friends cannot expect that the officers of the Federation can impress either upon political parties or upon Congress the demands of the workers for justice and right, unless those workers themselves have shown sufficient interest in the use of their political power as to make it clear that they are the potent force behind their chosen officers and representatives."

Here we briefly catch something of the spirit and vision that animated Samuel Gompers and many of the generation of labor leaders who worked with him.

The organization they built in the face of hostility and often opposition of the forces of law, the press, and the respected opinion of their day—the organization in which we carry on today is the finest tribute to their accomplishment.

Today, with 107 international unions, State federations in every State and central labor bodies in all industrial and trade centers, the American Federation of Labor is indeed a living and growing memorial to its founders.

Its activities in rebuilding the trade unions in Europe and in strengthening the unions in Asia and Latin America merely carry on the work that Samuel Gompers started.

Our publications in various languages carry the message of unionism to all parts of the world.

Increasingly our officers and members are called upon to serve on community and public agencies at all levels of government. This, too, stems from the ground work Gompers laid.

I have been referring to Gompers not merely because of the fact that this is his centennial—as a bow to chronology, but because Gompers, though dead for more than a quarter century, still has much to teach us.

John R. Commons, the historian, called Gompers one of our 10 or 12 greatest Americans. His greatness was not only in his acts, which built the modern American labor movement, but in his ideas, which provided it with an enduring democratic philosophy.

His story, I think, is one of the most valuable and inspiring in the American past. Yet all too few people are aware of it. I believe it is entirely accurate to say that no figure in this country's recent past has been at once so important and so little known.

It was encouraging to learn, for this reason, of the Samuel Gompers' Workshop, conducted by the American Federation of Teachers, for the purpose of acquainting its members with Gompers' significance in American life. But I hope that it will not end there. I hope that, through your members, Gompers' significance will be brought home to millions of students.

In fact, I should like to see your organization take the lead in preparing material on the various aspects of labor's contribution to American democracy for use in the schools. It would, and should, help to counteract the material now flooding the schools glorifying the big corporations.

I do not think it an exaggeration to say that the American Federation of Labor, which has done so much to lift the material and spiritual level of American life, is as worthy of a student's attention as General Motors or United States Steel.

Nor do I think that it is an exaggeration to say that the American Federation of Labor, the most consistent antagonist in this country to totalitarianism in all its forms, provides a better example of Americanism than certain corporations which, for profit, have bolstered some of these totalitarian governments.

We realize, too, the efforts being put forth to have the schools, the press, the radio, the arts, music, and the sciences, business, and even the workingman's organizations become puppets performing at the direction of one officially accepted, superimposed point of view, as in Russia and the satellite countries.

We have particular reason, therefore, to value and defend our democratic heritage which makes it possible for us to participate in a determination of our personal and common economic, social, and institutional lives.

Much indeed remains to be done to free the schools from the pressures of selfish and special interests in many communities of our Nation.

We, your fellow trade-unionists in the labor movement, need your continuous advice and counsel on how we may most effectively join you in eliminating their influences. Whether these pressures on the schools would make them instruments of totalitarianism of the left or of the right, organized labor shares with you the responsibility for exposing, challenging, and resisting them.

This defense, in view of the tremendous cost to our Nation of underwriting the United Nations program of defense against Communist aggression in Korea may again mean that the health and welfare measures and certain educational measures, including Federal aid to education, which we regard as vital and necessary, may be given scant consideration by the Eighty-second Congress.

It would be premature to make any forecast because the possibility of change that might alter our plans for the future is ever with us. However, a long needed and forward-looking step that should be in our thinking is that of providing an opportunity for the various groups interested in Federal aid to get together to exchange their points of view and, if possible, agree upon provisions which should be included in a Federal aid bill.

For the moment, I have strayed from my topic in discussing problems of the present and the future. Yet, this I am certain would be as Samuel Gompers would have wished it. For he preferred to think of his contribution, great as we know it was, as merely one to the foundation of an organization.

This organization itself in Gompers' mind would never be finished, but was one to which you, your fellow workers, I, and those who come after us, each in our turn

and through and out of our talents, whatever they might be, would make our contribution.

It is in this light and to these ends I would urge the utmost and unrestricted cooperation between all who labor, whether of mind or hand, of brawn or intellect, for as Gompers so well stated nearly half a century past:

"Today modern society is beginning to realize that the trade-unions are the only hope of our civilization, and to regard them as the only power whose mission it is to evolve order out of social chaos, to some of us from reaction, brutality and, perhaps, barbarism."

The realization to which Gompers referred has been slow in developing. Yet the fact is that today, more than ever, trade-unionism is the strongest force for democratic power.

All of us may be proud that we are a part of it.

Our Inner Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 11 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, while we are considering the various antisubversive bills, I should like to call attention to a thoughtful and sound editorial of the Chattanooga Times of August 21, 1950. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR INNER DEFENSES

There is in the United States today a rising tide of fury against Soviet Russia and its purveyors of communism in this country. The anger springs from deep within the American consciousness. It is based on the knowledge that the Communists deliberately provoked the Korean aggression and that Americans are fighting and dying as a result. It feeds upon the presumption that Russia has set the timetable for these little wars by which we are to be bled white in conflict against Russian stooges and made ready for the final assault by Russia's own forces. It is fanned to white heat by battlefield atrocities against American prisoners of war.

With it comes a louder, more insistent clamor for direct action against Communists in the United States, not the result of hysteria alone, but also in the sober realization that we must look to our inner defenses. The demand for stringent laws no longer comes from the extreme right or the Fascist-minded, although the latter, of course, is still with us.

The very urgency of the matter requires that we base our actions upon clear thinking rather than emotional stresses.

A very large segment of our citizens believes the thing to do is to outlaw the Communist Party and to make membership in it a punishable offense. They cite the fact that the party is an organ of an international conspiracy, dedicated to the overthrow of this Government. They declare that to continue to allow it to exist in our midst under the myth that it is an ordinary political organization is not democratic, but dangerous. They say: "Ban it, break it up, destroy its strength."

They have persuasive arguments which, would be well-nigh unanswerable if the methods they prescribe actually would accomplish what they would like to see done. We are not yet convinced.

In the first place, the proscribing of any organization is alien to our principles. Our cherished freedoms of assembly, of expression, of thought are intended to protect those who disagree as well as those who agree with us. They imply the right to be unpopular, to be wrong in beliefs and attitudes.

To outlaw the Communist Party would be to send its members and activities completely underground, instead of only partly so, making them more difficult than ever to detect. A law may prevent a man from calling himself a Communist; it won't change his beliefs. And it is his belief and not a label which makes him a danger. No law can be strong enough to combat an idea; it can be overcome only by a better idea, a more enduring principle.

Our constitutional liberties, of course, do not include the right to spy, to sabotage, to disrupt through the perversion of one's freedoms in the service of an ideology which denies all freedom. But these are actions which come into the province of enforceable laws. We have on our statute books measures which protect the Nation against their commission. Some of the laws need strengthening and this should be done at once. Subsequently, a campaign of vigorous enforcement should be undertaken in protection of the Nation.

Such a course of action would answer the immediate needs for greater internal security without endangering the freedoms which are the basis of all our security and without weakening the moral fiber of the leadership we must present to the world.

We still do not need thought control in this country. We do need more and better and straighter thinking.

Army Is Carrying the Ball, But Acheson Calling Plays—State Department Dictates Military Strategy Through White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of September 3, 1950:

ARMY IS CARRYING THE BALL, BUT ACHESON CALLING PLAYS—STATE DEPARTMENT DICTATES MILITARY STRATEGY THROUGH WHITE HOUSE

(By Constantine Brown)

The conflict between Secretary of State Acheson and Defense Secretary Johnson is much deeper than a mere clash of personalities.

It is, in fact, a conflict between two groups of men—those in the Pentagon, on whom was thrown suddenly the problem of fighting a well-armed enemy who has been preparing for conflict for the last 5 years, and those in the State Department, who are still optimistic and who believe that diplomatic formulas will solve our present problems.

From the day when our enemies of the last war surrendered, the handling of our national defense—in the broad sense of the word—was taken over by the State Department, under the general supervision of President Truman, who, however, had many other problems which required his more immediate attention.

Unlike his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman had to rely exclusively on the State Department to formulate policies which he invariably approved. He did not have that vast knowledge and understanding of foreign affairs which permitted Mr. Roosevelt to be his own Secretary of State.

ENTER THE IDEOLOGISTS

The men who were placed at the head of the State Department were not experienced either. James F. Byrnes had been a shrewd Senator. General Marshall was an able soldier who, until the day he gave up his post as Chief of Staff, not only was uninterested in but actually detested what he generally regarded as diplomacy. Mr. Acheson had been in the State Department for a number of years, but until he became Under Secretary of State his role there was confined to economic affairs.

All these men, like their predecessors over many years, had to rely on the help of their staff—the State Department career men. Whatever criticism may have been made of these officials, there is no question that until the end of the war they were hard-working men. Sometimes they lacked imagination and were sticklers for formality, but by and large the Foreign Service—particularly in the last 25 years—has been composed of hard-working men who made diplomacy a career, just as men in the Regular Army and Navy.

It was not until the DP's were brought into the State Department in large numbers that the quality of that vital agency began to change. The DP's were outsiders who had worked in the FEA, OWI, OSS and other Government organzations which had been suppressed because they had outlived their usefulness. A number of ideologists—generally described as "wooly haired and wavy-brained" individuals—were brought into the Department.

PROFESSORS BLAMED

These newcomers, who had no practical knowledge of what makes international relations tick, are the underlying reason why our foreign relations have reached the stage where we find ourselves close to another world war.

The weakness of our foreign policy is due largely to the professors, both inside and outside the State Department, who by training or other reasons could not bring themselves to see the realities of the world in which we live.

Our present predicament is due to the misconceived idealism which has permeated our foreign policies.

When it became too obvious that Russia could not be induced to cooperate in a move to assure world peace, we decided to strengthen the economic structure of the free world but strictly on lines of prejudice. The Marshall plan did much to restore confidence and prosperity to European nations which had been severely damaged by the war. But our diplomats refused to accept the obvious fact that the problem was to strengthen all the nations which were willing to oppose Russia.

When it became obvious that mere economic measures were not sufficient and that a military alliance, a coalition of nations to defend us against the Eastern colossus, was necessary, such an alliance was created, also on strict lines of prejudice. In Europe we made our Allies in the fothcoming contest with the U. S. S. R. mostly played-out and tired nations which no longer have the will to fight.

The inexperienced newcomers in the State Department kept the ideological line which

was necessary during the war, but which was of no use in the present conflict. Germany still was regarded by them as a Nazi country. Despite cries to the contrary from those who understood the situation practically, the dismantling of German industries continued.

But, what was worse, up to a few weeks ago any suggestion that this territory, from the borders of the U. S. S. R. controlled zone of Germany to our first line of defense ond the Rhine, should be protected by a Germany army had been violently rejected by our own policy makers.

Similarly, the State Department refused stubbornly to understand the enormous strategic importance of China. The timid arguments set forth by a number of military men were that if the Chinese mainland fell into the hands of a regime strictly controlled by Russia another world conflict would be inevitable, since Russia's rear would be safe against attack while we once more would be faced with war on two fronts. These arguments were drowned out by the shouts of those men in the State Department and their kibitzers outside that the Chinese Nationalist Government was a corrupt and undemocratic outfit. This was as true in 1947 as it was 10 or 15 years earlier when we challenged the Japanese over their encroachment in Manchuria and later in the rest of China.

IN DRIVER'S SEAT

These men went in for high-sounding words and denunciations of the corrupt Kuomintang officialdom. When men like Gencrals MacArthur and Wedemeyer—to mention only those names which are prominent in the eyes of the public—ventured to say that we should be mindful, under present circumstances, of what is best for America and worry over social changes in China after world peace has been established, they were shouted down or described as reactionaries or worse.

Our policies in Europe—where we tied ourselves to the militarily weakest nations—and our polices in China—where we abandoned a military force which could have been saved for the sake of our own security—have brought us today face to face with the stark reality of fighting another war almost single-handed against an enemy which possesses vast military power.

Until the Russians showed their hand in Korea, where one of their puppet armies was ordered to advance against the South Korean Republic, the military men kept themselves in the background. Defense Secretary Johnson made foolish speeches about our being ready at 5 a. m. if the Russians attacked at 4 a. m. He trimmed the armed forces to the bone.

President Truman impounded appropriations for a 58-group Air Force and permitted this important arm of national defense to build only 48 groups. The Marine Corps, our ablest force for fighting campaigns in the Far East, was reduced to a weak contingent. The word has been passed from the State Department that we must not give any impression to the rest of the world that we even think in terms of war, lest our moral prestige suffer in the world.

Between the fall of 1945 and the summer of 1950, the State Department assumed indirectly the control of our military strategy. Whenever the Joint Chiefs of Staff was asked pertinent strategic questions regarding Korea and Formosa, they had to submit their military opinion to the political views of the diplomats. Thus, only a few months ago they conceded that neither Formosa nor Korea had any real strategic value—except possibly from the purely defensive viewpoint.

DICTATES THROUGH PRESIDENT

The ambitious Defense Secretary, mindful of what had happened to his predecessor, James Forrestal, and anxious to keep the "teamwork" going, was easily "handled." He had some definite ideas about the importance of Spain in another world war. He had been thoroughly briefed about the importance of creating a German military force to supplement the weak Allied contingents in Germany. His first visit to Tokyo, where he had a long and illuminating talk with General MacArthur, convinced him that our hold in the Pacific would be made untenable unless Korea and Formosa are kept out of Russia's hands. But, in order not to disturb the "teamwork," he preferred to play along with the ideologists of the State Department, much as he disliked the idea.

The alternative would have meant his resignation. And he felt that on the eve of an important domestic political contest next November he could not give his own party a black eye.

It is true that in recent months he has disagreed with his colleague in the State Department. He has tried to convince him that old prejudices must be discarded in the face of the grave crisis which faces us now. But as far as can be ascertained at present neither his views, those of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, nor the forceful arguments presented by General MacArthur have made much of a dent in the general outline of our foreign policy.

The State Department is dictating our military strength through the President of the United States. But the Armed Forces, which have to take up where the diplomats leave off and do the actual fighting, in the past have had no voice in certain aspects of our foreign relations which affect our fighting ability.

How Quickly Can America Strike Back At the Power To Make War?—Time Article Explores the Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand one of the most challenging and provocative articles that I have ever read.

With conditions as they exist in Korea today—and the fact that men here at home find it expedient to seek out and discover all possible political ammunition to fire in the coming congressional campaigns, it is to be expected that questions will be raised as to the factual security and defenses of our own country.

If any one wants to know in truth as to how quickly America can strike back at and strategically destroy the power to make war, on the part of any enemy who might attack us—no matter from what quarter—let him read this all revealing article on our Nation's air defenses, taken from this week's copy of Time magazine.

This article looks in on Gen. Curt LeMay, head of the Strategic Air Command; the man, who with his men, are readied to take to the air on a moment's notice in the almost unbelievable mammoth aircraft, the United States Air Force's B–36.

Ride the midnight air with Gen. Curt LeMay, 8 miles above the earth through the long twilight of the fifty-fifth parallel which crosses Moscow, in the blunt nose of one of the fleet of B–36's, the mightiest of all bombers ever conceived by the mind of man.

There is not a citizen of these United States who will not take pride and find a new security in life after reading this article from Time magazine which I now insert into the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The article is as follows:

BACKGROUND FOR WAR—MAN IN THE FIRST PLANE

For an airliner, the 463-mile flight from Fort Worth to Kansas City is a matter of 2 hours, but for the B–36 bomber that waddled out onto the runway one day last week, the flight would take some 30 hours and its course would take it over 7,000 miles. Shortly after noon, the long, blimp-nosed craft, her six propellers glinting in the sun, climbed out westward from her Texas base, on past the sandy fringes of California, high over the glazed emptiness of the Pacific; then her navigator pointed her northward to the tip of the Aleutians. She did not have an atom bomb aboard, but she had its equivalent weight.

She headed east through the long twilight of the 55th parallel—which also crosses Moscow—over the frosted spikes of southern Alaska, and rumbled southward to bore through the storms that lay down the spine of the Rockies. At 2 a. m., in the cold, subzero blackness 8 miles above the earth, she found the telltale bend in the Missouri River on her radar, opened her bomb bays, and sent—not a bomb, but a long flash on her radio.

In the brightly lit war room at Offutt Air Force Base (Nebr.), midcontinent headquarters of the United States Air Force's Strategic Air Command, an operations control officer made a routine notation in his log. Another night's work was done, another major United States city had been theoretically demolished by the United States' mightiest atom-bomb carrier. More important, another weary plane crew had flown through much the same kind of weather, over precisely the same number of miles it would have taken to deliver the bomb to the industrial heart of Russia.

AT THE READY

This was the Air Force's intercontinental bomber at the ready last week. The free world's Sunday punch was getting its daily windup. These were the men and this was the weapon, which in Winston Churchill's words, form the one "effective deterrent" hanging over the heads of the Soviet Politburo—the likeliest reason why Russia's aggressors have so far started only a proxy war in Korea, and not the big one.

In the middle of a nation pursuing a faraway war in a faraway mood, a tough, hard-driving Air Force bombardment expert had tirelessly trained the Sunday punch to battle fitness. Lt. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, commanding general of the Strategic Air Command, was leaning on no hope that the world might get better or the U. S. S. R. more reasonable. His 16 air bases, strung across the Nation from Puerto Rico to California—and his outposts in England, Japan, and Okinawa—bristled with readiness. His officers wore their sidearms at desks, at meals, and in the air; his A. P.'s (air police—Air Force for M. P.'s) cradled loaded carbines ready for sabotage or parachute attack. Even ground crewmen worked at their big planes with their guns besides them. At one base Curt LeMay strode by a master sergeant who had laid aside his piece to dive into his lunch bag. The CG rounded up all the maintenance men for one of his longer

speeches. "This afternoon," said he, "I found one man guarding a hangar with a ham sandwich. There will be no more of that."

A quick, certain fate awaited any LeMay man who betrayed the slightest sign of the milkshaky unpreparedness that enveloped the occupation troops of Germany and Japan. The Strategic Air Command (known to the Air Force as SAC) was a $310,000,000-a-year business, a top-priority task force with 1,100 planes, some 60,000 pilots, crewmen, and groundmen. For 22 rugged months Curt LeMay had been holding them all to a relentless, competitive training schedule. With an impersonal assortment of charts and graphs—his numbers racket, he called them—he kept a sharp, hazel-eyed watch on everything from bombing accuracy (up 500 percent) to venereal-disease rates.

Every month he waved the numbers in the faces of his wing and group commanders. "Al, your maintenance is down to 62 percent," LeMay might say. "Joe's is up to 72 percent. He's got the same problems you have. How come? Now, Joe, don't look so damned smug. Your costs are up." One colonel complained that he was being marked down for "an act of God," because an eagle had damaged one of his planes in flight. LeMay sucked on his pipe, replied in a flat, low voice: "I'm not interested in distinguishing between the unfortunate and the inefficient. The result is the same." Such ruthlessness, which comes easily to some commanders, can either be sensible or silly. One of LeMay's victim's shrewdly summed him up: "He's tough, but he's not stupid-tough."

THE PLANE

SAC's complicated and out-size bombers demand ice-cold thinking, endurance, and guts from the men who fly them. The Consolidated Vultee B–36, a cigar-shaped aerial monster, is LeMay's blue-ribbon flying warship. It costs $4,700,000 before it ever gets off the ground (a small submarine costs $6,000,000). The tanks in its 230-foot wing can swallow 2½ tank-car loads of gasoline, enough to feed its six pusher engines for nearly 2 days. It can cruise over the enemy out of sight of earth—and, the Air Force insists, fairly well above the range of effective interception. Four new jet engines, hanging beneath the wing tips, were designed to give it a spurt over the target to at least 435 miles an hour. It can carry a bomb load equal to 30 B–17's at extreme range, or four B–29's.

A commander of a B–36 is usually a captain or a major, on the average a seasoned "old man" of 29 years and 3,000 hours' flight experience. LeMay laced SAC with veteran pilots, navigators, and bombardiers from his old World War II bomber commands in England, India, and the Marianas. Around them he has tailored the individual B–36 flight crews, trains them for weeks in ground school and on the Consolidated assembly line before he allows them to set foot in the superplane.

"If they build an airplane any bigger they'll have to give the aircraft commander a desk and a secretary to help him run things," a harassed plane skipper groused last week. The pilots, sitting far forward in the ribbed, safety-glass nose, can't even see back to the six engines at midfuselage. Said one: "It's like standing in the bay window and flying your house."

Before the plane can take off, the commander and his flight engineer spend an hour chanting their way down a 600-item check list to be certain every one of their maze of controls is working—and will work in the air. The engineer operates from a console of 120 dials and gadgets, spends nearly half of every hour logging their readings. Just figuring the miles-per-gallon on a 5,000-foot climb keeps him scribbling for 20 minutes. "A man can just about keep up with his work if the flight is ideal and not a damn thing goes wrong," an engineer explained. "If anything slips, it's a rat race all the way back to the base. What this thing needs is an engineer with four hands and five eyes."

Thirty continuous hours in the air, ground out in the seconds, degrees, and miles of a B–36 flight, mean packing aboard survival kits for the Arctic, life rafts for the ocean, 100 pounds of food[1] to be cooked in two tiny electric ovens—and endless time for minor irritations of dreadnought flying to sap the toughest crewman. The crew's sections are pressurized like bug bombs. To get from the nose compartment to the rear chamber a crewman has to lie full length on a little roller sled, pull himself hand over hand down an 85-foot connecting tube.

Among the guns and fire-control apparatus of the after section are eight inviting bunks. But at high altitude nobody is allowed to "sack out." Reason: An accidental pressure failure would fill the cabin with a frigid blue haze, and the loss of oxygen would kill a man in 30 seconds if he didn't slap on his oxygen mask. A sleeper would be a dead duck. A more earthy problem: The toilet mechanism won't work at high altitude. The most practical makeshift is a bucket, and by unwritten law, the first man who needs it on the flight cleans it after landing. This makes the hours of flight a competition in painful restraint.

In the B–36's early days it was grounded so frequently by "bugs" in the 30 miles of wiring, tubing, and cables that the crews dubbed it "the ramp rooster." But after long, slow shakedown, it is now admiringly known as "the magnesium monster," and the SACmen are ready to battle anyone who says it isn't the best bomber in the world. When the Navy insisted a year ago that the B–36 could be shot down, Curt LeMay shot back a blunt answer.

"I think that under certain circumstances it can be shot down," he told a congressional committee. "But I do not think, whether it can or cannot be shot down, enters into this controversy at all. * * * The thing that I am concerned about is whether the proper number of B–36's in the proper tactical disposition can penetrate enemy defenses and destroy a target with acceptable losses ourselves, and I believe the B–36 can do this job. * * * I expect that if I am called upon to fight I will order my crews out in those airplanes, and I expect to be in the first one myself."

The number of B–36's now in service is secret, but the United States has more atom bombs than B–36's. Of SAC's 14 striking groups, only three have the intercontinental bombers. The rest of SAC's groups are equipped with World War II-type heavy bombers, now known as mediums. There are eight groups of Boeing B–29's (which SAC pilots used to call "mouse-powered," and their 2,200-horsepower engines, "dollar alarm clocks"), and there are three groups of their beefed-up postwar cousins, the Boeing B–50's. The mediums can't fly from United States bases to Russia without elaborate aerial refueling,[2] but they could shuttle devastatingly between Britain, Russia, and the Middle East.

THE C. G.

Curt LeMay, 43, runs his armada from a second-floor office at Offutt Base, a converted World War II aircraft plant set peacefully among the rolling cornfields just west of the Missouri River. He leaves his door wide open and is usually "at home" to any brass hat or buck private—somewhat as a lion is at home on meatless Tuesday. He sits immobile behind his polished walnut desk, black-maned, broad-shouldered and heavy-faced, his lips set as straight as the five rows of service ribbons on his tan uniform jacket.

"The Old Man doesn't say 'hello' to you; he just looks up from his desk, nails you with a stare and listens," one SACman says: "You begin talking and you don't hear a reply—all you hear is your own voice. Then when you are in midsentence he takes the pipe out of his mouth and says, 'Get to the point.' A minute or two later: 'You're straying from the point. Don't waste my time. Come back when you've got this thing in hand.'"

LeMay's capacity for anger has probably never been tested to its fullest. He runs himself as he flies an airplane; to spout smoke or to get off course would be inefficient. He can ignore an uncut lawn or an unpolished shoe, but will pick out an unkempt airplane across the field. "He is a single-minded 'why?' guy, an administrator of high ability, and above all a hard-shelled military realist," one of his staff said appraisingly. "And I'm damn glad he's not on Russia's side."

The only place where he is likely to unbend is in the privacy of the commanding general's red brick house, across from the green Offutt parade ground. There in the evenings he sits in a comfortable armchair pulling at his ever-present pipe. His gregarious twinkly-eyed wife Helen, whom he met 19 years ago at a dance, is not afraid to chatter or to stray as far from the point as she chooses. SAC's officers have unconcealed admiration for LeMay's 11-year-old daughter Jane, who frequently tells the Old Man "No; I won't."

LeMay first landed on SAC in October 1948, relieving 59-year-old Gen. George Kenney, MacArthur's top airman in World War II. Kenney, a good commander, had neither LeMay's training as a long-range bomber specialist, his experience as a battle pilot, nor his hard-driving temperament. Kenney's bombers spent much of their time making easy training flights, "just boring holes in the air," as one of them recalls it. LeMay picked the outfit up by the neck, shook it in a way none of the oldtimers will soon forget, and flung it across the United States to get ready for its mission.

THE STAFF

To help him get going in a hurry he wangled the best officers he knew. Slight, short Brig. Gen. John B. Montgomery, one of the Air Force's rising young (38) one-stars, moved into SAC's new headquarters at Offutt. For his deputy commander LeMay picked handsome, high-polished Thomas Sarsfield Power, 45, a bold, skillful pilot, and something the Old Man is not—a diplomat and smoother-over. LeMay's chief of staff, tall, soft-spoken Maj. Gen. August Walter Kissner, 44, is two other things LeMay is not—a West Pointer and a man who can do paper work and like it.

---

[1] Sample larder: 40 pounds of steak, 80 cans of soup, 20 boxes of cereal, 5 dozen tomatoes, 5 dozen apples, 5 dozen oranges, 6 dozen eggs, 4 gallons of milk, 100 tea bags, coffee, lettuce, celery, tomato and orange juice, water, sugar, salt, and pepper.

[2] In March 1949, one of LeMay's B–50's, *Lucky Lady II*, flew 94 hours and 23,452 miles nonstop around the world from Carswell Air Force Base, Tex. It refueled from B–29 tankers over the Azores, Dhahran (Saudi Arabia), Manila, and Hawaii.

Neither the staff nor anybody else fawns—for long—around Curt LeMay. His friends are few and he works them the hardest. "They know how I feel about them," he once explained. "They know I wouldn't hesitate to send them out on a one-way mission if it ever became necessary." For his commanders he has one stock warning: "You will make some mistakes, and I will back you up—until you make the same one the second time. But don't ever try to fool me. That will be your last mistake."

THE AMBITION

Curt LeMay's fierce single purpose first showed itself back in high school in Columbus, Ohio. Boyhood friends recalled that he paid girls little attention, preferred to spend his leisure building crystal wireless sets or prowling through the hills of southern Ohio with a gun and a bowie knife.

His one ambition even then was to fly for the Army. He tried to make West Point, but couldn't get a congressional appointment. So at Ohio State [3] he began an alternate route to flying. He busied himself in ROTC, graduated (in 1928) to a National Guard summer camp with a Reserve commission. In the fall he began training as a flying cadet at California's March Field.

LeMay loved flying (has since logged 7,000 hours), but he was no comic-strip fly boy. While his classmates swooped off for week ends in Los Angeles, he often hung back to take engines apart, work at machine guns, pore over weather charts and navigation logarithms. Result: After 7 years in fighters, he was called from Hawaii to fly the first of the Army's flying fortresses because he was the rare Army airman who could find his way around with a navigator's sextant and chart. From then on his career was set as a big-plane man.

In World War II he became a legend—a brigadier general at 36, a major general 6 months later. In England, LeMay decided that too many of his B–17's were missing enemy targets because they zig-zagged out of the way of heavy antiaircraft fire. He clamped a cigar in his jaw, led the next raid over St. Nazaire, held his plane on course up to the bomb drop through murderous ack-ack for a grim 7 minutes. Next day he issued a flat order: no more evasive action on the final bombing run. Plane damage went up, but results went up more.

In the Pacific, where he ran the 300-plane B–29 raids against Japan, he suddenly pulled the high-tailed bombers down from the clouds, took out their guns and gunners, and overloaded them with fire bombs to dump on Japan from low level. It was a risk that could have wrecked an air fleet and a career, but it caught the Japanese off guard, ripped Tokyo and three other industrial centers as devastatingly (over a period of 10 days) as the atom bomb tore up Hiroshima.

THE AIRLIFT

Less than 3 years after the peace, when everyone else was loosening up their military girdles, LeMay found himself running the Berlin airlift as chief of United States Air Forces in Europe. One day a C–54 pilot at Frankfurt felt a heavy hand on his shoulder, looked up into the Old Man's three stars. "Son, I'll take this load," said LeMay. "Go and tell your dispatcher—and if he lets the other end know I'm coming he'll get hell from me." LeMay flew into Berlin, unloaded, then took his place in the take-off waiting line for 40 minutes.

Back in Frankfurt he buzzed for his staff. Said he: "Get it fixed. I will expect airplanes to be taking off 5 minutes after they have unloaded—by day after tomorrow." Three days later he dropped in again. "O. K., it's fixed," he grunted. "See if you can better it."

When things eased up in Germany, he relaxed by hunting wild boar in the Black Forest and running his own "ham" radio transmitter at Wiesbaden. He invited his enlisted men to draw all the surplus radio equipment they needed to set up their own stations, often swapped midnight advice with his fellow hams. It was characteristic of his attitude toward his men; he never would step out of his way to make a public show of thoughtfulness, but was willing to rustle up radio gear on their behalf, be responsible for it and sit up late at night telling them how to use it. His reasoning: "I might want a lot of radio operators some day."

FLYAWAY DAY

When SAC moved from a field outside Washington to Offutt, next-door Omaha was tingling with anticipation of the big armadas to come. "What will this mean to Omaha?" asked a reporter as LeMay arrived on the scene. "It doesn't mean a damn thing to Omaha, and it doesn't mean a damn thing to me," he growled.

Actually, Offutt was to become the nerve center; no war planes are based there; the armadas and their crews are safely dispersed around the world at the other end of private telephone lines and powerful short-wave radios.

On the morning of Korea, LeMay didn't wait for the Pentagon to stir. He got on the wire with the commanders of his air forces: the second, eighth, and fifteenth. He ordered in Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, boss of the fifteenth at March Field. For 2 days, while SAC was in the dark on Washington's plans, the staff pored over their own top-secret intelligence on North Korean targets. "Rosie" O'Donnell's B–29's were loaded with flyaway kits, holding enough spare engines and parts to keep them flying for 30 days until normal supply lines could be set up wherever they might go.

Within 4 days and 23 hours after LeMay got his orders, Rosie's B–29's were bombing targets in Korea. LeMay almost worked up a pleased smile at this achievement,[4] then nearly bit through his pipestem when he heard that his high bombers had been used, as they were never intended to be, in low, front-line support. He recognized, of course, that in a tight spot a commander had to use whatever he had wherever he could.

ONE HAND TIED BEHIND

Korea wasn't really Curt LeMay's fight and it made him as restless as any main-eventer during the preliminaries. His Sunday punch was tense and ready, but, like a fighter with one hand tied behind him, he knew he would probably never be allowed to use it until the enemy struck first.

One thing that most worried LeMay and his command was the possibility that their outfit could be crippled before it ever got orders to strike back. LeMay has a hunch that SAC itself offers a more tempting initial target for an all-out Russian atomic attack on the United States than cities like New York and Detroit. That is why he keeps his men on ever-ready alert; why all of them constantly wear sidearms; why Offutt is fenced in and on the watch for saboteurs and guarded against paratroop surprise; why two men have been trained to spring to LeMay's side in case of trouble. It is why, too—though they know the decisions of state are not theirs to make—that men in SAC often fidget at the notion that they must first be hit before they can hit back. Like most men, they prefer peace and life to war and the possibility of death, but, more than most men, they have had to condition themselves to a pessimistic reading of the possibilities of peace.

Guarding themselves and keeping fit is a negative necessity; retaliating against an enemy is SAC's real job. That is why, nearly every night, the big B–36's nose through the long twilight of the fifty-fifth parallel, learning more and more about Russia's kind of weather, and how to get through it, in case of war, with their death-spreading weapons.

[3] An Ohio State classmate: Milton Caniff, creator of comic-strip Airmen Terry, Flip Corkin, Steve Canyon.

[4] A bad sinus condition years ago paralyzed some of LeMay's facial muscles, making smiling difficult and exaggerating his reputation for ferocity. He has long used a pipe or a cigar to anchor these muscles.

Field Day at the Farm of Herbert Bruce Thomson, at Forest, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me on September 9, at the field day on the farm of Mr. Herbert Bruce Thomson, Forest, Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There have been just 5 years since World War II ended. They may well go down in history as the most irresponsible 5 years of the great American Republic, and, unless we begin thinking straight and acting accordingly, they may be recorded as the prelude to the downfall of the greatest democracy of all time.

To think straight and act accordingly from this point forward, we would do well to analyze the postwar orgy to which we have indulged ourselves, for we are about to find that the adversaries which now confront us are strong and ruthless.

In these 5 years we have squandered the greatest prosperity ever to come to any nation; the Federal Government has collected far more taxes than ever before; it has spent far more money on purely domestic-civilian programs than ever before; it has spent far more money abroad than ever before; it has spent far more money for defense than ever before without achieving preparedness; and we have failed to curtail the greatest public debt any nation has ever known. In the past 20 years our Government has been in the black only 2. We have started deficit spending again in a large way, and it is possible that our Federal budget may not be balanced before we go over the precipice of financial disaster.

Before the invasion, Congress was told that the South Koreans were well trained, well equipped, and well prepared to defend themselves, and later we were told that we did not dare to train them extensively, or give them effective military equipment for fear they would attack the North Koreans.

We were told that the ECA (Marshall plan) expenditures abroad are necessary to contain communism and prevent war, but at the same time, we were told by Administrator Hoffman that the great effect of the foreign give-away program in Korea provoked the Communist Koreans into starting a war to hide its benefits.

We unified our armed services, and joined the United Nations to work as an integrated national and international team for peace. But, as we sent the marines to the war front to do a dirty job of shock-troop relief for our own unified forces under the direction of the United Nations, we called them a bunch of ballyhoo-bedecked policemen.

Our leaders complained that the high cost of defense was depriving socialistic domestic-civilian programs of Federal funds, but now we are saying we didn't spend enough for defense.

How inconsistent can national policy be?

To shift the blame, or conceal it, is a natural and inevitable follow-up to irresponsibility. Thus we have what is obvious hostility between the two greatest and most vital departments in the executive branch of the Government. Who is shifting the blame or whose blame is being concealed remains to be seen.

These are some of the things I have in mind when I say we had better start thinking straight and acting accordingly, for I assert without fear of contradiction that the American democracy—all of the things that make it and all of its beneficence—stands today in the hour of its greatest peril. If we don't recognize it it's because we haven't thought about it, and if we don't know it it's because we haven't been told about it. If we haven't thought about it then our civilization is void of its vaunted intellect. If we aren't told about it then our leadership is criminally delinquent.

We have maneuvered the greatest country, the best form of government, and the finest nation of people in the history of the world, into a position where they are fiscally vulnerable from within, and perhaps so greatly extended that they may be militarily vulnerable from without. Neither democracy nor freedom can survive in either the shackles of overwhelming debt or the bondage of military dictatorship.

This then is a simple plea for the preservation of freedom in our homes, in our work, and our religion. It is a simple plea that we do what we know has to be done—strip off the luxuries of sociological ventures and political bids for votes by spending public money. It is a simple plea that we get down to the sweat and the toil of the work that is required to make this country fiscally sound and militarily impregnable.

Here is the situation into which we have gotten ourselves—the situation which we must overcome if we are not to be overcome.

We have only 6 percent of the world's population. We have assumed the responsibility for propping up the economy of half the world and defending more than half the countries of the world from military attack by Communist dictators who control the other half of the earth.

These are tremendous responsibilities which we have assumed at a time when our national debt is more than a quarter of a trillion dollars—more than any other nation ever dared to conceive, much less assume. Our taxes are already approaching confiscatory levels, and much greater taxation must yet come.

Our only hope to meet the responsibilities we have assumed and to preserve our free way of life lies in the capacity of the free-enterprise system to produce in mass quantities those goods, materials, and engines of war which are needed under such conditions in better quality and greater quantity than all of our adversaries combined. And there is no reason for us to expect much help from the nations who are associated with us, for they are more wards than allies.

Yet, the President and our leaders are still insisting upon expansion of socialistic legislation—socialized housing, socialized medicine, socialized farming (the Brannan plan)—which, if adopted, will destroy the free-enterprise system. This free-enterprise system upon which we depend cannot survive in confiscatory taxes or overwhelming debt, or state socialism. What happens to free enterprise under socialism has been demonstrated by the British before our very eyes in these same 5 years since World War II.

In these 5 years the Federal Government has spent approximately $40,000,000,000 for strictly domestic-civilian programs, exclusive of the cost of the interest on the debt, veterans, foreign assistance and defense. Since 1948 domestic-civilian expenditures by the debt-ridden Federal Government increased approximately 75 percent, exclusive of interest, veterans, foreign assistance and defense. At the same time, during these 5 years, we thought it was necessary to spend approximately $100,000,000,000 to prop up our foreign friends economically, and defend them and ourselves militarily—roughly $35,000,000,000 in foreign assistance and $65,000,000,000 in our defense and in foreign military aid.

Whether our Communist adversaries will continue to weaken us by prolonging this series of sideline satellite wars breaking out here and there all over the globe, or whether they will risk committing themselves and their own resources to an all-out third world war, is to be their decision—not ours. Russia has the timetable—not us.

Perhaps there is no sadder commentary on the quality of postwar Yankee shrewdness at Washington than the fact that we have allowed ourselves to be maneuvered into the shameful position where communistic dictators can call the tunes to which the free people of Christian democracies must dance.

At any rate the end of the sacrifices we must make—in blood, in standards of living, and in hard-earned dollars—is not in sight, whether we continue hopping thither and yon to put down sideline wars set off by satellites in remote areas, or whether we are called upon to exert our supreme effort in another world conflagration.

We must do everything it takes to defend ourselves. Our own defense should be as nearly impregnable as possible and should be our first consideration. But, even before we started building our own military defenses, we committed ourselves to military defense of virtually indefensible foreign nations. To defend ourselves in any circumstances, of course, is our duty, and to defend the others in the current circumstances is a responsibility to which we have committed ourselves.

These things the Russians know. Apparently they know it better than we do. And, these things the Russians are exploiting. They are especially exploiting our vulnerable fiscal condition at home, as Russia is waging against us today a war of economic attrition. More than her own military might, the Russians are probably counting on the traditional American reluctance to give up luxuries as usual, business as usual, and politics as usual. In short, they want us to beat ourselves by our own profligacy.

I have been frequently criticized by some of the New Dealers and Fair Dealers for voting with Republicans in the Senate, but I tell you now, as I have said before, the test of my vote in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, are determined by the test of what I believe in my conscience to be the best for my country. I say with all the sincerity of which I am capable that such must be the test to be applied to everything by everybody in this country—in public office or out—for a long time to come if we are to restore the peace and freedom for which this Nation was founded, and to which it is dedicated.

There is no short cut—there is no easy way; it can't be postponed—it must become a part of us for a long time to come.

Our Federal expenditure budget this year will be between $50,000,000,000 and $75,000,000,000, and it will be higher for years to come before it gets lower. Our tax budget must approach the expenditure figure as nearly as possible, and it, too, will be higher for a long time before it gets lower. Our debt, also, will rise for years to come before it gets lower. Add to these the dangers of uncontrolled inflation, and the outlook for the future is gloomy indeed. As awful as these prospects are, they, of course, cannot be compared with the fact that our casualty lists may be expected to grow much greater before they become smaller.

These are the grim facts that we face but have not been told about. Unfortunately, the more gruesome part of the burden we carry must be borne by the fresh young armies, navies and air forces we send abroad. It is not too much to ask the older generation to roll up its sleeves and cast aside its luxury and make the economic sacrifices which are necessary to the preservation of the Nation, the form of government, and the freedom which were its heritage.

I do not concede that either democracy, or free enterprise, or any other American freedom has run the course of its usefulness in the world. They have been worth fighting for and winning for in the past against both economic and military challenge, and I do not concede that they were any dearer to those who have fought and won before than they are to us today. We shall win again, but not until we begin thinking straight through all the double talk that we hear to the hard core of the problems that confront us; until we recognize the sacrifices we must make; until we see clearly the course we must take; and until we act accordingly.

In all of these, leadership characterized by unselfish and selfless patriotism is the first requirement. We have had it in the past. It is not too much to ask now.

"To Malik" Is To Lie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dewey L. Fleming entitled "'To Malik,' Voice Tells World, Means Violent, Repeated Lying," from the Baltimore Sun of August 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TO MALIK" VOICE TELLS WORLD, MEANS VIOLENT, REPEATED LYING

(By Dewey L. Fleming)

WASHINGTON, August 25.—The new verb "to malik," which appears to have made its debut in print in a Baltimore Sun editorial of August 14, has been bouncing over world air waves recently in English and 10 foreign languages via the State Department's Voice of America.

The Voice picked up the word on the day after initial publication and subsequently in repeated broadcasts has sought to explain its

origin and meaning and to impress its utilitarian value upon all the peoples of the world.

DERIVES FROM DELEGATE NAME

In the French, Chinese, Hungarian, Greek, Czechoslovak, Polish, Serbian, Italian, Spanish, and Russian languages—and, of course, in English—the Voice has explained that the word derives from the name of Jakob Malik, Russian delegate and current president of the United Nations Security Council, and has quoted the definition constructed by the Sun:

"Malik—verb, intransitive (Russian): To lie repetitiously and violently in the hope of overwhelming the obvious truth; especially to lie in this fashion to obstruct parliamentary proceedings."

Certain linguistic difficulties have attended the efforts to translate the newly coined word into all tongues, but experts of the Voice seem to have surmounted all of them and it would not be the fault of the Voice if the word fails to win a place in world-wide diplomatic vernacular.

EMBELLISHED FOR RUSSIANS

In the Russian tongue the new word comes out "malikovshchina," and for the benefit of Russian listeners the Voice has embellished the Sun's definition with some additions of its own.

"Malikovshchina," said the Voice in a broadcast of August 16, "means an endless systematical distortion of facts, remembering well that water hollows a stone. The word 'malikovshchina' is based on the assumptions that repeated mendacious distortions of fact finally succeed in obscuring the most obvious truths."

In its French broadcast, after transmitting the Sun's definition, the Voice added a facetious footnote to the effect that "Malik" may have been the original source of the expression "Honi soit qui malik pense."

In passing the new word along to the Hungarians, the Voice explained that there could be no objection from the philological point of view to making a verb out of the proper name "Malik."

"The word 'galvanization' derived from the name of Galvani," the explanation continued, " 'pasteurization' from that of Pasteur, 'lynch' from Lynch, and Captain Boycott gave his name to the word 'boycott.'

"After last week's performance," the script continued, "Jakob Malik, representative of the 'glorious' Soviet Union at the United Nations, seems to deserve that in view of his activities his last name should be preserved for posterity in the form of a verb or noun."

IN CHINESE, ITS DEER HORSE

The Voice gave the word to the Chinese, too, but pointed out that the Chinese already had a word meaning the same thing. That word, it said was "deer horse," deriving from the story of Eunuch Chao Kao under Ehr Shih Huang Ti, who forced his puppets among the emperor's ministers to call a deer a horse, and then liquidated those who would not lie when the eunuch wanted them to.

"Today, to call a deer a horse has become proverbial in Chinese as a quality belonging to a person who distorts the truth," the Voice added.

In apprising the Greeks of the new word, the Voice said it would be glad for the Academy of Athens to pass judgment on it, and to the Czechoslovaks it commented:

"This verb could be, naturally, used in various other forms, as—to malik in, to malik out, to malik under, to malik over, but the meaning remains in principle the same."

In Spanish the new word emerges as malikear, and Spanish listeners were advised that those who attempt to copy Mr. Malik's behavior could be called "maliks, synonym of lies and fallacies."

Tax Loopholes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on taxes appearing in the September 4 issue of the Trainman News be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE UNIT IS WALL STREET SANTA

(By Public Affairs Institute)

Any tax structure that lays claim to fairness should be related to income and wealth. Individuals and businesses should share the tax burden on an ability to pay basis.

Incorporation of the progressive income tax schedule in our tax laws is supposed to reflect that principle.

A majority of Members of the Eighty-first Congress Senate Finance Committee, however, do not share this belief. An analysis of the tax bill reported by this group shows that it lays heaviest burdens on those least able to pay and actually provides new gratuities for the few well-to-do individuals and families at the highest income brackets.

The table in the next column shows, for example, that the largest increase in tax liability under the Senate bill is levied on the lowest income groups.

This table shows the principle of progression applied in reverse. For the entire income group earning under $5,000 taxes are raised over 20 percent, while for the entire income class earning $5,000 and over the bill increases the tax less than 15 percent.

Look at the individual income classes and notice how the percentage rise in tax bears heaviest on those in the lowest brackets—20.48 percent and then diminishes to an 8.5 percent increase in the million-dollar-and-over bracket.

The effect of the Senate bill is to wipe out the percentage reductions of 1945 and 1948 and restore tax rates close to the highest wartime level of 1944. However, the Senate bill does not repeal the gratuity made to the wealthiest families in 1948 which permits a husband and wife to split their income for tax purposes.

The story of inequities, however, does not end with the analysis of the tax liabilities schedule. The well-to-do get other special considerations.

For example, capital gains, whether from a bona fide investment, a purely speculative venture, or merely as a cloak for other income, are taxed at a rate considerably lower than the surtax rate on income.

Capital gains is in reality a device for tax avoidance and constitutes a major loophole in the tax structure benefiting the few who derive substantial income from stock investment.

Instead of attempting to close the loophole, the committee's bill now makes it easier to get preferential rate treatment for capital gains by reducing from 6 months to 3 months the period that an asset must be held for the gain to be taxed at the 25 percent long-term rate.

The committee has made numerous other gifts which benefit only a minority of wealthy families.

One amendment under the guise of preventing further concentration of industry reduces substantially the tax liability on dividends paid out by family corporations.

Another amendment specifically nullifies a United States Supreme Court decision which held that a gift of a partnership interest to a member of the family cannot be used as a device for tax avoidance. This amendment is made retroactive to 1938 and since many cases are in litigation will involve considerable refunds of taxes.

The tax avoidance loophooles inserted by the committee is by no means exhausted by these few illustrations.

To add insult to injury the committee has announced that its staff is to study the possibilities of increasing revenues by means of a Federal sales or transactions tax.

As with wealthy individuals, the committee's treatment of corporate income is also marked by considerable leniency.

The chairman has not only refused to enact a corporate excess profits tax but has threatened there will be no tax bill at all if such a tax is adopted by the Senate.

Corporate income before taxes will be running in excess of $35,000,000,000 before the year is out. The rate will be over three times as high as the wartime peak of $10,800,000,000 in 1944.

Dividend payments are currently running at a rate of over $8,000,000,000, almost double 1944 and are rising rapidly. Corporate profits retained in company treasuries currently are at a rate close to $12,000,000,000, also double the 1944 rate.

In the first quarter of this year the profits of stockholders in the largest private manufacturing corporations was over 21 percent. This means that profits were at a rate which would return the stockholders' entire investment in less than 5 years.

The liquid-asset position of corporations is the highest in history.

By any reasonable standards of comparison, profits were phenomenally high and rising from 1946–48. They are going even higher now.

These profits are excessive and arise in large part from the Government's expenditures for defense. Yet the Senate Finance Committee has refused to tap these profits to pay for defense.

Under the committee bill total corporate tax liability is to be raised $1,500,000,000. The maximum increase is under seven percentage points in the effective tax rates. And it is by no means certain that corporations will make even this relatively small contribution.

For corporations are to be given additional tax relief in the form of accelerated amortization of defense facilities. Many such plants built during World War II are still producing civilian goods—a gift to their owners from Uncle Sam.

Corporations will also recoup some of these extra taxes from the extension of the period over which a loss may be carried against income in the preceding period.

The committee report acknowledges that some revenue loss is involved in this amendment. "The amount (is) uncertain and will depend upon future business conditions."

This bill is a bad tax bill. It is grossly inequitable and will further shift the burden of taxation on those least able to bear it.

Tax liability

[Money amount in thousands]

Income class after deductions before exemption	Present law	Finance committee bill	Percent increase in tax liability
Under $1,000	$111,971	$134,900	20.47
$1,000 to $2,000	920,795	1,109,408	20.48
$2,000 to $3,000	2,440,298	2,940,115	20.48
$3,000 to $4,000	2,000,454	2,400,855	20.01
$4,000 to $5,000	2,014,164	2,416,118	19.95
Total under $5,000	7,487,682	9,001,396	20.21

Tax liability—Continued

Income class after deductions before exemption	Present law	Finance committee bill	Percent increase in tax liability
$5,000 to $10,000	$2,156,251	$2,558,362	18.64
$10,000 to $25,000	2,382,662	2,743,294	15.13
$25,000 to $50,000	1,496,822	1,701,586	13.67
$50,000 to $100,000	856,063	963,180	12.51
$100,000 to $300,000	966,543	1,079,124	11.64
$300,000 to $500,000	177,723	195,241	9.85
$500,000 to $1,000,000	150,926	165,274	9.50
$1,000,000 and over	139,480	151,412	8.55
Total over $5,000	8,326,470	9,557,473	14.78

Source: The Revenue Act of 1950—Report of the Committee on Finance, U. S. Senate No. 2375, p. 7, table 3.

Resignation of Morris Shenker From Democratic National Finance Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been considerable controversy over the question of the disgraceful new appointment to the Democratic National Finance Committee. I have contended that no individual connected as an attorney, or in any other capacity, temporary or permanent, with a racing wire service or any similar activity should hold a political post of any party.

But I do not want to take the valuable time of the Senate, particularly today when it is debating this very important anti-Communist legislation, and so I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of a supplementary statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SAYS SHENKER RESIGNATION "DOES NOT CLOSE BOOK ON THIS DISGRACEFUL EPISODE"; EXPRESSES REGRET CRIME COMMITTEE WILL NOT PROBE

The latest news reports that Morris Shenker, St. Louis attorney, is resigning from the Democratic Finance Committee because of an allegedly crowded legal schedule. This sudden turn of events is another one of those "coincidences" that seem to dog the Democratic Party. Whatever the real reason (which it will never admit) the Democratic Party may feel assured that this will not close the book on this disgraceful episode. The minds of the American people cannot so easily forget nor forgive this outrageous appointment.

The Democratic bosses of Kansas City and Washington consistently underestimate the intelligence, memory, and decency of the American people.

KEFAUVER WAS RIGHT IN URGING RESIGNATION

I am sure that the American people read with deep interest and support the previous statement of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to the effect that Shenker should resign from the appointment. From the very moment the news of the appointment came out, there was a feeling along all segments of American society, regardless of political party, that it was a brazen act to appoint any individual remotely connected even in the slightest way with the forces of interstate gambling.

KEFAUVER WAS WRONG IN REJECTING PROBE OF SHENKER

I am indeed sorry, however, that Chairman KEFAUVER did not feel that this shocking episode merited an investigation by the Crime Committee. Apparently it is all right to investigate the racing wire service, but it is not all right to investigate individuals legally associated with the service, who have high-up political connections. To my mind, high-up political connections are the most sinister aspect of the whole situation.

Chairman KEFAUVER felt that the situation apparently was foul and malodorous, but not foul enough for the Crime Committee to investigate. I am sorry, but I disagree with him completely.

With regard to Shenker's telegram, I may say that as former chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, as an attorney for over 30 years and as a former district attorney, I naturally respect the rights of American attorneys. I respect the privacy of attorney-client relationships. But at the same time, I am sworn to protect and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States, and I do not believe that any individual could remain silent or inactive in the face of this terrible situation.

SHENKER'S PIOUS PLEADINGS DO NOT EXCUSE SITUATION

Yes, it is the right of an American attorney to defend whomever he pleases. Yes, it is quite obvious that there must be individuals to defend persons accused of crime, and in legal history some of the finest attorneys in America have indeed represented such individuals. However, I do not believe that it is the right of any attorney to wrap about himself the flag and the Constitution and piously plead that he has the right to simultaneously represent racing interests and also serve on a political committee.

Let us discuss, however, the principle involved; not personalities or individuals. I am speaking for the principle of clean government and clean politics. I don't want civic students in American schools to read that the way to become a member of a party finance committee is to represent gambling interests.

RACING WIRE HISTORY IS LONG BLOOD BATH

The able chairman of the Crime Committee has often stated that the racing wire service is a key to interstate gambling. Illegal horse betting approaches a total often estimated as high as five to eight billion dollars a year. The whole history of the racing wire service from the days of James Regan, before and after, is a story of blood baths, killings, corruption, extortions, beatings, and every other sort of foul play. The racing wire service is right now being investigated by the Senate Crime Committee. Shortly the committee will leave for open hearings in Kansas City and St. Louis to explore it further. How, then, could any American condone, forget, or forgive the apointment of an individual who represents one section of the racing wire service—Pioneer News Service of St. Louis.

THIS REPRESENTS PENDERGAST PATTERN

There are larger implications to this situation. The great State of Missouri is, unfortunately, the home of the vicious Pendergast philosophy. A St. Louis attorney seeking parole of gangsters is entertained at the White House. Another St. Louis attorney (Shenker) receives a high political appointment. This is a part of the whole historical pattern of Pendergastism.

The most obvious fact is that the Democratic Party has, to say the least—and take the most charitable interpretation—been careless about its associations, or, at the worst, that it has intentionally adopted a policy of associating itself with individuals who do not command the respect of the average American. The same party which coddled the Pressmans, the Hisses, and other individuals with alien political associations also coddles individuals associated, albeit in an entirely legal way, with sinister subrosa interests. This is, as I said yesterday, symptomatic of a decline in moral standards, a breakdown in moral values on the part of a political party. These are not just my conclusions, but the conclusions which come from the very facts in this matter. It is evidenced by the fact that decent segments of the Democratic Party quickly rushed to get rid of this individual.

Decent Democrats like decent Republicans, have no stomach for a situation which is ripe for political favoritism to illegal interests. We all know that gambling interests have contributed fabulous sums to political campaigns in the past.

NEWS FACTS ABOUT SHENKER

Lastly, so as to keep the record straight, may I quote from a Washington Post story by Chalmers Roberts in the Sunday, September 10 issue. This story which preceded my initial statement shows the facts about Mr. Shenker—facts carried by the great news services of America:

"NAMING OF GAMBLERS' LAWYER BY DEMOCRATS STARTS TROUBLE

"The Democratic National Committee has just made itself a peck of political trouble by naming to its finance committee a St. Louis attorney who represents some of the country's biggest gambling figures.

"The man is Morris A. Shenker. He has appeared here before the Senate Crime Investigating Committee and before the Senate Commerce Committee with St. Louis betting commissioner James J. Carroll, with William P. Brown, chief owner of the Pioneer race news wire, with Brown's partner, William Molasky, who contributed $2,000 to Missouri's Governor Forrest Smith's 1948 campaign, and he has been on hand several other times as an interested spectator.

"Only yesterday, the Associated Press reported he was in Jefferson City, the Missouri capital, representing four St. Louis men indicted along with Western Union officials for conspiracy to violate gambling laws in New Jersey by accepting telegraphed horse race bets. Shenker lost his effort to prevent their extradition."

Democratic Functions of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democratic Functions of Labor," published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of September 4, 1950. This is a very sound account of the labor movement in the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC FUNCTIONS OF LABOR

More than 16,000,000 men and women today are members of labor unions in the United States. (Some claim the figure is actually more than 20,000,000 but 16,000,000 is the number which is officially accredited

and accepted.) Organized labor in the United States is almost as old as the Nation itself. It is not, as many seem to believe, a relatively new and startling phenomenon. The last 20 years have merely been the years of greatest growth and power.

Associations of free workingmen have existed nearly 150 years. In the beginning they were entirely local and limited to a very few of the more skilled trades and crafts. But as early as 1827, the failure of a carpenters' strike in Philadelphia led to the formation of the Mechanics' Union of Trade Associations, and it grew to have considerable power, both economic and political in its area.

The depression of 1837 had a disastrous effect on this early movement toward broad organization. In those days, the courts in many States interpreted strikes as a form of conspiracy against property. The movement was undoubtedly retarded by the opening of new frontiers, the call of opportunities in the West. The labor movement received its greatest impulse in the period of industrial expansion which followed the Civil War.

A National Labor Union was attempted in 1866, and in 1869 came the Noble Order of the Knights of Labor (a sort of combination lodge and one big union plan). This order came to have 700,000 members by 1886, but its influence waned after the bloody Haymarket riots in Chicago during that year. The American Federation of Labor which was founded in 1881 at Pittsburgh as the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada moved in to take its place. Sam Gompers, the cigar maker, was one of the founders. In 1885 he became president of the AFL and held that office until his death in 1924.

The great railroad brotherhoods date from this period, although most of them have remained independent on the theory that they could fight their battles alone, theirs being highly specialized trades. In our times, we have seen the development of the CIO which is based on the theory that in many industries unions must be "horizontal" or industry-wide instead of by crafts, as in AFL.

Today organized labor must be accepted as one of the most important facts of American life. After more than 100 years of continuous and sometimes bloody struggle, the right to organize and the right to bargain collectively for wages and hours and pensions and privileges has become law of the land, but we have not yet found any very efficient or orderly process for the adjustment of industrial disputes. It is a futile truism to say:

"Peace will come only when labor and management realize that their interests are essentially mutual and not antagonistic."

There are many who fear that labor will not be content with anything less than control of government and control of industry. There are some labor leaders who are obviously power mad. Such a dictatorship as that of John L. Lewis over 600,000 coal miners is not healthy, even for the labor movement. Those labor leaders who set political goals ahead of the progress and welfare of the members violate the principles set down by the statesmanlike Gompers who preached as long as he lived that labor's political power should be used only to achieve its rights, not for purely political gains.

(The troubles labor is having today with its Communist infiltrators and its crackpots are not at all new. Throughout its history, the labor movement has always been beset by schemers and theorists seeking to divert it from its major aims).

It has occurred to us on Labor Day that a review of labor history in the United States might be helpful, because to our mind this history means just one thing—organization of working men to bargain for their rights is essentially a democratic function. Labor leaders who use czaristic tactics often forget this. Those few employers who still do not recognize it as a natural and inevitable process for free men are forgetting something that is part of the inheritance of every American—his right to speak up, his right to choose his representatives, his right to claim as rights many benefits which otherwise take the character of "largesse" or a form of charity.

Perhaps the greatest service the labor unions have rendered this Nation is what they have achieved for the self-respect of the man who works for wages. Union members owe it to themselves and to the Nation to keep their unions truly democratic. In spite of any faults which may be in unions the rest of us owe it to ourselves and to the Nation to understand their essential meaning to the 16,000,000 Americans who use this means of expressing and asserting their rights.

The Sunken Battleship "Arizona"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article that appeared in a recent edition of the Denver Kiwanian.

It is an interesting report by a member of the Denver Kiwanis Club who had visited in Honolulu and was impressed with the sight of the partly sunken battleship *Arizona* in Pearl Harbor.

I feel certain Members of Congress will be interested in knowing that through the efforts of this visitor the flag again flies daily over the *Arizona* as a permanent memorial to the 1,092 American boys whose bodies remain buried in the sunken hulk of the battleship.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMEMBER THE "MAINE", FORGET THE "ARIZONA"—UNITED STATES SLEEPS

On February 17, 1950, Denver Kiwanian Bill Wafer went on a sight-seeing cruise of Pearl Harbor. The sunken battleship *Arizona*, the unmarked tomb of 1,092 American boys, was pointed out to him, and from then until the day he left Hawaii, February 25, he worked, cajoled, and threatened in his efforts to remove the stigma of the unmarked tomb. He went to the Governor, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps, and he was met with: "* * * it is forbidden to fly the American Flag over a sunken battleship." So he went to that citadel of builders—his Kiwanis Club in Honolulu—and said, "There is a monument in Havana, a memorial for the boys on the battleship *Maine* * * * across the road from the Maine monument stands a tribute honoring four Cuban boys killed in Spain. This is a life-size memorial done in marble at a cost of one-half million dollars—to mention but two of many throughout the world. I know my Kiwanis club in Denver will help me, and I want your help to get a memorial for these lads of the *Arizona*." Bill stayed after the meeting, and two members of the club were selected to call on the Navy the following day.

On March 7, 1950, just 17 days after Bill began his fighting campaign for a memorial—the flag flew again over the sunken U. S. S. *Arizona*. Here are excerpts from an article that appeared in one of Honolulu's newspapers that day:

"The American flag for which they died flies again over 1,092 U. S. S. *Arizona* crewmen, trapped in the seared and mortally wounded battleship in the opening hour of World War II * * *.

"Yesterday was the first time a flag has flown over the *Arizona* since 9 a. m. of that day of infamy when she crumpled and sank in the shallow water off Ford Island. That was just 8 years and 4 months ago yesterday * * * Only the barettes which seated her gun turrets and the rust-ruined superstructure protrude today from the water tomb of the battleship.

"Underneath the shredded deck lie the remains of 1,092 Navy men who never really knew why they died. It was in their memory that the 20-by-30-foot flag was hoisted yesterday atop a 50-foot silver flagpole, welded to the armored trunk of the midship superstructure.

"The sun shone brightly, the sky was clear, and the waves lapped easily during the 4-minute ceremony attended by Governor Stainback, Hawaii's Navy and Marine chiefs, and a handful of newsmen.

"A color guard of marines in dress blues and sailors in neatly-pressed whites came to attention as Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Pacific Fleet commander, stepped aboard the orange-stained hulk.

"He spoke just 32 words: 'We are here this morning,' he said, 'to do honor to the *Arizona* and her splendid crew, so many of whom are still with their ship.

" 'From today on, the *Arizona* will again fly our country's flag just as proudly as she did on the morning of December 7, 1941. I am sure the *Arizona's* crew will know and appreciate what we are doing.'

"Capt. E. B. Harp, the Pacific Fleet chaplain, then offered a short prayer. 'May our efforts,' he asked, 'now be viewed as a solemn covenant with our fallen comrades—a covenant to complete the tasks which will help shape a better world for tomorrow.' He prayed that 'the flag we are about to raise will ever stand as a symbol of our devotion to those virtues which have made our Nation great.'

"The ceremony was over. The Governor and 10 white-clad admirals left the *Arizona*.

"From today on, a color guard will go out by boat each morning and at sundown to raise and lower the flag over the permanent tomb of one-third of all Pearl Harbor Day victims."

At our Wednesday's meeting, as part of our Armed Services Day observance, past president Col. Floyd Pool recounted these facts to us while Bill Wafer sat in humble silence at our head table. As Floyd finished, every man in the room was on his feet and the burst of applause told Bill how we felt. What did Bill do? In a voice which he couldn't quite keep steady he said, "Will you all stand a bit in silent prayer for those kids, and when you're praying say, 'Kids, on this day we'll remember you from now on.' " And as we sat down there wasn't a dry eye in the room!

How the Public Was Deluded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "How the Public Was Deluded," by Editorial Research Reports, published in the Portland Oregonian of August 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THE PUBLIC WAS DELUDED

(By Editorial Research Reports)

Given 4 or 5 months' more training, American ground troops throughout the world will be able to take on anybody, any time, anywhere (Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, November 3, 1949).

The reduced budget of $13,545,000,000 for the armed services offers an adequacy of defense for any situation that may arise in the next 2 years (Secretary Johnson, January 10, 1950).

If South Korea were invaded, our attitude would be that South Korea would be able to resist (Secretary of State Acheson, January 12).

The defenses of the United States are in better shape than they have ever been when the country was not at war (President Truman, March 2).

The situation is now not nearly as bad as in the first half of 1946 (President Truman, May 4).

The basic reason I have for concluding that there will not be a war soon is because of the changed nature of war (General MacArthur, May 26).

The world is closer to peace now than it has been in the last 5 years (President Truman, June 1).

As you establish here a wholesome society of steadily expanding well-being, you will set up a peaceful influence which will disintegrate the hold of Soviet communism on your fellows to the north and irresistibly draw them into unity with you (John Foster Dulles to Korean Assembly, June 19).

If we can hold out for a month, the worst will be over (Gen. Chung I. Kwun, South Korean chief of staff, June 28).

The morale of North Korean troops is reported deteriorating under the continued pressure of United States air attacks (MacArthur headquarters, July 11).

It is not hopeless, like Bataan, but it takes time. * * * You haven't got a catastrophe staring you in the face (Army General Staff spokesman, July 14).

An extensive bridgehead will be held (General Collins, July 15).

The enemy has had his great chance, but failed to exploit it (General MacArthur, July 20).

We aren't going to give up one more inch. We are going to stand and fight. There is no thought in the minds of anybody in this Army that there is a chance—even if we were so disposed—that there could possibly be a Dunquerque (Gen. Walton E. Walker, July 29).

We had hell kicked out of us this morning (General Walker, July 31).

United States Race Bias Cost Is Put at Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Race Bias Cost Is Put at Billions," written by Edmond J. Bartness, and published in the New York Times on September 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES RACE BIAS COST IS PUT AT BILLIONS—INDUSTRIALIST TELLS THE URBAN LEAGUE PREJUDICE IS DRAIN ON NATIONAL BUDGET, VIGOR

(By Edmond J. Bartnett)

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., September 7.—Intolerance and prejudice are "highly expensive indulgences," costing the American people "billions of dollars annually," Dwight R. G. Palmer, president of the General Cable Corp., declared here tonight.

Mr. Palmer, a member of the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services, said that "ordinary national self-interest demands that all our human resources be made available without delay or inhibitions."

His remarks were made in an address as he received the 1950 Two Friends Award of the National Urban League at its fortieth anniversary convention here. The award is made annually to a Negro and a white who have cooperated in an "outstanding instance of interracial teamwork for the good of the American community."

The Negro award went to John H. Sengstacke, editor and publisher of the Chicago Defender. He served on the seven-man President's committee with Mr. Palmer. In a message to the convention, President Truman said "the work of this committee will bear fruit for years to come."

POINTS TO JOB OPENINGS

Mr. Palmer, a member of the Urban League's Commerce and Industry Council, noted that more and more business concerns were opening jobs to Negroes. That, he said, was important to the American economy as a whole.

"The companies which have opened wide their doors to job-seekers, and thereafter to promotion on sheer merit, without reference to race or creed, enjoy a distinct advantage over competitors still hamstrung by prejudice," he asserted.

In the first place, he said, it means that America is beginning to tap a great reservoir of "talents and energies that otherwise would have remained inert." Prejudice, he declared, represents "a fearful drain on our national budget and a fearful strain on our national vigor."

Secondly, he declared, when the blocks to work, education, promotion, and equal opportunity are removed, more people will be aided in an escape from slums and poverty, where disease and crime are bred.

DENUNCIATION MADE

Mr. Palmer, last year's winner of the American Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, denounced industries, labor unions, and technical schools that refuse to utilize the talents of 15,000,000 Negroes and 5,000,000 Jews. He accused them of "sabotaging the military might and committing a crime against the security of the United States."

Mr. Sengstacke said the success of the President's committee "demonstrates again the moral courage of our Nation to acknowledge our frailties and to have enough common sense to tackle them. The integration of our Armed Forces was not only pertinent because it reinforced and buttressed our defense but it gave virility to the moral fiber of our Nation."

Winners of the annual Thalheimer award for essays on vocational guidance were announced tonight. First prize of $100 went to Edward Smith, of Hope, Ark., and second prize of $75 was won by Miss Jerolyn Johnson, of Corona, Queens, a sophomore at Morgan State College, Baltimore.

Irresponsible Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Irresponsible Years," published in the Washington Evening Star of September 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"IRRESPONSIBLE YEARS"

In his talk at Forest, Va., Saturday, Senator BYRD said that the period since the end of World War II "may well go down in history as the most irresponsible 5 years of the great American Republic."

The Virginia Senator offered a certain documentation in support of his contention, and, though it will not be accepted in all of its particulars by all people, there are certain things that cannot be denied. One of these is that, after spending $60,000,000,000 for national defense over the past 5 years, we now find ourselves in a war, and a minor war at that, for which we are not effectively prepared. To say this, of course, is not to tell the whole story. The Korean war is not the kind of war in which we can effectively use our B–36's and our atom bombs, into which much money has gone. Perhaps these weapons, in an all-out war, would more than justify the expense of producing them, but the fact remains that, after spending $60,000,000,000, we are barely able to hold our own in Korea and probably could not fight at all in other places where the Communists may elect to move. And in view of this, Senator BYRD was on solid ground in saying that "we have maneuvered the greatest country, the best form of government, and the finest Nation of people in the history of the world into a position where they are fiscally vulnerable from within, and perhaps so greatly extended that they may be militarily vulnerable from without."

We cannot relive the past 5 years, however; the time and opportunities lost cannot be retrieved. What we can do is to recognize that this Nation is "in the hour of its greatest peril," and resolve to do what can be done and what has to be done if we are to survive.

We can heed what Senator BYRD describes as a simple plea that we do what we know has to be done—"strip off the luxuries of sociological ventures and political bids for votes by spending public money, and get down to the sweat and toil of the work that is required to make this country fiscally sound and militarily impregnable."

Taking note of criticisms that he has sometimes voted with the Republicans in the Senate, Senator BYRD said he has set this standard for himself: "My votes in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, are determined by the test of what I believe in my conscience to be the best for my country."

That is an excellent standard, one to which all of us should adhere.

Why Were We Deceived?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Were We Deceived," published in the Portland Oregonian of August 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WERE WE DECEIVED?

In other columns on this page are printed some quotations from high governmental and military officials prior to and after the opening of the Korean war. Perhaps they will help to explain why the public was so completely in the dark about our lack of military readiness. Putting it plainly, the people were deceived.

Primary responsibility for this deception lies with the Truman administration. The President repeatedly assured us of the adequacy of our defenses, and the prospect for peace. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson made it even more strong—and the boodled people applauded him for slashing military expenditures. John Foster Dulles, the Republican foreign expert, added his reassuring voice. The generals have played along.

These statements which now astound us were tossed out with the abandon of confirmed optimists. On what were they based? That is the question for which the people must now require an answer—and without dissembling. Why, in a free country with elective government responsible to the voters, have the officials in whom we placed the highest confidence duped us—and perhaps themselves?

Address by Hon. Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, Before Order of the Sons of Italy, West Haven, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 13 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me on Sunday, August 27, 1950, before the Order of the Sons of Italy at West Haven, Conn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends and fellow members of the Sons of Italy:

Thank you—thank you from the bottom of my heart for the high honor you have done me. This is one of the happiest hours of my life. In making me an honorary member of the Sons of Italy you have given me great pride. You have given me also a special responsibility—acting and working in keeping with the ideals and achievements of the Sons of Italy.

This responsibility will not be easy to discharge. The Sons of Italy has a tradition of great work on behalf of a great cause—bringing Italy and our own Nation ever more closely together. Tonight, my friends, and that friend of all lovers of freedom—the Vice President of the United States—honors us with his presence. With us also are distinguished Americans from all walks of life. Their attendance is proof of the esteem our Nation bears toward this great organization. The esteem is fully merited. No group has worked harder, or more successfully, in knitting more tightly together the community of freedom-loving peoples.

A gathering such as this would be impossible in the Soviet Union. In this hall are members of both political parties. This audience has assembled of its own free will, and not at the dictate of any official. No propagandist in charge of "spontaneous demonstrations" has forced you to come—nor has anyone compelled you to honor me with this award. If you had stayed home, you would not have run the risk of losing your job—or else getting a new job in a concentration camp. You may applaud or not as you choose. You may leave here saying what you please. No one has told me what to say. No censor has passed on my manuscript. No secret policeman sits in this audience and furtively transcribes my words.

Stalin could never understand—nor tolerate—a meeting of this kind. Nor could Stalin understand or tolerate an organization such as the Sons of Italy. He could never realize that the Sons of Italy demonstrates its loyalty to America by enriching our Nation with the traditions of its forefathers. Its members have an abiding affection for the country which is their ancestral homeland. It is good that this is so. I can think of nothing more unnatural or unwise than that Americans should rudely sever the affectional cord which ties them to the ancient soil from whence their fathers came.

Our national glory consists of diversity within the framework of unity. Differing national foods, folk songs, and customs—these are what give America its peculiar characteristics, its unique flavor. In our Nation, these diverse traditions blend into a harmonious whole that is greater than the sum of its parts. Today, the United States and Italy find themselves partners in a common cause. This cause is the same cause for which the men of the United Nations now fight—and die—in Korea. There are those who claim they do not know why we are fighting in Korea. All our history tells us the answer—we are fighting for the same ideals we fought for at Trenton and at Gettysburg and in Argonne Forest. We are warriors in the age-old fight of freedom against tyranny.

They now work together, the United States and Italy, for a decent world, a world of peace with justice. This joint enterprise is a partnership of equals. A few people are inclined to forget this. They look at rich America and impoverished Italy; they total the dollars we have sent in the form of Marshall aid; they count the guns we have shipped to the outpost of freedom in the Adriatic and they wrongly conclude that we bear the brunt of the load.

It is true that our Nation is blessed with unrivaled resources; our farms and factories were not desolated by war. Italy has comparatively meager resources. Its true wealth resides in the spirit and determination of its people. Italy was ravished by 5 years of warfare. So it is just and inevitable that in today's partnership we should supply the bulk of material goods.

But it is grossly misleading to measure the mutual contributions to our joint undertaking only in physical terms. America's debt to Italy can never be completely repaid. Italian genius has left its indelible mark on western civilization. In art and sculpture, in music and architecture, in the advancement and science of learning, no nation has given the world more than Italy. It has been said that it would be impossible to record the 10 greatest men of all history without listing at least 3 of Italian blood. Christopher Columbus, Michelangelo, Da Vinci, Galileo, Dante—the names of these giants will live on to the last syllable of recorded time. The Italians have been the great colonizers of the world—bringing to far-off regions that amalgam of reverence for the past and an open mind toward the future that makes up the spirit of Italy. The Italian spirit has spread over the world in a way the Kremlin never can—not by tanks and fifth columnists but by the invincible force of Italian culture. I need not dwell on what Italians have contributed to America. It is a proud and impressive tale, known to all of you.

My own work in the field of atomic energy has brought me first-hand knowledge of one signal contribution. I am thinking of Dr. Enrico Fermi—Nobel prize winner and one of the world's most distinguished physicists. To Dr. Fermi belongs credit for some of the most important discoveries ever made in science. In fact, without his genius, the riddle of the atom might yet be unsolved. He was in charge of the atomic-energy project at the University of Chicago in December of 1942, and he supervised the first controlled nuclear chain reactions that heralded the beginning of the atomic age. Throughout the war he worked unstintingly to help make atomic energy the shield of our liberties. It is impossible to measure how much Dr. Fermi's discoveries have meant to our freedom and security and the world's hopes for the future.

At the end of the war there were a few who said that Italy was through. They said it could never recover from years of rapine and unparalleled destruction. These men of little faith had statistics on their side. They could point to the gutted towns, to idle factories, the broken transport system. Here—said the doubters—were hard facts.

But the so-called hard facts overlooked one thing—the tenacity of everyday Italians. The statistics did not reflect the courage of the people of Naples or Palermo or Florence; they ignored the toughness of the farmers who tilled the recalcitrant Italian soil. The odds against them were fearful. In 1945, Italy's production was down to a third of prewar levels; the Communists who owe their allegiance not to the Italian people but to Moscow sabotaged recovery.

And yet, despite problems which would somber the bravest of men—Italy is winning through. Thanks to the Marshall plan—thanks still more to the unvarnished courage of everyday Italians—Italy is fighting its way back to a proud place in the democratic family of nations. Production is back to prewar levels—and going up. The Communist influence has been blunted and reduced.

But even more important, a new vitality—a new resurgence of spirit—is sweeping over Italy. Every American who returns from Europe speaks of it; we hear talk of Rome supplanting Paris as the leading center of European arts and letters. Italy is resuming her former role as the great colonizer of ideas. The remarkable new movies, the new literature, the impressive revival in art and sculpture—these are again making Italy a nation to be reckoned with wherever things of the mind and soul are exalted.

We can be truly proud of our role in Italy's revival. The Marshall plan, which is both the most humanitarian and the most practical undertaking of all times, is working. It is giving Italy a desperately needed economic shot in the arm; it is helping Italians help themselves.

Were it not for the Marshall plan and for our stockpile of atomic bombs, I believe that the Soviet armies would by now have engulfed all of Europe and would be poised on the English Channel. My greatest satisfac-

tion in public life has come from the opportunity given me, in my role as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to help make our atomic stockpile the world's No. 1 deterrent against Soviet aggression.

A great deal is said, and properly so, of the Marshall plan and our military-assistance program. More—much more—should be said about the help that Americans of Italian descent give their mother country on their own initiative. Every CARE package, every encouraging letter, I estimate, offsets a column of Communist propaganda.

This was eloquently demonstrated in the spring of 1948. Italy hung in the balance between freedom and tyranny. Employing their familiar techniques of falsehood and coercion, the Communists threatened to take over the government. But Americans who proudly claim Italian ancestry rose to meet the threat. In over a million letters to their Italian friends and relatives, they spread the gospel of freedom. They told them that the eyes of all the world were on Italy; they promised that America would never let Italy down. And then, on that fateful election Sunday of April 1948, the Italian voters went to the polls and dealt the Communist Party a blow from which it has never recovered.

Italy is proving that she is a trustworthy ally in the common front against Red aggression. Our Nation must, and will, continue to prove that she is worthy of this trust. Italy's economic and military position—let us not deceive ourselves—is still difficult. She has the brains, the muscle, and the spirit, but she needs more tools and more arms. It is up to us to supply that need. I will do my best to see that it is done.

Italy, as you are aware, suffers from the twin problem of overpopulation and unemployment. It strikes me as simple common sense that the underdeveloped areas of the world near Italy—areas that are now underpopulated and need development—should be opened to the skill and energy of Italian workers. The unemployed Italian wants to make his own way in the world—he must be given a chance to do it.

We must help him. We must keep open—and open even wider, if possible—the door to Italian immigrants. In 1921, 42,000 Italians were admitted to our country. By the act of 1923, this number was reduced to 8,200. I think you know of my efforts to raise the quota of Italian immigrants.

We must do yet one thing more—we must make the reality of our Nation come ever closer to that promise inscribed on the Statue of Liberty. No Italian must ever have cause to regret that he forsook the land of his fathers for the New World.

Ladies and gentlemen, Italy and the United States are in this fight together. May the sons of Italy prosper still more mightily in their great work of welding our partnership.

Monetary Policy in a Free Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lecture entitled "Monetary Policy in a Free Economy" delivered by Mr. M. S. Szymczak, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. This lecture was given on August 29, 1950, before the School of Banking, University of Wisconsin at Madison, Wis.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONETARY POLICY IN A FREE ECONOMY

(By M. S. Szymczak)

Today I shall address my remarks to the basic issues of current monetary policy. Any discussion of this subject must take into account certain basic principles that underlie monetary policy at any time, whether it be a period of national emergency, the course of a business cycle, or a long-run peacetime period of economic growth. I would go so far as to say that thinking and rethinking of fundamentals are of maximum importance right now, for monetary policy, intelligently and flexibly administered, can and should play an important role in helping our economy to meet our defense emergency. My remarks today, therefore, begin with consideration of basic principles. Then I shall go on to consider their application to the current situation.

HOW MONETARY POLICY FUNCTIONS IN GENERAL

Timely and appropriate monetary policy can greatly assist in leveling off booms and recessions. Thus it can help to keep the economy on a stable and smooth functioning basis. A case in point is the action of the monetary authorities in easing credit in early 1949, when downward trends in business activity, employment, and prices appeared. Monetary action that is taken before isolated unsettling economic changes set in will often avert such developments. It does this by influencing the volume of spending.

In part this influence is exerted by pressure on the volume of spending which is financed through credit extension. Monetary influence is also exerted by moderate upward or downward pressure on the value of marketable assets. A third avenue of influence is through the regulation of terms on which borrowers obtain credit. A fourth avenue of influence on spending is through the effect of credit policy on the total volume of money and other liquid assets. Monetary policy, lastly, is a potent factor for affecting the financial climate of the economy.

THE MEANING OF A FLEXIBLE MONETARY POLICY

Flexibility in monetary and credit policy means readiness to move quickly in response to changes in economic conditions. The main advantage of monetary policy over some other policies to influence economic conditions is that it can be promptly enacted and can take effect quickly. No other instrument approaches its capacity for prompt and timely action.

As business begins to slacken off, action to ease credit is usually indicated. As the economy returns to higher levels of activity, measures that permit credit to tighten are usually in order. Monetary and credit medicine is something to be taken promptly as various symptoms develop—that is, taken in moderate, timely doses. As such, it can temper inflation and deflation. In an inflation, for example, it can help to restrain price increases before they become embedded in cost structures and before they give rise to an inflationary spiral that inevitably leads to deflation and losses.

Another noteworthy feature of well-implemented monetary policy is its quick reversibility. It is susceptible to rapid changes in tempo. For example, early in 1949 the monetary authorities eased credit as business slackened off. Later in the year, they shifted their policy from credit ease to restraint as inflationary forces strengthened again.

In a free economy, flexible credit and monetary policy to prevent "booms and busts" is bound to be reflected in some change in interest rates, particularly short-term rates, which are the market's expression of the cost of credit. Thus, short-term rates have been firming since the last half of last year as the monetary authorities have attempted to restrain credit expansion. Expanding demand for credit will naturally result in higher interest rates unless additional supplies of funds are made available. Putting limitations on credit availability tends to be reflected in a firming of short-term interest rates; an easing of credit tends to soften short-term interest rates.

Certainly it is true that if changes in interest levels are prevented from occurring in response to changes in credit demands, monetary policy directed toward greater economic stability is very difficult, if not impossible, to manage.

WHAT A FLEXIBLE MONETARY POLICY CAN DO

In the 1930's it was apparent that monetary and credit ease was not adequate to lift us out of a major depression. It was an easy step for some to reach the conclusion that monetary measures had little or no influence at any time, either on expansion or contraction of credit.

In the present era, when the world is so divided between those who would control every individual decision and those of us who would maximize the area of individual choice and initiative, I believe it is appropriate to take another look at the virtues of monetary policy. We should ask ourselves what monetary action can do to help us keep our free-enterprise economy functioning fully. In what specific ways can monetary action serve to promote economic progress and stability?

One of the areas where monetary measures can have a marginal influence is in connection with decisions not to spend but to save. It is true that a large part of our saving today is made through contractual arrangements, such as by the payment of premiums on life insurance, the regular repayment of mortgage and consumer installment debt, and the bond-a-month savings plans of bank and business enterprises. On this saving, monetary policy has little effect. On other types of individual saving, tighter supply conditions for credit and higher rates of return may stimulate more saving. On the other hand, easier credit conditions and lower rates of return may lead to less saving. Business saving may also be significantly increased in total when monetary policy becomes restrictive, since some businesses may tighten dividend and profit withdrawal policies.

Can monetary and credit action have any significant effect on borrowing: The businessman's expectations are certainly affected by changes in monetary policy, if for no other reason than that these changes signal changes in the availability of credit. The fact that the money he needs is harder (or easier) to borrow, and perhaps dearer (or cheaper) is a concrete fact—a change in the business climate. He proceeds more cautiously in his working-capital commitments. From the monetary standpoint he uses less credit and does less credit spending.

Underwriters of new securities are particularly conscious of the influence of credit and monetary policies on the market for new issues. When credit policies are restrictive, for example, these middlemen between borrowers and lenders encounter difficulties in distributing new issues. They become reluctant to commit themselves on proposed new offerings.

Finally, monetary action has an important influence on lenders themselves. Total lending power of Federal Reserve member banks can, of course, be very closely circumscribed if the Federal Reserve is disposed to take such action. Bankers are aware of this and even moderate credit tightening action is carefully watched and has its impact on the amount of lending banks are willing to do.

All of the effects of restraining monetary action in particular financing areas that I

have outlined here, taken together, can add up to important dimensions. If monetary measures are vigorously and appropriately applied they can be positive stabilizing forces, operating to influence the volume of spending and saving and thus to moderate sharp changes in economic activity. To all who prize a high degree of freedom in economic and political life, it is most desirable that this be done without direct Government intervention in a single individual decision. Results effected through credit and monetary policy come about through general influences on the market place, where millions of judgments can still be freely made and tested every day. Such results continue to be the composite expression of the individual decisions and wishes of all of us who buy and sell.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MONETARY POLICY AND FISCAL AND DEBT MANAGEMENT POLICY

Monetary and credit policy has always been closely related to fiscal and debt management policy, but this relationship has been much closer and more important as a result of the huge expansion of the public debt during World War II. The Treasury has always had such monetary powers as the issuance of currency against silver, the minting of coin, and the ability to make changes in its cash balances with the Federal Reserve System. More recently, however, the magnitude of its public debt operations and the rate of interest paid on refundings have come to have a much more important effect than formerly upon Federal Reserve policies to influence the supply, cost, and availability of money to private as well as public borrowers.

The greater influence of fiscal policy on monetary policy comes about as a result of the responsibility of the Federal Reserve System to maintain orderly conditions in the market for Government securities. At times that responsibility involves some sacrifice of positive influence over the supply of bank credit. During much of the postwar period, for example, the Federal Reserve System purchased a large volume of United States Government securities. This action operated to create bank reserves which in turn tended to ease the private credit market at a time when price inflation was occurring. During some of this period, however, the Treasury had the benefit of a budgetary surplus which was used to retire bank-held public debt and thus affect the inflationary impact of Federal Reserve open market operations.

It stands to reason, in the kind of financial situation we have had since World War II, that monetary policy and fiscal and debt management policy must maintain a close liaison. Both monetary policy and fiscal and debt management policy have a primary responsibility to make a maximum contribution to economic stability. Consistency with the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 means that these respective policies should be coordinated and tailored to the economic situation.

For example, at high levels of employment and production, when inflationary dangers are greatest, fiscal policy should aim to produce a budgetary surplus so that monetary policy may operate freely, if necessary, to restrain excessive credit and monetary expansion. Debt management policy, in these circumstances, needs to play either a neutral role or a role of supporting monetary policy by emphasizing borrowing from nonbank investors.

When economic activity recedes from high levels, another arrangement of policy may be appropriate. Fiscal policy at such times may permit a Government deficit, and debt management policy may need to stress financing through the banks. Monetary policy, while adapted to discouraging credit contraction and encouraging the expansion of credit, may at that time favor deficit financing through the banks.

MONETARY POLICY IN THE CURRENT SITUATION

On the basis of this broad background of the role of monetary policy in a free economy, what can be said regarding the role of such policy can and should play in helping to solve the economic and financial problems that have arisen as a result of the invasion of South Korea? Prior to that invasion, inflationary pressures had already gained considerable momentum as a result largely of heavy peacetime consumer and business buying. This buying was financed by a substantial expansion of credit and by an increased use of our very large supply of currency and bank deposits, as well as by high levels of current income. Following the Government announcement of a larger military program, the tempo of private spending accelerated greatly, credit demands increased substantially, and commodity prices rose sharply. From the end of June to the middle of August, the prices of basic commodities rose 17 percent and the loans and holdings of corporate and municipal securities at member banks in leading cities alone expanded by 1.7 billion dollars. Inflationary forces have become so strong that the public has clamored for effective action to stop them.

In recognition of the inflationary situation into which the Korean developments have catapulted the country, President Truman on July 18 directed the Federal agencies concerned with real-estate credit operations to tighten the terms on which federally aided credit is available. A day later he requested the Congress to authorize emergency powers to limit the use of essential materials; to regulate consumer, real estate, and commodity trading credit; and to assure adequate financing for defense production and productive facilities. Still later in the month he presented to the Congress a tax program to increase Federal revenues by approximately $5,000,000,000. When this lecture was being written, the Congress was considering in conference the Defense Production Act of 1950. This bill was intended to provide the President not only with the powers he requested, but in addition standby controls over price and wage stabilization and rationing. Legislation to raise taxes was also receiving active consideration by the appropriate committees of the Congress at that time. Indications are that the added revenue will come mainly from higher levies on personal and corporate incomes.

The two principal means that were advocated for preventing indefinite and cumulative price increases were (1) imposing a comprehensive harness of direct controls, including price and wage fixing and rationing, and (2) undertaking a vigorous credit and fiscal program to limit the total demand for goods. It is outside the scope of my talk today to embark upon a discussion of the problems involved in imposing an inclusive set of direct controls.

It is relevant to note, however, that an adequate mechanism for administering such a set of controls does not now exist. Even if the establishment of an adequate mechanism could be accomplished within a reasonable period of time, I do not believe direct controls are the present answer to our immediate inflation problems. They deal only with effects and not with basic causes. The basic cause of our inflationary problem is continuing rapid credit with monetary expansion, abetted by current Government deficits which threaten to grow larger and larger.

Some people look upon direct controls as a practically painless way of meeting the emergency financial problem. No more serious error could be made. There is no painless way of controlling inflationary pressures. Either we meet them head on and overcome them or we wage a losing rearguard action against them. If the fuel of inflation is provided, all that direct controls can do is to drive the inflationary pressures underground and to postpone some of their effect.

Therefore, even if direct controls eventually become necessary, broad, basic monetary and fiscal measures will be essential to make them effective. Price and wage fixing and rationing are much more difficult to administer in a protracted period of partial mobilization than they are in a limited period of all-out war effort. Civilian goods will still be available in large amounts but the total demand for such goods will far exceed their supply. The job that direct controls can do, which is to cushion the pressure of military demands on supplies of goods and services and distribute available civilian goods at equitable, administered prices, can only be accomplished if some of the civilian demand is drained off by higher taxation and if new private credit creation is prevented.

It is my belief that the proper method of dealing with our immediate inflationary situation is to adopt a coordinated program of monetary policy, fiscal and debt management policies, and a system of selective priorities and allocations of strategic materials. The cornerstone of our anti-inflation program must be bold fiscal measures including across-the-board increases in personal and corporate income tax rates, selective excise taxes, and taxes on war profits and speculation. Financing the expanded military budget cannot be limited to the taxation of wealthy individuals and business enterprises if it is to be useful as an effective anti-inflationary measure. It must restrict spending, and most spending is done by the vast number of individuals and families with low- and middle-bracket incomes. In an emergency situation like the present, our tax changes must be designed primarily to meet the danger of inflation.

In addition to higher taxes, the Government should make every attempt in its debt management policies to tap as large a volume of available private investment funds as possible. Concerted efforts should be made to sell nonmarketable bonds and tax savings notes to individuals, businesses, and nonbank financial institutions, thus absorbing money that would otherwise be spent on current consumption or on new private investment. Such a program would not only absorb redundant funds but would also make it possible to reduce the volume of Government financing through banks, which is highly inflationary.

Monetary and credit controls to deal with our immediate inflationary situation can and should be broad in scope, restrictive in character, and vigorously administered. They involve, for one thing, the application of effective curbs on consumer and real estate credit. There is no doubt that the recent large increases in consumer and mortgage credit have added fuel to the inflationary fires. Since the end of 1945, consumer credit has been increasing by about $3,000,000,000 a year. The increase in May and June of this year was about a billion dollars, the largest on record for those 2 months. Home mortgages made by all lenders in the first half of 1950 exceeded $6,500,000,000. By the end of June, total home mortgage debt outstanding exceeded $40,000,000,000, a new peak and more than double the volume outstanding at the end of the war.

In addition to effective consumer and real estate credit regulations, general measures to curb the availability of credit to other types of borrowers are called for. On August 4 a joint statement was made by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Loan Bank Board, and the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks urging that banks and all other institutions engaged in extending credit exercise special care in their lending and investment activities. Somewhat earlier the American Bank-

ers Association had issued a similar statement, and more recently President Peterson of that association has further urged bankers to cooperate in restricting nonessential credit. I should like to underscore the importance of your own support of these efforts to encourage voluntary restraint in bank and other lending.

On August 18, the Federal Reserve System took further restraining action in the area of monetary and credit policy. The Board of Governors then approved an increase in the discount rate of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York from 1½ to 1¾ percent, and within a few days approved a similar increase at other Reserve banks. Also, on August 18, the Board and the System's Open Market Committee issued a joint statement indicating that both bodies were prepared to use all the means at their command to restrain further expansion of bank credit consistent with the policy of maintaining orderly conditions in the Government securities market. On the same day, the Treasury announced that it had temporarily increased the volume of series F and G savings bonds available to nonbank financial institutions.

It is to be hoped that all these efforts may prove effective in curbing loans to businesses and individuals which might be used for speculation or other purposes that would have adverse effects on our defense effort. If they are not, monetary policy will need to resort to even more restrictive use of one or more of the general instruments of credit control at its disposal, namely, open-market operations, changes in the discount rate, and changes in bank-reserve requirements. In case these measures prove inadequate, the Congress might very well need to consider the desirability of authorizing additional powers over bank credit expansion in some form of supplementary reserve requirements. Such powers might include a secondary or special reserve requirement similar to that the Federal Reserve requested in 1947, or some ceiling or dual reserve plan about which I have spoken to this group on previous occasions.

SUMMARY

My remarks today reflect a sincere belief that monetary and credit measures, taken together with appropriate fiscal measures, are invaluable weapons in our economic and financial arsenal for use in the battle to maintain economic stability within the framework of a free enterprise system. This is true not only over the long run when we look forward to normal peacetime activity again, but also in the short run when military and inflationary pressures seem almost overwhelming. Fiscal measures, particularly higher taxes, must be our main line of defense, but monetary and credit action is also necessary to restrict private credit expansion and, moreover, can be applied more promptly to hold the line until fiscal measures take effect. Financial instruments therefore must be among our major weapons against economic instability as long as we value our freedom.

Why United States Bears Brunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Why United States Bears Brunt," from the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY UNITED STATES BEARS BRUNT—A MOTHER'S QUESTION ABOUT KOREA—AND AN ANSWER

(Joseph C. Harsch, chief of the Washington News Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, recently received a letter from a reader asking, in effect, why her son might be sent to Korea. Since both question and answer are of universal interest, the letter and Mr. Harsch's reply are printed below.)

BELLE PLAINE, KANS.

JOSEPH C. HARSCH,
Chief, Washington News Bureau, the Christian Science Monitor.

DEAR SIR: I follow the current events in the Monitor, especially all of your comments. It gives me the only reason for anything and everything. These questions haunt me, likely because I am concerned about my 20-year-old son enlisting, etc. Who gave the President the power to send our men to Korea all of a sudden? If this is a United Nations problem, why are not the other nations taking the responsibility of the gigantic operations? Why must we send our men to slaughter, to a seemingly lost cause and effort? Could it be true that the United States is protecting personal interests?

I am a true American, and I realize the growing threat of communism. In fact, I could see the threat of it when many of my neighbors and friends laughed about it when I mentioned it to them.

I must know more of the cause of the United States lone participation in this pitiful struggle in Korea. I also know of the thirty-eighth parallel agreement and the aggression, but why is my country involved in the fight? It looks to me that we might have been the trigger-happy country this time.

I shall appreciate your direct answer to me. I am grateful for the Monitor. It gives me all I need to know about world events. I appreciate your most sound and wise journalistic expression to the American people, and to the foreign peoples as well. America needs more enlightening representation. Erwin D. Canham's call for America's awakening and to articulation is the need of the hour.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JAMES BARNER.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR,
WASHINGTON NEWS BUREAU.

Mrs. JAMES BARNER,
Belle Plaine, Kans.

DEAR MRS. BARNER: The responsibility you put upon me by your question is heavy. I can attempt to answer it only in humility and with the knowledge that my words cannot be adequate.

This is the way I see the picture in which the fighting in Korea is one part:

The Russians of today, like the Germans before them in our lifetime and the French a century and a half ago under Napoleon, are engaged in attempted imperialistic expansion. Today, as in those other times, the possible victims of such expansion are seeking in their various ways to form an effective defense. Today, as also in those other times, they are having their difficulties agreeing on the division of the burden.

Korea is only one incident in this pattern. Others of our allies are doing a great deal at other places around the rim of Russian power.

The French have a ground army of 10 divisions, which is the same as ours. Five of their 10 divisions are in Indochina, as 5 of ours are in Korea. Those five French divisions are taking heavier casualties in Indochina than ours are in Korea. They have been sustaining this heavier rate of casualties for some 3 years.

The British are engaged in a similar war in Malaya which has been going on for more than 2 years. They also are indirectly sustaining the whole line from Singapore to Suez.

All the west European countries are on the front line in Europe, where another blow might come at any moment. In terms of proportion of national income being spent in this common effort to contain Russian imperialism, several of the European governments are spending more on the common defense than we are.

In spite of these heavy responsibilities at other places in the common effort, the others are making some contribution to the battle in Korea. At the outset of the Korean campaign General MacArthur was given command of a British naval force larger than the original American naval force at his disposal. An Australian air unit is at the front. British ground troops are in Korea, and Australian ground troops are on the way. The South Koreans themselves have been holding nearly half of the line.

It remains true that we are carrying the major burden of the task in Korea. But that is because Moscow struck at a point of the line which was our primary responsibility. We are the occupation power in Japan; Korea is on the Japanese doorstep. If the attack had happened to come against Burma or Thailand, the burden would have been just as disproportionately on the British as it is now on us. Considering the extent of British involvement on other fronts, I regard it as remarkable that they have agreed to do as much as they have in Korea.

The right of the President to send American troops into Korea is explicit in the Constitution. As commander in chief of the Armed Forces, he has both the right and the duty to use the Armed Forces at his disposal in whatever way seems necessary to protect the security of the United States.

Similar use of United States Armed Forces without any declaration of war by the Congress has occurred on many occasions. To my knowledge, the earliest occasion was the expedition against the Barbary pirates between the Revolution and the War of 1812. There also was a 5-year "undeclared war" with France during the same early period. The sending of marines to Latin America happened on many occasions on Presidential order.

It is not accurate to call Korea a "lost cause." On the contrary, our military campaign there has been successful beyond expectations. Our forces have stalled a powerful and well-organized offensive by much larger forces, they have established a defense perimeter which is now holding well, and they are gathering forces for a counteroffensive. All of this comes to nought if the Russians and Chinese enter the battle.

But there is no present sign of such a development. The prospect at the moment appears to be for a successful counteroffensive this fall. The odds against us in this campaign were greater than they were in Greece. In spite of that, there is a chance of resolving it more quickly.

There are slackers in this common cause. The Latin-American governments are not making any notable contribution to the common defense. Some are trying to make money out of us in the process. But our European allies can hardly be called slackers. Their contribution is high in terms of their energy and capacity.

However, there are two reasons they hesitate to commit much force to Korea itself.

The first is that if Russia strikes next in Europe, the burden will fall on the Europeans. They must retain strength in Europe against that danger, and we wish them to do so.

Secondly, in every previous issue of this kind it is the others who have shouldered

the major burden, while we sheltered in comparative security behind their efforts. We waited from 1914 to 1917 to help them against the Kaiser, and from 1939 until Pearl Harbor to join them in the line against Hitler. I am sure that many of them have the feeling that this time it is fair that we take more of the initial shock of the attack.

The evidence is strong that Korea was intended to be only one of a series of attacks outward from the Russian realm. If the Communists had gotten away with this one unopposed, we may be reasonably sure they would have followed it up by others around the rim. In that case, we probably would have ended up fighting Russia with our backs to the wall, with few or possibly even no allies, and with all the advance military positions in the hands of the Russians.

As it is, we seem to have given them cause to hesitate and reconsider. There is a growing belief among the observers of Russia that the Russians have decided to slow up on other attacks until they see how the land lies. If this is borne out by time, then we could conclude that our vigorous action in Korea had in fact spared us from the greater horror of a general war with Russia.

Surely, if we can avoid world war III by courage in Korea, our efforts there will not have been in vain. That is the hope, and intent, of those who accepted the gage of battle in Korea.

I hope that this letter will be of some help to you.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. HARSCH.

United States Policies Confuse Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Policies Confuse Europe," written by Karl H. Von Wiegand, and published in the San Francisco Examiner on September 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES POLICIES CONFUSE EUROPE

(By Karl H. Von Wiegand)

LONDON, September 2.—An apocalyptic atmosphere of great uncertainty, ominous expectations, fear, and confusion hangs heavily over Europe.

There is a very general feeling that an avalanche of unprecedented destruction and human suffering is gaining speed and force as it sweeps onward and ever nearer. There seems to be no man big enough in the west or the east to stop it.

The tragedy is that those who see it can do nothing to hinder it, and those who are materializing the catastrophe and bringing it on do not see it.

The delusion of Lake Success—it should be rebaptized "Lake Failure"—still obsesses the minds of many.

OMINOUS OMENS

The ominous foreboding concerning pending events began with the Korean war, thickened with America's setbacks and sharp Anglo-American differences over Formosa, and was intensified by the talk of plans for west German rearmament and Adenauer's demand for a defense corps for west Germany.

It came to a peak in the confusion of public thought and anxiety with United States Secretary of the Navy Francis Matthews' calling for something like a Pearl Harbor surprise assault upon Soviet Russia in an American aggression for peace, and solidified by the split on far-eastern policy between President Truman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Large sections of the peoples of western European countries from Scotland, Sweden, and Norway in the north to Italy and Greece in the south just do not know what to think. It is all too confusing, too complicated, too contradictory in the camp of the leading western nations with their quarrels and disagreements which form a belt of disunity around the globe.

To add to speculation and to the confusion of thought, there are persistent reports in London, Paris, and Rome that Secretary of State Dean Acheson will retire before the end of the year and be succeeded by Averell Harriman.

It is also reported that Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson will be succeeded after the congressional elections by W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Other reports speak of a leading industrial executive, a man of exceptional ability and capacity, as being considered for the post of Secretary of Defense.

The open rift between Truman and MacArthur over Formosa overshadowed all else this week.

Interest in the Korean war had waned generally almost into indifference but was suddenly and strongly revived by what is called in some quarters the Formosan war between the United Nations Commander in Chief and the President of the United States.

Interest is added in official circles in all European capitals as well as among the public by the view taken in numerous quarters that MacArthur's statement and Truman's rebuke are the "beginning of the 1952 Presidential campaign."

A well known former European statesman who recently returned from the United States remarked:

"There is nothing that the Democratic Party leaders in Washington fear more and want less than that General MacArthur return home a great popular hero. It was the consensus of all with whom I talked that that would mean the end of the five consecutive terms—20 years—of Democratic administrations in Washington."

Through the British Socialist Labor Government's strong opposition to America's pro-Chiang Kai-shek Formosan policy and differences that have arisen between Truman and MacArthur, interest in the Korean war is shifting to Formosa and China to the detriment of Korea.

It has been no secret in London, Paris, and Rome diplomatic circles that MacArthur, Truman, and Acheson do not see eye to eye on America's far-eastern policy, and Formosa has not been the only point in their divergence of views. There are also points of difference in regard to peace terms for Japan.

SECOND TIME

For the second time within 10 years MacArthur is in a similarly difficult position.

The present situation recalls to me those days in Manila in December 1941.

MacArthur's warnings and calls for reinforcements had gone unheeded. I had given Vice Admiral Glassford secret information from Tokyo that the war would start at any hour after midnight December 6, if there was no peaceful settlement in Washington by November 26.

The Pearl Harbor attack came at dawn of December 7.

In Manila I was told to file no more dispatches. They would not be accepted.

The reinforcements promised MacArthur never came. To save Manila from destruction, he evacuated the Philippines capital and retreated into Bataan. There was nowhere else to go. No help came.

MacArthur was ordered to leave the Philippines by Roosevelt and go to Australia. Wainwright took over.

The sacrifice of American soldiers in the Bataan jungle from bullets, shells, bombs, dysentery, malaria, and other tropical diseases was all in vain.

Over a radio I had concealed I heard Wainwright's pathetic order to American and Filipino troops to surrender. MacArthur's relations with Roosevelt could not be called cordial at that time.

MacArthur's independence of attitude and action during and since Japan's capitulation and his disposition to place America's strategical interests in the Far East in the foreground has aroused some ill feeling against him in London during those years and now.

BEST RECORD

Gen. Douglas MacArthur knows oriental mentality and psychology better than any other American soldier or statesman. On the battlefield and in statesmanship he has proven himself to be America's best soldier-statesman of the first half of this century.

MacArthur has always stood for a strong, clear-cut American foreign policy, firmly carried out.

Speculation and reports that President Truman may retire him are not taken seriously at this time. As he has been appointed "United Nations Commander in Chief" in the war against the North Koreans, request for his removal would have to come from the United Nations Security Council.

If the Council made such a demand at Washington's request, it would be evidence to the Soviets for their charges that the United Nations is the instrument of the United States.

Navy Secretary Matthews' demand or proposal that America immediately begin a "preventive war" and become the "world's first aggressor for peace," with an atomic assault on Soviet Russia "to force peace," shocked Europe and placed in the hands of the Russians propaganda material as "evidence of America's war intentions" and "plans to attack Soviet Russia" such as Moscow has never before been given in one lump.

MOSCOW RADIO

And how the Moscow radio is using that throughout Asia and Europe.

It probably was the most unfortunate and, in a sense, most irresponsible statement to be made by a member of the President's Cabinet in decades.

The Navy Secretary's public demand tended to confirm reports from Washington in diplomatic circles in London and Paris 2 weeks earlier that some members of the National Security Council were increasingly urging "preventive war" against Russia.

In London, a Fleet Street letter which is privately circulated said on August 17:

"Propositions for preventative war in which the United Nations, clad in United States uniform, would assault the Red fortress with atomic bombs before being destroyed themselves, have begun to win a sober hearing in the National Security Council which advises President Truman."

DOUBLE DANGER

The danger in the Matthews statement and in such reports is twofold:

1. It gives Moscow material for its vast radio propaganda in Europe and Asia, and especially the Russian people, that the United States is intent upon war.

2. It provides a possible and plausible pretext and justification for Soviet Russia to strike first with its own "preventive war" to prevent America's alleged "preventive war."

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD program No. 33 in the series entitled "Happenings in Washington," which I have been broadcasting to the citizens of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 33)

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

As the second session of the Eighty-first Congress comes to a close I speak to you in this broadcast with a heavy heart.

I want to tell you frankly that I am extremely worried about how things are going in our country at this most critical period. And I know that many of you are just as deeply concerned.

One of the things that worries me most is the apparent failure of the American people to recognize the seriousness of the situation confronting us.

The danger that we face today from Communist aggression does not seem to have aroused the same patriotic fervor that swept the Nation in previous times of crisis.

How can this be explained? The reason is simple enough.

At a time when the future of our country is at stake—when the survival of freedom hangs in the balance there is uncertainty at Washington where there should be decisive action. There is conflict where there should be unity and weakness where there should be strength. There is concealment where there should be truth and frankness.

At a time when the blood of our finest young men is being spilled in far-off Korea and when thousands of others are being called into the armed services the people have a right to expect strong, capable, determined leadership at the head of their Government.

But I regret to state, developments are proving that such leadership is lacking. Instead there is confusion, bordering on chaos.

How could it be otherwise with the policy makers in Washington and the military leaders in the field working at cross purposes and pulling in opposite directions?

And above all there seems to be a deliberate refusal to tell the people the truth. The blunders of the leadership are concealed behind a camouflage of words.

In brief, the administration at Washington does not trust the good sense and understanding of the people and will not take the people into its confidence.

After watching events at close range in the National Capital I have come to the conclusion that the administration is frequently so mixed up it does not know what to tell.

President Truman's order to General MacArthur to withdraw his statement to the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention was one example of that kind of mix-up.

In his statement General MacArthur explained, from a military standpoint, the prime importance of Formosa to our defense position in the Pacific.

General MacArthur stated—and I quote:

"As a result of its geographic location and base potential, utilization of Formosa by a power hostile to the United States may either counterbalance or overshadow the strategic importance of the central and southern flank of the United States front-line position."

It is difficult to understand the President's indignant rebuke to General MacArthur when it is recalled that Mr. Truman on June 27 made virtually the same statement in these words which I now quote:

"The occupation of Formosa by Communist forces would be a direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to the United States forces performing their lawful and necessary functions in that area."

It should be recalled also that President Truman did not display the same indignation a few months ago when his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, announced publicly that Formosa had no special military significance for the United States and should be regarded as a problem to be settled by the Chinese Communists and the Chinese Nationalists.

Let me give you another example:

Recently when the Secretary of the Navy, a member of the President's Cabinet, made a speech in Boston suggesting that the United States might be willing to start a war to establish lasting peace the President told him to shut up.

Secretary Matthews did not mention Russia in his speech, but it threw the State Department into wild excitement.

Even at this late date Dean Acheson and his boys seem to be fearful of offending Joe Stalin and his band of international bandits.

After all our experience of the past decade in seeking to appease the Communists, has the administration embarked once more upon a crusade of appeasement? Do they think this time it will be different?

But the Russian propaganda mill pulls no punches. In their press, their broadcasts to the world, out of the mouths of their diplomats at the United Nations and from their satellite Communist countries, the United States is being attacked with vicious lies and slanders. The Russians call us the aggressors in the Korean war.

But we answer these charges timely, fearing to say Russia when we mean Russia.

Can this be the kind of leadership which our people want from Washington? I believe the apathy and the bewilderment which our people suffer is but a reflection of the incompetence of many in high places in our Nation's Capital. The facts show that time and again, the top leadership of this country has guessed wrong, estimated wrong and forecast wrong. This is what we are paying so dearly for today.

On November 3, 1949, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, announced: "Given 4 or 5 months more training, American ground troops throughout the world will be able to take on anybody, any time, anywhere."

Then, on March 2 last, President Truman said:

"The defenses of the United States are in better shape than they have ever been when the country was not at war."

And more recently the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, announced:

"If the enemy attacks at four, we will counter-attack at five."

With all of these fine words from our highest authorities it naturally was a great shock to the Nation to learn how miserably unprepared we were. Our people had been taxed billions of dollars for defense in the postwar years only to discover that we did not even have enough manpower and equipment to fight North Korea.

Do you remember that on January 12, 1950, the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, declared in a speech:

"If South Korea were invaded, our attitude would be that South Korea would be able to resist." And then Mr. Acheson went on to add that we certainly would not get mixed up in any wild adventures in the Far East.

Well, within a very few months, the invasion came. South Korea was not able to resist and we did get involved in that so-called wild adventure.

Perhaps you remember the famous remark of the President of the United States who told the Nation on June 1, of this year:

"The world is closer to peace now than it has been in the last 5 years."

My fellow Pennsylvanians, these are words of your leaders in Washington.

And, as I said earlier, the administration does not trust the American people. It is your blood and the blood of your sons which must flow in this war. The wages earned by the sweat of your brow will be taxed away to pay the bill. But your leaders do not tell you the truth.

On July 19, your President declared to the Congress, and I quote:

"We must recognize the possibility that armed aggression may take place in other areas. The world situation requires that we increase substantially the size and material support of our Armed Forces over and above the increases which are needed in Korea."

Notice the word "substantially." What does it mean? Does it mean we must get ready for world war III? If it means that, why don't we have all-out preparation?

Just the other day, at the request of the President, the Senate Armed Services Committee killed the bill to establish universal military training. The committee said it would consider the matter next year.

You will recall that the request for universal military training came from the Secretary of Defense. And he didn't ask for it next year. He asked for the enactment of the bill now. Yet the President ordered it killed.

That is not only a fine example of our failure to adequately prepare, but also another example of the confusion within the administration.

Preparation for full-scale war calls also for real controls to maintain the national economy on a sound basis. Such controls should be instituted now on prices, wages, and scarce materials.

But the President demanded from Congress—and was given—a rubber-stamp control bill which empowers him to impose whatever controls he wants whenever he wants them. And he has said he doesn't want price and wage controls now.

What can this mean except that the administration does not trust the people in this congressional election year? The administration does not want to tell them how serious the situation really is and what controls should be placed in effect—until after the election.

That is a shocking, shameful thing to do when the Nation's life and future may hang in the balance.

The administration, it appears, is still gambling with the safety and security of this Nation of 150,000,000 men, women, and children—gambling that we can escape world war III. That is recklessness. It is not the leadership the people have a right to expect.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, we have been living under a great delusion. We have been led to believe we had new miracle weapons, super bombs, super planes, and other things with which to defend our country without the use of properly trained ground soldiers.

Misled by the administration, the people have only now awakened to the fact that these were weapons on paper, bombs on paper, tanks on paper, planes on paper, and an army on paper.

A paper defense for the billions upon billions spent in the past 5 years.

We are outnumbered in Korea.

We have lost prestige throughout the Far East.

We have lost prestige in western Germany.

We have lost prestige in western Europe.

The American people are learning now the lesson they must learn—that money alone does not win wars. They are learning that sweat and blood and proper training and equipment are the tools of victory.

And they are beginning to wake up. They are demanding to see our balance sheet. The American people want to be trusted and taken into the confidence of their leaders.

The American people want to know the military and economic commitments of the United States over the world. This news may startle the Nation but unless the truth becomes known we cannot expect our people to become aroused to their full strength.

It is up to the administration to tell our people the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about these matters. Let us not be deceived into thinking that a war in which we are suffering thousands of casualties is nothing but a little police action.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this war will not be won by soft-hearted diplomatic maneuvering. It is a rough, tough clash of armed men and machines in the flaming hellfire of battle.

It calls for the best we have in military genius, in bold and courageous leadership and heroic sacrifices on the battlefront.

It calls for strength, determination and sacrifice on the home front.

It demands that we raise our moral and spiritual standards to the highest levels of righteousness and obedience to the laws of God and man.

That, my friends, is the foundation of the patriotic service which each of us owes to our country.

Let the call go forth to every corner of our land, to the cities, the towns, the farms and the countryside.

"Wake up, America!" The time for action, the time for truth, the time for real leadership is now.

If our leaders give us a bold, courageous plan and policy, and we all do our full duty, living in righteousness, world war III will be prevented.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Political History Around the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include the following article written by Paul J. McGahan and published in the Washington Sunday Star of September 10, 1950.

The article follows:

THREE DECADES OF POLITICAL HISTORY AT CAPITOL

(By Paul J. McGahan)

The approaching demise of the Eighty-first Congress closes three decades of control political history in American life. They have been decades of war and peace, depression and prosperity, mirrored nowhere more indelibly than in the minds, memories and minutes at those who have moved through the stately halls of the Capitol building, that magnificently imperturbable command post of democracy.

There have been great changes in American life in these 30 years and a great flow of new faces in the Halls of Congress. But there have been other things which have not changed—the American love of freedom and our devotion to the parliamentary processes which exist in such lusty fashion in the old Capitol building. And there have been individuals, a surprisingly large number, who have throughout all these 30 years participated directly as or observers in this making of history.

In the Sixty-sixth Congress which came in on March 4, 1919, the House of Representatives consisted of 435 Members and the Senate of 96 Members, as in the present Eighty-first Congress. In 1920 the Congressional Press Gallery consisted of 217 correspondents representing the news services and newspapers. Today the Congressional Press Galleries have a roll of 771 correspondents. Then 217 newspapers and press associations were represented. Now 470 newspapers and news services are represented. In addition the periodical press and the radio have press galleries which are apart.

MANY STILL ACTIVE

The newspapermen have a better longevity record than the congressional group. Still active on the press gallery list are 20 scribes who covered the Capitol in 1920, while only 13 congressional figures have withstood the march of time. One other scribe played both roles during the period.

In the House of Representatives ADOLPH SABATH, Democrat, of Illinois heads the list of the seven Members of that body who were serving there 30 years ago. Mr. SABATH came to the House on March 4, 1907. In the Senate, KENNETH MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, is the sole survivor of the Senate of 1919. But three of his colleagues, TOM CONNOLLY, Democrat, of Texas; M. M. NEELY, Democrat, of West Virginia, and CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, were Members of the House then. In this same category is Vice President BARKLEY, Democrat, of Kentucky, who is now Vice President.

Other House Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, now in the Eighty-first having served continuously are Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, Democrat, of North Carolina; Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas; CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia; DANIEL A. REED, Republican, of New York. Two members then, but their continuous service interrupted, are ROY O. WOODWARD, Republican, of Michigan, and EARL C. MICHENER, Republican, of Michigan; Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Republican, of New York, was a Member of the Senate in the Sixty-sixth Congress.

Press Gallery members still representing the same newspapers now that they did at the time of the Sixty-sixth Congress include: Walker S. Buel, Cleveland Plain Dealer; Mark Foote, Booth Newspapers of Michigan; Jay G. Hayden, Detroit News; Arthur S. Henning, Chicago Tribune; David Lawrence, of David Lawrence Associates; Gould Lincoln, the Washington Star and the Boston Globe; John Lorance, the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News; Paul J. McGahan, the Philadelphia Inquirer; Lorenzo W. Martin, the Louisville Times; Hal H. Smith, the New York Times; Stanley H. Smith, the Daily Traffic World; Bascom N. Timmons, the Houston Chronicle, and Paul Wooten, the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

LUDLOW SEATED

The newspaper veterans of the Sixty-sixth Congress now in the Press Gallery but representing other newspapers are: George Rothwell Brown, King Features Syndicate, then of the Washington Post; Sam Bell, the New York Herald Tribune, then of the Philadelphia Public Ledger; George W. Combs, the Baltimore Evening Sun, then of the Lynchburg (Va.) News; Winifred Mallon, the New York Times, then of the New York News; William Philip Simms, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, then of the International News Service; Lewis Wood, the New York Times, then of the Columbia (S. C.) Record, and James L. Wright, Buffalo Evening News, then of the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Thus of the 20 newspaper folk working the Capitol run in 1920, 12 still represent their original papers, while the 8 others have changed jobs, but have unbroken gallery service, Mr. Brown of King Features is the dean. He became a gallery member in 1902.

The one newspaperman who played both the role of correspondent and of Congressman during the 30-year period is Louis Leon Ludlow, now back in the gallery representing the Indianapolis Star after 10 terms as a Member of the House, representing the Eleventh Indiana Congressional District.

Mr. Ludlow was the first newspaper correspondent to go directly from the Press Gallery to a seat in the Congress. He was first a Washington correspondent in 1901, and until his election to the House, which he entered on March 4, 1929, he represented the Columbus Dispatch.

Mr. Ludlow is a former president of the National Press Club, a role he has in common with several of the 30-year veterans of press gallery service. He served in 1927. The others are Bascom Timmons, president in 1932; Mark Foote, president in 1934 and 1935, and Paul Wooten, president in 1946.

Among the graduates from the Press Gallery to politics are two of President Truman's secretaries, Charles G. Ross, formerly of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, is now secretary to the President, handling the press relations. The other Presidential secretary is William D. Hassett, who 30 years ago represented the Washington Post.

Previously three members of the Press Gallery of the Sixty-sixth Congress had become Presidential secretaries. These were Judson C. Welliver, who represented Echo de Paris and later served with President Harding; Theodore Joslin, then of the Boston Evening Transcript, who served with President Hoover, and Stephen T. Early, then of the Associated Press, who was secretary to President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He is now Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Of the Members of Congress then who were later destined to serve as Presidential secretaries were Everett Sanders, Republican, of Indiana; Walter H. Newton, Republican, of Minnesota; and C. Bascom Slemp, Republican, of Virginia. Mr. Sanders and Mr. Slemp served with President Coolidge, and Mr. Newton with President Hoover.

THREE BECAME DIPLOMATS

Of the Press Gallery group at least three became American diplomats. These were Leo R. Sack, of the Cleveland Press, who was Minister to Costa Rica; John D. Erwin, of the Nashville Tennessean, who was Ambassador to Honduras, and Charles C. Hart, of Boise News, who was Minister to Persia.

Of the congressional group of the earlier period, Senator Walter E. Edge, Republican, of New Jersey, became Ambassador to France; Alanson B. Houghton, Republican, of New York, and Frank B. Kellogg, Republican, of Minnesota, went to the Court of St. James's, as Ambassador, and Senator Miles Poindexter, Republican, of Washington, served as Ambassador to Peru. Earlier the doughty Senator George H. Moses, Republican, of New Hampshire, had been Minister to Greece.

Thirty years ago the indestructible William J. Donaldson was—as now—the super-

intendent of the House Press Gallery. Holding forth then as superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery was the practically inexhaustible fount of information, James D. Preston. Now Jim Preston is installed as registration clerk in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, in the confines of which he has spent practically his entire lifetime.

Thirty years ago when the Sixty-sixth Congress held sway, the American public very largely relied on the members of the Congressional Press Gallery for their news about national affairs. The gallery membership and newspapers and news services represented have increased tremendously but the character of their service to the public has remained basically unchanged.

Radio Press Galleries of both branches of Congress have come into being and today 150 radio broadcasters and news commentators, representing some 78 radio stations and network services cover what transpires so that all who hear can listen.

WOMEN MAKE GAINS

Another addition to news coverage has been the creation of the Periodical Press Gallery, whose membership of about 200 men and women writers chronicles the happenings and gossip for the country's leading magazines and trade publications. In this gallery are two veterans of former newspaper service who were in the Press Gallery itself 30 years ago. One of these is Carter Field, of the McGraw-Hill Publications, then of the New York Tribune, and a former president of the National Press Club. The other is T. N. Sandifer, of the Penton Publications and then with the International News Service.

The distaff side of the picture in both the Press Galleries and the Congress develops an interesting picture of the manner in which the women folks have come into the foreground. There were woman members of the Press Gallery long before women attained congressional dignity.

In the Sixty-fifth Congress the first woman—Jeannette Rankin, Republican, of Montana—had been elected to the House, the first woman to be elected to Congress. But in the Sixty-sixth Congress there were no feminine members, while the records reveal that the Press Galleries boasted nine newspaperwomen. The group included Miss Winifred Mallon. The others were Mrs. Carolyn Vance Bell, Newspaper Enterprise Association; Roberta V. Bradshaw, Buffalo Evening News; Elizabeth Miner King, New York Evening Post; Mrs. Katherine C. Lacy, Newport News Daily Press; Annabel Lee, Chicago Herald-Examiner; Edith McDowell, Daily Oklahoman; Mrs. George F. Richards, Worcester Gazette and other New England papers, who was the dean of women; and Cora Rigby, Christian Science Monitor.

In the present term of Congress there are 85 accredited women correspondents in the Press Galleries. The White House News Photographers Association and the Radio Press Gallery and the Periodical Press Gallery have many more.

On the congressional side the women have made substantial gains.

In the Senate there is MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, Maine, who is starting on a 6-year elected term, and is a graduate of the House. Other women have served in the Senate in the interval of the intervening 30 years both by appointment and by election.

In the House of Representatives there are now 9 women Members. The dean of the group is Mrs. MARY T. NORTON, Democrat, New Jersey, who came in 1925, and is retiring at the end of this Congress. A few months later, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, Massachusetts, became a Member succeeding her deceased husband, John Jacob Rogers, who had been a Member of the Sixty-sixth and other Congresses. The other Congresswomen now serving include Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, Ohio; REVA BECK BOSONE, Democrat, Utah; Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, Democrat, California; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, New York; CECIL MURRAY HARDEN, Republican, Indiana; CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Democrat, Connecticut; and EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, New York.

The Congress itself has undergone a very complete make-over since the days of the Sixty-sixth Congress. It is now a decidedly more efficiently organized body than it was then. But then, as now, it had its partisan difficulties.

The Senate of 30 years ago consisted of 48 Republicans and 47 Democrats, with Hiram Johnson, of California, listed as Republican and Progressive. Today the Senate boasts 54 Democrats and 42 Republicans. But the ailing Woodrow Wilson had just as much trouble with his lawmakers as Harry Truman is now having with his.

The House 30 years ago had 236 Republican members, 190 Democrats, and 4 minority party Representatives. Today it has 263 Democrats and 171 Republicans, together with 1 American Laborite.

Three decades ago there were so many committees in each body that a minority party member could be, and often was, a committee chairman. The Senate boasted of 74 committees, with each of its 96 Members belonging on from 5 to 7 of these groups. Today it has been streamlined to 15 committees, with each Senator holding membership on two major committees and not more than an aggregate of three. The House then, had 63 committees, and some Members belonged to 4 or 5. Today the House has 19 standing committees, and each Member, with a few notable exceptions, serves only on one committee.

LODGE WAS DEAN

The Sixty-sixth Congress was notable among those in the history of this country. Both in the House and the Senate were Members who have left an imperishable record in the annals. Tariff laws, revenue bills, treaties with foreign nations, and a host of other matters of importance came before it.

Dean of the Senate was Henry Cabot Lodge, Republican, of Massachusetts, who then had been a Member since March 4, 1893. The baby member was Carter Class, Democrat, of Virginia, elected only 2 years before. Among the Senators were William E. Borah, Republican, of Idaho; Porter J. McCumber, Republican, of North Dakota; Boies Penrose, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Atlee Pomerene, Democrat, of Ohio; Oscar W. Underwood, Democrat, of Alabama; James E. Watson, Republican, of Indiana; Francis E. Warren, Republican, of Wyoming; John Sharp Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi; Furnifold M. Simmons, Democrat, of North Carolina, and dozens of others of great renown.

Heading the House membership was the onetime Speaker of the House Joseph G. Cannon, Republican, of Illinois, "Uncle Joe" of affectionate regard who had first come to the Forty-third Congress on March 4, 1873. He served 22 terms before he retired on March 4, 1921, with the expiration of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and died some years later. Elder statesmen of the House included Frederick H. Gillette, Republican, of Massachusetts and Champ Clark, Democrat, of Missouri, who came to Congress in 1893. Both became Speaker and Mr. Gillette also served in the Senate later.

In 1919 as the Sixty-sixth Congress took over, there was a freshman class of 106 members. Today, as the Eighty-first Congress holds sway, there are only half a dozen Members with a record of continuous service. But in that earlier House membership of 30 years ago the names are recalled of James W. Fordney, Republican, of Michigan; Claude Kitchen, Democrat, of North Carolina; Andrew J. Volstead, Republican, of Minnesota; Thomas S. Butler, Republican, of Pennsylvania; James R. Mann, Republican, of Illinois; Julius Kahn, Republican, of California; George S. Graham, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Frank W. Mondell, Republican, of Wyoming; Willis C. Hawley, Republican, of Oregon; William R. Green, Republican, of Iowa; Finis J. Garrett, Democrat, of Tennessee; Martin B. Madden, Republican, of Illinois; Philip P. Campbell, Republican, of Kansas; John J. Esch, Republican, Wisconsin; Edward W. Pou, Democrat, of North Carolina; and Gen. Isaac R. Sherwood, Democrat, of Ohio.

By curious circumstances the Sixty-sixth Congress (1919–21) is the definition line of venerability in the national legislative Halls, especially when its survivors are contrasted to the aggregate memberships of the present House and Senate.

Congressman Adolph J. Sabath, Democrat, Illinois, entered the House on March 4, 1907, in the Sixtieth Congress; Robert L. Doughton, Democrat, North Carolina, became a Member March 4, 1911. Speaker Sam Rayburn, Democrat, Texas, came on March 4, 1913; and Carl Vinson, Democrat, Georgia, on November 3, 1914. Schuyler Otis Bland, Democrat, Virginia, arrived on July 2, 1918. Daniel A. Reed, Republican, New York, and Earl C. Michener, were elected for the first time to the Sixty-sixth Congress. Robert D. Crosser, Democrat, Ohio, and Roy O. Woodruff, Republican, Michigan, currently Members, had been Members prior to the Sixty-sixth Congress. Thus seven Members of the House have been in service continuously since the Sixty-sixth Congress of 30 years ago.

Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY is the odd figure in the picture. He was a Member of the House from March 4, 1913, until March 4, 1927, when he was elected to the Senate. He served in the opening period of the current Eighty-first Congress in his role as a Senator from Kentucky, and the majority floor leader. Then he assumed the Vice Presidency to which he had been elected in November 1948.

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, Democrat, Tennessee, the dean of the Senate, began his service there on March 4, 1917. Previously he had served in the House, to which he was elected to fill a vacancy on November 9, 1911. At the time of the Sixty-sixth Congress, two present Members of the Senate were then Members of the House. These were CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, Arizona, who began his House service on February 10, 1912, and TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, who served in the House from March 4, 1917, until his election to the Senate for the term starting March 4, 1929.

Senator HAYDEN, Democrat, Arizona, has an unusual background. He was elevated to the House and assumed his seat as the at-large Representative on February 10, 1912, when Arizona was granted statehood. He served in the House until he entered the Senate on March 4, 1927. He is now the third senior Member of the Senate. His only seniors in congressional service are Senator MCKELLAR and Congressmen SABATH and DOUGHTON.

The legislators who served in Congress 30 years ago and their successors through the three decades have left an indelible record in the annals of the United States. Vice President Thomas R. Marshall was the presiding officer of the Sixty-sixth Senate, and Wilson was finishing out his term of office in the White House. On the House side, Joe Cannon and Champ Clark were basking in the past glories of 16 years previous that they had served as Speaker of the House.

Then House Members, Mr. Gillette, who also became a Senator; Nicholas Longworth, Republican, of Ohio; John N. Garner, Democrat, of Texas, destined to be Vice President;

Henry T. Rainey, Democrat, of Illinois; Joseph W. Byrnes, Democrat, of Tennessee; William B. Bankhead, Democrat, of Alabama; and Sam Rayburn were destined later to serve as Speaker of the House. Joseph W. Martin, Republican, of Massachusetts, the only other to serve as Speaker in the 30-year period, did not enter the legislative Halls until the Sixty-ninth Congress in 1925.

In the corresponding period eight Senators were to attain the dignity of President pro tempore of the Senate. These were Albert C. Cummins, Republican, of Iowa; George H. Moses, Republican, of New Hampshire; Key Pittman, Democrat, of Nevada; William H. King, Democrat, of Utah; Pat Harrison, Democrat, of Mississippi; Carter Glass, Democrat, of Virginia; and Kenneth McKellar, Democrat, of Tennessee. The only other Senator to serve in this office in the 30-year period was Arthur H. Vandenberg, Republican, of Michigan, who began his senatorial service on March 31, 1928. In prior years to 1919 short terms as President pro tempore had been served by the senior Henry Cabot Lodge, Republican, of Massachusetts; Frank B. Brandegee, Republican, of Connecticut; and Charles Curtis, Republican, of Kansas.

The Senate of the Sixty-sixth Congress was destined to figure importantly in the national politics of the Republic in the ensuing years. From its ranks Warren G. Harding, Republican, of Ohio, moved on the presidency. And Charles Curtis attained the vice presidency.

SOME MOVED UP

On the House side, John Garner and ALBEN BARKLEY were destined to become Vice Presidents of the United States.

Two Senate Members of that period— Robert M. La Follette, the Wisconsin Progressive, and Hiram Johnson, alternatively a Progressive and a Republican—were presidential candidates in later years. And as unsuccessful candidates for the vice presidency, Charles R. McNary, Republican, of Oregon, and Joseph T. Robinson, Democrat, of Arkansas, took a fling at the Nation's highest office.

The Sixty-sixth Congress produced six Cabinet members in the succeeding years. Earlier, Philander Chase Knox, Republican, of Pennsylvania, had served as Secretary of State. Cordell Hull, Democrat, of Tennessee and James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina destined first to become Senators, ended their public careers later as Secretary of State. Of the then Senators, four became Cabinet officers at later dates. Included were Albert B. Fall, Republican, of New Mexico, who became Secretary of the Interior; Frank Kellogg, who became Secretary of State; Harry S. New, Republican, of Indiana, who became Postmaster General, and Claude Swanson, Democrat, of Virginia, who became Secretary of the Navy.

The House of Representatives of that 3-decades-ago period was a fine training school for graduation to the United States Senate. Among the then Representatives to be subsequently elected or appointed to the Senate were Alben W. Barkley, Democrat, Kentucky; James F. Brynes, Democrat, South Carolina; Thaddeus H. Caraway, Democrat, Arkansas; Porter H. Dale, Republican, Vermont; Tom Connally, Democrat, Texas; Simeon D. Fess, Republican, Ohio; Frederick H. Gillette, Republican, Massachusetts; Frank H. Green, Republican, Vermont; J. Thomas Heflin, Democrat, Alabama; Cordell Hull, Democrat, Tennessee; William B. McKinley, Republican, Illinois; Matthew M. Neely, Democrat, West Virginia; Thomas D. Schall, Republican, Minnesota; Frank L. Smith, Republican, Illinois; Hubert D. Stephens, Democrat, Mississippi; William S. Vare, Republican, Pennsylvania; John M. Robsion, Republican, Kentucky; and Wallace H. White, Jr., Republican, Maine.

An astronomical number of words have been uttered by the Nation's legislators in debate and discussion in the Senate and House Chambers. These are preserved to posterity and the historian in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

But there is a trio of veteran "official reporters of debate" who have listened to the oratorical flood for the past 30 years and are still going strong. These are James W. Murphy and John D. Rhodes of the Senate group and Allister Cochrane of the House contingent of shorthand experts.

Thinking It Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Parkesburg (Pa.) Post and was called to my attention by a valued constituent, Mr. Louis B. Humpton:

THINKING IT OVER

(By A. Parke)

EMPTY VICTORIES

Whether or not we're willing to admit it, the effectiveness of the U. S. S. R. technique has been brilliant. The methods we may abhor, the ultimate objectives we can condemn, but the skill behind Soviet procedure we must admire. Not only can this over-all effectiveness be admired, but it should be recognized as ample field for our own learning. For example, the Soviets have, with few exceptions, expanded on all fronts since the end of World War II. They have forced us to spend billions of dollars to hold the line against Russia. They can call the tune anywhere in Europe or Asia and we are forced to dance—with money, arms, men, and blood. Korea is but a temporary example. Tomorrow it may be Iran, Red China, Indochina, Yugoslavia, Germany, or what have you. They decide the battlefield—diplomatic or military—and they select the area or action. We tag along behind.

How can the Kremlin regulate the affairs of all nations and so consistently concern the minds of all citizens so effectively? It would pay Washington to analyze the technique, adopt its good points and get on the offensive. Holding the line is acceptable over short periods, but one doesn't advance by building barriers.

Communism has prospered and is winning the minds of millions for several reasons. Outstanding are these two: It has an ultimate long-range strategy in any and all diplomatic or military operations. (We haven't.) It has recognized the value of propaganda in world relations. (We haven't.)

The United States answer to Soviet methods has been to go along and treat each new tactic as it arises. As a result we're inevitably slammed by the opening punch and sorely battered with each succeeding propaganda haymaker. In Korea we might safely assume that Russia launched the Communist offensive with complete plans in the event of (a) Communist victory, (b) Communist defeat. No matter which of these evolves, Russia will see to it that the people who count—those folks in Asiatic territory, get her side of the question so often and in so many ways that they begin to believe it. When the military decision arrives in Korea, Moscow will roll out the appropriate procedure to be followed—a procedure polished, refined, and perfected down to the most minor details. She has plans—long-range plans—and even if she loses the battle of bullets she wins the war for men's minds.

Consider our own conduct over Korea. Whether it was the fault of the State Department or of our Intelligence the fact remains that we were caught flat-footed. Everyone was surprised and momentarily stunned. Deciding we must act, we expedited mobilization and rushed men and guns to Korea. That's it. Period.

What of tomorrow? Ask Washington and they'll tell you, "To blazes with tomorrow, we've got a war to win." Agreed. But how about the thirty-eighth parallel where the whole mess started? Will we stop there? Do we just chase the Commies back home and wait a few months until thy're ready to start fighting again? Do we go on into North Korea in the name of the UN and slap a few hands? How about Korea when it's all over—do we keep it, station an armed protective force there, or give it to Japan? If Washington has any future plans on such matters it will be most unusual and a most unexpectedly pleasant surprise. Chances are that no one has even thought about it. The Russians would have.

The only complication in this United States arrangement is that America ends up holding an empty peacetime sack to show for commendable wartime accomplishments.

That we have no long range plan is amply demonstrated by Air Force conduct. Whole cities are being bombed off the South Korean map. After the Commies are driven out you and I will be financing a type of Korean Marshall plan to rebuild the uselessly destroyed rubble. In those cities are homes as well as military targets—but bombers flying at high altitudes can't be too particular. In those homes live South Korean civilians and noncombatants. No matter how you look at it, war or no war, killing innocent folks without need is murder. Those very folks are the people to whom we intend to sell the happiness of democratic living. Admittedly, military targets must be destroyed, but if we are to win the peace those people must see that America respects the individual. We should make every effort to hit railroads, enemy supply lines, etc., yet it is not reasonable, indeed it is stupid to wipe out a whole city (which you must later rebuild) merely to destroy its rail yards or its bridges. Air power is most effectively used in low level tactical support. The Navy and Marine Corps have both argued for this point. If Korea doesn't prove them right nothing will. The Air Force remains adamant and continues to bomb towns and cities from way up in the wild blue yonder. When it's over with, the American taxpayer inherits the mess—a mess much bigger than it should be.

Think of this the next time your newspaper shows droves of B-29's dumping hundreds of tons of bombs on Korean towns.

Our dissemination of the American viewpoint (propaganda is the word) leaves much to be desired. Congress bickers and squabbles over funds for the Voice of America, but happily votes millions to keep farmers smiling and to store eggs. We pay $100,000 a day to subsidize peanuts, but act like mute misers when it comes to selling freedom. In the UN our delegate, Warren Austin, has truth on his side. He's won all the fine points in debate with Russia's Malik—but Malik talks more often and speaks longer when he does. Every word he says is for Asiatic consumption—and Russia will see to it that the Asiatics hear. "Brutal American bombing—," that makes sense to an Asiatic who's family has been wiped out. We win the fine points in debate but don't even bother to let the world know our viewpoints.

Television's fine; but Americans are already sold on democracy. Asia and Europe need to know our arguments. Russia crows her story 24 hours a day—and millions are listening.

We should have long-range diplomatic planning—plans for conduct during and after a war. We should fight now to win the peace and not the war alone. While we're at it we'd do well to spend a buck to tell the little people of the world our side of the story. Otherwise we'll go on winning wars and losing the victories.

Building Commissioner Reynolds Declares: "Dignity, Simplicity, and Efficiency Attended by Low Costs Are the Qualities Especially Sought in the Design of New Federal Buildings"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is probably no column written and published which gives me more pleasure than does the column written by the nationally known writer, John White, and carried locally in the Washington Times-Herald.

With rare and keen insight, John White seems to have a never-ending catalog of persons about whom he can tell the most interesting and fascinating things, and do so in a manner which intrigues the mind and fires both the imagination and admiration for the subject of the article.

Mr. Speaker, I remember years ago when on some occasion or other our great Senator John Bankhead, Sr., the father of our beloved speaker, Will Bankhead, once said to me:

> Frank, my boy, the President and the Cabinet officers * * * who are Secretaries charged with the administration of the various departments of Government, may come and go * * * but * * * generally way back in some office is a man whose name may not even be written on the door but who is, in fact, the driving force of all the action programs projected in that particular department of Government.
>
> Frank, it is the civil-service workers, the technical men, the economists, the architects, the engineers, the scientists in governmental departments * * * obscure though they be who have builded the Government services of this country to the heights which they now have attained.

Mr. Speaker, prominent among those who have done so much to build this country great is your good friend and my good friend, W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings in the General Services Administration.

Mr. Speaker, it is because I know Bert Reynolds that the article which John White wrote about him held such a deep interest for me, for out of all the wide circle of my friends, there are few whom I admire more ardently and whose friendship I cherish more than I do the friendship of Bert Reynolds.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few agencies or departments in the Federal Government that are as old as is the agency now called Public Buildings Service, formerly the Public Buildings Administration. Moreover, there are very few agencies who can boast of personnel the tenure of whose service is as distinguished as is the personnel of that agency. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is no better administrator in all of Government service than the Honorable W. E. Reynolds, Public Buildings Commissioner, who has been associated to Public Buildings for the last 20 years.

My long membership on the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee of this House together with my private building activities in Washington, D. C., even before I came to Congress have brought me into very intimate, close contact with Mr. Bert Reynolds and his able assistants. In his appearances before our committee he has never failed to impress us as other than a man devoted to his task, ever and always on the alert to accomplish the things which would bring more and ever-continuing efficiency and economy in the administration of the Department which he has headed up these many years.

It was, therefore, no surprise to note John White's article telling of Bert Reynolds' ideas of improving Federal building practices—which he has personally been struggling to achieve for these past 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, when I read the short article about Commissioner Reynolds' ideas, I called him on the phone to ask for a copy of his remarks in full for my further perusal and study.

Congressman—

He said—

> I am sorry, but it was not a prepared statement. It was just some extemporaneous remarks which I made together with a few observations that would look to lower capital investment per foot as well as increased efficiency and lowered operating costs with respect to the construction and operation of the buildings built by the Government of the United States.

Telling me that his remarks were brief, he said they were entirely covered in a news item published in the Bulletin of the Washington Building Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in his conversation with me, Mr. Reynolds pointed out that subsequent to July 1, 1950, the Public Buildings Administration would be operating about 100,000,000 square feet of space, and that to reduce the cost of operating by merely 1 cent a foot per year a savings of $1,000,000 annually could be effected. He stressed the splendid cooperation that had been extended him since the Public Buildings Administration was covered into the General Services Administration headed up by the Honorable Jess Larson, and said that he looked further to even more splendid work than had been accomplished in the long years it had acted as an independent agency under the Treasury Department.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few buildings within these United States with the exception of veterans' hospitals and several of the newer post offices that are not monuments to the engineering, architectural, and other skills of the civilian employees of the Public Buildings Administration.

I at one time heard it said that there was no architectural office in the whole world that could even begin to rank with the ability and skill possessed by the men who labor over the drafting boards designing public buildings for these United States. Certainly there are no buildings in the United States, the solidity and type of construction of which, both as to functional architecture and the quality of materials used, will excel those used in the construction of our Federal buildings, during the long years that have passed.

Modern design which comprehends the use of improved materials, power-driven tools, and skilled, specialized workmanship contribute to the change that is evolving in building construction, equally as much as do all factors that have affected other changes noted in this—the atomic age.

Always ahead of the times, Bert Reynolds now tells of further changes that should be made in Federal buildings applicable to their function, capital investment, management, servicing, and operating costs.

It is because of the interest of this House in this subject of efficiency and economy of operation that I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, include therein and insert into the Congressoinal RECORD two articles.

One, written by John White, and entitled "Did You Happen To See W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings." The other article entitled "Reynolds Tells About Federal Building Practices," has been clipped from the Washington Building Congress Bulletin. They follow:

DID YOU HAPPEN TO SEE W. E. REYNOLDS, COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

He believes that Government buildings should feature dignity, efficiency, and simplicity, and he has a lot of ideas about how those desirable qualities may be had. For instance, says he, Government structures should have air conditioning, because that increases workers' efficiency; they should have big shallow elevators, for quicker loading; they should have windows washable from the inside; they should have rounded corners, for easier cleaning; they should have recessed entrances, for rainy-weather protection; and lighter doors, for easier opening.

They should not have outside steps, because they are not necessary and people fall down them and sue the Government.

They should not have parapets. "It is silly," says Reynolds, to edge a roof with a parapet which holds some water, leaks some, and must be repaired.

They should have as little ornamentation as possible.

They should have no connecting doors between offices. "If an office worker has a job to do, he should not be running back and forth anyway," Reynolds believes.

They should have as few windows as possible. Reynolds frankly admits he would do away with practically all windows, except that people would complain of claustrophobia.

They should be painted in light tones—ceilings white and furniture nearly white.

Light goes farther in such surroundings. Furthermore, if restrooms are painted in light tones and brightly illuminated, loafing there is reduced, says Reynolds.

They should be, but go down and inspect the new Federal-courts building for the District at Third and Independence, or the new section of the GAO, if you want to see Reynolds' ideas in operation.

Those buildings don't embody all of the new notions of Mr. Reynolds and his Public Buildings services, but they are a notable improvement on older Federal piles around here.

And while you are scouting around those places notice how they have uplifted the neighborhoods surrounding them. For it is one of Reynolds' greatest satisfactions how the simple act of plumping a fine white dignified Federal building down into a ramshackle section can make that section change itself into a thing of beauty. Look at what happened to the streets around Social Security.

Reynolds is an Iowan who took his B. S. from Iowa State College in 1911, his civil-engineering degree in 1919, and was a draftsman and engineer and teacher before joining the Government. He is a good all-around man. In 1932 the RFC asked him if the projected huge San Francisco-Oakland Bridge would pay for itself in tolls. He said it would, so it was built, and it did.

He is also a good fisherman. Some people say he holds the record for the biggest channel bass ever caught in the Chesapeake—40 pounds—and he has an eye for beauty; he would like nothing better than to knock down our ghastly "temporary" buildings.

JOHN WHITE.

REYNOLDS TELLS ABOUT FEDERAL BUILDING PRACTICES

In a talk at the May 8 meeting of the Building Congress, Commissioner of Public Buildings, W. E. Reynolds stressed the fact that the cost of upkeep and operation of Government buildings is one of the important factors in determining their design. Speaking on Improving Federal Building Practices, Mr. Reynolds said, "That PBA leaves actual research on building materials and products to the laboratories of large private companies, but it has acquired a wealth of information from constant studies of its experience in building, operating, and repairing Federal buildings."

He pointed out that if a way can be found to reduce the cost of operating 1 cent per square foot a year, $750,000 a year can be saved. After July 1, 1950, PBA will be operating about 100,000,000 square feet of space. It has been demonstrated that quality materials save money in the long run.

Dignity, simplicity, and efficiency are the qualities especially sought in the design of new structures. The tendency is toward block-type structures with all parapets, outside steps, and excess ornamentation eliminated.

AIR CONDITIONING

Air conditioning is now being specified for most new Government offices. Formerly it was not considered necessary in such locations as New York and Boston, but the greatly increased efficiency of employees which results from comfortable summer temperatures, has proved its worth. Taking the average of the salaries of the Government as a whole, it was found that the cost of air conditioning, including amortization and replacement, is 1½ percent of the average salary per employee, per year. On the basis of 480 minutes a day working time, if 7 minutes a day can be saved, the cost of the air conditioning and its upkeep is soon paid for.

VERTICAL TRANSPORTATION

Studies have shown that larger elevators are the most efficient as long as there are sufficient to serve each floor. At one time 3,500 pounds was considered large. When the cost of the operator was figured in, the most economical size immediately jumped to 4,500 pounds. Wide, shallow elevators can be loaded and unloaded in half the time required by narrow, deep ones. The cost of operation goes down when elevators are grouped together in banks. Studies on automatic controls within elevator banks are in progress.

Escalators are being used more and more. In the General Accounting Office they will go up five floors. The Hancock Building in Boston is using them to the eighth floor.

COLUMN SPACING

Study of the relation between building design and space utilization has paid real dividends. The average space per person in Government buildings in Washington is now under 110 square feet. If this can be reduced by 6 square feet, a space equivalent to the Commerce Building will be saved.

Outside bays should not be deeper than 18 feet. Those parallel to the face of the building can measure 25 feet. This permits them to be divided into 8- or 12-foot offices. It makes possible private offices with 172 square feet instead of 400 square feet often found at present.

On the new General Accounting Office, PBA is experimenting with flat-slab construction with all of the ducts suspended beneath that. Suspended ceilings of uniform height, and using no beams, make the space more flexible and permit better lighting. It is estimated that this method of building will cost less than any other type of construction. Careful cost data are being kept through 100-percent cooperation with the contractor. The information should prove valuable in determining future building design.

WINDOWS

If it weren't for causing claustrophobia, Mr. Reynolds would prefer buildings with no windows at all. The cost of washing is one of the most important items in determining the type of windows to be used. PBA is now generally using windows which can be washed from the inside, which should cut the cost of washing by 40 percent.

ENTRANCES AND CORRIDORS

Recessed entrances which provide waiting space in bad weather are preferred. Very large, heavy doors are no longer used. Outside steps are eliminated wherever possible. Corridors will have rounded corners, and all fountains, telephone booths, etc., will be recessed. Mr. Reynolds commented that more money is being spent on corridors than formerly.

LIGHTING

Ease of reading rather than the intensity of light on the working plane is the prime consideration. Mr. Reynolds emphasized the effect of color on lighting efficiency. All ceilings are now being painted white, which gives a reflective factor of 80 percent. Most ceilings are only 30 percent. The brightness ratio should be no more than 3 to 1. The tops of desks and equipment are finished in light colors to reduce the contrast between the working surface and the papers on it.

PANEL HEATING

This is recommended for outside steps, drives, and approaches, to remove snow and ice. While there have been some objections to present installations, the problem is one of improving the engineering design and it will be worked out.

TOILET ROOMS

Ease in cleaning is the paramount requirement. Some wall-hung fixtures have been used, but they cost too much to be used generally.

Mr. Reynolds said that it had been discovered that if the intensity of light is as great as in an office, people do not stay as long in toilet rooms. He could not explain why this occurred. To prevent clogged drains, no mirrors are placed over washbasins in women's restrooms.

Other items mentioned briefly were the elimination of transoms and communicating doors between offices. Stairs are no longer built of expensive material; all over one story are completely enclosed. No foreign materials are used. Vacuum cleaning systems are installed in buildings with areas of 50,000 square feet and up; in smaller buildings movable equipment is cheaper though not as efficient.

In summing up, Mr. Reynolds emphasized the need for beauty, dignity, and functional efficiency in public buildings, as well as continued emphasis on economy in operation to spread the taxpayers' dollars as far as possible.

Coffee Swindle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Coffee Swindle," published in the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of September 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COFFEE SWINDLE

We American coffee drinkers have been taken.

But good.

We've been taken in one of the greatest international squeeze plays ever devised in the world's commodity markets.

This squeeze play begins in the coffee-growing countries of South and Central America, particularly in Brazil and Colombia, largest coffee producers in the world. There government-controlled cooperatives and exporting cartels set up artificial shortages by (a) limiting production, (b) restricting exports, and (c) buying and holding or actually destroying surplus coffee.

It extends to the Pan-American Coffee Bureau, a nonprofit cooperative with offices in New York. This bureau represents South and Central American governments which control the coffee deal. It is dedicated to increasing coffee consumption, but is charged with putting out hints of $1 coffee and inaccurate information concerning coffee crop conditions—hints and information that have caused panic buying and cost United States coffee consumers countless millions.

It also extends to the big American importers and roasters, some of which help support the Pan-American Coffee Bureau and some of which (A. & P. and Maxwell House) were given preferential deals by Brazil in 1948 and 1949.

Finally the squeeze play extends down the line, from American roaster to distributor to retailer—each employing the percentage markup system on each price hike—until the payoff: Coffee as high as 88 cents to consumers of Portland.

Just how far-reaching the great coffee swindle of 1948, 1949, and 1950 has been is officially revealed by the United States Senate subcommittee, GUY M. GILLETTE, chairman, which recently completed its investi-

gation of price spreads in coffee. It found that:

"The speculator, exporters and importers seem to be the ones who profited by the rise in coffee prices.

"Repeatedly witness after witness has stated that there has not been a shortage of coffee at all during recent years and none appears likely over the current year 1950."

In short, publicity releases from Brazil and Colombia and from the Pan-American Coffee Bureau, indicating serious weather damage to coffee crops, were either greatly exaggerated or pure fabrications. But they served to hike green coffee prices 250 percent between April and November of 1949, inducing scare buying by American roasters and hoarding by American consumers. Says the Senate committee:

"The consumer fell unwittingly into the trap, and thus aided the price spiral."

That's the whole sordid coffee story. At last.

It wouldn't be quite so bad if the growers of Brazil and Colombia and Central America were making the money. But they aren't. Because of tricky and unrealistic foreign exchange they have been realizing only 50 percent more income (on an American dollar basis) while green coffee prices are now 10 times their 1902 low.

Can the great coffee squeeze be halted?

It can be and it should be.

The Senate committee has some pertinent suggestions, and we would add some of our own. Here they are:

Slap a stiff capital-gains tax on alien individuals and foreign corporations doing business in the United States.

Place coffee trading under the control of the Commodity Exchange Act and eliminate the tricky deals in coffee futures.

Require foreign coffee interests to dispose of stocks warehoused in the United States through regular trade channels instead of holding them for speculative profits.

Instigate criminal investigation (by the Department of Justice) of possible violations of the antitrust laws in the United States and employ civil suits against foreign manipulators operating in the United States.

Refuse further allocation of dollars (by ECA) for the purchase of coffee.

Assist the Brazilian and Colombian Governments to readjust their exchange rates so the coffee farmers, rather than the Government and the coffee speculators, will realize more equitable returns.

Develop our own (reliable) statistics on coffee production and consumption and on weather damage in coffee-growing countries.

If Brazil, Colombia, and other coffee-producing countries won't cooperate, encourage coffee growing in other areas.

Persuade American coffee roasters, distributors, and retailers to abandon the practice of percentage markups and apply a more reasonable rate of return on a pound basis.

If all this doesn't work, switch to sassafras or slippery-elm tea—ugh!

The New Social Security Law—A Great Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the outstanding achievements of this Eighty-first Congress is the enactment of a law expanding and bringing up to date our social-security system. This law extends security in their old age to 10,000,000 additional Americans as a matter of their earned right, not as a matter of charity or a public dole. It raises social-security benefits to conform with higher costs of living.

I believe that our social-security system should be extended even further, so as to cover all working men and women, and I have introduced legislation to accomplish this. But the new law passed by the Eighty-first Congress is a great step forward, and I was proud to cast my vote for it.

In view of the widespread interest in this law I think it will be helpful to set forth the changes in our social-security system which it brings about.

MAJOR CHANGES SUMMARIZED

Summarized in a few sentences, the major changes are:

First. Larger benefits: The nearly 235,000 Californians now receiving social-security payments will find that in the checks to be mailed out October 3 their benefits will be, on the average, roughly 75 percent greater than they have been. For those who will retire after June 1952, benefits will be twice what they are now, on the average.

Second. Broader coverage: On January 1, 1951, over 750,000 people in the State of California, who up to now have not been covered by social security, will come under the system. For the first time the nonfarm self-employed—persons in business for themselves, such as grocery store, retail store, or gas-station owners—will have the opportunity to earn security in their later life under the social-security system.

Third. Easier eligibility: In general, it will take fewer years of social-security coverage before you are eligible to draw benefits. Specifically, persons who are now 65 or over, and who have had six quarter-years—a year and a half—of social-security coverage can and should apply immediately for benefits. Any retired worker as well as survivors and dependents will be able to earn $50 a month—as against the present limit of $15—without losing their benefit payments.

Here, in more detail, are the answers to questions I think will be of most general interest:

HOW MUCH LARGER BENEFITS?

First. How much larger will benefits be under the new law? Benefit increases will go to two main groups of people: (a) Those who are currently receiving benefits, or who will begin receiving them before 1952; and (b) those who will reach retirement age after June 1952—these are called "new starts." Let me explain more fully how the new bill affects each of these groups.

IMMEDIATE INCREASES AVERAGE 77½ PERCENT

There are nearly 235,000 people in the State of California who are now receiving social-security benefits. In the checks which they will receive early in October—their September payments—they will find that their payments will be, on the average, 77½ percent greater than they have been up to now.

The table below shows what the increases will be for an insured wage earner without any dependents, and for a married couple:

Retired wage earner without dependents		Retired wage earner and wife	
Now	New law	Now	New law
$10	$20.00	$15.00	$30.00
$11	22.00	$16.50	33.00
$12	24.00	$18.00	36.00
$13	26.00	$19.50	39.00
$14	28.00	$21.00	42.00
$15	30.00	$22.50	45.00
$16	31.70	$24.00	47.55
$17	33.20	$25.50	49.80
$18	34.50	$27.00	51.75
$19	35.70	$28.50	53.55
$20	37.00	$30.00	56.50
$21	38.50	$31.50	57.75
$22	40.20	$33.00	60.30
$23	42.20	$34.50	63.30
$24	44.50	$36.00	66.75
$25	46.50	$37.50	69.75
$26	48.30	$39.00	72.45
$27	50.00	$40.50	75.00
$28	51.50	$42.00	77.25
$29	52.80	$43.50	79.20
$30	54.00	$45.00	81.00
$31	55.10	$46.50	82.65
$32	56.20	$48.00	84.30
$33	57.20	$49.50	85.80
$34	58.20	$51.00	87.30
$35	59.20	$52.50	88.80
$36	60.20	$54.00	90.30
$37	61.20	$55.50	91.80
$38	62.20	$57.00	93.30
$39	63.10	$58.50	94.65
$40	64.00	$60.00	96.00
$41	64.90	$61.50	97.35
$42	65.80	$63.00	98.70
$43	66.70	$64.50	100.05
$44	67.60	$66.00	101.40
$45	68.50	$67.50	102.75
$46	68.50	$69.00	102.75

These same increases apply to anyone who retires before June 1952.

The following table shows the benefits that will appear in the September checks of a widow with two children who is currently receiving benefits:

Widow with two children

Present benefit: $20; new benefit: $40.
Present benefit: $25; new benefit: $46.
Present benefit: $30; new benefit: $53.
Present benefit: $35; new benefit: $59.
Present benefit: $40; new benefit: $67.
Present benefit: $45; new benefit: $76.
Present benefit: $50; new benefit: $92.
Present benefit: $55; new benefit: $110.
Present benefit: $60; new benefit: $117.
Present benefit: $65; new benefit: $122.
Present benefit: $70; new benefit: $128.
Present benefit: $75; new benefit: $133.

INCREASES SENT AUTOMATICALLY

You do not have to apply for the increases; they will be sent to you automatically. If, for any reason, the increase fails to show up in your October check, it will show up very soon, in full. Recipients are asked not to start writing in for information because the more letters that have to be answered, the slower the program will be in getting under way.

BENEFITS DOUBLED IN 1952

For anyone who retires after June 1952 a new formula may be used to compute benefits, which will yield, roughly, twice the benefits now being received. You can begin to use this new formula just as soon as you have worked for six quarter-years—or a full year and a half—under the social-security system after January 1, 1951.

The following table shows, roughly, how much the benefits will be according to this new formula:

Average monthly wage	Single	Married
$50	$25	$38
$100	50	75
$150	58	86
$200	65	98
$250	72	109
$300	80	120

The minimum primary benefit has been raised from $10 to $25 in most cases, and the maximum family benefit has been raised from $85 to $150. These changes are long overdue in bringing our social-security system into line with high living costs.

WHO WILL BE COVERED NOW?

Second. What new people will be covered under the new law? On January 1, 1951, over 750,000 people in the State of California (nearly 10,000,000 in the Nation as a whole) will come under the social-security system for the first time.

THE NONFARM SELF-EMPLOYED

The largest and most important group to come under the system are the nonfarm self-employed—numbering about 424,000 in California. For the first time the druggist, the grocer, the gas station owner, and thousands of other persons who are in business for themselves can look forward to security in their later years as an earned right, to which they have contributed during their working lifetime.

Farmers are still not included under social security; nor are many professional people, such as doctors and lawyers.

ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS MUCH SOONER

At this point, I should emphasize, for the benefit of these businessmen, as well as all those who will come under the social-security system now, it will be much easier for you to become eligible for benefits under the new law. If you are 62 or over on January 1, 1951, and begin your social-security coverage on that date, you will need to work only a year and a half under the system in order to be fully insured and eligible for benefit payments upon retirement. That means that you will begin to draw benefits just as soon as you reach the retirement age of 65.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Some 130,000 agricultural workers in California will come under the social security program on January 1. This includes not only persons who regularly work on farms, but also the so-called borderline agricultural workers—those who work, say, in raising livestock or fur animals; or in processing or delivering crops to storage or to market; or those engaged in household work on a farm. Employees of commercial handlers of fruits and vegetables are included in this borderline group, as are employees of farmer cooperatives.

Those who regularly work on farms must work for one farm operator for 3 months before their social security coverage even begins. After that, they must work for him for 60 full days and earn $50 in cash during each 3-month period. If they change employers, they must work regularly for 3 months before their work with the new employer begins to count for social security.

DOMESTIC WORKERS

About 58,000 California domestic workers in nonfarm homes will join the system next January, provided they work 24 days for one employer and receive cash wages of at least $50 during each quarter-year.

VOLUNTARY COVERAGE FOR STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

With regard to the inclusion of employees of the State, and of cities, towns, or counties, this is the situation: Sometime after January 1, the State of California may, if it wishes, enter into an agreement with the Federal Government. That agreement will set forth specifically which groups of employees of the State, or of cities, towns, or counties, will be covered under social security. Any State or local employee who is covered by an existing retirement system cannot be included in such an agreement. In this way, existing retirement systems will be fully protected. If any group of State or local employees is included in the agreement, then social security coverage for all members of the group will be automatic. There are in California about 130,000 State and local employees who are not covered by existing retirement systems who might be included in the social security system.

Employees of the Federal Government in California who are not presently covered by a Federal retirement system, will be included under social security.

EMPLOYEES OF NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

Employees of nonprofit institutions (hospitals, churches, schools, and the like) will be covered only if the employer agrees to pay his share of the tax contribution and if two-thirds or more of the employees favor social-security coverage.

Ministers and members of religious orders will continue to be excluded.

SALESMEN AND TRUCK DRIVERS INCLUDED

The new bill will also include all full-time life-insurance salesmen, certain full-time traveling salesmen (other than house-to-house), many delivery truck drivers and home industrial workers who satisfy certain conditions.

HOW LONG TO QUALIFY?

Third. How long will you have to work under social security before you can start drawing benefits?

One of the greatest advantages of the new social-security law is that although the retirement age is still 65, in the future you will not have to work under the social-security system nearly as long before you are fully insured and eligible to draw benefits upon reaching the retirement age of 65.

The following table shows how many quarter-years of coverage under social security you will have to have under the new law, as compared with the present law. Simply look at the figure next to your age on January 1, 1951.

Quarter-years of coverage required to be fully insured

Age reached in first half of 1951	Present law	New law
76 or over	6	6
75	8	6
74	10	6
73	12	6
72	14	6
71	16	6
70	18	6
69	20	6
68	22	6
67	24	6
66	26	6
65	28	6
64	30	6
63	32	6
62	34	6
61	36	8
60	38	10
59	40	12
58	40	14
57	40	16
56	40	18
55	40	20
50	40	30
45 or under	40	40

All of the time you have worked under social security up to now still counts toward meeting your "coverage" requirement.

This change means three main things.

MANY AGED 65 CAN GET BENEFITS IMMEDIATELY

First, any insured worker who is now 65 or over, and who has had 6 quarter-years (or a full year and a half) of social-security coverage, can draw benefits immediately. He should apply for them at the nearest Social Security Administration field office.

In California, these offices are located in Bakersfield, Eureka, Fresno, Glendale, Hollywood, Huntington Park, Englewood, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Oakland, Pasadena, Redding, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Monica, Santa Rosa, Stockton, and San Jose. Your local post office should be able to tell you how to address your request.

Second, any worker who is 62 or over on January 1, 1951, even if he only starts his social-security coverage next year, will be eligible to begin drawing benefits just as soon as he reaches the retirement age of 65, if he has had six quarter years (a year and a half) of coverage.

ELIGIBILITY MUCH EASIER FOR THE NEWLY COVERED

Third, and most important to the thousands who will become eligible to join the social-security system next year, it will be possible for them to begin drawing benefits upon retirement (at age 65) with much less social-security coverage than now. The table above shows the tremendous improvements brought about by this law.

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS

The fourth main question of general interest is: How much will dependents and survivors receive under the new law?

The "primary benefit" is the basic payment made to an insured wage earner who has no dependents. Generally speaking, dependents and survivors will receive the same part of the "primary" as at present. This means that their benefits will also be about 75 percent higher than at present, up until 1952, and double the present levels after that.

MAJOR CHANGES LISTED

The major changes in dependents' and survivors' benefits are:

(a) A retired worker's wife who is under 65 can receive benefits if she has a child in her care.

(b) The benefit for a dependent parent has been raised to three-quarters of the "primary" benefit of the wage earner (it has been one-half).

(c) Lump-sum death payments, though reduced to three times the "primary benefit" of the wage earner, are now payable to the family of every insured worker. Formerly, these payments were made only when no other member of the family was entitled to survivors' benefits at the time of the wage earner's death.

(d) Retired workers, survivors, or dependents may now earn $50 a month (as against $14.99 under the present law) without losing their benefit privileges.

NEW LAW A LANDMARK IN SOCIAL LEGISLATION

This new social security law is a landmark in the field of social legislation. The improvements in our social insurance system which it brings about are long overdue. In my opinion, they do not go far enough. I believe that our insurance system should include the permanently and totally disabled, who are entitled to security as a matter of right, and not a matter of charity. I believe that the system should extend to all working men and women—for old age is a problem shared by all Americans alike. I believe that the retirement age for women should be lowered from 65 to 60. I believe that all insured workers should receive a minimum benefit of $75.

All of these provisions are contained in a social security bill which I introduced early this year.

We have taken a great step forward, but there is still room for progress and improvement. There is still a challenge for the future.

"The Span Thus Built of Priceless Parts, of Love Divine in Human Hearts, Has Strength No Evil Force Can Sever—the Bridge of Kindness Lasts Forever"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it was an inspiration to read in the August 1950 issue of the magazine American Engineer a poem written by Dr. David Barnard Steinman, internationally known bridge engineer and author of many books on bridge design, construction, and direction.

It is significant indeed that this message on the spiritual ingredients of a bridge "to span the gap from man to man" should have come from the pen of a man who has participated in the design and construction of such imposing structures as the Triborough and Henry Hudson Bridges in New York City, the Cologne-Mulheim Bridge over the historic Rhine; the Florianopolis of Brazil, largest suspension bridge in South America; the Thousand Islands International Bridge over the St. Lawrence River—bridges, in fact, in five continents of our troubled world.

Dr. Steinman, honorary life member of the New York State Society of Professional Engineers, has given us a beautiful and timely message in his poem, The Bridge, and I ask that it now be made a permanent part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the Members of this and the other body, together with the countless readers of our proceedings, may have the benefit of reading it.

THE BRIDGE

(By Dr. D. B. Steinman)

(Editor's Note: Below is a poem written by Dr. D. B. Steinman, internationally known bridge engineer, and first president of NSPE.)

In days gone by, a valiant band,
With consecrated heart and hand,
Set out as pilgrims, seeking ways
To pierce the wilderness of fear,
To bring the distant places near,
To build new roads to brighter days.

Through field and forest, hill and vale,
They cleared a path and blazed a trail.
In heat and frost, they toiled each day
To make more smooth and safe the road,
To ease the heartache and the load
For others who would come that way.

One night the pilgrims reached the rim
Of canyon deep and torrent grim,
With alien tribes on farther side.
The need was clear—a mighty span,
A link of peace uniting man,
Built high above the swollen tide.

The pilgrims built a bridge of wood:
In massive strength the great span stood.
But ere the bridge with load was strained,
A fiery spark fell on the span
And flames consumed this work of man—
Then naught but glowing ash remained.

The pilgrims labored to atone:
This time they built a bridge of stone.
But ere the builders' thrill had waned,
A sudden earthquake heaved the ground
And felled the bridge, with crashing sound—
Then naught but rubble heap remained.

Imbued with unabated zeal,
The pilgrims built a bridge of steel.
But as their eyes aloft were trained,
A thing of terror, hurtling past,
Dissolved the bridge in fission blast—
Then naught but vapor glow remained.

The pilgrims now were sad of heart.
Their best was spent of skill and art,
Yet all their work had come to naught.
What part was missing in their plan?
How could they build a lasting span
To reach the goal their toil had sought?

While hearts were heavy with despair,
There came an answer to their prayer.
As clouds rolled back before their gaze,
A radiant vision met their eyes—
A rainbow span across the skies,
Resplendent in its glowing rays.

And as they gazed with wonder high,
They heard a voice speak from the sky:
"To span the gap from man to man,
Construct a bridge not made by hands,
Not wood or stone or iron bands—
Of human kindness build the span!"

The pilgrims' hearts with hope were fired;
With prayer they turned to task inspired:
By overcoming human blindness,
By giving loving thought to others,
By treating all men as their brothers,
They built the bridge of human kindness.

And there the span of spirit stood,
Conjoining men in brotherhood,
Uniting men in love supernal.
Fierce storms may rage and lightning flash,
Wild floods may swirl and earthquakes crash—
But naught can shake the span eternal.

The span thus built of priceless parts—
Of love divine in human hearts—
Has strength no evil force can sever.
The dream of heaven-inspired sages,
The prayer of mankind through the ages—
The bridge of kindness lasts forever.

Indeed, It Is Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal of September 11, 1950, entitled "Indeed, It Is Time."

INDEED, IT IS TIME

Addressing the convention of the Illinois department of the American Legion in Chicago last week, Governor Stevenson presented a plea for a cessation of criticism of the administration of President Truman.

"It is time now to close ranks and put an end to strikes, to recriminations, to political charges and countercharges," he said. "It is time to stop fighting each other and start fighting the common enemy."

The governor thus echoed the administration line that decries any criticism of its bungling as an attack upon the whole country. Mr. Truman and Governor Stevenson expect the people of the United States to blindly and uncomplainingly follow the blundering policy that has placed this country needlessly in a most precarious position.

Indeed, it is time for a closing of ranks and a determining to face up to the "common enemy" and to actually begin doing something to defeat that enemy. It is time that the administration that Governor Stevenson attempts to defend began delivering the goods and giving the people of the United States something they can support instead of fumbling along and plunging the Nation totally unprepared into a bitter, bloody war. It is time for the leaders the governor wants us to follow to stop coddling and ignoring the Communists within their ranks and to begin doing something to oust them from positions where they can carry on their destructive work.

Governor Stevenson and the Democratic politicians seem to believe that anyone who doesn't agree entirely with them is working against the best interests of the United States. They believe that unless we swallow down without gulping the colossal bungling indulged in by such men as Secretaries Johnson and Acheson and the even greater mistakes of Harry Truman that we are sabotaging the effort to preserve America.

Loyalty to the United States and support of the Government do not remove the right and the duty to criticize and assail stupid blunderers and disloyal agents of the enemy who are leading the way straight to destruction. Indeed there is more loyalty in the man who has the courage to stand up and cry out against the selfish efforts of petty men in high places to gain political advantage at the expense of their country, than

there is in the submissive acceptance of incompetence and skulduggery in the upper levels of government urged by the governor.

It is time for the people of America to rally to the support of their country, Governor Stevenson, but it will never be the time for them to cease their efforts to curb the fumbling and bungling of incompetents like Truman, Johnson and Acheson who have brought about the needless deaths of untrained and unequipped American boys half way around the world. A man who asks them to silence their criticism is doing his Nation no favor. He is merely putting partisan politics ahead of patriotism.

Mary Theresa Norton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with the retirement of the gentlewoman from New Jersey at the conclusion of this session of Congress, the membership will lose one of its most distinguished and most respected colleagues. Few of us had the pleasure of her acquaintance when she first entered the House of Representatives more than a quarter of a century ago, yet everyone who remembers the dark days following 1929 will recall with appreciation her persistent efforts to raise the standard of living for the millions of Americans who suffered most in that period of depression and destitution. Mrs. NORTON was a predominant figure in the long battle to obtain the deserved benefits which our working men and women eventually came to realize, and it was she who personally sponsored and guided legislation for higher wages and shorter hours after she assumed the chair of the Labor Committee in 1937.

As a resident of a mining, industrial, and farm district, I was acutely conscious of the progress that came about through the work of such outstanding legislators as Mrs. NORTON. Not until my election to Congress and my subsequent appointment to the Labor Committee, however, could I comprehend the magnitude of her task. And only then could I understand the struggle that was required to prevent revocation of those laws responsible for labor's progress. Time and again Mrs. NORTON experienced severe criticism for her continued deferment of antilabor legislation during war years; on every occasion she chose to accept undeserved censure rather than yield to demands contrary to her principles and to those of her people. Such courage of conviction has won for Mrs. NORTON the admiration of the entire Congress and of the wage earners of the Nation, regardless of political affiliation.

I should also like to point out that in succeeding the gentlewoman from New Jersey as delegate to the International Labor Organization, I found that representatives of the many other countries throughout the world were highly aware of her ability, respectful of her judgment, and appreciative of her friendship. And I assure you that it was most gratifying to know that the esteem which we here have for Mrs. NORTON is not confined to America alone.

Helicopter Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the RECORD some information about helicopters:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, September 8, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I should like to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated August 30, 1950, concerning a recent discussion on the floor of the House with respect to helicopter operations. During that discussion a comparison was made between the cost of transporting mail by truck and by helicopter, and the question was raised as to whether the latter service was too costly. In your letter you request information which would explain the expenditures for helicopter services.

In this connection I believe the most pertinent information is contained in the Board's opinion in the Chicago Helicopter Service Case (copy attached) from which I should like to quote the following two paragraphs appearing on pages 689 and 690:

"On the basis of cost figures obtained from the Post Office Division of Motor Vehicle Service, the report indicates that a fleet of nine Government-owned trucks could perform a service approximately equal to the helicopter service at an annual over-all cost of $74,605, or $2.44 an hour. It is, of course, clear that the operation of trucks to provide mail service in lieu of the proposed helicopter service could be conducted at a substantially lower cost to the Government than the helicopter service. However, there are, we believe, considerations of broad national interest which justify the inauguration of the proposed helicopter service on an experimental basis. The establishment of this service in the Chicago area offers an additional opportunity for providing answers to the air transport industry as to the utility and efficiency of a relatively new type of aircraft in scheduled commercial operations. Moreover, further development of the helicopter and the experience to be gained from the operation is desirable in the interest of the national defense.

"The recent war and the present trend of events demonstrate that it is of considerable public interest that new types of scheduled air transportation be fostered when circumstances portend a reasonable expectation of success. In many respects, military and commercial fields of air transportation are one. At the present time military versions of the helicopter are similar to commercial types. The interest of the military in the operation is abundantly clear not only from its active participation in this proceeding but also by reason of the fact that military helicopters were made available to the Post Office Department for conducting a test operation in the Chicago area. The Air Force and the Navy urge certification of the service, emphasizing the value of the helicopter in military operations and the assistance which the operation would give by providing a valuable background of experience and building a nuclei of trained helicopter flight, maintenance, and engineering personnel as part of an emergency reserve for defense. Chicago has a varied climate the year round and from an operational viewpoint the experiment also would give the military weather experience with the helicopter in addition to that afforded by the Los Angeles operation. Upon the basis of the foregoing considerations we find that the operation of helicopter service for the transportation of mail in the Chicago area is required by the public convenience and necessity."

It is clear from the above that the Board recognized the savings in cost if the service were performed by truck, but concluded that there were overriding considerations, mainly of a national-defense nature, which justify the authorization of this experimental service. In connection with the national-defense aspects of this case, I should like to refer you to footnote 6 of the attached opinion (appearing on p. 690) which contains excerpts from testimony by the military services, giving strong support to the helicopter experiment. In reaching its decision in this case the Board gave substantial weight to such testimony.

In the event they may be of use to you, I am enclosing sets of financial and mileage and traffic recurrent reports for feeder carriers for the 12 months ended March 31, 1950. On page 4 of these reports will be found statistics for the two helicopter services now in operation, Los Angeles Airways and Helicopter Air Service. It may be of interest to note that during the 12 months ended March 31, 1950, Helicopter Air Service transported 1,163,151 pounds of air mail and received $191,237 in temporary mail pay, and that Los Angeles Airways transported 3,790,639 pounds of air mail and received $419,237 in temporary mail pay. Assuming that each pound of air mail contained 25 pieces (on the basis of Post Office Department estimates), the cost for the helicopter service in Chicago, which had been in operation less than a year, was equivalent to $0.0066 per letter, and the cost for the service in Los Angeles, which had been in operation two and a half years, was equivalent to only $0.0044 per letter. These amounts compare with revenue which would approximate $0.06 per letter. It would seem that the unit cost to the Post Office Department per piece of air mail for helicopter service is not very substantial in comparison with the air mail postage revenues derived by the Department, and in addition it should be reasonably expected that unit costs may decrease as a result of further operating experience. Under these circumstances, and in view of the many national-interest aspects of the helicopter operations, we believe the authorization of this experimental service can be fully justified.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance in connection with this matter.

Sincerely yours,

OSWALD RYAN,
Acting Chairman.

The Brave Men of No Name Ridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an article from Life magazine by James Bell entitled "The Brave Men of No Name Ridge."

It was the privilege of Representative LATHAM and myself during active-duty service with the Navy to participate in a very small way in one of the phases of this engagement. I have never seen braver men and every marine is prepared to fight and to take and hold ground. I hope this statement will not be construed as propaganda. The best Marine propaganda I know is a marine, and that kind of propaganda is not almost as good as Joe Stalin's, it is better.

THE BRAVE MEN OF NO NAME RIDGE

THE MARINES ENGAGE THE ENEMY IN A HIDEOUSLY BRUTAL BATTLE THAT RECALLS PELELIU, TARAWA, AND IWO JIMA

(By James Bell, Time-Life correspondent)

This little ridge was hardly worthy of the term. It ran north and south, paralleling the Naktong River 10 miles west of Yongsan. It was the southern end of an enemy salient in the Changnyong area where for 10 days United States troops had been trying to shove a North Korean bridgehead back across the sluggish stream. It was just a little hump three-quarters of a mile long and less than 300 feet above the green valley floor. But this ridge with no name, undignified even by a primitive trail, will not be forgotten by the United States Marine Corps.

What historians will call it I have no idea. Perhaps it will be known simply as objective one, as it was designated on the map Brig. Gen. Edward Craig, commander of the First Provisional Marine Brigade, held in his lap as he sat in a bean field. But no one is going to forget it any more than he will forget Bloody Nose Ridge at Peleliu or Mount Suribachi at Iwo Jima or the sand dunes at Tarawa. Here took place the most brutal battle in the first 2 months of the Korean campaign.

"This," said one of Ed Craig's senior officers as he watched the long line of litters coming out of the valley below No Name Ridge, "is the toughest we've hit. This is like Iwo."

The Marines, having won the objective assigned them south of Chinju, were thrown into the Changnyong bulge after 1 night's rest. With the Nineteenth Regiment and a regimental combat team they set out to drive an estimated 12,000 Commies from positions which were a menace to Pusan. No Name Ridge was the first assault point. The Marines had to take it before the combat team could move ahead in the center. Intelligence figured the enemy had around 600 troops well dug in along the ridge.

During the night of Wednesday, August 16, the Marines moved into position on another ridge just east of there. Early on Thursday morning American artillery hammered No Name Ridge for 5 minutes. Then for 15 minutes Marine Corsair fighters raked it with bombs, rockets, and machine guns. Then came another 10 minutes of artillery. Finally as the 8 a. m. jump-off hour neared, the Corsairs moved back in for their final strafing runs, and No Name Ridge was smoking with dust and cordite.

Then the Marines started down into the valley, and the seemingly lifeless ridge suddenly became alive with the enemy. From the left rear of the assault force came the angry eruption of a machine gun. Another machine gun opened up from the valley floor to the right. From the top of the hill came more machine-gun fire, interlaced with bursts from automatic weapons and mortars. Hell burst around the leathernecks as they moved across the valley and up the ridge. Everywhere along the assault line men fell.

But, glory forever to the bravest men I ever saw, the line did not break. It went forward in spurts. The casualties were unthinkable, but the assault force never turned back. It moved, fell down, got up and moved again.

"God!" exclaimed a veteran Marine officer as he watched. "How brave can men be?"

"I never saw men with so much guts," said General Craig watching through glasses. His hand shook slightly, but his mouth was a firm line and his cold blue eyes did not cloud.

For more than an hour the assault force stumbled and struggled forward. The enemy mortar was knocked out by artillery, but the machine guns and automatic weapons never let up. As the Marines neared the crest, their line ripped apart, the North Koreans came out of their positions throwing grenades. They were cut down, but the grenades did terrible work.

The Marine line wavered, paused, withdrew a bit and waited. Then, with a final thrust, an estimated 10 Marines reached the crest of the ridge. They never came back.

The rest were ordered to withdraw. Men too exhausted to cry crawled back down the ridge. For all the terrible sacrifice the position stayed in enemy hands.

The ridge became quiet. Corpsmen, leading stretcher teams of South Koreans, who never flinched at sniper fire which raked their trail, began crossing the valley to pick up the wounded. They took them to an aid station just beyond the bean field where General Craig sat sweeping the ridge with his field glasses. I sat beside him all choked up and wondered if the stream of litter bearers would ever stop coming up out of that damned valley.

Craig, a kind and sensitive man, tried not to look at his torn kids. Finally he said, with sad pride, "I haven't heard one of the wounded cry. We'll take this piece of real estate, but the cost is going to be terrible."

Artillery began plastering the Communist positions. Then the Corsairs came roaring out of the sky with a terrible anger. They seemed to be live creatures mad for revenge. Their gull wings almost touched the tops of the low bushes as they screamed in on all sides. Their rockets hardly left their wings before they blasted into the targets with searing orange flame. The pilots, knowing the kids down there had had a horrible time, jerked their planes out of dives and pulled away in turns that were almost too tight, eager to make another run.

The wounded on the litters were carried past their general, who sat with a terrible calm waiting for his second assault wave to come up the winding mountain road. Near General Craig the bearers gently lowered the litters and rested for a brief moment. Troops nearby and correspondents watching the battle gave the wounded water.

I asked Corpsman Charles Scribner, of Rochester, Mich., who had just come off the ridge, what is was like over there.

"Sir," he said panting, his fatigues dripping with sweat and his arms so weary they dangled at his side, "over there is much shot and much hell. We are doing the best we can. We'll get 'em out."

Scribner could not remember how many trips he made across the valley. He had a record of the wounded he brought out. It indicated he made more trips than seems humanly possible.

Scribner waited until his South Korean litter bearers had loaded the men they had just brought up onto a jeep. He shook himself, said "Come on, characters," and started down into the valley again. The South Koreans followed without a word. No one knew their names. They were just "Scribner's characters," and they were good characters to have on your side.

The new assault wave moved up and they watched the wounded going in the other direction. They were unsmiling, and there was fear in their faces. The faces were so young.

As they got ready to jump off, the last of the wounded were coming out of the valley. General Craig came down from the edge of the bean patch and watched. Finally he walked to a litter and touched a badly wounded boy on the shoulder.

"Nice work, son," he said very softly. "Thank you." Then he returned to the bean patch. The boy did not hear what the general said. It is probably just as well.

It is nice to report that the second assault wave carried the ridge with no name and that the marines continued their advance. But it will never be nice to remember those kids who were being carried out of that valley. The only good of it all is the wonderful knowledge that there are good, brave Americans still about.

As Thick as Fleas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star, September 12, 1950, entitled "As Thick as Fleas":

AS THICK AS FLEAS

The list of persons arrested as wartime or postwar Communist spies, and charged with perjury for denying Communist connections, added to former Communists who confessed their past activities, has grown bewilderingly long. And it continues to grow.

It becomes more obvious all the time that there has been no place in the United States which Communist spies could not easily penetrate, whether it was a laboratory doing top secret work on atomic fission or the Department of State, where foreign policy was being made.

Last week, on the same day, one scientist was arrested and charged with being a Communist and another was convicted of perjury. Both had access to jet propulsion secrets at the California Institute of Technology. One was Dr. Hsue-shen Tsien, an alien who has been in this country since 1948 and was head of the Guggenheim jet propulsion center at Caltech. The other is Dr. Sidney Weinbaum, a physicist who worked at the same jet propulsion laboratory. A jury found Dr. Weinbaum guilty of perjury in denying that he was a Communist in order to remain at work in the laboratory.

There was another physicist who worked in California in 1943 and was accused of passing atomic secrets to a Russian spy, but the Department of Justice is mysteriously reluctant to present his case to a grand jury. For a time he was known only as Scientist X. September 30, 1949, the House Committee on Un-American Activities identified him as Dr. Joseph Weinberg, assistant professor of physics at the University of Minnesota. The committee turned its evidence over to the Department of Justice and asked that Dr. Weinberg be prosecuted for perjury on the grounds that he lied when he testified that he was not a Communist and did not know Steve Nelson, Communist agent. It has been 11 months and 12 days since the Department of Justice received this recommendation from the House committee. Why the long delay?

The committee also named four other scientists who are alleged to have attended a meeting with Steve Nelson in Weinberg's home. They were Giovanni Lomanitz, once professor at Fisk University; David J. Bohm, physics professor at Princeton University; Irving David Fox, assistant instructor at the

University of California; and Max Friedman, now Ken Max Manfred, who a year ago was studying for a doctor's degree at California.

There is not now, nor has there been any real security for the Nation's top secrets, nor very much danger of punishment for betrayers of those secrets.

What Is Going on in Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, this week the spotlight shifts for one moment from the terrible events in the Far East to events in Europe which can prove even more terrible in the future. This week the Secretary of State will meet with the Foreign Ministers of Britain and France to discuss the momentous question of rearming Germany.

Barely 5 years have passed since we crushed the military might which the Nazis and the militarists and industrialists who supported them turned loose on the world.

When Germany surrendered in 1945 we swore that never again would the same cliques of totalitarians be allowed to control the potential military, financial, and industrial power of a resurgent Germany. We are now facing momentous decisions on whether and under what circumstances German armed strength is to make its reappearance in world affairs. Our Government is proposing to place armed strength in the hands of Germans only 5 years after the highest officers of our Government declared that it would be 25 to 40 years before Germany as a nation could be trusted to take its place alongside the democratic nations of the world. That, in itself, is a dangerous proposition and one not to be undertaken lightly.

But, Mr. Speaker, shocking though that decision may be, there is another which is even more shocking in its implications for the future safety of the United States and the peace of the world.

At the very moment of decision, without any apparent rhyme or reason, our High Commissioner for Germany is permitting spokesmen and representatives of the ultra-nationalist and ultra-militarist backers of the Nazis to assume a dominant position in the new Germany. Within recent days the Brotherhood of German Officers, with an insolence which could scarcely be matched by any but a German military clique, has issued an ultimatum to the Government of the United States, laying down the conditions under which they will continue to obey the laws which the United States has enacted to govern the occupation of our zone in Germany. I had expected that this outburst would bring an immediate crack-down from our High Commissioner, the Honorable John J. McCloy. I have found nothing in the papers voicing any objections by our High Commissioner to the conduct of the German officers. Instead, I have read a statement by Mr. McCloy that he supports the idea of rearming Germans for their own defense.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an isolated incident. Day after day we are piling up evidence that the same groups which dominated Germany under the Nazis are keeping everything in a turmoil, shaping future events so that there can be but one outcome: Nazi domination of Germany and German domination of Europe. The result of all this well-planned confusion, engineered by the worst elements in Germany, is that our Secretary of State is occupied and our High Commissioner is occupied, but Germany is not.

A few days ago I was shocked to read in the papers that High Commissioner McCloy had ordered the release of eight more war criminals: Top Nazi bankers and industrialists who had been convicted in 1948 of furthering and profiting from the Nazi war effort. These war criminals have now been released, long before the completion of the sentences imposed upon them, on the ground of good behavior in prison. These men, who were among those who "spark-plugged" the rise of the Nazi Party, are presumably to be given the right to resume their positions of power and influence in the new Germany. When I protested, I received a reply from the Honorable Jack McFall, Assistant Secretary of State. This reply is so unresponsive to the spirit of my protest that, under leave, I am inserting both my telegram and the reply in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, these separate events are merely the shadows of things to come. As I noted in my telegram of protest, I have already examined an advance copy of an astounding new book which will be published on September 18 by Little, Brown & Co., of Boston. This book, All Honorable Men, by James Stewart Martin, tells the inside story of how the bankers and industrialists who supported the Nazis have defeated all efforts to control their postwar activities. This book names men on both sides of the Atlantic who have carried out a conspiracy of planned forgetfulness, overriding the safeguards which the American people have consistently demanded ever since Germany surrendered. Here is the blow-by-blow account showing how these Nazi "bigwigs," with the help of friends on this side of the Atlantic, frustrated every effort to institute reforms and safeguards which could have prevented Germany from resuming her former position as the Black Widow of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am also inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter to the Secretary of State, furnished to me by Mr. Martin, together with the unresponsive reply from the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, what is going on in Germany? The present meeting of the foreign ministers presents a good opportunity to ask that question. Have we no right to expect an answer? Have we been so carried away by the cold war and the Korean situation that we will accept without question, blindly, any ally at all, even including the Nazis and their financial backers, if only they will tell us by word of mouth that they are opposed to communism?

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more dangerous to our own security and to the peace of the world. I suggest that we look into this in all seriousness before it is too late.

Text of telegram dated August 18, 1950:

This morning's New York Times informs the American people that eight dangerous Nazi war criminals are being released August 25 in approximately 2 years less than their assigned sentences, through a most amazing computation of good behavior credit of 10 days a month, amounting to a reduction in sentence of one-third by fiat of the High Commissioner of Germany.

The only possible explanation of this depresing information is that these Nazis, convicted in a duly consitiuted court of revolting crimes against humanity, are to be restored to power in postwar Germany.

Since the extermination of working men and women by various means of cruel death was the basic crime of these monsters, I hardly need point out to you that organized labor in the United States is going to resent this amnesty to the murderers of labor. I am certain that you had no prior knowledge of this peculiar means of rewarding dangerous criminals for eating their meals without protest while their fellow sinners fought for crusts.

It has been my privilege to read advance proofs of a new book by James Stewart Martin to be published September 18 under the title of "All Honorable Men" which, in a scholarly and legal presentation of the economic crimes of Hitler Germany, tells something of the vicious history of these men.

Even more of their direct guilty for the death of millions of human beings, in battle and in death camps, is made clear in the documents presented by Mr. Martin to the House Monopoly Subcommittee.

Friederich Flick and his fellow criminals have served less than one-third of the time in which they rose to the Nazi wave of triumph.

To release them now is not only small punishment for brutal crimes, it is an insult to the memory of 20,000,000 human beings of ever nationality, including our own American soldiers who died that nazism might be rooted out from our world.

I hope you will use the authority of your high office to see that these criminals are not rewarded for their crimes.

ARTHUR G. KLEIN, M. C.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 28, 1950.

The Honorable ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KLEIN: Your telegram to the President concerning the release this week of certain war criminals imprisoned in Germany has been referred to this Department for reply.

As your telegram notes, the release of the prisoners in question results from a decision to increase the credit for good behavior allowed to war criminals. This decision was the result of full discussion within the office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany and with leading prison authorities.

The revised credit for good behavior was designed to bring the practice of the High Commission closer to that followed in the United States. For example, the correction law of New York State, as amended in 1948, authorizes the reduction of 10 days for each month of the original sentence for good conduct and efficient and willing performance of duties assigned. Similarly a prisoner convicted of offenses against the United States and confined in penal or correctional institutions for a definite term other than for life may be credited with as much as 10 days for each month, depending upon the length of the original sentence, if his record of conduct shows that he has satisfactorily observed all the rules and has not been subjected to punishment.

You may be interested in knowing that Mr. McCloy has appointed a clemency board to review cases of war criminals under his jurisdiction. This board consists of Frederick A. Moran, chairman of the New York State Parole Board; Judge David W. Peck, of the Supreme Court of New York; and Conrad E. Snow, assistant legal adviser for this Department. It is understood that the members of this board were consulted before the decision was made to increase the good behavior time.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

For the Secretary of State.

ANNAPOLIS, MD.,
August 17, 1950.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Dispatches from Germany dated August 16, 1950 state that on August 25 eight more leading backers of the Nazi regime previously convicted of war crimes are to be released from prison after having served a fraction of their sentences.

A fair appraisal of the record will show that these defendants got off with ridiculously short sentences in the first place. Nevertheless, the High Commissioner, Mr. John J. McCloy, is reported to have issued new regulations cutting by one-third the original sentences imposed on Friedrich Flick, the Nazi-made steel man; Karl Rasche, head of the Dresdner Bank; Fritz Ter Meer, I. G. Farben's poison gas man; Heinrich Lehmann, Krupp's slave labor boss; and four others scarcely less distinguished for their service to the Nazi cause.

These men are to be rewarded for their good behavior while under sentence. Their good behavior has consisted in remaining quietly warm and dry in prison and eating three square meals a day while serving sentences for participating in and profiting from the murder of more than 6,000,000 human beings.

Under this new order, these men will leave prison next week instead of about July 1, 1952. Unless some positive action is taken, they will come back in time to assume positions of powers and influence in the rearmament of Germany.

These men were more than participants in murder and loot. Flick and Rasche were among the 20 secret contributors of funds who made it possible for Hitler to take over in 1933. The activities of the Krupp and I. G. Farben managements are too well known to need further comment. The record of all these men, and the complicity of certain prominent American businessmen in their world-wide intrigues, were exposed during the first years of the occupation of Germany.

I have detailed these facts from documentary evidence and personal observations in my book All Honorable Men. Since the book will not be released for public distribution until September 18, I am asking the publisher, Little, Brown, & Co., to forward to you by airmail an advance copy in the hope that something can be done to review this ill-considered action before the men are turned loose on August 25.

The record of the occupation to this date has been that of repeating, one by one, the errors made in dealing with Germany after the First World War. At this critical time it will be indeed unfortunate if the foreign policy of the United States becomes confounded with the Nazis' plans for postwar revival under cover of the confusion which the Nazi leaders have done so much to create.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES STEWART MARTIN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 31, 1950.

Mr. JAMES S. MARTIN,
Annapolis, Md.

MY DEAR MR. MARTIN: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated August 17, 1950, in which you have expressed your views concerning the release of eight Germans convicted of war crimes prior to the expiration of the full prison terms.

The release of these prisoners has resulted from a decision of the United States High Commissioner for Germany to increase the credit for good behavior allowed to war criminals and was designed to bring the High Commissioner's practice closer to that followed in the United States. For example, the correction law of New York State, as amended in 1948, authorizes the reduction of 10 days for each month of the original sentence "for good conduct and efficient and willing performance of duties assigned." Similarly a prisoner convicted of offenses against the United States and confined in penal or correctional institutions for a definite term other than for life may be credited with as much as 10 days for each month, depending upon the length of the original sentence, if his "record of conduct shows that he has satisfactorily observed all the rules and has not been subjected to punishment."

You may be interested to know that Mr. McCloy has appointed a clemency board to review cases of war criminals under his jurisdiction. This board consists of Frederick A. Moran, chairman of the New York State Parole Board; Judge David W. Peck, of the Supreme Court of the State of New York; and Conrad E. Snow, assistant legal adviser of this Department. It is understood that the members of this board were consulted before the decision was made to increase the good behavior time.

Your courtesy in requesting your publisher to provide the Department with a copy of your book All Honorable Men is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN HAY,
Officer in Charge, Security and and Allied Controls, Office of German Political Affairs.
(For the Secretary of State).

Slave Labor in Stalin's Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the September issue of the American Federationist, an official publication of the American Federation of Labor, entitled "Slave Labor in Stalin's Russia," and written by Toni Sender:

Why are western Europe and the western world shut off from the Soviet Union by the iron curtain? What is hidden behind it? Is it the need for concealing the enormous rearmament and other war preparation, knowledge of which would destroy the smoke screen of the internationally organized "peace" propaganda? Or is it to hide the shockingly low standard of living of the average Russian worker and its contrast with the standard of the Soviet ruling group, the members of the managerial class?

Or is the foremost reason for the iron curtain the desire of Russia to hide the horror of the appalling conditions of slave labor, knowledge of which throughout the world would destroy the illusions of workers and fellow travelers about the "Socialist" state of the Soviets?

It was the American Federation of Labor which first drew the attention of governments to the following facts: In the Soviet Union millions of men and women, natives and foreigners, are working far away from their homes, separated from their families, under conditions of starvation and torture. They are clothed in rags. They are deprived of sanitation and medical care. The utter disregard for the dignity of the human person in Russia's slave-labor camps of today is much worse than in the ancient days of slavery.

The charges of slavery in Russia are supported by documents and witnesses and surviving victims. World War II gave some of the victims a chance to escape from the Soviet Union. They are haunted by the pathetic pleas of their cosufferers, left behind in Stalin's crowded slave-labor camps:

"Do not forget us. Will you give testimony for us? Was not your suffering also ours?"

At the end of World War II, when the unbelievable horror of the Hitler concentration camps became known to the world, these crimes against humanity were brought before the Nuremberg tribunal, the criminals were sentenced, the principals to capital punishment. Is there a dual measurement? Are forced labor, deportation and cruelty crimes when committed by a defeated enemy but sanctioned when practiced by the victor?

Soon it will be 3 years since the American Federation of Labor first brought the facts on forced labor in the Soviet Union before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It required persistence and prodding on the part of the A. F. of L. consultant to the UN not only to have the item put on the agenda of the Council but to have it discussed and action taken.

During 1948 forced labor was carried on the agenda, but the delegates still hesitated to start the discussion. Many of them were afraid that the A. F. of L. would not be able to make a strong case with sufficient facts to prove the accusation.

During the passing months the material in the possession of the A. F. of L. grew. Documentary evidence was adding up. It was the weight of this documentation which finally forced the discussion, first in the session of the Economic and Social Council of February, 1949. Since then no Council session has been held without the subject of forced labor in the Soviet countries appearing on the agenda and being discussed.

In the February, 1949, session testimony from dozens of victims was presented and the volume of affidavits was put at the disposal of the delegates. These affidavits were given by persons from all walks of life—workers, peasants, Red Army officers, a

foreign trade expert and widows of former Comintern leaders who had been executed.

The presentation of this shocking evidence of Soviet slavery stirred public opinion throughout the civilized world beyond anything that had ever been before the Economic and Social Council previously. Members of the Council as well as visitors to the Council chamber listened with strained attention. Everyone felt that these facts were a definite statement of the return to the most barbarous days of human history.

While the Russian delegate was highly embarrassed by the volume and content of the incriminating material, there was only one defender of the Soviets—the World Federation of Trade Unions. Playing the innocent, the WFTU stated that it had never received complaints in this connection from any of its affiliated national unions. For once, one may be inclined to believe the WFTU.

The discussion ended with the adoption of a resolution inviting the International Labor Organization to give further consideration to the problem of forced labor in the light of all possible information, including the memorandum of the A. F. of L. and the records of the Council's discussion. The Council also requested the Secretary General of the UN to approach all governments and to inquire in what manner and to what extent they would be prepared to cooperate in an impartial inquiry into the existence of forced labor in their countries, including the reasons for which persons are made to perform forced labor and the treatment accorded them. The Russians opposed this action of the Council.

In conformity with the resolution adopted by the Council, the Secretary General approached the various governments about their readiness to cooperate in a fact-finding effort. The Russians, in reply, merely referred to the speeches of their delegates. The majority of the governments, however, declared themselves ready to cooperate. Some, like Britain, stated that they would do so only on condition that other governments, especially the U. S. S. R., would do likewise.

This result was submitted to the next session of the Economic and Social Council in July 1949, in Geneva. The great surprise of this session was new evidence submitted by Britain. The British delegate presented photostatic copies of the Russian Corrective Labor Codex together with English and French translations. This document was a full confirmation of the accusations as expressed by the A. F. of L. It showed:

Forced labor is inflicted in Russia on so-called hostile elements as well as on so-called unstable elements among the workers—in other words, for reasons of political dissent.

It may be inflicted by a decree of an administrative organ—in other words, outside a court of law and without due process of law.

The institution of forced labor serves as a highly mobile manpower source for industrial enterprises, particularly for projects in remote regions.

Incitement to utmost exertion is introduced by setting norms of production for paying of wages, namely, by using hunger and starvation as a means for exploitation.

To the supervisory command are appointed persons convicted of ordinary crimes.

Sources of financing the system of corrective labor and the industrial establishments they serve are income from the productive activity of the corrective labor institutions and deductions from the wages of persons performing corrective labor.

The Soviet delegate at this session had the task of meeting this new challenge. No longer was the denial of the existence of forced labor possible. So he claimed that mistakes had been made in the translation of the document—quite irrelevant in view of the fact that the British delegate had attached the full Russian text to the document.

But the United States was willing to go a step further in the desire to come to practical results. The United States presented a resolution asking for the appointment of an 11-man commission authorized to take testimony and hold public hearings under such rules as it would itself establish. The commission would report to the Economic and Social Council as well as to the ILO, with recommendations to each as might be appropriate.

Unfortunately this resolution did not obtain a majority. Another, presented jointly by Brazil, Denmark, and India, was adopted. This resolution asked the Secretary General to request governments which had not yet stated that they would cooperate in an inquiry to consider whether they could give a reply to that effect.

The question of forced labor was kept alive. Again it appeared in the Council session of February 1950.

The A. F. of L. consultants had succeeded in obtaining further and still more revealing documentation on the practice of arrest and forced labor in the U. S. S. R. Information from reliable sources indicated that the Soviet secret police (MVD) have slave labor projects of such major importance as to form an essential part of Soviet economic planning; in some economic sectors MVD production dominates, if not actually monopolizes, the field. The 5-year plan's share in production from forced labor amounted to one-tenth to over one-half of the total production of the U. S. S. R. in some industries.

The Soviet delegates in the United Nations had argued that all persons held in Russia's forced labor camps were criminals. Documents obtained by the A. F. of L. of a strictly secret character, photostats of which were presented to the Council, contain a listing of the categories deported from the Baltic countries to Russian forced-labor camps. Among them figure "persons who had occupied prominent positions in the civil or communal service," "prominent members of the anti-Communist parties, Social Democrats, Liberals, small farmers, active members of Jewish organizations, such as Bund and Zionist organizations," "industrialists, wholesale merchants, owners of large houses, shipowners, owners of hotels and restaurants, persons who have been in the diplomatic service, relatives of persons who have escaped abroad." Thus it is stamped a crime to belong to certain professions or to be related to a person who has succeeded in escaping to a free country.

Again a very profound impression was made by the presentation of these most revealing facts. However, with the Russians absent from the Council as a result of their walkout, the majority did not see fit to come to a final conclusion and to action. The matter was postponed until the session of February 1951.

Meantime, however, the matter was brought before the governing body of the ILO by the workers' representative of the United States of America. As a result, it was already in the July–August 1950 session of the Council that the item appeared on the agenda.

A new development had taken place. The United Kingdom was willing to start action. Unfortunately, the matter was left to be dealt with almost at the very end of the session. There were still a few governments hesitant to take action in the Russians' absence. Also some delegates, whose attitude in favor of action is well established, wished to have a more thorough preparation before starting proceedings, which did not seem possible in such a rush as is inevitable on the last days of a session.

Neverthless, the United States and Britain insisted on starting the debate. The delegates of both countries presented a new series of facts. The British delegate submitted two volumes of laws of the U. S. S. R. and Czechoslovakia, confirming to the letter all the accusations that had been previously made by the A. F. of L. They also presented a resolution which reads in its operative part:

"Decides to invite the International Labor Organization to cooperate with the Council in the earliest possible establishment of an ad hoc Committee on Forced Labor of no more than five independent members to be appointed jointly by the Secretary General and the Director General of the International Labor Office with the following terms of reference:

"'(1) To survey the field of forced labor, taking into account the provisions of International Labor Convention No. 29 and inquiring particularly into existence, in any part of the world, of systems of forced or "corrective" labor which are employed as a means of political coercion or punishment for holding or expressing political views, or which are on such a scale as to constitute an important element in the economy of a given country;

"'(2) to assess the nature and extent of the problem at the present time; and

"'(3) to report the results of its studies and progress to the Council and to the governing body of the International Labor Office.'

"Requests the Secretary General and the Director General to supply professional and clerical assistance necessary to insure the earliest initiation and effective discharge of the ad hoc committee's work."

After the accusing speeches of the American and British delegates, it was the Canadian delegate, making it very clear that he wished the investigation to take place, who proposed postponement to the twelfth session of the Council in February 1951, in order to have sufficient time for thoroughly preparing the action desired. This proposal was adopted by eight votes for and seven abstentions. Thus the question will come up again. And it may not be deleted from the agenda until final action has been taken.

We are now a step further. The abovementioned motion will have to be voted on 6 months from now. Forced labor will be on the agenda of the free world until it ceases. Because our freedom is not secure as long as millions of helpless creatures are dying miserably behind barbed wire.

One Hundred and Fifty Years Devoted to Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 1950, an event will occur in Chillicothe, Ohio, which possesses national significance. I refer to the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth birthday of the Chillicothe Gazette.

This paper was founded and first issued at Chillicothe, the first capital of Ohio, in 1800, which was 3 years before Ohio was admitted to the Union as a State. The Gazette is the oldest newspaper in the United States west of the Alleghenies. In the century and a half since its first issue, no notable event has gone unrecorded in its columns. It has recounted the growth of a Nation from a struggling group of States until now

when that Nation has become the greatest power in the world.

In commemoration of their one hundred and fiftieth birthday the Gazette will issue a special sesquicentennial edition and it is my intention to secure copies of this edition and to have them displayed not only in the Congressional Library but also in the main reading room just off the House floor in the Nation's Capitol. Due to the remodeling of the Capitol it will not be possible to display it in the latter reading room until the new Congress convenes next January.

Mr. Speaker, I desire herein to extend sincere congratulations and best wishes not only to Mr. J. K. Hunter, the present publisher of this fine paper, but also to the other members of his staff for the ethical manner in which they conduct the policy of this paper. I am proud to represent the congressional district in which this splendid paper is published and sincerely hope and pray that it may continue to faithfully record events of the future as it has those of the past.

Fine Fighting Qualities of South Koreans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I can attest to the fighting qualities of the South Koreans. Once given the proper support on the ground and in the air they have proved themselves to be fine fighting men. The South Korean Navy has sunk more ships than they have ships of their own and have virtually prevented all movement of the enemy by sea. The South Korean marines once marched 80 miles in 3 days and inflicted casualties on the enemy greater than the total number of marines involved. They are first-class fighters.

Under permission granted, I include herewith an article by Robert P. Martin appearing in the Manila Bulletin of September 4, 1950.

GI'S REVISING OPINION OF THEIR IMPASSIVE-FACED SOUTH KOREA ALLIES

(By Robert P. Martin)

Somewhere in Korea: In less than a month of combat, hundreds—perhaps thousands—of GI's have radically reversed their opinion of the slender, impassive-faced South Korean soldier.

When the first United States infantry arrived in Korea, the American-trained South Korean Army was in full flight, its men desperately afraid of the Communist tanks and artillery. The GI's—and a number of generals—dismissed the South Koreans as men of little courage and proceeded to fight the war by themselves. Then the GI's broke and ran when they too found themselves unable to stop the North Korean tanks, ran out of ammunition, or were cut off from the rear. It was a humiliating experience to Americans, but it taught a lesson that may prove of incalculable value in Asia—that a man isn't a coward or a fool just because his skin is other than white.

This correspondent was among those who predicted, quite inaccurately, that the South Koreans could be dismissed as a factor in the war, that the Americans would have to depend on themselves to win the war. The South Koreans are not, and probably never will be, in a position to beat the Communists by themselves. But they are proving valuable allies under certain battle conditions. They are not as great as enthusiastic public relations-minded Americans make them out to be. They still have a tendency to break under pressure, but they perform certain jobs magnificently.

Recognition of their peculiar qualities came when Gen. Douglas MacArthur ordered that South Korean soldiers be incorporated into American combat groups, as regular replacements in platoons and companies. The South Koreans were given equal standing with the GI's. They wear the same uniforms, eat the same chow, and fight the same battles. Nothing has yet been said about possible bonuses or whether they will be eligible for benefits under the GI Bill of Rights.

The experiment was ordered by General MacArthur to see if the nucleus of a real UN army, to be reinforced by British, Australian, Filipino, and other troops, could be created. But the experiment will have more materialistic benefits.

In the past, the GI's have been fighting under a heavy handicap. Few of them could speak Korean; the terrain was strange. They were unable to distinguish between friend and foe, between guerrilla and refugee. The South Korean soldier, living with and fighting beside the GI, will be able to help his ally, guide him across country, protect him from unrecognizable enemies, and serve as a buffer between the American who dislikes the Korean and the Korean who fears and hates any foreigner. More prisoners may be taken if the GI's can restrain the volatile South Korean from killing every enemy soldier he sees.

Until recently, the Koreans fought as separate units. They were given entire sectors to defend. They did it well, once they had proper equipment, plenty of ammunition, and artillery support. They were also used to protect the flanks of American attacking units. They could move much more easily among the hills, and through the roadless valleys. Now, however, the American and the Koreans will fight side by side, and the experiment will be worthwhile if it has no other result than to get the two acquainted.

Given the same fire power, the South Korean is as good a soldier as his Communist brother. In this war, half modern and half medieval, the South Koreans have shown considerable adaptability. They will leave their lines with a couple of balls of rice wrapped in seaweed, some dried fish, and a back-bending load of ammunition. They fight for days, with only the most antiquated transportation and a virtually nonexistent medical service. And they keep going, trotting across the stony ridges or down the sun-baked valleys, while the GI's puff their way to the nearest bit of shade.

The South Koreans fight a primitive war. Like the Communists, they do not set their mortars on the reverse side of the hill, using communications and observers to direct fire. The man who fires the mortar is his own observer. He is dug in on the highest hill, protected by infantry. He shoots visually, and keeps on shooting until the position is overrun.

"It isn't the way we use mortars," an American officer marveled, "but they lay them right in the enemy's hip pocket."

One does not know which of the many stories about the South Koreans to believe. But the Air Force swears by this one. Mustang pilots were bombing and strafing enemy positions about 150 yards ahead of the South Korean lines. One pilot failed to pull out of his dive and crashed into a hill about 500 yards behind the Red lines. A company of South Koreans, according to the story, came out of position, without orders, and shot their way through the Red lines to rescue the pilot.

And there was the unforgettable moment when a South Korean officer, his leg swollen with gangrenous pus, came out of the hills near Pohang, leading 17 Americans who had been ambushed and cut off by a Red attack. There was no interpreter present, and we could ask no questions. But an interpreter was not needed to express the gratitude of the rescued Americans, or the delight of the South Korean at his successful feat.

The language barrier has caused misunderstandings and ill feelings. But this is changing as one sergeant said, "We can't understand them and they can't understand us. But we get on fine, and they are good guys to have with you in a fire fight; none better."

Important Legislation Should Be Completed Irrespective of Reports of Plans for Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a statement issued Wednesday evening by 32 Republican Members of the House representing congressional districts in 16 States. The statement and signatures follow:

A soundly prepared excess-profits tax law should be enacted by Congress at the earliest possible date. We urge that the House Ways and Means Committee schedule this for immediate action.

The Democratic leadership apparently intends that Congress shall adjourn without acting on an excess-profits tax law.

We shall oppose and vote against any such adjournment. Some of us intend even to vote against sending the pending tax bill to conference unless the Democratic leadership gives positive assurance that Congress will not adjourn before voting on an excess-profits tax bill.

It is intolerable to send American youth into battle, or even to freeze wages and prices, without at the same time removing the excess profits resulting from war.

H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota; J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland; FRANCES P. BOLTON, Ohio; ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, California; WALTER E. BREHM, Ohio; GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey; CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey; ROBERT J. CORBETT, Pennsylvania; JAMES L. DOLLIVER, Iowa; H. R. GROSS, Iowa; CECIL M. HARDEN, Indiana; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Massachusetts; JOHN W. HESELTON, Massachusetts; WALT HORAN, Washington; JACOB J. JAVITS, New York; ANTONI N. SADLAK, Connecticut; WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota; BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, New York; CARROLL D. KEARNS, Pennsylvania; KENNETH B. KEATING, New York; CLARENCE E. KILBURN, New York; JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Connecticut; CHARLES P. NELSON, Maine; JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Minnesota; ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Wisconsin; EDWARD H. REES, Kansas; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, New York; JOHN P. SAYLOR, California; HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., Pennsylvania; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Washington; JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Pennsylvania; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, New Jersey.

Ed Dodd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to speak a word of commendation to a real American and an outstanding figure in the field of agriculture, Ed Dodd, former Under Secretary of Agriculture and now Director-General of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations.

Ed Dodd approached this work with his usual energy, and is today one of the best informed men in the world on the problems of agriculture. There is little of vague theory about Ed; he has a down-to-earth, practical approach.

Pipe dreams are not acceptable to him; he wants to see plans work in reality for the purpose for which they were intended. Ed is not afraid to get his shoes dirty by going out into the fields to see what is going on. He feels at home among people of all occupations.

The United States is making a substantial financial contribution to the Food and Agricultural Organization. As Members of Congress, we can feel more confidence in this program when we know that men of the caliber of Ed Dodd are at the wheel.

Our efforts to make the world a better place in which to live can be successful only if we approach these problems in a practical and realistic manner. It is a task that requires vision, understanding, and practical knowledge. It is a tremendous task but a task well worth the effort. This program is making progress.

Americans can be glad that our representative in that effort is Ed Dodd. The assistance will be lasting and will be understood by the people of the world. It will be sound because it is under the direction of a man who recognizes the human value of the people with whom he is working and who knows the social and economic problems under which they are trying to exist. Ed Dodd can meet a problem squarely with the intelligence and energy necessary in our present complex international situation. We can only hope that he will continue to give his guidance to the program in the critical period ahead.

Radio Purge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, September 10, 1950:

RADIO PURGE

More and more the techniques of the Communists are being embraced by those who profess to be fighting communism. Self-appointed policemen of Americanism tend increasingly to insist upon a rigid, stereotyped conformity, striving to suppress as disloyal any opinions that deviate a hairbreadth from their own. If they have their way, they will destroy the diversity that is the genius of American life. They aim, like the commissars of Moscow, to silence dissent and to dictate the forms and observances of what they consider patriotism.

They have enjoyed a rather frightening success of late in the entertainment industry. Puffed up over their success in destroying the careers of Paul Draper and Larry Adler, a group of them has now undertaken a systematic purge of radio. The index for its purge seems to be a book called Red Channels, purporting to show Communist infiltration in the broadcasting business; it amounts actually, of course, to nothing more than a listing of the group's personal dislikes and has about as much validity as Elizabeth Dilling's silly Red Network of some years ago. Nevertheless, it has already scored a shoddy triumph in depriving the television actress, Jean Muir, of her leading role in the program known as The Aldrich Family. This is a triumph closely akin to that of the Russians in disciplining the composer, Shostakovich, and in silencing every voice that does not faithfully follow the Communist Party line.

Whatever Miss Muir's political opinions and associations may be, the plain fact is that she has been made the victim of a form or organized thuggery. Her name was listed in Red Channels. As a result, the sponsor of her program, General Foods, received a series of telephoned protests, deliberately mobilized no doubt. And the sponsor, desiring understandably to avoid offense to any potential customer, at once canceled her contract on the ground that she had become a controversial personality. No attempt has been made to find out if there was any warrant for the listing of Miss Muir in Red Channels, although she has indignantly denied any Communist sympathies. At present there is no tribunal to which she can turn for a hearing or for vindication, but alarmed representatives of the radio and television industry are considering formation of a body to investigate such complaints against performers. We hope their efforts will succeed.

There is no nicer name for what was done in Miss Muir's case than blackmail. Advertisers being naturally sensitive to controversial personalities are generally subject to this kind of pressure. Unless repudiated by a concerted effort, it can be repeated in the case of any entertainer whose opinions the blackmailers dislike. But it represents an intrusion into American life of methods that have hitherto been considered distinctly communistic. They are methods that are unlikely to contribute to the defeat of communism. They can result only in bitter disunity and a destruction of American values.

The Way To Stop Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 8, my colleague, the Honorable E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, placed a letter from Mr. W. C. Dawson, of Lepanto, Ark. I found Mr. Dawson's letter so interesting that I have taken the time to answer it. Feeling that there may be others who found Mr. Dawson's letter interesting and who would likewise be interested in my reply, I include my reply in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1950.

Mr. W. C. DAWSON,
Lepanto, Ark.

DEAR MR. DAWSON: I have read with interest your letter which our mutual friend, Congressman GATHINGS, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

First, may I compliment you on some deep thinking. Most people are too indifferent, or are not gifted with enough talent, to go into our complex economic system as deeply as you have.

I have spent most of my adult life as an international trader in commodities and foreign exchange, so in addition to these things being an interesting avocation to me, they have also been my principal source of income.

In my humble opinion, you have certainly reached the correct conclusions when you say that surpluses cause unemployment and economic dislocation; and that the main source of the trouble is that the consumers do not have the money to buy the products.

In those last 11 words you have struck upon the main cause of most of the trouble in the world. But, if you will pardon my saying so, you do not offer the proper remedy because you say: "If all the money was put through the hands of the consumers there would be no need for labor laws, because in this case there would be enough buying power in the hands of the consumers to buy all we produce."

Well, my dear friend, that is a big "if." Who are the consumers? Certainly not us capitalists—we don't amount to 5 percent. The consumers are mostly the people who work for us and their families. The only way to get money into the hands of the consumers is to pay good wages, and the only way we are ever going to pay good wages is to have labor laws. We tried it from 1776 to 1935 without them. The more machines continue to displace men, the more men's wages must be raised and their hours shortened, in order to keep them employed at living wages and with enough buying power to buy the products you mention. As an employer, and as a 50-year-old observer who has studied these matters all his life, it is my humble opinion that, in general, wages will not be raised nor hours shortened without the labor laws to which you seem to object.

The main reason that our country is stronger than the rest of the world is that we pay good wages and they don't. We cannot stop communism with bombs and bullets and the temporary giving of money and economic aid. We must insist that any nation to which we extend economic aid shall force its employers to pay wages equal in purchasing power of food and clothing, to wages paid in this country for similar work.

Then the foreign countries will create their own markets by doing just what you suggested in your letter—putting money into the hands of their consumers which, may I add, are mainly the workers and their families. Then those foreign countries could not, and would not have to ship their cheap goods over here and put our people out of work.

In looking at the labor problem and the economic picture in general, I am afraid you have left out the effect of the scientific changes in the world since Adam Smith's day. As I see it, that is a common error of most modern economists. In the days of Adam Smith, or let us use an American, George Washington, over 90 percent of our people were engaged in agriculture. As long

as crops were good, times were good because nearly every family raised all its own food, cut down trees and built its own house, and spun its own clothes off its own sheep's backs. But through the adoption of labor-saving machinery like the combine harvester, the corn picker, the cotton gin, the 18-bottom plow and tractor, etc., our Nation has been transformed into a nation of specialists in agriculture with only 19 percent of our people farming instead of the former 95 percent. And that measly 19 percent, through the use of these modern machines, can produce a veritable avalanche of surplus products that will wreck our economy and bring depression and war. Yes, all wars are of economic origin. Wars originate from human suffering, and most of the human suffering comes from economic dislocation which has come about through social change not keeping pace with scientific change.

Generally speaking, the same scientific changes (without comparable social changes) which have taken place in the agricultural industry have also taken place in other industries. Through the use of machines one man now can do the work that several men did in George Washington's time. This makes shorter hours and higher wages absolutely necessary.

In addition to having labor laws to force us to pay living wages, we must also have laws to regulate the volume of production to fit the estimated demand.

I don't like labor laws. I have a cotton compress and warehousing business and I fight with the union to which my employees belong. But I say thank God for labor unions. For if we did not have them, we employers could, and would, break the price of labor. When you break the price of labor you break the price of everything and bring on a depression.

I have also operated some farms for several years and I don't like Government regulation. But I prefer it to bankruptcy. Distasteful as it is to me to have Government regulation of farm production, bank credit, and labor laws, I prefer it to communism, and that evil system is just what may engulf the world if we have another depression like 1932. Communism thrives on depressions.

Maybe I am all wrong. Glad to compare views with you.

Sincerely yours,

CECIL F. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

United States Repeating Errors of 1938, Baruch Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the Baruch plan for national preservation from the beginning, and I call attention to Mr. Baruch's latest warning and to seven important recommendations, which I heartily approve. The importance of a policy for peace cannot be underestimated and Mr. Baruch's seventh point to the effect that we should state our peace terms to the Russian people highlights a failure of policy on the part of our administration which has not yet been guaranteed. Under permission granted, I quote the article, as follows:

UNITED STATES REPEATING ERRORS OF 1938, BARUCH SAYS

NEW YORK, September 11 (UP).—Bernard Baruch said today that the United States was making the same mistakes it did in 1938 shortly before Hitler unleashed his Panzer divisions across Europe.

The elder statesman, writing in Look magazine, warned that the Korean war was "not a one-alarm fire." He said the Kremlin had challenged this country to choose between "guns or butter, discomfort, or defeat."

"So far," Baruch said, "we are failing that challenge."

The man who has advised a half dozen Presidents urged this country to adopt the following points:

1. Mobilize now, all out. Place one central agency in charge to see that our defense production matches Russia's. "If we lose, we lose forever," Baruch said.

2. Halt inflation now, by clamping price-wage-rent controls.

3. Eliminate profiteering by raising taxes. Put defense spending on a pay-as-you-go footing.

4. Rearm western Europe fast—"so we can reach our allies before they are overwhelmed."

5. Revitalize the National Security Council into "a genuine general staff for peace."

6. Enact universal military training or revamp selective service so that pools of trained men are quickly available.

7. State our peace terms to the Russian people, "drawing a line between Russia's legitimate aspirations and the aggressive aims of her leaders."

"The Soviets learned the lesson of the last war," Baruch said. "We did not."

"When the last war ended, the United States was the mightiest arsenal of military and productive power in all history. Instead of holding that power together until peace was won, we scuttled and ran.

"We clamored to bring the boys home, cut taxes, lifted controls.

"Our neglects in the past leave no easy course. Let us do what must be done as quickly as possible."

Upper Colorado River Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the problems attendant to the conservation and use of water throughout the Nation, but especially in the West, are most technical and are not easily understood by those of the West, let alone the people of the East who are not conversant with arid lands and the procedures of irrigation. Recently John Geoffrey Will, secretary and general counsel for the Upper Colorado River Commission, presented an exceptionally well-written treatise on these matters to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. I am having the statement of Mr. Will placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope that the Members of the House and Senate will give sincere and thoughtful consideration to this most worth while explanation of the use of water in the West.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION,
Grand Junction, Colo., July 13, 1950.

Hon. MORRIS L. COOKE,
Chairman, The President's Water Resources Policy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COOKE: The Upper Colorado River Commission is glad to respond to the request of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission for an expression of its views and recommendations with respect to Federal responsibility for and participation in the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources, including related land uses and other public purposes directly concerned with water resources. I have been authorized, by unanimous vote of the Upper Colorado River Commission, to transmit these views to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission.

In the light of the background (hereinafter set forth) of its creation and of its functions, powers and duties, it would seem that the views of the Upper Colorado River Commission should be accorded great weight.

The Upper Colorado River Commission is a creature of article VIII of the Upper Colorado River Basin compact which was executed by commissioners for the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming on October 11, 1948, and which was thereafter ratified by the legislature of each of such States and consented to by the Congress.

The Commission consists of five Commissioners, each of whom has a vote, as follows: one Commissioner representing the State of Colorado, one Commissioner representing the State of New Mexico, one Commissioner representing the State of Utah, one Commissioner representing the State of Wyoming; and one Commissioner representing the United States of America. Because of its comparatively slight land area in the Upper Basin, Arizona is not represented on the Commission and does not participate in the expenses of its administration. Arizona has taken, however, and will continue, the Commission is assured, to take a keen interest in the proceedings of the Commission.

The powers of the Upper Colorado River Commission are broad. In addition to the usual and routine powers with which an administrative body must necessarily be equipped, the Commission is particularly empowered to establish and construct, operate and maintain, water gaging stations to make estimates to forecast water run-off on the Colorado River and any of its tributaries; to engage in cooperative studies of water supplies of the Colorado River and its tributaries; to collect, analyze, correlate, preserve, and report on data as to the stream flows, storage, diversions, and use of the waters of the Colorado River, and any of its tributaries; to make findings as to the quantity of water of the Upper Colorado River System used each year in the Upper Colorado River Basin and in each State thereof; to make findings as to the quantity of water delivered at Lee Ferry during each water year; to make findings as to the necessity for and the extent of the curtailment of use required, if any, in order that the flow at Lee Ferry shall not be depleted below that required by article III of the Colorado River compact; to make findings as to the quantity of reservoir losses and as to the share thereof chargeable under article V to each of the States; to make findings of fact in the event of the occurrence of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the irrigation system in the upper basin, whereby delivery by the upper basin of water which it may be required to deliver in order to aid in fulfilling obligations of the United States of America to the United Mexican States arising under the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, of February 3, 1944, become difficult, and to report

such findings to the Governors of the upper basin States, the President of the United States of America, the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, and such other Federal officials and agencies as it may deem appropriate to the end that the water allotted to Mexico under division III of the treaty may be reduced in accordance with the terms of such treaty.

The powers of the Upper Colorado River Commission partake of a semijudicial character, in that they pertain to the obligation of the Commission to make findings as to certain matters of vital importance, such as quantity of use of water, quantity of deliveries at Lee Ferry, the need, if any, for curtailment of use of water, and the justification, if any, for reduction of deliveries to Mexico.

The powers and functions of the Commission partake also of an engineering character in that they deal with various hydrological investigations required in order to estimate and to forecast runoff and to determine consumptive uses of water and manmade depletion of stream flows. The construction of numerous large storage reservoirs will be essential if the Upper Colorado River Basin is to attain the development which is clearly indicated by present trends in the growth of its population, agriculture, and industry. Many engineering and economic problems will inevitably arise in the design and operation of such reservoirs. This is clear in the light of the multiple uses which should be made of the storage capacity provided by these reservoirs, and when there is envisaged the need to harmonize interests of the several States and of the Federal agencies which will be affected by these uses, to the end of bringing about the most profitable and economic conservation and utilization of the most vital of our western natural resources. The Upper Colorado River Commission expects to have a major share in the planning, coordination, and harmonization involved. It proposes that development of the water resources of the upper basin shall proceed on a comprehensive basis that takes into account the legitimate concerns of all—domestic, agricultural, and industrial water users, forests and reforestation programs, national parks, monuments, the protection of fish and wildlife, and recreation.

Finally, in article I (a) of the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, it is laid down, in part, that one of the major purposes of the compact is to "secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the upper basin * * *." The Commission has adopted a program designed to achieve that purpose. In working toward that objective, the Upper Colorado River Commission fulfills the desire of the people of the Upper Colorado River Basin for an agency that will interpret the needs of the upper basin for prompt and sound development.

While it is believed that the views and recommendations hereinafter presented may well be found to be useful generally in the consideration of problems affecting the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources in the Nation as a whole, and especially in the 17 Western States, they are intended to apply particularly to such development, utilization, and conservation in the upper basin portions of those States which are parties to the Upper Colorado River Basin compact. The Upper Colorado River Commission recognizes that geographic, economic, and other differences between areas may well call, as they have in the past, for differences in approach to the solution of problems affecting the development, utilization, and conservation of their water resources. Each area should, in the judgment of the Upper Colorado River Commission, have the fullest opportunity, consistent with its relationship to other areas, and, of course, with Federal interest, to work out its particular destiny in these respects.

The Federal Government has, in the light of the commerce, general welfare, and treaty clauses of the Constitution, major responsibilities in connection with the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources. The States likewise have important responsibilities in the same fields. Experience in the West has proven that the exercise by each jurisdiction of these responsibilities can be accomplished without serious conflict. In the judgment of the Upper Colorado River Commission, therefore, the Federal Government should, in view of its responsibilities to the Nation as a whole, prosecute vigorously a Nation-wide program looking to the continued development, utilization, and conservation of water resources. Such a program should be well balanced and should consist of the authorization and construction of works for the improvement of navigation, for the control of floods, for river regulation, and for the development, storage, conservation, and use of waters for all beneficial purposes, including particularly the fulfillment of domestic, agricultural, and industrial needs and the development of hydroelectric power, the improvement and protection of national parks, monuments, and recreational areas, the protection and improvement of conditions favorable to fish and wildlife, the fulfillment of obligations of the United States to Indian tribes.

The character of Federal Government participation in major water-resources programs should follow the general pattern developed to date. That is to say, the Federal Government should investigate and report from time to time on proposed projects, following the policies and procedures laid down in section I of the act of December 22, 1944, commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1944." Authorized projects should be constructed by or under the direction of the Federal Government. Projects should be operated by or under the direction of the Federal Government to the extent necessary to assure fulfillment of the broad national purposes which they are designed to serve. The operation and maintenance of works that have primarily local significance should be confided, to the fullest practicable extent, to local organizations, under contracts that will assure the fulfillment of legitimate Federal objectives to be served thereby.

The need and justification for the maintenance of an ever-expanding national economy are such as to indicate that curtailment to any considerable extent of a national program for the worthy purposes heretofore enumerated would constitute not merely a tragic failure of the Federal Government to carry out a vital function, but economic folly as well. It should be borne in mind that projects for the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources, in addition to their other virtues, enrich and strengthen the Nation by providing expanded opportunities for agricultural and industrial development. They constitute investments that return many times their cost. Although the Upper Colorado River Commission recognizes the need for development on a comprehensive basis and advocates comprehensive planning, it does not believe that the development of individual projects should await the final completion of basin-wide plans. After all, basin-wide plans are subject to expression in general terms. Their details are perfected over the years.

The question then arises: Where shall appraisals as to the relative priority of water resource programs, from the standpoint of economic and social need, be made? These appraisals are made today in the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government. In the judgment of the Upper Colorado River Commission, existing jurisdiction should remain undisturbed, subject only to some improvement in the mechanics utilized by the executive branch in connection with the analysis of proposed projects and to the consideration of the extent to which conflicts between existing Federal agencies can be eliminated. The Bureau of the Budget should confine itself to the relation of proposed projects to the National budget. It is, in our judgment, inadequately equipped to make detailed analysis of such projects. This is said without intending criticism and merely for the purpose of recognizing a fact. Furthermore, attempts on its part to perform such a function would result in inevitably in duplication that ought to be avoided. Finally, the need for the performance of such a function would be obviated, for the most part, by the application of uniform principles in determining the economic justification of projects. In this connection, your Commission might well give consideration to the May 15 report of the Subcommittee on Benefits and Costs of the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee. Basically, the question ought to be whether the amount paid by the direct beneficiaries plus the amounts made nonreimbursable because of the national interests involved exceeds the estimated cost of the project. The direct beneficiaries are those who derive an immediate benefit through the provision of a supply of water, the creation of a source of electric energy, and the improvement of local business conditions. The amounts which they can repay are usually susceptible of reasonably accurate determination. Difficulties sometimes arise in determining the extent of the national benefit which justifies the Federal Government in making an investment of funds derived from tax sources. Certain purposes for which such an investment of funds should be made have been recognized for many years. They are accepted by the American people as a whole. They include: navigation improvement, flood control, the protection of fish and wildlife. Investment for these purposes should be continued. Consideration should be given to the extent to which additional purposes, of broad national interest, should be added by laws of general application.

Questions of allocation of costs inevitably arise as an incident of the economic justification of projects. Allocations should, in our judgment, be made in accordance with formulae capable of general application. If an allocation of costs is fairly and openly made, then the relative status of each function to be performed by a project will be clear.

It is economically sound, in certain instances (such will be the case in connection with the upper Colorado River storage project, for example), to group together a number of projects in a river basin. For certain areas, the use of water for domestic and agricultural purposes is the principal basis of their economy, and yet the users of water for agricultural purposes are not able to repay the total cost properly allocable to such purposes. It is eminently appropriate in such cases that aid should be derived from power revenues to fill the gap between what agricultural water users can repay and the amount allocated to agricultural purposes.

The Congress itself has dealt ably with the problem of evaluating priority needs for and the feasibility of proposed projects, notwithstanding that, in particular cases, it has been faced with difficulties stemming from conflicts between agencies in the executive branch of the Government and apparently overlapping committee jurisdiction.

Greater by far than the need for modification and adjustment of the Federal Government's water resources policies is the need for a better understanding of existing policies, of their historical background and of their gradual evolution, from the days when public works in the nature of river and harbor improvements were first confided to the United States Army engineers, to the day when such works were broadened in conception to include flood control and when the measure of the desirability of such works came to lie in whether their benefits, to whomsoever they might accrue, exceeded their estimated costs; from the day when the Federal reclamation program was designed primarily as an aid to settling the West to the day when it became a means as well for a broad scale attack on the multiple problems of navigation improvement, flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, agricultural production, the fulfillment of treaty obligations, recreation, the protection of fish and wildlife, the generation and distribution of hydroelectric power, and other purposes. If the background of the development of Federal policy to date and the extent to which such policy has evolved to meet the needs of society were better understood, there would, in our judgment, be fuller appreciation of the extent to which existing policy results generally in the reasonably efficient accomplishment of worthwhile national objectives and there would be manifested a less ready tendency to substitute for the status quo virtually untried policies and administrative schemes.

Much has been heard in recent years, for instance, about Federal policy with respect to the generation and distribution of hydroelectric power and some criticism has been leveled at the policy which permits application of the interest returned on the Federal Government's power investment in reclamation projects toward the return of the costs of such projects. Much has been heard also about repayment policy and about the so-called excess land policy. Much that has been heard about all of these things evidences a lack of knowledge regarding their objectives, their historical background, their intrinsic merits and the fact that comparatively minor improvements, where required in certain fields, will adjust them well to present day needs. The wiping out of these policies and the substitution for them of anything untried or approaching mere executive fiat would be destructive work, fraught with serious dangers to a free people.

The generation of hydroelectric energy as an incident of Federal water resource projects and the disposition thereof, "giving preference to municipal purposes" was first authorized as far back as April 16, 1906, in an act of Congress entitled "An act providing for the withdrawal from public entry of lands needed for town-site purposes in connection with irrigation projects under the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes" (34 Stat. 116), and, shortly after that, the Comptroller of the Treasury held that receipts from the sale of such power should be classified as repayment. Therein lie the beginnings of a policy which has been elaborated through the years, as required to meet the needs of society, until today, under the Federal Reclamation laws, power plays an increasingly vital function both in the physical and in the financial aspects of water resource projects. With existing general Federal reclamation law on the subject of authorization, construction, operation and maintenance of hydroelectric power plants, including transmission lines, and governing rate-making and the distribution of power (and subject to its modernization and modification in certain respects such as to provide, among other things, for the establishment of a basin account), the Upper Colorado River Commission is satisfied. If other regions believe that they require different treatment of the subject, then they should, of course, have an opportunity to demonstrate the desirability of legislation that will permit such treatment there. The present state of Federal reclamation law on this subject, is, however, in general, well suited to development of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

This is so, because the present state of such law, while recognizing fully the vital role of power in itself, protecting against the monopolization of its benefits, affording preferences to municipalities and other public corporations, to REA's and other nonprofit organizations, also recognizes the vital role that power plays in the financing of water resource projects as a whole, making feasible from the financial point of view many desirable and worth-while projects that much otherwise fail to measure up to standards of feasibility. Long-delayed development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin depends in large measure upon the application to that development of the established policy of the reclamation law that power plants shall be constructed as an incident thereof wherever the generation of power proves feasible; that preference in the distribution of such power shall be accorded to municipalities and REA's; and that power revenues, in excess of those required to meet operation, maintenance, and amortization costs of the power plants, shall be available to help pay off the other costs of water-resource projects. In this connection, the suggestion has been made in certain quarters that REA cooperatives, for instance, ought not to have to pay for power a rate in excess of that required to operate, maintain, and return the cost of the power generation and distribution plants themselves. Such a conception fails to take account of the fact that, in the Western States, at least, the farmers in the main owe their very existence to water-resource development projects which could not, in turn, exist without power as a paying partner. So far as the Upper Colorado River Basin is concerned in any avent, it appears clear that even the large-scale irrigation development which is in the offing will not require financial assistance through any special component of power rates, but that interest returned on the power investment will be sufficient therefor. In other words, those irrigation costs of our prospective development that are beyond the reasonable ability of prospective irrigation water users to repay within a reasonable period of years can be financed through revenues derived from the interest component of power rates as provided by existing reclamation law, and, so long as the traditional policy of application of such interest revenues to return of costs permits, the REA cooperatives and others are assured of reasonable rates for power. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that the interim report on development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin (a report the salient features of which have been favorably commented upon by the five upper basin States) envisages the establishment of a basin account that recognizes the financial interrelationship of projects participating and that provides for financial assistance from power revenues. This basin account recognizes the essential unity of the Upper Colorado River Basin. It serves a twofold purpose: First, in that it averages the cost of power development throughout the upper basin, thus diffusing, by means of uniform rates, the benefit of the upper basin's power developments; and, second, in that it provides a means whereby proposed irrigation developments may be judged on their intrinsic merits, that is to say, on the basis of their benefit-cost ratios, without regard to the question whether a particular development has associated with it a power development of magnitude sufficient to repay those irrigation costs that are beyond the ability of the water users to repay. We regard a basin account as necessary for the purpose of achieving a power rate based upon the cost of all the proposed power developments in the upper basin and also for the purpose of providing a pool of financial assistance to irrigation developments so that their undertaking will be dependent solely upon their own merits and without regard to the geographic accident of their location in relation to a particular power development. In other words, the essential need in the Upper Colorado River Basin is a plan for the upper basin as a whole—a plan whereby projects will be developed, not only in and of themselves, but from the standpoint of their relation to the upper basin as a whole.

As has been pointed out, the policy of application of power revenues to project costs was first laid down in 1906. It was reiterated in the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment of 1938. It has been applied ever since that date. It is an established policy that is fully consistent with sound government and with sound accounting. It is highly beneficial to existing and further water resource development in the Western States.

The historical basis for the traditional policy of application of the revenues derived from the interest component of power rates to the return of the Federal Government's investment is so often used as to give rise to the statement: "Yes—we understand the historical argument. We understand that such has been the practice ever since the year 1906; but what about the merits?" Merit, as well as tradition, is on the side of adherence to the policy of application toward return of the costs of Federal reclamation projects of the revenues derived from the interest component of power rates.

The basis for not requiring the return, by those who repay and return the reimbursable costs of Federal reclamation projects, of interest on those costs, lies principally in the fact that encouragement thus given to the undertaking of projects for the development, conservation, and utilization of water resources produces benefits for the general welfare of the country as a whole and that the cost of providing such encouragement should, therefore, be borne by the country as a whole. In the final analysis, under the provisions of the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment, once power revenues have paid into the reclamation fund all sums allocated to be returned from the power revenues of a particular project, then all subsequent net power revenues flow into the general fund of the Treasury. Thus, the Federal Government stands, in time, to collect directly, many times the interest first forgiven. And this is in addition to the gain in Federal revenues derived from increased tax revenues in the area served by the project. The Upper Colorado River Commission confidently predicts that studies will show conclusively that in particular areas this gain in tax revenues alone is much more than sufficient to reimburse the Federal Government with interest for its total outlay in the construction of a project.

The preservation and continued application of that policy is vital to further development of water resource projects in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Finally, since the abandonment of that policy would greatly increase the cost of power, the preservation and application of that policy is of immense importance to REA cooperatives, municipalities, and others, for which power should, of course, be supplied at the most reasonable rates.

Certain costs of Federal reclamation projects are, by existing law, declared to be nonreimbursable. These are those costs allocated to certain broad purposes, generally recognized as bringing about benefits to the

Nation as a whole, as distinguished from purely local benefits. Among these purposes are: The improvement of navigation, flood control, and the protection of fish and wildlife. In recent months the question has arisen whether the cost of certain additional purposes should be added to the nonreimbursable class. The Upper Colorado River Commission believes that, insofar as water-resource projects serve additional broad national purposes in the interests of the taxpayers as a whole, costs properly allocable to such additional purposes should, likewise, be nonreimbursable. It believes, furthermore, that the operation and maintenance costs properly allocable to any and all purposes the costs of which are or hereafter may be held to be nonreimbursable should be nonreimbursable.

The repayment policy of the Federal reclamation laws has been modified from time to time to meet the needs of society. In the beginning (June 17, 1902) 10 years constituted the maximum repayment period. That period has since been expanded to 40 years, in the case of the traditional repayment contract, and in the case of the newer type of water-service contract, to a reasonable period of years. The Upper Colorado River Commission would look with favor upon a reasonable extension of the repayment period under the traditional form of repayment contract. It would look with favor also upon the modernization of section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 in such a way as to afford, so far as practicable, to parties contracting under that section the advantages of the traditional repayment contract. All in all, the Bureau of Reclamation has achieved an enviable record in obtaining the repayment and return of project costs. That record can be improved, so far as repayment and returns from irrigation water users are concerned, by the more realistic analysis of repayment ability and by the application of formulas that will permit of adjustments in times of economic change.

The so-called excess-land policies of the Federal reclamation law, designed as they are to encourage the settlement of the West through the creation of farm homes, to prevent the growth of excessively large estates and thus to prevent the monopolization of irrigation benefits, are sound in conception. Their intrinsic merit is beyond question. The Upper Colorado River Commission is in accord with their basic policy. There will, however, be found cases where rigid insistence upon an irrigable acreage not exceeding 160 or 320 acres, as the case may be, results in an acreage insufficient for the support of a family and thus, to a degree, in thwarting the basic policy of the excess-land provisions. There will be found, also, cases involving the provision of supplemental water supplies to established areas, where rigid insistence upon the rule is contrary to common sense as well as the general welfare. Such cases may lead to outright winking at contravention of existing law or to the strained construction thereof. The Upper Colorado River Commission believes that consideration might well be given to the creation of statutory procedures designed to permit the Secretary of the Interior to authorize holdings in excess of the existing statutory maximum in cases where, after hearings and the consideration of pertinent facts, he determines that in the light of soil quality, character of agriculture, historical background, the need of the affected community to retain a given operational unit and other appropriate factors, a larger area should be permitted. If such decisions of the Secretary of the Interior were prevented from becoming effective prior to the expiration of 60 days from the date of report thereon to the President and the Congress, abuses would be obviated.

It has been pointed out that, in the view of the Upper Colorado River Commission, subject to its modernization and modification in certain respects, the existing state of Federal law and policy constitutes a generally satisfactory basis for development in the upper Colorado River Basin. It is our view that such development should proceed also in accordance with the law of the river, to wit: The Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the California Self-Limitation Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, the Mexican Treaty, and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact. It is our view that such development should be authorized promptly. The development of the upper Colorado River Basin has too long lagged behind that of other areas of the West. The plans for its development are sound from the engineering and financial points of view. Development to the fullest extent permissible, within the limits of consumptive use apportioned to the upper basin by the Colorado River Compact, will redound also to the benefit of the lower basin and to the Nation as a whole.

Finally, we believe that administration of the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin should, subject to regulations that will fully safeguard the Federal interest, be confided to the fullest practicable extent to the Upper Colorado River Commission. In its very nature and by its very location, the Upper Colorado River Commission would constitute a practicable means for decentralization of administration and for administration through an agency close to the people most affected.

There are enclosed the answers of the Upper Colorado River Commission to a series of questions posed by your commission. Time limitations are such as to compel us to ask your commission to refer to the text of this letter in those cases where we have found it impossible to elaborate the answers to particular questions.

Should you desire information or further details in connection with the subject matter, please feel free to call upon me. I shall be glad to respond to the fullest practicable extent to any inquiries which you may desire to make, or to meet with you at your convenience, in Washington or elsewhere, to the end of furnishing the fullest possible assistance.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN GEOFFREY WILL,
Secretary and General Counsel.

The Chickens Come Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the feeding of Russian communism with machinery, vehicles, ships, gasoline, petroleum and the potential weapons of war from May 15, 1945, as disclosed in December 1947, and continued deliveries to Russian communism thereafter, has aided Russia to force communism on Manchuria, China, and Korea. And I did not believe it made sense at that time, to spend millions and billions of dollars to halt the march of communism in western Europe and at the same time aid communism by shipping supplies to Russia. The chickens have now come home to roost, Russian communism having taken over Manchuria, China, and Korea, and on such shipments to Russia I am including a news item of that earlier date.

OUTRIGHT BAN ON SALES TO SOVIET ASKED—OHIO CONGRESSMAN MAY OFFER BILL TO HALT EXPORTS

WASHINGTON, December 6.—An outright embargo on all exports from the United States to Russia was proposed today by Representative ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Republican, Ohio, as "a last resort if necessary to stop supplying a potential enemy."

WEICHEL is chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee now investigating Soviet use of American-built ships.

"While the President now has the power, under export control laws, to curb the sending of supplies to Russia, he does not seem to be overanxious to use it," WEICHEL told a reporter.

Information obtained by the committee, WEICHEL said, shows exports of such supplies as farm equipment and industrial machinery continue to leave this country for Russia in large numbers.

MUST BE STOPPED

"Unless this is stopped and stopped quickly," he said, "I shall ask my committee to approve legislation that would prohibit any ship from leaving United States ports with supplies for Russia or Russian-dominated nations."

This can be done, WEICHEL said, simply by making it illegal for customs officials to issue the necessary clearance papers without which no ship can sail from an American port.

WEICHEL said he prefers a less drastic approach to the problem "but something must be done."

"It just doesn't make sense for us to spend millions and billions of dollars to halt the spread of communism in western Europe and at the same time aid communism by shipping supplies to Russia," he said.

VESSELS RENAMED

WEICHEL said a preliminary investigation disclosed numerous American-built vessels, many of them Government-owned and transferred to the Soviet under lend-lease, "are plying the seas under Russian names and under the Russian flag."

"These ships used to fly the American flag under such good old names as the *Iowan*, the *Dakotan*, the *Texas*, the *Vermont*, the *Maine*, the *American Robin*," he commented. "Now some of them are known as the *Stalingrad*, the *Leningrad* and the *Vladivostok*."

WEICHEL said there are indications that since the committee started an inquiry earlier this year into retention by Russia of an estimated 96 lend-lease ships, "some of the names have been changed again."

"The evident purpose of this," he said, "is to make it more difficult for us to trace them and eventually get them back."

True Liberalism—Spiritual Freedom—Political Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on September 7, 1950, the following address was delivered by the Most Reverend Bernard T. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, at a dinner sponsored by the Polish Newspaper Guild. The banquet

was held at the Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill., honoring Zygmunt Stefanowicz, newly elected president of the Polish-American Journalists Guild:

It is interesting and rewarding to compare the history of Poland with the history of civilization in the Western World. One sees in such a comparison a striking parallel—a history, as it were, of the career of the human spirit in its age-old struggle for dignity, happiness and freedom under God.

With moral, ethical, and historical validity, Poland has aptly been called The Key to Europe and The Bulwark of Civilization. For its fertile inland plains, drained by the Vistula, have been since the tenth century, a central setting for the majestic and sweeping drama of western civilization.

From the monumental defeat of the Teutonic Knights at Tannenberg in 1410, through the destruction of the Bolshevik hordes at the gates of Warsaw in 1920, and clear on to the gallant defense of the same key city against the Stalinists in 1945, the blood of Poland has proven to be the blood of western civilization—shed for the cause of sound territorial integrity—shed against the enemies of Christianity for the dignity of man.

As one of the most outstanding fortresses of Christian Europe, Poland has withstood the onslaughts of barbarian invaders for almost a thousand years. It survived battle after battle, partition after partition, and even now, in chains, the noble spirit of its people is restless for a renewed struggle to drive off the tyrant and return to the liberty and dignity of the Christian-Democratic tradition.

History has proven, and will prove again, that Polish nationality cannot be permanently enslaved. Polish nationality is strong with the strength of the Christian faith, strong with the simple love of family, strong with a quenchless devotion to a free and independent homeland. Poland and its people are vastly more vigorous in spirit than any alien government which may dominate it.

Consider, for example, the enormous and extraordinary intellectual vigor of the democratic Polish press which consistently sounds a note of accuracy and right reason in a profession where distortion and willful omission of the truth have occurred all too frequently.

Most symbolic of this superb journalistic integrity in the Polish press is Mr. Zygmunt J. Stefanowicz, who honors us with his presence here tonight.

Mr. Stefanowicz, who is presently the editor in chief of the Polish Roman Catholic Union's newspaper the Polish Nation, has been for many years a distinguished Christian apostle of the Polish press. His work in the cause of Polish freedom, under the banners of Christ, has been so impressive that both Pope Pius XI and XII have seen fit to confer on him exceedingly high honors.

He is your recently elected president of the Polish American Journalists' Guild and I feel it a distinct pleasure to greet him here this evening.

Because of this spirit, this irrepressible vigor, identified with Poland, the democratic Polish press and leaders like Mr. Stefanowicz, one feels called upon to say:

Poland, Christian Poland, cannot and will not perish from this earth.

Yet, why—why—one asks, almost in desperation—why this present enslavement of such a free, proud nation—an enslavement undeserved by a country which has kept its faith with God and with the nations of Christian Europe

It is a difficult question to answer. The answers, I would say, are both simple and complex.

We know that Poland occupies a strategic geographical position which disposes it to function as a buffer state in time of peace and a two-way avenue of invasion in time of war.

Therefore, the simple explanation of Poland's present status as a slave state would seem to be that Soviet Russia has been able to assert her total and nefarious power over Poland, absolutely without interference from the free countries of the world.

It is of moment for all of us to inquire into the possible reasons why the Soviet Union was permitted by her formerly influential allies to reduce a proud and independent nation to the lowly status of a vassal.

This brings us, of course, to an inevitable consideration of the decisions made at Yalta and Teheran.

It was at Yalta that the historically acceptable boundaries of Poland were cut to fit the Russian Bear. And it was at Teheran that the diplomatic tomb of the legitimate Government of Poland was irrevocably sealed.

The recent disclosures of the Alger Hiss trial impel us to inquire into the influences which secured the Hiss position as a virtual Red emissary at Yalta. These are conceivably the same fifth-column influences which have been quite as effective as Soviet arms in bringing our peace-thirsty world close to the interminable Sahara of a third world conflict.

Granting the fact of liberal influence in placing Alger Hiss and other traitors in positions of topflight executive advantage with regard to governmental affairs, I should like to pose a few questions. I should like to inquire tonight into the nature and background of what might be called the leftist liberal mind. For such is a mind and spirit which markedly contrasts—in its restlessness, in its meandering—with the simple, God-anchored spirit of say, the Polish patriot. I should like to inquire tonight as to the extent such a mind is culpable for the present plight of Poland and the free or formerly free nations of the world.

"From the wreckage of liberalism nothing can be saved but its values * * *."

This acute observation made several years ago by a noted European thinker, has for us, in this time of international darkness, an even more profound meaning.

Whence came the wreckage of liberalism?

Is the wreckage of South Korea the wreckage of liberalism? Is the Stockholm peace petition the death warrant of pro-Marxist thinking. Did liberalism fail on the Marshall mission to China? Is it failing now in the State Department as it has already failed in Alger Hiss?

In advancing an affirmative answer to these questions as I do now, we must keep in mind our failures in the field of foreign relations since 1945.

The wreckage of liberalism and the failure of the leftist liberals themselves, during the past decade, can be attributed in great measure to their tremendous infatuation with the Soviet idea of government and of life.

Because of this great capacity for self-delusion, I am not at all persuaded that there is much value to be salvaged from leftist liberalism, or, for that matter, from any kind of liberalism which is not anchored to absolute and eternal truth.

Is there such a thing as true liberalism? Yes.

It is the kind of liberalism—very hard to find these days—which would know profound sympathy for Christopher Dawson's analysis. "True liberalism," says Mr. Dawson, "combines the Christian ideal of spiritual freedom with the medieval tradition of political liberties." He sees the failure of liberals in the past century as a failure to take Christian ideals seriously and also notes their unwillingness to give expression to the weight and the truth of Christian tradition.

Instead, most liberals, found themselves saying, "Credo in hominem" "I believe in man" This, because they had no supernatural credo.

To be more particular, the leftist liberals have been naive enough to say: "We believe that 'People's Democracies' are actually people's democracies. We believe that Chinese communism is 'agrarian communism.' They have insisted that Joe Stalin means peace when he says peace, and democracy when he says democracy. They have gulped down the lie which insists that the Progressive Party is not influenced by the Communist line.

They believe in the common man and they believe in the slave masters of the Kremlin, which taken together is a contradiction and a belief in nothing.

Since 1932, any newsboy on the street corners of America could have told the liberals that they were the high-priority object of a world-wide seduction, conceived and engineered by the Kremlin.

But would they have believed such ordinary horse sense? Hardly.

The astonishing and pathetic truth of the matter is that the pro-Stalinists no longer know how to believe. For genuine belief in anything implies a standard of absolute truth—the truth of God's existence and authority, for example. I would dare to assert further that if a man does not believe in the perennial truths of the Christian tradition, he has not learned how to believe at all and is incapable of genuinely believing in anything.

Expressing it with even starker simplicity, one must set forth the concise truth of man's origin and destiny: man came from God as his creature and he will go back to God to be judged. Within that framework of supernatural law he is free—free to acquit himself as he will, but subject to the sanctions of divine law.

But the liberal mind, since the nineteenth century, has maintained that the only way man can be free is by getting rid of the framework.

"Be yourself," the liberals cried. "Get rid of stifling tradition, get rid of religious belief that is nothing more than ignorance and superstition. Assert your natural rights in business, love, politics."

"Religion is a private affair," said the liberals. "It has nothing to do with business and politics." "One religion is as good as another," they went on. "There is no such thing as a personal God," they insisted. "The universe is the creative result of blind chance."

Such were the dicta of the nineteenth and early twentieth century liberals—they, the progenitors of many of the rudderless liberals of our present day.

But why such an emphasis on personal freedom and emancipation from moral responsibility? Was it merely because Rousseau said so—Darwin, Nietzsche, and other philosophical golden calves of the liberal movement? Was it really genuine belief in the philosophers who deified man and obliterated God which prompted the liberals to locate man at the center of the universe in place of his Creator?

Yes.

Yet the liberals of the nineteenth century were not quite as intellectually fanatical as their high-sounding phrases would seem to indicate. This bruiting about of altruistic affirmations concerning the freedom of man was also concerned with something as crass and pragmatic as the almighty dollar.

We would indeed be the victims of extreme naïveté and even gross self-deception—those unfailing characteristics of the false liberal—if we were not to recognize that much of the nineteenth century liberalism was a brazen sublimation of the worst aspects of laissez faire capitalism. Nineteenth

century liberalism might further be characterized as a defense of irresponsible free enterprise, cleverly instrumented by an intellectual attack on the principles of the one institution—the church—which has, over the centuries, constantly reminded man of his moral responsibility.

We know now that modern liberalism in its earlier phases was the intellectual justification of the bourgeois struggle for profit and for power. The noble words of a Gladstone or a Disraeli are hard to disassociate from Britain's cruel and ruthless exploitation of primitives in Asia and Africa. The brilliant anticlerical pronouncement of the Kulturkampf liberals in Bismarck's Germany are one with the Pan-O-German imperialism that was to plunge our world into its first tragic global war.

It was the late Mr. Harold Lasky, the British Socialist doctrinaire, who epitomized liberalism as "the byproduct of the effort of the middle classes to win their place in the sun."

The definition is both clever and astute, but could only be completely acceptable if it were reordered to read: "Liberalism is the byproduct of the irresponsible effort of the middle classes to win their place in the sun at the expense of the economic and moral welfare of all other classes."

If religion was allowed no voice in the national market place of the nineteenth century liberal, it is not difficult to understand why the twentieth century heirs of liberalism would give short shrift to supernatural values in the international market place of the atomic age.

The self-deception of the nineteenth century liberal—his sorry substitute for religion—was an almost ludicrous belief in the sanctity and power of laissez-faire capitalism.

In his liberal offspring of the twentieth century we have encountered this same self-spoofing with a scope that has been extended from the national scene to the international. This is so because the gullibility of the modern liberal is concerned with the validity and the mission of world-wide communism.

We have said that the earlier liberals tended to get the profit motive all tangled up with their high-sounding altruisms. And I do believe that an interesting accumulation of evidence might be gathered which would demonstrate that it has not been unprofitable for certain liberals to espouse, with or without sincerity, the cause and party line of Stalinism.

With what trepidation, during the past decade, have we watched the welcome mat being spread out for pro-Stalinist liberals in our universities, in Hollywood, in Washington. This, in the name of a democratic freedom which we may have seriously endangered by the excessive and unreasonable practice of tolerance.

Far too many of the leftist liberals have been faithful to democracy, only in their fashion—and it has been a very profitable fashion.

Yet, one would not desire the invocation of undemocratic methods of suppression in order to combat such folly as that of the Stalinist and the innocent but duped liberal. However, every American and every man of good will everywhere, can only be thankful for the presently implemented policy of "clear and present danger" with which, through the justice and order of the judiciary, we should be able to save ourselves from ourselves.

Consider the devious cleverness with which a good measure of the Stalinist line has been successfully practiced within our midst—largely through the influence of leftist liberals, professors were permitted to place the imprint of atheistic materialism on many wieldy young American minds. They have prepared all too many young intellects for eventual apostasy from the Christian and democratic tradition by filling their minds and hearts with the sweet songs of moral license and the alluring, yet spurious prophecies of positivism and pragmatism. Such ideas as:

"Live dangerously—pitch your tents on the slopes of Vesuvius"; "the Bible is a book of tribal myths"; "the Vatican is a stronghold of Fascist reaction," were poured into young minds, from which eventually could come only bitter fruit.

In a day of world peace—and God bring it to all free men soon—when there is greater detachment and leisure in which to review the blunders and blindness of the 1940's, it will be most interesting to study the textbooks of our country and attempt to detect therein certain influences, calculated or not, toward the acceptance of the Soviet idea.

I cite, for example, a quotation from a study of international politics published in 1944. The work was written by an outstanding scholar in the field of world politics, and indicates, I think, how Soviet hypocrisy has been able to dupe and deceive even men of honest intellectual accomplishment. Said the scholar, without, I believe, intention to deceive: "As between the risk of acting as if the Soviet Union will be a trustworthy partner in maintaining peace and the risk of acting as if it will not, the lesser risk is clearly that based on expectation of Soviet good faith. * * * If we assume faith in the motives and integrity of the Soviet Government, there is a good chance of agreement upon a common program of Soviet-Anglo-American leadership in peace as in war."

I am under the impression that the scholar who made this statement is devoid of sympathy for the Communist line. Yet one cannot help but wince when coming in contact with a mind—so typical of the liberal—which can advocate faith in the integrity of a gangster government whose motives are world domination and whose trustworthiness is comparable to that of a murderer stalking his victim in the blackness of the night.

I must insist again that this gullibility of the liberal rarely has a basis in supernatural truth, and it is all the more erratic, vague, and uncertain because it lacks the stability of traditional religion. Make no mistake about this: The appetite of certain liberals for Stalinism and the things of Stalinism is a perverted search for religious stability on the part of souls who have rejected perennial truth only to discover that the residual hunger within them drives them from one unsatisfactory political fashion to another.

The shocking effect of liberal influence on the State Department in Washington has been revealed to our people only within the past 2 years. It was clearly liberal influence which placed Alger Hiss—not to mention others—in vital and strategic foreign office work at Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, and the Far Eastern Division of the State Department.

It was the influence of duped and deceived liberals which defended Hiss until he could no longer be defended, until the whole infamous story of his top-level, top-secret treason against the American people screamed from the newspapers and shattered the myth of liberal reliability in an age of Communist siege.

If the Hiss case smashed one panel of the rose-colored glasses with which so many liberals have looked on Soviet Russia for so long, the ruthless attack of the Reds upon South Korea shattered the remaining panel of roseate hue. Many of our fellow-traveling liberals are seeing the murderous monster of Red communism face to face for the first time. With remorseful cries they are stumbling back toward the Stars and Stripes, looking upon the face of Uncle Sam and finding him good.

May God help them all and restore in them the supernatural faith that alone can bring them peace and stability.

In the words of a medieval divine, glowing with truth, now as then, one can glean further understanding of the failure of the liberals and those they have seriously influenced in a groping, war-sick world. Said the medieval thinker: "Whatever the world thinks, he who hath not much meditated upon God may possibly make a thriving earthworm, but will most indubitably make a sorry patriot and a sorry statesman."

The present failure of the liberals to find a substitute for the true God whom they have rejected will be followed only by the dark night of bitterness and cynicism if the supernatural springs of the democratic idea are not rediscovered. At the roots of true democracy flow the deep, pure springs of God—the waters of refreshment available to all men of good will.

The true patriots of Poland, enslaved or in exile, have refreshed themselves at these waters for centuries. With the strength of the supernatural belief in the dignity of man, the arms of Poland were successful at Tannenberg and at the gates of Warsaw. It was the Christian dignity, not only of their own nation, but of all Europe which Poland preserved in their struggles with the barbarians from the east and the west.

The people of Poland had and still have things noble and enduring to defend—a way of life, based neither upon the sophisticated vagueness of the liberals, nor upon the bestial regimentation of the Marxists.

Poland, as a people and as a nation, will rise again because of its steadfast belief in the sweet democracy of Christ—the love of family and country, based securely on the love of God.

It is this regard for the sanctity of the human individual which has spread from Europe to our own America. This is the Christian tradition of civilization which has made our country great. It can make Europe itself great once again when Poland and all other free peoples have risen from their chains.

The recent words of General Anders—that brave and distinguished leader of free Poland in exile, express I believe, the heartfelt prayer of all true Polish patriots and lovers of freedom everywhere. Said General Anders: "And what do we want today? We want that law and justice reign in the world, that all nations live peacefully and freely in their lands, that Poland regains freedom and independence, that peace and God's blessing return to our country."

The world that General Anders envisions is the same free and abundant order of nations toward which men of good will have struggled since the beginning of time. With renewed hope and courage let us face the difficult days ahead, dedicated to the eternal proposition that all men must be given the free opportunity to live with decency and dignity as children of God.

The Yellow Oleo Threat in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, out in the State of Michigan the citizens of the State will on November 7 determine whether or not the milk products industry, which is so vitally important to the economic and social welfare of the people, is to be substantially damaged

through the substitution of oleo and its various products for animal fats in the form of butter. So many people in the State are concerned about the result of this determination that I wish to submit for the RECORD the following Fifteen Facts You Should Know About Keeping Michigan Prosperous, prepared by the Dairy Action League:

FIFTEEN FACTS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT KEEPING MICHIGAN PROSPEROUS

1. On November 7, 1950, the people of Michigan will vote on a proposal which will determine whether Michigan shall continue to prohibit sale and manufacture of an imitation of butter known as yellow oleo.

2. If yellow oleo is permitted in Michigan, one of the greatest dairy States, it will open the door to a host of other substitutes for dairy products—oleo milk, oleo ice cream, and oleo cheese—which will at first damage and then ultimately destroy the prosperity of one of the largest industries in the State, dairying.

3. This is the real issue at the polls: Shall vegetable fats raised in the cotton South and in the soybean Midwest and West destroy our markets for animal fats produced in Michigan? A vote to bring yellow oleo into Michigan is the same as voting to move a large part of the automotive industry into the cotton South as far as the ultimate effect will be on prosperity and employment in Michigan.

4. Michigan has a tremendous stake in its more than 132,000 dairy farms. These dairy farms represent an investment of $2,375,000,000, which, together with 107 creameries and 620 other dairy products plants, is more than twice the assets of the Ford Motor Co. in the entire world. One in every six families in the State is dependent on the dairy business. Some 600,000 persons derive their income, in whole or in part, from dairying. One out of every four mouthfuls of food eaten by Michigan residents is dairy products. Our Michigan income from dairying in 1949, exclusive of meat sales, amounted to $185,000,000.

5. Damage to dairying in Michigan would adversely affect the economic life of every person in the State, no matter what he or she was doing for a living.

6. For example, the automotive industry will suffer. Farmers own about 35 percent of all the trucks and are the heaviest buyers, as a group, of automobiles. If farm purchasing power is cut down, as it certainly will be if imitations of dairy products are substituted for dairy products on the Michigan markets, the automobile industry will be hard hit and many people will be thrown out of work. The same argument applies to every other line of business—food, clothing, building, amusements, hardware, etc. The men and women in the cities who make or sell the goods which the farmers buy have as much at stake in keeping imitations of dairy products out of the State as the men and women who milk the cows.

7. The dairy industry does not oppose in this campaign the use of white oleo or the coloring of it at home. In this case the housewife knows that she is buying oleo and is not paying for good butter and getting commercially colored yellow oleo instead.[1] The minute or two a week the housewife devotes to coloring oleo is not regarded by most women as any more of a chore than peeling apples or pitting cherries for a pie. If she must have oleo, and colors it herself, the housewife is helping to prevent serious damage to the economic welfare of Michigan which would come with commercially colored oleo. She is helping to keep a job for her husband, opportunity for her children, and protect the security of her home when she votes against commercially colored oleo.

8. On the other hand, when a pound of oleo is purchased to replace a pound of butter, Michigan agriculture loses 50 cents in buying power. Oleo is like the carnival business, the money taken in goes out of town, because the principal ingredients are grown in the cotton South or in the soybean States. Compared to other agriculture, the soybean crop in Michigan is so small it is not an economic factor.

9. Dairy products and the meat from dairy herds produce about 43 percent of the farm income of Michigan which last year amounted to $681,000,000. Twenty-seven percent of the dairy products of the State is butter. The dairy industry cannot exist without butter. Oleo, however, not only threatens butter but every other form of dairy products by imitation.

10. Imitations of dairy products in the State will mean fewer people on farms and fewer jobs in cities with more people after them. It will mean farm and city unemployment.

11. Yellow oleo means higher oleo prices. Although all Federal taxes have been eliminated and there has never been a State tax in Michigan, in States where yellow oleo has been permitted yellow oleo prices range to 55 cents a pound.

12. There is no substitute for dairying in the State of Michigan through which the people on farms can maintain a satisfactory standard of living.

13. To preserve dairying, those engaged in it are vigorously supporting a three-point program:

(a) Advertise the advantages of dairy products.

(b) Work toward constantly improving grade and pack.

(c) Maintain a legislative program which will keep the industry alive and on an even keel.

Elimination of any one of these points opens the road to disaster.

14. Soil conservation is vital to the welfare of Michigan. By nature, dairying is a great processing operation. It converts the products of our soil into food for our people. Most of our crops are roughages—pasture, hay, silage, and straw. These crops would be wasted unless used by livestock. No other animal equals the dairy cow in her efficiency and ability to convert these coarse farm feeds into human food. The dairy farmer is the only farmer in the world who can sell off a thousand dollars' worth of the produce of his land and still leave the soil in better condition than when he started. Imitations of dairy products threaten the rich pastures and green countrysides of Michigan, and would replace them with rapidly deteriorating, eroded, abandoned, nontaxpaying lands characteristic of cotton farming in the South.

15. We have the "No" vote on proposal IV on the ballot in the fall election. Only by the hardest kind of work and deep interest on the part of the men and women of the State can enough "No's" be obtained to win. It is hoped that you and your friends will actively support the program to keep Michigan prosperous by working and voting "No," to the question of bringing yellow oleo and other imitations of dairy products into the State.

[1] "Butterleggers" are now active in Michigan. Since the first of the year 23 persons have been convicted of publicly selling oleo and representing it to be butter. The head of the Federal Food and Drug Administration at Washington recently expressed his fear that many more unscrupulous people would be buying up oleo reserves and selling them to the public for butter now that the Federal regulatory taxes have been removed.

Scare Buying Is Vicious—Scare Selling Is Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article from the New York Times, September 6, 1950:

SCARE BUYING IS VICIOUS—SCARE SELLING IS WORSE

There is another side to war.

It's known as profiteering.

It's ugly, uglier by far, than that part of war in which men fight—and die.

It can lose a war right here—in the very shadow of the Empire State Building, after that war has been won on foreign soil.

Profiteering or chiseling or anything stronger you want to call it, can help the monstrous thing we seek to defeat, and destroy the very freedoms we seek to preserve.

Ever hear of "scare selling"?

We're experiencing this wartime cancer that is festering, doctored by apostles of greed.

We're experiencing it in all its vicious forms.

So is the rest of the building industry.

We don't like it.

And we're willing to call a spade a spade—publicly.

We don't like it because we know that in most instances the price increase can't be justified by any comparable rise in production costs. We know the escalator clause is dictated by nothing more than greed. We know that the price-on-delivery dictum is based on pure, selfish gain—chiseling opportunism at its worst.

We don't like it because there's real danger ahead.

We feel it's high time to put on the price brakes.

Otherwise we're going through that red light—and crash.

Mind you, we're not hitting at those suppliers who have been forced to boost prices because their costs have gone up legitimately. We are concerned with those selfish interests who, for example, add 10 percent to the price of their material—5 percent of which is justified, the other 5, plain avarice.

We say this is the road to inflation, the road to economic disaster. We say this is the quick and sure way to the kind of controls that will hold us like a vise, and from which we never will ease out. And when and if that happens, we will have lost—lost everything, regardless of the battlefield victories.

For the unfortunate truth is, we're in the middle. If we succeed militarily, we can be beaten in still another way—by the undermining of our economic structure.

Our enemies don't care which way they win.

Yes, and there is this to ponder. The economic war can be won by the enemy only if we ourselves help him to win.

As builders, with $125,000,000 of construction behind us, we think we know a little about building costs. If these costs keep spiralling, we are laying the foundation for the kind of economic structure that is bound to topple, and bury us all, deep.

We're currently building apartments, at an investment of $16,000,000, to house 5,000 people. They are the talk of the town.

Why? Because these apartments are offered at rents people can afford to pay.

What will happen to this kind of building if war profiteering and chiseling continues?

We know this: You can't contract to deliver a house, or anything else, a year from today at a firm and fixed price, and produce it on the basis of paying for materials prices that prevail on the day of delivery.

We'd like to keep on building, and so would our subcontractors—our plumbers, painters, carpenters, masons, plasterers, electricians, et al.—building at the lowest possible cost by using every ounce of construction know-how, ingenuity, and resourcefulness we possess.

Let's put on the price brakes—now.

Let those who now profiteer use their managerial skill and ingenuity instead. Their profit will be greater not only in dollars, but in national welfare.

Profiteering is not fair to the contractors who build, to the subcontractors who do their work, to the men, women, and children who need housing.

Profiteering is not fair to the men who fight—and die, so that all of us can continue to live in freedom.

Profiteering is not fair to a United States.

The Gregory-Roth-Schenker Corp., building construction, New York, N. Y.

Bureau of Community Development of Wisconsin University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the inspiring work of the bureau of community development of the University of Wisconsin. I ask that this statement and appended materials be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement and the matters referred to by him were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN UNIVERSITY BUREAU SETS PACE IN COMMUNITY PLANNING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the finest jobs to my way of thinking that is being done by any unit in any State university is that being performed by the bureau of community development of the great University of Wisconsin. This bureau has for its purpose the mobilizing of research and other facilities to assist local communities throughout the Badger State in adjusting to changing social and economic conditions.

I feel that if there were similar bureaus in other State universities and in private colleges and educational institutions, the needs of the respective States would be that much more easily met. I feel that these bureaus could be a tremendous help in the adjustment of the respective States and in their increasing self-reliance rather than becoming exclusively dependent upon Washington because of inability to change with changing times. We all recognize, of course, that Uncle Sam must cooperate with the States and localities, but we want them to meet their own obligations insofar as possible by their own efforts.

I have in my hand the latest issue of the fine university magazine, Community Development Service. This particular issue is devoted to regional development in the upper Wisconsin River Valley. I think that the work being done in that particular region—the story of how community leaders have come together under university leadership to plan the problems of population, industry, education, health, uses of raw materials, encouragement of tourist travel, and so forth--I believe that this story will be of tremendous interest as a sort of case history of what can be done when local leaders set their minds to the task.

There follows thereafter four materials:

(a) A statement of the work of the bureau of community development itself.

(b) A description of the work being done in the upper Wisconsin River Valley.

(c) A schedule of local meetings in that region.

(d) A list of the local leaders participating in it.

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The object of the bureau is to further a better understanding of the social and economic resources of Wisconsin; to make readily available to the people of the State the university's knowledge, experience, and researches in the handling of social and economic problems; to stimulate interest in citizenship and good government; to collect and organize material relating to community development; and to assist local communities in meeting social and economic adjustments.

The functions of the bureau are:

1. To provide individuals, groups, and communities of the State with counsel, information, and services in its field, in cooperation with other organized agencies, public and private; to assist local school authorities and county citizenship committees in the arrangement and conduct of their programs for citizenship training and induction of new voters. Such information and services are extended only when there is a definite request.

2. To organize and conduct community, regiona., and State-wide institutes, seminars, and short courses for business, industrial or civic leaders—such as seminars on industrial management problems; merchants' seminars on trade area, merchandising, and management problems; leadership institutes on community development. Such educational programs are arranged only on request and based on what the applicants themselves, or their selected committees, suggest.

3. To collect, organize, and publish data relative to the social and economic resources of the State, in cooperation with the school of commerce, the department of economics, sociology, and political science, and other departments and divisions of the university, and with governmental departments. Such information is made available to the schools and local business and civic leaders of the State when they request it. (Requests for technical information on business and industrial matters should be sent to the bureau of business information.)

Bureau of Community Development, 208 University Extension Building, Madison, Wis.

A GUIDEPOST—VALLEY VIEWPOINTS ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Is the upper Wisconsin River Valley a region? What are our regional problems? Should we be working out more of our area-wide problems on a cooperative basis? Would a regional development program be of value to the upper Wisconsin River Valley? If it would be of value, how should it be organized?

In order to get answers to these questions, leaders from the area met in a community development conference in Merrill in April 1950. Representatives came from Vilas, Oneida, Forest, Taylor, Lincoln, Langlade, Marathon, Wood, and Portage Counties. They listened to what other parts of the country were doing. They discussed regional effort already under way in the valley. They decided that a regional development program would do much to strengthen the life of the valley.

To get things rolling a temporary committee was elected to lay plans for a regional organization and set possible goals for consideration at a subsequent regional meeting. This bulletin grew out of the work of this temporary committee. It will serve as a guide in getting a regional development program started.

At the invitation of President W. C. Hansen of the Teachers College, the temporary committee met in Stevens Point. There was unanimous agreement that the regional development program should be formulated as close to the community level as possible. To this end, a series of county-wide meetings should be arranged between September 10 and 21, 1950. The general outline of these meetings will be the same for each meeting. Local community leaders in each county will prepare a list of regional goals and suggest the type of organization which they think necessary to do the regional development job. By the middle of October the results of these eight community meetings will be pooled at a regional conference. This conference will complete the organization of the regional development program. This regional conference is tentatively planned for October 20, 1950.

At the April conference in Merrill, Norman Bitterman told of the accomplishments of his regional organization, Southern Illinois, Inc. This organization has been active for almost 30 years in strengthening agriculture, recreation, education, and industry of southern Illinois. A digest of his account is here presented. While the needs of the upper Wisconsin River Valley are different from those of southern Illinois, the basic principles of regional development are much the same, and a consideration of them may be helpful to this area. There is no question but what the leadership of the valley can profit from the experience of any such area development project.

At the county meetings in September, the first job will be to get down on paper lists of specific needs in the upper Wisconsin River Valley. Problems of regional importance will be our first concern. To start the thinking on this subject several ideas are listed in the final section of this bulletin.

Valley leaders should be thinking about the type of organization best suited to work on a regional level. Again, the suggestions made at the county meetings will be helpful.

As soon as the permanent valley organization is formed and a basic list of regional goals agreed upon, action committees will be organized.

The upper Wisconsin River Valley has already gone a long way in regional development work. Here are just a few of many illustrations:

1. Wisconsin Valley Librarians: Regional organization of librarians.

2. Trees for Tomorrow: Better forest management program cooperatively sponsored by the paper companies.

3. Wisconsin Public Service Corp.: Electric utility serving this region.

4. Stevens Point Teachers College: Teacher training for the valley.

5. Wisconsin Valley Improvement Co.: Power development and flood control on the river by a joint effort of the paper and power companies.

6. North Central Labor Body: Organized labor in more than eight larger communities.

7. Wisconsin Valley Mayors and Chamber of Commerce Managers Association: Cooperative study of common problems.

8. Wisconsin Valley Schoolmen's Association: Cooperative study and action on common problems.

9. University of Wisconsin Extension Center, Wausau: Liberal arts and preprofessional education for the valley.

10. Wisconsin Valley athletic leagues.

These organizations were selected to illustrate the wide variety of regional development activities already under way. They point to the fact that there is now a strong recognized need for regional cooperation. We are thinking about enlarging this effort so that all of the resources of the valley can be brought to bear on specific regional goals that are agreed upon by everyone. This plan has worked effectively in other areas of the United States; it can work well in the valley if the people are ready to make the effort.

A REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE UPPER WISCONSIN RIVER VALLEY

COUNTY-LEVEL PLANNING MEETING

8–8:10: What is our job? Statement of objectives.

8:10–8:20: Regional development possibilities. What organizations are already active on the regional basis? How far have we come already?

8:20–8:40: Basic regional problems in the upper Wisconsin River Valley. Informative talk built around colored-slide series. This is just to start the thinking on a regional basis.

8:40–9: What are our regional needs? Panel discussion by representative group from the county. Can we handle the problems suggested in the preceding section better through a regional organization or through our own community? What are some of the other basic regional needs not listed earlier?

9–9:10: Intermission.

9:10–9:30: What should be the specific goals of a regional development organization? The proposals made at this meeting will be pooled with those made at seven other county meetings in the valley; next month at the regional workshop they will become a part of the program of the regional development organization. Discussion led by Bureau of Community Development staff.

9:30–9:50: What should be the form of a regional development organization? The results of this session will be used at the regional workshop next month at which time it is expected that a permanent organization will be formed. Discussion led by Bureau of Community Development staff.

9:50–10: Summary.

Tentative schedule of county meetings

Date	County served	Meeting location
Sept. 12, 1950	Oneida	Rhinelander.
Sept. 13, 1950	Portage	Stevens Point.
Sept. 14, 1950	Lincoln	Merrill.
Sept. 15, 1950	Taylor	Medford.
Sept. 18, 1950	Wood	Wisconsin Rapids.
Sept. 19, 1950	Langlade	Antigo.
Sept. 20, 1950	Marathon	Wausau.
Sept. 21, 1950	Vilas-Forest	Eagle River.

TEMPORARY COMMITTEE, UPPER WISCONSIN RIVER VALLEY REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

H. C. Ahrnsbrak (chairman), University of Wisconsin Extension Center, Wausau, Wis.

W. C. Hansen, Central State Teachers College, Stevens Point, Wis.

Alvin Koerner, Resort-Tourist Industry, Manitowish Waters, Wis.

M. W. Kyler (vice chairman), Wisconsin Valley Improvement Co., Wausau, Wis.

Joyce Larkin, newspaper, Eagle River, Wis.

Raymond Blakeslee, City Planning Commission, Medford, Wis.

M. H. Montross, (Earl Prain, alternate), Wisconsin Public Service Corp., Wausau, Wis.

O. E. Olsen, School for Vocational and Adult Education, Antigo, Wis.

Walter Schmirler, CIO, Wausau, Wis.

Ray Sorenson, Recreation Department, City Hall, Rhinelander, Wis.

H. C. Stanton, North Central Labor Body, A. F. of L., Wausau, Wis.

M. N. Taylor (secretary), Trees for Tomorrow, Inc., Merrill, Wis.

W. A. Uthmeier, Association of Wisconsin Valley Mayors and Chamber of Commerce Managers, Marshfield, Wis.

Ken Wedin, Agricultural Agent, Lincoln County Court House, Merrill, Wis.

A. W. Zellmer, Wood County Normal School, Wisconsin Rapids, Wis.

(NOTE.—Ten people were elected at Merrill. The chairman was authorized to appoint additional people, to create, so far as possible, a representative committee.)

A Discharged Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Harry F. Davis, of Newberry, S. C.:

A DISCHARGED SOLDIER

Friends, I'm a discharged soldier
Back from across the seas,
I have a story to tell you
If you'll listen to me.
You see me maimed and crippled,
I got it all over there.
After you have heard my story
I'll ask if fate dealt me fair.

Before the war of '40 I was happy,
Living a quiet but simple life,
Blessed with a good job and home,
Two blue-eyed babes and wife.
Health was another treasure
We held in our small store.
Sickness and death seemed far away,
A stranger we did not know.

We were living in a small village,
Wife, babies and me,
Never thinking of parting,
Happy as happy could be.
Then came the call to arms,
I wanted to volunteer,
But it was so hard to leave my home
And the ones I loved so dear.

Yes, I was in the trenches,
I've been covered with muck and mud,
Frozen by the drenching rain,
Spattered with human blood.
I have hiked in the rain all day;
Night found me tired and spent,
No place but a shell hole to sleep in,
Not even a blanket or tent.

Yes, I was in three battles,
Their blazing, raging hells,
Singing and whining bullets,
And horrible bursting shells.
The shrieks of the mortally wounded
And cries of the thousands of dying men,
The crash of steel on helmets
Was awfully mixed in the din.

At last I came over seas
And was bound for my home town,
Expecting to meet my loved ones,
But what a change I found!
No one was there to meet me—
The house stood silent, alone.
There doors were all wide open,
The inmates, they were gone.

I asked the gray old parson,
He pointed beyond the blue hill
Where stood the tall church steeple—
Oh, God! My heart stood still.
Slowly I went to the churchyard
And found three mounds side by side,
Two the graves of my babies,
The other Ruth, my bride.

Friends, that's the wages of war—
Death and a broken heart.

—*Harry F. Davis.*

California Faces the Facts of Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in civilian and industrial defense, California again shows the way to the Nation under the able leadership of Gov. Earl Warren.

The problems of defense for the State of California with its vulnerability to coastal attack and for its great cities with their magnificent industrial potential are formidable. But the people of California under the guidance of capable public officials, both State and local, have faced their problems and taken positive action to build adequate defense.

Not only has California established a Defense Security Corps which serves as a standby organization to serve at home in place of the National Guard, but State-wide moves have been made by California's local governments to help the Federal Bureau of Investigation uncover Communists. Chief among these was the recent ordinance adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors requiring registration of Communists and Communist sympathizers and providing heavy penalties for violation of this law.

There is no sign of complacency in California, and the following article by Kimmis Hendrick, of the Christian Science Monitor, emphasizes the example California has set for the Nation during the present international crisis.

STATE OF THE NATION—CALIFORNIA FACES THE FACTS

(By Kimmis Hendrick)

LOS ANGELES.—It is encouraging to be able to report that California is considerably prepared in the field of civilian and industrial defense. It is even more encouraging to be able to report an evident determination to avoid complacency.

No Californian enjoys the vulnerability to attack of his State's coastal position. This vulnerability is accented by the vital role of

the great shipping, oil production, and aircraft manufacture facilities. But no Californian—or anyone anywhere who is concerned for Californians—need overlook certain facts of strength.

One is that the State has retained most of its war powers. And for 5 years it has maintained a State Disaster Council, safeguarding the civil defense know-how acquired in World War II.

Last year the legislature established a California Defense and Security Corps. This gives the State a standby organization to serve at home in place of the National Guard.

Governor Earl Warren has just called a special session of the legislature for September 20 to consider urgent problems relating to the State's school construction program, civilian defense measures, and social service legislation. Of the second, the Governor says that he considers the danger of sabotage one of the greatest confronting California, and he will ask the legislature to strengthen California's Sabotage Prevention Act.

He believes this needs to be done because the present law covers any period when the Nation is at war. A technical dispute over the country's status, say as of now, might keep the law from being applied.

There are other examples of forethought. The State has moved quickly to facilitate cooperative civil defense liaison among the cities and counties; also cooperation between California and other States. These are, as the governor stresses, nonhysterical efforts.

Los Angeles has a number of assets as the West's biggest city. One is its spread-outness. To bomb Los Angeles' 450 square miles effectively would be a big assignment for any enemy. Here is a city with more than 20 major shopping centers. Its city limit signs are so far removed from city hall that jocular visitors to Alaska, Hawaii, and the South Pole like to report they have seen them there.

Of great value is the fact pointed up by Samuel B. Morris, general manager of the city's department of water and power, in a communication to Mayor Fletcher Bowron, that Los Angeles has adequate water and electric power supplies. It also has the substantial reserve of skilled and unskilled manpower essential to industrial vitality.

Los Angeles Harbor has been called one of the best protected in the country.

In State-wide moves to help the Federal Bureau of Investigation uncover Communists, and in such laws as those passed by Los Angeles County to keep Communists out of civil defense, there is no sign of complacency.

At the same time, it seems as though Californians are becoming more balanced in their appraisal of communism than they were before Korea illuminated the issue. There seems to be less thoughtless confusing of American liberalism with Moscow-spread communism.

Whether California has yet the biggest of all defenses—a conviction of the spiritual roots, power, and universal promise of democracy as America conceives it—nobody can say. Only the apathetic liberal or the dogged isolationist would want to be dogmatic at this juncture. It seems plain here that all Americans will have to do much more than they have already done to offer mankind the alternate of real freedom for Russia's cynical and desperate substitute.

Governor Warren puts this big challenge in these words: "In all the travail of the moment we dare not take our eyes from the horizon upon which we have set our sights. Force of arms may be necessary—even increasingly so—to defend democracy from its enemies in the Kremlin and elsewhere.

"But the force of arms will never be the means of spreading the blessings of democracy to the peoples of the world who have never known them. This must be done through the slow and unspectacular process of making democracy work right in our own home towns, our State, our Nation, and any place else where it still has a chance to breathe."

News of the War Hasn't Yet Reached Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "News of the War Hasn't Yet Reached Washington," published in the Riverside (Calif.) Press-Enterprise September 8, 1950. This reflects a wide area of public opinion, as evidenced by the comments of many Members who were in their home districts for the brief recess last week. I concur in the opinions expressed by the writer of the editorial.

NEWS OF THE WAR HASN'T YET REACHED WASHINGTON

Washington has lagged behind the rest of the country in accepting the seriousness of our situation. And there's no better example of this than the so-called war-tax bill which is working its way out of Congress. It falls short of being a half-way measure.

Our Canadian neighbors, whom we don't watch closely enough, are intent on working out a tax program which will wholly meet the cost of their war effort. They're making an effort which is proportionally as expensive as ours; and they're going to pay the bill. As a consequence, they won't have too many worries about inflation, and they can probably forget about price and wage controls.

But look at our war tax. The $4,500,000,000 it will raise won't pay a third of our added costs. It doesn't have any bite. It increases individual withholdings an average of 3 percent, not enough to change any personal habits. And a continuance of normal buying habits puts us on the road to inflation, wage and price controls, ration books, and a soaring national debt.

We need a tax bill that hurts, a bill that forces us to do without things that we want. That's the only way to meet the cost of a war. And the country, whether or not Washington realizes it, is ready and willing to pay the cost.

The Washington attitude has been clearly indicated in the failure of the administration and Congress to take any steps to trim peacetime expenses. The Korean explosion should have led to a complete review of the Nation's nonmilitary budget, a trimming of nonessentials and a deferring of new projects. Some few Congressmen have urged this; but the prevailing sentiment has been for government as usual. If there's to be any belt tightening, it's not to be in Washington.

The domestic spending of the Federal Government (leaving out all expenses relating to past, present, or future wars) has increased more than 100 percent from the 1948 to the 1951 budgets.

Certainly in January, after Congress has had a chance to absorb the sentiments of the people back home, we can expect our Government to be put on a wartime basis. We can expect a real tax bill and some trimming of nonmilitary spending.

Or, we hope we can.

Borrowed Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article from the New York Journal-American, Friday, September 8, 1950:

BORROWED SHIPS

The American Government, under the pressure of the Korean emergency, has been compelled to borrow foreign ships in order to get vital military supplies to our hard-pressed fighting forces.

Ironically, with the single exception of 1 vessel, all of the first 13 ships of foreign registry chartered for this purpose were built in American shipyards and had been either loaned or given to foreign operators.

This desperate and humiliating measure graphically illustrates the shocking decline and virtual disintegration of the American merchant marine and associated maritime industries since the Pacific war.

The United States emerged from that conflict just 5 years ago as the greatest maritime power in history.

But in those 5 years there has been an almost total cessation of ship construction in the United States.

During the same period, hundreds of American ships have been given outright to other countries or loaned to them with neither promise nor expectation of repayment.

Other hundreds of America's once-powerful fleet of merchant ships have been left idle in the so-called moth-ball fleets in our coastal backwaters, the virtual graveyards of American maritime hopes and opportunities.

Consequently, now that we are suddenly involved in an unexpected and unprovoked war, we have a depleted and obsolete maritime establishment, entirely inadequate for our own critical needs.

But this is only part of the whole appalling story of American neglect and incompetence in the vital matter of maritime policy.

We have not only let our shipyards fall into disuse and decay, while giving away or mothballing most of the ships we built at such great cost during the last war, but we have made it almost impossible for American shipping operations to be conducted successfully or profitably with the few vessels remaining to them.

Unbelievable as it may seem, with the Korean war many weeks old, we are not deviating from that disastrous policy.

At this very moment, with thousands of Americans already dead and maimed in Korea, there is actually a proposed bill in Congress to make the devastation of the American merchant marine complete.

This bill would permit foreign ships to engage in American coastwise and intercoastal trade.

It would eliminate all subsidies to American shipping, thus delivering all world commerce into the hands of cheap labor and even slave-labor foreign operators.

It would repeal the existing law requiring the shipment of at least half of all Marshall plan goods in American ships.

Finally, it would still further deplete our diminishing and vanishing American maritime resources by pledging the immediate gift of 100 more tankers and cargo vessels to our foreign competitors.

This legislation, which remains actively before Congress despite the war in Korea, has been deliberately proposed by agencies of the American Government, although it would greatly and gravely weaken America militarily and economically in a manner that our worst enemies must view with some amazement.

Strong Republican Party Called Essential Need in War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Mark Sullivan which appears in today's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this article is very timely, coming as it does before this fall's election. As Mr. Gabrielson has said, "The Republicans will support the war effort to the hilt, but policies and actions preceding the war will be reviewed completely." The Republicans have every right to insist on having the facts brought before the American people, and the Democratic administration will have to defend their position. My prediction is that the people are going to demand a change, as they want to know "where they are going."

MARK SULLIVAN SAYS OPPOSITION IN CONGRESS COULD TAKE SOME RESPONSIBILITY FROM TRUMAN

(By Mark Sullivan)

After Chamberlain had appeased Hitler at Munich, after he had assured the British people that this meant "peace in our time," after the assurance had turned out to be wrong and appeasement had brought war, after Chamberlain had been dropped from power and Winston Churchill substituted—after that, Churchill, now having responsibility and seeking to get unity of his people, said, in effect, "If we quarrel about the past, we shall lose the future."

The United States today would be greatly served if that could be duplicated here—if there were someone in a position to make Churchill's plea for national unity. But while we have the same need that Churchill had, our situation is otherwise reversed.

Churchill could ask his people to ignore the past and look to the future, because the government system of Britain makes it possible to separate the past from the future. Britain does not have national elections at stated intervals, like our biennial and quadrennial ones. In the British usage, if the party or leader in power has made mistakes or otherwise incurred disapproval, and if this is made apparent by a vote in the House of Commons, a general election is held throughout the country. Thus a party in power is retired and a new government takes over with a clean slate. (Sometimes change of leadership is brought about within the party in power. This was the case of Chamberlain and Churchill. Or change may be brought by a coalition of parties within the House of Commons.)

PAST AND FUTURE UNITED

With us today, the past and the future are united in the Truman administration. It has been in power for more than 5 years, and has been responsible for the country's policies and actions during the development of the condition that now exists. That there have been serious mistakes in the administration's course goes without saying. But under our system Mr. Truman will remain in power for more than 2 years, until January 1953; his administration will have the power to decide and carry out whatever is done about the condition in the creating of which the administration itself had a part.

By analogy to Britain, it is as if Chamberlain, after making the mistake of appeasing Hitler, had continued in power during the period when Britain had to deal with the consequences of that mistake. It is not likely that if Chamberlain had continued in power Britain could have had the confidence and spirit it acquired by the substitution of Churchill.

Without doubt the Truman administration would be glad to have the benefit of Churchill's aphorism, would like to have the country ignore the past. In effect this is said by spokesmen of the President's party, or the portion of it that upholds him. In the congressional campaign now under way, criticism of the administration by Republicans is denounced as impeding our war effort. The implications of this attitude would go far. Because Mr. Truman was in office when war broke out, he would be given a broad sanctity, and immunity from criticism not only about policies and actions that had a part in the coming of war, but immunity from criticism about the conduct of the war.

The position of the Republicans in the congressional campaign has been made explicit and authoritative. It is set down plainly in a formal statement by the Republican Members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and further set down in a parallel statement by Republican National Chairman Gabrielson. The Republicans make a clear separation of the past from the present and future. As put by Mr. Gabrielson, the Republicans will support the war effort "to the hilt," but policies and actions preceding the war will be "reviewed completely."

REPUBLICAN POSITION CLEAR

To the same effect of clear separation between the past and the future, the statement of the Republican Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is equally explicit and includes a solemn promise: "On the basis of honest recognition of past errors and courageous resolve for the future, we wholeheartedly pledge our unpartisan cooperation to final victory."

That pledge on behalf of the opposition party is assurance to the country and ought to be welcome to President Truman. For a large part of the tragedy that both Mr. Truman and the country face is inherent in the President's position. The future steps he can take in the conduct of the war and of foreign relations are in some cases determined or limited by commitments implied in past steps the administration has taken, some of them mistakes. He would be to some degree released from his imprisonment to the past by the existence of a strong Republican Party in Congress cooperating with him. This would take responsibility for steps which need to be taken but which Mr. Truman, if he had sole or predominant responsibility, would find difficult or embarrassing to take.

The Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New Era, A. F. of L. weekly newspaper, published in Reading, Pa.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

One of the greatest censorship jobs ever put over on the American public by the daily press has just been completed.

Except for a few outstanding examples, this indictment takes in every reputable daily newspaper in the United States. It is their self-imposed indictment. It is their own product, the result of preconceived planning to ignore or hide as best as possible the House of Representatives' investigation of Fascist lobbying in the United States, lobbying done with the aid and support of the Nation's biggest and best-heeled corporations.

We do not blame the 100 or more Republicans in the House of Representatives for defending men like Dr. Ed Rumely, executive secretary of the pro-Fascist Committee for Constitutional Government, or Joe Kamp, head of the Constitutional Educational League, or Mervin K. Hart, one of the most vicious anti-Semites living in America today. Dr. Rumely is a former convict, having been found guilty by a jury for dealing with the German enemy during World War I. Joe Kamp is in jail today, guilty of contempt of Congress.

We say we do not blame the Republicans in the House for defending these men because Dr. Rumely and Joe Kamp disseminate the vicious, antilabor, antisocial security, anti-Fair Deal, anti-minimum-wage law propaganda which is part and parcel of the Republican philosophy.

We do blame the daily press, however, for playing the Republican game and refusing to tell the public about the many Dr. Rumelys and the many Joe Kamps who are a great threat to America today. The Commies are vicious enough, but they can easily be detected by checking their ideas against the current Commie line from Moscow.

The native Fascists like Joe Kamp and Dr. Rumely, however, hide behind the American flag. They say they are defending the Constitution, yet they try to make fools out of Members of the House of Representatives who are investigating lobbies. They figuratively spit in the face of Congress by refusing to answer questions and by refusing to produce records showing where their tainted money comes from.

The House has cited Joe Kamp and Dr. Rumely for contempt. This is as it should be. The sad commentary, however, is that so many Republicans defended these Fascist traitors to democracy. And equally tragic was the virtual blanket of censorship which the daily press imposed on this important action.

Some time ago 54 alleged Commies and Commie sympathizers rapidly were cited for contempt by the House with only one Member arguing that this was a violation of their civil rights. The House then acted on the theory that no individual is bigger than the Congress of the United States. The press gave big headlines.

The same issue was at stake in the Rumely and Kamp proceedings. Only this time Rumely and Kamp found many friends who defended them for doing exactly what the Communists did. The Republicans cooked up all kinds of excuses to save their Fascist friends.

The reason must be obvious: The reactionary Republicans in the House of Representatives who defended Rumely and Kamp get their campaign funds, their spending money, from the same corporations and big-money interests as do Rumely and Kamp. Ironically, the Republicans also voted against contempt citation for William Patterson of the Red civil right congress, simply to be consistent with their stand on Rumely and Kamp.

We feel that this lobby investigation must be continued until the real voices behind the Republican puppets are brought to light. Names of the big contributors to Committee for Constitutional Government and Constitutional Education League must be made public.

Another Benton Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 13 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Washington columnist Marquis Childs has written an article about the good, solid work which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] has been doing on behalf of small, independent businessmen in his State of Connecticut. Mr. Childs' article appeared in the Washington Post of September 12, 1950.

I call attention to the article because it was my pleasure to attend the first pilot model clinic started at Bridgeport in my capacity as chairman of the Senate's Select Committee on Small Business, a committee I might add in which the Senator from Connecticut played an outstanding part in the formulation of policies to help small, independent businessmen not only in his home State of Connecticut but indeed throughout the Nation.

The Senator started the first clinic at Bridgeport, Conn., as the outgrowth of an idea we both advanced during a hearing. The response was so enthusiastic that the idea spread throughout the Nation with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle endorsing the project wholeheartedly. The Senator from Connecticut has provided admirable leadership in this area of business, based on his understanding of the problems confronting business and industry, and, in large part, I believe that much of his drive and sincerity here stem from his work with the Committee on Economic Development, a nonprofit organization which during the war numbered 70,000 businessmen in thousands of communities throughout the United States. He was the original vice chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, as ECA Director Paul Hoffman was the original chairman.

This piece by Childs gives the Senator from Connecticut the credit he deserves, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLINICS FOR PROCUREMENT
(By Marquis Childs)
ANOTHER BENTON PLAN

With Congress racing to get out of Washington, a great many minds are fixed on one thing—the harsh necessity of getting reelected. But clearing the first hurdle, which is to get back home, may prove to be the easiest step of all.

In this strange season of half-war and half-peace (if that's what it is called) the ordinary campaign appeals are likely to have little weight. The word comes back that the voter is distracted and depressed. He's not thinking much about elections and when he does it's with a feeling that maybe the "outs" wouldn't be any worse than the "ins."

The best way to campaign is not to seem to campaign—the nonpolitical approach. That may be one reason why an innovation introduced by a newcomer to politics, Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, has caught on so quickly.

This is the small-business clinic.

BENTON, who has made several fortunes in the course of an extremely active career, was one of the founders and moving spirits of the Committee for Economic Development, the organization of forward-looking business executives who have exerted an influence on the economy far out of proportion to their numbers.

In the Senate as a member of the Small Business Committee, BENTON has continued this interest. There are many small manufacturers in Connecticut and their letters made BENTON aware of the difficulties small business has in dealing with the Federal Government. Big business can afford the overhead of a Washington representative who can hunt his way through the labyrinth of big Government. But this is beyond small business.

BENTON initiated the first small-business clinic at the manufacturing center of Bridgeport. Key officials from various Government departments were present. Each official came prepared to spell out what the small manufacturer should do to get contracts under the swiftly expanding program of defense production.

Many of the industrialists accepted the invitation in a skeptical frame of mind. They expected to get what they often refer to scornfully as "the Washington runaround." They were agreeably surprised by the brass-tacks talks they heard. Senator BENTON had made it clear at the outset that he wanted no political question since the goal was a practical one to aid the small manufacturer.

Later the clinics were set up for New Haven and Hartford, sponsored by the chambers of commerce in those cities. In his letter of invitation, BENTON said:

"The Korean situation stresses the critical nature of the problem in terms of procurement, industrial mobilization, and dispersal of contract awards. This problem was not foreseen in the planning stage of the pilot clinic at Bridgeport, and I shall devote more time to it. Frankly, this clinic stems from the enthusiastic response to the Bridgeport affair."

At the later clinics officials of the Departments of Defense, Commerce, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the General Services Administration gave even more detailed information on how and where smaller business firms could bid for Government business. The only politics, and this was not directly related to office seeking, was BENTON'S preliminary talk stressing his conviction of the need for real competition in the private enterprise system and of his desire to help small business provide that competition.

Both Republicans and Democrats have now taken up the small-business clinic idea. They have been held or are scheduled for cities literally from Maine to California. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH sponsored a clinic in Augusta, Maine, and Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND in San Francisco. Both are Republicans.

Told of the spread of these clinics, a veteran politician expressed the skepticism of his trade, doubting that they would get the sponsors any votes in November. If they do not mean actual votes in the ballot box, they certainly mean good will. And they may also mean more defense production and a healthier economy less likely to be dominated by monopoly, which is good for the country regardless of party.

Collin County, Tex., Welcomes Speaker Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day, Monday, September 4, 1950, the McKinney Daily Courier-Gazette, published in McKinney, Tex., carried a front-page editorial addressed to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Under the title "The Editor Speaks," the editor-in-chief, L. L. (Pete) Perkins, Sr., welcomed Speaker RAYBURN to Collin County and paid our colleague and leader one of the highest tributes possible. The editorial was inspired by the visit of Speaker RAYBURN to Collin County to attend the first anniversary of the establishment of a model soil conservation farm at Princeton, nearby.

We know—

The editor wrote—

that you are glad to be back among the folks that for the past many years have loved and respected you, not for just the things you have done for your district, but for what you have done for America and the world.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE EDITOR SPEAKS

Mr. Speaker, to say "Welcome to Collin County" would be putting it very mildly in our way of thinking. We know that you are glad to be back among the folks that for the past many years have loved and respected you, not for just the things that you have done for your district, but for what you have done for America and the world. Throughout your life you have rubbed shoulders with the biggest and the mightiest, but you have never forgotten the folks back home in your thoughts.

These editors have seen times when things looked awfully blue and then you would step in and through sincere efforts, thoughts and constructive work, would help us. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have learned to lean on you very

much, we seem to think that you can do the impossible, and the truth about it, you have many times.

Mr. Speaker, in your district you might not get every vote, but it would be our guess that you have the respect of every citizen. People recognize leadership, ability and sincere efforts, and if we might do a little Texas bragging, Mr. Speaker, we would say that not in the history of this glorious country has there ever been a man that has or will equal your worth-while accomplishments.

Every American knows that this is a troubled world and we know that we have true American leadership in you. It is with real sincerity that we pray that you may be able to give many more years of service to these United States and the world.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, welcome to Collin County.

Comparison of Voting Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the September 1 issue of the Wisconsin CIO News an effort is made to discredit the voting record of certain Republican Members of this House from Wisconsin by comparing their votes on a few selected roll calls with the vote cast by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. The direct inference is drawn that the votes of the gentleman from New York represents the Communist Party line position. It is not my purpose to argue the question of whether or not the inference is justified.

It is my purpose, however, to keep the record straight. I, therefore, call your attention to the following open letter that I have addressed to Mr. Robert Treuer, editor of the Wisconsin CIO News:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 9, 1950.

AN OPEN LETTER

Mr. ROBERT TREUER,
Editor, Wisconsin CIO News,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. TREUER: The lead story in the September 1 issue of the Wisconsin CIO News proposes that Congressmen's records be judged by comparing them with the voting record of Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, of New York, who, according to the story, "has followed the [Communist] Party line devoutly."

Your noble purpose is to show "how palsy-walsy Republican and Communist ideologies become when it comes to voting time," and the story is illustrated by a cartoon showing the GOP and a Commie preparing to share the same bed.

This Marcantonio comparison interests me, particularly since one of my hobbies is collecting voting guides issued by various pressure groups. In that collection, my most prized possession is a series of official CIO voting guides for the years 1947 to 1950, inclusive. These "guides" tell whether a Congressman voted right or wrong, in the opinion of the CIO, on every issue considered significant by the CIO during each session.

In view of your new standard, I was somewhat surprised this morning, in thumbing through my collection, to note that Party Liner MARCANTONIO has voted right 47 times out of a total of 52 key issues covered by the last four CIO voting guides.

Your sports editor will tell you that this is a batting average of .903 both for the CIO in the Marcantonio League and for MARCANTONIO in the CIO League—more than enough for the first team and winning for you the privilege of bedding down with him on all road trips. With a signal lack of regret, I concede that my batting average of .019 (1 out of 52) in the CIO League and .076 (4 out of 52) in the Marcantonio League disqualifies me from playing ball with either you or the Reds.

Yours for foolproof voting guides,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Representative in Congress,
Eighth District, Wisconsin.

The Golden Jackass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by Vivien Kellems:

THE GOLDEN JACKASS
(By Vivien Kellems)

"And when the people saw that Moses delayed to come down out of the Mount, the people gathered themselves together unto Aaron, and said unto him, 'Up, make us gods which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.' And Aaron said unto them, 'Break off the golden earrings, which are in the ears of your wives, of your sons, and of your daughters, and bring them unto me.' And the people brake off the golden earrings which were in their ears and brought them unto Aaron. And he received them at their hand and fashioned it with a graving tool, after he had made it a golden calf; and they said, 'These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.' And when Aaron saw it, he built an altar before it; and Aaron made proclamation and said, 'Tomorrow is a feast to the Lord.' And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt offerings, and brought peace offerings; and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play."

For 150 years, ours was a Christian Nation. It was founded by brave, God-fearing men and women who left the eternal wars and oppression of Europe and came to a new land where they might find peace and freedom; freedom to live and work as they pleased, freedom to worship God as they chose. All kinds of people came, all nationalities, all religions. There was room for everybody. But every person who came to these shores had one compelling motive—the determination to be free. No hardship was too severe; no danger too great, they were willing to risk life itself to make this dream of freedom come true.

By bitter experience these people knew that freedom for a nation is possible only where the individual is free, where every man is as good as every other man, with equal opportunity for all. They knew they had to work for that freedom; it could not be superimposed in the form of a dictatorship, no one was going to bestow billions of dollars upon them, or fight a world-wide war to give it them. They, themselves, had to establish it and put safeguards around it for their children. And they did an amazing thing. They declared in writing, on a piece of paper, that all rights and liberties reside in the people. They repudiated the divine right of kings. People, just because they are human beings, own all rights, and governments exist only by the consent of the governed. This was a new, a revolutionary idea and upon it, in the short space of 150 years, this little band of immigrants and their children built the richest, most powerful nation in the world. They secured and maintained for the majority of the people a standard of living undreamed of before, the hope and envy of the whole world.

And then something happened. We had a depression! It was not the first depression in our history, nor will it be the last. But it was a good one. We saw thousands of people standing in breadlines, we saw veterans selling apples on street corners, millions of men were out of work, little children were cold and hungry. And we were terrified! We rushed pell-mell to Washington and we said unto Aaron, "Up, make us gods that shall go before us for we are deep in depression and we wot not what will become of us." And Aaron smiled, reassuringly and with great charm, and said, "Fear not. The only thing we have to fear is fear itself. Break off the gold pieces which are in your safety deposit boxes and in the coffers of your wives, and of your sons, and of your daughters, and bring them unto me." And we took the first train back home and brake off from ourselves every gold piece we owned and we delivered them unto Aaron.

And Aaron received the gold at our hand and fashioned it with a graving tool after he had made it a golden—calf? No, not a calf. We would never be satisfied with a pusillanimous, spindle-legged little calf. We needed a noble animal, a proud, arrogant one, a god we could worship and to which we could offer burnt offerings. There was but one animal for this job. Up to this time we had always had a two-party system in our country and whenever the elephant began to feel his oats and throw his weight around, as he did ever so often, we'd toss him out and install the donkey. What more natural that in our extremity we should again turn to this familiar friend who had served us before? But this was to be no ordinary donkey. We were in dire straits, this one was of solid gold—our gold, all of it—a golden jackass, the perfect symbol of what we were about to do. And we said, "This be thy god, Oh America, which shall bring thee up out of the land of depression."

And when Aaron saw the golden jackass, he built an altar before it. And Aaron made proclamation and said, "Tomorrow is a feast to the Lord." And we rose up early on the morrow and offered burnt offerings.

First, we offered our gold certificates. They weren't any good anyway, we couldn't redeem them in gold. We were off the gold standard. And make no mistake about it. When we surrendered our gold we surrendered our power, because ownership of gold is power. Every indignity that has been heaped upon us during the last 17 years, every liberty stolen behind our backs, has been made possible by the debauching of our currency, by the forsaking of our gold standard.

And our next burnt offering was the good, old American dollar itself. We decided to devalue what little value was left by raising the price of gold. And what a smart burnt offering that was. We made $2,000,000,000 for Aaron right out of thin air. One minute the price of gold was $20.60 per ounce, and the very next minute it was $35 and all we had to do was multiply the ounces of gold in the Treasury by 35 instead of 20.60 and there it was—$2,000,000,000 more for the golden jackass, a nice reward for perpetuating the most gigantic swindle in history.

Signs and portents indicate that we may be contemplating another slight singeing of the American taxpayer. We're quite smug about our horde of gold buried in the ground, but did any of you read in the newspapers recently that we had shipped 10 tons of gold to Italy? I wonder what for. And did we give Italy the gold, or did Italy go through the motions of paying for it with money we had already slipped her? If she did pay us the legal price of $35 an ounce, she could turn right around and sell it on the world market for $42 an ounce. And what other nations have been bleeding gold out of the Treasury while American citizens are forbidden to own gold? Wouldn't it be a good idea to send a few adding machines down to Fort Knox and do a little counting? How much gold is there in the ground down there? And how much isn't? And what isn't, where is it?

But having sacrificed these burnt offerings to the golden jackass, we sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play.

We began with a new philosophy. We reversed the precepts and teachings of 150 years, all those old bromides about hard work, and frugality, and integrity, and self-reliance—all that piffle. This was a new era, a new deal for everybody, the feast of the forgotten man. We didn't have to worry any more. The Government owed us a living.

It was wonderful. There was something for everyone. The money was inexhaustible, we had billions of dollars and the checks flowed from Washington in every direction. First there was relief. And it was so simple. All you had to do was to apply. And then there was CPA and PWA and WPA. No more breadlines, no more worry. We had such fascinating things to do. Boondoggling all over the place. Down in Florida we built shower baths for the dogs. Over in the Washington Zoo Mr. Ickes built a mountain for the mountain goats. The poor goats. There they were on flat ground. It was a shame and the goats so unhappy. So Harold built a beautiful mountain and would you believe it, those ungrateful goats refused to go up the mountain.

The money flowed faster and faster, an endless stream—anything and everything was provided. Labor got the Wagner Act. The farmers got the AAA (nice, but not to compare with the Brannan plan). They needed seeds. They got seeds, and then got paid not to plant them, or to plough them under aftr thy had sprouted. We just had the most marvelous ideas.

Of course, a few old fogies became a little nervous and ventured to sound a warning but we promptly put them in their place. "Why, you copperheads, you. Don't you know this is a new deal? We're spending our way out of the depression. What difference does it make how much we spend? We owe it to ourselves, don't we? These be our gods, oh, America, that shall bring us up out of the land of depression.

And finally, even we economic royalists got our dish. We got the NRA. And we loved it. We sat down to eat and to drink. Now this was something like it. For the first time in our history, price fixing was made not only legal but mandatory by the Federal Government. This was just what we were waiting for. We took one triumphant look at that underhanded, double-crossing competitor who had been cutting prices on us, and we tore off to Washington on the first plane. We'd fix him. We'd make a code. And we did. Codes, codes everywhere and for everybody. We all had a code. We set prices where they ought to be and we defied that lousy competitor to cut them. Right into the hoosegow if he did! Remember the man who charged 5 cents too little for pressing a pair of pants? He got his and so did anybody else who violated that sacred code. This was our god which would bring us up out of the land of depression.

And then there was a sick chicken. It was in a coop. And a rabbi, fearful for the health of his people, refused to take the sick chicken even though the code said he had to. "Straight killing" the code called it. And the whole thing went to the Supreme Court. And in those days we still had a Supreme Court and it very rightly threw the whole NRA right out the window. It said price fixing was unconstitutional and impossible in our free competitive system. Maybe it's all right in Germany or in Russia but not in the United States of America. That golden god suffered a sudden demise.

And Aaron was very wroth. And he said, "Why, those nine, decrepit, senile, old men. Who do they think they are, refusing to offer up a little burnt offering to the golden jackass, the god which is bringing us up out of the land of depression. They belong in the horse-and-buggy days. I'll fix them. I'll make a new Supreme Court."

But strangely enough, while we clamored for new gods to go before us, deep in the heart of every loyal American was planted a respect and reverence for one god that even Aaron, with all of his charm, couldn't take away from us. In spite of all the glamor, and not having to work, and the forgotten man, and the social gains, and the worship of gold, we still had sense enough to realize that the Supreme Court stood above petty, partisan politics, our last bulwark of liberty and freedom. And so we said, "No." Aaron couldn't have his new Supreme Court, and he was annoyed.

But Aaron was always lucky. What he couldn't force from the American people, time gave him and you can take a look at it today—including Harry's notable contributions.

But we soon forget about the Supreme Court. We had bigger and better things to do. As we began to run a little short of projects here at home, someone had a brilliant idea—the good neighbor policy. There was all of Central and South America, with unlimited possibilities, right on our doorstep. The worship of the golden jackass could become hemispheric. And so we turned to the south. A vanguard of goodwill missions by glamorous movie stars was followed by slaughterhouses for San Salvador, fishing boats for Peru, a water filtration plant for Honduras. We taught the Paraguayans how to farm and sent tractors and farm machinery to them. We established a collectivist food production program in Haiti with all necessary tools, seeds, fruit trees and vegetable plants. We trained nurses in Nicaragua and conducted a pathological investigation in Guatemala. Too bad we didn't conduct one in Washington first! Like Mr. Ickes' goats, the South Americans were just a bit startled and bewildered by all this outpouring of solicitude and generosity, but nobody shoots Santa Claus and in a short space of time we were able to get rid of $6,000,000,000 in 6 years, and we still had 11,000,000 unemployed.

Then war broke out in Europe. And stunned America momentarily shocked into its senses. The War to End All Wars, The War to Make the World Safe for Democracy was still fresh in our memory. Many of us still nursed hidden grief for loved boys who had not come back from that war. We wanted none of it. Frantically we passed the Neutrality Act, quickly followed by lend-lease. We would gladly give anything and everything to keep war from our shores and our boys at home. But as lend-lease began to take hold, a great light burst upon us. Here was global opportunity for the golden jackass. And we economic royalists who had loved NRA fell for this one just as hard. Under the guise of shipping the tools of war to our friends, anything was possible.

We suddenly grasped the gigantic, world-wide possibilities of lend-lease which was only intensified by our entrance into the war. Fighting with our backs to the wall, the lives of our boys in danger all over the world, we still had time and money to bring boondoggling to a degree of perfection undreamed of before. Anything up to now was just practice for the real job that faced us.

It's never nice to say "I told you so" and believe me, I derive no satisfaction from what I'm about to say. This is a signed article by Leon Denner which appeared on the front page of the New York World Telegram on September 24, 1949. "Four Red atom units going full blast." It gives details as to the location of these atom factories. I can't pronounce the names of the towns but permit me to read this. "No. 3, near Zlatoust, south of Cheliabinsk. The Ural atomic laboratories here are served by high power lines drawn from the most powerful generators in the Urals' industrial network. Zlatoust is the site of the oldest arms manufacturing center in Russia, founded by Peter the Great. It is equipped with American machinery." As are all the other atom plants in Russia. Do you know when that machinery was shipped to Russia? Right in the middle of the war. MacArthur pleading for supplies in the South Pacific, and we changed over whole cable factories to make these high tension lines for Russia. Let MacArthur wait. What difference does it make if American boys are killed? Russia must be served and given everything she wants.

These cable specifications came into my hands in 1943 and I was so incensed I stood up before the Chicago Rotary Club and told it, giving the amounts and the uses of the cables. That speech was so hot the Chicago Tribune buried it on the financial page, and I was called everything from a Nazi spy to a tool of Goebbels' propaganda machine. Today those papers are a matter of public record and anyone can go to the Treasury Department and see them. And the directive which forced our manufacturers to hold up our own war materials and ship cables, and generators and machinery to Russia with which to make postwar atom bomb plants, came right out of the White House.

But we were eating and drinking. We had risen up to play. Faster and faster flowed the money, madder and madder became the dancing.

But through it all there were enough of us who fought, and worked, and died, that we finally won the war.

We were prepared for that eventuality, too. We had UNRRA all cooked up. UNRRA. To feed the starving and clothe the naked. We redoubled our efforts. Machine tools, whole factories and plants for making every conceivable object poured across the ocean to Russia. Our boys back from war couldn't find homes. Let them wait. Russia must be served first and we sent materials and factories for fabricating them to make thousands of homes. To Italy the same. We installed a tremendous public works program, conducted in the best WPA tradition with ex-WPAers at its head. We not only reconstructed the war damage in Italy but boondoggled all over the place—everything from teaching the children of Naples how to play baseball to repairing the leaks in the gondolas on the Grand Canal.

A gangster, Tito, murdered five of our boys in flames. That's all right, Tito, it's all good clean fun. Not a pause in UNRRA largess, we poured out tons of sugar (we were rationed at home), thousands of automobiles, and trucks, tractors, steel rails, freight cars, porcelain doorknobs and bubble gum.

Ex-Governor LEHMAN was at the head of this gravy train while it was running full

blast, but he had to resign because he got sick. I should think he would, probably sick at his stomach along with the rest of us. However, he wasn't too sick to get himself elected to the United States Senate. If Mr. Dulles had opened up to the people of New York the plain and fancy graft corruption in UNRRA which Mr. LEHMAN knew about and about which he did nothing, Mr. LEHMAN would not now be in the Senate, where he shouldn't be. He was backed 100 percent by the Communist vote in New York. Not that Mr. LEHMAN is a Communist. He isn't, but the Communists know that his policy will hasten the day they're waiting for. And Mr. Dulles' reward for his discreet silence is a fat job as adviser in the State Department.

As the odors of UNRRA began to penetrate our nostrils, the State Department hastily shifted operations. Now don't be misled by the squeamishness of our State Department over UNRRA. Mr. Acheson's boys in the striped pants (only instead of stripes on the pants they use lace on their panties) never leave one rotten egg until they've laid a riper one. They turned to the left and there was the Export-Import Bank, all ready. We must make loans to war devastated countries to rehabilitate their economies. Again the money was shoveled out—all the old favorites, Russia, Rumania, Yugoslavia and for good measure countries who hadn't had a cowshed destroyed, Denmark, Sweden, Ireland, Portugal and our dear old good neighbors in Central and South America. A steel mill to Chile—no coal or iron ore near but that's a minor matter, followed with a wonderful hydroelectric plant for the Indians in adobe huts, 300 miles south of Santiago. There's a 100 mile transmission line and the peak load on that line is 80 kilowatts. Those Indians can't afford to buy one light bulb but they can always go out and look at the line. Ditto for Peru and those Indians 150 miles from Lima. And don't think these crack-brained schemes are confined to South America. They're all over the world.

We can't afford to have our mail delivered more than once a day but at the very time this new cut in our standard of living is bestowed upon us, we graciously give Korea and Formosa $60,000,000, Indonesia a hundred million and our dear friend, Mr. Peron in Argentina a tiny one hundred and twenty-five million.

Didn't you hear about our old friend Tito? He's back again, large as life and twice as natural. First we bestowed a steel mill upon him quickly followed with a loan from the Export-Import Bank of $20,000,000. You thought that was all, didn't you? It was only the beginning. The World Bank followed through with another two million seven hundred thousand. And just recently we slipped him another twenty million. Tito's doing all right for himself, isn't he? I carefully followed the clever build-up given Tito to make all this traitorous gold palatable to the American people. First were nice pictures in the newspapers; Tito at his desk, Tito with his little son, Tito catching a fish. He caught a fish, all right. It's a big sucker, and we're it. All this was timed to appear just before a charming article in the Saturday Evening Post with a nice editorial saying it's all right, we'll let the dust settle in the Balkans. The dust will settle—after the explosion. The Balkans have always been the tinder box of Europe and if we think we can play the power politics in that area we're due for a rude awakening.

But the Export and Import Bank couldn't bankrupt us fast enough and banking is dull and prosaic. It isn't dramatic. The golden jackass became restive, and the people were bored. We needed a crusade, a slogan. Suddenly President Truman appeared before Congress and asked for $400,000 to fight communism and stop Russia in Greece and Turkey. And at the very moment he was high pressuring this money from Congress, Dean Acheson and those same lace-pantie boys in the State Department were demanding that we ship $17,000,000 worth of oil-refining machinery into Russia on lend-lease, $400,000 to fight communism and stop Russia, and $17,000,000 into Russia. And what were we doing shipping lend-lease into Russia 3 years after the war; no other countries were getting it?

But that isn't all. May I quote from the Newport News Daily Press, Newport News, Va., of April 24, 1947, right while Congress was debating a Greek-Turkish gift. "With one Russian vessel already loading UNRRA goods, another Soviet ship is due to come into Newport News within the next few days to take on a sizable consignment for Russia. The *Krasnodar* is taking on approximately 6,000 tons of cargo, most of it heavy machinery, including such items as concrete mixers and boilers. This ship is to transfer to Norfolk within the next day or two, according to present plans, to take on some bag cargo. Scheduled to arrive here shortly is the Russian vessel *Baku*, also to load machinery and other Russian goods."

And yet Congress voted those funds to fight communism and stop Russia. Is the pattern beginning to take form?

And from the modest little beginning of the Truman doctrine grew the Marshall plan. For the past 17 years the American people have been lied to, bamboozled, and cheated. But never has anything approached the amazing deception and sell-out of the Marshall plan. The blueprint was laid down for us in an editorial in the Eastern Economist, an English publication in New Delhi, India, on July 12, 1946. May I read this editorial to you, which, believe it or not, is called the World's Santa Claus.

The premise of the editor is that the United States can never balance its imports and exports because any imports to our country "might reduce employment within and create unemployment." He concludes as follows: "In such circumstances it would not be such a foolish thing (as some might imagine) to give away goods to other countries, for on balance it would be better to part with surplus goods than to create unemployment. What is essential is to devise a peacetime machinery on a semipermanent basis, of an orderly scheme of goods and equipment from America to the rest of the world. We suggest that from now onward a machinery should be set up by America whose purpose would be to provide gifts of loans to other countries. If President Roosevelt's famous Freedom from Want is not to be a pious wish and a slogan empty of content, it should be the duty of America to organize systematically the outflow of goods to the poorer countries. * * * If this is to play the world's Santa Clause, the United States of America is both rich enough and should have sense enough to fill the role."

And we fell for it. Two years ago when Congress was voting the Marshall plan funds for the year, England and Russia signed a bilateral trade agreement whereby Russia shipped to England food and timber in exchange for steel, machinery, tools, and other industrial equipment which was used to build up Soviet industry. And where do you think England got those tools, machinery, steel, and other industrial equipment? I'll give you three guesses. The exact commitments of the equipment shipped from us to Britain in the Marshall plan. Wouldn't it be simpler to just ship this material directly to Russia? And are you surprised that Russia has four tremendous atom bomb factories? How long will it be before those bombs are dropped on us and whose fault will it be?

But now it's no longer the Marshall plan. It's the ECA, not the good neighbor policy, not lend-lease, not UNRRA, not the Export and Import Bank, not the puny little Truman doctrine—it's ECA, soon to be superseded by point 4, to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world—a whole new idea, I don't think. But whatever they call it, a rose by any other name would smell as sweet—or as sour. It's still the same old thing, the worship of the golden jackass, but not now to bring us up out of the land of depression but the god who will keep us from going down into the land of depression.

But Aaron was a piker when he fashioned it with a graving tool. In his balmiest days he could only get rid of a puny 60,000,000,000 in 6 years. King Truman the First is handing it out at the rate of a billion a week and will keep it up until after the election in November—unless we collapse before then.

But with all our global worship of the golden jackass, we have not neglected the home front. Oh, my, no. Public housing, Federal aid to education, socialized medicine, increased social security (which is neither social nor secure) and of course, farm subsidies.

Two years ago we women of Connecticut were buying Canadian potatoes at three times what they were worth, while all those wonderful Maine potatoes were shipped to Richmond, Va., dumped into a trench, oil poured over them and burned. Today the Government has billions of eggs stored in a cave near Atcheson, Kans. It costs $25,000 a month to keep the eggs cool. It will cost more than that to keep the women of this country cool when they finally get onto what is being done to them. And while we're fighting communism all over the world, we're shipping millions of eggs from Red China and putting them in the cave, too. But this system enables us to pay twice, once to the farmer to make the price high, then again at the grocery store at the price our taxes have boosted it up to.

I suppose all of you get letters asking for contributions from time to time. I get my share and unfortunately I cannot contribute to all the causes that are deserving. But today I'm going to read one I got recently. It's not a form letter, it's written to me personally.

MOUNTAIN CHILD WELFARE MISSION, INC.,
Hazard, Ky.

Miss VIVIEN KELLEMS,
Kellems Cable Grip Co.,
Stonington, Conn.

DEAR MISS KELLEMS: There are thousands of underprivileged and undernourished children in the isolated and neglected mountain areas—children who can't go to school because they do not have clothing to wear—children who never know what it is to have a full and satisfying meal, a decent outfit of clothing or a pair of shoes—never a toy or storybook of any kind. Little joy comes into the life of these unfortunate children.

We would like to give you the opportunity of sharing with us in this needed work for these worthy and deserving mountain children—our own American children, and assure you that any help you can send will be put to a good use among these children in distressing need.

With kindest best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,
MARY SUE WHITE, R. N., *President.*

What folly is this? Potatoes burned, eggs stored in a cave and our own little children hungry.

But surely this spectacle is unique in history—a rich, powerful nation deliberately committing suicide by giving away everything its owns.

But the crowning achievement of the golden jackass was the monstrosity, the so-called bipartisan foreign policy. There is no such thing, a bipartisan foreign policy. Our foreign policy is based upon our domestic policy. The two are inseparably bound together, one and the same thing. You cannot approve one without endorsing the other. Now you do not have to take my

word for this. May I quote from no less an authority than Mr. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, in his speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 22: "I mean there is no longer any difference between foreign questions and domestic questions. They are part of the same question." Our domestic policy is to confiscate the wealth and property of the American people by increasingly heavy taxes. Our foreign policy is to take that wealth and squander it all over the world with a prodigal hand. Combined, the two are designed to accomplish one ultimate objective—to hand this country, lock, stock, and barrel over to Joe Stalin.

The golden jackass laughed when he persuaded the blind Republicans that we must present a united front to the world. Otherwise patriotic, intelligent Republicans fell for this clever scheme, conceived in the facile minds of the gangsters and Communists who hold positions of power in our Government. It successfully shut the mouths of the loyal opposition and tolled the death knell of the Republican Party.

Do you believe in giving a steel mill to Tito? Do you believe in opening our Treasury to this murderer and pouring out other gifts and loans? Do you believe in handing over our gold to Italy? Do you believe in dismantling the factories of Germany and shipping them into Russia at the very same time we are spending billions all over this world to fight communism? Do you believe in selling the English people into bondage and poverty by financing this communistic Labor Government—using dollars earned by free Americans to socialize British industry? Do you believe in shipping Rumanian oil to the Chinese Communists through the port of Darien in American tankers, with the approval of our State Department? Do you believe in building a vehicular tunnel with Marshall-plan dollars in prosperous Brussels, while every day people are maimed and killed in the streets of our cities and we can't find a place to park right here in Bridgeport? Do you believe in the sell-out at Yalta where with one grand wave of his hand, Roosevelt delivered to Stalin the fruits of our victory? Thousands of dead American boys lie betrayed in their graves. Do you believe in dropping two atom bombs on Japanese cities when Japan had been suing for peace for 6 months? Do you believe in burning our wheat in Greece in order to keep the price up when we supposed that wheat was feeding the hungry Greek people? Do you believe in letting a convicted Russian spy go free and sending him home first class at our expense, while an innocent American businessman is tortured and thrown into a filthy Communist prison for 15 years? Do you believe in burying our potatoes in trenches and hoarding our eggs in a cave while millions of people are starving all over the world and our own little children can't go to school because they haven't enough to eat or a decent pair of shoes to wear?

What madness is this, what insanity? Every American who, even though in good faith, has acquiesced in duplicity, this colossal sell-out of the American people, should hang his head in shame. Lose elections? Of course the Republican Party loses elections and it will never win an election until it has the courage to stand up before the whole world and repudiate this gigantic swindle. All over the earth, millions of people are waiting to hear that there are some sane Americans who stand aghast at the crimes that are being committed in the name of this so-called bipartisan foreign policy, that there are some decent Americans who recoil in horror at the deliverance into the hands of Russia of one country after another, that there are Americans who will demand an end to a foreign policy which constitutes the blackest page in our history.

You cannot buy love, friendship, or loyalty. The old roue with the diamond bedecked blonde cutie on his arm, deceives no one but himself. And Uncle Sam, vulgarly throwing his gold around all over the world isn't deceiving anyone but himself and isn't buying himself anything but hatred, tragedy, bankruptcy, and war.

What a time for power to be in the hands of small men, petty men, men who care only about their personal political fortunes and what next November might bring them. And what a time for statesmen—men who are ready to take the objective course and to unselfishly serve their country. What a time for the courage of the martyrs, willing to risk everything for principle and a holy cause, the cause of human freedom.

Will the Republican Party accept the challenge? Will the Republican Party once more boldly proclaim that a man is free just because he is a man; that all rights and liberties are his because he is born a human being? Will the Republican Party once more restore to that man his Government, and make that Government his servant, not his master? Will the Republican Party shake off the shackles of a dishonest foreign policy that are binding our Nation, and tear away the chains that have been forged upon a free people to reduce us to slavery?

And, most important, will the Republican Party renounce the crass materialism of the past 17 years, the cynical purchase of a man's vote paid for in coin stripped from that same man in taxes? Will the Republican Party forsake the worship of gold—yes, the blind idolatrous worship of the golden jackass—and return in contrite humility to the warship of the God of our fathers?

Then, and then only, can we go to the American people with clean hands. Then, and then only, can we lead our country back into the paths of peace and liberty and righteousness.

(This speech was delivered by Miss Kellems at the Klein Memorial, Bridgeport, Conn., on May 25, 1950.)

Address of Hon. Frances P. Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANCES P. BOLTON, OF OHIO, WEDNESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 30, 1950, AT THE CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUBS IN CLEVELAND

Ohio, the great Twenty-second District, which I have the honor of representing in the Congress of the United States, Cuyahoga County and the city of Cleveland welcome you warmly, and trust that your all too-short stay among us will be both happy and fruitful.

It is a rare privilege for us to have such leaders in our midst.

Especially is this so at a moment when the future of mankind itself may well rest upon this 1950 election.

Republican women, we stand today upon the threshold of opportunity. Behind us are 17 years of difficult rear guard action, with but 2 years when we could make ourselves heard, and even then we were not able to make ourselves understood and adequately felt.

But we have held back the attack upon the American principle that free men are capable of governing themselves. We have reminded the people of this country of ours that they actually do a better job in the long run than a centralized government of appointed, not elected, bureaucrats. Nothing could be further from the ideals and principles upon which these States joined together than the methods that have been sold the voters during these past 17 years. The moment for an attack on all fronts is now—not 2 years from now.

We stand today upon the threshold of opportunity, holding in our hands a responsibility as great as any with which men and women separately and together have ever been entrusted.

It is for us to see that the people of this country recognize what has been done to freedom in the guise of beneficence—to see that they recognize the hand of Esau, and hear the undertones of danger in the lilting voices, the honeyed words.

Why is it ours to do?

First and foremost because the Republican Party came into being to protect the people of that day from supercontrols. John Hay, President Lincoln's Secretary, reports a conversation in which Mr. Lincoln said, "It is for us to prove that government by the people is not an absurdity."

No truer word could be said today. Supercontrols of the people of this great land of freedom have been slipped over our heads and fastened upon us so smoothly, so skillfully that most people haven't known what was happening to them. Just as the world-wide propaganda agencies have covered the earth with clouds of misstatement, of high sounding promises, so have those in power in this country confused and befuddled the thinking of the freest and most intelligent people on this earth.

Take just one phase of our living:

Every housewife knows she has to stay inside the sum total of her husband's earnings. Every man knows he can't keep on borrowing to meet the interest payments on his mortgage. That way he would lose both his home and his credit. But during these long years of the rawest deals any great people were ever given, the idea that the Government can pile up fantastic debts and keep doing it forever and ever, has been dripped onto our good American common sense and solid experience drop by drop until many have accepted it not only as possible, but actually as a sound way of meeting the ever-increasing and wholly unsound Federal budget.

The Republican Party in the Eightieth Congress proved in deeds not words that the budget can still be balanced.

Of course it wasn't popular to cut down Government expense when that meant fewer cushy Government jobs. Of course it wasn't popular when it meant States, cities, and towns, and so forth, would have to square their shoulders to take back much of the burden of meeting their own local responsibilities. Of course, it wasn't popular because the people have been most carefully and subtly led to believe that the Federal Government can and will take care of everything they want.

So, in 1948 the dealers once again shuffled the pack and dealt the cards. Pretty poor hands for everybody except the dealers.

What so many of us forget is that every dollar the Federal Government spends has come out of our own pockets. We forget that the Federal debt is a burden we have to carry. Only a few years ago every man, woman, and child in America had a debt responsibility of only $300. Today every man, woman, and child has a chain around his neck of $1,697.

The Republican Eightieth Congress did not forget where the dollars came from. It reduced taxes, paid, on the national debt, and balanced the budget, while at the same time providing to increase our national defense.

We are gathered here not just to talk together, not just to tell each other about what

Republicans have or have not done. We are here in an effort to stimulate the women of our own party to work for freedom in these United States. We are here also to assume the task of getting the real picture to all the women of the country without camouflage, but with imagination and force. A very large number of them are waking up to the danger that lurks on every highway and in every alley. They are recognizing their responsibility and their opportunity not only to keep freedom a living reality but to build it into the most powerful force in all the world.

Of course there are large groups of women who are Democrats just as we are Republicans. But there are many even of these who are deeply disturbed over the methods of the New Deal and its successors. They are beginning to wonder if it has not all been a very raw deal to them and to their children. And there are the Independents who are looking for something they can take hold of, something they can believe in and trust.

To catch their imaginations will take a lot of practical thinking. As our new National Chairman Guy Gabrielson so wisely says, it will take well organized political machinery without party cliques or personal feuds, welcoming and utilizing every group in every community utterly without regard to race, creed, color, age or sex. All these, says Mr. Gabrielson, must be gathered up into the great driving force of a powerful machine. This is happening, and you who represent the half million members of the National Organization of Republican Women's Clubs are a tremendously important part of this machine.

What has to be done? More than any other one thing: the voters must be registered and gotten to the polls. The 45,000,000 who failed to vote in 1948 must recognize and assume their personal responsibility this year. There were 93,000,000 men and women eligible to vote in 1948 (and 45,000,000 didn't)—automatically there are more now.

Freedom itself is in grave danger when people stop caring about it. Agnes Hale, wife of fine Congressman ROBERT HALE, of Maine, in the Federation's News Letter of July of this year, reminds us that while 95 percent of the voters of Australia and New Zealand voted in 1948 (and incidentally the New Zealanders turned out their Socialists) it is believed that only 51 percent of the eligibles voted here—a drop from 83 percent in 1896.

Don't let people say to you—oh—my vote won't count. Remind them that Thomas Jefferson was elected President by just one vote in the electoral college—so was John Quincy Adams—so was Rutherford B. Hayes, whose election was contested. And then one vote cast by an Indiana Congressman, who won his seat by one vote, decided the matter. One vote gave statehood to California, Idaho, Oregon, Texas, and Washington.

One vote gave us the Draft Act in World War II. And we here in Ohio will do well to remember that one additional vote in each of our 8,800 precincts would have carried the State for the Republicans.

All over this great country there needs to be a doubling and redoubling of effort for registering our citizens such as the unions, the League of Women Voters, and many other organizations are making, in addition to the work of the regular political parties. In every State your club women must join with your organization women to see to it that every eligible man and woman is registered and votes. That's the practical end of it—and it is one in which women play a major role always. This year our efforts must be crowned with overwhelming results.

So I say again: This is the moment when the Republican Party—the party that was born in Lincoln's time to keep Government in the hands of the people—must rouse itself as from a deep sleep and prevent Government being taken for keeps out of the hands of the people to whom it was given when America was born. Isn't it time that somebody put the truth into plain words that everybody can understand?

Our Constitution set up a representative Government, not a Socialist state. But Norman Thomas, long a candidate for the Presidency on a Socialist ticket said in 1946 there is no longer need for such a party. He said that his 1932 platform has been 90 percent carried out by the Dealers. He ought to know.

Organized labor is giving much time, effort and money to see that every eligible working man and woman is registered. Some Republicans fear this. I do not. I have a sincere confidence in the rank and file of American workers. I am one of many Republicans who believe deeply in the right of labor to organize, who rejoices in the gains many of the major unions have made in these last few years particularly. I am one of the many who are relieved to learn that the wiser leaders are warning their members that socialism in America would put an end to unions as we now know them. I am deeply certain that many of this great body of Americans are well aware of the danger to their organizations and to the country as a whole of centralized controls, and so will not lend themselves on election day as tools of their own destruction.

The Eighty-first Congress majority leaders have made several broad gestures toward more complete control over the free people of the country. The balloons of compulsory health insurance and the Brannan plan were blown up with a lot of attractive hot air and launched on trial. A bill was introduced "to conserve our natural resources" that creates regions under the complete control of bureaucrats in Washington—doing away with State lines. But the people of the country didn't quite like the looks of any of them too well—so the administration decided to hold their fire, to retreat a bit just as the Marx boys in the Kremlin do when things go against them.

From what one hears on Capitol Hill the Dealers have decided that the opposition will have little to say in the Eighty-second Congress because they expect to take at least 40 more seats in the House and 5 or so more seats in the Senate. This, they say, would give the administration a complete control and the whole great control program will then be passed easily. So why bother about those various bills now?

I say to you again that this is a moment of great responsibility—a moment when only the election of a Republican-controlled House and Senate can keep a people's government from becoming a bureaucratic dictatorship. Unless freedom is maintained here in these United States there will soon be no freedom anywhere in the world.

As Americans we are all faced with so much that is jeopardizing the principle of individual freedom under law that means America. Part of this is the infiltration into every phase of our living of Communist doctrines, strategies, techniques. We are waking up and realizing that these dangers are right here, too, not only in France or Italy; not just in the Philippines, China, Malaya, but also right here at home. A mounting tide of anger is rising against the administration which has turned its eyes away from the danger, which has even condoned it and refused to move against it.

The attack upon Korea has shocked us awake.

The fact that we had only a handful of unbattle-trained occupation troops to throw into the breach; that no fighting units were anywhere near our Pacific outposts; that we were so evidently caught in another Pearl Harbor, dazed us at first. Little by little the tide of anger is rising against those responsible, both in the Defense Department and in the Department of State, which is both the adviser and the mouthpiece of the President in whose hands all foreign policy rests.

What of the foreign policy in Europe? It is a long history of poor judgment, blundering, and appeasement. The results are there for all to see: Hundreds and thousands of freedom-loving people forced under the iron curtain by a ruthless, well-trained police group, while we stood by and let it happen.

Why haven't we hammered on the violations of every agreement that the Kremlin has been and is daily guilty of? Why isn't the Voice of America a continuing protest against the high-handed Politboro, so comfortably ensconsed in the palaces on the hill above Moscow's Red Square? We have checked the Communists to some extent in Europe through the Marshall plan and the military assistance Greek-Turkish Act, both of which came out of the Republican Eightieth Congress, but we know that the danger is still grave.

The Marx boys did not disband their armies and put their ships of sea and air into mothballs. They didn't stop research on fire power, tank armor, or end their war production. They didn't set aside appropriations made by a Republican Congress for a 70-group air force and arrogantly say 48 groups are enough. They didn't let those 48 shrink to 38. They have spent every minute of these 5 years strengthening their air, land, and sea forces, adding to their war factories, training their youth and the youth of every satellite country, as well as the children they kidnapped from across their own and satellite borders, to be Communists and to be fighters. They have stopped at nothing that will bring them nearer the goal set up 100 years ago by Karl Marx; complete control of the world.

Our appeasement policy was one of the main contributing elements in the take-over by the Kremlin of what we now call the satellite countries. We know (and knew at the time) that there are hundreds of thousands of freedom-loving people in those countries, as well as in Russia proper. But in spite of that the President—in whose hands the foreign policy of this country rests—not the Congress—made the shameful agreements of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

What of our foreign policy in the Far East which blew up in Korea? Remember always that the foreign policy of the United States is made by the President, and implemented by the Secretary of State. It was the President of the United States who brought Russia into the Japanese war just in time to take the surrender of the Japanese in Manchuria and North Korea, and to take over the great industries built there over a period of years. It was again the President who made the secret agreements at Yalta, at Tehran—with Alger Hiss at his side. From Tehran (1943) until the move on Korea (June 25, 1950), the foreign policy of this country in Asia was based on abject appeasement of Soviet Russia.

Convinced that the free nations had to be strengthened, and that they had to be joined together for combined effort if the Communists were to be stopped in their ruthless march across the world, the Republican Eightieth Congress passed the Greek-Turkish Act launched the ECA legislation, initiated the idea of the Atlantic Pact and passed laws strengthening the United Nations. These measures were the result of real bipartisan efforts.

The shameful agreements at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, the blundering methods that have resulted in placing over half a billion of the people of the world under the Soviets in China are strictly the outcome of the policies of the Dealers. Republicans had no part in their inception and have no

responsibility for their failure. Do not let yourselves be misled by present protestations that are being poured out upon the land.

Remember this: During the Republican Eightieth Congress there was written into the China Aid Act of 1948, largely through the consecrated efforts of the Congressman from Minnesota, the Honorable WALTER JUDD, a bipartisan China policy. It is still in the law, but the Executive has not seen fit to carry it out. Rather has it been evaded and misconstrued and action delayed by those charged under law with making it effective. Remember also that it has been the Executive's refusal to carry out the expressed will of the Congress that held up the rebuilding of a strong Air Force and a more powerful Navy.

We are a people slow to anger. We have courage to meet whatever comes. We are ready to give up all lesser things to preserve the priceless heritage that is ours as no other people have known it: Freedom. We know that no man and no government is faultless—that all make mistakes. These we can and must accept.

But today questions as to why we have so little military strength when we have spent so much are heard on every hand. In Korea we are told the battles are bloody, that the courage of our troops is magnificent, and yet the casualty lists are small. Why are we not told the truth? Why are we not told the extent of our commitments and plans so that our young men may know whether they must plan on military service?

When Government gives but half-truths, when it withholds parts of the picture, there begins the rising of a tide of deep resentment that must sometime before long burst the dikes and turn upon those responsible for half-truths, for repression of facts, terrible as these may be. Woe betide those who have trusted the people so little that they have withheld the truth.

Don't let anyone mislead you. Get the recorded facts so clearly into your minds that you will find yourselves alert and full of a flaming faith in the great party that must and will rise up once more in behalf of freedom.

Take with you wherever you go in these next weeks the Digest of the Republican Principles prepared by the national committee last February. They are good American principles with no taint of alien ideologies.

Carry with you also the 10 points Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH put into such succinct language—swell with pride that we have so fine a woman representing us in the United States Senate.

Remember, too, that they aren't just words, for during the short 2 years of Republican control of the Congress taxes were reduced, the budget was balanced, and a start was made on the reduction of Government spending, and a very real effort was made to repair the damages done to our Military Establishment. We were helpless, however, when the President refused to act upon the mandate of the Congress, set aside the appropriations made, and cut the Air Force.

Economy at every possible point is imperative. To this end Congress set up the Hoover Commission to study the Executive Department of Government, and report back on possible methods for greater economy and better administration. The whole country wants action, and what do we get? Twenty-one reorganization plans, few of them having much if any relation to the findings of the Commission and almost all of them adding to the power of the heads of departments and bureaus.

It is significant that the only Cabinet officer who made any economies has been the Secretary of Defense.

These are all matters that need the most careful consideration by every man and woman in the United States.

But the question before us here in Cleveland this morning is, what we must do, we Republican women, whether we are members of Republican clubs, or members of our local and State Republican organization or members of neither, or of both? We must use every scrap of intelligence, of wisdom, of understanding and all of the best sense of humor that we have to one purpose: The election of Republicans on November 7, not just because they are Republicans but because they are the only voice the free people in this great country have left.

If you have sensitive toes that are often stepped on, wrap them up thoroughly and put on stout boots until after the votes are counted. If you are downhearted put on the biggest smile you ever saw, yes, practice it in front of your mirror, but smile and sing an hallelujah chorus of gratitude that you have a chance to get to the people of this country straight from the shoulder before it is too late the fact that the Government is their Government; that the money it spends so recklessly, with so few visible results, is their money. Make it clear to them that they have a right to demand good management, efficient administration, a strong national defense and adherence to American principles, and results.

We, we Americans found out how to break up the atom and release the terrible power with it, we made the atom bomb possible and used it. Now atom bombs are loose in an unfriendly world, a terrible power.

But we Americans did something much more difficult, much more important, when we set up our three-part Government, and released the individual from domination by others of his kind or by government itself. We have seen the power that can be developed by the individual when he is free to use all of himself. There is no greater power on earth than the power of free men joined together by common purpose and by a common will.

It is this power that must be insured to the world. Only by a change over of the controls of the Congress from the dealers to the Republicans can this be assured.

Only by working with passionate unity can we do our part to preserve freedom here and across the world.

Let us go out from this place with determination to do three things:

1. Lay aside all our selfish littleness.
2. Give ourselves completely to the task ahead.
3. Work day and night, night and day to bring to the people the realization of their individual responsibility to the Infinite God of all mankind to keep the torch of freedom alight in an ever-darkening world.

Fellow Republicans: It is my earnest hope that you will go out from here fired with fresh courage and a burning faith in the task before us. It is my prayer that we may prove ourselves worthy of the help of Almighty God whose purposes we have the responsibility and the privilege to serve.

Timely Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 9, page A5744, embodies an editorial, "The WCTU and the War," from the Richmond Times Dispatch dated August 7.

The editorial is a warning against the kind of temperance which brought upon the Nation the era of prohibition which we should like to forget and which we hope shall never recur.

The attached interesting and pertinent articles were gleaned from two different newspapers. One captioned "No Complaints" is from the Detroit Free Press under date of September 7, 1950, headlined Korea, and giving proper weight to beer, the food drink so popular with the average American soldier. The other was clipped from the Washington Post, dated September 9, and indicates the rampant hypocrisy prevalent in our country, particularly in dry territory where the crop of stills and the output of deadly moonshine whisky is as a rule the greatest.

NO COMPLAINTS—BEER REPLACES WATER FOR CUT-OFF GI'S

KOREA.—About 100 American troops were isolated from the main body of United Nations forces in the Naktong River bulge for 4 days.

Despite their isolation and precarious position, they effectively supported the drive to push the Reds back across the river.

Their principal assignment was to report Communist troop movements. They could watch the Reds easily from the high peak where they were cut off. They reported by radio.

The unit was supplied twice daily by air drops. Planes brought ammunition and everything else they needed—except water.

Every time water was dropped from a plane, the container burst when it hit the ground. The situation was becoming serious.

Then some one, with typical GI ingenuity, suggested individual cans of beer be dropped one at a time. It worked. After that no one complained of a lack of water.

"If I could have a can of beer everytime I wanted a drink of water," one GI remarked, "I think I'd stay up there all the rest of the month."

ILLEGAL LIQUOR SOLD "LEGALLY" IN "DRY" CITY

YAZOO CITY, MISS., September 8.—An unofficial agreement between the city council and local bootlegers under which the whisky salesmen operate by paying one $100 fine a month was revealed here today.

"Yes, that's right," said Mayor Pro Tempore P. J. Whalen. "The agreement was made about 2 weeks ago."

Mayor W. S. Perry is out of the State.

"Unless something unforseen happens, I don't think we'll make any change in it," Whalen said. "We're going to try and get ourselves some revenue from it."

Mississippi is one of the two remaining States with a prohibition law on its statute books. Enforcement, however, is left to city and county authorities.

The State does impose a black-market tax of 10 percent on all liquor sales. Similar taxes are collected by several cities in the State.

A protest against the local agreements was sounded at a mass meeting earlier this week, called by Dr. Webb Brame, pastor of the First Baptist Church.

Norman Mott, publisher of the Yazoo City Herald, told the meeting the council acted because "they sincerely believe it is the best way to cope with the whisky and gambling situation."

Whalen today said "only about 5 percent of the people here are excited about it."

Recommendations by the State of Texas to the President's Water Resources Water Policy Commission, Fayetteville, Ark., June 30, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, the statement in behalf of the President's Water Resources Water Policy Commission for the State of Texas, which statement was presented at Fayetteville, Ark., on June 30, 1950.

In addition, there are included exhibits Nos. 2 and 3, constituting recommendations by the State of Texas in connection with water conservation.

There is no greater domestic problem than that of water supply and particularly in the great Southwest. I think the discussions in this document will be of intense interest to the Congress, and that it may bring to our attention helpful information upon which to base further considerations.

The statement follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE STATE OF TEXAS TO THE PRESIDENT'S WATER RESOURCES WATER POLICY COMMISSION AT FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., JUNE 30, 1950

PRESENTATION

Gentlemen of the Commission, the Commission has graciously invited Gov. Allan Shivers to communicate at this conference the recommendations of the State of Texas. The Governor authorized the Texas water code committee, an interim committee established by the legislature to study the water problems of the State, to prepare and present a statement designed to reflect the attitude and recommendations of the State. The privilege of presenting this statement to the Commission has been accorded to the undersigned subcommittee. We are mindful of the Governor's suggestion that our recommendations be built around these cardinal principles: recognition of the fundamental right of the Federal Government to exercise powers necessary to navigation in all streams which are navigable; when such streams are intrastate that the individual States have supervision of all other rights therein; and when such streams are interstate that all other rights therein be administered through interstate compacts.

In performing our assignment we have received valuable assistance from the State board of water engineers.

PLAN OF THIS STATEMENT

This statement contains in addition to certain primary assumptions:

I. A brief summary of the recommendations.

II. Comments on each of the recommendations; and

III. Exhibits.

We do not propose a suggested water policy, but seek to recommend some of the elements which we think should be incorporated in the integrated policy which this Commission will evolve.

I. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Congress should reaffirm the doctrine that the waters of navigable streams are the property of the people of the State in which they flow, limited by the right of the Government to prevent any material interference with actual navigation, and as to interstate streams, by the coordinate rights of the people of other States.

2. The storage of the waters of the people of a State should create in the Government no proprietary rights to the stored water, but at most an obligation on the part of the owners to pay the Government reasonable compensation for storage of the water.

3. Obviously, the necessity for soil conservation is inseparable from flood control and water conservation.

4. Floods do not recognize State lines, but our rivers in their uncontrolled and natural condition have never obliterated the boundaries of the State. It is believed that flood waters can be stored and managed in such way that the sovereignty of the States will not be washed away in the process.

5. A comprehensive flood control and water conservation program must be on the basis of the whole watershed of a stream. We believe that this can be accomplished best as to an interstate stream through employment of designated agencies of the Government in cooperation with the officials of the respective States, and to the extent necessary to adjust equities between or among the States, through the service of interstate compact commissioners. We do not feel that the employment of authorities or administrators having jurisdiction of areas created without respect to State boundaries is essential.

6. In all instances where a watershed is confined wholly within, or where the contributing portion of the watershed is situated within, a single State, all water stored in any flood-control or water-conservation program for such watershed should be owned and used in accordance with the laws of the State.

7. The Federal law should make provision for cash reimbursement to a State or a State agency which constructs a multiple-purpose dam to the extent of the approved cost of that part of the structure, incurred and effective for flood control, provided that the amount reimbursable and the State's plan for the operation of the flood-control facilities of the structure shall have first been approved by the agency of the Government charged with the duty of operating flood-control facilities in that vicinity.

8. We feel that the Reclamation Act should be amended in harmony with what appears to be its original intent, to the end that the legal title to a project should remain in the United States until it has received reimbursement of the capital cost of the facilities; but that throughout the repayment period the equitable title to such facilities be vested in the landowners. The contract should provide that upon repayment to the Government of its cost both the legal and equitable title will become vested in such landowners without the necessity of any affirmative action by the Government or by the Congress.

9. We feel that the Reclamation Act should be further amended in harmony with the recommendations heretofore made to the Commission by the Texas Water Conservation Association in its presentation, dated April 28, 1950. An excerpt from the presentation by the association, proposing such amendments to the Reclamation Act is attached hereto as exhibit 2.

10. The Federal Power Act should be amended so as to remove obvious impediments to the active cooperation by States in the water-conservation and flood-control program of the country. The following amendments are suggested:

(a) No State, agency of a State, municipality or other public body should be required to obtain a license from the Federal Power Commission before construcing a dam at which power will be developed unless there is a finding by the Department of the Army that the structure will affect adversely navigation on the stream;

(b) The provisions of the Federal Power Act under which the United States Government would have the right to recapture a dam and other works owned by a State, a State agency, municipality, or other public body, after the expiration of the license should be repealed.

11. We feel that to the extent permitted by the Constitution, Congress should place greater emphasis on the value of water storage for industrial and municipal purposes, in determining the feasibility of a multiple-purpose dam.

PRIMARY ASSUMPTIONS

We will assume that certain principles will be incorporated in or recognized in any declaration which may be made of the Government's national water resources policy, including the following:

1. That the national interest requires: A substantial or major participation by the United States Government in the provision of flood-control facilities for navigable streams and their tributaries; provision by the Government, upon request of the landowners, at a cost not greater than cost to the Government for irrigation facilities for lands economically irrigable under standards and regulations prescribed by the Reclamation Act (not a primary duty of the Federal Government); contribution by the Government to the cost of soil treatment so as to prevent erosion, a substantial contributor to floods of streams and because of siltation, an important factor in the expense of controlling floods; and wherever practicable in the performance of its reclamation and flood-control obligations that the Government employ multiple-purpose dams so as to produce revenues which will reduce the expenses of operation, and, to the extent possible, provide reimbursement of the capital expenditure. (Serious consideration of the Commission is invited to suggestions contained in a report heretofore filed with the Commission by the irrigation task force of the Engineers Joint Council. It proposes a modernized approach to determination of benefits and the allocation of payments for a Government-constructed project. Attached hereto as exhibit 3 is an excerpt (p. 18) of that report.)

2. That in the several States practices in the use of water and laws regulating the use of water have become a part of the economy of the State, and based thereon important vested rights have become fixed and perfected.

3. The State of Texas (as is the case in other States) has authorized substantial integrated river-improvement programs, and in the case of the Brazos River is in the midst of its own flood-control and water-conservation program. Pursuant to acts of Congress the Army also is building flood-control and multiple-purpose projects on the Brazos. There is no conflict between the program of the Army and that of the State. The work of one complements the other. Each Government structure eliminates the construction by the State of that unit. The State legislature created the Brazos River Agency in 1929, being the first instance in the United States of a public agency charged with the duty of controlling the water of an entire watershed. The laws of the United States should encourage and not place any impediments to such activities.

4. Experience has taught that flood control and conservation improvements can be planned and constructed most economically and efficiently when the planning is on the basis of the entire watershed of the river; but that there is no necessity for using an improvement unit larger than a complete watershed, which would include all contributing sources of water and its outlet to the sea.

II. COMMENTS ON RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Congress should reaffirm the doctrine that the waters of navigable streams are the property of the people of the State in which they flow, limited by the right of the Government to prevent any material interference with actual navigation, and as to interstate streams, by the coordinate rights of the people of other States.

2. The storage of the waters of the people of a State should create in the Government no proprietary rights to the stored water, but at most an obligation on the part of the owners to pay the Government reasonable compensation for storage of the water.

Comment

Congress recognized water rights which were vested under State laws and the propriety and the necessity of complying with State laws when the National Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed. Those provisions of the act have never been repealed. Section 8 of the original act denied any intention to "interfere with the laws of any State or territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder" and required the Secretary of the Interior to "proceed in conformity with such laws."

Perhaps the Commission will recall that during the Seventy-eighth Congress when the flood-control bill was under consideration in the Senate the States became alarmed over some of the provisions in the bill because it accorded no recognition to any rights of the States in reference to the construction of the many proposed flood-control and multiple-purpose dams, nor in the disposition and use of the water to be stored by such structures. This agitation resulted in the calling of a conference in Chicago attended by the representatives of the governors of approximately 40 States. Out of this conference grew the so-called O'Mahoney amendments to the flood-control bill. The amendments were enacted into the law known as the Flood Control Act of 1944. Under that act no such structure planned by the Government can be constructed until the Governor of the State or a representative of the State designated by him shall have had an opportunity to examine, criticize, and to approve or disapprove of the proposed project. It cannot be constructed over the opposition of the State unless and until Congress shall have had an opportunity to pass again on the propriety of the project.

There is another provision in the Flood Control Act of 1944, applicable to all of the so-called Western States, including the State of Texas, that the use of water for consumptive purposes as prescribed by State laws in the streams thus improved has priority over the use of the water for navigation.

If there is any doubt that these principles announced in the Reclamation Act of 1902 and in the Flood Control Act of 1944 constitute a general policy of the United States Government Congress should make the declaration of policy as to such matters definite.

Under the Flood Control Act of 1944 the Secretary of the Army and his representatives in the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army have assumed properly, that the water stored at a multiple-purpose dam is the property of the people of the State in which the water is stored, but that reasonable financial arrangements should be made with the Government for payment of the cost of storing the water. We refer, of course, to storage space at such a dam not devoted primarily to flood storage. It is provided at the expense of the Government, but conservation storage is made available for use by the people of the State through sale or contract. In several instances the Corps of Engineers of the Army has made contracts with municipalities under which the municipality pays either in a lump sum the cost of the part of conservation storage to be used by it, or makes annual payments designed to liquidate the capital investment of the Government in the conservation storage capacity of the dam. In two or three instances in Texas the Government has sold perpetual storage rights in reservoirs to water districts. The Army has no water to sell but it can sell all or part of its excess storage capacity. If this is not the general policy of the United States Government it should be declared as the general policy.

And if our laws are not clear enough on the subject to convince the officials of the several agencies charged with administering Government-owned dams and the Department of Justice, that the primary rights of the people living on the banks of a navigable stream extend to the reasonable use of the water of the stream, a renewed declaration of policy on this subject should be made. The Commission, doubtless, is cognizant of the difficulties between the Bureau of Reclamation and the residents of the San Joaquin Valley in California. Evidence adduced in court shows that before the Friant Dam was constructed the Bureau assured the people of the valley that their riparian and appropriative rights to water in the river would not be disturbed by the construction of the dam and to the extent that those rights existed independently of the dam they would be honored and respected by the Government. After the dam was completed litigation was instituted in which the Bureau of Reclamation, represented by the Department of Justice, is insisting that because the stream is navigable the Government owns paramount rights to the water, and that all so-called riparian rights existing because of the location of the land on the banks of the river and all so-called appropriative rights theretofore granted by the State of California must fall, although the question of navigation is not involved in the proceeding. No doubt the Commission will feel that this situation should be clarified.

May I remind you that in the President's speech at Grand Coulee Dam on May 11, 1950, in connection with his remarks on the proposed Columbia Valley Administration, he emphasized the fact that in the western part of the country as distinguished from the needs in the East, special consideration should be given to private rights in the water of the streams. After concluding his comments on the Tennessee Valley Authority he said:

"We have worked out a set of recommendations for a Columbia Valley Administration which builds on that successful experience but recognized the different circumstances out here. Take one simple example. In this area, a farmer's right to the use of water is vital to his livelihood, and is protected by State laws. That is the way it should be, and the Columbia Valley Administration I have recommended would have no power to tamper with anyone's water rights."

By the same token the Congress should make it crystal clear that no one connected with any branch of the United States Government whether it be the proposed Columbia Valley Administration or otherwise shall have power to tamper with anyone's water rights. We believe that this Commission will conclude that such doctrine is worthy of recommendation to the Congress.

3. Obviously, the necessity for soil conservation is inseparable from flood control and water conservation.

Comment

The United States Government is doing such an excellent job in its soil conservation program operating principally through the Department of Agriculture, and to some extent through other agencies, that extended comment is unnecessary. The importance of stopping every drop of water as close as possible to the place where it falls is so well recognized that emphasis is superfluous. One reason impelling this observation by Texas is that during the first hundred years of civilized agriculture in our State three-fourths of the top soil of our watersheds has been washed into the Gulf of Mexico. Fortunately this condition is being improved under the organized soil conservation program, but it takes many years to restore the soil which is carried away by a 24-hour flood.

4. Floods do not recognize State lines, but our rivers in their uncontrolled and natural condition have never obliterated the boundaries of the States. It is believed that flood waters can be stored and managed in such way that sovereignty of the States will not be washed away in the process.

5. A comprehensive flood control and water conservation program must be on the basis of the whole watershed of a stream. We believe that this can be accomplished best as to an interstate stream through employment of designated agencies of the Government in cooperation with the officials of the respective States, and to the extent necessary to adjust equities between or among the States, through the service of interstate compact commissioners. We do not feel that the employment of authorities or administrators having jurisdiction of areas created without respect to State boundaries is essential.

Comment

We realize that this item is controversial. There are persuasive arguments in favor of the so-called regional river authority which would have jurisdiction over territory situated in two or more States. It is conceivable that if such a project were operated by one man or by three men the expense would be less and time saved by avoiding the necessity of consulting with the component States situated within his or their jurisdiction. A fair answer to that argument is that a great deal of time and money could be saved to taxpayers of the United States by vesting complete powers of government in one man or in a three-man commission. Thus would be obviated the expense of a Congress, the delays and expense of our court systems, and the tremendous expense, delays, and duplication of effort in the many bureaus and agencies of the executive department. But we hold to the principle that even though a democracy is the most expensive form of government, still we are willing to pay perhaps 25 percent more cost and put up with 50 percent more delay in the processes of our Government rather than give a power of attorney for all governmental functions to a single man or commission.

When the Constitution of the United States was adopted, the States yielded sufficient of their individual prerogatives of sovereignty to permit the formation of the Union. There doesn't seem to be any invitation in the Constitution for the Government to dissect the area of the United States into segments comprising groups of States or parts of two or more States which would have authority or power to determine the economic life and substantial rights of the people of those particular groups of States or areas.

We believe that the Congress should refrain from an attempt to create the so-called regional authorities until it has been demonstrated that the objectives cannot be accomplished satisfactorily through cooperative efforts of the representatives of the Government and the individual States or the coordinated efforts of representatives of the several States which may be involved in a given problem. It occurs to us that the arrangement now in effect as to the flood-control and conservation program in the Missouri Valley is adequate. Here the governors of the several States are working with the representatives of departments of the United States Government on the vast program. The job is being done without surrender by the States.

Particular attention should be given to the use of interstate compacts in working out problems of this kind. Texas has had great success in working through interstate compact commissioners and feels that the remaining interstate problems will be worked out satisfactorily through compact commissions recently authorized. It would appear that little, if any, argument is needed to support this recommendation.

In short, if there are to be any Federal regional authorities, borrowing an expression from a prominent Hollywood executive, Texas prefers to be included out of them.

6. In all instances where a watershed is confined wholly within, or where the contributing portion of the watershed is situated within, a single State, all water stored in any flood control or water conservation program for such watershed, should be owned and used in accordance with the laws of the State.

Comment

Acting under constitutional mandate (1917), the Texas Legislature has created its several agencies, each vested with full power to perform all flood-control and conservation duties in the watershed involved. Through agencies of this kind the State is approaching the complete control of the Colorado River of Texas. It is in process of controlling the Brazos River. The Brazos agency is cooperating closely with the Corps of Engineers of the Army in its program. Much work is being done by other so-called districts and State authorities created by the legislature. Attention is called to this matter because there has been some effort by Members of Congress from other States to include the watersheds situated in the State of Texas in an administration or authority which would be created to regulate and conserve the waters of the Arkansas River Valley. A glance at a watershed map of the State of Texas incorporated as exhibit No. 1 will show that all of the rivers in the State of Texas with the exception of our boundary rivers (interstate and international) have their respective sources within the boundaries of the State and discharge their flow into the Gulf of Mexico. Because our rivers could have no effect whatsoever upon the flood or conservation problems of any other State, it is inconceivable that the Congress would consider seriously superimposing over Texas an administrative body which, among its duties, would have jurisdiction over the watersheds of the State. This is especially so since the State is in the midst of its own vast program for the control of the floods and for the conservation of the waters in its several watersheds. The State's program is progressing satisfactorily. The Army which is effecting the Government's flood-control program in Texas is working in full harmony with the State agencies. It is believed that at the next session of the legislature, serious consideration will be given to vast expansion of the State's water conservation program.

Even as to our boundary rivers our international and interstate problems have either been solved or are well on the way to solution.

The State of Texas is affected by one international water treaty—that between the United States of America and the United Mexican States relating to the utilization of the waters of Colorado and Tijuana Rivers, and hose of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico. This treaty was consummated and became effective November 8, 1945. As a result three large dams are to be constructed jointly on the Rio Grande, one of which is expected to be under construction during 1950. The water in these dams allotted to the United States will be administered under Texas laws.

The State of Texas is also a party to two interstate compacts—the Rio Grande compact, affecting the Rio Grande above Fort Quitman, and the Pecos River compact.

Congress has authorized the States of Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico to negotiate a compact on the diversion of the waters of the Canadian River, and the compact commission is already actively engaged in the formation of this compact.

H. R. 8873 has been introduced to Congress asking for the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Red River by the States of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas, and a similar resolution will be introduced within the next few days affecting the waters of the Sabine River between the States of Louisiana and Texas.

7. The Federal law should make provision for cash reimbursement to a State or a State agency which constructs a multiple purpose dam to the extent of the approved cost of that part of the structure, incurred and effective for flood control, provided that the amount reimbursable and the State's plan for the operation of the flood-control facilities of the structure shall have first been approved by the agency of the Government charged with the duty of operating flood-control facilities in that vicinity.

Comment

There are and will be instances where a flood control and conservation agency of a State is planning a multiple purpose dam which with slight modification could be made to serve a very useful objective of the Federal Government in its flood-control program. This is especially so if the State's project is situated upstream from other units projected by the Federal Government. In such instances it should be possible to effect a real economy. The Federal Government should make a contribution to the cost of the State's unit to the extent that the Government itself would be relieved from providing similar capacity on the stream. To illustrate the point your attention is directed to pending Senate bill 3432 by Senators KERR and THOMAS of Oklahoma. This bill seeks to modify the Government's general plan for improving the Arkansas River basin by authorizing the appropriation of $7,000,000 to be paid to the Grand River Dam Authority of the State of Oklahoma as the Government's contribution for the flood-storage capacity of Markham Dam which is to be constructed by the State agency. We have in mind similar instances in Texas. Doubtless there are instances in several other States. Why duplicate the effort of a State agency if a real economy can be effected by the Government in contributing a part of the cost of the State unit?

8. We feel that the Reclamation Act should be amended in harmony with what appears to be its original intent, to the end that the legal title to a project should remain in the United States until it has received reimbursement of the capital cost of the facilities; but that throughout the repayment period the equitable title to such facilities be vested in the landowners. The contract should provide that upon repayment to the Government its cost both the legal and equitable title should be vested in such landowners without the necessity of any affirmative action by the Government or by the Congress.

9. We feel that the Reclamation Act should be further amended in harmony with the recommendations heretofore made to the Commission by the Texas Water Conservation Association in its presentation to the Commission, dated April 28, 1950. An excerpt from the presentation by the association, proposing such amendments to the Reclamation Act is attached hereto as exhibit 2.

Comment

Reclamation projects of the United States Government are financed by the Government on the assumption that during the term of the contract with the landowners or their representatives the Government will receive payments which will liquidate the Government's cost of the project. We believe the Reclamation Act of 1902 is sufficient authority to justify quit-claiming these improvements to the people who have paid the bill as soon as the Government gets its money back. The 1939 amendment to the Reclamation Act seemingly permits contracts which could extend beyond the repayment period. At any rate, the Bureau of Reclamation does not appear particularly anxious to deed, or otherwise divest itself of title to, the properties after the projects have been fully paid out. As to new projects which are under consideration by the Congress designed with the praiseworthy purpose of affording municipal water supply, the status of the title to the properties after the subscribing municipalities shall have repaid to the Government the full cost of the project is not clear. The Bureau of Reclamation, sponsoring these projects suggests that it should be the responsibility of Congress after the entire repayment has been made to quit-claim the interest of the Government to the municipalities which have paid for the projects. In those instances, as well as in all other instances, we think it should be made crystal clear by Congress that when the Government has received reimbursement for reclamation projects (whether primarily for irrigation or for municipal storage) the title should be recognized as in the people or the agencies which have paid for the projects.

Without some amendment to the Reclamation Act we believe there will be minimum use of the Bureau's facilities in Texas, at least on the major rivers. Waters stored on Texas rivers for irrigation purposes (except the Rio Grande which is an international stream) would be used principally in the extreme southern part of the State for rice culture. Because of the inherent nature of the crop requiring rotation of land use (2 years in crop and 3 years fallow), there can be no 160- nor 320-acre rice farms. Rice can be grown successfully only in large acreages and in large ownerships. So long as it is the principal crop the 160-acre limitation will prevent extensive operations of the Bureau in Texas. This is so likewise as to pasture lands which otherwise could be irrigated very successfully.

10. The Federal Power Act should be amended so as to remove obvious impediments to the active cooperation by States in the water conservation and flood control program of the country. The following amendments are suggested:

(a) No State, agency of a State, municipality or other public body should be required to obtain a license from the Federal Power Commission before constructing a dam at which power will be developed unless there is a finding by the Department of the Army that the structure will affect adversely navigation on the stream;

(b) The provisions of the Federal Power Act under which the United States Government would have the right to recapture a dam and other works owned by a State, a State agency, municipality or other public body, after the expiration of the license should be repealed.

Comment

There is probably sound reason for regulating under license a power project owned and operated by a private utility company; but the reason does not exist in the instance of a power project of a State or a State-owned or sponsored agency. This is manifestly so if the project is not to be situated on Government-owned lands. In its original conception the Federal Power Act (formerly the Water Power Act) was enacted to protect the interests of the United States in instances wherein private utility companies were preempting through special legislation valuable power sites on Government-owned land. The late President Theodore Roosevelt urged

the passage of legislation which would regulate under general law the granting, in the future, of these valuable rights, which previously had been conferred by Congress through special legislation without any material consideration to the Government. The provisions of the law as now written are applicable to public bodies as well as to private interests. Where Government lands are not involved it is difficult to see why public agencies should be required to take out such licenses. For that reason we think that the provision requiring the license should be restricted to those cases only where the structure might be injurious to navigation. In such instances the license would be withheld until facilities to accommodate navigation could be installed.

Certainly there is no real justification for the Government to have the right to take at its "net investment" a State-owned project at the expiration of the 50-year license. This means in effect that the Government would be permitted to take over (without reference to its value) without pay a State-owned project, because within 50 years a project of this kind would ordinarily be fully depreciated. If the investment is depreciated at 2 percent per year it will be fully depreciated at the end of the 50-year license even though the project itself may have another 100 years of useful life, because it is the policy of owners of these projects to maintain the properties in good operating condition.

At this time the Brazos district, mentioned in another part of this statement, has completed all of its plans and the financing for the construction of three small dams at which hydroelectric power will be developed. The Federal Government is making no contribution whatever to the construction of these units, and the district proposes to liquidate the entire construction cost by pledging the net operating revenues of the dams for a period of 30 years. It has filed a declaration of intent with the Federal Power Commission as required by law. While it is conceded that the construction of these units can have no practical or material effect on the navigability of the stream, if the Federal Power Commission finds that the construction will "affect" the navigability of the stream either adversely or favorably, the district cannot proceed with its construction program until it applies for and receives a license from the Federal Power Commission. The attorney general of Texas has advised the district that it cannot legally accept such license because of the recapture provisions. Under the State law any net profits after payment of its indebtedness earned by the district belongs to the general fund of the State of Texas. So the attorney general holds that the district cannot jeopardize the State's property to recapture by the Federal Government as is required under the Federal Power Commission Act as now written. So if the Federal Power Commission finds that it has jurisdiction over these three dams, they cannot be built. The power the dams would develop and the water they would conserve will be lost. Also, the net earning power of the dams in the amount of $1,250,000 per year would be lost. Furthermore, a finding that the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction over these three dams will likewise cause the inability of the district and the State to construct three additional dams in west Texas which would doubtless be subject to the same ruling. For these reasons and because other States and public agencies in the country are affected, we recommend the proposed amendments.

11. We feel that, to the extent permitted by the Constitution, Congress in determining the feasibility of a multiple-purpose dam, should place greater emphasis on the value of water storage for industrial and municipal purposes.

Comment

Under general law, the Corps of Engineers of the Army, in determining the feasibility of a dam, is not permitted to take into actual consideration the value of storage capacity which may later be sold to municipalities and to industries for water supply. We feel that because of the recognized shortage and increased use of water for domestic, municipal, and industrial purposes throughout the Nation, a new emphasis should be placed on the value of such storage.

An acre-foot of water, stored where it can be used economically, will yield: In electric energy at 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, 45 cents; for irrigation use 75 cents to $1; for municipal use at 2 cents per thousand gallons, $6.40. So there is every reason to accord a very high value to storage facilities which will be used for municipal and domestic purposes. We believe the encouragement of such procedure is in line with the Commission's objectives. The States should be interested in working out financing arrangements under which they might purchase such storage rights at Government owned dams, thus assuring a needed supply for their people. Moreover, water thus stored would remain under the control of the State. It is believed that Texas would give interested consideration to cooperating with the Government in financing the cost of such storage at Government dams.

Respectfully,

GEORGE A. KNAPP,
Houston, Tex.
R. DEAN MOORHEAD,
Austin, Tex.
HIRAM CHILDRESS,
Sweetwater, Tex.
JOHN BELL,
Cuero, Tex.
JOHN D. MCCALL,
Chairman, Dallas, Tex.

EXHIBIT 2 TO RECOMMENDATIONS BY STATE OF TEXAS (AN EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT FILED BY TEXAS WATER CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION DATED APRIL 28, 1950)

Amend the National Reclamation Act so as to—

1. Eliminate the automatic authorization of projects by the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 9 (a) of the 1939 Reclamation Project Act permits the Secretary of the Interior to authorize construction of a project, without action by Congress, when it will pass certain standards of feasibility. When the Secretary finds that the project will pay out under any form of contract which he is authorized to make, then he can authorize it.

All reclamation projects should be authorized by the Congress with Congress fixing the repayment period on irrigation features, based on a reasonable number of years within the useful life of the project. The nonreimbursable costs should be based on a reasonable number of years within the useful life of the project at the going cost of Government money.

2. Eliminate the open end or service type of contract permitted under section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

Section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 permits the Secretary of the Interior to make contracts with water users which would establish to the United States in perpetuity as a public utility in the distribution of water on a rental basis. The term of such contracts cannot exceed 40 years, and at the end of the term the contracting organization and water users therein would have no right to continued water service, and no right to renewal, or to negotiate a new contract except upon terms and conditions acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior.

Such contracts violate and nullify the fundamental policy established by the Congress in the Federal reclamation law assuring water user organizations contracting pursuant thereto, permanent water rights appurtenant to the land based on beneficial use, and providing for control by them of their distribution facilities.

Section 9 (e) should be amended so as to permit, at the option of the water users, a conversion from the 9 (e) to the 9 (d) contract when repayment can be completed within a 40-year term. This association believes that, at the option of the water users, this will terminate the so-called open end features of the 9 (e) contracts.

3. It should also be provided that when a 9 (e) contract is first entered into it shall include the terms and conditions later to be included in a 9 (d) contract, which shall have been determined and included, as far as practicable, in the first contract entered into under this section 9 (e).

4. The act should limit the renewal of 9 (e) contracts, and unless the automatic authorization of projects by the Secretary of the Interior is eliminated, then the law should be amended so as to fix a definite period in which the reimbursable costs of a project must be repaid.

5. Limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands by condemnation or otherwise for recreational purposes without first obtaining the consent of the local taxing unit.

6. Eliminate economic control over the project or the water users by the Secretary of the Interior by amending section 6, Reclamation Project Act, 1939, thus eliminating under this section the authority of the Secretary to require certain cropping practices as directed by the Secretary of the Interior.

7. Repeal 160-acre land-limitation provisions of Reclamation Act.

The land-limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act were enacted primarily to facilitate the settlement of public lands in the arid areas of the Western States, and to prevent speculation therein. In many projects under contemplation or construction by the Bureau of Reclamation there is little public land and the larger part of the areas to be served consists of lands in private ownership for which only a supplemental water supply will be furnished.

Any attempt to enforce the 160-acre land-limitation provisions on projects which will furnish a supplemental water supply to private lands having an existing economy built up over a period of many decades in which the pattern of land ownership is the result of economic development created by private capital, enterprise, and initiative, is unjust, unworkable, discriminatory, and confiscatory.

In Texas, which is not a public-land State, there are under irrigation more than 2,884,000 acres of land developed by local districts and private enterprises. This includes thousands of acres of rice lands which cannot be cultivated to rice year in and year out; the better practice is to farm rice 2 years and pasture the land 3 years. The 160-acre limitation is wholly unworkable in the Rice Belt. In other areas, like the ranching area, 160 acres is not an economic unit.

EXHIBIT 3 TO RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE STATE OF TEXAS (AN EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT OF THE IRRIGATION TASK FORCE (P. 18) OF THE JOINT ENGINEERS' COUNCIL)

Development of the water resources of the United States in the best interests of all of its citizens requires that no distinction be made between different types of projects nor between projects of different size. The same fundamentals must govern in each case and their application must be consistent.

Those who benefit from the construction of a project should bear the burden of its cost in proportion to the benefits received, and there should be no difference between the obligations of immediate beneficiaries on irrigation projects and the obligations of such beneficiaries on other projects.

Irrespective of the purpose or function for which nonreimbursable expenditures are made or subsidies are granted by the Federal Government, each should be subjected to the test of what is best in the national interest. The test requires that the benefits to be derived from each such nonreimbursable expenditure or other subsidy should be greater than the benefits which would accrue from the expenditure of a like sum for any other purposes or at any other location in the United States.

While conservation and control of the waters of the United States is in the national interest, the construction of works for such purposes is not necessarily the function of the Federal Government. On the contrary, that which can be done by the individual should be done by him, and that which requires collective action should be done at the lowest governmental level practicable. The Federal Government should intervene only when and to the extent that the collective action of all the people of the Nation is necessary to the orderly development of the water resources of the United States.

Beer for Our Fighting Men in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, press dispatches indicate that somewhere along the line an order has been issued which deprives our American fighting forces in Korea of beer, the safe and wholesome food drink. The order is one that disturbes me and it should be made one of great concern to the American people, for if it is not promptly rescinded its effect will be reflected in sharply increased casualty lists from the battle front. Everybody knows that the people in Korea and the Far East drink tea, not water, because streams, rivers and lakes all are dangerously polluted and the water is for obvious reasons unfit for human consumption. The oriental people are smart enough not to use water for drinking purposes.

To force our American troops, especially on the battle front, to drink water from these sources is the equivalent of an attack from the rear by infiltration. Water in Korea is deadlier than bullets. No amount of prophylactic precautions can safeguard the lives of our fighting men against typhus, cholera, and deadly dysentery in various forms, if our men must quench their thirst with polluted water. To issue beer to our fighting men as a health and safety measure will not compel all of our troops to drink it. Those who still prefer polluted water likely as not can have it, if under fire it is available. But men who prefer to drink beer which gives energy and quenches thirst ought to be privileged to have it when in the discretion of the commanding general, in conformity with the order, the needs of the fighting men require the substitute.

There is nothing sinful about a drink of beer, but it is the equivalent of a death sentence to force our fighting men exposed to shot and shell in the battle lines to drink polluted water. I surmise that this order stems from some narrow and bigoted source. If this is true somebody should be either court martialed or impeached. The order is not in the interests of the safety of our men and should be immediately countermanded.

It is a matter of common knowledge the world over since beer was first produced over 6,000 years ago that beer is a food. Everyone knows that beer is a part of the daily rations of the working man. The average 12-ounce bottle or can of beer contains about 160 food calories.

Dr. Howard W. Haggard, long-time professor of applied physiology at Yale University and one of the world's best-known nutrition experts, is quoted in the following:

A food is a substance which, when eaten, supplies the body with nourishment and with energy for warmth and movement. Beer satisfies this definition and is in every sense a food.

It has been a well-known fact to everyone that beer has not only served as a beverage for a workingman's lunch, but has, like milk, added many valuable nutritional elements to that meal. As early as 1784 Benjamin Rush called attention to the nutritional values of beer. He pointed out that many of the poor people of Great Britain had endured hard labor with no other food than a couple of pints of beer with a few pounds of bread.

Food is measured by its contents of nutritional elements essential to good health. These are energy or fuel foods (carbohydrates or fats), protein, minerals, vitamins, and bulk. No single food supplies all these nutritional requirements of the body. Upon analyzing the nutritional values of beer, we find that beer compares favorably with most of the common foods.

Beer is essentially an extract or broth of cereal grains which have been first treated to render their carbohydrates soluble. Beer, therefore, contains most of the food values of grain products, that is, carbohydrates, minerals, and some protein.

In a pint of beer there are approximately as many calories as in a pint of pea soup. Beer contains 90.6 percent of water, but grapefruit, rhubarb, strawberries, asparagus, spinach, tomatoes, cabbage, and lettuce, to mention only a few other foods, contain a higher percentage of water. Even meat, such as chicken or beef, contains from 68 to 78 percent of water, and milk contains 88 percent.

Proteins: Beer contains about 0.5 percent of protein. This is only about one-seventh of the protein content in milk, but milk is a protein food and, therefore, is rich in this element, but beer contains more protein than apples and approximately as much protein as oranges, rhubarb, and grapefruit, and slightly less than tomatoes, strawberries, and carrots.

Minerals: Beer contains many of the minerals of the grains from which it is made, such as phosphorus and potassium. Most foods have one or two minerals, but never all of them.

Vitamins: Beer likewise contains the general vitamins of the grains from which it is made and lacks only those vitamins which the grains lack. Thus, beer contains adequate amounts of the vitamin-B complex, such as riboflavin, nicotinic acid, and pyridoxin.

Bulk: The bulk in beer is approximately the same as the bulk in milk.

Alcohol: Beer contains 3.2 to 3.7 percent alcohol. Beer is not unique as a food containing alcohol, for raised bread often contains some and occasionally will contain as much as one-sixth as much as that in beer. Many puddings and other desserts contain very appreciable amounts of alcohol from the flavoring extracts added to them.

People of all times have instinctively realized the nutrient value of beer. Their sound instinct has now been substantiated by modern science in the form of chemical research which has proven that beer has been found to contain as much of the nutritional values as are found in the common foods. This cannot be said about any other beverage, with the exception of milk. Beer is a beverage, but, like milk, it is a food.

I have today placed a bill in the legislative hopper directing the Secretary of Defense by law to provide a daily ration of beer to our fighting men in Korea and elsewhere, whenever and wherever the health and welfare of our fighting men may require it. This applies particularly to Korea at the present time, but will be applicable wherever polluted water endangers the lives of our combat troops.

Acceptance Speech by Walter A. Lynch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Hon. WALTER A. LYNCH, of New York, appearing in the New York Times of September 8, 1950:

TEXT OF ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY LYNCH

ROCHESTER, N. Y., September 7.—Following is the text of today's speech by Representative WALTER A. LYNCH, accepting nomination as the Democratic candidate for Governor:

"My heartfelt thanks are yours for the great honor you have bestowed upon me. I am proud to be the Democratic candidate for Governor of the State of New York. Proud, because I know that I shall follow that traditionally great army of Democratic Governors, Alfred E. Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Herbert H. Lehman. Proud, also, because,, like them, I shall be Governor of all the people of the State and not just a small segment of our citizens.

"The time has come for us to take stock. In the last 8 years the State has amassed the greatest revenues in our history. But during the same period we have seen the greatest spending. Who profited by all this? I know that I didn't, and you didn't, either. Your State taxes went up, so did mine.

"We were promised and we expected to get more schools, more hospitals, more social services. Where are they? We just didn't get them from the Republicans. The large corporations and bankers got what they wanted. That is why they spend so much money trying to keep the Republicans in power.

"Unlike the Democrats, whose feeling is with all the people, the Republicans represent now, as always, that small privileged

class which has sought, for its own advantage, to have influence in government. It is the same kind of support the Republicans have had in national campaigns. It was the same kind of vicious campaign this coalition of Republicans and bankers ran against our beloved Democratic President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"They failed. It was the same kind of unholy combination of Republicans and bankers which had sought to unseat our great President Harry S. Truman 2 years ago. They failed again, but they still keep coming back. Trying the same tricks all over again. In their candidate for Governor these Republican bankers hope yet to gain control of the Federal Government. They have attempted it twice with the same candidate, and 1952 is only 2 years off. The Republican Governor, denied ambition for the Presidency before the 1944 and the 1948 national campaigns, and here we go again.

"As for myself, I have no such ambitions. I am a candidate for Governor. My sole desire is to be a governor worthy of all the people of the State. I cannot foretell the future, but I hope to stay in Albany a long time. I shall not have a personal publicity bureau to help me to higher national office.

"But I will attend to State business and only that; it is a full-time job and you'll find me at it full time. That's what Al Smith did, that's what Roosevelt did, that's what Lehman did. And I'll be following in their footsteps.

"It is about time we had a Governor who thought of his office as a place of work for the people of the State and not as a personal steppingstone. And you are going to have such a man in me.

"They tell me that the Republican candidate is going to run his campaign on national issues, not on State issues. Is he afraid to face the questions the people are asking about 8 years of inefficiency in Albany? Is it because he cannot account for such things as the disappearance of the $700,000,000 postwar reconstruction fund, or give straightforward answers to why there aren't enough schools for our children or public housing for our veterans or hospitals for our sick? I intend to talk about these things during my campaign. The people of New York State want something done about these things that affect them so vitally.

"If this were a national campaign, national issues would have their proper place. I discussed them when I ran for Congress every 2 years. And after many years in Washington I know that our national Democratic administration under President Truman has been courageous, forceful, and progressive both in its domestic policies and in our relations with the rest of the world. The United Nations, the North Atlantic Pact, the Marshall plan, point 4, and the other programs have all been the result of our national administration's planning. And I have had a part in their enactment. President Truman needs no defense.

"The only effect of the Republicans talking about Federal issues and not State issues is to break up the present unity of Americans in our fight against world communism. It is purely politics; that can only help the enemy. Let us remain united as a Nation and confine ourselves in this State election to the issues at hand.

"The people of this State have caught on to slick slogans, 'local home rule' with mandatory education expense items is just a phrase. But that's the kind of home rule with which this administration has been saddling the people.

"The people have caught on to promises on a cash-paid Thruway in 1947, only to find no cash in 1950. If you want that road now, you'll have to get it by a bond issue plus Federal aid. The people have caught on to promises of thousands of additional beds in mental institutions only to find less than 200 more provided. The people have caught on to claims of economy and reduced budgets. They are wiser today than they were 4 years ago. They will be wiser as the campaign goes on.

"Let me tell you this: I am known well by the people of the district I represent in Congress. They know of my devotion to work and to them. They have seen me in action in that great borough of the Bronx and they know all of my accomplishments in Congress. I don't have to tell them. And before this campaign is over, I will be known as well by all the people of the State. And don't forget that. I am going to tell all the people of our State what is wrong with this Republican administration and what I am going to do about it as governor.

"I will see, and meet, and talk with the farmer, the businessman, the housewife, and the workingman from Niagara Falls to Montauk Point. They can then judge for themselves whether they want a man in Albany who believes in the things in which they believe.

"I accept the nomination with sober respect for what is expected of a candidate for governor. I am mindful of the responsibilities entailed in the office of the chief executive of this great State. I have never been awed by responsibilities. And my record attests to the fact that I have shouldered them well. I do not intend to change my ways as Governor.

"With divine guidance and your help, the people of the State will have a good Democratic administration, come the first of next year."

Land Reforms by the Republic Would Rob Communists of Their Biggest Point in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to understand why communism is embraced by people without knowing much about it. The trouble now in the Philippine Islands where a great many are flocking to communism can be explained by looking into their feudal land system. A careful examination will indicate that the land question is back of this Soviet movement. People who are landless, hungry, and destitute will follow any movement that insures them life.

Ramond R. Ravanzo, civil engineer, Republic of Philippines, explained the trouble there in the following statement recently published:

Present communistic unrest in the Philippines stems from conditions which had their beginning during the Spanish control of the islands. Large land grants were given individuals who were in the favor of the government and are still held by descendants of those people. The church also holds large areas of agricultural lands. In many instances the population of several villages and the surrounding agricultural lands are tenants of rich landowners or the church. The people were not allowed to migrate freely over the islands and are now too poor to do so. Private holdings of small landowners which were once adequate for the support of the family have been so divided by inheritance that it is no longer possible for individual landowners to make a living on their small tracts, and they must seek other employment in order to exist. Wages for common labor range from about 87 cents to $1.25 per day. Since commodities which they must buy come principally from the United States and must be purchased at prices comparable to, or higher than, our present inflated level, it is understandable under such conditions that the Communist doctrines are being accepted by some of these people.

It is apparent now that if Chiang Kai-shek had instituted land reforms in China, and not left that for the Communists to do, he would now be presiding over China instead of being chased out of the country.

Lawrenceville Tobacco Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure last week of attending the tobacco festival at Lawrenceville, in the county of Brunswick, State of Virginia. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I herewith insert an address I made on that occasion:

LAWRENCEVILLE TOBACCO FESTIVAL

It is a great privilege to be here today among my friends of Brunswick County. I am highly honored to participate in the celebration of your tobacco festival, and to share this platform with the charming and beautiful ladies from whom will be chosen the tobacco princess. You were most generous in extending me the invitation to be with you at this time.

I would like to say a few words about the part that tobacco has played in the development of south-side Virginia. It is impossible here to fully cover the complete story of tobacco in our great Commonwealth. But a few brief statements may serve to remind us of the importance of tobacco to our forefathers, and to those of us who are fortunate enough to live here today.

We are proud of the fact that tobacco was first successfully cultivated in North America at Jamestown in the year 1612. The early years of the colony had been marked by very troublous times. Disease and the failure of food crops had taken their toll. The very life of the settlement was at stake. There was no cash crop upon which the colonists could depend for export to the mother country in exchange for the manufactured products they so urgently required. It was John Rolfe who first recognized the need for a staple crop—easily grown and sold abroad. Tobacco filled that need, and virtually guaranteed the permanence of the colony that was later to become the Commonwealth of Virginia.

From the early beginnings in Virginia, tobacco production increased rapidly to meet the ever-increasing European demand. For many years it was about the only commodity that could be sold abroad to purchase manufactured articles which colonists were not able to produce themselves. In 1615, about 2,300 pounds were shipped from the colony to London. In 1622, the total was 500,000 pounds; by 1640 the total shipped from Virginia reached 1,500,000 pounds. By the end of the seventeenth century, the colonies of Virginia and Maryland together were sending about 35,000,000 pounds abroad each year, about two-thirds of which was from Virginia.

Tobacco was not only important to the export trade of Virginia during those early years, it was the medium of exchange for our domestic economy. Tobacco was money. Debts were contracted in terms of tobacco. Ministers, merchants, lawyers, physicians, all were paid for their goods and services with tobacco. According to historians, when a shipload of brides-to-be arrived in the colony in 1619, widowers and bachelors paid for their passage with tobacco. In order to marry one of these ladies, the gentleman had to redeem her with 120 pounds of leaf.

As tobacco production increased to meet the greater demand from abroad, problems some of which are similar to those we are currently confronted with beset the grower. The history of the first century of tobacco production in Virginia is replete with periods of overproduction, disastrously low prices, poor-quality production, and foreign competition. It is interesting to note in passing that the attempted solutions to these difficulties were quite similar to those we have used—much more successfully—in recent years.

In 1619, more than 300 years ago, the Virginia Assembly provided for the establishment of an inspection system designed to eliminate tobacco of poor quality from the market. Inspectors were required to burn tobacco of inferior quality. This didn't work out too well apparently, although inspection laws were on the books off and on throughout the 1600's.

High prices in the very early days resulted in a sharp increase in production. As a consequence, surpluses and low prices immediately followed. Under these circumstances production controls were resorted to, and with the help of these, and the weather, the surplus was reduced and some increases in prices were noted. This cycle was repeated a number of times. (Compare and contrast problems and solutions during the colonial period with current decade.) Some of the production controls are very interesting to look back upon. One was a limitation upon the number of plants that could be grown by a family; another upon the number of leaves that could be harvested from each plant; still another was a complete prohibition on planting during the year 1666. Along with the efforts to limit production various price-fixing measures were attempted in order to assure growers a reasonable return. History fails to record whether all these ventures were entirely successful. In any event, production and exports continued upward, and tobacco continued to be the chief article of commerce.

During the pre-Revolutionary period, tobacco was closely linked with political, fiscal, and commercial developments in England—which was then, as now, the major foreign market for tobacco exports. Tobacco growers fought vigorously the English navigation laws designed to direct all trade in tobacco to England, where merchants could and did pay less for the leaf than those in other countries; they protested the high excise taxes upon imports of leaf; the welfare of tobacco growers was closely involved with British politics. But in general, throughout the period, the British market provided Virginian tobacco growers with a virtually guaranteed outlet at fair prices.

So much for the early history of tobacco in Virginia. Much progress has been made over the past 300 years. We have come a long way from the year 1612 when John Rolfe first planted tobacco successfully, and was able to harvest a few hundred pounds. The road has been a long one—at times very difficult—but tobacco has been throughout our history one of our most important agricultural commodities, one of the mainstays of our economic life.

This year—1950—should be one of the most prosperous years in history for our tobacco farmers. (In making this statement I am fully aware of the difficulties being experienced by producers of the dark types of tobacco.) According to the latest crop report released by the United States Department of Agriculture, the farmers of Virginia have produced nearly 150,000,000 pounds of tobacco. I am including all kinds of tobacco in the figure—flue-cured, fire-cured, burley and sun-cured.

We know something about 1950 prices for flue-cured tobacco. For the belts to the south of us, prices so far this season have been averaging better than 10 percent above full parity prices. If prices hold up—and I see no reason why they shouldn't—the flue-cured tobacco growers of this State should receive about $62,000,000 from the sale of their 1950 crop. If we add probable returns to other growers—from sales of fire-cured, burley and sun-cured, the total should be in the neighborhood of $77,000,000.

This will mean one of the highest returns in history to the tobacco grower of Virginia. It will keep tobacco in its rightful position as one of Virginia's most useful and profitable crops. It will mean good incomes, not only to the tobacco farmer who labors long and hard to produce it, but also to the merchant, the doctor, the sales clerk, the school teacher, the insurance man. Good prices to the tobaco grower will help to assure jobs and good income to all of us.

Although other agricultural commodities—livestock, grain, poultry, peanuts, fruits, and vegetables—have been important crops to our farmers, tobacco still plays an outstanding role in the total economy of Virginia. In fact, in recent years, the position of tobacco as a producer of farm income has become relatively more important. Just a few figures to prove my point. During the years 1925–29 the gross value of tobacco produced in Virginia was equal to about one-fourth of the State's income from farm crops. During 1945–49 tobacco's share rose to better than one-third. When we include the value of livestock, dairy products, and poultry—all the produce of our farms—one dollar out of every six received by our farmers during 1945–49 was represented by tobacco.

Now let's look for a minute at the importance of tobacco to Lawrenceville and Brunswick County. According to published census records, in 1929 the gross value of all farm products sold in Brunswick County amounted to $2,000,000. The value of tobacco produced here was slightly less than $900,000—representing approximately 45 percent of the total cash farm income. By 1945, however, the value of tobacco grown here in this county was more than $3,000,000, or 76 percent of the county's cash receipts from the sales of farm products. It probably will account for at least as high a share this year.

Our farmers here in Brunswick County have a good crop of leaf tobacco. About 8,000,000 pounds will be marketed, and growers should realize a total of about $4,400,000. I am including both flue-cured and fire-cured. The good prices you are going to receive for your tobacco mean much to everyone in Lawrenceville and to your neighbors in other parts of the county. For when the farmer prospers we all share in that prosperity. We have come a long way from the depression years of the early thirties when tobacco was bringing 6 to 8 cents a pound. For the crop of 1932 the total value of tobacco produced in all Virginia brought farmers only a little more than the 1950 crop will bring to the farmers of this single county of Brunswick. It sounds unbelievable, but records will bear me out.

What has brought about such a change? Why will this year's crop mean so much in the way of good incomes to farmers and others of us not only in Brunswick County, but throughout the tobacco land of the South?

You farmers, through your own efforts, have been largely instrumental in bringing about this great improvement. You have cooperated with each other and with your Government in a tobacco program that assures a reasonable return for labor expended in planting, cultivating, harvesting, and marketing your crop. "Tools" have been provided for the operation of the program. The "tools," consisting of inspection, loans, and marketing quotas, are effective only when applied together. You have recognized the necessity for this interdependence. You farmers are to be congratulated for having accepted your responsible roles in the promotion and operation of the tobacco programs. These programs, perhaps, have their shortcomings. But when we think back to the 1930's we recognize that our efforts along these lines have paid big dividends.

We can readily understand, when we review the economic situation, how important tobacco is to all of the people of Virginia. It will benefit the farmers in 1950 by paying them approximately $77,000,000. The income from payrolls and salaries of the employees of the various industries that process the tobacco amounted to approximately $60,500,000 in 1949. These same industries spent almost $577,300,000 in 1949 for materials utilized and the services expended in the manufacturing process of transforming the raw tobacco into the various products that we buy at the corner store. This process yields the most valuable commodity of the entire State, for the value of the output of the tobacco-manufacturing industry in Virginia for 1949 was $637,800,000.

Thus, we can see how very important the cultivation and manufacturing of tobacco is to the economy of Virginia. It benefits the farmers by paying them about $77 million for their efforts; it serves to the advantage of the men and women who work in the factories processing the tobacco to the tune of another $60 million in the form of wages and salaries; it serves the manufacturer of the tobacco products by accounting for about $637,800,000 in sales of the output.

In addition to the above, tobacco is the largest revenue-producing commodity to the Government by way of taxes than any commodity in existence.

I am also proud of the splendid tobacco market that you have here in Lawrenceville, it being the only market to increase its sales last year over the previous year and tied for the best price average in the belt.

In closing, I wish to express my pleasure in being here with you. It has been an honor to be a subject of your beautiful tobacco princess. It has been a privilege to say a few words about tobacco, which for more than 300 years has played an important part in shaping the destiny of our Commonwealth. I hope that, in the years to come, tobacco will continue its important role in providing the good things of life for the people of Virginia.

Society of American Foresters Celebrates 50 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, in December 1950, the Society of American Foresters will celebrate 50 years of outstanding service to the American people. Forestry represents one of the greatest industries that this country has. It is one of the great natural resources that the American people possess and

the Society of American Foresters is doing much to foster the proper development and management of this great American resource.

The Seaboard Airline Railroad Co.'s industrial department prepared an article dealing with the Society of American Foresters which was published in the Forestry Bulletin No. 22. The original article dealt with the growth of the society in both the Appalachian and Southeastern sections. This article was so well received that a revision has been prepared for the Nation at large and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith insert a copy of the revised article which I know will be of great value to those of us who are interested in forestry:

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS CELEBRATES 50 YEARS OF SERVICE—GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY MEETING TO BE DECEMBER 13–16, 1950

Celebrating its golden anniversary this year, the Society of American Foresters has shown a growth in membership and influence comparable to the growth of interest and activity in the development and management of the American forest resource. The society and its growth, moreover, has been the cause of the present acceptance of the economic soundness of scientific forestry, rather than its result.

Through the society's 50 years of service to the profession, its members have been studying and developing forestry knowledge applicable to the diverse timber stands and the rapidly changing economy of this country. European forestry knowledge, although forming a background for departure by American foresters, was found inapplicable to New World conditions unless considerably altered and improved. Thus members of the society, working as officers and scientists in Federal, State, or private employ, pioneered new methods of forest fire prevention and control, new methods of handling timber stands for maximum productivity of timber, and the management of related resources such as wildlife, soil and water, and recreational opportunities.

Today their knowledge and methods are being put to work by both public and private landowners. But still the search for new knowledge and better methods goes on, attempting to keep pace with the economic and social demands which bring increasing pressure against the forest resource.

During the first quarter of this century professional forestry expanded from near nonexistence to the point in 1925 when over 1,000 foresters were members of the Society. The second quarter-century saw a sixfold increase as total society membership reached 6,800 on August 1, 1950. The most phenomenal growth has been during the past 15 years, however, when membership in the professional forestry organization more than doubled. Significantly, this growth is closely related to the increased adoption of good forestry programs by owners of forest lands.

Membership in the society is made up of citizens of the United States and Canada and is restricted to persons who are professionally trained in forestry, those who have forestry experience equivalent to professional training, and those in related fields who have made outstanding contributions to forestry.

As a professional group, the society establishes and maintains the standards of forestry, provides a medium of exchange of professional thought, and promotes the science and practice of forestry. The members of the society's 21 regional sections, with their 60 chapters, meet periodically in those interests. Likewise, the society holds an annual meeting which is attended by members from all parts of the United States and Canada. The golden anniversary meeting of the Society of American Foresters will be held in Washington, D. C., on December 13 to 16, 1950.

The Journal of Forestry, official publication of the society, is the only professional publication in this country devoted entirely to the science and application of forestry. As such, it provides each month accurate information on new developments in all phases of forestry, and is widely used, not only by foresters, but by students and land managers.

As a means of promoting and developing the highest type of professional training for foresters, the society regularly examines the schools giving courses leading to a degree in forestry and has established an accrediting system. Schools accredited by the society are considered as having been given a stamp of professional approval.

Because of the many fields of American life to which the professional forester has been able to make contributions, there exists among foresters, as among other professional people, areas of specialization. For this reason, the society has found it desirable to establish subject-matter divisions in addition to its 21 regional sections. These divisions, which include education, silviculture, forest products, public relations, private forestry, forest economics, forest recreation, range management, forest-wildlife management, and watershed management, serve to bring together for exchange of knowledge the various specialists among foresters themselves. Through the formation of the divisions, the society has been able to increase the development and dissemination of forestry knowledge and methods.

Much of the work toward the objectives of the society is accomplished by a number of standing committees, including committees on civil service, forestry terminology, tree nomenclature, community forests, policies and objectives, international relations, ethics, and grade standardization of forest planting stock. In addition, representatives of the society serve for the society on various national and regional committees with other scientific organizations.

The impact of the work of the society is felt, although not always recognized, throughout the country, indeed, throughout the world. Although the society has its headquarters in the Mills Building, Washington, D. C., its leadership stems from every State in the country. Elected officers include a president and council of 10 outstanding foresters chosen by the membership at large, in addition to the elected officers of the 21 regional sections and 10 subject-matter divisions. Members of the society can be given considerable credit for the sound economic principles of forest management which are contributing in an increasing degree to the public welfare. You will meet the society member not only in the woods, but at the luncheon club, the civic association, the church, and the school; and if at that moment he happens not to be wearing the society's emblem pin, you'll be able to recognize him anyway by his sincere enthusiasm for the accomplishments of forestry and the possibilities for still greater accomplishments in the future.

Who Did Make American Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, on a previous occasion a little more than 3 months ago I directed attention to the column entitled "Pertinent Comment," which is written by Mr. Frank Saylor, editor of the Labor Herald. This outstanding labor newspaper is published weekly in Wilmington, Del.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, I said that Editor Saylor "expresses his views with thoroughgoing honesty, independence, and patriotism," and that "his incisive appraisals of matters of public interest are thought-provoking and merit the earnest attention and consideration of all of us."

I now reiterate those statements about Mr. Saylor and the Labor Herald, and as a further substantiation of those remarks I include in this statement a portion of Mr. Saylor's "Pertinent Comment" column from the issue of September 9, 1950. This column, you will note, deals with the refusal of American stevedores to unload a shipment of canned Russian crab meat brought in aboard a British liner and the President's criticism of the stevedores for their action.

Mr. Saylor's column follows, and I urge again that it be read most carefully:

PERTINENT COMMENT ON MATTERS OF LOCAL AND NATIONAL INTEREST

(By Frank Saylor)

When President Truman, critical of the refusal of New York longshoremen to unload 80 tons of canned Russian crab meat brought in by a British liner, declared that American foreign policy was not made by the stevedores, the stevedores came right back with the question of who did make American foreign policy?

The question, we believe, is quite pertinent. Who does make foreign policy? Who decides, after expensive backing of Nationalist China, to withdraw and leave it as a clear field for ruthless Red expansion? Who would have surrendered Korea and minimized the importance of Formosa in the military scheme of things? We dislike to bring the thought in again but how about Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam? Did the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate or Congress have anything to do with these commitments of the gravest import, or, for that matter, with what happened and now goes on afterward?

It is established union policy not to handle struck work or nonunion materials. From time immemorial union members have acted in accord with that policy without interference from the Government. It has long been common knowledge that Russian slave labor has been processing crab meat and furs which the Soviet Union barters with England in a trade deal. Despite this foreknowledge nothing was done about preventing the entrance of slave-produced crab meat into this country. That waited upon the direct action of the longshoremen.

The charges of slave labor within the Soviet domain, made time and again by representatives of organized labor, have never been denied, not to mention refuted. The charges therefore are tacitly admitted.

If the Government does not step in when unionists refuse to handle struck work why should they cavil at the refusal of the New York stevedores to handle the product of real slave labor?

In the 1930 Tariff Act it is provided that: "All goods, wares, articles, and other merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor or/and forced labor or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation

thereof is hereby prohibited." Doesn't that mean anything?

There is local and sectional interest in the attempt to import Red crab meat into the salty waters of the blue-clawed crab, the Delaware and Chesapeake bays.

Red crab meat has been coming into, of all places, Baltimore, where every day during the season is a crab feast, but we doubt whether the natives will go for it unless it is in a crab cake or salad. Lovers of crab meat who go for them steamed and enjoy the cleaning, won't do any trafficking with the Reds.

One shipment was landed several weeks ago, but after that a second cargo of 2,000 cases was not unloaded and went back to Britain. Again stevedores determined foreign policy.

We do not doubt that once unloaded there would be a market for the slave-produced crab meat, especially if it were to be priced accordingly. Locally crab meat costs over a dollar a pound and if it could be had for less, there would be plenty of buyers.

It is unfortunate that conditions are strained by the iron curtain between Russia and the world, that we and they cannot live in peaceful accord, the free labor of Russia producing crabs and furs in exchange for the product of the free labor of America. The Soviet ruling classes have decided this is not to be and the stevedores are answering them in the only language they will listen to.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter of imports from Russia, I want to state again, as I have on other occasions, that our policy of foreign trade with Russia and satellite nations needs a complete review and realistic action. In addition, our present policy of shipments to Russia and other iron-curtain nations and recipients of ECA funds also needs immediate clarification and revision.

We all know now that within the past few months a substantial amount of molybdenum, which is used for hardening steel, was shipped from the United States to Great Britain under a Department of Commerce license and then immediately transshipped to Russia. Why, Mr. Speaker, was this permitted, and what assurance do we have that it will not reoccur?

In testimony submitted only last week to a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it was stated that western European nations who are now receiving economic and military aid from the United States shipped more than $1,000,000,000 worth of goods to Russia and her satellites last year. This included in excess of $100,000,000 in war goods, such as machine tools, ball bearings, barbed wire, and brass, which were sent to Russia and her satellites from Great Britain. This testimony also stated that shipments to iron-curtain nations last year from Belgium, France, and Luxembourg included various metals, railway rolling stock, chemical products, explosives, and rubber. Again the questions are, Why is this permitted, and what steps are being taken to prevent a continuation of this policy?

Referring again to our own country, we find, for example, that Communist China received $50,000,000 through exports to this country in only the first 5 months of this year. Furthermore, during the first quarter of this year the United States continued to ship to Red China such war potentials as petroleum products, steel, and electrical machinery. Mr. Speaker, the American people want to know why.

In view of the foregoing, it appears that when the President criticized the stevedores and declared that they do not make American foreign policy, the stevedores were speaking not only for themselves but for the American people at large when they came back with the question, "Who did make American foreign policy?"

What Made America Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Walter L. Hays, president of the American Fire & Casualty Co., and president of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, at the commencement exercises of John B. Stetson University, Deland, Fla., on August 18, 1950:

WHAT MADE AMERICA GREAT

President Edmunds, distinguished guests, candidates, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a privilege to be with you and I want to congratulate you on having Ollie Edmunds as your president. He is one of the best-loved men in Florida. It is good to see businessmen become leaders in education; it is good to have business ideas and educational theories intermingled.

This is an era of security. Security can be something desirable—and can be something harmful. The way I am thinking now, so-called security is doing this Nation damage; damage which may never be completely repaired, and security (this alleged security) is giving us as individuals a great setback.

The dictators of all time promised security. The dictators of our time—Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler—promised security in return for support. What the people received was slavery and imprisonment.

Three hundred thirty years ago, the Pilgrims landed on this continent seeking freedom, seeking opportunities. Since the birth of the United States of America in 1776 to 1933, this country skyrocketed in industry, in education—in every kind of development. No other country has ever equaled this record. Our foundation was based on competition, on free enterprise, on opportunities, and not security. The people had the opportunity to provide their own security.

Beginning with the Roosevelt administration, people in this country, like those of other countries in the past, were promised security, and this trend is still being carried on. For this alleged security we have given up a certain amount of freedom, and there has been a lessening of opportunities.

This scheme of security offered by the Government goes so far as to give a certain amount of "security from competition," which is contrary to the principles which made this country different and made this country great. This security from competition is brought about by Government and bureaucratic regulations.

If, in the past, we had had our present-day Government, as it operates today, there would be no General Electric, General Motors, Standard Oil, or any of the many great concerns which mean so much to our daily lives. We would not be able to buy an electric refrigerator for a modest figure. Instead, we would probably be like the people in many other countries today—no refrigeration. If we had any at all, it would probably still be the old-fashioned ice box. There would be no opportunity to buy a radio for $25 or $30. If the great oil companies had not been developed in the past, you would not be able to drive a car today unless you were a millionaire.

The first thing which made cars possible was the development of the great oil companies, making gas obtainable at a reasonable price. Gas is still a problem in countries which do not produce oil. The big motor companies have automobiles on a production basis where we have the finest piece of machinery possible within the reach of a great part of our population.

None of these concerns could start out the way they found it necessary to start and develop under present-day Government. If we had had today's Government from the beginning, we would have none of the luxuries which we enjoy today, unless we paid a price many times the present cost. You might say that these firms are making lots of money. This may be true, but new ones are not starting. Those which tried under present-day regulations have fallen by the wayside.

In 1916 I had a 1910 two-lunger Maxwell. No top, no windshield, no self-starter. With a good tail wind I could get up to 25 miles an hour. If there had been no competition in the automobile business, probably we would still be driving a car similar to this and be paying around $3,000 for it.

There is much being said about security these days. There is not enough being said about opportunity. There is too much stress being placed on security by the heads of our Government. They are offering an alleged security with our own money—and depriving us of freedom and opportunity.

This country wasn't built on security. It was built on opportunity—and our progress in the future, if we make progress, will be on our opportunities. If we accept security we will stagnate and deteriorate.

In a recent speech, General Eisenhower decried and ridiculed the idea that the most important thing in life is security. He aptly emphasized that prisons provide absolute security: food, shelter, clothes.

We may become modern, but if we consider free enterprise and competition old fashioned and toss them aside, we are tearing out the very foundation of this Nation.

In our educational program, we should emphasize the advantage of the development of free enterprise—of the American way of life as we once knew it—not the one we are drifting toward. We should take business out of Federal, State, and local Government. As I have said before, our great industries were built on free enterprise and free competition—and that is what makes this country the greatest country of the world in which to live. Our free-enterprise system is one of the main things which helped us to win the last war, because we outproduced our enemies. The Government depended on industries developed by free enterprise. Our scientific advancement—the airplane, medicine, and many others—has been made possible not by Government but by free enterprise. Even the making of the atomic bomb was actually done by free enterprise, private firms.

Universities haven't placed enough importance on this part of our educational program. I would like to see Stetson University develop a free-enterprise department; to

make a research and get all the material possible—that those who graduate from this university might have a true picture as to what made America great.

To cure our present situation, we must get back to individuals; those individuals who want something for nothing. There seems to be a weakness with many to become dependent after they have been given help. We should come to the realization that the people support the Government and not the Government the people.

Abraham Lincoln said, "You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

A serious mistake is made by parents spoiling their children by doing for them what they should do for themselves. It develops lack of confidence, shiftlessness, and makes weaklings.

There are those who look to the Government for a living—depending on the Government "hand-out" or "give-away" programs of one kind or another. Many have been spoiled by the Government the past few years. They have been made dilatory; no aim or purpose in life other than "getting something for nothing."

No one, not even the Government, can give "hand-outs" forever. The only thing we will ever have that is worth while is what we get for ourselves. With this goes self-respect.

The best way to hurt someone and spoil his life and happiness is to give him "something for nothing." Those who have to battle and work hard for what they get are more progressive, alert, get more out of life, and are happier than any other group.

Last year, some wild mallards showed good judgment by not going back north with the flock, but remained on the little lake in Orlando in front of my home. They raised some young ducks and were happy families. They worked hard all day, from daylight to dark, fishing and foraging for their food. They were peaceful and happy. But my bright idea was their undoing. I got the idea of feeding them some grain. Now, they work not—they sleep all day under a tree. They wake up fighting—always disgruntled—"too much time on their hands." Gone are the happy days of foraging for their food. Instead, at 5: 30 p. m. they are on the lakefront in front of my home. If I am 5 minutes late, there is a terrific squawking. The complaining is such that it disturbs the whole neighborhood. If I don't rush out immediately with the grain, they indignantly come across the street, despite the traffic, and up the stairs to my door.

Someone has said, "An honest name for 'welfare state' would be the 'farewell state.' " The welfare state is not for Americans. Government cannot give anything to anybody, unless it first takes away something from somebody else. If we look to the Government to fill all our wants, we cannot have freedom of action.

We must remember that the power to regulate is the power to destroy. When we accept a dole, subsidy, or any kind of a handout, we lessen our freedom, we strengthen central control, whether it be Federal or State. Every time we accept something, we give up something. The pendulum of our Nation is swinging to the left. We are swinging toward socialism, away from free enterprise and free competition.

The famous words which made a college famous were the simple words by Daniel Webster, speaking of Dartmouth. He said: "It is, sir, as I have said, a small college. And yet there are those who love it."

It seems only fitting that I speak to you at Stetson University on the subject of free enterprise, because you are a free-enterprise university, not subsidized by the Government—Federal or State. You are free enterprise itself. Thank God for the small college, for a college small enough that the student doesn't lose his identity and where he receives individual attention in his classroom. Today many colleges are becoming too large, too cumbersome, for students to receive all that to which they are entitled. You have a marvelous record. You have been an influence for good here in the South. Your footprints are forever in the sands of Florida. There are those who love Stetson.

The president of a Florida college, returning from a visit to Europe, said: "We are losing the cold war in Europe. The people of Europe have no will to fight because they have lost all hope of ever having free or fair lives for themselves and their children."

People must have hope for freedom and justice—hope for opportunities for themselves and their children—if they are to have the will to fight.

It is our hope that through the educational halls of this country we will be able to emphasize to the students of today and tomorrow the importance of carrying on our form of government, preserving our freedoms, and continuing our system of free economy. Our hopes for the future lie with those who will carry on our responsibilities.

When Paul was saved from a Jewish mob and stood before a Roman captain to be examined by scourging, not for any offense but on the theory that anyone attacked by a mob must be guilty of something, he saved himself by declaring his Roman citizenship. The astonished and unconvinced captain asked, "Art thou a Roman? With a great sum obtained I this freedom." The captain said he paid a great sum of money for his freedom. Paul answered dryly, "But I was born free."

We, too, were born free. Thanks to God, and thanks to all the brave men who have paid a great price, who have given us that inheritance, and all who have fought and died to preserve it.

We are free, and heir and joint owner of the greatest nation ever built on this earth. We are the most favored and most fortunate people the world has ever seen. But American citizenship is not all privileges. We have a responsibility too. Our responsibility is as coruler of this Nation—to make ourselves worthy of being Americans.

Status of Government Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The record of the Eighty-first Congress in the field of Government reorganization, while not as good as it should be, nevertheless is little short of monumental.

What has been done is far ahead of the achievements in this area of any previous Congress.

As much as one-half of the program as proposed in 1949 in the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the Hoover Commission—has now been made effective through reorganization plans, new legislation, or administrative action.

What this means is that almost as much remains to be done as was accomplished during the 1949 and 1950 sessions, forming the work of the Eighty-first Congress. On the assumption that the parts of the program encountering the fewest difficulties have been disposed of, the toughest problems lie ahead. The unremitting efforts of Members of the Congress and of citizens and groups interested in the accomplishment of the goals of the Hoover Commission will be needed.

THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE

The persistent activities of the Citizens Committee for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, or as abbreviated, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, have been of incalculable value during the last two sessions.

Continuance of the work of this committee on an intensified basis is essential if the Eighty-second Congress is to make a record in Government reorganization matching that of the Eighty-first.

Interest in the reorganization program may lag unless the public is kept informed of progress and means are provided for channeling expressions of sentiment to Members of Congress.

HOOVER COMMISSION BACKGROUND

Public Law 162 of the Eightieth Congress, which created the Hoover Commission, was enacted on July 7, 1947. The Commission's 12 members, equally divided between the two parties and representing appointments by the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House from the legislative and executive branches of the Government and from civil life, worked on the problem of reorganization for almost 2 years. The life of the Commission expired in the spring of 1949.

The Commission submitted to the Congress in the early months of the 1949 session 19 reports, together with numerous supporting task-force reports and related documents.

Partisanship has been notably absent in the consideration of recommendations of the Hoover Commission in Congress as it had been in the deliberations of the Commission itself. Factors other than partisan have accounted for controversies on some of the features of the program.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

The most impressive part of the accomplishments in the reorganization program has been the initiation of changes by the President, and consideration of his proposals by the Congress under the procedure offered by the Reorganization Act of 1949, Public Law 109 of the Eighty-first Congress, enacted June 20, 1949.

Under this key measure, the President, until April 1953, may submit plans for shifting agencies or functions, abolishing unnecessary functions, improving administration, and eliminating overlapping and duplication. The plans are referred to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the respective branches of Congress. Unless disapproved by a majority of the total membership of either House, a plan becomes effective 60 days after submission, or upon such later date as may be specified.

Seven reorganization plans were submitted at the first session of the Eighty-first Congress in 1949, not counting an eighth plan relating to the Military Establishment which was withdrawn after

legislation covering it was enacted. Of the seven, only one was rejected.

Twenty-seven plans were submitted at the second session in 1950, seven of which were rejected.

Thus, out of 34 plans in the two sessions, 26 became effective. Of the eight rejected, only four had been certified by the Citizens Committee as in conformance with the Hoover Commission program.

The seven plans in 1949 proposed a new Department of Welfare and reorganizations in the Labor and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, the Civil Service Commission, the Maritime Commission, and the Public Roads Administration.

The only plan rejected was No. 1 which proposed the creation of a new Department of Welfare.

Of the 27 plans submitted during the 1950 session, the first 6 provided for clearer lines of responsibility and authority in the Departments of the Treasury, Justice, Interior, Commerce, and Labor; the next 7 for a strengthening of the internal organization in seven regulatory commissions, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the National Labors Relations Board, and the Civil Aeronautics Board; the next eight for changes in labor standards enforcement, transfers of functions to and from the General Services Administration, transfers of certain functions from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor, and establishment of a Maritime Board and a Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce and abolishment of the Maritime Commission; and the final six for transfers of certain functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the placing of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the Department of Commerce, the creation of a new Department of Health, Education, and Security, the transfer of functions of the National Security Resources Board to the chairman of the Board, and the strengthening of powers of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The seven which were rejected in the 1950 session were No. 1 for the transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury of powers of subordinate officials, including the Comptroller of the Currency; No. 4 for a strengthening of the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture; Nos. 7, 11 and 12 for a strengthening of the powers of the Chairmen of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the National Labor Relations Board, respectively; No. 24 for the transfer of the independent Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Department of Commerce; and No. 27 for the creation of a new Department of Health, Education, and Security.

The Senate was responsible for the rejection of plan No. 1 in 1949, and plans Nos. 1, 4, 7, 11, 12, and 14 in 1950. The only plan rejected by the House of Representatives was No. 27 of 1950, creating new Department of Health, Education, and Security.

The four plans clearly conforming to recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which were rejected, were the first Treasury plan and those relating to the Department of Agriculture, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission.

NEW LEGISLATION

More than a dozen new laws embodying recommendations of the Hoover Commission were enacted during the two sessions.

Besides the Reorganization Act of 1949, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress enacted as one of its outstanding achievements the Military Unification Act, which contained amendments to the National Security Act of 1947 to strengthen the authority of the Secretary of Defense and provide for a performance type budget and other fiscal provisions recommended by the Hoover Commission. This was Public Law 216, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 10, 1949.

A separate measure, Public Law 36, approved April 2, 1949, created a Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Another notable enactment of the first session was the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, creating a General Services Administration, which has brought together such housekeeping functions as those relating to supplies, public buildings, and records. This was Public Law 152, approved June 30, 1949.

A highly significant law of the first session was Public Law 73, approved May 26, 1949, strengthening the powers of the Secretary of State, and providing for reorganization of the Department of State in keeping with principles put forward by the Hoover Commission.

Two measures in harmony with Hoover Commission recommendations on personnel management were Public Law 359, approved October 15, 1949, increasing salaries of higher officials, and Public Law 429, approved October 28, 1949, revising the Civil Service Classification Act.

A further enactment of the first session in keeping with the program of the Hoover Commission was Public Law 231, approved October 16, 1949, providing a long-range program for improvement in methods, procedures, equipment, and supplies in the Post Office Department.

The record of the second session will show the enactment of at least five laws based on recommendations of the Hoover Commission, including some highly important measures.

The first to be enacted was Public Law 507, approved May 10, 1950, authorizing establishment of a National Science Foundation.

The next was Public Law 673, approved August 8, 1950, authorizing the President to delegate certain functions, including the signing of documents. This should be an important timesaver for the President.

The Post Office Department Financial Control Act, Public Law 712, approved August 17, 1950, will make possible abolishment of antiquated accounting procedures and adoption of reforms advocated by the Hoover Commission.

Accounting reforms in other parts of the Government service and budgetary methods recommended by the Hoover Commission are provided by the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act. This measure, Public Law 784, was approved September 12, 1950.

Improved records management under the General Services Administration, along lines recommended by the Hoover Commission, is provided by amendments to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. This measure, Public Law 754, was approved September 5, 1950.

Two or three other Hoover Commission measures, which are pending in Congress, may reach the statute books during the closing days of the session.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS UNDER HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS

REPORT NO. 1—GENERAL MANAGEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

In this report the Hoover Commission dealt with reorganization powers proposed for the President, and also with the essentials of effective organization of the executive branch. The Commission reiterated recommendations previously made in a letter to Congress for the granting of authority to the President to submit reorganization plans. In the second part of the report the Commission urged creation of a more orderly grouping of the functions of Government into major departments and agencies under the President, establishment of a clear line of control from the President to these departments and agency heads and from them to their subordinates, stronger staff services for the President and department heads, and other steps to promote effective, responsible, and economical management.

Enactment of the Reorganization Act of 1949, Public Law 109, approved June 20, 1949, carried out the Commission's recommendation for the granting of reorganization powers to the President.

Public Law 673, approved August 8, 1950, authorizing the President to delegate certain functions, was not a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission but is in harmony with its recommendations for more effective organization.

H. R. 2613 and S. 942, designated as the General Executive Management Act, was drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission. It provided general authority to implement all recommendations in the report on general management of the executive branch. The bill became obsolete by reason of provisions in various reorganization plans and other measures.

The Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense were vested with clear authority and responsibility for the organization and conduct of their departments in Public Laws 73 and 216 enacted in 1949. Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949, and Plans Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, and 26 of 1950 extended this principle to the Post Office, Justice, Interior, Commerce, Labor, and Treasury Departments, respectively. The laws and plans have provided for additional staff assistance.

Reorganization Plans Nos. 5 and 6 of 1949 and Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 13 of 1950, extended the principle of top management responsibility to the Civil Service Commission, the Maritime Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively.

Better staff assistance for the President was provided in Reorganization Plans Nos. 4 of 1949 and 25 of 1950, relating to the National Security Resources Board.

One of the tasks of the next session will be to determine what new legislation or reorganization plans are needed to complete action on recommendations relating to general management.

Progress has been made toward adoption of Hoover Commission recommendations by administrative action. The Administrative Management Division of the Bureau of the Budget is furthering the cooperation of all departments and agencies in improvement of management. An Advisory Committee on Management Improvement, appointed by the President, also is active in this field.

REPORT NO. 2—PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

The Hoover Commission proposed a far-reaching revision in structure and methods of personnel management in order "to build a career service which will select the best of our citizens on merit, free of political influence, with incentives in the form of genuine opportunities for promotion in the service, and which will eliminate the unnecessary and inefficient employees."

Enactment of Public Law 359, approved October 15, 1949, increasing salaries of higher officials, and Public Law 429, approved October 28, 1949, revising the Civil Service Classification Act, was in line with recommendations of the Commission.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949, strengthening the authority of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission with respect to administrative responsibilities, was in harmony with a Hoover Commission recommendation.

Hearings were held during the early months of the 1950 session by both the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the corresponding Senate committee on a bill—H. R. 5181 and S. 2111—drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission. This measure, incorporating recommendations of the Commission for decentralizing functions relating to recruitment, examination, and certification of personnel, encountered opposition and was replaced by a measure sponsored by the administration—H. R. 8925 and S. 3830.

As introduced, the substitute bill did not meet with the approval of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. After a number of amendments had been made by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, H. R. 8925 was endorsed by the Citizens Committee as representing a marked advance toward recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

H. R. 8925 has been on the House Calendar for a number of weeks. Opponents thus far have succeeded in preventing action. S. 3830 has been considered by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which as yet has taken no action.

The personnel recruitment bill will be reintroduced in the next session, probably in a form more completely conforming to Hoover Commission recommendations. Enactment of adequate personnel legislation will offer a major opportunity for those interested in adoption of the Hoover Commission program.

A personnel bill of lesser importance, in general conformance with a Hoover Commission recommendation, H. R. 7824, has been passed by both Houses and awaits final action. This measure provides a new performance rating system.

Progress has been made toward adoption of some of the personnel recommendations of the Hoover Commission within the scope of administrative action.

REPORT NO. 3—OFFICE OF GENERAL SERVICES (SUPPLY ACTIVITIES)

The Hoover Commission regarded as of fundamental importance its recommendations for reorganization of the Government's housekeeping services, including those relating to the purchase, utilization, storage, and disposal of supplies and other property, the keeping of official records, and the management of public buildings.

Enactment of Public Law 152, approved June 30, 1949, creating a General Services Administration, is one of the major accomplishments in the Hoover Commission program.

In the second session of the Eighty-first Congress there have been a number of proposals in legislation and reorganization plans to perfect the mechanism established under the General Services Administration.

Public Law 754, providing for a more effective preservation, management, and disposal of Government records, was approved by the President on September 5, 1950.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1949, and plans Nos. 15, 16, 17, 18, and 20 of 1950, all had to do with the General Services Administration, plans No. 7 of 1949 and Nos. 15, 16, and 17 of 1950 removing certain activities not properly belonging to this agency, and plans Nos. 18 and 20 of 1950 shifting to it functions appropriate to its statutory responsibilities.

H. R. 7429 and H. R. 7430 to clarify General Services Administration responsibilities for central management of Government traffic have been under consideration by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT NO 4—THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Hoover Commission, in its report on the Post Office Department, made nine recommendations, substantial parts of which have been carried out.

The first recommendation was that the Postmaster General should continue to be a Cabinet officer appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, but should not be an official of a political party, such as the chairman of a national committee. The present Postmaster General is a career official conforming to these specifications.

The second, third, and fourth recommendations related to the organizational structure of the Department. These recommendations were carried out in part by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949. Parts of the recommendations were objected to by the Postmaster General.

The fifth recommendation was that the confirmation of postmasters by the Senate be abolished with a view to elimination of partisan considerations from the postal service. H. R. 5643 to carry out this recommendation has not been acted upon by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. A companion bill, S. 2213, was killed by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by the device of indefinite postponement.

The sixth recommendation related to reorganization of budgeting, accounting, and auditing procedures. This has been carried out in substantial part in Public Law 712, approved August 17, 1950, the Post Office Department Financial Control Act.

The seventh recommendation had to do with a revision or repeal of restrictive laws and regulations, which have hampered the operation of the Post Office Department on a business-like basis. To a limited extent, this recommendation has been carried out in Public Law 712. Public Law 231, approved October 16, 1949, for a long-range program for improvement in methods, procedures, equipment, and supplies, also looks in this direction.

The eighth recommendation was that the Congress authorize and instruct the Postmaster General to fix rates for registered mail, insured mail, money orders, postal notes, special delivery, and collect-on-delivery mail which would make each of these services self-supporting. Authority of this nature is provided in a section of H. R. 2945 for a general increase in postal rates, which has been passed by the House and is before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The ninth recommendation was for a separation of subsidies from air mail compensation. Extensive hearings on this issue were held during the present session before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has approved H. R. 9184 to carry out the Hoover Commission recommendation.

As matters now stand, the principal recommendations of the Commission for which legislative proposals must be reintroduced and pressed in the next session are those for elimination of politics in the appointment of postmasters, for authority to fix rates for special services, and for a separation of subsidies from air mail compensation.

Some of the other recommendations which have been carried out only in part will require reconsideration.

REPORT NO. 5—FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Hoover Commission's recommendations for statutory authority to reorganize the Department of State on a more efficient basis were carried out in Public Law 73, approved May 26, 1949.

This law vested authority for the conduct of foreign affairs, previously held by subordinates, in the Secretary of State. Under this authority, the Secre-

tary of State was able to commence a thorough-going reorganization in keeping with principles advocated by the Hoover Commission. The law made provision for an Under Secretary and 10 Assistant Secretaries of State.

Full implementation of the law is a matter for administrative action within the Department.

REPORT NO. 6—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Hoover Commission held that the Department of Agriculture is urgently in need of reorganization. The Commission recommended an extension of the functional organization of the Department and a better grouping of activities related to the same major purpose. It proposed a thorough overhaul of the organization of the Department at State, county and farmer levels.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950 was rejected by the Senate. This plan would have strengthened the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with Hoover Commission principles. It omitted, however, many of the specific proposals of the Hoover Commission.

A bill drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission (H. R. 5179 and S. 2055), and embracing most of its recommendations, was introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture in the respective Houses. This measure, which received no serious consideration, will require revision before introduction in the new Congress.

The Department of Agriculture is the only Cabinet Department in which basic organizational principles of the Hoover Commission have not been established either by legislation or reorganization plan.

Special attention to the problems of this Department will be needed in the new session.

REPORT NO. 7—BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

Recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to budgeting and accounting were of special significance. The Commission asserted that the budget and appropriation process is the heart of the management and control of the executive branch and that there is great need for reform in this field. The conduct of the accounting system of the Government, the Commission said, affects all other administrative problems. Complicated checks and balances in present accounting practices, the Commission asserted, make for unnecessary inefficiency in every activity. Improvement of the accounting system was urged as one of the very first steps toward economy in governmental operations.

The new Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, Public Law 784, approved September 12, 1950, goes a considerable distance toward the goals of the Hoover Commission, although not in all respects in accord with its specific recommendations.

H. R. 9038, which became Public Law 784, was a substitute for H. R. 5823 and S. 2054, drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission. The substitute measure evolved from hearings and conferences of members of the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the two Houses with financial officials of the Government.

The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act omits a basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission for the shifting of primary responsibility for accounting procedures from the Comptroller General, an agent of the legislative branch, to a new Accountant General of the Treasury Department in the executive branch. The powers given to the Comptroller General, while at variance with the shifting of authority proposed by the Hoover Commission, would center responsibility for accounting to an extent that is lacking at present. These powers are such as to make possible the implementation of accounting reforms developed in the Hoover Commission report and in the present joint voluntary program of the Comptroller General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Budget.

The budget provisions of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act are in complete conformance with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Statutory direction is provided for a performance type budget, based upon functions, activities, and projects.

REPORT NO. 8—NATIONAL SECURITY ORGANIZATION

The Hoover Commission said that while gains had been achieved under the National Security Act of 1947, there was continued disharmony and lack of unified planning, interservice rivalries, and lack of close working relationships among important elements in the Military Establishment. The Commission pointed to serious organizational defects, the lack of central authority in the direction of the Military Establishment, a rigid statutory structure established under the 1947 law, and divided responsibility. These had resulted, the Commission said, in a failure to assert clear civilian control over the Armed Forces.

Unification of the three military services in substantial conformance with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission was accomplished under Public Law 216, approved August 10, 1949. Enactment of this law, embracing amendments to the National Security Act of 1947, has been one of the major achievements in the Hoover Commission program. The speedy mobilization under very difficult circumstances to meet the Korean crisis testifies to the value of the 1949 law.

Public Law 36, approved April 2, 1949, creating a Deputy Secretary of Defense, also was based on a Hoover Commission recommendation.

Reorganization Plans No. 4 of 1949 and No. 25 of 1950 relating to the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board were in the direction of a better defense organization.

Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1949 relating to the Military Establishment was withdrawn after enactment of Public Law 216.

Among minor bills in harmony with recommendations of the Hoover Commission under consideration during the 1950 session is S. 1740 for interservice transfer of commissioned personnel of the armed services.

Additional legislation will be required in the next session for the more complete implementation of the Hoover Commission report. In the meantime the fullest success under the present unified structure of the defense establishment requires wise administrative policies.

REPORT NO. 9—VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Hoover Commission recommended a reorganization of the Veterans' Administration in accordance with principles in its report on general management. Much of this reorganization can be accomplished by administrative action. No bills or reorganization plans have been presented.

One measure which was pending during the present session would create a Veterans' Insurance Corporation as recommended by the Hoover Commission. Bills drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission on this subject (H. R. 5171, H. R. 5288, and S. 2019) were not acted upon either by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs or the Senate Finance Committee. Further consideration of the proposal will be desirable in the next session.

REPORT NO. 10—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Hoover Commission proposed a grouping of all major nonregulatory transportation activities of the Government in the Department of Commerce as a major feature of a general reorganization.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1949 transferred the Public Roads Administration to the Department from the General Services Administration. Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950 abolished the Maritime Commission and created a Federal Maritime Board and a Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce. The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report approved the placing of a regulatory agency, the Maritime Administration, in the Department because of close relationship between that agency and the Maritime Board.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1950 strengthened the authority of the Secretary of Commerce in a manner similar to plans applying to several other departments.

A bill drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission (H. R. 5180 and S. 2056) was considered obsolete by reason of Reorganization Plan No. 5.

Some remaining recommendations of the Commission are likely to be embodied in new legislation in the next session.

REPORT NO. 11—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The Hoover Commission said that the enormous expansion and far-reaching implications of Government finance made it imperative that the Treasury Department be thoroughly reorganized. Transfers to and from the Department were proposed in order that it might again be made the real fiscal center of the Government.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, strengthening the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, was rejected by the Senate because of objections to the inclusion of the Comptroller of the Currency among officials whose statutory powers were absorbed.

Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950, which excluded the Comptroller of the Currency, subsequently became effective.

The reorganization plan made obsolete a bill drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission (H. R. 5174 and S. 2058).

A bill for Federal bonding of employees (H. R. 8706) as recommended by the Hoover Commission was passed by the House in July 1950 and has been under consideration by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Recommendations of the Commission for transfers of agencies to and from the Treasury Department remain to be acted upon either through legislation or reorganization plans.

REPORT NO. 12—REGULATORY COMMISSION

The Hoover Commission made general recommendations applicable to nine regulatory agencies. These included the placing of all administrative responsibility in the chairman of each commission, improvement in administrative procedures, shifting of executive functions to departments, and bipartisan representation.

Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1949 strengthened the administrative authority of the Chairman of the Maritime Commission in accordance with the Hoover Commission recommendation. Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950 abolished the Maritime Commission and created in place of it a Federal Maritime Board and a Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce.

Reorganization Plans Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 13 of 1950 strengthened the administrative authority of the Chairmen of the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively.

Reorganization Plans Nos. 7 and 11 of 1950, which would have strengthened the powers of the Chairmen of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Communications Commission, were rejected by the Senate.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950, relating to the National Labor Relations Board, which raised issues outside the question of effective organization and therefore was not regarded as part of the Hoover Commission program, was rejected by the Senate.

Several bills applying general recommendations of the Hoover Commission to specific regulatory commissions were introduced in the two Houses, some of them being drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission. These bills were tabled in committee as a result of action on reorganization plans.

Further consideration of Hoover Commission recommendations, especially as applied to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Committee, and the National Labor Relations Board, will be desirable in the next session.

REPORT NO. 13—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Besides recommending a reorganization of the Department of Labor of the same nature as proposed for other departments as a means of improving administration and fixing responsibility, the Hoover Commission favored a return to the department of agencies shifted elsewhere in previous years. This proposal was intended as a means of restoring to the Department its former significance in the field of labor and thereby making for greater efficiency in the Government.

Recommendations of the Commission for thus strengthening the Department of Labor were carried out in Reorganization Plans Nos. 2 of 1949 and 6, 14, and 19 of 1950.

Plan No. 2 of 1949 transferred to the Department of Labor the functions of the Federal Security Administrator with respect to employment services and unemployment compensation.

Plan No. 6 of 1950 provided for administrative reorganization of the Department of Labor and strengthening of the powers of the Secretary of Labor.

Plan No. 14 of 1950 provided for the coordination by the Secretary of Labor of the administration of labor standards under various laws.

Plan No. 19 of 1950 transferred the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor.

No legislation embodying recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to the Department of Labor was pending during the 1950 session.

REPORT NO. 14—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Hoover Commission proposed that the Department of the Interior be given more clearly the mission of development of subsoil and water resources. As these activities require large public works, the Commission recommended that other major public works also be managed by this Department. To this end the major construction activities of the Government would be concentrated there.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950 provided for administrative reorganization of the Department of the Interior and a strengthening of the powers of the Secretary.

Reorganization Plan No. 15 of 1950 transferred public-works programs in Alaska and the Virgin Islands from the General Services Administration to the Department of the Interior.

Bills to effectuate major recommendations of the Hoover Commission, notably the transfer of the civil functions of the Corps of Army Engineers to the Department of the Interior, were introduced during the Eighty-first Congress but received no consideration.

Transfer of the Army engineers to the Department of the Interior, with a view to placing rivers and harbors improvement and flood control under the same management as reclamation and thus avoiding the wasteful conflicts now occurring, should be a major task in the Hoover Commission program for the next session. This might be accomplished by either legislation or a reorganization plan.

REPORT NO. 15—SOCIAL SECURITY, EDUCATION, AND INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Hoover Commission recommended establishment of a new Cabinet department to embrace social security and educational functions. It would include the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It would not take in the health activities of the Government.

As a result of submission of reorganization plans which were not in complete conformance with recommendations of the Hoover Commission, the Congress acted adversely.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 creating a Department of Welfare, and Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950 creating a Department of Health, Education, and Security were both rejected, the former by the Senate and the latter by the House. Neither plan was certified by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report as in conformity with recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Under both plans, the Federal Security Agency, including the Public Health Service which, under the Hoover Commission program, would be placed in a proposed United Medical Administration, would have been elevated to Cabinet rank. Little else would have been accomplished. Plan No. 27 was objectionable from the standpoint of Hoover Commission principles because of its continuance of autonomous powers of the Public Health Service and the Office of Education.

Only one minor reorganization plan became effective in this area of Government. Plan No. 16 of 1950 transferred assistance to school districts and water-pollution control activities from the General Services Administration to the Federal Security Agency.

Legislation embodying the Hoover Commission's recommendation for creation of a new department received no consideration. Identical bills (H. R. 5175 and S. 2060), drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission, would have created a Department of Welfare along the Hoover Commission lines.

Further consideration of recommendations in this field will be necessary in the next session.

REPORT NO. 16—MEDICAL ACTIVITIES

The Hoover Commission recommended the establishment of a United Medical Administration into which would be consolidated most of the large-scale activities of the Federal Government in the fields of medical care, medical research, and public health. The proposed United Medical Administration would provide the major part of all hospital care required by the military forces in the continental United States and would be responsible for medical care for veterans. The purpose would be to eliminate overlap, waste, and inefficiency.

Identical bills (H. R. 5182 and S. 2008), drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission, was the subject of hearings before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It would create a United Medical Administration as proposed by the Hoover Commission.

This proposal is one of the major Hoover Commission recommendations on which action will go over until the next session.

REPORT NO. 17—FEDERAL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The Hoover Commission made a wide variety of recommendations for reorganization of Government business enterprises, only a few of which received

attention during the Eighty-first Congress.

Four reorganization plans submitted by the President had to do with activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Reorganization Plan No. 17 of 1950 shifted public-works planning from the General Services Administration to the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Reorganization Plan No. 22 of 1950 transferred the Federal National Mortgage Association from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Reorganization Plan No. 23 of 1950 transferred the financing of prefabricated housing from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Reorganization Plan No. 24 of 1950 placed the now independent Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the Department of Commerce. This plan was rejected by the Senate. It was not in conformance with a recommendation of the Hoover Commission that it be placed under the Treasury Department.

Recommendations by the Commission that the Export-Import Bank and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation also be placed in the Treasury Department did not come before Congress.

H. R. 6325, designated as the Federal Income-Producing Activities Control Act, is a pending measure in general conformity to principles enunciated by the Hoover Commission.

No legislation based on recommendations in the report on Federal business enterprises was drafted by counsel for the Hoover Commission.

Numerous recommendations relating to Government corporations, lending and insurance agencies, housing, farm credit and power agencies, remain for consideration.

REPORT NO. 18—OVERSEAS ADMINISTRATION, FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS AND FEDERAL RESEARCH

The Hoover Commission recommended that the Congress direct a comprehensive study of the entire problem of overseas operation and administration. It suggested that it might be desirable ultimately to create a separate Administration of Overseas Affairs, under which would be integrated overseas administrative activities, excluding the diplomatic and consular services of the Department of State.

Report No. 18 also included reports on Federal-State relations and on Federal research.

With respect to Federal-State relations, the Commission made various recommendations, including the establishment of a continuing agency with primary responsibility for study, information, and guidance in this field.

The Commission in its report on Federal research recommended that authority be granted to the President to coordinate research and to strengthen interdepartmental committee organization for this purpose and that a National Science Foundation be established.

A bill to create a Commission on Overseas Administration, S. 2072, was passed by the Senate in August 1949. It was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the House.

A bill to create a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, S. 3147, was reported from the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments in June 1950 and is on the Senate Calendar. The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has had the problem under consideration.

Public Law 507, approved May 10, 1950, establishes a National Science Foundation. It was the first Hoover Commission recommendation on which action was completed in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

REPORT NO. 19—CONCLUDING REPORT

The Hoover Commission in its concluding report discussed problems of organization and administrative management common to most agencies and reviewed its major recommendations, but with the exception of a few minor proposals offered no new recommendations.

REMAINING PROPOSALS IN HOOVER COMMISSION PROGRAM

Recommendations of the Hoover Commission which were not disposed of during the Eighty-first Congress and await further action in the Eighty-second Congress convening in January 1951 constitute a formidable program combining legislation and possible reorganization plans.

The remaining proposals include the following:

First. Reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, the only Cabinet department whose administrative structure was not streamlined under the Hoover Commission formula during the Eighty-first Congress.

Second. Strengthening of the administrative organization of three regulatory agencies, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Labor Relations Board, for which reorganization plans were rejected.

Third. Creation of a new Cabinet department to include social security and educational functions.

Fourth. Creation of a United Medical Administration into which would be consolidated activities in the fields of medical care, medical research, and public health with a view to elimination of overlap, waste, and inefficiency.

Fifth. Completion of action on recruitment and other personnel management recommendations on which some progress was made during the Eighty-first Congress.

Sixth. Further steps to strengthen the unification of the armed services to which the Hoover Commission program already has made a notable contribution.

Seventh. Transfer of the civil functions of the Corps of Army Engineers to the Department of the Interior with a view to elimination of present wasteful conflict in the development of natural resources.

Eighth. Elimination of politics from the postal service by abolishing Senate confirmation of postmasters.

Ninth. Authority to the Postmaster General to fix rates for special services on a self-supporting basis.

Tenth. Separation of subsidies from air-mail compensation as a means of shedding light on transactions of this nature.

Eleventh. Determination of the organizational status of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Export-Import Bank and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which the Hoover Commission proposed to place in the Treasury Department.

Twelfth. Reorganization of other business enterprises, including those in the farm credit, housing, and power fields.

Thirteenth. Provision for a study of methods of integrating overseas activities of the Federal Government.

Fourteenth. Creation of a continuing agency for improvement of relations between the Federal and State governments.

Fifteenth. Other proposals scattered through the 19 reports of the Hoover Commission, which were set aside for further study or escaped attention during the Eighty-first Congress.

The Eighty-second Congress should complete the job of reorganizing the executive branch of the Federal Government along lines recommended by the Hoover Commission, insofar as the proposals are found to be feasible and desirable. Thereafter, the success of the program will hinge largely upon administrative action. The fixing of responsibility and the granting of adequate powers are basic tenets of the Hoover Commission program. If the Congress does its part, it should be less difficult to fasten the blame for inefficiency in the Government.

Ninety-fourth Infantry Division Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. LIND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution passed at the first convention of the Ninety-fourth Infantry Division Association on Sunday, August 6, 1950, at the Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass. This resolution is timely, to the point, and expresses the sentiment of a great group of good Americans who have served their country in World War II. The men of the Ninety-fourth Infantry Division have rendered excellent service in time of war and are again, through their expression of confidence in their Government, repeating this service during these serious times.

I congratulate their president, Mr. Harry J. McLaughlin, of York, Pa., and the men of this great organization on their fine spirit of Americanism.

Whereas the Ninety-fourth Infantry Division Association represents some 35,000 Americans who served from September 15, 1942, to May 8, 1945, during which period the division engaged in the battle of northern France, Ardennes, Rhineland, and Central Europe, and suffered some 10,957 casualties.

And whereas we as combat veterans know full well the meaning of war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we pledge our unswerving support of our country and the United Nations in their policy of seeking to stop Communist aggression in Korea. We recognize that if unchecked in Korea, Communist aggression will go on to seek other victims among freedom-loving people.

We ask the President of the United States and Congress to once more utilize the manpower and the industrial strength of our people to face the enemy of our people and ideals.

We ask for universal military training so that the young men of this country will be better trained and better enabled to protect themselves in the event of combat.

We pay tribute to our fellow Americans now in uniform who are engaging the enemy in Korea. We join with all Americans in support of the leadership of Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker, commanding general of the Eighth Army in Korea, under whom we served when the Ninety-fourth Infantry Division was a part of the XX Corps in the European theater of operations.

We wish Godspeed and good luck to those members of our division who are now in Korea or elsewhere in the Army, or who will be called to service.

We ask for an end to business, labor, and politics as usual. We call for American loyalty and unity. We condemn the hoarders, the black marketeer, the profiteer, and the slacker. We denounce those who would weaken our country at this time.

We call upon all Americans to join with us in an all-out effort; and further be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary General of the United Nations, and to Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker.

The resolutions committee was composed of Attorney Bernard Frank, Allentown, Pa., William Godenzsweig, Washington, D. C., and Harry J. McLaughlin, York, Pa.

The resolutions were passed unanimously at the first convention of the Ninety-fourth Division Association on Sunday, August 6, at the Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass.

The Need for Economy in Government and Control of Inflation Persists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, like millions of other loyal but deeply concerned citizens of the United States, I listened intently to the radio address of the President last Saturday night. I subsequently read the full text of that statement by the Chief Executive to the American people.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the address was good. Many parts of it were realistic and to the point. But many things which ought to have been said were omitted. Furthermore, it is still a fact that deeds are far more significant than words.

Nowhere in the President's address did I find an outright request or demand that the Government, or those elected or appointed to operate the Government, be called upon to set an example by making the sacrifices which he stated are essential in solving the three "hard, tough problems," which must be solved in order to protect the world from the threat of communistic domination. There is still a sound basis for maintaining that no organization, whether it be government, military, fraternal, business or otherwise, can be any better or stronger, or successful in operation than its officers or leaders. It is, in the final analysis, their actions and not their words which determine the outcome of their endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, the present Chief Executive has undoubtedly been given more power than any other President when a state of declared war did not exist. Millions of Americans look to the President, in fact feel dependent upon him, for guidance and leadership. That is why so many of our people concur with his statement that the defense program cannot be achieved on a business-as-usual basis. But it is also the reason why our citizens cannot understand his failure to denounce and disclaim any policy of politics-as-usual.

Mr. Speaker, let us, in order, consider the solutions the President offered for the three major problems he mentioned.

He stated that the production problem can be solved by harder work, longer hours, the development of new techniques, increased efficiency, and more manpower. And he is right. But he failed to mention what directives or orders he will issue as the head of the largest single employing agency in this great country, and probably the most inefficient, to reduce and eliminate waste, duplication, and unnecessary expenditures of taxpayers' funds—and release manpower.

What could have been more appropriate, Mr. Speaker, then for the President in the course of his Nation-wide broadcast to the American people last Saturday evening to have stated that he was ordering every Federal department and agency, except the Federal Bureau of Investigation and those dealing primarily with military and defense matters, to reduce where possible without impairing established and necessary public service its number of employees by not less than 10 percent within the next 6 months. At the same time he could have assured the citizens of America that he would have subsequently reported to them how effectively that order was being complied with and carried out.

The effect of the issuance of such an order by the President would have been tremendous. Not only would such action create a very substantial additional reservoir of manpower and save millions of dollars for hard-pressed taxpayers but at the same time it would have demonstrated that our Federal Government practices what it preaches and is willing to set an example for those who must produce the materials and equipment for our national defense and security.

The second major problem discussed by the Chief Executive was the method to be used in paying the bill for increased defense. The Chief Executive said that insofar as possible this increased cost should be met by additional taxation. And again, Mr. Speaker, he was right.

Nevertheless, it is becoming increasingly self-evident that, unfortunately, the entire bill for increased defense costs cannot be financed on a strictly pay-as-you-go basis. Consequently, our tremendous national debt will be further increased. It is generally conceded that any further increase in our national debt will either now or at some time in the future result in further inflation and depreciation of dollar values.

Substantial economies in Government expenditures and a release by the Government of unnecessary manpower would serve to restrict the further growth of our national indebtedness and make available additional manpower for the production of much needed goods and services.

In emphasizing the necessity for the payment of increased taxes by our citizens the President also had another excellent opportunity to set an example which would have promoted a greater willingness to accept and carry this additional tax burden. That example could have been set by the President if he had requested that all of his own personal compensation and allowances, as well as the salaries and allowances of Members of Congress, be subjected in entirety to the same rate of taxation as will be imposed on all other citizens.

This suggestion, Mr. Speaker, has been made on previous occasions by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, but has lacked the support which Presidential endorsement might be expected to produce for such a recommendation.

The final problem discussed by the President in his Nation-wide address was that of controlling inflationary forces. There is no doubt that this is a difficult problem for a nation which has been spending beyond its means for almost two decades and which is now in the process of a vast rearming and defense program. Nevertheless, it must be tackled and it must be solved.

Strong and repeated requests have been made that all the citizens refrain from making any purchases which are not absolutely necessary. Nevertheless, our own Federal Government, of which the President is the Chief Executive, continues to be the greatest purchasing and spending agency on record.

It would therefore appear to be appropriate for the President to have announced that as long as our vast defense program is under way, he would disapprove any legislation for public works, reclamation, power development, and similar projects which are not clearly essential for our national defense. To assure that politics as usual in this field be avoided on the one hand and

that essential public improvements not be jeopardized on the other, the President might have suggested the creation of a board of review, comprised of such outstanding public servants as the Honorable Herbert Hoover and Mr. Bernard Baruch. To such a board could be given the power and responsibility of reviewing all public-works appropriations and the recommendation to the President of those which should be rejected and those which should be approved as necessary to our defense undertakings during the period of emergency. It is my opinion that such a board would be a tremendous factor in stabilizing our economy as much as can possibly be done in these times and of effecting monetary savings and the full utilization of our manpower.

Mr. Speaker, economy and efficiency in government—with a constant thought for the welfare of our citizens and for their responsibilities as taxpayers—is at all times important. Realization of that fact is more prevalent today than it has been. And since such economy is important at all times, it is imperative today.

Maj. Gen. Keller E. Rockey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, if World War II taught us one lesson, it was the necessity of having a closely knit unified command.

To win a modern war a nation must have a hard-hitting, quick-moving, mobile striking force on the land, sea, and in the air. Hitler taught us that lesson at the beginning of the last war, but we taught him and all the world much more before it ended.

All branches of our Armed Forces are essential—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and Coast Guard—each one performs magnificently. There is enough glory for them all.

Many of our generals and admirals on land, sea, in the air and beneath the sea won immortal renown. Among all our valiant heroes there is none who fought with greater valor, or with more success, than Maj. Gen. Keller E. Rockey, of the Marine Corps.

General Rockey, born in Indiana, graduating from Gettysburg College, serving in World War I, in Haiti and Nicaragua, and in World War II, won for himself the highest honor that could be bestowed upon any man in any branch in all our Armed Services.

In my limited time I shall not attempt to enumerate the many high honors that have been conferred upon him by the different branches of the armed services and many foreign governments, which will be detailed in another report, because he has received practically every decoration in the catalog of our Military Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, bear in mind that the Marine officer, or soldier, is the only one who, in all our defense forces, serves on land, sea, and in the air. Before a marine ever flies he must have served at least 2 years on the ground and on the sea. Consequently he knows the problems that confront any individual who fights in the defense of his country.

General Rockey came up the hard way. From ordinary beginning and obscure origin he has, through personal merit, risen to the heights of distinction and honor.

Only in the United States of America could such a man achieve the recognition and render the service he has to his country. With a rugged constitution, inherited from worthy ancestors; with a resolute will; with untiring industry; with unconquerable courage, his faith and fortitude born of Christian parents has enabled him to lead men of all classes, creeds, and colors to follow him down the hard and bitter road, up the steep and painful slopes of high endeavor to glorious victory.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot and I shall not attempt to add to the laurels of so great a man. Words fade in the shadow of his glowing deeds.

Keller Rockey was a severe taskmaster but he was true to the Marine tradition. He never demanded of others anything he was not willing to give of himself. As he retires this month at the age of 62 and after the many years of faithful, loyal, and patriotic service he takes with him not only my good wishes but the benediction and blessings of the people of the old Free State of Maryland and of the people in all the States of this Union.

My people in Maryland join me in offering this tribute to a great, grand, and gallant soldier, a true, loyal, and red-blooded American, who has contributed so much to preserve the Republic which Washington founded, which Lincoln kept, and which we all shall give our last full measure of devotion to save.

Increased Benefits Granted Under the Amended Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, due to the great interest in the amount of coverage granted under the recently enacted amendments to the Social Security Act, I would like to insert in the RECORD, some information which I believe will be helpful to many.

Almost 10,000,000 more jobs will be covered, to include the nonfarm self-employed, domestic workers, agricultural workers, and, on a voluntary basis, certain employees of nonprofit organizations and of State and local governments.

The more than 3,000,000 aged persons, widowed mothers, and surviving children now receiving benefits under the system, will receive automatic increases averaging 77½ percent, beginning with checks received in October 1950. For the lowest-benefit payments, this increase will be 100 percent.

Persons who retire in the future, can qualify for even larger benefits under a new formula, which will increase them by about 110 percent over the amounts under the old law.

It will not be necessary for retired workers and their wives, the widows and dependent parents and children now receiving benefits, to apply for these increases, since they will be made automatically, using a so-called conversion table which appears in the law. Increases in benefits provided in this table are as follows:

If the primary insurance benefit under the old law is—	The primary insurance amount under the new law shall be—	And the average monthly wage for purpose of computing maximum benefits shall be—
$10	$20.00	$40.00
$11	22.00	44.00
$12	24.00	48.00
$13	26.00	52.00
$14	28.00	56.00
$15	30.00	60.00
$16	31.70	63.40
$17	33.20	66.40
$18	34.50	69.00
$19	35.70	71.40
$20	37.00	74.00
$21	38.50	77.00
$22	40.20	80.40
$23	42.20	84.40
$24	44.50	89.00
$25	46.50	93.00
$26	48.30	96.60
$27	50.00	100.00
$28	51.50	110.00
$29	52.80	118.60
$30	54.00	126.60
$31	55.10	134.00
$32	56.20	141.30
$33	57.20	148.00
$34	58.20	154.60
$35	59.20	161.30
$36	60.20	168.00
$37	61.20	174.60
$38	62.20	181.30
$39	63.10	187.30
$40	64.00	195.00
$41	64.90	210.00
$42	65.80	220.00
$43	66.70	230.00
$44	67.60	240.00
$45	68.50	250.00
$46	68.50	250.00

The effect of these increases on the benefit check of a widow with two children is suggested by the following table:

Widow with two minor children now receiving benefits

Benefit under old law:	*Benefit under new law*
$20	$40
$25	46
$30	53
$35	59
$40	67
$45	76

For persons who retire in the future, the new start feature of the 1950 amendments means that benefit rights may be computed on a work record beginning with 1951, instead of 1936 as in the old law. This change represents a liberalization in two ways: First, wages are generally much higher now than they were in 1936, and thus the amount of the average monthly wage is increased; and second, earners who have not been continuously in covered employment since

1936 could not include wages or time in uncovered jobs in computing the average monthly wage. Frequently this acted to decrease its amount greatly. In this respect, the fact that more jobs are also covered by the 1950 amendments will also help to increase the average wage for earners who transfer from one job to another.

One very important effect of this new start for older workers, will be to increase their chances for becoming eligible for full benefit rights. As has been noted, persons aged 62 and over can become eligible for the doubled benefits under the new formula by working for only six quarters—1½ years—in covered employment. The first of these new benefits will, therefore, be paid in May 1952 or about 1½ years after January 1, 1951.

Under the old law, approximately 35,000,000 jobs were covered by old-age and survivors insurance. The 1950 amendments add approximately 10,000,000 more, to bring the total coverage up to around 45,000,000. Of the approximately 15,000,000 jobs not included, an estimated 7,500,000 are protected by other public retirement systems for the Federal civil service, the Armed Forces, railroads, and State and municipal jobs. The largest occupation groups excluded are self-employed farmers and certain professional persons.

Americans working in the following occupations are compulsorily covered in the new law, but not covered in the old law:

SELF-EMPLOYED

The new law extends coverage to include self-employed persons who have net annual earnings therefrom of at least $400. For example, self-employed persons are covered if they operate a store, beauty parlor, filling station, barber shop, bar, jewelry shop, laundry, pharmacy, theater, hotel, flower shop, tourist court, printing shop, photographic studio, advertising agency, secondhand shop, shoeshine stand, manufacturing plant, real-estate agency, and so forth. Also covered are self-employed writers, photographers, appraisers, adjusters, artists, private teachers, sign painters, private detectives, independent contractors, and so forth. Members of a partnership are considered as self-employed.

"Net earnings," for purpose of coverage includes net profit from a trade or business carried on by an individual or partnership, excluding rental income unless it is received by a real-estate dealer as part of his business; dividends and interest on stock and bonds—except such income received by a securities dealer as part of his business; capital gains and losses; and income from an estate or a trust.

Such self-employed persons will file yearly social-security returns in connection with their regular income-tax returns, effective beginning in the year 1951. If an individual works for an employer part of the time and is also self-employed, both incomes will count up to the limit of $3,600 per year.

But specifically excluded from coverage as self-employed individuals are farm operators—the largest group—lawyers, physicians, dentists, osteopaths, chiropractors, naturopaths, Christian Science practitioners, optometrists, veterinarians, professional engineers, architects, funeral directors, and certified, registered, licensed, or full-time practicing public accountants.

It should be noted, however, that this exclusion applies to farmers and professional groups specified above, only if they are self-employed, since salaried farmers, lawyers, and so forth, would be covered under the new law—as under the old law—as employees.

DOMESTIC SERVICE

Compulsory coverage for persons performing domestic services—maids, cooks, laundresses, butlers, gardeners, practical nurses, and so forth—if they receive $50 or more in cash wages during a quarter by working full or part time on 24 or more days for one or more household employers.

Such services performed in a farm home are included as agricultural labor.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES NOT NOW UNDER A RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Although most Federal employees are covered by other Federal retirement systems, approximately 200,000 who are not so covered in special systems will be included under old-age and survivors insurance. This provision will cover most short-term Federal employees now under temporary appointments, as well as employees of national farm-loan associations, production-credit associations, Federal credit unions, the Tennessee Valley Authority (if not under the TVA retirement system), post exchanges, State, county, and community committees under the Production and Marketing Administration, and certain employees of the Federal Reserve System.

DEFINITION OF EMPLOYEE

As newly defined, the term "employee" accepts the usual common-law rules covering the employer-employee relationship, and also includes full-time life-insurance salesmen; full-time traveling or city salesmen (except house-to-house salesmen) taking orders for their principal for goods to be resold or consumed from retailers, hotels, wholesalers, jobbers, and contractors; agent-drivers and commissioned drivers engaged in distributing meat, vegetables, fruit, bakery products, beverages (other than milk), or laundry and dry-cleaning services; and industrial homeworkers who work according to an employer's specifications. (NOTE.—Many part-time life-insurance salesmen, house - to - house salesmen, operators of leased taxicabs, and newsboys over age 18 who are not covered as employees will be eligible as self-employed persons.)

Employees in the following occupation groups (which were not covered in the old law) can be covered in the new law by voluntary arrangement, as follows:

NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

Optional coverage is provided (beginning January 1, 1951) for employees of charitable, religious, educational, or other private nonprofit institutions (except ministers and members of religious orders in the performance of their required duties), if the employer agrees to accept coverage, and not less than two-thirds of his employees express a desire for coverage. If such an agreement is reached, coverage is extended only to those employees who requested it at the time of such an agreement, but any new employees hired after the effective date of coverage will be automatically covered. Such agreements must extend for a minimum period of 10 years or for 8 years prescribed plus the 2-year advance notice required for termination of the agreement.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Optional coverage is provided (beginning January 1, 1951) for employees of States and their political subdivisions if the State government negotiates a coverage agreement with the Federal Security Administrator for such coverage. Excluded from such possible coverage are employees in positions covered under other public retirement systems (viz, policemen and firemen), employees engaged in work-relief projects, or patients or inmates who perform services in a hospital or other institution; also excluded, at the request of the State, may be services of an emergency nature, or those performed by elected officials, part-time workers, workers paid on a fee basis.

Senator Morse Helps Good-Neighbor Policy With Respect to Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the recent loan of $150,000,000 to Mexico by the Export-Import Bank represents a forward step of great magnitude in promoting a good-neighbor policy between this country and Mexico. Great credit should be given to the distinguished and able Senator from Oregon, the Honorable WAYNE MORSE, for the interest he has taken and the part he has had in bringing this matter to a satisfactory conclusion. It is pleasing to learn that his great service has been recognized in an editorial appearing in the Laredo Times, issue of September 10, 1950. This editorial, which I include as part of my remarks, reads as follows:

Mexico's $150,000,000 loan from the Export-Import Bank represents a big step forward for realistic thinking in Washington and Mexico City.

For the past several years Mexico has been trying to negotiate several loans through Washington, which have been turned down.

One of these suggested loans went so far that President Truman himself publicly announced that the loan would be made and that he was 100 percent for the loan. The very next day the State Department announced that the loan had been refused.

This confusion in our State Department is a matter of record on more things than on loans to Mexico. Therefore, this new policy concerning the progress of Mexico is refreshing.

The McAllen Monitor, which is considered one of the most outstanding small papers in

the United States, a few days ago commented editorially that it was about time that some of the progress that we are passing around in the United States reach the places where it can actually be more beneficial. Thus the Monitor endorsed the $150,000,000 Export-Import Bank loan to Mexico.

There has already been too much said about the fog and confusion and the disloyal people in our State Department.

It is time that we blow the whistle of victory when our State Department comes around to realize that the safety and progress of North America is inseparably tied up with the progress and security of Mexico.

This fog we speak of in the State Department (which we admit has a silver lining now) did receive some lifting from a Senator who one would think would be too far removed from Mexico to realize that country's importance to the safety of the United States.

This Senator visited in Mexico for about 10 days last winter and while there reviewed, just as a matter of hemisphere solidarity, the needs which Mexico had requested from Washington—such as a loan.

This was Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, who is considered the most forward looking Republican in the United States Senate and has the distinction of voting more with the progressive Democrats than he has with the Republican Party. In fact, he is considered about 70 percent with the Truman Administration.

Senator MORSE, after leaving Mexico, reported back to Washington. There he said that he felt that Mexico had been sadly neglected and that it was about time that Washington woke up to the fact that not only charity but also progress and solidarity start at home.

Therefore, he recommended to President Truman and the various Government agencies that Mexico (which he considered an excellent 100 percent risk) receive substantial loans from Washington.

As we have already stated, Senator MORSE votes with the Progressive wing of the Democratic Party more than with his own Republicans. Yet in his own party the forward-looking Republicans are beginning to feel that if they are to win the White House in 1952 that no less place than the vice presidency can be offered Senator MORSE.

We mention this loan and Senator MORSE because we want to emphasize that it is about time that Senators from all of our 48 States wake up and realize that to preserve democracy we must not only talk the good-neighbor policy but we must demonstrate it.

At this point we say that if our Texas Senators and Congressmen in Washington would turn their eves to the south of the Rio Grande more often and help Mexico they would be helping our own country increase its strength and reserves so that democracy can be preserved for all time against the ravage of communism.

Montana's Rights to Waterton-Belly Water Must Be Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] in urging that the International Joint Commission use every possible means at its disposal to come to an agreement with Canada for an equitable use of the Waterton-Belly water. I know that this Commission and the Montana delegation have all been working toward this end and I am alarmed at statements to the effect that Canada intends to use all of this water. Should this happen, we will of course be forced to take drastic steps and the Montana delegation will use every means at its disposal to corral all the water through the development of an all-American plan.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following letter which I have today sent to A. O. Stanley, Chairman, United States Section, International Joint Commission, Washington, D. C.:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1950.

Hon. A. O. STANLEY,
Chairman, United States Section,
International Joint Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will recall that in company with Senators MURRAY and ECTON and Representative D'EWART, I had a meeting in your office last week relative to the use of Waterton-Belly water. You will recall also that all four of us, the full Montana delegation, were somewhat alarmed at statements made by the Canadians that Canada proposed to use all of this water.

I would like to call to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that Montana needs this water also and has over many years planned to use all or part of it. We realize that Montana has the right and the power to use the water first but we would like to cooperate with our Canadian neighbors and we would not dream of taking it all to the detriment of Canada unless we are forced to do so and that proves to be the only way to get a fair share of this water which originates in our State. Montana has held off pushing for an all-American plan because we had hoped that this matter would be worked out amicably both to the satisfaction of Montana and Canada. I want to urge upon you, Mr. Chairman, that you and your group continue to do everything you possibly can to see that Montana's rights are protected in the use of the Waterton-Belly water. If it becomes evident that an equitable apportionment cannot be expected as a result of this reference, I can assure you the Montana delegation in cooperation with other State delegations, will explore ways and means to find some way to develop an all-American plan for the use of this water.

Must close now but thanking you for your courtesy in meeting with the Montana delegation last week, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Hon. William T. Granahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to me to take this opportunity to express my high regard for our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of the Second District of Pennsylvania, and to place before the House a commendation of Mr. GRANAHAN, voiced by Mr. Elihu D. Stone, of the American Zionist Council, a great American and humanitarian of whom we are all justly proud.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we, as Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, should not permit to go unnoticed the words of high tribute expressed in homage to Mr. GRANAHAN in recognition of his distinguished services to the Nation as a Member of the House.

By his untiring devotion to duty and profound concern with the legislative measures before the House, he has demonstrated not only his ability to cope with the urgent problems with which the Nation must contend, but also his awareness and determination to meet the needs of the constituents he is privileged to serve. Mr. GRANAHAN, a veteran of World War I, is a man of character, integrity, and action, whose career in public office reflects credit on our Nation and his community.

It is with great pleasure that I include in the RECORD, under leave, as part of my remarks, the communication addressed to the gentleman on June 21 by Mr. Elihu D. Stone, to which I have previously referred:

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
WASHINGTON BUREAU.

Hon. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRANAHAN: The joint declaration by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France relative to the Near East, which was made public by the President on May 25, is a significant document which may lead to the establishment of peaceful relationship between Israel and Arab neighbors if honestly carried out.

Your kind and effective cooperation in urging our State Department to take action for the purpose of promoting peace and tranquillity in the Near East is deeply appreciated.

The said declaration, as I analyze it contains the following points:

1. For the first time in modern history the Big Three—the United States of America, England, and France—agreed on concerted and coordinated action in that sensitive region of the world, the Near East. It is a wholesome substitute for the pursuit of the hitherto policy of unilateral action resulting very often in conflicting action. It imposes collective responsibility.

2. The calling for a pledge on the Arab countries and Israel to refrain from any and every aggressive or warlike action against one another as a condition precedent to the future delivery of arms should serve to discourage the Arab warmongers.

3. The pledge by the Big Three to place Israel in a condition of equality and parity with the Arab states with reference to delivery of arms, and the establishment of a balance of arms between them, if honestly carried out, should serve as an encouragement toward establishment of permanent peace between the Arab states and Israel.

4. The unequivocal declaration by the Big Three of their opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab states and Israel implies a policy of vigilant watchfulness obligating the Big Three to stop the shipment of arms whenever the threat of such an arms race manifests itself.

5. The Big Three pledged themselves to take immediate and joint action whenever and wherever a threat to peace in that section of the world may appear. They agreed

to take such joint action within and outside the United Nations. The term outside is most decisive. It implies speedy and prompt action by the Big Three to prevent a threat of aggression from being converted into actual aggression.

Like any other similar document, this declaration will not execute itself. It is as strong as the reliability of its authors and no more.

We assume and we must assume that the Big Three—the United States, England, and France—acted and will continue to act in good faith.

However, in the light of past sad experiences and disappointments, we must rely upon the vigilance of the friends of Israel like your good self to see to it that the Department of State carries out honestly the terms of the said Big Three declaration. As you well know, the past record of the Near East Division of our Department of State is one of unfriendliness to Israel. The Bevin line dominated.

Your noble services to the cause of Israel will always be remembered. The Jewish people are a grateful people; they never forget their friends.

You, dear Congressman, have proven yourself to be a true and tested friend.

With kindest regards and best wishes,

Sincerely,

ELIHU D. STONE.

Let's Have a Little More Common Sense in the Potato Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it seems that each day something new happens that demonstrates how unrealistic our whole potato program has been. The latest that has come to my attention is the neglect to utilize our so-called potato surplus for the manufacture of industrial alcohol to be used in the production of synthetic rubber. We need rubber. It is in short supply. We need industrial alcohol for its production. We are in short supply. Potatoes are considered surplus. We continue to dump them even though they could be used to advantage in our synthetic rubber program.

It is discouraging to realize that the first of the Truman Administration's "control" programs is threatened by "burro-cratic" stubbornness. On September 1, the first of the allocation programs went into effect in which use of rubber for civilian needs was cut 17 percent. On September 7, the "watch-dog subcommittee" of the Senate Armed Services Committee took sharp issue with the Administration's handling of the stockpiling program and failure to reactivate the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants. Clearly indicated in the committee's report were further cuts in rubber available for auto tires and other civilian needs.

Strangely enough, two of the biggest synthetic plants now idle use a process in which industrial alcohol is a necessary ingredient. I am informed that the supply of industrial alcohol is short. The Department of Agriculture has bought over 2,000,000 bushels of potatoes in New Jersey under the price-support program and has ordered them dumped. It is expected that they will buy several more millions of bushels of potatoes before the harvest has been completed.

Across the river in Philadelphia is one of the largest industrial alcohol plants in the country, that as recently as last February used surplus potatoes in the manufacture of alcohol. At that time, the Secretary of Agriculture was able to get special freight-rate concessions from the Pennsylvania Railroad to move potatoes from New York State and from Long Island to Philadelphia.

Why is not similar action taken now, that the potatoes may not be completely wasted and raw materials made available that synthetic-rubber production may be increased? Why not a little more common sense?

Senator Lehman Accepts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN in accepting the nomination of the Democratic Party:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ACCEPTING NOMINATION OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Chairman and delegates to this convention, this is a gratifying moment. My satisfaction today is increased by knowing that you have just nominated for Governor of New York my old and good friend, Judge Walter Lynch. You may be sure that I will be proud and happy to stand on the same platform and run on the same ticket with a man of his caliber and integrity.

In your wisdom, you have nominated in him a man of selfless devotion to the public interest. He has not sought public notice or acclaim. But I know of his long and distinguished record in Washington, always on the side of the public interest. In recent years he has been the leader in the fight for liberal tax and social-security legislation. He has been a good Democrat and a great liberal.

I know of his sound judgment and his legislative skill. But most of all I know of his fighting heart. That is what he and all of us will need in the weeks head. With that fighting heart and courage, he is going to win. I know, because I am going to win with him.

I have come to Rochester and to this hall today almost directly from the floor of the United States Senate. I secured the permission of the Senate to be absent so that I could be here. But I may not long delay my return. Every day, almost every hour, questions of momentous importance to our country, and to the world, are being considered and decided.

Tomorrow or the next day, we will vote on internal security legislation. I am going to vote for President Truman's bill to combat subversive Communist elements. I am going to vote for the legislation recommended by J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI.

I, myself, have sponsored legislation to put all Communists and would-be spies and saboteurs in detention camps during times of invasion or other national emergency. In my judgment that would in a practical manner really meet the Communist threat to our internal security. I hope my bill will pass.

But I am going to vote against the Mundt-Ferguson bill. That bill would not harm Communists at all, because they could and would evade it. That bill would, on the other hand, endanger ordinary patriotic citizens and legitimate patriotic organizations, such as labor unions and even church groups which take an active interest in social questions.

But be assured when I go back to Washington—tomorrow and next January—I am going to fight, and to keep on fighting, just as hard as I know how against communism, and against Communists. And also for Americanism and for all Americas. I will persist in my efforts to defend all our rights.

Mr. Chairman, I came to Rochester because I wanted to see and speak in person to the duly elected representatives of the political party—my political party—which is going to take over the government of New York State next January. If candidates are elected on their record, and on the issues—and I sincerely believe that New Yorkers vote that way—I have no doubt that a new administration is going to take over in Albany next January, and that you, my friends, will have nominated those men.

On the record, and on the facts, the people will vote for our candidates.

In every national crisis since the Civil War, the American people have turned to the Democratic Party for leadership. Today as never before the people need bold, courageous, and imaginative leadership. Let us proceed in that tradition and with that confidence.

The delegates to the New York State convention of the Democratic Party have greatly honored me in offering me again the nomination for the high office of United States Senator. I accept this nomination with a deep sense of the responsibility which it entails. I accept it with warm appreciation of this expression of continuing confidence.

The greater part of my adult life has been devoted to public service. At no time have I felt the call to such service as urgently as today. Our Nation is confronted with problems of such magnitude that they challenge each of us to bring to their solution the greatest contribution of which he is capable.

During my first term in the United States Senate I have found that in this forum, above all others, I can best serve the people of my State and of my country.

The overriding problem with which the new Congress, like the old Congress, will be concerned, is the menacing threat of Soviet communism. To counter this threat I have supported and shall continue to support every measure designed to strengthen the military defenses of the free world, and the internal defenses of the United States.

Yet I am convinced that military and security measures are not alone sufficient. Not by far. They must be supplemented by furnishing the world with a fighting example of democracy at its best.

Clearly reaction offers no acceptable answer to communism in the field of ideas. The only effective answer lies in the American tradition of enlightened liberalism. This means that we must continue to seek for ourselves, as well as for others, an ever-improving standard of living and an ever-widening range of opportunity, an ever-continuing sense of freedom and justice in a world at peace. I say this in full recognition of the fact that progress toward these ends may necessarily be temporarily slowed because of the priority that must be given

to the demands of military mobilization, defense and foreign aid required to meet and overcome the pressing dangers of this day.

It is in this spirit and these beliefs that I look forward with undiminished enthusiasm to six more years of service to my State and my country.

Democratic Candidates "Marined" by Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jack Ramey, one of the top newspapermen of the country, has written a very lucid and informative article on the subject, Democratic Candidates "Marined" by Truman.

Much has been said about this subject but Mr. Ramey covers it so completely I felt that readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be glad to read this very able summation of the important topics discussed in the article:

"MARINED" BY TRUMAN

When President Truman completed his Marine-ing with a full apology to the Marine Corps in his abject haste to retrieve an abysmal, unexplainable blunder, it was apparent that he might become the biggest load Democratic candidates would have to carry in the November elections.

Easiest thing in the world for a wrongdoer is to do intentionally a thing he knows is an error, and then rush with an apology to the persons harmed, with a full expectation—even knowledge—that they are going to judge him a good fellow for eating his words or acts and forget the affront.

Nine times out of ten that apologetic, subservient crow-eater is going to pull the same procedure upon the next victim unaware of his methods.

Mr. Truman, may the heavens help us, is beyond compare as a Presidential blunderer adept at doing things without thinking. Without thinking, he says. Then he apologizes, and every marine and the entire country is to accept it, please, for this is the President speaking. When the one person in the entire Nation supposed to know better would be the President.

There's never been a President like Mr. Truman. That is conceded. He accepted a speech from Henry Wallace for examination and approved it, and Mr. Wallace immediately vocalized his communistic diatribe in New York City and the trouble popped right back into the lap of Mr. Truman, who, Mr. Wallace said rightly, had approved the speech.

Mr. Truman got out of that one the hard way. His reason for approving the speech: He had not read it. He knew Mr. Wallace's leftward leanings—or, as President of the United States, he should have known them—but his simple explanation was that he had not read the speech. A glance at the trouble-maker's speech would have sufficed, but the President had omitted the glance.

For his Missouri confederates, inadequate for the administration places he finds for them, he never so much as apologizes. They are his friends, and he's going to stick with them through every flood of criticism. Mr. Truman and his friends can do no wrong. The country is stuck with them.

There is throughout this country a vast distrust of Dean Acheson's capabilities as Secretary of State and of Louis Johnson's performance as Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Truman tells the country succinctly that they are going to remain in the administration so long as he is President, because Mr. Truman believes in them. There is no doubt that Mr. Acheson and Mr. Johnson try their best. It still is a fact that virtually everything they say is derided by the citizens, because the citizens' faith in Mr. Acheson and Mr. Johnson long since evaporated.

Mr. Truman's duty is not to himself and his belief in his selections, Mr. Acheson and Mr. Johnson. His duty is to the majority of the citizens' conviction that Mr. Acheson and Mr. Johnson, splendid private citizens though they be, are not big enough for their administration positions.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur is taken to task for his statement regarding Formosa's necessity as a UN defense against possible Russian attack. He was ripped apart because he failed, it was said, to consult policy-makers in the Defense and State Departments before issuing the statement the administration tried to squelch.

Russia hops upon the statement as proof of United States imperialistic intention.

Now, what were the facts?

General MacArthur had talked to one United States policymakers after another in Tokyo. He knew their intentions, and he was talking with Washington every day, and he knew what had happened in Korea, and he must have known that the administration was writing off Formosa.

A diplomat and a world stagewise militarist who knew his every word brought publicity not only in the United States but around the world, he must have considered that statement well, and he must have determined that he was going to issue it, no matter what the outcome.

His reason? General MacArthur had decided—and so stated—that Formosa, on the Soviet perimeter, was the best place for blunting any air or sea attack upon the United States from Russia. He had determined that Formosa was more than worth the gamble, that, even though it eventually might be lost, it would more than overbalance the chance by placing United States air strength where it could trade blow for blow with the Russians, and from the most advantageous position.

Now, I submit that the only reason General MacArthur issued his statement was that he knew, he must have known from his conferences, that the administration was opposed to placing forces upon Formosa, and that he considered the United States populace should be apprised of the contrary opinion for use of Formosa, and why.

A lesser general might not have issued the statement, because it would have meant his walking papers home. General MacArthur realized it would cause trouble, but that the administration would not dare move him out of Japan for it. He simply was a figure large enough to place a foreign policy view opposing the administration's opinion before the people without being railroaded for it.

What Moscow thinks, what propaganda it makes, of General MacArthur's statement can be disregarded. Moscow is going to do whatever Moscow thinks it can do in defeating the UN intention, spearheaded by the United States, of preventing world-wide Communist expansion.

General MacArthur had a point to make—Formosa's strategic geographic importance for countering any attack instituted by sea or air from Russia.

The militarist-diplomat achieved his point, although the administration tried its best to have the statement withdrawn, and yielded only when it found a magazine already published was ready to hit the newsstands and could not be withdrawn.

There was no necessity for General MacArthur to apologize. Nor did he.

Unloading a Liability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of yesterday, September 13:

UNLOADING A LIABILITY

Defense Secretary Louis Johnson's resignation came as no surprise, despite President Truman's recent statement that Mr. Johnson and Secretary of State Acheson would never leave his Cabinet.

This is an election year.

Some of the Secretary's decisions, the bad consequences of which have been revealed by the Korean War, had made him a political liability.

Mr. Johnson's hardboiled economy program made him many enemies. But he is a determined, courageous man, who might have taken hostile criticism in stride if he had not put all his defense eggs in one basket.

He accepted the popular thesis that victory in war could be achieved by air power alone, and more particularly by strategic bombing. When the United States became involved in a war in which the atomic bomb could not be used it found itself with a Defense Establishment not geared to wage any other kind of war.

So Mr. Johnson became another casualty of Korea and of politics.

He also was the victim of certain circumstances over which he had little or no control.

Long before he took office blunders in American foreign policy—blunders for which Mr. Truman has basic responsibility—had set the stage for the abandonment of Nationalist China and the eventual Communist invasion of Korea.

Moreover, it had been decided not to defend Korea from such an invasion. When that decision was reversed overnight, and properly reversed, Mr. Johnson and our other military planners naturally were not prepared for the emergency suddenly thrust upon them.

Secretary Acheson sponsored many of the unwise policies which contributed to Mr. Johnson's undoing. Mr. Acheson inherited those policies, especially the disastrous China policy, from his State Department predecessor, Gen. George C. Marshall.

Yet President Truman has selected General Marshall to succeed Mr. Johnson, and will ask Congress to make that possible by changing the law which forbids appointment as Secretary of Defense of any person who within 10 years has been an active officer in the Regular armed services.

General Marshall is a professional soldier—a great one—to whom this country owes great gratitude for military services of the highest order.

But the law which requires the Department of Defense to be headed by a civilian is a wise law, supported by sound American traditions. Changing that law to make an exception in the case of General Marshall would establish a dangerous precedent. This newspaper believes that Congress should not change it.

Moreover, the general's legacy of mistakes in State Department policy would handicap him heavily as head of the Department which now must try to overcome the consequences of those mistakes.

Calling up a big name from retirement for that job impresses us as a political attempt to gloss over a situation distasteful to Mr. Truman. But it is not good politics for General Marshall, for the Defense Establishment, or for the country. The position demands an able, vigorous, wise civilian administrator, free from any necessity to defend past errors, free to devote his full time and energy to defense of America.

Universal Military Training Should Be Enacted Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great dissatisfaction to me that the second session of the Eighty-first Congress is planning to recess without any action on a bill to provide universal military training.

It has been argued that the question of universal military training is too controversial a subject to spend time on before the fall elections. I am inclined to disagree with that theory. Since the subject has been raised, I have received a great many letters from constituents urging that universal military training be enacted without delay. The writers were not only veterans of World War I and II, but also parents of boys who will be affected by universal military training, and parents of men who fought in the last war. It is my observation that the matter is not as controversial as is commonly thought. I believe that a vast majority of Americans have reluctantly accepted the inescapable fact that universal military training is necessary now, whether we like it or not. Beside the individual popular clamor for universal military training, the press of the Nation has lined up in favor of it, with only a few, and characteristic, exceptions.

The United States is the only major nation in the world which does not have a military training program. How much longer are we to slumber?

It may be true, as some say, that the Army itself does not want universal military training because of the shortage of personnel with which to train the recruits. If that is the case, I say let us take remedial steps immediately. Let the Army pick out men already within its ranks who are best fitted as instructors and cadre personnel. Let the Department of Defense begin to reopen camps which could be used for such training.

It is true, of course, that universal military training, even if enacted tomorrow, would provide no men for the Korean conflict, but the passage of such a bill would be of great psychological value throughout the world. It would serve notice on the Kremlin that we are willing to sacrifice and work for our goals, no matter how long it takes.

At the moment, the United States is enjoying the luxury of time in which to prepare ourselves for the future. It should be completely clear to everyone that we must move immediately toward some systematic method of providing military manpower for the days ahead. Such legislation should be enacted before this Congress goes home.

The Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee—Article by Robert K. Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER C. HUNT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Robert K. Walsh, published in the Sunday Star for September 10, 1950, in regard to the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE PREPAREDNESS UNIT GETS OFF TO ROARING START—SUCCESSOR TO TRUMAN COMMITTEE STIRS UP FEDERAL AGENCIES WITH ITS RECOMMENDATIONS

(By Robert K. Walsh)

"Like father, like son" is a description that will have to be used in more than a relative sense when applied to the new "Truman committee" in the Senate.

Born less than 2 months ago, the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services is a creature of the Korean crisis. It is, nonetheless, a natural heir of the special committee that functioned from March 1941 to 1948 for investigation of the national-defense program.

By its own admission, and unquestionably with the paternal blessing of former Senator Harry S. Truman, Democrat, of Missouri, who headed the war investigating committee from March 1941 to August 1944, this currently created subcommittee proposed to "reactivate the Truman committee which showed so effectively what a legislative investigating committee could do during a grave emergency when close understanding between the legislative and executive branches is essential to the national security."

But the new seven-member group, headed by Senator JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, is no longer a fledgling, if indeed it ever had time to enjoy preliminary pursuits.

The impact of its first interim report, published last Thursday, has been heavy on Capitol Hill. Moreover, the subcommittee's activities that prompted the recommendations of that report have stirred many administrative agencies into an explosive chain reaction in recent weeks.

PRIMARY OBJECTIVES

It is no disrespect to the Truman committee's methods and achievements to observe that the preparedness subcommittee already has set something of a record in blending unanimity, quietness, scope, and the one-two punch.

The effectiveness of its first report—whether or not all its findings were correct—was doubly compelling because the subcommittee and its still small staff have worked with a minimum of words and covered a vast area since last July 17.

The subcommittee's prime job at the moment, as explained by Chairman JOHNSON, is to rid the Government—and that means Congress, too—of the "siesta psychology."

Its main operations to date have dealt with proposals for conserving and developing the supply of natural and synthetic rubber and with putting the surplus property disposal system in line with national emergency demands. It is concerned not merely with the Korean situation, but any possible kind of future war, hot or cold, military or economic, declared or undeclared.

The subcommittee, despite its youth, and notwithstanding its fondness for comparative quiet, cannot be accused of hiding its light under the Capitol dome.

"Facts discovered by the subcommittee in its short existence has justified its creation," the members declare. "The improvements in preparedness which have already resulted from its activities show that it must continue and expand its efforts."

NO RABBIT CHASING

Under the resolution that created it, the subcommittee hardly can harbor a passion for anonymity. It is supposed to report at least every 30 days to the Senate Armed Services Committee on the results of its watchfulness.

Last July the following members assembled under the chairmanship of Senator JOHNSON, sponsor of the resolution by which the full committee established the Preparedness Subcommittee: Senators CHAPMAN, Kentucky, KEFAUVER, Tennessee, and HUNT, Wyoming, Democrats; BRIDGES, New Hampshire, SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts, and MORSE, Oregon, Republicans.

"We were not created to tell the generals and admirals how to fight battles, but rather to make sure that they and their men have what they need to fight those battles," the chairman told them.

"We will not hunt headlines. Politics will be left at the committee room door. We will strive for unanimity. We will see uncolored, unemotional facts. There will be no second-guessing, battle-front strategy. We propose to be blunt but not unfair; zealous but not persecuting; helpful but not compromising."

And, as a postscript, another member assured reporters that "we don't want to go rabbit chasing."

Even before it was born—or reborn, as the case may be—the subcommittee had a large slice of work cut out for it.

SURPLUS SALES STOPPED

The surplus-disposal program had become a problem before Korea made it acute. The rubber supply had aroused considerable concern. Senator JOHNSON, for instance, urged the Office of Rubber Reserve in the RFC early in July to take faster and longer steps in reactivation of synthetic rubber plants.

There also was a major question—discussed at the subcommittee's first meeting—of the way in which the Defense Department spent almost $49,000,000,000 since the 1946 military demobilization.

Subcommittee sources say they did not have to be prodded by the course of events during July and August to center their attention on industrial preparedness and military material requirements in the United States.

"We wanted to make certain," they said, "that we are not continuing to demobilize with one hand while trying to mobilize with the other."

In its effort to speed the slackened tempo of the postwar period in and out of Government, the subcommittee came up with evidence that caused the General Services Administration recently to freeze the sale of all Government-owned property previously declared surplus.

In its first formal report and the infrequent public and private comments of its members and staff, the subcommittee often has employed fighting language. In this it has been referring to itself as much as to Korea.

STIRS MUNITIONS BOARD

"The subcommittee," it says, "has fought at every Government level for reactivation of our synthetic rubber-producing program. The word 'fought' is used advisedly."

Furthermore, it has waded into what could be a first-rate feud with the Munitions Board.

Complaining that it has not yet received a satisfactory reply to its inquiries about establishing a firm, aggressive acquisition program for natural rubber, the subcommittee stated last week:

"Either the Munitions Board has a program or it has not. If it has a program it could readily be described. If it has no program it should be candidly admitted. In any event, if the diligence to which the Munitions Board addressed itself to our inquiry is any measure of the manner in which it attends to its other duties, its competence would seem to leave something to be desired."

In any event, the subcommittee says its suggestions so far have been heeded by several key agencies. And, it indicates it has just begun to fight wherever it believes necessary to cope not only with shooting in Korea but with the distinct threat of a war of attrition in which the total resources and the total productivity of the Nation must be kept constantly available."

MODEST HEADQUARTERS

For such a far-flung battle line the subcommittee at present maintains GHQ in one room off the Armed Services Committee's suite in the Senate Office Building.

Besides its chief counsel, Donald C. Cook, it has a staff of only two secretaries but avails itself of specialists from the full committee staff. With an appropriation of $25,000, it manages to save money also by calling on specialists from administrative agencies.

Widely known in Washington as Vice Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Mr. Cook began his Government career 17 years ago on the SEC staff in the Legal and Public Utilities Divisions.

From 1943 to 1945 he was special counsel to the old House Naval Affairs Committee. After a year as executive assistant to the Attorney General, he became Alien Property Custodian in 1946. He returned to private practice of law here for 2 years before going back to SEC as Vice Chairman.

Whatever idea the subcommittee had of beginning with a leisurely look into the Defense Department and related matters was soon dispelled. That, according to members, does not mean the subcommittee dashes about in all directions.

MANY SIMILARITIES

Nor does it means, they assure fellow Members of Congress, that the subcommittee will necessarily collide with other congressional "watchers" or investigators. The House Armed Services Committee, for example, has more than a half dozen subcommittees checking on various phases of the national defense conditions and planning.

In the public view, however, the preparedness subcommittee is far more likely to be compared constantly with the Truman committee, or at least the wartime phase of that committee's record.

Many similarities are obvious already to anyone who remembers the work of the former committee, and especially the policy that the then Senator Truman laid down against investigating matters of military strategy or tactics.

Further resemblances may develop when and if the Preparedness Subcommittee reaches the stage of public hearings or adopts the "case system" generally followed by the old war investigating committee.

But the times have changed and the subcommittee seems bound to change with them. The studies it is making and on which it will report from time to time carry echoes from the early 1940's, but they touch on yet wider and more troublesome topics.

The Preparedness Subcommittee is not embarrassed about being acclaimed as the Truman committee's successor. It merely wants the public to understand that it has a mind as well as a way of its own.

St. Joseph's Church, Buffalo, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of Congress will want to join with me in extending felicitations to the pastor and parishioners of a church in my home town of Buffalo which last Sunday celebrated its one hundredth anniversary.

I refer to the little church built log by log by the farm folk of Elysville, N. Y., in the autumn of 1849. When it had been completed in January of 1850, it was dedicated to God and named for St. Joseph. As the years went by, Elysville became the Buffalo Plains and later the University Heights section of Buffalo. The log church was supplanted by a stone church on the same site at Englewood Avenue and Main Street.

The Reverend Bernard Fritsch, S. J., was the first pastor of St. Joseph's which was founded by half the families who belonged to St. John's Mission Church in Northbush, now the intersection of Englewood and Belmont Avenues, town of Tonawanda.

During the first 35 years of the church's existence, 26 priests served as pastors, some for a few weeks and some for 5 years. Frequently, secular priests were so scarce that members of religious orders were called upon for brief pastorates.

The Reverend George Zurcher, who was pastor from 1885 to 1900, built a new brick church and rectory in 1894. It was in the period from 1908 to 1944, during the pastorate of the Right Reverend Joseph Schemel, one of St. Joseph's most highly respected pastors, that the school, the present rectory and the church were built and, by 1939, all were free of debt. In June 1944, Monsignor Schemel celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination and died 3 months later at the age of 72.

The present pastor of the church is the Right Reverend Albert Rung who was named pastor in 1945, after serving 16 years as pastor of St. Mary's Church in East Eden and 12 years as pastor of Blessed Trinity Church.

The history of St. Joseph's Church is one of considerable struggle and a great amount of hard work over the years. It has achieved an enviable record in religious, educational, and community matters and occupies a respected place in Buffalo.

I am proud to acquaint the Members of Congress with the successful achievements of this fine parish and of its present pastor whose spiritual leadership and indomitable perseverance augur well for the future of the church.

I am sure that the members will join with me in extending to Monsignor Rung, to the good Sisters of St. Joseph who teach at the school and to the parishioners, cordial greetings on this centennial celebration, and all possible good wishes for the coming years.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith including an article from the Buffalo Evening News of September 11, relating the story of the anniversary celebration.

FOLLOW EXAMPLE SET BY ST. JOSEPH'S, BISHOP O'HARA SAYS

The Most Reverend John F. O'Hara, CSC, bishop of the Buffalo diocese, Sunday morning commended to a world seeking peace the example of devotion set by parishioners of St. Joseph's Church.

"The world can have peace," Bishop O'Hara declared, "only when it has the formula that has blessed this congregation throughout its 100 years"—that of obedience to God and the living of His rules.

Bishop O'Hara presided at a solemn high mass which initiated a 5-day program commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the church at 3269 Main Street. The Very Reverend Raymond Schouten, S. J., Canisius College president, delivered the sermon.

"Too many people want to change the rules of God," warned the bishop.

MILESTONE TO GLORY OF GOD

"Only when they are God's rules that we live by can we have peace in the world and international understanding. You have demonstrated that here in your 100 years which have been blessed. Ask God to spread that spirit all over the world."

Father Schouten said the anniversary is a cause for profound rejoicing because it marks a "milestone to the glory of God."

In a century of Catholic education, "boys and girls of St. Joseph's have been * * * trained in the ideal of working for our neighbors, working for God, and being good citizens of the land where they were born—100 years of the saving influence of correct education, 100 years of young men and women setting up homes from the altar of God."

MESSAGE OF GOD'S LOVE

"All over the world parishes and churches have been destroyed, devoted Christian followers killed and maimed," he continued. "Yet here we have a miracle of 100 years of solid accomplishment and God's grace poured into the city of Buffalo through devoted Catholic hearts."

St. Joseph's anniversary, Father Schouten said, also is a cause for reflection upon "God's wondrous design of love. * * * From all eternity God has planned so many souls to be a credit to Him * * * and for 100 years souls have lived * * * here to be a credit to Almighty God. The message of God's love is written in large letters all over this parish."

FIVE HUNDRED INSPECT NEW CONVENT

The Right Reverend Albert Rung, pastor, celebrated the mass. He was aided by his assistant pastors, the Reverend Paul J. Eberz and the Reverend Arthur T. Sullivan. Assisting Bishop O'Hara were the Reverend Charles A. Klauder, pastor of St. John the Baptist Church, Kenmore, and the Reverend William M. Martin, pastor of Our Lady of Lourdes.

The Very Reverend John Lodge McHugh, assistant pastor of St. Joseph's Cathedral, was master of ceremonies to the bishop.

The Most Reverend Joseph A. Burke, V. G., auxiliary bishop, was assisted by the Very Reverend John Obendorfer, CSSR, pastor of St. Mary's Church, and the Reverend Gerald McCann, OFM, of St. Patrick's Church. The Reverend Martin Marnon, of the Little Seminary, also participated.

More than 500 former and present parishioners inspected the new convent for the Sisters of St. Joseph, adjoining the church, during a reception Sunday afternoon and evening in the school hall.

Complaint Against General Electric Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1950.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, herewith applies for the issuance of a complaint against the General Electric Co. IUE-CIO charges that General Electric Co. has engaged in acts and practices which prejudice and injure the public and constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

General Electric Co. is a New York corporation having its office and principal place of business at 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. The company is engaged in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of electrical equipment in interstate commerce.

At present the General Electric Co. is engaged in a labor dispute with the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, and its thousands of members in the General Electric plants. To maintain whatever "institutional good will" it still possesses and for the purpose of inducing the purchase of its products, the General Electric Co. has caused to be published, in newspapers which have been circulated among its purchasers and prospective purchasers located in the various States in the United States and in the District of Columbia, false, misleading, and deceptive statements and representations. Such statements and representations pertain to the value of the offer which the General Electric Co. has made to IUE-CIO, to the nature of the working conditions at plants of the company, and to the character of the company's labor-relations policies. Typical of the statements and representations contained in such advertising matter are the following:

"What is the GE offer?

* * * * *

"2. $125 a month guaranteed minimum retirement incomes, with no ceilings; pensions go up as pay and service go up. * * *

"Other plans in the news have $100, $104, or $117.50 as the maximum for 25 years service—and some go to $125 for 30 years.

"3. A whole new broad program of life, sickness, and accident insurance; hospitalization, surgical, and maternity benefits.

"These benefits are right up with the best of the recently publicized settlements, or in the rest of major industry.

* * * * *

"5. That means 10 to 15½ cents an hour in wage increases offered in the 90 days of negotiations.

"And the increased pensions and insurance programs in addition are worth still another 15 to 28 cents an hour to our employees.

"And the new holiday offered—Election Day—means another day's pay without work.

"The total of the wage offers and the value of the insurance and pension programs is obviously worth 25½ to 43½ cents an hour, plus the extra holiday."

A copy of the advertisement in which these statements and representations appear is attached to this letter.

The statements and representations quoted above are false, misleading, and deceptive.

"First, the pension plans referred to in the above advertisement as having recently received wide publicity are noncontributory in nature. By comparing its own plan with such noncontributory plans GE has given the impression that its pension plan is also noncontributory. This misleading impression is strengthened by the fact that the advertisement is silent concerning the type of pension plan which is the subject of GE's proposal. In truth and in fact, the GE pension plan is not noncontributory, but calls for substantial contributions by GE workers.

"Further, in actuality the insurance and other benefits offered by GE are not as advantageous as similar benefits involved in recently published settlements or in effect in the rest of major industry.

"Finally, GE has grossly perverted the truth in implying that its offer to IUE-CIO is worth 25 cents to 43½ cents an hour. In fact its offer is worth far less. GE has admitted this. In other advertisements, it has attempted to explain away its falsehood by contending that in the assertion quoted above, it referred not to the value of the increases offered by it, but the combined value of present programs and offered improvements. Even so, the assertion is false. The falsehood is patently demonstrated by the fact that the company has tried to justify the alleged value of its pension and insurance programs by asserting that the figures given are what an individual would have to pay for similar protection outside the company, not what they do cost under a group program. There can be no reasonable construction of the company's statement concerning the total of its wage offers and insurance and pension programs that is not in flagrant conflict with the truth."

The effects of the foregoing misrepresentations are as follows:

1. Large sections of the consuming public are influenced in their purchases by the labor relations policies of producers. The General Electric Co. grossly misrepresented to consumers its actual labor-relations policy. It has grossly misrepresented to them the actual working conditions in its plants. Thereby the General Electric Co. has materially deceived purchasers and prospective purchasers of its products.

2. By its conduct General Electric has also engaged in major misrepresentations to its workers concerning the services and other compensation it would furnish them in return for their labor.

3. The General Electric Co. has falsely disparaged its competitors, their working conditions, and labor policies. By doing so, it has engaged in unfair methods of competition.

IUE-CIO is fully aware of the necessity for preservation of the fullest possible measure of free speech on the part of parties to industrial disputes. In no way is IUE-CIO seeking to cause any infringement of that freedom. GE has a right to express its opinions. We request, however, that the Federal Trade Commission act to prevent gross misrepresentations of fact by the General Electric Co. in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Enforcement of such legislation would not in any way impair General Electric's freedom of speech.

We are fully aware, of course, that our request may be unprecedented, and seem to require a novel application of the law. We believe that such application would be within the principle of the law. No corporation, no matter how large, should be permitted to use its unrestricted access to the public press to gain unfair economic advantage over its business competitors through deceiving the consuming public and its employees by publication of grossly misleading, deceptive, and mendacious statements as to its conditions of employment.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY,
Chairman, Administrative Committee.

Special Political Letter by A. L. Schultz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great political analysts and writers of the country is Mr. A. L. (Dutch) Schultz, of the Topeka State Journal. His sage observations and comments have long been respected by all Kansans. His faculty for hitting the nail on the head and boring through to the fundamentals of issues has great weight among the thinking people not only of Kansas but of the entire Middle West. This faculty is well evidenced by his weekly column of August 30 in which he sets forth the reasons for the grave anxiety which grips the people of this country today.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his comments herewith:

TOPEKA, KANS., August 30.—Kansans have lost faith in the soundness, the clear thinking, and even the integrity of men in high places in their Government in a measure never before registered in this State.

Nobody is going to be able to immediately change that thinking. It will require months, maybe years, to restore confidence in official Washington. In a period of weeks public doubt, suspicion, and resentment against policymakers in the National Capital has mounted almost to complete distrust. It is in no measure political. It doesn't apply to any group or class of citizens. It affects people of all ages, all groups, all creeds, and in all walks of life from the little man with a broom or a truck patch to the highest salaried executive in the community.

Something seems to have loosened the flood gates of a pent-up public resentment that has been gathering in volume for months. There is no one feature of National Government to which a person can point as the real cause of this shattered faith that seemingly extends into every locality. The reports which are brought to Topeka from every element of sentiment sounding combine in providing a common story. People are confused, bewildered, uncertain, and in a large measure—afraid. The cause of their fear isn't entirely clear. Really, most people don't know. Their unrest stems from a loss of confidence in Washington philosophies, and in the sound judgment and stability of

men who shape and execute domestic and foreign policies.

The Korean situation contributed tremendously to this crash in confidence. Don't put an improper interpretation on that sentence. Kansans and people everywhere in the Nation have the same deep-rooted loyalty to their Government that has made this country great in every crisis. Kansans won't complain about dollars spent for victory. They will sacrifice and pay in blood and tears. Yet away down inside, just about every Kansan has a feeling that something has gone wrong. Defenses don't add up to the scores of billions granted by Congress. Fighting forces are not equipped as advertised. Swaggering claims of the high command are not sustained by conditions on the fighting front.

You don't laugh those things off. Boys only recently home from the late world conflict, are surrendering jobs and opportunities. They are leaving newly established homes, saying good-by as they go to fight another war. Controls over prices, profits, wages—controls so easy to grant, so hard to regain—are greedily grabbed by the White House.

Hundreds of Kansans are volunteering—without pay—to aid the war effort. Yet those patriotic impulses are being deadened by acts of arrogant, bombastic labor dictators who threatened to back their country to the wall to win selfish gains. Neither management nor labor will gain public approval of moves which endanger national defenses, disrupt transportation, or produce economic chaos.

Each day there are new stories of private enterprise forced to surrender to racketeers with "influence." It is rather easy to understand how the little fellow—the forgotten man of a few years ago—develops the idea that the "influence" trial leads down Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington. And it is the little fellow who has to pay.

One by one, bit by bit, the man on the street and the woman in the home are putting together the suspicions and resentments which have developed over a long period. There is a tremendous notion that a supine Congress has all too often been more concerned with the approaching election than the stability and salvation of the country. Suspicion, doubt and fear have contributed to a state of confusion that ought to alarm folks in high offices. There is tremendous, deep-rooted feeling that the confidence of the people out in this great grain-growing area has been betrayed.

That notion is not based on any single act. There is a conviction that business is being pillaged and wrecked with public funds which should be used to encourage and build better, sounder private enterprise. There is deep resentment against the use of public money to put Government in competition with taxpayer groups. Maybe it is all just an awakening of dulled sensibilities at the end of a drunken doze during an orgy of Government squandering. Yet it is evidence of a trend of major importance.

Gradually the thought has developed that Government regulation, control, and competition is destroying freedom and opportunity. No single factor has been sufficiently powerful to smash the reservoir which held back a flood of increasing resentments. The threat of a welfare state didn't do it. Socialized medicine wasn't of sufficient force. Deficit spending jarred but didn't smash confidence in Washington. Government competition with private lending agencies didn't do it. Protests came when the Government used tax money to drive taxpaying private power projects to the wall. There was grass roots protest when rail and communication interests were intimidated and coerced. Trade agreements threatened destruction of the Midwest's livestock, grain, oil, and mineral interests. The workingman faced loss of his high wage scales when products of his toil were offered in competition with outputs from so-called slave-labor countries.

No single loss of freedom by the American citizen, though, brought the revolt that today threatens destruction of confidence in Washington policy makers. Now there is evidence that public faith in national leadership is at an all-time low. The average citizen is demanding that the country get along with the least possible Government dictation. Kansans themselves may react rather violently when the legislature comes to Topeka next winter. There is increasing thought, for example, that welfare expenditures should be made known to folks who pay the bills. That course would have been adopted some years ago, too, except for pressure on the lawmakers by the then Governor, Payne Ratner.

Every day there is new evidence that a resentful, balky Kansas is out to seek freedom from Washington dictates. The protests run to pattern. They are not from any political party. They are from men and women of all creeds and all walks of life. They want their voices heard on Capitol Hill and at the White House.

More Kansans have written to Members of Congress in the last 3 months than during any normal 5-year period. Those letters are a common outpouring of complaint. There is a mutual appeal for advice and assurance by bewildered men and women who voice disillusionment in the strange philosophies of their Government. Those letters reflect increasing suspicion and even a conviction that men in high offices have not told taxpayers and voters the truth about conditions. This accumulation of evidence arousing distrust has tended to add weight to stories about communistic infiltrations in offices of state. There are fears that lax, stupid, and even wanton neglect has caused loss of defense secrets of untold value.

Those things all add a touch of frenzy to appeals to Congress to take a tighter grip on controls. This demand goes hand in hand with the plea to safeguard and protect private enterprise against oppression and destruction. There is a fear on the lips of people who write those letters or sound those thoughts.

Something frightening may well be behind it all. America has known ground swells and protests in other years. They were leveled at private groups. Big business was often the target. Now business which provides employment pays taxes and develops markets is threatened in the same measure that human freedoms are endangered. It is a trend far greater than immediately realized. This loss of confidence in men at the head of our Government is a threat of major magnitude.

Why Congressional Immunity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER C. HUNT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast on the subject Why Congressional Immunity? participated in by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and myself on September 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY CONGRESSIONAL IMMUNITY?

The ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Company presents The American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik, and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the NBC Theater in Washington, D. C.

Now, here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. Recent congressional investigations, with charges and countercharges, have stirred vigorous debate on the question of congressional immunity—that part of the Constitution which reads:

"And for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place."

There are some who feel that this gives to Members of Congress the privilege to make defamatory, smearing statements, with complete immunity from laws as applied to all other citizens.

But Senator LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming, has introduced a resolution lifting this congressional shield, making Members of Congress legally responsible and legally liable for their words and actions.

However, others feel the principle that Members of Congress shall not be held to answer in a libel or slander action for what they may say in the Halls of Congress is a part of the very bedrock of our legislative process. They contend that it would be the sheerest folly to abandon the system, simply because it has been abused on a few occasions.

So the American Forum of the Air has invited the author of the resolution, Senator HUNT, to discuss the issues involved with Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, one of the Senate's leading constitutional authorities.

Senator HUNT, is our congressional immunity being used today for the purpose originally intended by our founding fathers?

Senator HUNT. It is not. A study of the origin of this provision in the parliamentary law of England, a study of the Constitution of the United States when it was adopted and discussion being entirely lacking on this provision, I would say we are using it today for an entirely different purpose from that which was intended.

I might elaborate on that for a minute just to show you what I mean.

In the English Parliament years ago, the King could do no harm. So it was during the reign of Queen Elizabeth that certain members of Parliament were taken to task, were imprisoned for remarks they made with reference to the throne.

A few years later, when Charles I was king, he left his residence one day, left the palace, and he said to his Queen, "When I return I will be master of my kingdom." He was on his way down to Parliament to arrest five men.

However, when he arrived at Parliament, the five men had heard of his coming and the purpose of his visit, and so they had left the halls of Parliament. When he demanded the chair, he was forced to say, "I see my birds have flown."

Immediately after that this immunity was written into the English law to protect the members of the Parliament from the Crown, from the King.

Our founding fathers adopted it for exactly the same principle: that is, when our Government was founded, there were many who did not believe but what George Washington, instead of being President when elected, would be a sort of king.

So we wrote it into our Constitution without any debate, without any discussion, and for the specific purpose of protecting the Members of Congress from the Executive.

Chairman GRANIK. Now, Senator Stennis.

Senator STENNIS. Senator HUNT, I agree that that was largely the origin of this rule in the English Parliament, but that was in the infancy of the parliamentary law. The King was overcome soon thereafter, and there

flourished the great system of English parliamentary law that has been the fountainspring of our freedom ever since.

You speak of this rule as having been casually adopted in America. Why, it was in every colonial law. It is in the constitution of every State. It is written in boldly into the face of our Constitution itself, and it here, as in England, has been the main fountainspring of our parliamentary system's growth and source of our real, true freedom, defended always by the press and by those that have been favored by the people to sit in the constitutional halls.

Chairman GRANIK. What steps would you take to eliminate the abuses, Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. Mr. Granik, there are two steps that we may take to remove this abuse. The first would be a resolution providing for a repeal of this particular part of the Constitution, which is in section 6.

Another approach to it would be the introduction of a bill, which I have introduced, providing in part, that for any defamatory statement made on the floor of Congress, the Congressman shall not be held liable, but as a representative of the Government, as an employee, may we say, of the Government, the Government itself is liable for the remarks.

Chairman GRANIK. Under the resolution, is the individual liable, Senator?

Senator HUNT. Under the resolution at the present time, as our Constitution stands today, nobody is liable. We have complete immunity.

Chairman GRANIK. I mean under the resolution you propose?

Senator HUNT. Under the resolution I propose, if it were adopted by three-fourths of all the States of the Union and the Congress, then I, as a Senator, and the judge, as a Senator, the Senator from Mississippi, would have exactly the same privileges as you enjoy today, and no more. And I don't think he should enjoy any more.

Senator STENNIS. Senator HUNT, let us define our terms here just a minute. Let me point out that the common acceptation of this so-called immunity is that it is something in favor of the individual Member of Congress.

Now, here is a case from Massachusetts that has a very pertinent summary, where a judge wrote it up this way:

"These privileges are thus secured, not with the intention of protecting the members against prosecutions for their own benefit, but to support the rights of the people by enabling their representatives to execute the functions of their office without fear of persecutions, prosecutions, civil or criminal."

That is the real purpose. It is not to protect the member as an individual, but it is to protect him in the discharge of his official duty and responsibility as a spokesman for the people. That is fundamental.

You have a law here that has some merits in it, but you propose primarily to repeal this cardinal principle of the Constitution.

That is why I respectfully submit the Doctor is in error.

Senator, I use that term of "Doctor" because you are a doctor, and it is a term of affection with me.

But it rests on a fundamental principle.

Senator HUNT. I do not think that your concept of the use of this privilege at the present time is correct at all. In the United States, Senator, I have this privilege: Of defaming, of smearing, of slandering any citizen of the United States. He is then my victim. He has absolutely no redress. There is no way that he can protect himself. There is no way that I can be punished for saying things on the floor of the United States Senate that I should not say. No civil suit can now be started against me for any action that I may take on the floor of the United States Senate.

I disagree with you that it is being used today for the good of the people as a whole. I say it is being used as a special privilege for a few, very few, irresponsible Members of Congress, who say things in debate and in their remarks and get them printed in the RECORD, things that never should be in there.

Let me say to you, too, Senator, that here is another feature.

Chairman GRANIK. Would you let Senator STENNIS comment on your remarks first, Senator HUNT?

Senator STENNIS. You said that today you have the privilege of slandering someone on the floor of the United States Senate. Let me put it this way: You have the duty of exposing before the American people any person, be he in the Government or out of the Government, in Wyoming or in Mississippi, or in Maine, you have the duty of exposing anything about him that is corrupt, or anything that is injurious to the public welfare.

In so doing, doing it courageously and definitely and positively, you might frequently step over the line—unintentionally, of course—of the very strict rules that we have in law covering slander and libel. A step over the line far enough will sweep away whatever possessions you may have and leave you a pauper unless you have immunity.

So the few that are injured—and you are correct, there are some injured and there are some abuses—are greatly minimized in view of the great blessings and benefits that flow to the people as a whole.

Chairman GRANIK. Would it be possible that this would deter Members of the Congress from making libelous statements on the floor of the Congress?

Senator STENNIS. Do you mean the bill would, or the resolution, or the repeal of this?

Chairman GRANIK. I mean the resolution and the bill.

Senator STENNIS. I think the constitutional provision would deter some of those that are irresponsible. I think it would do some good along that line.

But it is like cutting off a leg because you have a sore toe. That is not an extreme illustration. We have a cardinal, fundamental principle here of our freedom.

Chairman GRANIK. Now, Senator HUNT.

Senator HUNT. Are you contending that, as a United States Senator, you have the right on the floor of the Senate, to call somebody a Communist, not with the true knowledge of facts that he is a Communist?

He may be an enemy of yours, you may have some ulterior motive; so you call this enemy of yours a Communist. What do you do? If he is a businessman, his business is ruined. If he has a position, he probably loses his position. That is because today we have this instrument of television and we have radio, with instant recording all over the United States. That man is smeared then throughout the United States for the rest of his life, and because it is Nation-wide, regardless of where he may go, he cannot lose that stigma.

It follows him every place.

Do you mean to say that there should be no means whereby that man can get redress for the injury that has been done to him?

Chairman GRANIK. Will you answer that, Senator STENNIS?

Senator STENNIS. I will not say that he should not have redress. My point positively is, though, that the remedy is not to repeal this cardinal principle of the Constitution that does give this freedom of speech and gives a man an opportunity to conscientiously carry out his duty.

I think you have part of the remedy in your bill that would give him some redress, but I think your constitutional amendment is erroneous altogether.

Your bill then provides for a remedy in that he could sue the Government and get a monetary return. I do not go with you that far. I think this injured citizen—and there are some—should have a remedy to the courts and a chance to clear his name, and that the Government would have to pay the cost of the court and even attorneys' fees.

But I would not give him a monetary return. I think you have great merit in your bill, but I want to preserve the Constitution without touching this provision of it. I see your point.

Senator HUNT. If he loses his business, if he loses his job and his job opportunities, if he suffers other great monetary losses as a result of this smear, do you contend that it is right or proper?

Senator STENNIS. No.

Senator HUNT. Do you not think, Senator, that our Constitution, in its entirety, was built around the right of our constituents to protection and not to protect us from our constituents?

Senator STENNIS. If he loses his business—and you state that very strongly—if he loses his business, that is one of the rare hazards of being an American citizen. Now, he can go to another country where you do not have freedom of speech on the Senate floor and Congress, and that same man would not have any business, no freedom, nothing to lose. No one else will have any freedom; he would not have any freedom.

Senator HUNT. Senator, you are taking the position that the state is superior to the individual. I say to you that in these United States, our democracy, our American way of life, is built around the proposition of the dignity of the individual over the state. You are placing the state above the individual. We are not living in that kind of a country.

Senator STENNIS. I like your idea there, the way you state it, but we put the individual supreme in every way that we can. But there are some things in which he has to yield to the good and the welfare of the state, and this is the outstanding one thing where the individual has to yield for the good of the whole.

Senator HUNT. Let me tell you another evil that is coming out of this community. The courts are constantly extending this immunity. It extends to you, Senator, at the present time, not just while you are addressing yourself and making remarks on the floor of the Senate, but as you go from your office to the Senate floor, you can make derogatory remarks about any person, and you again are immune from any punishment of any kind.

It is extended to committees; it is extended to subcommittees. It has been extended now to appointee officers, and it has been extended to quasi-judicial units of the Government. It has even been extended in one case to employees of a committee.

Then here is another thing that is very bad about it: If a newspaper, for instance, wants to publish some certain derogatory statement and can get you to make that statement on the floor of the Senate and then have it published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, then that newspaper can take it and scatter it all over the United States. It also can be broadcast Nation-wide over the radio.

Chairman GRANIK. All, right Senator STENNIS.

Senator STENNIS. This privilege is too sacred and too important to be unduly extended, and I do not think it should be, although it has to extend beyond the mere legislative chamber itself. The courts have laid down this test:

Is the member engaged in legislative business at the time he makes the defamatory statement?

In other words, is he on a mission for the people?

If he is, then he has the people's protection. If he is not, he is responsible and should be responsible for what he says.

Now, let me call attention to something else to which it is extended. The privilege extends to grand jurors, too. They bring in a long bill of indictment here and just read the riot act in a man's home town before the public and publish that in the newspapers. They accuse him of every crime under the sun, and the foreman signs it, and the rest of them all vote for it. You never thought of holding them liable for what they say in that indictment, because if they were you could not get a man who could afford to sit on the grand jury.

The judge is immune to it.

Senator HUNT. Let me ask you a question, Senator.

Senator STENNIS. All right.

Senator HUNT. You will agree with me that certain derogatory, certain slanderous, certain libelous, certain smearing statements, are made in the Halls of Congress, will you not?

Senator STENNIS. Unfortunately; yes.

Senator HUNT. They are not made often. The Senator from Mississippi does not need the protection of this immunity; many, many other Members of Congress do not need this immunity or this privilege. You do not need it.

There are a few who do need it, and, to my way of thinking, those few should not have it.

Let me go on and ask you: What is the advantage to a Member of Congress when he uses such tactics, when he takes advantage of this special privilege that we have, which our constituents, the people, do not have?

The moderator here does not enjoy it. What does the Member gain?

First, he gains notoriety. And primarily, that is what he is looking for, publicity.

Secondly, he injures his enemy. That is rather inconsequential.

In the third place, he makes of himself a Congressman to be feared, on which point I am sure you will agree with me.

For those various reasons, together with many others, I cannot see why we continue to use this protection. It never was meant to protect us from the people, but to protect us from the Executive.

Senator STENNIS. History is against you on that. It was not to protect the legislators, but to put them where they can serve the people.

You say that I do not need it and I am flattered by your compliment. I can certainly say, knowing you as I do, that I do not think you will ever need it, as the law is now; but if you repeal that privilege, you will wish you had it. You will find then the reason why it was put in.

Senator HUNT. I hope the time will never come when I need it.

Senator STENNIS. Take that privilege away and you will need it as certainly as night follows day.

Senator HUNT. Let me make one more point. You know, Senator, that it is with great difficulty that we get proper men to head our departments of Government today; I mean in the upper level. Why is that? Is it because of monetary reasons? Because of insufficient salary?

No; that is not the reason. The real reason is because these outstanding men in the country today do not care to come into the Government and subject themselves constantly to these smearing and slanderous remarks.

Senator STENNIS. Senator, you have served the people long and well, and you have been subjected to slander and libel yourself. You have loved your country more, though, than you despised the abuse that you had to take. That is why you are here. The people have more faith in you for it.

Chairman GRANIK. Let me get a question from the floor. Let us hear from one of the constituents. Go ahead.

Mr. WYLER. I am William Wyler and I am a lawyer. I have a question for Senator HUNT.

Do you not think that the adoption of your resolution would mean that the people will be deprived of the voice of their representatives in the Congress by continually having them called away to face damage suits and court action in addition to making them afraid to speak out on many legislative issues?

Senator HUNT. No; not at all, because my bill provides that the suit shall be against the Government, not against the Congressman. It further provides that it is not necessary even for him to appear as a witness.

Further than that, let me answer your question a little indirectly by saying I think it would be a very splendid thing for our constituents to have the right to bring this suit. First, to clear themselves in their own community, be tried by 12 true and good men who would clear them of this smear. And I think, too, then the Members of Congress, who may take advantage of this privilege, would be a little more reluctant, perhaps, and a little more restrained in their statements in the future if any individual they had smeared was cleared by a jury of 12 men.

Senator STENNIS. Senator HUNT, may I say this to be sure that it is understood. You talk about your bill. Your bill is proposed as a remedy during the interim between now and when you get the constitutional repeal, if you do. Once you repeal the Constitution, you will have no bill, then, no remedy, and everyone who is a Member of the legislature will be absolutely subject to these suits and harassment and all the attention that goes with it.

Is that not true?

Senator HUNT. Why shouldn't they be? Why should they say anything and not be held accountable for it by the people?

Senator STENNIS. I want to be sure the issue is understood.

Chairman GRANIK. Another question. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. JAQUET. My name is George Jaquet, and I am a management analyst. Senator STENNIS, I should like to ask a question, please:

In what other way than through Senator HUNT's resolution can we prevent recurrence of gross abuse of the senatorial privilege such as by one Senator in recent months when personal reputations were damaged and our country held up to world ridicule by a reckless disregard for the truth and by often unfounded accusations?

Chairman GRANIK. Senator STENNIS?

Senator STENNIS. I make no reference to anything that has recently happened. I am referring to the history of this matter. For gross abuse of this privilege the people usually take care of those things in the elections. Now, the Senate of the United States could do a great deal within their own rules and within their own power under the Constitution. They have the right to, in effect, punish a Member. They have the power under the Constitution to make their own rules.

And I think that the Senate could improve a great deal on its power of censure.

The people have a power. And I think Senator HUNT has something in his bill providing for a remedy in the courts. But my point is: Do not repeal this constitutional provision, but give the individual Member the responsibility, the responsibility of speaking out and the responsibility of taking a chance.

Chairman GRANIK. What about that congressional improvement, Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. We have taken care of ourselves, Mr. Granik. We have taken care of that very nicely by a Senate rule which says that no Senator in debate, shall directly or indirectly, in any form of words, impugn another Senator's actions or conduct or motive as being unworthy and unbecoming a Senator.

So we have our constituents at our mercy. We have taken care of ourselves by the Senate rule. We are immune from whatever any other Senator may say and we have the privilege to go ahead.

Senator STENNIS. May I just say a short word?

That rule that Senator HUNT refers to, that is a rule to apply to us when we get mad with each other. Everyone there is not as cool as Senator HUNT and his colleague, JOE O'MAHONEY. We have to have some rule to cool our tempers down. That is not something special for ourselves; that is to make things move along.

Chairman GRANIK. May I take another question from the lady?

Miss YOUNG. I am Elizabeth Young, employment counselor. My question is addressed to Senator HUNT, and it might have been amended if I had known what you were going to talk about.

It seems to me that the Government office needing the greatest protection against intemperate attacks is the office of the Secretary of State. Do you think of any way, Senator HUNT, that this office might have that protection without abrogating any of our democratic processes, or without relinquishing your own rights to constructive criticism?

Senator HUNT. Yes, there is a way. I have suggested two ways: First, the repeal of this constitutional provision, and second, the bill that we have been discussing. As to your contention that we keep our democratic rights and not lose any of our privileges, I contend that this so-called democratic right that we have is an arbitrary right; it is not a democratic right at all.

It is not in harmony with our American way of life.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, Senator HUNT, it is time for our summaries.

Senator STENNIS, your summary?

Senator STENNIS. I stand firmly and unyieldingly on the proposition that this valuable and necessary rule of immunity from damage suits and criminal prosecution for what they may say in the course of legislative duties was not created nor is it now continued for the benefit of Members of Congress. It was created and continued for the benefit of the people so that they may be better served by their public servants.

It is, in effect, the people saying to the legislators, "You do what you think is your duty. Speak up and speak out, point out the rotten apples in the barrel, be they among the people or in the Government. Say what you think you should say to protect the people and then for our part we will not let the offended person jerk the rug out from under you by hailing you into court and suing you for your last dime, nor prosecuting you criminally for libel."

Now, under this system, England and the United States have built up the greatest system of parliamentary law in the world, and we are today the world's citadel of freedom.

Do you want to knock that out?

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, Senator STENNIS.

Senator HUNT, your summary?

Senator HUNT. Indeed I do believe it should be knocked out. I contend this provision was written into our Constitution almost verbatim from the English law. It was done so for exactly the same purpose; namely, to protect the members of Parliament from the King, and to protect the Members of our Congress from the Executive.

That is obsolete at this time, and we no longer have need for it; it is just the reverse. The Executive needs some protection from us.

I further contend that as long as we have special privileges the courts may continue to expand their coverage and I know that is going to be bad, and I know you, as a Judge, will agree with me.

I further contend that the spirit of our Constitution and our democratic way of life

is that the people should be protected, not the elected officials protected from the people.

And I want to say further that if we had such a provision, it might shorten some of the speeches in the Senate of the United Sttaes, and I think that would be good.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen.

You have been listening to a discussion, "Why Congressional Immunity?" Our speakers have been Senator LESTER C. HUNT, Democrat, of Wyoming, and Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

ANNOUNCER. For reprints of this discussion, send 10 cents to Ransdell, Inc., Printers and Publishers, Washington 18, D. C.

Join us again next week at this same time for a discussion on the vital question, "Our Foreign Policy."

Our speakers will be Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, and Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California.

The American Forum of the Air, founded and moderated by Theodore Granik, has been presented as a public service by the National Broadcasting Company, and has come to you from Washington, D. C.

Draft of World War II Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a very clear and highly intelligent letter from one of my constituents, Mrs. Gerald W. Thiel, of Bay City, Mich., whose husband is a World War II veteran. She discusses a problem which is most disturbing not only to the wives of these veterans, but also to the veterans themselves.

I shall not at this time discuss this situation except to say that I am in complete harmony with the views expressed and commend them to the Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the letter from Mrs. Thiel:

SEPTEMBER 7, 1950.

Representative ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Tenth District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: First I would like to introduce myself. I am John B. McCullough's granddaughter.

My husband, who is a World War II veteran, has asked me to write you concerning the proposed draft of World War II veterans.

My husband works for Consumers Power, and I am a secretary for the Wallace H. Chanel Insurance Agency. Both of us come in daily contact with veterans, and therefore know how they feel about this proposed draft. They are very bitter about the whole idea. Their opinion adds up to this: "If there is total war, and only then, they would be willing to ser-e."

They have all recently come back to civilian life, and now Draft Director Lewis B. Hershey is proposing to draft them again. Do you think this is fair?

There are thousands of young men now being deferred who should be drafted. They are laughing and boasting about being deferred and telling the veterans that they will sit home or go to college and let the veterans be drafted.

My husband and I, and the veterans we have talked to, feel that they should not defer these young men to go to college. These young men should go before the Government even considers the drafting of nonveterans with dependents. The excuse right now for this proposed draft is that the single 19–25-age group of young men is not passing the mental and physical qualifications. The veterans definitely feel that these standards should be lowered to the standards of World War II. Their reasoning goes thus: "Veterans of World War II served under the more liberal World War II standards, therefore they believe these young men aren't any better than they were or are, and they should serve under the standards of World War II."

These opinions aren't only our opinions, but those veterans and civilians that my husband and I have talked to.

Another greatly discussed topic is that of UMT. The people would like to know why it hasn't been passed yet? Why not do it now when the need for it may become very great in the future? My husband and other veterans were on their way overseas when they were 17 years old. Are the 17–19-years-olds of today any better than these veterans?

The veterans and people are 100 percent behind UMT. Why put off what you can do now? The Korean war should hasten its passage, not retard it.

If the country wants a large Army, build it of single, young, nonveteran men. They claim that 800,000 young men come of age for the draft every year. There should be quite a few now available providing the Government Armed Forces aren't so choosey.

We will greatly appreciate your cooperation and assistance in the above-mentioned matters. The veterans feel that they have done their part and want a fair deal. We believe that if you, Representative WOODRUFF, and your colleagues know how we feel, you will see that the fair thing is done.

A reply will be appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GERALD W. THIEL,
Bay City, Mich.

Oh, Say Does That Star-Spangled Banner Yet Wave?—Broadcast by Paul Harvey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast entitled "Oh, Say Does That Star-Spangled Banner Yet Wave?" by Paul Harvey, under date of August 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OH, SAY DOES THAT STAR-SPANGLED BANNER YET WAVE?

This brings us up to date on the day's essential developments. Pending later advice from the fighting fronts, let's just visit for a few minutes.

By now we pretty well understand each other.

So I hope I can say this without being misunderstood.

At any event, I have to say it.

I am aware that in time of crisis we cannot afford the luxury of much individual freedom and you can't fight a war in your backyard without tracking in some dirt.

But this is not directly connected with the Korean War.

It began a long time before.

When Americans * * * who would not under any circumstances walk headlong into disaster began "backing into it" while looking at something entirely different.

In the business of news analysis we usually try and determine where we're going first by taking a good look at how we got where we are.

Our problems are not new ones.

Christ was born in Bethlehem because Joseph was on his way to pay his taxes.

And Christ was born in a manger, because there was a housing shortage when he got there.

You know what fouled up the Roman Empire?

It wasn't all the armies of Hannibal.

It was simply because from about 146 to 49 B. C. internal Roman history was a welter of class wars and conflicts within the republic. Street brawls, corrupt governors, attempts at reform, and the gradual rise of individuals to military power—culminating in Caesar.

Rome's senatorial oligarchy had waged successful wars, but Roman citizens were corrupt. The Roman Government upkeep weighed ever more heavily upon the hard-taxed people. Immorality rose to a crescendo with the crucifixion of Christ. And the Empire, after about 200 years, hit the skids. The great Empire of Rome, with more effective cold-war tactics and better hot-war weapons, fell away * * * because within it had decayed and degenerated morally, socially, and economically to where, like an angry scorpion, it turned on itself and died of its own sting.

The Empire at its height lasted about 200 years. That's just about our time in the new world—and here we go again. What happened to Rome and Spain and Greece and China, decay within, can happen now either to the United States or Russia.

The one which remains strong within will survive. Which will it be?

Let's lay it on the line.

Russia shows no signs of weakness.

Where the United States shakes its guns in the face of the Kremlin yet permits hard-hearted Reds and soft-headed pinks to infiltrate our own Government, our educational institutions, our press and information facilities, and our vast labor unions.

In Korea tonight where the Communists are shooting our boys tying their hands—we shoot back.

Is that what we're waiting for over here?

Don't, because it won't happen that way.

No, Russia is handling the United States no differently from the way she's handled China.

Simply furnishing the United States the weapons—and watching us destroy ourselves.

And they're diabolical weapons.

Explosive lies in harmless appearing pamphlets.

Shrewd lawyers full of legal double-talk aimed at ridiculing our courts.

And treasonous pirates masquerading as a political party.

Uncle Sam's taking a terrific beating. He's lasted this long only because the old boy has a remarkable Constitution.

I mention this because everywhere I hear sufficient concern for what's happening in Korea—yet few appear aware or seem to care that while we're saying no to communism in Korea—we're buying the same soiled product for home consumption under a different label.

Here it's called planned economy.

One hundred and fifty years ago the United States of America was a contemptuously disregarded political experiment on the wrong side of the Atlantic. Today we are the most prosperous Nation on earth. In 150 years. And the economic vehicle we rode to the top was democratic American capitalism. Don't let the word frighten you. "Capitalism." It has been our good servant. Yet some want to trade a good servant for a bad master.

Today we must decide whether the economy which made us great shall be continued or abandoned. Or, and it amounts to the same thing, be modified beyond recognition. The whole world awaits our decision.

Why should we change?

When the car's running, why should we tamper with the carburetor?

Matthew 9: 12: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick."

And another undeniable truth that's as old as the gospel of St. Luke 11: 17 reads, "But He, knowing their thoughts, said unto them, every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation."

I didn't mean to preach. I just hate to see Americans emulate the near-sighted dog in Aesop's fable—who dropped the luscious morsel he held in his teeth to snap foolishly at the reflection of the larger morsel he thought he saw in the water.

Oh, it can happen here. For 1,000 years England was impregnable. Napoleon and Hitler couldn't storm across the Channel with all their bombs and guns.

But Karl Marx made it without firing a shot.

I personally, would rather see my Nation die—valiantly and cleanly under the H-bomb—than rot away under any cancerous form of any Godless slave-statism.

But the signs are all about us: Flag poles without flags. Only 51 percent of our eligible voters bothered to vote in the last Presidential election. Only about half.

Where 15 years ago all a vigorous college student asked for himself was opportunity, opportunity, opportunity.

Now he asks instead, security, security, security.

We're not selling free competitive capitalism to our young people simply because a lesser product is better advertised.

And it's the same way with the other certain signs of decay.

We have freedom of religion, but we don't go to church.

So we stand to lose it because we haven't bothered to use it.

Immorality has sunk as low as a television neckline and now a burlesque show is brought right into your child's nursery.

And bigger government and higher taxes have created a vicious cycle which we can prove from countless historical precedents, always ends in economic ruin.

In the United States of America tonight we're plowing under, diluting, and throwing away the very things our men in Korea are buying with their lives.

Perhaps, you say, it has always been, so it will always be.

It is a natural evolution.

That is absurd as it would have been for a physician to give up on appendicitis, when this century was in its teens, because appendicitis then, generally was fatal.

I say let's profit from history. Let's learn how changes happen.

Let's learn what are the likely developments today and tomorrow, and then let's change our course before it is too late.

How stupid can we be; to keep making the same identical mistakes for 2,000 years.

In 1776 the world came to a fork in the road. The world divided. The Old World took the road to the left. The New World took the road to the right. Look what's happened in the few short years since.

We now have to take care of them.

When America's early pioneers first turned their eyes toward the West, they didn't demand that somebody take care of them when they got ill or got old. They didn't demand maximum pay for minimum work, and even pay for no work at all. Come to think of it, they didn't demand much of anything—except freedom.

They looked at those rolling plains stretching away to the tall, green mountains and lifted their eyes to the blue skies and said, "Thank you, God, I can take it from here."

That spirit isn't dead in this country.

It's been ridiculed by the Red medicinemen to where it's gone into hiding. It's been unsold to our children in our schools and to our workers in our factories and our fields, but if there's a spark left, let's breathe new life into it while there is yet time.

So many will not hear nor heed this warning.

The gravy train is running in three sections and factory whistles are making too much noise.

They figure God will save America, without giving Him any reason why He should.

Let's try.

Each in his own way, let's try.

Let's live for the things for which tonight our sons die.

There are green years, new frontiers, for America's new pioneers.

If we can just revive that wonderful land which once was—where any man willing to stay on his toes—could reach for the stars.

Paul Harvey—good night.

(Excerpt from Paul Harvey's News, August 3, 1950, American Broadcasting Co.)

Marshall, Johnson, Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of September 14, 1950:

MARSHALL, JOHNSON, TRUMAN

President Truman has abruptly thrown Defense Secretary Johnson out of his Cabinet to save the skin of Secretary Acheson, the arch bungler who brought about the Korean war. To direct the war against the Korean Reds he picks George C. Marshall, who was the principal agent in betraying China to Stalin's agents, and thereby making Korea indefensible.

This futile changing of the guard was accomplished with Mr. Truman's usual maladroitness. As recently as August 3 he asserted that neither Acheson nor Johnson was going to resign "as long as I am President." Just what status that leaves Mr. Truman is uncertain but it is too much to hope that he has at last confessed, even obliquely, his own hopeless inadequacy for his job.

The new appointment has the further peculiarity of being illegal. Mr. Truman will ask Congress to repeal the provision of the Defense Unification Act which bars as Secretary of Defense anyone who has been in military service during the 10 years preceding his appointment.

This was a sound precaution to keep the military under civilian control, and General Marshall offers no special talents to justify waiving it. Before they change any laws, the Members of Congress should start out by asking him where he was on the night of December 6, 1941, when the warning should have been sent to Pearl Harbor, but wasn't, and comb his record from there on.

They will find a good deal that bears on his fitness for the office for which he has been designated. As one of those deeply involved with Roosevelt in the Pearl Harbor conspiracy—he was saved from official censure only by President Truman's repudiation of the Army investigating board's report—General Marshall rode through the war as the military darling of the New Dealers.

As Ambassador to China, General Marshall, on instructions from Mr. Acheson, then Under Secretary of State, exerted every effort to compel Chiang Kai-shek to admit the Communists to his government. Failing in this, Marshall enforced an armistice between the Nationalist and Communist armies by withholding promised American military aid to Chiang. This action gave the Communists time to build up their forces with Russian aid and eventually to conquer China.

As Secretary of State General Marshall was no more successful in guarding American interests than he had been in China. The European aid plan given his name has been labeled a failure by subsequent acts of the Truman administration.

Secretary Marshall was going to stand off the Communists by pouring billions in economic aid into Europe. Now it is alleged that we must give the continent military protection—that the Marshall plan only fattened the western Europeans for Stalin to eat whenever he pleases.

If Congress permits him to take office, General Marshall will find a kindred spirit in Secretary Acheson, the architect of his folly in China. Mr. Truman's impulsive military action in Korea was a complete repudiation of Acheson's policy in Asia.

MOVE WILL SAVE ACHESON

Only last January the Secretary of State announced that we had no interests in Korea or Formosa, a view that was indorsed by President Truman. Marshall, when he was Secretary of State in 1948, told a congressional committee that with Communists in control of Manchuria and North Korea, South Korea was an untenable military position.

When a President disowns a policy, he usually disowns its author with it. The outcry against Secretary Johnson was in large measure a counter-offensive by Acheson's friends designed to save the Secretary of State. Johnson bought his job with campaign contributions and was guilty of some serious mistakes in it, but the greater malefactor is Acheson.

Insofar as any change in policy can be predicted under a President who very obviously doesn't know his own mind from day to day, the substitution of Marshall for Johnson may be a move to rescue Mr. Truman from his unhappy Korean adventure. Are those two old collaborators in appeasement, Acheson and Marshall, prepared to buy Stalin off by the recognition of Red China and the abandonment of Formosa?

Prof. Owen Lattimore would no doubt hail this a triumph of statesmanship.

School of International Studies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in his column a few days ago, Drew Pearson referred to an announcement which was

about to be made by the president of Johns Hopkins University and myself jointly dealing with the taking over by Johns Hopkins of the School of International Studies in Washington as a graduate school of the university. Mr. Pearson interpreted this move as being a big boost for Owen Lattimore, who is connected with the Walter Hines Page School at Johns Hopkins. Mr. Pearson also intimated that, because I was the chairman of the board of trustees of the School of International Studies and a lifelong Republican, this constituted an endorsement by myself as an individual and as a Republican of Mr. Lattimore's views.

This entire article is a complete distortion of the facts. I have never met Mr. Lattimore, and disagree emphatically with his views. In all the negotiations between myself and the distinguished president of Johns Hopkins, Dr. Detlev Bronk, with respect to the merger of the school with the university, it was made absolutely clear that this merger had nothing whatever to do with the Walter Hines Page School.

Drew Pearson was fully aware of the true facts.

In order that the record in this matter may be complete, I am quoting herewith Drew Pearson's statement, made on September 10, which appeared on the same day as did the official release issued by President Bronk and myself dealing with the same matter, a paragraph from which I am also quoting:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—JOHNS HOPKINS PREPARES TO ELEVATE OWEN LATTIMORE

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON, September 9.—Johns Hopkins University is preparing an announcement that will make GOP Senator JOE MCCARTHY, the State Department's No. 1 detractor, most unhappy.

It may also upset Republican plans to make Owen Lattimore, the former State Department consultant whom MCCARTHY has been denouncing as a Communist "tool," an issue in this year's campaign.

For Johns Hopkins will soon announce that its Walter Hines Page School of International Studies, of which Lattimore is director, will take over a similar institution in Washington—the School for Advanced International Studies.

This will make Owen Lattimore even more important in the educational world. It will also show that Johns Hopkins still thinks Lattimore is a good American.

Also significant is the fact that a high-ranking member of MCCARTHY's own party, GOP Representative CHRISTIAN HERTER, of Massachusetts, helped arrange the merger—showing that HERTER agrees with John Hopkins. HERTER, a lifelong Republican, is chairman of the Washington school which is to be taken over by Lattimore's institution in Baltimore.

[From the official release issued by Johns Hopkins University, September 10, 1950]

President Bronk pointed out that affiliation of this School of Advanced International Studies with the university does not involve duplication of the work now being carried on in the university's Walter Hines Page School of International Relations. The Page School, Dr. Bronk explained, is primarily a research institute devoted to far eastern affairs, and its personnel consists principally of senior faculty members and students who have already obtained their doctoral degrees. Its major activity at the moment is an exhaustive study of Mongolia—its literature, culture, and place in the international scene—and will not be directly related to the new school.

Soil Preservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I ask permission to have reprinted an article from the August issue of the Iowa State Watershed Bulletin reporting the recent meeting of the President's Water Resources Policy Committee at Sioux City, Iowa. Especially I want to call attention to the splendid statement made by William Gannon, of Valeria, Iowa who addressed the gathering. Mr. Gannon is an ardent conservationist and an inveterate champion of soil preservation.

TWO PROBLEMS BEFORE US IN HANDLING WATER CONTROL

The President's Water Resources Policy Committee, attempting to devise some consistent national policy governing use of natural resources, heard many divergent views regarding Missouri Basin development:

The Sioux City was the first of eight scheduled throughout the country.

Speakers on flood control, soil conservation, irrigation, navigation, wildlife and recreation appeared before the Commission.

Governor Peterson declared that people of the Missouri Valley are opposed to a valley authority. He said the valley authority may work in Tennessee but it may not work in the Missouri Valley, because this development is 13 times as big.

Skunk River Bill Gannon, of Valeria, Iowa, and vice president of the Iowa State Valley Association and speaking as the representative for the association, said: Mr. Chairman and kids:

Please pardon me for calling you kids. We are all kids here today, because we are here in school. I would like to call it the third or fourth grade at that. I, just a common farmer, have not passed the first grade yet. I have a lot to learn.

Two years ago I was appointed chairman of the Skunk River and tributaries project. That watershed is 200 miles long, 20 to 50 miles wide, about 3,000,000 acres in the watershed, and is part or all of 18 counties. So a lot of boys call me Skunk River Bill.

I also was appointed vice chairman of the State Watersheds Association. That association represents all of the watersheds of Iowa.

Now I would like to try to give just a few answers to a couple of your most important questions you have asked.

HOW CAN EROSION BE REDUCED?

By sound land practices.

Soil conservation.

Crop rotation, keeping the soil more spongelike; put more humus in the soil.

Plow under legumes. Any way every fourth year. (For heaven's sake don't burn your corn stalks.)

More grass farming.

Iowa should be raising three or four times more livestock.

Contouring; strip cropping; terracing.

Gully and water control; dams; hold water back.

Make the water walk off, not run off.

Good wide waterways.

Do the things that are necessary to get that water down into our soil.

Build up our water table that has been getting lower and lower for some time.

Spend more effort on upland water control.

Keep more of the raindrops where they fall.

HOW CAN WE GET CLEANER WATER INTO OUR STREAMS?

One answer is: Stop soil erosion. (Now you cannot stop soil or any other kind of erosion by large dams on the main stream.) It makes no difference if you build a dam that costs $1,000, $1,000,000 or $100,000,000. I claim you should have soil erosion control on the watershed above the dam first.

We should all pray that God will forgive us for wasting his precious top soil like we have been doing in the past. This soil, this farm that we call ours: it is not ours; we are just His stewards. God created this soil here for unborn generations, that they may have a livelihood in the years to come. If we do not do more to save this soil than we have been, God help America.

The farm that I live on in central Iowa is a little over 100 years old. The fifth generation of Gannons are playing on that farm now. What about 100, 300, 500 years from now if some of us do not change our way of land uses. Conservation in Iowa is only 11 years old. We should have had meetings like this 50 or 60 years ago.

More and more farmers are doing a better job every year, but that number should be doubled many times. The absentee land owner, the tenant operator, the farmer who still belongs to the old school: We must do something to get them to do a better job.

Maybe we should have a conservancy law in regard to soil conservation. We are not only losing our soil, we are losing our mineral elements that are necessary for better grains and grasses. How many of us know that in bad erosion years we lose 21 times more food elements out of our soil than one growing crop takes out?

Men, do not get me wrong: I know that some of our dams are necessary, but I also know that some of our interested parties can think only of dams. If a dam is necessary, let us also think of protecting that dam, not let the water basin slowly fill up with silt until a few years from now the water-carrying capacity of that dam site is lost.

By upland control you are not only making this soil of ours more productive, a better place to live, better communities, better living standards, but you are also solving a big percentage of our flood troubles.

By building hundreds of small dams on our upland, for gully and water control, you are solving more than one problem. You, with the help of crop and soil management, are keeping the soil where it belongs. You are keeping the silt out of our main streams. You will have a better place for fish and wildlife. And at the same time, in many, many places, you will solve most of your flood-water trouble. We have five or six small watersheds in Iowa that are doing just that now.

So with hundreds of that kind of upland watershed projects in Iowa and other States, maybe we would not have to build some of the proposed large dams. I claim that if it can be done in small watersheds—now you know it takes many small watersheds to make a large watershed—so it seems but common sense to me that if you have control of your small watersheds, you cannot help but have control of a large percentage of the water in your main streams.

Now, my dear kids, if what I have said doesn't sound reasonable, please keep this one thought in mind anyway:

Put your shoulder to the wheel; help some of us do what should be done to keep this topsoil where it should be and not let it be washed down to silt up our main streams and some of it on down into the Gulf of Mexico. No matter where it stops, it is lost forever.

How many years does it take to build up 1 inch of topsoil?

Medical Monopoly Still Upheld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of common knowledge that there is a shortage of doctors and other medical personnel in this country, a shortage already being aggravated by the crucial needs of the Armed Forces in Korea and elsewhere.

All of us remember the shortages of doctors for civilians during World War II. There are many who know of rural areas in this country which have needed more doctors badly ever since, which are again in danger of still more acute shortages.

Yet I have here an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal which tells the story of yet another able and competent physician from abroad who is unable to practice in Wisconsin because of the American Medical Association's monopolistic domination of the medical profession in this country.

Dr. Hania Ris, of Madison, Wis., is licensed to practice in Maryland and New York. Her husband is now on the faculty of the University of Wisconsin so she wishes to practice there. Her competence has been certified by the American Board of Pediatrics. She is a graduate of the University of Zurich.

Yet the Wisconsin State Board of Medical Examiners has refused to grant her a license for more than a year. Why? Because the AMA does not accredit the University of Zurich for a series of indefensible reasons as outlined in the attached editorial.

This is just one more bit of the evidence piling up that the AMA is currently guided by individuals who have no faith in the American system, but would clamp a self-controlled medical monopoly on the people of this country.

It also raises the question of permitting an organization of private citizens to dictate to a governmental body on a matter vital to public health. Neither this action nor the many others like it in which the AMA has been involved should be tolerated.

I attach the editorial from the July 15 issue of the Milwaukee Journal:

MEDICAL MONOPOLY STILL UPHELD

Dr. Hania Ris of Madison has had another go-around with the State board of medical examiners. The situation remains normal. She is no closer than ever to being allowed to practice in this great progressive (?) State.

Here are the dismaying facts, some old, some new. Dr. Ris is licensed to practice in Maryland and New York, but her husband is here, on the University of Wisconsin faculty. The American Board of Pediatrics has certified her special competence. Yet for a whole year now she has sought a Wisconsin license in vain.

Why? Because her medical degree is from the University of Zurich, in Switzerland. The State board arbitrarily bans foreign educated doctors unless their schools have been accredited by the American Medical Association. The AMA has now accredited 38, but hasn't got around to Zurich yet.

Last February, under pressure, the State board agreed to let foreign-educated doctors submit evidence that they were adequately schooled despite lack of accreditation for their schools. This now appears to have been an empty gesture. Dr. Ris has submitted such evidence. The board is still quibbling.

Now the new gimmick. AMA headquarters have said they expect to approve Zurich "within a few months," but only as to graduates who were Swiss citizens and got Federal licenses, or received "certificates of medical study." Mere M. D. degrees from Zurich won't satisfy.

Dr. Ris was a Pole (she is now a naturalized American) and couldn't get a Swiss Federal license. Zurich didn't start giving "certificates of medical study" to its graduates until 3 years after she got her M. D. The medical qualifications for a license or a certificate were the same as for a degree, but Dr. Ris is still caught in the web of technicality. Even accreditation of her school won't set her free.

For all the pious talk by our State medical leaders about protecting us from unskilled practitioners, the Ris case is not easy for plain people to understand.

Why must rules of thumb determine who is a competent doctor and who isn't? Why can't the examiners simply find out for themselves whether Dr. Ris knows her business, and act accordingly?

Or, if they must rely on the AMA, why must it be so ponderous? Zurich is not behind an iron curtain and never was. Switzerland was never subject to either Hitlerism or world wars. Surely it could have been determined within days or weeks—instead of many months—whether or not Zurich had an adequate medical faculty and curriculum in the thirties.

The shortage of doctors in Wisconsin is far from cured, and now the Armed Forces are calling for them again. This will prolong and increase the shortage.

How long do the medical leaders think they can try the patience of Wisconsin with their legalistic mumbo-jumbo in this situation?

Inter-American Response to the Korean Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the article written by my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. Thanks to his first-hand knowledge of personalities and movements in the other American Republics, Dr. Thorning, a strenuous worker for the good-neighbor policy, is admirably qualified to describe the Latin-American reaction to the conflict in Korea.

LATIN-AMERICAN REACTION TO THE KOREAN SITUATION

(By Joseph F. Thorning)

It would be gratifying to be able to report a tremendous surge of practical support for the United States throughout the American Republics, with respect to the conflict in Korea. Juridically, of course, the Organization of American States has gone on record, denouncing the Soviet-inspired North Korean invasion of South Korea. The American Republics, on paper, accord their cooperation to the United Nations. But, with regard to an effective supply of ground troops sorely needed to restore order through the Korean Peninsula, there have sprung up a number of obstacles that can be removed only by patient diplomacy and more liberal trade practices in North America.

It is interesting to note that the resolution calling upon the Organization of American States to show solidarity with the United States originated with one of the smallest and most democratic nations in the Western Hemisphere: Costa Rica. Dr. Otilio Ulate Blanco, President of the Republic, immediately upon the outbreak of hostilities, instructed the Costa Rican Ambassador in Washington, Dr. Mario Echandi Jiménez, to take the initiative; just as Costa Rica had been the first American State to declare war upon Japan when the crime of Pearl Harbor was perpetrated. Thanks to this instant, strong Costa Rican move, the position of Organization of American States was established, with unanimity. Legally, the Americas are united about Korea.

What concrete measures have been adopted in order to implement this juridical position? One indication of a desire to help was the offer of the Republic of Bolivia, through Ricardo Martínez Vargas, to dispatch 30 Bolivian Army officers to the fighting front to serve with the United Nations forces there. Without doubt, this must be deemed a gesture of good will. Celebrated for their bravery, the Bolivians would not flinch from the ardors of the Korean campaign. The sad fact remains, of course, that what the United Nations requires in the Far East are foot soldiers. Infantry, "the queen of battles," appears quite as indispensable as at Thermopylae or Waterloo. In order to do the job, officers have to command men. A head without a body is useless. Consequently, the Bolivian proffer, although inspired by high motives, had to be rejected. Incidentally, it may be remarked that, on several occasions within the past 2 years, sizable units of the Bolivian Army have been needed at home in order to put down riots excited by extremists of both the right and the left. The extremists, in turn, have their opportunity in the miserable conditions of work and life that prevail in the tin-mining districts. In other words, defense of human rights abroad calls for a decent standard of living in the Americas.

Another indication of solidarity was given by the Republic of El Salvador. On August 17, Foreign Minister Miguel R. Urquía informed Secretary General Trygve Lie that his country would be glad to facilitate the sending of volunteers to the United States for the necessary training before they were sent to the field of operations. Obviously, in the cast of modest-sized republics, such as El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, and Costa Rica, it would be folly to expect that young men without battle experience be thrown into the ring of fire around Pusan. A minimum of 18 months' indoctrination

would be necessary for all volunteers. In the meantime, the tide of battle is bound to fluctuate in Korea. Nevertheless, it may be wise for the United Nations to consider the possibilities of recruiting "token" forces of volunteers from each of the American Republics. This would be a good move in case the Soviet-dominated Chinese attempt further intervention and aggression.

The record shows that the first American Republic to speak of outright "military" cooperation was Colombia. This was the straightforward announcement made, within 48 hours of notice about the Korean invasion, by the Colombian Ambassador, Dr. Eduardo Zuleta-Angel, who, before coming to Washington, had a distinguished career in the Foreign Ministry at Bogotá. Ambassador Zuleta-Angel insisted that it would not be enough to pass legal resolutions, or to furnish tropical commodities for the fighting forces. It was the view of the Colombian statesman that every American be prepared to shed his blood in order to resist slavery and to promote freedom. Therefore, Dr. Zuleta-Angel openly proclaimed the duty of the Americas to "organize a number of battalions for service in the Orient." The Colombian leader acknowledged that such military organization would demand considerable liaison work. Among the problems to be solved he enumerated the following: Coordination of caliber of guns and ammunition; uniform methods of training; harmonization of supply systems; and acclimatization of troops accustomed to balmy weather in Central and South America. Unquestionably, the rigor of the Korean winter was much in the forefront of Ambassador Zuleta-Angel's attention. At the same time, this scholar-statesman did a great deal, by reason of his prestige among his colleagues, to crystallize American sentiment with respect to organized military cooperation.

At this point, it is natural to inquire: "What about the United States of Brazil?" The question is relevant, because, in World War II, Brazil was one American Republic that got around to placing its own divisions on the line of fire in Europe. Every American remembers the good will and the good service of the Brazilians in Italy. Moreover, most North Americans have immense respect for Brazil, not only thanks to a long tradition of friendship (the United States of America was the first country to recognize an independent Brazil), but also because this sister republic, both in population and extent of territory, is in a class by itself. Experts on far-flung strategic requirements would add that the famous northeast "hump" of Brazil projecting far into the Atlantic Ocean, served magnificently during World War II as a vital "corridor of victory." Without the technicians, guns, munitions, and supplies funneled through this corridor to French Dakar and North Africa, the fate of Marshal Erwin Rommel and his ravaging tanks might have been somewhat different.

Although this chapter of recent history may be overlooked, or forgotten, in some North American circles, it is a vivid memory throughout the American Republics. Since the Brazilians are, by nature, a loyal and generous people (one has only to read the bicgraphy of Joaquim Nabuco by Carolina Nabuco to recognize this truth), they expect the Government and the people of the United States of America not to use the question of coffee prices as a political football.

The present Brazilian Ambassador, Mauricio Nabuco, like his father, Joaquim, is an illustrious American. Eager to maintain the good will of the United States consumers of coffee, Brazil's best customers, Ambassador Nabuco has been distressed by the "slanted" attacks on his country by Senate politicians who, apparently, do not realize the repercussions which their words have among the other Americans. As long as such misrepresentations fill the press, it is likely that the Brazilian Government will be slow in outfitting army divisions to protect Korea. And the example will not pass unnoticed in Latin America.

In this connection, it must be stated that there are 16 coffee-producing nations in this hemisphere, although all 16 are not exporters of coffee. Colombia, a close neighbor of Brazil, is likewise an exporter of high-quality coffee. Intense indignation followed upon the publication of the so-called Gillette report submitted to the United States Senate by the Committee on Agriculture. Neither the Colombians nor the Brazilians look upon themselves or their merchandisers as monopolists or greedy extortioners. They do not believe that their deliberations in the Social and Economic Council of the Organization of American States have to be scrutinized or supervised by a representative of the United States Justice Department, presumably alerted to observe, report, and penalize any violation of the United States antitrust laws. What a curious way, the South Americans opine, to win friends and secure solid support for champions of liberty.

It is important to know that the Honorable Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, understands and sympathizes with our good neighbors on the coffee issue. Born in Puerto Rico, reared in Cuba, and educated in the United States, Secretary Miller is that rare combination: a North American who feels, thinks, and acts like a Latin. The fact that the United States official principally charged with the progress of inter-American friendship, agrees wholeheartedly with the Latin American diplomats on the necessity of providing lucrative markets for South American products, including Chilean and Peruvian copper as well as Colombian-Brazilian coffee, should be sufficient motive for the United States Senate and the North American public to stabilize the Latin economy in such ways as would enable the Organization of American States to organize armed strength for the benefit of the United Nations. Trade, friendship, and collective security go hand in hand.

Hon. Carl Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of Sunday, September 10, 1950, contains an article by William S. White titled "Carl Vinson Has Been Unified, Too."

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I fully appreciate the service and ability of our chairman, Hon. CARL VINSON. In these trying times all of the services, the Congress, and the people are fortunate in having Mr. VINSON as chairman of the committee handling legislation affecting the Military Establishment. I include that article as follows:

CARL VINSON HAS BEEN UNIFIED, TOO—ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE LEARN FROM A SUAVE GEORGIAN WHAT THEY CAN EXPECT

(By William S. White)

(William S. White of the Times Washington Bureau has covered many aspects of congressional action on military affairs.)

WASHINGTON.

So far as Congress sees it, Representative CARL VINSON of the little inland Georgia town of Milledgeville is admiral of the ocean seas, field marshal of the armies and, as to the air, wing commander of everything.

There was a time when he was boss only of the United States Navy—the high patron for 15 years, as iron-handed chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, of all the blue waters from the Caribbean to the China Sea.

But these were in the old, unreconstructed days before the Armed Forces, and Mr. VINSON, too, were unified and solidified—which meant, for the forces, a unification into rather more establishments than before and, for Mr. VINSON, a solidification into a place of congressional power so high that it might have brought a certain dizziness to a less earthy man.

The Unification Act amalgamated the old rival Committees on Military Affairs and on Naval Affairs into the House Committee on the Armed Services. This, of which Mr. VINSON is the chairman and absolute boss, is a formidable body of 35 men so big that, collectively, it sits upon 3 staggered tiers in its hearing rooms in the old House Office Building, with Representative VINSON front and center rather like an ancient monarch surrounded by ministers whose proximity to the throne depends upon the years that lie upon their heads.

The juniors are thus far away and their voices seem—but only seem—to be heard a little faintly as Mr. VINSON and his bipartisan elder regency with the senior Republicans sitting just to his left and the senior Democrats just to his right, settle the high and low affairs of national defense—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine, whatever.

It is not that the juniors are ignored, however. The chairman keeps a nice balance between protocol and practicality. While he gives far more outer deference to the graybeards, as congressional custom infallibly demands, he gives far more work to his favorites among the committee youngsters. These, until he has tried them out, he sometimes calls "ensign." When a new man has done a good task, however, Mr. VINSON may suddenly begin to call him "commander." When, one day, he changes this salutation to "captain," the member knows he has arrived.

His old "ensigns," whether still in the House or now promoted to the Senate, are deeply devoted to him, and the long finger of his influence is thus not limited to his own side of the Capitol. One of the former "ensigns," Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, who made "captain" before he left the House, still keeps deferentially in touch with his old chairman, and now and then goes over to the House to report in person to Mr. VINSON on matters of mutual interest. Men call on Mr. VINSON; Mr. VINSON does not call on them.

Indeed, the chairman, who used to be called the Admiral but now is more commonly known as the Old Operator, by virtue of the fact that he is no longer limited simply to caring for the Navy, is in a position of a prophet handsomely vindicated in his robust later years. No prophet has more honor in his own country—which in this case is Congress and the Pentagon. For Mr. VINSON—"Cahl" to the other southerners, not one of whom has quite the richness of his own Southern accent—was complaining bitterly as early as 2 years ago of economies in the Military Establishment.

He was in the extraordinary position of a congressional leader who was urging the Pentagon to spend not less but more. Now, his own personal chief of staff, he is at work on an unfolding, and personal, Vinson plan for mobilization—more tanks, more marines, more carriers, more of everything for the cutting edges of the military force. It is often a fact that the administration proposes but VINSON disposes, and the powerful logic, in Congress, of any Vinson plan should never be underrated.

Not to be underestimated, either, is the thing that is the life force of his being, a curious, politically perfect, intermingling of the art of attack and the science of withdrawal and compromise. This has carried Mr. VINSON to his not inconsiderable summit and it has preserved him, personally as a politician who must be elected and professionally as a leader among other politicians, these many years.

Not so long ago no man of influence in Congress was so implacably opposed to unification of the armed services; the proponents, mainly the Air Force men, looked with a great fear upon Mr. VINSON and the administration leaders were in despair. But somehow, with many changes in the original text and with the slow attrition of popular pressure, the VINSON rock was softened and unification became the law. Its most important convert was Mr. VINSON himself.

This, to the Navy was an incredible issue to events, and nothing more sadly incredible in it than to see CARL VINSON accept the principle of a partial merger—VINSON for whom admirals in the past gladly had served as little more than office boys; VINSON, whose burning conviction had made the Navy the unquestioned elite of the Armed Forces, and the proudest pet of an adoring Congress.

The old blue-water men began to shake their heads a bit, while Mr. VINSON himself kept the dignified and forbearing silence of a father who has, for reasons he considers sufficient, temporarily put aside an elder, and really favored, son in behalf of another. But not this, even, was to be the end. Soon, VINSON, of Georgia—the old "Battleship Carl" of another day—began to take a great and direct interest in the Air Force. W. Stuart Symington, then Secretary for Air and now Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, began what was perhaps the most unlikely, difficult, and rewarding bit of personal lobbying in the recent history of Washington. First he got Mr. VINSON into an airplane—the chairman before that had been at home only on anything that sailed. What followed was, to the service people, nothing less than history, poignant or elating, depending on where one stood.

For Representative VINSON "put on the crushed cap," as it was said by the Navy partisans, and went all-out for the Air Force. Over the objections of the President that a defensive imbalance was being created, he joined in 1948, and then led, a rebellion in the House for 70 air groups. He thus unquestionably gave a powerful, if not the decisive, impulse to what he was later to indicate was a questionable high command preoccupation with strategic air power at the Navy's expense.

The Navy people, who before this had been in anxious sorrow at what had happened to Mr. VINSON, were now simply aghast and in despair. For them, the established church had fallen; all, so it seemed to them, was lost. But then it was the same Mr. VINSON who, in due season, gave to them, last year, the first great forum from which to voice their heretofore throttled complaints; it was the Vinson committee that made the investigation of the troubles of unification. And it was Mr. VINSON, too, who began to protest at the Pentagon and elsewhere and to restore some of the Navy's combat strength. When he had insisted on so much more for the Air Force, it was said by his friends, he had never intended that this was to mean much less for the Navy and Army.

In other words, Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has pursued at times what has seemed a most unseamanlike course of unexpected zigs and violent zags. His view would be that all these were necessary and that all preparations for any war mean, necessarily, the selection of the least undesirable alternatives. There is never enough money; there is never enough firepower; there is never enough time.

The Vinson philosophy, in everything, is that the best world possible is this present best of possible worlds. By doing things the way he has done them, by zigging and zagging sometimes, he has had a major hand in providing for the defense of the United States so many uncounted billions of dollars that, if stacked against the sun, they would cast so fantastic a glitter as almost to be seen from here to Moscow.

To be a committee chairman in Congress requires, first and foremost, longevity and continuity of service. One cannot, of course, be a statesman here until first, and continuously, he is a successful politician, in Milledgeville or elsewhere. Mr. VINSON is the archetype of the successful politician. His predominantly rural district in Georgia is generously sprinkled about with great Federal installations connected with the armed services which did not reach that distant area by accident or by academic considerations like the annual rainfall and incidence of humidity.

So long has he been entrenched in Congress—36 years, to put a figure upon it—that he has sensible reason to fear for his reelection every 2 years as the years roll by. But he is an immensely practical man and he doesn't like to be annoyed by even possible opposition in the Georgia Democratic primary, which, of course, is all that matters. So, he keeps an ear to the ground, not by running about shaking every hand in his district but by staying in touch with five or six "Vinson men" in each county who pretty much run things and keep him advised, well in season, of any prospective trouble.

In the matter of possible opponents in the primaries, he stands no nonsense. Once he heard that a Mr. Lewis might engage him, for the nomination. Promptly, he telephoned the junior of the Georgia Senators, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, in these words:

"Dick, I do not want you to let that cousin of yours run against me."

Senator RUSSELL protested that to his knowledge he had no cousin with such designs.

"Well," Mr. VINSON complained, "anyhow he married one of your cousins. Get him out of there, Dick." Senator RUSSELL, hurriedly promising to do what he could, made some research and discovered that Mr. Lewis had married a very distant connection of the Russell family—what is sometimes called "a Southern cousin." Anyhow, the crisis for Mr. VINSON was averted; he was unopposed.

"Cahl's" highly developed sense of self-preservation has often, and more subtly, been illustrated. It is said of him that when the time for Congressional redistricting comes around every 10 years he has not once failed to have been on the side of the man who that year was or was going to be Governor of Georgia, and thus in a decisive position as to what Congressional Districts would be reshuffled by the Georgia legislature, and how.

All this would provide, perhaps, some rather interesting speculation about the relative value of absolute consistency in ordinary political affairs as against the value to a nation—and Mr. VINSON'S value to this Nation, quite simply, is great—of the man who manages, with a little bending here and there to political necessity, to stay on where he can serve.

His demagogies, if they exist at all, are small; his sins in this direction are of the genial, venial kind. There is, to a reasonably close observer, absolutely no trace of partisan politics or political chiseling in the House Committee on the Armed Services. If CARL VINSON has got a few extra Federal dollars for Georgia, he has earned them and more from the United States of America.

His service on the committee is intense and by the accounts even of his enemies it is brilliantly informed. His work begins at 7:30 in the morning; at 4:45 p. m., nearly every day, he leaves the Capitol to go home to an invalid wife. Not even the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS of Maryland, is thought to be quite so well up on military subjects, since he has not had Mr. VINSON'S tremendous length of service.

These committees lay out the basic military policies. They decide whether there shall be a draft, for example, and how. They give general direction to the highest military authorities, from Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson on down. They authorize the money—the billions upon billions of it—and they they must get the Appropriations Committee and finally Congress itself, to come through.

Over the House committee of 35, Mr. VINSON presides with a sort of seemingly absent-minded paternalism that fools nobody. He knows, and intimately, everything that goes on in the big staff organization which a far more executive-minded Republican predecessor as chairman, the late Walter G. Andrews of New York, provided in the days of Republican control.

Under Mr. Andrews, the committee organization quit looking much like a congressional group and had the sharp efficiency of a corporation office and much of the snap of a military company. These go on, though much softened at the edges, in the VINSON regime. Mr. VINSON, most of the time, has the outward casualness of any rural southerner on his front porch—though he reserves his tobacco chewing for his actual front porch in Milledgeville—but nothing is allowed really to go slack.

He is so homespun, in a Georgia way, as almost to suggest a case of art improving upon nature, and it is his habit, though he knows the military language down to its last polysyllable, to put things to military witnesses with a challenging air of simplicity. When one speaks, for example, of "logistical problems," Mr. VINSON may say to him earnestly: "You are speaking of how you are going to get those things from here to there?"

For the most part, like many of the old-timers, he rarely bothers the House with his rhetoric, but when a crisis is up for one of his bills he moves about the lobbies without an obvious care in the world, buttonholing the Members with a kind of happy friendliness and, in effect, signing them on the dotted line. He keeps a great voting power, in his committee and in the House, by not overexercising his position as one of the House leaders—by not intruding, for example, on issues that don't mean much to him anyhow.

The members of all House committees are designated by the parent of them all in this regard, the Committee on Ways and Means. But Ways and Means, by one of those unspoken understandings that are a part of congressional life, does not offer to Mr. VINSON for Armed Services anybody whom Mr. VINSON, privately, has not already nominated. Thus, to a very considerable extent, he controls the selection of his associates and though he certainly would never make a point of it, the point nevertheless is not lost on them.

Then, he has another technique that has always stood him well when voting is close on something for which he is responsible. When a Member wants anything legitimate from the Military Establishment he gets it, and quickly, by applying to CARL VINSON. A Vinson request "downtown" does not mean tomorrow; it does not mean this afternoon. It means this morning, now. The Old Operator through the years has unforgettably impressed this fact upon all concerned.

The soft manner, in this and in everything else, imperfectly conceals a profoundly determined personality, which is shown in the conferences between deputations from the Senate and House that become necessary when the two bodies have passed differing versions of the same bill. Each delegation goes forth charged by its House to yield not to the other. The resulting process is a kind of collective bargaining.

Recently, on a military bill, Mr. VINSON liked certain provisions in the Senate text better than those he had been able to obtain from his own House. In the conference, Senator TYDINGS, for the Senate, was pressing for those provisions. Representative VINSON plainly was going to give in, after offering what might be called a token resistance. The senior Republican conferee present from the House, Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, began in vehement pain to shout his protests to Mr. VINSON: "Mr. Chairman, you are going against your own House."

"Now, Mr. SHAWT, Mr. SHAWT," Mr. VINSON said softly, waving his hands in vague deprecation. "Just wait a minute—just wait a minute." Mr. SHORT waited. Mr. VINSON prevailed, and got his Senate provisions.

Thus, the small legends gather about the former "admiral." The one of which his colleagues are most fond is that which deals with what Mr. VINSON calls his "ice cream pants." These, the sort of striped flannels that in his youth used to go with a blazer, the chairman wears, so the superstition runs, only on days when things are going well. What these "things" are is never clear—whether an improvement in the Military Establishment, a looking-up in the prospects for a Vinson bill, or, conceivably, the successful frightening-off of one more prospective opponent down in Georgia.

The wearer of the ice-cream pants is enigmatic at times; an elderly man, 67, with vanishing hair and a bulge at the middle. But there is a bright, smiling, knowing eye, with a touch of cynicism in it and shining out beyond that a deep, long-proved devotion to the military safety of the United States.

Louis A. Johnson—Editorial From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Wednesday, September 13, 1950, issue of the Fairmont Times.

This editorial is about Col. Louis A. Johnson, an esteemed resident of my State.

Colonel Johnson has served his Nation faithfully and honorably in many high positions. He has traveled the ofttimes tortuous path of public life with a firm determination of duty and devotion to his Nation.

I commend the Fairmont Times for its excellent editorial, and urge every Member of the Senate to read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUIS JOHNSON

News of the resignation of Louis Johnson as Secretary of Defense will sadden the hearts of thousands of West Virginians. Mr. Johnson seemed to personify, more than any other West Virginian in the public service, the intense interest of our people in the momentous events which "follow fast and follow faster" throughout the world today. In all levels of our society there has been a feeling that so long as Mr. Johnson was at the helm, everything would work out as it should and the country would be secure from all enemies either foreign or domestic. This may have been naive thinking, but such is the pride of our people that we have minimized the storm of criticism that has whirled about the head of our Clarksburg neighbor since shortly after he assumed office in April 1949.

Those of us who know Mr. Johnson and admire his great ability feel certain that those events which spawned the criticism and forced him to resign his office, will all be justified by history. We believe the future will tell us that we were not unprepared for the war in Korea. Without posing as a military historian we would say that never before in the history of our country were we ever so well prepared to meet that challenge as when the Korean Reds surged over the border.

Many of Mr. Johnson's political enemies were made when heeding the almost universal demand for economy in the war budget, he cut deep to pare down the fighting forces to eliminate the fat and the inefficient. The result has been that not since Gen. Robert E. Lee's brigade of "Texicans," who were his shock troops, has this country seen fighting soldiers such as we have in Korea today.

In public life no man can protect himself from the political wolves when they begin to howl. One example might be cited of a pair of writers who demanded that Mr. Johnson give them a national scoop, and when he refused, hounded him to the limits of unfair criticism and vituperation.

Looking back over the years every man who held such a position in time of war suffered the slings and arrows of unfair criticism and abuse. Newton Baker, Secretary of War, and Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, in the first World War, went through the same thing but did not resign. Secretary of War Alger in the Spanish-American affair of '98 was almost hounded to his grave by charges that he fed his soldiers tainted food. And so it has been with them all in greater or lesser degree. All, perhaps, except Secretary Stanton in the Civil War. He disposed of his political enemies by the simple expedient of having the writ of habeas corpus suspended and locking them up in military prisons.

Louis Johnson, a victim of his critics, was courageous enough to step down, but in this hour of his political defeat he is still close to the hearts of the people of West Virginia.

Rail Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the Coshocton Tribune, dated September 12, including a statement issued by Lt. Col. Frank Towenend, commanding officer of the One Hundred and Ninth Field Artillery Battalion, from Pennsylvania, relative to the activities of the citizens of the community of Coshocton and West Lafayette at the time of the recent rail tragedy.

As the Congressman from that district and a citizen of that community, I can express to Colonel Towenend our sincere sympathy for the families and friends of the men under his command who lost their lives. The actions of the residents of this community in offering assistance was typical of the willingness of our people to be of every possible service to those in need.

THANKS EXPRESSED BY ARMY OFFICER FOR PUBLIC'S HELP

A statement of sincere gratitude to Coshocton, West Lafayette, and other communities giving assistance in yesterday's troop-train tragedy was issued today by Lt. Col. Frank Towenend, commanding officer of the One Hundred and Ninth Field Artillery Battalion, from Pennsylvania, which was riding aboard the ill-fated train.

His statement follows:

"On behalf of officers and men of the One Hundred and Ninth Field Artillery Battalion, I would like to publicly express sincere gratitude and thanks for the magnificent response of citizens of Coshocton and surrounding communities for the care and treatment of men involved in the rail disaster.

"Fortunately when the wreck occurred we were close to a city so well prepared to meet emergencies that within what seemed to be a matter of minutes a well-coordinated emergency plan was in effect and efficiently being operated.

"We were all amazed at the tremendous amount of assistance which seemed to appear at the scene without any call whatsoever coming from us.

"To single out any one service would probably be unfair. But we would like to mention the farm women of the neighborhood who first reported the accident and then appeared before daylight with containers of hot coffee.

"This battalion will always be grateful for your prompt and willing assistance." (Signed) Lt. Col. Frank Towenend, commanding officer, One Hundred and Ninth Field Artillery Battalion.

BODIES OF 33 SOLDIERS PREPARED FOR BURIAL IN IMPROVISED MORGUE

The bodies of 33 victims on the troop train from Pennsylvania, plowed into early Monday morning by the Spirit of St. Louis, were prepared for burial Monday night in the building occupied by the West Lafayette Transfer, Railroad Street, West Lafayette, owned by Commander John E. Phillips, Jr., of Post 46, American Legion.

Funeral directors and their assistants from West Lafayette, Coshocton, and Tuscarawas County worked all night.

At intervals they took time out for coffee and lunch at the American Legion home, where members of West Lafayette Unit 466 and Coshocton Unit 65 worked in shifts during the night.

You had only to let any resident of West Lafayette know what was needed Monday and they were off to get it.

Soon after the accident West Lafayette Unit 46 was ready with sandwiches and coffee. Within a short time Boy Scouts and other volunteer workers joined their efforts to speed up the service. Individuals came from everywhere with large kettles of coffee ready to go. Others made sandwiches. Some went to the scene of action and took cards for the boys to write messages home and then

brought them back for mailing. Others took magazines, aspirin, and cigarettes.

Then the train workers had to be fed. That emergency was met too. High school students and business people went in, rolled up their sleeves and assisted at Dickerson's restaurant, serving about 300 people in addition to their regular trade. Many were fed at Thompson's restaurant. Some did their bit by washing dishes.

The worst tragedy in the history of the community brought hundreds of curious to town. There were two steady streams of traffic from early morning until 10 o'clock in the evening. East of town cars were parked along the highway and in the fields for a distance of almost 3 miles.

American Legion members and auxiliary patrolmen from Coshocton, West Lafayette, Newcomerstown, and many other neighboring posts assisted the State highway patrol and Army officers in directing the heavy stream of traffic.

Red Cross, Salvation Army, and others provided their usual fine emergency service.

Tracks for the first train to pass through were cleared about 7:30 Monday night.

Interim Report of the Watchdog Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the country applauded when the Senate Armed Services Committee appointed within its membership an emergency "watchdog committee" to keep close watch on our defense preparations and operations. Recently this "watchdog committee" filed an interim report showing that it was doing the job. The Washington Evening Star, a few days ago, had a very good editorial discussing this interim report and the work of this committee. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TIME FOR A SIESTA

Although in existence only since the Korean outbreak, the Senate's emergency "watchdog committee" has found enough weak spots in the Government's defense program to justify a lot of additional exploration. The first interim report of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S bipartisan group contains ample evidence of the need for awakening some agencies and officials from what Mr. JOHNSON calls "a siesta psychology." The committee has done a public service in prodding victims of such psychology from their reveries.

As a result of its prodding, sale of a synthetic rubber plant as surplus in the face of a threatened rubber shortage has been halted, the production of synthetic rubber has been materially stepped up, and a review of the whole surplus property disposal program in the light of Korean developments has been instituted. And the committee has only begun its checking-up operations.

The committee was created at a propitious time. The Red invasion of southern Korea came before the surplus disposal program of World War II had been completed. Thus, as the committee points out in its report, a new mobilization effort suddenly was begun in direct conflict with the tail end of the demobilization program of the postwar period. It was inevitable that indecision and confusion would result in governmental circles during the early days of the crisis. It is disturbing, however, to learn from the committee's report that the clash of programs and policies in some important areas continued until committee investigators stepped into the picture. It is apparent from the letters which the committee exchanged with some officials that the synthetic rubber program had not been geared to the realities of the new emergency until the committee demanded action. Only then were plans canceled for sale of a vital synthetic rubber plant at Akron, Ohio, that had, before the Korean war, been declared surplus, and only then was a "freeze" put on all further sales of war-surplus properties, pending reconsideration of their potential defense value.

Particularly disturbing is the committee's disclosure of a noncooperative attitude on the part of a few officials. Chairman JOHNSON mentioned the "polite brush-off" which the committee received from the Air Force when inquiries were made regarding the advertised sale of airplane motors and parts at an Air Force base. The committee is warranted in deciding to make a further investigation of these sales. Generally, however, the committee found high administration officials willing to assist in probing for defects in policies and procedures and in acting to correct them. Continued scrutiny of the war effort by the committee and continued cooperation by the executive branch in eliminating complacency or confusion wherever it may exist is bound to improve the whole defense undertaking.

Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, during the war years I served on the small business committee of the Committee for Economic Development with Mr. S. Abbot Smith, with whom I now serve as a fellow trustee of CED. He has been an outstanding student of the special problems of small business for many years. He has served as president of the Smaller Business Association of New England, is still a director, and, I believe, treasurer. I think Congress will be interested in his views on some problems faced by small business as we move into a Korean war economy. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting letter from Mr. Smith.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
Boston, Mass., August 8, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM BENTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I am sorry it will not be possible for me to attend either of the clinics you are holding in Connecticut. There is no question but what they will prove valuable both to those who attend for the information they gain and also for you because of the insight they will give you into the troubles of small business in these critical times.

In addition to the normal difficulties experienced by small business with regard to general management problems, financing, production, merchandising, etc., there are others, perhaps even more acute, which arise because of the war conditions and controls under which business will soon be operating. Judging from our experience during the last war, it seems to me there are certain key problems which must be kept in mind and alleviated to whatever extent is possible although we all recognize clearly the fact that in wartime all businesses suffer and all must make sacrifices. If necessary, the nonessentials may have to go out of business entirely. However, to keep our economy healthy and sound, in order to obtain the greatest possible production of war and essential civilian items, it is also necessary to utilize the services and facilities of the small plants to the greatest extent possible. This saves moving manpower and relieves pressure to some extent on housing, public utilities, etc.

The No. 1 problem, it seems to me, is the deferment of key personnel in small businesses so long as possible. The taking of a key man may wreck an entire business and should not be done until absolutely necessary even though the business in question may not be one on the essential list.

As much assistance as possible must be given to small businesses in the obtaining of prime and subcontracts, the furnishing of technical assistance in the performance of those contracts, and financial assistance to carry them out. Priorities for scarce materials and equipment should not be given large companies until they prove the work in question cannot be done in already existing facilities.

It seems to me it would be advisable to have special officers in each agency assigned to advising small businesses in their contacts with the price-adjustment boards, renegotiation, controls of all kinds, etc. Speaking of renegotiation, any contract on which there were three or more bona fide bidders should be exempt from renegotiation.

In their dealings with the War Labor Board also, small business needs special advice.

In fact, it seems to me that all the various Government boards and agencies should have special men assigned to deal with and help small businesses in their dealings with these boards and agencies to explain the regulations and help them in their administration. Furthermore, one of the duties of the man in charge of the small-business division in each agency should be to act as an appeal board to whom any small-business man could go if he felt he were not being treated fairly. If the appeal board thought the complaint had merit it would be his job to take it up with the head of the agency to see that justice was done.

An excess-profits tax encourages waste and extravagance just when economy, efficiency, and maximum production are most needed. If, however, it is felt that an excess-profits tax must be passed, a substantial, specific exemption from the tax would be of great value to small businesses in helping pay for their conversion to war work and also providing reserves for reconversion to peacetime operations when that time comes. Also, as you know, a heavy excess-profits tax kills the incentive to produce after that point is reached. Most small businesses do not have the base of either invested capital or income over past years which most larger businesses have and, consequently, they are hit especially hard by such excess-profits taxes. This is particularly true of new businesses such as those started by GI's since 1945.

We all recognize that heavy taxation is essential both to raise money to conduct the war and also to siphon off purchasing power. At the same time, however, those taxes must be so levied that they do not kill or maim the businesses which pay them. Small business must be recognized and preserved so far as that is possible and compatible with national necessity or we may very well lose the very things for which we are fighting.

Sincerely yours,

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
S. ABBOT SMITH,
Director and Past President.

Morale and Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am including under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, a notable contribution to public thinking by a group associated with the Connecticut State Department of Education.

This letter, expressing the views of this group, supports strongly my contention that our citizens are perhaps more cognizant of our Nation's needs than its lawmakers and administration.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Hartford, Conn., September 6, 1950.
Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATTERSON: The people whose names are attached to this letter were named by Commissioner of Education Finis E. Engleman as a committee on morale and citizenship to "identify problems of the present crisis in terms of morale and to proceed as expeditiously as possible to prepare materials and suggestions for action."

The committee felt that some of the problems discussed could best be attacked by you and your colleagues in the Federal Government, both in Congress and in the executive branch. We were pleased by the "fireside chat" of President Truman on September 1, but feel that much more needs to be done. We recommend:

1. That even greater publicity be given as to why we are in Korea, perhaps through a greater circulation of the white paper on Korea, perhaps through additional fireside chats by the President or others in authority, and perhaps through well documented statements from sources in authority. Perhaps Mr. Austin, as a United Nation's delegate should be encouraged to make a radio address. Our people need to know that our troops are in Korea in support of the United Nations, which is an agency that prizes democratic procedures and international law as methods of settling international differences. Our people need to know that this is not an imperialistic adventure. They and the world need to know that we are among the few nations of the world that has given freedom to its possessions.

2. That consideration be given to a policy of interpreting the peoples and cultures of Asia to the people of the United States. We sense that there is a real tendency on the part of people in our Armed Forces to look down upon the cultural life of the Chinese, Koreans, Japanese, Indians, and other oriental cultures. We suggest that constructive steps be taken by the Armed Forces to reorient these concepts in their services. We are making a recommendation along this line to our public schools and various State organizations.

3. That legislation be expedited for dealing with rising prices, black markets, and other shortages.

Thank you for whatever help you may be able to give in this matter. This letter has been approved by the committee as a whole, but is sent to you under the signature of the chairman.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR E. PITKIN, *Chairman.*
ELEANOR LITTLE.
GEORGE R. CHAMPLIN.
HENRY LITTLEFIELD.
LEO M. MCCRANN.
CHARLES PERRY.
Mrs. HENRY GODFREY.
Mrs. HELEN MACFARLAND.

We Who Are About To Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the American people are confused and bewildered by the muddled foreign policy of the administration. Our State Department supported in every move by the President has consistently blundered in every major decision since the end of World War II.

At the initial meetings creating the United Nations, our representative in the person of Secretary of State Stettinius failed to recognized the threat of Soviet communism and agreed to the veto-power proposal. With the granting of this power to the Soviet representative, the United Nations lost all opportunity to become a strong league of nations which could halt Communist aggression by combined action whenever any nation became a threat to world peace and security.

The United Nations action in Korea was only possible because at the time it was proposed, Russia had no representative present in the Security Council to block it with the veto. With the return of Russia to the UN, further attempts to strengthen the position of the UN in its fight against aggression have been effectively stopped by the Soviet Union.

Outside of the United Nations, the State Department has continually followed a program of appeasement in Asia prior to its Korean turnabout. China was deserted to the Communists. No positive stand was taken by the United States to establish our position in the Far East. No effort was made to assure the Communists in China and in North Korea that we would meet any attempt at Communist expansion with force.

And today there is strong suspicion in the minds of the American people that even while American boys are dying in Korea, our State Department with the full approval of President Truman is at least considering if not already committed to the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Where is this nightmare foreign policy going to end? We fully realize the grave danger to our freedom and security from Communist aggression. We are willing to sacrifice to build military strength to whatever extent may be necessary to halt Soviet aggression or to meet it if the rulers in the Kremlin are determined to bring about the third world war.

But to what avail are our efforts if they are sabotaged through the blundering of the State Department and its continued policy of appeasement?

The following article in the form of a letter to the President clearly States the doubts and questions that are in the minds of many of our young men today as they enter the armed services. They are entitled to an answer for their lives are at stake. They have a right to know if their sacrifice will again be in vain.

WE WHO ARE ABOUT TO DIE

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: Early Christians lined up in the Roman Colosseum, waiting for death through a thousand tortures, faced their pagan emperor and hailed him thus: "We who are about to die salute you." In the year 1950 we young men poised on American shores, and ready to leave and possibly give our lives to preserve our ideals and our way of life salute you, our duly elected President. You are our Commander in Chief and, as such, we owe you full-fledged allegiance. We are not slaves but free men fighting for the rights of free men. We who are about to die would like to ask a few questions. We have always been brave men, meeting and defeating the enemy in every war. In past wars the home front has always given us a hundred percent backing. In this Korea fracas we are not so sure. The same men, who deliberately helped our enemies gain control of China, followed the advice of Lattimore who on July 17, 1949, said "The thing to do is let Korea fall but not let it look as though we pushed it," are still in power. If, in the past, they played into the hands of Stalin, gave in to his every demand and ruined our chances for world peace after World War II, how can we trust them now when our lives are at stake?

The record shows the homeland is infested with Reds and pinks, ready to sabotage every effort we might make at the cost of blood and life. We want to fight with our faces toward the enemy, not wondering what the State Department may be figuring out to bump us off in the rear. It is a hard accusation, but repeated actions prove these home-grown enemies either enjoy the intoxication of lunacy or are clever tools, placed in a strategic position to further the work of the Red menace they profess to abhor. Mr. President, you may think it a virtue to condone and defend your political appointees. When the safety of country and the world are at stake, forget back-slapping and politics and remember perhaps thousands and millions of lives are in the balance. Get rid of these soft-headed betrayers, and when we grab a little roadside sleep in the mud of a strange and hostile country, we will breathe a little easier. When a comrade clutches his stomach and keels forward, his face writhing pain, we will know he will not have died in vain. We are willing to forget the past; we trust you will recognize it for what it is worth and assure us success in future effort. The fight against communism will not end in a victory in one land or a series of victories in any one continent. It will be long and drawn out, testing American metal to the utmost. We know the evil in communism and how it threatens our very existence. We are willing to sacrifice all, but in the struggle, we don't think we should be asked to line up with doubtful characters we have reason to suspect.

Mr. President, we may be young and foolhardy, but we still can read the records and know the score! If we are to die for our country, we want a clean-up in the State Department before we give to the fullest. As far back as 1945, when Acheson was Under Secretary of State, we remember Gen. Patrick Hurley's explosive resignation as Ambassador to China. His accusation—Acheson and his clique were dealing behind his back with the Chinese Communists. We remember June 19, 1946, when Acheson and Patterson (the Secretary of War) appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and gave their blessing to Marshall's proposal, that the United States should actually train and arm Communist fighters in China. In the meanwhile, as expected, Stalin takes over, leaving only the southern portion of Korea (a narrow dagger pointing into the heart of Japan) that is not Communist dominated. With Stalin, it is all or nothing. In spite of repeated warnings from men like MacArthur, the State Department does nothing to protect our last hold on the mainland. Congress appropriates $10,000,000 to supply the Koreans with guns and ammunition. Actually they got only $200 of this and that for telephone wire, not enough to pay for a good TV set in an average American home. When war comes our boys are outnumbered 20 to 1 and and take a terrific beating. They are left without sufficient tanks, guns, and ammunition and forced to retreat, with only a promise of help to come. As we write (July 18) things look pretty bad for the United States and if the Communists rejoice in our reverses, they can be grateful to our muddle-headed geniuses in the State and Defense Departments, responsible for our present plight!

The State Department forms our foreign policy. True to Communist tactics to confuse issues in foreign lands, the State Department up to recent days, seems to play the partyline and has been the essence of confusion and uncertainty. It helps China, it drops China. It abandons Formosa; it protects Formosa. It dismantles German industries; it furnishes money to rebuild them. It denounces Tito as the murderer of American airmen; it gives him money to build a steel mill. Supposedly, it denounces communism all over the world; it refuses to take Spain, a bulwark of strength against communism (the only country to defeat Stalin) into the western European military alliance. Mr. President, "We who are about to die" may be just kids; if we are to do the dirty work, on the fighting front, we have a right to know what is going on in the home front. If in so-called peace, the motive question hangs on the State Department, we want to make sure free Americans and not enemy pinks and Reds or Communist sympathizers control the land for which we are willing to give our lives.

The Clinton Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans reared in the traditions of fair play, integrity, and common decency have been outraged in recent weeks by the despicable and infamous mouthings of the Russian delegate to the United Nations.

But it remained for the Clinton Herald, an outstanding newspaper published at Clinton, Iowa, in my district, to suggest practical means by which these loyal citizens can register their protests officially, namely, by communicating directly with our able delegate to the United Nations, the Honorable Warren Austin, who formerly served in the Congress with great distinction.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it would have a most salutary effect upon the deliberations of the United Nations if the post office at Lake Success were to be deluged with basket upon basket of mail from every corner of the land commending Delegate Austin for his fearless opposition to the aggressor-tyrants.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the Clinton plan, which I include herewith under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

[From the Clinton Herald, Clinton, Iowa, September 9, 1950]

IF YOU THINK WE SHOULD CONTINUE TO DROP BOMBS—NOT POWDER PUFFS—ON NORTH KOREA, THEN READ THIS

Attention Herald readers:

Jacob Malik, Russian delegate to the United Nations, says he is unhappy about the dropping of bombs on North Koreans.

What's more, he also whines that he has in his possession over 20,000 letters from people who agree with his attitude.

There must be millions of Americans who feel that if Red aggression is to be stopped, it must be done the hard way—with steel and blood. They don't agree with Jake that we should be dropping powder puffs instead of bombs on North Koreans (those quaint folk who now are so busy trying to slaughter Americans).

Don't you think it would be sensible to let Warren Austin, United States delegate to the United Nations, know that we are convinced that the spread of the Red cancer must be stopped now; and that his actions in the UN have our wholehearted support?

The Herald thinks so. We believe it is our duty to furnish him with ammunition to fire back at the Reds when they start bleating.

So today, in two columns below, this newspaper is publishing a form letter which it is suggested you clip, sign, and mail without delay to: Hon. Warren Austin, United States delegate to the United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y.

It would be even better, of course, if those interested in supporting Austin would send him personal letters. The phrasing need not be fancy. Just speak out. Any type of communication will be helpful; the form letter makes it easy for everyone to help.

Our delegate is entitled to assurance that Americans across the land are standing shoulder to shoulder in his viewpoints.

We hope that this letter-writing movement will spread throughout the United States. Clinton folk can help get the ball rolling by calling it to the attention of friends in other cities.

Imagine the effect Austin could create by dumping a few million letters in a pile on the floor of the UN conference room and then inviting Malik to put his (alleged) 20,000 alongside them.

Austin could take pride in pointing out that the letters he received were written voluntarily, and not by individuals who had machine guns trained on them.

Could Malik do likewise without blushing? We doubt it.

Every American has a stake in the United Nations. Our future will be molded by the success or failure of its deliberations.

Are you willing to invest a 3-cent stamp in this future?

If so, then sign this letter, clip it, and mail it without delay.

(Extra copies of the letter can be obtained at the Clinton and DeWitt offices of the Herald. It is suggested that all adult members of families sign and mail them.)

A FREE AMERICAN SPEAKS

CLINTON, IOWA.

HON. WARREN AUSTIN,
United States of America Delegate,
United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Americans abhor war and all the suffering which accompanies it. No nation in the world has a deeper hunger for world peace than do we.

But there can be no peace as long as some nations seek to force freedom-loving people into slavery; to deny them the right to live a clean and decent life, paying respect to God, in their own fashion.

Russia is intent on bringing the world under the yoke of communism. This cancerous growth is spreading and even now we are attempting to burn it out of Korea by the force of arms.

We have no choice but to fight. When Russia protests against bombings in North Korea she is closing her eyes to the millions of lives snuffed out by her inhumanity, torture, and treachery.

You, our delegate to the United Nations, have my support in your present course of action.

I read recently in the Clinton (Iowa) Herald that Jacob Malik, Russian delegate, says he has 20,000 letters protesting our bombing attacks. I think you should have some letters of rebuttal and hence this communication.

I sign this communication voluntarily. No one is threatening me with prison or death if I don't. This is America; not Russia.

God bless you and your efforts on behalf of world peace.

Signed:
Name_____
Address_____
City_____

Expanded Social Security—Is It Socialism, Welfare Statism, or Is It Good Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

SOCIAL SECURITY IS DEMOCRATIC

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that we still hear charges that the social security system is socialistic and is leading toward a welfare state. However, when we look at the source of these charges, we can readily see that they are coming from the same persons who are and have been against any legislation which raises the living standards and improves the welfare of individuals. These same charges were made by these same people when the original social security legislation was under consideration and during consideration of the slum clearance act, workmen's compensation and employer liability legislation, minimum wage legislation, child labor laws, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and all similar legislation. It only takes a moment's thought to see how unfounded these charges really are. Far from being a paternalistic hand-out, the social

security insurance system is a self-supporting, contributory system in which the worker shares directly in meeting the cost of protection afforded him in his old age or his survivors in the event of his death. The contributions and benefits are directly related to his own productive efforts, thus preserving self reliance, initiative, ambition, and rewarding effort. Benefits under this system are not a charity dole but are paid as a matter of right and preserve the worker's dignity and independence. Since the system provides only a basic protection it encourages workers to accumulate savings to supplement the benefits. No flat benefits are provided. There are no Government contributions and benefits are payable only to the covered members of the labor force or their survivors. Far from being socialistic, this system is one of the most democratic and humane systems ever established by our Government.

INCREASED COVERAGE AND BENEFITS

The revision in the social-security laws, which was signed by the President on August 28, 1950, is second only to the original Social Security Act and is one of the most important pieces of legislation within the past decade. Coverage was extended to around 10,000,000 additional people, bringing the total now covered under the social-security insurance system to 45,000,000. These approximately 10,000,000 additional people consist of 4,700,000 nonfarm self-employed persons; 1,500,000 State and local employees; 1,000,000 domestic workers; 850,000 agricultural laborers; 600,000 nonprofit employees; 400,000 life-insurance and traveling salesmen, agent and commission drivers, and industrial workers; 200,000 Federal employees; and 550,000 employees outside the United States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The new social-security law protects 3 out of 4 of the Nation's paid workers and covers 9 out of 10 full-time self-employed persons.

Benefits for those now on the social-security insurance rolls will be raised from $62,000,000 in August to $112,000,000 in September. Benefits for those retiring after mid-1952 will be doubled. Average payments for a retired worker and his wife were raised from $41 a month to $75 and after a few years' work under the new law, this average will be $95.

BENEFITS AND COVERAGE IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

On August 31, 1950, 131,321 persons were receiving insurance benefits in Michigan, amounting to $2,855,039 per month. The 1950 amendments immediately raise these payments to $5,165,618 for September or nearly $62,000,000 per annum. At present 1,778,000 people are covered by the social-security insurance system in Michigan. As of January 1, 1951, the following additional persons will be covered in our State: 181,000 nonfarm self-employed; 19,250 agricultural workers; 30,500 domestic workers; and 73,500 employees of State and local governments who may be covered by voluntary agreement. In addition to these persons there will also be certain full-time life-insurance salesmen, certain agent and commission drivers, certain full-time traveling or city salesmen, and certain industrial home workers covered by the revised definition of an employee. No breakdown for the State of Michigan is available for these latter groups.

Korean War Tests Role of Aged; Will They Be Casualties, Too?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

KOREAN WAR TESTS ROLE OF AGED; WILL THEY BE CASUALTIES, TOO?—FULL-FLEDGED EFFORT MEANS ALL MUST HAVE BUYING POWER TO HELP

CLEVELAND.—During World War II we learned that not all of the casualties took place in the foxholes and on the beachheads. A lot of people died a living death right here at home. The aged were the forgotten folks of that war. They were battle casualties along with the soldiers and sailors in the front lines.

When war comes, strange things happen to the American dollar. Everybody needs more of them. Prices of food and clothing double or triple. And so everybody makes more money. Wages go way up. So do profits.

Everybody makes more money except the old people. They stay where they were before war broke out. The 3,000,000 on old-age assistance received just about the same checks in 1945, when prices reached their peak, as they did in the years before the war.

Their $45 old-age assistance checks bought goods they could have purchased for about $20 in peacetime. The Government refused to grant them more. So they slowly starved. Their poverty grew more critical. They were the casualties of the home front.

CALL IT POLICE ACTION BUT IT'S STILL A WAR

Now we are in another war. Don't let anybody tell you that the fighting in Korea is merely police action. You know we are at war. On paper, the aggressor is North Korea. In reality, the aggressor is the Soviet Union. The North Koreans, knowing full well that the United Nations would never stand for a war of invasion, would never have dared to fire the first shot without the backing of Russia. The North Koreans are supplied with Russian materials.

So the United States—and the United Nations—are warring with Russia even though no formal declaration has been made. That adds up to a long war. And the experts tell us that to win this one the Nation must be placed on an all-out wartime footing.

That means total mobilization of all our resources, human and material. It means that every last person in this country must contribute to the winning of the peace. We can't do that if we have millions of casualties at home.

Today there are at least 11,500,000 people in America 65 years of age or older. That's a lot of people. They are needed in a war economy.

But millions of these are already casualties. More than 3,500,000 of them have absolutely no income at all. More than 2,000,000 have incomes of less than $500 a year. More than 2,000,000 have less than $1,000 a year.

So, of the 11,500,000 past 65, some 7,500,000 have less than $1,000, or nothing at all. They live in poverty or on the fringe of poverty. These 7,500,000 are casualties. They cannot help the economy because they have no purchasing power to contribute to the war effort.

MAKE HOME SOLDIERS OF THE MILLIONS OF AGED

Now, if America is to convert to an all-out war effort, it is going to have to make home soldiers of these people. Some of them, of course, will find jobs, especially when the employment market tightens. But millions of them will not be acceptable to industry because they are too old, or because they are blind or otherwise physically disabled. Nevertheless, they can be made good soldiers if the Government wants to help them enlist in the war to save democracy.

They can help in a valuable way. They can help by being transformed from paupers into folks able to hold their own in the market place.

Why should our Government make things tougher than they already are? Why try to fight a war overseas and at the same time support an intolerable burden of poverty at home? Why saddle ourselves with people who are useless to the economy, and expensive to the taxpayers, when we have the means to enable them to stand on their own two feet?

Let's grant that these folks can't put on a uniform and march off to the wars. Let's grant that they can't, because, of advanced age or disability, compete with younger people in industry. Let's grant that they have passed the stage of productivity.

WE CAN'T AFFORD A WAR AND A DEPRESSION, TOO

That doesn't mean that they can't be useful. In a war economy (and for that matter, in a peace economy, too) everybody must have purchasing power to keep the Nation healthy. When millions have no money, and there are pools of poverty, we wind up with areas of depression.

This Nation cannot afford to fight a war and depression at the same time.

So the smart thing to do is to win the war against depression at home, and to do it right now, before it is too late.

We aren't winning it with the weapon called H. R. 6000, the Social Security Act as amended. True, it will increase average old-age insurance by about 77 percent. But that only means that the average will be increased to $47 or so a month, and you can't get along today on that kind of money. The 3,000,000 on old-age assistance aren't going to be helped at all; they will still continue to receive their $46 average each month.

So the Social Security Act isn't the answer. It won't prevent casualties on the home front.

Antitrust Penalties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the September 13 edition of the Christian Science Monitor:

ANTITRUST PENALTIES

There has been some talk lately of increasing the penalties for violation of the anti-

trust laws in the United States. We are heartily against monopoly and monopolistic practices but we question seriously whether this is the fair or effective way to suppress them.

What seems to be needed first is reliable legal definitions of what constitutes monopolistic business practice or conspiracy in restraint of trade. Recent judicial decisions have so extended the area of presumption allowed to the Federal Trade Commission that it is genuinely difficult for many executives of large firms to know when or whether they are violating the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

In the somewhat simpler sphere of personal criminology it has been found that certainty of punishment is a much more effective deterrent to crime than is severity of a penalty the culprit may hope to escape. Armed robbery will be less frequent in a city whose police force has a good record of detection than in one with stern judges but a low percentage of convictions.

Correspondingly, what seems needed in the business field is a thorough restudy and overhauling of the antitrust laws to state more specifically what is or is not permitted as to methods of competition or degrees of concentration in business. Then when businessmen, attorneys, and courts have more definite criteria to apply, the present penalties may be found sufficient.

This is a situation in which one good yardstick would have better effect than a dozen switches—or clubs.

The San Francisco Formula for Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of personal pleasure that I ask permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent bulletin issued by the San Francisco Employers Council. The bulletin is entitled "Formula for Industrial Peace" and relates how a threatened strike of retail-store delivery drivers was averted by persistent negotiations under the formula, which had its inception back in 1938.

At that time I was just completing my first year of service as president of the San Francisco Labor Council. During my initial year in that office it had become increasingly evident to me that many of our labor-management disputes and the strikes which sometimes resulted were due, at least in part, to the fact that there was no general clearing house through which efforts to promote the maintenance of industrial peace could be coordinated. There was no mechanism to permit those in both labor and management with a clear understanding and an honest interest in encouraging good relations, yet not directly connected with settlement of specific issues, to attempt an adjustment.

It is psychologically true that often in the heat of discussion basic problems, capable of solution, become embroiled in personal attitudes and differences, and deadlocks develop as a result. With this thought in mind I initiated a requirement that all unions affiliated with the labor council consult the council and obtain strike sanction from that body before a strike could be called. Under this procedure, when strike sanction is sought the employer is called in to present his views and arguments on the issue at hand. The matter is then referred to the president of the labor council, until recently myself, and he contacts official representatives of the major employer's organizations which may be involved to confer on possible means of settlement. By this means discussions are held on a plane permitting sober consideration of the basic issues and without the discoloration of personal animosities. Out of such meetings, and over the period of years since they were first initiated, San Francisco has emerged with a $99\frac{44}{100}$ percent clean record of working out disputes without strikes. That is the true picture of the labor situation in San Francisco, as contrasted with the statements made from time to time by some uninformed or prejudiced individuals to the effect that San Francisco is a strike-ridden city.

In a summary of labor-relations activities accompanying the bulletin to be printed with these remarks, the employers council points to the fact that June of 1950 was the tenth consecutive month during which no strikes were called against council members operating under the formula. Such evidence is striking proof of the effectiveness of the formula for industrial peace and is a direct refutation of irresponsible publicity depicting the city as the victim of industrial warfare. I take considerable pleasure and pride in this record, Mr. Speaker, and in the successful operation of the formula as exemplified in the case cited in the employers council bulletin, which follows:

FORMULA FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE

The threatened strike set for Wednesday, August 30, by AFL Retail Delivery Drivers Union, Local 278, which would have crippled the operations of more than 200 San Francisco retail stores and inconvenienced thousands of San Francisco residents perhaps for months has been settled mainly through the persistent efforts of the San Francisco Labor Council and the employers council after 3 months of negotiations.

It is noted here because it is another outstanding example of the working of the San Francisco formula for industrial peace which has averted many costly strikes in San Francisco during the past 10 years.

The contract between the Retail Delivery Owners and Operators Association and the union expired last June. The union voted to strike to enforce its demand for an increase of 13¾ cents an hour after the negotiations became deadlocked. The San Francisco Labor Council, working with the officers and rank and file of the union, then recommended a compromise, which was agreed to by the employers council on behalf of the owners and operators and accepted by the union membership last Tuesday. It provided a wage increase of 6 cents per hour by the Owners and Operators Association, who in turn were given important cost-item concessions by the union.

W. G. STORIE,
Executive Vice President,
San Francisco Employers Council.
SEPTEMBER 1, 1950.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include, at this time, the address I delivered on September 4, 1950, in Worcester, Mass., at the first joint Labor Day commemoration ceremony held by the combined membership of the Worcester Central Labor Union and the Worcester Industrial Union Council. The address follows:

I feel especially proud and privileged to take part in this first joint Labor Day celebration of the Worcester Central Labor Union and the Worcester Industrial Union Council.

Both as a public official and a private citizen, I am exceedingly glad that the keynote of your meeting here today is unity.

No one can say, with absolute certainty, whether or not the Korean war is the first fighting step of communistic challenge to the whole power and existence of the United States. However, I would not hesitate to say, with certainty, that no matter what develops, we are facing disaster, unless every element in our American society does not unite in patriotic purpose for our national welfare. The character strength of America as a Nation, and America's ability as a world leader, is being directly tested by Russian leaders this very minute, and we need make no mistake about that.

Unless we answer that test by demonstrating true national unity, we will be in grave danger of being destroyed.

That national unity will have to be a lot more concrete than words or proclamations, or mere political compromise; we will have to achieve something far beyond any polite bipartisanship. It is absolutely necessary for us to strive for, and demand as an ideal and an actual practice, complete national unity, something that each and every one of us must engage in with our hearts and our souls.

Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, we have in war and in peace fought together in common causes against common dangers, shared common sorrows and sufferings, triumphed in common successes, and the independence of liberty which we now possess are the works of combined councils and united efforts, resulting in benefits to all. This unity is the source of our strength, the core of our liberty, the foundation of our peaceful living. It is, therefore, a great and grave mistake to assume that any one class of Americans is naturally and inevitably hostile to any other class, that the wealthy and the workingman, employer and employee are destined to live in mutual conflict.

Down through the years America has lived to give the lie to all who would deny that in unity and justice for all, reside the strength, wealth, and peace of our United States and all its varied peoples, who, living and working as one, have made and kept our country one. Upon our continued productive activity and efficiency depend the maintenance and the improvement of our standards of living as well as our very survival as a democracy able to meet and repulse Communist tyranny.

In no business, nor profession, nor craft, nor institution in America is there room today for any man with a divided allegiance.

We Americans cannot afford to blind ourselves to the terrible conflict which faces us today. The issue is obvious and we must solve it or disintegrate; the hope of all mankind rests with us in this hour.

The United States cannot and will not successfully sustain the position of leadership as one of the two mighty, opposing, and world-wide forces contending for the fate of humanity—with "one hand tied behind her back." In this dangerous time, if we fail, we disappear as a great nation. Whatever Russia's further intentions are, it is high time we begin adjusting our mind and our conduct to meet any additional threats.

Nowadays, the field of battle is the whole world. Wars are fought not only for territory or economic gains, but for a fundamental way of life. The whole plan of living must change when our democratic way of life is opposed. Business as usual, pleasure as usual, standards of living as usual, political prejudices and partisanships as usual, are shameful objectives for any individual or class to pursue now.

If we try to gain the victory at the least cost, it is very likely we shall lose all. The struggle we are presently engaged in is everybody's struggle and the meeting of it is everybody's duty. That is the kind of unity we need to convince our fighting men in Korea, and those who are being called, that the American people are squarely behind them.

To establish our basic national unity, we must, first of all, respect and uphold the laws and regulations promulgated by our legislative authorities. We cannot all be Presidents, or generals, or Cabinet Members. The rules we permit to be made, under our democratic form of government, in regulation of our economy, in restriction of our personal privileges and to concentrate on our national resources to one single purpose, must be observed and accepted.

We must also persistently encourage the creation of a public opinion that will recognize the public duty of a private citizen. American public conscience is the unified demand of the people that each individual promotes the general welfare in personal conduct by obeying the regulations to which all of us are subjected. Evading, either by cunning or official favor, the observance of laws, which have been properly approved, is little short of treason when this Nation is fighting for its very survival against the most poisonous enemy in the history of the world.

This is the moment for national and individual sacrifice. Sacrifices raise our self-respect to the point where it becomes a mighty national asset. Those who take advantage of the Nation's perils and sacrifices to enrich themselves by exploitation or for the gain of personal, class or political power are saboteurs of unity. Neither sophisticated criticism, nor blind obedience is unity. True unity comprises impeccable honor, unselfish devotion and invincible purpose.

I wish to congratulate you for the demonstration of unity emphasized through this gathering this morning. I know, and everyone knows, that the heroic contributions and patriotic services of labor, during all our wars, are among the proudest pages of our national history. The labor movement in this country is as thoroughly American as the Washington Monument or the Lincoln Memorial. There are approximately 15,000,000 trade unionists in the United States; with the members of their families and close relatives, they undoubtedly represent almost a fourth of our entire population. The Communists have made desperate efforts to secure a firm foothold in the American labor movement, but they have failed utterly, because the hand of American labor is raised against them and will continue to be raised against them.

God forbid any devilish decision of the Communist leaders in the Kremlin to plunge this Nation and the world into the hell of a third world war, but we must remain prepared for any such eventuality. If it comes, I am supremely confident that the American working people, their sons and daughters, will not be surpassed by any other group in promoting the national unity essential for the preservation of ourselves and all Christian civilization.

Are the Loaned Ships Stopping Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, of the ships loaned to Russia some of the naval craft have been returned and only a few of the merchant ships. What are these ships doing today to help the United States to stop the march of communism?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following timely editorial from the Cleveland News, of Cleveland, Ohio:

WHY ARE UNITED STATES-OWNED SHIPS WORKING FOR THE RUSSIANS?

Here is a piece of fine auxiliary news about the war in Korea:

Russia has in Korean waters, or nearby, a fleet of about 800 large and small merchant vessels.

In 1946, the United States "loaned" Russia 581 naval craft. They were classified as follows: 15 river tugs; 34 mine sweepers; 30 landing craft, infantry; 28 frigates; 78 submarine chasers; 8 motor torpedo boats; 17 landing craft, tank; 194 motor torpedo boats; 43 motor mine sweepers; 4 floating workshops; 26 submarine chasers; 54 land craft, mechanized; 36 submarine chasers; 1 motor launch; 1 plane personnel boat; 2 landing craft, support; 2 landing craft, vehicle; 3 ice breakers; 4 250-ton pontoon barges; 1 light cruiser.

Russia has returned some of the craft, no one will say how many.

Question is, how many of these United States "loans" are working for Russia and/or North Korea this minute? For a great deal of the imported North Korean material is arriving by ship from the nearby Russo-Siberian ports.

Representative ALVIN WEICHEL, of Sandusky, has been trying for months to get an answer to the question. In 1946, he was chairman of a House committee which tried to get details of the Russian-United States deal over the ships, succeeded finally in getting Secretary of State George Marshall's attention. General Marshall said the then Under Secretary Dean Acheson knew more about it, and produced the Under Secretary.

Mr. Acheson promptly told the committee the loan of the ships to our then "brave war ally" was none of Congress' business. But Congressman WEICHEL has kept at the matter, got the details, and recently learned from Navy and State Department sources that Russia returned "some" of the craft, still using some, though no one will say where.

Three weeks ago, Congressman WEICHEL told the House he had learned from an ex-GI who had been at an Okinawa supply base that, after the Jap surrender, we sold tanks there to Russia at $12 a ton. Gives us a creepy feeling to wonder how much of our own manufacture is coming at us over the mountains north of Pusan.

Exposé of Medical Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association will launch one of the most vicious assaults ever directed against the President of the United States, the administration, and the Democratic Party beginning the week of October 8. In a concentrated and concerted 2-week period this organization, which we well know as one of the most insidious lobbies in Washington, will spend $1,110,000—let me repeat, $1,110,000—in a so-called Message of Freedom that will reach 150,000,000 Americans through their daily newspapers, magazines, and radios.

The real purpose of this campaign is to mislead the people and to corrupt the public mind against its own best interest. It is far more than an attack on the President's health program. It is a concerted all-out method of beating Democrats and those who support the President's health program, at the polls this November. Bear this in mind, the AMA campaign is not directed against socialized medicine, it is aimed against health insurance.

If you examine how the American Medical Association is going to spend its money, you will see that this is no ordinary advertising campaign. Usually an organization with a $1,000,000 advertising fund spreads the money over a 12-month period. Contrary to the usual procedure of American business, the AMA is concentrating its spending in 2 weeks—two extremely important weeks during the month of October just preceding the close of the fall political campaign. It is quite obvious that by using the pretext of calling this an educational campaign, the AMA is invading the sanctity of American homes and the men and women in those homes have no way of fighting back.

I have recently learned how the doctors' lobby is going to spend its $1,000,000 fund. The AMA is budgeting $560,000 for ads in 11,000 newspapers—every major newspaper in the United States. The AMA is budgeting about $300,000 for announcements on more than 1,000 radio stations—stations broadcasting in every important city in the Nation. The AMA is budgeting $250,000 for full-page ads in the 30 national magazines having the largest circulation.

And that is not all. The medical lobby has fellow conspirators who are conniving and conspiring with them to help kill liberal legislation by defeating those who support the President's Fair Deal program. The American Medical Association hopes for tie-in advertisements on the radio and in newspapers that may reach the staggering total of $19,000,000.

They want to spend $20,000,000 to tell the people that "the moon is made of green cheese" and that health insurance is socialized medicine, when it is nothing of the sort. I ask myself, and I ask

you, what we can do to combat this unholy, un-American propaganda campaign. For myself, I intend to ask my constituents to expose this campaign for what it is—an attack on President Truman, on the administration, on the Democratic Party, on Democratic candidates, and above all, primarily an attack upon the people themselves. I am going to tell my constituents that their candidates and they themselves will be the victims unless they take the initiative from the reactionaries by telling everyone—everywhere—what is going to happen before it happens.

I am suggesting that the people put on a telephone campaign or exposé in their communities long before October 8. If each person calls 10 people and each of these people calls 10 others, and the chain continues, everyone will be on the alert to this new, insidious, political tactic designed to cripple the Democratic Party and the Fair Deal program.

The magazine, Editor and Publisher, which is published for newspaper and public relations people, carried an article in the issue of August 26, 1950, in which it outlines the American Medical Association's propaganda program against the people. I would like to read the full text. It follows:

AMA'S $1,110,000 AD PROGRAM SET FOR OCTOBER

(By George A. Brandenburg)

CHICAGO.—Advertising's heavy artillery at the national and local level will boom out messages to reaffirm and solidify public faith in American enterprise through endorsement of voluntary health insurance and opposition to State socialism, according to plans announced this week by the American Medical Association.

During 2 weeks in October, the AMA "Message of Freedom," together with thousands of tie-in ads, will reach 150,000,000 Americans through the greatest number of newspaper, magazine, and radio ads ever devoted to a single theme.

NEWSPAPERS HEAD LIST

Newspapers will carry the heavy load of AMA and tie-in advertising, with copy scheduled to run during the week of October 8. It was announced by Clem Whitaker and Leone Baxter, delegated to coordinate AMA's national education campaign.

The advertising budget approved by the AMA board of trustees totals $1,110,000, of which $560,000 has been allocated to newspapers, $300,000 to radio, and $250,000 to national magazines. Approximately 144,500 individual doctors, in every community in America, will share the cost of this advertising program through their dues payments to AMA.

"This, without doubt, is the broadest-coverage newspaper advertisement of the year, judged from the standpoint of the number of newspapers included in the schedule," declared Whitaker and Baxter, the husband-and-wife public-relations counselors who have prepared the advertising ammunition for this mass appeal.

ELEVEN THOUSAND NEWSPAPERS SCHEDULED

The AMA's schedule will run in approximately 11,000 newspapers, including every bona fide daily and weekly paper in the 48 States, District of Columbia, and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

Every newspaper on the schedule will receive an insertion order early in September from Lockwood-Shackelford Co., Chicago advertising agency selected to handle this business, for a 70-inch (5 columns by 14 inches), black-and-white display ad. Full-page ads are also scheduled in Sunday newspaper supplements and national magazines. Sunday magazines are in addition to all dailies and weeklies.

AMA copy will likewise appear in business, professional trade publications 30 days ahead of general schedule to develop tie-in advertising support from allied organizations, business, and industry.

During the second and third weeks of October, more than 1,000 radio stations will broadcast spot announcements, covering every State, Hawaii and Alaska. In addition, 30 national magazines will carry full-page messages concurrently.

The AMA advertising schedule is as follows:

Weekly newspapers: the week of October 8.

Daily newspapers: October 11.

Sunday newspaper supplements: October 15.

National magazines: the week of October 8 for weeklies; the November issues of monthlies, distributed in October.

Radio: second and third weeks of October.

Sunday newspaper supplements will include American Weekly, This Week, Parade, and 28 independent Sunday magazine sections, representing an estimated total circulation of over 38,000,000.

SEEK TERRIFIC IMPACT

Commenting on AMA's blanket-coverage policy, Mr. Whitaker told E. and P.: "We want the terrific impact of all media hitting at once. This is a 'grass roots' advertising campaign, directed to all the people of America, whether they live in great cities, small towns, or villages, or on farms.

"Wherever there is a newspaper, there are doctors—and doctors' patients. The AMA advertising program is designed to blanket every area of medical practice. Consequently, the schedule calls for the use of advertising space in all the newspapers of America. There will be some duplication of circulation but the added impact of that duplication is desired, so that medicine's story can be hammered home by repetition."

Newspapers will have ample tie-in possibilities, he pointed out. The Whitaker-Baxter team has prepared an advertising kit which will reach newspapers about September 1, outlining in detail 20 or more profitable tie-in promotions at the local level. These include drug stores, all types of merchants and businessmen, manufacturers, insurance companies and agencies, local health plans and hospitals.

BLUE CROSS TO COOPERATE

Local Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans will be provided with material which they can use as a part of their own institutional promotion campaigns to coincide with AMA's advertising program, Lawrence C. Wells, public relations director of Blue Cross and Blue Shield Commissions, told E. and P.

These groups will advertise in newspapers, he said, to exploit Blue Cross and Blue Shield prepaid insurance programs from a brand-name standpoint.

Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans will receive suggested newspaper ads in various sizes, including mats for larger ads up to half-page size.

In addition to specific suggested tie-ins from local business firms of all types, the AMA kit also includes a full-page Freedom Roll-Call layout that will permit individuals, or their organizations, to be identified with the program.

In order that national advertisers may avail themselves of the opportunity to tie in with the campaign, letters, signed by Dr. Elmer L. Henderson, AMA president, and Dr. Louis H. Bauer, chairman of the AMA board of trustees, are going out this month to the presidents of 25,000 big firms, telling of the campaign's objectives, and why their respective firms should participate.

HAVE NRDGA SUPPORT

Another letter is going to the 7,000 members of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, urging retailers to join in the program at the local level. Whitaker and Baxter also indicated they expect cooperation from unrelated groups, such as the railroads and power companies.

To develop tie-in advertising support from allied organizations and business generally, special AMA copy will be used early in September in business, medical, drug, advertising and publishing publications. The latter will include Editor and Publisher, Publisher's Auxiliary, American Press, National Publisher, Publishers' Tab, and all State press association publications in the United States.

Excess-Profits Tax Should Be Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of an excess-profits tax. The conference committee of the Senate and House has returned to us a bill that greatly increases the taxes to be paid, but it does not provide any excess-profits tax on the corporations. It is inconceivable that the administration should ignore the right and justice of requiring corporations, with the highest profits ever recorded, to escape payment of taxes based upon what is easily discernible as excess profits.

We had an excess-profits tax during World War II. We need it badly at this time as a source of revenue to help meet the cost of the present war, and to provide an adequate defense for the future. War is a time of sacrifice. Our boys are being wounded and killed in Korea. Many of them have already made the supreme sacrifice. These boys and their families know what sacrifice really means. There are other boys and their families who will know what it means before the present war is ended. With sacrifices such as this being made it would be a gross injustice not to tax the dollars that represent excess profits of corporations. If we draft men, then we should draft dollars.

The administration spokesmen claim that it is a difficult task to draw the necessary legislation to provide such a tax. For this reason they claim that the whole matter should go over until the next session of Congress, and that hearings can be held at that time. There is in my opinion no justice in this claim. There was no delay for hearings and committee consideration before our boys were sent into Korea. There was no delay in their response. There was no putting off their sacrifices until next session. They are there now fighting and dying. We must do everything possible to assist them.

The revenue that the excess-profits tax would produce is needed now. It is our duty to see that legislation is drawn to accomplish the purpose before this Congress adjourns.

Whose Leadership Are We Following?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address, entitled "Whose Leadership Are We Following?" delivered by George E. Stringfellow, chairman, board of trustees, Ithaca College, before the Kiwanis Club of Salt Lake City, on Thursday, August 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHOSE LEADERSHIP ARE WE FOLLOWING?

(Address given by George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., before the Kiwanis Club of Salt Lake City on Thursday, August 31, 1950)

Thank you very much for your gracious and generous invitation. I consider it a signal honor to be asked to address such a fine group of American citizens as comprise the Kiwanis Club of Salt Lake City. Few service clubs in America enjoy the standing in their communities and throughout the United States, Canada, and Alaska as does your club.

I wish to speak to you today on politics—not partisan politics or patronage politics, but rather as defined by Webster, "the science of government". If we knew more about the science of government, our demands for more economical government would be more productive. We American taxpayers are today perhaps getting less for our tax dollar than any other group of citizens in the world, certainly less than any other group of free or relatively free citizens.

For example, 20 years ago the annual cost of Federal Government was a little less than $5,000,000,000. Excluding the Korean War, which the President says is a "police action," the cost of Federal Government this year will be about $45,000,000,000, or nine times more than it was 20 years ago. Our taxes 20 years ago were a little less than $5,000,000,000 a year. This year our taxes will probably reach $45,000,000,000 and, conceivably, sixty billions next year. Twenty years ago, our national debt was a little less than $20,000,000,000. Our national debt now is well in excess of $260,000,000,000, not taking into consideration a number of bad loans, political loans, made by RFC. The cost of government 20 years ago was equal to 75 percent of the total income of all the citizens in California. Today the cost of Federal Government is equal to all the income of all the people west of the Mississippi, save Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, Iowa, and 10 percent of Minnesota.

When he was seeking the Presidency of this Republic in 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt complained bitterly about the high cost of Government. He was especially critical of unbalanced budgets or deficit spending. Roosevelt said that a government, like a family, can spend a little more than it takes in for a year or so, but when that government, like a family, becomes a spendthrift and throws caution to the winds, you know and I know, said Candidate Roosevelt, we are headed for the poorhouse. I submit that when a government goes to the poorhouse it takes all of its people with it. If we are to avoid going to the poorhouse collectively, we must balance our budget. We must get back to living within our income.

When a corporation gets into financial difficulties the courts appoint a receiver, who liquidates the corporation's obligations and, if there is anything left, reorganizes the corporation and staffs it with officers who know how to live within their income or the income of the business. The receiver is, of course, responsible to the court by which he is appointed.

When a Government gets into financial difficulties there is no court to appoint a receiver. A dictator arises and takes over. This dictator is not responsible to a court of law; he is responsible only to his whims. The dictator determines the way of life for the people. The people become his subjects. They lose their savings; they lose their way of life; and they lose their liberty.

Inflation always produces dictators. It was inflation that produced Mussolini; it was inflation that produced Hitler; it was inflation that produced Stalin; and inflation will produce a dictator in America just as sure as night follows day. And do not delude yourselves into believing that if we in America have a dictator he will be a benevolent dictator. There is no such thing as a benevolent dictator. All dictators are ruthless, overbearing, and cruel.

One of the things that disturbs me about our Government in Washington is that it no longer is concerned about balancing our budget. Before the war in Korea the President nonchalantly budgeted a deficit of more than $5,000,000,000, at the peak of prosperity. I submit that if a government cannot balance its budget at the peak of prosperity it never will balance it. And if we are to continue with an unbalanced budget, Roosevelt's prediction that we are headed for the poorhouse will become a grim reality and, in which event, we will be destroyed by inflation.

The administration in Washington appears to be more interested in the balancing of the budgets of foreign countries than they are in balancing our own. For example, the early part of this year Secretary of State Acheson, who seems to have many loyalties, all of them unfortunately not to our way of life, wrote a letter to the President of Korea in which he said that he wanted that Government to balance its budget and that it must balance its budget if it was to avoid financial chaos. He wrote a similar letter to the Government of Greece, but never a word about chaos in America from unbalanced budgets. The British budget for 1949 and 1950 shows a surplus of £1,667,000,000, or $3,278,000,000. During that time we gave considerable aid—financial aid—to Britain, which helped to balance her budget and unbalance ours. Our neighbors to the north, the Canadians, for the 2 years ending June 30, 1950, not only balanced their budget but reduced their national debt by $686,000,000—while we show a deficit of $4,900,000,000.

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, one of the ablest men in the United States Senate, outlined for the President how he could reduce expenditures $10,000,000,000 without affecting the war effort. The President ignored the Senator's suggestions. The President is not interested in savings; he's interested in spending and in higher taxes.

Eighteen years ago there were 30 major Federal spending agencies. Today there are 62, an increase of 110 percent. Eighteen years ago there were 564,000 Federal employees. Today there are more than 2,000,000, an increase of 250 percent.

The President of the United States should, in my opinion, be a symbol of economy. That being the case, let's take a look at the White House payrolls. The White House payroll during the last year of the Hoover administration was $127,200. During the last year of the Roosevelt administration the White House payroll was $256,431. During last year of the Truman administration, the White House payroll was $998,254. Most of you recall that the President early in the year made a "nonpolitical" trip to the Northwest to dedicate some dams which had already been dedicated. This trip cost the sorely pressed American taxpayer more than a quarter-million dollars. That, I contend, is a wanton waste of our funds.

The Department of Agriculture recently conducted a pajama probe which cost the American taxpayer $100,000 and developed this startling information:

1. More than half the men in the United States use pajamas for sleeping purposes.
2. Rich men have more pajamas than poor men.
3. The more educated the man, the more likely he is to sleep in pajamas.
4. Pajamas are worn more in cold climates than in warm climates.
5. About half the pajama wearers select the garments themselves, while one-third leave it to their wives—the report does not track down the remainder. (This can, of course, be a project for another probe.)
6. More men between 30 and 54 wear pajamas than those younger or older.

The 192-page pamphlet, which can be had by writing the Government Printing Office and sending along perhaps a dime, said nothings about nightshirts. Perhaps Mr. Brannan would consider this of sufficient importance to conduct another probe at the cost of $100,000.

I realize that it is hard to conceive that we have administrators of Government who are so stupidly throwing away our funds when they are so urgently needed to prosecute the war and other vital things, but if there is any doubt in your minds about the pajama probe, write the Government Printing Office for the 192-page pamphlet.

The President has been very critical of the Eightieth Congress. However, the Eightieth Congress gave us the Taft-Hartley Act, which is a great measure. A measure which the President did not have the intestinal fortitude to sign, although he has found it necessary to use that law on a number of occasions. Yet he wants to repeal it only because the labor bosses want it repealed. The President has often referred to the Eightieth Congress as "the second worst Congress in the history of America." The Eightieth Congress was the only Congress to balance our budget in the last 20 years. Not only did it balance the budget, but it reduced the national debt by $9,200,000,000.

Now, let's take a look at the Eighty-first Congress, often referred to as the "Eighty-worst," which it probably is. The Eighty-first Congress established a deficit of $4,900,000,000. The President seems to think that the Eighty-first Congress is a pretty good Congress. The President has, in the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, thrown caution to the winds and has become a spendthrift. He is the most extravagant President in the history of our Republic and you will recall that it was extravagance that ruined Rome, extravagance is ruining Britain, and we in this Republic are on the "Roman road to ruin," for our politicians have led our people to believe that Government is something to live on instead of under. It was Grover Cleveland, that great American, that true Democrat, who said, "People should support the Government instead of Government the people."

On leaving Convention Hall in Philadelphia following the signing of the Constitution of the United States, Benjamin Franklin was asked, "What do we have?" The wise old man responded, "We have a republic, if we can keep it."

Sixty-one years ago, James Russell Lowell, that great statesman and diplomat, was asked, "How long will the American Republic endure?" To which he replied, "As long as the ideals of the men who made it continue dominant."

Obviously, we cannot keep our Republic if we continue to spend more than we take in. Obviously, the ideals of the men who made

America are not as dominant now as they were a few years ago, for the Communists have infiltrated our Government. We still have, in my opinion, Communists in all departments of Government. Moscow is still directing our affairs in Washington.

Thirty-five years ago, Lenin, the patron saint of communism, said, "We Communists hope to force America to spend her way to destruction." One hundred years ago, Karl Marx said, "The only way to destroy the capitalistic form of government is by tax and tax and tax." In his farewell address, George Washington warned us to "Cherish public credit and avoid the accumulation of public debt." In the last 20 years we have been doing much to make Lenin's wish a grim reality by spending more than we take in. During that same time, we have been following Marx's philosophy of tax and tax and tax. The combination of Lenin's and Marx's philosophy will destroy our way of life. We are following it. We are not following the leadership of Washington, for Washington told us to "Cherish public credit and avoid the accumulation of public debt."

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD recently said that if the Congress enacts into law the three proposals advocated by President Truman, this country cannot avoid state socialism. Those three measures are: socialized medicine, socialized agriculture, socialized housing. Few of us believe that President Truman is setting out to give us state socialism or communism. However, there are many who do not believe that President Truman knows the difference between capitalism and socialism. Capitalism produces things for people to divide. Socialism divides them and when there is nothing left to divide, chaos reigns and communism takes over. Chaos is as important to the growth of communism as moisture is to sustaining life. Socialism is the intermediate step between capitalism and communism. It is often the bridge over which capitalism passes. Almost every move Truman makes is in the direction of socialism. There was never a time in the history of this Republic when the people were more ready for determined leadership and it is our responsibility to do what is necessary to provide that leadership if we would save our way of life.

Only you and others like you can save America. I know there are those in my audience who agree with what I am saying but feel that I am saying it to the wrong audience. I beg of you to believe that my talk is keyed to the only audience that can save America. If you and others like you will become Paul Reveres and warn the people of the approaching danger, America will be saved.

Fellow citizens, the greatest deficit in the world today is not money, materials, or men; the greatest deficit in the world today is intellectual integrity. We need to elect to public office men who possess that priceless ingredient—intellectual integrity. Will you do your part to elect such men and, thus, save our way of life?

Radio Could Have Prevented Railroad Wreck Which Took Lives of 33 Pennsylvania National Guard Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania train crash at Isleta, Ohio, is a tragic lesson on the need for two-way radio communication on all our railroads.

I made exactly the same statement on January 2, 1948, the day after the New Year's Day wreck on the Missouri Pacific at Otterville, Mo., in which 14 persons lost their lives.

Definitely, these are two major railroad tragedies which could have been prevented by radio.

The recent Pennsylvania wreck occurred on a stretch of track fully protected. But was it? The record speaks for itself. Almost every modern safety device was aboard the crack Spirit of St. Louis. But train radio was missing.

I have introduced legislation in the Congress for the past 4 years which if enacted into law would require railroads to install and maintain radio-communication systems. Adequate hearings have been held on these proposals and in my opinion this legislation should be considered by Congress before adjournment.

I am convinced the lives of the 33 Pennsylvania National Guard men could have been saved had the stalled train, on which they were trapped, the means to communicate immediately with the crew of the oncoming Spirit of St. Louis. The two-way radio system would have required an acknowledgment that a warning had been received.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith three timely editorials from the Tuesday, September 12, editions of the Belleville News-Democrat, the St. Louis Star-Times, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

[From the Belleville News-Democrat]

END THIS CARNAGE

It happened again. Another terrible train wreck in fogbound Ohio early yesterday morning took a toll of at least 34 lives and injured scores—many of them permanently maimed. Needless to say, the disaster left the entire Nation stunned.

Had the ramming of the crack Pennsylvania Spirit of St. Louis into a stalled troop train been completely unavoidable, its shocking impact might have been lessened somewhat. But this accident, along with all the rest in a deplorable series, could have been prevented.

Congressman MELVIN PRICE pointed the way several years ago, and had his urging been heeded then, and the rail carriers been forced to equip with modern electronic safety devices, train collisions would not be happening every few weeks.

Notwithstanding all our vaunted flair for technological advancement, most of America's railroads are hidebound by obsolescence. They cling tenaciously to outmoded and antiquated operating procedures that ignore the well-being of the traveling public.

It seems strange that a much higher price is placed on human life and limb by the National Military Establishment than by domestic railroads. But it is a fact that airmen in combat are protected by safety devices that are denied to civilian railway passengers simply because the railroads refuse to adopt them.

The railroad's foot-dragging in this matter of public safety is ascribable to only one thing—the cost of installing up-to-the-minute equipment which would safeguard not only the customers, but the operators, too.

This attitude is based on false economy. Accidents like the one in Ohio yesterday morning do not come cheaply, and getting out from under that one may tax the resources of the Pennsylvania line. The dollar cost of this catastrophe would have bought an awful lot of radio sets to keep trains from smacking into one another.

America can ill afford to sacrifice its life blood in pointless carnage. If the railroads will not keep abreast of the times—and they have given every indication they will not—certainly Uncle Sam is justified in stepping in to insist that the public shall be protected.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times]

ONE DEVICE MISSING

Almost every modern safety device known to railroad engineering was aboard the Pennsylvania's crack Spirit of St. Louis. But one was missing. That one was train radio. And because it was missing, 33 soldiers are dead today, another 60 are injured.

What happened to kill these Pennsylvania National Guard men before ever they got near the Korean front, according to witnesses, was this: The troop train on which they were riding broke an airbrake hose just west of a signal at Isleta, Ohio. Crewmen jumped from the stalled train and set out flares—but they were not fast enough. The Spirit of St. Louis, roaring through heavy fog, rammed the troop train, driving a Diesel that was pushing it into an old-fashioned coach ahead.

This tragic accident occurred on a stretch of track that was what too many railroad men like to think of as "fully protected." That is to say, it was in "automatic block-signal territory," where the mere passage of trains automatically sets the signals. Beyond that, the Spirit of St. Louis was equipped with cab signals; even if fog obscured the overhead signals, then, the engineer could still read an exact duplicate of them in his cab.

But the evidence that there was not full protection lies scattered in the wreckage of the crash.

It might so easily have been otherwise: If the trains had been equipped with radio, there would have been no reliance on mere visible signals, no reliance on flares. Instead, the engineer of the stalled train would simply have radioed the engineer of the Spirit and warned him to stop. Then there would have been no chance for oversight or for blinding by fog.

The Pennsylvania happens to be in the vanguard of the roads that are using the safety of radio. But this wreck proves that even the Pennsylvania has not moved far enough fast enough. It should be even stronger proof for the other roads that have not managed even the progress the Pennsylvania has made.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

THE FATAL STOP

Railroad trains sometime have to make unexpected stops. When they do, the methods at their disposal to warn off the next train behind them are too primitive. That seems to have been the reason for the wreck of the Spirit of St. Louis and a troop train at Isleta, Ohio, early Monday morning. It has been the reason for several other major wrecks in recent years.

At the speed at which a modern crack train travels it requires a distance of a mile to a mile and a half to stop. Yet the warning flares and a single lantern set up at Isleta were reported to have been only 100 yards behind the stalled train—not far enough back to be of any practical use. But the flagman did not have time to set them far enough back to do any good—only some 5 minutes elapsed between the stopping and the crash. There was the same want of time in other recent rear-end collisions.

Repeated wrecks on the railroads resulting from the unexpected stops with no adequate

way of warning off the train that is coming along behind should plead eloquently for the use of train radio. A means is needed to enable the crew of the stalled train to communicate immediately with the crew of the oncoming train and to obtain acknowledgment that its warning is received and understood. No such means exists on most trains. Radio would provide it.

Uncle Sam—the Goose That Lays the Golden Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident from the facts which I am presenting in the RECORD, under unanimous consent previously obtained, that the people of this country are going to pay very dearly for attempting to support the entire world.

There are those in the New Deal who believe that we can feed the world and engage in wars everywhere. I am not one of those who believe that this can be done without destroying the security of those who look to their investments, their pensions, their annuities, and their retirements to take care of them in the days to come:

UNCLE SAM—THE GOOSE THAT LAYS THE GOLDEN EGGS

On June 30, 1950, the daily statement of the United States Treasury reported gold assets of the United States Government at $24,230,567,200.91.

The daily statement for September 11, 1950, reports the gold assets at $23,576,155,300.45, a net loss in gold assets of $654,411,900.46.

The Wall Street Journal of September 13, 1950, commenting upon the transfer of our gold to the accounts of other nations, related that Mr. Camille Gutt, former Belgian Minister of Finances, and presently chairman of the executive board and managing director of the International Monetary Fund is quoted from Paris for the statement that the United States is losing gold at the rate of $2,000,000,000 a year.

The situation appears to be that foreign governments now have a surplus of United States gift dollars and prefer gold as the medium of settlements in foreign trade.

A study of this complicated monetary situation reveals some highly interesting facts.

In 1940 the total stock of money in the United States (as of June 30, 1941) was $28,457,960,000 of which amount gold represented $19,963,091,000 or approximately 70.15 percent.

Between 1940 and June 30, 1949, our gold stocks increased to $24,466,324,000 and the total stock of money to $53,103,980,000. The percentage of gold to the total money supply then was 46.07.

On August 23, 1950, the money in circulation amounted to $26,963,000,000 and the gold assets of the Treasury were $23,803,000,000, making the total money supply as of that date (including silver bullion and silver dollars carried at $2,347,000,000) $53,113,000,000.

The percentage of gold to the total money supply thus has been reduced from 47.07 percent to 44.39 percent in a little over a year. Since American citizens must depend upon an irredeemable currency, an examination of the Government's fiscal situation appears in order.

THE ACT OF JANUARY 30, 1934

"No gold shall, after January 30, 1934, be coined, and no gold shall, after January 30, 1934, be paid out or delivered by the United States: *Provided, however,* That coinage may continue to be executed by the mints of the United States for foreign countries in accordance with section 367 of this title. All gold coin of the United States shall be withdrawn from circulation, and together with other gold owned by the United States, shall be formed into bars of such weights and degrees of fineness as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct." (Title 31, section 315 b, U. S. C.)

Besides discontinuing the coinage of gold, the Congress by section 733 of the act of January 30, 1934, further provided:

"The Secretary of the Treasury may anticipate the payment of interest on the public debt, by a period not exceeding 1 year, from time to time, either with or without a rebate of interest upon the coupons, as to him may seem expedient; and he may sell gold in any amounts, at home or abroad, in such manner and at such rates and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the public interest, and the proceeds of any gold so sold shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of the Treasury may sell the gold which is required to be maintained as a reserve or as security for currency issued by the United States, only to the extent necessary to maintain such currency at a parity with the gold dollar."

By section 734 of title 31, the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase gold in any amounts at home or abroad with any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, at such rates and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the public interest, but the gold so purchased "shall be included as an asset of the general fund of the Treasury."

Section 463 of title 31 declares:

"(a) Every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy; and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred."

A comparison of the daily Treasury statements for June 30, 1950, and September 11, 1950, reveals that of the $654,411,900 loss in gold assets, the distribution was as follows:

Reduction in gold certificates outstanding	—$311,480
Reduction in gold certificate fund, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	641,000,000
Reduction in gold reserve	4,514,562
Reduction in gold in the general fund	8,575,858
Total reduction, gold assets (73 days)	654,411,900

As our gold assets diminish and with dollars divorced from redeemability, and Federal spending mounting day by day, Mr. Orval Adams, executive vice president, Utah First National Bank, Salt Lake City, Utah, in an address entitled "The Printing Press and the Treasury," said in part:

"With Federal spending, therefore, out of control and the Government committed to arm the western democracies and provide assistance or rehabilitation on a world-wide scale, the dollar question surges to the front as the most vital issue.

"With dollars divorced from redeemability in gold and a printing press anchored in the United States Treasury—and those in charge of the printing press devotees of the welfare state (or farewell state), the United States of America is a victim, in the words of Virgil Jordan, who is the chancellor of the National Industrial Conference Board, of 'government by subsidy, bribery, and robbery; the government willing to steal, and convert to fake money the savings of its citizens to satisfy its lust for ever-increasing power.' He also said: 'The welfare and protection promised for the future in return for votes can only be called the cruelest and most colossal fraud that has ever been practiced on a credulous people.'"

With Government spending at Federal, State, and local levels during the calendar year 1951 probable to be approximately $81,000,000,000, the Congress ought to find out just where our gold assets are being sent, and the amounts, if any, that have been covered into the Treasury as part of the general fund as provided by section 733 of title 31.

Since May 1, the Dow-Jones spot commodity index has risen from 160.0 to 199.18 as of September 11. This rise in commodity prices means the purchasing value of the dollar has been lowered by 20 percent from the level of May 1, when it stood at 58.2 percent of the 1935–39 average.

KILLING THE GOOSE

In a message to Congress, March 10, 1933, President Roosevelt warned:

"Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger."

Our present fiscal policy seems to be not only loose but dangerous. By trying to extend our finances and resources over many lands and many people, we may kill the goose that lays the golden eggs from out the United States Treasury.

It is time for the Congress to assume the full responsibilities delegated in the Constitution, "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures."

PAUL O. PETERS.

Lest We Perish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, United States Army, retired, in this week's issue of Collers in the article, it suggests food for will find time to read—and then read the second time. While I do not concur in all the statements made by General Fellers in the article it suggests food for thought and in these critical times should be considered required reading:

HOW WE CAN LICK STALIN

There is not a moment to lose. The deadline was long ago. The cold war has been lost.

The Korean war caught us dangerously unprepared. General MacArthur's sure touch, coupled with the failure of the Red Korean tanks to exploit early gains, probably will enable our resourceful forces to stabilize the situation. Then, as more reinforcements arrive, we shall be able to turn the tide.

Nevertheless, it is disconcerting to contemplate what could happen if hundreds of thousands of the oriental Red army, covered

by a Red air force, were to move down into Korea.

Neither the bravery of our GI's nor General MacArthur's genius could overcome the disaster they would face. Even if our boys were to kill 10 or 20 to 1, we would be wiped out by an endless stream of Communists pouring upon us with complete abandon of life.

For many months before the Korean war started General MacArthur had pleaded in vain for stronger forces in his Far East Command. The Joint Chiefs of Staff personally had agreed with his views but, as they explained to him, the civil branch of the Government had final authority.

In South Korea our responsibilities had been assumed, March 1949 by the Department of State. In June of that year our troops were relieved. While it was known that North Koreans were being heavily armed, it was decided our aid from that time would be almost entirely economic. Of a $10,000,000 aid authorization by the Congress, only $108 worth of radio wire had been delivered prior to the Communist invasion. Administration leaders had made it clear that Korea was not essential to our strategic position in Asia.

Referring to President Truman's sudden reversal of this policy, General MacArthur said "the Far East Command, until the President's great pronouncement to support the epochal action of the United Nations, had no slightest responsibility for the defense of the free Republic of Korea. With the President's decision it assumed a completely new and added mission."

It was a State Department decision to leave the thirty-eighth parallel undefended on the south side. It was a White House decision which suddenly junked this policy in favor of armed intervention—at a time when sufficient military force was not readily available.

One or the other of these decisions was wrong.

In Europe, although there is no fighting there at the moment, our position is potentially far more critical than in Asia. There the State Department, without appreciation of the complexities of modern war and the terrific combat effectiveness of the Red army, has committed the United States to assist in holding western Europe's frontier. It is my belief that few professional military men of reputation really believe such a program can succeed. Yet the military, subordinated to the civil branch of our Government, has offered no public protest. Our Nation is in imminent peril unless our military leaders, even at the risk of their professional careers, insist that our plans be militarily sound and that the objectives given us by the civil branch of the Government be attainable.

WHY WE MUST AVOID GROUND COMBAT

We cannot win against Russia on the ground. We cannot win in ground combat against Red oriental forces on the Asiatic mainland. These Red forces are too vast numerically, too well equipped, too willing to sacrifice their men, for us to accept full-scale ground combat with them in Europe or Asia. Moreover, the distances and winter factors in Russia give her enormous advantages. Where Napoleon and Hitler failed from nearby bases, we had better not make the plunge from across the ocean.

It would be folly to strike Russia's greatest strength, her ground forces, with what in that war would be the weakest element of our three arms—our Ground Forces. Russia's hope for a military victory would lie in her ability to throw the full weight of the Red army against the United Nations forces, which of course would be mainly American. Under no circumstances should we allow Stalin to maneuver us into the position of opposing his strength with our weakness. Rather, we should avoid Russia's incalculable strength and attack her where she is most vulnerable. Russia is weakest at her heart. She is strongest on her periphery. Inside Russia, communism is a miserable failure.

The Russian people never have entirely accepted communism. I am reliably advised that during the 20-year period preceding World War II there were 30 sizable revolts, rebellions, and plots against the Kremlin dictatorship. They were staged by peasants, workers, and even by members of the Red army itself.

When Hitler's forces struck Russia, an important segment of the population greeted the Nazis as liberators. Four million Russian officers and soldiers are reported to have surrendered. Eight hundred thousand troops joined the Nazi forces. Russian General Vlassov set up three Russian divisions to fight Stalin. But Hitler, with his race supremacy complex, looked upon the Russians as inferior. He wanted only the rich Ukraine land, not the people. Confident of victory, he slaughtered the population and the forces which had surrendered to him.

Stalin, sensing his precarious position, somewhat relaxed his despotic control, appealed to the patriotism of the people, and promised postwar relief. The Russian people, faced by an invader whose atrocities exceeded those of Stalin, rallied to the defense of their motherland and fought history's greatest defensive battle.

After the war, hundreds of thousands of Russian nationals refused to return to Russia. They resisted by all possible means, including suicide. Compelled by a wartime agreement to assist in forced repatriation, we played a part in this affair which is a dark chapter in the American record. Purges in the Red army subdued the military. Desertions were by the thousand.

Today conditions inside Russia are almost unbearable even for a population accustomed to harsh treatment. There are 15,000,000 Russian prisoners behind barbed wire. I have seen some of these prison camps on my two trans-Siberian trips. About 9,000,000 of these are male political prisoners between the ages of 18 and 58. They comprise 16 percent of the male population between these age limits. There is scarcely a family in Russia which has not lost a member to the barbed-wire prisons. It is evident that the Communist system carries within itself the seeds of self-destruction. The iron curtain is plain evidence the Kremlin does not trust the Russian people. It is afraid for them to have contact with the outside world, to know how other peoples live.

Stalin's problem of control is terrific. Of necessity, if he is to continue in power, he must subject his people to their own military occupation. He must transmute the hatred his people hold for the Kremlin into hatred for their alleged external enemy—the United States.

We should launch immediately a full-scale psychological campaign to drive a wedge between the Kremlin and the Russian people. Psychologically, the enslaved Russians are ripe for revolt. But they have neither the military equipment, nor the leadership and organization to implement their desires. Nevertheless, secret groups exist in Russia dedicated to the overthrow of the Kremlin and the establishment of a liberal government. At least one of these anti-Communist organizations penetrates the iron curtain regularly. It needs help—money, printing presses, paper, radio sending and receiving sets, small planes, small free balloons and various other aids to intensify and expand the underground activities. The cost in relation to military expenditures would be almost negligible.

The Red army, some reliable observers believe, is saturated with revolutionary ferment, and cannot be relied upon unless Russia is attacked. Yet, in spite of this situation, which might be strengthened immeasurably by a psychological campaign by the United States, our steps to exploit this positive vulnerability are ineffective. The Voice of America, even if increased as contemplated, is a mere whisper. The State Department must always be diplomatic. This precludes success in Russia; for to be effective the psychological campaign must be aimed at the eventual overthrow of the Kremlin. This cannot be achieved merely by radio broadcasts into Russia. It will require the individual initiative of those behind the iron curtain and the integration of their individual efforts into mass action.

ENEMIES WITHIN MENACE THE KREMLIN

No border so vast as that of Russia, and touched in so many places by unhappy vassal states, can be guarded against all penetration. Peasants and others who pass for peasants can move in and out at night. There is bound to be talk between those on one side and those on the other. Our messages can be transmitted by ardent anti-Communist Russians who know just the right word to attract somebody, just the right touch to give verisimilitude to leaflets that might be dropped from balloons, or small Russian-piloted planes. We in our American towns, would know at once whether a message that came to us showed intimate knowledge of our town and our surroundings. Russian fugitives from the brutality of the Kremlin have friends back where they fled from, who will pass the truth around, convincingly.

We have the best story in the world to tell. The Kremlin feeds its listeners with distortions of American life, with exceptions to the normal. Our task is to give them the truth. The Reds have done alarmingly well with their lies. Certainly we should be able to do more with our truth. We have a better chance to weaken Russia than we have to strengthen western Europe militarily, at far less cost. By choosing the more practical way we could tip the balance of power heavily to our side.

In Japan our psychological campaign drove a wedge between the Emperor and his people on the one hand, and the militarists on the other. This campaign contributed in a marked degree to Japan's surrender. It was one of the reasons why the Japanese surrendered on the mainland without a fight. What worked against Japan can be made to work against the Kremlin. In this field I speak from experience, for it was my privilege to serve as Chief of Psychological Warfare on General MacArthur's staff while the war was on.

A full-scale campaign to project the truth through the iron curtain to the Russian people should be initiated immediately. We can and must create a situation of unrest in Russia which would make Stalin hesitate to go to war lest his home front turn actively against him. Our military leaders should demand the campaign.

It is obvious that we cannot hold the Red Army out of western Europe. As the prospect of combat with Russia closes down upon us, our early lesson in Korea makes crystal-clear what it means for us to engage vast land armies.

Russia could start some 150 to 200 divisions across Europe in a matter of weeks. Within 90 days she could probably have 500 divisions available. She could have a thousand divisions eventually if she needed them. In the latest war Russia put 11,000,000 troops into action before lend-lease aid was available. She now has some 20,000,000 trained ground troops.

Even if the mutual defense assistance program were completed—which it will not be for several years—the western world would be able to oppose the Russians with only 50 divisions. Such United States divisions as might possibly be available could scarcely reach Europe before the Red Army reached the Atlantic.

A comparison of Allied with Russian strength near the close of World War II is significant. On the western frontier the

United States had 3 airborne, 15 armored, and 45 infantry divisions. Great Britain had 12, France 11, and Canada 5—a total of 91. This force, with complete domination of the air, was pushing the Nazis toward Berlin. On the other frontier, Stalin has 502 Red army divisions pushing the German Army westward across central Europe.

The 91 divisions represented the Allied peak strength in Europe for World War II. The 502 Red army divisions did not represent Russia's peak strength. She had already lost some 10,000,000 soldiers.

If the United States permits its forces to engage the Red army in Europe, our losses will be so appalling that the American people will recoil in horror and belatedly examine our leadership. This tragedy must not happen.

Our economic position is such that we can no longer afford any program which is not vital to our existence. Our debt is nearing the $300,000,000,000 mark. Our total taxes will climb to $50,000,000,000 annually. Since the end of the war we have spent $91,000,000,000 for national defense, and yet we have doubtful security. Our foreign aid has amounted to $33,000,000,000.

Since the Korean War began we have embarked upon a new and vast multi-billion-dollar spending program. If it encompasses everything now planned, including the increased military assistance program for Europe, the total spent will mount to some $50,000,000,000.

The European countries have already reached prewar economic levels. Therefore, we should terminate the Marshall plan without delay. The point 4 program, at this time, should not be started. And our domestic economy should be pared to the bone.

The military assistance program, for which we have already earmarked billions of dollars plus vast quantities of surplus equipment, also should be terminated immediately.

We should advise our allies that the equipment we have provided will enable them to preserve internal security and prevent civil war. We should advise them that we are not abandoning them, nor are we welshing on the North Atlantic mutual defense treaty. If war comes, we should propose to lend military assistance by striking Russia from the air, continuing this assault until Russia surrenders or is destroyed.

It is far from an acceptable solution to permit the Red army to occupy Europe. But there is no acceptable solution for our European allies if war comes—merely two sinister alternatives. The lesser of these is occupation. If the Europeans resist the Red army, they will be slaughtered.

To be sure, the manpower which our allies can provide for military service is impressive. In addition we could also recruit a formidable ground force of anti-Communist Russian and satellite DP's. We might decide to persuade the people of west Germany to form an army. But would Russia remain still and allow the creation of a force sufficiently formidable to hold the Red army out of Europe? And were we to move toward establishing sufficient United States air units in Europe to cover the force, Russia would be almost certain to strike before her enemy became really formidable.

The 1950 defense budget being spent by our European allies—less the negligible budgets of Luxemburg, Portugal, and Iceland—amounts to only $4,000,000,000 annually. There is the equivalent of two American divisions in Germany. France has three occupational divisions, but her best troops, 150,000 of them, are in Indochina, and her second-line troops are in North Africa. There are possibly 200,000 more assorted allied troops in Europe, but these cannot be said to be on a war footing.

A negligible allied air force is available to cover these meager ground forces.

After considerable pondering, I have reached the unhappy conclusion that we cannot depend on our allies in Europe for military assistance should war come. This is no way a reflection on the character of these people, nor on their valor or loyalty to us. It is merely recognizing a reality.

Russia probably has the atom bomb and 16,000 combat planes. Stalin will be in position, should war become imminent, to advise our allies to remain neutral and be spared attack. If they elect to give the United States bases in Europe or to cooperate with us in the war, he might try to take their population centers out by atomic assault the first 24 hours of the war. And he might very well succeed, because the Allies would not have sufficient air power in Europe at the outset to neutralize the Red air force. Thus, through no cowardice, the Allies may be driven into neutrality.

It would be interesting to know what Secretary of State Acheson would advise our allies to do under these circumstances. Presumably his policy would take us into war to save western Europe. But their destruction would defeat our war objective in Europe before the war was well under way.

Russia can be defeated—militarily—by the United States only through air assault. We can build an Air Force superior to the Red air force; we can gain mastery of the air over Russia; then we can force Russia into submission or destroy her. Air power can destroy Russia's war potential. From secret intelligence sources and by air reconnaissance we can learn the sites of her key industries. Our planes can fly the thousands of miles necessary to reach them, and return. We can take out Russia's steel industry, her oil supplies—the sinews and lifeblood of modern war. Air power can take out the bridges over her great rivers and paralyze her communications. With her railways out—there are practically no roads—Russia could not distribute food for the population.

These objectives—destruction of steel, oil, and communications facilities—are attainable. It is within our industrial capacity to build an Air Force to achieve them. We have the genius to build the best Air Force in the world. We have learned from the mistakes of the last war. If we eliminate all wasteful political expenditure, we can build such an Air Force within the limits of sound economy.

A decision to knock out Russia's war potential by air assault in no way should imply that only air power is necessary. We must continue to maintain a fleet which can control the seas. It is essential to our survival. So long as the fleet is in existence, Red forces—except relatively small airborne units—cannot invade the Western Hemisphere. But the fleet cannot deliver a knockout blow against Russia, for Russia cannot be blockaded.

The Army and Navy are important as formerly, but against Rusisa the weight of their roles has changed. They have become supporting arms for the Air Force. Against Russia and Army and Navy would seize, hold, and supply essential overseas bases from which air strikes may be unleashed against the heart of Russia.

REST SITES FOR OUR AIR BASES

We cannot hold bases in western Europe proper, except perhaps in Spain, but there are potential base sites which we can hold and from which any target in Russia could be destroyed, eventually, by our Air Force. Bases which can be held must have the incidental protection of mountains or deserts or bodies of water or combinations of these natural barriers.

The great Pyrenees Mountains barrier would make Spain a difficult operation for the Red Army. So, it would be well to tie Spain into our war strategy.

We may be compelled to consider Africa as a huge north-and-south approach to potential bases in Libya. These bases can be held. To take bases away from us in Libya would require an airborne invasion by the Red Army.

Such an operation is vulnerable to ground defense. In the defense of Crete, the British—though eventually overwhelmed—destroyed 80 percent of the German paratroopers.

In the Pacific we must hold the Aleutians, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines and possibly some lesser islands in the chain. If the Reds ever occupy this chain, or any great part of it, we will be denied the ocean approaches to Asia, and also bases from which to bomb important Red Asiatic centers. Possesison of these islands from Alaska to the Philippines is vital to our security.

From bases in Africa and in the Orient our long-range bombers can strike any target in Eurasia. The effectiveness of the Red air force interceptors is an unknown factor. Our newest bombers, refueled in flight, may be fast enough to evade interception, especially at night or in bad weather. But the chances are, if war comes we shall have to win the battle of the air over Russia first. This will require a long and costly advance of air bases in areas where natural barriers preclude a major engagement with the Red Army.

Our Air Force faces another assignment of magnitude. For the first time since 1812 our population centers will be endangered by a foreign power, if war with Russia comes. Fighter protection must be provided not only for our cities but for entire industrial areas; and the Air Force must help defend Alaska. It is all a vast and costly undertaking.

PROBLEMS OF WORLD POLICING

But war with Rusia is not the only threat to us. Our war in Korea could be merely the beginning of a series of critical disturbances. We are committed to lend assistance to certain peoples who oppose the spread of totalitarianism. Have we the means to do this?

Korea already has provided the answer. We simply have not the combat units, the manpower, nor the proper transport to police the world. Nor have we the wealth.

The forces we must create to deter Russia from waging war are not suitable for police action, nor can they be committed deeply, lest the real war be kindled.

To handle probable emergencies a United Nations task force should be tailor-made to meet any problem which might arise in Formosa, Japan, and the Philippines and possibly other areas in the Far East vital to the success of our cause. The force should be strong in manpower, equipped with small arms, and supported by medium bombers and fighters both land and sea-based. It should have tanks, cannon, and antitank weapons, all balanced to meet known conditions in given areas. Only a small fraction of the manpower can be recruited from the United States. Friendly Chinese, the Japanese, Filipinos and others in the Orient to whose protection we commit ourselves have ample volunteer manpower.

In the Middle East there should be created a second and larger United Nations task force, tailored to handle Communist uprisings in those troubled areas which we consider essential to the success of our cause. This Middle East task force could be trained in Libya. The manpower could be recruited from volunteers among displaced Russian nationals, and from German and Allied volunteers. The United States should furnish only a small unit. More than one-half million anti-Communist Russian displaced persons are political refugees in Europe, who will be destroyed if Stalin invades. They dare not return to Russia lest they be purged. Naturally they would be eager to join in what to them might be a crusade to liberate the enslaved Russian population.

These two task forces, with certain elements airborne, would be trouble shooters to quench insurrection and civil war in the Orient and Middle East—in areas which we consider vital to our security. In selecting these vital areas care must be taken not to place ourselves in the role of underwriting European colonial imperialism. Already Communist propaganda is effectively appealing to all Asia by branding us as imperialists.

These selected areas which are capable of being defended must be determined at once. The military should then be instructed to proceed with plans to defend them. If they can't be defended, as is clearly the case in Europe, the military must speak frankly and openly—and fearlessly.

The military preparation for the defense of these areas must be separate and distinct from the military force which we must have to deter Russia from war, and to strike her if war is forced upon us.

Were we to build without delay the best air force in the world and create United Nations task forces for the Far East and the Middle East, danger of war with Russia would be far less than now. On the other hand, if we continue to dissipate our means and follow present piecemeal, fuzzy policies, war is inevitable.

OUR TWO MOST POTENT WEAPONS

Total mobilization, universal military training, invocation of a full-scale draft and other related measures will not bluff Stalin. He fears neither our mobilization nor our manpower. He fears and respects only our air power and our power to project the truth through the iron curtain. Yet, we have continued not to build air supremacy, and we are neglecting an effective psychological campaign.

Because of our early reverses in Korea, the cry has already gone up: The airplane is merely an auxiliary weapon; jet planes are too fast for certain types of combat; we can win only with doughboys and more tanks than Stalin can build. The tendency among those charged with planning is to pull the Air Force down to the role of a supporting arm for land and sea forces. Congress seems in a mood to rubber-stamp the authorization for the President to spend vast sums at home and abroad, to move into total mobilization, to invoke a full-scale draft, to shape a vast army to handle local disturbances everywhere and to challenge the Red hordes of Asia as well as the Red army.

This would be precisely what Mr. Stalin wants. His own planners could not improve on the program. If we endeavor to handle local civil wars wherever they break out—as the President has indicated—we shall piecemeal our means and collapse our economy. If we accept combat with vast Red ground forces in Europe and Asia, our losses will mount into the millions and we shall fail.

Planning to keep the peace by force on a global scale is no amateur assignment. There was a time when rifles were our most effective weapon and military matters could be safely entrusted to the guidance of those without professional background. Today, however, with war the most complex phenomenon of our civilization, we continue to adhere to the political tradition of entrusting our national security to those with little or no military background. The President and State Department are making political commitments whose military implications are not only unsound but dangerous.

Of course, we have the Joint Chiefs of Staff to direct the complexities of war preparation, but their professional views have been subordinated to decisions of the White House and State Department. In spite of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the civilian leaders have taken us into one unsound military situation after another. And they are still doing it.

We should no longer allow this arrangement for global planning. To accept Stalin's challenge anywhere and everywhere that a Communist-inspired insurrection breaks out is playing into his hands. It makes us the victim of his cunning.

Stalin realizes far better than we that, if we build air supremacy, our air power can destroy his war potential. Consequently he has invented methods to get around this possibility. By creating ground combat wars about his vast periphery he proposes to bleed us white, while neutral Russia, free from air strikes, continues to produce munitions for her fighting satellites.

While our strength is thus being sapped, a creeping total mobilization program at home could spell disaster. The secret of American progress is free enterprise. Under it we have created abundance. Our liberty and individual freedom, our moral and spiritual aspirations all spring from this solid economic basis. Gradual total mobilization and war will destroy the abundance we have created, and with its destruction we shall lose our freedom.

OPPOSITION PARTY IS NEEDED

War hysteria is already revealing itself in the widespread demand that opposition to all Presidential measures be silenced as a patriotic duty. Nothing, not even defeat in battle, could harm us more. Unless a strong and challenging opposition party exists, the power of the executive branch becomes absolute. Then the administration thinks it has become infallible. When no one dares to oppose them, we are on the road to ruin.

The United States has only 6 percent of the world's population. It is time we took stock of where we are drifting. Unless we do this and create a plan to lift ourselves out of the certain danger which we face in the immediate future, it will be too late to save ourselves.

In shaping our Constitution our forefathers rightly subordinated military authority to civil. They had had enough of military conscription and domination in England and on the Continent.

Today, however, we find the civil branch of our Government abusing its power. The military has been subordinated to the extent that our national security is imperiled. Military leaders must be unshackled and permitted to express views freely on the military implications of our commitments.

If the Chief of Naval Operations was fired for expressing his views at a B–36 hearing before a congressional committee—at which he had been promised immunity—what would happen to a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who opposed Mr. Acheson in cooperating on defense proposals to Europe? Nevertheless, if we are to remain free, our military leaders, at the risk of their careers, must oppose measures which imperil our existence. In the final analysis it is the American people to whom they owe their loyalty.

We must have a dynamic strategic concept of how to survive. No longer can we afford to drift without sound, long-range planning and attainable objectives. No longer have we the resources to dole out to this ally or that former enemy. Our position is so precarious that every dollar and every soldier must be made to count. American economic and military aid to any friendly power must implement this over-all strategy. No longer do we dare squander our means for purposes which do not further this strategy.

We need a new dynamic strategy now. Its principal provisions should be:

1. Attainable political objectives backed by commensurate military might, including air supremacy and two United Nations task forces.

2. Improved intelligence agencies—the eyes of our defenses.

3. Assistance programs that further attainable objectives.

4. A sound domestic economy.

All this—and that other element that could be the most effective: Weakening the Kremlin dictatorship from within. This is our best chance to avoid war. It will hasten victory if war comes.

Army Dental Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a new Army dental bill, the enactment of which, in my opinion, is of vital concern to the morale and efficiency of the Dental Corps. Naturally this increased efficiency will be reflected in service to the recipients of Army dental treatment.

I realize that it is rather late in the session to expect any committee action; however, I sincerely trust that the Members will read the following explanation of the bill, and that quick, speedy, and favorable action may be taken shortly after the next Congress convenes.

EXPLANATION OF NEW ARMY DENTAL BILL

Section (1) amends the Army Organization Act of 1950 so as to designate the chief dental officer of the Army as "Chief of the Dental Corps." It makes him responsible to the Surgeon General and to the Secretary of the Army for making recommendations on all matters concerning the dental health of the Army.

There is presently no such title as Chief of the Dental Corps; however, the chief of corps title is held by the Army Nurse Corps—10 U. S. C. 165; the Medical Service Corps—10 U. S. C. 156 (b); and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps. The heads of the Veterinary and Medical Corps are not so designated.

This amendment is intended to fix the responsibility of the senior dental officer of the Army. It will not conflict with the theory of Army administration as announced by former Secretary Gray in the hearings on the Army Organization Act (Committee Print 187, House Armed Services Committee, 81st Cong., p. 6023), where he says: "We would like to see that the Congress does not prescribe for officers who are subject to the responsibility of the Secretary, duties and functions which he cannot change."

Throughout this bill an attempt is made to place the direct responsibility for any action upon the Secretary of the Army, but to express the sense of the Congress, which is a lawful superior of the Secretary of the Army, that the Secretary shall take steps to insure certain effects within the Army Dental Service. In this respect it is similar to the Navy dental bill of 1945.

Section (2) of the bill amends section 307 of the Army Organization Act. The first subsection of section 307 is changed only to the extent that the present name Army Medical Service is changed to Army Health Service. The term "medical' is not sufficiently comprehensive

to define the true meaning of the various health activities concentrated under the general jurisdiction of the Surgeon General of the Army. It is believed that the proposed name provides a more accurate denomination for this group of activities. The remainder of this subsection is new.

Subsection 307 (b) (I) requires the Secretary to fix the authorized strength of the Dental Corps at a number which will provide approximately two dental officers for each thousand personnel on active duty with the Army. The Officer Personnel Act of 1947—10 U. S. C. 506 (d)—provides that the Secretary of the Army shall determine the authorized active list of commissioned officers strength of each of the several corps of the Medical Department of the Regular Army. Section 307 (b) (I), as proposed in this bill, is consistent with the present law but is broader in its scope in that it fixes the ratio of dental officers in relation to active duty strength personnel instead of within the limits of authorized commissioned personnel. This ratio is consistent with the present policies of the Army.

Section 307 (b) (2) is entirely new. It attempts to solve the problem of providing an adequate number of trained dental assistants, hygienists and laboratory personnel for service with the Dental Corps. Since the Dental Corps consists exclusively of commissioned officers who are dentists, it would not be feasible to designate the additional personnel as members of that corps; however, it is believed that under the provisions of the bill sufficient numbers of necessary personnel, commissioned or enlisted, can be assigned for duty with dentists and that while so assigned they would be under the control of the Dental Corps. This section does not conflict with the Army policy of assigning personnel to duty by military occupational specialty number. This subsection is consistent with existing section 307 which provides that each corps of the medical service shall consist of regular Army officers appointed and commissioned therein and such other members of the Army as may be assigned thereto by the Secretary of the Army.

Section 307 (c) is derived from section 3 of the Navy dental law—5 U. S. C. 456 (c). It differs from the wording proposed in H. R. 3479, S. 1205, and S. 2380, but it is believed that the same effect will be accomplished and that it is desirable to have parallel wording for the various functions of the Dental Corps of the several services. The authority of the Secretary of the Army is not interfered with, but responsibility would be placed in the Chief of the Dental Corps to perform those functions which should inherently flow from his office and title.

Section 307 (d) is derived from Army Regulations 40–15 as promulgated on September 14, 1948, and which follows closely the sense of section (6) (c) of those regulations.

Section (3) is intended to insure that this act will extend to and cover the activities of Reserve officers of the Dental Corps when on active duty.

It is believed that this bill can be administered effectively by the Army without the necessity for substantial changes in its present organization; it will, however, give statutory backing to the organization of the dental services within the standard military framework, and will place proper emphasis upon the professional status of the dentists so that they will function within the Army with the same efficiency toward the health of the patient as does the civilian profession.

Honey Should Be Given Higher Support Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, believing that you will agree that the people should be kept informed on legislative measures passed in their benefit, I ask permission at this time to make a report to the beekeepers of my district.

When many people think of beekeepers, the first thing that comes to mind is honey. But I would like to remind my colleagues that honey is only a small part of the valuable contribution that honeybees make to the agricultural economy of the United States.

Far more important than the value of the honey is the part the bees play in pollinating many crops. Some crops are self-pollinating, but many others are incapable of pollinating themselves and require the activities of bees and other insects for the pollination that is necessary before fruit or seed can be produced.

It is estimated that about 50 important agricultural crops require insect pollination, and that bees are responsible for approximately 80 percent of the pollination activity. Among the crops that are dependent upon pollinating insects for full production of fruit or seed are apples, apricots, blackberries, cherries, cucumbers, grapes, muskmelons, peaches, strawberries, watermelons, alfalfa beans, cauliflower, and nearly all of our clovers.

In the past few years, the wild bees have disappeared to a great extent because of the destruction of their nesting places and the much more widespread general use of powerful insecticides. As a result, the average yield of alfalfa seed in the United States has decreased during the past 23 years from 3.59 bushels to 1.61 bushels per acre.

In many parts of the country, therefore, the hives of honeybees kept by farmers in the business of producing honey are almost the only solution to the problem of the necessary cross-pollination of our perennial legumes and other seed crops.

In order to have a bee population in the United States capable of doing the pollinating job, beekeepers must either receive direct payment for the pollination done by their bees or they must receive full and fair prices for the honey they have for sale, to make the operation of the hives profitable.

I have long favored adequate return for the beekeepers. When H. R. 29—providing price support—came to a vote in the House, I not only supported the bill myself but urged many of my colleagues to do the same.

Soon after the price-support measure passed the House, I received a message from C. S. McReynolds, president of the Minnesota Beekeepers' Association, from which the following quote is taken:

> I wish to express my thanks and appreciation for the part you had in the passage of H. R. 29 to place honey in the price-support program. I will acquaint the beekeepers of the Ninth District with it.

I strongly favored this price support because it means recognition for the honey industry like that given to other agricultural commodities. Price support also brings to the honey industry for the first time a stabilization of the honey market.

I am in hearty agreement with the four resolutions recently passed by the Executive Committee of the American Beekeeping Federation. These resolutions are:

First. That the American Beekeeping Federation has as its major objective for 1950 the development of methods and means whereby the pollination services of the honey bees pay a greater part of the cost of beekeeping.

Second. That the Federation urgently request the United States Department of Agriculture to make available to the honey industry sufficient funds to move through both the industry diversion and export subsidy programs approximately 20,000,000 pounds of honey.

Third. That the Federation request State and Federal agencies to place new and increased emphasis on research and on the dissemination of information relative to the problems of the package bee and queen industry of the United States.

Fourth. That the Federation work in full and complete cooperation with the Production and Marketing Adminstration, Department of Agriculture, to assist in the establishment and functioning of a support program for honey that will be of benefit to both the Government and to the entire bee and honey industry.

A portion of a letter which I recently received from Glenn O. Jones, secretary-treasurer of the American Beekeeping Federation, with offices at Atlantic, Iowa, will be of special interest to beekeepers. It follows:

> You may be sure the beekeepers appreciated the action of Congress in giving to honey the same recognition that is given to other important commodities. They were, however, a bit disappointed to have the USDA set a parity figure that was at least 1½ cents below any previously given and then to grant support at the very minimum of 60 percent of this new, and low, parity.
>
> With world conditions as they are, we do not expect to ask further changes in the honey support program this year. It is, of course, entirely possible that the near future will see controls and ceilings that will affect us as an industry and that we will want to have a part in determining. In that case I know we can depend upon you for further good advice and assistance.

I am convinced that the decision of this Congress to help the honey industry

will have a far-reaching effect upon the programs of soil conservation, soil fertility, and the retirement of cash-crop lands to grasses and legumes.

As the Congressman from the Ninth District of Minnesota, I want to assure the many beekeepers and honey producers of my fullest interest and cooperation in getting congressional attention to their situation, and in getting consideration of their problems. I am at their service at any time.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a leading Montana newspaper, the Bozeman Daily Chronicle, making certain comments regarding communism, and containing some quotations from that great American whom we all remember with so much pride, the late Will Rogers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Bozeman (Mont.) Daily Chronicle of September 10, 1950]

A LIFE WORK BASED ON COMPLAINT

Whenever he can get his mind off trout fishing, my friend Harry, who has the stool next to mine at the coffee counter, can usually nudge you on to a line of thought that opens up some interesting vistas.

The other day we got to talking about the delightful new autobiography of Will Rogers—the part where Will, writing from Moscow in 1926, is telling about how a Russian "is never as happy in his life as when he is miserable," and says:

"Communism to me is one-third practice and two-thirds explanation. * * * This guy Marx * * * could explain to you how you could save a million dollars, and he couldn't save enough for himself to eat on. * * * He never did a tap of work—only write propaganda * * * for the dissatisfied. The dissatisfied is the fellow who don't want to do any manual labor. He always wants to figure out where he and his friends can get something for nothing. * * * A Communist's whole life work is based on complaint. * * * When they are running everything themselves, why, that takes away their chief industry. They have nobody to blame it on. Even if he is satisfied with it, why, he is miserable because he has nothing to complain about. * * * You make one satisfied, and he is no longer a Communist."

Kicking that around for a while brought us to some tentative conclusions as to why the revolutionists who set up utopias never seem to get the hang of running them properly. The main reason for that, it seemed to us, is that if a man is smart enough to adapt himself successfully to any given set of conditions he never has much reason to become a revolutionist.

The man who has the intelligence and ability to make an economic system work tends to be conservative. He has what it takes to get along under any set of ground rules you lay down for him. No matter how much you push him around, he will come out sooner or later smelling like a rose. Since he is likely to be doing all right for himself under the existing rules, he seldom will see any compelling reason for changing them.

It is the man who isn't satisfied with the way he personally is doing in the current game who puts up the howl to redistribute the marbles and start over. And he might just as well sit tight and save his breath, for he doesn't have what it takes to hang onto his marbles under any other system, either.

This may be an odd way to look at things for a couple of fellows who, the same as everybody else, like to think of themselves as intelligent and progressive in their outlook. But that's the way it seemed to Harry and yours truly when we left it.

Of course, we were pretty well tanked up on coffee at the time and had no supporting data readily at hand. So the theory is not yet ready for distribution through the retail outlets.

But some day we're going to check it against the records and see how it stands up.

Need for Improved Radio Service for the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Improved Radio Service Needed," published in the May 1950 issue of Farm and Ranch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVED RADIO SERVICE NEEDED

Our farm population has given only casual notice to Senate bill 491. But, if resolved into law, this bill would deprive them of much of the radio broadcasting service they now receive and would prevent badly needed improvement, by doing away with clear-channel stations, as such.

In the South there are vast regions where radio reception never has been consistently good. Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, recently said, "This is a big country, and a lot of people live in it. Some twenty millions of those people never had adequate radio service." Chairman Coy's statement points up the most important unsolved problem of Federal regulation of broadcasting, namely, how to provide those millions in rural areas with service somewhere approaching that provided city listeners. Until this problem 's solved, radio-set owners in most of the rural South must be content with continued unstable reception and limited program choice.

It is only proper, therefore, that we fight for the continuance of clear-channel stations which reach into many rural regions. The spokesman for these stations says: "There is only one effective way to remedy this defect. It is by retaining what are known as clear-channel stations and permitting them to increase their power so as to provide improved service."

Fur Farmers Deserve More Stable Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district in northwestern Minnesota there are many fur farmers. During the years that I have been in the Congress, I have had many contacts with these men, for they have naturally taken a great interest in legislation that would have direct bearing on the fur-farming industry. Therefore, as the Eighty-first Congress nears adjournment, I desire permission to make a report to them as a group—a report similar to the report to the people made by the President on his western tour recently.

These fur farmers in my district make a business of growing fur-bearing animals in captivity. The furs produced on a commercial scale are mostly fox and mink. The fox and mink farms range in size from a few animals providing employment for only one person up to large organizations employing a dozen or more persons.

However, the great majority of these farms are small family-size enterprises on which the owner, with his family, does all the work. Many of these Minnesota people have pioneered the fur-farming industry.

Two conditions under the present Democratic administration have been of great detriment to the fur farmers. They are the 20 percent Federal excise tax and the unusual amount of foreign furs that have come into the United States since the end of the war.

As a result of these two factors, the Nation's efficient and industrious fur-farmers are producing only about 66,000 silver fox skins a year. This is only about one-fifth of the annual silver fox production prior to 1945. Valuable equipment used in silver fox farming is standing idle. Many men who have been engaged in this work have been required to turn to other employment.

Mink farmers are in just a little better position, due to the popularity of mink in recent years. But I must caution that even a very moderate decline in general prosperity, combined with the 20 percent tax, will force many of the mink farmers out of business.

It takes no great logic to figure out that this 20 percent tax is an unfair burden. Only a few industries have been singled out to pay this heavy sales tax while other industries no more essential than fur farming slide by tax-free.

For example, high-priced tailor-made clothing for both men and women, expensive hats, special box candies, and many other articles of a luxury nature escape excise taxes entirely.

The Democratic administration has been overlooking the fundamental principle of taxation in a democracy—tnat taxes should be levied with equality.

And while I am speaking in behalf of the fur farmers, let us not overlook the

important subject of fur imports. While our industrious fur farmers are struggling to make an honest living in the true American way, the Democratic administration is tightening a stranglehold on them by permitting huge imports of furs from Soviet Russia. Much of these foreign furs come in free under trade agreements—there is no tariff on them at all. Such discrimination must end.

Statistics that I obtained just a few days ago from the United States Tariff Commission show that the total fur imports increased more than 94 percent between 1940 and 1945. This was an increase from $73,661,564 in 1940 to $143,474,260 in 1945. In the first 6 months of this year the total fur imports—with no tariff—were $46,400,000. Of this amount $11,118,000 came from the Soviet Union. Who is getting the better break here—the fur farmer in Minnesota or the one in Russia?

Of interest to fur farmers especially, in connection with my efforts to cooperate with the various organizations, are the following extracts from a letter I received under date of September 1 from David W. Henderson, member, executive committee, National Board of Fur Farm Organizations:

> Your letter of August 8 last was just opened since I have been out of town for some time. I am no longer active in the Mink Breeders Association of the United States, but am taking the liberty of forwarding your letter to Mr. Henry H. Tufford, of Minneapolis, who is very conversant with Minnesota affairs through his guidance of the Fur Farmers Cooperative Association.
>
> It is gratifying to know that you and other Members of the House and Senate have given some consideration to the plight of fur farmers, who, by and large represent a solid and considerable factor in the readjustment of agricultural by-products and surplus land and labor in our national economy.

In conclusion, I wish to remind the Minnesota fur farmers that if I am returned to Congress in January, I shall continue to fight for the repeal of these unfair taxes and I will work to prevent imports that are threatening the ruination of our fur industry.

I also want to advise the fur farmers of my district that they may secure from my Crookston office copies of booklets on Diseases of Fur Animals and Home Tanning of Leather and Small Fur Skins. Also available is a leaflet on Hygiene in Fox Farming. There is no charge for these publications.

On the Philippine Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the New York Times, on September 11, carried a very interesting and informative editorial on the economic and political conditions—and the dangers—existing in the Philippines. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE PHILIPPINE FRONT

It seems generally agreed that President Truman was right when he stated that a part of our Asiatic policy would be to strengthen the defenses of the Philippines. The immediate need, however, is not merely military. At the present time the Bell mission is concluding its survey of the economic needs of the Philippine Republic and will make corresponding recommendations. But the Philippine front is so critical that it may be wise for Congress to take some action even before the Bell report is formulated.

The big problem in the Philippines is short-range economic instability. The United States has put quite a bit of money into the archipelago since the Japanese surrender, but much of it has gone into consumer goods. Full-scale rehabilitation has not yet been brought about and the Government is operating in the red. One result has been the necessity for drastic import controls. Meanwhile, there has been so great a drain on monetary reserves that the stability of the currency is threatened.

There are at least two things that the United States can do, immediately, that will be of great assistance. First, we can create a currency stabilization fund for the Philippines that will remove all doubt about the position of the peso. There is ample precedent for such an action in the case of Mexico, and the Philippine need is greater. Second, Congress can adopt legislation now pending that will provide for the payment of approved war damage claims up to about 75 percent. The additional income for the Philippines, about a hundred million dollars, can be channeled directly into rehabilitation, and its fiscal as well as psychological effect should be salutary.

There is need for prompt action. The Philippine Government is in a shaky position, not because of any failure of the democratic process but because of an economic imbalance resulting from war, occupation, and the uncoordinated way in which American help has been given thus far. That trouble can be remedied if we will move quickly. The longer-range problems can certainly be solved through Philippine resources, Filipino skills and the sympathetic cooperation of the United States. But our democratic front in Asia is imperiled and we must move immediately to strengthen it.

Work of Subcommittee on Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article dealing with the work of the Preparedness Subcommittee. I have been very much impressed by the work of this subcommittee, which I believe is doing much to see to it that our Nation is properly prepared for any eventualities we may have to face.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE TASK FORCES DELVING INTO DEFENSE COSTS—SENATE INVESTIGATORS TO SCAN DEALINGS WITH FOREIGN CARTELS

(By John G. Norris)

Five Senate task forces start this week on broad investigations into the American defense effort which will have ramifications in every part of the Nation and far parts of the globe.

One, it was disclosed yesterday, will probe into the effect foreign cartels have on the quantity we can get and price we must pay for scarce material required for the rearmament program, and what can be done about it where the monopolies are controlled by our allies.

They are being undertaken by the Senate preparedness subcommittee—a new congressional "watchdog" of our military program patterned closely after the old Truman War Investigating Committee.

As set up with a no politics, no headline-hunting procedure, the investigations promise to become a major element in the Nation's rearming plan.

DISCLOSED BY SENATOR JOHNSON

Here is the ambitious interrogation program of the preparedness subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee as disclosed yesterday by its chairman, Senator LYNDON D. JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas):

1. A probe into how the recent tripling of the price of natural rubber and other price advances of foreign-produced strategic and critical materials may affect our efforts to rearm ourselves and our allies. "Can ECA be made a two-way street to help remedy the situation?" they ask.

2. A careful survey as to whether we have enough steel capacity in the United States for probable future armament programs, plus domestic use, and if not, what must we do to meet it?

3. An on-the-spot probe of our Alaska defenses—recently described by General Eisenhower and others as perhaps our weakest military link. Senator LESTER HUNT (Democrat, Wyoming) yesterday was named chairman of the group's Alaskan problems. Other members are Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (Republican, Massachusetts) and Senator WAYNE MORSE (Republican, Oregon). Col. Justice M. (Joe) Chambers of the Senate Armed Services Committee's professional staff, with an investigator, will go to Alaska late this month. The Senators will join them later.

CHECK ON ORDNANCE

4. An investigation into questions, particularly into how willing Ordnance has been to accept outside ideas plus its relations with the field and equipment boards of the using arms, as well as the Research and Development Board. Other sources indicated the probers would want to now why the new 3.5-inch bazooka and other new weapons were not in the hands of troops when the Korean War started.

JOHNSON will head this "task force" of the preparedness subcommittee, assisted by Senators ESTES KEFAUVER (Democrat, Tennessee) and STYLES BRIDGES (Republican, New Hampshire). Col. Mark Galusha, of the committee staff, will head the investigation.

5. A broad manpower study, with particular attention paid to "when, how, and what changes must be made in the Draft Act." The group also is charged with drafting a new universal military training bill by next January.

Senator JOHNSON has not yet named subcommittees or "task forces" to go into the manpower, critical-material, and steel studies, but work is getting under way on these probes.

Committee members, who already have made a study of the rubber situation, are concerned about world price changes in this and other scarce materials. They point out that rubber, nickel, tin, mercury, industrial diamonds, and other materials not produced in the United States but vital to our security come almost entirely from countries with which we are linked by defense pacts and to most of which we are giving economic or military aid.

RIGIDLY CONTROLLED

In many cases, they state, the quantity produced and price is rigidly controlled by monopoly corporations of our allies. This affects not only our stock-piling program but also our armaments production for both ourselves and these same allies. Recent price changes could add many hundreds of millions of dollars to American spending.

Some Senators feel a government-to-government approach, tied in with ECA, might help in this field. While ECA has worked on this and brought in stockpile materials under the counterpart program, there is feeling that much more could be done.

For the present, the Johnson committee's small staff plans basic studies in the field of steel and critical materials, using information on file with Government agencies as far as possible. One element in the steel study which interests some of the Senators is whether the industry is too greatly concentrated from a security viewpoint, in case of heavy bombing raids.

There are no immediate plans to call in leaders of the steel industry for hearings on the adequacy of our present plants, though this is likely before the probe is complete.

Hearings on the Army ordnance investigation are expected to start next month. Preliminary work already is under way. The Alaskan study will include such questions as possible subversive elements in the labor movement there. Strikes have delayed some military construction. Housing and the progress on the radar net also are scheduled for close scrutiny.

The seven-man Senate subcommittee already has done yeoman work in its watchdog capacity. Named late in July by the Senate to maintain a "continuous watchfulness" over all defense matters, the group last week submitted its first report. It concerned rubber stockpiling and the disposal of surplus property.

While the report did not make page one—too often the sole objective of congressional investigating bodies—the Preparedness Subcommittee had the satisfaction of knowing that its efforts had:

(1) Helped in doubling the projected rate of synthetic rubber production in the United States; (2) stopped the sale of at least one, and perhaps four, synthetic rubber plants for conversion to other use which had been declared surplus before the Korean crisis and apparently forgotten by military planners; (3) ended the disposal of aircraft parts at one Air Force base where there was evidence that the United States Air Force was buying similar products elsewhere for many times the money; (4) put a bug in the ear in many a defense official, particularly in the Munitions Board, by their criticism of "business as usual" attitude and "siesta psychology" at the Pentagon.

Veterans on Capitol Hill who had watched the Truman committee and other investigating bodies liked the approach of the new Preparedness Committee. They noted that its chief counsel was a man with unusual experience in Government. He is a high-placed official from downtown on loan part-time to the group without pay—Donald C. Cook, Vice Chairman of the SEC.

Cook, a George Washington law graduate, who lives at 2800 Woodley Road, served in a similar capacity to the old House Naval Affairs Investigating Subcommittee during the war. The then Representative LYNDON JOHNSON was chairman of the group.

JOHNSON, a lanky, tireless Texan, one of the youngest of Senators, laid down these rules for his preparedness committee: (1) We will not hunt headlines; (2) politics must be left at the committee door; (3) we'll be blunt but not unfair; (4) we won't try to be Monday morning quarterbacks on battle-front strategy, but stick to defense problems at home.

Much of the success of the subcommittee's watchfulness program, Senators feel, will depend upon how the executive agencies receive their prodding and criticism. A defensive argumentativeness on large and small points can only lead to unnecessary committee crackdowns. A willingness to admit mistakes and correct them quickly, on the other hand, would speed its job.

Benefits for Old Folks and Pioneers Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, following out a policy which has been established for many years past and which more recently was carried out by our President, I desire to make a report of my activities during the present term in Congress to the elderly people of my district.

I refer to the hardy pioneers, our "old folks" who, through years of faithful labor, have developed the fertile farmlands and the industries of northwest Minnesota. The scores of letters that come into my office come from these elderly people, clearly indicate that they are not spending their "twilight of life" just resting in the rocking chair—their letters show that most of them still have a keen interest in the current social, economic, and political problems of today. They are very disappointed in the failure to increase the Federal portion of old-age assistance.

In opening this report, I quote two brief paragraphs from letters that will be of special interest to the elderly people of my district. I think that these quotes clearly show that the problems of the aged are of a most definite interest to me:

Accept my personal gratitude to you for your splendid cooperation in furthering the interests of our Townsend-plan bill * * * you are among those who have distinguished themselves as fair-minded and democratic citizens.

DR. FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND,
Founder and President, the Townsend Plan.

Be sure that we appreciate the support you have given the Townsend program in the past and as usual we want to offer our wholehearted cooperation to the end that we may be able to develop for America a program of national mutual insurance which will take care of the needs of all the people.

HERBERT F. HAREN,
Director of Promotion, the Townsend Plan.

My interest in the problems that face the aged in our modern society dates back many years. One of my most specific statements on the subject was made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD back in February 1946. I quote here my remarks that were printed then under the heading of "Aged entitled to pension—not a dole":

Mr. Speaker, during these flush days when the present administration is willing and anxious to loan billions of dollars to most any nation in the world, we are continuing to ignore the older people of our own country who are existing on as little as $14 and $20 a month pension.

Many people who are entitled to old-age assistance will not even apply for it for two major reasons: First, our State and Federal Government so grudgingly hand out a mere pittance in many instances that often it is obvious that pensions are in fact a dole and nothing more; and, secondly, in some States, including Minnesota, the State has laws called homestead liens which require persons applying for old-age assistance to execute a lien upon their property and give it to the State and Federal Government, with the view to wholly or partially diverting that property into the hands of the State and Federal Governments at a time of their death in payment for the pension.

A further reason is the hostile attitude of some of the employees of the program toward old people.

Five years ago, when our old folks were finding their assistance checks insufficient to meet the tide of rising prices, I introduced a bill for their benefit. This bill provided a 20-percent increase for the duration of the war in the amount of Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and in the amount of Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the Social Security Act. The provisions of this bill have since been revised and included to a limited extent in later legislation.

During the present Congress, I have always given wholehearted support to all legislation that would improve conditions for our aged citizens. On two occasions I have signed petitions to take the Townsend legislation from the Ways and Means Committee and bring the measure to the floor of the House of Representatives. I have not only signed these petitions myself, but I have urged my colleagues in the Congress to do the same.

Although I realized that the social-security patch-up bill is inadequate to meet the needs of our people today, I supported the measure, for it is a step in the right direction. This bill will hike benefits to some on an average of 77½ percent. For example, the bill would raise old-age-insurance benefits from the present average of $26 to $45 a month. The maximum family benefit would be $150 rather than the present $85. Benefit payments will increase from the present $800,000,000 annually to $2,100,000,000—these go to workers now retired and to survivors of those who die.

However, more than 100,000,000 people will still be left unprotected by the improved social-security set-up. Even the increased benefits are inadequate at today's prices, and taxes to support the

program will continue to hit hardest those who can least afford to pay. The bill fails to increase old-age-assistance benefits at all.

In addition to my activities in Washington in behalf of our aged people, I have on many occasions contacted my friends in the State legislature at St. Paul, urging passage of State legislation that would aid our old folks. This I did as an interested citizen of the State of Minnesota.

I hope that I have made it clear in this report that I fully realize that the Nation has the duty to lighten the burden of old age; that it is the human as well as the patriotic thing to do. I have not forgotten the debt owed these men and women whom we once cherished as healthy, productive, enterprising, valuable citizens. We must provide a just and fair expression of concern in a tangible way for our old folks. The right way is increased money payments to those receiving old-age assistance.

It is a shame that this Congress, controlled as it is by a large majority of Democrats, has not provided the necessary Federal program and appropriations so the needy and deserving old folks can receive a larger monthly payment. Prices and costs have risen and they need more now to pay for groceries, fuel, and other necessary things. The blame for the failure of favorable legislation for our pioneers, of course, rests squarely on the Democrats and their supporters and followers.

As for myself, I pledge to these good citizens my continued fight and full efforts in this and succeeding Congresses, if I am reelected, to secure larger old-age-assistance payments which they deserve.

Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Our Flag," written by Albert Ralph Korn.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FLAG

Raise to the waiting breeze our flag,
Unfurl it far and wide;
Let all who view that noble sight
Lift up their heads with pride.

We who abide beneath its fold
And worship our own God
Fear not the tyrant's burning lash,
Free on our sacred sod.

We are the favored of the earth,
The masters of our fate.
Take pause from life's unceasing round
Our flag to venerate.

—*Albert Ralph Korn.*

Attempt by John Libed To Reenlist in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the United Press carried on September 12 a very interesting article by Mr. James Cunningham dealing with the problems of a young man, son of a United States Navy veteran, and himself a veteran of World War II, who is trying to reenlist in the United States Army to fight in Korea, but who is having his troubles in reaching a recruiting station. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, September 12.—You think you've got trouble with your draft board?

What about John Libed, with internationality involved? The United States Army reached all the way to Turkey to draft him in World War II. He served 2 years and got an honorable discharge.

Now, he is free, 25, and has been 3 years trying to join up again.

But after voyaging half way around the world—from Istanbul to Manila—to try, he still can't seem to get within a thousand miles of a United States recruiting station.

His problem is citizenship. Should he salute the Stars and Stripes, the Philippine or the Turkish flag? Until someone decides or lets him visit his father in this country, John can't answer reveille.

The father, a retired United States Navy veteran, lives in Puerto Rico. So the government of that United States Territory has taken a hand. Resident Commissioner ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico's representative, says, "It's the darndest snarl of internationality I ever saw. But I'm going to see if the State Department can't straighten it out."

According to affidavits from the boy and his father, John was born in Istanbul. His mother was Greek. His father, Eduardo, was a Filipino on duty with the United States Navy.

They were married in Turkey but Eduardo left with the fleet after John's birth. He became a United States citizen, retired from the Navy in 1945 and settled in San Juan.

That was the year the draft caught up with his son John's troubles started. One day in April 1945, the United States consul in Istanbul ordered him to a United States induction center in Heliopolis, Egypt.

He joined up there on April 17. After service in the United States Army's Middle East Command, he was transferred to Germany. At Bremerhaven he tried to straighten out his citizenship.

The Army was puzzled. And section 701 of the United States Nationality Act, they said, bars naturalization of foreign-born soldiers who were inducted on foreign soil.

So they sent John back to Turkey and discharged him on April 18, 1947. He tried to reenlist. No luck. The Army wasn't recruiting in Europe.

Finally, on January 29, 1949, according to John, the State Department advised him by memorandum to go to Manila. He couldn't come to the States. He had GI benefits coming. Rules prohibit entry of persons who may become public charges.

But in the Philippines, the Department advised, he could enlist in the Philippine Scouts—a United States Army component, dating from preindependence days. From there he might transfer to the stateside United States Army.

John invested his savings in a ticket. By March he was in Manila. But by then the United States had disbanded the Scouts.

The frustrated would-be GI was perplexed and broke. Red Cross Far East Field Directors Harold A. Kirk and Jerry Gutman arranged United States veterans' benefits to keep him in food and clothes.

But they told Puerto Rican government authorities in an open letter that the United States consulate in Manila cannot seem to get him to the States. Meanwhile, his VA entitlement was running out, and his dream of a United States uniform was turning into a globe-girdling nightmare, they said.

Resident Commissioner FERNÓS-ISERN has obtained an affidavit from the youth's father. Eduardo promises not to let John become an expense to the United States Government.

With this he hopes to persuade the State Department to tell its Manila consul to grant Libed a visa. The Red Cross representatives believed that, once here, he might be declared a United States citizen after all.

Community Builds Own Clinic and Gets Young Doctor by Cooperative Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, an example of community cooperation on the part of the business people, citizens, and farmers nearby, is well shown by the efforts and success of the community of Oklee, Minn., in building and providing for a community clinic and getting a new doctor for their community.

The story is well told in the special article written for the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune and published on April 2, 1950.

It follows:

FIVE YEARS WITHOUT DOCTOR, OKLEE BUILDS OWN CLINIC

OKLEE, MINN.—Residents of this community of 500-plus population no longer have to drive 25 miles to get their pills prescribed—or have their appendixes removed or tonsils X-rayed.

For the first time in more than 5 years they can get complete medical care from the town's own doctor rather than drive to Thief River Falls, Crookston, or Fosston.

This town had been without adequate medical services since Dr. W. B. Torgerson, the community's only doctor, became an invalid about 5 years ago, according to O. M. Sundrud, publisher of the Oklee Herald.

CAMPAIGN STARTED

About 2 years ago a campaign was started to persuade a doctor to come to the town. But to interest doctors it was found that modern facilities had to be provided.

No longer were doctors willing to operate on kitchen tables as a regular thing or diagnose cases without X-ray equipment.

A nonprofit group, called the Oklee Community Hospital Association, was formed and plans were drawn for a modern, well-equipped medical clinic. Actual construction of the $34,000 building was started last August.

In December, Dr. F. L. Behling moved here from Moorhead, Minn. He'll rent space in the clinic. Associated with him is Minnie Stoneouse, registered nurse who took training at Minneapolis General Hospital.

Space has been provided for a dentist's office and the association is now seeking a resident dentist for the town. Also, there is a heated ambulance garage and it is hoped that an ambulance to go in it can be acquired soon.

ORGANIZATIONS HELP

Some of the equipment in the building, besides the X-ray machine, are an electrocardiograph unit for graphical heart readings, basal metabolor for measuring oxygen consumption and a diathermy machine.

The local camp, Woodmen of the World, paid for furnishing the waiting room; the American Legion Auxiliary contributed; the Oklee Study Club furnished drapes. Other organizations contributed money and services.

Sundrud is president of the hospital association. Other officers are W. B. Seeger, vice president; Joe Dufault, secretary; A. D. Collette, treasurer, and Ole Sovde and K. R. Rolandson, directors.

Cargo for Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to shipments to Russia that aided Russian communism in its march on Manchuria, China, Korea, and the rest of the world, the stockpiling for such operations of communism was merrily going on in December 1947, when the President called a special session of Congress to stop communism, and I am including my remarks of December 10, 1947:

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress is in special session, called by the President for the avowed purpose of keeping down communism in Europe and keeping down prices, the Secretary of Commerce is continuing to permit commodities of every kind and description to go through to Russia, making our own supply scarcer and the prices higher. On November 18, 1947, while the House was in special session at the call of the President demanding hundreds of millions of dollars to stop communism, the Russian-named ship U. S. S. R. steamship *Mikhail Kutuzov*, owned by the Government of the United States, being the former United States flag ship named *Graham Taylor*, left the Atlantic coast for Russia with electrical machinery and apparatus, car wheels, construction machinery, metallic working machinery, and other items, as follows:

Russian steamship "Mikhail Kutuzov"
(Cleared from New York Nov. 18, 1947, for Odessa)

Principal items of cargo and value:	
Sisal rope	$43,439
Other nonmetallic minerals	19,952
Railway car wheels	59,000
Electrical machinery and apparatus	634,030
Engines, turbines, and parts	56,604
Construction and conveying machinery	82,534
Mining, well, and pumping machinery	267,162
Metalworking machinery	594,361
Other industrial machinery	656,971
Agricultural machinery and implements	307,555
Automobiles, parts, other vehicles and parts	239,550
Chemical specialties	6,942
Scientific and professional instruments, apparatus, and supplies	249,280
Commodities exported for relief or charity	1,954
Miscellaneous commodities	12,123
Lend-lease: Mining, well, and pumping machinery	11,475
UNRRA: Miscellaneous commodities	26,520
Total	3,269,452

And further on December 4, 1947, the Russian-named ship U. S. S. R. steamship *Novorossisk* owned by the Government of the United States and formerly the United States flag ship *Edward Eggleston* left Longview, Wash., on the Pacific coast for Russia, with cargo as follows:

Cargo laden on the U. S. S. R. steamship "Novorossisk" (former "Edward Eggleston") at Longview, Wash.

	Weight	Value
	Pounds	
17 cases of spare parts for can-making machine	38,581	$154,096
256 boxes of spare parts for Diesel engines	32,945	110,815
1,000 pieces of sheet steel piling	3,669,559	153,291
1,082 pieces of tie rods, turnbuckles, and nuts	1,615,070	113,718
36 pieces of head cone crusher and spares for crushers fork	279,761	81,818
12 crates of jaw crushers and spares	56,570	16,105
5 boxes of crane steam locomotive, in bond from Canada	240,260	40,000
2 boxes of clamshell buckets, in bond from Canada	8,400	3,000
414 cases of complete dump trucks	2,002,385	228,178
16 cases of electrical testing equipment	3,690	8,740
18 pieces of flotation machine and electric motors and spares	55,740	15,990
2 boxes of filter presses and spares	1,364	615
11 boxes of spectrograph equipment	2,965	5,735
10 boxes of steel dredge pumps	71,650	19,299
20 spare parts for Marion model 840 machine	59,874	39,882
15 pieces of complete stone crusher	148,325	53,111
1 box of impellers for turbine pump	250	1,402
62 pieces of electric shovels and spares	116,694	33,111
20 boxes of steel vertical pumps and spares	124,340	32,239
2 boxes of deep-well turbine pump and spares	1,650	1,068
33 pieces of Symons standard cone crushers	184,195	81,280
10 packages of model 480 power shovel and parts	37,360	18,994
17 boxes of Slurry pumps and spares	39,572	13,564
95 pieces of ore-crusher parts	97,784	41,539
69 pieces of deep-well turbine pump and parts	27,315	9,893
21 boxes of engine parts	3,546	23,819
21 drums of steel grinding balls	39,900	1,741
96 boxes of drill rods	100,586	30,676
16 cases of electrical equipment	3,478	10,129
2 cases of motor generator set and parts	2,180	2,329
8 cases of pumps, motor and parts	30,000	43,532

Cargo laden on the U. S. S. R. steamship "Novorossisk" (former "Edward Eggleston") at Longview, Wash.—Continued

	Weight	Value
	Pounds	
2 boxes of spare parts for shovel	490	$471
18 pieces of crawler chain shovels	197,135	57,983
276 boxes of continuous drill rods	256,222	80,152
8 boxes of electric motors and switches	3,240	1,681
136 pieces of manganese steel feed and shell liners	116,403	17,356
8 cases of motor and drive assembly for Wemco Lohead conditioner spare parts and (2) deep welded steel tanks	14,690	2,786
89 packages of core drill rods	82,030	24,435
101 packages of march ball mill and spare parts	298,903	69,655
92 boxes of drill rods	84,955	25,259
cases of pumps	10,000	14,000

Mr. Speaker, this is all in the face of nearly $300,000,000 worth of exports to U. S. S. R. during the period from June 1946 through September 1947, and further in addition to $563,000,000 exports in 1945, of which only $26,000,000 were commercial, the rest being gifts, of nearly $400,000,000 in 1946 of which $64,000,000 were commercial and the rest being gifts; and of nearly $114,000,000 from January 1947 through September 1947, of which $66,000,000 were commercial and the rest being gifts, Mr. Speaker, flaunting to the public such exports to Russia making our supply short and the prices high, and the President demanding special aid to stop communism, it is inconsistent with the call of the special session by the President to have his appointees go merrily on sending goods to Russia even in the ships owned and paid for by the taxpayers of the United States and ships Russia does not return.

Beer for Combat Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter and article that I have received from Mrs. A. Politano, 2 Shawmit Place, Chelsea, Mass.:

CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE.

DEAR SIR: I'm writing in regard to the clipping you find in this envelope. I want you to think, after you read the piece, as a mother of a GI now serving in Korea. My son wrote me when he was leaving Japan that all the boys had a can of beer in their hand, why? I know why, because they were leaving for Korea and the band was playing Over There. The men all cried, yet that can of beer kept them up. No mother wants her son to be a drunk, but I'm sure one small can of beer means a lot to a tired fighting, weary GI. As a mother, not only for my son, but all sons, please don't stop that little can of beer. The Catholic chaplain had the right idea. It takes men like him to really know how the boys feel, as he is the man that really never leaves his duty to God of standing by every GI, and believe me, as a mother it isn't the easiest thing in this troubled world to take as my son, my only son and my livelihood is in Korea, and God only knows one little can of beer won't hurt him but will keep up his morale. Why should others with pockets that jingle get it.

How about the poor boy who doesn't have pockets that jingle? This is America the beautiful, America the free, let's help our boys. I'm sure a few cases of beer can be placed somewhere on some ships. Remember the fishermen who went fishing and their nets were with so few. The good Lord saw to it that the fish nets were blessed with many a fish for all the poor. Let a little space carry a small can of beer to my son, all sons of mothers, whose hearts ache with the troubled world, knowing somewhere in Korea a son is fighting for all our freedom, for our beautiful America.

Mrs. POLITANO.

GI's BLAST HALTING OF FREE BEER—SAY PUBLIC AT HOME FAILS TO REALIZE ITS PURPOSE

(By Stan Swinton)

SOMEWHERE IN KOREA, September 12.—A howl of protest from the American front lines today greeted the Army's ban of free beer for combat troops.

MAJOR FAVORS BAN

Combat men have been receiving a ration of one small tin of beer daily. The Army said it acted because of adverse public opinion in the United States.

Henceforth beer will be available only to soldiers with change jingling in their pockets or with comrades free to make shopping trips behind the lines.

An unofficial survey uncovered only one person in favor of the decision. Maj. J. R. Woodbridge of Lynchburg, Va., defended the order this way:

"I love beer as much as anyone. But that space in ships can be used for ammunition and essential war matériel."

Said Catholic Chaplain W. A. Ziogar of Harrisburg, Penn.:

"Everyone looked forward to that one can of beer. It was the great relaxation of the day up front. People at home must have misunderstood the situation if they asked that the ration be halted."

Congress Again Shows Greatest Foresight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House by a vote of 324 to 9, sent H. R. 9490, the Subversives Control Act of 1950, to conference. Obviously some of the 20 who voted against this measure 2 weeks ago, including one Member from my State, Wisconsin, have seen the error of their ways. I submit herewith a pertinent editorial by G. H. Koenig which appeared in the September 12 issue of the Waukesha Freeman:

CONGRESS AGAIN SHOWS GREATEST FORESIGHT

The administration's milk-toast bill to control subversives in this country was recently defeated by an overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives and in its place the House adopted the Wood bill which is an improved version of the former Mundt-Nixon measure. Only 20 House votes were registered against it. The single Wisconsin Congressman who opposed the harsher Communist-control measure was Representative BIEMILLER, of Milwaukee. On the heels of that action is the Senate's almost certain approval of one of the toughest control bills ever to see the light of day. Supporters of the McCarran antisubversive measure claim there will be no more than a dozen votes against it. Sentiment in both Houses of Congress is so in favor of clamping down on Communist activity in this country that strength is being mustered to pass the final draft over the President's veto, if that becomes necessary. President Truman has already served notice he will not sign the bill.

As in so many other instances having to do with the security of the Nation, Congress is ahead of the administration in security legislation. There is no reason for dealing softly with Communist forces in the United States while we battle them abroad with arms and ammunition and billions of our national wealth. That is the feeling of Congress which presently is so concerned with setting up the proper safeguards against subversive home-front activities. Congress on previous occasions has been months ahead of the President and his advisers on questions of national defense. We need only to go back to the consideration of the 70 Army air groups recommended by Congress to find that the White House allowed only 48. Congress had recommended Armed Forces personnel of 2,500,882, while the administration alowed only 1,507,000. Organized reserves would have been 1,977,000, had Congress been given its way, but the White House allowed only 522,000. Congress had recommended a super aircraft carrier, but the administration scrapped it entirely. Congress wished to enlarge stockpiling, but this was cut from 60 percent to 38 percent by the administration. Only 1 dollar in 7 since the war has been spent on arms of any kind. Only 1 dollar in 16 has gone for equipment other than aircraft.

These and other statistics become a part of the war in Korea, and the poor showing we are presently making in that theater, because of shortages in military supplies that are all too apparent. Since the outbreak of hostilities against Communist invaders the administration has failed to honestly face its lack of foresight in national defense and foreign policy. It has attempted in various ways to fix the blame upon the American people by inferring that the people dictated the extent to which the Nation could go in preparing to resist Communist aggression. But the record in this respect is very clear. It is found day after day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where recommendations of a far-sighted Congress contrast vividly with objections from the Nation's Department of Defense. Criticism for the administration's short-sighted policy is being heaped upon the shoulders of Secretary of Defense Johnson, and various responsible groups and individuals have asked for his resignation. Events of the past few months have shown that Johnson had no adequate conception of the policy needed to match the foreign policy of this country. His Department failed to provide the kind of military strength Korea shows we need. Johnson's repeated assertions that his economies and budget cuttings resulted in a stronger defense are revealed as tragically false. But all the blame for our shortcomings cannot be put on Louis Johnson's doorstep. The blame here extends beyond him to his Commander in Chief and to the Secretary of State.

By its vote in both the lower and the upper Houses, Congress is again revealed as the agency of our National Government that wants to be sure about our security. It wants laws with teeth in them to deal with the Communist element in this country which is committed to the overthrow of representative government, while Communists in other parts of the world do other diabolical tasks assigned to them. But rather than receiving help and assistance in this job, Congress is again getting nothing but obstruction from the White House and from those Congressmen, like Mr. BIEMILLER, who makes up the liberal element in the United States.

What We Fight for

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial which appeared in the New York Times, under date of August 20, entitled "What We Fight for."

WHAT WE FIGHT FOR

These are desperate days in Korea, days that try men's souls as well as rack their bodies. Americans at home should stop to think what they are asking their young sons and brothers to do, and why they are asking it. The more important question is the "Why," because men will fight and die gladly in a great cause if only they understand what they are fighting for. The reports from the front of the bitterness and bewilderment of our troops are too insistent and too obviously correct to be ignored. The young infantryman who said to a New York Times correspondent the other day: "Damned if I see why I'm fighting to save this hell hole," was giving expression to a tragic ignorance, but one for which his superiors and not he should be blamed.

Anyone who went through the World Wars knows the pitful inadequacy of the political indoctrination given to American troops. In the last war, for instance, it was shocking to find GI's slogging their way up the mountains of Italy month after month without any idea of what fascism or nazism really meant and what ideals they were defending. It is too easy to put these youngsters on the front lines where the age-old alternative of "kill or be killed," plus their native guts and pride, will lead them to fight hard and even heroically. It stands to reason that a soldier who thinks he is fighting for a "hell hole," or does not know what he is fighting for, is at a disadvantage, and is, incidentally, being criminally neglected.

The basic facts that every American soldier—and for that matter every civilian—must understand are relatively simple. The soldier in the Korean hills and the folks back home who pay higher taxes and accept controls are, to begin with, fighting for survival. Korea is only a single battle in a long war whose sphere of action is the greater part of the world. This is an acute phase of a struggle in which our liberty and our whole way of life are at stake. One filthy, bleary-eyed boy firing a bazooka at a Russian-built North Korean tank is defending the freedom of his country and everything that Americans hold dear as surely as if he were defending the shores of California or Virginia against Communist hordes. His enemy is only incidentally the fanatical misguided Korean who comes at him to kill. It is communism, totalitarianism, slavery, the police state, that is the true enemy.

He must, then, know what communism means and how it works in practice. He must be made to realize that there is no ground for compromise between Soviet communism and western democracy; they can both live at peace in the world only if the Communists stay on their side of the iron curtain. But communism is an aggressive, expanding force carrying a pseudo-religious message. It believes that the so-called bourgeois-capitalist-imperialist world seeks the destruction by war of communism but that in the inevitable final conflict, the Communists must win. It uses methods that have no regard for normal principles or scruples;

the end justifies the means, and it is a wicked end. It is powerful in its appeal, especially to the backward Asian masses, but it is also powerful in its military strength.

This is the enemy that the young infantryman is fighting in his Korean "hellhole," and it is tragic that no one has made him realize the truth. It would be more tragic if we go on allowing our troops to be inducted and trained and sent to battle fronts in continuing ignorance of the real issues at stake. There is a powerful instinct in military leaders to think of war in purely military terms, and to forget that war is an instrument of politics. If that was true in the Napoleonic days of Clausewitz, how much more true is it today when the world could almost be expressed in ideological terms.

The simple fact today is that there is a price to be paid—a very great price. The soldier pays it in blood, others in other ways, but there is no escaping it. If everybody concerned knows what he is fighting for, the price will be paid gladly and bravely.

Malik's Departure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the Salem Evening News, Salem, Mass., Monday, August 28, 1950:

GOOD-BY, MR. MALIK

(By Col. Roland W. Estey)

Now that August is coming to a close, along with it comes the exit of Malik as president of the Security Council of the United Nations. Many people probably will give a sigh of relief for Mr. Malik will no longer be able to hold the floor and denounce the United States and the other progressive nations of our earth.

Malik's exit should bring with it an end of the verbal bombastic barrage based upon lies created in the minds of this man and his communistic associates of the Kremlin. To what extent he has been able to damage the peace programs and desires of many nations, and the world as a whole, will be known when history is written years hence.

The people of the United States have experienced many torrid political campaigns during which accusations have been tossed by candidate after candidate. Some campaign speeches have left voters in bewilderment but never in this Nation's history have our people been forced to listen to words packed solid with lies and statements so obviously filled with incorrect information.

Malik has presented to us the real Soviet communistic manner of working and thinking. He has opened the doors of the Kremlin and given us the first opportunity to learn of the real workings of this group. Stalin has forbidden us to look behind the iron curtain until recently. We now have had the curtain pulled aside and we can readily ascertain to what extent communism will proceed to gain and further its objectives.

I believe that, with Malik's departure from the presidency, he will travel an even greater distance—he will return to Moscow. Such a trip back would be a definite indication that his propaganda endeavors have not attained the success originally anticipated. This would designate that the Soviet Union has taken another defeat in their operation of the cold war. If he remains and no replacement from Moscow is delegated then we may assume that the Soviet's plans were successful. This would be a move of great importance and would designate the trend of future Soviet actions.

I am of the belief as previously stated, that Mr. Malik will return to the confines of the Soviet Union. How soon this will occur is problematic but it will occur. I doubt that we shall hear much of Malik hereafter. He will join Molotov, Vishinsky, Gromyko, and the others who have tried their particular specialty and have been found wanting in a successful operation.

Who shall replace the most qualified person for the world's organization of the Liars Club is a matter of conjecture. Whoever may arrive to pick up the threads of defeat will possess a new set of instructions fresh off the tables and desks of the Kremlin. He will be selected for his particular abilities along certain lines. It will be well to study the replacement and learn of his characteristics and training—this will designate the new moves of the Soviet Union as directed by Josef Stalin.

Malik has denounced the presence of the United States Seventh Fleet off Formosa. Naturally, this new attack emanates from Moscow. In these statements, as regards our Navy in the Pacific, may possibly be the key to future plans of the Kremlin. It indicates one of two things; these are: first, a frank admission that Malik's use of propaganda has failed to achieve the desired effectiveness; or secondly, it may point to the next aggressive move in the Soviet's plans for world domination.

Any invasion of Formosa seems rather remote at this time for the success of such an operation would have been at its highest peak during the early days of the Korean conflict. Sufficient time has elapsed for us to have strengthened our position in the Pacific with armament and manpower. This makes sense unless, of course, the United States has changed its policy as regards the protection of Formosa and the forces of Chiang Kai-shek. If we have changed (and I have no information on the subject) word of it may have leaked out. Information of this nature has a habit of slipping through fingers unintentionally.

At this writing, I am more apt to give consideration to the possibilities of Hong Kong or Burma in the Asiatic area and the possibilities of Iran, Berlin, or Greece in the European area. Any move on Iran would utilize the Soviet Red Army and this, in my belief, is the one type of aggression the Kremlin desires to avoid as it would incur the first definite activity of the Red Army. This has been deliberately avoided for an obvious reason—Stalin wants no war in which the Russian people are involved.

So good-by, Mr. Malik, and happy hunting in the coolish areas of the northern U. S. S. R. You have opened our eyes to a new type of man as well as to the basic plans of your bosses. You didn't realize it but you pushed aside the iron curtain.

Stockpiling Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Russian communism since the end of fighting in Europe on May 8, 1945, in its march to force communism on Manchuria, China, and Korea, as well as upon the rest of the world, has been helped by the State Department not getting back the nearly 100 merchant ships loaned to Russia, kept and still in possession for its use to force communism on Manchuria, China, and Korea. These ships since May 8, 1945, hauled hundreds of millions of dollars worth of potential war goods for the use of Russian communism to force its will on the rest of the world.

In addition for its stockpiling there has been delivered untold millions of dollars of gallons of gasoline to Russia in the Far East for its forcing of communism on Manchuria, China, and Korea.

The stockpiling of gasoline and fuel oil shows deliveries in 1945 of 5,000,000 barrels and in the first 6 months of 1946 730,000 thousand barrels most of which went in May and June while the gasoline shortage was on in the United States. And the Russian Communists used our Government-owned tankers and flying the Red flag to build up its supplies for the use of communizing Manchuria, China, and Korea.

And especially in the Far East between May 15, 1945, through September 6, 1945, with Russia only having a nominal declaration of war against Japan on August 8, 1945, there was delivered for the use of Russian communism in the Far East 41,380 long tons of railroad transportation equipment; 238,117 long tons of trucks and other vehicles; 249,202 long tons of metals; 57,788 long tons of chemicals and explosives; 406,166 long tons of petroleum products; 68,538 long tons of machinery and equipment; 258,201 long tons of food; and 117,207 long tons of other United States supplies.

During that period the United States delivered to Russian communism in Asia 1,436,599 long tons of the instruments and potential instruments of war while the British delivered 105,100 long tons to Russian communism.

And further which included during this period from May 15, 1945, to September 1945, the departure for the use of Russian communism in the Far East: 744 United States aircraft; 454 marine engines; 92 tanks; 89 field repair trucks; 2,426 jeeps; 42,599 trucks; 1,115 motorcycles; 1,119 tractors; 2,459 short tons of smokeless powder; 5,459 short tons of TNT; 316 steam locomotives; and 2 flat cars.

Mr. Speaker, this was all delivered to Russian communism in the Far East when the shooting was over in Europe and has been in possession and use of Russian Communists to force communism on Manchuria, all of China, and Korea.

Further, is it any little wonder with this great mass of material delivered to Russian communism after the end of hostilities in Europe let alone what was left over from other activities, that any help to Korea was less than lip service? Especially after we had built up Russian communism not only with its own goods but with that we delivered to Russian Communists after the war. In addition there was millions of dollars of

UNRRA food, the representatives of this country seeing to it that the Communists got one-half the food and the Nationalists of China got the other half. By the delivery of trucks, tractors, food by the millions of dollars to Russian Communists in Asia, the executive side of the United States did more to force communism on Manchuria, China, and Korea than any other nation of the world exclusive of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, here is the stockpiling of Russian communism by dollars from May 15, 1945, down through June 1950 that was brought about by the executive branch of our country.

United States exports of domestic and foreign merchandise to U. S. S. R. and exports by vessel from west coast customs districts for unlading at Vladivostok, U. S. S. R.

Commodity description	Export shipments by all methods of transportation to U. S. S. R.	Export shipments by vessel for unlading at Vladivostok
Calendar year 1945, May to December:		
Petroleum and products (schedule B, Nos. 501103-505900)	$19, 851, 155	$13, 578, 178
Machinery and vehicles (schedule B, Nos. 700000-799998)	551, 542, 523	236, 557, 780
All other commodities	352, 672, 635	208, 789, 808
Total	924, 066, 313	458, 925, 766
Calendar year 1946:		
Petroleum and products (schedule B, Nos. 501103-505900)	5, 972, 657	4, 137, 368
Machinery and vehicles (schedule B, Nos. 700000-799998)	169, 123, 376	32, 323, 956
All other commodities	182, 695, 522	4, 472, 543
Total	357, 791, 555	40, 933, 867
Calendar year 1947:		
Petroleum and products (schedule B, Nos. 501103-505900	3, 513, 732	1, 965, 644
Machinery and vehicles (schedule B, Nos. 700000-799998	108, 773, 287	9, 291, 174
All other commodities	36, 581, 933	2, 048, 420
Total	149, 068, 952	13, 305, 238
Calendar year 1948:		
Petroleum and products (schedule B, Nos. 501103-505900)	403, 262	402, 677
Machinery and vehicles (schedule B, Nos. 700000-799998)	23, 346, 676	3, 436, 431
All other commodities	4, 129, 040	168, 838
Total	27, 878, 978	4, 007, 946
Calendar year 1949:		
Petroleum and products (schedule B, Nos. 501103-505900)		
Machinery and vehicles (schedule B, Nos. 700000-799998)	465, 783	
All other commodities	6, 151, 149	
Total	6, 616, 932	
Calendar year 1950 January to June:		
Petroleum and products (schedule B, Nos. 501103-505900)		
Machinery and vehicles (schedule B, Nos. 700000-799998)	287, 708	
All other commodities	288, 389	
Total	576, 097	

Export figures include reexports, lend-lease and UNRRA shipments, but do not include shipments to the U. S. Armed Forces, shipments in transit through the United States and supplies for vessels and planes for voyages outward and return.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder after this stockpiling that Russian communism took over Manchuria, China, Korea, and marched on into South Korea so that now we are forced to defend ourselves against the very monster of communism so well built up by appeasement and stockpiling from the United States?

Register and Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, compelling reasons for every citizen to register and vote are given in the following editorial from this week's issue of Labor, the national weekly newspaper of the railroad labor organizations.

The action on the part of all labor organizations to obtain full registration is well illustrated by a news story from the American Federation of Labor weekly news service.

Mr. Speaker, I include two articles in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COLD FIGURES SHOW WHY YOU SHOULD REGISTER AND VOTE—CLOSE VOTES ON FOUR VITAL MEASURES REVEAL HAIRLINE BALANCE OF POWER IN CONGRESS

In last week's leading editorial Labor urged workers to register and vote in next November's elections—and thus change the hairline balance between progress and reaction in this Congress. The editorial pointed out that a handful of votes in Senate and House now swings the decision for or against the people on vitally important legislative measures.

Now let's look at the record and show, by recent and specific examples, what a narrow majority of reactionaries in Congress are getting away with because more workers did not register and vote in 1948.

The Knowland amendment: Sponsored by a rich man's son, Republican Senator KNOWLAND, of California, and backed by antiunion employers' organizations, this Social Security Act amendment squeezed through Congress a few days ago. It makes the unemployment insurance system a strikebreaking weapon, and may deny jobless benefits to thousands of workers in their hour of need.

The crucial vote on the Knowland amendment came on August 16, on a motion to send the social-security bill back to a committee to have the amendment stricken out. This motion lost by 188 to 185. A switch of only 2 votes would have killed the vicious Knowland amendment.

Food speculators: President Truman asked Congress to put into the war controls bill a provision restricting gamblers who boost the prices of foods and other commodities. This provision apparently passed the House.

Then Congressman MARTIN, of Massachusetts, GOP floor leader and former Speaker, got three Republican Congressmen to change their votes from "yes" to "no." So the anti-food gambling provision lost by a vote of 198 to 194. The switch of only three votes was enough to make the food gamblers richer and every worker's family poorer.

Edward A. Rumely: He heads the Committee for Constitutional Government, the biggest lobby and propaganda organization, which is out to cut taxes on the rich, destroy labor unions, and smear progressive men and measures. Rumely refused to tell the House Lobby Investigating Committee where he gets his big money. So the committee asked the House to recommend that he be found guilty of contempt of Congress.

This time the House took the people's side, but Rumely lost by a vote of only 183 to 178. If just five Congressmen had voted "no" instead of "yes," Rumely and his reactionary lobby-propaganda outfit would have won the day.

Excess-profits tax: Senator O'MAHONEY, progressive Wyoming Democrat, said Uncle Sam should draft dollars as well as men for the war in Korea. He proposed a tax on the fabulous excess profits of big corporations.

This proposal was shelved by a Senate vote of 42 to 36. A switch of only four votes would have put through the tax on the war gains of corporations, and lightened the tax burden workers and other plain people will now have to carry.

There you have it in cold turkey facts and figures. Four vital measures lost or won by margins so close that two to five votes, one way or the other, meant victory or defeat for the workers and the masses of the people.

You can change that situation. There's no doubt about it. If you and other workers—and particularly the members of your family—register and vote in November, there will no longer be a hairline balance in Congress.

LABOR SPURS DRIVE TO REGISTER VOTERS

WASHINGTON.—AFL unions in every State pushed a steady doorbell-ringing drive to register every possible voter for the November elections as final registration deadlines neared.

Rank and filers throughout the Nation were spurred on in their efforts by ringing pleas from AFL and Government leaders at huge Labor Day rallies, the biggest of which was held in Soldiers' Field, Chicago, by the Chicago Federation of Labor.

Every AFL union has been urged to wage an intensive registration campaign to October 1. The drive will get another boost from the sixty-ninth AFL convention opening in Houston, Tex., on September 18.

The drive to elect a new liberal Congress which will repeal the Taft-Hartley law was endorsed by almost every Labor Day speaker across the land.

The speakers pledged also full voluntary support for national defense, called for a halt in profiteering on the home front, and paid tribute to Samuel Gompers, founder and first president of the AFL, whose one hundredth birthday is being celebrated this year by the AFL.

Analysis of First-Quarter Reports, 1950—Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, an analysis of the quarterly reports filed under the Federal Lobbying Act for the first quarter of 1950 is now available. Two hundred and fifty-seven organizations reported spending close to $3,000,000 in the 3-month period to influence the passage or defeat of legislation, directly or indirectly. In addition, 953

agents filed reports for that quarter, listing more than $1,750,000 in salaries and expenses. The analysis follows:

FIGURES REFLECTING COMPLIANCE WITH THE FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT FOR THE FIRST QUARTER, 1950

Registrations: 150 were filed during the quarter.

ORGANIZATION FILINGS

Number filed, 275; original filings, 20; contributions, $6,625,393.74; expenditures, $2,568,495.77.

Number filed (by 257 organizations) [1]; contributions, [2] $4,527,018.62; expenditures [3] $280,588.65.

Total contributions, $11,152,412.36; total expenditures, $2,849,084.42.

NOTE.—A number of the reports state that the money received and expended was for all purposes.

FILINGS BY AGENTS

Number filed, 953; salary, $1,330,540.55; receipts, $411,620.49; expenditures, $457,612.54.

NOTE.—A number of the reports state that the money received and expended was used for all purposes.

FILINGS ON OLD FORM C—FOURTH QUARTER 1949 [4]

Number filed, [5] 59; salary, $103,427.95; receipts, $41,600.10; expenditures, $41,781.28.

[1] Because of the change in the new reporting form, which was adopted this quarter, some organizations filed two forms—one on the old and one on the new form. If identical, the figures were shown for one form only; some organizations also filed for previous quarters.

[2] Reported for previous quarters. Of this amount, $4.480,155.87 was reported by the National Association of Manufacturers for the year 1949.

[3] Includes amounts for previous quarters, but not heretofore reported.

[4] Fourth-quarter filings not received until the first quarter 1950.

[5] Of this number, five were reported for previous quarters.

The Russian Delegate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., September 7, 1950:

MALIK, AMERICAN ASSET

Jacob Malik, the Russian Delegate to the Security Council, has one great merit. He has become the best showpiece that the United States has on the Council. By his arbitrary decisions as president for August and his savage attacks on all who did not accept as gospel every Russian falsehood, he has alienated everyone except the representatives of the satellite states. They have to say "Yes, sir" to Malik, or lose their careers, perhaps their lives. A number of states were not convinced, before the August sessions opened, that the Russians were as difficult as they have been painted. A month of listening to Malik has proved to them all that the United States was right about that point, at least.

It would be a mistake to blame Malik personally for his torrents of abuse. He is merely a phonograph, playing whatever record is given him. Any other Russian representative would do the same, or face recall. That fate is not out of the question for Malik, if his bosses should decide that, in his conduct of the Council presidency, he has been more clumsy than successful.

Our Last, Best Hope for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article entitled "Our Last, Best Hope for Peace," by Hon. Bernard M. Baruch, which should be read by every American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR LAST, BEST HOPE FOR PEACE—AMERICA'S 1945 MISTAKE HAS BECOME AMERICA'S 1950 PERIL

(When the last war ended, the United States was the mightiest arsenal of military power in all history. Instead of holding that power until the peace was won, we returned to "business as usual." The Soviets, on the other hand, built a war machine. Here's what we can do about it now.)

(By Bernard M. Baruch)

When the grim headlines of Russia's aggression in Korea leaped up at me, my first reaction was: "Is this it? Is a third world war coming? Or can we still prevent it?"

Pondering that question, my mind turned back to mid-October of 1938. I had just returned from Europe, and was reporting to President Roosevelt that England and France had knuckled under at Munich because they had nothing with which to fight. If war came, they would be virtually helpless. One hope was left. The United States had to arm in earnest.

The President stroked the velvet lapel of his smoking jacket. "Why don't you say that some Thursday," he urged, "and I'll back it up at my Friday press conference?"

WE MADE THE SAME MISTAKE IN 1938

It was Wednesday then. The next day I was at the White House again. As I walked out, the reporters buzzed, "Any news?" I told them that if America were not to drift into the same tragic plight as England at Munich we had to get ready with a two-ocean Navy, a much bigger air force, and mechanized ground troops, develop closer economic and cultural relations with South America, and levy higher taxes to pay for it all.

At his press conference the next day the President did back up my preparedness plea. Others protested, "We aren't at war." The rearming I urged got sidetracked.

Had the United States armed in 1938, before Hitler broke loose, the Second World War might have been prevented. Certainly the struggle would have been shortened. Today, we face a similar crisis. Again, our last, best hope for preventing war is to mobilize now, all out. To dawdle is to risk losing that chance.

In recent weeks, there has been a tendency to belittle what needs to be done. By the time this article appears, let us hope the Korean fighting will have turned for the better. A let-up in Korea must not produce a let-down at home. Victory there will not lessen the need for all out preparedness.

The crisis is not Korea alone. The whole world is gripped by the same cruel choice—"guns or butter," discomfort or defeat. That is the Soviet challenge—can a ruthless dictatorship exact a greater measure of sacrifice in preparation for war than can the free peoples in defense of peace?

So far, we are failing that challenge.

When the last war ended, the United States was the mightiest arsenal of military and productive power in all history. Instead of holding that power together until peace was won, we scuttled and ran. We clamored to bring the boys home, cut taxes, lift controls. We dumped huge quantities of ammunition.

Russia emerged from the war with much of her territory laid waste, millions of her people homeless. Yet, the Soviets continued to put military power ahead of improving living standards. As late as 3 days before the Korean outbreak, it was contended in Washington that the United States "could not afford" a 70-group air force. Yet, we were then devoting much less of our national income to defense than was Russia.

THE SOVIETS LEARNED A LESSON

The Soviets learned the lesson of the last war—we did not. Hitler's war taught the terrifying advantage any aggressor gains by mobilizing in advance of war. When Germany invaded Poland, according to the United States Strategic Bombing Survey, she had only 3,000 tanks, 1,000 operative bombers, 1,050 fighter planes. Her factories were producing about 700 planes monthly. Still, because France and Britain had neglected to mobilize, Hitler swept over almost all of Europe, enslaving its peoples and resources, requiring an immensely mightier effort to dislodge him.

Today it is the Soviets, imitating Hitler, who have a jump in mobilization over the rest of the world. Recently Winston Churchill warned that the peril to the western democracies was even greater than in 1940, when Hitler came so close.

It is not a "one-alarm fire" in Korea we must grapple with. It is the three-alarm fire of having to catch up with the jump in rearmament Russia now holds.

Will the Soviets feel they cannot let North Korea be defeated or lose face before all their satellites? Sooner or later we must expect an effort to reunite Germany. The Soviets may attempt to overrun not only west Germany, but all Europe. Or, they may contrive to capture Germany in the Korean manner, using their Polish and Czech satellites.

To guard against these dangers, western Europe's defenses must be rebuilt speedily and our own arming stepped up so we can reach our allies before they can be overwhelmed.

Let me emphasize, I am making no predictions. I do know, though, that in weighing the risks and fruits of possible aggression, Soviet war planners must ask themselves one question—on how much time can Russia count before America can mobilize its enormous potential for war? In that time what paralyzing blows can be struck directly at the United States? In that time how much of the world can be overrun, acquiring the bases and the additional resources for assault on this country?

TO PRESERVE PEACE, WE MUST ACT QUICKLY

To influence the calculations of the Soviet general staff in favor of peace, we must narrow the time lag between our mobilized preparedness and that of the Soviets.

I do believe strongly we should make another effort at peaceful negotiation of the cold war. That is something I will return to later. To preserve any chance for peace, though, we and our allies must achieve a full measure of defense—double quick.

The Soviets may seek to involve us on other fronts. They may try to embroil us—also the British, French, and Dutch—in a general Asiatic war which will retard Europe's rearming while leaving the Soviets free to race their rearmament for all-out war in the future. However great the drain on our resources, we must not be distracted from pressing our own preparedness and the strengthening of Europe's defenses.

Nor is it America alone that must mobilize. America can furnish only limited aid to others and only to those nations willing to help themselves. Until the threat of a Soviet blitz is removed, we will have to supplement what Europe does with greater preparedness on our own.

WESTERN EUROPE CAN DEFEND ITSELF

Collectively, the nations of western Europe do have the resources for effective defense—a greater population and a larger production of steel, coal, and chemicals than Russia's. What is needed is to translate those resources into military readiness. I appreciate how harsh a time Europeans have had. But the Soviets, whose people endured even more, have chosen "guns" over "butter." That challenge cannot be ignored.

If we lose, we lose forever.

Ironically, America's sorest obstacles could grow out of the high living standards to which we are accustomed, our traditional fear of too much government.

What is needed for defense can be obtained only by cutting down less essential uses. Every additional dollar spent on defense or on aid abroad releases a dollar of additional spending power, with no increase in the production of things civilians can buy. Taxes are never high enough or soon enough to blot up this excess spending power. The $15,000,000,000 in additional defense appropriations so far requested is being matched by only $5,000,000,000 in additional taxes. As the defense program gains momentum inflationary pressures build up steadily.

PRIORITIES MUST BE FULLY EFFECTIVE

By invoking priorities—telling manufacturers "you must produce more of this and less of that"—the Government may get what it wants. But the more of the available supply withdrawn through priorities the more frantic becomes the bidding for what is left. By paying higher prices for defense materials, manufacturers compete with the Government's priority system.

The present defense program, I am told, will entail shifting an estimated 2,500,000 new workers into defense jobs, beyond those called to the foxholes. With wages uncontrolled, less essential industries can battle to keep their workers by paying higher wages than defense industries. There is much talk of making these less-essential industries release labor by limiting the materials they get. But this requires a fully effective system of priorities. It cannot be effective through partial mobilization.

There is nothing new in this. The experience of both world wars taught that when the Government enters the market with such enormous demands, requiring such quick priority, our economy must be brought under stable control at once. Instead of waiting for inflation to throw everything out of balance, a general ceiling should be put over the entire economy, over all prices, all wages, all rents, all other costs. Machinery is then set up to correct inequities and make orderly adjustments.

WE MUST TIGHTEN OUR BELTS, AND DO IT NOW, IF WE REALLY WANT PEACE

This general ceiling still is imperative. It should be invoked at once. With it should go high enough taxes to eliminate profiteering and to pay the full defense cost; a halt to unnecessary public and private spending, putting off all less essential works; control of all exports and imports; conservation of whatever is scarce, developing substitutes wherever possible; the power to ration scarce civilian essentials, if necessary. Above all, we must accept denials which winning the peace entails.

I believe all the great segments of our economy—labor, agriculture, business—are prepared to accept an over-all ceiling, provided all are treated equitably. How tragic if this opportunity is let slip, as in the last war, when the failure to control inflation added a hundred billions to the cost of the war and needlessly prolonged the conflict, swelling the casualties.

Since the Korean war began, the cost of many defense items has already increased almost 10 percent; some by 50 percent. At least a billion dollars has already been needlessly added to the price of defense and to the taxpayer's burden.

THE MAN WITH FIXED INCOME SUFFERS

The rises which have taken place will be used to justify wage increases this winter, which could force prices still higher. And what will happen to the millions with fixed or low incomes and with no pressure group to represent them? The inflation of the last 10 years has already cruelly slashed the real wages of teachers, firemen, policemen, civil servants, and others; as well as the real worth of all pensions and social-security payments, all insurance and savings. Colleges, hospitals, charitable institutions are being undermined by the shrinking value of endowment funds and rising operating costs.

The very fact that we face a struggle of such uncertain duration requires our damming back the rising inflationary waters now, lest they wash away all the savings of society.

Let us consider what mobilization really means. To many the word stirs fears of dire austerity. Yet at no time during the last war were those at home asked to undergo real privation. Much less will now be required for defense. Actually, mobilization, if properly conducted, minimizes the denials.

The object of mobilization is to organize the Nation so every farm and factory, every worker, every bit of material, every dollar can be put to fullest use. Defense needs can change overnight. We must be ready to meet every shift in demand with the least possible delay and the least necessary dislocation to civilians, with all sharing alike any temporary denials.

My political philosophy inclines me to oppose Government controls. But I do not believe in withholding from our Government the powers needed to achieve victory. The gravest threats to the preservation of the American system are defeat abroad and further inflation at home.

WHY PATTON DIDN'T GO ON TO BERLIN

Voluntary means or stop-gap controls will not suffice. To prevent a third world war, our rearming will have to be vastly increased, in a hurry. Moreover, requirements for defense extend far beyond direct military needs alone.

The last war, for example, taught us the penalties of being caught without an adequate stockpile of rubber. By developing synthetic rubber, a catastrophic breakdown of motor transportation was averted. However, the creation of synthetic rubber plants slowed the construction of escort vessels and aviation gasoline facilities. Invasion dates had to be postponed, prolonging the war. Gen. George Patton told me that had he been given enough gasoline in August 1944, he could have gone right on to Berlin.

Through our entire economy are numerous deficiencies which would drag at our military power if war comes—inadequate stockpiles of copper and zinc, freight cars, electric power, steel, and aluminum, the need to develop new sources for the chrome and manganese which came from Russia, the enormous needs of civilian defense. In New York City alone it has been proposed that $450,000,000 be spent to build bomb shelters. To be prepared for atomic warfare would require stockpiling immense quantities of medical supplies.

To plug these and other needs, materials, manpower, and other resources must be diverted from less essential uses. Unless started upon now, many of these deficiencies will remain perilous weaknesses for years to come.

ARE WE ALREADY AT WAR?

Here, we come to perhaps the grimmest fact of all. No one can really say we are not already at war. As Hitler showed, preparations for modern war extend over many years before actual shooting begins. Were the Soviets to plunge the world into all-out war at any time in the next 5 years, all of us would look back to 1950 and say, "We really were at war then, but didn't know it."

What should be done is to take inventory of our entire economy, asking what all-out war would require against what we now have? Wherever the gap is dangerously wide, prompt steps should be taken to narrow it. Universal military training should be enacted at once or selective service altered to produce the same pools of trained men. Since troops are more quickly mobilized than factories, we should hurry into production vast quantities of weapons, far beyond any present military need. Such stocks of munitions would be priceless should our forces be expanded abruptly, or in arming our allies, or in dealing with possible aggression anywhere. Even if these weapons are never used—as we would hope—the insurance would be worth the cost.

THE POSSIBILITIES OF A RUSSIAN ATTACK

Some will cry, "Won't Russia attack if we mobilize now?" That risk cannot be avoided. Having gained a headstart in rearming, the Soviets may strike before we and our allies can get ready. This risk will not be lessened by our refusing to get ready or through a creeping mobilization. Russia's rearming would race on, making it more difficult to overcome.

Surely, there is less likelihood of an attempted Soviet blitz of Europe in the next year or two, while our own atomic superiority is overwhelming, than a few years from now, when Russia's atomic development will be much further advanced.

Our neglects in the past leave no easy course. Let us do what must be done as quickly as possible. Having once achieved a balanced defense in relation to Russia, we could then relax somewhat, lifting controls where no longer needed, always keeping pace vis-à-vis the Soviets and the risks of war.

With armaments balanced, we can perhaps turn the productive energies of the world back into peaceful purposes. If all the resources which Russia, the United States and other nations would expend in another war were to be invested peacefully, poverty could soon be wiped out.

One final point: To win the race of readiness is not enough. We must also undertake a peace offensive, which will make clear to the whole world, including the Soviets, the specific terms on which we are prepared to come to a settlement. Working with the United Nations, we should spell out our proposals for lifting living standards everywhere, for defining aggression and how to end it, for total disarmament, for strengthening the United Nations. I appreciate the difficulties in drawing up such peace terms, the risk of seeming to appease the aggressor, the lack of faith in all agreements. But I believe it can be done.

LET US DEFINE OUR PEACE TERMS NOW

In dealing with Russia it will not do to freeze into an attitude of no terms but unconditional surrender. Were the Soviets to

force war upon us, we would have to define our peace terms to the Russian people, drawing a line between Russia's legitimate aspirations and the aggressive aims of her leaders. Let us do that now, when it may still serve to prevent war.

To accomplish all this, we must abandon our habits of draft as usual. I have long urged revitalizing the National Security Council into a genuine general staff for peace. The whole of our peace waging should be reevaluated and a global strategy formulated. Some agency abroad should coordinate the efforts of the United Nations cooperating in common defense. At home, instead of scattering priority powers among several agencies, there should be one central all-embracing mobilizing agency.

"These are the times that try men's souls," wrote Thomas Paine when America was struggling to be born. "Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. Heaven knows how to put a price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

Today we are being asked to place our own valuation on freedom, in the things we are ready to give up, the taxes we will pay, the self-disciplines we embrace—in how quickly we will do all this. Let us not haggle, clinging to petty profits and petty comforts. Should we price freedom too low, it will be taken from us.

BARUCH'S 7-POINT PLAN TO STOP WAR

1. Mobilize all-out, with one central agency in charge, until we balance Russia's rearming.

2. Stop inflation now, invoke a general ceiling on all prices, wages, rents and other costs. We should try to restore the economic balance which existed before the Korean emergency.

3. Raise taxes high enough to eliminate profiteering, pay all defense costs, and absorb excess spending power.

4. Speed the rebuilding of western Europe's defenses. To meet the threat of a third world war, we must help strengthen the free nations of Europe while staving off diversionary attacks elsewhere.

5. Create a general staff for peace. We must formulate a global strategy for peace-waging, with some agency abroad to coordinate efforts of the United Nations to create a common defense.

6. Enact universal military training, or change selective service to produce comparable pools of trained men. Hurry into production all the weapons we need—plus ample reserve stocks.

7. Define our peace terms to the Russian people, working through the United Nations. If we were forced into war, we and the other United Nations would have to state our peace aims. Let us do it now, while it may still serve to prevent war.

The Port of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting and enlightening letter that I have received from the Honorable Nicholas Cefalo, Washington representative, Port of Boston Authority:

PORT OF BOSTON AUTHORITY,
Boston, September 11, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Boston is 1 of only 2 Atlantic coast ports to show an increase in foreign import and export tonnage handled in 1949 over that in 1948, it was disclosed in figures for consolidated tonnage for the 15 principal United States ports, from the United States Department of Commerce.

Boston, with 3,432,000 long tons in 1949, showed a 22 percent increase over its 1948 figure of 2,823,000 long tons. Philadelphia had an increase of 16 percent, Baltimore remained stable, while New York lost 16 percent, Norfolk 21 percent, and Newport News 28 percent. In the Gulf, New Orleans lost 20 percent.

The cooperation of the various agencies interested in the deep-water trade of the port of Boston and the efforts of the authority are beginning to have their effect. Our tabulations for 1950, as compiled thus far, indicate that we will show a further increase this year, despite a Nation-wide decline in export trade.

The authority urges all New England manufacturers and shippers to continue this cooperation with its promotion and solicitation program and again assures them of its readiness to assist them in routing their shipments through the port of Boston.

The Department of Commerce figures show that only five of the principal United States ports surveyed showed tonnage increases. In addition to Boston and Philadelphia these were Houston and Port Arthur on the Gulf and Los Angeles on the west coast.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
NICHOLAS CEFALO,
Port of Boston Authority,
Washington Representative.

Oil and Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, in the tremendous job which our country faces of preparing for whatever the future may hold it is heartening to remember that in some respects we have a decided superiority. One of these is available, developed petroleum, the lifeblood of industrial effort as well as of the war and defense mechanical equipment.

It is appropriate that the petroleum industry is making known the facts of its situation. The times call for whatever encouraging words may be justly spoken. We are daily confronted by much that is discouraging. Some of the articles we read tend to create the impression that we are lacking in almost every essential material.

Two of the industry's special efforts to tell the Nation about itself are scheduled for October. On the 3d the Independent Petroleum Association of America will devote 1 day of its annual meeting in St. Louis to the subject of "Preparedness—for Peace or War." Seven speakers will discuss the chain of industry functions from the drilling of a well to the supplying of the many products to civilian and military users. The authoritative spokesmen on this occasion will be Maj. B. A. Hardey, of Shreveport, past president of the independent association; J. Ed Warren, Midland, Tex., the present president; Frank M. Porter, president of the American Petroleum Institute; Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, member of the Texas Railroad Commission; Gov. Roy J. Turner, of Oklahoma, chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission; Walter S. Hallahan, Pittsburgh, chairman of the National Petroleum Council; and Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming.

Soon after this, Oil Progress Week, October 15–21, sponsored by the American Petroleum Institute, will be observed throughout the Nation. Here, again, the facts of the high degree of efficiency of the oil industry and the reasons underlying its ability to meet emergencies will be made known through various ways.

I feel a particular and intimate interest in these events. The modern oil industry began in the district which I represent. In 91 years it has met the demands, grown to a place second to none in the rank of essential industries. The reason for its splendid performance should be apparent to all. Individual initiative has been the principal factor. Men, free to exercise their own judgments, have found the oil and developed the processes and the methods of converting it to beneficial uses.

If anyone is looking for a convincing contrast between free enterprise and regimentation under a communistic or socialistic form of government, he can find it in the petroleum industry as it operates here and in some other countries. Demaree Bess, in the Saturday Evening Post of September 9, examines the war potential of Russia. The Russians, he said, are well aware of the necessity of an oil supply and since 1945 have made frantic efforts to increase their production. "But," he says, "that is the point of greatest weakness in the Soviet economy. Although the Soviet press boasts of newly discovered oil reserves in various parts of Russia, not one big new field has been developed since the war."

In the United States scarcely a day passes that a new field is not found. Some are small, some large. Together they make up a supply that is today in excess of our national requirements. It is the oil industry's prime objective to maintain a comfortable excess producing capacity. To do that many wells must be drilled. It is not to be assumed that the present fields and the present wells will be enough. Such an error of assumption was made back in 1941 and the industry was put on such short rationing of steel and equipment that the excess-producing capacity was absorbed and gasoline and heating oil rationing was a cause of great disturbance. That can be avoided to large extent, no matter how great the military needs, provided the oil industry is given due recognition of its necessities and is untroubled by controls.

The industry is undertaking to make everyone aware of its present readiness to meet the demands which may come, and to give assurance that it can continue to do its traditionally splendid job if allowed to. It has today the greatest producing capacity in its history and it can increase it. That should be of much comfort to all who are worried about our ability to meet the emergency.

An Excess-Profits Tax Is Just and Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it is our absolute duty to require an excess-profits tax before we send this bill any further. It is clear to all of us that we are only at the beginning of the sacrifices which our country will have to make in the months and the years ahead. There is every reason for establishing at the very outset that every part of our Nation shall be given a fair chance to make a proper contribution. We need this tax to help to establish that business, especially big business, will do its part. We need this tax for the revenue it will bring. We need this tax to discourage inflation.

For the benefit of those who are urging us to wait, I would like to submit some facts showing why we cannot wait. The reason is simple—excessive profits will not wait. War contracts are going out to companies which, unlike the situation in the 1939–41 period, are already running at top capacity. These corporations are already running at profit levels that are very high. The evidence is in the following table from the monthly letter of the National City Bank. To prevent a profit inflation we must act now and act firmly.

Net income of leading corporations for the second quarter and first half year

[In thousands of dollars]

Industrial groups	Number of companies	Reported net income, Second quarter		Percent change [1]	Reported net income, Half year		Percent change [1]
		1949	1950		1949	1950	
Food products	28	$34,137	$36,043	+6	$69,877	$72,420	+4
Beverages	12	19,514	23,378	+20	39,467	38,569	−2
Tobacco products	11	14,777	16,110	+9	28,310	29,541	+4
Textiles and apparel	29	10,812	32,177		37,341	64,334	+72
Pulp and paper products	21	14,376	24,426	+70	33,664	46,519	+38
Chemicals, paints, etc	35	93,022	163,002	+75	198,269	293,640	+48
Drugs, soap, cosmetics	9	8,481	12,455	+47	20,316	26,282	+29
Petroleum products	20	202,736	246,857	+22	438,682	452,367	+3
Cement, glass, and stone	22	30,624	46,678	+52	56,930	80,853	+42
Iron and steel	33	134,087	215,020	+60	315,143	374,648	+19
Building, heating, plumbing equipment	17	7,697	14,543	+89	16,117	25,921	+61
Electrical equipment, radio, and television	21	47,636	80,958	+70	99,403	156,725	+58
Machinery	34	20,758	30,299	+46	43,199	52,290	+21
Office equipment	10	16,766	17,068	+2	35,269	34,189	−3
Automobiles and trucks	12	207,551	329,234	+59	371,608	547,573	+47
Automobile parts	25	18,963	34,776	+83	40,499	55,061	+36
Railway equipment	10	9,935	7,830	−21	21,652	14,164	−35
Aircraft and parts	7	4,018	8,663		9,212	13,963	+52
Other metal products	48	14,245	37,294		39,404	63,146	+60
Miscellaneous manufacturing	25	8,916	16,335	+83	20,568	28,142	+37
Total manufacturing	429	919,071	1,393,146	+52	1,934,930	2,470,347	+28
Mining and quarrying [2]	35	28,823	37,992	+32	54,100	61,860	+14
Trade (retail and wholesale)	20	7,053	9,554	+35	11,807	14,754	+25
Service industries	16	9,470	9,481	−.1	20,699	20,620	−.4
Total	500	964,417	1,450,173	+50	2,021,536	2,567,581	+27

[1] Increases or decreases of over 100 percent not computed.
[2] Before depletion charges in some cases.

Source: The National City Bank of New York, Monthly Letter on Economic Conditions, Government Finance, August 1950.

Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., September 1, 1950:

WHO OWNS FORMOSA?

All kinds of people have been telling America for months to get up on her haunches and holler back at Russia. We've been doing more of it lately, but far from enough.

Formosa is a good example. Russia and Red China scream that we're invading Chinese territory by having our Seventh Fleet patrol the waters between the island and the mainland.

We say we're not invading, but we allow the most important fact in the whole situation to get buried under a lot of confusing blather. The fact is this:

Under international law, Formosa doesn't belong to China at all—either to the Communist Government or to Chiang Kai-shek. In 1895, after the Sino-Japanese war, the island was ceded by a defeated China to Japan, which held it continuously until the end of World War II.

From the moment of Japan's surrender, Formosa became conquered enemy territory. Since it had been formally yielded by China in the 1895 treaty, it did not automatically revert to the control of China as would land gained during war by force of arms.

The final status of conquered enemy soil is settled only in peace treaties or by general international agreement. Since there is as yet no Japanese peace treaty and no step has been taken to have the United Nations handle the issue, Formosa legally still belongs to Japan. And Japan is a nation occupied by the victorious Allies.

There's one complication. In wartime conferences at Cairo and Yalta, the United States promised Chiang Kai-shek he could have Formosa back when Japan was licked. On the strength of that, he moved in without waiting for a peace treaty. But that doesn't alter the fact that his control has no real status under international law.

If we choose to modify or repudiate our pledge to Chiang, he may complain but he has no basis for appeal. By ordering our fleet to police the seas off Formosa, this is in effect exactly what we've done. As the chief occupying power in Japan, we could go further (though we don't intend to) and move land forces onto Formosa. We'd be infringing nobody's legal rights.

Those are the cold facts, the true answer to Moscow's frenzied shouts that we're violating Chinese "sovereignty" in Formosa. China has no sovereignty there. She hasn't had since 1895.

How Formosa shall be disposed of ultimately is something else. If resistance by Russia and Red China makes a fair peace treaty settlement impossible, the question should fall to the UN. Who knows? Formosa might even be given to the Formosans.

Graduates in County Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached article which appeared in the Daily Times published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., under date of July 13, 1950, entitled "In the Public Interest."

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

It is pleasing to read that the Westchester League of Women Voters has been invited to send trained representatives to sit in with college "intern" graduates who are being indoctrinated in county government.

These graduates are to study and work in various county departments and bureaus for a year and then to select the work of which they wish to make a career. Naturally, the women from the league who attend the same indoctrination courses will get a valuable insight into county affairs and the manner in which more than 600,000 citizens are governed.

Particularly valuable will be the experience to those representatives of the league who are to study closely the 1951 county budget. And it is noteworthy that on this committee of the league are women already

gifted by experience for this civic task. There are, we note, not only former presidents of the league who have studied earlier county budgets, but a league member with cost-accounting experience, one who has herself been in business for 19 years, another who is an attorney, one who is a certified public accountant, and one with academic training in economics.

The help which the county taxpayers may receive from recommendations made by this group of alert, experienced women can well be invaluable.

"We Deeply Feel Honored"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the Walter resolution has again passed this House. In eliminating race as a barrier to naturalization, it remedies at long last the great wrong perpetrated by the Oriental Exclusion Act of 1924 against a fine group of our people, the Japanese.

The Reader's Digest for September 1950 contains an article which pays tribute to a Japanese family. It is typical, I believe, of most of the Japanese people.

Rated among the most valiant soldiers of the world, Japanese-Americans made a record for heroism and loyalty unexcelled in World War II. Some of them—like Sgt. Ben Kuroki, who flew 58 bombing missions over Europe and Japan—became national heroes. Two Japanese-American units, the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team and the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, later merged with it, were among the most decorated in the history of the United States Army. Fighting in Italy and France, the Four Hundred and Forty-second more than lived up to its regimental motto, "Go for broke," Hawaiian idiom meaning "shoot the works." It won 10 unit and more than 5,000 individual awards. Six hundred and fifty of its Purple Hearts had to be delivered to the next of kin. No man in the Four Hundred and Forty-second ever deserted.

Americans of Japanese ancestry not only fought the enemy abroad but had to bear the brunt of prejudice at home. After Pearl Harbor, wild rumors of sabotage made them our most persecuted minority group. Exhaustive investigations by Army, Navy, and FBI showed that not one act of sabotage was committed in Hawaii—although citizens and residents of Japanese ancestry comprise a third of that Territory's population.

"WE DEEPLY FEEL HONORED"

This is a story about Frank Shigemura who had grown up in a set-apart section of Seattle. Frank had been attending the University of Washington. Then came Pearl Harbor. Suddenly—with other Japanese-Americans—he found himself being moved away from the west coast. At Carleton College in Northfield, Minn., he found friendship and got good grades.

That winter Frank was one of 60 boys in the Army's Enlisted Reserve Corps, and in March all 60 were shipped to Winona for officers' training. Three days later Frank was back. He alone had been rejected. "People might misunderstand," said an official in the training program.

Lindsey Blayney, dean of Carleton College, didn't like that at all.

Despite the blow to his hopes of serving his country, Frank said, "This is just something else that happens. Let me go ahead and study here."

Meanwhile, Dean Blayney wrote letter after letter to the Army, to selective-service officials. They weren't temperate letters, for the dean was in a mighty mood of protest. At the end of the semester, in June, he told Frank, "You've just been called up. Your notification is coming."

Pfc Shigemura, of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team, fought in Italy with the Thirty-fourth Division, along with other boys from Minnesota. Then, on October 20, 1944, he was killed in action.

Two years later the college decided to publish a booklet honoring Carleton men who had lost their lives in service. Each of the Gold Star parents received a letter: Did they have a photo? Could they tell anything more about their late son's deeds?

From Seattle came a picture, a sentence about Frank's Army service, and these words: "We deeply feel honored in having Frank's picture in a memorial booklet. Enclosed is a small amount in check. Please accept this donation for publishing the booklet."

From the envelope fluttered a hundred-dollar check.

Next year another letter: "I am very happy to learn of your proposed student-union building that will be dedicated to those who served and died. As parents of the late Pfc Frank M. Shigemura we feel greatly honored. Enclosed find check for $500. Please accept this small contribution."

Later Mr. Shigemura sent two more checks. His gifts totaled $1,200.

A few months ago President Larry Gould and Alumni Director Warren Breckenridge, of Carleton, were visiting alumni groups. When they came to Seattle they wanted to invite Frank's parents to an alumni banquet.

In Seattle, in a not very modern apartment building, they inquired for Mr. Shigemura. They were told, "You'll find him at the Union Station. Everybody knows him."

There Breckenridge found Frank's father, who for 39 years had carried bags, touched his red cap and said thanks for the tip, sir. Thanks very much.

A Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, following my usual practice of submitting a report to my constituents of my activities during each Congress, I want to take this opportunity to review briefly some of the high lights of the Eighty-first Congress.

BUSY AND HECTIC SESSIONS

Both sessions of the Eighty-first Congress which convened in January 1949 were busy and hectic ones. From the standpoint of legislation, nearly 16,000 bills and resolutions were introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives. By comparison with previous Congresses, it represents about a 25 percent increase.

COMMITTEE WORK INCREASED 100 PERCENT

In addition to the tremendous volume of legislation, the committee work increased 100 percent which meant that literally for days I found myself behind closed doors receiving first-hand information on matters pertaining to military defenses, atomic energy, and domestic and international affairs.

12,000 PIECES OF MAIL RECEIVED IN 1 MONTH

I have never witnessed such a large volume of mail as I received during the Eighty-first Congress. During the month of March of this year over 12,000 pieces of first-class mail were received in my office from residents of this congressional district.

I can say without fear of contradiction that almost every piece of mail received at my office has been read personally by me. In the majority of cases I have developed the information in answering the writer.

My files are full of commendatory letters in appreciation for services rendered. I assure you that I appreciate these testimonials of my effort at all times to truly represent all the people of the congressional district.

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

During the Eighty-first Congress I found it necessary to take bold steps on various occasions by criticizing high officials of our Government and asking for investigations of ugly rumors and disturbing reports.

While at times I found myself standing alone and the victim of severe criticism, conditions today prove that I was absolutely correct.

I think that my position in regard to some of the national issues can best be explained by quoting two of the Nation's leading newspaper columnists—Ray Tucker and David Lawrence.

In a letter I received last month, Ray Tucker said:

Single-handedly your illuminating speech in May 1949 in which you asked for an investigation of the B–36 and related national defense problems, exposed our weaknesses on land, sea, and air.

David Lawrence in his Nation-wide newspaper column of August 15, 1950, said:

VAN ZANDT's courageous demand for an investigation of our national defense last year brought out a record of facts that tells the story of why there has been a failure in Korea.

"YES MAN" PSYCHOLOGY RUINED NATIONAL DEFENSE

My exposure of the "yes man" psychology, or in plain words, the gag on spokesmen for our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps imposed by Executive order, revealed to the American people that their representatives in Congress were being denied the advice of our military leaders who by reason of their training and years of experience were qualified to tell Congress the type of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps needed to provide this Nation with

adequate security. Recent events support the fact that this "yes man" psychology was destructive of the best interests of our country.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS IMPOUNDED

As a member of the House Committee on the Armed Services, I joined other members of that committee in our continued effort to provide for a 70-group Air Force.

In this connection, Congress appropriated $736,000,000 during the Eighty-first Congress, only to have the money impounded by the Secretary of Defense on orders of President Truman.

In addition, Congress appropriated many more millions of dollars earmarked for the purchase of tanks, bazookas, and other military equipment. This money was not spent, but was also ordered impounded by the President. Thus, in a period of 5 years, or since the end of World War II, we find that close to $1,800,000,000 appropriated by Congress for national defense was not spent. Of that amount, in the last 2 years $1,270,000,000 was not spent.

Time and time again I called to the attention of Congress that refusal to spend appropriations for national defense was nothing less than cutting the heart out of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. I was told that the fat was being trimmed from national defense needs, but in truth the very sinews of our military defenses were being destroyed.

SOCIAL SECURITY

In the field of social legislation, I am proud of the part I played in bringing about liberalization of the Social Security Act. For 10 years I have been among a group of Congressmen who have militantly and consistently advocated increased benefits and a broader coverage under the Social Security Act. Many of the provisions of the new Social Security Act were contained in bills I introduced during the past 10 years to liberalize the provisions of existing law.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Having a firm belief that a universal pension with everybody contributing and participating is the answer to the old-age problem, I continued my activities by serving on congressional steering committees on the Townsend plan and the American Pension Committee.

The part I played is best told by Dr. Francis E. Townsend, founder of the Townsend plan, and Mr. Russell Saville, of the American Pension Committee.

Dr. Townsend said on August 17, 1950:

Because you are one of the "101" immortals who voted for the Townsend bill in 1939 and because of your efforts to secure additional signers to Townsend discharge petition No. 15, I wish to commend you and I trust that the Eighty-second Congress will see you returned to Congress to support our program 100 percent.

Russell Saville of the American Pension Committee said on August 21, 1950:

Your great interest in the pension cause, running through your entire tenure in Congress and particularly during the present session, has not passed unnoticed. Your leadership at the head of the bipartisan Steering Committee of the House of Representatives working for a uniform Federal pension to take the place of old-age assistance marks a high-water mark in the history of the pension movement.

EFFORTS TO AMEND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

In reviewing my work in the field of social legislation, I am greatly disappointed that the Eighty-first Congress did not approve my efforts to liberalize benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act.

I was one of 45 Members of Congress who introduced bills to liberalize the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and to increase present benefits. Not one of the 47 Members of Congress received any consideration from the Democratic-controlled House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and as a result no action of any kind was taken on railroad retirement legislation. The responsibility for inaction rests entirely on the shoulders of Congressman ROBERT CROSSER, Democrat of Ohio, chairman of the Democratic-controlled House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

During the Eighty-first Congress, I pleaded, prodded, begged, and in fact used every parliamentary procedure at my command in an effort to have action taken on legislation to amend the Railroad Retirement Act. I was consistently refused such action by Chairman CROSSER who constantly explained that you cannot increase benefits without a corresponding increase in payroll taxes. Therefore, I yield to no one in the effort I put forth to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

EFFORTS TO AID SMALL BUSINESS

Ever mindful of the fact that small business is the backbone of our economic life, I devoted much effort to aiding and assisting the businessmen of my congressional district and the Nation as a whole.

I take pardonable pride in the fact that I have on file scores of letters of commendation from small business enterprises in Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties expressing gratitude for my success in aiding them with their manifold problems.

From a national standpoint, Mr. Fred A. Virkus, chairman of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations, comprising 600,000 small business concerns, commended my efforts on June 19, 1950, in the following words:

You have the reputation of being one of the hardest working Members of Congress. I have found that you have voted according to what you considered the right thing to do and not according to pressure by lobbyists and special interest. * * * You have been one of the best friends the small-business men have had in Washington.

VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

During the Eighty-first Congress I continued my efforts in behalf of the veterans of all wars and their dependents, an activity that I began after my discharge from the United States Navy in World War I.

My efforts were not alone in the field of veterans' legislation but I personally assisted hundreds of veterans and their dependents in obtaining benefits to which they were entitled.

During the latter part of 1949, I took time out from my congressional duties and served as State-wide chairman for the successful veterans' bonus campaign in Pennsylvania.

I can think of no better words of commendation for my efforts in behalf of veterans than the tribute paid me by Congressman JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, and chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, when he said in the House of Representatives on June 1, 1949 (p. 7253 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD):

There is no man in this House who has had more to do with veterans' legislation than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. He has been through two wars and knows what he is talking about.

LABOR MANAGEMENT

Believing that the welfare of all Americans demands that labor, industry, business, agriculture, and Government accept their duties and responsibilities. I favored the retention of the Taft-Hartley law because it protects the constitutional rights of the workingman and his employer.

In recognition of the fact that the Taft-Hartley law is not perfect, I supported efforts to improve the law by amending its provisions. While the House approved the amendments the Senate did not take action on the measure.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY MESS

As the result of amazing military ability, production and financial strength displayed in World War II, the United States emerged as undisputed world leader. We became the hope, the rallying point and the strength of the free peoples of the world. We could have enforced peace on the earth. We could have enlarged the territorial boundaries of freedom.

Instead our President and our State Department committed us clandestinely to the unmoral contract known as the Yalta agreement. Later, as if the betrayal of freedom of our friends at Yalta were not enough our officials supinely stepped into the Potsdam agreement bear-trap.

Directly and indirectly as the result of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements 600,000,000 people have lost what freedom they had and are now under the heel of the Russian Communist dictator. At the end of World War II the Russian Government controlled less than 200,000,000 people. Now it controls 800,000,000.

Instead of peace the blundering administration which controls the foreign policy of the United States, and so the destiny of all free people, has brought us again to war.

In voicing these harsh opinions of the manner in which the Truman administration has conducted the foreign policy of our country, I do so with considerable knowledge of the record and the facts. I am convinced that future written history of the past 5 years will more than bear out the comments I make here.

THE KOREAN CRISIS

Korea

Today our American boys are dying in the rice paddies of Korea because of the

present administration's weak and vacillating foreign policy in the Far East and constant appeasement of the Russians which has resulted in the fall of Manchuria, China, and North Korea, and which threatens the entire continent as well as Japan and the Philippines. It must be remembered that the Congress itself has nothing to do with formulating the foreign policy of this country. That is entirely within the province of the President and the State Department.

I have favored a strong far-eastern policy, but Secretary Acheson told us in February 1949 it was the policy of the administration to "wait for the dust to settle" before deciding our next move in China. He also stated in January 1950, in his far-eastern report that—

> This defensive perimeter (where the United States will defend in the Far East) runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus.

In other words, that the United States was not interested in the defense of Korea, and that only Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines were in the perimeter of our defense set-up, thus announcing to the world that we would not intervene to halt Communist aggression in China, Formosa, or Korea, all three of which lie beyond that perimeter. To the Asiatic peoples, and unquestionably to the Soviet Union, Mr. Acheson's amazing declaration was an open invitation for the Chinese Communists to complete the conquest of China by taking Formosa and South Korea.

We were told by spokesmen of the present administration that South Korea could not be defended if attacked, and that it had no military or strategic value. So we withdrew our troops, leaving $56,000,000 worth of small arms and equipment, light jeeps, clothing, and food. The Republican members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in an official document issued July 26, 1949, protested this withdrawal from Korea as occurring at the very instant when logic and common sense both demand no retreat from the realities of the situation.

It was on January 19, 1950, exactly 1 week after Mr. Acheson's statement about our perimeter of defense, that a majority of the House Republican Members joined 61 Democrats in rejecting the so-called Korean aid bill containing only economic assistance, with warning to the administration that without military aid to Korea and appropriate assistance to other critical areas in Asia, the proposed $150,000,000 in economic assistance would not only be useless, but it would enhance the prize dangled before the Communist aggressors by Secretary of State Acheson in January 1950 in his far-eastern report. Under the terms of the bill for economic aid, we would have sent fertilizer, seed, and money for building of roads, dams, and the construction of hydroelectric plant. It simply meant building up a greater and richer prize for the Communists to take over in Korea. What has actually happened in Korea today confirms our fears at that time. None of the economic aid, which was finally voted in February 1950 ever got there; and although $10,000,000 in military aid was voted for Korea, actually only the small amount of $200 worth of this aid ever got there, and that was Signal Corps wire. This accounts for the fact that when our boys were first sent to Korea they had only the small arms and equipment which had been left behind when our troops withdrew with which to fight back the heavy tanks and equipment with which the Russians had armed the North Koreans.

The present administration and the State Department have been running the show, and their first policy was as expressed by Owen Lattimore, State Department adviser for the Far East, who helped formulate the policy, "the thing to do is let her—Korea—fall but not let it look as though we pushed her." Neither the voting of military nor economic aid to Korea was consistent with such policy. On June 27, 1950, however, President Truman suddenly changed his mind, and our boys were ordered to fight in Korea. I regret that the mistakes of the present administration can now only be paid for in the high currency of blood and treasure.

A SOUND NATIONAL FARM POLICY

During the Eighty-first Congress I joined with agricultural leaders in Congress in advocating a sound, national farm policy for the country, the taxpayer, and the farmer.

In this connection, I worked arm in arm with my colleague and good friend Congressman HAROLD LOVRE, of South Dakota. For months he had conducted grass-roots conferences with better than 3,500 farmers and consumers in the Middle West. We agreed to sponsor jointly a farm bill that would incorporate the views of the family-sized farmer in the United States. As a result we introduced identical bills in Congress to provide a national agricultural policy to be carried out on a self-sustaining basis and to promote conservation and development of the Nation's soil resources.

Briefly the bill provides that farmers would choose their own organizations with elected county, State, and National committees directing the program from the farm level. The committees would work with the Secretary of Agriculture, who would determine the normal production needs ahead of planting time. This total would be divided among the farmers producing the particular product. They would receive 100 percent of parity for the produce marketed under these quotas.

If a farmer produced more than his quota and wanted to sell it, he could buy additional marketing quotas, paying enough for them to finance the disposal of the surplus through food stamps, exports, and new uses of the product. If the surplus did not cost the entire sum the balance would be returned through the local farm committees. Those who created the surpluses would thus stand the expense of disposing of them.

While we have received no action on the Lovre-Van Zandt bill, its provisions are being discussed in congressional and farm circles.

The sponsoring of the Lovre-Van Zandt bill is not my sole effort in behalf of the farmers of America. I have supported farm legislation and have been in constant contact with farm leaders in the State and Nation.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

The recommendations of the Hoover Commission came before the Eighty-first Congress early in 1950, and legislation authorizing the President to prepare and submit reorganization plans was promptly passed. The President has submitted 35 reorganization plans, and all but 9 have been accepted by the Congress. The defeated plans were rejected mainly because they did not actually carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I have supported the purposes of the Hoover report, as I think it has gotten down to fundamentals and has been of definite assistance to the Congress in an effort to bring about improved and more economical ways of running the Government so that it will give better service at lower cost to all citizens. These reorganization plans have been in accord with my announced campaign slogan when I filed early this year for reelection to the Congress. I said then, and I say now, "I am for government that lives within its income and without most of yours." This means I am for national solvency which permits strong military defense and sound domestic progress but provides for paying all costs as we go and reduction of nondefense and nonessential Government expenditures. I take this position as to national finances as I believe financial preparedness is the source of all preparedness.

THE COAL AND RAILROAD INDUSTRIES

I continued my efforts during the Eighty-first Congress to convince the Congress that existing Government policies are a menace to the coal and railroad industries.

In my appearance before committees of both branches of Congress, I pointed out that the Government policy of subsidizing fuel substitutes such as hydropower projects as well as the importation of foreign oil, steel, and coal is playing havoc with the economy of this Nation and in particular with the economy of central Pennsylvania.

I called attention to the fact that since 1949, at least 177 coal mines have been abandoned or closed and nearly 18,000 soft-coal miners have lost their jobs.

I concluded by stating that if the Government wants to help the coal and railroad industries, let it cease the program of subsidizing hydro-power projects such as TVA and others. Let Congress shelve the St. Lawrence seaway project and let the administration restrict imports of foreign-mined coal, oil, and steel.

In addition to my appearances before congressional committees in behalf of the coal and railroad industries, I sponsored legislation providing for the creation of a joint congressional committee for the purpose of making a complete investigation and study of the available fuel reserves of the United States and the present and probable future rates of consumption and to formulate a national fuel policy to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace or war.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

Throughout the entire Eighty-first Congress I was one of the many Members

of Congress who daily labored in an effort to convince the administration that the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign products was destroying the jobs of workmen in my congressional district.

Numerous times I addressed the Congress presenting factual information regarding conditions in the leather, gas meter, textile, pottery, light bulbs, coal, and fur industries.

I was in touch with President Truman, the State Department and the Committee on Reciprocity protesting the importation of foreign goods that are being dumped on the American market and which are menacing the jobs of American workmen. These foreign products are manufactured in many instances by slave labor behind the iron curtain.

I am sorry to report that the present Democratic administration has turned a deaf ear to my pleadings and if it were not for the Korean War and the need for expanded production, American workmen would be walking the streets as the result of reciprocal trade agreements now in effect.

MISCELLANEOUS

At all times during the Eighty-first Congress I was keenly interested in legislative proposals in the field of atomic energy, health, education, housing, postal service, taxes, economic controls, scientific research, and other subjects vitally affecting the American people.

It took many hours of night work to prepare myself for not only the debate on these measures, but to vote intelligently and in the best interest of those whom I represent.

ORCHIDS FOR CONGRESSMEN

In the October 14, 1949 issue of the Congressional Quarterly, an independent news feature organization, I had the honor of being named as 1 of the 10 outstanding Members of the Senate and House of Representatives during the Eighty-first Congress. Of the 10 selected out of the total membership of 531, I was the only Republican Member of the House of Representatives, the other Republican being Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine.

My selection was based on my legislative activities in behalf of national defense, social security, and the veteran and his dependents.

NEW PROJECTS

During the Eighty-first Congress, in cooperation with groups in the Blair-Centre-Clearfield District, I was privileged to play a part in the successful effort to secure new projects for the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania. These projects are as follows:

Garfield Thomas water tunnel, State College, Pa.: Over-all investment $1,775,000; number of employees 20; annual payroll $60,000.

United States Veterans' Administration hospital, Altoona, Pa.: Over-all investment $7,000,000; number of employees 250; annual payroll $800,000.

All-American Airways—air-mail and passenger service serving Blair Centre and Clearfield Counties: Number of employees 6; annual payroll $19,000.

Reopening of the Sylvania plant, Altoona, Pa.: Number of employees 500; annual payroll $1,500,000.

In addition to the above projects, I have worked with various business groups in bringing new industries to their communities.

PERSONAL SERVICES TO CONSTITUENTS

I want to mention the efforts I made to keep in touch with you and to keep you informed of happenings in Washington.

As you know, I reported weekly by radio, and I also wrote a column for daily and weekly newspapers.

Reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of statements I made in Congress were mailed throughout the congressional district.

In addition, I conducted a public-opinion poll with the help of the newspapers in my congressional district. The poll was for the purpose of determining the sentiment on national issues.

On most of the week ends when free from congressional duties in Washington, I visited as many communities as possible in my congressional district and interviewed constituents in an effort to help them with their problems.

NEAR-PERFECT ATTENDANCE RECORD

During the Eighty-first Congress I maintained my near-perfect attendance record being included among a handful of Congressmen who have the enviable record of missing less than 6 percent of quorum and roll calls. It has been a difficult task to maintain such a fine attendance record because often committee assignments make it impossible to be on the floor at all times. During my entire congressional carecr I answered 96.1 percent of all quorum and roll calls.

CONCLUSION

As a member of the House Committee on the Armed Services and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, together with my legislative and other duties, the Eighty-first Congress has proved a very busy one for me. I devoted all of my time and effort to the job of representing you in Congress. I considered all issues first from the standpoint of their effect on our Nation and on the American people as a whole.

I have tried to meet every issue fairly and squarely and at no time did I permit narrow, partisan views to influence or hinder me in doing what I considered my duty.

To many of you who have written letters of gratitude and encouragement, I am profoundly grateful. I assure you that I treasure your best wishes and shall always strive to justify your confidence and respect.

Senators—Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following two editorials which appeared in the Daily Times, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., under date of August 17, entitled "Draft-Proof Senators" and "Roll-Back on Prices."

DRAFT-PROOF SENATORS

On Tuesday the United States Senate postponed until next Monday the vote on the economic mobilization bill, the legislation designed to put the Nation upon an all-out war footing.

The postponement was ordered when it was learned that a number of Democratic Senators wished to attend a party rally at Huntington, W. Va., on Friday, the day set for the vote on the bill.

"The success of the Democratic Party in the coming elections," explained Senator MATTHEW J. NEELY of West Virginia, "is more important to the United States and to the world in general than any other consideration."

Yes?

We wonder how many American soldiers will die between Friday and Monday?

And we wonder if the Senators would be amenable to postponements of this nature if they, themselves, were not exempt from the draft for armed service?

ROLL-BACK ON PRICES

When and if price controls are put into effect by the administration it will be necessary to pick a certain date. Prices will then be frozen as they were at that time.

There are two schools of thought as to what date will be selected for the roll-back. One group thinks the period chosen will be for the month prior to June 25, when the Korean war started. The other believes the time selected will be the 30-day period just prior to the time the controls are ordered.

Which is right will make a great deal of difference to the American consumer. We know what prices were in the period between May 25 and June 25 of this year. But what they will be a month hence, or 3 months, or a year, no one can tell.

For already labor unions, scenting wage controls, which must accompany price controls if we are to avoid black markets and shortages, are demanding higher wages. Strikes to secure these demands are becoming increasingly more frequent. This is, in effect, a race against time to jack up wages before controls are ordered. And every time a wage is raised prices must necessarily be increased since labor is the largest cost item in any commodity.

Therefore, in plain logic, the longer we wait before we have price and wage controls, the higher will go both prices and wages, and this means the heavier will be the blow to the family's pocketbook.

Think it over.

Appointment of General Marshall as Secretary of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a critical situation in the midst of our war effort. It arises as a result, first, of inadequate preparation of our Military Establishment to meet the emergency with which we are now faced; second, because of what has been appar-

ently a feud between the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. This latter condition grew to such proportions, together with general dissatisfaction with the failure to properly arm the military, that the President has seen fit to accept the resignation of the Secretary of Defense. This course has evidently been adopted by the President to offset the growing indignation of our people. I am inclined to believe that the people would have been additionally pleased if Secretary of State Dean Acheson had take a similar course as the Secretary of Defense. The responsibility for our present unfortunate position rests upon the shoulders of each. The policy pursued in China and Korea by the State Department has had a part in bringing us to the unfortunate position in which we now find ourselves, and it should bear its fair share of the responsibility. It is plain, however, that it is the present intention of the administration to let the Secretary of Defense be the scapegoat, and, thereby hope that the resentment of the people will be sufficiently appeased not to demand the resignation of the Secretary of State. It remains to be seen whether the disposal of the matter in this manner can be successfully accomplished.

In view of the expressed intention of the President to appoint General Marshall in place of Secretary Johnson, the question is now raised as to the propriety of appointing a military man in the Office of Defense. It has been a long tradition in our country that only a civilian should occupy such an office. This has been due to a desire to prevent military rule being imposed upon a free people. Thus, a question of policy must be decided in passing upon the pending bill, to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army George C. Marshall to the office of Secretary of Defense.

The argument that is made against the pending bill, in most instances, has not been based upon any question of the personal fitness of General Marshall or upon any fear that he will set up an overwhelming military government, but upon the ground that it would violate the tradition of our country. While there may be some justification for holding to tradition, yet we cannot, in my opinion, overlook the advantages that would come to our national defense structure in this time of need by the appointment of a man with the ability and experience of General Marshall. He has had a long and distinguished career in the Army. The experience and knowledge he has gained during this service, and particularly as Commander in Chief of the Allied Armies in World War II, in my opinion, equip him as no other man with the knowledge and ability to build our military forces to that standard of strength that is so necessary in the dangerous times in which we are now living. Furthermore, he possesses the confidence of our people. This is a great asset. It gives him additional strength in the performance of the important task to which he has been called. These are days that call for strong men. General Marshall is a strong man. He can and will do the job expected of him. The Nation will feel safer with him at the helm of our Defense Department.

As a part of my remarks I include an editorial entitled "Nation Will Applaud Marshall Appointment," appearing in the Courier-Post Newspaper of Camden, N. J., issue of September 14, 1950. This editorial closely, forcibly, and logically sets forth the reasons that justify the passage of this bill, enabling the President to appoint General Marshall as Secretary of Defense. It reads as follows:

NATION WILL APPLAUD MARSHALL APPOINTMENT

President Truman's replacement of Defense Secretary Johnson by General Marshall should help restore unity within the Cabinet and the administration which has been a crying need in recent months.

Criticism and abuse has been heaped on Johnson both for things for which he was responsible and things for which he was not. Defense economies which now are seen to have been mistakes were hailed by press and public at the time he made them. Though he accepted the praise for them then and has shouldered the blame for them since, it is only reasonable to believe that the economy policy stemmed from the President himself and that Johnson's real share was only in executing it.

Johnson's departure should end the bitter feud between the Defense and State Departments which has done so much to destroy confidence in our foreign policies. Inferentially, it makes Secretary Acheson the winner in this feud and strengthens his position in the administration, since he and General Marshall see eye to eye on most points in the Far East. For this very reason, however, and because Marshall, as Secretary of State, had so much to do with formulating far-eastern policy and the decision to write off Chiang Kai-shek, the controversy over that policy will continue to rage. But now it will not rage within the administration itself.

Marshall's apointment violates a deep-rooted tradition in our Government that civilians, and not military men, should head our Military Establishment and direct its policies. It will even be necessary, apparently, to amend the laws in order to permit him to accept his new post.

But Marshall's case is exceptional. He has already served as head of the State Department and is universally regarded as more than a professional soldier. If the letter of the tradition is to be broken, no individual is less likely than Marshall to bring the professional soldier's attitude to the job, or to violate the spirit of the tradition.

The resignation of Johnson, and the Marshall appointment, come within a matter of days after Mr. Truman's flat assertion that both Johnson and Acheson would remain in the cabinet as long as he was President. This sweeping statement seemed a risky one to make at the time. Now that he has had to reverse himself on it so quickly, the Chief Executive may better realize his weakness for speaking without sufficient meditation, which is much more serious in a President than in a person of less exalted rank.

The Johnson resignation also is interesting because it was demanded by the Marine Corps League in a resolution passed after Mr. Truman's celebrated faux pas and apology to the Marines, though there is no evidence that this incident had anything to do with it.

General Marshall's appointment will end the persistent rumors that Mr. Truman was preparing to emulate Franklin D. Roosevelt's example of 1940 and bring Republicans into his cabinet for national-unity purposes as F. D. R. did with Secretaries Stimson and Knox.

Such a move might have been at the same time a stroke of political genius, as Roosevelt's undoubtedly was, but evidently Mr. Truman never had it in mind. Perhaps Marshall's appointment is the next thing to that of a Stimson and a Knox, since the general, while a Democrat, is not a politician in any sense of the word but replaces a man who always was very active politically.

General Marshall, in any event, has the confidence of the country and is one of our greatest living men. The Nation will feel safer with him at the helm of our Defense Department.

Senseless Government Waste Brings Added Burdens to Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I wish to include an article by the alert and able correspondent, Mr. Herman A. Lowe, which appeared in the September 10, 1950, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

This article presents in a lucid manner additional examples of unexplainable and senseless Government waste which have been uncovered and brought to public attention by Delaware's distinguished senior Senator, JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

I strongly urge every Member to read this article. The facts disclosed by Senator WILLIAMS show conclusively, as Mr. Lowe has pointed out, that our Federal bureaucracy still refuses to do business with itself and as a result causes the taxpapers' pocketbook to take still another terrific beating.

The article by Mr. Lowe follows:

SENSELESS BUSINESS METHODS OF UNITED STATES BRING ADDED BURDENS TO TAXPAYERS

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, September 9.—The Federal bureaucracy is fighting itself again. It won't let its right hand know what its left hand is doing. It refuses to do business with itself and, as usual, the result is a terrific beating for the taxpayers' pocketbook.

These latest examples of senseless Government waste have been uncovered by Delaware's Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS who, since his election nearly 4 years ago, has plugged away with tenacious single-mindedness at the job of disclosing such facts.

Here are some of the most recent "cuties" dug out by WILLIAMS:

On June 20, 1949, the War Assets Administration (a Government agency) leased 43 warehouses at Camp Crowder, Mo., to the V. M. Harris Grain Co., of Scott City, Kans. The annual rental for the 331,000 square feet of floor space was $16,700.

The Harris Co. promptly turned around and sublet the property to the Commodity Credit Corporation which, by the end of March 1950, had paid $138,658 in rent on the 43 warehouses to the Harris Grain Co. The places were used to store surplus grain which the Commodity Credit Corporation

purchased and took off the market to support prices.

Then the CCC needed additional storage space for surplus grain it had bought in the area.

Did it go to the War Assets Administration and dicker for some more of the surplus buildings at Camp Crowder which was a Second World War Army training camp?

No, indeed. It waited until the Midwest Storage and Realty Co., of Kansas City, leased 163 of the buildings from WAA for an annual rental of $11,270. Then CCC sublet from Midwest Storage for $158,083—which figures out to about 1400 percent profit for the Kansas City company.

Why didn't the two Government agencies do business with each other directly? Senator WILLIAMS suspects there is more to this than meets the eye, but he is having trouble getting additional facts.

WILLIAMS told the Senate the other day that:

"The Department of Agriculture has been buying U. S. No. 1 potatoes from the farmers in North Carolina at an average cost of $1.68 per hundredweight, and then immediately reselling them to the same farmers for 1 cent a bag to be dumped as fertilizer or in the hog lots.

"At the same time the Armed Forces needed 23,500,000 pounds of potatoes. They paid $2.95 per hundredweight."

The Commodity Credit Corporation, subsidiary of the Agriculture Department, has bought up 192,000,000 pounds of surplus butter. Does the Army get any? No, the surplus butter is kept in caves and becomes rancid. The Army has been buying butter on the open market at approximately 61 cents a pound.

WILLIAMS is a quiet, slow-to-anger kind of guy. But he admits these things get him mad.

East of the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "East of the Iron Curtain," from the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST OF THE IRON CURTAIN

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—It soon will be a year since three members of an American family, all traveling on valid and duly visaed passports, disappeared, one by one, behind the iron curtain, without a trace.

The first to go was Noel Field, former official of the State Department, later director of the Unitarian Service Committee's medical and relief organization in Europe during the war. He disappeared in Prague on or about May 12, 1949.

Next to disappear was his brother Herman, a Cleveland architect, who had gone to Poland to study reconstruction architecture in Warsaw and was escorted by friends to the airport in Warsaw on August 22. He was not aboard the plane when it reached Prague, and there had been no intermediate stops of the plane.

Noel's wife, Herta, was waiting for Herman's plane at the Prague Airport on August 22. She reported Herman's nonarrival to his wife, who was waiting for him in London. Then she, too, disappeared. The last known trace of her is a letter to a friend in Switzerland dated August 26.

Since the disappearances, the State Department has written a number of notes to the Governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary asking information about these three persons. The Poles have replied invariably that they are investigating. Their investigations have brought no information to our Government or to relatives of the three vanished Americans. The Hungarians claim that none of the three ever entered their country. The Czechs claim that Noel and Herta both left Czechoslovakia of their own volition, but are unable to say when or where they crossed the frontier.

The case is complicated in several ways. Noel Field was an intimate personal friend of Lawrence Duggan and also a fairly close acquaintance of Alger Hiss in the middle thirties when all three were employed in the State Department. The House Un-American Activities Committee has claimed to have evidence that Noel Field was once a Communist Party member.

During the war Noel Field was instrumental in rescuing many persons from the German gestapo. In that activity he developed contacts with the underground movement in both France and Germany. He was used by the American Office of Strategic Services as a channel for transmitting funds, leaflets, and instructions to the resistance and underground movements.

Herman Field also had extensive contacts with political refugees from eastern Europe. He had aided Czech refugees to escape after Munich to Poland, and later from Poland to the west.

The supposition is that Noel Field was seized by the secret police in Prague because he had personal contacts with a number of the Titoist variety of Communists, who at that time were beginning to be picked up throughout the satellite area in connection with the great 1949 purge of "deviationists." Since Noel Field was known to have been used by the OSS during the war, the iron curtain police may have suspected that he was a secret American intelligence agent attempting to establish contact with the anti-Stalinist underground. They may have seized the other two just to cover their tracks.

There are several reasons for a real effort to rescue these three Americans. One is that Noel Field probably could throw more light on the Duggan-Hiss cases than any other living person. Another is that failure to take strong measures probably will convince the Cominform secret police that the three probably were secret American agents and that, therefore, our Government considers them expendable. Another reason is that, whatever their past, they carried valid American passports.

If three American citizens bearing American passports can disappear without trace east of the curtain, then there is no security for any American in that part of the world.

If that is the case, the State Department should refuse passports for Americans to travel to those countries.

Either the mystery should be cleared up or Poland and Czechoslovakia should be declared unsafe. Hungary already has been declared unsafe over the Vogeler case. But at least we know where Mr. Vogeler is. The Hungarians have been penalized for the fraudulent and lawless arrest of one American, The Poles and Czechs have gone unpunished for a year for the total disappearance within their borders of three Americans.

SDA Bill of Rights for Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in these times when the youth of America is once again being called upon to defend their birthright of liberty and safety, we are finding good reason for pride in their maturity and in their responsibility. As evidence of that, I should like to call to the attention of the House the Student Bill of Rights adopted by the Students for Democratic Action at their third annual convention at Swarthmore College.

SDA BILL OF RIGHTS FOR STUDENTS

Students for Democratic Action favors free exchange of ideas; our opposition to communism and fascism in no way qualifies this position. A spoon-fed educational program denies American students their faith in democracy and prepares them poorly for participation in the real world of competing ideas. We are certain that totalitarian dogmas can be defeated openly and fairly without the curtailment of the political liberties of their proponents. We oppose the censorship of books and other educational materials. Secrecy for scientific data is necessary only so far as it assures national security; otherwise it should be held to the strictest minimum.

FACULTY RIGHTS

We oppose legislative and college administrative efforts to suppress teachers' rights. To demand that a professor sign either a non-Communist oath or a loyalty pledge is to deprive him of his privileges as a citizen in a free society. College faculty members who are often especially qualified for civic leadership should in no way be denied the chance to take part in off-campus political affairs. The holding of any political or religious opinion should not in itself be considered evidence of incompetence to teach. Employment, rehiring, and tenure of faculty members should depend solely upon their qualifications to teach their particular subjects. Decisions regarding faculty tenure and the college curriculum are properly the province of the faculty, rather than of nonacademic elements which are often in control of college policy because of financial influence. Dismissal should result only after the accused is tried publicly by his faculty colleagues.

We urge the American Association of University Professors and the teachers' unions to redouble efforts to increase their membership and to defend more militantly the rights of their members when they are discharged for political affiliation or activity. Teachers should have the full right to strike, bargain collectively, and form unions.

We view with apprehension the increase of unwarranted restrictions placed by many college administrations and State legislatures upon the rights of students to organize groups, to hold off- or on-campus meetings, to hear speakers of their own choice, and to publish and sell newspapers and magazines. Students are entitled to clear statements from their college administrations concerning their rights in the above matters, and should resist infringements on these rights by State legislatures.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

We oppose current efforts to establish sectarian religious instruction in public schools.

whether on "released time" or any other basis. We feel these efforts to be both a violation of academic freedom as well as a contradiction of the American tradition of separation of church and state. Religious services and sectarian courses offered in nonsectarian colleges should be voluntary rather than compulsory.

STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS

SDA chapters should cooperate with the National Students Association and the American Civil Liberties Union in making academic freedom a reality for American students and teachers. We reaffirm our support for the SDA bill of rights, as revised below:

1. The policies of every college in relation to student activities outside the classroom should be set forth in definite terms, with support from the college community. To insure democratic procedures, interpretation of the precise policy should be made by a body of equal number of elected student and faculty representatives.

STUDENT ASSOCIATIONS

2. The stated policy of a college should make it clear that students are free to organize associations for political, religious, social, and other purposes and that they are free to invite and hear on campus speakers of their own choice. Student organizations may properly be required to register their organizational names, purposes, bylaws, officers, and activities with the college authorities. They should not be required to disclose membership lists. Disapproval of the actions of any of the organizations shall not be grounds for interference by the college, unless these organizations function in some way contrary to the rules set forth in previous and subsequent paragraphs. Secret societies may, of course, be prohibited or regulated.

OFF-CAMPUS RIGHTS

3. No disciplinary action should be taken against students for engaging in activities such as campaigning for political candidates, picketing in labor disputes, participating in public demonstrations, etc., provided such students do not claim to be representing the college.

4. A student association should be permitted to use the name of the college and its own name in all activities held on college property. However, restrictions may justifiably be placed on the use of the college name when an organization's activities extend beyond the campus, but such restrictions should be administered only by the student-faculty body recommended in paragraph 1.

5. The use of college property for other than its primary purpose of instruction should be made available to any registered student organization carrying out its stated purpose in accordance with the regulations for use of college property. Such use should in no way be contingent on the purpose of a meeting. Student organizations should not be disciplined for meeting off the campus. Students should be free to post publicity for their meetings.

FACULTY ADVISERS

6. In institutions where it is thought desirable to have faculty advisers for student organizations, such advisers should be chosen by the student organizations themselves. In no case should advisers have authority to regulate or veto the activities of a student group. Student groups should not be forbidden to function because no faculty member will consent to serve as their adviser and no adviser should be held responsible for the actions of his group.

PRESS FREEDOM

7. College students should be permitted to publish and sell such newspapers or magazines as they wish, subject to the provisions for registering with the college authorities the name, purposes, and editors of such publications. No censorship by the college authorities should be exercised over the contents of any publication. If student editors abuse their responsibility, or fail to live up to responsibilities ordinarily accepted by the press, disciplinary action should be taken by the student-faculty body recommended in paragraph 1. However, editors should not be penalized for editorial expression of opinion.

8. Membership on the staffs of college-financed publications should be open to all students, the only criteria being journalistic ability and interest. The student- or staff-elected publication board should be free to select editors without the exercise of control or influence by the college authorities or faculty. A student editor should be removable only for previously listed reasons. Removal of student editors should be under the jurisdiction of the representative body specified in paragraph 1 or carried out by the student-publication board in open trial.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT

9. Every college should have a system of popularly elected student government acting as the agent for student activities and opinion. But experience has shown that freedom of organization on the campus is no safer in the hands of a student council than it is in the hands of any other person or group. Consequently, whatever regulations student government exercises over student organizations should be subject to the same safeguards as are regulations exercised by the college administration.

10. Students employed by colleges should have the right to form unions and bargain collectively.

11. Students should have the right to petition for changes in faculty and curriculum.

The Wisconsin General Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the forthcoming Wisconsin general election. I ask unanimous consent that the text of it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN VICTORY ASSURED IF WE ARE NOT OVERCONFIDENT

The people of Wisconsin will go overwhelmingly to the polls on Tuesday, November 7, 1950, and will elect the Republican ticket.

The following are the candidates endorsed by the Republican State convention:

For United States Senator, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

For Governor, Hon. Walter Kohler, Jr.

For Lieutenant Governor, the Honorable George Smith.

For State treasurer, the Honorable Warren Smith.

For secretary of state, the Honorable Fred Zimmerman.

For attorney general, the Honorable Vernon Thompson.

I am humbly confident that the people will recognize the need for continued experienced leadership of Wisconsin in the United States Senate and at Madison, our State capital. There we have had sound, intelligent, far-seeing administration under Gov. Oscar Renebohm, and I know that our people will want to continue in these policies under Walter Kohler, Jr. We must not, however, be overconfident.

Inevitably in a campaign season, millions of words fill the air, the newspapers, political literature, and letters.

When, however, you boil down the essence of all the campaign arguments, the charges, the accusations—boil them down to one point—it is this:

THE BASIC ISSUE: FREE ENTERPRISE

"Do the people of Wisconsin and the people of America believe in continuing in the way of free enterprise, or do they want to go the socialistic way of other countries, England and other foreign lands?"

That is the principle question. In fact it is the only real question, whether you are voting in Milwaukee or in Superior, in the city or out on a rural route.

On the one hand, your senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, is dedicated to the preservation of the American free-enterprise system. Yes, I am dedicated to the American proposition that a man has a right to work where he pleases, to build an industry, create jobs, own a home, own a farm, sell his goods and services at a profit, do things as he pleases so long as he does not hurt anyone else.

DEMOCRATS WANT ALL-POWERFUL STATE

On the other hand, the Democratic Party is committed to the alien notion that it is the state which should plan everything, direct everything, order everything. It is the all-powerful state which should direct socialized housing, socialized farming, which should proceed with unlimited spending, unlimited taxes, unlimited powers. That is their idea.

Naturally the Democrats are not willing to admit frankly that the end result of what they propose is socialism. They will veil that end result in all sorts of glittering generalities. They will say that all they want to do is allegedly to help the common man. The people, however, have a right to ask: "How can you help the common man by taxing him to death?" "How can you help him by burdening him with a thousand and one controls—even in peacetime?" "How can you help him by ordering him about, bothering him with nonsensical questionnaires, spying on him, snooping on him?"

THE DEMOCRATIC WAR PARTY

In recent months, another major issue has come to the fore. It is a fact that three times in 33 years the American people have been precipitated into war. Three times in 33 years, 1917, 1941, 1950, American boys have gone off to foreign battlefields. Those three times we have had Democratic Presidents in office. Three times we have been marched unwittingly down the road to foreign slaughter.

We all recognize that it is our patriotic obligation to defend our Nation. We all recognize that America is challenged today by world-wide communism.

CHICKENS COMING HOME TO ROOST

We feel, however, that under Republican leadership, we might have avoided the bloodbaths which have been our lot. We feel, for example, that at the present time the Democratic chickens are coming home to roost; the chickens of Yalta, Potsdam, Tehran, the secret agreements with Dictator Stalin, the disgraceful appeasement of the Reds, the terrible sell-out of devout Poland.

CLEAR-CUT CHOICES OPEN TO VOTERS

Thus on both domestic and foreign policy, the people of Wisconsin have clear-cut choices:

Do they want socialism or do they want free enterprise?

Do they want more wars, more appeasement, more softness to communism, more

secret deals; or do they want frank, open, strong diplomacy?

If anybody in Wisconsin wants socialism, wants secret appeasement, then he is welcome to vote for the Democratic Party. I do believe, however, that the people of the Badger State will overwhelmingly vote for continued Republican leadership.

REPUBLICANS HAVE BEEN STANCH FRIENDS OF FARMERS

We of the Midwest pride ourselves in our balance between industry and agriculture. We of America's dairyland know that the Republican Party has been the traditional friend of the American farmer, and in particular of American dairying. For over 34 years, I personally have owned and operated a Wisconsin dairy farm and I know the farmer's problems at first hand. It is our Republican Party which is spearheading the fight for the St. Lawrence seaway. It is the Republican Party which has led the fight against the labor big shots in the East, who have constantly sought not only to bring about unnecessary industrial strife in the Midwest, but who now seek to control the Midwest politically.

LABOR BIG SHOTS TRYING TO PURGE SENATOR WILEY

A handful of labor bigsters are in fact trying to control this Nation, lock, stock, and barrel. They want to purge United States Senators like myself who have refused to take their orders. They want to destroy the vital Taft-Hartley law, which is our only protection against dictatorship by a few labor racketeers.

The honest rank and file of American labor—the average workingman of the A. F. of L., the CIO, the Railway Brotherhoods, the Machinist's union, and other unions, does not, however, believe in communism, does not believe in senseless industrial warfare, does not believe in secret appeasement, does not believe in socialism. That is why the honest rank and file of our workers will support their senior Senator, will vote for Walter Kohler, Jr., for the Republican Party, for GOP Congressmen, assemblymen, and State senators, just as will all average citizens in other types of occupations.

HOW BIG SHOTS ARE TRYING TO SMEAR SENATOR WILEY

The labor big shots are recklessly pouring in thousands of dollars of money and millions of pieces of political smear literature in order to try to defeat me. They did this in 1944 and 1938, and their wretched efforts were unsuccessful then as I know they will be unsuccessful now. It is, however, essential that every American who believes in the free enterprise system work as hard as those who oppose it. Yes, every American should register and encourage every possible other voter to go to the polls on Tuesday, November 7. That is why I am glad that all over Wisconsin in every one of our 71 counties, individuals have taken on themselves the responsibility to:

HOW ALERT VOTERS ARE STRIVING FOR SENATOR WILEY AND GOOD GOVERNMENT

A. Call up by phone their friends, their neighbors and business acquaintances in order to have them support Senator WILEY, Walter Kohler, Jr., and the rest of the GOP ticket.

B. Write letters to their friends.

C. Distribute political literature in the mails, in letter boxes, under doors.

D. Hold political rallies.

E. On November 7, arrange to transport invalid or ill voters to the polls.

F. Help to collect the necessary finances to support this fight. Support the Republican State Finance Committee.

G. Organize citizens' committees both generally and in given occupations—doctors, lawyers, farmers, teachers, businessmen—on behalf of my reelection and on behalf of the election of the entire Republican ticket.

H. Cooperate with Wayne Hood, our splendid Republican State chairman, with Jack Rouse, our party's hard-working executive secretary at the Hotel Lorraine in Madison and with our 71 industrious county chairmen and other officers in striving for GOP victory.

EVERYONE HAS A JOB TO DO NOVEMBER 7

It takes work, hard work on the part of all of us. I have been here on the job for 12 years, working night and day, 52 weeks a year. It is a privilege to do so.

I well recognize that the average man has his personal affairs to attend to, his business, his job, or his farm, his family, his home; but this is not the sort of situation where we "can let George do it." This is the situation for you—the average voter—to take hold of.

You don't want Pendergastism, you don't want crime allied with crooked politics, you don't want the Democratic war party, the party that had coddled the Reds, the party that works hand-in-hand with the leftist labor big shots.

So, Tuesday, November 7, is not only important insofar as your Congress is concerned. It is a crucial day insofar as Mr. and Mrs. Average American is concerned. You need and must have experienced leadership in Washington and Madison.

THE CHALLENGE TO YOU

So, will you support free enterprise against socialism?

Will you support peace and preparedness against war?

Will you strive for prosperity rather than Government bungling and depression?

The challenge is up to you, the decision is up to you, the future of America and the world are up to you.

Go to the polls November 7 and vote Republican, for yourself, for your country, and for your world.

A Short Tour in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, my two colleagues from New Jersey, the Honorable Representatives ADDONIZIO and HOWELL, went back into the Army with me last week.

We offered ourselves as Congress' first "guinea pigs" after newspapers in the Garden State had repeatedly criticized certain aspects of the Federal inductee machinery. In order to determine firsthand if this public criticism was warranted, we appeared at the Newark induction station early one morning and underwent the same processing as the regular inductees, including submitting to the literacy test which has been the main target for editorial attack.

After this, we departed for Fort Dix with a group of inductees and for 2 days lived with the men. We ate in the enlisted men's mess halls, we slept in the enlisted men's barracks, we participated in their training, in their world affairs indoctrination, in their recreation. And, most important, we listened to their gripes.

Out of our 3-day tour of duty, myself and my colleagues have formulated a 3-point plan of suggested reforms within the draft machinery which I would like to outline briefly at this time.

First, the literacy tests on which the Army is rejecting an average of 60 percent of potential inductees in the New Jersey area is too severe. With World War II veterans and family men facing induction before many months, in light of the present world situation, we must lower the standards to take advantage of all sound-bodied manpower. Certainly a man who drives a truck or cooks in civilian life can drive a truck or cook in the Army, even if he can't pass the present literacy tests, which we personally thought were confusing, even to college-educated men.

Second, we discovered that the Newark induction station, under the capable and efficient command of Maj. Walter C. Money, has set up an X-ray system which is costing the taxpayers only 50 cents per picture. It is a system which is workable anywhere, and we recommend that it be adopted for all induction stations to save our taxpayers such fantastic bills as the $1,000-per-day rate reported in some sections of the country.

Third, we recommend that tax-free privileges be restored to military stores serving members of our Armed Forces. One of the biggest and most warranted gripes we found at Fort Dix was that soldiers, who are serving our country on a lower pay scale than civilians, are forced to pay civilian prices, even in their own post exchanges. It is only fair that, with a shooting war once more in progress, World War II's tax-free privileges be returned to our soldiers. They need every break we can give them.

Dr. John W. Rustin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, when one thinks of people in Washington, D. C., the Capital City of the Nation and the political center of the world, he usually thinks of people who have official positions with the Government. There are other people in Washington who have no official connection with the Government who are doing a great national service.

I am inserting for printing in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of September 15, 1950, which pays tribute to the magnificent job which has been done in Washington by Dr. John W. Rustin, who for about 14 years has been pastor of Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church in Washington, D. C. Dr. Rustin is completing his work in Washington and is about to assume a new work in Nashville, Tenn. Dr. Rustin has made a tremendous contribution to the moral and spiritual development of the city of Washington—he, has been both a reli-

gious and civic leader—and I think it very fitting that the editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD. The dynamic personality of John Rustin will be missed by large numbers of people in Washington—civilians and public officials alike:

[From the Washington Post of September 15, 1950]

DR. RUSTIN'S SERVICE

Dr. John W. Rustin, for 14 years pastor of the Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, is now saying his farewells as he prepares to take over the pastorate of Belmont Methodist Church in Nashville. His sermon on Sunday will terminate his service. His going will be a great loss to the community as well as to his congregation. The latter will miss his courageous and progressive preaching, which regularly filled his church to overflowing, so that there was scarcely standing room left. And this city will be deprived of a man who gave himself wholeheartedly to the city's civic and religious life. It was as "John" that he was known to many people—testimony to the personal imprint he made upon them, and the affection in which he was held.

Son of a Georgia circuit rider, Dr. Rustin has retained a fervor of spiritual conviction and a warmth of human sympathy that have been the most impressive witnesses of the faith he expounds. Today when pulpits are tending to become lecture platforms and the churches to lose themselves more and more in administration, Dr. Rustin has demonstrated that it is possible to be both preacher and pastor to a great congregation and to minister personally to many outside it.

Correcting Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am including herewith an editorial by Mr. Dwight Payton, one of the leading editorial writers in our congressional district.

It is entitled "Correcting Injustice." This editorial reflects the feeling of quite a number of veterans of World War II. I believe it is worthy of your consideration.

[From the Gazette-Record, Scranton, Kans.]

CORRECTING INJUSTICE

A young farmer-stockman of Osage County, veteran of World War II, recently remarked, "You know, if I had a couple of hundred years allotted to me for this life on earth, I would be right glad to put in another 4 or 5 years in the Navy."

His comment points up a grave injustice being done through lack of any policy in drafting for the Armed Forces. A large number of men, veterans and subject to call, are being kept on a make-no-plans-for-the-future basis when there is no excuse for such. Formation of a policy for drafting men would put an end to this uncertainty and there is no good reason why such a policy is not in effect.

Our veterans might also feel that it would only be fair to dip first into the deferred ranks of the last war before calling on them for a second hitch. Some such provision should be speedily put into effect and the demand for it might well come from the home fronters of which group this writer is one.

Of course, in event of an all-out war, there would be no question of such a balance-up, but until that time comes the element of fairness deserves full attention. It is easy to say that those who stayed in the Reserve Corps took a chance of being recalled, but it is not so easy to say that one man should have to serve twice in the Armed Forces, spend double years away from home and family, denied opportunity to develop his own interests, while another is never called.

Another consideration by way of policy would be to provide for the possibility of continuation of small-front wars. When only a small fraction of available manpower is to be used, it stands to reason that some method of limiting service and providing a rotation system should be established.

The Habit of Lying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil:

THE HABIT OF LYING

Lying is prevalent in today's world. As a matter of fact, it has always been a common habit. As far back as history goes there are accounts of lies in all phases of human relations.

The psalmist David, greatly afflicted, once wrote: "All men are liars."

A lie is an untruth. It may consist of giving a false impression by something said, by telling only a part of the truth, or by the way one acts without saying a word.

What constitutes lying is indicated by the oath administered to witnesses in courts of law: "Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?"

Witnesses invariably answer in the affirmative, but it is common knowledge that our courts reek with perjury.

The purpose of lying is to gain some advantage. It may be a financial advantage, an advantage over some other person, an advantage in pretending we have done what we have not done, or, vice versa, an attempt to gain advantage by pretending that we know more than we do or are more capable than we are.

Lying is very much like stealing, which is also done for personal gain.

It may seem that an advantage is gained by lying, for many a lie is told that is never found out, just as the perpetrators of many thefts are never apprehended.

But many people think they get away with lies when they do not. You have doubtless heard it said of more than one person, "His life has been a lie." Yet the people thus described probably were sure their lies had never been detected.

Lying is always harmful to the liar, whether he realizes it or not, and is usually harmful to others—often to those he loves best.

Lying is also contrary to God's command. No sin is more emphatically condemned in the Bible than lying.

The ninth commandment says, "Thou shall not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

Proverbs 6: 16–19 says: "These six things doth the Lord hate; yea seven are an abomination unto Him: A proud look, a lying tongue, hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that deviseth wicked abominations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren."

Lying is practiced without much compunction, but it is a grievous sin. It may seem a convenient way of escaping minor difficulties and embarrassments, but little lies often make big lies necessary and eventually lead to ruin.

"Be not deceived, God is not mocked; for whatever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

TRYING TO FORGET TYDINGS REPORT

The report of the Tydings committee is already all but forgotten, and the Democratic leaders hope it will be completely forgotten before election.

Why? Because it is everything a report of an impartial investigating committee ought not to be—one-sided, unfair, frantic, hysterical. It is couched in such intemperate language and so manifestly partisan that not a single Republican voted to accept it, although a number of Republican Senators thought Senator MCCARTHY had gone too far in his charges.

They refused to subscribe to the TYDINGS findings which in effect say that Senator MCCARTHY is a vicious criminal, guilty of subversive activities, who should not only be expelled from the Senate but probably ought to be placed in solitary confinement for the rest of his life.

According to Senator TYDINGS and his administration colleagues, no American was ever quite so low as JOE.

They would like to have the American people believe that there never was and never will be anyone in the administration who in any way sympathized with communism.

If at any time any of the administration pets were found to have taken secret papers from the files and turned them over to Russian agents, they were just indiscreet.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., one of Harvard's left-wingers, tried to explain their derelictions in a recent magazine article. He said that Alger Hiss and his pals in the State Department were just ardent, high-minded idealists, who meant no harm.

Their thefts, according to Schlesinger, were not only understandable but entirely excusable, because in an earlier day "many Americans looked on Communist Russia as a great and significant social experiment."

The vast majority of Americans are not so gullible. They see no great and significant social experiment in the brutal butchery of all opposition in Russia or the ordered starvation of 5,000,000 farmers, because they thought they had a right to the food they had grown.

The idealists Schlesinger writes about stole war secrets that may be in part responsible for the butchery of American soldiers now going on in Korea.

Our prisons are full of men indiscreet enough to be caught stealing and robbing.

But not even the most unscrupulous shysters among the lawyers who tried to keep them out of prison, ever tried to free them on the plea that their ideals were so lofty they didn't know right from wrong.

It was left for the Tydings committee to insist that the idealists be given a clean bill of health, and that their accuser, Senator MCCARTHY be consigned to the lowest depths of infamy.

To their horror, the administration henchmen are finding out that more people believe Senator MCCARTHY than believe Senator TYDINGS. That is why the administration is so anxious to have the Tydings report consigned to oblivion as quickly as possible.

This Can Stop Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an article entitled "This Can Stop Russia." Some weeks ago the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] wrote this article for Coronet magazine. His great fight for what he has called a "Marshall Plan of Ideas" has just resulted this week in the Senate action trebling or quadrupling the State Department appropriation for the area for which he was responsible as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs from 1945 through 1947. In this article the Senator from Connecticut explains why, in order to help create a world climate for peace, we must hammer home to the world what he calls "America's Big Truth." This article will not be published in Coronet until September 22, and I am grateful to its editors for permission to reprint it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the Congress just before we plan to recess.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CAN STOP RUSSIA

(By WILLIAM BENTON, United States Senator from Connecticut)

HERE IS A BOLD PROGRAM TO SELL DEMOCRACY AND HALT THE SPREAD OF COMMUNISM

For 5 years now I have been trying to awaken this country from a complacent and dangerous sleep. I have talked, written, and proposed in the Senate, over the radio, and to anyone who would listen. My program is quite simple: in order to create a climate for peace and defeat the big lie of communism, we must hammer home to the world America's big truth.

Arms and ammunition are necessary to the protection and defense of our independence. But to win a war that results in the survival of what we stand for, human ideas can be stronger than weapons. But we must act quickly if we are to win.

The Korean situation may be only a fuse to set off disastrous explosions of Communist violence in other parts of the world. And it requires no Government official to tell you that such action means World War III.

Before it is too late, we, as a great peace-loving nation, must wrest from Russia the initiative in a fighting war of ideas. If we do not, the remaining free nations stand to suffer the fate of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other countries that have raised their hands in silent surrender.

In effect, this is a last call to reason—a final appeal to those who understand why propaganda cannot be defeated by troops, planes, or bombs. To some extent, the dreams of myself and my colleagues are beginning to be realized.

For instance, I took great hope, not long ago, in the announcement that President Truman supported our effort to have Congress increase the State Department's Voice of America appropriation by an additional $89,000,000.

Money, however, is not the real problem here, for President Truman's proposals would not cost nearly as much as we spend for atom bombs, and not one-twentieth as much as we now spend for farm subsidies. Actually, I believe our plan should be regarded as a hopeful way of saving money, since nearly three-fourths of our vast Federal budget is attributable to war.

Our best hope for realizing our investment in the future is to seize the initiative in the cold war of ideas. The only way to accomplish this is by taking the offensive in the battle of propaganda.

We must ask ourselves, when we read of the North Korean aggressors, of Red storm troops in east Berlin, or of secret trials in the Balkan countries—how did they get that way? A very large part of our answer will be: because of false Soviet promises, coupled with false accusations against western democracy.

You do not have to look any further than the Communists' outrageous claims that the Republic of Korea, on word from Wall Street and John Foster Dulles, invaded Northern Korea. Yet, strangely enough, millions of people throughout the world are ready to believe that—because it is told them, and repeated to them in infinite variations, by a diabolically clever propaganda machine.

The road to lasting peace calls upon us to set the record straight, and to do it on a scale never before attempted in history. In my service as Assistant Secretary of State, I saw the true nature of the Soviet's challenge; they have flung down the gauntlet to western civilization in a struggle for the minds and loyalties of mankind. Their skill in that struggle is a far greater threat to the free world than the Red army—in Korea, Berlin, or even Moscow. The scale of their effort is without precedent. Their success can be measured in the 800,000,000 human souls who now move to the beat of Stalin's dictates.

The Communists were specialists in the big lie long before Hitler. They learned that the big lie, if it is shouted loudly and often enough, can, in the absence of a counterargument, produce the kind of action—or inaction—the Communists want. The kind of action or inaction they want in this crisis is anti-Americanism.

What can we do about this? To put it simply, we can oppose the big lie with the big truth. Eleven other Members of the Senate joined me not long ago in sponsoring Senate Resolution No. 243, which calls for a Marshall plan in the field of ideas and spells out, in general terms, how the big truth can be launched.

We use the phrase "Marshall plan" for these proposals because the Marshall plan sprang from a positive, boldly conceived proposal on a scale adequate to the need. It was designed to close the dollar gap until recovery could permit Europe to earn its own way. This plan was no mere containment of communism; it has been a smashing setback for communism, and by means other than war.

Each day that passes proves the necessity for immediate launching of a Marshall plan of ideas. For, if we succeed in this broad and imaginative project, we are forging a weapon more powerful than the most deadly secret weapon that we or our enemies can ever produce.

Today the United States faces two main questions in the launching of a Marshall plan of ideas: (1) How do we go about reaching the hundreds of millions we must talk to? (2) What do we say to them?

The ECA in Europe has shown great resourcefulness as to means. In addition to the mass methods of press, radio, and film, it has met special situations with imagination and vigor.

This past summer ECA toured the canals of France with showboats carrying documentary movies and displays. In Sicily, where the wandering minstrel is still a chief source of information, ECA has its own native troubadours, who tell the romantic story of a boy and girl in love, and how the girl was saved from fatal illness by penicillin flown from the United States by ECA.

My own three proposals are perhaps more obvious, but they must be carried forward on a scale commensurate with the need. My first proposal calls for creation of a unified world-wide broadcasting network, potentially capable of booming a signal into every radio receiver on earth—by medium or long-wave signals where needed, not only by short-wave transmitters.

Even with its limited system, the Voice of America today receives more than 20,000 letters a month from overseas, despite the fact that only a fraction of the world's receivers are equipped to receive short-wave broadcasts.

The Kremlin was so alarmed by our Voice broadcasts in Russian language (which I had the privilege of launching in 1946), that it has installed at strategic points in Russia some 200 transmitters for the exclusive purpose of jamming our broadcasts from the United States and England. Can we not conclude from this that the Kremlin feels it cannot afford to let its people know the facts about our American way of life?

Important though it is to reach the Russian people, there are other peoples who are even more important. These are in the critical areas of nations that are undecided, wavering, or under Moscow pressure. It is here that we must concentrate, and in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

For this task, broadcasting has unique virtues. It is instantaneous. It can leap over censorship at boundaries. It is cheap. It can reach remote areas as easily as metropolitan centers. It poses no requirement of literacy. It is not affected by shortage of paper or film stock. Above all, it can reach hundreds of millions of people, and it can reach them quickly.

My second proposal calls for a world-wide program of producing and distributing documentary and educational motion pictures, designed to explain the democratic ideals which underlie our foreign policy.

Nothing equals the motion picture in its capacity for gripping and holding masses of people, and communicating information and attitudes in vivid, memorable form. If we would exhibit documentary films to at least one-fourth of the population of the earth once a month, their impact could well change the face of history.

There are some 91,000 theaters in the world where motion pictures are shown. They have a seating capacity of 39,000,000 people, so that, in theory, half a billion people could see a single film in 2 weeks. Further, there are tens of thousands of 16- and 8-millimeter projectors in the schools, churches, clubs, and homes of the world.

Even where there are no projectors, our State Department has drawn crowds from miles around when they have toured foreign towns and villages with projection trucks, showing films like Valley of the Tennessee and Tuesday in November, the latter a documentary on American elections.

My third proposal calls for immediate expansion of our program for bringing labor leaders, journalists, students, and others to the United States. Foreign students of our universities have always been among our best friends abroad. Many go home to become leaders in their countries.

I favor an exchange program which would absorb as many as 100,000 foreign students a year, a vast increase over our present enrollment of such students. I also favor—as even more urgent—a huge expansion in our program for bringing to this country for relatively brief visits the key leaders of opinion from foreign lands.

The ECA, under its technical-assistance program, brought 900 people from European

industry and agriculture last year to study our methods. Two among the 900 were influential Italian labor leaders. When they had seen American labor-management relations, when they had seen that our workers share in the benefits of increased productivity and from the use of labor-saving machinery, when they had seen that competition is not without economic value to our workers, they went back to Italy, pulled 700,000 workers out of the big Communist-dominated general trade union, and launched an independent union.

At the start of the technical-assistance program, a group of Norwegian labor leaders came here to study the American system. When they returned to Norway, they found that a similar group had just come back from a visit to Russia. By mere comparison of the findings of the two groups, it was directly seen how infinitely better the workers fare in the American free-enterprise economy than in the economy of the U. S. S. R.

Broadcasting, motion pictures, and exchange of persons are my three main methods of gaining communication with the rest of the world, though every technique should be explored, including the use of the comic-strip books. But what do we want to communicate? I think of four things we should say to counteract the fraudulent Communist propaganda:

1. Without boasting, without falsifying, let us begin to dramatize abroad the strength and potential stability of the United States. Let us make clear that, although we have many problems, under the American business system our whole people, and not just the few, share a rising standard of living. Let us dramatize our peaceful record and peaceful intentions—our devotion to the ideal of political and economic independence for all peoples. Let us explain that we are a people slow to anger, but united and mighty in a righteous cause.

2. Let us increasingly share with other peoples our agricultural, industrial, and business know-how, the results of our research in medicine and public health, what we have learned about labor-management relations, city planning, public education, power development; and let us invite others to teach us what they have learned.

3. Let us begin, preferably in concert with other free nations, to dramatize those ideals which the free nations hold in common. Chief among these are personal and political freedom, equality of opportunity, and the God-given dignity of the individual. These are the ideals which most clearly divide us from the Communists, and in which they are most vulnerable in the eyes of the world.

4. Let us begin deliberately to lay bare before the world the gaping difference between Soviet deeds and Soviet words.

I urge that we say these things wherever possible through the United Nations and UNESCO, and jointly with other free nations. But much of the job will of necessity devolve upon ourselves, acting through groups of private citizens and through our Government.

Can we peacefully win men toward faith in human dignity and individual freedom? Of about 200,000,000,000 people who have lived on earth since the time of Christ, not more than 2,000,000,000 have known freedom as we understand it. As freedom has grown and spread, it has faced a series of stupendous totalitarian reactions. But it has survived because it is an inspired faith.

But it cannot and will not survive unless we are prepared to defend it. And our obligation to history, to the world and, most important, to ourselves, demands that we beat Russia at her own game. For, unless we can convince the people of the globe that our ideas spell peace, freedom, and happiness, we shall lose the war of guns as well as the war of ideas.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Its Relationship to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the development of the St. Lawrence seaway has become a priority project. Our national security, our strength as a free Nation, may well depend upon the construction of this important artery of transportation.

It is most unfortunate and may well prove disastrous to our national security that the St. Lawrence seaway bill has not been acted upon by the Congress.

While the seaway is of particular concern to the State of Minnesota, it is of even greater importance to the entire Nation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address prepared by me on this vital subject, The St. Lawrence Seaway and Its Relationship to the National Defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

It is always a pleasure for me to speak to my fellow Minnesotans, the kind of pleasure a traveler feels when he glimpses the familiar outlines of home and exchanges greetings with old friends. And today it is a very special pleasure, because I want to talk with you about our State's future. There is not one of us—from the miner extracting the earth's treasures, to the man in the factory, to the white-collar worker at his desk, to the farmer who sees his fields of ripe grain stretch to the horizon of the Minnesota sky—who has not a very personal interest in what the next generation will bring to our State.

These are times of far-reaching economic changes. It is not unusual that Minnesota's future should be intertwined with an issue which also has great significance for the Middle West and our Nation as a whole. I am speaking of the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin.

From the days of the earliest settlement of our forefathers in the Northwest, this waterway has been the very lifeline of our industrial growth. The Governments of Canada and the United States—in the belief that great natural resources should be developed for the benefit of the people—have been making improvements along the channel. In 1855 at Sault Ste. Marie the first primitive lock was constructed between Lake Superior and Lake Huron, opening the way for the ore boats. Today on that spot are the famous Soo Locks through which pass 85,000,000 tons of ore a year. In 1932 the Canadian Government completed the Welland Canal and locks, making it possible to navigate a 300-foot drop between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. The question of further improvements at Niagara Falls is also under consideration. Each time a barrier has been removed from the channel, the trade in grain and coal and ore has increased. Every improvement has lifted the wealth and standard of living of the surrounding regions. Now there remain only 113 miles of river to be brought under control. It is this relatively short stretch of water which has become the core of controversy. And here lie the answers to some of our questions about Minnesota's future.

The St. Lawrence seaway project would make these 113 miles navigable. It would provide a 27-foot channel from Duluth at the head of the Great Lakes through the St. Lawrence and out to the Atlantic Ocean, a distance of 2,400 miles. Obviously, this would open the interior of our continent to the trade of the world. A dam and powerhouse would be built in the International Rapids of the St. Lawrence River in northern New York. The water's energy would be converted into electric power and sold to residential and industrial users in New York and probably in New England.

The seaway has received unstinting support in Minnesota and other forward-looking States, but for a quarter century, whenever it reached Congress, it has been battled to a standstill by—principally—a tight little knot of potent but misguided people.

If the seaway were a reality, Minnesota's products could be sent into the markets of the world—her wheat and flour, her flaxseed, dairy foods, lumber, farm machinery, and other manufactures. And the wealth of the world would pour back to the people of our State. It would come in the form of payment for our goods. It would come in the form of raw materials from new sources.

Minnesota's farmers would stand to gain in two ways: They could expect their products, enjoying the advantage of cheap water transportation, to become competitive in world markets. And, as always, they could expect to prosper in direct relation to Minnesota's urban centers which will be stimulated by the new outlet to the Atlantic. Our cities on the shores of Lake Superior—Duluth and Two Harbors—will become busy ocean ports. Our inland cities—Minneapolis and St. Paul, for example—cannot help but benefit from the State's growth in agriculture, manufacturing, and shipping.

Although it can be said that Minnesota's body is composed of fertile farmland and thriving cities, her veins are truly of iron. From the great ranges of the Lake Superior region comes the high-grade iron ore which supplies nearly 85 percent of America's vital steel industry. In a giant semicircle, beginning at Buffalo, swooping down through Pennsylvania and southern Ohio, and up to Chicago, the steel mills of the United States are concentrated. They are there for a reason—because our Lake Superior ore is easily and cheaply accessible. From these reserves came the ore for steel which has contributed to our high standard of living. From these reserves was produced the steel for the weapons of our victory in World War II. And now again our iron and steel will go forth to protect our way of life.

But the Superior ore gradually is being depleted. I say depleted, not exhausted. Until now approximately 2,500,000,000 tons have been consumed. The remainder is estimated at from 1,300,000,000 to 1,600,000,000 tons, of which 500,000,000 to 600,000,000 tons are in open-pit ores. These are being used up at the rate of 50,000,000 to 55,000,000 tons a year.

How long could they last if they were subjected to the demands of another war, or even of stepped-up rearmament, as the President has ordered? In 20 years at the very latest—some experts say in half that time—the steel mills will need other sources of iron ore.

Naturally the steel industry knows this and it is already seeking and finding new deposits of ore. United States Steel has purchased land on the Delaware River in eastern Pennsylvania for a new steel mill to use ore from Venezuela. Bethlehem Steel is expanding in Baltimore, and using Chilean ore.

There is talk of a steel mill to be built in New England. All of them want to be near Atlantic coast ports in order to utilize foreign ores.

What effect would this have on the Middle West? A tragic one. The men who make steel are hard-boiled and realistic. They choose their plant locations because transportation of ore to steel mills is a heavy factor in production costs. If their supply of ore runs out, they will relocate closer to a new supply. It would make no difference to them—nor any other businessman in the same situation—that the Middle West might suffer.

The entire livelihood of some of our Minnesota towns depends on iron ore. If we continue to mine it at the current rate, their source of prosperity will be drained dry eventually. We have seen the ghost towns of the West—pitiful skeletons where men once lived and thrived on a single commodity—gold. When that was exhausted the town and its inhabitants went with it, leaving nothing but dusty remains. Are we going to let this happen to the ore towns of Minnesota? Our fine cities of Hibbing, Virginia, Coleraine, Buhl, Ely on the Mesabi—and Crosby and Ironton on the Cuyuna—were nourished on ore and through it made a great contribution to the economy of our Nation. The answer is "No." Not as long as the splendid people of Minnesota continue to exercise their rights of citizenship wisely.

Our first step is to keep the steel industry from deserting the Middle West. We must not only preserve our ore supply, but we must have supplementary ores. In Labrador there are deposits which compare in quality to our best Superior ore. If the seaway were open, Labrador ore could come in via a cheap water route, to supplement, but not to supplant, our Minnesota ores. It would be unnecessary to move steel plants to the Atlantic coast to receive foreign-ore shipments if Minnesota and Labrador ores could be used as complementary sources. It would be unnecessary to watch the decay of Minnesota's ore towns, to see their populations desert, their businesses sicken and die, and their markets disappear for the farmers of the State. The recent census shows that Minnesota has gained almost 200,000 in population these last 10 years, putting us up close to 3,000,000. This trend, however, may not continue. The experience of our neighbors, North Dakota and Nebraska, who lost population to the coastal States, is too close for comfort.

The seaway would give the steel industry the assurance it needs and wants that it could remain exactly where it is, and, by the same token, the seaway would stabilize the economy of the Middle West. It would resolve our uncertainties about the future.

I do not wish to overlook the existence of the great veins of second-grade ore—the taconites—which we also have in the Lake Superior region. I am tremendously interested in the development of taconite ore, and where national legislation is necessary to bring it into use I shall do all within my power to secure such legislation. Research is now under way to develop our taconites. However, the best estimates say that we cannot expect more than about 20,000,000 tons by 1970. Now, since current demands average about 50,000,000 tons of open-pit and 30,000,000 tons of underground ore yearly, you can see that 20,000,000 tons of taconite concentrates would only meet part of the future needs of iron ore.

We know that the development of taconites will employ large numbers of people. It will put our second-grade ores to good use. There is no doubt that we should go ahead with it; but the steel industry is not going to wait for us to do it. As long as cheap foreign ores are available, it will move to coastal areas to get them—that is, unless we can have Labrador ore shipped in via the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway to meet and combine with our Minnesota ores in the blast furnaces of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan.

Ours is not a selfish interest. It is not just Minnesota, not just the Middle West, but the entire Nation which needs the seaway. National security demands not only that the Middle West remain the center of the steel industry, but that iron ore coming to the Middle West be shipped in by the protected route of the St. Lawrence. Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., speaking for the various defense agencies and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had this to say about the seaway:

"In time of emergency it is essential that adequate quantities of iron ore be readily available to meet the needs of the Armed Forces. The Labrador ores are generally recognized as the most important now available within the North American continent. If the seaway is completed, ore from this area could be brought into the Great Lakes steel-industrial area over a protected inland water route, requiring, in time of war, less protective measures than open-sea routes."

Now that President Truman has asked for a $10,000,000,000 mobilization program, we naturally are concerned over rising Federal expenditures and any further drains on the Treasury. It is good to know in these circumstances that the seaway is expected to be self-liquidating. Both the Canadian and United States Governments have agreed that a system of toll charges should be established. Farm and industrial leaders have indicated their willingness to pay these tolls. And even with the tolls, the seaway remains a cheaper method of transportation. Power sales will be another source of revenue to help with self-liquidation. The cost of $388,000,000 to the United States would be liquidated in 50 years. And the benefits in dollars to our farms, factories, and great metropolitan centers would be incalculable.

Since 1919 the State of Minnesota has supported this project. The States of New York and New England expect to receive electric power from the dam on the St. Lawrence River. We in Minnesota want to see them get it. We want their electricity bills to drop and their standard of living to rise. When easterners are prosperous they buy more of our products—particularly those shipped over a cheap water route. Any great economic development that is helpful to one region of the United States will result in national benefit. And so it is with the St. Lawrence seaway.

You may wonder why such a worthy proposal has failed to receive congressional approval. It has been supported by Presidents and Congressmen of both political parties, since it was first introduced. But its opponents are powerful and articulate. The railroads and the power companies of the Northeast, in the mistaken belief that it would take business from them, are fighting the seaway. They have battled it so successfully over the years that we still do not have it.

I am reminded of the time, around the turn of the century, when the great railroad baron, James J. Hill, put up a terrific battle against approval of the Panama Canal. The American taxpayers, he said, would be pouring their money into a lily pond. He claimed the Canal would ruin our transcontinental railroads. Well, he was wrong on both counts. The Panama Canal became a vital part of our national defense and an essential link in our foreign trade. And our transcontinental railroads are among the most profitable lines in the country. The same thing happened to the southern power companies which fought TVA tooth and nail. Today they are utilizing low-cost TVA power and their profits are higher than ever.

At this moment resolutions to complete the St. Lawrence seaway are in committee in both Houses of Congress. It is most unfortunate that the Congress has not acted. We must continue the fight for this great legislation.

The St. Lawrence seaway is the key to Minnesota's future. It holds opportunity, development, wealth. Our industries are entitled to the expansion brought by low transportation costs. The Middle West is entitled to send its products forth to world markets. It is time for Congress to recognize the needs of the Middle West and of our great State of Minnesota.

Letter of Robert B. Dresser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *August 17, 1950.*

GUY GEORGE GABRIELSON, ESQ.,
Chairman, Republican National Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GABRIELSON: On August 14, 1945, Japan accepted the Allied terms of surrender and World War II came to an end. On June 25, 1950, less than 5 years later, the North Koreans crossed the frontier into South Korea, and a war was started which may ultimately develop into world war III. While on the surface it is a war against the North Koreans, it is in reality a war against Russia.

What has led to this war in which we have become involved—the third in 31 years? Has the conduct of our Nation's affairs been honest and able, or is the reverse true? These are questions which the American people are entitled to have answered, and answered now. If there have been mistakes or worse in the past, how can their repetition in the future be prevented unless the facts are known?

The answer to these questions undoubtedly lies in the incredible bungling (to speak mildly) of our Nation's affairs by the party which has controlled our National Government for the past 17 years. It began in the first year of President Franklin Roosevelt's first term when, on November 17, 1933, diplomatic relations with Russia were resumed, ending a policy of nonrecognition which had prevailed since the overthrow of the Kerensky government in 1917. From that time on the foreign policy pursued by our Government has had the effect of building up Russia from a comparatively weak nation to a very strong one. This course was followed despite the knowledge that the Russian Government was one of the most cruel and ruthless despotisms the world has ever known.

Even after the end of World War II, when it became clear that Russia was building a huge war machine with the obvious intention of using it against us, our Government continued to follow a course in Asia that played right into Russia's hands. It shamefully betrayed our stanch ally, Chiang-Kai-shek, and the Nationalist Government in China, and turned China over to the Communist stooges of Moscow. By so doing it rendered impotent the one power in Asia that could have stopped Russia in her tracks, and by so doing have prevented the present war in Korea.

Very revealing statements have been made and articles and books written on the subject of this country's policy toward China by such men as (1) Ambassador William C. Bullitt, who was President Roosevelt's first Ambassador from this country to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, from 1933 to 1936, President Roosevelt's Ambassador to France from 1936 to 1940, and his Special Envoy to Nanking, China, in 1934, and who returned to China again in the summer of 1947 to write a series of articles for Life magazine; (2) Dr. WALTER JUDD, Republican Congressman from Minnesota, a recognized authority on China, who spent a number of years there as a medical missionary of the Congregational Church and as the managing head of certain hospitals; (3) Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, who suceeded General Stilwell in China; (4) Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, the celebrated American general who commanded the famous Flying Tigers in China during World War II, and who wrote a book on China bearing the title "Way of a Fighter," which was published early in 1949; (5) Mr. Roscoe Pound, former dean of the Harvard Law School and one of America's leading jurists, who spent 18 months in China ending in the spring of 1949, during which he served as adviser to the Ministry of Justice of the Nationalist Government; (6) Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, President Roosevelt's personal Ambassador to China in the latter part of the last war; (7) Joseph P. Kamp, author of America Betrayed; and (8) Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The conclusions to be drawn from the statements of the above persons and from press reports and other resources are these:

(1) The United States is in great peril. If a war with little Korea can do what it has to this country, what will the ultimate war with Russia do?

(2) Through American aid and the incredible errors and bungling of our Government (to put it mildly), Russia has been built up from a comparatively weak nation to a very strong one, while our own military power during the past 5 years has steadily and drastically declined.

(3) Russia intends to use her huge military machine to conquer and enslave the world.

(4) The Chinese Communists are, like the Korean Communists, acting under the orders of Russia, and control of China by them means control by Russia.

(5) Control of China by Russia will probably lead to Russian control of all Asia, which has one-half the population of the world.

(6) With Russia in complete control of Asia. it is probable that she will be able to achieve her ambition of world conquest.

(7) With Chiang in control of China, there would have been no Korean War, and the danger of Russia's getting control of Asia would have been eliminated. As a result, the thousands of American lives which have been and will be sacrified in Korea would have been saved.

(8) The responsibility for all this rests with President Harry S. Truman and his predecessor in office, Franklin D. Roosevelt. While many of the acts that have created this state of affairs may have been performed by persons other than the President, such persons held office only at his will and could have been removed by him at any time. Instead, he has consistently supported them and their policies and has insisted on continuing them in office. The responsibility, therefore, is his.

(9) The present indecision of our State Department as to the course to follow regarding the defense of Formosa and the support of Chiang, described in the press as a "dilemma" is no dilemma at all, unless it be a domestic political one of having to admit to the American people that its previous policy toward Chiang has been utterly and disastrously wrong. If Formosa is of great military importance to us, as General MacArthur and our other military leaders seem to think, and if our policy toward Chiang has been wrong, the parlor debate now going on should be stopped before it is too late, and we should declare to the world that Chiang is our ally and that we will support him to the limit. We need as never before allies that will do something more than talk and take our money.

Not only has the clique that has ruled the United States for the past 17 years pursued a foreign policy that has placed this Nation in the greatest peril in its history, but it has followed an equally disastrous domestic policy.

For 17 years the Federal Government has been under the domination of individuals who, having seized control of the Democratic Party, have been steadily leading the Nation down the road to socialism.

In violation of the rights expressly reserved to the States and the people by the Federal Constitution, these Socialist planners have succeeded in steadily diminishing the powers of the States and increasing the power of the Federal Government, until today we witness the sickening spectacle of State and municipal officials going to Washington in a steady stream with hat in hand begging for Federal aid—aid which is granted only on conditions that render the States and municipalities still more subservient to the Federal will. The obtaining of this money by the State and municipal officials is proclaimed by them as a splendid achievement, despite the fact that the money which they obtain is money which the Federal Government has collected from the people of the very States which they represent; for it must be remembered that, with minor exceptions, every dollar of revenue collected by the Federal Government comes from the same sources of revenue that are available to the States.

The result has been the building up of a huge Federal bureaucracy with 2,000,000 individuals on the payroll at a tremendous cost to the people of the country.

Through abuse of the taxing power the Federal Government takes each year a large part of the income of the people of the States and hands back to the States only a small fraction of the sums so collected. For example, for the 5 years, 1944 to 1948, both inclusive, the figures for Rhode Island are as follows:

Year	Payments to Federal Government by Rhode Island taxpayers	Federal aid to Rhode Island
1944	$257,513,531.32	$5,435,293
1945	246,342,330.13	4,511,754
1946	225,919,539.43	4,091,500
1947	216,325,430.14	5,073,210
1948	236,234,082.51	31,848,753

The large increase in Federal aid in 1948 was due to veterans' education facilities, which increased from $164,866 in 1947 to $24,424,719 in 1948.

This practice of the Federal Government is very harmful.

(1) It deprives the States of sources of revenue to which they are justly entitled and makes it difficult for the States and municipalities to raise the revenue needed for their own operations.

(2) It greatly increases the power of the Federal Government and diminishes the power of the States. In fact, it is the most effective imaginable scheme to create a centralized government, and is a sly constitutional destruction of American constitutional government.

(3) It is extremely costly, for not only does it result in building up and maintaining a huge and unnecessary Federal bureaucracy, but much more money is spent for the various purposes than would be the case if the States raised their own revenue and spent it for their own purposes.

(4) It therefore increases greatly the amount of taxes which the people must pay.

In its lust for power the Federal Government under Mr. Truman spent in five peacetime years, from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1950, $214,000,000,000, an amount greater by $34,000,000,000 than the total amount spent by all the 32 previous Presidents in 152 years, from 1789 to July 1, 1941. In 1931 the cost of the Federal Government was $30 for each man, woman, and child. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, it was over $300. This has been merely a continuance of the policy on the part of our Federal managers of "tax, spend, and elect," the formula for socialism proposed by the late Harry Hopkins and so religiously followed by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Through this and other policies of the Roosevelt administration a depression, which started in 1929 and should, according to all normal experience, have ended within 2 or 3 years, was stretched to 11 years, and it took a war boom to end it. Throughout the life of our country there has been no depression to approach it, either in length, severity, or cost. During this period we had the greatest unemployment in our history, with an average of 10,000,000 unemployed. Have these facts been forgotten by the people?

The war ended the depression by putting everybody to work. The war at the same time created an unprecedented scarcity of materials and goods that kept industry operating at capacity for more than 3 years after the war ended.

During the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, through deficit spending due in large part, but by no means wholly, to the war, the national debt has been increased from $21,000,000,000 in 1933 to almost $260,000,000,000 at the present time, and an inflation has been caused which has cut the purchasing power of the dollar almost in two as compared with 10 years ago. As a result there has been a drastic increase in the cost of living, and the solvency of the Federal Government has been endangered.

During this period the New Deal administration has consistently followed a course based upon an alien philosophy of government, which, as history has demonstrated time and time again, can have but one ending—the complete loss of freedom, and the enslavement of the people in a fully regimented and Socialist state.

Again and again have the people been warned of this. A majority, however, have ignored the warning. Bought by Government jobs and hand-outs at the taxpayers' expense, and cajoled and deceived by Government promises and by the temporary benefits flowing from an inflated economy, a majority of the voters have chosen to continue in office the most incompetent and unscrupulous administration the country has ever known—an administration which led Senator BYRD, of Virginia, a Democrat, to say on the floor of the United States Senate on July 14, 1949, referring to President Truman's speech the night before on the economic report:

"I say that the fiscal program announced last night by the President is the certain road to ruin. Unless the Congress and the people can defeat this program, we will go over the precipice of financial disaster.

"Such a program can only hold in prospect for business increased taxes or national insolvency. Increased taxes applied to a declining business probably would reach a point of confiscation, and insolvency would mean default on the public debt, in which is now invested a great part of the security

of the American public. Confiscation would mean socialism, and default would mean national bankruptcy."

It is under these conditions that we face the prospect of a third world war, with a national debt of nearly $260,000,000,000, as compared with $60,000,000,000 at the beginning of World War II.

If world war III comes shortly and we win it, we shall be ruined economically. If it is deferred for a number of years, it is probable that we shall also be ruined economically; for there is little chance of raising sufficient revenue to meet the increased costs of either a long cold war or a series of wars with Russia's satellite nations. This certainly could not be done with an administration which insists, even in the face of a growing deficit, on politics and handouts as usual, and opposes every constructive effort to eliminate nonessential expenditures. The inevitable result will be the serious impairment, if not the virtually complete destruction, of the purchasing power of the dollar.

As a result of the amazing stampede on the part of Congress to give to the President at this time dictatorial powers over our economy, we appear on the verge of becoming a regimented state, which is what the Socialist planners, of course, desire. If this step is taken, it may be found difficult, if not impossible, to prevent the complete conversion of the United States into a Socialist state, the goal of the New Deal administration for 17 years.

Perhaps it is too late to save the country from the impending ruin brought on by the New Deal administration. The only hope is to elect to office men who will put the good of their country above all else, men who will refuse to follow the New Deal Socialist line which has brought us to the brink of disaster. This applies not only to national but to State and local offices as well.

The Republican Party seems to be the only available agency to which to turn in this hour of need. Unfortunately, it has shown a lack of courage in the past in failing squarely and vigorously to oppose the New Deal's Socialist program. If the Republican Party is to survive, this course must be abandoned, and the issue must be squarely presented to the people of whether they shall have socialism or liberty.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

The Statehood Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times entitled "The Statehood Bills" under date of September 8, 1950:

President Truman is right in pressing upon the Senate the urgency of the bills granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. This is obviously the psychological time for their passage. This action would put us in a stronger position in the Pacific when we need all the strength we can muster. It would be, in a very real sense, a closing of our ranks.

The support for these measures, both congressional and public, is widespread. They were adopted in the House by large majorities. It is believed that they can win overwhelming Senate approval if the Democratic policy committee permits them to come to the floor. The reasons for adoption are many and sound. The ground for delay at this point is flimsy and may possibly be unworthy.

It has been suggested that a long Senate debate might be precipitated at a time when some legislators are eager to get home to make political hay. This is not a valid excuse for sidetracking legislation that the country wants and that a majority of the Congress is ready to approve. Behind this suggestion of protracted debate is the more sinister thesis that the long objection will come from a small group of Democrats who fear that legislative representatives of Hawaii and Alaska would support the civil rights phases of the Truman program. It is certainly no display of statecraft to impede the legislation for Hawaii and Alaska in order to pander to the prejudices of a minority.

The President's appeal should be heeded. The measures should be brought out and adopted before any adjournment.

American Medical Association Attack Upon the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a simple truth that needs constant repetition in these days of confusion and pressure. We must never lose sight of the fact that our democracy depends for its strength upon the wisdom of an informed people—a public that has access to the facts about important issues so that each American can weigh all sides of controversial questions and come to his own independent conclusions.

That independence of mind is America's greatest strength. It is not to be found under Communist or Fascist dictatorships. Anything that seeks to undermine that independence, that seeks to substitute manufactured stereotypes for independent opinion seeks, in effect, to weaken and erode our strength and to drug our minds.

AMA CAMPAIGN STARTS OCTOBER

To help preserve that independence of mind, I call attention to a forthcoming assault on American free thought which will be among the heaviest ever launched by powerful interests. I refer specifically to the forthcoming advertising campaign which the medical lobby will launch in the press and radio starting October 8, expending for this one month alone $1,110,000. That saturation campaign is designed to spread by massive injections of untruths, lies, distortions, and innuendoes a contagious infection among our people so that they will fall victim to the big-lie technique of the medical lobby's $100,000 a year propagandists.

These doctors of public opinion are seeking to doctor, drug, and slug the American people into believing the crude big lie that sickness is health; that insurance is socialism and communism; that the President's plan for National Health Insurance is socialized medicine. With 90,000,000 printed political tracts and diatribes and other special pieces of propaganda, these political medicine men are shouting from their million-dollar soapboxes, microphones and presses against health insurance.

The medical hucksters are not merely attacking the President's health program. They are not only attacking Federal aid to train more and badly needed doctors and health personnel. They are not merely attacking Federal aid to increase local health units in American communities throughout the land. They are not merely attacking disability insurance.

AMA CAMPAIGN AGAINST FAIR DEAL

No; they are using these needed legislative measure as springboards in a desperate effort to defeat all Fair Deal measures and supporters. This is a fight against progress itself in economic and social fields. The AMA is a Dr. Jekyll in the field of medicine; it is a rampaging Mr. Hyde about measures to meet human needs. Willfully suppressing independent-minded doctors, it is launching a million-dollar attack against the Fair Deal and against this administration and every Member of this Congress who supports the idea that we can hope and plan for a better life.

The magnitude of that campaign against progress can be realized from the outlined report of proposed action in Editor and Publisher of August 26, 1950, which in substance is quoted further on in this discussion. According to the medical lobby's chief propagandists, their saturation campaign is designed to invade every home where a newspaper, magazine, or radio can be found. The combined weight of that attack undoubtedly is designed to have a narcotic effect upon the American mind, to deaden it with a platitudinous repetition of untruths and slanders, to inoculate it against the truth that the President's plan is the sound and sensible way to take the dollar sign out of sickness.

I submit that this spurious AMA campaign is a terrible threat to freedom of American thought. Let me document that statement and indicate the precise type of threat—a threat that is real and as dangerous and ominous as that of communism or fascism.

LOBBY SUPPRESSES LIBERAL DOCTORS

The medical lobby's huckster drive could only be launched through the curtailment of free thought among the medical profession itself. This million-dollar propaganda campaign struck first at the freedom of countless independent-minded doctors—the legion of those who do not accept supinely the canned and stagnant economic and political views of the AMA hierarchy. Our doctors were never asked whether they approved of such a campaign. Our doctors were never asked whether they want to contribute millions to play politics with health, whether they wanted to aline with and assess themselves $25 a year for such a low purpose. Our doctors were never permitted to say whether

or not they would prefer to devote this money to furthering medical research, to the discovery of new drugs to ameliorate human suffering, or to the development of new programs to bring the miracles of modern medicine within the reach of every family.

No; our doctors were never asked what they thought of such a compulsory assessment to finance this huckstering campaign of misrepresentation against the spirit of liberalism itself. They were never asked because their disapproval would prevent such a campaign. Proof of that statement can be seen in the fact that in 1949, when the medical lobby first conceived of these $25 political-assessment dues, but on a so-called voluntary basis, more than one out of every three physicians did not pay up. And this refusal came in the face of tremendous pressures which a few leaders of the medical hierarchy can and did direct against the average hard-working, "nonpoliticking" doctor.

AMA PERMITS NO OPPOSITION

These independent-minded doctors never had a chance to assert their views about the monstrosity of being compelled to contribute to a corruption fund of more than $3,000,000 per year out of which $1,110,000 was to be spent in 2 weeks of October alone to promote a false and malicious huckstering campaign. The medical body arrogantly thrust aside such a plea from physicians that they be allowed to express their views through a secret poll. Instead, the medical lobby declared that any AMA member who did not pay the assessment would face the most stringent disciplinary action—loss of AMA membership. For many doctors this would amount to professional blacklisting, loss of hospital connections and perhaps the loss of most of their private practice. For the patients, for us who might count that doctor our family physician, it might mean that we could longer have his services.

SEEKS LOBBYING ALLIES

So with the independent-minded doctors bottled up, the medical lobby in a few short weeks shall soon launch its assault and thereby endanger freedom of though for all independent Americans. For the medical lobby is seeking to enlist millions of other dollars in tie-in advertisements and canned material. It is turning for support to many of the scarlet groups which always have money to spend to block liberal measures intended to meet human needs and to advance progress. The medical lobby is seeking out all the groups which support reactionaries—the backers of the Committee for Constitutional Government, the private utility lobbies. With their allies, they hope for tie-in advertisements which may reach the staggering cost of $19,000,000.

Think of that—a total of $20,000,000; over a million dollars from AMA campaign funds, and probably $19,000,000 tie-in advertisements; spent not for medical research, not to bring cancer or diseases of the heart, or arthritis or rheumatism, or cerebral palsy, under control. Twenty million dollars not spent for any of the other diseases that plague and cripple or kill so many millions, but spent for crass political attacks on health insurance, which as a part of the of the social-security system is intended to help the American people.

Thus, a $20,000,000 saturation campaign shall sweep through the United States shortly to form and manipulate mass opinion against its own self-interest.

Do not think for yourself, says the medical lobby insistently, from the paid columns of your daily and weekly paper: Insurance is socialism and communism. The President's plan for national health insurance is socialized medicine. Everything we do not like is socialism and communism.

What if we do not have enough doctors or hospitals? The medical lobby dismisses that as unimportant. Under the heading of socialism and communism they dismiss vitally important plans to help our medical schools out of their financial troubles. They ignore the pleas for Federal aid which would enable qualified young men and women to get medical training. Also ignored by the AMA are the desperate rural needs for doctors and their services.

To conceal its moral bankruptcy, the medical lobby is seeking to overwhelm every source of public expression, to shout louder and longer than all the forces of truth, to cry down all facts and saturate our eyes, ears, and our very minds with its all-pervasive cry of reaction.

And therein lies the grave threat to our independence of mind and advancement. Here we see propaganda's millons of dollars ranged against the pennies of truth in a death struggle. For days on end, there will be no escape from that raging fever of falsehood—on the air and in the press. By dint of repetition, the medical lobby hopes to corrupt all thought, stamp out all reflection, deliver us into the hands of hucksters.

If this campaign succeeds, then we shall witness the begining of a new and evil mechanism on the American scene—the unparalleled use of money to dominate and control all thought. Money—and money in staggering amounts—will be the open sesame to all future contests, for with enough money, selfish interests will feel able to mold public opinion as they will without fear of truth.

I do not think this evil day is yet upon us. It do not think that this raging fever of falsehood, injected by the medical lobby into the American body politic, can withstand the serum of truth. That is why I sound this warning and urge all forces of liberalism in this country to mobilize against the coming attack of the medical lobby.

I call upon our forces in the Democratic Party, upon all liberal-thinking Americans, upon the leaders of our free-trade unions, and upon our independent-minded physicians to help spread the truth to counterattack the lies of the medical lobby. We must not abandon the field to the forces of reaction. We must stand and fight.

For against the medical lobby's millions there is the antidote of truth. And that antidote can and must be spread by al of us who are dedicated to the welfare of our people, the progress and the satisfaction of their needs.

The article on the AMA campaign was published in the August 26, 1950, issue of Editor and Publisher.

Why Are American Soldiers Fighting in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the question, Why are American soldiers fighting in Korea? supplying this statement with its title, has been propounded to me in letters received daily since the beginning of the fighting in the peninsula of Korea. It is a fair question. Every American citizen should have it answered fairly and to his or her satisfaction. The unprovoked invasion of South Korea is the latest Communist outrage against the United Nations and the freedom-loving peoples of the world, and should be recognized for what it really is. It is a flagrant act of aggression such as the United Nations is authorized, constituted, and pledged to resist, suppress, and punish, no matter when, where, or by what nation committed. It is an act of crass opportunism, not to mention a violation of the precepts that the Communists themselves had agreed to observe. It is well to review briefly the historical record. This shows that Russia—whose approval of the aggression is clearly indicated—has lost no opportunity to further its nefarious purposes by the same kind of opportunism.

The story of Korea cannot be related in a few words. Events leading up to the present situation in that unhappy country cover a long period of years, but for the purpose of this statement we will begin with the Japanese surrender in 1945.

Russia did not enter into the war against Japan until August 8, 1945, just 2 days before the Japanese announced their intention to surrender. In its declaration of war against Japan the Russian Government positively endorsed and reaffirmed the declaration made some time before at Cairo and restated at Potsdam that "the Japanese will be driven out of Korea and that country" (not part of it, but all of it) "will be made a free, sovereign, and independent nation."

Immediately following her declaration of war against Japan, Russia sent her forces sweeping down through Manchuria. By the time Japan was ready to surrender the Russian Army was in south Manchuria poised on the northern border of Korea, apparently ready to continue her sweep down across the entire Korean Peninsula. At this time.

with the Japanese ready and willing to surrender at once their great army and all its equipment then in Korea, the United States had no troops in Korea to accept the surrender, in fact, none nearer than the Philippines. To solve the problem of accepting the Japanese surrender quickly and efficiently, the allies agreed—at the highest level—that Russia could take the surrender in Korea down to the thirty-eighth parallel of latitude, and that as soon as the United States could get her forces into Korea they would accept the surrender up to the line determined upon. The line was never intended to divide Korea, nor to have any political significance whatever.

The Russian forces moved immediately after making this agreement. They moved into Korea on August 12, 1945, but instead of stopping at the thirty-eighth parallel, they continued southward. The United States did not get her forces from the Philippines into Korea until September 8, 1945, nearly 1 month after the Russians moved in. Our forces, with great difficulty, forced the Russians to move back to the thirty-eighth parallel line. When they did move back, they at once clamped down the iron curtain exactly on the thirty-eighth parallel. And since that time, no American, official or civilian, no commission nor commissioner, no representative of the United Nations, no representative or citizen of any free country in the world, has been permitted to cross that line.

After the Russians accepted the surrender of the Japanese forces in Korea down to the thirty-eighth parallel, and closed down their curtain, the question of organizing and establishing a government for Korea came to the front. After a continuous but fruitless effort by the United States to work out with Russia a basis for unifying the country, the matter was taken up with the United Nations, and that organization agreed that all of Korea should have a representative self-government of its own choosing. This was approved by the United States. A commission was appointed by the United Nations and sent to Korea to assist in establishing a free government and to observe and see that free elections were held. The United States also sent a commission. The Russian Government established a similar commission, but that commission declined to function in respect to what is now South Korea. The Russians set up a Communist government in North Korea. This North Korean Government refused not only to take any part in the South Korean elections, but refused to let either the United Nations Commission, the United States Commission, anybody connected with either, or any representative of any outside nation or organization—other than communistic—enter North Korea.

There was, therefore, nothing left for the United Nations to do but to direct and supervise a free election for the establishment of a free, independent, democratic government in South Korea. This was done. The Republic of Korea came into being and was recognized by the United States and 26 other countries.

Under Russian direction, a North Korean Army, estimated to number 100,000, was organized, trained by Russian military experts and equipped, not only with arms and munitions taken over upon the surrender of the Japanese Army, but also with modern Russian tanks and other improved instrumentalities of war. Evidently believing this army to be strong enough to invade and take over South Korea, Russia withdrew her troops from North Korea.

In South Korea, the United States military mission had undertaken the task of training a security force sufficient to preserve internal stability and resist successfully sporadic raids from across the border. The force was not designed to resist a full-dress aggressor invasion such as occurred.

On the 25th day of June 1950, without any declaration of war, without notice or warning, a North Korean army of over 100,000 men, spear-headed by Russian-built tanks, swept across the famous thirty-eighth parallel into South Korea with the obvious intention of laying the country waste, destroying its government and forcing its people to accept the domination of communistic rule. The raid was patterned after that of Pearl Harbor, marked by similar elements of betrayal, surprise, and duplicity. Its initial success was, of course, costly to the cause of freedom the world over. It was a direct challenge, not only to the United Nations, but also to all free nations holding a membership in that body. Its final success would mean the collapse of the United Nations and would imperil every free nation throughout the world.

This treacherous attack presented the free world with two alternatives: The United Nations and its members, including the United States, must either lie down and tamely submit to Soviet domination, with the consequent loss of freedom and of our status as independent nations, or all must join with the United Nations in its fight to preserve a world in which men can be free. Under authority granted by its Charter, the United Nations called upon all of its member nations to join in the fight. The United States and other members have responded to the call.

Therefore, one important fact that should be known to every citizen of the United States, is that our country is not fighting in Korea alone. The war is that of the United Nations, and the flag of the United Nations flies above our troops by the side of the Stars and Stripes. Fifty-three nations of the world are our allies, and a number of these, including Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, France, and the Netherlands, have already sent contingents of troops, naval vessels, and air units to join us in the combat. Others have offered to send troops, while still others have offered important supplies. Altogether, 30 nations have offered assistance in various forms to the United Nations.

It has been said, and truly, that this is a fight for our very lives. We are fighting for our freedom and that of our families. We are fighting for the security of our Nation and of our homes. We are fighting for and with the United Nations—the world's one and last hope for peace. We are fighting for all freedom-loving peoples the world over. We are fighting for liberty against tyranny. We are fighting a battle against the most deadly enemy the free peoples of the world have ever faced, a battle we must not lose, a battle that, with our own might, the aid of our allies, and the help of the God of our fathers, we must win.

Coast Guard Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcripts of proceedings of the Chamber of Commerce of Washington, N. C.

COAST GUARD DAY

WASHINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, "THE ORIGINAL WASHINGTON," WASHINGTON, N. C., AUGUST 4, 1950, THE ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY, COAST GUARD DAY

CLYDE HARRISON. We want to thank the people of North Carolina, of Beaufort County, Mr. A. B. Futrell, of the Washington Daily News, Mr. Jonathan Daniels, of the Raleigh News and Observer, radio station WRRF, and radio station WHED, to every single person in North Carolina who contributed some small part, we thank you very much; also to the Washington Park Garden Club for taking care of all concessions here in Washington Park today.

It is now a great pleasure of mine to introduce to you the honorable mayor of Washington, N. C., Dr. L. H. Swindell.

Dr. SWINDELL. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are happy to have as our guests members of the Coast Guard. We are also happy to have with us today a man who has been always interested in the Coast Guard. He has done everything in his power to give the Coast Guard that to which they are justly entitled, and the Coast Guard loves him. He is not only interested in the Coast Guard but he is interested in the district which he represents, and he has served this district with honor and credit, not only to himself but to the State and Nation—our own HERBERT BONNER. We should be and we are very proud of the Coast Guard. They play an important part on the coast of North Carolina, more than we possibly realize. Therefore, it is a pleasure on behalf of the city of Washington and Beaufort County to welcome to Washington the members of the Coast Guard and distinguished guests who have come from near and far to celebrate the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the Coast Guard and make it one of the best in its history. I thank you.

CLYDE HARRISON. Thank you, Mayor Swindell. At this time we would like to recognize some of our distinguished officials sitting on this stand:

Maj. Gen. L. E. Woods, United States Marine Corps, commanding, Aircraft Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic, based at Cherry Point.

N. C. He is also commander of the Second Marine Corps Air Wing. Major General Woods.

Capt. L. H. Baker, United States Coast Guard, Commander Fifth Coast Guard District, Norfolk, Va. Captain Baker.

Capt. A. L. Ford, United States Coast Guard, Operations Division, Fifth Coast Guard District. Captain Ford.

Capt. S. C. Linholm, United States Coast Guard, Commanding Officer of the Elizabeth City Coast Guard Air Station. Captain Linholm.

Twenty-one years ago there was a man sitting on this stage who was chairman of such a celebration in our town—Mr. E. L. Roebuck. Today, 21 years later, we have his son, J. Max Roebuck, who is small in stature but big in civic and community affairs and who is the over-all chairman for Coast Guard day in Washington, N. C. Mr. Roebuck.

We also have with us today a man also small in stature but very large in community affairs and in his work. He has worked diligently with all of the committees to stage this big occasion. I now present to you the president of the Washington Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Jarl E. Bowers.

JARL BOWERS. Thank you, Clyde.

Friends, neighbors and guests, it is indeed a pleasure to welcome you to the original Washington and Washington Park on behalf of the Washington Chamber of Commerce and the good people of Washington Park for the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of that great organization, the United States Coast Guard. We are very fortunate in having the Fifth Coast Guard District to celebrate their one hundred and sixtieth anniversary in our city. I consider the one man most responsible for having the Coast Guard bestow this honor upon us is our devoted friend and most capable Representative from the First Congressional District of North Carolina, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. One of his many duties in the United States Congress is ranking member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He is also chairman of the subcommittee on Coast Guard, and at this time I would like to turn the mike over to none other than our good friend, HERBERT BONNER.

HERBERT BONNER. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the United States Coast Guard and my friends: It is indeed a great honor that my home town has been selected as the site of this occasion. I would like to congratulate the town of Washington, and in particular the chamber of commerce, for their splendid work in making this day a great success. I am sure that a great deal of energy and effort has been put forth in preparation for the event. To all who have lent a hand we owe a debt of gratitude.

We today are gathered here to celebrate the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of a great arm of our national defense; a service whose history reaches back to the beginning of these United States. During the 160 years of the Coast Guard's life it has grown from a tiny service created primarily to chase smugglers from our coast to an organization which perhaps has as wide a range of duties and responsibilities as any in our Armed Forces. In times of peace its men are called upon to police our shores and the navigable waters and to enforce the law on the high seas. To them the task also follows of manning the lifeboat stations, ships and air stations and be ever ready and diligent to answer any call of distress, whatsoever it may be. A big part of their job is to keep accidents and disaster from occurring. One way it does this is by maintaining aids to navigation, such as lighthouses, lightships, land stations, radio beacons, buoy spot signals and guides to conduct ships safely into port through the darkness. In time of war, in addition to carrying on their peacetime functions, the men of the Coast Guard are called upon to guard the sea lanes for convoys, to man the landing craft that spearhead the invasion, and to man the troop transports that carry our men to the foreign shore. Throughout these years this noble service has written its record high in the annals of naval history. It has truly been a record of courage, sacrifice, valor, and honorable service. Perhaps it is fitting as we stand here today celebrating the birthday of this organization whose life parallels the growth and progress of our Nation that we reexamine the principles upon which this great Nation was founded. The men and women who settled this land from foreign shores sought a new kind of life. They sought a life of liberty. They sought a life that offered an opportunity to all men, regardless of race or creed. They sought a life which offered no fear of oppression from ruler or dictator. The story of America is indeed the story of the achievement of this new way of life. Today we, the American people, are faced with the most critical crisis in our history. I sometimes believe in my own heart that God Almighty destined the free American people to guard and protect the freedom of the other men and women throughout the length and breadth of the world. All of the institutions which are engrained in our heritage are being treated as they never have before. The immediate future is one of extreme sacrifice. We must call forth all our energies and resources to prepare for what threatens to be our greatest challenge. It is indeed a time of courage on our part. Many of our precious liberties will be suspended. Our men will be once again called to the defense of our country and the defense of other people who enjoy and desire both freedom and privileges that we are blessed with. Price control, wage control, and rationing are eminent. There is no place for selfishness and greed in this period. Hoarding and profiteering will not be tolerated. I repeat, hoarding and profiteering will not be tolerated. The men that stand in Korea today are not profiteering. The men that defend freedom in Korea today are not profiteering. They are offering their all that you might gather here as free men and women and that others around the face of the earth might have the privilege that you so enjoy. I sometimes feel that the great hope of the American adventure is that one day it will bring the sacrament of freedom to the people of the earth.

It is now my privilege to introduce a distinguished American. He is a native of the great State of Ohio. He attended the United States Coast Guard Academy at New London and began his career after receiving a commission as an ensign in 1921. Since that time he has served many a term both at sea and on shore. He early demonstrated his ability as an executive and an administrator and in the late twenties served as commandant of cadets at the Coast Guard Academy at New London. And let me pause here to say that in our midst today there are second-year classmen from New London—young men who will soon be the leaders of this great service—and to you, my friends and my home people, I ask that you be particularly hospitable to these young men today. The present speaker, after serving as commanding officer of several destroyers, was detached and transferred to Coast Guard Headquarters at Washington in 1937, where he served as technical adviser and was later sent as a delegate to the International Conference in England. During World War II he served as commanding officer of an attack transport and participated in amphibious operations in north Africa, Sicily, the Gilbert Islands, and the Marshall Islands. For his meritorious service during these assignments he was awarded the Legion of Merit and the Navy Unit of Commendation. Shortly after the war he was appointed Assistant Commandant of the United States Coast Guard and on October 12, 1949, he was nominated by President Truman to become Commandant. He took his office as Commandant on January 1, 1950. It is a high honor, a great privilege, therefore, to have here within our midst, and to me a personal pleasure, to introduce to you such an outstanding American, and a great defender of our national freedom. I present Vice Adm. Merlin O'Neal, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

Vice Adm. MERLIN O'NEAL. Thank you, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. Mayor, guests, fellow Coast Guard men, active and retired. Friends, to be with you today is not only a privilege but my pleasure. I have a particular reason for emphasizing this fact. All of us, of course, have birthdays. As we grow older many of us prefer to observe our anniversary more and more quietly in the faint hope that others will permit us to forget that passage of time, but today on this 4th of August we are celebrating one birthday with pride and acclaim—the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the beginning of the United States Coast Guard. Today, in fact, we mark the completion of another decade of its service to mankind and in any event, whether it is celebrated or merely observed, birthdays were intended to be spent impartially with those who wish us well. I count myself fortunate on this memorable occasion to be among friends of the Coast Guard. Congressman BONNER, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Coast Guard Affairs, is and always has been a stanch supporter of our service. He and Mrs. Bonner have shown their friendship by their gracious invitation to Mrs. O'Neal and to me to attend this celebration. There is something heartwarming about being invited home to meet the folks. The many courtesies that have been extended to us since our arrival here in Washington are greatly appreciated. There also has been a strong and close relationship between the Coast Guard and the State of North Carolina, particularly in the eastern part, in the tidewater part and the Outer Banks. It is the natural kinship that follows among men who love the sea and its traditions. I am reminded of several well-known families of North Carolina who have made the Coast Guard a career. Grandfathers, fathers, sons, uncles, brothers, nephews—even entire families have joined the service—a degree of participation of which no other State can boast.

CLYDE HARRISON. Thank you, Admiral O'Neal, for a very timely message. At this time we want to recognize Don Pierce, program director of Station WRRF, who will aid in the commentary on the events stated by the United States Coast Guard.

We are very fortunate today in having Lt. David Oliver, who has the reputation of being the crack helicopter pilot of the United States Coast Guard and who will explain to you the different events which are about to take place. It is a great pleasure to introduce Lt. David Oliver, of the Elizabeth City Coast Guard Air Station, Lieutenant Oliver.

Lt. DAVID OLIVER. Harrison's choice of articles was a little bit exaggerated—articles and also adjectives. However, I thank you for it. I am glad to be here. My job today is to explain to you and to keep you up with the events and give you a short glimpse of the Coast Guard equipment. Due to the river here being a far distance inland, we were unable to bring the Coast Guard cutter this close. That is one of the principal pieces of the Coast Guard equipment. However, we will mention them, and I am sure you are familiar with the Coast Guard cutters which do so many jobs on the high seas. Today, however, we will give you a glimpse of the work of the Coast Guard inshore and in these waters and areas around Washington. You

have already seen some of the equipment on display, such as the Coast Guard vehicles, the Coast Guard dollies for handling boats, the line-throwing cannon north of the area here, the breeches buoy equipment which is mounted and strung from the trees to the west of us; also the amphibious vehicles, termed a "duck"—aptly so, although the spelling of it is "dukw"; "duck" fits very well for its pronunciation, and then the fine event of the day will be the boat race for the Josephus Daniels trophy, to be performed by the pulling, self-bailing lifeboats, which are now beached at the edge of the crowd. These boats in themselves weigh about 1,800 pounds, and with their occupants well over a ton, yet these sturdy oarsmen make these boats fly through the water at a speed of 7 knots—sometimes better. Today they will pull these boats through the water for 1 mile, capsize, and cross the finish line. May the best crew win. Also as a part of the Coast Guard equipment and a part of the event to be demonstrated is the aviation equipment and aircraft, which will be on the scene very shortly following distress signals as indicated from the Coast Guard boat a few yards off shore. To give you a sequence of the events—Mr. Pierce, would you like to follow through on that or shall I continue? Is Mr. Pierce around? Mr. Pierce is unable to get up at present, so I will go ahead and give you a brief résumé. In just a few moments the cue to begin the event will be a distress signal indicated by a flare from the Coast Guard boat directly behind the reviewing stand. As soon as this flare goes off a PT 1–G four-engine search plane from Elizabeth City will come in and answer the call of distress.

(Music by the Cherry Point Band.)

We are now listening to the United States Marine Corps Band from Cherry Point, N. C.

(More music.)

Ladies and gentlemen, that is the Coast Guard marching song.

Unfair Draft Law Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. WILSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my State of Oklahoma is being treated unfairly in the application of the draft-quota system under the Selective Service Act because of the refusal or failure of those in charge to grant my State full credit for men already called into service now, instead of some future date.

Mobilization of the Oklahoma National Guard and the Oklahoma Air National Guard, together with numerous Organized Reserve units of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, during the last few weeks has resulted in Oklahoma being required to send such a large number of her men into service at this time that my State has provided far above her fair share of the armed services manpower for the present moment.

In spite of these heavy calls, involving many thousands of men, the Selective Service System has announced Oklahoma draft quotas for as far ahead as next November without having granted Oklahoma any credit for this unusually high number of men already called.

I have joined in a demand that Selective Service withdraw these quota calls until these credits due my State are used up. My colleague, the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, likewise is making a similar demand. The following editorial from the Daily Oklahoman, of Oklahoma City, titled "Steed Is Right" clearly presents the case for Oklahoma:

STEED IS RIGHT

Congressman TOM STEED insists that the War Department give Oklahoma credit for the thousands of Oklahoma National Guard men that are already in uniform. He suggests that no Oklahoma boys be drafted until the States which have no National Guard men in the service shall have supplied as many men in proportion to population as Oklahoma already has in the service.

According to the Shawnee Congressman's estimate Oklahoma will be required to supply five times as many men as other States of equal population whose National Guard men have not been called. Manifestly this would be unfair. Why should Oklahoma send five times as many of her sons to the service as the State which is not sufficiently alert to maintain an efficient National Guard?

For this suggestion STEED has been criticized sharply by the candidate who is opposing him in the November election. He charges that STEED is impeding the Government's effort to win the war speedily. We cannot see it that way. The Government could very easily increase the quota of the States which has sent no National Guard men into the service. And that would not be treating the other States unfairly. It would merely require the other States to do as much as Oklahoma has done already.

What if the Government should rely entirely upon the National Guard in the war that is now under way and draft nobody else at all? In that event Oklahoma and a few other alert States would have to do all the fighting and make all the sacrifices for the entire United States, and who could say that such a system as that would be fair?

Address of Hon. Frances P. Bolton, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include in the Appendix to the RECORD an address by the distinguished and beloved Member of this body, the gentlewoman from Ohio, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, before the sixtieth graduating class of Provident Hospital School of Nursing in Chicago, Ill., on September 7, 1950, in the First Congressional District of Illinois, which I am honored to represent:

Madam President, members of the board of trustees and faculty of Provident Hospital School of Nursing, honored guests, and you, the members of the sixtieth graduating class, it is indeed a signal honor which has come to me—that I should be invited to participate in these sixtieth commencement exercises of the Provident Hospital School of Nursing. * * *

Your invitation was an irresistible temptation, for not only has nursing and all that pertains to it long been one of my chief interests, but this particular school has been one whose work stands out—whose graduates are carrying the responsibility of leadership wherever they have gone. May I thank you once again for giving me the deep pleasure of coming to you on this commencement day.

I need not tell this distinguished gathering that Provident Hospital and Training School is unique, with its long service to the community at large and the high standards of its professional training. It stands alone in its position of prestige as a voluntary general hospital, maintained by the community—the first and still the largest Negro-staffed hospital in the United States.

How proud you must be that four out of every five Negro physicians in the United States who have been certified by specialty boards were trained right here at Provident. How proud—that the graduates of this school of nursing are in such demand from coast to coast!

I do congratulate you with all my heart.

In the early days the apprentice-trained nurse served the old-fashioned family doctor well—but the modern scientifically trained physician requires a much more technically trained person to work with him in the broader areas of the care of the sick, the prevention of disease and the wonder field of health.

Provident Hospital has kept pace with the need for more scientific training in magnificent fashion.

The quality of your officers and board members assures a continuance of the courageous recognition of the constantly increasing responsibility resting upon professional leaders in the field of health. The inspiration of your courage and that of your professional staffs reaches out much farther than you know.

May I thank you for being what you are!

It has been a very thrilling part of my life experience to have had a small share in the efforts that have brought the training of young women for nursing careers from the apprentice method to educational procedure.

Until 10 years ago when I was elected to represent the great Twenty-second District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States, nursing was my primary interest outside my home.

It began many years ago when Miss Mathilda Johnson, superintendent of the Cleveland Visiting Nurse Association, piloted a group of girls through our first experiences as volunteers in the districts. It continued during years of service on the board of trustees of old Lakeside Hospital (now part of the University Hospitals of Cleveland). Then, when World War I overtook us I was privileged to work very closely with Miss Annie Goodrich in establishing the Army School of Nursing. In World War II it was my bill that set up the United States Cadet Nurse Corps and made possible graduate and refresher courses to many nurses who came back into service when the need grew great.

I don't remember how many years ago it was that I first met Estelle Riddle, but I count it one of my great good fortunes to have done so. She is a woman of high courage who has achieved fine things not only for herself but for all Negro nurses. It was through her that I became associated with the National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses. Let me take this opportunity to congratulate the membership of this splendid association for the wise choice of leaders that gave you as your presidents Mrs. Riddle, Mrs. Staupers, Mrs. Vessells (now Mrs. Johns).

To these women and to the calm dignity and perseverance of the members of this as-

sociation is largely due the integration of Negro nurses in the American Nurses Association. The doors have opened in all but a very few States. These will soon yield to wisdom, to understanding, and to an ultimate desire to be part of a great whole—that is inevitable. This has brought to me, as to you, a deep joy.

But I have not come here to speak only of my own interest in nursing. Rather have I come from Washington to talk with the members of this fine graduating class—a little about the profession they have chosen, and a little about the world in which they will find themselves as they step across this threshold of accomplishment.

Nursing has become a profession—and it offers a very wide field of opportunity, not just to the white nurse, but to the colored nurse as well. Little by little those who have preceded you have proven that Negro girls, given the necessary opportunity, can measure up to the ever increasingly high standards of today's nursing requirements. This marks a new era in which you younger women have the very real responsibility of maintaining the high standards that have been achieved.

You could not come through your years here as Provident, exposed to the fine quality of your teachers and of the professional men and women with whom you have been associated, without having absorbed something of their superior attitudes and capacities. You in your turn will carry the ideals of this institution and of your own dreams of service to ever wider horizons.

You are graduating at a moment when qualified nurses are needed as never before. Most of the barriers have been broken down and an integration not dreamed of even 10 years ago has become a reality. New fields hitherto closed are awaiting you as they are awaiting all nurses.

In today's world, nursing training provides a woman with the tools for a career where new doors of opportunity are constantly opening, where the supply is so far less than all anticipated demand that jobs should be no problem for many years to come. This will mean better pay as well as higher standards of work. The ever increasing recognition by both the medical profession and the laity that the nurse has become in very truth the doctor's assistant. More and more hospitals in the building, more and more public health fields being developed, bring more and more demand for highly skilled, qualified professional personnel.

You young women, graduating today, step across the threshold of the Provident School of Nursing with great and grave resonsibilities, for you have had of the best—and privileges bring with them responsibilities.

First and foremost let me say that you must be and must continue to be tops as nurses, selfless in your work, ever more and more meticulous in your techniques. But to be real nurses you must be, first of all, real women—true to the highest ideals of womanhood. Service must be your watchword; patience, tolerance, and understanding must be your guideposts on this way of your choice.

I am sure I need not remind you that you, who have received the highest standard of nursing training, have more than one contribution to make. With the traditions of this great hospital a part of your very bloodstream, you young women can play a splendid role in the growth of tolerance and of understanding. I feel certain that you will carry yourselves in all your life's contacts with a dignity that will of itself open wide such doors as may yet be only ajar. Using your woman's understanding you will go quietly out into a constantly more friendly world.

My privilege of service on the board of both Tuskegee and Meharry, as well as my contacts with all phases of nursing in this country and abroad, has given me the sense of the almost limitless need for you.

Let me mention some of the fields of opportunity that lie before you: Institutional nursing in ever broader fields as one State after another opens its doors to you.

The Indian Service is a fascinating Government service that needs women of high standards, qualified in all branches of nursing.

Veterans' Hospitals, too—and the Public Health Service—and nursing in the armed services.

Here let me pay tribute to that fine group of Negro nurses I had the privilege of reviewing in England as they were about to take over the nursing of one of our hospitals. They were pioneers; to them is largely due the affirmative answer of the question "Should there be Negro nurses in the Army?"

Nor can I refrain from taking this opportunity of expressing appreciation of the brilliant performance of the nurses who went out from this country under the command of Maj. Mary Mills, this group established a record which has won the wide attention in medical circles, to such a degree have they reduced the maternal death rate and the incidence of malaria. This is such a splendid evidence that the American nurse is doing outstanding work wherever she goes. With such a training as yours, and with the experience you can have in this country in public health work, in administration, in teaching, you will find yourselves needed in ever increasing numbers everywhere.

To this end I would urge you to take every opportunity to learn wherever you can, broadening your knowledge, perfecting your techniques, so that when a larger opportunity for service knocks you may be equipped and ready to open the door.

City and State hospitals in many sections of the country are opening their doors to Negro nurses and doctors. Privately financed hospitals and nursing schools are no longer closing their doors to adequately prepared young people.

Yes—the world is opening before you, its privileges, its obligations and its responsibilities are falling more and more upon your shoulders. So be sure those shoulders are elastic and strong, be sure your hearts are pure, your souls anchored in the Almighty God, for it is His work you are called upon to do in these days when the powers of darkness are reaching out ruthless hands to destroy those who believe in Him.

For a few minutes I want to talk to each of you apart from your companions, from your faculty, apart from this great gathering of your friends and the friends of Provident Hospital. I want to address myself to each of you, in the innermost recesses of mind and heart into which I cannot see, yet where the real you lives.

What I want to say is to each of you as Americans with the peculiar responsibility that rests upon you because of this fact. As a Member of the United States Congress and a fellow American I would speak earnestly to you in this hour.

This America of ours is a young and wonderful country—no where in all the world has so much opportunity been made possible to so many people. Oh, we have a long way to go yet if we are to realize the dreams of those who came to these shores centuries ago in search of freedom. But we have already come far—so far that the free world looks to us not only for the material things that we have learned to produce in such abundance, but most of all perhaps for leadership. Only a united people can give the leadership the world so sorely needs. To move forward together, knowing that we are one people with many different kinds of contributions to make to what will someday be the country, the Nation where there remains no person without opportunity, without the chance to be born with a healthy body and a clear mind, to live where the sun can shine, where children can grow up in decent surroundings, to have such education as each can absorb, to be able to work to one's full capacity for only in work is there joy and satisfaction. Then in addition to have a chance to laugh, to weep, to sit in the sun, and to be grateful to God.

That is my dream for America—that is the goal toward which my life is aimed. Isn't it yours?

This is a moment of great opportunity—of great responsibility for us all. You girls have chosen a life of service to humanity. The profession you are entering is, of all professions, the most suited to a woman. What you do as a member of that profession will give relief and help to many. But it is what you do as human beings as citizens of this, our beloved country, that matters most of all. Your training and experience in this great hospital sets you apart for the responsibilities of leadership. In your profession there is no place for selfishness. You are consecrated to service by constant giving, to a continuation of learning by doing, a never-ceasing outpouring of your own need to help the suffering, to teach ways of life that mean health and happiness.

In your life as an American citizen you have even greater responsibilities, for there it is what you are that matters.

Professionally you will join and work with the groups which do most to promote that profession. You must build your own advancement by continuing study, by research, by practice, adding to your capacity for service through each new experience.

As Americans you cannot escape the responsibility of protecting the principles of freedom which are American—principles which will bring opportunity in proportion to our use of them.

May I tell you from my heart what I believe is the most fundamental challenge before us all? We must get away from thinking and acting from a racial point of view. I say to you as I say to myself daily, and would like to say to every man and woman in this country: Whatever your race, your creed, your sex, think as an American. Act as an American. Be an American.

You, who are of the Negro Americans, have so much of which you can be proud. It is for you to live so that you in your turn will build respect for yourselves and for your race through efficiency in your own field of endeavor. Those who have gone before you, hewing a path through the wilderness, have built a broad highway for you. Be worthy of their agonies—be proud of such heritage.

But remember that roads must be kept in good condition. The road ahead for this country of ours and for God's world is through dark and dangerous country. We shall need all our vision, all our wisdom, all our capacities combined, to get out beyond the darkness.

Negro Americans have taken their place in the field of science, of law, of medicines, of nursing, in sports, in teaching, in the arts. And while I speak of the arts let me say that while it is a disappointment to me as I know it is to everyone here that Etta Moton is not here to sing to us, we do join in congratulating her and that splendid American, who is her husband—Claude Barnett, head of the Associated Negro Press—in recognition she has had from the Theater Guild.

And as I think of her I think of Katharine Dunham and her contributions to the dance, of Zelma George and her truly wonderful work in The Medium, of a lad at Karamu House whose every motion is beauty. Oh—of many more of whom America is justly proud.

Yes—recognition has come to Negroes in every field of human endeavor.

You are part and parcel of the most wonderful country in all the world—America.

Very little more than the foundations have been built yet—the walls are only just coming up above ground. Part of those walls are for you to build—and the material must be strong, the work must be well done. Only teamwork will make the building hold together—teamwork and a flaming faith in the principles of true freedom under law—not under man, that is America's destiny.

I have been in a good many countries before World War II, during World War II and after it, including Russia in 1945. Never anywhere have I seen the kind of freedom we have in America. Yes, we have injustice here still, we have poverty here still. But we are doing something about it. And we believe that the individual has importance, that he has rights and that his Government must uphold those rights.

The discrimination and the segregation that has existed all too long in America, in fast disappearing, not because of laws but because we who are all Americans are learning a new respect for each other. We are discovering that only a true unity will give us the strength we must have to survive in the great struggle that has begun between those who believe that all men and women are God's children, precious in His sight, and those who have made the power of the state their God and consider the individual only as a tool of that power.

The history of man on earth and his efforts to govern himself has proven that power in the hands of the few is and always has spelled death to freedom. This great Nation of ours is founded upon knowledge of that fact and the consequent principle that the people can govern themselves. For this end a government was formed in which power is divided into three parts so that no one of them can grow too strong. We must keep it so.

These principles are our security as free people. It is our responsibility to preserve them, to build their strength.

It is our responsibility, also, to build what some call a new social order, but which I believe to be the goal set for us by those who gave us our Constitution and Bill of Rights, within the broad framework of this Constitution.

Promises won't give it to us. And what beautiful promises we hear every day and all night, on television, over the air, in the moving pictures and the newspapers, and out of the mouths of many. Why should we trade the record of achievement we have made under our Constitution in these one-hundred-and-seventy-odd years for any promises? Personally I do not believe any thoughtful American would, once he looks at the facts. I believe that what has been called progressive thinking and doing is more possible under our representative Government than under any other government on earth. Evidence of this is on every hand.

I have learned something of the dangers that lie in diverting one's energies away from one's work by joining this group or that group. If I have any advice for you it is to keep yourselves free. Don't be known as a joiner—be yourself. Don't let yourself be a fanatic on any subject—keep a balance so that you will be known as a woman of sound judgment and common sense. You will, of course, want to be part of certain professional organizations. You will want to associate yourself with one of the two great political parties—for through this competitive method we have the best means of protecting our governmental machinery from being taken over too permanently by any one group. Most of all you will want to make yourself and your particular segment of the many people of which our Union of States consists, self-sufficient so that you walk with your heads high as truly free people walk. May joy be yours in the doing.

It is now my very pleasant privilege to congratulate you upon your attainment and to wish you deep inner satisfaction in the career of nursing that you have chosen. To me there is no finer professional path for women to tread. Not only does it offer you a career of practically limitless opportunity, but it provides an outlet for all that is essentially womanly in your nature.

What a curiously passionate desire there is in every woman's heart to relieve pain and ease suffering. What a deep inner urge we have, we women, to create and recreate God's children.

Let me say again that to me there is no field so filled with opportunity for a woman as in nursing. To me there has never been a better preparation for living than that which makes possible a career of nursing. In our modern world of science and scientific method training in the nursing field opens up whole new vistas of woman's service to mankind.

As a long-time worker in the fields of public health, of nursing education, of wartime needs, and as a woman just a few years ahead of you in the great adventure of life and living, I take great pride in you and congratulate you upon your success as students in this great school of nursing. Your diplomas have been won through effort and self-discipline. You alone know at what cost. May they be to you always the symbol of an attainment of which you can be very proud. May they stand for all that is best in your womanhood. May they be as a crown upon you as you assume the privileges and the responsibilities that are now yours.

Your country needs the service you are prepared to give. She needs your loyalty—she needs each one of you in these days of world confusion, of world problems.

I would say to you at this rather breathless moment when you step out into that world in which we as individuals and as a nation must build our own security this is a time when we must unite that we may be strong against the power of men who have denied the Infinite God, setting up the state in His place, using the individual as tools to build a ruthless central power. Our strong defense is our passionate belief in the wonderful certainty that we are all children of Almighty God and the determination to unite under His banner, praying that we may prove ourselves as individuals and as a free nation worthy to do His work.

May He bless and keep you in the life of service you have chosen.

We Have What It Takes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 10, 1950, at Asbury Park, N. J., contestants from all over the United States competed for the title of Mrs. America. Honey-haired Betty Eileen McAllister of Johnstown, Pa., was the unanimous choice for Mrs. America of 1950. This was the first beauty contest Mrs. McAllister had ever entered. The holder of the title Mrs. America of 1950, is 25 years of age and the mother of two fine, lovely children, Marvel Lee McAllister, age 5, and William P. McAllister, age 3.

It is a matter of importance for all concerned that this vivacious mother was selected not alone for her pulchritude, but for her ability as a housewife. To demonstrate her housekeeping ability, Mrs. America broiled meat along with other finalists as the judges and some 8,000 spectators looked on. The judges smacked their lips and after tasting of her Johnstown cooking unanimously awarded her the trophy.

Mrs. McAllister, in commenting upon her being awarded the title of Mrs. America of 1950, stated that "a thing like this makes me feel as dizzy as the day I was married." She remarked that her victory "will be perfect only if my husband does not get jealous." There is no doubt in anyone's mind that Mr. McAllister will not get jealous, as it was his idea for his wife to enter the contest.

While Mrs. America of 1950 has created a great deal of furore among the people of the Nation, the residents of Johnstown do not understand why all this undue fuss and furore, because it has always been obvious to Johnstowners that the best looking, best cooking, best all-around wives in America come from that city. Furthermore, I defy the husbands anywhere in the United States to challenge that statement. The mere fact that the rest of the country is not able to understand this fact is because there are many unenlightened people who have not had the privilege of living in Johnstown.

I extend my congratulations to Mrs. Betty Eileen McAllister for showing to America that Johnstown does have superior wives, who are superior in every respect.

Power in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, with this country again becoming involved in an emergency situation, I believe it is time to reexamine our power potentials in order to determine the adequacy of our power situation if a full emergency comes upon us—if we are again engaged in a major conflict of nations. During World War II the production of this country attained heights never before thought possible, and it has been said, with complete truth, that the war was won by production. This is not intended to deprecate the valiant service of our fighting men but, without the materials for war, the victory would have been impossible.

One of the major producing areas of critical materials during the last war was the Pacific Northwest and, since I am from that region, I am particularly desirous of reviewing our present situation from a power standpoint.

When the actual emergency came upon us, precipitated suddenly by the attack upon Pearl Harbor, it was found that vast new sources of power were needed in order to meet the requirements of all-out war production. Cer-

tainly a tremendous increase in power consumption occurred. World War II began in 1939, and this country became involved in December of 1941. It was over in 1945. During that period, total power production increased 75 percent. A substantial amount of that increase was for war production. In the Pacific Northwest, consumption of electric power between 1940 and 1945 more than doubled, the peak consumption actually being reached in 1944, at which time power consumption in the Pacific Northwest was 240 percent of the 1940 usage.

The impetus of the war period produced a continuing expansion of power needs, so that by 1949 the annual energy consumption was approximately 3½ times the usage in 1940. This upward trend in power requirements is expected to continue and, based on a normal peacetime expansion of regional economy, it is anticipated that power requirements in 1958 will be double the requirement of 1949. I must emphasize again that this is based on a peacetime expansion. Furthermore, I would like to point out that these requirements will only be met by the initiation of new power projects in the Pacific Northwest as outlined in what is termed schedule S, a schedule of dam construction and generator installations that has been agreed upon between the Bonneville Power Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bonneville Power Administration has informed me that, based on this schedule of generator installations, it will still be 1958 before reasonable reserve of firm power will be available to the Pacific Northwest, again based on a peacetime economy.

The dates for completion of projects in this schedule are later dates than were formerly contemplated in previous schedules. These dates have had to be moved up because of lack of funds and authorizations to initiate construction in accordance with these former schedules. That is one of the basic reasons why we now have a severe power shortage in the Pacific Northwest that is going to continue under the most optimum conditions until at least 1958.

Now what are the prospects for schedule S being followed so that we can have some reasonable assurance that in 1958, again on a peacetime basis, we will have ample power. In this schedule there are some 22 projects. In addition, one dam is entirely completed and in full operation. I would like to review the status of some of the major projects in this schedule.

The one dam that is completed and operating is the Bonneville Dam. It has been operating at peak capacity for a number of years. Grand Coulee Dam has also been producing power since 1941, but it is not completed. At the present time 14 generators—incidentally, the largest hydroelectric generators in the world—are installed, the fourteenth having been installed in July of this year. The fifteenth generator is scheduled for installation in October of this year, with the three remaining generators to be installed during 1951. Hungry Horse Dam in northwestern Montana is under construction, with the first generator scheduled to be operating in 1952 and to be completed in 1953. This is a most important project to the Bonneville system. Installed capacity will be 285,000 kilowatts but, more important than the generation from this plant, is the water storage that will firm up some 400,000 additional kilowatts at plants on the main stem of the Columbia River.

Another important project is the Albeni Falls project in northern Idaho, for which this body approved funds to initiate construction in the supplemental appropriation bill passed a few days ago. By initiating construction this year, the first benefits from this project will be available in 1952. This project is somewhat similar to the Hungry Horse project, in that its water storage for firming of power downstream is the most important part. Installed capacity will be 42,600 kilowatts, to be available by 1955. However, the water storage will firm power to the extent of some 140,000 kilowatts at downstream plants when they are in operation. Another plant now under construction and of the utmost importance is the McNary dam, scheduled to begin operations in December of 1953 and to be fully completed in December of 1957. Installed capacity of this plant will be 980,000 kilowatts when it is finally completed in 1957, and it will be a most important addition to the power supply of the region. Another smaller project is also under construction on the Willamette River in Oregon. This project is the Detroit Dam, and it is scheduled for completion in 1953, with installed capacity being 100,000 kilowatts. One more dam of major importance is under construction. This is the Chief Joseph project, to be located downstream from Grand Coulee on the Columbia River. However, first generation from this project will not be available until December of 1956, and it will not be completed until April of 1961. Installed capacity of this plant will be approximately 1,000,000 kilowatts.

All of these plants, taken together, represent a sizable addition to the power supplies of the region but, as presently scheduled, they will be insufficient to completely solve the power problem in this area, as all of the firm power from these projects will be absorbed as rapidly as it is brought into production and will still leave a major deficit.

What of the other projects contained in this schedule? There is presently authorized for construction, four projects on the Lower Snake River, known as Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite. Three of these projects are contained in this schedule, Ice Harbor being scheduled to begin production in August of 1955, Lower Monumental in December of 1956, and Little Goose in December of 1957. However, to meet these dates, funds must be made immediately available to begin construction of Ice Harbor. Lower Monumental must be started by July of 1952, and Little Goose by July of 1953. It appears at this moment as though these schedules will not be maintained inasmuch as this body denied funds for the start of Ice Harbor, which request was contained in the supplemental appropriation passed a few days ago. These plants, particularly the Ice Harbor Dam, are extremely important because their geographic location is such as to support power needs near the southern end of the Bonneville system and in the center of the Pacific Northwest region. If these projects do not come into operation as scheduled, it is going to mean continued power shortage, as well as additional expenditures for transmission facilities to transmit power from other projects into this general area.

Another most important project in this schedule is the Hells Canyon plant, which would be located on the Oregon-Idaho border, making it doubly important to my district. This plant is contained in schedule S and is scheduled to begin operation in 1957 and to be completed in 1960 but, to meet this schedule, it should be started this year, whereas the project is not even authorized for construction. Other projects in this schedule, such as the Upper and Lower Scriver plants, Libby Dam, Garden Valley and Palisades, are also required since they will all play their part in providing adequate power supplies in order that we may overcome by 1958 the power deficit now existing. However, several of these plants are not even authorized, which makes it appear at this time as if these schedules will not be met, thus continuing the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest.

There are other plants authorized for construction in this area, which plants were authorized in the rivers and harbors bill passed by this Congress a few months ago. Some of these plants are John Day and The Dalles on the lower Columbia River and Cougar, Green Peter and White Bridge plants in the Willamette Valley. No particular proposed schedules have been set up for construction of these projects. However, they can become important power producers in this region.

I have pointed out that the present schedules for hydroelectric projects are based on a normal economy. If, however, full mobilization of production for national defense becomes necessary, our power needs will expand much beyond normal requirements. If we take the experience of the last war we can determine that several million kilowatts of installed capacity will be needed over and above those presently scheduled. For this reason, work on plants already under construction should be expedited, where possible, and new plants should be started immediately in the Pacific Northwest in order to be assured that sufficient power will be available for whatever needs may arise. The schedules that I have given you can be expedited. It has been estimated that over and above present schedules, an additional two to three million kilowatts can be brought into operation in the Pacific Northwest by 1955 if authorizations and funds become immediately available. I think that these steps should be taken. We do not know what faces us, but we cannot afford to depend on having time available in which to expand our production machinery after the emergency is upon us. During World War II such time was available to us before it became necessary to make an all-out fighting effort.

We may not have that much time available the next time and such plans as are needed to insure our complete security should be made and implemented at once.

Some of the Nation's most important defense industries are located in the Pacific Northwest. One of our atomic energy plants is there, and nearly half of the aluminum producing capacity, which metal is badly needed in time of war. Other electrometallurgical process plants, such as magnesium plants and ferro-silicon plants, are also located there, and in the event of an emergency, requirements of these critical materials will greatly expand and the power must be available to permit this expansion.

Another important consideration in the Pacific Northwest is the transmission lines needed to carry this power to load centers. At the present time there is absolutely no reserve of transmission capacity. New lines will be started during this fiscal year, but these lines will be barely enough to transmit the power that will be brought into operation. During the past year we have had several severe system break-ups, resulting in power failures all over the Northwest because there was not sufficient transmission reserve to overcome normal operating hazards. Operating conditions that require transmission lines to carry as much as twice their rated capacity is a definite hazard and must be eliminated as early as possible. Loss of an important grid line through either normal operating hazards, sabotage or enemy action, could have very serious consequences if conditions as presently exist are allowed to continue in a time of national emergency. Such conditions should not be permitted at any time.

It is further indicated, if we are thinking in terms of insuring the national security, that present schedules for construction of transmission lines and substations must be accelerated. The southwest Oregon loop line, for which funds were appropriated during this fiscal year, is intended not only to increase power supply to the southwest Oregon area but is intended to integrate the power resources of that area with the rest of those in the Pacific Northwest in order to make more firm power available. This line is presently scheduled for completion in December of 1953, but definite advantages to the region and to the Nation can be gained by bringing this line into operation at an earlier date. I believe that this should be done if it proves feasible. I supported the request for appropriations for this line because of my realization of the great need for additional power supplies in the southwest Oregon area and, further, by the fact that the people of this part of our State have yet to achieve any of the benefits accruing from low cost Federal power which are available to other parts of the Pacific Northwest. These benefits should be brought to these people at the earliest possible date, and I intend to do everything possible to bring about this result.

I must also say a few words about another important facet of this power situation in the area. This has to do with funds provided for operating and maintaining a system as large and as far-flung as this one is. Additional transmission lines are a dire necessity, but funds to maintain existing transmission lines are equally important. In past years the Bonneville Power Administration has not had sufficient funds to properly maintain and operate this system, and these conditions must be changed before any emergency is upon us. When one realizes the many hazards to service that can exist from incomplete maintenance and undermanning of operating staff, it becomes inexplicable that such funds are so restricted. At the present time there are substations operating on this system completely unattended where an operator should normally be present. Many major substations are undermanned by from one to four people. Under such conditions, maintenance of reliable service is very difficult and the length of outages is prolonged.

Maintenance schedules must be accelerated. Control equipment must be checked at very frequent intervals. Improper operation of a single relay can upset the entire northwest power pool, and the only way to insure adequate operation of control equipment is by adequate maintenance and test of this equipment at frequent intervals. Line patrols must be maintained constantly, and sufficient funds must be available for this purpose. Danger trees must be removed from rights-of way; adequate weed-abatement programs must be maintained at all times in order to avoid weed infestation of agricultural areas.

The Bonneville Power Administration has done a marvelous job within the funds available to them, but at the present time there is a seriously great backlog of such work that must be reduced at the earliest possible time, making it mandatory that adequate funds be made available for this purpose.

I am told that the Atomic Energy Commission is very much concerned over certain conditions existing on the Bonneville system resulting from a lack of operation and maintenance funds. They are very much concerned over the recent outages that have occurred, some of which at least could have been prevented if stricter operation and maintenance schedules could have been maintained.

Yes, there are many aspects to national security. Power is the very lifeblood of national security, and without it national defense would be an impossibility. We think normally in terms of power supplies available. Obviously this is a primary consideration but, unless this power can be transmitted to the location of manufacturing plants, it would be of no value. Therefore, security requires equal consideration of adequate transmission facilities and adequate maintenance of those facilities. I think that a large part of the reason why Bonneville has been able to get by with as little difficulty as they have is because this system is new, thus requiring less actual maintenance than required when the system becomes older. Much of the system is now over 10 years old, and this in itself means that a greater degree of maintenance activity is required. We cannot continue to maintain an aging system on a new-system basis, and these conditions definitely cannot be carried into an emergency period.

I would like to mention one further aspect of this entire situation which is very important. During the last war, this Government spent billions of dollars in loans, grants, and subsidies to obtain critical materials as needed. Much of this expenditure was not recoverable. We can avoid such expenditures in the future by planning ahead, and the investments required for the power producers and transmission lines that I have outlined herein will not be in the nonrecoverable category. Even without a national emergency, all of the power that we can bring into being within a reasonable time will be absorbed by normal domestic expansion if the ultimate war emergency does not come upon us. All of the projects that I have outlined are completely feasible from a financial standpoint, and the experience to date indicates that all investments of the Federal Government in such plant will be returned to the Federal Treasury and with interest. Not a dollar will be wasted if plans are made now to provide these power supplies. We thus not only insure that adequate facilities are available to take care of whatever defense needs exist, but we also insure adequate power supply to support the domestic economy of one of the most rapidly growing regions of this country.

Power development in the Pacific Northwest must not be a war casualty. for any conceivable war effort that may be necessary for the preservation of this country, hydroelectric power is indispensable in meeting the challenge. It is just as vital as tanks, planes, and guns, and much more time is required to make it available. Planning for wartime emergency must of necessity include, expand, and give priority to power dams on the Columbia and its tributaries, the Nation's greatest potential source of hydroelectric power.

Marshall Will Take Orders From Acheson—More Appeasement Is in Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a broadcast by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., which was presented over radio station WEAM on September 13. Mr. Lewis has correctly analyzed the situation in the resignation of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson and the appointment of George Marshall to be the new Secretary of Defense. I commend this radio talk to all Members of this body:

In Washington, the sudden resignation of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson in favor of Gen. George Marshall has proved to be something of a bombshell and congressional quarters generally are still stunned and dazed. The White House, apparently hoping

to push the necessary legislation for the nomination through as quickly as possible before any major opposition can crystallize, had letters waiting at both Armed Services Committees this morning requesting immediate legislation to exempt General Marshall from the provision written into the Defense Unification Act of 1947, forbidding any person who has been in the Armed Services within the past 10 years from holding the job of Defense Secretary.

With the letters went drafts of the proposed special legislation and before noon the Senate Armed Services Committee, under the ever-cooperative Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland, had approved the bill by a vote of 10 to 2. The two opposing votes came from the only two members of the Armed Services Committee who served actively in the last world war, during which General Marshall was Chief of Staff, Senator HARRY CAIN, of Washington State, and Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, both Republicans. They explained that they had nothing against General Marshall personally, but, said Senator CAIN—I cannot conceive of any emergency in fact or in prospect that justifies the waiving of this provision adopted under cool deliberation at the time the Unification Act was passed.

He said that to have inserted such a proviso and then the first time an appointment is made to cast it aside, makes no sense. If it was a wise precaution then, he said, and we all agreed that it was, then it is a wise precaution now.

Senator KNOWLAND said that it is preposterous to say that out of 150,000,000 American people the only person who can hold the job as Secretary of Defense is General Marshall. The requirement that the Defense Department be under a civilian head, he said, is a fundamental part of American philosophy.

Actually the talk about the 10-year provision was not the real concern when you got behind the scene. The real issue, although few Members of Congress have yet screwed up the courage as of this afternoon to bring it into the open, is the fact that General Marshall is in the vest pocket, so to speak, of Secretary of State Dean Acheson, so far as far eastern policy is concerned, and for him to go in as head of the Defense Establishment means that Mr. Acheson will have in the future complete and unchallenged authority over the far eastern policy, military as well as diplomatic, and the far eastern defenses of the United States will be dictated not by the military but by the State Department. In short, Mr. Acheson, with his long-time carefully planned program of appeasement of the Chinese Communists, will have at the head of the Department of Defense a 100-percent cooperative partner.

Remember, it was Mr. Dean Acheson, who, as Under Secretary of State, coached and instructed General Marshall on his ambassadorial mission to China at the close of the war, on which occasion General Marshall tried to force Chiang Kai-shek to accept the Communists into the Nationalist Government despite the rapid-fire series of object lessons in Europe as to what happened every time that was done. In no time flat the Communists had seized the entire government.

And it was Dean Acheson in the same position as Under Secretary of State who constantly shuttled back and forth to the White House all the time that Secretary of State James F. Byrnes was in Paris, and during the course of that shuttling succeeded in undermining Secretary Byrnes with President Truman to the extent that Byrnes got home to find himself out, and General Marshall took his place.

While the general was Secretary of State, Acheson remained on long enough to make sure that his position in favor of the Chinese Communists would not weaken, indeed that the general's attitude would strengthen, then returned to his law practice with the firm for which he had okayed as Secretary, a $90,000,000 loan to Communist Poland for the purpose of arming the Communist police force and for which the law firm got a fee of $50,000,. Then when General Marshall resigned as Secretary of State he recommended to the President that Acheson be recalled from private life and made Secretary.

That's the array of facts which was causing the real worry in Congress today, those plus the lesser background on the picture, the testimony on record, that back in the early 1940's Dean Acheson was listed as the head of the pro-Communist clique in the State Department. He had with him his protégé, Alger Hiss, and around them, or reporting to them from the field, were Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent, John Stuart Service, and John P. Davies, the latter two of whom Pat Hurley sent home from China because of their pro-China affiliations.

The whole crowd of those who were propagandizing in favor of Communist China, including the Amerasia magazine crowd in New York on whom were cause some 1,800 secret and confidential State Department documents. It was the crowd that worked its way into such a position in the State Department that they constituted the line of information and advisors on China policy, and when Marshall came in as Secretary of State and obviously had to depend on existing channels of information, they were the ones who were there to supply it to him.

And those facts, those are facts which disagree seriously with the State Department's present commitment to remove naval forces from the protection of Formosa, as soon as the Korean difficulties are settled. Louis Johnson, leaning on the advice and counsel of General MacArthur, took issue with Mr. Acheson and the high councils of the administration, and has been taking issue with him for some months past. The normal expectation under the new set-up is that General Marshall will go along with Mr. Acheson and that General MacArthur's military advice is in the discard. All of which means, of course, inevitably, that Formosa is destined to fall to the Chinese Communists, particularly if they refrain from rocking the boat and agree and follow out the agreement to keep out of the Korean dispute.

One of the few people who brought the matter into the open today was Senator JOE MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin. He says that unless he is convinced that General Marshall has learned the facts of life about the Chinese Communists, which he plainly did not know at the time of his disastrous mission to China after the war, when he went there loaded with secret instructions from Acheson that he, Senator MCCARTHY, will oppose the nomination. He said that as a diplomat General Marshall did as much to lose the war in the Far East as he had done as an outstanding general to win it.

So there it stands. The little clique that began at Yalta to sell out China to the Communists, Alger Hiss personally being the one who was the chief instrument in writing and selling that agreement to the ill President Roosevelt, the little clique that opposed military aid to Nationalist China and controlled the State Department when that aid was being delayed and delayed by the State Department until it was too late. They seem to have won the battle tonight and to have clear sailing in the future. Not that there is the slightest question as to the integrity or patriotism or honor or good intentions of General Marshall as a man or as an American. But the record is there. He did participate in the evolution of the policy, he was one of the cogs in the evolutionary machinery, he has played hand-in-glove with Secretary Acheson all the way through, and, if the truth were known, it was Secretary Acheson who was responsible for his appointment this time—not the retiring Secretary Johnson. That's the record—take it or leave it.

What Is There to Hide?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to direct the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to an article which appeared in the American Federationist of September 1950. It is entitled "What Is There to Hide?":

WHAT IS THERE TO HIDE?

(By FRANK BUCHANAN, United States Representative from Pennsylvania; chairman, Committee Investigating Lobbying)

Most Americans think of lobbyists—if they think of them at all—as bag men tempting Members of Congress with offers of bribes, seeking to "buy" passage of certain legislation or defeat of other legislation.

This concept of lobbyists is completely out of date. It might have been true, and probably was true, 50 years or so ago when Members of Congress were very poorly paid and when the people back home had only the remotest idea of the day-to-day legislative battles in Washington.

Today a Member of Congress operates most of the time in a white glare of publicity and public attention. His recorded votes on important issues and even his secret votes in closed committee meetings are flashed back home by the press and radio. Furthermore, the people back home take a direct and personal interest in almost everything that their Congressman does. They are interested because these things affect them all personally, and particularly in their pocketbooks.

Bribing a Member of Congress, therefore, to vote against his convictions or against the best interests of his constituents is not only illegal—as it always was, of course—but is also impractical and virtually impossible.

Nevertheless, this old concept of sinister lobbyists "buying" the votes or support of Members of Congress has persisted down through the years. That has made the work of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities much more difficult than it should have been.

If lobbyists are not as a general rule sinister and corrupt characters seeking to subvert American democracy for the benefit of special interests, why is a committee of Congress—the committee which I direct—so interested and concerned about lobbying and lobbyists?

To answer that question I will have to explain just how lobbying works, 1950 style, what the lobbyists do and how they do it, and also why they do it that way.

The lobbyists you read about in Washington, the men who seem to wield mysterious powers in persuading Congressmen to vote for certain bills or against other bills, are slick professional persuaders. They are men—and there are some women among them—who know the technical side of their work thoroughly.

If they represent railroads they know the railroading industry inside and out. If their field is oil they know the merchandising end and the refining end and the producing end, and they may even know the geology of the business they represent.

If they represent labor unions, as many of them do, they know the labor field inside and outside and probably rose up themselves through the ranks of labor. That is particularly true among legislative agents in Washington of the American Federation of Labor unions.

Now what do these people do? They watch the Congress of the United States and the executive agencies—the administrative agencies downtown—like hawks. They study the bills that are introduced. They analyze those bills in terms of what the proposed legislation would do to the business or industry or interest they represent. Once they make an analysis they get the word back to their organizations and to the members of their organizations.

If the bill looks good from their point of view the lobbyists work out the strategy for supporting it. If it looks bad—if it looks as if it will hurt their profits, in the case of a business, or their wages and working conditions and negotiating strength, in the case of a union, or it might hurt their cause, in the case of a "cause" lobby—they line up the strategy of opposition.

No matter which side of the street they work—whether on the reactionary side or the liberal side, industry or labor—they generally get down to business in much the same manner.

They see members of the committees handling the legislation in Congress. They contact officials of the agency which would administer the law. They get their people back home to write, wire, telephone, or visit their Congressman. They make speeches. They get material in the newspapers and magazines and on the radio. They try to interest political leaders who, in turn, are urged to put pressure on Congressmen with whom they have influence.

In other words, the lobbyists make their cause as important to as many Members of Congress and to as many voters as they possibly can, often of much more importance than the matter deserves. Instead of buying the support of Members of Congress as the old-style, corrupt lobbyists of 50 years ago used to do, today's lobbyists try to sweep Congressmen off their feet with a deluge of arguments to prove their cause is a good one and in the public interest. If he doesn't support them in this cause, the Member of Congress is reasonably certain that he will have their vigorous opposition the next time he runs for office.

Well, what's wrong with that? There is absolutely nothing wrong with that. That is democracy in action, and I'm for it. Nevertheless, Congress does have a big problem where lobbyists and lobbying are concerned.

The more direct a role the Government plays in the daily lives of our people and in the health of our economy, and the more the world shrinks in size through advances in communications, transportation, and military science, the more important it is that the legislation we pass in Washington be honestly prepared and honestly discussed and fully understood. Similarly, the activities of lobbyists become of more direct significance to every voter and to every citizen.

For years Congress talked about putting lobbyists under some sort of control. The Constitution guaranties the right of petition, and lobbying is a form of the exercise of that right, so regulating lobbyists or restricting them in any way would be difficult if not impossible under our Constitution. Besides, it would not be a good thing, in my opinion.

But it is important—vitally important—that we in Congress and the people who vote for us and the men and women affected by the legislation we pass should know who those lobbyists are, whom they work for, what they are paid, and for what they spend money in connection with their work. We also have a right to know where the money is coming from that pays the lobbyists' salaries and expenses.

In the case of a business, a labor union, a trade association, or any organization of that caliber which is established for broad purposes, we know pretty well who they are and whom they represent and where the money comes from. But a good deal of the lobbying that goes on today is through high-sounding committees or foundations which profess to be operating in the public interest but which actually may be grinding axes for special interests.

Congress in 1946 passed a law to require lobbyists and lobbying organizations to come clean with Congress and the public by letting us know what the interests are behind them, where the money is coming from to carry on this work, how it is spent and how much is spent. That is all that the Lobbying Act requires.

In principle that act is a good one. In operation, however, it has not been as effective as it should be. There are still a lot of phony fronts which mask their true purposes behind a high-sounding name and don't report to Congress on what they are doing. When we pin them down, as we have done in the current investigation, they have often tried to wiggle out from under on the grounds that the precise language of the act does not apply to them. It is true, unfortunately, that the Lobbying Act has a lot of loopholes in it. And it has not been fully tested in the courts.

My committee is trying to devise ways of closing those loopholes and making the act airtight and completely effective.

To do that job, we have to know how lobbying operates 1950 style. Like women's fashions, styles in lobbying are always changing. The act we have on the books now would probably have been fine for 30 years ago, but we aren't meeting the lobbying challenge of 1950 in this statute.

There has been a lot of discussion lately about the powers and the methods of Congressional investigating committees. Some committees have abused their privileges and brought discredit to the congressional investigative technique. I was determined that my committee, when I was honored by the Speaker of the House in being selected as chairman of the lobbying investigation, would not fall into the traps which had caught other congressional investigations and ruined their effectiveness.

I was determined that we would conduct a fair and objective investigation, that we would look for the facts and show those facts, whatever they reflected. But I have found that no matter how far one may lean over backward to be fair, there are some vigorous, well-financed, and unscrupulous groups in this country which are determined to discredit representative government, government in the public interest, and to fasten un-American ideas into the fabric of American government.

The Communists, of course, are known for that technique. But they are not alone in it. Some of our big business executives, I am sorry to say, are suckers for the same kind of un-American propaganda of the right, of extreme reaction, as are some of our foolish people for the propaganda of the Communists on the lunatic fringe of the left.

Big money—and I mean really big money—is being poured into the coffers of pressure groups and phony patriotic organizations seeking to kill off the liberal-labor movement in America. We have gone after some of these organizations and they have screamed like stuck pigs. But we have been getting the goods on them.

We are exposing their failure to tell the Congress of the United States, under the Lobbying Act, where their money is coming from. We are exposing their failure to report to Congress, under the Lobbying Act, what expenditures they make. And in the process of showing these things, we have been exposing their techniques for masquerading as something that they are not.

We are doing those things because a proper and complete investigation of lobbying demands that we do just that. We have avoided smear tactics, however. But that hasn't stopped some elements from smearing us. That's the price we must pay for trying to do our job objectively. It was these smears, I gather, which prompted the American Federationist to ask me for this article to counteract the unfair and perverted reports which have been circulated about our investigation.

Actually, the lobbying investigation proceeded calmly and quietly until we ran into the head-on refusal of the Committee for Constitutional Government, antilabor, anti-Fair Deal propaganda mill for reaction in this country, to provide us with the identical sort of information we had already obtained without difficulty from a wide variety of lobbying organizations. We wanted their list of big contributors. The Lobbying Act requires that this information be made public automatically every 3 months, but the Committee for Constitutional Government had fashioned what it thought was a device for avoiding this disclosure.

Besides refusing us the information and brazenly daring our committee to cite him for contempt of Congress, Edward A. Rumely, the executive secretary of the organization, flooded the newspapers of the country with denunciations of the committee for allegedly violating the Constitution. And, of course, one segment of the extremist press picked up the hue and cry.

Even some otherwise intelligent publications were taken in by this distorted attack and carried editorials condemning us as being out to "get" anti-administration groups and business generally. That, of course, was nonsense.

Because the Committee for Constitutional Government and one or two other lobbying organizations had refused to turn over to us the facts on their financial operations, we turned to other sources to find those facts. From information we already had, we knew that many business concerns in this country were financing all sorts of organizations engaging in political and economic propaganda work. It was quite simple to ask those business concerns for a list of the contributions they had made during the period since the Lobbying Act has been in effect.

We addressed questionnaires to about 175 concerns, and we received full and complete replies from nearly all of them. Most of them had no hesitation whatsoever, for they felt they had nothing to hide.

And so we learned where much of the money has been coming from to finance some of the hidden lobbies. And it is my hope that we can close any loopholes in the Lobbying Act which might permit this information to remain secret in the future.

No American who believes in a cause should have any hesitation about contributing to a movement designed to advance that cause unless the cause itself is one to be ashamed of.

There should be no stigma of any sort attached to the act of contributing that money or of hiring lobbyists with it, unless, again, the cause is un-American.

Our whole approach has been to show the public and Congress that lobbyists and lobbying organizations, by and large, are very useful and very necessary parts of the legislative process in a real democracy.

But as long as some lobbyists and some lobbying outfits operate in secret, in the dark, masking their purposes by failing to disclose the names of their contributors, lobbying will remain suspect. That is what the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, in its investigation, is seeking to correct.

Hiawatha Is Subversive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I include herein a news item appearing in the New York Times of Wednesday, September 13, and an editorial from the same paper of Thursday, September 14.

No comment is needed.

[From the New York Times of September 13, 1950]

HIAWATHA MAY AID REDS, SAYS STUDIO—INDIAN CHIEF IMMORTALIZED BY LONGFELLOW SOUGHT PEACE, SO MONOGRAM SHELVES FILM

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., September 12.—Fear that a motion picture dealing with the life and exploits of Hiawatha, Onondaga Indian chief of the fifteenth century, of whom Longfellow wrote in his classic poem, might in the present temper of the country be regarded as Communist propaganda has caused Monogram Studio to shelve such a project, it was learned today.

Put in preparation 6 months ago, a script, written by Arthur Strawn was ready for filming with Walter Mirisch producing, and an announcement concerning it was to have been made at Monogram's annual sales meeting which ended here after a 3-day session on September 7. The picture, however, was withdrawn from the production schedule shortly before the convention began.

It was Hiawatha's efforts as a peacemaker among the warring Indian tribes of his day which brought about the confederation of the Five Nations that gave Monogram particular concern, according to a studio spokesman. These, it was decided, might cause the picture to be regarded as a message for peace and therefore helpful to present Communist designs.

[From the New York Times of September 14, 1950]

HIAWATHA IS UN-AMERICAN

"By the shore of the Pacific,
By the shining Big-Sea-Water,
At a small wigwam in Hollywood,
They have learned that Hiawatha
Wears the peace-paint of a Red-man."

So might a surprised Longfellow have been forced to revise The Song of Hiawatha after discovering that a proposed movie on the Indian chief was considered un-American at this time and therefore would not be made. A west coast studio has discovered, somewhat belatedly, that Hiawatha "smoked the calumet, the peace pipe, as a signal to the nations."

One more movie, more or less, that is announced and then not made will not shake the entertainment foundations of the country. But there is a principle involved, even if only a small one. It is that a point of ridiculousness can be reached and passed in unreasoned hysteria. Such is the case here with the suppression by the movies of a schoolboy's poem. Such, too, is the case with the recent radio censorship by privately appointed vigilantes.

Hiawatha apparently was suppressed because it would be regarded as a message for peace and therefore would aid Communist designs. But the important thing to remember is that peace is not Communist property; that it must be stressed here and abroad that peace guides our policies; that we act peace as well as talk it. In the war of words and ideas, we must not allow ourselves to be taken "on a long and distant journey, to the portals of the sunset."

Busts of Chippewa Indian Chiefs and Paintings of Indian Life by Seth Eastman in the United States Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Minnesota we have the greatest number of Chippewa Indians, as well as the largest number of Chippewa Reservations. These native Americans reside on the Red Lake, White Earth, Greater Leech Lake, Bois Fort or Nett Lake, Mille Lac, Fond du Lac, Grand Portage, and Vermillion Lake Reservations. The first two named—Red Lake and White Earth—are the largest and are wholly within my congressional district.

It is a high honor and privilege to represent these fine native Americans in the Congress of the United States. It has even been my privilege and great honor to have been adopted as an honorary member of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians under the authority of a resolution adopted by the General Council of the Red Lake Band on June 13, 1948, in general session and concurred by all other organized and unorganized groups of Red Lake Indians. I was presented with a beautiful "certificate of adoption" by Paul H. Beaulieu, ceremonial representative in charge, witnessed and approved by Bazil Lawrence, chairman, General Council, and Peter Graves, secretary, General Council, on July 10, 1948. My Indian name is "Gigi go we ne ne" or "The Spokesman." I am truly appreciative of this honor and cherish my "certificate of adoption" as one of my most valuable possessions.

I have many times admired the two beautiful marble busts of Be-sheek-kee and Aysh-ke-bah-ke-ko-zhay in the Senate wing of the Capitol and the bronze bust of Be-sheek-kee off the Houses Chamber on the west side of the Capitol. The Chippewa Indians are very proud of the fact that two of their great chiefs represent the American Indian in bronze and marble in our Nation's Capitol, their tribe being the only one represented in bronze and marble among the many tribes of native Americans.

I have long been a student of the history and art of the American Indians and in order to get some authentic record as to how these fine art objects were placed in the Capitol, I appealed to Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, and under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include the following letter and material so graciously furnished me by Mr. Lynn:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D. C., August 5, 1950.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: In response to your letter of July 25, 1950, I enclose a statement regarding the busts of the Chippewa Indians, Be-sheek-kee and Aysh-ke-bah-ke-ko-zhay, which I hope will be of interest to you.

As there is a reference in the article to Capt. Seth Eastman, I include some facts regarding the work of this well-known painter of Indian life.

Our records do not disclose all the details you mention, such as the name of sponsors, and the dates on which the busts were placed in the Capitol. Vincenti was employed for a considerable length of time on a per diem basis at the rate of $6 per day, and Lassalle received fixed compensation in his capacity as foreman of the bronze shop. Whether these men received any additional compensation for the work we are considering is questionable. I doubt very much if there were any formal unveilings or other ceremonies.

Yours very truly,

DAVID LYNN,
Architect of the Capitol.

BUSTS OF NATIVE AMERICANS—BE-SHEEK-KEE AND AYSH-KE-BAH-KE-KO-ZHAY

In a group of miscellaneous works of art located in the east gallery floor corridor of the Senate wing there are marble busts of two Indians by Francis Vincenti, a sculptor of Italian birth. Mr. Vincenti was employed in the Capitol for a period of from 1853 to 1858 and was responsible for much of the carving in connection with Thomas Crawford's sculptural group in the Senate pediment. The busts are those of the Chippewa Chief Aysh-ke-bah-ke-ko-zhay or "Flat-Mouth," and of Be-sheek-kee or "The Buffalo." It is believed that these Indians came to Washington as members of delegations for the negotiation of a treaty between the Government and the Chippewas, and that it was Capt. Seth Eastman who suggested to Capt. M. C. Meigs, superintendent of the Capitol extension, that the Indians be induced to pose for their portraits in marble. Captain Eastman, a Regular Army officer, who later attained the brevet rank of brigadier general, is well-known for his paintings of scenes of Indian life.

Nine of these works now hang in the Public Lands Committee room in the New House Office Building, and 17 painting of Civil War forts by Eastman may be seen in the corridor walls of the ground floor of the Capitol, central section. The records show that Be-sheek-kee received from the Government the sum of $5 for "having taken his bust in 3 days."

The following is quoted from Art and Artists of the Capital of the United States of America by Charles E. Fairman (Government Printing Office, 1927):

"Several years ago the Architect's office was advised that there was a marble bust of an Indian in one of the committee rooms in the Senate wing of the Capitol. It was not known at that time whom this bust was intended to represent. Inquiry in the office where it was then placed resulted in the information being given that it was a bust of Tecumseh, but subsequent investigation revealed the fact that there was no valid grounds upon which to make the claim that it was the bust of this celebrated warrior. For many years this bust had been carried upon the records of the Senate wing of the Capitol as being private property and that the owner was unknown. As a matter of decoration it was considered of enough importance so that it had found a place in one of the committee rooms.

"It was felt that possibly some information might be secured through the Bureau of Ethnology, and accordingly an expert from that bureau called and examined the bust and gave it as his opinion that it could not possibly be a bust of Tecumseh and that it belonged to some of the Indians whose tribal homes were in the northern part of the Middle Western States. In the quest for information a photograph of the bust was published in several papers, with the result that

an elderly man, who had been a Senate page at the time when the Senate met in the present Supreme Court room, came and identified this bust as one that had formerly been in the Senate lobby and that it had been called by one of the Senators "Billy Bowlegs" a famous Seminole chief. This identification seemed to be of value, and the Bureau of Ethnology was again called upon for an opinion. Notwithstanding this seemingly positive identification, the Bureau of Ethnology stated that "Billy Bowlegs" had never been in Washington and that the cranial development of the bust was not that of a Seminole.

"At about this time Lot Flannery, a local sculptor, who was an apprentice sculptor at the Capitol in the fifties, came and identified the bust as the work of Francis Vincenti and stated that he had seen Vincenti modeling in clay from the Indian whose bust had been reproduced in marble. Mr. Flannery, however, was unable to give the name of the Indian or his tribal relation. It seemed at this time almost a hopeless quest to determine the name of the Indian who served as the model for this bust, and at last an attempt was made through the Indian Office to devise some means by which this work might be identified. Acting upon the suggestion of the Indian Office, several photographs of the bust were supplied and the office assumed the task of sending a photograph around to different Indian agents occupying the territory indicated by the Bureau of Ethnology as the probable location of the home of the tribe of Indians to which this Indian belonged. One identification was made, but it did not seem either to the Architect's office or to the Bureau of Ethnology sufficient to warrant the belief that the bust had been properly identified. A second identification from another source on information produced through the Indian agents identified this bust as that of "Flat-mouth," known by the Indian name of Aysh-ke-bah-ke-ko-zhay, a Chippewa chief who was known to have been in Washington at the period to which the letter from Captain Eastman refers. This has been corroborated by the Bureau of Ethnology upon a comparison of the records of the treaty Indians in Washington at the time referred to. It was then considered that the identification was complete, and the proof that the clay model had been made by Francis Vincenti and that it had been reproduced in marble by the same sculptor settled the question of ownership and showed conclusively that it was the property of the Government.

"For this reason it was considered best to remove this bust from the committee room, where it had been for many years, and place it on the gallery floor of the Senate in the east corridor. At the time that the bust was removed it happened that Senator Clapp, of Minnesota, occupied the room in which the bust was located. He showed much interest and was very anxious to find out who the Indian might be who had posed for this bust, and upon being informed that it was 'Flat-mouth,' or Aysh-ke-bah-ke-ko-zhay, looked at it steadily for a moment and said: 'I knew him. It is a good portrait.' He then requested to be given all the facts concerning the identification, and after going over all the papers in the case expressed himself as well satisfied with the proof of identification. A record was, therefore, made in the case of the examination of papers by Senator Clapp and his agreement upon the completeness of the identification. This was done not so much for the satisfaction of those who at this time were in possession of these facts, but for those who might ask for this information in later years. While not a part of the art history of the Capitol, it may be that some have become interested in 'Flat-mouth' and will find further interest in having it brought to their attention that 'Flat-mouth' was made one of the chief characters of a story, Gentlemen of the North, by Hugh Pendexter, who has not only used this Indian as one of his characters, but has shown in the development of his book a large amount of research in the records of the Indian tribes of the period prior to 1860."

The bronze bust of Be-sheek-kee located west of the House Chamber on the principal floor of the Capitol is a reproduction of the marble bust by Vincenti on the Senate Gallery floor. When the Senate and House wings were added to the original Capitol a bronze foundry was established either in the building or on the grounds. During the years 1857 to 1860 a bronze founder and artist in bronze by the name of Joseph Lassalle was employed in the capacity of foreman. Under his supervision much of the decorative bronze used in the construction of the Senate and House wings was cast. Lassalle also cast the bronze fountain now in the office of the Architect of the Capitol from the model of the distinguished American sculptor, William H. Rinehart.

Joseph Lassalle

A bronze founder and artist in bronze who was employed in the bronze shops at the Capitol in the capacity of a foreman during the years 1857–60. In the files of the Architect of the Capitol are several letters written during the above period containing information relating to the work of the bronze shops during that time. From other papers in the Office of the Architect it is learned that this artist was a brother of Charles Lassalle, the proprietor of Des Etas Unis, whose political support had been valuable in the last election. In an appeal for reinstatement to his former position from which he had been suspended pending the investigation of charges, the artist gave a list of the works in bronze executed by him. In addition to the list given below, it appears that much of the decorative bronze work of the Capitol was executed under his supervision.

Bust of Be-Sheck-Kee (bronze) (copy from marble of Francis Vincenti)—facing west staircase, main floor, House wing.

Bronze fountain (from plaster cast by William H. Rinehart)—Office of Architect of the Capitol.

Brig. Gen. Seth Eastman

(From Art and Artists of the Capitol of the United States of America, by Charles E. Fairman)

During a discussion in Congress upon the merits of different painters and the advisability of securing their services in the decoration of the Capitol, a very strong endorsement was made in favor of Seth Eastman, who has been referred to before as assisting Captain Meigs in securing some Indian models for the sculptors at the Capitol to model in clay. It was Captain Eastman who secured for the sculptor Vincenti, Aysh-ke-bah-ke-ko-zahy (Flat-mouth) as a model for the bust which was referred to during the period of its execution. Interest in Captain Eastman, who had since become Brevet Brig. Gen. Seth Eastman, United States Army, retired, has not lessened, and on March 26, 1867, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Schenck made the following remarks:

"Mr. Schenck. I ask unanimous consent to offer a joint resolution agreed to unanimously by the Committee on Military Affairs of the last Congress, but which was objected to when we endeavored to get it in by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Boyer] who since then has become satisfied that it ought to pass. If there be no objection I will make a brief explanation.

"There was no objection.

"The Clerk then read a resolution authorizing the employment of Brevet Brig. Gen. Seth Eastman of the United States Army, now on the retired list, to duty so as to entitle him to the full pay, emoluments, and allowances of his lineal rank, that it shall be competent to have such duty consist in the employment of the said officer in the execution under the supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, of paintings from his own designs for the decorations of the rooms of the Committee on Indian Affairs and on Military Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, and other parts of the Capitol; and no additional compensation for such service is to be paid to said Eastman beyond his pay, allowances, and emoluments as aforesaid.

"Mr. Cullom. I believe I was one of the persons who objected to that resolution when it was up before. I have since learned it is important; it should pass, and I withdraw any objection on my part.

"Mr. Schenck. We have been paying for decorations, some displaying good taste and others of a tawdry character, a great deal of money to Italian artists and others, while we have American talent much more competent for the work. Among others possessing native talent is General Eastman, who is now a lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army and a brevet brigadier general. He is more of an artist, in all that relates to the Indians, except possibly Catlin and Stanley than anyone we have had in the country. He is disabled from doing full duty now and is on the retired list suffering from rheumatism occasioned by exposure in the field on active duty.

"The General of the Army is perfectly willing to have Congress, if it thinks proper, provide for detailing General Eastman for the duty of executing for the Capitol some of his magnificent paintings. It is not military duty and it is thought better the General should be authorized to assign him to this duty. If assigned to this duty, General Eastman will draw his full pay as lieutenant colonel instead of as on the retired list, making a difference of about $1,200 or $1,500 a year. For at the most $1,500 a year we will secure services for which we have been paying tens of thousands of dollars to foreign artists and we will get better work done. I think under the circumstances a gallant American officer, who has taste and artistic ability, should be permitted to be assigned to this duty. I invite Members to look at a book I have here of engravings from his paintings, which display everything that is elegant and tasteful in art.

"The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

"Mr. Schenck moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

"The latter motion was agreed to." (Congressional Globe, 40th Cong., 1st sess., proceedings for March 26, 1867, pp. 361, 362.)

Under Special Order 427, Headquarters of the Army, Adjutant General's Office, Washington, D. C., August 28, 1867, Lieutenant Colonel Eastman was placed upon the active list and assigned to duty under the Secretary of the Interior. At this time the Capitol Building was under the Interior Department, and the assignment to the Interior Department really meant assignment to the Capitol for the purpose of decorative work therein. It seems that the Architect of the Capitol was not certain that it would be permissible for him to pay to General Eastman commutation of fuel and quarters to which he was entitled as a lieutenant colonel upon

the active list. On October 5, 1867, Captain Eastman requested of the Interior Department that instruction be given to the Architect of the Capitol to govern his action in this particular case. In accordance with the request of General Eastman the following communication was sent to the Architect of the Capitol:

"EDWARD CLARK, Esquire,
"Architect of the Capitol Extension

"SIR: Brevet Brig. Gen. Seth Eastman, lieutenant colonel, United States Army (retired), was by direction of the President detailed by special orders of the War Department No. 427, dated August 28, 1867, for duty in this Department. He is and has been on duty in the Department, in connection with the Capitol extension, and is entitled to commutation of fuel and quarters, agreeably to Army regulations from the 1st September 1857—(1867).

"I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant.

"W. T. OTTO,
"Acting Secretary."

Under the commission as outlined above Lieutenant Colonel Eastman executed nine paintings of Indian life. There may be some misconception connected with the idea of decorations which may lead many to conclude that they are painted upon the walls of the rooms for which they were executed. On the contrary, these paintings are upon canvas, properly framed, and hang about the walls of the rooms of the House Committee on Indian Affairs. As works of art they are creditable examples of the best of that period, but their art value is overshadowed by their historical value, as they admirably illustrate various incidents of Indian life. These examples could not be obtained at this time, as the present mode of savage life is far removed from the conditions which Colonel Eastman has so well portrayed. In addition to these nine paintings illustrating Indian life, Colonel Eastman painted 17 pictures of United States forts for the rooms of the House Committee on Military Affairs. It is learned from the correspondence relating to the work of Colonel Eastman that on June 23, 1870, the Architect of the Capitol advised the Secretary of the Interior that the artist proposed to proceed with the pictures for the decoration of the rooms of the House Committee on Military Affairs at a compensation of $100 per month in addition to his pay as a retired officer of the Army. It also appears from correspondence in relation to this work that Colonel Eastman had discussed the matter with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, Hon. J. A. Logan, and that as a result of this conference the plan of decoration was approved provided that it only included views of the principal forts and West Point, but there was no inclination on the part of Mr. Logan to have battle scenes used as subjects for the decoration of this room.

The paintings representing the 17 forts of the United States are probably more valuable as examples of historical accuracy and as illustrations of the conditions of the fortifications existing at that period than for purely decorative purposes. The Committee on Military Affairs, however, is not supposed to be a committee particularly solicitous in art direction. It was important that knowledge concerning the fortifications of the Government should be easily accessible, and these medium-size framed pictures contain desired information and also relieve acceptably what might otherwise be blank spaces upon an uninteresting wall. The acquaintance of the artist with military life as well as with Indian life was the natural result of his long-time service in the Army, much of which had been spent upon the then frontier of the country in close contact with Indian tribes. Colonel Eastman was born in Brunswick, Maine, January 24, 1808. He was the eldest child of Robert and Sarah (Lee) Eastman. He was of pure New England stock and was of the sixth generation from Roger, the first of the name in this country, who settled in Salisbury, Mass., soon after landing in Salem in 1638. He graduated at the Military Academy at West Point in 1831, passed through the several grades from second lieutenant to lieutenant colonel of infantry, and was placed on the retired list December 3, 1863. He was brevetted brigadier general August 9, 1866. Lieutenant Eastman was teacher of drawing at the Military Academy 1833 to 1840. He published a treatise on topographical drawings in 1837, and soon after 1850 a history of Indian tribes. He was stationed with part of his regiment for several years at Fort Snelling, Minn., and there became greatly interested in the history and customs of the Sioux and Chippewa Indians. During that period he made many drawings and paintings of the Indians and their various tribal ceremonials. His death occurred in Washington, D. C., August 31, 1875. (From pp. 235–240 of Art and Artists of the Capitol of the United States.)

It will be remembered that it was the intent of the Government to decorate the committee rooms of the House Committee on Military Affairs and the House Committee on Indian Affairs with paintings in oil by Seth Eastman. At the time of the employment of Brigadier General Eastman both committee rooms were in the Capitol Building, but with the erection of the House Office Building the House Committee on Military Affairs was given a committee room in this new building, and consequently the paintings (framed pictures of medium size) were taken to the committee room in its new location. It seems unfortunate that these very excellent works—17 paintings of United States forts—should be in a place where so few have an opportunity of inspecting them. The work was seriously done and the paintings are meritorious, and although hidden in a committee room it is not possible to determine where, if taken from this room, they could be hung so that the general public might have an opportunity of seeing them. As historical records they are valuable, as well as being fine examples of the work of a prominent painter of his period. (From p. 476 of Art and Artists of the Capitol of the United States. (NOTE.—These paintings are now located in the corridor of the basement floor, west front, of the Capitol Building.)

The following is a list of the 17 paintings of United States forts: Fort Knox, Maine; Fort Tyler, Fla.; Fort Snelling, Minn.; Fort Scamel and Fort George, Maine; Fort Defiance, N. H.; Fort Sumter, S. C. (before the war); Fort Sumter, S. C. (after the war); Fort Sumter, S. C. (after the bombardment); Fort Mackinac, Mich.; Fort Mifflin, Pa.; Fort Lafayette, N. Y.; Fort Tompkins and Fort Wadsworth, N. Y.; West Point, N. Y.; Fort Delaware, Del.; Fort Jefferson, Fla.; Fort Trumbull, Conn.; Fort Rice, N. Dak.

PAINTINGS OF INDIAN LIFE BY SETH EASTMAN

Formerly in the Indian Affairs Committee Room in the Capitol, now in the Public Lands Committee Room, room 1324, New House Office Building.

1. Dog Dance of the Dakotas.
2. Buffalo Chase.
3. Feeding the Dead.
4. The Indian Council.
5. Indian Mode of Traveling.
6. Indian Woman Dressing a Deer Skin.
7. Death Whoop.
8. Spearing Fish in Winter.
9. The Rice Gatherers.

The painting of The Rice Gatherers is the only one identified by name plate.

Six Hundred and Twenty-eighth Heavy Tank Battalion, Twenty-eighth Division, Pennsylvania National Guard

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 10, 1950, the Six Hundred and Twenty-eighth Heavy Tank Battalion of the Twenty-eighth Division, Pennsylvania National Guard left Johnstown, Pa., aboard a special troop train for Camp Atterbury, Ind., for combat training.

The city of Johnstown turned out en masse and lined the streets for over 4 miles as the soldiers marched from their armory to the train. They were accompanied to the station by three bands and marching delegations from the twelve groups associated with the veterans council of greater Johnstown.

It was the most dramatic sendoff ever witnessed in that city. Not even during World War II did such a large number of men leave the city bound for active duty in a single day, and probably never before was enacted the sight at the Pennsylvania Railroad station waiting room. Waving goodbys with one hand, brushing away tears with the other, the wives, sweethearts, and children left only room for a single file of men from the main entrance of the station to the doors at the ramp leading to the track platform. Many saw their loved ones leaving for a second time within a decade for the grim emergency of war—all of the friends and relatives of the soldiers trying to catch a last glimpse of their loved ones before boarding the train.

This departure of the Six Hundred and Twenty-eighth Tank Battalion brings the fighting in far-off Korea closer to Johnstown and directly links that area with the involved pattern of the Nation's foreign policy.

The Twenty-eighth Division, of which the Six Hundred and Twenty-eighth Tank Battalion is a part, has a long and distinguished record in America's wars. It will maintain its traditions this time, if the Nation requires fighting men in large numbers again. In World War I it was known as the Iron Division and dubbed the Bloody Bucket in World War II because of its red keystone shoulder patch.

Thousands of men have been summoned from their peaceful pursuits to take an active part in the national defense. Most of them, like our Johnstown men, have had preliminary training. We did not anticipate, however, that when the tank and aviation engineer units were formed in Johnstown last year, that they would be called into active service so soon, or at all. But that training has demonstrated its value.

We are in an era when real peace, secure peace, is not probable for quite some time. In the meantime, even an uneasy

peace can be preserved only if the warmakers are assured that those who really want peace will not pay the price the U. S. S. R. demands for it Since the power of America is to be mobilized, the men who left from the Twenty-sixth Congressional District are forming a notable part of it.

As I remarked, at the sendoff to the National Guard members, it is my sincere hope that speedily as possible the world situation may be corrected so that American families will again be reunited so that we can truly live in a world of justice, tolerance, and freedom for all mankind. The men and women of the Johnstown area, and the whole country, owe a real debt of gratitude to the men of the Six Hundred and Twenty-eighth Heavy Tank Battalion.

Where Do Our Rights Become Infringed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Denver Post, September 3, 1950, entitled "Where Do Our Rights Become Infringed?":

WHERE DO OUR RIGHTS BECOME INFRINGED?

Citation by the House of Representatives of the executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government brings up some ticklish legal points, and while we are not at all sure that Congress has the right to go as far as it has in invading private rights in its lobbying investigation, we are sympathetic to the House action in citing this man.

He is Dr. Edward Rumely. In 1944 he was indicted by a District of Columbia grand jury for "willful default" in refusing to submit documents requested by a congressional committee investigating campaign expenditures.

Dr. Rumely and his friends in this right-wing lobbying organization claim again that Congress has no right to make certain demands. This time it is in connection with a lobbying investigation. This time they refuse to tell the congressional committee headed by Representative BUCHANAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, the names of bulk buyers of the literature the organization puts out.

Dr. Rumely claims that this demand infringes on his rights as an American citizen. He has pleaded, in rapid succession, that this is an abuse of power, and that it violates the freedom-of-the-press amendment to the Constitution, punishing him because the Committee for Constitutional Government would not reveal the names of purchasers of books and literature in excess of $500.

The committee, however, is not a publisher, primarily. Its purpose is not to sell books for a profit. Its purpose is to print and sell propaganda to persuade people to a set of political ideas. Its purpose is to lobby for what it wants from the Federal Government, and to exert as much pressure as it can in as many ways as it can.

Besides, this sale of propaganda in large lots is a dodge. The committee does not accept contributions of more than $499, for the lobbying laws of our country state that such contributions are subject to registration. It gets around this provision by selling literature in excess of that amount.

The cry, "freedom of the press," when exercised by the Committee for Constitutional Government, then, threatens to give the legitimate press a bad name.

Dr. Rumely has been cited by Congress for refusing to answer questions about lobbying. We believe his citation is just in the light of events, just as were the citations of members of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee for refusing to produce their financial records.

If Dr. Rumely's organization were not primarily a lobbying organization, the case might be different. In questions such as this the shadings of right and legality are fine. But the doctor's organization is a pressure group, which spends great quantities of money sending great quantities of material to newspapers and other public-information media. It is a lobbying organization, and as such should not be allowed to hide behind other skirts in trying to evade answers to legitimate questions.

The Committee for Constitutional Government has every right to publish what it will, subject to the laws of libel. But the American people have a right to know who is behind the committee so they can tell why it publishes what it does.

We should like to see the case taken to the courts for decision, though, because in that case the judiciary might give us some indication as to just how far the lobbying investigators can go. We remember that they have made some inordinate demands of corporations, and some high-handed and foolish demands, too.

Throughout this question it must be the aim of the American people to preserve the right of inquiry of Congress, which it must have in order to pass sane legislation, and which it must be able to back up by punishment of those who refuse to aid its legislative inquiries.

At the same time we must protect the rights of Americans against that terrible monster—government.

In this case we believe the citation of Edward Rumely can be carried out legally and properly without infringing on the basic rights of Americans.

Resolution of Hartford County (Conn.) Chapter of Catholic War Veterans, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, in today's mail I received a copy of a very interesting resolution passed at the regular meeting of the Hartford County Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans, Inc. Transmitted by Commander Lucian J. Kragiel, it demands action by the Secretary of Treasury to prohibit entrance into United States of products made by forced or slave labor under the Tariff Act of 1930 having reference to such items. I am in fullest accord with this resolution and have pending House Concurrent Resolution 207 expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries. I am continuing my fullest efforts to have this resolution favorably considered. Its passage will attain a like desirable objective sought by the CWV; and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include their resolution:

Whereas the United States of America together with other free countries of the world is engaged in a war with communism; and

Whereas the United States of America is importing goods manufactured in the Soviet Union and its satellites; and

Whereas the money acquired by the Soviet Union and its satellites for these goods is being used to secure and manufacture arms and munitions to be used against the armed forces of the United States of America and other free countries; and

Whereas these goods are manufactured by slave labor and sold in this country at a price so low that American-made goods cannot compete with these imports, thereby causing American manufacturers to curtail production which in turn throws American workmen out of work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Hartford County Chapter does hereby demand that the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America place an embargo on any and all imports manufactured or otherwise prepared for consumption in Soviet Russia or any of its satellites.

Love of God and Home and Native Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the men who follow the line of battle tell us that in the dying hour the soldier unclasps his weapons and reaches for the inner pocket to touch some faded letter, some little keepsake of wife or mother. This pathetic fact teaches us that our boys are not fighting because of the abstract rights of man alone. It is love of God and home and native land that enter into our soldiers and makes their arms invincible. No stronger or more convincing evidence of the truth of this than the letter from Pfc. John J. McCormick to his two lovely little daughters, Rose Marie and Joannie. Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Friday, September 15, 1950:

DADDY ON WAY TO DIE IN KOREA WRITES GIRLS LETTER TO CHERISH—ALWAYS DO WHAT CONSCIENCE TELLS IS RIGHT, HE URGES

COLLINGDALE, PA., September 15.—A young soldier in Korea took a piece of notepaper from his helmet and wrote a letter to his two small daughters back home.

That letter was delivered yesterday to the home of 6-year-old Rose Marie McCormick and her sister, Joan, 3.

Three days ago, their mother was notified that Pfc. John J. McCormick, 28, paratrooper veteran of World War II and infantryman in Korea, had been killed in action.

This is what Private McCormick wrote to "Dear Joannie and Rose Marie":

"This is daddy. I want you to listen and pay attention while Mommie reads this to you. Just try and make believe I was there, talking to you.

"Joannie, I don't think you'll remember me because you were a little baby when I had to go away, but I used to sit and hold you a lot, and when you were a bad little girl, I used to make you sit in a chair until you were good, but I always loved you a lot and I was very proud of you.

"Rose Marie, you should remember me because I used to take you out with me a lot, and I used to buy you a lot of candy and sodas, and I used to feel so good when people used to say you had eyes like mine. Remember the little puppy I bought you? Your Mummy used to tie a little pink ribbon around its neck and you used to carry it in your arms. You looked awfully cute.

"I want you both to know that I'd be with you if I could, but there are a lot of bad men in the world, and if they were allowed to do what they wanted to do, little girls like you wouldn't be allowed to go to church on Sunday or be able to go to the school you wanted to.

"So I have to help fight these men and keep them from coming where you and Mummie live. It might take a long while, and maybe Daddy will have to go and help God in heaven, and if I do, I always want you both to be good for Mummie, because she is the best Mummie in the whole wide world.

"She has always taken care of you while I have been away. You see, kids, I happened to be caught in two wars inside 10 years, and the reason I am where I am today is because I am fighting for what I think is right.

"That's one thing I always want both of you to remember. If your conscience tells you something is right, always stand up for it. You might be ridiculed for doing so, but in the long run you'll find out that people respect you more for doing so.

"When you grow up to be young ladies, don't ever forget all that Mummie has done for you. She has often gone without clothes for herself so that both of you could have nice things. I want you to do as she says; go to church on Sundays and you can always pray for Daddy.

"So remember, kids, when you grow up, save this letter in case I'm not there to talk to you, and try and remember all I am saying, for it's for your good, and because I love you and Mummie so much.

"I'll be in a hole, fighting, in a few days, in a place called Korea. I carry your picture, and Mummie's next to my heart, and if I have to go help God, you'll know that the last thought I had on this earth was for the two of you and Mummie. All my love and kisses. Be good and God bless you.

"DADDY."

Freedom To Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Boston Herald under date of September 2, 1950:

FREEDOM TO LOBBY

The House of Representatives has raised a tempest by its decision to cite Dr. Edward A. Rumely for contempt of Congress. Unlike most others who have been cited recently, Dr. Rumely has powerful supporters in the Congress and among leaders of business and the press.

Yet, considering the precedents which have recently been set in the congressional-contempt cases, it is difficult to see how the House could have acted differently.

Dr. Rumely is executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government and his current citation results from his refusal to turn over to the House Committee on Lobbying Activities the names of purchasers of CCG publications. The doctor contends that this information is irrelevant to anything the congressional group is entitled to investigate and that the demand for it violates the free press and searches and seizures clauses of the Bill of Rights.

The Lobbying Committee, on the other hand, argues that the CCG is a registered lobby, that it is supported in large part by the quantity orders for its propaganda publications from financial angels, and that the identity of these angels is something the committee has a right to know. The investigators deny that any constitutional question is involved.

Admitting that opening the subscription lists of publications, or groups sponsoring publications, might be abused in such a way as to place a burden on the freedom of the press, there is no clear evidence that such an abuse exists here. If the CCG's right-wing anti-Fair Deal bias has made it a special target for the probe committee, it is noteworthy that the left-wing Civil Rights Congress was cited at the same time.

Moreover, the congressional group does not ask for a complete list of subscribers. That would, of course, be indefensible. It asks only for the names of those from whom $1,000 or more has been received either through book purchases or other means.

We see no valid reason why lobbying organizations, even though they operate chiefly through the press, should not be required to disclose their sponsorship or financial backing. Newspapers which are corporations have long been required to make such facts public, and the requirement has not noticeably restricted their freedom of expression. Dr. Rumely's group should not consider itself more privileged, certainly, and there is no question of restricting its right to lobby.

In CCG's case there is, to be sure, a sharp difference of opinion as to whether the organization is in fact supported by quantity orders and whether, therefore, the list of purchasers is relevant. But the Congressmen feel that they must examine the list in order to determine the answer and this, too, seems reasonable.

If, as Dr. Rumely contends in one of his publications, CCG has 90 percent of the press on its side in this fight, we must reluctantly number ourselves with the skeptical 10 percent until a better case is made.

Inflation Threatens Our Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 26, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, on September 5, 1950, wholesale commodity prices reached the highest level in the last 25 years.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports the index on all commodities at wholesale for September 5, at 167.5 of the 1926 average.

The Dow-Jones spot commodity index, computed on the average prices for 1924, 1925, and 1926 equal to 100, on September 11, 1950, was reported at 199.18. On May 1 it was hovering around 160.

The rise of approximately 25 percent in spot commodity prices during the past 4½ months means the purchasing power of the dollar has been decreased by 20 percent.

It takes $5 to buy now what $4 would have bought in late April and early May of this year.

In previous times I have referred to the "high crime of inflation" as evidenced by the rising cost of the family food basket from week to week.

We now are about to witness a further devaluation in the purchasing power of the dollar stimulated by Government deficit spending to finance the new programs for national defense, mutual aid assistance to European nations, and general aid and assistance to countries all over the world, all of which spending has been authorized by this Congress.

Government costs at Federal, State, and local levels, according to minimum estimates will exceed $81,000,000,000, in the calendar year 1951.

To raise this almost unbelievable amount the taxes which will of necessity have to be levied will take approximately every third dollar of national income.

The consequences of such a punitive program have not been either fully or satisfactorily explained to the American businessman, the American farmer, or the American workingman.

PUBLIC DEBT HELD BY PEOPLE

Many people think that our public debt of more than $257,000,000,000 is held by the banks and big corporations of the Nation. This is a delusion.

As of July 1, 1950, the commercial banks of the Nation held but $65,000,000,000 in United States Government securities and the balance was owned by savings banks, building and loan associations, insurance companies, and the individual purchasers who purchased these securities from their personal earnings and savings as part of their plans for security and comfort in their declining years.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

As of June 30, 1949, the public debt, then at $250,800,000,000, was held as follows:

By commercial banks	$63,000,000,000
By Federal Reserve banks	19,300,000,000
By individuals	68,000,000,000
By insurance companies	20,900,000,000
By State, local, and Territorial governments	8,000,000,000
By mutual-savings banks	11,600,000,000
By corporations and associations	21,600,000,000
By the United States Government as investments securing trust funds such as civil-service retirement fund, Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, railroad retirement account, unemployment trust fund	38,400,000,000
Total held	250,800,000,000

Mr. Speaker, every dollar held by the United States Government in these trust funds has already been spent and the security for this money consists of Government IOU's. With the dollar value collapsing from month to month, the beneficiaries of these trust funds will be paid off in devalued dollars, a system of skillful robbery achieved by inflation accelerated by deficit financing for the past 20 years.

DEFICITS IN 18 OF THE LAST 20 YEARS

Mr. Speaker, we have been going down the road to disaster and inflation in 18 of the last 20 years. We have built up the public debt by deficit spending by over $200,000,000,000. And all of this has been done with an irredeemable paper currency as the basis for our fiscal policies.

And this deficit spending has occurred during a period in which we collected more taxes by two hundred and two billion than the total cost of our Government from the beginning of the Republic down to the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933.

The tables which follow show the trend in Federal spending, a large part of which can be charged to waste, mismanagement, and downright incapacity on the part of the New Deal-Fair Deal administrators of our Government to measure up to the responsibilities of their jobs.

A RECORD OF DEFICIT SPENDING

In 18 out of the past 20 fiscal years the Federal Government has operated at a deficit. In 2 years, 1947 and 1948, the surpluses amounted to $9,173,257,504.

The public debt which was $16,185,308,299, or $131.38 per capital at the close of the fiscal year 1930, has risen to $257,357,352,351 or $1,704.50 per capita.

The details of the deficits by years are shown in the table following:

TABLE 1.—*Surplus or deficits of the Federal Government by fiscal years 1931 through 1950*

[Compiled from official Treasury statements]

	Budgetary surplus or deficit (−)
1931	−$461,877,080
1932	−2,735,289,708
1933	−2,601,652,085
1934	−3,629,631,943
1935	−2,791,052,085
1936	−4,424,549,230
1937	−2,777,420,714
1938	−1,176,616,598
1939	−3,862,158,040
1940	−3,918,019,161
1941	−6,159,272,358
1942	−21,990,242,358
1943	−57,420,430,365
1944	−51,423,392,541
1945	−53,940,916,126
1946	−20,676,170,609
1947	753,787,660
1948	8,419,469,844
1949	−1,811,440,047
1950	−3,122,102,357
Gross deficit	−244,422,233,802
Less 1947–48 surplus	9,173,257,504
Net deficit (20 years)	−235,248,976,298

During the 20 fiscal years from 1931 through 1950, the Treasury Department collected revenues in the total amount of $342,292,461,609.

The Treasury receipts, other than borrowings, are shown by years in table 2, which follows:

TABLE 2.—*Budgetary receipts of the U. S. Treasury by fiscal years from 1930 through 1950*

1931	$3,189,638,632
1932	2,005,725,437
1933	2,079,696,742
1934	3,115,554,050
1935	3,800,467,202
1936	4,115,956,615
1937	5,028,840,237
1938	5,854,661,227
1939	5,164,823,626
1940	5,387,124,670
1941	7,607,211,852
1942	12,799,061,621
1943	22,281,642,709
1944	44,148,926,968
1945	46,456,554,580
1946	43,037,798,808
1947	43,258,833,189
1948	44,745,542,077
1949	38,245,667,810
1950	37,044,733,557
Total receipts (20 years)	342,292,461,609

The total receipts for the 20-year period, plus the accumulated deficits, indicate that the total expended by the Federal Government during the period was $577,541,437,902, or an average of about $28,877,071,895 per year.

Of the money spent during this 20-year period, approximately $110,000,000,000 was spent during and since the beginning of World War II. This foreign aid is expected to continue for many years.

One important factor generally overlooked by those who claim our economy is on a sound basis is the inflation brought about by Government deficit spending, and the depreciated purchasing power of the dollar. We Americans are in fact living in a land of make-believe. Making ourselves believe the more we spend and the more we go in debt the more prosperous we can become, and the higher we can raise our standard of living. Time will awaken the people from this trance. It is a fact that in 1931 the dollar was worth 96.6 cents in the market place. In 1932 it was worth 108.1 cents and the person who had saved a dollar drew some small comfort out of the fact that he had been thrifty. Today the dollar is worth only 58.1 cents and every person who saved in the days between 1929 and 1939 now finds that he has been robbed of the purchasing power of his savings by the deficit spending of the Federal Government, which has inflated prices in the markets. Borrowed money competing for goods drives up the price, and will continue to do so until deficit spending ends.

The irony of the situation is that while the Truman administration is aggressively campaigning to save democracies all over the world, and at the same time campaigning for comprehensive and more liberal social-security programs here at home, at the very same time by this deficit spending all over the world, it is undermining the very programs they offer the people, by devaluing the purchasing power of the dollar by deficit financing.

The dollar of 1935–39 is worth less than 50 cents today, and surely will go lower unless the Congress itself acts to place our economy and our money on a sound basis.

Fifty-five million men and women with savings accounts, the millions with investments in building and loan associations, and insurance policies are being systematically robbed of their savings. Additional billions of dollars saved by the working men and women of the Nation have gone into the stocks and bonds of the industries of our country. These savers too will be robbed of the fruits of thrift, by a punitive excess-profits tax if the New Dealers and the Fair Dealers have their way and succeed in setting up the hand-out or authoritarian state.

Some of you will remember that not more than 30 years ago, a so-called leader of the people set out to better the conditions in his country by promising he would institute a program to:

Decentralize the executive power; free the judiciary from executive influence; pay the public debt by increased levies on the wealthy classes; limit the Government's activities to civic and political affiairs; and work for peace and disarmament.

This was the promise of Benito Mussolini when he marched with his "black shirts" on Rome. He took over the Government of Italy and established the most corrupt, the most licentious, and the most hated dictatorship in Europe. His promises went for naught, and his dictatorship wound up in war, defeat, and bankruptcy for the Italian people.

Here in America we still have time, but very little to put our house in order, restore the purchasing power of the dollar by rigid governmental economy and the abandonment of plans for the socialistic state.

Lobbying—Buchanan Answers Times-Herald Editorial of September 1, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, very few of the Members sitting in this House today have not at one time or another during their public careers been subjected to ugly, vicious, and thoroughly unwarranted attacks by certain segments of the Nation's press. We often chafe under these attacks, but we recognize that they are unavoidable. We recognize further that though these attacks may be intemperate to the extreme, they are at the same time reminders of the genuine freedom which the press enjoys in these United States.

Every Member of this House is aware of the attacks which have been directed against me and against the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

These attacks have come from the press of both the extreme left and the extreme right, and this has actually been a heartening sign to us that we were doing an honest and objective job in our investigation. For it is the extreme left and the extreme right which have most to fear from full disclosure of their lobbying activities. Their outraged cries of injured innocence have shown us that we have struck pay dirt without playing favorites.

Mr. Speaker, we have suffered these attacks with what I believe has been great forbearance. I like to remember that Lincoln once said:

> If I were to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, the shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how, the very best I can, and I mean to keep doing so until the end.

But there is a point, Mr. Speaker, beyond which forbearance is impossible. This point was reached and passed by the Washington Times-Herald when it published on September 1, 1950, an editorial entitled "License for 'Burocrats,' No Rights for Others."

Many Members are undoubtedly familiar with this editorial. It featured a picture of myself, flanked by pictures of Joseph Goebbels on the right and Jacob Malik on the left—the inference clearly being that we were three men cut from the same cloth.

If this were the only objectionable feature of the editorial, I would be inclined to dismiss it as cheap innuendo of the usual heavy-handed Times-Herald type. But the editorial continued with what purported to be an analysis of the forthcoming report of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that this alleged analysis is the most thoroughly reprehensible piece of yellow journalism that I have seen during my tenure in this House. It is to reveal this vicious so-called analysis for what it is that I speak this afternoon.

In the very first place, the document on which the editorial was based was not the report of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities at all. It was the first unrevised draft of such a report which was circulated confidentially among members of the committee for their objections, additions, and comments. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this draft was circulated in confidence among the members of the committee. Furthermore, at the very time that this first draft was given to the Times-Herald a second substantially revised draft had already been completed and placed in the committee's hands. Since that time, still a third draft of our report has been written.

These facts alone are enough to show the complete irresponsibility of the Times-Herald editorial. Even if the report had not been substantially revised, however, this editorial would have been a gross and willful distortion of the document which the Times-Herald had in its possession. Let me point out just a few of the many instances where the Times-Herald blandly ignores or twists the facts. The editorial states:

> The report assumes that the Constitution is outmoded, that the executive departments should be freed of all restraints while the rights of citizens to petition for redress of grievances should be reduced, and that the criminal penalties applying to Federal officers who misuse public appropriations in order to influence legislation should be reduced to a dead letter.

Mr. Speaker, our report assumes nothing of the kind, and the Times-Herald knows it. We are charged with assuming that the executive departments should be freed of all restraints, but nothing could be further from the truth. We vigorously investigated every charge of misused appropriations which came to our attention. Not only did we investigate, but we also initiated investigations by the Comptroller General of the United States, an officer whose impartiality few would question. Furthermore, the draft report clearly and specifically spells out the dangers of executive participation in legislative policymaking. Could any fair-minded person say that this sounds like freedom from all restraints?

As to the charge that we would reduce the right of citizens to petition for redress of grievance, this is so much brazen nonsense. The draft specifically states on page 28xs:

> This committee is convinced that a great deal can be done without in any way curbing these rights or making their exercise more difficult. We reject at this time any suggestion that the lawful means of lobbying should be restricted.

Does this sound like reducing the right of petition?

The charge that we would reduce the law restricting the use of public moneys for influencing legislation to a dead letter is equally phony. What the draft report actually says is:

> There are five related questions involved in a proper evaluation of lobbying activities by executive agencies * * * (3) Is this statutory prohibition realistic or enforceable? Or have conditions so changed since its enactment in 1919 that it is and must be a dead letter?

The Times-Herald knows very well that the draft report comes to no conclusions whatsoever on this question.

The editorial continues by saying that in the draft report all citizens and groups of citizens opposing executive policy are dismissed as pernicious pressure groups. This statement is utterly and completely false. The report has never at any time called any citizen or group pernicious, nor has it so implied. Indeed, the draft states, as I myself have stated many times, that lobbying is both necessary and healthy in a democracy. I find such a statement on the very first page of my copy of the draft. Perhaps the Times-Herald's editorial writer suffers myopia whenever he reads something which does not conform to his preconceived notions. Whatever the cause, the result is nothing less than a bald and ugly lie.

These, Mr. Speaker, are only a few of the outright untruths contained in this extraordinary editorial. There is no possible excuse for such dishonest journalism. Even more glaring, however, is the ingenious way in which this editorial twists, distorts, and wrenches phrases out of their normal context. For example, the draft report is quoted as saying, which it did:

> We do not believe in passive government.

To which the Times-Herald adds its own interpretation:

> Therefore, all "burocrats" are to be relieved of criminal responsibility.

Now it is perfectly apparent that no committee of Congress in command of its senses would say anything which any reasonable person could construe as the Times-Herald did. And, of course, our draft report neither said nor implied anything which could remotely support the Times-Herald comment. What the Times-Herald failed to tell its readers was that the draft actually said:

> We do not believe in passive government. We believe that there are interests in this Nation other than those which can be mobilized along group lines, and we believe that it is the responsibility of government—both morally and politically—to defend them. We believe, in sum, that government must lead as well as follow.

Does this sound like relieving "burocrats" of criminal responsibility? Could it be that the Times-Herald withheld the full paragraph because it states facts which even the Times-Herald cannot explain away? Or could it be that the Times-Herald is singing the same theme song of stalemate and confusion that it has been singing for years. It is quite a song, Mr. Speaker. If government does act to meet a crisis, then it is totalitarian. If it does not act, then it is timid and confused. With papers like the Times-Herald, you are damned if you do and you are damned if you do not. This may seem like clever journalism to some Members of this House, but to me it represents a cynical and degrading conception of editorial responsibility. The Times-Herald is well aware that the great bulk of its readers will never have the chance to read our committee's report, so it presumes that it can play fast and loose with the facts without anyone ever being any the wiser.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial was written with a strange inner logic all its own. It proceeds first from a series of deliberate falsehoods to a series of deliberate distortions. These then become the basis for a series of hysterically ugly conclusions. Our views, said the Times-Herald, would, if sustained, "destroy republican government, would reduce Congress to a chorus responsive to the baton of a dictator, and would cast the Constitution and the statutes upon the ash heap."

Perhaps I should feel flattered, Mr. Speaker, that the Times-Herald thinks our committee has the power to do all these things. But I am not flattered. I am outraged and this entire House should be outraged, for what the Times-Herald is saying is that a lawfully constituted committee of this House, acting within the proper purview of its investigative authority, is bent on subverting the American constitutional system. This is not only an affront to the intelligence of the American public; it is a deliberate and calculated attack on my integrity, on the integrity of the other members of my committee, and on the integrity of this entire House.

The charge that we are subverting the Constitution would be preposterous if it were not so ugly. I yield to no one in my deep attachment to constitutional principles. But this is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. The Times-Herald is not interested in protecting these principles, but in protecting those groups which fear a full investigation and disclosure of their lobbying activities. This is the issue, Mr. Speaker, and we should not let it be beclouded by the efforts of these groups and their kept defenders to keep the truth from the people. The Times-Herald says that we "allegedly" investigated lobbying. We didn't "allegedly" investigate, we did investigate, and this is precisely what the Times-Herald is upset about.

The final paragraphs of this editorial, Mr. Speaker, are on the same level as the first. I quote:

As a contribution to the literature of totalitarian dictatorship, the mouthings of the Buchanan New Dealers deserve a place along with the edicts of Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's minister of propaganda and national enlightenment, and the orations of Mr. Malik and the outgivings of the Soviet-controlled press.

What does one say in reply to this kind of language? That it is simply untrue? That it smacks of the gutter? Or should one point out that the Times-Herald is itself reading from the largest page of the dictator's propaganda book? Lenin, Stalin, and Hitler have all shown us the power of the great lie. The greater the lie, the better. Repeat it loudly, repeat it endlessly, and eventually it will be believed. So it is with the Times-Herald attack on our committee. It is the same old pattern of falsehood, distortion, name-calling, and low innuendo—all so that the truth can be kept from the people. The Times-Herald has learned its lessons from masters.

But, Mr. Speaker, we will speak the truth. Our report will set forth the facts about lobbying as we found them. The Times-Herald and its ilk may call us dictators. They may call us Goebbels and Maliks. They may spread the great lie that we are subverting the Constitution. But still the truth will be told, and it will dispel all the murky logic and hysterical slander of a hundred Times-Heralds. For unlike the Times-Herald, I have faith in the intelligence and judgment of the American people when they are armed with the facts. We will arm them with the facts, Mr. Speaker, and they will judge.

Rustling of Iron Curtain Portends New Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article in the Washington Sunday Star of September 17 by Constantine Brown entitled "Rustling of Iron Curtain Portends New Aggression."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSTLING OF IRON CURTAIN PORTENDS NEW AGGRESSION—SOVIETS REPORTED READYING SATELLITES FOR EARLY PUSH AGAINST WEST GERMANY

(By Constantine Brown)

For the last 12 months an almost impenetrable curtain has been lowered around the Soviet-controlled areas of the Baltic Sea, extending from Tallinn, the capital of what used to be the republic of Estonia, to Wismar, near the frontier of the British occupation zone in western Germany.

It is in this area that the Soviet is making the most formidable preparations for aggression against the west. The few natives who have been allowed to remain in their old homesteads no longer are permitted to leave. Even a 5-mile trip is subjected to the most rigid control by Soviet and east German secret police.

The natives are branded like cattle so there can be no doubt that they belong to these provinces and no outsider has a chance to enter the prohibited zones without quick detection.

Finnish, Swedish, and Danish ships which occasionally have to put into the many ports of this area must follow strict regulations. They are allowed only to enter harbors and can have no contact with people ashore.

There have been some persons—but very few—who have escaped recently from the top secret zone, particularly Russian officers who have had enough of the Communist paradise. They have surrendered to western Allied guards and under friendly and skillful interrogation revealed a few of the secret preparations Moscow is making there.

They spoke about the new improved guided missile platforms, the strength and intensive training of the new German Army, whose officer corps is composed largely of Nazi elite corps officers, and of many other matters which are being kept secret by their interrogators.

All this information and more, obtained at great risks, shows clearly that the Kremlin has speeded up the tempo of preparedness of the satellite forces in eastern Germany. They also show that Moscow is ready to give full support to these troops when they are ordered to overrun western Germany.

APPRAISALS FAULTY

These revelations have prompted many military men of the west to conclude that we may be faced with an aggression of the Korean type in Europe sometime in the next few months and not later than the summer of 1951.

The requests from France and from the Bonn government that more American troops be made available for the defense of western Europe have sprung from the belief among the nations which are most directly menaced by Russia that a show-down is inevitable, regardless of how optimistic the diplomats at Lake Success and Washington may be.

These officials have been wrong in their appraisals of the international situation since the end of World War II. They have failed to heed the storm warnings in Korea. There is no reason to believe now that they are right about conditions in Europe. The news from the east is factual; the hopes of the diplomats are based on wishful thinking.

The request for more help from the United States, in the form of five more American divisions, has fallen on friendly ears in Washington. President Truman has replied that we would not shirk our responsibilities, but insisted that our efforts be matched by those of the defenders of western Europe.

The fact is that at the present time we do not have even one division available for the European theater. It is also a fact that the members of the Atlantic Pact do not have the necessary manpower to organize a force to meet a Soviet-backed attack within the next 12 months. And here we come face to face with the madness of allowing sentimental and emotional factors to outweigh dire military necessity.

For more than a year military men in America, Britain, and France have quietly urged their Governments to bring into the European defense system all the nations which are willing to offer full cooperation against the Russian threat. While some of the British and French made certain definite restrictions in regard to Germany, they all agreed that Spain, which has never been a threat to western Europe, even in the days when Hitler was conquering Europe and offered General Franco Gibraltar and a large slice of the French African colonial empire, should be accepted as a full-fledged partner.

ALLIES WORN OUT

Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery came to Washington last winter. He urged openly that Spain be associated with the common western defense. He told officials in Washington that he had pleaded with Foreign Minister Bevin to bury the ideological hatchet and made the same plea here. The blunt fact is that without the inclusion of western German and Spanish manpower in the western defense system the chances of saving Europe are, to say the least, extremely limited.

The Atlantic Pact nations, with the exception of America, are worn-out, war-weary countries which cannot be expected to make any large contribution of manpower. This is not said in a critical spirit. France has been bled white in two world wars and has on its hands a colonial war in Indochina, to which she has committed the bulk of her best troops.

Italy, also, is tired out and incapable even of defending her own borders, to say nothing of sending troops for the defense of other countries of the western coalition. Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Luxembourg are small nations with no military potential. Norway may be able to resist a Soviet onslaught for a few months, if she is properly supported by American and British air and naval forces.

Britain is about as tired militarily as France, although she is expected to make another real effort if war comes and her Government decides to join the fray with everything it has in its power. Portugal, a small country in the extremity of southwestern Europe, cannot be considered a military power, and has been made a member of the Atlantic alliance only out of courtesy. She has some strategically important islands, such as the Azores, which are essential to the American and British Air Forces.

In addition to these material conditions there is a political factor which must not be overlooked. There are strong Communist movements in most of the continental European countries, particularly in France and Italy. While the Communist Parties have been losing ground for 2 years, they still have several million active members and a large number of associates.

SPAIN'S POTENTIAL VALUE

The Communists have been carrying on tremendous propaganda against the warmongering United States and its puppets, the Paris and Rome governments. The peoples of France and Italy are so war-weary that nobody should be surprised if a large portion of the non-Communist population agreed that it would be better to accept honorable neutrality to the devastations of another war.

Thus, from the viewpoint of available manpower and from the psychological point of view, it is doubtful that the European countries which are the pillars of the Atlantic Pact will be willing to fight when the showdown comes, unless they are strongly supported by other armies.

We are engaged in a bitter campaign in the Far East. It will be essential for some time that we send across the Pacific whatever troops are available to us at the present rate of mobilization of our Armed Forces.

How then can we fulfill our commitments to western Europe in the near future?

If it is true that manpower alone does not make armies these days, it is equally true that military equipment alone is not sufficient unless you have men behind the guns and in the tanks. And only few men are available among the members of the present coalition in western Europe.

After a good deal of bickering the powers which occupy western Germany have agreed to permit the recruiting of 60,000 Germans for service in a police force armed with tanks and all the other paraphernalia of modern warfare. It is hoped that this decision will be put into effect at the earliest possible moment and that the necessary equipment for such German troops can be found readily.

But it is Spain which can be of utmost importance to the defense of the West. There are today some 450,000 men under arms in the country. Another 500,000 trained reserves are immediately available. The Spaniards have not fought a foreign nation, except the United States, since the days of Napoleon and then their role was limited to the old-type guerrilla warfare. The civil war fought between 1936 and 1939 does not give any indication of the ability of the Spanish forces.

JOINT CHIEFS PUZZLED

Of all the countries of western Europe, however, Spain is not contaminated in the least with Communist ideology. Quite the contrary. The Spandiards are all determined anti-Communists, regardless of whether they are Falangists, Royalists, Socialists, or Anarchists.

The present world conflict is, among other things, an ideological conflict. Russian propaganda has succeeded to a remarkable degree in camouflaging its aims of world conquest with an ideology which has sucked in millions of dreamers or power-hungry demagogues. There is no doubt in the minds of those who have looked into conditions in Spain that the country would be of utmost importance as an ally against the Russian steamroller.

Yet, in Washington everything is being done to prevent Spain from fulfilling its role in the struggle against the evil forces of Moscow. The State Department and the White House, which alone oppose any steps to include the whole Iberian Peninsula in the forthcoming struggle for survival, have placed every conceivable barrier in the way of Spain's participation.

The stated reason is that General Franco is a dictator. But so is Tito, and a Communist to boot. That, however, does not impress our foreign-policy makers. They do not admit that the policy of expediency as it is applied to Tito should also be applied to the Communist-hating Spaniards.

President Truman has gone to greater lengths than any of his predecessors in thwarting the efforts of those who realize that Spain's military support is essential to the defense of Europe.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are reliably reported to have urged in the National Security Council that Spain be included in the defense of western Europe, are puzzled. Their views are being ignored because the State Department insists that such a move would offend the Socialists in Britain and France.

Advantages of Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there is an awareness today, I believe, among our citizens of the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States that is most gratifying because of the attacks which are being made upon the very rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution.

It was my privilege to speak on Saturday, September 16, 1950, before the joint Constitution Day banquet sponsored by the Delaware State Societies of the Sons of the American Revolution and the Daughters of the American Revolution, outstanding groups of patriotic citizens. These organizations have been conducting an educational campaign on the subject of the Constitution, which was given special emphasis last week by a campaign in the schools of Delaware which culminated in the combined banquet on Saturday evening.

Anything that can be done to bring before our people the advantages of our Constitution serves a definite purpose in these critical days. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my address before the Delaware societies be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Delaware, of all States of our Union, has the undoubted right to point proudly toward the Constitution of the United States.

Delaware has every right to acclaim its title as "First State" by reason of having been the first of the Original Thirteen Colonies to ratify, on December 7, 1787, the historic, but then unique, Constitution of this great land of free men.

On Constitution Day, it is fitting that all our citizens should pause and consider what our United States Constitution means to them and should give heartfelt thanks that they are fortunate enough to live under its protection. We are inclined to take our Constitution somewhat for granted. Yet, without it, most of the things that all of us hold most dear and precious would be denied us.

It is particularly in order that we should do so at this time, when memories of the greatest war in history are still fresh in our minds, and when turmoil and strife again are threatening the peace and security of the entire world.

Basic in our Constitution is the thought that government exists for the benefit of the governed; that those who govern are the servants and not the masters of the people. Basic also is the thought that freedom and justice and liberty must be preserved to every individual and safeguarded against the assaults of opportunism, against the expediency of the passing hour, against encroachments that would eventually destroy the entire structure of our system.

These principles lie at the base of all our civil and political institutions—they are deeply rooted in our history and traditions. Many men have fought and bled and died that they might be preserved. The Constitution serves as a constant bar against all branches of our Government to prevent their destruction, to the end that freedom of the individual, under law, may forever continue in this country.

Our enemies now threatening these American institutions would destroy these precious freedoms. To them, the individual has no rights save those which the government chooses to accord him. It would be inconveivable in a totalitarian form of dictatorship for an individual citizen to claim protection against governmental action, and to be able to appeal to the courts to protect him against such action on the ground that it is forbidden to the government to take it. Here, each and all of us may do so.

In any evaluation of America's contribution to the art of orderly living in the world, our constitutional form of government must be placed at the head of the list. The system of life achieved and guaranteed by that imperishable document has weathered the storms of 163 years, in a world where progress during this long span has been noted chiefly for the changes of its various forms of government.

Since the American Constitution first was adopted, practically every other nation in the world has seen great changes, in many cases a succession of changes, in its form of government. Thrones have tumbled, dynasties have fallen, new empires, new republics, dictatorships have come into existence. Yet today, the United States of America, thanks to the foresight of our ancestors, is living and preparing for the solution of the vast problems ahead, under essentially the same instrument of government adopted in 1787.

If America has, indeed, made any lasting contribution—anything that deserves preserving, no matter what the cost—it is this immortal document, representing as it does a permanent endowment to the science of government and orderly living of men among men.

In this reference to the adoption and the maintenance of our great Constitution, may I be permitted to mention briefly, but with deep satisfaction, the part played by a distinguished son of Maryland, Luther Martin, in its framing and adoption, and the memorable defense of its integrity by another famous Marylander, Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, of the Supreme Court.

One explanation, possibly the basic one, why our constitutional form of government has managed to survive throughout a period that witnessed the decay and overthrow of countless other systems is the coordination of the separate agencies of Government.

Never has there been a time when this coordination has been more necessary, when the best thought and wisest counsel have been so much needed, as at present. Thousands of American young men again are fighting in a foreign land, to defend our national and constitutional rights. They fight, furthermore, not by choice, but from necessity.

Uppermost in the minds of all our people during these trying years is the responsibility of preserving inviolate in our own land the essential, the fundamental liberties for which this war is being fought.

All of you know what those liberties are. Liberty of speech and press, of peaceful assembly, of religious worship; freedom from condemnation except after fair and impartial trial—all of those basic rights which are included within our concept of due process of law—rights which we regard as so precious, so fundamental that, in the words of Justice Cardozo, they are "of the very essence of a scheme of ordered liberty."

They lie at the base of all our civil and political institutions, "rooted in the traditions and conscience of our people."

Today those rights again are threatened with destruction—with replacement by a cold and brutal philosophy which would accord no liberties to the individual and make of him a slave to government by despots.

We are at war to preserve those rights for all mankind.

But we have a right to feel that the liberties which we regard as basic are qualified and not unlimited—that they cannot be pushed to the extent of endangering the existence of the government that protects them.

Justice Holmes once laid down the rule—repeatedly approved in recent decisions—that such liberties as freedom of speech and press, fundamental as they are, may yet not be carried to the point where their exercise constitutes a clear and present danger of causing substantive evils to result. Such a rule presents no easy standards to apply. For we know that danger may be great and all about us, and yet not clear to see. To apply that rule the courts, in the final analysis, must determine what constitutes a danger that is clear and present. They must strike a balance between the preservation of basic freedom, on the one hand, and of public safety, on the other. The future preservation of both will depend upon how that balance is struck.

When our Constitution was adopted it was generally regarded as a compromise—it satisfied neither those who favored a strong National Government nor those who felt keenly about maintaining the independence of the States. It was not written to make the Federal Government powerful. It set up a Union of States and provided that those powers not granted to the Federal Government are reserved to the States. The founding fathers had the wisdom to see that free speech, a free press, and freedom of assembly are not the only conditions necessary to maintain the democratic way of life. They set up a governmental structure which would give free play to the principles of diversity.

Today we are confronted by the vastly increased growth of governmental power. We must revitalize the traditional American doctrine which aimed to check the growth of the executive Government and bring about a revival of federalism, with its diffusion of governmental powers.

We should think once more in terms of a three-level system of government—Federal, State, and local, in order to strengthen our democracy. The importance of this three-level system lies in the fact that no one level can solve any of our major problems, whether it be housing, social security or the like. We must gear together all levels of government, the different public revenue systems, and the tax bases of the detailed conditions to which the law is to apply.

The most urgent message that can be given to the American people in connection with a Constitution Day observance, I am firmly convinced, is the necessity of our doing two things which are of prime importance to the preservation of constitutional guaranties and freedoms.

Our Nation must vigorously prosecute the fight to stop communism. Korea is merely a "local action" in what may well prove to be a continuing series of attacks on the world. At home here the effort to control subversives, both alien and American, is but another phase of that great world struggle.

Of equal importance, however, I am convinced, is the necessity of the utmost alertness and caution to preserve the economic soundness and stability of our Nation. Communism has proved itself thoroughly adept at taking advantage of national troubles and the one development in America to which they are looking forward expectantly and with full confidence is that our country will overspend itself to its own destruction.

We must rid ourselves of the false notion that the United States is rich enough to ignore the ordinary teachings of experience and common sense. The very fact that the Federal Government shoulders an increasing bonded indebtedness should be a warning flashing in every corner of the land to warn not only legislators but every thoughtful American citizen of the dangers that confront our country and the world.

In line with this conviction I tried, through appeals to the Congress and to the President himself to have $400,000,000 worth of nondefense projects eliminated or at least deferred because of the tremendous new spending which the Korean attack has shown to be necessary for our safety. Unless there is far greater appreciation of the dangers of unwise and unnecessary spending, we will not only find it more difficult to stem communism but we will weaken our internal strength which is what the enemies of our economic system fervently desire.

World events of the past decade have served to emphasize, as nothing else has ever done in the lifetime of most of us, the singular benefits and unmatched advantages which we, as American citizens, enjoy under our great Constitution. In the long and generally prosperous period between the Civil War and World War I, these constitutional safeguards of our liberties, priceless as we now know them to be, were taken more or less for granted. Our people enjoyed them, but because there was no apparent danger of losing them, the occasion for proper evaluation of their worth was lacking.

Today, however, as we look about us in the world, there is the tragic spectacle of hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings in abject bondage, toiling under brutal masters, despoiled not only of their earthly goods but of their every precious individual right. The comparison between our own privileged state and their condition is too pronounced to be ignored. It is as if the people of America were living in a world apart, a world far removed from the miseries of those once-free millions whose weakness or lack of alertness made possible their subjugation by communism's ruthless forces.

There is cause for heartfelt satisfaction that, in God's mercy, we have escaped the evils which have befallen other lands and other peoples. But there is cause also for renewed appreciation of the constitutional rights which are ours, and for the utmost vigilance in defense of those rights. Else the fate of so many other nations may well be ours, rich and powerful though we may be.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement which I have prepared dealing with the development of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As all my farmer constituents know, I have been extremely interested in all movements that contribute toward world peace and toward a reasonable share of world prosperity for those who are engaged in agriculture. For several years I have been watching the development of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and I have been particularly impressed with the practical farmer approach adopted by its Director General, Mr. N. E. Dodd.

The FAO was set up in Hot Springs during the wartime period with the hope that it would become a real force in getting farmers to cooperate in the solution of their mutual problems. Its principal objectives were (1) to promote good relations between all nations, thereby promoting world peace, (2) to exchange the results of scientific research, and (3) to see that the farmers receive their fair share of the national income, providing of course that the consumers are supplied with good quality products at reasonable prices and that the farmers increase the fertility of the soil for future generations.

At this particular stage of world affairs, when everyone's eyes are turned toward the hopeful goal of peace rather than war, I want to stop for a minute and commend the real progress the FAO is making. Director General Dodd, though his intelligent administration and leadership, has made this progress possible. He has traveled widely among the less fortunate nations and has done everything he can to give them hope for a better standard of living. This is a proper and effective approach in our fight against communism, and I, for one, feel certain that all my associates join me in hoping that he will continue in the FAO, which he has managed in such a forthright and vigorous manner.

Letter From Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, to Pure Food and Drug Administration Regarding Enforcement of Oleomargarine Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have written a letter to Director Dunbar of the Pure Food and Drug Administration regarding enforcement of the oleomargarine law requiring restaurant identification of the artificial product. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
September 15, 1950.

Mr. PAUL B. DUNBAR,
Commissioner, Pure Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand that a recent order of the Pure Food and Drug Administration prohibited the use of yellow coloring materials for various salad dressings. This was done on the ground that consumers might be deceived as to the amount of egg yolk contained in the dressing. It seems most peculiar to us of the dairy region that the Pure Food and Drug Administration should prohibit such yellow coloring in salad dressings but that the present National Administration as a whole doesn't seem to mind the equally unfair practice of yellow coloring of artificial oleo as a disguise for butter. Indeed, the present Administration killed the Gillette-Wiley amendment which was designed to prevent such disguising.

Your own agency stated that the yellow color in salad dressing which was imparted

by various types of spices made the dressing appear to contain more egg yolk than it actually did. However, as recently pointed out by Mr. John Brandt, president of the Land O'Lakes Creameries, "Not only are there greater possibilities of deceiving the public in the substitution of a yellow-colored product for butter, but the economic effect to a great industry is far more serious than that which exists with respect to deception in the use of salad dressing."

Mr. Brandt went on to say that the possibility of oleo deception is even more important from the standpoint of the health and well-being of American families, especially children. I think, of course, that Mr. Brandt hit the nail right on the head.

It has been most disconcerting to me, therefore, that your Administration has not been given what I feel to be adequate funds to enable you to enforce the present unfortunate oleomargarine law. If you had been given sufficient funds, the harmful effect of that law might have been reduced, because you might have been better able to police those restaurants which might want to slip over oleo as butter.

I realize that the Pure Food and Drug Administration does not have as its major concern the welfare of American dairying, but rather the enforcement of those laws involving food and drugs. May I respectfully point out, however, as background, that the prices received by Wisconsin's farmers for milk sold in July 1950, averaged only around $3 per 100 pounds for all uses. It was only $2.90 for milk used in cheese and $3.05 for milk used in butter. This is an incredibly low return for a hundredweight of milk when one considers the prices paid by consumers at the retail level. While dairy products represent a perfect buy for the consumer because they are so vitamin-rich, it is a fact that the farmer does not get enough of a proportionate share of the money the consumer pays. I get around 6 cents per quart for milk sold on my farm; but the consumer pays 22 cents or so for that same milk.

In 1949, my State of Wisconsin produced 168,000,000 pounds of butter, which was an increase of 68,000,000 over 1948. Butter is now and has always been the balance wheel of the dairy industry.

The effects of the inadequate new oleo law are only beginning to be felt and the consequences throughout the Wisconsin economy will be very bad, indeed, as you can appreciate.

I was wondering, therefore, if you would be so kind as to send to me a statement as to how much you expect to accomplish with the funds which have been granted for enforcement of the present oleo law. Moreover, what do you think we in the Congress can now do to help you educate the American people so that they secure compliance with the law requiring restaurant identification of oleo? What can the dairy industry do to try to be of help in this regard?

I am sorry that the United States Bureau of the Budget, an agency of the Chief Executive, did not request sufficient funds for your enforcement duties, and am sorry, too, that the Congress failed even to provide the amounts which the Bureau had requested.

We of the dairy industry who have prided ourselves on constantly improving the nutritional standards of our national products want to be of maximum assistance to the Pure Food and Drug Administration. However, we have a right to ask the Administration be just as zealous in protecting the natural yellow color of butter as it seems to be in trying to prevent the unfair practice of disguising the amount of egg yolk in salad dressing.

I would very much appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible on this issue.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

The Fight Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I received from one of my constituents, Mrs. Inez M. Johnson, of Little Rock, Ark., a letter which deeply impressed me. I believe that the views and sentiments which she expresses are characteristic of and represent the profound thought of all informed, patriotic Americans.

I believe that every Member of Congress should read this letter. It is worthy of publication in the RECORD, and I have obtained her consent that it may be. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from this fine American citizen be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *July 18, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: May I add my voice to the many who are thinking about America's future?

You, who have made such an outstanding contribution to the clear-thinking statesmanship in these times, are probably deeply concerned over our grave crisis, because of your inside knowledge, that my small words are just so many more added to the daily grist.

I do believe, though, that the majority of the American people are aware of the seriousness of the situation. I believe that most Americans would prefer the gird for an all-out fight now with communism instead of dribbling away our resources as time runs out and we grow callous and weaker. Those of us who have recognized communism as a threat to our way of life, for more than two decades, and have suffered derision at the hands of the scoffers and apologists, are not going to join the silly ranks of "I told you so-ers," but are ready to do without if it means we can wipe out communism here before it completely takes over.

We have gone a long way in adopting many Communist objectives, and we as a people have grown soft in the mad scramble for something for nothing, while our resources have been drained. The home front will be chaotic, with many misguided wanting to tar everyone who will not swallow every idea proposed, as a Communist, with many others smeared because they won't fall into the propaganda booby traps prepared in Moscow. It will not be easy to recognize the fifth and sixth columns, for they can be your neighbor and mine, your friend and mine.

Never in our history has there been offered such an opportunity to rededicate ourselves as Americans, as now; never in our times has there been such a need for the whole of us to reaffirm our belief in America; never has there been a greater need for the Voice of America to be turned inward, to retell to our own citizens, the never-tiring miracle of America.

The people will not accept a business as usual, or a politics as usual attitude. And if we delay, accept official whitewashes of scandals in high places, we can expect the home-grown traitors to become bolder, while those who owe first allegiance to Moscow will not hestitate to carry on their plans for the overthrow of the United States and the establishment of the United States of Soviet America. It is customary for the public to wait until a terrible crime is committed, then round up the known suspects. Must we wait until a terrible tragedy happens before we round up the known suspects, the agents who are known to the FBI as trained saboteurs, acting under orders from Moscow?

The Communists have long recognized that the strongest force in America is the Congress of the United States, and that is why their smear artists have never failed to attack Members of Congress as objects of ridicule, derision, and scorn. And why the home-grown Communists and their supporters have always worked to reduce not only the power of Congress but to subtract, wherever possible, these powers. The only hope of the American people and their survival lies with the Congress.

The American people are deeply grateful to congressional committees, even though some of these have been springboards to personal political ambitions for some. The people need the protection of the Congress, for it is the only branch of Government that directly represents all the people. This fact seems to me, is so important, that the Congress should devise some way to set up a program to inform the people of their rights and responsibilities. And let it not be done with comic books.

Thank you, not only for Arkansas, but for the whole Nation, in your forthright and vigorous stand on so many vital public problems. Your many supporters and admirers throughout America look to you for wise leadership in these grave months and possibly years ahead.

Sincerely,

MRS. INEZ M. JOHNSON.

The Movement of Troops by the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. Edwin W. Estep, a former serviceman, in regard to the movement of troops by the railroads. I believe that undoubtedly there were many abuses, particularly in the early days of World War II, and it seems to me that today, when many troops are again being moved, the responsible officials of America's railroads might well give consideration to the thoughtful suggestions of this former serviceman.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOPPERSTON, W. VA., *September 15, 1950.*

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is not my intention to harshly criticize the movement of troops in the United States, but I think you should know exactly how one of your supporters feel about the subject.

I was in the military service from January 17, 1941, until October 4, 1945, and during that time I served in Camp Shelby, Miss.;

Canal Zone; Fort Benning; Camp Pickett; Camp Jackson, S. C.; Fort Meade, Md.; Camp Shanks; and Camp Miles Standish, Mass. You can see that in all those movements, that I should have some idea about how troops travel. In this respect, I unhesitatingly state that the United States Army, coupled with the American railroads, have no idea as to how troops feel about the way they are transported. The recent affair at the little town in Ohio where 33 men died, in my opinion, is still more of the same principle whereby men are moved such as cattle. The Army or the railroads are at fault. I have yet to see any troops given the common decency of providing them with the same travel that civilians use except when they reserve their own seat and pay for it.

When I was at Camp Shelby, Miss., I noted with disgust that furloughs were granted en masse and several troops got to go home at the same time. Accordingly, the Southern Railroad Co. evidently was notified that the furloughs were granted and they promptly got two or three cattle-car type of coaches which had cinders a quarter of an inch thick in them. The windows were all raised which you know is a far cry from the modern air-conditioned coaches. At the beginning of the regular train cars, the doors were locked so that the "dog faces" could not mingle with the better class of travelers. The same thing happened at Camp Picket, Va. The N. & W. Railroad picked up a car or two extra and at Blackstone, Va., the main train was locked so the GI's could not get anywhere except in the cattle-car section. And on down the line. Well, so much for the furlough type.

Now take official traveling. When I was transferred with several other men from Camp Jackson to Fort Meade, the QM ordered so many cars and we got exactly the same type of cars as probably blew out the air hoses in Ohio. Going from Meade to Shanks, the same thing again. It was so cold men wore their overcoats in the cars which were also dilapidated type. This was credited to the N. Y., N. H. & H. Railroad.

In another instance, I was sent from Fort Benning, Ga., to Camp Pickett, Va., and I was informed that I would ride coach to Atlanta, thence pullman to Burkeville, Va., which is the southern connecting point on the Norfolk and Western. After I got to Atlanta I was informed that I had no priority and must ride coach. I talked to some of the authorities at Fort Oglethorpe and all I got from them was to see the chaplain. Now we know that the railroad got the pullman fare and I rode to Burkeville, Va., in the cattle-car type of cars. However, due to the war effort, everyone seemed to let things ride and cause as little confusion as possible, but every single GI knew he had been on a cattle train. When he got off, he was supposed to look like a soldier, but you should have seen those GI's as they unloaded with train cinders and soot all over their clothes. Now, one shouldn't criticize unless he can offer a solution. I propose:

1. That United States troops be moved on the finest equipment available on the railroads. This would eliminate a casualty list before they get to the front. After all, why shouldn't they get the best. After all, they are only putting their life on the line.

2. That American railroads give first priority to traveling troops so that they arrive at their destination without being sick of days and days on the rails.

3. That American troops be fed on trains the same as other first-class travel. No more of this lining up in the cars such as has been the practice in previous years. Have enough tables that the customary chow line vanishes from the rails. Even if it takes four diners on the rails.

4. In the case of small detachments moving, instead of troop trains, that they be given a reserved seat on the regular trains, and that they be allowed to eat and sign the bill instead of having to pay the porter or waiter extra for first-class service that he so richly deserves. Remember, he is laying his life on the line at the end of his trip. In the last war, tickets to the diner were issued and the waiters had a set cheap menu already picked out for him unless you tickled his hand with some "green."

If the above things are considered, it will certainly make a soldier feel like his country is behind him. It will not solve the problem but it is bound to help. When troops are traveling, they need all the help they can get.

Please allow me to share your views on this and other subjects relative to troop travel. Certainly we don't want another of the Spirit of St. Louis affairs. We cannot stand that type of casualty lists. I'm probably sounding bad and prejudiced against the rails but as good as the United States Government is to them during an emergency or normal times for that matter, troop consideration would be a small price to pay back.

Your very respectfully,

EDWIN W. ESTEP.

Address at Democratic Rally, Belleville, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the Democratic rally, Fairgrounds, Belleville, Ill., Sunday, August 27, 1950:

As we assemble here this afternoon let us as Democrats review the achievements of our party. We Democrats have the satisfaction of knowing that our party has accomplished much for our Nation and our State during the past 17 years. Our party reestablished the people's confidence in their Government which was left prostrate back in the 1930's, after 12 years of Republican incompetence and misrule. Our party has made a great record of achievement by applying Democratic principles and ideals to the solutions of the people's problems.

The record of the Democratic Party from Grover Cleveland to Harry Truman is replete with legislation that recognizes the welfare of the individual. Individual prosperity means a more happy and patriotic American family life.

During the last 17 years the Democratic Party enacted a procession of legislation for the benefit of the individual which never has been equaled by any nation in world history.

The basis for a free democracy is a contented, prosperous, and wholesome family life. History has taught us that when the family disintegrates, government crumbles. No organization in the world has recognized the family as an essential unit in preserving free government more than the Democratic Party. A prosperous, contented family, free from want and fear, with reasonable security for the future, will never capitulate to communism. I recall some of the Democratic legislation which has built up the American home, both on the farm and in the city.

In 1912, with the aid of a Democratic Congress, Woodrow Wilson established Federal aid for the construction of highways, a workable farm-credit system, the Federal Trade Commission and the Clayton antitrust laws to modernize machinery against monopolistic practices. The Adamson 8-hour-day law and the Democratic Congress aided Wilson in giving labor and agriculture a charter under which they might form associations for their advancement and protection. It was in Woodrow Wilson's administration that the Federal Reserve System was established which gave us the soundest and best banking system in the history of the world. Wilson also established a good neighbor policy with the republics of the Western Hemisphere and did away with dollar diplomacy.

Then came the administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, which period was characterized in the beginning by an era of public corruption and ended with the most devastating depression and unemployment debacle in the history of the Nation. The people, discontented and despondent, turned to the Democratic Party in those dark days of 1932 and 1933.

Once again the Government became interested in the welfare of the individual. The farmer was elevated from near-serfdom to his present high position in the Nation's economy. Democratic farm legislation has placed agriculture on an economic basis equal to industry. Every farmer is thankful for the Agricultural Adjustment Act, soil conservation, rural electrification, farm supports, and legislation bringing about greater markets and greater uses for agricultural products. In 1935 only 12 percent of farm homes enjoyed electricity. Today over 85 percent of our farm homes have rural electrification.

A flood-control program was adopted to protect our rivers and valleys from recurring and devastating floods. We cooperated with agriculture on a comprehensive reclamation program.

A National Labor Relations Act which gave organized labor its first charter of freedom and equality with the employer was made a reality under the Wagner Act. Maximum wages and minimum hours were also provided for the workers of the Nation.

A social security system was initiated providing old-age benefits, old-age assistance, and unemployment compensation. The Democratic Party recognized the duty of society to those who have spent their lives in its service. The Eighty-first Congress has further expanded this system with greater benefits to a greater number of people. Republican reactionary Congressmen called social security socialistic when the original bill was passed in 1938, and also when the present Congress expanded it they repeated the charge.

Confidence in our American banking system was reestablished by the Democratic Party by the national banking guaranty law and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Eighty-first Congress has increased the protection to the Nation's bank depositors.

Before the people turned to the Democratic Party back in 1932 and 1933 to rescue them from the Republican misrule, bank failures were daily news stories. The creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was one of the very first of the New Deal reforms. In 16 years of operation it has been compelled to go to the aid of only 407 banks, with practically all of the depositors insured against loss. What a contrast to the Republican picture—the 1930–33 period when 3,643 banks failed and total losses to depositors amounted to more than $1,000,000,000. In 12 years of Republican rule, from 1921 to 1933, the number of commercial banks in the United States decreased from approximately 30,600 unit banks to fewer than 14,000 banks. That was Republican free enterprise.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is one Democratic creation that even the most hardshell Republican conservative knows is here to stay because of its manifest benefits.

And there are millions of American home owners who were saved from mortgage foreclosures by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and millions of new home owners who have been aided by the Federal Housing Administration.

Time does not permit reviewing all of the progressive legislation passed under Democratic administrations. The Democratic Party has been successful in five Presidential elections because it does not complacently wait for a problem to solve itself. It takes affirmative action before the problem overwhelms us. For that reason the people of the Nation have supported our party and have rejected the timid and vacillating leadership of the Republican Party. Republican leaders are terrified at progress. They are forever looking fondly backward for safety. They squint timidly at the future, hoping that nothing new will ever have to be done. The elephant never forgets, because he only dreams of the past.

We Illinois Democrats are justly proud of the great statesmen that our party has produced. We proudly boast of the names of Altgeld, Dunne, Horner, Stevenson, J. Hamilton Lewis, Paul Douglas, and Scott Lucas. What a glorious parade of distinguished Democratic leaders, who never committed an act that dimmed the luster of their party or their State.

Why is it that the Republican leaders never mention with pride the names of their former governors and party leaders? They are silent about the names of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, and they wish that Illinois would forever forget the Len Smalls and the Dwight Greens.

After 20 years of defeats, the Republican Party leaders should realize that the American people demand constructive progress and are not interested in gripes, criticism, phony investigations, and slogans. We all remember the slogan of McKinley's day: "The full dinner pail." In the Harding campaign, it was "Back to normalcy," and as a consequence, the Lodges, Pews, and the Jim Watsons defeated our entry into the League of Nations and brought on the greatest depression in world history. In 1928, Hoover advocated "two cars in every garage and a chicken in every pot." In 1936, the slogan of Alfred Landon was, "Vote Republican and save the homes, schools, and churches of America," and the only people Alf scared were up in Maine and Vermont. They have had other fine-sounding slogans since, and will have them again this year—a party without a record to which they can point with pride and without a program to offer must have such bait. But they no longer find the American people gullible.

Republican orators claim the United States is on the road to bankruptcy and traveling "The last mile to collectivism." The facts prove them wrong. No nation is on the road to bankruptcy whose people enjoy a national income of $220,000,000,000 dollars per year. No nation is on its way to bankruptcy which in 1 year, produced $250,000,000,000 worth of goods and services—has more than $100,000,000,000 in savings—has over 60,000,000 employed—guarantees deposits of its people—and whose corporations are paying the largest dividends in history.

Just about a year ago when the Republicans were trying to talk up a depression they received little encouragement even from the most conservative financial experts and from their usually supporting national magazines. News Week, for instance, joined others in stating that America could never be visited by another depression as serious as the one in the early thirties. Their reason for that statement was that the progressive legislation, some of which I have already enumerated in this speech, has formed an economic cushion which would, in spite of widespread unemployment, provide buying power and stability which would save our Nation from panic and paralysis.

Yes, my friends, the domestic program of the New Deal has been a success. So much so that the Republicans have ceased their cries to repeal the legislation that has brought so many benefits to the people of America and which has made the Nation's economy stronger as a result. But they have not ceased their back door attempts to sabotage these gains the people have made under Democratic administrations. The workingman will never forget the Republican Eightieth Congress—neither will the farmer.

For 10 years while he was a Member of Congress our Democratic Representative from this district, my former boss, Ed Schaefer, gave his full support to this progressive program and labor and the farmers of this area owe to Mr. Schaefer a lasting debt of gratitude. Since I have been a Member of Congress I have supported a continuation and improvement of these reforms. As a Member of the House of Representatives and as a Member of the United States Senate, SCOTT LUCAS supported the program of the Democratic Party to bring a better way of life to the American people.

The Republicans can't say as much for their candidate for the United States Senate. Labor knows how the Republican candidate voted in opposition to its interest at every opportunity. The farmers of Illinois will not forget Mr. Dirksen's votes against rural electrification and soil conservation, nor his attempt at complete sabotage of the Democratic farm program when as a subcommittee chairman during the Republican Eightieth Congress he sought such drastic cuts in appropriations for rural electrification, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, agricultural research fund, Farmers Home Administration and for construction of forest roads, that these programs would have been stymied.

So much for our domestic problems, which have been and should always be of major importance to us. Our party has certainly held them so—that is the reason it does something about them when it is in power. But today, the first, and without doubt, the most important problem to us—is world peace.

With American soldiers dying in Korea—it isn't easy to keep that goal before us. Yet, we must realize that this Korean war is a war for peace. The United Nations must win that war and forever make clear to totalitarian governments that they will not tolerate aggression. This is the test of the United Nations. If we fail now we will face the infinitely greater danger of a third world war and the catastrophe it will mean for mankind.

And I think it is important to remember that in Korea under the United Nation's flag there are men with white, black, and yellow skin fighting and dying together to uphold the principle that men should be free to govern themselves.

The unanimous support the American people are giving President Truman in his courageous course in Korea—in the President's firm determination that the peaceful will of the United Nations shall prevail in Korea, indicates the sort of unity that is the strength of our democracy. It is the kind of unity that will insure not only our own national security but that of freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

But with a few professional politicians, even in the face of this world crisis, it is politics as usual as they seek to make political hay of this serious international situation. Placing politics above everything else, they seek to confuse the people and make the most reckless charges in an effort to further their own selfish end. The remarkable thing about this is that the very ones who are shouting the loudest are those whose records would not bear close scrutiny—those who believed a balanced budget would bring them more votes than expenditures for adequate military preparations—those who believed they could defeat the Soviet aggressor from the back seat of a Cadillac.

There is plenty of hindsight on the Republican side of the congressional aisle today. All of us are gifted with a bit of hindsight, but I am glad that I can stand here this afternoon and report that I opposed the drastic cut in military appropriations the Republican Eightieth Congress made back in 1947. I charged then that our military strength would suffer from those cuts and in an Armistice day speech at Collinsville in 1947, I said this:

"There is a great deal that we can do to prevent a third world war. We can do what we failed to do between 1914 and 1917, and what we failed to do between 1932, when Hitler came to power, and 1941, when war was forced upon us. We can build our own defenses. We can make sure that when any aggressor nation attacks us, he will find us prepared to defeat his attack, and indeed to take retaliatory action."

That was my warning to the Republican Eightieth Congress in 1947.

I further warned them:

"We cannot enjoy freedom and be weak. If we are strong, freedom becomes our reward and our inheritance. It is for us to choose." But those who today have so much hindsight preferred then to make their political stand on a balanced budget, in itself a worthy objective, if it could be obtained without the sacrifice of world peace.

While the hindsight experts of today were shouting for quick demobilization in 1945, I sounded this warning in a Labor Day speech at Woodriver:

"If at this time we weaken our international position—by quick demobilization—it just means that the United States relegates itself to the status of a second- or third-class power.

"Other nations will be only too glad to do the occupation job for us and to establish world peace in conformity with their thinking and ideologies."

Those statements were made in 1945 and 1947.

So I think I can challenge the hindsight boys today, and I can talk up to them when they attempt to place the blame for the disturbed world situation. I believe that they, more than any other single factor, should be charged with the blame for the North Korean act of aggression because it was the lack of vision shown by such men that gave comfort to potential aggressors.

There is just cause for the people of America to be concerned about our defenses. Because of Korea we are now awakened to the real danger that exists in the world and we are preparing to meet it. Because of Korea we will be united in the effort.

Many have been very much disturbed by the early reverses we suffered at the hands of the Korean Reds. Now the tide is turning and we will ultimately attain complete victory. My concern over our defenses isn't of recent vintage. I have always advocated the maintenance of a strong American Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force. Upon every occasion I have vigorously advocated the strengthening of our Armed Forces to make them powerful enough to defend America against any enemy. I am proud, as a Democrat, to be able to point to a similar record for Senator LUCAS.

The aggregate amount of military appropriations for the 5 fiscal years of 1946-50 totals $90,000,000,000. It is only natural that thoughtful people should be asking the question, "Where did the money go?"

We have believed—we had been led to believe—that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force was ready to meet and put down aggression anywhere in the world. We have heard the boast of men in high places of our ability to wage immediate and successful

retaliatory counterattack, whenever and wherever aggression occurred.

Why then, these thoughtful people now ask, with such enormous expenditures to make us militarily strong, did the Communist attack in Korea find us so tragically weak? What of our promised retaliatory action? What of our national security? Just how were our defense dollars spent? And what will happen if the next aggression should be against the continental United States?

These are questions thoughtful people have every right to ask. They are all questions of the sort we should expect from people concerned—and properly so—with economy. I think my friends will agree with me that Americans in general are always concerned with economy, and the reduction of taxes.

As a Nation we are unexcelled for patriotism, but our patriotism in war has always been matched by our insistence on economy in time of peace. We long for normalcy, and reduced taxes. Always in war we have made a supreme effort, rallied to the colors, increased our industrial production, made sacrifices—achieved victory. But always in the period of peace that followed war we have demanded economies, reduction of taxes, reduction in the size of the Military Establishment, and a stepping up of our already high standard of living. We have been willing to pay for wars; we have been generous with our veterans, their widows, and their children; but we have never been less than grudging about paying for peace, and providing the sort of Military Establishment that could keep the peace—and provide an adequate national defense.

Since the end of World War II, economy, therefore, has been the order of the day and the American people as a whole approved. Under our democratic form of government, Congress is ever mindful of the wishes of the American people. As a result Congress has made certain economies in government that the present course of events indicates to have been unwise. Up to the time of the Korean War, Congress was considering making additional cuts and imposing further economies on our Military Establishment.

So, in my opinion when we ask "Where did the money go?" we are revealing a preoccupation with the past that bodes ill for our planning for the future. But let's see—where did that $90,000,000,000 appropriated since 1946 go?

Forty-five percent of it—$42,000,000,000—went to pay for the cost of liquidating World War II, including the cost of terminal-leave payments to military personnel who were demobilized, the amounts paid to contractors whose wartime production contracts were terminated, and so on. Terminal-leave payments alone accounted for two and one-quarter billion dollars.

During the postwar years we have incurred heavy costs for maintaining the peace in distant lands. Nearly half of our Army has been overseas in occupied countries in Europe and in Asia. We have had to bear the costs of having substantial portions of our Navy in the Mediterranean in the interest of world peace, and we have had to bear the costs of saving Berlin with the airlift.

Because most of the liquidation costs referred to above were incurred during the fiscal year 1946, that year alone accounted for approximately half of the 5-year total of $90,000,000,000.

During the past 4 years the money needed to pay, feed, and clothe the Armed Forces has cost an average of $5,000,000,000 a year—41 percent of the 4 years' average of approximately $12,000,000,000 annual Armed Forces appropriation.

An average of $3,000,000,000 a year, 26 percent, has gone to meet the cost of operating and maintaining the aircraft, ships, tanks, and military installations that go to make up our military strength.

The purchase of aircraft, ships, tanks, and other weapons has accounted for two and one-quarter billion dollars, 18 percent. And it is worthy of note that the procurement of such equipment has increased from a low of 6 percent in fiscal year 1947 to a high of 19½ percent in the fiscal year that ended last July 1. It is also worthy of note that 60 percent of the President's recently recommended ten-and-one-half-billion-dollar supplemental budget is for such major procurement.

Over the 4-year period research and development on new weapons accounted for approximately 5 percent, or an average of slightly more than one-half billion dollars a year.

The remaining 10½ percent went as follows:

National Guard and Reserve costs, 4 percent;

Service-wide and classified projects, 3 percent;

Retired pay of military personnel, 1½ percent;

Military public works, including housing, 1 percent; and

All other costs, 1 percent.

True—economy, in one form or another, was imposed on the armed services. But even with the reduced funds appropriated the armed services did not wither away. The funds appropriated were not spent wastefully, nor without achieving strength in the Defense Department by establishing a framework ready for quick expansion to develop a combat potential to meet our commitments in the fight to halt aggression. Armchair strategists notwithstanding, I say the armed services have built up their strength tremendously with the funds provided. They have used well what limited sums were allotted to them.

The enemy never attacks where a nation is strong. The enemy always attacks where a nation is weak. The Reds have not attacked the industrial heart of our Nation; they have not attacked our allies in the North Atlantic Defense Pact. They attacked in Korea, where we had no military commitments, no troops, and no pledge of defense. Their attack provided reverses that have led earnest citizens to ask the natural questions about our military expenditures, but the success of Red strategy has not proved our weakness elsewhere, and it has not proved that money appropriated for defense has been misspent.

The money we have spent on long-range strategic bombers has not been wasted. The strategic aircraft that can carry the atom bomb was and still is the blue chip on which we have placed our hope of ultimate victory—it pins Russia down all over the world. It is not yet in action, and unless the Korean situation develops into a global war, it may never be in action. But it exists, and the decision to maintain it—the delivery agent for the atomic bomb—still remains a deterrent to the Red's plans.

It is without apology, therefore, that I say let us stop crying over the past and start working for the future. Let us do whatever needs to be done now to increase our military strength, to support our President, to keep faith with our people, and to insure the victory of the United States and the United Nations in restoring peace in Korea and preserving it elsewhere in the world. The course of events in Korea has now brought us to the point where the military considerations are more important than the fiscal considerations. It is no longer a question of what military establishment the economy of the country can afford, or even of what military establishment we have built with the funds appropriated, but of what military establishment is necessary to win the war, and to prevent it from growing into world war III.

Awakened to the danger by the Korean situation, many Americans have at last recognized the threat posed by communism anywhere in the world. We know that it is not enough to be strong in the continental United States, or in the conquered countries we occupy. We must have the reserve strength to put what we need, in the matter of arms and men, in Korea, or elsewhere, and still maintain our strength at home.

President Truman has been determined in his resistance to the spread of communism wherever it reared its ugly head. Our international program in extending aid to war-stricken democracies, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, the mutual defense program, the Greek-Turkey aid program, which brought the promulgation of the Truman doctrine, have curtailed the advance of communism in Europe and are building defenses to preserve world peace. In country after country in western Europe where free elections have been held, since the start of the Marshall plan, communism has been rolled back. No wonder Communists hate free elections and fight the Marshall plan.

We who love freedom and hate tyranny face the task not only of maintaining the strength and power of our own country but of giving inspiration and material aid to other countries that also love freedom.

We have learned throughout world history that the fight for liberty and free government never is ended. Only the far-sighted nations that are willing to undergo sacrifice survive.

Every human who believes in God and Christianity throughout the world is trusting America's leadership. Providence has given us freedom, democracy, prosperity, power, and strength. May we have the wisdom and courage to accept our responsibility that future generations can enjoy self-government, freedom, and liberty.

We must not fail our responsibility.

Mrs. Perle Mesta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement prepared by me dealing with the friendly type of good-will diplomacy practiced by one of our newest and friendliest of ministers, Mrs. Perle Mesta, at Luxemburg.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these times when good will is so necessary, and so often lacking, in relations with people of other lands, perhaps too little attention is paid at times to the very friendly type of good-will diplomacy which is the stock in trade of one of our newest and friendliest ministers, Mrs. Perle Mesta, at Luxemburg.

I am prompted to make the above observation by receipt of word that has just come to me from that principality concerning the prompt and humane action which Mrs. Mesta took to relieve the woes of a number of young people from the United States, members of the Youth Argosy traveling through Europe, when they were unexpectedly delayed in their return to this country and many of them found themselves entirely without funds.

Certainly the American Legation must have seemed a real haven of refuge to these worried and hungry young people. Mrs. Mesta

set up a canteen where all were welcome to meals of baked beans, ham, sandwiches, apple pie, and coffee. Good, homely American fare all of it but, under the circumstances like manna from heaven to the several hundred young travelers.

Every one of these young Americans of the future will long remember the cordial treatment received at the hands of Mrs. Mesta. Likewise the Luxemburgers, who have seen repeated instances of such hospitality, and many of whom have been guests of the Minister at the Legation, will be favorably impressed toward America and all its people by the kindliness and thoughtfulness with which Mrs. Mesta carries all her responsibilities as American representative at Luxemburg.

Address by Hon. J. M. Donaldson, Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an address delivered by Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson at the national convention banquet of the National Association of Postal Supervisors held in Washington on September 13. Since this speech contains a great deal of new information on present conditions and reforms in the postal service, I am sure all Members will find it informative and valuable reading.

The text of the address follows:

It is a pleasure and a privilege to be here tonight, breaking bread and visiting with the postal supervisors of the United States, in this great hotel ballroom located in the Nation's Capital.

Believe me, folks, I am always proud, indeed, to meet and talk with the men and women of this fine organization of postal people, who strive day in and day out to render a good postal service to the public under many adverse conditions.

At the outset I want to express to each and all of you my deep and sincere appreciation for the unstinted and wholehearted cooperation you have given to me and the officials of the Post Office Department during these trying times. During the past several months our road has not been an easy one; neither has yours. The path ahead will contain some thorns and stumbling blocks. I take much consolation in the fact that through all of this we in the Department can be assured that you postal supervisors will be in there pitching. It is reassuring to know success in operating an adequate and economical postal service to the public is not yet regarded as a disgrace in this great country of ours, and that the greatest number of our people are understanding and unselfish.

Most, if not all, of our troubles have been caused by lack of knowledge of the postal service by those who are constantly making misrepresentations and engaging in so much loose talk about a business of which they know so little.

Let us take a brief glance at the problems, over which we have little or no control, that have brought about this almost impossible situation for us.

Since June 30, 1945, the annual cost of operating the postal service has increased by more than $1,000,000,000, while the annual receipts have increased by approximately $250,000,000. This has increased the gap between receipts and expenditures to approximately $750,000,000. Little or nothing has been done to increase the revenues to at least partly close this gap. About $800,000,000 of this additional cost covers well-deserved salary increases for postal people, and approximately $150,000,000 is for additional cost for transportation of the mail by surface and by air. We have no control over either. There have been increased costs to cover rentals on buildings occupied by post offices and stations, trucks, equipment, and supplies.

Had there not been good management and good supervision on the part of you people, we could have ended the last fiscal year with a deficit of $750,000,000. Well, we absorbed about $200,000,000 of the increased cost and ran a deficit of about $550,000,000.

Over the years little attention was paid to the amount of the deficit until it became so large dollarwise. It then began to attract attention notwithstanding the fact that the postal service had grown to become the greatest single business institution of the country and notwithstanding the fact that the deficit during a number of years of operation was greater percentagewise than it is today. In other words, in the fiscal year 1852 the deficit was 37 percent of the revenues; in 1853 the deficit was 52 percent of the revenues; in 1860 the deficit was 125 percent of the revenues; in 1921 the deficit was 34 percent of the revenues; in 1932 it was 34 percent of the revenues; in 1948 it was 22 percent of the revenues, and in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, the deficit was approximately 33 percent of the revenues.

Because the current deficit is large dollarwise, many statements have been made to the effect that this indicates archaic methods, poor management, and much waste in the operation of the service. This is not a good yardstick and such figures do not reflect good or poor management. If it did, then there must have been some poor management in previous years when the deficit was much larger percentagewise than it is today. However, the deficit is much too great and I have been trying to do something about it for the past two or more years.

There seems to be little or no inclination to increase rates on low-revenue producing mail and many of those who feel that the rates should not be increased frequently make statements to the effect that if the Post Office Department was modernized and streamlined, and a new accounting system was inaugurated, some two hundred and fifty to three hundred million dollars annual savings could be made. They do not realize that annual savings of not more than $25,000,000 could be made if we eliminated entirely all accounting now performed by the postal service. In other words, if we threw all our books and records into the river and maintained no accounts at all, it would be most optimistic to think we could save in excess of $25,000,000 per annum. It does not cost us that much now to perform all of our accounting procedures.

So much propaganda has been used in opposition to increased postage rates on low revenue-producing mail that it tends to minimize factual statements presented by the Department. Misrepresentations will travel across the country twice before truth gets its boots on; this in spite of the fact that there is no power on earth more formidable than the truth. There is no novelty in the statement that we live in a period of stress, and this may be responsible for the inconsistency on the part of those who are prone to make loose statements. This reminds me of a statement made by a distinguished Member of Congress before a recent postal gathering in which he criticized me because of his opposition to the recent reduction in deliveries in residential sections of cities. This gentleman voted for the appropriation which had been reduced below the Department's request and, subsequent to the issuance of my order for readjustment of postal service, he voted for the so-called Taber-Thomas amendment which would have further reduced the amount of money appropriated for the Post Office Department by more than $200,000,000. He signed the discharge petition to bring H. R. 8195 out of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, and he voted for this bill to rescind my order of April 17, 1950. While the bill was under discussion a Member of Congress offered an amendment, which I quote:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

This amendment was to provide the money to restore the postal services which were curtailed in accordance with my order of April 17. This gentleman who criticizes me voted against the amendment to appropriate the money for the restoration of the services and then within the next few minutes voted for the bill to order me to restore the services. I wonder what he thinks I can use for money. In dealing with this kind of inconsistency, about all we can do is to argue with patience, differ with respect, give honor to sincerity, and seek the truth.

I shall not burden you good people further with our troubles. I prefer to tell you a little about some of the progress we are making in line with the reorganization of the Post Office Department and, in our efforts to improve the service, reduce the cost, and take advantage of any and all kinds of modernization in the way of facilities which are suitable for use in the postal service and which can be adapted to postal needs.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FINANCIAL CONTROL ACT OF 1950

On August 17, 1950, the President approved Public Law 712, Eighty-first Congress, which is an act to provide improved procedures with respect to the financial control of the Post Office Department.

Under this law, the Postmaster General is authorized to set up a new system that shall conform to accounting principles and standards prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States which will give to the Department:

1. Adequate accounting and internal control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets for which the Department is responsible, including appropriate provisions for internal audit.
2. Assembling of financial information needed for management purposes.
3. Full disclosure of the financial results of the operations of the Department.

This law was passed after many conferences and discussions and much study over a long period by representatives of the Post Office Department, Bureau of the Budget, Treasury Department, and the General Accounting Office. The Comptroller General and I met on a number of occasions to discuss the proposals set forth by all parties concerned. This bill lays a solid foundation for the modernization and improvement of the financial controls of the Department. It is a constructive and cooperative development which the Comptroller General and I have every reason to believe will provide for the Post Office Department a system of accounting, financial reporting, and audit second to none inside or outside the Government. It gives full recognition to the Department's special status as a revenue-producing public service organization.

For a long time, due to other laws enacted many years ago, a great deal of the administrative accounting work of the Post Office Department has been done by the General Accounting Office. Those laws have been repealed by the new act.

Under the existing procedure all of the individual accounts of postmasters with supporting papers and vouchers were transmitted to the Department for administrative examination and then submitted to the General Accounting Office for final audit and settlement.

This law was approved less than a month ago but my representatives and the representatives of the other agencies affected are actively engaged in the preliminary steps necessary for the establishment of the new system.

Congress recognized the enormity of the problem by providing that the President may, by Executive order, postpone the application of any or all of the provisions of this act for a period of not to exceed 2 years if he determines that such postponement is in the public interest and necessary to insure the implementation of this act in an orderly and efficient manner.

In the Post Office Department we have never been satisfied with the arrangement set up many years ago requiring that our accounts and financial transactions be preaudited and finally audited in detail by the General Accounting Office. While we are in agreement with the idea that the Congress should exercise, through the Comptroller General, final audit of all governmentary expenditures, the Comptroller General and I have also agreed, and the Congress has approved of this agreement, that in carrying out that function it is not necessary for the General Accounting Office to keep our books and to carry on the day-to-day accounting procedures for this far-flung organization.

Under the new system that will be set up, it is my purpose to avoid duplication and rehandling of items to the fullest extent possible. The new system will provide for audits and adjustment to be concluded in the field with practically all of the accounting papers to be retained in the field audit units. Adequate controls will be established to protect the public generally and to protect postmasters and other accounting officers. These field units will make frequent reports to the Department where the general ledgers will be maintained and where accounts will be consolidated. The central control unit in the Department will make up all financial statements which are now being prepared in the General Accounting Office and will also supply to me and to the operating officials information for managerial purposes.

In setting up this system, we are going to utilize the most modern machinery that has been or can be developed for accounting purposes. This is a progressive step of major importance and I am quite sure that we will be ready to install many of its features which affect the field service by July 1, 1951.

NEW MONEY ORDER FORM AND PROCEDURE

One of the oldest and most popular and widely used special services operated by the Post Office Department is the money order service. This service was established November 1, 1864, and from the standpoint of convenience, necessity and universal availability, it has without doubt become the Nation's outstanding if not its leading medium for remittances of money in amounts up to $100. This is evident from the volume and value of the money orders issued and paid annually.

During the fiscal year 1949 more than 313,000,000 money orders, aggregating almost $5,000,000,000 in value, were issued. This means the handling or turnover of approximately $10,000,000,000 annually in the issuing and paying of orders. In addition to this vast business, more than 90,000,000 postal notes amounting to $470,000,000 were issued and paid during the fiscal year 1949, making a total of 403,000,000 transactions representing a combined total value of $5,345,000,000.

Unfortunately, the revenue from this great service is not sufficient to pay for its operation. The excess of expenditures over the revenues from the money order service in the fiscal year 1949 was $28,409,699. This condition has prevailed for many years and has been the subject of considerable discussion, in the Department, by Congress, and elsewhere. One of the principal causes of the loss in the handling of the money order business is the unavoidable, involved and complicated accounting procedure in connection with the issuing, payment, and auditing of the business.

Much consideration has been given during the past 5 years to studying and developing plans for modernizing, streamlining and improving the money order service. The resumption of the issuance of postal notes in the form of a prepunched card was an effort to determine by actual experiment the feasibility of the use of a punched card form of remittance. The results have amply demonstrated the advantages and economies which may be obtained through the use of a punch card form and it is with considerable satisfaction that I can say to you at this time that we are in process of completing plans for the adoption of a new money order form and system for its handling which it is believed will not only improve and modernize the money order service but at the same time will effect a substantial saving in the cost of its operation.

The basis of the new system, which it is planned to inaugurate on July 1, 1951, is a money order form printed on a tabulating card prepunched to designate a regional post office and serial numbers which will supersede the present blue paper form and also the postal note now sold at post offices of the first and second classes.

The new money orders may be cashed at any post office or bank and will be cleared through Federal Reserve banks. The area to be served by each of the 12 regional post offices will conform generally with the Federal Reserve districts. The installation of newly designed electrical tabulating equipment in Federal Reserve banks and at the regional post offices will enable the paid orders to be set up in serial number sequence and mechanically checked against the issuing postmaster's accountability much more quickly and economically than is possible under present accounting procedure.

In developing the new money order form and system it was essential to bear in mind that in large cities as much as 95 percent of the money orders are paid through banks. While, of course, the banks accept money orders as an accommodation to their depositors, the troublesome third-office feature presents an annoying obstacle to the ready clearance of money orders by the banks, as well as a lot of work to post offices in keeping records of such transactions. This problem will be eliminated by making the new money order payable anywhere.

The new system will involve many departures from the present procedure, one of the most important of which is that money orders paid by banks will be routed through banking channels to the Federal Reserve banks in much the same manner as Treasury checks and other cash items are now cleared. The Federal Reserve banks will then turn the paid orders over to the respective regional post offices, which in turn will prove the debit created by the Federal Reserve Bank and forward the orders to the several regional post offices of origin, as indicated by the regional office numbers prepunched in the cards at the time of their manufacture. The regional post office of origin will then mechanically arrange the items into serial number sequence and set them up in a master file.

Under the new system post offices of the first class will be relieved of the task of compiling lists of issued and paid money orders and inquiries regarding paid money orders will be sent to the regional post office of origin where the searches will be made mechanically. In lieu of the individual listing of issued orders, postmasters will forward to their respective regional post offices a statement showing accountability for total amounts and total fees for orders issued within a given period. Following the close of a quarter, these statements of accountability will be matched against the paid items at the regional office by means of a newly developed electronic machine which, at a high rate of speed, will total the amount and fees of the orders, indicate the outstanding orders, and at the same time check the file for duplicates, stolen orders, and so forth. In other words, the accountability for money order transactions will thereafter be determined by the postal service instead of by the General Accounting Office. This is in keeping with recent legislation affecting the accounts of the postal service.

This is a brief outline of the new system. While some of the details are yet to be worked out, the plan is an actuality and has been developed to include the most modern business techniques available as well as the most progressive thinking of the Department, the General Accounting Office, the Treasury Department, and Federal Reserve Board and banks, and is in keeping with the need and desirability of modernizing and improving the operation of the postal service in order not only to effect economy but the better to serve the general public.

MOTOR VEHICLE SERVICE

On June 30, 1950, the total complement of Government-owned trucks was 14,486.

From July 1, 1946, to this date, the Department has purchased 13,588 new trucks of which 6,600 have been delivered. The remaining 6,988 trucks are being received in a regular stream from the factories.

It is estimated that by June 30, 1952, all old trucks purchased prior to the fiscal year 1947 will have been retired from service.

In addition to acquiring trucks with bodies built to the post office standard specifications, the Department has purchased a large number of standard paneled body trucks for use in the lighter services. We have also purchased, and have had delivered, 14 stock trucks of the package delivery type that are considered experimental trucks. This experiment is being made to determine which, if any, of the package delivery type stock models of automobile trucks are suitable for efficient operation in the postal service.

We are using 2 tractors which have been delivered for experimental purposes and have ordered 30 tractors and 90 trailers to be used in transporting mails between depots and post offices and stations and branches in large cities where the volume is very heavy.

When the truck replacement was started after the war, it was contemplated that complete replacement of all old vehicles would have been accomplished by this time. However, the volume of the mails, particularly parcel post, has increased to such an extent that we have had to retain in service both new and old trucks to the fullest extent possible. This is indicated by the fact that on June 30, 1946, the complement of Government-owned trucks was 9,448, while at the close of the last fiscal year, the complement had increased to 14,486, or an increase of more than 5,000 vehicles.

Unless there should be some interruption, due to circumstances over which the Department has no control, I am confident that within the next 2 years we will be in a position to begin the replacement of trucks bought as late as the fiscal year 1947.

RESEARCH

The Department's research and planning activities which have been carried on with a very limited force are being developed at this time into an important staff function

which will operate from departmental headquarters. Additional personnel will soon be assigned to this permanent research planning and development group. The Department will also use the services of outside engineering concerns, under contract, if the need for their service develops.

We have been hampered in proper research and planning in the past due to inadequate appropriations. Some additional funds have now been provided by the Congress and I anticipate that rapid progress will be made in developing new ideas, new techniques, and new equipment. A part of this staff will be assigned to special studies looking to the better utilization of personnel, the improvement of working conditions, effective supervision, and the more efficient use of the present equipment and facilities. This headquarters staff will need active and sincere cooperation on the part of the supervisory forces in the field.

As an indication of what has been done along this line during the past year, we have expended large sums of money for additional payroll machines of modern design, new and improved check-writing equipment, coin counting machines, and similar equipment. Additional sums have been expended for modern garage equipment; more postage meter machines have been provided.

Continuous studies are being made of mail handling. Automatic tying machines have been placed in use. Automatic motor loading conveyors and gravity roller conveyors, as well as electric tractors, have been placed in use in several of the large offices. Widespread use of these devices will be determined when full reports showing their advantages in postal operations have been received and considered. One of the best known developments in mail handling is the improvement of mail-sorting machines now being used in the post office at Chicago. Additional money was invested in this development during the past year which resulted in many improvements. These machines are large and offer the advantage of increased production as well as more comfortable working conditions for the employees. Such machines in their present form can only be used to advantage in the relatively few offices that handle millions of pieces of mail daily. Further engineering studies will be made by experienced postal engineers and probably by mechanical and electrical engineers to determine what further perfection may be made to find out if it is possible to retain many of the advantages and to overcome the disadvantage of the large floor area needed for this kind of an operation. Of course, there are many other so-called distributing machines; one is a foreign make. All of them appear to have the same fault that excessive floor space is required in order to set them up. When I refer to distributing machines, I am quite sure that every one understands that no machine has been developed that actually distributes the mail. We still need human beings to read the addresses and determine into which slot or on which belt the letter is to be deposited in its onward movement.

Many citizens, a number of them employees in the postal service and a number outside the service, have submitted suggestions for mechanical devices to be used in mail handling. We are inquiring into these suggestions and examining the devices submitted. I am sure by persistent effort and constant research, we will develop new facilities that will greatly aid in the distribution of mail matter.

Another important example of research will be found in our present experiment of utilizing collapsible containers instead of mail sacks which can be stacked into mail cars. With the cooperation of the railroad officials and officials of private and industrial concerns engaged in manufacturing equipment, were all utilizing metal containers for carrying mail in storage cars, operating one car in each direction daily between New York and Chicago over the New York Central; between New York and St. Louis over the Pennsylvania, and between Chicago and Kansas City over the Santa Fe. This is a new joint industry-Government experimental program to develop new, cheaper methods of handling mail. The metal containers used in this experiment are several types that have the capacity equal to that provided by 14 mail bags. The metal containers are made of various metals and combinations which include wire mesh, combinations of steel and expanded metal, and aluminum. We are also trying out some wooden containers. All of the containers are so constructed that they can be stacked in storage cars. They are handled in and out of the cars by the use of automatic lifting devices and are of such dimensions that they may be moved by means of trucks now available in post offices, railroad stations, and terminals. They may also be accommodated in motor vehicles as well as in railroad cars. Theoretically there should be a great saving in the handling cost when container loading is developed and made practicable. However, the actual savings can only be determined by tests under actual service conditions.

In the long-range program it is our intention to reduce the use of mail sacks and to provide for the transportation of bulk mails with fewer handlings which, of course, eliminates the possibility of errors, damage, and depredation. With this type of movement, the number of individual handlings is greatly reduced. Outside parcels as well as the smaller parcels are accommodated in the containers which accelerates the loading and unloading.

The Department's research and development program is not necessarily limited to the activities carried on by the headquarters group. A great deal can be accomplished by the postmasters and supervisors in their own offices. Each supervisor should realize that by the very nature of his employment which brings him in daily contact with financial operations and mail-handling activities of the postal service, he is well equipped to bring about improvements in that part of the operation that comes under his direct supervision.

This covers only four of the postal reforms or accomplishments during the last few months. Others are under study. The postal service has always been first to take advantage of any modern facilities in the mechanized line that can be adapted for its use. With the assistance of our capable supervisors in the field, we will continue to make progress in the operation of this great public service, and I am sure I will continue to have the full cooperation of the members of this fine postal group.

Again, I want to express appreciation for the splendid cooperation you supervisors are giving to us in the Department. Without it we could not function.

It was kind of you to invite Mrs. Donaldson and me to your wonderful banquet. If I were confined to one wish for you, it would be, "May each and every one of you live as long as you wish, and have all you wish so long as you live."

Military and Civilian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me, I include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, September 17, 1950. The Herald Tribune is a Republican newspaper but its editorials usually, and certainly in the case of the following item, show a willingness to put the Nation's welfare ahead of mere partisan political maneuvering and mud slinging. The editorial follows:

MILITARY AND CIVILIAN

The opposition, such as it is, to General Marshall's selection as Secretary of Defense has been neither very logical nor very convincing. But a certain grotesque climax was surely reached Friday when Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri (one of the less fortunate examples of Republican statesmanship in the House), exclaimed that with the confirmation of Marshall "every general in the United States will start building a political machine to take the country over."

This is the kind of nonsense that the party should, and that the country certainly will, do without. The fact that Marshall never has and is never likely to build a political machine is exactly what has recommended him to a President harassed on every side by party and personal politics.

A good argument could be made for the thesis that Secretary Johnson— a product of American Legion politics, with unconcealed personal ambitions and a tendency to use the tremendous powers of the Defense Department for political ends—was a far greater threat to civilian control than a nonpolitical career soldier like General Marshall ever could be. Such an argument might be made; it is pointless now. What is not pointless is the lesson that the American people must grow up to the vital importance of the military problem which confronts them. Time was when War and Navy could be left to their own theoretic devices while State looked after the current and pressing business of international relations. If State failed, then War and Navy would roll out the fire brigade. That time has gone.

State relies in its daily operations as immediately upon the support of Defense as Defense must rely upon State for its daily directives. It is no accident that we set up a National Security Council to combine the two, that our leading military statesman has served as Secretary of State or that an ex-Secretary of State has been called to serve as Secretary of Defense. Civilian control has never been a real issue in any of this. The significant issue is how to get unity and intelligence of direction into our foreign policy—military and diplomatic—without too many monkey wrenches flung by opposition politicians thinking primarily of domestic matters. Opposition leaders like Senator LODGE see this very clearly and speak truly on the problem; the country at large sees it quite as clearly, and those politicians who still fail to grasp it are doing no service to themselves, their party, or their country.

Secretary Marshall Will Provide Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item of September 14, 1950:

APPOINTMENT RESTORES CONFIDENCE—SECRETARY MARSHALL WILL PROVIDE UNITY

One could almost hear the cheer go up when President Truman announced the appointment of General Marshall to succeed Louis Johnson as Secretary of Defense.

It is impossible to exaggerate the confidence this great and selfless citizen inspires among the voters of both political parties at home, the soldiers in the field, among the leaders and peoples of other nations. It was even big news in Moscow.

There has to be confidence in the Military Establishment. Louis Johnson, whatever his virtues, could not provide it. But that vacuum of public trust is filled at once by the naming of Marshall; and that alone would justify his appointment.

There are, however, other considerations of paramount importance. The execution of war and foreign policy requires consistent and spontaneous collaboration between the Defense and State Departments. From now on the commander in chief can rest easily on that score.

Marshall and Acheson have worked together as a team for years. They have a mutual respect and admiration for each other. They are compatible as individuals, and the record shows that they see eye to eye on American policy both in Europe and the Far East.

It was Acheson, speaking in Mississippi in early 1947, who first enunciated the great program that became the Marshall plan. Marshall was then Secretary of State and Acheson his Under Secretary. They worked together in constructing our present policy in the West. The same is true of the East, for today Acheson is carrying out the policies established by Marshall after his return from his special China mission.

Few Americans will shed any tears over the retirement of Louis Johnson, but it should not be forgotten that he was burdened with the thankless task of unifying the armed services and the even more thankless one of imposing a difficult economy program.

In our opinion he was by no means the incompetent and bungler that he has been portrayed. But he had other and greater defects; he was long on ambition and short of knowledge. He was bent on the presidency and that inevitably colored some of his actions; he knew plenty about domestic politics, but not nearly enough about global affairs; he was jealous of Acheson, opposed his policies, and sniped at him.

The last was his undoing, for our present foreign policy was jointly hammered out by Acheson and Truman. Thus, when Johnson sought to upset Acheson's program he was striking at the President as well as the Secretary of State. Only yesterday it was revealed that Johnson had tried at a secret congressional hearing to block the Truman-Acheson move to rearm Germany as part of the European defense against communism.

But now the air has been cleared. With the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting in Washington this week, the President could not have chosen a more opportune moment to bring Marshall back. At last we have a united front on foreign policy.

Marshall has always been regarded as a citizen-soldier, rather than purely a military man. The proof of that is the willingness of Congress to exempt him from the prohibition of a career soldier serving as Defense Secretary.

Twice now the general has been called from retirement. For him, it seems, there will be no farewell to arms. But, in once more answering the call of duty, he can be sure he has the good wishes and gratitude of all America.

Westbrook Pegler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Earl Wilson, the writer, not our colleague, recently did a snapshot X-ray of Westbrook Pegler.

It is worthy of the 90 seconds' reading time, from anybody's busy day.

Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD:

ABOUT MR. PEGLER

HOLLYWOOD.—Pegler's hallucinating again.

I borrow this $4 word, "hallucinating," from psychiatry, for only psychiatry can explain Pegler, the grave digger.

This master distortionist has the gall to browbeat Broadway columnists for twisting facts when he twists them till they holler. He challenges our journalistic bravery. This comes, mind you, from Pegler the fearless, who goes on year after year yowling that Franklin D. Roosevelt was a crook, overlooking the slight fact that F. D. R. has been forever silenced. Naturally, Pegler sneers at the Broadway journalists' taste. Grave digging, presumably, is good taste in his code.

Like a demented punch drunk pug who battles barroom shadows, Pegler keeps trying to kill Roosevelt, unable to get it through his brain that he's already dead.

I'm far from alone in this opinion.

"Ye Ed" in the famous Kansas City Star announced to the world June 14 that he'd sold his stock in Westbrook Pegler at the market.

Now this comes from the conservative Middle West.

I looked this essay over thoroughly.

"What really made a decision to sell imperative," wrote Ye Ed, "were two or three recent occasions when Pegler considered it a propitious time to dig up the Franklin D. Roosevelt family and machine gun it all over again.

"Peg has come recently to a point where he no longer can appraise and interpret his huge collection of damning facts by a restrained and effective process. His anger not only weakens but frequently belies his sincerity," continued Ye Ed.

In short, the kid has blown his wig, he's seeing Roosevelts under the bed and on the wall. He's hallucinating.

Pegler enjoys claiming that "the gutter-snipes covering the saloon beat"—I must answer "Present, teacher" to that—can't or won't do any reporting.

I told you once how he lied when he claimed Roosevelt was a drunkard, his authority for the statement being a dead man. Recently in a base, villainous piece he offered us the yarn that many crippled children couldn't get into Warm Springs Foundation because of "impossible high fees."

I checked that one.

Seventy percent of the patients there are charity cases. Not one has ever failed of admittance because he couldn't pay.

Pegler is fond of sneering at actors' war efforts.

This reminds me of the story they tell you up around his home, which he managed to make repairs on during the war despite shortage of materials. He had partially agreed to buy a war bond during one of the drives. When they called on him, he had discovered he couldn't take it. That income tax (nine blasphemous words censored here) had strapped him, he said, and he couldn't buy one just then.

As Heywood Broun had said years before, Pegler had been bitten by an income tax return and never recovered.

Lately Pegler's been "exposing"—honest to Betsy, right there it was in the paper, in red ink—"the show business underworld."

You read it all, tremble and see he's now digging up old news stories as well as old corpses. He should start out his pieces, "Flash, 15 years ago this happened." Personally, I'm not defending the people he attacks in show business. Show business is no prouder of some of those people than the newspaper business is proud of, well, let's say, Westbrook Pegler.

Level of Lake of the Woods Must Be Lowered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, extensive damage has been caused this spring and summer by exceedingly high waters of the Lake of the Woods in northern Minnesota. Since this situation is of such vital interest to the flood victims of that area, I wish to make a report to them and all the citizens of that section. This report will be similar to the reports made frequently by the President to the American people on various matters.

This flood situation in the Lake of the Woods area has long been of great concern to me. The Lake of the Woods file in my office is bulging with correspondence on the high water situation this year. Just recently I returned to Washington after making a personal inspection of the Lake of the Woods sector with the entire membership of the American section of the International Joint Commission, a representative of Governor Luther Youngdahl, United States Corps of Engineers of the Army, State Conservation representatives, and other Federal and State officials.

The flood situation around the Lake of the Woods is appalling. One really has to inspect the area as we did—making surveys from planes and motor launches over and on the lake and by car and foot around the lake shores—to fully realize the extent of the damage. The inundated farm lands, buildings, fish houses, resorts, and residential summer property are causing untold personal and financial hardships to the flood victims.

An important feature of the inspection trip was that we were able to meet personally with the flood victims and reassure them that we are doing everything in our power to find a solution to the situation. Through my frequent correspondence with the residents of that area I had outlined the program which, when adopted, will greatly lessen future flood damages and may even fully prevent future floods. The four main points in this program are as follows:

First. Complete control of the lake level by the American Section of the International Joint Commission.

Second. A new method of determining the lake level.

Third. Increased lake outlet capacity of the dams on the Canadian side.

Fourth. Lowering of the maximum lake level at least 1½ feet.

With these proposals in mind, I contacted Secretary of State Dean Acheson early in August this year, advising him, among other facts, of the following:

The water level on the Lake of the Woods on the border of northern Minnesota is the highest in history. More disastrous damages are being suffered by property owners than at any time before.

Notwithstanding the treaty of 1925, it was intended to enlarge the powers of the Commission in an effort to solve this question of protocol in 1940, which had the same object in view, that is, of controlling the flood situation in the whole chain of lakes, as well as the Lake of the Woods.

Judging from the various hearings by the International Joint Commission, it is perfectly manifest that the artificial rising of the Lake of the Woods is the sole basic cause of the enormous damage that the people of Minnesota are suffering this year.

It is now shown that any effort to maintain a maximum of 1062.5 as provided in the treaty of 1925 is at least a foot higher than the margin of safety required.

It is obvious that this whole question should be reviewed, especially since it is true as was pointed out by the Honorable James Tawney, a Minnesotan, in 1917, when he was Chairman of the American Section, that the Commission has been investigating just half the problem, that is, the outflow, and paid no attention to the inflow. The inflow into the Lake of the Woods is twice as great as the outflow.

This and other questions should be reviewed by the Commission at the earliest possible moment. I believe a solution to this question can be found. In my opinion, if this Commission, with its experience, is instructed under a proper reference, we can get the desired relief. There is no other way because of the treaty by which this relief can possibly be fully obtained.

Therefore, will you be so kind as to refer this problem to the International Joint Commission for consideration.

Later, I received a letter from the Department of State which read in part:

The Commissioners will return to Washington about September 3 and at that time your suggestion that a new reference to the Commission be arranged, will be discussed with them. In the meantime, the matter is receiving consideration by other interested agencies of the Government. You will be advised promptly of further developments with respect to this important matter.

The letter was signed for the Secretary of State by Jack K. McFall, Assistant Secretary. I have contacted our two United States Senators from Minnesota, for their cooperation. They have assured me of their help.

Many of the letters that I have received from flood victims have naturally dealt with the subject of flood-damage claims. I have contacted the office of the United States Attorney General on this subject and in a recent reply, Attorney General J. Howard McGrath informed me in part:

I appreciate your interest in this subject and will be glad to advise you fully concerning it at the earliest practicable date.

I have also urged the Farmers Home Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans available to residents of the Lake of the Woods area. They have done so. Arthur W. Carlson, manager of the loan agency of the RFC, informed me in a letter of August 17 that—

Upon receipt of your letter of August 16, we wired our Washington office asked that Lake of the Woods County be included in our disaster loan authority. I am sure that this request will be approved at once.

Mr. Carlson also arranged to have his assistant manager, E. M. Rowlands, make the flood damage inspection trip with us.

Before I conclude this report, I wish to thank the newspapers of the Lake of the Woods area for their help and cooperation during the floods and in connection with the flood meetings held at Baudette, Williams, and Warroad. This "well done" goes in particular to the Baudette region, the Warroad Pioneer, Williams Northern Light, and the Roseau Times region. Their objective and interpretative reporting and their splendid news photos were of great help in keeping the commissioners and me posted on the situation previous to our inspection trip.

The job of securing a permanent solution to the problem is not an easy one. It will take time. I have a full knowledge of the situation and know first hand the area which was flooded and I personally know most of the people who have suffered from the flood.

We are making some progress. We have the fullest interest, cooperation, and support of Mr. A. O. Stanley, Chairman of the International Joint Commission and other members of the Commission.

The residents of the flood area have already given me much information but I solicit their further interest and cooperation in supplying me with any new data that may be available from time to time in reference to the flood situation.

I want to assure them all that I will do all within my power and influence as their Ninth District Congressman from Minnesota to work out a solution to this serious flood problem.

I will continue to do all I can during my present term of office which expires January 3, 1951, and if reelected, I will continue my efforts in their behalf.

It is my intention to make another trip or two to the flood area this fall to make a personal report to the flood sufferers and to make further inspection of the flood damages.

As we make progress in our plans to bring about a final solution to the problem, I will make further reports to the newspapers of the area and also report by my own personal visits to the people of the Lake of the Woods territory.

I am sure I have the support of most of the people for my efforts to bring about a final and satisfactory solution to this high-water-level problem of the Lake of the Woods.

The Late Honorable Ed H. Moore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DIXIE GILMER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. GILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to pay respect to the memory of the Honorable Ed H. Moore, who passed away at his home in Tulsa, Okla., September 2, 1950, at the age of 78 years.

Ed Moore's career from a humble beginning as a country school teacher to success as an oil operator, then United States Senator at the age of 71, was characterized by his boundless energy and intense desire to render service to his country.

No American citizen has appreciated more deeply his country as a land of opportunity than did Ed Moore, and no stout heart was ever more devotedly consecrated to the preservation of the American way of life than was his.

Inspired with this burning purpose in his later life, no obstacle appeared too insurmountable, no course was too difficult and no sacrifice was too great for him if, in his opinion, it would contribute to the attainment of his ideal.

His strong character and unyielding determination naturally made his political career an eventful and a stormy one, but his lofty ideals, honor, integrity, and ability were respected by everyone who knew him.

Ed Moore played an important role in the development of Oklahoma and was always found where progress, expansion, and civic improvement were being promoted.

Though his passing brings great grief to me and the multitude of others who loved and respected him, it will always be a great pleasure and privilege for me to remember him as a personal friend.

Cabinet Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Dixon:

WASHINGTON SCENE
(By George Dixon)

President Truman, who won reelection by urging the voters not to change horses in midstream, is himself the greatest horse-changer in American Presidential history.

Incredible as it may sound, Truman has made 38 Cabinet and sub-Cabinet changes in the 5 years and 5 months he has been in the White House. Louis Johnson, his pal and political money raiser, was the thirty-eighth Cabinet nag to be horse-traded in midstream.

As the all-time horse-in-midstream changer, our steadfast leader has changed his ministerial steeds at the rate of 6.91 a year.

That's more than one every 2 months since that stunned day of April 12, 1945, when the ex-haberdasher, a political accident, took over as President.

For changing horses he has beaten the previous horse-changing champ, Franklin D. Roosevelt, hands down. F. D. R. made 26 Cabinet changes in 12 years—or at the rate of slightly more than 2 a year.

It's utterly staggering—completely fantastic, when you go back over the list. You check and recheck, convinced you must be seeing double. But here are the official family members he has had in exactly 5 years and 5 months to the day:

Secretaries of State: Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., James F. Byrnes, George C. Marshall, Dean C. Acheson.

Secretaries of the Treasury: Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Fred M. Vinson, John W. Snyder.

Secretaries of Defense: James V. Forrestal, Louis A. Johnson, George C. Marshall.

Secretaries of the Army: Henry Lewis Stimson, Robert P. Patterson, Kenneth C. Royall, Gordon Gray, Frank C. Pace, Jr.

Secretaries of the Navy: James V. Forrestal, John L. Sullivan, Francis P. Matthews.

Secretaries of the Air Force: W. Stuart Symington, Thomas K. Finletter.

Attorneys General: Francis Biddle, Tom C. Clark, J. Howard McGrath.

Postmasters General: Frank C. Walker, Robert E. Hannegan, Jesse M. Donaldson.

Secretaries of Agriculture: Claude R. Wickard, Clinton P. Anderson, Charles F. Brannan.

Secretaries of the Interior: Harold L. Ickes, Julius A. Krug, Oscar L. Chapman.

Secretaries of Labor: Frances Perkins, Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Maurice J. Tobin.

Secretaries of Commerce: Henry A. Wallace, W. Averell Harriman, Charles Sawyer.

Not all of the cabineterial equines were changed peaceably. It was necessary to take the bat to some, as we say in horsey and midstreamy circles.

The great horse-changer traded in Stettinius because he didn't like his work. He put Byrnes in as State Secretary and then forced him out because he felt his erstwhile bosom pal was trying to be President of the United States.

He horsed Henry Wallace out of Commerce in a conflict over foreign policy. He eased Biddle out of Justice because he was under obligation to friends of Tom Clark for election support in Texas.

He let Forrestal go from Defense to reward Johnson who had done more than any man alive to reelect him by raising desperately needed campaign funds.

He got rid of old McBurp Ickes from Interior because he just couldn't stand him—as who can? He allowed his friends to force Krug's resignation from Interior so he could reward Chapman for managing his campaign tours.

Harry keeps looking his gifted horses in the mouth.

Use of the Waters of the Waterton and Belly Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial concerning the necessity of cooperation between the United States and Canada with regard to the use of the waters of the Waterton and Belly Rivers.

Mr. Ken Byerly, publisher of the Lewistown Daily News, in which this editorial appeared, points out that Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, a member of the Canadian Section, International Joint Commission, is a firm advocate of close cooperation between our two nations. In the speech from which Mr. Byerly quotes, General McNaughton mentioned the development of our resources as one of the many fields of endeavor in which cooperation was required. Such cooperation, in the case of the Waterton and Belly Rivers, is precisely what the people of Montana are working for. We hope it will not be long before agreement is reached upon a mutually beneficial plan for the development and use of this resource. The editorial follows:

CANADA'S GENERAL MCNAUGHTON COMMENTS ON COOPERATION

Canada's Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton is a man of great prestige and stature.

North of the border, he occupies about the same position as does Gen. George Marshall in the United States.

Both commanded their Nation's Armed Forces during World War II. Both were great generals. Both, since the war, have done yeoman services for their countries in nonmilitary capacities.

Here in Montana, though we are south of the border, General McNaughton is also important to us. He is a member of the International Joint Commission, which conducts hearings on Canadian-United States problems, and makes recommendations for their solution.

Right now this commission is considering the division of waters of the Waterton and Belly Rivers, which rise in Montana's Glacier Park, but flow north into Canada.

The United States gets none of this water today, but it wants a share to irrigate about 150,000 acres in Glacier, Toole, Liberty and Hill counties on the Montana side of the Canadian line. It is the American contention that this is only fair—that Alberta and Saskatchewan farmers will still get the largest portion. It—the United States—points to the need for international cooperation and understandings in solving this problem.

General McNaughton, many feel, has been stalling the settlement of the Waterton-Belly water problem so that more and more of it will be taken up in irrigation projects on the Canadian side of the line. This may or may not be true, but delay in deciding the issue does add some credence to the claim.

Anyway, the general has preached United States-Canadian cooperation himself. In a speech on May 25, 1950, to the Canadian Manufacturers Association, meeting in Toronto, General McNaughton discussed joint defenses on both sides of the line. He praised the working together of the two nations, and pointed to its importance.

"It is a happy circumstance," the great Canadian leader said, "that Canada and the United States, as two countries of North America, have come to realize the great interests which they hold in common; after the experience of two world wars, our peoples have learned the necessity for close cooperation in defense. We have learned also that the habit of cooperation is one which grows in intimacy with practice."

Later in his speech the general also said: "It requires that we work closely together in all defense matters * * * it calls for intimate association in all these matters right up to and including the employment of our forces in war, if that unhappy eventuality should come."

General McNaughton is correct in his comments, and we can feel fortunate that Canadian leaders such as himself are thinking along these lines, that there is similar thinking and willingness to act in the United States, too.

But cooperation is necessary in other activities, too, and such mutual working together has been marked through the years.

It is necessary, now, in the settlement of the Waterton-Belly dispute.

We hope the general's comments on defense will also apply in water problems, that this great man will act quickly and effectively in this case, just as he did during the war in his working for victory.

The International Joint Commission meets in Ottawa on October 10. The American members will press for a settlement at that time.

There seems to be no reason why the matter should drag on and on, so it is hoped that the Canadians will cooperate in making recommendations that will be fair to the water users on both sides of the international line, recommendations that will settle the question forever, so that all can go ahead with their plans for the development or irrigation projects—in Alberta and Saskatchewan, and in Montana.

New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the September 1950 issue of Americas, the magazine published by the Pan American Union, entitled "New Orleans," by Serge Fliegers and Alvaro Pérez. The article follows:

A Latin American businessman visiting New Orleans can scarcely avoid doing business there. For the city realized the importance of a direct economic tie with Latin America and did something about it. It put on a planned and systematic trade drive. Today this initiative has paid off. During the past 3 years, New Orleans enjoyed the biggest trade boom in its history. With its shipping volume past the billion and a quarter mark this year, it is now the Nation's second port. Every third cup of coffee drunk in the United States is brought in through New Orleans, which also handles items ranging from wines, nuts, and toys to textiles and Haitian wood masks.

In 1943, during a sightseeing cruise of the lower Mississippi Delta, the newly appointed manager of the Port of New Orleans, E. O. Jewell, overheard a conversation that set him to thinking.

"*Qué tal, amigo,* this great river is magnificent. In my country, Costa Rica, we do not have such rivers. * * *"

"But, my friend, we don't have them in my country either—Peoria, Ill."

"There are other things we don't have in our country that I'm looking for right now. Electrical equipment, for example. I need 1,000 dynamos."

"What a lucky coincidence. I think I can fill that order for you."

The port manager took the story back to a group of New Orleans businessmen, including shipping and life-insurance company

officials and a newspaper publisher. "Our port," Jewell pointed out, "is naturally suited to trade with Latin America. It would be nice to stimulate it by using a ship as a trysting place for importers and exporters—but a little impractical, I'm afraid."

Instead, his listeners suggested a spot on terra firma, right off New Orleans' famous Canal Street. William Zetzman, president of a local bottling plant, sent a letter to his more important commercial colleagues: "We want to start something new," he wrote, "something that has never been tried before." He invited them to a meeting, but added: "Don't bother to come unless you have a lot of money to invest in the future of your city."

Zetzman himself put up some $30,000 and more than 50 of his colleagues brought the minimum contribution—a thousand dollars. They bought an old bank building and refurbished it in record time, decorating it with the flags of the 21 Western Hemisphere nations. Office space, a library, a lobby, and meeting halls were provided. They christened the new trade center International House.

At first businessmen were apathetic. During the peak 1945 war year, the port of New Orleans did some three quarters of a billion dollars' worth of trade. After the emergency stimulus had worn off, they felt New Orleans would again become a sleepy southern town handling mostly cotton and coffee. Not many of the thousands of manufacturers, distributors, consumers, and farmers in the midcontinent area—the 13 Mississippi Valley States served by New Orleans—had ever done business with Latin America before. "Why should we seek trade abroad?" they asked. "We have no contracts, we don't know the language or the procedure."

International House officials went to work. They sent representatives to Latin America, invited Latin American businessmen to stop over on their way north. Once in New Orleans, they were furnished with a bilingual secretary, a desk, a telephone, and a long list of midcontinent firms they could approach directly. Soon the businessmen of the United States and Latin America saw—like the two who had met on the sightseeing boat—that one manufactured what the other needed.

One firm in Demopolis, Ala., is in the export business solely because of the contacts New Orleans provided. The firm manufactured all types of agricultural equipment and had a surplus stock because of the weakening domestic market. It hesitated to try selling abroad because its officers knew nothing of the export business—what forms to fill out, to whom to write, how to pack and ship, and what technicalities to prepare for. International House provided a detailed manual and a list of 30 prospective buyers from its files. In just 2 weeks orders arrived from Venezuela for 3 wagons, 3 trailers, and 50 trucks. Today the Demopolis firm has a flourishing foreign-trade department that is still expanding. During its first 2 years, International House arranged about thirty thousand such contacts between buyers and sellers.

But how about the Latin American visitors? More and more of them, stepping out of planes, disembarking from ships, spent a few days in New Orleans. They dropped in at International House, met their United States colleagues and concluded their business deals. Meanwhile, officials of International House had absorbed some of the Latin spirit of hospitality and began to multiply its services.

One morning staff members found at the door a dejected-looking woman with a 6-month-old child in her arms and seven heavy suitcases. A Panamanian, speaking no English, she was looking for her husband, a United States sailor. She wanted a room, food for the baby, and help in finding her husband, and La Casa Internacional seemed the place to get them. The baby was fed, and a room found for her. Within a matter of days, her husband was located, and there was a touching family reunion.

Another time, a honeymooning couple from Venezuela came to see the historic places of New Orleans, its Cabildo built by Spanish colonists, the French Quarter, and the old cemetery. They stopped off at International House for dinner and a chat in Spanish with one of the Latin advisers. "We would love to see the rest of the United States," the husband remarked, "but we haven't enough money. If only I could sell a consignment of hides I have in my country, we could afford the trip." The same afternoon a United States purchaser was found and papers were signed. A month later a grateful postcard arrived from Niagara Falls.

No request is too large or too small for International House. So far, it has helped export a $4 consignment of toy balloons, and facilitated the purchase, by Argentina, of $3,000,000 worth of ships.

After confidence had been established among the businessmen of the midcontinent area, a new difficulty presented itself. Although products were available, Latin American businessmen could ill afford to travel through 13 Southern and Midwestern States showing their samples or inspecting prospective purchases. Instead, many proceeded farther north to the large manufacturing centers, where great numbers of factories and sales offices were grouped together.

New Orleans' international planners soon found an answer. At a cost of nearly a million and a half dollars, they constructed a Trade Mart. Again the flags of the 21 republics were raised; and today, across the street from International House, a huge, modern, windowless building, gleaming white and completely air-conditioned, houses more than 600 different exhibit items. It takes just a couple of hours to sample the products of half the world, without moving farther than half a city block.

Recently a Peruvian purchasing mission arrived in New Orleans—"just passing through," they said, "as we have a long trip ahead to locate manufacturers of the various items we need." Instead, they were taken on an afternoon's tour of International House and the Trade Mart. During the next week, without moving from New Orleans, they purchased all they could with their half-million-dollar budget and saved considerable traveling expense and fatigue into the bargain. The same thing happened to a group of buyers from Colombia, who were able to supply the needs of their country's merchant marine after a few business sessions at the International Trade Mart.

Neither International House nor Trade Mart facilities are restricted to nations of the Western Hemisphere. A visitor wandering through the long aluminum-and-glass-lined corridors of the mart can see United States agricultural machinery, Bohemian glassware, and Costa Rican lumber products exhibited side by side. Except for direct rentals, there is no charge for the unending variety of services offered by the two institutions. They are supported mainly by membership dues levied on New Orleans businessmen and operate on a nonprofit basis.

But for the city itself there is a distinct profit. Director Charles Nutter (who has a long record of successful dealings with Latin America, first as a newspaperman and later as an executive) and New Orleans' Mayor De Lesseps Morrison say that 70 cents of every dollar in the pocketbooks of New Orleans residents comes directly or indirectly from the trade of their port. They expect that trade to pass the billion-and-a-half-dollar figure next year, making New Orleans one of the world's largest ports.

There is another development that will help New Orleans become one of the globe's foremost trading centers. Under a law recently enacted, sponsored by Congressman HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, both United States and foreign businessmen will be permitted to exhibit and manufacture goods in all the United States free-trade zones.

The New Orleans trade zone today comprises some 20 acres of excellent storage and warehouse space where foreign goods can be deposited without payment of United States tariffs. The idea of a free-trade zone was first tried by the Hanseatic League in the sixteenth century, but the first American free port was set up in New York as late as 1937; New Orleans created its zone in 1947. A reaction against high tariffs, it permitted the shipper to store his goods, dry them to reduce weight, remove parts that had spoiled or broken during the sea voyage, and sometimes re-pack or re-sort them to make use of a lower tariff classification.

For example, 30 cents' duty per gallon is charged on fresh pineapple juice imported by the United States from Cuba. But if, in the free-trade zone, some coloring and preservative chemicals are added, the duty is only 8 cents per gallon, which means considerable saving for the United States importer and consumer. Brazil nuts, taxed according to their weight, can remain in the zone until most of their water content has evaporated, reducing their final weight and, consequently, the import duty.

Wines and other liquids can be brought into the New Orleans free-trade zone in barrels, there to be repacked into bottles. This avoids possible loss from breakage en route. And Latin American countries that have no facilities for manufacturing the kind of bottles required by United States buyers can now avoid the tedious and costly process of importing the necessary glassware from the States, only to have it shipped back on the next boat.

J. H. Boyd, the zone manager, showed us around the enormous layout of the New Orleans free port. It was a far cry from the wooden reshipping platforms constructed 300 years ago by the Hanseatic traders. We saw lumber from Costa Rica, machine parts from Belgium, emeralds from Colombia, and blue, shimmering aquamarines from Brazil. "This is another free-port facility," Mr. Boyd explained. "In the case of jewels, for example, a United States importer no longer has to lay out the 10-percent duty on a stone before it is sold. He can keep it here and show it to prospective purchasers. If he makes a sale he pays the tariff; otherwise, he is free to return it abroad."

As far as the United States public is concerned, the free-port operation does not mean loss of duty income. According to the zone manager, it offers these advantages: It encourages imports and thus provides dollars for foreign purchasers of United States goods; stimulates the United States transportation business; gives employment to United States personnel in the handling, packaging, and grading of goods; provides a market for the United States manufacturers of packaging materials; and enables the small importer to operate without tying up his capital in tariff payments.

Typical of such small importers was the United States sailor who had used up all his savings to bring precious stones from Latin America. When he returned to the States he had $7 left, not enough, naturally, to pay for the import duty, and was advised to store his wares in the free-trade zone. One by one he sold the jewels and paid the tax. He is now back in Latin America on another buying expedition.

Last year the New Orleans free-trade zone received some 50 different types of goods from 28 countries with a total estimated value of $27,101,114. With manufacturing within its area it will be busier than ever.

Small Business Needs More Favorable Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received an open letter from the Conference of American Small Business Organizations that I think will be of interest to the business people of my district.

This organization is represented on the Business Advisory Committee of the President's Council of Economic Advisors and on the President's Conference on Industrial Safety. It was a supporter of standing congressional small business committees for permanent liaison with all major Federal departments and agencies. It expresses the deliberated opinion of delegates from organizations representing over 260 different lines of industry in 48 States, representing an affiliated membership of over 600,000 small business concerns.

The letter, written on July 25, 1950, from the Chicago headquarters of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations, follows:

JULY 25, 1950.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: As you know, the legislative work of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations takes me to Washington frequently and so I have had the opportunity of estimating the ability and character of many Congressmen and Senators, and to evaluate their services, especially to the business interests of the country. Also how each man is rated by his colleagues, which is an excellent criterion as to whether a man is regarded as a statesman or a dud.

Although I do not vote in your district, nevertheless when I have had occasion to call on you in Washington I have received the most friendly welcome, was made to feel at home and that you and your staff were at my service, and believe every caller receives the same friendly treatment. I mention this to indicate that public office has not given you an exaggerated sense of self-importance, which so many men acquire and then forget who elected them to office. This modesty stamps a man's character.

In discussing legislation, I found you to be unusually well informed. I have found that you have noted according to what you considered to be the right thing to do, not according to pressure by lobbyists and selfish interests. It requires courage in public life to oppose powerful, selfish interests. Whether we have always agreed with you or not, this is statesmanship of a high order, and the most valuable kind of Congressman that can be elected.

And you have been one of the best friends the small-business men have had in Washington, which you demonstrated many times, especially by your support of the policy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, Eightieth Congress (which this conference wrote), by which, for the first time, Congress recognized small business as an economic entity on a par with the farmer and labor groups, and entitled to equal representation on appointive commissions, boards, and committees. This resolution placed small business on the map.

I wish it were possible for me, personally, to tell every businessman in the Ninth Minnesota District that he should feel under obligation to you.

Cordially and sincerely,

FRED A. VIRKUS,
Chairman.

I am, of course, grateful for this recognition of my interest and cooperation in the problems of the small merchant and businessman of my district.

In these days of excessive Federal meddling and interference into their affairs, they need a friendly Representative in Washington.

As the Congressman from the Ninth District of Minnesota, I pledge to them my continued interest in their welfare and success. I offer them my official services at any time during my present term of office. I hope that I may continue to serve them and the other people of the Ninth District again during the next 2-year term of Congress, starting on January 3, 1951.

From Enemy to Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig of September 15, 1950:

FROM ENEMY TO ALLY

Should western Germany be accepted into full partnership in the military preparations being made for the defense of the western nations against communism? That is the perplexing question before the Big Three foreign mnisters now meeting in New York. Just beyond is the question of rearming Japan. Certainly if the democratic portion of Germany is accepted it won't be long before the Tokyo regime is treated similarly.

Historians of the distant future will read with amazement the record of the twentieth century. Unless one had been an observer of the strange events of the last few decades it would be impossible to understand why the allied powers would consider acceptance of their erstwhile foes as military friends.

Only a little more than 5 years ago the western Allies were locked in death combat with Germany and Japan. Hardly had the stench of the Buchenwald atrocities and the Bataan death march lifted before the victors' feeling against their enemies had cooled. A victor can be magnanimous. The willingness to forgive is commendable. The free world should hold no grudge against the German or the Japanese people. Certainly we should be eager to welcome both into the family of free nations.

But there is the vital matter of safety to be considered. Our trust has been violated so often that we have good cause to be wary. Even today we are reaping the bitter results of placing too much faith in the world of an ally.

The majority opinion in this country is that western Germany has made great progress toward democratic thinking and that the need for unified action to defend the west is so great that Germany must be permitted to contribute her part in men. Before long we may come to the same conclusion with respect to the Japanese. MacArthur believes the Japanese are sincerely committed to free ways.

Certainly, both western Germany and Japan appear to have made commendable progress toward free ways, but the aggressive spirit of militarism cannot have been wholly effaced. We have had some experience with arming one menace in order to defeat another. The west can't afford to repeat that practice. We may find it necessary to use the vast manpower of our recent foes and the technical training which they possess. If so, we should hedge to the extent of minimizing the danger to ourselves. The new troop units should be scattered through the international army so that none would have independent status.

We might also find it worth while to lay down the rule that where American arms go in considerable quantity they must be accompanied by units of American military forces, so that the arms remain under the supervision of the nation which supplied them.

We know of the military skill of the Germans and Japanese. It can be useful in defense of freedom, but it can be equally potent as a threat to that freedom.

Letter of Charles P. Strain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many clear-thinking, independent people living in my district of California. One of these is Charles P. Strain, of Santa Ana. At 82 years of age he is still speaking forth clearly for the Republic, and with a vigor I envy. I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD one of his letters, recently published in the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register. It follows:

Fellow citizens, isn't this a time when we should consider well acts which constitute treason. Webster defines it as the offense of betraying the state or subverting the government of the state to which the offender belongs; treachery. He defines subvert: "To turn upside down; to ruin; overthrow; to corrupt."

This applies with special force during war, when treason is most likely to ruin the Government. And war is something we have had since the close of World War II. Up to now it has been a cold war, but still a most costly and dangerous one.

Let us now, each for ourself, review our own acts with reference to treason and see if we have not, millions of us, committed not one, but many acts of treason.

Doesn't any act by us which gives aid and comfort to the Stalin dictatorship constitute treason? And doesn't a strike by union labor give such aid and comfort to Russia? Isn't its object to use its monopolistic power to extort wage increases above parity with the incomes of unorganized classes?

And haven't most strikes involving a vital industry been waged for gaining such advantages? And haven't such strikes succeeded to the extent that the Washington Government found it necessary to support farm prices with the result that these sub-

sidies run up to around $5,000,000,000 a year and pile up surplus farm crops beyond the warehouse capacity of our country where without sufficient shelter it rots? And why are not conspiracies by the unions, such as strikes, treason? For they weaken the Nation in the face of a deadly foe.

And what of profiteers who grow fat and consume necessities during war while at home, so far in safety, while the young men are being drafted to endure all the hardships and perils of war at a wage that is not won by the power of any union monopoly of labor or of capital? Doesn't war profiteering tend to ruin our Government by reducing its power in the face of the world's most dangerous and immoral government?

Isn't this a time and hasn't the need been with us all these years of the cold war to think more of the Nation's security than just of gratifying our own selfish wants? Wouldn't we be safer now from attack if we had tightened our belts and spent more in retaining our power of defense here at home? One phase of self-defense is a solvent government, and a government is solvent only when it is able to meet its obligations out of current income, and it is financially sound when, if heavily in debt, it reduces such debt.

But didn't Russia—and doesn't she even yet—have trained agents in our country seducing our labor and many others into the extortionate demands which have weakened us in all these respects?

And have not each and all of us who have greedily sought the selfish gains promised by such agents committed treason? And will the God in Heaven see fit to favor a nation so full of traitors that they control its policies?

And should these sins and their resulting weakness induce Russia to open a third world war, wouldn't this plunge us so deeply in debt that our Government could no longer meet its obligations with tax funds collected from its people or loans obtained from them?

This would be Federal bankruptcy, and when this occurs Government creditors do not siege the Government as the creditors of corporations siege the assets of bankrupt debtors. But the Government confiscates to itself private property and drafts labor into its services.

This constitutes dictatorship which is the end of freedom and self-planning—the beginning of slavery.

CHARLES P. STRAIN.

Carl Vinson Has Been Unified, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine of September 10, 1950:

CARL VINSON HAS BEEN UNIFIED, TOO—ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE LEARN FROM A SUAVE GEORGIAN WHAT THEY CAN EXPECT

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—So far as Congress sees it, Representative CARL VINSON of the little inland Georgia town of Milledgeville is admiral of the ocean seas, field marshal of the armies and, as to the air, wing commander of everything.

There was a time when he was boss only of the United States Navy—the high patron for 15 years, as iron-handed chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, of all the blue waters from the Caribbean to the China Sea.

But these were in the old, unreconstructed days before the Armed Forces, and Mr. VINSON, too, were unified and solidified—which meant, for the forces, a unification into rather more establishments than before and, for Mr. VINSON, a solidification into a place of congressional power so high that it might have brought a certain dizziness to a less earthy man.

The Unification Act amalgamated the old rival Committees on Military Affairs and on Naval Affairs into the House Committee on Armed Services. This, of which Mr. VINSON is the chairman and absolute boss, is a formidable body of 35 men so big that, collectively, it sits upon three staggered tiers in its hearing rooms in the Old House Office Building, with Representative VINSON front and center rather like an ancient monarch surrounded by ministers whose proximity to the throne depends upon the years that lie upon their heads.

The juniors are thus far away and their voices seem—but only seem—to be heard a little faintly as Mr. VINSON and his bipartisan elder regency, with the senior Republicans sitting just to his left and the senior Democrats just to his right, settled the high and low affairs of national defense—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine, whatever.

It is not that the juniors are ignored, however. The chairman keeps a nice balance between protocol and practicality. While he gives far more outer deference to the graybeards, as congressional custom infallibly demands, he gives far more work to his favorites among the committee youngsters. These, until he has tried them out, he sometimes calls "ensign." When a new man has done a good task, however, Mr. VINSON may suddenly begin to call him "commander." When, one day, he changes this salutation to "captain," the member knows he has arrived.

His old "ensigns," whether still in the House or now promoted to the Senate, are deeply devoted to him, and the long finger of his influence is thus not limited to his own side of the Capitol. One of the former "ensigns," Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, who made "captain" before he left the House, still keeps deferentially in touch with his old chairman, and now and then goes over to the House to report in person to Mr. VINSON on matters of mutual interest. Men call on Mr. VINSON; Mr. VINSON does not call on them.

Indeed, the chairman, who used to be called "the Admiral" but now is more commonly known as "the Old Operator," by virtue of the fact that he is no longer limited simply to caring for the Navy, is in a position of a prophet handsomely vindicated in his robust later years. No prophet has more honor in his own country—which in this case is Congress and the Pentagon. For Mr. VINSON—"Cahl" to the other southerners, not one of whom has quite the richness of his own southern accent—was complaining bitterly as early as 2 years ago of "economies" in the Military Establishment.

He was in the extraordinary position of a congressional leader who was urging the Pentagon to spend not less but more. Now, his own personal chief of staff, he is at work on an unfolding, and personal, Vinson plan for mobilization—more tanks, more marines, more carriers, more of everything for the cutting edges of the military force. It is often a fact that the administration proposes but VINSON disposes, and the powerful logic, in Congress, of any Vinson plan should never be underrated.

Not to be underestimated, either, is the thing that is the life force of his being, a curious, politically perfect, intermingling of the art of attack and the science of withdrawal and compromise. This has carried Mr. VINSON to his not inconsiderable summit and it has preserved him, personally as a politician who must be elected and professionally as a leader among other politicians, these many years.

Not so long ago no man of influence in Congress was so implacably opposed to unification of the armed services; the proponents, mainly the Air Force men, looked with a great fear upon Mr. VINSON and the administration leaders were in despair. But somehow, with many changes in the original text and with the slow attrition of popular pressure, the Vinson rock was softened and unification became the law. Its most important convert was Mr. VINSON himself.

This, to the Navy, was an incredible issue to events, and nothing more sadly incredible in it than to see CARL VINSON accept the principle of a partial merger—VINSON for whom admirals in the past gladly had served as little more than office boys; VINSON, whose burning conviction had made the Navy the unquestioned elite of the armed forces, and the proudest pet of an adoring Congress.

The old blue-water men began to shake their heads a bit, while Mr. VINSON himself kept the dignified and forbearing silence of a father who has, for reasons he considers sufficient, temporarily put aside an elder, and really favored, son in behalf of another. But not this, even, was to be the end. Soon VINSON, of Georgia—the old "Battleship Carl" of another day—began to take a great and direct interest in the Air Force. W. Stuart Symington, then Secretary for Air and now Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, began what was perhaps the most unlikely, difficult, and rewarding bit of personal lobbying in the recent history of Washington. First he got Mr. VINSON into an airplane—the chairman before that had been at home only on anything that sailed. What followed was, to the service people, nothing less than history, poignant or elating, depending on where one stood.

For Representative VINSON "put on the crushed cap," as it was said by the Navy partisans, and went all-out for the Air Force. Over the objections of the President that a defensive imbalance was being created, he joined in 1948, and then led, a rebellion in the House for 70 air groups. He thus unquestionably gave a powerful, if not the decisive, impulse to what he was later to indicate was a questionable high-command preoccupation with strategic air power at the Navy's expense.

The Navy people, who before this had been in anxious sorrow at what had happened to Mr. VINSON, were now, simply, aghast and in despair. For them, the established church had fallen; all, so it seemed to them, was lost. But then it was the same Mr. VINSON who, in due season, gave to them, last year, the first great forum from which to voice their heretofore throttled complaints; it was the Vinson committee that made the investigation of the troubles of unification. And it was Mr. VINSON, too, who began to protest at the Pentagon and elsewhere and to restore some of the Navy's combat strength. When he had insisted on so much more for the Air Force, it was said by his friends, he had never intended that this was to mean much less for the Navy and Army.

In other words, Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has pursued at times what has seemed a most unseamanlike course of unexpected zigs and violent zags. His view would be that all these were necessary and that all preparations for any war mean, necessarily, the selection of the least undesirable alternatives. There is never enough money; there is never enough firepower; there is never enough time.

The Vinson philosophy, in everything, is that the best world possible is this present

best of possible worlds. By doing things the way he has done them, by zigging and zagging sometimes, he has had a major hand in providing for the defense of the United States so many uncounted billions of dollars that if stacked against the sun they would cast so fantastic a glitter as almost to be seen from here to Moscow.

To be a committee chairman in Congress requires, first and foremost, longevity and continuity of service. One cannot, of course, be a statesman here until first, and continuously, he is a successful politician, in Milledgeville or elsewhere. Mr. VINSON is the archetype of the successful politician. His predominantly rural district in Georgia is generously sprinkled about with great Federal installations connected with the armed services which did not reach that distant area by accident or by academic considerations like the annual rainfall and incidence of humidity.

So long has he been entrenched in Congress—36 years, to put a figure upon it—that he has sensible reason to fear for his reelection every 2 years as the years roll by. But he is an immensely practical man and he doesn't like to be annoyed by even possible opposition in the Georgia Democratic primary, which, of course, is all that matters. So, he keeps an ear to the ground, not by running about shaking every hand in his district but by staying in touch with five or six Vinson men in each county who pretty much run things and keep him advised, well in season, of any prospective trouble.

In the matter of possible opponents in the primaries, he stands no nonsense. Once he heard that a Mr. Lewis might engage him, for the nomination. Promptly, he telephoned the junior of the Georgia Senators, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, in these words:

"DICK, I don't want you to let that cousin of yours run against me."

Senator RUSSELL protested that to his knowledge he had no cousin with such designs.

"Well," Mr. VINSON complained, "anyhow he married one of your cousins. Get him out of there, DICK." Senator RUSSELL, hurriedly promising to do what he could, made some research and discovered that Mr. Lewis had married a very distant connection of the Russell family—what is sometimes called "a southern cousin." Anyhow, the crisis for Mr. VINSON was averted; he was unopposed.

"Cahl's" highly developed sense of self-preservation has often, and more subtly, been illustrated. It is said of him that when the time for congressional redistricting comes around every 10 years, he has not once failed to have been on the side of the man who that year was or was going to be Governor of Georgia, and thus in a decisive position as to what congressional districts would be reshuffled by the Georgia Legislature, and how.

All this would provide, perhaps, some rather interesting speculation about the relative value of absolute consistensy in ordinary political affairs as against the value to a nation—and Mr. VINSON'S value to this Nation, quite simply, is great—of the man who manages, with a little bending here and there to political necessity, to stay on where he can serve.

His demagogies, if they exist at all, are small; his sins in this direction are of the genial, venial kind. There is, to a reasonably close observer, absolutely no trace of partisan politics or political chiseling in the House Committee on the Armed Services. If CARL VINSON has got a few extra Federal dollars for Georgia, he has earned them and more from the United States of America.

His service on the committee is intense and by the accounts even of his enemies it is brilliantly informed. His work begins at 7:30 in the morning; at 4:45 p. m., nearly every day, he leaves the Capitol to go home to an invalid wife. Not even the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, is thought to be quite so well up on military subjects, since he has not had Mr. VINSON'S tremendous length of service.

These committees lay out the basic military policies. They decide whether there shall be a draft, for example, and how. They give general direction to the highest military authorities, from Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson on down. They authorize the money—the billions upon billions of it—and then they must get the Appropriations Committee and finally Congress itself, to come through.

Over the House committee of thirty-five, Mr. VINSON presides with a sort of seemingly absent-minded paternalism that fools nobody. He knows, and intimately, everything that goes on in the big staff organization which a far more executive-minded Republican predecessor as chairman, the late Walter G. Andrews of New York, provided in the days of Republican control.

Under Mr. Andrews, the committee organization quit looking much like a congressional group and had the sharp efficiency of a corporation office and much of the snap of a military company. These go on, though much softened at the edges, in the Vinson regime. Mr. VINSON, most of the time, has the outward casualness of any rural Southerner on his front porch—though he reserves his tobacco chewing for his actual front porch in Milledgeville—but nothing is allowed really to go slack.

He is so homespun, in a Georgia way, as almost to suggest a case of art improving upon nature, and it is his habit, though he knows the military language down to its last polysyllable, to put things to military witnesses with a challenging aid of simplicity. When one speaks, for example, of "logistical problems," Mr. VINSON may say to him earnestly: "You are speaking of how you are going to get those things from here to there?"

For the most part, like many of the oldtimers, he rarely bothers the House with his rhetoric, but when a crisis is up for one of his bills he moves about the lobbies without an obvious care in the world, buttonholing the Members with a kind of happy friendliness and, in effect, signing them on the dotted line. He keeps a great voting power, in his committee and in the House, by not overexercising his position as one of the House leaders—by not intruding, for example, on issues that don't mean much to him anyhow.

The members of all House committees are designated by the parent of them all in this regard, the Committee on Ways and Means. But Ways and Means, by one of those unspoken understandings that are a part of congressional life, does not offer to Mr. VINSON for Armed Services anybody whom Mr. VINSON, privately, has not already nominated. Thus, to a very considerable extent, he controls the selection of his associates and though he certainly would never make a point of it, the point nevertheless is not lost on them.

Then, he has another technique that has always stood him well when voting is close on something for which he is responsible. When a Member wants anything legitimate from the Military Establishment he gets it, and quickly, by applying to CARL VINSON. A VINSON request "downtown" does not mean tomorrow; it does not mean this afternoon. It means this morning, now. The "old operator" through the years has unforgettably impressed this fact upon all concerned.

The soft manner, in this and in everything else, imperfectly conceals a profoundly determined personality, which is shown in the conferences between deputations from the Senate and House that become necessary when the two bodies have passed differing versions of the same bill. Each delegation goes forth charged by its House to yield not to the other. The resulting process is a kind of collective bargaining.

Recently, on a military bill, Mr. VINSON liked certain provisions in the Senate text better than those he had been able to obtain from his own House. In the conference, Senator TYDINGS, for the Senate, was pressing for those provisions. Representative VINSON plainly was going to give in, after offering what might be called a token resistance. The senior Republican conferee present from the House, Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, began in vehement pain to shout his protests to Mr. VINSON: "Mr. Chairman, you are going against your own House."

"NOW, Mr. SHAWT, Mr. SHAWT, * * *," Mr. VINSON said softly, waving his hands in vague deprecation. "Just wait a minute—just wait a minute." Mr. SHORT waited. Mr. VINSON prevailed, and got his Senate provisions.

Thus, the small legends gather about the former "admiral." The one of which his colleagues are most fond is that which deals with what Mr. VINSON calls his "ice cream pants." These, the sort of striped flannels that in his youth used to go with a blazer, the chairman wears, so the superstition runs, only on days when things are going well. What these things are is never clear—whether an improvement in the Military Establishment, a looking-up in the prospects for a Vinson bill, or, conceivably, the successful frightening off of one more prospective opponent down in Georgia.

The yearer of the ice-cream pants is enigmatic at times; an elderly man (67) with vanishing hair and a bulge at the middle. But there is a bright, smiling, knowing eye, with a touch of cynicism in it and shining out beyond that a deep long-proved devotion to the military safety of the United States.

Another Letter the President Should Not Have Written

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the correspondence between our President, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, and our colleague, WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon. I would call your attention to the President's letter wherein he stated:

I read your letter of August 22 with a great deal of interest and, for your information, there has never been any intention to divert any water from the Columbia River, except at the point where it flows into the Pacific Ocean. * * * I hope you will inform yourselves more fully on the situation before you come to a conclusion that this project cannot and should not be done.

Mr. NORBLAD was a little more diplomatic when he replied to the President as follows:

In your letter you state that the water will be diverted from the Columbia River at the point "where it flows into the Pacific Ocean,"

and I wish to respectfully call your attention to the fact that because of the high tides at that point the water is very salty and would be useless for any purpose.

I think this correspondence answers my statement that the President should not have written his letter of August 28.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 7, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 28, in which you indicate approval of proposals to divert Columbia River water to California. In view of this fact, I feel it only proper and right that the people of the Pacific Northwest should be given complete information on the subject.

The questions which are raised in my mind, and I am sure in those of the people of the Northwest, are:

(a) Has feasibility been established from an engineering or economic standpoint, or both?

(b) What would be the cost of such a project?

(c) Just how would the project be paid for?

(d) Will this be undertaken now during this time of national-defense needs and increasing deficits?

(e) Would it not be cheaper and easier to tap the waters of the Smith, Mad, Eel, Russian, and other rivers in northern California?

In your letter you state that the water will be diverted from the Columbia River at the point where it flows into the Pacific Ocean, and I wish to respectfully call your attention to the fact that because of the high tides at that point that the water is very salty and would be useless for any purpose.

On the other hand, I have understood from statements of those in the Reclamation Bureau that the water would be taken from the first point on the river below where it is used for reclamation. This particular point would be near the confluence with the Yakima River, which is about 300 miles upstream from the point you indicate in your letter that the diversion would take place.

Although I am still firm in my opposition to the proposal, I feel that it is only proper at this time for yourself or the Interior Department to give these facts to the people of the region affected.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER NORBLAD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., August 28, 1950.

Hon. WALTER NORBLAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN NORBLAD: I read your letter of August 22 with a great deal of interest and, for your information, there has never been any intention to divert any water from the Columbia River, except at the point where it flows into the Pacific Ocean.

The best survey that I have been able to have made states that 140,000,000 acre-feet of water flows into the Pacific Ocean every year. There isn't any reason in the world why this waste water should not be used. Of course, there has never been a project, which is for the welfare of the Nation as a whole, that hasn't had opposition and I expected opposition to this one.

If I remember correctly some of your colleagues in the Northwest made the statement that Grand Coulee Dam would serve only coyotes, ground hogs, and jack rabbits. That prophecy doesn't seem to have come true.

I hope you will inform yourselves more fully on the situation before you come to a conclusion that this project cannot and should not be done.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 22, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May I herewith express to you my disapproval of the plans currently being undertaken by the administration to divert and transport Columbia River water to the State of California.

I am advised that you are in accord with these general proposals, which it is apparent would terminate the California-Arizona controversy over the use of the Colorado River waters by giving a major share of this water to the State of Arizona and diverting Columbia River water in turn to California.

May I respectfully call your attention to the fact that Representative CLAIR ENGLE of California, a Democrat, and Representative NORRIS POULSON, of California, a Republican, and each ranking members of the Public Lands Committee from their States, have both publicly expressed their opposition to the Columbia River diversion plan.

At present the Interior Department is spending $520,000 on these studies, and engineers advise that completion of the proposal would cost from five to ten billion dollars. The distance between the Columbia River and the San Francisco Bay area is over 700 miles, and the lowest point at which major rail traffic crosses the mountains is over 5,000 feet. While it is true that there is now a surplus of water in the Columbia River at certain periods of the year, that with our tremendous growth in the Pacific Northwest, this situation will not long obtain. I particularly refer to the constant growth of irrigation and industry in our part of the country and to the fact that the Grand Coulee project within itself will require a very large withdrawal of future Columbia River water.

Very truly yours,

WALTER NORBLAD.

The Defense of Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me, I include a penetrating article by Dr. R. E. Lapp. Dr. Lapp was with the Manhattan project during the war and subsequently was head of the Nuclear Physics Division of the Office of Naval Research. Currently an independent consulting scientist, he is the author of Must We Hide? The article, entitled "The Defense of Our Cities," appeared in the September 12 issue of the Reporter magazine. The above-mentioned article follows:

THE ATOM—THE DEFENSE OF OUR CITIES
(By R. E. Lapp)

After jolting the Nation into hasty military preparations, the Korean outbreak has thrown our civic leaders into a mad scramble to do something about civil defense. For 5 years Federal officials have treated civil-defense plans as blackboard exercises. As Mayor Elmer E. Robinson, of San Francisco, put it: "Federal agencies have been shuffling papers, plans, and schemes back and forth between themselves. One report supersedes another. Neither is officially accepted as a guide for local authorities but both are sent to local authorities. That is a deplorable situation because you may plan the defense of your city one way, I may plan mine another, and someone else may have even a third plan. * * *"

The late James Forrestal, acting with a foresight and wisdom only now beginning to be appreciated, set up an Office of Civil Defense Planning in the Pentagon in the spring of 1948. By the end of that year the comprehensive Hopley report, Civil Defense for National Security, was prepared for the Secretary of Defense and given wide distribution. But like many other Government reports, it was acted upon; in fact, this report was never blessed by any other Government agency. It fell into discard when the President plucked the civil-defense problem out of the hands of the military and gave it to the National Security Resources Board, where it was promptly pigeonholed. A year passed before W. Stuart Symington, the present Chairman moved over to NSRB from the Secretaryship of the Air Force, and a young atomic-weapons expert, Dr. Paul J. Larsen, was appointed Director of Civilian Mobilization.

Under Larsen's direction, planning began to move. On June 13, 1950, Larsen promised the assembled mayors on the west coast: "* * * I want to assure you that the Federal Government is developing a modern, flexible, and practical civil-defense program to meet all types of twentieth-century warfare. We have little doubt that the final results * * * will be adequate to whatever situation an enemy might impose upon us." These words mollified the mayors, and they sat back to wait for September, when the NSRB plan would be unveiled.

Communist aggression in Korea overtook the timetable for the defense of our cities. Several cities and States plunged ahead on their own plans. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey picked Gen. Lucius D. Clay to head civil defense in New York State. In accepting the position, Clay remarked: "After a very calm and clear analysis of the facts we expect to develop a plan as soon as possible." These words keynote the fact that the Nation starts from scratch in the summer of 1950 to prepare against wide-scale devastation.

As if to atone for its policy of not informing the American people, the administration authorized the publication last month of a monumental treatise called the Effects of Atomic Weapons, a 456-page book which examines in detail the various effects produced when a bomb is detonated in the air, on the surface of the ground, or below water or earth. The layman is confronted with an array of scientific terms, equations, and graphs. One Washington official summed it up as he laid the publication aside: "I wonder who it was written for?"

The British have published a homely little training booklet on atomic warfare which depends almost wholly upon an easy narrative augmented with simple diagrams, and

can be read and understood by the man in the street. Such a publication is a major requirement on this side of the Atlantic.

Enough atomic bombs have been detonated so that we can predict fairly accurately just what the effects will be if the bombs are set off above the surface of the earth. From a strictly military viewpoint, an air-burst atomic bomb does the most damage over the greatest area, and for this reason it is generally assumed that an enemy would employ this method of atomic attack against us. Obviously, the bigger the bomb, the wider the area affected. The 1945 Nagasaki-type atomic bomb was rated as being equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT. We may call this a small bomb. Assuming a big one as equivalent to 50,000 tons of high explosive, and the probable future H-bomb as equal to 200,000 tons, we can make a comparison of the areas subject to moderate blast damage from the detonation in the air of a small atomic bomb, a big atomic bomb, and an H-bomb.

For planning purposes, what size bomb should we assume the Russians can produce? It seems reasonable to give them the benefit of the doubt and plan for a medium-sized bomb—something between a 20,000 and 50,000-ton high-explosive equivalent.

If we assume that the Soviet bomb is of the 35,000-ton type and further assume that it is detonated half a mile above an American city, we can then proceed to predict the probable areas of damage from such a burst. The damage can be cataloged in three different categories.

The first, most spectacular effect of an atomic explosion is the blast effect. It is in terms of blast effect that an atomic bomb is compared with conventional explosives. Experts classify blast damage in five degrees, ranging from demolition or virtually complete destruction to light damage. In between there are severe, moderate, and partial damage, the first classed as heavy structural damage (irreparable), the second heavy (but reparable), and the last self-explanatory.

When an atomic bomb is detonated, a relatively small amount of solid uranium is instantaneously converted into a glowing intensely hot gas which quickly expands to form a fireball. Energy is radiated from this glowing mass in the form of visible, infrared, and ultraviolet rays as a prolonged flash of brilliant light. An ordinary TNT bomb produces temperatures of about 5,000° centigrade, but an atomic bomb boosts the temperature to the multimillion-degree level. Although this flash of heat can cause wood to ignite and causes conflagrations as widespread as many bomberloads of incendiaries, the most significant effect is on human beings.

In addition to blast effect and flash burn, there is nuclear radiation, which is emitted from an atomic explosion in a burst, half being produced in the first second after the explosion and the rest within 10 seconds thereafter. A high air burst leaves no residue of radio-activity of any serious consequence, but bombs burst below earth or water may be expected to leave residual radiation (Bikini effect).

All three primary effects of the bomb—blast, heat, and nuclear radiation—occur simultaneously, and each has its own radius of action. Assuming that the enemy detonates a 35,000-ton bomb half a mile over a city, if a person is within 1 mile of the ground zero he may be killed by any or all of the three effects. Beyond 1 mile, he is safe from penetrating radiation but can be killed by flash burn or by blast injury. Civil-defense planners can assess the casualties in their community by drawing a series of circles on population maps. While the results will vary with each city, the average figure for large American population centers has been estimated by NSRB experts at 140,000 casualties. This figure includes the dead, missing, and injured. In an area such as that around Times Square the total casualties would be two to three times higher.

These estimates are based upon the assumption that the city receives no alert; they are, therefore, maximum figures. If a city receives a sufficient alert, if the people are disciplined to seek shelter, if shelters are available or the people seek good makeshift shelters, and if secondary damage from fires, cave-ins, and collapse is contained, then these casualty estimates can be halved. In the most favorable circumstances one can hope to reduce casualties to as little as a tenth, but this involves a tremendous amount of preparation for disaster. The alert is of the greatest importance to effective civil defense. If a man happened be on the eightieth floor of the Empire State Building when an alert sounded, his chance of survival would be negligible unless he had a 1-hour warning, for it would require at least that to evacuate the building.

Just what kind of alert time is it reasonable to expect? There is no firm answer to this question, for we do not know what means of delivering the bomb an enemy would use. If he employed the covert or clandestine technique, as it is technically termed in high Government circles, then he could plant atomic bombs in our harbors, in tramp steamers, or in the basements of skyscrapers. Unless the bombs could be ferreted out in advance, the alert time would be zero. During the past summer the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation were alerted more than once to the danger of a smuggled bomb.

Despite the publicity given to the tramp-steamer or Trojan-ship method of delivery, it is by no means an open-and-shut case that an enemy would elect to employ such a delivery scheme. The risk for him would be very great. Should a single bomb be detected, he would lose the all-important initiative. Furthermore, the mechanics of exporting bombs from a distance and the technical problems in preplacing and detonating them are by no means simple. Even the results obtained would argue against this method of delivery.

The means of delivery apparently considered as the most probable by our defense experts is the heavy bomber. Today our $85,000,000 radar screen is still under construction, and even when it is completed it will not be holeproof, for radar has a horizon limitation that allows low-fying aircraft to escape detection. It is this well-known fact which, being misinterpreted by civil-defense officials, has led to the mushroom regrowth of an obsolete aircraft-spotting system. Life magazine recently featured a full-page photo of a grim-faced woman spotter gazing intently at the sky above San Francisco's bay area. The pathetic futility of the scene strikes home when one realizes that the bomb-release point for an atomic bomber would be 10 or more miles from the city.

It is highly improbable that an enemy could stage a simultaneous attack upon our far-flung network of cities, or that such an attack, if attempted, would go undetected by all radar stations. Depending upon the nature of the alert, some cities should implement evacuation plans while others should have the populace routed to previously designated shelters. Here the man in the street will rightfully ask: What constitutes an adequate shelter?" Perhaps the best answer is simply: "Any port in a storm." It would hardly be feasible to provide adequate shelters for everyone, if by adequate we mean bunkers with 5-foot concrete walls designed for all-night occupancy. British and German experience in the Second World War showed that far from perfect shelters can be highly effective against high explosives, and it is to be expected that we shall find this true for the atomic weapon. Of course, the 1-mile circle directly around ground zero would have to be written off, for within it only the most ruggedly built shelters could be effective. It is highly unlikely that many such shelters will be—or in fact should be—constructed.

A lesson to be learned from the past war is that civilian discipline is just as important as shelters. Panic could be as disastrous as atomic explosion.

Thus the problem of civil defense is framed in terms of the probable damage from an atomic explosion, the maximum casualties, and the practicability of an alert. Clearly, it is an exceedingly tough problem; some will say it is one without a solution. Actually, there is a solution. The dispersion of our cities and industries would make targets which would be unprofitable for the enemy to bomb. However, this is viewed as political dynamite in Washington, and now that the Korean war has revised our time scale for preparedness, there is not sufficient time to undertake effective dispersion. While dispersion is the complete and eventual answer to weapons of mass destruction, there are partial answers that may prove useful. It is well to adopt the philosophy of a skilled boxer who knows that his opponent can knock him out with a series of lucky punches, but who nonetheless trains conscientiously, toughening his body to absorb punishment while perfecting his defense to ward off as many punches as possible. The analogy may be extended to point out that while the boxer has capable medical aid in his corner he does not rely upon it to win his fight. In this respect many of our defense planners, too much impressed with medical advice and in awe of radiation, have built their plans around medical relief for a bombed area. Medical aid for a stricken community is important, but it should not constitute the whole of civil defense.

The most reliable medical estimates of the casualties resulting from an air burst atomic explosion over a large American city place the total toll at 140,000, of which half would be deaths. Not all the deaths would occur instantly, although it is estimated that about 45,000 would be killed outright, or would die the first day. Another 15,000 or so would succumb during the first week and the remainder would die within six weeks. This means that apart from those missing or killed, there would be 95,000 casualties requiring medical treatment during the first week. Not all casualties would require extensive treatment and hospitalization, for many would suffer minor injuries from falling debris, superficial burns, and flying glass. About one-third of those injured would require hospitalization and careful treatment for radiation injury, serious flash burn, or internal injuries. Another third would require some hospitalization but not as much medical care and nursing; these people would in general come from the areas of intermediate blast damage. The remainder of the patients should not require hospitalization and could be treated at first-aid stations.

When these casualty estimates were given to an NSRB medical committee, the doctors were staggered. How could a city paralyzed by an atomic attack muster the medical facilities and personnel to cope with these tens of thousands of casualties? With hospitals demolished, many doctors killed or injured, medical supplies destroyed, and transportation at a standstill, how could the

injured be evacuated, hospitalized, and treated?

Plans must be made for establishing emergency hospitals, evacuating the wounded, enlisting medical aid from all nearby towns, setting up emergency reserves of medical supplies, and a whole host of allied measures. To the extent that we prepared in advance, we should be able to cope with an atomic disaster.

The very magnitude of the medical problem ought to compel civil-defense authorities to undertake every measure to minimize casualties. One of the most effective procedures would be to evacuate all women and children, along with nonessential workers, to smaller communities. This measure should remain in effect for the duration of the war. Those who had to remain in the target cities should be thoroughly disciplined for their role when disaster struck. They would have to be schooled in the rudiments of survival in an atomic bombing. A person caught in the open at some distance from a detonation can still survive—if beyond the lethal range of nuclear radiation—by shielding himself from the heat flash and the blast wave. At a distance of 2 miles from the blast it takes 10 seconds for the conclusion to be felt, and this may be sufficient time to seek some sort of shelter.

An atomic attack would obviously have a serious effect upon specific communities. But unless the attack were widespread, the resulting loss of population and industries would not knock out the United States. Especially if we were prepared, we could withstand terrific punishment. For the most part our industry is located on the peripheries of our cities and is not as vulnerable as the hearts of them are. But there is one prime target city that is of such importance to the Nation that its loss would seriously cripple the country. This city is Washington. From the steps of the Capitol to the low silhouette of the mammoth Pentagon is only 3 miles as the crow flies. Yet within this 3-mile circle are concentrated the National Military Establishment with its 25,000 employees, the Navy Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and many offices of the executive branch of the Government. All lie within the area which a single modern atomic bomb could devastate completely.

Within high Government circles there has been angry debate about doing the obvious—moving the Government agencies out of town. There are still many diehards in the Capital who prefer to believe that it can't happen here, and who vigorously resist any attempt to transplant the critical Government agencies. Instead of moving out to Bethesda, Silver Spring, and Alexandria, the Government is crowding more and more personnel into the District. Needled into action by the Korean war, Congress has authorized the establishment of an Office of Civil Defense for the District. However, the steps taken and the measures planned so far are wholly inconsistent with the size of the problem.

The confusion that exists in civil defense, with the local communities and the Federal Government at loggerheads as to who should do what, reminds one of the classic story of two fire companies that rushed to put out a fire in a house. The house straddled the city line, and while the two fire companies argued over who should put out the fire, the house burned down. While the National Security Resources Board is charged with responsibility for civilian defense, it has no clearly defined authority and no operational function. The Board has farmed out civilian defense to more than a score of Government agencies, and it acts as a sort of holding company over them all. Now that cities are clamoring for civilian-defense preparedness and are specifying such measures as shelter construction, it is clear that staggering sums of money will soon be needed. True civilian defense will cost many billions of dollars, and if this money is to be spent sanely it must be cleared through a single operating agency, just as requests for appropriations from the Army, Navy, and Air Force are processed through the office of the Secretary of Defense. To handle the defense of our cities on a scale proportional to the magnitude of the problem, there must be established an Office of Civilian Defense with far greater authority than that now vested in the National Security Resources Board. Only in this way can this extremely tough problem be tackled realistically.

Mistakes of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Farm Journal of September 1950:

MISTAKES OF THE FUTURE

The mess in Korea highlights grievous mistakes in recent American statesmanship. That this Asiatic peninsula, with no strategic military importance to the United States, must be the scene of a bloody struggle proves once again that all mistakes must be paid for. The price for governmental errors always comes high.

In order that future mistakes may be fewer, those of the past should not be dismissed. They should be studied.

The route to Korean bloodshed began back in 1933 when our Government recognized Soviet Russia. Much has been lost by the appeasement policies which the administrations since then has followed. We gave the Soviets generously of lend-lease materials, with little in return. We yielded to Stalin by making the second front in Normandy. Had that attack been made from the Mediterranean, Russia would not today be solidly installed in half of Europe. We stopped our advancing armies so that Russians could be first to enter Berlin—an error that cost millions for the air lift later, and that may yet cost far more to protect western Europe.

We suspended the war with no plans for winning the peace. At Cairo, Tehran and Yalta concessions were made to Stalin which set the Communists up in business in China, Korea, and elsewhere in the Orient.

Then our confused and infested State Department faltered year after year over China. Bemused by attempting to mix into the economic affairs of half the world, it failed miserably to head off the Communist control which now holds China in iron grip.

Meanwhile, a 1948 campaign money-raiser was made Secretary of Defense. Recommendations for defense expenditures were whittled, while nondefense spending mounted to unprecedented figures. The Navy was weakened, the Air Forces throttled down, and the Army limited, while the illusion of adequate preparedness was fostered in the public mind.

The Voice of America was held to an ill-managed whisper while Russian propaganda against the United States blanketed the earth.

Soft methods have enabled Communists, and their helpers to penetrate deeply into American industry. Should world war be resumed, American action could be crippled in countless ways by Communist sabotage from within.

The Nation has been weakened internally by governmental borrowing, which has cut down the value of savings.

Bad examples in high places have impaired moral standards, and have weakened another great source of strength.

This is a gloomy record. We regret that it can be recited. America deserves more glorious history than this.

The mistakes which have been made can not be reversed. They can only be paid for in the high currency of blood and treasure. We are the people, and cannot escape the cost.

If the courage, character, and good sense of the people will rise this autumn to choose patriotic, nation-minded representatives for Congress, the United States may begin again to make history with more triumphs and fewer errors.

General Marshall Comes Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "General Marshall Comes Back," published in the Duluth News-Tribune for September 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MARSHALL COMES BACK

The much criticized Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson resigned yesterday and, he said, he had recommended Gen. George C. Marshall, former chief of staff, to take over the job of rebuilding this Nation's moldering defenses.

The resignation of Johnson is good news, if for no other reason than the need immediately for a man of strength, personal prestige, and experience. General Marshall fits that description perfectly.

He will bring to the Department of Defense the quality it has lacked most—confidence.

There was not a thing Johnson could have done to inspire the men under him and, of greater importance, the American people. The public has been aware of the need for a change. The question remains whether this change is enough. Time will tell.

General Marshall has sought a quiet life in retirement for a decade or more, but each retirement has been followed by a crisis that brought him back into the service of his country. He is a soldier above all else and, in this hour of need, it is no surprise that he willingly accepted President Truman's offer that he now serve as Secretary of Defense.

Johnson, too, is motivated by a desire to serve the best interests of the United States.

He has recognized by his resignation that he could not gain the support of the American people in the Korean war and in preparations for a greater conflict now in the threatening stage.

The return of General Marshall will serve a dual purpose. It will jack up the sagging morale of the fighting men in Korea, the American soldiers spread so thinly over a confused Europe, and the people back home who soon will be called upon for cutting sacrifices. It also will be a clear warning to the Politburo in Moscow that the United States has been asleep at the switch once again, but now has come out of its stupor and soon will be prepared to meet any test.

It is the sincere hope of the American people that Congress will rally behind General Marshall and offer him the support he now needs to tie together loose ends. The general can do the job, he has the mental equipment and experience to do it, but he must be backed right down to freedom's hilt.

Federal Rent Control in Los Angeles

REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, before this House took its recent Labor Day recess, I called attention to the decidedly unusual way in which Housing Expediter Tighe E. Wood first delayed and then was prevented by a series of legal maneuvers from issuing an order decontrolling rents in the city of Los Angeles.

The manner in which this matter has been handled has been extraordinary, to say the least, and increasing suspicion has been voiced about the possibility the Housing Expediter, or members of his staff, are in cahoots with groups fighting decontrol in the hope that an order removing controls can be held up until Congress possibly passes a new law—under the guise of checking inflation and helping out new defense armament program—reestablishing Federal rent control.

I have discovered the delay in issuing the decontrol order—twice requested by overwhelming majorities—has bewildered and confused thousands of people. Landlords and tenants both are upset about this complex situation, which is marked by some strange shenanigans by lawyers representing a group that claims to be made up of large numbers of tenants.

On the very day this House went on its Labor Day recess, the United States Court of Appeals here in the District of Columbia issued another restraining order that has the effect of continuing controls indefinitely in effect. Before taking that action, the three-judge panel showed deep concern over suggestions the judicial proceedings are the result of or at least partly made possible by collusion between the Housing Expediter or his staff and the people who are trying to block removal of rent control in Los Angeles.

Judge Harold M. Stephens asked attorneys participating in an argument in this case to comment on the insinuation the Expediter was in cahoots with the people trying to get the courts to tie his hands judicially. Of course, the lawyers denied anything improper in their actions.

The court of appeals, Mr. Speaker, so far has not gone into the peculiar circumstances—which may be entirely outside the court's jurisdiction—that mark the time-consuming handling of this Los Angeles decontrol matter. Perhaps the court here in the District cannot look into the possibility that certain individuals in Los Angeles were in communication with certain Federal officials plotting possible ways of preventing the Expediter from issuing a decontrol order. Perhaps the court is not concerned with the shenanigans that have caused much comment. By this, I mean the way the attorney for the so-called tenants council went into the chambers of a Federal district judge here—3,000 miles away from the city where this matter is of vital importance—after the end of normal business hours and obtained a temporary restraining order tying Expediter Woods' hands temporarily. I also mean the way in which the Expediter's legal counsel failed to oppose the issuance of this order and then made no move to ask for dismissal of a petition for a temporary injunction blocking issuance of a decontrol order.

The peculiar maneuvers in this matter were reflected recently in Los Angeles. Councilman Ed J. Davenport, one of the city councilmen who favored decontrol, has protested against the apparent effort of Federal bureaucrats to nullify the will of Congress and their defiance of local governing bodies whom we in Congress decided are best situated to decide whether there is any need to continue rent control.

Councilman Davenport has asked us, the Congress, to investigate what he terms "bureaucratic interference." He has charged Expediter Woods with conniving with groups desiring continued bureaucratic control of local affairs.

Another Los Angeles Councilman, George P. Cronk, who sponsored the rent-decontrol resolution in the council, has echoed Mr. Davenport's feelings and said the handling of this matter indicates "how far this great Nation has drifted down the road to socialism."

Mr. Speaker, I ordinarily do not encourage Congress to meddle in local affairs and heartily favor the maximum amount of local self-government. I know a large number of my colleagues feel the same way. The question that has been presented by this Los Angeles rent controversy is whether Federal bureaucrats are undermining local self-government.

When Congress enacts a law defining clearly the powers and authority of administrative agencies of the Government, we are entitled to expect the officials of those agencies will respect the law and carry it out faithfully, as they have sworn to do when taking office. If officials can connive with groups outside the Government who dislike the laws we pass, if they can engage in collusive steps to use the courts to prevent the will of Congress from being put into effect, the privileges and prerogatives of this House are seriously challenged.

This situation may affect only one city—but I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, it is the fourth largest city in the Nation—but the facts I have just given and the statement I put in the RECORD 2 weeks ago seem sufficient to me to warrant asking this House to investigate these weird shenanigans, to find out if the courts are being used by attorneys who are in cahoots to get around the laws enacted by Congress, to look into the motives and actions of the parties in this unusual situation. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution calling on the Banking and Currency Committee to conduct an inquiry and report the facts back to this House so we may decide whether further action is necessary to see that our statutes are honestly administered, whether our judicial processes are being abused, and whether our officials are living up to the trust we put in them.

Mike Mansfield Reports on Project Developments in Western Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in accord with my annual custom, I am happy to include with my remarks a summary of appropriations approved by the Congress for specific Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Indian Office, and Army Engineer's projects in the district I have the honor and the privilege to represent. The time covered by these appropriations is for the period during my service as a Representative from the First District of Montana and follows up similar reports sent out by me in previous years.

These projects, with the coming into western Montana of new industries in the Butte-Anaconda and Hungry Horse areas, mark the beginning of the development of our State, a diversification of our economy, and greater security for our people.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS

1. Hungry Horse project

1946	$1,700,000
1947	867,210
1948	2,500,000
1949	14,611,650
1950	22,093,125
1951	29,500,000
Total	71,271,985

2. Canyon Ferry project

1946	$236,270
1947	106,205
1948	775,000
1949	2,950,000
1950	7,928,300
1951	5,800,000
Total	17,795,775

3. Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line and substation

1951	$365,000

4. Helena Valley project

1948	$29,000
1949	21,000
1950	90,000
1951	75,000
Total	215,000

5. Jefferson River project

1946	----------
1947	$25,945
1948	80,000
1949	82,500
1950	236,000
1951	100,000
Total	524,445

6. Three Forks project

1946	----------
1947	----------
1948	$151,000
1949	299,600
1950	104,000
1951	116,000
Total	670,600

7. Bitterroot project

1946	----------
1947	$89,238
1948	----------
1949	40,000
1950	50,000
1951	----------
Total	179,238

8. Missoula Valley project

1945–47 (completed)	$269,355

	Cash	Contract authority
Hungry Horse-Kerr No. 1 transmission line:		
1950	$167,450	----------
1951	Completed	
Hungry Horse-Kerr No. 2 transmission line:		
1950	$99,450	$408,850
1951	600,000	1,079,000
Kerr-Anaconda transmission line:		
1950	----------	323,000
1951	500,000	2,847,000
Kerr-Spokane transmission line:		
1950	271,150	1,544,450
1951	3,977,000	835,000
Kalispell substation addition:		
1950	4,250	57,800
1951	71,000	----------
Kerr switching station:		
1950	4,250	153,850
1951	33,000	----------
Bonneville office for western Montana (estimate):		
1950	30,000	----------
1951	51,000	----------
Total	5,808,550	7,248,950

ARMY ENGINEERS PROJECTS

1949: Orchard Homes flood-control project (expended $40,000) ------ $140,000

1950: Libby Dam—Authorized—May 17, 1950. (Estimated cost, $220,000,000; estimated capacity, 550,000 kilowatts).

INDIAN OFFICE PROJECTS

1. Indian Tuberculosis Hospital, Warm Springs:

1949	$750,000
1950	750,000
Total	1,500,000

2. Polson drainage project: 1950 - 100,000

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECTS

1. Ravalli County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Corvallis, Mont. (it includes Ravalli and Missoula Counties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943–46	568	546	$272,800
1946	637	592	----------
1947	744	728	73,000
1948	784	765	150,000
1949	800	772	----------
1950	859	809	----------
Total	----------	----------	495,800

2. Vigilante Electric Cooperative, Inc., Twin Bridges and Dillon, Mont. (it includes Jefferson, Madison, Silver Bow, Beaverhead, and Broadwater Counties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943–46	1,016	545	$960,000
1947	1,305	687	405,000
1948	1,434	787	100,000
1949	1,547	829	278,000
1950	1,630	879	----------
Total	----------	----------	1,743,000

3. Missoula Electric Cooperative, Inc., Missoula, Mont. (it includes Ravalli, Granite, Powell, Missoula, Mineral, and Lake Counties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943–46	505	306	$505,000
1947	546	337	----------
1948	629	394	450,000
1949	704	465	----------
1950	748	478	190,000
Total	----------	----------	1,145,000

4. Flathead Electric Cooperative, Inc., Kalispell, Mont. (it includes Flathead and Lake Counties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943–46	777	551	$413,700
1947	1,098	702	----------
1948	1,323	777	635,000
1949	1,623	824	----------
1950	1,614	843	170,000
Total	----------	----------	1,218,700

5. Elmo Electric Cooperative, Inc., Polson, Mont. (it includes Lake County):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1949	216	135	$110,000
1950	190	135	220,000
Total	----------	----------	330,000

6. Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc., Fortine, Mont. (it includes Lincoln and Flathead Counties). Construction not completed:

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1949	----------	----------	$415,000
1950	24	20	192,000
Total	----------	----------	607,000

In addition, funds allocated to the North Idaho Electric Cooperative were used to energize lines and serve farms in Sanders County, and funds allocated to the Park County Electric Cooperative were used for similar purposes in Gallatin County.

Truman's Turn-Abouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Earl Richert, writing in the Washington News, calls attention to the President's nimble mental gyrations. He points out simply, clearly, that Mr. Truman has, over a long period, been talking one way and then shortly after acting oppositely. As part of my remarks, I include the article:

TRUMAN'S TURN-ABOUTS

(By Earl Richert)

The speed and frequency with which President Truman executes turn-abouts on hired hands and policies has sent this wisecrack on its way around the Capital circuit.

"When the President makes up his mind, no power on earth can keep him from changing it."

Defense Secretary Louis Johnson's dismissal is the latest in a series of acts that make this wisecrack appropriate.

On August 4, the President said at a press conference that Secretaries Acheson and Johnson would not resign as long as he was President. On September 12, little more than a month later, Secretary Johnson's letter of resignation was politely accepted by the President.

That turn-about, fast as it was, was not as speedy as one the President made in the fall of 1946 during the great meat shortage.

On September 27 of that year, the President flatly declared himself against removal of price controls on meat. On October 14 he was on the air announcing the removal of all controls on meat.

Only last Thursday, President Truman was asked about a story saying W. Stuart Symington would be made the over-all defense boss.

That, said Mr. Truman, was the first he had heard of it.

Saturday night, in his radio talk, the President announced that the new powers provided by the Defense Production Act of 1950 would be coordinated by the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, W. Stuart Symington.

Also at last week's press conference the President was asked if he had under consideration an economic stabilization agency which would have control over wages, prices, and commodities.

The President said that was not under consideration at the present time and he probably would answer the question Saturday night.

On Saturday, he issued an Executive order setting up an Economic Stabilization Agency. Its function will be to guide voluntary efforts to hold down inflation and to prepare to impose price-wage ceilings if, and when, they are necessary.

Most important turn-about of all, of course, has been that on far eastern policy. That switch sent our troops into Korea and the United States fleet to guard Formosa, although Mr. Truman repeatedly had indicated that Formosa was not in the United States defense plans.

Back on December 3, 1948, Mr. Truman said Defense Secretary James Forrestal had been asked to stay in the Cabinet. Mr. Truman pointed out at the time, however, that all persons at the top level in Government served at the pleasure of the President.

Three months later, on March 3, 1949, the President announced that Mr. Forrestal had resigned.

On the same day the President said Army Secretary Kenneth Royall was not resigning. On April 20, 1949, less than 2 months later, the White House announced Mr. Royall's retirement.

And so it goes.

Mr. Speaker, consistency is a necessary virtue for a man who is the President of the United States. It is a quality that Mr. Truman obviously does not possess. How much longer will the people continue to follow this kind of leadership?

Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Washington Post, September 18, 1950, which I have been asked to insert in the RECORD:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The withdrawal of 11 names from the petition to bring the home rule bill before the House is a cruel blow to the hope for self-government here. Only 13 more signatures were needed to insure action on the bill at the present session. Now the sponsors of home rule will have to obtain 24 additional signatures to save the bill from the ashcan to which the House District Committee consigned it. We hope this will not prove impossible, but it is obvious that extraordinary efforts will have to be put forth if the goal is to be reached before the present Congress expires.

All the reasons given by the Representatives who changed their minds seem petty beside the overshadowing fact that this Capital of the world's greatest democratic power is denied any participation in its own government. This is not a new issue thrown at the Congress in the last days of the session. It has been kicking around Capitol Hill for years. Indeed, the Eightieth Congress put a similar bill aside on the ground that it did not have time for adequate discussion. Since then the issue has been thoroughly explored. The community has debated the bill and expressed its approval by the only means available. The measure has been passed by the Senate; it has the support of the President and was written specifically to carry out the platform pledges of the Democratic and Republican Parties. To let it die for want of action by the House would be not only a gross waste of legislative time and effort, but an inexcusable frustration of the national will. The same may be said, of couse, of the statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii.

The chances for any of these bills before Congress takes its long-postponed recess is very slender. But their enactment is of sufficient importance to warrant a postelection session of the present Congress even if there were no other reason for Congress to return. Incidentally, some Congressmen are likely to hear from their constituents regarding these bills. For example, the New York Times asked editorially the other day why 16 Republicans from New York State have failed to sign the District home-rule discharge petition. The issue of "democracy in Washington" has won support in many States because of the gross injustice resulting from the present situation. If Congressmen returning to their home districts to campaign would ask their constituents whether voting rights and home rule should be restored to the Nation's Capital, we should have no doubt as to the outcome.

Respect for the Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association is one of the great stabilizing influences in this country, because it has a wholesome respect for the law. It stands four-square in defense of the Federal Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of September 18, 1950, which refers to Frank E. Holman, of Seattle, the distinguished past president of the American Bar Association, and his views with reference to the United Nations:

The journal of the American Bar Association in its August and September issues calls attention to the disposition manifested by the California State court of appeal to regard to the UN Charter as a self-executing treaty despite the specific disavowal of the Charter that it so regards itself. The legal and constitutional dangers of this attitude are certain to engage the attention of the association at its annual convention, opening here today.

VOTE REFLECTS CURRENT ILLUSION

An editorial in the journal for August implies that the Senate was extremely shortsighted when it ratified the Charter in 1945 by an overwhelming vote of 89 to 2 without serious concern for its hidden implications. The vote was a reflection of the illusions current at the time, when internationalists were professing to be certain that UN would cure all of the world's evils.

Since then Americans have had an extended opportunity to find out for themselves that UN has not only been incapable of achieving its purposes of outlawing war and guaranteeing peace, but that it has served principally as a sounding board for the most flagrant sort of anti-American Soviet propaganda.

These consequences would have been harmful enough without an American court attempting to read into the Charter mandatory duties resting upon the United States which any reasonable reading would show were not there. Such a decision was that in California rendering invalid the State's law on alien land holdings, which had been upheld in a long series of decisions by the State courts and the United States Supreme Court.

Conceding that the law was constitutional under the State and Federal Constitutions, the court still insisted that the UN Charter superseded the State constitutions. The argument turned on the provision of article VI of the United States Constitution that treaties shall be supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

MANDATE NOT SELF-EXECUTING

The California case involved land ownership by an alien Japanese. The court of appeal contended that under statements of the UN Charter undertaking to promote respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without discrimination as to race, sex, language, or religion, the American States were obliged to enforce this mandate, whatever their own laws might say.

The fact that there was no self-executing mandate however, is attested by Article 56 of the UN Charter, pledging the members to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of purposes. No such action has been taken by Congress, although the California court brings in the fact that a draft covenant of human rights for the world has been prepared by a UN agency under the chairmanship of Mrs. Roosevelt. Not only has this document never been submitted to the Senate for acceptance as a treaty, but the UN Social and Economic Council recently laid it aside as wholly unsatisfactory, so that it does not even have the approval of UN.

The bar association editorial states that, should the California opinion be affirmed, the power of Congress and the States to legislate will be subordinated to a whole series of rights and responsibilities which would automatically become binding upon the United States simply because of some value UN statement concerning them. The Truman civil-rights program, for example, would almost certainly come into effect, notwithstanding the refusal of Congress to pass it.

WOULD "GIVE AMERICA AWAY"

Again, in its September issue, the Journal deals extensively with the question of whether the treaty-making power constitutes a blank check for writing a new Constitution. Frank E. Holman of Seattle, the distinguished past president of the ABA, offers a penetrating analysis of the revolutionary offshoots that endanger the Republic as a result of UN. He says that if the bar fails to resist the threat it will be a criminal accomplice to giving America away.

The interest of the American Bar Association in these grave matters is heartening for the Constitution and the laws of the Nation and the States, as legal instruments, must depend largely for survival upon the advocacy of our trained legal minds. If their integrity is impaired, the Nation's sovereignty will be gone. International bodies, rather than the elected representatives of the American people, would then legislate for us all.

N. E. Dodd, a Successful Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just heard that the Food and Agriculture Organization has to elect a director-general, since the term of N. E. Dodd, the present director-general, will expire in November. Considering the present unsettled world situation and the fact that the organization is planning to move its headquarters to Rome early in 1951, I sincerely hope that Ed Dodd can be prevailed upon to stay with the organization. The United States has a large

stake in this international organization and pays the largest sum toward its operation.

I have known Ed Dodd most of my life. I know of his successful farming operations and of his efforts during the past 25 years to improve the position of people engaged in agriculture. While he was with the United States Department of Agriculture he served in many positions—the county office, the State office, in Washington as director of the farm program in the 13 Western States, then as chief of the agency which had the major responsibility for food production during the war, and as Under Secretary of Agriculture until 1948. He has appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Appropriations of both houses many times and I have never talked to a Member of Congress that did not express respect for his great general knowledge of agriculture as well as for his good practical judgment.

We have voted a large appropriation to be used in providing technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. The Food and Agriculture Organization will receive the largest single share of the part of these funds that will be administered by the United Nations, these funds being in addition to the funds voted directly for the FAO. The object of this program is to teach underdeveloped nations "to help themselves," to supply practical plans, along with technicians and a small amount of equipment, for improving their agriculture and raising their standards of living.

I am sure that many of my colleagues in Congress will agree with me when I say that we will have more confidence in the success of these programs if we can keep N. E. Dodd directing and guiding them.

Politics as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Evening Observer, of Dunkirk, N. Y., on September 14, 1950:

POLITICS AS USUAL

Under the threat of a new war emergency there seems to be a tendency to condemn the idea of "politics as usual."

Why? Politics will be about as usual this fall and there is nothing destructive nor unpatriotic about that.

When the emergency becomes so great that we cannot permit the democracy to function with politics as usual it will be a sad day for our country and for human rights.

A part of the fight for human freedom is to keep politics as usual.

This year we will elect a State ticket, a Senator, and various Representatives. That means the people will register and go to the polling places. They will govern themselves as usual which means that politics will be as usual. When politics are not as usual we will no longer have a democracy and we will no longer have anything worth fighting for.

Let the incumbents defend themselves. Let the aspirants attack with constructive criticisms. Let the people decide. That's democracy. That's politics as usual. We can't see where there is anything unpatriotic about it. Let there be the usual number of investigations, inquiries, and hearings. Keep the searchlight on. It is our Government. If government by the people be right, and it is right, no part of government need be concealed. If government by the people be right in peacetime it is right in wartime. If the people cannot be trusted in emergency they cannot be trusted at all. Politics is nothing more than the system by which the people rule themselves. Any time politics departs from the usual the people will have a right to be more suspicious than usual.

Communist Charge Against Farmers Union Is Not Substantiated by Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, a vicious attack was made against the Farmers Union by one of our Senators, in which he charged that the Farmers Union was a Communist-front organization. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am a member of the Farmers Union and was identified with the organization and development of the Equity Society of America and the Equity Exchange at St. Paul; I aided in organizing the Farmers Union, which was the successor of the organizations above named.

The National Farmers Union has supported the President, as that is their perfect constitutional right; they have supported the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, and appropriations generally to prevent communistic aggression, and have very definitely fixed the blame for the Korean invasion on Russia. Does that sound like a Communist front? I do not always agree with the National Farmers Union, but that is my right. In presenting here the resolutions of the board of directors of the National Farmers Union in answer to the irresponsible charges of a Member of the other body, I wish to say that I approve that resolution on all points mentioned. Here is the resolution:

The National Farmers Union board of directors adopted the following statement at a meeting in Denver, Saturday, September 9, 1950. The board is composed of all presidents of State Farmers Union organizations.

"Senator BRIDGES' attack in the Senate on the National Farmers Union has done a disservice to the cause of truth and decency by resorting to the tactics made infamous by totalitarian dictators in Italy, Germany, and Russia. His assignment to such a role in the Washington drama of terrorism and deception obviously was made because he has no Farmers Union members in his State, and, therefore, he can safely pretend to bravery in his name calling. Few will envy him the responsibility he has accepted for this unsavory attack on the second oldest farm organization in the United States, an organization whose basic political philosophy has its roots deep in the American soil and in the fundamental principles of democracy.

"The speed with which fellow Senators repudiated the charges made by BRIDGES is clear indication of the lack of foundation for the statements.

"As every honest observer knows, the Farmers Union is not communistic and is not a Communist-front organization. Farmers Union officials on many occasions have denounced communism as well as other forms of totalitarianism. For example, on July 29, an official statement of the President, approved by the executive committee, charged the North Korean aggressors had been trained and agitated into waging war on South Korea by Russia.

"We, the democratically elected presidents of State Farmers Union organizations, constituting the board of directors of the National Farmers Union, and representing more than 400,000 farm people, support and approve that declaration.

"The Farmers Union will not be diverted in its determination to follow the course it has pursued for 48 years, that of fighting for the interests of family farmers, who represent the bulwark of democracy in this great Nation. We will not be muzzled by such use of fear techniques of dictatorship.

"We are for the freedom and dignity of the individual citizen, and we will continue to oppose any hysteria-spawned legislation that threatens that freedom and dignity.

"We are for the independent family farm operator, and we will continue to fight for the Brannan farm program and any other legislation that we regard as aiding family farmers.

"We are for a healthy Nation, and we will continue to fight for a national health-insurance program.

"We are for the strengthening of such instruments of true democracy as farmer cooperatives, and we will continue to fight the monopolies that seek to tear down these instruments.

"We are for genuine international collaboration to build a peaceful and prosperous world, and we will continue to support wholeheartedly the United Nations.

"We herewith rededicate ourselves to the ideals of our organization and pledge ourselves to answer any and all attacks by building a Farmers Union increasingly more effective for the strengthening of democracy."

Retailing Daily Praises Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by Earl Lifshey, which appeared in the Retailing Daily of New York City, on September 11, 1950:

ARKANSAS TRAVELER

(By Earl Lifshey)

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., September 10.—It's high time we big-city hillbillies stopped selling Arkansas so short. Even a brief visit to the pine tree State should be enough to convince any but the most uncomprehending that tremendously exciting things are happening here and that our traditional cartoon-concept of it as being primarily a place of bare-footed, mule-riding mountaineer

moonshiners is just so much more Manhattan madness.

Since the war Arkansas has been revolutionizing its economy in an effort to balance its agriculture with industry. At long last the tremendous potentials of the State's great natural resources, (which include the only United States diamond mine) are being recognized. "Land of opportunity" say all Arkansas car license plates; "Arkansas is opportunity" say the Little Rocklans and a host of former GI's have returned to seize their share. The statistics sparkle; some samples:

In 1939 the State had 1,178 manufacturing firms—now there are almost 4,000 with a growing list of big names. (A G-M division just opened an aluminum auto-parts pilot plant near Malvern.) Last year the value of manufactured goods hit nearly a billion dollars; lumber production hit one and one-half billion feet (could hit three). In 1939 Arkansas produced $11,500,000 worth of furniture—last year it nearly doubled that amount. Fifty percent of every tax dollar is going for schools. Little Rock is having the greatest increase in housing of any city its size. Vigorous healthy growth is evident everywhere—you can almost hear it.

Must We Change Our Mining Laws?—Report of the Chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee on the Conference on Revision of United States Mining Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a determined effort on the part of some of the Government departments to abrogate the mine lode location law and in the place of this law enact a mineral leasing system to include not only the nonmetallic minerals but also the nonferrous metals of all classes such as gold, silver, copper, lead, and zinc—and thereby take away one of our last remaining birthrights to procure and own any of the natural resources in the public lands.

Before making any of these proposed changes in our mining laws, Congress should give thoughtful consideration to the effect such a plan would have on the development of our mining industry and the utilization of the Nation's mineral resources.

Only recently, I was informed that leasers had been successful in taking over all the known nitrate deposits in the public lands, and thus had a monopoly, and were charging exorbitant prices for nitrate and nitrate fertilizer.

The whole program of the changes proposed in our mining laws by these Government departments has been the subject of an investigation reported in the Hearings on the Conference on Revision of United States Mining Laws, pursuant to House Resolution 66. The report and recommendations made in connection with the hearings by myself as chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining is presented herewith:

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINING TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I have the honor to report to the members of the House Committee on Public Lands the findings of the joint investigation conducted by the members of the Public Lands Subcommittee and the representatives of the Bureau of Land Management concerning the development of mineral deposits on the public lands, and the effect of the suggested changes in the provisions of the Federal mining laws proposed in the memorandum recently issued by the Bureau of Land Management.

The transcript of the record of the joint hearings held in Spokane, Wash., on October 17 and 18, 1949, together with addenda and mining illustrations, are submitted herewith for the record of the Public Lands Committee and the consideration of Congress.

Mining in all its branches ranks second in our basic industries. The development of the Nation's mining industry since colonial times, when the mother country, England, forbade the American Colonies to manufacture so much as a horseshoe or horseshoe nail, has outstripped mining in every other country in the world.

To the constructive Government policy that gave this country its liberal mining laws, which stimulated the development and utilization of our mineral resources, must be credited in a large measure the successful defense of our country, the preservation of our Government, and the present preeminent position this Nation has attained among world powers.

No other nation, with the possible exception of Canada, enjoys the constructive and liberal mining laws that foster mining and protect the rights of their citizens to go upon the public domain to seek, acquire, and utilize mineral deposits.

The mining laws enacted in 1872 established the rules and regulations by which our citizens could go into the unsurveyed and unexplored rugged mountain sections of the Western States to search for, acquire, and perfect their rights to their newly discovered mineral wealth by staking mining claims which were theirs to hold as long as they complied with Government regulations.

The plan embodied in these Government laws has worked so well that mining flourishes in every State where minerals have been discovered, and the Nation's factories and industries are abundantly supplied with the minerals and metals used in the fabrication of the vast assortment of things used in every branch of human endeavor.

It is now proposed to modify and change the provisions of the existing laws, as set forth in a memorandum recently issued by the Department of Interior.

Without changing the mining laws, there should be a turn to the Government policy that has been followed in the past, of fostering and assisting mining development. If the location work and annual assessment work requirements are complied with, the rights and enterprise of our citizens to own, develop and patent mining claims will be protected, and mining development on public land will be encouraged and the development of the Nation's mining industry will be stimulated.

The Government's constructive policy as enacted in the provisions of the Federal mining laws were designed to encourage the search for mineral deposits and stimulate mine development. This plan has been carried out by giving any of its citizens the right to locate a mining claim on public land by performing 10 feet of discovery work on each claim staked and the right to hold possession of the same by expending $100 annually in labor or improvement, and the further right to acquire title to each claim or group of mining claims on which $500 has been expended, and fulfilling the provisions of the Government requirement by making a final payment of $5 per acre or fraction of an acre contained in each mining claim patented to the applicant.

Laws suspending the requirements for the performance of the annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims were enacted by the Congress for the protection and temporary relief of mining claim owners in meeting impossible labor conditions as a result of the war emergency and depressed financial conditions. This emergency relief measure was not intended to be and should not be a permanent Government policy. With the expiration of this temporary law and the restoration of the requirements for the performance of the annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims, much of the uncertainty as to title will be removed, and the stimulus to mining development will be restored.

In considering the conditions affecting the acquisition and holding of mining claims, and the proposed change in the Government's policy and provisions of the mining laws presented in the memorandum of the Department of Interior, it appears that the experience gained in the development of the Nation's mining resources and the facts relating to geological conditions and the uncertainty as to the location, extent and character of mineral deposits in underground vein structures should be taken into consideration, as well as the conditions to be met in financing, exploring, equipping and operating a new mining property to the producing stage by owners of moderate means. It is urged that the salient facts should be taken into account by those in Government departments responsible for the formulation of Government policies in planning for utilization of the mining resources in the public lands.

Rarely do we find pay ore in the outcrop of a mineralized vein where these surface exposures have been weathered for millions of years. Attention is called to the fact that some of the veins containing the richest copper at depth in Butte are exposed and can be seen and traced in the surface in the railway cuts, and contain no ore of value in these surface exposures.

We know that the deep explorations of the mineralized veins in Butte, Mont., and in the Coeur d'Alene mining district in north Idaho, have encountered literally hundreds of extensive and extremely rich ore bodies of copper, lead, zinc, and occasionally silver ore literally thousands of feet below the surface.

Outcrops or traces of mineralized veins in our public lands are usually found on steep hillsides in rugged, mountainous country where the prospector or finder must search out the course of his vein and the existence of ore deposits that may exist in the underlying rock formations, in many cases covered over with a dense growth of brush and timber, and, in most places, overlaid with deep deposits of loose earth and gravel.

The plan usually followed in exploring a mineralized vein by the locator, who in most cases is a man of limited means, is to follow the vein into the hillside with a mine tunnel, with the result, in most cases, that while further development is encouraged, little or no pay ore is encountered in the mineralized contents of the vein. After the first tunnel has been extended at some length, it may be found advisable to explore the vein at a deeper level. Accordingly a second tunnel is driven farther down the hillside where the

mineralization in the veins may be found to contain a series of submarginal ore bodies within and along the vein without the discovery of pay ore. Indications in the vein may encourage the owner to look for richer ore in the lower horizons of the vein by driving a still lower tunnel, or sinking a shaft and opening the lower levels in the mine by driving a series of tunnels on levels deeper and deeper underground, where water may complicate mining difficulties.

Once the exploration of a vein structure is undertaken by a locator or a group of investors of limited means, in the hope of developing a paying mine, these owners may continue to work their claims year after year, spending their money to equip and explore their mining properties which usually consist of a group of unpatented mining claims. Until ore is found in paying quantities, these owners can ill afford to divert their limited funds, available to continue their search for pay ore, to finance the expensive process of patenting a group of unproven mining claims and shoulder the burden of paying real-estate taxes on land where paying ore may not exist.

The proposed change in the mining laws that would force owners of unpatented mining claims to make cash outlays for costly mining patents at the end of 3 years or forfeit all the work that has been done, and the money that has been expended in exploring a vein structure in unpatented mining claims on public lands, undertaken in good faith by men of limited means in the hope and expectation of developing a paying mine, is impractical and unfair, and will seriously retard the development and utilization of our mineral resources.

It is stated by the Bureau of Land Management that "In practice most mining claims are not located for mining purposes."

When consideration is given to the cost of labor in doing the prescribed 10 feet of discovery work, and the annual assessment work of $100 as a requisite of obtaining and holding each unpatented mining claim, and the further requirement to be met in obtaining title by mine patent that $500 of work must be done on each claim or group of mining claims, with outlays to be made for costly surveys and legal service, and a final payment to the Federal Government of $5 for each acre or fraction of an acre embraced in a patented mining claim, we find the effort and expense of obtaining title to the 20 acres comprised in a mining claim is on the average more costly than obtaining title to Government land than under other provisions of law providing for the acquisition of public land.

The tax revenue received from building and improvements placed on an unpatented mining claim, and the real estate taxes on patented mining claims paid each year to the county and State where the claims are located, seems to be completely overlooked. Taxes that go to support schools, roads, and other State and county activities, as well as income taxes received by the Federal Government from those owning or employed on this class of property, should be taken into account.

In considering the benefits received by the schools, the county and State governments from the disposal of the land and timber, if any, the miner may obtain and utilize in developing his mining claim, contrasted with the benefit derived from the disposal of national forest timber exchanged with privately owned lumber companies for denuded cut-over stump lands in a plan which operates to take this privately owned land off the tax rolls and deprive the schools of their 25 percent of the proceeds received under the provisions of existing law from cash sales of national forest timber, it appears the benefits derived from the mining claims and patented mining property far outweigh the benefits derived by the Government and the American people from this forest program.

In California where Government officials are obstructing mining development by contesting mine locations and mine patent applications in the national forest on every pretext, many of these mining locations have been staked in worthless brushlands. We learn that in making land exchanges, the Forest Service has openly induced the lumber companies to retain the mineral rights in the cut-over lands traded to the Government for standing timber, so the prospector could be barred from these reacquired lands for the reason the minerals was in private ownership.

In considering the use of public domain for the propagation and protection of wildlife and for public recreation, we find there is little interference with wildlife and recreation by the miner and prospector in the staking and development of mining claims, which are, for the most part, in isolated areas where the public and game can range over the surface at will. It is only after paying ore is developed and large mining operations take over, that industry replaces the wilds that had been frequented occasionally by vacationists and wildlife in its migration.

In weighing the benefits that accrue to the people of this country between the conservation of wildlife and recreational areas and the developments and utilization of our mineral resources, it may be pointed out that both Manchuria and Ethiopia abound in areas suitable for recreation with an abundance of wildlife, but when these nations failed to utilize the mineral resources and develop their mining industry, they were helpless when attacked and were despoiled by the invader. Under our system of development of our resources, a balance is maintained between industrial utilization and the conservation of wildlife and recreational uses.

In considering the problems of the Forest Service, and the list of alleged fraudulent mining locations in California, presented by the Bureau of Land Management, it seems that there has been a conflict between mining development and forest conservation, with mining getting the worst of it, due to the obstructive program being followed by local Forest Service officials. It develops that if the outcrop of mineralized veins and lodes which the prospectors were seeking to locate did not contain paying ore where an outcrop was exposed, these veins were simply declared nonmineral by the representative of the Forest Service, and by his dicta, they were nonmineral, with the result that the exploration and utilization of indicated underlying mineral deposits are effectively stopped.

The same rule could have been applied to most of the outcrops of the veins of many of the Nation's famous ore producers that contained little in the way of pay ore in the outcrop which later have been developed into big mines by deeper exploration. For instance, the United Verde Extension, the New Cornelia, the Polaris, the original Anaconda at Butte, the Hercules, the Independence on Cripple Creek, and thousands of other mines scattered all over the world.

We know that the autocratic and restrictive policy of the Forest Service officials in dealing with mining development throughout the West has given rise to the unpopularity of bureaucrtic control.

The record discloses that the Forest Service attempted to set up a mine-leasing program for the mining of nonferrous metals in administering the lands reacquired under the Weeks law, and had printed for distribution rules and regulations for leasing these lands for the extraction of metals and nonmetallic minerals but for some reason the book containing these rules and regulations was withdrawn and the leasing scheme was abandoned.

While the Federal Government is spending millions of dollars to construct access logging roads to isolated timber areas within the national forests, very little, if anything, is being done to build mine-access roads to isolated mining districts in the national forests and mineralized public-land areas. In contrast to this neglectful policy as to mining, our neighbor, Canada, on the north appears to be going the limit in encouraging and assisting the development of its mining resources by enacting liberal mining laws by providing geological advice, building mine access trails and roads, and maintaining a liberal and constructive policy, governing the issuance and marketing of mining securities and has outstripped this country in the development and utilization of their mining resources, with a stimulating effect on Canada's national economy.

We learn that when Canada expected and prepared for a severe financial recession during the depression years in this country, the inflow of mining investment capital and the outflow of mine production buoyed and sustained Canada's national economy, and spared the Dominion much of the financial distress experienced at the time in other countries.

The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management should be relieved of the proprietary complex. Government policies should be formulated and laws enacted that will convince the officials of these Federal departments of the intent of Congress to follow a policy of preserving and safeguarding the right of the individual citizen to acquire, develop, and utilize the natural resources in the public domain, which have been intrusted to the custody and administration of these agencies of the Federal Government.

The separation of the surface and subsurface rights of mining claims is impractical and unworkable. The locator or owner of a mining claim or group of mining claims seeks the discovery and development of pay ore, and in making underground explorations requires surface areas for the disposal of the excavated material. He requires room to construct the necessary mine buildings. When pay ore is developed he requires large surface areas for timberyards and the storage of material, mill sites, haulageways and miscellaneous passageways, and mine structures. It is out of reason to expect the operation of a producing mine to be confined to restricted surface areas.

The proposal to tie up as much as 2,560 acres of Government land in a mining district by a single owner or company in a geological mining claim that may embrace several units of 640 acres of land, without complying with the provisions of the mine location law, approaches the policy and plan being followed in granting wholesale mining concessions as practiced in European, African, and South American countries, and is contrary to sound public policy and is not in the interests of the prospector and the average American citizen and will operate to deprive them of their rights to locate, develop, and procure title to mineral deposits in unappropriated public lands.

This proposed change in the mining law could be used by special interests to tie up all the public land in an entire mining district for a long period of time to the exclusion of the miner prospector.

With the abrogation of the rights of a citizen to obtain possession or title to public lands under the Homestead Act or the stone and timber law, by the provisions of the

Taylor Grazing Act we find that practically all of the remaining unappropriated land has been withdrawn and is now embraced within the national forests or Taylor grazing districts, and the only opportunity the average citizen has to obtain any public land is to find a mineral deposit and locate a mining claim, and now the Bureau of Land Management seeks to take away from the American citizen this last birthright.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In reviewing the Federal mining laws and the stimulating effect of the application of these laws on the progress that has been made in development and utilization of the Nation's mineral resources, we concur with the Hoover Commission in their recommendation which states: "The mineral patent system, under which outright ownership of mines can be acquired, has remained unchanged since its enactment on May 10, 1872. Under it, prospecting of the public domain has been extensive. Protection has been assured to claims on which a discovery has been made while exploration and development to establish the value of the discovery were carried on. The discoverer has been eventually rewarded by grant of title by patent to a holding of prescribed size. The system has worked well, and the committee favors the retention of location and patenting for the mineral deposits to which it now applies."

Your committee further recommends that in the light of present-day mining experience in the discovery of extensive ore deposits that have no surface exposure, we recommend that the validity of mining claims in mineralized districts or adjacent to proven mines be recognized without the requirement of discovery of valuable minerals, so that ground without surface exposures or other positive evidence of ore or other valuable mineral deposits can be acquired and explored under the provisions of the Federal mining laws.

To avoid confusion and uncertainty concerning the status of the appropriations of public lands we further recommend that the provisions of of the Federal mining laws be amended to provide that mine location notices filed for record with the county recorder, after being recorded in the county where the mining claims are located, be forwarded to the nearest Federal land office for recording with the Bureau of Land Management.

In recognition of the fact that the greater part of the mineralized areas of the public lands in rugged and inaccessible mountainous areas of the country are embraced within the boundaries of the national forests and that the development of these mines is dependent in a large measure on the policy of the Forest Service, we respectfully recommend that a division of mining be established within the Forest Service in charge of competent mining executives or experienced mining engineers, so that the Government's mining resources, discovered and undiscovered, within the national forest land may be given proper consideration in the administration of the national forests and the allocation of funds appropriated for the utilization and development of the natural resources within the national forest.

Recognizing the need for an active, prosperous, and productive mining industry as a safeguard to the national defense, we recommend and urge the restoration of a liberal and constructive legislative and administrative policy in fostering and encouraging the continued development of our mining industry.

Respectfully submitted.

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Chairman.

Cavendish W. Cannon, United States Minister to Syria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, last Friday the Senate confirmed the nomination of Cavendish W. Cannon, to be United States Minister to Syria and for other ambassadorial duties. The nomination was acted upon so rapidly that I did not get to say what I wanted to say about Mr. Cannon, one of Utah's distinguished citizens. He is highly regarded. He is a career diplomat, who has served faithfully and loyally, and with great efficiency in various parts of the earth. His last assignment was as Ambassador to Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, two editorials, one entitled, "One of Utah's Famous Sons Is an Able Diplomat," published in the Salt Lake Tribune of September 14, 1950, and the other entitled "Cavendish W. Cannon Goes to Syria," published in the Salt Lake Deseret News of September 14, 1950. Both editorials deal with Mr. Cannon's appointment.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of September 14, 1950]

ONE OF UTAH'S FAMOUS SONS IS AN ABLE DIPLOMAT

The active and distinguished son of Utah who has received commendation and advancement in the diplomatic service during the past 2 years has been assigned to an important post in the Middle East, where his exceptional qualifications are especially needed.

As Ambassador to Yugoslavia he was instrumental in the establishment of friendly relations with the Tito regime and thus preventing the Soviet Union from adding another power to its galaxy of satellites. Recently he was assigned to a wider sphere of action as a member of the National Planning Board, a department that molds the foreign policy of this Republic.

According to a press dispatch from Washington, he was chosen for this position because of his wide and practical background of dealing with the peoples of eastern Europe and combating the influence of Soviet propagandists in that critical area. "The appointment gave him the title of chief political consultant for Europe and the Near East, although Mr. Cannon's assignment virtually covers the entire globe," said the announcement.

Word has just been received that Cavendish Wells Cannon, Utah's astute State Department trouble-shooter, has been given a new assignment to one of the hot spots of the globe. The President has nominated him to represent this country in Syria, where another uprising similar to that in Korea is threatened.

It is believed that Mr. Cannon will be able to avert another local war while police forces of the United Nations are trying to quell the communistic disturbance in Asia.

[From the Salt Lake Deseret News of September 14, 1950]

CAVENDISH W. CANNON GOES TO SYRIA

Cavendish W. Cannon, former United States Ambassador to Yugoslavia, and more recently a member of the planning board of the State Department in Washington, D. C., has been appointed as United States Minister to Syria.

Cavendish W. Cannon makes national and international news. He is one of the truly experienced and efficient career diplomats in the service of this Nation, and has been assigned some of the most tricky and difficult responsibilities that could fall on men in foreign service. He got his European background through 19 years in the United States consular service, much of which was as vice consul in Sofia, Bulgaria, during the thirties when this city was one of the most important listening posts on the Communist fringe.

His transfer to the State Department, and his service as Ambassador to Yugoslavia followed. He has represented the United States in vital conferences at Moscow, at Potsdam, and in London.

Of special personal interest is the fact that Cavendish Cannon grew up right here in Salt Lake City. He is a son of the late John Q. Cannon, long-time editor of the Deseret News, and a grandson of George Q. Cannon, formerly a member of the first presidency of the church.

His personal connections with Utah are interesting, but not nationally important. His Syrian appointment is of very great importance, as affairs in the Middle East are threatening to come to a boil, and a man of Cavendish Cannon's sound experience and proven judgment is needed in such a post.

Financial Help Now Essential to Nation's Medical Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent third-round defeat in committee of legislation to provide urgently needed Federal aid to the medical and health-training institutions of our country, the following article entitled "Financial Help Now Essential to Nation's Medical Schools" by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, veteran New York Times medical reporter, New York Sunday Times, September 17, 1950, is particularly relevant reading for Members of the Congress, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

FINANCIAL HELP NOW ESSENTIAL TO NATION'S MEDICAL SCHOOLS—COLLEGE FACILITIES KEEP UP WITH POPULATION, BUT TRAINING COSTS GO UP MORE RAPIDLY

(By Howard A. Rusk)

This month about 7,000 fortunate young men and women will start their first year of medical school. They are fortunate because they were chosen from the 24,434 persons who applied last spring to an average of three or four different medical schools.

Upon first glance it appears paradoxical that cries are heard in many quarters for more and more physicians, and legislation is being enacted to draft doctors for the Armed Forces, while thousands of prospective young students are denied the opportunity of studying medicine.

This view was taken last January at a meeting in Cincinnati of the academic deans of several colleges and universities whose actions indicated that they believed there was a serious shortage of doctors that there was insufficient competition to maintain a high quality of education or medical service and that research suffers because thousands of qualified young men and women do not get into medical school. The problem, however, is not so simple as this.

Today in the United States there are 72 medical schools and 7 schools of basic medical sciences. These 79 schools had a total enrollment of 25,103 students last year. This is compared with 66 class A medical schools with an enrollment of 12,530 students in 1910; 70 class A medical schools with an enrollment of 12,559 in 1920; 76 approved medical schools with a total enrollment of 21,597 in 1930, and 77 approved medical schools with 21,271 students in 1940.

COST OF EDUCATION MOUNTS

With the increase in the number of physicians, there has been a disproportionate increase in the cost of medical education. Comparative data show that the educational expense of medical schools nearly doubled between 1941 and 1948. In that period the depression of the 1930's and later increased taxation resulted in less private funds available for endowment.

One large medical school estimates that it now costs nearly $14,000 to train a medical student for 4 years. Tuition fees covered 70 percent of the costs of medical education in 1910, but they account for less than 25 percent at present, for, obviously, the current high costs of medical education cannot be borne by the students. The council on medical agencies and hospitals of the American Medical Association has reported recently that budgets of medical schools for 1950–51 totaled about $76,500,000. This is an increase of $19,500,000, or 42 percent, in the last 4 years.

Recently the House Interstate Commerce Committee voted 9 to 8 to table a bill providing Federal aid for the operation of medical schools and for construction and equipment. Following this action, Representative ANDREW BIEMILLER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, introduced a new bill (H. R. 9508) that provides $15,000,000 a year for a 5-year period for construction grants to educational institutions in the health fields. This bill, which was tabled, side-steps the controversial issue that Federal grants for operations might lead to Federal control. The Senate has already passed a bill providing for both construction and operational grants.

Even if unlimited funds were made available for medical education, this alone would not make it possible for all who wish to attend medical school, for there are the interrelated problems of laboratory facilities, clinical training, teaching personnel and other factors that make medicine the most complex of professional courses.

SCHOOL FACILITIES KEEP PACE

Despite these difficulties, the opportunity to study medicine in approved medical schools has practically doubled in the last 40 years, and has more than kept pace with the growth in population. This week's issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association reports that the number of freshmen medical students increased last year by 5.3 percent to 7,042. This is a 17 percent increase over the average-size freshman class in the 10 years preceding World War II.

The shortage of doctors is real, but not as acute as some alarmists would indicate. The new doctor draft legislation is for the purpose of providing an equitable system of service in the Armed Forces, and not primarily because of an over-all shortage of doctors. With the closing of a number of inferior, second-rate medical schools during the period of 1904–14, the number of physicians to 100,000 population in the United States declined from 149 in 1909 to 125 in 1929. Since 1929, the ratio has risen steadily, until today it is 133.

At the same time, however, specialization, increased research, higher standards of care, better distribution of services, and new programs such as industrial medicine and public health have created a need for more doctors. As our national income is at the highest level in history, more people have the funds to buy the medical service that they need.

It is obvious that if the medical schools are to maintain even the present quality of medical education, much less expand to meet the present shortage of doctors, they must have financial help. In view of the present national emergency, differences must be resolved and action taken, for some type of Federal aid is an urgent necessity.

Appointment of Edgar B. Brossard as Member of the United States Tariff Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brossard Nomination," published in the Washington Post of September 15, 1950, commenting on the nomination of Edgar Bernard Brossard to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission. Mr. Brossard's nomination was confirmed last Friday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROSSARD NOMINATION

President Truman was well advised to reappoint Edgar B. Brossard to the Tariff Commission. The nomination had been held up for many weeks and rumors had spread that it would not be made. Dr. Brossard was an economist for the Commission before he was advanced to a commissionership 25 years ago. Since then he has gained a vast knowledge of the country's economic problems and an invaluable experience in fact-finding and laying the economic groundwork for governmental policies. In addition to his work at the Commission, he served on the executive committee of the interdepartmental group responsible for the scientific and cultural cooperative program—the forerunner of point 4. He was also a delegate to the Geneva and Habana Conferences at which the charter for the International Trade Organization was worked out. The high quality of his work is attested by the endorsement given him by many agricultural, business and labor organizations and by Members of the Senate and House of both political parties from the 11 Western States.

While the Tariff Commission is a bipartisan body, its work calls for economists and expert fact finders. That Dr. Brossard, a Republican member, has worked primarily as an economist interested in the national welfare is indicated by the widespread, bipartisan support accorded him. This is no time to lose such experienced men from the public service. It is to be hoped that the Senate will confirm the nomination before adjourning.

Another Look at the Tariff Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an article appearing in the current issue of the journal of the United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers Union, A. F. of L., by O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy which deals with the Nation's existing tariff problems.

This is an objective and thoughtful discussion of an important issue, one bound to become even more important when the present emergency ends and we turn back to normal times.

The article follows:

In order properly to understand the tariff question, it is necessary to understand the reason for trade among the nations in the first place. The fact is that nations do not produce all of their requirements in the way of goods and commodities. There is the further fact that some nations produce some items which other nations need but which the latter themselves do not produce. On the other hand, the nations that have a scarcity of particular products may produce other products which other nations require for their own economy. Under those circumstances, the natural basis of trade exists.

The first natural development then is for each nation to import those commodities which they themselves do not produce or produce in a quantity which is not sufficient for their requirements. The theory of free trade, in fact, is based on this kind of disposition of resources among the various nations of the world.

The basic concept of free trade consists of each country producing those commodities for which it is best fitted and to import from other countries commodities which the other countries produce to better advantage. The theory is that in this way each nation will devote its economic energies to the production of the commodities and the goods for which it is best fitted and to draw from other countries those goods and commodities for which they are best fitted. Assuming that all nations act on this principle, all the peoples in this world would be devoting their energies to the end of greatest possible production in each country.

This is an idealistic economic concept and was propagated particularly by the British political economists in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. England, under this theory, became the workshop of the world. By drawing their raw materials from other countries and taking them into England and fabricating them and then exporting the finished products to other countries which were not industrialized, England was able to build up a very strong and prosperous economy. This theory which fitted so well the British economy was in a sense imported into the United States and was taught in the

colleges and universities and particularly in the schools of economics of such institutions.

It became apparent in a very short period of time, however, that the United States was in a different position from that of England in the days when she was the workshop of the world. The United States was a young country and had few, if any, industries and imported most of the manufactured and finished products which she needed from England and the other European countries. In order to build up her own industry, it was found necessary to erect certain barriers against imports from abroad in order to protect the industries in this country which were only getting under way and did not have the advantages of the skills and machinery which had already been developed overseas.

Under this system of protection, the United States did develop in time into an industrial nation. There was some inconvenience to this system, however, because in the United States industrial activity was confined considerably to the northern part of the country. The Southern States were primarily agricultural in character and it soon dawned upon them that the prices which they paid for manufactured products produced in the Northern States were somewhat high because of the very fact that the industries were protected by a high tariff. As a result, the Southern States tended more and more toward the idea of free trade, while the northern industrial States insisted upon protection.

BECOMES POLITICAL

It was not long before the tariff became a political issue upon this basis. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, the Democratic Party, as everyone knows, associated itself with the free-trade philosophy, whereas the Republican Party was dedicated to the idea of protection. This political division continued through the end of the century and on each occasion that the Republicans came into power, a new tariff bill was brought up and, in general, the tendency was either to increase the tariff or to bring additional items under tariff protection. On the other hand, when the Democrats came into power, their first step was to lower the tariffs existing at the time they came into power.

This alternation of high and low tariffs continued through the Woodrow Wilson administration, through the Coolidge and Hoover administrations. With the advent of the New Deal, the previous philosophy of free trade was again embraced by the Democratic Party, but on a somewhat different basis from the previous system. The idea was launched that world trade could be freed of barriers by a system of reciprocal trade agreements. Since 1934 some forty-odd trade agreements have been negotiated by the United States, and the tariffs on the whole and on the average have been decreased by some 50 percent.

The question now arises whether these tariff reductions have gone too far or whether they have not been carried to the extent that they might be, or whether, having gone far enough, they should now be halted.

FREE TRADE

Going back now to the theory of free trade, there are several observations that may be made with respect to the United States. In the first place, the United States does honor the principle of free trade to the total of two-thirds of its imports each year. During the past 40 years, from 60 to 65 percent of our total imports have come in free of duty. The items that are free of duty consist largely of raw materials and other commodities which are not easily produced in the United States or could not be produced without sacrificing economic principles. Among the items that are imported free of duty are such commodities as coffee, tin, rubber, bananas, undressed furs, hides and skins, newsprint.

On the other hand, there are items which are produced abroad but which are also produced in this country, but upon which we do insist upon having some tariff protection. Now, what is the basis for this protection? The basis lies in the fact that the advantage which other countries have competitively over the United States in the production of these goods, lies not in any advantages of soil or climate or skill in the country of origin, but rather in the fact that other countries, without exception, pay lower wages than are paid in the United States. In other words, the principles of free trade as enunciated by Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, and other political economists do not really call upon us to import items in which other countries merely possess an unfair economic advantage. So long as the advantage enjoyed by other countries consists in the mere fact that they pay lower wages than those prevailing in this country, it cannot be said that we violate the principles of free trade when we seek to place those commodities on a competitive parity in our own market.

The question remains whether or not the competitive advantage which is derived from lower wages than those prevailing in this country is really one that can be justified. It is usually said that the consumers in this country are entitled to the cheaper products which are thus made available to them, permitting them to make certain savings in their dollars and to take these savings and buy other commodities. In this connection it should be said that the political economists who enunciated and elaborated on the theory of free trade did not take into consideration the disparity in wages prevailing in the different nations. No thought appears to have been given at all to this differential.

The very New Deal, which espoused the reciprocal trade agreements program was responsible in great part for making this country and perhaps other countries, wage conscious. This consciousness was carried to the extent that one of the prime purposes of the national minimum wage legislation was to protect those employers who pay high rates in wages, against the type of competition which bases its advantages on lower wage payments. Employers who engaged union labor found themselves at a great disadvantage when they were exposed to competition from employers who were not unionized or who paid in some instances sweatshop wages. It was realized that high wage standards could not be maintained under such conditions. As a result, the idea of establishing national minimum wages made headway and was finally enacted into law.

PARITIES ESTABLISHED

About the same time attention was given to the fact that farm prices had a tendency to fall below the price level of manufactured goods. As a result, the principle of price parities was established and was recognized as a national institution. The system of price supports was enacted and is still in effect. Thus our economy was bolstered both in the field of wages and in the field of farm prices. Neither the industrial labor nor the agricultural segment of our economy was to be allowed to fall out of balance and thus upset the economy as a whole.

Strangely enough, our economy was to be exposed without benefit of such protective measures to the undermining competitive influences of imports which derived their principal advantage from low-wage scales. Thus the domestic producer is protected from the influences of low wages paid within our own country, but is to be subjected to unfair competition from abroad. Why it should be thought necessary to set up protective measures within our own country while exposing our producers to the same kind of competition from other countries, often in a much more serious form than any experienced within our own country, is something of a mystery. As economic philosophy, this seems to be entirely contradictory.

In answering this charge of contradiction, the supporters of the trade agreements program maintain that the United States can outproduce all the other countries of the world and therefore has nothing to fear from foreign competition. It is true, of course that the United States can and does outproduce other countries in the mass-production industries. In the production of automobiles, steel, electrical equipment and appliances we have no peer anywhere in the world. However, there are numerous smaller industries which supply us with a wide variety of products that we need in this country and which we consume from coast to coast, that do not have the advantage of mass production. This is simply in the nature of the case. Consumption is not sufficiently large to permit the installation of mass-production systems or the variety of the products is so great that they do not lend themselves to this type of production. We have only to mention such products as toys, scientific instruments, pottery, glassware, hardware, pharmaceutical items, and many others to be reminded that not all of our industries consist of production line types. In other words, the advantages, the economic advantages, of mass production do not extend to all of our industries. It is in this wide variety of miscellaneous industries that the impact of foreign competition makes itself felt.

Yet the fact remains that these industries pay wages that compare very favorably with those paid in the mass-production industries. Unless some form of protection is granted these industries, it is quite obvious that they will not be able to withstand the kind of competition they will be called upon to meet if the tariffs are cut below a point which will guarantee competitive parity in this country with imported products. Typically the measures of protection which we have historically used have consisted principally of the tariff either in the form of ad valorem rates or in the form of specific rates or a combination of the two. Other nations have used many other forms of protection, among them import quotas, import licenses, exchange controls, barter arrangements, and many other related devices.

QUOTA BARRIERS

Our State Department is on record before all the world to the effect that quotas are the worst form of trade barriers. Thus the United States has condemned out-of-hand all forms of quota regardless of their character. This has been most unfortunate. It has been most unfortunate because quotas need not necessarily be restrictive of trade. They need not necessarily act as a trade barrier and can, in fact, be of great advantage to our own producers as well as foreign producers, and foreign exporters. I suggest that the State Department has taken an extremely narrow view of the case.

Quotas may be devised which bear a certain relation to past imports and past consumption and production in this country by the utilization of which products could be brought into this country without restricting their comparatively free flow. The device is very simple. I would propose that in suitable cases, many of which can be found, imports be limited to quantities which can be determined by reference to records of past years and then permit imports to continue, in direct proportion to consumption in this country.

FEAR IMPORTS

Assuming that during a representative past period 10 percent of a given item had

been imported into this country, that is, 10 percent of the total consumption, then 10 percent of total consumption would be permitted to be imported in future years. It is obvious that as consumption in this country increased imports would also increase. The great advantage of this proposal lies in the fact that it would remove from imports the effects which are most feared by our producers and by our wage earners. This fear is the fear of the effects of low-priced imports upon our own price structure. In a buyer's market the ability of foreign exporters to sell in this country in competition with our own producers at prices lower than those which are offered by our own manufacturers can be very disruptive of the market.

It is the unkown factor of how great a supply is available abroad for shipping to this country at low prices that does the damage. A quota limitation would remove this question, this doubt, this fear, and would permit our producers to plan for the future and to establish production schedules accordingly. They could systematically plan their plant expansions, renewal of equipment, and other outlays of capital. When, on the other hand, it is not known how large a supply is available or potentially available from abroad, it is extremely difficult to plan for future production and for future plant expansions and the reequipment of plants and factories. All of this has a depressing effect on the economy. It affects employment; it affects wages; and it affects the hours of work. If, in place of this uncertainty, it were known definitely that in any case no more than a certain percentage of the total consumption would be imported, then the producers would be free of this fear and uncertainty. Therefore, I say that the percentage quota system should be established in those commodities where such quota systems could be instituted with comparative ease.

There is little question that many industries in this country would be willing to accept quotas which would provide for a larger volume of imports than have previously come in, in return for the certainty that the quota limitation would establish. In many instances they might even be willing to have the tariff removed entirely.

This type of quota would have the additional great advantage of overcoming one of the great defects of any tariff. It is one of the notable facts of foreign trade that not all nations operate on the same economic level. Therefore, the competitive impact of the different countries upon the importing nations may vary greatly. Thus a rate of duty of 30 percent might establish competitive parity if applied to products, imported let us say, from Canada. On the other hand, on the same product, a rate of 3 or 4 or 500 percent might be necessary in order to produce similar competitive parity in this country on imports coming from some other country in which the labor standards are far below those of Canada. In such instances there is no single tariff rate that can perform the function for which tariffs have been established. Under those conditions, the percentage import quota would fill the gap and would very admirably perform the function in which the tariff has so completely failed.

CHANGED ECONOMY

Coming back now to the claim of the consumers to low prices; one thing should be made clear and that is that the United States economy today is not the United States economy of 1939. Today we are operating on an economic plateau. We have a national indebtedness of some $260,000,000,000 and a national budget ranging from forty to forty-five billions of dollars. To sustain this sort of structure of obligations and debts, it is absolutely necessary that the annual national income of this country be maintained well over the $200,000,000,000 mark. This cannot possibly be done unless prices are maintained at or near their present levels. This, in turn, cannot be accomplished unless wages remain high; unless production remains unusually high; unless fair profits are maintained and unless employment continues at the highest levels. Therefore, to say that the consumer is entitled to lower prices through imports of cheap goods from abroad, simply does not stand up.

The consumer, too, must make his contribution to this vast burden that we are carrying. The consumer is no more entitled to cheap prices based on cheap labor abroad than he is entitled to cheap prices based upon slave labor abroad. It is simply a matter of degree.

All in all, the chief protective problem of the United States arises from the fact that the United States is unique among all the nations of the world in the great good fortune of our country which lies in the fact that we have attained the highest standard of living in the entire world. This makes trade between us and other nations something quite different from trade among nations that are of an equal economic level. This fact has not been given sufficient acceptance and sufficient recognition. It makes of protection not a matter of selfishness or the promotion of selfish interests, but the maintenance of something which we have attained and for which all other countries are striving and to the attainment of which we can help them best and most effectively if we succeed in maintaining this high standard of living. Clearly, success in holding our unique position is dependent upon a reasonable degree of protection.

Marshall and China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of September 16 entitled "Marshall and China."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARSHALL AND CHINA

While it seems to us that what General Marshall can accomplish as Defense Chief is of overriding importance, a debate on China policy and his part in it might well clear the air. Let's hear the objections of Senators TAFT and WHERRY—and replies to them. The better Americans understand what has happened in China the better they will be prepared to deal with the future in the Far East.

It is easy now to point out some of the mistakes. The first was in continuing to consider Rusisa as an ally. The second was in believing that the Chinese Reds could be led to cooperate in a civil-war truce and the formation of a coalition government. General Marshall was sent to China late in 1945 as a mediator. He was also authorized to put pressure on Chiang Kai-shek to reform his government and end the civil war.

After a year's efforts General Marshall concluded that it was neither possible to make peace with the Communists nor to reform the Nationalist regime. But the effect on those efforts was to weaken the Chiang regime—which lost some military advantages in the truce, some face through American willingness to treat with the Reds, and some aid Washington withheld in endeavors to force reforms. For this the Truman-Acheson policy must bear responsibility.

But any fair judgment must weigh alternative policies. The chief of these was General Wedemeyer's plan for an American protectorate. That would have meant active, large-scale military intervention in China. It would have virtually made China an American colony and lost for the United States the moral position of a nonimperialist.

Moreover, an operation of such scope in Asia would almost surely have greatly curtailed American anti-Communist efforts in Europe. It might have foreclosed the Marshall plan and invited the disaster of Red political triumphs which so closely threatened France and Italy 3 years ago.

To assume that something less than the Wedemeyer plan would have done the job in China is to miss the nature of the change in that country. To imagine that the Marshall mission was the cause of the Communist triumph is to forget that America was dealing with a social revolution among 450,000,000 people. It is to forget that Chiang received $2,000,000,000 in postwar aid, especially arms which quickly fell into Red hands. It is to forget that popular rejection of a corrupt oligarchy had more to do with Nationalist defeat than any Communist military operations.

Debate on the Marshall role in China may well point up official mistakes. But it ought also to expose both the partisan insinuation that Washington sold out to Moscow and the shallow supposition that China can be rewon by backing a discredited and exiled regime. The genuine issue is not whether but how to combat the spread of Communist imperialism.

Numerous Misconceptions on Taxing Excess Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excellent article entitled "Numerous Misconceptions on Taxing Excess Profits," written by Lawrence L. McKenna, and published in the editorial section of the Sunday Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUMEROUS MISCONCEPTIONS ON TAXING EXCESS PROFITS—LEADS TO INFLATION INSTEAD OF DEFLATION; DOESN'T STOP WAR CONTRACT PROFITEERING

(By Lawrence L. McKenna)

Congress has no power greater than the power to tax—unless it is the power to spend. Through the use of these it can either create or destroy. And although they are sometimes used for various purposes, political and otherwise, which may be questioned, these powers were delegated to Congress by the framers of the Constitution so that the people might be assured that they would

always be used for the purpose of strengthening the Nation by adequately providing for the defense of the country and the general welfare of the people.

Today, with the Nation embarked on a military enterprise the implications of which are so vast it is difficult for the majority of the people fully to comprehend, the Congress, in the exercise of these powers, is presented with the choice of (1) taxing and spending wisely with a view to strengthening the country militarily, economically and socially, or (2) merely taxing and spending expediently with a view to strengthening political positions of parties and individuals.

CONNALLY-O'MAHONEY PROPOSAL

The interim tax bill was presented to Congress originally as a bill designed to reduce taxes rather than increase them. But the Korean war so changed the fiscal environment of the Federal Government that this legislation, first proposed as a tax relief measure, became a bill aimed at increasing taxes.

This tax legislation originally called for a reduction in excise taxes which contemplated a net loss in revenue of $910,000,000 annually. But when the bill was referred to the Senate-House Conference Committee last week it carried provisions calling for increases in taxes which contemplated raising total revenues by at least $3,000,000,000 in the current fiscal year, and by at least $4,500,000,000 annually when the law becomes fully effective.

Although this proposed increase in taxes was deemed to be quite substantial, there nevertheless were Senators who pressed for including an excess-profits tax provision in the bill. Four amendments designed to accomplish this were proposed. The most important of these, and the one around which debates in Congress raged, was the so-called Connally-O'Mahoney amendment.

The Connally-O'Mahoney amendment proposed a virtual reenactment of the excess-profits law which was in effect during World War II. The only essential difference between the law proposed by this amendment and the law in effect during World War II was in the base established for computing the tax.

The World War II Excess-Profits Tax Act fixed the years 1937, 1938, and 1939, as the period during which profits of corporations might be regarded as normal. Under this act, all profits above the average of these years were deemed excess and hence taxable as such. On the other hand, the Connally-O'Mahoney amendment stipulated that 80 percent of the average corporate profits for the 4 years—1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949—was to be regarded as normal. All profits above this average were, under the amendment, deemed excess and taxable as such. As was the case in the World War II Excess-Profits Tax Act, this amendment provided a specific exemption of $10,000 for all corporations, and an additional exemption of $10,000 for corporations choosing the invested-capital formula instead of the 4-year average-profits base.

The two most important provisions in any excess-profits tax law are the base and the rate—that is, the formula upon which the tax is to be based and the rate at which the levy is to be imposed.

POPULAR MISCONCEPTIONS

The excess-profits law in effect during World War II fixed the 1937–39 period as the base. Profits during this period were deemed normal, according to this law. Therefore, all corporate profits above the level of the average profits of this period were considered excess profits and taxable as such. This law fixed the rate of taxation as 95 percent—that is, 95 percent of all profits above the level of the average of this 1937–39 period were siphoned off by the Federal Government as excess profits.

In the Connally-O'Mahoney amendment (which was rejected by the Senate—the base was fixed as 80 percent of the 4-year period 1946–49 and the rate was put at 85 percent. That is, all corporate profits above 80 percent of the level of the average profits of the 4 years, 1946–49, were to be deemed excess and taxable as such at the rate of 85 percent thereof.

There is no tax about which there is such an abundance of misinformation in nonexpert circles as there is regarding the excess-profits tax. Vast numbers of people believe that excess-profits taxes are levied on excess profits everywhere. Very few people realize that they are levies on the profits of corporations only. Indeed, the name excess-profits tax is a misnomer. This form of tax really should be called "corporate excess-profits tax," not merely "excess-profits tax." If it were, people may then understand that it applies solely to profit-making corporations.

There are some 383,000 profit-making corporations in the United States. During the 1941–45 World War II period, when an excess-profits tax was in effect, these corporations paid a total of $39,491,251,000 in so-call excess-profits tax to the Federal Government—in 1941 they paid $3,359,186,000; in 1942 it was $7,851,814,000, in 1943, $11,291,483,000, in 1944 $10,431,762,000 and in 1945 $6,557,006,000.

Under the Connally-O'Mahoney amendment, because of the ill-conceived base which this improvised amendment provided, not more than 20,000 of these 383,000 profit-earning corporations would have been compelled to pay an excess-profits tax. Since the large automobile industry, as well as the mammoth steel industry, have enjoyed abnormal profits during the base-period 1946–1949 stipulated in this amendment, corporations operating in these industries would have been called upon to pay only a very small amount had this amendment been adopted. Most revenue produced by it would have come from medium-sized and small corporations, and from industries which have not prospered during the postwar period.

In the course of the debates in the Senate on this Connally-O'Mahoney amendment, Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, told the Senate that an excess-profits tax law could not be intelligently written until hearings on it were held. "There is no one capable of writing an excess-profits-tax law without hearings," he said. It simply cannot be done. It is impossible to impose on the structure of the Excess-Profits Tax Act of World War II, or World War I, for that matter, a new excess profits tax act when conditions are not only different but when they are actually completely opposite to the conditions which existed when we formulated the Excess-Profits Act for World War II. * * *

"The difficulty about an excess-profits tax is this: An excess-profits tax which is no more than the changing of a base period, with an attempt to fit into an act which was passed at the beginning of World War II, is wholly inapplicable, because none of the relief proposals will fit into it, and the average credit formulas will not fit into it. Without relief provisions in an excess-profits tax, the result is one of the most harmful forms of taxation that could possibly be devised."

GREAT POLITICAL VALUE

It is generally believed—especially by many of those whose sons are called upon to face the enemy in battle—that an excess-profits tax must be imposed during wartime in order to stop wicked profiteers. And since such a policy is loudly applauded, it has great political value. But an excess-profits tax cannot stop wartime profiteering. The real way to curb excess profits (that is, profiteering on war contracts) is through the device known as a contract negotiation, which is a provision in all agreements with the Government under which all contracts for war materials carry a drastic stipulation giving the Government the right to reprice products contracted for.

Another popular view is that an excess-profits tax is deflationary. This, too, is a great fallacy. As a matter of fact, such a tax is perhaps the most inflationary type of tax that can be devised. It encourages corporations to be wasteful and extravagant. It causes them to spend money simply on the grounds that if they do not somehow spend it the Government will take it from them in taxes. Moreover, it creates its own inflationary money with which to pay the tax. Only insofar as it provides money which the Government would otherwise be compelled to raise through deficit financing is it a check on inflation. In every other respect it is inflationary.

However, such a tax has great psychological value during wartime. It also is a means of providing revenue. "I think," Senator GEORGE said, "that if military preparations continue on a large scale we will need it, both for psychological effect and primarily to get revenues."

Although there are many other and perhaps better methods of raising revenue (such as boosting corporate and individual tax above the presently proposed levels, or by boosting the excise tax—which the interim bill now before Congress originally proposed reducing—or maybe through imposition of a general sales tax), an excess-profits levy will be enacted early next year. It may even be effective retroactive to October 1—maybe to July 1—1950. Indeed, an excess-profits tax is inescapable—if for no other reason than on psychological grounds.

Warning that we face vastly more taxes, Senator MILLIKIN, Republican, of Colorado, said that no one is going to find an umbrella under which to shelter himself. Whether they are paid directly or indirectly is beside the point; we all must pay them. In emphasizing this, the Senator, in the course of the debates on the excess-profits taxes, said:

"If there are any implications in this debate that the adoption of an excess-profits tax is adequate to meet the expense of the military program, that, I respectfully suggest, is sheer fakery or ignorance. I mention this to remove from the debate—and, if not from the debate, from opinion outside the Senate—the thought that an excess-profits tax is the complete solution, that the rich corporations are going to pay for the war, and that others will not be called on to carry additional burdens."

The Perfect Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Need the Perfect Leader," published in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of September 4, 1950, together with a letter which I have written to President Truman on the subject of this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED THE PERFECT LEADER

We have shown what the perfect citizen is. We had only to quote the words found

in the diary of Martin Treptow, an American soldier killed in the battle of Chateau Thierry in World War I.

"America must win this war. Therefore I will work; I will save; I will sacrifice; I will endure; I will fight cheerfully and do my utmost as if the whole struggle depended on me alone."

The perfect citizen is the man or woman who carries out Martin Treptow's resolution.

The perfect citizen requires the perfect leader; where can he be found?

The leader is already chosen by circumstances. He is the head of that one of the free nations which is potentially, though not yet actually, the most powerful on the globe.

He is Harry S. Truman, President of the United States.

In his hands destiny has placed this great issue—whether the free world shall survive, whether western civilization, even though it might win shall take such a beating that we shall face a new Dark Age, whether this Nation, never yet defeated, shall go down before a better prepared foe and yield world leadership to an evil power which imposes slavery.

Truman is our leader. What must he be and do that he shall meet the awful requirements of this hour—the greatest demand that has ever been made on a human leader?

Is Truman capable of becoming the perfect leader which we require for our survival?

Yes. What qualifications does he have?

He is willing to take responsibility; he doesn't dodge it or pass the buck.

He has good judgment, when he does not allow it to be clouded by politics, ideology, or a mistaken sense of loyalty to particular persons.

He has courage, as shown, for instance by his daring pronouncement of the policy that we would defend Greece and Turkey.

He has a strong physique and an untroubled mind.

He can walk with kings yet keep the common touch.

What must Truman do to use these qualifications to the utmost, to rise to the greatness that alone can meet this crisis?

He must give up politics.

He must give up the desire for a third term. He need not announce that decision, but he should follow no course dictated by third-term politics. (Might not Harry S. Truman be more influential as a former President who had retired with honor and vigor, than a third-term President who might crack under the strain?)

He should regard it as unimportant whether the Democratic Party wins in 1950 or 1952. If the free world and this Nation survives—and it will survive only if Harry S. Truman is wholly dedicated to that survival—the Democratic Party will survive along with it, none the worse in the long run though it should lose a particular election.

He should not make his swearing off of politics conditional on the Republicans doing the same thing. There is no single Republican leader who can make that decision, as Truman, head of a Democratic administration, can make it. (Besides for a President, even in normal times, the best politics is no politics; there is no way you can beat a perfect performance.)

He must not defend the tragic past mistakes in our foreign policy which led us to the situation we are in; they cannot be defended. But they can be wiped out by sound and great actions now.

He must abandon the policies which seem so unlike him and so inappropriate to his traditional American character, such as socialized medicine and deficit financing for other than defense.

He must substitute, for his fierce loyalty to particular persons, a fiercer loyalty to the hundreds of millions of living people who depend on him for their survival, for the billions yet unborn who depend on him to be cradled in a civilization it has taken centuries to build.

He must pray, and know that this whole Nation will join him in praying: "Not my will, but Thine, be done."

This hour of danger cries for the perfect leader. Only the resolution of Harry S. Truman, and the grace of God, can give him to us.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1950.

Hon. HARRY TRUMAN,
The President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Dr. Charles E. Diehl, president emeritus of Southwestern University, Memphis, Tenn., sent me a copy of an editorial in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of September 4 by Edward J. Meeman, one of our great American editors.

I know that you do not have time to read many editorials, but this editorial so clearly states the aspirations of the American people during this critical time, and the confidence that thoughtful people have in you, that I do hope you will read it. I think that your recent speeches are definitely in line with the type of leadership this editorial envisions.

I am also sending you Dr. Diehl's letter to me, and I hope you will particularly read the second paragraph in this letter.

Respectfully,

———.

Our Senior Citizens Are Home-Front Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I include an article which appeared in the September 16, 1950, edition of the Townsend National Weekly, written by the editor, Mr. George B. Fritz. This article points out that while public attention is focused on Korea our old folks are allowed to become home-front casualties.

KOREAN WAR TESTS ROLE OF AGED: WILL THEY BE CASUALTIES, TOO?

(By George Fritz)

CLEVELAND.—During World War II we learned that not all of the casualties took place in the fox holes and on the beachheads. A lot of people died a living death right here at home. The aged were the forgotten folks of that war. They were battle casualties along with the soldiers and sailors in the front lines.

When war comes strange things happen to the American dollar. Everybody needs more of them. Prices of food and clothing double or triple. And so everybody makes more money. Wages go way up. So do profits.

Everybody makes more money except the old people. They stay where they were before war broke out. The 3,000,000 on old-age assistance received just about the same checks in 1945, when prices reached their peak, as they did in the years before the war.

Their $45 old-age-assistance checks bought goods they could have purchased for about $20 in peacetime. The Government refused to grant them more. So they slowly starved. Their poverty grew more critical. They were the casulaties of the home front.

CALL IT POLICE ACTION, BUT IT'S STILL A WAR

Now we are in another war. Don't let anybody tell you that the fighting in Korea is merely "police action." You know we are at war. On paper, the aggressor is North Korea. In reality, the aggressor is the Soviet Union. The North Koreans, knowing full well that the United Nations would never stand for a war of invasion, would never have dared to fire the first shot without the backing of Russia. The North Koreans are supplied with Russian materials.

So the United States—and the United Nations—are warring with Russia even though no formal declaration has been made. That adds up to a long war. And the experts tell us that to win this one the Nation must be placed on an all-out wartime footing.

That means total mobilization of all our resources, human and material. It means that every last person in this country must contribute to the winning of the peace. We can't do that if we have millions of casualties at home.

Today there are at least 11,500,000 people in America 65 years of age or older. That's a lot of people. They are needed in a war economy.

But millions of these are already casualties. More than 3,500,000 of them have absolutely no income at all. More than 2,000,000 have incomes of less than $500 a year. More than 2,000,000 more have less than $1,000 a year.

So of the 11,500,000 past 65, some 7,500,000 have less than $1,000, or nothing at all. They live in poverty or on the fringe of poverty. These 7,500,000 are casualties. They cannot help the economy because they have no purchasing power to contribute to the war effort.

MAKE HOME SOLDIERS OF THE MILLIONS OF AGED

Now, if America is to convert to an all-out war effort, it is going to have to make home soldiers of these people. Some of them, of course, will find jobs, especially when the employment market tightens. But millions of them will not be acceptable to industry because they are too old, or because they are blind or otherwise physically disabled. Nevertheless, they can be made good soldiers if the Government wants to help them enlist in the war to save democracy.

They can help in a valuable way. They can help by being transformed from paupers into folks able to hold their own in the market place.

Why should our Government make things tougher than they already are? Why try to fight a war overseas and at the same time support an intolerable burden of poverty at home? Why saddle ourselves with people who are useless to the economy, and expensive to the taxpayers, when we have the means to enable them to stand on their own two feet?

Let's grant that these folks can't put on a uniform and march off to the wars. Let's grant that they can't, because of advanced age or disability, compete with younger people in industry. Let's grant that they have passed the stage of productivity?

WE CAN'T AFFORD A WAR AND A DEPRESSION, TOO

That doesn't mean that they can't be useful. In a war economy (and for that matter, in a peace economy, too) everybody must have purchasing power to keep the Nation healthy. When millions have no money, and there are pools of poverty, we wind up with areas of depression.

This Nation cannot afford to fight a war and depression at the same time.

So the smart thing to do is to win the war against depression at home, and to do it right now, before it is too late.

We aren't winning it with the weapon called H. R. 6000, the Social Security Act as amended. True, it will increase average old-age insurance by about 77 percent. But that

only means that the average will be increased to $47 or so a month, and you can't get along today on that kind of money. The 3,000,000 on old-age assistance aren't going to be helped at all; they will still continue to receive their $46 average each month.

So the Social Security Act isn't the answer. It won't prevent casualties on the home front.

TOWNSEND PLAN WILL WIN WAR AGAINST POVERTY

But the Townsend plan will. Suppose these 7,500,000 casualties each had $150 a month to spend. We would have won the war against depression at home. The great horde of case workers and welfare bosses would be free for more useful work. There would be no need to divert our attention from war problems to Community Chest drives and other forms of uneconomic charity. We would be in a position to devote our entire efforts to making democracy victorious.

If the Townsend plan is needed in peacetime, it is needed even more in wartime. If the United States Congress really wants to get this country in shape to win against any threats from foreign nations, it had better get our own house in order first. The place to begin is by abolishing charity and poverty at home.

Korea is the crucial test. How are we going to face up to it? Are we going to try to fight two wars at once—one abroad, the other, against poverty, in our own country? Or are we going to stand up to the enemy confident that our own economy is healthy and sound?

Are the old people going to be the home front casualties of the Korean war? Or are we going to have the Townsend plan?

A Constituent Wants His Share

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent which reads as follows:

HARTFORD, MICH., *August 8, 1950.*

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: The other day I was talking with a fellow on the street when another fellow comes along and says "What's your name?" Well, sir, I kind of scratch my head and told him. Then he says to me, "Just how much of that scratching do you do a day?" I knew right away he was one of them big Government men making a dandruff survey. Well, sir, I told him I don't know just how much scratching I do. He says, "What do you mean you don't know how much scratching you do?" Well, sir, I says, I really don't know; you see I got the itching piles, too. He started looking through a big book that he had with him, and the more he looked the madder he got; finally he slammed that book shut and says: "I got to consult Washington." He was sure upset because he started right off in the wrong direction. Well, sir, this fellow that I had been talking to says to me, "Why don't you get one of them big Government expert jobs?" I says, I don't know nothing about being a big Government man. Now you'll notice that this writing isn't very good, that's because my arm is sore. I thought that fellow would shake my arm right off. He says, "Son, I thought all the time you was a big Government man; but as soon as you said you didn't know anything, I knowed you was."

Like all people he started wanting to know all about the Government. He says, "I know the Boy Scouts have a slogan, 'Do a good deed daily,' and the Navy's is 'Sink or swim.' What have you big Government men got?" Well, sir, I don't know if I gave away a Government secret or not, but I told him, ours is "Don't do today when you can do tomorrow." You can be sure if this is a secret it won't go any further, because he said he wouldn't tell no one but his wife. Then he says to me, "I hear they got them big Government experts that can just take a peep at a man's differential and tell if he is high speed or geared down like a Mack truck." Well, sir, I says, "That is a top secret no one is supposed to know that but us and the Russians; we can't let every Tom, Dick, and Harry know about these things." I did tell him if he would wait until he got his income paper and look at Form B, paragraph 2, he would learn a lot.

I'd kind of like one of them big Government jobs, but I don't want to travel. I used to drive truck and I got kind of tired of traveling. I thought maybe I could get a job I could do right here at home, like counting hairs on a dog; that's something the Government hasn't done yet, and I could furnish the dog.

Sincerely,

MAX DANIEL HOGMIER.

Registration of Communist Organizations and Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Our Inner Defenses," published in the Chattanooga Times of August 21, 1950; an editorial entitled "Blunderbuss and Rifle," published in the Nashville Tennessean of September 14, 1950; an editorial entitled "The Anti-Subversive Bill," published in the Chattanooga Times of September 14, 1950; an editorial entitled "Hodge-Podge," published in the Washington Post of September 14, 1950; an editorial entitled "Is Communism a Yardstick?" published in the Wilmington (Del.) Journal; and an editorial entitled "The Senate on Subversion," published in the New York Times of September 14, 1950. These editorials criticize and point out the weakness of the McCarran bill passed by the Senate on last Tuesday.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times of August 21, 1950]

OUR INNER DEFENSES

There is in the United States today a rising tide of fury against Soviet Russia and its purveyors of communism in this country. The anger springs from deep within the American consciousness. It is based on the knowledge that the Communists deliberately provoked the Korean aggression and that Americans are fighting and dying as a result. It feeds upon the presumption that Russia has set the timetable for these "little wars" by which we are to be bled white in conflict against Russian stooges and made ready for the final assault by Russia's own forces. It is fanned to white heat by battlefield atrocities against American prisoners of war.

With it comes a louder, more insistent clamor for direct action against Communists in the United States, not the result of hysteria alone, but also in the sober realization that we must look to our inner defenses. The demand for stringent laws no longer comes from the extreme right or the Fascist minded, although the latter, of course, is still with us.

The very urgency of the matter requires that we base our actions upon clear thinking rather than emotional stresses.

A very large segment of our citizens believes the thing to do is to outlaw the Communist Party and to make membership in it a punishable offense. They cite the fact that the party is an organ of an international conspiracy, dedicated to the overthrow of this Government. They declare that to continue to allow it to exist in our midst under the myth that it is an ordinary political organization is not democratic, but dangerous. They say: "Ban it, break it up, destroy its strength."

They have persuasive arguments which would be well nigh unanswerable—if the methods they prescribe actually would accomplish what they would like to see done. We are not yet convinced.

In the first place, the proscribing of any organization is alien to our principles. Our cherished freedoms of assembly, of expression, of thought are intended to protect those who disagree as well as those who agree with us. They imply the right to be unpopular, to be wrong in beliefs and attitudes.

To outlaw the Communist Party would be to send its members and activities completely underground, instead of only partly so, making them more difficult than ever to detect. A law may prevent a man from calling himself a Communist; it won't change his beliefs. And it is his belief and not a label which makes him a danger. No law can be strong enough to combat an idea; it can be overcome only by a better idea, a more enduring principle.

Our constitutional liberties, of course, do not include the right to spy, to sabotage, to disrupt through the perversion of one's freedoms in the service of an ideology which denies all freedom. But these are actions which come into the province of enforceable laws. We have on our statute books measures which protect the Nation against their commission. Some of the laws need strengthening and this should be done at once. Subsequently, a campaign of vigorous enforcement should be undertaken in protection of the Nation.

Such a course of action would answer the immediate needs for greater internal security without endangering the freedoms which are the basis of all our security and without weakening the moral fiber of the leadership we must present to the world.

We still do not need thought control in this country. We do need more and better and straighter thinking.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of September 14, 1950]

BLUNDERBUSS AND RIFLE

The Senate's 70-to-7 vote on a subversive control measure may be taken as an accurate reflection of the country's demand for some such legislation before a major war emergency occurs.

The time is surely ripe for making possible a crackdown on Communists and their colleagues when necessary, and at the same time safeguarding the basic liberties of the people. There are grave doubts as to whether these ends will be achieved by the catch-all measure that has now been approved.

President Truman has already announced that he will not sign the McCarran bill which includes provisions of the Mundt-Nixon-Ferguson measure. And it is the McCarran bill that has been passed, with its complicated and ineffective program for registering Communist organizations and members, and also the leadership of "front" groups.

The dangers of this registration provision were effectively pointed out in a scholarly analysis by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, but the majority was not impressed. It does credit to the Senate, however, that it finally reversed the opposing vote on the Kilgore program for clamping down on dangerous Communists overnight and putting them under immediate detention.

Assuming that blunderbuss methods might not work, the Members decided to add the rifle technique which is designed to get immediate results.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who was one of the sponsors of the Kilgore bill, is listed among the few who voted against the final compromise measure on grounds that it "endangered many of the basic rights held dear by Americans." He would go further than Senator MCCARRAN in blocking spies and saboteurs, but he will not encourage legislation that seems destined to bring endless confusion and at the same time pave the way for possible persecution of good citizens. His steadfast stand for his convictions is a commendable demonstration of political courage.

The country will not be apt to forget that it was due to the persistent demands of Senator KEFAUVER and others that the concentration camp provision was finally accepted after its initial defeat. Under it, the FBI can proceed to round up the listed 12,000 dangerous Communists in an emergency, and the country will not have to wait for court action on endless petitions citing nonregistering Communists to appear in court.

Assuming that the House will support Senate action, the anti-Communist legislation can easily become an important political issue if the President stands by his determination to withhold approval. For the Republican standpoint, of course, this will be entirely satisfactory.

The White House shares the general opinion that the liberties of those who are bent on undermining national liberty are not important. But the resolve to see that the Bill of Rights will always apply to good citizens is in strict accordance with the oath Mr. Truman has taken to uphold and defend the Constitution.

The idea of suppressing the overt act rather than trying to establish controls over thought is thoroughly American and its projection at this time by the Chief Executive of the Nation merits the attention from lawmakers that it has received from the plain people who think.

[From the Chattanooga Times of September 14, 1950]

THE ANTISUBVERSIVE BILL

Where should that eternal vigilance which Jefferson said is the price of liberty be more religiously exercised than in Congress, which makes the laws? And yet Congress has passed a bill which, though based on a laudable aim, strikes at basic constitutional rights of the people, the right of freedom of opinion and the right to be immune from arrest without due process. Such restrictions are common and indispensable in police states, but Americans fought two world wars against tyrannies based on enslavement of human thought.

Congress happens to be supported by public opinion, and public opinion is motivated by a desire which every patriotic American must share—the desire to see all dangerous Communists or potential pro-Russian saboteurs placed where they can do no harm. But that should be done without adopting a sort of vigilantism against all who do not conform to orthodox thinking.

ESTES KEFAUVER was 1 of 7 Senators who voted against the bill, while 70 were in favor. It was not that the Tennessee Senator hates communism less but that he loves liberty more.

Likewise, Senator LEHMAN, of New York, the only one of the seven facing an immediate contest for reelection, declared: "My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult," and he called the bill "this tragic, this unfortunate, this ill-conceived legislation."

By requiring that they register with the Government and imposing a fine if they fail to do so, the bill outlaws all Communists, the misguided theorists as well as the potential tools of Soviet Russia. If signed by the President or passed over his veto, the law would mark the usurpation by Congress of the authority of the Supreme Court to decide whether a political group constitutes a conspiracy against the country.

The dangerous Communists will immediately go underground. If enforced by the Attorney General, who is made responsible under the bill, the measure may result in clogging the courts with cases against citizens suspected or merely accused of harboring Communist ideas, though many of those citizens might be willing to die for a country which, in the past, has placed no restrictions on how a man shall think or what he may believe.

The particular provision of the bill which Senator KEFAUVER simply could not stomach was section 4 which says that it will be illegal "to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship." He might have argued that Congress, by passing such a law, has possibly itself performed such an act. The Manchester Guardian recently printed a dispatch from its leading American correspondent, Alastair Cooke, which stated that "President Truman remarked to an intimate a few weeks ago that if he had a taint of the hysteria now rampant in Congress, it would be possible to have an American police state in no time at all."

A veto by the President seemed probable yesterday, but not certain. The Senate included an amendment favored by administration leaders, calling for the internment of suspected individuals in time of war.

If the bill finally becomes law, there is no reason for opponents to entertain too much optimism over the possibility that the Supreme Court would hold it unconstitutional. The alien and seditions laws, of 1798, were upheld in court tests, though they later led to the first nullification proceedings in the Southern States and contributed to the downfall of the Federalist Party which sponsored them. Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer's "red hunts" in the Wilson administration find no defenders now, but he managed to make convictions stick in the courts.

The antisubversive bill, in several of its provisions, sets up orthodoxy and conformity as the American pattern, though the Constitution guarantees just the opposite. The coming world struggle is between freedom for the individual in the democracies and enslavement of the human soul in the Communist dictator states. If we are not fighting for that, we are not fighting for anything.

The bill has some strong points, in tightening the laws against espionage, but in other provisions it clearly seeks to force conformity by intimidation and under it not only the Communists, but the precious constitutional right of dissent may go underground.

[From the Washington Post of September 14, 1950]

HODGEPODGE

The internal security legislation adopted by the Senate on Tuesday combines at least three radically different and essentially contradictory approaches to the Communist problem. It includes (1) the President's recommendations to protect the country from the real and immediate threat of espionage and sabotage by Soviet agents; (2) the Kilgore-Douglas proposals to protect the country from the contingent, yet nevertheless serious, threat of Communist fifth-column activities in case of war, invasion, or insurrection; and (3) the Mundt-Nixon-McCarran provisions to protect the country from the remote and wholly imaginary threat of subversion by Communist propaganda. The hodgepodge bill into which all these measures were scrambled for reasons of political expediency deserves sober and realistic analysis.

The existing laws which forbid and penalize espionage and sabotage have loopholes which urgently need plugging. The President sought to plug them by asking Congress to extend the statute of limitations on espionage and to make punishable the disclosure of defense information as well as defense documents; to authorize the promulgation of regulations for safeguarding defense plants, facilities, and installations; and to provide for the supervision of deportable aliens whose actual deportation is blocked by the countries from which they came. These are sensible precautions entailing no trespass on personal liberty. We believe, as we urged in a recent editorial, that Congress should have enacted these measures, concerning which there was no responsible dispute, in separate legislation. Unfortunately, they are now tied up with the highly controversial sections of the omnibus bill.

The Kilgore-Douglas proposals deal with a danger that does not now exist but that may arise in the near future. It was reported just the other day that the director of the FBI had told a congressional committee he would at once arrest some 12,000 suspected enemy agents if the United States should become involved in war with the Soviet Union. The number seems fantastically high, but there is no doubt that some suspect citizens as well as aliens would have to be rounded up and detained pending clearance in the event of war. Since there is now no legislation to authorize such executive action, it would be sensible to provide it in advance and to provide at the same time, as the Kilgore-Douglas measure does, a rational procedure for judgment and review of every case on an individual basis.

The Kilgore-Douglas proposals as actually incorporated into the omnibus bill would be put into effect only in case of war, invasion, or insurrection. The original version would have made them applicable additionally in case of an internal security emergency jointly declared by Congress and the President. The Senate did well, we think, to eliminate this uncertain contingency in accordance with an amendment offered by Senator MCCARRAN. Quite needlessly, in our opinion, it also adopted an amendment by Senator FERGUSON stating that nothing in the detention provisions should abridge any right guaranteed by the fifth and sixth amendments or suspend habeas corpus unless in conformity with the Constitution. This seems sheer surplusage.

Admittedly there are grave constitutional questions involved in legislation which authorizes detention on the ground of mere

suspicion of an intent to commit espionage or sabotage. Such authorization is a drastic measure repugnant to American traditions. But it is meant to meet an unprecedented danger threatening the survival of the American society. The validity of the measure would have to be determined by the courts in the light of the danger. We think it preferable in any case that it should be undertaken in conformity with considered legislative authorization instead of on the basis of executive expediency. The Kilgore-Douglas proposals represent a conscientious, careful attempt to reconcile security and freedom.

Senator McCARRAN's contributions to the omnibus bill—including the Mundt-Nixon Communist registration requirements and the Senator's own provisions for an asbestos curtain shutting out all aliens with inflammatory ideas—have no direct relation to security at all. These are measures that would do no injury to spies and saboteurs but would do irreparable injury to rights of expression and association. These are the measures which prompted President Truman—correctly and courageously, in our opinion—to declare that he would interpose his veto. They are the measures which led an honor roll of 7 Senators to vote against the bill. They are so dangerous and corruptive that they overweigh all the commendable protections that the bill provides and make a Presidential veto imperative. The United States needs protection against Communist treachery, but this country has no occasion to fear Communist ideas.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal of September 13, 1950]

IS COMMUNISM A YARDSTICK?

Passage of the McCarran Communist-control bill by a thumping Senate majority is evidence that America is losing its sense of proportion where Stalinist communism is concerned. By any test but one, the McCarran bill is inferior to the House version and to the Kilgore substitute. It is more dangerous to the traditional liberties of all Americans. It upsets diplomatic immunities, provokes retaliation on Americans, and adds to international tensions. It will be hard to enforce; it imposes methods on the FBI and other agencies which they have not asked for and which would make their job more difficult. It discriminates against refugees from Stalinist persecution. The bill is not so much a blow at communism, in short, as a trumpet blast at it.

Not all the Senators who voted for the bill could have been unaware of its disadvantages. Why, then, did they vote for it? Presumably because the McCarran bill is "more anti-Communist" than other versions, its practical application will be less troublesome to Communists, its dictatorial restrictions will threaten the liberties of anti-Communists; but its provisions are more aggressive and more unrestrained. No man who voted for it can be accused of wanting to coddle Communists.

The bill, in short, is evidence that where communism is concerned Americans are no longer able (or so their representatives assume) to judge an issue on its merits. Is a bill (or a doctrine, or an act) anti-Communist? If so, it is good. Can it, by any device of oratorical prestidigitation, be linked up with communism? Then it is bad.

Communism as practiced by and for Russia is thoroughly cynical, vicious, and dangerous. But communism is not, and cannot be, the yardstick by which we should measure all other questions. You cannot run a business that way, or play the stock market, or pick a winner at the races. We doubt that you can run a country that way, either.

[From the New York Times of September 14, 1950]

THE SENATE ON SUBVERSION

As it passed the Senate Tuesday evening the McCarran antisubversive bill is something of a hodgepodge. On the credit side it now includes as a last-minute addition the Kilgore detention-center bill, which goes to the heart of the Communist problem. And it retains a few useful technical provisions that would strengthen existing security laws. But the fact that the bill embraces some good features does not alter the more important fact that it would impose infringements on the freedom of thought, speech, press, and political association that Americans have always held dear. It is noteworthy that HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, was one of the seven Senators who voted against this measure.

Of course, it is necessary to protect our country from the menace of Communist aggression, whether in the form of Russian imperialism or of internal espionage and sabotage. But it has been and still is our belief that the principal features of the McCarran bill, far from achieving this goal, would interfere with it. Its registration provisions would ensnare Federal authorities in interminable litigation, while the Communist Party itself would be blithely going underground or making its appearance under a succession of aliases. Its prohibitory language is so broadly worded that there would be danger of involving in the toils of the law perfectly loyal citizens of leftist or radical or even merely unpopular views. Its immigration sections give vent to Senator McCARRAN's own peculiar version of the know-nothingism that was rejected in this country nearly a century ago. This bill would strike primarily at beliefs; the real danger to our country lies far more in actual or potential espionage or sabotage at the hands of Russian sympathizers who may or may not be members of the Communist Party than in the public expressions of Communist belief, however offensive, mendacious, and contemptible such expressions may be.

The Kilgore bill, on the other hand, would deal directly with activists at a time of danger. It would afford concrete protection from that which we fear. Mr. Hoover speaks of the existence of some 12,000 dangerous Communists on whom the FBI has its eye. The Kilgore bill would give a legislative basis, replete with constitutional guaranties, for the police action that undoubtedly should be taken against this "hard core" in an emergency.

It is obviously too much to hope that the House and Senate will now agree on the Kilgore bill alone. We would like to see them come up with an antisubversive measure that the President can sign, but we hope that he sticks to his announced decision to veto the McCarran bill and that he will veto anything that looks like it.

Our Government in Its Whole Constitutional Vigor Must Be Preserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial appearing in the September 15, 1950, issue of the Retired Officers Association Bulletin, entitled "Our Government in Its Whole Constitutional Vigor Must Be Preserved." This article is a sequel to the fine editorial entitled "Constitutional Liberties Endangered by World Government Proposals," published in the June 15, 1950, issue of the Retired Officers Association Bulletin, which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, June 5, 1950, by my worthy colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]:

OUR GOVERNMENT IN ITS WHOLE CONSTITUTIONAL VIGOR MUST BE PRESERVED

"Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the general Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; * * * freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation."—Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801.

Many letters received from our members and others record their praise of our editorial "Constitutional Liberties Endangered by World Government Proposals," which was published in the last June issue of the Bulletin. That article was republished in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, June 5, 1950.

Although comments were overwhelmingly favorable, a few letters suggested that some form of world government might be established by vesting such an organization with defined and limited powers which would not detract substantially from our present scheme of self-government under the Constitution and, that through the establishment and maintenance of such type of government, world peace could be achieved through enforced regulation.

The members who expressed such views, however, have uniformly agreed that the world-government concept, as suggested by the Chicago group's proposal for a world constitution, would be definitely dangerous, in that it would grant superior power to a government that is not our own. In view of that obvious conclusion, it is unmistakably clear that the granting of any executive, legislative, or judicial powers we now enjoy under our present Federal Constitution to any form of world government would inevitably lead to the very kind of world government as proposed by the Chicago group, and would endanger our constitutional liberties. All such proposals should be vigorously opposed.

We believe that the high aims of peace might be achieved through international cooperation under long-established principles of international relationships without the necessity of establishing a world government. We also believe that this can be done in a world organization, such as the United Nations organization, without granting to it attributes of sovereignty, provided there is a uniform desire and willingness on the part of the great nations for the peaceful settlement of international differences. Modern history has indicated that peace is not to be had merely by forms of organization or peace

pacts; for the causes of conflicts are complex and often economically deep rooted. It has long been evident to students of history that the only remedy for war is the elimination of the causes of war. While this has heretofore been impossible, it is the ultimate hope of mankind as the only means of world peace.

The widespread support of the views expressed in our article on world government in the last issue of the Bulletin comes from a vast majority of a group which venerates the traditions of valor and personal bravery passed on to our generation by the Founders of our Republic and those who have supported them. These traditions are embodied in the immortal document which the great British statesman, William E. Gladstone, described as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man"—our Federal Constitution.

In view of the certain impairment of the constitutional guarantees for our national and individual welfare, patriotic Americans should be alert to all proposals for changing our constitutional setup and refrain from approving such proposals, however plausibly they are presented. We should be aware that some such proposals are made by those with possible inimical purposes which have not been clearly set forth or explained. In the parallel column on this page is one such proposal.

We should be especially alert to the fact that there are also those who, through the medium of agreements with undisclosed objectives, are actually weakening our domestic law and our form of constitutional government that has protected us for more than 160 years.

Constitutional dangers, comparable to the present, have been foreseen by statesmen of other countries. Among them was William Pitt who, with reference to our Federal Constitution, once observed that—"It will be a pattern for all future constitutions and the admiration of all future ages." We, who received such a heritage, must not permit it to be weakened or encroached upon in any respect, lest it be entirely destroyed, and we and future generations deprived of our birthright.

The people of this Nation certainly do not wish to be victimized or enslaved through any form of world government that might be organized and directed under a proposed world constitution. They are determined to remain free to worship according to the dictates of their conscience, free to write and speak within the limitations as designated by laws of their own making, free to be taxed according to their constitutional methods and not at the erratic and capricious will of a world potentate who perhaps could not distinguish between capital assessments and unjust taxation.

Why should a great and free people give alien agencies any power and control over their vast reservoir of actual and potential wealth—our national resources? The world government advises that "plans for improvement of the world's physical facilities, either public or private, and for the productive exploitation of resources and inventions shall be submitted to the (planning) agency or to such development authorities or regional subagencies as it may establish. The (planning) agency shall pass judgment on the social usefulness of such plans." The meaning of this provision is unmistakably clear. Not satisfied with our gold, our banks and credits, our atom and H-bombs, they would take from us our natural resources as well as our liberties.

In effect, the proposed "world constitution" would abolish or weaken our Bill of Rights, those first 10 amendments to our Federal Constitution, phrased by the great Virginian, George Mason, which comes to us through English jurisprudence, after their principles had been established and tested in England against considerable resistance. These tried precepts form the keystone of our civil liberties. Our Bill of Rights would go with the disappearance of our Federal Constitution and our form of government. Shall we permit this to happen?

The establishment of a world government under a "world constitution," however limited the initial grant of power and authority might be would, in our opinion, ultimately and inevitably mean the abolition of our Federal Constitution with all of our traditional rights and the protection under it. The proposal would result in the elimination of our laws concerning emigration and immigration and the movements of peoples. The proposal would eventually mean that freedom to enter our country would be extended to all peoples, regardless of their political and moral views, or degree of assimilability, and would permit to enter our country those we consider undesirable, including elements which may be hostile to our traditions of freedom.

The world government proposes to assume direction of all armed forces. Thus, our Armed Forces would pass from United States control to that of world government. With that would pass our right to organize, direct, and dispose of the constituent parts. Insofar as we would be permitted to have our own Federal military forces, they would be in the nature of a police guard. Our military groups would not follow the Stars and Stripes, as our national flag would no longer exist as our primary symbol of loyalty and patriotism. The Commander in Chief of our military forces would not be our duly elected President. As a matter of fact, the powers of our President, as now exercised under the Constitution, would no longer obtain. Even the office of President, as we now know it, would be abolished.

Two provisions of the world constitution are of particular importance: "The limitation and control of weapons and of domestic militias in the several component units of the world republic" is one of its functions, and the control and use of the armed forces of the federal republic of the world (of which ours would be a part) shall be assigned to a chamber of guardians under the chairmanship of the (world) president in his capacity as protector of the peace, is another.

Quoting further from the world constitution, officers holding professional or active rank in the armed forces of the federal republic, or in the domestic militia of any component unit thereof, shall not be eligible as guardians. These guardians are to have the control and use of the armed forces of the republic of the world—a situation that requires the closest scrutiny by members of the armed services of all nations.

Military appropriations would no longer be within the scope of the powers of our Federal Congress; all appropriations would be under the control of the chamber of guardians. Appropriations for retired pay of officers, pensions, and similar benefits no longer would exist. Active-duty compensation would be subject to the same control. Many patriots of unimpeachable record in the line of duty, whose vitality is lessening with the passing of years, would probably be deprived of their well-earned financial assistance.

We need no superstate to sap the vitality of our Federal Union. We desire no superconstitution to weaken, destroy, or supersede our Federal Constitution. We are satisfied with its wise checks and balances when they are properly observed. We take pride in our tripartite system of Government and insist that each branch of it shall not be unduly encroached upon. We are a Republic guided by a Federal Constitution and wish to remain so. We must protect our inalienable rights. In connection with such dangers as now face us, Stanley Baldwin once stated: "It will be for you to protect democracy * * * it must be defended from without and it equally may have to be defended from within." This can best be done by becoming aware of the threats which confront us in connection with erroneous proposals for the establishment of a superworld organization which, based upon untenable assumptions, is being aggressively advocated in an organized propaganda as the only means of achieving peace.

The full implications of such proposals must be investigated, studied, and understood by all, lest—through acceptance of plausible, but impracticable, panaceas for world peace—freedom under constitutional government is to become a mere memory in our Nation.

Truman's War or Stalin's War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the September 14, 1950, issue of the Capital Times, Madison, Wis., entitled "Truman's War or Stalin's War?" The editorial follows:

TRUMAN'S WAR OR STALIN'S WAR?

The Korean war is making one thing clear: The Republicans, who do so much talking about communism, do not hate Stalin half as much as they hate Truman.

In a frenzied effort to win 1950's election the Republican high command is doing everything it can to embarrass the administration in Washington and to shake popular support of the war to stop communism.

As with every war, there are fears and doubts on the part of the people. The Republican Party and the Communist Party are doing everything they can to exploit these fears and doubts and to whip them up. The Republican National Committee and the Communist Daily Worker continue to refer to the war as "Truman's war." The Chicago Tribune, which has once again become the recognized voice of the Republican line, thinks so little of the news value of the Korean war that it won't put the war news on the front page. The Wisconsin State Journal, which could support the war against Hitler, is now writing editorials advising our GI's in the foxholes that they are being double-crossed. So is the Daily Worker.

The free nations of the world have lined up with the United States but the Republican Party takes its position with the Communists.

The Wall Street Journal, the Daily Worker of the Republican Party, exposed the Republican strategy on questions of wartime economic controls the other day when it said:

"A break in Republican ranks has insured passage of wage and price control powers, even though the President isn't asking for them. Some Republicans voted such controls to put Mr. Truman and the Democrats 'between the devil and the deep blue sea.' They figure as prices are regulated, black markets will flourish and red tape will rile businessmen and consumers. If prices aren't held down, living costs may creep up and the administration will be blamed for that."

In other words, the Republicans were willing to act, not because they want to stop inflation, not because they want to get Stalin. They want to get Truman.

That's the way it was with Taft & Co. before Pearl Harbor. They were more against

Roosevelt than Hitler. And that's the way it was with the French reactionaries in the days before World War II. But they were more frank about it. They admitted that they would rather have Dictator Hitler in preference to Premier Blum.

One gets the impression from reading the Republican pronouncements that if the Nation could get rid of Truman, all its foreign policy troubles would disappear. Someone should remind them that there's a fellow by the name of Joe Stalin who is not entirely blameless. Perhaps Harold Stassen should do the reminding. It was Harold who, in an article in the Ladies' Home Journal in 1947, assured us that Stalin had an "open mind" on the question of whether the American system and the Russian system could get along together in the world.

This may be "Truman's war" to the Republicans, but to an awful lot of Americans and the people of the free world, who have joined in condemning the aggression in Korea, it is Stalin's war.

The United States and China in a World Three Ways Divided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an address entitled "The United States and China in a World Three Ways Divided," written by Stanley K. Hornbeck.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing this address. The estimated cost is $451.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA IN A WORLD THREE WAYS DIVIDED

(By Stanley K. Hornbeck)

The old warrior statesmen of Japan had a precept: "After a victory, tie tighter the cords of your helmet."

The people of the United States had in 1945 an idea: Having achieved victory and having created a new association of nations, hurry home—and throw away your helmets." And the Government of the United States implemented that idea.

Every effect has its causes. In political affairs, mankind is given to attributing responsibility either to persons or to gods. In democracies, when things go wrong the people blame the government; the party or parties not in power blame the party in power; and critics of all sorts attribute fault to agencies and persons in positions of authority. Those who are charged with error either deny that there has been fault or declare the fault not theirs, or both: "The responsibility was not mine, not ours; it was that of some other fellow." Thus the apologists for what was done at Yalta: "The American contribution was all right; the whole fault lies with the Russians; they did not live up to their agreements." Thus the makers and the defenders of our China policy since Yalta: "There were no errors on our part; it was all the fault of Chiang Kai-shek." And in recent years there has been evolved in this country a technique of passing the buck downward. Thus in reference to the responsibility for lack of an adequate alert at Pearl Harbor: "The Government was not responsible, no agency was responsible, no persons were responsible; the fault was that of the American people, all of us." Now, there are suggestions of resort to that technique in regard to our obviously inadequate preparedness in connection with Korea: "The Government was not at fault, no department was at fault, the Congress wasn't at fault, no persons were at fault; the people had elected their Representatives and had told them what to vote for and what not; the people had preferred movies and motorcars to military training and modern weapons; therefore the fault is that of the people—all of us."

That technique has not yet been resorted to in explanation of or apology for our China policy during the years since Yalta. It probably will be, but not with warrant.

The people of the United States, even the majority of the Members of the Congress, have relatively limited knowledge of the Far East, of situations there and of problems that arise therein and therefrom. So, generally speaking, the people and the Congress leave largely to the President, i. e., to the executive branch of the Government, the formulating and conducting of policy in relations with and regarding that part of the world and the countries therein. This has been especially the case since the middle years of World War II. In the discharging of this responsibility, the President must, of course, and does, rely upon various counselors; and his counselors must and do rely upon experts and technicians. Theoretically, all important decisions are made at top level; but in matters relating to the Far East, especially to China, most of the reporting and the formulating of estimates, proposals, policies, and plans has been the work of small groups of officers who are supposed to have special knowledge of the area and the problems involved. Thus, for decisions made and action taken in United States official dealings with and regarding China during recent years, whether for better or for worse, the credit or the blame belongs to a very few persons, those men whose views have prevailed in official circles, most of them in the Government and of the executive branch. These, not the people, not the Congress, have been the makers of our China policy (policies).

It is said that once upon a time, when Prince Charles, later Charles II, King of England, was in exile, a group of his companions tacked on the door of the Prince's apartment a card inscribed: "Here dwells Charles, a prince who never says a foolish thing and never does a wise one." Later the pranksters found under that sally and in Charles' handwriting: "Quite right; my words are my own; my acts are the work of my ministers." It may be surmised that several of our top-level officials might, if they chose, make some use of such an alibi in connection with no small part of the course pursued by the United States in matters relating to China since early 1945. They might say: "The voices have been ours but the ideas expressed have been those of the men on whose reports, estimates, proposals, and plans we have relied."

The most portentous and most tragic fact about our policies in relations with and regarding China of the years under reference is that most of the persons whose views have prevailed in the formulating and implementing of those policies have, until very recently, believed about China, and about China's National Government, and about China's Communists, and about the part played or not played and playable or not playable by Russia in and regarding China, a great many things which simply haven't been so. They've believed that the United States should do things which it shouldn't; that China could do things which it couldn't; that China's Communists both were what they weren't and weren't what they were and are. The same regarding their view of the Soviet Union. Wishing the people of China well, and perturbed over ways in the political and social life of China that they consider dark, they failed—until recently—to take adequate account of a fact in international political life much more warrantable of concern both to the United States and to the Chinese, namely, the fact that communism, no matter where or of what brand, is being used by the Government of the Soviet Union as an instrument of imperialism and is committed to objectives which call for subjugation of all mankind.

World War II began when, in 1931, Japanese imperialists staged an assault of China in Manchuria, and the League of Nations and the United States in effect acquiesced. Before that war was ended Russian imperialists began a new assault on China via Manchuria, and for five long years, until 7 weeks ago, the United Nations and the United States in effect acquiesced.

Now, 8 years plus after Pearl Harbor and 5 years after VJ-day, we are living in a world politically divided—divided three ways: a world of free peoples; a world of enslaved peoples; and a world of those peoples who, neither free nor enslaved, are seeking freedom and are in danger of becoming enslaved. The United States is outstanding in the first; the Soviet Union outstanding in the second; and China outstanding in the third of these worlds.

We, the United States, are today confronted with probably the greatest test of our capacities that has ever been imposed upon us. Wanting peace, yet having since 1914 been drawn into two world wars, we have become a party to and are a leading figure in an even greater conflict: the Kremlin and communism versus democracy.

In this current conflict the Kremlin is the ultimate aggressor. Its objective is to perpetuate itself and, to that and other ends, to make world-wide its system and its control. The creators and beneficiaries of that system reason that they must either destroy democracy or be destroyed by democracy. They therefore are attacking all democratic ideas and regimes and aspirations. They intend to win. They would prefer to win by cold war, but they expect to have both cold and hot. Lenin said so. Stalin says so. As the United Kingdom's Ernest Bevin said some 3 years ago, "We would be as foolish as barnyard geese not to believe that they mean what they say and that they are preparing accordingly."

Foremost among the Kremlin's weapons of assault is communism. In prospectus, communism offers mankind government of the people, by the people, and for the people. In practice, Communists establish, wherever they gain control, regimes in which a few enslave the many. Communism is authoritarian and Communist regimes are totalitarian, absolutist and expansionist. Every member of a Communist Party—no matter where or what his or its nationality, whether he and his party be Marxist, Trotskyist, Stalinist or National Communist—is pledged to work for world victory of communism. Every Communist thus is a sworn enemy of democracy. To that extent, all Communists are subject to the Kremlin and all Communist regimes are allies of the Soviet Union in service of a common cause: Communism over all.

Because of those facts, there can be no compromise between communism as it is and men and nations that value freedom. Nor can agreements, if and when, with Communist authorities, be relied upon. Those authorities, making war on freedom, at home and abroad, neither think nor act in terms

of "live and let live"; and they regard agreements not as contracts but as camouflage.

This third world conflict may be expected to continue until either the Kremlin and communism desist from the policies and practices to which they are now committed or the still free peoples, including the United States, subverted or subjected one by one, have all capitulated and with totalitarian governments, become confederates, satellites, or subjects of the Moscow authoritarian regime.

Such being the setting, foremost in importance among the political problems that should long since have been apparent and of priority concern to all of our policy makers has been and is the problem of our national security, which in turn is a part of the larger problem of the survival of freedom, free peoples, and free men.

Neither during World War II, nor for a good while after, did more than a few of our leaders have any appreciable comprehension of what communism, Kremlin brand, was, is, and intends, or of what Soviet policy makers have had in contemplation. Of the many and contradictory things which the Russians have said to all the world about themselves, their system, their objectives, and their methods, our policy makers long believed what they most wanted to believe and refused to believe what they found unpleasant or inconvenient to believe. Only as the Communists have provided, with acts of physical aggression involving American nationals and properties and other interests, indisputable evidence that communism means conquest, has there been grasped, gradually, the fact that Lenin and Stalin meant what they said the first time—and the second and the third—to their own followers rather than what Stalin has said to some diplomats and to some publicists.

President Truman sensed danger some 3 years ago. He declared it his belief that it must be the policy of the United States "to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures," and that "if we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own Nation." The policy makers formulated, and the Congress approved, a plan which committed us to the principle but whittled down the scope of that utterance. Toward resistance to the Communist assault, we undertook to give some support to some countries, but some only, menaced by that assault. The principle of combating the spread of communism by giving support to resistance to it has since loomed large in our foreign policy as a whole, but with some glaring inconsistencies.

In two countries, Greece and China, the Communist assault was being pressed simultaneously in terms of "hot" war. In the case of Greece, we, the United States, gave moral support and economic and military aid to a government which, under armed Communist attack, made armed resistance, a resistance which but for our support could not long have persisted. In the case of the other, China, we ostentatiously withdrew our moral support and discontinued our material aid; and the resistance there of a government which was likewise under armed Communist attack and resisting became ineffectual but did not cease.

Strategically, China was and is of extreme importance in relation to the conflict between democracy and the Kremlin because China lies in a buffer position, both geographically and politically, between the free peoples of the Pacific area—including ourselves—and the main base (Moscow) from which Communist operations are conducted. An anti-Communist China would be at least a barrier—to the advantage of the free peoples. A Communist China, if and as, will be a highway by which a base from which Soviet influence will move and Communist armed forces be able to strike southward and eastward toward free and freedom-seeking peoples. Manchuria is so serving today.

Politically, China was and is of importance because she has vast potentialities and she has a permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations. An anti-Communist China votes there on our side. A Communist China, if and when, would vote—and veto—there on the Soviet side.

Yet, with that country, China, the largest, the most populous, the most richly endowed country in Asia, the enduring "Middle Kingdom," a neighbor across the Pacific, long our friend, lately an ally, under armed attack and in process of being subjugated by militant communism, and with Korea, Japan, the Philippines, and other far-eastern countries, in fact most of Asia, almost sure to go as she goes—our policy makers caused this country, the United States, to refrain, from August 1946 to June 27, 1950, from giving any real support to those who there were—and are—resisting Communist aggression. They said, successively and cumulatively, that we should not, we could not, and we would not "intervene" in what they declared to be a "civil conflict."

That was just what the Kremlin and communism wanted and worked for. William Z. Foster said some 4 years ago: "The war in China is the key to all problems of the international front * * * the key task * * * is to stop American intervention in China * * * the question of China is our key concentration."

Seeds of communism were first planted in China by Russian agents in 1920. Sun Yat-sen accepted an offer of assistance from Russia in 1923. Sun died in 1925 and Chiang Kai-shek became his political heir. Chiang (who had studied in Japan and had visited Moscow) made use of and was used by Russian and Chinese Communists until, in 1927, those elements attempted to seize control of the Nationalist movement and he thereupon expelled the former and set about suppressing the latter. Communism in China then took the form of armed rebellion. In course of time the Chinese Communists moved, under arms, by the "long march," from South China into North China. There they were when, in the last week of World War II, the Russians entered and occupied Manchuria, and when, in Manchuria, in 1946, the Russians made available to them the vast quantities of military equipment and supplies surrendered by the Japanese which enabled them to begin massive attack on the Nationalists—China then, Korea now.

China's Communists have from that point on enjoyed the undivided continued moral support of the Soviet Government, the Soviet satellite states, the Cominform, the Communists throughout the world, and of many non-Communist liberals who have been moved by propaganda—much of it Kremlin-originated—which has magnified the faults of the Nationalists and portrayed the Communists as "agrarian reformers" leading a "peasants' rebellion."

The American people have always been well-disposed toward the Chinese. For more than a hundred years it was the policy of the United States to respect and befriend the recognized Central Government of China. This—not because each such government was a good government nor because China was politically pure and wholesome, but because American statesmen and the American people believed it to be to the interest of the United States and of all concerned that orderly processes prevail and that China survive as a state, be independent and be within the orbit of democratic influence.

In pursuance of that policy, we made in China and in our relations with her people an investment of influence—especially moral influence—which has been substantial and has produced substantial benefits in both directions. We came to be regarded by the Chinese and by the world as China's best friend. In the decade which preceded 1945, that relationship paid handsome dividends to the cause of the free peoples in the war of defense against the aggression of the Axis powers.

But there came—beginning in 1942—a change. Pearl Harbor had made the United States and China allies. In the course of the subsequent efforts of both countries to make the most of that relationship, many Americans, several in high places, became so intent upon ways and means for winning the war that they overlooked, were indifferent to, or were utterly impatient of Chinese methods and susceptibilities; while many Chinese, some also in high places, became so intent upon ways and means for safeguarding China's and their own interests against the pressures which they knew would develop after the war had been won that they insisted—not unnaturally—on trying to have some say of their own regarding military and political strategies and tactics in their own country.

The long and short of it was, and has been: Americans, in a variety of capacities, attempted to compel the Chinese to do various and sundry things; and the Chinese, a people who can be persuaded but who cannot be driven, were unwilling or unable to do those things and reacted unfavorably in several contexts. The irresistible force hammered at an immovable body—with results and consequences most unfortunate for China, for the United States, for the world, and for the reputations, in the long run, of some of the American participants, many of whom became hostile to the National Government, embarked on campaigns of criticism of it, and have ever since been extravagantly condemning it and crusading against it. The only gainers from that tragedy have been, until 1945, the Japanese, and since 1945, the Communists (in China, in the Soviet Union, and throughout the world).

While the war effort in China was thus being plagued, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill made to Generalissimo Chiang in 1943, at Cairo, certain commitments. Most important, it was the agreed "purpose" of the three that Manchuria and Formosa (and the Pescadores) "shall be restored to China," and that "in due course Korea shall become free and independent."

In the same transaction it was agreed that President Roosevelt would, upon signal from Marshal Stalin, take measures to obtain the concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The United States thus, with a view to saving American lives, paid Russia, in advance, with a draft drawn on China, guaranteed to Russia by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, kept secret from China for many months, and honored by China on American official advice.

Later President Roosevelt, who did not understand the Russians, who thought he had persuaded Stalin, who was told by his military advisers that without Russian participation in the war against Japan the American casualty list in achieving Japan's defeat might be enormous, President Roosevelt made, with Prime Minister Churchill, to Marshal Stalin in 1945 at Yalta, concessions at China's expense inconsistent with earlier international agreements and with the commitments made at Cairo. (Incidentally, Stalin had already promised Russian participation.)

True, we could not have prevented the Russian aggression which ensued, but by giving, in advance, our assent to a predatory trespassing on Russia's part, we did in Russia's favor in relations with China a thing which we had for many years refused to do in Japan's favor; and in doing so we disregarded principles and pledges of our own and we authorized a violation by Russia of pledges which both she and we had given. No matter how much or how well our part at Yalta

may be explained, defended, and justified, we there bargained in and with China's rights and interests for expected advantages to ourselves. We bought, with Chinese coin, unneeded Russian action and worthless Russian pledges. We later caused the Chinese to buy, with their confirmation, a made-in-Moscow Trojan horse. And all too few of our people, including many in high places, seem subsequently to have taken any account of the extraordinary moral obligation which we thus incurred.

In December of 1945 the American Government proclaimed its commitment to a new policy regarding China. President Truman announced that the United States would be inclined to give aid to China if and as China made, along specified lines, progress toward "unity and peace." In pursuance of that policy, and toward trying to stabilize the situation in China, it sent General Marshall to urge compromise and coalition.

The new policy was an expression of concepts and views that the Nationalist leadership in China was corrupt and incompetent; that the power of that leadership should, therefore, be diluted or be destroyed; that Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers; that Russia's pledges could be relied on; and that it was appropriate and feasible for the American Government to ask of the Chinese Government adoption and implementation in and for China of a program of political and economic reform. The policy was based in substantial part on mistaken assumptions. It envisaged the impossible. So, too, the Marshall mission. And in both there was deviation from traditional principles of American foreign policy.

Earlier in 1945, when Mr. Byrnes had become Secretary of State, he had begun operations with an assumption that relations with Russia could, should and would be conducted on a basis of cooperation. Within 6 months he was driven to the conclusion: You can't do business with Russia on any such basis; you've got to be tough. His experience was in Europe and in relation to problems there. We became tough—or we tried to. At about the same time, General Marshall decided that we must be tough in regard to China. In practice, our "be tough" policies were—they could only be—expressed in pressures on governments. In Europe that worked out as a pressure against a Communist regime engaged in aggression. In China it worked out as pressure upon an anti-Communist regime engaged in resisting aggression.

The Yalta and early post-Yalta developments had weakened the position of China's National Government and strengthened that of the Communists. Many of the things done and things said by the American Government and by some parts of the American public since then have had similar two-fold harmful effects.

There has been much loose, prejudiced and prejudicial talk about the amount of aid which we have given China. The facts do not bear out the impressions created by various statistical exhibits and official interpretations thereof. Much of what appears in various accountings is in no way warrantably describable as postwar aid to the National Government or as contribution to the military effort of that Government in its battle against the Communists. Our economic assistance was sent both into Nationalist-held and into Communist-held areas. It is more than questionable whether on balance the aid which we have given the Nationalist Government since VJ-day has not been more than offset by the encouragement which our other courses, in words and in deeds, have given to its Communist opposition, whether we have not in effect given the Natinal Government more of hindrance than of help.

Surely, for instance, the embargo in 1946 on export to China of munitions, official statements in 1947 after the Marshall mission, testimony officially given in 1948 in public hearings, the white book in 1949, the announcement in January 1950, that we would not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa, surely such and various other of our contributions have been the opposite of helpful to the Nationalists and highly helpful to the Communists. The withdrawal of our moral support, with substitution of official criticism and abuse, probably did the Nationalists more damage than our munitions (while, and as given) had ever done them good.

The recent flowering of the Communist operations in China has been no more the consummation of a people's or peasants rebellion than had been 20 years previously the rise to power of the Nationalists. In both cases, able leaders of originally small articulate groups organized armed forces and set about ousting the existing authorities by use thereof. Both had at the outset foreign support—Russian. Each—first the Nationalists and ultimately the Communists—picked up adherents as it piled up military victories. As of 1946, the Communists, after 25 years of effort, had no substantial following outside of the ranks of their own armed forces. In that year we began our withholding of material aid to the Nationalists, and the Russians began their giving of material aid to the Communists; in the next year the Communists began to win armed victories; and thereafter, where the Communists appeared in force the Chinese people accepted them on a basis of hope and of fear, not, with the exception of various and sundry intellectuals, on a basis of enthusiastic choice.

The Communist conquest of the mainland was not a victory or, by, or for the Communist ideology. The Communists won skillful of armed forces, an abundance of munitions and a marvellous propaganda of big lies and bigger promises. They were the outs capitalizing on conditions of distress, which, after the Japanese, they themselves had helped create and which the ins were unable—as the Communists now are unable—to alleviate. They broadcast to the Chinese people and to the world that these conditions were all the fault of the Nationalists; they, the Communists, would liquidate those rascals, set up a government of and by and for the people, and make everything all right. And many of the Chinese people and many of the Nationalist soldiers—impoverished and frustrated by two decades of warfare, yearning for peace, discouraged and demoralized by the discontinuance of American moral and material support of the National government, and noting the successes of the Communist armies—were easily taken in by that line—many Americans, with no such preconditioning, also.

The Kremlin is making its conquests, is enslaving one nation after another, by skillful manipulation and support of persons, parties, and peoples who think that communism will make them free and prosperous and powerful. The Communist success in mainland China would have been duplicated, easily, in Korea, had not the United States and the United Nations promptly given support, moral and physical, to a government and a people resisting Communist agression there.

There is a myth regarding China which runs to the effect that the Chinese are a people who always absorb their conquerors. The fact is, the Chinese have absorbed only those of their conquerors who have invaded China and moved in substantial members from elsewhere into China. Observers and analysts who suggest that Russia will become bogged down or Russian conquerors be absorbed in China are reckoning with phantom phenomena of their own conjuring. The Russians are not moving into China, nor do they intend to try to govern China—now. No need for them to step in and assume the burdens, responsibilities, and risks of direct involvement where local Communists are, under their tutelage, advancing the frontiers of the Kremlin's empire. And, China's Communists will not be absorbed—for they are Chinese, they are in China and of China; they are not invading conquerors.

Nor is there warrant for a belief—and still less for an affirmative suggestion—that the Chinese people will be able to rise up in revolt and throw off the foreign yoke. The yoke in China will not be a foreign yoke; it will or would be a local copy of the totalitarian system which, effective in the Soviet Union and countries satellite thereto, is giving at this moment in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere new demonstrations of its methods. Communist totalitarian regimes are ruthlessly effective in anticipatory elimination of would be—or even might be—revolters.

There is the wishful thought that Mao Tze-tung may become a Chinese Tito and a Communist China under him become an Asiatic Yugoslavia. But how can any statesman or any thoughtful layman seeking to combat the spread of communism and to make the world safe for peoples that are free or hoping to become free—how can any such person find comfort or cause for cheer in a hope for such a consummation? Tito is a proponent of world revolution. Tito's Yugoslavia is a totalitarian state. Mao Tze-tung has declared that Chinese communism is a part of world communism, and Mao's China will be a totalitarian state. Can it be imagined that a Communist China will ever become more antipathetic to Moscow dictation than Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist China has been?

There is no warrant for an assumption that a Communist regime in China could or would be friendly or helpful to the United States. Communism is by nature intolerant of democracy. The Chinese Communists are avowedly committed no less than are the Russian—and the Yugoslav—to the objective of overthrowing all capitalistic or bourgeois or imperialist governments and making the victories of communism universal. The Chinese Communist leaders have—openly, emphatically, and repeatedly—declared that Chiang Kai-shek is their enemy No. 1 and the United States their enemy No. 2. They've copied the Russian pattern; they use the Russian methods; they follow the Moscow line. Wherever they gain control they conduct themselves just as their counterparts or prototypes in other countries have done and are doing. They have told us over and over, and they show us day by day, to whom they consider themselves indebted, where their allegiance lies, what they envisage, and how they intend to operate.

We all know what these Chinese Communists did to and about our consular establishments in Mukden; what they've done at Dairen; what they did to our Embassy premises and to our military attaché at Nanking; what they did to one of our Foreign Service officers at Shanghai; what they've done to our official property at Peking; what they've done to Catholic missionaries and to foreign journalists; and what they say regarding interests and agents of "imperialist" powers. It would seem that they've been, as the Japanese once were doing and as the Russians constantly are doing, testing us out.

More serious, however, than any of these matters: If the Communists gain unchallenged control in China, the natural sequel, China, then having passed completely into the Kremlin and Cominform orbit, will be intensification of Communist pressures in areas to the south, to the west, and to the east of China; the influence of the democ-

racies (western Europe and North America) will be diminished; Russian influence will be expanded; the interests, investments and commitments in general of the United States throughout the Far East—especially in Japan and in the Philippines—will be gravely endangered; the chance of our being involved in a "shooting" war with Russia will be increased; and the likelihood of our having any allies in eastern Asia will be reduced to approximately zero.

The authors and factors of the Marshall plan originally portrayed the foreign-aid program as in "investment" in security—to be implemented on a basis of "calculated risk." They envisaged economic aid—to certain countries. They figured that this would require expenditures up to a certain amount. They said that we could afford that amount but no more; that we therefore could not include—could not find funds to include—China. But, less than a year later they saw and they declared that economic aid to western Europe must be supplemented by military aid. They then decided that we could afford that supplement. Next, they perceived that Europe could not make a full economic recovery unless access be regained to the resources and trade of eastern Asia. But the Communist advance in China was creating obstacles to that restoration. So, they thought and said, the Communist advance must be stopped—at China's borders. Hence the idea of economic aid to countries peripheral to China—with particular thought for Korea and the Philippines, and general thought, under a point 4 program, for several other areas. Next, they realized that in Asia as well as in Europe economic aid must be supplemented by military assistance. So, plans for such aid, with thought especially of the Bao-dia government in Indochina. All the while, however, a studied insistence that China, including Formosa, not be included.

Was it not and is it not patent that the more the Communists gain in China, the stronger would be Russia's over-all strategic position and the greater the risk feature of the investment, under the Marshall plan, in aid to and for western Europe? Could it not be seen, be foreseen, that if communism gains undisputed control in and of China, the initiative, in the struggle in the Far East between communism and democracy, will thereafter be overwhelmingly at the disposal of the Soviet Union and any likelihood of firm resistance by indigenous governments or populations to Communist pressures against or within the areas peripheral to China be greatly diminished? Could it not be seen that no Asiatic would believe that American capacity to spend was so limited that we could give aid in Europe but could not give aid both in Europe and in China; that every Asiatic would note that discontinuance of American support of China's Nationalists and the rise to power of China's Communists had taken place in that order; and that politically minded Asiatics, no matter what their principles and preferences, would be skeptical of the enduring reliability of proffered American support? Could it not be foreseen that with a Communist domination of China we would stand to lose all that we had with a century of effort gained—not only in China but at other, or at all, points in the Far East; that the relief which we had gained at a great price from the threat to our security which had all along been implicit in Japan's policy of expansion by force would be gone; more, that our losses might easily become the Kremlin's gains and the whole of our investment in the Far East, before and in World War II, be turned against us?

The Kremlin-planned and Russian-supported invasion of South Korea is a sample of the fruit to be expected from a policy of first letting a middle and key area go by default and then hoping that a modicum of aid to weak peoples in scattered peripheral areas will suffice as a quarantine.

The whole question of what the United States could afford was and is a question of relative evaluations. We must, of course, at all times consider our national economy. But in war we spend freely in order that we may save. Now the simple fact is we have been at war with Communist totalitarianism for a longer while than we were at war with Nazi and Fascist totalitarianism. We have talked of "cold" war. But our policy makers have shown little awareness of the fact that war, whether "cold" or "hot," is nevertheless war and calls for planning and action accordingly. Compared with the expenditures that our people are now demanding be made, and which no one now says we can't afford, in response to a top-level decision to support resistance to Communist aggression in Korea, the cost of an aid to Nationalist China such as we gave to Greece would have been a small amount indeed. We could not afford it because the people who said we could not were the same people who said we should not. They were at outs with China's Nationalists because the Nationalists had declined or been unable to adopt and implement a program for China which they had prescribed. They believed that, as Stalin had said, China's Communists were "not real Communists." They believed that democracy and communism could exist and be at peace side by side. They refused to believe that a Communist domination of China could have serious—to say nothing of tragic—implications in regard to our policies and our position in the cold war which they expected to win by giving much economic and some military assistance to a few countries in western Europe and in western Asia. They insisted that the issue between communism and democracy was one of ideologies. They reasoned that we could check and roll back the tide of communism by showing some peoples and telling all peoples that our democratic way of life produces a better standard of living and general welfare than does the Russian Soviet way. They simply did not understand the Communist, the world Communist, movement. They did not and they would not see that Soviet Russia is, as was Tzarist Russia, expansionist minded, bent on conquest, a moral and ruthless. "We must not support a 'corrupt' government in China. We must not intervene (though we already had intervened) in a 'civil conflict' in China. If China's Communists won in that conflict, we can thenceforth give them economic and cultural assistance, enroll them on the side of democracy, and see them become a thorn in the side of Soviet Russia."

One year ago, in August 1949, the Department of State, in the white book, declared China's National Government bankrupt. It said that the Communists had won and that nothing that the United States had done or had not done could have changed that result. At the same time it declared itself at last awake to the fact of Soviet Russian imperialism, and it admonished China's Communists that an attempt on their part to engage in aggression against China's neighbors would be an affront to the United Nations.

At that time China's Nationalists still had a government, they still had armies, they still had a treasury, they still had bases, they long had been and they still were resisting the armed advance of militant communism, and they still were hoping for American assistance. Moreover, what remained of the Nationalist organization was the hard core of the Kuomintang and its armed forces. What they most lacked were the very things which but for the United States the Greeks also would have lacked, the things but for which Greece would have been overrun by the Communists. Yet our Government all but crossed them off, and perhaps worse, told them and the world that we were doing so. Today, a year after that cross-off, those Nationalists still carry on. They have better political and military assets than they had then.

When China's Communist leaders created a government in Peking and proclaimed that government the Government of China, the Kremlin and all of its satellites promptly accorded that government recognition. Our policy makers, along with those of Great Britain and of several other non-Communist countries, gave favorable consideration to a plan which, had it been fully implemented, would have brought about recognition of that government by the United States shortly after recognition by the United Kingdom, India, and others. Popular opposition in this country, aroused by observation of the treatment accorded American interests in China by the Communist regime, spared us the making of that mistake.

Meanwhile China's Communist government talked of and went ahead with preparations for invasion of Formosa and liquidation of the National Government. With that the number coming up on the Communist timetable, our Department of State, at the end of December 1949, issued a memorandum instructing its officers in the Far East to portray Formosa as an area of no strategic importance.

Three weeks later, in January of this year, 1950, after ex-President Herbert Hoover had suggested that the United States Navy be used, if necessary, to keep Formosa from falling into Communist hands, our policy makers caused the President of the United States to announce, unnecessarily and to the world on January 12, 1950: "The United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa."

In the course of the past 2 years our Government, impelled partly by dictates of a "Europe first" strategy, partly by a belated realization that economic assistance without military assistance is not only a risk but a risk which invites aggression, and partly by a feeling of alarm born of communism's gains in Asia, has entered into arrangements for mutual defense between and among the free peoples of western Europe and ourselves. We are giving to the North Atlantic Pact countries economic assistance and moral support and weapons and military collaboration. All to the good—in principle—but it does not go far enough.

The North Atlantic Pact and the military aid program may have strengthened us in one theater, but they could not and cannot give us security, all theaters considered. Strength and vulnerabilities have to be considered together. In today's world, security is, as is peace, indivisible, a condition for all or a reality for none. There can be no real security in the North Atlantic area, none in Europe, none in Asia, none, in fact, in America—no real security anywhere—so long as it is left possible for communism or any other "ism" or system to impose itself or be imposed anywhere by force.

American support of China's Nationalists having been ruled out by our policy makers, and American support of China's Communists having been ruled out by the acts of those Communists themselves and the reaction of the American public thereto, American official thought turned to the idea of "containing" communism in eastern Asia by giving support to governments of countries peripheral to China—Indochina, Indonesia, Malaya, Siam, Burma, the Philippines, Korea: "Concede China to the Communists but let them have nothing more." And there came also emphasis on point 4 and new emphasis on the Voice of America. Communism, however, is making clear that it does not intend thus to be contained.

On June 24, 1950, Korean Communist armed forces in North Korea marched against the Korean Republic in South Korea, a peripheral area state for the birth of which the United Nations was partly responsible and to which the United States had given

and was giving assistance. The United Nations, on United States initiative, at once declared this an act of aggression, called upon the North Koreans to withdraw, and called upon its own members to go to the assistance of the resisting South Koreans. On July 27 President Truman announced that he had ordered the United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support; that the attack on Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and will now use armed invasion and war; that it has defied the orders of the Security Council of the United Nations; that in these circumstances the occupation of Formosa by Communist forces would be a direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to United States forces in that area; that accordingly he had ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa and was calling upon the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland; that he had directed that military assistance to the Philippine Government be accelerated; that he had similarly directed acceleration in the furnishing of military assistance to the forces of France and the Associated States in Indochina; that the United States will continue to uphold the rule of law; and that he had instructed Ambassador Austin to report these steps to the Security Council.

With those developments and what has transpired and what has been disclosed since, all here present are familiar.

In relation to United States interests, objections, over-all policies, and facing of realities, the decision which President Truman made regarding Formosa was soundly complementary to but more bold and more significant than his decision regarding Korea. In the case of Korea, there was no question of an inconsistency with previous decisions; there was present the mandate of the United Nations; there was the compelling consideration that between the alternatives of committing or not committing the United States to prompt physical support of the South Koreans there really was no choice; we had to act, affirmatively and at once; and it apparently was assumed that the commitment could be easily implemented a police action. In the case of Formosa, there was recent previous inclination to the contrary; there was no mandate from the United Nations; the considerations of sound strategy, political and military, which underlay the inclusion of this commitment would be little appreciated in some quarters; and it had to be presumed that implementation might not be easy.

Obviously, President Truman perceived, as many others had not, and some haven't yet, that the decision taken regarding Korea made essential a tightening up of the whole line of resistance to the onward march of communism, and that resistance at the ends of a crescent peripheral to China calls for a resistance in the middle of that line. Success for our side in Korea would be more difficult, and, when achieved, would be more than offset, to our loss, if in the interval the Communists took Formosa. And he probably sensed that there may come a time when China's Nationalists and bases held and provided by them will again be an asset in a common cause, as they were in World War II.

In that context, there persist a number of serious questions to which, brushed off or answered indifferently during recent years, renewed attention must now be given:

Can we afford to abandon a friendly government, to the fashioning of whose predicament we have contributed, while that government still lives and still is resisting a common enemy?

Could be afford to add, by such an act, to the doubts regarding our standards and our reliability which already exist in the minds of various governments and peoples whom we exhort to stand with us in a common effort to combat communism and produce conditions of national and international security?

Can we afford to accept—by facilitating a completion of the Communist conquest of China and a consolidation by the Communists of their position in that pivotal and crucial area—the increase which will inevitably result therefrom of Communist pressures upon and against other areas in the Far East in which we have interests and involvements, especially Japan and the Philippines?

Could we afford to accept by default the loss of the advantage which it might be to us to have remain alive in China at least a nucleus of organized resistance, some element allied with us in the common cause of resistance by freemen and peoples to the armed advance of communism?

Formosa is an island a hundred plus miles off the coast of China, southwest of Korea and of Japan, and directly north of the Philippines—area about that of Maryland and Delaware combined, larger than Haiti, more than three times that of Puerto Rico. Population, slightly greater than that of Virginia and North Carolina combined, about that of Australia; by race almost all Chinese. Ceded to Japan in 1895; surrendered, in keeping with the Cairo and the Potsdam declarations, to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in 1945; now the seat of the National Government and the headquarters and base of Nationalist resistance to China's Communists. Richly endowed and practically self-sustaining as regards production of foodstuffs. Little industrialized. On Formosa there are in and with the National Government a large number of men and women who, from all parts of China, have been educated in Occidental schools and colleges, in China or abroad, most of them Americans. There are Nationalist armed forces numbering from 350,000 to 700,000 men, with reasonably good equipment, including artillery, tanks, aircraft and some naval vessels. As these are expended, they can be replaced only by importation from foreign sources. Most of the energies of the population are devoted, currently, to the training and maintenance of the armed forces and corollary activities related to preparation to repel an invasion. The coast lines on the west have been heavily fortified.

Formosa has been since 1948 literally the lifesaver of Nationalist China. It has provided not only a refuge but a base for reorganization. Some of the ablest of the younger men of the Kuomintang have been effecting reforms—administrative, social, and military. Chiang Kai-shek now commands there land, sea, and air forces, composed largely of veterans who, although they were defeated in battles on the mainland, did not succumb to the blandishments of Communist propaganda and who, if assured of adequate munitions, can be expected to put up a stiff resistance to further Communist attack. He has been able to offer to the United Nations for use in Korea a contingent of troops numbering more than have thus far been offered by all the other members put together.

Formosa, were it taken by China's Communists would become, to communism, a valuable asset. Who can say that, held by the Nationalists, it may not some day be more than that to the free peoples in the global effort which will have to be made first to contain and ultimately to roll back the forces of Communist aggression?

In the light of the Communist invasion of South Korea and the action to which he was on June 27 committing the United States toward physical support of resistance to that act of aggression, President Truman at the same time committed the United States to a dual undertaking in reference to Formosa: that of preventing any attack by the Communists upon Formosa and, as a corollary, that of causing the Chinese Government on Formosa to desist from air and sea operations against the mainland. "The Seventh Fleet will see that this is done." By the terms of that decision, the announcement of it, and action promptly taken in accordance with it, the United States became very definitely committed to the objective of Keeping Formosa out of the hands of the Communists. That objective coincides with the foremost of the immediate objectives and preoccupations of Chinese Government and people on Formosa. Question arises: Do we intend, toward implementing this commitment, to cooperate with and have the help of the Chinese on Formosa, or do we intend to discharge our obligations under it all by ourselves? If the former, we shall have to revise our official attitude and some features of our earlier policy regarding the National Government. If the latter, we may find ourselves inviting the very act of aggression which we have said we "will" prevent.

In a Department of State publication, in its issue of August 11, there appears, in the account of that day's press conference, this statement: "Asked if the United States policy on Formosa leaves room for further military aid to Generalissimo Chiang, the Secretary (Mr. Acheson) replied that it does." (Wireless Bulletin, No. 194, August 11, 1950, p. 13).

The over-all purpose of the decisions announced on June 27 was, of course, to make resistance to Communist aggression. The method, initially: (a) to give support to Governments in Korea, in the Philippines and in French Indochina toward making resistance in those areas and (b) to deploy United States naval forces to prevent further hostilities between the Communists on mainland China and the Nationalists on Formosa. There comes then this question: Is the conflict between China's Communists and China's Nationalist a civil conflict or is it a local part of the world conflict wherein the Kremlin and communism are making war on democracy?

Communist propaganda long has declared the conflict in China to be strictly a "civil conflict." The American Government has for several years taken and expressed the same view of it. But now, a similar conflict having developed in Korea and the Communists (witness Mr. Malik) declaring this conflict strictly a "civil conflict," the American Government and the United Nations say: "No. This is a case of Communist aggression, Russian inspired and Russian supported. It must be stopped." (Witness, the recent discussions and the resolutions adopted at Lake Success.) "Even if it were merely a civil conflict, where there is a danger to world peace it is a right and may be a duty of the United Nations to intervene." (Witness, Sir Gladwin Jebb, on August 11, 1950.)

No matter what may have been before 1946, the character of the conflict between China's Communists and China's National Government, that conflict has been since that year a conflict the fundamental characteristics of which have been and are Communist aggression and Russian support. What has been going on in China since 1946 differs little from what has been going on in Korea since June 24, 1950. In both cases communism, engaging in armed aggression, has been on the march. In China, Chinese Communist armed forces have overrun the country; in Korea, Korean Communist armed forces have overrun the country. In both, there has been Russian inspiration and support. The American Government and the United Nations are right in declaring the developments in Korea a case of Communist aggression and in giving support to South Korean resistance thereto.

They would have been right had they so done in regard to the conflict in China. They would be right were they to do so now. President Truman was right when in March 1947 he said: "I believe it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." He is right now in coupling with United States action toward resisting Communist aggression by armed Koreans, United States action toward resisting Communist aggression by armed Chinese. The conflict in Korea is not a civil conflict. The conflict between China's Communists and China's Nationalists has not been and is not a civil conflict. The attacking forces in both cases bear a made-from-and-for-Moscow stamp.

A policy of resisting aggression by giving support to resistance to aggression calls for action not only toward repelling aggression but toward preventing aggression. Our operations toward repelling a Communist aggression in Korea would be jeopardized if currently therewith there occurred a Communist attack on Formosa. Success for the United Nations in Korea would be a hollow victory if at the same time communism made gains in Formosa or in the Philippines or in Indochina. President Truman doubtless took all these considerations into account in the making of the decisions which he announced collectively and in combination on June 27. He gave us, for the region involved, a coordinated program toward comprehensive resistance to an enemy which, unfortunately, is in position to strike at any one or several of many points.

In a leading role as we are in this third world conflict, involved as we are in an operation of armed resistance to Communist aggression in one region, and perceiving as most of us now do that communism may attack and we be compelled, along with other peoples, to make armed resistance elsewhere, it behooves us to do, without delay and with all our might, two things: (a) tie tighter the cords of our helmet, gird on our full armor toward preventing more and greater attacks, and, if such are made, defeating the aggressor; and (b) make friends and give support wherever possible toward the same ends.

The question of making friends brings us back again to the question of relations with China. There has been in this country and elsewhere an advocacy of an idea of making friends with China's Communist regime: "Be nice to them, recognize them, give them the seat on the Executive Council of the United Nations which is now that of China's National Government; they are only superficially and temporarily allied to the Kremlin; they would, of their own volition and in gratitude for favors received from and expected of us turn against the Russians, become friends with us, and be on our side in the world conflict."

I have discussed some aspects of that subject in another form. There remains no time for discussion of it here. Let me say only that in my opinion the most stultifying action that the United States could take now would be to give any form of political encouragement or support to the Communist regime in China or to any advocacy, no matter by whom, of such course. That regime cannot be won over to, nor will it come over to our side. Mao Tze-tung may, as Tito has done, quarrel with Stalin; but neither is Communist China nor is Communist Yugoslavia likely to side with us and democracy against communism's imperialism. And, in my opinion, the most stultifying thing that the United Nations could now do would be to take from China's Nationalist government and give to China's Communist government China's seats in the Executive Council and elsewhere. The Soviet authorities could be appeased only by a total surrender, and the Chinese Communist authorities are almost as hostile to the democracies as is the Kremlin. In the practical politics of international relations, the eyes, the ears, the voices and the acts of nations are, at any given moment or period, those of their own governing authorities. This is especially true where peoples are ringed 'round by iron curtains. We cannot now reach and make friends of the people in Russia or the people in Communist China. Nor can those peoples deviate.

On the other hand, China's Nationalists have been our friends, still wish to be our friends, and are committed even more firmly to resistance to communism than we are. We can influence them and, through them, China. Both the United States and the United Nations should take full stock of those facts and make the most of them.

No country in Europe, no nation in Asia has been won over to communism by communism's idealogy. None has been saved from communism by democracy's idealogy. But 12 countries have been subjugated by Russian manipulation of the forces and resources, including manpower and arms and propaganda, which communism has put at the Kremlin's disposal. Others are in jeopardy—and we are in danger. As Sir Gladwyn Jebb said on Friday last (August 11, 1950) at Lake Success, "Whatever their (Europe and Asia's) relations in the past, they are likely both to be lost unless they both realize the danger and concert to meet it. For this purpose, what has happened in Korea must not be allowed to occur again."

For our own good, toward defense and survival of our country, our democracy, our own and other peoples rights to freedom and security, we need to prepare now, to the maximum of our ability, to discourage aggressors, to prevent attacks, to support those who resist attacks and, if we are attacked, to defend our own soil and from it, with help from others, whom we may have helped, put an end to aggression. The Communist attack is global. We cannot all by ourselves meet it on every front. But it must be met. We need friends and our friends need friends. We should think of China in that setting, and of Nationalist China and Communist China in terms of relative potentialties. In a world three ways divided, the free peoples and those who seek freedom must stand together or, failing that, be one by one destroyed.

The Improvement of the Snake River To Bring Tidewater Navigation to the Confluence of the Snake and Clearwater Rivers at Lewiston, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important inland navigation projects in this country to be undertaken by the Federal Government is the improvement of the Snake River in Washington and Idaho to bring tidewater navigation to Lewiston, Idaho. The Congress in recognition of this project has authorized the construction of four multipurpose dams on the Snake River, and the Bureau of the Budget has approved the appropriation of $4,000,000 to start work on the Ice Harbor Dam, the first of the series of navigation and multipurpose dams to be built on the Snake River.

The House Appropriations Committee included the item for Ice Harbor in the 1950 appropriation, only to have it dropped out in the Senate on the plea that no provision had been made for the migration of fish past the dam. This item has again been approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the 1951 appropriation bill, but was dropped from the bill by the House Appropriation Committee.

I have endeavored to have the appropriation restored by the Senate Appropriations Committee in a personal appearance before the committee, when the importance of the Snake River navigation in the upbuilding and economy of our country was presented in the following statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

ICE HARBOR DAM PROJECT, IDAHO

Representative WHITE. I wanted to address myself to the appropriation for Ice Harbor Dam.

I have a map here that we have prepared to better illustrate the situation.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You may tell us what you wish.

Representative WHITE. This map was used when we obtained the authorization to build the dams on the Snake River from the confluence of the Columbia and Snake Rivers, near Umatilla and Pasco, and is one of the most important navigation projects remaining to be constructed in the United States. I have no hesitancy in saying that. We have navigation in high water on the Snake up to Lewiston in Idaho, at the confluence of the Snake River and the Clearwater River, and that is nothing new. They have been hauling wheat by boats in high-water stages for years, and I have pictures on this map of the tugs and the barges navigating the Snake River. There are a number of pictures of boats going up under the drawbridge at Lewiston in high water.

Now, the Congress has already authorized the construction of the dams on the Snake River to bring tidewater transportation on the Columbia and Snake Rivers all the way up to Lewiston, Idaho. Ice Harbor is the first dam on this authorized project.

Now, just to illustrate to you gentlemen how important this navigation program is, and what it means in the development of the United States, we are in the initial stages of bringing in the great Columbia Basin project of 1,200,000 acres bordering along the Snake River and the Columbia River. The towns and communities are all to be built; the homes are to be built with streets and concrete sidewalks. Buildings and communities will be constructed a[illegible] over the big project.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Who is going to pay for that, Congressman?

Representative WHITE. The cost of the irrigation project is reimbursable to the Government. The farms, homes, towns, and communities will be built and financed by private enterprise. We have already built Coulee Dam and we are in the process of bringing water to the Columbia Basin. Canals are being constructed and millions are being spent to develop the Columbia Basin, which will be one of the fruit and breadbaskets of the whole United States when it is finished. We have already demonstrated that at Yakima on one side and Wenatchee on the other, trainloads of grain and apples are rolling out of that section now.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT AREAS

When this semiarid country is brought under water, and it soon will be, we are going to build a new section of the United States. The material needed to build that is up here

in Idaho. We have the biggest white pine sawmill in the world in Lewiston. Lewiston is a beautiful, thriving city, as it shows in this picture, at the confluence of the Snake and the Clearwater Rivers. The railroads are in there, the country is now in big production, and it is one of the great wheat centers of the Northwest [indicating on the map] besides cattle and farm produce. There is timber and building material of all kinds and look at the tremendous country.

Now, there are a number of tributaries upstream to the Snake River. There is the Clearwater, that drains a great amount of undeveloped country, and the Salmon River, a big stream that drains another big country, these two big rivers join the Snake River and converge on Lewiston, and flow on down to Pasco, where the mighty Columbia comes in.

We already have navigation from the tidewater with the tugs and barge lines that are bringing material in all season of the year up to Umatilla, taking oil in and bringing wheat back.

Now, this dam project is a part of the navigation plan by building this Ice Harbor Dam you will carry forward the program of bringing tidewater navigation up to the Lewiston area where you have all of these vast resources of material, raw material, and manufactured lumber, navigation on the Snake River is an important thing and it is going to be needed to transport the material used to build that great Columbia Basin project.

DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL DEPOSITS

Now, as I have indicated, this is an old map. The Bureau of Mines, has gone into this immense country in central Idaho and tested out the metal deposits with a diamond drill. At Stibnite, Idaho, they bored into the veins and discovered tungsten that was worth $2 a pound. It was a godsend to the Nation in the last world war emergency. Tungsten is an alloy for steel and the Japs had cut off our supply that we were getting from China. Lo and behold we found this indespensable alloy metal in central Idaho.

Fortunately the Bradley Co., a big mining organization with all of the capital needed and all the resources required to bring these deposits into production mined the metal discovered by the Bureau of Mines and saved the day in the war.

But that isn't all. We have all kinds of resources locked up in central Idaho. It is one of the greatest underdeveloped sections of the United States. When I say that I am using the words of a former head of the Bureau of Mines, Dr. Finch.

As I said before, there is in northern and central Idaho the biggest stands of white pine timber in the United States. Much of it is being manufactured in Lewiston, and that is not saying anything about the vast stands of other varieties of timber, much of it needed downstream to develop this great Columbia Basin project that we have already invested two or three hundred million dollars into now.

Dr. Raver, what did the Grand Coulee cost?

Mr. RAVER. About $169,000,000.

Representative WHITE. Dr. Raver, as to these big canals that they are building into these reservoirs, and the reservoirs that have been built there to store the water and get it out to the land, what did that project cost?

Mr. RAVER. The total project, including the canals and the generators and the dam, cost about three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Representative WHITE. You see, gentlemen, there is a three-quarters of a billion dollar investment that we have here.

RESTORATION OF HOUSE REDUCTION

You have the lumber and an abundance of lime and material for a cement plant right up there at Orofino, Idaho, just above Lewiston and there are iron and mineral deposits of all kinds to be mined, processed, and floated down this river to the local market in the Columbia Basin and on out to world market by seagoing navigation via Portland. And to think that some little selfish interests in this country would pull a string to block this development, after the project has been authorized by the Congress, after this item was put in the budget and somebody—some Member made an objection and said that it was going to interfere with the migration of fish. They knew very well that the fish are going through the great Bonneville Dam, and they know the plan contains two fish ladders here. That was just a flimsy excuse and, gentlemen of this committee, I do hope that you will restore that $4,000,000 and let us start with this great navigation project that will mean so much in the upbuilding of the Northwest and the whole United States. We have a tremendous interest in the development of this country. If any foreign nation wanted to come in here and take over any of this land, we would stop them with the last drop of blood we have, and yet we stop the development of this great Northwest country with some little quibble over an imaginary barrier to the migration of fish.

I know that fish are important, but they will be taken care of here, and I do hope that you gentlemen will restore this project.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Did the House pass this one?

Representative WHITE. The House did not pass it; they did not have a chance to vote on the appropriation. It was dropped in the committee. It seems the committee took out Ice Harbor on the same old excuse about the fish. That part of the project has all been taken care of. The practicability of fish ladders has been tested by the Army engineers.

Here we have a bird's-eye view of the beautiful city of Portland, right down on the Columbia River, and I also have pictures of boats, navigating the Snake River, actual photographs, gentlemen of the boats going under the drawbridge at Lewiston. We have a picture here of the grain pouring down from the elevators along the river near Lewiston into the boats for transportation down river. They can do it in the high water—let us make it so they can do it all the year around, and at the same time get a multiple use from the dam that will give power where it is needed. You have transportation, power, and flood control—what better investment could we make?

Chairman MCKELLAR. Was there a vote in the House?

Representative WHITE. They did not get a chance to vote this item in the appropriation at all, it was excluded from the bill in the committee. But the House has previously authorized those dams, and this is the map I used before the House and before the committee, to show them what we have at the Columbia Basin—1,200,000 acres of land to be brought in to build up and condensed with communities, and we have you know, our ex-servicemen waiting to get on this land.

Let us lose no time in making the Snake River navigable to get the material down there that we need to build with: Lime, building stone, lumber, and everything that is needed, can be floated right down to the threshhold of the Columbia Basin project at Pasco and Wallula.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I want you to refresh my memory. I have been out there to Seattle and in that country. How far is it from Lewiston to Salem or Portland?

Representative WHITE. It is just an overnight ride by train. It is about 300 miles.

Once that navigation is started, once that material starts to move, the railroads will be the last people who will want to block it.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are they opposed to it now?

Representative WHITE. I think they are opposed to any competition. They are opposed to building navigation facilities. But it will mean so much to the railroads, because it will develop all of this country and they will get so much more tonnage to the eastern markets out of the Columbia Basin.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I will say this to you, Congressman: We started the same at Muscle Shoals when you were a boy, about 50 years ago. The railroads were very much opposed to those dams, and opposed that very vigorously. In later years, I think due to the building of dams, they have found it very profitable.

Representative WHITE. When you go through Pittsburgh and see the Ohio River and the iron ore and coking material moving to those foundries and realize the commerce the railroads are getting by the manufacture of this raw material, you can see what navigation of the Ohio River means to the railroads.

If you were to stop navigation on the Ohio River today it would ruin the railroads in that area.

NAVIGATION ON COLUMBIA RIVER

Senator KILGORE. Would that be navigable from the mouth of the Columbia River clear up to Lewiston?

Representative WHITE. It would be, and I think the Army will bear me out on that.

Senator KILGORE. I thought there were some terrible falls in there.

Representative WHITE. There is a place we call The Dalles. I do not want to take the time of the committee with a lot of history on this, but I have lived on the upper Columbia all my life. When the great Oregon Trail movement started, and people went into Oregon, about that time they discovered gold in California, and the people with covered wagons settled on the land of the big red apples or went down to dig gold in California. As those countries began to settle up and they needed flour and grain, settlers at Walla Walla and along the river found it was possible to raise wheat by dry farming and they began to raise it. The only way to get their grain to market was to haul it by wagon down to the Columbia River and there they stacked it in sheds along the shore and the boats came along and loaded it to go out to this wonderful market down in Oregon and on down to San Franciso, and that's the way the grain business in this country was started.

They improvised a wooden railroad around the barrier to navigation at The Dalles, and later the Government built Celilo Canal, so that the boats could go through. For years there has been a large amount of traffic on the Snake River in high water, and all we need to do is improve the river for year-round navigation.

I think, gentlemen, if this Congress fully understood the situation it would certainly put in and restore that $4,000,000.

That is all I have to say about that project and I do hope the gentlemen of the committee will give it favorable consideration.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Thank you, Congressman.

The New Dealers, Fair Dealers, or Double Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New Dealers, Fair Dealers, or double

dealers have never yet plugged a leak in any dike. Instead, the New Dealers have opened the floodgates of the Treasury to the whole world. The security of the American citizen is running out in a flood of subsidies and political hand-outs. Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting the following editorial in the RECORD:

OUR GREAT DIKE CAN HOLD TOO, IF THE LEAKS ARE PLUGGED NOW

By plugging a small leak in Holland's great dike with his finger until help came, little Peter became a national hero. Had the hole grown larger, the sea wall would have crumbled. Angry waters would have swept over Holland.

America, too, has a great dike which must be held. The dike which protects your security, your savings, your insurance, your comfortable living, and the welfare of your children. We cannot afford leaks in that dike.

AMERICA'S GREAT DIKE IS HER FINANCIAL SECURITY

Even a country as great as ours can spend only what it can collect in taxes. Or what it can borrow on its promise to repay in the future from future taxes. And it can keep on spending only as long as it can keep on taxing and borrowing.

Taxes are already high—today about one-fourth of the average American citizen's income goes for taxes, both direct and hidden. And we've already borrowed so much that our national debt has reached the staggering figure of $258,000,000,000—about $1,700 for every person in America.

WE MUST SPEND FOR PROTECTION

Now we must spend new billions of dollars for building our military might to inspire respect, and, if necessary, fear among those who must be held in check if America and the world are ever to enjoy freedom, security, and peace. We must spend to hold back the spread of communistic dictatorship which means poverty and slavery wherever it prevails.

BUT WE MUST NOT SPEND FOR WHAT WE CAN DO WITHOUT

For truly vital needs, we must spend freely with no thought but final victory. All the more reason, then, to stop the leaks of needless and wasteful spending. Economy need not deprive us of essential services. In fact, it has been estimated that we can save four to five billion dollars a year, just by cutting out the overlapping of governmental departments.

MILLIONS FOR DEFENSE, BUT—

When you, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen, have a big bill to meet you go without luxuries for a while. You practice sensible economy. So there is nothing unpatriotic at a time like this in asking your Government to do the same. Spend to help pay the big bill for defense and the preservation of freedom, but, in all else, economize. Plug the leaks now and help America's great dike of national security to hold firm.

The Three Keys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it was in the free state of Trieste a few years ago that I first had the pleasure and honor of meeting Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore.

At that time, General Moore was in command of the 5,000 American troops stationed there. Those troops, though mere boys, were among the best our Committee on the Armed Services ever have inspected in any place all over the world.

In spite of their youth, they were highly trained and well disciplined, with the lowest percent of veneral disease of all our troops. They were tough and fearless soldiers, but they were also kind and Christian gentlemen. Their appearance and their conduct were a high compliment to the splendid patriotic officers in their command.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following brief article which appeared in yesterday's This Week Magazine, written by Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore, former commander of our troops in Trieste and now Superintendent of the United States Military Academy.

Indeed we are fortunate, as a nation and a people, to have such a man to supervise, train, and direct the efforts of our American youth.

THE THREE KEYS

(By Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore, Superintendent, U. S. Military Academy)

In these days, every school—including West Point—has a double duty. One is to train the minds of its students; the other is to help form their character. As knowledge expands that becomes a difficult task. The sheer effort of mastering many complicated subjects tends to crowd out everything else.

That is why we are grateful for the coat of arms of the Military Academy. The motto emblazoned on the scroll consists of three words: Duty, Honor, Country. These are the three keys of character, and for the West Pointer they are an everlasting reminder of the other side of education, a reminder that, in life, a man without character, however clever, is nothing.

Duty, Honor, Country. These are simple, elemental words. They need no interpretation.

Duty goes farther than mere obedience to orders. It implies willingness, loyal execution and the sacrifice of personal interest, if necessary.

Country means more than display of patriotic sentiment. It calls for devotion, whether in the tedium of unspectacular service or the mortal struggle of the battlefield.

Honor is the central and highest word on the scroll. It is the keystone of the arch; for without it, all principles, ideals and beliefs will surely fail.

This trinity of principle is the heritage of the American people. West Point received it from the founders of the Republic—Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson and Monroe—who were also the founders of the Academy. It has been tried in the fire of experience and found equal to the test. It guided West Pointers in war and peace for a century and a half. Grant found in it the key to victory, and Lee the strength to turn bitter defeat to the service of a reunited country. Pershing, Eisenhower and MacArthur drew their power from it.

Duty, Honor, Country. Here are three words to guide both soldier and citizen in these troubled times. They are words to live by.

Investigation of Adequacy of Fuel Supplies in Northeastern States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday I filed House Resolution 851 which would authorize and direct the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to conduct a full and complete inquiry into the adequacy of fuel supplies in the Northeastern States now and for the coming winter.

The resolution calls for a report of the committee findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the House at the earliest practicable date, but not later than December 15, 1950.

When I filed the resolution, I was aware of the proposal in the other body for such an inquiry by its Select Committee on Small Business, but confined to New England. I also knew that that proposal carried authority to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants as the committee deemed advisable, and that it provided for the payment of expenses not to exceed $10,000.

It will be recalled that in 1947, and particularly in the early months of 1948, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted an extensive series of hearings and studies with reference to this same subject matter. These hearings were the logical results of the existing jurisdiction of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of its prior efforts in this field. It led to a very comprehensive report. All of this would obviously serve as a sound foundation upon which to base the suggested inquiry.

It seems to me entirely unnecessary to spend any additional funds in making the inquiry. The committee's staff is thoroughly familiar with this problem and entirely able to assist in developing facts in cooperation with well-informed representatives of the industry and responsible Government departments and officials.

It seemed clear to me that the inquiry should be broadened to at least the question of the adequacy of fuel supplies in the Northeastern States since their problem is very similar to that in New England and the situation in any one of the Northeastern States can very easily reflect itself promptly in the rest of them.

I think it is obvious to all of us that the requirements for our National Defense Establishment can easily bring about a situation which would be most serious so far as the domestic supply of fuels is concerned. In that connection, I wish to include a news account from the Journal of Commerce of September

15 which bears directly upon this problem. It is as follows:

MORE, BETTER GAS, LESS FUEL OIL DUE IF NEW WAR COMES

(By W. M. Jablonski)

ATLANTIC CITY, September 14.—In the event of another world war, civilians can expect more and better quality gasoline than they had during World War II, but will see "deep cuts" in the availability of kerosene, home heating oil and Diesel fuel.

This was indicated here today by a panel of military and industry experts who analyzed the effect of war requirements on petroleum fuels at the National Petroleum Association's forty-eighth annual convention.

AVIATION GASOLINE NEEDS

Members of the panel cautioned that supplying war needs for high quality aviation gasoline, jet propulsion fuels and Navy Diesel oil would pose difficult and complex problems and would require rationing of civilian use of gasoline, heating fuels, and other oils.

"If an all-out war comes," said C. M. Larson, chief consulting engineer of Sinclair Refining Co., "constructive controls will be needed to avoid chaotic scarcity of oil products."

He said that war needs for large quantities of jet fuel would "bite deeply" into kerosene, range oil and No. 1 fuel production—affecting not only the quantity but the quality of fuel available for space heaters, Diesel engine and farm tractor users.

DIESEL FUEL SUPPLY

City Diesel powered busses, for instance, will have to learn to use higher end point Diesel fuels even though the exhaust smoke level does go up slightly, he observed. As for the large need for light distillate type farm tractor fuel, gasoline will have to take its place.

The Sinclair official also noted that some homes would probably be converted to gas, though he said this probably would not offer a large avenue for oil saving.

GASOLINE OUTLOOK

A much rosier gasoline outlook was painted by both industry and military representatives. Officials of Ethyl Corp. and E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.—the Nation's two manufacturers of tetraethyl lead—reported that production capacity of this antiknock motor fuel compound has been boosted 75 percent since World War II, and that further expansion was under way.

"It is clear," said Dr. Graham Edgar, vice president of Ethyl, "that any military needs will be easily taken care of, and that the capacity available for use in civilian gasoline will be several times that which was available in World War II. A substantially higher antiknock quality can, therefore, be expected for civilian gasoline than in World War II * * * and probably quite adequate for the great majority of cars."

CIVILIAN OCTANE CUTBACK

Concurring with this view, J. R. Sabina, technical manager for du Pont, said that even maximum military aviation gasoline demand would only cut back civilian gasoline some 4 octanes because of the greater lead available. This, he pointed out, would merely mean a rollback to the octane levels of civilian gasoline of a few years back.

Dr. Edgar expressed doubt that military demand for tetraethyl lead would exceed that of World War II in view of the increasing importance of jet fuels which do not require this compound. A relatively small war, such as that in Korea, has hardly a measurable effect on the civilian supply situation.

Col. Ray W. Whitson, chief of the technical branch of the Munitions Board petroleum committee, said his board estimated that the lowest civilian grade gasoline would drop in a war would be to 74 octane motor method and 76 octane research method. This compares with 78.8 octane motor method and 84.3 research method for regular grade motor fuel at present and to 70 octane in the last war.

These estimates, the colonel reported, call for the use of the maximum allowable of 3 milliliters of lead per gallon, about 11 percent of catalytic cracked stock, and the remainder straight run, thermal cracked and natural gasoline. Present regular grade gasoline includes 2.1 milliliters lead and 28 percent catalytic cracked stocks, while premium includes 2.4 milliliters lead, 59 percent catalytic stock and 2 percent alkylates.

AVGAS PROBLEM

Contrary to popular impression the "No. 1 problem on the priority list will be high octane aviation gasoline," not jet fuel, T. L. Apjohn of Socony-Vacuum Laboratories told the meeting.

"Reciprocal engines are a long way from being obsolete," he pointed out, "while both the quality and quantity of high octane fuel will be higher than in the last war because of the use of larger and heavier planes."

One barrel of 115/145 grade aviation gasoline now being used requires twice as much alkylate as the 110/130 grade used in the last war, he explained. Alkylate is already critically short.

Mr. Apjohn listed problems facing the industry in also supplying aromatic blending components and other feed stocks for aviation gasoline and outlined various steps that would have to be taken to meet these needs.

JET FUEL NEEDS

He admitted that supplying any large quantities of jet fuel would also present tough headaches, but pointed out that these did not include any "major processing problems."

"Supplying the Air Forces will be the chief difficulty," the Socony official noted. "Demand from the ground and sea forces probably will be only nominally greater than in the last war and we should be able to take care of these needs with the refinery capacity added in the past few years."

Dr. Gustav Egloff, director of research, Universal Oil Products Co., emphasized the importance of the oil industry being advised of the military's needs as promptly as possible.

"There is no question that the industry will cooperate with the military as successfully as in the last war when all our Armed Forces' needs were met on schedule," he said. "But we cannot simply push a button and have tailor-made products rolling in a day if we have no advance information of what will be needed."

I am also including a news account in the same issue of the Journal of Commerce with reference to the admirable and entirely proper appeal by the Navy for a foresighted and constructive policy as to meeting its requirements. Certainly the responsible committee in the House should be equally alert to the probabilities of the requirements not only of the armed services, but of the industrial production which is vital to victory, and to those of the civilian economy.

NAVY ASKS PREPAREDNESS FOR ITS FUEL OIL NEEDS

ATLANTIC CITY, September 14.—The Navy appealed today to all oil refineries to be prepared to manufacture fuel oil meeting Navy specifications.

Capt. W. C. Lathrobe of the Standards and Specifications Division, Bureau of Ships, told the National Petroleum Association meeting here that in the last few years many refiners have indicated they no longer have a fuel oil meeting the Navy's approved list.

I feel that it should be a part of your policy to be abreast of the requirements for stable, compatible boiler fuel at all times; particularly during these troubled times.

This is an appeal.

I want to make it clear that I would have no objection whatever to broadening the area of the inquiry if my colleagues from other sections of the country feel it would be desirable to do so.

Sees Truman To Blame for More Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Frank R. Kent is one of our greatest political and economic writers. He is not without interest in religion and things spiritual.

For years Frank Kent has been one of our leading columnists for the Baltimore Sun and the Washington, D. C., Evening Star. He has been a Democrat most of his life but long ago saw the political trickery, economic fallacy and spiritual decay of the Democratic Party.

Without venom or revenge, but with a desire to tell the truth and speak objectively, he comments on the great issues that confront the American people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following enlightening article which appeared in yesterday's Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star:

TRUMAN TO BLAME FOR MORE INFLATION

(By Frank R. Kent)

The White House attitude toward inflation, which many feel to be our most dangerous enemy, is not such as to inspire confidence. The acts of the administration not only clash with its words but seem clearly designed to promote rather than restrain inflation. In addition, they certainly have a high political flavor.

In a time of national peril, this is a serious charge. But the apparent intention of Mr. Truman not to use—at least until after the election—the great powers which Congress has given him to keep prices down seems to leave no other possible conclusion. A review of the facts makes this plain. In the first place, the President did not ask for the full powers voted him. He got them not because he wanted them but because in his remarkable illuminating statement before a Senate committee, B. M. Baruch not only made clear the frightful consequences of uncontrolled inflation but again reiterated the obvious and uncontrovertible facts that prices cannot be controlled unless food costs, profits, and wages are controlled at the same time.

It is, he pointed out, absurd to deal with inflation piecemeal. Ceilings must be put over everything—and without delay—to be effective. Failure to deal firmly with wages had added a hundred billions to the cost of the last war, prolonged it by 6 months and greatly increased our casualties. No one—not even Mr. Truman's Council of Economic Advisers—disputed Mr. Baruch's facts, and they made so deep an impression on Congress and the country that by an overwhelming vote the former passed the bill giving Mr. Truman full powers to do what clearly should be done. Never before has the Con-

gress voted a President comparable powers without being asked. Never before has a President had such powers forced on him. Never before has Congress shown more eagerness than the President for the imposition of economic controls in a crisis. Never before has the country evinced a greater desire to be put under economic control than the President proposed.

Why, then, is the accusation now made that the President does not intend to use these powers until after the election—if then? Why is it charged that politics is influencing the President's course?

Primarily, this is because of the extraordinary way in which Mr. Truman avoids any save the vaguest mention of wages in his talk about controlling inflation. Not once has he said a single, firm, unequivocal word about wages; not once did he suggest to Congress that he wanted authority to deal with wages, as well as other things.

The Presidential shying away from this vital subject is given added significance by four things: (1) The absolute unity among the labor bosses in opposing any wage control of any kind at this time; (2) their equal unity in pressing for further wage increases before the election; (3) Mr. Truman's frequent conferences with Jack Kroll, head of the CIO's political-action department, and his recent off-the-record dinner meeting with some 50 of the labor bosses; (4) the almost complete dependence of the Democratic Party on the organized-labor vote—New York is the most notable example—and the consequent subserviency of the national Democratic leaders to the labor demands; (5) the militant prounion attitude of the Secretary of Labor.

Considering all this, the present conviction that Mr. Truman will do little, beyond making gestures, to combat inflation in the next 2 months is not surprising. The new law ties prices and wages together and requires control of both. If, as is evident, no move is to be made to control wages, then both will be postponed. In a recent issue the authoritative United States News asserts that "the decision appears to have been reached to permit inflation to run a full new round before setting up any real resistance." "A full new round of wage rises," it declares, "is to be permitted before any controls are clamped upon wages and prices. This will carry retail prices up by 10 percent." Considering the heights which these have already reached, this is a rather appalling prospect.

Justice Douglas in Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington, D. C., Star of Sunday, September 17, 1950:

JUSTICE DOUGLAS IN IRAN

If reports from Tehran are accurate, this country is being poorly served by the Iranian peregrinations of William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Further—again if the reports are accurate—it seems fair to say that he would be displaying more common sense than he appears to have been displaying if he stopped making speeches over there, put a halt to his vacation travels and headed back home without further delay.

For Justice Douglas, according to a dispatch to the New York Times, has been doing anything but making friends for the United States among the Iranians. To begin with, many of the country's newspapers (not just the leftist ones) apparently feel there is considerable truth in the Soviet canard that his visits to the provinces are part of an imperialistic American plot in which he is stirring up trouble and intrigue among the tribes. So a lot of editors are angrily inveighing against him in a way that hardly reflects credit on his qualifications to play the role of a good-will ambassador.

Of course, nothing could be sillier than the idea that Justice Douglas is engaged—as the Moscow propagandists say—in an international conspiracy. Nevertheless, even to those Iranians who realize the absurdity of that charge, the statements he has been making over there must be more than a little irritating. Thus, for example, in a speech at Tehran, he seems to have taken it upon himself, in what sounds like a patronizing manner, to lecture the country with such gemlike remarks as these. "Iran should work out its destiny according to its own genius, perhaps 10 percent communism, 15 percent capitalism and 75 percent something else. In an agricultural land like Persia you can guarantee men the right to work. It is simple. All you have to do is to make the peasant the landlord."

In connection with these remarks, it should be observed, as the Times dispatch reports, that the question of land reform is about the hottest and most complex political issue now troubling Iran. Needless to say, therefore, Justice Douglas must have rubbed a great deal of fur the wrong way with his somewhat know-it-all statement that the "simple" solution to it, and to the Communist threat, is to make every peasant a king by making him a landlord. Even if the problem were as easy as that—which is not the case—a member of our highest court is speaking out of his province in telling the Iranians how to mind their own business.

It is not a completely rare phenomenon for average American tourists, when they toss care to the winds in foreign lands, to do and say things that are occasionally less sensible. That is to be expected. But when the traveler is a member of the Supreme Court of the States, his host country cannot be blamed if it takes a dim view of the kind of injudiciousness that has been attributed to Justice Douglas. In Iran, according to the Times story, "his visit has created considerable ill-will." If so, the sooner it ends, the better.

Distribution of Surplus Food Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the remarkably sudden developments before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with reference to H. R. 9313 on Friday constitutes an interesting chapter in the effort to see that the surplus food commodities, now stored in gigantic quantities by the Federal Government, threatened with spoilage, and costing the taxpayers more than $60,000 a day for unnecessary carrying charges, are turned over to people who could eat them but who cannot afford to buy them.

On September 1 I wrote to the President and to Secretary Brannan, urging that each take the most vigorous kind of action to insure that the bill which the House passed unanimously on August 22 was brought before the Senate promptly for action there. I placed copies of those letters in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A6319.

On Friday I was shown a copy of a letter that the President sent to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and I want to make it readily available to all my colleagues who have shared in this effort. It is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, this Government has made certain perishable surplus commodities available to public and private welfare agencies at home and abroad. Dried milk, dried eggs, cheese and butter acquired under our price support program and not salable on the open market, have been offered to these agencies without charge, in order to forestall spoilage and waste.

We have done this because it makes no sense for the Government to store surpluses which cannot be sold and will surely spoil, while there are people in our own country or overseas who badly need the food.

Unfortunately, the welfare and relief organizations to whom we have offered these surpluses have often been unable to pay the cost of transporting the food from Government warehouses to distribution and shipping points. Transportation within the United States has been a particular problem for relief agencies overseas. As a result, our gifts have been refused in many cases, and the Government has had no choice but to continue to store the food.

In order to remedy this situation, the House of Representatives recently passed a bill, H. R. 9313, which is now pending before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. This bill would authorize the Government to pay costs of transportation in cases of this kind from storage to central distribution points for domestic use and to ports for shipment overseas. The appropriate public and private agencies would be expected to pay for further shipment and handling.

The school-lunch program and the Federal Government's other welfare activities would be the first to benefit. State, local, and private relief organizations would also be assisted. The agencies of the United Nations and the many private groups contributing to the welfare of those in need abroad would be helped greatly. This will not be a costly program. It is no more expensive to ship dried eggs and milk, for example, than to carry them in storage for months on end.

We have a statute on the books permitting us to give these perishable foods to those in need. We ought at once to take the necessary steps to put this authority into effect and get these surpluses where they will do some good. As I recall, you were the principal sponsor of this program of surplus disposal. I hope it will be possible for your committee to follow up on the original law by reporting H. R. 9313 to the Senate in time for final congressional action at the current session.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. Speaker, although I had not received any acknowledgment of my letter of September 1 to the President, I felt it would be advisable to write to him with reference to this letter and to again urge the speediest possible action in

making certain that this bill becomes law in the very near future. That letter reads as follows:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You will recall that I wrote you on September 1, 1950, urging that you request the proper persons in the Senate to bring about speedy action on H. R. 9313 and on the same date I wrote to Secretary Brannan requesting the same action. Although I have not received any reply, I was delighted today to read a copy of your letter of yesterday to Senator THOMAS and to learn this morning that Secretary Brannan would appear before the Senate committee.

As you know, I have repeatedly pointed out that it makes no sense for the Government to store surpluses which cannot be sold and will surely spoil while there are people in our country or overseas who badly need the food. I have also called your attention many times to the obvious fact that it is no more expensive to ship dried eggs and milk, for example, than to carry them in storage for months on end. This applies equally to butter, cheese, and other commodities which the Federal Government is storing in inconceivably large quantities. According to reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Government has wasted a total of $21,088,580.40 for unnecessary carrying charges on 16 food commodities between February 2, 1950, when I introduced H. R. 7137 upon which H. R. 9313 is based and June 30, 1950.

I was delighted to learn this noon that the Senate committee has reported favorably on H. R. 9313. I hope you will continue to extend every effort to see that this bill becomes law immediately.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. HESELTON.

Mr. Speaker, while it was impossible this afternoon to obtain definite information as to the final congressional action on this bill, I do hope that efforts will be made by all who are interested to bring that about.

Frank Pace, Jr., Secretary of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 18 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in times of crisis such as these it is inspiring and encouraging to find young men of ability and capacity serving the Nation in positions of great responsibility.

One of the most effective young men in public life today is the Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, Jr. Those who have had an opportunity to observe Secretary Pace's work, especially in recent weeks, have been inspired by the high caliber of his performance, the breadth of his vision, and the efficiency of his administration.

The New York Times magazine of Sunday, September 17, presented a very fine report of Secretary Pace's service during the past few years. I ask unanimous consent to place this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND NOW IT'S PACE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

(By Mcgruder Dobie)

WASHINGTON.—If the Soviet Foreign Office ever holds a post mortem to determine why the United States reacted with such unexpected speed and firmness to the invasion of South Korea it may well take note of an informal dinner party held in the Georgetown section of Washington on the night of June 24, 1950. Among the guests were Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who specializes in far-eastern affairs, and handsome, 38-year-old Frank Pace, Jr., of Little Rock, Ark., the new Secretary of the Army.

Dinner was over. The men had finished their brandy and cigars and were about to join the ladies when the State Department duty officer called Mr. Rusk to the telephone and read the historic dispatch from Ambassador John J. Muccio, in Seoul, Korea. Mumbling apologies to their host, Rusk and Pace grabbed their hats and tore down to the State Department. Pace thought for a moment of continuing across the river to his own office in the Pentagon. But the big news was coming in at State. For the time being, at least, military action would follow diplomatic developments.

A man who saw Pace swing into action as soon as he reached a State Department phone said later that the Secretary grabbed the responsibility of getting our military machine into gear without orders from anyone. He contacted the Army for corroborating evidence of the Korean attack, then telephoned Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the offices of the Secretaries of the Navy and Air Force. The Army put through its first call to General MacArthur, and the machine began to roll.

In the days that followed, Pace attended the Blair House conferences which led to the President's decision to fight for Korea. Mr. Truman relied heavily on his protege, Frank Pace, who had worked so closely with the President when Pace was Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Pace, in fact, emerged as the unofficial chief liaison man between the White House and the Pentagon, and his private line to the President's office became one of the busiest in Washington.

During the first few weeks of the Korean crisis the Army held its telecon conferences with General MacArthur in a well-guarded room in the Pentagon at 2 o'clock in the morning. Pace attended the conferences regularly. Sometimes he caught a few hours of sleep after dinner, after which he would return to the Pentagon for the conference and then work right through the rest of the night. At other times, he would not leave his office until after the conference. He needed every moment he could spare to direct the mobilization of an Army saddled with a job for which it was unprepared. Six weeks after the war began Pace finally took a few hours off, remarking to a friend that this was the first time he had not spent almost the entire day in his office.

By now, the Secretary's schedule has settled down to a 10- or 12-hour stint, with an occasional break at lunch for a quick game of tennis. The outer offices of his Pentagon headquarters bustles with unceasing activity. Lights flash. Telephones ring. A squawk box sends out a call for an Assistant Secretary. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, the Chief of Staff, pops in from his adjoining office with a sheaf of top-secret papers under his arm. A major arrives with a carefully folded chart of Korea, ready to brief the Secretary on the latest front-line developments. An Air Force captain, just back from Korea, comes in with instructions from Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter to give Mr. Pace the latest reports on tactical air support. Secretary Johnson's office calls to remind Mr. Pace of an important meeting at 4:30.

"We've got the toughest job in the Pentagon," says an officer on the Secretary's staff. "We've got a million people, uniformed and civilian, to look after, and billions of dollars in equipment, supplies, and services. Besides fighting, we have to know procurement and transportation, storage, distribution. Our management and accounting procedures are more complex than those of the largest industries. We run probably the biggest educational system in the world. We keep tabs on our own medical and hospital system, our own police, our own court system and worldwide communications network. We are swamped with occupation responsibilities to the east and the west. We even run our own railroads—and, as of now, other people's too."

The officer paused for breath. "But don't think we're complaining," he added. "We've got the hottest administrator in Washington working for us now. Our boss is really a 'wheel.'"

The Secretary of the Army, even if he is one of the most energetic, is not the youngest to hold the job. John C. Calhoun was only 35, John McAllister Schofield was 36, and Robert Todd Lincoln, 37. But Pace looks even younger than his 38 years. He has a lanky, athletic build, dark hair, a rather long face with clean-cut features and slightly protruding ears. In the Washington heat, when his seersucker suit is mussed, when his straw hat is pushed to the back of his head, and his Arkansas drawl drags a bit more than usual, Pace could pass for a wide-eyed tourist from his home town of Little Rock. In the cooler months he wears expensive, well-tailored clothes. The stamp of his Hill School-Princeton-Harvard background is unmistakable. He is suave and assured. He has charmed many a hostess at Newport and other fashionable resorts with his smooth southern manners.

Pace was never in better form than when he was sworn in in April with the usual ceremonies at the Pentagon. He took the oath in a loud, clear voice, then turned to his friends and delivered exactly the kind of speech which most public officials dream of making in such circumstances, but seldom do.

He spoke of his affection for President Truman and promised to give "unstintingly of whatever competency I possess." He ended with a perfect tribute to his wife, the former Margaret Janney, of Philadelphia, acknowledging that everything he was he owed to her. Spoken by a less skillful orator this statement might have sounded a bit "corny." Frank Pace said it just right.

When the show was over the officers and civilians who work in the Army Secretary's office agreed that their new boss had plenty of polish. They wondered what sort of administrator he would make.

They received their first hint a few days later when a colonel on the general staff asked for 30 minutes of the Secretary's time to get his decision on a complicated aspect of a reorganization plan. With due consideration for the fact that he was addressing a newcomer to the Pentagon, the colonel began slowly, patiently sketching the background of the plan.

"I don't want to interrupt your story," Pace broke in with a smile, "but I remember something about this plan from hearings at the Budget Bureau."

The Secretary then gave an accurate and comprehensive résumé of the project, listened briefly to the wide-eyed colonel's recommendation, and made his decision. The colonel had his answer in 8 minutes instead of 30.

Near the end of his first week in office, work piled up faster than Pace could handle it. By lunch time he was swamped with

papers and problems, and at 2 o'clock he was scheduled to address another indoctrination course for visiting VIP's. Under similar circumstances many an executive would have foregone lunch and plowed ahead, trying to think clearly with a clouded brain. Frank Pace grabbed his hat, hurried over to the tennis courts at the Army-Navy Country Club and played two fast sets of singles. He was back in the Pentagon, munching a sandwich, when his press officer came dashing up with a batch of warmed-over speeches for the Secretary to choose from before addressing the VIP's. Pace waved the speeches aside. Promptly at 2 o'clock he stood up before his audience and gracefully ad libbed without a break.

Close teamwork exists between the Secretary and his chief of staff. After a meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Collins usually gives the Secretary a detailed briefing of what transpired. In turn, Pace, who maintains close liaison with Congress, the Budget Bureau, the Navy and Air Force Departments, and especially the Secretary of Defense's office, keeps his chief of staff informed as to what the civilian heads are thinking and doing.

The Defense Secretary's office is approximately a fourth of the distance around the Pentagon Building from Pace's office. Pace made it a practice to see Louis Johnson, who, as Defense Secretary, was his boss, at least once a day and often lunched with him and other Pentagon officials.

Pace had met Johnson at the White House and Budget Bureau on frequent occasions before coming to the Pentagon. The two men also shared an interest in the legal profession. Pace called his former boss "Louis"—in fact, he calls almost everyone by his first name.

The President once said that anyone who could master the Budget Bureau job could hold any post in Washington. Pace more than mastered it. He made some lasting contributions toward doing the job more effectively. He published the first Budget in Brief which condensed the meat of t'e regular 400-page budget document into a 44-page pamphlet, written in layman's language and illustrated with understandable graphs. He tightened the liaison of divisions within the bureau, implemented his predecessor's policy of interesting young men in budget work, pushed reforms outlined by the Hoover Commission, and traveled around the country to address clubs and schools on the need for clearer public understanding of the administration's fiscal policy.

Old friends who have known Frank Pace since he went tearing through the streets of Little Rock in one of Eddie Rickenbacker's high-powered autos contend that the Budget Bureau job was the first one into which Pace threw all of his energy and talent. Previously, his friends say, he had divided his time about equally between work and play.

He graduated from high school in Little Rock at 14 and went on to Hill School. At Princeton he was a promising golfer, a rather indifferent student, and an unsuspectingly skillful bridge player who financed several trips to Bermuda with his bridge earnings.

Pace graduated from Harvard Law School in 1936. He pleaded a tax case before the United States Supreme Court when he was only 27. He lost the case, but favorably impressed Chief Justice Hughes, who called him "my dear young Senator." Before the Arkansas supreme court pace won 20 out of 21 cases.

The war interrupted Pace's legal career. He entered the Army as a first lieutenant and came out a major. He spent most of his time in desk jobs for the Air Transport Command and was in Washington when the war ended. He stayed on, first as a special assistant in the Department of Justice, and then as assistant to the late Bob Hannegan at the Post Office Department.

While running political errands for the Postmaster General, Pace made a favorable impression on James E. Webb, who was then Director of the Bureau of the Budget and was looking for an understudy. Webb offered Pace a job, provided he agreed to curtail his extensive social and athletic activities and immerse himself in the anonymity of the Budget Bureau.

The new Secretary of the Army is an excellent golfer and shoots in the low 70's. He once qualified for the national amateur championship, and has twice been low scorer in the Government officials' class at the National Celebrities Golf Tournament in Washington. He has won the National Press Club tennis tournament—although this feat hardly qualifies him for national ranking. He has played in national squash tournaments. Until recently he carried a small rubber ball in the palm of his hand which he squeezed to develop his arm muscles. He does not smoke or drink coffee, but keeps a jar of hard candy in a drawer of his desk.

The fact is, whatever Frank Pace does, he does well. Even on the rare occasions when he falters, he falters gracefully.

While serving as Budget Director, Pace, in the interest of economy, proposed that medical care for dependents of service personnel be curtailed. He also advocated reduction of the number of veterans' beds in hospitals. The Army, Navy, and Air Force howled with indignation. These proposals were not forgotten when Pace moved over to the Pentagon, but he parried questions with a neat little speech to the effect that his views as Budget Director no longer applied and that he came to the Army with no preconceived notions as to how it should be operated.

In 1947, when he was with the Post Office Department, Pace headed a delegation of postal officials to the Universal Postal Conference in Paris. As usual, he spurned a written speech when he left his hotel to address the delegates in the Grand Palais. However, just before entering the hall Pace was informed that all speeches were to be given in French.

The future Secretary of the Army had not encountered the French language to any extent since leaving high school in Little Rock. But he struck out boldly, waving his long arms in expressive pantomime when his limited vocabulary failed him. After he finished the delegates applauded heartily and pressed around to offer congratulations. A Canadian was the first to pump his hand.

"Frank, you were magnificent," the Canadian said. "Your French was so atrocious we listened to every word."

Military Preparedness—Report of Special Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very able article entitled "An Example of Congress at Its Best," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of September 19, 1950. The article deals with the very fine work of the Johnson Committee on Military Preparedness.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EXAMPLE OF CONGRESS AT ITS BEST

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 18.—In the rush of dramatic events not very much attention has been paid to the first report on preparedness made by a group of seven Senators under the chairmanship of LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas and the guidance of Donald C. Cook, chief counsel. Yet this report is a model of its kind in that (1) it is unaffected by partisan or political considerations; (2) goes to the heart of the subject of military surplus disposal and rubber stockpiling; and (3) gives specific instances of sleeping bureaucracy and the successful methods employed to awaken it to the fact that the cold war ended June 25, 1950, with the invasion of South Korea by a Russian-trained satellite army equipped with modern Russian arms.

The seven Senators, a division of the Armed Services Committee, are all practicing politicians. Four are Democrats and three are Republicans. But in this first report of activities patterned on those of the special committee which, headed by the then Senator Truman, watchdogged our military-production program during the Second World War, there is not a trace of the political animation by which, for example, democratic executives are taken care of by democratic legislators and their lapses are magnified by Republican legislators.

The subcommittee found, in effect, that the vast organization dealing with surplus disposal, rubber production and other matters made critical by the Korean war was proceeding at certain points on the continuing basis of the postwar policy of general demobilization. It began to prod, inquire, complain and then demand changes in this policy and reversals of acts accomplished or projected. And its accomplishments as set forth in the report are both real and substantial.

CREDIT TO THE MINORITY

A striking illustration of the nonpartisan thinking of the subcommittee with its Democratic chairman and majority was given by the following section of the report:

The subcommittee's interest in this matter [disposition of Government-owned industrial plants and other property as surplus] was in many ways the outgrowth of the interest which Senator BRIDGES * * * had displayed in the subject prior to the organization of the subcommittee. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator BRIDGES had been disturbed by a request for appropriations for items by one agency without any check as to whether at the same time such items were in surplus in the hands of other agencies.

He told the subcommittee that various surplus items were being offered for sale at a time when it appears that their productive capacity was necessary for the use of the Government.

These items ranged from industrial plants and their facilities to unused airplane motors and like material. The subcommittee followed a number of such trails—important among which was one pointed out by a constituent to Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia—and reported them to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the National Security Resources Board, the Munitions Board, the three armed services, Secretary of Defense Johnson, and many others. When it did not get action, or was not informed of action that had been taken, the subcommittee got out its prod, sharpened the point and plunged it into the seat of bureaucracy.

THE MUNITIONS BOARD

One of its principal targets was the Munitions Board, whose Chairman's resignation today was made immediately effective

by the President. The Board was commissioned by the Secretary of Defense to pass on all sales of property in the national industrial reserve (plants and facilities essential to military preparedness), and to determine whether to keep, change, or in any instance remove the national security clause which guarantees that anything sold will remain available for national defense. "Since the Korean attack," the subcommittee reported, "at least five properties in the reserve have been sold or have been in the process of sale, one of them without even a national security clause. * * * The subcommittee will likewise investigate the basis for a declaration of the Munitions Board that it believes in continued sale of Government-owned industrial plants in these times so long as there are provisions for Government use of the property if needed."

Secretary Johnson, Chairman Symington of the NSRB, and Hise, of the RFC, and other officials bombarded by the subcommittee were credited with prompt and effective cooperation. And it may well be that some of those criticized have a better case than appeared to the subcommittee. But more important is the demonstration that it has fixed on sound objectives and is pursuing them diligently, logically, and without political concern.

Here are some of its maxims:

"Our vision must extend beyond Korea. It must be realized in all disposal and planning programs that we face the distinct threat of a war of attrition, in which the total resources and the total productivity of the Nation must be kept constantly available. The sale of Government property as surplus cannot be countenanced if it is usable in our preparedness effort. We cannot with good sense continue old demobilization activities while at the same time undertaking a great new mobilization effort. We believe there is sufficient organizational ability and imagination in this country to prevent the Government from buying and selling the same commodity at approximately the same time."

The Senators From Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Example of Teamwork," written by R. F. MacPherson and published in the Wyoming Eagle, of Cheyenne, Wyo., on September 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

According to press reports, the United States Senate has feuds comparable to that of the Hatfields and McCoys in Kentucky.

In contrast to this bickering and backbiting, Wyoming provides a shining example of teamwork. No two United States Senators work together as consistently and harmoniously in behalf of their State as do Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and Senator L. C. HUNT.

Two years ago Senator HUNT in his campaign stressed the benefit that would accrue to Wyoming by having two Senators of the same political faith who would cooperate—quite a contrast to the conditions that existed for 6 years when one Senator voted with and associated with the eastern old guard.

On one or two occasions the Wyoming press as well as Republican leadership in this State have cited instances where the two Wyoming Senators voted differently on two or three measures. They play these votes up as something sinister, almost a national disaster. Apparently they think Wyoming should be represented by two "yes" men, two puppets who think alike, look alike, and act alike.

A man qualified to occupy a seat in the United States Senate should have a mind of his own, forming his own opinions, making his own decisions, and voting as his conscience dictates. Wyoming now has two Senators of that type. So it is remarkable, almost miraculous, how frequently these two men agree, how rarely they appear on opposite sides of the many matters with which they have to deal.

Generally speaking, Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator HUNT have voted on 100 bills and amendments. Yet they did not differ on more than four or five. And on matters affecting Wyoming, and much vital legislation affects this State, they invariably agree. And when one Wyoming Senator encounters lassitude or opposition, making it difficult to attain the desired results, the other Wyoming Senator, who probably is extraordinarily busy with other matters, comes to his aid and between the two they get the job done.

In all essential matters there is cooperation. Wyoming furnishes the Nation a sterling example of teamwork in the United States Senate.

American Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY CORDON

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a most pertinent and common-sense editorial written by Albert S. Goss, Master of the National Grange, entitled "Dollars," and appearing in the National Grange Monthly. The editorial warrants the attention of all thinking people. As Mr. A. W. Prescott, of Warrenton, Oreg., said of the editorial, "It's a corker."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLARS

(By Albert S. Goss)

All the world is trying to earn American dollars. It was generally assumed that when Europe could return to normal production, trade would pick up, and by exporting their products to America, European nations could secure dollars with which to buy American goods. The first efforts of the ECA, therefore, were devoted to restoring production. These efforts have been extraordinarily successful. Most of the European industries are now producing at substantially above prewar level. The United Kingdom is close to 40 percent above prewar level and just about everyone in England is busy.

There are ample markets in sterling-bloc countries, but British manufacturers are finding it very difficult to invade American markets and earn American dollars because their production costs are too high.

The Socialist government which started out by promising everyone more income for less work has found that less work increases costs, and more income at government expense increases taxes, both of which lead to less work has found that less work increases the difficulties of earning dollars by selling goods to America. This was temporarily met last year by devaluing the pound from $4.03 to $2.80, but this provided only a temporary respite. It has meant lower standards of living and the people have demanded more pay to maintain the artificial standards inaugurated by the new government. Gradually the government is coming to grips with the problem, but as people begin to realize that they have been duped, the government's control becomes difficult to maintain. A recent majority of one vote in Parliament saved the government from falling.

In the meantime the government is still promoting its program of austerity in the hope that the people will come to learn that sooner or later they must earn what they get. A recent example of the type of austerity is the increase in the gasoline tax to 42 cents per gallon which became effective June 1. Sometimes a commonplace item like that brings home to the American people what the people of the United Kingdom are going through better than by reading some learned economic analyses. Why so many people in America want to follow the same route still remains a mystery.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at the request of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, remarks on the subject of Justice for Poland, transcribed by him for a radio program sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress, Inc.

Mr. President, so thoroughly do I concur with my distinguished colleague that I desire to be associated with all that his message implies.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

(By Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH)

It is a real privilege to be invited by the Western Massachusetts Branch of the Polish American Congress to talk to you briefly about Justice for Poland. It is especially significant, I think, that so many of our distinguished citizens of Polish extraction are determined to acquaint their fellow Americans with the free, cultural, and political background of Poland. Many people in America are inclined to take for granted the basic principles of freedom and justice on which our democratic form of government is based and without which it cannot survive. There never was a time in the history of the world when it was more important for those who enjoy the fruits of freedom to assume their God-given responsi-

bility to prevent that freedom from being destroyed.

No country has suffered more for the cause of freedom than has Poland. The Polish struggle for independence has always been characterized by fierce determination against tremendous odds. This struggle is continuing today against the most dangerous threat to freedom the world has ever known—world communism as interpreted by the Kremlin. It is vitally important, I think, for us to understand the reason why there is no freedom in Poland today, and to see clearly what the Polish fight for freedom means to people all over the world.

On September 1, 1939, just 11 years ago, the Nazi army launched its brutal invasion of Poland from the west. Then on September 17, in accordance with a secret German-Soviet agreement, the Russian Army invaded Poland from the east. The Polish people fought fanatically for their freedom, but they fought alone. Within a few days the Russians stood at the gates of Warsaw while the heroic defenders of the city were wiped out by the Nazis. The two invaders promptly and brazenly divided Poland between themselves in the fourth partition of that unfortunate country that has occurred since 1772.

It is well for us to remember why it was that Poland had to stand alone and hopelessly outnumbered in 1939. Subsequent to the First World War the League of Nations had been established for the peaceful solution of world problems. But for all practical purposes, the League of Nations had already died by 1939. Because of its failure to take effective action in Manchuria, in Ethiopia, and in Spain, it had completely lost the confidence of its members. International cooperation to prevent aggression through the League had been discredited. The United States had not yet awakened to its responsibilities as a world power and a defender of freedom. And so it was that Hitler and Stalin were able to carry out their diabolical plot against Poland while the rest of the world stood helplessly by and watched a noble, freedom-loving people bludgeoned into submission.

Of course, the subsequent defeat of Germany in World War II did not bring relief to stricken Poland. The world was told that Poland would once again be free and independent. But it has been perfectly clear for some time that the Russian promises to allow the inclusion of democratic elements in the Polish Government, and to guarantee free elections and freedom of the press, were empty and cynical pledges which they had no intention of fulfilling. Under Russian rule Poland has remained a land of lingering fear and slavery, drained of its strength by its Soviet masters, crippled by purges and tyranny.

This tragic story of Poland should constantly remind the freedom-loving world of two very important lessons. First, it should impress upon our minds the necessity of international cooperation and action through the United Nations to prevent aggression and to protect the independence of small nations. And it should also be an everlasting reminder that when the Russians speak of democracy and promise freedom they are in reality thinking of tyranny and promising slavery.

Many noble Polish patriots died to teach us these lessons. Certainly the Communist aggression in Korea has reiterated them, and, I hope, indicated clearly that we have finally learned them.

Let us consider for a moment what would have happened in Korea if there had been no United Nations. Any action taken to prevent the aggression by the Communists would have necessarily been unilateral action by the United States, or, at best, joint action by the United States and a few of our allies. Under these circumstances, I doubt very much if such action would have been taken. We know now that without help Korea would have been completely subjugated within a matter of days, since the South Korean army was totally unprepared to combat the heavy armament that the Russians had given to the Communists and trained them to use.

If they had gained a quick and easy victory in Korea, the Russians would undoubtedly have followed up this success with similar aggressive moves all over the world. When the other nations finally awoke it would have been too late.

And so it seems particularly appropriate that we recall today the reasons for the success of the Nazi-Soviet invasion of Poland, and the tremendous change wrought by the creation of the United Nations and by our determination and the determination of the freedom-loving nations of the world to act with courage and with speed through the United Nations to prevent aggression.

The people in Poland and in other countries behind the iron curtain are given new hope by the action of the United Nations in Korea. These people will not submit to enslavement and brutality forever.

We in America have learned to appreciate the courage, the devotion to freedom, and the high ideals of the Polish people not only through our knowledge of the many battles they have fought for their own freedom and independence, but also because of the great contribution they have made to our country. Among our American citizens are thousands of people of Polish extraction who have played an important part in the growth of a progressive and democratic America in peace and in war. Even before we had gained our independence, when we were fighting for our own freedom, numerous Polish volunteers fought heroically in the American Revolutionary Army.

I would like to pay special tribute to one of these volunteers because I think he well represents the enduring spirit of a free Poland, and because we in New Jersey are particularly grateful for the skill and bravery he displayed in Revolutionary campaigns conducted in our State.

It is perhaps ironic that Count Casimir Pulaski was forced by Russian oppression to leave Poland as an exile in 1777. He landed in Marblehead, Mass., in July of that year, and went directly to the headquarters of Gen. George Washington. Pulaski's reason for devoting himself to the American cause is clearly described in a letter he wrote to Congress in which he said:

"I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe so I came to hazard all for the freedom of America."

The hazard was, indeed, a real one. After brilliant service with the American Revolutionary forces he died in 1779 as a result of a wound received in battle.

I am sure that many of you have driven over the bridges of the great Pulaski Skyway, which spans the heart of industrial New Jersey, and reminds thousands of our citizens daily of the contribution made by this great citizen of Poland to the cause of freedom in this country and in the world.

The forces that have enslaved Poland today are more dangerous and more powerful than all of the European sovereigns of Pulaski's time. The atheistic, materialistic concept of world communism has succeeded in breaking the bodies of millions of men and is trying desperately to subjugate their minds and spirits as well.

We know that Poland has been fighting for her freedom for centuries and that Poland will never cease that fight until her freedom is secured. We pledge to Poland that her struggle for independence has not been and will not be forgotten. We shall not waver in our determination to build a United Nations devoted not to peace alone, but to peace with justice—to the kind of peace that allows small nations throughout the world to work out their destinies according to the desires of their peoples. We do not expect this to be an easy task, nor do we expect to accomplish it overnight. But, with God's help, we shall succeed in establishing His principles of justice and freedom as the fundamental principles for peace and human progress in the world.

Red Channels Becomes Best Seller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Christian Science Monitor discussing the newsletter entitled "Counterattack" together with some comments of my own.

There being no objection, Mr. MUNDT's statement and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The following descriptive news story written by the United Press and appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of September 14 provides an interesting report on how four former FBI agents have launched a Nation-wide crusade against the financing and subsidizing of Communist dupes and agents by American industrial corporations, business interests, and advertising agencies. It is a crusade in which every courageous and loyal American can participate. If communism is to be repelled in this country it must be remembered that freedom is everybody's job.

The highly readable, interesting, and informative newsletter issued by Ted Kirkpatrick and his three associates is called Counterattack and either the newsletter or its now nationally famous guidebook called Red Channels can be secured by addressing requests to Counterattack, 55 West Forty-second Street, New York City (19). Those who value freedom, individual initiative, and private enterprise sufficiently to fight back against the forces which would destroy these priceless American heritages now have a way in which to make themselves effective.

If every American who opposes Godless, aggressive, totalitarian, collectivistic communism would resolve to strike back against those who espouse or endorse this menace to our freedoms, we could have our home front in America safeguarded against this vicious conspiracy by the time our servicemen in Korea complete the victory which they are now pursuing against communism there. It will avail us little to defeat communism in Europe and/or Asia unless we measure up to the challenge it presents at home and see to it that gullible and selfish Americans no longer support and finance those who promote and protect the Communists within our homeland.

Fortunately freedom still flourishes in America sufficiently so that those who disapprove of communism or who would resist the march toward collectivism in this country have the opportunity—if they have the energy—to take effective action against those who pound the tom-toms for the Communists. We are still free enough so that we can write a letter, send a telegram, or put

in a long-distance telephone call advising the sponsors and purveyors of programs utilizing talent which is ashamed of its Americanism or affiliated with communism that we will refuse to buy their products or attend their theaters or listen to their broadcasts or to tune in their television shows.

We are still free enough to strike back against those who would chisel away our freedoms by carefully avoiding the purchase or use or patronage of any merchandise or entertainment which utilizes un-American talent or individuals in its promotional campaigns. They can try to feed this red-tainted material to the American public but if we have courage enough to deserve to remain free we can refuse to eat it, or wear it, or buy it, or listen to it, or to part with our hard-earned capitalistic coin to buy tickets to see it portrayed on stage or screen.

Just as soon as good Americans and supporters of free enterprise cease being all-American suckers to the current extent wherein they spend their money to support the advertisers, the entertainers, the columnists, the commentators, and the publications that are slyly and coyly trying to undermine free enterprise, private initiative, and individual freedom and to substitute some form of communism or collectivism in lieu thereof, we can be sure that the battle against totalitarianism in America will start producing victories for freedom. Until then, perhaps we do not deserve to win.

The following article from the Christian Science Monitor suggests one way in which your letters, your telegrams, and your support can help dry up the fountainheads of communism in America:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of September 14, 1950]

RED CHANNELS BOOMS INTO BEST-SELLER ROLE

A paper-bound booklet is a current best seller in the radio offices of mid-Manhattan and the advertising agencies of Madison Avenue. Its title is "Red Channels," and its subject matter is one of the most controversial topics of the day in the radio, television, and advertising offices.

In the booklet the authors present a list of persons reported to have affiliations with Communist or Communist-front organizations. The public heard little of it until recently when television actress Jean Muir was dropped from the cast of the Aldrich Family. The ban on Miss Muir by the National Broadcasting Co., and by her sponsor, General Foods, followed a number of protests by persons who complained because her name was in Red Channels. So are the names of 150 other actors, writers, musicians, producers, and persons connected with show business.

TO BE USED IN SCHOOLS

Another of those listed is actress Gypsy Rose Lee, scheduled to appear on a new American Broadcasting Co. television show. A former commander of the Illinois American Legion protested to ABC that Miss Lee's name is in Red Channels. The broadcasting and television company replied with a sworn denial from Miss Lee that she never had been a Communist or a Communist sympathizer and asked the legionnaire to produce any evidence to the contrary.

The superintendent of the Newark, N. J., public schools brought the booklet further attention by disclosing that it will be distributed in the schools as a reference book for principals and teachers.

In the Muir case some organizations and individuals protested that the ban posed a serious threat to American liberties. Others applauded the action.

And the uproar over the Muir case focused attention on Red Channels and its publishers—four former Federal Bureau of Investigation agents whose organization is known as American Business Consultants, Inc.

Their aims, they say, are to protect industry from the Communists and to protect radio and television artists from being duped by Communists. Sometimes artists lend their names or talents to Communist fronts without realizing the nature of the organization, they say.

"COURT" TAG DENIED

One of the four former G-men is Theodore C. Kirkpatrick. He made it clear in an interview that his agency does not pass judgment on the persons listed in Red Channels. The list, he said, is made up of information culled from public records of the House Un-American Activities Committee and such other public sources as court records, letterheads of organizations, and newspaper items—including those of the Communist Daily Worker.

He protested some reports that the agency had set itself up as a private court with self-imposed power to clear persons of alleged Communist leanings by removing their names from Red Channels, if they could prove they had no Communist sympathies.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said, however, that anyone who thinks the agency has treated him unjustly can come in and ask for advice. The Red Channels publishers will tell him how to go about clearing his name.

They did that, he said, for the Negro folk singer, Josh White. They suggested to Mr. White that he go before the House Un-American Activities Committee and tell his story. Mr. White testified that he had been duped into entertaining Communist groups before he knew their politics.

OVERT ACT

Mr. White's appearance in Washington was what the Red Channels publishers call an overt act by a person to prove that he is not a Communist or a Communist sympathizer.

Although satisfied by Mr. White's overt act, Mr. Kirkpatrick said his name would not necessarily be removed from Red Channels.

However, he said Mr. White's name would be eliminated from any future editions or, if included, would include a notation of his overt act.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said his agency was formed because while they were FBI men during the war its four founders "saw the dangers of communism."

"When we left the FBI after the war, we decided that we probably could do something about it," he said.

First they formed a nonprofit organization financed with their own money. But after 6 months they had no members. Then, they decided to form a profit corporation. They began the publication of the newsletter Counterattack, which is received by more than 2,000 subscribers each week for a $24 annual subscription fee.

FEES FOR SPECIAL JOBS

In addition to what it gets from the newsletter subscriptions, the organization collects fees for special jobs performed for the subscribers.

One such job was the preparation of a brochure for the AFL Retail Clerks International Association in a recent attack on another union. Another brochure, prepared by the publishers of Counterattack, was distributed by the Prudential Insurance Co. of America to expose some officers in a union.

As for Miss Muir's case, Mr. Kirkpatrick said:

"There is no reason why she should have to come to us (to clear her name) and make peace with us. If she is against communism, she can demonstrate this in a number of ways."

Four named have called personally on the agency, and two have written to it, he said. These included Mr. White.

Another was Roger de Koven, stage and radio actor, who signed a statement given heavy play in Counterattack along with a statement that he had impressed the group with "his sincerity" and an expression of pleasure in being able to "clear De Koven's name of any unjustified suspicion of pro-Communist sympathy or activity."

Mr. Kirkpatrick is a graduate of Earlham College, Richmond, Ind. He was with the FBI from 1942 until late 1945. His associates are:

John G. Keenan, a New York lawyer, who resigned from the FBI in 1945 after 4 years' service to become a partner in a law firm founded here by his father.

Thomas A. Brady, also a lawyer, who was with the FBI from 1942 until 1947, when he resigned to resume private practice here.

Kenneth M. Bierly, the third lawyer member of the agency, who was with the FBI from 1941 until 1946.

Mr. Kirkpatrick is the only nonlawyer in the group. All quit the FBI of their own volition.

Airline Pilots Say S. 450 Jeopardizes Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning because of my objection, S. 450 was prevented from being passed on the Consent Calendar and was later taken up under a rule. I had intended to be present to raise some questions about this bill relating to commercial airlines safety, but unfortunately because of a misunderstanding was not notified in time to be present when it came up for consideration under the rule.

I am a little surprised that a measure vigorously opposed by the Airline Pilots Association passed both the committee of the Senate and the committee of the House with no opposition from any Members, so little discussion, and with no formal hearings whatever. I know that the membership of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has some of the ablest men in this House, and possibly they gave the measure all of the consideration that it deserves, and all of them are satisfied of its merits. It is my understanding that it clears up the legality of a practice which has been followed for some time by the CAA in the delegation of its authority. However, to keep the record straight, and to make it plain that my objection to this bill going through on the Consent Calendar was not a trifling objection, I wish to place in the record the telegram I received today from Mr. David L. Behncke, president of the Airline Pilots Association. This telegram, I think, and the opposition of the airline pilots, should be a red light to those who are interested in the safety of commercial aviation.

It will be observed that Mr. Behncke urges that air-safety regulations should be turned over to an independent air-safety board and not left in the hands of the airline companies as he contends it is today. Legislation is now pending for the creation of an independent air-safety board, and I trust that this entire subject matter will be reviewed when that legislation is brought to a hearing. Defeating S. 450 or delaying its enactment I presume would not change the present practice and certainly would not bring into existence the independent air-safety board Mr. Behncke contends is necessary.

It should be remembered that the airline pilots have a more vital—and personal—interest in air safety than any other people I can think of. Their recommendations in connection with legislation of this character should carry great weight. I insert the following telegram which I received from Mr. Behncke, president of the Airline Pilots Association, as a clear expression of their views in this instance:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 18, 1950.*

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The airline pilots who fly our Nation's airlines both continentally and internationally and who are best acquainted with our air-safety problems are against the CAA-sponsored S. 450 for which there isn't the slightest need, and if passed will usurp and destroy the authority given to the Civil Aeronautics Administration by Congress and turn it over to the airlines and aviation companies. The air-safety situation on the airlines is anything but good. In the weeks just passed there have been two more fatal accidents and two potentially fatal, and the death toll has been 72 with 7 injured. Even now present air-safety regulations are waived far too often and changed by the CAA and CAB all against the best interests of air safety without public hearings or consultation with the pilots and others including the public all vitally interested. Now this same governmental agency, the CAA and its Administrator, Mr. Rentzel, are sponsoring still another move the effect of which will be to turn over the safety regulation of the airlines and civil aviation generally to the airline companies except for some loosely knit second-hand supervision by the CAA that the airline pilots are certain will not be effective. Instead of turning the regulation of air safety over to the companies the trend must be in the other direction and air-safety regulations should be turned over to an independent air-safety board and not turned over to the airlines by the passage of S. 450. It is a bad bill and should not be passed. We must not forget that since the independent air-safety board was abolished approximately 10 years ago there have been 1,310 fatalities and 270 injuries on the airlines, a record that is a black page in the history of our country's airline and civil flying that is undeniable. It is an experience high-priced in life and millions of dollars by which we must benefit or all these lives will have been sacrificed in vain. Your cooperation to defeat this measure in the best interests of the safety of the air-traveling public and in the public interest generally will be deeply appreciated by the men who fly the planes. We understand another bill is coming up in Congress today, S. 3504, which as presently written is also a bad proposal and which unless properly amended should not be passed.

DAVID L. BEHNCKE,
President, Airline Pilots Association.

Listen, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order that it be available to my colleagues and to others who have access to the RECORD, I insert herewith a stirring editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 10, 1950:

LISTEN, AMERICA

Tell me, Americans, as the cooling winds of approaching autumn brush over your ripening fields and your fragrant hills, what you are thinking of.

Are you thinking of your sons, young and strong and brave, who are dying for you in distant Korea?

Or are you thinking of maintaining "life as usual" for yourselves?

Are you thinking of what you can do to fill the life or death needs of the boy from your block who is fighting for this country in the mountains and rice paddies of a strange land around the world?

Or are you thinking of profits as usual, or better than usual? Or the higher wages that a national emergency might bring if exploited?

Are you thinking of the neighbor boy who mowed the lawn, or delivered your paper, and is now marching down the streeet on his way to a bestial war?

Or are you thinking of how you can cram your locker, your freezer, or your shelves with hoarded goods so that, come what may, your stomach will be full?

Are you thinking of what you can do to help in community efforts to protect yourself and your neighbors in event of a bomb disaster that could come with all-out war?

Or are you indifferent to these vital moves and concerned only with your golf, your canasta, or your next vacation?

Are you thinking of the awesome problems that confront your Nation and how you can help to elect men this fall who have the ability, the will, the integrity to solve them? Or is your attitude that of so many politicians—we don't care what we say, or what its effect is, just as long as our side wins? Or are you simply indifferent?

Are you thinking of helping—just in your casual conversation, if no other way—in the attempt to build a United Nations that can effectively combat aggression and assure peace?

Or are you cynical and antagonistic to the most hopeful attempt that mankind has ever made to assure a world of peace?

Listen, America! The hour of your rendezvous with history is here. The foe, powerful, unprincipled, dedicated to the destruction of what you love and believe in, is pounding at the door. The struggle ahead, be it hot war, police actions in half a dozen Koreas around the globe, or simply armed vigilance, will be long and costly and exhausting. There will not be life as usual. There will be a time of trouble and only national unity, personal sacrifice and persistent courage will see us through victoriously.

Awake, slumbering giant. There is no time to lose.

Civil Defense Progress in United States Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following report from the president of the All America Defense Association, Mr. Robert K. Christenberry, on Civil Defense Progress in United States Cities:

CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRESS IN UNITED STATES CITIES

(By Robert K. Christenberry)

SUMMARY

A welter of conflicting and confusing stories has confronted the public in recent weeks regarding the state of preparedness for civil defense of America's larger cities. In order to discover just what the situation is and what is being done the All America Defense Association research staff conducted a survey of this problem in all cities of the United States having more than 300,000 population. While other available sources of information were used, the chief means was a questionnaire sent directly to the mayors of those cities. Results of this survey are outlined in this report.

In order to avoid divulgence of any information which might be prejudicial to security of the areas themselves, the names of cities in which little or no preparations have been made will not be given.

On the basis of the survey, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. In nearly all cities, the local authorities have taken the initiative in civil defense planning and are doing the best they can while awaiting issuance of the National Security Reseources Board's master plan.

2. Every mayor who reported feels that civil defensce planning is his own responsibility, not that of some higher authority.

3. The mayors feel their people are neither unduly excited nor apathetic toward the need for civil-defense preparations. The extent of activity has been directly proportionate to degree of public demand.

4. Most cities have a survey under way and are working out a plan, but only four cities have completed such plans to date.

5. Three-fourths of the cities reporting are proceeding with full-scale organization of civil-defense agencies. Of the remainder, half feel it is sufficient to lay the plans "on the shelf" until further need arises.

6. Only two cities have actually begun a program of physical defense preparation, including provision for emergency supplies and bomb shelters.

7. The cities accept the responsibility for civil defense planning but will expect money from the Federal Treasury to finance operations in time of war.

This report is not intended to cover progress of civil-defense planning on the national or State levels. Nor is it intended to enter the still-unsettled controversy over whether national civil-defense policy should rest in military or civilian agencies.

While direct replies were received from only half the cities queried, independent checks reveal that progress in the remainder has been proportionate to those which did report—some are proceeding rapidly, others have done nothing at all.

THE SURVEY ANSWERS

Following are points covered in the survey, with answers as received from the mayors and gathered by AADA staff:

1. Need for civil defense: Some of the Nation's headline writers are more excited about civil defense than most of the people responsible for it. In contrast to the scare stories published in many magazines and newspapers, not one mayor felt the people of his city were unduly excited about it. One mayor answered that only a few were interested in the subject. The rest said folks were "thoughtfully concerned" and proceeding calmly. (No reply was received from Los Angeles, where civil defense responsibility has been a highly controversial issue.)

2. Responsibility: Seventy percent of the mayors believe that responsibility for civil defense planning and organization rests primarily on their own shoulders. Twenty percent said the responsibility rested with State officials, the remainder divided it between State and local authorities. None thought it belonged either to the Military Establishment or a Federal civilian agency.

However, the survey revealed a sharp conflict in municipal circles as to who should pay the cost of civil defense activities. On the one hand, most mayors reporting to AADA agreed with Seattle's William F. Devin that it is totally a local responsibility, for which municipal officials cannot pass the buck to higher authority. On the other is the apparent attitude of the United States Conference of Mayors. In the August 15 issue of that organization's bimonthly News, editor Paul V. Betters says the idea of local responsibility is "all well and good insofar as community organization and operation of civil defense is concerned. But when it comes to financing the tremendous cost, this is clearly and completely a Federal responsibility."

Apparently, in the eyes of the mayors' conference leadership, Federal cooperation is spelled "m-o-n-e-y."

Interestingly enough, the conference organ goes on to insist that the Federal Government's leadership consists of "more than just to issue a few booklets," and states that if the NSRB's plan is not immediately followed up with Federal appropriations, "then the cities will know that neither the President nor the Congress takes civilian defense too seriously."

Whatever the degree of its validity, this attitude is in strong contrast to the controversy which arose over the ill-fated Hopley Report. (Civil Defense for National Security by Russell J. Hopley, written for Secretary of Defense Forrestal in 1948.) Criticism of that work was based almost entirely on its purported policy of concentrating civil defense authority in the Federal Military Establishment.

The NSRB's Office of Civil Defense Mobilization has leaned over backward in trying to be helpful to States and cities without dominating them—and has had little thanks for its efforts. Stalemated for more than a year by a lack of a clear mission (chiefly because the National Security Resources Board has no active chairman until W. Stuart Symington took over this Spring) the Civil Defense Mobilization staff has combed the field of available experience and suggestions and should be in a position to bring out a fairly complete and constructively flexible plan in its September report. Even so, the agency's officials already are stressing that this will be no stiff "blueprint" upon which all local civil defense organizations can be based. Each local plan must be tailor-made to the peculiarities of the area and the special problems there confronted.

The question of financing has been handled in a number of different ways. In the Nation's Capital, District of Columbia commissioners have asked Congress for a special appropriation of $290,000 to finance a newly authorized civilian defense agency. The House of Representatives slashed this to $60,000. In virtually every other city, operations to date have cost a fraction of that amount. In St. Paul, one of the first actions of the (volunteer) civil-defense committee was to conduct a drive for dollar contributions to finance its operations.

3. Relative danger: The difference in approaches to the finance question is only one indication of an even greater problem: City officials don't know how big a civil-defense program to adopt because more than half of them have not been informed by the military as to the relative danger their towns face of being subjected to sudden attack.

Obviously, the extent to which local agencies should be organized can be determined only if they know how great is the danger. Some of the larger cities are known to be relatively less important as targets for atomic explosions than some smaller ones. The officials of municipalities are reluctant to embark on extensive programs of relocation of facilities or shelter construction unless they have reason to believe they would enjoy high priority on a potential enemy's list. This information vacuum has occasioned a good deal of political demagogy since it is impossible to prove whether a local official's performance has been sufficient or lacking.

4. Legal authority: The NSRB has reported that only 21 States have passed necessary laws to carry out minimum civil-defense programs. Only 60 percent of the mayors said they had sufficient legal authority to cope with civil emergencies. The others said they had asked their State legislatures and Congressmen to help provide needed authority. Several States have merely revived civil-defense laws passed during World War II, usually with amendments based on experience from those years.

Areas which are organized under voluntary programs are less dependent upon legislation for their activities—but must rely almost entirely on voluntary compliance with hazard-removal and damage-limiting regulations.

5. Local leadership: In the absence of any standard pattern, localities are divided almost equally between those which have centered civil-defense matters in volunteer committees and those which have turned the problem over to existing municipal agencies. Several cities have combined the two methods.

Some cities have called on retired military officers to head civil-defense organizations, among them San Antonio, Tex., where Gen. Walter Kreuger, South Pacific Ground Forces commander during World War II, has taken on the job. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, recently retired as Military Governor of the United States zone in Germany, is chairman of the New York State Civil Defense Commission.

In other cities, men who directed civil defense during World War II have been called back to service. These include Lewis G. Hansen, of Jersey City, N. J., where the program is just getting under way.

Wherever voluntary committes have been formed, only the clerical staff are reported to be on a paid basis. All cities reported they had no trouble securing voluntary planning assistance. However, there are reports from several cities that many of these "volunteers" expect paid jobs when the agencies become active.

6. Survey and tentative plan: Most of the cities reporting were still working on the basic survey of civil defense needs and tentative plan of operations. Only four cities had completed their plans. One, a seaport city on the Atlantic coast, had not even started such a survey. Of those under way, half expected plans to be completed within 60 days; the others were less definite.

7. Mutual assistance: Two-thirds of the reporting cities have already begun to work out mutual-assistance plans with neighboring communities. This is especially important in the eastern industrial area, where cities are close together. In several areas, such as New Jersey, Maryland, and the New York port area, civil-defense districts crossing State lines are being organized to facilitate joint action. However, this work is proceeding slowly and not without an expected amount of friction.

8. Organization: In contrast to great progress being made in civil-defense planning, not one city is reported to be fully organized for action. However, three-fourths of those reporting are undergoing full-scale organization. Three cities were content to place the survey and plan on the shelf for future use.

9. Municipal agencies: All except three cities reported they had already begun to train employees of their police and fire departments, utilities and health agencies for their roles in case of attack. Recent release by the Atomic Energy Commission of books on the effect of atomic warfare has enabled the cities to make these training programs more practical. One city, Baltimore, even reported that its utilities were ready as of now.

10. Physical actions: The really expensive and difficult task in civil defense is that of physical protection and dispersal of vital facilities. Only two cities reported they had actually begun programs of this type—St. Paul and Pittsburgh. Several others, including Seattle, San Antonio, and Baltimore, were drawing plans for execution when the need becomes more apparent.

Among activities contemplated in this regard are dispersal of vital community facilities (such as making sure the telephone center is not next door to the gas works), provision for emergency water, power, medical and food supplies, construction of bomb shelters or conversion of existing structures into shelters, mass evacuation plans, and the like. In most cities, the cost of such actions is considered near prohibitive.

CONCLUSION

All in all, the survey indicated that officials of the big cities of the United States are doing their best to provide necessary civil-defense programs for their communities. They have been handicapped most of all by lack of reliable information on the nature and extent of the danger against which they should prepare. The National Security Resources Board has passed on a great deal of advice and technical information. Its master plan, expected this month, is being put together in record time but should have been started a year earlier than it was (this is not the fault of present NSRB officials).

Most important of all, the general public have been complacently unaware of the need for civil-defense mobilization. The current controversy on the subject should serve to stir all concerned to greater and more definite action.

Because of the many complicated problems involved and because of the necessity for developing an adequate but reasonably balanced civil-defense program in each community, members of the All America Defense Association are urged to take an active personal interest in the civil-defense planning and organization in their own cities.

Rustling of Iron Curtain Portends New Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

the following article from the Washington (D. C.) Star of September 17, 1950, by Constantine Brown, one of America's ablest and most fearless correspondents or commentators on foreign affairs:

RUSTLING OF IRON CURTAIN PORTENDS NEW AGGRESSION—SOVIETS REPORTED READYING SATELLITES FOR EARLY PUSH AGAINST WEST GERMANY

(By Constantine Brown)

For the last 12 months an almost impenetrable curtain has been lowered around the Soviet-controlled areas of the Baltic Sea, extending from Tallinn, the capital of what used to be the Republic of Estonia, to Wismar, near the frontier of the British occupation zone in western Germany.

It is in this area that the Soviet is making the most formidable preparations for aggression against the west. The few natives who have been allowed to remain in their old homesteads no longer are permitted to leave. Even a 5-mile trip is subjected to the most rigid control by Soviet and east German secret police.

The natives are branded like cattle so there can be no doubt that they belong to these provinces and no outsider has a chance to enter the prohibited zones without quick detection.

Finnish, Swedish and Danish ships which occasionally have to put into the many ports of this area must follow strict regulations. They are allowed only to enter harbors and can have no contact with people ashore.

There have been some persons—but very few—who have escaped recently from the top secret zone, particularly Russian officers who have had enough of the Communist paradise. They have surrendered to western Allied guards and under friendly and skillful interrogation revealed a few of the secret preparations Moscow is making there.

They spoke about the new improved guided missile platforms, the strength and intensive training of the new German Army, whose officers corps is composed largely of Nazi elite corps officers, and of many other matters which are being kept secret by their interrogators.

All this information and more, obtained at great risks, shows clearly that the Kremlin has speeded up the tempo of preparedness of the satellite forces in eastern Germany. They also show that Moscow is ready to give full support to these troops when they are ordered to overrun western Germany.

APPRAISALS FAULTY

These revelations have prompted many military men of the west to conclude that we may be faced with an aggression of the Korean type in Europe sometime in the next few months and not later than the summer of 1951.

The requests from France and from the Bonn government that more American troops be made available for the defense of western Europe have sprung from the belief among the nations which are most directly menaced by Russia that a show-down is inevitable, regardless of how optimistic the diplomats at Lake Success and Washington may be.

These officials have been wrong in their appraisals of the international situation since the end of World War II. They have failed to heed the storm warnings in Korea. There is no reason to believe now that they are right about conditions in Europe. The news from the East is factual; the hopes of the diplomats are based on wishful thinking.

The request for more help from the United States, in the form of five more American divisions, has fallen on friendly ears in Washington. President Truman has replied that we would not shirk our responsibilities, but insisted that our efforts be matched by those of the defenders of western Europe.

The fact is that at the present time we do not have even one division available for the European theater. It is also a fact that the members of the Atlantic Pact do not have the necessary manpower to organize a force to meet a Soviet-backed attack within the next 12 months. And here we come face to face with the madness of allowing sentimental and emotional factors to outweigh dire military necessity.

For more than a year military men in America, Britain, and France have quietly urged their governments to bring into the European defense system all the nations which are willing to offer full cooperation against the Russian threat. While some of the British and French made certain definite restrictions in regard to Germany, they all agreed that Spain, which has never been a threat to western Europe, even in the days when Hitler was conquering Europe and offered General Franco Gibraltar and a large slice of the French African colonial empire, should be accepted as a full-fledged partner.

ALLIES WORN OUT

Field Marshal Vicount Montgomery came to Washington last winter. He urged openly that Spain be associated with the common western defense. He told officials in Washington that he had pleaded with Foreign Minister Bevin to bury the ideological hatchet and made the same plea here. The blunt fact is that without the inclusion of western German and Spanish manpower in the western defense system the chances of saving Europe are, to say the least, extremely limited.

The Atlantic Pact nations, with the exception of America, are worn-out, war-weary countries which cannot be expected to make any large contribution of manpower. This is not said in a critical spirit. France has been bled white in two world wars and has on its hands a colonial war in Indochina, to which she has committed the bulk of her best troops.

Italy, also, is tired out and incapable even of defending her own borders, to say nothing of sending troops for the defense of other countries of the western coalition. Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Luxemburg are small nations with no military potential. Norway may be able to resist a Soviet onslaught for a few months if she is properly supported by American and British air and naval forces.

Britain is about as tired militarily as France, although she is expected to make another real effort if war comes and her government decides to join the fray with everything it has in its power. Portugal, a small country in the extremity of southwestern Europe, cannot be considered a military power and has been made a member of the Atlantic alliance only out of courtesy. She has some strategically important islands, such as the Azores, which are essential to the American and British Air Forces.

In addition to these material conditions there is a political factor which must not be overlooked. There are strong Communist movements in most of the continental European countries, particularly in France and Italy. While the Communist Parties have been losing ground for 2 years, they still have several million active members and a large number of associates.

SPAIN'S POTENTIAL VALUE

The Communists have been carrying on tremendous propaganda against the warmongering United States and its puppets, the Paris and Rome governments. The peoples of France and Italy are so war-weary that nobody should be surprised if a large portion of the non-Communist population agreed that it would be better to accept honorable neutrality to the devastations of another war.

Thus from the viewpoint of available manpower and from the psychological point of view, it is doubtful that the European countries which are the pillars of the Atlantic Pact will be willing to fight when the showdown comes, unless they are strongly supported by other armies.

We are engaged in a bitter campaign in the Far East. It will be essential for some time that we send across the Pacific whatever troops are available to us at the present rate of mobilization of our Armed Forces.

How, then, can we fulfill our commitments to western Europe in the near future?

If it is true that manpower alone does not make armies these days, it is equally true that military equipment alone is not sufficient unless you have men behind the guns and in the tanks. And only few men are available among the members of the present coalition in western Europe.

After a good deal of bickering the powers which occupy western Germany have agreed to permit the recruiting of 60,000 Germans for service in a police force armed with tanks and all the other paraphernalia of modern warfare. It is hoped that this decision will be put into effect at the earliest possible moment and that the necessary equipment for such German troops can be found readily.

But it is Spain which can be of utmost importance to the defense of the west. There are today some 450,000 men under arms in the country. Another 500,000 trained reserves are immediately available. The Spaniards have not fought a foreign nation, except the United States, since the days of Napoleon and then their role was limited to the old-type guerrilla warfare. The civil war fought between 1936 and 1939 does not give any indication of the ability of the Spanish forces.

JOINT CHIEFS PUZZLED

Of all the countries of western Europe, however, Spain is not contaminated in the least with Communist ideology. Quite the contrary. The Spaniards are all determined anti-Communists, regardless of whether they are Falangists, Royalists, Socialists or anarchists.

The present world conflict is, among other things, an ideological conflict. Russian propaganda has succeeded to a remarkable degree in camouflaging its aims of world conquest with an ideology which has sucked in millions of dreamers or power-hungry demagogues. There is no doubt in the minds of those who have looked into conditions in Spain that the country would be of utmost importance as an ally against the Russian steamroller.

Yet, in Washington everything is being done to prevent Spain from fulfilling its role in the struggle against the evil forces of Moscow. The State Department and the White House, which alone oppose any steps to include the whole Iberian Peninsula in the forthcoming struggle for survival, have placed every conceivable barrier in the way of Spain's participation.

The stated reason is that General Franco is a dictator. But so is Tito, and a Communist to boot. That, however, does not impress our foreign-policy makers. They do not admit that the policy of expediency as it is applied to Tito should also be applied to the Communist-hating Spaniards.

President Truman has gone to greater lengths than any of his predecessors in thwarting the efforts of those who realize that Spain's military support is essential to the defense of Europe.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are reliably reported to have urged in the National Security Council that Spain be included in the defense of western Europe, are puzzled. Their views are being ignored because the State Department insists that such a move would offend the Socialists in Britain and France.

Printing of Return Addresses on Envelopes by the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the printers of this country are the victims of unfair competition, not from their brother printers, not from foreign lands, but from their own Government.

The local printer, frequently also the publisher of his home-town newspaper, is a resident of his community, a taxpayer, a substantial citizen. Yet, on one important potential source of income and service, the imprinting of return addresses on envelopes, he finds himself bucking the Post Office Department. For the small-town merchant can purchase from the Post Office Department envelopes imprinted with his own corner card at a fraction of the cost the home-town printer would have to charge.

The Post Office Department advances many excuses for thus not only underselling but in many cases actively soliciting, business which the print shops, especially in smaller communities, badly need.

They claim that it encourages small-business men to use return addresses and that its low price is a service to the people. This same Department recently cut its genuine service, the rapid delivery of the mail, in two.

The Department claims that private printers cannot match its mass-production price. That may be correct. The independent printers can hardly present the taxpayers with their deficit.

Now, why do the printers of the United States want to have Post Office Department printing of envelopes banned?

The first reason is the most obvious and there is no reason for the printers being bashful about expressing it. This is business taken from them, business they should have, business they can perform at a just price.

The Government's low prices, according to the Publishers Auxiliary, are aggressively advertised by eager postmasters seeking increased revenue for themselves and give an erroneous impression of all private printing-plant prices. This is especially unfair. When the Post Office does it so cheaply the customer is apt to think all private printing prices are out of line.

Printers resent an obvious intrusion on free enterprise.

Printers contend, their opinion based on National Editorial Association surveys, that the current Government customers would continue to use corner-cards, even at advanced price. And that advanced price, let me reiterate, would be only a fair one. The printers are not looking for a gravy train. They only ask a fair deal.

The major objective claimed by the Post Office Department is that of securing wide use of printed return addresses on the part of all businesses. Can we not assume that private printers would, in their own interest as well as that of the Government, work toward that objective?

There is the question of price. The Post Office Department probably fears that patrons will complain because the private printing concerns cannot match the low, mass-production cost. Printers will readily admit they cannot match the current price, but if every printer had more envelope business, the price would obviously come down. These local print shops have no desire to gouge the public. But on the other hand, if all Government departments set up similar programs for the production of consumer goods, eventually not one private concern in the Nation could do business.

The Post Office Department's argument just does not hold water.

If the Post Office Department got out of this business it would mean increased revenue of more than $2,500,000 annually to the legitimate printers. How could we attempt to justify the local post office selling groceries or hardware or sporting goods, on the grounds that it wanted to increase the public's use of these products and could sell them cheaper than a retailer? Where is the principle different?

Why then try to justify this unholy condition?

I say to you, in all earnestness, there is something wrong with the thinking of the Post Office Department.

To digress—we have all learned how they pay full freight rates on empty mail cars.

We have watched them, this year, slice mail deliveries and other service which they should be trying to improve instead of eliminating.

We have seen faithful, loyal employees terminated in some sort of an economy drive—while service was retroacted to pre-1910.

Yet the Department hangs on like a dog to a prize bone, to this antiquated and unfair service which robs our printers of legitimate revenue and may even make them appear in a bad light to the fellow townsmen.

Mr. Speaker, if the solution to this unfair situation must originate here—let us go to work.

Behind the Front Page

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert H. Stopher and James S. Jackson, from the Akron Beacon Journal of September 17, 1950:

BEHIND THE FRONT PAGE
(By Robert H. Stopher and James S. Jackson)

BOW BRUISED

After what happened to Frank T. Bow in Washington last week, Representative JOHN MCSWEENEY, of Wooster, Democratic Congressman from the Sixteenth Ohio District, suddenly began to look like a cinch for re-election.

Bow, a Canton lawyer, is the Republican nominee and until last week had been regarded by fellow Republicans as an even bet to unseat MCSWEENEY. Even some Democratic leaders were willing to concede privately that the district could swing the other way.

But then Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, Kansas Republican, got himself into a jam with a Senate speech which hinted broadly that Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman had been chummy with Communists. When the speech backfired, SCHOEPPEL said he had got his material from his legislative assistant—Bow.

Then it was Bow's turn to take a whipping. He spent a bruising day before the Senate's Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, with Senators MURRAY, of Montana; LEHMAN, of New York; and O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, all Democrats, taking turns at the lash. LEHMAN made one of the milder statements of the day when he said Bow's charge against Chapman was based on absolutely nothing except innuendo.

By the time the Sentors had finished they had succeeded in painting Bow as something of a minor league MCCARTHY in the matter of making charges that don't stand up.

O'MAHONEY summed up after the Bow testimony by calling the Bow-inspired SCHOEPPEL speech "one of the most infamous libels ever uttered against an honorable man."

M'SWEENEY MUM

Representative MCSWEENEY took pains to give the Senate committee hearing a wide berth and refused to be prodded into commenting on Bow's part in the affair.

"I'm telling you honestly," MCSWEENEY told a reporter, "I don't know a thing about the man or his activities."

If MCSWEENEY doesn't know Bow, maybe some other readers of the Beacon Journal don't either.

Max Abelman, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article about Max Abelman, of Brooklyn, N. Y., which appeared in the Long Island Press on September 3, 1950:

WHEN IT COMES TO FUND DRIVES, MAX ABELMAN IS THE MAN TO SEE
(By Joseph O. Hatfield)

When two Brooklyn charity executives argue about ways to raise money they usually end up saying "Let's talk it over with Abelman."

Max Abelman has urged the citizens of Brooklyn to voluntarily cough up over $100,-

000,000 during the past 40 years. He is considered one of the country's leading fund raisers, and a large part of the success of modern Brooklyn charity drives can be attributed to him.

Abelman, who lives at 311 Beach One, Neponsit, is at present working on plans to combine Brooklyn and Queens charity drives.

During the panic of 1907 Abelman went broke in the construction business. A newlywed, he needed a job badly, and after being turned down by dozens of construction companies, department stores, and manufacturing concerns, he finally secured a position as a $50-a-month clerk with the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Charities.

Since 1907 raising money for organized charities has been Abelman's business.

"Raising money is like being a salesman," he says. "You've got to have a good product. Then if it's well advertised, selling is easy."

In 1920 the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Charities needed $1,000,000 for a special building program. Every possible resource had been tapped in another drive, and nobody knew how to raise the money.

Max Abelman was consulted.

"A million dollars," Abelman said casually. "I can raise that in one night."

To his face, the prominent leaders who had consulted him said, "Fine, go ahead. We'll help you."

Behind his back, they said, "Abelman thinks he can raise any amount of money. Now he'll learn not to talk so big."

Abelman raised the money in one night.

Although Jewish charities are his specialty, Abelman has a remarkable record as a fund raiser for Catholic, Protestant, and nonsectarian causes.

"When I set out to get money for a charity," says Abelman, "I usually get it. Sometimes I have to hit the big givers over the head, but finally they all come through."

Abelman first made his name as a money raiser during World War I when he sold $49,000,000 in liberty bonds at one meeting at the Brooklyn Academy of Music. This was the most successful bond sale meeting of the fifth liberty loan drive.

In 1932 Abelman became secretary of the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital where his particular interests have been fund raising and publicity.

Just before World War II Abelman heard a report that some of the youngsters in the children's wards were exceptionally melancholy.

"If I had to look at white plaster walls all day, I might get a little melancholy too," he commented.

A few minutes later, after a brief conference with the hospital's president, Abelman was telephoning to Albert Cugat, the artist brother of the bandleader Xavier Cugat.

Cugat agreed to do the job and there are now 16 children's wards in the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital with names like Snow White, Pinocchio, Red Riding Hood, Goldilocks, Alice in Wonderland and Humpty-Dumpty.

When these rooms were completed Abelman did not overlook their fund raising possibilities. He arranged to have murals autographed by notable national and international figures, and each time a celebrity came to the hospital, its fine work got front page publicity. Some of the autographers have been Wendell Willkie, Eleanor Roosevelt, Lord Halifax, Thomas Dewey, Herbert Lehman, Leo Durocher, Eddie Cantor, Myrna Loy, Joe Medwick and Generals Bradley and Marshall.

It is inevitable that a man whose fame rests on successful charity campaign dinners should regularly be called on to help promote testimonial dinners. Abelman has helped arrange over a hundred testimonial dinners.

Although Abelman has always avoided partisan political activity, it is because of men like him that democracy continues to flourish. Freedom flourishes where there is religious tolerance, community spirit, privately supported charities and each man is aware of his duty to his brother. These causes have been Abelman's life * * * a life that has been both vital and creative.

Navy Veteran 100 Years Old Offers To Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, time brings its changes, but time has not lessened the desire of Dr. George C. Lippincott to serve his country. With the same spirit of loyalty that has always characterized him throughout his entire life, Dr. Lippincott, although 100 years old, has offered his services in the present war emergency, as a medical doctor, to the Navy Department.

The news article appearing in the Courier-Post newspaper of Camden, N. J., issue of September 18, 1950, gives in full the interesting details of the previous service of Dr. Lippincott and his willingness to again serve his country. It reads as follows:

THANKS, BUT NOT THIS WAR—NAVY VET, 100, OFFERS TO SERVE; SALEM TO HONOR DR. LIPPINCOTT

SALEM, September 18.—Dr. George C. Lippincott, retired naval lieutenant, today offered his services to the Navy Medical Corps.

The Navy, however, politely declined the doctor's offer. Instead, Dr. Lippincott was presented with a letter of congratulations from Secretary of the Navy Francis P. Matthews.

And no wonder.

Today Dr. Lippincott is observing his one hundredth birthday anniversary.

The oldest living member of the naval service on the retired list, Dr. Lippincott has been out of service since 1886. But when he recognized the needs of the Armed Forces for medical services, the Salem physician, despite his age, volunteered to serve.

The observance of his century mark is not being passed unnoticed. A birthday party, arranged by the Salem Citizens Committee, is being held at his home, 271 East Broadway.

The committee, headed by the Reverend Thomas Wingate, rector of St. John's Episcopal Church, and William DeLong, of the Salem Chamber of Commerce, arranged a party that is complete with birthday cake and presents.

And to show the feeling of the community for the physician, there were messages of congratulation from residents of Salem where Dr. Lippincott was born and has spent most of his 100 years.

Congratulations from Secretary Matthews and the Navy Department were delivered by Capt. Lyle J. Thomas, Fourth Naval District medical officer.

Dr. Lippincott was commissioned in the Navy in 1875, shortly after his graduation from Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia. His first duty was aboard the *Vandalia* for a cruise to the West Indies, returning to Philadelphia in July 1876, for the Centennial Exposition. In September of that year the *Vandalia* sailed for Gibraltar, a 50-day trip.

During the Russian-Turkish War in 1877 Dr. Lippincott served at Constantinople, then was granted 6 months' leave to visit Paris and London.

Returning to the *Vandalia* in December 1877, Dr. Lippincott had as fellow passengers President of the United States Ulysses S. Grant and Mrs. Grant, who were touring Egypt, Palestine, and Greece.

From 1879 to October 1880 Dr. Lippincott was on duty in the Navy Department bureau of medicine and surgery, then went aboard the *Galena* for 3 years' sea duty and a 6,000-mile cruise. While on the cruise Dr. Lippincott witnessed at close hand the British bombardment of the fort of Alexandria held by Arabi Yaski. He was at Chios during the destructive earthquake of April 1881, and remained there for several weeks attending the wounded at an improvised hosp'tal.

In December 1886, Dr. Lippincott was retired from the naval service, suffering from rheumatism and malarial fever incurred while he was on duty in the Mediterranean area.

I am proud of the fine spirit of loyalty that has been shown by Dr. Lippincott. It should be an inspiration to all of us. I trust that he may have many more years of health and happiness.

Bible Can Give All Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, September 17, 1950, the Reverend Dr. J. Walter Carpenter, pastor of the Metropolitan Baptist Church, here in Washington, delivered a most impressive sermon particularly appropriate during these serious times. The Times-Herald in its Monday issue carried the following story regarding this great sermon. I am happy to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the excerpt from the press:

BIBLE CAN GIVE ALL ANSWERS, SAYS PASTOR

The Bible can supply the answer to every need of the heart and life and soul of man if he will but listen, the Reverend Dr. J. Walter Carpenter, pastor of the Metropolitan Baptist church, said yesterday.

"Our modern world today is crying out in need of the Lord," Dr. Carpenter said. "His way of life is the only way, His teachings are truth undefiled, His atoning death for our sins has made possible life abundant for all mankind both in this world and in the world beyond.

TENSION RELIEF OFFERED

"Our modern lives are so filled with tension and confusion. Our homes have tensions, our offices, factories, and stores are filled with people whose nerves are ragged and whose lives are frustrated. People crack up in the business world and many marriages end in the tragedy of divorce.

"All of this could be avoided if only men would come to Jesus and trust their lives and souls to Him," he declared. "One of the most tragic sayings of our Lord was, 'Ye would not come to Me that ye might have life.' "

Dr. Carpenter then cited the case of the disciples of Jesus, who, after enduring suffering and confusion at His death on Calvary, felt they were ready to conquer the world for God when they saw Jesus alive again and risen from the dead.

THEY NEEDED TESTING

"But Jesus knew they were not yet ready," the pastor said. "The Kingdom of God demands that its leaders be men of stable faith, unmoved by the confusion and disappointment of their earthly lives.

"Each of these disciples of our Lord became a great and mighty leader," he said. "But how were their lives so changed and transformed that the unbelieving world looked at them and was so reminded of Jesus that people nicknamed them 'Little Christs,' or 'Christians,' a name that still today describes a true believer of Jesus?

"First, Jesus made certain that each of His disciples was a true believer in His deity and lordship. Judas, the renegade, had died a traitor's death, Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, was soon destined to take his place in the apostolic band."

SPIRITUAL POWER IS KEY

"But faith in Jesus is not enough," he said, "Scripture tells us that 'the devils also believed and trembled.' One of the last words of Jesus to His disciples was given just before His body ascension from this world. 'Tarry ye * * *,' He said, 'until ye be ended with power from on high.'

"The power that Jesus referred to was Holy Spirit power. When will is frustrated, weak men learn what scripture so plainly teaches: 'Not by might, not by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord.'

"Holy Spirit power comes only to those who have been 'born again.' As Jesus spoke to Nicodemus of old, so He speaks to every man today, 'Except a man be born again (i. e. born from above) he cannot see the Kingdom of God,'" Dr. Carpenter said.

If We Must Have UMT, Do It Without Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives a thought-provoking editorial on the subject of universal military training; this editorial being written by Mr. Paul G. Norris, Jr., publisher of the Marshalltown (Iowa) Times-Republican, and published in the columns of that newspaper on September 15, 1950.

Mr. Norris makes no profession to being a military expert; neither does he attempt to write legislation. He does recognize the corrosive effects of military conscription as practiced through the years by foreign countries and he offers suggestions through which some of these effects may be avoided.

Following is Mr. Norris' editorial:

This newspaper has never been in favor of adopting the European idea of universal military training in America, because so far we haven't been convinced it is the answer to our defense problems. But since the Korean war broke out, agitation for universal military training has been revived and it may be that we will be forced by world events to adopt some kind of general military training.

But if we are forced to come to universal military training to save ourselves, let's not rush into it without every effort to prevent waste of time, money, and manpower.

The whole idea of universal military training is repugnant to most of us; many of our ancestors came to this country for the sole purpose of escaping it in Europe. Furthermore, universal military training failed to save France or Italy and it made a militaristic nation out of Germany that twice lost a major world conflict.

However, our unpreparedness for Korea must force us to the conclusion that our present defense program is inadequate. We have two alternatives for the future, either a huge standing army, or a powerful conscripted reserve that will be immediately ready for combat on mobilization. Most Americans would prefer the latter.

But we still don't think that calls for 2 years of active military service on the part of all able bodied young men, or even for a full year. Basic training should be given under Regular Army supervision, of course, but that is compressed into 3 or 4 months in wartime, so there is no reason why it couldn't be done in peacetime.

Here is our suggestion: That the summer after a youth graduates from high school, or after he reaches 18 if he drops school, he be drafted for 3 or 4 months of intensive basic training under professional instruction; then transfer him to a National Guard or active Reserve unit to continue his training at home through age 25.

If he could afford to go to college, he might qualify for an ROTC unit with the Government paying only for his officer training. Each summer he might be subject to a few weeks of intensive field maneuvers as long as he remained in the active Reserve.

In the end we should have a Reserve that is constantly at full strength, always young and vigorous, and whose training is kept up to date. At the same time our young men's civilian careers would not be disrupted except by actual war.

There may be some "bugs" in this idea, for this editor is not a military man. But we would prefer to see it tried than to waste time, money, and manpower on military training that may be outdated when we need it.

The Associated Press News Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have observed tremendous interest by Members of Congress in the Associated Press news printer located in the Speaker's lobby. A great amount of favorable comment also has reached me about the usefulness of this service in keeping Members informed of top news developments in Washington and throughout the Nation and the world.

Because of this interest, I have asked the Associated Press for some details about the compiling and transmission of its Washington news service.

I have learned that the news we read here is the cream of more than 1,000,000 words transmitted daily by the many wires of the Associated Press—tailored swiftly and carefully by a staff of editors in Washington to include those items of most interest to Members of Congress and others in Washington who need to be continuously informed on the latest news.

The Associated Press gathers and distributes news in every one of the 48 States and in almost every one of the nations of the world. The specialized news report we see in the Capitol is culled from the best that this outstanding news service has to offer.

The main purposes of the Associated Press Washington wire are these: To report the details of newsworthy events throughout Washington; to report news from all parts of the Nation which is of particular interest in Washington; and to report the latest top news from the rest of the world, including news from the battle fronts of Korea.

Much of the material which you see on the teletype nearby is gathered by the Associated Press staff in Washington—the largest news staff in the Capital.

This Associated Press service certainly is one of the most important aids we have to keep us abreast of the news—and as a result, to enable us to do a more intelligent and more efficient job. Without such a service, we would in many instances have to wait until the late afternoon or evening to hear of events or actions which bear on many of the measures we are considering.

Because of the value of this service, I am convinced that similar Associated Press teletypes should be located in strategic spots in the New and Old House Office Buildings, so that Members could be close to reliable news outlets throughout the working day. Moreover, the Associated Press informs me that this service can be extended to the individual offices of the Members of Congress if they desire.

I recommend these possibilities for your consideration in this day when the complexion of the news changes by the hour—even by the minute.

Hon. J. Hardin Peterson, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, before the Congress recesses and we all set our respective courses for home grounds, there is still one important piece of unfinished business we should attend to. I might say it is also a pleasant and yet a sad one. That is extending sincerest thanks and Godspeed to one of the outstanding public servants in the House of Representatives. The distinguished gentleman of whom I speak, is, of course, our colleague, J. HARDIN PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON is returning to private life after 18 successive and successful

years of serving in Congress the people of Florida, whom, I am sure have never been better represented in the House of Representatives. I wonder whether the people of Florida realize how well their interests and the interests of the Nation have been represented here by Mr. PETERSON. We, who have seen him in action on the House floor, in committees, or in his office, are well aware of his effectiveness here. Always in regular attendance and invariably in command of the salient points of the legislation at hand, he has been a vigorous and participating Member.

During this Congress, especially, in which he was chairman of the Public Lands Committee, was Mr. PETERSON exceedingly busy. I can say it was a pleasure to serve under him as a member of that committee. However demanding the tasks or however numerous or diversified, J. HARDIN PETERSON always found time, somehow, to give the other fellow's problem courteous and unselfish attention.

I particularly appreciate this quality in our colleague, since the people of Puerto Rico depended upon his committee and his chairmanship in no small degree. The people of Puerto Rico, as well as those of Alaska and Hawaii, look to the actions of the Public Lands Committee as exceedingly important to their political and economical lives. For the Public Lands Committee has jurisdiction over the organic legislation governing the offshore areas. Mr. PETERSON'S cooperation and sympathetic understanding of Puerto Rico's problems were both steadfast and magnificent.

As his service here draws toward its close, and he prepares for a well-earned rest before, I understand, returning to his private practice of law, the people of Puerto Rico join with the people of Florida and the Nation in expressing their warmest thanks and best wishes to Mr. J. HARDIN PETERSON.

What Depleted Companies of (Negro) Twenty-fourth Have Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the fighting tradition established by the Twenty-fourth Infantry in the days of Teddy Roosevelt's charge up San Juan Hill in the Spanish-American War is being carried on today in the Korean war. The following article which appeared in the September 12 issue of the Boston Daily Globe brings this out clearly and marks another instance of distinguished action in the record of this famous Negro regiment. The article follows:

WHAT DEPLETED COMPANIES OF (NEGRO) TWENTY-FOURTH HAVE DONE

(By Stan Swinton)

ON THE MASAN FRONT, September 11.—The Army is checking into the combat performance of the Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, oldest Negro fighting unit in the American Army.

It is generally believed that the survey will result in a decision on integration of both Negro and white troops in the regiment. Such integration is favored by both white and Negro officers in the field.

While neither white nor colored officers like to discuss the matter on the record, privately it is conceded that the inspection was touched off because the North Korean break-through September 1 on the Twenty-fifth Division front was made through the Twenty-fourth Regiment.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Twenty-fourth Regiment was among the first American units to see action, hence has been fighting longer than most other troops in the line.)

This break-through followed the see-saw struggle for Battle Mountain 2 miles west of Haman, which the Twenty-fourth Regiment captured, lost, and then retook a half dozen times.

Some officers felt that other troops might have held.

The regiment's new commander, Lt. Col. John T. Corley, Brooklyn's famous "Fighting Irishman" of World War II, made his feelings known today with a general order to all his troops shortly after an Eighth Army inspector visited to check into the Twenty-fourth combat record.

Corley said:

"To the fighting Twenty-fourth United States Infantry: In 60 days of continuous combat you have withstood a roughness of battle which I had not seen in five campaigns in Africa, Sicily, and Europe with the First Infantry Division.

"You have held ground against superior odds. You have lived up to the regimental motto of Semper Paratus (always ready).

"The first United States victory in Korea was your action at Yechon. It has been noted in Congress. The people back home cover in detail your efforts on Battle Mountain, west of Haman, Korea.

"Other units have been unable to accomplish what depleted companies of the fighting Twenty-fourth have done. I am proud of the 'Blockhousers.' (The regimental nickname comes from a blockhouse the Twenty-fourth captured in the charge up San Juan Hill in the Spanish-American War."

After the Negro infantrymen lost Battle Mountain last week, a full white battalion regained the position but was unable to hold it. The scarred high point now is in North Korean hands.

Negro officers concede that combat efficiency of the Twenty-fourth Regiment has dropped as its experienced, noncommissioned officers, officers and soldiers became casualties.

Negro officers say 80 percent of their men favor integration.

Secretary Chapman Upheld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to have inserted what I consider to be a truly excellent editorial from a Republican paper of New York State, the Watertown Daily Times, relative to the recent discredited charges against Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman. That editorial of September 7, follows:

ATTACKING SECRETARY CHAPMAN

Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman is the latest victim of a wild loyalty attack. Senator SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, has charged the Cabinet officer with being associated with Communist front groups in the Senate and now must ensue an inquiry which will in the end clear Mr. Chapman although he may suffer personal harm.

The line of Senator SCHOEPPEL runs something like this: Chapman is in favor of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii and should that statehood materialize, he recommends that they be brought within the province of the Department of the Interior. Since the Alaskan Governor, Ernest Gruening, has hired a former public-relations counsel for Communist Poland to publicize the desirability of Alaska becoming the forty-ninth State and since it is the ambition of Governor Gruening to have the Interior Department direct the affairs of Alaska in its prospective statehood; therefore, all who favor this are Communist fronters. There seems to be no recognition of the fact that Alaska, the nearest point to Manchuria and the Soviet, is the one area which the Russians would object to as an American State.

Probably what is behind this attack on Mr. Chapman is his abilities not only as the Administrator of the Interior Department but also his abilities as a politician. The Interior Department has for many years been at the forefront of all programs working for the preservation of the American resources whether land or mineral or forests for the American public. In seeking this objective, the Department comes against many private interests, many of whom can be quite vocal and very critical. Mr. Chapman is also a politician and is pretty competent as demonstrated by the way he organized the last tour of President Truman to the west coast and back. That trip occurred late last April and in early May and the best judgment of all who watched the tour was that it was the best political trip the President ever made.

If the President's campaign trip in October of 1948 was the difference between his victory and Governor Dewey's defeat in the Presidential campaign, the tour of 1950 preserved and enhanced the political popularity of Mr. Truman. Senator SCHOEPPEL, a Republican, naturally does not want Mr. Chapman in any position in Washington which would permit the organization of another such tour, particularly as 1952 rolls around.

Mr. Chapman has made an excellent record for public service since his first arrival in Washington in 1933. He served as Assistant Secretary of the Interior from 1933 to 1946. He had had some political experience before that, having managed the sentorial campaign in New Mexico of the late Senator Edward Costagin. He was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1932 and he managed another campaign in Colorado for a victorious Democratic senatorial candidate in 1932. President Roosevelt appointed him as the Assistant Secretary of the Interior in May 1933, under Secretary Ickes. Even after Secretary Ickes left the Interior Department, Mr. Chapman stayed on and served as Under Secretary for Captain Krug. Upon Krug's retirement in 1949, Mr. Chapman moved up to the top job in the Interior Department. Mr. Chapman has been at the front of the campaign to assist the American Indian in getting fair treatment. He has been for the admittance of Hawaii and Alaska for statehood since 1948 when he first testified in their behalf. He has long been a supporter of the St. Lawrence seaway and has so spoken on many occasions.

It seems fairly clear that it is not Mr. Chapman's loyalty that is under fire but rather his progressive views and his abilities as a politician.

Red Drive for Western Europe Grain Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith an article which appears on the front page of the Wall Street Journal for Monday, September 11, 1950. This article, written by Edward Hughes, staff correspondent for the Journal from Geneva, Switzerland, recites the efforts which are being made by and through the Economic Commission for Europe, a United Nations agency, by which our grain exports to western Europe will be supplanted by exports from the Communist-dominated countries behind the iron curtain.

If the program inaugurated by this United Nations agency is carried out, it will have some important and far-reaching effects. In the first place, any steps to supplant American outlets for wheat in western Europe will vitally affect every American wheat farmer. Our present farm program as related to wheat is based upon exports in excess of 300,000,000 bushels per year, most of which must go to European countries. To the extent that these markets are lost, it means one or two things, either that our surplus will greatly increase or that American farmers will be compelled to substantially reduce their acreage and production.

Furthermore, if this proposal is carried out it could disastrously affect the present international wheat agreement to which this country is a party. This agreement, which has been entered into by more than 30 of the leading importing nations of the world, is based upon a series of maximum and minimum prices. Should Russia dump large quantities of wheat into the western European countries, which are the largest importers under this agreement, it could very easily break the entire price structure of the agreement, something which would be very costly to the Government of the United States, because sales under the agreement are subsidized and the lower the world price the greater the subsidy which must be paid. In fact, the entry of Russia into this field might very well result in destroying the wheat agreement altogether.

But this proposal has other and far-reaching implications. If western European countries are going to purchase Soviet grain, they will have to give something in exchange. Russia will drive a hard bargain. What she wants is critical materials and machine tools to assist her in building up her war potential. Can we afford to have the nations of western Europe, with whom we are now allied in a military way, and whose defense systems we are building up with large expenditures of American money, contributing to the expansion of Soviet military might? I am bringing this proposal to the attention of Ambassador Harriman, the President's assistant in foreign affairs, and the State Department, and I am urging that efforts be made to protect the vital interests of this Nation in connection with this matter. The newspaper article follows:

RED'S GRAIN—WEST EUROPE WILL TAP IRON CURTAIN COUNTRY BINS—IF STALIN ASSENTS—UN AGENCY THINKS THE DEAL COULD BE STARTER FOR AN EAST-WEST TRADE REVIVAL—WILL KANSAS FARMERS LOSE?

(By Edward Hughes)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—The nations of western Europe want more Russian grain in their daily bread.

If they get it, it will make a big difference to United States wheat farmers from Texas to Kansas to Montana.

Britain and major grain-importing countries on the Continent have notified the Soviets they're ready to sit down and bargain for large additional supplies of the wheat, rye, corn, oats, and barley they need to feed their human and animal populations.

Concrete estimates of their requirements have been handed to the Russians, through the Soviet diplomatic mission in Berne, not far from here. If Stalin and the Politburo decide to go ahead, it will be the signal for a large-scale grain conference—possibly within 30 days.

SOME UN SPONSORSHIP

The negotiations are being sponsored by the Economic Commission for Europe, an agency of the United Nations which maintains headquarters in the vast white-marble Palais des Nations here. Back in June, ECE chief Gunnar Myrdal approached the Russians with a proposal that the traditional east-to-west grain movement be revived. If such could be accomplished, he argued, it might rejuvenate over-all east-west trade, which has dwindled since the war.

The Russians grabbed the grain suggestion in an unusual display of interest. They told Myrdal: Bring us some concrete purchase offers from west Europe and we might talk turkey. Within weeks, a team of ECE dignitaries was speeding across the Continent, interviewing top economic officials in countries which might be interested in buying more Russian grains.

The ECE grain mission recently returned to Geneva, with portfolios crammed with bushel-and-ton figures on possible purchases by the west. "If the Russians want to sell, we've got them some customers," says one expert. He adds: "We found an enthusiastic interest in our project."

FIGURES STILL CONFIDENTIAL

ECE is keeping its newly gathered figures confidential for the moment, but one top official claims west Europe had offered to buy "a very considerable quantity of both bread and coarse grains" from Red-run east Europe, to supplement currently available supplies.

Russia would have much to gain by enlarging her westward sales of grain. Her current orders for western finished goods indicate a continuing desperate need for all sorts of machinery—and for the foreign exchange with which to buy this industrial equipment.

But more important, it's believed the men in the Kremlin might have more subtle political and economic purposes in mind. One of the most important bonds cementing western Europe to the United States politically is the continuing trade dependence on America fostered by the Marshall plan. Experts here think Russia may hope to weaken these political ties by a return to commerce on a sizable scale between Red Europe and the rest of the Continent.

PRICE-HAVOC PLOT?

Another attraction for the Russians, as seen by some experts here, is the possibility of wrecking havoc in the west's price structure by injecting large additional supplies of grain into the world's commerce.

More than 30 nations, for example, are tied to the United States, Canada, and Australia as major sources for their wheat supplies under the 4-year International Wheat Agreement—which Russia recently tried unsuccessfully to enter. This pact involves a specific guaranty on the part of exporters to sell portions of their wheat at prices within a fixed range.

So far, exporters have been able to hold purchase prices under the agreement at or near the top of this price scale. But with world supplies of wheat at postwar peaks, there's new pressure building which threatens to send pact prices crashing to the floor levels provided under the agreement.

Given that situation, what if Russia decided to start selling large quantities of wheat in European markets? United States wheat officials bravely insist they're all for a revival of this east-to-west trade, but they admit it might be all that's needed to break the price structure of the present agreement.

COULD COST THE UNITED STATES

Such a development would be extremely costly to the United States. That's because Uncle Sam subsidizes all sales under the agreement. The United States pays American farmers the difference between going market prices and sales prices for export under the agreement. This gap is already wider than expected, with the resulting expenditures by the Government now running into millions of dollars annually to pay the subsidy.

What's more, if Russia comes into the European markets in a big way, it would likely mean American farmers would be selling much less wheat abroad. As it is, United States sales under the wheat pact lagged well below the quota last year, because of a natural tendency on the part of importers to seek nondollar wheat.

American growers of other grains would face the same prospect if Russia started pouring rye, corn, oats, and barley into western Europe.

With cost-free Marshall-plan grain beginning to dwindle, there's no question that west Europe would jump at the chance to procure large amounts of nondollar grain. The ability to buy Russian wheat, for instance, would solve western Germany's greatest single dollar-gap headache. Much the same goes for Britain, which is frantically seeking as much wheat as possible from nondollar Australia, but must spend much of her dollar fund for United States and Canadian grains.

GRAIN-TRADE HISTORY

The east-to-west grain trade since the war has followed the general downward pattern of over-all commerce between the two political spheres. Back in 1938, shipments of grains comprised nearly 25 percent of the total value of $1,213,000,000 worth of a score of the most important food and industrial items exported from east Europe to 11 western European nations. They were the largest single item on the list.

What's that picture these days? In 1948, this over-all list of commodities in the east-to-west commerce was valued at just $393,000,000. Bread and coarse grains were still the most important shipments, valued at a total of $143,000,000, a substantial quantity, but less than half the 1938 grain-trade value Last year, there was some recovery toward the prewar level, but shipments remained relatively small.

Moreover, as the political winds shifted, bringing the formerly independent eastern European countries under the Communist wing, long-range prospects for expansion of this east-west trade grew slimmer. Russia and her satellites began insisting that western payment in return for eastern raw materials be in finished commodities which were being kept out of Soviet hands for strategic reasons.

MORE MOSCOW TIRADES

When the question of east-west trade came up at ECE meetings, it became the habit of Russia's delegate to take the floor to launch a political tirade against the United States charging that Uncle Sam was blocking western Europe's trade with the east in order to protect his own markets for the Marshall-dumping plan.

That's why it came as something of a surprise to ECE officials when Russia stopped hampering ECE proceedings long enough to promise a modicum of cooperation in the new grain-trade development scheme.

Just how much additional grain can Russia supply the west? The answer to that question is a mystery outside the iron curtain. Statistics on production, supplies, and exports for Russia and the satellites are few and far between. Even UN experts have been able to put together only a fragmentary picture of the situation. But, whatever the supply position of the Reds, experience in the 1930's shows that they're willing to go to any lengths to export if the political or economic situation requires it.

RUSSIA CONTROLS BREADBASKET

With her new control over the valuable east Europe grain region, Soviet Russia is in a much stronger position to coordinate sales of grain to the west—providing there's grain to export. It seems safe to say that grain production in the European grain area still lags behind prewar average output, but indications are that the Russian grain crops have already topped prewar levels. In 1949, according to the United Nations experts, Russia's output of all grains was about 124,500,000 tons. That would be about 8,000,000 tons above 1948 output and about 4,000,000 to 6,000,000 tons above 1940 production.

There is little definite that can be said of this year's grain crops east of the iron curtain. Earlier in the season prospects were for bumper crops of both bread grains, like wheat and rye, and coarse grains, like corn, oats and barley, which usually are used for livestock feeding. Now, however, reports from the Danube basin indicate that protracted dry weather in recent weeks has caused extensive change in all grain harvest prospects.

The corn crop is said to be especially damaged. The well-informed British trade publication, "Corn Trade News," reported a few days ago that Rumania's corn crop may actually fall below last year's harvest, from which nothing at all was exported. There's been severe damage in Hungary also, says the publication, concluding that "the evidence seems to suggest forcibly that no supply of any importance will be available from this year's crops" in the Danube area of east Europe. Other reports say the dry weather has reached into Russia's Ukraine, too.

WANTS LONG CONTRACTS

But, if Russia sits down with western Europe at a grain parley, chances are she'll be trying to commit importers to contracts extending over a period of several years. And, says the UN, chances are Red-run grain producing areas will be turning out larger exportable supplies in the next few years. Despite an apparent reduction in investment in agriculture, eastern Europe plans a 20 percent increase in bread grain production over prewar levels by 1953. Says an ECE expert: "It appears reasonable to suppose that these nations could supply out of this production a volume of exports amounting to the 1934–38 average."

The outlook for exportable supplies of coarse grains, like corn, oats, and barley, isn't as good. Because of a planned reduction of acreage of coarse grains in favor of bread grains and other crops, it appears that exportable supplies won't exceed 60 percent of the 1934–38 level in eastern Europe, in the next 3 years.

There's no way to be certain, but Russia seems able to do better than that herself. In 1934–38, she exported an average 750,000 tons of bread grain annually as well as a yearly average 400,000 tons of coarse grain. There are indications she can supply twice that amount to foreign nations now. It is recalled, for example, that during her recent futile attempt to join the International Wheat Agreement, she demanded an annual export quota of 2,000,000 tons of wheat.

Foot Soldier Still Tops in Modern Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to an editorial published September 8, 1950, in the Karlstad Advocate, of Karlstad, Minn.

Published by Dane H. Nordine and L. Curtiss Lindberg, the Karlstad Advocate is one of the finest weekly newspapers in Minnesota.

Comprehensive in its analysis and practical in its conclusions, the editorial drives home a very important point—the poor, bloody infantry has been the queen of battles in Korea.

The Advocate publishers pay fitting tribute to the finest and most reliable weapon the American Nation will ever have—GI Joe, our foot soldier.

The editorial follows:

In the light of current events, it is interesting to look back about a year, to the time when the headlines were largely occupied over what kind of weapons we needed, and how the next war would have to be fought. The star of the Air Force was then in its ascendancy, and its more extreme partisans were arguing passionately that the airplane—and most especially jet fighters and the huge intercontinental bombers—could do practically all of the job. The Navy, the argument ran, would in the future be only a minor, auxiliary service, and should be deprived of most, possibly all, of its own planes and carriers. The tank was obsolete, or nearly so, because new weapons had made it practically as vulnerable to fire as a jeep. And the role of the foot soldier, always paramount in past wars, would be relatively a minor one next time.

In this war, the biggest bombers have hardly been used, nor are they likely to be used to any extent. They are adapted to global, all-out war, in which they would carry A-bombs to vital enemy targets thousands of miles away from their bases.

The Air Force has performed splendidly in Korea, and has inflicted heavy damage on Red forces. But reports from the front have said time and again that the jet planes in this type of campaign, have been a disappointment. Valuable as they are in air combat, they are too fast, and too limited in the time they can stay aloft, to operate as well in close support of troops as piston-engined planes.

Navy air, once written off as an obsolete weapon, has proven enormously vital. A traditional Navy dominates the sea lanes and the harbors.

The most dramatic example of the worth of an old weapon is found in the tank. It was the greatest single factor in making possible the North Korean drive.

Finally, the role of the foot soldier has again been all-important. Despite all the new and revolutionary concepts yet uttered, the "poor, bloody infantry" has been the queen of battles in Korea.

It may be that in the future, and in another kind of war if it comes, those new concepts may find some justification. They have not so far, and it is evident that it would be disastrous folly to accept them at theoretical value.

Let's Keep Him on the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, like almost all of us in the House of Representatives, my colleague, Representative HUBERT B. SCUDDER, of the First California District, is asking the people of that district to reelect him to Congress in November, on the basis of the excellent record he has made here. He and I served together in the State assembly. When the distinguished and beloved dean of the California delegation, Clarence F. Lea, retired in 1948, HUBERT SCUDDER was asked by his people to run for that office and was elected by a pleasing vote. He is a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, an important committee to my State. He has worked hard and successfully for his district and for California and for this Nation in a critical period of its history. He brought to Congress the experience he had acquired in previous legislative and administrative work. The results speak for themselves. His constituents will do well to send him back and so take advantage of the experience and the seniority he has here.

Evidently that is what the people think in the first district. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Petaluma Argus-Courier of September 9, under the heading "Let's keep him on the job":

LET'S KEEP HIM ON THE JOB

"He is tailor-made for the job."

That is what we said of Hubert Scudder during his first campaign for Congress in this district.

We made that statement because we knew from his record as assemblyman from this district and later as real-estate commissioner for the entire State that he had proved himself as a capable legislator and administrator.

Now that he has served us for the greater part of one term, we are more convinced than ever that he is tailor-made for the job.

His record entitles him to another term and as many more terms as he may wish to serve.

He knows this congressional district better than any man we know of. He has served it better than any man we know of could have served it during his first term of office.

Every important interest in his entire district has had his earnest attention when there was especial need for it. That he will continue to give that kind of service, regardless of his political affiliations, is a foregone conclusion. For this reason alone, we should keep him where he is.

He is a Republican. That is important because we must have a balancing of power in the national legislative chambers to prevent the avid seekers for power from taking advantage of the present world crisis to further their efforts toward the welfare state, the socialistic state, the state that considers itself above the individual and seeks to retain its power by handing out special privileges to pressure groups.

We need him to preserve that essential balance between the urban and rural sections. He is well grounded in the needs of the country districts as against the special mass interests of the city districts. He is not opposed to legislation that is for the benefit of the urban sections, but he is more zealous than a city dweller could be for the preservation of the integrity and influence of the rural areas.

Every county in his congressional district needs that vital protection against the policies advocated by the masses of the more thickly settled portions of our State, against the masses that are swayed by the blandishments and promises of the demagogue.

He is firmly grounded in the belief that private enterprise must be protected against the further encroachments of the Federal Government.

He believes in preserving the rights of the States and of the local political entities so that we shall not be governed by bureaucrats centralized in Washington, unfitted for Government and bent on preserving their power by whatever means they may think will win the votes of an unthinking majority.

He is broad minded to the extent that he will go along with the administration in Washington in the prosecution of a war that is almost certain to engulf us in the most titanic struggle we have ever had. Yet he will not hesitate to prevent, as far as possible, a rooting of trends that will turn the United States into a totalitarian state just because its war powers have been so great and so devastating to the democracy we love.

We cannot take chances on a candidate who promises pieces of cheese from the moon, who has had little, if any, experience in political office, who has advocated policies that will, if put into effect, lead us further into the clutches of the welfare state.

We still believe that Hubert Scudder is tailor-made for the job. Let's keep him in it.

Go down to the American Legion Hall next Tuesday afternoon at 3:15 and hear him speak in his "Washington Report." You will be more convinced than ever that we should retain his services as Congressman from this district.

Truman Pays Off Labor Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman fired Robert N. Denham, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, he was paying off a debt or a promise to Phil Murray, of the CIO, and Bill Green, of the American Federation of Labor, either for past favors or favors to come—who knows. As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on September 18 which is pertinent to this subject. It follows:

PARTIAL PAY-OFF

President Truman has asked and received the resignation of Robert N. Denham as general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

That, coming just ahead of the congressional elections, is an obvious pay-off to Philip Murray, William Green, and other union leaders for their political support, given in the past and avidly desired in the future, of the President and his branch of the Democratic Party.

It is, to be sure, only a partial payment.

Mr. Truman has not been able to deliver on his promise to bring about repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

That's what the union leaders really want, and want more than ever just now, since it would restore their power to enforce legalized closed shops and impose compulsory union membership on present and new workers in expanding defense industries.

AFL craft unions, in particular, used such power ruthlessly to enrich themselves in World War II. They exacted outrageously high fees and dues from workers seeking jobs on defense projects—workers who, in countless cases, got only what amounted to temporary work permits and never were given the real or theoretical benefits of full union membership.

But Mr. Truman has failed to convince many Democrats and most Republicans in Congress that the Taft-Hartley Act is as bad as he and the union leaders say. He could have had it modified, to meet reasonable objections, but he could not get it repealed and the biased Wagner Act restored.

So, as the next best thing, he has ousted Mr. Denham, whom the union leaders denounce as an "enemy of labor." He tried unsuccessfully to do that a few months ago, by asking Congress to abolish the independent office of general counsel to the NLRB, in the name of "Government reorganization." Now he has done it on the theory that the general counsel must be someone who will work in "harmonious relationship" with the NLRB's members.

When the Taft-Hartley Act became effective in 1947, Mr. Truman appointed Mr. Denham and the NLRB members and told them that, much as he disliked the new law, he wanted them to enforce it as written and as Congress intended.

Mr. Denham and the members have differed, frequently and at times bitterly, as to how the law should be enforced. The rerelationship, certainly, has been far from "harmonious"—but whether that was the fault of Mr. Denham or of the Board members is a quite different question.

This newspaper believes that Mr. Denham tried conscientiously and courageously to enforce the law as Congress wrote and intended it, and a preponderance of court decisions seems to support that belief. What results from harmony between a new general counsel and the Board may please the union leaders, and enhance their power. How well it will please rank-and-file union members and the general public remains to be seen.

Practice Before Federal Administrative Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at the American Bar Association convention:

I

Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentleman, I am glad of this opportunity to appear before the section of administrative law of the American Bar Association and to discuss the pending legislation to regulate practice before the Federal administrative agencies.

It is now evident that the Congress will not be likely to enact legislation upon this subject during its present session. Furthermore, it is perfectly apparent to those of us who have been working to secure a needed law to regulate practice before Federal administrative agencies that, if a law dealing with the situation is ever enacted in the immediately foreseeable future, it will only be brought about by the united efforts of every person who recognizes the need for such a law.

Opposition to any law dealing with practice before Federal administrative agencies is fairly widespread. I think that, in large measure, most of the opposition is due to a lack of understanding of the purposes of such legislation.

It is fitting, therefore, to review with you the history of the efforts which have been made to date to secure what many of us feel to be much-needed legislation in this field. It is my hope that this discussion will contribute to a deeper understanding of the problem.

II

Let us begin our consideration by a review of the objectives of the latest bill upon this subject, which is H. R. 8201. This bill is designed (1) to impose standards of professional or ethical conduct upon lawyer and nonlawyer practitioners before Federal administrative agencies; (2) to provide a centralized system for the licensing of lawyers, permitting the several agencies to license nonlawyers, as the agencies are now permitted by law to do; and (3) to establish a needed statutory system for disciplinary proceedings relative to lawyers and nonlawyers. The bill is also designed to clarify the circumstances under which former Government officers and employees may practice before Federal administrative agencies.

Thus, H. R. 8201 deals with several distinct problems. While all of these problems relate in one way or another to practice before Federal agencies, separate circumstances have given rise to the need for the several provisions of the bill.

1. From the standpoint of lawyers, perhaps one of the most troublesome features of practice before Federal agencies is the necessity for a lawyer to qualify separately before each of the several agencies with which he may have occasion to do business. Under our system of government and law, it has long been customary for the States to issue licenses to persons found to be competent and qualified to practice law. In a great majority of instances, the highest courts of the States (and I include the United States Dis-

trict Court for the District of Columbia insofar as lawyers in the District of Columbia are concerned) supervise the admission to practice of lawyers. Moreover, lawyers are subject to the ethical standards which prevail generally in the legal profession, and they are subject to disbarment by State courts in appropriate instances.

Notwithstanding the qualifications and competence of a lawyer, as determined by the State which licensed him to practice, such a lawyer is not now entitled to practice before many Federal administrative agencies unless he meets the special qualifications of a particular agency.

Many of you must have personally had the experience of coming to Washington to represent a client only to find that you were not qualified to practice before some particular agency, and that it was necessary for you to apply to that agency for permission to appear before it.

The situation is made more difficult, from a lawyer's standpoint, because, even after a lawyer qualifies to practice before a given agency, he is not entitled to practice before another Federal agency. In short, each agency is presently privileged to impose its own requirements upon persons who appear before it in a representative capacity.

Of course, not all agencies have requirements, and there is a great deal of variation among the requirements of agencies which do regulate the persons who appear before them as lawyers or otherwise. One agency may, for example, enroll the name of a lawyer to practice before it upon application of the lawyer and a statement by him that he is qualified to practice law in a given State. In another case, the agency may require a certificate from the clerk of the highest court of the State in which the applicant is licensed to practice.

The full absurdity of the situation is demonstrated by the fact that some agencies will not accept the certificate of the clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States as evidence of a lawyer's qualifications, but insist upon a certificate from the clerk of the highest court of the State wherein the lawyer is licensed to practice, notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States itself, as a preliminary to admission to practice before it, requires the lawyer to furnish a certificate from the clerk of the highest court in his State. Still other agencies do not require the furnishing of a certificate from any court, but require a sworn statement from a lawyer who desires to practice before it stating that he is licensed to practice before some State or Federal court.

Finally, it may be noted that at least one agency, the Patent Office, requires lawyers to demonstrate a special technical competence apart from other legal training before admitting lawyers to practice.

The sheer difficulties arising from the minute differentiations in procedures for admission to practice relative to the different agencies creates useless obstacles to lawyers without any corresponding benefits to the public or to anyone else.

The conditions which I have just outlined have resulted in the proposal, now incorporated in H. R. 8201, to provide a centralized system for the licensing of lawyers. Basically, the idea is to make it possible for a lawyer who has already been authorized to practice by the courts to go before a central Federal credentials committee and to secure a permit or a license which will entitle him thereafter to practice before any Federal administrative agency.

There does not seem to be much objection to this particular feature of the proposed legislation. As can be readily seen, it is a matter of primary concern to lawyers, and almost everyone who has considered the problem recognizes the merit of the proposal.

The principal opposition to H. R. 8201 arises because of other features of the bill growing out of still other conditions, which I shall now discuss.

2. Unlike the situation which prevails in courts, the Federal agencies now permit nonlawyers, as well as lawyers, to practice before them. Certified public accountants regularly appear before such agencies as the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Also, lay rate experts, sometimes known as traffic managers, may appear in a representative capacity before such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission. Many of the agencies, by rules, separately provide for the admission to practice before them of such nonlawyers. Moreover, these nonlawyers may now appear in proceedings required to be conducted pursuant to sections 7 and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act. Consequently, they may appear in proceedings the records of which subsequently are subject to review by the courts.

While these nonlawyers must meet the requirements of particular agencies before practicing before such agencies, they are not, with some notable exceptions, subject to any professional or ethical standards similar to those which govern the conduct of lawyers. Many people feel that modern government is so intricate that no man should be permitted to hold himself out as a professional unless he has met professional requirements. In saying this, I do not mean for one moment to disparage the nonlawyer specialist. Rather, it is my intent and that of those of similar thinking to place the nonlawyer specialist upon a real professional footing. The public is entitled to representation by persons not only of good moral character, but equipped with the necessary technical skill and understanding of professional responsibilities. Practically all of the States already have legislation upon this subject for the better security of the people against incompetency and dishonesty.

At all events, there are many people who feel that, in these days when administrative agencies have taken over much of the work formerly left to the courts, it is timely that there be regulation of all practitioners before such agencies, just as there has long been the licensing of lawyers by the courts. Regulation which has been found advisable for lawyers should surely apply as well to others who undertake to perform similar functions. The lack of an effective counterpart to the professional and ethical requirements governing lawyers among nonlawyer specialists in the administrative field tends to undermine the application of standards of conduct to any practitioner, whether he be lawyer or nonlawyer.

It is out of the foregoing considerations and conditions that it is proposed, in H. R. 8201, to require the agencies to license nonlawyers.

3. Another condition which has contributed to the proposal for a Federal licensing system with respect to lawyers and nonlawyers is the fact that, whether we like it or not, Washington appears to be the gathering place for some persons who, back in their home communities, have dubious professional reputations. In many cases, persons on the verge of being disbarred move to Washington and hold themselves out as practitioners before administrative agencies. It is not possible, under the present system, for the agencies themselves to screen all applicants in such a manner as to weed out the unfit and incompetent. Indeed, as I have previously pointed out, many of the agencies do not require any showing, and some agencies which do require a showing only require that the applicant prove that he holds a license to practice in a particular State, and do not require him to show that he is presently practicing in such State.

In view of this condition, it is proposed, in H. R. 8201, to require lawyer applicants, among other things, either to show that they are engaged in the practice of law, or, if that is not the case, to submit reasonable and satisfactory evidence of character and fitness. It is felt that, in this way, the problem of the so-called migratory lawyer will be dealt with effectively.

4. So far, I have only dealt with the conditions out of which have grown proposals to license both lawyers and nonlawyers. But H. R. 8201 also deals with the right of an officer or employee, or a former officer or employee, of the Federal Government to practice before Federal agencies. As all of you know, there is today a multiplicity of conflicting and diverse statutory provisions upon this subject.[1] It is frequently difficult to decide, even after investigation, whether, in a given instance, it is permissible for a lawyer or nonlawyer to appear before a Federal agency when such person is or has been connected with the Government. Out of this condition has grown the proposal, contained in H. R. 8201, for a simple rule upon this subject.

III

Although H. R. 8201 is the latest bill in which it is proposed to deal with the conditions just described, in a comprehensive fashion, the regulation of practice before Federal administrative agencies is not a new matter. Bills upon the subject have been introduced in practically every Congress during the last 15 years. Some 20 bills in all have been introduced.

In 1938, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia issued a report dealing with "Admissions to and control over practice before Federal administrative agencies." In 1941, the final report of the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure took note of the fact that lawyers, although duly licensed and subject to discipline by the courts of both the Federal Government and the several States, have been unnecessarily required to obtain many special licenses from administrative agencies to do what the courts have already authorized them to do.

When the Administrative Procedure Act was before the House of Representatives in 1946, it was earnestly argued by some persons that it should contain something on the subject; but it was too large and important a subject for fragmentary treatment as a mere part of the Administrative Procedure Act. Accordingly, those responsible for the Administrative Procedure Act specifically eliminated therefrom any provision dealing with the present subject matter in a definitive way, it being the express intention on the part of the congressional proponents of the Administrative Procedure Act to deal with the subject of practice before Federal administrative agencies in a subsequent and separate bill.

Consequently, in the Eightieth Congress, H. R. 2657 and H. R. 7100 were introduced. Elaborate and extensive hearings were conducted on H. R. 2657 before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in July of 1947 and in January and February of 1948. At these hearings all interested persons were given an opportunity to express their views on any and all of the problems relative to practice before Federal administrative agencies.

Although no legislation was passed upon the subject during the Eightieth Congress, the aforementioned hearings furnished the

[1] 5 U. S. C. 99, 41 U. S. C. 119 (e), 5 U. S. C. 100, 18 U. S. C. 198, 50 U. S. C. App. 1151, 50 U. S. C. App. 1636.

basis for proposed legislation during the present Eighty-first Congress. Accordingly, during the first session of the present Congress, on April 29, 1949, I introduced H. R. 4446, which was designed to deal with all of the conditions which I outlined above, as well as related matters. This bill was favorably reported, with certain amendments, by the House Committee on the Judiciary, on June 24, 1949, accompanied by report No. 905. This report, as an official administrative law document of lasting interest and importance to the bar, was published in full in the July 15, 1949, issue of the Administrative Law Bulletin, issued by the Section of Administrative Law of the American Bar Association.

H. R. 4446 was briefly discussed in the House on July 6, 1949, but was passed over without any decisive action. It again came before the House on March 15, 1950, at which time considerable debate occurred. However, upon this occasion also no decisive action was taken on H. R. 4443, since it appeared that Members of the House were under a misconception of the purpose and effect of the proposal.

The chief point of concern, expressed by several Members, was whether some form of monopoly was being fostered for the benefit of lawyers, particularly for the lawyers of the District of Columbia. Some Members also expressed concern over the creation of the credentials committee, feeling that it was given too much power by H. R. 4443 and that it would be another needless Federal agency. Still other Members felt that no authority should be given to the credentials committee or to the agencies to determine the morals of the persons sent to Washington to represent companies or other persons having business with the Government. Considerable discussion ensued as to what was meant by the moral fitness of practitioners.

At the hearings in 1947 and 1948, one of the principal opponents of legislation upon this subject was the American Institute of Accountants, an organization comprising some 10,000 certified public accountants in this country. However, I was able to inform the House, during the debate on H. R. 4443 on March 15, 1950, that a committee of the American Bar Association and a committee of the American Institute of Accountants had reconciled their differences. I was also able to state that the American Institute of Accountants no longer opposes the measure, but feels that it is in the public interest to enact it as quickly as possible.

Notwithstanding all of this, no decisive action was taken on H. R. 4443, and, in view of the indicated concern of the Members of the House of Representatives I revised H. R. 4443 by the elimination of the provision which provided for a single credentials committee to license both lawyers and nonlawyers. I also revised the section of H. R. 4443 dealing with the licensing of nonlawyers so as to permit the several Federal agencies to continue, as they are now doing, to license nonlawyers to appear before them.

My revised bill was introduced as H. R. 8201 on April 25, 1950, and was favorably reported, without amendment, by the House Committee on the Judiciary on June 7, 1950, accompanied by report No. 2488. Although H. R. 8201 was brought up at least twice on the call of the calendar in July, it was objected to and passed over without debate. On August 17, 1950, the House Rules Committee reported out House Resolution 816 (H. Rept. 2954), granting a rule to permit H. R. 8201 to be placed on the House Calendar. It was my hope that the House would see fit to pass H. R. 8201 as it now stands. However, in view of widespread continued opposition to any legislation dealing with the regulation of nonlawyers, I regret to report to you that it is useless to expect any legislation to pass upon this subject during the remaining months of this session of Congress.

IV

Proponents of this legislation must look to the future.

It is clear that, if we are to secure the passage of legislation respecting practice before Federal administrative agencies, much educational work must be done. It is apparent to me that at least some of the opposition to a law upon this subject stems from a misunderstanding of what is proposed. I think that the groundwork for effective action in the next Congress can be laid if, starting now, the lawyers in every community will apprise the public of the problems involved and of the solutions proposed. To date, the organized bar of the country has given this legislation its unqualified endorsement and approval. But I wish to say, as emphatically as I know how, that those of us in the Congress who are sponsoring this legislation must continue to have the active assistance of the organized bar through every stage of the legislative process. Only in this way can we hope to pass this remedial legislation.

When you return to your communities, I would like for you to carry with you a clear understanding of certain basic principles and to make these known wherever it will do the most good. Permit me to recapitulate.

First, I ask you to bear in mind that, after a good many years of experimentation, there has now developed what might be termed a national program with respect to administrative law and procedure in this country. The Administrative Procedure Act, passed in 1946, carried into effect one phase of the program. Pending proposals to establish an administrative court and to prescribe uniform rules of administrative procedure deal with another part of the program. We are not here to discuss that phase of the program. In due time, I am sure that the American Bar Association and the Members of Congress will make known their views upon these subjects.

The proposed legislation presently under discussion, that dealing with practice befor administrative agencies, represents another phase of the program respecting administrative law and procedure which is actively engaging the attention of the bar and of the country in general.

As to this last phase of the program, I ask you, as lawyers, to remember what is needed.

There is need for a centralized credentials committee where a regularly licensed lawyer may go and obtain a license or permit which will enable him to practice before all Federal agencies.

There is also a need for the licensing of nonlawyers and for the prescription of appropriate ethical standards to govern nonlawyers.

There is need for some provision to provide for disciplinary proceedings respecting persons practicing before administrative agencies.

Finally, there is a need to bring some order out of the chaotic state of the law respecting the right of former officers and employees of the Government to practice before Federal agencies.

The foregoing are some of the things which should be covered by the proposed legislation. Between now and the next session of the Congress we shall have time to perfect our draft of a bill to carry out these and related objectives.

I would like to close by pointing out some of the things which would not be affected by the proposed legislation.

While the bill will, of course, prohibit a person from practicing before any agency without credentials, this only means that a person must hold credentials to participate in regulatory proceedings for compensation and, therefore, does not extend to advisory functions, commercial-type transactions with agencies (such as some of the work of the customhouse brokers), or mere applications or requests for information. Also, the proposed legislation does not relate to proceedings in customs courts or public authorities composed of representatives of parties. It would also not include proceedings before the Tax Court of the United States.

Under the definition of practice, which it is proposed to incorporate in the legislation, attorneys or others who appear before administrative agencies as an incident to some other activity would not be included. Neither would a person be subject to the act who appears on his own behalf. Also exempted would be religious, fraternal, benevolent, philanthropic, charitable, labor, veterans', and other organizations of a nonprofit nature in their legitimate fields of endeavor.

V

I hope that I have made some contribution to your understanding of the problems which have confronted those of us inside and outside of the Congress who have fought so long to secure the passage of a law upon the subject under consideration. We believe in what we are doing. I hope, also, that you believe in the cause and that you will use every resource at your command to help us to secure the passage of a law which will constitute another milestone on the road to a more perfect administrative justice.

A Tribute to Willis Eide, a True Sportsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Crookston, Minn., has recently lost one of its most widely known and respected sportsmen and citizens. A tragic automobile accident has taken the life of Willis Eide, a true friend of the city's youth, not only in Crookston and its immediate vicinity but everywhere.

In my brief remarks today I wish to pay tribute to this fine young sports enthusiast whose loss is so sorely felt not only in my Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, but in adjoining areas as well.

Although not an active participant in sports, Willis Eide actively promoted them--especially baseball and basketball. He was the city's most loyal rooter for local teams.

For many weeks this summer he had worked on his most outstanding sports promotion job. Assisted by Roy Lindell, another of Crookston's most loyal sports fans, and sponsored by the Crookston Elks Lodge, 342, Eide planned and built 26 basketball backboards to be used by local youths.

On the night of August 31, approximately 350 persons gathered to dedicate the backboards that bore the notation—"Willis Eide Memorial." Youngsters, city officials, Elks brothers and many parents attended.

Two youngsters in basketball suits led a parade from the Elks club to the scene of the dedication.

One of the most appropriate tributes on the program was made in the remarks of Earl Hoffman, Grand Forks, N. Dak., high-school athletics official. "In the

halls of fame reserved for the Babe Ruths, the George Gipps, the Ty Cobbs, the Lou Gehrigs," said Hoffman, "there should be reserved an especial niche for the Willis Eides, the men whose inspiration in the finest principles of American sportsmanship bring out the best in participants and officials and inspire the younger generations to even greater athletic achievement."

From Washington, D. C., I wired:

The basketball backboards dedicated today are a fitting tribute to this friend of the city's youth. Crookston will long remember the kindness and sportsmanship of Willis Eide.

I commend the Crookston Elks lodge for their impressive memorial program and join them in expressing sympathy to Willis Eide's parents, Mr. and Mrs. P. J. Eide; his brothers, Everett and John; and his sister, Jeul.

Council of Futility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Washington News on Monday, September 18, 1950:

The Council of Foreign Ministers—the so-called Big Three, composed of Secretary of State Acheson and Foreign Ministers Bevin of Britain and Schuman of France—met for 3 days last week without reaching agreement on any of the major problems vital to western security.

They meet again today in a final session, with little prospect that anything will be accomplished.

All decisions on important issues have been laid aside for further consideration at a future meeting. This has been the pattern followed by the Council since its creation at Potsdam in 1945, when it included Russia and was known as the Big Four.

The Big Four was inoperative because Russia would not work in harmony with the west. Since the Soviets quit attending Council meetings, the British and French Ministers' hands have been tied by domestic political considerations.

At the meetings last week, Messrs. Bevin and Schuman would not agree to rearm the west Germans now, as Mr. Acheson proposed, even while admitting that German troops would be needed if western Europe is attacked.

Both also balked at expanding their own rearmament programs.

Secretary Acheson urged them to agree on measures which would make them strong enough to fight by 1952, if possible, and by 1953 at the latest. The British and French said they couldn't rearm on the scale proposed before 1955 at the earliest. The thought that Russia might not be willing to wait that long was not their immediate concern. Both the British and French Ministers are thinking of their next home elections, just as the party in power here is doing.

But the French and British statesmen appear to forget that Americans also vote. Unwilling to risk the displeasure of their own constituencies by urging larger expenditures for armament, Messrs. Bevin and Schuman confidently expect continuing American financial assistance in what little their respective countries are doing. More than that, both countries want more American money than they have been getting.

The Economic Cooperation Administration has just cut its aid program to Greece on the grounds that the Athens government has not shown sufficient progress in its own recovery efforts. Britain and France may need a dose of the same medicine to speed their rearmament.

When the Ministers failed to agree on anything at their meeting in London last May, Secretary Acheson made the mistake of promising that some new form of assistance would be forthcoming at the end of the Marshall plan. On the eve of the current meeting, President Truman tossed away more of our bargaining power by promising more American troops for Europe. Certain conditions were attached to the pledge, to be sure. But Europeans have come to believe that all such conditions will be waived if they find them too onerous—as they always do.

Our generosity is defeating our own purposes. It is high time to insist on something to show for our money. We get nowhere by helping people who refuse to help themselves.

Psychiatric Casualties at High Rate in Korean War

REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, a situation has come to my attention which warrants the sober consideration of each Member of this House and, indeed, of the entire populace of this Nation. It is the number of psychiatric casualties suffered by our Armed Forces engaged in the Korean war.

The shocking conditions among our troops in the Far East were described by Dr. Karl M. Bowman, of the University of California, one of the Nation's foremost psychiatrists, upon his return to the United States. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article from the San Francisco Chronicle of September 8, 1950, describing an interview with Dr. Bowman.

Those of you who read the article will note the words of reassurance Dr. Bowman gives—that the chances for cure in psychiatric cases are good, at least 3 to 1.

Such cures can be achieved, however, only if sufficient neuropsychiatric hospital facilities for veterans are made available in the United States. The duty of Congress is to assure that these men are given the best treatment possible. We must see that the Nation-wide neuropsychiatric hospital program is carried on without delay.

As the only California Member serving on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am particularly interested in seeing the early construction of two such hospitals already authorized for my State—one in San Francisco, the other in the Los Angeles area.

Following is the article from the Chronicle describing the interview with Dr. Bowman:

PSYCHIATRIC CASUALTIES—UC EXPERT REPORTS FAIRLY HIGH RATE IN KOREAN WAR

A top psychiatrist just back from the Far East yesterday reported the Korean war is a tough one—on the minds as well as the bodies of our fighting men.

The psychiatrist, Dr. Karl Murdock Bowman, of the University of California, warned that the special conditions of the Korean fighting might result in a fairly high rate of mental breakdown among the first troops in action.

He did not define fairly high rate.

But he added the reassuring word: The changes of a cure in psychiatric cases are good—at least 3 to 1.

TOUGHER THAN ANZIO

Dr. Bowman said psychiatric casualties from Korean battle fronts even included quite a number of tough combat veterans who fought through the last war without a breakdown. "Every one of these insisted that what they'd hit in Korea was tougher than anything they'd ever seen on the Normandy or Anzio or Pacific beaches," he explained.

Dr Bowman is medical superintendent of the university's Langley Porter Clinic here. He toured military hospitals in Japan and Okinawa as a consultant to the Army's Surgeon General.

"The men I saw," he related, "had been fighting a retreating war against overwhelming numbers, under horrible climatic conditions.

"They had a hard time knowing who were friends and who were foes, and they knew the enemy was constantly infiltrating. They had not expected the North Koreans to be so well trained and equipped.

"One would expect a fairly high rate of psychiatric casualties under such conditions in those first troops thrown over there."

TYPICAL CASE

One of the typical mental cases he cited from the early Korean fighting was that of a sergeant, 26, a Luzon combat veteran, who had never even been nervous before.

The sergeant lasted only 7 days at the Korean front. He told Dr. Bowman later: "It was all mixed up. Every day we'd hold, and then get out as best we could. They'd keep coming in behind us, and we couldn't get out, but we got out."

He broke under sustained, heavy, close-range artillery fire. "He was suffering from typical battle dreams when I saw him," Dr. Bowman said, "but was responding to rest and treatment. He is probably back at the front by now."

Truman's China Policy Caused Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my conclusions as to why Truman's China policy caused the Korean war:

The Truman-Acheson policy in China is responsible for the tragic war in Korea. This policy encouraged the Chinese

Communists and when the Nationalist Government fled to Formosa, the vital interests of the United States in the Pacific became precarious.

Here are the facts relating to the situation that has involved us in a war 7,000 miles from home and is taking the lives of thousands of our sons and billions of dollars:

First. President Truman sent General Marshall to China with orders to force the Chinese Communists into the Nationalist Cabinet. This was the same appeasement policy advocated by the Democratic administration in Poland and Czechoslovakia. Both these governments were finally taken over by the Communists.

Second. General Marshall did not succeed in his effort but he took other steps that led to the fall of the regular Chinese government by denying economic and military aid.

Third. Under such threats and pressure truces were brought about between the fighting forces of the Communists and the regular government of China. Each time the government was weakened. At one point the Nationalists agreed to and did reduce its Army from 151 divisions to 57 with the specific understanding that the Communists would reduce their army too. But the Reds made no reduction in their forces.

Fourth. Gateways to Manchuria and Mongolia were granted to the Chinese Communists under pressure from Marshall upon the pretext that it would promote mediation. This was a fatal move and led directly to the downfall of Chiang Kai-shek—our ally.

Fifth. The indefensible Truman-Acheson policy in China started the Korean war and thousands of American boys will pay with their lives for this blunder. Billions of dollars will be required to prepare and fight a war that must be won.

Sixth. Secretary Acheson, the real instigator of the China policy, still remains to direct our foreign policy, aided by Lattimore, Jessup, Service, and many other pro-Russian appeasers. This is an insult to our people.

The Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as an old-fashioned conservative, with faith in our form of government, our way of doing things, I have sometimes wondered whether those in Congress who boast of being liberals, of ridiculing those of us who do not wish to swallow without inspection their economic nostrums, will ever realize that it may be that congressional committees and executive agencies are sticking their official noses into things about which they know little, and that some of their liberalism may be harmful.

My doubt that liberal remedies and programs will solve all our troubles is increased by the following article from the Reader's Digest of October:

DETOUR—TO UTOPIA

(By Benjamin F. Fairless)

Someday I hope to get back to Pittsburgh long enough to find out what's happened to the steel business. But the past few months I have been specializing in Washington investigations of big business, and Washington has certainly been specializing in me. From the time the United States Steel Corp. was organized 50 years ago it has been subjected to almost constant investigation by various agencies of the Government, and for the past 10 years I myself have been on the business end of most of these investigations. I have been through so many congressional inquisitions that no self-respecting skeleton would hide in my closet on a bet.

I am not an alarmist, yet I am gravely disturbed by what I have seen. In my opinion, our American economic system is in deadly peril today—from self-styled friends in Washington who would literally hack it to death on the pretext of saving its immortal soul. If these misguided planners and politically ambitious officeholders have their way, three of our most precious liberties—freedom of opportunity, freedom of initiative, and freedom of enterprise—will vanish from this earth.

These self-appointed saviors of our national welfare seem always to miss the point: That our American system of free competitive enterprise is the only one left in the world that is not controlled by power-hungry politicians; and that once the dead hand of politics gets its convulsive grip on American business and industry free competition will be strangled and our economic system will be no different from those which are crumbling in Europe.

I am convinced that the American people will never knowingly travel that road to economic disaster. They have built the most magnificient industrial machine this world has ever seen and they are certainly not going to wreck it that way as long as the road is clearly marked by signposts which honestly reveal its destination. But in Washington today there are theorists and bureaucrats who are trying to take down the honest guideposts and put up another reading: "Detour—to utopia."

The most dangerous deception which has been practiced upon us is the fallacy that our whole economy can be divided into two parts labeled big and little business. Because some statistician has drawn an imaginary line between companies employing more or less than 500 persons, we argue about big business and little business as though they were two hostile armies warring against each other.

How silly that concept is if we stop to analyze it. There are some 4,000,000 individual business units in this country, big and little, and they all form one great interdependent industrial machine. Never has the complete interdependence of big and little business been so clearly demonstrated as during World War II, when this great industrial machine shattered all records. It took a big company to deliver a finished B-29, but it took hundreds of companies of every conceivable size to make all the parts and materials that went into it. Which did the most important part of the job? You might as well ask which soldier won the war. When the shooting was over we found that, although 75 percent of the prime contracts had gone—of necessity—to the 100 largest manufacturing companies in the land, it was little business that scored the greatest increase in sales, in profits and in assets.

The second fraud that the jugglers would perpetrate upon us is the signpost they call monopoly. Properly employed, monopoly is a useful word, meaning the exact opposite of competition. But our jugglers use the word as an epithet which they hurl with abandon at any large and successful enterprise they may hope to move in on.

Some of our Washington critics insist that there is no competition in the steel industry. Apparently they never heard of Bethlehem—or a couple of hundred other competitors of ours who are doing very nicely, thank you. Sometimes I wish these critics could join our sales force for a few weeks and try to sell a little steel. I think they would find out what competition really is.

With logic, they declare that it is the right of any man to try to establish himself in any business he wants—even the steel business. And that is true. But then they insist that he can't make steel because "the monopoly" won't let him. And that is utterly, ridiculously false.

It isn't "monopoly power" that keeps any small-business man from making steel today. It is a matter of money. A blast furnace alone will cost him about $12,000,000, and when he gets his coke ovens, open hearths, mills, power and fuel lines and auxiliary equipment, he might start turning out hot-rolled bars for an investment of $50,000,000 or so. If he wants to make light plates and cold-reduced sheets, his plant will cost him something over $200,000,000. Any businessman who has that kind of money is not "small."

But just because a small-business man may not be able to go into the business of making steel, that does not mean he cannot go into the steel business. He can set himself up in the business of fabricating steel for a relatively small capital investment, turning out one or more of thousands of useful, profitable products.

Thirty-three years ago, it is true there were nearly twice as many establishments making steel as there are now. But today there are 12,000 more establishments fabricating it. For every steel-making company that has disappeared, 60 new metal-fabricating plants have been successfully established. And for every wage earner who had a job in the industry 33 years ago, three are employed today. Is that bad?

Let's look at another trick word the jugglers have been palming off on us—"giantism." Nobody loves a giant. From early childhood we have thought of giants as monstrous, wicked, bloodthirsty creatures. So naturally a giant corporation must be evil. But what are the facts?

According to the Government's latest count there are nearly 7,500 big companies in America today. A century ago there were none. But for every company that has grown big in this country during the past 100 years, 440 healthy new enterprises have been born. That didn't just happen. Had it not been for the fact that there are giants, most of these small establishments could never have existed at all and could not today survive.

The size of any company depends upon the product which it intends to manufacture—upon the amount of money it takes to buy the plants, machines, and tools necessary to manufacture that product efficiently and competitively. From that point on the growth of the company depends on its customers. If they like the product and want to buy more of it, the company will have to expand in order to meet their demands.

So when our Washington theorists attempt to place an arbitrary limit on size they are saying in effect that certain products shall not be manufactured at all—except, perhaps, by the Government. And when they try to put a limit on growth they are denying to the American people the right to buy as much as they want of a particular company's product.

Finally, there is one more treacherous signpost which seriously menaces us all. The

jugglers call it concentration. It is based on the fallacy that there is something evil and dangerous about the fact that a limited number of companies do 40 or 60 or 80 percent of the business in their particular industry.

Well, of course they do—and they always will as long as free and honest competition exists in our American economy. For concentration is the result of competition. Any time you see an industry where everybody has come out even, you can be reasonably sure that the boys got together in the backroom and indulged in a little high-handed conspiracy, known as the fix.

Our inquisitors in Washington insist that concentration is especially marked in the steel industry. I think the facts will amaze you.

The Census Bureau recently completed a count of more than 400 American industries, and reported on the degree of concentration in each. The report on steelworks and rolling mills shows that this industry stands one hundred and seventy-fourth on the list. So if they are going to break up every industry which is as highly concentrated as the steel industry, nearly half of the units in our American industrial machine will be torn apart.

What are some of these industries where the concentration of power in the hands of the few is so great as to menace our national welfare? You'd never guess. There is the pretzel industry for one. And the candlemakers. Then there are straw hats and streetcars, breakfast foods and chewing tobacco, wallpaper and cigar boxes, lead pencils and pianos, window shades and garters.

I wonder if it isn't time to have an entirely new congressional investigation—one that will hale before it all the Government agencies and congressional investigating committees which seem to be trying to destroy the finest and the only successful economic system in the world today, and find out just what public interest they are serving.

In short, I wonder if it isn't time to get back on our highway to progress and growth and production, before we get mired and lost forever on a detour to utopia.

The Panama Canal Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM B. FUGATE
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, in early 1949 I was designated by the late Representative Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia, to be a member of a special subcommittee under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, to investigate the financial operations of the Panama Canal. Since then I have visited the Isthmus and studied many angles of this complicated subject.

The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, in an extension of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1949, made a notable contribution toward securing the proper consideration of the problem in the form of a bibliography on "The Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States." In subsequent issues of the RECORD, many informative papers have been published, notably by the late Representative Bland, concerning the general Isthmian Canal background, and by Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN relative to the national defense angles.

Another timely contribution is an editorial in the September 1950 issue of the National Bulletin of the Military Order of the World Wars with which I am in hearty accord. Especially do I commend its suggestion for the creation of an independent Interoceanic Canals Commission, charged with the duty of studying the entire subject of Isthmian waterways, including the matter of increased capacity and operational efficiency of the Panama Canal. The text follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL QUESTION

Time is rapidly approaching when a decision must be reached as to the future of the Canal and its capacity. This major issue is now before the President and the Congress.

The new organizational and toll aspects of this problem are covered in a communication from the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on January 31, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 460, 81st Cong.). With these questions settled, the way will be cleared for consideration of the more basic question of the type of the future canal.

The plan of the existing Canal was conceived in the heated controversy regarding two diametrically opposed ideas; a high-level lake type of canal, and a canal at sea level. Both types require locks and other major structures.

The decision for the present Canal was brought about in 1906 mainly through the efforts of the late John F. Stevens, the great railroad engineer who, as chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, developed the basic canal plan and organized the transportation systems and construction forces to build it. Though his primary reasoning was based on engineering and economics, he clearly foresaw the navigational advantages of a canal formed by lakes as compared to one at sea level with its greater length of restricted channel.

The present Canal discussions now occurring in Congress are the result of report by the Governor of the Panama Canal under authority of Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, directing an investigation of the means of increasing the capacity and security of the Canal to meet the future needs of the interoceanic commerce and of national defense.

As was pointed out in a notable address by former Representative Willis W. Bradley—published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 21, 1948—under the title, "What of the Panama Canal?" the enactment of this law, approved December 28, 1945, was secured by the proponents of the sea-level type of canal after the advent of the atomic bomb.

The law served to resurrect the 1906 controversy with a rehashing of most of the old arguments under title of relative security instead of relative vulnerability. Either type is vulnerable to atomic bombs.

Though there are many aspects of the sea-level proposal, the one challenged most vigorously by independent authorities of outstanding ability and experience, is the initially estimated cost of the sea-level project—$2,483,000,000. This, in the opinion of those independent engineers, has been grossly underestimated. Another is the challenge of the leading atomic-warfare authorities that any canal, regardless of type, would be critically vulnerable beyond any reasonable expectation of prompt restoration.

An oversight of the sea-level investigators was their failure to consider the treaty question. As proposed, the sea-level canal has different alinement from the existing canal. An entirely new treaty would have to be negotiated with Panama. What such a covenant would cost in the form of a vast indemnity and greatly increased annuity, no one can state.

The very practical proposal which makes clear what the late John F. Stevens described as the "confusion of ideas" concerning the Canal, is the terminal-lake plan developed in 1942 and 1943 by Capt. Miles P. Du Val, United States Navy, while he was captain of the port at Balboa, in charge of marine operations at the Pacific end of the Canal.

This plan is an urgently needed operational improvement of the existing lake-type waterway. Its main features are: (1) The removal of the Pedro Miguel locks, thereby eliminating the time of locking and the many accidents that occur there on entering and leaving; (2) the construction of all Pacific locks near Miraflores; (3) the formation of a summit-level lake at the Pacific end of the Canal to match the Gatun Lake anchorage now on the Atlantic side. This would give a reservoir for transit traffic on the Pacific side, and remove the bottleneck at the Pedro Miguel locks.

The cost of this plan would, in the opinion of independent engineers, be less than $750,000,000—only a fraction of the cost of the other. Its additional operational security is obvious. It should be noted also that the terminal-lake plan was not presented as a new idea. It dates back to W. L. Sibert, William Gerig, John F. Stevens, and even to Godin de Lepinay in 1879.

In much of the propaganda for the sea-level movement there has been more heat than light. As indicated by Hon. T. E. MARTIN in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13, 1950, certain powerful interests in the country—manufacturers of earth-moving machinery, dredging, contracting, and certain civil engineers associated with them, both civilian and military—have engaged in a strong drive to secure authorization for a sea-level canal at Panama. Such interests are not proper ones to make the decision in an issue so vital to our national security, our economy, and our merchant marine, which would have to pay transit tolls that measurably reflect the costs of construction.

The best way to handle the vital issue is by means of a broadly based and completely independent Interoceanic Canals Commission.

A Boy Died Last Night

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, today our Nation faces a crisis which requires total mobilization of our military and economic forces. The Congress has appropriated more than $60,000,000,000, and it is likely there will be a deficit of one-fourth that amount. Legislation is being approved to increase taxes on corporations and individuals by about $5,000,000,000—but that is not adequate at a time when Federal expenses and national income are at peacetime peaks. When the manpower of our Nation is being drafted, all Americans should be called upon to support preparedness, and all profiteering should be outlawed. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, an editorial on this subject

written by John B. Cook, editor of the Burley (Idaho) Bulletin, and published in that newspaper on September 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BOY DIED LAST NIGHT

A boy died last night. He died in the mud on a rain-swept Korean ridge, in the terrifying blackness. When he died he was alone and afraid. He fell forward on his face in a pool of rainwater and with his last breath he moaned: "Help me, Ma, help me." And there was no one to hear him except his God.

Who was this boy? Who knows? He might have been your neighbor's boy, the one who used to irritate you almost to distraction with his mufflerless "hot rod." Or he might have been the kid you used to watch on the football field. Or he might have been the tall awkward youngster who, a short year ago, used to call to take your lovely daughter to the movies on Saturday night. Who he was doesn't matter so much now. What matters now is that he is lying out in the stinking Korean mud and the pool of rainwater is stained with his young blood.

What did the boy look like? Why, like a million or so other young Americans. He was blond and lanky and quick with a grin and a wisecrack. He was 20 years old and his cheeks had only recently felt a razor. He had big hands and big feet and in his weeks of training he had had the usual trouble keeping in step during close-order drill. And he had good eyes, ice blue and quick. He was a good man on a night patrol and during 2 months in Korea he had learned what he had to learn.

He had learned plenty about night fighting and patrol work. But who can avoid the stealthy ambush in the rain-dark? And who can stay the blast of a machine pistol at close range?

And so a boy died last night. His five companions on patrol, two wounded, could not bring him in. They'll send the GRO boys out this morning. They'll bring him in provided they can get to him, and within 2 weeks or so his next of kin will receive a telegram: "* * * regret to inform you that your son * * *." And then we'll know who the boy was.

A boy died last night. And last week the President of the United States, in a radio message to the Nation, urged citizens to refrain from hoarding and scare buying and war profiteering. And in an east coast city the housewives formed an organization to fight against unwarranted price rises in food and clothing.

And in an Idaho city a pound of coffee which had been selling for the already high price of 78 cents a pound, suddenly jumped to 91 cents.

And in Chicago a used-car dealer tacked on a blanket raise of $25 per car on all his cars.

And in North Dakota an implement dealer went about quietly telling farmers that, for a bonus of $300, he could get them a brand new combine, one which would last out the war in Korea.

And in a Western State a young man who had already taken his physical examination for service in the Army had a long talk with his father's friend, who just incidentally happens to be a United States Senator, and just coincidentally the young man was granted a deferment.

And in New York State a tire dealer who had been quietly buying up every tire he could lay hands on, made some discreet calls on many of his customers: "Look, George, I can get you two sets of 6.50 by 16's right now. They'll cost you a little more than they would have last week but you know how it is." And George, who needs two sets of tires like he needs another head, bought them.

And a woman in Georgia looked through her lingerie chest and found to her amazement that she has 41 pairs of nylons, still in the cellophane wrappers.

And on Labor Day the Nation closed its shops and factories and labor leaders made pretty speeches about how our brave boys on the firing line could be sure labor would make every sacrifice necessary to see that the tools of war were at hand. And in Washington the president of the AFL demanded that wages be allowed to rise a little before a Government freeze is put on.

And on a muddy Korean ridge a blond American boy died last night.

Let's Do Right by the Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, attached hereto is an excerpt from the Clipsheet of September 11, 1950, on the question of beer for our fighting men:

LET'S DO RIGHT BY THE BOYS

We are spending a lot of fighting money and we are going to spend more, all because of our stupid failure, years ago, to recognize the essential character of communism. Now we are calling many thousands of young men into the armed services and even talking about universal military training for youth. One of the great blessings of getting away from Europe, was leaving behind just this sort of thing, and now here it is camping on our doorstep in this "brave new world."

This brings up the whole question of selling alcoholic beverages on military reservations, which is strictly illegal, and it also brings up the question of selling beverages to men in the Armed Forces when they are off the military reservations. To see uniformed men in the dismal beer taverns, being ogled by underfed and bedeviled prostitutes, is not a pleasant sight. Are we doing everything we can to give these young people in service, the recreational facilities of which they stand in such great need? We ask the question, and we'll answer it: We are not.

It is with great reluctance that we advocate the spending of any money the spending of which can by any possibility, be avoided, but we are firmly convinced that the Congress ought to appropriate whatever funds are needed, to provide the most inviting recreational facilities possible on military reservations, wherever practicable. These facilities ought to provide books, comfortable chairs and lounges, and above all, a soda fountain, and not just a little dinky one, either. It ought to dispense hamburgers and frankfurters and all the attractive drinks of a typical American soda fountain, not just bottled pop, and it ought to dispense them at cost. In war areas, we ought to do the best we can under the circumstances. We ought not to dispense beer of any alcoholic content whatsoever, here or abroad, for one reason—because the law strictly forbids it; and for another reason, because the dispensing of beer to the armed services during the last war made large numbers of alcoholics who are now quite a problem to the Government as well as to the people who love them. But we ought to get them soft drinks, fruit juices—everything refreshing which can be transported.

And so here goes: $100,000,000 for sodas for the boys, and more, if needed.

Veterans of the Eighth War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a timely and interesting editorial entitled "Veterans of the Eighth War," published in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of September 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF THE EIGHTH WAR

Getting a photographic send-off on the front page of the Alabama Journal yesterday was a group of Montgomery draftees which included a man out of our building, H. E. Brown, a stereotyper, and Jack Chambless, an insurance man.

They are 2 of the 170,000 draftees that will become soldiers by the end of November. They will be 2 among the combined Armed Force of 3,000,000 that is the first goal.

By the time the westering sun went down yesterday and left a dismal autumn rain to its own devices these Montgomery men had assumed status as veterans of the Republic's eighth war. The list of which is:

1776–83: American Revolution.
1812–15: War of 1812.
1846–48: Mexican War.
1861–65: Civil War.
1898–99: Spanish-American War.
1917–18: World War I.
1941–45: World War II.
1950: Korean war.

It happened that we saw a good deal of Citizen-Soldier Chambless over the long Labor Day week end, and we got to reflecting on his status as opposed to that of the Americans who were veterans of the first seven wars.

Young Chambless is to his contemporaries a "character"—that is, jaunty, a wit, smart, and full of animal spirits. For some time now he has been waiting for his call-up day and being addressed as "soldier" and "colonel." He had, of course, been discriminating against sleep when it conflicted with winding up his property appraising and pleasuring himself. He played in a tennis tournament, wore a loud T-shirt, and counted the ticks of his expiring time as a civilian.

But he was no more self-conscious about his departure than were some of his younger friends who were going off to school. He was surrounded by friends who had been drafted in the two World Wars and by others who would be called very soon. His going had become a commonplace experience.

When the draftees of 1941 and 1942 were going in, the Army and its experiences were legendary and unknown save through the musty reminiscenses of an uncle who had gone in 1917. But all draftees today know the Army intimately through the testimony of hundreds who so recently had been in it. Chambless will hit camp as well versed in the art of evading latrine duty detail as any veteran. It will not be a "new" experience to today's draftees as it was to those long-spaced Wars I and II. Their Army sophistication, their sense of the Army climate, is largely formed before they enter upon the experience.

As Chambless was having his last days of Pompeii, stoically resigned to the grinding boredom of Army life, we got to thinking about all the national fuss-budgeting over whether the American soldier knows "what he's fighting for" as well as the Gooks. A

lot of that discussion has been stuff and nonsense. Suffice it to say here, Chambless and his draftee group have a far clearer idea of why they're wearing a uniform than Washington's men. The idea of seeking independence from England was far from a prewar goal.

It will never be said of the present Army, as Washington disgustedly said of his, that they were so lacking in patriotism that they did not deserve victory.

The war of which Chambless' drafting is an incident is not likely to result in an American defeat such as that in the War of 1812.

Nor is it tarnished with the aggressive, imperialistic taint of the Mexican and Spanish-American Wars.

The present Army is being marshalled as no other American Army has ever been marshalled—to act under the banner of the United Nations, an agency to abort war.

It may be that the United Nations will fail as its predecessors have failed. But certain it is that for 2,000 years and more mankind, sporadically but with significant presistence, has sought to form a peace agency that would outmode war. At least, it may be said that the UN represents the farthest advance yet in man's very brief civilized history. It is shallow cynicism to suppose that since nations have always made war, they always will.

The Genocide Convention Should be Ratified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, there is probably more misunderstanding about the Genocide Convention, now being considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, than any other treaty submitted to the Senate in recent years. The objections to ratification of the convention by the United States are generally based on highly technical, legal, and constitutional grounds. In an effort to meet these objections, as chairman of the subcommittee on international organizations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have had the staff of the Committee prepare a memorandum on the question. I feel that this memorandum amply meets the objections which have been raised against ratification of the Genocide Convention by the United States. The memorandum follows:

I. CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF THE CONVENTION

"The Constitution was intended to meet the varying crises in human affairs and was adopted for all time" (Chief Justice Marshall in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*).

The general position of the Department of State with regard to the Genocide Convention was set forth in the Department's letter to the President which accompanied the President's letter transmitting the convention to the Senate on June 16, 1949. (Executive O, 81st Cong., 1st sess.) The Department's letter recommended that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the convention, without reservation but with one proposed statement of understanding as to the meaning of the phrase "responsibility of a State" in article IX of the convention.

The Department's letter reviewed the history of the formulation of this convention and in particular included certain important statements made by the United States representative in connection with several provisions of the instrument. The letter did not deal with the constitutional aspects of the convention, although it was based upon the implicit assumption that the convention represented a proper exercise of the Federal treaty power and contained nothing therein in violation of the United States Constitution.

A. GENERAL CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO NEGOTIATE AND BECOME PARTY TO THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

The Genocide Convention involves a matter within the present constitutional jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and does not result in any enlargement of that jurisdiction, because article I, section 8, clause 10 of the United States Constitution expressly authorizes the Congress—

"To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations."

Congress could therefore even in the absence of the Genocide Convention define genocide as an offense against the law of nations and provide for its punishment by statute.

1. History of article I, section 8, clause 10, United States Constitution

The provision of the Constitution which authorizes the Congress to define and punish offenses against the law of nations is not as well known as some of the other provisions granting powers to the Federal Government, because it has seldom been used and there are few precedents under it. It is, however, one of the notable instances where criminal jurisdiction has been expressly conferred upon the Federal Government.

The Federalist throws little light on this clause. In No. XLII, Madison observed:

"The power to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations, belongs with equal propriety to the general government, and is still a greater improvement on the Articles of Confederation. These articles contain no provision for the case of offenses against the law of nations; and consequently leave it in the power of any indiscreet member to embroil the confederacy with foreign nations."

The framers of the Constitution were, of course, familiar with Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England; and in volume IV of that work, Blackstone stated:

"The principal offences against the law of nations animadverted on such by the municipal laws of England, are of three kinds: (1) Violation of safe-conducts; (2) infringement of the rights of ambassadors; and (3) piracy" (fifteenth ed., London, 1809, p. 66).

In *Respublican* v. *De Longchamps* (1 Dall, 120 (1784)) a Pennsylvania court fined and imprisoned an individual for assaulting the Secretary of the French Legation, solely on the basis that such conduct violated the law of nations. The first American statute penalizing assaults against ambassadors was enacted in 1790.

In an early case in the United States Supreme Court, *United States* v. *Smith* (5 Wheat. 153 (1820)), which involved piracy, Mr. Justice Story remarked (ibid., p. 159):

"Offenses, too, against the law of nations, cannot, with any accuracy, be said to be completely ascertained and defined in any public code recognized by the common consent of nations. In respect, therefore, as well to felonies on the high seas as to felonies against the law of nations, there is a peculiar fitness to giving the power to define as well as to punish; and there is not the slightest reason to doubt that this consideration had very great weight in producing the phraseology (art. I, sec. 8, clause 10) in question."

In 1887, the Supreme Court had occasion to consider article I, section 8, clause 10 of the Constitution, in a case in which the Court sustained the constitutionality of a Federal statute to prevent and punish the counterfeiting within the United States of notes, bonds, and securities of foreign governments. In that case. *United States* v. *Arjona* (120 U. S. 479), Mr. Chief Justice Waite made the following pertinent observations (ibid., p. 483):

"Congress has the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States (art. I, sec. 8, clause 18); and the Government of the United States has been vested exclusively with the power of representing the Nation in all its intercourse with foreign countries. It alone can 'regulate commerce with foreign nations' (art. I, sec. 8, clause 3); make treaties and appoint ambassadors and other public ministers and consuls (art. II, sec. 2, clause 2). A State is expressly prohibited from entering into any 'treaty, alliance, or confederation' (art. I, sec. 10, clause 1). Thus all official intercourse between a State and foreign nations is prevented, and exclusive authority for that purpose given to the United States. The National Government is in this way made responsible to foreign nations for all violations by the United States of their international obligations, and because of this, Congress is expressly authorized 'to define and punish * * * offenses against the law of nations' (art. I, sec. 8, clause 10).

Finally, the Supreme Court, in the recent case of *Ex parte Quirin* (317 U. S. 1 (1942)), sustained the validity of trial of enemy agents by a military commission. Mr. Chief Justice Stone made the following pertinent statement, at page 28:

"By the Articles of War, and especially article 15, Congress has explicitly provided, so far as it may constitutionally do so, that military tribunals shall have jurisdiction to try offenders of offenses against the law of war in appropriate cases. Congress, in addition to making rules for the government of our Armed Forces, has thus exercised its authority to define and punish offenses against the law of nations, by sanctioning, within constitutional limitations, the jurisdiction of military commissions to try persons for offenses which, according to the rules and precepts of the law of nations, and more particularly the law of war, are cognizable by such tribunals."

It may be concluded from these authorities therefore that the Federal power to define and punish offenses against the law of nations is a general power to be exercised by the Federal Government as required by changing times and conditions.

It has been suggested in some quarters that, because the power is set forth in the Constitution as an express grant of legislative authority to the Congress, Federal action in this sphere must take the form of legislation and not the form of a treaty. On this point, Senator Kellogg (later Secretary of State) once remarked that such a theory, "as Hamilton says, would practically destroy the treaty-making power of the United States." Mr. Kellogg continued his statement as follows:

"The argument is as old as the history of treaties in this country. It was presented with great ability by the opponents of the Jay treaty and overcome by the able statesmen of that day, foremost among whom was Alexander Hamilton.

"From that day to the present time the question has been frequently raised in connection with treaties for the payment of money, regulating commerce, fixing import duties, regulating rights of trade with foreign

countries, fixing boundaries, and various other subjects, the objection being that as the power to legislate in relation to these matters was in the entire Congress, any treaty made by the President and the Senate was therefore void. But these objections have proved unavailing and a large number of treaties have been made and ratified by the Senate where legislation was necessary to carry them into operation." (Senate debate on the Treaty of Versailles, quoted in V Hackworth, Digest of International Law, p 12.)

As a recent illustration, the Supreme Court reviewed a naturalization treaty concluded in 1869 between the United States and Sweden, in the case of *Perkins* v. *Elg* (307 U. S. 325 (1939)), and ruled, Mr. Chief Justice Hughes speaking at page 329:

"As at birth, she became a citizen of the United States, that citizenship must be deemed to continue unless she has been deprived of it through the operation of a treaty or congressional enactment or by her voluntary action in conformity with applicable legal principles."

It seems clear, therefore, that the treaty power is concurrent with the legislative power of the Congress. The true significance of a specific constitutional grant of legislative power to the Congress is that it establishes that such a subject is properly one within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government for action either by Federal statute or treaty.

2. International law with respect to crimes

In determining the meaning of article I, section 8, clause 10 of the Constitution, it is necessary to consider the international law on the subject of crime. As Mr. Justice Story remarked in 1820, international law on this subject was then far from defined, and, in this respect, is still quite undeveloped.

One leading authority on international law has defined international crimes as "crimes like piracy on the high seas or slave trade, which either every state can punish on seizure of the criminals, or whatever nationality they may be, or which every state has by the law of nations a duty to prevent." (I, Oppenheim, International Law, p. 246 (3d ed., Roxburgh, 1920).)

The best known example of a crime under the law of nations is piracy, which is recognized as a crime on the basis of customary international law. Many authorities consider, moreover, that as a result of various international conventions on the subject, slavery and the slave trade are crimes under international law. These conventions were inspired initially by the Congress of Vienna, which condemned the slave trade. The United States became a party to several conventions on the subject: the General Act of the Anti-Slavery Conference of Brussels, 1890 (II, Malloy's Treaties, 1964); the Convention of St. Germain of September 10, 1919 (IV, U. S. Treaties (Trenwith) 4849); and the Convention to Suppress the Slave Trade and Slavery of September 25, 1926 (IV, U. S. Treaties (Trenwith) 5022). The provisions of the last-mentioned convention are of some interest in this connection. The convention is designed not only to suppress the slave trade, but "to bring about, progressively and as soon as possible, the complete abolition of slavery in all its forms," within the territories under the "sovereignty, jurisdiction, protection, suzerainty or tutelage" of the contracting states (art. 2). The contracting states further agreed to take all necessary measures to prevent compulsory or forced labor from developing into conditions analogous to slavery (art. 5). Moreover, article 6 provided that those of the contracting states "whose laws do not at present make adequate" provision for the punishment of infractions of laws and regulations enacted with a view to giving effect to the purposes of the present convention undertake to adopt the necessary measures in order that severe penalties may be imposed in respect of such infractions.

A number of conventions have also been adopted on other subjects such as the white slave trade, traffic in narcotic drugs, counterfeiting, injury to submarine cables, and illegal traffic in arms; and the various types of conduct at which these respective conventions are aimed are also sometimes categorized as crimes under international law.

By its own terms, the Genocide Convention states that genocide is a crime under international law, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war (art. I). The contracting parties undertake to prevent and to punish genocide by article I and, more specifically, undertake by article V to enact the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide.

Thus genocide becomes a crime under international law, and consequently a matter falling within the Federal power to define and punish offenses against the law of nations.

3. Genocide is in fact a matter of international concern

It has been suggested that genocide is not a proper subject for an international convention because it invades the internal jurisdiction of states vis-à-vis their nationals. It is true that international law is normally concerned only with relations between states and does not interest itself with the relations between the people and the government of a state.

Yet, history shows that there have been various occasions upon which the internal conditions existing within a given state have become so atrocious and shocking to the human conscience that they have in fact become a matter of international concern.

For example, in 1827, England, France, and Russia intervened with armed forces in the Greek revolution against Turkey to end the atrocities taking place in that situation. Similarly, Russia declared war upon Turkey in 1877 "to alleviate the position of the Christians in the Balkan Peninsula" (proclamation of the Czar, 12/24 April 1877). In the ensuing treaty of Berlin of July 13, 1878, moreover, Turkey was required to undertake to ameliorate the treatment of Armenians who remained under Turkish jurisdiction and to report periodically thereon to the other contracting states.

The United States has had a long history of humanitarian diplomacy. President John Quincy Adams publicly expressed our sympathies with the Greek patriots in his annual messages of 1825 and 1827. President Van Buren intervened with the Turkish Government on behalf of persecuted Jews in 1840; and, again in 1872, this Government strongly remonstrated with the Turkish Government as to persecution of Jews.

One of the principal causes for United States intervention in Cuba in 1898, which brought on the Spanish-American War, was, in the language of the Fifty-fifth Congress, that—

"The abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than 3 years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization * * * can no longer be endured" (preamble, joint resolution, Apr. 20, 1898; 30 Stat. 738–739).

Or, in the words of President McKinley in his special message of April 11, 1898, requesting congressional authorization for intervention in Cuba:

"In the cause of humanity and to put an end to the barbarities, bloodshed, starvation, and horrible miseries now existing there, and which the parties to the conflict are either unable or unwilling to stop or mitigate. It is no answer to say this is all in another country, belonging to another nation, and is therefore none of our business. It is specially our duty, for it is right at our door." (Foreign Relations of the United States, 1898, p. 750.)

Again, both President Harrison, in 1891, and President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1903, publicly denounced the mistreatment of Jews in Russia by the Czarist government. And, in 1915 and 1916, Secretary of State Lansing instructed the United States Ambassador to Turkey to protest against the horrible mistreatment of the Armenians by the Turkish Government.

These examples from history show that when atrocities are perpetrated upon helpless, innocent people other governments cannot sit idly by and ignore the situation. Such conditions existing within a state not only result in internal unrest but have repercussions elsewhere, not only in consequence of the almost inevitable emigration of people under such conditions but in consequence of the fact that such conditions result in internal strife and revolution and have in fact led to war between nations.

It is in the light of this history that the Genocide Convention must be considered. The historical events just prior to and during World War II outraged decent people everywhere and gave impetus to the international movement which caused the General Assembly twice to declare unanimously that genocide is a crime under international law, and that its punishment is a matter of international concern. (Resolutions adopted December 11, 1946, and December 9, 1948.)

This view has been shared by an eminent group of American lawyers, as expressed in the International Law of the Future, published by the American Bar Association Journal on March 25, 1944. This project, prepared, in the words of the board of editors of the American Bar Association, by "200 of the best-informed minds that we have in the United States and Canada," proposed the adoption of the following principle of international law:

"PRINCIPLE 2

"Each state has a legal duty to see that conditions prevailing within its own territory do not menace international peace and order, and to this end it must treat its own population in a way which will not violate the dictates of humanity and justice or shock the conscience of mankind."

The following excerpts from the comment on this proposed principle, published in this same project at page 35, are also of interest:

"A state cannot be free to permit conditions to prevail within its own territory which menace international peace and order, and cannot be free to treat any part of its population in such a way as to produce that menace. Living as a good neighbor in a community of states, it may be called upon to place its own house in order. 'The right of self-determination,' as the President of the United States of America has declared, 'does not carry with it the right of any government to commit wholesale murder or the right to make slaves of its own people.'

* * * * *

"The enumeration of this principle seems particularly important at the present time when shocking efforts are being made in more than one part of the world to exterminate whole groups of human beings. It is important, also, because new situations have arisen which will require attention to be given to the future welfare of certain dependent peoples, and the world must be assured that such atrocities as the decimation of the Herreros in southwest Africa 40 years ago are not to be repeated."

4. Scope of the treaty power of the Federal Government

The above discussion is intended to state in detail the view that article I, section 8, clause 10 of the Constitution confers express authority upon the Federal Government to enter into the Genocide Convention. In view

of this clear-cut constitutional authority, it seems unnecessary to consider in detail the question of the scope of the treaty power. It is well known that the Constitution does not attempt to define the scope of this power. While the Supreme Court has never declared a treaty invalid, the Court has not attempted, in its various decisions relating to the treaty power, to fix any hard and fast limits to that power (*DeGeofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258 (1890)); *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416 (1920)); *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332 (1924)); *Neilsen* v. *Johnson* (279 U. S. 47 (1929)); *Santavincenzo* v. *Egan* (284 U. S. 30 (1931))). Probably as clear a pronouncement as the Court made on the subject may be found in the case of *DeGeofroy* v. *Riggs*, cited above, where Mr. Justice Field states, at page 267:

"The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of portion of the territory of the latter without its consent."

In this connection, attention is called to several other instances of the use of the treaty power in matters that under our domestic law have criminal aspects; e. g., the traffic in drugs and the traffic in arms. In the field of narcotic drugs, as in the case of the slave trade and slavery, it was found necessary, in order to establish effective international control, to go beyond regulation of the international traffic itself and to get directly at the root of the evil, existing in internal conditions in various states. To this end, there was negotiated the Geneva Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs in 1939, to which the United States and a large number of other states are parties (IV U. S. Treaties (Trenwith) 5351). As the title of this convention indicates, it is designed not only to regulate the international traffic in narcotic drugs but also the internal manufacture of such drugs. Thus, in this country, not only are exports and imports of narcotic drugs strictly regulated but the manufacture of drugs within each State is stringently limited. This is accomplished through Federal license of manufacturers and through a careful periodic inspection of the plants, inventories, and records by narcotic agents. (Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs for the Year Ended December 31, 1943, Report by the Government of the United States of America, p. 31 et seq. Issued pursuant to the 1931 convention.)

There is also an interesting history with respect to the use of the treaty power to control the traffic in and manufacture of arms. The United States has become a party to the Geneva convention for the supervision of the international trade in arms and ammunition and in implements of war of 1925 (IV U. S. Treaties (Trenwith) 4903). It was also proposed that a convention be formulated for the regulation of private manufacture of arms, but doubt was expressed as to the competency of the Federal Government to enter into such a treaty. In 1932, however, Secretary of State Stimson instructed the American delegation at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva in 1932 that—this Government could, on the basis of a treaty, exercise control of the manufacture of munitions (V, Hackworth, Digest of International Law p. 21). Subsequently, Secretary of State Hull reaffirmed the position taken by Secretary Stimson and stated in a letter to Congressman Tinkham, dated January 24, 1935:

"The treaty-making power of this Government clearly includes the power to enter into an international convention, under which this Government would be obligated to establish such a measure of supervision and control of the manufacture of arms and implements of war within its jurisdiction as was then under discussion" (ibid., p. 22).

In connection with this subject, the Senate's special committee investigating the munitions industry issued a report (Senate Committee Print No. 1, 73d Cong., 2d sess.), which stated at page 52:

"There never was any adequate legal basis for the position taken by representatives of the United States to the effect that the Federal Government could not by treaty deal with the private manufacture of arms and munitions; on many occasions the United States has by treaty dealt with problems which would ordinarily fall within the exclusive legislative competence of the States."

It is significant that the subjects of traffic and manufacture of drugs and also that of arms have been regarded as proper for the Federal treaty power. It seems equally clear that genocide, which has twice been declared to be a crime under international law by all of the members of the United Nations, is also a proper subject for the Federal treaty power, particularly because it comes within the specific Federal power to define and punish offenses against the law of nations.

B. PARTICULAR CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS ARISING IN CONNECTION WITH THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

1. The convention is not self-executing in character

It will be necessary for the Congress to exact implementing legislation before the courts of this country will give effect to the Genocide Convention.

Attention is called to the language of article I of the convention whereby the contracting states undertake to prevent and to punish genocide. More particularly, article V provides:

"The contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III."

Thus, while the convention defines the conduct which is to be punished, it does not attempt to prescribe penalties and procedures but leaves this up to each contracting state.

It seems clear, therefore, that this convention comes within the rule enunciated by Mr. Chief Justice Marshall in *Foster* v. *Neilson* (27 U. S. 253, 314 (1819)):

"Our Constitution declares a treaty to be the law of the land. It is, consequently, to be regarded in courts of justice as equivalent to an act of the legislature, whenever it operates of itself without the aid of any legislative provision. But when the terms of the stipulation import a contract, when either of the parties engages to perform a particular act, the treaty addresses itself to the political, not the judicial department; and the legislature must execute the contract before it can become a rule for the Court."

The Genocide Convention, when ratified, would obligate the United States to punish the crime of genocide; and the Congress must execute this contract, by enacting appropriate legislation, before the courts can give effect to the convention.

In this connection it should be noted that penal conventions in general are not regarded as self-executing in character. Thus, in *The Over the Top* (5 F. (2d) 838 (D. Conn., 1925)), the court said (p. 845):

"It is not the function of treaties to enact the fiscal or criminal law of a nation. For this purpose, no treaty is self-executing. Congress may be under a duty to enact that which has been agreed upon by treaty, but duty and its performance are two separate and distinct things. Nor is there any doubt that the treaty-making power has its limitations. What these are has never been defined, perhaps never need be defined. Certain it is that no part of the criminal law of this country has ever been enacted by treaty.

"Illustrations of congressional effectuation of treaties are plentiful. All treaties requiring payments of money have been followed by acts of Congress appropriating the amount. The treaties were the supreme law of the land, but they were ineffective to draw a dollar from the Treasury. The Russian-American Treaty of 1824 (8 Stat. 302) against selling liquors to the Alaskan natives was followed by the necessary penal legislation by the Congress. The treaty with various powers made in 1847 defining piracy and declaring its punishment received similar reinforcing enactments. The same was true of the treaty of 1862 with Great Britain (12 Stat. 1225), suppressing the slave trade; of the treaty of 1884 (24 Stat. 989), with various powers imposing fines and penalties for the protection of submarine cables; and of the treaty of 1912 (37 Stat. 1542), for protection of seals in the North Pacific Ocean."

(The above case was cited with approval in *Cook* v. *United States* (288 U. S. 102, 109 (1933)).

2. The convention does not violate the guaranties of the first and fourteenth amendments

Some concern has been felt that article III, paragraph (c) of the convention might conflict with the right of free speech as guaranteed by the first and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution. This provision makes punishable direct and public incitement to commit genocide.

It is important to recall that, under the common law, solicitation or incitement to commit a crime in itself constituted an offense; and the constitutional guaranties of free speech have not been held to protect this kind of conduct. In one most pertinent case, *Frohwerk* v. *United States* (249 U. S. 204 (1919)), Mr. Justice Holmes stated, at page 206:

"The first amendment, while prohibiting legislation against free speech as such, cannot have been, and obviously was not, intended to give immunity for every possible use of language. * * * We venture to believe that neither Hamilton nor Madison, nor any other competent person then or later, ever supposed that to make criminal the counseling of murder within the jurisdiction of Congress would be an unconstitutional interference with free speech.

The Supreme Court has evolved the principles governing the constitutional right of free speech in a line of decisions including the well-known cases of *Schenck* v. *United States* (249 U. S. 47 (1919)) and *Bridges* v. *California* (314 U. S. 252 (1941)). The Court's most recent pronouncement on the subject was made in the case of *Terminiello* v. *Chicago* (17 U. S. Law Week 4395; case decided May 16, 1949). In that case, the Court reversed a conviction for breach of peace under a Chicago ordinance, on the ground that the ordinance, as construed by the Illinois courts, unduly restricted free speech and consequently violated the fourteenth amendment. In this decision, the Court stated:

"Freedom of speech, though not absolute, * * * is nevertheless protected against censorship or punishment, unless shown likely to produce a clear and present danger of a serious substantive evil that arises far above public inconvenience, annoyance, or unrest."

In view of these various precedents, it seems clear that, in enforcing this convention, the courts will continue to act as guardians of the constitutional right of free speech.

3. Sufficiency of definitions "in whole or in part" (art. II)

The legislative history on this point in the United Nations shows that the words "in whole or in part" were inserted in article II of the convention at the instance of the representative of Norway, who felt that it should not be necessary to kill all members of a group in order to commit genocide (Official Records, General Assembly, 3d sess., pt. I, Legal Committee, 89–98).

The Department of State's letter, transmitting the convention to the Senate (Ex. O, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 4), set forth in full the text of the declaration of understanding made on this point by the United States representative in the United Nations on October 13, 1948. That statement made clear the United States position that it continued to proceed on the principle that genocide is a denial of the right of existence of entire human groups and that one of the elements of the international crime of genocide would be the intent to destroy one of the groups enumerated in article II.

4. Sufficiency of definitions: "mental harm" (art. II, par. b)

The legislative history shows that the phrase "mental harm" was inserted in the convention at the instance of the Chinese representative on the ground that the Japanese had intended to commit and had actually committed genocide by debauching the Chinese population with narcotics (Official Records, General Assembly, 3d sess., pt. I, Sixth Committee, pp. 175–179).

This phrase seems too vague for purposes of penal legislation; and in the implementing legislation it should be made more precise. Language such as "causing serious bodily harm to, or permanent injury to mental faculties of" or "causing serious bodily harm or mental incapacity" has been suggested, in order to correct this.

5. Sufficiency of definitions: "complicity in genocide" (art. III, par. 3)

The word "complicity" is not a familiar term in American law, although it apparently is in the legal systems of some of the countries which participated in the formulation of the genocide convention.

The United States representative at the Ad Hoc Committee on Genocide stated that he understood this term "to refer to accessoryship before and after the fact and to aiding and abetting in the commission of crimes enumerated in this article" (UN Doc. E/794, p. 21). Again, it seems that the simplest way to describe this obligation in terms of our jurisprudence is to use more precise language in the implementing legislation, possibly along the lines suggested by the United States representative.

6. Extradition

If the convention is ratified, implementing legislation will be necessary to give effect to the extradition provisions of article VII.

It is well known that extradition conventions usually apply to nationals of the United States as well as to the nationals of the country concerned. The crimes for which extradition may be granted are listed in the respective extradition conventions, and they are not limited to crimes denominated Federal offenses under our laws. Nor are they limited to an agreement on the part of the United States to surrender persons within the exclusive Federal jurisdiction. Thus, a person wanted for the crime of murder under the law, say of Great Britain, and who may have sought refuge in the State of Illinois, may be extradited to the British provided that the acts alleged would constitute murder under the law of Illinois, and, of course, provided that all other provisions of the extradition convention and procedures are complied with. The constitutional basis of extradition treaties was explained by Chief Justice Taney in the early case of *Holmes* v. *Jennison et al.* (14 Pct. 540, 569 (1840)), wherein he stated:

"And without attempting to define the exact limits of this treaty-making power, or to enumerate the subjects intended to be included in it; it may be safely be assumed that the recognition and enforcement of the principles of public law, being one of the ordinary subjects of treaties, were necessarily included in the power conferred on the general government. And, as the rights and duties of nations towards one another, in relation to fugitives from justice, are a part of the law of nations, and have always been treated as such by the writers upon public law; it follows, that the treaty-making power must have authority to decide how far the right of a foreign nation in this respect will be recognized and enforced, when it demands the surrender of any one charged with offenses against it."

7. International tribunal

It seems clear from the language of article VI of the convention that trials for genocide committed in the United States can take place only in American courts, and that no such trial could take place in an international tribunal until the United States had accepted the jurisdiction of such a tribunal. This obviously would require the advice and consent of the United States Senate.

Under article IX, of course, disputes as to the interpretation, application or fulfillment of the convention would go to the International Court of Justice. This Court, of course, has no criminal jurisdiction at present and could not be used as an international penal tribunal, unless the parties to the statute of the Court agreed to confer such jurisdiction upon the Court.

From the foregoing statement it may be concluded that the Genocide Convention is a proper exercise of the treaty power, based as it is upon the Federal power to define and punish offenses against the law of nations. The convention defines a new Federal offense, but it does not enlarge the present constitutional jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The convention will have to be implemented by legislation before it can be enforced in the courts, and that legislation should make more precise certain language of the convention.

II. Excerpts From Testimony Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

Thomas Dodd (member of the American Bar Association special committee on peace and law through United Nations and formerly executive trial counsel at Nuremberg):

"You have been asked what good would this have been against Hitler. I am one of those who believe, after living 18 months over there among the Hitler regime, that had this Genocide Convention been in existence in the early days of the Hitler regime, what happened might not have happened. For one thing, the Nazi state would have stood condemned. Its ministers and ambassadors would not stand in the some position as those of other nations not in violation of a genocidal convention, and great numbers of people inside Germany would have taken heart and might have been more vigorous in their residence to the regime itself.

"You have been asked what can we do about the Russians, who are perhaps and probably doing this same sort of thing behind the iron curtain now. Well, at least we will have the moral influence of the covenant of the convention. Russia in its plan, as I see it, wishes to influence people all over the world. If people all over the world see Russia as a nation which does not subscribe to or adhere to the Genocide Convention she will be severely affected in her efforts to influence people everywhere, and the forces of good thinking and of right conduct in the world will be immeasurably strengthened."

Charles W. Tillott (chairman, section of international and comparative law, American Bar Association):

"The basic reasons for supporting this Genocide Convention, as I see it, are these: The slaughter of huge groups of people, the indiscriminate killing of women, children, and men who fit into some other classification. The killing of them merely for the sake of killing is the most abominable of all crimes. People from all over the world meet on common ground in condemning a crime so heartless and barbaric as genocide. And this international unity of though presents a compelling opportunity for action. The main objective can be effected even though reservations are necessary to maintain an individual legal system.

"Genocide is a crime with international effects and reverberations, because when the members of a group in one country are murdered because of their group membership, violently hostile feelings are aroused in the hearts of all members of that group in other countries. Hostile feelings can easily lead to active hostilities. Hostilities anywhere affect peace everywhere. Religion is international; it knows no national boundaries. Hense the destruction in a country of a religious group must in the nature of the case arouse instantaneously in all other members of that group everywhere deep-seated resentment.

* * * * *

"This Genocide Convention is the first piece of international legislation that has been proposed by the United Nations for the purpose of making real and dynamic the principles contained in the Charter. It is the initial point of departure as between isolationism and internationalism. The action of the United States will show whether or not we really mean what we say when we approve the United Nations Charter or are merely paying lip service to the form and not the substance of the organization.

The extermination of groups of human beings is conduct that all agree is abhorred and despicable. There is no disagreement about that. The sole point at issue here is will we obligate ourselves by a multipartite international agreement to take domestic measures in accordance with our own Constitution to wipe this abominable and beastly crime from the face of the earth. I am sure that I am representative of thousands of American lawyers and their opinion who feel that our Constitution is a great instrument of liberty and freedom and is not an instrument which, as some would have you believe, will shackle and paralyze us in the face of this international effort to outlaw this detestable crime."

Adrian S. Fisher (legal adviser, Department of State):

"I would like to deal only briefly with the question of Federal-State relations and point out that what is before the Senate is this Genocide Convention, nothing else. To my mind, based on the evidence of history and the two resolutions of the General Assembly which have been passed, there is no doubt that Congress could define genocide as a crime against the law of nations. In doing so it would be acting under a specific constitutional provision, article 1, paragraph 8, clause 10 of the Constitution.

"We are criticized because it is claimed that we are relying upon the migratory bird case. I personally do not consider it is unethical to come before the Senate and place your reliance on a case which has stood unchallenged for 30 years. In this particular case I am not doing so, because it does not appear to me to be necessary to rely upon the treaty power alone to support this convention.

"*United States* v. *Arjona* (decided in 1887) clearly supports a Federal statute implementing this convention, and therefore it is hard to see how the convention would have any effect in granting Congress a power it would not otherwise have, or drastically change the relations between the States and the Federal Government.

"It also should be pointed out that in *United States* v. *Arjona*, which held that Congress could constitutionally define counterfeiting of foreign bank notes as a crime against the law of nations, it was specifically said that nothing prevents the State from acting. I would like to read just a section of that opinion because of the charges made here that we are taking over a large section of State authority. Mr. Chief Justice White, referring to the crime against the law of nations, says, as follows:

" 'This, however, does not prevent a State from providing for punishment of the same thing, for here, as in the case of counterfeiting the coin of the United States, the act may be an offense against the authority of a State as well as that of the United States.'

"That was acceptable law then, it is acceptable law now, and nothing that has been said in the last 2 days can change it.

"I would like to conclude on just one point, sir. This convention, it has been argued, goes too far. It has been argued it does not go far enough, and it has been argued that it will hurt rather than help our foreign policy.

"Now the question of whether or not this convention will hurt rather than help our foreign policy is a question which I as a lawyer, whose qualifications are primarily technical, must of necessity approach with a great deal of humility. But I do think that when we consider that such men as General Marshall, John Foster Dulles, Senator Austin, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and the President of the United States have all urged the adoption of this convention in its present form as the best way to show that this country is prepared to stand and be counted in terms of the moral position which it has before the world, I hope that this committee, and I know that this committee, will consider the views of these men in making up its own mind as to whether or not this is an important thing from the point of view of the foreign policy of the United States."

Dr. Brendan F. Brown (dean of the Law School, the Catholic University of America):

"The word 'genocide' is new, but the juridical concept which the word signifies forms part of an idea which is ancient. Genocide was declared to be an international law crime in 1946, but a concept broad enough to include genocide was recognized centuries before by some of the great medieval writers, who believed in a scholastic, natural law. They advocated a form of the doctrine of tyrannicide which accorded a right under international law to any righteous ruler, acting for world society, to resort to war, if necessary, against any ruler who was inflicting gross injustice against his subjects, as such, or as members of groups, who were unable to exercise their juridical right of revolution to overthrow the criminally unjust despot. The bona fide representative of world society might exercise this right to use force even to the extent of war. The particular crime which evoked this form of doctrine of tyrannicide was essentially the same as the crime now described as genocide. Genocide may not adequately be comprehended, unless it is based on the concept of the spiritual, mental, biological, and moral solidarity of the human race, and on the ideal of the brotherhood of man, which in ultimate analysis constitutes the substratum of global society."

Frank B. Frederick (general counsel, the American Unitarian Association):

"I represent one great denomination and am empowered to promise for it the support of this treaty. One hundred million people or more, represented by the witnesses who have testified before this committee, will also support the treaty.

"I am aware of the objections of the American Bar Association. I am a member of that association but I do not agree with its committee's conclusions nor with the vote of its delegates to oppose the ratification of the Genocide Treaty.

"I join with those who have said that in carrying out the treaty if there be risks they are calculable and who have said 'Let us take those risks.' I am glad that the American Bar Association has pointed out the risks. It was the duty of some group of lawyers to do so. Equally, it is the duty of all of us now to appraise those risks and see them in a world perspective, match them against the penalties if we refuse the treaty and come to a great decision.

"In my opinion, there is no risk when we consider the treaty primarily in its international aspect. Genocide is carefully defined so that it is distinguished from homicide and it is unthinkable that as a Nation the United States of America will ever be a defendant in a genocide complaint.

"In its national aspect the greatest risk, as I understand it, lies in the possibility that genocide complaints against individuals will be confused with homicide and that in such complaints our citizens will have something less than their present constitutional rights and protections.

"But the treaty provides for its implementation in this country under laws to be made by Congress. It is doubtless true that because it will be dealing with a treaty, Congress in passing implementing law could ignore the Constitution because treaties themselves are on a par with the Constitution.

"I say to this argument and with all respect to the American Bar Association's point of view, 'What of it?'

"Even if it is possible, it is unthinkable that any Congress would ignore constitutional principles and protections affecting our own basic human rights. This problem of Congress legislating to implement a treaty is not a new one. No Congress has yet sold us down the river because of its special law-making powers when treaties are involved. I am willing, and I believe the American people are willing, to trust Congress not to defeat the basic constitutional rights of its own citizens while it is in the very act of making similar rights available to the rest of the world.

"We, of the American Unitarian Association, are not afraid of the national or international risks inherent in the adoption of the Genocide Treaty.

"We believe in the power of our churches and other churches to support the treaty effectively and make the treaty a practical working force when it has been ratified.

"Once again, the world looks to our great Nation for leadership. We must stand for human rights in all the world as we have always stood for human rights in our own country."

Dean Rusk (Deputy Under Secretary of State):

"It is an inescapable fact that other nations of the world expect the United States to assert moral leadership in international affairs. The United States has a record of humanitarian diplomacy, beginning with the early days of the Republic when President John Quincy Adams expressed the public sympathies of the American people with the Greeks in their struggle for independence from Turkish rule. The United States Government has remonstrated more than once with other governments regarding their persecution of the Jews; with Rumania in 1902 and with Czarist Russia in 1891 and 1904. In addition, the United States has also intervened diplomatically with other governments for the protection of Christians, not only on behalf of American missionaries but also on behalf of converts. For example, it is interesting to note that in the treaty of October 8, 1903, between China and the United States, the Chinese Government specifically agreed not to persecute teachers of Christian doctrine nor to molest Chinese converts in the peaceable practices of Christianity. This Government has also intervened diplomatically on behalf of native Christians, in the case of the Armenian population of Turkey.

"Finally, it should be recalled that the United States intervened in Cuba in 1898, in the cause of humanity and to put an end, to quote the joint resolution of April 20, 1898, to 'the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than 3 years in the island of Cuba, * * * have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization.'

"It is a familiar role, therefore, for the United States to take the lead in raising moral standards of international society. And, prevailing international conditions make it imperative that the United States continue to play this role. We all know too well that millions of human beings are still subjected to the domination of ruthless totalitarian regimes, and that the specter of genocide still haunts mankind. It should be made clear to such governments that the United States and other civilized countries do not condone such conduct now any more than in the past.

* * * * *

"Also we are engaged in a very fundamental struggle in our foreign relations between the forces that are trying to build up a free world and the forces that are trying to tear it down. We have committed considerable material resources to that struggle. The attempt to build is a difficult attempt. It is not easy to get an economic system in order or to get an international collective security system in order. It is fairly easy to tear it down. On the physical side the odds are strongly against us. The bridge which cost $1,000,000 in Greece was destroyed by a $25 bomb.

"We are in this fight against enormous odds on the physical side because of the nature of the opposition and the opportunities being offered to the opposition for destruction. We therefore must turn to the field in which we have enormous advantages, that is, to the moral, political, and spiritual field, in order to mobilize mankind around these basic measures of freedom and try to offset thereby some of the disadvantages on the physical side.

"Therefore we look upon this Genocide Convention as a major element in the attempt to mobilize the moral and spiritual resources of mankind in the interest of our common objectives as written in the United Nations, and we believe that if we can offer this leadership we will see a continuing consolidation of mankind behind these principles and through that contribute greatly to the interest, the peace, and the well-being of the American people."

Philip B. Perlman (Solicitor General of the United States):

"In our view the United States has complete authority to enter into the Genocide Convention. The treaty power is being invoked, and that the treaty power of the United States extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and the governments of other nations is clear (*Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 266 (1890)); *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332, 341 (1924)). The treaty-making power is broad enough to cover all subjects that properly pertain to our foreign relations * * * (*Santovincenzo* v. *Egan* (284 U. S. 30, 40 (1931)).

"The contention advanced by some of the critics of the convention that these subjects must be completely or exclusively foreign or international or external overlooks the whole history of treaty making which has,

from the first, dealt with matters having direct impact on subjects intimately of domestic and local concern. See *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dall. 199 (1796)), holding the 1783 treaty of peace with Great Britain preserved debts owed British creditors by American citizens, and was superior to a statute of Virginia which purported to effect a discharge; *Hopkirk* v. *Bell* (3 Cranch. 454 (1806)), holding that the 1783 treaty of peace with Great Britain prevented the operation of the Virginia statute of limitations on debts owed Britons, contracted before the treaty; *Fairfax's Devisee* v. *Hunter's Lessee* (7 Cranch. 603 (U. S. 1813)), holding that a 1794 treaty with Great Britain confirmed title to land in Virginia in a British citizen notwithstanding the law of Virginia; *Chirac* v. *Chirac* (2 Wheat. 259 (U. S. 1817)), holding that a 1778 treaty with France enabled subjects of France to purchase and hold lands in the United States and overcame the effect of a Maryland escheat law; *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483 (1879)), holding that a treaty with Switzerland removed the disability of a Swiss citizen under Virginia law to inherit real property, the Supreme Court stating specifically: 'We have no doubt that this treaty is within the treaty-making power conferred by the Constitution (100 U. S. 490),' and to the same effect regarding inheritance by a French citizen under a treaty with France, *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258 (1890); *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416 (1920)), holding the 1916 treaty with Great Britain for protection by the United States and Canada of migratory birds which traverse parts of both countries, and congressional implementation of the treaty, to be a proper exercise of the treaty-making power and Federal legislative power thereunder; *Asakura* v. *City of Seattle* (265 U. S. 332 (1924)), holding a treaty with Japan, which provided that citizens and subjects of both countries shall enjoy liberty to carry on trade, and so forth, in the territory of each other on equal footing, overcame a city ordinance which limited pawnbroking to United States citizens; *Neilson* v. *Johnson* (279 U. S. 47 (1929)), holding an Iowa inheritance tax was subject to a treaty with Denmark, which forbade discriminating taxes on the removal of personal property by citizens of either country from the other; *Santovincenzo* v. *Egan* (284 U. S. 30 (1931)), holding a convention with Italy and a treaty with Persia governed the intestacy of an Italian subject in preference to the escheat law of New York, the Supreme Court stating specifically: 'There can be no question as to the power of the Government of the United States to make the treaty with Persia or the Consular Convention with Italy (284 U. S. 40).'

"That genocide is equal with descent and distribution of real and personal property, or nondiscrimination on grounds of citizenship in business opportunities and taxation, or protection of migratory birds, as a subject appropriate for action under the treaty-making power seems to us an inescapable conclusion. The historical background of the Genocide Convention indicates the view of the representatives in international affairs of practically all the governments of the world on the appropriateness and desirability of an international agreement 'to outlaw the world-shocking crime of genocide.' This Government has shared in this view; in fact, has taken a leading part in shaping the convention. If there is any issue here as to whether the exercise of the treaty-making power is the appropriate means through which genocide should be effectively condemned, and we doubt the validity of such an issue, the view of the President as the principal organ of the United States in foreign affairs, and of the State Department as his representative in such matters, is entitled to great weight.

"But more than this, as a Nation, by action of the President and the Senate, the United States has already made clear its policy on the propriety of giving due international regard, by cooperative methods, for the promotion and protection of human rights, of which the fundamental right to life of whole groups of people is certainly one.

"A question was asked Mr. Rusk about the United Nations Charter and its covering such a situation as this, I think Mr. Rusk listed one covering item. We have listed seven separate references to the Charter that indicate that this subject that is dealt with in the Genocide Convention, the subject of human rights and fundamental freedom, was intended to be one of the matters over which the United Nations should function, and that we think is made clear not by the one section but seven different sections that we have listed:

"'ARTICLE 1

"'The purposes of the United Nations are—

* * * * * *

"'3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion (59 Stat. 1037).

"'ARTICLE 13

"'1. The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of—

* * * * *

"'(b) * * * assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion (59 Stat. 1039).

"'ARTICLE 55

"'With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote—

* * * * *

"'(c) universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedom for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion (59 Stat. 1045–1046).

"'ARTICLE 56

"'All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55 (59 Stat. 1046).

"'ARTICLE 62

"'2. It (the Economic and Social Council) may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all (59 Stat. 1046).

"'ARTICLE 68

"'The Economic and Social Council shall set up commissions in economic and social fields for the promotion of human rights, and such other commission as may be required for the performance of its functions (59 Stat. 1047).

"'ARTICLE 76

"'The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the purposes of the United Nations laid down in Article 1 of the present Charter, shall be—

* * * * *

"'to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world (59 Stat. 1409).'"

"These provisions, as a minimum, embody a clear expression of policy, of our intention (as well as that of other nations) to promote respect for human rights by peaceful international cooperation. The treaty method is the best known means of achieving international cooperation. The Genocide Convention is a treaty, and whether or not it be regarded as stemming from obligations undertaken under the United Nations Charter, the reservation of domestic jurisdiction in article 2 (7) of the Charter: 'Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state' and so forth, is of no relevance on the question as to whether genocide and its punishment are appropriate subjects for a new treaty. This is so because, first, the Genocide Convention does not purport to grant any jurisdiction to the United Nations which it does not already possess, and second, the acceptance of the Genocide Convention will be a separate contractual exercise of sovereign power by each state accepting the convention."

Robert P. Patterson (former Secretary of War):

"What is our form of government? It is a government of a federal character, with national and international matters the business of the Federal Government, and with local matters the business of the 48 States and subdivisions of those States. By the Constitution, the treaty-making power and also the power to define and punish offenses against the laws of nations, those powers are specifically given to branches of the Federal Government, clearly in line with the general classification that matters of national importance belong at the seat of the Federal Government while matters of local importance belong with the 48 States.

"We have in our brief cases that expound those principles, cases in the United States Supreme Court, cases in which opinions were written by Justice Holmes, Chief Justice Hughes, and other leading jurists in the Nation.

"This convention is in clear conformity with that dual system of government. It declares, the treaty does, that genocide shall be an international crime which the contracting parties undertake to prevent. It binds the contracting parties simply to enact legislation that will carry into effect the provisions of the convention and inflict penalties on violators within their borders, trials to be in the courts of the Nation and to be in accordance with the respective constitutions of the contracting parties.

"In other words, this convention deals with a matter that by the Constitution of the United States is in the Federal field. It does not deal to any degree with local matters, with what the provisions of a plumbing code should be in a city, or anything of that matter. It deals with an offense worldwide in its effects, an offense declared to be of grave international concern by the unanimous vote of the United Nations General Assembly.

"More specifically, I think the objection may be this, and I take this from the report of the special committee of the American Bar Association committee on peace and law, through the United Nations. In that report you can find the thread of a thought—I say the thread of a thought because I do not think it is stated categorically anywhere, but the thread of a thought—that this convention goes along unheard-of lines, lines of a revolutionary character, in that it imposes individual obligations on persons by treaty or by international law.

"I submit that a careful reading of the convention will afford no support for that charge whatsoever. No individual obligation will be imposed upon any United States citizen or any subject of Britain or citizen of any country until a national law is passed by that country. Then and not until then will there be any duty or obligation of any sort imposed upon the individual citizens. That argument, I submit, misses the whole point of this convention, which is a contract on the

part of the signing and ratifying governments that they will pass legislation of their own in accordance with their own constitutions, to make genocide a crime within their own borders."

III. STATEMENT BY HON. ERNEST A. GROSS, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE SIGNING OF THE CONVENTION ON GENOCIDE

[United States Delegation to UN General Assembly, Press Release 93, December 11, 1948]

The adoption of the Convention on Genocide by the General Assembly is an important achievement by the United Nations. The convention provides for the repression and punishment of the crime of denying the right of existence of entire human groups. It responds to the unanimous request of members of the United Nations that suitable methods of international cooperation be organized to prevent a recurrence of acts of barbarism which are still fresh in our minds.

I am privileged to sign this convention on behalf of my Government, which has been proud to take an active part in the effort of the United Nations to bring this convention into being.

The Government of the United States considers this an event of great importance in the development of international law and of cooperation among states for the purpose of eliminating practices offensive to all civilized mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I can sum up my reaction to the necessity for prompt ratification of the Genocide Convention with the following quotation from Thomas Paine: "He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression; for if he violates this duty he establishes a precedent that will reach to himself."

Defense of Europe by American Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Britain, France Want Europe Defended, But at Expense of American Manpower," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of September 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN, FRANCE WANT EUROPE DEFENDED, BUT AT EXPENSE OF AMERICAN MANPOWER

(By Constantine Brown)

Britain and France, our principal allies in Europe, want to eat their cake and have it, too. They want Europe defended against the Russians, but they do not want to tax their own resources and do not want anybody but the United States to provide the bulk of the manpower.

Secretary of State Acheson made positive suggestions for the integration of a German military force into the over-all defense of Europe. Before the Western Big Three foreign ministers met in New York there were indirect approaches by the military for the inclusion of Spain in the over-all program to resist eastern aggression. But the French and British Governments remained adamant against it.

The members of the North Atlantic Alliance admit frankly that they cannot, for domestic political and other reasons, provide manpower for the ground force to oppose the vast Russian and satellite armies.

NEED 60 DIVISIONS

The original optimistic estimate that 25 ground divisions would suffice to stop an eastern onslaught were drastically revised after the outbreak of the Korean war.

The top-ranking officers of the Atlantic Alliance calculate that we shall need at least 60 divisions to do the job.

The growing threat from Russia has worried the people of continental Europe. Soon after hostilities started in Korea there was a clamor for increased American military forces in Germany. The French requested at least five additional divisions. They were right. The recent allied war games in Germany under the supervision of Gen. Mark Clark showed that present allied strength there is totally inadequate to cope with an attack from the east.

Factual reports from military specialists led our Government to recommend that the western Germans be rearmed as a part of the over-all defense plan. It was estimated in Washington that a German army of 60,000 men as a starter would greatly bolster our chances of victory.

The idea of rearming Germans under an allied—in all likelihood, American—commander was ill-received by the French and British. Although the supplies for the new German army would be controlled by the United States, French Foreign Minister Schuman refused to accept our plan. He insisted that rearming the Germans would be disastrous for the present government of Premier Rene Pleven.

FRENCH ARE AFRAID

The French, who cannot add substantially to their present manpower under arms, while anxious to prevent another invasion of their territory, refuse to accept the help of their former enemies, even after we offer them the most sweeping assurances that there will be no repetition of the 1914 and 1939 aggressions. They say they cannot afford to put many more men under arms. They are afraid of the political consequences for the present shaky government if they agree to permit Germany to be rearmed. Yet they want their country adequately defended. This is tantamount to asking us to assume the bulk of the burden of the defense of Europe.

The British are only lukewarm to our proposal. Foreign Secretary Bevin, who stated publicly last week that Britain is opposed to arming the west Germans, is reported to have softened somewhat. But not enough to influence his French colleague.

Both Mr. Bevin and Mr. Schuman are determined to prevent the supplying of modern war materials to the Spanish Army, which is 400,000 strong. While psychologically there may be some grounds for the French fear of the Germans—since the two countries have been at bitter odds since 1870—Spain has never been actively hostile to her western neighbors.

In World War I King Alfonso maintained strict but friendly neutrality toward the allied powers. In World War II, General Franco's assurances to Paris permitted the French high command to withdraw its divisions from the Pyrenees and send them to the German front.

Opposition to the French and British to inclusion of Spain in western defense is based only on the fact that the Socialist parties in those countries do not like the present dictatorial regime in Madrid. Yet both Governments are most anxious to see Communist China, where Mao Tse-tung rules as ruthlessly as Stalin, seated in the United Nations and fully recognized as a member of the peace-loving nations.

Spain can contribute far more to the defense of western Europe than either Yugoslavia or China.

Judge's Remarks on Motion for Rehearing, Frenchman-Cambridge Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this action was filed in 1948 and was not heard until February 23, 1950. It was pending and there were briefs filed. The Bureau of Reclamation was represented at the date of hearing, but for some reason or other did not attempt to participate and help the court. They knew that in the ordinary processes of our democratic form of government according to the laws of Nebraska and according to the reclamation law that the reclamation works would be subject to the laws of Nebraska. They knew that the matter would be submitted in court. They knew that, but they did not come in with any brief of any kind. They were the ones that had the big investment here. They, the Reclamation Bureau, had a big investment, and we knew and appreciated it. It was of vital interest to them that the court be properly advised and helped in rendering a decision, which would not only be of value and benefit to them and the district and to the people of this area, but also for the purpose of protecting their investment and the investment of the taxpayers. Not only that, they knew that it was of vital concern to the public, and as public servants, which they profess to be, it was their duty to be in court and assist the court, not only at the first hearing, but to assist the court by briefs. They were aware of briefs being filed by the objectors and by the district, and it was their opportunity to come into court and advise the court what their contention is, and what the court ought to do for the benefit of everyone affected, but for some reason or other, which the court does not understand, the Bureau personnel saw it the way they did, and I will use the word "expedient," not to come into court and assist the court. Why? Can we say that the Bureau personnel had no appreciation of our democratic processes, and no appreciation of the functions of the court to the extent that they could ignore the proceeding that was pending in Nebraska. A vital proceeding, not only to them, not only to the district, not only to the people and the taxpayers, but would perhaps create a precedent in the entire United States. After the court had rendered its decision, and the decision and the journal entry were submitted several days before it was filed so that everyone could have an opportunity to "shoot" at it and give the court further assistance in this vital

matter, there was nothing said. There was nothing said. The Bureau should know, and should have known that they were looking after the interests of the Bureau and representing the welfare of the people, which they claim they are, they should have known that if the court made any decision which was contrary to their version of the law, they would have the opportunity to ask the court for a motion for retrial within 10 days. They knew that, or should have known that. During that period there was no motion for new trial filed according to the practices of Nebraska, which they should be familiar with. They could have filed an appeal directly into the Supreme Court within 30 days. Here was a question of vital interest. A legal question whether the court should be governed by the academic rule as to the interpretation of contracts, or whether the court should be guided by section 46–1, 151, which expressly authorized the court to declare certain parts of the contract invalid. It was the golden opportunity to have the interpretation of this statute before the court, but for some reason or other the personnel of the Bureau did not file any appeal in the Supreme Court. This court would have been happy to see this case go to the Supreme Court and get a determination of the questions involved, but for some reason or other the Bureau found it, if I may use the word "expedient," not to file an appeal. Then, after all this time expired we notice in the papers—after the time had expired—then we find in the papers that the Bureau is going to rescind any further work. We also find in the papers that there is certain pressure placed upon the attorney of this district that unless this ruling is set aside, or to similar effect, that the Bureau is not going to proceed further with their contracts.

Now, gentlemen, I will say advisedly to these men representing the Bureau today that that did not only amaze me, it shocked me as I am sure it shocked every American person. There was every opportunity to follow the procedure, the regular procedures provided by our Constitution and democratic processes, of having this matter presented in an orderly and direct manner and go straight to the Supreme Court. But for some reason or other when the time has expired then put pressure, and I was amazed to listen to this statement of the argument that unless this contract was confirmed in total, the Bureau cannot do business with the district.

Gentlemen, what does it mean? We come to this conclusion. By the very history of what has transpired here, the very history that has transpired, our administrative bodies are trying to coerce the courts to conform to administrative will, and the courts, to maintain respect and dignity to preserve our social order, cannot bow to administrative will.

This motion was filed out of time and the court has no jurisdiction at this time to hear a motion for new trial. The motion is going to be overruled.

Congress Uneasy—Members Fear Resentment From Voters at Delay in Passing Excess-Profits Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, following my observations in the House a few days ago regarding excess-profits tax legislation, I attach hereto a statement appearing in the Washington newspaper by the columnist Thomas L. Stokes.

Current rumors indicate that some sort of a compromise has been agreed upon by the conferees by which no immediate excess-profit taxes are to be levied. Surely these rumors cannot be well-founded in fact. How anyone can justify immediate adjournment of this Congress without taking care of this essential and greatly needed tax measure is beyond my conception. I know that many of our colleagues are anxious to get home to look after their political fortunes. I believe it would be to their political advantage to stay in session and thus discharge their full duties. From my experience through the years, I have never suffered at the hands of the voters when they were convinced that I was making a conscientious effort to faithfully discharge the trust they have reposed in me. If we must recess for a while, and I see no reason for that, let us return again soon after the election early in November to finish our work in the Eighty-first Congress. It will not suffice to adjourn this Congress with some sort of a pretended agreement to enact excess-profits-tax legislation in the Eighty-second Congress. We have no authorty to speak for subsequent Congresses. When the report from the conferees on the tax measure comes up for consideration, if it does not provide for proper excess-profits-tax levies, let us recommit it with specific instructions to carry out the expressed wishes of the House.

Regardless as to what we do with the tax measures, I intend to vote against the adjournment of Congress in view of the continuing serious international problems confronting us. The abovementioned statement follows:

CONGRESS UNEASY—MEMBERS FEAR RESENTMENT FROM VOTERS AT DELAY IN PASSING EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Uneasy lie the heads of many of those who wear the crowns in this Eighty-first Congress who in 7 weeks must face the voters to answer for their stewardship.

Around the Capitol you hear much frightened conversation about a voter rebellion against the "ins" of whatever party, come November 7. That happens occasionally in critical times such as these, when people are disturbed and confused about things in general and strike out blindly at the exposed targets—those in public office.

That fear, of course, is subject to the usual discount that most politicians "run scared." Nevertheless, the anxiety is manifest in numerous ways, among them, the overwhelming vote last week of the House, 331 to 2, instructing its Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to prepare a bill to tax excess profits for the Eighty-first Congress which runs until January 3.

This gesture, which probably will turn out to be no more than that, reveals how sensitive Members of that body—all of whose seats are at stake in November—have become to complaints from their constituents about raising their income taxes beginning October 1—a month before election, incidentally—and not at the same time taxing war profits.

OBVIOUS IN SENATE, TOO

This does not look like equality of sacrifice—and isn't, of course.

The guilt consciousness so obvious in the House was apparent also in the Senate, only a third of whose Members are up for reelection. There, after the House action, proponents of an excess profits tax now lost by only 2 votes, 34 to 36, in an attempt to get the Senate to rescind its previous resolution for a bill at the next session and follow the House recommendation for one in this Congress.

The resolutions of each body are only promissory notes, and no action appears likely before next year, since an extra session after the election would be required. But they at least give hard-pressed Members a piece of paper to wave frantically before their constituents who already are figuring how they are going to meet their increased tax bills and may, consequently, not be too sympathetic.

Anybody who knows anything about the operation of Congress—and this reporter lays some claim to that after 29 years here—knows that there is no excuse whatever for not taxing war profits now. There's been a lot of sham and flapdoodle about how long it takes to write a bill because of the complicated subject. There has been plenty of time. The Korean war is nearly 3 months old. Just after it started the tax committees of both House and Senate were reminded that an excess-profits tax should be included to make for equality of sacrifice. But the Senate Finance Committee, before which the tax bill already passed by the House was pending, voted for postponement until next year, which, likewise, was advocated by Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder.

PLENTY OF TIME NOW

As a matter of fact, there is plenty of time now to write an excess-profits tax. The Treasury Department has done considerable research on the subject, which it did to be ready in event Congress decided to act now and could submit a workable measure very shortly.

The dilatory tactics have worked very nicely for those who hope somehow to avoid enactment of such a tax or, if it comes, that it not be made retroactive to the beginning of the Korean war, July 1, this year, or October 1, when increased individual and corporate income taxes become effective, as was recommended in Senate and House resolutions.

This part of the resolutions about retroactivity of the tax may turn out to be lip service. In this connection, Representative JOHN CARROLL, Democrat, of Colorado, one of the leaders in the House for an excess-profits tax now, pointed out that the Senate Finance Committee, in its report on the tax bill, said flatly that the tax would apply to 1951 profits, and also read a recent interview in Paris with Secretary Snyder who said the tax would be applied to 1951 profits, as it would be difficult to make the tax retroactive to 1950 profits.

Representative EBERHARTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, also active for an excess-profits

tax now, put the issue in a nutshell when he told the House:

"We feel that it is not fair, particularly to low-income groups of this country, people earning less than $5,000 a year, to have their taxes increased an average of 20 percent and at the same time be forced to pay higher prices for groceries, for rent, and for the other necessities of life, and not have this tax measure do anything about war profits."

That seems fair and reasonable.

Information Program of the Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, last Friday I received from the Assistant Secretary of State, Jack K. McFall, a note which said:

I thought you might be interested in seeing what your constituents are doing to help put over the Department's information program.

Attached to this note was a clipping from the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of August 27, written by David Botter. Believing this excellent article will be of interest to other Senators, I am asking that it be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXANS AIR NATION'S VOICE

(By David Botter)

WASHINGTON, August 26.—We have a story to tell. It's all true. But a lot of people can't, or don't, believe it. They haven't seen our proof. They can't even imagine the things we say. And some other people are telling them our story isn't so—even if they are allowed to hear or read it.

It's a matter-of-fact story, to us. But it's pretty tall Texas telling, to folk who haven't seen us or what we talk about.

To tell this story straight, to convince these people that we are playing fair with them, we have a big selling job. We have ideas for sale. But our ideas can be no more winning than our story.

This, then, is the job of America's expanding information services—which this year will cost about $130,000,000. And it's the job of some of your old friends and neighbors—Texans who have been recruited to help tell and sell America to people who just can't believe what they hear about us.

HAPPY INDUSTRIOUS PEOPLE

Ours is the story of a big, rich country, filled with big-hearted, basically happy, pretty industrious people who respect human beings because they are human beings; who don't go looking for fights but will take one on when it's necessary; who believe in human and governmental decency and fair play; who think policemen are there to help people, not frighten them into cellars.

Now our job—the job of this bunch of Texans—is to tell the story so people can understand it. It must be told so men and women who never saw a towering bank building or a State fair or a town full of cars or beautiful department stores won't hold it against us for having the things they never saw. It must be told so people who aren't free and who don't make $10 or $15 a day will want to improve their own systems instead of wanting to tear ours down.

We want to sell freedom, with this story, because we know that free people will want peace.

This is a big job of story telling. But it's not too big for people like Parker May of Abilene and Jack McDermott of Lufkin, for Ruth Lewis of Austin and Bess Stephenson of Fort Worth, for Carolyn Ramsey, of Marshall, and Bernice Strong, of Alpine.

BIG JOB OF STORY TELLING

Their job is in radio, newspaper, magazine, book, picture—every available avenue of information. It centers on one word—"truth".

McDermott is a former Lufkin editor and publisher. He used to write beautiful prose about the Lufkin Panthers, toughest football team in the Piney Woods. Now he directs the entire program of news gathering that keeps American press officers and local newspaper editors around the world alert to what is happening here. It is a plan for shipping news and stories about every facet of American life all over the world for publication, for repetition by word of mouth, for speechmaking. It even includes preparation and printing of magazines and other documents for free distribution, setting up libraries of information for people who will take time to hear what the United States is doing.

Working with McDermott is Bess Stephenson. Her bylines in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram were widely known. Today her field is unlimited Americana.

She is chief of a section that produces and directs the production of basic story material about this country—stories about how we do things, how we view things, what our basic policies are. In her ken are science, literature, art, politics, business, industry, labor, agriculture, forestry—the works.

Carolyn Ramsey has a farm home near Marshall. Now she jeeps across the country with a camera. Seven times she's gone across the land, getting pictures to prove what America is. And she is a secret weapon, because the Soviets will let us exhibit pictures of America, even when they jam our broadcasts and ban our printing. So Miss Ramsey's pictures can pierce the iron curtain and her product goes on display in libraries and galleries all over the world.

EACH HAS PART IN PROGRAM

Parker May is executive officer for the whole information program—press, radio, movies. His is the business-office job of trying to figure out where money spent on a certain phase of the American story will do the most good.

Bernice Strong used to be a publicist for Sul Ross College. Now she aims her stories at Latin America, keeping the hemisphere neighbors alert to our doings. Jim Bob Calley did turns on Lubbock and Abilene newspapers. Now she aims her pieces at the Far East, trying hard to tie American interests in those lands to tangible evidence here and abroad.

Charlie Miller of Clyde, Abilene, and El Paso, and Ed Capers of Fort Worth are editors, sorting, selecting, perfecting stories for shipment abroad. Capers works on the wireless bulletin which moves out regularly to American embassies and Foreign Service offices. Local editors in all parts get copies for reproduction, for comment, for information about America.

And in faraway Rangoon, where Uncle Sam looks for friends in Asia, Ruth Lewis, the former Austin American-Statesman drama critic, sees that the bulletin and all other stories of America get to radio stations and native newspapers so they can have the truth. A top-flight operative in American information work since World War II, she will be coming home soon. They have a job for her in New York, writing script for the Voice of America to beam to the Far East.

RADIO INFORMATION SPECIALIST

Also in New York is Vestal Lott, the former Clarendon newspaperman who now is a specialist in radio information for the Voice headquarters, whence stem the 210 hours a week of American words in 33 languages by short wave—to be picked up and rebroadcast.

There are many more Texans out there telling our story—throwing millions of words into the great battle for men's minds.

All you have to do to know their job is big is to listen to or watch Jacob Malik in action. Stalin's UN mouthpiece is the past master of the "upside down" language. His is typical of the tripe that is spread around the world about us. He talks about "Asia for the Asiatics," or "Iran for the Iranians" or "Germany for the Germans." But what he means is Asia for the Russians, Iran for the Kremlin, Germany for the supreme Soviet.

This is the phase of war that surpasses physical combat in planning and precision, and for promise of return. People fear what they do not know. They fear, some of them, the very prosperity and happiness of America. They envy it. They are told ours is the aim of imperialism.

TRYING TO GET TRUTH ACROSS

These Texans and their cohorts are just trying to get the truth across. Russia is spending more and more radio time and more dishonest effort in its propaganda program. We know ours is working because the Soviets are trying to stop it by every means.

We think we have the truth, the faith, the hope of men who want freedom on our side. But we still have some preaching and selling to do.

And in the market place of ideas, these Texans are working for you. They are trying to win friends for your country, trying to sell just one commodity—truth—in daily, direct, throat-cutting competition with the big lie.

Fifty Billion Dollars and No Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people in Wisconsin want to know what became of the $50,000,000,000 that was supposedly spent for national defense. There are no new tanks, no new Navy, no big guns, no 70-group Air Force. Now we are told that only $1 in $7 actually went to buy arms. Most of the money went for salaries, supplies, freight, and for other services. This is nothing less than bungling and inefficiency on a high level. The Democrats cannot escape the responsibility for this situation.

Mr. Speaker, taxpayers in 4 years of cold war, put on the line, $50,000,000,000 for our military defense, a stupendous sum. That is twice the cost of World War I and we never fired a gun. At that price the American public was assured that it was buying security. Yet the war in Korea today shows the United States to be short of almost everything. Now, Mr. Truman wants ten billion more, just for a starter. Bigger and

more staggering sums will be requested after the elections in November. He dares not make additional requests at this time, 6 weeks from the 7th of November.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that high-ranking generals and admirals are asking what became of the $50,000,000,000. They want to know: Where are the guns, the new tanks, the planes that are designed to stop infantry movements, the new weapons that would surely stop any tank? Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense said once, not long ago, that these weapons made tanks useless in time of war. Korea, no doubt, jolted him.

We are informed that one-half of those defense dollars have gone to pay military salaries, all of which have been raised above the prewar level. The other half has gone to pay for services and supplies. This includes pay, travel, telephone, freight, rent, and pensions. Food, fuel, ammunition, clothing, and other items are also included.

I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, only $1 in $7 was spent on arms of any kind. One dollar in sixteen has gone for equipment other than aircraft. Only four billion was invested in aircraft and three billion for all other equipment—guns, ships, trucks, radar, new weapons, machinery, and noncombat equipment, such as furniture, typewriters, and passenger automobiles.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a bird's-eye look at our defense spending for which we received so little in the way of ships, guns, planes, and tanks. This situation should be fully investigated. In the meantime it is quite obvious that our spending for war must be increased if we are to win it. However, the question that confronts the American people is: Can we trust the Democratic administration to do the job?

Contract Between Southwestern Power Administration and Oklahoma Utility Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have a letter from Mr. L. J. Wilhoite, chairman of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, Tenn., and one from Ken G. Whitaker, secretary of the information committee of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association. Both these letters are dated July 20, and are addressed to Hon. Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior. The letters commend Secretary Chapman for his devoted public service. I ask that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRIC POWER BOARD
OF CHATTANOOGA,
July 20, 1950.

Hon. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have very closely followed the negotiations between the Oklahoma private utilities and the Southwestern Power Administration which resulted in signing the contract last week. I have been kept in close touch with the situation through Ken Whitaker of this organization and Sam O'Neal who represents the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association in Washington.

I say to you in all sincerity that I think that you have made a real contribution to the cause of making electricity available to the greatest number of people at rates within their ability to pay. I feel that you have every right to take a very just pride in this accomplishment. I am familiar with some of the difficulties which you were up against and think you ought to be congratulated most heartily.

Sincerely,

L. J. WILHOITE,
Chairman.

TENNESSEE VALLEY PUBLIC
POWER ASSOCIATION,
July 20, 1950.

Hon. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAPMAN: I received a copy yesterday of the contract between Southwestern Power Administration and the two Oklahoma utility companies. While I was generally familiar with this situation, through conversations with you and others in your department, I nevertheless enjoyed very much examining the contract.

I think you did an outstanding job in protecting the interests of the preference customers. Not only did you protect the interests of those municipalities who now own their distribution facilities, but you made it possible for any municipality in the future who decides that this is the proper course to be protected as well. There has been some ambiguity in the Congress on the definition of preference customers and I believe this contract will serve to clarify the situation.

Realizing as I do the extreme difficulties under which you were working, I want to again very heartily congratulate you on the way in which you handled this situation. You made a definite contribution to the cause of making electricity available to the largest number of people possible at the cheapest rates consistent with good business. This, in the opinion of our association, is a real accomplishment.

Sincerely yours,

KEN G. WHITAKER,
Secretary, Information Committee.

Denis Hurley Nominates Hon. Herbert H. Lehman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Denis M. Hurley, Esq., of Brooklyn, N. Y., renominating Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN for the United States Senate at the Democratic State Convention at Rochester, N. Y. Mr. Hurley's address follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, if we have learned nothing else from this great convention, we have once again seen demonstrated the time-honored principle that political success must be founded upon personal sacrifice and upon party unity. We saw this exemplified here, only a few moments ago, when the nomination of Congressman WALTER A. LYNCH for the governorship of the State of New York was made unanimous.

Out of this great convention, I knew that some high honor was eventually bound to come to the Borough of Churches, with its millions of ardent baseball fans, but I did not suspect in what form that honor would come. I take it as a signal tribute to Brooklyn, and to her contribution of the largest Democratic vote in the State of New York, that two of her sons have been chosen to place in nomination the two standard bearers of our party.

Twenty-two years ago, in 1928, I discovered that an outstanding man in the business and financial world was dedicating all his time, his energy, and his talents to stamping out the curse of religious intolerance in this country. The campaign of vilification waged against the Happy Warrior, the unforgettable Alfred E. Smith, of blessed memory, was the signal for the entrance into the political arena of the Gallant Crusader.

For twenty-two years, I have watched the spectacular rise of his star on the political horizon, and, in my judgment, he is still fighting for the same sublime causes.

However, I am not here to nominate a saint with a record of absolute perfection. My candidate is a human being. And so, on occasion, as every American has the right to do, I have disagreed with my candidate's stand on certain public questions. Any statesman, worth his salt, who has the courage to stand up and be counted upon important controversial issues, runs the risk of sharp and violent disagreement with some of the voters. But, disagree with him, as I have at times, I have never once doubted the sincerity of this gallant crusader. I have also had the temerity, once, maybe twice, to disagree with my beloved wife. I soon got over that. But I still love my wife, and I still respect, admire and esteem my candidate. Since charity covers a multitude of sins, then, surely, the spirit of universal charity manifested, through all his years, by this great man, should blot out a few errors of judgment committed without the slightest taint of malice.

It is my proud privilege to nominate one whose name has become synonymous, not only throughout our own State but throughout the Nation and the world, with statesmanship, sincerity, and nobility of purpose, one whose name is as familiar to you as your own—a name that, through the years, has become one of the chief boasts, not only of the Democratic Party but of the people of the State of New York and of the United States of America.

The outstanding record of accomplishment of our candidate for over two decades has already brought him imperishable and lasting fame. Strictly on his merit, and upon the excellence of his performance, he has won a unique place in the historic annals of our generation and certainly has no further need for the honor which we are about to bestow upon him. But like the noble soldier that he is, he will respond when duty calls.

Twenty-two years ago the people of New York State gave him their first vote of confidence as a candidate for State-wide office on a ticket headed by his devoted friend and coworker, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

From 1928 to 1932, during two terms, he served his State well as lieutenant governor, acting as Governor Roosevelt's chief assistant and deputy and as the leader and key member of that illustrious group which served Franklin Roosevelt in his two memorable terms as Governor of New York.

When the American people called Franklin Roosevelt to Washington as President of the United States in 1932, the people of New York, in their great wisdom, turned to the man who had been Roosevelt's right hand and named him as their Governor.

For the next 10 years, through four successive and unprecedented terms, this gallant crusader gave to New York one of the most brilliant administrations in all the history of this State. His very name became a symbol of sound, wise, and progressive government. He carried on as the fearless champion of right and progress, as a fighter for the underdog, and at the same time as a sound and practical business administrator.

A man born in New York City, with roots deep in that metropolis, he nevertheless became, as Governor, a friend and advocate of the farmers, of their interest, and their welfare.

Before entering upon State-wide public service this man of many talents had proved his skill and worth in the world of business and finance. He turned that background to good account by so managing the finances and business affairs of New York State as to leave the State treasury with a huge surplus—a surplus which his successor has found it possible to spend and waste away.

This record of achievement would have seemed more than sufficient honor and glory for any man, but the public interest still clamored for his services. In 1942, with the Nation at war, he was again called to duty in the service of all humanity. He was selected by the unanimous vote of many nations to serve as the first Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In that capacity, he organized and carried through the noblest adventure in humanitarianism in the history of the world, one of the most difficult tasks any man had ever been called upon to perform. But this gallant crusader for every cause that is good, performed it with such skill and brilliance, with such compassion and understanding, that the name of UNRRA remains today synonymous with humanitarianism throughout the earth.

And, then, only last year, when the Democratic Party of this State called him forth from a well-earned retirement to be its candidate in a special election for the high office of United States Senator, he again, like Cincinnatus, bowed to the wishes of his party and of his fellow countrymen and was again elected in a contest too fresh and green in our memories to need recalling.

In his 1 year as United States Senator, he proved again his statesmanship and grasp of large affairs too numerous to mention. In every one of the vital issues that confronted the United States Senate during the past year, he had a leading voice. The cause of liberalism, the cause of progressive legislation, the cause of the poor, the humble, the friendless, and the underprivileged had a new and bold champion in the Senate of the United States. At the same time, the cause of economy in government, of orderly and constructive and appropriate conservatism in government had also found a friend.

And, finally, the cause of totalitarian communism and godless tyranny found in him a fierce and implacable enemy who never lost an opportunity to urge and to demand all-out military preparedness. His voice was often heard in the Senate urging the mobilization of every force, both our own and those of all our friends and allies abroad, for concerted resistance to the black evil of atheistic communism.

In the lexicon of the Democratic Party, the letter "L" stands for leadership and for loyalty, for liberty, and for liberalism; and now it stands for Lynch, our next governor. But, for many, many years, it has stood and it still stands for this great and good man, for this champion of champions, this fighter against tyranny and totalitarianism, this preeminent statesman, this voice of wisdom and courage in our Nation's councils; it stands for this gallant crusader, whom I now give you as I place in nomination for the high office of United States Senator, the name of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

The Katyn Massacre

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in line with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] let me call your attention to the fact that Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet filed a report with the War Department 5 years ago showing that the Russians were the ones who murdered these Poles.

That report disappeared, either in the War Department or in the State Department, and Colonel Van Vliet has now filed a supplemental report showing that the Russians murdered these Polish prisoners.

Yet, during all these years this Government has permitted the carrying on of a persecution of the German people that is far worse than anything we southern people went through at the hands of the carpetbag administration during the dark days of reconstruction.

They have been hanging German soldiers, German doctors, and German civilians, in the name of the United States of America, as late as 5 years after the war closed. This has been done largely by an alien element in order to create, perpetuate, and intensify the ill feeling between the Americans and the German people, and thereby drive the Germans into an alinement with the Communists of Russia in case of war between that country and the United States.

I am not for this United Nations investigating this incident. That is the duty of the Congress of the United States. We should investigate and see what the facts are and stop these useless persecutions of the German people in our name.

At this point I am inserting the supplementary letter which Colonel Van Vliet has filed with the War Department giving the facts in this horrible Katyn massacre. I hope every Member of Congress, and everyone else who scans this RECORD, will take the time to read it carefully.

The letter referred to follows:

FORT LEWIS, WASH., *May 11, 1950.*

Subject: The Katyn case.

F. L. PARKS,

Major General, United States Army,
Chief of Information:

1. Pursuant to your letter of April 26, 1950 (inclosure No. 1), I am personally typing this report of my recollections concerning the Katyn case. I am retaining one carbon copy for my personal file.

2. Since 5 years have elapsed since I made the first report to Major General Bissell this report will have to omit some details, such as names which I have forgotten. In order to assist in locating my original report, here are the circumstances under which it was made:

On May 22, 1945, General Bissell discussed the case with me alone in his private office in the Pentagon for about 20 minutes. He decided that it was important and directed his civilian female assistant (secretary? stenographer?) to go with me to closed room across the hall and take dictation. I dictated my report, she typed it up, and we added the photographs as inclosures. The general read the finished report, directed that it be marked "top secret," and filed. He then dictated the letter directing me to silence, and had me sign a copy of it in his presence. He explained the importance of my remaining silent, gave me my copy of the letter, and thanked me.

3. Narrative: I was a prisoner of war at Oflag IX/AZ in Rotenburg, Germany, in April 1943. It was primarily a British officers prison camp headed by Brigadier Nicholson (who had been the defender of Calais). I was the senior of the 125 (approximately) American officers in the camp. At this time the German press began a big splurge on the Katyn case. So also did the German radio.

(Note: Mention of this radio violates the certificate I had to sign upon being processed as a returned POW.)

Hauptman Heyl, the German camp commander, told Brigadier Nicholson and me that he had orders to send two American officers and one British officer to the railroad station at Kassel, Germany, where they would be met by British Major General Fortune (from another nearby POW camp). He had commanded the British First Division in France.)

Hauptman Heyl stated that I would be one of the two United States officers; that I would select the other one; that together with other Allied prisoners we would be a board of inquiry to investigate the Katyn massacre. I flatly refused to have any part of it. Brigadier Nicholson backed me up on this and together we wrote a letter to the Swiss protecting power which stated that no officers from the camp would make any visit to Katyn or make any investigation, or express any opinion. That if we were forced to go it would be only as individual prisoners under guard and against our protest. That we could not be considered as representatives of the prison camp, our Army, or our Nation, and that we protested violently this apparent attempt to use us for German propaganda purposes.

Our protest did no good. Using armed guards, the Germans took me and Capt. Donald Stewart, F. A. (Regular Army) to the Kassell railroad station, where they expected to meet Major General Fortune. He did not arrive, to the surprise of the German guards. We were then taken to Berlin and jailed in an Arbeits Kommando (sp?)—a building overlooking the Spree River, housing PW's of several nationalities who were performing labor in Berlin.

In this jail we met several United States soldiers who had been brought from a nearby PW camp for the same reason that we

had. One of these (I knew Taussig personally) was a Corporal Taussig, who had been in the same regiment with me for the invasion of Algiers by the One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Infantry. There were also several British soldiers and a British civilian (internee) as well as Lieutenant Colonel Stevenson (British, South African Signal Corps), and a British captain, Medical Corps, whose name I cannot now remember. In my opinion these men were actually what they appeared to be and did not include any "plants." We prisoners of war were very careful in our efforts to make certain identification.

Soon we were taken, one by one, to the jail office, where we were interviewed by several German staff officers and some civilian officials who appeared to be from both the foreign office and the propaganda ministry. The procedure appeared about the same for all of us: "Since you have volunteered to investigate this terrible Katyn atrocity, we are taking you to the scene. You will, of course, sign a parole not to escape."

"The hell we did volunteer. We don't want to go. Send us back to our camps." Great surprise and much chatter among the Germans. Then the same thing over again.

Finally they announced that since we wouldn't give our paroles they would have to place guards on the airplane with us. This meant that some prisoners would not make the trip, to make room for the guards. The American soldiers were left back.

Lieutenant Colonel Stevenson was from the same camp as Captain Stewart and myself. He had come to Berlin with us. We knew him.

Lieutenant Colonel Stevenson was the senior in the group. We cautioned the entire group to do no talking, to give no indications of opinion, and not to cooperate in any way with the Germans. All agreed. It was evident to all of us that we were involved in an international mess with terrific political implications.

An English-speaking German captain was placed in charge of the group together with an English-speaking Sonderfuehrer, who gave the name of Von Johnson, spoke idiomatic American, and said he had attended school at Rice in the United States of America.

We were flown from Templehof to Smolensk about the 6th of May 1948. At that time Smolensk was about 60 miles from the front and appeared to contain only garrison troops. We were billeted in some of the remaining intact buildings, of which there were only a few. Some sort of a German service unit maintained an officers' mess where we all ate. While in Smolensk we were taken on a sightseeing tour by the local service unit commander and a major who appeared to be an agricultural expert and enthusiast who was trying to rehabilitate the land with the remnants of the Russian peasant population. His efforts included a model village. In my opinion this "hospitality" was spontaneous and was prompted partly by his own enthusiasm for his work and partly because he hadn't had many visitors. It didn't appear to be organized on orders from Berlin.

A German lieutenant (spoke no English) appeared from the group that was in charge of operations at the scene of the mass graves in Katyn Forest. He acted as our guide. We were driven to the site where there was a gate, guarded by young soldiers in Polish uniforms. A sickly sweet odor of decaying bodies was everywhere. At the graves it was nearly overpowering. There were several graves. Professor Herr Dr. Butz (Bootz?) a German expert in forensic medicine was present together with other technicians. Several Polish Red Cross workers were present. Civilian labor was being used to remove bodies from the graves. Each body was searched very carefully, examined, identified, and reburied in a nearby mass grave which was to become a national shrine with suitable monuments. The articles removed from each body were placed in a large manila envelope for safekeeping. The search of the bodies was very thorough, including removal of shoes or boots where it was possible. (Sometimes the whole leg from the knee down came off with the boot.) The examiners wore rubber aprons and rubber gloves. A typist was present recording the findings on each body.

We followed our guide right into each of the graves—stepping on bodies that were piled like cordwood, face down usually, to a depth of about five to seven bodies covered with about 5 feet of earth. About 300 bodies were laid out beside one of the graves. These all had their hands tied behind them with cord. The rest appeared not to have been tied. All bodies had a bullet hole in the back of the head near the neck with the exit wound of the bullet being in the forehead or front upper part of the skull.

The graves on the down-hill part of the slope were more moist than the others. One end of one grave had standing water in it. German photographers were present and took both still and motion pictures of our party while we inspected the graves. Copies of the still pictures were later given to us. We never saw or heard anything of the movies.

After we inspected the graves we were shown several other test holes which had been dug in vicinity, together with very old human bones, i. e., no meat left on them, which were said to have been dug up there. I am inclined to believe the story, although there was no proof. The Germans made much of the fact that this wooded knoll was a long-standing burial site used by the Russian secret police. I forget whether they called them the OGPU, NKVD, or MVD. There was a rustic lodge on the low bluff overlooking the small landing on the river (Dnieper River, I believe). This lodge was alleged the scene of frequent tortures, drinking parties, and various other orgies held by the Russian police as matters of amusement and recreation as well as routine business. The Germans produced an old peasant, Russian, who claimed that this forest of Katyn had an evil reputation—it was forbidden ground—that he had seen big closed vans go from the railroad siding (some miles distant) into the forest and that there were stories of shots being heard very often in the woods. This was supposed to confirm that the Russians had brought the victims to the mass graves by rail and truck some time before the Germans occupied the area.

The British medical captain in the group understood German very well and a little Russian which he had learned while taking care of Russian prisoners.

About a mile down the road the Germans had taken over a house as a field museum and office. The porch and front rooms were filled with glass showcases containing items removed from bodies in the graves. There were sample uniform insignia ranging from general to lieutenant, there were several Geneva arm bands, many letters, photographs, diaries, news clippings, personal souvenirs, etc. These items were just the better samples. In the back rooms of the house there were the individual envelopes containing the items removed from the corpses. This building was also permeated with the smell of the graves, coming from the showcases and the envelopes.

At this point the Germans produced two small drinks for everyone and then we returned to our billets in Smolensk.

We were flown back to the same jail in Berlin and stayed there about 10 days. During this time the Germans were apparently trying to decide what to do with us. (The British soldiers and the civilian internee were returned to their respective camps before the end of this 10-day period—or so we were told—leaving us four officers to wonder what it was all about. An English speaking German soldier or Sonderfuhrer Von Johnson would take us for walks through the Tiergarten every day, along with guards. It was during this walk period that we had a chance to talk without fear of microphones. Our discussion while in the jail always avoided any mention of what we thought about who had committed the murders at Katyn.

During these walks, Lieutenant Colonel Stevenson did a lot of talking with the Germans. Told them that he had once published a book and that as soon as he returned home he was going to get permission from his superiors to write a book about this experience. We couldn't get him to shut up about any subject at any time except the big question of "Whodunnit?" He was a windbag. He claimed to be a member of a group of amateur investigators of the supernatural. He even carried a feather in his wallet which he said was from the headdress of the American Indian Chief (spirit) whom he had contacted through a medium in South Africa.

We gathered from the Germans that the front office didn't know what to do with us. There was some hopeful implication that we might be released, possibly through Spain.

One afternoon Lieutenant Colonel Stevenson was bundled off by the Germans on about 10 minutes notice. He seemed very surprised and quite uneasy as he left the jail. We never saw or heard of him again. That night Captain Stewart and I were returned to our original prison camp, where we were met by Hauptman Heyl. We asked him what kind of a story he had told us about going to meet Major General Fortune. He replied that Fortune had been seriously ill with bronchitis.

(I later met Major General Fortune and he had not been sick at all.)

Prior to leaving Berlin we were told that Germany had not and would not make any propaganda use of our visit to the graves or the pictures taken of the visit. I have never heard of their doing so.

Throughout the rest of our time in prison camps Captain Stewart and I refused to discuss our experiences concerning Katyn and never stated what opinion we had formed.

I reached the American lines in the sector of the One Hundred and Fourth Infantry Division near Duben, Germany, at the Mulde River line on May 5, 1945, still carrying the photographs given me at Katyn.

I showed the photographs to G–2 of the One Hundred and Fourth Division. (I had previously showed these to only one other person apart from the German prison camp security personnel who conducted periodic searches, but always allowed me to keep the photographs because they had been stamped "Gepruft." This other person was Col. Thomas D. Drake, senior officer in Oflag 64, who was repatriated for stomach ulcers. Before he left the prison camp to be repatriated Captain Stewart and I talked with him, showed him the pictures and asked that he report the matter to the War Department. He laughed a me and said that I had been taken in completely by the German propaganda experts. I don't know if he ever mentioned the matter when he reached the States.)

G–2 of the One Hundred and Fourth Division recognized that my report was one of interest to both the State and War Departments and provided transportation to Headquarters VII Corps in Leipzig. Gen. J. Lawton Collins then commanded the VII Corps.

General Collins (who has known me since I was a child) discussed the matter with me and set the necessary wheels in motion to get me back to the Pentagon with all haste.

In Paris I stayed with General Barker and at his suggestion discussed the matter with a full colonel (whose name I have forgotten) connected with war-crimes investigations. He decided it was a matter for

the War Department and the State Department and took no action.

Colonel Drake, General Collins, General Bissell, and General Bissell's stenographer are the only persons I have ever told of my conclusions concerning who murdered the Polish officers at Katyn (except, of course, the other members of the party who visited the site with me).

4. Conclusions: I believe that the Russians did it. The rest of the group that visited the site stated to me that they believed that the Russians did it. (Captain, now Major, Donald Stewart, Field Artillery, can be asked to verify this. I don't know his present address. He is in the Regular Army.)

5. Discussion: At the beginning of the newspaper publicity concerning Katyn I believed the whole thing to be one huge, well-managed, desperate lie by the Germans to split the western allies from Russia.

I hated the Germans. I didn't want to believe them. At that time, like many others, I more or less believed that Russia could get along with us.

When I became involved in the visit to Katyn I realized that the Germans would do their best to convince me that Russia was guilty. I made up my mind not to be convinced by what must be a propaganda effort.

The apparent weak spot in the German story was the fact that Germany had occupied the ground around Smolensk for a long time before announcing the discovery of the graves. (The exact dates are a matter of record. I do not have the facilities to look them up for entry in this report.)

I wanted to believe that whole thing was a frame-up. Could these be bodies from an extermination camp, dressed as Polish officers and "planted"?

Could the letters, diaries, identification tags, news clippings—all be forgeries?

What about the state of decomposition of the bodies? Did it appear to agree with the German story of when they must have been buried? After all, I am no expert on body decomposition. What about the temperature, moisture, soil bacteria? What about the German statements that Polish families had been trying to locate their relatives, known to have been imprisoned when Russia occupied part of Poland? Was it true that these Polish relatives ceased to get answers from their imprisoned relatives—that a cloak of mystery descended all at once? Where is proof of who killed these men? Who saw it done?

And so on and so on—I tried every way I knew how to avoid believing that Russia had done it. I tried every way to convince myself that the Germans had done it. I wanted to believe that the Germans had done it.

Since the graves were already opened when we were there, it was not possible to see for ourselves what sort of growth had existed on top of the graves, in order to see how long the graves had existed. And if we had been present, how could we know that the Germans had not cleverly transplanted older bushes to give the appearance of age to the graves?

So you see that we pursued every line of attack to weaken the German story and avoid the conclusion that the Russians had done the killing. It was only with great reluctance that I decided finally that it must be true; that for once the Germans were not lying; that the facts were as claimed by the Germans. I have thought about this a lot in the past 7 years, and freely admit that there never was presented to me any single piece of evidence that could be taken as an absolute proof. But the sum of circumstantial evidence, impressions formed at the time of looking at the graves, what I saw in people's faces—all forces the conclusion that Russia did it.

The uniforms on the bodies were obviously of the best material and tailor made. The footwear appeared to be of the best and included many pairs that were obviously made to order. The uniforms and footwear all were obviously well-fitted. This convinced me that the bodies were truly those of Polish officers. The degree of wear on the clothing and particularly the wear on the shoes led me to believe that these officers had been dead a long time, otherwise the shoes and clothing would show much more wear. This was a point that was not called to our attention by the Germans. It is one of the strongest arguments by which to fix the date of the killing.

6. Last summer I receive some letters from Mr. Montgomery M. Green. I wrote the Department of the Army for instructions on how to reply to Mr. Green. In order to clear my files and possibly to be of assistance to Captain Semple, I am enclosing some papers marked: "Montgomery Green and related papers."

JOHN H. VAN VLIET, Jr.,
Lieutenant Colonel, Twenty-third Infantry.

Mr. Speaker, the war with Germany has been over for more than 5 years. It is high time that we made peace with the people of Germany, whose support we are going to need if those Communists who are plotting the destruction of our civilization should succeed in plunging us into a world conflict.

We were betrayed at Yalta into turning the victory over to Communist Russia, the worst enemy civilization has ever known. The same elements that murdered those Polish prisoners at Katyn, through an organized racial minority, are now attempting to control the world, overthrow the Government of the United States and wreck the civilization of mankind.

It is about time for the American people, and especially the ones in control of our Government, to wake up, clean house, fumigate, and drive from power every individual who even sympathizes with the enemies of our country.

Echoes From the Threatened Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a mimeographed statement which Mr. G. Metzman, president of the New York Central Railroad System, sent to the employees of that system on August 24, and a copy of a reply to the mimeographed statement dated September 1, 1950, which Mr. W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, sent to Mr. Metzman. I think the two documents speak for themselves.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, *August 24, 1950.*

To All New York Central System Employees:

Again there has come a threat of a paralyzing national railroad strike. It was called by leaders of the Trainmen's and Conductors' Brotherhoods at the very moment when many of our loved ones are sparing no sacrifices in Korea and need every ounce of military production and other home-front backing that can be given them. It was called within an hour after assurances were given the President of the United States that there would be no strike.

A fact-finding board appointed by President Truman heard all the issues and made its report in June. This board was composed of men of national reputation known for their understanding of the problems of those who work in the ranks. The railroad management, whether they have agreed with board findings or not, regularly have felt that public opinion requires their acceptance. As usual, therefore, the managements accepted the report. But the union leaders, as has happened so frequently, rejected the report.

The management representatives, in their efforts to obtain a peaceful settlement, agreed just a few days ago to do even more than the fact-finding board proposed. At the request of President Truman's personal representative the managements agreed, as a part of a proposed 3-year peace settlement, to accept the board report plus granting an additional 5-cent-an-hour wage increase, plus automatic cost-of-living increases based on the rise in the cost-of-living index. This would have meant a total raise of 23 cents an hour for yard service employees; 5 cents an hour, instead of no increase, for road service employees; and, of course, security against price increases which add to the cost of living. But the brotherhood leaders rejected this also.

Under these circumstances it is shocking even to threaten a Nation-wide railroad strike in such a period of national emergency. Like anything else the right to strike can be abused. History shows that abuse of power inevitably leads the public and its legislative representatives to conclude that such abuses must be stopped—by law, if necessary. In the interest of everyone—the unions themselves, if they wish to retain the right to strike, all railroad employees, the American public, and the members of our Armed Forces—the leaders of the Trainmen's and Conductors' Brotherhoods should be brought to their senses before they inflict irreparable harm.

G. METZMAN,
President.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Cleveland, Ohio, September 1, 1950.

Mr. GUSTAV METZMAN,
President, New York Central System, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. METZMAN: Numerous copies of your unwarranted circular of August 25, 1950, addressed to New York Central System employees, have been forwarded to me by our general chairmen and other members on your railroad.

We are disturbed and surprised that one holding the high position of president of the New York Central System did not determine the facts before issuing such a deceptive, vicious circular.

As you well know, President R. O. Hughes of the Order of Railway Conductors and I sent the following telegram to President Truman under date of August 25:

"We wish to personally advise you that at the concluding conference presided over by Dr. Steelman, in the east wing of the White House from 3 to 4 p. m., Wednesday, August 23, 1950, no mention whatsoever was made regarding the calling of any Nation-wide strike, and therefore any statement to the effect that we had broken our pledge is 100 percent false. Respectfully."

It occurs to me that, if, instead of injecting yourself into this controversy at this belated date by posting propaganda on your bulletin boards, you and one or more of the

presidents of the principal railroads had long ago come forward to cooperate with the President of the United States and with his mediator, Dr. John R. Steelman, in an attempt to effect a just and peaceful settlement of this 17-months-old controversy, affecting the welfare of your employees, such action might have proved to be more constructive and more effective.

In the second paragraph of your circular you create the impression with your employees that a recommendation of an emergency board is final and binding. As you well know, this is contrary to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. Then you go on to convey the impression to your employees that all recommendations of all emergency boards have been acceptea by railroad management. This also you know to be untrue. Daniel P. Loomis, representing the American railroads, testified before the Donnell committee, in an attempt to impose compulsory arbitration upon all railroad labor, testified that on at least three occasions railroad management had refused to abide by the recommendations of Presidential emergency boards.

Nor did you tell your employees that you, as president of the New York Central System, had personally appeared before the Donnell committee, recommending the enactment of the Donnell compulsory arbitration bill, while at no time did you show the slightest interest in effecting a just settlement in the current controversy, which eventually led to the possession of all American railroads by the United States Government, in keeping with the recommendation which the brotherhoods made to the President of the United States as of August 4.

Nor did you advise your employees that on numerous occasions dozens of American railroads, including the New York Central, had refused to apply decisions of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, which decisions are final and binding, as you well know, under the Railway Labor Act.

In these instances the brotherhoods were required to employ economic strength against the railroads involved to induce the railroads to apply the decisions of the National Railroad Adjustment Board.

Reference to the patriotism of railroad workers is wholly uncalled for, entirely out of order, and certainly unbecoming. As you well know, the history of World War I and World War II fails to reveal that the Unknown Soldier was a railroad president or that any railroad president offered his life in combat. On the other hand, the history of these two wars does record that many loyal members of the brotherhoods fought and died for their country, while, in this country and abroad, hundreds of thousands rendered service, which the railroads reluctantly admitted was magnificent.

No need for you to wrap yourself in the American flag and close your eyes to the fact that members of the brotherhoods are now fighting in Korea, while we at home in their interest are fighting to preserve those things for which they stand.

Why don't you tell your employees that, in an attempt to force upon the brotherhoods the unjust and unfair and unacceptable findings of Emergency Board No. 81, you attempted to bait us into the acceptance of the same by offering an additional 5 cents per hour with the understanding that all wage and rules requests would be frozen for a period of 27 months, save for a cost-of-living adjustment.

For your information I attach a release which went forward to the newspapers August 21 over the signature of the presidents of the two brotherhoods involved in the current controversy. To be very fair to you and to the presidents of the other American railroads, I will be delighted to publish in the Trainman News your honest answers to the questions which we raise in this release.

Interested as you must be in the promotion and development of harmonious labor-management relations throughout the New York Central System, without which prosperity and profit cannot accrue, I am at a loss to understand how, in justice to your shareholders and to the bankers who hold the working control of your railroad, you went out of your way as a propagandist to promote discord and dissatisfaction among your employees, and then stooped low in an attempt to dislodge the affection and regard which they have for the brotherhoods of which they are a living, vital, and militant part.

Do you not know such tactics belong to the ages and inevitably boomerang?

Very truly yours,

W. P. KENNEDY,
President.

Site for Atomic Bomb Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted, I am extending my remarks to include a letter from the Honorable Frank Annunzio, the able and distinguished director of the Department of Labor of the State of Illinois, in which he convincingly presents the advantage to the Nation of locating in the extreme southern part of Illinois the proposed new plant for the manufacture of hydrogen bombs. I commend to my colleagues, as well as to the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, a careful reading of the thoughtful presentment of Mr. Annunzio of the advantages of this site in southern Illinois. The letter follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Chicago, September 11, 1950.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: A recent announcement that the Atomic Energy Commission was seeking a suitable plant site inside the United States for the manufacture of hydrogen bombs is of particular interest to me at the present time in view of the desirability for locating such project in Illinois, especially the extreme southern part of Illinois, more commonly known as Little Egypt.

The desirability of a Little Egypt location, first, is warranted because of geographical advantages. The area is conveniently situated with respect to rail and water transportation being served by several of the major railroad systems and located close to both the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. The need for about 300 square miles of uninhabited land can be met readily without any appreciable displacement of residents. Much of this land is Government-owned which would simplify the acquisition process. It should be noted that during the war, one of the major ordnance plants was built and operated at Crab Orchard Lake and practically all of these buildings are now unoccupied and are immediately available. Another location which has been broached is Metropolis, located at the Ohio River in Massac County.

However, the most important reason for locating the plant in southern Illinois is the abundant supply of manpower. In the six county Crab Orchard labor market area [1] alone, there were 9,750 unemployed as of mid-July 1950 or 16.2 percent of the area labor force. The economic plight of these jobless is substantiated by various indicators such as unemployment, general assistance, old-age pensions and aid to dependent children. Month after month, the Crab Orchard area and the Cairo area [2] lead all other areas in the State in these fields of economic distress. Many of these workers are forced to uproot their families and travel to other areas in order to obtain employment. The shortage of employment opportunities has dulled much of the incentive among the workers of this area to be self-supporting and has forced many of these people to rely upon relief measures. The more ambitious and better talented adults frequently migrate elsewhere and thus deprive the area of much of its potential leadership material. Further, the low income is reflected in substandard purchasing power and this in turn adversely affects local trade.

In the light of the above, I urge you most strongly to give your most capable support to bring the hydrogen-bomb project to southern Illinois. If I can be of any assistance to you in advancing the effort, please call upon me.

Sincerely,

FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Director.

Relief of First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.

REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, when it became the time for Members of the House who wished to speak in support of the rule and on the justice of the bill S. 784, the time allotted to the supporters of the bill under House Resolution 818 was taken up on out-of-order discussions between Members on other subject matters, wholly foreign to this bill.

For this reason I wish to extend my following statement so that Members of the House may become familiar with the facts in this case.

One of the primary arguments advanced by those who oppose S. 784 is that the issues involved in the bill are res judicata by reasons of alleged actions by the Court of Claims in November 1935 and May 1946. In other words, it is argued that because the Court of Claims considered the merits of the case and reported basic facts in favor of the companies, but pronounced a res judicata status as an applicable theory and thereon ruled against the three companies—or Mr. H. O. Schundler, the real party in interest—such issues have been finally and legally disposed of and should not be reopened by the legislative branch of the Government.

[1] Consists of Franklin, Jackson, Johnson, Perry, Union, and Williamson Counties.

[2] Consists of Alexander and Pulaski Counties.

Res judicata is a highly technical legal defense inherited from the common law. The facts do not support this argument, furthermore, the Government of the United States should not employ or attempt to employ such a technical, legalistic shield when the facts demonstrate that the Government is in possession of $384,256.26 which the Fleet Corporation wholly owned by the Government, but now inherited by the Government, secured from the companies of Mr. Schundler and, in return for which sum, no consideration has passed from the Fleet Corporation or the Government to Mr. Schundler.

The res judicata argument has been discarded by the Department of Justice, the final authority in the executive branch of the Government on legal matters, following a meticulous review of all the facts. That argument has likewise been discarded by all other groups and individuals who have seriously studied the facts. The res judicata argument is still insisted upon by spokesmen for one agency of the executive branch, i. e., the recently discontinued United States Maritime Commission.

For 15 years the Maritime Commission has insisted that the Court of Claims' action in dismissing the early cases in November 1935 rendered the issues res judicata. It is unnecessary to recite the circumstances which led up to the Court's action in 1935 because it is clearly apparent, from even a casual glance at the record of the early cases, that the dismissal was not based upon a consideration of the merits of the cases. Those cases were dismissed at the voluntary request of Mr. Schundler, and took status of nonsuits.

The Maritime Commission's contention that the report and action of the Court of Claims in May 1946 rendered the issues res judicata is null and invalid, and it collapses when analysis of the limits of the court's jurisdiction is made and when the intent of Congress and its legislative prerogative is realized and affirmed.

The case decided May 6, 1946, titled "The First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos. against The United States," identified by the Court of Claims as Congressional Case No. 17764, resulted from a Senate Resolution, No. 327, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, passed November 19, 1940.

This resolution referred a bill for Mr. Schundler's relief, then pending, to the court with instructions to consider the bill in accordance with section 151 of the Judicial Code—now section 1492, title 28, United States Code—the section which then authorized the court to investigate and determine the facts concerning pending legislation at the request of either House of Congress—and requested the court to—

> Report specifically to the Senate—
>
> (1) Whether there were any sales of or valid contracts to sell the subject vessels to said companies, and whether the companies breached any contracts, and thereby damaged the United States Shipping Board to the extent of $384,256.26, or any part thereof; and
>
> (2) whether the payment to said companies on October 7, 1935, was a payment of all of the moneys due and owing said companies on account of the claims of said companies existing on December 31, 1925, notwithstanding any statute of limitations, laches, any release, settlement, accord and satisfaction, or prior adjudication.

The Senate obviously wanted the Court of Claims to investigate the claim fully and, after reviewing all the evidence, to determine whether in fact and in reality the Government had been damaged by Mr. Schundler, and whether in fact and in reality the Government still retained moneys belonging to Mr. Schundler. The court was specifically instructed to disregard the technical legal defenses of res judicata and accord and satisfaction. The court was not asked to enter a judgment, but only to aid the Senate by making two specific factual determinations.

However, the general jurisdictional statute under which the court then dealt and deals with congressional reference cases—section 151, Judicial Code—contains this proviso:

> *Provided, however,* That if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court upon the facts established, that under existing laws or the provisions of this chapter, the subject matter of the bill is such that it has jurisdiction to render judgment or decree thereon, it shall proceed to do so, giving to either party such further opportunity for hearing as in its judgment justice shall require, and it shall report its proceedings therein to the House of Congress by which the same was referred to said court.

In other words the court has authority to enter judgment in congressional reference cases, even though the resolution referring the case does not request the court to do so, provided the language of the proposed bill shows that the subject matter, or the issue which would be resolved by the proposed bill, falls within the general statutory jurisdiction of the Court of Claims. The pertinent part of the statute fixing the court's general jurisdiction (sec. 145, Judicial Code) reads as follows:

> The Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the following matters:
>
> All claims * * * founded upon * * * any contract, express or implied, with the Government of the United States.

Employing the two statutes quoted, and disregarding the absence of any desire on the part of the Senate to have a judgment entered, and further disregarding the clear intent of the Senate that Congress would make the final decision on the merits of the claim (without hiding behind technical defenses), the court decided that the subject matter of the proposed bill was within the court's general jurisdiction and attempted to enter a judgment against Mr. Schundler based on a complete disregard of the rebutted evidence adduced in the court, and in reality obviously based on res judicata and accord and satisfaction.

Thus the court, ignoring the intent of the Senate, and employing the technical defenses the Senate had specifically instructed it not to employ, took the matter out of the hands of Congress and attempted to take on jurisdiction.

However, this attempt of the court and its decision of 1946 did not and could not render Mr. Schundler's claim res judicata because the Court of Claims did not have jurisdiction to enter or attempt to enter a judgment.

The court's jurisdiction was limited to determining the two questions posed by the Senate. When the court went beyond that special jurisdiction, and attempted to take on jurisdiction not granted to it, its actions became void and of no effect.

In ruling and attempting to justify that the subject matter of the bill for Mr. Schundler's relief was within its general statutory jurisdiction, the court said:

> The subject matter of this suit is one over which this court has jurisdiction, damages being laid for breach of contract with the defendant, represented by the United States Shipping Board.

In other words, the court was endeavoring to bring the subject matter of the proposed bill within its general jurisdiction by saying that Mr. Schundler was seeking damages for the Fleet Corporation's having breached a contract.

Without pausing to belabor the fact that in the same opinion the court had firmly stated there were no contracts, that a contract "cannot be erected out of mere negotiations," it was clear from the wording of the proposed bill which the Senate had referred to the court that Mr. Schundler was not seeking damages for breach of contract. That bill, S. 4420, would have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to pay $384,256.26 with interest to the First, Second and Third National Steamship Cos. as a "refund" of the remainder of "certain sums deposited by or on behalf of those companies in the year 1920."

The bill did not propose to pay $384,256.26 as "damages" for breach of contract. "Refund" means "return a fund." The subject matter of the bill, therefore, was not damages for breach of contract, but the return of a fund wrongfully retained.

The Court of Claims had no authority to render judgment on the subject matter of the bill because that subject matter was not a breach of contract but a tort, specifically a conversion:

> Conversion is a tort, a wrongful act, which in the nature of things cannot spring from the exercise of a legal right. The law of conversion, it has been said, is concerned with possession, not title, conversion being an offense against possession of property. It may either be direct or constructive, and may be proved directly or by inference. The essence of conversion is not acquisition of property by the wrongdoer, but a wrongful deprivation of it to the owner, although a temporary deprivation will be sufficient; and in consequence it is of no importance what subsequent application was made of the converted property, or that defendant derived no benefit from his act. To constitute a conversion there must be either some repudiation of the owner's right, or some exercise of dominion over it inconsistent with such right, or some act done which has the effect of destroying or changing its character, or, as otherwise expressed, there must be a wrongful taking or a wrongful detention, or an illegal assumption of ownership, or an illegal user or misuser. (Corpus Juris, vol. 65, pp. 12 and 13.)

The Court of Claims has no jurisdiction over cases involving torts (see annotations at notes 162–167 following sec. 145, Judicial Code), hence the court had

no jurisdiction to render or attempt to render a judgment in this case. Its jurisdiction was strictly limited to the questions posed in the reference resolution.

A judgment rendered by a court having no jurisdiction is a mere nullity, and will be so held and treated whenever and for whatever purpose it is sought to be used or relied on as a valid judgment. (Corpus Juris Secondum, vol. 49, p. 45.)

It is conceivable that the Maritime Commission might argue that the court had jurisdiction, and that the 1946 judgment is res judicata, on the ground that since the fund was held in trust, either express or constructive, a quasi-contract existed, and the existence of such a contract brought the subject matter of the bill within the court's general jurisdictional statute. But quasi-contracts are not implied from the facts in any given situation. Such contracts are implied by law for the purpose of preventing unjust enrichment. The implied contracts over which the Court of Claims has statutory jurisdiction has long been interpreted as not including contracts implied in law, but only contracts implied in fact. Hence the existence of a quasi-contract did not give the court jurisdiction.

Implied contract of which the Court of Claims takes jurisdiction must be one implied in fact, not merely implied by law (Corpus Juris Secondum, vol. 36, pp. 583 and 584).

There is yet another reason why the Court of Claims had no jurisdiction to go beyond the reference resolution and attempt to enter judgment in the 1946 case. In a long line of cases the Supreme Court and the Court of Claims itself have repeatedly held that the latter court has no jurisdiction where the Government claims title to property and denies the title or ownership of the individual seeking return of the property.

The Court of Claims has no jurisdiction to award damages for a mere consequence of lawful governmental action which does not constitute a contractual breach or a taking of private property for public use. Under this provision of the jurisdictional act the Court of Claims has jurisdiction of a claim for private property taken for public use, but, since no contract can be in fact implied therefrom, the court has no jurisdiction of a claim for private property taken for public use under a claim of right by the Government (Corpus Juris Secondum, vol. 36, p. 584; and see annotations at notes 139–140 following sec. 145, Judicial Code).

For these reasons then the Court of Claims had no jurisdiction to enter any 1946 judgment, its attempt to do so is a nullity, and the attempted judgment does not render Mr. Schundler's claim res judicata. First, the subject matter of the bill was not damages for breach of contract, therefore was not within the Court's general jurisdiction; second, the Court has no jurisdiction in cases where the Government asserts title to funds and denies claimant's title.

Neither the 1935 case nor the 1946 case warrants the Maritime Commission's assertion that the subject matter is res judicata. But, as stated above, even if the Court of Claims had jurisdiction, which it did not have, and had decided the case on the merits which it did not do, if it is shown that in actuality the Government now has a large sum of money, to wit $385,256.26, which it obtained from a citizen, without giving that citizen anything in return, it would not be in keeping with our antiauthoritarian form of political organization for that Government to cloak itself in the technical fiction of res judicata.

The undisputable fact remains that the Court replied to the questions it was asked by the Senate. Reference that it found as a fact from unrebutted evidence that the companies breached no contracts and that the companies did not damage the Government to the extent of $384,256.26 or any part thereof and these fact findings and the Court's report thereof were within the province of the Court and its prerogatives or jurisdiction did not go further.

S. 784 provides for the return of the aforesaid sum to the companies.

The Fifteenth Anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Charles Baker, a very distinguished citizen of the State of Washington, at Walla Walla, Wash., on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approximately 15 years have elapsed since the Rural Electrification program was created by Executive order and supplemented the following year by the Rural Electrification Act passed by the Congress of the United States. During these 15 years just passed, amazing progress—as you are all aware—has been made through the medium of this act in bringing electric service to the farms of America. Two billion one hundred and forty-one million dollars in loans have been approved by the REA to REA cooperatives throughout the United States. Almost 1,200,000 miles of lines, it is estimated, have been built, or are under construction, which will serve 3,600,000 farmer-customers. Of this number, 2,167,000 farms are served by REA cooperatives and presently 47 percent of all farms that enjoy electric service are supplied by REA cooperatives.

Probably no act of Congress has been of greater importance in enabling the farms of this country to keep pace with industrial development than the Rural Electrification Act. Electricity on the farms of America today is a must in this highly specialized and mechanical age. Power for irrigation, power for equipment, power for household uses, all are vitally essential to helping the American farmer keep pace in our industrial economy. And had it not been for our REA cooperatives and their rapid program of expansion, hundreds of thousands of farms would still be working in the dark and denied electric service. Not only would those farmers now served by REA's be without this service, but hundreds of thousands of other farmers presently served by private power utilities would doubtless, also, be without service—for you and I well remember the extreme difficulty farmers experienced prior to the REA Act in securing service from our so-called business-managed private utilities. It has been the threat of competition from the REA's that has brought the lines of the private utiliies into many rural areas where previously they had refused service.

LEGAL INEQUITIES

I think it might be wise for a moment to review some of the obstacles through which we have had to go during the past 15 years in extending and developing the program. In the first place, restrictions were put into the law to make it impossible for REA cooperatives to serve any customer of a private utility. However, nothing was done to prevent private utilities from moving in once an REA cooperative was projected and taking the heart of the territory to be served and thus make it much more difficult for the REA to have an economical operation. Throughout the past 15 years constant pressure has been brought by the private utilities to harass and to place obstacles in the way of our REA cooperatives. Now, as we look to the future, there is every indication they are launching all-out warfare. I shall have more to say about this problem later, but now we are not so much concerned with the past as we are with the future—our plans and problems, and how best to succeed.

FOUR MAJOR PROBLEMS

It seems to me there are four major points on which our REA's could well concentrate, as we look ahead in the next 10 years.

1. Number one should be to seek to bring rural electric service to every farm in America, insofar as practical, by 1960. Certainly, if the sparsely settled rural areas are to be served, it must, and will, come only through our REA cooperatives. And, in this program of extending service to all farmers, it seems to me serious consideration should be given in planning this program to see that it is carried through in the most economical manner possible. For instance, here in the Pacific Northwest, too often we have seen an area organize and secure an REA allotment of funds, following which Bonneville Power Administration has gone to great expense to build transmission lines into the territory and to give substation service. Frequently, the over-all planning has not included all the farms in the area, which could be advantageously served by this substation, and later on other groups of farmers in the immediate area unable to secure service from the existing REA cooperatives have had to make application to Bonneville for another substation and another line to serve the area. This not only results in higher costs to Bonneville, but it also tends to raise distribution costs for all the farmers in such an area. Sound planning, as we look to the future, having in mind the maximum area that can be served advantageously from one substation, would seem to be basic if we are to obtain maximum benefits in low-cost distribution.

2. The second point which it seems could well receive major consideration, as we look ahead, based on our experience in the past, is that of building our lines with adequate capacity to take care of the great growth in use of electric power which has resulted in almost every instance when the REA has brought service to a rural community. Many REA's in a few short years have found their original construction utterly inadequate to carry the loan which has rapidly developed. Undoubtedly our experience in the past in this connection will result in much less difficulty in the years ahead as new lines are projected.

3. The third point which I think is quite important and one which should not be overlooked is to remove the legal obstacle which the private power utilities have established which prevents REA cooperatives from taking on farm customers now served by the private utilities. I know of no legitimate reason under the free competitive system of America why the private power utilities should have a legal fence built around their customers, thus giving them a complete monopoly, while REA cooperatives are forced to set out in the open and compete with the private utilities to protect their own members. It certainly is un-American and unfair competition and it ought to be removed at once. Let the private power utilities who spend so much of the rate payers' money crying about free enterprise operate on a street that runs both ways, instead of just their way.

Presently, you are serving customers at the rate of from one to not more than three to the mile, generally, on a highly competitive cost price with that of the so-called business-managed private power which serves great congested areas. Were the legal restriction just referred to removed so that you could take rural customers in the areas served by you and presently served by competition, you could greatly increase your load and reduce your unit cost of operation. Speaking from my own personal viewpoint, I have been served by the Pacific Power & Light Co. for many years on my farm. I use quantities of electric power for irrigation pumping. I pay an exorbitant price for this power. I could buy it much more cheaply, were it possible to get service from the REA cooperative in my area. But the law prevents this. I know there must be countless thousands of other farmers who are in the same predicament. Ladies and gentlemen, let's restore honest-to-God competition in the electric power field as it exists in other types of free private enterprise in this country. Let's remove the one-way streets which can only be traveled by the private utilities.

4. The fourth point, and in my opinion the most important, is speedy development to the maximum of the power resources of the Columbia and Snake Rivers. This is a program of great magnitude, and one of basic importance not only to every citizen living in this area but essential to the safety of our entire Nation. The building of great multiple-purpose dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers embracing navigation, flood control, irrigation, and power development, is probably the greatest peacetime project, in the history of mankind. Its effect upon the economic development of this area, when completed, is staggering. It is estimated that some 30,000,000 kilowatts of the cheapest hydroelectric power in the world will be developed when all the dams projected for this great river system are completed. In terms of economic value, it has been estimated that every kilowatt of power adds $2,500 to the economic resources of an area. If this be true, then 30,000,000 kilowatts means $75,000,000,000 added to the economic resources of the Pacific Northwest and to the strength of this Nation. The great quantity of cheap hydroelectric power developed means new industries, many of them vital to our national defense. It means great increases in population, and this great growth in population means markets at home for a far greater percentage of the farm products that you and I grow on our farms, rather than having to ship them 2,000 and 3,000 miles to markets which in the last 4 years have been pushed some 1,500 miles farther away by a 63-percent increase in railroad freight rates. And, of particular importance to us, it means a long time and continuous source of low-cost electric power for the REA cooperatives, PUD's and municipalities in this area, providing we protect and preserve the present law under which the Bonneville Power Administration now functions.

FISH—POWER SABOTAGE

I am sure I don't need to tell you of the great obstacles that have been put in the way of this great river development program since its early inception some 15 years ago. The railroads, the fish interests, and the private power utilities—particularly the latter two—have left no stone unturned to sabotage the building of these dams. Even within the last 2 years a combination of the private power utilities and the fish interests have made a bitter—and so far successful—fight to prevent the appropriation of funds to start the building of Ice Harbor Dam. Ice Harbor Dam, as you know, is the first of a series of four dams on the Snake River between Pasco, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho, which, when completed, will make a navigable waterway to Lewiston, and will add more than 1,000,000 kilowatts of power to the Northwest. We are still battling for funds to start the construction of this dam. It is a strategic dam from the standpoint of the over-all development on the Columbia and Snake Rivers. I know some of you perhaps think of it only in terms of local distribution in the area tributary to Ice Harbor. But, let me point out to you, most earnestly, that such is not the case. Ice Harbor power is just as vital to the Eugene area, or the Portland area, or any other section of the Northwest, as it is to the immediate territory surrounding the dam itself. If this power is not made available, then other power will have to be taken from McNary Dam to supplement local needs and make just that much less power available for Portland and the areas in southwestern Oregon.

The building of these dams on the Columbia and Snake River is a regional program—not a State program, and should be considered as such at all times. We should constantly think of it in terms of an over-all program of development of the Northwest that will give us—in the final analysis—flood control, full navigation benefits, complete reclamation development, and the maximum capacity of hydroelectric power. When completed, the power developed on these streams will be the single greatest resource in the Pacific Northwest—one which we will never deplete so long as the snows and rains fall in the headwaters of the mighty Columbia and Snake Rivers.

NATIONAL DEFENSE THREATENED

We need to push this program as rapidly and as aggressively as possible, not only for the economic welfare of the people of the region, but from the standpoint of national defense. Today we are living in a perilous age. Tomorrow all-out war may confront us. If it does we will find ourselves short—if the same demands are made upon the power resources of the Northwest as in World War II—by more than 200,000 kilowatts of power. Not only should we make a continuous and concerted effort to bring about a rapid development of the multiple-purpose dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers, but we also have a keen interest in seeing that this great program of development is coordinated—it seems to me—in order to get maximum efficiency. We should have a keen interest in seeing that transmission lines make available this power to industries and to REA cooperatives in all sections of our Northwest under the policy that has existed since the passage of the Bonneville Act.

PHOSPHATE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY

Here is one example of what the extension of Bonneville transmission lines, carrying low-cost power to the southeastern Idaho area, means to the farmers of the western half of the United States. In southeastern Idaho, in the Montpelier and Soda Springs area, lie phosphate rock deposits representing some 65 to 70 percent of the total phosphate rock available in America. Deposits in Tennessee are depleted and, as we look to the future, the phosphate rock to supply the phosphate fertilizer needs of America must come either from Florida or from south Idaho.

Commercial fertilizer has become an increasingly important item in our farmers' cost of production, during the past 10 years, and particularly here in the Pacific Northwest where consumption during this time has increased some 700 percent. Undoubtedly, a great expansion in the use of commercial fertilizer will continue in this territory. Because of high transportation costs we cannot afford to bring phosphate rock from the deposits of Florida to the Pacific Northwest when we have these great deposits in our own front yard.

As you probably know, there are two methods by which phosphate rock can be processed successfully to make phosphate fertilizer. One is by the use of sulphuric acid. The other, by the use of an electric furnace. Approximately 60 percent of the phosphate rock of south Idaho is of too low a quality to be successfully processed by the sulphuric acid method, but can be processed very successfully in an electric furnace. Furthermore, the cost of sulphuric acid in the Pocatello area is extremely high. By the time the sulphur is shipped in there, and converted into sulphuric acid, or if purchased from other sources, the total cost will approximate $18 to $24 per ton. Were Bonneville power made available to the area, at 2½ mills, it would be equivalent to $8 sulphuric acid. Not only would low cost power greatly reduce the cost of producing treble superphosphate for the farmers, but it would also be more practical because all of the phosphate rock mined could be utilized in an electric furnace, whereas by the sulphuric acid method at least 60 percent would have to be discarded. A number of our large farm cooperatives have already secured very valuable deposits of phosphate rock in the Soda Springs area of Idaho, running into millions of tons, and studies made for us by competent men indicate that if low cost power from the great dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers can be brought to south Idaho, we can produce treble superphosphate for the farmers of the western half of the United States at a very substantial reduction in cost over any method presently used. This is a major program of development in the interest of our farm people as we look to the future—and strange as it may seem, one bitterly opposed by the Idaho Power Co., which is fighting to the maximum of its capacity to prevent the building of these dams and any extension of Bonneville transmission lines into the south Idaho area which they now serve.

BUS-BARS AND "SOCIALISM"

I don't need to remind you that the private power utilities are vitally opposed to present provisions of the Bonneville Act. They would like to change it so that they could buy the power at the bus-bar and then capitalize on it and force you and other customers to buy from them on their own terms.

One of the steps by which the private power utilities hope to pave the way for this objective is being pounded out now by their great propaganda machines financed by the money paid by the rate payers whom they serve. They are attempting through national magazine articles and advertising and radio programs to convince the people of America that REA cooperatives, PUD's, and municipalities are "socialistic"—that ownership of electric systems by the people themselves is "socialistic"—and that both public and private individuals who support these programs—are "Socialists." That is what the propaganda machines of the private power companies would have you believe.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. The truest types of democracy in America are our cooperative institutions which are

merely legal instruments used by the farmers—if you please—and many other types of private business to get better service for themselves and to make more profit for themselves—certainly the two outstanding objectives in our capitalistic system.

TEN-YEAR OBJECTIVE

And, so, as we look ahead in the next 10 years—let's set up as our objective to bring to every farm in America, and particularly in the Pacific Northwest—electric service.

Let's plan our program so that the lines we build today will not be obsolete tomorrow due to inadequate capacity.

Let's plan to serve each area in the most practical and efficient manner.

Let's remove the legal obstacles which now give a one-way street to the power monopolies.

Let's get back to the true, competitive American basis again where we can serve any farmer if he so desires, adjacent to REA lines, regardless of whether he is presently being served by a private power utility.

And, finally, let's not forget that our future source of power for our REA cooperatives all over the Pacific Northwest in adequate quantities as well as our own economic interests lie in pushing aggressively for a rapid expansion of the great system of multiple-purpose dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers in a coordinated manner, and the preservation of the basic principles of the Bonneville Act which means the building of transmission lines to all areas of the Northwest and maintaining for public agencies, including REA cooperatives, first call for the power needed by their customers. The fight ahead will be hard and bitter, I am sure, but we are equal to the task.

That Spanish Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of September 8, 1950:

THAT SPANISH LOAN

President Truman has indicated that he won't make the $62,500,000 loan to Spain which Congress authorized in the omnibus appropriation bill he just signed.

However, he left the door slightly ajar, suggesting that he may give the subject further study, as he should.

We need Spain's help if we mean to defend Europe against an armed Communist attack. Spain needs our help to become an effective ally. The question isn't one of religion, ideology, or personalities. It's a practical arrangement, dictated by a mutual desire for security and survival.

The Pyrenees make Spain the best protected beachhead in western Europe. This mountain chain, separating Spain from France, extends 240 miles from the Bay of Biscay to the Mediterranean. The only low passes are at its ends, where the main highways and railroads run between the two countries. Only five passes in the mountains themselves are practicable for unobstructed motorized traffic. A barrier as easily defended would be mighty welcome to our forces in Korea just now.

Spain also has the largest army in western Europe—an army which, properly equipped, could well defend its own boundaries. But it has almost no modern arms. And it needs money to build a modern road system, which could be vitally useful if Allied air bases are established in Spain for European defense.

The problem can't be shelved indefinitely. Providing new equipment for the Spanish Army and training troops to use it would take time. Paved roads and airfields suitable for heavy bombers can't be built in a day.

Our military leaders long have advocated including Spain in the North Atlantic security program. Their views have been suppressed by the State Department on the lame excuse that certain elements in Europe—meaning the left wing of the British Labor Party and the French Socialists—might not like it.

These same elements have been dragging their feet on the whole preparedness program, including their own countries' part. If they are to be permitted to override the views of our best-informed military men, we might as well withdraw to our own side of the Atlantic and stop wasting money on efforts to help people who won't help themselves.

Stockholm Peace Petition Failing Throughout the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy of Mr. Victor Lasky of the New York World-Telegram I have received an article from the New Palestine issue of September by Mr. Mark M. Krug, entitled "Reading the Israel Press." The headline is "The Stockholm peace petition in Israel." The news report is as follows:

The Israel Communist Party and the left-wing Mapam Labor Party have been busy for some time now collecting signatures for the so-called Stockholm peace petition, which asks for the outlawing of the use of the atomic bomb. As it is now well known, the attempt to obtain signatures on this petition is being made throughout the world on orders from the Cominform and the propaganda strategists of the Soviet Union.

But the Communist and the Mapam leaders are meeting with little success in Israel and have so far collected an insignificant number of signatures because of the united opposition of all other political parties and particularly of the Mapai, the powerful Socialist Labor Party. The whole question of whether the so-called peace petition should be signed or not has become a subject of bitter controversy in the Israel press. In this controversy, the official organs of the Communist Party and of Mapam are the only ones urging the citizens of Israel to sign the petition. The other newspapers have vigorously condemned this propaganda trick, aimed to serve the interests of the Soviet Union in the cold war. The North Korean aggression against South Korea has made even those who were undecided on the question of this petition declare themselves as unalterably opposed to a move which asks the prohibition of atomic weapons but does not condemn the use of conventional bombs and conventional arms in an act of open and unprovoked aggression.

MAPAI STAND

The executive committee of the Mapai has published a manifesto directed to the workers of Israel which said in part: "We state that the opposition to war and the desire to assure permanent peace in the world are common to all citizens of Israel. The tragedies that wars have brought on this generation and the terrible losses suffered by the Jewish people in the Second World War have strengthened the opposition against war in the hearts of the masses of the Jewish people and imbued them with a strong desire for peace. A permanent peace is a vital necessity to humanity, to the Jewish community wherever they may be, to the state of Israel, to the great task of the in-gathering of the exiles and the realization of the objectives of Zionism.

"Filled with this determination, the overwhelming majority of our people are supporting the policy of the Government of Israel, a policy of nonidentification with the two warring world blocs and a policy of constant efforts toward the assurance of the peace of the world.

"It is our conviction that a true concern for peace makes it necessary to maintain an attitude of respect for all sides and the omission of a propaganda of libel and smearing. It demands nonidentification with any of the warring sides and the condemnation of all those who endanger the peace and the avoidance of abject subjugation to one side in the controversy.

TOOL OF COMMUNISM

"It is our conviction that this policy is not the policy of the so-called Israel Congress for Peace. This outfit is not ready to fight against all dangers to peace regardless of the side they come from. The Israel Congress for Peace is one of the organizations and one of the tools of the world Communist movement. This congress has only wholesale condemnation for everything that the western democracies are doing and wholesale commendation for the eastern bloc.

"Because of this, we feel that the attempt to obtain signatures on the so-called Stockholm peace petition which is now being made does not serve the cause of the peace of the world and we are convinced that it merely serves the needs of world Communist propaganda."

Answering this statement, the Al Hamishmar, the official organ of the Mapam, wrote: "Let everyone who refuses to sign the petition know that if those who want peace in the world shall succeed in saving the world from danger of an atomic death, that he had no part in this great achievement. Let him also know that if the disaster comes that the responsibility for it will lie also on his shoulders."

Hatzofe, the organ of the Mizrachi, stated the following: "The white pigeon of peace, which symbolizes the so-called peace movement, is being exploited for aims which are neither pure nor naive, because through the celebrations, speeches, and the beautiful words which come from the speakers and through the well-sounding phrases which are to be found in the so-called Stockholm petition, one can clearly see the cold and realistic interest and the propaganda of the eastern bloc behind the iron curtain.

DOUBTS ITS VALUE

"If this peace movement would have been an honest one and even if it would not, as it does now, serve the best interests of the Soviet Union only, even then there would be reason to doubt the good that such a petition would do. In the lands of democracy elections decide the question of war or peace, but the rulers of dictatorships laugh at petitions and disregard them just as they disregard the will of the people.

The Hador, the official organ of the Mapai Party, declared in an editorial: "The leaders of the 'Israel Congress for Peace' are not ready to oppose all dangers to peace; they are not ready to oppose all steps that might bring war regardless of the side they come

from. The Congress for Peace is not ready to do so because it is clearly a Communist tool which is conducting a propaganda campaign of libel and deprecation against the western democracies because it serves only the side of the Soviet Union in the cold war.

"Because of this the signing of the petition does not serve the cause of peace but only the needs of the Communist movement, and the workers of Israel are not ready to become the servants and the tools of Communist propaganda."

The refusal of the people of Israel and particularly of its labor to be taken in by the maneuver of the "peace petition" is a clear and decisive indication of where the sentiment of Israel lies in the present world situation.

Mr. Speaker, this is particularly interesting in view of the fact that Israel has established what it describes as a policy of nonidentification in the Korean war. In the face of that, it is obvious that the specious and false nature of this Communist peace petition is well-known to nearly everyone in Israel. It is particularly significant, as Mr. Krug reports, that the widespread rejection of this communistic maneuver provides a clear and decisive indication of where the sentiment of Israel lies in the present world situation.

While I regret that our House Committee on Foreign Affairs apparently is disinclined to even schedule a hearing on House Concurrent Resolution 247 which I filed on July 20, it has been most encouraging to me to have widespread support for this, or some similar, proposal and to have had the opportunity to observe the mounting indignation here in America and in the free countries when the true character of this petition and the motives of its supporters became more fully known. I am more than confident that the excellent counter proposal here in America, the crusade for freedom movement, is gaining much ground. I am certain that by October 24, scores of millions of Americans will have not only contributed to this program but will have gladly given their names as sponsors.

Fire Insurance—An Article From the American Bar Association Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the American Bar Association Journal of April 1950, appears an article by W. Jefferson Davis, Esq., calling for a reform of the fire insurance business.

Mr. Davis is a distinguished member of the bar of California practicing in the city of Los Angeles. He is a member of the California Commission on Uniform State Laws and president of the American Academy of Public Affairs. He has long been active in the American Bar Association. I might add that in the campaign of 1912 which placed Woodrow Wilson in the Presidency, Mr. Davis, then in his dynamic youth, was prominent as the national president of the League of Democratic College Clubs, of which I was privileged to serve as vice president for the Middle Western States.

Because of Mr. Davis' standing in his profession and his activities as a student of State laws and the ways of bringing about advisable unification, as well as the fact that his article has the high prestige of appearing in the official magazine of the American Bar Association, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that it may have the careful and thoughtful scrutiny of my colleagues.

The subject has seemed to me so important that I have introduced House Resolution 855 authorizing and directing a full and complete investigation of methods and practises obtaining in the fire-insurance business. It may be that the methods and practices Mr. Davis complains of can be defended. It may be that such legislation as may be needed should come from State legislative bodies. But certainly fire insurance does concern, in large or small degree, every person in our country, certainly in very large measure the home owners and the owners of industrial and commercial buildings as well. I think the select committee, for which House Resolution 855 provides, should undertake its inquiry with an open mind, should proceed constructively and make only such recommendations as sound business and financial judgment would dictate after a thorough study of the facts; but such an inquiry and study, conducted in the manner and the spirit I have indicated, would seem to me something that we should not seek to avoid. I would think it possible that the large fire-insurance companies, some at least, would welcome such inquiry and study.

Mr. Davis' article in the American Bar Association Journal of April 1950 follows:

WHAT IS YOUR FIRE INSURANCE POLICY WORTH—THE EVILS OF THE STANDARD INSURANCE FORM

(By W. Jefferson Davis)

How sound is your investment in fire insurance?

If you placed your fire-insurance policy under scrutiny would it stand the test?

Or would you discover, to your dismay, that your policy, in the event of fire, would not be honored for payment by the insurer?

The clamor in our legislative halls for remedial legislation to regulate the business of fire insurance underwriting, and the growing demands for a thoroughly amended standard fire-insurance policy form have focused the spotlight of public attention on a matter seriously affecting the average householder and businessmen.

There are leaders in every walk of life concerned with the present conduct of this enormous business and they unhesitatingly point to questionable practices in some quarters of the fire-insurance field and insist that new methods, procedures, and contractual bases must be speedily introduced if stricter governmental regulation is to be avoided.

In a word they say that the insurance colossus of America, one of the greatest accumulations of entrusted wealth extant, must clean house as it did a score of years ago, or possibly face another "Armstrong" inquiry similar to the one so ably led by the late Charles E. Hughes.

Property owners subscribe in good faith to fire-insurance protection, sometimes under high-pressure salesmanship overinsure their holdings, and seldom, if ever, realize how easily they might have been victimized through innocent violations of antiquated and inequitable provisions of the so-called standard policy. The policyholder would do well to devote one evening to study and analysis of his fire-insurance policy. He might be shocked at his findings.

A sense of security is felt by the average fire-insurance policyholder. He pays hard-earned money in good faith for a protection against loss by fire and assumes that the term "coverage" implies a fact. In his possession is an elaborately phrased document—customarily the so-called standard insurance form—upon which he places his confidence that his future security against loss is sound. Because he has paid a premium to a representative of one of the companies constituting America's great insurance colossus doing billions of dollars of business each year, he holds the belief that his policy means a dollar-for-dollar protection against loss for himself and his loved ones.

Out of habit the policyholder takes a casual glance at his pretentiously prepared document, notes that the entries on page 1 appear to be accurate, and without noting the complex and ambiguous qualifications beyond the typed entries that would challenge the interpretation of a Philadelphia lawyer, tucks the paper into his safe-deposit box.

He is fully covered against loss—he thinks!

POLICY IS WORTH ONLY WHAT COMPANY WILL PAY

Put yourself in his place, if you are a fire insurance policyholder. Do you know what your fire insurance policy is worth to you in event of a loss? You would learn through the unfortunate experience of a fire and the resultant efforts to adjust the loss and obtain payment from the insurance company that it is worth just exactly what the insurer decides to pay you despite the value underwritten and upon which you paid the full premium. The insurance company has an odd conception, if any, of the oft-used term "full coverage."

Your conception of the term is this: You own a $20,000 home. The place cost you $20,000 or more to build. You buy insurance in good faith, having confidence that the insurer will, in the event of a total loss through fire, reimburse you in the amount for which the property is insured. You bought $20,000 of insurance and expect $20,000 in the event of total destruction of your home by fire. You feel you are entitled to full value just as you expect scrupulous dealing and full value in other purchases for your home. Perhaps the thing that has given you greatest confidence in your policy is the large type on page 1 in which such and such insurance company, in consideration of the "stipulations herein named," and so many dollars premium, "Does insure (you)" against "All loss or damage by fire" except as hereinafter provided.

You gazed upon a beautiful mirage as you fondly tucked away the new policy in your safe deposit box. You missed the boat, as it were.

STUDY OF POLICY GIVES YOU SHOCK

If you had taken time to study your insurance document you would have been prepared for the shock that the average burned-out policyholder experiences when he seeks settlement of a loss. Then the full implication of the policy phrases "except as hereinafter provided" and "stipulations and considerations specially referred to" hit you between the eyes.

After the fire you consult your policy and the agent from whom you purchased supposed security. You prepare the proofs of loss, complete inventories and file with the

company underwriting your loss the necessary papers. You contemplate payment of the principal sum of your policy, in the event of a complete loss, within a reasonable time. Perhaps in a discussion of fire insurance with business associates someone has mentioned that a negligible few fire losses ever are paid to the full value of policies, that the insurance companies scale down losses under a thousand and one devious procedures and claims, and that the average fire-loss sufferer settles a claim for less than the value of his policy to escape financial inconvenience or expensive litigation. You give little note to these observations until you join at the scene of your fire the company agent and the new character introduced on the scene at this juncture—the adjuster.

This noble exponent of equity is the shock absorber of the insurance octopus and emerges at the time of a loss from an octopus-owned, operated, and inspired adjustment bureau to conduct the three-ring circus that follows your filing of the proof of loss.

APPRAISER RESEMBLES SIMON LEGREE

This man knows all the answers the insurance company wants you to have in your dilemma. If you are skilled in your ability to estimate human values, you'll convince yourself in a hurry that he is a company man. He reflects many of the attributes of Simon Legree, Satan, the county coroner, and the oily politician. His professional airs are most overwhelming (he believes) and you are not overly impressed by his regal and austere approach to the subject.

He rakes through the ashes of what was once your home and castle. You believe your eyes when you observe what you have reason to know is a 100-percent incineration. To you there is nothing left of your home; there is nothing to salvage. "Complete destruction? And you expect payment of the face value of your policy?" He scowls as he makes the observation. "Perhaps we should admit some liability," he condescendingly admits. "I believe we can offer you a substantial sum for partial loss"; substantial to him means 10 percent. "Look! The stone foundation still stands." Like an automaton he can see in his mind's eye only the provisions of the section of the policy under stipulations and conditions entitled in the standard form, "Ascertainment of Amount of Loss."

You heretofore and subsequent to the fire complied with the duties of insured in case of fire. That is a big order in itself and requires the wisdom of Solomon and the ability of a well-trained lawyer.

YOU HAVE TO FIGHT TO OBTAIN WHAT IS DUE

Your faith in the integrity of insurance companies now is waning. You foresee a fight to obtain what you honestly believe is due you. All the unimpressive technicalities listed by the adjuster, the evasive and questionable exceptions he injects into the negotiations and the uncalled-for delays annoy you during the 30-day period, until out of a clear sky you are formally notified in writing by registered mail of the partial or total disagreement of the insurer with the amount of loss you claim. You are told of the company's recognition of the amount of loss, if any, the company admits on each of the different articles or properties set forth in the preliminary proofs or amendments thereto.

Of course the company offer, as is the custom, is negligible; just sufficient to open the doors for them to require you, under the terms of the contract, to submit to appraisement proceedings.

If, within 10 days you and the company fail to agree to the terms offered by the company (the negligible amount offered as settlement in full), after you are notified in writing, the company demands an appraisement of the loss or part of loss as to which there is disagreement. The company forthwith appoints a competent and disinterested appraiser. You have 5 days to do likewise. Then you notify the company in writing you have complied and name your appraiser. You will probably appoint some trusted friend. The policy says he must be competent and disinterested. You are sure he will be. You wish you could feel the same about the disinterest of the company man.

Further delays occur while you await the action of the company's appraiser and the person you have named. They must select a competent and disinterested umpire. You can be forgiven for seeing "red" at this juncture. You ask yourself "What is this all about? Didn't I pay out sound money for protection? Have I bought a leaky umbrella? Does this insurance octopus whose assets have increased one-hundredfold over the years have the temerity to insist my house wasn't worth $20,000, notwithstanding it accepted premium payments on a $20,000 valuation? Can it be that the company virtually obtained part of my premium payments under false pretenses by selling me $20,000 of protection when, in fact (as evidenced by the current impasse) it planned to pay but a part of the full coverage and disputes my claim that my house was worth $20,000? You question the ethics of that deal.

Your appraiser and the company appraiser review the matter, and if they fail to reach an agreement as to your loss, and that is most probable, for your man will not accept the low offer of the insurer, the umpire is called in to decide.

The payment to you, if any, is agreed upon by any two of the arbitrators. Guess who will make the decision? Your appraiser and the company appraiser? No. They have already disagreed. So the company appraiser and the kindly "umpire," a gentleman who frequently eats regularly only because of the largess of the insurance companies, get their heads together and give you the bad news.

SETTLEMENT IS LESS THAN FULL VALUE

You receive and must accept the judgment of the umpire and company appraiser. You won't get $20,000. That would set a bad precedent. You'll get but a fraction of the insurance amount of $20,000 which you understood you bought.

With millions of homes and other properties insured against fire, and with the customary latitude of over-insurance underwritten by hundreds of concerns, it is easy to understand how company assets have increased more than one hundred fold into the billions, and why victims of the iniquitous practice look to the Government for relief, all in vain, of course, because the subject of Federal regulation of insurance is unpopular despite the practices of fire-insurance companies that border on almost universal racket methods.

If you decline the judgment of the appraisers, within 90 days, you then may institute suit against the company. That means added cost to you. You already have been required to pay the fee of your own appraiser, and half the cost of the umpire's fee and expenses. Now you must have counsel if you proceed against the company. More expenses.

First you placed your problem in the hands of appraisers. The decision was not to your liking, so you proceed with litigation and its attendant costs. Trial of the issue may require long drawn out litigation.

Somewhere along the arduous course of negotiations you obtain enlightenment. Never before have you given such serious and profound thought to the importance of fire insurance and how it affects the welfare of your family. You bought your first policy as you would buy a pair of shoes. You got two shoes. Not one shoe for the price of two. You asked for $20,000 worth of protection against fire; the glib-tongued fire insurance salesman approved when you mentioned you valued the home at $20,000 and said you wanted full protection. You thought you were paying for full coverage. At that time it was not a mythical term to you.

You discover that the insurance codes in many States, perhaps your own, provide that before you make payment of the premium on fire insurance you may, if you choose, require an appraisal by a company agent and after it is agreed the writing of, say, a $20,000 policy is justified, you are given a valued policy, under which, in event of total loss, the insurer undertakes to recognize that a $20,000 insurable valuation existed at the time of the issuance of the policy, and the measure of damage in case of loss shall be the amount for which the property was insured. Now, in your dilemma, you wish you had known about the valued policy at the time you applied for insurance.

But despite the fact that the standard (Old New York) fire insurance form is employed in some 28 States of the Union, and in many if not all States, provision is made for issuance of the valued policy, comparatively few, if any, are written.

In California, residents who desired valued policies should benefit by a law of that State that provides for issuance of such policies and the recognition of full value by carriers in event of loss. An arbitrary ruling by the Pacific Coast Association of Fire Underwriters, however, prohibits operation of the beneficial (to the policyholder) statute.

AVERAGE POLICYHOLDER DOES NOT KNOW

Obviously the average fire insurance policyholder is not versed in fine points of law, especially the statutes and rulings governing underwriting of properties against loss. Being untrained and unskilled in attempted interpretation of stipulations, conditions, agreements, or exceptions contained in the standard fire insurance form, what a shock it must be to one if his attorney examines his policy and gives especial attention to, say, the unconditional and sole ownership clause.

In your eagerness to obtain protection against fire loss you give little consideration to what might seem to you a minor factor. Your agent asks if you own the property in fee simple. Of course you do. The policy is made out in your name. You have forgotten that the deed to the property names you and your beloved wife as joint tenants (or tenants in common). Of course you want your wife and family protected against loss, although you have had the policy issued in your name only.

Because you innocently failed to comply with this so-called moral hazard clause and unintentionally withheld the fact that you were, in fact, not the unconditional and sole owner—the insurance company would avoid your policy, holding that the policy was void not only as to the interest of the unnamed coowner (your wife), but also as to the interest of the person named in the policy—you.

Statistics and records reveal that many outstanding policies today are void and unenforceable because of innocent noncompliance with various moral hazard conditions couched in stiff legal phraseology.

FIRE-INSURANCE ABUSES ARE EXTENSIVE

Just how extensive is this abuse by fire underwriters in "living up to the letter of the word" in policies issued, and the inclination the insurance adjuster has to take advantage of trivial technicalities, oversights, and innocent mistakes on the part of agents of their own and policyholders, is reflected in a study made in a Midwestern State. Examination was made in a small community of outstanding fire-insurance policies. Of 581 insurance policies on real property examined, nearly 25 percent were found to be void, due to innocent violation of the "unconditional and sole ownership" clause. The probers reviewed 255 policies on jointly owned real

property and found over 50 percent to be void.

If your property were in Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, or Minnesota, you probably would not face entire loss of protection, or even partial recovery, for in these States the so-called moral-hazard or unconditional-and-sole-ownership clause is omitted from fire-insurance policies. Allowance in those States is made for a wife's undisclosed and limited interest in property.

In Wisconsin and South Carolina the vicious and devastating clause does not apply to the co-ownership of property by husband and wife.

Why, you ask, can such a situation exist and entrap one who purchased a policy in good faith only to be penalized and deprived of protection through "technicalities"?

Many insurance executives and legal lights in highly organized and efficient legal departments make the feeble claim that undisclosed co-ownership of real property creates a moral hazard, describing the moral hazard as a risk resulting from the creation of a temptation for the owner of insured property to destroy it himself in order to realize upon his policy.

They contend that undisclosed coownership creates a hazard because the policyholder gains full protection of property in which he has but limited interest. They suggest he might be tempted to destroy the property in order to recover for a full loss and thereby make a profit.

Does it seem justifiable, critics of the system ask, for fire-insurance companies to issue such a large percentage of void policies to innocent persons in the hope of occasionally apprehending a law- and policy-violating incendiary aimed to enriching himself through a ruse? Are not the results too meager for the terrific price the companies assess against the public?

The law says that one who willfully burns his property cannot recover his insurance regardless of the provisions of his policy, should the facts be presented in the proper tribunals.

Little wonder, then, that from every quarter of the country there arise from time to time vehement demands for reform in the fire-insurance practices of supposedly responsible companies.

Over the years the inequities, stumbling blocks, and vicious exceptions of the standard insurance form have victimized innocent policyholders, and in many States where constructive changes have been offered in legislative halls the powerful insurance lobby has succeeded in defeating remedial legislation to the detriment of policyholders.

INSURANCE COMPANIES INSIST ON OLD FORMS

The insurance octopus prefers to hold the majority of the blue chips in dealing with the public; it insists on clinging to the provisions of the old New York policy form in some 28 States, the revised New York form in some 15 or 16 States, and the Massachusetts form in four Commonwealths.

The need for modification, clarification, and refinement of the standard insurance policy (contract), the elimination of its iniquitous provisions, and the adoption of more equitable, honest, forthright, and sound provisions in favor of the policyholder today is widely stressed by advocates of sound business ethics.

Many insist it is high time the board and other fire-insurance companies of America dispense with the so-called adjustment bureaus, the nonverified and "chiseling" appraisals growing out of compulsory arbitration conducted by company-controlled appraisals, and approach the matter of fire-loss adjustment in a business-like manner and afford the policyholder protection to which he is entitled.

Critics of fire-insurance procedures seem to be justified today when they turn the tables and call for the protection of the fire-insurance policyholder from so-called moral hazards created and practiced by some of the supposedly responsible major concerns in alleged illicit practices bordering on "racket."

In many instances policyholders who have experienced complete losses, or unsatisfactory adjustment of losses, today raise the cry that when they in good faith bought insurance protection the concern with which they dealt actually was guilty of obtaining money (premiums) under false pretenses. This view grows out of experiences following consummation of a contract which ostensibly offers protection. * * *

Under State supervision, insurance companies in the past have thrived and strengthened their hold, influence, and control of American business and its financing. They have been slow to correct abuses and have allowed in their ranks the spread of a vicious practice bordering on racket. Their fabulously fattened coffers have given them increased power and influence to maintain standards of doing business that are universally conceded to be out of step with the public's appreciation of ethics and equity.

Perhaps there is relief in sight for the downtrodden policyholder. An encouraging light recently has been thrown on the whole disputed subject, not only by those intent upon having the standard forms modernized and causing enactment of new and broader laws regulating insurance in the several States, but by leading figures of the insurance business who from time to time have voiced the necessity of reforms in insurance forums, meetings of bar associations, and other bodies. They are men of wisdom and vision, and have seen the handwriting on the wall.

They are as keen to discourage any move toward Federal control of insurance as are the sound American policyholders who patronize their concerns in good faith and fear any step that would lead to federalization of the insurance business. * * *

In a word, they prefer to have private enterprise—the giant insurance business, one of the greatest concentrations of wealth in the world today—handle the trusteeship of their resources. * * *

Until relief is given the oppressed policyholder, it would behoove him to study carefully every word of present contracts offered him before accepting the supposed protection, and watch for the pitfalls maintained by a blinded and grasping industry that must clean its house and correct its ways, or face certain regulation in Washington.

Providence spare us such a move, yet it looms as a certainty if the insurance companies delay a purge of their business ways. A quarter of a century ago an aroused public caused reforms in insurance practices. Under the able leadership of the late Charles E. Hughes the so-called Armstrong investigation cleansed American insurance and brought about needed reforms.

Can it be that another such inquiry will be required to correct present-day evils of insurance?

Airline Officials on Air Mail Subsidy Separation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD for Monday, at page 15030, I attempted to outline the basic arguments in favor of enacting this bill into law promptly, and discussed briefly the reasons why the objections raised to it are not tenable.

I would now like to provide for my colleagues certain excerpts from reports, statements and letters by able executives of certain of our airlines pointing up the absolute necessity of separating the subsidy paid for carrying air mail. These statements are as follows:

STATEMENT BY AIRLINE EXECUTIVE

EASTERN AIR LINES, INC.

Eddie V. Rickenbacker in a letter to stockholders, April 4, 1949 (reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 7, 1949, at p. 4102):

"The foregoing tabulations (on comparative airline costs, etc.) indicate that frequently the efficient and economical carrier has not been recognized and rewarded in new route and mail pay proceedings, and that the taxpayers have suffered the burdens of underwriting the large subsidies redected in the above charted rate differentials.

"This is indeed a gloomy and discouraging picture. But there are some hopeful signs.

"The President is said to be making inquiry into airline economy; the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is instituting an investigation; the Postmaster General has expressed his desire to see better business principles applied to the transportation of air mail; the CAB lately has instituted investigations designed to develop essential information regarding airline efficiency and economy; measures have been introduced in the Congress calling for a clearly stated separation of compensation and subsidy in respect to air transportation of mail, and providing that as between two identical points a new competitor may not receive air mail pay at a higher rate than that received by the existing carrier.

"The chairman of the CAB in an address on March 23 * * * made this timely statement: 'I believe that the advantages of separating the subsidy outweigh the disadvantages and dangers. From the standpoint of a sound air transportation system these advantages would be to hold constantly before the carriers and the Board the dollar amount of the subsidy. This would provide a considerable incentive to the carriers to put themselves in a sound economic position and it would make it far easier for the Board to determine those areas where service being performed by the carriers was uneconomic.'"

Eddie V. Rickenbacker, president, in a statement before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, May 24, 1949 (Senate Airline Hearings pursuant to S. Res. 50, p. 1118):

"I believe the President's Air Policy Committee, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, the Hoover Commission, and more recently a majority of the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, have recognized the desirability of having a separation of subsidy from compensation. Senator JOHNSON, in S. 1431, and Congressman KENNEDY, in H. R. 2908, have introduced bills to bring about the desired objectives. I am not saying that these measures are perfect in their details, but they are steps in the right direction and they ought to be perfected and carried to enactment at the earliest possible date." (H. R. 9184 is a revised form of H. R. 2908.)

Eddie V. Rickenbacker, president, in annual report for 1949, April 4, 1950:

"Some of Eastern Air Lines' competitors receive the equivalent of your company's tax payments from the Government in the form of mail subsidy. There apparently is no restriction placed on the use of this subsidy, and it enables such competitors to engage in wasteful competitive practices in an effort to divert your company's traffic.

"Without mail subsidy, underwritten by your company's tax payments and your personal tax payments, the competing carriers would and should be allowed to succeed or fail on their own merits or deficiencies.

"Your management is continuing to fight for correction of this discriminatory practice."

In the Senate Airline Hearings, page 1116, Rickenbacker also stated that he had urged separation in his appearance before the Finletter committee.

UNITED AIR LINES, INC.

W. A. Patterson, president, in a statement before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, May 9, 1949 (Senate airline hearings pursuant to S. Res. 50, p. 675):

"In principle I approve the separation of subsidy so that we all know exactly where we stand. With subsidy being identified directly as such, it would serve as an incentive for management to increase its efforts to reduce and eliminate subsidy."

W. A. Patterson, president, in annual report for 1949, March 15, 1950:

"There has been considerable discussion in recent months regarding the advisability of separating so-called subsidy and service payments for carrying air mail. Your company favors such separation, believing that subsidy payments should be plainly labeled as such."

NORTHWEST AIRLINES, INC.

Croil Hunter, president, in a statement before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, May 3, 1949 (Senate airline hearings pursuant to S. Res. 50, p. 599):

"Senator, I certainly believe that the separation of service pay and subsidy is advisable."

AMERICAN AIRLINES

C. R. Smith, president, in a statement before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, May 12, 1949 (Senate airline hearings pursuant to S. Res. 50, p. 764):

"The system of merging service mail rates with subsidy payments is confusing, discouraging, and unfair to those air carriers which seek to keep their operation on service rate basis, and free from subsidy. In addition, it is poor accounting, depriving you of accurate knowledge of how the money you provide is being spent and the purpose for which it is being expended.—

"These defects can and should be corrected; their correction can and should be prompt.

"Senator BREWSTER. You would favor, then, an attempt to divide the compensatory payment from the subsidy payment?

Mr. C. R. SMITH. I would be wholeheartedly in favor of that."

More About Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Ludwell Denny and which appeared in the Washington Daily News of September 8, 1950:

There is still a chance of American aid to Spain, despite President Truman's rejection of the $62,500,000 loan provision in the general appropriations bill.

The outcome does not depend chiefly on the mood of the President and the State Department, as commonly supposed, but rather on the attitude of our British and French allies and on what kind of a bargain can be made with the Spanish dictator.

While both of these decisive factors are still negative, the Anglo-French opposition is somewhat less adamant than formerly, and in Madrid there are faint hints of cooperation. The reason for this softening on both sides, obviously, is the rising Soviet menace to Europe.

As far as Washington is concerned, ideological differences have ceased to be a major barrier. General Franco and his totalitarian system are no more popular here than before. But he is no longer a threat to American interests, as he was when he collaborated with Hitler and his fifth column tried to poison Latin America against us.

The administration here recognizes that our dominant need is trustworthy allies who can deliver. It has not choked on cooperating with other nondemocratic governments for mutual advantage against aggression.

Our military experts are overwhelmingly in favor of gaining Spain as an ally. They think defense of the Western World could be greatly strengthened by Spanish naval and air bases, by Spanish ground forces, and by the Pyrenees barrier in case of extreme need. Political pressures here tend to offset each other. The pro-Franco lobby has grown, while the anti-Franco lobby is less effective because of the critical defense situation. So there is no big obstacle to a changed American policy, provided foreign conditions are favorable.

Of course, no President is ever likely to sign a blank check for Franco such as Congress proposed. If he gets either economic or military aid, it will be under the same safeguards as other recipient nations.

Political obstacles still exist among our allies. The Socialists govern Britain and hold balance of power in France and Belgium. Their old feud with the Fascist dictator is still bitter.

Nevertheless, the British navy is very much interested in Spanish bases, and the French army consider Spain useful for defense of north Africa as well as western Europe. These military pressures are increasingly important in London and Paris.

Curiously enough, in view of all the big talk and wide assumptions, there is as yet no adequate evidence that Franco is willing to give us anything in return for economic or military aid. Would he trick both sides, as he did in the last war, to remain "neutral"? So far he has been very cagey and promised nothing.

Despite all these adverse factors in London, Paris, and Madrid, however, the trend is toward an eventual agreement of necessity.

Our Government Is Abandoning the Orderly Flood-Control Program in North Idaho To Increase Private Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, so much haste and so much pressure has been exerted in forcing through the Government departments and the Congress the approval and the appropriation for the construction of the Albeni Falls Dam project to store water in the Pend Oreille River, the Pend Oreille Lake, and the Clarks Fork River that the rights of the people of Idaho have been totally disregarded and, at the same time, we are abandoning the orderly flood-control program on the Clarks Fork River started with the construction of Hungry Horse Dam in Montana.

This program to build Albeni Falls Dam first and flood thousands of acres of productive land in north Idaho will, at the same time, leave the Kootenai Valley with its beautiful city of Bonners Ferry and the diked districts of Boundary County at the mercy of the floods of the Kootenai River.

That the facts concerning this program may be placed before the Congress, there is inserted herewith a statement made by myself before the Senate Appropriations Committee when the deficiency bill containing this appropriation was under consideration.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

SUPPORT OF BONNERS FERRY LEVEE PROJECT AND LIBBY DAM, UTAH

Chairman MCKELLAR. I see that Congressman WHITE has come into the room.

Will you proceed, Mr. WHITE, with the matter you wish to take up?

Representative WHITE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I come before you not to make a record, but to see if we can get some help affecting the great State of Idaho and its people in north Idaho on a mistaken policy of the Army engineers and a plan that will just ruin two productive valleys and be in reverse of the whole program of flood control.

I have here a map of Idaho put out by the Bonneville Power Administration showing the streams in north Idaho and the proposed flood-control development of the great Columbia River system.

A part of this river system, as you know, is the Snake River, branching from the Columbia at Pasco which makes the boundary line between Idaho and Oregon and Washington and crosses the State of Idaho and heads up in near the Yellowstone Park. The water of the Snake River is being used to irrigate much land in southern Idaho, but up in the northern part of the State we have two great arms of the Columbia River where the Government has started an orderly flood-control program of a series of flood-control dams by the construction of Hungry Horse Dam. The Hungry Horse Dam is now under construction and will deliver 285,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. Further downstream on the Clark Fork River we have the Glagir View and the Paradise Dam site. By following this plan we have the program that will control floods on the entire Clark Fork River to the Washington State boundary at Newport, Wash.

North of the Clark Fork we have another valley, traversed by the Great Northern Railroad, on the Kootenai River where we have an approved dam site at Libby. The water of that river flows into the Columbia and will develop extra power at Grand Coulee and down at Bonneville, so that the committee will know the urgent need of building Libby Dam on the Kootenai River.

I want to read to you from a letter addressed to the Secretary of Interior from the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, dated February 1, 1950. It has to do with canceling the plan to raise the levees at Bonners Ferry and strengthening the dikes for the protection of the drainage districts in Boundary County.

We have some of the finest land there in Idaho, and I was surprised when they told me that the land contained in diked dis-

tricts in the Kootenai Valley in Boundary County in Idaho produced 80 bushels of wheat to the acre; 60 bushels of wheat is tops in the rich valleys in North Dakota but that land is so rich out there in the Kootenai Valley they have produced as high as 80 bushels of wheat to an acre and some of it is the most productive land we have in the Northwest.

This land is protected from floods by dikes built by private enterprise as well as the beautiful city of Bonners Ferry, the county seat.

The Government and the Army engineers has had to go in when we had exceptional floods that broke the dikes and repair the dikes and the Government has helped refinance the people on the land. It has a big job and it is a continuing thing that needs protection.

OPINION OF BUDGET BUREAU ON PROJECTS

Here is what the Bureau of the Budget said in their release and why the construction of Libby Dam should be given first priority:

"Benefits to be realized through the raising of levees at Bonners Ferry would be of an interim nature since the protection would not be required after regulation of the stream by Libby Dam. There appears to be a lack of local interest in provision of additional levee protection at Bonners Ferry. Relative infrequency of flood stages sufficient to overtop existing levees appears to render an interim protection at this location inadvisable, at this time. In case construction of Libby Dam is not undertaken within a reasonable period of years, this project might be resubmitted for consideration."

As a result of that recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget the Senate took out $100,000 out of the last appropriation bill that had been put in the bill for the protection of Bonners Ferry and the Boundary County dikes, with the result that two of those dikes broke. If there had not been a very exceptionally cold spring, all the dikes would have gone out and we would have lost everything in the valley this year as a result of the plan to withhold appropriations pending the building of Libby Dam.

What is proposed in this bill? We propose to jump ahead of all of the flood-control projects and go down below Lake Pend Oreille and raise the level of the lake and flood out the lands around the lake and Clark Fork Valley lands, and that are in my home district—and leave the beautiful Kootenai Valley to the mercy of the floods of the Kootenai River.

All of that great wide valley there [indicating on the map] 8 or 10 miles wide and extending clear into Canada from Bonners Ferry is to be left out of the flood-control plan by the Army engineers who now propose to abandon the orderly flood-control program on the Clark Fork and Kootenai Rivers and to jump ahead of all the proposed dams and build the Albeni Falls Dam that will flood out the Clark Fork and Kootenai Valley and all the land around Pend Oreille Lake just for the power generation of which will be less than 1 percent of the power produced when the dams in being and under construction in the Northwest are finished.

The only excuse they raise here for building Albeni Falls first is that they will get more water over Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams from the water stored in Lake Pend Oreille.

Now, as to the power situation? You have now 14,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually being produced by Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

When the dams that are now under construction in the Northwest are completed, Hungry Horse, McNary, Chief Joseph, and Detroit Dams, you will get another 14,000,000 kilowatt-hours before Albeni Falls will be in production.

The main reason that there is such a pressure for Albeni Falls is that the local power interests have their transmission lines built right to the dam site, and a transformer station nearby, and they are now buying Government power for 2½ mills a kilowatt-hour and distribute this power for industrial use for 1¼ cents per kilowatt-hour.

I am a customer operating a mine, and we are paying 1 cent and 2½ mills. It is easily to be seen that if Albeni Falls Dam is rushed to completion and produces 210,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, and the local power company can get it all because we will not duplicate their transmission line, there will be $2,000,000 a year spread, or the difference between what they paid for the power and what they will use the power for.

So that is why we are working under a continuous pressure.

To put the Albeni Falls project through ahead of everything else, the Army engineers will abandon the Kootenai Valley and all of the lands that we spent so much money to protect.

It is proposed to flood out our country to produce less than 1 percent of the power that will be generated in the Northwest when the dams now building are constructed.

REQUESTED AMENDMENT FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

I am submitting an amendment to the bill, on page 20, line 24: "$2,900,000 for flood control."

The bill does not provide where. It just says for "flood control." So I am asking you gentleman to earmark that money for flood control and in a logical program and start the work on Libby Dam and protect Bonners Ferry and all that country and leave our country on the Clark Fork River for the orderly protection when they build the series of dams starting with the building of the Hungry Horse Dam.

Senator KNOWLAND. Where does that amendment go in again?

Representative WHITE. Page 20, line 24, after the words, "until expended" insert the following: "and shall be used for the construction of Libby Dam on the Kootenai River in the State of Montana."

That is where that money should go, and that is where it would put twice as much water over Bonneville and Grand Coulee to increase the power generation by those dams. All that Albeni Falls will produce would be 1 percent of the power that will be produced when the dams now being built are completed.

Senator THOMAS. If that amendment is not adopted, where will that money be spent?

ALBENI FALLS PROJECT, IDAHO

Representative WHITE. We are told it will be spent on Albeni Falls. They will neglect one valley in Idaho and ruin another.

As you can see, the balance of the land is mountainous country. The proposed plan would leave us without a nickel of protection.

I was chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee when we handled Boulder Canyon project. Those States were ably represented. The upper basin States came in and the lower basin States came in. The upper basin States got a half million dollars set aside every year for Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

The money is set aside and it is used to build reclamation projects and dams in these four States. In the lower basin States of Arizona and Nevada, they get $300,000 each a year.

Senator HILL. Are both of these projects in the State of Idaho, Mr. WHITE?

Representative WHITE. One is in Montana. They are both approved. You can put the money in either one. They are both approved.

LIBBY AND BONNER PROJECTS AUTHORIZED

Senator HILL. Are both of them authorized by the flood control act?

Representative WHITE. Yes, they are authorized.

But here comes the Bureau of the Budget and tells you that if you build Libby Dam you would not have to build these dikes every year. The Senate dropped out $100,000 this year in response to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget because they said that if you built Libby Dam, that project would protect Bonners Ferry and the Kootenai Valley permanently.

Then this $100,000, a part of the money that is being spent from time to time, would only be for an interim and won't be needed when the Libby Dam is built.

So the logical thing to do is build Libby and you will get twice as much stored water over the Coulee Dam and over the Bonneville Dam to increase power, if that is what you are after. You will get twice as much power as you would by building Albeni. Albeni will just disrupt the whole program because we are jumping ahead of the Glacier View and the Paradise Dam projects and the whole orderly program.

By building the Albeni Dam first we are jumping ahead and building a dam at the lower end of the lake to flood out all the country along these rivers and around the lake.

When I was a boy I saw the Northern Pacific Railroad tied up for 20 days by the floods in 1894. For 20 days all the railroad in the West was closed because of floods, and now it is proposed to abandon the orderly program of flood control, to go down Albeni Falls, because revenue for power is involved.

I want to file a letter from the county commissioners of Bonner County, Idaho, asking that we oppose the dam until they are taken care of.

Chairman MCKELLAR. That will be put into the record, without objection.

(The material referred to follows:)

COUNTY OF BONNER,
STATE OF IDAHO,
Sandpoint, Idaho, August 17, 1950.

Re proposed Albeni Falls Dam, Bonner County, Idaho.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congressman from Idaho,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You will recall that a year or two ago the suggestion was made that the above-proposed dam be located across the boundary in the State of Washington and as a result thereof strong protest was filed because it was plain to see that the dam would inundate valuable property in that State.

We have recently been informed that the Army engineers are seriously considering the construction of this dam just inside the Idaho boundary and that as a result thereof a lake will be formed across our State to the Montana boundary, a lake which will forever deprive this country of approximately $1,000,000 of assessed valuation and which will ruin the economy of this region as we now know it because our seed-potato industry will be destroyed and our dairying industry reduced in size because of the loss of base properties now existing along the Clark Fork River.

While we of Bonner County and northern Idaho have no desire to stop progress it has been called to our attention by our legal adviser that in the case of the Boulder Canyon Project Act the Congress did considerable to do equity by the State of Nevada, and the State of Arizona as well. Inasmuch as the water to be impounded by the Albeni project as well as the power to be produced is eagerly awaited by potential customers within the State of Washington we feel it is timely that any legislation that is enacted by the Congress for the purpose of

authorizing and expediting the construction of the Albeni Dam project should give us the same equitable protection that the Boulder Canyon Project Act has granted to the States of Arizona and Nevada. Turning for a moment to the situation of the Boulder Dam we find not only an annual lieu tax payment to both Arizona and Nevada but we also find that the city of Los Angeles is the second largest taxpayer in the State of Nevada because it owns the transmission lines going from Boulder Dam as well as much of the electrical and generating equipment. It is our understanding that the assessed valuation in Nevada of the city of Los Angeles property is in excess of $5,000,000. It is also our understanding that the city of Spokane and other empire basin communities are to be the beneficiaries of any power produced at Albeni Falls as well as the beneficiaries of any water that is impounded. While the circumstances may be such that it is impossible for the city of Spokane and other interstate areas to build and pay for similar installations within our State in connection with the Albeni Falls project yet it would be a simple matter for the Congress to weigh the power rate charged those communities in order to pay back to our community those sums which we would ordinarily receive in taxes if the venture were a private enterprise undertaking.

As we see the picture, this dam will be a liability to our county and to our State and the natural resources to be controlled and produced thereby would be used primarily for out-of-State purposes.

It has been called to our attention that in 1945 the Massachusetts Legislature provided a method whereby the equities are adjusted by the State treasurer between the taxing districts and the counties which are flooded as a result of the construction of Federal water-control projects, for the benefit of taxing districts and counties lying below. We think that such a practice represents the application of sound equitable principles but unfortunately action in this case by the Idaho Legislature of a similar nature would be fruitless. Therefore, our only protection and our only chance for justice must come through congressional legislation patterned after the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

Our attention has recently been called to the fact that the Congress recently amended the Boulder Canyon Project Act by providing for the payment of tuition to the Boulder City school district upon the children of the Federal employees in the community, the cost of which is reflected by a higher power rate charged the city of Los Angeles. We have been informed by persons who personally handled that subject before the Congress some 2 years ago that the city of Los Angeles was willing to pay said increased costs of some $80,000 per year without a quibble. We feel certain that the power consumers in the Spokane area and other Columbia Basin project communities would act the same toward our school district if we gave them the opportunity by and through the enactment of the necessary Federal legislation.

It has just been called to our attention that an interstate and an interbasin committee is now at work upon a preliminary draft of a proposed interstate water compact affecting the Columbia River and its tributaries. Since most of the plans that we have seen relative to the development of the Columbia River Basin call for the flooding of the fertile valleys of Montana and Idaho for the benefit of States and communities farther down the stream we feel that no such compact would be complete unless it would include the usual provisions for the division of water as between the States and also earmark power for future use for the States of Montana and Idaho as the Boulder Canyon Act does for the State of Nevada, and, furthermore, that no such compact would be complete unless it provided an equitable method for the creation and distribution of lieu tax payments to the school districts and counties which are to be flooded for the benefit of downstream areas.

If all parties concerned are unwilling to do equity of that character the dam should fall back upon private enterprise because in that way taxes will be paid in perpetuity upon reservoir sites as well as upon transmission lines and generating equipment.

Unless and until the Congress is willing to come to grips with the problems raised by our letter we request that you vigorously oppose any and all attempts to expedite the construction of the Albeni Falls project as a Federal undertaking.

We would appreciate it very much if you will meet with us either at Sandpoint or in Spokane on Saturday, September 23, at 1 p. m., for the purpose of discussing this subject with us. In the meantime, we repeat our request that no action be taken until Congress has done as much for northern Idaho as it has done for the State of Nevada.

Respectfully submitted.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
BONNER COUNTY, IDAHO.
M. D. HART, *Chairman.*
GLENN REED, *Commissioner.*
CALVIN HUFF, *Commissioner.*

Representative WHITE. Our county of Bonner is going to lose the tax revenue on a million dollars' worth of property and they want some protection just as the other States receive, just as the upper-basin States and the lower-basin States on the Colorado River receive.

Gentlemen, do not rush into this thing. Do not let them come over on the Idaho side and make our people carry all the load, when we see the protection they are getting in all these other States.

COMPARISON OF STORAGE CAPACITY OF LIBBY DAM AND ALBENI FALLS DAM, UTAH

There is another program of putting in this Libby Dam that will protect everybody and save two valleys in Idaho instead of one. Here are the figures on Libby Dam:

There will be a storage of 4,250,000 acre-feet at Libby, while at Albeni Falls it would be only 1,000,000 acre-feet of storage.

If you switch this money to Libby, you get double storage and double production of power from the control water at Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

REQUESTED AMENDMENT, GENERAL PROVISIONS

If you will not do that, if you will not put in that amendment, I am submitting a second amendment, to insert the following on page 20, line 24:

"No part of the appropriations made in this chapter shall be expended on the Albeni Falls Dam project until the widening of the narrows in the Pend Oreille River at Priest River is made a part of the Albeni Falls Dam project and included in the construction plan and provisions are made to reimburse the State of Idaho for the loss of tax revenues for the land that will be damaged or overflowed by the construction of the Albeni Falls Dam project."

The Army engineers come to us with a program and tell us that they are going to control the flood levels of Lake Pend Oreille. We know that cannot be done under the present plan, we organized in Bonner County a drainage district or a drainage association a long time ago. We did not propose to lower the level of Lake Pend Oreille.

All we wanted was protection from those unusual floods that periodically overflowed all our good farming land. Our drainage association hired engineers. These engineers went down and looked the river over. Previously to their survey everybody was telling us, "Go down Albeni and blow out those rocks and you will have no more trouble."

TERRAIN AT ALBENI FALLS DAM

Our engineers went down and made a survey at Albeni Falls, and they came back and reported that the cause of the floods in the lake was not at Albeni Falls at all; that it would do us no good to blow out those rocks down at Albeni because of the barrier to the outflow of floodwaters was at the narrows 5 miles upstream into the stream at Priest River.

The floodwater chokes there and no matter how wide you open your gates down at Albeni, the water will be choked above there and the Army will be as helpless to control the level of Lake Pend Oreille in floodtime, as it would be if they opened all the gates down at Grand Coulee.

Senator HILL. Can you point out Lake Pend Oreille on the map?

Representative WHITE. It is right here [indicating]. The lake is much bigger. This is a kind of exaggerated map.

Lake Pend Oreille has a surface area of 40,000 acres.

Senator HILL. Where is your Albeni Dam?

Representative WHITE. It is right here on the Idaho line [indicating]. Right there you see where these big transmission lines and the transformer station are located. Power company now sends the power around the lake to these customers and these towns above.

So when this is built, they will be in a position to take all the power right at the busbar.

Senator HILL. The other dam, Libby Dam, to which you want the money to go, is in another part, is it not?

Representative WHITE. Yes. It is further north and will protect the land of the Kootenai from floods and will store and put twice as much water over these dams downstream. The records of the Army engineers will show you that if you build Libby Dam it will store twice as much water, put twice as much water over Bonneville and Grand Coulee than Albeni Falls. The only excuse for building Albeni is that it will store water in low-water season and regulate the flow of the river by letting it out.

But while you are doing that you will ruin all the good farm land around it.

Senator HILL. How many acres is that?

ACTION REQUESTED ON LIBBY DAM

Representative WHITE. I do not have the exact acreage, but I know it will back the water clear from the Washington line at Newport and clear across the State to the Montana line. We have only two valleys in the Idaho panhandle that are farm land.

Gentlemen, protect us. We ask you to switch this appropriation to Libby Dam. That will be carrying out the flood-control provision in this bill. Make the job stick.

Senator HILL. What if it is left like it is?

Representative WHITE. They will use it for Albeni and flood our valley and leave the Kootenai Valley at the mercy of the floods up there.

I want to get this across to the committee in all seriousness, because we had flood appropriations one after another over there in the Koontenai Valley. We have 13 dike districts and they are left at the mercy of that river. If you will earmark this money you will do a good job all around.

This plan will leave the Clark Fork Valley as it is and protect Bonners Ferry.

Chairman MCKELLAR. We will give it the best and most sympathetic consideration that we can.

We are very much obliged to you for appearing, sir.

Representative WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Role of the Federal Government in Combating Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on The Role of the Federal Government in Combating Crime, delivered by Attorney General McGrath before the criminal-law section of the American Bar Association this morning.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN COMBATING CRIME

The Federal Government does not exercise general police powers in ordinary criminal matters. Basic criminal law enforcement is and should be performed at the local level in the States. The Federal Government has only such jurisdiction over criminal law enforcement as is given to it by the United States Constitution. We cannot avoid being acutely aware of this division of governmental responsibilities in dealing with crime. The Federal Government has exclusive criminal jurisdiction over such matters as violations of the postal regulations, protection of the United States currency, enforcement of revenue and tax statutes, and in general those which protect the operation of the Federal Government itself. By their very nature these laws must necessarily be enforced by the Federal Government. In addition to the strictly Federal matters, Congress is given by the Constitution the exclusive power to regulate commerce between the States; and it is in the exercise of this power that much of the Federal criminal legislation is based.

While both the State and the Federal Governments have primary responsibilities in combating crime, their fields of operation are separated by constitutional limitations and well-established concepts of States' rights. May I state at the outset that so long as I am the Attorney General it will not be the purpose of the Department of Justice, the chief Federal law enforcement agency, to usurp the functions of the State and local police or to conduct activities that extend beyond constitutional limitations, or the usages of our people. We must never lose sight of the fundamental principle that local responsibility, fully realized, makes for sound government and healthy law enforcement. That is the true meaning of States' rights and home rule. Conditions which breed contempt for law can only become worse if we allow ourselves to be lured away from sound principle by the temptation to pass off State and municipal responsibilities to the Federal Government. Nevertheless, adherence to this view will not detract from the common purpose of the Federal and local agencies in devising means for aiding each other, within the limits of law, nor of the Federal Government assisting and complementing local law enforcement agencies charged with primary responsibility.

It was with this idea in mind that in February of this year there was called the Attorney General's conference on organized crime. Attending that conference were representatives of the major law enforcement associations throughout the United States, such as the National Association of Attorneys General, American Municipal Association, the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, as well as representatives of the United States Attorneys Association and other Federal agencies. This conference was called by me in an effort to find a way of greater cooperation among all law enforcement officials to the end that a more efficient and successful fight against organized crime might be conducted at municipal, State and Federal levels. The President of the United States appeared and gave his wholehearted support to the undertaking. At that conference, as well as from many of the representatives of the States and municipalities with whom I have talked, there was almost unanimous agreement that one of the most serious threats to efficient law enforcement and good government was the apparent increase in organized crime which had resulted from a flourishing of the most lucrative field of all criminal activities, that of organized gambling. While historically the fight against gambling had been a matter of State concern, yet it became apparent that State agencies were having considerable difficulty in combating this insidious evil; and that the Federal Government might well find means to assist the States in this fight without encroaching upon any of the powers of the State in this field. Because of the general agreement that the major problem was one of organized gambling, legislative committees were appointed and immediate study was directed toward formulating constitutional means of aiding the States in this fight. Following extensive study by the legislative committee of the crime conference, drafts of two proposed bills were submitted to Senator JOHNSON of Colorado who introduced them in the Senate. One of the bills, S. 3357, was designed to prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. The other bill, S. 3358, was intended to prohibit the transmission of gambling information by communication facilities through interstate channels. Both of these bills were the result of special resolutions enacted at the conference endorsing the idea of Federal legislation which would prohibit the transmission of gambling devices or information through communication facilities in interstate commerce. The committee on interstate and foreign commerce in the Senate reported the slot machine bill favorably 8 days after its introduction and 7 days thereafter the Senate passed it unanimously. It has now been amended and passed by the House of Representatives on August 28, and is awaiting Senate approval of the House amendments. Extensive hearings were held by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the other bill, S. 3358, and a modified form of the bill was reported out on May 26, 1950.

These bills are examples of the means by which the Federal Government may aid the State in its primary responsibility in combating crime. In the history of Federal-State relationships the use of the Federal power to support State policies has had a number of important precedents. For example, in the field of liquor-law enforcement, Congress enacted the Wilson Act (26 Stat. 313, now 27 U. S. C. 121), which provided that all fermented or intoxicating liquors transported in interstate commerce must be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of the State into which they were shipped upon arrival in that State. The Wilson Act was held valid in *In re Rahrer* (140 U. S. 545). The Wilson Act, therefore, permitted the State to take away from interstate-commerce shipments of liquor the privilege attaching to such shipments—that is, the right of the original purchaser after receipt to sell liquor while still in the original package, even though the State law prohibited such sale. Following the enactment of that legislation, Congress passed the Webb-Kenyon Act of 1913 (37 Stat. 699, now 27 U. S. C. 121), which statute prohibited shipment or transportation of liquor into any State where the receipt, possession, or sale of such liquor was prohibited by State statute. The Webb-Kenyon law was approved by the Supreme Court in *Clark Distilling Co.* v. *Western Maryland Railway* (242 U. S. 311). Still later the Reed Amendment of 1917 (39 Stat. 1069) enlarged the statute to include a criminal provision punishing any individual who "shall order, purchase, or cause intoxicating liquors to be transported in interstate commerce." This supplemental amendment to the Webb-Kenyon Act was upheld in *United States* v. *Hill* (248 U. S. 420).

By these statutes Congress aided the States in controlling the distribution and sale of liquor: The interstate transportation of intoxicating liquor into a State where the law forbade the bringing in of intoxicating liquor was prohibited, while allowing for its continuous interstate transportation through the State (18 U. S. C. 1262); its transportation where it was to be used in violation of the law of the State was prohibited (27 U. S. C. 122); it was subjected to State laws regarding intoxicating liquor (27 U. S. C. 121). As the Court stated in the *Clarks Distilling Co.* case, supra:

"Congress * * * considered the nature and character of our dual system of government, State and Nation, and instead of absolutely prohibiting, yet so conformed its regulation as to produce cooperation between the local and national forces of government to the end of preserving the rights of all. * * *" (242 U. S. 311, 331).

Of course, ever since the decision of the Supreme Court in the lottery case of 1902 (*Champion* v. *Ames* (188 U. S. 321)) holding that Congress may prohibit the interstate carriage of lottery tickets, there has been no room for doubt of the authority of Congress to exclude from the channels of interstate commerce various forms of gambling paraphernalia, as well as other illegal activities and fruits of crime. What the Court said almost 50 years ago is equally appropriate today.

"We should hesitate long before adjudging that an evil of such appalling character, carried on through interstate commerce cannot be met and crushed by the only power competent to that end. We say 'competent to that end,' because Congress alone has the power to occupy, by legislation, the whole field of interstate commerce. What was said by this Court upon a former occasion may well be here repeated: 'The framers of the Constitution never intended that the legislative power of the Nation should find itself incapable of disposing of a subject matter specifically committed to its charge.'" *In re Rahrer* (140 U. S. 545, 562).

There are many additional statutes which employ the Federal Government's power over interstate commerce in an effort to eliminate from these channels other types of illegal activities as well as the fruits of crime where the criminal attempts to escape State enforcement officials by taking advantage of jurisdictional limitations. Examples of these other statutes are the Mann Act, National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, Fugitive Felon Act, Stolen Property Act, and others too numerous to mention.

Today the problem of combating crime is more complex and difficult than ever before, but it is not insurmountable. It will require constant vigilance of the law-enforcement officers and citizens alike, for that is the price of our liberation from the domination of all unlawful elements. The criminal today has become smart, at least in the sense of becoming organized, and utilizes every technical advantage available under our system of dual laws and divided jurisdictions and geographical limitations. By becoming organized the criminal elements have become wealthy and through the use of big money have become powerful. But

that is all the more reason why there must be close and constant cooperation between the Federal law-enforcement officials and the State. In this fight the Federal Government can play an important role in assisting the States by depriving the criminal element of those advantages he seeks through the utilization of interstate commerce channels, upon which the State officials may not encroach under the Constitution. It is in this role, which the Federal Government may constitutionally assume, that the President of the United States and I have pledged the cooperation of the Federal law-enforcement agencies toward the end that we may present a united front with the State officials in the fight against this serious menace to good government. I have offered the facilities of the Department of Justice to the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in the Interstate Commerce Committee of the United States Senate, and I have pledged to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER every possible cooperation that we may give him. To accomplish this cooperation I have instructed all United States attorneys (circular 4133, July 31, 1950) to cooperate in every possible way with the members of this committee and those assisting it in its investigation of organized crime.

Griffiss Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge the immediate passage by this House of S. 3727, to authorize certain construction at Griffiss Air Force Base and the establishment there of the Air Force Electronic Development Center.

The overwhelming merit of this legislation is shown by the wide approval it has received. The plan to move the Watson Laboratories from Eatontown, N. J., and to establish an Air Force Electronic Development Center at Griffiss Air Force Base first received the unqualified endorsement of the Department of the Air Force and was approved by outstanding scientists. After introduction in the Senate on June 9, 1950, S. 3727, the bill to carry out the above plan, was referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and then the full committee voted unanimously to report the bill favorably to the Senate. The Senate, after full debate, passed the bill on September 13, 1950. On September 18, 1950, the House Committee on Armed Services voted, by an overwhelming majority, to report the bill favorably to this House. The bill therefore comes to the floor with the impressive record of support that it deserves.

The Air Force has stated with every indication of total urgency that it was necessary to make this move to install these laboratories at Griffiss Air Force Base, where they will have unusually good facilities in order adequately to carry on the vital development, engineering work, and testing in the field of electronics which these laboratories perform.

The Department of the Air Force has, as recently as August 23, 1950, explicitly stated in a letter from the Honorable John A. McCone, Under Secretary of the Air Force, that the recent international crises give additional emphasis to accomplish the desired transfer at the earliest possible moment. The Air Force has stated that in view of the inevitable acceleration of the electronic program an even more urgent requirement exists now than heretofore. The transfer of Watson Laboratories to Griffiss Air Force Base with its air field, space for expansion, and permanent buildings capable of more efficient utilization will in the considered opinion of the Air Force enable that Department to accelerate many vital projects.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us involves a vital question of national defense and security, as well as one of economy and efficiency.

The main witness who appeared on September 18 before our Committee on Armed Services to represent the Department of Defense and the Air Force on this legislation was Maj. Gen. Gordon P. Saville, Deputy Chief of Staff for Development of the Air Force. I have never seen a more complete, cogent, and convincing explanation of the urgent necessity for this legislation than is contained in his statement before the committee. After giving very fully the history of this project, he enumerates the seven factors which the Air Force found to be essential for the permanent location of the Air Force Electronic Development Center, namely:

First. Permanent buildings for laboratories, storage, and test facilities.

Second. Adequate airdrome handling all types of aircraft under all weather conditions.

Third. Existing facilities to minimize cost of land and new construction.

Fourth. Space for expansion for both buildings and runways.

Fifth. Flying atmosphere where engineers associate intimately with flying problems, requirements, and people.

Sixth. Housing for personnel.

Seventh. Accessibility.

General Saville then proceeded to show item by item that Griffiss Air Force Base fully met all these standards and that the present location of the Watson Laboratories most emphatically did not. One of the points made by General Saville which most impressed me—and I may add that I believe it also impressed the distinguished chairman and other members of our committee—was that the present location of the Watson Laboratories in the congested New York air traffic area prohibits, by CAA regulations and proper regard for air safety, test flying under any but unlimited visibility conditions. He stated that the special routes and altitudes which must be flown during such tests endanger routine civilian and military air traffic, or must be continually interrupted at great expense and delay. As General Saville particularly pointed out, this congested New York air traffic area has the highest density of civilian air traffic in the world.

Some other startling facts were brought out by General Saville. Griffiss Air Force Base, with a value of $36,000,000, is a permanent installation with permanent type buildings, machine shops, and facilities, while all of the buildings and facilities at Watson Laboratories are of a temporary nature and would require replacement. Watson Laboratories could not be expanded in time of emergency except at exorbitant cost. Griffiss Air Force Base includes an adequate airdrome in a suitable geographic location and in a low-density air traffic area. Watson Laboratories has no airdrome, and even if one were provided it would not be suitably located from the standpoint of flight test efficiency and of hazard to civil air traffic. The Watson Laboratories' fire hazard is excessive in these temporary buildings and they house equipment which cost millions of dollars, the loss of which would have incalculable effect particularly in time of emergency. The proposed movement of the Watson Laboratories would take them out of an area where air traffic density, air collision hazard, and lack of provisions for commercial air safety prevent them from fully accomplishing their part of the Air Force mission of national defense and keep them from operating at high efficiency. This movement would put these laboratories in suitable, permanent buildings which are now available, at a construction cost savings of about $15,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. After the laboratories are located in their permanent quarters at Griffiss Air Force Base, there will be a saving each and every year of at least $1,000,000 due to reduced operating, overhead, and maintenance costs.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse the statement made by General Saville before our committee on September 18, and I urge in the best interests of national defense the immediate adoption of S. 3727 by this House.

The complete statement of General Saville is as follows:

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. GORDON P. SAVILLE, USAF, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, DEVELOPMENT HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, ON S. 3727 AND COMPANION BILL H. R. 8783, TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you very much for this opportunity to testify in behalf of the Department of Defense, before your committee in support of S. 3727 and companion bill H. R. 8783, a bill authorizing certain construction at Griffiss Air Force Base.

My name is Gordon P. Saville, major general, United States Air Force. At present, I am Deputy Chief of Staff for Development, at Air Force headquarters here in Washington. Although the matter you are considering today is not a new one to your committee, I should like to recapitulate briefly, in an attempt to show the growth and changes of our plans with regard to electronic development facilities. I believe that such a résumé will be helpful in your evaluation of the soundness of our plan to move the Watson Laboratories from Eatontown, N. J., to Rome, N. Y.

We in the Air Force strongly believe that, to discharge our heavy responsibilities to this Nation within budget and manpower ceilings, we must place our primary reliance on technical superiority of our weapons. With this object in mind, immediately after the last war, we took stock of our research

and development facilities, and realized that we had inherited a veritable hodgepodge of laboratories and test establishments, most of them hurriedly constructed during the war, to meet critical and constantly shifting needs as the war situation changed. Our Air Matériel Command, charged with conducting technical research and development for the Air Force, was therefore directed to prepare a long-range facilities plan.

The establishment of an electronics development center grew out of this study. In the area of electronics, with which we are concerned today, we found that we had three major centers of research and development activity: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio; Watson Laboratories in Eatontown, N. J.; and the Cambridge field station near Boston, Mass. In addition, there was the Florida field station of Watson Labs, primarily for engineering testing, and a portion of the proving ground at Eglin Field which was also devoted to electronic testing. With the exception of three laboratories at Wright Field, all of these activities were housed in temporary wartime structures, or leased warehouse-type buildings. It was possible, almost immediately, to consolidate all of the Florida test facilities at Eglin, thereby eliminating the Watson Labs Florida field station. Our plan also called for the consolidation of Watson Laboratories and Cambridge field station at a permanent installation, Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y. This base was originally constructed as an air depot at a cost of approximately $36,000,000, offered many fine permanent buildings as well as excellent concrete runways, but had become surplus to our needs. Many of the repair shops originally constructed for depot facilities lent themselves readily to laboratory work; others could be made suitable with a minimum of conversion.

At this point I should like to digress for a minute to discuss the nature of the work performed at these different laboratories, which will explain subsequent modification of our plans. The process of providing the operational groups and squadrons of the Air Force with new weapons systems starts with basic research in such fields as chemistry, physics, or biology, where new phenomena are discovered and explored which might have military application eventually. Those which look promising are given further study—this we call applied research. Basic and applied research in the general area of electronics are the responsibility of Cambridge, but much of the actual work is done in universities and industrial research laboratories. Cambridge is responsible for evaluating their results and funneling them into the military development machinery, as well as actually performing some of the work internally, particularly in highly classified areas. To date, the results are largely ideas—paper studies, not hardware. When it has become reasonably certain that a particular combination of new techniques has military application and will provide a better means of doing a specific military job, development starts. Components are fabricated in breadboard form—they do not yet look very much like the finished end product, but the essential operating characteristics are brought out and refined. Early development models undergo various tests, and finally some prototypes are constructed by hand which have substantially the outward appearance as to space and weight of the eventual production model. It is this area which, for electronic material, is the responsibility of Watson Laboratories. At Wright Field, some research and development intimately connected with aircraft and airborne equipment is conducted. Since all three of these establishments work for the Air Force, however, developing Air Force weapons and equipment, almost everything they do is quite closely related to aircraft and guided missiles. Even though the Watson Laboratories has been largely responsible for developing ground terminals of navigation and communications systems, the equipment they work on is only one part of an air-ground loop. To test the effectiveness of their equipment realistically, it must function as part of the complete system, requiring extensive use of flight-test facilities.

We began effecting our master plan with the move to Rome, N. Y., of the research laboratories at Cambridge field station. As soon as our plans were announced, we ran into strong opposition from many of the distinguished scientists who had worked with us during the war at the Radiation Laboratories and the Radio Research Laboratory of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. While these men all strongly supported the creation of a centralized, modern, and vigorous electronic development center by the Air Force, they urged that our basic and applied research be conducted separately, and pointed out the manifold advantages of leaving this activity in the Boston area, close to a great concentration of skilled personnel in this field. Please remember that the Air Force, until 1945, had depended on the Army Signal Corps for all of its technical work in this field. We had comparatively little staff experience in the management of such work. Accordingly, we asked a special committee of scientists, of our own employees, and of Air Force officers, presided over by the chairman of the Electronics Committee of the Research and Development Board, to investigate this question fully and to recommend the best course of action.

Dr. Stratton's committee recommended against the move of the Cambridge Laboratories. Their report was accepted and our plans were modified. Instead of one combined research and development establishment, they advocated two: A development center at Rome and a research center at Cambridge.

Watson Laboratories, at present devoted almost entirely to development, located in very poor buildings, at a distance of 44 miles from the nearest adequate military air base, we feel must be moved to Rome, where we have an existing installation surplus to our needs, with excellent buildings and runways. A small portion of the present Cambridge Laboratories, which is more closely related to initial development than to applied research, we feel should at some future date be consolidated with the development facility at Rome. Similarly, the laboratories at Wright-Patterson have certain electronic projects which will eventually be moved to Rome. It is as yet too early to make specific recommendations on the exact nature and extent of these moves—they must be carefully investigated from all angles and spread over a period of time to minimize delay and disruption of vitally important work, as well as hardship to employees. Our ultimate objective, however, is clear: To create a sound, vigorous group of laboratories, located so as to be able to provide the Air Force with the best possible new weapons and equipment economically and rapidly, making full use of our military and civilian resources. These are generalities. To make them valuable in the actual selection of sites for these laboratories, we enumerated seven essential characteristics our new development center should possess. We then measured all possible sites against these criteria. I should now like to review these with you briefly, and later submit to the committee secretary detailed factual supporting data which is too voluminous to warrant your attention at this time. I would like to point out, however, that the figures quoted therein fall into two categories:

(a) They are extracted from operating records and represent actual costs in recent months, or

(b) They are detailed estimates by professional people in their own specialty, bids made by potential contractors, and the like.

In all cases, the source and authority for the data is indicated.

I have also some maps of the Watson Laboratories area and the Rome area, showing the geographical relationships of the various facilities under consideration, as well as a map of commercial airways in both places. The booklet also contains photographs of typical buildings at Watson and at Rome.

Let me turn to a chart which shows the major factors influencing the choice of a suitable location:

1. Permanent buildings for laboratories, storage and test facilities.
2. Adequate airdrome handling all types of aircraft under all weather conditions.
3. Existing facilities to minimize cost of land and new construction.
4. Space for expansion for both buildings and runways.
5. Flying atmosphere where engineers associate intimately with flying problems, requirements, and people.
6. Housing for personnel.
7. Accessibility.

I would like to make a brief comparison of the two bases against the major factors mentioned above and shown on the chart.

1. Permanent buildings: Watson Laboratories has only temporary wood or cinderblock buildings with tar-paper roofs as against Griffiss Air Force Base which has permanent steel framework, brick and concrete buildings.

2. Adequate airdrome: Watson has no airdrome at or near the base as against Griffiss which has an airdrome adjacent to the buildings planned for laboratory use. The runways are hard-surfaced and will handle any of the types of aircraft in the test squadron.

3. Existing facilities: Watson has no permanent buildings while Griffiss has existing supporting facilities, such as a central heating plant, and permanent laboratory buildings available now.

4. Space for expansion: Watson has no suitable space for expansion whereas Griffiss has space for expansion of both buildings and runways.

5. Flying atmosphere: Watson has no airdrome and no aircraft assigned to the base while Griffiss has a fighter squadron, an electronic test squadron, and aircraft assigned to the base, operating regularly from good runways. Watson has few flying personnel while Griffiss has many pilots concerned with operational problems and needs.

6. Housing for personnel: Watson has no housing on the base for officers or airmen. The housing in surrounding communities is similar to that in other areas within commuting distance of New York or along the New Jersey coast. On the other hand, Griffiss has some houses and apartments for the families of officers, airmen, and civilian employees, and sufficient housing for bachelor officers and airmen. The adjacent city of Rome has two recently constructed apartment developments with vacant apartments.

7. Accessibility: Watson is not near a main line railroad and is 40 miles from a commercial airport. Griffiss is only several miles from the main line of the New York Central and has three commercial airlines operating from airports in Utica and Syracuse within 15 and 35 miles, respectively.

We then asked the question: To what extent does Watson Laboratories possess these essential characteristics? If it does not measure up to our minimum requirements, is it possible to provide them? How much would it cost?

We found that Watson Labs did not measure up to minimum requirements, and that certain essential facilities could not be provided at any cost. One of the principal missions of the laboratories, for example, is to develop the ground electronic equipment we must have for all-weather flight. This task simply cannot be accomplished without

adequate flight-test facilities, as we have learned from the experience of the past several years. The present location of the Watson Laboratories in the congested New York air traffic area prohibits, by CAA regulations and proper regard for air safety, test flying under any but unlimited visibility conditions. The special courses and altitudes which must be flown during such tests endanger routine civilian and military air traffic, or must be continually interrupted at great expense and delay. This area has the highest density of civilian air traffic in the world. Nonetheless, detailed estimates were made on the cost of providing permanent laboratory, test, storage, and airdrome facilities at Watson Laboratories. These estimates come to about $18,000,000.

We then considered all of our other available bases and measured them against the seven major requirements. By a process of elimination, we determined that Griffiss met our needs more completely than any other base available for the purpose. It was built during the war years for a supply and maintenance depot. It was well equipped for the overhaul of conventional piston engine aircraft. But we have less and less need for such facilities in an age of jet and turbine engines, and less need for depots designed like the one at Griffiss. It was therefore decided in 1947 to discontinue repair and overhaul work there, but to retain Griffiss as a specialized storage depot. This made available many fine buildings and paved the way for our subsequent decision to use them for laboratories and development testing.

REASONS FOR CHOICE OF GRIFFISS

The final decision was made in February 1948 to move Watson Laboratories and associated electronic activities to Griffiss Air Force Base. That portion of the plan to move the 3171st Electronic Experimental Squadron from Middletown, Pa., to Griffiss Air Force Base has been completed. This squadron does the experimental and developmental flying required by Watson Laboratories.

The decision was based on the following:

(a) Griffiss Air Force Base with a value of $36,000,000 is only partially utilized (the value of Watson Laboratories is $1,860,000).

(b) Griffiss Air Force Base is a permanent installation with permanent type buildings, machine shops and facilities while all of the buildings and facilities at Watson Laboratories are of a temporary nature and would require replacement; Watson Laboratories could not be expanded in time of emergency except at exorbitant cost. The Watson Laboratories temporary buildings require excessive maintenance cost to prevent deterioration; the permissible floor loading of many of the floors is limited; fire hazard is excessive, and they house equipment which costs millions of dollars, the loss of which would have incalculable effect, particularly in time of emergency.

(c) Griffiss includes an adequate airdrome in a suitable geographical location, and in a low density air-traffic area. Watson Laboratories has no airdrome and even if one were provided it would not be suitably located from the standpoint of flight-test efficiency and of hazard to civil air traffic.

(d) Economy in general: The overhead personnel cost (for supply, administration, security, transportation, personnel, etc.) of two bases is inevitably decreased by the consolidation of activities at one base. Further, the maintenance and utilities costs after consolidation at Griffiss would be less than the total required by the two present bases. The savings after consolidation will amount to $1,000,000 per annum.

(e) Now let us compare the construction and/or modification costs, considering on the one hand the movement of Watson Laboratories to Griffiss Air Force Base, and on the other, the provision of permanent buildings and facilities for Watson in the Eatontown area. Doing the job in the Eatontown area would cost about $12,000,000. If we consolidate at Griffiss, the cost would be about $3,000,000. Subtracting one from the other we see that about $15,000,000 of the taxpayers' money would be saved by consolidation at Griffiss.

SUMMARY

In the foregoing, we have indulged in considerable detail. Actually, our objective can be stated quite simply. Here it is: "Buy a full dollar's worth of defense capability with each and every dollar entrusted to the Air Force by the American people." Let us summarize and see whether our plans for the movement of Watson Laboratories to Griffiss Air Force Base meet this objective:

(a) We remove Watson from an area where, in air-traffic density, air-collision hazard and provisions for commercial air safety prevent it from fully accomplishing its part of the Air Force mission of national defense and keep it from operating at high efficiency.

(b) We put it in suitable permanent quarters, at a construction-cost savings of about $15,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

(c) After Watson is located in its permanent quarters at Griffiss, we save at least $1,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, each and every year thereafter.

These facts, then, should point out the advisability of this proposed consolidation, and the Air Force, representing the Department of Defense, urges the enactment of this legislation.

Nehru's Ideas for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Nehru's Ideas for Peace," published in the September 15, 1950, issue of United States News and World Report. I ask that this article be inserted in the RECORD at the request of Mr. Raymond Wilson, of the Friends Committee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEHRU'S IDEAS FOR PEACE—AN INTERVIEW WITH THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What do the hundreds of millions of people in Asia see in the conflict that has put a United Nations army into combat against Communist aggression for the first time? To get the views of one of the outstanding political leaders in Asia, the editors of United States News and World Report arranged an interview with Prime Minister Nehru of India by overseas radio communication. The questions on these pages were submitted to Prime Minister Nehru through the Ambassador of India in Washington. The Ambassador has forwarded the following replies to us from the Prime Minister. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been the Prime Minister of India since that country became independent of Great Britain after World War II. The Nehru government was among the first to extend diplomatic recognition to the Communist government in China—and it also was among the first to support the United Nations action denouncing Communist aggression in Korea. Early in the Korean fighting, Prime Minister Nehru proposed that Communist China be admitted to the United Nations as a way to end Russia's boycott and speed the peace in Korea. His proposal was rejected, but the Russians returned to the Security Council anyway.)

Question. Mr. Prime Minister, why do you believe mediation of the Korean dispute should be considered at this time?

Answer. Your question presumably refers to my approach to Marshal Stalin and Secretary of State Acheson. This was not an attempt at mediation, but an effort to bring the new China and the U. S. S. R. into the United Nations Security Council, so that the Korean problem could be considered in association with these major powers.

Even though my personal appeal did not succeed, I do not regret having made it. At any rate, it has made people think that something possibly can be done to stop the onward rush toward catastrophe.

Question. Many people in the United States feel military victory over North Korea should come first. What is your view, and why?

Answer. Military victory need not necessarily precede efforts for peace. Since prolongation of warfare will increase the threat to world peace through an extension of the area of conflict, efforts at a peaceful solution would be preferable before a greater feeling of bitterness and hatred has taken hold of the minds of people everywhere.

Question. Do you believe a formula for settlement of the dispute can be made without first determining responsibility for the underlying causes of the Korean war?

Answer. The underlying causes are well known and no practical purpose will be served by trying to determine responsibility at this stage. Whatever the past history, it is perfectly clear that North Korea launched a full-scale and well-planned invasion and this, in the context of the United Nations Charter, has already been described as an aggression by the Security Council.

A search for a formula of peace is, however, always desirable and although none has yet been devised, attempts to explore all avenues for a peaceful settlement should not be given up.

Question. Do you think that the United Nations report on the origin of the Korean war was adequate, or should it be supplemented by further investigation?

Answer. It would not be fruitful at this stage to consider the adequacy or otherwise of the report of the UN Commission on Korea. It is impossible at this stage to supplement the report by any further investigations owing to the existence of a state of war in Korea. Peace must first be established before any fruitful investigations can even be considered.

Question. Do you think mediation should be undertaken by governments as a separate effort, or should it be done directly by the United Nations machinery?

Answer. Any method for a peaceful settlement of the dispute should be considered acceptable. If mediation appears hopeful, it does not matter whether it is done within or without the Security Council, so long as it is done with the consent and cooperation of the United Nations and in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

Question. If mediation fails, do you think the Korean dispute will lead to world war III?

Answer. There is not doubt that if all efforts at a peaceful settlement end in failure, then the chances of an extension of the conflict with all its dangerous consequences will be greatly enhanced.

Question. What is the viewpoint in Asia toward communism? Is it regarded as wholly controlled by Moscow or are the national movements independent of control of Moscow?

Answer. The birth of communism in Asia is largely due to its alliance with nationalist

movements fighting for independence from foreign domination.

The widespread hunger and poverty of the peoples of Asia to which centuries of colonial exploitation have contributed also makes communism look attractive by contrast.

Thus, communism is strong in places like Indochina, where foreign domination still exists, and weak in countries like India, which have already attained their independence and are now actively engaged in bettering the living conditions of their people.

The tendency of Asian nationalist movements to follow the leadership of the Communist Party is dependent on the degree to which their deep-rooted anticolonial impulse is ignored by the western powers. Communism throughout the world no doubt draws ideological inspiration from Marx and Engels, Lenin, and Stalin; there is no evidence of direct control of the Communist movement in India from Moscow. So far as the nationalist movements in Asia are concerned, they are genuine and indigenous.

Question. Would you say that communism in China is a national movement and that the Government of China is independent of Moscow control?

Answer. The Government of China is a national coalition with the Communist Party as a dominant partner. The coalition is composed of all sections of the nation, including some members of the Kuomintang pledged to work a common program of democratic advance.

Mao Tse-tung [head of the Chinese Communist Government] has openly declared that China at this stage is a new democratic state preparing itself for socialism. It has a mixed economy as its immediate objective and a coalition government as its present machinery.

The Chinese revolution appears to be following the law of its own development—influenced by others, but chiefly influenced by the conditions prevailing in China. In our view, the Government of China is entirely independent.

Question. How long ago did you take the position that Communist China should be admitted to the United Nations, and what were your reasons for doing so?

Answer. Ever since we [India] recognized the new People's Government of China, it was natural that the consequences of such recognition would follow. We recognized it for a variety of reasons, the main reason being the fact that a sound and stable government existed over the whole continent of China.

It was none of our business to like or dislike it. In recognizing countries, normally one does not go by likes or dislikes, but by the fact that they do represent stable governments. It, therefore, seemed to us not only illogical but exceedingly unreasonable not to accept the consequences of that recognition, which were that the new China should function in the United Nations.

The United Nations was never intended to be a group of nations thinking one way and excluding other nations. With new China and the U. S. S. R. and some other nations out, the United Nations would assume a new shape. It will cease to be what it was meant to be, and if this state of affairs were allowed to persist the outcome would probably be a world war.

Question. Why does India regard the settlement of the Korean dispute or the solution of the Communist China problem as vital to her interests?

Answer. We have historical and almost immemorial ties of culture and friendship with China. For us, situated as we are and where we are, the friendship of China is desirable and natural.

The importance of free and independent China is a most effective assurance of stability in Asia.

So long as a nation of 450,000,000 people remains outside a world organization, that organization cannot be regarded as fully representative.

As for Korea, India is vitally interested because the peace of Asia is involved.

Question. Does India view with alarm the Communist efforts to control Tibet? If so, why?

Answer. India has no political or territorial designs in Tibet but is interested in that country because of cultural and other associations that have grown up through geography and the intercourse naturally between neighbors. The Indian Government has suggested to the Chinese Government the desirability of settling the Tibetan question peacefully through negotiations.

AN END TO COLONIALISM

Question. What should be done by the western powers to assist non-Communist countries in Asia to combat communism?

Answer. The habit of thinking only in terms of military and economic power unfortunately persists in the west, and while it is not possible to ignore the force of arms or of money, there are strict limitations to what arms and money can do if they go against the prevailing mood of millions of people. There has been ample evidence of this in Asia.

The first thing, therefore, should be an attempt by the western powers toward a better understanding through the mind and heart of Asia. Tagore, our great poet, expressed this very vividly when he said: "You do not open a lock with a hammer, you open it with a key devised for the lock."

Certainly we cannot open the lock of men's hearts with hammers, bayonets, and bombs. The strongest urge in every country in Asia today is the anticolonial urge of which the positive side is nationalism. Remnants of colonialism must, therefore, be completely ended and the national movements receive support.

The other powerful urge in Asia is the social urge. Asia is poor and backward in many ways. It has not profited by the great wealth poured into the world since the industrial revolution. In fact, Asia has been exploited and has been a passive witness of that revolution. But now Asia is wide awake to these differences and feels her poverty and distress, and wants to remedy it and does not want to wait too long in the process.

Question. What is your attitude toward communism in India?

Answer. Theoretically, communism in India, as elsewhere, offers to solve the problems of poverty, inequality, and low living standards which cause discontent among the masses everywhere. The Communist Party in India is banned in two states, but in other parts of the country it is permitted freedom of expression so long as it adheres to peaceful methods. Like the United States, India has a democratic constitution which guarantees fundamental liberties to the citizens.

In practice, however, the Indian Communist Party has indulged in the technique of fraud and violence to disrupt established institutions. It has functioned as a terrorist group, and to that extent has been dealt with according to law.

In India, since 1947, communism has come into conflict with nationalism and progressively isolated itself from the masses it sought to convert.

Question. Do you agree with the view that the future status of Formosa should be settled by the United Nations?

Answer. In order that the United Nations may arrive at a decision which is acceptable to the parties concerned it is necessary that the People's Republic of China should occupy its rightful place in the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations. No decision relating to Formosa should be taken by the United Nations in the absence of new China.

Question. What are the essentials to a settlement of the dispute in Indochina?

Answer. The desire of the people of Indochina for their independence is legitimate and should be respected. It is not a military problem to be solved in terms of strategy, but a human one. No outside help should be given to bolster up the colonial regime in Indochina. The Nationalist movement, on the contrary, should be encouraged.

NEED FOR MUTUAL TRUST

Question. What are the principal factors necessary to a better understanding between Asiatic peoples and the people of the United States?

Answer. To come closer to each other there must first be trust of each other's motives. The United States has the opportunity to assist the nations of Asia to develop their resources and raise their living standards. Such assistance would be welcomed if made in the right spirit. It is also important that in all matters concerning Asia, decisions should be taken only after close consultation with the free countries of Asia.

Question. Is India in a position to send ground forces to assist United Nations forces in Korea?

Answer. Any military assistance is beyond India's capacity and would make little difference. India's defense forces have been organized essentially for home defense and not for service in distant theaters of war.

The best assistance India can render in this grave crisis is to help to limit the area of conflict, and in ending it.

Question. Can you give us your reasons why it was not desirable to go to Peking (capital of Communist China) at this time?

Answer. This question does not arise because no formal invitation has been received from the Peking Government.

Hon. Donald Jackson, of California, Speaks on the Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, on September 9 our colleague, Mr. DONALD JACKSON, of California, delivered the keynote address at the King County Republican Convention in Seattle, Wash. The consensus of opinion of the approximately 2,000 people in attendance was that Mr. JACKSON'S speech was the finest, most timely, and masterful that it had been their privilege to hear. I take the liberty of inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an excellent document on the Korean situation and the present foreign policy as it affects the Far East. Mr. JACKSON'S speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege and an honor to be invited to appear here in the great State of Washington, and to have the honor of addressing this convention. These are truly days of decision * * * days in which all of us are quite rightfully concerned with the momentous problems confronting our beloved country and its traditional institutions. It is also the period that will long be remembered as the era of "the skeleton in the closet," and the years in which the favorite colors in Washington, D. C., were

"whitewash white," and "Communist Red." History will record it as the period when a President of the United States was unable to tell a vast and menacing cloud of subversion and espionage from "a red herring" and that tragic era when a Secretary of State refused to "turn his back" on a convicted perjurer, whose lies were born in treason against his own land and his own people.

Yes, it has been a weird and fantastic period. It has seen men and women in positions of trust and responsibility hailed into court, charged with peddling America's top military secrets to foreign agents. It has witnessed a long procession of court favorites and Government workers charged, though seldom convicted, with such innocent little pastimes as the presentation of gift deep-freezers to friends in high places; the obtaining of special favors in the way of hard-to-get construction materials for race tracks when veterans and their dependents were unable to obtain a board-foot of lumber for the smallest of homes. It is the day of the "five-percenters" who had ready access to the great and near-great in his quest for immense Government contracts.

It has been the era when a pall of Kansas City politics crept eastward to envelop the dome of the greatest capital in the world. It has seen reprisals inflicted upon those who refused to "go along" with administration policies, and the smearing of those who had no patronage of which they could be deprived. The age of the "legislative blackjack" has dawned on Washington, D. C., and it is indeed a relief to be able to inhale fresh, clear air uncontaminated with the nauseous odors of political sewers.

We are reaping the whirlwind of blind stupidity which passeth all understanding. At Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, under the guise of winning the war we lent ourselves and the power of this great nation to the dismemberment of China and the enslavement of millions of human beings. As a bribe to bring the Soviet Union into a war in the Pacific that was almost finished in victory, we made one of the most unsavory deals ever consummated in human history. We sold Chiang Kai-shek down the river of rubles, from which no nation and no people once engulfed have ever escaped. We let the Lattimores, the Jaffes, the Hisses, and many another architect of disaster undo in the span of a few short years all that had been done in a hundred years to create a friendly, free, and democratic China. As a result of the construction job accomplished by these great "builders of a new order," war has flamed in Korea, China lies under the heel of the Red Fascist masters, and all of Asia lies open to the threat of new aggressions. If we had deliberately set forth to accomplish the downfall of China and the complete degradation of her millions, we could have devised no more certain course of action than the one foisted on us by the intellectual appeasers who had so much to do with foreign policy during and after World War II.

Some small measure of consistency is essential to the development and subsequent implementation of any foreign policy, but consistency, that rare jewel, must long since have taken refuge far removed from the intelligence that has dictated foreign policy in the United States for many years. On the one hand we berate dictatorships in general, and Franco's brand in particular. In the same instant we embrace Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia and try to wean this international kidnaper of thousands of Greek children into the freedom-loving camp. The administration excludes cheap labor from the American market, with the same stroke of a pen permitting the products of that labor to flood the domestic market place. While American fishermen seek to provide themselves and their families with a decent living, ship loads of Russian crab meat arrive at the dockside in New York.

Intent upon establishing a great and voracious bureaucracy in Washington, D. C., the administration proclaims its "paramount right" to the tidelands of the several States, and seeks to establish a precedent, which once defined and accepted can and will threaten every last remaining segment of State sovereignty, few as they are today. Already, the Federal Government holds clear title to more than 50 percent of the land in seven Western States. If any country in the world ever stood in need of land reform, this one does. By a process of gradual encroachment on the taxing authorities of cities, counties, and States, the Federal Government has closed channel after channel of legitimate taxation sources, upon which local subdivisions of government have long depended for revenue. As a result, the elected officials of the several subdivisions must now come to Washington, hat in hand, to beg for Federal largess with which to carry on the essential functions of home government.

Yes; ladies and gentlemen, the bite is on.

False promises based upon false premises have led us well along the rosy road to destruction. The opiate of the social state has done its work well. Only now is the great fury of a disillusioned and angry people commencing to make itself evident. The one bright spot in the whole black picture is the fact that a sharp weapon is at hand, ready to be wielded in defense of ideals and principles. That weapon is the Republican Party. It is a weapon forged in the fiery faith of millions of good Americans, who are not only completely loyal to their country, but determined to salvage what is left of our national heritage. Millions strong, the GOP in every State stands ready, anxious, and willing to join battle with those who contend that everything and everyone has a price, and that human cupidity is stronger than devotion to the general welfare of all and the human dignity of the individual.

These false premises we indignantly deny.

These premises we will destroy.

Expediency rules the roost in Washington today and the god of opportunism is the idol before which the present administration lays its burnt offerings.

The hour has arrived when we must put other hands on the wheel of the Ship of State, and start the financial bilge pumps working if the battered old vessel is ever to make port. The quarrels on the bridge of the great old ship have resulted in a course that zigzags from primeval chaos to destruction. There have been too many navigators with too many divergent ideas of seamanship to ever make port.

The ineptness and bungling of those charged with the development and implementation of foreign policy, together with those responsible for the national defense has brought us to the verge of total war, unprepared in both manpower and matériel. In spite of the bright flashing lights of international danger; in spite of testimony before committees of the Congress that to embark upon the Korea military action might well result in tragic consequences, the President on June 27, last, completely reversed his previously announced position and ordered sea and air cover for South Korea. Within a few days American ground forces were engaged in action. In spite of the fact that the Congress had voted more than $10,000,000 in military assistance to the Republic of South Korea, only $200 worth of combat wire had arrived in that country previous to the outbreak of hostilities on June 26. In spite of the fact that the Congress had appropriated ample funds for the national defense, arbitrary acts on the part of the Executive and the Secretary of Defense resulted in the impounding of more than a billion and a half dollars of this amount. While tragedy was stalking our national footsteps, the President of the United States was assuring the people of this country and the world that we were "nearer to peace" than we had been for many years. The Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, was following a like line in telling the American people that our defenses were in order and that if an enemy attacks us at 4 a. m. we will be on the march by five. So decimated was the United States Marine Corps that no more than 5,200 combat troops were immediately available for action in spite of the fact that the wartime Marine Corps strength had been over 500,000 men. With a cavalier disregard for the public interest and with near criminal disregard for the evident handwriting upon the wall of our national destiny, the administration toyed with our essential preparations for security here at home and abroad. Important statements of military and naval officials in the field have been censored by the Executive. The Wedemeyer report, which clearly pointed out the dangers which lay ahead, was kept from the public knowledge for several years, and when released, did not include General Wedemeyer's comments and recommendations with respect to Korea.

Today, in a frantic effort to disentangle itself from the tragic maze, the administration has the temerity and the brashness to assign to the Republican Party responsibility for its own failures and mistakes. But to no avail. The record is too clear and too unmistakable to escape. In this connection I want to read to you from the committee hearings on the Korean-aid measure in order that all of you may properly understand the position taken by our military authorities at the time Korean economic aid was under consideration in the House of Representatives, statements which influenced many thinking Members of the Congress in their opposition to the administration program of economic assistance to South Korea, unless such assistance was adequately bolstered by military supplies in sufficient quantity to insure delivery and utilization of the capital goods and supplies.

Former Secretary of State George C. Marshall was asked in testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 20, 1948, whether the position of the United States in South Korea would be untenable if North Korea and Manchuria fell to the Communists.

"I think it would not be tenable," he replied.

"Would you say that without American help there is great danger of a collapse of the Chinese Government within the next few months or a year or so?", asked Representative JUDD, of Minnesota.

"I would say that deterioration is dangerously rapid now," was the reply. "Unless something is done to halt it, it can rapidly run away and bring about the fall of the Chinese Government."

The National Assembly of the Republic of Korea adopted a resolution on November 20, 1948, imploring the continued presence of United States troops until security forces of the new Republic should be fully capable of maintaining national security. The South Koreans recognized as the shadow of the bear something which the Democrat administration saw as the silver lining to a cloud.

On December 12, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations called for the withdrawal of occupying forces from Korea "at the earliest practicable time." That declaration must have caused hearty laughter in the Kremlin, but to the starry-eyed idealists in our Department of State it was greeted with the reverence usually accorded Holy Writ.

With a great and audible sigh of relief the Department of the Army, on June 30, 1949, announced the withdrawal of the only force that stood between the Soviet and its goal of domination of the whole of Korea. Fifty

thousand men departed the peninsula, and the ill-trained and ill-equipped South Koreans were left to their own devices, aided only by the presence of 500 American officers and men left behind as a "training mission." Scarcely were the American transports out of sight before a long series of border incidents commenced in the vicinity of the thirty-eighth parallel.

Maj. Gen. Charles E. Helmick, former military deputy to the governor of Korea, was asked by Representative CHIPERFIELD, of Illinois, during testimony on June 9, 1949, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

"If we withdraw our troops out of South Korea, is there anything that would stop the Russians from taking over South Korea if they decided to do it?"

"If they decided to do so, they could take over South Korea without any great military difficulty, sir," replied General Helmick. "They are right there with large armies. Any troops that we have there would suffer another Bataan."

On June 21, 1949, the committee witnesses were Brig. Gen. E. M. Hamilton, Chief of the Policy Division, Directorate of Plans and Operations, United States Air Forces; Rear Adm. E. T. Wooldridge, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations; and Brig. Gen. T. S. Timberman, Chief of the Operation Groups, Plans and Operations Division, United States Army.

Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, asked General Timberman: "Is it your opinion, General, taking into consideration world conditions as they are * * * that it would not be wise to keep troops in Korea?"

"Yes, sir, it would not be wise," was the reply.

"I concur," said Admiral Wooldridge.

"I concur fully, and that has been the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff," said General Hamilton. "It has been unanimous. There have been no differences as far as I know."

But what do we find 11 months later on July 25, 1950, when Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson told a House Appropriations Subcommittee an entirely different story. Representative HARRY SHEPPARD, of California, inquired again into the decision to withdraw United States troops from South Korea. He asked: "That was a decision of top echelon and not at the moment a part of the military conclusion as such?"

"Correct, sir," replied Johnson.

Washington has every reason to believe that the Secretary referred to the White House and to the State Department as "top echelon."

On July 26, 1949, and I stress that date, ladies and gentlemen, because it was almost 1 year to the day before the invasion of South Korea, five Republican members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, including your speaker today, joined in a minority report opposing a proposal to supply $150,000,000 in economic aid to Korea. I quote the minority report in full because I feel that it, perhaps more than any other statement or document, expresses the position of the Republican minority in the Congress with respect to the Korean problem as it existed at that time and in light of the hostilities which were to follow. The minority report, ladies and gentlemen, reads as follows:

"Bill H. R. 5330 is a measure designed to furnish $150,000,000 for aid to Korea. The aid is of an economic nature and is frankly intended to resist communization of that portion of Korea lying south of the thirty-eighth parallel of latitude. Proponents of the measure contend that our national interests in the Far East demand immediate assistance to this peninsula which projects southward from the land mass of Asia and which is presently divided in two parts at the thirty-eighth parallel, with the Communists in practical control of the northern half of the country, and with the new Republic of Korea dominant in the south.

"As desirable as are the aims of those who would furnish economic assistance in Korea at this time, there are factors which indicate that such a program is foredoomed to failure. Korea is hopelessly outflanked by the adjacent land mass of China, and the peninsula has no connecting link with any friendly continental power. Every ton of supplies contemplated to be furnished under the terms of this legislation must be transported vast distances, only to be put down in the midst of a complex and daily shifting Pacific picture, in which the rapid and undeterred spread of communism is the salient feature.

"Nor are there in Korea the considerations of our national security which 2 years ago brought the United States to the aid of Greece. The flanks and the frontiers of South Korea are open to attack at any time by the militantly hostile forces of Communist aggression. Recent disturbances in widely separated parts of South Korea must be interpreted as evidence of Communist infiltration and agitation. Political assassination, together with serious constitutional differences between the executive and legislative branches, indicate a situation of internal turmoil and dissension, which may be expected to increase under the prodding of nationalists and subversives.

"Every authority who has testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs with respect to the Korean situation has acknowledged the fact that there could be no effective defense against an armed aggression originating in the northern half of the country. Nor has any satisfactory evidence been produced to indicate that a determined political attack could be long withstood. Guerrilla activity in the vicinity of the thirty-eighth parallel during recent weeks presages to many the institution of a campaign of harassment and terror not unlike that which has proven so successful in the mountains of northern Greece.

"It was reported from Seoul, Korea, under date of July 6 last, that eight Soviet soldiers had been wounded by national army forces in the fighting on Ongjin Peninsula. The Office of Public Information stated that the Ministry of National Defense had 'confirmed the fact that Soviet troops are taking part in the battle in the Ongjin area.

" 'It is reliably reported,' continued the announcement, 'that Soviet troops, attached to the North Korea puppet government armies, are in positions of command, as well as acting as advisers.' "

If this is the case—and there is no reason to doubt the report of the South Korean Government—the Soviet has actually entered the conflict along the frontier. This development may well presage the launching of a full-scale military drive across the thirty-eighth parallel. Unless this Nation is prepared to meet force with comparable force, economic assistance cannot of itself insure the safety or the integrity of South Korea. To the contrary, there is every reason to believe that the lending of economic assistance at this time will only enhance the prize to be taken by force of arms and internal intrigue.

"Our forces, with the exception of an advisory mission, have been withdrawn from South Korea at the very instant when logic and common sense both demanded no retreat from the realities of the situation. With our forces on the scene of action, there might have been advanced substantial arguments in favor of economic assistance, but without the presence of an adequate force to protect delivery of, and guarantee practical utilization of, the great volume of matériel and supplies, it appears folly of the highest order to embark upon the program.

"While we are in full agreement that Korea is a logical showcase for the wares of democracy in the Orient, we are also certain that the Soviet Union appreciates this fact and will go to any lengths to defeat our efforts in that part of the world. The conditions and circumstances which have rendered the European recovery program a success in western Europe are almost totally lacking in the case of Korea. The successes of the western European nations have been rendered possible through a strong interlocking of national interests and economic destinies in a wide and defensible belt, extending from the Baltic on the north to the Mediterranean on the south. There are no gaps in the defense wall of western Europe. In the Orient, however, the conditions are exactly reversed. To expect Korea to withstand the aggressive political tactics of the Soviet in a surrounding climate of rampant communism would be to expect an isolated and powerless Luxemburg to repel the ideology and the tactics of a Hitlerized Europe.

"One can imagine and respect the Korean people without sacrificing reason and logic. Again we are confronted with the constantly recurring specter of piecemeal and stopgap legislation. Admittedly, this country has no policy with respect to the Orient; nor has any program been put forward which would tend to develop such a policy. We labor with the mountain of Asia and succeed only in bringing forth the molehill of economic aid for South Korea. Disregarding the raging tides which threaten to wash away the foundations of every constitutional government in Asia, we are asked to content ourselves with the construction of a dike of sand around the southern half of Korea.

"What Korea requires, what China requires, what the United States requires is a statement of policy with respect to our future conduct in the Pacific and on the land mass of the continent of Asia.

"Should this measure be passed and should the aid furnished to Korea prove to be in vain, we shall have suffered a greater loss in national prestige than the same disaster would occasion in western Europe. The proposed program is a double-bitted ax, and one which may well be turned against us in the future. Already, along the thirty-eighth parallel aggression is speaking with the too-familiar voices of howitzers and cannon. Our position is untenable and indefensible. The House should be aware of these facts."

Even Professor Lattimore, certainly no Republican, and equally certainly an unofficial "consultant" to the Department of State, described the proposal of the $150,000,000 in economic aid to South Korea, after the withdrawal of United States troops, as follows, in an article in the New York Compass, on July 17, 1949:

"The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not let it look as though we pushed it. Hence, the recommendation of a parting grant of $150,000,000."

No, ladies and gentlemen, the Democrat administration, with its Truman, its Johnson, its Acheson, its Vaughan, its Pendergast antecedents, its clowns, court favorites, five-percenter friends; its reds, its pinkos, its wobbly intellectuals and out-of-work and out-of-place college professors, its crackpot economists and Communist fellow travelers, cannot successfully shift any of the blame for their too-obvious shortcomings onto the shoulders of the Republican Party. For many, many years, the GOP has raised the only effective voice to be heard in protest of the administration's policy or total lack of policy in the Far East. Today, after those warnings went unheeded and the protests unnoticed, and after millions upon millions of Asiatics promise fair to align themselves with our enemies and against the West, it would be out of character if the President and his architects of disaster did not run true to form in a big-lie effort to shift responsibility for a succession of errors that no sane individual or party would dare to acknowledge.

Korea is much more than what the President calls a police action. Korea is a hot war that will likely become much hotter before it ever starts to cool. Perhaps you and I will never see the end of this so-called police action in our day. Korea is a Democrat war * * * the third Democrat war within the short space of little more than one generation. It is a war for which this Nation was not prepared, and represented, for all practical purposes, another Pearl Harbor. Let us hope to heaven that it will not end as another Bataan.

Now that we have been launched into war 7,000 miles away from our shores, it becomes a personal charge upon each of us, and the Republican minority in the Congress has met the challenge by giving full cooperation to the war effort. We must each of us take up a few notches in our belts and put our shoulders to the wheel. But lest the infant war go through life under the stigma of bastardy, it's paternity should be placed on record. If we achieve eventual victory over the foreign counterparts of our domestic Alger Hisses, it will be because of the valor and ability of our fighting forces. It will certainly not be due to the foresight of our diplomacy or to our advance military planning.

The bitter fact remains that even to this moment we have no policy with respect to the Orient. The President's statements on Formosa are a mass of sheer gobbledegook, the utterance of which by a Third Secretary of Embassy in the field service would serve to confine the offender to the nearest mental institution. Certainly, the pronouncements to this time have left the vast majority of the American people in a state of confused bewilderment.

The attack on Formosa may be launched at any time. There is evidence of large barge and junk concentrations on the Chinese coast. The people of the United States have every right to know if we intend to resist an attack on this vital outpost of our national security with every resource at our command, or whether our alleged diplomacy is going to dictate abject surrender.

If we do not intend to forcibly resist an attack upon Formosa, the American people and our few remaining Chinese allies both have a right to know. In spite of evidence that the administration has some doubts about the matter, the fact remains that this is still a free and sovereign nation of 150,000,000 people.

We Republicans will continue to fight communism whenever and wherever it appears. We are no "Johnny-Come-Lately" in this battle. Since the treachery of the Soviet was disclosed following Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam we have nurtured no illusions as to the end goals of the Communists. While the President was berating the Committee on Un-American Activities for its prosecution of Alger Hiss, and terming the committee members "more un-American than the persons being investigated," the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress was meeting the challenge by drafting and passing the Mundt-Nixon Communist Control bill. While the President roared "witch-hunt," the Republicans in the Congress, aided by many a fair-minded and honest Democrat, were citing Eisler, Josephson, and others of like slimy ilk for contempt of Congress in refusing to disclose the nature of their subversive activities.

Only last week Members of the House of Representatives who had never supported the Committee on Un-American Activities, and who had never voted one red cent for the continuation of its activities, practically fell over each other to pass again the self-same Mundt-Nixon bill, which had died previously in the Senate.

Republicans were anti-Communist when it was considered anti-social in Washington to say anything derogatory about "Good Old Joe Stalin," to quote the President's own words. We Republicans have fought a continuous and bitter rear-guard action against the philosophy that saw only boyish pranks in the theft of top secret documents from the files of War, Navy, and State Department's documents, and only girlish enthusiasm in the transfer of such secrets to the agents of the Soviet Union.

There may well come a day when atom bombs will plunge down upon our own cities, spreading terrible death and monstrous destruction. At that time the tortured, the suffering, and the torn can lay their agonies to what can only be termed a disregard for the public safety that has approached the criminally negligent.

If these be harsh words, I make no apology for them. They are intended to be not only harsh, but shocking enough to bestir Americans to their obvious duty. It is past time that our people awoke to the unpleasant knowledge that they, together with the Poles, the Chinese, the Czechs, and a dozen other free peoples, have been sold down the river to a lust for power and more power. True, our people have been given large doses of the administration's prime panacea, "Dr. Truman's Security Lozenges," but the opiate of "everything for nothing" is commencing to wear off.

We have frittered away our national resources and our great substance in a never-ending procession of economic aid grants, when reason and logic both screamed for effective and ultra-modern prototypes of aircraft and tanks. In the face of world-wide aggression, we have attempted to stem the roaring tide of Red-Fascist aggression with garden seed and tons of manure.

This country needs new leadership today as it has never needed it before. It needs leadership in full accord at policy level, and leadership to whom the battle against communism is a holy crusade. We cannot expect that type of dynamic leadership from a party whose spokesmen have been apologists for enemy espionage agents, and who have made every effort to defeat prosecution of domestic spies.

In April 1777, Gen. Benedict Arnold deserted his post and fled from West Point to the British Fleet. He carried with him important and secret papers of state.

When Gen. George Washington, the Commander in Chief of the American Army, heard of his defection, he was grieved—almost as grieved as Dean Acheson must have been when informed of the Alger Hiss tragedy. But Washington, unlike Acheson, did turn his back on an old and trusted friend. Furthermore, he issued an order to the army that evening—an order which we might well adopt as our slogan for the coming campaign. General Washington said:

"Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

Let, us in this hour of turmoil, put none but those whose records are clear on guard today. The tragedy of Korea is likely to be but the first fruit from the Tree of a Lack of Knowledge. Inevitably, there will be other and more serious aggressions. The present administration has failed, but the high principle, the ability and the unquestioned loyalty of the Republican Party are all at the disposal of the country.

We Republicans must fight as we have never fought before—fight with the gloves off and with no holds barred. This is no hour for another campaign based in light, harmony and soft words. We must displace those who have failed—those who are corrupt—those who corrupt. We must raise standards of honesty and decency around which the disillusioned and the heartsick may rally with faith and enthusiasm.

There is no other course of action which we can in good conscience follow. To fail in our mission is to destroy forever the sacred fabric of the greatest way of life ever devised by human mind. To succeed is to win a great victory, not alone for the Republican Party, but for all honest men and women of good will everywhere.

The Menace of Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject the Menace of Organized Crime, delivered by me before the criminal law section of the American Bar Association today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENACE OF ORGANIZED CRIME

The first thing I shall say to you today is something I heard Joe Keenan, then an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, say in 1934 in Milwaukee:

"Crime—as one writer put it—is the great sewer of society."

Sewers are not pleasant, and—after 6 months of living it—I can assert with confidence that crime is no more palatable than sewers.

This is a problem that addresses itself primarily to the legal profession. Lawyers represent and counsel criminals. Lawyers suggest changes and improvements in our laws and judicial system. The lawyer understands the extent to which corrective measures can be taken within the limitations of the constitutional guaranties of basic freedom.

So, I am glad that a majority of our Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce—Senator HERBERT O'CONOR, of Maryland, Senator ALEXANDER P. WILEY, of Wisconsin, and myself—are lawyers; and lay members—Senator LESTER HUNT, of Wyoming, and Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire—have served as chief executive of their States. (As a matter of fact, I am the only non-ex-governor on the committee.)

Too long, I think, we have left the crime problem to policemen, prosecutors, prison wardens, and social workers. When I say "we" I refer to the general public as well as to the legal profession. At the same time, those of us in government and in the profession must not seek to escape our primary obligation in this matter by contending that it is the people alone who are responsible for proper law enforcement.

The public in general seems to fall naturally into several classifications so far as law enforcement is concerned:

1. Those who are indifferent.
2. Those who tend to glorify crime and criminals.
3. Those who are hostile to any governmental coercion in enforcement on the theory that personal freedom is restricted.
4. Those who hold to one cure-all for the problem: such as legislation of gambling.
5. Those who make it their active civic responsibility to suppress crime and/or cheer on others who lead in the fight.

You have asked to consider here the Menace of Organized Crime. That subject implies, first that criminal operations in Amer-

ica are organized; and, secondly, that these activities constitute a menace to our way of life. Unfortunately—to the point of great concern—both of these implications are too true.

Since the middle of May, pursuant to a resolution of the United States Senate, a committee of which I have the honor to be chairman has been probing into the subject of crime in the Nation. For 4 months now my colleagues and I, with the assistance of a capable, trained staff of investigators, have been lifting the lid on organized crime conditions in various parts of the country.

We have been trying to find out a good many things about crime. Is it organized on a local or national basis? Who are its leaders on whatever scale it exists? Is there a national crime syndicate, and if so, is it headed by a single overlord? What criminal activities ply across State lines and can Congress do anything about them? What effect are criminal operations having on the general public? And probably most important of all, to what extent is crime subverting and corrupting law-enforcement and Government officials?

Right here I would like to correct a misconception which has existed in the minds of some people about the committee's function. We are not a law-enforcement authority. We have not been organized to supplant, correct, or even to supplement the regular Federal law-enforcement authorities, all of which are doing an excellent job in their fields. Nor have we the authority or the personnel to supplement local-enforcement officers in the various States. Operating with a budget of $200,000 over a period of 10 months, at the end of which the committee expires, we have a total investigative staff considerably smaller than the number of men that regular law-enforcement authorities frequently put on one case. We would do a disservice to ourselves and to the country were we to attempt to ferret out all crime in 48 States.

Those who look to our committee to cure corruption and local crime, therefore, have misconceived our function. It is our task to ascertain the extent to which organized criminals, working across State lines and utilizing the channels of interstate commerce, have been able to thwart the existing agencies for the enforcement of law. We must concentrate our efforts on organized, interstate crime. Using their immense concentration of wealth and the legal advantages which they gain from operating in 49 different jurisdictions, gangsters have been able to thrive in violation of the law and to corrupt many officials who should prosecute them. Our committee will seek to learn the facts about such operations so that it can suggest curative legislation.

In 4 months of intensive investigation we have learned the answers to some of these questions. To some of them we have only partial answers. But this much we can say unequivocally: Crime is definitely on an organized basis in the United States. So widespread are organized criminal operations and the conditions under which they are permitted to continue that they threaten to make a shambles of law enforcement and to create such a universal disrespect for law that our entire system of government may be endangered.

Whether there exists one or more big-time criminal gangs operating on a country-wide basis, it is too early in the investigation to say. We do know, however, that there is some sort of rapprochement between gangs operating in various sections, a sort of gentlemen's agreement among gangsters—if gangsters may be so termed—that one gang will not invade the territory or activities of another.

Occasionally the hoodlums call upon each other for cooperation in a venture; they sometimes pool their capital or manpower or influence for a joint venture. They have large resources at their command; they have been able to capitalize on a unique situation to control the gambling business of the country as a practical monopoly.

How big this industry of gambling may be nobody knows with certainty. But the lowest figure for the amount of money that changes hands each year through illegal gambling in the United States that has been given the committee by experts is $15,000,000,000—a billion or so more than the current year's appropriation for national defense. My personal opinion is that the actual figure far surpasses this estimate.

We have been asked why we have concentrated on gambling. To be sure there are other forms of organized criminal activity. The narcotics traffic continues, but not nearly on the scale of former days. The Treasury Department's Bureau of Narcotics has seen to that. Counterfeiters still make and pass bogus currency, but only at the greatest risk. The Secret Service has seen to that. White slavery has been reduced to a minimum through the vigilance of the FBI.

But when it comes to gambling there is no Federal law enforcement agency under whose jurisdiction its suppression, or even its control, might come. For gambling, as it is practiced far and wide in the United States today, is not a Federal offense. This is undoubtedly one of the principal reasons why it has been chosen by the present-day racketeers as their main activity.

Another reason for its popularity as a racket is that it involves no merchandise which has to be handled. There are only two commodities involved in gambling—money and information. It is easy to pass both of these when compared with the last big-money racket of these same gangs—the illicit liquor business.

For they are the same gangs that operated on such a high-handed, even murderous, basis in the "roaring twenties." There is still the Costello mob in New York, the Capone gang in Chicago, the Purple gang in Detroit: The names are the same, and—to the extent that their owners have survived inter- and intra-gang feuds and massacres—the faces are the same, too.

From information so far gathered, it would appear that there is hardly a community in the United States that is not stained with the brush of gambling, either on horse racing or the numbers game. The gangs have taken control of these two major gambling activities through monopolistic distribution of the racing wire service. Gambling on its present Nation-wide scale couldn't exist for 24 hours were it not for the racing wire service—which there is strong evidence to show the racketeers control.

We saw this in Florida when we investigated the activities of the S. & G. Syndicate, a betting combine of five individuals who reported to the Internal Revenue Bureau a total gross business of more than $26,500,000 for 1948. When a Chicago mobster, believed to be a "front" man for the revitalized Capone gang of that city, came to Miami early in 1949 and insisted on being taken into the combine, the refusal of S. & G. to make him a partner was promptly followed by a shutdown of their racing wire service, which, by the way, comes out of Chicago. Within 2 weeks this fellow was made a partner; his share of the 1949 "take" is estimated at somewhere near $100,000. And we know that S. & G. is not the only—or perhaps the largest—criminal combine in Florida.

When it comes to monopoly, the organized gangsters of the United States could give wild cards to some of the big corporations which have been the targets of antitrust action, and still win.

This tremendous betting business cannot proceed without an organization. The big shots don't come down to the street corners or the cigar stands to write the numbers or book the horse bets from the general public. That phase of the operation is carried on by the small fry number writers or the bookies.

There are probably several hundred thousand persons employed in these activities across the country. S. & G. Syndicate alone employed some 300 bookmakers in Miami Beach; they were not the only bookies operating at that resort, either. In the bigger cities, the number of writers and bookies runs into the thousands in each place.

In every State except Nevada, it is illegal to "make book" away from the track enclosure. In 27 States, bets are legal within the track limits, but even in those States betting away from the track is illegal. Nevertheless, gambling goes on everywhere.

It stands to reason, therefore, that gambling away from the track could continue only through the connivance or negligence of the law enforcement officers of the respective communities. When a law enforcement officer does not do his duty, it is for one of several reasons: Either he has been ordered not to do it; or he has been paid—bribed is the general term used under the circumstances—not to do it; or he feels the uselessness of it all.

Any orders to a law enforcement officer to look the other way while the law is being broken must come from his superiors; they in turn generally get their orders from those who are responsible for their appointments and the trail thus leads to political levels.

Without fear of contradiction, I say that corruption of law-enforcement officers is rampant in many American communities today on a scale that makes the corruption of prohibition days look like kindergarten play. I say further that in a number of communities where organized crime flourishes there are tight alliances between the racketeers and the politicians, many of whom undoubtedly cut in for their "split" of the profits of these gambling operations.

That is one of the menacing aspects of this Nation-wide crime situation. Corruption is fast becoming part of our everyday pattern of life; a thing which 50 years ago was one of the most abhorrent elements in public affairs, today rolls off the public conscience like water off a duck's back. We tolerate it, smile at it—yes, we have almost even come to expect it of some of our police and Government officials.

Our committee is not naive enough to believe that gambling can be stopped. No amount of legislation was able to keep people from drinking liquor during prohibition days. Nor is any amount of legislation going to be able to keep people from gambling; in my opinion. So long as human nature is what it is, and so long as somewhere there exists the possibility of procuring an easy dollar, not through any work or effort, but merely by wagering on the fleetness of a horse or by a guess on the odds to be paid at a certain track on a certain race; just so long will some people find a way to gamble. And if it isn't on horse races or numbers, it will be on something else. But interstate organized gambling which systematically fleeces people and especially the poor people in many communities is a matter about which we must have great concern. This is particularly true when organized crime uses its great influence to corrupt public officials.

We must find some means of stopping this tide of corruption—and we must find it without delay. We must maintain honest, fearless and incorrupt law enforcement to make safe our democracy. Once these pillars of good government crumble, no man can say what oppression and evil may result.

The lawyers of the Nation have a great share of responsibility in this situation. Being a lawyer myself, I believe that every man is entitled to counsel when accused of a crime. But sadly enough, our investigations in some parts of the country show that lawyers in some instances have gone much further than providing representation to gambling defendants. Shocking as it may seem, we have found cases where lawyers were actually partners in gambling enterprises.

We have found other instances where the tie-in between certain attorneys and the organized gangs were so close that when small-fry associates of the gang were arrested in raids, lawyers retained by gang headquarters appeared on their behalf without having been called by the defendants—in many cases without ever having known the defendants.

Such close affiliations between organized criminals and lawyers can have only one result—to bring contempt and disrespect for the legal profession, which would hurt every practicing lawyer, regardless of his clientele.

There is another menacing aspect of this organized crime picture that I want to advance briefly. The profits from gambling are enormous. A single dice game at Miami Beach has shown as much as $600,000 profit in a 3- or 4-month season. The modern-day racketeers have taken a lesson from Al Capone's book; they don't want to go to jail for income-tax evasion so they hire accountants to keep their records and make out their income-tax returns.

Some of them pay a lot of money in taxes. We suspect, however, that since gambling is virtually an all-cash business, a good bit of the income still goes unreported. Certainly such money they may pay for protection—"ice," they call it in Miami—does not appear on their books for obvious reasons, either coming in or going out. One reason is that the recipient doesn't report it as income, either.

So they accumulate immense hoards of cash. Invariably the first thing a racketeer thinks of when he has made a lot of money is to make himself appear legitimate and find a business that will serve as a front. Consequently you will find racket money in innumerable apparently legitimate businesses and industries.

Hotels, women's clothing manufacture, real estate, oil wells, laundries—all these and countless other business ventures have been founded on capital that came from the big bookmaking and numbers operations of the racket leaders.

To these businesses, in many instances, the gangsters have brought from the underworld their peculiar methods of competition—intimidation, monopoly, and the threat of the strong arm. It seems that as much as he may want to "go legitimate," a racketeer wild never compete honestly and fairly if he can cut sharp corners.

That's why a great deal of racket money can be found invested in scarce commodities, so that the gangsters can take advantage of black markets with quick and outlandish unconscionable profits which again, largely go unreported in their income-tax returns.

Established modern business takes pride in the quality of its merchandise. You can pretty generally trust the label on the merchandise you buy in a dependable store. But when you buy the product of a racketeer business—unknowingly, in most cases—you are unwittingly furthering the fortunes of a gangster or a group of gangsters who would not hesitate to skimp on quantity or quality any more than they would hesitate to take your money away from you with loaded dice.

Profiteering is demoralizing. Carried on as it has been and might be again by those organized gangsters, it could break and back of public morale in the days of dark shadow predicted for us in the not-distant future. The President has already indicated that he will institute price controls in our economy if the situation warrants; it is important that we prevent these gangsters from torpedoing our economic ship in its home waters.

As we said in our first interim report to the Senate on the results of the investigation in Florida, it is essential that the true nature of this evil of organized crime be recognized. We are not concerned with the question of whether gambling is morally good or bad. We are concerned, however, with the total effect on the people of this country when powerful groups of criminals are allowed to utilize the channels of interstate commerce to gain great power and a monopolistic control of illegal enterprises, which they now possess.

We are especially concerned with this because through this monopoly the gangs are corrupting and controlling local government and are constantly reaching higher and higher in their level of control.

We do not believe that the people of the United States want to be governed directly or indirectly by racketeers and gangsters any more than they want to be governed by a ruthless, cold-blooded dictator. By pointing out to the people what might happen, by directing their attention to the real menace of organized crime, we hope to break into their apparently sympathetic apathy and bring about the enactment of legislation that will make impossible the continued existence of this criminal empire in the United States.

To whatever extent you are willing and able, we ask the legal profession of these United States to assist our effort.

The American Bar Association and other bar associations can assist us by joining in our effort to work with the organized bar on certain studies. In this work we have been greatly aided by Mr. James Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, who has made many fine suggestions and given unsparingly of his time. Thus far the response from various bar associations has been good. We are anxious to have your help in analyzing both the substantive and procedural laws which should be changed or passed in order to meet the menace of organized interstate crime. In this connection we have sought and welcome the suggestions and studies which can be made by committees of the organized bar.

The committee also is seeking your advice in its efforts to ascertain the sociological causes and reasons for the existence of large-scale organized crime in this country. In this work, too, we have had a fine initial response from the bar, but here also we will welcome every assistance members of this association and local bar associations can give us in studying the factors which have led to the growth of organized crime. In the future organized crime may be minimized if its causes are understood.

Finally we need and welcome the assistance of every member of the bar in the continuing personal and individual fight which every citizen must wage against crime. Lawyers in particular are equipped to lead the battle to defeat racketeers and gangsters. Public acquiescence and apathy are the gangster's greatest asset. Such apathy must not carry into the legal profession itself. The very presence of you gentlemen here and your interest in these proceedings is an assurance to me that you intend to carry on the fight.

Our Domestic Sugar Producer in the World Setting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, Mr. Lawrence Myers, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, delivered an address to the Western Beet Growers Association at its meeting at Brookston, Minn., on September 6, dealing with the difficult and complex problem of world sugar supplies and the relation of the Sugar Act to that problem. The speech details in a very factual manner the splendid stabilization results which have proceeded from the Sugar Act and from the administration of that act under the Secretary of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed at length in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DOMESTIC SUGAR PRODUCER IN THE WORLD SETTING

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure to get back to my home State of Minnesota and to participate in this annual meeting of the Western Beet Growers Association. It is also a pleasure to get back to Crookston and see the developments that have taken place in the 24 years since I was here last. However, I shall not take time to tell you about the good hunting and fishing of those days.

The world sugar situation has been changing so violently over the past few weeks that it reminds one of the joker's reference to the weather: "If you don't like it, just wait a few minutes."

When I agreed to talk on the subject of our domestic sugar producer in the world setting, I expected to discuss the normal situation in which there is a world sugar surplus with depressed world sugar prices. I intended then to tell how the Sugar Act cushions domestic producers against effects of such world conditions. That was a few weeks ago. Now we are confronted with a world sugar shortage and for the time being Cuban producers can obtain more for their sugar by selling it in the world market than they can by selling it to the United States. The Sugar Branch, while in the midst of winding up liquidations on what was to have been our final sugar-purchase program, has again purchased a large quantity from Cuba to protect this country's requirements and to prevent inflationary prices.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the chronic world sugar surpluses and the temporary shortages, such as we are now experiencing, come largely from the same fundamental causes. The world sugar surplus problem that is normally with us arises primarily from the fact that consumers in many parts of the world are unable to pay the prices charged in their countries for sugar. Consumers in the United States utilize directly and in sugar-containing products around 100 pounds of sugar each per year. We are among the largest sugar users in the world. Moreover,

our prices to consumers are among the lowest in the world.

In many foreign countries excessive tariffs, excise taxes, monopoly prices, and other restrictions force sugar prices to levels far above those in the United States. Consumers in such countries frequently use only a fraction of the sugar used by consumers in the United States. As a result, there tends to be an underconsumption of sugar in many countries of the world. Sugar coming from the beet fields and cane fields tends to be dammed up in warehouses instead of moving into consumption. The resulting surplus can properly be likened to the floods occurring here in the Red River Valley when ice farther north retards the spring flow.

The world sugar surplus has been made worse over the years by the extremely low wage rates prevailing in a number of the tropical sugarcane growing areas. Prewar wages in some cases were as low as 15 cents per day. With production costs based on such wage rates, low sugar prices had little effect on production.

To make matters still worse, some countries have subsidized exports. Both Poland and Czechoslovakia are important sugar exporters. Yet, sugar prices in those countries are kept so high that per capita consumption in Czechoslovakia is only about 53 pounds and that in Poland is only 40 pounds per year. High internal prices check consumption in those countries and thereby leave a residual supply for sale in the export market at far lower world prices.

Only about 10 percent of the world's sugar produced in the prewar period was sold in the so-called free world export market, that is, in export markets in which the sugar had no preferential. In the prewar period, world sugar production amounted to about 35,000,000 tons, and only about 3,600,000 tons were sold in the world market. A change of 1,000,000 tons would be only 3 percent of the world total supply but it would exceed 25 percent of the supply for the export market. A very small percentage of the world sugar supply, therefore, exercises a dominating influence in establishing prices in the world market. The importance of supply changes is greatly magnified.

If barriers to trade and consumption of sugar throughout the world could be reduced to the level of those in the United States so that prices to consumers would be reasonably in line with prices in the world markets, it appears that world consumption could be greatly increased. The larger supplies and freer flow of sugar in world markets should add stability to the world sugar situation. The greater stability that could be achieved in world markets would be of great benefit to our producers as well as to our consumers.

In an effort to turn the world sugar economy in the direction of freer trade and greater consumption, the United States has supported the proposals made by Cuba for the development of a new international sugar agreement. The position of the United States Government on this matter was adopted after a public hearing and consultations with the various branches of the domestic sugar producing and consuming industries. The International Sugar Council held a meeting on the matter in London starting June 26. In addition to the official delegation selected from among the various agencies of the United States Government, there were present also a representative of domestic beet processors, a representative of domestic beet growers, a representative of the Hawaiian industry, and a representative of the Puerto Rican industry. This industry group worked in close collaboration with the Government delegation throughout the meeting. Certainly the representatives of all countries attending the conference found that the United States sugar industry, as well as the United States Government, wish to develop a program in collaboration with the other countries of the world to bring about a greater consumption and freer trade in sugar.

The conference adopted the American draft agreement as a starting point for the development of its own draft. The conference draft embodies the various suggestions made by representatives of the many countries in attendance. Naturally, no country is committed to adopt any agreement and some of the proposals in the draft are mutually contradictory and included as alternative suggestions. Nevertheless, many of the problems of fundamental importance to the world sugar economy were considered and the present draft embodies various suggestions as to extent and manner of dealing with them. When the time arrives to deal further with sugar surpluses the work done in London should furnish the outline for a new program.

The outbreak of fighting in Korea touched off a heavy buying movement in the United States and the rest of the world. There is strong evidence that consumer buying has subsided in most sections of the country. Nevertheless, it has been necessary to provide sugar to protect the requirements of the domestic market, especially in the East, until new crop Puerto Rican and Cuban sugar becomes available in February. To do this, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 600,000 tons of Cuban sugar, most of which it will make available to the domestic market as needed during the remainder of 1950. This sugar was purchased at a price of 5.38 cents per pound, f. a. s. Cuba, which is approximately equal to the current price of 6.25 cents per pound, duty paid, c. i. f. New York. It is of significance that at the time negotiations were completed for the purchase of this sugar, the world price was one-half cent per pound above the price Commodity Credit Corporation was required to pay. Although the Sugar Act is not designed to protect this country against the effects of world shortages, the fact is that domestic prices remained relatively stable during the heavy buying period while world prices rose sharply.

Cuba protected its long-time market in the United States in preference to seeking the temporary gains of selling a larger quantity in the world market at the present high price.

To satisfy the present high demand at stable prices the determination of sugar requirements was raised to 8,700,000 tons. That is more than 1,100,000 tons above the quantity distributed in 1949 and it is more than 600,000 tons above the record quantity distributed in 1941, when a hoarding movement was in progress for the entire year. The only Cuban sugar available for meeting this increased requirement was the 600,000 tons owned by Commodity Credit Corporation, and a part of that was required for carryover and other purposes. Therefore, 400,000 tons of the increased quota were reallocated to domestic areas. In round figures, Puerto Rico received 150,000 tons; Hawaii and the beet area each received 100,000 tons; and the mainland cane area received 50,000 tons. This should enable these areas to market without restriction during the remainder of 1950. Incidentally, this should meet the problem of overquota supplies this year in our domestic areas.

Since 1934 when the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act was written, this country has developed a new type of protective program for sugar. The present version is contained in the Sugar Act of 1948. This program recognizes the needs of consumers as well as those of producers. Moreover, it contains the flexibility which is essential in dealing with changing domestic and world conditions. Supplies for the United States come primarily from six producing areas. Four of these are domestic: The beet area, the mainland cane area, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Cuba and the Philippines, of course, are the major foreign suppliers of our market. The sugar programs since 1934 have done much to keep each of these six competing areas in a healthy, fighting condition. The advantages of having several competing sources of supply are always evident from the standpoint of consumers. The advantages were especially great during the recent war period—first, when supplies from the Philippines were cut off, and later when the submarine menace and the shortage of ocean shipping facilities restricted shipments from Puerto Rico and Cuba. The advantages of giving equitable treatment to producers is demonstrated at the present time by our large supplies from Cuba and the domestic areas.

The ample supplies of sugar that now prove so welcome are traceable in large part to the operations of the Sugar Act during the past 3 years. In the spring of 1948 the price of refined cane sugar fell from $8.40 to $7.40 per 100 pounds. To check the decline in prices it was necessary to reduce quotas from 7,800,000 tons to 7,200,000 tons. In all probability prices would have gone somewhat lower, temporarily, if quota reductions had not been made. There followed a moderate recovery in prices, although the price in June 1950 was only $7.70 per 100 pounds. The loss of confidence on the part of growers while prices were falling, and the return of confidence when the market was stabilized probably had more effect on production than the actual level of prices.

In 1948 our production of beet sugar fell to 1,300,000 tons. This year it may exceed 1,900,000 tons. Production in the mainland cane area, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico has also increased during the past 3 years, although prices were probably not the dominating influence in those areas. Even in Cuba the stability given the industry under our Sugar Act helped bring about the increase in production in 1950 in contrast to the sharp cut that came in 1949 following the low prices of 1948.

Certainly the operations of the act checked the decline in prices that took place in the first half of 1948. Certainly also consumers would have gained temporarily if that decline had continued. Consumers would be paying dearly now, however, if we did not have the large 1950 supplies which can be attributed to the price stabilization in 1948 and 1949.

In administering the sugar program, we recognize that in the Sugar Act of 1948 Congress provided for a program of stabilization for the protection of the proper interests of both producers and consumers. The flexibility permitted under the Sugar Act is the great advantage this program provides in maintaining stability under greatly changing conditions. In 1948 when consumer demand fell, supplies made available under the quota system were reduced from 7,800,000 tons to 7,200,000 tons. This year, when consumer demand has increased sharply, the supplies have been raised from 7,500,000 tons to 8,700,000 tons. Such flexibility is necessary if we are to deal with a widely fluctuating demand situation and undertake to give the American consumer what he wants when he wants it.

Under the Sugar Act domestic producers have been afforded a very effective protective system under which they can supply a large part of the needs of the domestic market with confidence that they will be protected against a part of the price declines that frequently occur in the world market. The great and

growing efficiency of our domestic producers is adequate testimony of the keen competition existing between the six major suppliers of the United States' market. It is essential that producers, both farmers and factories, strive for ever-increasing efficiency in production if they are to keep abreast in the competitive race of selling their products.

In the future it should be possible, through cooperation of all or a major portion of the nations of the world, to develop a freer international economy for sugar that will simplify the problem of protecting the interests of producers and consumers in this country. While the present conditions continue in the world sugar economy, however, and while tremendous uncertainties confront us in other respects, both our producers and consumers need protection they are receiving under the Sugar Act.

New Foreign Studies Course at University of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Des Moines Register of September 4, 1950, entitled "New Foreign Studies Course at Iowa," along with a portion of a letter on the same subject from President Virgil M. Hancher of the University of Iowa.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, September 4, 1950]

NEW FOREIGN STUDIES COURSE AT IOWA

We are glad to see the new program of foreign studies in the general cirriculum of the University of Iowa this fall. Our times call for a broader knowledge and a deeper understanding of peoples and lands which a shrinking globe is bring ever closer to us.

It is not enough for us to learn a country's mean annual rainfall, the ratio of its imports to its exports, its form of government and the important events in its history.

These facts are important, but to be really meaningful they must be tied together into the whole that constitutes a people and a nation. We need to know the people as human beings with certain important motivating traits and traditions. We need to know what social forces have shaped their hopes, their fears and their prejudices. We need to speak to them in their own language instead of waiting for them to learn ours.

By regrouping into one unit isolated courses from four departments—geography, history, modern languages, political science—the university hopes to provide this broader knowledge. Germany and Austria, France, Spain, and Russia are the nations that will be studied.

The new studies will be of special interest to students who expect to work or travel abroad or go into government service, of course. But they should find their largest field among those who will remain at home, to be active citizens in forming our world policies.

Describing this new course, President Hancher, of Iowa University, has written to my office, in part, as follows:

"I have your inquiry about our program of foreign studies which we are initiating at the university this fall.

"In a meeting of the graduate college of August 1, referring to the critical international situation I suggested that the faculty submit programs of teaching or research which might be useful in connection with the present defense program and the role of our country as a leader among the nations of the world.

"Following this suggestion a program of foreign studies was organized by an informal committee and approved by Dean Dewey B. Stuit, of the college of liberal arts. The program resembles in a general way the area and language program of the ASTP of World War II. Our program differs from that of the ASTP in that it brings together a large number of departments—geography, history, modern foreign languages and political science—and emphasizes the importance of this type of training not only for defense purposes but in particular to give students the preparation they need if they are to function effectively in international affairs—business, governmental, professional, and scientific. The goal of the program is to familiarize the student with the geography, the political and economic concepts, the cultural traditions, and the language of a foreign area to an extent where he may use his knowledge as a member of our Armed Forces, in the diplomatic service of this country or as a business representative.

"From a general educational viewpoint the program will give the student a broader outlook and better understanding of other nations and enable him to understand and judge the international situation in a more objective manner."

Speculation on the Commodity Exchanges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a part of the text of a radio interview by Mr. Charles Collingwood with Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, broadcast last Sunday evening, September 17, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This portion of the broadcast refers directly to speculation on the commodity exchanges, a problem with which the Senate attempted to deal through the amendment offered by me to the Defense Production Act of 1950 which was eliminated in conference.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Do you consider the Defense Production Act satisfactory from the agricultural standpoint?

Secretary BRANNAN. Aside from the fact that it does not include one necessary type of authority, it seems to be a very good piece of legislation. We're still in the process of making a thorough study of the provisions and getting organized to carry out the parts of the act for which the President has made us responsible.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. You said you're organizing to carry out the Agriculture Department's responsibilities under this act; is that anything comparable to setting up a War Food Administration?

Secretary BRANNAN. No, nothing like that. We'll have a few people watching the supplies of materials and facilities needed in farm production and food processing. We'll keep an eye on requirements for food and other agricultural products and make any allocations that become necessary to insure that all essential needs are met, both domestic and foreign. And we'll have a few people keeping up with the price picture.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. When you said the Defense Production Act failed to provide one necessary type of authority, what were you referring to?

Secretary BRANNAN. I meant authority to hold down excessive speculation on the commodity exchanges. Wild speculation speeds up a boom and it speeds up a bust. It's downright dangerous. In a few weeks beginning with the Korean outbreak, speculators in soybeans had a field day. Prices mounted so that they could take profits of as much as 270 percent on their margins or down payments. They could buy soybeans for 20 cents a bushel down payment—less than 10 percent of the price—and in just a short time prices went up 54 cents a bushel.

While housewives were being shamed for buying an extra 5 pounds of sugar, a speculator with $400 could buy a sugar contract calling for future delivery of 112,000 pounds of sugar—then worth about $6,000.

The new law restricts the use of credit for buying homes and the goods we all use. I don't think the speculators ought to be treated as a privileged class. The Government should have authority to control the margins or down payments in the commodity futures markets just as we have other kinds of credit control.

American Garrisons Over the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Garrisons," written by Vermont Royster and published in the Wall Street Journal of September 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GARRISONS

(By Vermont Royster)

A subtle but significant shift is taking place in America's world role, a shift that now in the midst of a war seems like a matter of small moment and yet one that has far-reaching implications for us at home and abroad. For it is an alteration that will not undo itself even when peace comes again.

We are being transformed, partly by circumstance and partly by design, from a

nation that exercises world power from a home base into a nation that will wield its power from armed outposts located not only in our possessions and protectorates but also in friendly countries all over the world.

This change, and it is a change in the kind of nation we will henceforth be, comes from the fact that our temporary armies of occupation in Europe and Asia are to become permanent garrisons set in the midst of free peoples.

It may seem like a small change because we have already become accustomed to the fact that we have interests in Asia and in Europe and we have perforce undertaken long-range commitments in both places. It may seem a small matter, for instance, to move from the Atlantic Pact, which pledges us to defend Europe, to the establishment of a permanent armed force in Europe to support the pledge. It may seem, too, nothing new because we have long maintained similar outposts in such places as Panama and Guantanamo, Cuba.

Yet, in truth, to change the label on the Army from "occupation" to "garrison" and to dot those garrisons all over the world means that both we and the world must adjust to thousands of new problems.

The armies of occupation in Germany and Japan have their problems, but at least they are all-of-a-piece. There the occupation is the government. It is justified to the occupied on the grounds that they are a defeated nation, an understandable if not pleasant reason. The cost is justified to ourselves because we must reorganize the vanquished. But to both viewpoints it is temporary; it is not a permanent alteration in the way of living.

Now the United States plans to negotiate a peace treaty with Japan, to return the country to the Japanese. But the Army will not leave; it is to remain behind as an outside force in but not of the country. When that happens, the whole relationship must alter, not only the individual relationship between Japanese and United States soldiers but the relationship between the two governments. And most important of all, the time element changes. Neither we nor the Japanese can look forward to an end of it.

In Europe we are not only going to put our permanent garrisons into the lands of former enemies; we will place them in countries with which we have never been at war, completely sovereign countries. Unlike Panama and Guantanamo, these garrisons will not be isolated points cut off from the rest of the garrisoned country. They will be intermingled, both geographically and politically, with the life of the country itself.

The countless personal irritations that will arise may be passed over, not because they are unimportant but because they can probably be surmounted. Anyway, there are other, more important implications.

The moment we set down a permanent garrison in, let us say, France, both we and France have given hostages to one another. The size, the organization, the training and supply of the French Army would become instantly a matter of vital concern to us.

We could not—and would not—avoid interference.

On the reverse side, the French could not—and would not—give us carte blanche to locate our forces or to fortify them as we see fit. Our garrison commander, too, becomes subject to the ideas and orders of an alien, though friendly, government.

This is only part of it. When we have an American garrison in France we are entwined with France's economic well-being, with her politics, with her foreign policy, for these things all would affect the operation and security of our garrison. To what goes on in France we are more than an interested observer. We are then an anxious party.

In theory our garrison might not touch France's sovereignty or restrict our own freedom of action. In practice we could not ignore what France did. In practice we would not be free to follow our own policy within this sphere; our military policy would have to be adjusted to the internal, as well as foreign, policies of France.

The rest of the world—the non-garrisoned part—would also have to make adjustments. To all of Europe the United States would cease to be a country over the sea (albeit already a powerful one) and become a country with fingers permanently stuck in their areas. The army of occupation can be treated as a passing matter; the garrison would be ever-present evidence of empire.

The garrisons will likewise bring new tasks for us at home. The armies of occupation mean sending men abroad, they mean heavy costs, they mean wrestling with the internal problems of other lands. But with armies of occupation there is the aim—and the expectation—of "bringing the boys home" as soon as a certain job is done. The garrisons are something different.

Even if the Korean war should not be followed by another outbreak, the garrisons would not end for they are not planned as temporary measures. Once we undertake to garrison Europe and Asia, when do we come home?

The meaning of this, in its simplest terms, is that we must be prepared to maintain very large armies permanently all over the world. We must be prepared to pay the cost of them in manpower, in taxes, in the willingness to intervene in domestic affairs abroad, and in the willingness to have our own domestic affairs regimented in "peace" as in war. And the outlook for all this is permanent—or for as long as "permanent" is in history.

Two world wars have changed the United States from a continental island into a world power. But soon the far-flung garrisons will change it into something it never was, a world-wide empire with outposts of power even in peace and in the midst of friends. It is not an easy role to play. Hereafter we shall have to live differently at home. And the world and we will have to learn to live together—differently.

Mobilization of Moral and Spiritual Resources for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement prepared by me, together with excerpts from an address which I delivered last night before the Philadelphia Chapter of the Gold Star Wives of America, on the subject of mobilization of our moral and spiritual resources for national defense.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Home front support of our fighting forces will not reach its full effectiveness unless we mobilize all our moral and spiritual resources for national defense, United States Senator MARTIN said last night in an address to the Philadelphia chapter, Gold Star Wives of America.

Senator MARTIN spoke at a dinner marking the installation of officers of the organization held in the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. Its members are World War II widows.

"One of the most serious problems which arises in war time grows out of greed and selfishness," Senator MARTIN said. "There is danger to our country from the chiseler, the profiteer, the black-market operator, and all others who seek to enrich themselves out of the blood and suffering of our fighting men.

"Those who stoop to such outrageous practices betray their country at a time when American lives are being sacrificed on the altar of patriotism.

"We must fight the sabotage of the unpatriotic chiselers with all the righteous influence of real Americanism. We must mobilize all the moral and spiritual resources in complete support of our national defense effort.

"Your organization was born of sacrifice for our country and our flag. Your members know the tragedy of total war. In your hearts there is hope and prayer that the present conflict in Korea may soon be ended in victory for freedom and that our beloved country may be spared the terrible horrors of another war.

"But I am firmly convinced that we must put forth every effort now—not after the November election—but now—to place our country in a state of total preparedness.

"This is no time to play politics with the lives of our boys who are fighting in the mud of the Korean battlefields.

"This is no time to dilly-dally with rising prices. This is no time for higher profits, work stoppages, or demands for increased wages.

"To deal effectively with inflation we must freeze prices and wages now—not after the November election. We should act before the damage is done—not some time in the future when it may be too late."

Victory for Senator Tydings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "A Real Victory for Tydings," published in the Washington Evening Star of September 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REAL VICTORY FOR TYDINGS

Senator TYDINGS seems to have suffered his worst defeat before the votes were counted. There have been a lot of tall tales about what his brush with the mighty Senator MCCARTHY had done to him in Maryland and how he was up against the toughest fight of his career—tougher even than 12 years ago, when President Roosevelt tried to purge him.

But when the votes were counted, the Senator seems to have done all right. For Maryland Democrats not only nominated him for a fifth consecutive Senate term—a precedent for the Free State—but by the size of his majority gave him a vote of confidence with a pat on the back. It would not appear that he has much cause for anxiety in November and the number of converts won by Senator MCCARTHY is not staggering. Senator TYDINGS deserved what he won and the Star, for one, finds some satisfaction in the result, not only because of the Senator's personal triumph but because of the implied repudiation, in Maryland, of McCarthyism.

Governor Lane's victory, after a particularly hard-fought campaign, lacks the substance of real triumph for most of the voters in Maryland preferred his opponent. While the unit system of convention nomination seems to put him in the clear, he still has a hard fight in the election.

In nearby Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, the regular Democratic organization won without difficulty. But voters in both counties should have something to apologize for. When only about 10,000 out of 56,000 registered voters in Montgomery and only 11,600 of Prince Georges' 48,000, turn out to cast their votes—popular government has received a set-back, no matter who wins.

What Should Be Our Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a discussion on what should be our foreign policy, which occurred on the American Forum of the Air on Saturday, September 9, 1950. The two participants were the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the junior Senator from California.

There being no objection, the text of the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT SHOULD BE OUR FOREIGN POLICY?

(By Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN and Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND)

ANNOUNCER. What's ahead in the Far East? What should we do about Formosa? What should be our foreign policy?

The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the NBC Theater in Washington, D. C.

Now here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. The Republican National Committee recently issued a campaign white paper entitled "Background to Korea," contending that administration policies on China, Korea, and Formosa, had "boomeranged" disastrously.

In a 20,000-word document, the committee charged, through quotations from party officeholders, that Republicans had not been consulted about far-eastern decisions.

Last week came a restatement and a clarification of administration foreign policy, in a fireside chat by the President. He defined the United States aims in these words:

"We do not want the fighting in Korea to expand into a general war. * * * We want peace and we shall achieve it. Our men are fighting for peace today in Korea. We are working for peace constantly in the United Nations and in all the capitals of the world. Our workers, our farmers, our businessmen, all our vast resources are helping now to create the strength which will make peace secure."

So spoke the President.

In view of every American's vital interest in our foreign policy, the American Forum of the Air has asked two distinguished United States Senators to give us their views: Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican of California, one of the Senate's foremost authorities on far-eastern problems, and Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, who was recently appointed as a delegate to the United Nations.

Now, Senator KNOWLAND, what do you think of the recommendation by Gen. Douglas MacArthur that Formosa should not be allowed to fall into unfriendly hands?

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Granik, I believe that the recommendation of General MacArthur was a sound one. I do not know a single responsible commander, military or naval, in the far Pacific area, who does not recognize that the falling of Formosa into unfriendly hands will pierce the American defense position that runs from Japan through Okinawa to the Philippines. And what jeopardizes the defense of this country, jeopardizes the defense of the entire free world.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN?

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, I think that the unfortunate part about General MacArthur's statement relating to Formosa was the fact that he proposed unilateral action instead of relating it to the United Nations. We must never forget that the fighting in Korea is being done under a directive from the United Nations and is not merely a United States action. As quick as we moved into Korea, the President announced that he had instructed the Seventh Fleet to neutralize Formosa to protect our flank; not to see that we protected it forever, or that we should occupy it, or anything of that kind. And it seems to me that General MacArthur ignored that particular part of our program; that it was a United Nations action. And, by the way, he is the United Nations commander.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KNOWLAND, do you think that unilateral action on our part would break up solidarity of the United Nations?

Senator KNOWLAND. No; I do not think that unilateral action on our part would break up the solidarity of the United Nations. I think we must recognize the fact that we are involved in a war in Korea at the present time, that although it is called a police action, there are men dying as we are meeting here tonight. That is largely because the United States had not properly equipped the Army of the Republic of Korea to withstand the type of aggression which came down from the north and had been supplied by the Soviet Union.

I do not believe that it makes for peace for us to more or less indicate to Communist China, which is a satellite of the Soviet Union, that Formosa is theirs for the plucking.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN?

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, I don't think we are indicating that Formosa is China's for the plucking. I think our attitude is that Formosa is still a problem that the United Nations must settle, and that we must not move in on it in an effort by ourselves to settle it alone.

Senator KNOWLAND. Of course, I think that the problem that my friend from Alabama does not quite appreciate is the fact that the legal government of China, of the Republic of China, has its temporary capital on the island of Formosa at Taipei, the Republic of China is a member of the United Nations, it is a permanent member of the Security Council, it has wholeheartedly supported every effort of the United States to withstand aggression in Korea, and it was the first nation outside of the United States to offer troops. It offered 33,000 troops, which were not accepted, but that is a larger number of troops than offered by all the other United Nations with the exception of the United States put together. And up to the very hour when we meet, outside of the forces of the United States and the Republic of Korea, there are only 1,500 ground troops from other United Nations countries, and all of those are from Great Britain.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator KNOWLAND, you do not believe, do you, that we should have accepted the offer of troops by nationalist China?

Senator KNOWLAND. I would say that as long as the Republic of China is a member of the United Nations and a member of the Security Council, and inasmuch as we are faced with the problem of the Communists charging western imperialism, one of the ways of withstanding that would be to accept the offers by Asiatic powers to help uphold international law and order. I would be happy if India had offered some troops against aggression in Korea. The fact of the matter is that up to this very hour when we meet, the only forces India has offered are some ambulance units. And you are not going to stop aggressive communism either in Asia or the Middle East or in Europe just with ambulance units.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator Sparkman?

Senator SPARKMAN. I certainly agree with you. I wish very much that India had offered some troops. I was very glad to see little Thailand offer some troops. I want Orientals in. But I think there is a real reason for not using Chinese troops, and I think it was well stated at the time. As a matter of fact, I think General MacArthur is the one who sent in the declination immediately. Because we must recognize that China is engaged in a civil war.

Senator KNOWLAND. So is Korea.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes, but we were pledged to support the South Koreans. If we accepted in the Korean war the troops offered by nationalist China, of course there would be every excuse for Communist China to come in on the other side. And we know that it probably would have meant an all-out war.

And I think Senator KNOWLAND will agree with me that we are not ready for an all-out war. We are not in any shape today to fight an all-out war.

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, I would say to the Senator from Alabama that in my judgment, and I think it can be confirmed by the facts of the situation, the Chinese Communist Forces have permitted men who were fighting in China just a short time ago, and other people who fought with the Russians at Stalingrad, to cross over the Manchurian-Korean border and to reinforce the North Korean aggressive forces. I don't think there is anyone in our own Government or anywhat his brush with the mighty Senator this infiltration. Now, it is true they are not coming as organized Chinese troops; but, that they are coming as individuals, battle-seasoned veterans, to add to the prob-

lem of our men in Korea is, I believe, without doubt, a fact at the present time.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN?

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes, I admit that that is true. We all know that it is true. For our own satisfaction, we know that Russia has been giving aid to the North Koreans. But at the same time, I don't think the Senator from California would say that that would be justification for our declaring an all-out war against Russia.

Senator KNOWLAND. No. But I think if we are going to have a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world will be secure for ourselves and our children, we must stop yielding to international blackmail. Now, the Soviet Union and the Communists have been carrying on that type of international blackmail for a long time. They did it at Berlin, when they put on the blockade and made us have the airlift. They have done it in this situation in China. They have threatened that if we go north of the thirty-eighth parallel, they will come into the war. I think it is time that we stopped yielding to Communist blackmail throughout the world.

Senator SPARKMAN. I will say that I am in thorough accord with the sentiment that we ought to maintain a strong attitude toward Russia. I think our moving into Korea, our moving into the Security Council and asking the United Nations to intervene in Korea, was an action that Russia did not anticipate.

Senator KNOWLAND. And I think it was an excellent action, and I think all supported it on both sides of the aisle. It was the only move that could be made unless the United Nations was to die on that date.

Senator SPARKMAN. That is correct. And I think perhaps the Korean situation may have at least one happy outcome, and that is that it may very well revitalize the United Nations.

Senator KNOWLAND. And it may also warn the people of the United States, as well as the United Nations, that the Communists' talk about peace is but a mask for aggression.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, I think we all agree with that statement. We all know that we have a very difficult situation to deal with.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN, many people are asking why our Defense Establishment was so unprepared for that Korean war, when the administration spent some $50,000,000,000 in the last 5 years.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes; that is true. A great many people ask us. I am sure Senator KNOWLAND has had many inquiries, as I have, and as every other Member of Congress has had. What has become of the $50,000,000,000 that we have appropriated for the Armed Forces since 1945, since the end of the war? Well, as a matter of fact, the biggest single part of that appropriation has gone for pay, maintenance, clothing, supplies, and things of that kind. Another sizable item has gone for obtaining equipment and ordnance, munitions, heavy munitions. When you break it down and see what has actually become of the money, you will realize that not a great deal of the money has gone into building up, making an army stronger.

Of course, it is easy for us looking back upon it and using hindsight to say that we made a mistake. We did make a mistake. We should have spent many additional billions of dollars. But I think if we would just, in all fairness, review the situation over the past several years, we would realize that the American people, the taxpayers, were calling upon us to cut down, cut down, cut down. And when Secretary Johnson, a year or so ago, announced that he was going to cut down by $1,000,000,000, the applause that went up from all over the country was tremendous.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you think it came from the Republican side of the House?

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes; from all of us, and from the taxpayers out over the country generally. I think we ought to keep those things in mind when we are talking about that.

Senator KNOWLAND. I don't quite agree with my friend from Alabama in that regard, I think in the first place, one reason the American people had great admiration for Winston Churchill was that even during Britain's darkest hour he took the British people into his confidence. He gave them the cold, hard facts of life, whether it was good news or bad news. He treated them as adults, and they responded as such.

Now, as a matter of fact, the Congress of the United States appropriated money that would have gone a long ways toward building a 70-group Air Force. The President of the United States froze those funds and did not use them. The Congress of the United States appropriated all of the funds asked by the Military Establishment, and they could have had more at any time they requested. They did not even expend the funds which the Congress had appropriated.

Now, I just happened to look up to see what a bazooka costs. A 3.5 bazooka costs $63. You could have had a thousand bazookas for $63,000. A thousand more bazookas in Korea of the 3.5 variety at the time of the outbreak of hostilities might have made a great difference. I believe that we have not been sufficiently alert to recognize that the people in the Kremlin will only be impressed by a force in being and not one on blueprints.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN?

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes, I will say one word on that. I don't differ greatly with my friend BILL KNOWLAND in that statement. As a matter of fact, I supported the 70-group Air Force every time it came up. Now, he throws the blame on the President. Let me remind you that it came up in the Congress of the United States. And when it was voted on in the Senate, there were only nine Senators that voted in favor of a 70-group Air Force. I was one of the nine.

Senator KNOWLAND. And the Senator will recall that I offered the amendment, and the Senator supported it. But to give the entire story, one reason why a great many of the Democrats and Republicans did not support the amendment was because they were told that the President would not use the funds even if the amendment was adopted. So, I think, in fairness to some of the Senators who did not vote with us on that day, that background must be given as a matter of fairness to them.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN?

Senator SPARKMAN. Of course, that is true. But at the same time, there had been very strong support for a 70-group Air Force, there would have been greater support for the amendment offered by my friend, the Senator from California. There were only nine Senators that voted for it. There was a time when Congress had the right, and the privilege, had the power to show the President what the people of the country wanted, if they wanted that. And only nine voted for it.

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes; but I will say, John, that as a matter of fact, in conference, funds were provided for 52 groups, despite that Senate action; and that bill went to the President, the funds were provided, and the President froze the amount and did not use any more than would take care of 48 groups.

Senator SPARKMAN. And that was about the time that Secretary Johnson was putting on his economy campaign that met such widespread approval of the people of the country.

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes; but I am afraid we cut out some muscle as well as some fat.

Senator SPARKMAN. I know we did. But, Bill, you and I were on the same side. We voted for the funds. However, a great many of the people who are now raising these cries are profiting from hindsight rather than foresight.

Moderator GRANIK. Gentlemen, may I take a question from the audience?

During this past week, the Marine Corps League had an exciting convention in Washington, particularly with the visit of President Truman.

We have invited some of these distinguished marines to attend our program today. I see the commandant, Clay Nixon, of Seattle, in the audience, and I am wondering if he would like to ask a question.

Mr. NIXON. I think both Senators could answer this.

Gentlemen, do you feel that—I am speaking as a Marine Corps League official on behalf of a lot of marines who will go to immediate duty—there should be a demand by the United Nations for an atomic inspection of Russia as well as all of the world, that we could avoid the so-called police action?

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KNOWLAND?

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, of course, I think, Mr. Nixon, that you can have no worth-while international control of atomic energy unless you have full inspection and as you well know, the Soviet Union has refused that type of inspection, without which there can be no real control. I cannot quite understand from your question whether you are proposing that we should demand that they open their doors to inspection and take such action as our national interests require if they do not do it.

Mr. NIXON. You believe that we can avoid what we should have asked for years ago, the matter of "put up or shut up" at this time?

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, I think that we are either going to have a system of international order or we are not. Certainly as far as I am concerned, I believe that it is time for the free nations of the world to establish a line behind which they will no longer continue to retreat.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN?

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes, I think we have pretty well established that line, certainly in some parts.

Senator KNOWLAND. In Europe.

Senator SPARKMAN. In Europe, I think we have done it very well. One thing that I think we need to keep in mind is this: in this fight against Communist aggression, it is necessary to follow somewhat the same pattern that we found it necessary to follow during World War II. I know that the forces that were out in the Pacific cried for help. My friend, BILL KNOWLAND, at the time, insisted on our sending more help to the Pacific. Instead, we simply held in the Pacific until we completed the job in Europe, and then we turned toward the Pacific. I think we have to conduct some such campaign as that in this holding of Communist aggression throughout the world. As my friend, BILL KNOWLAND, has said, we have pretty well now drawn the line in Europe.

Moderator GRANIK. What do you think about his comment, "put up or shut up?"

Senator SPARKMAN. I think we are doing a good bit of that. I think the Korean instance has indicated to many that we are not going to take just anything and everything.

Senator KNOWLAND. The only thing that disturbes me is the current policy of appeasement at Lake Success and in Washington relative to the seating of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations. Now, the proposal is being made that if that is done it would give us another arsonist in the

town fire department, so to speak, where you would have a Chinese Communist Malik there to disturb and sabotage and obstruct the activities of the United Nations Security Council. I think our Government is very weak in that policy. We have said we would not vote for it, but we will not try to line up any votes, we will not utilize our veto. I think we should take a firm stand, vote against it, line up against it, line up others to vote against seating the Chinese Communist, and, if necessary, use our veto as the Russians have done many times in the past.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KNOWLAND, do you not think that our new delegate will alleviate some of that confusion?

Senator KNOWLAND. I certainly hope so. Knowing what an able statesman and an able legislator he is, I hope he will bring some sense in that regard to our foreign policy.

Senator SPARKMAN. Bill, I want to say this, that the thing you were talking about was talked about when Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, returned from the conference of the big ministers several months ago, but I do not believe there has been any such talk of that since the Korean outbreak. I do not go along with you when you talk of the existence of a spirit of appeasement. I think we are through appeasing and I do not believe that there is any great spirit present regarding the seating of Communist China, certainly I do not want to see them seated.

Senator KNOWLAND. At the very moment the representatives of the new nation of India are in Peiping assuring Mao Tse-tung's representative that they will do everything that they can to line up votes to seat Mao Tse-tung's representative at the meeting that will be held in New York this very month. So I hope you will double check that question quite carefully.

MODERATOR. Let's take another question. There is another convention in town, the thirty-second annual convention of the new Beta Epsilon law fraternity. Some of the delegates are present. Would one of you gentlemen like to ask a question?

Mr. GOLDBERG. My name is Joseph A. Goldberg, of Winnetka, Ill. I would like to address this question to Senator SPARKMAN. Do you believe that the United Nations army should stop at the thirty-eighth parallel if and when they drive the North Koreans to that point?

Senator SPARKMAN. I believe that that question should be determined by the United Nations. And again, I want to stress this necessity now, if we believe in the United Nations; and we have declared our faith in them when we put this problem in their lap, and we are fighting under the assumption that this is a United Nations war—and it is; 53 of the 59 United Nations have pledged their support.

Oh, it's true not many of the ground troops are there yet, but more than 30,000 have been pledged and some of them are there and some of them are on the way while others are coming. I think it is one of the most hopeful things that has happened; that is, that 53 out of 59 members of the United Nations came to our side in this fight. Now, it is a United Nations action. I think that we must keep faith with the United Nations and a decision as to what will happen above the thirty-eighth parallel will have to be decided by the United Nations.

Moderator Granik: Senator KNOWLAND?

Senator KNOWLAND. I would like to amplify that a little. Of course, it is a United Nations action but we are going to have some part in what that determination is. If we only go back to the thirty-eighth parallel and allow the Communist Government of North Korea to reorganize, to get new equipment from the Soviet Union, it will be a continual threat to the peace of the Republic of Korea. Unless the world now can give a United Nation to the Republic of Korea, all of this bloodshed will have been in vain and we will have to face the same thing over again. I think our policy should be clear, we should take some leadership in it, and it should be that these aggressives are going to be moved out north of the thirty-eighth parallel. If they want to go back into Communist China, let us chase them back into Communist China and let them be there with the ideological conditions that they apparently want but let us not plague the free people of Korea with this aggressive force by merely letting them again take up their positions north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN?

Senator SPARKMAN. I would just like to add this, that I still say that the ultimate decision ought to be left to the United Nations. Naturally, we are going to have an important part to play in making that decision. I do say that whatever we decide to do we ought to make certain that they will not be in a position to exercise this aggression any more.

Moderator GRANIK. May I take another question? Go ahead, sir, please.

Mr. MATSON. My name is Earl Matson and I am a delegate from Chicago, Ill. My question is addressed to Senator KNOWLAND.

Is there any necessary validity in the opinion which many people express to the effect that the only way to achieve a sound foreign policy is to have a sound internal government?

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, of course, I think that foreign policy and domestic policy tie in very closely together. One of the great problems, I think, that we have is that we have allowed our foreign policy commitments to exceed our Armed Forces in being and that is always a very dangerous thing to do. It is necessary, I think we found from World War II, not only to have a strong Army and Navy and Air Force but it is necessary to have a sound industrial capacity and sound economy as well so they all tie in very closely together.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN?

Senator SPARKMAN. I have no argument with that. I certainly agree with that statement, that they must develop and go hand in hand.

Moderator GRANIK. Gentlemen, we have just time for summaries. Senator KNOWLAND, will you give us your summary?

Senator KNOWLAND. I would say that I have supported our foreign policy in Europe because I thought we had a policy that made sense to the American people and to the American Congress. That was that we would help rehabilitate the war-torn world, we would help maintain a free world of free men. I have differed with our policy in the Far East because we had no such policy there. In other words, we have closed the door to communism in Europe and we left our door wide open in the Pacific. We tried to encourage a coalition between the Chinese Communists and the government of the Republic of China. When I was in China last November one of the leaders of the Republic said to me, "Senator, you know there cannot be any real coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the tiger." That has been the experience with every country that has tried coalition with communism.

I think that it is time that we give some real support to the Republic of China and see to it that the Island of Formosa does not get into unfriendly hands.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, Senator KNOWLAND.

Senator SPARKMAN, may we have your summary, please?

Senator SPARKMAN. I will go back to the statement that I made earlier in this discussion and point out again the fact that we called upon the United Nations to aid in this Korean situation. As a matter of fact, it was a problem that rightfully belonged to the United Nations. We should be pleased with the response that we have received from the United Nations in this first program of offering armed resistance to Communist aggression. There are 59 members of the United Nations; 53 of them definitely came to our side and pledged their support and several of them are sending armed forces. I think it is one of the most hopeful things that has happened. I think we must continue to make it a United Nations action, and we must realize that the time is past when we, acting alone, can determine all of the foreign policy.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

You have been listening to a discussion on our foreign policy. Our speakers have been Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, and Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Address by His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, some 2 weeks ago I had the profound privilege of listening to words of wisdom from a great American at Albuquerque, N. Mex., my home city, when I attended a dinner honoring a son of the South. That worthy and great person was His Eminence Cardinal Stritch, now of Chicago.

Cardinal Stritch made an address which in my opinion could have been made anywhere, whether in religious circles, in a meeting of civic leaders, or anywhere else. It was a patriotic American address, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with the introductory remarks by Archbishop Byrne.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIS EMINENCE SAMUEL CARDINAL STRITCH'S ADDRESS

Archbishop BYRNE. Right Reverend, Very Reverend, Monseigneur, Honorable Ernest Everly, distinguished Senator of the State of New Mexico in Washington, ladies and gentlemen, and friends, it is very gratifying to me as your Archbishop to see the reverent way in which you have received today a Prince of the Church. From the moment he entered the confines of the city of Albuquerque this afternoon, the greatest honor has been bestowed upon him by all. Evidences of profound respect, reverence, and love and the presence of such a large number of Albuquerquians is evidence that you realize the grandeur of this occasion; that you all realize that we have with us this evening one who is higher than anyone who has ever come among us, one that is closer to God and to the Vicar of God on this earth, His Eminence brings the Pope with him wherever he goes. He is an extension of the Holy Father, and those of us who have had the privilege, the sacred privilege of meeting His Holiness and recognizing the keenness of mind of Pope Pius the Twelfth, the warmth of heart that he has, and his holi-

ness of life can see the counterpart of Pope Pius the Twelfth in His Eminence Cardinal Stritch. Verily he is another Pius the Twelfth, and no greater tribute could be paid to him than that, and so with the greatest of reverence I present to you this evening His Eminence and ask all to rise.

Cardinal STRITCH. Mr. Toastmaster, Most Reverend Archbishop, Most Reverend Bishops, Mr. Senator, Mr. Mayor, Monseigneurs, Very Reverend and Reverend Fathers, Surrogates, my dear friends, I want first to thank your Archbishop and you for giving me this visit to Albuquerque. The several reasons for my thanks are going to appear from what I shall say to you this evening. But one reason is personal. It is very personal. You know, some of the thinking in everyone's life goes back to his childhood. Every boy has somehow on some occasion conceived a desire and that desire has lasted to such an extent that the thinking of the grown man is not right until the desire is satisfied. This visit satisfies a desire which goes back to the time when I was in the fourth grade in elementary school down South. We had a teacher from New England, a most unreasonable person. I remember we used to call her Miss Prissy. It was our conviction that before examinations she would sit up all night trying to figure out trick questions. One time she announced an oral spelling examination, and we studied our spelling. When the day came and we lined up before her with that perfect discipline which she commanded, she looked at me and said, "Young man, spell 'Albuquerque.'" Of course, I couldn't spell Albuquerque. So I had to write it 100 times. That stuck in my memory. After this incident, every chance I got I tried to find out something about Albuquerque. I read stories about Albuquerque. Every news dispatch in which there was reference to Albuquerque intrigued me. I have always wanted to come to Albuquerque. Tonight I thank the Archbishop for giving me this opportunity.

These days in New Mexico have been wonderful. I have met with nice people, very nice people. These wonderful days have led me to do a little meditating. As I went about, your good people told me about what is old. They pointed out to me the impress the Spaniards left on New Mexico by this civilizing hand, how they imprinted indelibly some of their culture upon this territory. Then I would think of New Mexico and see its people about me, many of whom came to this country just a few years ago from other parts. Everything seems so youthful; the climate, of course, has something to do with that. New Mexico is new and it is old. It seems to me that to put the new and the old together is one of the great obligations which rests upon us citizens of this great Republic today. Only too often we have forgotten the old. Sometimes people thought about the old without thinking about the new. That is a mistake, too. We must think of the content of our culture which reaches all the way back to the beginning of Christianity and the bringing of Christian teachings to our Western World. That seems to be our obligation today.

You know the old Roman used to boast about being a citizen of Rome. He was very proud of his rights and conscious of his obligations, but Rome was not a republic in the real sense of the word. I think Pope Pius the Twelfth said that the most successful form of government for our times is democracy, and democracy is government by individual citizens who assume their responsibility in promoting the common good. He said it is not just a form, not a government in which there are just masses of people. It is a form of government in which the citizens all unite together to promote the common good. That is very different from the totalitarian ideology of government, from the dictator's idea of government in which some sort of supermind exists and the population is just a mass—a mass having nothing to do in determining its own course of action, nothing to do but to obey in promoting what the dictator decides is the common good.

Mussolini, in one of his aberrations, said, "Liberty in the modern state is freedom to obey the government." A democracy is a government in which all assume the responsibility of promoting the true common good.

Now it seems to me that in these days we ought to think on the fundamentals of the period which we have reached in history. This is a grave period. We are at a crisis which is perhaps the gravest crisis we have ever faced in the history of our country. If we are going to face up to our responsibilities, we ought to think clearly on the fundamental things on which our responsibility rests.

What do we mean when we talk about American democracy? We will say it is a government in which we have freedoms and in which we also have obligations. But that isn't fundamental enough. The old Greek philosophers wrote something about democracy, but their writings are very disappointing. Aristotle's best idea of a state was one of slave labor, and Plato never got above this same idea. In the Roman Republic two-thirds of the population were slaves. Rome was not a real democracy. Why? Because there was no clear cut idea of the dignity and the inherent rights of the human person. The dignity and inherent rights of the human person were not a potent social concept until after the death of Christ, when men stood before the cross of Christ who died for each and every man, died for each and every human person. That brought about two wonderful things, which only then people began to understand—the sacredness of the human person, the inherent rights in the very nature of man. They began to understand freemen, the dignity with which God has clothed the human person, began to talk human rights, inherent human rights.

How can there be any inherent human rights unless there is an immutable moral law, unless in this moral law written by God every right has its roots. Right isn't mere conviction. It must be written in immutable, eternal law that individual man is endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights.

Getting away from God as authority, God as judge, getting away from immutable rights—that type of reasoning leads to totalitarianism, to atrocities, and to abberations. When we began to understand the Christian gospel from Christ Jesus and His Father God, we learned of the dignity of man. To put this into practice in living, into social contacts, and into social life is a hard job. If you have studied the story of the codes of law from the beginning of Christianity, you will see how slow was the change toward recognizing this idea. The great Justinian Code of Roman Law was a relic of the old feudal system. There had to be a beginning of new spirit different from what had existed under the old Roman law. The masses were serfs. The serfs had certain rights and obligations. Slowly the idea of serf disappeared, and the idea of citizen developed. We believe one of the finest developments in all western civilization came about when we tried our first experiments of democracy here. Our Government was established on a Constitution for free men on the premise that religion, morality, education must forever be encouraged. When there comes a breakdown in the religion of the population—religion is a permanent thing—democracy will not endure. We have held to our ideal because we have held to our religion.

Times change, we pass from one economic condition to another. We started out largely as an agricultural country. We become an industrial country. These changes brought problems. We wrote an ideal Constitution—our fundamental doctrines. We have had a hard time trying to realize that ideal. We have realized in practice that there have been times when selfish individuals and personal greed dominated. Many petty tyrannies have led to injuring the common good. There have been times when group interests have prevented the richest enjoyment of native rights to all our citizens. We have made a lot of mistakes, but on the whole we have held to our ideal because we have held to religion.

Today we stand face to face with the great social monster, atheistic communism. It was interesting last year when I was in Europe to hear a university professor in reply to my question about communism in his country say, "You Americans are still talking about the ideology of communism. We see the fact of communism. We have stood face to face with it. We know it to be the enemy of man. We know that it is the negation of everything countless generations here in our Western World have striven to build up and to give us. We know that it degrades, ruins—we know that ultimately it will ruin every human thing." But they are in our own midst, these toyers with novelties, these people who seem to think you have the right to forget God. They use the word God as rhetoric, pay public rhetorical tribute, but they work on problems without any thought of God. They try to impose a godless philosophy on the world while they talk about rights and freedoms. How can such a philosophy be any support for our idea of American democracy. These people have broken down the ideals of people. These people are trying to destroy our inheritance. These people boast of patriotism. Many boast of being progressive and original thinkers. Actually they are destroyers in our midst and do much less for us than those under the hammer and sickle who are openly trying to destroy our western civilization.

This is the time to recognize our responsibilities. We must first recognize our responsibility to God and to our country. We shall be true to our flag if we are true to our cross. It seems to me, and I am sure it seems to you, that in this crisis we must all think. We must all contribute our thoughts. We must allow ourselves to be heard. We must not allow a form of totalitarianism to come into our country. Our country has grown great because in humility we knelt before our God and recognized our responsibility to God; and in recognizing our responsibility to God, we have seen in the Gospel of Christ the ideal of real brotherly love, the idea which the pioneers of our country had in their recognition of the sacredness of the human person.

I know there are some who will tell us the day of the pioneer is gone. There are no more trails to be blazed, no more lands to be settled. The people who say that have forgotten what has gone into our inheritance. The day of the pioneer will never be gone for us. Maybe there are no more virgin forests. Maybe there are no more new lands to be settled. But there are other ways of pioneering, other ways in which we can be pioneers. We have pioneered in building mass production by use of machinery in our economy. We have pioneered in bringing the blessings of the science of medicine to many in our country. We have pioneered in making dry land fertile. There are a million ways in which we can pioneer if we only keep the spirit of our fathers. Remember as in the past we can face the future with security if we face the future with ideals which have been implanted in us and implanted in our civilization and keep them bright and operative. I say this because we are passing through what historians will describe as the end of an epoch and the beginning of a new epoch in history. In this time we can make a great many mistakes,

but we can do a great many good things. The best thing we can do is to make our democracy work. We will make our democracy work if all of us get together, each one conscious of his responsibility for the common good—no group interests advanced to the detriment of the common good—no individual advancement opposed to the common good. There are times when groups must sacrifice themselves; times when individuals must sacrifice themselves. Our first responsibility to God and to our country is that we fully contribute to the common good of all.

The blood of our boys is flowing in Korea. We sent them there because we believe in human freedom, and we recognize our world responsibility. But we know the pain that is in the heart of all of us because of the blood of our boys. We are there in spirit on the battlefield with them. We are willing to sacrifice. We are willing, for a time, to stand heavy taxation. We are willing to vote controls upon ourselves, if necessary for a time. While we are willing to do all this for our bleeding boys, we are willing to do this to keep our inheritance, to enrich our inheritance, but we are not willing to experiment with some new kind of America that some shallow minds are trying to project. This is a time when all of us must stand conscious of our responsibility to God. You cannot make a distinction in that responsibility between your acts in private life and your acts in social and political life. Your actions in social and political life as well as those of your private life must be guided by God's moral law and must be entirely in conformity with the sacred thoughts of the Gospel of Christ.

Let me say on the occasion of this delightful visit to Albuquerque that we should do one thing. We ought to reintensify our sense of responsibility as citizens of this democracy. We must be proud of our citizenship. We must defend our rights and live up to our obligations. But, first of all we must forever understand that the Stars and Stripes will wave in honor and be a beacon light to people all over the world only as long as there falls on the Stars and Stripes the shadow of the cross of Calvary. Thank you.

The South Will Come Altogether Into Its Own When Our Fields Are Green in Winter. May Your Business Continue To Grow to This End. I Hope Your Increased Business Will Be in Clover Seed, Caley Pea Seed, Vetch, Dallis Grass Seed—Seed That Will Keep Our Pastures Green the Year Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, Alabama has no man more beloved, nor does America have any citizen more distinguished and respected than is the good friend of the vast majority of the older men in this House—the Honorable Donald Comer, president of the Avondale Cotton Mills.

Donald Comer, the son of a great father, was born a leader.

His father was a leader and his father's fathers before him were distinguished leaders of their fellow men even in the earliest days of Alabama's history.

His father, B. B. Comer, was overwhelmingly elected Governor of our great State, in addition to having served as a United States Senator from Alabama.

Donald Comer has long been recognized as one of Alabama's greatest industrialists, owning and operating as he does a great many cotton mills throughout the State and which spin more than a quarter of a million bales of cotton a year.

Avondale Mills consumed nearly 33⅓ percent of all the cotton raised in Alabama, or to state it in another way, Avondale consumes not alone the 276,000 bales raised in the State of New Mexico, but additionally thereto, all of the cotton grown in the States of Virginia, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, and Nevada.

One of Alabama's most beloved citizens, he is recognized throughout his State as a leader, the driving power in everything that is right and good, and measures up to my concept of what in reality constitutes one of God's own noblemen.

I have known and I have worked with Donald Comer for more than 40 years. I know him as one who has more energy, more real ability, and more know-how of how to do things right than any man that I have ever known. Like all true southerners and great industrialist that he is, Donald Comer knows that the only wealth that annually comes into this world comes either out of the sea or out of the soil.

He knows that the farmers, planters, miners, and fishermen are the creators of all new wealth. Now, I am not saying that others do not add values by diverse processes and services—but unlike farmers, they do not produce.

Donald Comer loves the land almost as much as he loves his fellow man and life itself.

Noted for his philanthropies, he is a banker, educator, soldier, statesman, farmer, and humanitarian. When Donald Comer speaks, he gives emphasis to the power of fact. He states these things simply, lucidly, and fairly.

Colonel Hanson has just handed me a talk made by Donald Comer, on the future of cotton in the South, delivered before the Alabama Seedmen's Association at their annual meeting at Montgomery.

The long and well beloved friend of every cotton, peanut planter, vegetable grower, and orchardist in all the cotton South is Col. C. C. Hanson, secretary to the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, whose work in behalf of the cotton South is known to my every colleague in both Houses of Congress.

The subject of Mr. Comer's talk is without doubt the most important economic problem facing our Southland and certainly what he has to say on this subject is born of a ripened wisdom and a sagacity and knowledge which spring from a lifetime of effort spent in behalf of cotton farmers as well as improving the staple itself.

The thing that struck me as most remarkable about this talk was that it encompasses all problems of our cotton farmers. Moreover, he has set down in black and white the various observations, findings, and suggested solutions of those whose interests and particularly such of those whose findings had been enriched by experiences like unto his own.

He quotes eminent authorities, names names, tells of their accomplishments, their ambitions, their hopes, their contradictions, and their disappointments.

Let me quote but one of Donald Comer's observations. It is from an address by the Honorable FRANCES BOLTON, Republican Member of Congress from the great State of Ohio. This leading member of the Republican delegation is herself as equally distinguished in her understanding of economic trends and all of the humanities as Donald Comer himself.

Mr. Comer points out that FRANCES P. BOLTON at the annual meeting of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, in discussing her subject, Parity Price Is an Economic, Not a Political Principle, spoke in part as follows:

> Read history and you will find that every human crisis, upheaval, panic, depression, recession, or what not that has ever even temporarily stopped or caused market distress to the financial structure and the progress of our country, has been directly traced to unjust pricing of agricultural products in these United States. This unjust system of pricing decreed that the annual crop was worth no more per unit than the value placed upon a needless surplus.
>
> TAKE FARM ECONOMICS OUT OF POLITICS—BOLTON
>
> It is not, perhaps, as simple as I am making it sound—for the moment is upon us when we must reevaluate existing methods and conditions. We must find ways to put these basically important matters clearly into the field of sound economic principle, where they belong. We must take them definitely out of politics.
>
> If we, as farmers, seek our own particular solutions with no thought of America as a whole, if industry or labor or white-collar worker looks after himself only, we shall find ourselves in a dead-end street instead of on that great road to freedom upon which destiny placed this Nation of ours.
>
> True as it is that America prospers in proportion to prosperity on the farms, it is no less true that unless America as a whole swings along with everything in balance, with all the instruments of her great symphony of freedom synchronized and in harmony, not only the people of America, but the people across the world will find themselves lost in an intolerable darkness.

Mr. Speaker, it behooves every American interested in the economic security of this great country, and it is almost incumbent upon every southern Member of this House, to read the remarkable paper prepared by Donald Comer, chairman of the board of Avondale Mills for presentation before the Alabama Seedmen's Association. I am certain they will find it one of the most thought-provoking documents that has ever been brought to their attention.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of these reasons that I am asking to extend my remarks and include therein the address of Donald Comer on the future of cotton in the South.

Mr. Comer's talk was as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Alabama Seedmen's Association, friends and honored guests, I am happy to be here with you today and particularly happy to participate in your proceedings at this annual meeting, which as are all of your annual meetings of such vital import to our cotton planters.

I am, moreover, gratified to be here with you today in order to discuss the question of The Future of Cotton in the South which, as I have frequently emphasized, is not a southern but a truly national problem of first magnitude.

The growth of cotton is indigenous to our great Southland. While its cultivation and growth is foreign to all of the rich and luscious soils that abound in these United States above the Mason-Dixon line, the fact is that the vast acres in our Southern States which were cultivated to cotton last year, next year can go into wheat, into corn, peanuts, pasture, hay, and other fodder crops this year.

I need not point out to you, however, that were we to make the change from the cultivation of cotton to the cultivation of other row and field crops historically produced in the Northern States, that it would not alone mean more beef, pork, milk, butter and cheese, and more bread raised at home, but that less would be purchased from our neighboring States.

My friends, while it is true that down here in our south country the historic cultivation of cotton is natural to us all—it is equally true that our cotton planters today are progressing rapidly in the development of new methods of one kind or another for even more intensive cultivation and economic growth and harvest.

More than a million and a half families are now altogether dependent on farms that grow cotton. Mississippi grows cotton in 80 counties out of the 82 counties in the State, and moreover, half of all the cash from farm receipts in Mississippi are derived from the cultivation and growth of cotton.

With all of this in mind, it is indeed a startling fact that the statistics of the cash income from agricultural crops disclose that despite the fact that cotton in Mississippi is its most valuable farm crop, and that the year 1947 afforded the most valuable crop ever produced on record, that it afforded a gross receipt of but a mere $435 to each person living on a Mississippi farm.

HELP OURSELVES BY HELPING OTHERS

My friends, the duties of every one of us, whatever our respective vocations, businesses, or gainful employment might be, is first to achieve success in making his own endeavors fruitful and profitable to himself as well as to his fellow man.

As a cotton spinner I spend most of my time on problems directly concerned with the immediate success of Avondale or Cowikee Mills. But I try to remember there is another way, and a very important one, to improve my business, which is to be interested in and to help improve the business of the other fellow. If we could double the income of one and a half million cotton farm families, if we could double the income of all farm families, how greatly we could increase the use of cotton from the present 25 to 50 pounds per person annually.

When I speak of doubling the farm income, that does not mean doubling the price of cotton or whatever else the farmer raises.

The constant effort of the spinner is to give to the customer better values for less money and at the same time with better income for the spinners.

A PROSPEROUS AGRICULTURE INSURES STABLE ECONOMY

When agriculture is prosperous, the market is prosperous; when agriculture slows down, unemployment is present in every mine, every mill and every factory in the land. Statistics show that our national business always is approximately 7 times our national farm income. Statistics also show that our factory payrolls equal approximately our farm income. Therefore the imperative necessity of establishment and wise administration of a sound and enduring national farm program.

CONSTANT IMPROVEMENT THROUGH RESEARCH

Avondale Mills has given over $100,000 in the last few years of research institutes and laboratories in order that we might develop better and more attractive uses for cotton. In addition to this, our mills contribute 5 cents per bale for a general advertising program for new and increased uses of cotton. Most of this money, together with that which comes from farmers, ginners, and so forth, is handled by the National Cotton Council of Memphis.

The cotton spinner, together with the cottonseed crushers of Alabama and North Florida, offer yearly prizes for those communities who do the best job in improved quality of one variety of cotton, the Extension Service of Alabama to be the judge. It has been my pleasure to be present at the last 2 awards of these prizes. The prize money was spent for improved recreational facilities for the whole community, and this was as it should have been. Every one—men, women and children—had had a part in the effort.

We have heard it said that 60 percent of the 1949 Du Pont income was from products not produced 20 years ago. Edison turned the goldenrod into rubber, and no doubt we would be growing goldenrod today had not a cheaper way of making rubber from oil been found recently in Key West, Fla., at the Edison Memorial. I saw Edison's old car there with tires made from goldenrod rubber.

FARM CHEMURGY IMPORTANT

While we spent $200,000,000 to take care of the potato surplus, the Government only spent $69,000 in search of new uses for potatoes. Mr. Wheeler McMillan, president, National Farm Chemurgic Council, says, "No one has yet quite voiced such a slogan as 'billions for subsidies, chickenfeed for research.' I shall, however, venture to propose its reverse 'billions for research and eventually not one cent for subsidy.'"

Partly as a result of Congress being disappointed in the results of research work that has been accomplished under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, the House Agriculture Committee appointed a study group. It is interesting that Mr. McMillan was a member of this committee and had as one of his assistants Mr. John L. Liles, agricultural economist of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta. They have just filed a very comprehensive report.

COTTON AND COMPETITION SYNONYMOUS

Cotton has many competitors and certainly every cotton farmer knows that he can't sit down forever and a day secure in a Government-pegged price. Here is a recent headline in a trade paper: "Burlap's Competitive Position in Bag Trade Strengthened by Advance Cost of Cotton." Bag manufacturers are the third largest consumers of cotton; automobiles and shirts are first and second.

We have got to get entirely away from 50-cent hoes in farming and move up to $1,000 tractors. If there is land that doesn't permit tractor use, perhaps it should be in pastures and pine trees.

The San Antonio (Tex.) Express said: "The late Dr. Charles Herty, chemurgist who originated the process, foresaw the day when the pine tree might succeed cotton as the South's No. 1 money crop. The time has arrived to make that prophecy come true."

A recent news item states that Alabama farmers are planting just exactly 435,000 acres less in cotton this year than they did in 1869.

In the 1949 international edition of the Cotton Trade Journal, under the heading, "A Task for Research," I discussed the need for more uniform length of fibers on each seed. A recent count showed there were 1,130 fibers on one cottonseed of the following varying lengths: 9 fibers, ⅛ inch; 9 of ¼ inch; 9 of ⅛ inch; 37 of ½ inch; 119 of ⅝ inch; 350 of ¾ inch; 429 of ⅞ inch; and 168 measuring 1 inch.

COTTON AND RAYON

Every Avondale and Cowikee mill spindle can spin cut rayon just as easily as they can cotton. Rayon comes cut to the desired length and today we have customers asking us to change our product from cotton to rayon because rayon is cheaper.

The Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co., the United States Steel subsidiary of this section, have set a very fine example in this matter. Years ago when Mr. Gordon Crawford was president of this company, he established a department under Dr. M. F. Jackson for visiting rural sections of Alabama to help them standardize production and also help them to find markets. I think their first interest was in Johnson grass hay and cane sirup.

Mr. Crawford is long since dead but this program has continued and grown under his successors, Herbert Ryding, Lester Perry, and now under Robert Gregg. Dr. Jackson too is dead but his work, now in charge of Leroy Holt and Luther Fuller, with a staff of 11 men, has spread to include all Southeastern States from the Carolinas to Texas. This work is carried on in connection with State agricultural departments and our agricultural colleges.

You are in the seed business. I doubt whether cottonseed has ever been an appreciable part of your business because, as a rule, farmers save their own seed year after year, refreshing occasionally with new strains from seed breeders.

In wishing for your industry a continued growth, I hope that this increasing business year after year will be in clover seed, Caley pea seed, vetch, Dallis grass seed—seed that will keep our pastures green the year around. May I also add bicolor lespedeza to the list for our bobwhites.

Hugh McRae said "The South will come into its own when our fields are green in winter." May your business continue to grow and grow toward this end.

I would like to quote below some short extracts from recent statements by farm leaders.

COMMISSIONER M'DONALD FOR DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT

Commissioner of Agriculture J. E. McDonald, of Texas, continues to think a domestic-allotment arrangement will solve the cotton problem. He also says: "During the past 15 years the Congress of the United States has enacted national farm legislation and appropriated billions of dollars to stabilize agriculture. Nevertheless, today the Government has billions of the taxpayer's dollars tied up in surplus farm commodities and American farmers are confronted with production restrictions or Government regimentation which encourage foreign production and the surrender of foreign markets for our crops grown in excess of American needs."

Hon. Chester C. Davis, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, and first president of the AAA, speaking before the Twelfth Annual National Farm Institute, Des Moines, Iowa, February 17, 1950, said: "For I'm not sure that we've learned anything from 15 years of farm progress."

CHESTER DAVIS HITS PRICE FIXING BY LAW

"From the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 to now, emphasis has steadily shifted to price fixing by law. I think that is leading us down the wrong track.

"Government price supports and high level Government loans can help cushion the shock but they cannot and should not be expected to avert the adjustments that need to be made. We are living in a fool's paradise if we think otherwise. A system of rigid, legislated price supports extended indefinitely into the future and at levels higher than the over-all supply-demand situation will support, will have extremely undesirable consequences, including a great deal of harm to farmers themselves."

1950 ECONOMIC PEACE FOLLOWED BY 1952 HEADACHES SILLY—DAVIS

"It does no good to lull us to sleep in 1950 if in so doing you insure we will have something worse than a headache when we wake up in 1952, or 1953, or 1954.

"Next, I have the feeling that current programs of higher prices and income supports tend to freeze production patterns, to deemphasize adjustment as a goal of agricultural policy.

"By midsummer this year we will have doubled the Nation's population in 50 years—from 76,000,000 in 1900 to 152,000,000. We may be coming in sight of the time when rising living standards combined with population growth will put pressure on our ability to expand and maintain the needed production of milk and meat. I believe present farm programs fall short in encouragement to shifts that need to be made in land use to fit the demand pattern of tomorrow.

"Adjustments are still ahead of us and they will be particularly severe in the wheat and cotton areas. They will face us as soon as we quit sending out the dollars for which to pay for our exports. Our postwar farm programs do not recognize this fact right down to and including the Agricultural Act of 1949."

GUARANTEED PRICE SUPPORTS WRONG—DAVIS

"I do not agree with the idea that Government can or should guarantee price supports fixed at a level that will yield farmers in the aggregate a cash income from marketings equal in purchasing power to the average cash income from marketings in the decade 1938–48, and year by year thereafter maintain a level equal to the average of the first 10 of the 12 preceding years. It just can't be done, and that promise, along with the implied promise of low-priced food for consumers, is the fundamental weakness in the Brannan plan."

FOOD SUBSIDIES SHOULD BE SCRAPPED—DAVIS

"I didn't like the idea of general food subsidies during the war, and I like them less now. There's no good reason why nonagricultural workers can't and shouldn't produce enough goods and services to pay for agriculture's production without help from the Treasury.

"If labor leaders will make their followers realize that in the long run higher wages depend on increased production. Without it the wage increases are not real—and if management will deliver lower prices as volume grows, and will share fairly with labor and consumer the benefits of increased productivity, etc."

TEAMWORK IN ATTAINING HIGH LEVELS OF PRODUCTION NEEDED—DAVIS

"These are stubborn 'ifs,' but they are very important. Perhaps you say there isn't much agriculture can do about these things. Perhaps you think that kind of talk doesn't fit a farm institute. But I tell you these issues are fundamental to farm welfare. Many farm, business, and labor leaders have seen clearly the policy we must follow if our economy is to function. Teamwork in attaining and holding a high level of production is necessary if we are to develop the full economic life required of this Nation."

CONGRESSWOMAN BOLTON'S FARM SPEECH CITED

In an address by Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, M. C., before the annual meeting of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Columbus, Ohio, November 29, 1949, on the subject Parity Price Is an Economic, Not a Political Principle, she says:

"Read history and you will find that every human crisis, upheaval, panic, depression, recession, or what not that has ever even temporarily stopped or caused market distress to the financial structure and the progress of our country, has been directly traced to unjust pricing of agricultural products in these United States. This unjust system of pricing decreed that the annual crop was worth no more per unit than the value placed upon a needless surplus.

TAKE FARM ECONOMICS OUT OF POLITICS—BOLTON

"It is not, perhaps, as simple as I am making it sound—for the moment is upon us when we must reevaluate existing methods and conditions. We must find ways to put these basically important matters clearly into the field of sound, economic principle, where they belong. We must take them definitely out of politics.

"If we, as farmers, seek our own particular solutions with no thought of America as a whole, if industry or labor or white-collar worker looks after himself only, we shall find ourselves in a dead-end street instead of on that great road to freedom upon which destiny placed this Nation of ours.

"True as it is that America prospers in proportion to prosperity on the farms, it is no less true that unless America as a whole swings along with everything in balance, with all the instruments of her great symphony of freedom synchronized and in harmony, not only the people of America, but the people across the world, will find themselves lost in an intolerable darkness."

THE SOUTH LOOKS AHEAD

Dr. Paul W. Chapman, associate dean, college of agriculture, University of Georgia, before the 1950 annual conference advertising staff of the Progressive Farmer at Point Clear, Ala., on the subject the South Looks Ahead, 1950–60, said: "2,240,000 electrified farms in the South—a 10-year increase of 1,820,000. Of the 4,863,266 farm consumers listed in the report, 48 percent were located in 14 Southern States.

"Cash farm income: During the favorable years for farming that have existed since 1942, the South has made great gains in cash farm income. In 1943 it reached $5,000,000,000 and by 1948 had risen to the all-time high of $8,250,000,000. Since 1940 the gain in cash farm income for the Nation has been 233 percent; for the South it has been 272 percent.

"Gains in farm management and operation: Gains in farm owner-operators have been going forward faster in the South than in other sections of the Nation. There is a marked decline in tenants and sharecroppers. From 1930–45, 286,000 more owner-operators; 951,000 less tenants and sharecroppers.

"Crop production is being balanced with animal production; breeding stock is being increased on southern farms faster than in other sections of the Nation.

"Most important of all in relation to soil conservation and livestock profits, feed production is keeping pace with gains in animal population. Many Southern States are organizing 100-bushel corn clubs; Georgia has inducted 200 members in 2 years. Major emphasis is being placed on the development of improved pasture."

ALABAMA NEEDS MORE TRACTOR POWER—P. O. DAVIS

Mr. P. O. Davis, director of extension for Alabama, recently wrote me:

"In talking to the bankers at the university last week I emphasized additional financial needs for our changing agriculture in Alabama. I reminded them, for example, that:

"Stated differently, mule power and equipment per crop acre was valued at $18.74; tractor power and equipment, $48.72.

"By multiplying this $48.72 per acre by the number (8,500,000) of cropland acres we have in Alabama, we get an idea of how much real money is needed to fully mechanize Alabama farms. Of course, a considerable amount has been done, but not near enough for efficient and proper operation.

"Mechanization and pasture fertilizer are only two major examples of big financial needs for Alabama's changing agriculture. For example, to prepare land, buy seed and fertilizer, and plant an acre of alfalfa calls for $30 to $50, and we should, but won't, plant a million acres this year.

"To buy livestock on a big scale big money is needed. Dairy cows are costing $150 to more than $200 each. And homes and fences are expensive. So the story goes."

WHEELER M'MILLEN COMPARES POTATOES TO BUGGIES

Mr. Wheeler McMillen, president of the National Farm Chemurgic Council, opening the Fifteenth National Farm Chemurgic Conference March 29, 1950, Hotel Statler, Washington, on the subject Green Frontiers said:

"The photograph which I hold up for your view is a picture of a buggy. For those of you who do not know this object from experience I might explain that a buggy is a horse-drawn vehicle which was used for the transportation of human beings in those days of antiquity which preceded the motor age.

"The market for buggies began to decline when low-priced automobiles became available to the general public. The manufacturers in the industry discovered they had a buggy problem. They could make more buggies than the public demanded. In those medieval times there was no such thing as parity for buggies. There was no Government system of buggy price supports, flexible or nonflexible.

"Some of the buggy manufacturers went into the automobile business where they made a great deal of money and created large numbers of new jobs. The automobile was better than the buggy. Vast new stores of purchasing power were created by the enterprise which supplied the demand. Consequently today a higher proportion of American families enjoy automobiles than ever owned buggies.

"The object I now hold in my hand is a potato. The potato is agriculture's 1950 model buggy. The potato manufacturers are producing more of this model than the public demands."

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF CROP PLANTING ALWAYS DISASTROUS—M'MILLEN

"This situation has arisen at a juncture in time when people have been led to expect impossible things from Government. The administration of Government has been bitterly and raucously criticized for what it has done about potatoes. Much of this criticism has been entirely unjustified and nearly all of it has completely missed its proper mark. Government should not be criticized only for having engaged in an effort which has proved less than success-

ful. Government can fairly be criticized for having attempted to do something entirely beyond the capacity of Government to accomplish.

"You could give a giraffe a license to drive an automobile. You could give a giraffe permission to take your car onto the highways. Neither a license nor the permission would enable him to drive the car. Such a performance would be entirely beyond his capacity. No giraffe was ever cut out by nature to become a chauffeur.

"Neither is it within the capabilities of government to direct the planting of crops or to determine the price at which they shall be sold. Every such attempt in history has come to an unsuccessful end, usually to the accompaniment of disaster.

"Industry and government alike rest forever uneasy in apprehension of depression. Agriculture today shudders in the fear of accumulated surpluses."

NEW CROPS AND NEW USES REMEDY FOR SURPLUSES—M'MILLEN

"Give industry an ever-expanding economy and it will not fear depression. Give Government a sufficiently expanding economy and it can pay its debts out of production. Give agriculture enough new crops and enough uses for its products, and surpluses will not reappear. Remove the specter of surpluses from agriculture and an ever-expanding economy will give us ever-expanding industry and a first-class chance to save American freedom for future generations."

NATIONAL GRANGE FARM PROGRAM DISCUSSED

In the National Grange, May number, there is printed the Grange farm program from which I quote:

"Fifth, some production controls either through marketing quotas or acreage allotments. While we do not like either, we recognize that they may be necessary, if fixed supports are to be used, and possibly in some cases with flexible supports. We prefer the marketing quota to the acreage allotment because the marketing quota is reasonably manageable while the acreage allotment is too easily evaded, resulting in little or no production control whatever. As an example, some years ago the acreage of cotton was cut to half, but farmers laid aside their poorest acres, poured fertilizer on the remainder, and many raised more cotton than they did before the cut. In most crops, we consider both devices as emergency in character, to be used only in extreme cases where it is necessary to make rapid substantial readjustments in production. Marketing quotas and acreage allotments are, therefore, accepted as a fifth general class of measures which we would make available but we would put them near the bottom of the list in order of preference."

KEEP AGRICULTURE INDEPENDENT OF TREASURY PAYMENTS—GRANGE

Sixth, and at the bottom of the list, we would make production payments available only as an emergency measure. We do not want to see agriculture dependent upon Treasury payments for its existence, not only because of its effect on agriculture, but we believe that it would be economically unsound. We do not want to see farmers reduced to the uncertainty of income based upon the annual action of Congress. We do not want to see farmers reduced to the political necessity of voting for the candidate who would promise the biggest and best raids on the Federal Treasury. We do not want to see the Government paying a portion of the food bill of American consumers, rich and poor alike, with an unknown drain on the taxpayers which would inevitably result in inflation similar to that which has brought so much economic distress to so many European nations, making the rich richer and the poor poorer. We do not want to see the widespread regimentation of farmers that would follow, with the hordes of public employees necessary to administer such a program. Nevertheless, we feel that in periods of emergency or adjustment it may be necessary to use such payments to meet a condition which could not be met in any other way, provided such payments are safeguarded by a definite order of preference to be used in connection with the recommendations of the Federal Farm Commission. We believe that such a provision should be available for use, but should not be used until it was clear that other means would not suffice. We feel that it would be a serious mistake, and would go a long way toward destroying the incentive for farmers to develop self-help, self-supporting programs, if production payments were made the main reliance for meeting the farm problems.

COMPARATIVE STATISTICAL REFERENCES

Following are a few statistics:

In 1930 viscose staple rayon was 60 cents and cotton was 13 cents per pound. In August 1949, rayon was 35 cents and cotton was 31 cents.

Our annual exports of cotton: 1925–30, 8,251,000 bales; 1930–35, 7,244,000 bales; 1935–40, 5,300,000 bales.

During those same periods foreign-mill consumption increased from: 1925–30, 18,400,000 bales; 1930–35, 18,740,000 bales; 1935–40, 21,600,000.

During those same periods cotton production in foreign lands was: 1925–30, 10,660,000; 1930–35, 11,680,000 bales; 1935–40, 16,780,000 bales.

The average foreign production of rayon: 1926–30, 256,000,000 pounds; 1936–40, 1,610,000,000 pounds.

In 1941 foreign rayon production reached the equivalent of 5,280,000 bales of cotton.

From the prewar period there were two trends—first, the decline in the foreign market for United States cotton. Second, this decline was offset by increase of the foreign market for foreign-produced cotton and rayon. Today there is a demand for synthetic fiber beyond home production and we are importing rayon.

Siesta Psychology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the reading of two articles I am today inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In my opinion Senator JOHNSON is performing a most worthwhile service for our Nation as the chairman of his subcommittee referred to in these articles.

[From the Fort Worth Press of September 8, 1950]

THE TEXAS LISTENING POST—SENATOR JOHNSON SCORES DEFENSE SIESTA

(By Norton McGiffin)

The special Senate subcommittee headed by LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, is getting down to work and putting some of the military and the defense planners on a hot griddle. The group, which includes four Democrats and three Republicans, criticizes sharply the "siesta psychology" of those in charge of national preparedness.

Senator JOHNSON is an excellent choice for leadership of the committee. He was a member of the House Armed Services Committee and is on the companion body in the Senate. Furthermore, the Senator is not afraid to speak out. It looks as though he will let the chips fall where they may.

One of the proposals of the committee is to reactivate the synthetic rubber-producing facilities of the country. In view of the fact that we are already at war, or at least in what passes for one, it seems strange that such steps should not have been taken long ago. But the executive branch needs prodding from the legislative branch.

To show how much asleep some governmental agencies are, the subcommittee, under Senator JOHNSON's leadership, has prevailed on the administration to stop the sale of a synthetic rubber plant at Akron, Ohio, and order an increase of 80,000 tons in synthetic rubber capacity.

The incredible thing, to me, is that the administration has to be needled into such common-sense arrangements by the Senate subcommittee. The Johnson group is upset because the military is blithely continuing to sell surplus military goods. There's a war on, or is there?

The "complacency on the Potomac" to quote the report of the subcommittee is staggering. Apparently the motto of the Munitions Board and others is "business as usual." The subcommittee accused the Air Force of selling airplane engines and equipment at Robins Air Base in Georgia. The Air Force denied the charge, and the subcommittee produced newspaper ads to prove its point.

A lot of us have long maintained that the military should not buy or sell its equipment because there isn't a CPA in the lot. No general is adequate to act as a purchasing or dispensing agent, because no general is at heart an economizer. That's why we need a committee like the Johnson group to check and double-check.

[From the Houston Post of September 8, 1950]

SIESTA PSYCHOLOGY

In its first report, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's subcommittee investigating national preparedness delivers some haymakers at the Defense Department and the Munitions Board for failing to revise policies with respect to the disposition of surplus material and defense plants in the light of conditions created by the Korean war. Officials were charged with a siesta psychology, and with neglecting precautions which the subcommittee feels to be of urgent necessity in view of the possible spread of the conflict to other areas.

That Federal agencies have been slow to adjust themselves to the new turn of affairs is no secret. The trouble may be due to the highly complicated governmental structure in which one part may not know what the other part is doing. For instance, the committee report tells of the Armed Forces holding bargain sales of needed materials while simultaneously buying the same things on the open market at nonbargain prices. It charges that five defense plants have been sold or put on sale since the Korean crisis, some of them without provision for prompt return to the Government in case of need.

Much of the report deals with rubber. The subcommittee was unable to find out what, if anything, was being done to encourage the cultivation of natural rubber in the Western Hemisphere, and called for a sharp increase in the stockpiling of the natural product together with a full reactivation of the Nation's synthetic rubber industry. It claims credit for having halted the sale of an Ohio plant, and said its efforts had

resulted in stepping up synthetic rubber production from 462,500 tons to 755,000 tons.

Government rubber policy, the subcommittee properly holds, should be directed to insure a continuous supply of rubber on a long-term basis as well as to provide for possibly military needs. The points made in the report have a strong common-sense appeal. Sales of surplus property should be stopped abruptly, stocks should be promptly inventoried to ascertain what is on hand and what may be needed, and there should be a more imaginative and foresighted effort in the stockpiling of critical defense items.

International Whirligig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that was released by the McClure Newspaper Syndicate on August 26 and 27, and written by Mr. John Fisher. The article follows:

INTERNATIONAL WHIRLIGIG—RESIGNATION OF DIPLOMATS BARES EXTENT OF TERRORIZATION OF POLAND; RUSSIANS CONTROL ARMY, POLICE TO KEEP PATRIOTS IN SUBJECTION

(By John Fisher)

Resignations of Polish Embassy attachés in Washington, who sacrificed their careers rather than obey orders to return home, are unimpeachable evidence of Communist terror in their fatherland.

All of Malik's booster talk about happiness and freedom under the Red flag is exposed as bunk by these fear-haunted diplomats, who are in the best position to know the whole truth about conditions behind the iron curtain.

Their self-preservation act follows previous withdrawals by Dr. Aleksander Rudzinski, United Nations Polish legal counselor, and 25 other Polish officials, who cut themselves adrift rather than be a party to delivering their countrymen into complete Soviet bondage.

The spirit of independence in Poland is being ruthlessly snuffed out. Certain Marxist leaders like Gomulka had hoped that by eagerly championing orthodox Leninism, Poland would be allowed a token share of political and economic independence. But they were accused of Titoism and silenced.

CRINGING COPY OF RUSSIA

Today the proudest and strongest Russian satellite is being whipped into the role of a cringing Soviet lackey, its entire system of living a mere copy of the oppressive Russian system. It even suffers the ignominy of being the only Moscow puppet in which a Russian, Marshal Konstantin Rokossovsky, has been forced into its national politburo.

Poland right now is a key factor in the tense European military situation. Her flat plains are a pathway into Russia; her airfields, steppingstones. If the country were in rebellion, an assault of the Soviet frontier would have a better chance of success.

But in the event of a Russian attack on Berlin and west Germany, the Poles, though the most anti-Russian of all satellites, are still anti-German—even the non-Communists—and they might side with Russia as in the last two wars.

At present Stalin is trying both the carrot and stick—mostly the stick—to woo Poland into doing his will. He ordered a speed-up in collectivization of farms on the exact pattern of Soviet agriculture.

Out of a peasant population of 15,000,000, only 200,000 are Communist Party members. Angry farmers hid their seed grain and smashed government tractors. Warsaw used violence to beat down the resistance of prosperous farmers. Posters were displayed in rural areas quoting Lenin: "Rely on the poor peasant. Fight the kulak."

PUNISHMENT FOR NOT WORKING

A new 5-year plan was inaugurated on July 22, Regeneration Day, the sixth anniversary of the birth of the notorious Russian-Polish Government. Its objective is to expand agriculture, trade, building, and industry.

To approach the preposterous production targets, workers toil long hours and finally stay away from work from sheer exhaustion. In an effort to combat absenteeism, Warsaw recently enacted Socialist labor "discipline" laws, copied from the Soviet labor code, with heavy fines and imprisonment for tardiness or truancy.

A revived anti-American campaign is based on obtaining signatures to the Stockholm peace petition outlawing the atomic bomb. Warsaw maintains that 18,000,000 names already have been collected.

Local police went from door to door offering bewildered residents the choice of signing or facing arrest as the secret agents of American imperialists. President Bierut told signature collectors to call attention to the criminal United States attack on peaceful Korea as a persuasive argument.

WORK UP HATRED OF AMERICANS

Hilary Minc, Vice Premier and Politburo member, ranted, "These [American] successors of Hitler are carrying on armed intervention in Korea and are arguing when and where to drop the A-bomb." A Warsaw paper reported, "American soldiers are committing unbelievable atrocities on Korean prisoners." No lie is passed up if it can be used to make Poles hate Americans.

The organized underground no longer engages in large-scale revolt because retaliation against innocent families follows. But small desperate groups pay off old scores with the police. Arrests are frequent. One of the methods employed by the UB (secret police) is to quiz a suspect about his own subversive activities or those of his neighbor. His fingers are placed in a door jamb. If he fails to give the desired answers, the door is pressed.

Military tribunals are still sentencing victims to 30-year prison terms or to death for outbreaks against the Communist authorities. Many other trials are held in camera. Relatives of the condemned rarely know the fate of their loved ones until months afterward—sometimes never.

So far as fearing war with the United States, the Polish peasants would welcome war as their only means of escape from the Red terror.

HOLDS FIRM CONTROL

Marshal Rokossovsky is the real boss of Poland. He not only holds the power in the Politburo, he also commands an army of 350,000 troops and a security police force of 120,000. The army organization now exactly duplicates the Soviet set-up so that the Polish Army can be swiftly geared in with the Russian armed forces in case of war.

High-ranking career officers have been removed. Young officers, trained in Soviet tactics and ideologies in Russian military academies, now run the Polish Military Establishment.

Moscow recently made a bid to bind the troops to Stalin by compelling the east German Red government to recognize the Oder-Neisse frontier, which leaves 44,000 square miles of former German territory in Polish hands. Nearly all Poles, whether Communist or not, want to keep these provinces, rich in farms, factories, and mines.

If later the double-crossing Kremlin seeks to gain German favor, it can repudiate the present sell-out agreement and promise Germany that these lost lands will be restored. Of course, almost everyone in Poland would be enraged by the bargain. But by that time Marshal Rokossovsky will have such a stranglehold on both the army and the police that revolt or even protests would be futile.

Poland is not entirely subdued. But it is so much of a giant slave colony that Polish diplomats, who have tasted American freedom, prefer exile to returning home.

Justice for Crawford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of certain statements which have been made over the radio and in the press in the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan, as well as in the city of San Juan, P. R., I wish to submit for the RECORD, an editorial which was published in El Imparcial, a Puerto Rican daily newspaper, under date of September 7, 1950:

JUSTICE FOR CRAWFORD

Congressman FRED CRAWFORD is facing political difficulties in his district in Saginaw, Mich., because of the controversy between the beet harvesters and the Puerto Rican farm hands, 5,000 of whom are moving to that State to help with its beet harvest. This controversy, with which we have not extensively occupied ourselves, is on the way toward a solution, raising the pay and the living conditions of the workers in accordance with the terms arrived at.

CRAWFORD collaborated in the plan—at least he supported it—to gather the beet harvest with the aid of Puerto Rican workers. To be sure, the beet harvesters should be grateful to the veteran legislator of Michigan. It is unfair that because the harvesters did not from the beginning meet all the terms of the work contract with the farm hands, CRAWFORD should become a political victim of incomprehensibility in his own State. It seems to us that Congressman CRAWFORD has not received the fair deal which should be given an active and indefatigable politician, with a long list of services rendered his State.

We say this because CRAWFORD is, in the truest sense of the word, not an object of devotion so far as we are concerned, but, as we have felt toward all politicians, we are incapable of lending our support to the injustice against him. His position with regard to Puerto Rico has not always been a correct one, and there have been frequent discrepancies between his point of view and ours. However, we would not be able to deny that his intervention, for one reason or another, has always been wholesome.

Neither should they criticize in Michigan CRAWFORD'S interest and participation in the problem of the Territories and possessions. The voters of Michigan, which is a civilized and democratic region, should feel proud of CRAWFORD'S record in the Congress, which outlined and strengthened the policy of friendship and fraternization regarding the territories by which he has rendered a valuable service to the North American Nation. His State should understand that it is an honor to have a man who occupies an im-

portant position, and who is respected for it, in the Congress of the United States. It would be foolish to exchange him for any kind of beginner without proper justification for such action. It would mean the loss of his great experience, his wide connections, and the commitment of an injustice against a Member of Congress who has known to lend sparkle to his office.

The Primaries in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of what has heretofore been said in the press and over the radio in the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan, as well as in Puerto Rico, I wish to submit for the RECORD, an editorial which appeared in El Mundo, a Puerto Rican publication, under date of September 15, 1950:

THE PRIMARIES IN MICHIGAN

The Representative, FRED CRAWFORD, won the Republican nomination in the district that he represents in the State of Michigan.

CRAWFORD has been for many years in the House of Representatives of the United States, elected by his fellow-citizens at Saginaw. It had been said that in these times he was confronted with the most difficult situation in his political career, since his opponent, attorney Robert J. Curry, had made an intense campaign.

Part of this intense campaign against CRAWFORD had been in pointing out that said Congressman spent more time in the defense of Puerto Rican matters in the Congress than he spent in taking care of the matters of his constituents of Michigan.

Such accusation was an exaggeration, since, although it is true that this Congressman has been among those most occupied with Puerto Rican matters in Washington, it cannot be maintained that the larger part of his time was spent in these matters.

We are happy that his ties with Puerto Rico were not the cause of a defeat. The judgment of the Saginaw electors in giving him a new indorsement indicates that such allegations had no adverse weight in the mind of the voters.

On the contrary, if the result of the elections can be interpreted in any form, it is to affirm that the electors of that congressional district recognize as a legitimate and proper activity of their Representative that he interest himself in Puerto Rican matters.

Truly, that is a responsibility that all persons elected to Congress assume, since the welfare of this island depends in a great part, by the force of political reality, on the actions of the Congress. Puerto Rico is part of the group of the congressional responsibilities, as are the Armed Forces, the atomic bomb, the tax policy, the civil rights, and so many other important matters that are apparently far away from the interests or local preoccupations of the districts that elect the Representatives.

Mr. CRAWFORD, on knowing the results of the primaries, hastened to affirm that, if he were elected in the November elections, as is expected, he will continue his actions in favor of the island. "I will continue in my attempts to aid the Puerto Ricans," he stated, "in all that I can."

Puerto Rico and its people need good friends in the Congress. Mr. CRAWFORD, on past occasions, has interested himself in matters of the country, and, in general terms, it can be stated that the island owes much to him for his intervention and actions.

We are happy that, after the primaries, he remains in the same frame of mind and is disposed to continue cooperating in the insular benefit.

We hope this is so.

It is just that the country be grateful for the attitude assumed by Representative CRAWFORD.

Miracle on the Vistula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter received by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, THOMAS GORDON, from the Honorable Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State, as well as Congressman GORDON'S letter to me. The letters follow:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1950.
Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GORDON: I want to thank you for taking part in the Voice of America's special broadcast to Poland on August 15, commemorating the Miracle on the Vistula.

I want to tell you, too, how encouraged I am to hear that within a few days after your broadcast you had mail from Poland telling how well it was received and expressing gratitude that the Polish people have friends in the United States, such as yourself, who have their interests at heart.

I am sure that there is going to be a similar response, in the form of letters addressed to the Voice itself, to the message you delivered to the Polish people.

Your experience, I might add, typifies the reaction of people behind the iron curtain to the Voice of America broadcasts. They look to us for the truth and, despite the risks usually involved, often try to express their thanks for our broadcasts. Fugitives from the captive areas tell us that Voice of America broadcasts were a major factor in persuading them to flee.

Our letters—we are now getting as many as 29,000 a month from all over the world—indicate that we have a large and growing audience and that our broadcasts are helping to convince people everywhere that the United States is interested in their welfare.

Thank you once again for your interest and your assistance in the program.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1950.
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAN: Enclosed find a letter I have received from Assistant Secretary of State, the Honorable Edward W. Barrett, who is in charge of the Voice of America program.

As I told you, I made the broadcast referred to, on August 15, commemorating the Miracle on the Vistula.

The other day, I received a letter from a relative of mine, whom I have never seen, advising me that some of his friends in the same city where he resides, Braumburg, Poland, which is about 90 miles from Warsaw, the capital city, heard my broadcast and were delighted to hear my words commemorating this great event in Poland, which in former years was a national holiday, but now is suppressed by the new regime.

I made other broadcasts last year and received quite a number of letters praising the remarks I made, which gave them a little hope that America had not forgotten them in their days of trial. These courageous people took a lot of chances by writing me.

With kind personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

TOM.

Peat Is a Valuable Resource of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I think all of the Members of this House can agree that the development and productive use of our natural resources is of utmost importance at this stage of our national growth. Both great political parties of the United States have always supported efforts to bring the benefits of modern science to undeveloped areas rich in untapped resources.

Throughout the country we have made notable progress in turning our resources into materials, business, and jobs needed for our economic well-being and national security. But there are still new possibilities for the development of resources that have been neglected, among them the immense deposits of good quality peat throughout the United States.

In my own State, Minnesota, there are 5,000,000 acres of peat land with excellent quality peat deposits of 7,000,000,000 tons. This is over one-half of the national peat supply, though deposits are found extensively in Wisconsin, Michigan, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Washington, Alabama, New Jersey, Ohio, Florida, Georgia, and many other States.

Because of the remarkable beginning made in peat research, I supported the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. FRED MARSHALL, when he recently asked the House to seriously study the legislation he has introduced to encourage further research and development of peat production for both industrial and agricultural uses.

The supplementary bills, H. R. 7330 and H. R. 7574, would authorize vitally needed research into the use of peat as a fuel in the generation of electrical power and its usefulness as a source of valuable industrial byproducts and would authorize loans to private business by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the utilization of peat and its byproducts.

The best possible use of this great resource is important to the economic growth and security of our country. It is not a matter of political partisanship

any more than any of our other resources. We are all interested in making the best possible use of our resources for the best interest of all of our people.

I therefore feel that we should meet this problem with a common spirit of cooperation to find the most effective method of developing our peat deposits and the related byproducts. In a recent report to the Bureau of Mines, 19 States reported peat production largely for agricultural uses, but this is negligible compared to the industrial uses already indicated in our own research and in the experience of other countries which have been more advanced in the development of peat.

In Minnesota it is imperative that we have an adequate supply of low-cost fuel to be used in the generation of electrical power, particularly since we can be very nearly isolated from fuel or power sources because of our geographical location. This is an element of both strategic and economic danger. The vulnerability of long overland and overwater hauls of fuel for power and heat are obvious. Other States in the Midwest and central United States are facing a similar threat.

At the same time, lack of low-cost fuel and low-cost power has hampered the development of many areas that are the sources of materials necessary to industry and commerce. Peat lands in the United States have been considered wastelands and have retarded the economic growth of those areas where they exist in large quantities.

By taking advantage of the scientific progress in the use of peat and peat byproducts, we can help the poor counties and the poor areas of our States to help themselves and we can do this without interfering in any way with the industrial developments already made.

As some of my friends from Minnesota in this House have already pointed out, American and European research has already found peat a source of numberless valuable byproducts which can be produced cheaply simply because they are byproducts of the peat being processed for fuel for power-generating purposes. It is a source of industrial chemicals like ammonia, methyl alcohol, acetic acids, cresols, and furfural. It has been used in the manufacturing of paper, textiles, brick, surgical dressings, benzine, and various exploded or artificial woods.

What other byproducts can be found will be determined by the development of a strong peat industry and new technological schemes and methods. In some States private producers are already using it extensively for fertilizers, insulation, and packing materials. As a low-cost fuel in power generation and as a source of valuable byproducts, it can be readily seen that a good, sound peat industry in the underdeveloped areas in Minnesota and the United States will be a major contribution to economic growth and to national defense.

It is because of these facts that I again urge members of both parties to work together in achieving a common method of developing this resource which might well be a hidden treasure in what we called wasteland.

The Why of Minnesota's Northwest Angle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, at times during these hectic days I have found myself thinking of one of the truly great wilderness areas of our Nation.

I refer to the Northwest Angle country of Minnesota—an area of 80,000 acres. This great region of real solitude is accessible in summer only by foot, by water or by air, or over ice in winter. Furthermore, there are no telephones.

I need not remind you who live in the West or have spent your vacations in the great mountain and lake regions, of their beauty and grandeur; of the true relaxation and rest which one can enjoy; and of the fine fishing and hunting.

Time will not permit me to continue, but, I hope that each of you will read the historical article by William Heritage in the further extension of my remarks, and that all who can do so will come to Minnesota when this session of Congress adjourns and come to the Angle country for a real vacation. If you prefer, you can enjoy the pleasures of the modern hotels and resorts in many of the other magnificent areas of one of the Nation's great vacation States, marvelous Minnesota.

The following article about the Northwest Angle country will be of interest I am sure. It is entitled "The Why of Minnesota's Northwest Angle" by William Heritage and it appeared in the Blackduck (Minn.) American on April 21, 1949:

THE WHY OF MINNESOTA'S FAMOUS NORTHWEST ANGLE

(By William Heritage)

Many people when looking at a map of Minnesota wonder why a block of some 80,000 acres of this State is separated from the main body by some 12 miles, and almost wholly surrounded by Canada.

This area, known as the Northwest Angle has a population of some 100 persons; has no roads or telephones; is accessible to the main portion of the State in summer only by foot through Manitoba, by water or by air or over ice in winter. Three post offices are located on the Northwest Angle. The first real fur trading post in Minnesota was located here, being built in 1732 and operated for some 7 years.

In 1875, upon completion by the Canadian Government of the Dawson Trail, a stage line was maintained from Winnipeg to Northwest Angle which was located on United States soil, and had a population of more than 500. A steamer ran from there to Fort Francis and it is reported that 2,700 people used this route that year, 800 of whom were immigrants.

Ben Franklin was a man of great foresight and when he represented this country in negotiations of the Treaty of 1783 with Great Britain, he insisted that boundary should be located through Lake of the Woods, "to the most northwestern point thereof, and thence on a due west course to the river Mississippi."

The map of 1755 which Franklin used, showed a stream running into the north end which is really the outlet and Rainy River is shown running into Lake Superior.

During the next 35 years many negotions between the two countries were had in an effort to reach an agreement as to the boundary west of Lake of the Woods. The convention of October 13, 1818, provided that the forty-ninth standard parallel should be the boundary and the most northwestern point of Lake of the Woods should connect with this parallel by due north or south line as the case may be.

The following treaties and conventions between the two countries have been entered into in determining this part of the international boundary:

Treaty of 1783, Treaty of 1815, Convention of 1818, Treaty of October 13, 1842, Treaty of April 11, 1908, and the Treaty of July 17, 1925.

Major Long of the United States Army visited the Lake of the Woods in 1819 after he marked the forty-ninth parallel at Pembina (he made a mistake of about a mile and a half and located the point too far south), but he was unable to locate any point that appeared to properly mark the most northwestern point of the Lake of the Woods.

The first United States Boundary Commission visited this lake in July 1823 but reported they were unable to find any well-marked topographic feature entitled to be called the most northwestern point.

David Thompson was appointed the chief astronomer for the British Boundary Survey and was commissioned to locate parts of the international boundary in 1823. He arrived at Lake of the Woods in 1824 and built a series of log cribs filled with rock in Angle Inlet leading to what he considered wa the most northwestern point, after he and his party had built up this map.

The next summer he returned to Lake of the Woods with the chief astronomer of Great Britain, Dr. Tiark. After Dr. Tiark looked the lake over he adopted a point about 1 mile north of the location determined by David Thompson the year before by using the following formula: If a line whose bearing is exactly northeast and southwest be passed westwardly over the surface of the lake, on paper, that point of the main shore which is last cut will be the point required.

In 1872, Captain Twining, chief astronomer for the United States Boundary Survey was instructed to locate the boundary from the most northwestern point to the forty-ninth parallel. He spent 3 weeks trying to find the monument set in 1824. As the lake had been raised 8 feet by the construction of a dam at Rat Portage (now Kenora) which completely changed the surface of lake at this point, he was unable to locate it. Finally, an Indian showed him the remains of the monument.

He then surveyed the west boundary of the angle a distance of 17 miles, marking the line for 9 miles by setting cast-iron posts about 5 feet high marked United States on the east side, and Canada on the west side.

In 1902, the angle was subdivided by G. L. O. Surveyor E. J. Mulligan.

In 1912, 1917, and 1925 the international boundary was resurveyed and well marked by the International Boundary Commission, made up of engineers of both countries.

Because of errors in Mitchell's map of 1755, used by Franklin while negotiating the treaty of 1783, Minnesota has this area projecting into Canada and completely separated from the main body of the State by a distance of over 12 miles.

The Gentleman From Georgia, Mr. Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased and deeply impressed by the type of service and devotion to duty exhibited by the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, Representative in Congress from the Fifth District of Georgia.

He has served here only a short time, now concluding his second term, but I venture the assertion that no Member has ever moved forward more rapidly in gaining and meriting the respect and esteem of the leadership and Members of the House or in proving his worth in service to his country, our State, and the people of his district. He is a constant source of pride to the Georgia delegation in Congress.

It is also pleasing to me to know that his home people share our pride and confidence. A slight evidence of this is shown by the following comment by Walter Reiman in his column, Talking It Over, published in the September 14 issue of the De Kalb New Era:

The present Congress is to be congratulated for taking its privileges and duty seriously. Let's never see in America again the woeful rubber-stamp salary-drawers of the past.

Very fortunately for you, your own Representative JAMES C. DAVIS has taken a leading stand for Congress to remain on the job constantly. Once again he has stood up forthrightly, we believe, for the best interests of the Nation, as so many of his addresses before Congress have pointed up, and so many of his votes on legislation show with Fabian socialistic tactics undermining his party.

On July 27, as he addressed the Congress, pleading with them not to adjourn, he proved again his interest in behalf of the Nation—a Nation now facing a war emergency and a future hope of remaining free.

"Go home to what?" Representative DAVIS asked his colleagues. "To see the question written upon the faces of everyone we meet upon the streets, even though they may not ask it with their lips, 'What are you doing to win this war? What are you doing to prevent the Korean War from breaking out into world war III; what are you doing to protect us from Communists and fellow-travelers who are foot-loose and unhampered here in the United States?'"

KEEP POWERS BALANCED

Representative DAVIS underscored the point that any such plan of adjournment would carry with it the implication that Congress would transfer the obligation and responsibilities which properly belong to Congress onto the shoulders of the President "by voting to him supreme authority over the civilian as well as the military—to unload all responsibility upon him, and escape our own, when we vote to adjourn and go home."

And: "Have we come to the point where it is fitting for Members of Congress in effect to say: 'I am of no value at the seat of Government in time of emergency. The proper course for me to take is to vote my powers into the Executive and go home.'"

A major question, we believe: Should we as a people, accepting the methods of dictatorships, allow the degradation of dictated people to sap our strength—our greatest strength?

Representative DAVIS reminded his fellow Congressmen that "there is plenty of legislative work * * * to do."

Among other things, he said, Congress should stay in session to perfect and enact legislation to provide universal military training "that is sorely needed." And "to confine Communists where they will be unable to sabotage our industries, to wreck our public utilities, and to aid Russia * * * (and laws) to enable us to properly supervise, control, or confine the fellow-travelers, each of which for all practical purposes is nearly as great a menace as a member of the Communist Party."

And listen to these excerpts from your Congressman's address:

"Congress is the voice of the people. (Here) their causes can be pleaded, their desires made known, and their rights upheld. * * *

"Our duty is to keep faith with the members of our Armed Services and with the people of America * * * to stay on the job * * * set the example of patriotism and self-denial our actions in passing legislation will require of our servicemen and our citizens possibly for years to come."

Hon. John Crain Kunkel, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the sessions of the Eighty-first Congress, three members of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation voluntarily retire.

Among these is Hon. JOHN CRAIN KUNKEL, who after serving with distinction in this body has chosen to return to private life and devote himself to his personal affairs, principally banking and farming.

Mr. KUNKEL first entered Congress as the Representative from the Eighteenth Pennsylvania District in the Seventy-sixth Congress. He is the grandson of Hon. John C. Kunkel, a member of the Thirty-fourth and Thirty-fifth Congresses; and a great-grandson of John Sargeant, a Member of Congress for eight terms and chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Twenty-sixth Congresses.

Mr. KUNKEL attended Harrisburg Academy, Phillips Academy, Yale University, and Harvard Law School.

Few men have ever come to Congress better equipped than JOHN KUNKEL. He inherited a splendid background of congressional service from his grandfather and great-grandfather and he has lived up to the highest traditions of his ancestral forebears.

Serving as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency he has risen to a place of power and influence on that committee.

By nature, reserved and somewhat diffident, yet, nevertheless through his long service here he has demonstrated that he has courage of highest order and has battled hard and consistently in support of those principles and policies he considered right and proper.

Both in and without the Pennsylvania Republican delegation he has been highly regarded and his departure will be sorely missed by the hundreds of friends he has made while serving here.

Mr. KUNKEL has been a sound thinker, a deep student of governmental affairs and his ability has particularly shone forth in two fields of action—banking and housing, in both of which he has made valuable and lasting contributions.

So we say farewell to a true friend, a genuine American, a devoted public servant and a real man.

Good-by, good friend, and may your remaining years outside of Congress be as happy and pleasant as those which you have spent in these historic halls.

Hon. Franklin Herbert Lichtenwalter, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the short time I have been privileged to membership in this House I have been reluctant to usurp the time which could be better left to others whom I feel are more qualified than I to explore most of the issues which come before us. Today, however, I am grateful for this opportunity to speak on behalf of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation in renewing our regret over the decision of our esteemed colleague FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER not to seek reelection, which means that his services in this body will terminate with the end of the Eighty-first Congress.

I am sure that you will recall Mr. LICHTENWALTER's election at the special election held in September 1947, when he decisively defeated an opponent who was backed by organized labor. That contest was hailed throughout the country as the first real test of the popularity of the Taft-Hartley law and FRANK's victory gave heart to those who were doubtful as to public reception of the new labor law. Incidentally, that campaign was a model of organized teamwork although the reaction of the public to the importation of outside political workers and organizers unquestionably reacted in Mr. LICHTENWALTER's favor, which is not to minimize, however, the fact that his ability to meet at their own level and at the same time to literally talk their

language had much to do with winning the solid Pennsylvania Dutch citizenry of Lehigh County to his banner.

I doubt if there has ever been anyone who has come to Congress with a wider legislative experience than has this colleague of ours from Pennsylvania's Eighth District. With 8 years' service in the lower house at Harrisburg, including brilliant discharge of the duties of majority leader and speaker, he brought to this body a wealth of legislative know-how which was readily appreciated by anyone who sought his opinions on pending bills. It is left, however, to those who were privileged to have his advice in delegation meetings and the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Select Committee on the Problems of Small Business to attest to his outstanding contributions in the legislative field.

Our sense of deep personal loss in the termination of his services in this House, however, stems more particularly from the knowledge that we will be denied his genial companionship and the leavening influence of his unfailing good humor. In these troubled times when tempers are short and repartee is sharp it has been heartening to have amongst us one whose philosophy is predicated on the thesis that "a soft answer turneth away wrath." This admirable quality he will take with him into new fields of endeavors and as we wish him well and confidently anticipate his success in whatever he undertakes it is our prayerful hope that God's richest blessing will go with him and that he will return often to these scenes where he has left his indelible mark and made for himself a host of stalwart friends.

A Great American, a Great New Yorker, a Wonderful Man—Abraham Cahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following well-deserved tribute to one of the most beloved figures of our time. There is no point in my repeating the tribute paid by the editorial from the September 9, 1950, issue of the New York Herald Tribune; I can only say that I adopt and endorse everything said here. The editorial follows:

A GREAT NEW YORKER

One of the really great figures in the rich and varied tradition of New York is being honored today, for his attainment of 90 years of service, of leadership, of abounding life. Abraham Cahan helped found the Jewish Daily Forward—as a small, doctrinaire Socialist organ—in the first year of McKinley's Presidency. He returned to it in 1902, at the dawn of the Theodore Roosevelt era; and through nearly half a century since then has remained as its editor in chief and as one of the vital intellectual and cultural forces in the New York community.

For half a century the Forward has daily brought into many thousands of our Yiddish-speaking homes a quickening sense of life and letters; it has interpreted the strange American scene to countless newly arrived Jewish immigrants and, in itself or through the prodigious energies of its editor, it has interpreted the Jewish community to their fellow-citizens of older origins in the country. There was no aspect of that community's life in which Abraham Cahan was not a wise and vigorous counselor—in the formation of its great labor unions, in its charities, in its social, political, artistic, and intellectual life. His newspaper and the influence of the personality it reflected have been in themselves an education for countless fine Americans of today. The Forward was and is an expression of nineteenth century socialism; but Abraham Cahan, born in the Russia of the Czars and a fugitive from their tyranny, has stood rocklike against the infiltration into America of the new tyranny of the new Communist czars of today.

The Forward has been both a fructifying and an integrating force in our community life. Inevitably, as the new generations which it helped to teach grow up, its function is bound to change. But change will still be based upon the sure foundations laid by the man and leader whom the city is today glad to honor.

To Prevent Other Troop Train Wrecks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 15, 1950, entitled "To Prevent Other Troop Train Wrecks." The Inquirer editorial follows:

TO PREVENT OTHER TROOP TRAIN WRECKS

Wilkes-Barre and nearby Wyoming Valley communities received yesterday in numbing grief their 33 soldier-dead, home from the troop train wreck in Ohio.

To the afflicted families of these men, members of the camp-bound Twenty-eighth Division, we offer our deepest sympathy. At the same time, we are confronted with the necessity of finding why this appalling tragedy occurred and of taking measures to prevent others like it.

Certain facts were made clear at the hearing into the collision conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Ohio Public Utility Commission, the Army, and the Pennsylvania Railroad. One was that there was no breakdown in the railroad-signal equipment. Another was that the engineer of the express train which rammed the rear of the troop carrier had not made effective use of those signals to slow down in time.

The engineer, 68-year-old William E. Eller, made some startling admissions at the hearing. He had been operating the "Spirit of St. Louis" at the rate of 50 miles an hour when he received a signal, 2 miles from the stalled troop train, to slow down to 30 miles.

Instead of that, the automatic tape recording of the train's speed, found intact in the diesel engine, showed that he actually stepped up the pace to 70 miles an hour, then waited for another block signal before he slammed on the brakes, only 850 feet from the cars ahead.

Meanwhile, trainmen on the troop carrier, which was forced to stop a second time for repairs on a steam line, had placed red flares on the track behind them, and when they saw the express approaching attempted frantically to halt it—one man even throwing a flare against the locomotive windshield. But the express rammed into the other train at a speed of 50 miles an hour.

The engineer testified that he had been told there was a troop train ahead. He testified also, though he did not explain, that he had shut off the whistle in his cab which gives warning when the track ahead is not clear.

The ICC will determine if negligence on the engineer's part calls for punitive action. But there should be decided also whether it is safe to entrust an express train into the hands of a man 68 years old, regardless of his experience and apparent state of health. Handling a locomotive running at great speed requires unusual alertness, sureness, and instantaneous response to sudden demands. Persons on the threshold of 70 do not always possess those qualification.

The engineer stated that his train was running 30 minutes late when it went through the block signals. Was he taking a chance to make up the lost time?

It has been brought out that the signal apparatus which should have slowed down the "Spirit of St. Louis" in time to avoid the collision was functioning properly. But it was not sufficient to prevent the wreck. Does not that mean that existing signal systems are inadequate?

Block signals, red flares, lanterns, and the rest appear rather primitive in the light of present-day advances in quick communication. Other forms of transport, such as airplanes and ships at sea, rely upon the radio for instantaneous contact. Why should not the railroads employ this device more widely?

If the stalled troop train could have notified the oncoming express by radio, either directly or through intermediate tower control, of the imperative need to stop at such and such a location, there might have been no collision.

Another accident preventive would be the combining of automatic train stops with the block-signal system, to bring trains to a halt when emergency demands.

Desirable also are measures assuring safe riding equipment for troopers transported by railroads, and priorities for their trains.

Familiar in other wars has been the cramming of soldiers into antiquated and broken-down railway cars and their frequent shunting into sidings to make way for passenger expresses and freights. Men in the Armed Services should be given the best in transport and the right of way in getting to their destination.

The Ohio train wreck points to the need for precautionary measures, to protect human life, that are now lacking.

Despite Korea the Air Force Is Still Top Dog in the Pentagon's Plans for Defending America if There Is Any World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, those words that I have just spoken are not my words. They are the studied findings of Andrew Tully, world known cor-

respondent of the Scripps-Howard news syndicate and one of their ace editorial writers. In the signed editorial written by Mr. Tully as carried in the Washington News of Monday last, he discusses frankly and convincingly the reliance of our country on the value of the strategic bombing mission of the United States Air Force and the incalculable value to the Nation's defenses of the Air Force B–36 long-range bombers.

The service rendered to this Congress and our Nation by the President's Air Policy Commission headed by the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, now Secretary of the United States Air Force, was a service second to none ever performed by any citizen group in these United States.

I remember the fine things that were spoken of Mr. Finletter some years ago by top-ranking members of the Armed Services Committee of this House when the Finletter committee first publicized their findings under the heading of "Survival in the air age." Little did we then dream that this soldier, statesmen, patriot, author, educator, skilled and learned in all phases of law, would some day himself be called out of private life to serve his country as Secretary of our great Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, military experiences in Korea justify the findings of the Finletter committee. Nobody in America today is afraid of a practically nonexistent Russian surface Navy competing with the United States Navy now by far larger in size than all the navies of the world.

Nobody is afraid of Russian tanks making amphibious landings on our coastal shores and lumbering up over the Allegheny Mountains to attack our people in the Middle West.

The Russians do not even have a substantial maritime force to transport troops.

What the American people are afraid of is the death and destruction that can be rained upon our country—dropped out of the bowels of Russian airplanes circling over the great cities of Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, and all other great industrial centers of our country from Maine to California or from Mexico to Canada.

They know that if the vital strength of our war plants are destroyed or crippled, the war is lost and our country and its people actually made slaves to the Russians.

Above all else, they know that the greatest defense that this country can devise is a good offense and that the United States Air Force is in fact what Mr. Tully states it to be—

The only branch of the Armed Forces which can attack on short notice.

Not in 1 hour or from "4 o'clock to 5 o'clock which Louis Johnson said it would," but within the matter of but a few minutes that it would take to send our B–36's coursing on their way to the very heart and center of every strategic point in the Russian empire.

It is because of their current value to the membership of this House and to Americans everywhere that I am asking the unanimous consent of my colleagues to insert into the RECORD two articles: First, the editorial by Andrew Tully, headed, "AF still best weapon," and second, a United Press Tokyo dispatch headed, "B–29's running out of targets—Air Force dams enemy traffic." These are as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of September 18, 1950]

AF STILL BEST WEAPON

(By Andrew Tully)

Despite Korea, the Air Force is still top dog in the Penatgon's plans for defending America if there is another world war.

Korea is supposed to have made the fly boys look bad. But that isn't the way the top brass sees it. To them Korea—for all its admitted bitterness—is still a side issue to the main danger, which is Russia. And they still feel our best weapon against the main danger is the Air Force.

"Put it this way," said a Defense Department spokesman. "The best defense is still the best offense—and the Air Force remains the only branch of the Armed Forces which can attack on short notice."

If this sounds like Defense Secretary Louis Johnson's famous speech about hitting the enemy at 5 o'clock if he strikes at 4, that's all right with the Defense Department. Mr. Johnson's been kidded a lot about that crack, but he wasn't talking about a war in Korea when he made it—he was referring to a major war, plus the atom bomb and the B–36 long-range bomber.

So Korea hasn't changed things a bit as far as the over-all concept of fighting a major war is concerned. The plan is still to hit Russia fast and hard with the B–36 and the A-bomb if she attacks us, in order to destroy her striking force before it can hit us over here. There'll be radar and interceptor planes for defense, but the emphasis will be placed on attack, destroying the ability of the enemy to strike at America through the skies.

As the Joint Chiefs see it, our vital strength in time of war lies in our war plants. If they're destroyed or crippled, the war is as good as lost. It will be the Air Force's primary mission—through such long-range attacks on the heart of the enemy—to prevent such an eventuality.

All you have to do to be convinced of how high the Air Force is riding is to look at the Defense Department's budget figures for the fiscal year 1951. A good bit more than the lion's share is going to the fly boys.

The budget for all three services and the Defense Department totals $24,993,000,000. Of this amount $9,309,000,000 is earmarked for the Air Force. Increases are in the works all along the line, of course, but the most significant one is for new airplanes. The Air Force, during fiscal 1951, will spend more than $4,000,000,000 on new planes, just about three times the amount it spent in fiscal 1950.

Another item of significance is that it was after the Korean war started—not before—that the Joint Chiefs agreed on an Air Force of 69 groups, and they have not seen fit since then to change their minds publicly.

As Chairman CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, of the House Military Affairs Committee, sees it, the Air Force will be boosted from 48 groups to 58 by July 1, 1951, and to 69 by July 1952. And he did not demur when Air Force men insisted it probably would be necessary to expand even further.

[From the Washington Daily News of September 14, 1950]

B–29'S RUNNING OUT OF TARGETS—AIR FORCE DAMS ENEMY TRAFFIC

TOKYO, September 14.—Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, commander of the United States Far East Air Forces, said today that sweeping Allied aerial attack had halted all large-scale traffic in Communist-held Korea.

At the same time, Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Far East Air Forces bomber commander, reported that "practically all major military industrial targets" in Communist North Korea had been knocked out by American B–29's.

"Aerial reconnaissance shows that large-scale traffic in enemy-held Korea is to all intents and purposes at a halt as of today," General Stratemeyer said. "More than 170 attacks on bridges, 60 on secondary marshaling yards, 21 on tunnels, and more than 50 cuts in rail lines have been made by B–29's, F–26's, F–51's, F–28's, and F–80's since September 4."

INDUSTRY CRIPPLED

General O'Donnell said in a report to General Stratemeyer that the B–29's now had trouble finding worth-while targets north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

"Results on both strategic targets and in the interdiction program have been most gratifying," General Stratemeyer replied. "Heavy North Korean industry has been severely crippled by an estimated 75 percent destruction of assigned targets.

"The movement of supplies and troops from North Korea to the south has been seriously disrupted by the carefully planned severing of rail lines, the bombing of bridges, and the saturation of marshaling yards, leaving wide gaps in North Korea's highly important rail and highway network," General Stratemeyer said. "Some of the bridges and rail lines have been repaired but the interdiction program took this into account and scheduled return attacks on the principal communications tributaries."

The B–29's, which have been winging over North Korea from both Japan and Okinawa for 2 months, often went out 50 at a time in the early days of the Korean War. Ninety-eight of them were used for a saturation bombing raid of North Korean troops along the Naktong River. But now they are taking off in small groups and individually, hitting bridges, rail lines, and marshaling yards in the interdiction program, because of a lack of major industrial targets.

Report From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a news article from the Long Island Daily Press of Sunday, September 17, 1950:

CONGRESSMAN LATHAM REPORTS ON HIS 30 DAYS AT THE FRONT

(By Andrew J. Viglietta)

WASHINGTON.—Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM, of Queens Village, his "crew" cut hair evidence of his active participation in the Korean War, sat back at his desk in the Capitol yesterday and unfolded his reactions of 30 days at the fighting front.

Latham, a lieutenant-commander in the Naval Reserve, recently returned from temporary active reserve duty which took him to Korea at his own request.

He and Congressman HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania were the first legislators to take their active reserve duty at the front. Both are Pacific veterans of World War II and wanted to get a first hand picture of the fighting in the Far East.

LATHAM, a navigator during the last war and skipper on several ships, was elected to Congress in 1944 while he was on duty in the Pacific.

When South Korea was invaded by the Red-dominated North Koreans, LATHAM was itching to get into uniform. When it came time for him to go on reserve duty, he quickly asked for an "active" assignment.

LATHAM was not a congressional observer, but a member of the fighting forces of the Navy. On several occasions he flew on missions and participated in the bombing of the Rising Sun Petroleum Co.'s huge plant in North Korea.

Queens residents will get a first-hand report of LATHAM'S reactions from the following interview:

REPORTER. How did you come to make this tour of duty in the Korean Area, Congressman?

Mr. LATHAM. I take annual training duty with the Navy each year. I sought this assignment because I felt that if I could get to Korea and see for myself what is going on out there, it would be helpful in understanding the critical problems on which we have to vote.

REPORTER. How much did you get to see?

Mr. LATHAM. I had an excellent close view of the war. I was at Pearl Harbor, Kwayalein, Guam, Tokyo, Sasebo, and other military bases. I flew on a combat mission with dive bombers off Carrier Task Force 77; was with the Marines at the Naktong Bulge; flew over most of the front; observed the Army and Air Corps operations along the front and around Taegu; talked to the wounded, the enlisted men and officers of all branches of the services, and had a 2-hour conference with General MacArthur.

REPORTER. Our operations out there have been called a "police action." Do you agree?

Mr. LATHAM. To call it a "police action" is to perpetrate a cruel hoax on the American people. For its size, it is the bloodiest, dirtiest and toughest war we have ever been in.

REPORTER. Why?

Mr. LATHAM. The terrain is very tough. To gain ground, you have to either fight uphill over rough mountains or through nasty, muddy rice paddies that can hide an enemy sniper 20 feet away. The climate is desperately hot. Dust from the roads blind and choke you. Vicious red ants bite you in the daytime and mosquitoes at night. Up till recently, our front line has been so thin it was a cinch for enemy snipers to infiltrate behind our lines.

REPORTER. How have the American boys performed under these tough conditions?

Mr. LATHAM. Having in mind that we had very limited troops and equipment, they have performed magnificently. Since the start of the war, each branch of the service has strained every sinew to hold the line. The usual Navy liberties and Army leaves have been necessarily eliminated. There has not been time to stop fighting.

REPORTER. How would you say the various branches of the service are cooperating?

Mr. LATHAM. They are getting along splendidly. They have a friendly spirit of cooperation. Urgent needs in equipment are supplied by other services. This is due not to any law Congress has passed, but because Americans always work well and stick together in a fight.

REPORTER. After World War II some people said the next war would be fought almost by remote control. Is this in any sense a "push button" war?

Mr. LATHAM. It certainly is not. It is the old-fashioned ditch-by-ditch, road-by-road, hand-to-hand fighting that many people predicted was out of date.

REPORTER. What do they need most out there?

Mr. LATHAM. From what I saw, I would say they need more foot soldiers, more aircraft carriers, and more destroyers.

REPORTER. What do the North Korean Communists most fear?

Mr. LATHAM. I was told they fear most the napalm bomb. This is made of an incendiary jelly which splatters fiercely burning fire in all directions.

REPORTER. Do you agree with those who say we were caught unprepared in Korea?

Mr. LATHAM. Yes, sir. President Truman cut defenses below our apparent needs and the wishes of Congress and the people. He impounded billions of dollars appropriated for national defense, moth-balled our Navy and particularly our aircraft carriers, cut the Marine Corps to the bone, cut our Air Force from 70 groups to 48 groups, and refused to take cargo ships out of the reserve fleet.

REPORTER. You say the Korean War could have been avoided. Why?

Mr. LATHAM. I believe the fault lies squarely with the present administration and particularly with our State Department. They have steadfastly maintained an unrealistic attitude toward Communists. Their belief was that they could do business with the Communists. This policy resulted in a long series of incidents and appeasement. Specifically, in Korea they permitted the Communists to effectuate the dividing of this country at the arbitrary thirty-eighth parallel. This kept all Korean industry within the Russian orbit. They permitted the withdrawal of our occupation troops from South Korea and announced to the world that Korea was unimportant to our defenses. When Congress voted appropriations for military aid to South Korea, they neglected to send that aid. In all, it was an open invitation to Communist-led North Koreans to move in and take over.

REPORTER. Are the Russian Communists really behind this?

Mr. LATHAM. They certainly are. I personally saw the Russian-made tanks, guns, and bullets that are killing our boys.

REPORTER. Are the South Koreans giving us much help?

Mr. LATHAM. Yes. They are tough, hardy people with plenty of courage. In addition, they are doing splendid work unloading ships. And they also act as litter bearers to take our wounded from the battlefield. I might add that the North Koreans are also tough, fanatical, and vicious fighters. That is why they have given us so much trouble.

REPORTER. How soon do you think we are going to win in Korea?

Mr. LATHAM. The exact timetable is hard to predict. But we're going to win. However, we must face the possibility that Russia will send the Chinese or Manchurian hordes down through North Korea. As things now stand, I am completely confident we will hold our beachhead and completely destroy the North Korean forces before they ever get back to the thirty-eighth parallel.

REPORTER. Would you say we were ever in danger of defeat in Korea?

Mr. LATHAM. We had a very close call. Each unit we had in there performed remarkably well and without any one of them we would probably have been licked. The mobile Navy Carrier Task Force struck hard and straight. The Army troops in the first critical days fought a rear guard delaying action that will go down in military history as a classic. The Marine Corps, when it arrived with its splendid balanced fighting team, recaptured critical lost ground. The Naval Surface Force with deadly shore fire knocked out the Korean Reds advancing down the east coast. The Air Force struck supply channels behind the lines. General MacArthur, the master strategist, furnished brilliant direction.

REPORTER. You saw General MacArthur. How is he?

Mr. LATHAM. He is in splendid health and absolutely confident of victory. We must not forget that he probably knows more about the Orient than any other living American.

REPORTER. What questions were you asked by the boys out there?

Mr. LATHAM. I spoke to hundreds of them. The question most frequently asked was: "Do the people back home know how tough the fighting is out here?" They were also concerned about reports of "business as usual" and "politics as usual" at home. They were stunned and incredulous at reports of hoarding while they were fighting so desperately.

REPORTER. What can we do here at home to help?

Mr. LATHAM. We can expose and fight the Communists in this country. We can see that the men on the fighting line get everything they need. We can tighten our belts and do everything possible to help the general war effort. We can bear in mind that while statesmen debate academic questions at the United Nations in Lake Success, these boys are fighting and dying—for keeps.

Develop and Conserve Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial on resources development and conservation appearing in Report From Washington by Michael Hudoba in the October 1950 issue of Sports Afield. The editorial follows:

This Nation has mobilized its strength and called upon its resources to protect its existence for the third time in this half century, and the second time within the present generation.

That our natural resources have been abundant is a vital factor in our continuing position of leadership in a world of peril. But how long can we draw upon the good fortune of nature's beneficence without exhausting its capacity as well as the patience of the good earth? There is a limit to the future we can spend today.

The natural resources of soil, water, land, forest, and mineral are the basic elements of existence to men and nations. We have turned the wheels of industry to create the highest living standards in the world by our raw resources. In addition to ourselves, we have fed, clothed, and sheltered much of the civilized world on a land capacity which is only a fraction of the earth's surface.

While we pour billions into costs of past wars and defense for future wars, we virtually neglect the defense of our nonrenewable resources. While we spend more than 71 percent of our multi-billion-dollar budget for defense, only 5 percent goes toward conservation of the natural resources, which is the basis of our whole existence. And wrapped up in that 5 percent are pseudo-conservation programs that dabble in after-effects of resource ills, without attacking fundamental issues.

We cannot continue to implement our defense efforts indefinitely in the absence of expanding such programs, nor can we avoid the tragic Maginot line philosophy with stockpiles of defense material if our natural resources position is allowed to deteriorate.

Our enemies know too well the restriction of resource deficiencies and they cast covetous eyes and lick their chops over the profligacy of our policies.

It is time for this Nation to take stock of its natural resources. It is time to organize an all-out mobilization to preserve our resources and to restore those which we are depleting. We must not be trapped in the rush of budgetary readjustments to counter international crises, to deaccent vital domestic resource restoration programs. This is no less a mandatory defense need than arms and implements of war.

Before it is too late, this Nation must aggressively undertake and expand its resource restoration and conservation programs. And contrary to prevalent Washington philosophy, this is not all dam building, nor all subsidy payments. It must deal objectively in basic restoration of soil, water, land, and forest resources.

And in the future, with crises past, these are the elements on which we must depend to rehabilitate our domestic economy. These are the elements which will have to pay the bills.

Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning praising the work of the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness, which is headed by our colleague the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and is made up of eminent members of both parties. I am sure all of us have had a feeling of pride in the splendid work of this sumbcommittee, and it is very reassuring to find that the excellent progress which the subcommittee has made is being approved by the press and the public opinion of the country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUNITIONS LAG

Hubert E. Howard's resignation as Chairman of the Munitions Board cannot be dissociated from the critical report of the Board's activities by the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness of which Senator LYNDON JOHNSON is chairman. Shortly after the war broke out in Korea this new watchdog committee, which is following in the footsteps of the Truman committee of the Second World War, became alarmed over the laxity of the Munitions Board in building up the country's natural rubber stockpile. On August 15 the committee wrote to Mr. Howard that the rubber stockpile was inadequate and asked what plans be had to rectify the situation. Three weeks later it had had no reply. The committee found other strong evidence that the Munitions Board has been asleep at the switch, and this congressional finding, of course, went into the hands of the President, and no doubt precipitated the resignation of Mr. Howard.

Now the stockpiling program was undertaken for the specific purpose of avoiding in any future emergency the critical shortages that plagued our war efforts in the early forties. It is shocking in view of this experience that the job has been neglected. But no other conclusion is possible. Before Korea the Munitions Board missed an excellent opportunity to acquire large supplies of natural rubber at prices which last fall were 16 cents a pound. Under the stimulus of the Korean War the price of natural rubber jumped to 55 cents, and then the Board appears to have revised downward its inadequate stockpiling plans. This record seems to show neither business prudence nor recognition of national need. In issuing its first report recently the Preparedness Subcommittee sharply criticized this lack of foresight and commented that "we need more imaginative and far-sighted men responsible for the attainment of the stockpiling objectives."

Mr. Howard was asked to appear before the Preparedness Committee yesterday, but the hearing was canceled because of his resignation. Mr. Truman's prompt acceptance of the resignation affords further evidence that he is working with the congressional investigators to correct weaknesses in the defense effort as quickly as they are brought to light. He had previously arrested the disposal of Government rubber-producing plants and his interest in the work of the committee probably stimulated various departments to revise business-as-usual policies under prodding from the committee. Senator MORSE highly commended the President for his enlightened attitude toward the fact finders and said that the President's promptness had set a "magnificent example" for other governmental agencies.

In this there is evidence of strength. The bipartisan subcommittee is turning the spotlight on mistakes that need correction without fanfare or political bias, and the White House is responding with a largeness of spirit. We hope this singleness of devotion to building up our national security will carry over into the selection of a new Chairman for the Munitions Board, for the Board serves as a sort of joint chiefs of staff for industry. From the Munitions Board, specifically, must come the military requirements program for setting in motion the new National Production Authority.

W. Harriman: Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of September 20, 1950:

MR. HARRIMAN: POLITICIAN

W. Averell Harriman's attack on Senator TAFT belongs under the heading of cheap—very cheap—politics.

The labor bosses, aided and abetted by the President and his political hatchet men, have been gunning for Senator TAFT ever since the labor law which bears his name was passed. At the beginning, they relied on an utterly false attack on the law itself. They said that it was a slave labor act and that it would destroy unions. But that line of attack has worn itself out. Labor unions have become bigger and stronger than ever before, and no amount of falsification can make anyone believe that the unions have been crushed and enslaved by the Taft-Hartley Act.

So the attack has been switched to Senator TAFT's voting record on foreign policy. And Mr. Harriman, who heretofore has been somewhat above the ward-heeler level in politics, has obediently gone down to the AFL meeting in Houston and joined the "get TAFT" chorus.

The Star has differed with Senator TAFT in several of his votes on foreign-policy matters. It was not in agreement with his opposition to General Marshall as Secretary of Defense. This newspaper has not the slightest doubt, however, that in these matters Senator TAFT's stand has been taken as a matter of principle and honest conviction. To say, as Mr. Harriman told the AFL assembly, that the Ohio Senator has ignorantly been furthering the designs of the Kremlin is to resort to the shoddiest kind of political slander.

There is, and there always should be, a place in this Government for sincere opposition. There is no other way in which faulty administration policies can be tested and perfected. But the labor bosses and their political servants do not accept this view. For purely selfish reasons, they will tolerate no opposition to their political demands and they openly boast of their determination to drive from public life Senator TAFT or any other man who has the courage and the integrity to stand out against them.

Mr. Harriman, with the President's approval if not at his direction, has joined this partisan hue and cry, and in so doing he has forfeited any claim to respect or support as an instrument of a bipartisan foreign policy. He says, magnanimously, that the most charitable thing one can say about TAFT is that he knows not what he does. That is more than one can say of Mr. Harriman. He knows very well what he is doing, and that makes his performance at Houston all the more regrettable.

Communism and American Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I consider it a privilege to include in the RECORD an address by Mr. Dave Beck, Executive Vice President, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco.

During the past 4 years, I have had the opportunity, as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, to participate in a number of investigations of the Communist conspiracy in the United States. These investigations have revealed that the most effective work in removing Communists from positions of power is being done by the anti-Communist leaders of the American trade-union movement. Our Government, our schools, and other American institutions which the Communists have succeeded in infiltrating could well follow the lead of the trade-union movement in this respect.

Dave Beck has long been one of the most outspoken and able opponents of communism in the labor movement. It is to his credit, particularly, that he saw the danger from communism, both to the labor movement and to our American system, long before others both in and out of labor unions recognized the seriousness of the problem.

Mr. Beck's address follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, I am delighted to discuss with you today the subject of communism and American labor unions. Communism is not solely the problem of labor, however. As you know in the State of California, it is also a problem within our universities and in many other segments of our social and economic life.

All of us are deeply interested in meeting the problem posed by communism in America, and throughout the world. If we are to do this, however, we must first understand the reasons for the spread of communistic doctrine, how it is propagated, and to whom it makes its appeal. It will not help us to shift the responsibility, for personal advantage, to the shoulders of either labor or industry.

The organization with which I am identified, and which I have served for so many years, is the largest labor union in the world. It has a membership of more than a million men and women. It is made up largely, if not entirely, of people who are classified as unskilled. Yet we have no problem whatever with communism.

There must be a reason for this fact. It is because for more than 30 years in the history of our international union, its basic constitution—the law of the union—provided that a Communist shall not be eligible to membership. At our last national convention, here in San Francisco in 1947, we further clarified and broadened that provision by barring from membership all who are affiliated or associated with subversive organizations or groups of any kind, or who advocate any subversive philosophy.

Since we are a voluntary organization, we do not require positive proof that a man is a member of the Communist Party; we must simply satisfy ourselves that he advocates the philosophy of communism. If he does this, then for all practical purposes, he is a Communist, and we do not waste time in throwing him out.

There can be no compromise between Americanism and communism. Any attempt at compromise is an admission of defeat. Surely we have had enough of appeasement, of attempting to compose differences with those whom we know to be sworn enemies of our way of life. I believe that the greatest result that can come out of the situation in Asia is that we will bring sharply home to the attention of our people this outstanding fact: That just as we must carry life insurance for the protection of our families, and fire insurance on our homes and businesses, so must we carry national insurance in the form of adequate military preparedness for our Government and our free institutions and ideals.

More than 5 years previous to the last World War, in many talks which I made before business and professional groups and service clubs, I advocated as strongly as my ability would permit, that we maintain our Army and our Navy and our Air Force at the highest possible degree of strength and efficiency, regardless of the cost. There is not a man or woman in front of me today—not one—who, is confronted with the choice of losing the life of his son or contributing his entire fortune, would hesitate for an instant. Of course he would sacrifice everything of material value he possesses for his loved ones. Yet, we hesitated then as a nation to prepare to defend our rights and our way of life, with the result that untold thousands of our boys did not come back from that war, or returned maimed and broken in body.

So long as communism spreads its fangs across the world, we must be ready, we must be prepared to hurl the vicious beast back from our shores.

We must demand in these hours of national peril that men in positions of trust tell us truthfully where they stand on the question of communism. I have no time whatever for men in politics, or in labor, or in business, or on the faculty of any of our universities, who refuse to take a positive stand on this question of communism.

It is a lot of tommyrot for members of university faculties to talk about interference with their academic freedom, while young Americans are making the great sacrifice on the battlefields of Korea to defeat communism and to defend free America. We are in an era of national emergency which has endured for a long, long time. World War II has not been officially ended. Thousands of men who gave up their peacetime ambitions for a period of years, who gambled their lives on the battlefields of Europe and in the South Pacific, are again being called into military service, while some of our theorists, exponents of what they pretend to call their constitutional rights, refuse to stand and be counted as Americans. They forget that the soldier, both in peace and war, lives under military law, not civil law. They blandly suppose that their rights would survive if communism should sweep this country. How wrong they are. American rights and all the liberty our forefathers fought to give us, would be destroyed instantly and without trace if we were to prove unworthy to survive in this present conflict.

It was my privilege to travel to Europe a year ago and to speak as a representative of the American Federation of Labor before the British Trades Union Congress, and to visit some of the countries on the eastern side of the Atlantic. I had a private audience with the Pope at his summer palace near Rome. We discussed the problem of communism. I also conferred at some length on the same subject with Bishop O'Connor, who heads the North American University in Rome, one of the outstanding schools for the development of young men for the priesthood.

Both the Pope and Bishop O'Connor stated that it was where the common people were struggling against direst poverty that communism made its greatest advances.

Later we drove through the streets of Rome, on a hot afternoon, just as the day was coming to a close, and we could look into the houses and see where 15 to 20 lived in absolute squalor in a single room. Down in Naples, as well as elsewhere in Europe where communism seemed to thrive, we found the same appalling conditions, and we could then understand something of the problem of communism and how it could appeal to those people. There indeed was a fertile breeding place for ideas which appeal to desperate men, to men who have lost their hope and their faith in themselves and in the future.

But these facts do not excuse men and women in American labor for tolerating communism. There is no such fertile ground here for the propagation of the Moscow doctrine.

The problem of communism in America is one which labor and capital must solve jointly. We are making definite and steady progress in this country toward the solution of the other problems of capital and labor. There is a constantly improving standard of living here.

If we want the truth, and I am sure that we do want the truth, we must not judge men and women in any phase of our social, economic, and business life by the actions of an individual, or of a few misguided individuals. We must judge industry as well as labor by the character and the conduct of the overwhelming majority. I can say to you positively, because I know whereof I speak: the working men and women of America want no part of communism whatever.

My friends, the strongest bulwark to restrain the sweep of communism must come from within labor. You cannot find Communists in the membership of the Kiwanis Club, or the Rotary Club, or the Lion's Club, or the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. Why? Because you people and others in similar organizations are financially successful. You enjoy a standard of living, you and your families and your associates, that does not permit the seeds of communism to take root. You and your families and your friends may not be wealthy but you are a long, long way from poverty.

We must recognize the fact, both in labor and elsewhere in America, that many of the evils, which once were destructive of our standards of living, and which made possible the fetid breeding grounds for communism, are no longer tolerated.

As we right the old wrongs and as we banish forever the ancient evils of squalor and poverty and substandard living, we will sound the death knell of communism in this country.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not lay the responsibility for communism and its growth in the lap of industry, because I know that men in labor—men in high places in labor—also have tolerated communism and have courted it. Neither do I condemn those who change their minds, and abandon that false philosophy, or any other evil doctrine. We are all members of this human family and we can all err.

Yes; there have been men in high places in labor who put their arms around the Communists and welcomed them, back in 1934 and even in later years. There was Philip Murray, for instance, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and Walter Reuther, of the Auto Workers. There were also many others whom I could name. They tolerated the Communists in their ranks, they invited them in, and they worked with them and trusted them.

There was also John L. Lewis, with whose philosophy and actions I do not agree in many, many instances. Lewis definitely is not a Communist, but he, too, tolerated them and their leaders.

Why did these men in labor consort with Communists? Because they believed they could use Communists in labor to accomplish their objectives more easily.

But they were in error. They made a serious mistake, and they are still trying to correct it and to live it down. They discovered, as will anyone who makes the experiment, that the Communists, as quickly as they could do so, using any and all methods, no matter how reprehensible, tried to take over their union organizations. That is the objective of Communists when they infiltrate labor unions and organizations of university professors and any other group in our social and economic life. The Communists cared nothing for the American toiler or his union; they sought places of authority so that they could promote the Communist Party line. The Communists have no loyalty to America or Americans; their hearts and their loyalties are with the Kremlin. They will destroy a union or any other group if it will serve the ends of Russia. Their very thoughts are subservient to the Soviet dictators.

The chief goal of the Communist is revolution—violent and bloody revolution. He wants chaos and disorder and ruin for our country, for it is through such catastrophe that he hopes to take over and to rule America with an iron hand, destroying every trace of our democratic institutions, and blotting out our rights and liberties. Our American system of free enterprise is his especial enemy.

We of American labor believe in our free-enterprise system. We do not believe in it simply because it benefits those who have money invested in business upon which they may make profits. Not at all. We believe in free enterprise because we know that it

has preserved our liberty and at the same time has given us the highest standard of living and opportunity the world has ever known.

Free enterprise, as opposed to communism and socialism, is in the interest of the vast, overwhelming majority of the people who toil for their living, both here and in other countries. I believe in free enterprise because it inspires initiative within men and women. It provides them with opportunities to rise above their environment and to attain any high place which their ability and intelligence will permit them to achieve. I contend that no system in the history of the world has ever made possible such progress for the working men and women, as free enterprise has accomplished for the American people. I have traveled somewhat around over the world and I do not know of a single, solitary country where the workingman lives under as fine conditions as he does in this land of free enterprise. Certainly no honest, intelligent man can think that communism offers more.

I have never known of a Communist, or one who advocated communism—and I have watched them in action for more than 30 years—I have never known of one Communist who, of his own volition, has left this country to live in Russia. They fight deportation to Russia with all their might, and if they go to Russia, they fight just as hard to get back to this country.

In days long gone by, in Seattle in 1918, there was a general strike. I think that I headed the only labor organization in Seattle which voted against that general strike. I listened then in the Central Labor Council to men espousing the cause and extolling the wonders of Russia.

To hear them talk, you could put them off the boat blindfolded at Vladivostok and they could walk from one end of Russia to the other without bumping into a single obstacle. But not one of them went to Russia and stayed there. Why? Because no workingman anywhere in the world can earn for himself and his family the benefits and security that he can receive as a matter of course under our system of free enterprise.

Among the men and women in this room today, successful men and women, the overwhelming majority were not born to wealth and position. They fought and they earned their way up to the places they now hold. The tragedy is that so many have forgotten the adversities and misfortunes they endured and overcame in the early days.

I represent an organization which, I believe, has as good wages, hours, and working conditions as any labor group in the world. We accomplish this by working with industry and within the framework of this Government, and by no other method.

I disagree with employers in many parts of the country almost every day, and undoubtedly I shall continue to disagree with them, but I will disagree with them within the framework of our American law and Constitution and in an effort to take from industry what I honestly believe the men and women of labor are entitled to receive. That, in my judgment, is the only way we can stop the spread of communism.

We can go back into the history of any industry and where we find the greatest number of Communists today we also will discover that in the days gone by the most intolerable conditions existed. Yet, communism is not the solution for these people.

Yes, we are making progress. There was a time when, in the midst of depression, there was nothing for thousands upon thousands of hungry men and women to do but get into the breadlines, or go to the soup kitchens. Those who have lived in San Francisco since 1928 have had the experience of seeing hundreds and hundreds of men and women in the breadlines. Does anyone think we can send men and women into the breadlines without giving tremendous impetus to the spread of communism?

We must take steps to keep men and women out of the breadlines in times of business depression. It is futile to expect all of the working people to accumulate financial resources on their own initiative sufficient to provide insurance or some other form of protection to save them from destitution in such times of business distress. It therefore devolves upon this social and economic structure of curs to find the way to solve this problem.

I advocate that during the period of our working lifetimes, we set aside from our own earnings—not from the earnings of others but from our own—and out of the development of the resources and industry of this country, sufficient reserve savings to prevent breadlines and poverty. Perhaps you will criticize this idea. If so, what do you suggest to solve the problem? For it is our problem, and it must be solved if we are to stop communism in this country.

It is possible, perhaps, that we may go too far in the direction of social welfare, but I say to you: As surely as you are in front of me today, we must continue social security, for if we do not we will one day stagger this Nation's industry under a pension load which it cannot possibly carry. We must take steps now to provide for future needs. You may argue whether or not there should be investment of security funds as we go along, so that money will be available out of earnings to meet future emergencies, but no one can possibly disagree when I say that we must solve the problem of destitution and poverty among our people. Otherwise this great structure of business will not remain as you and I want it. If, however, we follow the policy of preparing now to meet future needs of our people, we will never have much of a problem from communism in America.

We dare not try to compromise with communism, for there can be no compromise. Phil Murray learned, Walter Reuther learned, and John L. Lewis learned by bitter experience that compromise with communism is disastrous. Neither can we compromise with a Russian Government which follows and advocates the philosophy of communism.

I detest communism as much as any man in America. We must stop it inside labor because, as I said a few minutes ago, that is the only place where it can possibly find an opportunity to grow; that is the only place where destitute, poverty-ridden people may ever be found. It is true that some of the working people have made mistakes. They are not, in many instances, well educated. Add poverty to their other handicaps and we will have ground for communism to take root.

I say to the leaders of industry and business: Associate yourself with men of character, ability and courage within the American labor movement and help to find the solution to these problems which cause unrest and which threaten to tear the very structure of our Government to pieces. Together we can find the causes, and the answers.

No man in labor today, who is worth anything to his membership, advocates the strike as the first step toward the solution of any dispute he may have with any employer. A 15-year old boy may be able to organize a strike, and if all labor respects the picket line, he may accomplish his objectives even though they may be absolutely wrong. That is not the road to industrial peace or to the proper solution of our problems, for wrong methods will not stand the test of time.

We need more men in the labor movement who have the courage to say "No!" when that is the unpopular thing to say. We can find any number of men who are willing to say "Yes" if that seems popular. We need courageous men in our universities, on our boards of regents, directing the affairs of industry. I repeat: We need them in the labor movement.

What shall we say of the man in industry who goes along for a period of time, dealing with honorable men and women in labor but who, when he sees that they are on the road to a solution of their common problems, double-crosses them and enters into an agreement, or creates a situation which strengthens and promotes communism? I have had that experience. I have worked with industry and helped to force the Communists into a corner and then I have discovered men in industry who were willing to take advantage of the opportunity to continue contractual relations with Communists and thereby give them a breathing spell in which to regain their strength.

That kind of dealing will not stand the test of time. Such leaders of industry will wake up some day to find that the leaders of labor, who proved they had the courage to stand up against almost unbearable pressure, have lost confidence in them and are unwilling to trust them again.

I have had some experience in saying "No," when it was extremely unpopular. I said it across the bay in Oakland a few years ago when a general strike was threatened. I told our people in Oakland that I did not care if we lost every member in the bay area, we would rather lose them than participate in a general strike, for all general strikes are revolutionary in character and philosophy. I say this not only to the Commonwealth Club, but I also say it to my own people. A general strike is revolution, and nothing but revolution.

My friends, when we in labor educate our people to practice honorable procedures, and when our people display the courage to stand up and be counted against communism, we do not like it when men associated with industry walk away from us when by so doing they can save themselves a few paltry dollars. Double-crossing will not stop communism in labor or anywhere else.

Yes; we in labor have had associates who forgot and disregarded their duty and their obligations to God and man. Industry has had them, too. There have been men in both labor and industry who transgressed the law, who entered into racketeering schemes and combinations. I remember not too many years ago when a New York labor leader was sent up the river to Sing Sing. I also remember that the man right across the corridor from him was Mr. Whitney of the New York Stock Exchange. It is neither fair, nor just, nor even intelligent, to hold all men in labor and in industry and business guilty and to condemn them all because a few have fallen by the wayside. I do not condemn the banking business because a banker occasionally forgets his trust. Nor should you condemn labor because, now and then, a labor leader proves faithless and foresworn.

How to meet the threat of communism concerns not only the people of America; it concerns all free peoples. Here in America the solution lies with those of us who are charged with the responsibility of striving and working together intelligently in this American system of free enterprise, under the finest government in all the world.

First, we must learn to understand each other. Those of us who direct the affairs of labor—to use the vernacular of the street—must have the guts to stand up within the ranks of labor for what we know to be right. Leaders of industry must also have that same qualification.

Industry cannot meet the issue by attempting to destroy the leadership of labor, for instance, by propagandizing the salaries which labor's leaders receive. That will not stop communism; that may build a Frankenstein to destroy us all.

If we believe in the philosophy of free American enterprise, and I believe in it—no man in this room believes in free enterprise more completely and sincerely than I do—then we must realize that if labor is to be represented ably and intelligently at the conference table, if it is to have leadership of high competence, based upon character, experience and brains, then, under our system of free enterprise, labor has the right—yes, the duty—to pay its representatives in accord with the same standards that industry has set for itself. I know an attorney in San Francisco, whose law firm receives a retainer fee of $250,000 a year to represent the interest of employers. Would any sane, fair-minded man insist that labor send a truck driver, earning $60 or $70 a week, untrained and inexperienced and with little knowledge of economics, or labor, or industrial problems, to sit across the conference table from this attorney? Would you think that fair? Does anyone believe that would solve our problems in America? No, it cannot.

There are a great many men in labor who could command much larger salaries if they were working for industry. Through the years industry has watched the leaders of labor carefully. Often, when it has found men of outstanding ability, it has offered them many times more than labor could afford to pay, and put them to work for industry. I offer no objection, for under our system it is each man's individual right to sell his services where and at a price that his own judgment dictates is to his best advantage and the advantage of his family. What I am trying to emphasize is this: do not tear down the outstanding leadership of labor which, under the test of time and in the crucible of action, has measured up to our American ideals. Do not tear such men down, for if you do, the consequences will come home some day to haunt you.

I wish that we had thousands of trained young men within the ranks of labor, not only in this country but throughout the world, striving for positions of leadership, of whom there was not the slightest question as to integrity, citizenship and belief in our economic system and our form of government. We never have trouble with that type of leadership in labor. Our trouble comes in labor from the men and women in positions of leadership who endorse communism, or through ignorance tolerate it. Communists believe the oath that they may take in a courtroom is not worth a snap of the fingers. They will place their right hand on the Holy Bible and swear to tell the truth, but since they do not believe in God, their oath is meaningless.

I am reminded of the university professor who says he is not a Communist, but who objects to taking an oath to that effect. My friends, I advocated within the American labor movement, within our own national convention, long years ago, that we stand up proudly and take the oath. For we are not Communists.

It is my opinion that a certain large percentage of those who object to taking the anti-Communist oath, or to signing such an obligation—and I want to make it plain that I am not referring alone to your problem in the California academic world—are more afraid of prosecution for perjury than of admitting they are Communists. I do not know what makes Communists among faculty members in our universities. It is over my head. But I want to make this statement: all crackpots are not in labor, there are a lot of them in the universities.

I had some small part, let me assure you, not only in getting rid of Communists at the University of Washington, but also along with my associates on the board of regents and in the president's office in initiating that action, and the Communists do not like it. I wish that I could say over the radio what I think about them.

My friends, we can solve the problem of communism in American labor only through honorable dealing between labor and industry.

Labor must come to realize that the man or woman who invests in business does not always find success and profits easy to obtain. I know there are many instances where the owners or managers of business, from time to time, sweat blood simply to meet the payroll. All men in business and industry are not rolling in wealth. Labor must realize that fact. We have a right, under our system of enterprise, to earn a bona fide, legitimate, and reasonable return upon capital investment, if we have the brains and ability to do so. I also believe the owners of industry have a right to plow back into their business sufficient money for expansion and growth, so that more jobs can be created and greater production made possible, for out of such expansion and employment comes the wealth of our country and the ever-improving standard of living for all of our people.

Neither labor nor industry has a right to enter into collusive action or conspiracy, for that will not stand the test of time. It contradicts the right of the great consuming public.

In this system of ours, free and open and unregulated competition no longer exists in many fields of endeavor. A man cannot invest his money in a new railroad, an air transportation company, or a trucking company and take his own chance, in open competition, of making a reasonable profit. He must first obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity, or some other form of regulatory permit which tends to control competition. That is a development which has come about over a long period of time.

I say to you in conclusion: The greatest Government ever founded in all the world is our American Government. Above everything else, above the rights of labor, or the rights of capital, or the rights of the individual, is our duty to our Government. We must always subordinate our interests to its welfare. Finally: If you want to solve the problem of communism in American labor unions, I beg of you to recognize character and ability and honorable dealing wherever you find it—in Government, in industry, or in labor. Thank you.

Party Chairman Tells Commies To Back Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Willard Edwards from the Washington Times-Herald of September 20, 1950:

PARTY CHAIRMAN TELLS COMMIES TO BACK TRUMAN

(By Willard Edwards)

The Communist Party of the United States has been put on notice by its chairman, William Z. Foster, that support of the Truman administration is the best means to obtain a Soviet America.

This is the studied opinion of a number of experts on Communist verbiage after examining a 10,000-word report by Foster in which he outlines a shift in policy, one of the sharp turns and twists which have featured Communist procedure in the last 17 years.

PRINTED IN BUCHAREST

The Foster document reached Capitol Hill recently. It was printed August 11 in Bucharest in the official organ of the Cominform, the Soviet propaganda agency. International directives are carried in this publication but a statement of American Communist policy has never been given such official recognition before.

Instead of the present all-out drive for communism in the United States, Foster called for support of a government "operating within the framework of a bourgeois state" which would have the support of labor and "curb the power of the monopolists."

A number of authorities, attaching deep significance to the cominform imprimatur, spent days in study of the Foster statement. Ex-Communist leaders were called in for an opinion. The final, unanimous agreement was that Foster, with the Kremlin's approval, was conveying a sensational change in policy for American Communists under cloak of the customary Communist double-talk and tortuous wording.

ANOTHER SHARP REVERSAL

Just as the American Communist Party switched suddenly from its "anti-imperialist war" stand on the day that Germany invaded Russia, calling loudly for America's entry into the war, now an equally sharp reversal has been ordered, the experts agreed.

Nowhere does the Foster statement directly call for support of the Truman regime. But a number of significant passages were noted which, to those acquainted with Communist procedure, point to such a conclusion.

Foster began his statement with a discussion of the recent trial of 11 Communist Party leaders which resulted in their conviction for conspiracy to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. He referred to a pamphlet, written by himself, which was introduced for the defense at the trial, which analyzed Communist Party policy since 1935.

WRITES APOLOGETICALLY

Paving the way for a change in this policy, Foster wrote apologetically in the Bucharest cominform publication:

"In view of the immensity, complexity and newness of the subject matter, certain errors and shortcomings could and did creep into it (the pamphlet). The most serious shortcomings, dealing with the policy of the American Communist Party, left a number of important propositions open to misunderstanding and distortion.

"I am writing this with the special purpose of clarifying and elaborating upon a number of questions."

Foster then paid tribute to the "tremendous political achievement, under the leadership of Stalin and Dimitrov," at the Communist international meeting in 1935 which called for "certain important changes in policy and action."

PLOTTED CHINESE REVOLUTION

"From it came the great Chinese revolution," he wrote, "the main line of which was stated by Stalin as long as 24 years back."

But, he added immediately, the rise of "people's democracies" (communism) in eastern Europe and China could obviously not be accomplished by the same tactics everywhere.

"Only political fools," he emphasized, "would try to apply rigid, uniform tactics to all these widely ranging situations."

The statement then turned to the American scene.

"It must be solidly emphasized," Foster wrote, "that our orientation is for a people's front government stated in terms adapted to American conditions. This clear policy is in its basic essentials valid for us now."

By a people's front government, Foster explained, he meant one supported by the labor unions.

ECONOMIC CRISIS NEEDED

"The trade unions and every other organization of the workers and their allies would have to throw their whole strength into the struggle for a people's front," he continued. "It may well be that the people's front movement in this country will develop at a very rapid speed.

"One of the most important factors is development of a deep economic crisis. It is possible in the United States, during such a time, to elect a coalition, anti-Fascist, anti-imperialist government."

Foster then explained that a "people's front" government would be compelled to move steadily toward communism.

"A people's front party," he wrote, "would have to orientate to the left or it would be destroyed. It would be compelled to attack monopolists in their economic, military, and political spheres.

NATIONALIZATION EMPHASIZED

"It would have to orientate toward nationalization of banks and industries, break-up of big landholdings, the beginning of a planned economy, elimination of reactionaries from all State institutions."

"Communists would defend such a government against reactionary efforts to overthrow it."

Such a people's front government, Foster continued, "operates within the framework of a bourgeois state, curbing the power of the monopolists."

This was not communism, he warned, but communism would evolve from such a government. And he added a sinister warning:

"Eventually, the Soviet Army must play the decisive role."

The Visitor Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my friends and colleagues an unusual little book entitled "The Visitor Speaks." This account, just off the press, should be of special interest in this Chamber, since it deals with the 36 distinguished guests from other lands who have addressed the Congress since 1800, when Washington became our Capital.

I am confident that each of us will find something of interest and of inspiration in this account, which has been prepared by two talented staff members of the Department of State, my very good friend, Dr. Andor C. Klay, and his collaborator, Walter T. Kamprad. The book was, of course, prepared on their own time and does not necessarily represent the views of the Department of State.

It is appropriate that this fascinating historical research is published in the year of the sesquicentennial of our Capital City. To give an idea of the scope and purpose of the book, I want to insert at this point the authors' introduction:

This book, the first of its kind, traces the birth of a typically American tradition.

Since 1800, when Washington became the Nation's Capital, many celebrated representatives of friendly nations have visited here as honored guests of the United States.

In the course of 150 years, 36 of these guests—representing 31 countries—were accorded the privilege of addressing the legislators of our Congress.

The first among them was General Lafayette, great son of France, beloved hero of the American Revolution, who spoke before the Congress in 1824. It was almost three decades later that the second, Louis Kossuth, exiled Governor of Hungary, romantic hero of a revolution similar in many ways to the American, appeared in Congress. Nearly another quarter century passed before David Kalakaua I, King of Hawaii, spoke before the assembled Houses.

These extraordinary guests of the Nation, whose gallery is presented on the following pages, range from king to commoner; from soldier to statesman and to rebel; from European to Asiatic, African, and Latin American. Some of them spoke no English; one of them could not speak at all when the time came to orate; some delivered resounding addresses and one spoke but five words; one of them had no title or public office and two of them were women.

Symbolized by these honored guests, the people of the world have marched through Washington, paying tribute to American freedom and thanking the people of America for their help and support.

The reader will recall from comparatively recent years the memorable address delivered by Winston Churchill in the Congress of the United States. But does he know who Ishii was? Can he tell why Bakhmetiev was here, or where Apponyi came from? Each was an important man with something interesting to say to the American people; each appraised us with the objectivity of the foreign observer, showing us how American freedom appeared when viewed from afar.

The purpose of this book is to recall the bygone; to re-create the forgotten; to outline the rapid growth of this Nation and this city from 1800 to 1950. It is the heartbeat of an ever-growing, ever-stronger, free, and democratic America that one can hear behind these pages, and it is with pride in our past, trust in our future, and confidence in our destiny that this little volume is offered to the reader.

Behind the Flying Saucers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, in these dangerous days when mass hysteria is created all too easily, there is an unfortunate amount of information—or misinformation—about so-called flying saucers. It has been difficult to obtain a forthright statement on the matter from those who should know, the Air Force, the Navy's air arm, or Governmental aeronautical experts.

In this vacuum of authoritative assertion, we now find a questioning public rushing to buy a book on the subject. Pathfinder magazine, in the science column of its current issue, reports it thus:

FLYING SAUCER RIDE

"No more flying saucers, I'm sorry," was the rueful, day-long chorus at Brentano's midtown bookshop in Washington, D. C., last Friday. "We had ordered only 50," explained one clerk, "and they were gone shortly after the store opened."

The same thing happened at a number of bookstores across the continent. It was an astonishing demonstration of word-of-mouth advertising. There had been almost no advance publicity for Behind the Flying Saucers, by Frank Scully (Henry Holt; New York). It also showed that many people were willing to believe (A) that space ships from another planet might have landed on earth and (B) that the United States Government might have kept such an epoch-making event secret.

This was Scully's story, and book reviewers were stuck with it. They could hardly help remembering that Scully was best known as humorist-author of another book called Fun in Bed, although he also contributes to Variety and once ran for lieutenant governor in California.

However, publisher's representatives vigorously denied that any monkey business was afoot. And in the book, Scully's tone was that of a man belligerently bent on being taken seriously. His story was that a group of magnetic research scientists, apparently working for the Government on a $1,000,000,000 secret budget, had investigated three flying disks forced down at different points across the Nation. These were unmistakably space ships, each manned by a crew of 36-inch-tall, non-terrestrial human beings, all killed in the landings. The Air Force, which was in on the discovery, promptly spirited away the dead little men and their ships, the largest of which was $99\frac{99}{100}$ feet in diameter, for further investigation.

The ships, according to Scully, seemed to be magnetically propelled. They were made of an alloy which resembled aluminum except that no tests could melt or break it. Each contained a "radio," the size of a pack of cigarettes, which beeped hourly in the key of C, but did nothing else. The little men, dressed identically in cloth of incredible toughness, wore wafer-thin watches.

All this was told Scully by a "magnetic scientist" he calls Dr. Gee, on whose trail he was set by a Denver radio man named Koehler. Dr. Gee couldn't explain why the Air Force should have declared the disk discoveries secret, except that he considered the question of magnetic propulsion very hot.

So does Scully, whom Dr. Gee apparently convinced that a magnetic ship could travel through the earth's atmosphere at 186,000 miles a second. Dr. Gee thought the visiting minikins came from Venus, which would be a mere 21 minutes away. He also gave Scully some inside dope on the use of a "Tenescope," a detector device (for spotting space ships anywhere in the earth's air envelope) which is so new the National Bureau of Standards hasn't even heard of it.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the public is entitled to know the truth of this matter in the language of the layman. We cannot afford hysteria in our present hour of defense peril. The public should not have to feed on doubt or conjecture. It seems to me it is time for our authorized aviation experts to speak up. Let us concede them and explain them or expose them and bury them.

S. 784

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I ask permission

to extend my remarks on the subject matter of S. 784.

Members of the House, heretofore not aware of the actualities in this case, may be interested to take note of this data. This case encompasses public interest for the reasons stated in the report of the House Judiciary Committee on this bill.

The just merits of this bill could not be adequately explained to the Members of the House on August 31, because the time allotted for debate on rule on S. 784 was used up "out of order" for subject matters not concerned with this bill.

The following data is based on the evidence set forth in House Report No. 2135, in re S. 784, published on May 25, 1950, which recommended that this bill do pass.

On page 9 of this report, the simple, common-sense terms of the operating agreement betw.en the three companies and the Fleet Corporation are set forth; these agreements were entered into in midyear 1920 with the approval of the Shipping Board; these terms covenant a fair and reasonable consideration from one to the other; the three companies and the Fleet Corporation dealt with each other without interference in compliance with these terms during the entire period of the three companies' custody, physical operation and commercial use of the three vessels respectively from commencement of such custody to the termination of such custody in regard to each of the three vessels.

It may be recalled that in 1920, the Fleet Corporation had allocated to it by the Government through its agency, namely, the Shipping Board, the husbanding of all merchant marine vessels owned by the Government.

The Fleet Corporation maintained over 1,000 such vessels at public expense. Of these, it was forced to lay up in idleness at considerable expense, over 750 of the freight vessels, because it could find no business for them under its then current method of commercial operation.

The lay-ups were in effect an outright loss of public funds. Also, most of the seamen, namely, most of the ships' crews of laid-up vessels, were thrown out of employment.

A few hundred of these vessels, however, were being operated by the use of public funds, by the Fleet Corporation for the Government's account, to serve that part of the American commercial foreign trade which chose to or would give trade to these American-flag vessels.

The Fleet Corporation lost approximately an average of $11,000,000 per month of public funds during the fiscal year June 1920 to June 1921 as a result of this operation in cargo transportation of these commercially active Government freight vessels; this loss was the deficit created by the excess of the physical operating costs of these active vessels over the freight income which the vessels were able to obtain for their transporting services.

These aforesaid large losses of public funds included the fees and commissions which the Fleet Corporation paid out to its so-called managing agents to whom the Fleet Corporation allocated or turned over these active vessels for attention; these managing agents collected the freight moneys for the account of the Fleet Corporation which paid for all expenses and costs.

These managing agents did not risk any of the capital of their own in the operations; they were supplied all physical operating capital and costs of the vessels and needed supplies and all costs of maintenance of seaworthiness by the Fleet Corporation, which in turn received public funds from the Shipping Board, the Government's agency, to disburse such costs and overcome the monthly deficits. Schundler's agreements were beneficial to the Government in such ways as follows: Schundler's agreement with the Fleet Corporation was totally different from the agreements by which the aforementioned managing agents were employed.

First. By the operation of the three ships by his three companies, it kept the ships in active commercial use and made them available instantly as ready "spot vessels" for use and activity by the Fleet Corporation whenever needed, wherever needed.

Second. By the commercial operation of the three ships, it kept three American seamen ship crews employed and helped thereby basic American payrolls.

Third. It saved the costly lay-up in idleness of these three vessels, thus saving the Shipping Board's use of public funds for lay-up costs, while Mr. Schundler's companies operated the vessels. By his operation of the three ships by his companies he saved the Government a loss of considerably over $200,000 of public funds, as attested to by a qualified maritime expert of the Department of Justice, as cited on page 8 of report of the House Judiciary Committee.

If the Fleet Corporation had attempted to keep the ships in active commercial use and thus keep the ships and their seamen employed at the time while the three Schundler companies operated and used the three vessels, the Fleet Corporation would have lost, for the account of the Government, public funds exceeding $12,000 per month per trip ship.

On aforesaid page 8 of the House Report, it mentions the table entitled "United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, General Comptroller's Department—summary of specimen voyages in major trade routes from July 1, 1920, to April 30, 1921." This table showed that in the operation of 195 voyages of Shipping Board vessels, the loss of public funds was $5,849,385.21, or about $30,000 per ship voyage.

Schundler operated the three ships for nine voyages which would have resulted, according to afore-mentioned evidence, at that time in about a loss of $270,000 for the Government, from which loss Schundler effectively protected the Government.

Fourth. Mr. Schundler's companies' operation of the three ships brought about an income to the Government in the form of Federal taxes of $30,672.95 or a profit to the Government of about $3,400 per each ship voyage under Schundler's management. This is instead of a loss of about $30,000 a voyage, if the Fleet Corporation had operated the three vessels in commercial cargo transporting according to its then ordinary method.

The over-all picture of the Government's loss of public funds in the fiscal year of June 1920 to June 1921 is best illustrated by the Fleet Corporation's own official report to Congress, set forth on page 21 of the House Judiciary Committee's report. That evidence shows that, as a result of the excess of physical operating costs of cash over the income, the Fleet Corporation lost $133,111,-706.38 for the fiscal year of 1920–21, or an average loss of public funds of over $11,000,000 per month during that period.

This proves the undeniable considerable advantage to the Government and the adequate consideration and value of the service which Schundler and his three companies rendered to the Shipping Board—the Government—when he agreed to keep the Shipping Board harmless of loss arising out of physical operating costs over income, namely, when he and his companies agreed to pay as charter-hire-rental of the three vessels in consideration for their commercial use, a sum of over $1,000 per day per ship, with the understanding that the resulting profits or losses were to be that of Schundler's companies.

Let us look at the resulting profits or losses which Schundler and his three companies made as a result of their operating agreement with the Fleet Corporation. As set forth in House Report No. 2135 of the House Judiciary Committee in re S. 784, on pages 11, 12, 13, and 14 thereof; to wit:

> The evidence on file in the case and in the Internal Revenue Bureau, proves that the companies did faithfully fulfill their operating agreement with the Board-Fleet Corporation; and as of January 5, 1921, their cash security funds, as hereinafter set forth, had fulfilled their purpose as a bond and were forthwith returnable.
>
> The Internal Revenue Bureau's report, reports the details of the companies' fulfillment of their operating agreement with the Board-Fleet Corporation, to wit:
>
> The companies had had the vessels in custody under their management and use, as follows:
>
> Two hundred and thirty-three days for the *Independence*, 166 days for the *Hoxie*, 104 days for the *Scottsburg;* i. e., total custody-days of 3 vessels, 503 days; the companies paid out during such custody for the entire physical operating costs, the sum total of $526,559.17.
>
> Therefore average paid by the companies for hire-rental for use per day per vessel, $1,046.83. This equals and is tantamount to the payment by the companies, for each vessel, of a hire-rental of $1,046.83 per day per vessel or over $31,000 per month per vessel.
>
> This constitutes a fair and equitable, reasonable value for the use of the vessels, as shown by exhaustive data in evidence on the maritime conditions prevailing 1920–21.
>
> This latter evidence was assembled at the suggestion of Commissioner Rammseyer, who is referred to in the report by Senator Gibson, dated May 3, 1936. The Commissioner had made inquiry as to the question of maritime conditions existing in 1920 and as to what would constitute a fair measure of the reasonable value of the use of the vessels. Detailed evidence on file in the case

affirms the fact that the companies saved the Government's predecessors harmless from a loss which same would have made if same had had the vessels under their own control and custody and under their own management or that of their managing agents, and in commercial operation for the Board's own account and use at the Board-Fleet Corporation's own expenses in 1920 during the specific period while the companies did operate the three vessels for the companies' account at the companies' expense.

Thus, the Internal Revenue Bureau documented that Schundler and his companies had fulfilled their agreement to hold the Board harmless from the expense of physical operation, to wit: He and his companies paid out their own funds for the physical operation costs of the three vessels in the consolidated cash expenditure of $526,559.17, during the period of a few months in the last half year of 1920 while the companies did have the custody, management, and operation of the three vessels, and while, in consideration of their paying these costs of physical operating, the companies had the commercial use of the three vessels.

Their commercial use had consisted of transporting nine full cargoes of coal which brought in a consolidated freight income to the companies of $572,819.74; as evidenced thusly, the companies had expended and risked their own operating capital and had, as a result, made a consolidated gross operating profit of $46,260.57, being the excess of freight income from the companies' use of the vessels over the companies' expenditures for the cost of the "physical operation costs" of the vessels during the period of their custodies of the vessels.

Pursuant to the companies' operating agreement with the Board-Fleet Corporation, his operating profit or loss was the companies' concern; however, the Income Tax Bureau did not permit the three companies to make a consolidated return. Schundler's and his companies' loss in the operation of the *Hoxie* was $58,048.17. This remained exclusively their loss; this was the interpretation of the Tax Bureau in accordance with the operating agreement, namely, to keep the Shipping Board harmless of the physical operating cost, harmless from any loss resulting from freight income being less than the physical operating costs of a vessel. Schundler declared that he had expected that consolidated returns of the three companies could be made, but the Tax Bureau declined this, after consultations with the Shipping Board-Fleet Corporation.

The Internal Revenue Bureau assessed income taxes of $30,672.95 against the companies as the result of the ascertainment by the Tax Bureau of the following facts:

"The First National Steamship Co. or H. O. Schundler, on its behalf, expended for the physical operating expenses of the *Independence*, the sum of $248,377.68 and collected freight revenue from such operation of $317,319.60, and thus made a gross profit of $68,941.92, from the operation of the *Independence*.

"The Second National Steamship Co. or H. O. Schundler, on its behalf, expended for the physical operating expenses of the *Hoxie*, the sum of $154,888.51, and collected freight revenue from such operation of $96,840.34, and thus sustained a loss of $58,048.17, from the operation of the *Hoxie*.

"The Third National Steamship Co. or H. O. Schundler, on its behalf, expended for the physical operating expenses of the *Scottsburg*, the sum of $123,292.98, and collected freight revenue from such operation of $158,659.80, and thus made a gross profit of $35,366.82 from the operation of the *Scottsburg*.

"The tax assessed against the First National Steamship Co. was $20,271.75, based on profits of $68,941.92 from the operations of the steamship *Independence*.

"The tax assessed against the Third National Steamship Co. was $10,401.20, based on profits of $35,366.82 from the operations of the steamship *Scottsburg*."

Thus the total taxes were $30,672.95.

There was no tax assessed against the Second National Steamship Co. based on the operations of the steamship *Hoxie*, as there were no profits from the *Hoxie* operation, but a loss of $58,048.17 (there remained Schundler's and his companies' loss, pursuant to the terms of the operating contract).

Therefore, the concluding fact is that: The Internal Revenue Bureau assessed income taxes of $30,672.95 against the companies, and this constitutes the Government's income from this transaction without having had to risk any ship-operating capital.

The fact remains that when deducting these taxes of $30,672.95 from the three companies' consolidated gross operating profits of $46,260.57, there remains, as apparent income of Schundler and his three companies, the sum of $15,587.62 from this transaction.

The following status of accounts, as set forth in each of the congressional reports and reported by each as the factual status, came into existence as of January 5, 1921, as a consequence of the Shipping Board's action in late 1920, to wit, by the withdrawing of the vessels from the companies after same had had the custody and operation and use of each of the three vessels for a few months during the last half year of 1920.

On January 5, 1921, the total sum of $634,256.26 became due and refundable to the petitioning companies.

Of this aforesaid total sum, $538,048.23 thereof was cash deposited with the Shipping Board-Fleet Corporation as a security and bond and as a guaranty for the fulfillment of the agreement of the companies to hold the United States Shipping Board harmless from the expense of physical operation of the three Government cargo vessels while these vessels were in the custody and under the management and operation of the companies and while the companies had the commercial use of the vessels in consideration thereof.

The balance of aforesaid total sum, namely, $96,208.03 thereof, was, per agreement, reimbursable to the companies as of the aforementioned same date; it was a net difference in favor of the companies of certain debits and credits resulting from disbursement accounts between the Fleet Corporation and the companies, and fully agreed upon between both parties, as set forth.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Tax Court of Appeals, after consultations with the Shipping Board as shown in evidence by its report hereon, shows that the taxes were assessed in accordance with the terms of Schundler's operating agreement with the Board-Fleet Corporation and were predicated on the companies' receiving a full return for their deposits, i. e., $538,648.23, and full reimbursement of $96,201.23, being the heretofore stated net difference in favor of the companies of disbursing accounts pro and con between Schundler and the Fleet Corporation.

Thus, an independent agency of the United States, i. e., the United States Board of Tax Appeals, had determined the results of the transaction here involved and the net income of the First and Third National Steamship Co.'s and the net loss of the Second National Steamship Co. from their operations of the three subject vessels, and this determination was based upon a thorough investigation of the facts involved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue who had referred to all records and acted at the instance of and with the help of the Shipping Board-Fleet Corporation, as the evidence in the record shows.

This, therefore, proves that Schundler and his three companies as a consolidated operating profit made $15,587.62 as the gross sum total in exchange for their excellent faithful performance of their operating agreements with the Fleet Corporation, and in order to make this profit, they risked their cash operating capital paying out a total of $526,559.17, and in addition thereto, they tied up over half a million dollars of their capital funds as a cash security bond—$583,048.03—to guarantee their performance of these agreements, by placing these funds in good faith, into the escrow custody of the Fleet Corporation pending the termination of their operating agreement with the Fleet Corporation.

It is very pertinent to note that Schundler, if he had become active under the standard Shipping Board managing agency contract used by the Fleet Corporation in 1920, would have been better off; he would have made a fee of $17,184 without tie-up of his cash bond deposit and without risk of his cash operating capital.

Had Schundler been a standard managing agent of the Fleet Corporation, he need not have put up as a security the cash deposit of $538,048.23 as a bond to guarantee his undertaking and that of his three companies; Schundler and his companies would not have had to pay out and risk $526,559.17 of their cash operating capital and Schundler need not have had the trouble of any pro and con disbursement accounts; the Fleet Corporation would have had to supply all consumable supplies and fuel oil and radio service, at its expense with public funds, as part of the physical operating costs; the Board-Fleet Corporation would have had disbursed by the use of public funds for the Government's account as owners the fixed costs of improvements and seaworthiness and owner's hull and total loss insurance, as a matter of course, because these fixed expenses are the owner's own expenses irrespective whether vessels are idle or active.

The iniquity, the injustice of not returning these cash bond funds to the companies in early 1921, when the operating agreements had terminated and faithful performance of their operating agreement had been made by the companies, must become clear to any intelligent examiner.

The sham shallowness, the unjustifiable fallacies of the invalid objections and contentions alleged as adverse to the purpose of S. 784, become glaringly apparent when the service rendered by Schundler and his companies, as evidenced by the above data, is examined.

It is noteworthy that the companies and the Fleet Corporation behaved on the basis of the operating agreements, toward each other, during 1920 and early 1921 without interference as from one to the other, during the entire period of the companies' custody and operation and use of the vessels. These periods were evidenced as follows: Steamship *Independence*, May 17, 1920, to January 5, 1921; steamship *Hoxie*, June 2, 1920, to November 15, 1920; steamship *Scotsburgh*, September 23, 1920, to January 5, 1921.

The evidence proves that the companies returned to the Board-Fleet Corporation when and where so requested by the Board, the Government's property, namely, the three freight vessels, in proper order, without hindrance or delay.

However, the Fleet Corporation did not return in early 1921 when due, the companies' cash property and reimbursements amounting to $634,256.26 in proper order; on the contrary, not until 1935 was $250,000 returned to the companies by the Fleet Corporation; and as of the present, September 1950, the precisely determined stated balance of $384,256.26 has not yet been returned to the companies but is still being withheld by the Government, without warranty or right.

The House Judiciary Committee of this Congress as a result of a review of the evidence in this case by a majority of the Members who made an adequate study of facts, determined that the return of the balance of the cash bond of these companies, ascertained as precisely a balance of $384,256.26, is undisputably due to the companies.

The bill S. 784 is a thoroughly warranted legislation which should be enacted into law in order to do justice, in order to comply with morality, equity, and constitutional law, and as a matter of integrity and honesty required of our Government in dealing with a citizen, who rendered efficient and faithful service.

As set forth so pointedly, in the Judiciary Committee's report on page 17 there to wit:

It is pertinent to remark that Schundler and his companies undeniably rendered a distinct service to the United States Government in saving the United States Government harmless from a serious loss during the period that his companies and he had the vessels under their management, custody, operation, and use. That his companies and he have been treated unjustly to date is undeniable.

And as so clearly stated on page 19 of the report, namely:

The Senate bill, S. 784, will correct the injustice inflicted on the companies for so many years.

In conclusion, the following excerpts from pages 16 and 17 of the report of the House Judiciary Committee in re S. 784, are noteworthy:

The evidence supporting the statements herein are on file with the Judiciary Committee and are on record with the Supreme Court, the Court of Claims, the District Court of the District of Columbia, the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, the Archives Office, and are available on call for perusal. The evidence is complete and exhaustive and there remains no reason for any misinterpretation of any fact in this case. The evidence includes the attestations obtained by Attorneys General, by the Internal Revenue Bureau, and by congressional committees, from former officials of the Shipping Board-Fleet Corporation, who were in charge of the subject matter in 1920–21, for the Board-Fleet Corporation; this evidence was transmitted by the Senate's direction into the court records, subject to rebuttal. Those of the former officials who became available testified in court and none of the statements made in their affidavits were rebutted. Their attestations and testimony supported the companies' claim in every respect. Their attestations are set forth in full in congressional report (H. Rept. 3005), and include the statements and testimony of the late Captain Foley (U. S. Navy, 1920), referred to by former Attorney General Cummings in his message to Congress, and who was the Director of Operations of the Board-Fleet Corporation; it also includes the statements and/or testimony of W. W. Nottingham, assistant general counsel of the Board in 1920 and until 1926; J. H. Philbin, ship-sales manager and vice president of the Fleet Corporation, 1920 until 1927; R. C. Wells, statistical assistant to the Board in 1920. (H. Rept. No. 3005, pp. 10–12, 28–31, 30–31, 32–34.)

(It is noteworthy that in early 1921 Admiral Benson appointed a committee consisting of the then Commissioner Frederick I. Thompson, Commander A. B. Clements, who was the special assistant of Admiral Benson, Hon. W. W. Nottingham, assistant general counsel of the Board-Fleet Corporation, and Hon. J. A. Philbin, ship sales manager and vice president of the Fleet Corporation for many years. This committee directed in early 1921 the escrowed cash funds to be returned to the companies and set up the formula of accounting of disbursements in keeping with the operating contract, and it is this method which the internal revenue applied in its determinations. The directive of this committee was not carried out by the Fleet Corporation at that time and failure to do so became the commencement of the delay in the return of the funds due the companies.)

There never was any reason for confusion on any circumstance in this case, there does not remain any excuse for misunderstanding of any phase of the subject matter; the evidence on record is comprehensive, exhaustive, and complete; any item or its status, if for any reason not clear to anyone, can be clarified by study of the evidence on file in the record.

This is the first time in the history of the case that all the evidence in its assembled and probative form has come to the House Judiciary Committee for its analysis.

It is readily discernible to any intelligent examiner, that the procrastination in this case was brought about by contentions made by the Maritime Commission and its predecessors; these contentions have been proven as invalid and nonjustifiable objections. Every Member of the House who becomes aware of the probative facts in this case, will no doubt, emphatically support the proposed legislation, S. 784, as a measure of justice, long overdue.

On page 3 of the House report, the following comment of the committee is noteworthy:

The Senators of the Eightieth Congress and the Senators of the Eighty-first Congress have expressed their approval of the bill by voting for same by unanimous consent. The Members of the House of Representatives are warranted in subscribing and in approving the judgment of the other Chamber of Congress.

The Gun Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Reporter, a fortnightly magazine of facts and ideas, of September 12, 1950:

THE GUN GAP

It has become standard refrain in the sermons of our Jeremiahs: We have 12 divisions against the Russians' 175, a few thousand tanks against more than forty thousand. A few thousand modern planes against nineteen thousand. These figures have become particularly night-marish since they were proclaimed in Parliament by that Jeremiah in chief, Winston Churchill.

Only a few months ago—just last spring in fact—one of the main worries of our policymakers was the dollar gap. Our national economy was growing too fast for its own good and for the good of the rest of the world. As a result foreign nations had great difficulty selling us anything or buying anything from us. The Korean aggression has dramatized another case of overproduction. Soviet Russia has—so it seems—produced so many guns and tanks and planes and snorkel submarines that only with a gigantic effort of total mobilization, lasting several years, can the countries of the western alliance hope substantially to narrow or close the gun gap.

Unquestionably, the Jeremiahs have a formidable case. The picture they paint is gloomy enough, yet an even gloomier and more realistic one can be painted, for we should all know by now that Soviet Russia is using several powerful nonmilitary weapons in its systematic campaign for the conquest of the world. In fact, it is rather naive to think that the only form of Russian aggression is to set Red satellite divisions marching, North Korea style, against some weak nation on the perimeter of the Russian empire.

At present the Communist nonmilitary offensive is aimed at the individual—every man and woman who cannot accept the idea of a new war and who is looking for some form of personal exemption. With their drive for new members or with their so-called peace petition, the Communists corner the frightened and bewildered, extract their signatures, and promise in exchange if not peace in the world at least a measure of personal peace the day communism takes over.

The Jeremiahs who bewail our lack of arms sometimes forget that the Communists have become extraordinarily cunning at the art of unnerving, man by man, the people who are supposed to bear arms. They have been particularly skillful in western Europe, where people have gone through too much. The result is called neutralism. Actually, European neutralism is a naive, pathetic expression of the anguish of European individuals who see the next test coming and beg to be left out. More than a policy it is an individual state of mind. And more than a state of mind it is a reaction of the flesh.

WHERE OUR GOVERNMENT WAS RIGHT

Our Government might have miscalculated the Communists' readiness to fight; it might have misjudged the amount and the quality of their arms. But certainly it did not need the Stockholm petition to realize that despair is the best ally of communism. Since the end of the war, the United States has done something more than feed hungry foreign people. It has learned, through the ECA, the first rudimentary notions on how to work on the economy of other countries, speed the machinery of production, reduce unemployment, stabilize the rates of exchange, increase exports. ECA missions have done all this—not as colonial masters, but in the closest possible cooperation with local national, business, and trade-union leaders. Of course, quite a number of ECA representatives have been gullible and indiscriminate in their associations and friendships; yet the job that ECA has done in a little over 2 years has been so striking

that the Russians have launched all their offensives, political and military, against what they call the "Marshallized" countries.

After Secretary Marshall's Harvard speech, the main aim of our Government's foreign policy was to reduce and finally to close the dollar gap. We were not happy to be forever outproducing other countries and wanted the friendly nations to catch up with us and trade us the products they were the most fit to produce. This was our policy—what the Communists call the warmongering policy of American imperialism.

Then on June 25 another nation, Soviet Russia, that had been outproducing the rest of the world in its kind of products—weapons—launched its export drive of blazing guns and robotized men.

That rude jolt taught us and our allies quite a few lessons. We suddenly realized that our military weakness had been too tempting to the Communists and that they were aiming not only to conquer South Korea but to unleash a shattering wave of fear in the world that would pave the way to other conquests. It became clear that we as well as our allies had to produce far more weapons and train a very large number of men to handle these weapons. Some people, particularly in Congress, have gone so far that they now consider that all other expenses for foreign rehabilitation and assistance are sheer waste, and that the only thing to do is to produce tanks and guns and planes, prayerfully hoping that Joseph Stalin will kindly wait a few years and let us close the gun gap.

OUR WEAPONS AND RUSSIA'S

If we follow this policy, we shall be entering the kind of competition with Russia that would multiply rather than solve our difficulties. For we need allies in our struggle with international communism; we need men all over the non-Communist world who not only can manufacture weapons but, if need be, use them with steady hearts, with the firm knowledge that the defense of their countries is the only way of defending their personal lot—without any yearning for indulgence or escape. We cannot expect any real help from mercenaries or from captive armies brought to our side by anti-Stalinist chieftains. We need, in our country and in the countries that are with us, well-trained armies of citizen-soldiers ready to fight for the defense of their citizenship.

If we are to win this struggle, the work to improve the economic and political conditions of the people on our side must become immensely more effective and articulate. Now, in western Europe there is no longer any talk of a dollar gap, and war matériel is once more being produced in ever-increasing quantity. This gives the old predatory interests all over the continent a golden opportunity to extract fat contracts from their governments, ultimately to be paid for by the American taxpayer. They are the same interests who have for decades sedulously prevented the large-scale production of consumer goods so as to enjoy the advantages of huge profits and of cheap labor. This is exactly the time when ECA missions are most needed in Europe to see that American money is not wasted or siphoned into the pockets of the most selfish business leaders. Too much of it has disappeared that way already. The ECA representatives must see to it that war contracts go to healthy industries, that war production in the various countries intensifies the process of European economic integration, and that the people's standard of living is raised. In narrowing the gun gap we must attack the causes that have created the dollar gap. Weapons manufactured by workers who do not enjoy a decent living, have no real bargaining power, and are too harassed or ignorant to care about their rights of citizenship ultimately turn out to be of very limited use.

Since the end of hostilities we have been living in a strange twilight between war and peace, war economy and peace economy, conversion and reconversion. At home so far we have managed well. In spite of all the prophets of impending bust we are steering a middle course between boom and crash—for the New Deal taught us to ballast the booms and cushion the crashes. This democratic capitalism of ours has proved to have more resilience than our wise economists could ever have foreseen. Yet, powerful as it is, it cannot buy us out of the Communist menace. It must become closely interlocked with healthy economic systems in the nations on our side. Now our missions abroad must see to it that during the conversion to war production the level of civilian welfare is raised at the same rate as the production of military weapons is increased.

Otherwise we lose, for without allies we cannot stand. The weapons manufactured in Europe with our money will eventually fall into the hands of the Communists, if the large majority of European workers and soldiers do not regain the sense of the stake they have in their countries' freedom. Indeed, it is not the number of Russian tanks that is so frightening, but the prospect of how lonely and friendless we should be if we entrusted our safety only to the guns we can make and the divisions we can raise.

We must be prepared to tighten our belts more than we did during the last war: We have many fronts to defend—military, political, and economic—and they all demand sacrifices. Unlike the enemy we do not use slave labor. We can never neglect the basic needs of man—man as producer, consumer, citizen, soldier. The unit of what makes our strength is man, and the kind of man on whom we can count is as good as his sense of freedom—his capacity to work and fight for it. Given our late start, we cannot easily compete with the Russian Empire in the sheer production of weapons. We must acquire enough strength to discourage political and military aggression while we must start releasing among our own and the allied people that kind of unbreakable strength which the enemy will never match.

In their brutish conception of force the Communists cannot think of anything better than production of guns and the dissemination of fear. Some day the unfortunate people on the other side will realize that they are the main victims of the weapons they overproduce, and that they cannot eat guns.

Norris E. Dodd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has a number of important auxiliary organizations. Of these certainly one of the most important, if not the most important, is the Food and Agriculture Organization, usually referred to as FAO. FAO deals with subjects of universal interest. Food is of direct concern to every human being and 80 percent of the world's people are engaged in agriculture. I was present at the initial meeting of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations at Quebec in the fall of 1945 and I have attended most of the annual meetings since that time in the capacity of congressional adviser to the United States delegation and have kept in close touch with its progress and activities.

I have been particularly interested in the work of this great organization since Norris E. Dodd became its Director General. Mr. Dodd, whom I have known for a great many years, assumed this important position with a fine background of experience. He was a successful businessman and farmer before he came to the Department of Agriculture a number of years ago. His record in the Departman was outstanding. He quickly became known as one of its most competent executives and at the time he resigned to assume his present position as Director General of the FAO, he was Under Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Dodd's service in the Department of Agriculture covered a period which marked a tremendous advance in agriculture production. He was there during the war years when American farmers expanded their production by more than one-third. Prior to the war, he helped initiate and work out the agricultural adjustment programs which are still an important part of Government agricultural policy in this country.

During my 24 years as a Member of Congress, I have maintained close touch with the Department of Agriculture. I have known many men there who were distinguished and capable public servants. There are many such there today but I can think of no one during that period whom I hold in higher regard or for whose work I have a greater admiration than Mr. Dodd. During his long service with the Department of Agriculture Mr. Dodd not only became familiar with American agriculture but with world agriculture as well. He was closely in touch with FAO activities from the beginning. With this background it is not surprising that Mr. Dodd has successfully met the great problems which have confronted him as Director General of the FAO during the past 2 years. He has been a good executive. He has thoroughly familiarized himself with world agricultural conditions and has spent a considerable amount of his time in making first-hand contact with agriculture and agricultural producers in all parts of the world.

Shortly the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization will be moved to Rome under a decision made at the last annual meeting. While many of us would have preferred to have seen FAO headquarters remain in Washington, the fact that this move is being made should not lessen our interest in the work of this great organization. We know that as long as Ed Dodd is at its head the FAO will continue to grow and progress. At this particular time when the organization is just beginning to carry out its tremendous responsibility under the point 4 program, it is especially important that a man with the capacity and experience of Mr. Dodd continue his position of leadership. I therefore hope that he will find it possible to carry on as Director General until the organization is well established in its new home and its point 4 program has successfully gotten under way.

General Fellers Presents Sound Reasoning in Article on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the article in Colliers' magazine of September 16 entitled "How We Can Lick Stalin," written by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, United States Army (retired), has occasioned a great deal of thoughtful reaction. Among the many who have found it an informed and stimulating discussion is Mr. Joseph H. Barnhart, an attorney at Danville, Ill., long a leading citizen and public figure, and one of the close personal associates of the famed fellow townsman, the Honorable Joseph G. "Uncle Joe" Cannon, for 46 years a distinguished Member of this body and for 8 years its Speaker.

Mr. Barnhart has contributed a guest editorial on the subject of General Fellers' article to the editorial page of the Danville Commercial News. Under permission granted by the House, I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the value it has for every Member. It follows:

GENERAL FELLERS PRESENTS SOUND REASONING IN ARTICLE ON RUSSIA

(By Joseph H. Barnhart)

Vermillion County's distinguished soldier-citizen, Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, United States Army, retired, is author of a magazine article in the September 16 issue of Colliers which is calculated to send the cold shivers down the backs of a complacent citizenry. The boy from Ridgefarm who attended the United States Military Academy, by appointment of Uncle Joe Cannon, and then set out to make a name for himself as a dependable soldier, knifes into our blissful ignorance of world conditions like a thunderbolt slicing a Chinese elm.

You may disagree with General Fellers if you wish, but disregard what he says we dare not, as individuals and as a nation. A man of his reputation, who was on General MacArthur's staff when Japan surrendered, would scarcely dare make such stunning statements unless he knew what he was talking about. Yet, from the first short paragraph of three brief sentences until the last word, the article sounds like good American horse sense.

In fact, such good horse sense is it that one is led to conclude that General Fellers might be all wrong about his deductions, and yet what he advocates for us to do is sound—bedrock sound, and in the very best American tradition of daring, of courage, and initiative.

Now that disposes of the negative possibility. The other possibility is that he is right. His thesis is very simple. Stated in a few words it is this: America and Europe combined cannot send a ground army against the Red horde whose numbers would total more than one-fourth to one-third of the Red Army. Therefore, we had best exploit our alternative, which is to fight Russia with two effective weapons: (1) air power, and (2) the truth.

And whether you agree or disagree with his conclusions about our Ground Forces' maximum potential, his proposal that we prepare in the air and that we break the iron curtain with definite propaganda moves is sound.

Just to strengthen his whole statement, consider that General Fellers is a West Point graduate. What reason would he possibly have for understimating American manpower? His article reveals the arguments of a patriot who places the will to win on the high plane of something worth fighting for. So he ranks the strength of an intangible weapon like propaganda alongside the more tangible strength of air power. This hardly smacks of the jingo, or the professional soldier on a military bender.

His article deserves calm reading, intelligent discussion, and demands prompt Government action. He has reasons for believing that while we prepare our air defense, we can also do some fast and effective talking. He says that there are millions of disgruntled Russians who long for peace and for freedom. We always suspected as much, but General Fellers cites a case in point that verifies this. He says Russia is ripe for internal dissension, and that there has been more of it than the outside world knows about.

General Fellers has also spotted the possibility which General Patton foresaw shortly before his death—that Russia plans to bleed Europe and America white by having us fight one satellite nation after another, using up a couple of divisions here, a half dozen there, until we are helpless before Russian manpower superiority. It is high time somebody pointed out to us all the possibilities in the present dangerous situation—somebody like the General who is bold enough to argue not from the best but from the worst possible case, just on the possibility that we need a real eye-opener.

Thanks to General Fellers, we have an estimate of our weakness as well as of our strength. But that is not the whole story. Hats off to a man who values the power of right speaking so highly in these critical days. America is too prone to trust her physical resources, her production potential, her inventive genius. Is that all that is to save us? If so, why not put a robot army in the field? Why shed good blood to prove we can out-produce Russia?

General Fellers has hit the right note. Let's put our trust into our words. Ten years ago Mussolini and Hitler publicly abused freedom in their speeches; but freedom of human spirit triumphed over them. Do we really imagine that we must bomb Russia for the triumph of the human spirit? We may have to, yes—but only when freedom's voice has shrunk to too thin a pipe, and free men are too few or too unconvinced to care that many are still in slavery to untruth.

Address of Hon. J. Vaughan Gary of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of the Honorable J. VAUGHAN GARY, of Virginia, delivered at the commencement exercises of the University of Florida on September 2, 1950:

Mr. President, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, I deem it a high honor and I assure you that it is a very great pleasure to be permitted to participate in your exercises on this occasion. I have known your president for a long time. As a fellow alumnus of another great institution, I have watched his progress with interest and pride, and I rejoice that notwithstanding his brilliant success and flattering opportunity in the North, he decided to devote his energy, ability, and talents to the development of this great southern university. The South needs men of his stature.

I love the State of Florida. Next to the Old Dominion, it is my favorite State. I cherish the friendship of the members of the outstanding delegation which represents your State in the halls of the Congress. Practically all of them are alumni of this institution, which has every right to be proud of their records, for in my judgment no State is more ably represented.

However, my task this evening is not an easy one. I would like to paint for you a rosy picture of an attractive world which you will enter when you leave these cloistered halls. But, unfortunately, the world at the present time presents a rather dismal picture.

There are wars and rumors of wars, debts and deficits, taxes and more taxes. The many complex problems with which we are confronted, however, present a challenge to the college graduate of today.

I well remember some years ago when my class, like yours, was graduating into a world of turmoil and strife. We thought then, of course, that we had the answer to all of the problems. I must confess now, however, that my generation does not have a record of which it can be too proud. We have experienced a major depression and two world wars, a cold war, a warm war, and now face the prospect of a third hot war.

We longed for peace, and I am certain that you want your world to be a world of peace. There can be no guaranty of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness in a world which is constantly in the throes of war.

Those of us who participated in World War I were fired with the promise and hope that it was a war to end all wars. Our great leader, the immortal Woodrow Wilson, labored diligently to make that hope a reality. After the victory he broke all precedents and attended the peace conference in Paris in person, where he made many concessions in order that he might attain the establishment of a league of nations to stop aggression and to preserve peace. Having concluded agreements with other world powers for the creation of such an organization, he returned home to witness the repudiation of the league by the United States Senate, which was required to ratify it.

We then embarked upon a policy of isolationism. "We care not what course others may take," we said, "but in the future we will take no part in the disputes of other nations, and never again will we send our American boys to fight on foreign soil."

With a broad expanse of ocean upon either side, we lulled ourselves into a sense of false security. We sat idly by as Japan moved into Manchuria. We made no protest when Italy took over Ethiopia. We permitted Hitler to enter the Ruhr. We were against aggression, but we took no steps against the aggressor. We soon found ourselves drawn, against our will, into another foreign war, and again sending our boys by the millions to foreign fields of battle.

Surely, we thought, the misery and destruction of World War II will bring men to their senses and pave the way for a program of world peace. The technique of war had been developed to the point of threatening the destruction of our entire civilization.

The time had come to develop a technique for peace. This was the objective of the United Nations. When 51 nations with different languages, different customs, different ideologies and conflicting interests met in San Francisco in 1945, and agreed

upon a charter, we entertained high hopes that at long last the foundations had been laid upon which the superstructure of world peace might be erected in the years to come.

The Charter contemplated that the organization would be further implemented by other instrumentalities for the promotion of peace and better understanding among nations.

It provided for a world court for the adjudication and settlement of international disputes. It anticipated a world police force for the suppression of aggression.

But there is one nation that does not want peace. Its leaders seek world domination.

It was my privilege to visit Europe late in the fall of 1947 as a member of a congressional committee, and even then I was impressed with the fact that the leaders of the Soviet Union had embarked upon a definite program of world conquest. In every country that we visited from England to Turkey, there was coming from behind the iron curtain a vicious line of Communist propaganda against the United States and the free countries of Europe. The United States was being depicted as a warmonger nation.

The Marshall plan was then merely in the stage of discussion and the free countries of Europe were being told that it was a scheme of capitalistic America to gain control of their economy and to enslave their people. There were many then in Europe who were willing to wager on the beginning of a third world war within 6 months.

An effective world organization did not fit into the Soviet plan of world conquest and by use of the veto practically every effort to implement and strengthen the United Nations has been blocked.

The Communists attempted at first to extend their dominion by infiltration, intrigue, and treachery. Finally, finding themselves blocked from further encroachments by those methods, they have now resorted to force of arms.

When on June 25, the armed forces of Korea crossed the thirty-eighth parallel they committed an act of aggression which threatens the security of every free nation. This breach of the peace was met with prompt and bold action.

At the time of the attack, a United Nations Commission made up of representatives of seven nations was in the Republic of Korea. Within a few hours after the invasion was launched, the Commission reported to the United Nations that the attack had come without warning and without provocation. The Security Council of the United Nations convened in New York at the request of the United States just 24 hours after the attack began, and passed a resolution which called for the immediate cessation of hostilities and for the withdrawal of the invading troops to the thirty-eighth parallel. The resolution requested the members of the United Nations to refrain from giving aid to the northern aggressors and to assist in the execution of the resolution.

Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, in compliance with its terms, the United States sent aid to the South Koreans. Thus commenced a historical engagement in which a police force of the United Nations supported by 52 of the 59 member nations attempted to suppress a breach of the peace of the world.

This situation poses many uncertainties and raises questions of grave import.

The Korean situation as an isolated incident is relatively unimportant. Already those in command have reported that the armed forces of the United Nations have the situation under control and that a change in the tide of battle may soon be expected. We must recognize, however, that this is but a segment of the Soviet pattern of world conquest. If the decisive action of the United Nations does isolate the incident and deter further acts of aggression, the faith of its founders will have been justified and there will be some encouragement to look forward to an era of peace.

But what if the Chinese Communists now mobilized along the Manchurian border should come to the aid of the North Koreans?

What if there is an attack on the island of Formosa or an outbreak in Germany, or in the Middle East?

What if Russia herself should enter the conflict?

Can we wage war in various parts of the world without exhausting our resources and disrupting our national economy to the point that our own shores will be vulnerable to attack? Even now we have a national debt of $258,000,000,000 which will be increased $10,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 by the anticipated deficit of the present fiscal year.

On the other hand, whatever the cost, can we permit Russia to take over the weaker nations one by one when we are convinced that eventually her entire power and resources will be turned against us?

If there is another outbreak, should we change our long-established policy and attack the instigator of the disturbances so that we will be able to determine the time and field of battle?

I raise these questions not for the purpose of answering them, because frankly I do not know the answers.

For the immediate future, in my judgment, our course of action is reasonably clear. We must continue to support and strengthen the United Nations, for that constitutes our only hope of eventually securing an enduring peace.

We must continue for the time being our economic aid to the countries of Europe. It has been my privilege during the past 2 years to serve as chairman of the special subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which handles the foreign-aid appropriations. In my judgment no money has been spent which has paid greater dividends to the American people. The Marshall plan has been a major factor in checking the spread of communism in Europe, and the free countries of that Continent have been rehabilitated and strengthened to the point that they can effectively assist in the maintenance of peace.

We must, however, also increase their military strength by speeding up our program of military assistance.

And last but by no means least, we must augment our program of national defense so that we will be able to meet whatever emergency may arise. But while we prepare for war may we ever keep our eyes fixed on the goal of peace.

You will find that your world into which you are now being graduated is a highly scientific world. We have made remarkable progress in all branches of science in recent years. Our knowledge of the universe has so increased that some wag has suggested that we might change the poem:

> Twinkle, twinkle, little star
> How I wonder what you are.

To read:

> Twinkle, twinkle, little star
> Now we all know what you are
> Fumes of sulfur,
> Flames of tin
> And incandescent hydrogen.

We have learned to harness the forces of nature for the service of man, but the same discoveries which have opened to us avenues of benefits untold have also disclosed methods of destruction which threaten our existence.

One of the most interesting meetings which I have attended during the 5 years which I have been in Washington took place shortly after the close of World War II. Ten or twelve of the scientists who had perfected the atomic bomb met with Members of Congress and gave us such information as they were permitted to divulge at that time. They informed us that there were about 1,000 physicists in the United States who were familiar with the principals of nuclear energy.

They said that the entire group were in unanimous agreement on three points.

First, they unanimously agreed that there is no defense to the atomic bomb;

Second, that the atomic bomb can be controlled only at the world level; and,

Third, that unless it is controlled at the world level, no nation can be secure from complete annihilation at any time.

We were discussing in the Congress at the time the question of guarding the secrets of the atomic bomb. They said that we were merely wasting time because, regardless of what steps we should take, sooner or later every nation would know the secrets of the bomb and no nation could retain a monopoly of its use. Moreover, they said do not think in terms of a bomb that will destroy 6 square miles, as at Hiroshima, but think rather of one with a destructive power of 100 square miles.

These were by no means comforting words, and yet in contrast, I mention a recent conversation with a physicist from the atomic laboratory at Oak Ridge, which is engaged in developing atomic energy for peacetime purposes. He narrated how atomic cocktails are being used with amazing results in the diagnosis and treatment of diseases. In his judgment the future will reveal untold uses of atomic energy for man's welfare. It is a challenging undertaking for your generation to find the solution to the problem of permitting the world to enjoy the benefits of scientific research without constant fear of extermination.

In conclusion, may I express the fervent hope that your world will remain a place of opportunity. There are many today who seek to substitute security for opportunity in our economic and social order. Our Nation was not developed on the basis of security. When our forefathers first landed on the shores of the New World they built shelters for themselves and families and surrounded them with stockades as a protection from the Indians. Behind this enclosure they enjoyed some measure of security, but as they peered into the vast wilderness that stretched before them opportunity beckoned them on. They sacrificed their security and beat paths through the trackless frontiers until the entire continent was settled.

But you say "there are no frontiers today." The land frontiers have passed away, but notwithstanding the progress which has been made we have only reached the frontiers of science, medicine, transportation, and television. These and many other fields of endeavor are still open to modern pioneers.

Experience has abundantly demonstrated that opportunity for achievement can be best preserved under our American system of individual initiative and free competitive enterprise.

Those who seek to destroy that system by force, infiltration, or subversive activities are public enemies and should be dealt with as such. We must, however, also guard against gradual encroachments, which although less vicious will in the end rob us of our heritage.

My hope in speaking to you this evening is that I might bring to you the challenge which these uncertain and critical times present.

In the days of King Ahasuerus, Queen Esther held a high place in the affections of the ruler. Through the insistence of Haman, his favorite prince, the King issued a royal decree that all of the Jews in the kingdom should be put to death. Mordecai, the uncle of Queen Esther, entreated her to

intercede on behalf of her people. Queen Esther hesitated because of the danger of losing her own life if her intercession was not pleasing to the King. Mordecai presented to her this challenge, "Who knoweth," he said, "whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?" Whereupon Queen Esther repaired to the King, saved her people, and brought about the destruction of Haman, their enemy.

"Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?"

Address of Hon. Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by CLARENCE J. BROWN, Member of Congress, Seventh Ohio District, at Chicago, Ill., September 15, 1950, over the Mutual Broadcasting System. The address follows:

This is a time of grave crisis.

If we are to survive as a free nation, and are to continue to enjoy individual liberty under law here at home, the time has come for every American to engage in real soul-searching, straight thinking, and plain talking regarding the problems which confront us.

Each of us, regardless of our political or religious beliefs, has the duty and responsibility of giving our every support, aid, and comfort to our American boys who, on a little beachhead in South Korea 7,000 miles away, are fighting and dying with their backs to the sea. Outnumbered and outgunned, they are going through the hell of a no-quarter war against a cruel and savage enemy, through no fault of their own.

As a Republican I make the pledge that all who belong to our party will, as loyal Americans, contribute their every effort and resource to the support of our fighting men. That is the duty of every true American.

But as loyal Americans, as Republicans, and as the party of opposition, we also have other duties and responsibilities. Under our American system of representative government and free elections, we are on the threshhold of an important political campaign. In the November election one-third of the United States Senate, and the entire membership of the House of Representatives are to be elected. In order to choose well those who will represent the Nation in the Congress—in order that the people may make their views known and have their desires carried out—it is necessary, wise, and urgent we discuss national issues in the coming weeks, and make our decisions known on election day—November 7.

The principal issue of the coming campaign will be the incompetence of the Truman administration to either attain peace or to prepare for war.

Into that one great and all-important issue will melt and blend many lesser ones.

It will probably become necessary to discuss the reasons why we have failed to attain world peace, and to tell how the policies of the Democrat administrations of Roosevelt and Truman have aided the spread of communism thoughout the world, and created misunderstandings and enmities which have put Soviet Russia and her satellites in position to threaten and endanger the security, the liberty, and the freedom of all mankind, including the people of the United States.

It will undoubtedly be necessary, not only to point out and discuss the dangers which threaten us from without, but also those which threaten us from within. Communist infiltration and radical influences within the Government of the United States have brought about a situation which requires the prompt attention of the American people if we are to be safe here at home. They must decide whether to elect a Congress which will cleanse our political blood stream of the impurities which now threaten our national life.

The American people are rightfully asking: What is wrong with our national defense? Why is it, after spending nearly $60,000,000,000 for military purposes in the last 4 years, that our boys fighting in Korea are without the weapons and munitions they need.

The people are also asking: Why, in a grave crisis like this, does the Truman administration continue to play petty politics and keep in office men who have proven themselves unfitted to meet or to solve the problems which confront us? What about the Dean Achesons and the Louis Johnsons? What about the John Maragons and the Gen. Harry Vaughans? Why is it that when American boys are fighting and dying to stop aggression and the spread of communism in South Korea, little or nothing is being done by this administration to stop the spread of communism here in the United States.

In view of the internal dangers we face, why is it the President continues to oppose the Hobbs bill which would permit jailing alien criminals, convicted of subversive or moral crimes, who cannot be deported to their country of origin?

Why is it, with communism threatening us, both abroad and at home, the President announces he will veto the Mundt-Nixon-McCarran bill, which would require American Communists and Communist organizations to register and report their activities?

The President insists the Hobbs bill and the Mundt-Nixon bill are too harsh upon those who would destroy us. Is Mr. Truman forgetting the captured American boys found shot to death in Korea with their hands wired behind their backs?

Yes, Mr. President, this is a harsh world in which we live, and we must meet the dangers of the day realistically. The American people are entitled to protection from their enemies working from within, Mr. President; and they are entitled to security from the forces of evil which threaten them from without.

Administration apologists are attempting to tell us we must forget the past; that we must think only of the future and docilely permit the very same officials and influences responsible for our present situation to continue in charge of our national affairs.

I say to you—those who have failed us in the past cannot, and should not, be trusted in the future. If we do not profit from the mistakes of the past, there is no hope for the future. We must face the fact that we are confronted with great and grave dangers, both abroad and at home. The realization has dawned upon most Americans—if not upon the President himself—that it is a war we are fighting in Korea—not a police action. We are no longer in position to decide for ourselves whether world war III is to come, or when. That decision rests with another power—Soviet Russia.

We are fighting in Korea, technically at least, as a part of the United Nations forces. Fifty-two other nations have joined with us in opposing Red aggression in Korea, but only a few of them have sent token forces to fight alongside American troops on the battle lines. If Communist aggression is to be stopped in Korea or elsewhere, and the ambitions of those in the Kremlin to dominate the world are to be blocked, it is American manpower, equipment, and money which must do the job.

Today Communist Russia stands astride the continent of Asia like a great Colossus, with millions of armed men, huge quantities of guns, tanks, and planes; and limitless natural resources at her command, while within the United States many thousands of Communists, fellow travelers, radicals, parlor pinks, are now doing Russia's bidding.

All of this because of the tragic mistakes of past and present Democrat administrations. The mistake of the Roosevelt administration in 1933 in recognizing and bringing back into the family of nations the government of Red Russia opened the way for the spread of communism throughout the world. An even greater mistake was made during World War II, when the Roosevelt administration decided that because Hitler had invaded Russia, the Soviet believed in human liberty and freedom, could be trusted as an ally, should be given all-out American aid, and supplied with our military and industrial secrets.

It was the dreadfully tragic agreement made by Roosevelt and his advisers at Yalta and confirmed by Truman at Potsdam, which sold eastern Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia into virtual slavery and put Russia in position to control eastern Europe and endanger all the Continent. It was these same tragic secret agreements which betrayed the Nationalist Government of China, gave Manchuria to Russia, and placed the Soviet forces in position to dominate Asia.

It was Alger Hiss, later convicted of perjury when he denied his traitorous acts, who stood whispering into the ear of Roosevelt at Yalta, as Stalin had his way.

It was the same Alger Hiss, fair-haired boy of the Truman State Department, who opened the San Francisco Conference and urged American delegates to give Russia the veto power in the Security Council which has been used so effectively to make the United Nations impotent to bring peace to the world.

It was Alger Hiss, the convicted perjurer, whom Secretary of State Dean Acheson continued to support and call his friend when he said, "I shall not turn my back on Alger Hiss." And in recent weeks we have heard the President of the United States say: "As long as I am President, Dean Acheson shall continue as my Secretary of State."

Yes, it was the Hisses, the Achesons, the Lattimores, the Wadleighs, the Whites, the Services, and those like them—placed in positions of power and influence by two New Deal administrations—who, insisting upon appeasement of Communist Russia, formed and executed the foreign policies which have failed so miserably to bring peace. Now they attempt to tell us they were bipartisan foreign policies. My friends, we have never had any bipartisan foreign policy. What we have had were New Deal foreign policies with some bipartisan support.

The Truman administration must also accept the responsibility for its failure to prepare for war, for the Republican Party, both in and out of Congress, has always believed in and supported a strong national defense for our country.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress, in 1947–48, which passed the Unification Act at the request of the administration, for the purpose of making our National Defense Establishment more efficient, cohesive, and effective.

It was the same Republican Eightieth Congress which established the Central Intelligence Agency to keep the President, our State Department, and military leadership

informed as to events in other parts of the world.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress which, by law, created the National Security Council, with the duty and responsibility of coordinating all national defense efforts.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress which cooperated with the administration in establishing the National Security Resources Board and provided the funds for stockpiling strategic materials needed for war. Yet, for some incomprehensible reason, we now find ourselves without adequate stockpiles of necessary materials.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress, realizing the seriousness of the world situation, which fixed the strength of our Armed Forces at slightly over 2,000,000 men—nearly 600,000 more than the Secretary of Defense and the President insisted were necessary—until the Korean emergency suddenly developed.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress which provided for the construction of the Navy aircraft carrier—the United States—upon which work was ordered suspended by the President and the Secretary of Defense on the claim it was not needed.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress which sent to the White House legislation to increase the size of our Air Forces from 48 to 70 groups, and provided the funds therefor, only to have the President and the Secretary of Defense refuse to carry out the law or to strengthen the Air Forces, until after the attack on South Korea came.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress which, by action of two of its committees, blocked the administration plan for the virtual destruction of the United States Marine Corps—the same Marine Corps to which the President made such an insulting reference recently.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress which protested, and attempted to block, the unwarranted reduction by the administration in the size of the United States Navy.

Every Republican in Congress during the last war voted for and supported every military appropriation. During the Republican Eightieth Congress, and in the succeeding Congress, no administration request for funds for military weapons or military supplies was ever rejected.

I charge the responsibility for our present dangerous situation rests squarely upon the Democrat administration which controls the Government at Washington. The President's action in getting rid of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson proved the correctness of my charge.

So I say: The one great issue of the coming campaign will be the incompetence of the Truman administration to either attain peace or to prepare for war.

Campaign in Eighth Congressional District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan there came to a close the night of September 12, 1950, one of the most unusual campaigns attacking a citizen running for renomination to the House of Representatives of the Federal Government that has occurred in the history of the great State of Michigan.

This campaign of innuendo, of character assassination, of violation of State and Federal laws, rules, and regulations, was conducted as would be a prosecution. The intellectually dishonest presentations rank among the vilest which the good citizens of that State ever witnessed.

Those prosecuting this campaign failed to win their objective, and that objective was to bring about the defeat of Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD, who has served his district in the House of Representatives for almost 16 years.

Representative CRAWFORD gave this team of prosecutors the full "length of the rope." They were allowed to demonstrate to the citizens of the Eighth Congressional District just how far they would go, and the foul means they would use, to attain their objective. It would be very interesting to know whether or not this team of prosecutors were offered a legal fee to prosecute their case.

It appears that this team of prosecutors have not only injured themselves professionally and lowered their standing in the minds of the many good citizens of the Eighth Congressional District, but they have, in addition, extended great aid and comfort to the opposition political party. This situation they would have had to deal with had they won the primary election. As a matter of fact, this team of prosecutors went so far in their condemnation of the policies, with respect to a sound fiscal program and the protection of the savings, the industry, and economic and social welfare of the people, which sound policies have been followed over almost a 16-year period by Representative CRAWFORD, that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the team of prosecutors to establish themselves on a sound basis. In the Saginaw News of September 14, 1950, there appeared the following editorial, and I wish to emphasize for the benefit of the reading public that the author of this editorial pointed out that—

It should be enlightening to note that those candidates who campaigned more on personalities than on political issues—who conducted what some would call smear campaigns—failed to make the grade.

The complete editorial follows:

DOUBTFUL POLITICAL TACTICS

The primary election has been called the weak link in our election process. It makes possible the nomination of men of little ability, self-starters, or pressure group spokesmen; it destroys the party responsibility which the convention system of making nominations was supposed to guarantee, say those opposed to the primary principle.

As a matter of fact, all candidates, whether nominated in a primary or in a party convention, are self-starters. It may be true that men of higher caliber might be willing to run for public office if they did not have to go through both primary and final elections, but the primary has the virtue of permitting all who aspire to office to place themselves before the voters. It does not give a party convention, which might be controlled by a small clique, the right to determine who shall carry the party's banner.

The Democratic ticket nominated in Saginaw County Tuesday perhaps might be considered a ticket chosen by party convention. There weren't enough self-starters to produce a single contest; in fact, party leaders had to draft some candidates to fill out the ticket, exactly as a convention would have done.

The Republican ticket, on which most places were contested, stacks up about as favorably as the Democratic ticket does in caliber and ability of the men concerned.

At any rate, the primary system is with us, and here to stay. Voters of both parties must realize that the time and place to nominate party candidates is at the primary. Democratic voters Tuesday had no choice to make in Saginaw County but Republicans who did not bother to vote have no valid complaint if they do not like the choices made. If their favorites lost out, they have the task now of deciding between those candidates who won.

It should be enlightening to note that those candidates who campaigned more on personalities than on political issues—who conducted what some would call smear campaigns—failed to make the grade. There is always the inherent danger that such tactics will boomerang. How much they affected the net results is probably a close question among political dopesters but it is encouraging to note that none of the winners in Saginaw County resorted to those tactics.

The International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, two recent editorials on the international situation by A. C. Kuiper of the Grandville Star have come to my attention. I sincerely believe that the two editorials from Mr. Kuiper's weekly column entitled "The Leak in the Dike", should be thoughtfully read by my colleagues. Consequently at the conclusion of my remarks the editorials follow.

The views expressed by Mr. Kuiper are to the point and well written. He has made an accurate analysis of our diplomatic blunders of recent years, particularly those in the Far East. At the moment, however, I disagree on a point. In my estimation, it would be unwise to use the atomic bomb on Russia until our military strength is sufficient to prevent retaliation in kind. We know, or at least our President and our intelligence reports indicate, that Russia has the atomic bomb and the Communists have the ability to attack our homeland with this devastating weapon. When our military preparedness is such that we could adequately thwart an atomic attack on the United States, then our country would be in a position to make use of the bomb on Russia providing, of course, Stalin and his associates refuse to stop their tactics on world-wide aggression.

[From the Grandville Star of August 4, 1950]

THE LEAK IN THE DIKE

(By A. C. K.)

It is regrettable that the Korean situation caught our Government off base as it did, but perhaps it took something like Korea to bring the matter of our relations with Russia to a head.

For nearly a decade our leaders (Roosevelt, Hopkins, Wallace, and Truman) have played right into the hands of the Russians. Their

antics in the name of diplomacy have made us a bunch of fools in the eyes of the Kremlin. They did everything but deliver the keys to the Capitol building in Washington to Stalin.

Let's review the sad history of our dealings with Russia since the outbreak of World War II. Hitler and his henchman, Von Ribbentrop, sign peace treaties with Stalin. Thus the maniac of Germany is free to slaughter and pillage western Europe at will.

Hitler and Stalin made fine bedfellows for a time. Then Hitler stupidly sent his armies to attack Russia. What does Stalin do? He jumps from Hitler's harlot's bed into ours. We welcome him with open arms. The Washington propaganda machine feeds us a lot of guff about Uncle Joe and we Americans are supposed to forget the godless, brutal system on which Russian communism is founded.

Russia was supposedly our ally in our war against the Axis. But she was never our ally in fact. We could not land our planes on Russian soil, so many thousands of United States airmen gave their lives needlessly because we could not use Russian bases for shuttle bombing. If there was any coordination of our war effort with Russia it was achieved through high level conferences of Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill. This was certainly inadequate to achieving real close cooperation.

What happened at Cairo, Yalta, and Potsdam? The full details are still cloaked in secrecy. Perhaps realist Churchill was less easily beguiled than our friends, Roosevelt, Wallace, and Hopkins, but Uncle Joe apparently got all the concessions. Can you name anything he conceded to us?

The war in Europe progresses and our armies are poised for the entrance to Berlin. What happens? We hold our armies back and we let Russia take Berlin.

Then when Germany is zoned for occupation by the victors Russia winds up with a protective belt all around Berlin. All the Allies want to be in Berlin and so we place ourselves in a completely untenable military position, surrounded as we are by the Russians. The Soviets block our transportation through their area and so we have the airlift into Berlin. We let the Russians maneuver us into a mess and then we have to save face by flying planes over their blockade. The Kremlin, undoubtedly, got a good laugh out of that.

Only 20 days before the war in Japan comes to a conclusion Russia is permitted to enter the fray. Certainly our Government knew that the fall of Japan was imminent. But still our craven policy was to let the Russians nominally enter on our side. The victorious Russ are given Manchuria for their efforts. This belonged to China, and it wasn't ours to give, but Russia got it.

As time went on the Russians picked up one after the other of the Balkan countries and placed them securely within the fold behind the iron curtain. We made a show of strength in Greece, but I can't for the life of me see what the purpose of isolating Greece was when we didn't follow up our policy of containment elsewhere.

Our policy in the Far East has been something that will amaze historians for many years to come. Beyond a question our brain trusters in the Government for the last 10 years have aided and abetted the Communists in their drive to conquer China. The bright boys in the State Department viewed the Reds as agrarian reformers. They insisted that we give the Reds as well as Chiang Kai-shek arms during the war with Japan. The Reds used these to overrun their country. Perhaps some of this material is being used against us in Korea today.

As late as a few months ago Truman and Acheson in line with their "Let the dust settle" policy announced that we were not going to defend Formosa. We weren't concerned about the Chinese Nationalists and the Chiang Kai-shek government on the island. Now, suddenly we have an about face. MacArthur rushes over and confers with Chiang.

How can you explain the impasse we have permitted ourselves to get into? We wonder if the historians of a few decades hence will be able to explain it.

Right now we are faced with the grim possibility of long fighting in Korea and outbreaks of Russian advances elsewhere in the world.

The thought of a long war with Russia is too horrible to contemplate. Short of a miraculous change of heart, however, on the part of the Kremlin or an unforseeable revolution in Russia against the present regime Russia will embroil the world in an atomic war.

We have two things in our favor and we should exploit them to the utmost. First, Russia cannot afford to go to war. It does not seem possible that she could have completely recovered from the staggering losses she suffered in the last war. Second, we have a superiority in atomic-bomb production and know-how.

Enough is enough. This writer believes Russia should be warned that any further aggression by her or her stooges will be the signal for an atomic bombing of a dozen of her largest cities.

We can no longer afford to temporize. It is appalling to think what Russia has gained in her drive toward world conquest for communism in the last 5 years. Russia's policy is to grab off any country or area she wants and to do it without resort to warfare. The Kremlin has bluffed their way through 5 years of conquest. They would like nothing better than to see us bleed ourselves white on a dozen fronts scattered around the world.

The time to call a halt is now.

[From the Grandville Star of August 25, 1950]

THE LEAK IN THE DIKE

(By A. C. K.)

There can be no question that the issues in our difficulties with the Russians are clearly drawn. This writer feels that these issues were clearly defined long ago. To anyone who has read the statements of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, there can be no question as to the basic aims of world domination by communism that has been preached by these men. It should not have taken the North Korean advance across the thirty-eighth parallel to arouse Washington, D. C. to this fact.

From the time Hitler insanely sent his armies to attack Russia until recently, our Government in Washington tried to whitewash Russia, her system, and her objectives of world conquest. Looking back over the history of the last decade we wonder how our leadership could have blithely ignored the candid expression of Russia's ruthless aims and objects. While our boys in Government were abjectly licking Russia's boots the Kremlin goes forward coolly and calmly with her well-laid plans.

Regardless of past mistakes it seems obvious that barring a miraculous change of heart on the part of the Politburo, Russia will not back down from her plan of conquest. Thus the issue is whether we together with the rest of the non-Communist world can permit this undeclared war of attrition to go on.

We raise the question, "How long are we going to permit Russia to make a farce of the United Nations?" If your neighbor tells you he is going to burn down your house and destroy your family often enough and grimly enough you will eventually come to believe him. When are we going to believe Russia?

This writer feels that the travesty in the U. N. should be brought to a sharp focus and immediately. With or without Russia the U. N. should be reorganized into an effective agency for world peace and not a show place for Jake Malik to make fools of the United States of America and the non-Communist member nations.

We also raise the question, "How long are we going to let precious time slip by without resorting to the use of the atomic bomb in bringing Russia to her senses?" The atom bomb, it seems universally agreed, is our ace card in the game of international poker Russia has been playing with the rest of the world.

Over a cup of coffee the other day a businessman and I were talking about the diabolical situation the world finds itself in. We agreed that it seems the devil himself has been unleashed by providence to wreak vengeance on the people of the whole world. How can you explain the mess we are in? Certainly it is hard today to find the spirit and teachings of Christ in evidence in our international situation. Are we to believe the devil has free reign in a world berserk?

When you speak of the devil the corollary connotation is that there is an omniscient providence. If we do not have faith there is providence controlling and guiding the destiny of the world there seems little hope in the world situation today.

There is no question in this writer's mind that Russia and her system represent the most diabolical tendencies ever encountered in world history. Can a Christian believe that God will permit the forces of evil to conquer?

Nishnabotna, Nodaway, Boyer, and Indian Creek Watersheds in Southwestern Iowa

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, severe floods have occurred once every 5 years in the Nishnabotna, Nodaway, and Boyer River, and Indian Creek watersheds. These streams are tributaries of the Missouri River in southwestern Iowa. The flood of 1947 on these streams took people's lives, drowned livestock, swept away improvements, took out public roads and bridges, damaged railroads, drainage ditches and ruined several thousands of acres of crops. Floods of damaging character occur on these streams at least once a year on the average. The area of these watersheds is subject to both intense cloudburst type summer storms which result in flash floods and to prolonged rainy periods in late winter and spring. The steep valley slopes and high bluff and hill topography combine to produce quick concentration of runoff waters. The long, narrow character of the watersheds makes it possible for floods originating upstream to sweep and damage the entire valleys. The uplands have a very fertile, silty soil and are intensely cultivated. As a result the area has the highest rate of sediment production per square mile of drainage to be found anywhere in the entire Missouri River Basin.

The original alluvial deposits along the stream bottomlands have some of the most fertile soil in the world. Floods, since man's occupation of the area, have not only ruined crops year after year but have scoured the flood plain, deposited sediment and made poorly drained land until now hundreds upon hundreds of acres of once highly productive land is no longer usable.

Floodwaters from these streams contribute materially to damage in the main Missouri River bottomland and also increase the height of floodwater at the time the Missouri River is at flood stage. The sediment carried by these streams adds to the already overloaded sediment carrying waters of the Missouri and increase the need for flood control works on the main stream.

These four watersheds in southwestern Iowa comprise the following area: Nishnabotna River, 3,094 square miles; Nodaway River, 1,777 square miles; Boyer River, 1,140 square miles; Indian Creek, 18 square miles. The Indian Creek watershed is a high bluff area lying immediately north of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa. It is the source of many floods through that city since the outlet is directly through the central part of the city to the Missouri River. The Corps of Engineers and the city of Council Bluffs have constructed floodways and levees to protect property, but there is an immediate need for a program of soil conservation and upstream flood prevention on Indian Creek.

The Corps of Engineers is engaged in the protection of downstream property on each of the Nishna, Nodaway, and Boyer Rivers. These works of improvement lie unprotected as long as upstream flood-prevention work goes undone.

The entire acreage within these four watersheds is in organized soil conservation districts. Rapid progress is being made by individual farmers in applying soil and water conservation measures to their land. In fact, the lands of more than a dozen subwatersheds are almost all completely treated with soil and water conservation measures except for major gully controls and small stream channel improvement works. These latter works are awaiting Government assistance and give rise to the urgency of work being initiated on these watersheds.

Watershed associations, in which both upland and bottom land farmers, city people and townspeople alike are interested, have been in operation for several years. These associations are a medium for combining the interests of all the local people to work with the State and Federal Governments in developing a plan and carrying out works of improvement to reduce damages by flood. The people of these watersheds are not only ready but awaiting Federal Government cooperation to accomplish their objective of a complete valley-wide watershed soil-conservation, flood-prevention, and flood-control program.

Due to the facts I have stated, about 30 days ago I submitted the following resolution to the Public Works Committee of the House:

Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, That the Department of Agriculture be, and is hereby, requested to review the reports on the Missouri River Basin, submitted in House Document No. 373, Eighty-first Congress, first session, with a view to determining whether any modifications in the recommendations contained therein with respect to the Nishnabotna, Nodaway, Boyer, and Indian Creek Basins in Iowa should be made at this time.

The Public Works Committee requested Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan to review his Department's Missouri River Basin agriculture program in regard to specifically named watershed with a "view to determining whether any modifications in the recommendations contained therein" should be made at this time.

The Department in a written statement to Committee Chairman WHITTINGTON considered the request inadvisable and suggested that Congress instead expedite the approval of the Missouri agricultural program at a total cost of more than $8,000,000,000—$8,000,000,000, mind you.

My resolution stems from a growing desire of various watershed groups in my district that needed flood-prevention work not be retarded until Congress saw fit to approve the highly controversial $8,000,000,000 Missouri Basin agricultural program, as recommended by Secretary Brannan.

Since the passage of the 1936 Flood Control Act, and as later amended, Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for a number of upper watershed flood-prevention programs. Surveys have been approved on still a larger number with detailed plans requested when the benefits sufficiently exceed the cost of the proposed work. Surveys on the Missouri River Basin had been requested by the Public Works Committee but to date the committee has not received the requested material. Instead, the Department after making the requested surveys used a portion of the material as a base for the Missouri agricultural program, now before Congress as House Document No. 373. Hearings were held in the past couple of months on the document, but no decision was reached or action taken.

As I pointed out, the four watersheds named in the resolution are in drastic need of immediate upper watershed flood-prevention work. The watersheds cover a total of about 6,000 square miles and have on the average at least one destructive flood every year.

Although basically rich in productive soil, many hundreds of acres of the intensely cropped uplands and the fertile alluvial bottom lands of these watersheds are fast losing their productiveness because of sedimentation and constant flooding. Preliminary studies show that these watersheds have the highest rate of sediment production per square mile of any drainage area to be found in the entire Missouri Basin. Damage to town property, public roads, railroads, drainage systems, and other improvements is also high.

Watershed associations in my district have taken the initiative to encourage the State and Federal Governments to develop a flood prevention program for the area. All of the four watersheds except the Indian Creek have such associations made up of both farmers and town people. The State of Iowa also has such an association and recently a national council of water associations was organized. An upper watershed flood-prevention program would provide for small headwater-retarding reservoirs, sediment-retaining structures, channel improvement, and similar works to reduce flood and sediment damage. This is the type of work generally approved by the Public Works Committee under the Flood Control Acts, primarily because it is the quickest, and by far the cheapest and best way to get this necessary job done, because the farmers themselves do most of the job and want to do more.

Much of the needed flood-prevention work is already underway in the conservation programs being applied by farmers through their local soil conservation district operations, such as good land use, contouring, strip cropping, and pasture improvement, all of which contribute to flood and sediment prevention, but a complete job cannot be accomplished until the Congress directs the Soil Conservation Service and the Army engineers to cooperate with the farmers in a valley-wide watershed soil-conservation, flood-prevention, and flood-control program, such as I have requested for the watersheds in my district. But Mr. Brannan refuses to approve, or at least, has refused to approve up to this time. I hope he will soon see the light.

A Report to the Farmers of the Second District of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, several years ago we wisely adopted a national farm policy which declared that all of us must share with the farmer the responsibility for maintaining our agricultural resources. We decided that the farmer must be protected against low prices and low income and against the danger of inadequate credit. Our Government adopted laws establishing farm programs to assist and cooperate with the farmer to eliminate speculation in the farming industry, and to provide the opportunity for the farmers to have the use of electric power—REA—and other modern machinery and conveniences to secure for himself and family the high standard of living to which he was and is justly entitled to receive for his investments, labors, and management. Because we adopted this policy, American agriculture was able to set new production records during every year of the war.

One of the great lessons of history is that no nation can be stronger than its agriculture. Hungry and ill-nourished people cannot practice and promulgate democracy and peaceful commerce. Peace cannot be built on a foundation of human want.

The continuing high volume of agricultural production in the United States has been an important element in our efforts toward postwar reconstruction and rehabilitation of other free nations to preserve world peace and prevent the spread of communism. During the year ending June 30, 1949, the United States exported over 22,100,000 tons of food. This was exceeded during the year ending June 30, 1950, which amounts to more than five times the average amounts exported during the 1935–39 years inclusive. Financial gifts and loans by the United States Government to foreign nations have contributed significantly to supporting the record large volume of farm exports from this country. The United States furnished or sold one-half of all world grain exports last year, which is approximately seven times the amount of grain exported from the United States in prewar years. Therefore, our European recovery program to build forces against communistic aggressors, and the International Wheat Agreement, have contributed substantial support for our farm prosperity. We must continue our efforts to facilitate and increase the flow of world trade on a permanent, long-term basis through the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Export-Import Bank and international agreements, such as the wheat agreement.

Mr. Speaker, Missouri contains 242,934 farms, covering 5,300,000 acres. The farmers of Missouri by producing unprecedented quantities of food in the first half of the decade helped to win World War II. Since 1945, by expanding their production, they have been helping our great Nation in its efforts to maintain prosperity and to establish world peace. I have the honor of serving, as Representative in Congress, the Second District of Missouri. Its boundaries include an area of 15 large counties in the heart of Missouri, and it is one of the most fertile and productive agricultural regions of the United States.

This is my first term in Congress and at it, the Eighty-first Congress, draws to a close I believe it appropriate that I present a report of the actions taken by this Congress and my votes on such measures affecting the interests of the farmers in my district. I believe they are entitled to be informed of my votes on legislation affecting agriculture and to know why I have served them as their Congressman. This they have the right to know when deciding whether or not to cast their vote for me on general election day, the next 7th day of November.

Mr. Speaker, more than 12,000 legislative bills and resolutions have been introduced during the sessions of the Eighty-first Congress, and several hundred were reported by committees for our action on the floor of this House. I have carefully studied and considered each bill voted upon, and have cast my vote in accordance with sound judgment and highest principles—that is, for the best interests of the people.

Of that number the following legislative actions are of major importance to the farmers of my district and my vote appears of record, as follows:

Bill No.	Description	Voted
H. R. 5240	Continues authority of the Government to control imports of fats, oils, rice, and rice products.	For.
H. R. 6305	Authorizes United States participation in International Wheat Agreement.	For.
H. R. 5345	Authorizes continuance of 90 percent support of farm prices through 1950, revising to sliding scale and new parity thereafter.	For.
S. 715	Extends authority to support tobacco price to Sept. 30, 1950.	For.
H. R. 3699	Improves and makes more effective the Federal land bank system to aid farmers.	For.
S. 900	Revises charter of Commodity Credit Corporation to provide adequate crop storage facilities and for exchange of surplus commodities for strategic and critical materials.	For.
H. R. 2101	Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make production disaster loans to farmers from $44,000,000 revolving fund balance of the Regional Agriculture Credit Corporation, which was abolished.	For.
H. R. 3825	Extends and broadens crop insurance program	For.
H. R. 2960	Authorizes the REA to make loans for construction of rural telephone lines.	For.
H. R. 2514	Authorizes loans by Farmers Home Administration to homestead entrymen.	For.
H. J. Res. 327.	Appropriates $1,750,000 for control of pests and plant disease.	For.
H. R. 6567	Authorizes $2,000,000,000 increase in borrowing capacity of Commodity Credit Corporation to continue farm price supports of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, peanuts, and other crops.	For.
H. R. 2023	Repeals tax on oleomargarine	Against.
S. 930	Provides for disposition of $50,000,000 balance of rural rehabilitation funds to be claimed by States within 3 years or revert to Farmers Home Administration.	For.
H. R. 4830	Finances European recovery program; aid to Greece and Turkey, and relief of occupied areas.	For.
H. R. 1211	Restores and extends reciprocal trade agreements	For.
H. R. 5895	Authorizes military aid to western Europe, Nationalist China, Korea, Iran, and the Philippine Republic.	For.
H. R. 7797	Authorizes economic assistance to: (1) European Marshall plan countries; (2) Korea, southeast Asia and non-Communist China; (3) underdeveloped countries requiring technical aid as part of point 4 program. Continues United States support of UN's international children's aid programs.	For.
S. 2319	Authorizes $60,000,000 economic aid to Southern Korea and $10,500,000 to Chinese nationalists.	For.
S. 1008	Legalizes basing-point price system for freight rates when not in conflict with antitrust laws.	Against.
H. R. 8920	Reduces excise taxes and increases tax rate on larger earning of corporations.	For.
H. R. 2734	Tightens antitrust laws to prohibit acquisitions or mergers which lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.	For.
H. R. 7827	Increases criminal penalties for violation of Sherman antitrust law.	For.
H. J. Res. 371.	Tax earnings of life insurance companies	For.
H. R. 7941	Authorizes Federal aid to States for highway and farm-to-market roads construction.	For.
S. 3357	Prohibits interstate transportation of gambling devices	For.
S. 1070	$300,000,000 in Federal aid to farmers for construction and repair of farm dwellings.	For.
H. R. 6000	Extends coverage of Social Security Act to bring over 10,000,000 more persons under benefits of old-age and survivors insurance, increases payments; brings public assistance program into balance.	For.
H. R. 4424	Grants 320-acre homesteads to veterans to promote settlement and development of Alaska.	For.
H. R. 5472	Authorizes improvements to rivers and harbors and the construction of flood-control projects.	For.

REA

The Rural Electrification Administration Act was enacted by Congress in the year of 1935 and it empowers the Administrator of the REA to make loans for the construction of power plants and transmission lines to serve rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, the rural electrification program is of great and special importance to the farmers. I have vigorously supported and voted for all appropriations to provide for loans to establish and expand rural electric power and service to the farmers.

Almost everyone agrees that the farmers and people residing in the rural areas should have the opportunity of the advantages and conveniences provided and served by electricity. The farmer, especially, has as much or more use and practical need for electricity than most other people. He needs electricity not only for providing lights and conveniences for his home, barns, and storehouses, but he also needs electricity to provide power for his use in the many productive activities on the farm.

The vast expansion and improvement of the Rural Electrification Administration, and the appropriations by Congress which made this activity possible have always received my sincere and consistent support. I would like to relate a few facts which clearly and concretely show that the farmers of Missouri have been greatly benefited by this beneficial type of legislation. As of June 30, 1950, approximately $125,000,000 has been loaned to the REA cooperatives for the expansion of their facilities. As of the same date approximately $50,000,000 has been earmarked for loans in Missouri for the construction of generating and transmission facilities. Also, as of this same date, loans in the amount of $627,000 have been made for the purchase of consumers' facilities which have materially aided and lightened the farmers' operation in many of the onerous burdens that must be performed by hand where electricity is not available. Briefly, one must reflect upon the fact that as of June 30, 1950, there were over 56,000 miles of energized lines in Missouri, and 181,000 consumers are being benefited at the present time by REA. Seventy-eight percent of the farms of the State of Missouri are served with electricity.

In 1935 less than 7 percent of the farms in Missouri used central-station electrical service. As your Representative in Congress, during my first term, I have consistently supported all legislation and appropriations which have so materially benefited the farmer and brought to him those benefits and that standard of living which he so justly deserves.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. Speaker, more miles of rivers flow within the boundaries of the Second Congressional District of Missouri than in any other congressional district of the United States. Destructive and disastrous floods have been a constant menace and danger to the welfare of the people in my district. Therefore, I requested and was assigned to the Public Works Committee in the beginning of this my first term in Congress. The Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, has jurisdiction over rivers, harbors, and flood-control legislation. You will recall H. R. 5472, approved May 16, 1950, now Public Law 516, drafted and reported to the floor of the House by the Committee on Public Works, and my vigorous efforts and support for the passage of that bill, which authorizes flood-control projects on and in the Missouri River Basin, which includes Missouri River tributaries, the Osage, Chariton, Grand, Moreau, Blackwater, Lamine, and others. This law, Public Law 516, abovementioned, authorizes flood-control projects, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan by the United States Army engineers, $250,000,000, and also authorizes flood-control projects for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan—levees and soil conservation—by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, $200,000,000. A total authorization of $450,000,000 for such flood-control projects on the Missouri River and its tributaries.

Mr. Speaker, if reelected to Congress I will continue my efforts to obtain each year such appropriations as the circumstances of national and international affairs may reasonably allow or permit for complete construction of the Missouri River Basin flood-control projects, authorized by Public Law 516, which we passed during this session of Congress.

As evidence of such efforts on my part I quote from the RECORD of the debate on the floor of this House, August 22, 1949, concerning the Garrison flood-control dam on the Missouri River in North Dakota, which is of vital importance to prevent floods on the Missouri River in my district:

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"On page 19, line 15, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: '*Provided*, That no part of the authorization of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than 1,830 feet, or for acquiring land, or for constructing dikes or levees which would be required by a higher maximum normal pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam.'"

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes to explain the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEMKE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I hope you will be patient with me while I present very briefly my arguments against the proposal made by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

First, I will state that 200 miles of the Missouri River winds its way through my Second District in Missouri. I would also like to acquaint you briefly with something about the physical facts pertaining to the Missouri Valley. The waterway formed by the Mississippi-Missouri Rivers is the longest waterway in the World. The Missouri River is by a considerable margin the longer of the two rivers which form this waterway, over 2,400 miles in length. The Missouri River originates in the slopes of the Continental Divide in the Yellowstone National Park in southwestern Montana, and courses its way through or along seven States. It has an average slope of slightly less than 1 foot per mile downstream from the Montana-North Dakota State line, and is 1½ to 17 miles wide, flanked on both sides by bluffs. It has 30 tributaries, varying in length from 100 miles to 1,000 miles.

This vast region is called the Nation's bread basket. The two basic problems that prevail in the Missouri Valley are drought and floods, affecting 10,000,000 people who reside in the Missouri Valley.

The Public Works Committee has carefully considered the amendment proposed by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] and unanimously rejected the amendment. The amendment would destroy the very purposes which the North Dakota project, known as Garrison Dam, proposes to effect. It is for flood control and irrigation, and after the gentleman from North Dakota has succeeded in obtaining the project that has already been started and $60,000,000 expended on the production of the project, he now wants to control the plans of construction, and says after the Government has spent that money, "You shall keep the water level at 1,830 feet in order that those who are expecting to develop resorts along the bank, the real-estate operators, may keep it at such constant level so that it cannot be used for flood control."

Now, the Garrison Dam; it was planned to be built to the full ultimate capacity of the site, based on a unanimous agreement of the members of the Missouri River Basin Interagency Committee, which met at Omaha, Nebr., in August 1945. The project as originally planned by the Corps of Engineers and as proposed for construction at this time contemplates the provision of the greatest water shortage capacity available in any reservoir within the Missouri River Basin. The project will provide a storage of 23,000,000 acre-feet of water at an elevation of 1,850 feet above mean sea level.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] would restrict the water level to 1,830 feet, which would provide storage capacity of only 17,000,000 acre-feet. The objector, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], contends that it is not necessary nor desirable to build the project to provide water reservoir at an elevation of 1,850 feet, but that an elevation 20 feet lower would provide all the capacity that is needed in the reservoir. This contention is not correct. By the Flood Control Act Congress authorized full development and utilization of water resources of the basin. Accordingly, the plans of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army contemplated construction of the Garrison Dam to a height of 1,874 feet, with a normal operating pool elevation of 1,850 feet. To illustrate that this height was contemplated right from the inception of the plan, the estimate of $130,000,000 for the Garrison project as set forth in the Chief of Engineers report in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, was based on construction of the dam to an elevation of 1,874 feet with an operating water level of 1,850 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. At the time that capacity was estimated at 17,000,000 acre-feet. It was purely an estimate. No firm figures had been prepared. It was a rough approximation of the storage capacity that would be available with a water reservoir operating at an elevation of 1,850 feet, since accurate contour maps of the Missouri River Valley were not available until a later date. Subsequently the valley was accurately mapped by the Corps of Engineers and it was found that the Garrison Dam with a pool elevation of 1,850 feet would provide 23,000,000 acre-feet of storage instead of approximately 17,000,000 acre-feet.

Any limitation on the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project to the full capacity planned by the Corps of Engineers would be in contravention to the policy of Congress to fully utilize and develop the water resources of the Missouri River Basin. Further it would be very uneconomical to limit the operation of the Garrison project to 1,830 feet since the Garrison site provides the least unit cost per acre-foot of storage of any reservoir site within the entire Missouri Basin. A reduction of the normal operating pool elevation of the Garrison Reservoir to 1,830 feet would cause a loss of 6,800,000 acre-feet of storage. Based on comparative costs for a project constructed to the 1,850- or to the 1,830-foot elevation, computations by the Corps of Engineers have shown that the additional 6,800,000 acre-feet of storage in the "1,850" reservoir can be provided at a cost of $5.53 per acre-foot. For comparison the cost per acre-foot of storage in the "1,830" reservoir is $12.15.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] mentioned the fact that people will lose their homes and their land. The Constitution and laws of our country protects the interests of such persons and specifically provides that they shall receive just compensation for their property and interests. They will be fully compensated for their land and properties acquired by the Government for use in connection with the Garrison Dam flood control project. We are here trying to provide a properly designed flood control project to protect the farms and homes of the people residing in the Missouri River Valley below the Garrison Dam, of North Dakota. They who produce the major part of the food for our Nation, and whose crops and homes, produced by their labors, are frequently destroyed by destructive floods, and without any recourse, they suffer the loss from such floods. We must consider the overall benefit to all the people who live in the lower Missouri Valley, millions of people who will be affected by this amendment if it is adopted, whose homes and farms are ravaged by floods without compensation for damages which they will suffer and continue to suffer from floods, if the proposed amendment is adopted; and I earnestly urge the Congress to reject and disapprove the proposed amendment to restrict or reduce the water storage capacity of the Garrison Dam by limiting the water level of the storage pool to 1,830 feet above mean sea level.

The foregoing record of my argument on the floor of the House against an amendment which was defeated is only one of many of my efforts to secure proper legislation for adequate flood control projects.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF MY WORK AS A MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

In addition to general legislative work in Congress, my daily mail requesting miscellaneous services for the people in my district, and my work as a member of the Public Works Committee, I was assigned and have served as one of nine Members of Congress to serve on the

Committee on Un-American Activities. It was and is a great honor for me to serve on this important committee, and I am especially grateful for such recognition to the Second District of Missouri, because I am the only first-term Member of Congress on our side of the House serving on the Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee has conducted many hearings and investigations on communistic and subversive activities. Hundreds of witnesses have appeared before the committee. Our committee staff and investigators work daily in our work of exposing communistic and subversive activities. Thousands of letters are answered each week and thousands of bulletins and other information exposing the evil of communism and how it operates as a danger to our Nation have been prepared by the committee and distributed throughout the country in our work to expose and spread the truth about communism. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities prepared, drafted, and reported to the Congress H. R. 9490, a bill to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, by requiring registration of Communist organizations. In addition, the bill bars Communists from Government and defense plant jobs, requires labeling and identification of Communist propaganda, denies passports to members of the Communist Party, requires publication of subversive organizations in the Federal Register, prevents the running of the statute of limitations in certain cases. A major provision of the bill authorizes and directs mass round-up, jailing or internment of suspected Communist subversives in time of war or national emergency. In addition to providing for internment of subversives, the compromise agreed upon by Senate-House conferees this week, will—

Require Communists and fellow travelers to register with the Government, under penalties up to 10 years in prison and a $10,000 fine for failure to do so;

Bar Communists from Government jobs or work in defense plants;

Provide stiffer penalties for espionage and sabotage, and make it a felony to picket Federal courts as happened in the famous Communist trials in New York;

Tighten the immigration and naturalization laws; bar citizenship to aliens belonging to subversive groups, and permit canceling the citizenship of persons who join subversive organizations within 5 years of naturalization.

I am proud of my work and services on the Committee on Un-American Activities and equally proud of the above-mentioned Communist-control bill which we prepared and reported to the House. I vigorously supported and voted for the bill on the floor of the House, when it was passed by a vote of 354 for to 20 against. It may not be a perfect law to discourage and control communism and subversive activities, but as time develops needed changes can be made by amendments.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have diligently performed my duties with conscientious devotion to the people of my district and for what I honestly and sincerely believed to be for the best interests of the district, State, and Nation. However, there are some who may find fault and criticize, and when I hear of such criticism, I will think of the words of Benjamin Franklin when he said:

We must not in the course of public life expect immediate approbation and immediate grateful acknowledgment of our services. But let us persevere through abuse and even injury. The internal situation of a good conscience is always present, and time will do us justice in the minds of the people, even those who are at present the most prejudiced against us.

Hospital Care for Civil War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, while our minds and hearts now naturally turn primarily to the men who are fighting in far-off lands, nevertheless we should not neglect our older veterans who have already made great sacrifices in our country's battles.

To correct a situation which is working a grave hardship on a group of men, unfortunately few in number, but unusually deserving, I have today introduced a bill which would permit veterans who fought for the United States in the Civil War to enter the hospital of their choice when they require medical treatment.

While these veterans are eligible for treatment at veterans' hospitals now, the few who are still with us are well over 100 years old and should not be forced to undergo the inconvenience, and often impossibility of traveling many miles for treatment. In most cases, the only practicable way that these aged heroes can obtain medical assistance is at a local hospital, since, once disease strikes, they cannot be moved the necessary distance to a veterans' facility.

Therefore, my bill provides that every person who served 90 days or more in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War, and received an honorable discharge, shall be entitled to the payment of hospital costs in the hospital of his choice in the locality where he lives if there is no Veterans' Administration facility in such locality in which he may receive treatment.

James A. Hard, 109 years old, is one of the most venerated elder citizens of Rochester, N. Y. Mr. Hard, who is the oldest living veteran of the Civil War, has suffered several illnesses of such gravity that he has needed immediate treatment and could not travel the distance required for treatment at a Veterans' Administration hospital. The Government pension granted these veterans is not sufficient to meet the burden of these additional expenses which Congress certainly never intended that they should have to bear when the original provision for their medical care at Veterans' hospitals was made. Several friends of Mr. Hard's have been kind enough to bring this situation to my attention.

There are only a handful of these veterans who are still living, but we cannot allow ourselves to ignore the additional problems which come with their advanced age. At a nominal cost, we can provide extra security and good health for the remaining years of their lives. Certainly our conscience and sense of gratitude should require no less of us.

I appreciate the fact that it is late in the present session to obtain immediate action on this legislation, but it is my hope that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will consider it sufficiently meritorious that early and favorable consideration may be accorded the proposal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a text of the bill to which I have referred:

A bill to permit Civil War veterans to receive hospital treatment in hospitals of their choice if Veterans' Administration facilities are not available in their locality

Be it enacted, etc., That every person who served 90 days or more in the Army, Navy or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War, and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having so served less than 90 days, was discharged for disability incurred in the service and in the line of duty, or was on June 9, 1930, on the pension roll as a Civil War veteran, under then existing pension laws, shall be entitled (in addition to any benefits to which he is now entitled) to the payment of hospital costs in the hospital of his choice in the locality where he lives if there is no Veterans' Administration facility in such locality in which he may receive treatment.

So-Called Antisubversive Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following editorials from the leading press of the Nation. These important newspapers, of unquestioned reputation, take their stand against the so-called antisubversive bills.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post of September 20, 1950]

HARD CHOICE

The internal security bill agreed upon by House and Senate conferees will impose upon the President a most difficult duty. It contains provisions which he specifically asked Congress to adopt and which are needed to protect the country from the danger of espionage and sabotage. It contains drastic provisions for the internment of dangerously disloyal persons in case of war, insurrection, or invasion—provisions which the President did not think it necessary to request but which might well seem acceptable to him. And it contains the substance of the Wood bill which, when it was adopted by the House as a separate measure a fortnight ago, the President said he would veto. The Wood

bill has not been made any less objectionable by virtue of being packaged with other more reasonable measures.

The difficulty of the President's choice stems only in part from the fact that he must veto the entire internal security act if he wishes to keep the Wood bill from becoming law. The difficulty is compounded by the fact that most of his own supporters on Capitol Hill voted for the omnibus legislation in the final showdown. No doubt it would be embarrassing to him as well as to them if he should publicly dissociate himself from their decision. Moreover, any temperance or rationality in dealing with the Communists is considered politically disastrous today.

Nevertheless, it is precisely in such a situation that a Presidential veto serves its most significant constitutional function. The bill passed so overwhelmingly by Congress is panic legislation. It contains features of which this country will be ashamed when sobriety returns. The prestige of the President's office ought to be interposed in an effort to stem the panic—even if the effort now seems a hopeless one and overriding of the veto is considered inescapable. For the sake of the historical record, if for no other reason, the President of the United States ought to register his opposition to an act which flouts the Nation's best traditions. And perhaps it is not too much to hope that leadership of this sort will inspire the palsied Members of the Senate who saddled the President with this painful responsibility. Courage, no less than panic, can be contagious.

[Letter from Reinhold Niebuhr in the New York Times of September 18, 1950]

SENATOR LEHMAN COMMENDED

NEW YORK, *September 14, 1950.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A special acolade should be awarded to Senator LEHMAN for his vote on the bill, which has just passed the Senate, designed to curb communism in this country.

One need not add anything to your own wise editorial comment on the unwisdom of this type of legislation, which, as Senator LEHMAN observed, seems to assume that a totally submerged iceberg is less dangerous than an only partially submerged one.

The point about Senator LEHMAN'S vote is that he was not only one of seven Senators who dared to brave the dangerous hysteria which is arising in this country but he was also the only Senator facing a fall election who took this position.

RHEINHOLD NIEBUHR.

Editorial from the New York Times, September 17, 1950, said in part:

THE WORK OF CONGRESS

So far as domestic legislation goes, the most serious failure of this session of Congress was in the entire field of civil right. Both Houses showed a disheartening willingness to accept shotgun legislation which, in the name of anticommunism, represents a very real threat to liberty of thought, speech, press, and political association.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of September 15, 1950]

NO JOB FOR AMATEURS

We would stake a good deal on an assertion that everybody in the United States, from archconservatives in both major parties clear through the ranks of the Socialists, would heartily support legislation which would thoroughly dispose of the actual menace in domestic communism.

The Kilgore portion of what has come to be known as the McCarran bill aims at the core of the danger. In event of declaration of war, or imminent invasion, foreign-inspired insurrection, or other circumstance declared a national emergency by Congress and the President, it would empower the Government to round up and intern all foreign agents, saboteurs, spies, and members of the Communist Party. It also would protect and facilitate the individual's right to judicial review.

The trouble is, Congress seems likely either to drop the Kilgore sections or to lump them with provisions which threaten not only to smother freedom of opinion and to harm many sincere and loyal people, but also actually to hamper apprehension of the real subversives. And the President will have no choice but to sign or veto in toto what comes to him.

This newspaper already has pointed out how the arbitrary power to declare any group subversive and compel it to label everything it says or prints "Communist front" could be turned to choke off any reform at the moment unpopular or misunderstood.

Of more immediate concern is the prospect of swamping the FBI with the task of seeing to it that everyone of some 60,000 Communists registers, and that the roster of every alleged "front" organization is complete and correct. The dangerous spies and saboteurs won't register. In fact, not many take the risk of tying up with suspect organizations. The few that have would go underground while the FBI ferrets out political ideologists whose attempts to persuade Americans already have failed dismally.

As we have remarked before: We don't like rats around the national farmstead. But we are chary of amateur exterminators who propose a little poison for the general water supply—especially when even that wouldn't get many rats.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 15, 1950]

A DANGEROUS ROAD

The McCarran internal-security bill is admittedly a catch-all; it contains what its author likes to call segments of a broad and diverse nature. Among these segments are the President's recommendations for tightening espionage laws; the amended Hobbs bill; the Mundt-Nixon bill, and (as it now stands) the Kilgore bill. Some of these are good, some bad; and the whole is a mixture which, it seems to us, could have been more effectively dealt with on a piecemeal basis. There is, however, one portion of the bill which has received from the public less attention that it deserves, and which casts across the entire measure a disconcerting cloud. This is the portion dealing with immigration and naturalization.

Senator MCCARRAN'S general attitude toward foreigners and their admission to this country was made unpleasantly familiar to the country during the long debate on the Displaced Persons Act. Much of the mistrust and narrowness which the Senator revealed during his obstinate fight against the DP's found expression in his omnibus immigration bill (S. 3455) introduced last April; and that is in turn extended into his internal-security bill. The parts of the immigration bill incorporated in the new measure ostensibly deal with subversion and sabotage; but they are so broadly and so loosely framed, so inclusive in their prohibitions and so generally menacing to our traditions of freedom and tolerance, that it is difficult to foretell the lengths to which they might lead us.

Aliens to be denied admission to the United States are classified, for example, under a diversity of novel heads. Those would be excluded who seek to enter the United States "principally or incidentally to engage in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest." Or again, those would be excluded who at any time may have written or published, or had in their possession, printed matter advocating (among other things) "the economic and governmental doctrines of any * * * form of totalitarianism." These, it seems to us, go far beyond the safeguards required. They are not directives defining the role of administrative officers but are invitations to every form of exaggerated and hysterical intolerance.

Other provisions of the bill would prohibit the naturalization of an individual who within the preceding 10 years had been in any way connected with an organization registered with the Attorney General as subversive; and would hold one to be prima facie disloyal to the Constitution who, within 5 years of naturalization, was found to have joined such an organization. The effect of the latter provision would be to create a second-class citizenship, the members of which could be deprived of basic rights on technical grounds, or as a result of ignorance or misjudgment.

The problem of internal security is a real one; its very urgency requires that it be treated with soberness, clarity, and a rooted respect for traditional liberties. It is highly regrettable that there should have been injected into the present bill a group of provisions of a patently dangerous character. The duty of the President and the Congress is plain; they must deal—and deal resolutely—with the menace presented by communism. That duty, unfortunately, has not been made easier by Senator MCCARRAN'S particular contribution, in the fields of immigration and naturalization where he has so often before shown himself prejudiced.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 14, 1950]

A HODGE-PODGE ANTI-RED BILL OF DOUBTFUL VALUE

As a result of its Members' preelection day determination to pass anti-Communist legislation—without being too choosey about what form it should take—the Senate has approved a hodge-podge bill that is loaded with impracticable and perhaps unconstitutional provisions that promise little real hurt to subversive movements in this country.

In their rush to get something through that might avoid a Presidential veto, opposing sides in the Senate, who had been hotly accusing each other of trying to assault the Constitution, managed to accept each other's proposals and place them side by side in a compromise bill.

Its major defect is its superficiality in fighting Communist-promoted espionage and sabotage. It would rely upon two measures: A requirement that all Communists and Communist fronts register as such and an authorization for the internment of Communists in the event of war, invasion, or insurrection.

But such moves would only scrape the surface of subversion. Our greatest danger does not lie in the known, out-in-the-open, loud-mouthed members of the Communist Party but those unknowns, many of them not card-carrying members of the party, who in underground channels labor for Soviet interests. They won't register under the new bill and they cannot be interned under it, either, until they are first exposed and seized.

But even in coping with known, or suspected, Communists and fronts, the bill is deficient. It will be necessary to prove that the persons whose registration, or internment, are wanted, are Communists, and that process is likely to take a great deal of time and machinery. In addition, provisions of the bill are almost certain to be attacked in the courts as unconstitutional. Judging from past performances put on by Communists, it might take 2 years or more before such cases could be adjudicated. Meanwhile, pro-Soviet activity might be spreading

rigidly in many parts of the country during a period of increasingly grave emergency.

What is needed, above all, is more aid for the FBI in its efforts to track down and expose spies, saboteurs, and subversives generally—quite aside from identifying by means of registration Communists who are already well known. J. Edgar Hoover has warned that the problem we had in the last war from the Nazi fifth column was very small compared with that caused by Communist activities now. He has pointed also to an increase in the Communist movement underground since beginning of the Korean war. The proposed legislation will probably accelerate this movement. It will not, certainly, take care of the problem of Communist subversion and it would be the worst kind of folly to depend upon it for that purpose.

[From the Washington Post of Thursday, September 14, 1950]

PRESIDENT PLEADS FOR TOLERANCE

(By Drew Pearson)

Sometimes the President's off-the-record remarks that never reach the papers are his best. Those present thought this was the case when Truman addressed the joint session of the AFL-CIO last week.

Speaking without notes and obviously straight from the heart, the President made a plea for tolerance in wartime.

To a considerable extent it was a historical speech. The President reviewed the different periods of hysteria which have gripped the country—the Alien Sedition Act in the early days of the Republic, the Know-Nothing Party, and Ku Klux Klanism.

He pointed out that the Know-Nothing Party had been anti-Mason and referred to the fact that he, himself, was a Mason. The Klan, he recalled, was first against the Negro; then when revived in the 1920's, against the Jew and the Catholic.

These were evidences of intolerance which did not truly represent the American people, he said, and he was absolutely confident that the good judgment of the American people would always win out.

The President did not mention the Mundt-Nixon bill or the McCarran bill, but it was obvious he had them in mind. For he referred to congressional witch hunters who wave the American flag while persecuting alien immigrants and trampling on the rights of loyal Americans.

"This is the raw material of totalitarianism," he said.

While fighting the intolerance of totalitarianism, he emphasized, we must not take on the methods of totalitarianism. Recalling that totalitarian regimes had persecuted labor unions, religious groups and fraternal organizations, he pointed out that under the Alien and Sedition Act, naturalized citizens hardly dared say anything in public about the Government for fear of being thrown in jail, and this, he inferred might also happen under the Mundt-Nixon and McCarran bills.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch of September 14, 1950]

WORDS TO MARK

Statements by two of the seven Senators who voted against the McCarran-Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon-Wood thought control bill deserves to be read and reread by their colleagues and by the American people.

Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, said:

"I could not live with my conscience if I gave my approval to a bill which does violence to the Constitution, to the Bill of Rights, and which I think destroys many of those freedoms which makes America the great land of the free."

Senator LEHMAN, of New York, who goes before the voters of his State in some 6 weeks, did not hesitate to describe the repressive catch-all as "this tragic, this unfortunate, this ill-conceived legislation." For voting against it, he said:

"My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult."

There are times when a few words count for more than overwhelming numbers on the other side. This is such a time. President Truman should not deviate in the least in his resolve to veto this hysterical bill. He should welcome his opportunity to give the country as great a veto message as any one of his predecessors back to Washington ever wrote.

Betrayal at the Expense of Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity last fall to make an on-the-spot study of the operations of the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund when in Europe as Chairman of the Select Committee on International Organization. I was very much impressed with the excellent work of this agency in the humanitarian work of feeding and caring for children in war-devastated areas of Europe and the Near East, and I am sure that the other members of the committee were likewise impressed.

I was therefore most disappointed when the conferees eliminated the $12,500,000 appropriation for the children's fund contained in the supplemental appropriation bill. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the September 20 issue of the New York Times. It follows:

FOR THE WORLD'S CHILDREN

One of the most useful and successful activities of the United Nations has been the children's fund, known throughout the world as UNICEF. Throughout the difficult postwar struggle to keep the peace the children's fund for nearly 4 years now has been busy saving lives, perhaps five or six million of them. It has spent close to $150,000,000, and it is to the great credit of the United States that the major part of the funds have been supplied by this country without thought of political or economic return. At the present moment emergency feeding programs in such areas as Greece and Yugoslavia, India, and the Near East are being conducted by UNICEF, and $500,000 was set aside only a few weeks ago for work in Korea.

But the emphasis has been gradually shifting to longer-range projects primarily in Asia and in Central America. As the critical postwar food shortages in Europe have been ameliorated, attention has been turning toward helping governments in the less-developed areas of the world to eliminate disease directly and, perhaps even more important, to train personnel in public health and related matters as they affect mothers and children. In fact, the United States is one of the principal backers of a resolution, to be brought up at this session of the General Assembly, which would formally establish the children's fund as a permanent agency of the UN instead of as the emergency body that it is at present.

All of this is by way of saying that it is almost incomprehensible that in approving a $17,000,000,000 supplemental appropriation bill a conference committee of the two Houses of Congress should have completely eliminated the American contribution of $12,500,000 to the children's fund for the year 1950–51. If this move was supposed to represent "economizing," we can only say that it is economizing of the most misguided sort. Failure to provide these funds will not only seriously cripple UNICEF by making it almost impossible to plan for the coming year but inevitably also will have a depressing effect on contributions from other countries which have always looked to the United States for leadership in this cause.

Inspiring Statements of Famous Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, in this hour of history, when the free nations of the world are under great stress and burdened with the fear of world-wide communistic domination, and while our Armed Forces are fighting for the defense of freedom, to promote and preserve international peace and our democratic way of life, I believe it is appropriate to consider and record some of the immortal words of famous Americans who have inspired us as a nation in times of momentous problems of the past.

Now we are challenged by a ruthless communistic totalitarian dictatorship, and the following great statements of wisdom and courage should inspire our heritage of freedom and stimulate our true American spirit:

OUR IDEAL, AS EXPRESSED BY FAMOUS AMERICANS IN THE BEGINNING

(William Bradford, History of the Plymouth Plantation)

But here I cannot stay and make a pause and stand half amazed at this poor people's present condition. * * * Being thus past the vast ocean and a sea of troubles before in their preparation, they had now no friends to welcome them, nor inns to entertain or refresh their weather-beaten bodies, no houses or much less towns to repair to, to seek for succor. * * * And for the season, it was winter, and they that know the winters of that country know them to be sharp and violent and subject to cruel and fierce storms, dangerous to travel to known places, much more to search an unknown coast. Besides, what could they see but a hideous and desolate wilderness full of wild beasts and wild men? * * * May not and ought not the children of these fathers rightly say, "Our fathers were Englishmen which came over this great ocean, and were ready to perish in this wildnerness"? But they cried unto the Lord, and He heard their voice and looked on their adversity.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

(Roger Williams, the Bloody Tenet of Persecution)

Breach of civil peace may arise when false and idolatrous practices are held forth, and yet no breach of civil peace from the doctrine or practice, or the manner of holding forth. but from that wrong and preposterous

way of suppressing, preventing and extinguishing such doctrines or practices by weapons of wrath and blood. * * * Whereas it is light alone, even light from the bright shining sun of righteousness, which is able, in the souls and consciences of men, to dispel and scatter such fogs and darkness.

We Must Fight

(Patrick Henry, speech in the Continental Congress, 1775)

If we wish to be free, if we wish to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending, if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained, we must fight. An appeal to arms and to the God of hosts is all that is left us.

We Hold These Truths

(Declaration of Independence)

We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

Times That Try Men's Souls

(Tom Paine, the Crisis, 1776)

These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country, but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap we esteem too lightly; it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated.

An Early Charter

(Virginia Bill of Rights, 1776)

That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people; that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them. * * * That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and, therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity toward each other.

The American

(Crévecoeur, letter from an American farmer, 1782)

The American is a new man who acts on new principles; he must, therefore, entertain new ideas and form new opinions. From involuntary idleness, service, dependence, penury, and useless labor he has passed to toils of a very different nature, rewarded by ample subsistence.

Three Essentials

(The Northwest Ordinance, 1787)

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

We the People

(Preamble of the Constitution)

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The Four Freedoms

(First amendment to the Constitution)

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Intolerance Condemned

(Jefferson, first inaugural address, 1801)

Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that, having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind has so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions.

The World's Best Hope

(Jefferson, first inaugural address, 1801)

I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this Government is not strong enough; but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth.

Remember the Alamo

(William Barrett Travis, appeal from the Alamo, 1836)

To the people of Texas and all Americans in the world: Fellow citizens and compatriots: I am beseiged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Ana. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion; otherwise the garrison are to be put to the sword if the fort is taken. I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender nor retreat.

The Building of the Ship

(Longfellow)

Thou, too, sail on, O Snip of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all it fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hope, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee.

The Fiery Trial

(Lincoln, Message to Congress, December 1, 1862)

Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor, or dishonor, to the latest generation. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth.

Shall Not Perish

(Lincoln, Gettysburg Address)

It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Ship of Democracy

(Walt Whitman, from Leaves of Grass)

Sail, sail thy best, Ship of Democracy,
Of value is thy freight, 'tis not the present only,
The past is also stored in thee.
Thou holdest not the venture of thyself, not of the Western Continent alone.
Earth's résumé entire floats on thy keel, O ship, is steadied by thy spars
With thee time voyages in trust, the antecedent nations sink or swim with thee,
With all their ancient struggles, martyrs, heroes, epics, wars, thou bear'st the other continents.
Theirs, theirs as much as thine, the destination port triumphant;
Steer then with good strong hand and wary eye, O helmsman, thou carriest great companions,
Venerable priestly Asia sails this day with thee,
And royal, feudal Europe sails with thee.

Safe for Democracy

(Woodrow Wilson)

The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

Eternal Truths

(Franklin D. Roosevelt)

If the fires of freedom and civil liberties burn low in other lands, they must be made brighter in our own. If in other lands the press and books and literature of all kinds are censored, we must redouble our efforts here to keep them free. If in other lands the eternal truths of the past are threatened by intolerance, we must provide a safe place for their perpetuation.

LIBERTY UNDER GOD

(Franklin D. Roosevelt)

We are going to win the war and we are going to win the peace that follows. And in the dark hours of this day—and through dark days that may be yet to come—we will know that the vast majority of the members of the human race are on our side. Many of them are fighting with us. All of them are praying for us. For, in representing our cause, we represent theirs as well—our hope and their hope for liberty under God.

Increase in Production and Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as far back as I can remember, America has been afflicted by the weepers and the wailers, the gloom-peddlers who see nothing ahead except disaster and destruction for this great country. These defeatists and professional pessimists who have been placing us in the poorhouse every 2 years for the past 20 years have been completely consistent in one thing—they have been wrong about every prediction they have made.

At the present time America is enjoying the greatest economic prosperity in the history of this Nation. The value of the goods and services produced by the American people is now approaching $270,000,000,000 a year. Americans have more income, more money in the bank, and more savings than they have ever enjoyed before.

The gloom-peddlers do not try to deny these facts. But they do try to spread fear and uneasiness by telling Americans that the dollars we have today are not worth nearly as much as the dollars in past years. That is true, but we have a great many more dollars now than we had in the years of the great depression.

In those times, millions of Americans had no dollars at all. Their families existed on charity while they paced the streets in search of work or stood hopelessly in the bread lines. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point, an editorial from the Pike County Democrat of Pittsfield, Ill., which brings out this point very clearly.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pike County (Ill.) Democrat of August 16, 1950]

AT LEAST MOST PEOPLE HAVE MORE DOLLARS

We try not to be such prejudiced Democrats that we claim the Democrats bring about everything that's good and the Republicans are the cause of everything bad. Even so, when our all-wise, distinguished and exalted Republican editorial contemporaries vigorously charge that everyone is so much poorer than they were in 1932–33, we can't resist trying to reply—meekly and timidly.

At least, most people have a lot more dollars than they had in 1932–33—statistics prove it. A letter from Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS gives us some of these Government figures. The national income this year is estimated to reach 221 billion dollars, two and a half times the 1929 level and at least five times that of 1932–33. Corporation dividend payments are now highest in history, as is total personal income and per capita income. Savings at highest peacetime level.

Figures for Illinois show that income payments to individuals totaled $3,335,000,000 in 1933 and $15,167,000,000 in 1948. Bank deposits were $2,252,972,000 in 1932 and $11,464,000,000 in 1949. Bank suspensions during the period 1930–33 were 817 and 1934–49 only 10. There were 2,117 business failures in 1932 and only 305 in 1948. Total cash farm income for Illinois in 1932 was $256,000,000, but in 1949 it was $1,702,943,000.

Figures for Pike County show that total retail sales in the county for 1929 were $5,579,000 as compared to $2,645,000 in 1933 and $14,374,000 in 1948. Bank deposits in Pike totaled $5,304,000 on December 31, 1941, and $13,672,000, June 30, 1949. These figures tell the story of all business statistics—in every case the number of dollars is from three to five times what it was in 1932–33.

We do not even claim that these better business conditions and higher individual income are due entirely to the Democratic administration. Naturally, other factors have helped bring about the vast increase in production and the highly increased volume of money in circulation. However, policies of the Democratic administration have made possible many of these achievements. Take just two examples, the farm price-support program and rural electrification. Just think of the tremendous volume of business these two factors alone have created. Good farm income and rural electrification have made it possible for farmers to buy a vast volume of manufactured products—in 1932–33 they could not even pay their taxes.

We are also fully aware of the serious economic problems facing the country, due to World War II and the threat of inflation since the war started in Korea. The national debt is something to think about, too, but even at that, we doubt that it is as serious as pictured by some when you compare the debt of around 255 billion dollars to the total national income of 221 billion dollars.

Even in view of the serious economic problems presented by war, past and present, we think that most people are much better off financially right now than they were in 1932–33. At least we have a lot more dollars and a mighty lot of people think they are better off with more dollars (even 65-cent or 50-cent dollars) than they were in 1932–33, when they had no dollars at all—50-cent dollars or any other kind of dollars.

Report From the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a report from the Department of Agriculture on its September 11 estimates of the quantities of some of the food commodities held by the Federal Government in storage. The following is the estimated inventory on nine of these items:

	Pounds
Dried milk	320,700,000
Cheese	106,100,000
Butter	191,800,000
Dried eggs	110,595,296
Beans, dry edible	942,700,000
Peas, dry edible	76,600,000
Rice, rough	7,500,000
Mexican meat	52,623,504
Grain sorghum	3,052,500,000

Although this represents a slight decrease in the amount of dried milk from the report of June 30, the amount of cheese has increased approximately 47,200,000 pounds, or about 80 percent; butter has increased approximately 30,200,000 pounds; and eggs show an approximate increase of 16,700,000 pounds.

This makes it all the more imperative that full legislative action be taken without any further delay so that the President may sign the bill and the Department of Agriculture may start promptly the task of distributing these surplus foods.

The Mobilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal this morning, dealing with the work of the Senate Armed Services subcommittee headed by our esteemed colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. This story is an illuminating commentary on the great work already undertaken by this "watchdog committee" and I am sure all of us in the Senate, and the people of this country, will benefit greatly from the work being done by this subcommittee. In these times, it is comforting to know that such a committee is maintaining the constitutional watchfulness over the operations of the executive agencies concerned which is the duty of the Congress under the law.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE PRODDERS—NEW SENATE COMMITTEE BEGINS SCRUTINIZING MOBILIZATION PROGRAM—ON LOOK LIST: STEEL INDUSTRY, ARMS OUTPUT, MANPOWER, ALASKAN DEFENSES—WHITE HOUSE GIVES GO AHEAD

(By Philip Geyelin and Ellis Haller)

WASHINGTON.—Keep an eye on the Senate's new Preparedness Committee. It's about to put the heat on the administration's slow-moving mobilization program.

If you're involved one way or another in rearmament plans as a businessman, a worker, or even a serviceman—chances are you'll feel the warmth from the committee's activity.

The Senate group, headed by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas), is a sub-

committee of the Armed Services Committee. It was set up, quietly, a few weeks ago to keep continuous watch over the progress of the new defense buildup. Take a look at the impressive subjects the committee already proposes to investigate:

It's launching a study of the whole steel industry of the United States to find out if there's adequate capacity to meet demand in the next 10 years, and whether more production facilities—perhaps Government-financed—should be built. This has been a Fair Deal interest both in war and peace.

It is pushing a survey of the Government's manpower policies. It wants to know whether Federal bureaucrats know what they're doing on this subject—and whether they need some new laws to strengthen their control over the work force.

ALREADY CHECKING IN ALASKA

The committee will range as far as Alaska, where its checkup on Alaskan defenses is already in progress. Investigators are starting with the assumption that there's a probable lack of coordination between civil and military activities in the northern Territory, that bottlenecks are arising in the over-all construction program, and that labor difficulties there are possibly subversive in origin.

The Ordnance Corps, and manufacturers who produce guns and other weapons, will come in for scrutiny, too. The committee thinks it should study and ascertain reasons for the delay in production and issue of certain types of equipment.

As if these far-reaching checkups weren't enough to keep the committee busy, it's also going to try to determine whether farm commodities are being used effectively in war and peace, and look into the "effect of foreign monopolies on the cost of our mobilization program."

What will come of all this probing and surveying remains to be seen. Apparently the committee feels that nothing related to the national defense is outside its scope. Other investigations probably will be coming along later. Judging from the experience of the last war, knuckle-rapping from the Capitol tends to increase efficiency in laggard defense agencies.

This ambitious set of projects is already well-launched. But lack of publicity about the committee's plans is catching some Federal officials off guard. The Labor Department, for example, is not anxious now for a study of its manpower program, which has been slow to develop.

UNHAPPY AGRICULTURE

The Agriculture Department is none too happy about the prospect of a fresh spotlight on its hoards of surplus commodities purchased under Federal price-support operations. The committee makes it clear it wants to find out whether some of the present surpluses can't be used to further the defense program. It wonders whether other Government agencies (such as the Army) couldn't use up some of the food now in Federal storage. It suggests more surpluses might be traded for strategic and critical materials overseas. It hints that future foreign aid programs ("we will undoubtedly shortly be faced with the problem of feeding millions of starving Koreans") might use up Government-owned foodstuffs.

What's behind this new congressional study group and who's making it tick?

Strangely enough, one of the prime movers is President Truman himself, who owes much of his political prestige to his chairmanship of the special Senate War Investigating Committee in World War II. That group served as the model for the new subcommittee.

Even though some of Mr. Truman's lieutenants will come under fire from Senator JOHNSON and his colleagues, the President is understood to be in favor of such a vigorous watchdog group. White House intimates say, "The boss is willing to let the chips fall where they may."

The committee has promised to take a bipartisan approach to mobilization problems. In that respect, one Government agency official proclaims, "It looks like a pretty tough group."

SEC MEMBER IS COUNSEL

Here's the line-up: In addition to 42-year-old Senator JOHNSON, the chairman, the Democrats are represented by Senators KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; HUNT, of Wyoming; and CHAPMAN, of Kentucky; and the Republicans by SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; ERIDGES, of New Hampshire; and MORSE, of Oregon.

General counsel of the set-up is Donald Cook, Democratic Vice Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He is on loan from the SEC to handle legal snarls that may arise as the committee gets into full swing.

Committee staff members say the spadework is already in progress for each of the major studies the group has proposed so far—steel, manpower, foreign cartels, ordnance output, Alaskan defenses, and farm commodities.

"We'll get down to work on the studies on Alaska and ordnance next month," one committee expert explains. "The other studies will be pushed just as rapidly as we can get at them." He added the committee will continue its operations regardless of whether Congress adjourns soon, or comes back for a special session in November.

SEE A RASH OF HEARINGS

"No particular study has priority," the committee aide says. "We're going to have them going simultaneously. We don't know which one may be completed first."

Another committee expert declared the studies now contemplated won't turn into congressional investigations with witnesses and full-dress hearings—"unless," he added cautiously, "we happen to flush out something that appears to need investigating."

Congressional old-timers are predicting, however, that the defense prodders likely will run into enough questions in their studies to bring on a rash of hearings and a parade of witnesses to Capitol Hill.

The committee in its brief existence has already stirred up a ruckus in some parts of official Washington. It issued a report criticizing the sale of some World War II surpluses that are needed in the present Korean fighting, and it has openly questioned the way the Munitions Board has gone about stockpiling natural rubber and other commodities.

Largely as a result of this criticism from the Johnson committee, Munitions Board Chairman Hubert Howard resigned last Monday. Mr. Howard had been scheduled to appear before the Preparedness Committee yesterday.

Committee Chairman JOHNSON, who moved into his Senate seat 2 years ago after serving 11 years in the House, got some experience in prodding defense programs in the last war. He then headed a Naval Affairs Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. Activities of that subcommittee drew praise from the late James Forrestal, who was Secretary of the Navy in those days.

Though the committee started its operations without much fanfare, and has gone out of its way to protest that it is "not looking for headlines," some of its recent actions indicate a desire for more attention.

A recent session, originally scheduled as a closed hearing, was opened to reporters at the last minute. And Senator JOHNSON personally writes letters to Washington correspondents assuring them of his interest in their stories.

OUTLINE FOR STUDIES

Here are some of the details the new Preparedness Committee wants to find out about the subject it intends to "study":

Steel.—The investigation will trace the steel industry's growth, probe gray markets in steel, and survey the financial resources and dividend records of steel companies. The committee's outline for the proposed steel study ends with this heading: "Conclusions: Do we need more production? If so, how quick? If so, where? If so, what should be done?"

A steel company representative here thinks the study will be "pretty comprehensive." He adds, "The committee has already asked us for statistics going back to 1920."

The new steel checkup will be the third congressional probe into steel problems in the past 12 months. The Joint Economic Committee under the chairmanship of Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming) held hearings on the December 1949 steel price increases back in January of this year.

Later, in April, Representative CELLER (Democrat, New York) studied the steel industry as part of his antimonopoly investigation. During the CELLER hearings, SEC Commissioner Cook, the new Preparedness Committee counsel, gave testimony on the financial history of the steel industry and details about the affiliations of officers of various steel companies.

Ordnance.—The committee wants to evaluate the relationship of the Ordnance Corps with other organizations within the Army and the Defense Department. Among other things, it proposes to inquire into "the reasons for the failure to have 3.5-inch bazookas and ammunition in the hands of combatant troops throughout the world; what is the status of development of an accurate long-range projectile capable of delivering a shaped charge?" Looking farther ahead, the committee suggests it may find "other areas for further study, such as types of guided missiles, tanks, and other improved ordnance."

The committee's staff thinks it already knows what may turn up as part of the ordnance look-see. It says, "We will probably find a tendency to delay production awaiting perfection of design" and a "tendency to reject suggestions from manufacturers and others outside the Ordnance Corps, and reluctance to incorporate such suggestions in either their research or production." It also believes there's a "tendency to withold production of recommended items because of pending development of new models."

Manpower.—The proposal in this field is to "test the adequacy of plans, policies, and operating structures and programs pertaining to manpower against the requirements of the Nation for (A) the current international situation, and (B) total mobilization."

The committee's outline suggests there is some question in the members' minds as to whether policies are now "clear, well-defined and adequate." And whether "the delegation of authorities and responsibilities is clear and effective."

Foreign monopolies.—The purpose of this study is to look into the effect of cartels on the cost of the United States mobilization program. This will trace basic facts about production of strategic materials overseas; whether producers are organized; price movements; and "recommendations made to facilitate acquisition for stockpiling without having to pay exorbitant prices." The committee suggests as "possible approaches" a look into the possibility of direct Government-to-Government dealing on critical materials; whether buying of strategic items couldn't be tied more closely to United States foreign aid; and whether the United States couldn't barter with other countries.

Alaskan defenses.—This investigation is just getting started, under the direction of

Senator HUNT. Senators MORSE and SALTONSTALL propose to accompany him to Alaska for a first-hand glimpse of problems there. They'll look into military housing, transportation, communications, and similar matters. Hearings probably will be held after preliminary facts are developed.

Farm commodities.—The group will try to estimate normal United States peacetime commodity requirements, as well as those for a period of semimobilization or for a full-scale 5-year war. It will inquire into the status of current inventories and ask what can be done about stocks of commodities acquired under the price-support program.

Democracy in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Democracy in Washington," published in the New York Times of Wednesday, September 13, 1950.

This editorial points out the great importance of this Congress extending home rule and suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia. It calls attention to the fact that only 10 or 12 additional signatures to the discharge petition now pending in the House of Representatives are necessary to bring the measure up for consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY IN WASHINGTON

Home rule for the District of Columbia is in a situation somewhat analogous to that of the statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii. All three of these proposals, which would bring a greater measure of democracy to important areas under the American flag, seem at last to have victory almost within their grasp; yet all three are in peril because of the drive for adjournment of Congress.

The statehood bills, which have passed the House, require mainly a little more determination and fortitude on the part of the Senate Democratic leadership. But the bill that would bring self-government to the Nation's Capital, which has passed the Senate, requires something more concrete; it needs less than a dozen additional signatures on a petition that would force it out of the House committee where it has been bottled up for many months.

In view of all this, the wonder is not that so many Members of Congress have endorsed the discharge petition for Senator KEFAUVER's proposal to give self-government to the District, but that it still lacks enough signatures. For example, although all Democrats and 4 Republicans of the New York State delegation have reportedly signed the petition, there are still 16 New York Republicans who have failed to sign. They alone could carry the petition over the top, and there is still time—not much time, but enough—for them to do so. It is hard to see why at this late date they should hesitate to bring one step nearer realization a plank of both party platforms of 1948.

United States Marine Corps Has Earned and Deserves a Place in the Joint Chiefs of Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have written another letter today recommending the appointment of a representative of the United States Marine Corps on the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces. This one to the newly appointed Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall.

I trust that one of the first official duties of the newly appointed Secretary of Defense, George C. Marshall, will be to give serious and favorable consideration to the following letter which I have mailed to him today, immediately following his being sworn in to the most vitally important office in the President's Cabinet at the present time as Secretary of Defense.

The following is a copy of my letter to Secretary Marshall:

MY DEAR SECRETARY MARSHALL: In a recent exchange of correspondence with President Truman on the subject of the United States Marine Corps representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President in his reply to me used what he later described as "an unfortunate choice of words" which he sincerely regretted in stating that "the Marine Corps is the Navy's police force and as long as I am President that is what it will remain," and then added, "They have a propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's."

It is my hope that you will be successful in convincing the President that he is wrong. This is the positive and definite opinion of the American public as indicated in the large volume of mail I have received from all parts of the Nation criticizing the President's opinion of the United States Marine Corps and supporting representation of the United States Marine Corps on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The United States Marine Corps is held in the highest regard and respect by the people of the United States whom they have successfully defended and fought for on the world's battlefields since it was established. They believe that the United States Marine Corps, as a major integral part of our Armed Forces, are entitled to recognition and equal representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff along with the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

I am confident that you will agree with me that the United States Marine Corps has earned equal status and recognition with the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy because of their military know-how which has been demonstrated so many times in defense of the United States in all parts of the world since 1776. And that we need all the military know-how we possess on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I, therefore, sincerely suggest that you as Secretary of Defense urge and recommend to President Truman that the United States Marine Corps be given representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in response to the Nation-wide, considered opinion of the people of the United States, who believe that the appointment of a representative of the United States Marine Corps on the Joint Chiefs of Staff would strengthen and improve the unification of our Armed Forces, and be a beneficial addition to the national security.

Yours sincerely,
GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress, Fifteenth District, California.

There appears to be no logical reason for denying the United States Marine Corps equal representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces, especially since the Marine Corps is the oldest military organization in the Armed Forces of the Nation with an unblemished record of courage, faith, and devotion to duty in defense of the Nation.

I am hopeful that Secretary Marshall will act favorably on my proposal in the interests of unity in the Armed Forces and security of the national welfare in view of the present threatening and perilous position of the United States in world affairs.

United States Information and Education Program—T-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 25, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming clearer that in our battle to win the world's peoples to our side in the struggle between democracy and Communist totalitarianism, that the T-(truth) bomb is as potent a peace weapon as the H-bomb is a war weapon. Not to utilize the T-bomb is to jeopardize democracy's battle by default.

Appended hereto is a letter from Hon. Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, detailing some phases of the campaign for truth in which our country is engaging. The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1950.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: I was interested in the questions you raised on the floor of the House recently regarding the appropriation for the campaign of truth and thought you might like to have a few comments on them.

Regarding the consolidation of the State Department and ECA information activities under one common direction, I would like to point out that it was the Congress which established two separate information entities in ECA countries. On the other hand, the State Department and ECA have made, and are making, a very special effort to coordinate the information activities of the two organizations so that they will represent joint planning and will not overlap at any point in their functions. Last winter we sent the director of our program planning and evaluation staff overseas to look into this coordination and to make suggestions on the development of closer working relations between USIE and ECA. At the end of a 3 months' survey, he reported that the coordination in practically all posts was extremely effective and that little, if any, duplication existed. He did find, however, that some improvement in joint planning was possible and we have now set up additional machinery to provide for this. This same man is returning to Europe at the end of

this month to work with ECA and the State Department information officers to develop further coordination and joint planning of all such activities. ECA has entered into the spirit of this coordination with the same enthusiasm that we have, realizing that the United States Government must speak with one voice in foreign countries. It is my belief that the two information programs are actually working in close harmony.

On your question of whether the Department of State is working with indigenous people, organizations, or agencies sympathetic to us, I wish to assure you that this is one of the guiding principles of the information and educational exchange program. We have done our utmost within the capacity of our manpower and funds available to work with and assist indigenous groups favorable to our cause. In some countries this has been done with marked effect and substantial result, while in others the task has been more difficult due to the existence of prejudice and fear. You may be sure, however, that we are not neglecting this highly important phase of our work.

Another question you raised was why the State Department, through its information program, could not sell the United States as effectively as American companies sell automobiles or toothpaste. This question has been raised before by members of the advertising profession, among others, and is a little difficult to understand unless you have actually been engaged in information work abroad. The basic reason, however, lies in the fact that the purchaser of an automobile or a tube of toothpaste is not deciding whether an automobile or a tube of toothpaste is a useful article but merely whether he will buy this brand or another brand. The State Department information program is attempting to sell a philosophy of living to people who in many cases have already made up their minds that they do not want it. To influence them we must reach them through far more subtle means than paid advertising. We must not only tell them that we have a better product but we must prove in realistic terms the facts which support our case. One of the ways in which we do this is through the very indigenous organizations which you mentioned on the floor of the House. Our information program is most effective when it is heard but not seen.

I hope you find these comments helpful and I will be glad to give you any further information on our program if you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

Albany, N. Y., and the Felt Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements:

THE THREAT TO ALBANY, N. Y., OF A FURTHER REDUCTION IN THE TARIFF ON PAPERMAKERS' FELTS

1. Both the management and the CIO and A. F. of L. unions in the papermakers' felt industry are alarmed that the tariff on these felts may be again reduced during the trade agreements negotiations which begin this month at Torquay, England. This is a matter of the greatest concern to the community of Albany, N. Y., since the papermakers' felt industry is the largest single source of employment in Albany.

2. The duty on papermakers' felts provided by paragraph 1109 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, has already been twice reduced—once by 50 percent in 1935, and again by 20 percent to 33⅓ percent in 1947. These reductions were greater than those imposed on any other part of the woolen industry.

3. As a result of the tariff cuts already made as well as of monetary devaluation, foreign-made felts can now be sold in the United States at a price less than the United States cost of production for domestic felts. The demand for felts will not be increased by any reduction in price since such demand depends on the number of papermaking machines in the United States. Consequently, every foreign felt imported into the United States can only mean one less felt sold by the American industry.

4. Taken together, these facts show that any further cut in the felt tariff will see the American industry gradually dry up and disappear. The capital equipment and highly skilled labor force in the felt industry cannot be readily adapted to other types of production. The destruction of the industry would be a vital blow to the whole Albany area, a useless waste of capital and a tremendous disruption in the lives of a group of loyal and efficient American workers, many of whom have known no other type of work.

5. The papermakers' felt industry is a small business consisting of 11 small competing companies. The industry has provided a livelihood for American labor for over 100 years. To turn over the American market for felts to foreign production could not significantly improve the dollar earnings of Europe; it would wreck this established American industry and do tremendous harm to the entire Albany community.

ALBANY AND THE FELT INDUSTRY

1. The Albany Felt Co. and F. C. Huyck & Sons are two of the oldest and most important industries in Albany, both having been established for more than half a century. Together they provide employment for over 2,000 men and women in the Albany area.

2. These companies produce woven woolen felts which are used for machine clothing in many industrial operations, but principally in the manufacture of paper. The making of these felts is a carefully developed art requiring highly skilled labor. The cost of this labor is a high percentage in the cost of each felt. For this reason the American industry cannot compete in an unprotected market against low-paid foreign workers.

3. The American industry was driven from the world market a number of years ago by the competition of cheap labor in Sweden, Finland, Germany, Britain, France, Argentina, Brazil, and Japan. During the war and immediate postwar period, while the European industry was occupied or disorganized, American felts were again seen in the world market, but with the revival of the foreign industry, American felt exports are again disappearing. The American industry has been able to survive in the domestic market only by virtue of the United States tariff. This tariff is being rapidly eaten away by the trade agreements program and the continued existence of the woven woolen felt industry in Albany is in grave jeopardy.

4. Until 1935 felts were dutiable under an ad valorem tariff ranging from 50 percent to 60 percent and under a specific duty of 50 cents per pound to compensate for the duty on wool. However, a trade agreement with Sweden in 1935 cut the ad valorem duty in half so that the range, instead of being 50 percent to 60 percent, was 25 percent to 30 percent. This was a greater cut than that imposed upon any other part of the woolen industry.

5. Following this reduction imports of felt into the United States, which had averaged only about 6,000 pounds per year, rose 633 percent to 38,000 pounds by 1939. Foreign manufacturers were beginning to invade the American market in force when the war interrupted foreign trade.

6. Following the war foreign felt mills were taxed to capacity to supply the accumulated European demand. During this period of shortage a trade agreement with Great Britain in 1947 further cut the American tariff by another 20 percent to 33⅓ percent. As a result the ad valorem duty is now only 20 percent, and the compensatory duty has been reduced to 37½ cents per pound.

7. Monetary devaluation has come on top of this second cut. It has operated to reduce British and other foreign prices by an amount in the neighborhood of 15 percent to 20 percent.

8. The result is that the cost of producing felts in the United States is far greater than the cost of producing felts in Europe. So-called common wet felts, which constitute the single largest felt item, can be landed in this country at a price, after payment of duty and all other costs, of $2.58, against the price for comparable United States felts of $3.50, after giving effect to a recent cut in American prices. A similar price differential exists for other types of felt. The principal felt mill of Sweden has announced that by 1951 it will double its felt-making capacity, which, on the basis of its own figures, will give this single mill a surplus capacity for export equal to 25 percent of the whole American production.

9. The production of felts at Albany is high cost production, in spite of the highly efficient manufacturing methods which the Albany companies have developed. Any further tariff reduction would raise a serious question whether these companies would survive at all, or could survive only by removing their production activities to a cheaper labor market such as Canada or one of the Southern States.

10. Such a further tariff reduction is now threatened. The State Department is planning a third round of tariff negotiations with more than 50 countries at Torquay, England, which will begin the latter part of this month. Papermakers' felts have been included in the list of commodities for tariff negotiation.

11. Under the existing authority in the trade-agreements legislation, the tariffs, which are now 20 percent ad valorem and 37½ cents per pound, may be reduced to 15 percent ad valorem and 25 cents per pound. This reduction may well represent the critical margin upon which the life of the American industry depends. Because of disturbed conditions abroad, the effect of previous tariff cuts has not yet been tested. Up to this point there have been few imports of foreign felts because there has not existed a foreign felt surplus production, but now foreign producers have goods to sell and are pressing at the door to the American market. There is every sign that we are at the beginning of a major export drive to capture that market. The present low tariff, the currency devaluation and the expansion of foreign production which is now under way, may without any further tariff reduction, bring disaster to the American industry. Such a further reduction would bring disaster even closer.

Air Power Alone Hit by Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the New York Times, Wednesday, September 20, 1950, concerning Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, which everyone should read. He is great because he is fair. The article from the New York Times follows:

AIR POWER ALONE HIT BY VANDENBERG—GENERAL SAYS IT NEVER WILL WIN A WAR—HE EMPHASIZES NEED FOR TEAMWORK

WASHINGTON, September 19.—Air Force friends who see air power as the answer to all the Nation's military needs are a source of worry to the Nation's top air commander.

In an interview today Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, pointed with pride to a job well done in the skies over Korea, and then pricked a series of gas balloons raised by all-out air-power enthusiasts.

"Air power," he said, "can never win a war by itself. Air power cannot now and never will be able to guarantee that enemy planes may not deliver some atomic bombs to American cities."

Finally, despite the current Korean success General Vandenberg said United States land, sea, and air forces could not be expected to play fire brigade everywhere and, by themselves, guarantee the safety of every land on the globe.

As he answered critics who have found fault with the country's military performance in Korea, the 51-year-old general ticked off the fundamentals of an air-war lesson that, he said, "I wish both our friends and our hostile critics would understand."

First, there is the theory that victory will automatically flow to the nation with the biggest air force.

HE EMPHASIZES TEAMWORK

"It is not," he emphasized, "the Air Force's job to win wars alone, and no one in authority in the Air Force has ever said it was or could be. By 'authority' I mean the Secretary and Chief of Staff, the only two individuals who can speak for the Air Force on such a matter."

The Air Force, he said, "is one part of an air-land-sea team on which no one unit is more important than the other two.

"It is not," he emphasized, "a matter of dividing available men and money in equal portions between the services. Each needs its own tools to do its job and the respective size or cost of each of the three branches is unrelated to its importance."

General Vandenberg has his own three-step timetable of Air Force defense obligations.

"Since we will never start a war," he said, "our first problem is to have a defense of interceptor planes ready to go in the air at once, if enemy planes start an atomic attack early on any given morning. We know that, just as Germany at the peak of its air power was unable to force the turnback short of the target of a single one of our bomber strikes, we cannot expect to prevent all enemy planes from getting through. But we will stop some."

Next, he said, is the Air Force obligation to hit back at an enemy.

"Perhaps late on the day of the assumed morning attack, or maybe the next day, we must hit long range at the force attacking us. That strike-back power, combined with local defense at home, constitutes 'air security' and is designed to make any potential enemy hesitate over the costs of an attack upon us."

THE NEED FOR TACTICAL AIR POWER

Third, the general said, comes the matter of tactical air power—the branch in which some critics say the United States is lacking.

"Tactical air power is for the support of troops," he continued. "Up until now we have not had a large Army to support and, for that reason, have concentrated on the first two essentials. In the near future that situation may be changed."

The general said flatly that national air defenses were still below the safety level he sought.

"At present," he said, "we scarcely have 48 air groups, let alone the 69 that is talked about. We have just got the money to start building a radar net around the country. That net is an essential for air defense but it will not, it should be remembered, be any sort of mosquito bar that will make it impossible for any enemy plane at all to reach an American target."

Turning to Korea, General Vandenberg first warned that a success there must not lead to the assumption that the United States was ready to do "fire brigade" duty everywhere on earth.

These 48 States Are Truly United—Back of Our Men in the Field Is the Entire Nation. In the Shops and Factories, on the Farm, in Office Skyscrapers, and in Every Home Men and Women Are Contributing Their Bit To Keep the Fires of Freedom Burning.—John Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss in brief the fifth Battle Report—Washington, made by our good friend, the Assistant to the President, John Steelman, in collaboration with the National Broadcasting Co.

In this teledocumentary Mr. Steelman took the American people on a sort of a visit with Vice Adm. Ross T McIntyre; the Honorable Adrian Fisher, legal adviser to the Secretary of State; and Brig. Gen. Wallace Graham, personal physician to the President.

He then took us on a visit with Rear Adm. Norton D. Willcutts, commanding officer of the National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md., where the wounded are daily coming in from Korea by the dozen.

Mr. Speaker, while they are mostly Army men, now under the program of unification that has been perfected, they are being treated by the United States Navy. This is indeed substantial evidence of the manner in which the unification problem which long beset us in Congress has now been achieved and is working insofar as hospitalization is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot point out too strongly the wonderful work that Dr. John Steelman is performing in rendering this service to the American people. These reports, telecast over the National Broadcasting Co.'s tremendous television system, bring the White House and top-flight officials of our Government right into the living rooms and the homes of our people.

This particular Sunday broadcast was made most interesting and highly informative in many aspects, particularly so with respect to that portion of the talk made by the Air Force Flight Surgeon Brig. Gen. Wallace Graham, which dealt with new drugs, surgical and medical procedures, and techniques which our armed services have been employing since World War II.

Mr. Speaker, again I wish to point out that there is a veritable arsenal of information not otherwise obtainable made available by this program, Battle Report—Washington.

In order that it can receive the greatest possible dissemination throughout the Nation, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and place the same in the RECORD:

BATTLE REPORT—WASHINGTON

Mr. ROBERT MCCORMICK. On the second Sunday in September, the sixty-eighth day of bombs in Korea, NBC television once again turns its cameras upon both war front and home front for your fifth Battle Report, Washington.

Washington, where the President and Congress, this week, moved another step forward to assure—thousands of miles away in embattled Korea—the victory men of United Nations are struggling to achieve.

This is Robert McCormick, greeting you from the Nation's Capital. Here with us today, waiting to report to you against the background of the conflict in which we are engaged, are men who represent the executive, the military, and the diplomatic arms of our Government. Our cameras turn first upon the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is not an exaggeration to say that the eyes of all the world are upon the United States today. To many millions, we are the champions of the cause of liberty—the enemies of every system which makes men slaves. Men everywhere are watching every action we take—and listening to every word we speak.

The heroic work of our men fighting in Korea under the United Nations flag is reported almost hourly all over the world. With each success, freemen everywhere rejoice. With each reverse, they do not become disconsolate or fear for their own freedom. They know we cannot and will not fail.

For back of our men in the field is the entire Nation. Every one of us is in this struggle. In the shops and factories, on the farms, in office skyscrapers, and in every home, men and women are contributing their bit to keep the fires of freedom burning. These 48 States are truly united.

This afternoon we will visit with several Government officials and hear how they are carrying their share of the load. We will take a short trip to the Bethesda Naval Hospital where we will hear from soldiers who were wounded in Korea and are now fighting their way back to health. We will hear what steps are being taken to guarantee them the best medical care in the world. Several pertinent parts of the address the President made last evening will be repeated for us.

Next week a meeting will be held in New York which is of tremendous importance to every citizen of the free world. There the council of foreign ministers will gather to discuss and make plans to avoid war and

to preserve freedom. Mr. Philip Jessup—our ambassador at large—will tell you about that meeting, and of our hopes for the future.

Truly, this is a struggle of all freemen everywhere. Each of us has his work to do, and the better he does it, the sooner the day will come when we will know a genuine peace.

Mr. McCORMICK. Our studio cameramen now pick out a man to report to you on an aspect of the war that concerns all our troops. He is the President's personal physician—Air Force Flight Surgeon Brig. Gen. Wallace Graham.

General GRAHAM. You have probably heard many accounts of the new drugs and the new surgical and medical procedures and techniques which we have been employing since World War II. This has been augmented, of course, by the discovery of the antibiotics such as penicillin, streptomycin, etc., and the residency program which the general hospitals of all services have been combined in putting forward. Since World War II, however, we have made commensurate advancement much more rapidly than from World War I to World War II, which was like from the horse and buggy to the jet airplane, but we are making steady advancement all along the line. Tonight, however, I would like to talk to you about an advancement in military medicine which is a bit different but fully as important. It stemmed essentially from a nonmedical development when our President Truman and the Nation's leaders decided that our Armed Forces could achieve greater defense strength by integrating their power and by integrating their plans and cooperating more closely in their operations. When the National Defense Act of 1947 and its amendments were made a law the military medical services were confronted with many of the same problems as the fighting forces they support. Now, when the combat units grow closer in mutual strategic and tactical support, they know that the medical services must be closely integrated into one solid fighting force. The results of these changes have brought into sharp focus the necessity of our integration since our assault upon South Korea. Well, the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force have carried out combined operations against the enemy. Their medical services have worked closely together so that a man now wounded can be returned to the zone of the interior or to the first stage for his treatment within a matter of minutes and his life depends upon this. Now, to those of us who have the privilege of caring for the men who are wounded in Korea as I am at Walter Reed General Hospital every day, where we can get first-hand information from these men, as a splendid example of American team play and action, it is a stimulating development in military medicine which is only surpassed by the spirit and courage of the wounded man himself.

Mr. McCORMICK. As war continues in Korea, last week Defense officials reported approximately 2,000 more casualties, bringing the total announced since war's beginning to close to 9,000. Of these, over 5,000 are wounded, removed from the battlefield and, if seriously injured, hastened home for treatment by the speedy air-evacuation system we described to you 2 weeks ago. Today, by means of a special remote television pickup, we have arranged to take you some 10 miles away from Washington to Bethesda, Md., where rises the tower of the National Naval Medical Center. Originally intended strictly for the Navy, it serves today as an excellent example of what unification has done—for its doors are now swinging open to receive Army wounded. Off we go, then, to Bethesda, Md., to the eighteenth floor of a Navy hospital to hear about Army injured from NBC's civilian—David Brinkley.

Mr. BRINKLEY. We are on the eighteenth floor of the Naval Medical Hospital in Bethesda, Md., just outside of Washington, D. C.—the National Naval Medical Center. The wounded from Korea are coming in here by the dozens. Though they are Army men mostly, they are being treated by the Navy. Today in the next few minutes we are going to talk to a few of them, and the man who is responsible for the care they are getting.

First of all, Pfc. Gilbert Weatherly.

Mr. Weatherly, where are you from? Where is your home?

Answer. My home is in Salisbury, Md.

Question. That's pretty near by here, isn't it?

Answer. Yes; it is.

Question. Tell me what happened to your arm. Where were you when you were hit?

Answer. I was on the Naktong front and I got shrapnel in my left arm.

Question. How do you feel now? Is it in pretty good shape?

Answer. It is in pretty good shape and I feel fine.

Question. You are in the Army. The Navy, though, is taking care of you?

Answer. Yes; it is.

Question. Are you looking for a 3-day pass pretty soon?

Answer. A 3-day pass and more if I can get it.

Mr. BRINKLEY. The admiral is here with us. Maybe we can talk to him about it in a minute.

Over here is another Army man. Tell us your name, will you?

Answer. My name is Percy Hubert Davis.

Question. And you are in the Army too?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. Well, what happened to your arm?

Answer. I got hit in small arm fire.

Question. Where? In Korea?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. And how did they get you back here?

Answer. By ship, all the way.

Question. How's the food here in the hospital? Are they feeding you pretty well?

Answer. Yes, sir; they're feeding me fine.

Question. Did you volunteer for the Army or did they draft you?

Answer. Volunteered.

Question. Would you volunteer now?

Answer. Hard to say.

Question. The Navy is taking pretty good care of you?

Answer. Yes sir.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Well, here with you is the man responsible for it, Director of the National Naval Medical Center, who we are going to introduce right now. He is Read Adm. Morton D. Willcutts, Commanding Officer of the National Medical Center. Admiral Willcutts.

Admiral WILLCUTTS. Mr. Brinkley, the Naval Medical Center is humble and feels keenly the privilege of extending our medical facilities to our brothers in arms, sick and wounded, from the distant battlefields.

Mr. BRINKLEY. About how many do you have, Admiral?

Admiral WILLCUTTS. At the minute we have over 30 Army men from Korea and more coming in.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Tell me, what are these jugs and bottles here?

Admiral WILLCUTTS. We have in these bottles a new development that I am very pleased to report on. You understand the blood plasma bank?

Mr. BRINKLEY. The blood bank; yes.

Admiral WILLCUTTS. We are developing a new human tissue preservation, the bone bank, the skin bank, and the blood vessel bank.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Now what's in here?

Admiral WILLCUTTS. That is the container in which we preserve it to ship it overseas, if necessary, or to another hospital, or to any boy at the front.

Mr. BRINKLEY. And these little bottles?

Admiral WILLCUTTS. The little bottles are some specimens of skin and blood vessels and bones.

Mr. BRINKLEY. How do you use these pieces of bone?

Admiral WILLCUTTS. Well, if you know war wounds, they are often destructive of tissue, wide tissue, and that requires major reconstruction surgery. So when we have a gap, we immediately have available a piece of bone, skin, or blood vessel to use, preserved something very much like blood plasma, immediately available to replace these gaps.

Mr. BRINKLEY. You replace a piece of live bone with another piece of live bone that has been frozen. Well, I thank you very much, Admiral. Now we want to talk to another two or three of your patients over here.

What's your name?

Answer. Pfc. Donald L. Woodie, Institute, W. Va.

Question. What happened to your leg?

Answer. I was shot by small-arm fire.

Question. Where did this happen?

Answer. Korea.

Question. Are you an air evacuee?

Answer. That's right.

Question. How long did it take?

Answer. Approximately 2 days, 2½ days.

Question. How's the Navy taking care of you?

Answer. Fine.

Question. You don't have to say that just because the admiral is here. It's pretty good?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Well, here's one of your buddies here that we want to talk to. He's a master sergeant.

Question. What's your name?

Answer. My name is Jack Poine.

Question. Where are you from?

Answer. I am from East Bank, W. Va.

Question. And you are from Korea, hit in Korea? What happened to you?

Answer. A tank was firing and I happened to get in the way.

Question. Caught you in the foot. I notice there's a mark in the cast?

Answer. That's where a piece of shrapnel went through my ankle.

Question. I see. Well we hope all of you have a very quick recovery. Do you want to go back to Korea? Or should I ask you?

Answer. Well, my outfit is still over there. If they are going to stay I guess I'll have to go back.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Thank you very much. On the 19 floors in this hospital there are a great many wounded from Korea. Obviously there is a great deal of need for medical care. President Truman just yesterday signed a bill authorizing the Defense Department to draft physicians and dentists. Now we are going to hear from a naval medical officer who you all know of. Now let us hear from Vice Adm. Ross T McIntyre.

Admiral McINTYRE. During the past week President Truman took positive action in signing the bill that established the draft for doctors and scientists. There is no disgrace in this for it is absolutely necessary that we have in the Armed Forces a sufficient number of doctors who can take up the slack that has been so obvious in these past few months.

As we all know, a great number of our young doctors during 1945, 1946, and 1947 had the advantage of free medical training in the various hospitals of the Armed Forces. Many of these young doctors had great opportunity for advanced study, for not only did they have the staffs of hospitals themselves but the consultants who were the finest in the Nation. These men will now have the opportunity to go on following this work that they have done in these institutions and go on to take their places in the field in the various combat organizations, and they will also help fill up the vacancies that now exist. The doctors are doing the job

that they have been asked to do, the quick handling of the wounded, that these men may live.

Mr. McCORMICK. At ten-thirty last night, the headlines featured the North Koreans' new strike at Taegu * * * and focused attention on the two vital highway junctions of Youngchon and Kyongju. Against this backdrop * * * and for the second time within eight days * * * President Truman spoke to the Nation. He told us what we may expect in the way of economic mobilization to match our expanded defense program. Because the President's remarks—perhaps more than anything else—give a hint of "the shape of things to come," Battle Report has prepared for you a special digest of the highlights of that speech—as our announcers put it * * * "Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States * * *."

President TRUMAN. I want to talk with you about what we must do here at home to support our fighting men and to build up the strength which the free world needs to deter Communist aggression.

Our goals are plain.

We must produce the military equipment that is needed.

We should pay for our defense as we go.

We must hold the cost of living steady, and keep down the cost of defense items.

We have been spending about $15,000,000,000 a year for defense. We are stepping up this rate rapidly. By next June, under our present plans, we expect to be spending at the rate of at least $30,000,000,000 a year. In the year after that, we shall probably have to spend much more than $30,000,000,000.

We must do everything we can to expand our total production. This will require harder work and longer hours for everybody. It will mean additional jobs for women and older people.

It means the businessmen should expand productive facilities, develop new techniques, and increase efficiency in every way possible. It means enlarging our capacity to produce basic materials such as steel, aluminum, and copper.

There is only one sensible way to pay for our increased defenses. It is the plain, simple, direct way. We should pay for them as we go, out of taxes.

There are very good reasons for this.

To to the extent that we finance our defense effort out of taxes now, we will avoid an enormous increase in the national debt. Furthermore, if we tax ourselves enough to pay for defense, we will help to hold down prices. Taxation—just an equitable taxation—is the way to distribute the cost of defense fairly. We must carry out the defense program without letting inflation weaken and endanger our free economy.

Everybody would lose if we let inflation do unchecked. Workers would be hurt. The extra dollars in Saturday's pay check would be taken away by the higher prices for Monday's groceries.

The wives and children of our fighting men would be hurt even more. Everybody living on a pension, on retirement benefits, or a fixed income of any kind, would be hurt in the same way.

We must not let these things happen.

The fight against inflation is not just the Government's fight. It is your fight, the fight of all of us, and it can be won only if all of us fight it together.

For the consumer, the guiding principle must be: Buy only what you really need and cannot do without. If every American housewife does this there will be enough of the essentials to go around. But if she buys more than she needs there will not be enough to go around and prices will go up.

For businessmen, the guiding principles must be: Do not pile up inventories; hold your prices down. There is no excuse for price increases which go beyond the amount of cost increases. For wage earners, the guiding principle must be: Do not ask for wage increases beyond what is needed to meet the rise in the cost of living. If wage earners ask for higher and higher wages, they will be driving prices up—all along the line.

The Government is not putting on mandatory ceilings on prices and wages at this time. But we will impose ceilings as vigorously and promptly as the situation calls for them.

I am sure that we will be willing to make sacrifices here at home, if we think of the much greater sacrifices being made by our sons and brothers and husbands who are fighting at the front.

Mr. McCORMICK. To fill what Winston Churchill has called the "hideous gap" in the defense of Europe, last year, 11 nations, America included, bound themselves into the North Atlantic Treaty organization—and signed what is called the Atlantic Pact for mutual defense against the threat that faces us in Europe. This week, in New York, America will play host to its partners, the signatories of the Atlantic Treaty, who will meet following an important conference of the west's big three foreign ministers. To sketch the significance of these meetings, we now present to you a man who is daily concerned with the strategy of international relations—the legal advisor to the Secretary of State—Mr. Adrian Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. You have seen and heard the heroic sacrifies which our men are making for us in Korea. You have heard of the steps that are being taken to see that they get the best medical care. You have heard the President of the United States tell us what is going to be done to back them up here at home. What I would like to talk to you about is what the Department of State is going to do in the next few weeks in the big job that faces us all, to see that these sacrifices are not made in vain. On Tuesday our Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, will meet with the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. Ernest Bevin, and Mr. Robert Schuman, Foreign Minister of France. The problems they face are without precedence. I can say simply that every discussion in this meeting between the foreign ministers at New York will revolve around this one central issue, "How Can We Best Meet the Threat of Communist Aggression?" Later in the week, these three men will join the representatives of the other countries which have signed the North Atlantic Treaty. We and our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty are convinced that the best defense against aggression is strength, strength which can be quickly summoned and unmistakably recognized. To achieve that strength and to achieve it quickly the United States and its partners in the North Atlantic Pact are engaged in a great effort to develop balanced collective forces. The President of the United States has indicated that we are prepared to increase substantially the United States forces stationed in Europe. We will expect comparable efforts by our North Atlantic partners so that our contributions together will result in real strength and security. On Tuesday the 19th, the circle widens. As the General Assembly of the United Nations opens its meeting, there we will have again the town meeting of the world where the leading statesmen of 59 countries will meet to work for peace. All of these countries by adhering to the United Nations Charter have solemnly resolved to unite their strength to maintain international peace and security. In this larger meeting, which many of you will possibly follow on the radio and on television, there will be one discordant note. You will find the Soviet and the satellite representatives following the pattern of obstructing the work for peace which has been made so familiar in the United Nations Security Council. It is a good thing that the Communist imperialists should meet with the free world in the General Assembly. It is well that the world should see and hear them trying to obstruct the efforts of the free nations to end the threat of war. It is well that the representatives of Communist imperialism should see at first hand the united determination of the free world to prevent aggression, and to work for peace. Communist aggression has the physical power to disrupt the peace, but the truth is that the free countries, the peoples of the free countries, and the plain men and women who live behind the iron curtain want peace. By remaining united and by increasing their determination and strength, the free countries of the world can make this universal human wish come true.

Mr. McCORMICK. Thus the Nation, America—as top Federal and defense officials have come before you to report—moves into the twelfth week of war in Korea. And the latest headlines, that reflect that war.

HEADLINES

Communist troops apparently are squaring away for another smash at Taegu, the anchor point of our defense line, on the northwest corner. The Reds are drilling away with a heavy barrage, on our positions about 5 miles north of Taegu. United Nations military men are convinced it's the first step, of a big offensive, so they squared themselves away as best they could and waited for it to hit. Our answering artillery fire was fairly light.

Around Pohang, the second best port we had in Korea—around Pohang, we were forced to retreat but spokesmen deny emphatically that we have lost the Pohang airport, as claimed by the Reds.

Air work has again been held down by weather, but over the week end began to pick up; but the lull was long enough to give the Commies a chance to move fresh supplies up to the front.

And aside on the news: American military men tell us that they've liberated 73 South Koreans, who had been captured by the Reds, forced to fight, with North Korean troops.

Mr. McCORMICK. But even as we hear these headlines, let us not forget the vision of faith of our forefathers who welded our Thirteen Original Colonies into the democratic system for which we are fighting. Author Paul Green has captured that vision for us in his stirring symphonic drama, Faith of Our Fathers, now being enacted here in the Nation's Capital under the auspices of the Washington Sesquicentennial Commission. To Laurence Ryle who performs the leading role of George Washington in Faith of Our Fathers, we turn now for the final words of that play and this battle report.

"GEORGE WASHINGTON. Today there is rising in the east a dictatorship of tyranny and oppression. The hopes of men there are perishing, the people all over the earth are looking toward us as guardians of the rights they are losing. We must keep those rights safe and inviolate here until the blessed day when they can share them, for it we do not stand ready to fight for these principles, giving our very lives if necessary, then our struggle is in vain. The hopes of men will perish and the light of liberty will go out, engulfing the sons and daughters that come after us. Freedom, justice, truth among men—this is our dream, this our faith forever more, and that dream shall not die."

Mr. McCORMICK. Until we point our cameras upon the Nation next week for another teledocumentary—this, then, against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your fifth—Battle Report, Washington.

Diplomatic Immunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Peter Campbell Brown, Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, before the insurance section of the American Bar Association at the Hotel Willard, Washington, D. C., on September 19, 1950:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the insurance section, fellow members of the American Bar Association, ladies, and gentlemen, I deem it a high honor and distinct privilege to be here this morning to participate with you in the discussion of the doctrine of diplomatic immunity, a subject not often encountered in the average lawyer's general practice, but one which bids fair to occupy us much more frequently with the passing of time.

It should be noted at the outset of such a discussion that we are dealing with individuals who comprise that class which is known generally as the diplomatic corps and to whom the general rules of civil conduct do not apply. In order to further appreciate the reasons for such special treatment we must briefly survey the historical background of the doctrine.

The practice can be traced to the nether reaches of history and carries through to the present because it has proved to be essential to the conduct of international relations. In ancient times, rulers, whether patriarchs, kings, or emperors, were each regarded by their subjects as the veritable fountainheads of all rules of conduct or law. Each ruler, in his own domain, was not subject to the law but was himself the guardian or patron of the law. So, also, he was the dispenser of justice within his realm and each subject could seek the ruler's opinion or advice touching upon the rights and duties of the individual subject under the law. Thus the phrase, "The king can do no wrong," came into general use. As the population of a particular political subdivision increased so that the king could not personally hear and determine every matter brought to his attention, it became necessary for him to deputize his authority to chancelors, magistrates, or judges, who would, in the ruler's stead, hear and determine the rights of the subjects under the precepts of the law.

It frequently came to pass that some rulers would meet with other rulers to discuss the problems which were mutual to the domain of each. As each ruler was supreme insofar as his subjects were concerned, the laws of neither country could apply to any ruler. This is the basic origin of the concept of sovereign immunity wherein each ruler was accorded abroad the same privileges and immunities which he enjoyed at home.

As time went on and with the increase in commerce between the peoples of the world, it was not always possible for sovereigns to continue to meet face to face to discuss various matters. Too, it was often not politic for one sovereign to leave his own domain in order to travel to the land of another lest he return later to find a usurper in his place. It thus became necessary for the rulers to send out deputies or agents to conduct such negotiations as might be necessary. In all respects each of these individuals represented their respective sovereigns strictly in accord with specific instructions given them by the ruler of each, and they were known as legates, nuncios, envoys, ministers, or ambassadors. Since they were commissioned by their rulers to act for them in a representative capacity of the highest order, they were accorded the prerogatives, privileges, and immunities which were enjoyed by their masters.

The envoy was thus regarded as a sacred individual and treated as though he were the ruler who had never left his own country. This was formerly, and is in many countries today, referred to as the privilege of extraterritoriality. The envoy was considered to embody the head of the state from whence he came and was regarded as the personification of the ruler himself. The primary purpose of immunity, however, was to grant the envoy complete freedom of action in the advancement of his representative functions, by relieving him of the fear of transgressing the law. It is most desirable that he be permitted to discharge his responsibilities unfettered and free of the possibility of harassment and indignities. On the basis of reciprocity, privileges and immunities are the accepted means by which the normal functioning of diplomatic intercourse is assured.

Thus in the concept of the law of nations there became established the doctrine of diplomatic immunity. This idea of diplomatic immunity was a part of the law of nations or international comity for many centuries although never reduced to writing. Each nation adhered strictly to the unwritten code and exercised only the right to expel an ambassador or one of his retinue if such an individual were ever to become offensive.

While there has never been a written international code embodying this doctrine, we do find occasional reference to the subject such as, for example, in the body of the ancient written law, like the code of Hammurabi, but those references have been somewhat scant as to the extent to which the privilege obtained.

In the thirteenth century (1263 A. D.) we find the subject was not neglected by the compilers of the Lao Siete Partidas, or the seven parts of the law of Spain, since in part VII, title XXV, law IX, appears the following:

"Envoys frequently come from the land of the Moors and other countries to the court of the King, and although they may come from the enemy's country and by his order, we consider it proper and we direct that every envoy who comes to our country, whether he be Christian, Moor, or Jew, shall come and go in safety and security through all our dominions, and we forbid anyone to do him violence, wrong, or harm, or to injure his property.

"Moreover, we decree that although an envoy who visits our country may owe a debt to some man in our dominions, which was contracted before he came on the mission, he shall not be arrested or brought into court for it; but if he should not be willing to pay any debts which he contracted in our country after he came on the mission, suit can be brought against him for them, and he can be compelled to pay them by a judgment of court."

In 1708, in England, several turbulent and disorderly persons in the town of London took occasion to seize upon the ambassador extraordinary of his czarist majesty, the Emperor of Great Russia, taking him out of his droshky in the public street and detaining him for several hours in a place of confinement. Her Majesty, Queen Anne, upon being told of this indignity to a diplomat, called upon the lords spiritual and temporal of the British Parliament, and caused to be enacted a law for preserving the privileges of ambassadors and other public ministers of foreign princes and states. On the basis of this British statute, the United States enacted laws for the protection of diplomats in the year 1790, which laws are still in force and effect. They are contained in sections 252–255 of title 22, United States Code, and are as follows:

"SEC. 252. Suits against ministers and their domestics prohibited.

"Wherever any writ or process is sued out or prosecuted by any person in any court of the United States, or of a State, by any judge or justice, whereby the person of any ambassador or public minister of any foreign prince or State, authorized and received as such by the President, or any domestic or domestic servant of any such minister, is arrested or imprisoned, or his goods or chattels are distrained, seized, or attached, such writ or process shall be deemed void (R. S. sec. 4063).

"SEC. 253. Penalty for wrongful suit.

"Whenever any writ or process is sued out in violation of section 252 of this title, every person by whom the same is obtained or prosecuted, whether as party or as attorney or solicitor, and every officer concerned in executing it, shall be deemed a violator of the laws of nations and a disturber of the public repose, and shall be imprisoned for not more than 3 years and fined at the discretion of the court (R. S., sec. 4064).

"SEC. 254. Exceptions as to suits against servants, etc., of minister; listing servants.

"Sections 252 and 253 of this title shall not apply to any case where the person against whom the process is issued is a citizen or inhabitant of the United States in the service of an ambassador or a public minister and the process is founded upon a debt contracted before he entered upon such service; nor shall section 253 of this title apply to any case where the person against whom the process is issued is a domestic servant of an ambassador or a public minister, unless the name of the servant has, before the issuing thereof, been registered in the Department of State and transmitted by the Secretary of State to the marshal of the District of Columbia, who shall upon receipt thereof post the same in some public place in his office. All persons shall have resort to the list of names so posted in the marshal's office and may take copies without fee (R. S., secs. 4065, 4066).

"SEC. 255. Assaulting, etc., foreign minister.

"Every person who assaults, strikes, wounds, imprisons, or in any other manner offers violence to the person of an ambassador or a public minister, in violation of the law of nations, shall be imprisoned for not more than 3 years and fined, at the discretion of the court" (R. S., sec. 4062).

In recent years, the problem has arisen as to whether this doctrine of diplomatic immunity includes foreign governmental representatives to international conferences, courts or other organizations and bodies who are not generally regarded as diplomats within the meaning of the term "diplomatic immunity." Nevertheless, the functional need for protection, courtesies and immunities exists in such instances as well and, accordingly, such immunity has been extended in the case of such bodies and their officials and employees.

To be sure, prior to 1946, instances did exist where privileges and immunities were, by statute or treaty, accorded to representatives of sovereign states to international organizations. In almost all these cases, the immunity was brought about by according these representatives "diplomatic status." It became apparent, however, that the carte blanche granting of diplomatic privileges and immunities to such persons did not realistically meet the problem, because in some respects diplomatic immunity was too broad, and in other respects too narrow, to meet the needs of a foreign representative to an international body.

It has therefore now become the practice to define the scope of the immunity applicable to such a class more specifically, and to measure it according to the standing and the function of the person on whom it is to be conferred. A typical example is the provision with respect to immunity in the United Nations Charter. Thus, in article 105, chapter 16, subsection 2 of the United Nations Charter it is provided that:

"The organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its members such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the fulfillment of its purposes."

Subsection 2:

"Representatives of the members of the United Nations and officials of the organization shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the organization."

This has been implemented by the General Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, to which the United States of America has not yet acceded, but is expected to do so. This provides that the Secretary General and the Assistant Secretaries General of the United Nations shall enjoy the privileges and immunities, exemptions and facilities accorded to diplomatic envoys in accordance with international law, and representatives of members, in addition to specifically enumerated privileges and immunities, shall enjoy such other privileges, immunities and facilities not inconsistent with the foregoing, as diplomatic envoys enjoy; whereas experts are accorded such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of functions during the periods of their missions, including the time spent on journeys in connection with these missions, and most officials are immune only in respect to acts performed in their official capacity.

Though the United States of America has not acceded to the General Convention, it has adopted the headquarters agreement, which is intended to be complementary to the provisions of the General Convention. The headquarters agreement makes provision for immunities to resident representatives to the United Nations and prohibits the impediment to transit to or from the headquarters district by such resident representatives, officials of the United Nations and certain other specified classes of persons whose attendance at the headquarters is deemed necessary to the proper functioning of the United Nations.

It is interesting to note that it is specifically provided in the General Convention that the immunity shall be waived where "the immunity would impede the courts of justice and can be waived without prejudice to the interest of the United Nations."

A good example of the functional limitation is that employed in the International Organizations Immunities Act, which provides that "representatives of foreign governments in or to international organizations (as defined in the act) and officers and employees of such organizations shall be immune from suit and legal process relating to acts performed by them in their official capacity and falling within their functions as such representatives, officers, or employees, except insofar as such immunity may be waived by the foreign government or the international organization concerned."

It should be observed, however, that diplomatic envoys and their staffs, by virtue of their immunity, are not entitled to break the law or disturb the peace. They must be law-abiding people, but if they do break the law they cannot be punished or made to submit to civil, criminal, or police jurisdiction. When the law is broken by an envoy under the cloak of diplomatic immunity, or if in any manner such diplomat becomes undesirable or objectionable, the receiving state has two remedies:

1. Formal request for recall.
2. Reprisals or retortion.

The procedures for obtaining redress are as follows:

1. Proceed through diplomatic channels first by approaching the offender, This is seldom done.

2. Approach the chief of mission. The offender, if approached by the head of a mission, may be willing to make satisfaction to protect his honor and pride, and to guard against getting a bad reputation and periling his diplomatic career.

3. Approach the foreign office. The second approach is the one generally followed.

The sending state may waive the immunity in which case the diplomat may be sued or prosecuted.

The receiving state may request recall of the diplomat offender. This method has limited application and is followed only where charges are grave and have a nation-wide impact.

Immunity is frequently waived in cases of minor officials involving violations which should be decided on their merits. The United States waived the immunity of one of the staff members in the American Embassy, London, in a case in which the diplomat was sued for breach of promise. In this case the diplomat secured judgment in his favor on the merits of the case. Quite recently the United States waived the immunity of a clerk in the Embassy at London in a suit brought by her landlord on a lease. This case has not yet come to trial and is therefore not here cited.

There are certain rules for the waiver of diplomatic immunity which prevail in different countries. The British, for example, place authority in the chief of mission to waive his own immunity or that of any member of his retinue. The United States, on the other hand, permits none of its diplomatic personnel to waive immunity, but requires them to submit the question of waiver to the Department of State for decision. This determination by the State Department precludes further inquiry by any other tribunal.

Violations of traffic regulations constitute the largest group of violations of law on the part of the diplomatic corps in Washington and this is probably also true of those enjoying diplomatic immunity at the seat of the United Nations in New York.

In replying to an inquiry some years ago by the Attorney General of Maryland, Counselor Polk, of the Department of State, advised that the chauffeur of a foreign minister should be regarded as immune from arrest, whether or not the foreign minister was in the car, and whether or not the chauffeur was driving it for his own pleasure.

It is interesting to note here that it has been held that the diplomatic immunity attaching to a passenger in a taxicab does not protect the driver—a nondiplomat—from prosecution for violating the speed laws. However, a contrary view has also been officially announced, and this latter determination is the more recent decision.

On occasion it has been said that the only employees entitled to protection by virtue of the diplomatic immunities attaching to their employers are those contributing to the performance of their employer's official duties and in an "intimate association with the work of a permanent diplomatic mission."

Where the employment of a person by a foreign diplomat is in such a capacity that such person would be entitled to the immunities attaching to a foreign diplomat the better view seems to be that the immunity will not be lost merely because the employee is a national, provided such employment is not prohibited by law, except in the one case covered by section 254, title 22, U. S. C., i. e., where process is served upon the national because of a debt contracted before he entered into the service of the foreign diplomat.

A distinction has been drawn between immunity from the operation of a law and immunity from prosecution under the law, and, as applied to diplomatic immunity, it is held that the diplomat is immune merely from prosecution while holding the diplomatic rank, and not from the operation of the law, with the result that once the status ceases, he may be prosecuted even for acts performed while he held the diplomatic rank.

It might be parenthetically added that until recently diplomatic immunity caused very slight concern to the United States. The diplomatic corps in Washington, prior to World War II, was an extremely small, compact group; only a very limited number of international organizations were in existence, and the staffs of each were small; the United Nations organization did not yet exist, and its predecessor, the League of Nations, had its headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. In contrast, today the diplomatic corps in Washington has increased immeasurably. This is the result of the creation of several new states and an increase in diplomatic functions brought about by reparations, rehabilitation, military aid and economic assistance, together with the backlog of regular and ordinary functions which had accumulated during the course of World War II.

In addition, the United Nations organization and its specialized agencies have brought to the United States additional delegations, many of the personnel of which being accorded diplomatic privileges and immunities.

The problems arising as a result of administering these privileges and immunities have increased materially, and it is regretted that time does not permit a full discussion of the subject which deals with the protection of diplomatic property and archives, leases, taxation, and insurance. Within our limitation, it is believed that a discussion of the problems arising out of the insurance of diplomats would be of greater interest to those present.

It is only quite recently that any problem has arisen in this field although diplomatic personnel have carried casualty insurance for many years. In most instances in the past where damages were caused by a diplomat in the operation of an automobile, the cases were usually settled without much difficulty and the question of waiver of immunity did not arise. A few months ago, however, a serious accident occurred here in Washington in which a diplomat was charged with negligence, which he admitted. He felt, however, that since he had insurance coverage there would be no difficulty. As the investigation progressed it became apparent that the damage caused would far exceed the amount of coverage in the policy. As a consequence, the insurance carrier was hesitant to make any settlement until all parties damaged had been investigated. At this stage of proceedings the attorney for one plaintiff sought the good offices of the Department of State to secure a waiver of diplomatic immunity, but such waiver could not be obtained. The policy contained a legal liability clause. At this point it occurred to someone that selling a legal liability policy to a diplomat who, while under immunity, could not be subjected to the jurisdiction of a tribunal to determine legal liability, was a practice not to be condoned and one that should be discontinued. Most of the casualty companies agreed that this was true and many now refuse to insure diplomats on such a policy without first obtaining a waiver of humanity. The case under discussion has since been settled and, I believe, for an amount somewhat in excess of the total coverage.

In the case of *Dickenson* v. *Del Solar*, the First Secretary of the Peruvian Legation in London was sued for injuries caused by the negligent operation of a motor vehicle. The Chief of Mission at the Peruvian Legation in London notified the court that the First Secretary's immunity was waived, and the Secretary thereupon sought to invoke the third party liability of his insurance carrier. The carrier defended on the grounds that (a) the First Secretary was not legally liable and (b) that, having permitted his immunity to be waived, the insurance company was discharged. The Court, however, held that the First Secretary was not immune from the law, but only from the jurisdiction of the courts and therefore, was at all times legally liable for his culpable negligence, and secondly, that the First Secretary's immunity having been waived by his superior officer, the Secretary had done nothing which would discharge the carrier from liability.

In a similar case in New York, involving a delegate to the United Nations, the delegate's government waived his immunity. The insurance carrier then sought to stand on the immunity on the ground that the carrier might avail itself of any defense which the insured might have. In this case, which had not reached the court, the Department of State notified the legal adviser of the United Nations that the plea of diplomatic immunity was not a defense since it was to the jurisdiction and not to the merits. Following this the case was settled without litigation.

Lately, there has been a hue and cry in the United States against the application of the doctrine of diplomatic immunity under any circumstances. It therefore appears necessary to present some defense of the system. In the first place, the size of the class which enjoys diplomatic immunity is extremely small. Moreover, there has been a minimum of abuse by those who enjoy the privilege. Most of the cases are adjusted to the satisfaction of all. Besides, the functions of diplomats would be difficult, if not well nigh impossible, of performance, if such immunities were not granted. It would seem that there is every reason for a continuance of the system without change. It is based upon the law of nations and it is reciprocal. We of the United States give no more than we receive since our American diplomats in foreign countries are accorded like privileges and immunities. Without such immunities the United States representatives in foreign service would be unable to function in many countries, and I am certain that all of us readily appreciate the importance of their work in the present state of world affairs.

Social-Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that many of my associates here in the House are concerned as I am at cuts made on the social-security items in the appropriation bill today. Many of us are much concerned because the Social Security Administration, which has an excellent record for a very minimum administrative cost, has had its appropriation to administer the social-security amendments that we approved this session cut in half.

There is nc one in the administration who feels that the job can be done on any lower per capita basis than is now being done. Since Congress passed these social-security amendments and has made commitments to an additional 10,000,000 people who will come under the Social Security Act and to others who will be brought in by the new start and who will also receive the protection of this law, can it be assumed that the Social Security Administration has the authority of Congress to proceed with the administration of this law as economically as possible but still if it finds that $8,000,000 will not do the job can they go right ahead and carry out the program as intended and come back to Congress for money when it runs out?

When we passed the social-security amendments we extended the old-age and survivors insurance program to 10,000,000 more people and about a million more survivors but now we are proposing to appropriate only one-half the funds that are needed by the Social Security Commissioner to carry out our intention.

The Congress practically doubled the Federal grants for the States' health programs for mothers and children and the services for crippled children; it tripled the child-welfare grants for States. Now we are proposing to deny any interest in seeing that these programs actually get underway for we provide no money whatsoever to the Children's Bureau for administering these additional grants.

In addition, Congress voted to provide more adequate assistance to dependent children, and now we are planning to appropriate less than 20 percent of the funds needed to administer this program.

We are proposing to save a small amount of money by a means which will adversely affect a large number of children and old people whose families had a right to assume that we meant what we did when we passed the amendments to the Social Security Act.

The American Citizen Must Not Surrender One of His Few Remaining Birthrights—To Locate and Secure Title to Mining Claims on the Public Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, ever since the days of Harold L. Ickes as Secretary of the Interior there has been a sustained effort by some of the Government departments to secure a revision of the mining laws and substitute a mine-leasing system for the present laws that give an American citizen the right to go upon public land, including the national-forest land, and prospect for mineral deposits and locate and patent mining claims.

These proposed changes in our mining laws were the subject of the hearing in the Spokane meeting of the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee on October 17 and 18, 1949.

My response to an invitation to address the meeting is inserted herewith:

Mr. GOLDBY. I'd like at this time to call upon Congressman WHITE for a statement. I asked and Congressman WHITE kindly consented to have himself put on the agenda for the meeting, and he has consented to present a statement at this time. Congressman WHITE.

Congressman WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful to you and appreciate your splendid courtesy in permitting me to participate in the meeting and ask the questions I have, because they come before us all the time in the committee. Nothing can go through Congress, in dealing with mines and land, unless it goes through our committee. If we stop it, it stops.

You know, I believe it was Mr. Dooley that said Uncle Sam bet you $13.50 you can't live on 160 acres of land for 5 years without starving to death. Then there's another saying that more money has been put into the ground in mining than has ever been taken out. Now, all I want to do as your Representative of Idaho and the rest of the Northwest is to see that the common fellow, the fellow that's struggling along, looking for an opportunity, gets a square deal. We have a number of birthrights. Some of us with gray heads, when we were born, had more birthrights than we have today. We had the right to go out and locate, if we could find an unappropriated piece of public land, whether it had timber on it or not; we had the birthright of homesteading and acquired it and living on it and developing the country. Today we haven't that right. I was in Congress when the Public Lands Committee passed the Taylor Grazing Act, which abrogated the homestead law. You can no longer squat on a piece of land and take it; you must get it classified and get permission, or you'll never get the land. There are very few classifications going on today.

I can take you down in Idaho through the beautiful Bear Valley, beautiful grassland and pretty brooks going through it, and the law plainly states if you want to locate a piece of land more valuable for agriculture than for timber you have that right. They've first got to classify it, but you try to get the Forest Service to classify any part of it as more valuable. In that big valley it's one of the most productive grazing areas in the State of Idaho; it's used for sheep under the administration of the Forest Service, and they're hanging on to it. It's all right, but it could make nice homesteads.

But I think our system in the wisdom of the Congress and the men that passed that law, in 1872 they revised the mining law. Prior to that time a mining claim was only 10 acres or 300 feet wide, then they revised the law and made it 600 feet wide. Presumably or theoretically, you locate a vein; as near as you can, you stake it out in such a way you have 300 feet on each side of the vein and 1,500 feet up and down, and you make your discovery where you select, and you can either have most of your claim below it or above it. That's up to you.

Now, as between the system we have here and the fruits of our policy in developing this country, and the system in the South American countries, where you can get a concession for so many thousands of acres, some big company, or the system in Russia where the poor humble Russian uncovers a vein of gold—he has no incentive to uncover it; he just covers it up; it belongs to the Czar—I think our system is the best ever devised. It provides, if you found a mine or the outcrop of a vein and you think there might be

a chance to develop a mine, you could stake it out, 20 acres, by doing 10 feet of discovery work, putting up your stakes, and you have, if I remember right, 60 days to do the work and 30 days to do the filing after that; in all, 90 days. Each year you must go back and do $100 worth of work.

Now, that's pretty heavy expense to own a piece of ground, to do $100 worth of work every year. Then, if you want to own it, you must pay $5 an acre, and you must bear the cost of the patent survey, and most of those mining claims are located where there was no Government sections or survey; so you had to tie it in as best you could by metes and bounds; and it's all provided in the law, you must get a competent man to survey it, and it will cost you, I'm told today, about $500 to obtain a mining patent to a mining claim.

Now, there's great stress on the timber. Most mining claims are not where there is any; they're not down in the heavily wooded Olympic Peninsula. A great many of the claims are where the timber is scarce and needed. You can't do much with a mining claim unless you have timber to timber up your underground workings, and then you must have some buildings and other equipment. If you develop a mining claim you'll need every stick of timber on that claim, and a lot of the surrounding timber, and I want to say this to you from experience: That if you and I went out today and found a fine deposit or outcrop of good rich ore, and the mining engineer comes along and gives you every assurance that it was a fine mine, you'll have to put down $200,000 before you can equip that mine and put it into production. Now, if you think that isn't true, try it. You'll have a mill—that costs a thousand dollars per ton capacity to build a mill. You'll have tunnels; you'll have equipment. I doubt if you could put a mine into production today, no matter how convenient and good it was, and how rich, for less than $300,000.

Just remember that, and the main thing that I am struggling for, and I say struggling, because I've been sitting on the committee and seen these gentlemen from the departments come in with their theories, their college theories, if you please; they have never been out and dug a tunnel, or as I've seen them, hew rails out of poles in the woods, and covered them with strap iron, to lay a track in a tunnel and cover the wooden wheels of a home-made mine car with rawhide, and stand there 10 hours a day windlassing up that rock; when you sink a shaft by hand, they've never done that; they don't know anything about what these men that go forth, these prospectors, and find something, stake their claims and think they've got a fortune, go through; they live in isolated countries, make their own bread, rustle some meat, cut their wood, build a cabin, and it's a hard life and today the prospectors are dying off. There was many a good American citizen imbued with hope and expecting to win a fortune as others have in the fastness of the mountains.

You know, I live up here, in north Idaho, I never knew, living in Idaho, living in a mining State, very much about what we have in central Idaho in the way of mining. I lived up there just over the hills from the Coeur d'Alenes mining district where the prospectors flocked in there in the early days, built their cabins, dug their tunnels, none of them ever got anything out of it; the depression hit them in 1893 and they faded out of the picture. In later years I've run across editors and college men down there in central Idaho that have gone in there before Teddy Roosevelt withdrew land and threw it into a forest. I'll go into Dixie with you, on the Divide beyond Elk City, Idaho City. I didn't know there was such a country, and I didn't know there was such men in there waiting for the Forest Service to do something to open up the country. The Forest Service have their laboratories; they study the culture of grass, and they'll spend millions of dollars promulgating the improvement of the range. What do they get? Two and a half cents an acre a year from grazing land.

They've got in central Idaho all this lodgepole pine—most of it scrub timber that the lumber companies can't use and don't want and are not interested in—that would make ideal mining timber. I have letters on my desk where men have gone in and located a mine, developed their ore, and asked for roads, and I have letters from the Forest Service telling me it's set aside as a primitive area, and they can't build roads in there. That's the big country south of the Salmon River, where Buffalo Hump, Seven Devils, Artillery Dome, and the Thunder Mountain, and many other mining districts are located. We've got an empire down in central Idaho that we should pay a little attention to. Just as the Forest Service propagates grass and has a big laboratory back in Wisconsin to study every little thing about timber, let's do something for mining. There may be more value, more wealth, more tax revenue under those hills than there ever will be on their surface.

When I was a boy and got my first job in the sawmill at Bonner, Mont., in the railroad office back in 1897, we were shipping 10 to 20 cars of timber a day to the Butte mines, one of the richest hills on earth, they said. Today, after all these years have rolled around, there's still 10 or 20 cars of timber going into the Butte mines every day from the mills at Bonner. It's the best market for timber and nearby farm products we've got. Let us develop our mining industry and build up our markets right here at home.

The best thing that ever happened to little Idaho Falls, one of the most prosperous and prettiest cities we have in Idaho, was the building of a direct rail connection into Butte, which gave an outlet for their products, turkeys, chickens, potatoes—everything they can raise. The Butte mines have made a beautiful and prosperous city out of Idaho Falls. I've been trying to hammer the fact home to these Forest Service fellows that if they want to develop their timber, and develop a domestic market for it right here at home, let's develop our mines.

Dr. Thomson, who used to be the head of our mining school, now president of the Butte School of Mines, wrote some very splendid articles on the Idaho mineral veins and big mineralized dikes and low-grade gold deposits in central Idaho. I, your Congressman, in an effort to convince Chief Forester Silcox, of the Forest Service, that he should do something for mining, went to the library of the Bureau of Mines and got copies of the engineering and mining juornals from the files containing Dr. Thomson's articles and laid them on the desk of Mr. Silcox, the Chief Forester, to convince the Forest Service they had values underground as well as on top of the ground, and that we had something to develop in our mountains that would make Idaho great and build up the Northwest.

We have got to get a change of policy, gentlemen, from the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, if we are to develop our country. We must keep the door of opportunity open to our citizens. We want to keep hope alive in the breast of the fellow getting a start in the world. We want to tell him if he goes forth and finds minerals on the public land it's going to be his.

Leasing: Where would we get with the development of our mining resources if we left it to a leasing program? That puts me in mind of the policy of the Standard Oil Co. They do little prospecting. They let you do the wildcatting, and when you strike oil they come in and buy it. So it is with mining. You can do the prospecting, and take the chance of developing a new mine, and after you get that ore, the big companies will come in. You can do as Tommy Cruse did at Marysville, near Helena, Mont. I told the story of Tommy Cruse on the floor of the House, and the Washington papers printed it, something they rarely do for a new Member of Congress. We are told that Cruse drove 900 feet before he struck the ore. Old Tom drove that tunnel single-handed and alone, only stopping when supplies gave out to earn a grubstake, and return to his work. He had no money to patent his mining claim. All he could do was hammer away, driving his drills into hard rock and labor to extend his tunnel day by day.

What would the Forest Service and mining fraternity say if Tom was doing that work today? People were skeptical even then, and chalked on the door of his tunnel "Cruse's Folly." And then what happened? When Tommy hit the Drumlummon vein he hit it rich. Tom always wanted a million dollars. He wanted to be a millionaire. We are told that Tom Carter, an enterprising young lawyer in Helena, afterward, Senator Carter, sold the Drumlummon for Tom for a million dollars. So Tommy got his million. But Carter was thoughtful enough to retain a sixteenth interest in the mine for old Tom, and he got more out of his sixteenth interest than he got out of his million. Then Tom wanted to be a banker, and started a little bank in Helena. In those days, when I was a boy, during the time my father was a railroad agent, the railroad remitted all its cash receipts to the First National Bank of Helena, and a good many people got the idea that the First National Bank of Helena, because it was a railroad bank, couldn't go broke. But the depression of 1893 hit, and all the banks went under, including the First National Bank with its railroad deposits.

The depositors started a run on Tommy Cruse's bank. He went to the vaults and set the gold up in trays and said, "Come and get it." This stopped the run and made financial history in western Montana.

There's a lot of romance in mining, and I'm wondering if these gentlemen ever recall the days when a few men developed the Hercules Mine in Idaho's Burke Canyon, and how far these pioneer individuals would get in acquiring title to the Hercules property under the changes in the mining laws being posed here.

These pioneer mining men, who developed the fabulous Hercules Mine, were E. W. Hutton, a railroad engineer on the railroad run between Missoula and Wallace; the three Day brothers, running a little feed store at Wardner; F. M. Rothrock, a butcher; Cardoner, a Portuguese merchant; Dad Reeves, a barber; and August Paulsen, a dairyman whose sister, a schoolteacher, we are told, put in her money to help drive the tunnel that opened the great Hercules ore body that produced $88,000,000 worth of ore, and paid $22,000,000 in dividends. It is reported that when they encountered the ore, they didn't recognize what they had in their vein—a white substance that some old miners told them was carbonate of lead. We are told that when they got into the vein the ore was so rich in the Hercules mine that they got around the efforts of the local smelters to freeze them out when they refused to buy their ore, by making shipments of crude ore to Swansee, England, and to Belgium, which paid handsomely and soon put these pioneers on their feet and enabled them to finance the development of their mine. The Hercules later provided the money to build many of the beautiful office buildings that grace the streets of the neighboring metropolis of Spokane, Wash.

The ore in the Hercules Mine might still be lying dormant if the Government departments had applied the rules to mining that they seek to impose on us today.

I want to report to you a little further. As you know, as a result of my retirement from Congress for a term, I went to the foot of the class on my return to the Public Lands Committee and the Mining Subcommittee, and have little to say about conducting the affairs of these committees.

The strategic metals procurement program now being put through by the Munitions Board and the manipulations of the metals market by the big fellows doesn't look good to me.

This stockpiling program was first proposed by the late Senator Jim Scrugham, former Governor of Nevada, in a program to stabilize our mining markets and help our domestic mining industry by getting the Government to buy and stockpile strategic metals so that we would be prepared in case of war and would have the strategic metals that we can't produce domestically, bought and piled up ready for use. Senator Scrugham worked for the adoption of this plan persistently and continuously. On week ends down in his summer home on Chesapeake Bay he would invite admirals and generals and occasionally I and others, always talking stockpiling. And then he would have meetings in his office and invite Director Finch and later Dr. Sayer of the Bureau of Mines to confer with the generals and admirals and talk stockpiling.

Now old Jim is gone and we have the stockpiling program under way, financed with an appropriation of over a billion dollars. And now what is being done? A Munitions Board, comprising the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, has been set up. And how is it being managed? They went to the Du Ponts of Wilmington, Del., and borrowed Mr. Carpenter to manage the stockpiling purchase program for the Munitions Board, and the next thing we knew, by manipulating the market, lead went to 21½ cents a pound, and copper, zinc, antimony, and the rest of the nonferrous metals followed suit, and we soon heard talk about the high prices and the scarcity of domestically produced metals which couldn't be obtained in the United States and the Government would have to go outside the country to get the metals for stockpiling. It appears that purchases were made in Mexico, Canada, South America, Africa, everywhere but here, under long-term contracts at high prices.

Realizing the adverse effect of this procurement program of foreign-produced metals, coupled with the heavy importations of nonferrous metals being made by the Economic Cooperation Administration, the Mines and Mining Subcommittee, of which I am a member, endeavored to ascertain something concerning the stockpiling program and its effect on our domestic mining industry, by calling in the Director of the Munitions Board and his assistants for a short session with the committee.

At this hearing, I asked one of the generals in charge of procurement to tell me the percentage of strategic metals being bought in foreign countries, and the percentage being bought in this country, and what do you suppose he said: "I am sorry. For security reasons I can't tell you." This led to quite an argument. It's all in the record. I went on to explain to him that the Bureau of Mines was getting out data publicizing our mining and metal reserves, and that I didn't think that revealing what was in the stockpile would be any more dangerous to be known by a potential enemy than our domestic metal reserves. But we were given no information concerning the purchase of foreign-produced metals. The members of the committee and the chairman seemed satisfied to let the Director and his assistants get by with their evasions.

When the bill for the ECA came through, the Marshall plan, there was a clause in the bill providing for stockpiling; a provision that earmarked 5 percent of all the money appropriated for the procurement of critical materials. When you read that provision you would naturally think of rubber and other strategic materials not produced in this country, but the money was used mainly to purchase lead, zinc, and copper and other nonferrous metals.

ECA brought in Mr. Evans Just from New York, and they've got a whole building down there on Pennsylvania Avenue filled with his assistants, and they are buying and bringing in this copper, lead, and zinc and other nonferrous metals from foreign countries for stockpiling in this country. At the hearings, I got out of them that the earmarked money out of the first ECA appropriation amounted to $192,000,000, and they were using this money to build up foreign mining industries. The Strategic Metals Division of ECA has divided their appropriation into two funds, one a development fund and the other a procurement fund. We learned that out of the development fund, they are advancing money to build mining roads, develop mines, and build smelters. They are financing the opening of manganese deposits in Madagascar in Africa. We were very much surprised to learn that ECA is using our money to develop lead mines in French Morocco. They are not only buying the lead produced there but are financing two American companies, the Newmont Mining Co. and the St. Joseph Lead Co. in developing French Morocco lead mines.

We are told that two mining funds have been set up by ECA to finance this Morocco lead-mine development program. One a fund of $1,500,000 and the other a fund of $3,500,000. The French don't permit these American companies to operate on their own; they must operate as a minority interest in the French mining company.

We also learned that ECA is building a smelter in France and another in Italy with our money.

We have just made another ECA appropriation, and it still carries the 5 percent for the procurement of strategic materials, which is another $192,000,000 to be spent by the Strategic Metals Division of ECA. Is it any wonder that our mines are shutting down all over the country, particularly our lead, copper, and zinc mines?

Having been retired in the election of 1946, I am now at the foot of the class in the Mining Committee of which I am a member, and have little to say about conducting the affairs of the committee. If I had my old job as chairman of the main Public Lands Committee and the subcommittees, I would bring those fellows to committee hearings and get to the bottom of their procurement program until I found out what they were doing, and how far they intended to go in wrecking our mining industry.

Gentlemen, in considering our mining program and the policies of our Government, I want to keep the door of opportunity open to the common fellow. This leasing scheme would simply deprive the ordinary citizen of his birthright to locate, own, and develop a mine if he can find one on public land, and give the advantage in developing our mining resources to the big companies.

An issue has been made of the pitifully small amount of timber that some prospector might cut in developing his claim, as in the case of Jack Moore in his efforts to develop the Oro Grande mining property in central Idaho. When he cut the timber for three mining claims to build the flume and mill on the Oro Grande property, the Government came in and penalized him triple damages for the timber they cut.

Our mining industry has a lot to contend with. One of them is the attitude of the Forest Service. There's a classic in this record, and I'm glad it's there; the statement made by the game commissioner, which will be quoted back and forth in Washington many times. He simply stated the attitude of the departments, rehearsing a story I've heard in committees over and over again, pounded into these Members from Florida, Oklahoma, Alabama, and other farming States. They don't know much about mining when they come to Congress, and many of them believe everything that's told them by the representatives of the Government bureaus. Mining bills are drawn over in the departments and handed to the chairman, and then introduced, and bear his name. The department heads act as they did in introducing the Taylor Grazing Act. They work to put their legislative schemes across on the Congress, and sometimes there are jokers in the bill that you don't catch until after the bill is passed and has become law.

There are many things that I would like to talk about from my experiences of 16 years in Washington. I have been fighting the tide and working steadily to keep the door of opportunity open to the prospector and the miner.

One of the most pathetic things in mining that has ever come to my attention, a thing that would make a good Saturday Evening Post story, is the history of the prospectors and their claims way up in the mountain fastness on the Divide between the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers at Dixie, Idaho. These hardy pioneers followed the placer miners and staked their claims on the big, low-grade gold-dike veins that abound in that isolated region. Louie Larson, one of their number, had the good fortune to locate his claim on a small vein of free-milling gold ore, and was able by hand methods and the use of a primitive Mexican arrasta to mine the freegold in his vein. It might be explained that a Mexican arrasta is a circular, stone-lined pit with a post in the center, to which was attached a sweep for a horse to pull around and drag the big boulders chained to the sweep over the gold-bearing ore that had been dumped into the arrasta until the ore is ground fine enough to release the gold which can then be washed and amalgamated.

It is reported that by the use of these primitive methods, Louie Larson took out over $50,000 in gold in working this claim over the years, while his neighbors, with their claims staked on big veins of low-grade, refractory gold ore had to content themselves with holding their claims and doing their annual assessment work year after year, earning money for their subsistence as best they could, waiting for the country to open up and capital to come in to develop their big, low-grade mining properties.

While Louie Larson has been growing old and making some money by his mining operations, these other old gray heads have been dropping off, one by one, and are buried over on the hillside in the little cemetery at Dixie, and Louie out of compassion takes his worn-out arrasta stones and chisels their names to mark their graves—"Buried hopes and buried opportunities," because the country is locked up and neglected by the Forest Service. You couldn't get a road in there to save your soul. I know, because I have tried it. An old friend of mine, a lumberman, took me back to see the Thunder Mountain country and told me this story, of the trials and efforts of the prospectors in this vast mountain region to interest their Government and the Forest Service in opening up the country for development. We went as far as we could in automobiles to the end of the road, and had to finish the trip by riding on horseback the last 10 miles to the Thunder Mountain country and the surrounding low-grade gold mines.

We were told that the Washington office of the Forest Service some years before had allocated the money to build the road down to the Sunnyside mine, a famous early-day mining property on Thunder Mountain. It

seems that the owner had been a little critical of the dilatory tactics of the Forest Service, and the supervisor in charge of the area in retaliation for the criticism, used the money to construct the road into the country to the top of the Divide and then turned off to a dead end miles off in the other direction where it did no good to anyone, leaving the miners and their property isolated and without any access except by pack train.

Observations and experiences of this kind have something to do with the sort of questions I have been asking these gentlemen.

Over on the Snake River we have in the Seven Devils district admittedly one of the richest copper areas in the Northwest. Could I get a road into that country? Ever since I have been in Congress I have been trying to get access roads built into that country, but the Seven Devils region is as primitive and isolated today as it was when Teddy Roosevelt withdrew all that country and put it under the control of the Forest Service. There is a real man's job for your Congressman in Washington, and I have been trying to fill it. Thank you.

Mr. GOLDY. Thank you very much, Congressman WHITE.

Our Farm Legislation Needs an Overhaul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is very unfortunate that the Eighty-first Congress has not seen fit to enact legislation which would clarify and correct the complete muddle which exists in the farm legislation picture at present.

Many of the faults in the present program can be traced to the Eightieth Congress; some are merely the result of changing picture in regard to certain commodities and support prices. It remains for the next Congress to do all in its power to correct the glaring inadequacies of the present laws.

The so-called potato scandal of this past spring, plus the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has vast quantities of many commodities stored all over the country clearly point up the fact that we need new laws in the price support field.

The growing public reaction against excessive Government storage of commodities is proof that we need a farm plan which will allow for the natural consumption of most of our most abundant commodities. The bulk of the annual crop of each perishable commodity should be allowed to reach the market and have its retail price determined by the law of supply and demand. At the same time, the farmer is certainly entitled to a fair price for his crop and he should be guaranteed such a price if the market price does not bring it.

The present muddle exacts an unfair toll on some groups of farmers. A good example is the squeeze which hits dairy and poultry farmers. Their products bring prices determined on the open market, but their feed, which is their biggest expense, is supported at a high level.

These and other inequities should and must be corrected for the good of our economy and I only regret that this Congress has not acted on the matter.

Defense of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Evening Star of September 19, 1950:

BRITAIN, FRANCE WANT EUROPE DEFENDED, BUT AT EXPENSE OF AMERICAN MANPOWER

(By Constantine Brown)

Britain and France, our principal allies in Europe, want to eat their cake and have it, too. They want Europe defended against the Russians, but they do not want to tax their own resources and do not want anybody but the United States to provide the bulk of the manpower.

Secretary of State Acheson made positive suggestions for the integration of a German military force into the over-all defense of Europe. Before the western Big Three foreign ministers met in New York there were indirect approaches by the military for the inclusion of Spain in the over-all program to resist eastern aggression. But the French and British Governments remained adamant against it.

The members of the North Atlantic Alliance admit frankly that they cannot, for domestic political and other reasons, provide manpower for the ground force to oppose the vast Russian and satellite armies.

NEED 60 DIVISIONS

The original optimistic estimate that 25 ground divisions would suffice to stop an eastern onslaught were drastically revised after the outbreak of the Korean war.

The top-ranking officers of the Atlantic Alliance calculate that we shall need at least 60 divisions to do the job.

The growing threat from Russia has worried the people of continental Europe. Soon after hostilities started in Korea there was a clamor for increased American military forces in Germany. The French requested at least 5 additional divisions. They were right. The recent allied war games in Germany under the supervision of Gen. Mark Clark showed that present allied strength there is totally inadequate to cope with an attack from the east.

Factual reports from military specialists led our Government to recommend that the western Germans be rearmed as a part of the over-all defense plan. It was estimated in Washington that a German army of 60,000 men as a starter would greatly bolster our chances of victory.

The idea of rearming Germans under an Allied—in all likelihood American—commander was ill-received by the French and British. Although the supplies for the new German army would be controlled by the United States, French Foreign Minister Schuman refused to accept our plan. He insisted that rearming the Germans would be disastrous for the present government of Premier Rene Pleven.

FRENCH ARE AFRAID

The French, who cannot add substantially to their present manpower under arms, while anxious to prevent another invasion of their territory, refuse to accept the help of their former enemies, even after we offer them the most sweeping assurances that there will be no repetition of the 1914 and 1939 aggressions. They say they cannot afford to put many more men under arms. They are afraid of the political consequences for the present shaky government if they agree to permit Germany to be armed. Yet they want their country adequately defended. This is tantamount to asking us to assume the bulk of the burden of the defense of Europe.

The British are only lukewarm to our proposal. Foreign Secretary Bevin, who stated publicly last week that Britain is opposed to arming the west Germans, is reported to have softened somewhat. But not enough to influence his French colleague.

Both Mr. Bevin and Mr. Schuman are determined to prevent the supplying of modern war materials to the Spanish army, which is 400,000 strong. While psychologically there may be some grounds for the French fear of the Germans—since the two countries have been at bitter odds since 1870—Spain has never been actively hostile to her western neighbors.

In World War I, King Alfonso maintained strict but friendly neutrality toward the Allied Powers. In World War II, General Franco's assurances to Paris permitted the French high command to withdraw its divisions from the Pyrenees and send them to the German front.

Opposition of the French and British to inclusion of Spain in western defense is based only on the fact that the Socialist parties in those countries do not like the present dictatorial regime in Madrid. Yet both governments are most anxious to see Communist China, where Mao Tse-tung rules as ruthlessly as Stalin, seated in the United Nations and fully recognized as a member of the peace-loving nations.

Spain can contribute far more to the defense of western Europe than either Yugoslavia or China.

Know Your Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am including in today's RECORD an editorial which appeared in the September 20 issue of Pathfinder:

KNOW YOUR ENEMY

The free peoples of the world are engaged in a bitter struggle with their arch enemy—communism. Even if the Korean incident is localized, the fight will continue for many years; the Communists have admitted that their war with the democracies must be and will be never-ending. They believe that democracy must be destroyed if communism is to survive.

Obviously, then, it is important for free peoples to know their avowed enemy, to understand communism, to recognize the difference between their present freedom and the way of life communism would force upon them.

Communism is more than a political belief; it is a form of fanaticism. It is an evil

doctrine, against all our concepts of life. It is atheistic, and opposes all forms of religion.

Communism claims it works for the benefit of all the people, yet it does not trust those it claims to help. Did you ever hear of a Communist regime voted in by the people in a really free election? Under communism, there is no choice. You vote for it—or else.

Democracy holds the individual as all-important and the master of the state. Communism considers the individual the servant of the state; the state is all-important. Yet under communism the state is a small group of individuals, the bureaucrats who—usually by violence—have gained control of the party.

In a democracy, you enjoy freedom of speech, thought, worship, and opportunity. Under communism, you do as you are told, you even think and speak as you are told; you work where you are told, and for as little as the group of bureaucrats at the top decide you should be paid. If you do not like such a way of life and are foolish enough to say so, you are "purged"; you end up in a labor camp, prison—or a cemetery.

Democracy dignifies man as God's masterpiece; communism disavows God, and man is a robot. No man, woman or child is permitted any individual ambition, any personal hope, any private plans. Communism demands everyone's soul, mind and body—without question, without mercy, without appeal.

Under democracy, the people elect to office those they consider best fitted; if they prove incompetent, the people themselves vote them out and elect others in their place. Under communism, there is no hope of change; the party is considered incapable of error. It gains control of the state by violence and keeps control by violence. Communism has pledged itself to the overthrow of every other form of government in the world—by violence. Yet, would violence be necessary if communism really were the utopia it claims to be? Would not people willingly vote for such a system? Would the millions of suffering Russians, slaving under the Communist yoke, vote in a free election to keep the Kremlin crowd in power?

Small wonder that the Communists maintain their iron curtain; the real reason for its existence is to prevent the people from learning the truth about the high living standards and freedoms enjoyed by the American people. The Russian worker would soon learn what a sham communism is. And in his rage he might use on his masters their own greatest weapon—violence.

Hysteria on March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following editorial from the Woodland (Calif.) Daily Democrat of September 11, 1950, and a letter published by the Sacramento Bee of September 14, 1950:

[From the Woodland (Calif.) Daily Democrat of September 11, 1950]

HYSTERIA ON MARCH

Whether or not one agrees with Congresswoman HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS' vote against the Wood antisubversive bill, Mrs. DOUGLAS must be commended for her fairness and courage. Undoubtedly, she recognized that as a result of voting against this particular bill, she would be subject to bitter editorial attacks by a partisan press. This is exactly what has happened.

The papers opposing her candidacy for the United States Senate are charging that Mrs. DOUGLAS, by her opposition to the Wood bill, showed signs of leaning toward the Commies. As a matter of fact, Congresswoman DOUGLAS is as much an enemy of communism as the editors who are assailing her.

At the risk of jeopardizing her chances for success in the November election, Mrs. DOUGLAS refused to support the measure because she favors common sense and moderation in legislation dealing with subversive activities. She contends that at all times Congress should exercise reasonable restraint. Mrs. DOUGLAS, along with Congressmen FRANCK HAVENNER and JOHN SHELLEY, of San Francisco, and GEORGE P. MILLER and CHET HOLIFIELD, among other good Americans, declined to join in the hysteria which is causing many Americans to do to liberty of their own volition what a potential enemy could not force them to do.

Many influential and independently edited newspapers over the country are in agreement with Mrs. DOUGLAS and the others who teamed with the minority against the bill.

The measure passed by the House is properly known as the Wood bill and is a modification of the Mundt-Ferguson measure.

When the bill went before the House, Mrs. DOUGLAS stood with other members of the California delegation to amend the bill. She demanded that Government employees suspended or dismissed under the law should have the right of appeal. It was her contention, and properly so, that the right of appeal was fundamental.

She had previously recorded her approval of the primary purpose of the bill, which is to safeguard the security of the Government, by voting for an amendment proposed by Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, of Alameda. This amendment would have given a discharged employee the right to appeal to the United States Civil Service Commission from the decision by his immediate superiors to discharge him. The Miller amendment received bipartisan support and lost by only a few votes.

On the final submission of the bill with no right of appeal, no safeguards against administrative abuse, Mrs. DOUGLAS exercised her right to vote against the measure. The bill has now been amended in the Senate to include these appeal provisions. Mrs. DOUGLAS promises that she will vote for the measure when it returns from the conference committee.

Among the outstanding reputable metropolitan papers editorially in accord with the stand taken by California's Mrs. DOUGLAS, are the New York Times, the Philadelphia Inquirer, Louisville Courier-Journal, Washington Post, and St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The following editorial from the New York Times, urging great care and most careful consideration, is typical of the comments of other newspaper editors who are not especially interested in the outcome of the senatorial election in California and have no axes to grind.

CAUTION NEEDED

Now that the House has passed its own antisubversive bill (H. R. 9490), the Senate has for its consideration this week no less than four distinct measures dealing with this highly controversial subject. Maneuverings of both Democrats and Republicans to snare the credit for whatever legislation of this type is enacted may obscure—but cannot lessen—the urgent necessity of examining such proposals with the greatest care.

We have already expressed our opinion regarding the three major Senate bills on antisubversive activities: The Mundt-Ferguson bill (S. 2311), the McCarran omnibus bill (S. 4037), and the administration bill (S. 4061). We have explained why we think the first two, going far beyond the proper and laudable aim of making the Communists harmless, represent a potentially serious threat to American civil liberties.

The bill which the House passed on Tuesday is a modified version of the Mundt-Ferguson measure; but it still contains such drastic registration provisions, it leaves such great power in the hands of an administrative board and it is couched in such broad language that we feel that it, too, is more far-reaching than necessary or advisable. By and large, the law as it now stands appears adequate to protect us against the Communist menace, so far as any law as such can protect us. In fact, between the upper millstone of present legislation and the nether millstone of the American voters' common sense, communism is not getting very far in the United States. But improvement in existing law can certainly be made, and this the administration bill, generally speaking, would do.

It is natural in these times that there should be a demand for anti-Communist legislation; but it is imperative that in our haste to pass such legislation we do not endanger the freedom of thought and speech that is a vital part of the American tradition and is, in fact, essential for the proper functioning of democratic government.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of September 14, 1950]

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE

TRUSTS THE FBI

EDITOR OF THE BEE:

SIR: Regarding B. W. Vaughan's letter I agree wholeheartedly with everything he says, including requiring all Communists be indelibly branded on the forehead with a red star.

But in regard to this I do not believe Vaughan goes far enough. If the branding is to be effectual, it should be possible to determine if all Communists and subversives have registered and to accomplish this we should insist that all Republicans be branded with an R, all Democrats with a D, etc., ad infinitum. If every person over 18 years of age were identified in this manner then we would have the means of identifying the Commies as having registered.

On second thought, maybe Vaughan and I are both wrong because I have heard that the Reds will resort to any subterfuge to further their nefarious ends, and in this connection, they might register Republican or Democrat and be so branded and we still would be in doubt as to who was who, even as we are today.

I believe that our best bet in identifying Reds is the Biblical saying: "By their works ye shall know them." By the very nature of their works it is difficult for them to conceal from an intelligent and informed citizenry just what their true character is, no matter what particular label they may choose to be known under.

And as for a twenty-third article in the Bill of Rights, as Vaughan suggests, it seems to me the FBI has done a pretty good job of identifying all of the subversive groups and organizations in this country; and that our present legislative and law-enforcement agencies are capable of handling the situation without any changes in the Bill of Rights.

GEORGE E. SWARTZ.

ORLAND.

Planning for Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues and those who are actively engaged in planning for civilian defense, I am proud to report on a civilian defense plan which originated in my district and which may well become a pattern for voluntary efforts, throughout the Nation.

I refer to the offering by a New Jersey industry of its transportation and manpower to aid relief agencies during peace or wartime emergencies. This offering is in the form of mobile emergency disaster relief units composed of trucks and other plant vehicles and manned by plant personnel trained in disaster relief procedure.

This plan originated as a spontaneous and unselfish act on the part of Carl W. Badenhausen, president of the P. Ballantine & Sons brewery in Newark, N. J., on the night of May 19, 1950. Immediately upon hearing of the ruin and human misery caused by the great South Amboy ammunition explosion of that date, Mr. Badenhausen offered the trucking and manpower of his organization to New Jersey State authorities in the disaster area. A convoy of 200 trucks and the company ambulance was formed for use in the devastated area.

While this voluntary act by private industry in time of local crisis is indeed noteworthy, it is the subsequent action of this Newark firm that has national significance and which I commend to the attention of those responsible for civilian defense and disaster relief. This act and the blueprint which Ballantine officials have drafted to make this plan available for other centers is, I believe, an extraordinary example of community-mindedness and responsibility.

The Ballantine Co. has now formed an emergency relief unit in Newark, N. J., on a permanent basis, and is now organizing another in Washington, D. C. These units are available to State civilian defense agencies in the area in which they are located.

The units are built around a nucleus of spot convoys of 10 trucks and 3 cars each, which can move instantly on call, with blankets, stretchers, tools, first-aid kits, flares, portable lights, ropes, and ladders.

They are manned by Ballantine personnel which has been given training in the basic operations of mobile disaster relief units and in duties which normally are in demand at the site of disasters.

The company also is prepared to augment these spot convoys with additional convoys. Within an hour it could have hundreds of trucks dispatched in organized convoys.

The readiness of these units for service is assured by a carefully designed communications system. Appreciate relief authorities have been notified that calls for the units are to be placed with the central yard dispatch office at the plant. The dispatcher and alternate members of the company staff have been trained to obtain from the caller pertinent information regarding the whereabouts of the disaster and the contemplated use of the Ballantine units. Verification of this vital information is made by a return call to the relief agency. The plan provides for full control of the units by the State authorities during the emergency, eliminating the possibility that full use of the units will be lost because of confusion on the part of unit personnel.

In addition to the spot convoys which are ready, the company has pledged the availability of its entire fleet of some 800 trucks if and when they are needed. The units are currently at the disposal of Leonard Dreyfus, civil defense director for the State of New Jersey.

I submit that here we have a concrete example of a workable plan for aid by industry in the event of disaster anywhere in our great country. Whether a particular firm has only one truck or a great fleet of trucks, it can play an important part in disaster relief work by making transportation and personnel available to the appropriate State and community relief agencies.

As those of us who have been at the scene of disasters know too well, removal of disaster victims, transportation of relief workers, quick transportation of medical supplies and other necessaries to the scene of the tragedy, all of these are matters of utmost urgency.

It is not feasible for the average relief organization to have as standard equipment the amount of transportation it often needs to perform the tasks listed. The initial cost of such transportation would be prohibitive, the maintenance of the vehicles would require additional funds, and the personnel needed to operate the vehicles are simply not available in many cases.

The relatively few large and fully equipped disaster relief units which now exist are often called great distances to aid in emergencies. It is not uncommon to read in the press of fire companies and other relief units from a large number of communities converging on one area to aid in an emergency. While this may be an adequate procedure for peacetime purposes, it is not desirable because it leaves unprotected many areas where the equipment is normally based.

It takes but little imagination to picture a wartime situation in which a number of disasters ocur in a relatively limited geographical area. In such a situation, pooling of existing relief transportation to serve at the scene of a single disaster would be impossible. Without an actual plan for the acquisition of supplementary transportation, the suffering which would result at many of the disaster scenes defies description. Because of the lack of vehicles, transportation of the injured to hospitals would be delayed, the arrival of skilled emergency relief workers would be stymied, urgently needed supplies would not reach the suffering. In short, all of the tragedy which always accompanies a disaster, might well be compounded again and again because of a lack of transportation at the scene.

I should like to stress that the size of a plant or industry is not important to participation in this program. In our extensive farming and nonindustrial areas, for example, it is conceivable that many owners of single trucks could cooperate with relief agencies to devise a workable plan which would result in the immediate availability of adequate transportation at disaster scenes. Although war-caused disasters are less likely in these nonindustrial areas, we cannot under present conditions consider any area immune for disaster and thus not in potential need of mobile emergency disaster relief units.

I shall not attempt to blueprint the makeup of mobile disaster units. The Ballantine plan which I described can be considered a model. Substantial variations would be warranted according to the geographical location of the unit base. In areas where floods are a problem the units would differ from those used in areas likely to be the scene of great fires. The number of small cars in a unit would vary according to traffic conditions, since these vehicles are intended to facilitate traffic control.

The important point I wish to make is that this proposition deserves serious attention from the Government and from industry, everywhere, at this time. We are hearing a great deal about civilian defense at the community level. Here we have more than just talk and paper planning. We have a workable plan which is already in limited operation because of the civic-mindedness of one industrial leader. I have no doubt that industry throughout the Nation is eager to cooperate. With this cooperation our Nation will have taken a real step forward toward the goal of adequate preparedness for emergency which we must reach before it is too late.

Richard H. Balch, an Outstanding Citizen, Is Candidate for the Office of Lieutenant Governor of New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last week to be present at the New York State Democratic Convention in Rochester and see an outstanding citizen and friend of mine nominated for lieutenant governor of New York State. He is Richard H. Balch, of Utica.

Dick Balch is one of those rare Americans—a man whose energies are unbounded, and who has turned his talents into countless fields in his efforts to better the lives of his fellow citizens and those who work with him and for him.

He is president of the largest fishing tackle manufacturing company in the Nation—the Horrocks-Ibbotson Co.—and yet he is a stanch friend of labor. His company is successful and profitable, and at the same time, it is an outstanding example of good labor-management relations. It has contracts with the CIO textile workers and the AFL teamsters.

Dick Balch is highly regarded in business circles, being a member of the board of Devine Bros. Manufacturing Co., Utica Fire Insurance Co., and Frost & Co., of New York City. He has been a vice president of the Utica Chamber of Commerce, and was management representative on the area war manpower management-labor committee during World War II.

Always interested in civic affairs, Dick Balch has been a member of the board of education of Utica for several years. In addition he has been a member and chairman of the Utica Board of Water Supply since 1924. He has also been instrumental in the success of community chest campaigns and similar worthwhile drives.

Dick Balch, at 40, is the possessor of many enviable talents. He is in the prime of life, with characteristic vigor and imagination, and yet is a successful businessman and public servant. He has had over 25 years of experience in public and civic affairs and has many fine years of service to his fellow citizens ahead of him.

It is an honor for the people of my district to have a man like Dick Balch nominated on a major political party's State ticket.

Meat Inspection Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the attached resolution adopted by the Greater New Haven Industrial Union Council, September 11, 1950:

Whereas the Meat Inspection Service is a division of the Bureau of Animal Industry which was formed some 60 years ago by an act of Congress, and was later augmented due to public demand by the Meat Inspection Act of June 30, 1906, and is this year being further augmented to increase its duties and responsibilities due to public demand; and

Whereas the sole duty and responsibility of this service is to protect the public health and welfare by insuring a safe and wholesome meat supply to the consuming public, and by their own regulations the Armed Forces, Veterans' Administration, and all other Government services, and to all foreign countries who import our meat and meat food products; and

Whereas the cost to the American people for this service is insignificant in return for the protection received, being less than 10 cents per person per year; and

Whereas the Meat Inspection Division is faced with a disastrous cut in appropriations requested for the next fiscal year, which will necessitate the dismissal of 344 meat inspectors through the country from its presently undermanned force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Greater New Haven CIO Council and its affiliates go on record as opposing this dangerous proposal; that it use every means at its disposal to bring this matter to the attention of the public through any means it may see fit, and that the public be urged to contact their Congressmen in opposition to this appropriation reduction; and be it further

Resolved, That steps be initiated to have Congress place the personnel of the Meat Inspection Division on the same level as personnel of the Armed Forces, Veterans' Administration, and medical personnel of the Public Health Service who were excluded in this amendment to the appropriation bill; namely the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

WILLIAM STAPLETON,
President.
IRMA MEI,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Railway Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to briefly supplement the remarks that I made recently in connection with the Railroad Retirement Act. It is my considered opinion that this act is in need of substantial amendment. Any amendment to a law affecting the welfare and even the livelihood of an important segment of our society should only be enacted after careful and painstaking study.

I therefore repeat my request that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce schedule public hearings as soon as practicable and thereafter bring to this floor appropriate amendments for the benefit of hundreds of thousands of railroad workers throughout the country. It is possible that with prompt and vigorous action on the part of the committee this much-needed legislation might be passed during November or December by this Congress. In any event such hearings and deliberation will enable the next Congress to work its will promptly and intelligently.

Mr. Speaker, by almost unanimous action this Congress recently raised the pension payments to those presently on the social-security retirement rolls. In some cases the benefits were actually doubled. I have no quarrel with that legislation. I was happy to support it. But I respectfully submit that the cost of living for the retired railroad worker is just as high as the cost for any other American citizen. The old railroaders who have devoted their productive years to the most essential of all American industries receive no special privilege or discount in the purchase of food, clothing or shelter.

The employees of the railroads have their own retirement fund with payments and benefits prescribed by Federal statute. They want to continue their separate and independent status. They have no desire to become a part of the broad social-security program and I do not so recommend. Nevertheless separate status should not make the men and women working for the railroads the victims of discrimination. Such discrimination does exist and only the Congress can correct it.

Today's newspapers are filled with the exploits and accomplishments of the United States Marines. Today all Americans are grateful to the Eightieth Congress which prevented the liquidation of the Marine Corps and its absorption by the Army. There is a definite parallel between the Marines and the railroad workers. Each group is justly proud of its separate entity and its history of accomplishment. Just as the Marines rightfully and vigorously resist absorption by the Army, so the railroaders resist absorption by social security.

Mr. Speaker, when we consider disability and retirement benefits the parallel which I have pointed out comes to an end. The Marines receive the same benefits as do all the other members of the armed services. The railroad workers, on the other hand, based on their own contributions, do not receive benefits commensurate to those of the 45,000,000 Americans now covered by the Social Security Act. Furthermore, the railroads themselves make proportionately larger payments than does industry in general.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the time for action. We have had 4 years of experience under the Crosser amendments. We can no longer hide behind the old excuse, "Let's see how the present law works out." I earnestly hope that this Congress and the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will meet the responsibility to the American railroad worker who has contributed so much to this, our country.

Hon. John C. Davies, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, before the second session of the Eighty-first Congress adjourns, I would like to say a few words in praise of one of our colleagues from up-State New York, the Honorable JOHN C. DAVIES.

Congressman DAVIES came to us as the third youngest Member of the Eighty-first Congress, and a man who had never before held public office, but he has proven to be an outstanding freshman Member of the House of Representatives.

When voting on legislation, he supported almost all progressive measures for the betterment of our Nation and

our people, but he did not hesitate to cross party lines on occasion in his vote on bills in which he could not believe. His votes were dictated by his conscience and the best interest of the people in his district, rather than by political expediency.

JACK DAVIES supported and voted for the working out of labor legislation which would be equitable to all sides. He has supported legislation which will improve the housing shortage and give the lower and middle income groups a chance to own homes. DAVIES supported the FEPC bill, the new social security law, the new minimum wage law, liberalized displaced persons legislation and the bills to give statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. He also favored those Hoover Commission recommendations which he believed would actually result in increased efficiency and economy.

In his effort to aid in bringing some bit of clarity in the muddle of farm legislation which now exists, he has constantly fought to protect the rights of the dairy farmers in his district. In addition, he has been instrumental in securing some Government contracts for firms in his district so that the employment situation could be improved.

DAVIES' wide range of interests can be seen by some of the bills he has introduced during this Congress. They include measures to provide more adequate provision for the health of school children, to regulate oleomargarine, to suspend certain import taxes on copper, to condemn the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty, to abolish the poll tax by a constitutional amendment, to improve the harbor at Oswego, N. Y., to encourage construction of rental housing near military installations. He also introduced bills to aid in the development of Great Lakes shipping, and to aid poultry farmers by providing Government surplus feed to them at a lower cost.

It can be readily seen, Mr. Speaker, that JACK DAVIES is the kind of legislator of which we need more in this country—young, progressive, independent and active in his representation of his constituents. It has been a pleasure to have served with him in the Eighty-first Congress and the people of the Thirty-fifth District of New York should be glad that JOHN C. DAVIES was their Representative during that period.

Dried Eggs From Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer and another from the Gloversville (N. Y.) Herald dealing with the silly performance of allowing dried eggs to be shipped into this country from Communist China at a time when our own Government warehouses are bulging with dried eggs resulting from domestic production.

The answer proposed by the editor of the Observer to the State Department's contention regarding the lowering of the tariff rate is, of course, unanswerable. This country has no treaty with Communist China, so that there is no necessity to consult with any other nation before advising the Communists that the import rate will be 27 cents a pound as fixed by the Tariff Commission rather than the present bargain rate of 17 cents. As the editor says:

> You can't violate a treaty that does not exist.

The purchase of these dried eggs, of course, does nothing but bolster the Communist regime in China. Any money sent out there now certainly will not further the interest of our country and, indeed, may be used for the purchase of munitions and other material to be used against us. No possible need can be shown for dried eggs which already are in huge surplus in this country. Their importation ought to be prohibited altogether. If that cannot or will not be done, certainly our Government should insist on imposing the maximum duty of 27 cents a pound instead of the tariff of 17 cents established by the Geneva Trade Convention for nations signing the International Trade Agreement.

The above-mentioned editorials follow:

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of August 25, 1950]

YOU NAME THIS ONE

It seems that there is no end to the imbecilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Every day a new one crops up, and it is always a little sillier than the one we heard about yesterday.

It is no secret that the storage cost on the farm products that the CCC has taken off the market and hidden away in warehouses, oil tanks, idle ships, and caves amounts to $105,000,000 a year, or about $25,000 an hour. That, mind you, is just the storage cost.

Among the commodities in storage are dried eggs by the billions of dozens, which the CCC has bought up to keep the retail price high and has sequestered in a cave in Kansas.

Most of us knew about that caveful of eggs. What we did not know, until Representative KEATING, of New York, told about it in a debate in the House, is that we are importing 800,000 pounds of dried eggs a month from—of all places—Communist China.

It came about this way:

In 1931 the Tariff Commission set the import duty on dried eggs at 27 cents a pound. At the Geneva trade convention in 1947 the State Department negotiated a treaty with all nations signing the International Trade Agreement reducing the tariff to 17 cents.

Last spring, when the Communist Government took over in China, it informed our State Department that it did not recognize our trade treaty with Nationalist China; so it would insist on selling its dried eggs to the United States, duty free.

The State Department says it can't do anything about it without consulting the other 58 nations that signed the treaty.

We think it could do one thing: It could just remind Peiping that there never was a treaty between the United States and Communist China; hence, as far as Communist China is concerned, the tariff will be 27 cents.

It is hard to see how the other 58 nations could object, because Communist China never signed the collective treaty. You can't violate a treaty that does not exist.

[From the Gloversville (N. Y.) Herald of August 29, 1950]

THE MORNING HERALD'S EYE OPENER—BUT WHO IS REALLY TO BLAME?

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, New York, Republican, charged in the House the other day that the Government actually is encouraging Communist China to ship dried eggs into this country—while at the same time spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to buy up eggs here, in dried form, under the Federal price support program.

"During the very time that our Government has been buying up surplus eggs and hoarding dried eggs in caves and warehouses," the Congressman declared, "it has refused to take any action to bar the import of dried eggs from Communist China.

"In fact, the administration actually is encouraging these imports by granting bargain-basement, cut-rate import duties to a government we have not even recognized."

And it's perfectly true, too.

The Government is very much to blame in the matter; but someone else must shoulder at least a portion of the responsibility.

For the United States Government, itself, is not importing those Communist-Chinese dried eggs.

That is done by individual American commercial concerns, because it pays them to do so.

There need not be any delusions in the matter. There is nothing illegal about the transactions. The Chinese have dried eggs to sell. They can produce them at a relatively low price. It is cheaper for American firms which use dried eggs in the manufacture of various commodities to purchase consignments of those dried eggs from Communist China, and pay the import duties, than it would be to purchase dried eggs in this country.

And the American dollars that the Chinese Communists receive for these dried eggs will help the Chinese Communist government to equip its armies. They may even already be helping to equip the North Korean forces with whom American troops now are at grips.

Yes, there would be an easy way to put an end to the traffic—by raising the import duty so that it would not be profitable to import Chinese dried eggs.

But there would be an even easier way—for the American importers concerned to decline to utilize Chinese dried eggs in their business as a matter of sheer loyalty.

Then there would not be any need of augmented tariff duties.

The Korean Seductress Who Betrayed America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have today addressed letters to Congressmen CARL VINSON and DEWEY SHORT, of the Armed Services Committee, calling for attention to a critical

situation that has had a tragic effect on the fortunes of our fighting men in Korea.

The Soviet aggressors have successfully used Korean women to obtain valuable information from American military personnel as well as to conduct a thriving underground operation in the Korean Republic. The deadly skill of these adventuresses, prior to the North Korean invasion, has undoubtedly had a great deal to do with the grave misfortune suffered by the brave defenders under the leadership of General MacArthur.

Because this situation is so vicious in its implications and so dangerous in its relationship to our occupation troops throughout the world, I am asking at this time for the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the following article that appears in Coronet Magazine for October 1950:

THE KOREAN SEDUCTRESS WHO BETRAYED AMERICA—HERE, TOLD FOR THE FIRST TIME, IS THE AMAZING STORY OF A COMMUNIST MATA HARI

(By Mary Van Rensselaer Thayer)

Although the name of Kim Suim, a beautiful oriental girl, failed to appear in communiques from the Korean front, it deserved a place there. For, when the alluring young temptress was shot as a spy a few hours before the Red troops crashed into Seoul, the event was comparable to the destruction of a column of Red tanks.

With her voluptuous charm and oriental seductiveness, Kim Suim, known to her compatriots as the "Doctor of Lovemaking," was a deadly weapon, shaped and set in motion by Russian hands. She and thousands of others like her—all chosen for their beauty and easy morals, indoctrinated with the Communist credo and turned loose to do as much damage as possible—were part of a vast plan.

These lethal ladies of the Soviet operation sex used their charms to protect Red underground terrorists, and to seduce the enemy—South Korea and America—into betraying its deepest secrets.

We know there was a large number of these Mata Haris in Korea, well trained and, in their coldly amorous fashion, highly effective in gathering vital information from unsuspecting American officers and GI's. Their far-flung sisters are a problem that will confront us again and again. Luckily we have a blueprint of their methods, for Kim Suim stood trial in a Korean court, where her machinations were glaringly exposed.

Her first exposure to communism took place in 1942, at a meeting of so-called patriots. There, she fell in love with the principal speaker of the evening a tall and handsome Korean named Lee Kung Kook, administrative director of the Communist National Front Federation.

Lee Kung was a fanatic, who never spent time on anything—even lovemaking—without a sound ideological reason. Even before submitting to Kim Suim's wiles, he looked into her background and evaluated her potential usefulness to the party.

An orphan, she had been educated at American Methodist schools and later had found a job as private secretary of the head of the dental school at Severance College. All this counted in her favor. But her greatest asset, from Lee Kung's point of view, was not her education but her looks—and the power they gave her over men.

She was a miniature Venus, perfectly proportioned, with the shiniest and longest black pigtails in all Korea, and with enormous black eyes, enhanced by extravagantly arched eyebrows. Nature obviously had endowed her to be a charmer, and it was at Severance College that she received her nickname, "Doctor of Lovemaking."

Lee Kung decided Kim Suim could be of great value both to him and to the Communist cause. So interspersing doctrine and embraces, he slowly bent her to his will. When the payoff arrived it exceeded his most optimistic dreams. Three years after that 1942 meeting of "patriots," all of Korea below the thirty-eighth parallel was taken over by United States occupation forces—and Kim Suim stepped forth confidently to meet them.

Missionary-trained and accomplished in English, she knew perfectly how to ingratiate herself. She was received with open arms. They made her the receptionist at the Banto Hotel, United States military headquarters in Korea. Kim Suim was touchingly grateful. She went out of her way to please, smiling and bowing all day long—and at night supplying her Korean lover with increasingly valuable information.

She discovered, well in advance, the impending withdrawal of United States forces and even the precise dates of their departure.

For a year she remained at the Banto, in a constant glitter of top brass. Then her fortune took a still more dizzy upturn. She was shifted to the United States Provost Marshal's office, part of the Counter Intelligence Division—which meant daily contact with high-security data. It was the sort of job spies dream of.

About this time, the private life of the "Doctor of Lovemaking" also underwent a change. She found a proper place to hang out her shingle, a luxurious house on Kind Jade Street, in Seoul's most fashionable district. Originally the establishment had belonged to a wealthy Japanese, who had surrendered it to the American military government, which, in turn, surrendered it to Kim Suim.

Why was it given to her? In seeking the answer in the records of her trial, one is impressed chiefly by the elaborate discretion of the Korean prosecutor. Others were less reticent. They named an American officer, the one, they added slyly, to whom she had borne a son.

Soon the house in Kind Jade Street was a busy and curious place. Above stairs, there were revelry, romance, and a continual coming and going of American dignitaries; downstairs, things were quite different. Kim Suim shuttled between the two levels, one minute rushing up to greet a couple of colonels, then hurrying down to speed a Communist fugitive on his way to safety beyond the thirty-eighth parallel. At night she would sing native songs to an appreciative uniformed audience, perform her amorous devoirs, and after that, dash away to count the profits of a brisk side line she was running in stolen jeeps, ammunition, and guns.

In her unassailable position, beyond suspicion, she master-minded a whole network of Communist intrigue and espionage. Bundles of Japanese currency, brought down from the Communist north, were secreted in her cellar. When they had been distributed among the Communists of the south, in came rice boxes filled with pilfered American arms. The munitions—as well as occasional refugees for whom Kind Jade Street served as a stop on the underground railroad—were loaded into American vehicles and driven to the thirty-eighth parallel, where all would promptly disappear into Red territory. The drivers were Korean employees of the American military government, whose passes permitted them to go anywhere unchallenged.

Then, one night in September 1946, as Kim Suim and her naïve American protector were having tea, a servant whispered in her ear. Excusing herself, she hurried down to the cellar, where Lee Kung Kook was waiting. A disastrous thing had happened. The timid South Korean Government at last had issued a warrant for his arrest. She would have to help him escape.

It was an easy enough assignment, for, out of consideration for the Americans, the police were no more likely to invade the house on Kind Jade Street than they were the Banto Hotel. For 3 days Lee Kung remained in concealment, while his sweetheart made arrangements to smuggle him to the border.

Tearfully, she told her American friend that her "mother" lay dying in Kaesung, the nearest city to the Red border. As a dutiful daughter, the least she could do was rush a doctor to the scene. The American expedited the journey. Touched by her obvious grief, he showered her and the doctor—who happened to be Lee Kung Kook—with good wishes for the "mother's" recovery.

At her trial, this trip north and Lee Kung's escape were commented on, but the prosecutor discreetly refrained from mentioning the fact that the journey was made in an American jeep.

Lee's departure brought no decrease of underground activity in Kind Jade Street. It went on for nearly three more years, years of unmarred success during which Kim Suim became known as the best-dressed, best-informed, most powerful native woman in Seoul.

Then, at last, her luck ran out. She had predicted the event herself—and had been congratulated for doing so by her Communist masters. The American occupation troops left South Korea.

Kim Suim was desolate. She wept on her departing protector's shoulder and assured him of her undying devotion. Then, wiping her eyes, she sat down to await what life would bring her next.

What it brought her, eventually, was the long-suffering incredibly patient South Korean police, and once more the house on Kind Jade Street was filled with lamentations.

"But what have I done?" wailed its mistress, a picture of outraged virtue. The arresting officer regarded her stonily.

"Madame," he began, "we have known about your activities for years. We would have acted long before this, only—." He left the sentence unfinished, but its meaning was clear—somebody high up might have objected.

In June 1950, charged with 4 major and 26 lesser crimes against the State, Kim Suim stood trial. One of the chief defense witnesses was Yung Sook Mo, former classmate of the accused and Korea's foremost poetess. Speaking with the voice of befuddled liberals all over the world. Miss Mo discounted the prosecution's talk of communism and treason.

"The reason Miss Kim Suim committed this crime," her strange deposition read in part, "was love. She fell in love with this man, Lee Kung Kook, and though Mr. Kook was working against the Republic of Korea, all she could do was to cooperate fully."

This starry-eyed poetess' plea for sympathy was rejected by the court, the prosecutor calling it regretable. No doubt Miss Mo came to regret it herself some weeks later, for she was one of the first to be shot by North Korean Communists after they took Seoul.

While the Red troops still were in the outskirts of the city on June 28, Kim Suim, who had confessed and had been condemned to death, was removed from the military prison to Kimpo airport. In honor, perhaps, of her American friends, she had been used to going around in slacks with her hair done up in an American-style permanent. Now, for this ceremonial occasion, she was dressed conservatively in Korean garb, and her long black hair was bound tightly about her head.

When she had crossed the compound and taken her stand against the far wall, one of the soldiers, lined up in front of her,

whispered to a companion, "How small she is. We must lower our sights."

A minute later there was the command, and the staccato bark of rifles. As the "Doctor of Lovemaking" sank to the ground, her Red comrades were swarming into Seoul, shooting off the American guns and ammunition which she had so adroitly smuggled in to them.

The New Social-Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the outstanding achievements of this Eighty-first Congress is the enactment of a law expanding and bringing up to date our social-security system. This law extends security in their old age to 10,000,000 additional Americans as a matter of their earned right, not as a matter of charity or a public dole. It raises social-security benefits to conform with higher costs of living.

I believe that our social-security system should be extended even further, so as to cover all working men and women. But the new law passed by the Eighty-first Congress is a great step forward, and I was glad to cast my vote for it.

In view of the widespread interest in this law I think it will be helpful to set forth the changes in our social-security system which it brings about.

MAJOR CHANGES SUMMARIZED

Summarized in a few sentences, the major changes are:

First. Larger benefits. The people of Illinois now receiving social-security payments will find that in the checks to be mailed out October 3 their benefits will be, on the average, roughly, 75 percent greater than they have been. For those who will retire after June 1952 benefits will be twice what they are now, on the average.

Second. Broader coverage. On January 1, 1951, many Illinoisans who up to now have not been covered by social security, will come under the system. For the first time the nonfarm, self-employed persons in business for themselves, such as grocery-store, retail-store, or gas-station owners, will have the opportunity to earn security in their later life under the social-security system.

Third. Easier eligibility: In general, it will take less years of social-security coverage before you are eligible to draw benefits. Specifically, persons who are now 65 or over, and who have had six quarter-years—a year and a half—of social-security coverage can and should apply immediately for benefits. Any retired worker as well as survivors and dependents will be able to earn $50 a month as against the present limit of $15—without losing their benefit payments.

Here, in more detail, are the answers to questions I think will be of most general interest:

HOW MUCH LARGER BENEFITS?

First. How much larger will benefits be under the new law? Benefit increases will go to two main groups of people: (a) those who are currently receiving them before 1952; and (b) those who will reach retirement age after June 1952. These are called new starts. Let me explain more fully how the new bill affects each of these groups.

IMMEDIATE INCREASES AVERAGE SEVENTY-SEVEN AND ONE-HALF PERCENT

There are approximately 183,828 people in the State of Illinois who are now receiving social-security benefits. In the checks which they will receive early in October—their September payments—they will find that their payments will be, on the average, 77½ percent greater than they have been up to now.

The table below shows what the increases will be for an insured wage earner without any dependents, and for a married couple:

Retired wage earner without dependents

Now:	*New law*
$10	$20.00
$11	22.00
$12	24.00
$13	26.00
$14	28.00
$15	30.00
$16	31.70
$17	33.20
$18	34.50
$19	35.70
$20	37.00
$21	38.50
$22	40.20
$23	42.20
$24	44.50
$25	46.50
$26	48.30
$27	50.00
$28	51.50
$29	52.80
$30	54.00
$31	55.10
$32	56.20
$33	57.20
$34	58.20
$35	59.20
$36	60.20
$37	61.20
$38	62.20
$39	63.10
$40	64.00
$41	64.90
$42	65.80
$43	66.70
$44	67.60
$45	68.50
$46	68.50

Retired wage earner and wife

Now:	*New law*
$15	$30.00
$16.50	33.00
$18	36.00
$19.50	39.00
$21	42.00
$22.50	45.00
$24	47.55
$25.50	49.80
$27	51.75
$28.50	53.55
$30	56.50
$31.50	57.75
$33	60.30
$34.50	63.30
$36	66.75
$37.50	69.75
$39	72.45
$40.50	75.00
$42	77.25
$43.50	79.20

Retired wage earner and wife—Continued

Now:	*New law*
$45	$81.00
$46.50	82.65
$48	84.30
$49.50	85.80
$51	87.30
$52.50	88.80
$54	90.30
$55.50	91.80
$57	93.30
$58.50	94.65
$60	96.00
$61.50	97.35
$63	98.70
$64.50	100.05
$66	101.40
$67.50	102.75
$69	102.75

These same increases apply to anyone who retired before June 1952.

The following table shows the benefits that will appear in September checks of a widow with two children who is currently receiving benefits:

Widow with 2 children

Present benefit:	*New benefit*
$20	$40
$25	43
$30	53
$35	59
$40	67
$45	76
$50	92
$55	110
$60	117
$65	122
$70	123
$75	133

INCREASES SENT AUTOMATICALLY

You do not have to apply for the increases; they will be sent to you automatically. If, for any reason, the increase fails to show up in your October check, it will show up very soon, in full. Recipients are asked not to start writing in for information because the more letters that have to be answered the slower the program will be in getting under way.

BENEFITS DOUBLED IN 1952

For anyone who retires after June 1952 a new formula may be used to compute benefits which will yield, roughly, twice the benefits now being received. You can begin to use this new formula just as soon as you have worked for six quarter years—or a full year and a half—under the social-security system after January 1, 1951.

The following table shows, roughly, how much the benefits will be according to this new formula:

Average monthly wage	Single	Married
$50	$25	$38
$100	50	75
$150	58	86
$200	65	98
$250	72	109
$300	80	120

The minimum primary benefit has been raised from $10 to $25 in most cases, and the maximum family benefit has been raised from $85 to $150. These changes are long overdue in bringing our social-security system into line with high living costs.

WHO WILL BE COVERED NOW?

Second. What new people will be covered under the new law? On January

1, 1951, nearly 10,000,000 people in the Nation as a whole will come under the social-security system for the first time.

THE NONFARM SELF-EMPLOYED

The largest and most important group to come under the system are the nonfarm self-employed. For the first time the druggist, the grocer, the gas station owner, and thousands of other persons who are in business for themselves can look forward to security in their later years as an earned right, to which they have contributed during their working lifetime.

Farmers are still not included under social security; nor are many professional people, such as doctors and lawyers.

ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS MUCH SOONER

At this point, I should emphasize, for the benefit of these businessmen, as well as all those who will come under the social-security system now, it will be much easier for you to become eligible for benefits under the new law. If you are 62 or over on January 1, 1951, and begin your social-security coverage on that date, you will need to work only a year and a half under the system in order to be fully insured and eligible for benefit payments upon retirement. That means that you will begin to draw benefits just as soon as you reach the retirement age of 65.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Agricultural workers will come under the social-security program on January 1. This includes not only persons who regularly work on farms, but also the so-called borderline agricultural workers—those who work, say, in raising livestock or fur animals; or in processing or delivering crops to storage or to market; or those engaged in household work on a farm. Employees of commercial handlers of fruits and vegetables are included in this borderline group, as are employees of farmer cooperatives.

Those who regularly work on farms must work for one farm operator for 3 months before their social-security coverage even begins. After that, they must work for him for 60 full days and earn $50 in cash during each 3-month period. If they change employers, they must work regularly for 3 months before their work with the new employer begins to count for social security.

DOMESTIC WORKERS

Domestic workers in nonfarm homes will join the system next January, provided they work 24 days for one employer and receive cash wages of at least $50 during each quarter year.

VOLUNTARY COVERAGE FOR STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

With regard to the inclusion of employees of the State, and of cities, towns, or counties, this is the situation: Sometime after January 1 the State of Illinois may, if it wishes, enter into an agreement with the Federal Government. That agreement will set forth specifically which groups of employees of the State, or of cities, towns, or counties, will be covered under social security. Any State or local employee who is covered by an existing retirement system cannot be included in such an agreement. In this way existing retirement systems will be fully protected. If any group of State or local employees is included in the agreement, then social-security covering for all members of the group will be automatic.

Employees of the Federal Government in Illinois who are not presently covered by a Federal retirement system will be included under social security.

EMPLOYEES OF NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

Employees of nonprofit institutions—hospitals, churches, schools, and the like—will be covered only if the employer agrees to pay his share of the tax contribution and if two-thirds or more of the employees favor social-security coverage.

Ministers and members of religious orders will continue to be excluded.

SALESMEN AND TRUCK DRIVERS INCLUDED

The new bill will also include all full-time life-insurance salesmen, certain full-time traveling salesmen—other than house-to-house—many delivery-truck drivers, and home industrial workers who satisfy certain conditions.

HOW LONG TO QUALIFY?

Third. How long will you have to work under social security before you can start drawing benefits?

One of the greatest advantages of the new social-security law is that although the retirement age is still 65, in the future you will not have to work under the social-security system nearly as long before you are fully insured and eligible to draw benefits upon reaching the retirement age of 65.

The following table shows how many quarter years of coverage under social security you will have to have under the new law, as compared with the present law. Simply look at the figure next to your age on January 1, 1951.

Quarter years of coverage required to be fully insured

Age reached in first half of 1951	Present law	New law
76 or over	6	6
75	8	6
74	10	6
73	12	6
72	14	6
71	16	6
70	18	6
69	20	6
68	22	6
67	24	6
66	26	6
65	28	6
64	30	6
63	32	6
62	34	6
61	36	8
60	38	10
59	40	12
58	40	14
57	40	16
56	40	18
55	40	20
50	40	30
45 or under	40	40

All of the time you have worked under social security up to now still counts toward meeting your coverage requirement.

This change means three main things.

MANY AGED 65 CAN GET BENEFITS IMMEDIATELY

First, any insured worker who is now 65 or over, and who has had 6 quarter years—or a full year and a half—of social security coverage, can draw benefits immediately. He should apply for them at the nearest Social Security Administration field office.

Second, any worker who is 62 or over on January 1, 1951, even if he only starts his social security coverage next year, will be eligible to begin drawing benefits just as soon as he reaches the retirement age of 65, or if he has had six quarter years—a year and a half—of coverage.

ELIGIBILITY MUCH EASIER FOR THE NEWLY COVERED

Third, and most important to the thousands who will become eligible to join the social security system next year, it will be possible for them to begin drawing benefits upon retirement—at age 65—with much less social security coverage than now. The table above shows the tremendous improvements brought about by this law.

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS

The fourth main question of general interest is: How much will dependents and survivors receive under the new law?

The primary benefit is the basic payment made to an insured wage earner who has no dependents. Generally speaking, dependents and survivors will receive the same part of the primary as at present. This means that their benefits will also be about 75 percent higher than at present, up until 1952, and double the present levels after that.

The major changes in dependents' and survivors' benefits are:

(a) A retired worker's wife who is under 65 can receive benefits if she has a child in her care.

(b) The benefit for a dependent parent has been raised to three-quarters of the primary benefit of the wage earner—it has been one-half.

(c) Lump-sum death payments, though reduced to three times the primary benefit of the wage earner, are now payable to the family of every insured worker. Formerly, these payments were made only when no other member of the family was entitled to survivors' benefits at the time of the wage earner's death.

(d) Retired workers, survivors, or dependents may now earn $50 a month—as against $14.99 under the present law—without losing their benefit privileges.

Another major improvement is the provision allowing war veterans an arbitrary wage credit of $160 per month for all the time spent in the service. This provision will be of direct benefit to thousands of Illinois veterans.

The adoption of the Knowland amendment in this legislation was, in my opinion, uncalled for and unnecessary. It is also unfortunate that the provision contained in the original House bill for permanently or totally disabled persons was cut out by the Senate.

Further information and details will be supplied by the local offices of the Social Security Board throughout Illinois.

Pulpit Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. WILSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the House and our great country, a timely and excellent article recently prepared for a religious magazine by the Honorable Josh Lee, formerly United States Senator from Oklahoma and now a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. In these trying times as we give deep and serious consideration to our national defense, it is well to have before us the subject of Senator Lee's article which is as follows:

PULPIT PATRIOTISM
(By Josh Lee)

What should be the attitude of Christian leaders toward this war? Whose war is it? What are we fighting for? We are fighting for Christian principles and in defense of Christian ideals. Christians have more at stake than any other group in the free world. The heart and soul of the Christian religion is faith, and that faith is being challenged today by a diabolical doctrine of cynicism and atheism. The gage of battle is lying at our feet. Shall we pick it up or shall we pretend that we do not know it is there? We dare not ignore it. The very foundations of the Christian world are being shaken by communism; therefore, Christian leaders cannot afford even to appear to be indifferent toward this war in conducting their services. An aroused Christendom should be on the march with the battle cry, "I believe."

I believe that man has an immortal soul. He was given an intellect with which to reason and a heart capable of faith. This contradicts the materialistic philosophy that man is merely an animal whose only needs are physical. God breathed the breath of life into him and thereafter he became a living soul, not merely a living creature but a living soul endowed with immortality.

I believe that man is a free moral agent. He is fully able to bear the burden of freedom and fully capable of making the decisions required of a free agent. He is not merely a zombie for whom all decisions must be made by the Comintern. He is able to decide right from wrong and is capable of self-government without the use of iron curtains, barb-wire enclosures, paid informers, and secret police.

I believe in the dignity of man. He is more than an economic unit. The very posture of man belies the idea of slavery. He was not created to walk on four feet like a beast of burden but was created to walk upright on two feet in an attitude of dignity. The upright position is one which commands respect whereas the prone position is an indication of subservience. As punishment for his sins, Nebuchadnezzar was condemned to walk upon all fours and eat grass like the beasts of the field. The curse that was placed upon the serpent for deceiving man was that it should crawl upon its belly all of its days. But man was created in the image of God and, Godlike, he was made to stand and to walk in an upright position.

When the rubber lifeboat of the four brave Americans who had escaped from a wrecked bomber during the recent war in the South Pacific washed upon the beach of an island, the four men were so weak and exhausted from 34 days of famine and exposure that they could hardly stand, but with their last ounce of energy they forced themselves to their feet and walked upright, military file, because, as they said, "If there were Japs, we did not want to be crawling."

The Christian belief in the dignity of man, created as he was in the image of God, to walk upright and to kneel to no man is the very antithesis of the craven philosophy of communism with its slave labor. Man alone was given dominion over the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air and the fish of the sea. But no creature was given dominion over man. To God alone is man required to kneel. That is why the founding fathers wrote in the Declaration of Independence that man is created free and equal. Therefore, an ideology that would deprive man of that freedom and deny him that dignity is totally repugnant to the Christian concept and should be vigorously resisted by Christians everywhere.

Not only are we at war with communism spiritually and psychologically but we are at war with the Communists physically. Since the end of World War II, the Kremlin's ruthless agents have seized control in one country after another, until today 800,000,000 people are prisoners behind the iron curtain. The Communist leaders have the cunning of a demented mind. Part of their strategy is to exploit our love of peace and our cherished Christian beliefs by using our own preachers and teachers to soften up America for the kill. They know that our Government is no stronger than the public opinion which supports its policies. Therefore, if under the guise of advocating Christian ethics, the Communists can get enough of our people committed to the spineless policy of nonresistance or even an attitude of apathy toward the war effort, they will undermine our national security. Such a paralysis of our national strength would render us helpless before their endless battalions of armed fanatics.

Man for man, our soldiers have always been better than the soldiers of our enemies. Why? Because of a firm conviction on the part of our soldiers that they were fighting for a principle. In other words, "Thrice armed is he whose cause is just." Never was our cause more just than it is today, and never has Christianity been challenged by a more ruthless and more powerful foe than now. Therefore, it would be expected that every church service would include a patriotic rededication to the ideals for which men are giving their lives in Korea today.

But suppose a young man who is about to go to war should attend a church service somewhere in the United States and the business-as-usual manner with which the services were conducted gave him the impression that Christian people were indifferent toward stopping Communist aggression. Then suppose the preacher should deliver a splendid sermon on Christian living with no apparent interest in winning the war now being fought to keep the world a fit place in which to do that living. What conclusion would be forced upon that young man by such an apathetic attitude toward a war he is expected to fight? He would undoubtedly wonder if the cause was really a righteous one and if it was worth the sacrifice which he was being asked to make for it. Such a doubt in the justice of his cause would render him less able to do his duty as a soldier. Therefore, if we by our apathy shake the faith of our boys in what they are fighting for, we must accept the responsibility for the consequences.

Suppose another soldier boy should attend another church service somewhere in the United States and hear a sermon that left him with the impression that in the eyes of the Christian people it is wrong to bear arms and use force regardless of what the circumstances might be. The effect of such an impression upon his will to fight would be as deadening as a shot of cocaine to the muscles of his body.

How can any Christian say, "This is not my war. It is no concern of mine if other countries are invaded and their peoples enslaved. I am not my brother's keeper." No Christian can say that and make an accurate statement because it is inconsistent with Christian ideals. Hence, the churches cannot afford to support the Communist-inspired doctrine of nonresistance either by direct precept or by a significant absence of patriotism in their services.

When did God ever rebuke his people for defending their freedom and their homes and their lives? When was it ever wrong to fight for principle? Many of God's greatest leaders in the past have been mighty warriors, and the time has come again when His leaders must be strong fighting men. They must be able to rally His people not only to meet the spiritual challenge of communism but to prevent the powerful Communist armies from enslaving the world. If we are to enjoy the blessings of liberty, we must pay the price of that liberty ourselves and not expect non-Chrisitians to pay it for us. I cannot believe that God expects His children to ride on the freedom train without paying their fares. I cannot believe that He expects them to shirk their duty when there is a war to be fought to prevent communism from enslaving the world.

The threat to freedom today is greater than it has ever been in our time. America has been called the land of the free and the home of the brave, but I would like to suggest that it is the land of the free because it is the home of the brave, and when it is no longer the home of the brave it will no longer be the land of the free. Freedom exists only where men are willing to defend it with their lives.

Everything that Christians hold dear is at stake in this war. Therefore, every Christian leader should be a firebrand for freedom and should rekindle the fires of patriotism on all of the sacred altars throughout the free world. It is not necessary to abandon evangelism in order to preach patriotism. We need spiritual guidance, but we also need some good red-blooded preaching which tells us what to do after we have turned both checks and had them smitten with hammer and sickle. We need evangelistic preaching more than ever before, but we also need some praise the Lord and pass the ammunition preaching, too. We need to hear the battle cry of Christian soldiers on the march.

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important bills passed during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress was S. 2446, the so-called middle income housing bill. Although many of its important and best provisions were stricken from the bill before its passage, notably the cooperative housing section, the measure showed the people of moderate means that their Government was interested in doing something to alleviate their plight.

There are millions of families in this Nation who are in the middle-income bracket, and who have largely missed out on housing programs in the past. In many cases, slum-clearance programs and lower income housing provisions have had restrictions barring their utilization by persons or families of this economic class. Their housing problem, however, is just as real as that of people who earn less.

It was this large group of citizens which the middle income housing bill was designed to help. It is regrettable that some of its best provisions were not retained, so that more people might have benefited.

Now that we are in a state of speeded-up war activity and with the accompanying danger of inflation, President Truman has placed restrictions on credit and building. This was, of course, the only thing he could do under the circumstances, even though it hindered many of the building programs now in effect. But let us hope that if our economic situation becomes stable once again, another and far-reaching housing bill is passed by Congress. We are still faced with a housing problem in this country. By the time our economy is completely stable once again we will surely have a far greater problem.

Let us earnestly hope that the Congress at that time will contain men who can and will grasp the situation and write adequate legislation to aid the millions who want and need better housing.

The Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Monday, September 18, 1950:

DRIVE DESERVES SUPPORT

Crusade for freedom drive officials in Massachusetts today made public the Declaration of Freedom which citizens throughout the State will be asked to sign when they enlist in the fight to stop the spread of Communist propaganda.

The declaration calls for a renewed pledge on the part of patriotic citizens in the "sacredness and dignity of the individual * * * the belief that all men derive the right to freedom equally from God * * * and to resist aggression and tyranny wherever they appear on earth."

The pledge appears on every freedom scroll to be placed in enrollment stations which will be established soon in all parts of the State. The scrolls, with the signatures on them, will be enshrined in the base of the giant, 10-ton bronze freedom bell, to be installed and dedicated behind the iron curtain in Berlin on United Nations Day, October 24.

Bell-ringing ceremonies throughout the free world will accompany the dedication of the freedom bell as a tribute to those who today are giving their lives in the struggle for human freedom. It will stand as a permanent symbol of the free world's determination to triumph over totalitarian aggression.

First to sign the freedom scroll in Massachusetts was Gov. Paul A. Dever. He also was first to contribute to the support of radio free Europe, a new radio station in Germany which brings to the people behind the iron curtain the truth of the democratic way of life. Funds also will help support a proposed network of freedom radio stations throughout Europe and Asia to combat the lies, big and little, being promulgated by Communists.

The following is the declaration for freedom pledge:

"I believe in the sacredness and dignity of the individual.

"I believe that all men derive the right to freedom equally from God.

"I pledge to resist aggression and tyranny wherever they appear on earth.

"I am proud to enlist in the crusade for freedom. I am proud to help make the freedom bell possible, to be a signer of this declaration of freedom, to have my name included as a permanent part of the freedom shrine in Berlin, and to join with the millions of men and women throughout the world who hold the cause of freedom sacred."

The crusade for freedom drive will continue for 6 weeks as an all-out effort is made to enlist the public in the drive.

This is a worth while drive and merits the support of all patriotic citizens.

Our Social-Security System Has Been Improved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, gratifying to know that, despite all the bumps and unexpected turns which the legislative road has taken during this second session of the Eighty-first Congress, the new social-security bill was passed by both Houses and signed into law by the President.

The social-security idea was one of the most progressive steps ever taken by any government when it was passed in the midthirties. As is almost always the case with such revolutionary and far-reaching legislation, it was discovered in time to contain several inadequate points and not to contain some much-needed provisions.

It is, then, a pleasure to have supported the new social-security bill which improved many of the points which were found to be wanting in the original legislation.

Under the new law over 45,000,000 workers are covered—an increase of 10,000,000 over the number covered under the old law. In addition, benefit payments have been increased an average of 77 percent. In addition, the increased benefits will apply to those who have already retired, as well as those who retire in the future.

Under the old law a person must have been employed in a covered industry for half of the total working quarters from 1936 to his retirement. Under the new law a 62-year-old man who was covered for any six quarters in the past is fully eligible for benefits at age 65.

World War II veterans will get wage credits for each month of service financed from the old-age and survivors insurance fund. Another feature which I am glad was finally included in the new law is the exemption of State and local employees who already have a retirement plan. Many of my constituents were especially interested in this feature, since they were already covered by their own plans.

There are still many improvements to be made in the social-security plan. It is not yet perfect, but the passage of H. R. 6000 and its being signed into Public Law 734 is a great step forward and an accomplishment of which the Eighty-first Congress can be proud.

The Mighty "Mo's" Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, last January, at about the same time that a majority of one in the House of Representatives defeated an aid to Korea bill, a great many people were highly amused at the unfortunate grounding in Chesapeake Bay of the battleship *Missouri*. Today we know the great role played by the *Missouri* in the recently begun offensive of the United Nations' forces in Korea. All will acknowledge now that the *Missouri* has played her role in defense of freedom with greater effectiveness than those who described aid to Korea as operation rat hole.

Mr. Frank Tallman, of Kansas City, a distinguished veteran of World War II, who since the end of that war has actively participated in and worked hard for the defense forces of the United States, has called to my attention an excellent editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star of Saturday, September 16, 1950. I include herewith the Mighty *Mo's* Comeback:

THE MIGHTY "MO'S" COMEBACK

Let every loyal son of Missouri hold his head high and his chest thrust forward. The proud battleship named for his State has redeemed herself.

It was a dark and perverse day last January 17 when the Big Mo found herself stuck in a Chesapeake Bay mud bank, as helpless as a fish beached by the tide. Before 14 little tugs could huff and puff the *Missouri* to floating safety, she had become a pathetic figure of ridicule, a national joke for all her gallant past.

Whereupon the Navy, in its embarrassment, relegated the grand lady warrior to the rocking chair status of a training ship. In an era when atomic weapons would be all-determining, the *Missouri* was supposed to be as obsolete as a wooden frigate.

So what happens? Along comes tne Korean War and the admirals find a job made to order for their only active battlewagon. The *Missouri* hears the call to arms, glides out of semiretirement and heads for the

scenes of conflict. While racing 11,000 miles she cuts through a hurricane, eludes a tropical storm and arrives off the Korean coast with a typhoon lashing its tail behind her. Then the queen of the seas stands near the Communist-occupied port of Samchok while her 16-inch guns soften defenses for United States marines and infantry landing there in the first big United Nations counterattack of the war.

It's the sweetest vindication possible for a fighting lady. And there can be no true Missourian so lacking in sentiment as not to be aboard his State's favorite vessel in spirit as she goes about her grim business of gaining new and greater glory.

Congressional Frank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the news services, under date of September 18, 1950, carried the story of the Buchanan Special House Committee Investigating Lobbying Activities report, charging that some Congressmen had permitted indiscriminate use of their franking privileges.

For example, I have been accused of mailing out 2,400,000 pieces of information at the taxpayers' expense during the last 6 years. That is an average of 400,000 pieces per year. Assuming these figures to be correct, yet the printing, paper, and envelopes for these speeches constitute the big expense and not the postage. It is obvious therefore, that few speeches and inserts of editorials and the like would be sent to the public unless paid for by the Congressmen or private persons. If the Congressmen can pay the bills themselves for printing and sending the material out, what's wrong if private organizations pay the bill and the Congressman sends it out under his frank? It must be assumed that the Congressmen will not use their frank unless they endorse their own material, or what they insert, as pertinent to legislation before the House.

Since there are 300,000 people in my district for example, it costs each of them about 1⅓ cents per year—postage costs only—to hear directly from their Representative in Congress and/or to provide wider dissemination of his report, speeches, or other messages. While the taxpayers of my district paid 1⅓ cents per year, I, or private persons or organizations, met the cost of all the paper and all the printing of the 2,400,000 pieces; and I, personally, paid for much of the research entering into statements prepared, inserted in the RECORD, and distributed under frank, by me.

Postmaster General Donaldson advised me in a letter dated June 22 that the cost of mailing out administration mail is about $75,000,000. Subsidies for air mail and other services bring the cost up to around $149,000,000 a year. Add to that the salaries and expenses of 45,000 writers of the material and the printing at a cost of about $100,000,000, according to Senator BYRD. This information and propaganda machine, costing the taxpayers about $250,000,000 is overlooked when appraising the effort that Congressmen make to present the opposition viewpoint, at their own expense and with the help of private persons, at a pitifully small franking—postage—cost of $1,200,000. It is too bad Congressmen send so little to their constituents.

Oddly enough, too, the administration mail goes first class, at a 3-cent rate, whereas the congressional frank generally carries congressional mail at a 1-cent postage rate, the slowest and cheapest method of handling.

But far more important than what I or any other individual Congressman has or has not done, with regard to dissemination of views he upholds through the use of his frank, is the fundamental reason for the establishment of the franking privilege.

This privilege and obligation was given to Congressmen without limitation because our founding fathers, like the members of the British Parliament, had fought for the right of representation. And they knew that they needed the fullest, freest communication between their representative and themselves. With overwhelming New Deal majorities, President Roosevelt attempted to destroy, by court-packing, the balance between the judicial, executive, and legislative departments. It was by the use of 15,000,000 pieces of franked mail, setting forth the constitutional issues, the Members of the Senate were able to carry the issue to the country and save the independence of our courts. This was a small price to pay for safeguarding our Constitution in a time of crisis and peril.

The use of the frank is the Congressman's most important, often his only means of communication with the people. By this method the people should get the facts from Congress as opposed to the propaganda of the administration. The taxpayers pay a little over $1,200,000 for this service from both parties in both the House and the Senate. On the other hand, they pay more than $250,000,000 for one-sided material put out by the admin'stration, to say nothing of other costs and salaries of those who prepare and disseminate it.

But that is only part of the story. More than half the Members of Congress belong to the party in power and they make far more use of congressional committee reports and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the franking privilege than the minority party has yet learned to do.

Without the right to communicate with their constituents the Members of Congress soon cease to be an independent legislative body, fulfilling its duty under the Constitution to act as a check against usurpation by administrative power and to uphold minority views and rights.

The material I have distributed related to such matters as the dangers of Federal housing, Federal aid to and control of education, and the effect of centralized Government controls such as OPA throughout history. It favored the free economy against communism.

The men who are working night and day to change our form of government from a Republic to a Socialist autocracy under a ruling clique know well that they must destroy the ability of Congressmen to communicate with the people. They have put a congressional committee to work studying "lobbies," but that committee spends much time studying the communications of Congressmen with the citizens. It seems to find little time to investigate the vast propaganda network of the biggest and most dangerous lobby of all, the Government itself—the bureaucrats working under direction of the party in power.

Senator Ingalls, of Kansas, in June 1878, in the course of a debate on the franking privilege, in which such Senators as Hannibal Hamlin, James G. Blaine, and Roscoe Conkling participated, said:

> The privilege (of franking) is one that belongs to the people and not to the representatives. The people never demanded the abolition of franking. Its object is to furnish the people with information and to allow them to receive from their representatives statistics, data, and information as to what is being done here by those who represent them in the different departments of the Government.

I can understand why our collectivists are trying to break down the communication between Congressmen and their constituents. I think the people should understand it, too.

Address by Hon. Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland, at 1950 Barry Day Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Sunday, September 10, to address the 1950 Barry Day celebration of the Society of Commodore John Barry, United States Navy, one of the very outstanding patriotic organizations of the country. The ceremony, following the traditional parade, was held in Independence Square, Philadelphia, and was dedicated according to the custom of the society to the gallant members of the United States Navy of the present and of the past.

It was most gratifying to have the opportunity on that occasion to pay tribute to the "father of our Navy" and through him to the thousands of patriotic men and women who today are carrying on so nobly in the Naval Establishment. Likewise, it is a source of satisfaction to pay tribute also to the distinguished chairman of that splendid ceremony, Mr. Patrick J. McNelis, and to his loyal and efficient associates, among them the Honorable Michael J. Bradley, collector of the port of Philadelphia, and the Honorable Vin-

cent A. Carroll, judge of the Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia.

In honoring one of the great heroes of our great Naval Establishment, it seemed pertinent to me to discuss the dangers presently facing the United States—those dangers against which the Navy would be most effective, as well as other dangers from within the country, to which every citizen should be alerted.

Because of the urgency of a more thorough understanding by all our people, to these threats to national security, I ask uanimous consent that the address be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this day dedicated to the memory of a great American who well deserves the title of "Father of our Navy", it is our immediate urge to pay deserved tribute to the gallant members of our present day Navy, and of its splendid "junior partner" in the Naval Establishment, the United States Marine Corps.

It is particularly gratifying that it was a native of our well-beloved Emerald Isle who was actively instrumental in the founding of the United States Navy. Commodore Barry, a seafarer from his early youth, realized, among the very first of the early Colonists, that freedom could never be won nor could the Colonies survive or progress as an independent nation, without an adequate Navy. Thoroughly fitting it is, therefore, to keep alive his memory, and his faith in the Navy, in this atomic era where there has not been evident a recognition of the Navy's part in future wars.

Korea has shown how desperately the military forces of the United States depend upon the Navy. The remarkable dispatch with which the Navy transported to Korea the men and armaments and supplies that alone could stop the Communist onslaught there is directly in keeping with the Navy's highest traditions.

While it was from Philadelphia, his adopted home, that Commodore Barry first demonstrated to the world of his day the exceptional understanding of and aptitude in naval affairs, it is understandable that your neighbors in my own State of Maryland, the home of the great United States Naval Academy, have particular affection for that branch which Commodore Barry did so much to establish and whose early and lasting prestige stemmed largely from his glorious achievements.

It might well be recalled, too, that Commodore Barry was one of the first, if not the first Navy man to join forces with the Army. His services at Trenton while he was temporarily "on the beach," during a period when his ship was unable to put to sea, were a fitting forerunner to the splendid services which members of the Navy and of the Marine Corps have given ashore in many sections of the world, particularly in the amphibious landings of World War II.

On a day devoted to honoring the Navy as a bulwark of our country, it seems appropriate to consider some phases of America's security which are uppermost in the minds of citizens today.

Many threats to national security have arisen since Commodore Barry first offered his services in the defense of his adopted country against the powerful attacks of foreign sea forces. But that there has never been, at any time, the danger to national security both from within and without that there is today is demonstrably clear.

On the world front a mighty dictatorship, ruling from Russia, and controlling one-third of the world's population, is seeking by force of arms, and by the most clever and unscrupulous methods of infiltration, to extend to other lands and other peoples its enslaving control. Within the borders of the United States, and just as immediately pressing, is the threat to our internal security, a threat likewise stemming from the Kremlin; devised, nurtured, and directed by the most accomplished group of propagandists, spies, and saboteurs ever unleashed upon the world.

One of the immutable laws of nature, experience teaches, is that everything must be in balance. The world is in balance with the universe which surrounds it. And in this world, for every advantage or benefit which is enjoyed, there usually is a corresponding disadvantage to be suffered. Consider our own great country, for instance. Nothing like it has ever been devised in world history. No other people ever enjoyed the freedoms, the opportunities, the advantages and benefits of citizenship possessed by all in the United States.

Yet those very freedoms which are praised so highly, and which are "Columbia's proud boast" to all the world, render the United States particularly susceptible to attacks from both without and within.

The dictator states, to the dismay of the whole free world, have proven their ability to wage war successfully and devastatingly. When a dictator decides that a certain thing needs to be done, he simply orders it done. Ruthlessly he brushes aside consideration of the rights or even of the lives of the people involved—his own subjects or those to be conquered. To the dictator there are no individual rights. To him individuals are expendable; they are mere chattels of the State.

In a nation of freedom such as ours, however, war cannot be carried out with anything like the brutal efficiency the dictators can employ. The liberties, which our citizens are guaranteed, must be zealously guarded. Their right to freedom of speech, to criticize, and even to oppose policies which the heads of our country consider necessary, must ever be upheld.

Recent events throughout the world have clearly outlined the pattern of aggression which is looming over the entire world. We see it unmistakably in Korea, where hundreds of thousands of non-Russians are being sacrificed in a needless, unjust war under the guise of Korean nationalism, but actually to further Communist imperialism.

In our own country there is clear and brazen evidence of an intent by a foreign power to undermine American institutions as has been done in nations in Europe and Asia. Foreign agents have come here in droves to spy, to propagandize, to mislead our people into the belief that they would be better off under the Communist form of government. So clear is the pattern of such aggression in Europe and Asia, so well defined are the subversive procedures, that one would be more than foolish not to appreciate that present Communist infiltration activities are intended simply as a prelude to the day when Communist forces hope and plan to take over and rule by force.

In such circumstances, therefore, it would seem that any prudent people would take the steps enabling them to combat successfully both the open and hidden aggression against us. Make no mistake about it, though, it is a difficult assignment that faces our Nation if it is adequately to prepare itself to withstand communism's assaults.

In all truth it must be admitted, however, costly as it is, and despite the mounting American casualty lists, the Communist-inspired Korean incident may well be a blessing in disguise.

Already it has shown up the inadequacies of United States Armed Forces in several respects. Already it has given our military leaders an insight into the type of aggression that they will be called upon to face in other sections of the world if and when the Moscow leadership decides that the time is ripe for an all-out bid for world domination.

Anyone conversant with the military situation in the United States would have to admit that, had Russia launched a full-scale offensive months ago in western Europe, the United States would have been hard put to find the manpower and the firepower to stop it. Korea has simply afforded a bit of a breathing space. It has shown up weaknesses and prompt steps are being taken to eradicate them.

For instance, Russian-made tanks in Korea have pointed up the undiminished importance of the tank in warfare, and the necessity of having tanks in being, in quantities, rather than on the drawing boards. The United States did not have them in readiness when the Korean attack struck, but thanks to American productive ingenuity they will be rolling off the assembly lines shortly and they will be far better tanks because of what Russia has shown us in Korea.

For the Navy, particularly, planning for the future has been drastically revised as a result of lessons learned in Korea. Where would the hard-pressed UN forces, tenaciously fighting to retain their foothold there, be without the support of Navy airpower from the carriers which responded so speedily to the alarm? Global warfare, it has been clearly shown, still reserves a vital sphere of action for carrier-based air power. And pilots of the United States Navy, it can be taken for granted, will, by their gallant exploits in the air, add new glory to the service which Commodore Barry served so well on the Seven Seas.

There is another side to this security picture, however, with which some of you may not be as thoroughly familiar as you are with Navy affairs. I have been living with it as a member of the Senate committee which considers matters of espionage, immigration, and other activities of aliens within our midst. For those alien activities, coupled with the military aggression which Russia is so busily preparing, comprise a double-barreled danger to American security.

From the intimate knowledge gained as to the activities being carried on by Communist agents and under Communist direction throughout the United States, it is my sincere conviction that America must strengthen its internal security to avoid following in the footsteps of Poland and Czechoslovakia and other countries which have succumbed to Soviet pressure and now are slaves of Communist masters.

Nevertheless, there are some who still insist, despite all that we know about Communist methods and activities here and abroad, that we must not "be too hard" upon these disloyal citizens or their alien instigators.

Many persons—and there is clear evidence that Communists are instigating and supporting such protests—have thrown up their hands in horror at the danger of "thought control" as a result of the proposed legislative measures. Let me say there will be no thought control in America as long as common sense rules our Nation; no thought control unless we fail to take proper measures and the Communists take over. Then we will have not only thought control, but we will have slavery and injustice worse than our forefathers knew it when they fled the countries of Europe to come here and found this new nation of freedom. But additional legislation must be passed containing real sanctions and with teeth to prevent and to punish subversive acts against our Nation—acts as deadly to freedom and liberty as an assault on the battle front.

As part and parcel of the Communist bid for world supremacy you will read and hear

much, beginning next week, when the United Nations General Assembly convenes, of Russia's efforts to force seating of Communist China's representatives in the United Nations. I say to you that it would be a great tragedy for the world at this time if Russia were successful in these efforts.

What respect could the smaller nations of the world have for the United Nations if a powerful, aggressive nation like Russia could bring about the overthrow of an independent government, set up its own puppet government there, and then force the admission of that puppet government into the United Nations? Not only would the United Nations decline sharply in prestige but its power for good, its activities for establishing peace throughout the world, would be negated in that Russia would gain another supporter to bolster the efforts which she has pursued so consistently to prevent any just settlement of pending world affairs.

No doubt some of our people are struck with confusion sometimes as they try to figure out why dictators like Stalin and Hitler single our country out as the major target of their abuse and their attacks. Is it simply envy of America's material wealth? No; I believe not. They see the advantages our people enjoy and they know their subjects can never be kept completely under control as long as America stands as a beacon in the sky, a promise in the heavens to all the downtrodden peoples of the earth. As long as the torch of liberty burns in our land, dictators know that there will be light upon the earth, there will be hope for the oppressed, and with such hope there will be incentive to rise against the oppressor.

By our very nature, by the consecrated blood of our forefathers who established this land of freedom, we are the moral enemy of all tyranny. We are the moral opponents of any nation or any dictatorship which sets itself up as master of mankind.

For it is our national faith that men shall be free, and not be slaves; that they shall be equal before one another as they are equal in the sight of God, and not be subservient to false godheads of military might or political expediency.

We are the spiritual antagonists of racial hatreds and religious intolerance. And with these moral enmities come responsibilities which America has no right, or wish, to escape.

Even if we did wish it, America could not help being the symbol of world-wide hope. We have been just that for 300 years. It was to the New World that the victims of old oppressions began to look. It was to the North American colonies that experimenters in workable democracy first came and set up constitutional responsive governments.

It was on this continent that the first great and enduring union of free peoples was instituted. And it was to this country that the fugitives from aggressors migrated in search of what they could not obtain at home. Small wonder it is if the eyes of Europe still turn west—the people looking with longing, the dictators with loathing.

Having gathered into their hands almost incredible power, the enemies of civilization now confront us with defiant confidence while they predict, and do their best in subtle ways to bring about, the destruction of our liberties and our way of life. It is in the face of such dire contingencies that our people watch and wait, speeding with all their energies further preparations for defense while they wait.

As we stand today, therefore, in respectful and admiring tribute to one of the great naval heroes and geniuses of our history, let me emphasize once more America's pride in her Navy and in its men. In intelligence, in training, in courage, and morale the United States Navy is the equal, or superior, of any navy in the world today. While ominous clouds may darken the horizon, while despotism seeks unceasingly to undo the marvelous magic of government which our forefathers established in 1776, there is no cause for gloom, no reason for despair.

Free men will ever rise to sublime heights in defense of their homes and firesides. The future still belongs to valiant hearts and stanch arms. While the flame of liberty burns bright within our breasts, while freedoms and opportunities such as ours are the heritage of brave men and women, we will retain that legacy which our forefathers won and bequeathed to us.

We, of this generation, will keep faith with Commodore Barry and that gallant host of loyal Americans whose deeds have made our world the haven it is today. We will preserve the Nation they founded, and we will pass on to our descendants the same democratic form of government, and the same individual liberty and freedom which always have been and, God willing, always will be the heritage of the American people.

Legal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that a short talk which I delivered this noon on the subject of legal aid, before the legal aid section of the American Bar Association, in session at the Mayflower Hotel, in Washington, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, we spend millions so that in Europe and the rest of the world the minds of men will be able to reason and think rationally. And will be able to appreciate the great ideas we believe in.

Let us never forget the ideas of communism know no iron curtain. Here in our beloved America they strike hard and often. We must see to it that the minds of America are immunized so that the isms of Russia cannot here get a foothold.

We have more wealth per capita in this country than was ever attained before in any nation of the earth. We have the highest standard of living ever attained by any nation on this globe. We have the greatest amount of personal freedom, and no nation ever before presented more opportunities for its citizens.

Does that mean that we have arrived, and that there is no more opportunity for development, for growth. Of course it does not.

As we measure history we know that we are only a few thousand years away from the caveman, and yet in that march of the centuries we on this continent have attained the highest standard of living, with more of the good things for the individual and for the race than ever before attained by man.

All this is due in large part because of the system in which we live. It is a system where liberty prevails, where man has the largest amount of real freedom. The system that we have arises out of three great facts—our religious concept under the Judaic-Christian religion, our political concept which is the result of our Constitution with its checks and balances, and our economic concept called the American way or the way of free enterprise.

All of these great ideas have been tremendous factors in pushing this people forward to the place of leadership where we are.

The millennium, however, is not here. We have problems due to the fact that individuals create these problems. The rule or the principle if followed, as outlined in these three great ideas, would do away with the problems, but we are constantly breaking these principles.

When the individual commits an offense against his Maker or against society, he is making himself less adequate and thus he contributes toward the creation of a problem, just the same as if one in seeking to get at the right result in mathematics were to multiply two times two and make seven, he would never get the right answer. Now, we don't try to abolish the principles of mathematics when someone makes a mistake; we try to correct the mistake by correcting the individual who makes it.

THE ANSWER TO SOCIALIZED LEGAL PROFESSION IS THE NEW JERSEY LEGAL AID PROGRAM

It has been said that nearly 8 persons out of every 1,000 in the United States are unable to pay for legal assistance which they need. In a good many of the States the bar association has carried on an active program of legal-aid promotion. In the larger cities the problem has been met by establishment of a community law office open to anyone who cannot pay a lawyer's fee. This office is taken care of by the local Community Chest. We feel this is needed because a man who believes he has suffered an injustice through inability to get a lawyer is an easy convert for the isms from abroad.

In other words, justice is not for the rich man only, justice is for all. The tools of justice must not be denied anyone.

The people who need to make contact between our system of justice and themselves are those who cannot pay for legal service; therefore, when they get this service, a new understanding of the lawyer, what he stands for and what he does comes into being, and, of course, when you have legal aid it creates an improvement in the public relations of the bar.

A legal-aid office in the city helps the businessman, the welfare worker, the retailer, the merchant; in fact, everybody.

The Chief Justice of the United States has said:

"Legal aid should not only exist in the cities; it should be extended to every part of this country to protect the rights of those who cannot protect themselves." Former Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes endorsed it as have countless others.

As a former practicing lawyer and as a member of the American bar, I know the importance to the individual who needs this aid; I know the importance of this matter to the community and of its importance to the legal profession—I refer to the sponsoring of legal aid as a private enterprise available to every needy citizen of the State.

Full Employment a Mockery—Copper Shortage Plagues Defense Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is sad to note that failure of the United

States Senate to suspend the import tax on copper is hampering the efforts of patriotic men and women to make a real contribution to the defense program of this Nation.

Action stemming from my bill, H. R. 7151, resulted in House passage of the tax suspension; unfortunately, the Senate Finance Committee completely disregarded the needs of our Nation by tabling this legislation.

With increased production in our brass and copper fabricating industries necessary for military reasons, cut-backs are now being made because of a copper shortage. Opponents of H. R. 7151 stated over and over again that there was a sufficient supply of domestic copper to meet our needs for both military and civilian requirements. Now we find that less than 3 months after reimposition of the tax a shortage already exists. Workers are being laid off and brass companies are curtailing production. This is a very real problem to communities like Waterbury, Ansonia, Bristol, Torrington, and Bridgeport in Connecticut, as many thousands of their citizens depend upon these industries for their livelihood. It is a very real problem also to our fighting men in Korea who depend upon an unbroken supply line to bring about an early victory.

The short-sighted legislators who brought about these conditions must answer to their consciences for the damage they have wrought.

The following editorials and news items from Connecticut newspapers portray vividly the effects of a continuing copper shortage:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of September 16, 1950]

ABC CASTING SHOP'S WORKWEEK SLICED—ON 4 DAYS DUE TO COPPER SHORTAGE; SCOVILL, CHASE HIT

Approximately 150 employees in the casting shop of the American Brass Co. had their workweek reduced to 4 days this week because of a shortage of copper, the company disclosed yesterday.

A spokesman for the ABC said the 32-hour workweek schedule will remain in effect for the casting shop next week. He said the shortage of copper may mean shorter hours for other departments eventually.

Similar curtailments appeared to be in store at the Scovill Manufacturing Co. and the Chase Brass & Copper Co. All of the firms recently cut out overtime work because of the copper shortage, and curtailments below the normal workweek appeared likely.

At the Scovill Manufacturing Co., a spokesman said there was a possibility of a curtailment. He said no action had been taken as yet, but the hours in the casting shop may be curtailed in the very near future.

At the Chase Brass, stewards of the CIO Progressive Metalworkers Council said they had heard from company officials that 81 probationary employees will be dropped at the metal works plant and operations will be put on a 32-hour basis.

CHASE COMMENTS

Rodney Chase, vice president in charge of industrial relations for the Chase company, said he was unable to comment on the stewards' report, which was disclosed by PMC Chairman John J. Driscoll. He confirmed, however, that there may be lay-offs. "When we don't have enough, as we fear we won't, we simply won't have work," he commented.

Driscoll reported that the union has been advised by managements of the big three brass plants of pending manpower reductions. He said he has wired to Senator BRIEN MCMAHON and the National Security Resources Board, advising them of the serious effects on manpower here, caused by the copper shortage.

OTHER LAY-OFFS

ROME, N. Y., September 15.—Two copper processing plants today laid off workers and two others said labor curtailments could be expected unless a shortage of raw materials is eased.

General Cable Corp., said that about 500 of its 2,500 workers were furloughed today when copper stocks were depleted. Plant Manager F. Y. Kreimendahl said he hoped the employees could be recalled on Monday.

The Rome division of Revere Copper and Brass, Inc., said it laid off about 75 casting shop workers. The plant employs about 2,000.

Revere, on August 18, announced it was forced to cut its 6-day production schedule to 5 days due to the shortage.

Plant officials have blamed a growing shortage in the copper market on failure of the Senate to act on a bill continuing the suspension of a 2 cents a pound import tax. Customer demands have continued high, they add.

Rome Cable Corp. said it was "operating on the basis of what (stock) we have," according to A. D. Ross Fraser, president. The Spargo Wire Co. faces a "small cut-back" on Monday, James A. Spargo, president, said.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American of September 19, 1950]

BRASS FIRMS FORCE TO CUT WORK WEEK

Work-week reductions from five to four days were ordered for 150 casting shop employees at the American Brass Co. plant this week, the company disclosed last night.

Curtailments were also reported by the Scovill Manufacturing Co. and the Chase Brass & Copper Co., which recently cut out overtime work because of the copper shortage.

A spokesman for the ABC said the 32-hour work-week schedule will remain in effect for the casting shop next week. He said the shortage of copper may mean shorter hours for other departments eventually.

At the Scovill Manufacturing Co., a spokesman said there was "a possibility" of a curtailment. He said no action had been taken as yet, but the hours in the casting shop may be curtailed in the very near future.

At the Chase Brass, stewards of the CIO Progressive Metalworkers Council said they had heard from company officials that 81 probationary employees will be dropped at the metal works plant and operations will be put on a 32-hour basis.

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel of September 18, 1950]

THE COPPER TARIFF

The Nation is at war but in brass industries in Conecticut, lay-offs are imminent.

There is a shortage of copper.

Goods manufactured in these industries are the sinews of war, and if the Nation is to arm itself to the extent outlined as necessary by President Truman, there will be still greater need for their products.

Yet, thanks to the obstinacy of Senators from our copper-producing States, a new suspension of the tariff on copper imports is blocked.

Men may be laid off because there isn't enough copper in the country. Our copper-producing States are producing copper, and there is no question but that they are getting a fair price for it at the mines. In these days when the Nation is arming for defense and already engaged in war in far off Asia, there is no defense for the 2-cent duty on foreign copper. In fact the sons of some of those who are fighting to keep that impost may find themselves lacking the proper implements of battle. The House has already voted repeal of the tariff. It is in the Senate that it is being held up. The President is on the record as favoring the lifting of the copper impost. It is high time for the Senators from the copper States to pry themselves loose from an unrealistic and myopic pattern that may seriously hamper America's effort to defend itself.

Of course, there are, perhaps, other factors, besides the copper tariff, involved. There may be some Government stockpiling that is making the supply short. Or there may be some hold-up, somewhere, for speculation, which should be looked into. But the fact remains that renewal of the copper import duty suspension would do much to end a sorry situation.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of September 19, 1950]

HOARDING COPPER

Anybody who tries to corner the copper market can now be fined $10,000 or put in prison for a year—anybody, that is except United States Senators who promote the cornering of the copper market by voting to maintain a prohibitive import duty on copper.

The Commerce Department, under powers granted it by Congress, has put copper on the list of commodities that can't be hoarded. Hoarding copper can now be an offense punishable by a year in prison and a fine of $10,000. The Commerce Department has acted wisely.

Like steel, rubber, tin, cement, lumber, and a number of other commodities, copper is vital to security at this time because an unobstructed supply is essential for defense production.

Yet the same Congress that gave the Commerce Department the authority to put copper on the no-hoarding list has been doing everything possible to make it difficult for copper-using industries to get the supply they need.

As a result the casting shops in the Naugatuck Valley brass industries which ought to be working overtime have had to cut their workweek to 4 days in some cases.

This is because American mines don't produce enough copper for American industrial consumption and because Congress insists on blocking copper imports by maintaining a $40-a-ton import duty.

The Members of Congress who have been blocking copper imports must have felt pretty funny about giving the Commerce Department authority to ban the hoarding of copper. These Members of Congress which have been fighting to maintain the $40-a-ton tariff are really in favor of hoarding copper. They are trying to make it scarce. They want the price to go up, and they make no bones about saying so. They don't care whether their action adds hugely to the Nation's defense costs—which it most certainly will.

To be consistent at this point, Congress should either demand that copper be stricken from the list of critical commodities that shouldn't be hoarded or vote unanimously to remove the import tariff.

It isn't fair to make an ordinary individual punishable by a $10,000 fine for trying to corner the copper market when a United States Senator who is using his congressional position to help bring about just such a cornering of the market gets away scott free.

International Information and Educational Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement made by my colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], on the subject of the international information and educational exchange program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM BENTON, OF CONNECTICUT

I was greatly pleased when the Senate Appropriations Committee restored the cuts made by the House Appropriations Committee in the State Department's budget request for its international information and educational exchange program. I respectfully invite attention to the letter I wrote Chairman McKELLAR urging this restoration. Further, I invite attention to a brief analysis which I have prepared, a statement of facts, on the impact of the cuts in the budget as to which the conference committee largely upheld the House position instead of the Senate position. I deeply regret this action by the conference committee and I think this is an example of an instance where the Congress is pennywise and pound foolish. At the same time we are appropriating billions for armaments, we are cutting back on proposed activities which are a necessary adjunct to our military power.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

STATEMENT OF FACTS

In April of this year the President directed the Secretary of State to plan a stronger and more effective national effort to mobilize the power of truth in defense of peace and freedom.

To that end the President submitted a supplemental estimate in the total amount of $97,212,000 to provide for an intensification of the International Information and Educational Exchange Program in certain areas of the world where the threat of Communist aggression is of critical concern to the national interests of the United States. The President emphasized at that time that he regarded "such an expanded campaign of truth as vital to our national security," and that "we will never attain real security until people everywhere recognize that the free nations of the world are the true seekers of permanent peace." Of this total amount of $97,200,000, the Department of State estimated that approximately $15,200,000 could be expended from available ECA counterpart funds.

The House approved the entire amount of the supplemental estimate submitted by the Department for the radio-broadcasting program (the Voice of America) in the amount of $48,890,000, including the sum of $41,288,000 for the construction of new facilities. The Department's estimate for the press and publications activity was reduced in the amount of $25,894; and the estimate for the motion-pictures program was reduced from $11,017,833 to $10,000,000. Thus the total for information program activities, apart from overseas missions, domestic services, and administrative support, was reduced from $64,633,727 to $63,590,000, or about 1.6 percent.

The Department's estimate for educational exchange program activities was reduced from $18,834,664 to $5,000,000, or approximately 73.5 percent.

Specifically the supplemental estimate for information centers was reduced from $6,078,664 to $2,000,000, or approximately 69.1 percent. This activity, as planned by the Department of State, contemplated not only the operation and maintenance of United States libraries, but also the establishment in the Eastern Hemisphere of American centers similar to those which have been operated with singular success in the American Republics for the past decade. It was also proposed under this program to step up the translation into foreign languages of significant American books, and to provide also for expansion of the extension services of the libraries by which loan collections are made available to peoples in rural areas. In other words, it was the Department's intention to gear this activity into the world situation as an effective complement to the information program. There is ample evidence of the contribution which could be made by this type of activity to the foreign policy of the United States, provided it is conducted on a scale commensurate with demands of the present world situation.

The supplemental estimate for exchange of persons was reduced from $12,756,000 to $3,000,000, or approximately 76.5 percent. A significant part of the supplemental estimate was intended to bring to the United States foreign leaders of thought and opinion, and to provide additional dollar support to the Fulbright program in order to assure maximum utilization of foreign currencies available under Public Law 584, Seventy-ninth Congress.

The Senate Appropriations Committee, after hearing testimony by officers of the Department, recommended approval of the full amount of the budget estimate of $97,212,000, or an increase of $19,344,150 over the House bill, on the understanding that the Department may be able to use $19,600,000 in counterpart funds instead of the amount of $15,212,000 originally estimated. Thus the Senate committee has recommended a dollar appropriation of $77,612,000 and authority to use $19,600,000 in counterpart funds.

The conference committee recommended restoration of $1,000,000 over the House figure for exchange of persons and an additional $200,000 for the information centers activity, including libraries and related activities as outlined hereinabove. The action of the Senate, had it been sustained, would have resulted in an educational-exchange program calculated to make a truly significant contribution to the Department's foreign policy and to the containment of Communist aggression.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1950.

Hon. KENNETH McKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: I very much appreciate the invitation from your committee to testify today on the proposed information program of the State Department. The pressures on the committee are very heavy, however, as Congress works toward adjournment, and instead of taking your time with personal testimony—particularly in view of the fact that my views on this subject are well known—I request that you insert this letter in the record. I write it only as a reminder to your committee that in my view it is imperative to provide the State Department with the funds it has requested for its so-called Voice of America program.

The truth is that I wish the State Department now felt itself staffed for an even more rapid expansion in this crucial area of our foreign policy. The Department's requests for funds which you are now considering were prepared before Korea. Before the Korean outbreak, the State Department had sought approval to submit a budget some 50 percent larger than the eighty-nine million request you are now considering. The House Appropriations Committee acted unwisely in cutting back a budget which was already inadequate.

I know I need not remind you that there are many experienced observers who feel that the question of war or peace in the next few months may depend upon our success in answering the Russian propaganda and in projecting to the people of the world the fact that we in the United States are deeply and genuinely interested in their welfare.

As you know, the House Appropriations Committee approved the requests for funds for radio but cut way back on what it deemed to be the longer range types of activities such as the exchange of persons and libraries. I do not accept the premise upon which this decision rests, and I hope your committee will also reject it. The broadcasting has had the publicity and it has the greatest allure, but it may take us 18 months to build the radio stations and years longer to develop highly successful programs and to teach people to listen to them. The exchange of persons, however, can operate almost at once. Further, it is a tried and true method. The same is true of the libraries which cost little. Further, as I learned while I was in the State Department, although the libraries aren't spectacular, they do a big job.

I urge upon your committee the restoration of the funds requested by the Department and cut by the House Appropriations Committee. There is no money requested for our present world-wide effort more important than this. The safety of the United States depends on our learning how to do the job in this field which must be done. I am only sorry that since the Korean outbreak the State Department has not developed even bolder plans on a far wider scale.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate.

Address by Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of the State of Illinois, Before the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent address delivered by Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of the State of Illinois, at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association, section on criminal law, Washington, D. C., on September 19, 1950, preceded by the introductory remarks of Hon. Arthur J. Freund, of St. Louis, Mo.

There being no objection, the address and introduction were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ARTHUR J. FREUND

We are here today to discuss one of the most important and one of the most perplexing problems which confronts our national interests—the menace of organized crime. For organized crime in our democratic government threatens the very existence of a free people. If subversive groups in powerful places weaken the foundations of our Republic; if they can corrupt the courts, defile our prosecutions, control our police departments and law enforcement agencies to their evil purposes, and thereby collapse our administration of justice, then there is small hope for the endurance of a system where all men are equal under law.

Organized crime has been defined by the California Crime Commission as follows:

"Simply stated, organized crime is what the term implies. It's the activity of a group of persons working together for the express purpose of more effectively accomplishing criminal acts against society. By organizing, criminals are able to secure greater immunity from the law, a wider field for operations, a monopolistic control over specific types of criminal activity, and, of course, greater profits. The emergence and development during the past 20 years of criminal syndicates extending throughout our entire country is recognized by criminologists (and, I might add, by our statesmen, our bench, bar, and law enforcement agencies) as the most threatening, and the least understood feature of our national crime problem."

Organized crime flourishes, in greater or less degrees, in all parts of our country. Syndicates and groups of criminals, often in silk shirts and nylon underwear, always in cooperation with hoodlums and gangster killers, conduct illegal operations in a large number of our States from northern New York, through Mississippi to the tip of Florida, through our Midwestern States of Wisconsin, Illinois, Missouri, to Louisiana and spreading across our plains and mountains to the Pacific coast.

Organized crime cannot exist successfully where there is honest, fearless and intelligent State and local law enforcement. Gambling and rackets, which impose a cruel and illegal levy on various legitimate types of business, require for their continued existence some form of illegal liaison with those who have sworn to uphold the law.

I have seen, for instance, in my neighboring State of Illinois, a cesspool of crime and corruption for over a quarter of a century, existing under good Governors and bad ones. We now have with us one of the most able and forthright governors that State has ever had, Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, but I suspect he will tell you that with all he has done, conditions are not satisfactory. I have seen it happen and I see it happening in my own State of Missouri—I have seen it happen in many other places in America.

But it is quite obvious that the problem is one of such national proportions and such national danger that some effective legislation must be enacted by the Congress. The mere passage of a law does not eliminate an evil, but there are measures which can be taken and I hope will be taken to deal with this subject and can do much to stifle this menace which confronts all of our people. We have the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, to express his views and the Senator from Tennessee, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, who more than any one man in our national life has focused national attention on this subject. This section of criminal law and the American Bar Association as a whole stands ready to give the full power of its support and effort to eliminate this horrifying evil of the menace of organized crime which confronts us.

ADDRESS OF GOV. ADLAI E. STEVENSON

A few months ago the Illinois State police, acting upon my orders, launched a program of raiding notorious gambling establishments throughout the State.

This action was widely heralded as a "crackdown" against commercialized gambling in Illinois. But it wasn't only a crackdown. It was a breakdown as well—the breakdown of local law enforcement, the breakdown of decency in government in many parts of the State, the triumph of greed, corruption, and, perhaps worst of all, cynicism.

In ordering these raids, I did not feel the joyful exhilaration of a knight in shining armor tilting with the forces of darkness. I felt more like a mourner at a wake. For something had died in Illinois—at least temporarily. And what has happened in Illinois is by no means unique. The positive leadership of Attorney General McGrath, the formation of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, under Senator KEFAUVER's able and effective leadership, as well as the fact that you have chosen this subject for your annual meeting, indicates that organized commercialized crime is in reality a menace throughout the country.

I was not, I repeat, happy about the State police raids in Illinois. They were a last resort. In Illinois, as in most States, the enforcement of the general criminal laws traditionally has been a local matter, with responsibility resting squarely upon local officials—the county sheriff and State's attorney, and the mayors and city police. That is as it should be. Government should be as small in scope and as local in character as possible. And, if all local officials in Illinois had done their sworn duty, as many of them have, there would have been no occasion to use the State police.

But almost from the moment I took office I was besieged by urgent requests from outraged citizens who complained that open gambling and other forms of vice were rampant in their communities, and that they could secure no action from local officials. I was reluctant to use the State police, despite insistent demands. For over a year prior to the first raids, Attorney General Elliott and I attempted to stop commercialized gambling by several methods. We found direct talks with local officials of offending counties and personal persuasion the most effective method. The local authorities cooperated with us in many cases. In others we were successful only temporarily, or in part, or not at all. On the whole, however, the results were reassuring, and commercialized gambling dried up in many counties.

But, even after these conferences, some local officers failed to act. Hence the raids by the State police. The evidence obtained by the police is turned over to local prosecuting authorities. They can no longer claim to be ignorant of the existence of organized gambling in their counties or that they have been unable to obtain evidence upon which to base a prosecution. The evidence is there. If these officers fail to do their duty now, they must answer to the people, and, if nothing happens, it is the people's own fault, because the people are stronger than the gamblers or any other criminal element.

Our campaign against commercialized gambling has resulted in what the St. Louis Post-Dispatch referred to the other day as a "new kind of payoff"—the payoff of success, of new and increased respect for law enforcement, the payoff of the satisfaction which every decent citizen can take in the fact that commercialized gambling, with all of its poisonous effects upon the quality of local government, is at its lowest ebb in Illinois. As evidence of this change, the collector of internal revenue for the central and southern Illinois counties reports that Federal tax stamps for gambling devices have declined 40 percent in 1 year.

Some people have urged that the State take over the enforcement of the criminal laws, and that the State police should make wholesale raids and arrests. Apart from any constitutional and legal considerations involved, I have three objections to this, at least so far as our situation in Illinois is concerned.

First, the State does not now have the resources to assume this responsibility. Our State police force has its hands full patrolling the highways, enforcing traffic laws, and cracking down on overweight trucks—in other words, in performing the functions for which it was primarily intended. Second, the use of State officers to enforce the general criminal law when local officers are already charged with that responsibility would mean that the public would be paying for law enforcement twice—and this at a time when both State and local governments need more revenue, and the public is demanding economy in government. The third and most fundamental objection is that such a move would be one more step in the abdication of local governmental responsibility, one more example of the growing and dangerous tendency to look to higher levels of government for the solution of problems that could and should be solved closer to home.

For the State to take over local police powers seems to me a dangerous acknowledgment of the failure of local government. But organized crime with its attendant corruption and corroding disrespect for law enforcement is even more dangerous, and, if local government cannot or will not meet the challenge, the people will demand and receive help from other levels of government, just as they have demanded and received other services which were not provided on the local level.

But, whatever our views as to who should enforce the laws, we are, I take it, all agreed that law enforcement can and must be improved. What are some of the obstacles to better law enforcement, and what are some of the things that can be done to improve it?

Securing better personnel is part of the answer, but only part. Crime and politics must be divorced.

Police forces, on whatever level of government, must be severed from partisan political control.

In Illinois one of the first things I asked from the legislature was the removal of the State police from politics—and we now have a force which functions under a merit system. The old system was intolerably expensive and inefficient. Every time the governor's office changed political complexion, virtually the whole police force of 500 was discharged and a new one of the proper political faith recruited and trained, only to go out when the State changed its politics again. And it is obvious that a man cannot be a good police officer and owe a greater measure of loyalty to his political sponsor than to his superior officer.

But safeguarding against political interference does not in itself guarantee a competent police force. And the fact that a man is honest doesn't necessarily make him a good policeman. Amateur crime detectors can't cope with the professional criminals of today. We need more police forces that are truly professional in the best sense of that term. Recruiting and training practices must be improved. We have made progress along these lines under our new merit system in Illinois, too, and hope to make more.

And our police must be paid adequate salaries—salaries that are not an invitation

to graft and corruption. In many of our larger Illinois cities, policemen have not had a salary raise for several years, despite skyrocketing living costs. Here again, this salary problem is tied up with the pressing need of local governments for more revenue, thus emphasizing the interdependence of so many of our governmental problems.

Another thing we can do to improve the quality of law enforcement is to reexamine our entire law enforcement structure. Obsolescence and duplication present formidable obstacles to efficient law enforcement, and diffusion of authority makes it difficult to fix responsibiilty. Where responsibility cannot be fixed, public opinion has no chance to operate effectively, and the democratic process is weakened.

The basic pattern of our law enforcement structure is an inheritance from a bygone day. To this, some latter-day accretions have been added more or less haphazardly. In some instances, State, county, and municipal officers have overlapping or conflicting authority. The duties of the office of sheriff and constable, for example—to say nothing of the coroner—have been largely inherited from medieval England. Some law enforcement officers are so burdened with other unrelated duties that they can give only a fraction of their time to the apprehension or prosecution of criminals. They are, at best, only part-time law enforcement officers. Some elective offices have constitutional or statutory restrictions as to succession, making it impossible for them to be manned by professional career men. I do not say that all of these things are necessarily bad, but I do say that they need to be constantly reexamined in the light of present-day conditions.

Of course, this problem of obsolescence and duplication is not peculiar to our law-enforcement machinery. It is a problem of Government generally, and the Hoover Commission report, followed by the formation of "little Hoover" commissions in approximately one-half of our States, shows that the public is acutely aware of the general problem.

It seems to me that there should be similar studies with a view to improving our law-enforcement machinery. Of course, there have been studies like that in the past, and I am not unmindful of the invaluable work that the organized bar is constantly doing to improve the administration of criminal justice. But there is need for a larger, more comprehensive study, and the problem must somehow or other be dramatized for the public.

Among the questions to which answers should be sought are these:

What should be the respective roles of State and local governments in law enforcement? What controls, if any, should the State have over local law-enforcement officers? Should these controls be direct or indirect? In Illinois, for example, the State's attorney is a county officer, but he is charged with prosecuting violators of State laws, and he receives part of his salary from the State treasury. Yet no State officer exercises any control over him. In some States, although not in my own, the governor may remove any local law-enforcement officer who fails to do his duty; and this has proved to be a most potent instrument for improving local law enforcement. Given some such power, I have little doubt that commercial gambling could be quickly and inexpensively ended in Illinois for keeps.

There is another means for securing good law enforcement which appears to me to have been too little used—and that is the weapon of disbarment. In Illinois, for example, I should say that it represents as effective an instrument as we have for disciplining attorneys who hold law-enforcement positions. This is, of course, an area where the organized bar can be of the greatest help, and I was greatly interested in the action of the Illinois State Bar Association a few months ago in filing disbarment proceedings against the State's attorney of a county where organized gambling had been permitted to flourish under a cynical system of periodic fines. I know of no duty more clearly comprehended within our obligations as members of this profession than to live up to our oaths of office when we occupy public posts with law-enforcement responsibilities.

What Federal laws should be enacted in aid of State laws? Parenthetically, I am gratified that Congress seems disposed to close the channels of interstate commerce to slot machines and racing information.

To what extent should the functions of investigating and prosecuting be separated? In some States, the prosecuting attorney prosecutes only upon complaint. In other States he is expected to take the initiative in discovering violations of the law. And in many localities the public insists that he conduct investigations but refuses to allow his office to have any investigators. The result is that the average prosecuting attorney must rely for his evidence upon a police force over whose activities he has little, if any, direction.

Combining the functions of investigation and prosecution in one officer may possibly lead to abuses, but this division of authority makes it easy to escape responsibility and encourages "buck passing." We have some counties in Illinois, for example, where the bipartisan approach has been used with singularly devastating effect. The managers of the two parties, in collaboration with the gamblers, see to it that there is always a Republican sheriff and a Democratic State's attorney, or vice versa, with the result that the citizen who wants action is told by the one that it is the responsibility of the other, and is shunted back and forth between them to no purpose whatsoever.

These are only a few of the questions which are worth considering. But the things I've mentioned, however important, are in a sense secondary and superficial. For the greatest obstacles to effective law enforcement are public indifference and cynicism. The greatest menace of organized crime is not the crime itself nor the criminal. The greatest menace is that the public will come to accept organized crime as something inevitable, as a necessary part of our social system.

Cynicism toward law enforcement is as old as government itself. When Solon was writing the laws of Athens, he was told that laws were like spider's webs and would only entangle the poor and the weak, while the rich and powerful would easily break through them. This attitude toward law enforcement has persisted throughout the ages and unfortunately, has not always been without some justification.

But, in a democracy, there is no justification for such helpless cynicism. Nor is there any use to place the entire blame for crime and lax law enforcement upon a real or supposed alliance between criminals and politicians and to assume that the members of the public are helpless bystanders. Organized crime cannot thrive without the active support of many elements of the community, nor without the passive support of many more elements. The respectable businessman who falls for the myth that a wide-open town is good for business is just as effective an accomplice of the criminal as is the politician who seeks to win friends by influencing people. The solid citizen who thinks that illegal slot machines are just fine for his country club but bad for the corner saloon does not realize what difficulties he is making for the persons he has elected to enforce the laws.

Of the 2,700 gambling machines presently registered for Federal tax purposes in 76 Illinois counties, only 800—less than one-third—are in taverns and other public places. The other 1,900 are in the country clubs, the fraternal organizations, the veterans' clubs, the Army posts and other places with which we do not customarily associate law violation, organized or unorganized. I ask you to consider the effect on the public mind, and the vexatious problem of law enforcement through this wholesale violation of the law by the most responsible elements of our communities.

And while we are on the subject of organized crime, let me say that one of the most disheartening things that I have encountered is what might be termed "unorganized crime." One example of this which we have had to battle incessantly and expensively in Illinois is the persistent and flagrant violation of our very liberal laws regulating maximum truck weights on our highways. It appears, I can only conclude, that at least some otherwise reputable businessmen prefer to overload their trucks and pay the occasional and meager fines when they are caught because it pays.

To what point, I inquire, does violation of the laws have to go, or what character does it have to take, before it achieves the status of organized crime? I have a feeling that this category has been a little too exclusive.

This last prompts me to call your attention to something else which is too often lost sight of. The phrase "organized crime" has, in the ears of the average citizen, a horrendous ring and conjures up visions of masked men with tommy guns, bank robberies, murders, and similar high and unspeakable crimes. Our average citizen also feels, probably as a result of this lurid conception, that organized crime does not touch him very closely and is something that can safely be left to the FBI.

Senator KEFAUVER would, I am sure, be very quick to join me in my assurance to you that this is a highly mistaken concept. The most powerful and affluent in the world of organized crime operate in much more prosaic fields and in much less dramatic ways. They move where the money is, and this too often seems to be in such twilight zones as that of gambling where there are prohibitory laws on the books but no unanimity of moral conviction.

The happy hunting ground of organized crime is in the area where too many people are disposed to participate in the breaking of a law. What these people seem not to realize is that the law cannot be broken without the connivance of elected officials, and that open and long-continued violation inevitably means that there is corruption—a payoff in some form or another. And corruption is a cancer which cannot be confined—a public official who has gotten in on the take for one purpose has become a captive and his usefulness as a public servant is largely at an end.

I am new in politics, but I happen to believe in the value and importance of partisan political organization. I think that strong and healthy political parties are essential to our democracy, and I think also that a broader and more active participation in them by all good citizens is one of our greatest needs. But I can understand the discouragement and despair which assails those who find their own party machinery dominated by those who can fight with the aid of money supplied by the gamblers—who can, if you please, buy up all the billboards, bribe or bid highest for the services of election workers, and do all the other seemingly trivial but highly practical things which can snuff out the hopes of decent people in politics.

These are some of the facts of life about the menace of organized crime in a democracy. These are the reasons why the dropping of a 50-cent piece in a slot machine is too often not merely a matter between you and

your own conscience or budget. This is why a double standard of law observance is no more feasible in the gambling field than it is in that of burglary.

Law enforcement doesn't exist in a vacuum, and it can't be considered in isolation. The crisis in law enforcement is but one aspect of the crisis of representative government. Good government is indivisible. You can't expect good government in other departments along with dishonest or ineffective law enforcement, and you can't have effective law enforcement without honest, efficient, responsible government all down the line. And I suspect the major problem of our age is whether or not we have enough citizens who are willing to labor unceasingly to achieve good government. Wherever law enforcement continues lax over an extended period of time, it is so only because a large segment of the population does not want effective law enforcement, at least not badly enough to labor for good government as diligently as those who want bad government labor for it.

We speak glibly of the necessity for ending the alliance between crime and politics. But so long as the support of the lawless element of the community is reckoned a more potent political asset than the support of the people who are willing to labor for effective law enforcement, this alliance will be a constant threat.

One of the most disheartening things that any conscientious official has to face is the lethargy and apathy on the part of most of the public. The malicious criticism that is leveled against us doesn't hurt so much. We have come to expect that. Every man in public life knows that his words and deeds will be twisted by knaves to make a snare for fools. The truly disheartening thing is that so many people—people who are neither knaves nor fools—just don't have enough interest, enough sense of civic responsibility, to take the trouble to make their government work better.

The ultimate answer to the menace of organized crime and to the problem of lax law enforcement is public opinion. And, above all, it must be continuously active. Too often public opinion is a sleeping giant. We have already had too many cycles of reform and relapse, too many moral crusades followed by business as usual. Just as our Nation can no longer withdraw into an isolationist shell until some Pearl Harbor stirs us to vigorous action, so we can no longer afford to postpone effective law enforcement until lawlessness becomes a national scandal.

Today there are signs that the public is awakening to the twin menaces of organized crime and corrupt law enforcement. Let us hope this time that it will not be another ephemeral crusade but a true rebirth of citizen responsibility.

Proclamation of Constitution Day by Governor Bowles, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the September 17 issue of the Sunday Herald, of Bridgeport, Conn., concerning the proclamation by Governor Bowles of September 17 as Constitution Day. My colleague notes that it is particularly fitting for our State of Connecticut to take notice of this occasion because it, among all States, had the first written constitution. He asked me to state his belief that our founding fathers planned well, for while the basic tenets of the Federal Constitution have come to be regarded with reverence, the application of its principles has been wisely adapted to the changing times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTION DAY PROCLAIMED

Today, the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the signing of the American Constitution, has been proclaimed Constitution Day by Governor Bowles.

In setting aside today for patriotic observances, Governor Bowles noted that "the Constitution of the United States remains as the one hope of freedom-loving people all over the world and stands as the most solid political guide the world has ever known."

Bowles urged all citizens to take part in appropriate programs to the end "that we, the people who benefit from the Constitution, shall have a better understanding and a greater respect for the gifts of liberty, equality, and justice granted us by the Constitution."

Courage Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Courage Pays Off," published in the Washington Post of September 21, 1950. The editorial deals with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURAGE PAYS OFF

There may be a most important moral for politicians in the outcome of this week's Maryland primaries. It appears that a regard for decency and courage is not dead among American voters. Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, who exhibited these qualities conspicuously in his conduct as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee which investigated the McCarthy charges, was renominated by a landslide that gave him more than twice as many votes as the aggregate of his two opponents. Both of these opponents conducted campaigns based principally on criticism of the Senator for his part in what they persisted in calling a "whitewash." Marylanders evidently were not taken in by this tawdry attack.

We think Senator TYDINGS' experience deserves some reflection on the part of Members of Congress who seem to suppose that only the most extravagant vilification can pass for patriotism these days. They show small respect for the intelligence of the electorate; and it is by no means impossible that the sentiment will be reciprocated at the polls. Senator TYDINGS dealt with the McCarthy affair more conscientiously than opportunistically. He and his Democratic colleagues on the subcommittee called a hoax a hoax and forthrightly expressed the disgust which decent men generally felt over Senator MCCARTHY's abuse of his senatorial position. It is heartening to know that the American people can be counted on to save seats in the Senate for men like Senator TYDINGS who are not afraid to say what they think.

Students Warned by Deane Malott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the following news report in the Lawrence (Kans.) Journal-World, giving the high lights of an address by the chancelor of the University of Kansas, Deane Malott, so filled with sane, sound Americanism, is worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I include it herewith:

STUDENTS WARNED BY DEANE MALOTT—CHANCELOR LIKENS AMERICAN PATH TO THAT OF ANCIENT ROME—TALKS AT ASSEMBLY

Kansas University's Chancelor Deane W. Malott likened the path of today's American people to that so disastrously followed by the smug and ignorant citizens of ancient Rome in his speech to a convocation audience of about 2,800 in Hoch auditorium this morning.

The chancelor offered education not only in technical and scientific skills but training "in the art of how human beings can live together" as one of the favorable detours from the road we are traveling. The convocation officially opened the university's eighty-fifth year, and Lester McCoy, of Garden City, chairman of the State board of regents, was on hand to welcome the students on behalf of the board. Full-time classwork began at 8 this morning.

PROUDLY ON SEVEN HILLS

"Behind the human ramparts of the Roman legions Rome lived securely and proudly on her seven hills and received tribute from all the world," Chancelor Malott pointed out. "And then, as inexorable as darkness consumes the earth after sunset, the empire crumbled; and Rome fell to the barbarian hordes; Rome fell not because of the triumph of outside force; Rome collapsed spiritually, succumbing to the insidious poison of the idea that the government could do all things for its citizens.

"The long shadow of that fallen empire looms over free America, a greater threat than all the armaments that communism may ever muster," the tall administrator warned.

The chancelor stated that today too many are asking the Federal Government to do for us what our grandparents would have done for themselves, and that Government, under the guise of every major political party, reaches out like an octopus to wrap itself around more and ever more phases of our lives.

"It is the direction of ancient Rome; the implications are clear," Chancelor Malott said emphatically.

"I hope that the voices of the men and women of the University of Kansas may echo the imprint of their education here, saying always that this university has encouraged us to think and act like free men, and we do not propose to surrender the freedom which above all else makes life worth living.

SHOULD WEIGH VALUES

"I hope you will be students of the positive values of America; that you will understand and think about the widening discrepancy between what the theory of democracy requires of its citizens, and what the practice of democracy reveals."

The chancelor opened his talk by stating there is more uncertainty, more concern for the future, more responsibilities for the American people than in any day of the school's 85 years. More and more, education appears to be the main solution to the problems that lie ahead.

Chancelor Malott pointed to the many facilities that university offers to help a person obtain this education, but that those facilities in themselves assure no one of an education. That is up to the individual.

"You may, if you wish, I suspect, remain here during this year, skirting the dangerous academic reefs that lie just beyond the reach of the deans' probation lists, and be little affected by the educational facilities and the education process," the KU head said in an ironic tone.

NO PLACE FOR DRIFTERS

"The world, however, is too sober for academic drifters. The greatest undeveloped territory in the world today lies right under your own head of hair. If you are not interested in developing that territory, we shall not keep you for any great length of time," the speaker added.

The chancelor stated that no other form of government demands such high intelligence, public spirit, or virtue by its citizens as ours. But he quickly added that he feared we are hurrying along to social ends which taken one by one may be desirable as tending to increase human welfare and happiness, but which added together may have sad consequences for human freedom.

"In this troubled period of history no one can predict the future with scientific accuracy. But man's survival depends both upon his intelligence and his faith," the chancelor concluded.

Members of the KU faculty sat on the stage after moving into the auditorium during the processional. The Reverend Harold G. Barr, dean of the school of religion, opened the event with a responsive reading and prayer, and Dean Thomas Gorton of the school of fine arts led the group in a hymn.

Ingersoll's Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. R. Leigh, of Louisville, Ky.:

INGERSOLL'S WORD

Three-quarters of a century ago Robert G. Ingersoll, for years America's foremost orator, in nominating James G. Blaine for President, stated the qualifications for that office prescribed by Republicans of that day.

He said in part: "They demand a man who will sacredly preserve the financial honor of the United States, one who knows enough to know that the national debt must be paid through the prosperity of this people; one who knows enough to know that all the financial theories in the world cannot redeem a single dollar; one who knows enough to know that all the money must be made, not by law, but by labor; one who knows enough to know that the people of the United States have the industry to make the money and the honor to pay it over just as fast as they make it."

If the great Ingersoll was moved to such words 75 years ago when the Government was operated on a shoestring, what could he say today upon viewing the national debt and budget other than, "abandon hope, all ye who enter here"?

A copy of Ingersoll's words, quaint as they must seem now, should be placed on the desk of every Congressman every time a new budget is considered.

E. R. LEIGH.

LOUISVILLE.

My Report to the Fifth District Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report to my constituents:

With the completion of my first term in Congress in 1948, I reported to you upon my service; and I have the honor, at this time, to inform you of my activities as your Representative to the Eighty-first Congress, which convened in January of 1949, and whose Members will be succeeded by those elected in November of this year.

Under ordinary circumstances, we would now have adjourned, and it would be possible to report all action taken by this Congress. As this is written, however, we are engaged in a conflict in Korea as a member of the United Nations, and Congress will recess in order to be available for meeting as the need should arise.

I, of course, was a member of the majority in the Republican Congress of 1947–48. In January of 1949 I returned to sit as a minority member in the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress. My assignment to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee continued through the first session. And in January 1950 I was appointed to fill a vacancy on the House Armed Services Committee. Assignment to the Armed Services Committee is much sought after, and I was pleased to have been honored by appointment to this—one of the most important committees of Congress. Later in this report I will discuss in more detail the legislative record of that committee.

On the domestic front, this Congress will be judged as much by what it left undone as it will by the action it took. Even though controlled by the party of the President, it was reluctant to enact many of his recommendations for social legislation—feeling that they were too far-reaching, and not in accordance with the wishes of the people.

In the labor field, Congress enacted a 75-cent minimum wage to replace the 40-cent minimum in effect since 1938; liberalized compensation benefits to Government employees injured or killed in line of duty; and provided pay increases and improved working conditions for post-office employees. I supported all these measures believing them to be necessary and worthy legislation. Congress refused to make changes in the Taft-Hartley labor law although some amendment seemed desirable. It was because of administration insistence that the law be totally repealed that no progress was made in this instance.

Governmental reorganization was the most talked-about and the least done-about reform before Congress. The Hoover Commission recommendations were ignored for the most part. Some reorganization plans submitted by the President were adopted. In some instances, they conformed to the Commission's recommendations; in the main, they were only piecemeal suggestions which neglected the elemental reorganization needs. I supported those plans which followed the Hoover Commission's recommendations and opposed those which did not.

This Congress enacted no legislation of any consequence in the field of civil rights. Some measures which had my support were adopted by the House but failed even to be considered in the Senate. Numbered among these were anti-poll-tax and fair employment practice bills.

Veterans of military service received almost no recognition from the Eighty-first Congress. The only measures of importance which were enacted granted increased payments to disabled veterans; fixed a 3-year presumptive period for arrested tuberculosis cases; and defined more clearly provisions of the educational privileges under the GI bill of rights. Two other bills were passed by Congress but vetoed by the President; these affected veterans in the postal service and provided automobiles for crippled veterans.

Many items of legislation concerning agriculture were adopted by this Congress. Notable among them was the new price-support bill, which has resulted in the tremendous surpluses with which we are all familiar—at a cost which imposes a tax burden upon our citizens. Crop-insurance programs were enacted; the Federal tax on oleomargarine was repealed; increased acreage was allotted, and price supports voted for cotton, tobacco, and peanuts.

Social legislation enacted included Federal housing programs for both low- and moderate-income families and a liberalized social-security system. In this category, also, was the extension of rent control.

Legislation on international affairs continued to be considered in a bipartisan manner. Most measures were enacted with the overwhelming support of members of both political parties. It should be explained, however, that bipartisanship existed only on legislative

matters—our foreign policy is established and carried out by the administration in office. I cite this difference so that there may be no confusion as to my complete disagreement with our foreign policy in the Pacific. Bills continuing the European recovery program; financing aid to Greece and Turkey; extending reciprocal-trade agreements; granting military aid to both western Europe and eastern nations; and amending the Displaced Persons Act were approved without substantial opposition.

National defense measures occupy a prominent place in this report because of their very great importance now, and because of my assignment to the Armed Services Committee. I consider myself to be partially responsible for the excellent record of Congress in the field of military preparedness. Our failure to be fully prepared for the invasion of Korea lies with the Defense Department in that Congress approved every request for military spending. Both the Republican Eightieth and the Democratic Eighty-first Congresses authorized a 70-group Air Force, but in each instance the President refused to allocate the funds appropriated for this purpose. Radar and guided missile installations were provided for. The administration of the Central Intelligence Agency was improved, selective service was continued, a ship-construction program was authorized, continuance of the synthetic rubber program was voted as was the authority to search foreign vessels in United States waters. Induction of doctors and dentists into military service was approved. Late in the session Congress approved a measure providing for the registration and control of subversive elements. A supplemental appropriation for the Armed Forces in the amount of approximately $17,000,000,000 was voted to assure victory in Korea. Restrictions on the size of the military services were lifted to assure full support of our forces in Korea. On my recommendation the United States Marine Corps was increased from approximately 65,000 officers and men to 250,000. On the economic front there was enacted legislation giving the President authority to impose price, wage, and rationing controls when he deemed them necessary. An increase in taxes to cover additional military expenditures was also authorized.

The amount of money authorized to be spent in carrying out the functions of the Federal Government for a 2-year period approaches an astronomical figure. A total of about $45,000,000,000 was appropriated by the first session of this Congress, and close to $60,000,000,000 will have been appropriated before the end of the second session. In each instance it will be noted that expenditures exceeded the income of the Government in the collection of taxes from its citizens. Of interest to Connecticut residents is the fact that while you, as taxpayers, make the second highest per capita contribution to the Federal Government, our State ranks second from lowest in the amount returned as Federal benefits. The rate of return approximates 7 percent in contrast to that of some Southern States which reach 120 percent. Over $700,000,000 was paid in Federal taxes by Connecticut citizens last year. Much of your money was used to subsidize industry in the South, which results in a loss of earning power to Connecticut workers, paid for by their own tax payments. Your stake in reducing nonessential Federal expenditures is a large one.

During these 2 years I have personally sponsored legislative measures of interest to citizens of the fifth district. Suspension of the import tax on copper during 1949 was a result of legislation introduced by me. The House in 1950 has again recommended suspension of this tax. Failure of the Senate to act will impose hardships upon our people in the nature of shorter workweeks, higher prices for copper products, and a weakening of our military-preparedness program. Much veterans' legislation was sponsored by me, as was a bill to extend relief of mortgage payments for service personnel for a 12-month period after their release from active duty.

In addition to answering voluminous correspondence on legislative matters, my office has processed thousands of inquiries of a more personal nature relating to compensation claims; national service life insurance dividends; immigration cases; selective-service cases, and others of a varied nature. I have fought for the maintenance of New England's industries—realizing full well that a vast majority of our people depend upon them for their livelihood. I feel strongly that no justification can be made for encouraging our manufacturing facilities to move to the South from New England, and that there has been a complete disregard of our welfare in the excessive and inequitable imports from foreign slave-labor nations in competition with the products of our own workers.

I have reported continually through both the press and radio to you—and I now express my sincere gratitude for the opportunity you have granted me to serve as your representative in Congress.

Statements by Drew Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on or about February 25, 1950, in the newspaper column which is edited by one Drew Pearson, there appeared certain untruthful statements which have been used more or less by people who had little respect for the dissemination of the truth.

Without going into great detail, with respect to the general standing of Drew Pearson in the minds of the people of the United States, as those details have more or less been expressed by the Chief Executives of this country as well as by many individuals, including Members of the Congress, I wish to submit for the RECORD certain affidavits which completely disprove the slanderous, libelous, and absolutely false statements which were published by said Drew Pearson in the article referred to. I submit these affidavits for the enlightenment of those who have been misled by the untruthful statements made by Drew Pearson:

WASHINGTON,

District of Columbia, ss:

On this, the 20th day of September A. D. 1950, there personally appeared before me Mrs. Paul O. Peters, of 5825 North Four Mile Drive, Arlington, Va., personally known to me, who deposes and says:

"That she is the mother of Ruth C. Peters, who is employed as secretary in the office of Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD, of the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan; that said daughter, Ruth C. Peters, resides with her at the above-stated address and has so resided since February 1946; and that prior thereto and for the period from January 1943 to February 1946 that the said Ruth C. Peters resided with her mother at 818 North Edgewood Street, Arlington, Va.; that on or about March 15, 1948, said Ruth C. Peters began working for said Representative CRAWFORD in the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and that to her certain knowledge at no time prior to March 15, 1948, or subsequent thereto has her daughter, Ruth C. Peters, ever been in the Territory of Alaska, or nearer to that Territory than San Francisco, Calif. Deponent further states that any and all persons who have made the statement that her daughter, Ruth C. Peters, visited Alaska, has, to deponent's certain knowledge misstated the truth; and that this affidavit is made to correct erroneous impressions that might have been gathered as a result of such untruthful statements having been made in the public press, over the radio, or otherwise."

Further deponent saith not.

MRS. PAUL O. PETERS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this the 20th day of September A. D. 1950.

[SEAL] ELTON J. LAYTON,

Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia.

My commission expires March 1, 1951.

WASHINGTON,

District of Columbia, ss:

On this, the 20th day of September A. D. 1950, there personally appeared before me Miss Ruth C. Peters, personally known to me, who deposes and says:

"At no time during my life have I ever been in the Territory of Alaska and the nearest I have ever been to any portion of Alaska is when I visited the city of San Francisco with my mother, Mrs. Paul O. Peters, on November 1948."

Further deponent saith not.

RUTH C. PETERS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this the 20th day of September A. D. 1950.

[SEAL] ELTON J. LAYTON,

Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia.

My commission expires March 1, 1951.

WASHINGTON,

District of Columbia, ss:

On this, the twentieth day of September A. D. 1950, there personally appeared before me, Charles Apfelbeck, United States Park Police, who deposes and says:

"That my name is Charles Apfelbeck and my official capacity is sergeant in charge of the investigative unit; that I have been with the organization known as the United States Park Police for a period of about 19 years.

"There has been called to my attention a press release entitled, 'Washington Merry-Go-Round' by Drew Pearson, which carries

the following language and which refers to 'two Negro boys' who rifled a purse owned by Miss Ruth C. Peters. The article goes on to say, 'The Congressman (referring to Rep. FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan) gave chase, recovered the purse after $15 was stolen, but did not prefer charges. When asked to prefer charges by Sgt. Charles Apfelbeck, he said: "Hell, I can't do anything. You know what the situation is with me."'

"This affidavit is made for the purpose of branding as an absolute falsehood this quotation printed by one Drew Pearson in which he leads the reader to believe that I told said Drew Pearson that Representative CRAWFORD said to me, 'Hell, I can't do anything. You know what the situation is with me.' At no time did Representative CRAWFORD ever make such a statement to me. Mr. CRAWFORD performed his duty by apprehending the boys and placing the police call which brought myself and Porter M. Beale into the case. In no way whatever, directly or indirectly, did he ever suggest to me any secrecy with respect to the handling of the case involving the theft of money from Miss Peters' purse. The records of the United States Park Police at Park Police Headquarters are public records and carry the facts of the case. The record shows that the robbery took place on or about 1 p. m. on July 15, 1949, on the driveway which serves Hains Point and directly alongside the public golf course and the picnic grounds on said point, populated at that time of the season by hundreds of people who seek relief from the heat. This affidavit is made to clear the record of the untruthful quotation submitted in said press release by Drew Pearson."

Further deponent saith not.

CHARLES APFELBECK.

Submitted and sworn to before me this the twentieth day of September A. D. 1950.

[SEAL] JOHN R. GARDNER,
Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia.

My commission expires January 31, 1952.

Flow of War Goods to Russia Must Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that I have directed attention to the vast amount of war material which Russia, Red China, and other Communist-controlled countries are receiving from the United States and numerous other non-Communist nations. Neither is it the first time, Mr. Speaker, that I have commended the information provided and the action taken by members of labor unions to put an end to this dangerous and unjustifiable flow of warmaking materials to Russia and her satellites.

The President has already chided and criticized these members of organized labor for their actions and position they have taken with respect to the uninterrupted, unrestricted flow of trade with Russia and other Communist countries. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I commend them on the actions, position, and recommendations which they have taken.

Mr. Speaker, as long as American men are fighting and dying in Korea and being prepared to fight in other areas of the world against Communist aggression, I can find absolutely no justification for us knowingly to permit war material to be shipped to Russia and her satellites.

As a part of my remarks I wish to include the very excellent column on this subject by Mr. Victor Riesel entitled "Labor Chiefs Expose Trade With Reds," which appeared in the September 20, 1950, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Mr. Riesel's article follows:

LABOR CHIEFS EXPOSE TRADE WITH REDS

(By Victor Riesel)

HOUSTON, TEX., September 19.—In a series of private lunches and hotel-room parleys eyewitnesses from across the world have reported that our own allies and even some of our own American merchants and shipowners are taking Soviet gold for a ghoulish profit on sales of rubber, tin, wool for uniforms, steel, steel rails, munitions-making machinery, chemicals, medicines, and cargo space to Russia, Red China, and North Korean agents.

These reports, brought here by global labor leaders, moved AFL Chief William Green to urge the federation's most powerful 700 leaders (gathered here for their sixty-ninth annual convention) to demand a world boycott of all Russian trade.

There can be no doubting this evidence. These men know, for example, that the Chinese Communists have asked the London steel merchants (dominated by the Government) for prices on 50,000 tons of steel rails for Peiping's Red lines along which, even now, Communist troops are being moved to the Korean frontier. And London is ready to sell those rails to the Chinese Stalinists.

But the Chinese need not wait that long for Allied steel. They're getting tens of thousands of tons of Japanese steel from Nyahata in Kyushu in exchange for coal from mines owned by British and Chinese. The British conceal the destinations of the metal—and our military authorities in Japan are now too concerned with Korea to police the delivery of this steel.

Other war materials are moving into Soviet ports by shuttle from Ceylon and Malaya. In that area, as well as Hong Kong, British merchants have openly boasted—and the Labor representatives here can prove it—that they will sell to anyone with gold and American dollars. The Soviets have plenty of both.

From these oriental areas the Soviets are getting at least 50 percent of the rubber supply for their automotive weapons and transport systems. Also tin. And the labor men here say American freighters are especially chartered for the run between these ports of our allies and Soviet docks.

And from big Tom Dougherty, leader of the Australian Workers Union, I have personal evidence that the Russians are buying millions of pounds worth of Australian wool from Aussie brokers. This wool is being woven and cut into millions of Soviet uniforms.

After listening to Bill Green's demand for a boycott of the Soviet similar to that slapped on the Japs and Nazis years ago, Dougherty came off the convention floor and told me he's returning to Australia to demand that his government halt all shipments to Russia and its satellites. If the government rebuffs him, Dougherty will call out on strike the 40,000 members of his huge union who ride the Australian range and process the wool.

Dougherty added that he and his New Zealand colleague, also with us at the moment, would try to influence the entire East to cripple all potential war shipments—and these include oil and aircraft parts to Red China via Hong Kong.

Only the British Labor delegates here seem oblivious to the bitter demand that they force their government to stop dealing with the Soviet. The English attitude is that they must sell machine tools to Russia because there are some things they must get from Russia—and machine tools are the only thing Russia wants in return from the British.

Expert metal workers here say London's claim that only nonstrategic tools are being sent is deceiving nonsense. No machine tool of any kind is without strategic value. I've just been informed by a Midwest industrialist.

And the Australian and New Zealand labor people are determined to put the heat on their British labor colleagues.

As for payment for all this material (except the tools) the Russians have ample dollars and gold, because we ourselves helped them get it.

The dollars come from American purchases of Soviet materials ranging from furs to timber—and these greenbacks are spread through Asia by such outfits as the Soviet controlled Czech Trade Commission which finances Stalinist activity in much of the Orient. The gold comes from Russian mines, now equipped with special digging and refining machinery supplied by us under wartime lend-lease. Nice dividends we're getting—especially for the kids on those Korean hills.

The Home Folks Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a letter which is typical of one school of thought, of an appeal for help where the Congressman at the moment, can give none, reads as follows:

STEVENSVILLE, MICH., *September 16, 1950.*

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Again, another war is in progress and we are facing another great problem. My son got his papers today and to think they would take the last hand off the farm. I have a son 19 years old; they sure will take him but please spare one of them so we can live. My husband is 67 and I am 57 and a cripple, just released from St. Ann's Hospital in Chicago a month ago. I was there 17 weeks but my leg will never be good.

We have a large hospital and doctor bill; lots of peaches and grapes to harvest, a mortgage on our farm and how are we going to meet this? This boy is also registered but we even can't think of him going to a hospital—no funds.

Dear Mr. CLARE HOFFMAN, our dear Congressman, please do something for us. He has to report to Benton Harbor next week. But we sure need him: he is our sole support. As to our other boy working in the Stevensville lumber yard, if they were not supporting us, we could not make it.

So many peaches and you can't get anything for them. Buy your basket and pay for packing and go to the market and get $2.25 a bushel, but now you are lucky if you get $1.10—what profit.

Please do what you can for me.

Your friend,

MRS. ANNA SIEROSLAWSKI.

Zaccheus, Come Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George M. Docherty, minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in our Nation's Capital, preached a soul-searching sermon last Sunday that is so universal in its application, and so challenging that I implored him to let me share it with the Congress as well as their friends—all over the Nation—who read the RECORD daily. Dr. Docherty's sermon follows:

ZACCHEUS, COME DOWN

Scripture lesson: St. Luke's Gospel, Chapter 19, verses 1 through 11.

Text: The Book of Joshua, chapter 24, verse 15: "And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom you will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

The story of Zaccheus is not simply the tale of the little Publican who climbed a sycamore tree to see the Lord Jesus pass by through Jericho. It is rather the spiritual history of any soul with an uneasy conscience, such as Zaccheus had, and might easily be the spiritual pilgrimage of any man attending church Sunday by Sunday.

Luke sums up Zaccheus in three devastating sentences. His name was Zaccheus. He was chief of the Publicans. He was very rich. Zaccheus! What a name to bear in such an occupation, for the word means "pure, sincere one." He was not merely a Publican, but he was chief among the Publicans, chief among that sect who bought territory from the Roman Government and then extorted their own price in taxes from the already tax-ridden people. And yet the objection to the Publicans was not so much their extortions in money, but rather that in the eyes of the people of Israel, they were fifth columnists, quislings, who had been bought by the occupying power and had turned their backs upon their own people, living on the gains from the overlords of Israel. He was very rich, is the obvious conclusion of such a syllogism. But what brought this little man to the forefront of the crowds that lined the streets of Jericho that day, is not easy to say. We know that he was elbowed out of the way by irate spectators who had no time for him and certainly were going to give him no room to watch the prophet of Nazareth. And so he climbed the sycamore tree, or rather the species of fig tree from whose overhanging branches and luscious leaves, he looked down to the street below as the Lord Jesus passed by. But He did not quite pass by, for standing there, looking up into the branches, He said, "Zaccheus, come down, for today I must abide in thy house."

It would be interesting to speculate why Jesus should have stopped, how it came that He knew Zaccheus' name, and why He chose to dine with him of all the people who would love to have shared their meal with Jesus that afternoon. Perhaps, Matthew, standing at the Master's side had said, "There he is, up there—Zaccheus. Remember, I told you about him back there in Capernaum." Or was it that Jesus, Who could read men's hearts as well as their faces, saw something behind the eyes of Zaccheus that delineated an agony of soul and torment of conscience through which the man was obviously passing. On the Gothic arch at the crossing of Iona Cathedral, built by Queen Margaret in the eleventh century, in Scotland, the monk architects have carved the face of a man, with sightless eyes and agonized lines, and an open mouth and swollen, parched tongue, giving all the appearance of mental anguish, and there it stands as a permanent reminder to the preacher in Iona Abbey that to this condition must he always preach, for this is what the world is like. Perhaps Jesus saw something of this agony written in the face of Zaccheus. At any rate, he beckons him to come down, and as the crowd stands back, aghast, agape and derisive, shouting at them as they walk away, "Some prophet this, to go and dine with such a person as he is," it is at that moment that Zaccheus makes his witness. "Behold, Lord, half my goods I give to the poor, and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore to him fourfold." And now watch the little fellow as he walks out into a new life with the new Master of his life, with the crowd hooting and jeering as they recede into the distance. This moment for Zaccheus is the moment that comes to every man when he must make his decision, whether, in the words of Joshua, we must serve the gods of our fathers, or the gods of the Amorites, and stand forth and say, "as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

This experience of Zaccheus which is so common to so many of us has three phases, and the first phase is the most important for us.

The first phase can only be understood by a particular interpretation of verse 8. Verse 8, you will notice, states that Zaccheus says, "I give to the poor half my goods," "I restore fourfold to any man from whom I have taken by false accusation." These are two present indicatives. Dr. Weymouth and Father Ronald Knox, in their Modern Translation, state, "Here and now I give half my goods to the poor." Dr. Moffatt places it into the future by saying, "I will, at some future time, give * * * restore." But the exegesis I would follow this morning is to treat them as they are written in the Authorized Version as two present indicatives. What Zaccheus says, in effect, is, "It is my custom to give half my goods, half of my capital in the bank, to the poor. It is my custom to restore fourfold to men whom I have falsely accused, and this is something I've been doing for sometime now, although none of you knew anything about it." In other words, this man, troubled by the position that he was occupying, uneasy in his conscience about the evil he was committing, was trying in the only way that he could think to undo the evil he was doing, by making recompense to those whom he had falsely accused, and giving away half of his capital to the poor. Yet the extraordinary thing is that the man still had an uneasy conscience, and must somehow see the prophet of Nazareth, because He, and He alone, is the one who can salve this conscience and give him the peace that the world cannot give. And that's why it seems to me that Zaccheus speaks to every one of us, especially the good among us, particularly the Christians among us, and those who come to the church Sunday by Sunday. For the problem of this life is: not that evil people have uneasy consciences—only God knows that; but why it is that so many of us seeking to do good and the right and be just, find, in the end, we still have an uneasy conscience, still feel dissatisfied with life and unable to find the peace that it seems God alone can give. And what we do is what Zaccheus did. We write our check out to the benevolent fund, or to the Community Chest, or give a large donation to our church. We take our talent and we dedicate it to some good cause. We take our time and we use it for the furtherance of the good of man. We may even seek to take on some office of authority, indeed, as an act of patriotism, dedicate our lives to some noble cause, and even in the government of the land itself. Thus we occupy ourselves with these good works, and all the time deep down there is a dissatisfaction of knowing that we somehow have not achieved the best, that we have not been perfectly true to our true selves, and live our lives from day to day with our consciences stinging. The only escape is somehow to try to balance the evil that we do in secret with the good deeds that we do equally in secret. The surgeries of every psychiatrist are crowded with those people who would seek to live this kind of double life—by paying off in goods, and talents, and time, and gifts the kind of life that deep down they want to live. "And he who lives a hundred lives, a hundred lives must die," and he who lives a double life, a double life must live. In James M. Barrie's play "Dear Brutus," it is fascinating to see how the author brings out this sense of paying off our frustrations by good deeds. And so Jack, who thinks his marriage is a failure, as he has secret meetings with another woman, continually says to her that his knowing of her has made him kinder to his wife. "The first time we met, I went home and was kind to my wife. The first day you allowed me to hold your hand, I bought her a bouquet of flowers. The first day you allowed me to kiss you, I went home and bought her a ruby ring. Indeed, the more I meet you the more loving I am to my wife." Lifting the matter out of the realm of drama and the psychiatrists' surgeries to the level of experience that we know, the thing that stands between us and the fullest life in Christ is just this—that Christ comes to us asking not your money or your life, but your money and your life. Indeed, it's only when we dedicate our lives to Christ, that our money and our talents and our gifts and our time and our ability become significant and relevant. And pointing to you and me the challenge comes, "Today I must abide in thy house."

Now the second phase of Zaccheus' conversion is this: he made a public confession of his faith. It was a brave thing to do, for the people were mocking him and laughing him to scorn. And yet he did it proudly with his head raised. He plighted his troth beneath the shimmering heat of the sun to be the Lord's forever.

And the longer I live, the more I'm convinced of the necessity of this public act of dedication and commitment. There was a day when I regarded as a form of exhibitionism those testimonials so frequently seen in mission halls in which a man gives his heart to Jesus Christ on Saturday night and takes it back on Monday, to return it again on the following Saturday, or after the hangover was passed, or after the emotional urge was over, and some are. Yet nothing big takes place unless a man completely and finally and publicly dedicates his life to it. In any public office, a solemn oath is taken with hand upon the Bible. The Rotary Club, Kiwanis Club, Round Table, all have their commitments. I'm mindful of the alcoholic I know, who passing through the agony of realization that he was a drunkard and could do nothing about it, found release, not in the doctors' surgery (although they helped him greatly), but on that day when he battered at the door of Norman Vincent Peale's church in New York and found it closed, yet wrote his testimony upon an envelope and put it through the letter box and went on his way rejoicing. Until you and I have the courage to stand forth and say "I'm not ashamed to own my Lord, or to defend His cause," we will continue to have the uneasy conscience of uncommitted persons, and look upon the Gospels and the Christian faith much as a spectator looks at a lovely garden of flowers, beautiful to behold, but not yet experienced.

And the third phase of Zaccheus' pilgrimage is the realization of the fact that he did it now. He didn't wait to come down

from that tree, but tearing his way down through the branches, he came breathlessly to the Master and stood there awaiting his commands. But suppose he had retorted by some such words as you or I might easily make—"Don't speak this way to me, Jesus, in the midst of these people. Don't you know it's rather embarrassing?" Or, "I've a rather heavy schedule on—I've got 3 weeks of meetings and interviews before me and can't have a moment to see you. I'll write to you someday and we can make an appointment." Or, suppose like some of these young fellows who pass through the colleges, they feel that life is so busy they haven't quite time to make up their minds. (But Zaccheus was young. It takes a young man to climb a tree, you know.) There's still plenty of time to make up his mind about religion when he's middle-aged and thinks of these serious things. If this had been his answer, then he had lost forevermore the possibility of his salvation. For Jesus Christ was passing through Jericho on His road to Jerusalem, and in Jerusalem was a court waiting to try Him, and a cross on which He was about to hang, a tomb in which He was to be laid, and never again was He to pass that way. Zaccheus took the chance that was given him now. A senior padre was once examining a young chaplain before going forth to the forces to serve in the fields of battle. "Suppose," said the senior chaplain, "you're in the battlefield. A man has got 60 seconds to live. What will you say to him?" The young man hesitated, trying to bring out of his subconscious mind the lectures at college he had received, trying to pick out the appropriate chapter of the Bible he might speak to, and the seconds ticked by, until finally, in desperation, he searched for his prayer book. "It's too late for that now," said the chaplain general quietly. Yes, it's too late for that now. Now is the time for decision. Suppose the Lord Jesus passes by and sees again the uneasy agony of soul that torments so many folks, unknown to their neighbor, and knows that the only remedy possible that you might have peace is to come down and be his guest and commit yourself publicly to the life that Christ would have you live, what is your answer—"Now is the acceptable year of the Lord"? Or, are you like the Hebrew slaves of old, who on the eve of their freedom after 7 years of servitude stand at the open doorway breathing into their lungs the fresh air of a new life: and then, this new found freedom frightening them, they halt at the doorstep and go back to their pots and pans in the kitchen, feeling that there, at least, is security. But their ears are pinned to the lintel of the door, symbolizing they remain forever afterward a slave. It is the choice that comes to every man, and time is running out. "Zaccheus, come down, for today I must abide in thy house." What is your answer?

Our Muddled Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, William Henry Chamberlain writing in the New Leader for September 16, 1950, points out our inconsistent and muddled policy in Formosa. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including said article:

American policy toward the island of Formosa has become an almost incredibly tangled web of reversals, contradictions, and inconsistencies. Some difficult issues of diplomacy and strategy are involved. But almost any clear-cut policy would be preferable to the official attitude to date, which has been consistent only in its wavering.

Consider first this logical absurdity: We still recognize the Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai-shek as the legitimate Government of China. We have steadily opposed the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. Yet up to June 27 President Truman, under the influence of Secretary of State Acheson, had taken the stand that America would not lift a finger to prevent the Communists from taking the island.

Since June 27, it has been our declared policy to neutralize Formosa, to use our naval and air power to prevent a Communist invasion, while discouraging offensive operations by Chiang's forces against the mainland. The President has taken the position that Formosa, although today the sole remaining territorial base of the Chinese Government we recognize, is not really part of China at all, but territory taken from Japan by the victory of the Allied forces [whose] legal status cannot be fixed until there is international action to determine its future.

This is in clear contradiction with Secretary Acheson's position last January. At that time, the Secretary dismissed as a quibble the idea that Formosa was not part of China as a result of the Cairo declaration of November 1943, subscribed to by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang, which stated that China would obtain Formosa after the defeat of Japan.

The President veered away from this assumption that Formosa was part of China in his declaration of June 27. He suggested that disposition of the island must await a peace treaty with Japan or United Nations action. But Mr. Truman has further confounded the confusion, if that be possible, by his recent announcement that the American fleet would be withdrawn from Formosan waters as soon as the war in Korea ended.

This looked like a reversion to last January's passive attitude toward the possibility of a Communist breach in the immensely important Pacific defense line. If Chinese Communist seizure of Formosa is an intolerable threat to American security while fighting is in progress in Korea, why should it be any less a threat when the fighting is over? The Chinese Communists are hardly likely to desist from carrying out their oft-announced threat to invade Formosa until the UN reaches a decision, or to respect such a decision unless it assigns Formosa to them.

General MacArthur, in a statement withdrawn by Presidential order but fortunately not suppressed, made a brilliant and altogether convincing military argument for keeping Formosa out of Communist hands. The core of his message is summarized in the following sentence:

"Formosa in the hands of a hostile power could be compared to an unsinkable aircraft carrier and submarine tender ideally located to accomplish offensive strategy and at the same time checkmate defensive or counteroffensive operations by friendly forces based on Okinawa and the Philippines."

MacArthur's statement was criticized—very unfairly, I think—as an expression of American imperialism. The United States, it so happens, is the most powerful member of a coalition of free nations trying to hold back aggressive Communist expansion in Asia as well as Europe. MacArthur emphasized in his message that more than American national interest and security are at stake. He referred to "our friends in the Philippines, our friends in Australia and New Zealand, our friends in Indonesia, our friends in Japan."

It is certainly a matter of grave doubt whether there is ever a serious moral case for turning a people over to Communist rule. But there is not the slightest valid argument for turning the Formosans over to Chinese Communist domination. For half a century, the island was dissociated from China; two generations of Formosans grew up entirely isolated from Chinese political and cultural influence.

Nor will American public opinion understand the logic of fighting a sanguinary war under disadvantageous logistical conditions to repel Communist aggression in Korea, and then acquiescing in similar aggression against strategically more important Formosa. A large majority of the Formosan people, if given the chance, would almost certainly vote for autonomy and eventual independence, not for absorption into Mao Tse-tung's Red Chinese empire. This question might properly be referred to a plebiscite under UN auspices. As for the idea that Mao Tse-tung would be appeased and satiated by the acquisition of Formosa, we tried that method with Stalin. The results, to put it mildly, were not happy.

Bosone Plan for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, one of the most difficult problems before the country today is the future of the American Indian, and particularly Indians who are still wards of the Government.

For more than 100 years the United States has been acting in the capacity of guardian of the American Indian. Any number of investigations have been made to determine what should be done to help them become self-sustaining and take their place as citizens in this great country.

Legislation is now pending in the Congress. I refer to House bill 490. This bill has caused much public discussion. Lately former Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes addressed a column to the Washington Post on this subject, which was published Sunday, September 17.

Although I am not in full agreement with Mr. Ickes' position, yet there is merit in his comment on H. R. 490. I think it will be informative to Members of the Congress, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSONE PLAN FOR INDIANS

(By Harold Ickes)

ATTACK ON RIGHTS

The Bosone resolution (H. Res. 490), which has passed the House and has been favorably recommended to the Senate, by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, is all the worse because of its sponsorship. I have high regard for Mrs. BOSONE. I believe that she has a real passion for justice and fair treatment of minority groups. I have no doubt as to her good faith in offering this resolution, but I am frank to say that no greater harm could be done to the Indians than its passage. For this reason, I hope

that, if it does pass, it will be vetoed by President Truman.

This resolution does not, in express terms, direct that Indian rights be thrown into the ash can. As a matter of fact, no bill, the effect of which would be to despoil the Indians, has ever expressly said so. From times immemorial, bills to make the Indians an easy prey to white cupidity have all been defended in terms of "liberation," "assimilation into the general population," etc. If Mrs. BOSONE and those Representatives and Senators, who fell so easily into the trap into which the Indians themselves are expected later to fall, had studied prior Indian legislation, they would have been chary about letting someone else do their thinking for them and lending their support to a measure, which, if adopted, may turn out to be as notorious in its effects as the Bursum-Fall bill of two or more decades ago.

The Bosone bill would adopt a Federal policy to breach contracts, to terminate present Federal protections and services, and undo all that the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, passed with the keen approval of President Roosevelt, has made it possible for the Indians to accomplish for themselves. This bill is aimed at whole tribes, not merely at individual Indians. It is a mandate to the Secretary of the Interior to determine, as quickly as possible, that the Indian wards of the Government no longer need protection. It has been suggested that it can all be done within a year.

The effect on the Indians would not be dissimilar to the effect on members of trade unions, if the Congress should enact a law declaring that the members of a union might no longer have the protection that is theirs as the result of united effort and united action. Moreover, this bill contains a unique and particularly sadistic provision. Up to $250,000 are to be taken out of the already inadequate appropriations for the education, health, etc., of the Indians to finance the engine of their economic destruction. Could devilish and sardonic humor go further? Of course, $250,000 to be expended by the Office of Indian Affairs, at its own sweet will, would mean more jobs. Apparently, trained and experienced personnel from the Indian Bureau would not be employed, but outsiders, many of whom would probably lack interest in, or sympathy for, these first Americans. Money could even be spent to subsidize so-called welfare organizations and even religious and pseudo-scientific groups, to report as the Indian Bureau might wish them to report. I have had faith in Indian Commissioner Dillon Myer, but it has been somewhat shaken by the fact that he has supported this legislation. I hesitate to believe that he understands what could be done under this legislation.

These $250,000 should be devoted to health and education, for the benefit of the Indians themselves. Instead of being spent for the Indians, they are to be dissipated in paying for formulae that on their face would seem to justify the further exploitation of the Indians. By the terms of the resolution, the Secretary is required to specify, not later than January 3 next, "which tribes, bands, and groups of Indians are, in his opinion, qualified to be relieved by all supervision and control by the Federal Government in the management of their affairs." The resolution further imposes upon him the duty of reviewing "not later than the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress * * * programs undertaken by the Department" to denude of Federal protection, the tribes that had been given the "bum's rush" on the preceding January 3.

Once the Bosone resolution becomes the law, its language, and not the benevolent intent expressed by Secretary Chapman in his letter to Chairman Peterson, will determine the fate of the Indians. Furthermore, Secretary Chapman's intent would in no way control his successor. His wishful thinking would in no way alter the fact that the Bosone resolution would open wide the gate, that now protects our Indian wards, to the two-legged predator who has traveled that familiar road in the past. Even Secretary Chapman seems to have forgotten the history of legislative efforts in the past, some of which have been all to successful, to denude the Indians of their property. His indorsement of the Bosone resolution is in contradistinction to his adverse report on S. 2726 which boldly and directly proposed to do what could be done just as easily, if less abruptly and more smoothly, under the Bosone resolution.

Title to Submerged Lands Beneath Navigable Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the State of Maryland consistently has taken the position, through its duly elected officials, that submerged lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the several States belong to the States in question. Those officials have supported legislation which would confirm and establish the titles of the States to such lands.

At a hearing on the matter by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate, a statement outlining the position of the National Association of Attorneys General on the matter was presented by Mr. Hall Hammond, attorney general of Maryland, and chairman of the submerged lands committee of the National Association of Attorneys General.

Because of the paramount interest of this controversy to the State of Maryland, and to the many other States of the country, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. TYDINGS] and myself, that the statement be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am Hall Hammond, attorney general of the State of Maryland, and I appear here in behalf of my State and as chairman of the submerged lands committee of the National Association of Attorneys General.

You are aware that we believe in and are committed to a program which would confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, but as Senator O'MAHONEY has stated it seems to be quite impossible that any permanent legislation along these lines could be enacted at this session.

Therefore I confine my remarks to Senate Joint Resolution 195 relating to the interim operation and development of oil deposits in the submerged lands off the shores of the United States.

Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the committee, introducer of the measure, says "the resolution does not attempt to settle any controversial issue" and "failure to enact interim legislation of some kind would precipitate very serious confusion at a time when the country can ill afford it."

At the outset let me say that I would favor a bill for interim operations provided it did not give any of the parties an advantage and the status quo is maintained.

Recently this committee has considered legislation giving statehood to Alaska and Hawaii and in your reports which recommend favorable action, we find the following (quotes taken from Rept. No. 1929):

In a letter dated May 5, 1950, written by President Harry S. Truman, he says in part:

"It should not be forgotten that most of our present States achieved statehood at a relatively early period of their development. The stimulus of being admitted as full partners in the Union, and the challenge of managing their own affairs were among the most significant factors contributing to their growth and progress. Very few of our existing States, at the time of their admission to the Union, possessed potential resources, both human and natural, superior to those of Alaska and Hawaii. I am confident that Alaska and Hawaii, like our present States, will grow with statehood and because of statehood" (p. 9).

The Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, in a letter to you said:

"You asked in your letter of March 30 as to whether from the point of view of national defense, it would be advantageous to extend statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, and you inquired specifically as to whether statehood would give greater strength to our military position in those areas than does the present territorial type of local government. It is obvious that the more stable a local government can be, the more successful would be the control and defense of the area in case of sudden attack. There can be no question but that in the event of an attack any State would be immensely aided in the initial stages of the emergency by the effective use of the State and local instrumentalities of law and order. By the same token it would seem to me that, as persons in a position to assist the Federal garrisons which might exist in Hawaii or Alaska, the locally elected governors, sheriffs, and the locally selected constabulary and civil defense units all would be of tremendous value in cases of sudden peril. Therefore, my answer to your question is that statehood for Alaska and Hawaii would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the over-all defense of both areas in event of emergency" (p. 15).

The Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman, in his appearance before the committee stated:

"The United States has spoken out loudly and firmly against colonialism in world councils, but surely to require a people qualified for the ultimate in self-government to continue in a dependent status is to foster colonialism" (p. 5).

He stated further:

"Statehood would permit Alaska to foster and protect the development of the natural riches. Most important of all, statehood would give Alaska's people their rightful voice in the Federal Government, as well as in the management of their own affairs" (pp. 14 and 15.)

The committee report in speaking of national resources has this to say:

"Economic development: In addition to the advantages to national security and the furtherance of America's leadership in world affairs, statehood for Alaska is desirable for America's peactime development and economic expansion. The region has the greatest reserves of untapped raw materials—minerals, forest and sea products—under the American flag. * * *

"Alaska's gold and furs have been glamorized by Jack London, Rudyard Kipling, Robert W. Service, and other writers, but the Territory has far more valuable resources in

her iron ore, coal, copper, lead and zinc, and even tin. * * *

"All of the foregoing is merely a sketch of some of the high lights of Alaska's industrial and agricultural potentialities. If the historic patterns established in the admission of each of the 35 States is followed in Alaska—and the committee can perceive of no valid reason why it should not be—statehood for Alaska should supply the needed stimulus for enterprise and private capital to make that area of vast riches one of the strongest segments of the American economy of tomorrow" (pp. 5 and 6).

Do the foregoing expressions have any significance?

They speak of "the stimulus of being admitted as full partners in the Union, and the challenge of managing their own affairs, the growth because of statehood."

They say, "It is obvious that the more stable a local government can be, the more successful would be the control and defense of the area in case of sudden attack."

They say that "to require a people qualified for the ultimate in self-government to continue in a dependent status is to foster colonialism."

You speak of the "advantages of development of the natural resources by the people of the States."

And then what would you be saying to the people of the States who from the beginning have been in possession of and considered the owners of the lands involved, and who have developed the production of the natural resources therein, if you pass a measure embodying the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 195 in its present form?

You say to those people, "you are incompetent and no longer fit or qualified to manage your own affairs, and from the standpoint of a stable local government and in the interest of the national defense, it is necessary for us to appoint a guardian to protect you."

Anyone who believes in the Communist method of confiscating and nationalizing all natural resources might say that to the people of this country but I cannot believe that the members of this committee would take such a position.

I believe you recognize from the facts that have been presented to you that the appointment of the Secretary of the Interior as a so-called receiver, or should we say guardian, will cause more confusion and definitely retard the operation and development of the lands involved.

Let us repeat what the National Petroleum Council named by the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a national oil policy for the United States had to say in its report last year:

"The petroleum resources of the lands beneath the marginal seas extending to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf can best be explored and developed under State, rather than Federal, control."

I think an examination of the record will convince any unbiased person that oil production under State control has been far more successful than similar operations by the Federal Government.

You have been advised as to the method employed in California during the past 3 years where operations have continued smoothly and without interruption. In my opinion, such a plan will work with the greatest degree of efficiency, with the minimum of cost, confusion, and delay. I hope Senator O'MAHONEY and the other members of this committee will recognize the merit of the plan and amend Senate Joint Resolution 195 accordingly.

It seems to me that it is more important in the interest of the Nation and national defense to have a stable local government carrying on the operations in an efficient manner with the least of confusion and cost rather than attempt to satisfy the lust for power of some Federal officers who would manage these lands.

The National Federation of Independent Business Is Doing a Great Job for Small Business in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, small business in America is having a hard road these days. It is difficult for the average small-business man to compete with big business monopolies, trusts, and furthermore with Government regulations, red tape, bureaucratic delays, regimentation, and so forth.

Therefore, it is well that they have representing their interests and welfare several groups and organizations here in Washington. Many small-business men hold memberships in these groups and subscribe to their programs and, to a more or less degree, finance their activities.

One of the most active and most influential organizations carrying the banner and carrying on the struggle in behalf of small business is the National Federation of Independent Business. It has the largest individual membership of any organization in the United States. Their Washington office is in the Bond Building, Washington 5, D. C.

The organization has an advisory counsel which reports to the organization here in Washington, D. C., every month. This comprises 2,000 district chairmen reporting the opinions of the average small-business man on important issues and problems of the day. Through them, the organization keeps in touch with small business throughout the country. Then in turn, the organization officials can report the overall information to Members of Congress, Federal officials, public service organizations, educational groups and others.

Of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the general public is the enclosed letter dated September 21 which I have just received from Mr. George J. Burger, vice president. The letter follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Burlingame, Calif., September 21, 1950.

Hon. HAROLD HAGEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: I believe that your suggestion, solely as a matter of information and guidance to Members of Congress, should be carried out by spreading on the RECORD what independent busines leadership is striving for to protect the people they represent—independent business of this Nation.

Too often there is confusion in the minds of many Members of Congress as to "who is who" in independent business leadership. So there should be no difficulty in acquainting the Members of Congress on this score.

The National Federation of Independent Business, headed by Mr. C. Wilson Harder, founder and president, a nonprofit corporation whose head office is located in Burlingame, Calif., with division offices throughout the United States, including a public-relations office, in charge of Mr. Ed Wimmer, in Cincinnati, Ohio, from the very first instance has ruled that the policies of the federation must be by the majority vote of its Nation-wide membership. This is carried out by the registered vote of the membership through the official publication of the federation, "The Mandate." No group of officers, nor any selected group of members determines the policy of the federation. We believe this is the only democratic way, and the safest way for any trade association to operate.

When major economic questions are involved, before any position is taken by the federation, it's the Nation-wide membership majority vote which determines the position.

We have found from experience in our many appearances before congressional committees, due to our active interest, that too often among trade associations has the opinion of only a few of their membership been the position taken by that organization, and the position being unknown to all the members.

In my official position as vice president in charge of the Washington office of the federation, every so often we are visited here by heads of Government agencies or called upon by Members of Congress to answer the question "How can you protect independent business at the local level?" This question is readily answered, and not merely through "lip service" but by direct and positive action, that if independent business is to get relief at the local level it must come about through all-out sincere, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

The federation's position was ably presented before the Joint Committee of the Economic Report July 14, 1947. Then again, before the House Small Business Committee November 17, 1948, and in its numerous appearances before Judiciary Committees of both the Senate and the House, holding to the original objective as the No. 1 objective—all-out vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

The position of the federation was also ably presented, through the splendid cooperation of the respective chairman of the Republican and Democratic Platform Committees in their conventions in Philadelphia in the summer of 1948. To their credit, both of these committees extended to the spokesman for the federation the fullest possible time in oral presentation of the objectives of the federation, and it must be said for the chairmen of both committees that special, careful attention was given to the remarks of the federation, and particularly on their recommendations for an antitrust program. I think it is well to list the small-business blank which the federation presented to both committees:

1. Antitrust program.

2. Small Business Committees in the Congress, with special emphasis on the creation of these committees as permanent standing small business committees of the Congress, and in this respect our objective was gained in the splendid action of the Senate on February 20, 1950, when they voted the creation of the standing Committee on Small Business. It will be found from the record that the federation was the only small business organization sponsor of this resolution, and the only organization in getting this recognition from the United States Senate.

3. Government competition with private enterprise.

4. Small independent business representation.

5. Labor practices.

6. Government regulation of business.

It is interesting to note, and I quote from the statement made before the committees:

"I urge your favorable attention to, and action on, all of these suggestions, with special emphasis on the first two—without

which the last four would be only idle gestures."

This has been the consistent program of the federation, as ratified by its Nation-wide membership in each and every instance.

The federation, in its honest efforts to acquaint the public at large with all-out necessary information on the problems of independent business, has carried on an extensive Nation-wide weekly radio program for over 2 years, and at the moment we are sponsoring a small-business column in many thousand weekly newspapers, all tending to give the needed information to the public at large, and acquaint them with the need for a healthy, virile, efficient independent business segment to function in our economy.

We were very interested in a very necessary piece of legislation which you sponsored in the Eightieth Congress, which provided that exporters of rubber tires be given the same consideration on excise-tax exemption on tires and tubes that is permitted to tire producers. This legislation was very much in order as a protective measure for independent business in the export trade, and it is an unfortunate situation that Congress did not approve the legislation.

The independent tire retailing trade has the same problem. Their stocks are subject to excise taxes as soon as they are received, where the stocks of tire manufacturers operating in the retail field through their own retail stores are exempt from the tax until the tires and tubes are ultimately sold to users. This is a rank injustice and a severe penalty on independent tire retailing establishments. For nearly 10 years we have been attempting to get this injustice corrected, and we hope action will be taken on this and your important bill before very long.

Many Members of Congress are confused, and to their credit desire all-out information on independent business leadership, and the insertion of this material in the RECORD, with any appropriate remarks, we believe will be of great service to all within our economy.

With highest regards,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles, entitled "Of Civil Rights—I," "Of Civil Rights—II," and "Of Civil Rights—III," written by John P. McKnight, and published in the Charlotte News of September 12, 1950, September 13, 1950, and September 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF CIVIL RIGHTS—I

(By John P. McKnight)

"Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."—From the first amendment to the Constitution (art. I of the Bill of Rights).

Last month, in Durham, a man named William Evans, a 26-year-old former student at Davidson, the University of North Carolina, and Duke University, now an employee of a Durham soda shop, got himself arrested for seeking signatures to the so-called Stockholm petition for peace, a document which has Communist backing.

Deliberately, Evans approached three policemen and asked them to sign. They jailed him, on the specific charge of vagrancy. In so doing, they were merely following the instructions of Recorder's Court Judge A. R. Wilson, who several weeks ago directed Durham law enforcement officers to pick up as vagrants persons circulating the petition. The judge observed that persons having nothing better to do in the present emergency should be working on the roads.

Arraignment before Judge Wilson the day after his arrest, Evans pleaded innocent, demanded trial by jury, and posted bond of $200 for appearance at the Superior Court session opening in Durham early this month.

In a statement Evans issued after his release, he described himself as "an ardent pacifist" who firmly supported the Stockholm appeal "as well as other genuine efforts to remove the threat of atomic war." He asserted his purpose was to challenge the constitutionality of Judge Wilson's order. And he predicted that attempts would be made to "prejudice this case by dragging in the issue of communism."

Those are the salient facts of the affair. On the basis of them, it is easy enough to dismiss young Evans as a callow youth (although he has lived out a third of man's allotted span, and is a professed student of history). It is easy enough to brand him a publicity seeker, with perhaps a touch of martyr complex in him. Since he avers his personal support of the Stockholm petition, and since his father testifies to his onetime membership in Henry Wallace's Progressive Party, it is easy, all too easy, to damn him as a parlor pink if not a fellow traveler, an intellectual Communist if not a party card holder.

In the present state of the country's temper, that is sure to be the popular approach to the problem of William Evans.

Irate as Americans rightfully are over Communist aggression in Korea, uneasy as we justly are over Russia's intentions, fearful as most of us are that the horrors of world war III may be just around the corner, concerned as we are for national solidarity in this time of crisis, we are understandably disposed to give short shift to those who do not see eye to eye with the majority. A nation in peril, or one that believes itself in peril, ill brooks its dissenters. So most of us will call young Evans a Russia-loving Red, and say that whatever happens to him is too good for him.

Nevertheless, it is true that—as Evans himself insists—it is muddying the waters to drag communism into his case. He will not be tried for callowness and immaturity, for wrong-headedness, for publicity seeking, for desiring martyrdom, for pacifism, or for communism. All those labels may fix him; but whether they do or not is neither here nor there; none of them is, as of this writing, an offense under the law of the land, whatever the current popular opinion of them.

Nor is Evans accused of threatening public order, nor of imperiling the security of the Nation; and so he is prima facie innocent on those counts.

Nor, finally, will he be tried for the specific act that provoked his arrest, circulating the Stockholm petition.

At the direction of the Durham justice, he will be tried for vagrancy—that is, strictly, for having no means of support and so being likely to become a public burden.

Yet it is written in the record that the occasion of his arrest is his having sought signatures for the petition.

Thus the issue is quite clear: shall peace officers and courts at the lower level be permitted, by means of arbitrary redefinition of statutes, to vitiate the basic rights enshrined in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution?

You may or may not like young Evans and his political philosophy, and you may or may not approve of his decision deliberately to seek a legal test of Judge Wilson's order; but you cannot get away from the fact that he has posed a question to a democratic way of life.

And behind that question are others yet larger: How shall we win the hearts of men to practical democracy if panic fear of communism causes us to repudiate the very virtues that make ideal democracy dear to much of mankind, and what profits us victory in the cold or hot war with totalitarian communism if the price we pay for that victory is our grand birthright of freedom?

I shall return to these questions tomorrow, and the day after.

OF CIVIL RIGHTS—II

(By John P. McKnight)

"A little rebellion now and then * * * is a medicine necessary for the sound health of government."—Thomas Jefferson.

Although Soviet Russia notoriously tramples underfoot the liberties of the individual, the Kremlin requires of American Communists vociferous defense of our civil rights.

This seeming paradox is customarily resolved, or dismissed, with the allegation that the Communists crouch in safety behind the barricade of our constitutional guaranties the while they plot the destruction of our democratic institutions. And there is much truth in this. But it is by no means the whole story.

A moment's thought will suffice to disclose Moscow's subtler purpose in ordering this perfervid advocacy of our civil rights. It is to trade upon the truism that praise from the wrong quarter may be as damning as blame from the right. It is to make the cause of civil rights suspect in our own eyes, to make it "reprehensible by association." (Similarly, in Europe, Communist propaganda discredits the very word democracy by seizing upon it and affixing it to the various "fronts" that serve the Kremlin.)

For Moscow knows very well that democracy's most potent weapons in the global contest for men's hearts and minds are these same civil rights, these guaranties of personal freedom. And if the Communists' hypocritically ardent championship of them causes enough Americans to suspect these weapons, and so discard them, then Moscow will have won a greater victory than any it can achieve in Korea.

(Just how far this Communist tactic has succeeded, you may be able to measure by looking into your own mind. What is your first, instinctive reaction on reading that John Doe—about whom you know nothing—has gratuitously taken up the cudgels in defense of the right of assembly, or freedom of speech, or security against unlawful search? Do you not instinctively suspect him of Communist leanings? At the very least, do you not put his conduct down as quixotic?)

Now none of this is intended to suggest that young William Evans, the St. Paul's youth who last month deliberately sought arrest to challenge a Durham court's asserted invasion of the right of petition, is a Communist or a tool of communism, or even a sympathizer with communism.

Inevitably, many will so regard him. Those of us who detest and fear Russian totalitarianism and who believe that the Kremlin's cynical policies are leading straight to world war III—and it goes without saying that we are the vast majority in America—are likely to let Evans' political beliefs prejudice our judgment of the issue

he has raised. We are likely to say that it serves him damn well right to be arrested for seeking signatures to the Stockholm (Communist-backed) peace petition, and let it go at that.

That is because Evans' professed political philosophy is tremendously unpopular—and perhaps deservedly so—in the United States just now.

So it may be regrettable that we have left it to the St. Paul's youth to cast himself in the role of champion in our North Carolina courts, of the constitutional right of petition. Another might have fared better at the bar of public opinion, if not in the courts.

Were Evans a, let us say, highly respected, elderly deacon of a reputable church seeking signatures to a petition to Congress against an allegedly discriminatory tax on church property, his arrest for vagrancy would have rocked the State to its foundations.

But, alas! he is not. Elderly deacons, lawyers, bankers, newspaper editors, if you like, are not given to seeking arrest so that they may do battle in court for their beliefs. Age is conservative; and, no matter how much oldsters may dislike the way things are going, they rarely rise in revolt. No graybeard would have written "common sense."

No. It is the young who rebel. And in our complacent middle age as a Nation, forgetful that we were born of rebellion, we tend to look down our noses at youthful rebels. We tend to ignore Jefferson's dictum that we need a little rebellion to test, and insure the continuing soundness, of our institutions.

But to the liabilities of our dislike of rebellion, and of his youth, Evans adds avowed pacifism, erstwhile support of Henry Wallace, sympathy with the Stockholm petition—all attitudes decidedly out of favor right now. That he has studied at Chapel Hill may further prejudice his case with the few who have heeded irresponsible talk about the political complexion of the university. And a Durham newspaper has grumpily consigned him to "Cranks' corner."

Yet none of those considerations is germane to his case, and so must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the issues he raises are real enough.

In yesterday's article I defined them: the propriety or impropriety of arbitrarily redefining statutes (i. e., that on vagrancy) to negate the Bill of Rights; the effect upon our cause if, in the stress of the current crisis, we abjure the basic guaranties of democracy; the worthwhileness of victory over communism if it costs us our freedoms.

A recent analysis purports to show that Moscow now controls—in body, if not in mind—some 700,000,000 of the world's people. Another 700,000,000, approximately, side ostensibly with the democracies, although among these are many whose faith is weak. All the rest sit on the fence. The side that captures their loyalties will possess preponderance of power in the world, and may confidently look forward to victory in a cold or a hot war.

As of today, Russia appears to be winning the battle of propaganda. There are many reasons for this.

To millions in the world, the message of communism is new and thrilling, while that of democracy is old and, since many of its promises have not been fulfilled, suspect. Too, Russia has had three decades of trial and error to perfect her propaganda techniques: we are Johnnies-come-lately, amateurs competing with professionals. Again, Russia is adept at capitalizing on our errors; our attempts to proscribe the Stockholm petition, domestically valid though the FBI's reason may be for condemning it, will yet be used abroad to convince unsuspecting millions that we are indeed dedicated to war. And as for Korea, the black and white of it, for much of the world, is that Americans are openly fighting there, while Russians are not: it is not to deny the inevitability of President Truman's decision to say that the resultant propaganda position is unfavorable to us.

Yet to offset our many disadvantages is this inestimable advantage: alone among existing systems of government, western democracy guaranties certain freedoms to the individual, and they are freedoms that strike deep response in the hearts of oppressed millions everywhere.

If to the underprivileged America—with all her sins of omission and commission—is still the promised land, it is these freedoms, as much as our wealth, that we have to thank.

So to allow Russia to maneuver us into setting these guaranties aside, or to let the exigencies of the current crisis impel us to lay them on the shelf for the duration, is to greatly, if not fatally, impair our chances of victory.

The Constitution is a great dike protecting us against the sea of oppression that lies always without. A tiny breach in it may grow enormously, with frightening speed, until we are all of us engulfed in a flood of tyranny. That is why we must all be alert to see that its guaranties are denied to none who deserve them. For, as the unknown who signed himself "Junius" observed in his epoch-marking letter of 1767 to the printer of London's Public Advertiser:

"When the constitution is openly invaded, when the first original right of the people, from which all laws derive their authority, is directly attacked, inferior grievances naturally lose their force, and are suffered to pass by without punishment or observation."

Of Civil Rights—III

(By John P. McKnight)

"It has long been a grave question whether any government, not too strong for the liberties of its people, can be strong enough to maintain its existence in great emergencies."—Abraham Lincoln.

If it is true (as Thomas L. Stokes wrote recently) that our civil rights are "our buckler and our shield," and if it is true (as yesterday's article sought to demonstrate) that they are our greatest asset in the world ideological struggle with communism, then it is evidently very much in our interest to cherish and defend these rights as our lives.

But it is also true that no nation, in grave peril of disastrous attack from its enemies abroad, may permit its enemies at home—partisans and agents of its foreign enemies—to shelter behind the liberties it offers while they carry on their work of sapping its power to resist.

Yet how may our enemies within be restricted in their nefarious abuse of our liberties, without also restricting the loyal citizens of the land? Specifically, how limit the Communists in their use of freedom of speech, publication, assembly, and petition to subvert our Government, without muzzling the patriotic critic whose intent is simply to correct evils? How, in time of crisis, centralize authority to assure swift, effective action, without doing serious—perhaps irreparable—injury to the democratic processes?

In short, how do battle with totalitarianism without aping totalitarian methods?

That is the dire dilemma of democracy.

It is the problem so neatly posed by Abraham Lincoln, in the passage quoted at the head of this chapter. It is the problem that vexes every farsighted American today. It is the problem with which Congress wrestles as it seeks to close loopholes in our legislative structure hampering our effective control of subversive activities.

Our survival may very well depend upon our finding an adequate solution of it; for without the moral leadership of the world that our espousal of man's basic liberties confers we can have little hope of ultimate victory over the forces allied with Soviet Russia.

That is why three long articles have been dedicated to the issues raised by the recent arrest for vagrancy of William Evans, a young man of no particular importance except as his defiance of a Durham court's measures to stop circulation of the Stockholm peace petition suggests the necessity of reexamining the nature and uses of our liberties.

Now it goes without saying that the founding fathers, with all their wisdom, did not foresee the nature of modern warfare, in which entire peoples, rather than small professional armies, are engaged. No more did they foresee such absolute weapons as the atomic bomb, which of its very nature is directed primarily at technical noncombatants. Nor could they foresee the ideological struggle between communism and democracy, which makes geographical and national boundaries naught, so that no man may say with certainty who is friend and who foe.

Had they been granted foreknowledge of the future, the makers of our Constitution would doubtless have written into it provisions for dealing with the monstrous perils of today. But they did not. Thus we, who are justifiably diffident about our statecraft, are left to confront the ticklish problems that the fearsome advance of totalitarian communism imposes.

A few modern constitutions have had written into them the stipulation that rulers may set aside guarantees of civil liberties in domestic or foreign crisis. But with one or two notable exceptions, the end of that has been dictatorship. For love of power grows with the exercise of power; and few men, having enjoyed absolutism, willingly renounce it. As Solon observed, "dictatorship is a very fair spot, but there is no way down from it."

I do not propose to try to tell Congress, and the courts, how our difficulties may best be resolved (as, it may be said in passing, there is no intent to prejudge the case of William Evans). After all, no single, simple answer exists. We shall have to trust to trial and error, to the proved democratic system of checks and balances, and in the last analysis to the good sense of the American people to preserve our ancient liberties substantially unimpaired in this time of crisis.

Yet I believe that these considerations may, with propriety, be urged upon the Congress, and the courts, and law enforcement officers.

1. Beating up Communists in Georgia wins no victories in Korea, and may conceivably cost us friends elsewhere. To quote Lincoln again, "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law." Besides, that way lies fascism.

2. Justice is ill served when statutes are stretched to cover actions that they do not in fact cover, even though those actions, in the opinion of one man of one hundred million, merit punishment; if enough of us so believe, the democratic method is to enact new laws embodying our judgment.

3. In writing new laws for control of subversive elements, Congress must take care that the present mood of the country does not stampede it into needless invasion of our freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and political activity. In our contrition over past errors, it is natural enough for us to long for the hair shirt, to rush to offer up our freedoms on an altar of atonement. But the pendulum will swing the other way, and that, no doubt, right soon.

4. Congress will convict itself of partisan politics at its worst if it fails to give proper weight to President Truman's specifications of the legislative equipment he needs to do the job, and votes restrictive laws far exceeding them. For the executive branch of the

Government, which by definition executes, may be presumed to know what is required. When Truman warns that the provocations of the moment must not sweep Congress into broad, vague laws gravely infringing our freedoms, lest we forfeit our moral leadership in the world, he speaks in statesmanlike vein, and should be heeded.

5. Finally, Congress and the courts alike may find a sound yardstick in the late great Justice Holmes' dictum that our liberties ought to be denied only to those who so use or abuse them as to offer "a clear and present danger" to our security. It was this that formed the keystone of Judge Learned Hand's recent decision denying the appeal of the 11 convicted Communist leaders. On such a line of reasoning, Congress may well justify legislation enabling punitive action against active Communist Party members, since their adherence to a foreign, hostile power constitutes a demonstrable "present danger." But by the same token our Union Square orators, parlor pinks, petition circulators and such other harmless pathics will be left in peace.

We may indeed, in this unprecedented crisis, find it necessary temporarily to curtail some of our liberties, so as to preserve our larger freedom. But we must, all of us, heed the Biblical injunction to "let all things be done decently and in good order." We must take care that none of us, however unpopular his views, is deprived of his liberties without due—which is to say adequate, sufficient—process of law.

In so proceeding, we shall respect the spirit of our democracy, we shall confirm the rest of the world in its good opinion of us, we shall take up arms against our sea of troubles, and we may face the future in full confidence that we are not unworthy of our great past.

As "Junius" observed, in the letter quoted before:

"We owe it to our ancestors to preserve entire those rights, which they have delivered to our care: We owe it to our posterity, not to suffer their dearest inheritance to be destroyed."

My Report to the Post Office Department Personnel of the Ninth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, as the second ranking Republican on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I would like to make a report to all of the United States Post Office Department and service in my Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota.

My purpose is to explain to them the program of legislation presented in their behalf during the Eighty-first Congress and to point out to them the part that their own Representative played in introducing and guiding much of this legislation through the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House of Representatives.

These postal workers are truly deserving of such a report. They are the people whose faithful service makes possible the incredible miracle of the mail—giving us a postal system that reaches across space in a never-ending chain to link man and his thoughts through the written word.

But before I list this legislation, I ask the postal workers to keep in mind the fact that during the Eightieth Congress—a Republican-controlled Congress in which I was on the majority side—the postal workers received the largest salary increase ever given by any Congress.

Furthermore, what is more important to many persons, a most liberal and comprehensive retirement program was approved by the same Congress.

But it has been a different story during the Eighty-first Congress. There are now 15 Democratic members on the House Post Office Committee and only 10 Republican members. As a result, the postal workers have not fared as well as they did during the previous Congress. For despite my efforts and those of the other Republican members of the committee and some of the Democrats in behalf of these deserving postal workers, the Democratic administration has blocked much of the beneficial legislative program. Some of the members in the majority have been all too willing to accept the dictates and wishes of the Democratic Postmaster General, the Democratic Budget Department, and the President.

Here is a list of the bills that I introduced during the Eighty-first Congress in behalf of the postal workers. They are listed in the order in which they were introduced, with the resolution number and a brief explanation of the purpose of the bill. The action that was taken on each bill is also mentioned.

And again I would remind the postal workers of Minnesota's Ninth District to note the many unfavorable reports handed down by the Democratic-controlled departments and agencies. It is very clear that the welfare of our postal workers was of no great concern to the present Democratic administration that otherwise has broken all previous records of public spending.

Here is the record of many of the bills introduced by your United States Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN in the Eighty-first Congress:

January 3, 1949: H. R. 397 (H. R. 926, 4181), providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers. (One hundred dollars annually for the purchase of uniforms.) Both the Bureau of the Budget and the Post Office Department's later reports were unfavorable. (Passed House as a part of H. R. 4495 but removed in conference at Senate insistence.)

January 3, 1949: H. R. 398 (H. R. 6774), providing cash allowance for uniforms for employees of the United States Government. Bureau of the Budget and Civil Service Commission reported "favorable, if amended." The Post Office report was unfavorable.

January 19, 1949: H. R. 1217, to provide longevity pay for postmasters (5 percent or $100 for each year up to 10 years and for each 10 years of service up to 30 thereafter.) Civil Service Commission, Bureau of the Budget, and Post Office Department all reported unfavorably. (Adopted in part in Public, No. 428.)

January 13, 1949: H. R. 1362, to provide for the display of the American flag on every post office in the United States. The Post Office Department report was unfavorable.

January 18, 1949: H. R. 1646, to provide retirement annuities for retired fourth-class postmasters with 30 years of service. Post Office report, no recommendation. Civil Service Commission report, unfavorable.

February 2, 1949: H. R. 2178, to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the nine hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of America by Leif Erikson. Post Office Department report unfavorable.

February 9, 1949: H. R. 2569 (S. 1479) (this became Public Law 431), to convert village letter-carrier service at second-class post offices to city letter-carrier service. Legislation on this subject was first introduced by Mr. HAGEN in the Eightieth Congress and as H. R. 2569 in the Eighty-first Congress.

February 9, 1949: H. R. 2568 (H. R. 2771), to provide credit for salary purposes to carriers advanced from the status of village delivery. Post Office Department reported unfavorable on account of "cost."

February 15, 1949: H. R. 2739, to promote and maintain amicable relations between the Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General and the employees in the field service of the surface and air postal transport by the establishment of a board of arbitration. Post Office Department report opposed as too beneficial to employees.

March 15, 1949: H. R. 3556 (S. 1907), to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 regarding personnel ceilings. Bureau of Budget report unfavorable while Post Office Department reported favorable.

March 15, 1949: H. R. 3557, air mail field railway postal clerks time allowance for service on lay-off periods. Post Office Department report unfavorable.

May 9, 1949: H. R. 4595 (H. R. 4495, 4395), this bill became Public Law 428 on October 28, 1949. Provides increase in the basic pay rates of employes in the field service of the Post Office Department by $120 per annum for all postmasters and employees paid on an annual basis, except fourth-class postmasters who receive an increase of 5 percent and employees paid on an hourly basis who receive an increase of 2½ cents per hour. Supervisors and postmasters are granted longevity pay increases of $100—5 percent for fourth-class postmasters—at the end of 13, 18, and 25 years of service, counting all years of service. Three longevity grades are provided for classes of employees not now receiving any, one longevity grade to those now receiving two so that all employees having automatic grades will also have a series of three longevity grades. All new appointees to regular positions will be appointed in grade 3, present appointments in regular positions in a grade lower than 3 will be placed in grade 3, and substitutes and temporary employees will be placed in grade 3 after 1 year of service. In determining longevity grades provided in this legislation and in Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, postal employees may be given credit for all years of service for which credit has not been received.

NOTE.—As the bill passed the House, it also contained provisions for 5 days additional annual leave and a uniform allowance. These provisions were taken out of the bill in conference at the insistence of Senate conferees.

August 5, 1949: H. R. 5905, grant certain peacetime veterans and their unmarried widows preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed. Comptroller General and Civil Service reports unfavorable.

January 4, 1950: H. R. 6600 (H. R. 8143), automatic annual pay increases for postmasters. Comptroller General report unfavorable. Bill is still in subcommittee.

January 16, 1950: H. R. 6774 (H. R. 397, H. R. 398, H. R. 7305, H. R.7908), uniforms for employees of the United States Government Bureau of the Budget—defer consideration. Civil Service Commission—favorable. Post Office Department—unfavorable.

March 30, 1950: H. R. 7936 (H. R. 7909), providing a minimum daily automotive-equipment maintenance allowance to special-delivery messengers in post offices of the first class, and requiring the use of messengers' vehicles under certain circumstances. Comptroller General, Post Office Department, and Bureau of the Budget reports were unfavorable.

In addition to these measures which I introduced myself and sought favorable legislative action, I have supported the following bills of particular interest to you:

Public Law 381 (approved October 25, 1949), providing an increase of 1 cent a mile in equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers.

Public Law 500 (approved May 3, 1950), designed to clarify the Comptroller General's decision on Public Law 428. In so doing, it permitted rural carriers, custodial employees, special delivery messengers and clerks in third-class post offices and motor-vehicle employees to count all of their time in the postal service toward their longevity grades.

Public Law 29 (approved March 29, 1949), eliminates necessity for reappointment in cases of postmasters whose post offices are advanced from fourth class to a higher class or where post offices of a higher class are relegated to fourth class.

Public Law 214 (approved August 8, 1949), clarifies laws relating to the compensation of postmasters by providing the Postmaster General with authority to retain fourth-class post offices in the salary grade and class to which they were advanced because of unusual conditions until the annual adjustment is made at end of fiscal year.

Public Law 257 (approved August 22, 1949), provides that automatic promotions for part-time employees in the Custodial Service of Post Office Department shall be based on a calendar year rather than on present procedure requiring 2,024 hours of service.

Public Law 288 (approved September 7, 1949), provided that with respect to the computation of night differential for employees in the field service of Post Office Department, night work shall be defined as any work performed between the hours of 6 p. m. and 6 a. m., and either standard or daylight saving time shall be used, depending upon whichever time is observed where such night work is performed.

Public Law 310 (approved September 30, 1949), provides for extending survivorship benefits to widowers of employees retiring under the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930 (present law extends such benefits to widows), and changes the reduction factor in the annuities of the retiring employees from 10 to 5 percent on the first $1,500 per annum of such annuities and retains existing law of a 10 percent reduction factor on that portion of the annuities exceeding $1,500.

Public Law 552 (approved June 15, 1950), authorizes the Postmaster General to detail employees to postal units at armed services camps and to authorize allowances not exceeding $4 per day in lieu of actual expenses.

Public Law 577 (approved June 27, 1950), permits the Postmaster General to renew star route mail contracts for 4 years at the same rate as the original contract. Permits renewals with subcontractors who have performed satisfactory service for at least 1 year.

Public Law 601 (approved July 6, 1950), allows annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948, to retain or accept an increased annuity (civil service retirement), and at the same time name his spouse as survivor annuitant.

H. R. 87, to grant a pro-rata credit for time spent in military service toward automatic promotions of veterans who entered the postal service following their military service. This bill has passed the House twice, the second time being passed over the President's veto. However, the Presidential veto was sustained in the Senate and the proposal is dead for this session of Congress.

H. R. 8195 (bill passed the House only), to restore postal service curtailments made by the recent order of the Postmaster General. This bill has passed the House and is pending on the Senate Calendar.

H. R. 8711 (bill pending before House), to provide that employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department who were transferred by Executive order to the General Services Administration would continue to be paid under the provisions of Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, the Postal Employees Classification and Salary Act. Companion bill, S. 3812, passed Senate.

EXPRESSED APPRECIATION

I also take this opportunity to thank the editors of the official postal magazines and publications for the many fine articles they have printed about my work during the years I have been a member of the Post Office Committee. This "thank you" applies also to the individuals and postal groups which have sent letters to me such as those from which the quotes below were taken:

THIEF RIVER FALLS, MINN.

Accept our sincere thanks and appreciation for all your efforts in behalf of the postal family. We most sincerely appreciate all you have done for us.

FRED F. PROTZ,
Treasurer, Minnesota State Association of Letter Carriers.

STRATHCONA, MINN.

Members of the Ninth District Rural Letter Carriers Association, in appreciation of what you have done for us and are doing for us as rural carriers, voted unanimously, making you an honorary member of the Ninth District Rural Letter Carriers Association. A hearty thank you is herewith extended.

OSCAR H. OLSON,
Secretary, Ninth District RLCA.

Every one of the more than 15,000 members of this association, in every State and Territory, sincerely appreciate the time and effort which you have devoted to postal employee legislation.

JESSE V. HORTON,
First Vice President,
National Association of Postal Supervisors.

Public Law 428 (H. R. 4595, 4495, 4395) would not have been possible without your very effective assistance. Speaking for the members of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks in particular, and for postal employees generally as well, we express our very sincere thanks and appreciation for your friendly and always helpful counsel and assistance, as well as for your magnificent efforts in support of fair and just treatment for postal employees. Your postal employee constituents are fortunate indeed in having the able and friendly support which you have always given them.

LEO E. GEORGE, *President,*
National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

In behalf of the members of this organization, the officers extend to you their heartfelt thanks and sincere appreciation for your cooperation and support of H. R. 4495, and other remedial postal legislation.

JAMES A. ELARDO,
Secretary,
DAVID SILVERGLEID,
President,
Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees.

CAMPBELL, MINN.

To thank you for the support you gave to the beneficial postal legislation. I do this in my own behalf and for the rural carriers of Minnesota and the Nation.

As a rural carrier, and public servant like yourself, I have found that men in your position haven't lost sight of the fact that postal workers are human beings. I am sure that as long as you hold the position you do, you will always support legislation in reason.

WALTER L. PEHL,
President, Minnesota Rural Letter Carriers' Association.

And with best wishes for your continued success, I am

Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers.

And again finally, Mr. Speaker, a few words of tribute to these faithful public servants. They are truly the backbone of the Post Office Department. They are the ones who are helping to fulfill the hopes of George Washington, who said:

Let us bind the people of the world by a chain that can never be broken, and set about providing means for intercommunication so that common interest and common understanding may prevail.

Amendments to Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the Social Security Act passed by the Eighty-first Congress are now law. The new provisions extend a measure of security in their old age to 10,000,000 additional Americans. Social-security benefits are raised in recognition of today's higher cost of living. I am convinced that our social-security system should be extended even further, so as to cover all working men and women. But these amendments are an important step forward and I was glad to vote for them.

Because of the widespread interest in this matter, I include an excellent series of question and answers entitled "Your New Social Security" and prepared by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Federal Security Agency:

YOUR NEW SOCIAL SECURITY
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The President has signed the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act. They are now part of the law.

The new law provides for increasing present old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments beginning with the payment for September 1950. Also beginning in September 1950, any person aged 65 or over may qualify for immediate payments if he has as much as six calendar quarters of work under social security.

The provisions of the new law extending social-security coverage for the first time

to certain kinds of work will become effective on January 1, 1951.

Beginning January 1, 1951, Federal old-age and survivors insurance under the social-security law will affect nearly 8,000,000 additional workers and their families; it may also affect about 2,000,000 more workers, to whom coverage may be extended through special arrangements. This will bring the number of workers who may have social-security protection to about 45,000,000, representing three-fourths of the Nation's paid workers.

The purpose of this pamphlet is to anticipate and answer the more obvious questions that may be prompted by the new social-security law.

General

1. What is Federal old-age and survivors insurance?

It is a family insurance plan provided by the social-security law, and operated by the United States Government.

2. What is the purpose of this insurance?

To compensate, in some measure, for loss of earnings in old age, and to give some protection to the family if the insured wage earner should die.

3. How is this insurance financed?

Insurance payments to beneficiaries come from a fund made up of the social-security tax contributions of employees, employers, and the self-employed.

4. What kinds of insurance payments are made?

There are three kinds of payments:

(a) Monthly retirement payments to insured persons and their families.

(b) Monthly survivors payments to the families of insured workers who die.

(c) Lump-sum payments to an insured worker's widow or widower, or to the person who paid the worker's burial expenses. This lump sum will be paid even when there is a survivor who is immediately eligible for monthly insurance payments.

5. How do you earn these insurance payments?

By earning enough in wages or self-employment income over a sufficient length of time in work that comes under the law. These requirements are measured in quarters of coverage.

6. What is a quarter of coverage?

The calendar year is divided into four 3-month periods or quarters, ending March 31, June 30, September 30, and December 31. Each calendar quarter in which an employee is paid wages of $50 or more in covered employment is a quarter of coverage for determining his insurance status under social security.

For self-employed persons, a quarter of coverage is a calendar quarter in which he has been credited with at least $100 of self-employment income. Four quarters of coverage are credited for each year in which self-employment income is $400 or more.

7. What is meant by a covered job, or covered work?

Any kind of job, work, occupation or business in which the wages or the self-employment income count toward old-age and survivors insurance.

8. What changes were made in the kinds of work that count toward Federal old-age and survivors insurance?

Most jobs in private industry and commerce have counted toward social-security payments since January 1, 1937. Many of the kinds of work that formerly were not under the social-security law were brought under it by the 1950 amendments, effective January 1, 1951.

9. What kinds of work are newly covered by social security?

Among the kinds of work which will count toward social-security protection beginning January 1, 1951, are nonfarm self-employment, regular farm work, and household work in private homes. Under certain conditions, employees of religious, charitable educational, and other nonprofit organizations, and employees of State and local governments may come under the law beginning January 1, 1951.

10. What kinds of work do not count toward social-security payments?

The owner or operator of a farm does not get credit toward old-age and survivors insurance payments from his farm earnings. Income gained from self-employment as a physician, lawyer, dentist, professional engineer, and certain other professions is not counted toward social-security benefits.

NOTE.—In all of the above cases it is self-employment that does not count toward social security. The salary of a person employed as a lawyer, doctor, etc., will count toward old-age and survivors insurance protection.

The wages paid to a child under 21 by his father or mother, to a husband by his wife, to a wife by her husband, or to a parent by his son or daughter, do not count toward social security, nor do the wages paid to a minister or member of a religious order for performing the duties required by their religious orders.

Some kinds of employment by the Federal Government have been brought under the law, but Federal jobs covered by other retirement systems are excluded.

Employment by State and local governments and by certain nonprofit organizations is not covered by the law, but some of these jobs may be brought under the law at the option of the employing organization. In the case of the nonprofit organizations, the agreement of two-thirds of the employees is also necessary.

11. How do you qualify for retirement benefits?

Monthly retirement benefits are payable at age 65, if the worker is fully insured. Supplementary benefits are payable, when the worker qualifies for retirement benefits, to his dependent children under age 18 and to his wife. A husband may receive benefits at age 65 on his wife's social-security account if he is dependent on her for support and if she is currently insured as well as fully insured when she retires at or after age 65.

12. How do you qualify for survivors' benefits?

Monthly survivors' benefits are payable at death if the worker was either fully or currently insured. If a worker was fully insured, benefits may be paid to his dependent children under 18, to his widow (in some cases his divorced wife) if she is caring for the children, to his widow who is age 65 or over, and sometimes to his dependent aged parents. The dependent widower of a fully insured woman worker may qualify for a widower's benefit at 65 if his wife was also currently insured at her death. If the worker was only currently insured at death, no benefits are provided for survivors at age 65 but any of the other benefits may be paid.

A lump-sum death benefit is paid if the worker died either fully or currently insured.

13. How does a worker become fully insured?

He must have six quarters of coverage in every case and also either one quarter of coverage for each two calendar quarters after January 1, 1951; or one quarter of coverage for each two calendar quarters after he became 21 years old; or 40 quarters of coverage.

14. How does a worker become currently insured?

A worker is currently insured if he had at least six quarters of coverage within the 3 years just before his death or just before his entitlement to old-age insurance benefits.

15. Is it easier to become fully insured now than before the 1950 amendments?

Yes, many people, now 65 or over, may begin to have insurance payments immediately. Newly covered workers are enabled to qualify for benefits much more quickly than before. About 500,000 additional persons may be paid benefits in 1951.

16. Will any people be able to claim benefits now, although they did not qualify before the law was amended?

Yes. A person who is 65 or over on September 1, 1950, needs only 1½ years of employment to be eligible for benefits. He is immediately eligible if he has already had that much work under the law.

A wife under 65 may now receive benefits if she has in her care a child who is entitled to child insurance benefits on her husband's wage records.

The divorced former wife of a deceased insured worker may in some cases receive benefits on his record if she is caring for his children.

A child may qualify for monthly benefits on his mother's record more easily under the new law than before.

A dependent husband or widower of a fully and currently insured woman who is entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits or who died after August 1950 is now eligible for insurance payments when he becomes 65.

17. Suppose a worker died before the amendments were enacted and was not insured. Will his survivors be eligible for benefits under the amendments?

No. The old eligibility requirements remain in effect for persons who died before September 1, 1950.

18. Does the amount of the insurance payment depend on a worker's earnings?

Yes. The law in effect up to September 1950 also counted the number of years of employment and that law will continue to be used in many cases. Where the old system of figuring benefits is used, the benefit will be increased by a table given in the new law. Beginning in July 1952, the formula given in the new law will be used where it will result in a higher payment.

19. How much will benefits be under the new law?

When the benefit formula in the new law is used, the old-age benefit amount will be one-half of the average monthly wage for persons with an average monthly wage of $100 or less. For those whose wages average between $100 and $300, the benefit amount will be between one-half and one-quarter of the average monthly wage. A newly retired worker who is entitled to payment will get at least $20 even if his average monthly wage is less than $40.

20. What is the amount of the social security tax?

Until the end of 1953 the amount will be 1½ percent each for employer and employee. The rate will then be 2 percent from 1954 to 1959, 2½ percent from 1960 to 1964, 3 percent from 1965 to 1969, and 3¼ percent after 1969.

Only the first $3,000 of wages in a year is taxable through 1950. Beginning in 1951 the first $3,600 is taxed. (This question applies only to wage income. For tax rates on income from self-employment, see question 29.)

21. Are benefits paid automatically upon attainment of age 65 or death?

No. A claim must be filed before any insurance payments are made. It is very important to remember this because the law permits monthly payments to go back for only 6 months from the date on which the claim is filed. The lump sum can be paid only if a claim is filed within 2 years of the worker's death.

22. Where are benefit claims filed?

The place to make claims for insurance benefits under old-age and survivors insurance is the nearest social-security office. A person 65 or over, who has been employed in work covered by social security, should go to that office for advice about his insurance status, even though he has not yet retired.

23. Do those already receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits have to file new claims to get the larger benefits?

No. The law provides that all benefits in effect at the time the law was changed will

be raised under the special table of benefit increases. Beneficiaries will receive the larger amounts beginning with the September checks to be issued early in October 1950.

24. Does a person have to be in need before he can claim benefits?

No. This is an insurance program. A retired worker, his wife or widow, and minor children may qualify for benefits without regard to their financial resources, such as savings, property, or other insurance. Husbands, widowers, and parents, however, must establish that the worker on whose record they claim benefits had been furnishing at least half their support.

25. Can a person receive monthly insurance benefits if he has earnings from work?

Beneficiaries aged 75 and over may receive benefits regardless of the amount of their earnings. A beneficiary under that age will have his benefits suspended if he does more than a limited amount of work. If he works for wages in covered employment, he may earn as much as $50 in a month and still accept his social-security check for that month. If he engages in covered self-employment and his earnings are in excess of $600 during a taxable year, his benefits are not payable for those months in which he is so engaged.

When an individual works for wages which would cause a suspension of his benefits or is engaged in self-employment and expects to have net earnings from self-employment which may result in a suspension of benefits, he should report to the nearest social security field office immediately.

26. Can a person receive monthly insurance payments if he has income from any sources besides earnings from work?

Yes. Once a person has qualified for benefits, he may receive payments even though he has income from capital investment, such as annuities, rentals from real estate, dividends from stocks, or interest on bonds.

27. What kinds of self-employment are covered by the new social-security law?

In general, most kinds of trades, crafts, or businesses in which the owner or partner works for himself. The sole owner or partner operating a store, shop, garage, lunchroom, and so forth; the independent contractor; the artist and the writer may build up old-age and survivors insurance protection under this new part of the law.

Not included for social-security purposes is income from self-employment as a farm operator, physician, lawyer, dentist, osteopath, chiropractor, optometrist, naturopath, veterinarian, architect, certified, licensed, or full-time practicing accountant, Christian Science practitioner, professional engineer, or funeral director.

28. What amount of earnings must a self-employed person have to be covered by social security?

If self-employment net earnings amount to $400 or more in any 1 year, they will be credited toward old-age and survivors insurance payments.

29. What is the contribution rate for self-employed persons?

A self-employed person will contribute 2¼ percent of his income from self-employment in 1951. This rate will continue through 1953. Beginning in 1954 and through 1959 the rate will be 3 percent. It will be 3¾ percent through 1964, 4½ percent through 1969, and 4⅞ percent thereafter. Only the first $3,600 of total wage and self-employment income is taxable.

30. How will the self-employed person pay his social-security tax?

His contribution toward old-age and survivors insurance protection for himself and his family will be payable at the time he files his income-tax return. The self-employed person will make his first contribution in 1952 when he files his 1951 return. At that time, he will fill in a special schedule which he will find on his income-tax form. This will be his report on his self-employment income for 1951. This schedule will be detached from his income-tax report form by the collector of internal revenue, who will forward it to the Social Security Administration. This self-employment income will be credited to his social-security account.

31. How will prior "covered" employment affect the self-employed?

Any wages a self-employed person previously earned in a job covered by social security will still be listed on his social-security account. These previously earned wages will help to establish his insured status and will be considered in determining his wage for retirement or survivors insurance payments. His self-employment income will be credited to his social-security account in the same manner.

Household workers

32. Are all household workers covered?

Only regularly employed workers in a private home will be covered by social security. "Regularly" employed applies to a household employee who is paid $50 or more in wages by an employer for work in one calendar quarter, and who worked for that employer on at least 24 different days in the same calendar quarter or in the calendar quarter just before it.

33. Is a chauffeur considered a household worker?

Yes, if the automobile he drives is for family use only. Butlers, valets, grooms, footmen, as well as cooks, housemaids, nursemaids, housekeepers, etc., are considered to be household workers. Laundresses, gardeners, and furnacemen are regular household workers, too, if they meet the conditions described in the previous answer.

34. Are room and board considered a part of cash wages for a household worker?

No. Only wages paid in cash, not wages paid in kind. For instance, only carfare paid in cash (not in car checks or car tokens) can be counted as part of cash wages.

35. Do close relatives of a household employer get social-security credit for their work?

The employer's child under 21, spouse, or parent does not receive social-security credit for work done in that household. All other relatives are covered by the law, and may receive social-security credit for their wages if they meet the 24-day–$50 test.

36. How do you report your household workers?

On a simple and brief report form, furnished to household employers by the United States collector of internal revenue. The household employer fills in the name and social-security number of the worker and the amount of cash wages paid to the employee during that quarter. This report is sent quarterly to the collector of internal revenue together with the tax on the worker's wages. The tax is 3 percent—one-half to be deducted from the cash wages, one-half contributed by the household employer.

37. May household workers be reported with other employees?

Yes. If the household employer is already making social-security reports (Form 941) as sole owner of a business or professional practice, the houseworker may be reported on that form, together with his nonhousehold employees. If the husband of the household employer is the sole owner of a business or professional practice, the report on his wife's household worker may be included in the report on his business employees sent from his office.

38. If a household employee leaves before working on 24 different days in a calendar quarter, or 24 different days in the preceding quarter, what should the employer do about the tax?

If, by agreement with the worker, the tax has been withheld from her weekly cash wages up to the time of leaving, it should be refunded. It will not be necessary to send in a report on her wages.

Veterans of World War II and survivors of World War II servicemen

39. Are World War II servicemen's rights under social security affected by the new law?

Yes. The amended law provides wage credits of $160 for each month of active military or naval service in World War II. This applies to men and women who had 90 days or more of active military service between September 16, 1940, and July 24, 1947, and were not dishonorably discharged. Those who died in service or were discharged because of service-connected disability are not required to have 90 days of service.

40. Will these wage credits be affected by Veterans' Administration pension or compensation?

No. Veterans' Administration payments will not affect social-security benefits under the new law. However, if other Federal retirement benefits are based on the veterans' military or naval service in World War II, these special wage credits will not be counted toward social-security benefits.

Farm workers

41. What farm workers are covered?

Only regular farm workers. A farm worker is "regular" if:

(a) He works continuously for one farm operator during an entire calendar quarter.

(b) He does farm work on at least 60 days for this same employer on a full-time basis in the succeeding calendar quarter and received $50 or more in cash wages for his work. He continues to be a regular farm worker for the same employer as long as he meets these requirements in each succeeding calendar quarter.

(c) He also is a regular worker if he is paid $50 or more cash wages in a calendar quarter and was a regular worker for the same employer in the preceding calendar quarter.

42. Is a cook or household worker on a farm covered?

Yes. A cook in the farm household or on the farm or ranch, and other household workers on a farm operated for profit are considered farm workers and subject to the same conditions as a regular farm employee.

43. Are room and board or house rent considered a part of cash wages for a regular farm worker?

No. Only wages paid in cash are counted. Room, board, house rent, farm products, firewood, etc., cannot be counted as wages.

44. How do you report these workers?

On a form (Form 941) furnished to the employer by the United States collector of internal revenue. The employer fills in the name and social security number of the employee and the amount of cash wages paid to the worker in that quarter. This report is sent quarterly to the collector of internal revenue together with the tax on the employee's wages. The tax through 1953 is 3 percent—one-half deducted by the employer from the worker's wages—one-half contributed by the employer.

45. Are any other agricultural workers covered?

Yes. Employees of farm cooperatives handling any agricultural commodity, employees of commercial handlers of fruits and vegetables who are getting these products ready for market, and employees of certain agricultural businesses not located on farms, such as poultry hatcheries, are covered. All of the work of these employees is now covered under social security, regardless of length of employment or amount of wages.

Nonprofit organizations

46. What is meant by a "nonprofit" organization?

For social security purposes this means any charity or any educational, religious, scientific or literary organization, no part of whose earnings go to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

47. How many employees of nonprofit organizations come under the new social-security program?

The employees will come under the new law only if the employing organization accepts social-security coverage and files with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue a certificate to that effect. This certificate must be accompanied by a list containing the name, address, and social-security number of each employee who wishes to have social-security coverage. If at least two-thirds of the employees of that organization agree to the filing of the certificate, social-security coverage will be extended to employees of that organization.

48. Would all employees of the organization then come under social security?

No. Only the two-thirds or more employees who expressed by signature their wish to be covered, plus all new employees of that organization hired after the certificate is in effect.

State and local government employees

49. How can State and local government employees have social-security coverage?

If the State enters into an agreement with the Federal Government to accept coverage for any one or more groups of State employees, or employees of a political subdivision of the State.

50. Would all employees of those groups then have social-security coverage?

All employees of the groups specified in the agreement, except those employees in any of the groups who were covered by a State or local retirement system in effect at the time of the State-Federal agreement.

51. How about employees of State or local government-operated transportation systems?

Employees of some transportation systems operated by State or local governments are not subject to this State-Federal Government agreement. They will have social-security coverage, beginning January 1, 1951, if their system was taken over by the State or local government after 1936 and prior to 1951.

Supplementing this pamphlet is a series of leaflets giving more detailed information about the new social security law as it affects the several groups of workers, their families, or their survivors. These leaflets may be secured at your local social-security office.

Give the Sportsmen a Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, since my Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota is the center of activity for scores of sportsmen in "The Land of 10,000 Lakes," I desire at this time to make a report on my activities during the Eighty-first Congress in behalf of these sportsmen.

In making this report, I am following a policy which has been established for many years past and which recently was carried out by our President.

During the first session of this Congress, I introduced H. R. 2648, a bill to establish the Fish and Wildlife Advisory Board. This is how the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created in the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior a board to be known as the Fish and Wildlife Advisory Board. It shall be the duty of the Board to consult with and to advise the director of the Fish and Wildlife Service with respect to ways and means of improving the Fish and Wildlife Service. This would achieve increasingly effective cooperation between such service and similar State agencies. The Board shall meet at such times and places as the director of the Fish and Wildlife Service may direct.

SEC. 2. The governor of each State, Alaska, and Hawaii may, if he so desires, appoint one member of the Board. The term of office of members of the Board shall be for 2 years, and any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The Board shall elect a chairman from among its members. Members of the Board shall receive no compensation for their services as such, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Board.

H. R. 2648 is a good bill. It would give an opportunity for members of sportsmen's groups throughout the country to have an exchange of views, ideas, and programs in regard to the meritorious matters that the various groups in different parts of the country have in mind. Opinions could be exchanged in connection with wildlife restoration programs or any other policy or program in connection with fish, wildlife, and game.

The Department of the Interior, however, was opposed to my bill. And that is logical. I find that the average bureaucrat—the average person in the administrative side of the Government—does not want public interference or advice. The bureaucrat does not want congressional interference or at least interest on the part of Congress or the general public in any policy or program.

I know that from my long experience with many Government departments and agencies that operate under the present administration in Washington. They oppose anything that might happen to represent a public interpretation of feelings throughout the country on any policy or program.

Statements by Representative ALVIN F. WEICHEL, of Ohio—taken from the official record of the committee hearing on my bill on March 16, 1950—elaborate further on this bureaucratic interference. Mr. WEICHEL is a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries which was holding the hearing on my bill.

Said Mr. WEICHEL:

The Fish and Wildlife Service * * * want advice from nobody, which was evidenced before this committee on various occasions * * * they object to everything except their pay.

Mr. WEICHEL continued:

I think the thought expressed in this proposed legislation is a very worthy one with reference to the sportsmen and recreation people of the country having an opportunity to make their views known. After all, it is the people we want to serve—not the Fish and Wildlife Service.

It was this bureaucracy that blocked my bill. As a result, the sportsmen of my area and other parts of the country are deprived of having a voice in matters that could have been considered by my proposed Fish and Wildlife Advisory Board.

A voice must be raised in behalf of the sportsmen against the obstructionist tactics of the gigantic bureaucracy in Washington.

Other measures that have come before the Congress that would benefit the sportsmen have received my full support. Among these measures that I backed was the Dingell bill which was recently enacted into law. This bill provides that the Federal excise taxes on fishing equipment be divided among the States for the purpose of fish propagation and other methods of improving fishing. Minnesota will receive approximately $200,000 annually under the law.

ROSEAU WILDLIFE REFUGE PROJECT

I am glad to report to the sportsmen of the Ninth District that construction on the Roseau Wildlife Refuge project will get under way early in 1951. The Roseau Wildlife Refuge project will serve two purposes:

First. It will take land of no productive value and make it a part of an area to hold water to provide a habitat for ducks, geese, and fur-bearing animals.

Second. It also will hold back waters coming into the area in a large reservoir and thereby help to prevent periodic flood conditions in the Roseau River.

I was glad to cooperate from the very beginning in the development and progress of this very fine wildlife project.

I have taken out fishing and hunting licenses—both large and small game—for each of the last 28 years, so naturally I have the interest of our sportsmen at heart. I have hunted and fished in all parts of the Ninth District so I know the area and its problems.

FISH APPLICATIONS

Sportsmen interested in stocking their favorite lake can secure a supply of fish from the Fish and Wildlife Service. I will be glad to supply application forms to anyone interested in getting supplies of these fish for stocking suitable fish waters.

In conclusion, I wish to remind the sportsmen of my Ninth District that if I am returned to Congress in January, I shall continue to fight for legislation and wildlife and hunting projects and programs that will be to their benefit and welfare and for our youngsters growing up.

Stockpiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, viewed in retrospect, it appears that immediately following World War II we deliberately embarked upon a program of self-destruction. Review of the policies which we have followed since that date makes this incredible situation stand out in bold relief.

I am not at this time referring to our over-all foreign policy but to the fundamental problem of self-defense. We

stripped ourselves of our armor and at the same time made available to potential enemies resources vital to our national defense. Not only did we disarm while Russia armed, but we utterly failed to maintain the valuable war potential which we then possessed. Our present crying need for steel for the purposes of national defense would have been much less piercing had we had the foresight to encourage through proper methods the expansion of our steel-making facilities. This could have been readily accomplished by allowing accelerated depreciation schedules on new steel-making facilities.

The Government and the steel industry could also have cooperated in an iron and steel scrap importation program. This would have served the purpose of stabilizing the scrap market and at the same time provided an adequate stockpile of this important steel ingredient. Instead, we permitted millions of tons of scrap to remain in western Germany—scrap which we now desperately need—scrap which lies beyond our grasp but not beyond possible seizure by the Russian Communists.

More than 2 years ago, the Committee To Investigate Questionable Trade Practices, established by unanimous vote of the House and of which I had the honor of being chairman, recommended that both of these actions be taken. We also pointed out that necessary iron and steel scrap should be imported and stockpiled for national defense purposes. I felt then and I am even more satisfied now that these were wise recommendations, as additional evidence of which I wish to offer two articles running in the current press. On Sunday, September 17, there appeared in the New York Times the following article urging accelerated depreciation as a means of encouraging steel expansion. The article follows:

[From the New York Times of September 17, 1950]

WRITE-OFF BIG ITEM IN STEEL EXPANSION—UNITED STATES COULD SPUR PLANT BUILDING BY REVIVING 5-YEAR BASIS, INDUSTRY LEADERS SAY—TAX OUTLOOK DETERRENT—PRESENT PROJECTED CAPACITY HELD AMPLE FOR NEEDS BUT FINANCING IS PROBLEM

(By Thomas E. Mullaney)

The most constructive step the Government could take to encourage further steel expansion would be to reinstitute the World War II provision for 5-year amortization on essential new facilities instead of the 25-year rule under present tax laws, top steel executives said last week.

In response to an inquiry by the New York Times, officials of several leading steel companies declared they still believe that the long-range expansion program projected by the industry will permit a continuing high level of consumer production after all military needs are filled. They added, however, that they could expedite their programs and increase expansion goals if conditions require such steps, but to do this, they will need the accelerated depreciation allowance.

Before the start of the Korean war, the domestic steel industry laid plans for a 6,363,000-ton expansion of raw steel capacity by the end of 1952. Further expansions announced since then assure a greater increase, although one steel executive warned that recently approved higher corporate taxes and the promise of excess profits levies place some of the expansion program in jeopardy.

FINANCING A PROBLEM

"When this large program was prepared by the individual companies," he pointed out, "there was no indication of the imminence of these taxes. Since these programs were undertaken on the belief that taxes would not cut into profits to be used for paying for the facilities, there is a real question now whether the facilities can be financed on a sound basis."

This official advocated the 5-year amortization on a current basis to offset the lower profits available to the industry to pay for its new capacity, costing between $250 and $300 a ton.

The aggregate net profits of steel companies representing 91 percent of the industry's raw-steel output amounted to $1,700,000,000 for the 4 years 1946 to 1949. Of this total, according to the American Iron and Steel Institute, the companies used about $987,000,000 toward the $2,000,000,000 expansion program undertaken up to the close of last year. Borrowings and proceeds from the sale of stock issues supplied the balance.

This heavy drain on profits to pay for the new steel-making facilities installed has been necessary, the industry maintains, because of the inadequacy of depreciation allowances. Depreciation on the present 25-year basis is charged against original cost of each piece of equipment, but with prices of equipment in recent years at least double those of a decade ago, the purchasing power of each dollar in the depreciation charge has shrunk. This is another reason cited by the industry in support of accelerated depreciation if profits are to be skimmed by taxes.

The steel leaders were asked their views on the adequacy of present steel capacity and the expansions now planned following revived assertions earlier last week in Government and labor circles that the industry was not doing enough.

Replying to this, one prominent authority stated: "You don't need a ton of steel for every one who wants it. Steel consumers have gone crazy. We are now making more steel than can be sustained. For instance, we are now providing enough steel to make about 9,000,000 automobiles. That means that in little more than 4 years you will be producing a new automobile for every American family."

E. G. Grace, chairman of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., commented: "In my opinion, the steel industry will be able to care for military and defense needs in full as far as we can now anticipate for them and at the same time supply a strong domestic economy.

"We do not foresee acute shortages in any steel products for any extended period, assuming that steel is intelligently allocated to meet, first, military requirements, and then real domestic needs.

"The steel industry's current capacity of more than 100,000,000 tons, with 6,000,000 tons in prospect, should be ample.

"If more capacity is desired, the steel companies could hasten completion of their present program and undertake further extension of capacity. Accelerated depreciation should be provided for in the tax law to encourage future additions."

SEES AMPLE CAPACITY

A somewhat similar viewpoint was taken by C. M. White, president of the Republic Steel Corp., who stated: "There is ample capacity for all military and all necessary civilian steel requirements."

Asked if accelerated amortization would help further steel expansion, Mr. White replied: "Definitely."

W. W. Sebald, president of the Armco Steel Corp., remarked: "I don't think steel capacity is far right now from what we will need. Manpower shortages might be a bottleneck toward any further expansion, anyhow."

The Armco president also asserted that a 5-year amortization provision would be very important in the event the Government felt the steel industry should raise its expansion goals to cope with the present emergency. He pointed out that expansion will be difficult now that excess profits taxes are to be invoked.

On previous occasions, Irving S. Olds, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., and Ernest T. Weir, chairman of the National Steel Corp., have emphasized the industry's contention that steel companies are living up to their responsibilities to provide enough steel for the Nation's needs. For some time, also, they have been maintaining that depreciation allowances are not high enough. They have set aside extra, taxable charges in their corporations' financial statements to cover the additional cost of buying new equipment.

The steel industry generally seems to be agreed that capacity will be adequate, but it is ready to admit, as one executive pointed out, that it might be wrong. If such is the case, he said, the industry will need the benefit of accelerated amortization, or depreciation, to raise its expansion goals because the present objectives are the maximum the industry can undertake on a sound financial basis.

Last week, Tuesday, September 12, found in the Washington Daily News the following article pointing out our lack of wisdom in failing to secure unto ourselves the vast quantities of foreign scrap, which were so readily available earlier this year. The article follows:

UNITED STATES STEEL MEN MISCALCULATED—GERMANS PULL SCRAP FROM MARKET

(By James Daniel)

Some of the Nation's top steel executives now are regretting a miscalculation they made only a few months ago in the matter of importing scrap metal from Germany. They didn't buy it when they could get it and now it's withdrawn from the market.

Two years ago the steel industry was using scrap faster than the collectors could provide it. (A ton of steel contains roughly half a ton of scrap—50 percent obtained from the steel mills' own waste and 50 percent from the open market.)

The Commerce Department sponsored a plan whereby United States scrap dealers would form a corporation to buy scrap from the Germans, whose scrap yards were overflowing with war rubble and the civilian accumulation not needed after Germany's defeat.

But Justice Department lawyers pointed out that our antitrust laws permit such joint action only in exporting, and the one-corporation plan was dropped.

NO TAKERS

Meanwhile, the steel companies themselves went ahead and during 1948 and early 1949 bought about a million tons of the estimated 10,000,000 tons of scrap which Germany had to sell. Subsequently, scrap prices here declined sharply and late last year the Germans were offering virtually unlimited quantities of scrap with no United States takers.

After the Korean war started, the steel industry took another look at its ore and scrap piles and decided that if World War II history was repeated, scrap prices would rise and force up the cost of steel.

Buyers were sent to Germany. Meanwhile, the West Germans had been given considerable leeway in making their own economic decisions. Their attitude now is that the Bonn government can use all the scrap it has for its own role in the rearmament of free Europe.

LOSS PARTLY OFFSET

Commerce officials here say the loss of this source of scrap is at least in part offset by the reduced foreign demand for our own

steel output as a result of greater German production.

Here at home, Government and industry are keeping a close watch on scrap prices.

Scrap is the one element in the cost of steel over which the steel companies have little control. At one time last spring, scrap—No. 1 grade delivered at Pittsburgh, the bellwether grade—was selling around $20 a ton.

REBOUNDED TO $46

Then about May it bounded to $46. It dropped to about $41 or $42 just before the Korean outbreak. Thereafter it jumped back to $46.

At this point the scrap industry and the steel companies decided to forget their usual opposition. They are trying to stabilize the price of scrap at $44. During the past 10 days this has been the prevailing price, though the inflationary tendency has caused mills to pay higher prices for less desirable grades of scrap in "package deals" for grade 1.

Scrap dealers' representatives here say they're anxious to do everything possible to get out more scrap. Currently, they're delivering about 2,500,000 tons a month to the mills, or an annual rate of 29,000,000 tons, higher than in World War II and higher than in 1948, their most productive year.

PUBLIC SCRAP DRIVES?

Will public scrap metal drives be necessary?

Scrap dealers say they hope not. Though the steel mills may urge such drives, scrap dealers say their yards are still cluttered with useless bedsprings and garbage pails from the last war. Density and absence of other metals are prime requirements for good scrap iron and steel.

Mr. Speaker, the blame for our present predicament rests not only with the Government but with certain short-sighted individuals in both the steel and the scrap industry. In this connection, I wish to submit correspondence between myself and Mr. Edwin Barringer, vice president of the Scrap Iron and Steel Institute. You will note that Mr. Barringer took issue with me on the wisdom and necessity of importing scrap steel.

The above-mentioned correspondence follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1950.

Mr. EDWIN C. BARRINGER,
Executive Vice President, Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARRINGER: I have your letter of June 14, and wish to thank you for your courtesy in sending me, in advance, a copy of the press release relating to your speech in Columbus, Ohio, on June 15. Unfortunately, due to my absence from the city, I did not have an opportunity to reply sooner.

I appreciate receiving your views concerning my recent statements relative to our present scrap market, and I trust you will bear with me while I attempt to set out more fully in this letter my thoughts on the subject and I shall try to treat separately each of the main points you raise. Briefly, my position is this:

1. The increase of the price of scrap in the past few months of more than 100 percent has added approximately $5 a ton to the cost of making steel and is further inflating our economy.

2. The scrap market should be stabilized by curtailing exports of scrap and increasing imports.

3. By importing scrap (most of which would come from western Germany), we would not only be benefiting our economy and strengthening our national defense, but we would also be removing this vital steel ingredient from the possible grasp of Russia.

Since these points are more fully developed in recent statements I have made on the floor of the House, I am taking the liberty of enclosing copies of the same for your information.

You state that the export of scrap is so infinitesimal at this time that it has no bearing on the domestic situation. However, as you know, the difference between a stable and an unstable market can at times be very small and I believe you will agree that there is an unhealthy lack of stability in the current scrap market. In analyzing the latest figures which I have been able to obtain on the importing and exporting of scrap, it appears that a definite relationship exists between a favorable (or even potentially favorable) balance and prices on the domestic market. For instance, I note that in 1947 when our exports exceeded our imports by 141,101 tons, the price of scrap rose from $31 to $40 a ton. In 1948, when we had a favorable balance of 153,697 tons, the market was stabilized at an average price of $41.66 a ton. And, as you know, in 1949, when our imports exceeded our exports by 669,636 tons, the price of scrap dropped approximately $20 a ton.

The relationship between scrap imports-exports and domestic prices becomes even more evident when broken down on a monthly basis. Starting with September 1949 (the first month of sizable imports following World War II) and listing the plus or minus balances together with the domestic prices for the same periods, we see the following:

	Tonnage balance	Price
1948:		
September	+60,961	$43.16
October	+58,417	43.16
November	+43,388	43.04
December	+60,204	43.00
1949:		
January	+156,477	41.30
February	+189,689	39.50
March	+226,982	36.75
April	+85,622	26.20
May	+74,561	22.25
June	+40,972	21.50
July	−131,693	20.00
August	+15,865	21.00
September	−16,835	27.00
October	−3,233	28.80
November	−5,533	30.75
December	+241	30.20

You will note that the composite price varied only 16 cents during the last 4 months of 1948, when the plus balance remained rather static. However, when imports were greatly increased beginning in January 1949, the price of scrap showed a corresponding decrease. Although the plus balance began to taper off after April of that year, the total imports for the first 4 months were sufficiently large to cause the price of scrap to continue to drop until the beginning of the third quarter. As you will note, the exports of scrap in July exceeded our imports by 131,693 tons and the fall in scrap prices was checked. Thereafter, except for the month of August, there was a minus balance and the price of scrap rose steadily.

I do not mean to imply that the balance between our imports and exports of scrap is the only factor controlling domestic prices, but I do say that when our mills are running at or near capacity production such a balance is a very important factor. And, if the Office of International Trade permits the export of 400,000 tons of scrap during this year, I maintain that it will serve to further disrupt our domestic economy.

Your statement that barring the war years foreign trade of scrap has not been so low in 25 years, has me somewhat puzzled. As I read the Department of Commerce's compilation of scrap exports for the past 25 years, our 1949 exports were only exceeded in 12 other years—and during 7 of those years our exports were unnaturally inflated by tremendous shipments of scrap to Japan, Italy, and Germany. I will not dwell on this except to suggest that it might be well for your industry to exclude this latter period from their calculation when attempting to arrive at what might be considered normal foreign trade.

You also state that no consumer is losing any production owing to the lack of scrap and that there is no shortage of scrap. Although the first part of that statement may be true as a general proposition, I strongly suspect that production is being adversely affected to some extent by our decreasing supply of top-grade scrap—the type which is so plentiful in the Ruhr area of Germany. As to the question of whether there is a shortage of scrap, I believe the answer could be supplied immediately by the pattern of the current prices. Surely the increase of more than 100 percent in the price of scrap during the last few months cannot be attributed entirely to the shrewd business acumen of the scrap dealers. I strongly suspect that the law of supply and demand played a major role much as it did in forcing the prices down during that period in 1949 when we were increasing our imports.

I have noted carefully your statement that the scrap industry feels that it has been discriminated against in the matter of exports since pig iron is not restricted in this respect, and although your statement does not say so, I believe it might give the uninitiated the impression that huge quantities of pig iron are therefore being exported. However, I doubt seriously if your industry would prefer to have scrap exports equalized with pig-iron exports. I say this because I find that in 1946 one and one-half times more scrap than pig was exported; in 1947, five times more scrap than pig was exported; and in 1948, 34½ times more scrap than pig was exported. Under the circumstances, I think you will agree that any discussion of discrimination would be purely academic.

Please do not think that I am unaware of the important position which your industry occupies in our national economy. As a matter of fact, it is this knowledge which has caused me to take the stand I have in an effort to bring stability to the scrap market. I believe that if this can be done the Nation as a whole will be directly benefited.

You have on occasions in the past been kind enough to give me the benefit of the knowledge which you have gained through years of work with the scrap industry, and if at any time you feel that my evaluation of any phase of this business is unsound, I would sincerely appreciate your bringing the matter to my attention. Although I feel that I should apologize for the length of this letter, nevertheless, I find that it is still too short to cover all of the aspects of the initial problem. However, should you so desire, I will be pleased to discuss these things with you in person at a mutually agreeable time.

With kind personal regards, I am
Faithfully yours.

INSTITUTE OF SCRAP
IRON & STEEL, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1950.

Hon. W. KINGSLAND MACY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am sorry to have to take issue with you but I felt that exports of scrap are so infinitesimal at this time that they have no bearing upon the domestic situation.

There is no shortage of scrap, and no consumer is losing any production owing to the lack of it.

In 1947 and 1948, as in the war years, our industry was pushed to the limit to get out enough scrap.

Then, in 1949, we were dropped like a hot potato and many of our dealers were hard pressed financially. The price of scrap as measured by the Iron Age composite dropped from $43 per ton in October 1948 to $19 in July 1949; in 10 months values were more than cut in half.

This spring when the steel situation showed more vigor than expected consumers flocked back in the market, raising the composite from the low of $19 to about $41 at this time. It takes a little time to get the collection of scrap rolling, it is now in a satisfactory state.

Reverting to exports, we feel we have been discriminated against. After all that has been said about the shortage of iron ore and the necessity for domestic steel mills reaching out to Venezuela, Labrador, and Liberia for iron ore with which to make pig iron, no restrictions whatever are placed on the exportation of pig iron. Nor are there any restrictions on the exportation of steel. There is much more logic in exporting scrap, because it is a recurring crop, than pig iron.

Surely the exportation of scrap to the extent of 1 percent of domestic use has no bearing on the domestic situation.

Cordially yours,

EDWIN C. BARRINGER,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. Barringer's release enclosed with above letter:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 15.—Speaking here tonight at a joint meeting of the Cincinnati and Northern Ohio chapters of the Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Edwin C. Barringer, executive vice president of the institute, answered criticism by Representative W. KINGSLAND MACY that exports of iron and steel scrap should be restricted and more scrap should have been imported from western Germany.

"In the first 4 months of this year exports of scrap have totaled 107,000 net tons, amounting to 1 percent of the 10,520,000 net tons consumed domestically," said Barringer.

"Foreign trade in scrap, always a factor in the national economy, has not been at so low an ebb in 25 years barring, of course, the war years. Practically every ton of scrap that leaves this country goes to Canada and Mexico, which traditionally rely on the United States for part of their supplies of scrap.

"As a matter of fact, it is a paradox that scrap for export is still under Government license whereas pig iron, a similar raw material, made from iron ore which is getting in such short supply that overseas sources of supply must be found, is an unlimited export basis."

Barringer, who was a member of the War Department European mission which recommended in 1945 that all Government scrap and potential scrap be returned to the United States, pointed out that since last fall German civilian scrap has been on an unrestricted basis so far as exports from Germany are concerned except for the prohibition against its being shipped behind the iron curtain.

"There is no shortage of scrap and no production of steel is being lost on account of it," stated Barringer. "During 1949 consumers went out of the market, permitting scrap to fall below OPA price levels in most districts. This spring consumers returned en masse, finding dealers' yards bare. Now the machinery of collection and preparation has been revived, and stable market conditions are returning.

Mr. Speaker, although the time is drawing short, I feel we still have the opportunity for remedying the situation in which we find ourselves—a situation which is due primarily to blundering or worse on the part of people who should have known better.

August Paulsen—An Emigrant Boy That Took Advantage of the Opportunities the West Affords and Made Good in Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the history of the development of the great Hercules mine in the famous Coeur d'Alene mining district in Idaho and the sturdy pioneer that brought the mine into production reads like a romance.

The following biographical sketch is taken from the hearings of the Committee on Public Lands, House Resolution 66, inserted here for the information of the Members of the House:

RECORD OF A PIONEER MINING MAN OF THE COEUR D'ALENE MINING DISTRICT—AUGUST PAULSEN

August Paulsen was born July 29, 1871, in Denmark, living there until 19, when he came to America. He arrived in Chicago June 1, 1891, and followed farm work in Illinois until September 1892, when he came to Spokane.

WORKED AT $6 A MONTH

Shortly after arriving in Spokane he went to work for a dairy company just east of the city at $6 a month. The company later failed and Mr. Paulsen went to Wallace, Idaho, in 1894. There he again engaged in the dairy business with Sylvester Markwell. By 1896 Mr. Paulsen had saved some money, being economical and thrifty, and when given the opportunity he purchased a quarter interest in the Hercules mine for $850. He retained this interest until the time of his death.

The story of the development of the Hercules mine reads with all the flavor of a romance. It is a story of confidence of men in their own knowledge and ability, backed by judgment and the hardest kind of backbreaking labor. It is a story of denial and poverty, which in the end led to great wealth, not only to the men themselves but to the country in which they lived and helped to develop.

Until December 1901, Mr. Paulsen worked in the mine during the summer and handled the dairy business during the winter.

WAS POOR MAN'S MINE

The Hercules mine was essentially a poor man's mine. Associated with Mr. Paulsen were the Day brothers, Harry L., a mill man and bookkeeper; Eugene, a storekeeper at Kellogg; and Jerome, at school; C. H. (Dad) Reeves, a barber, now living in Spokane; L. W. Hutton, Spokane, then a locomotive engineer; Frank M. Rothrock, Spokane, then a provision dealer; Damion Cardoner, storekeeper; and the dairymen, the Markwells. Attorney H. F. Samuels later became interested, but sold out soon afterwards.

These men put all their earnings into the development of the mine, never losing faith. The "wise" ones laughed at them and called them fools for spending their money over such a fruitless proposition.

In June 1901 their dream began to materialize and the ore body was struck. It produced at one time 6 percent of the lead in the United States, and although it was shut down early in 1925 it will long remain as one of the happiest memories of the Coeur d'Alenes. That it was developed at at all by a group of men with virtually no capital and that these same men held onto it until the end was in a great measure due to August Paulsen.

HARD, HAND DRILLING

To reach the first ore the men had to drill a tunnel 1,500 feet through solid rock by hand. Sometimes there would be five men working, sometimes two, or even one. The owners worked out their assessments and persevered. When the ore body was struck it proved to be the best in the district, being a high grade of carbonate and galena carrying good values in silver.

The working of the mine called for hard manual labor upon the part of the partners. Mr. Paulsen put all his wages into the property, as did the other partners. The men were too poor to pay for the hauling in of the necessary timbers and at times one or two of them would go out and cut the timbers and haul them to the mine by hand.

Mr. Paulsen often related how they carried their supplies on their backs to the mine and one time in particular when he had taken a wheelbarrow and a few other things 1,500 feet up the mountain side on his back when the snow was soft and deep. He stated that he had traveled most of the way on his hands and knees.

PRODUCED $100,000,000

Since that time the mine has produced $100,000,000 and has paid dividends of approximately $18,000,000. After the closing down of the Hercules mine proper the partners incorporated the Hercules Mining Co. to work several other claims. During its remarkable career it had been operated on a partnership.

The mine itself was one of the wonders of the mining world. At one time the ore body was 53 feet wide and the east face on the 400-foot level contained streaks of high-grade ore 6 to 8 feet in width so rich that it was propelled out in wheelbarrows on a narrow plank for a long time.

In 1901 the mine produced 362 tons of ore and paid a dividend of $8,000. In 1902 it produced 5,003 tons with dividends of $94,200; 1903, 10,043 tons, $257,000; while in 1914 it produced 60,560 tons with dividends amounting to $2,176,000. Up until 1916 it paid out dividends to the partners nearly $10,000,000. From 1916 until 1925 it paid them $8,000,000 more.

BUILT OFFICE STRUCTURE

Since the mine was developed, Mr. Paulsen had been actively engaged in work in Spokane. In 1911 he completed the 11-story building at Riverside and Stevens which bears his name. The office building is thoroughly modern and one of the first strictly office buildings in the city.

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement prepared by me on the subject of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM, OF NORTH CAROLINA, IN FAVOR OF THE ADMISSION OF HAWAII AND ALASKA INTO THE UNION

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The admission of Hawaii and Alaska into the American Union of States would have significant meaning for the people of these two Territories, for the people of the United States, and for the free peoples of the world. Hawaii has been a possession of the United States for 52 years; Alaska for 83 years. Both have served probationary periods as Territories longer than the average period served by the American States admitted since 1789. Both have most strategic geographic, commercial, and defense positions in relation to the Pacific-Asiatic world. Statehood would strengthen the Hawaiian and Alaskan position against communism. Now is a most strategic time for the admission of both as timely expressions of the self-determination of peoples and for the defense of freedom in the world.

Hawaii is composed of seven main islands which are the tops of volcanic mountains, some of which rise from the ocean bed to a height beyond the height which any other mountains in the world have risen from a land base. The original people were Polynesians and are related to the fine stock of Indonesian and Southeastern Asiatic peoples who came in their big boats with masterful seamanship across the great waters in the dim past of the dispersion of these remarkable people. The great explorer, Capt. James H. Cook, of the British Navy, discovered these islands in 1778.

American influence on the island began with the coming of 17 missionaries from New England in 1820. Under President Franklin Pierce, Secretary of State William L. Marcy's treaty for annexation of the islands failed because it provided for immediate admission as a State into the Union. Hawaii, by the special invitation of the Hawaiian Legislature, was annexed to the United States as a joint resolution of Congress in 1898, and was made a Territory in 1900.

Polynesian, American, Asiatic, and European peoples contribute to the robust variety of the civilization on islands which have become a proving ground of the values of a composite culture and the voluntary, harmonious relation of the races. In 1948 the population of Hawaii numbered 533,000, and is larger than the population of most of our States at the time of their admission. These people proved their loyalty to America in a crucial time. The heroic record of the Japanese-Hawaiian soldiers in World War II is almost unparalleled in American history.

The resources in sugar, pineapples, coffee, vegetables, fisheries, and shipping provide an economically self-sustaining basis for a prosperous and enlightened commonwealth. In production of pineapples Hawaii leads the world. The commerce between the mainland of the United States and Hawaii was surpassed in 1940 only by Great Britain, Canada, France, Japan, and Germany. The death rate of the Hawaiian people is lower than that of any State.

In education and the arts the people are well advanced. Their agricultural research agencies of Hawaii, the School of Tropical Agriculture, the Oriental Institute, the Art Museum, the School of Drama give expression to their advanced culture. They are an industrious, self-respecting people and have had 50 years of experience with an elected legislature.

Hawaii is 2,000 miles from San Francisco, most strategic as a way station for ships and planes en route to Australia, New Zealand, Indonesia, the Philippines, the mainland of Asia and Japan. It is an outpost and a stronghold of national defense in the Pacific Ocean. The admission of Alaska will tie these loyal Americans to the United States with even stronger bonds of freedom and democracy at a critical time. Hawaii is a meeting place for the synthesis of eastern and western civilizations. Not only is the position of Hawaii in maritime and aerial transportation and commerce important, but the admission of Hawaii now would be most strategic in time as an offset to false Communist propaganda.

The Hawaiian Legislature has petitioned for admission 14 times. The bill for its admission as a State was passed by the House of Representatives in 1947 and in 1949 by a vote of 262 to 110. When the liberties and self-determination of little nations are being crushed by ruthless dictators in the East and the West, the inclusion of Hawaii in the Union of States would be a signal to the whole world that we sincerely believe in the self-determination of the Hawaiian people and that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

No less significant would be the admission of Alaska. Secretary of State William H. Seward once observed: "The Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and vast regions beyond, will become the chief theater of events in the world's great hereafter." The purchase of Alaska, called Seward's folly, has become, because of the values within Alaska and because of its present position in the world, one of the most farsighted acts of an American statesman. Alaska has become what the name means, "the great land."

After the acquisition of the American Pacific Northwest and of California, Americans on the Pacific coast had a special interest in the fisheries and furs of the Alaskan region. Baron de Stoeckl made a visit to St. Petersburg and soon after his return visited Secretary Seward in his home on the evening of March 29, 1867, and informed him that he had been authorized by the Emperor to negotiate for the transfer of Russian-America to the United States. Upon the Baron's suggestion that they meet next day for that purpose, Secretary Seward seized the night hour for immediate negotiations. At 4 a. m. in the morning of March 30, 1867, the Baron and the Secretary signed the treaty of purchase for $7,200,000.

Despite shortsighted and stubborn opposition, the Senate ratified the treaty May 28, and President Andrew Johnson proclaimed the treaty June 20. The actual transfer was made with solemn ceremonies at Sitka, October 18, 1867, since historic as Alaska Day. Civil administration was granted to the District of Alaska by the Congress in 1884. Alaska was made the Territory of Alaska by the act of Congress in 1912. Both major political parties have declared for the admission of Alaska. The last three Alaskan Legislatures have petitioned for statehood. A referendum of the people favored statehood. The House of Representatives voted to grant statehood to Alaska by the vote of 186 to 146.

The Territory has 586,400 square miles, three-fourths of which are in the north temperate zone. It is twice as large as the State of Texas, one-fifth the size of continental United States and is larger than Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland combined. Its population of around 130,000 people, approximately the population of Nevada, is larger than the population of 12 States when they were admitted into the Union.

Alaska is a picturesque region of Indians, Eskimos, Aleuts, and Caucasian peoples, of warm waters to the south and Arctic ice packs in the north, of majestic mountains, torrential waterfalls, and primeval forests, of temperatures ranging from 90° above and 70° below zero, of reindeer and dog trains, railroads, bus lines, and airways. A great future beckons.

The present rich resources in fisheries, minerals, and furs provide the economic base of the Territory. Gold, silver, lead, tungsten, platinum, copper, and coal are the main minerals. Minerals to the value of $1,000,000,000 have been mined since 1867. Salmon, halibut, cod, and herring are the chief fish indigenous to Alaskan waters. The salmon pack is the largest in the world. Dairying and beef cattle are also important. Vast potential resources in forests, oil, and arable land are as yet undeveloped. The forest resources could annually provide 1,000,000 tons of newsprint.

The schools are a credit to the people, the churches and the civil administration of Alaska. The University of Alaska has the foundations for a distinguished State university. Agricultural experiment stations carry on important research at Fairbanks, Petersburg, and Palmer.

The admission of Alaska would give a new impulse to the enterprises and hopes of the peoples of Alaska and a new meaning to its position in our national defense. If there be any defect in this bill then let us correct the bill and not reject Alaska.

Alaska is the American outpost nearest Asia, with only the Bering Straits between. It is the bastion of defense from whose air bases planes could fly over the Arctic ice by the shortest airways to Asia and Europe. Just as the admission of Hawaii would recognize before all the world at a critical time that the Americans sincerely believe in the democratic principle of self-determination of the loyal people of the various western and eastern races on the Pacific islands, so the admission of Alaska would be both a just and timely act in the global war of ideas by the grant of self-determination to these loyal Americans in this our last and strategically important frontier at a strategic time in the history of America and in the cause of freedom and peace in the world.

The admission of Hawaii and Alaska into the American Union of States would have the effect of dropping the highest potential moral bombs on the propaganda line of Communist imperialism in Asia and the Pacific with democratic reverberations in both hemispheres for strengthening the American leadership of the free peoples of the world.

Sex Perverts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item from the Washington Post of September 20, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, the news item indicates that there are still individuals in the State Department who must be classified as sex perverts. The man arrested this month was no minor official; he was acting official in charge of the Caribbean Affairs at the State Department.

The morals squad of the District of Columbia in their testimony before the Senate committee indicated they had the names and addresses of nearly 4,000 sex perverts in the District of Columbia. They indicated more than 3,000 were employed in Government. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that these homosexuals and sex perverts be taken off the payroll of the Federal Government. They

are dangerous individuals and can be a menace to our security.

The news item follows:

DIPLOMAT, 34, ARRESTED ON SEX CHARGE

Eugene Desvernine, 34, acting officer-in-charge of Caribbean Affairs at the State Department, has been arrested and charged with an assault or attempted assault on a minor, it was disclosed yesterday.

The State Department said the official was immediately suspended without pay pending an investigation.

Desvernine, who lives at 2220 Washington Avenue, Silver Spring, was arrested at 10:30 p. m. last Thursday in East Potomac Park after he had picked up a 13-year-old boy who was hitchhiking, an Interior Department official disclosed.

Booked on a charge of violation of the Miller Act—the so-called Sex Psychopath Act—he was arraigned Friday in municipal court. Judge George D. Neilson set bond at $2,000 and continued the case until October 3.

Milwaukee's Interest in the 1950 Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the interest of the people of Milwaukee—Wisconsin's largest city—in the November 7, 1950, campaign.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

MILWAUKEEANS SPEAK—THEIR LETTERS TO SENATOR WILEY EXPRESS THEIR SUPPORT OF REPUBLICAN PARTY

"We are sick and tired of the Democratic War Party. We are sick and tired of being blundered by the Democrats into war three times in 33 years. We have sent our sons into war in 1917, in 1941, and then again in 1950. * * *

"We want Republican leadership in Washington. Leadership which will enable us to achieve peace and remain at peace. * * *

Another Milwaukeean says:

"We don't want the socialistic ideas of the Democrats. * * *

"The Democrats seem to offer nothing but more taxes, more spending, more nuisance restrictions and regulations, more orders, more burdens on the average man. They want to tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect. * * *

"They have had 17 years in office and all that they do is suggest more tough powers for the Federal Government, more unlimited spending in war and in peace. We want to give the Republicans a chance. Seventeen years is far too long for any one party to remain in power in Washington. * * *

"The Republican Party will help assure decent pay envelopes for America rather than Democratic depressions and strife."

REPUBLICANS ARE FRIENDS OF MIDWEST

Those are voices from Milwaukee. These are sentiments which have been expressed to me by the average man in the street in Milwaukee—in his letters, phone calls, his visits.

The people of Milwaukee know that the Republican Party has been and is the friend of the Midwest, the friend of the Great Lakes region.

It is the Republican Party which has for so long battled for the passage of the Wiley bill to complete the Great Lakes seaway—the bill which would mean so much in creating jobs throughout Great Lakes ports and, in particular, in Milwaukee.

Just the other night in the Senate it was my pleasure to participate, too, in our final Senate passage of the Great Lakes package-freight bill, of which I am a cosponsor. This measure is designed to restore this type of package shipping to Milwaukee and other Lake ports—shipping which has been lost since World War II.

During my 12 years in the Senate I have fought to assure jobs for Wisconsin to secure a fair break for the little fellow, to assure business prosperity, to ease the tax load on the average man. In this Congress I have introduced over 80 bills for those objectives.

MILWAUKEEANS REMEMBER HOW REDS FOMENTED VIOLENCE

Over 9 years ago I sponsored an anti-Communist bill designed to identify the wretched literature sent by the Reds through the mails. Now, at long last, in 1950, the Democrats have gotten around to adopting that original Wiley proposal. It is a part of the over-all anti-Red bill which has just been passed by the Senate and sent to the President for signature or veto.

For years I have been pointing out how the Reds have infiltrated into every type of organization, creating strife, unrest, trouble.

We of Milwaukee recall the terrible and costly strikes which Communist leadership brought about in our factories—the Red beatings, the violence. We are disgusted with the Red menace, and we know that it is the Republican Party which has been spearheading the fight against it. Leaders like JOE MCCARTHY have aroused our country to the danger it faces.

POLISH-AMERICANS WILL NEVER FORGET DEMOCRATIC TREACHERY

Milwaukee with its great tradition of religious devotion knows what communism has done to lands across the seas from which our forefathers came.

No Milwaukeean, no Wisconsinite, no American of Polish descent will ever forget or forgive the disgraceful Democratic Party sell-out of free, religious Poland—the sell-out at Yalta, the terrible treachery done to our faithful Polish ally which was the first to fight for freedom. No Milwaukeean of Polish descent will forgive nor forget that Democratic Party betrayal. That is why they, like their fellow citizens of all descents, will vote Republican on Tuesday, November 7.

The Republican Party in our State has a splendid strong ticket which has been endorsed at the State convention and/or in the primary on Tuesday, September 19.

VOTERS WILL SUPPORT BROPHY AND KERSTEN

Two former Republican Congressmen, outstanding leaders, will be representing Milwaukee in the next Congress, provided our people give to them the full support which they so well merit. I know that they are going to get that support. They are, of course, the Honorable John Brophy, in the fourth district, and the Honorable Charles Kersten, in the fifth district. The fine record which John Brophy and Charlie Kersten accomplished in the Congress speaks for itself, and shows how well justified is their return to public office.

In Milwaukee County we have a fighting Republican organization, well organized in the wards and precincts. Its aim is to bring out the vote and it has been doing a great job. It needs more helpers, however, more volunteers, to make phone calls, deliver literature, write letters, to help stimulate the thinking of the citizens of Milwaukee to vote for good government.

According to the latest census report, Milwaukee County has over 863,000 people—an increase of 12.7 percent since 1940. Milwaukee City itself has over 632,000 of that number—a jump of 7.7 percent. West Allis City has over 42,000, Cudahy City over 12,000, Wauwatosa City over 33,000, Whitefish Bay Village over 14,000, Shorewood Village over 16,000, South Milwaukee over 12,000. These and other suburbs around Milwaukee have been increasing in population and in economic strength. It is the aim of our Republican leadership to assure continued prosperity for Milwaukee County and all of its components. We can do this by such legislation as the St. Lawrence seaway, by getting defense jobs for Milwaukee.

GOP TICKET MERITS YOUR SUPPORT

The Wisconsin Republican ticket well merits your approval. It is a pleasure and a privilege to have these running mates on our ticket.

For Governor, the Honorable Walter Kohler, Jr., a distinguished son of an honored Governor—Kohler, a great name in a great State.

For Lieutenant Governor, the Honorable George Smith.

For State treasurer, the Honorable Warren Smith.

For secretary of state, the Honorable Fred Zimmerman.

For attorney general, the Honorable Vernon Thompson.

SENATOR WILEY'S 12 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

During my 12 years in the Senate, I feel that I personally have gained the experience to help Milwaukee in its problems. All types of Milwaukee organizations and individuals have appealed to me during those years for various requests and it has been a pleasure to act on those appeals and in many instances to succeed in fulfilling them. I'd like to list now a few of the gracious quotations from letters of various Milwaukeeans—letters that were the spontaneous, unsolicited expressions of their hearts:

LETTERS FROM APPRECIATIVE CONSTITUENTS

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: What shall I say to thank you for the wonderful help you have given me in connection with the case for my nephew.

"A miracle has happened. After my nephew was once refused a visa, the Senator wrote him again and the consul changed his mind and granted my nephew the visa. It seems so incredible.

"My heart is full of gratitude to you, Senator."

From an immigrant:

"Once again, Senator, I take the liberty to write to you; this time to thank you with all my heart for all your kindness and great help.

"Because of your kind assistance and influence today I'm finally a permanent resident of this wonderful country, and soon I will be able to become an American citizen, something that I regard as a great privilege.

"Thank you again, Honorable Senator WILEY. Please be sure that I will be grateful to you forever and I will never forget how kind you have been with me. God bless your days."

From another Wisconsinite:

"It is this kind of consideration and cooperation that makes your constituents doubly conscious of the excellent job that you have always done in Washington."

From another Wisconsinite:

"DEAR SENATOR: I want to express the appreciation of my wife and myself for your kindness recently by interceding on our be-

half for permission to file a joint internal revenue tax return.

"After many delays, the Commissioner finally granted the permission, in line with the spirit of the act of Congress, and we are filing accordingly.

"This is the second time you have come to my assistance and proved that we of Wisconsin are fortunate in having a real representative in the United States Senate."

As everyone knows, it takes experience to be able to handle an assignment. If we need a doctor when a member of the family is ill, we want an experienced physician to treat our dear one—not a novice in his first year in medical school. So, too, we need men of experience in Washington and in Madison.

SENATOR WILEY SERVES ON ANTICRIME COMMITTEE

It is my pleasure to serve as the highest ranking active Republican member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; the highest-ranking member on the Senate Judiciary Committee; and a member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee.

Milwaukee has always been famed throughout the Nation for its standards of clean government. We recall the days, however, when the Chicago mobsters tried to muscle in on Milwaukee—bringing their filth and vice into Wisconsin's largest city. That is why I have been busy on the Senate Crime Committee to try to keep Milwaukee as clean from the influence of these dirty racketeers as we can possibly make it.

SAMPLE LETTERS FROM MILWAUKEE ENDORSING SENATOR WILEY

Now, friends, each week I receive over 2,000 letters from Wisconsin. Hundreds upon hundreds of these letters come from Milwaukee. I am happy to receive these letters and lots more. I should like now to quote from some other letters which have recently come to me. I want to express my appreciation to each of the individuals who kindly sent these letters. I am humbly grateful for their expression of support of my policies here in Washington.

I try to do the very best I can—for our people as a whole. We may not agree 100 percent of the time, but we agree most of the time. That is what really counts.

A letter from city comptroller's office of Milwaukee:

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have (because I fully believe that our Senators and Representatives want to know exactly what their constituents are thinking) recently introduced for the consideration of the Milwaukee Common Council several resolutions pertaining to bills now before the Congress. In each case, the resolutions were adopted by the council and then forwarded to you.

"Upon receipt of our resolutions, you made them a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the most opportune time. I have received a letter from the assistant director of the American Municipal Association saying that our resolution on the Highway Aid Act formally appeared just when it would have the maximum effect.

"It is indeed gratifying to know that our actions are carefully watched, respected, and carried to the fullest fruition by our spokesman in Congress."

"MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I'm just a little old lady here in Milwaukee, but I want to congratulate you first, on your votes cast against the Kerr bill (which would have increased natural-gas rates in Milwaukee), and the (rat hole) Arizona project; second, on your coming out so fine in backing Senator MCCARTHY in his efforts to rid the State Department of subversives. You are on the right track—in fact, have always voted as a true representative of the people in old Wisconsin."

"Received your card a few weeks ago stating your views on happenings that are going on in our Federal Government. Keep up the good work and you will be reelected for another term. We will be hoping and praying that you come home a winner."

From a physician: "The newspapers report that you are a candidate again for reelection. I am glad of it and I hope you will be successful, and that many other Republicans will win, and that we will soon have a Republican administration. If there will be no change this time, I am afraid our country will face bankruptcy."

"Am fully in accord with your past actions on all legislative matters sponsored by yourself or your constituents, as I feel you have taken the interest of the American people to heart."

Letter from another Milwaukeean: "It is with considerable interest that I have noticed in the papers that you have been singled out for defeat by both President Truman and the A. F. of L. That, Mr. WILEY, is sufficent indication to me and to a good many other voters that you are doing a good job and should be returned to office. You have my admiration for your successful efforts to prevent repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and I certainly cannot be classified as a capitalist."

"DEAR SENATOR: We wonder how you manage all the many details when being a United States Senator is such a very full-time job. We and our families are life-long Republicans and have followed your splendid work with a great deal of pride and satisfaction."

From West Allis:

"In conclusion I want to do all I can for you in West Allis. Can you suggest any additional service I may render (and I don't want a thing from you or government). I'd like to see you reelected with such a thumping majority that will convince Boss Truman he cannot dictate to us whom shall represent us."

From an attorney in Milwaukee:

"Many thanks for the pamphlet sent to this office. I certainly appreciate the same. I am satisfied that you are doing a good job as our Senator, and I want to extend my sincere and best wishes for your reelection."

Another constituent writes:

"I have watched your record in Congress, the way you have voted on various issues, etc., very closely and have been pleased with your stand. I trust you will continue this splendid record."

PLEASE GO TO THE POLLS NOVEMBER 7

I need the help of you, the citizens of Milwaukee, in order to continue policies aimed to protect your freedom. So, folks, please go to the pools on Tuesday, November 7. Vote for the free enterprise system against socialism. Vote for fair taxes against outrageous taxes that confiscate all of your earnings. Vote for the Republican Party of peace rather than for the Democratic Party which has blundered us into three wars in 33 years.

Vote for the Republican Party which is against secret deals, secret appeasement of the Reds, which is against the terrible treachery which sold free Poland down the river.

Vote for Walter Kohler and our other fine Republican teammates, for our Republican congressional candidates, assembly and State senate candidates.

Vote for the Republican Party which believes in a frank, open foreign policy—in a united democratic Germany, a Germany which will take her place in the free family of western nations rather than a Germany controlled by the Communist terror.

Vote for the Republicans who have fought against the coddling of the Reds—the Hisses, the Coplons, the Pressmans.

Yes, folks, vote for peace, freedom, and prosperity, for full pay envelopes, fair taxes economical government.

CONCLUSION

For your own sake, for the interest of your family and your dear ones, for the sake of a strong, prosperous, free, clean Milwaukee, vote Republican on Tuesday, November 7.

Thanks a million, friends. See you at the polls election day.

How the FBI Trapped Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the American Weekly:

HOW THE FBI TRAPPED HISS

(By Win Brooks)

High officials of this Nation he betrayed testified Alger Hiss bore an excellent reputation for loyalty, integrity, and veracity.

A little Negro maid proved him a liar to clinch his conviction for perjury committed in denial of a traitorous act.

If Edith Gland Murray had testified at the first Hiss trial there probably would have been no jury disagreement.

The Government was aware of her existence and of her possible great importance but she could not be found. The FBI, racing the clock in the search for her, fine-combing Baltimore for her whereabouts, following time-dimmed leads to dead ends across the Nation, didn't even know her name and knew only vaguely what she looked like 14 years before. And Edith Murray had no idea she was sought.

How the FBI found her on the very eve of Hiss' second trial after a solid year of tracking and back-tracking is a fascinating story. How she justified the effort and how her memory of a simple truth baited the trap into which Hiss thrust his neck complete a drama that matches the finding of stolen State Department papers in a pumpkin on the Maryland farm of Hiss' accuser, Whittaker Chambers.

I heard from J. Edgar Hoover in Washington an outline of the story of search for Edith Murray. He described it as "one of the finest examples of FBI investigative procedure." I asked if I might have it in detail for the American Weekly and he agreed.

The considerable research necessary to correlate the reports of all FBI agents engaged in the hunt recently was completed and a 14-page condensation made available. With this account I visited Assistant United States Attorney Thomas F. Murphy, prosecutor at both trials, to build up the climax from his records. These he produced and helped screen to stress the importance of Edith Murray to the final conviction.

Here, then, is the complete, official story.

From the beginning it was obvious that either Hiss or Chambers was a terrific, accomplished liar. It was the word of Chambers, $30,000-a-year Time Magazine editor, ex-agent for the Communist underground espionage, against the word of Hiss, trusted State Department brilliant, patrician-nosed Harvard law protege of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter.

It was the word of solid, stolid Esther Chambers against the word of poised and pretty Priscilla Hiss. Chambers swore that in 1938 he received from Hiss the State Department papers he later produced in microfilm from his pumpkin. Chambers and his wife swore they had been on terms of intimate friendship with Mr. and Mrs. Hiss over a period of years.

Hiss swore he never gave the papers to Chambers and that Chambers had been, under another name, only a casual acquaintance.

One fact was mutually agreed: Chambers had the documents and they weren't grown in a pumpkin. The Hiss defense at both trials suggested that Chambers received these papers from any one of many others who had access to them and that his accusation of Hiss was the unexplainable act of a psychopathic liar.

The material evidence was that some of the documents were in Hiss' handwriting and others had been typed on an old typewriter Hiss once owned and which the FBI had located. The defense against this evidence was (1) that the papers were stolen after Hiss had copied some in the line of duty; (2) that the identified typewriter had been given away by Hiss before it was used to copy the other papers.

Hiss was indicted and tried on two counts of perjury before the Federal grand jury where he testified he did not give the papers to Chambers and that he had not seen Chambers after January 1, 1937. The statute of limitations barred any charge but perjury, and perjury under Federal law is difficult to prove because the lie under oath must be established by two independent witnesses, or by one witness and corroborating facts.

The great need of the Government was for a corroborating witness to prove Hiss a liar. Trap him in even a small lie that would be apparent to the jury—trap him with a solid witness whose obvious honesty would convince the jury—and a conviction seemed assured. The task was to find that witness, and a particular type needed was one who could disprove the claim of Alger and Priscilla Hiss that they were not on terms of close friendship with Whittaker and Esther Chambers. The importance of Edith, the maid, is early established in the FBI account:

"During late 1948 and early 1949, FBI agents sat for many weeks with Chambers while he related in detail incidents in his life tending to corroborate the allegations with respect to Hiss.

"Chambers related that in August 1934, during his Communist espionage activities, he and his wife and their infant daughter, Ellen, moved to Baltimore where they occupied an apartment at 903 St. Paul Street. Here they remained until spring of 1935, living under the name of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Cantwell. Chambers identified the landlady of this apartment.

"In the spring of 1935 the Chambers family moved to a Washington, D. C., apartment formerly occupied by Alger and Priscilla Hiss. They remained there several months and then took up residence during the summer in Pennsylvania.

"In October 1935, Chambers recalled, he and has family returned to Baltimore and on this occasion rented an apartment in Eutaw Place between Wilson and McMechen Streets. Again Chambers used the alias Lloyd Cantwell.

"Both Mr. and Mrs. Chambers were certain Alger and Priscilla Hiss visited them at the Eutaw Place apartment on several occasions. Mrs. Chambers recalled that Hiss actually brought to the new Chambers' apartment several pieces of furniture for which he had no need.

"Chambers mentioned to FBI agents that his wife employed a maid in the Eutaw Place apartment. Mrs. Chambers was of the opinion this maid also worked for them a short while at 903 St. Paul Street.

"The best description Mr. and Mrs. Chambers could give of the maid was that her name was Edith. They had a vague recollection her surname might have been Brown, Brun, or Brenner. They were quite certain her husband's name was Ellwood and that he had been employed as a mechanic in the vicinity of the 2500 block of Greenmount Avenue, Baltimore. They believed Edith had met the Hisses in the Chambers home."

So the hunt began and day after day the questioning of the Chamberses always returned to the subject of the maid, a prodding for any little elusive detail that would aid the search.

From the FBI account:

"Mr. and Mrs. Chambers furnished the physical descriptions of Edith and Ellwood. They remembered Edith gave the nickname Peachie to the Chambers' baby. They remembered that Edith and Ellwood were a devoted couple with no children, very quiet, sober, well settled. They thought Edith and her husband might have lived somewhere on Eutaw Street, in a second or third floor apartment. Edith didn't live with the Chambers; she was a day worker arriving in the morning, leaving in the early evening."

Not all of this at one sitting. A little at a time over the days and weeks as the questioning continued and the search was pressed.

"Both Mr. and Mrs. Chambers were quite certain that Edith, some time during her employment, saw the Hisses in the Chambers' apartment. Specifically, they said, Edith saw Priscilla Hiss when the latter took care of Mrs. Chambers' baby while the mother went to New York overnight for a physical checkup."

Stop there and repeat. Baby-sitting for a friend. There, surely, the intimacy denied by the Hisses could be established. If a maid named Edith could be found. And if, having been found, she could remember. Check the Browns in Baltimore, all of them. Check the Bruns in every large city through every FBI district office. Check the Brenners, too. Here's a description of what she looked like 14 years ago. Sift the haystack.

From the FBI account:

"The several facets of the investigation were simultaneously checked. Efforts were made to find the landlady described by Chambers. It was learned she had moved from Baltimore. Her whereabouts were traced to a town in northern Maryland near the Pennsylvania border. Inquiry there developed she had left for Florida. When finally located she could not recall the tenancy of Chambers (Cantwell) nor could she identify photographs of the parties involved."

Dead end. Back-track.

"Inquiry was conducted in the vicinity of 903 Paul Street after checking old city and business directories in an effort to locate former neighbors residing there during the period of Chambers' tenancy. Several former neighbors were finally located but they had no recollection of Chambers or Hiss or their wives or the maid.

"Efforts were made to find the garage where Ellwood worked. Only one garage is located in the neighborhood of the 2500 block of Greenmount Avenue. Records there revealed nothing concerning an Ellwood Brown, Brun, or Brenner—nothing of any Ellwood. The manager stated, however, that approximately 13 or 14 years ago a garage had been located at East Twenty-fifth Street, just off Greenmount Avenue. It had since gone out of business. A search was made for former owners and a former manager was located in Baltimore. This man stated all firm records had been destroyed and he had no recollection of anyone named Ellwood."

Dead end. Back-track.

"Investigation determined that the Eutaw Place apartment was actually located at 1617 Eutaw Place. The 1936 Baltimore city directory listed a Lloyd Cantwell residing in apartment C at this address. Names of four other occupants of the building at the time were secured. All had moved away."

Find those four other occupants. They may remember the Chambers' maid, may even remember Hiss. Investigative leads were run down in several directions. All four former families were found and interviewed by the FBI.

From the FBI account:

"Two of the tenants recalled Cantwell's (Chambers') tenancy and remembered the maid Edith but could furnish no information as to her identity or whereabouts. Photographs of the Hisses were displayed to them without effecting identification."

Dead end again. But for the first time here was proof that the maid existed other than in the minds of Whittaker and Esther Chambers.

"Records were checked as to the ownership of the Eutaw Place apartment building. The former owner had died. His son was located and produced records showing Cantwell (Chambers) lived there from October 2, 1935, to June 27, 1936. The son could not recall Chambers or his wife nor was he able to identify photographs of the Hisses. He suggested that the janitor employed by his father from 1927 to 1944 might recall them. He furnished the name of the janitor, address unknown."

Time was working at both ends for Alger Hiss. His first trial was under way in New York. The lapse of 14 years had dulled a lot of memories. Where were you 14 years ago? Who did you know? Ever hear of a maid named Edith? Might have been Edith Brown. Or Brun. Or Brenner. The FBI found the former janitor, still in Baltimore. From the account:

"The janitor recalled a family named Cantwell had resided in apartment C for about 10 months in 1935 or 1936. He could not recall a maid employed by them and when shown photographs of Mr. and Mrs. Hiss he said he had never seen them. He did identify photographs of the Chambers as the Cantwells."

In New York Alger and Priscilla Hiss were denying from the witness stand they were ever intimate with the Chambers, ever saw them in Baltimore. Testifying about a casual meeting in Washington with Mrs. Chambers during the year before Chambers moved to Baltimore, Priscilla Hiss said: "I don't think I ever saw her again at all."

The end of the trial in disagreement brought into sharper relief the Government's need of a corroborative witness. Every needed resource of the FBI was in the search for Edith. Find her before the second trial. She may remember.

Here was a short breathing spell affording the Bureau opportunity to go over still again with the Chamberses their recollections of the maid. Question, question, question. One question may bring a memory that will be helpful. From the report:

"Interviews with Mr. and Mrs. Chambers were continuing in an effort to glean further facts, however trivial. Mr. and Mrs. Chambers and FBI agents spent many more days carefully recounting events in an attempt to unearth additional facts. During one such interview Mrs. Chambers recalled that during the period of her Baltimore residence she had been interested in art and had made several oil paintings.

Were some of these portraits? Yes, some were. Whom did she paint?

It was the jackpot question. Esther Chambers came up with the jackpot answer.

The FBI report relates it in this prosaic fashion:

"She vaguely remembered actually painting a portrait of the maid, Edith, and thought she had given it to the maid."

Was she sure? She was not. Not sure she gave it to Edith. It was in the dim background of her mind. It hadn't been of consequence. So she thought.

If she did paint Edith and didn't give her the portrait, where might the painting be now?

If and if and if—well, in the attic of the Maryland farm there were some old canvases.

With Mrs. Chambers, FBI agents searched the attic. There, amid the dust, the castoffs, the laid-asides, the keep-me-alwayses—there against the eaves where cobwebs hung among a group of discarded finished and unfinished paintings, an oil portrait of a colored girl was found. A pleasant face.

"That's it," Mrs. Chambers said. "That's Edith."

That dusty, forgotten portrait of Whittaker Chambers' ex-maid, Edith, was to bring Alger Hiss to justice but beyond its mere discovery lay many more weeks of FBI investigation.

How good was this clue? How good was the likeness of the sought maid?

A fair likeness, Mrs. Chambers thought.

A fair likeness of a woman 14 years before. How much do you resemble your picture of 14 years ago?

Nevertheless, here was something new, something a little more tangible than a dim verbal description. Seize it. Make the most of it.

From the FBI account:

"Photographs of the oil pointing of Edith were produced. They were distributed throughout Baltimore at employment agencies and other places where Edith might be known."

Do you know anyone who resembles this picture? Someone may come in who looks like this. If she does, phone the FBI. Store to store, house to house. Have you ever seen this woman? If you do, contact the FBI.

From the FBI account:

"Preparations were under way for retrial of Hiss. Investigation to locate Edith was intensified, especially in view of the testimony of Hiss at the first trial denying he ever visited Chambers' home in Baltimore.

"A special squad of FBI agents carefully studied all the facts heretofore developed with respect to the maid. At daily conferences agents reviewed results of the previous day's investigation and new leads became apparent.

"Mr. and Mrs. Chambers stated that on further thought they were now of the opinion Edith and her husband probably had lived on Madison Avenue, Baltimore, somewhere in the 900 to 1200 blocks, rather than on the parallel blocks of Eutaw Street.

"They also remembered Edith had a friend named Missouri. This was her correct name, not a nickname, but they could not recall the last name. They said Missouri substituted for Edith on occasion and did housework for Mrs. Chambers at the Eutaw Place apartment."

Find a maid named Edith. Here's a "fairly good likeness" of her 14 years ago. Find another maid with the intriguing name, Missouri. Find one or the other and you may have the corroborative witness needed. If she remembers.

From the FBI account:

"Every conceivable possible source of information was contacted in vain. A search of city and phone directories over 14 years revealed nothing of assistance. Every employment agency in Baltimore was contacted. Managers of these agencies were interviewed and their records thoroughly reviewed for the name Edith Brown, Edith Brun or Edith Brenner. Every maid whose first name was Edith was checked.

"The hundreds of leads developed entailed tracing person after person from residence to residence, some in distant places. In each instance a dead end was the answer. Edith could not be located by these methods."

No grocery proprietor remembered an Edith who bought staples for her employers. No pharmacist recalled a maid named Edith who had prescriptions filled. No laundry man, no milkman, no iceman, no restaurant operator could help. Have you ever seen this woman or one who resembles her? We'll leave a picture; she might come in. If she does, notify the FBI.

Nobody notified the FBI.

Mid-September, 1949, with the retrial of Hiss set for November, brought no trace of Edith or of Missouri. A complete review of the search convinced the special squad of agents there was something wrong. Edith existed, unless she had died a young woman. No clue had been overlooked, no error in procedure had been made. The search should have found her. There was something wrong because there was no more logical ground to cover. Back-track. Go back. Go back. Go over all of it again because the answer has to be there.

From the FBI account:

"It was decided to reinterview persons who had lived or worked in the vicinity of 1617 Eutaw Place during the period of Chambers' tenancy. Despite the fact these people had been previously contacted and had been unable to supply information, it was thought that during the intervening months they had had opportunity to give further thought to the inquiry. Perhaps now they could recall additional facts concerning Edith."

Back to former tenants, neighbors, service people, went the FBI. Back to every house and store in that area. Dead end. No luck. Back to the former janitor who hadn't remembered any maid at all.

And there it was.

Since the FBI's first interview with him he had seen one of the reproductions of the portrait of Edith, and he had seen Edith in a Baltimore streetcar. He had remembered her as the maid. He had asked Edith her name and address without telling her anything of the search.

What is her name? Edith Murray. (A far cry, no matter how you say it, from Brown or Brun or Brenner.)

What's her address? She said she lived at 342 Bloom Street, Baltimore. (A long leap, no matter how you jump it, from the 900 to 1200 blocks of Madison or Eutaw.)

Why didn't you notify us—come forward with this information? The janitor said he did not want to become involved.

Okay, take it easy. That's enough here. Report back. Conference. Contact with headquarters. Orders from the boss; Blind approach, no suggestion, let her volunteer any information, don't mention the names Cantwell, Chambers, or Hiss.

A knock on the door of 342 Bloom Street. A pleasant-faced Negro woman answered. One agent of all the hundreds who had been seeking her stood on the porch. He had a little picture in his hand—a small reproduction of Esther Chambers' portrait of her maid.

"Do you know who this is?"

"Why sure," with a flash of smile, "that's me."

A year of search was at an end. From the FBI account:

"She said she worked for a family named Cantwell in Eutaw Place and volunteered the information they had a little girl named Ellen who she called Peegee, sounding like Peachie, but actually standing for the initials of Pretty Girl. Her husband's name? Ellwood. He had been employed, she said, as a gasoline station attendant in Baltimore at the time she worked for the Cantwells.

"She was shown the photographs of Mr. and Mrs. Chambers. She said their names were Mr. and Mrs. Cantwell. She had no idea they had any other name.

"She was asked to tell what she remembered of them. She related that in the fall of 1934 she first met Mr. and Mrs. Cantwell, then living at 903 St. Paul Street. She was referred to them, she said, by their former maid, Missouri Diggs."

Hail, Missouri!

"Edith said she worked for Mrs. Cantwell until the spring of 1935 when the family left Baltimore. Then in the fall of 1935 she accidentally met Mrs. Cantwell on the street in front of Edith's then home, 1113 Madison Avenue, Baltimore, and at this meeting Mrs. Cantwell rehired her to work at the 1617 Eutaw Place apartment."

From the interview it was obvious that Edith knew nothing about the Cantwells being the Chambers, nothing at all about the Chambers-Hiss case, nothing about any Communist connections of her ex-employer.

From the FBI account:

"Edith was asked about visitors at the apartment. She volunteered she recalled 'a lady from Washington,' a lady who came to visit the home on at least two or three occasions. She said the 'lady from Washington' had a son 12 to 14 years old. This she gathered from her conversation with her.

"She recalled specifically that the 'lady from Washington' sometime in April or May 1936, came to the Cantwell (Chambers) apartment where she remained all day and all one night until noon the following day while Mrs. Cantwell went to New York. This lady did not leave the apartment until Mrs. Cantwell returned from New York. Edith said Mrs. Cantwell had gone to New York for a medical examination.

"Not having seen a photograph of Priscilla Hiss, Edith then described the physical characteristics of 'the lady from Washington.' This description fitted perfectly that of Priscilla Hiss. Edith recalled one evening this woman from Washington came to the Cantwell apartment accompanied by her husband. Her description of this man generally coincided with that of Alger Hiss.

"She was then shown photographs of Alger and Priscilla Hiss. Edith was quite certain the photograph of Priscilla Hiss was 'the lady from Washington.' She was of the opinion Alger Hiss' photograph was that of the lady's husband. Seeing these people in person, she thought, would enable her to make a definite statement."

She first was taken to the Chambers' farm near Westminster, Md. There she greeted Chambers and his wife as Mr. and Mrs. Cantwell and recognition was mutual. Identification of Edith Murray as the long-sought Edith was established beyond doubt. Her value as a witness still remained to be proved.

On the day Alger Hiss went on trial for the second time in the United States Courthouse on Foley Square, New York City, Edith Murray was sent to New York with an FBI employee who did not know Alger or Priscilla Hiss by sight. The FBI was still leaning away over backward to guarantee Hiss his fair trial.

With the FBI man, Edith Murray rode to the 13th floor of the courthouse as trial was about to begin in a courtroom there. She was simply instructed to say whether she recognized anyone. The corridor was filled with men and women, scores of veniremen called to fill the jury. Six elevators continually fed the crowd.

From the FBI account:

"Within a short time Alger and Priscilla Hiss, together with a crowd of other people, emerged from an elevator. Edith grasped the arm of the FBI man with her and said, 'That is the lady from Washington and her husband.' "

Then the United States knew the value of its witness and her story went into the hands

of Assistant United States Attorney Murphy and Murphy planned to bait the trap that would ensnare Alger Hiss in his lie—not too big a lie, not too small—but one which Murphy effectively argued later to the jury was in a pattern of lies he began and didn't know where to end.

Nearly all of the evidence of the trial went in while Edith Murray waited back in Baltimore, unaware of what went on, not knowing she was guarded. And Murphy back in New York baited the trap.

The trap:

(Cross examination of Hiss by Murphy:)

"Question. Didn't you go to Baltimore with your wife—over to see them (the Chambers) in Baltimore?

"Answer. Never. Never, Mr. Murphy.

"Question. You never went to Baltimore?

"Answer. Never went to Baltimore to see them.

"Question. And Mrs. Hiss either?

"Answer. Never.

"Question. Any place in Baltimore to see the Chambers?

"Answer. No, sir.

"Question. At any time?

"Answer. Never.

"Question. 1935, 1936, 1937?

"Answer. No time. Never."

So there he was, and under oath again.

The trap:

(Cross-examination of Priscilla Hiss by Murphy:)

"Question. Did you see her (Mrs. Chambers) in Baltimore?

"Answer. I have never seen here in Baltimore.

"Question. Did you know she lived in Baltimore?

"Answer. I didn't know she lived in Baltimore.

"Question. Did you know there was a time she was living in Baltimore at Eutaw Place?

"Answer. I didn't know it then. I have learned it since.

"Question. I am talking now about the 1930's. Did you know it then?

"Answer. I did not know it then.

"Question. And I take it that you did not know she was living in Eutaw Place under the name of Cantwell, Lloyd Cantwell, Mrs. Lloyd Cantwell?

"Answer. I did not know anything about her, Mr. Murphy.

"Question. All right. So I can say, and drop it, that on your oath before this jury you didn't see her in Baltimore in any shape or form at any address or under any name?

"Answer. That is exactly right.

So Murphy got it in the record, thinking of that little woman in Baltimore who had something different to say. He was saving her for rebuttal.

So here at last comes Edith Murray (not Brown, not Brun, not Brenner) found by the FBI at the end of a year's search, to testify as one of the last of the trial's witnesses.

The trap is sprung.

(Direct examination of Edith Murray by Murphy:)

"Question. Did they (the Chambers) have any visitors?

"Answer. They didn't have many visitors, only two visitors that I know of.

"Question. Did these visitors tell you where they lived?

"Answer. The lady did. She said she lived in Washington.

"Question. Do you see her here in court?

"Answer. Yes, sir. There is the lady right there with the black hat with the thing on the side (pointing to Priscilla Hiss).

"Question. Where did you see that lady?

"Answer. Well, she visited Mrs. Cantwell in Eutaw Place.

"Question. Did she tell you anything about her family at all?

"Answer. Well, she came there and stayed overnight when Mrs. Cantwell had to come here in New York to see the doctor. She was pregnant at the time so she had to come to New York to see the doctor. So she came over and she (Mrs. Hiss) stayed overnight and so while we were in the bathroom with the baby—I attended the baby's bath—I asked her did she have any children and she said yes, she had one little boy. That is the only conversation we had.

"Question. Who else do you remember?

"Answer. Well, she came there one night with her husband just as I was getting ready to leave and the bell rang and I went to the door and then her and her husband came in.

"Question. Would you be able to identify her husband?

"Answer. Yes, I couldn't help but remember him (standing and pointing to Hiss).

"Question. What did you call the lady and gentleman if you remember?

"Answer. Well, I didn't call him anything.

"Question. What did you call this lady?

"Answer. I called her Miss Priscilla."

Her complete examination by Murphy is recorded in only eight pages of official transcript—a few minutes of appearance against a full year's search—but as she testified all the good character Alger Hiss had assumed in the light of big-name witnesses during two trials fell away from him like a canvas unveiling a new and ugly statue.

It fell away regardless of what Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed had heard about his integrity, what United States Circuit Judge Magruder heard of his character, what United States Judge Wyzanski said of his loyalty—what all the others of name and fame had testified regarding Alger Hiss in his plight.

Here was an honest woman with a good memory who knew a simple truth and told it convincingly. The jury hung on her every word.

The Hiss defense took Edith Murray under a cross-examination that fills 45 pages of official transcript. She couldn't be shaken. When she was excused, the fate of Alger Hiss was sealed.

Edith Murray went home to Baltimore. The portrait Mrs. Chambers neglected to give her 14 years ago now hangs in Edith Murray's living room.

Cutting at Roots of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 17, 1950:

CUTTING AT ROOTS OF COMMUNISM

A citation is due the Veterans of Foreign Wars for conspicuous common sense.

The national commander, Charles C. Ralls, has announced that the VFW is opening a campaign against communism here at home by trying to reduce the poverty, hunger and misery on which communism breeds. This large and influential veterans' organization, says Commander Ralls, will do its "utmost to see that there are no hungry children or impoverished families in this Nation." It will offer awards to VFW posts and auxiliary groups with the best programs of "positive action against communism" along this line.

Negative resistance is never going to check communism of Communists completely. Positive action is necessary to eradicate the conditions that nurture communism, that make desperate and hopeless fellow Americans susceptible to the lures of communism when they bitterly decide that American democracy and free enterprise have failed them.

The VFW has wisely determined to do its share in fostering such positive action against communism, right here in America, where it is within our own power to do something effective.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Could Strike Real Blow for Loyalty—Pass Statehood Bills," written by Lowell Mellett and published in the Washington Evening Star of September 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS COULD STRIKE REAL BLOW FOR LOYALTY—PASS STATEHOOD BILLS

(By Lowell Mellett)

One way to promote loyalty to the United States and its institutions is to scare the daylight out of anybody disposed to question our present state of perfection. Congress has sought to do this by enacting a new internal security law that gravely disturbs many patriotic believers in freedom of thought and expression. The latter fear the law will not accomplish its purpose; that, indeed, it will do more harm than good.

Another method of achieving the desired results is to do the things that arouse a positive feeling of loyalty, an active urge to serve and protect the national welfare. Congress, in the session now ending, has demonstrated again how laggard it can be in this respect. It has failed to grant full citizenship to two important groups of Americans, the people of Alaska and Hawaii. This, notwithstanding that now, as never before, we need the complete loyalty of these people, situated in outposts of our national defense.

CONGRESS CONVINCED

Session after session they have asked for the dignity of statehood. Gradually over the years they have succeeded in convincing Congress that they are ready for it. That is to say, they have convinced a majority of the Members of Congress. But they have failed to overcome the obstructions thrown up by a minority. During the past summer the House passed the bills authorizing admission of both Territories as States. The Senate committee to which these bills were referred has reported overwhelming in their favor. Action by the Senate itself, however, has been held up through fear of a prolonged battle by the obstructionists—possibly a filibuster—at a time when the Senators want to go home.

In the case of Alaska the opposition has two principal elements. There are the commerial interests, such as the salmon canners, mostly nonresidents of Alaska, who expect to pay a higher price for the privilege of exploiting the region's resources if the Territory becomes a self-governing State. And then there are the bitter-end oppon-

ents of civil rights legislation. They frankly say that admission of Alaska might mean two more votes in the Senate for civil rights.

In the case of Hawaii the commercial interests, mostly long resident in the islands, are strongly in favor of statehood. The important opposition comes from southern Senators. If civil rights are to be deplored, there is real reason for this opposition. A cosmopolitan mixture of native islanders, Japanese, Chinese and others form three-quarters of the Hawaiian population and the Senators representing them certainly would not draw the race line in the matter of civil liberties.

LOYALTY UNQUESTIONED

There is no reason to question the loyalty of the Alaskans and the Hawaiians as matters now stand. A full American casualty list out of the war to date in Korea, it is said, would reveal Hawaiian names out of all proportion to the Hawaiian population. This results from an accident of circumstances, the fact that well-trained Army units from the islands were among the first thrown into battle. That, however, does not explain the magnificent record made by the Japanese-Americans from Hawaii in World War II, those who fought in Italy, for example, described by Gen. Mark W. Clark as the most decorated unit in the entire history of the United States.

The real explanation is that these Hawaiians have the stuff from which real Americans are made, the stuff that entitles them to first-class citizenship. Our country has their loyalty and should appreciate and encourage it. Especially now that loyalty has been made the subject of such great national concern.

Report to the People of the Tenth Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to fulfill my obligations to the people of the Tenth Congressional District whom I have the privilege to represent, I deem it appropriate to report briefly to them on the major legislative actions of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

This report must, of necessity, be a realistic one in order to stress the hard and unpleasant facts which wishful thinkers are reluctant to face.

Our goal is set—peace. Every act must be viewed in the light of its contribution to that goal. Remember, one nation—only one nation, Russia—is blocking the achievement of a world at peace. She represents the Godless. She fosters the materialistic. Her ideological poison is known as communism. We first learned of communism as an economic principle; later, as a theory of government; then, a philosophy; and now as an ideology. Call it what you will and disguise it as they can, but it remains a powerful force with tentacles so strong we can scarcely recognize the stranglehold this octopus has on our world. Communism is opposed to all religion—Protestantism, Judaism, Catholicism, and Mohammedanism.

We hear this referred to as the atomic age. There is no crystal-clear answer to the great issues facing us. The solution of today can be undone by the morrow. We must not only face unpleasant facts, but we must go further than we have gone in countering danger to self-interests and world preservation.

Let no man say the Democratic administration failed in its endeavor to settle our world conditions. This Eighty-first Congress has been a dynamic force in coping with international problems, and a leader in seeking peace for the world. International cooperation and international foreign policy dominated the affairs of the Capitol. Public opinion has demanded that national affairs be subordinated. National problems could easily be resolved if the costs of war were forever removed. Seventy-five percent of the Federal budget arises out of servicing the Federal debt, in providing benefits for veterans, and in building national defense—in other words, these are our expenditures for past wars and for protection against threatened aggression.

The successful results flowing from our legislative programs turned the tide of communism in Europe and conceivably must have impelled the leaders in the Kremlin to strike hard in Asia where our humanitarian programs had not been given sufficient time to take root. We do not demand that every nation accept our way of life. Democracy can be demonstrated in action with such success that it will necessarily become the desire of almost all civilized people. An ECA program for Asia, wholeheartedly supported by Americans, together with the Democratic point-4 program in action, would have halted and forever throttled communism in the Far East. But June 25, 1950, dawned on another day of infamy. South Korea, an independent republic established under the sponsorship of the United Nations, was invaded by North Korea, a Soviet Union satellite. Three short months ago the free nations of the world, in their mission for peace, had high hopes that conflict in the world might be avoided. Once more an aggressive move, a disregard of others, and a cruel and alien ideology have produced a war thousands of miles from American shores, threatening the freedom of our Republic and the peace of the world. Now we see the nations of the world gearing their industries for military preparations. Translated in our own country, we have upon us all that this brings about—disrupted homes, casualty lists, higher taxes, and the adjustment again to a war economy. Yet, with a love of God and our fellow men, with hope, with courage, with cooperation from us all, we shall succeed.

Following is a brief summary of the most important legislation enacted during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress:

DOMESTIC ISSUES

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS, 1950

The new law makes 30 major changes in the programs established under the Social Security Act.

Among the most important changes are the following:

Extension of coverage to self-employed persons other than farmers and certain professional persons.

Coverage of regularly employed domestic workers.

Coverage of State and local government employees not members of retirement systems, through voluntary agreements between the State and the Federal Government, and compulsory coverage of certain employees of certain transit systems taken over by States or local governments after 1936.

A substantial liberalization of the benefit formula for future beneficiaries.

Increase in the wage base for benefit and contribution purposes from $3,000 to $3,600.

A substantial increase in benefits for current beneficiaries, averaging 77½ percent.

Payment of benefits to dependent husbands and widowers of insured women workers.

Liberalization of survivors' insurance benefits with respect to insured married women.

Payment of the lump-sum death benefit in all cases of insured deceased workers.

Increase in the benefits for dependent parents and for the first child in a family from 50 percent to 75 percent of the primary insurance benefit.

Provision of wage credits of $160 for each month of military service during World War II.

Provisions for Federal grants to the States for the needy permanently and totally disabled.

Inclusion in aid to dependent children of one adult relative in a family, for Federal matching purposes.

Provision for mandatory exemption of $50 earned income for the blind, beginning July 1952.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

This law gives the President discretionary power to impose rationing controls; to fix price and wage ceilings simultaneously; to requisition plants, equipment and materials; to allocate and assign priorities; to control consumer credit, to control credit on new housing; to make or guarantee production loans and to set up machinery for settling war labor disputes.

PUBLIC HEALTH

In this field, Federal aid for hospital construction was extended to 1955. Public Law 692 authorized support of research and training in the search for cures for rheumatism, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and other diseases.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY AID

This measure authorized $1,188,000,000 for a 2-year program of Federal aid to highway construction to assure adequate highway systems to keep pace with the progress of our Nation.

RENT CONTROL ACT OF 1950

This important legislation extends rent controls to December 31, 1950, with permission for local communities to carry them beyond that date for an additional 6 months.

HOUSING

Although curtailed because of present war conditions, the housing law of 1950 expands and supplements the Federal Housing Act for moderate income families and it increases the limit on mortgage purchases by the Government. It liberalizes financing terms on FHA-insured rental and cooperative housing, particularly for veterans.

AGRICULTURE

In this field, the following measures were enacted: The Federal tax on oleomargarine was repealed. Farm price supports for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, peanuts, and other crops were continued. The 1950 potato crop support was made subject to producer agreement on marketing quotas. Government control on imports of fats, oils, rice, and rice products were extended to June 30, 1951.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

The basic functions of this National Science Foundation are to promote basic research in the sciences; make grants to colleges and industry for basic research; award scholarships and fellowships in scientific fields; initiate and support research related to national defense; initiate and support nuclear energy research with the permission of the Atomic Energy Commission; act as a clearinghouse of scientific information; correlate individual and public research; and maintain a register of scientific personnel. This measure is in keeping with our defense program and is a necessary preparation for potential emergencies.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

This session of the Eighty-first Congress has liberalized procedures and payments for various types of disabilities, and has eliminated many of the abuses that existed in the administration of the GI bill of rights, providing assistance to veterans for educational purposes. Also laws were enacted extending time for filing, in certain cases, for pensions and compensation, and a bill was passed granting payments of family allowances to dependents of members of the armed services.

INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

This measure provides for registration of Communists and subversives, forbids Communists to hold Federal jobs, and tightens restrictions on immigration and aliens. It would also permit a round-up of all Communists and other subversives in time of national emergency. This legislation has passed the House and the Senate. It was forwarded to the President at the time of this writing.

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1950

Under the terms of this new law, the original act is extended to June 30, 1951. It increases the number of displaced persons who may be admitted to the United States from 205,000 to 415,744. Regular immigration quotas allotted to the various countries will cover most of this increase. Screening by the Departments of the Army, State, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and immigration authorities will check any influx of foreign ideologies.

REORGANIZATION

Twenty-six of the thirty-four reorganization plans were accepted by Congress. These plans included the streamlining and modernizing of the housekeeping of the vast Federal establishment. The adoption of these plans provides for the elimination of duplications and overlapping of functions of the various departments, and will result in a savings of one and one-half billion dollars, through increased efficiency and economy in the governmental services.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

This measure extended the existing draft law to July 9, 1951. It gives the President the right to call up the National Guard and the Reserves when he deems such action necessary.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1951

This bill is the spending bill for the fiscal year 1950–51. It is a departure from the procedure of former years when individual bills were enacted for every department and every item of Government expenditure. Fiscal experts, the Commission on Reorganization, and management groups have consistently urged a trial appropriation bill where the entire costs of the Government might be considered in a single package. They asserted that the former method of piecemeal examination by the Congress did not enable the public nor the Congressmen to get a clear-cut, over-all picture of the fiscal needs. Thirty-six billion dollars are allocated, in this bill, to normal operation of the Government. With the advent of the Korean war, a supplemental budget necessitated an additional amount of approximately eighteen billions.

The foregoing is the picture of the accomplishments of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress pertaining to affairs at home.

THE ATLANTIC UNION

On the international scene, in support of our ideals and our principles which we adhere to in the United Nations, the Congress enacted vital legislation to support the Atlantic Union.

This union was established to carry out the North Atlantic Treaty—the first act in the history of our country to renounce neutrality and to pledge assistance by the United States to countries abroad. The purpose of the Atlantic Union is carried out through our economic cooperation aid program:

Title I. Economic assistance to Europe and Asia.

Title II. Palestine refugee aid plan to resettle and to rehabilitate the refugees of this section so that the Nation of Israel can devote its energies to the necessary internal improvement.

Title III. Point 4 program: This is a noble plan for humanity, for security, for national defense. Its purpose is to develop the vast resources of undeveloped areas of the world through American techniques and American private capital.

VOICE OF AMERICA

Ninety million dollars were appropriated to the Voice of America to continue its program of educating the world on the truth of American democracy.

My constituents who have expressed themselves to me leave no doubt that the American public is well aware of the action of our Government in affairs at home and abroad. For the interest of my constituents, this report is respectfully submitted.

Not Above City Hall Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article that appeared in the Allegan (Mich.) Gazette shortly after the Truman insult to the United States Marine Corps. The writer, Leo W. Hoffman, points out that neither the President nor the officials under him have the right to ignore the basic law as provided in the Unification Act; but, of course, the New Deal officials have for many years been doing as they pleased. The law, as such, has never bothered them.

The article follows:

TRY AS HE MAY, TRUMAN CAN'T RISE ABOVE LEVEL OF A CITY HALL POLITICO

Recently Congressman MCDONOUGH, of California, urged President Harry Truman to permit the Marine Corps to be represented on the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff.

To us the request seems a reasonable one. As long as the Marine Corps is a fighting organization and is usually the first to engage an enemy, it is only fair to argue that they should have a part in planning the battles they have to fight.

However Truman evidently thought otherwise. He replied to the Congressman in his now infamous letter wherein he stated that the Marine Corps "had a propaganda machine comparable to that of Stalin's" and that the Marine Corps was merely a police force, and would remain such as long as he was President.

Public opinion immediately made itself felt and first the President by letter to the head of the Marine Corps, and later in person, apologized, saying that he was sorry for his unfortunate choice of words and that by police force he had in mind the language of the Unification Act as applied to the Marine Corps.

Many of our metropolitan papers have commented upon the action of the President in saying that he was sorry and point out that it was big of him to apologize, and are willing to forgive and forget.

This little paper has a different opinion. We conclude that it is another example of Truman's unfitness to hold the highest office in the Nation.

The incident illustrates that Truman is inclined to be dictatorial, has little if any common sense, and is unfair and insincere.

First, the unification law provides in substance that the Marine Corps is primarily a fighting force and that in addition to its primary duty it shall also act as a police force in certain naval establishments, provided however, that this secondary police duty shall in no way interfere with its primary duty.

We repeat, the unification act is a law, and neither the President nor any other executive officer is above the law. The President

cannot by Executive order change the character or duty of the Marine Corps. If he uses his power as President to circumvent the law, then he is violating his oath of office. His reply that the Marines would remain a police force as long as he is President indicates that he has little if any regard for the law and that he is inclined to use his power as President contrary to his duties as outlined in our Constitution. In brief, he wants his own way and whenever he can't get it he becomes angry and stubborn as would some little child who has not yet learned that obedience is necessary before you can accept responsibility.

Second, the incident indicates that Truman has little, if any, common sense. There are millions of Americans who believe that the Marine Corps is necessary to the defense of this country. In the fight by Truman and his supporters to reduce the Marine Corps to a police unit these people, unsupported by public tax money, have logically and reasonably presented their arguments in opposition to the President's plan. High Marine officers—refused the right to express their opinions by Executive order—resigned their commissions so that they could—as private citizens—express their opinion.

To compare the efforts of these people to preserve our Marine Corps with the Russian propaganda machine is so ridiculous as to indicate an utter lack of common, ordinary intelligence.

Third, Truman has permitted his two social schemers, Brannan and Ewing, to spend millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in advertising their schemes to socialize agriculture and medicine. If there is any propaganda machine in the country comparable to Stalin's, it is that employed contrary to law by Brannan and Ewing. We believe that this illustrates that Truman has little, if any, fairness in his makeup.

Fourth, Truman's apology comes a little late to be sincere. It was made only after the Marine Corps League had prepared a resolution condemning the President for his action and only after the press, radio, and people had expressed their opinion of the President's action.

In brief, his apology was window dressing; an apology of political necessity; one of expediency and not from the heart. When Truman said that by the use of the phrase "police force" he meant to refer to the language of the Unification Act, he is either guilty of complete ignorance of the English language or he is an unmitigated liar.

It is our conclusion that he is a liar because no one with his experience could be so ignorant. He must have read the act before he signed it, and its meaning is plain.

We conclude that this incident is only one blunder of many and illustrates Truman's unfitness for office. No matter how long he remains in office, he can never rise above the level of what he originally was—a member of the Pendergast city hall gang.

L. W. H.

Jenner Needn't Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "JENNER Needn't Worry," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JENNER NEEDN'T WORRY

Senator JENNER, of Indiana, knew, when he rose in the Senate the other day, that what he was going to say about General Marshall's unfitness for the office of Secretary of Defense wasn't going to win the acclaim of seaboard editors and radio announcers. The Senator was dead right. They thought it wasn't nice of him to examine the record and report the facts.

Nevertheless, the facts Mr. JENNER cited in his speech were not denied and they cannot be denied. The plain, inescapable truth is that General Marshall, the Chief of Staff before Pearl Harbor, knew that Mr. Roosevelt was engaging illegally in war against Germany and was consistently betraying this country's neutrality. When the Germans refused to accept these provocations to war, Mr. Roosevelt sought to get into the conflict by way of the Pacific and refused to make any terms with the Japanese that they could accept.

The short-run consequence was Pearl Harbor and the long-run consequences were the conquest of China and half of Europe by the Reds and the present war in Korea.

General Marshall's professed inability to recall where he was and what he was doing on the night of December 6, 1941, the most important night of his life, is an old story and so, too, is his failure on the morning of the 7th to alert his garrison in Hawaii. Mr. JENNER rightly called attention to these grave derelictions.

All through this period General Marshall was close to Mr. Roosevelt and went along with important conferences, and went along with his program of betraying the confidence of Congress and the American people. Mr. Roosevelt surrounded himself with Communists like Hiss and gave Russia priority over our own forces in the distribution of supplies at the cost of thousands of American lives. George Marshall attended all the conferences at which Russia got a free hand in Asia and eastern Europe. There is no record that he ever protested. His man, General Deane, in Russia reported again and again on Russia's true attitude but General Marshall took no warning.

His mission to China after the war was a ghastly failure in plan and execution. His Marshall plan originally contemplated enormous gifts to Russia as well as the western countries. When Russia refused to participate, the plan was proclaimed as the certain means of placing western Europe in a position to defend itself against Russia. It has not done so. The plan was supposed to operate until 1952; now its indefinite extension is assumed by the very people who are denouncing Mr. JENNER for daring to say that General Marshall isn't much of a statesman.

Mr. JENNER's speech is one of the few that have been made in this Congress that are likely to be read in years to come. Naturally it has been resented by those of his colleagues in the Senate who were themselves parties to the betrayal of the American people by the regime in which the general occupied a key position. Naturally, too, the speech is resented by the editors and radio commentators who were in the conspiracy against America and helped spread the New Deal's falsehoods.

Mr. JENNER need not worry about the attacks on him. The Korean war is itself proof that he is right, for the New Deal promised peace as the fruit of the last war and the promise was false. The American people know now that they were betrayed. They will be grateful to Mr. JENNER for his part in presenting the evidence.

Excess-Profits Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I voted to impose without delay a tax on the wartime profits of corporations.

The purpose of this so-called excess-profits tax, as I see it, is primarily to help raise funds to defray the expenses of our present "little war" in Korea, and all the other "little wars" presumed to be on Stalin's timetable.

But a second, and almost equally important purpose of the excess-profits tax, in this war as in those preceding it, is to drain off from corporate treasuries virtually all of those profits which may be excessive, by reason of the favored position of corporations as war contractors.

In other words, the excess-profits tax is one of the mechanisms used by the Government, both to raise war funds and to make sure that no corporate entity in control of a part of the means of production shall use that control to profit excessively from the desperate necessity for haste in getting a tremendous output of war materials and equipment.

As we all know, war contracts usually are made hastily and in large volume. Contract terms are generous, in order to expedite war production. Furthermore, no war contractor is going to shave prices on a "quickie" contract when wartime inflation so easily can make price shaving disastrous for all concerned. The excess-profits tax simply acts as a curb, as well as a source of Government income.

Now I did not think a few days ago, and I do not think now, that present proposals as to technical details of the excess-profits tax measure are satisfactory. Far from it. Drastic changes will be necessary. I did think, however, and still remain convinced that it was desirable to serve quick notice to the American people, and to American soldiers in Korea, that nobody at home shall be permitted to escape a fair share of the war burden. Profiteering is o-u-t, out.

So far as the faulty details of present excess-profits-tax proposals are concerned, it was my opinion that Congress should first get the tax into effect and then proceed to iron out the faults. Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the moral effect, upon the general public and the armed forces alike, of early imposition of this tax. American soldiers, and the American people, as well as American industry, will exert their best efforts only when they know, beyond question, that favoritism is dead.

But Congress, as a whole, decided that imposition of the excess-profits tax shall be preceded by public hearings and study by the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee. With this decision I shall not quarrel, because it was agreed that the tax shall be made retroactive, either to June 24, when the war started,

or to October 1, covering the last quarter of the calendar year. Thus forewarned, industry may be expected to set up the necessary tax reserves.

Nevertheless, as I said a moment ago, drastic changes in the present excess-tax proposals will be necessary. As they are now made they would lay the major portion of the burden on the shoulders of those least able to pay; the small corporations, whose profits out of subcontracts usually are small compared with those of the big prime contractors.

At the same time this very misapplication of the excess-profits tax not only would let the big corporations escape the heaviest part of the burden, while the medium-sized and small corporations would not, but the tax yield itself would be small. It should be borne in mind that we must make this war, and others to come, pay-as-you-go wars, so far as that may be possible. The tremendous proportions of our $264,000,000,000 national debt, the onset of wartime inflation, the necessity of preserving national solvency demand it.

I shall not attempt here to discuss at length the reasons why the present excess-tax proposals must be revised; even though such revision might take the form of amendments after the tax is imposed. It is preferable, I believe, to quote the words of Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and a tax expert second to none in America.

"It simply cannot be done," said the Georgia Senator. "It is impossible to impose on the structure of the Excess Profits Tax Act of World War II a new excess-profits tax act, when conditions are not only different but when they actually are completely opposite to the conditions which existed when we formulated the Excess Profits Act for World War II.

"The difficulty about an excess-profits tax," Senator GEORGE went on to explain, "is this: A tax of the kind which is no more than the changing of a base period, with an attempt to fit it into an act which was passed at the beginning of World War II, is wholly inapplicable, because none of the relief provisions will grant the relief actually needed, and the average credit formulas will not properly apply."

Without relief provisions in an excess-profits-tax law, the result is one of the most harmful forms of taxation that possibly could be devised, the Senator concluded.

He meant, of course, that without proper safeguards, to assure equitable application of the tax, it could happen, and probably would, that companies producing the most vitally needed war supplies, would be taxed out of existence at a critical moment, when lack of such supplies might bring disaster at sea, in the air, or on the battlefields.

Furthermore, failure to provide proper tax relief in hardship cases, and inequitable application of credit formulas, would be bound to encourage wasteful spending and inefficiency on the part of war contractors. Especially would this be so in the case of medium and small companies, which did not prosper after World War II, and whose postwar earnings base period would show returns so low as to make their new wartime excess-profits taxes excessively high.

Wastefulness and inefficiency on the part of war contractors, whose motive for economy and efficiency would be destroyed by excessive wartime taxes, could not do otherwise than add to the wartime inflation, which already is upon us. As a matter of cold fact, it should be said that because of the resultant tendency toward wastefulness, excess-profits taxes are deflationary only insofar and no further, than they provide the Government with money it otherwise would have to borrow. The inflationary effect probably is the greatest.

Possibly the effort of those weighed with the responsibility for making the excess-profits-tax law equitable, and at the same time high in tax yield, should be to keep the tax rate at levels not so high as to encourage wasteful practices. The latter would serve only to reduce tax income, while adding to inflation.

I say this at the risk, perhaps, of an accusation that I harbor a too tender regard for the interests of big business. But I speak, also, in the knowledge that there are other, and better, methods of reaching those excess profits. Methods that are better because they adhere more closely to the rules of fairness; methods that operate to make those pay most, who benefit most from war-created industrial prosperity.

One of those methods consists of a straight, across-the-board boost in corporation taxes. This, perhaps, is the least important of the various methods, so far as Government income is concerned. But it is fair to everyone concerned, because it is a tax paid strictly in proportion to present earnings, with no reference at all to what earnings may have been in some former period of years. All corporate taxpayers are on an even basis, with favoritism out of the window.

It appears to me that Congress has done a good job with respect to this form of taxation. The bill provides for a yearly increase of about $1,500,000,000 in corporate taxes, as distinguished from excess-profits levies. The bill would increase individual income taxes by about $2,750,000,000 annually. When it is considered that all corporate incomes this year will total only about $30,000,000,000, compared with a national income of something more than $220,000,000,000, it would seem that Congress has leaned over backward to protect wage earners and other individual income-tax payers.

The only danger here, as in respect to excess-profits taxes, is that the rate may prove to be so high that postwar industry may lack reserves wherewith to maintain employment and seek new markets, when war production ceases.

Another method for getting at those excess profits, and by far the most important and effective, is through what is called contract renegotiation. You may recall that this method was used during and immediately after World War II. It returned to the United States Treasury billions of dollars that otherwise would have been added to the cost of that war.

In substance, contract renegotiation is a mechanism whereby the Government keeps watch on the actual costs of war production in the various plants; and then, in the light of those costs, the Government proceeds to reprice everything it buys from the war contractors. In most instances, prices are revised downward, and substantially so. In a few isolated instances, prices are revised upward, when some unforeseen production difficulty, or increase in the cost of raw materials, makes it necessary in order to maintain satisfactory output of war goods.

Under all circumstances, by means of price renegotiation, prices and costs are so geared to one another, that war materials, munitions, and equipment are obtained at the lowest possible prices, which at the same time give the war contractors enough money to stay in business and continue production efficiently. At the same time, by this renegotiation method, public policy can be served insofar as it concerns leaving the war contractors funds wherewith in postwar years they may rehabilitate their plants, seek new markets and in general, maintain high levels of employment.

In the last war, contract renegotiation was conducted under the direction of Joseph M. Dodge, president of the Detroit Bank, and if any man ever deserved the gratitude of the taxpayers, who comprise all of the people, it is this Michigan banker and businessman.

On the basis of the considerations I have outlined for you, it would seem that Congress should act quickly to impose an excess-profits tax; but at the same time, that tax should be kept down to levels that will serve only to drain off such excessive profits as may redound, by reason of the war, to all corporations, whether or not they are engaged in war production. With equal expedition, provision should be made for setting up a contract renegotiation board; and this method should be used to recover all funds paid out by the Government, which may constitute war production profits in excess of such normal rates as public policy dictates.

If these things are done, I believe it will be possible to distribute the war-cost burden fairly and honestly among the various elements—wage earners, corporations, stockholders, and those who may fall into none of these categories. These things must be done, because every day it becomes more evident that a series of little wars is bound to explode eventually into world war III.

The Three Keys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege in 1947 to view the Ameri-

can GI's in Trieste under the command of Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore and I shall always remember how thrilled I was over their smart appearance and obvious discipline.

More recently General Moore, whose military record is so brilliant, has taken over the superintendency of the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. Last Sunday I was pleased to note in the supplement of the New York Herald Tribune a featured article, The Three Keys, by General Moore, in which he points to the three-word motto of the Academy, "Duty, Honor, Country," as a guide to both soldier and citizen in this time of crisis. The article follows:

THE THREE KEYS

(By Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore)

In these days, every school—including West Point—has a double duty. One is to train the minds of its students; the other is to help form their character. As knowledge expands that becomes a difficult task. The sheer effort of mastering many complicated subjects tends to crowd out everything else.

That is why we are grateful for the coat of arms of the Military Academy. The motto emblazoned on the scroll consists of three words: Duty, Honor, Country. These are the three keys of character, and for the West Pointer they are an everlasting reminder of the other side of education, a reminder that, in life, a man without character, however clever, is nothing.

Duty, Honor, Country. These are simple, elemental words. They need no interpretation.

Duty goes further than mere obedience to orders. It implies willingness, loyal execution, and the sacrifice of personal interest, if necessary.

Country means more than display of patriotic sentiment. It calls for devotion, whether in the tedium of unspectacular service or the mortal struggle of the battlefield.

Honor is the central and highest word on the scroll. It is the keystone of the arch; for without it, all principles, ideals, and beliefs will surely fail.

This trinity of principle is the heritage of the American people. West Point received it from the founders of the Republic—Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Monroe—who were also the founders of the Academy. It has been tried in the fire of experience and found equal to the test. It guided West Pointers in war and peace for a century and a half. Grant found in it the key to victory, and Lee the strength to turn bitter defeat to the service of a reunited country. Pershing, Eisenhower, and MacArthur drew their power from it.

Duty, Honor, Country. Here are three words to guide both soldier and citizen in these troubled times. They are words to live by.

Have We Licked Foot and Mouth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Have We Licked Foot and Mouth?" written by Paul Friggens and published in the October 1950 issue of the Farm Journal. The article refers to the aftosa or foot-and-mouth-disease-eradication program which the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Animal Industry, has conducted. They have done a splendid job in Mexico. I believe the article gives much good information to all who read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE WE LICKED FOOT AND MOUTH?

(By Paul Friggens)

MEXICO CITY.—The greatest experiment in livestock history is winding up in Mexico. But don't let anyone tell you that we're all through fighting the dread foot-and-mouth plague—aftosa, as the Mexicans call it.

United States and Mexican forces have performed four vaccinations on every pig, goat, sheep, and cow they could find between quarantine lines in Mexico—60,000,000 vaccinations.

We would have trouble vaccinating again. The Mexicans might not take it.

Science has done everything it knows how to do. We've got to stop now, sit tight, and wait for 8 months or a year—at least—to see if the gigantic vaccination experiment worked.

On August 1 we shut down mass vaccination, began pulling out our crews. We're leaving behind a rear guard of 1,500 Mexican and American inspectors, under orders to "find aftosa and destroy it." We're maintaining an 800-mile northern quarantine line, manned by Mexican soldiers.

The United States must stick in Mexico for another year—maybe two—before we can say we're out of the woods with aftosa, and the $10,000,000,000 United States livestock industry is no longer threatened.

"This is the most critical period of all," Gen. Harry H. Johnson, American codirector, told me.

"We believe aftosa still exists in Mexico. We're doing everything we can to find it. I'd like to assure livestock growers that this campaign is a success. But whether it is, it's too early to say."

Señor Oscar Flores, Mexican codirector, says flatly: "Aftosa is 95 percent licked."

Around aftosa headquarters in Mexico City and out in the field, though, the attitude is a cautious "wait and see." And there are good reasons.

"Vaccination never was totally effective," stresses General Johnson. "At best, it was only an aid—good for only 4 months. It's no good against a hot or massive infection."

By November 1—4 months after the last vaccination—probably 17,000,000 animals will be susceptible to aftosa again in Mexico. If there are small, sporadic outbreaks, the United States and Mexican forces are ready to move in fast. But if aftosa ever flares out of control again as it did before—then we're unquestionably through in Mexico.

We will have tried slaughter, and killed 1,000,000 animals.

We will have tried the world's greatest vaccination experiment.

Not a single outbreak has been reported this year. "On the other hand, aftosa is tricky," says Dr. L. R. Noyes, assistant director. "We don't know how long it will remain on the premises under ideal conditions. And we don't know how long animals remain carriers."

Meanwhile, General Johnson is cutting his 6,000-man crew in half. At the peak, aftosa cost us about $2,500,000 per month; we vaccinated 24,664 animals per hour, 8 hours a day, 6 days a week.

Vaccinators forded wild rivers, hugged dangerous mountain trails, dodged bullets and bandits, battled disease, and isolation.

"Gringo" (American) haters spread the story that vaccination produced sterility, poisoned the milk. In Guerrero State, only 500,000 animals were produced on first vaccination. But confidence grew later. About 1,200,000 animals were brought in for the second vaccination; 1,668,000 for the third.

On the Guatemalan border, vaccinators traveled by cayouca—a hollowed-out mahogany log; hauled their horses across swift streams in these same boats.

Communists kept up bitter attacks. Late this summer a Communist rally threatened to attack the United States Embassy in Mexico City. The Communists want us to fail.

But the worst difficulties were physical. Vaccinators stood waist-deep in malarial swamps in southern Mexico. There were no fences. You caught the cattle right in the water.

To keep vaccine effective, it had to be brought in ice from Mexico City laboratories, often hundreds of miles into the back country. Vaccinators used boats, pack trains, airplanes—sometimes hacking out their own airstrips. Vaccine often was stored in deep holes.

Steamed up by the fiery General Johnson, who turned a rout into a full-scale offensive (he was likely to show up anywhere in the field before breakfast), aftosa fighters somehow did the job.

What's more, costs dropped from $16 per shot to 35 cents. Today the general is cutting all costs below $1,000,000 a month. Total cost of the campaign so far is about $150,000,000.

As the vaccinators carried on then, so the inspectors carry on today.

They camp out in pairs—a Mexican and an American—and make joint reports, inspecting every ranch every 30 days.

Often the inspector has to climb through the window of a thatched hut to find a sick pig under the bed, or hidden down the well.

Mexican livestock suffers from every other disease from anthrax to hog cholera, and all must be reported fast. With the livestock industry of Mexico and the United States still at stake, inspectors can't take a chance. It might be aftosa.

As long as there's a single case, we still have a job in Mexico. Vaccination has ended. Now we're depending on inspection—and hope.

International Law Is Ignored by Victorious Occupation Forces, This Is a Deterrent to a Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our conduct as a victorious power in World War II and as one of the occupying forces now stationed in former enemy lands, is open to serious question. It appears that we have openly been a party to flaunting well-established international rules of law as set up by the Hague Convention. There is a good deal of propaganda in circulation today by those who contend that peace can come only by a world government based upon law. Yet these groups and officials in our Government have seen fit to ignore

a great body of international law which has accumulated over the centuries.

Since the termination of active hostilities in Europe and in the Far East, Congress has been requested by the President to furnish appropriations so that we can maintain a semblance of compliance to the Hague Convention which obligates this country as a military occupant to prevent disease and unrest and to restore and maintain proper order and normal living conditions in the occupied areas. This is in essence, Mr. Speaker, a provision under said convention. Now what do we find in actual practice?

Soviet dictators, the Polish puppet government, the British and the French occupation forces were declaring that the Hague Convention rules were not applicable to the victors. No doubt in order to justify the looting of conquered territory, the destruction of competition, the retention of prisoners of war as slave labor, the uprooting of people from their homes resulting in a further burden on the economy of the defeated nations. Even the executive branch of this Government, while insisting upon the sanctity of the Hague Treaty before this body and while engaged at Nuremberg in expressing righteous indignation because the vanquished had violated the Hague Convention concerning military obligations, was conniving with other victors to impose a Morgenthau plan to dismantle the private plants in our occupied areas and actually giving these war plants to Stalin without compensation to the rightful owners, and otherwise carrying out an occupation in the United States zone which was as illegal under the Hague Convention as the acts of many convicted war criminals.

Mr. Speaker, many of those lawyers who participated in this dishonorable act and who had some qualms of conscience endeavored later to find legal justification for it. Numerous grounds were suggested but now that another conflict which again involves the occupation of many European countries appears imminent, a justice of one of the few neutral countries of World War II expresses a fear of the precedent that we have established. Justice Algot Bagge, Swedish member of the Permanent Court for National Arbitration, in a Danish periodical discusses and gently annihilates the many reasons presented to justify this double-dealing. He then observes that the Hague Convention represents an interpretation which had its origin in a more civilized period, free from hysteria, and we should try to do something to preserve what there is still left of it.

Mr. Speaker, since the question will eventually involve appropriations of money for occupation purposes since observation of international law is the surest way to achieve peace in the world; since the Hague Convention has been accepted by this country as a treaty; since we must eventually make a peace treaty with Germany and Japan; and since there will be further military occupations in which this country will participate; let us pray, only as the occupiers. I present a partial translation of Justice Bagge's article which probably represents the views of the thinking people in western Europe today. It follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL LEGAL STATUS OF THE BIG POWERS IN GERMANY

(By Dr. Algot Bagge)

The 15 prominent lawyers who have been commissioned by the United Nations to ascertain what international law is still in force and also to patch up the wreck of the international law which has remained after the World War have not had an easy task. To ascertain in what form international conventions exist which are still regarded as binding and to interpret their substance, may sometimes present great difficulties, but to prove that there is orthodox law within international law puts the legal opinion and objectivity of the 15 lawyers to a still harder test. International law is just like a chameleon; it changes its aspect according to those who have the power in the world. To be sure, the small nations may be able to claim that a change in the present international law on the part of one of the big powers in unacceptable, but in the course of time one nation after another will find itself outside of the community of the big powers and forced to adjust itself even from a legal point of view to the new state of affairs, and thereby to recognize de facto the new order in international law which is tied up with it.

Such a case of theoretical interest and practical significance is the question of the international legal status of the Four Big Powers with respect to occupied Germany.

The beginning of the year 1943 already subsequent to the conference at Casablanca, marked the emergence of the proposition from the Anglo-Saxon quarter to unconditional surrender as an objective of war. Very likely it was attempted in this manner to avoid the difficulties and charges of breach of promise which Wilson's 14 points had caused during the previous World War.

When shortly thereafter at Yalta, in February 1945, the United States of America, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia agreed on the treatment to be meted out to Germany after victory, that point of the program came in handy. It was inconceivable to achieve a change of the German entity of such sweeping proportions as was planned there without an unconditional surrender.

But, as Prof. Andre Gros says in his article, a Condition Juridique de l'Allemagne (the Legal Status of Germany) in the Revue Générale du Droit International Public (1946, p. 76), such a situation, which is comparable to the Roman "deditio", by which the defeated nation by agreement surrenders to the good will of the victor who thereafter has all rights over persons and property, is no longer recognized under international law.

It is therefore natural that the legal profession in the Allied Big Powers has shown an interest in how the Yalta program might be brought into harmony with currently valid international law. The greatest obstacle in this regard is considered to be the War on Land Laws of 1907 (hereafter called Hague Convention).

A comparison between the program of the Four Allied Big Powers for the treatment of Germany and the regulations of the Hague Convention is, therefore, of interest.

An unconditional surrender of the various German military forces took place in May 1945. The surrender was, however, only a military surrender, signed by authority of the German High Command. With Doenitz, whom Hitler had selected as his successor, the Allies wanted to have nothing to do; he would not under any circumstances pronounce himself in favor of this military surrender. The documents of surrender contained no mention of Germany's status after this military surrender.

On June 5, 1945, the Berlin declaration was promulgated, signed by the Supreme Commanders of the Big Four Powers, acting by authority of their respective Governments. It was stated therein that these governments were assuming the supreme authority with respect to Germany, including all the powers possessed by the German Government and any local government or authority.

In September 1945 a series of proclamations, laws, orders, directives, and instructions began to be issued by the control council regarding the implementation of the resolutions of the Potsdam Conference bearing at length upon the question concerning personal integrity and private property of the German people:

The regulations of the Hague Convention should then be compared therewith. Under section I of the Convention is treated the belligerents; under section II, the hostilities; and under section III, the military authority on enemy alien territory.

Under the provisions concerning hostilities are taken up the subjects of surrenders and armistice, to be followed by the provisions for military authority on enemy alien territory. In accordance with the last-mentioned stipulations, an area is regarded as occupied when it finds itself under the authority of the enemy army. Inasmuch as the authority of legitimate power (l'autorité du pouvoir légal) passes over de facto to the occupant, he shall take all necessary steps to assure general order and security and at the same time, unless it is absolutely infeasible, respect the laws which are in force in the country. Family honor and rights, as well as the life of the individual, shall be respected. Private property shall be respected. It shall not be seized. Looting is prohibited. If the occupant imposes taxes or other contributions he shall, as far as possible, follow the current tax legislation of the country. He shall also pay the expenses of the administration of the territory. Other financial contributions are to be levied by the occupant only in an amount sufficient to provide for the needs of the troops and administrative expenses [connected therewith]. Receipts shall be rendered for contributions imposed. Requisitions in kind shall be made only to an extent sufficient to provide for the needs of the occupation troops. So far as possible, payment shall be made on demand or as quickly as possible. The occupying army may seize all movable property of a state which may be used for military operations. War needs, such as munitions stores, means of transportation, reserve stockpiles of any kind, although privately owned, shall be seized, but returned and compensation paid when peace is made. The occupying states must not regard themselves other than as administrators and utilizers of public buildings, real estate, wood- and farm-land facilities, under the ownership of the enemy state and located within the occupied country. Property which is used for religious purposes, care of the needy, education, and scientific pursuits shall also be treated as property under private ownership in the respective state.

In accordance with the contemporary international legal postliminium theory, the previous legal status obtains again after a belligerent occupation is ended. The former government resumes the administration. Real and personal property, etc., must be returned to the owners if the occupant has taken steps to which he was not entitled under international law, the postliminium invalidity of those unlawful measures becomes evident (Oppenheim, International Law, 1944, vol. II, pp. 487 ff.).

There has been no doubt on the part of the Allied Big Four Powers that the agreement with regard to the treatment of Germany (disarmament, political reorganization, reeducation, population transfers, reparations

to be taken out of personal property, etc.), far exceeds what under the Hague Convention is accepted as belligerent occupation. At the same time there is unanimous agreement that the occupying Big Powers continue to be bound by the Hague Convention.

It has consequently been of vital importance to demonstrate that the Hague Convention is not applicable to the situation at hand.

Justice Bagge then discusses the suggestion, made in 1945, before the American Society of International Law by a representative of the Department of Justice, to avoid the Hague Convention obligations and legally justify the Morgenthau plan. This suggestion was that the victors end the war by a declaration of unconditional surrender or merely a declaration of termination of war, and avoid the customary treaty of peace. Then, it was concluded, the Allies would be able to do what they wished, unhampered by international law. Bagge observes that the only recognized unilateral declaration which can end a state of war is a declaration of annexation.

Bagge also comments upon the view of the former German jurist, Prof. Hans Kelsen—another protagonist of the Morgenthau plan—that Germany ceased to exist after the "unconditional surrender," so the war ended and the Allies were no longer governed by the Hague Convention and its laws concerning wartime occupation. Bagge cites subsequent British and American judicial decisions which hold that the war continues and that Germany continues to exist as a nation.

There are, meanwhile, other circumstances which may give rise to doubt whether, although the state of war continues to exist between Germany and the Allies, we are dealing here with a belligerent occupation.

The Control Council and its dependencies is undoubtedly a military government. According to the United States Department of State Bulletin of May 13, 1946, the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, had stated that "the Four Allied Big Powers Military (High) Command has worked out a joint program to impose a stern military government" over Germany in order to carry into effect the policy agreed upon at Yalta. It can hardly be interpreted otherwise than that Germany is under the authority of the enemy army (Hague Convention, art. 42).

But it is obvious that at least certain stipulations in the Hague Convention have reference only to the event that the opponents of the occupying power still have an active army or, to say the least, have allies who carry on hostile operations of a military nature. In this respect article 44 prohibits a belligerent from compelling the population within the occupied territory to supply information concerning the army of the other belligerent, or to take part in military operations against their country (art. 52).

It would, however, be premature to draw from this the conclusion that the Hague Convention in its entirety bears upon a situation where hostile operations of a military nature continue to be carried on. The individual stipulations intended for such a situation need not imply that the same holds true of other stipulations in the convention which also fit a situation where similar operations no longer occur.

The following discussion confirms the assumption that the Hague Convention is to be regarded applicable even under an occupation which continues after an armistice pact is concluded and thus hostile operations of a military nature have ceased, but the state of war continues to prevail. See Feilchenfeld, the International Economic Law of Belligerent Occupation, Washington, 1942, paragraph 396, where he says: "An armistice presupposes that the war has not yet come to an end. Admittedly, the rules of international law, including the Hague regulations on occupants, continue to apply so far as they are not superseded by provisions contained in the armistice agreement."

The Swedish jurist then raises the question whether, by an armistice agreement, a more harsh treatment may be imposed on the occupied country than that permitted under the Hague Convention.

It will, in any event, have been brought out that the aim which the victorious power under international law has a right to pursue for its own ends by "belligerent occupation," must be differentiated from the goal which the victorious power wants to attain by a war. War objectives may be the destruction of the military and economic power of the vanquished for all time, the usurpation of portions of the territory of the defeated state and economic resources, as well as the imposition of reparations. Such aims may not, under presently enforced international law, be pursued for selfish ends through the actual power which an occupation implies. These aims are designed to stablize the relationship between the victor and the vanquished if they are not in conformity with the transitional nature of the occupation. It has been rightfully said that the guiding principle is that the occupation power must not undertake anything which is calculated to become a permanent condition. (See Castberg, Postliminium, 1944, p. 13.)

If, therefore, the occupation extends beyond the time limit set for the cessation of military operations, under international law this does not imply any increase in the powers of the occupant other than as motivated by the extension of the duration of the occupation.

It is therefore inconceivable that it is the intention of the stipulation of article 39 of the Hague Convention, on the possibility that by the armistice pact the relations of the population toward the occupant power be regulated, to make possible a defeat of the principles which are subsequently laid down in articles 42 to 50 of the Convention.

Should, however, the four allied big powers be regarded, under international law, to have overthrown the protective system of the Hague Convention by an armistice pact, there may be a question whether it is only a formality to be disregarded, inasmuch as the four Allies have taken the matter in their own hands and unilaterally declared the Hague Convention in its entirety null and void.

It should not be long, as soon as the military opposition is beaten down—which may occur immediately or under continuing belligerent occupation—before an unconditional surrender may [lawfully?] permit a unilateral complete setting aside of the protective regulations of the Hague Convention.

Justice Bagge points out that the Hague regulations require that the status of the population with regard to the occupant be regulated by armistice agreement, and not by a unilateral declaration of the victor. He observes, also, that the Berlin declaration states that Germany has no central government to carry on such negotiations, but he does not believe that this should effect the protection to which the German people are legally entitled, since the Allies would neither recognize Doenitz as Hitler's successor, not permit a government to function.

Justice Bagge then discusses the view proposed by a British professor, R. Y. Jennings, that Germany is in a new kind of legal status, between the final victory and the termination of war, in which the German people have lost their sovereignty and cannot recreate it. To refute this argument he quotes the British Attorney General, Sir Hartley Shawcross, that England "is now in belligerent occupation of Germany, with the army of occupation in control."

Even though, nevertheless, the Hague Convention should not be regarded as applicable in this connection, it is necessary that in addition to the negative presumption that the Hague Convention is not applicable, the unlimited power which the Allies exercise in Germany be recognized under international law and also, that a positive legal basis for that power can be proved.

The legal basis cited by the Berlin Declaration to establish the facts as they had been created was the unconditional surrender in conjunction with the absence of a German Government and the declaration of the Allies to assume the supreme power.

Professor Jennings has developed this point of view in greater detail in his article (British Year Book, 1946, p. 136). He stresses, and rightly so, that the legal basis for the Berlin Declarations cannot be effected merely by proving the inapplicability of the Hague Convention. Assumption of "the supreme authority" must be supported "by a demonstration of positive title."

Such a "demonstration" has been attempted by Kelsen in his article on "The international legal status of Germany according to the declaration of Berlin" (op. cit., pp. 519 ff.).

Justice Bagge observes that Professor Kelsen upholds the view that the Berlin Declaration resulted in the Control Council's assumption of sovereignty over Germany without annexation thereof, which has not hitherto been considered legally possible. Kelsen bases this theory on the premise that the German state has ceased to exist—a premise which the British Government, including its courts, have since denied. Bagge cites the Modern Law Review, 1947, page 407, for a further discussion:

Judging from the extremely far-reaching powers which have been vested in the Control Council, the Four Allied Big Powers must in any case regard themselves as having acquired, under international law, the right to exercise the still existing sovereign legal powers of the German state.

The Allies, however, count on exercising neither the powers which Hitler had usurped—all meddling in this regard has been expressly forbidden—now their predecessor's constitutional competence under which the German subjects were protected against intervention of the state in an entirely different way than under the present Allied Military Government. The Allies might do well to refrain from interfering with the unlimited right of the German people to exercise the sovereignty which resides in the German state. No cession of this right through representatives of the German people has as yet taken place. The unconditional surrender was an act pronounced against the military only and to be carried into effect by them.

This unilaterally assumed sovereignty is exercised by the Four Allied Big Powers jointly through the Control Council. Inasmuch as the German state continues to exist, there is still a state of war between it and the Allies, in spite of the fact that Germany is

governed by the Allied Power and authority (competence). In this respect there is no lack of agreement with the certificate of the foreign office.

Professor Andre Gros, who in his article in the Revue General de Droit International Public (op. cit., pp. 67 ff.) rejects the Kelsen theory on the establishment of sovereignty of the four occupying powers, leaning most closely to the idea that the four governments might assume a provisional trusteeship of the German territory in the interest of world security and for the purpose indicated in the Preamble to the Berlin Declaration of June 5, 1945. An interpretation of this Declaration, which is noteworthy because of the choice of language, should, Gros says, prevent one from concluding there is a sovereignty of the occupying power over the German territory. Professor Gros holds that the Allied governments' unilateral decision has been made possible exclusively on the ground that the organ of the German state has disappeared. Therefore, no general or particular convention on law in warfare binds the Allies with respect to Germany.

Jennings says finally that although the true meaning of "subjugation" is conquest together with annexation of the enemy state, the same legal principles apply to conquest in unison with the assumption of the powers of the enemy government, "always provided the former enemy government has ceased to exist."

This theory, which concerning its application specifically provides that "the former enemy government has ceased to exist," leads first of all to the question as to the various instances in which such a government has ceased to exist. It is not clear that it ceases if the government is exiled. Nor if all of the members of the government die, or the government mandate is terminated for some other reason. If there is evidence of the continued presence of the head of the state who is able to appoint a new government, that ought to be ample grounds for existence. In the event that the head of the state is a president, whose term of office runs out, but a new president may be elected under the constitution, that ought to be ground enough; provided that the occupation does not place insurmountable obstacles in the way of a new election. But if the occupying power intentionally prevents such an election, is that sufficient reason for not creating a government competent to be given a legal title to power. The Hague Convention prescribes that the laws of the occupied country shall be applied unless this is absolutely infeasible. No exception is made in the case of a constitutional state. One can go still further and hold that the Hague Convention gives the occupied people a right to create a new constitution and with it a new government if it is practicable to do so under an occupation. There is also a question as to whether the Allies, due to the fact that they had not wanted to accept, without extensive negotiations and for other obvious reasons, the provisional successor chosen by Germany's former unreservedly recognized head of state, could claim a legal title based on the excuse that the German Government "had ceased to exist."

Jennings solves this question by saying that the German Government has been extinguished by its authority having been transferred to the conqueror and that the right for their taking this step is the reason for the conqueror's right to annex Germany—although he has declared that he will never make use of this right.

Jennings' interpretation, that the party justified in annexing—the German state—is also justified, without in this manner stepping in as soverign, in assuming to exercise all soverign rights, is contrary to classical international law. There are a good many reasons which may be mentioned with regard to this particular stand toward the problem. As a rule, a sovereign governs his people in the interest of their welfare, unless he is a dictator who has no consideration for the people's welfare. The same reason namely, interest in the people's welfare, does not apply in the case of a transitional occupant. There is, therefore, no inducement for such a transitional government to protect the people's rights under international law. It is likely that these considerations are not alien to the Hague Convention nor to the interpretation of classical international law with respect to its application.

"When does a government cease to exist?" asks Bagge.

Probably not when it is exiled, or if its members are deceased, or their mandate otherwise terminated, especially if there is existing provision for election or appointment of these officials. But suppose the occupying power prevents an election. He believes this itself is a violation of the Hague regulations. He also questions whether the Allies can claim a legal title based on this theory where they refused to accept Hitler's provisional successor. With respect to Professor Jennings' view—that since the Allies could end the government by annexing Germany, they had power to end the government without annexation—he observes that the reason why international law never accepted this theory is because the sovereign is assumed to govern in the interests of his people, but a transitional occupant has such interest in the welfare of the occupied peoples.

Finally it should be mentioned that the significance of the Hague Convention would not be lessened by obliging the occupying states to approve, in a peace treaty, the measures which had been taken contrary to its terms. If without the protective terms contained in the Hague Convention having been notified by an armistice pact and the regulations of the convention should continue to be regarded as applicable, such a forced approval would likewise constitute a violation of the Hague Convention as being an act performed under the occupation in direct conflict with the Hague Convention. Otherwise the Hague Convention has been frustrated in a manner which cannot be regarded acceptable.

Professor Jennings, who so brilliantly defended the formal right of the Four Allied Big Powers to assume "the supreme authority," has at length found, it seems, that this new development—Mr. Bevin answered on March 20, 1946, a question from the floor in the lower House, "The positions of the Allied Control Council and that of Germany are without precedent" (Hansard, vol. 420, p. 1856)—calls for sanctions based on international moral standards. He says (p. 139) that when a state wages an aggressive war contrary to the most solemn covenants, it would be an anachronism of most damaging kind to observe the normal laws for military occupation. But, Jennings says, the aim of the occupation must be "effective control and reeducation of a recalcitrant member of the community of nations at large" and not "the individual benefit or aggrandizement of the occupying powers."

Even if this were now the case with the procedure in Germany—it is, after all, extremely difficult to cultivate such an aim especially with regard to what is revealed in the eternal quandry of the occupant in the matter of German property and German territory. There is reason for doubt that the goal is at all times what Jennings demands it to be—the rules of international law are concerned with the power of a victor during the time of occupation to interfere with the vanquished people to their disadvantage, as a result of fears concerning this power. A future combination of victorious powers, of a composition other than the present, may find that another educational and political "reeducation" should take place in order to achieve harmony with their respective moral and political beliefs. I am inclined to think that experience has shown that a "community of nations at large," unanimously agreed on these questions, is an illusion—at least within the reasonably near future. Those grounds and the procedure based thereon should therefore not be incorporated into international law. More likely, I believe, the statements of Professor Kelsen in his article in the International Law Quarterly (1947, p. 171) would hold true: "If the principles which are applied in Nuremberg should become a precedent—a legislative rather than a judicial precedent—after the next war, the governments in the victorious states would pass judgment on crimes by the governments in the defeated nations which have a definitely unilateral and retroactive effect. "Let us hope," he says, "that there is no such precedent."

This may happen, however, since a considerable number of matters have been brought up for discussion in connection with the procedure of the Allied Four Big Powers in Germany, as seen from the point of view of meaningless conformity with hitherto valid international law. This procedure has been approved by a great number of nations which were enemies of Germany during the war and, as concerns the other nations, as I have indicated before, they have had to adapt themselves to the actual state of affairs, that is, they have had to give their de facto approval to this state of affairs.

A discussion such as this is, perhaps, not without practical signficance with respect to international law. It is obvious that the new developments in international law present a great hazard to the Hague Convention. The first thought of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence in taking up this problem has been to produce sufficient grounds for setting aside the Hague Convention. That this means retrogression in the wartime protection of the population under international law is also clear. And that is not merely a theoretical question. In the April 1946 volume of International Affairs, Sir John Leale, who led the inhabitants of occupied Guernsey against the German occupant, reports that the Hague Convention was of great help to him. He said: "To the man who states, 'Civilized nations pay homage to the Hague Convention, it is not easy to reply, 'Well, I won't, anyhow' and at the same time to maintain one's self-respect; and the Germans were very, very self-respecting." The circumstances were, on the other hand, terribly different in the case of the countries occupied by the Germans. But we must map out our campaign on the assumption that international law will become regarded as a valuable prop for the civilian population, also against an unscrupulous occupant. Otherwise we might as well give up altogether working for an international law in this area of warfare.

The totalitarian ideas, which have been introduced into the relationship between state and population during the past 10 years, has also facilitated an objectionably harsh treatment of the occupied people. The Hague Convention represents an interpretation which has its origin in a more civilized period, and we should try to do everything in our power to preserve what there is still left of it. At least, the states which it may be presumed will became the victims of a belligerent occupation have every reason to appreciate the merits of the protective terms of the Hague Convention.

If the Allies are satisfied that the reason for the exceptionally far-reaching powers of the military government in Germany, as

mentioned above, is that the "situation in German is anomalous" (see Fawcett, op. cit., p. 383) and the viewpoints of international law should be entirely pushed aside, one can possibly avoid regarding the procedure of the Allies there as a precedent under international law which may threaten the people in occupied countries in the future, and thereby succeed in salvaging the Hague Convention in the above sense as the treasure of international law which the 15 prominent lawyers have been commissioned to administer by 40 nations.

Can We Pick Statesmen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Can We Pick Statesmen?" published in the October 1950 issue of the Farm Journal. The editorial is an excellent one.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE PICK STATESMEN?

The votes farmers cast for Congress on November 7 deserved to be planned with as much care and thoughtfulness as next year's crops.

Your congressional district is one of 435 which will elect the House of Representatives. One-third of the States will elect United States Senators. Men from both parties are asking for your votes. You can choose only one.

What reasons will you be able to give to yourself, when you emerge from the election booth, for the decision you will then have made? How will you distinguish between the "mere politician" and the statesmen?

The bloody facts of Korea, and the long list of costly mistakes that led to Korea, have sharpened the public awareness that these are difficult days. More dangerous ones may lie ahead. Throughout the land today one hears the question: "Why do so many ordinary politicians occupy places of power, when the Nation needs statesmen of the highest order?"

The only answer, when good men or bad get into office, is that the people elected them. Those who didn't vote had as much to do with it as those who did.

The opportunity to make these choices is the most precious privilege of Americans. Congress is the great instrument of American freedom. As long as we can send to Congress enough men who are devoted to American ideals, freedom will have a chance to continue. Enough real statesmen in Congress can protect freedom from encroachment by other branches of government. They can be powerful influences toward sensible foreign policies.

No candidate ever speaks against freedom. But if his record or his promises indicate that he supports restrictive or overspending measures which are dangerous to freedom, he may deserve defeat.

One able senatorial candidate complained the other day that a "better tomorrow" was his opponent's campaign promise. "How can I be against that?" he asked. He can't, but he may easily be able to show what is better—what is best for the common welfare. Government cannot deliver a better tomorrow. Government is a useful servant, but a dangerous master. It should be allowed to attempt little more than to keep order at home, and to protect us against agression from outside.

Your candidate's ability to tell a merry story, or to remember faces, neither proves him to be good or bad material for Congress, and will not influence the intelligent voter who has at heart only his country's good. His promises to deliver government benefits to your community only mean that some other district's candidate is promising his people to tax you for their benefit.

The dictionary describes a statesman as "one who shows unusual wisdom in treating or directing great public affairs."

Will "unusual wisdom" determine your vote? Can it win elections? It does sometimes when people think—and think patriotically.

Now, as October comes, is the time to begin to decide your choice. Picking statesmen is no matter to decide by whim, nor to postpone until breakfast time November 7.

The One Hundred and Tenth Infantry Federalized for Fifth Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The One Hundred and Tenth Infantry Federalized for the Fifth Time," written by Capt. Robert H. Campbell, public information officer, One Hundred and Tenth Infantry, and published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of September 9, 1950. This organization is commanded by Col. Henry K. Fluck, of Somerset, Pa.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND TENTH INFANTRY FEDERALIZED FOR FIFTH TIME—ORGANIZED MILITIA OF STATE CREATED IN 1873, LOCAL UNITS EARLIER

(By Capt. Robert H. Campbell, public information officer, One Hundred and Tenth Infantry)

Local military history will repeat itself again this week end when several hundred men from Washington and Greene Counties depart with the famous One Hundred and Tenth Infantry Regiment for duty with the federalized Twenty-eighth Infantry Division at Camp Atterbury, Ind.

Today's call is the fifth to be answered by this historic regiment since organization as the Tenth Pennsylvania Infantry in the summer of 1873. Many of the towns and counties from which the Tenth came, however, have enjoyed the distinction of fine military organizations for more than a century and a half. Predecessors to Waynesburg's Company K, for example, have all available records which show the company participated in the Indian wars of 1795 under "Mad" Anthony Wayne.

Few military organizations have enjoyed the distinguished career of the Tenth Pennsylvania Infantry which was reorganized in 1917 as the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry. Always located in the southwestern section of the Keystone State, the regiment has called to its ranks the best of all classes of the sturdy people of this section. When mustered for the Spanish-American War, it had within its ranks some men who won their spurs in the Civil War; when called for duty on the Mexican border, it retained the services of men who had served in the Philippine Insurrection; when ordered out in 1917 for World War I, many veterans of the Mexican incident were among its members; when mustered for World War II, some of its top leaders recalled vividly the trench warfare of Meuse-Argonne, and today, the One Hundred and Tenth answers its fifth call with its membership composed of many veterans who apparently failed in the United States' effort to "win the peace" in 1945.

Great names have been associated with the regiment since its organzation. Col. John A. Black, Claysville, was the first commander of the Tenth Pennsylvania Infantry and held the post until 1878 when he resigned and was succeeded by Col. Alexander L. Hawkins.

The history of the Tenth's participation in the Spanish-American War is a history of Colonel Hawkins whose first service in the National Guard of Pennsylvania was with Company H in Washington. He was in command of this company when elevated to the command of his regiment. Colonel Hawkins also served in the Union Army in the Civil War, enlisting as a private in Company K, Fifteenth Pennsylvania Cavalry, while a student at Waynesburg College. He was in command of the Tenth Regiment during its service in the Philippines, and while on his way home died on board the U. S. transport *Senator*, in 1899.

Original organizational orders in part consolidated and designated the Light Guards of Monongahela, as Company A; Washington Blues of North Washington as Company E, and Washington Guards of Washington as Company H. The Waynesburg Blues were mustered into the National Guard and designated Company K of the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry.

On May 11–12, 1898, the Tenth Regiment was mustered into the United States service and directed to San Francisco, Calif., to become a part of General Merritt's command.

On June 14 of the same year, the regiment boarded the steamship *Zelandia* and sailed for Manila, stopping at Honolulu, arriving at the latter place the day after the Hawaiian Islands were annexed to the United States. There followed the battle of Malate, the fall of Manila, the Philippine Insurrection and the Malolos campaign in which the regiment participated gallantly.

In 1899, the regiment sailed for the United States and was mustered out of service on arrival in August of that year.

During its service, units of the Tenth Regiment from this area were commanded by Colonel Hawkins, regimental commander; Lt. Col. James E. Barnett, second in command; Capt. Harry B. Duncan, adjutant; Capt. Thomas S. Crago, Company K; Capt. Gustav Schaaf, Company A; Capt. Alonzo M. Porter, Company H. The old "Washington Blues" of North Washington had been disbanded prior to entering the Spanish-American War.

The regiment was organized in the early part of 1900 and Colonel Barnett was placed in command and served until 1907 when he resigned and was succeeded by Col. Richard Coulter, of Greensburg.

In June 1918, a condition of affairs had developed on the Mexican border that was regarded as acute and relations between the Government of the United States and the de facto Government of Mexico were severely strained. On June 18 of that year the Secretary of War, at the direction of the President, called out the National Guard of various States and subsequent orders directed the National Guard of Pennsylvania be mobilized at Mount Gretna.

On July 2, the regiment entrained for the Mexican border, arriving at El Paso, Tex. The presence of troops on the border had a quieting effect on the Mexicans and no trouble threatened after the arrival of the Tenth. On September 29, the regiment received orders to return to home stations.

The final call for the Tenth Pennsylvania Infantry Regiment was received on July 15, 1917, and the units were drafted for Federal service and World War I on August 5 of that year.

When the regiment departed for training at Camp Hancock, August, Ga., on September 7, it was commanded in part by Lieutenant Colonel Coulter, regimental commander; Maj. Edward Martin, Waynesburg, second battalion commander; Capt. Edward Hartland, Monongahela, Company A; Capt. John Aiken, Washington, Company H, and Capt. Walter Montgomery, Waynesburg, Company K.

Immediately on arrival at Camp Hancock, rumors were heard concerning the reorganization of the Pennsylvania division. On October 11, division orders were issued designating the Tenth Infantry as the One hundred and tenth Infantry Regiment. Col. George E. Kemp, of Philadelphia, former commander of the Old Third Pennsylvania Infantry, was made commander of the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry on reorganization.

The regiment left Camp Hancock April 24, 1918, after working strenuously for 7 months on new combat principles evolved by the European war and assimilating them with the American ideas of fighting learned in wars gone by. The regiment traveled to Camp Merritt, N. Y., and sailed May 3, landing at Liverpool, England.

The history of the regiment's participation in World War I requires a separate volume in itself. Among citations won by the famous One Hundred and Tenth were battle streamers for Champagne-Marne, Aisne-Marne, and the Meuse-Argonne. Great names associated with the regiment in World War I include Coulter, Martin, Tompkins, Aiken, Winship, Ham, Kinnison, King, all of whom served as regimental commander; Hartland, Gee, Chambers, Heslep, Culpepper, Reid, Company A; Aiken, Ferguson, Braden, Rowe, Bell, Seavey, and Scott, Company H; and Montgomery, Garrison, Taylor, Purman, Herbert, Meighen, Foudy, Hendler, Roat, Cummings, of Company K.

Following World War I, the famed One Hundred and Tenth Infantry Regiment became part of the army of occupation and spent from December 1918 to March 1919 in Briey near the Verdun front.

On March 17, 1919, the regiment started to leave for the Le-Mans area and sailed for the United States April 29. Regimental headquarters, first battalion, machine gun and supply companies and a part of Company E arrived in Philadelphia on May 11 and entrained for Camp Dix. The regiment was mustered out of Federal service on May 24.

Once again the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry reverted to the old Tenth Pennsylvania Infantry with Colonel Martin in command. On April 21, 1921, however, the Tenth was again redesignated the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry and has retained that identity to the present day.

In the postwar period after World War I the regiment had two commanders, Lt. Col. John Aiken, who relieved Colonel Martin who was assigned as commander of the Fifty-fifth Brigade, and Lt. Col. A. O. King, who succeeded Colonel Aiken in 1940, remaining in command until December of 1941.

On February 17, 1941, the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry received its fourth order to Federal service. Serving in command at that time were Major General Martin, Commanding General of the Twenty-eighth Division; Brig. Gen. John Aiken, commanding the Fifty-fifth Brigade; Colonel King, commanding the Regiment, and Lt. Col. Raymond E. Goodridge, commanding the First Battalion.

Regimental commanders during World War II were Colonel King, Lieutenant Colonel Goodridge, Lt. Col. L. M. Crumrine, Lt. Col. Norman P. Groff, Col. Benjamin C. Jones, Lt. Col. Thomas L. Hoban, Col. C. M. McQuarrie, Col. William May, Col. Theodore A. Seely, Col. Hurley E. Fuller, and Col. Daniel B. Strickler.

Following training in the United States, the regiment sailed for Europe and participated in many glorious battles, winning battle streamers at Normandy, northern France, Rhineland, Ardennes, and Central Europe.

The One Hundred and Tenth arrived in United States from duty in Europe on August 2, 1945. Colonel Strickler, commanding the regiment on its return to America, was greeted at the dock by Governor Martin, of Pennsylvania.

On October 25, 1945, the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry was inactivated to end the activities of a regiment which served the United States proudly, faithfully, and well through two world wars and which had kept alive the traditions of the Keystone Division by constant applications of its motto—"28, Roll On!"

The regiment was officially reorganized as a major unit of the Pennsylvania National Guard on June 17, 1946, through the aid of Governor Martin, General Strickler, General Hoban, Col. George H. Rumbaugh, and others.

On reorganization, headquarters was established in Washington, Company H was again assigned to Washington, Company A to Monongahela, Company K to Waynesburg, and Company G to Canonsburg.

Later Company G was moved to Altoona and the heavy-mortar company organized in Canonsburg.

This week end the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry Regiment, under the able guidance of Col. Henry K. Fluck, Somerset, who rose from private to colonel in 20 years and assumed command of the regiment in 1947, entrains to answer, its fifth call to Federal service. Officers will include Lt. Col. Edward S. Martin, Maj. Lawrence R. Stewart, Maj. John Aiken, Maj. Richard W. Siegrist; Capt. John J. Weinzette, Lt. John P. Liekar, Lt. Joseph Lynn, Lt. Harry W. Purviance, all staff officers, Capt. Armand DiVicenzo, commanding headquarters company; Capt. Robert L. Shaw, Company A; Capt. Robert H. Stoner, Company H; Capt. Fred L. Phillips, Company K; and Capt. Phillip Ahwesh, Heavy Mortar Company.

Eighteen From Pennsylvania Are Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Eighteen From Pennsylvania Are Veterans," written by Herman A. Lowe, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 21, 1950, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article refers to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. It is a very good article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS RECORD—EIGHTEEN FROM PENNSYLVANIA ARE VETERANS

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, September 20.—With the country engaged in another war and preparing against the possibility of a much bigger one, it is noteworthy that Pennsylvania is represented in Congress by the largest delegation of war veterans of any State.

Senator EDWARD MARTIN and no fewer than 17 of its 33 House Members wore the uniform in one or more of the Nation's wars. It means the delegation is especially fitted to understand the problems of fighting men and veterans.

The No. 1 ranking serviceman in all of Congress is Senator MARTIN. He saw service in the Spanish-American War, fought under General Pershing on the Mexican border in 1914, was in France in the First World War, and was the major general who trained the Twenty-eighth Division in the early portion of the Second World War. No other among the 531 Senate and House Members has a record to compare with that.

A few fought in two wars. Most were in one.

The Pennsylvania Representatives who served in the First World War included: ANTHONY CAVALCANTE, PAUL B. DAGUE, HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, IVOR D. FENTON, LEON H. GAVIN, BENJAMIN F. JAMES, JOHN C. KUNKEL, JAMES F. LIND, GEORGE M. RHODES, RICHARD M. SIMPSON, JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, FRANCIS E. WALTER, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, and HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., JAMES G. FULTON, and JOHN P. SAYLOR were in the Second World War, in which LIND, VAN ZANDT, WALTER, and HUGH SCOTT again saw service. Seven Members of the delegation—EBERHARTER, LIND, RHODES, SAYLOR, VAN ZANDT, WALTER, and SCOTT—hold reserve commissions; and, of course, SCOTT recently returned from a brief tour of duty in Korea.

In case of those who were not in uniform, it should be pointed out that they were mostly too young for the First World War and a little over age to be called into the Second World War.

References on Postal Rate Increase Fight Recorded for Future Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, believing that it is necessary that hearings on important legislation not only be retained for future use, but that they can be made more useful and more informative in the future, I take the privilege of inserting into the RECORD the references, by pages and subject matter, to the material contained in the two volumes No. 1 and 2, of the hearings held last year and this year on H. R. 2945, the postal increase bill. These volumes are identified as volumes A and B.

In future years, these two volumes of hearings will be available and the references herein recorded will be useful to all persons interested.

The following page (p) references are useful in reading part two of Report No. 1452 of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to H. R. 2945, the postage increase bill:

REFERENCES

REPORT 1452, PART 2 (TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 2945)

(A—Pt. 1. House Committee Hearings, 1949)
(B—Pt. 2. House Committee Hearings, 1949)

Page 1, first paragraph:

Line 2: $131,715,000.

Page 1, report No. 1452, postal rate increases.

Line 4: Labor.

Testimony

Ralph W. Anderson, 4th par., p. 194A.
A. C. Kalmbach, 6th par., p. 464A.
Louis A. Lopez, 3d par., p. 486A.
E. T. Meredith, 1st par., p. 162A.
Alex Nunn, 5th par. p. 196A.
Cola G. Parker, par. 3–5 incl., p. 396: 2d par., p. 397A.
O. R. Strackbein, last par., p. 348A.
James R. Brackett, last par., p. 751; first par., p. 752B.
Imrie de Vegh, par. 1–3 incl., p. 785B.
John B. Haggerty, last par., p. 1097; first par., p. 1098B.
Joseph Hammen, last par., p. 1095; par. 1–3 incl., p. 1096B.
Albert M. Izard, 3d and 4th par. statement, p. 1097B.
Hon. William Lemke, Member of Congress, 1st par., p. 1128B.
Edward N. Mayer, Jr., last par., p. 1033; 1st par., p. 1034B.
Paul L. Phillips, 6th par., p. 1100B.
M. Ponzio, last par., p. 1101B.
Jean Thiessen, next to last par., p. 1082B.
H. G. Truscott, next to last par., p. 1096; 1st par., p. 1097B.

Line 9: Charities (and Patriotic Public Welfare Activities).

Testimony

Mrs. Arthur Forrest Anderson, p. 546A.
Bruce A. Campbell, pp. 246–249A.
E. Urner Goodman, 1st par., p. 438A.
Dr. Daniel A. Poling, par. 3–7 incl., p. 141A.
Charles E. Foster, letter pp. 1005–1006A.
Leo Gans, statement, pp. 1007–1009A.
Robert Hanson, 1st par., p. 1040A.
Carl D. Shoemaker, 1st par., statement, p. 1093A.

Page 1: (a) Increase efficiency in the Post Office Department before using the deficit as a basis for setting rates.

Testimony

Ed M. Anderson, 6th par., p. 322A.
Hon. HUGH H. BUTLER, 2d par., p. 549A.
H. Albert L. Cole, par. 3–5 incl. p. 474A.
Frank A. Daniels, 5th par., p. 123A.
Allen L. Grammer, par. 1–6 incl., p. 157A.
Godfrey M. Lebhar, par. 8 p. 299A.
James G. Lyne, 4th and 5th pars., p. 294A.
Lew Selvidge, 1st par., p. 553A.
O. R. Strackbein, par. 7, p. 349A
Leslie A. Watt, 5th par., p. 187A.
Dudley A. White, par. 4, p. 264; last par., p. 270; par. 3, p. 271A.

Page 1 (b). Provide for the setting of rates for special services administratively as recommended by the Hoover Commission Report.

Recommendation No. 8, page 16: The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the Post Office, A Report to Congress, February 1949.

Page 1 (e). Reorganize the Post Office Department's cost ascertainment system to include such important intangible considerations as relative priority, degree of preferment, and economic value of the several classes of service, which are essential if it is to be used as a tool in conjunction with all of the other factors that go into the operation of the Postal Establishment.

Last par., p. 15, first par., p. 16: Task Force Report on the Post Office Prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, January 1949, 4th and 5th pars., p. 29.

Testimony

Amory H. Bradford, pars. 2–5 incl., p. 312A.
A. L. Cole, pars. 6–8 incl., p. 426A.
Allen L. Grammer, pars. 5–8, incl., p. 156A.
Godfrey Hammond, pars. 1–4, incl., p. 389A.
Elisha Hanson, pars. 3–5, incl., p. 108A.
William N. Hardy, last par., p. 130A.
Josh L. Horne for American Newspaper Publishers Association, all of pages 84, 85, 86A.
James G. Lyne for Associated Business Publications, last two pars., p. 293; first par., p. 294A.
John F. O'Keefe, 5th par. statement, p. 366A.
Lew Selvidge, 4th and 5th pars., p. 551A.
Curt Teich, Jr., 15th par., p. 79A.
Leslie A. Watt, 4th par., p. 187A.
Dudley A. White, 5th par., p. 264; 3d par., p. 265A.
Irmie de Vegh, pars. 5–8, incl., p. 785B.
J. A. Fieseler, pars. 5–7, incl., p. 728B.
Edward M. Kriz, pars. 5–7, incl., p. 672; all of pp. 674–677B., incl.
Edward N. Mayer, Jr., Direct Mail Advertising Assn., last par., p. 1031; all of p. 1032; first 4 pars., p. 1033B.
J. T. Sanders, pars. 5–7, incl., p. 951; all of p. 952B.

Page 3, Increased Efficiency.

Second paragraph, second line: $28,873,558—Table 100, Cost Ascertainment Report, 1948 fiscal year.

Page 3, Rate Making Procedures:

Postal Rates, page 15: The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—The Post Office—A Report to Congress, February 1949.

Pages 28, 29, and 1st par. p. 30.

Recommendation XXIII, pp. 63–64.

Second paragraph: Nearly every Postmaster General, in his Annual Report, has recognized that the cost ascertainment system is not properly a basis for postal rate making and it should not be so used.

For example, Postmaster General Frank C. Walker, in his report for the year 1942, said:

"The purpose of cost ascertainment is to credit as accurately as possible to each class of mail and each special service the revenue earned by it, and charge each class of mail and each special service with its share of the expenditure. Its methods and figures have been criticized. I have not been satisfied personally that they should be used for rate purposes. * * * Cost ascertainment does not and possibly cannot reflect intangible factors such as degrees of preferment in mail handling, the relative importance and economic value of the several classes of mail, or the relative priority of service."

Testimony

Task Force Report on the Post Office, pars. 4 and 5, p. 29.
Albert L. Cole, last par., p. 426; 1st par., p. 427A.
Frank A. Daniels, 5th par., p. 124A.
Allen L. Grammer, pars. 3–8, incl., p. 156; 5th par., p. 157A.
Elisha Hanson, 8th par., p. 100A.
Godfrey Lebhar, last par., p. 299; 1st and 2d pars., p. 200A.
James G. Lyne, last par., p. 293; 1st par., p. 294A.
Leslie A. Watt, 4th par., p. 187; 7th par., p. 188A.
Edward M. Kriz, pars. 3–7 incl., p. 672; all of pp. 674–675; pars. 1–5 incl., p. 676; pars. 1–6 incl., p. 677B.
J. T. Sanders, all of p. 952; pars. 1–3 incl., p. 953B.
John Walker, 12th par., p. 659B.

Page 5, adopt Hoover Commission's recommendations.

Number of pieces by classes

First class:	
Regular	21,948,171,751
Air mail	796,447,911
Total	22,744,619,662
Second class	6,344,338,265
Third class	8,188,349,802
Fourth class	1,142,963,746
Penalty, franked, and free to blind	1,450,817,887
Foreign	409,284,845
Total pieces	40,280,374,207

Source: Cost Ascertainment Report 1948, table 41, page 52.

Testimony

John McD. Kane, par. 5, p. 682; par. 12, p. 693; pars. 11 and 15, p. 694; par. 8, p. 695B.
Edward M. Kriz, pars. 5–7, incl., p. 672; all of p. 674; pars. 1–3, incl., p. 675; all of pp. 676–677B.
Edward N. Mayer, Jr., all of pp. 1032–1035 incl. B.
James M. Mosely, pars. 11–13 incl., p. 896; pars. 1–4 incl., p. 897; last par. p. 898; pars. 1–4 incl., p. 899B.
Carleton W. Richardson, 5th par. of statement, p. 1053; all of p. 1054; top-half of p. 1055B.
John Walker, third from last par., p. 659; 5th, 6th and 7th pars., p. 662; last par., p. 663; pars. 1–3 incl., p. 664; 4th par., p. 665B.

Page 6, Economic Aspects of Postal Rates.

Testimony

Ed M. Anderson, pars. 7 and 8, p. 323; 1st par., p. 324; 8th par., p. 334A.
Willard Archie, 2d, 5th and last pars., p. 342; 6th and 7th pars., p. 344A.
Benjamin Bogin, 3d, 4th and 5th pars., p. 224A.
Amory H. Bradford, pars. 2–5 incl., p. 311; pars. 1–4 incl., p. 312A.
A. L. Cole, 6th par., p. 424; 11th and last pars., p. 425; 8th par., p. 427A.
Walter D. Fuller, last par., p. 157; pp. 158 and 159; pars. 1–4 incl., p. 160; pars. 5 and 6, p. 207; par. 1, p. 209A.
Godfrey Hammond, last par., p. 377; 2d par., p. 395A.
Elisha Hanson, pars. 11–13 incl., p. 103; 1st par., p. 104A.
Horace D. Klein, 2d, 7th, 8th and 9th pars., p. 410A.
Godfrey M. Lebhar, last par., p. 295; 1st and 2d pars., p. 296; ?d, 5th and 6th pars., p. 300A.
James G. Lyne, 4th par. of statement, p. 288; all of pp. 289–290; 1st par. p. 291A.
W. J. Rooke, 2d par., p. 319A.
Leslie A. Watt, 7th par., p. 184A.
Albert E. Winger, pars. 6–9 incl., p. 199A.
Charles A. Bethge, pars. 1–3 incl., p. 800; par. 9, p. 802; all of 803B.
James R. Brackett, pars. 4–7 incl., p. 750; all of pp. 751–752B.
Imrie de Vegh, 12th par., p. 778; all of p. 777; pars. 1–5 incl., p. 778; pars. 2–5 incl., p. 780, all of pp. 781–782; par. 7, p. 792; par. 8, p. 793; pars. 5–8 incl., p. 796; par. 2, p. 797B.
John C. Lynn, par. 2 to end of p. 611; pars. 1–4 incl., p. 612B.
Edward N. Mayer, Jr., 7th par., p. 1035B.
John Walker, 1st par., p. 656; pars. 1–5 incl., p. 657; all of p. 658; pars. 1–8 incl., p. 659B.
Paul B. West, section 2—The Economic Consequences, pp. 1087–1088B.

Second paragraph: Postal "Subsidy."

Testimony

Ed M. Anderson, par. 1, p. 324A.
Amory H. Bradford, par. 4, p. 308; pars. 2 and 3, p. 310; par. (d), p. 312A.
Albert L. Cole, pars. 1, 7, and 8, p. 426A.
Allen L. Grammer, 9th par., p. 146A.
Elisha Hanson, 4th par., p. 98A.
William N. Hardy, pars. 2 and 4, p. 128A.
Josh L. Horne, pars. 3–6 incl., p. 86A.

Godfrey M. Lebhar, last two pars., p. 299A.
James G. Lyne, last par., p. 290A.
E. T. Meredith, par. 2, p. 162; all of pp. 163–170 incl.; all of p. 176 to last par., p. 177A.
Robert H. Reed, pars. 8 and 9, p. 178; pars. 1–3 incl., p. 179A.
W. J. Rooke, pars. 2–4 incl., p. 319A.
E. P. Schwartz, last two pars., p. 282A.
Leslie A. Watt, par. 2 and bal. p. 184; all of p. 185A.

Page 7, post and postal cards.

Estimated increased revenue from post and postal cards from rates in amended H. R. 2945, $36,000,000.

Table, page 2, Majority Report to accompany H. R. 2945.

House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service Report No. 1452.

Estimated number of private picture post cards mailed annually, 773,461,266 pieces, in 1948. Curt Teich, Jr., par. 2, p. 77A.

Estimated number of private picture post cards now in stock, "probably a billion." Curt Teich, Jr., par. 2, p. 76A.

Number of postal cards mailed in 1948 fiscal year, 2,828,428,600 pieces. Curt Teich, Jr., par. 2, p. 77A.

Add to postage, cost of cardboard, printing, cutting, packing, boxing, distribution, and sale of postal cards, approximately 1 cent per card would produce approximately $30,000,000 additional revenue. Curt Teich, Jr., pars. 1–4 incl., and last par., p. 78; all of p. 79; pars. 1–15 incl., p. 80; all of p. 81A.

Nelson B. Wentzel, Deputy Third Assistant Postmaster General, testified that "it costs less than 70 cents a thousand to get out the postal card." 1st par., p. 80A.

Clyde T. Ellis, pars. 6 and 7, p. 998A.
William Heckendorn, 6th par., p. 726A.

Page 7, Local Drop Letters.

Increase in rate from 1 cent to 2 cents was requested by the Postmaster General after original draft of H. R. 2945—estimated increased revenue $1,375,000. Par. 7, p. 4, Majority Report.

William L. Manning, par. 11, p. 415A.

Page 7, Second-Class Mail.

Par. 3, p. 5, Postal Rate Increases, Report No. 1452—October 17, 1949, to accompany H. R. 2945.

Page 8, Second-Class Mail.

1. Rate Increases Are Too Steep.

Testimony

Amory H. Bradford, par. 4, p. 311; par. 1, p. 312A.
Albert L. Cole, 6th par. p. 423A.
Frank A. Daniels, 9th par., p. 125A.
Walter D. Fuller, pars. 1 and 2, p. 208A.
Allen L. Grammer, pars. 7 and 8, p. 150; pars. 1–8, p. 154A.
Godfrey Hammond, par. 1, p. 389A.
Josh L. Horne, par. 2, p. 88; next to last par., p. 101A.
George J. Hecht, 3d par., p. 361A.
Horace D. Klein, par. 11, p. 410; pars. 1–6, incl., p. 414A.
Godfrey M. Lebhar, par. 4, p. 303A.
James G. Lyne, 2d par., p. 295A.
W. J. Rooke, par. 5, p. 320A.
E. P. Schwartz, next to last par., p 282A.
Eugene R. Spaulding, 4th par., p. 370A.
Leslie A. Watt, par. 7, p. 185A.
A. E. Winger, last par., p. 201A.
J. T. Sanders, 3d par., p. 948; last par., p. 949B.
Paul B. West, for Assn. of National Advertisers, par. 1, sec. 1, of statement p. 1087; sec. 3 of statement, p. 1088; sec. 8 of statement, p. 1089B.

2. Any Increases Should Be Spread Over At Least 3 Years.

Testimony

Benjamin Bogin, pars. 6 and 7, p. 224A.
A. L. Cole, pars. 2 and 3, p. 427A.
Allen L. Grammer, par. 8, p. 150A.
A. C. Kalmbach, G., p. 468A.
Horace D. Klein, par. 1, p. 411; pars. 9–12, incl., p. 413A.
E. T. Meredith, pars. 1–5, incl., p. 175A.
A. E. Winger, pars. 4–12, incl., p. 198; par. 14, p. 205A.

3. Higher Second-Class Rates Won't Raise Revenue.

In addition to testimony referred to later, the committee should be supplied, by the Post Office Department, with cost ascertainment tables 40, 40A, 41, and 100, fiscal year 1949, which we understand are now available. These show second class, divided into 8 categories, for the first time. We understand they show (1) that zone-rated magazines paid 33.8 percent of their apportioned expenditures, or 2.45 times more on their apportioned expenditures than the rest of the second-class publications; and, (2) tables 40 and 41, when compared with corresponding tables for 1948 fiscal year, show that there was no increase in number of pieces of second-class mail.

The law of diminishing returns is already at work. Proposed increases in second-class rates will result in decreased volume and will not increase revenue.

Testimony

Ed M. Anderson, pars. 6 and 7, p. 322; pars. 4–6, incl., p. 333A.
Benjamin Bogin, pars. 2–5, p. 224A.
Amory H. Bradford, par. 4 of statement, p. 304; bal. of p. 304; bal. of (a), p. 305; (d) p. 308A.
A. L. Cole, next to last par., p. 424; pars. 1–3, incl., p. 425A.
Allen L. Grammer, last par., p. 153; pars. 1–7, incl., p. 154A.
Godfrew Hammond, pars. 1 and 2, p. 379; pars. 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, p. 382; par. 4, p. 383A.
Elisha Hanson, pars. 1–3, incl., p. 92; "Some Facts and Figures," p. 93; all of pp. 94, 95, 96, 97, 99; pars. 1 and 2, p. 98; pars 1–8, p. 100; "What Can Be Done About Rates," pp. 101–102; pars. 2–6, incl., p. 102; pars. 1–5, incl., p. 110; all of p. 113; pars. 1–8, incl., p. 114; pars 1–10, p. 115; par. 4, p. 116; pars. 6–19, p. 117; pars. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, p. 118A.
William N. Hardy, par. 9, p. 129; pars, 2–4, incl., p. 130A.
George J. Hecht, pars. 2–4, incl., p. 361; pars, 1–8, p. 362; par. 2, p. 363; par. 1, p. 364A.
Josh L. Horne, last 2 pars., p. 87; pars. 2–3, p. 88A.
A. C. Kalmbach, C., p. 465; last par., p. 466A.
Horace D. Klein, last 2 pars., p. 410A.
Godfrey M. Lebhar, par. 1, p. 299; 3d and last pars., p. 300; first par., p. 301A.
James G. Lyne, par. 2, p. 294A.
E. T. Meredith, next to last par., p. 169; next to last par., p. 177A.
Maurice S. Prescott, pars. 9 and 10, p. 190A.
Chas. McD. Puckette, last par., p. 121A.
W. J. Rooke, par. 2, p. 320A.
E. P. Schwartz, all of pp. 280 and 281; pars. 1–3, incl., and last par., p. 282A.
Lew Selvidge, pars. 7–8, p. 552A.
Ed E. Towns, last par., p. 547; par. 3, p. 548A.
Mrs. M. E. Walker, last par., p. 401; 1st par., p. 402A.
Leslie A. Watt, last par., p. 183; par. 2, p. 187A.
Dudley A. White, pars. 2–4, p. 265A.
A. E. Winger, par. 2, p. 202A.

4. New definition of "free-in-county."

Testimony

Ed M. Anderson, last par., p. 324; all of pp. 325, 326, 327A.
Willard Archie, par. 6, p. 340A.

Page 9, second-class mail.

5. Causes a special hardship on many small worthy publications.

Testimony

Mrs. Arthur Forrest Anderson, statement, p. 546A.
Ed M. Anderson, last two pars., p. 324; all of p. 325A.
Willard Archie, pars. 3–6, incl., p. 340; par. 6 and bal. p. 344; 1st par., p. 345A.
Charles E. Babcock, statement, pp. 568 and 569A.
James F. Barton, all of pp. 239, 240, 241A.
Rev. Paul Bussard, statement, pp. 133–137A, incl.
Bruce A. Campbell, statement, pp. 244–251, incl. A.
Rev. Samuel McCrea Cavert, statement, pp. 475–476, incl. A.
William J. Chisholm, statement, pp. 491–492 incl. A.
Edna P. Cook, statement, p. 557A.
Congress of Industrial Organizations, statement, pp. 553–554A.
J. T. Emery, statement, pp. 260–261A.
James Finucane, statement, pp. 417–418A.
Francis J. Garvey, statement, pp. 559–563, incl. A.
E. Urner Goodman, statement, pp. 436–446, incl. A.
Rev. Robert H. Heinze, statement, pp. 258–260, incl. A.
Olive H. Houston, statement, pp. 549–550A.
A. C. Kalmbach, C., p. 465A.
Omar B. Ketchum, statement, pp. 457–460, incl. A.
Dr. William B. Lipphard, par. 4, p. 453A.
Dr. Jay Elmer Morgan, pars. 4–8, incl., p. 478; par. 5, p. 479A.
Christian P. Norgard, pars. 4–9, incl., p. 559A.
Dr. Daniel A. Poling, statement, pp. 141–142–143A.
John Ribble, pars. 3–8, incl., p. 138; all of p. 139; pars. 1–2, p. 140A.
Harrison Sayre, last par. p. 215; all of pp. 216–221, incl. A.
Elizabeth A. Smart, statement, pp. 256–257; pars. 1–4 incl., p. 258A.
Rev. Luther Wesley Smith, see John Ribble, above.
Dr. Chester D. Swope, statement, p. 558A.
John Thomas Taylor, see James F. Barton, above.
M. E. Walker, all of pp. 401–403, incl.; last 2 pars., p. 406; all of p. 407A.

6. National publications using the mails 100 percent penalized more than those using mails to a much lesser degree.

Testimony

James F. Barton, pars. 6 and 7, p. 239A.
Rev. Paul Bussard, pars. 5 and 6, p. 137A.
J. T. Emery, 4th par. of statement, p. 260A.
E. Urner Goodman, colloquy, p. 445A.
Allen L. Grammer, pars. 1–10, incl., p. 153A.
Bishop Wilbur E. Hammaker, par. 7, p. 485A.
George J. Hecht, pars. 2 and 3, p. 361A.
Robert H. Heinze, 4th par. of statement, p. 258A.
A. C. Kalmbach, C., p. 465A.
Omar B. Ketchum, par. 7, p. 458; par. 4, p. 459A.
Godfrey M. Lebhar, pars. 2–4, p. 296A.
Dr. William B. Lipphard, par. 3, p. 452A.
James G. Lyne, par. 6, p. 290A.
Dr. Daniel A. Poling, last par., p. 141; pars. 2–3, p. 142A.
Maurice S. Prescott, par. 5, p. 189A.
Robert H. Reed, par. 6, p. 178A.
W. J. Hooke, pars. 3–4, p. 320A.
Harrison Sayre, last par. p. 215A.
Rev. Luther Wesley Smith, pars. 6–7, p. 138; par. 1–2, p. 139; last 2 par., p. 139A.
Mrs. M. E. Walker, all of 401; par. 1–5 incl., p. 402A.
Leslie A. Watt, par. 8, p. 183; par. 1, p. 184A.

Page 9, third-class mail.

Testimony

Clyde T. Ellis, pars. 9–10, p. 998A.
Clifford R. Emlong, pars. 2–4, incl., p. 642; pars. 1–3, incl., p. 643; pars. 4–5, p. 644A.
John A. Fieseler, pars. 3 and 6, p. 728A.
Charles E. Foster, third and last par., statement, p. 1005A.
Leo Gans, pars. 7–8, p. 1008; 1st par., p. 1009A.
J. M. George, pars. 4 and 9, p. 914A.
William Heckendorn, pars. 3–5, incl., p. 726; 1st par., p. 727A.

John McDonald Kane, 4th par., statement, p. 691; all of p. 692A.
Edward M. Kriz, all of pp. 675–676–677–679A.
George F. McKiernan, par. 2, p. 773A.
Michael J. Maher, pars. 4–6 incl., of statement, p. 1009; pars. 4–5, p. 1010; pars. 4–6, p. 1013A.
Edward N. Mayer, Jr., pars. 3–4–6–7, p. 1032; pars. 5–7, incl., p. 1033A; all of p. 1034A.
James M. Mosely, all of pp. 895–896–897 898–900–901–902A.
H. Willis Tobler, pars. 2–4, incl., p. 885A.
Mrs. May O. Vander Pyle, last par., p. 1103; pars. 5–7, p. 1104; pars. 4–6, p. 1105A.
John Walker, pars. 1–2–3 of statement, p. 655; all of pp. 656–665, incl.A.
Paul B. West, sec. 7 of statement, p. 1089A.
Richard P. White, par. 9 of statement, p. 622; pars. 2 3–8–9–10, p. 623; all of pp. 624 and 625A.
L. B. Whitehouse, pars. 1 and 2, p. 731A.
Arthur W. Winter, all of p.1113A.
J. B. Welfner, 12th–14th prs. statement, p. 733; last 4 pars. statement, p. 734A.
Page 10, Third-Class Mail.
Fifth paragraph: "By-product."

Testimony

Leslie A. Watt, par. 4, p. 187A.
Edward M. Kriz, par. 1, p. 673; par. 2, p. (75; pars. 1–2–3–4–5–7–9–10, p. 676; all of p. 677B.
Edward N. Mayer, Jr., last par. p. 1031; pars. 1–2–4–6, p. 1032B.
James M. Mosley, pars. 6–9, incl., p. 898; pars. 6–7, p. 900B.
Fred A. Prince, 4, bottom of p. 1110B.
Carleton W. Richardson, par. 5 and bal. p. 1054; last 2 pars., p. 1055; pars. 1–2–6, p. 1056B.
Robert Stone, 6., top of p. 747; 1., lower p. 747; 3., lower p. 747; 5., lower p. 747; par. 16, p. 748B.
John E. Tillotson, pars. 2–3, p. 683; par. 3, p. 684; pars. 2–8, p. 685; pars. 4–5, p. 687; pars. 1–4, p. 688B.
H. Willis Tobler, pars. 4–6, incl., p. 885; pars. 1–3–4, p. 886B.
Don M. Turnbull, pars. 3–4, p. 1086B.
John Walker, par. 8, p. 659B.
Richard P. White, par. 7, p. 626B.
L. Lowell Wilkin, pars. 5–11–13–14, p. 890B.
Arthur W. Winter, par. 3, p. 1113B.
J. B. Wolfner, pars. 6–7, p. 734B.
Paragraph 6: Edward M. Kriz, for Associated Third-Class Mail Users. Quotation is a consolidation of pars. 2–7–11, p. 676, part 2, House committee hearings, 1949.
Page 10 (a) Result in sharply reduced volume and smaller revenue.

Testimony

James P. Beatty, par. 6 of statement, p. 1111; par. 9, p. 1111; par. 2, p. 1112B.
Charles A. Bethge, par. 6, p. 799; par. 4, p. 803; pars. 2–3, p. 804; par. 4, p. 806B.
James R. Brackett, 1, p. 752; pars. 2–3, p. 753; exhibits 1–2–3–4, p. 754; exhibits 5–6, p. 756; exhibit 10, p. 757; exhibits 14–15, p. 758; exhibits 18–21, p. 759; exhibits 23–25–26, p. 760; exhibits 28–29, p. 761; exhibits 31–32–34, p. 762; exhibits 36–37–38, p. 763; exhibits 39–40–41, p. 764; exhibit 44, p. 765; par. 2, p. 767B.
Imrie de Vegh, (1) p. 781; V., par. 1, p. 784; last par., p. 784; par. 1, p. 785; next to last par., p. 793B.
I. R. Dickson, pars. 2–3–7–8, p. 1063; (1) and (4), p. 1067B.
Edward F. Dinan, pars. 4–6–7–8, p. 696; par. 2, p. 698B.
Clifford R. Emlong, par. 2, p. 643B.
John A. Fiesler, par. 7, p. 728B.
Leo Gans, pars. 6–7, p. 1008B.
Walter A. Gatzert, (f), top of p. 1076B. "The Post Office Department will not gain the revenue predicted," p. 1076B.
J. M. George, par. 9, p. 914B.
Albert M. Izard, par. 2 of statement, p. 1097B.
John McDonald Kane, par. 4 of statement, p. 691; pars. 1 and 2, and 1–2–3, p. 692B.
Edward M. Kriz, pars. 5–6–7, p. 675; last par. p. 677B.
George F. McKiernan, pars. 8–9–10, p. 813; pars. 1–4, incl., p. 814B.
Michael J. Maher, last par., p. 1009; pars. 5–6–7, p. 1010; par. 6, p. 1013B.
Edward N. Mayer, Jr., pars. 6–8, p. 1033; par. 5, p. 1034; last par., p. 1034; pars. 2–4, incl., p. 1035B.
C. B. Mills, pars. 4–5 of statement, p. 732B.
James M. Mosely, par. 5, p. 896; 2, p. 896; 5, p. 900; last par., p. 901; pars. 10–11, p. 902; 7, p. 903B.
Walter S. Oberfelder, last par. of statement, p. 1081B.
Fred A. Prince, pars. 5–6–7, p. 1109; pars. 2–3, p. 1110B.
Philip G. Rettig, last par., p. 1049; par. 3, p. 1050B.
Carleton W. Richardson, par. 5, p. 1056B.
George E. Rose, 4, p. 647B.
Carl D. Shoemaker, par. 2 of statement, p. 1093B.
Paul C. Stark, pars. 3 and 4, p. 736; pars. 3–12–13–14, p. 740; par. 4, p. 741; third from last par., p. 742; pars. 1–16–last par., p. 743B.
Robert Stone, pars. 2–3, p. 746; pars. 2–5, p. 747B.
John E. Tillotson, par. 2, p. 684; pars. 3–7, p. 685; par. 4, p. 688B.
Mrs. May O. Vander Pyl, pars. 5–6, p. 1105; exhibits 1–2–3, p. 1107; par. 3 of statement, p. 1108B.
John Walker, first and last pars., p. 656; pars. 10–12–14–16, p. 658; pars. 3–4, p. 659B.
Charles C. Wene, last par., p. 1081; pars. 1–2, p. 1082B.
Paul B. West, 7. Third Class Rates, p. 1089B.
Richard P. White, pars. 3–4, p. 624; pars. 4–6, p. 626B.
L. B. Whitehouse, par. 2, p. 731; par. 2, p. 732B.
L. Lowell Wilkin, par. 6, p. 891; par. 3, p. 892B.
Arthur W. Winter, par. 7, p. 1113; pars. 2–3–4, p. 1114B.
J. B. Wolfner, pars. 12–18 of statement, p. 733; par. 3, p. 734B.
Page 11, Third-Class Mail.
(b) Cause a Hardship to Small Business.

Testimony

James R. Brackett, par. 1, p. 752B.
Charles J. Brooks, pars. 3–4–14 of statement, p. 927; pars. 1–2, p. 928B.
George J. Burger, pars. 1–2 of statement, p. 1092; pars. 1–2, p. 1093B.
I. R. Dickson, par. 3 of statement, p. 1057; par. 4, p. 1058B.
Clyde T. Ellis, par. 6 of statement, p. 998; par. 15, p. 1003B.
Clifford R. Emlong, par. 2, p. 644B.
Albert M. Izard, pars. 2–3 of statement, p. 1097B.
John McDonald Kane, pars. 2–3 of statement, p. 691B.
Edward M. Kriz, table showing postal expenditures, p. 679B.
Samuel Levitties, par. 2 of statement, p. 1079B.
George F. McKiernan, pars. 1–2–3, p. 813; pars. 3–4–5–7, p. 814B.
Edward N. Mayer, Jr., par. 3 of statement, p. 1031; par. 7, p. 1034B.
C. B. Mills, par. 7 of statement, p. 732B.
James M. Mosely, pars. 2–3–4–5, p. 894; pars. 3–8, p. 895; par. 2, p. 896; last par., p. 900; pars. 2–4, p. 901; par. 11, p. 902B.
Walter S. Oberfelder, par. 6 of statement, p. 1080; pars. 4–7, p. 1081B.
Frend A. Prince, pars. 2–5, p. 1108; all of pp. 1109 and 1110B.
George E. Rose, p. 645, par. 3B.
L. R. Sjulin, par. 1, p. 1082B.
Jean Thiessen, par. 1, p. 1082B.
John E. Tillotson, pars. 4–5–6, p. 683; par. 1, p. 684B.
H. Willis Tobler, par. 2, p. 884; pars. 2–4–6, p. 885; pars. 1–3–4–5–6, p. 886B.
Mrs. May O. Vander Pyl, pars. 4–5 of statement, p. 1103; pars. 3–4–5–6–7, p. 1104; pars. 2–3–4–5–6, p. 1105; par. 1, p. 1106B.
John Walker, pars. 1–2–3–6, p. 656; pars. 3–5, p. 657; pars. 1–3, p. 658; par. 3, p. 659; par. 1, p. 662; par. 1, p. 663; par. 6, p. 664; data—bottom of p. 665B.
Richard P. White, 9th par. of statement, p. 622B.
L. Lowell Wilkin, par. 3, p. 889B.
Arthur W. Winter, pars. 4–5–6, p. 1113B.
J. B. Wolfner, pars. 5–6–15–16, p. 733; par. 17, p. 734B.

(c) Completely disrupt the financial support programs of such charities as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Crippled Children, the Red Cross, Tuberculosis Society, Cancer Research, and many others. Disabled American Veterans, for example, use third-class mail for their identotag program. The proceeds from the sale of these miniatures of license plate key rings maintain their hospital for veterans' children. The increases proposed in the bill will amount to $125,000 annually to this program alone, all of which must be subtracted from the money spent on this worthy charity.

Testimony

Charles E. Foster, par. 3 of statement, p. 1005B.
Leo Gans, pars. 6–7, p. 1007; par. 6, p. 1008B.
Philip G. Rettig, par. 4, p. 1048; par. 8, p. 1049; par. 3, p. 1050B.
Carl D. Shoemaker, par. 2, p. 1093B.
E. Urner Goodman, par. 2 and last par., p. 437; par. 1, p. 438; par. 3, p. 440; par. 3, p. 441A.
Page 11, paragraph 2: The Postmaster General testified that the Department did not give the mail users an opportunity to present their views before he presented his recommendations. The users of the mails say that the activities of the Post Office Department with regard to rates was a most closely guarded secret. Under such a procedure it is virtually impossible to arrive at a satisfactory rate solution. An analysis of the rates recommended by the Post Office Department which provided increases for some as high as 600 percent clearly substantiates this view.
Pars. 8–9–10–11, p. 1189; pars. 1–2, p. 1190; pars. 4–5, p. 1149B.

Testimony

Edward N. Mayer, Jr., pars. 7–8, p. 1035B.
Ed M. Anderson, pars. 5–6, p. 331; pars. 6–7, p. 337A.
Page 11, Fourth-Class Mail: Limitation in size and weight of packages.
The public has not had an opportunity to testify to the House committee concerning the effect of limitation of weight and size of packages incorporated in amended H. R. 2945.

Testimony

Paul W. Brown, par. 7, p. 711B.
Clifford R. Emlong, pars. 5–6, p. 643B.
George E. Rose, pars. 11–16, incl., and par. 21, p. 652B.
Richard P. White, par. 3, p. 627B.
Page 12, Fourth-Class Mail.
Paragraph 2: Situation confronting Railway Express Agency.

Testimony

Hartman Barber, pp. 985–993 incl. B.
Kinsey N. Merritt, pp. 962–982 incl. B.
Page 12, Special Services.
Data on December 1949, special delivery and registered mail not available to the public.

Testimony

Charles A. Bethge, pars. 5–6–7, p. 805; par. 1 (5), p. 806; pars. 4–10, incl., p. 809; pars. 1–15, incl., p. 810; pars. 6–7, p. 812B.

Charles J. Brooks, par. 12 of statement, p. 927; all of pp. 928 and 929B.

Paul W. Brown, pars. 10–11, p. 711B.

I. R. Dickson, par. 8 of statement, p. 1057; pars. 7–14, incl, p. 1058; all of p. 1059; pars. 1–6, incl., p. 1060; par. 18, p. 1062; pars. 1–2, p. 1067B.

Edward F. Dinan, pars. 8, 9, 10, p. 696; par. 1, p. 697; pars. 7–12, incl., and par. 31, p. 701B.

Walter S. Oberfelder, pars. 5–10–11 of statement, p. 1080; pars. 1–2–5, p. 1081B.

Sigmund A. Robinson, pars. 1–2–3–4–5–7, p. 941; point 2, p. 942; all of p. 843; point 3 and par. 2, p. 944; par. 2, p. 945B.

L. Lowell Wilkin, pars. 3–4–5–6, p. 889; par. 1, p. 890B.

Report of the Activities of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Eighty-first Congress, Second Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments under the distinguished leadership of its chairman, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, has made a brilliant record of accomplishments for itself during the first and present sessions of the Eighty-first Congress.

This committee, charged with the grave responsibility of perfecting legislative measures reorganizing the executive branch of the Federal Government and other fields, has done its job well. It is a pleasure to report the achievement of increased efficiency and economy in governmental services as a consequence of study and work of the membership of this House committee.

On Friday, August 26, 1949, in my extension of remarks, I was privileged on that occasion to be able to report to the Congress on a most creditable work performance of the legislative matters handled during the first session. It is my intention to here outline the legislative program successfully completed during the present session.

Last year saw our creation of the General Services Administration, a consolidated agency for procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government properties, attuned to the needs and requirements of the civilian branch of the Federal Government.

The committee has continued its interest by amending the basic act in order to spell out functions in greater detail. This month saw successful passage of Public Law 754 (H. R. 9129) which implements the mission of the General Services Administration in relation to operation of buildings and custodial care of property under its jurisdiction. This measure also permits the Government donable program to be extended to distribution for public health purposes. The original law—Public Law 152, the Federal Property Act—had limited distribution to educational purposes; thus, surplus property, no longer of need or usable within the framework of the Federal Government, is now made available not only to our educational institutions, but to our medical schools, hospitals, clinics, and other such agencies qualifying for inclusion.

Further, Public Law 754 includes the Federal Records Act of 1950. This landmark may be briefly said to reorganize the records management of the Government. The General Services Administrator is given increased control over the National Archives, and provision is had for creation of a National Historical Publications Commission. In the field of records management, it shall be the duty of the Administrator to develop and improve standards, procedures, and techniques aimed at improvement of management with an eye to economy and efficiency. Directly tied to this is the responsibility placed in the Administrator for better utilization of space, equipment, and supplies, a necessary adjunct of conserving and protecting Government records. Further, the Administrator is authorized to establish and operate record centers. Of interest to the Congress also is the inclusion of a section within this public law calling for conspicuous identification of Government motor vehicles.

The consideration of this legislation—which became Public Law 754—led to examination and incorporation of many points in pending committee bills dealing with similar subject matter. In this vein it can be recited that Public Law 754 incorporated and superseded H. R. 6315, H. R. 6566, H. R. 6634, H. R. 7545, H. R. 8353, H. R. 8416, and H .R. 8390.

Another measure of signal importance drafted by our committee is the "Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950." In my opinion this is the most constructive and remedial law which the Eighty-first Congress has had the opportunity to act upon. This is now known as Public Law 784.

Briefly, it may be stated that Public Law 784 reorganizes the budgeting and bookkeeping of the Federal Government. It will be recalled that 29 years ago the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 went into effect. During the interim period many studies and surveys have been undertaken to bring this legislation up to date; more adaptable to modern day circumstances. The tremendous growth of our Government in the last 30 years dictated the necessity for improving and renovating budget and accounting methods. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1950 is aimed at providing the Government and the taxpayer with accurate and complete information as to revenues received and expenditures made by the Government in its operations. Public Law 784 carries out substantially all of the suggestions in these fields of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. In this fashion, the budget, accounting, and auditing systems, procedures, and techniques will be brought into line with sound commercial and governmental practices and resultant better control over all Federal funds.

Laudable teamwork by the General Accounting Office, Treasury Department, and the Bureau of the Budget furnished the basis for the studies which produced this epochal public law, so well received on all sides.

This Public Law 784 marks a new high in legislative and executive cooperation for a common goal. In addition to a modernized "performance budget" program, this act provides that the Comptroller General shall prescribe the principles, standards, and related requirements for accounting in the executive branch. The auditing of Federal Government financial transactions, will continue to be the responsibility of the Comptroller General of the United States as an agent of the Congress. It can be noted in passing, that this act repealed in whole or in part 106 provisions of existing law now obsolete or outmoded. On the agenda of the committee H. R. 5178 and H. R. 5823 dealt with similar and related subject matter.

H. R. 5526 now designated as Public Law 673 is of engaging regard. This bill authorized the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government and for other purposes.

The committe was made aware of, and alerted to, the extremely heavy workload of the President of the United States by the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts, who sponsored this act. Testimony developed that the President is called upon to perform many minor duties, often bearing little relationship to the leadership tasks of a Chief Executive. This act provides for the performance of certain of the lesser duties of the President by others appropriately delegated. However, the law retains in the President responsibility for the acts of such designees in office. Consequently there is assured to the President a relief from the many smaller and often more burdensome tasks while affording him greater opportunity for concentrating his attention on the more important duties of his office.

In the program of reorganization President Truman, beginning in the period between March 13, 1950, and May 31, 1950, transmitted to the Congress 27 reorganization plans dealing with various departments and agencies of the executive branch. The plans covered a wide diversity of interests:

Plan No. 1: Reorganization in the Department of the Treasury. Failed of enactment: Rejected by Senate May 11, 1950. The defect cited by the Senate was adjusted; this plan was later resubmitted as Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950, and became effective July 31, 1950.

Plan No. 2: Reorganization in the Department of Justice. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 3: Reorganization in the Department of Interior. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 4: Reorganization in the Department of Agriculture. Failed of enactment: Rejected by Senate May 18, 1950.

Plan No. 5: Reorganization in the Department of Commerce. Effective May 24, 1950. Plan affirmatively sustained in committee and on floor by House Committee on Expenditures.

Plan No. 6: Reorganization in the Department of Labor. Effective May 24, 1950. Plan affirmatively sustained in committee and on floor by action of House Committee on Expenditures.

Plan No. 7: Reorganization in the Interstate Commerce Commission. Affirmatively sustained in committee by House Committee on Expenditures. Failed of enactment: Rejected by Senate May 17, 1950.

Plan No. 8: Reorganization in the Federal Trade Commission. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 9: Reorganization in the Federal Power Commission. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 10: Reorganization in the Securities and Exchange Commission. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 11: Reorganization in the Federal Communications Commission. Failed of enactment: Rejected by Senate May 17, 1950.

Plan No. 12: Reorganization in the National Labor Relations Board. Affirmatively sustained in committee by House Committee on Expenditures. Failed of enactment: Rejected by Senate May 11, 1950.

Plan No. 13: Reorganization in the Civil Aeronautics Board. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 14: Coordinating the administration of labor standards. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 15: Transferring the functions of the General Services Administration relating to public works in Alaska and in the Virgin Islands to the Department of the Interior. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 16: Transferring to the Federal Security Agency the functions of the General Services Administration relating to assistance to local school districts and grants and loans for water-pollution-control projects. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 17: Transferring the functions of the General Services Administration relating to the advance planning of non-Federal public works and the management and disposal of certain war public works to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 18: Transferring to the Administrator of General Services the functions of the various Federal agencies with respect to leasing and assigning general purpose space in buildings and the operation, maintenance, and custody of office buildings. Effective May 24, 1950. Committee print, "Memorandum—Status of Employees Transferred," issued by the committee after hearings were held to scrutinize the effects of the transfer, and to assure transferred employees protection in their rights.

Plan No. 19: Transferring from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor and the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board and their functions. Functions of the Federal Security Administrator with respect to employees' compensation are also transferred by the plan. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 20: Transferring from the Secretary of State to the Administrator of General Services a number of functions which have no connection with foreign affairs but bear a close relation to the archival and records functions of the General Services Administration. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 21: Effecting a basic reorganization of the functions of the United States Maritime Commission along the lines recommended by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Effective May 24, 1950.

Plan No. 22: Transferring the Federal National Mortgage Association from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Effective July 9, 1950.

Plan No. 23: Transferring from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency the lending functions of the Government with respect to the production and distribution of prefabricated houses and components. Effective July 9, 1950.

Plan No. 24: Transferring the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Department of Commerce. Affirmatively sustained in committee by the House Committee on Expenditures. Rejected by Senate July 6, 1950.

Plan No. 25: Transferring the functions of the National Security Resources Board from the Board to the Chairman of the Board and making the Board advisory to the Chairman. Also provides for a Vice Chairman, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Effective July 9, 1950.

Plan No. 26: Reorganization in the Department of the Treasury. Effective July 31, 1950.

Plan No. 27: Creating a Department of Health, Education, and Security. Rejected by the House July 10, 1950. This plan is similar in many respects to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949. Plan No. 27 was designed to meet the objections registered against plan No. 1 of 1949. It parallels to a large degree H. R. 575, 1949, and H. R. 782, 1949, and H. R. 8674, 1950.

In summary, it may be stated that 26 of the plans submitted during the Eighty-first Congress 1949–50, were successfully adopted by action of the Congress.

Public Law 467 which the committee drafted grew out of consideration of H. R. 4455. This measure authorized the transfer to the Attorney General of the United States of a portion of the Vigo Plant near Terre Haute, Ind., for use in connection with the United States penitentiary at Terre Haute. During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress a related bill, H. R. 4442, became Public Law 225. Public Law 467 supplements Public Law 225 by making available to the United States prison system for its use an additional tract of land near the Terre Haute penitentiary.

During the last session of the Congress the Travel Expense Act of 1949, Public Law 92, was passed, providing for increased per diem rates to be paid Government employees while engaged in field operations. It was brought to the attention of the committee that this legislation did not permit the receipt of a per diem allowance where civilian officers and employees become ill or injured, not due to their own misconduct, while in travel status on official business. Accordingly, immediate action was had on H. R. 5951, Public Law 432, which amended the Travel Expense Act of 1949. This meritorious amendment corrected a condition of employment which has resulted in inequities and in some instances extreme hardship for Government officers and employees. The result of this corrective amendment continues an employee's per diem allowance where he must remain at his temporary station until he recovers sufficiently to complete his assignment or return to his official headquarters.

The committee calendar included two bills which would authorize relief of certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Departments of Interior and Commerce. H. R. 6181, Public Law 540, developed this phase in the Department of Commerce, while H. R. 7688, Public Law 541, outlined it for the Department of the Interior. Thus, the Congress has cleared away the last accoutrements in these Departments in relation to the terminated agencies of World War II.

Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, Nahant, Mass., was transferred to that township as a result of H. R. 7477, Public Law 623. Acquired during World War I and World War II, this area is no longer of use to the Federal Government. The township of Nahant received this surplus installation in order to develop its civic needs, upon payment of $23,000. The committee, however, was insistent upon the Federal Government's rights to recapture this property in the event of a national emergency or for reasons of national security, or in the event that this property was not put to a public, educational, or recreational use. Under no circumstances would the committee countenance the future employment of this reservation land for general commercial, industrial, or residential purposes. H. R. 2816, a bill embodying similar provisions to H. R. 7477, was incorporated into Public Law 623 during the consideration by the committee.

The committee pressed for enactment of H. R. 5819, Public Law 633. This act authorizes the withholding of compensation due Government personnel who have received improper payments of Government funds for which a certifying officer is held responsible. Hitherto, compensation could not be withheld from Government personnel indebted to the United

States by reason of overpayment or improper receipt of public funds. This law, therefore, gives the necessary statutory authority to withhold current payments from Government personnel.

The Department of Interior in seeking to consolidate its property in low-rental areas in the region of Boise, Idaho, outlined the merits of H. R. 7667, Public Law 649. General Services Administration, under this act, accordingly transferred 11½ acres of land and appurtenances to the Department of Interior without reimbursement or transfer of funds. This legislation provided a short-cut for economical transfer, obviating the necessity for a Department of Interior appropriation item request which would be passed to the General Services Administration for eventual coverage into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. This legislation had the desired result of reducing governmental red tape.

H. R. 5281, Public Law 688, and H. R. 8662, Public Law 656, involved certain operations of the Treasury Department.

Public Law 656 provides a business-type budget and revolving fund method of financing for the operations of engraving and printing. Accrual accounting, integration of cost accounting with the general system of accounts, and the production of financial statements of useful purpose and management will, under this act, afford full disclosure with respect to the financial condition and operations of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

On the other hand, Public Law 688 authorizes executive departments, other Treasury Department bureaus and wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations to reimburse the Division of Disbursement, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, for work performed for the respective agency. In those instances where funds have not been made available to the agency or bureau of the Department of the Treasury.

It can always be said that every device to eliminate Government red tape is regarded as laudable. H. R. 9430, authorizing certain administrative expenses in the Government service, will go far toward this goal. This measure provides amendments based on administration of Public Law 600, 1946; studies of the Comptroller General; and recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. This estimable public law improves previous provisions for dealing with expenses of travel of employees, transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects on permanent change of station, and payment of expenses for persons appointed for duties overseas. This matter is of prime importance today in view of evacuation of civilian employees for military and other reasons at foreign posts. The Comptroller General has incorporated in this law his study of restriction in appropriation acts with a view to determining costs to the Government of complying with such restrictions. In addition, under the emphasis of the Hoover Commission on Organization's recommendation, this bill is designed to eliminate from appropriation language many useless phrases which are required under existing law and thus eliminate from the appropriation acts the "jungle of detailed provisions" of which the Commission was so critical. After favorable House and Senate action, this bill awaits the Presidential signature.

The House on July 27, 1950, passed H. R. 8621 which would facilitate settlement of accounts of certain civilian deceased personnel of the Government. The effect of this laudable bill would be to permit settlement at field levels in the Government service of amounts due the next of kin of Government personnel. This would avoid the reference of correspondence and settlement to the Washington area.

H. R. 8706 provides for the purchase of bonds to Government officials and employees of the Government now required by law to be bonded, and would authorize the payment of premiums of such bonds from Government funds. This bill passed by the House on July 17, 1950, parallels similar legislation. The following are recited from the committee calendar as covering the same subject matter: H. R. 2830; H. R. 2871; H. R. 2943; H. R. 4084; H. R. 4642; H. R. 7913; H. R. 8528.

The committee believes this legislation to be highly desirable and the cost to be a proper one to be borne by the Government. It was determined also that its enactment would be in keeping with sound business practices of private industry, State and local governments. It was also found to be firmly advocated by the Commission on Organization as a marked and progressive step for improvement and simplification of present outmoded bonding procedures in Federal Government.

The Expenditures Committee held a series of hearings which allowed for an exchange of academic and practical viewpoints with regard to the budget. In these hearings the budget was scanned as a technical instrument and its structure examined as a fiscal as well as an economic factor in Government. H. R. 8054 and H. R. 6275 were employed as avenues of approach to this absorbing problem. The presidential item veto, a scrutiny of the investment phases of the budget, and the many parts which go to creating it as a structure were amply explored. Serious scholars of government, expert witnesses, as well as public officials, were invited to attend the hearings. The results can be stated as highly productive and thought provoking, since it afforded an excellent opportunity for a keen appraisal of the structural framework of the national budget.

A number of hearings were had on H. R. 5182, which proposes to establish a United Medical Administration by consolidating hospitals of the Armed Services, Veterans' Administration, and Public Health Service. The complexities of effecting this proposed consolidation were brought to light. The studies of the Hoover Commission on Organization were analyzed, and the committee became thoroughly informed with the many ramifications of this proposal. This area, which can be fruitful of efficiency and economy, is of continuing interest to the committee.

Studies have been made, and it is hoped that appropriate legislation will be able to be considered in the near future on the subject of traffic management. H. R. 7429 and H. R. 7430 were introduced as a means of opening up this field for gainful staff analysis.

A number of fields remain for future legislative endeavor. Staff work is being done in exploring further potentials in these productive regions, in order to reduce the costs of government to the taxpayer. It is contemplated that from the present period until the beginning of 1951 basic studies now under consideration will provide basic legislative drafts, aimed at increased efficiency and greater economy, commensurate with our Nation's need in governmental services.

The membership of the committee is to be heartily congratulated on the excellent caliber of their work during this session and the entire Eighty-first Congress. Its past and present record will stand as a goal for others as well as a spur to their own future endeavors.

Report to the People of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith my second annual report to the people of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. Last year I prepared a report on my voting and attendance record during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. This is a similar compilation for the second session complete to the date of preelection recess on September 22.

By means of news letters, radio broadcasts, and conferences throughout the district during congressional recesses, I have attempted to inform my constituents and report to them on my stewardship as their Representative in Washington. This voting report is in keeping with my purpose of keeping the people of my district as fully informed as possible on congressional issues.

It is a complete record. It is not a hand-picked list of a few so-called key votes compiled by some lobbyist, pressure group, or political campaign committee. The whole record is there in concise form for the people to examine and evaluate for themselves.

If more complete information on any measure considered, or an explanation of any particular vote, is desired, I shall be glad to respond to such requests.

Roll-call record, 2d sess. 81st Cong.

Roll call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
	1950		
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 9	do	Present.
3	Jan. 18	do	Present.
4	Jan. 19	do	Present.
5	do	Motion to recommit to Foreign Affairs Committee H. R. 5330, to provide economic aid for Korea. (Rejected, 190 to 194.)	Aye.
6	do	H. R. 5330 to provide economic aid to Korea. (Rejected, 191 to 193.)	No.
7	Jan. 20	Quorum call	Present.
8	do	Motion to adjourn (made to delay consideration of rules change until after Monday's calendar, thus removing FEPC bill as issue in rules change). (Rejected, 161 to 255.)	Aye.
9	do	H. Res. 133, to repeal 21-day discharge rule which permits committee chairmen to call up bills which have been before Rules Committee 21 days. (Rejected, 183 to 236.)	No.
10	Jan. 23	Quorum call	Present.
11	do	do	Present.
12	do	do	Present.
13	do	do	Present.
14	do	do	Present.
15	do	Motion for previous question on H. Res. 217, providing for consideration of H. R. 331, for admission of Alaska as a State. (Carried, 373 to 25.)	Aye.
16	Jan. 25	Quorum call	Present.
17	do	do	Present.
18	do	do	Present.
19	do	do	Present.
20	Jan. 27	do	Present.
21	do	do	Present.
22	do	do	Present.
23	do	do	Absent.
24	do	do	Present.
25	Jan. 30	do	Present.
26	Jan. 31	Motion to recommit H. J. Res. 398, to increase and adjust cotton and peanut allotment for 1950. (Rejected, 136 to 240.)	Aye.
27	Feb. 1	Quorum call	Present.
28	do	Motion to dispense with Calendar Wednesday (thus preventing recognition of committee chairmen with bills ready for House action). (Rejected, 104 to 271.)	No.
29	do	Quorum call	Present.
30	do	do	Present.
31	do	do	Present.
32	Feb. 2	do	Present.
33	do	do	Present.
34	do	do	Present.
35	Feb. 6	do	Present.
36	Feb. 7	do	Present.
37	do	do	Present.
38	do	do	Present.
39	Feb. 8	do	Present.
40	Feb. 9	Motion to recommit H. R. 2945, postal rate adjustment bill. (Rejected, 150 to 218.)	Aye.
41	do	Motion to recommit S. 2319, to provide economic aid for Korea and Formosa. (Rejected, 137 to 239.)	Aye.
42	do	S. 2319, to provide economic aid for Korea and Formosa. (Passed, 240 to 134.)	No.
43	Feb. 14	Quorum call	Present.
44	Feb. 15	do	Present.
45	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under quorum call (quorum call for delay, to prevent bringing up FEPC bill). (Agreed to, 257 to 82.)	Aye.
46	do	Motion to adjourn (made to delay). (Rejected, 97 to 236.)	No.
47	do	Motion to dispense with Calendar Wednesday (made to delay). (Rejected, 94 to 238.)	No.
48	do	Motion to adjourn (made to delay). (Rejected, 109 to 218.)	No.
49	do	Quorum call	Present.
50	do	Motion to adjourn (made to delay). (Rejected, 126 to 198.)	No.
51	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under quorum call (made to delay). (Agreed to, 243 to 86.)	Aye.
52	Feb. 21	Amendment to S. 2734, to promote the rehabilitation of Navajo and Hopi Indians, which amendment would extend State laws covering certain offices to Indian reservations. (Rejected, 142 to 196.)	Aye.
53	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
54	do	do	Present.
55	do	Motion to adjourn (to delay FEPC bill). (Rejected, 127 to 278.)	No.
56	do	Motion to dispense with call of committees on Calendar Wednesday (to delay FEPC bill). (Rejected, 121 to 285.)	No.
57	do	Quorum call	Present.
58	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under quorum call. (Agreed to, 290 to 115.)	Aye.
59	do	Motion to adjourn (to delay FEPC bill). (Rejected, 127 to 284.)	No.
60	do	Question of consideration of H. R. 4453, fair employment practices bill. (Carried, 287 to 121.)	Aye.
61	do	Motion to adjourn (to delay FEPC bill). (Rejected, 165 to 239.)	No.
62	do	Question of consideration of H. R. 4453, fair employment practices bill. (Carried, 270 to 134.)	Aye.
63	do	McConnell substitute for H. R. 4453, FEPC bill, giving commission investigatory, educational, and persuasive powers, but striking out mandatory enforcement. (Adopted, 221 to 178.)	Aye.
64	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Present.
65	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 4453, fair employment practices bill. (Rejected, 177 to 239.)	No.
66	do	H. R. 4453, to establish a Fair Employment Practices Commission, and aid in eliminating discrimination. (Passed, 240 to 177.)	Aye.
67	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
68	do	do	Present.
69	Feb. 28	do	Present.
70	do	do	Present.
71	do	Motion that House insist on its amendments to S. 1008, so-called basing-point pricing bill, and agree to further conference with Senate. (Agreed to, 240 to 144.)	Aye.
72	do	Motion to table motion to instruct House conferees to insist on House amendment to S. 1008, basing-point pricing bill. (Agreed to, 210 to 161.)	Aye.
73	Mar. 1	Motion to strike out enacting cause of (and thus killing) H. R. 5953, to authorize contribution of $1,229,240 to CARE to assist libraries abroad. (Agreed to, 265 to 102.)	Aye.
74	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 4846, National Science Foundation bill. (Rejected, 134 to 240.)	No.
75	do	H. R. 4846, National Science Foundation bill. (Passed, 247 to 125.)	Aye.
76	Mar. 2	Quorum call	Present.
77	Mar. 3	do	Present.
78	do	H. R. 331, to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union. (Passed, 186 to 146.)	No.
79	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
80	Mar. 7	H. R. 49, to provide for the admission of Hawaii into the Union. (Passed, 262 to 110.)	Aye.
81	do	Quorum call	Present.
82	do	Conference report on H. R. 4406, to provide for the settlement of certain claims of United States, and United States nationals, against foreign governments (mainly Yugoslavia). (Adopted, 209 to 165.)	No.
83	do	Quorum call	Present.
84	do	Conference report on H. R. 2023, to regulate oleomargarine and repeal Federal tax on yellow-colored oleomargarine. (Adopted, 262 to 106.)	No.
85	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Absent.
86	do	do	Present.
87	Mar. 9	do	Absent.
88	do	H. Res. 481, making in order the consideration of H. R. 874, library demonstration service bill. (Adopted, 209 to 140.)	No.
89	do	Quorum call	Present.
90	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 874, library demonstration service bill. (Rejected, 162 to 178.)	Aye.
91	do	H. R. 874, library demonstration service bill. (Rejected, 161 to 164.)	No.
92	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.
93	do	do	Present.
94	do	do	Present.
95	do	Motion that House resolve itself into Committee of Whole to consider H. R. 3247, amending Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for District of Columbia. (Rejected, 70 to 242.)	No.
96	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
98	do	Motion to recommit the conference report on S. 1008, to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission and the Clayton Act to certain primary practices. (Rejected, 175 to 204.)	No.
99	Mar 15	Quorum call	Present.
100	do	H. R. 4703, to tighten governmental and internal security laws. (Passed, 368 to 2.)	Aye.
101	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
102	do	Motion to recommit H. J. Res. 398, relating to cotton, peanuts, and potato acreage allotments. (Rejected, 116 to 225.)	Aye.
103	do	Motion to recommit S. 2105, to stimulate exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical minerals. (Rejected, 155 to 161.)	No.
104	do	S. 2105, to stimulate exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical minerals. (Rejected, 144 to 166.)	Aye.
105	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
106	do	H. R. 7057, permitting land-grant colleges to include payments made by Federal Government under other programs to be included as cost of instruction when rendering estimates to Veterans' Administration. (Passed, 245 to 101.)	Aye.
107	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Absent.
108	do	Amendment to H. R. 7402, Housing Act of 1950, striking out title I, so-called middle-income housing title, providing direct loans to cooperatives. (Agreed to, 218 to 155.)	Aye.
109	do	H. R. 7402, Housing Act of 1950. (Passed, 361 to 10)	Aye.
110	Mar. 23	H. Res. 482, authorizing expenditure of $150,000 for investigations by House Committee on Un-American Activities. (Agreed to, 348 to 12.)	Aye.
111	do	Conference report on H. J. Res. 198, enlarging cotton and peanut acreage allotments. (Agreed to, 197 to 156.)	No.
112	do	Quorum call	Present.
113	Mar. 24	do	Present.
114	do	do	Present.
115	do	H. Res. 518, providing for the consideration of H. R. 7797, providing for foreign economic assistance. (Agreed to, 262 to 22.)	Aye.
116	do	Quorum call	Absent.
117	do	do	Present.
118	Mar. 27	do	Present.
119	do	do	Present.
120	Mar. 28	do	Present.
121	Mar. 29	do	Present.
122	Mar. 30	do	Present.
123	Mar. 31	do	Present.
124	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 7707, bill for foreign economic assistance, with instructions to strike out title III, the title providing for point 4 program. (Rejected, 150 to 220.)	Aye.
125	do	H. R. 7797, to provide foreign economic assistance. (Passed, 287 to 85.)	No.

Roll-call record, 2d sess., 81st Cong.—Con.

Roll call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
	1950		
126	Mar. 31	H. Res. 531, agreeing to Senate amendments to H. R. 1758, Kerr natural gas bill. (Agreed to, 176 to 174.)	No.
127	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
128	...do	...do	Present.
129	...do	...do	Absent.
130	...do	...do	Present.
131	Apr. 5	...do	Present.
132	Apr. 4	...do	Present.
133	Apr. 19	...do	Present.
134	...do	...do	Present.
135	...do	...do	Present.
136	Apr. 20	...do	Present.
137	Apr. 21	S. J. Res. 166, authorizing posthumous award of decoration to members of crew of U. S. Navy *Privateer* who lost their lives in Baltic Sea Apr. 8, 1950. (Adopted, 333 to 0.)	Aye.
138	...do	Quorum call	Present.
139	Apr. 24	...do	Present.
140	Apr. 25	...do	Present.
141	Apr. 26	...do	Present.
142	Apr. 27	...do	Present.
143	...do	...do	Present.
144	May 1	...do	Present.
145	...do	...do	Present.
146	...do	H. R. 7185, to provide open competitive examinations for veterans for the position of apprentice in the Federal service. (Passed, 209 to 93.)	Aye.
147	...do	H. R. 6354, to authorize District of Columbia Board of Commissioners to establish daylight saving time in District of Columbia. (Passed, 194 to 87.)	Absent.
148	May 3	Conference report on H. R. 5472, authorizing construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. (Approved, 210 to 137.)	No.
149	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
150	...do	Conference report on H. R. 1243, amending the Hatch Act relative to penalties for violations of this act by Federal civil-service employees. (Agreed to, 203 to 140.)	Aye.
151	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
152	...do	...do	Present.
153	May 6	Motion to adjourn	No.
154	...do	Quorum call	Present.
155	May 8	...do	Present.
156	May 9	...do	Present.
157	May 10	...do	Present.
158	...do	Gore amendment to H. R. 7786, general appropriations bill, increasing the funds for grants for hospital construction under the Public Health Service from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000. (Agreed to, 258 to 131.)	No.
159	...do	Case amendment to H. R. 7786, general appropriations bill, to reduce the funds for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration by $2,950,000. (Agreed to, 222 to 163.)	Aye.
160	...do	Thomas-Taber amendment to H. R. 7786, general appropriations bill, reducing total amount by $600,000,000 by making 10 percent cuts in civilian personnel, except medical and military personnel, and directing other specific percentage cuts. (Adopted, 274 to 112.)	Aye.
161	...do	Jensen amendment to H. R. 7786, general appropriations bill, prohibiting use of funds to fill more than 10 percent of vacancies occurring in Federal service, with exception of military, medical, and certain technical personnel. (Adopted, 201 to 185.)	Aye.
162	...do	H. R. 7786, general appropriations bill, carrying 27¼ billion dollars. (Passed, 362 to 21.)	No.
163	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
164	May 15	...do	Present.
165	...do	...do	Present.
166	...do	...do	Absent.
167	...do	H. Res. 567, providing for consideration of H. R. 5990, to provide $13,000,000 for Baltimore-Washington Parkway. (Agreed to, 194 to 32.)	No.
168	...do	Motion that House resolve itself into Committee of Whole House to consider H. R. 5990, providing for $13,000,000 for Baltimore-Washington Parkway. (Agreed to, 192 to 29.)	No.
169	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
170	May 19	H. R. 7941, amending Federal Aid Road Act, authorizing continuance of construction of highways. (Passed, 246 to 34.)	Aye.
171	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
172	...do	Conference report on H. R. 7797, Foreign Economic Assistance Act. (Agreed to, 248 to 88.)	No.
173	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
174	June 6	...do	Present.
175	...do	Amendment to H. R. 7468, omnibus claims bill, deleting title III, which would have paid $34,272 to Harry Tansey for liquor declared to be contraband in 1926. (Agreed to, 184 to 119.)	Aye.
176	June 13	Motion to recommit H. R. 8276, extending Federal rent control to Jan. 31, 1951. (Rejected, 143 to 227.)	Aye.
177	...do	H. R. 8276, extending Federal rent control to Jan. 31, 1951. (Passed, 202 to 163.)	No.
178	June 21	Conference report on H. R. 6567, to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. (Agreed to, 235 to 81.)	Aye.
179	...do	Conference report on S. 3181, to extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. (Agreed to, 176 to 145.)	No.
180	June 22	H. J. Res. 334, increasing United States share of expenses of 5 international organizations. (Passed, 209 to 91.)	No.
181	June 22	H. Res. 649, providing for consideration of S. 2269, providing for enlistment of aliens in Regular Army. (Agreed to, 232 to 61.)	No.
182	...do	S. 2269, providing for enlistment of aliens in Regular Army. (Passed, 201 to 84.)	No.
183	June 26	Motion to refer H. R. 87, crediting veterans of World War II with time spent in military service toward promotion and salary in postal service, and Presidential veto message, to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. (Rejected, 115 to 165.)	Aye.
184	...do	Passage of H. R. 87, crediting veterans of World War II with time spent in military service toward promotion and salary in postal service, notwithstanding Presidential veto. (Passed, 213 to 72.)	Aye.
185	...do	Quorum call	Present.
186	June 27	...do	Present.
187	...do	Conference report on H. R. 6826, extending Selective Service Act for 1 year. (Agreed to, 315 to 4.)	Aye.
188	June 29	Motion to recommit H. R. 8920, reducing excise taxes and increasing certain other taxes, instructing committee to divide bill into 2 parts, 1 on excise taxes, the other on remaining provisions. (Rejected, 147 to 239.)	Aye.
189	...do	H. R. 8920, reducing excise taxes and increasing certain other taxes. (Passed, 375 to 14.)	Aye.
190	...do	Motion to recommit S. 3550, extending import control authority over fats, oils, and rice for 1 year, by deleting coconut products and adding cheese. (Rejected, 72 to 264.)	Aye.
191	...do	Quorum call	Present.
192	June 30	...do	Present.
193	...do	Motion to recommit S. 3336, providing for the organization of a constitutional government for Puerto Rico, to require that referendum shall be in accordance Federal Corrupt Practices Act. (Rejected, 1 to 260.)	No.
194	...do	Quorum call	Present.
195	July 10	...do	Present.
196	...do	...do	Present.
197	...do	H. Res. 647, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 27, to create a new executive Department of Health, Education, and Security to which all functions and agencies of Federal Security Agency would be transferred. (Adopted, 249 to 71.)	Aye.
198	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
199	July 12	Motion to recommit H. R. 8083, authorizing the Export-Import Bank of Washington to guarantee, to the extent of $250,000,000, United States private capital invested abroad. (Rejected, 156 to 184.)	Aye.
200	...do	H. R. 8083, authorizing the Export-Import Bank of Washington to guarantee, to the extent of $250,000,000, United States private capital invested abroad. (Passed, 195 to 151.)	No.
201	...do	Motion to recommit H. R. 7439, to protect the national security of the United States by permitting summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various agencies of the Government. (Rejected, 144 to 193.)	No.
202	...do	H. R. 7439, to protect the national security of the United States by permitting summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various agencies of the Government. (Passed, 327 to 14.)	Aye.
203	July 17	Quorum call	Present.[1]
204	...do	S. J. Res. 2, proposing amendment to the Constitution of United States for election of President and Vice President, so that electoral votes would be divided in ratio of popular vote. (Rejected, 134 to 210.)	Not voting.[2]
205	...do	H. J. Res. 502, to continue for 1 year the exemption of certain import taxes on copper. (Passed 283 to 58.)	Not voting.[2]
206	...do	Quorum call	Absent.
207	...do	...do	Absent.
208	...do	H. R. 10, to facilitate the deportation of aliens from United States, to provide for supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of United States. (Passed, 326 to 15.)	Not voting.[2]
209	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
210	July 19	S. 3809, extending the mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 for 1 year and authorizing appropriations of 1.2 billion dollars. (Passed, 362 to 1.)	Aye.
211	July 20	Amendment to S. 2822, amending Federal Deposit Insurance Act, authorizing 1.5 million dollars for site and new buildings for FDIC. (Rejected, 90 to 227.)	No.
212	...do	Quorum call	Present.
213	July 24	...do	Present.
214	...do	Motion to recommit H. R. 6454, authorizing the appointment of 2 additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois, with instructions to reduce number from 2 to 1, and make appointment temporary instead of permanent. (Rejected, 116 to 163.)	Aye.
215	...do	H. R. 6454, authorizing the appointment of 2 additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois. (Passed, 163 to 110.)	No.
216	...do	Motion to recommit H. R. 6240, authorizing the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana, with instructions to make the appointment temporary instead of permanent. (Rejected, 102 to 171.)	Aye.
217	July 25	Quorum call	Present.

[1] This is in error. I was absent for entire session July 17.
[2] Absent. If present, would have voted "aye."

Roll-call record, 2d sess., 81st Cong.—Con.

Roll call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
	1950		
218	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
219	July 31	Motion to recommit H. R. 9109, amending AAA Act, increasing national acreage allotments for cotton and peanuts. (Rejected, 120 to 179.)	Aye.
220	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
221	Aug. 3	do	Present.
222	Aug. 4	do	Present.
223	Aug. 7	do	Present.
224	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 8396, to authorize $5,000,000 for supplementing State and local government aid in alleviating suffering and damage in major disasters motion requiring finding by Congress, as well as President, that assistance required. (Rejected, 25 to 232.)	Aye.
225	Aug. 9	Motion to recommit H. R. 5967, so-called freight forwarders bill. (Rejected, 145 to 233.)	Aye.
226	do	H. R. 7009, permitting appointment of additional Federal judge in eastern and western districts of Missouri. (Passed, 240 to 133.)	No.
227	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
228	do	Spence amendment to H. R. 9176, Defense Production and Controls Act of 1950, inserting a title authorizing stand-by price and wage controls. (Adopted, 393 to 3.)	Aye.
229	do	Wolcott amendment to H. R. 9176, Defense Production and Controls Act of 1950, exempting existing other than new construction from real-estate credit controls. (Adopted, 202 to 188.)	Aye.
230	do	Wolcott amendment to H. R. 9176, Defense Production and Controls Act of 1950, limiting credit control to consumer and real-estate credit (Rejected, 173 to 224.)	Aye.
231	do	Cooley amendment to H. R. 9176, Defense Production and Controls Act of 1950, deleting grant of power to the President to control, by regulation, margins on commodity exchanges. (Adopted, 198 to 194.)	Aye.
232	do	H. R. 9176, Defense Production and Controls Act of 1950. (Passed, 383 to 12.)	Aye.
233	do	H. Res. 749, citing Julius Emspak for contempt of Congress for failure to answer questions on his Communist affiliations before House Un-American Activities Committee. (Adopted, 372 to 1.)	Aye.
234	Aug. 14	Motion to adjourn (made by Mr. Murray of Tennessee to prevent bringing up motion to bring up H. R. 8195, to rescind the Postmaster General's curtailment order). (Refused, 48 to 274.)	No.
235	do	Motion to discharge Rules Committee from further consideration of H. Res. 667, providing for consideration of H. R. 8195, to rescind the Postmaster General's order curtailing certain postal services. (Agreed to, 249 to 81.)	No.
236	do	S. 192, conferring jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions to which Indians are parties. (Passed, 295 to 4.)	Aye.
237	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
238	Aug. 16	Thornberry amendment to H. R. 8195, rescinding Postmaster General's order curtailing certain postal services, which would authorize appropriation of sufficient funds to restore former postal deliveries and prevent curtailing of other essential postal services. (Rejected, 159 to 213.)	Aye.
239	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 8195, to rescind the Postmaster General's order curtailing certain postal services. (Rejected, 111 to 261.)	Aye.
240	do	H. R. 8195, to rescind the Postmaster General's order curtailing certain postal services. (Passed, 264 to 108.)	No.
241	do	Motion for previous question on motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 6000, Social Security Act amendments of 1950 (failure of motion would have made motion to recommit amendable). (Ordered, 188 to 186.)	Aye.
242	do	Conference report on H. R. 6000, Social Security Act amendments of 1950. (Adopted, 374 to 1.)	Aye.
243	do	H. Res. 716, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6277 to give military discharges (and consequently veteran's status) to members of the Russian Railway Service Corps. (Rejected, 91 to 242.)	No.
244	Aug. 17	Motion to recommit H. R. 7570, to provide for an additional judge for the northern district of Ohio (Rejected, 142 to 146.)	Aye.
245	do	H. R. 7570, to provide for an additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio. (Rejected, 133 to 148.)	Not voting.[3]
246	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
247	do	do	Present.
248	Aug. 23	do	Present.
249	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 8850, to provide an additional Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. (Rejected, 123 to 222.)	Aye.
250	Aug. 24	H. R. 3775, to provide an additional district judge for the third division of the District Court for the District of Alaska. (Passed, 196 to 147.)	No.
251	do	H. R. 9477, to provide allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services in all grades. (Passed, 361 to 0.)	Aye.
252	do	Motion to recommit 8677, to improve the organization, maintenance, and operation of the Panama Canal, by barring levy of tolls upon vessels engaged in coastwise trade of United States. (Rejected, 20 to 330.)	No.
253	Aug. 25	Motion to recommit S. 456, to authorize construction and operation of public airport in or near District of Columbia. (Rejected, 124 to 226.)	Aye.
254	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
255	Aug. 26	H. R. 9526, supplemental appropriations bill providing 16.7 billion dollars, including 11.6 billion dollars for military purposes. (Passed, 311 to 1.)	Not voting.[4]
256	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Absent.
257	Aug. 29	do	Present.
258	do	H. Res. 826, providing for the consideration of H. R. 9490, requiring registration of Communist organizations. (Adopted, 357 to 1.)	Aye.
259	do	H. R. 9490, requiring registration of Communist organizations. (Passed, 354 to 20.)	Aye.
260	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Absent.
261	do	S. 4029, providing for registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialists. (Passed, 362 to 1.)	Aye.
262	do	H. Res. 834, citing Edward A. Rumely for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions and produce documents before House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 183 to 175.)	No.
263	do	H. Res. 835, citing William L. Patterson for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions and produce documents before House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 238 to 106.)	No.
264	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
265	do	do	Present.
266	do	H. Res. 836, citing Joseph P. Kamp for contempt of Congress by his refusal to answer certain questions before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 215 to 115.)	No.
267	do	Quorum call	Absent.
268	do	H. Res. 818, providing for the consideration of S. 784, for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos. (Rejected, 139 to 159.)	No.
269	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
270	Sept. 13	do	Absent.
271	do	do	Absent.
272	Sept. 14	Motion for previous question on H. Res. 842, to take from Speaker's table H. R. 8920, 1950 revenue bill, and agree to conference with Senate. (Rejected, 106 to 226.)	Aye.
273	do	Eberharter amendment to H. Res. 842, sending revenue bill, H. R. 8920, to conference, requiring Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee to report a bill to levy an excess-profits tax before the adjournment of the 81st Cong. (Adopted, 331 to 2.)	Aye.
274	do	H. Res. 847, providing for sending H. R. 9490, Subversives Control Act of 1950, to conference. (Adopted, 324 to 9.)	Aye.
275	Sept. 14	Overriding Presidential veto of H. R. 6217, to provide out-patient medical treatment for all veterans of Spanish-American War. (Passed, notwithstanding veto, 321 to 12.)	Aye.
276	do	Overriding Presidential veto of H. J. Res. 238, to provide eligibility for naturalization of all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, and providing revocation of citizenship for any person thus made eligible who joins Communist or Communist-front organization. (Passed, notwithstanding veto, 307 to 14.)	Aye.
277	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
278	do	H. R. 9646, to authorize the President to appoint Gen. George C. Marshall as Secretary of Defense. (Passed, 220 to 105.)	No.
279	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
280	do	Conference report on H. R. 9490, to protect United States against un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, etc. (Adopted, 313 to 20.)	Aye.
281	do	Motion to concur in Senate amendment to H. R. 9526, supplemental appropriations bill, which amendment would relieve United States employees from obligations of certain bonds guaranteeing return of Mexican laborers to Mexico. (Rejected, 160 to 172.)	Aye.
282	Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.
283	do	do	Present.
284	do	Ordering previous question on Cannon motion that House concur in so-called Wherry amendment to H. R. 9526, supplemental appropriations bill, cutting off aid to countries which ship military matériel to Russia or satellite countries, only when National Security Council decides such trade is against best interests of the United States. (Ordering previous question prevented consideration of stronger Taber amendment.) (Ordered, 167 to 149.)	No.
285	do	Cannon motion to concur in so-called Wherry amendment to H. R. 9526, supplemental appropriations bill, cutting off aid to countries which ship military matériel to Russia or satellite countries, if National Security Council decides such trade is against best interests of the United States. (Agreed to, 286 to 30.)	Aye.
286	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
287	do	Conference report on H. R. 8920, Revenue Act of 1950. (Adopted, 328 to 7.)	Aye.
288	do	Overriding Presidential veto of H. R. 9490, to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, etc. (Passed, notwithstanding veto, 286 to 48.)	Aye.

[3] If present, would have voted "no."
[4] If present, would have voted "aye."

Appropriations for Projects in the Western States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, several members of the Committee on Appropriations have been interested in the money spent by the Department of the Interior in projects now under development in the Western States. In reply to our request, the Department has supplied figures covering all expenditures, from the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration, for the years 1934 to 1950, inclusive. I have asked consent to include these tables with this extension of my remarks, because I think they will be of interest to all Members, particularly those from the West.

I should call attention, in passing, Mr. Speaker, to the excellent record in this regard of the sometimes maligned Eightieth Congress. Not only does this Republican Eightieth Congress stand out in leadership for the development of the West, but I call particular attention to the well-known fact that the Eightieth Congress repeatedly emphasized, and insisted upon, the completion of the projects already started, particularly when hearing the appropriation requests of the Bureau of Reclamation. Money was appropriated generously to finish the projects then under way for years. This should be the major objective of the Department. The tables follow:

Amounts appropriated, fiscal years 1934 through 1950, for irrigation and power

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

State and activity	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Arkansas: Power											$3,280	$16,000	$15,000	$2,523,347	$6,000	$125,000	$757,000
Missouri: Power														160,842		10,000	850,000
Oklahoma: Power											118,720	106,700	78,000	4,890,702	107,000	231,000	2,368,000
Texas: Power											13,000	17,300	17,000	25,109	12,000	25,000	25,000
Total											[1]135,000	140,000	110,000	7,600,000	125,000	391,000	[2]4,000,000

[1] In addition $100,000 established in a continuing fund to cover emergency expenses.
[2] In addition, $200,000 to increase the continuing fund to $300,000.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

State and activity	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Idaho:																	
Irrigation																	
Power																	$1,130,000
Montana:																	
Irrigation																	
Power														$930,000	$425,000	$45,000	650,000
Oregon:																	
Irrigation																	
Power					$55,000	$3,465,000	$4,185,000	$1,900,000	$6,115,000	$1,085,000				2,835,000	3,820,000	6,690,000	8,975,000
Washington:																	
Irrigation																	
Power					45,000	10,950,000	9,215,000	9,600,000	46,745,000	20,620,000				8,685,000	6,200,000	20,440,000	19,530,000
Total					100,000	[1]14,415,000	13,400,000	11,500,000	52,860,000	21,705,000	(2)	(2)	(2)	12,470,000	10,445,000	27,175,000	30,285,000

[1] Includes transfer from PWA of $10,750,000 ($7,361,000 for Washington and $3,389,000 for Oregon).
[2] No new appropriations made during these years, unobligated balances of prior year appropriations used on an adjusted program basis which took into account changed facility requirements due to war.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

State and activity	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942
Arizona:									
Irrigation	$284,110	$105,029	$279,000	$456,900	$1,524,500	$1,463,712	$2,116,000	$1,619,000	$1,167,500
Power				106,000	171,000	217,975	255,000	220,000	220,000
California: Irrigation	26,575	18,200	30,800	27,000	115,338	80,000	107,500	55,350	63,700
Colorado: Irrigation	15,250	9,300	15,000	15,000	15,000	80,000	41,000	26,000	31,000
Idaho: Irrigation	27,200	22,500	47,000	45,000	48,000	52,000	68,000	53,000	53,000
Montana:									
Irrigation	224,850	49,450	191,000	273,000	734,275	1,085,000	854,000	1,016,500	572,650
Power				45,000	45,000	50,000	75,000	80,000	80,000
Nevada: Irrigation	33,324	26,950	24,900	46,414	124,410	138,946	141,434	121,900	201,946
New Mexico: Irrigation	52,156	424,854	40,000	330,250	165,250	314,250	196,639	97,820	93,257
North Dakota: Irrigation				15,000					
Oklahoma: Irrigation				16,000					
Oregon: Irrigation			2,000	17,000	5,000	31,000	10,000	10,000	14,500
South Dakota: Irrigation				10,000					
Utah: Irrigation		23,000	55,000	76,500	78,000	110,000	78,000	58,000	58,000
Washington: Irrigation	100,500	13,800	152,500	204,000	228,000	281,000	410,000	270,500	404,500
Wisconsin: Irrigation				5,000					
Wyoming: Irrigation	45,000	23,500	43,000	132,000	46,500	70,000	65,000	91,000	90,000
Miscellaneous small projects: Irrigation	13,000	10,000	12,000	17,000	23,000	20,000	20,000	16,500	16,500
Plans, surveys, administrative expenses	71,925	72,000	58,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	75,000	70,980	70,980
Total:									
Irrigation	893,890	798,583	950,200	1,746,064	3,167,273	3,785,908	4,182,573	3,506,550	2,837,533
Power				151,000	216,000	267,975	330,000	300,000	300,000

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

State and activity	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Arizona:								
Irrigation	$376,840	$268,145	$368,278	$628,810	$677,261	$1,017,041	$3,495,009	$3,412,608
Power	223,000	220,000	277,027	260,700	469,303	718,553	671,346	620,000
California: Irrigation	141,500	35,000	32,825	41,500	48,888	18,209	27,315	95,375
Colorado: Irrigation	25,000	16,000	18,545	16,000	69,513	28,599	22,235	27,160
Idaho: Irrigation	60,850	55,925	115,000	75,370	89,803	129,744	114,357	216,195
Montana:								
Irrigation	333,410	275,770	285,615	440,020	505,742	404,208	674,616	662,411
Power	118,200	115,750	129,175	116,400	140,286	343,947	601,167	816,000
Nevada: Irrigation	78,446	65,450	141,161	126,646	91,165	30,857	43,963	76,679
New Mexico: Irrigation	69,500	31,886	36,291	31,886	125,855	68,655	104,189	84,520
North Dakota: Irrigation								
Oklahoma: Irrigation								
Oregon: Irrigation	25,330	17,910	11,615	10,086	19,144	21,242	19,338	38,258
South Dakota: Irrigation								
Utah: Irrigation	59,502	65,250	71,750	67,360	113,458	115,198	127,215	134,765
Washington: Irrigation	230,480	233,990	262,735	608,060	373,512	404,315	598,059	822,550
Wisconsin: Irrigation								
Wyoming: Irrigation	100,850	48,000	56,800	53,610	84,330	89,304	114,153	124,265
Miscellaneous small projects: Irrigation	16,500	40,415	42,730	40,000	47,500	109,000	60,000	85,000
Plans, surveys, administrative expenses	63,250	68,835	79,960	78,000	237,500	100,000	137,500	175,000
Total:								
Irrigation	1,581,458	1,222,576	1,523,305	2,217,348	2,483,671	2,536,372	5,537,948	5,954,786
Power	341,200	335,750	406,202	377,100	609,589	1,062,500	1,272,513	1,436,000

Estimated amounts appropriated for irrigation, power, and joint facilities, fiscal years 1934 through 1950, Bureau of Reclamation

State and activity	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942
Arizona:									
Irrigation	$66,500	$37,200	$70,000	$2,823,000	$1,273,000	$1,570,000	$770,000	$70,000	$567,000
Power	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
Arizona-California:									
Irrigation				6,500,000	1,500,000	500,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	2,000,000
Power						4,000,000		3,500,000	6,000,000
Arizona-Nevada:									
Power	8,000,000	14,000,000		9,600,000	2,550,000	3,500,000	5,000,000	500,000	9,060,000
Joint facilities									2,000,000
California:									
Irrigation	35,200	33,500	6,936,000	36,000	12,568,000	3,700,000	8,025,000		
Power							300,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Joint facilities						5,300,000	6,675,000	18,600,000	32,750,000
Colorado:									
Irrigation				1,200,000	500,000		1,300,000	1,250,000	900,000
Power									50,000
Joint facilities					900,000	1,250,000	2,350,000	2,000,000	3,000,000
Idaho:									
Irrigation	40,600	37,300	41,600	1,151,600	1,041,600	1,141,600	341,600	256,600	306,600
Power	175,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	165,000	150,000	150,000	160,000	188,400
Joint facilities				50,000		800,000	300,000	720,000	4,650,000
Montana:									
Irrigation	300,000				300,000	3,000,000	1,937,496	77,478	250,934
Joint facilities	14,200								
Nebraska: Irrigation							1,310,235	519,490	844,862
Nebraska-Wyoming: Power	120,000	60,000	66,000	66,000	66,000	116,000	251,000	101,000	
Nevada: Irrigation								100,000	
New Mexico: Irrigation				900,000	200,000	350,000	350,000	100,000	1,300,000
New Mexico-Texas:									
Irrigation	305,000	305,000	340,000	340,000	350,000	25,000	30,000	30,000	45,000
Power								50,000	50,000
North Dakota: Irrigation							881,861	11,265	
Oklahoma: Joint facilities							500,000		350,000
Oregon: Irrigation	19,000	13,900		450,000		300,000	400,000	400,000	1,000,000
Oregon-California: Irrigation	45,500	40,900	50,000	50,000	179,000	158,000	68,000	268,000	568,000
Oregon-Idaho: Irrigation	1,577,000	9,300	50,000	275,000	575,000	410,000	370,000	170,000	341,000
South Dakota: Irrigation					130,000		64,581	343,889	540,710
Texas:									
Irrigation									250,000
Joint facilities						2,030,000	5,000,000	5,500,000	
Utah: Irrigation				500,000	1,000,000	450,000	1,350,000	1,400,000	2,318,494
Washington:									
Irrigation	641,000	246,400	265,000	1,265,000	1,990,000	2,090,000	2,030,000	1,650,000	1,840,000
Power	60,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	975,000	2,225,000	18,025,000	15,025,000
Joint facilities	355,000			20,750,000	12,775,000	11,225,000	26,930,000	500,000	1,000,000
Wyoming:									
Irrigation	33,300	35,400	38,000	913,000	1,544,500	1,265,000	1,235,000	3,134,878	837,000
Power	45,000	50,000	50,000	1,050,000	50,000	482,000	255,000	610,000	470,000
Joint facilities				90,000	70,500	283,000	250,000		
Total:									
Irrigation	3,063,100	758,900	7,790,600	16,403,600	23,151,100	14,959,600	22,463,773	11,281,600	13,999,600
Power	8,425,000	14,310,000	316,000	10,916,000	2,881,000	9,248,000	8,206,000	27,971,000	35,843,400
Joint facilities	369,200			20,890,000	13,745,500	20,888,000	42,005,000	27,320,000	43,750,000

NOTE.—The appropriations for construction are made to projects as a whole; therefore, the breakdown between irrigation, power and joint facilities is on an estimated basis.

Estimated amounts appropriated for irrigation, power, and joint facilities, fiscal years 1934 through 1950, Bureau of Reclamation—Continued

State and activity	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Arizona:								
Irrigation	$1,315,955	$80,200	$67,500	$2,628,500	$2,107,850	$1,630,000	$2,596,000	$5,640,0000
Power		25,000	25,000	25,000	30,000	32,000	110,000	35,000
Arizona-California:								
Irrigation	1,000,000			6,000,000	5,000,000	3,245,000	4,000,000	5,100,000
Power	1,939,400	400,000	350,000	420,000	571,000	2,326,000	2,874,080	3,479,490
Arizona-Nevada:								
Power	7,291,225	1,675,000	968,000	4,000,000	3,947,935	5,523,000	20,725,000	40,104,860
Joint facilities	2,458,000			3,000,000	5,300,000	4,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
California:								
Irrigation		9,795,000		14,050,000	6,384,020	15,493,628	33,290,471	43,102,390
Power	5,000,000	1,874,000	400,000	9,215,000	5,565,537	4,989,060	8,588,936	19,848,550
Joint facilities	34,019,000	10,900,000	960,200	850,000	1,385,365	1,963,600	1,750,000	4,538,500
Colorado:								
Irrigation	229,000	200,000	20,000	2,226,900	6,424,567	7,800,000	8,671,000	5,558,000
Power	2,972,000	139,000	145,000	2,238,500	2,160,900	5,780,000	7,327,000	8,917,325
Joint facilities	3,053,070	3,461,000	2,482,000	3,674,600	2,744,500	4,300,000	10,150,000	11,999,510
Idaho:								
Irrigation	214,840	218,500	482,312	1,988,800	2,252,600	1,533,500	2,378,686	1,531,875
Power	86,400	82,175	60,500	885,060	294,525	2,914,950	2,054,154	1,431,825
Joint facilities	2,297,970	3,000,000	4,550,000	6,412,940	4,318,079	3,718,800	4,678,000	2,253,250
Kansas:								
Irrigation				65,000	350,000	900,000	1,750,000	
Joint facilities								5,385,000
Montana:								
Irrigation	74,985		595,196	60,000	41,625		361,500	807,500
Power	499,475		400,000	955,800	932,893	1,525,000	3,701,650	8,031,325
Joint facilities				2,280,000	1,282,210	2,175,000	15,600,000	26,909,270
Nebraska:								
Irrigation			241,648	458,900	2,455,000	5,500,000	10,605,000	4,045,280
Power					600,000	700,000	1,792,850	1,850,000
Joint facilities								9,500,000
Nebraska-Wyoming: Power	100,000	91,000	101,000	95,400	116,700	192,800	193,000	315,250
Nevada: Irrigation								
New Mexico: Irrigation	750,000	500,000	2,500,000	4,000,000	1,738,000	81,000	1,293,000	1,432,250
New Mexico-Texas:								
Irrigation	29,910	90,000	90,000					
Power		50,000	62,000	87,000	565,975	975,000	298,185	521,800
North Dakota:								
Irrigation				70,000	360,000	568,125	867,413	1,048,410
Power				15,000	1,327,500	600,000	1,100,000	3,870,000
Joint facilities				200,000	350,000	750,000	2,465,350	2,671,300
Oklahoma:								
Irrigation		150,000	1,045,000	3,020,000	2,664,610		320,000	255,000
Joint facilities	800,000	1,500,000						
Oregon:								
Irrigation	100,000	100,000	2,250,000	1,154,000	3,013,242	3,516,000	687,275	1,524,750
Power				300,000	170,000	32,000		
Oregon-California: Irrigation	133,925	550,000	526,000	1,131,000	169,500	200,000	274,550	1,097,460
Oregon-Idaho: Irrigation	199,995	186,000	189,000	411,200	234,500	260,000	457,600	360,000
South Dakota:								
Irrigation							45,000	531,150
Power								50,000
Joint facilities				181,500	2,566,000	4,609,000	5,527,750	6,856,180
Texas:								
Irrigation			440,000					
Joint facilities			126,000	6,900	68,400			
Utah: Irrigation	2,006,000		140,000	2,860,000	2,589,518	1,030,000	2,464,000	4,389,170
Washington:								
Irrigation	2,062,850	1,136,800	1,546,000	12,336,000	11,774,500	18,034,000	34,558,400	46,817,750
Power	16,925,000	965,000	2,325,000	5,240,000	8,275,200	12,125,000	18,441,100	22,366,833
Joint facilities	1,257,675		350,000	1,864,000	2,000,000	2,550,000	2,000,000	3,000,000
Wyoming:								
Irrigation	815,795	288,500	88,000	2,211,850	7,278,372	139,000	2,338,596	4,510,215
Power	195,000	203,000	230,000	3,109,000	2,622,545	4,350,700	7,365,131	9,036,932
Joint facilities				410,000	2,700,000	3,720,000	10,800,000	10,038,110
Total:								
Irrigation	8,933,255	13,295,000	10,220,656	54,672,150	54,837,904	59,930,253	106,958,491	126,731,200
Power	35,008,500	5,504,175	5,066,500	26,585,760	27,180,610	42,065,510	74,571,086	119,859,190
Joint facilities	43,885,715	18,861,000	8,468,200	18,879,940	22,714,554	27,786,400	53,971,100	87,206,120

Stalin Laughs at Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I wish to include an editorial entitled "Camden Can Spite Stalin and Lead United States in Reviving Industry Vital to Nation." The editorial appeared in the Courier-Post newspaper of Camden, N. J., issue of September 18, 1950.

This editorial refers to the unfortunate discharge last week of 1,000 workers at the Camden, N. J., yard of the New York Shipbuilding Co. A few days ago 2,000 more workers were laid off. This action has not only brought distress to the workers and their families, but has demonstrated again how inadequate is our national shipbuilding program. What we need is a long-range program that will keep our shipbuilding industry in a healthy condition ready to go. To do otherwise is to flirt with disaster. Too little and too late must not be our policy with reference to ships.

I commend the following editorial to the careful consideration of the officials of our Government who determine our shipbuilding program. It reads as follows:

CAMDEN CAN SPITE STALIN AND LEAD UNITED STATES IN REVIVING INDUSTRY VITAL TO NATION

Josef Stalin and his fellow plotters in the Kremlin received encouraging news from Camden last week.

The news was that 1,000 workers at the New York Shipbuilding Corp. had been given an indefinite lay-off—not that the company wanted it that way—high lighting the continuing failure of Congress and the administration, even in the face of the Korean War, to recognize the vital necessity of shipbuilding to assure America protection in time of war and prosperity in time of peace.

The 1,000 men were laid off because of construction changes ordered by the American President Lines in its three passenger-cargo ships now being built at the yard, delaying their delivery dates by 3 months and making it impossible for the company to find useful work for these men to do, since it has little on hand.

Following announcement of the layoff, officials of the vigorous and energetic union which represents 7,000 workers at the yard, the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, Local, No. 1, AFL, quickly boarded the train for Washington. There they held conferences with heads of the Federal Maritime Board, the Navy's Bureau of Ships, and Congressman WOLVERTON to see what, if anything, could be done about the lay-off and to forward the larger objective of an adequate shipbuilding program for America which will keep this Nation's yards open and give the country the adequate and modern merchant marine and naval shipping it so sorely requires.

James C. McKissock, union president, and Thomas W. Saul, executive secretary, report that all those with whom they conferred "fully realized the importance of an immediate shipbuilding program." But, Saul says, such assurances have been received on numerous occasions in the past, "only to see such programs and plans die on the desks of people in Washington" because of indifference and ignorance about shipbuilding needs.

The Wednesday conferences did, however, produce immediate and tangible results.

Within 48 hours the Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration announced that the three American President liners in the Camden yard, as well as the 48,000-ton superliner *United States*, now under construction at Newport News, Va., were being taken over by the Government and would be converted into troop transports.

The IUMSW leaders had specifically requested that this be done only in the case of the two liners not yet launched, but the Government is going further in adding the third to the list, in addition to the superliner.

The Maritime Administration also announced that it has ordered 25 more wartime Victory ships out of storage, to be repaired and reconditioned for the merchant marine reserve fleet at 10 shipyards on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

Such a move also was requested by the Camden union.

These two steps should benefit shipyards in the long run, but what immediate effect they will have on employment at the New York shipyard, and elsewhere, or whether they will mean the return of the 1,000 men laid off here, remains to be seen.

As MacArthur's troops storm ashore in amphibious attacks behind the Red lines in Korea, as we wage a campaign across 5,000 miles of water that requires enormous supply lines of merchant shipping and the support of the Navy, here are a few shocking facts:

We do not have the fast, modern cargo ships in our merchant marine that would have the effect of cutting our supply lines in half or less, and must rely on obsolete vessels to do a job for which they are unfitted.

We are doing so little building of new ships that, by next June, all present construction will be finished and there will be no work for American shipyards, except repairing and refitting—unless action is taken now.

"Demothballing" is not the answer. Our World War II surplus merchant ships, now rusting away in many a bay and estuary, are a menace rather than an asset for wartime purposes. Their 7-knot speed makes them sitting ducks for submarines and bombers. (It would be advantageous, however, to take a number of Navy vessels out of the "mothball fleet" and reactivate them as well as to construct more modern Navy ships.)

While our own shipyards are dying of dry rot, 19 yards are being operated in Japan now—with American money. Italy, as one sample in Europe, has restored shipbuilding to its prewar level—again with American dollars.

But if Russia were to declare war, it could quickly and easily bomb European and Japanese shipyards into destruction, and with no construction on the ways in America the democratic nations would be without the ships and the shipyards which are their first line of defense.

Even worse, in America the shipyards would have the utmost difficulty recruiting the skilled workers needed for building, who have turned in discouragement to other jobs because employment in their preferred occupation has been so precarious and uncertain.

What can be done, and done now, about this perilous situation?

First and foremost, says local No. 1, adopt and push with all speed the Maritime Board's program for 50 new fast, 20-knot cargo ships, as favored by the Board's Chairman, Admiral Edward F. Cochrane, and Admiral D. H. Clark of the Navy's Bureau of Ships.

This program is in the blueprint stage and can rapidly be set in motion if the Budget Bureau gives the go-ahead signal.

The Navy Department also should give demothballing jobs to private shipyards, and let east coast yards share in this work which is now being done almost exclusively on the Pacific coast.

Locally, the union proposes removal of obstacles now standing in the way of immediate resumption of work on the "killer ship" *Norfolk*, which is lying uncompleted at New York ship.

These proposals are all in addition to the steps ordered Friday at Washington.

The union urges all citizens to recognize their responsibility for getting these things done, and to wire or write President Truman urging immediate action on behalf of national security.

"It takes highly skilled workers to build ships," Saul rightly says. "If shipbuilding continues to be a 'feast and famine' industry, these skilled workers will be impossible to obtain in the event that there should be a national emergency requiring new ships to defend our Nation."

Shipbuilding is not and will never be a belt-line, mass production industry like the manufacture of automobiles or radio sets. It is like a tailor's work, a separate, individual job for every single product.

It requires a great variety and host of skills, skills that are hard to acquire but easy to lose when not steadily practiced.

The skilled, intelligent workers necessary to produce ships can find other jobs readily enough, in normal times, and do find them when they become fed up with "stop and go" employment at their own trades. They move away from the shipyard cities, they find their new jobs satisfactory enough, and many of them are lost to shipbuilding forever, together with the skills which they possess and which new workers can gain only by long, arduous and costly training.

That is what may happen to the 1,000 workers being laid off in Camden unless the Government takes immediate action.

This is a local issue as far as the 1,000 and the other workers at New York ship are concerned, but the same issue exists just as starkly in every shipbuilding center. It is both Camden's and the Nation's.

Will Camden, through a flood of protests to Washington, lead the way in solving it in the national interest?

Will the next news from Camden to reach Stalin's eyes give him cause to frown, instead of smile?

Draft Can Get Out of Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star of September 8, 1950:

DRAFT CAN GET OUT OF HAND

To the EDITOR: The medical draft legislation is one of the most significant pieces of legislation to be considered in Congress since the Korean emergency. It carries one of the most dangerous implications and potential threats to our democratic principles of individual rights that has ever been considered by a hasty and emergency-minded Congress.

The bill would draft doctors and dentists regardless of their draft standing, number of dependents, or other circumstances that apply to the male population of our country not in those professions. As such it is extremely dangerous because it will deprive a certain small segment of the population of their normal civil rights because of their profession.

Past experience with Federal legislation in other fields, both on an emergency and peacetime basis, has proven that once the precedent has been established there is no guaranty that it will stop in the relatively restricted field in which it was originated.

If doctors and dentists can be drafted solely on the basis of their profession, there is no guaranty that other small segments of the male population cannot similarly be deprived of their normal civil rights for the same reason or for any other reason that may be brought to public attention in an emergency. It is not fantastic to speculate that the next segment selected for such consideration might be in other areas than professional. Once the ball is rolling it could conceivably reach out for strikers, those labeled Communists, or any other field that Congress should select because it has been convinced by hysteria, public or financed propaganda, that it is necessary.

A. H. MUNSON.

PARK RAPIDS, MINN.

Stop Extravagance Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Third Iowa Congressional District have no illusions about the costliness of war and they are willing to pay to the best of their ability. But they have absolutely no patience with the continued wasting of money by some governmental agencies.

Following is a copy of a letter which I have received on this subject and which is expressive of many other similar communications from the Third Iowa District:

THE HINSON MANUFACTURING CO.,
Waterloo, Iowa, September 19, 1950.

MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary, United States Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOBIN: In today's mail we received a publication prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics entitled "Trends in Man-Hours Expended Per Unit Selected Types of Luggage, 1945 to 1948."

As manufacturers of luggage, we were of course interested in reading this pamphlet, and we found it to be interesting.

However, we cannot possibly imagine why this pamphlet was prepared. The information was somewhat of interest, but it was nothing that we either did not already know, or at least strongly suspect. We cannot possibly see how the preparation of this pamphlet could provide any earthly good whatsoever, to us or to any other manufacturer of luggage.

Undoubtedly the preparation of this material required the expenditure of a considerable amount of public funds. In our opinion such expenditure was almost 100 percent wasted.

We believe that this publication is typical of the unnecessary and wasteful expenditures being made by the Federal Government at this time. We beg of you to exert every effort to eliminate such unnecessary expenditures.

Yours very truly,

WM. H. HINSON,
Vice President.

Sale of China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, at the request of several of my constituents, Mrs. Gerald French and Mrs. Louise H. Padelford, of Pasadena, Calif., I am including with this extension of my remarks an interesting presentation of the backgrounds to the transactions by which Stalin may be said to have "bought" China. We are seeing the results of these secret pacts and negotiations in Korea today. The article, entitled "Sale of China," by Robert T. LeFevre, follows:

SALE OF CHINA

(By Robert T. LeFevre)

How much would you say China is worth—in good old United States dollars, that is?

From Manchuria and the northern Korean Peninsula, where some of the most fabulous deposits of minerals, iron, and lead in the world are located, to brawling, bustling Shanghai, pushing out into the East China Sea, to be scraped by the keels of ships from every country and every port in the world—China, with its more than half a billion people—what should the asking price be, if you had it for sale?

Think of some of the assets of China besides the land and the minerals and the peoples. What about the great cities, such as Canton, Hong Kong, Tientsin, Peiping, Chungking, Shanghai, Kwangchow, and scores of others? They must be worth something; and the trade, so vast there is no known commercial index which truly represents the yearly total, but it is assuredly in the billions. What about the vast farm lands that lie between the Hwang Ho and the Yangtze? What would your evaluation of them be?

Well, don't worry too much about it, because it is too late now, anyway. You see, China has just been sold.

Oh, yes, it has; although the sale was not consummated with the consent of the Chinese people. In fact, most of them know nothing about it. But we hope some of our Chinese wage earners in this country will translate this article and see that it gets into the hands of their cousins and brothers and sisters back in the Far East. For when the Chinese people learn what is in store for them, and how they have been betrayed, bartered for and delivered, they will rise up in their wrath and do away with the perpetrators of this most foul and perfidious act.

Secretly, and at night, there was delivered to the wage-earners committee a translation of the articles of the Mao-Stalin secret pact. We cannot reveal how it was brought to this country, nor how it was translated, for to do so would be to endanger the lives of certain people who are in position of trust and confidence elsewhere in the world. However we will be happy to produce it for any properly authorized representative of the United States Government.

We are not going to reprint it here in full. But we are going to tell you what it says in certain of its more important sections.

First, this is the secret pact of friendship entered into on February 12, 1950, at Moscow. It is signed by the plenipotentiary delegate of the Chinese people's government, Chou En-Lai, and by the plenipotentiary delegate of the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Andrei Noraivich Vishinsky.

Second, there were only supposed to be two copies. Each copy was written in both Chinese and Russian. One was taken by each delegate back to his own master.

The document consists for the most part of 19 articles of agreement between the upstart labor boss of the Communist Party in China, Mao Tse-tung, who in this case was the seller, and the labor boss of the Bolsheviks, Joseph Stalin, the buyer.

Buyer and seller agreed to the following arrangements:

Seller was to receive $300,000,000 United States dollar credit. (We should like to ask, how it is possible for the U. S. S. R. to make this bargain in United States money?) In return, certain obligations were to be undertaken. They were:

1. The Chinese People's Republic will assign northeast and north China air bases to the U. S. S. R., and will assume the responsibility of carrying out the "liberation" of Southeast Asia so as to effectuate the completion of the "liberation" of the whole of Asia (art. 2).

2. The Chinese Republic will organize its army into an international Communist Army to be under the direct command of the highest officer of the Red Army (art. 3).

3. The Chinese People's Republic must begin diminishing its population by 100,000,000. A lack of resources makes this necessary; details of this massacre to be left to the Chinese (art. 7).

4. The Chinese will mobilize 10,000,000 slave laborers to be turned over immediately to U. S. S. R. control to build necessary establishments in order to cope with "imperialistic aggression" (art. 4).

5. The Chinese will increase the number of men in the new Communist army by 4,000,000 before the end of 1050 (art. 6).

6. The U. S. S. R. will have special right to allocate iron, lead and other minerals and raw materials within the boundary of China (with the exception of 20 percent of lead production which the Chinese can maintain), to be supplied to the U. S. S. R. in order to assist in the industrialization of the Chinese People's Republic (art. 12).

7. The Chinese People's Republic must pay back the $300,000,000 advanced credit as follows: It must use as security the entire raw material production of the northeastern and northern sections of China, delivering such raw materials to Russia according to a schedule determined by the U. S. S. R. (art. 14).

8. Both parties agree mutually to assist each other in taking over the governments and the races of peoples living in Sinkiang, Inner Mongolia, Tibet (art. 16).

9. The contracting parties both agree that it is their duty to keep this agreement secret and never to announce it publicly (art. 19).

And there are more.

But now you can see why China is no longer for sale.

Now you see how far a labor boss and his villainous stooges can and will go. Remember that Mao Tsetung is a labor boss. What else can he be when he can enslave 10,000,000 men, corral another 4,000,000 into a mercenary army and put to death 100,000,000 at the demand of another, bigger, and still bloodier labor boss

Can you see the handwriting on the wall? That which has happened and is happening elsewhere can happen here. So while you're figuring out the price of China, how much would you be willing to take for America? Remember, America hasn't quite been sold—yet.

Statements of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Orvil Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following excellent editorial appearing in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer on September 4, 1950:

Within the past week two of the most devoted, competent, and patriotic American military men have been slapped down and humiliated for their honest appraisals of the grave war situation which confronts us.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, for 50 years an all but infallible prophet of the military dangers facing this country, was forced by the President to withdraw a statement concerning the importance of Formosa to our Pacific defense.

Yet hardly 2 months ago the administration ordered MacArthur to preserve the security of Formosa. He was given the Seventh Fleet to invoke that order.

Now, and probably to the consternation and dismay of MacArthur (who has forgotten more about the Pacific than Mr. Truman's Pacific advisers ever knew), he is told bluntly that Formosa does not count.

Mr. Truman (or is it Mr. Acheson?) seems to be saying, in effect, "We plan to spill blood and money fighting the Communist attack on South Korea, but let the Reds do as they please with Formosa—even though Formosa is immensely more important to us, strategically, than Korea."

The other general who in the past week has been transferred to the political doghouse is Maj. Gen Orvil Anderson.

General Anderson was quoted as saying that long-range United States bombers could break up Russia's atomic production plants in a week, if ordered to do so. And that civilization's best interest would be served in such an event.

For this statement he was relieved of his command as Commandant of the Air War College.

Surely this is a more temperate statement than that made by his boss, Defense Secretary Johnson, who promised the Russians an appalling atomic beating within hours after an attack on the United States.

I know from personal acquaintance and intimate conversations with any high-ranking officers of our three armed services that these banned views of General MacArthur and Anderson are widely and sincerely shared.

Two questions arise. First, are these men qualified to speak their minds? General MacArthur's qualifications are too well-known to review. As for General Anderson, let us briefly examine his background:

This veteran airman is entitled to wear five different types of wings, indicating his

wide experience ranging from Navy-dirigible training to the ability to command the latest in intercontinental bombers.

He has twice been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal; twice the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Silver Star for valor in action.

But most importantly, General Anderson served as a leading member of the War Plans Commission which plotted, far in advance, the destruction of industrial German war might by strategic bombing.

Fellow officers proclaim him to be one of the greatest planners in our military air arm.

So much for their qualifications.

Now, the second and even more important question: Should these unquestioned authorities have the right to speak?

Since they spoke as American soldiers trained and tried in combat with enemy forces in wartime, I believe they have every right—in fact, duty—to speak out at this crucial time.

But they have been muzzled.

Their opinions are banned because they do not have the blessings of the State Department, two of whose more recent and profound military stratagems resulted in our loss of China and the untenable position in which we find ourselves in Berlin.

Are we Americans to be permitted to hear or be exposed to only one official viewpoint?

Are we to have censored or kept from us any and all other views, even from the most competent sources?

MacArthur and Anderson won their rank in recognition of their many qualifications, not the least of which is their judgment in military matters.

But now, suddenly, there can be no other view except the one "official" stand of the President and his haphazardly gathered advisers.

Not many years ago another soldier general, Billy Mitchell, was busted in rank and publicly chastised for voicing an opinion contrary at the time of the "official" opinion. Mitchell said that airplanes could sink battleships. He even demonstrated that they could. World War II proved him abundantly correct, and a chagrined government eventually got around to awarding him the Congressional Medal of Honor—posthumously.

Is the only thing we are to learn from history again to be that we learn nothing from history?

Must we again blunder into censoring and humiliating experienced officers for courageously expressing viewpoints not necessarily "official"?

High among the evils we deplore and detest in dictatorships is control by government of freedom of thought and expression.

Are we not getting too dangerously close to that very same type of thought control right here in our own country?

Isn't it just about time for the American people to get answers to some of these questions?

Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, in response to an inquiry from the House Lobby Investigating Committee when it first began work, I suggested to them that the agencies and bureaus of the Federal Government were the most powerful, the most effective, and ofttimes the most offensive lobbyists. Apparently, little effort is being made by our committee to determine the extent of the pressure brought by executive agencies upon the Congress, or the effect of propaganda campaigns by newspaper columnists.

In today's mail I received a letter from a prominent and distinguished university official, in which he states:

Incidentally, some of the Federal agencies are pressing university officials to lobby for certain national loan and scholarship funds. I hope you will use your influence to kill this measure. Most colleges have all the loan funds they need—available at low rates of interest; such funds are on the increase. I sincerely doubt whether there are very many worthy boys and girls capable of taking a college education who do not eventually get it through the people in their home towns, through existing scholarships, and particularly through their own initiative. I know that you will do your part to keep the old-fashioned way of developing men and women fit for leadership and command. You don't get them by feeding them with spoons.

While Our Men Are Fighting and Dying, Some Are Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from Collier's of September 30, 1950, comes an editorial which reads as follows:

NEEDED: A VAST UN ARMY

Collier's strongly supports Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in his call for a vast world army of men from all free countries, under the flag and leadership of the United Nations. We made the same appeal on this page 4 weeks ago, and we think the matter is important enough to be urged again.

It is time that the other UN governments realized that there is a limit to America's ability to foot the free world's bills and fight the free world's battles. That statement is not inspired by any sympathy toward isolationism. It is inspired by a disappointment in the non-Communist government's leisurely and tentative response to UN Secretary General Trygve Lie's request for aid in Korea. It is inspired by a resentment of the American lives lost in a war that concerns every non-Communist member of the United Nations as much as it concerns the United States.

We do not mean to minimize the sea and air forces that two or three countries sent at the beginning of the Korean War. But the sea and air were not where help was most urgently needed. The need was for foot soldiers in the first bitter weeks when American forces were so vastly outnumbered, outtrained, and outgunned. The need was for foot soldiers, not in a few months or weeks, but then.

For 2 months, the American and South Korean ground forces fought it out alone. For 2 months, they fought without even the promise of help from the other major powers. The smaller nations like Australia, Thailand, Canada, and the Philippines, who were the first to volunteer assistance, perhaps should not be blamed for not having combat troops in readiness. But Great Britain had some 30,000 trained soldiers in Hong Kong when the Korean fighting broke out, and France had about 150,000 metropolitan and colonial troops under arms in Indochina. Yet, it was late August before Britain even offered to send 1,500 men to Korea and France promised a volunteer force of 1,200.

It is true that Hong Kong is a potential trouble spot, and that France is fighting a guerrilla war with the Communists in Indochina. But the fact remains that when the crisis came, this country's 50-odd non-Communist associates in the United Nations were unready or unwilling to send even a token force of ground troops into battle. The fact remains that it was the Americans alone who had to help the South Koreans defend their country and their freedom. It was the Americans alone who had to die for a cause to which the whole free membership of the United Nations was equally committed.

It may be too late now to hope for effective outside assistance in Korea. But who will be so rash as to say that Korea is the beginning and the end? There may well be other "incidents." But there must not be another Korea. With partial mobilization already under way in several countries, this is the time to start organizing the vast world army that Governor Dewey spoke of, an army prepared and alert to act in the event of further "incidents" and stop them quickly.

So long as the formation of such an army is delayed, the Soviet Government will find it easier to carry out some of its evident intentions. The intentions are these; to brand the United States as an aggressor and try to turn the masses of Asiatic people against us; to bleed our economy by forcing us to divert more and more of our wealth and effort to armaments; to expend its satellites' manpower while it keeps its own millions of men-at-arms safely at home.

Russia has spent only military equipment in Korea. America has spent equipment and lives, not to protect its own territory, not to gain any material prize, but to fight the UN's war. This cannot continue through crisis after crisis.

The United States is the bulwark of all free nations in the struggle against Soviet imperialism. It will not remain a bulwark forever if it is called upon to stand alone. As a matter of self-interest, if for no more noble consideration, the rest of the free world should realize this.

It has been said that the League of Nations expired because it had degenerated into a debating society, paralyzed by talk. There is danger that its successor might suffer the same fate unless the UN governments quickly realize that they must condemn Soviet aggression not only in indignant words but in action—action by a world army whose physical power and moral force could even make the men in the Kremlin revise their blueprint for world conquest.

It indicates that some of the internationalists should, before they subscribe so wholeheartedly to the proposal to take us into a one-world organization, have figured the possibility of a successful conclusion of that policy, of its cost to the people of the United States, its possible effect upon the security of the Republic.

Dean Acheson apparently will never learn, for he now wants us to furnish the major portion of the men and the money to form an international police force—the war in Korea is just a "police action," says Mr. Truman—to which American youth would be drafted, where

their duty would be to protect the commercial interests of the British Empire.

Is it not time that Acheson, who apparently has no conception of his duty to the Republic, should either step aside or be kicked out?

The Story of Five Tragic Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, 5 years have gone by since the end of the shooting in World War II. These have been tragic years for the United States. They have been years of the most reckless, the most extravagant, and the most shilly-shallying conduct of affairs by the administration in power. Unless our house in Washington is quickly put in order these 5 years could be the prologue to the collapse of the greatest and finest form of government ever conceived by man.

Just look back at the record of those five postwar years. It is a record of spending and squandering at home and of appeasement abroad.

In five short years we have wasted one of the greatest periods of prosperity in the Nation's history. The Federal Government collected more money in taxes from the people than in any other similar period and it has spent more.

In the past 5 years the Federal Government has spent about $40,000,000,000 just for domestic civilian programs and this does not include interest on the public debt.

In the past 5 years we have spent $95,000,000,000 on the Defense Department, and I ask, Where did the money go? Why were we in such a shocking state of unpreparedness when our boys were ordered into Korea to face the crack Russian tanks and the blazing cannon of the Communist's modern fighting forces?

In the past 5 years we spent more than $11,000,000,000 in foreign aid through the Marshall plan, and on top of this Congress appropriated millions for military aid under the Atlantic Pact.

We spent billions to prepare us for the day of emergency and we were unprepared and unready when that day came.

During these 5 years while we were spending all this money our Government was following a policy of appeasement toward Russia—a merry-go-round policy which lost China to the Kremlin's Red warlords.

Where do we find ourselves at the end of that 5-year period?

The answer is plain—our Federal Government has the greatest public debt that any Nation in the world's history has ever known—and we find ourselves again at war, with American boys fighting and dying on the mountains and on the plains of Korea.

People wonder and ponder over this sad state of affairs. They are amazed and they are worried at the results of the thinking by our Government leaders.

Can you blame them? Early this year Congress was told by officials who were supposed to know what they were talking about that the South Korean troops were well-trained units and were ready and able to defend themselves. What did Congress hear a little later? From other presumably well-informed officials we were told that the South Koreans were not trained and not given American military equipment because it was feared they would attack the North Koreans. Figure that one out.

Here is some more of the same fuzzy reasoning and queer statements by Washington thinkers. It was argued that big expenditures had to be made under the Marshall plan in order to contain communism and prevent war, but at the same time the chief of the Marshall plan said that the effects of the foreign-aid program in South Korea provoked the North Koreans into starting the war to destroy its benefits. Another one to ponder over.

The plain fact is that we have an irresponsible Government in Washington. We have officials and bureaucrats who do not know what is going on and who have fumbled and bungled the United States to the brink of disaster.

All these 5 years while the Washington star gazers have been squandering our prosperity and permitting our country to become weak defensively, our enemy has been growing stronger and bolder.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, recently made a speech which all real Americans should read. In it he said, and I quote:

> I assert without fear of contradiction that the American democracy—all of the things that make it and all of its beneficence—stands today in the hour of its greatest peril.

In the same speech Senator BYRD made a plea for preservation of the American way of life and American freedom. I am going to quote briefly from his speech again. He said:

> We have maneuvered the greatest country, the best form of government, and the finest Nation of people in the history of the world, into a position where they are fiscally vulnerable from within, and perhaps so greatly extended that they may be militarily vulnerable from without. Neither democracy nor freedom can survive in either the shackles of overwhelming debt or the bondage of military dictatorship.
>
> This, then, is a simple plea for the preservation of freedom in our homes, in our work, and our religion. It is a simple plea that we do what we know has to be done—strip off the luxuries of sociological ventures and political bids for votes by spending public money. It is a simple plea that we get down to the sweat and the toil of the work that is required to make this country fiscally sound and militarily impregnable.
>
> Our only hope to meet the responsibilities we have assumed and to preserve our free way of life lies in the capacity of the free-enterprise system to produce in mass quantities those goods, materials, and engines of war which are needed under such conditions in better quality and greater quantity than all of our adversaries combined. And there is no reason for us to expect much help from the nations who are associated with us, for they are more wards than allies.
>
> Yet, the President and our leaders are still insisting upon expansion of socialistic legislation—socialized housing, socialized medicine, socialized farming (the Brannan plan), which, if adopted, will destroy the free-enterprise system. This free-enterprise system upon which we depend cannot survive in confiscatory taxes or overwhelming debt, or state socialism. What happens to free enterprise under socialism has been demonstrated by the British before our very eyes in these same 5 years since World War II.

It should be very plain to everyone that the United States is paying the fiddler and the piper but that it is the Communist dictators who are calling the tunes. We have been outmaneuvered by the Reds, and because of our appeasement and State Department stupidity the free people of all nations are today in danger.

Because of the shameful administration of our Government at home, and because of our foreign bungling, the United States now wakes up to the facts of life. Our Nation must be reborn; it must emerge a nation strong on all fronts—the home front and the defense front. We must be powerful defensively; we must be ready for the aggressors and by being ready we can do much to prevent a global holocaust which could destroy civilization.

I am not going to give up yet on the real American way of life. I know that the American people want to preserve their freedom. I know that the people want the kind of leadership necessary to protect their liberty.

The people will make sacrifices, but those sacrifices must not be made in vain. Time is running short. Changes must be made in Washington. We must have in high office qualified men of unselfish and unquestioned patriotism; men who can chart and steer the course to keep our Nation free, keep our Nation strong, and keep our Nation at peace.

Citizens Committee Report on Hoover Report

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to discuss the report from the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report on reductions in postal deficits. The report is as follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT—REDUCTIONS IN POSTAL DEFICITS

The deficit of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1951 was estimated at $555,000,000 in the President's budget message. If the recommendations of the Hoover Commission are enacted and installed vigorously, it can be reduced by $262,000,000 or more.

Former President Hoover, in an address to the United States Junior Chamber of Com-

merce at Chicago on June 16, 1950, commented on the postal deficit as follows:

"We still have many major reforms to accomplish. They include our proposals:

"To organize the post office into a modern business concern with management free from politics. With this reform and some increase in rates to special commercial users, I believe its deficit of half a billion could be overcome."

ESTIMATES OF HOOVER COMMISSION

The Hoover Commission's estimates, based upon 1948 figures, were that the postal deficit could be cut by $256,000,000 annually as follows:

	(*Thousands*)
Increases in rates for special services	$64,000
Increases in rates for penny postcards	50,000
Managerial economies (post offices with receipts over $1,000,000)	90,000
Economies through modernization of methods and equipment	[1] 60,000
Subtotal	264,000
Deduct: Annual cost of economy program plus new equipment to effect managerial economies above	8,000
Estimated reduction	[2] 256,000

[1] Capital installation costs were not estimated in computation of this item.

[2] Appendix A hereto sets forth details regarding the reductions indicated in the Hoover Commission Report on the Post Office.

Current revenue and expenditure estimates would indicate increases in the amounts of the reductions in deficit attainable under items (1) and (2) above by approximately $6,000,000. This would increase the estimated reduction in item (7) above to $262,000,000. Proportionate increases in items (3) and (4) might well be expected on the expanded volume and might well lead to further reductions. But, due to the lack of appropriate data, no estimate of this latter possibility is made here.

ANALYSIS OF THE PRESENT DEFICIT

Assuming a deficit of $555,000,00 and the estimates given above, the possible reduction of $262,000,000 would bring the current deficit down to $293,000,000.

In his letter of February 21, 1949, to Speaker RAYBURN, the Postmaster General states that a "deficit of around $150,000,000" represents "the costs of official penalty mailing, franked mail airline subsidies, and other costs not properly chargeable to the users of the postal service, such items resulting from policies established by Congress as being in the interest of the Government and the public in general."

The Postmaster General's figure of $150,000,000 for subsidies not properly chargeable to postal users in general may be conservative if one considers the possibilities that (1) airline subsidies appear to be increasing, if prorated in accord with increases in gross payments to airlines; and (2) railroads appear to be receiving some subsidies, if the statements attributed to the General Accounting Office on this matter are given credence. However, the Postmaster General's estimate of $150,000,000 is used here because no others of provable authority are at hand. This item of $150,000,000, or whatever it is, should be separately appropriated for because it is, as the Postmaster General says, "not properly chargeable to the users of the postal service."

The Hoover Commission recommended that such a segregation of accounts be made. Recommendation No. 9 in the report on the post office makes such a recommendation specifically relating to separate appropriations for airline subsidies. In its report on Federal business enterprises, the Commission makes a similar recommendation to the effect that departments and agencies should set out subsidies separately as a part of their annual requests for appropriation. Recommendation No. 6, on page 16 of that report, says:

"Losses and subsidies should be made clear each fiscal year and passed upon by the Congress."

Were the postal recommendations of the Hoover Commission to be enacted, installed, and strongly administered, and were the subsidies to be properly segregated, the true postal deficit—that is, the deficit arising from costs properly chargeable to the users of the postal service—would approximate $143,000,000 annually, if we follow the reasoning above described.

It should not be impossible to reduce this remaining deficit, in part at least, by "some increase in rates to special commercial users" as mentioned by Mr. Hoover. Some reduction by this method would not be unreasonable when considered against the estimated losses on the following classes of mail (1949):

	Thousands
Second class	$174,675
Third class	129,053
Fourth class	104,881
Foreign surface mail	26,497
Total	435,106

The Hoover Commission made no recommendations with respect to the classes of rates listed above, stating:

"Certain postal rates are fixed, not primarily to provide postal income but as an element of public policy in the dissemination of information and in the provision of services not otherwise obtainable by the people.

"It is our view, therefore, that the final determination of rates for first-class (including air mail), second-, third-, and fourth-class mail should be made by the Congress."

The citizens committee, under its charter, is unable, therefore, to make any recommendation on such rates, but it will be of interest to the committee to consider establishment of a procedure to furnish Congress with information which would form the basis upon which it could act upon rates with more assurance.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

The large deficit of the Post Office Department or any other huge enterprise cannot be reduced by the stroke of a pen, or by the passage of a law or series of laws.

The passage of wise laws is the fundament upon which deficit reductions are based, but laws cannot, in themselves, achieve the ends desired by all of us.

In view of the Citizens Committee, three steps are necessary to produce substantial savings in the Post Office Department:

1. Congress must pass laws, wiping out anachronistic practices and providing a full framework for better management.

2. Postal administrators must have the managerial acumen and ability required to install new methods and practices.

3. Postal administrators must have the will and the courage to take all possible steps to save money and to cut deficits.

If the three conditions given above are met, savings of $142,000,000 can be achieved. In addition, revenues, as the Hoover Commission recommended, can be increased by $120,000,000, making a total reduction in the deficit of $262,000,000. The postal deficit can be cut by that amount without reducing postal services by one iota.

This cannot be done overnight. Reforms in so vast an establishment take time. Several years are required.

This cannot be done if authorization of the needed reforms is done piecemeal, or partially only, or slowly.

This cannot be done unless the full pattern of reform is accepted. Panaceas will not do the job—and, partially at least, cuts in services will prove to be but panaceas.

No single legislative measure or action is going to rectify the postal situation. Several moves are fundamental before the rectification process can even get started. Particularly important are a complete modernization of the scandalously bad accounting situation and the installation of a modern and nonpolitical personnel system. These situations are historical. Neither is the fault of the present Postmaster General or of his recent predecessors.

POLITICS AND THE POST OFFICE—ONE KEYSTONE

The personnel system of the postal establishment has historically been dominated by politics. Politics is the prime consideration in selection of the local postmasters. It also enters into the selection of rural carriers and, at times, into other selections for important postal positions. The establishment will never have a grade-A personnel system, or a high morale, or proper esprit de corps, or good public relations, or economy, until politics is utterly eradicated from it.

S. 2213 would eliminate Senate confirmation of postmasters. It would make it possible to take a long step toward a real merit system. If, in the opinion of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it offers no guaranties of removing politics forever from the establishment, the Citizens Committee will be glad to submit amendments to tighten it up.

Faced with a situation so deplorable, it is no time to quibble over language or details. S. 2213 is the best bill for the purpose before Congress today. If, in the opinion of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it will not put an end to politics, a measure should be drafted which will.

A modern career personnel system is a sine quo non of economies in the postal establishment. No legislative measure eradicating politics will, in itself, save money, but until this is done, the moneys will not be saved.

GOOD ACCOUNTING—ANOTHER KEYSTONE

A good accounting system is the second absolute essential, if the postal deficit is to be reduced.

Comparative costs, per service, per post office, per employee, and per piece of equipment are attainable only through good accounting. Inventories of supplies, purchases, traffic management, all are based upon accounting. Even proper real estate utilization rests on it. Without good accounting, economy is impossible.

This is not the time to labor the past. A constructive course of action is what is needed.

The Senate committee has before it H. R. 8923 (S. 3830), a compromise measure, which would provide for major modernizations in postal accounting.

The Citizens Committee has maintained that the original administration proposal, S. 2212, would give Congress more assurances of a good accounting system in the postal establishment. However, the purpose of this paper is not to debate the relative merits of the two measures.

Assurances have been given to the committee that the proposed measure, H. R. 8923 (S. 3830) would give the postal establishment a first-class accounting system. That is the end purpose for which the Citizens Committee is striving. To be more specific on the prospects this measure unfolds, the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States on Tuesday, July 18, 1950, made the following statement as to the adequacy of H. R. 8923 (S. 3830):

"While considerable time has been spent in working out the provisions of this legislation, the efforts invested have not been

wasted, for the bill being considered by you lays a solid foundation for modernization and improvement of the financial operation and control of the Department without doing away with any of the essential controls by the Congress. Both the Comptroller General and I feel strongly that the bill will provide the framework for the constructive and cooperative development for the Post Office Department of a system of accounting, financial reporting, and audit second to none inside or outside the Government. At the same time, the bill gives full recognition to the Department's special status as a revenue-producing public service organization."

If events bear out this statement of the General Accounting Office, the purposes would be achieved.

The research director of the Citizens Committee pointed out to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, that this bill can offer the following advantages:

"1. The actual accounting of the Post Office Department which has mainly been performed by another agency of Government in Asheville, N. C., would be transferred to the Post Office Department. It is a fundamental principle of good administration, private or public, that accounting operations should be performed under the supervision of the management.

"2. By so transferring the accounting to the Post Office Department, the present grievous delay between the postal transactions and the accountings therefor could readily be eliminated. The delay in accounting has for many years hampered the postal management in its calculations. Frequently, the results of accounting have not been known definitely for perhaps a year.

"3. The necessity of maintaining a duplicate set of books within the postal establishment itself should thus be eliminated.

"4. For the first time, the postal establishment will be given a basis in law for installation of a business-type accounting system with the flexibility permitted thereby.

"5. The proposed Post Office Department fund, a new revolving fund, should make it possible to eliminate the strict and unnecessary segregation of minor accounts in each of more than 42,000 post offices throughout the land. This should expedite all financial transactions.

"6. The warrant system, installed by Alexander Hamilton and long since outmoded by the modern volume of transactions it covers, can, under this bill, be eliminated.

"7. Site audits would be permitted without violation, witting or otherwise, of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, and it would also be possible to expedite auditing by the use of the spot-check or sampling technique universally used in business today. The absurd practice of shipping truck loads of vouchers to the Post Office Department and thence to Asheville, N. C., would thus be eliminated.

"8. Congress would have a fair and impartial audit performed by its own agent and that agent would no longer have dual responsibility, a practice long held to be unsound, for auditing the accounting maintained by its own employees. This would strengthen Congress' hand in that it would insure objectivity in consideration of the postal accounts.

"9. By the use of the accounting and auditing techniques contemplated by this measure, Congress would have more and better information about what the Post Office is doing."

If the measure succeeds in permitting accomplishment of these objectives, the Post Office Department will have most of the bases for the type of accounting system which Mr. YATES mentioned before the committee.

The measure in itself will not save great sums of money. One million dollars annually is the estimate of the citizens committee.

The measure can, however, offer the key to broad economies. The task force, for example, states that the total expenditures in post offices having receipts of over $1,000,000 [1] can be reduced by at least $90,000,000 if operations are placed under better management control. This large saving must be founded upon accounting. (See appendix A, item II.)

Accounting is the tool to savings. Without a good accounting system, economies are virtually impossible.

A good accounting system will not give the savings. That will come from good administration.

VALIDITY OF TASK FORCE FINDINGS

The task force of the Hoover Commission, composed of senior personnel of the distinguished management engineering firm of Robert Heller and Associates, made 24 specific recommendations. In item II of Appendix A hereto are stated that firm's conclusions as to the savings possible from their program. The net figure of annual savings foreseeable under this program is $142,000,000. This figure does not include the Hoover Commission's estimate of $114,000,000 of additional revenues referred to in item I of appendix A.

The survey required many months. Its cost was $146,000. The methods employed are summarized in appendix B hereto.

This management firm has long been considered by private business as preeminent in its field. Its current work in the Department of Defense is producing vast administrative savings—unrelated to the "cut-backs" which are quite a distinct and separate form of economy. The firm has detailed information to back up the statements in its report.

Significantly, it should be noted that the unanimous report of the Hoover Commission follows almost to the letter the program outlined by Robert Heller & Associates. The commission's report in no way differs from or refutes that of the task force.

The 24 recommendations of the task force must be taken one by one, enacted (if necessary), installed intelligently, and administered vigorously, if the envisioned savings are to be realized. It would not be inappropriate for Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to see to it that this is done.

EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE ECONOMIES

The task force not only stated the amounts of possible economies, but has given general examples of the types of action needed. A careful study of the task force report will show why the citizens committee believes these economies are possible. Some examples follow:

1. Railway mail terminals (task force recommendation No. VI): The task force pointed out that the railway mail terminals, frequently located in the same buildings and on the same floors as local post offices, come under separate jurisdiction. This system causes loss of efficiency due to duplication of operations. There is a lack of flexibility in the assignment of personnel, as well as ill effects from differences in conditions in employment and divided local responsibility. The same is true to a considerable extent in the cases of air-mail field terminals. In the opinion of the task force, "it has been proved that there is no type of transit mail which cannot be handled satisfactorily in a post office." Consolidations of these fragmented field services could save money and improve service to the public.

2. Consolidations of post offices (task force recommendation No. VII): Consolidations of post offices have been blocked by local protests and by the statute forbidding the establishment of a branch office more than 5 miles beyond the corporate limits or boundaries of a city or town. If suburban post offices were merged on a wide scale, operating economies would result through centralized use of purchasing, storage space, inventories, vehicles, administrative officials, records, machinery, etc. Services provided the public could be improved concomitantly.

3. Decentralization (task force recommendation No. II): Decentralization is widely used in private business and in Government agencies. Sears, Roebuck & Co., for example, services the Washington area from the Philadelphia regional headquarters. Similar regionalization is typical of most successful and profitable large private corporations. Appendix C hereto lists some Government agencies which have found decentralization feasible. The Post Office itself practices fragmentary decentralization for example in the case of the railway mail service. However, the individual post offices, comprising the bulk of the service, are responsible to Washington. Washington cannot give adequate supervision to any such vast number of post offices, because of geographic difficulties and because the very number of post offices so reporting to Washington violates a basic principle of management practice. An adequate number of regional offices would cost little money immediately and should almost immediately result in major operating economies. It has been alleged that this would destroy the authority of the Postmaster General. That allegation is not borne out by any known instance in Government or in private business. It has been alleged that this would lead to lack of uniformity. When done properly the contrary has proven to be true. Forty-two thousand units being supervised in a cursory manner, many of them from a great distance, cannot be operated in as uniform a manner as would be the case were 15 tightly-geared regions established. At the head of each such region would be one official, instilled with uniform basic principles of postal management. The regional office would thus be in the position to supervise closely the individual post offices and to insure uniformity, not leave it to chance. Furthermore, close operating supervision of a manageable number of units would insure better exchanges of new ideas, broader installation of improvements, and prompter action on the routine matters which comprise the bulk of all administration, particularly in the postal establishment. The savings from such regionalization should, after the first year or so, accrue in large sums.

4. Money orders (task force recommendation No. XIX): The present money order system of the Post Office is not too much dissimilar from that instituted by the Medici family in Florence in the fifteeenth century. Losses from operation of the present postal money order system are substantial. Postal authorities have, for some years, been working on a program for revising this system. Almost exactly the same system, operated by modern business methods, has long proved profitable for private banking companies which engage in it. Private companies make a moderate charge for travelers' checks and receive additional income, because they have the interest-free use of the purchasers' money for a period starting with the date the money order is purchased and ending with the date it is redeemed. These interest-free moneys reduce the need for the banking companies to obtain (and pay for) other capital. The same can be true of the Post Office, although the size of the units purchased in the case of postal orders averages considerably less dollarwise than is the case in private banking. Here again large economies could be attained.

These are but a few examples. The task force report indicates many other directions for those who seek economy. It speaks for itself.

[1] The task force informs the Citizens Committee that the figure of $1,000,000 was chosen because the installation of management controls on a large scale and the obtaining of savings thereby require units doing a substantial volume of business.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The citizens committee is fully convinced that the deficit of the Post Office Department can be reduced by $262,000,000 annually. Specifically, it recommends:

1. Subsides not properly chargeable to the users of the postal service should be segregated accountingwise and separately appropriated for.

2. The Congress should enact whatever laws are necessary to tear out by the roots every vestige of politics in the postal establishment. This is the first keystone of economy.

3. The Congress should direct the creation of a first class accounting system in the Post Office Department. This is the second keystone of economy.

4. The Congress should review every one of the nine Hoover Commission recommendations and 24 task force recommendations on the post office and pass whatever laws are necessary to permit effectuation of each and every one of these 33 recommendations.

5. The Congress should direct postal authorities to take immediate action on each and every one of 33 recommendations.

6. The Congress should review progress on the reform of the postal establishment constantly and continuously.

7. The Postmaster General should be required to report to Congress at specified intervals, his progress at installing the reforms and the dollar savings thereby achieved.

APPENDIX A

REDUCTION IN POSTAL DEFICITS

I. INCREASED REVENUES FROM SPECIAL SERVICES AND PENNY POST CARDS AS STATED IN HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT

Fiscal year 1948

	Receipts	Cost	Loss
Registry, paid	$23, 590, 349	$32, 552, 479	$8, 962, 130
Insurance	14, 967, 377	16, 634, 807	1, 667, 130
Collect on delivery	16, 883, 757	23, 363, 960	6, 480, 203
Special delivery	17, 977, 912	30, 153, 613	12, 175, 701
Money order	34, 149, 826	64, 982, 570	30, 832, 744
Postal notes	3, 711, 050	7, 602, 003	3, 890, 953
Penny post cards			50, 000, 000
Total			114, 008, 861

(The Post Office, Hoover Commission, February 1949, p. 5.)

II. EXCERPT FROM TASK FORCE REPORT OF ROBERT HELLER AND ASSOCIATES

V. Costs and savings

Based on broad experience in business and industry, and predicated on knowledge of what has been done in commercial operations, the study of the Post Office Department indicates that total annual expenditures in post offices having receipts over $1,000,000 per year can be reduced by at least $90,000,000 if operations are placed under better management control. If postal volume and the general level of all costs continue to rise, these excessive expenditures will become even greater in future years. In order to achieve the indicated savings, however, it will be necessary to expend annually an amount which should not exceed a peak of $8,000,000, plus minor capital expenditures, for the modernization program recommended in part V. This will leave net savings of over $80,000,000 per year at present volume and at current wage and salary levels.

In addition to the foregoing net savings of $80,000,000 anually, it is conservatively estimated that further annual savings of at least $60,000,000 are possible from improvements in methods and equipment requiring extensive development or major capital expenditures. Development and perfection of the necessary methods and equipment would be carried on within the organization recommended in part V, the cost of which is included in the $8,000,000 mentioned above. Authorization of the capital investment required for widespread application of perfected improvements should, of course, be dependent on prior demonstration of their practicability and money-saving value.

The increased expense required to make possible the estimated savings will be occasioned primarily by adoption of the recommendations dealing with organization, financial and accounting control, control of costs and methods, and personnel administration. The maximum annual expenditure of $8,000,000 will not be reached for several years because a number of the recommendations, particularly those concerned with cost controls and methods improvements, will require time for planning, development and gradual installation.

The length of time which will elapse before the peak of expense is reached will depend on the energy with which the program is pursued, but it will probably not be less than 3 years. Conversely, the estimated savings to be achieved will not reach peak level until the program is in full operation.

No one item of savings will be spectacular in itself. The measure of operating improvement in the postal establishment will be the cumulative effect of many individual savings leading to a very substantial total. Because of the continuing growth in the postal business (it doubled on the average every 11 years for 80 years prior to 1929 and doubled again in 14 years from 1934 to 1948) it is unlikely that any reduction in total expenditures will take place. Instead, the estimated savings will show up in improved productivity of the present organization and a reduction in the rate at which the organization must grow to meet the increasing volume of business.

It should be noted that the estimated additional expense for the Post Office Department will not represent $8,000,000 added expense for the Federal Government as a whole because of estimated savings on the order of $2,000,000 annually which will be reflected in the expense of the General Accounting Office and the Civil Service Commission by adoption of recommendations in this report bearing on their operations.

All the advantages to be realized by the Post Office Department by adoption of the proposed modernization program cannot be measured in dollars alone, nor can all of the financial gains be estimated at this time. Gains will also accrue from such factors as:

1. Better financial control.

2. Better management through on-the-scene direction of field operations.

3. Better recruitment of personnel.

4. Better training of postal workers and supervisors.

5. Better utilization of transportation facilities.

6. Better commercial practices.

After all possible savings in postal operations are effected, however, there will still remain a large deficit. Of major importance, therefore, will be the fact that adoption of the recommendations herein will provide more facts upon which to base consideration of adjustments needed in rates and classifications in order to bring revenues and expenses more nearly into balance.

In the last anaylsis, implementation of the proposed program will require additional annual expenditures of about 6 million dollars by the Federal Government. This amount will represent less than one-half cent of every dollar of postal revenue, and should be repaid many times over.

APPENDIX B

METHODS OF TASK FORCE INFORMATION

Data pertaining to the operation of the postal establishment were obtained from five principal sources:

1. Officials of the Post Office Department at Washington.

2. Personnel of the postal service in the field.

3. Other departments and agencies of the Government.

4. Organizations and persons outside the Government having an interest in postal matters.

5. Public documents, and internal reports and statistics of the Post Office Department.

It was found necessary at Washington to work with about 50 officials of the Post Office Department in order to become adequately acquainted with top management activities. These officials comprised the majority in the first three levels of authority in the Department. From them was secured a knowledge of administrative policies and procedures and considerable information on field operations.

Work with members of the postal service was conducted in 15 areas selected to provide a cross section of field operations. The areas were Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Chattanooga, New Orleans, Canton, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, Fort Worth-Dallas, Denver, Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. At each of these cities key personnel in all parts of the field service were interviewed, and visits were made to nearby smaller post offices. Internal operations were also studied in some detail at the Chicago, Kansas City, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and Washington post offices, and at the mail-equipment shops in Washington. In all, more than 60 first-, second-third-, and fourth-class post offices were visited, as well as a number of stations and branches of large offices.

Officials in several departments and agencies of the Government performing services for the Post Office Department or having information of significance to this assignment were seen. These included the General Accounting Office, Bureau of the Budget, Department of the Treasury, Department of Commerce, National Security Resources Board, Civil Service Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. In addition, special data were secured from other task forces of the Commission working with other Government departments and agencies.

Organizations and persons outside the Government, such as railroads, airlines, truck operators, printers and publishers, mail-order houses, advertising agencies, equipment manufacturers, representatives of postal workers' organizations, and former postal officials contributed much useful information and many constructive suggestions. Furthermore, officials of the Post Office Department, Dominion of Canada, gave generously of their time in explaining present and proposed organization and operating methods of the Canadian postal system.

Public documents and internal reports and statistics of the Department which were reviewed and studied are too numerous to list. It is noteworthy, however, that a wealth of written material on postal operations is available and that most of the recommendations contained later in this report have also been proposed in whole or in part by others in previous reports.

APPENDIX C

FEDERAL AGENCIES DECENTRALIZED INTO REGIONS

1. Federal Reserve System: 12 regions.
2. Federal Security Agency: 10 regions.

3. Wage-hour and Public Contracts Divisions (Labor Department): 9 regions.
4. Office of Solicitor (Labor Department): 9 regions.
5. Forest Service: 10 regions.
6. Civil Aeronautics Administration: 9 regions.
7. Public Roads Administration: 9 divisions.
8. Public Buildings Administration: 10 field offices.
9. National Labor Relations Board: 15 regional offices.
10. Securities and Exchange Commission: 10 regional offices.
11. Civil Service Commission: 14 regions (plus Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, etc.).

America's Most Historic City: Charleston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article which appeared in the De Kalb New Era, under date of Thursday, September 7, 1950. This article is written by the very able columnist Walter Reiman, entitled "Talking it Over," and it concerns my city of Charleston, S. C.

Those who have seen Charleston leave with a profound impression of a city that has preserved its past and still keeps abreast of history's progress.

The fine people of the South Carolina low country, of which Charleston is the principal city, represent the original Americans. It was here that the English royalty made some of the original land grants on this continent. History is present in every nook and cranny of this splendid section of the Nation. We are proud of our contribution to the history of our country.

Mr. Reiman writes well of my people and our city. We are grateful to him for a fine article and we want the rest of the Nation to see his impression of what we too feel about our metropolis. The article follows:

A visit to Charleston is a must for anyone who would know the South.

This Labor Day week end was our first visit to Charleston—a visit teeming with thrills over the discovery of what we believe to be America's greatest city.

The air of stability struck us most. Charlestonians have valued their old possessions—kept them in good repair—so that the glory of the eighteenth century as seen in their buildings serves present-day Americans admirably at home and at the place of their business.

There is no museum aspect about the town. Charleston is not a restoration, but, rather, a town that has been lived in all the while, a town well maintained spontaneously by thousands of its citizens.

Charleston points up the character of a people we'd like to know—a people who have the vision to evaluate their environment—a people, were we to become acquainted with them, who would open, we believe, a vast treasure of knowledge about the South, knowledge that would be useful for all of the South.

A THOUSAND GEMS

We saw a thousand architectural gems—a gate here, a window there, a wall of weathered warm rose brick.

At a snail's pace three times we drove the full length of Murray Boulevard and the East Battery and East Bay Street skirting the waterfront—and King and Meeting and Broad and Queen Streets—reveling in the beauty of half-concealed courtyards, great porches, graceful doorways, artistic gates, and iron grill work.

We enjoyed the old city market and its beautiful lamps, and St. Michael's church with its exquisite steeple and windows, the 1765 Pringle house built by Miles Brewton, the 1726 Dock Street theater, the Heyward-Washington house built in 1750 by Thomas Heyward, Jr., a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and occupied in 1791 by Washington.

Across the Cooper and Ashley Rivers and back inland whence a four-lane white-way brings U. S. highway 52 to town from the North, we saw modern Charleston's industry, business, and residences sprawl for miles in a great arc of activity.

All in all, we felt the power and the glory that is Charleston.

FOR FOOD IT'S HENRY'S

Henry's, down by the old market, is the place to dine—perfect cuisine, grand, grand service. Henry's has everything and anything you could desire—is one of those rare 'old timey' establishments found here and there about the Nation.

Unfortunately, we didn't visit the famed gardens out from town, Magnolia, Middleton Place, and Cypress.

Magnolia Gardens, John Galsworthy is reported to have said, is one of the most beautiful gardens in the world.

We want to go back to Charleston. When we do we'll see the gardens. They are part of the great living Charleston—Charleston whose people, we believe, post a stirring challenge to their fellow Americans; Charleston, which only a dozen essays, each keyed to a different channel of our culture, might do justice.

Yes; we want to go back to Charleston. We'd like to meet some of its people, because we feel, as Adiemantus in Plato's the Republic felt: "The good and true city or State, and the good and true man is of the same pattern."

Veteran's Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have received many inquiries lately concerning the provisions of my bill H. R. 9437, which seeks to provide automatic insurance protection for all men entering any branch of the Armed Forces during an emergency.

Last May 10, the committee unanimously adopted a resolution directing the staff of the committee to make a study of the possibilities of a new insurance program. The bill which I have introduced is the first step in this study.

Beginning next week, the staff will start a series of conferences with officials of the Bureau of the Budget, Department of Defense, General Accounting Office, Veterans' Administration, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and American Veterans of World War II, with a view to giving detailed consideration to this bill and other proposals in this field.

When the Congress returns, in November, it is my intention to have the Committee on Veterans' Affairs hold hearings on this measure.

I make this announcement so that Members may know of the plans of the committee on this subject, and may advise their constituents who are interested.

Revisions Needed in the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as you know, there was recently enacted by the Congress a new and important social-security law. This new law substantially broadens the benefits and extends the coverage for our national social-security program. This new law had my support as well as that of nearly all the Members of the Congress.

Enactment of the new social-security law directs attention, however, to the need for revision of the Railroad Retirement Act. Railroad employees are not covered under the provisions of the Social Security Act, and consequently, I urge the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake as soon as possible a careful and complete review of the Railroad Retirement Act.

It was quite a few years ago that the Congress established for railroad workers an independent retirement system. Under that act contributions to the retirement fund are made by both the employees and the management of railroads. In the Seventy-ninth Congress that act was modified by what has become known as the Crosser amendment.

In my opinion and that of a vast number of railroad employees, serious discrepancies exist between the payments made by railroad workers and the benefits which they receive under the Railroad Retirement Act, and the payments made and benefits received by the millions who are covered by social security.

I readily admit that the problem of equalizing these discrepancies is a complex one. Nevertheless, I am sure that the committee, with its specialized knowledge of these problems, can find adequate solutions. I am also convinced that the committee should launch as soon as possible a full-scale and thoroughgoing study of this problem so that remedial legislation may be presented to and enacted by the Congress at an early date. As I said previously, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of such study and new legislation should be primarily to make sure that the benefits payable under the Rail-

road Retirement Act are as generous, when compared with the respective payments made, as are the benefits for those covered by the Social Security Act.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is only fair that our railroad employees should be placed on a basis which is comparable with that of the employees of other industries and business enterprises. I am sure that there will be no disagreement with my feeling that no segment of our society should enjoy any undue privilege and, on the other hand, that no segment of our people should be unduly penalized.

A careful study by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the benefits provided by the Railroad Retirement Act and a comparison of those benefits—always bearing in mind the relationship of payments made—to the benefits under the broadened Social Security Act will be a step in the direction of ascertainment that there is fairness and equality for all.

Social-Security Law Points to a Brighter Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, great evidence has been given recently that our Nation is approaching a real maturity in its domestic life. This evidence is embodied in the Eighty-first Congress enactment of the amendments expanding and bringing up to date the Nation's social-security system.

The new law extends security in their later years to some 10,000,000 additional Americans. It raises benefits to conform with higher costs of living. Furthermore, it liberalizes eligibility requirements; potential recipients of benefits will not be required to work so many years under social-security coverage as before, and retired workers, survivors, and dependents will be able to earn more money without forfeiting the right to their benefit payments.

These benefits are made to the people not as a matter of charity nor as a public dole, but as their earned right. It must be kept in mind that social security is fundamentally an insurance plan.

BROADER COVERAGE

The 10,000,000 new recipients of social-security benefits are, for the most part, persons who have been self-employed, such as grocers, retail-store and gas-station owners, and life-insurance salesmen—full time. Beginning January 1, 1951, these persons will have the opportunity to earn security in their later life under the social-security system.

Also provided for under the new law are agricultural workers—although farmers, in the strict sense, are not yet included under social security. Included under the term "agricultural worker" are persons engaged in such work as raising livestock or fur animals, processing or delivering crops to storage or to market, doing household work on a farm, and handling fruits and vegetables for commercial firms.

Domestic workers in nonfarm homes will be eligible to join the system next January, as will the following: Federal employees not covered already by a Federal retirement system; State and municipal employees, provided the particular State wishes to enter into an agreement with the Federal Government whereby it will be set forth specifically which groups of employees will be covered under social security—any State or city employee already covered by an existing retirement system will be, of course, ineligible for social security—employees of nonprofit institutions, such as churches, hospitals, and schools, provided the employer agrees to pay his share of the tax contribution; certain full-time traveling salesmen—other than house-to-house—many delivery-truck drivers; and home industrial workers, provided they satisfy certain conditions.

LARGER BENEFITS

Immediately effective is an increase in social-security payments; checks to be mailed out October 3 will offer the recipient, on the average, about 75 percent more than he has been receiving.

The table below shows what the increases will be for an insured wage earner without dependents:

Now	*New law*
$10	$20.00
11	22.00
12	24.00
13	26.00
14	28.00
15	30.00
16	31.70
17	33.20
18	34.50
19	35.70
20	37.00
21	38.50
22	40.20
23	42.20
24	44.50
25	46.50
26	48.30
27	50.00
28	51.50
29	52.80
30	54.00
31	55.10
32	56.20
33	57.20
34	58.20
35	59.20
36	60.20
37	61.20
38	62.20
39	63.10
40	64.00
41	64.90
42	65.80
43	66.70
44	67.60
45	68.50
46	68.50

The table following shows what the increases will be for a retired wage earner and wife:

Now	*New law*
$15.00	$30.00
16.50	33.00
18.00	36.00
19.50	39.00
21.00	42.00
22.50	45.00
24.00	47.55
25.50	49.80
27.00	51.75
28.50	53.55
30.00	55.50
31.50	57.75
33.00	60.30
34.50	63.30
36.00	66.75
37.50	69.75
39.00	72.45
40.50	75.00
42.00	77.25
43.50	79.20
45.00	81.00
46.50	82.65
48.00	84.30
49.50	85.80
51.00	87.30
52.50	88.80
54.00	90.30
55.50	91.80
57.00	93.30
58.50	94.65
60.00	96.00
61.50	97.35
63.00	98.70
64.50	100.05
66.00	101.40
67.50	102.75
69.00	102.75

The table below shows what the increase will be for a widow with two children who is currently receiving benefits:

Now	*New law*
$20	$40
$25	46
$30	53
$35	59
$40	67
$45	76
$50	92
$55	110
$60	117
$65	122
$70	128
$75	133

After June 1952 a new formula may be used to compute benefits. This formula will yield approximately twice the benefits now being received. A person can begin to use this new formula just as soon as he has worked for six quarter-years—a full year and a half—under the social-security system after January 1, 1951.

The table below shows, roughly, what the benefits will be under this new formula:

Average monthly wage	*Single*	*Married*
$50	$25	$38
$100	50	75
$150	58	83
$200	65	98
$250	72	109
$300	80	120

The minimum primary benefit has been raised from $10 to $20, and the maximum family benefit has been raised from $85 to $150.

EASIER ELIGIBILITY

In the future persons will not have to work so long in order to be fully insured and eligible to receive payments upon reaching the retirement age of 65. The table below indicates how the new law compares with the old law as to the number of quarter-years of social-security coverage required for wage earners of various ages before they can be eligible for payment.

Age reached in first half of 1951	Present law	New law
76 or over	6	6
75	8	6
74	10	6
73	12	6
72	14	6
71	16	6
70	18	6
69	20	6
68	22	6
67	24	6
66	26	6
65	28	6
64	30	6
63	32	6
62	34	6
61	36	8
60	38	10
59	40	12
58	40	14
57	40	16
56	40	18
55	40	20
50	40	30
45 or under	40	40

All of the time a person has worked under social security up to now is, of course, still applicable to the new coverage requirement.

This means that any insured worker now 65 or over who has had six quarter-years of social-security coverage can draw benefits immediately.

Again, any worker who is 62 or over on January 1, 1951, even if he starts his social-security coverage only next year, will be eligible to draw benefits as soon as he becomes 65.

Finally, the relaxation of coverage requirements will greatly assist those who have just been allowed by the new law to come under social security—e. g., the self-employed businessman. It will not be so difficult for them to attain the requirements for eligibility, so that they might begin to draw payments as soon as possible after reaching the age of 65.

As to how much a retired worker, his survivors or his dependents can earn without losing the right to receive benefits, the limit has been raised from $14.99 to $50 per month.

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS

Survivors and dependents of the insured worker will, on the whole, receive the same proportion of the primary benefit—the basic payment made to an insured wage earner who has no dependents—as at present; therefore, their benefits will increase, on the average, 75 percent—and after 1952, 100 percent—over the present levels.

Other major changes in the law concerning survivors and dependents are:

First. A retired worker's wife who is under 65 can receive benefits, provided she has a child in her care.

Second. The divorced former wife of a deceased insured worker may in some cases receive benefits on his record if she is caring for his children.

Third. The benefit for a dependent parent has been raised to three-quarters of the primary benefit of the wage earner—formerly one-half.

Fourth. A dependent husband or widower of a fully and currently insured woman who is entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits or who died after August 1950, is now eligible for insurance payments when he becomes 65.

Fifth. Lump-sum death payments, though reduced to three times the primary benefit of the wage earner, are now payable to the family of every insured worker. Formerly, these payments were made only when no other member of the family was entitled to survivors' benefits at the time of the wage earner's death.

Veterans of World War II also are affected by this new law in that it provides wage credits of $160 for each month of active military or naval service to men and women who had 90 days or more of active military service between September 16, 1940, and July 24, 1947.

This new social-security legislation received my full support. I believe that it gives winning evidence that ours is a great Nation, devoted to its people and seeking the betterment of mankind.

Dr. Joseph F. Thorning Speaks on the Good Neighbor Policy as It Relates to Latin and South American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a synopsis of a recent address, delivered under the chairmanship of Mr. Sam Rosenstock, of the Kiwanis International Club of Frederick, Md., by my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, one of the best-informed scholars on inter-American affairs in the United States. This report is taken from the Frederick News-Post, September 20, 1950. It reads as follows:

A political policy of expediency in this country is responsible for South America's "cold attitude toward the United States."

In a talk to the Kiwanis Club Tuesday in the Francis Scott Key Hotel, Rev. Father Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, placed definitely in Washington blame for selling the good-neighbor policy down the river for votes which, he said, has produced only paper cooperation by South American republics with the UN plan of action in Korea.

"With reference to substantial quotas of men, materials and money, these neighbor countries have been conspicuous only for the modesty of their contributions," the speaker declared. This modesty he linked with recent events in the Senate—especially the Gillette investigation of the soaring price of coffee, and the Senate agreement to let rest until after the elections a plea for suspension of import tax on copper.

FEELING AGAINST UNITED STATES

Chile's President, on a visit to the United States, sought revocation of the import tax on copper from his country. During World War II when this country was doing preemptive buying, the tax was lifted, but after the House of Representatives passed recently a similar acceptable bill, the Senators decided to table the matter until after November lest it have repercussions from copper-mining States. New England actually does not get enough raw copper to supply her industries, Dr. Thorning said, and would profit largely from greater importations.

Both Colombia and Brazil now have "real feeling" against the United States, in the speaker's belief, because Senator GILLETTE'S report on coffee accused both republics as extortionists instead of blaming speculators in New York for the advanced price of the beverage. "No wonder Brazil sits on its hands and looks and listens," opined Dr. Thorning. "She sent troops to Italy but not this time."

Brazil also remembers, the clergymen continued, that the country was an important funnel of materials of war to North Africa in the campaign which defeated Rommel. These memories make even more bitter to the Brazilian the accusations in the coffee scandal. "Collective security and trade are indivisible," Dr. Thorning reminded.

AMMUNITION FOR COMMIES

Such American actions are excellent ammunition for the Communists in South American countries where left-wing union organizers are trying to "sell workers into the slavery of Soviet imperialism." In Uruguay and Costa Rica labor has been brought to high standards of pay in a democratic pattern but Communists are working diligently to "plant Soviet ideas which are reactionary against freedom."

In Guatemala Dr. Thorning found an apt example of the precarious position the United States holds in South America. Identifying that country's president as "a mystical Socialist," Dr. Thorning quoted some of "his double talk." The official wrote that relations between his own land and the United States are most cordial yet the government spreads Soviet propaganda, and when labor chieftains recently informed United States Ambassador Patterson that his health would suffer seriously if he remained longer in Guatemala, the diplomat had to leave. "An accredited representative of the United States dares not remain in a country because a group of murderers advise him to depart," Dr. Thorning exclaimed.

LOAN TO MEXICO

The New York Times recently sent an ace reporter to look into the situation and his front-page stories show how far Soviet infiltration has gone in this hemisphere, Dr. Thorning said.

A recently authorized loan of $150,000,000 to Mexico is the first fruit of the visit 2 years ago of President Aleman, and it is proving strengthening to the chief executive who has done much to reconcile the different groups in his country. Dr. Thorning suggested the wisdom of all-out aid for Aleman.

"United States officialdom should recognize the necessity of providing lucrative markets for South American products," Dr. Thornin; emphasized, and an effort "to stabilize the Latin economy in such ways as would enable the Organization of American States (formerly the Pan American Union) to organize armed strength for the benefit of the United Nations."

Dr. Thorning was introduced by Samuel Rosenstock, program chairman. President Milton Brunk was in the chair. Guests were Irving Weil and H. H. Harbaugh.

The Washington City News Service—A Subsidiary of United Press Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington City News Service was established in Washington nearly 17 years ago to

make available all the news of the world in brief form to individual correspondents and others, throughout the day. This service, which pioneered the field, has been in use in many of the governmental departments since that time. The White House, the Senate, and a number of Cabinet members have access to the service through their departments at all hours of the day. With direct wires from Capitol Hill news is instantly transmitted through this service to those interested. Especial emphasis is placed upon committee hearings, proceedings in both Houses of Congress, and such information is given precedence over routine news.

The entire world-wide news report of United Press is available to Washington City News Service, so that the subscriber may be kept fully informed, minute by minute, of the important events happening throughout the world.

This service may be purchased at a flat standard rate by any governmental department or bureau and individual installations may be made in any office at the convenience of the subscriber.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include four timely articles by John Jarrell, of the Omaha World-Herald, relative to the Voice of America. These articles bear testimony to the effectiveness of the program and support the position of those of us who believe that an expanded information service is essential in the battle of ideas. The articles follow:

TRUMAN'S COMMENT ON KOREA BROADCAST TO RUSSIAN PEOPLE

It is evening—a long, Moscow evening—and Kyril Petrov, home from a trying day at the factory, turns on his shortwave radio.

He has a certain feeling of guilt because, while there is no definite law in Russia against listening to foreign broadcasts, he knows it won't do his standing any good if the MVD learns he listens to programs coming from the United States.

Kyril twists the dial, and a voice, speaking perfect Russian, is wafted to him over the air waves.

"This is New York," the voice says. "You are listening to the radio broadcast of the Voice of America. Listen to the truthful information of a free radio. Listen to the Voice of America."

Kyril Petrov continues to listen. This is June 27, a memorable day in American history. It is the day that President Truman announced that he was ordering United States air and sea forces to the aid of Southern Korea, fighting Communist invaders from North Korea.

The Voice of America for June 27 was selected by a World-Herald reporter as a good day to review the entire Russian broadcast by the Voice of America, that controversial propaganda weapon with which this country tries to project the truth into the Soviet Union in the face of a radio-jamming technique that seeks to obliterate every spoken word before it can pierce the iron curtain.

The big story that day was President Truman's decision that virtually sent the United States to war, fighting Communists 5,000 miles from home.

The Truman story was given straight to the Russians, in their own language, without trimmings.

"President Truman pointed out," the Russian-speaking United States news announcer said, "that the invasion of the Korean Republic makes it plain beyond all doubt that communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to armed invasion, with its aim the conquest of independent nations."

That day also the five daily broadcasts in Russia (which are repeated 24 hours daily by United States relay stations) featured several routine news programs.

The news announcer related a little story from Rome without added comment. None was needed. It was about the resignation from the Polish Embassy in Rome of Poland's commercial attaché, who also announced he would not return to Warsaw.

There was a story on contradictory propaganda statements by the Russians, with the assertion:

"There can be no doubt that in other countries of the world too, this cynical difference between the words and the acts of the Communists will be properly appraised."

There was a labor round-up, quoting the United States Council of Economic Development on United States worker wages—three times as great as 50 years ago—his increased productivity, the reduction of the number of work hours, technical progress, industrial output, the vast amount of consumer spending, all matters deemed of interest to the worker in the U. S. S. R., fed a steady diet at home of propaganda designed to prove that in America the worker is downtrodden, underfed, abused.

VOICE OF 1950 MUCH BETTER—RUSS EFFORTS TO JAM IT ARE PROOF

Just how much good the Voice of America does in its broadcasts beamed to Russia is anybody's guess.

However, the fact that the Soviets utilize some 1,000 transmitters in their effort to jam these Russian-language broadcasts is the best endorsement, it would appear.

A World-Herald reporter has just made a study of quite a few of these broadcasts, enough to give a fairly good cross section.

Compared to the broadcasts he read 2 years ago, on a similar undertaking, the 1950 variety is vastly improved.

TOO SCHOLASTIC?

The criticism has been made that the broadcasts are too heavy, too scholastic in tone, suited perhaps to the political scientist but not to the Ivan on the street.

This reporter is not sufficiently acquainted with the average Russian mind, or to the type of Russians who listen to the broadcast, to know about that.

Following, though, are the results of a rather comprehensive sampling of some programs:

There was a broadcast by the VOA's special correspondent at the Berlin meeting of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, one Yakov Alexsandrovich Savelyev.

DOUBLE TALK

Mr. Savelyev pointed out that the Soviet press of Eastern Berlin was calling delegates to this Congress "lackeys of imperialism" and its organizers spies of the United States State Department.

Then Mr. Savelyev asserted:

"Today everybody knows that when the Communists speak of peace they mean an attack."

A feature of the VOA is a calendar which reminds Russians of events affecting them which the Soviet Government may have eliminated or would like to eliminate from history books.

SCIENTISTS DISGRACED

The Voice recalls, for instance, that in 1948 there was a controversy over the theory of heredity. It was resolved when the official Central Committee of the Soviet Party proclaimed that one theory was "an indisputable scientific truth."

The committee backed up this decision with measures placing a number of Russian geneticists, who followed the other theory, in a state of official disgrace for following a "false" and "bourgeois-decadent" line.

Into Russian-dominated countries went a broadcast relative to the charges by the U. S. S. R. that the United States had, by plane, sprayed Colorado potato beetles into fields to spoil crops.

ADVICE GIVEN

The broadcast denied this (high United States Government officials consider this Russian propaganda blast about the silliest in which it has engaged) and charged it was an attempt to divert attention from the fact that no measures had been taken to destroy the pest, though it had been prevalent in the area for some time.

Then the broadcaster proceeded to relay United States Department of Agriculture advice on how to eliminate the potato bug—good, sound advice that any European farmer could follow.

VOICE SHOWS COMPARISONS—SUBTLY TELLS FREEDOM IN UNITED STATES WAYS

The Voice of America, in its broadcasts in Russian to the Soviet Union, places considerable stress on comparisons between life in the United States and in Russia.

Voice officials consider that one of the really important phases of their propaganda job.

But the broadcasts touch many subjects in the five daily broadcasts.

The daily calendar is an essential part of these broadcasts.

In this feature, the Russians are told of past events which the Kremlin probably would like to have them forget.

TELLS OF AID

On June 11, for instance, the Voice recalled that it was exactly 8 years earlier that Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State, and Maxim Litvinov, then a top official of Russia's Foreign Office and since consigned to oblivion, signed the lend-lease agreement.

The broadcast touched on the amount of lend-lease aid given Russia, the sacrifices that it entailed in the United States, and the difficulty of transporting it to the Soviet Union over the perilous Murmansk sea route, or across Iran.

CITES PHILIPPINES

February 17, 1945, was recalled 5 years later as the day the last Japanese surrendered on Bataan.

It was pointed out that the United States made no attempt to force its will on the Philippines, but instead gave that country its full independence a little over a year later.

There was a broadcast on concentration camps in Russia, with an obvious reference that such things are unknown in America.

One story on the United States retreat in Korea pointed out that the aggressor usually made gains at the outset of any fighting, and mentioned examples.

FORMER NAZI NAMED

One of the examples was Napoleon. Any Russian who knows any history would recall that Napoleon once conquered Moscow—but finally had to retreat in one of the most costly military operations in history.

There is a feature, "Life behind the iron curtain."

For instance, the Communist Government of Hungary named a new cabinet member—and the Voice explained how this Communist used to belong to the Hungarian Nazi Party.

NOT CENSORED

Out of Poland was a story of the disappearance of 200 boy scouts "for collaboration with western imperialists."

Some space was given to a series of articles by two Pravda correspondents in New York, declaring that American workers suffered impoverishment and enslavement.

The VOA pointed out that the Pravda reporters sent their story without censorship—which is unheard of in Russia—and that Pravda, the New Times, and other Russian periodicals are sold here.

"But can a Soviet citizen buy a New York Times at a Moscow newsstand?" the Voice of America asked.

MANY REDS HEAR VOICE—PROBABLY 30 PERCENT GET SOME PROGRAMS

How many Russians listen to the Voice of America?

Anything would be a guess, but it is estimated there are 4,000,000 radio receivers in the Soviet Union, of which 3,500,000 are capable of receiving short-wave broadcasts, such as those broadcast by VOA.

Most of the Russian sets are short-wave receivers.

The Russian Government goes all out in its effort to jam the broadcasts.

PROBABLY EFFECTIVE

The Voice of America figures the jamming is quite effective in the large cities, but that the broadcasts from New York, and rebroadcasts from relay stations, get through about 30 percent of the time.

In less densely populated areas, the percentage is greater.

Officials of the Voice have pinned down 250 transmitters that are jamming the airways. They estimate there are 1,000 of them.

Voice of America officials have another yardstick by which they measure success.

PEOPLE LISTEN

That is the continual reference in Soviet publications to statements made by the Voice, and the attacks made on statements contained in the broadcasts.

This, say officials, seems an assumption by the Russian Government itself that its people listen to the broadcasts.

Not long ago, for instance, one Russian writer took 12 columns to refute a Voice of America broadcast comparing the living standard of people here with those in the U. S. S. R.

Deserters from the Russian Army also have told of the amount of listening.

REACHING ALL

They say that while there is no specific law barring citizens from listening to foreign broadcasts, Russians know that the MVD would write them down in their black books.

When Anna Kasenkina leaped from a window rather than return to the Soviet Union, a year ago, it was front-page news here. But the Russian Government hushed it up at home. The Voice of America, though, featured the case in its broadcasts, and Voice officials said it spread like wildfire through the U. S. S. R.

They count that further proof of the effectiveness of the Voice.

In addition to the 3,500,000 short-wave receivers in Russia, there are as many in satellite countries.

The Voice thinks it is getting through to all of them.

Economic Rehabilitation of Anthracite Area of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lay before the Congress the final proposal in the legislative program I have sponsored for the economic rehabilitation of the anthracite area of Pennsylvania. I herewith introduce a bill for the creation of a Susquehanna Watershed Commission whose assignment it will be to prepare plans for the development of the resources of the Susquehanna Basin for purposes of flood control, economic development, navigation, soil conservation, recreation, and other purposes.

This program of legislation I have initiated is made up of measures directed both toward immediate, short-range action and toward long-range development. I do not need to recite the facts concerning the acute and persistent economic distress of the anthracite area. They are well known. They stem from the decline in demand for anthracite which began over two decades ago and which has dropped further and further, year after year. They tell the story of unemployment running into the tens of thousands—not only during years of depression but even during the years of World War II and the great prosperity which the Nation generally has enjoyed since VJ-day.

The specific legislation which I have proposed covers: First, the construction of a large office building in Wilkes-Barre to house the anthracite activities of the Bureau of Mines; second, the stockpiling of anthracite by the Federal Government in order to assure a reasonable level of production and employment in the anthracite-coal fields; third, creation of a $10,000,000 fund for the establishment of an anthracite research laboratory and research program aimed at uncovering new uses for anthracite both as a fuel and a raw material; fourth, provision for a 5 percent advantage on bids to bidders from the anthracite area as contrasted to bidders from other areas selling to procurement agencies of the Federal Government; fourth, requests to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a $5,000,000 loan to local industrial development interests for use in building factories in the area for use by new manufacturing enterprises; sixth, establishment of a national Council on Chronic Unemployment Areas to prepare comprehensive plans and programs for the economic rehabilitation of the anthracite area and areas elsewhere in the Nation suffering chronic and acute economic distress.

Mr. Speaker, the anthracite area of Pennsylvania lies within the watershed of the Susquehanna River. That watershed includes a vast area of eastern Pennsylvania and smaller areas of the States of New York and Maryland. The resources of the Susquehanna Valley constitute a rich endowment of nature. Today they are only partially developed. Their full conservation and development can mean new wealth, new income, and new employment opportunities both for the distressed anthracite area and for the much larger area of eastern Pennsylvania.

The Susquehanna watershed comprises some 27,000 square miles. It is the largest stream along the Chesapeake Bay. It contains large industrial centers, the anthracite coal fields, and smaller bituminous coal fields. Somewhat more than half of its acreage is in farms. Some of the farm lands are the finest in the Nation. At the other extreme, some of the lands are definitely submarginal. The rest of the acreage in the watershed is in forest and game lands, with large areas of second-growth timber. Recreation opportunities are abundant.

The most urgent problem of the basin over the years has been the need for flood control. For example, it was estimated that the floods of 1935 and 1936 caused property damage just short of $100,000,000; at today's prices that loss would be even more staggering, yet it fails to reflect the far greater loss in human lives. Over the years there has been progress with respect to flood control. Through a large program of levees and protection walls along the main river, and by building dams, improving channels, and constructing flood walls along the tributaries United States Army Corps of Engineers has given the people of the Susquehanna Basin a large measure of flood protection. But the job has yet to be finished. Agricultural agencies of State and Federal Government have supplemented this flood-control program through forestry and soil conservation activities. The State of Pennsylvania has made great strides in pollution abatement in the basin.

In its lower reaches, the Susquehanna provides a channel for river transportation, with access to the sea. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, there may be opportunities for its further use as an artery of commerce beyond what has as yet been envisioned.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the steps which have been taken in the development of the water resources of this great river basin. They are piecemeal steps. I have searched and I cannot find an all-inclusive program for that development. I can find no total program which contains separate but interrelated plans for the full development of the Susquehanna's potential, its navigational potential, its recreational potential, the management of its lands for soil and forest conservation, complete protection from floods. Such programs and plans not only exist but are being implemented in the three great river basins—the Columbia in the Pacific Northwest, the Missouri in the vast area between the Mississippi and the mountains to the west, the Tennessee in the Southeast. This summer the President directed that such a comprehensive program be prepared for the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins in the

Southwest by the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Security Agency, in cooperation with agencies of State and local government. These same agencies are working jointly on the programs for the Columbia and Missouri Basins.

It is perhaps natural that the Nation should proceed first with the multiple-purpose development of its larger river basins, for they represent, of course, our larger opportunities. However, that work is well along in our larger basins. If the Nation is to achieve real economic security and realize the expansion roles which a growing population and labor force require, we must now turn to planning for the multiple-purpose development of our smaller watersheds. While we have abandoned or are on the road to abandoning a piecemeal approach to resources development in our larger basins, we are still using that approach in the Susquehanna and other small watersheds.

While there were certain efforts at Federal-State cooperation in multiple-purpose development of smaller watersheds during the 1930's, I am told that the bill which I am proposing will mark the first instance in which this approach will proceed under statutory auspices. I believe that what I am suggesting may be equally applicable to other small watersheds in the Nation, and that for this reason the bill to create a Susquehanna Watershed Commission merits the interest of many of my colleagues from other States.

Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting is the creation of a Susquehanna Watershed Commission to consist of three full-time members to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Two of these members shall be bona fide residents of the area, and each shall maintain his residence there. Using the staff facilities of Federal and State agencies conducting water resource development programs, it shall be the duty of this Commission, after reviewing existing plans and programs, to prepare such multiple-purpose and unified plans and programs for the conservation and development of natural resources and expansion of industry and business as may be useful to the President and the Congress in guiding and controlling the nature, extent, and sequence of Federal programs, projects, and activities in the area. The Commission will be specifically directed to suggest measures and plans for the economic rehabilitation of the anthracite industry and area. With respect to all of its work, the Commission will be directed to seek the advice, assistance, and participation of the people of the watershed and their State and local governments. To that end the Commission will establish a public advisory board of 12 members—3 representing agriculture, 3 business, 3 labor, and 3 State governments.

The Commission will report its recommended plans and programs to the President for transmission with his recommendations to Congress 1 year after the effective date of the act, and its recommendations shall include proposals with respect to ways and means of carrying out and giving force and effect to the recommended plans and programs, including legislation, organization, administration, budget requirements, and relationships with local and State governments. Having delivered its programs, plans, and recommendations, the Commission will go out of existence. After studying its recommendations with respect to implementing the program, I shall sponsor appropriate legislation for an appropriate operating organization.

Mr. Speaker, I have given considerable study to the activities of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Federal Power Commission, and the Corps of Engineers in the Columbia and Missouri Basins and elsewhere, and I have noted with particular interest their cooperation and collaboration with similar agencies in State government. What those efforts really involve is the marshalling of the programs of all of these agencies into unified plans which will achieve full development of our natural resources and the latent economic opportunites they hold in store. My observations leave me with the conviction that the collaborative planning work of those various agencies can be expedited and improved qualitatively if it can be done under the aegis of a central body vested by the Congress with real power of decision with reference to the detailed nature of the plans. It is for that reason that I have suggested the vesting of that kind of power in a Commission of three men, none of whom represents or is responsible for any going program of Federal or State government. I call particular attention to the fact that this Commission will have power only to plan and that it will go out of existence upon the completion of its mission. Whatever operating agency or agencies complete the development of resources in the Susquehanna Basin, this initial period of planning will be required. No time will have been lost, and, in my judgment, much time will have been gained through this procedure. I am, therefore, extremely anxious that a Susquehanna Watershed Commission be created at an early date so that it may make direct and practical use of these materials in what I firmly believe can be a landmark in our approach to the development of resources in our smaller watersheds and with particular advantage at once to the distressed economic areas of northeastern Pennsylvania.

For generations this kind of planning for this area has been talked about but no one has ever done anything about it. Now I have done something about it by introducing this series of bills, the last of which is this bill so that we may have before us a carefully planned and worked out short- and long-range program to meet and solve one of the greatest economic problems in the Nation.

Foreign Policy of Truman Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it becomes more difficult each day to follow the meanderings of the Truman administration foreign policy.

With thousands of our boys actively fighting the Communists in Korea, and hundreds of thousands more being called to military duty because of the Communist threat to freedom throughout the world, our State Department and the Chief Executive call upon Congress not to place any limitations upon nations receiving our financial aid.

The continuing practice of ECA countries supplying Russia with materials necessary to the prosecution of a war denotes a shameful disregard for the lives of our forces in Korea. Yet Congress is reluctant to take a forceful stand and write into law a prohibition of aid to any such nation. Is the thirst for profits so great that we will sacrifice lives of young Americans for it? It is the duty of Congress to override administration policy and cut off financial aid to any nation supplying Russia with goods which aid the Soviet war potential.

The people of America remember too well the pre-World War II policy of shipping scrap iron to Japan, which was returned in the form of bombs. While we are not directly aiding Russia, our money is enabling other countries to do it.

Appended is a letter from one of my constituents which sets out very well the fears of the citizens in this regard. The people of the United States want both direct and indirect economic aid to Russia stopped. They want a revision of trade policies wherein we support slave labor in Russia, and at the same time supply American dollars which build up the Communist war machine.

Evidence that labor groups are concerned as well with the failure of the administration to stop transshipment of war matériel to Russia is contained in the following column of Victor Riesel entitled "Inside Labor." The above-mentioned letter and Mr. Riesel's column follow:

SOUTHBURY, CONN., *September 12, 1950.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I should like to explain to you my opinion regarding our present foreign policy toward Russia and the satellite states.

It appears to me that our attitude toward Russia is split into two distinct departments; i. e., the diplomatic and the economic—the end result is that our foreign policy consists of little more than lip-service to democracy—a poor, weak front against communism.

Our statesmen decry communism and we read daily in our newspapers of the evils of this system—yet we indirectly support this system by trading with Russia. I understand that we are sending material vital to

Russia's war machine to her. Must we wait until the Russians establish a beachhead on the New England coast before an embargo is placed on those goods which make the Russian war machine more powerful?

It seems rather ridiculous that the American people must pay increased taxes to defend this country against communism while fellow citizens are enjoying profits made from building up the very same machine that we are preparing to fight. It is my opinion that there are war profiteers in the United States at this very moment—though they may not be making goods for Uncle Sam.

Furthermore, we import goods from Russia and, in this way, not only indirectly support communism; but we also support slave labor, threaten the American economy, and pour much-needed American dollars into Russia. For example, we are and have been, for some time, importing furs from Russia. It is known that these furs are produced under slave-labor conditions. Because of this and because Russia is badly in need of American dollars, these furs are sold on the American market at a much lower price than domestic furs—thus threatening the businesses of American fur growers, many of whom are disabled veterans who were advised to go into fur farming by the United States Government.

I realize that President Truman likes to leave the door open a crack should Russia decide to talk peace—but there are certain materials which we should not be allowed to export to Russia under the present existing world conditions.

Thus far, this problem has received little publicity from either the press, the radio, or Congress. I understand there have been a few attempts to introduce this problem to the Congress and they have failed. The longshoremen's union tried to prevent Russian goods from entering this country and were informed by President Truman that it was he who decided the foreign policy. I was much surprised at this news as until then I had labored under the misbelief that the State Department and certain learned men, acting in an advisory capacity—and the President, formed the foreign policy of the Nation. I also vaguely remember something about government of, by, and for the people.

It is my opinion that certain men in this country are powerful enough financially, or politically, to wield influence over the press and the Congress and because of this the significance of this existing situation is being withheld from the American people. These men know that aroused public opinion would force them to act on the issue.

I hope that you are sufficiently concerned about this important problem to do something about it, or at least to bring it to the attention of those who are in a position to do something about it.

Very truly yours,

(S) JEANNE FIELD SPALLONE.
Mrs. Daniel F. Spallone.

ALLIED WAR SUPPLIES AIDING REDS—INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

HOUSTON, TEX.—In a series of private lunches and hotel room parleys, eye-witnesses from across the world have reported that our allies, and even some of our own American merchants and swashbuckling ship owners, are taking Soviet gold for a ghoulish profit on sales of rubber, tin, wool for uniforms, steel, steel rails, munitions-making machinery, chemicals, medicines and cargo space to Russia, Red China and North Korean agents.

These reports, brought here by global labor leaders, moved AFL chief William Green to leaders (gathered here for their sixty-ninth annual convention) to demand a world boycott of all Russian trade.

There can be no doubting this evidence. These men know, for example, that the Chinese Communists have asked the London steel merchants (dominated by the government) to send along prices on 50,000 tons of steel rails for Peiping's Red lines, along which, even now, Communist troops are being moved to the Korean frontier. And London is ready to sell those rails to the Chinese Stalinists.

But the Chinese need not wait that long for allied steel. They're getting (or at least got) tens of thousands of tons of Japanese steel from Yahata, in Kyushu, in exchange for coal from mines owned by British and Chinese. The British conceal the destinations of the metal—and our military authorities in Japan are now too concerned with Korea to police the delivery of this special steel.

Other war materials are moving into Soviet ports, by shuttle, from Ceylon and Malaya, in that area, as well as Hong Kong. British merchants have openly boasted—and the labor representatives here can prove it—that they will sell to anyone with gold and American dollars. The Soviets have plenty of both.

From these steaming oriental areas, the Soviets are getting at least 50 percent of the rubber supply for their rolling guns, trucks, tanks, and other automotive weapons and transport systems. And the labor men here say American freighters are specially chartered for the run between these ports of our allies and Soviet docks.

And from Big Tom Dougherty, that lovable giant leader of the Australian Workers Union, I have personal evidence that the Russians are buying millions of pounds worth of Australian wool from Aussie brokers. They peddle the world's best wool—most of it from herds so carefully bred that the Australian Government won't permit the rams to be exported to any other nation. This wool is being woven and cut into millions of Soviet uniforms.

After listening to Bill Green's demand for a boycott of the Soviet, similar to that slapped on the Japs and Nazis years ago, Dougherty came off the convention floor and told me he's returning to Australia to demand that his government halt all shipments to Russia and its satellites. If the government rebuffs him, Dougherty will call out on strike the 40,000 members of his huge union who ride the Australian range and process the wool itself.

Dougherty added that he and his New Zealand colleagues, also with us at the moment, would try to influence the entire East to cripple all potential war shipments—and these include oil and aircraft parts to Red China via Hong Kong.

Only the British labor delegates here seem oblivious to the bitter demand that they force their government to stop dealing with the Soviet. The English attitude is that they must sell machine tools to Russia because there are some things they must get from Russia—and machine tools are the only thing Russia wants in return from the British. It is recognized by the expert workers here that London's claim, that only nonstrategic tools are being sent, is sheer deceiving nonsense. There are 230 kinds of machine tools, and absolutely no machine tool of any kind is without strategic value, I've just been informed by a Midwest industrialist.

But the Australian and New Zealand labor people are determined to put the heat on their British labor colleagues.

As for payment for all this material (except the tools) the Russians have ample dollars and gold, because we ourselves helped them get it.

The dollars come from American purchases of Soviet materials ranging from furs to timber—and these greenbacks are spread through Asia by such outfits as the Soviet-controlled Czech Trade Commission, which finances Stalinist activity in much of the Orient. The gold comes from Russian mines, now equipped with special digging and refining machinery supplied by us under wartime lend-lease.

Nice dividends we're getting—especially for the kids on those Korean hills.

Views of a So-Called Reactionary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, attacks have been made from time to time upon me, and others holding similar views, because of our publicly expressed advocacy of a philosophy of government which our critics declare to be outmoded. Frequently the critics abstain from discussing issues, and descend to the low practice of name-calling, the resort of the political demagogue. We are called Reactionaries, Old Guard, and similar names, which, through the unceasing efforts of the apostles of the New Deal, have acquired in the public mind a meaning of sinister character.

Only recently, a prominent local Democratic officeholder made such an attack on me.

It would be much more helpful to the public's understanding if the issues themselves could be discussed.

With a critical election about to be held, which may determine the ultimate fate of this country, it seems only fitting that these critics should be answered and the views which I and many others hold should be publicly stated.

This country is by far the richest in the world, with the widest distribution of wealth among the people and the highest standard of living ever known in any country, at any time, in human history. Essential to this success has been a system of government devised by our founding fathers 160 years ago. Our Republic then formed was a union of independent States, and the powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, were expressly reserved by the Constitution to the States or to the people. The limitations imposed upon the power of the Federal Government were basic to the purpose of the founders of the Republic, and for years the rights and powers of the individual States and their people were zealously guarded and respected.

For a century and a half the American people accepted as true the principles declared in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution that government is instituted by the people, that government is the servant of the people, and that the people must support the government. This concept and its connotation of individual liberty—each man to be free to make of himself all that his ability, his ingenuity, and his industry justify—have made this Nation great.

For the past 17 years, however, the leaders of the New Deal Party, which deceivingly bears the label of the once great Democrat Party, have preached the false doctrine that the people must look to their Government for jobs, for food, for housing, for subsidies, and generally for support from the cradle to the grave. In so doing, they have followed an alien philosophy of government which, as history has demonstrated time and time again, can have but one ending—the complete loss of freedom and the enslavement of the people.

For the past 17 years, these leaders have been following, step by step, a pattern cleverly conceived by European Socialists who have directed their countries down the road to the degradation and despair of the despotic Socialist state. Already we are far advanced on this road. This has been due in large measure to the work of Socialist-minded "intellectuals," who have infiltrated our Government in key positions.

In no case is the term "socialism" used by these planners of our destruction. Instead they speak of the "New Deal," the "Fair Deal," a "planned economy," or the "welfare state," knowing full well that if they should call their objective by its right name, "socialism," they would be promptly thrown out of office by an indignant people.

Working in subtle and devious ways, they have bored within our labor unions, our educational institutions, and even our churches. They have promised and given handouts to one group after another for the purpose of buying their votes. They have encroached steadily upon the rights and powers of the States, and have built up a huge Federal bureaucracy until there are now over 2,000,000 civilian employees on the Federal payroll.

Following the Communist manifesto of Karl Marx, they have used confiscatory income and inheritance taxes to destroy the value of private property, which is the basis of the private enterprise system, at the same time depriving the States of sources of revenue on which they depend.

They have used the taxpayers' money to promote competition by the Government with private enterprise.

Under the guise of rent control they have confiscated the property of landlords for the benefit of tenants, the more numerous voting class.

They have wantonly squandered the taxpayers' money. The Federal debt has increased from $21,000,000,000 in 1933 to over $260,000,000,000 at the present time, thereby causing a drastic increase in the cost of living and endangering the solvency of the Government.

In its lust for power, the New Deal government under Mr. Truman spent in five peacetime years, from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1950, $214,000,000,000, an amount greater by $34,000,000,000 than the total amount spent by all the 32 previous Presidents in 152 years, from 1789 to July 1, 1941. In 1931 the cost of the Federal Government was $30 for each man, woman, and child. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, it was over $300.

As a part of their scheme these Socialist planners have fostered racial and religious antagonism and have arrayed class against class.

They have extended, by Federal administrative, legislative, and judicial interpretation, the power given Congress in the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce. By so doing, they have subjected nearly all labor, business, and agriculture to Federal regulation and control, and have usurped the power of the States to regulate commerce within their own boundaries.

The goal of these Socialist planners, "Government unlimited, is at once the most diabolical, the most treacherous, and the most uncontrollable force known to man. While man has learned to cope with the forces of nature, he has never yet learned effectively to cope with this force he himself creates." In the language of the late President Woodrow Wilson:

> The history of liberty is the history of limitations upon the powers of government.

And now, in the midst of this chaotic domestic situation, we find this country of ours, within 5 years after the end of World War II, engaged in another war which may ultimately develop into world war III. This is our third war in 31 years, all of them under Democrat administrations. It is a war due wholly to the incredible bungling—to speak mildly—of our Nation's affairs by the New Deal Party which has controlled our national Government for the past 17 years.

Five years ago, at the end of the World War II, we had the most powerful Army and Navy in the world, and we were aided by a powerful British Army and Navy. We were in a position to dictate terms to Russia. We failed to do so, and instead, during the years that followed, President Truman and his administration proceeded to turn over to Russia the control of a large portion of the globe and to allow our own military power to decline to a dangerous low.

In pursuit of its policy of favoring Russia, a policy dictated by its Socialist planners, our Government, under the leadership first of President Roosevelt and then of President Truman, shamefully and dishonorably betrayed our stanch ally, Chiang Kai-shek, and the Nationalist Government of China, and turned China, with its 450,000,000 people, over to the Communist stooges of Moscow. By so doing, it rendered impotent the one power in Asia that could have stopped Russia in her tracks, and by so doing, have prevented the present war in Korea.

By so doing, our Government has placed Russia in a position to obtain control of all Asia, with half the population of the world, and has increased immeasurably her chances of achieving her ambition of world conquest.

As a result of all this, the United States is today in great peril. Even though the Korean war should terminate shortly, nevertheless, barring an early beginning and prompt ending of world war III, this country must for a great many years be subjected to the rigors and controls of a war economy, with millions of its men under arms, with crushing taxes levied to support a huge military establishment, with no hope of relief in the foreseeable future, and with the ever-present terrifying prospect of an inflation, already well advanced, that will destroy the purchasing power of our money and the value of every insurance policy and bank account in the United States.

This is the record of the administration that has ruled this country for 17 years; the most incompetent administration the country has ever known. No honest, sensible person having the slightest familiarity with the facts can arrive at any conclusion other than that the present lot of self-seeking, incompetent politicians be driven from office.

In the language of A. B. Genung, in the Country Almanac of September 1, 1950:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *September 22, 1950.*

The American people, on the average, simply have no comprehension of barbarian levels of life, thought, motive or action. * * *

But now, suddenly, incredibly, right here in the middle of the twentieth century, we and our civilization have come up stark against the seething, sinister might of a barbarian world. A world alien, unknown to us. But a world full of brutal, rapacious, predatory, utterly ruthless and savage men. Hordes of them, captained and enslaved by power-hungry tyrants to whom conquest is the one age-old road to enrichment.

It is as though, in a nightmare, the clock had been turned back 700 years and we stared out upon the savage Mongol hordes of Genghis Khan, moving westward like a tide to our destruction. It is monstrous, unbelievable.

But it is a fact. The barbarians of the East are on the move again. A billion of them. Armed, equipped, aflame with the fever of conquest and plunder. * * *

America faces a problem. A very simple problem. It is the problem of survival.

It is largely unaware of this as yet. Nor can any of us guess the time when that first sickening spasm of comprehension and of real fear will sweep across this land. It will. We don't know when. It might even be this month.

We are well-to-do children. And for 18 years we have been fed a patent medicine calculated to lull us, soften us, make self-seeking parasites out of us. We are still being fed the same insidious, enervating stuff, a socialistic opium as deadly in this mad world as though we were all literally being dosed with narcotic. The intent is to make us dependent upon a clique of bureaucrats who will plan our lives for us. And the effects are all about us. We are dependent children, believing in Santa Claus, voting for bigger and better presents, unconscious of all this barbarian menace building up. Such is our legacy from the Roosevelt era. * * *

Our own personal opinion is that when and if we do arouse ourselves, we shall discover that the one first job to be done is to clean out Washington, to cast off that incubus of weak, pandering, selfseeking leadership and put men at the head who knows the worth and meaning of the real American system. * * *

Even then the problem will be one of survival.

It is later even than the most alert ones thought.

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *September 22, 1950.*

Defends Lobbies for United States Aides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in the September 21, 1950, issue of the Washington Times-Herald, our colleague and distinguished member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Mrs. KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, appeared as a guest columnist.

The views of Mrs. ST. GEORGE are always timely. I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in her statement. It follows:

DEFENDS LOBBIES FOR UNITED STATES AIDES

Just as it is a fact that the Members of the House of Representatives are the people in Government who are the closest to the people, because they are all up for election every 2 years and therefore have to be ever in close touch with their own districts, so it is also true that of all the committees of Congress, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is in closer touch with the everyday lives of a great cross-section of our country.

The civil-service roster of the United States is now tremendous, including as it does, approximately 2,000,000 persons, from the humblest clerks to top executives. Besides these the committee has the Post Office Department and its affairs to care for. Here we have a giant business in which 500,000 employees are working and handling over $1,000,000,000 annually.

Nothing is closer to the people than the Post Office Department. In some parts of the country it is the main contact that people have with the Federal Government, and the local postman is indeed the representative, and in the majority of cases an excellent one, of the Government of the United States.

Now these people all have problems, the principal one being how to balance their budgets in these days of rising prices, and next, how to obtain security when their working days are over.

FEW CONGRESSMEN ARE OVERPAID

Congress has increased salaries in the last 4 years all along the line, and that includes Cabinet officers and others in the executive branch, notably the President.

The Congress has not, however, increased the salaries of its own Members, and I mention that because it is fashionable in some quarters to say that Congressmen are overpaid.

I know very few of whom this could be said, but my suggestion would be that if there are some who do not earn their hiring, you can always replace them by others who will, because going to Congress is like love, you cannot make it unpopular.

There is a great deal of talk and adverse criticism these days of the activities of lobbies and lobbyists and they now have to be registered and duly accounted for, with a statement as to salaries and whom they are working for.

The civil service employees and postal employees are represented by members of their respective organizations who may well be classed as lobbyists, who present their cases before the committee and visit members in their offices to talk over the various bills before them.

I have never agreed with the opposition to lobbying, because it seems to me to be a very important part of the American philosophy of government. The idea is embodied in the first article of the bill of rights where the people are guaranteed the right of petition.

Our country is now so vast, and our population so large, that it stands to reason that in many instances it would be difficult for them to come in person to petition Congress, although they still have that right and exercise it frequently to this very day.

It is, however, simpler, in most cases, for people in a similar profession or career to designate one of their own members to represent them and their interests with the appropriate committees of Congress, and it also stands to reason that this individual must be paid for his work and time. There is nothing to criticize in this practice which is a natural outgrowth of representative government. It is objected that through these lobbies, legislation is often influenced. Why not? Surely one of the cornerstones of our Republic is that the Government belongs to the people and they surely are the ones to influence it through their Representatives, or in person.

PEOPLE TO BLAME FOR FEDERAL FAULTS

The other side of this is that the people themselves are directly to blame for the kind of government they have in this country. In other words, when you complain of waste, extravagance, and red tape—and you have good reason to complain of all three—stop and ask yourself what you personally have done to correct this situation.

If you are perfectly honest with yourself you will have to admit that you are against waste, extravagance, and red tape for everyone and every organization except your own.

Here again we try to remove the mote in our brother's eye while leaving the beam in our own. This is human nature, but it does not help the cause of good government.

If we are to progress we must keep striving for liberty and justice for all, and not simply for ourselves and our immediate group.

Now that so many of our people are in civil service and Government employ there is a rising desire for more measures that will insure security.

This is natural because no one can get very rich in Government service; in fact, it is well-nigh impossible to lap up anything for sickness and old age, and for that reason legislation that will provide for these things is constantly brought before the committee and passed into law.

It is safe to say that there is more security in civil service and Government employ today than in any other kind of work.

But there is not the opportunity to make a fortune that the private individual can have if he is willing to take the risks without which no great success can ever be achieved.

CSC SHOULD PROVIDE SUPREME COURT

Great progress has been made in protecting the rights of employees in the matter of separation from the service.

It is my feeling that the Civil Service Commission should be a final court of appeal or supreme court, if you will, and that any employee may have the right to go before them for a final appeal if he or she does not believe a fair hearing has been provided in the department.

The commission would thus be in close touch always with all departments and a real living organization to the employees.

As our Government gets bigger and bigger we must guard against allowing the various boards and commissions in the executive branch to become a little group of untouchable and unapproachable Olympians, above and beyond the reach of average mortals. They must come down to earth and play their part in the rough-and-tumble of the arena.

This is one of the many dangers of big government: That it gets away from the people and then becomes their master instead of their servant. George Washington said: "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence. It is a force: Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."

This is a true saying and one to be followed and heeded.

The committee has, of course, been deeply concerned about eliminating bad security risks, subversives and Communists in Government. This is a most serious problem today and one that should not be handled in a namby-pamby, sentimental manner.

We have suddenly decided to fight communism all over the world and yet we are slow to eradicate Communists in our own Government. It is said that there are very few subversives and Communists in the departments of Government. The answer to that is that there should be none.

MORE COMMIES HERE THAN IN EARLY U. S. S. R.

Reliable sources, notably the FBI, tell us there are more Communists in the United States than there were in Russia before they took over that country. There is absolutely no excuse for coddling such enemies of the Nation.

I think I can truly say that the present Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is fully aware of this and is guarding the American philosophy of government and the rights of our people, most jealously.

This committee is also very free from partisanship and the committee votes are rarely along party lines.

This is due to the splendid leadership we have in our chairman, TOM MURRAY, of Tennessee, and our ranking minority member, EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas, who work well together and instill a spirit of fair play and cooperation in the whole committee.

We also are fortunate in that we in this committee are near to the people and as we pursue our way, no doubt making mistakes at times, we have the knowledge that we are working with 2,000,000 men and women in civil service and 500,000 postal employees who are, by and large, as fine a group of patriotic Americans as can be found, and that we are all working together for a better America and the preservation of our great Republic.

The Monster Hoarder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am having many letters from my district from housewives asking me why it is that prices of necessities, such as food, are so high, and the cost constantly increasing.

This is not difficult to answer in very plain language. Speaking generally, it is because of the inordinate waste of the New Deal, and its total disregard of the necessities of the overburdened taxpay-

ers, the depreciation of the dollar under deficit financing, the hoarding by the Government of the necessities of life, and the Truman war.

To put the whole matter, so far as necessities are concerned, in understandable and popular language, I am inserting as part of my remarks an article by George Dixon which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald under date of September 20, 1950:

WASHINGTON SCENE

(By George Dixon)

Ever since President Truman delivered his fireside chat I have been waiting impatiently for him to begin taking his own advice.

Our steadfast and peerless leader came out sternly against hoarding. He inveighed against housewives who buy up more than they need. He said:

"Every American housewife must not buy more than she needs. She must put off buying whenever she can. If the housewife insists on buying more than she needs, there will not be enough to go around, and prices will go up."

The President explained that hoarding only brings on inflation and scarcity.

It goes without saying that our infallible leader is right in what he says about hoarding. Would that he could only be as right about what he does.

Naturally, every American abhors hoarding. We loathe and despise that bloated Mrs. Potts who has 10 pounds of butter stashed away in her deep freeze. She is un-American. But, Mr. President, I know a hoarder who is hoarding 192,000,000 pounds of butter.

That nouveau riche Mrs. Helfer Eaton has almost a whole cheese weighing 20 pounds. She loves to pick at it between meals, the fat pig. But this other hoarder has 106,100,000 pounds of cheese.

I am pretty sure you are catching on to whom I mean, Mr. President, which is all right because I am not trying to keep you in suspense. But we will proceed, without definite identification, for a minute.

Nobody in our block is speaking to that stuck-up Mrs. Harpy. She has three 100-pound bags of potatoes in her cellar. We hope they sprout and she has potatoes growing through her floor. But, Mr. President, she is just an amateur. This other hoarder has bought 5,443,000 bags of potatoes, each weighing 100 pounds.

But he's done something even more abominable, Mr. President. He decided he had too many potatoes, even for him, and ordered nearly 80 percent of those 5,443,000 hundred-pound bags destroyed.

There's a creature up the street a piece from us, whose name we won't even mention because she is just plain sickening, who stocked up her cupboard until it is near busting with cans of that Mexican canned beef. She must have 50 cans if she's got a can. But this other hoarder has 68,891,113 cans of the same Mexican canned beef.

There seems to be no limit to the staggering amounts of food this hoarder will hoard and watch go bad rather than let any American eat it. He is the biggest hoarder in all history.

As of this last week he had a few other odds and ends of food put away, such as 80,952,918 pounds of dried eggs (the equivalent of 242,858,754 dozen eggs in the shell); 320,700,000 pounds of dried milk (the equivalent of 1,635,180,000 quarts as substracted from the cow, or 11 quarts for every man, woman and child in the country).

As I said before, Mr. President, I am not trying to build up any suspense. This monster hoarder is your own administration.

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL F. WHITE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, a lady who lives in my home town recently had published in our largest newspaper a letter which, while intending to be helpful to the cause of world peace, contained some statements which I feel were inspired by someone with an ulterior, political motive. The letter had to do with a proposal I made for world peace in 1940. The subject of world peace, Mr. Speaker, is too important to be trifled with and I have written an answer to that letter which I wish to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that all the people of central California may have all the facts. The answer is as follows:

EDITOR OF THE BEE.

SIR: Please refer to the letter of Mrs. M. Z. regarding my booklet, A World United.

The lady apparently overlooked the provision on page 2 of my booklet which reads: "A senate composed of two senators from each member nation." Some people have been creating the impression that I proposed representation in the world peace authority on the basis of population only. That is not true, as you will see from the provision for two senators from each nation.

My proposal for a world peace authority like the United Nations is simply to provide a world authority on the same basis as our own National Government is constructed. I think American democracy is the best form of government in the world and I want to see it extended throughout the world to stop these world wars and to stop communism.

Apparently the opposition objects to the spreading of American democracy to a world-wide basis to maintain world peace. That is all I proposed in my booklet and they seem to object to it.

With regard to the immigration clause in my booklet, which the opposition has criticized, the copyrighted edition contains the clause, "subject to the approval of the receiving nation," and I have a photostatic copy of the copyrighted edition from the copyright office to prove it. This knocks into a cocked hat the claim that I advocate impractical immigation laws.

If we only give American money and economic aid to individual foreign nations, we do nothing to promote a permanent world peace organization. If we offer military and economic aid to the United Nations as a united world peace organization, we build a permanent world peace authority, and I am for it.

I would not quibble about unimportant details of a booklet I wrote in 1940 advocating a world peace authority. I would not quibble about the unimportant details of a world peace plan now. To show my latest thinking and effort in connection with world peace, I introduced a resolution in Congress on June 7, 1949, along with 82 other Congressmen, both Republicans and Democrats. This resolution is stripped of all details and deals with the irreducible minimum of elements in order to eliminate details which might be subject to controversy. It reads as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

Let us build the United Nations into a real organization for peace by eliminating the veto and by expanding the present United Nations army (now under General MacArthur) into a force large enough to maintain peace in the world. If Russia does not want to go along, then we would at least have all the other most powerful nations of the world allied together against Russia to insulate the free world against aggression and communism.

I fought in two wars and my sons are now enlisted for this one. I am sick and tired of war. I wrote that booklet in 1940 hoping to help bring about a world authority like the United Nations with an international army to maintain world peace, and I am glad the same general pattern has been followed in the formation of the United Nations. The main reason I ran for Congress was to do what I can to bring about a permanent organization for world peace. If such a world peace authority is finally successful, it may save my two little grandsons from becoming cannon fodder some day, and save civilization from virtual extinction.

Appropriations for the Eighty-first Congress, First and Second Sessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting a table showing the appropriations for the Eighty-first Congress, first and second sessions, together with the requests from the budget, the House action, the Senate action, the Public Law, and the increases of the second session over the first session. In addition, I am showing the contract authority which has been granted.

The total amount which has been made available as a result of the direct appropriations is $52,540,855,488. This represents an increase over the first session's appropriations of $14,715,829,277. With the single exception of civilian foreign aid, where there is a large reduction, every item shows an increase. Tentative decreases are shown in the Labor-Federal Security and Treasury-Post Office items, but these are explained because of a reorganization which transferred the General Services Administration to the independent offices bill, and there is an item of a reduction caused by a failure to use the funds appropriated last year for railroad-retirement benefits in the Labor-Federal Security bill.

The contract authorizations are less than last year by $2,100,000,000.

The worst part of the whole situation is that the civilian activities of the Government have gone up by tremendous leaps. There has evidently been a throttling of the expenditures for the armed services, because the only set-up that shows an increase, in spite of our foreign situation in the period since the 1st of July 1950, is the Air Force which shows an increase of $596,000,000. The Army itself shows a decrease of $687,000,000. The Navy shows a decrease of $190,000,000.

Expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30 were $40,166,000,000 and the receipts were $37,044,000,000, leaving a deficit of $3,122,000,000. With appropriations available now totaling $52,540,000,000, it is easy enough to see that the expenditure figure of $40,000,000,000 last year is going to be exceeded by a very large amount, even though the first 3 months' expenditure is less than last year.

The expenditures in the last half of the year will increase very markedly, and unless we have large impounding, on the part of the President, of funds in the civilian establishments of the Government—where they are not needed—the deficit is going to be so large as to endanger our debt limit of $275,000,000,000.

The Republican Members of the House have stood very solidly for retrenchment in Federal appropriations for the civilian establishments, where it could be done. We wish we could say that all of our Democratic colleagues had done as well. We are grateful to those who did stand for economy. But it is apparent that unless a Republican Congress is elected, the wasteful operations of the Government will continue on a very considerable scale.

Appropriation and contract authority comparisons excluding permanent and trust fund accounts, borrowing authority, public debt transactions, reappropriations, etc.

	1st sess., 81st Cong.	2d sess., 81st Cong.				Increase or decrease, 1st sess.
		1951 budget request	House action	Senate action	Public law	
Appropriations:						
Independent offices	$7,617,739,361	$8,458,148,324	$8,021,827,007	$8,018,289,977	$7,996,140,947	$378,401,586
Civil functions	664,178,190	834,867,500	630,820,000	763,464,620	687,043,270	22,865,080
State-Justice-Commerce	677,972,102	1,184,035,897	1,110,870,462	1,066,260,732	1,065,627,962	387,655,860
Labor-Federal Security	2,387,381,385	2,462,072,500	2,271,099,614	2,276,842,274	2,272,428,614	(114,952,771)
Treasury-Post Office	3,090,528,903	2,812,155,600	2,754,105,000	2,760,305,360	2,757,846,000	(332,682,903)
Agriculture	715,601,607	806,278,446	764,032,701	780,374,074	773,208,924	57,607,317
District of Columbia	102,754,447	119,167,175	112,840,340	119,019,562	118,049,286	15,294,839
Interior	584,098,797	669,251,505	622,134,130	617,061,433	620,396,325	36,297,528
Armed services	12,949,562,498	13,078,675,000	12,910,702,300	13,294,581,821	13,294,299,443	344,736,945
Legislative	62,262,110	65,296,396	56,322,450	69,308,211	69,290,211	7,028,101
Foreign aid	5,659,990,000	4,855,073,729	[1]	4,599,873,729	4,387,373,729	(1,272,616,271)
Urgent deficiency	[2] 2,155,868,802	813,168,000	732,485,500	758,729,100	739,653,500	(1,416,215,302)
1950 deficiency		605,024,943	625,493,694	660,272,508	653,761,608	653,761,608
1951 supplemental	[3] 1,157,088,009	16,852,484,598	16,771,356,077	17,196,735,669	17,105,735,669	15,948,647,660
Total	37,825,026,211	53,615,699,613	47,384,089,275	52,981,119,070	52,540,855,488	14,715,829,277
Contract authority				[4]	[4]	
State, Justice, etc	68,200,000	91,036,500	58,786,500	69,650,000	62,325,000	(5,875,000)
Labor-Federal Security	185,161,300	161,211,000	154,288,000	154,288,000	154,288,000	(30,873,300)
Interior	66,703,900	44,750,000	38,250,000	37,830,000	36,230,000	(30,473,900)
Independent Offices	480,339,628	578,367,000	510,517,000	537,017,000	531,517,000	51,177,372
Defense	2,752,913,470	1,385,785,000	1,385,785,000	1,385,785,000	1,385,785,000	(1,367,128,470)
Foreign aid	500,000,000					(500,000,000)
Urgent deficiency		87,650,000	78,885,000	78,885,000	78,885,000	78,885,000
Deficiency, 1950		15,000,000		35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
Supplemental, 1951		780,000	717,600	58,217,600	58,217,600	58,217,600
Agriculture	100,000					(100,000)
District of Columbia	1,545,000					(1,545,000)
Treasury	420,000,000					(420,000,000)
Total contract authority	4,474,963,298	2,364,579,500	2,227,229,100	2,356,672,600	2,342,247,600	(2,132,715,698)
Grand total	42,299,989,509	55,980,279,113	49,611,318,375	55,337,791,670	54,883,103,088	12,583,113,579
Less over-all cuts			600,000,000	450,000,000	550,000,000	550,000,000
Net	42,299,989,509	55,980,279,113	49,011,318,375	54,887,791,670	54,333,103,088	12,033,113,579

[1] Foreign aid not considered in House.
[2] 1949 deficiencies.
[3] 1950 supplementals.
[4] In addition—indefinite amount for purchase of 100,000 pounds of wool, knitting yarn, and woolen fabrics.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the $52,540,855,488 of direct appropriations, there is available to the Departments to spend $6,557,462,804 of permanent appropriations, making a total for the bureaucrats to spend of $59,098,318,292.

My Report to the Indians of the Ninth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, northern Minnesota is the home of the Chippewa Indian and much of the Indian population is concentrated in Minnesota's Ninth District. Therefore, as the Congress nears adjournment, I ask permission to report to them on the legislation that I have introduced on their behalf during the recent months and my other efforts as their representative in Congress.

March 30, 1949: H. R. 3895, a bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

The purpose of this bill is to declare title to approximately 28,554 acres of land purchased by the United States in connection with the Flat Lake and Twin Lakes Indian demonstration projects in Minnesota, to be held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians.

It also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to proclaim this land as an addition to the White Earth Reservation. The chief purposes of the Flat Lake and Twin Lakes demonstration projects were to supply a place for homes for Indians; furnish the Indians a place to grow gardens; furnish the Indians a source of fuel; and to bring the whole area under Indian control in order to achieve an economical system of land use for the lands now owned by the Indians.

This measure was approved by the House of Representatives on June 20, 1949, and is now pending in the Senate.

October 4, 1949, per capita payment: H. R. 6319, a bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

This bill would authorize the payment of a $50 per capita payment to be made upon the passage and approval of this act and the second installment of $50 per capita to be made January 15, 1951, and is similar to the measures I introduced previously which authorized and provided capita payments.

My measure was approved by the House of Representatives on June 5, 1950, and was pending in the Senate until August 23 when it was taken up but not passed. On September 13, 1950, the Senate passed my bill in greatly changed form. Through my efforts and contacts and following out my desires, the House conferees insisted on the more desirable provisions of my bill. However, the Senate held out for the reduced payment of $75 instead of $100 as provided in my bill, H. R. 6319. The payments were divided with $37.50 to be paid this fall, and $37.50 during the winter.

June 30, 1950: H. R. 9017, a bill to promote the rehabilitation of the bands of Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, located on the Red Lake, White Earth, Greater Leech Lake, Bois Fort or Nett Lake, Mille Lac, Fond du Lac, Grand Portage, and Vermillion Lake Indian Reservations, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to provide a long-range program of rehabilitation which shall include off-reservation employment and adjustments related to such employment.

This proposal would authorize to be appropriated the sum of $15,000,000 for the establishment of a revolving fund to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act. Consideration and action on this legislation will come following reports of the House committee referred to in the next paragraph.

March 20, 1950: House Resolution 525, a resolution calling for the creation of a committee in the House of Representatives to investigate and study the rehabilitation needs of the Chippewa Indians located on the Red Lake, White Earth, Greater Leech Lake, Bois Fort or Nett Lake, Mille Lac, Fond du Lac, and Grand Portage Reservations, with special attention to be given to the following projects:

First. Development of industrial and business enterprises.

Second. Development of off-reservation employment.

Third. Surveys of physical and human resources.

Fourth. Development of agricultural opportunities.

Fifth. Development of educational opportunities, including loans for educational purposes.

Sixth. Hospital buildings and equipment, and other health-conservation measures.

Seventh. Establishment of a revolving loan fund for establishment of business; home and land improvements; for the purchase of machinery, stock, and other farming equipment; and for the purpose of building new tribal enterprises.

Eighth. Construction and maintenance of roads, trails, and so forth.

Ninth. Housing and necessary facilities and equipment.

Tenth. Water and sewerage systems and other common service facilities.

A congressional committee is now working on these suggestions and is expected to report to the next Congress in January.

I am convinced that a comprehensive long-range program for the rehabilitation of the Chippewa Tribe of Indians is essential. The handling of the situation by Washington had its mistaken start long ago and it is time for the Government to meet the situation squarely and effectively.

SURPLUS FOODS

During the past year I have been in frequent contact with the United States Department of Agriculture, urging them to distribute surplus commodities to the Indians of Minnesota. They have distributed $66,376 worth of foods. However, I feel that the amount distributed is not nearly sufficient in view of the great needs of the Indians themselves and the great surpluses of food which are available. I am now seeking a greater distribution of surplus foods for this coming winter.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this report has given the native Americans of my district a clear picture of my efforts on their behalf during the Eighty-first Congress. I am an adopted member of the Red Lake Band of the Chippewa Tribe, my Indian name being "Gi-gi-go-we-ne-ne."

I want to assure all of the Indians of my fullest interest, cooperation, and help relative to their personal as well as tribal problems. I ask them to write to me or personally see me at any opportunity concerning any matter they may have on which I can possibly be of service and assistance.

Daughters of the American Revolution Opposed to Any Form of World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a forceful, concise statement of the position taken by the great patriotic organization, the Daughters of the American Revolution, which opposes any form of world government which would include the United States. I commend it to the attention of every Member. It follows:

The National Society Daughters of the American Revolution is against any form of world government because:

1. The mere writing of a constitution, the passing of a law or the declaration of pious phrases about peace will not compel peoples to live in harmony.

2. Lack of a common cultural heritage, common language, traditions, religion, and law among prospective members of a world federation would prevent a community of interests.

3. With less than 7 percent of the world population in the United States, the surrender of our national sovereignty to a world governing body will forfeit our liberty, free enterprise and independence to the dictates of this governing body.

4. Forfeiture of sovereignty means forfeiture of our right (again with only 7 percent of the population in our county) to decide what taxes we shall pay and how they shall be spent. Authority of a world governing body to tax all citizens according to ability to pay would be disastrous to the citizens of the United States who enjoy the highest standard of living in the world today.

5. Any form of disarmament and the substitution of a world police force in which your husbands, sons, daughters, and perhaps you, would serve at the dictates of this body would subject this country to domination of the Communist Party, consider the population of Russia, Siberia, the countries behind the iron curtain, Communist China and the subversive groups in all other countries, ready to take over when the moment is ripe. International wars would become civil wars and we would be undefended, having no United States Armed Forces.

6. Concentration of power in a world government would provoke rather than prevent wars. Basic causes of wars are not political but population pressures, unequal distribution of resources, ambitions of dictators and idealogical crusades.

7. Abolishment of the laws of immigration would permit the free movement of all peoples. Every country except one has oversubscribed its immigration quotas to this country for years to come. These people would swarm our shores jeopardizing the economy of the United States with its high wage levels and industrial production.

8. World courts of law over which we would have little or no control would wipe out our system of justice.

9. Inability of these intellectual idealists to agree among themselves upon the form of a world government proves the impracticability of their propaganda. There are some 30 groups, each with a different plan being preached to and believed by many well-meaning earnest people, including a few Congressmen and Senators. Check on yours.

10. The Department of State, the United Nations officials and practical political scientists reject the idea of world government.

KATHARINE G. REYNOLDS,
(Mrs. Bruce D. Reynolds),
National Chairman, National Defense Committee.

FRANCES BARRETT LUCAS,
(Mrs. James C. Lucas),
Executive Secretary, National Defense Committee.

This Question of Bigness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to direct your attention and that of the other Members to an excellent article discussing the matter of bigness in business which is featured in the September 1950 issue of the magazine Steelways.

This splendid article concerning a matter of vital national interest is entitled "This Question of Bigness," and was written by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, JOHN J. WILLIAMS. I am sure that you will find, as I have, that this article by Senator

WILLIAMS is an interesting, informative, and eminently fair discussion of a matter in which there is widespread public interest.

The article by Senator WILLIAMS which appeared in Steelways follows:

THIS QUESTION OF BIGNESS—WHEN THE WHOPPING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONDEMNS BIG BUSINESS, IT'S TIME TO TAKE THE CASE TO THE CUSTOMER

(By Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware)

We seem to be about ready to rewrite Horatio Alger in this country. It was all very well for Mr. Alger's characters to struggle up the ladder by their own efforts and to wind up being great successes. But, in the light of the political philosophy extant today, there is some doubt as to just how big a success the hero ought to be. Perhaps he should level off somewhere down the line, at a point to be determined by a suitable committee of critics. Otherwise, he is bound to antagonize somebody.

In the business world, at any rate, nothing succeeds like success when it comes to inviting the displeasure of Washington, D. C. Corporations that have successfully developed and sold their products to an increasing number of satisfied customers now find themselves on the mat because they have grown too large in the process. A report recently issued by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report likens the steel industry to a public utility, saying that it is of such size that the Government should have a hand in fixing its prices and in guaranteeing competition among companies. In the House of Representatives, a Special Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power is eyeing du Pont, General Motors, General Electric, steel, and others on the assumption that their magnitude is inherently wrong.

Neither committee has produced any tangible evidence to show that big business has harmed its competitors, the buying public, or small business. The evidence—and much of it is the Government's own figures—points the other way. But by innuendo, inference and assumption, the idea has arisen that—because monopolies are often big business—big businesses must be monopolies. On that logic, we should certainly be obliged to state that all birds are owls, since it is common knowledge that all owls are birds.

This is not to say that every corporation is a model of respectability. But we do know that our present industrial structure has won a war and gone on to give us the most prosperous years we have ever known. Before we carve that structure into some other image, let us examine it on its economic and not its political merits, without recourse to the witch-hunter's technique of prejudging the case.

Is there, for example, any sound reason for an industry to grow large—apart from the fact that it is bound to do so if it can satisfy the wants of large numbers of customers?

In my home State of Delaware is the headquarters of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.—biggest chemical concern in the United States. On Capitol Hill, du Pont is considered by some to be an undesirable concentration. It is indeed a concentration of money, research men and managerial skills. To what purpose?

Well, take the case of nylon—which du Pont sells as a raw material for further processing as it does with 88 percent of its products. Nylon did not exist 20 years ago. As Crawford Greenewalt, president of du Pont, pointed out to the Subcommittee on Monopoly Power, basic research on the product began in 1928. Not until 1940 was the first commercially made pound of it ready for sale. In the meantime, according to Mr. Greenewalt, du Pont had spent $27,000,000 on development—$27,000,000 gambled on an untried, unknown product.

If there were no large corporations capable of making such an investment in research in hard cash, would there have been nylon? Certainly any small business which wanted to undertake such a development would have to assemble an enormous staff and enormous financial backing—i. e., it would have to become a large business.

Nylon is just one story. Testimony by steel companies brought out the fact that a single big continuous rolling mill for rolling sheet steel would cost a minimum of $50,000,000 to build today, while a complete plant capable of turning out 5,000,000 tons of ingots yearly would take more than $1,000,000,000 of capital. General Electric points to annual losses ranging up over $400,000 on its kitchen-sink disposal during the 19 years since research began.

Small business cannot undertake ventures of this kind. Bigness we must have. Bigness is sired by sheer necessity—the necessity for efficiency and economy of operation—and by consumer demand for improved products at a reasonable price. The question then becomes: Does bigness hurt competitors or damage the Nation's small businesses?

Geoffrey Lloyd, Britain's wartime petroleum secretary, once remarked, "I think we wouldn't have won the battle of Britain without 100 octane."

He was speaking of aviation fuels, natural and synthetic, that gave the RAF a performance edge over the luftwaffe in air combat. The story of those fuels goes back to 1916 when Charles F. Kettering and a small research team began studying auto engine knock in a vacated Dayton, Ohio., tobacco warehouse.

That study, which used up millions of dollars and involved the resources of General Motors research laboratories, not only produced tetraethyl lead, which limited knock in auto engines, but also touched off an exhaustive study of the molecules that make up fuel and paved the way for synthetics.

The wartime role of 100 octane only dramatized what this immense General Motors research program accomplished for aircraft. Beyond that it opened the way for engineers to develop new auto and truck engines that in the past 20 years have become 30 percent more efficient than the engines of the 1920's. And for the entire industry—not General Motors alone—the end isn't yet in sight.

Engineers predict that, with further fuel development, future high-compression engines will travel as much as 30 percent farther on a gallon of gasoline than they travel today. This will save the motorist's money and help conserve the Nation's petroleum resources.

General Motors' know-how in fuel and engine technology, requiring immense outlays of money, brains, and materials, has been made available to the entire internal-combustion engine and petroleum industries—for autos, trucks, aircraft, farm tractors or any other device that operates with a spark ignition. Moreover, much of this experience and development was ground work for the two-cycle Diesel program, which today is revolutionizing the railroads. Many manufacturers in these fields are, of course, in direct competition with GM.

As for the lot of small business, it is worth recalling Mr. Greenewalt's testimony about the $49.95 nylon dress. Du Pont sells the nylon staple for such a dress for $1.92. The difference goes entirely to smaller business—the spinners of the yarn, the throwsters who twist it, the weavers, the finishers, the designers and cutters, and the retail store that sells the dress. While Washington laments their fate, I dare say small businesses like these find things rather to their liking.

There is considerable muttering about monopoly in steel, too. In this industry there are more than 200 companies, according to American Iron and Steel Institute. It is a matter of record that the three largest companies owned 56.3 percent of our steel-making capacity in 1949 as against 58 percent in 1939. It is also a matter of record that the largest company, which produced two-thirds of our steel at the turn of the century, now produces about one-third. Even if these facts did not make an allegation of monopoly look pretty thin, the performance of the steel industry—if it is monopolistic—has been strangely out of character.

Monopolies traditionally tend to hold down production in order to create a scarcity and so keep up prices. Yet, I understand from steel's testimony before the Subcommittee on Monopoly Power that the industry has normally had, over the last 50 years, more capacity for steel making than the public required. In the half century, the public called for an average of only 70 per cent of what the industry was prepared to make—though of course there were temporary scarcities engendered by two wars and two postwar periods. No sane businessman would have on hand production facilities capable of meeting immediately a pent-up postwar demand, unless he wanted to see those facilities lie idle for many years to come.

Historically, monopolies also tend to sit tight on the status quo, since there is no need to underwrite research and develop better products in order to take the play away from competitors. Yet you do not have to be a steel man to see steel cars on the highway, "tin" cans in the kitchen, stainless steels in the food processing business—each of which was brought to its present excellence by competitive research, each of which has coincidentally opened up new fields of enterprise for hundreds of thousands of small steel fabricators.

If what is called monopoly or concentration has been at work in this country, it is hard to explain why the 1,660,000 businesses which existed in 1900 have grown to 4,000,000 today—a percentage increase far greater than that of the population. Even the much maligned A. & P. Co. finds itself competing against 30,000 more individually owned grocery stores than there were 10 years ago, and against 275 food chains which did not exist 10 years ago. On the other side of the coin, some of the industrial giants of 1900 have fallen by the wayside over the years.

There is nothing mysterious about the successes or the failures. In the main, they represent the decision of millions of customers as to what products satisfied them and what did not. It is the customers, indeed, who set the apparently suspect policy that like goods shall sell for like prices (since they are not prepared to buy for a dollar here what they can get for 75 cents over there). With the customers sitting in judgment and the law insuring fair play, we have created unparalleled material wealth and prosperity for ourselves.

Lacking any evidence that the relative size of an industry is harmful to the economy, having plenty of evidence that large industry has rendered an enormous service, let's not knock each other down in a wild rush to buy a pig in a poke.

Let us never forget that during the past 300 years our America under our American form of government has developed from a mere infant to the stature of a giant among the nations of the world. In the end, the fact that we have thus survived and grown in stature can be attributed only to our constant belief in and preservation of freedom for men and freedom for enterprise.

Present Democratic Administration Unfair to Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Minnesota along with other Midwest dairy States, are, and have been, confronted with a serious crisis in connection with the dairy industry and dairy farming.

If the dairy industry in Minnesota and other Midwest dairy States is to survive there must be an end to Federal, State, and municipal barriers and discriminations against interstate shipments of pure milk and cream from the Midwest and against all price discriminations beyond those actually justified by transportation and production costs against Midwest pure milk and cream in Federal milk orders.

The situation is best summed up by Alfred D. Stedman, brilliant associate editor of the Dispatch-Pioneer Press, of St. Paul, in an editorial dated May 14, 1950, when he outlined the gist of the crisis that is facing the Dairy Belt:

1. Midwest dairying is under a severe price handicap compared to seaboard dairying.
2. There's a real migration of Midwest dairying to high-price eastern areas.
3. Rigid Government butter price supports are handing over the Midwest's markets to other areas or products.
4. The effect of all this is to throw the brunt of intense competition on the Dairy Belt.

The figures of the Government offer the best evidence in support of this shift in the activities of the dairy industry. From 1940 to 1949 milk production in the United States as a whole increased 8.8 percent. New York State in the same period increased 15 percent; New Jersey, 18 percent; Pennsylvania, 24 percent; the North Atlantic States as a whole, 13.7 percent; South Atlantic States, 29 percent; and the East North Central, 16.2 percent. In the same period, in spite of the increase in population and the stimulus of war, Minnesota's milk production decreased 1 percent; Iowa, 10 percent; Nebraska, 16 percent; and the West North Central States as a whole are down 4.5 percent.

The dairy farmers in Minnesota and other Midwest States began to notice a decline in their markets early in the war period, and many of them attributed it to labor shortage and other factors incident to the war efforts.

The real effect of losing the commercial outlets was severely felt when many of the fine dairy herds of the Midwest were moved East to swell the supply of milk products to commercial buyers who were formerly customers of the Midwest.

The body blow came with the Government price-support program on butter, which resulted in the disastrous loss of the eastern distributive markets which the Midwest had worked so hard to create and develop as an outlet for their dairy products.

The PMA support program forced producing groups in Minnesota and the Midwest to sell to the Government instead of trade because the prices in the terminal markets are lower than Government support price. It costs 2 cents a pound to ship butter from Minnesota to New York City. Butter made in New York State can go to New York City at a cost of a half cent per pound. It, therefore, follows that New York State-made butter has an advantage over Minnesota of a cent and a half per pound.

The hardest hit under the present PMA support program is the small creameries, including many in the Ninth District of Minnesota. The greater majority of these "small creameries" do not have production capacity to ship in carload lots, and under present PMA regulations they must absorb and pay the freight to place of carlot assembly.

Time and time again I have urged the PMA to modify and change their regulations in regard to their price support on butter, and I have been especially insistent in efforts to aid the small producing creameries. The support price should be f. o. b. the producing plant for carload and less-than-carload lots instead of the terminals. If the present purchase program on butter is continued, it will surely wipe out the small producer in the Midwest dairy belt and eventually the large producers because of the intense competition they are receiving from the eastern producers with their at-hand gigantic channels of consumption for their products.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the dairy farmers of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota may be fully apprised of the present dairy-support program, I am inserting at this point the release of December 22, 1949, by the United States Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration, relative to the program from January 1950 through March 1951. It is as follows:

USDA ANNOUNCES 15-MONTH DAIRY SUPPORT PROGRAM

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, December 22, 1949.

A program to support farm prices of manufacturing milk and butterfat from January 1950 through March 1951 at national average prices of approximately $3.07 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk of 3.95 percent butterfat (yearly average test) and approximately 60 cents per pound for butterfat was announced today by the United States Department of Agriculture. The program will support the price of all milk.

The support program was announced for the next 15 months so as to extend through the next full marketing year for dairy products. The prices announced are within the range specified by the Agricultural Act of 1949 which requires that farm prices of milk and butterfat be supported at levels between 75 and 90 percent of parity.

The support prices represent about 79 percent of the parity equivalent price for manufacturing milk, as parity is estimated under the new parity formula. (The parity equivalent price for manufacturing milk is 88.5 percent of the United States average parity price of all milk sold by farmers at wholesale to plants and dealers.)

As a means of carrying out this support to dairy farmers, the Department will offer to make carlot purchases of processed dairy products at the following prices, f. o. b. at any location in the United States:

Cheddar cheese, U. S. grade A or higher (cents per pound)	31
Butter, U. S. grade A or higher (cents per pound)	60
Butter, U. S. grade B (cents per pound)	58
Nonfat dry milk solids, spray type, U. S. extra (cents per pound)	12½
Nonfat dry milk solids, roller type, U. S. extra (cents per pound)	10½
Evaporated milk (dollars per case)	3.95

The farm support prices (in dollars and cents) under the new program are approximately the same as the average levels supported during 1949. The percentages of parity support under the two programs differ, however, because of the new parity formula. It is estimated that 79 percent of parity for milk under the new formula is about equal to 90 percent of the old parity price.

In connection with the program, I asked for and received from the Department of Agriculture a few days ago the following data:

Price-support purchases in Minnesota, 1949–50

[Pounds]

	1949	1950 [1]	Total
Butter	23,300,000	26,900,000	50,200,000
Cheese	1,300,000	7,000,000	8,300,000
Milk solids	99,000,000	65,300,000	164,300,000

[1] 1950 figures include purchases January through June.

Minnesota contains 188,952 farms, covering 33,100,000 acres. Its farm people make up 29,300,000 percent of the State population. The available statistics disclose that the farm cash receipts declined considerably in 1949. Cash received from farm products in 1949 totaled about $1,145,055,000, compared with $1,332,313,000 in 1948. According to 1945 census figures, over half of the farmers who receive over 50 percent of their income from dairying live in the Midwest.

The Minnesota Creameries Association informed me in March of this year that their producer groups represent 352 member plants in Minnesota, serving 76,000 farmer producers, so it can be readily seen that the dairy industry is a very important factor in the life and economy of Minnesota.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to assure the dairy farmers of my congressional district that I shall continue to wholeheartedly support legislation and Federal policies that will benefit them and vigorously oppose those measures, regulations, and orders which are detrimental to their interests and welfare. I also invite them to write at any time concerning their Federal problems. My address is: Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, 1405 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., or 205 Post Office Building, Crookston, Minn.

International Aspects of Fishery Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent article by Edward W. Allen, of Seattle, entitled "International Aspects of Fishery Conservation." Mr. Allen is chairman of the International Fisheries Commission and vice chairman of the Pacific Fisheries Conference. He is one of the outstanding authorities on the subject with which he deals and I recommend his article to my colleagues. It follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF FISHERY CONSERVATION

(By Edward W. Allen)

The Pacific Northwest can properly claim credit for the greatest progress anywhere in the world in fishery conservation through international cooperation. Although the idea is spreading, even today the International Fisheries Commission, which deals with our coastal halibut, and the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, which deals with the sockeye salmon of this area, constitute the only examples of actual joint international fisheries management.

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Treaty, the whaling agreement, and the recent treaties entered into by the United States with Mexico and Costa Rica are still in the first stages, and the Great Lakes Treaty has not yet been ratified. To be sure, there have been multilateral pacts such as that dealing with the fur seals besides hundreds of other treaties relating to fisheries, but the two first mentioned are the only ones actually providing a continuous system of joint regulation of a fishery both within and outside of national waters.

The people of this region should take satisfaction in the fact that this method which originated here has met with remarkable success, so much so that the work of these two Commissions has been pointed to throughout the whole fishery world as the outstanding example of how international fishery management can be made practical. This should be borne in mind when considering some of the fantastic schemes which are being proposed as substitutes.

Millions of people today are pitifully hungry and the world population is, nevertheless, rapidly increasing. Whether we view the facts as pessimists or optimists, it must be admitted that there are natural limitations upon land food productivity and that some regions have probably reached that limit and are now declining. Drainage has leached out essential chemical elements and erosion has reduced the quantity of soil in huge agricultural areas.

Some ocean fisheries have also been badly depleted, but they differ from lands from which the soil has been washed away because they can probably be restored by proper management even though the process may be slow and expensive if not applied in time. It also seems reasonably certain that there are substantial fishery stocks which remain almost untapped. As it is, almost 40,000,000,000 pounds of fish are being taken from ocean waters annually. Properly utilized, the enormous food reservoir of the sea may save millions of lives. When one considers relative values, it may well be that the maintenance of wholesome food stocks is more important than building industrial power plants.

But how are we to manage these great marine food reservoirs? That is a mixed question of law and fact. Perhaps our ideas in both respects need reorientation in view of modern developments. Some clear thinking is required so that on the one hand we shall not be hide-bound by legal principles which had their origin in sailing-ship days, and on the other hand, not ignore the cold facts of experience.

Fish appear to be found in all ocean regions—hot and cold, shallow and deep—but there is enormous variation in density, and there can be little doubt but that the bulk of edible fish life is to be found above or adjacent to the continental shelves. In other words, most of the valuable fisheries, though not all, are coastal. These, however, largely extend beyond what Canada and the United States have generally recognized as national waters, that is, waters not more than 3 miles off shore. The law seems to be clear, and there appears to be no inclination to change it in this respect, that a nation has complete control of its fisheries in its inland and territorial waters except to the extent relinquished by agreement.

EXTEND 3-MILE LIMIT

In recent years a strong movement has developed in support of the principle that a nation has a special interest in its coastal fisheries even though they do extend more than 3 miles from shore; in other words, this special interest is not confined to territorial waters.

This movement has been stimulated by two factors. The first is the adverse effect upon a coastal nation's economy if a foreign power sends over its vessels and ruthlessly destroys the coastal nation's fisheries even though not approaching within three miles of shore. This is illustrated by the Japanese threat shortly before the war literally to destroy the highly valuable Bristol Bay Alaska red salmon runs. Similar damage, although perhaps not to the same degree, could be done even now if the Japanese, or any other people, were to engage in unrestricted fishing on Swiftsure Banks off the Strait of Juan de Fuca. The second factor is the success of the International Fisheries Commission in restoring and maintaining the great halibut fishery off this coast which now supplies almost three-fourths of the entire world catch of this delicious fish, much of which fishery extends more than 3 miles out. The recent encouraging results of the Fraser River salmon regulation has also been a contributing factor.

International law, like common law, should not be static, it should develop with changing conditions. Increase and success in the use of this method of bilateral or multilateral management of coastal fisheries may well have its impact upon international law and recognition of propinquous rights.

This still leaves open the subject of what may be termed the open-sea fisheries such as those for tuna and whales. There is now an international whaling agreement with reference to Antarctic whaling, the effectiveness of which remains to be seen. It is a progressive step and may encourage the application of multilateral treaties to other fields.

Nothing referred to is purported to constitute a complete solution of the problem of ocean fishery conservation. Developments have been slow, they have been based upon trial and error, but substantial results have accrued and give promise of even greater future success.

PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

Now let us consider some proposed alternatives. We find what I trust is a diminishing group, largely of Government economists and professional theorists, who seem to assert that there is some kind of peculiar sanctity to the so-called 3-mile rule so that the only way that any nation should be restrained from destroying another nation's coastal fisheries, as long as territorial waters are not actually penetrated, is by securing the affirmative unanimous agreement of all the nations in the world. In the meantime, our fishermen should sit calmly on the beaches twirling their thumbs while they watch foreigners destroy their livelihood.

On the other hand, some of these same planners or dreamers, whichever you prefer to call them, wish to restrict nations from entering into treaties such as Canada and the United States have done, by making them subject to the proposed International Trade Organization. Before singing the praises of the ITO Charter too loudly, it might pay businessmen to analyze it a bit more carefully than most of them have done.

Then there are some ambitious international bureaucrats who would like to subject all the ocean fisheries of the world to the supervision of the Food and Agriculture Organization, although some of us, anyway, understood that the basic concept of that particular United Nations subsidiary was to help hungry nations develop their own local food supplies for local consumption.

And, of course, one occasionally encounters a domestic fishery official who dislikes to see any jurisdiction get away from him even though his authority is so limited that he is helpless in the international field and hence utterly incapable of coping effectively with the international situations which complicate the management of many coastal fisheries.

CURRENT PACIFIC NORTHWEST FISHERIES PROBLEMS

Now you probably are waiting for something more specific. What are the most imminent international fishery problems of this, our own Pacific Northwest area?

There is, of course, the obscure Russian threat. Thus far I know of no Russian attempt to invade either the Canadian or the United States fisheries. It is true that during the war we deprived our own fishermen of badly needed supplies in order to turn them over to Siberian use to show what good fellows (some of us prefer the term "saps") we were. We also built up the Siberian fleet with the most modern equipment which we refused to our own people. Still, the Russians appear to be so well occupied attempting to develop the Asiatic fisheries which we took away from Japan and donated to Russia, that they do not seem ready to expand in our direction. There are, however, rumors that they are interested in Central Pacific tuna. It is probably as much to Russian interest as to our own to try to get together on some practical working agreement with reference to North Pacific fishing.

The really pressing matter relates to the Japanese. According to newspaper accounts, a peace treaty with Japan may be in the offing.

Prior to the war, the Japanese were said to have one and one-half million fishermen and several hundred thousand fishing boats. It may be stated roughly that they took about one-quarter of the entire world catch. They knew nothing of conservation. They concentrated upon production with apparent indifference to the future and, what was most irritating to other people, without any regard to the effect of their fishing upon the coastal fisheries of other nations.

In view of their methods and low standards of living, it is believed to be commercially practical for the Japanese today, if permitted to do so, to operate off the shores of British Columbia, Alaska, and elsewhere on our side of the Pacific. Fortunately,

General MacArthur has not allowed them to do so. I doubt whether he ever will, but how long he may be in command is another question.

When the so-called MacArthur Fisheries Mission, of which I had the honor to be a member, visited Japan last year to make a fishery survey, its members felt certain that if the Japanese were not in some way restricted they would be off our shores as soon as they could get there. Let me say that all members of the mission left Japan with a friendly feeling toward the Japanese people in general, but this did not blind our eyes to actualities.

It was somewhat significant that in discussing the situation with four members of the fishery committee of the Japanese Diet they all admitted that the Japanese would like to reengage in unrestricted fishery operations throughout the world, but they also admitted that they expected the United States and Canada to insist on some fishing limitations being placed in the peace treaty.

When Japan made her peace treaty with Russia in 1905 there was a definite understanding concerning fisheries. Regardless of whether or not Japan, at that time, took undue advantage of her position as victor, it is not desirable that we should be unreasonable or unfair. On the other hand, there would seem to be no historic reason nor any reason upon the basis of common sense why fisheries should not be dealt with in a practical manner so as to avoid future misunderstandings. Yet there is a strong element in our country, to which I have referred, who seem to think it would be ungentlemanly to insist upon determining fishery policies at this time but that we should sign an unrestrictive peace treaty first so that Japan will be in a position to refuse even to negotiate with regard to fisheries or anything else if she so chooses.

Wholly aside from economics, fisheries are so exceedingly important from the food standpoint that their future maintenance should not be left to chance. Pacific Fisheries Conference, an organization of fishermen's unions, vessel owners' associations, fish-company operators, and research bodies of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and California, has taken a strong position in this matter. The conference insists that the fishery situation must be dealt with concurrently with the peace treaty with Japan, not left for futile future discussion. This matter is so vital to the entire Pacific coast, as much on one side of the boundary line as on the other, that I have no hesitation in urging upon this body immediate consideration and aggressive action.

News Letter by Frank C. Hanighen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a portion of a news letter, dated September 20, 1950, written by Frank C. Hanighen.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT MERELY GOSSIP

(By Frank C. Hanighen)

MARSHALL

It would take a political seismograph of high sensitivity to register all the electric shocks that the appointment of Marshall has caused. Observers instantly assessed the appointment as a triumph for Acheson and the fellow travelers, but a lapse of days has been required to show how deeply and how seriously these shocks have gone. Americans, despite everything, trust their Government even while they damn it. What else can they trust? But what few vestiges of faith in the Truman Administration yet remained had all but vanished last week. The balloon raising for a quick peace treaty with Japan, no matter what the Russians say, is interpreted as a determination to get rid of MacArthur at whatever cost. (If the United States is at peace with Japan we do not need a Far East High Command.)

The jamming through of an amendment to the National Security Act to permit Marshall's appointment caused a convulsion. Senator JENNER'S speech on September 15 opposing the amendment provided a Senate spectacle of a sort seldom seen. JENNER (Indiana) is an old opponent of the Administration on the Red issue. The amendment released a lot of pent-up feeling from the Hoosier. His speech was like a bellow from a maddened bull. The frustration, the revulsion, the wrath that so many people feel at the limitless capacity of the Administration for welshing and deceit, found expression in this scalding discourse. Discretion was flung to the winds as JENNER screamed out his long list of charges. Despite the luridness of the speech, the core of the JENNER charges—the faithlessness of the Administration—is desperately true. It remains to be seen whether the Republicans as a party have the stamina, the resolution, the resiliency to follow through, not only as political astuteness would dictate, but also as common patriotism demands.

THE GOP AND MARSHALL'S PAST

As a matter of fact, the Republicans rallied to the challenge of the Marshall appointment more strongly than observers had expected (when the news first broke). Many GOP members rubbed their eyes on the morrow of the appointment news and realized the situation facing them: (1) That they had made the far eastern policy of the administration the issue of the coming elections; and (2) that Marshall was one of the principal architects of the disastrous Administration policy on China. How could they support the pro-Marshall legislation or vote for his confirmation, when they would have to attack his record on China in the campaign? At the same time, they recognized that Marshall—thanks to the Fair Deal propaganda machine—had been made a "sacred cow" in the eyes of the bulk of Americans. No little courage therefore dictated the stand of the score of Republicans in the Senate who voted against the legislation providing for Marshall's appointment.

There were a number of southern Democrats who were aware of Marshall's unsound record in the Far East. But the curious psychology which moves these southerners in respect to foreign policy matters apparently forced them into the ranks of the Marshall supporters. Western Republicans watched with disgust as Senator HARRY BYRD, who has quite a following in the North, went down the line in a speech on behalf of Marshall. The question was raised among groups in the Republican cloak room: Can one ever trust the southerners? Certainly BYRD missed a chance to allay the chronic suspicion which western Republicans feel towards colleagues from the South. How can the entente cordiale of southern Democrats and Republicans make any progress (and southern Senators profess to want such progress) with such spectacles as that put on by BYRD?

The case of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat of Nevada, stood in striking contrast to that of BYRD. MCCARRAN, now up for reelection, showed great courage in lining up with the Republicans against the pro-Marshall legislation. For he faces pressure at home, induced by New York money which has poured into Nevada. And he undoubtedly felt cloak-room pressure as well.

It is now reported that Senator JENNER encountered some of the latter himself. JENNER'S mimeographed speech was circulated in the press gallery some time before he delivered it on the floor, and a copy apparently got into the hands of a certain southern Senator who approached JENNER with the question, "You really don't consider delivering such a speech?" JENNER replied in the affirmative. "Well, then," remarked the southerner, "we'll break you." JENNER retorted, "The people of Indiana won't break me." Meanwhile, Senator LEHMAN, of New York, is reported to have read the advance copy of the speech and to have rushed to Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, Massachusetts. He is said to have urged SALTONSTALL to reply to JENNER.

All sorts of excerpts from the hardly brilliant record of Marshall in China have been going around. It is recalled that in 1947, in his farewell statement before returning to the United States, Marshall described as reactionary those Chinese who objected to bringing the Communists into a coalition government; that he prated of agrarian reformers, etc. (the line of the pro-Communists in the State Department). Not only did he fail to clean out Communists from the State Department, but it was when he was Chief of Staff that Communists were allowed to be commissioned officers in the Army, and that an attempt was made by officers in the War Department to destroy files on subversives. But it is his China policy which will principally plague him. It is reported that the opposition has Marshall worried. A friend of Marshall's tells us that the general is concerned about his place in history. Will historians look at the Marshall policy on China as does Congressman JUDD, who said: "It always was fantastic to imagine that we could convert our enemies into our friends by treating our friends as if they were our enemies."

Wisconsin and the St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert an article on the increasingly important and long-proposed St. Lawrence seaway project. This article, Wisconsin and the St. Lawrence waterway, appears in the 1950 edition of Wisconsin Labor, the official annual publication of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor. It follows:

WISCONSIN AND THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

(By H. C. Brockel)

Milwaukee-made oil pipe going by direct steamer from Lake Michigan to Venezuela; powdered milk from Wisconsin farms to Mediterranean ports; Milwaukee-built tractors, cranes, shovels, and machinery of all types flowing to all the ports of northern Europe—all this is not a fanciful dream but a present-day reality. The flow of world trade charted above took place at the Port of Milwaukee during May and June 1950.

The St. Lawrence seaway project is not a romantic dream but a practical fact. Eighty ocean ships will sail from the Port of Milwaukee down the Great Lakes and out the

St. Lawrence River to the ports of the world during 1950 in spite of the present physical limitations of the St. Lawrence shipping route.

The port of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin are not the only participants in this trade. A vast flow of farm and factory produce from all the States surrounding the Great Lakes is finding its way into world markets through the St. Lawrence River.

The whole economy of the Middle West is intimately tied in with the Great Lakes system. These lakes, one of the world's most important highways of transportation, have made possible the building of an industrial and agricultural empire around their shores as no other nation in the world enjoys. The high standard of living, the high level of production of the farms and factories of the Middle West, is intimately related to the transportation efficiency of the Great Lakes on which every day a vast fleet of ships furnishes the lowest-cost form of transportation known in the world.

Millions of words have been spoken and written about the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Its meaning to Wisconsin, however, can be reduced to a single phrase. It means job opportunity. Untold thousands of new jobs will be created in Wisconsin following the completion of the seaway project, due to expansion of shipping operations, shipbuilding, and other employment aspects of foreign trade. In our lake ports, the seaway will mean movement of a large volume of new commerce, with added business for railroads, truck lines, stevedores, warehousemen, brokers, bankers, and other enterprises associated with maritime activity. The seaway will act as a magnet to bring new industry to the shores of the Great Lakes with a corresponding increase in employment and production.

Perhaps most important of all, the seaway will enable midwestern producers to meet their competition effectively whether that competition is on the Atlantic seaboard or even overseas. From the experience already derived from direct ocean shipping through the port of Milwaukee, we have concrete proof of the fact that the transportation savings through use of direct ocean steamers make it possible for Wisconsin manufacturers to meet competition of more favorably located competitors. The freight savings by use of direct ocean ships at the port of Milwaukee not only permit us to meet domestic competition, but in several cases made it possible to meet intense competition from European manufacturers located only a few hundred miles from the point of delivery.

Export orders are a most important part of the over-all picture for Wisconsin industry and agriculture. If Wisconsin industry cannot compete effectively in foreign trade, production jobs will decline, the movement of raw materials to Wisconsin plants will dwindle to the injury of the railroad and the trucking industry, and the general prosperity of the State will be adversely affected.

For the Middle West, located 1,000 miles from the nearest seaboard, low-cost ocean transportation is directly translated into job and business opportunities. Although the population of our country has increased by 30,000,000 people since 1920, railroad mileage has been shrinking and it is essential that our national transportation plant be expanded to maintain transportation efficiency. In the 10 years between 1933 and 1948, the mileage of all tracks operated by the steam railroads of this country shrank over 13,500 miles. Although our highway system has been improved, our water transportation facilities have not been increased to the extent necessary to offset the continued shrinkage of our railroad plant.

For the past three decades, America's most distinguished statesmen, diplomats, engineers and business leaders have emphatically answered yes to the question: Should the St. Lawrence seaway be built? Legislation authorizing completion of the project is now before Congress. President Truman, following in the tradition of every President since Taft, has recommended the project urgently to Congress. Twenty distinguished Senators of both major political parties have introduced legislation to authorize execution of our agreement with Canada for the seaway development.

The State Department has given the seaway high place in its international program to demonstrate to the world that nations living side by side can peacefully develop projects whose benefits transcend international boundary lines, and to prove that America is sincerely determined to strengthen international relationships and achieve permanent peace, by peaceful commerce between nations.

The seaway has two great economic justifications—low-cost water transportation and low-cost hydroelectric power. The St. Lawrence is the greatest undeveloped source of hydroelectric power in North America. Two million two hundred thousand horsepower of electrical energy are running unused into the Atlantic because of our failure to harness this tremendous resource. President Truman has emphasized that our whole economic and military future requires further development of our power resources including the vast potential energy of the St. Lawrence.

The States bordering the Great Lakes want the seaway as a transportation resource. By extending deep-draft ocean shipping into lake ports, Midwest farms and industries will be able to use cheap water transportation on a scale hitherto impossible. Industry in the Great Lakes Basin could import raw materials in large quantities, at minimum cost, by substituting a direct water haul for a costly rail haul. Midwest agriculture and industry alike will be able to tap new markets abroad.

There is nothing new or experimental in the seaway project. For more than a century Great Lakes ports have been engaged in direct trade with Europe through the St. Lawrence River. Between 1920 and 1940 a substantial shipping trade developed between lake ports and northern European harbors in spite of the present 14-foot canals in the St. Lawrence River. Briefly interrupted by World War II, direct steamship services between the Great Lakes and Europe have been resumed on a tremendously expanded scale with four ocean steamship lines regularly engaged in the trade and with 80 ocean sailings scheduled for 1950. Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, Toledo, Toronto, and Montreal are now served regularly by these important services with other ports of call included as cargo movement warrants.

The history of the now well-established shipping service between lake ports and overseas destinations proves beyond doubt that large freight savings are possible by use of direct steamers, which eliminate transshipment charges at seaboard ports and costly rail hauls to and from the interior.

The St. Lawrence is not an inland waterway nor an artificial waterway—it is a natural highway into the heart of the continent. It is basic in water transportation that ships will penetrate inland as far as possible before discharging cargo, proven by the inland location of many great seaports, and by ocean shipping operations a thousand or more miles inland on rivers such as the Yangtse and the Amazon. A single factor—the rapids in the St. Lawrence between Ogdensburg and Montreal—has obstructed this principle of water transportation on the St. Lawrence. These rapids are now passable by locks only 14 feet deep and 260 feet long, which limit the size of ships using the route to those dimensions. The project thus contemplates nothing but a modernization of an existing transportation route. Ninety-five percent of the 2,400-mile sailing distance between Milwaukee and the Atlantic is now fully available for deep-draft shipping.

The cost of the engineering works in the St. Lawrence River will be shared by Canada, the United States, and the State of New York. The net cost of the project to the National Government will be a little over $300,000,000, or about one average day's war expenditure during World War II. This nominal expenditure is economically justified by tremendous potential savings in freight charges and electric power rates. The Department of Commerce, as recently as December 1948, estimated that traffic through the seaway including both general cargo and bulk freight would range from 57,000,000 to 84,000,000 tons per year. The Department of Commerce, in its study, estimated that freight savings of $7 to $10 per ton could readily be derived on shipments moving from overseas to Lake Michigan ports, even allowing for St. Lawrence seaway tolls on the basis of $1.25 per ton. Even on the basis of the present 14-foot-draft operations, limiting ocean carriers to about 1,600 tons of cargo west of Montreal, net freight savings of $5 to $10 per ton have been repeatedly demonstrated by the use of existing services.

Aside from the seaway's economic value, another factor of even greater importance is the future security of the United States and Canada. Before World War II, our military leaders urged the completion of the project for the national defense. Shortly after the end of World War II, the Joint Chiefs of Staff advised the Congress that from our experience in World War II, the project is absolutely essential to the national security as a shipbuilding resource, as an additional transportation facility and as a new source of power.

It is a national misfortune that the seaway was not developed before World War II. With it, Midwest industry and agriculture could have made a more effective contribution to the war effort, and much money and perhaps many lives could have been saved.

Our wartime shipbuilding production approached 70,000,000 tons. Sixty-five percent of the steel, machinery, and other component parts of these ships originated in the Great Lakes area. However, only about 2 percent of the completed ships were constructed on the lakes, although we have sheltered harbors, skilled workmen, vast industries, and great steel production. Small ships were constructed in lake ports and sent to sea through the Mississippi River at great expense. The shipbuilding potentialities of the Great Lakes have hardly been scratched. The bottleneck has been the difficulty of getting ships to salt water.

Had the seaway been developed, we could have constructed in lake harbors, escort carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and merchant ships. These ships could have been loaded in lake ports with foodstuffs, munitions and material of war—and if this seems like mere speculation, remember that Detroit was ranked as America's No. 1 arsenal, and was closely followed in war production by Great Lakes industrial centers such as Cleveland, Chicago, and Milwaukee.

Convoys could have been assembled in lake ports and sent to Europe with an ocean crossing 1,000 miles shorter via the St. Lawrence than from Atlantic ports. The submarine hazard would have been reduced in proportion to the saving in ocean mileage by use of the St. Lawrence.

The war has depleted our national resources. We have used lavishly our forests and our minerals. We find ourselves with rapidly dwindling supplies of iron ore, petroleum, manganese, copper, lead, and other strategic materials necessary in war and peace. A strategic stockpiling program is now planned, based upon industrial requirements and the national defense. These critical materials should be transported and stored as effectively as possible, in sheltered

interior locations, where they will be used in volume, which means the industrial area surrounding the Great Lakes.

Considering the exposure of our coasts to naval and air attack, it is sound national policy to locate strategic industry in the interior and at the same time, provide it with the advantages of ocean transportation by extending deep-draft shipping into the lakes.

The seaway will check the drift of population from the Midwest to the seaboard. In recent years, there has been a mushroom growth of new industry along the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific coast. The employment offered by these new industries has encouraged many people to migrate from the Middle West to the seaboard, resulting in a rapid growth of population around the seacoasts and a gradual decline of population in the interior. Between 1930 and 1940, many Midwestern States actually lost population. This trend was accelerated during the war.

States tributary to the Great Lakes normally account for 35 percent of our national exports. The foreign trade of the United States does not originate or terminate in our great exports but is in large measure traceable to the import requirements and the export production of the farms and factories located in the heart of the country. Much of our overseas business is highly competitive and must seek the most economical transportation route.

In spite of its distinguished support, the seaway has strong opposition. The principal objectors are seacoast ports, which fear the loss of transfer business between ship and rail; the eastern trunk-line railroads, which are hostile to Great Lakes water transportation; utility interests, who object not to the St. Lawrence power development, but to the fact that it will be publicly rather than privately controlled; and finally, the coal industry, which opposes hydroelectric developments as a threat to coal markets.

The early canal builders opposed the development of the railroads; when Edison invented the incandescent bulb, the gas industry declaimed the impossibility of electric lighting; the railroads opposed the Panama Canal bitterly, as impracticable, just as they today oppose the seaway. Nevertheless, the railroads were built, the automobile succeeded the buggy, electric lights have become commonplace, and the Panama Canal has joined the Atlantic and the Pacific. In each case benefits have exceeded expectations, and predicted disasters have not materialized.

History will prove the justification for the St. Lawrence, and its accomplishment is merely a matter of time. The case for the seaway has been proved and re-proved so often that its merit is axiomatic. It is not the St. Lawrence waterway which is on trial in Washington. The issue before Congress is whether the national interest will prevail or whether the self-interest of certain powerful and articulate groups will determine national policy. The seaway is inevitable. The only question is: How long can delaying tactics obstruct it?

American postwar planning is geared to a philosophy of expansion—greater production, full employment, expanded foreign trade, an enlarged merchant marine. The St. Lawrence seaway will help us to obtain every one of these objectives. An expanded foreign trade will cement friendly foreign relations. We need new trade routes and new traffic to support our merchant marine, the largest in the world. Full employment and full production must be geared to a greater volume of commerce and transportation. No project before the American people today will do more to accomplish these objectives than the seaway.

Secretary of State Acheson has said that the seaway will increase the wealth of the United States by developing one of the greatest natural resources in the world—the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. He has pointed to the mutual benefits which will be derived by Canada and the United States in terms of new economic strength and added security for both nations. He describes the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system as "a great highway of commerce stretching for 2,400 miles from Newfoundland into the industrial and agricultural heart of the United States and Canada." Secretary Acheson thus joins his powerful voice with those of his distinguished predecessors, with the Presidents of both parties, and with our greatest military leaders in the unanimous conviction that the seaway will open the Great Lakes area with its vast industrial and agricultural resources to ocean shipping; will give power-deficient areas a new low-cost source of electrical energy; and will add immeasurably to the national welfare and the national security.

The outlook for the early construction of the seaway project is bright. Even if all the arguments for the project outlined above were worthless, the Great Lakes iron ore situation alone will compel early building of the waterway. Most of the great steel industries of the country have thrown their full support behind the project, fearing early depletion of the Mesabi iron ore ranges and realizing that the tremendous steel industry of the Great Lakes Basin can be sustained only if the newly discovered iron ore of Labrador can be brought into the Great Lakes all-water. Without the seaway, the Great Lakes steel industry will, over the next 50 years, inevitably be forced to relocate along the Atlantic and Gulf seaboards. The tremendous machine shops and metalworking industries of the Great Lakes region will inevitably be compelled to follow their source of supply and to relocate close to the steel-producing centers. If the seaway is not built, the Great Lakes region 50 years from now will have reverted to a semiagricultural economy with industrial production possibly limited to the consumer needs of the area. With the seaway, the already splendid economy of the Middle West and the Great Lakes region will be fortified and strengthened and the whole national economy will assume a new vigor. While the benefits of the seaway to Wisconsin and the Middle West will be considerable, it is beyond dispute that it will render great national service comparable to that rendered by the Panama Canal and will immeasurably strengthen us in terms of peacetime economy and wartime security.

The Faith of the Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has been my privilege on several occasions to point out that the members of the motion picture industry are as fine a group of American citizens as one can find in any other industry. I am referring to the actors and actresses, producers, directors, technical aides, writers, company executives, and so forth. It has been my contention too that the occasional instances of undesirable individuals in the industry—individuals disloyal to our Government and/or individuals of low moral character—that those instances were quite isolated and that they should not be unduly magnified nor mistakenly construed as representing the typical Hollywood personality.

I have contended that the record of the American motion picture industry in war and peace in patriotically serving our Government speaks for itself and needs no defense on my behalf or anyone else's behalf.

In this connection, therefore, I was delighted to see in the August 1950 issue of the famed magazine, the Christian Herald, of which Dr. Daniel A. Poling is editor, and Mr. Clarence W. Hall, managing editor, the first in a series of stories entitled "The Faith of the Stars," by Robert Lindsay Young.

In the first of this series is an introduction to one of the screen star's statements. This introduction describes the true religious devotion of the average man and woman in our motion picture capital, including some of the leading stars.

I was indeed delighted to see this first article as I know other Members of the Senate will also be, including my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] whose deep spiritual devotion is so well known and respected by all of us.

There is a song that runs on the theme of "accentuating the positive" and "eliminating the negative." I think that the series in the Christian Herald does indeed exactly that. It accents the positive. It commends the affirmative qualities of Hollywood life and by that measure it helps to eliminate and reduce the few unfortunate instances of negative activity. Every churchman, every member of the churchgoing public will rejoice in the Christian Herald series as one more evidence of godly activity in Hollywood and elsewhere. We need more such illustrations, more demonstrations of the good, the beautiful, the devoted, which is all about us—in Washington or in Los Angeles. We need less harping on the negative, less magnifying of the isolated, less publicizing of the occasional transgressor. Therein lies the path to uplifting of our standards of morality in all America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this very brief article as published in the August Christian Herald, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAITH OF THE STARS

(By Robert Lindsay Young)

With this month we begin a series of brief articles in support of our assertion that Hollywood personalities, in the vast majority, are not the kind whose flagrant misdoings you see publicized in the newspapers. In this column, from month to month, we will introduce various stars whose daily lives, church activity, and statements of faith stamp them as the kind of folks you would welcome into your church fellowship.

We begin the series with Gale Storm and her husband, Lee Bonnell, active members of the Hollywood-Beverly Christian Church. Their pastor, Dr. Cleveland Kleihauer, calls them "pillars of strength to our church" and

goes on to say: "Lee is one of our junior elders, while Gale teaches a Sunday-school class of junior-high students. The Biblical names of their three lovely little boys—Phillip, Peter, and Paul—who are in Sunday school regularly, is another sign of their Christian interests."

Asked for a statement of her faith, Gale Storm says:

"I have never known what it would be like to be apart from the church. It has been such a normal and natural part of my life that I can't just imagine myself without it. Certainly the church has its weaknesses. What institution composed of human beings doesn't have its faults? Nor do I mean that regular attendance at church services is always easy or that teaching my Sunday-school class is just a bed of roses. But I do know that if one is going to live a creative Christian life he must have an understanding of what godly living means in our world. The church teaches us concerning our duties as citizens and followers of Christ, but it does more—it engenders power; it both informs and inspires. I have gone to church back on my heels and come out on my toes.

"I have never thought of the church as merely something I may get something from, but as an institution to which I can and should give. If I didn't share in the life and activity of the church in my community, I would feel like a moral parasite, deriving benefits from society without making any return for values received. No disciple of Christ can be a spiritual hitchhiker, going through life on the momentum of a goodly heritage. I look upon the church as my opportunity and privilege to creatively share in the advancement of the kingdom of God in this world."

Labor's Stake in the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert an article on the long-proposed and increasingly important St. Lawrence seaway project. This article, Labor's Stake in the St. Lawrence Seaway, appears in the 1950 edition of Wisconsin Labor, the official annual publication of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor. The above-entitled article follows:

LABOR'S STAKE IN THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

(By N. R. Danielian)

On June 8, 1950, I heard a remarkable speech by the celebrated president of General Motors Corp., Charles E. Wilson, before 500 or more members of the press assembled at the National Press Club in Washington. Mr. Wilson showed great statesmanship in advocating many of the principles which have been the ambition and the objectives of labor—high wages, stability of employment, job security, pensions, and technological progress—all the things that labor has fought for these many years.

Those who advocated these same principles 10 or 15 years ago were invariably characterized as radical, but today these principles are accepted, not only as desirable social objectives but as good business. Mr. Wilson said: "Our workers are our clients and we have an interest in their welfare. Admittedly, we have made great progress in the past 15 years."

I mention this because it shows that even though a matter may be the subject of controversy today in our system of democratic give and take and freedom to discuss, argue, and bargain, there is a chance—in fact a great likelihood—that in the end, when all the name calling has died down, opposing points of view will join together in agreement and common effort. The St. Lawrence project is one of those objectives of the workingman which, though somewhat controversial today, will ultimately be accepted because it meets and fulfills many of the objectives of the labor movement. It will improve the standard of living of labor, it will supply job security by preventing unnecessary shifting of industry, it will help industrial stabilization by supplying the necessary raw materials and powers; it will improve the productivity of labor and therefore the chance of securing higher wages; and, more important than all of the foregoing, it will increase national security in peace and military strength in war.

Briefly, the St. Lawrence project will do two things: It will create a 27-foot channel of navigation in the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, Canada, a distance of 113 miles, so that ocean-going ships can travel all the way from the Atlantic Ocean into Milwaukee, Chicago, Duluth, and other Great Lakes ports. At the same time, a large powerhouse will be constructed at the International Rapids section near Massena, N. Y., which will have a total capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower, equally divided between Canada and the United States. This power, which is probably the cheapest water power in the country, will be available for distribution to New York and New England, an area which has suffered from high power rates and shortage of supply.

These are large claims but they are justified by the facts of the case. The United States is the only country in the world, with the possible exception of Russia, which has agricultural and industrial sources centered mainly in the midcontinental area, between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains, anywhere from 500 to 1,500 miles removed from the seacoasts. Obviously such long land distances create a disadvantage as they increase the cost of bringing the goods from producer to consumer. This great industrial and agricultural empire of the Middle West has grown not because of, but in spite of its disadvantageous location. It has grown because the rich soil was there which the dynamic and progressive agricultural methods of our people made to blossom forth with unprecedented quantities of food. Industry developed in this area because the earth was rich in countless minerals—copper, iron ore, and coal. And a third of our people established in this area because the Great Lakes supplied matchless low-cost water transportation routes.

Favored by these wonderful advantages, midwestern agriculture and industry was able to overcome the disadvantages in high costs of transportation to and from the seaboard. Even though the St. Lawrence seaway would have reduced the cost of transportation by providing deep channels for ocean vessels, the absence of the seaway was not critical from a commercial point of view. It has now ceased to be a matter of choice, however, because the Great Lakes are rapidly losing their principal advantage, namely, availability of raw materials. It has become a necessity, therefore, to build the seaway in order to bring in raw materials and maintain production in the Middle West.

Obviously the workingman in a large part of our country, from northern New York up to the Continental Divide, has a vital interest in a project that means so much to continuity of employment, job security, and improved wage standards. The exhaustion of iron ore and copper resources in the Middle West will drive industry toward the coastal areas on the Atlantic and on the Gulf coast, unless some means is provided to bring these materials into the present centers of production. None can face with disinterest the alternative of dislocation of industry and employment in this great area, least of all labor.

Let us enumerate some of the basic facts which make the St. Lawrence seaway a necessity: All present estimates of the remaining iron-ore resources in the Lake Superior region from which more than 80 percent of the country's iron ore has been derived for many years indicate that we have about a billion two hundred million tons left in the soil, of which only half, or approximately 600,000,000 tons, is in open-pit, easily mined ore. Although we use 80,000,000 tons of ore a year from this area, 50,000,000 tons of that comes from open-pit mines, which means that this source may be exhausted within 12 years.

What will happen to the steel industry and the many steel-fabricating plants and heavy-consumer-goods producers in the Great Lakes area if these sources dry up. Some say they will develop low-grade ores, but this will cost many more dollars per ton. Others say they will bring iron ore from Venezuela, transport it over 2,000 miles through the Caribbean and the Atlantic to Baltimore and send it into the Middle West by rail. This will cost more, too. The net result is that it will cost more to produce steel in the Middle West.

We produce and use 90,000,000 tons of steel a year. If the price of steel is increased for this one reason alone, say by $4 a ton, the country will simply have to pay $360,000,000 more per year for its steel. Thus in 1 year the consumer will have paid the equivalent of the total cost of building the seaway.

Under our competitive system it is not possible simply to increase prices, particularly if there are other places in the country where steel may be made more cheaply. With the exhaustion of the iron ore in the Lake Superior area, the east and the Gulf coasts, particularly between Philadelphia and Baltimore, and possibly in the Norfolk and Mobile areas in the South, will have an advantage over every other location because they can get ore cheaply by ocean navigation. Hence there will be a tendency to expand the steel production there and contract it in the Middle West.

This process has already begun as the Bethlehem Steel Corp. has announced the expansion of its steel plant at Sparrows Point, Baltimore, and the United States Steel Corp. has also announced the establishment of a new steel mill on the Delaware River between Trenton and Philadelphia.

Unless the low-cost iron ore can be brought to the Middle West this tendency to shift industry to the east coast will continue at an accelerated pace, affecting not only primary industries but also fabricated consumer-goods industries which need steel for their raw material. Everyone can visualize for himself the effect upon existing communities in the Great Lakes area—on its peoples and its working force—if, within the next 20 years, 40 to 50 percent of the steel industry is so affected.

Fortunately it is not necessary to go through such a painful readjustment because the iron ore resources necessary to keep midwestern industries going are available in Labrador and are now being developed. We only need a cheap water route by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, a few canals and locks for the 113 miles distance between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, Canada, to bring this raw material to the mills of the Middle West. Another aspect of the St. Lawrence project is that it will make available immense amounts of low-cost hydroelectric power. As we talk and

argue the merits of this project, 13,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity go to waste every year. This is more than the total amount of production of electric energy by all of the twenty-odd dams in the Tennessee Valley in 1945.

The only reason why the St. Lawrence project has not been built heretofore is that the interests opposing it have been very powerful. These interests are centered in the economic groups around the eastern railway trunk lines and the power companies in New York State. It has been true unfortunately that organized labor leadership in the railway and coal-mining industries have lined themselves up with these groups. They have allowed themselves to be persuaded that the seaway would jeopardize their jobs. The eastern railway trunk lines and the power companies in New York are concerned about competition from this new source of power and transportation route.

Those of us who advocate this project in the national interest do so from the deep conviction that it will help rather than hurt these power companies and the railroads because it will not only retain existing industries in their present locations but will increase industrial activity in the areas which they serve and from which they derive their revenues. How can the eastern trunk lines benefit from a shift of the steel industry from Pittsburgh, Youngstown, and Cleveland to a seaport city on the Atlantic coast where the raw materials would be brought in by water and the finished products would find their way to market by water. Some of the transport and utility managements are sometimes slow in perceiving their own and the public's interest in issues of this kind, but labor which has a very concrete understanding of these issues as wage earners and consumers, sees that lower production costs gives them a chance to buy more things with their income.

One final point even more vital than all of those previously mentioned because it deals with a matter which may determine national survival—security and military preparedness. The steel industry just as the supply of electric energy is basic to industrial strength and mobilization. A constant supply of raw materials in times of emergency is vital. Any shift of a major industry to coastal areas goes contrary to present plans of our defense and security agencies. Any exposure of raw material supply lines to attack by submarine is dangerous, as was amply proved in the Battle of the Atlantic in 1942. As our potential enemies move their industries into the less vulnerable hinterland, it would be folly for us to allow willfully our major industries to move to more vulnerable locations. It should be obvious to anyone that a boatload of iron ore from Liberia or Venezuela will create additional burdens for convoy duty, at the risk of ships and lives on the high seas, whereas the transportation of iron ore from Labrador through inland waterways would be infinitely safer. For this reason the National Defense Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the National Security Resources Board unanimously recommend the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

It is not a matter of accident that most friends of labor in the United States have stanchly supported the St. Lawrence seaway project regardless of the views expressed by the railway and coal unions.

Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, the late Senator George Norris, Robert M. La Follette—father and son, Senator George Aiken, of Vermont, Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Humphrey, Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, the late Senator Wagner, and Senator Herbert Lehman, have all supported the project because they know not only that it will be in the national interest but also because they are convinced it will be in the interest of both the farmers and workers.

The Evil Good Men Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "The Evil Good Men Do," published in the Concord (N. H.) Daily Monitor of September 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EVIL GOOD MEN DO

Senator JENNER used some strong language in opposing a change in the law which would prevent a military man from being Secretary of Defense within 10 years of active service, a change designed to permit the appointment of General Marshall to that post, and the delegation to General Marshall by the President himself of the duties of Commander in Chief, duties reserved to the President by the Constitution.

Senator JENNER said the performance was use of General Marshall as a cloak to shield traitors. What is and what is not a traitor these days?

The more temperate David Lawrence, writing in the United States News, uses different words. He says:

"The appointment of General Marshall under extraordinary circumstances is a desperate attempt to save the prestige and political standing of the Truman administration for fear the mistakes in defense planning will reflect on the Democratic candidates who are up for election November 7."

David Lawrence means the same thing, for he, like Senator JENNER, holds the President accountable for "a series of major blunders [which] can be made and the President of the United States can escape responsibility—he merely shifts Cabinet officers when public opinion is aroused, and remains serenely in office himself. This is what has long been known to students of political science as 'irresponsible government'." The President has had four Secretaries of State and three Secretaries of Defense in 5 years.

Both Senator JENNER and David Lawrence believe the American people should be able to hold not only the President but his political party responsible in time of crisis, as can the people of all the other important democracies in the world. That way the Members of the Congress, as well as the President, would have to stand for election when the policies of the government came into question, as have the policies of the present administration in connection with foreign affairs which have now led to a war in Korea.

As matters stand there is only one way that the administration can be made more responsible in the elections this fall. That is to change the complexion of the Congress from Democratic to Republican. That is not a satisfactory way, when the President remains Democratic, and it does not eliminate "irresponsible government." It is, however, the best we can hope for. The only other possibility is to impeach the President, impossible actually with a Democratic majority in the Congress, and even if accomplished this would merely substitute ALBEN BARKLEY for President, another partisan who has gone along with the administration in all its multiple blunders and who has been one of its most abject apologists.

In the circumstances men can be forgiven for using strong language. The times have been made desperate, largely by those who have so long administered our National Government. Even if the good intentions of these Federal administrators are not questioned they still can be guilty of very, very irresponsible government and of mistakes in judgment and blunders before which the Truman damnation of the Marines pales into insignificance.

The word "traitor" is a strong word, and probably is not applicable technically or legally to what has been happening. But it expresses the strength of the feelings of a great many Americans about what has been happening. Here in this State it expressed the feelings of those Republican voters who sought to hold Senator TOBEY responsible for his share in the blunders which have been made, the only practical way they had under existing law to express their strong convictions that a change is needed in Washington. It was expressed in the vote of Senator BRIDGES against changing the law to permit General Marshall's appointment as Secretary of Defense, a vote on which Senator TOBEY absented himself.

Don't think that we wish to vote Democratic this year, for the candidate for United States Senator or any other job. We do wish to vote for a responsible Republican, and what we are seeking to do is to indicate some of the ways in which the man we shall vote for can act responsibly. That man is Senator TOBEY, and if he gives aid and comfort to the present administration he is only helping to compound the accumulated errors of its nearly two decades of misrule.

White House-Labor Opposition to Senator Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The White House-Labor Gang-Up on Senator TAFT," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE-LABOR GANG-UP ON SENATOR TAFT

It is hardly a creditable exhibition, in the midst of the war in Korea, for the Truman administration to throw the full weight of its political power and prestige into an effort to sway a purely local election.

In its determination to defeat Senator ROBERT A. TAFT for reelection in Ohio in November, the administration has joined hands not only with leaders of the CIO and the AFL, but with John L. Lewis—no friend of Mr. Truman in the past—to swing labor votes against the Republican candidate.

As the opening gun in this campaign, W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President, was assigned to deliver an unprecedentedly political speech at the supposedly nonpartisan convention of the American Federation of Labor in Houston.

That speech, ghostwritten in the White House and released to newspaper correspondents in Washington by White House press secretary Charles G. Ross, was an inflammatory affair declaring that had Congress followed Senator TAFT's opposition to the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Treaty, "Communist objectives would have been furthered."

The boss of the United Mine Workers, John L. Lewis, has obligingly lent himself to the "get TAFT" campaign by warning coal-mine operators in Ohio to keep Senator TAFT out of their mines during the campaign, lest his presence "enrage the men" to strike.

Back of this alliance to dictate to the people of Ohio is, of course, the common hatred of the administration and the union bosses of the Taft-Hartley law and the Senator who sponsored it.

But it is up to the Ohio voters and no one else—including President Truman, Averell Harriman, and John Lewis—to decide who is to represent them in the United States Senate.

The White House is making a mistake to meddle in State politics in this fashion, regardless of its antipathy to Mr. TAFT. President Roosevelt ran into plenty of trouble when he essayed to tell the voters in a number of States who should and who should not be sent to the Senate.

The spectacle of forces from outside the State, directed by the Truman administration and Boss Lewis, trying to unseat their Senator is one that the people of Ohio are unlikely to find to their taste.

Texas Watchdog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a timely and interesting article from the September 18, 1950, issue of the weekly news magazine Time, under the title "Texas Watchdog." It is justly complimentary of the public services of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] who is now making an admirable record as the alert, capable, and energetic chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS WATCHDOG

In the week that President Truman announced his program for mobilizing the United States economy, the Senate's new watchdog committee on United States preparedness uttered its first warning growl. After just a month's sniffing through the United States mobilization effort, Texas' sharp-nosed Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON has caught the strong scent of "business as usual" in some corners of the Defense Department's planning.

Government-owned reserve defense plants, JOHNSON reported, had been allowed to deteriorate. Such onetime surplus items as a synthetic-rubber plant, airplane engines, and radio equipment had been put up for sale while the United States was frantically mobilizing for Korea. Rubber stockpiling had slacked off while the need loomed greater than ever. "If we find in the other fields," said JOHNSON, "the same siesta psychology that we found in surplus disposal and rubber, our work is certainly cut out for us."

TRAINED FRESHMAN

The work that 42-year-old LYNDON JOHNSON had cut out for himself was just the kind that had lifted Missouri's Senator Harry S. Truman out of obscurity in World War II. Freshman JOHNSON was not unprepared for the job. During the war he had run an efficient House investigating committee which worked much like the celebrated Truman committee without drawing its headlines. JOHNSON believed that a congressional watchdog should be something of a seeing-eye guide for blind bureaucracy. His committee marshaled its facts in private, presented them to the appropriate Government officials, and usually received thanks for its suggestions.

LYNDON JOHNSON began learning his way around Washington in 1932 as secretary to Rancher-Congressman Dick Kleberg. Five years later he was back in Texas campaigning for a seat of his own. Franklin Roosevelt chanced to be fishing from a destroyer off the Texas coast at the time read and liked JOHNSON's hard-hitting New Dealing speeches. FDR saw to it that the freshman Congressman got a seat on the important House Naval Affairs Committee.

CAMPAIGN BY HELICOPTER

In 1941 JOHNSON tried the leap to the Senate; lost out to Governor "Pappy" O'Daniel by 1,311 votes out of more than half a million cast. Six months later, within 4 days of Pearl Harbor, he became the first House Member to go on active duty (as a Navy lieutenant commander). When the President ruled in mid-1942 that Congressmen might not serve in the Armed Forces, JOHNSON came back to Washington.

By 1948 he had decided to give up his House seat to run again for the Senate. He whirred across Texas by helicopter in a series of 18-hour campaigning days that won him a hairbreadth 87-vote margin over popular ex-Gov. Coke Stevenson. Since then, he has been a loyal, but not unquestioning, supporter of the Fair Deal; when it came to voting on labor and civil-rights bills, he lined up with the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats to help defeat the administration program.

For his newest task, JOHNSON had set himself a commendable set of rules: Don't spend time looking for headlines; try to avoid politics; avoid second-guessing war strategy; be constructive and impartial. As a starter, the seven-man Johnson subcommittee planned to survey Alaskan defenses, examine weapons and manpower needs, and investigate foreign monopolies of strategic United States defense materials.

The Communist Threat to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Honorable Martin Dies entitled "The Communist Threat to America." The Public Printer has advised me that the cost to insert this article is $287. As I believe that the information in this article is so pertinent, I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD. It follows:

THE COMMUNIST THREAT TO AMERICA

(By Martin Dies)

Democracy and Christian civilization are more gravely menaced throughout the world than ever before. At long last, many of our people realize it but there are still millions of people in the United States who have no adequate conception of the methods, tactics and ultimate objective of communism. We cannot shape the future unless we understand what has happened in the past.

It has been a short time since World War II was over. At least we thought it was over. You recall that when we asked our people to serve in the Armed Forces our leadership assured them that this was a war to end all wars. They were told that when they defeated Hitler, we would establish a just and lasting peace.

Today, however, the dictatorship and military might of Joseph Stalin is a greater menace to our security and freedom than the dictatorship of Hitler. Hitler controlled a country with 70,000,000 people which was limited in natural resources and small in area. Stalin has a country whose territory is larger than the United States and Canada and possesses more natural resources than any country on earth and has a population of 200,000,000 people. He has succeeded, without firing a gun, in acquiring more than 650,000 square miles and 110,000,000 subject people in the Balkan States and 400,000,000 people in China. In short he has welded the manpower and resources of nearly one-half the earth into a single, unprecedented striking force. Now, how did it happen? Our people should be vitally and deeply interested in finding out what happened because never in the history of the world has one country made such tremendous strides toward world domination as the Soviet Union has made in the past 5 years.

Only a few years ago, Russia was regarded as a third-rate power. Today she has attained the status of a world menace and is the most powerful country on earth with the exception of the United States. Now, how did it happen? I propose to answer that question. And in answering it, I am going to tell you about some of my conversations and conferences with President Roosevelt and other leaders of his administration. I think that my experiences will shed some light upon the motives which actuated our leaders in reaching the agreements at Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam. They may help explain the enormous concessions which our Government made to Stalin and our strange behavior toward China. Many people are unable to understand why the United States, after having spent three or four billions of dollars to aid the Nationalist Government of China, suddenly decided that that Government was too corrupt to help and exerted continuing pressure upon the Nationalist Government to accept the Communists as equal partners in the Government of China. Few people can understand why our Government accepted our sector in Berlin without making any provision for ingress and egress. Why did our leadership surrender vital lands in Manchuria to Stalin as the price of his 1 week's participation in the war against Japan? These and many other questions can be answered and understood when the attitude of our leadership toward communism is understood.

My experiences with communism began in 1937. I introduced a bill which passed the House of Representatives to exclude and deport Communist aliens. The purpose of the bill was to cure the defect in the law under the terms of which Communists were not excludable or deportable as such. The administration killed the bill in the Senate. Another bill of mine, passed in 1937 to prevent illegal entries and to strengthen immigration laws, was likewise defeated by the administration.

On March 21, 1937, I introduced at the request of Vice President Garner, a resolution to investigate and condemn sitdown strikes. Mr. Garner assured me that, when the President returned from Warm Springs, he would

issue a statement denouncing the sitdown strike method. When the President returned from Warm Springs, he not only did not issue any such statement, but he permitted his leaders in the Congress to defeat my resolution.

In May 1938, I got a resolution through Congress to investigate Communists, Nazis, and Fascists. The administration used its influence with the Accounts Committee to whittle down my request for funds to carry on the investigation to the paltry sum of $25,000 after the administration discovered that I was determined to investigate and expose communism the same as nazism and fascism. So I was compelled to begin our work with $25,000.

I recall that my uncle, Jack Dies, who is now dead, came to Washington on another matter and I discussed the situation with him. He said, "Martin, you know I hate to advise you to abandon this investigation but I have seen enough to know that you are now preparing to antagonize powerful forces in this country and that you will be harassed as few men have been in our history."

I told him, "Well, I have started it and I cannot back up."

One of the excuses given for the small sums placed at the committee's disposal was the provision in the resolution which requested the head of each department to detail to the committee such legal and expert assistance and investigators as the committee needed. It was argued that, since the committee could secure this outside aid from the various executive departments, we would not need more than $25,000. I immediately called upon the heads of the departments, and particularly the Attorney General, to assign to our committee investigators in accordance with the resolution. The heads of the various departments gave one excuse after another for their failure to comply with my request. While this was going on, Mr. Wohlforth, secretary of the La Follette committee, telephoned me that he had been advised that we were trying to secure some investigators from the executive branch of the Government and that he could get us some investigators. I suspected that his scheme was to pack the committee with Communist sympathizers but I let him send me several men so that I could show Congress that, while I could not get the departments to give us help, the secretary of the La Follette committee could get such help for me provided I would use the type of men he sent. I received an anonymous telephone call, shortly before these men arrived, telling me that both men were members of the Communist Party. I never knew who gave me that valuable information, but I acted upon it.

When they arrived, I questioned them very closely. As I recall this occurred in the presence of the committee and these men finally admitted enough facts to convince the committee that they were either Communists or Communist sympathizers. It was apparent from their admissions that someone very high in the administration wanted to plant these stooges on the committee for the purpose of sabotaging the investigation.

I knew what was in store for me when the administration was willing to plant two stooges of Moscow on my committee. I also knew that the administration was being influenced by Moscow propaganda.

On June 28, 1938, I received a letter from one of the leaders of the administration who is now the majority leader, enclosing a memorandum expressing certain views as to the kind of investigation our committee should make. Here is an excerpt from his advice: "For the committee to allow itself to be drawn into an investigation of a domestic organization, simply because some Communists are in it, or actively engaged therein, such as the CIO would be, in my opinion, a grave mistake." I believe that this instruction originated with the President because this is what the President told me in effect shortly after the receipt of this letter.

We began to accumulate evidence before opening public hearings. We secured a lot of evidence showing the infiltration of the CIO by Communist leadership. We discovered that a number of Communists went to Moscow and Leningrad at the expense of the Soviet Government and received special instructions in labor agitation, parliamentary procedure and class warfare and returned to the United States for the purpose of infiltrating labor unions. When John L. Lewis quit the American Federation of Labor and organized the CIO, he turned to these well-trained Communist agitators to form the rank and file of his organizers in many areas. We got their names and the evidence, which was clear and convincing, showing that thousands of them had joined labor unions and that some of them had wormed their way into strategic positions in the unions. They were intrenched in the leadership of 21 of the international unions affiliated with the CIO. Nearly one-half of the members of the executive board of the CIO, the governing board and the most powerful organization within the CIO, were members of the Communist Party.

Unions which vitally affect our whole economy and security were under the control of men and women who had been trained and educated in Moscow and Leningrad for the express purpose of returning to the United States, obtaining positions of importance in labor unions, so that they could promote the ideology and revolutionary program of Joseph Stalin.

When I got this information, I telephoned John L. Lewis and told him I wanted to talk with him. I went to his office a few days after the telephone conversation. When I walked into Mr. Lewis' office, Lee Pressman stood to his right. I knew that Pressman was a member of the Communist Party although he denied it then and thereafter until quite recently. He was the chief attorney for the CIO and Mr. Lewis. I said, "Mr. Lewis, I have received considerable information from reliable sources that many Communists have entered your union. They are shop stewards, presidents of locals, organizers, and so forth. It is our duty to investigate and expose them unless you are willing to cooperate with us to the end that we can get these people out of your organization. I have come to you to find out if you, as an American citizen, and labor leader, will be willing to cooperate with the committee without any publicity so that we can expel these agents and stooges of a foreign dictator from positions of leadership in your organization." Mr. Lewis was very angry. His face was flushed. He struck the desk with his fist and said to me, "Mr. Congressman, the CIO does not need you or anyone else to tell us how to run our organization. Yes; we have Communists in the CIO. We also have Baptists, and Methodists and we have Democrats and Republicans, but we do not need a committee of Congress to tell us who we are to hire and fire." I said to Mr. Lewis and those present: "Mr. Lewis, you have evidently overlooked the vast distinction between members of ordinary political parties and Communist stooges of a foreign power. All of our evidence, without exception, shows that Communists are disciplined to be servants of Moscow. They have no independence. They sacrifice their American citizenship when they become members of the Communist Party, and surely you will not compel us to expose these people publicly when you can get rid of them. We have their names and you can get them out of your organization."

The conversation was not very agreeable and I interpreted Mr. Lewis' attitude and language as an invitation to leave his office which I did cheerfully. I announced to the press that I intended to open hearings for the purpose of exposing communism in the CIO.

On August 12, 1938, we opened our public hearings on communism in labor organizations. As I recall, on the morning of August 12 before the committee's hearing began, I was at the White House to see the President concerning an important project in my district. Senator Sheppard was there also. At the conclusion of our discussion concerning the project, the President began in his magnetic way to persuade me to abandon my proposal to expose communism in the CIO. He said to me, "You know, Martin, I have been watching you for a long time. You have a promising future. You are an able speaker and a young man and I want vigorous and able young men in the New Deal Administration. You can go a long way working with me but not very far working against me." He continued, "You have to be loyal to me. I can't work with men that I can't depend upon. You have got to play ball with us." I asked, "What do you mean 'play ball'?" He answered, "You cannot go through with this investigation of the CIO and your proposed public hearings." I asked, "Why can't I go through with it, Mr. President?" Of course, I was somewhat frightened to tell the truth. The President is a powerful personage, especially when he happens to be the head of your political party and source of your patronage. And I must confess that the President's compliments sounded good to me. I am not going to represent myself as a hero because I was not. On the other hand, I had to keep my self-respect. Regardless of the consequences, I knew that I could not back up.

He said: "Well, if you expose the Communists in the CIO, the CIO will turn against the Democratic Party. If we lose the CIO in some of the Eastern States, we cannot win. Furthermore, you will antagonize the CIO and the Democratic Party and brand yourself as the foe of labor and liberalism. I said, "Mr. President, do you mean to imply that the Communists have so strongly intrenched themselves in the CIO that exposure of them will result in antagonism to the Democratic Party?" He said, "Yes, there are Communists in the CIO. Some of them may be in positions of leadership as you say. I think, however, you exaggerate the seriousness of communism. The Communists have just as much right in the CIO as anyone else. The point is that Mr. Lewis is considerably disturbed by your proposed hearings." I said, "Mr. Green, Mr. John Frey, and the leaders of the A. F. of L. are not disturbed. They have been cooperating with me by furnishing information and they have advised me that they will be glad if I will expose any Communists in the A. F. of L. so that they can get rid of them." "I have known Green, Frey, and the other leaders of the A. F. of L. a long time," replied the President. "They are reactionary. John L. Lewis is the most progressive and valuable leader in the trade unions today."

As I said, Senator Sheppard was present during the conversation. Later, however, he asked me not to mention his name in connection with the matter as he did not want to become involved. I thought a great deal of Senator Sheppard and during his lifetime I never mentioned his name in connection with this conference. However, I know that if it had become necessary, Senator Sheppard would have supported my version of the conference. However, since the President never denied the substance of what I am now relating it was never necessary to call upon Senator Sheppard.

One thing led to another, and finally the President became impatient and angry with me, and he turned to Senator Sheppard and said, "Senator, what are we going to do with Martin?" Senator Sheppard was a very genial and pleasant man and a good friend of mine. He said, "I don't know. I knew his

dad and when a Dies makes up his mind to do something he usually does it. I am afraid you are going to have trouble trying to persuade him not to do it." As I recall, the interview lasted about 35 or 40 minutes and finally I looked at the watch and said: "Mr. President, I have to go, because the committee meets and I must be there to preside."

So I began the public hearings for the purpose of exposing communism in the CIO and our evidence showed very clearly that in the majority of the unions affiliated with the CIO the Communists were intrenched in positions of leadership. As is well known, the CIO retaliated viciously. It conducted a prolonged and bitter campaign against me and the committee. It is interesting to note, however, that in the past 12 months the CIO have expelled the very individuals and unions exposed by our committee in 1938. By their own actions, they have proved the truth of our findings.

I recall that a man by the name of General Krevitsky, who had served under Stalin for a long time, had fled to the United States when he became disgusted with the brutality of communism in practice as distinguished from communism in theory. I learned of his presence in this country and was determined to see him and have him testify. He told an amazing story of what he had learned about the plans and purposes of the Kremlin; how it had built secret armies in every country and had spent millions of dollars for propaganda purposes. He revealed that the ultimate goal of Stalin was the conquest of Europe, Asia, and the Americas.

I sent word to him to come to Washington and testify because the American people ought to have his information. I was informed that he did not want to come to Washington and testify for fear that the OGPU, which is now the NKVD, the secret police of the Kremlin, would assassinate him.

I said, "Surely, they are not that powerful in the United States." I was very skeptical about it. He said, "I was chief of the western division of the Soviet Intelligence, and I know that there isn't a country, there isn't an industry of importance and there isn't a town of industrial importance that members of the OGPU are not there gathering information and transmitting it to the Soviet Union. They have their agents in the Soviet Embassies and not even the Soviet Ambassadors know the identity of the members of the OGPU." Of course, I do not purport to quote the exact language of these conversations but I made notes and memoranda at the time and I know that my accounts of the conversations are substantially correct. As I recall, we finally prevailed upon General Krevitsky to testify upon the assurance that we would protect him and conceal his identity. It is my recollection that I called up the Secret Service and said, "I am undertaking a rather perilous thing. This man is fearful of his life. I want him to testify because his information is tremendously important but I do not want him harmed." I undertook to get a commitment from the Government that they would help me protect him but, of course, no one in the Government wanted him to testify. He did testify. As I recall, within a short time after his startling revelations which foretold so accurately the plans of the Kremlin, he was found shot in his hotel room in Washington, D. C. While his death was pronounced a suicide, I was never satisfied with this verdict and I have always believed that his appearance before our committee was the cause of his death.

Another former agent of the Soviet Union in New York had given us valuable information. Shortly thereafter, he was found dead. I was told that his death was caused by a heart attack but that another examination disclosed that he had been shot with a fine steel bullet through the eye which had entered his brain and produced instant death.

Still another informant was a victim of a hit-and-run driver.

I am telling you these things because I want to show you what happened in our country during these critical years which finally resulted in the sacrifice of the fruits of victory won by our boys on the battlefields. I am at a loss to understand why our public leaders are not now clamoring for publication of all the secret agreements made by our Government with Joseph Stalin. I have been surprised that so many people have been indifferent and unconcerned about the tragic consequences of our pro-Communist policy which robbed us of the fruits of our victory. I think I can show you why the men who fought and died in World War II were betrayed by the stupid attitude of our leadership.

They were betrayed because the Soviet Union built up in this country the greatest espionage and propaganda machine the world has ever seen. They spent millions of dollars to deceive and hoodwink Congressmen, Senators, and Cabinet officers. The brother-in-law of Molotov, Sam Carp, was operating a chain of filling stations in New Jersey. He was investigated by our committee. We discovered several hundred thousand dollars in $100 bills in his safe-deposit box and a letter of credit from Molotov instructing the Amtorg Trading Corporation to extend him a credit of $150,000,000 to be spent in the United States in order to obtain information about the construction of battleships. The Government of the United States never raised a finger against him although he admitted that several national Democratic committeemen had been paid cash by him. These committeemen admitted that they received the cash fees but contended that the payment was for legal services.

Think of it! Think of the stupidity and indifference of a Government that will permit a foreign power to spend money to influence our own officials. The facts were admitted but no one in authority appeared very interested.

Yes; they spent money and they spent it lavishly in the United States. For a time the Soviet Embassy in Washington operated on a 24-hour schedule and they were able to dupe such nitwits as Henry Wallace and CLAUDE PEPPER.

I shall not give you anything which is the result of surmise or opinion but information that I know to be correct. I had people watching the Soviet Embassy and they observed the frequent attendance of prominent New Dealers at Soviet Embassy functions. Obviously, the caviar and champagne that flowed in the Soviet Embassy had a profound effect upon some of the flaming liberals.

When Henry Wallace spoke in Madison Square Garden the Communists packed it; however, when anyone spoke there against communism he was usually booed and jeered and the police force of New York was required to maintain order. The difference lies in the fact that the Communists work at their business of revolutionizing the world and spreading their ideology while we sit idly by.

Our committee struggled on. Because of the attitude of many of the reporters who reported our proceedings and because they wrote so many false stories, I had them investigated to find out about their background and affiliations. You know what I discovered, the New York chapter of the newspaper guild was Communist controlled. Some of the reporters assigned to our committee were Communist sympathizers or to say the least befuddled and confused liberals, and, of course, they garbled the accounts to make the committee appear ridiculous and to discredit and undermine it, because they were working hand and foot with the administration in power.

However, we continued to give the American people the truth. Finally, we discovered that several thousand Communists, agents, stooges, and sympathizers were on the Government payroll, occupying in many instances key positions in the State Department, in the Justice Department, and in the Interior Department. So I telephoned President Roosevelt's secretary and told him I wanted to see the President and he said all right.

I went to the White House and saw the President. I said to him, "Mr. President, we must do something about this. Here is a list of many of these people. We have their membership records in a Communist-controlled organization. If you understand the Communists as I do, you will know that they are in the Government for one purpose and one purpose alone and that is to steal important military and diplomatic secrets and to transmit them to Moscow." The President was furious. I was surprised at his anger. He said to me—he called me Mr. Congressman—he had called me Martin before—he said, "Mr. Congressman, you must see a bugaboo under every bed." I said, "No; I never look under the bed, Mr. President." "Well," he said, "I have never seen a man that had such exaggerated ideas about this thing. I do not believe in communism any more than you do but there is nothing wrong with the Communists in this country; several of the best friends I have got are Communists." Mind you that is a truthful account. He made that statement.

Some of the things I am telling you about I told to the House of Representatives and published in magazine articles and in speeches throughout the country during President Roosevelt's lifetime and he did not deny them. Although I published a book in 1940, and wrote a series of magazine articles for Liberty in 1940, revealing many of the things I am telling you today, no one sued me for libel.

The President refused to discharge these people from the Government although our committee reported to Congress in 1941 that more than 1,100 Communists were on the payroll. Finally, we got Congress to appropriate $100,000 to defray the expenses of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate our charges against these Government officials and employees and we submitted to the executive department our evidence to substantiate our charges and findings. Despite this mandate of Congress, the Department of Justice refused to comply with this mandate and by a subterfuge got around the direction of the Congress. Then I induced Congress to withhold appropriations to pay the salaries of some of worst offenders. The executive department defied Congress and refused to fire them. They were kept on the Government payroll. They were there while we were working on the secret of the atomic bomb and still there are people in America so dumb that they believe Stalin doesn't have the secret of the atomic bomb. How could he have kept from getting it with stooges in nearly every department of the Government? They were able to learn some of the secret in Canada, and Canada was not one-twentieth as well organized by the Communists as the United States. We were taken in, lock, stock, and barrel by Communist propaganda and deception.

There was a perennial youth by the name of Joseph Lash, who was head of the Youth Congress. Joseph Lash had been very active in communism and we exposed him. One day I got a telephone call from Mrs. Roosevelt asking me to have dinner with her. Well, I knew something was up because I had heard that Mrs. Roosevelt was trying to persuade Naval Intelligence to give Joseph Lash an appointment. He had never been inducted into the armed services. I went to the White House and there seated in the antercom were four or five young Communist

youth leaders waiting for Mrs. Roosevelt. They sat at the table with me and Mrs. Roosevelt.

At the conclusion of the lunch, Mrs. Roosevelt said to me, "Mr. Congressman, I presume you know why I asked you to have lunch with me." I said, "Well, I have an idea. It is about Joseph Lash." And she said, "Yes." I said, "Mrs. Roosevelt, I have brought the record of Joseph Lash. He perjured himself before our committee." She said, "Yes; he told me he did but he is very sorry and I think he should have another chance." I said, "Well, maybe, but not in Naval Intelligence." I said, "Did he tell you he was a member of the Communist Party?" She said, "Yes; but he was just an idealistic venturesome youth who embraced communism impulsively and now he wants to repent." I said, "Mrs. Roosevelt, how do you know he has repented? How can you afford to ask that he be put in Naval Intelligence?"

Well, we sat around and discussed it pro and con. When I went back to the office, I called the committee together and told them about my conversation with Mrs. Roosevelt. The committee agreed to permit Joseph Lash and his counsel, who was a New Deal official, to appear before it so that he could make his confession and ask for forgiveness. Among other things, I asked him why he was not in the Army and he was unable to give a satisfactory explanation. Later the committee instructed the secretary to telephone the draft board in New York to find out why Joseph Lash had not been inducted. We were informed that it was because of White House intervention. Shortly thereafter, I saw Gene Tunney at the home of some friends and he said to me, "Martin, I have something that will be amusing to you." I understood him to say that at one of the Army camps where Joseph Lash was stationed, Mrs. Roosevelt drove up in a White House car and sent for Joseph Lash and that Joseph Lash broke rank and got in the White House car and was gone several days. It may be that Gene Tunney was relating to me what someone else had told him.

We had a member of the Secret Service who worked in the White House and who gave us weekly reports in regard to what happened at the White House. I learned that Communists had access to the White House and were using their influence to affect our domestic and foreign policy. I do know that in 1940, the President called me by telephone at my home in Orange, Tex., and asked me to come to Washington. I had an appointment with him at 12 o'clock but I cooled my heels in the anteroom for 1 hour before his door opened and out walked Gardner Jackson, whose record may be found in the files of our committee. I do know that my telephone conversation with the President was very friendly but that when I entered his office after Gardner Jackson left he had a very belligerent attitude. A White House reporter took down the conference and later the President refused to give me a copy of the interview. It would be interesting to the American people to read the conversation between President Roosevelt and me on that occasion because I warned him very clearly what was going to happen as a result of the Government's pro-Russian policy. Now, I know this is difficult for you to believe, but it is true. I am telling you these things so that you may have some idea of how thoroughly Stalin was able to dupe the United States of America.

Did it pay dividends to Stalin? The record speaks for itself. Stalin got billions of dollars of your money—not your money because you will never repay it. He got it from your great-grandchildren. By the time it is paid off, it will probably be twice as much if you count the interest and that wasn't all he got. He had built such clever political machines in this country that he greatly influenced, if he did not control, the CIO for a long time. Some of the most expensive and destructive strikes were caused by Communists in the CIO for Communist purposes. The CIO cannot now deny the truth of our 1938 findings. If they deny it, why is it they are now expelling the Communist leaders we exposed in 1938? Why did they wait 10 years to expel them and what is the answer of the administration? The truth is that some politicians are getting away with murder because too many people are indifferent. If you manifested one-tenth of the interest in your Government as you do in your business you wouldn't elect weaklings to important public offices.

When you get ready to hire a president of a gas company you are most careful to secure the services of a competent man, and you do get competent men, for the most part. But when you come to elect a politician, the majority of us are indifferent and we think anybody can govern a country.

So my fellow citizens, here was Moscow in full swing in the United States. It was influencing our domestic policy by preaching public ownership. It formed innumerable organizations which were lobbying actively in Washington for this purpose. Of course, they didn't say this was communism. They didn't say these organizations were controlled by Communists, like the American League for Peace and Democracy. There was an organization—2,000,000 gullible Americans—completely controlled by communism. And yet, 2,000,000 of our great, heart-bleeding idealistic public joined it and contributed their money and influence to the support of it.

Do you remember before the World War? People were parading, shouting that we intervene to defeat Germany? There wasn't a day that they weren't lobbying with Members of Congress to stop Hitler. Why stop Hitler? Because he has taken these little innocent countries. The newspapers were shouting it and the radio commentators were shouting it. That is all we heard, we Members of the Congress. Why? They wanted us to get in it 2 years before we did, to stop aggression. They said, "Why, America cannot sit idly by and permit Hitler to expand his empire."

Perhaps they were right. But where are they now? Why have they become so silent when Stalin has absorbed far more territory than Hitler ever absorbed? What has brought about the change of Henry Wallace and PEPPER and all that group? They were shouting for war to stop Hitler, but are they shouting for war to stop Stalin? It was bad for Hitler to seize Czechoslovakia and Rumania, but it is perfectly permissible for Stalin to seize them. Why?

One day I got an urgent call to go to the home of a friend of mine in Washington because Justice Murphy had to see me instantly. My wife was present when we went to the home. Murphy was prancing up and down in a high state of emotional excitement, and I was at a loss to know what he wanted with me. Finally, he opened up and said, "Mr. Congressman, I have sent for you to tell you that the Communists are going to take over this country. They are in our Government; they are all about us." He was highly agitated.

I thought, well perhaps we have a convert here, and I said, "Justice Murphy, I am acquainted with that situation and any help or any information you can give us I will deeply appreciate and will keep it confidential." He talked like an insane man. My wife will tell you, he would walk up and down the floor. His face broke into a sweat, and all the time I saw him I thought, "What is America coming to when that kind of a man can occupy a seat on the highest judicial tribunal in the land."

Yes; I want to bring you a picture, to show you how completely you have been duped, because you must pay the bill. Of course, some of you will say that is "spilt milk," "water over the dam." Well, maybe so, but if you are going to fight another war, you must know how to preserve the fruits of victory. And you lost this war. You think you won it, don't you? But you didn't win it. Oh, you whipped Hitler, but you didn't whip the idea of a powerful central government controlling and dominating your lives and your business and political thought, did you? Now, why didn't you win it? Why is it when General Patton advanced to the borders of Czechoslovakia, he received an order from the White House telling him to hold his army, and why did his army stand there cooling their heels for 3 weeks, waiting for the Russian Army to advance and take over Czechoslovakia and to be hailed as the liberators of Czechoslovakia? Why was it that we sat in conference in Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam and entered into secret agreements delivering to Stalin the great bread basket of Europe? Why? Why did we agree to a clause in the Potsdam agreement that gave to Stalin all of the industries in the occupied area that belonged to the Nazi Government without investigating the fact that when the Nazis had taken over those countries by official decree, they had seized all property. By our own solemn agreement, we gave to Stalin all of the properties of the peoples of those countries, and now we must feed them.

I hate to talk this way because I know it sounds pretty bad, but the time has come for frank discussions, and I tell you from my personal information and knowledge that I know that our Government was completely duped by Stalin, that Stalin influenced our foreign policy.

Now, what are you going to do about it, friends? Well, you are in a bad shape, aren't you? There are some nitwits that tell you we can whip Russia in 3 weeks by using the atomic bomb. You may believe that. The northern boys said they were going to whip the South in 3 weeks. It took them 4 years. I remember we had an assistant secretary of the Navy who said we could whip Japan in 3 weeks. Well, my boy served all through the Pacific and he can tell you that we didn't whip the Japs in 3 weeks. And I am here to tell you we can't whip Russia in 3 weeks or in 3 years, and I will tell you why you can't. Napoleon thought he could, and he had a great military machine. He was the greatest military leader the world had ever seen, up to that day. He didn't take Russia. The Russians retreated and he froze his troops—the carcasses of horses and the corpses of human beings literally strewed the retreat of the French Army.

Hitler tried to take them. You know Hitler wanted to do business with Stalin, and for 3 years they were working together. At the very time that Roosevelt thought that he was doing business with Stalin, Stalin was doing business with Hitler.

To show you how completely the President was deceived—and I say that not in exultation—the President for his first 2 terms was a magnificent leader. I sat close to him when he made that memorable speech in which he said, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." And, as a young legislator, I looked upon his face and said, "God has given to America a great leader." But the President loved power.

When he got through Tehran and Yalta, he was not the man he had been when he took the oath of office in his first term. He was completely duped, and you and I must now pay the price.

It is important that you and I understand that if we fight Russia, we have a long war which will leave America exhausted. Oh, we have the idea that we can spend indefinitely. I know, we throw money away so much in this country that there are actually respectable people who think you can keep on issuing paper money and get by with it.

Well, I have known young men who thought they could get by by getting drunk every night, and they did get by for 10 years. They finally ended up with cirrhosis of the liver, the palsy, and the DT's. You will come out of the next war exhausted, and, furthermore, my fellow citizens, this Government is going to regiment you up to the hilt next time.

You think you knew what war was last time. Why, that was a picnic for some who stayed at home, if it wasn't for our sons. We made a lot of money out of it, didn't we? Of course, we did. Well, I will tell you it won't be that way again. It is going to require sacrifice and unselfish citizenship and courageous leadership. Americans everywhere must begin to emulate the enthusiasm and zeal which the Communists manifest throughout the whole world.

You cannot defeat this flaming ideology, this new religion based on atheism and materialism, with an indifferent and selfish citizenship. The Communists mean business, and they are prepared to make every sacrifice to extend their ideological religion through the world.

Not since the days when the Mohammedans threatened Christianity have we been confronted with so great a menace. Our America can only survive in this age and time when you and I revitalize democracy, rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles that made our country great.

You think we can buy peace and security. We are to the point where we think whenever an emergency arises in America, all we have to do is to appropriate $10,000,000,000 of our great-great-grandchildren's money. We are down now to about the tenth generation to be born. I say to you that you will never defeat Russia by those tactics.

For instance, Russia will avoid open warfare as long as possible. Her strategy is to win nations without firing a gun, and she has done a good job. If you think for one moment that this clever, shrewd Joseph Stalin and his lieutenants intend to commit the issue to a trial of arms, you are mistaken. He will take every country he wants to take without firing a gun—he takes them from within. Why, he only got 16 percent of the votes in Bulgaria, but within a few months, he took Bulgaria. He only got 37 percent of the votes in the free election of Czechoslovakia, but within 2 months he took Czechoslovakia. No, he doesn't need to use guns. He is too smart; his propagandists are too smart. He can infiltrate our Government; he can influence our foreign policy; he can dupe and deceive our leadership.

The only answer is for you and all America to awake. You have been asleep, my fellow citizens. You must drop the scales from your eyes and realize that no one can be happy or prosperous or secure under a bad government. The first business of every citizen is the business of self-government, and unless we in this generation make a success of our business of government, we will have miserably failed. You and I must become zealous citizens of America. Let us arise, my fellow citizens, and shake off sloth. Let us say that no longer will we tolerate open treason against our country—the idea of permitting 200,000 so-called Americans to enjoy the protection of our flag when we know that they are traitors to that flag. Since when have we come to the time that we cannot deal with known traitors in America? Every man whose primary allegiance is to Russia or any other foreign power ought to have his citizenship revoked and he should be branded for what he is.

That, my friends, is the challenge to you, a real challenge. No longer can you sit idly by. You, as American citizens must come to love your country with all your heart and all your mind. You, as American citizens, must put aside the selfishness that holds to your business, day in and day out. You must realize that the gas industry wouldn't be worth a dime to you under totalitarian government. Your industry can only survive and serve humanity under a free economy.

Your business is government, my friends. Are you carrying out that business? Do you ever speak out against the frauds that hold public office throughout our land, or are you afraid to do it? Are you afraid that if you get active in a campaign that it will hurt your industry in Austin or Washington? If you are afraid, then you are not a good citizen of these United States. I say to you we must fight. We Americans who value this great heritage won by the blood of brave men and the tears of devout women, we want this America preserved for our children. We must band ourselves together as American citizens and say to the Henry Wallaces and the Claude Peppers and all of the other aggregation of individuals who want to substitute Russian totalitarianism for American freedom, we must say to them, "You have gone far enough. We Americans are determined to preserve this heritage. If you want Russia, then we are going to give you an opportunity to go there."

My friends, I could talk to you another hour, but I know you want to eat. I have enjoyed this opportunity to deliver this message. I hope that I have said something that will make a fighter out of you so that when you go back home you will take your coat off and the first time a mealymouthed lying, hypocritical politician comes around to you and tries to carry water on both shoulders and tries to utter platitudes and avoid controversial issues, I hope you will stand up in your Legion Hall or your Rotary Club or wherever you are and say, "I am an American citizen and I stand for the preservation of my country. I am prepared to fight and die for it if need be."

Effort To Scare Senator Jenner From Attack on General Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article entitled "JENNER Tells of Effort To Scare Him From Attack on Marshall," written by Walter Trohan, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of September 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JENNER TELLS OF EFFORT TO SCARE HIM FROM ATTACK ON MARSHALL—DISCLOSES DEMOCRAT GAVE WARNING OF REPRISALS IF CHARGES WERE MADE

(By Walter Trohan)

Senator JENNER, Republican, of Indiana, was warned he would be cut to ribbons in most of the American press if he assailed General Marshall as unfit for the office of Defense Secretary. JENNER revealed this yesterday.

On the floor of the Senate, a few minutes before he analyzed the career of the general, a Democratic Senator sought to prevent JENNER from delivering his speech.

"Are you going to deliver the speech released to the press?" the Senator, a southern Democrat asked.

"I am," JENNER replied.

"You better not," the Senator said, "you will be destroyed utterly."

"I am expendable," JENNER answered, "but I am going to help my country by telling the truth."

SMEAR WARNING GIVEN

"They will cut you up in almost every paper in the country," his colleague said.

"It would be a sorry thing if the time has come that a man in public life can't tell the truth for fear of newspapers which are involved in a conspiracy to conceal the truth," JENNER said.

Colleagues said the face of the Democratic Senator reddened and he turned away.

How the southern Senator learned the contents of the speech is something of a mystery to JENNER. JENNER gave the speech to the press 3 hours before delivery, for release when he obtained the floor. He was not sure when he could get the floor.

Evidently some reporter gave a copy of the speech to the Democrats, JENNER said. JENNER'S colleagues believe that Senate Democratic Leader LUCAS, of Illinois, sent the southern Democrat to JENNER in an attempt to stave off the attack on Marshall.

ATTACKED, AS PREDICTED

JENNER was attacked as the Democratic Senator predicted. Part of the attack JENNER regards as below the belt because it was based on remarks he never delivered.

"As the speech was prepared, some material was discarded," JENNER said. "Through error, stenographers included discarded material in the mimeographs prepared for the press. These sentences were discovered before delivery of the speech. Wire services and newspapers were called and asked to strike the sentences which were not delivered on the floor of the Senate.

"Yet these undelivered sentences were not stricken. They were carried in the eastern internationalist wing of the press. They formed the basis of an attack on me by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. I will stand on what I said. However, I do not believe I should be assailed for revised remarks."

HIT BY INTERNATIONALISTS

JENNER noted that the heaviest barrage was leveled against him in the wing of the press which has striven to hide the facts of the attack on Pearl Harbor and works to stifle any criticism of internationalism.

"This section of the press has ignored books which have disclosed facts unfavorable to the administration or internationalist point of view," he said. "They have pumped for books supporting their cause. They have built myths around their sacred cows and blasted anyone who has disagreed with the picture they would present."

At JENNER'S office it was reported that the Senator's mail on his attack against Marshall is overwhelmingly in support of the Senator. A secretary said the ratio of favorable mail is 20 to 1.

Transportation of United States Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in view of the great importance of the ques-

tion of transportation of United States mail, I have devoted considerable thought to various phases of this matter. Hearings held by our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Senate Resolution 50 have revealed facts which are at variance with statements made elsewhere.

It is because I feel that it would be for the best interests of the general public and in the aid of the national transportation system that I ask unanimous consent to place the following statement in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

Having read critical comment in the press and elsewhere concerning payments to railroads for the transportation of mail, I have followed with great interest the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Senate Resolution 50. The charge that the Government was subsidizing the railroads for this service, particularly, seemed worthy of investigation.

Certain facts were developed at the hearings which in the interests of the public, the Post Office Department and the railroads generally, should be known.

First, the railroads are required by law to transport the mail and have no choice in the matter. The Postmaster General is empowered to specify the manner and means of transporting mail, including the designation of which trains shall be used.

The law also deals with railroad compensation for mail carrying. Some years ago Congress, on the recommendation of the Post Office Department, tentatively established a space basis of payment in lieu of the weight basis theretofore existing. At the same time, the Interstate Commerce Commission was given the authority to determine which of these bases or combination of them should be applied for the future. The Commission was also authorized to fix the rates of payment after both the Post Office Department and the railroads had been given the opportunity to be heard.

In 1919 the ICC decided to continue the space basis of payment advocated by the Post Office Department and opposed by the railroads. Since that time, I understand, mail has been the only commodity transported under that basis. The space basis, being unique, posed some novel questions. For example, the movement of mail is not evenly balanced in both directions: there may be three carloads of mail moving from Baltimore to Washington daily whereas only two may be returning. However, the railroad must, under penalty of fine for failure to provide needed equipment, return all three cars to Baltimore promptly so that they can be reloaded. The difference, which is the rule rather than the exception—is called directional unbalance. A round-trip rate would, therefore, be the fairest method of compensating all railroads.

The railroads are required to carry mail in specially designed cars rather than in the less costly freight cars except during the Christmas rush. No commodity other than mail may be loaded in these cars which are made to travel in fast passenger trains.

Mail is rarely, if ever, moved in freight cars, except during the peak of the Christmas rush. Railway post office cars, and cars for transporting storage mail or express, are much more costly to construct than ordinary freight cars. Under regulations of the Post Office Department, no commodity other than mail may be loaded by the railroads in a railway post office car, and such cars unless used by the Department in both directions must be returned empty. Storage mail cars are equipped with special running equipment such as wheels, automatic brakes, and so forth, so they may meet the requirements necessary for them to move in fast passenger trains. These cars must be kept in passenger service and moved in passenger trains and returned to origin promptly. Were they permitted to enter freight service, prompt return to origin would be impossible and efficiency of the mail service would suffer.

The present railway mail rates were fixed by the ICC upon evidence of the actual cost of the service. So long as the total compensation to the roads does not exceed the total cost to the roads of providing the service, there certainly is no railroad subsidy from the Government. As a matter of fact, the present rates do not meet the cost of service. In 1947 upon evidence that the cost was $1.54 for every $1 of compensation received, the ICC authorized a 25-percent increase in the rates which had been set in 1928. It is common knowledge that in the last 3 years numerous wage increases and rises in the cost of materials have occurred.

The rate paid by the Post Office Department is 50.62 cents per mile for a 60-foot car and two-thirds of that, or 33.75 cents per mile, for a 40-foot car even though the latter holds more mail because of higher ceilings. These rates may be compared to the average rate on freight commodities of 39.75 cents per mile for a 40-foot car which figure projected would mean 59.25 for a 60-foot car.

There are additional facts relevant to the question: A shipper of freight loads and unloads his freight whereas all mail must be loaded and unloaded by railroad labor. Wage increases in recent years, together with the 40-hour week which became effective September 1, 1949, have increased the cost of handling mail at terminals, so that I am advised that such cost is more than 40 percent of the total railroad revenue for mail transportation. It should be realized that the revenues received is properly chargeable for railroad equipment for handling the mail and for land, buildings, and other facilities (in the District of Columbia more than 25 percent of the space is used for mail purposes). An allowance of only 10 percent for this factor would mean that about 50-percent compensation is spent before anything is earned in the actual carriage of the mail.

In addition there are train crews engaged in transporting the mail over the rails, plus the many experts in rail movement who must be paid. In unloading parcel post the railroad employees must read the address on each package and reload "beyond" mail in another car. No compensation other than the mileage rate is made for this service.

Let me point out that at the end of the year 1948 (December 17) an Emergency Board appointed by the President of the United States, after considering the demands of the nonoperating railroad brotherhoods, recommended that a 40-hour week, with 48 hours' pay should be established effective September 1, 1949. The railroads accepted this Board recommendation and arrived at full agreement with the nonoperating brotherhoods so that the 40-hour week became effective on September 1, 1949, as recommended. I do not criticize the Board, the nonoperating brotherhoods, or the railroads in any way. On the contrary, I commend them all for the fine American spirit of cooperation shown. Labor is entitled to fair and just compensation, and so are the railroads. But the Post Office Department did not and has not yet increased the rate of pay to the railroads for transporting the mail to assist them in meeting this added wage cost for railroad employees who are engaged in loading, unloading, and sorting the mail at terminals. On the other hand, this additional wage expense consequently further depleted the railroad revenue for transporting mail.

Indeed, I find that statistics show that the increase in the straight-time railroad rate of pay to railroad employees increased 92.8 percent from 1939 to 1949. The establishment on September 1, 1949, of the so-called 40-hour week of course required the employment of more men because the railroads must operate and the mail must move 7 days per week. I find that in October 1949, 1 month following the inauguration of the 40-hour week on September 1 of that year, the straight-time hourly rate of pay to railroad employees had increased 112.4 percent over 1939. Thus, if the labor cost of more than $63,000,000 for handling mail at stations in 1948 were increased by 19.6 percent, and assuming the volume of mail had not increased, the portion of railway mail revenue paid directly to platform labor alone would be almost 40 percent.

Of course, the railway mail revenue was higher in the calendar year 1949 than it was in 1948 because of a greatly increased volume. But the rate of pay to the railroads had not been increased, and the heavier the mail the more labor required to handle it. Therefore, the fractional ratio of platform labor cost to revenue would remain approximately the same, regardless of volume, although in dollars, the railroad losses from mail transportation would be heavily increased.

I have no means of ascertaining the precise total costs incurred by the railroads in transporting mail for our Government. But obviously the cost of labor to load, unload and sort the mail at railroad terminals for the Post Office Department must be but a small portion of the total cost. The rolling stock used to carry the mail is expensive—more so than ordinary freight cars. The railroads must provide and maintain their own right-of-way and tracks and pay taxes upon them. They must pay their operating crews and other employees fair and reasonable compensation.

To summarize, I point out again that the law requires that the railroads be fully and adequately compensated. The Interstate Commerce Commission is directed to fix the rates upon a compensatory basis. One increase of 25 percent in 1947 is the only increase in mail rates since 1928.

As I have already stated, the question of whether or not a railroad should be compensated for transportation of mail on a one-way or on a round-trip basis is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission. This issue was committed to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Commission by Congress under the 1916 act. The Commission, by letter of May 25, 1949, from its Chairman to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, stated specifically that "The Commission has complete authority" to provide for railway mail rates other than on a round-trip basis "if the evidence justifies it." The Commission Chairman stated incidentally, however, that there "appear to be sound reasons for the provision that compensation should be on a round-trip basis."

The point is that in the Mail Pay case, Docket No. 9200, now pending before the Commission, the issue of round-trip versus one-way rates has been specifically raised by the Post Office Department. The hearing on that issue, and the other issues involved in the case, is now assigned for hearing next month. It may be expected that the Post Office Department and the railroads will present their respective views and will support them by sworn testimony, in accordance with

the rules of evidence and procedure which Congress has established.

The Interstate Commerce Commission will determine the cost of the service and adjust the compensation fairly. That is the administrative body to which we have delegated that duty. It is an expert body properly equipped to discharge that obligation in the best interests of the Post Office Department and the railroads. The point I wish to emphasize is that the mail revenues of the railroads must meet the full costs of the service, or the railroads, will be faced with deficits and uneconomical operation. Where the portion paid to labor for loading and unloading, before and after the actual transportation requires approximately 40 percent of the revenue received, the charge of mail subsidy to the American railroads has a hollow sound indeed. Money flowing from the Government through the railroads to the forces of railway employees has a most direct and beneficial effect upon our national economy. That effect, however, will be neutralized if the railroads through which it flows are not compensated fairly for the services they perform.

I believe that we may rest assured that the confidence heretofore reposed in the Commission will not be abused and I should prefer to entrust the matter entirely to the well-tested processes of that expert and well-qualified body.

Legislative Responsibility for Judicial Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the text of an address prepared by Hon. Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, for delivery at the judiciary dinner of the United States on September 19, 1950.

The title of this speech is "Legislative Responsibility for Judicial Reorganization."

The dinner in question was so long that this address could not be made.

Having been granted the courtesy of seeing this advance copy of the speech, I cannot but feel that it would be a loss to the bar of this country if the text of this address should not be made available in a public record. The thoughts of Mr. Justice Clark are so cogent, and his expressions are at once so forceful and so timely, that I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this address may be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR JUDICIAL REORGANIZATION
(By Tom C. Clark)

I am most grateful for the opportunity to share this rostrum with the distinguished representatives from our sister English-speaking democracies and with our own honored chairman of the Conference of Chief Justices and the able president of the American Bar Association. As one of the most recent judicial appointees present, I am almost reluctant to discuss the subject of judicial reorganization before this gathering of eminent lawyers and jurists, many of whom bring here a richer experience and greater wisdom than my own. I feel somewhat like the brigadier general whose position in the hierarchy of field officers was described by an old top sergeant as "the lowest form of general." However, I am reassured by my discovery this past year that justices of the Supreme Court, popular belief to the contrary, never have the last word. My mistakes and oversights, while not available as reversible errors, are not likely to go unchallenged, if only by the omniscient student editors of our law reviews.

The French philosopher of democracy de Tocqueville has long been a favorite of American judges. This, I am confident, is not solely because of his flattering toast that "The peace, prosperity and the very existence of the Union are vested" in the judges. But that tribute at least establishes his qualification as an authority so that I may mention more seriously the observation in his brilliant study of American democracy a century ago that judicial power "is * * * peculiarly adapted to the wants of freedom. * * * The strength of the courts of law has always been the greatest security that can be offered to personal independence; but this is more especially the case in democratic ages." In the period since de Tocqueville wrote, the relation of the judicial function to the other processes of the law has in some respects been modified: Legislation rather than judicial law-making has become the principal source of the law's growth, and the administrative process now accounts for much of the total volume of adjudication. However, these developments, when considered in the context of judicial review, have confirmed the relation as de Tocqueville saw it between the strength of the judiciary and the security of our republican form of government. Courts that lack for courage and independence make a mockery of the democratic principle. This precept has persistent timeliness. In the perspective it affords, your efforts to strengthen the judicial function are of the greatest importance to the future of democratic institutions.

Today our concept of freedom is being hammered by a new tyranny which is all the more menacing because by infiltration it attempts to destroy us. Our courts for some time have been under strong and persistent attack, our procedures ridiculed, our motives falsely represented, and our decisions derided. Despite this infamous world-wide campaign we have proudly seen our judges magnificent in their adherence to duty. However, we must not compound our troubles by failing to improve our judicial process. We must not be indifferent to opportunities for the improvement of the judiciary merely because it is under attack or because we also have urgent international responsibilities.

Indeed ours are favorable times in which to promote a general program for advancement of the administration of justice. The strengthening of our institutions for the impartial vindication of individual rights will further challenge alien systems and support our policy of a free and peaceful world. Such an objective should appeal to the high patriotism of our citizens and reinforce our allegiance to the institutions of democratic government. Moreover, the administration of the courts is an area of government in which progress is favored by wide general agreement as to objectives among the public and their legislative representatives on the one hand, and the Bench and Bar as proponents of judicial reform on the other. All of us demand a system of just, inexpensive, and prompt determination of controversies by courts whose independence and efficiency will promote the general security and protect and preserve individual rights.

To say that our State courts are seriously in need of modernization is not to minimize our appreciation of the high standard of performance which they have maintained. But the operation of our courts must be adapted, as we would adapt any other institution or business, to the progress, the ever-changing needs, and the growing experience of a free people. Anachronisms in our judicial organization and management must be excised, and the elements of permanent value retained. The problem was clearly indicated by a Minnesota committee several years ago:

"The explanation of the inadequacy of our present judicial system lies in the fact that it was adopted to meet the needs of an earlier day having a simpler civilization and very different economic and social conditions. It has never been adjusted to the tempo of the present day, with all of its economic and social complexities. * * * Little attention has been paid to coordination or the orderly development of what could properly be called a judicial system. Rather lack of system became the rule."

Modernization has been effected to a large degree in some States, and their notable progress affords a pattern for action in jurisdictions in which the existing court structure is not yet geared to perform the heavy demands imposed upon it. In the latter States the telling symptom of the strain on judicial organization is the inability of the courts to dispose of the business before them with reasonable promptness. For example, the last report of the Judicial Council of New York State reflects alarming delays in cases filed in metropolitan centers. In New York County there was a delay of 32 months between the docketing and the trial of a jury case; in Kings County it was 27 months; Queens was somewhat better with a 21-month delay, while the Bronx had the relatively good record of 18 months. Likewise, the Judicial Council in Connecticut in its most recent announcement reported that delay in the trial of jury cases in the more populous counties had resulted in almost three times as many suits remaining on the docket as in 1946. In Wayne County (Detroit), Mich., the delay between the time a case is ready to be tried and the trial was reported to have skyrocketed from a minimum of 10 months in 1938 to 20 months 10 years later. In Texas at the time of the most recent report 94,949 cases had remained on the dockets untried for over a year, and 66,625 for over 2 years.

I have referred to these four States only because they are among the few for which statistics are available. Seventeen States, perhaps because they are reluctant to verify that delay exists in their courts, have failed to provide statistics showing the condition of their dockets. The disturbing fact is that only five States have complete statistics available, although such information is requisite to evaluation of the judicial needs of a jurisdiction. However, there is strong reason to believe that in most of the States there are unreasonable delays.

Generally speaking the difficulty is not that there are too few courts or judges. Although judges in metropolitan areas are often overworked, judges of comparable jurisdiction in other districts are hardly kept busy. This difference is not the doing of the judges, for all of them would prefer to stay busy; it results from a failure of administration that prevents the full utilization of judicial manpower. The chief difficulty is the lack of central control over the judiciary by a responsible administrator with authority to assign and transfer judges and cases from court to court as conditions require. As Chief Justice Vanderbilt's monumental

survey has disclosed, there are 11 States in which neither the State supreme court nor any central agency has control over lower courts; seven States in which the highest court possesses such power but has not exercised it; 10 States in which there is a minor degree of administrative control, limited, however, to courts within a narrow geographical district and not exercised on a Statewide basis; 16 States which have some partial measure of control through a central State authority; and only four States which have a central State court or agency with the degree of effective control over court business which is necessary to administer properly the affairs of the judicial branch.

Another factor handicapping the courts in many jurisdictions is the absence of judicial authority to adopt rules of procedure. The principle of judicial responsibility for rulemaking has been accepted as to civil proceedings in only 23 jurisdictions and as to criminal proceedings in only 14. Legislative occupation of the rule-making field has made it impossible for courts to replace time-consuming and excessively technical procedures with simple, easily applicable rules designated to facilitate the conduct of lawsuits.

Further inadequacy in many of our judicial systems results from the unsatisfactory organization of the inferior courts. Characteristically in our States there are minor courts of concurrent jurisdiction without sufficient business among them to justify multiple units. Often courts which combine the functions of chief executive of the county are administered by persons chosen for their business or administrative skill rather than for their knowledge of the law. Probate and other matters are subject to almost interminable delay because retrial is permitted after the decision of the inferior court. Juvenile and family matters which are of primary importance for the very existence of our society are not infrequently sandwiched in at times when they receive only summary consideration. Justices of the peace and similar courts handling minor offenses such as traffic violations are in many communities influenced by political considerations, and in all but two States there is no requirement for professional training of the magistrates which preside over them. Yet these are the courts in which one in five of our citizens appears every year and which shape in large measure the popular impression of the administration of justice. The picture they present is one of costly and prolonged proceedings and of judicial determination with all too often a meager quality of justice. Consolidation of the jurisdiction of the inferior courts, improvement of the professional qualifications of their judges, and the integration of those courts into a unified state judicial system are essentials.

The improvement of judicial organization and administration in the various jurisdictions must be supplemented by revision of the methods of selecting judges, and of the conditions of their tenure and compensation. In 35 States there is a requirement of popular election of most judges; in only 6 States are both trial and appellate judges appointed, and in only 3 of these do they hold office during good behavior. Moreover, in 23 States the justices of the State supreme court are paid $10,000 a year or less and in 10 more States the salary does not exceed $15,000 a year. The necessity for expensive or distasteful political activity, the brief tenure of office, and existing constitutional or statutory limitations on compensation have discouraged many persons of high ability from judicial service and have undoubtedly made it difficult for many of those who have served to maintain an impartial attitude.

Improvement of the administration of justice in our courts depends upon the fulfillment of three objectives—unity of administration, simplicity of organization, and integrity and ability of the judges. The advancement of our State judicial systems requires that these objectives be recognized as of coordinate importance, that no one of them be neglected or sacrificed. The problem was put well by Dean Pound with characteristic vision many years ago: "Things are done by the combined working of men and machinery. * * * Our ideal must be the right men with the right machinery."

In a notable address last year on the occasion of the first meeting of the Conference of Chief Justices, the Chief Justice of the United States related to you the successful work of the bench and bar in securing the adoption by Congress of the administrative program now followed in the Federal courts. Our distinguished Chief Justice pointed out that in a short dozen years the program has assumed first importance in maintaining the Federal courts on a sound and business-like basis. He suggested this conference consider the desirability of establishing comparable administrative organizations auxiliary to the State courts. Chief Justice Vinson then declared significantly that those to whom State judicial officers "must turn for authority—the legislatures—have not in most cases sanctioned programs as ambitious as * * * are necessary." He counseled that "You must convince * * * the legislature in your State that continuing improvement in court administration through adoption of business-like methods is vital to public confidence in and respect for the courts."

The present responsibility of our State legislatures is as broad as the needs of their people for an independent, competent and efficient judicial process. The task of advancing the necessary legislative and constitutional proposals is one not only for the bar but particularly for the judges. In some jurisdictions, judges have been counted among those favoring these recommendations. Further progress, however, will be difficult, if not impossible, unless the outspoken support of the judiciary is forthcoming. If the judges of a State do not take front-line positions in behalf of these fundamental proposals, the lawyers can hardly be expected to stand vigorously for changes in the structure of the courts before which they practice. But the interest of the judges should be expressed in recommendations made jointly with spokesmen of the bar and the public, preferably through judicial councils or other representative bodies.

The responsibility that rests upon our legislatures will not go unperformed when the needs of our democratic judicial process are brought before them by the united appeal of lawyers, laymen, and judges. The leadership of the lawyers and judges of this Section on Judicial Administration has been instrumental in the progress that has been made. It continues to be needed for completion of the task so ably begun.

Responsibility of Labor Unions Under Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a short news item from the New York Times of today stating that the American Bar Association has adopted a resolution favoring legislation to make labor unions which enjoy a monopoly subject to antitrust laws when their activities jeopardize the national economy, health, or safety. That is in line with Senate bill 2912, which I introduced last January, which was unanimously reported by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to the full committee, and is still pending before the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUST CURBS ASKED BY BAR FOR UNIONS—LABOR GROUPS "MONOPOLISTIC," SHOULD BE UNDER SHERMAN ACT, REPORT DECLARES

(By Lewis Wood)

WASHINGTON, September 21.—A resolution asking that labor unions be made responsible under the antitrust laws when their activities "jeopardize the national economy, health, or safety" was approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association today. The resolution said that the unions should be brought within the scope of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

The association is meeting here jointly with the Canadian Bar Association.

Holding that unions are "monopolistic" by nature, a committee report on the resolution said that they were generally free from antitrust law control.

"It now seems apparent," said the report, "that some restraint should be imposed upon the monopolistic power of labor unions when such power is exercised to imperil the national welfare. Most fair-minded people will agree that some power should be vested in the Federal Government to protect the public interests where the whole national economy is threatened by a strike in an essential industry."

Recent events indicate, said the report, that injunctions were not effective in stopping critical strikes.

RESOLUTION REFERRED FOR STUDY

"It seems appropriate," the report went on, "that the labor organizations, just like the business organizations, should be subject to criminal sanctions of the Sherman Act."

Report of Tydings Committee Investigating on Certain Charges Against the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Senate Whitewash Is a Black Mark," published in the Huronite and the Daily Plainsman, of Huron, S. Dak., for July 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE WHITEWASH IS A BLACK MARK

The report by Senators TYDINGS, MCMAHON, and GREEN denouncing Senator MCCARTHY'S charges against the State Department is one that is purely political in intent.

The aim of the three Democrat Senators who made up the majority of the five-man TYDINGS committee investigating (?) MCCARTHY'S charges of Communist influence was not so much to prove the State Department innocent as it was to criticize MCCARTHY for a "sinister campaign."

It was obvious in the conduct of the investigation that the purpose of TYDINGS was to whitewash the administration. To that end, the President denied access to the loyalty files and TYDINGS several times made deliberate misstatements to the press that he and his fellow committee members had seen certain files and that nothing had been taken from them. FBI Chief Hoover publicly had to say that TYDINGS was wrong in quoting Hoover that the files had not been rifled. And despite the fact that a week ago MCCARTHY produced signed affidavits from a former FBI man and three former State Department employees that they had been employed at one time to clear out of the loyalty files in the State Department any embarrassing material, the committee declared in the majority report that the files were okay, had not been tampered with, and revealed nothing unfavorable.

The amazing part about the majority report is the manner in which it castigates scathingly Senator MCCARTHY. They hesitated not one bit to criticize bitterly and calumnify a United States Senator who started life a relatively poor boy, worked hard, became a circuit judge in Wisconsin, saw lots of action in the Pacific theater as an officer in a Marine fighter squadron, who went on missions as a gunner and intelligence officer, and was elected United States Senator.

That man they tried to crucify with the help of many proadministration columnists, while they gave a clean bill of health of MCCARTHY'S targets. And who were the heroes to whom the committe gave a clean bill of health? These are some.

1. Owen J. Lattimore, who wasn't proved to be a member of the Communist Party, but who certainly was proved by documents, pictures and testimony to have been a close friend and confidante of proved Communists while he was supposedly working for the United States. He was also the man who advised the State Department in October 1949 to abandon Korea to the Communists and to let the Communists have a freer hand in Japan and Indochina. Those facts are in the record.

2. John J. Service, a career diplomat in the State Department and supposed expert on the Far East, who transported out of the office secret files and papers on the Far East to Philip Jaffe, Communist editor of Amerasia magazine, a small magazine devoted to far eastern affairs. That fact he admitted himself on the witness stand. A lot of people knew Jaffe was a Communist. If Service was the expert the State Department said he was, he also certainly knew. So he gave him secret documents. He did not give them to the AP or UP reporters, or the New York Times or Washington Post. He gave them to a man pretty well known as a Communist. MCCARTHY had a longer list of charges against Service, but that one Service himself admitted and that one alone should condemn him as the bad security risk MCCARTHY said he was. But the TYDINGS majority overlooks Service's own confession, slapped him on the wrist for indiscretion, and said that he was not either a bad risk.

3. The Department of Justice and other administration officials who completely botched the 1945 Amerasia stolen-documents case. The TYDINGS majority committee report gave the Government a clean bill of health in the Amerasia case, and that is absolutely amazing, if not downright disheartening and disgusting to every intelligent American. For it was very obvious from the surface facts of the case that the Government failed to punish traitors and spies and protected some people, although the evidence was unmistakable.

On March 12, 1945, Office of Strategic Services, (cloak-and-dagger) agents raided the office of Amerasia and found hundreds of Government documents there—all of them from State Department secret files and many of them marked top secret and containing top level military information on the war. How did those hundreds of secret and top secret documents get from State Department files in Washington to Amerasia office files in New York? Nobody ever explained it and the Tydings committee hushed it up just as the Department of Justice did in 1945 when it got indictments for only three out of six persons arrested (one of them a naval lieutenant) and the judge fined editor Communist Jaffe a paltry $2,500, a second one $500 and dismissed the charges against the third. The story of the raid and what was found made headlines in March 1945. No group—and least of all the Tydings committee—investigated to get the full explanation of just who was the traitor in the State Department. Or traitors.

And the TYDINGS' committee blasts MCCARTHY for his "sinister campaign" in asking questions about it and reports that the Government—meaning the State Department and the Department of Justice—gets a clean bill of health for the way it handled the Amerasia case.

These facts add up to nothing more nor less than an official condonement of treachery in the Amerasia case, a pat on the back for the man who is obviously a bad security risk in the Service case and a posy for the man who advised his country to take the exact course the Communists wanted, to the disadvantage of the United States, and a course which has now been directly reversed, in the Lattimore case. In truth, the Lattimore line of "we should not defend Korea" undoubtedly encouraged the Red attack there.

Not only does the report whitewash those things but it then proceeds in an attempt to crucify an American who wanted the whole double-crossed American public to know about them!

The Tydings committee is truly bad tidings, and, to paraphrase its description of MCCARTHY'S charges the report itself is "a fraud and a hoax" upon the American public.

Republicans-for-Lucas League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, recently in a press conference the President of the United States recalled that often in the Senate I vote with the Republicans. It is true that I do vote as I see questions regardless of political party sponsorship. Consequently I get great satisfaction out of the knowledge that Illinois Republicans have formed the Republicans-for-Lucas League to support actively the majority leader and my revered friend, SCOTT W. LUCAS, in his campaign for reelection to the United States Senate. On September 22, Paul Potter, cochairman of this league, presided on a radio program in which numerous Republican leaders paid down-to-earth and warm tribute to the distinguished statesman from Illinois, SCOTT W. LUCAS.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of that program so that Congress and the country may know the affection and respect in which Republicans in his home State hold SCOTT W. LUCAS.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LUCAS. My friends in Illinois, this will be my last broadcast sponsored by a group of Republican citizens and independent voters who are strongly supporting me for reelection to the United States Senate this year. Next week I will begin a series of broadcasts in which I will discuss the major issues of the 1950 campaign.

In these reports from Washington I have discussed with you important legislation affecting the foreign policy of America and the future of the free way of life. I have tried to be completely objective in these broadcasts, because I am a firm believer in the principle of bipartisanship on all matters which affect the fundamental safety and security of our country and our civilization.

The Republican voters and independent citizens who have sponsored these radio reports have done so because they feel that I have made a consistent effort to place the welfare of my country above any considerations of political advantages. I am deeply grateful to them for their confidence and faith in me.

I can assure all the people of Illinois that I have never cast a vote on any piece of legislation affecting the national defense or the foreign policy of America with any thought of playing upon the political passions of the people. When I am relected to the Senate on November 7, I pledge to you that I will continue the steadfast course I have pursued during my years of public service.

For this closing broadcast, I have with me several members of the Republicans for Lucas League. I want you to hear from Paul Potter, cochairman of this league, a bona fide registered Republican and prominent businessman from Lake County, who is working enthusiastically and vigorously for my relection. Here is Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. I am pleased to participate with many other staunch supporters of the senior Senator in Illinois, SCOTT W. LUCAS, and work for his reelection by an overwhelming majority on November 7. I know that there are thousands of businessmen in this State who are deeply concerned about the future of this Nation, of their business, and the welfare of their families. Much depends upon the leadership in the Senate in the next 6 years in guiding whatever administration is in the White House along the lines that will be for the best interests of the American people. A large number of us feel that we are not in any way deserting the Republican Party in forming the Republicans for Lucas League. Rather, we feel that the Re-

publican Party leaders in Illinois have in fact deserted the voters of this party in attempting to sidetrack the avowed foreign policies on which the last Republican Presidential campaign was conducted. The American bipartisan foreign policy, authored by Senator VANDENBERG, Senator LUCAS, Senator CONNALLY, and others, is vital as a bulwark for freedom and peace among the nations of the earth.

Six years ago thousands of good Republicans took this same action at the polls. Such action followed the voluntary and spontaneous formation of a State-wide movement, called the Republicans for Lucas League. We campaigned in our own districts and communities, for the man we feel best qualified for the important Senate seat, regardless of party. We want the State of Illinois up in front on all vital questions of both foreign and domestic policy. SCOTT LUCAS, as majority leader in the Senate, has done just that. Speaking fearlessly and showing qualities of leadership in the Senate, he reflects favorably on this great State of Lincoln's training for leadership.

Now, with vital problems of world concern before us, why should Illinois risk a change that would put this State down the list in important Senate committees and influence? Seniority and experience are needed now as never before in Congress. SCOTT LUCAS is revered and respected on both sides of the floor, in Senate debate and in reconciling important differences. He stood up for the Anderson plan, when his State's farm interest were paramount, just as he opposed the packing of the Supreme Cour in a previous Congress. He is capable. He is hard working and conscientious. He has qualities of leadership that befit a Senator from Illinois. That's why so many will disregard party politics this November, and vote for Senator LUCAS again.

You can help by signifying your willingness to vote for SCOTT LUCAS on November 7 and ask many others to do likewise.

I would now like to call on the co-chairman of our Republicans for Lucas League in Illinois, Mr. Oakley Adkins, who is a farmer in Mason County, the home county of Senator LUCAS, and is also Republican member of the board of supervisors. Oakley Adkins.

Mr. ADKINS. Senator SCOTT LUCAS and I live in the same county. I have known him for 25 years, and I have watched him develop from State's attorney of our county to his present position as majority leader of the United States Senate.

The people of his home county have a warm affection for SCOTT LUCAS, as well as a great admiration for his ability and his achievements. He has many friends in both political parties.

Although I am a Republican and Senator LUCAS is a Democrat, I am supporting him for reelection to the Senate this year, as I did in 1944, because I believe that he has served all the people of Illinois during his years in the Senate. He has been one of the leaders in creating and maintaining our bipartisan foreign policy. I have backed that policy because I know that it offers us a constructive program for attaining an enduring peace in the world.

As a farmer, I know that SCOTT LUCAS deserves credit for helping to establish the national farm program which has brought us such tremendous prosperity to the farmers of Illinois. I know that the Republican candidate for the Senate tried to cripple the soil-conservation program, the rural-electrification program, and other programs vital to all farmers regadless of party. Senator LUCAS has a splendid farm record and his opponent has a very bad record.

So my belief in our successful farm program is another reason for my strong support of Senator LUCAS. We know that Senator LUCAS is opposed to the Brannan plan.

As cochairman of the Republicans for Lucas League, I am very pleased and happy about the enthusiastic response of Illinois Republicans to the league's call for bipartisan backing for Senator LUCAS. It is a source of great satisfaction to know that in this grave hour of history independent Republican citizens all over our country are rising above party considerations to express their faith and confidence in the wisdom, the high ability, and the sound integrity of our senior Senator, SCOTT LUCAS. Messages of support have come to me from Republicans all over our State who realize that Senator LUCAS is one of the foremost leaders of America today.

These Republicans share my conviction that it would be a tragedy for our State and for our country to lose his splendid services at a time when the fate of civilization despends upon wise leadership.

Senator LUCAS has worked in harmony with Senator VANDENBERG to keep America in the forefront of the free world. He deserves to be reelected because he is a statesman who has earned the respect and honor of his fellow Americans.

Mr. POTTER. Thank you, Mr. Adkins. Now, I would like to call on Mr. David Garrick, a businessman in Streator.

Mr. GARRICK. I am happy to be on this program as an independent Republican here in Streator. I am proud that I was permitted to introduce SCOTT LUCAS at a luncheon in his honor here in Streator today, given by independent voters and Republicans. I wish that every Republican in Illinois who is interested in independent thought and action could have heard the frank, patriotic, and independent speech the Senator made to the large audience assembled. It is a further pleasure and distinct honor to appear on this program sponsoring the Senator's reelection.

Mr. POTTER. Thank you, Mr. Garrick. I would now like to call on Mr. Chester Wonderlin, a businessman in Bloomington, Ill., secretary of the Republicans for Lucas League in Illinois.

Mr. WONDERLIN. As secretary of the Republicans for Lucas League, I am delighted to participate in this program. I want the people of Illinois to know that we independent Republicans have wholeheartedly sponsored and paid for this movement to reelect Senator LUCAS on November 7.

Mr. POTTER. Now, I would like to call on Mr. Ken Braendle, of Havana, Ill., the home town of Senator LUCAS, who is editor of a paper there and who has volunteered to be an executive director of the Republicans for Lucas League in Illinois—Mr. Braendle.

Mr. BRAENDLE. A few weeks ago at the Abraham Lincoln Hotel in the capital city of Illinois, it was my pleasure and privilege to become affiliated with the Republicans for Lucas League, an organization brought into being for the sole purpose of helping to reelect SCOTT W. LUCAS to the United States Senate.

My reasons for becoming identified with this movement are substantially the same as those which motivated the other Republicans present, and here, please let me interject that although Senator LUCAS is a resident of Havana and Mason County and the folks there are mighty proud of him, that is perhaps the very least of my own reasons for advocating his return to the Senate at the election this fall. There are many reasons which to me are much more important than the mere fact that SCOTT LUCAS lives in my home town.

For instance, it is important to me and to every farmer-citizen of the great Midwest, that SCOTT LUCAS is a friend of agriculture. He has proved that, time after time by his vote on legislation affecting the lives and fortunes of the American farmer. This record is written not in words alone, but in the twinkling lights of thousands of farm homes right here in Illinois; in the labor-saving devices, the comforts of life, the convenience and added efficiency that only electricity can bring. The Illinois farmer and his family remember that SCOTT LUCAS was their stanch friend in the fight for funds to electrify the American farm.

And what a boon it was for the businessman who provided the farmer with the thousand-and-one electrical contrivances now in common use—motors, refrigerators, ironers, radios, washing machines, stoves—the modern conveniences so essential in the American way of life, that only a few short years ago were unavailable to those living more than just a short distance from a town or city. The manifold benefits of electrification to the farmer, the businessman and the laborer, are simply incalculable.

Add to this record that Senator LUCAS has always been in the vanguard of those who have battled for equitable prices for the products of agriculture, for soil conservation, the benefits of which are becoming apparent as our Nation grows older, and you will agree with me that SCOTT LUCAS is indeed one of the greatest friends of the farmer in the United States Senate.

Another principal reason convincing me that there is something far more important than voting Republican in the senatorial race at this time is the record of this great American liberal, who with scant regard for his political future, has persistently and courageously waged a determined battle for adequate American defenses, for the bipartisan foreign policy, the world's last remaining hope for an enduring peace. With vision and fortitude, he has labored hand in hand with the other patriotic statesmen who created the bipartisan foreign policy and placed the welfare of their country above partisan politics. Certainly America cannot revert to primitive isolationism. We cannot retreat from a bold program to defeat communism. We cannot abandon our friends in Europe and Asia to the Kremlin and its satellite. America and the world needs stalwart men like SCOTT LUCAS and ARTHUR VANDENBERG in the United States Senate.

Illinois needs Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS. Illinois can lead with LUCAS. Illinois can render a monumental service to the American farmer, the American laborer, the American businessman, and the world by returning him to the United States Senate.

Mr. POTTER. Thank you, Mr. Braendle, and now, Senator, we would like to hear from you again.

Senator LUCAS. Gentlemen, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for these kind and generous words, the confidence you have reposed in me. And I assure you it will never be abused. With such independent help, victory is assured on November 7.

The McCarran-Wood Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the President's message vetoing the McCarran-Wood bill will go down in history

as a truly great American statement. It should be studied by every American.

It is the duty of the Congress and the President to maintain internal security, but it also is their duty to preserve the rights and privileges and freedoms of the American people.

Those who have used the Korean crisis to enlarge their wave of fear and panic that they might force through legislation to fetter the mind and spirit of America are sapping the well springs of our strength.

The President is not indifferent to communism or the dangers of espionage and sabotage by Communist agents. He has asked for legislation to strengthen those laws necessary to fight communism, and in this I have fully supported him.

Today I have introduced a bill which, in my opinion, would deal adequately with the problem of maintaining our internal security without impinging on the rights and freedoms and privileges of the American people, which the Wood-McCarran bill undoubtedly will do.

The Wood-McCarran bill which the President has vetoed would not deal accurately and realistically with the dangers of Communist action. Instead, it would undermine those American freedoms that make our fight against communism essential.

All of us want to do everything that is really necessary to protect ourselves from the evil of communism. But it would be tragic indeed if we were to undercut the freedom of our own people, and detract from our leadership in the world fight for freedom against communism in the process of doing so.

I have voted against the Wood bill in the House of Representatives because I felt that this particular bill would be entirely ineffective to prevent Communist espionage and sabotage, while undermining fundamental liberties guaranteed under the Constitution. I have voted for every measure which I felt was genuinely aimed at making America strong against Communist attack from within and without our borders.

I feel that my reasons for opposing the Wood bill have now been upheld by the President's veto. That decision of the President to veto was reached after consultation with the security and intelligence agencies of the Government. The Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State all concurred that the bill would seriously damage the security and intelligence operations for which they were responsible.

We must be secure in this Nation from the work of traitors, but our greatest danger is not treason; it is the fear and hysteria which jeopardize those freedoms which are our greatest weapon and our greatest treasure.

Hon. Alexander Wiley's Educational Motion Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a release which I have issued on the subject of a 16 mm. educational motion picture which I have prepared and which I am releasing among Wisconsin civic organizations.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this release be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY INVITES ORGANIZATIONS TO BORROW HIS NEWLY PRODUCED 16 MM. MOTION PICTURE; AN EDUCATIONAL FILM, DESCRIBING AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AMIDST KOREAN CRISIS

Production and release of a 16 mm. sound motion picture on the problems of American Government amidst the Korean emergency, have been announced by Senate ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, Chippewa Falls).

Arrangements are now being made for lending free prints of the educational, nonpartisan film to Wisconsin civic organizations requesting their use.

"I have prepared this 22 minute film entitled 'America in Crisis' at my own expense in order to show the American people some of the problems which we face at home and abroad in this midcentury," Senator WILEY said. "This film is one more means by which I feel a legislator can report to his constituents. In this modern age, it is essential that Congressmen use the most modern type of communications available."

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES FURNISHED PART OF FOOTAGE

The Wisconsin Senator has long been keenly interested in motion pictures as a powerful medium of information.

He has expressed his appreciation of the cooperation shown to him by the United States Signal Corps in making available documentary footage, the United States Corps of Engineers in enabling him to use motion picture sound studio equipment at the Engineers Research Development Laboratory, and several other Government agencies which also cooperated in furnishing brief film clips for the project. Costs for commercial processing of the film, etc., were paid out of Senator WILEY's pocket, however.

THEME OF FILM IS WISCONSINITE'S VISIT TO CAPITOL

The theme of the picture is Senator Wiley Reports To Bill Jones, an Average Wisconsinite. The preface shows Bill Jones, an amputee veteran (played by a serviceman who had actually lost an arm in combat) coming up the Capitol steps in order to "find out what it is all about."

One of the opening scenes shows the United States Capitol on which have been superimposed battle scenes of American Infantry in action, thus symbolizing the fight of GI's to preserve American freedom.

The main emphasis of the film is on the crisis of United States foreign policy arising out of Communist aggression. The background to the Korean war is shown in scenes of the signing in 1928 of the Kellog-Briand Peace Treaty, scenes of destruction in World War II, the explosion of the first atomic bomb in New Mexico, the activities of the United Nations, as well as Signal Corps footage of Dictator Joseph Stalin.

The home front is not neglected in that there is extensive footage also showing scenes of America's basic freedoms as well as her problems—industrial justice, dust bowls, and other key issues of the past, present, and future.

WISCONSIN CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS INVITED TO REQUEST FREE LOAN OF FILM

The Senator has issued an invitation to all Wisconsin civic organizations to write to him to obtain a free print of the film. The prints will be loaned without charge to any public-spirited organization—veterans' groups, farm, women's organizations, service clubs, youth groups, schools, churches, forums, and any other civic-minded organization which wants to show factually what Congress' work is like and how our two other branches—executive and judicial—work.

PROCEDURE FOR BORROWING OF PRINT

An organization president or secretary desiring to borrow a print should write to: Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

The following data should be furnished to the Senator: (a) Organization before which the picture will be shown; (b) approximate number of people expected at showing; (c) date of showing.

The print will be promptly forwarded from Washington. All that the organization need do is exercise care in the print's handling and pay the slight postage for promptly forwarding the print on to the next group in that area which has requested it. The next recipient's name and address will be forwarded by the Senator along with the print.

"In order to have as many folks as possible see the film, we will try to schedule the mailing of the limited number of prints as carefully and tightly as possible, rather than allow the prints to lie around unused."

DOCUMENTARY FILM IS FIRST OF ITS KIND BY A LEGISLATOR

It has been pointed out that although a few Members of the Congress have made 16 millimeter motion-picture films, those films have usually been exclusively devoted to stock shots of the Senate and House, or of Washington statues and memorials. "America in Crisis" is the first legislator-produced motion picture which actually shows some of the basic problems in current affairs, like the problem of military preparedness and other issues, and which attempts, moreover, to use the motion-picture medium in a modest, semiprofessional way with a varied musical soundtrack.

Work on the nonpolitical film was performed during evenings and in a few afternoons when the pressure of Senate activities permitted.

AIM OF FILM TO STIMULATE THINKING

Senator WILEY narrates only a brief portion of the film and is himself seen on the screen for but a few feet. "My aim was to stimulate interest in our Government and to encourage thinking about its problem and the only way to accomplish that was by showing the key issues of our times themselves," the Badger Senator stated.

"I hope to tour much of Wisconsin, showing the film myself. But since I am neces-

sarily limited as to the number of audiences I can personally reach, I hope many organizations will write in for a print—and that they will, if necessary, borrow a 16-millimeter sound projector from some local source in order to show it."

Federal Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this tax bill—H. R. 8920—which provides for increasing personal and corporate income taxes by $4,500,000,000, but I want to go on record as doing so under protest. I feel that the Congress has done a great injustice to the American people by its failure to include a tax on excess profits at this time.

Today corporation profits are running at the rate of $23,500,000,000 after taxes, which is the highest profit level in American history. These profits are the easiest and most accessible source of new revenues, and yet the excuse given for not levying an excess-profits tax is that "We have not time to take up such legislation."

I refuse to buy this "we haven't time" argument. The House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee have found time to increase income taxes—they have found time to increase the tax burden on the worker, the farmer, and the average citizen. But they just have not time to levy a tax on the bloated profits of the great corporations and monopolies. So the excess-profits tax has been postponed until after November.

This income-tax increase—and the failure to tax profits—has the effect of further breaking down the progressive nature of the Federal tax structure. It represents a continuation of the trend that began back in 1941 involving a shifting of a larger share of the tax burden from the corporations to the individual taxpayer, and from the big taxpayer to the low-income groups.

I will illustrate with a few statistics. In 1939 individual income taxes accounted for 25 percent of all Federal revenues, and corporation taxes accounted for 24 percent. Today, individual income taxpayers are furnishing 53 percent of Federal revenues—an increase of 28 percent—while corporations are paying only 23 percent, which is a drop of 1 percent. In short, the individual is paying an ever-greater part of the taxes, and the corporations are having their percentage share reduced.

Now, let us look at it from another angle. In 1939 those individuals with annual incomes below $5,000 paid only 10 percent of the income tax revenues. In 1949 those with incomes under $5,000 paid about 60 percent of income-tax revenues. This means that the tax burden has been shifted from the upper to the lower-income groups.

So I find it rather tragic that this Congress now insists on taxing incomes at increased rates but postpones action on excess profits. It is the same old story of selfish interests influencing the deliberations of Congress. I condemn this double standard whereby Congress soaks the little fellow but spares the profiteers and the corporations. I say that if there must be sacrifice, let there be equality of sacrifice. I cannot appreciate this kind of skullduggery—and our boys fighting in Korea—and their families who must wait until December 1 before receiving their allowance checks—are not going to appreciate it, either.

The Giant Awakens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, America is today forcefully and determinedly fulfilling its role as the leader among free nations of the world. In this connection I wish to call the attention of the House to a significant and splendid editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Fort Wayne Journal Gazette.

The editorial reads as follows:

THE GIANT AWAKENS

The spirit of the benevolent giant among nations which America displayed during World War II is awakening again.

We see it in the daring landing of United States troops far behind the enemy lines in Korea.

We see it in the various moves which are being taken to strengthen the Nation's defenses.

The frustrations which have been evident for the past year or two will soon begin to disappear as potential energy is harnessed in a mighty effort for freedom.

Would-be world conquerors in the Kremlin should not underestimate the toughness and resourcefulness of the American people once they set themselves to a major task. There has never been another nation like the United States since the dawn of history.

There is something different in the air of this New World. Perhaps the magic element is freedom. From that, all other distinguishing characteristics seem to flow.

We have been slow to rise to the challenge of Russian totalitarianism, hoping that the madness would somehow abate.

But the Korean aggression set off the burglar alarm and in the past few weeks we have done very well, for a nation which was supposed to have nothing to fight with except atomic bombs, in a situation where those weapons were not effective.

The anvil chorus of defeatism has been heard in every great cause in which America has ever participated. That is the poorly behaved minority, which is always with us.

Washington heard it during the Revolution, but he paid no attention to it. It was music in the ears of George III until the tide turned.

Lincoln heard it during the Civil War, but it did not sway him from his firm purpose. Jeff Davis counted too much on it.

Defeatism is not in the true American spirit. The spirit is to buckle down to do the job, and the bigger the job the better the effort.

We say that the United States is the benevolent giant among the nations, slow to arouse, but invincible in great actions worthy of its ideals.

Now we are mobilizing in defense of freedom and we say to Stalin "Stop, look and listen."

America has never bowed to the dictates of a tyrant and she never will.

It's against her principles.

Slandering Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, over the years it has been a partisan Republican pastime to not only ridicule and abuse the faithful and hard-working Federal employees but to slander indiscriminately and to vilify them without any cause or reason. Ofttimes it appeared to be for the sheer delight of doing so, a form of official sadism.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the printed hearings of the purposeful investigations reek with uncomplimentary references and sly innuendoes leveled against public officials, but more often with abuse of the subordinate Government employees innocent of any wrongdoing and helpless to defend themselves. It is a fact that Government personnel are generally employed at wages and salaries lower than are paid for comparable work in private industry, and work harder too.

They have progressively been called worse names as time went on. Thus in the early thirties the Federal employee was called an idler or a boondoggler, but later and more boldly, he was referred to as a bureaucratic chiseler to whatever degree his vilifier chose to malign him.

It seems that a competitive spirit of abuse and intimidation prevailed and extended throughout the entire Republican campaign organization in and out of season and included candidates from Congressman to constable, and not excepting the Republican Presidential nominee, who in his repertoire referred to Government employees as morons whom he promised to chastise and clean out in the greatest sweep ever to be undertaken in Washington. He failed to reach the opposite shore. He was swamped in the sea of ballots that saved the faithful Government worker from partisan vengeance, and for a while therefore the name calling and abuse subsided. In recent months, however, the campaign of vituperation reached the lowest depths of degradation when unfounded disloyalty charges and the brand of traitor, the lowest possible name, was applied to officials and employees without naming individuals,

thus characterizing and placing all under suspicion.

It is a common and everyday occurrence to smear the Federal service with charges of socialism and vile communism, then adding insult to injury labeling the men and women as sex perverts.

Mr. Speaker, the pay-off comes once every 2 years, but it comes. Then the tables are turned, and then the immunity of the vilifier is meaningless. The Government employee whether in the Post Office, the Internal Revenue Bureau, or any other agency or department can and will strike back with the most effective secret weapon wielded behind the curtain of the election booth. All the ranting of the paid political commentators and of the "presstitutes" and other similar influences will not prevail against the retribution which is due and follows the sinful and indiscriminate slander just as sure as day follows the darkness of night.

Certainly it is the duty of officials and of plain citizens alike to help ferret out subversives and the inefficient and idle in Government, but honesty, sincerity, and decency must stand the test of specific charges being leveled against particular individuals who should be named. To do otherwise is unjust, false, and hypocritical. The American sense of fair play will not condone continuance of such practice.

A Summary of the Actions of the Eighty-first Congress on National and International Affairs

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, the second and final session of the Eighty-first Congress has not yet been concluded, but for all practical purposes the record has been made and I feel it very much in order to briefly review the accomplishments of this Congress. I therefore wish to set down the more outstanding measures of importance, without at the same time detracting therefrom by indulging in any considerable comment concerning the various legislative enactments. The record speaks for itself, and the Congress will be judged on such record regardless of partisan comment. It cannot be disputed that the Congress as a whole has been a very independent Congress; it has, generally speaking, been a Congress subservient to no one except the people of this great Nation. This Congress has on several occasions over-ridden Presidential vetoes and has on other occasions taken action directly contrary to the wishes of the Executive. It has also taken action in accordance with the position of the Executive, and the sum total of its accomplishments is indeed substantial, regardless of whether or not one may happen to disagree with certain of the legislative enactments.

It is interesting to note that the Eighty-first Congress is the tenth Democratic Congress since 1900, there having been 13 Republican-controlled Congresses since that time. In the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress there were initially 262 Democrats, 171 Republicans and 1 American Labor Party Member. There were 118 new Members, 103 of whom were Democrats, and 15 of whom were Republicans. There were 9 women Members. The Senate consisted of 54 Democrats and 42 Republicans; there having been 18 new Senators, 14 of whom were Democrats and 4 Republicans.

It is obvious that this has been a Congress which weighed carefully the vital legislative issues brought forth for its consideration. This has unquestionably been a healthy condition for the country. I cannot help but again point out the fact that article I, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States places the legislative power of our Government in the Congress of the United States. Certainly there should be cooperation between the respective branches of our Government, but there never must be subservience. Our system of checks and balances constitutes in large measure our foundation of strength through which our future freedom and independence as a people and Nation may be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, having made the foregoing brief comment concerning our Congress and Government, I wish at this time to set forth the leading accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress:

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

The Eighty-first Congress enacted the Reorganization Act of 1949, which authorized the President to reorganize executive departments in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The act itself provides for the submission of reorganization plans to the Congress by the President, each of which would become effective after 60 days of subsequent continuous session of Congress, unless a concurrent resolution expressing disapproval of the plan be passed by a constitutional majority of either House prior to the end of the 60-day period. A few of the plans submitted occasioned some dispute as to whether or not such plan actually conformed to the original recommendation. As a result, a few of the reorganization plans submitted were rejected. It might be mentioned further that the Congress become aware of the fact that some people wanted economy only when it did not affect their own department or their own personal affairs.

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress approved on August 19, 1949, six out of seven reorganization plans submitted in 1949. In addition, during the first session, unification of the armed services was accomplished, although it should be mentioned that certain modifications still need to be made. During the second session 16 additional plans of reorganization were submitted and become effective on May 23, 1950. Our efforts toward governmental reorganization have not met with 100 percent success, but some substantial progress has been made. Certainly it is incumbent upon all responsible officials in both the executive and legislative branches of Government to devote themselves unceasingly toward achieving greater economy and efficiency in all respects in the operation of our Government.

SOCIAL SECURITY, LABOR, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Among the leading accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress in this particular category may be listed the following legislative actions: The passage of the Social Security Act of 1950, which extended coverage to over 10,000,000 additional persons for benefits of the old-age and survivors benefits program, increasing payments as much as 100 percent in some cases, plus various other changes and improvements; the passage of a new and revised minimum-wage law which increased the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour—Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949; legislation clarifying overtime-pay provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and outlawing retroactive claims; revision of Classification Act and including increased pay to classified employees; legislation improving working conditions and providing pay increases of postal-service employees; the appropriation of $1,500,000 in emergency funds for crippled children; legislation continuing for 1 year Federal aid for schools with war-swollen populations and for education of children on Federal reservations; the extension of the present Federal-aid program for hospital construction until 1955, combined with a provision for increasing the amount of said aid from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 annually; passage of the public housing law of 1949 providing, among other things, for the construction of 810,000 public-housing units to be built in the next 6 years; expanded and liberalized Federal housing assistance; establishment of a National Science Foundation; authorization of disaster relief grants by the Federal Government to States and local governments; authorized the United States Public Health Service to support research and training in rheumatism, arthritis, multiple schlerosis, cerebral palsy, and epilepsy.

AGRICULTURE

The Eighty-first Congress authorized United States participation in the International Wheat Agreement; authorized continuance of 90 percent support of farm prices through 1950, thereafter providing for revision of such to a sliding scale and new parity; revised the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation so as to permit the Government to provide and construct adequate crop storage facilities, and provided for exchange of surplus commodities for strategic and critical materials; authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make production disaster loans to farmers; provided emergency appropriation for relief loans to farmers whose crops were destroyed in the severe western blizzard of 1949; extended and broadened the crop insurance program. This Congress further enacted the rural telephone legislation and authorized the

Rural Electrification Administration to make loans for construction of rural telephone lines; repealed the tax on oleomargarine; authorized continuing appropriations for research, rural electrification, reforestation, soil conservation, school lunch program, extension program, Farmers Home Administration, and appropriations for the prevention of certain diseases in crops and animals.

I wish to point out in connection with the REA program, that in the 14 years of REA's existence, the number of farmers in the United States having this very important service has increased from a little over 10 percent to over 75 percent of all the farmers in the country. It is also significant to note the value of our investment in REA; less than six-tenths of 1 percent of REA borrowers are delinquent as much as 30 days in their repayment of loans. It has been my pleasure to have served on the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, which committee is not a legislative committee, but rather is a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

In conclusion, and in connection with the agricultural programs of this country, I wish to state that the overwhelmingly important thing is to recognize that agriculture is basic. The problem is not political. An agriculture program must be soundly conceived and in the public interest, and must be such as to preserve the dignity of the farmer himself. Our attention must be given to the continued conservation of our natural resources, as such is vital to the continued welfare of the Nation.

INTERNAL SECURITY

The Eighty-first Congress enacted legislation authorizing the summary dismissal of employees for security reasons, by the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force, Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; made it a criminal offense and provided penalties for revealing information about official secret codes; tightened the Foreign Agents Registration Act; provided the President with power to control the number of and to search foreign vessels in United States waters. Finally, and of momentous importance, the Eighty-first Congress passed the strongest law in the field of internal security ever enacted by a United States Congress, the omnibus Communist control bill which was passed overwhelmingly by the Congress. Briefly stated, it is an omnibus antisubversive act to protect internal security, and requires registration of Communist members and authorizes their confinement in wartime. Certainly the Congress has acted in an enlightened and constructive manner in enacting the foregoing legislation, thereby strengthening America's hand in dealing with the menace of communism here at home.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The Eighty-first Congress authorized the continuance and financing of the European recovery program; aid to Greece and Turkey, and relief of occupied areas; the Senate ratified the Atlantic Pact; the Congress restored and extended the reciprocal trade-agreements program; enacted the mutual defense-assistance program, thereby authorizing military aid to western Europe, Nationalist China, Korea, Iran, and the Philippine Republic; enacted legislation permitting national and State banks in Federal Reserve System to deal in securities in the International Bank for reconstruction and development; authorized aid to underdeveloped nations needing technical assistance under the President's point 4 program. The Eighty-first Congress further amended the Displaced Persons Act to remove certain discriminatory provisions and liberalized other provisions of the law.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Eighty-first Congress immediately following the outbreak of the Korean war appropriated over $17,000,000,000 in additional funds for the armed services and for military assistance to our allies. During the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the Korean war approximately 13½ billion dollars per year was being spent on the armed services alone. The Eighty-first Congress further passed legislation furthering unification of the armed services; extended the Selective Service Act and authorized the President to call up the National Guard and Reserves; authorized the induction into military service of certain doctors, dentists, and allied specialists, and established priorities as to order of induction; enacted legislation providing allowances to dependents of men in the service; authorized a 2-year, $596,000,000 program of public-works construction in Armed Forces installations in United States and abroad; authorized a construction program of armories and related facilities for National Guard and Reserves; removed limitation on size of Armed Forces; authorized a $350,000,000 naval ship-construction program which included the modernizing of submarines and construction of the first atomic-powered submarine. The Eighty-first Congress further passed legislation modernizing the internal organization of the Army; established a uniform code of military justice for all branches of the Armed Forces and the Coast Guard; provided military-pay increases totaling $300,000,000; defined the authority and powers of the Central Intelligency Agency and provided certain improvements in operation and administration; authorized the establishment of a guided-missile proving ground for the testing of rockets and similar weapons of warfare; authorized the construction and equipment of a guided-missile research laboratory for the National Bureau of Standards; authorized the construction of a supersonic wind tunnel and engineering center; authorized construction of permanent military public works in Alaska and Okinawa.

VETERANS

The Eighty-first Congress, as of September 1, 1950, devoted a considerable percentage of its time on deliberations affecting veterans; the records indicate that nearly 20 percent of the well over 600 laws passed by Congress, as of the aforementioned date, related to veterans and their dependents or the Veterans' Administration. Among the more prominent actions in this regard are the following: Legislation permitting payment to veterans of retroactive benefits during hospitalization; legislation extending the time for filing in certain cases for benefits and compensation, legislation increasing from 75 to 100 percent the rates of payment for presumed service-connected disabilities and providing liberalization of certain other benefits; legislation granting additional allowances for veterans who have been paralyzed from service-connected brain injuries; legislation defining authority of Veterans' Administration in carrying out veterans' education program under GI bill of rights. In addition, it should be pointed out that the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1950 will approximate $6,500,000,000. Assistance to veterans was rendered in many regards in certain provisions of housing legislation enacted by the Congress. As of the present time, over $60,000,000,000 has been spent on benefits and services for veterans of all wars.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The Eighty-first Congress, prior to Korea, strongly resisted efforts to increase taxes and in fact the House of Representatives adopted a bill reducing in some respects the citizens' tax bill, in particular as regards excise taxes. Following Korea the Congress immediately went to work and passed a tax bill increasing taxes so as to better be able to meet the costs of the Korean war and further related contingencies. The Congress has of this date gone on record indicating overwhelmingly that action shall be taken at this session of Congress on an excess-profits tax, and action is expected to be taken in the near future. The Eighty-first Congress amended the Federal deposit insurance law so as to authorize Federal insurance of bank deposits on accounts up to $10,000. The Eighty-first Congress created a Small Business Committee in both the House and Senate and authorized an investigation of crime and racketeering in interstate commerce. Finally, in view of the international situation, the Eighty-first Congress enacted the Defense Production Act which authorized price, wage, and credit controls, covers assistance to defense plants, a system of priorities and allocation of materials essential to the national defense effort, and provided certain penalties for hoarding.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing record does not profess or is not meant to be all-inclusive, as it definitely does not contain all matters acted upon by the Eighty-first Congress. The foregoing does, however, contain the leading measures of national and international significance upon which action was taken during either the first or second session of the Congress. Perhaps no individual would agree as to the wisdom of enacting all the foregoing matters, but the accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress

taken as a whole are substantial and in many respects have contributed to the well-being and security of not only the Nation but the entire free world.

It should not be overlooked in our attempts for peace and security in the world today that the present titanic world struggle is essentially one for men's minds and concerning in many respects diametrically opposed ways of life. It is not enough in this day and age to be simply anti-Communist; it is necessary that we think affirmatively and go forward in our quest for a better world with firmness and determination to do that which reasonable men feel is in the best interests of our country and mankind.

The significant development of the past 2 years has been the President's firm and historic decision, in accordance with a resolution of the United Nations, to stand fast against armed aggression by those forces who are avowedly committed to world domination. This action has in itself far overshadowed all other developments of the past 2 years, and I, therefore, welcome this opportunity to set forth the over-all picture of the past 2 years.

In conclusion, I wish to state that it is easy to criticize the actions of those who have the responsibility of rendering decisions day after day on matters of grave import. Surely it is far better for all of us to join together in a constructive and enlightened manner to mutually solve our common problems in the interests of one and all.

Employers Have a Patriotic Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that many employers throughout this Nation realize that they have a patriotic duty to the young men who may soon be called upon to defend our Nation's liberties. This statement is made as a result of numberless cases which have been called to my attention of young men who cannot obtain employment even in this time of a scarce labor market because they are of draft age.

What are these young men—many of them combat veterans of World War II who have just finished their college education—thinking when they go out to find a job which they know are so plentiful and are told "we are not hiring anybody subject to the draft"?

The parents of some of these boys have told me that they have been shocked by the remarks some of them have made as they came home after a weary round of job hunting. While, therefore, we are so busy devising laws against subversives, it seems to me that employers could certainly not help in creating a climate in which subversive tendencies can take root among bitter and dispirited young men.

It is true that an employer suffers some inconvenience when a young man he has trained for some particular job is suddenly snatched away by one of the armed services. Coping with such inconveniences is, however, a small price for that employer to pay for his security as against the sacrifice which is being asked of the young man who marches off to war. It is sad enough when young men who have been fighting for their country come home after a war and cannot find employment. It is worse than tragic when young men who may possibly be called upon to fight a war learn that this possibility debars them from sustaining the life which they may soon be asked to lay down for their country. This is a shameful situation which cannot be cured by legislation. I can only appeal to the conscience and patriotism of employers, and I hope that appeal will not fall upon deaf ears.

Report on House Concurrent Resolution 64 To Strengthen the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter written by Hon. WALTER JUDD and myself in regard to the status of House Concurrent Resolution 64, to strengthen the United Nations:

It has been impossible to have a personal discussion in recent weeks with each of the cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 64. But each of us has talked with a number of you and believes that in general there is wide recognition that the Korean crisis has increased the importance of our resolution.

Naturally, we are all absorbed at this time in the task of backing up General MacArthur and his UN troops with the mobilization measures which the situation requires. The forces of aggression must be put down in Korea and wherever they dare to strike.

We must build foundations for a long-range solution at the same time that we fight in Korea and other possible targets of aggression. If we fail to elevate our cause in the world's eyes to the lofty plane which it merits, we can lose the battle for the world's confidence and approval.

Events have propelled us faster than our deliberations. In this particular crisis, the United Nations was able, due to the absence of Russia from the Security Council and the presence of United States troops in Japan, to assume some of the strength with which we sought to endow it. Our sons are today fighting on distant battlegrounds for the United Nations as an organization to repel aggression and maintain peace. Should we not now formalize this position by adopting House Concurrent Resolution 64 as an expression of national policy? Should we not gain credit for our exertions by making it clear to the world that the United States fights, not for its own aggrandizement, but for a world organization adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretion, and enforcement of world law?

Here are some specific advantages to be gained by United States adoption now of the policy set forth in House Concurrent Resolution 64:

1. Reinvigorate the United Nations by revision of its Charter: It is clear to the world that the action of the Security Council on Korea was possible only because of Russia's action in absenting herself from the council table. Such a situation cannot be expected to occur again. Another act of aggression might find the UN hamstrung by the veto.

2. Seize the ideological initiative from Russia: The Communist Stockholm Petition has had a tremendous appeal to millions of people. We must offer a positive and sound road to peace which can arouse popular support and expose the insincerities of the Communist peace offensive.

3. Reassure and win over the undecided world: Important segments of the Far East and the Near East are not yet firmly committed to cooperation with the west in opposing Communist aggression. We must tell them that the United States is seeking not a western-dominated world but peace with honor and independence for all nations. The enunciation of a policy favoring a strong world organization would strike a responsive chord, for leaders in the east have been advocating such a step for years.

It is now apparent that we cannot hope for passage at this session. We hope, however, that you will give careful consideration to this problem during the recess so that we can take the matter up if we return later in the fall, or so that the matter can receive early consideration during the next Congress. Nothing is more urgent than the promulgation of a foreign policy which will maintain for the United States a position of world leadership. We do not feel that House Concurrent Resolution 64 is the only answer—indeed, we welcome discussion and hope that you will keep us advised of your thinking on the subject so that the best possible bill can be brought forth when we reconvene.

BROOKS HAYS.
WALTER JUDD.

Airlines Fight Subsidy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to provide my colleagues with an important and illuminating statement made in the Washington Daily News last night over the signature of James Daniel. It is entitled "Airlines Fight Subsidy Bill." It is as follows:

The Nation's mail-carrying airlines are lobbying to block House passage of a bill to compel separation of air-mail subsidies from earned air-mail pay.

At present only airlines certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) to carry mail are eligible for Federal subsidies. The subsidies themselves are concealed in "air-mail pay" paid to the lines by the CAB, which has a blank check on postal revenues for this purpose.

CAB officials say they have no way of knowing how much of the annual $125,000,000 air-mail payment is earned and how much

is subsidy. Outside estimates, however, set the subsidy payments as high as 40 percent. Some airlines are comparatively self-supporting; others depend on the Government for half or more of their income.

The Hoover Commission set the ball rolling to separate earned air-mail pay from subsidies. On August 31 the House Commerce Committee reported out the Heselton bill, which carried the endorsement of the Hoover Commission.

The airlines blocked it in the Rules Committee. But the bill's supporters have succeeded in getting a rule for it to come to the floor, if and when Speaker SAM RAYBURN is willing.

Meanwhile, ex-Representative Robert Ramspeck, who is vice president and lobbyist for the Air Transport Association (ATA), representing the mail-carrying lines, has urged House Members to take no action on the Heselton bill. He points out the Senate Commerce Committee has $200,000 to spend on advice on how to carry out subsidy separation.

Originally, Mr. Ramspeck announced that the ATA was neutral on the separation issue. But today Mr. Ramspeck, whose pay from the ATA is $23,000 a year plus expenses, said his outfit is opposed to the bill because of two features.

One is a provision that air-mail pay shall not exceed each airline's cost of carrying mail plus a reasonable return on that part of its investment attributable to carrying mail. Anything above that would be frankly labeled a subsidy and paid by the CAB out of a special fund appropriated by Congress.

Mr. Ramspeck said this would establish a "new principle" for the Government in its relations with transportation companies. He also objects to the provision which would require the CAB to demand that airlines receiving Government funds allocate their costs to the four main types of traffic. These are passenger service, mail, freight and express.

Such a provision would be a boom to the non-mail-carrying air coach and freight lines. They now complain that the mail carriers are able to undercut their rates because the mail carriers can ask the CAB to make up any losses sustained in this way by increasing air-mail pay.

But Mr. Ramspeck said this cost-accounting procedure—which is the heart of the Hoover Commission recommendations—would require the scrapping of a new accounting system recently set up by the airlines.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it will be read with great interest by the Members and that it will throw considerable light upon the activities of some of our airline officials since September 15 when the Rules Committee reported out a rule making H. R. 9184 in order for consideration.

Communist Activities in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement prepared by me, together with a list of selected important events relating to Communist activities in the United States from 1948 to 1950.

There being no objection, the statement and the list were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF EXPOSURE OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY)

The Communist problem at home and abroad is one of the crucial issues of the November 1950, election campaign.

It is obvious that the Democratic Party has been coddling the Reds abroad and coddling them here at home. In foreign policy, it sought to appease Dictator Joseph Stalin, to give him country after country.

In domestic policy, the Democratic administration for 17 years has been honeycombed with Reds and Red sympathizers—with the Coplons, the Hisses, the Pressmans, etc. Why in heaven's name the American people should have to pay the salaries of these traitors is beyond me. It is outrageous that the average taxpayer should sweat to earn a living to pay the taxes for the salaries of disloyal employees.

Every day that one picks up the newspaper he finds more evidence of Red activities. We of Wisconsin have known at first hand the damage that communism can do. We have seen how millions of dollars in wages have been lost because of strikes fomented by Reds. We have seen how men have been beaten up by Red goons. We are sick and disgusted over the coddling of Reds.

Now, Mr. President, the average man in the street is busy with a thousand and one things, and it is naturally difficult for him to try to keep up with the news as it breaks at home and abroad. For that reason, I am listing below what I humbly feel to be an important summation of some of the leading news on the anti-Communist front during the last 3 years beginning in January 1948.

This listing shows how, under the persistent Republican efforts, we have been able in case after case, to expose Red traitors. The Democratic administration has hardly given us its support in this crusade; on the contrary, it has fought at every turn Republican efforts to expose the Reds. The Democrats have tried to ridicule our fight—they have sneered at the chase after so-called red herrings, to use the term of the President of the United States. But it was no red herring when the shocking news came that Klaus Fuchs revealed practically every last secret of the hydrogen bomb to the Reds.

The vile revealing of those secrets did more damage to America's security—more damage to the life of our people than did perhaps any single event in recent years. What a national catastrophe. One single Red in effect jeopardized the lives of 150,000,000 Americans—one single Red who sold his soul to the Communist devil, deliberately told the Reds secrets with which to produce a bomb possibly to exterminate the lives of millions of Americans. That shows the danger we face. That is no red herring. That is the brutal hard fact.

As you read down the list below, remember that what we have discovered in the past is but a token of what we can discover in the future. That is provided the Republican Party is given the means by which to continue its exposures. So, I say to the people of our country, vote Republican Tuesday, November 7. Vote to stamp out the Communist menace at home and to curb Red aggression abroad.

Vote American.
Vote against communism.
Vote Republican.

SELECTED IMPORTANT EVENTS RELATING TO COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN UNITED STATES, 1948–50

January 5, 1948: Federal court ordered arraignment of 10 Hollywood writers and producers charged with contempt of Congress for failure to answer questions about their Communist affiliations.

March 1, 1948: Subcommittee of Un-American Activities Committee denounced National Bureau of Standards Director Edward U. Condon as weak link in atomic security. Hearings held.

March 18, 1948: Eight persons arrested in Los Angeles as alien Communists.

March 23, 1948: R. Morford convicted of contempt of Congress for refusal to produce American-Soviet Friendship Council records.

March 24, 1948: Gerhart Eisler sentenced for conviction on charge of concealing Communist files when seeking exit visa in 1945.

April 19, 1948: J. H. Lawson convicted of contempt of Congress for failure to answer questions on Communist affiliations.

May 5, 1948: D. Trumbo convicted of contempt of Congress for failure to answer questions on Communist affiliations.

May 28, 1948: Attorney General Clark issued list of 32 additional subversive organizations.

July 20, 1948: Twelve Communist leaders indicted by New York special grand jury (Foster, Winter, Davis, Williamson, Dennis, Winston, Stachel, Thompson, Gates, Potash, Green, Hall).

July 30, 1948: Elizabeth Bentley testified before Senator Ferguson's subcommittee, named W. W. Remington as source of information.

July 31, 1948: Miss Bentley testified before Un-American Activities Committee, named L. Currie, H. D. White, N. G. Silvermaster, and others as active Communists.

August 2, 1948: Louis F. Budenz testified before Senator Ferguson's subcommittee, listed several active Communists.

August 3, 1948: Whittaker Chambers testified before Un-American Activities Committee, named Alger and Donald Hiss, Nathan Witt, Lee Pressman, John Abt, V. Pello, and others as members of Communist group.

August 25, 1948: Hiss and Chambers testified at public hearing before Un-American Activities Committee. Chairman THOMAS said one of them faced perjury trial.

September 8, 1948: Un-American Activities Committee opened hearings on espionage by atomic scientists on behalf of U. S. S. R.

September 25, 1948: Attorney General Clark made public revised list of 123 subversive organizations.

September 27, 1948: Un-American Activities Committee issued interim report recommending indictment of former Manhattan project scientists—C. F. Hiskey and J. H. Chapin—and S. Nelson, A. A. Adams, and M. S. Hiskey for atomic espionage

December 14, 1948: Un-American Activities Committee issued statement on Chambers-Hiss case.

December 15, 1948: Alger Hiss indicted by Federal grand jury on two counts of perjury.

December 30, 1948: Un-American Activities Committee issued formal report on Hiss-Chambers case.

January 17, 1949: Trial of 11 of 12 Communist leaders began in New York before Judge Medina. Foster ill. Many Communists and Communist sympathizers named by witnesses (Budenz et al.).

February 10, 1949: W. W. Remington cleared by Loyalty Review Board of charges made by Miss Bentley.

March 5, 1949: Judith Coplon and V. A. Gubitchev held on suspicion of espionage.

March 10, 1949: Coplon and Gubitchev indicted on four counts for conspiracy related to espionage (New York).

March 16, 1949: Coplon indicted on two counts by Washington grand jury on removal of data from Government files.

April 23, 1949: Un-American Activities Committee revealed testimony of Polish Embassy military attaché, Gen. I. R. Modelski,

relative to spy ring operating in United States.

April 25, 1949: Coplon trial in Washington began.

May 14, 1949: Gerhart Eisler arrested on extradition warrant abroad Polish liner *Batory* in Southampton, England after stowing away.

May 27, 1949: Eisler released by British court.

May 31, 1949: Alger Hiss perjury trial began. Extensive testimony by W. Chambers included names of many Communists or Communist sympathizers.

June 4, 6, 9, 1949: Un-American Activities Committee investigated espionage case concerning Bell Aircraft Corp. plant at Buffalo, N. Y.

June 5, 1949: Subcommittee made public list supplied by Elizabeth Bentley of 37 Federal employees, 6 outsiders, 3 employees of other governments as persons involved in data transfer to U. S. S. R.

June 8, 1949: California Legislature Committee on un-American Activities submitted report, listing hundreds of persons as following or appeasing Communist program.

June 25, 1949: Un-American Activities Committee labeled American Slav Congress as Communist controlled, listed associated organizations and important individuals connected with them.

June 30, 1949: Coplon convicted in Washington trial, sentenced to from 40 months to 10 years (July 1).

July 8, 1949: Hiss jury deadlocked, 8 to 4 for conviction, and dismissed.

October 14, 1949: Eleven Communist leaders found guilty of conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government by force and violence.

October 23, 1949: Un-American Activities Committee report branded Congress of American Women as Communist and discussed several of officers.

November 17, 1949: Second Hiss perjury trial began.

January 21, 1950: Hiss found guilty on two counts of perjury.

January 23, 1950: Un-American Activities Committee reopened investigation of G. R. Jordan allegations as to shipment of uranium to U. S. S. R.

January 24, 1950: Coplon-Gubitchev trial began in New York.

February 3, 1950: Dr. K. E. J. Fuchs held in London on atomic espionage charges.

February 11, 1950: Senator McCarthy charged 57 Communists still working in State Department.

February 20, 1950: Senator McCarthy recited 81 cases of Communists in State Department. Senator Tydings named to head Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee to investigate charges (Feb. 25).

February 21–22, 1950: M. Cvetic, FBI undercover agent, testified before Un-American Activities Committee on Communist activities and officials, especially in Pittsburgh area.

March 1, 1950: Fuchs pleaded guilty, sentenced to 14 years for atomic espionage.

March 2–3, 1950: Un-American Activities Committee resumed hearings on shipment of uranium to U. S. S. R.

March 6–15, 1950: Tydings subcommittee probe opened on McCarthy charges.

March 7, 1950: Coplon convicted on two counts, acquitted on 3d: Gubitchev convicted on two counts.

March 27, 1950: Supreme Court sustained E. Dennis conviction on contempt of Congress conviction for refusal to answer questions concerning Communist affiliations, 1947.

April 16–30, 1950: Tydings subcommittee probe continued. Amerasia case reviewed; Budenz testified; Dodd testified; Browder testified.

April 26, 1950: W. W. Remington subpena issued for appearance before Un-American Activities Committee.

May 1–15, 1950: Tydings subcommittee probe continued. F. Utley testified; Lattimore heard; Bielaski testified.

May 9, 1950: Witness before California Legislature Un-American Activities Committee linked Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer and Dr. J. W. Weinberg (Scientist X) to Communists. Oppenheimer denied.

May 10, 1950: W. W. Remington case reopened by Federal grand jury after Un-American Activities Committee hearings, May 4–5.

May 23, 1950: H. Gold arrested as Fuchs intermediary in atomic espionage.

June 8, 1950: Remington indicted on perjury charge for denial of Communist Party membership. Resigned from Commerce Department, June 9.

June 9, 1950: Gold and two unnamed persons indicted by Brooklyn Federal grand jury for atomic espionage.

June 15, 1950: A. D. Slack held on espionage charges, Syracuse.

June 16–30, 1950: Tydings subcommittee probe continued. Amerasia case continued; Jaffe citation for contempt proposed; Service testified.

June 16, 1950: D. Greenglass held on atomic espionage charge.

June 16, 1950: Dr. S. Weinbaum held by FBI on charges of concealing Communist Party membership in applying for jet propulsion research job.

June 29, 1950: Eight Hollywood writers and directors convicted of contempt of Congress.

July 6, 1950: Federal grand jury, Santa Fe, N. M., indicted Greenglass on four counts of atomic espionage.

July 17, 1950: Tydings subcommittee majority report issued; Senator Lodge issued separate statement.

July 17, 1950: J. Rosenberg held on charges of conspiracy to commit espionage, linked with Gold and Greenglass.

July 29, 1950: Grand jury, New York, indicted H. Brothman and M. Moskowitz, linked with Gold.

August 5, 1950: Harry Bridges jailed as danger to United States security. Free on bail following April conviction for perjury concerning Communist affiliations. Freed August 24.

August 10, 1950: Commitee on Un-American Activities asked House to cite 58 persons for contempt. Julius Emspak and Steve Nelson cited.

August 11, 1950: Mrs. Ethel Rosenberg arrested on charge on conspiracy to commit espionage; said to have assisted husband, Julius, and brother, David Greenglass.

August 17, 1950: Anatoli H. Yakoulev indicted as spy. Left United States in 1946.

August 18, 1950: Morton Sobell, radar expert, arrested at Laredo, Tex., on espionage charges; linked with Rosenberg.

August 27–28, 1950: Lee Pressman admitted he was a Communist in 1934 while in Government; named Abt, Witt, and Kramer as fellow Communists at that time.

Roll Call 285

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the leave of absence unanimously granted to me by this House, I was not in attendance at the session yesterday.

I desire that the Record show that if I had been present at roll call 285, I would have voted in favor of the motion made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon] that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill of 1951 with an amendment providing that ECA funds may be withheld from any country whose trade with Soviet Russia or its satellite countries, including Communist China and Communist Korea, is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to our national security.

War and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to insert in the Congressional Record, an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., August 16, 1950, entitled "War and Politics." The editorial follows:

WAR AND POLITICS

The rather naive theory has been advanced by national spokesmen of the Democratic Party that it is somehow unpatriotic to make the present war an item for political discussion in the fall campaign. The theory is, presumably, based upon the flimsy assumption that any criticism of the administration for its failure to keep us out of war would give aid and comfort to the enemy, namely, Russia.

We find it difficult to follow this type of reasoning. What are campaigns for except to review the accomplishments and by the same token scan the failures of the administration which asks to be retained in power. What are elections for except that the public may approve or repudiate the steps taken by those in authority for the national welfare as they saw it?

And certainly there can be no issue of greater personal import to the families of our citizens than the series of decisions which have led to armed conflict with a deadly enemy and the taking from homes of millions of young men for combat duty. Surely these decisions are subject to review as to their wisdom, and certainly those who made the decisions must be prepared to explain why they were taken. That is the way of democracy.

All of this, we emphasize, is based upon the understanding that criticism is to be constructive, and above all that united support is to be given the administration in its prosecution of the war, now that we are undeniably plunged into it. This may seem a fine point, but we believe there can be honest criticism of what mistakes have happened in the past and at the same time unqualified backing of all measures taken to win the war, and get us out of the mess into which the administration has taken us.

It is in our political campaigns that through verbal controversy we segregate facts from propaganda and separate actuality from claims. It is in the give-and-take of heated partisan battle that the real truth finally emerges. And that is what the American public is entitled to.

What did we give away at Yalta and at Potsdam that we should not have surrendered?

How were we deceived into a childlike trustfulness and credulity toward promises by Russia now proven empty?

Why have we witnessed reverses in policy by the State Department which have produced such tragic consequences?

Were the billions appropriated and spent for our national security wisely or foolishly used?

These and similarly important questions should be fairly put and fully answered during the coming campaign. For it is only when we have the light that we may march forward with assuredness that the same mistakes will not recur.

This Is How It Started

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., under date of July 13, 1950, entitled "This Is How It Started." The editorial follows:

THIS IS HOW IT STARTED

American parents whose sons are being called upon to answer the draft may not remember clearly the gradual steps by which we were brought into this conflict.

It dates all the way back to Yalta. There, to induce a pledge of Russian cooperation in our war with Japan, President Roosevelt in 1945 promised Joseph Stalin certain territorial concessions. One of these was North Korea.

Then came in rapid order President Roosevelt's sudden death, the explosion of A-bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the surrender by Emperor Hirohito. By a military decision, Korea was divided at the thirty-eighth parallel. The Soviet sent 100,000 soldiers into North Korea and America sent 72,000 into South Korea.

An attempt was made at setting up a Korean government for the entire peninsula. It was doomed to failure, for it broke quickly on the rocks of Russian refusal to permit any opponents of communism to hold office in the proposed Korean government. Thereupon, two governments were established, the Communist People's Democratic Republic of North Korea, and the anti-Communist Republic of Korea in South Korea.

By agreement, when the two governments were established, both Russian and American occupation forces were withdrawn between December of 1948 and June of 1949. But small military forces remained behind in each Korean sector to train the respective armies. Then came the sudden invasian of South Korea by North Korea. And the world knows the rest.

Why, it may be asked, did America agree to withdraw, if we had knowledge that invasion might follow? And if we did not know this to be likely, what was the matter with our intelligence groups?

For that matter, if we are to start asking questions, we might go all the way back to Yalta 5 years ago and ask why President Roosevelt turned his back on the Atlantic Charter and granted to Russia control over territories on which it had absolutely no valid claim whatsoever?

The answer might conceivably be that the exigencies of war at that time demanded substantial concessions in order to insure Russian participation in the war against Japan. But President Roosevelt had personal knowledge of our A-bombs manufacture. And as events later proved, Russian participation in the war with Japan was largely of a token character, of less than a week's duration before Hirohito's offer to surrender.

Perhaps no real benefit can be expected from a resurvey of the historical past. Merely to locate the blame for the mess in which we now find ourselves may serve immediately useful purpose. Nevertheless, an indirect byproduct might conceivably be the realization by Washington that we fight best when we are kept informed of the reasons for our fighting. And if this induces greater frankness on the part of the administration, if it brings better teamwork between Government and public, then something will have been accomplished through public realization of the background of this war.

Give the people the truth and they will make the right decisions. That the full truth was not given us about Yalta and subsequent diplomatic events should not be a precedent for future mistakes of a similar nature.

We are in for a hard war and it can and will be won. But we must know exactly why we are fighting and for what we are fighting. That kind of partnership between those in authority and those who take their orders is absolutely essential.

Armed Services Committee Legislation, Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include below a list of the legislative items considered by the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives which have become law or which are, at this time, awaiting the signature of the President.

There are 117 of these items, which is an impressive record of legislative activity on the part of the committee, the total representing approximately one-seventh of the total number of Public Laws enacted by the Eighty-first Congress as of this date.

I must point out that this tabulation excludes the very active investigative program of the committee in this Congress. There was, for example, the committee's thorough examination of unification and strategy in the fall of 1949, which resulted in Public Document 600 of this Congress, a report which is generally considered to be one of the most objective and thorough studies of national-defense problems rendered by any committee of Congress in recent years. There was also an exhaustive investigation of the Air Force B–36 program in the late summer of 1949, an investigation of the Army's tank program a few weeks ago, an investigation of the guided missiles programs of the various Armed Forces, an investigation of the services' hospitalization program the services' post exchange and commissary programs and activities, allegations respecting the administration of the Army finance center at St. Louis, Mo., service clothing purchasing policies, the state of the Nation's stockpile of strategic and critical materials, and a number of other such studies and investigations relating to the efficiency and morale of the Armed Forces.

As regards the legislation, more impressive in my opinion than its quantity is its significant character. Rather than an aggregation of trivia, these legislative items are, in many instances, of signal importance to the Nation and of the greatest complexity. Taken together they represent the statutory framework created by the Eighty-first Congress to assure a state of readiness and efficiency in our Armed Forces.

Personnel legislation considered by the committee in this Congress has been especially far-reaching and difficult. Previous to the Korean crisis, the committee obtained favorable congressional action on the Career Compensation Act which completely revised and reconstructed, for the first time in 40 years, the pay and allowances structure of the Armed Forces and the services' disability retirement systems. This measure, tremendous in scope, fundamental to the morale and efficiency of the Armed Forces, is one of the most significant pieces of military legislation enacted by the Congress in many years and required many weeks of concentrated effort and detailed study by the entire committee.

The Korean crisis brought on a number of additional legislative items of a personnel nature, the impact of which is being felt throughout the Nation today. The extension of the Selective Service Act of 1948 for an additional year, with the added authority to order into Federal service members of the civilian components of the Armed Forces, is easily the most significant of these, but collateral thereto and derived in part therefrom was such legislation as the one-year involuntary extension of enlistments in the Armed Forces, the lifting of the Services' personnel ceilings, the granting of authority to induct doctors and dentists into the Armed Forces, and the granting of dependency allowances to men being taken involuntarily into the Armed Forces. All of this legislation is, of course, fundamental to the readiness of our fighting forces; and the committee takes pride in the fact that while much of this legislation, being of a compulsory nature in application to our citizens, could have been very controversial, the committee was unanimous in its support of every one of these bills.

Also in the field of personnel legislation were such items as a bill authorizing States to establish home guard units when National Guard units are withdrawn from the States for Federal service, a bill authorizing the Regular Army to accept the enlistment of 2,500 nonresident aliens, and a bill authorizing

Gen. Omar Bradley to be appointed to the grade of General of the Army—the so-called five-star grade.

A committee measure continuing Government control over the Nation's synthetic rubber plants, thereby insuring continuance of a dependable supply of rubber for the Nation in the event of a national emergency, is in a category all of its own. This legislation, committee written and sponsored, is becoming of steadily increasing importance to the national security as time goes by, its value to the Nation already having been demonstrated repeatedly since its enactment.

Two important bills relating exclusively to the Navy were considered in this Congress. One authorized a large-scale, new shipbuilding program for the Navy; the other authorized the Navy to build certain experimental types of submarines. Both of these measures are premised on the need for keeping the Navy modern and will have a continuing impact on the fleet's readiness for years in the future.

In these early days of unification and during this readjustment period after World War II, it could be expected that much legislation of an organizational nature would be considered. By far the most important of this type of legislation considered by the committee was a complete rewriting of the unification act, in the "National Security Act Amendments of 1949." This legislation created for the first time in the Nation's history a "Department of Defense" composed of the military departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, and great power was vested in the Secretary of Defense. Such new Government positions as Deputy Secretary of Defense, Assistant Secretaries of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were created by this important legislation.

Other legislation, generally of an organizational nature, were such item as the Army-Air Force Authorization Act of 1949, which gave the Army and Air Force statutory organization characters for the first time and also authorized by law, for the first time, a peacetime strength of 70 air groups in the United States Air Force. The "Army Organization Act of 1950," another very important and complex measure, modernized the old War Department and Army organization for the first time in many years, and legislation was also approved to give the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, a highly important aviation research agency, a statutory basis for the first time. Legislation granting to the Central Intelligence Agency statutory authority enabling it to perform its function of evaluating and correlating intelligence information throughout all Government agencies was also enacted, and early in the first session the committee invested prodigious labor in revising and improving the services' entire system of military justice, creating for the first time a uniform code of justice for the three armed forces.

At the very end of the session, the committee approved legislation authorizing General of the Army George C. Marshall to become Secretary of Defense despite certain statutory barriers to the holding of such office by men with a background of service in the Regular Armed Forces.

In the field of military construction, the committee has been very active. A tremendous public works program, involving highly secret projects and large-scale construction activities of the greatest military importance, was thoroughly studied by the committee and passed through the Congress. Legislation authorizing the construction of armories for the National Guard and other civilian components was approved, as was legislation authorizing the construction of a far-flung radar fence for the protection of America, a guided missiles proving ground, an Alaskan communications system, and certain wind tunnel construction of major proportions. Every one of these military construction measures is of great military importance and required many hours of committee study and examination of service witnesses.

Such items as these I have mentioned, plus the many others of a similar nature listed below, point up how tremendously complex legislation relating to the Armed Forces has become, and how significant much of this legislation considered in this Congress has been to the defense program. It is a legislative record reflecting great credit on the members of the Committee on Armed Services, collectively and individually; and, as chairman, submitting this legislative record, on behalf of the committee, to the House of Representatives, I wish to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to each member of the committee for the splendid cooperation, counsel, guidance, and great industry that made possible this fine record of accomplishment. The afore-mentioned list follows:

Armed Services Committee—Bills enacted into law, 81st Cong.

Bill No.	Title	Law No.
H. R. 33	Leasing of lands by Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion.	487
H. R. 210	Conveyance of portion of military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to New York State.	755
H. R. 263	Easement to Orange County, Calif.	130
H. R. 524	Provide for release of certain tract of land in Los Angeles County, Calif.	313
H. R. 540	Terminal leave for certain Navy and Marine Corps officers.	314
H. R. 1151	Amend act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers.	519
H. R. 1437	Army and Air Force composition bill.	604
H. R. 1741	Guided missiles proving ground.	60
H. R. 2216	Providing for Under Secretary of Defense.	36
H. R. 2417	Recreational facilities at Eglin Field, Fla.	209
H. R. 2418	Restocking, propagation, and conservation of game at Eglin Field Reservation.	345
H. R. 2485	Attendance of Marine Band at GAR Encampment.	24
H. R. 2546	Radar fence bill	30
H. R. 2663	Administration of CIA	110
H. R. 2737	Berlin Airlift Medal	178
H. R. 2895	Sale of base material at Fort Benning Military Reservation to Muscogee County.	496
H. R. 3155	Amending Public Law 885, 80th Cong.	395
H. R. 3205	1-year extension for application for terminal leave.	479

Armed Services Committee—Bills enacted into law, 81st Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Law No.
H. R. 3341	Attendance of Marine Band at Confederate Veterans Reunion.	88
H. R. 3783	Transfer of part of Camp Joseph T. Robinson to State of Arkansas.	593
H. R. 3864	Return certain lands taken from W. W. Stewart.	[1] 292
H. R. 3946	NACA personnel to attend accredited schools.	472
H. R. 4007	Construction of experimental submarines (S. 1505 passed).	213
H. R. 4050	Advances in pay to personnel upon permanent change of station.	318
H. R. 4080	Uniform Code of Military Justice.	506
H. R. 4316	Repeal authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings at Fort Monroe Military Reservation.	489
H. R. 4433	Retrocession to Commonwealth of Massachusetts over certain land at Shirley, Mass.	522
H. R. 4449	Adjustments on the promotion list of the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army (S. 1688 passed).	173
H. R. 4502	Disposal of certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va.	[1] 426
H. R. 4516	Retention of certain officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of Navy.	131
H. R. 4573	Repeal certain obsolete provisions of law relating to to naval service (S. 1794 passed).	144
H. R. 4646	Loan of certain Army property to national veterans organizations for use at national youth tournaments.	193
H. R. 4732	Conveyance of certain lands to Two Rock Union School District, Sonoma County, Calif.	527
H. R. 4767	Clarify active duty status of certain Army and Air Force officers.	342
H. R. 5007	Career Compensation Act	351
H. R. 5074	Authorizing functions of NACA.	672
H. R. 5238	Adjustment of lineal positions of certain officers of the naval service.	210
H. R. 5289	Conveyance of certain lands to city and county of San Francisco (S. 863 passed).	181
H. R. 5328	Conveyance of certain lands to city and county of San Francisco.	354
H. R. 5342	Loan of certain equipment to Boy Scouts of America for use at Second National Jamboree.	323
H. R. 5361	Relief of Capt. Charles G. McCormack, MC, USN.	[1] 419
H. R. 5368	Transfer of certain real property.	606
H. R. 5503	Easement at Langley Air Force Base, Va.	481
H. R. 5632	Reorganize fiscal management of National Military Establishment.	216
H. R. 5876	Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 amendment.	514
H. R. 5920	Payment of amounts due mentally incompetent personnel.	569
H. R. 5921	Terminate lump-sum benefits to certain Reserve officers of Navy and Air Force	485
H. R. 5929	Amend Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.	297
H. R. 6171	Administration of oaths by commissioned officers.	521
H. R. 6303	Construction at military and naval installations.	420
H. R. 6539	Army Institute of Pathology Building.	495
H. R. 6820	Acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in Berlin airlift (S. 2853 passed).	503
H. R. 6825	Extension of time for award of certain decorations.	501
H. R. 6826	Extend Selective Service Act of 1948.	599
H. R. 7058	Amend laws relating to Military and Naval Academies.	586
H. R. 7579	Extension of Rubber Act of 1948.	575
H. R. 7635	Graduation leave for the Academies.	532

[1] Private.

Armed Services Committee—Bills enacted into law, 81st Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Law No.
H. R. 7703	Easement within U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.	[1] 523
H. R. 7764	Construction of modern naval vessels.	674
H. R. 8139	Attendance of Marine Band at Confederate Veterans Reunion.	675
H. R. 8198	Army Organization Act	581
H. R. 8594	National Guard armories construction.	783
H. R. 8604	Conveyance of Percy Jones General Hospital to W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.	710
H. R. 9177	Extension of enlistments (S. 3937 passed).	624
H. R. 9178	Lifting of personnel strength of Armed Forces.	655
H. R. 9477	Dependency Allowance Act (S. 4071 passed).	771
H. R. 9554	Doctors and Dentists Draft Act (S. 4029 passed).	779
H. R. 9646	Appointment of General Marshall as Secretary of Defense.	788
H. J. Res. 230	Construction of hospital at St. Lawrence, Newfoundland.	389
H. J. Res. 281	Issue posthumously to John Sidney McCain, commission as admiral, U. S. Navy.	[1] 250
S. 213	Benefits for members of Reserve components on duty for periods of less than 30 days.	108
S. 278	Retroactive checkage of payments made.	41
S. 279	Advance on retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, U. S. Navy.	[1] 1
S. 489	Refund to Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission.	379
S. 509	Advancement of Warrant Officer Chester A. Davis, U. S. Marine Corps.	[1] 351
S. 621	Relief of Horace J. Fenton	[1] 458
S. 629	Disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property.	39
S. 630	Removal of upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in Supply Corps of Navy.	16
S. 632	Acceptance of certain gifts and foreign decorations.	[1] 8
S. 673	Relating to pay and allowances of Naval Reserve performing active duty in grade of rear admiral.	21
S. 779	Relating to pay and allowances of officers of Naval Establishment appointed to permanent grades.	104
S. 796	Establishment of grade of General of the Air Force.	58
S. 1181	Appointment of officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts in the Regular Army.	96
S. 1219	Conveyance to the city of Charleston, S. C.	97
S. 1267	Wind tunnel bill	415
S. 1270	Relating to percentage in time of peace of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps.	103
S. 1507	Relating to receipt of pay and allowances while drawing disability allowance, compensation or retired pay.	
S. 1560	Appointment of Col. Kenneth D. Nichols to grade of colonel, Regular Army.	[1] 352
S. 1578	Construction of stations of Alaska Communication System.	414
S. 1639	Relating to Presidential action on proceedings and decisions of Navy retiring boards.	184
S. 1660	Conveyance to Franciscan Fathers of California of approximately 40 acres located on Hunter Liggett Military Reservation, Monterey, Calif.	[1] 344
S. 1742	Removal of certain restrictions on lands conveyed to the trustees of Porter Academy.	202
S. 1794	Repeal certain obsolete provisions of law relating to naval service.	144
S. 1990	Requirement of detailed annual reports to Congress.	449

[1] Private.

Armed Services Committee—Bills enacted into law, 81st Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Law No.
S. 2269	Enlistment of aliens in Regular Army.	597
S. 2290	Authorize necessary improvements in cemetery plots at Blue Grass Ordnance Depot, Richmond, Ky.	385
S. 2335	Making certain revisions in Officer Personnel Act of 1947.	570
S. 2382	Quartermaster Research Laboratory.	424
S. 2440	Public works bill	564
S. 2441	Provide for additional officers of National Guard on duty with National Guard Bureau.	458
S. 2559	Extension of retirement benefits to certain persons who were given battlefield promotions.	473
S. 2724	Amend Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946.	
S. 2911	Appointment of Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director, ECC.	[1] 412
S. 3122	Conveyance to Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, of easement.	[1] 475
S. 3255	Amend Career Compensation Act of 1949 to extend effective date of sec. 412 to Dec. 31, 1950.	511
S. 3396	Authorizing Secretary of Army to convey certain lands to State of Kentucky.	518
S. 3446	Restoration of Lt. Comdr. Edwin M. Rosenberg to active list of U. S. Navy.	[1] 843
S. 3520	Abacá	683
S. 3579	Relief of Midshipman Willis Howard Dukelow, U. S. Navy.	
S. 3727	Transfer of Watson Laboratory.	
S. 3807	Appointment of Col. Henry A. Byroade as Director of Bureau of German Affairs, Department of State.	
S. 3875	Amend sec. 9 of CIA Act of 1949.	697
S. 3889	Increase amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for support of disabled soldiers and sailors.	
S. 4088	Home Guard	
S. 4118	Increase appropriation for Air Engineering Development Center.	
S. 4135	Appointment of General Bradley to permanent grade of General of the Army.	
S. 4136	Amend Selective Service Act to include Coast Guard.	

[1] Private

Water Resources in the Central Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to draw your attention, and the attention of the Congress, to the significant progress being made under democratic leadership to expand the development of our huge water resources, especially in connection with the great Central Valley of California.

In many parts of the country, people take their water for granted. Many areas are fortunate in having all the water they need to supply their industrial, agricultural, and domestic needs. However, there are a number of other areas, including the Central Valley, where there is not enough water readily available to supply the constantly growing demand.

The Central Valley contains some of the richest farm land in the United States. However, two-thirds of the water supply of the valley is located in the Sacramento Valley to the north, while two-thirds of the agricultural land is located in the San Joaquin Valley to the south. In 1939, the Central Valley supported 59,000 farms, covering 2,720,000 acres and produced a gross farm income of $220,000,000. If the water resources of the valley are fully developed, through the Central Valley project, the valley could support 110,000 farms, covering 6,580,000 acres, and produce a gross farm income of $420,000,000, or almost double the 1939 income.

However, because the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress sharply curtailed progress on the Central Valley project, the San Joaquin Valley does not have enough water to supply its ever-increasing demands. In the city of Coalinga, in the heart of the valley's rich oil fields, approximately 5,000 people receive their drinking water by way of Southern Pacific Railroad tank cars. Think of this in 1950. In Chowchilla, a few years ago, many farmers were ready to sell their land because they could not get the water they needed to cultivate their farms.

Today, thanks to renewed progress on the Central Valley project under a Democratic-controlled Congress, farmers in the Chowchilla water district will get the water they need. A contract was signed July 5 of this year between the Chowchilla water district and the Bureau of Reclamation, providing Central Valley project water to Chowchilla for 40 years under the 160-acre limitation.

This contract represents years of hard effort on the part of farmers and landholders in the area, and represents a real victory for those who were determined to see that the water resources which are the birthright of every American were utilized for the benefit of the greatest number for the greatest good.

The Chowchilla contract is one of 13 contracts completed between water districts in the Central Valley and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau has now completed contracts for approximately 75 percent of the dependable water from the Millerton Reservoir at Friant Dam, and enough applications have been filed with the Bureau to more than exhaust the remaining water supply expected to be developed in the project. Here, then, is the answer to those obstructionists who have fought progressive development of our water resources on the shaky ground that demand for water would never match the supply.

I would like to include in the RECORD the following clippings from the Fresno Bee for July 6, 1950, and the Chowchilla News for July 6, 1950, which refer to the signing of the Chowchilla water contract. I would also like to introduce another clipping from the Fresno Bee, dated August 25, 1950, referring to the resolution adopted by the California Democratic Central Committee with respect to power development. I commend these articles to Members of Congress who still

have any doubts as to the need for full development of our water resources. The above-mentioned clippings follow:

[From the Fresno (Calif.) Bee of July 6, 1950]

CHOWCHILLA SIGNS PACT, GETS CVP WATER SUPPLY

CHOWCHILLA, July 6.—Chowchilla water district and United States Bureau of Reclamation officials signed a 9 (e) type repayment contract for some 132,000 acre-feet of Central Valley project water annually at ceremonies held in the water district office yesterday afternoon.

The contract provides for 55,000 acre-feet of class 1 water not to exceed $3.50 an acre-foot and up to 77,000 acre-feet of class 2 water, when and if available, not to exceed $1.50 an acre-foot.

The historic occasion, which climaxed years of determined effort on the part of about 30 farmers and landholders to form the present 65,000-acre district, brought about the signing by the Bureau of its tenth Central Valley project contract and completion of Bureau contract negotiations with a total of eight water districts.

SIX CONTRACTS APPROVED

In addition to these, six contracts have been approved in final form and negotiations are under way with 11 other districts. Nine of these districts have given tentative approval as to the form of the contract terms.

Addressing district and Bureau officials during a luncheon which preceded the formal contract signing, District President Frank Justin complimented the Bureau for its splendid cooperation in consummating contract negotiations in record time.

"This is a great moment in our lives. The Bureau of Reclamation has made possible a dream which few of us present today thought possible 25 years ago," Justin added.

EQUAL TO WATER RIGHT

Duval Williams, district vice president, pointed out the contract not only gives the district a priority for project water along with other districts who have signed contracts but assures the district water users of what amounts to a riparian right to an improved supply.

Denslow Green, counsel for the district, supported Williams' view of the contract by commenting that "if the cooperation exhibited by the Bureau and district officials continues as it has up to the present stage of negotiations, there will be no need to look at the contract again."

H. V. Eastman and Howard A. Stoddard, district secretary and engineer, pointed out to the luncheon group that the project water is vital to the economic life of the district.

"Our water table already has begun to rise and after initial operation of the Central Valley project next year, we can anticipate a rise of several more feet," Stoddard said.

Eastman pointed out the earlier completion of the project would have saved local water users millions of dollars in pumping costs.

"Like many other areas, our national water supply amounts to only 50 percent of our actual needs. Only a few years ago many of us here in the Chowchilla area were ready to sell our land because without water we were unable to cultivate and farm it," Eastman commented.

Richard L. Boke, regional director of the Bureau, who signed the contract for the Government, explained that rapid completion of Delta-Mendota Canal, Tracy pumping plant, and other Central Valley project initial features, will make possible an improved water supply by this time next year.

SEES MORE COOPERATION

Jack W. Rodner, local bureau district manager, expressed his belief that "the progress made and confidence exhibited by the Chowchilla water users in the Bureau would lead the way to greater cooperation and progress with water users throughout the valley."

Other speakers reviewed the history of the district, which became a legal entity as recently as November 25, 1949.

Efforts to establish the district began in 1947. Its final formation became possible when permission was granted for the exclusion from the Madera district of 45,500 acres and for a division of Central Valley project water allocated to the Madera district under a contract executed in 1939.

Some 20,000 acres of lands not included in any distirct were added, bringing the district acreage total to about 65,000 acres, of which 54,173 are irrigable.

FORTY-THREE PERCENT IRRIGABLE

A land classification survey by the Bureau of Reclamation shows that 43 percent of its total land is irrigable. The land classification is as follows: class 1, 11,309 acres; class 2, 16,278 acres; class 3, 27,543 acres; class 4, 5,476 acres; class 6, 2,697 acres, and Chowchilla townsite, 784 acres.

Cotton is the principal crop, occupying 18,513 acres. Alfalfa is second with 12,024 acres, and irrigated pasture third with 10,511 acres. These three crops occupy about 90 percent of the district's cropped area.

Others present at the signing ceremonies were board members Mark Van Elswyk, H. P. Dower, and Charles Blalock, and district officers Legion School, Donald Cardwell and C. L. Chastain.

Bureau officials attending included Ralph Brody, assistant regional counsel; James H. Stamler, settlement chief; and T. R. Thompson, water supply head.

Murdo Campbell and M. G. Hughes also were present.

[From the Chowchilla News of July 6, 1950]

CONTRACT SIGNED YESTERDAY GIVES CHOWCHILLA 40-YEAR SUPPLY OF WATER—RICHARD L. BOKE, REGIONAL DIRECTOR FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, WAS HERE TO BIND GOVERNMENT TO PERMANENT WATER CONTRACT

Chowchilla's permanent water contract with the United States Bureau of Reclamation was signed yesterday afternoon.

This event was big news to farmers of the Chowchilla water district. The signing of the contract culminates nearly 4 years of energetic work on the part of the members of the board of directors, their advisory committee and numerous others.

The contract calls for the annual delivery of 55,000 acre-feet of class 1 water and 77,000 acre-feet of class 2 water by the Bureau. The water district is obliged to pay the Bureau for the water received by it. The contract is for a term of 40 years. The district accepts the 160-acre limitation of the Reclamation Act.

The 27-page document may not be as simple as that. It is a flexible document and provides for a trial period of 15 years during which time adjustments can be made. It gives the board the right to sell a portion of the class 1 water to other districts, or interim users should it not be required or if the charges become too burdensome.

CONTRACT GIVES PRIORITY

Chowchilla's contract is one of five already signed by water districts for CVP water in the San Joaquin Valley. It has been pointed out that had the contract been signed 6 months ago, Chowchilla could have had the full amount ordered for this season. The district ordered 125,000 acre-feet of water for the season. When it appeared the amount of water to be available to water districts served by Friant would not equal the demand, the Bureau cut the Chowchilla order to one-half. It is understood this condition will not exist next year. The five districts holding permanent contracts with the Bureau will have priority on the water stored in Lake Millerton. After their requirements are filled, any water left will be allocated among water districts who have yet to sign permanent contracts.

The contract was signed in the office of the water district at about 3 o'clock yesterday. Some 30 farmers and others witnessed the event. Richard L. Boke, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation of Sacramento, bound the Bureau to the terms of the contract when he signed the instrument. Bob Thomas, publicity man for the Bureau, of Fresno; a Bureau photographer; Ralph Brodie, Bureau attorney; and Jack Rodner, district manager of the Bureau at Fresno, were officials who were present for the occasion.

Frank Justin, president of the Chowchilla water district, was the first to sign for the district, other directors, Duval Williams, vice president; H. V. Eastman, secretary; Charles Blaylock, H. P. Dower and Mark Van Elswyk affixed their signatures to make the matter legal. Denslow Green, attorney for the district, and Howard Stoddard, district engineer, observed the proceedings with interest.

Prior to signing the contract, parties to the agreement had luncheon together and were in a jovial mood for the main event of the afternoon.

[From the Fresno (Calif.) Bee of August 25, 1950]

STATE DEMOCRATIC RESOLUTION URGES CVP COMPLETION

CHOWCHILLA, August 25.—Duval Williams, Chowchilla, a member, said today the California Democratic Central Committee, meeting earlier in the month in Sacramento, unanimously adopted his resolution regarding power development.

It urges completion of the Central Valley project, the Cahuma project, and the Solano project, and endorses the White-Douglas bill which would integrate the North Fork of the Kings River into the CVP.

ONE AMENDMENT

Williams said a single amendment added to his resolution read:

"We endorse authorization and construction of such lateral highways connecting major features of Central Valley and the coast, such as the highway project known as Winnemucca to the Sea."

The original "resources" plank, which, with the amendments, cleared the resolutions committee, then was adopted on the convention floor, read:

"We urge in particular the appropriation of the adequate funds and the immediate completion of the construction of the authorized transmission lines and substations and Delta steam plant, of the Central Valley basin which was submitted to the Congress with the approval of the President on August 29, 1949.

CONFIDENCE IN PROGRAM

"This committee expresses its confidence in the program being carried out by the Bureau of Reclamation in the 17 Western States, by urging that the California constitutional delegation join with the congressional delegations of the other Western States to promote the development of water and power resources to their fullest extent, for the benefit of the Nation.

"We endorse and urge the United States Congress to enact into law as soon as possible the White-Douglas bill to integrate the North Fork of the Kings River into the Central Valley project.

"We endorse authorization and construction of such specified projects in the Central Valley as the Feather River Dam, the East Side and West Side Sacramento Valley Canals, and the West Side San Joaquin Valley Canal."

ADL Rips Fake Red Peace Bid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues an item which appeared in the September 1950 issue of the Metropolitan Star, the official publication of the Metropolitan Council of B'nai B'rith. The article is as follows:

ADL RIPS FAKE RED PEACE BID

Ten major Jewish organizations, including B'nai B'rith and its Anti-Defamation League, have denounced the Stockholm appeal and characterized as a "despicable divide-and-conquer tactic" the circulation of a version of the pro-Communist petition directed specifically to Jewish groups.

In a statement, the Jewish organizations called upon "all who wish to serve the peace of the world and the preservation of freedom to reject, with calm and common sense, the Stockholm Appeal." The organizations charged that "those who assist the unscrupulous Communist aggressors in advancing this instrument of their destructive purposes make use of every device of confusion and distortion."

Organizations which signed the statement were American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, Anti-Defamation League, Association of Jewish Chaplains in the Armed Forces, B'nai B'rith, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans of U. S. A., National Community Relations Advisory Council, National Council of Jewish Women, and Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

The statement of opposition to the Stockholm appeal follows:

"At the very time when the peace of the world has been shattered by Communist aggression in Korea, a spurious peace petition, the appeal of the World Congress of Partisans of Peace, generally known as the Stockholm appeal, is being circulated by Communist and pro-Communist groups. The falsity of this misleading petition has been exposed by President Truman, by Secretary of State Acheson, and repeatedly by religious, labor, and other organizations genuinely devoted to world peace, including the undersigned organizations. On August 2 the officers of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Synagogue Council of America joined in a denunciation of the deceptive Stockholm appeal and correctly designated it 'a camouflage designed to confuse the free societies.'

"Those who assist the unscrupulous Communist aggressors in advancing this instrument of their destructive purposes make use of every device of confusion and distortion. In this connection, our attention has been called to the issuance and circulation among Jewish groups of copies of the petition containing alleged endorsements of some religious leaders and public figures in European countries and Israel.

"It is a well-known ommunist technique to make special and divisive appeals to the various religious, nationality, and racial groups in the United States. We resent this despicable 'divide and conquer' tactic. The falsity of the version of the Stockholm appeal directed toward Jews is transparent; the endorsements obviously come from pro-Communists, from those behind the iron curtain who had no choice, or from innocents who have been duped by the spurious appeal, if, indeed, the endorsements are authentic.

"We, the undersigned organizations, hereby denounce all versions of the false petition, and call upon all who wish to serve the peace of the world and the preservation of freedom to reject, with calm and common sense, the Stockholm appeal.

"The presentation of the deceptive Stockholm appeal has in some instances provoked groups to violence directed against those who would deceive them. By circulating the Stockholm appeal, the Communists are attempting to provoke the American people to violence, threat of violence, mob action, and disruptive disturbances. We urge the American people to avoid this trap. American democracy can and must be preserved not by abrogating the cherished principles of civil liberties but by confident reliance upon lawful processes and the appropriate governmental agencies."

Television As an Instrument of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous potential of television has perhaps not been fully realized, and I am therefore glad to have this opportunity to place in the RECORD certain remarks made by Philo T. Farnsworth, vice president in charge of research for the Capehart-Farnsworth Corp., concerning the possibility of television as a means toward world peace. Mr. Farnsworth is the inventor of the first practical system of electronic television, and his statement is therefore of considerable significance.

His recent statement reads as follows:

Television, despite the tremendous strides it has already made here as a medium of home entertainment, holds a far more important promise not only to this country but to the entire world, that of implementing universal peace, and universal understanding through its ability to present to the peoples of all lands understandable pictures of their respective ways of life and standards of living.

Despite the many fine educational programs our Government has broadcast into foreign lands, the sharp difference in languages has been a decided barrier to their full effectiveness.

Television, on the other hand, is, in a sense, a universal language. It can be a powerful tool for preventing misunderstanding. It is a picture more convincing than any words, by which ideas, experiences, and facts can be convincing and intelligently presented to the world's millions. Thus can we tie peoples together through common knowledge of each others ways.

The concept of international television is particularly important now, both in view of chaotic world conditions, and because the art is still in its compartive infancy.

Television will always be judged by its programs. The more it can broaden its scope of service, or education, and the more it can widen its sphere of interest, the more meaningful and worth-while it will become. International television is a means to this end.

The accomplishment of a practical system of international television is faced with tremendous technical difficulties, but these problems can, and will, be overcome in the not-too-distant future.

The benefits to be obtained from this service are so great that we must dissolve our technical difficulties as quickly as humanly possible. I believe that the day we can do this is not too far off.

Mining and the Harold L. Ickes Episode in Our Country's Mining Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, this country still has vast mining resources waiting development. Most of these undeveloped mineral deposits are located in the rugged inaccessible mountain ranges of the West. Practically all of the land containing these mineral resources has been withdrawn from settlement and set aside as national forests under the administration of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

To assist the prospector and miner in opening these inaccessible areas and have access to their mining properties, I have introduced a bill to provide necessary roads—a bill that was modeled as closely as practical to the Canadian law that has done so much to place Canada in the forefront in mineral production and developed the Dominion's mining industry, an industry that has contributed in such a large measure to Canadian prosperity.

This mining road construction program met with determined opposition by the Government departments. A copy of the mining-road bill and the report on the bill made by the then Secretary of the Interior, together with my correspondence with the Secretary, taken from the Government archives is inserted here for the information of my colleagues:

A MINE ROADS BILL AND ICKES EPISODE TAKEN FROM THE FILES OF THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

[H. R. 6098, 74th Cong., 1st sess.]

(In the House of Representatives, February 21, 1935)

Mr. WHITE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

"A bill to assist and promote the development of the mineral resources located within the national forests of the United States, authorizing the construction of roads by the Secretary of Agriculture for the use of the owners or operators of mining properties, and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted, etc., That, when an application is made to the Secretary of the Interior by any owner and/or operator of any mineral or placer claim, or group of mineral or placer claims, located within a national forest of the United States, for the construction of a road and bridges necessary for the transportation of mineral products of, or supplies for, such mineral or placer claims, it

shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to cause an examination of said mineral or placer claims by a qualified representative of the United States Geological Survey, and when it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that development on a mineral or placer claim or group of claims situated within any national forest of the United States has proved the existence of mineral or ore bodies in quantity and commercial value sufficient to warrant the expenditure of public moneys for the construction of roads and bridges to facilitate the operation and development of such mineral or placer claims, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide the construction, reconstruction, or repair of roads, trails, and bridges within the boundaries of any national forest in aid of the development and operation of such mineral claims.

"SEC. 2. Any road, trail, or bridge constructed or reconstructed or repaired as provided in section 1 of this act shall be available for the use of the general public, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sums of $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, to be expended for carrying out the provisions of this act."

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, April 15, 1935.

Memorandum for the Secretary.

The Geological Survey has prepared a favorable report on H. R. 6098. This bill provides that when the owner of a mineral or placer claim, located within a national forest, makes application to the Secretary of the Interior for the construction of a road necessary for the transportation of mineral products, such mineral or placer claim shall be examined by a representative of the Geological Survey and if such examination shows that the claimant has proved the existence of mineral or ore of commercial value sufficient to warrant the expenditure of public moneys for the construction of these roads to facilitate the operation of such claim, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide for such road construction.

Mr. Duncan, mineral attorney in the Solicitor's office, believes that we should report unfavorably on this bill, and Messrs. Thomas, Wiener, and Kirgis are of the same opinion. Mr. Duncan has rewritten the report, and both his and the one prepared by Dr. Mendenhall are attached.

Mr. Duncan takes the position that such roads should not be constructed to increase the profits of mine owners, and he points out that such action may also have the effect of placing unnecessary ores on a depressed market and that economically the mineral deposits may not justify the cost of the road construction.

Dr. Mendenhall points out that these roads are to be constructed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and the duties of the Department of the Interior are confined to geological surveys. He doubts the propriety of extending our report to activities which are not proposed by this legislation to be performed by this Department.

I am submitting both proposed reports to you herewith.

RUFUS G. POOLE,
Assistant Solicitor.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 17, 1935.

Memorandum for the Secretary.

In accordance with your decision, an adverse report on H. R. 6098, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to construct roads in national forests to facilitate mineral development, is submitted herewith. A copy of the favorable report prepared by Dr. Mendenhall is attached in folded form.

RUFUS G. POOLE,
Assistant Solicitor.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 24, 1935.

Hon. RENE L. DEROUEN,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DEROUEN: I am in receipt of your letter of February 25 requesting a report on H. R. 6098, a bill to assist and promote the development of the mineral resources located within the national forests of the United States, authorizing the construction of roads by the Secretary of Agriculture for the use of the owners or operators of mining properties, and for other purposes.

In the language of the bill, there is the plain implication that the proven presence of mineral or ore bodies in quantity and of commercial value is sufficient in itself to warrant the expenditure of public money to provide ways for their transportation, and upon the disclosure of such conditions alone, the applicant is entitled to the grant of his application.

In a broad sense, if ores are of commercial value, they can be mined, transported, and marketed at a profit, and if they can be so mined, transported, and marketed, no reason is seen for the use of public funds to increase the profits of the owner of the mine.

But assuming that what is meant is if minerals exist in quantity and commercial grade they can be produced at a profit, provided that the Government constructs and maintains roads and bridges to transport them within the forest, still I do not see the warrant for the expenditure of public money for such purpose unless a satisfactory showing is made that there is a public demand for the mineral from the mine to which the road is to be built, and like assurance that the road would be used for the transportation of minerals and supplies for a sufficient length of time to justify the cost of construction thereof.

Many factors, besides mere mineralogical conditions, would have to be considered as a basis for intelligent decision. Among these may be mentioned an inquiry whether the operator of the mine has the capital, the capacity, the mining facilities, and the bona fide purpose to mine and market the deposit; whether the existing market conditions would probably justify the throwing on the market of the additional product, or, stated differently, whether it is in the interest of sound conservation of mineral resources and economic policy to promote the mining of the particular resource at public expense, for it is not believed that any good purpose would be subserved in dumping unneeded mineral on a glutted or depressed market. An inquiry would also be pertinent, whether the contemplated scale of operations at the mine justified the cost of the building of the roads and bridges, which would entail the formulation and comparison of estimates of cost of the road and probable production of the mine.

It may be doubted whether the bill confers upon the Secretary the latitude of discretion above indicated and thought necessary for its proper administration. But unless such discretion can be exercised, there is a high probability in many instances that roads and bridges would be built for mines that would not be found economically practicable to work and the use for the purpose for which the roads were built would not be commenced or would be shortly abandoned, and that deposits that might be minable in a different situation or under different market conditions, would be used as a pretext for obtaining contracts to build roads.

Even if the bill confers authority upon the Secretary to consider all the factors necessary to justify the expenditure of public funds, the bill, if it becomes a law, is difficult of administration, requiring the determination of facts not easy to ascertain certainly, that are subject to controversy and change, and requires the Secretary to speculate upon the success of a proposed mining venture, and may result in the expenditure of public funds in private interest, without any compensatory benefits to the public interest.

The bill also further operates to give undue advantage to those having mineral deposits in the forests over others having like deposits similarly situation outside the forests.

For the reason stated, I do not look with favor on the bill.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE OF IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1935.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ICKES: Reference is made to your report on H. R. 6098, a bill introduced by myself "to assist and promote the development of the mineral resources located within the national forests of the United States, authorizing the construction of roads by the Secretary of Agriculture for the use of the owners or operators of mining properties, and for other purposes," which you disapproved.

In considering this matter, let me bring to your attention the fact that vast undeveloped mineral deposits are located within the boundaries of the national forests in the Western States; that in these national forests many mining locations have been made and mining properties have been acquired by companies and individuals in good faith; that the owners of these mining properties are devoting their time and money to the development of these properties; that under the rules and regulations governing the administration of the national forests the owners and operators of these mining properties are entirely dependent upon the Federal Government for the construction of the necessary roads to afford transportation to the mining districts in which the properties are located, and that, pursuant to the policy that is being followed by the Forest Service in the construction of roads, the needs of the mining properties are met only so far as may be incidental to the program of road construction for forest administration and fire protection.

As stated in a letter recently received from an executive of the Forest Service:

"Under the policies heretofore governing the use of forest highway funds, money has not been available primarily for the purpose of constructing roads needed by miners to develop their properties or to open up areas of assumed mineral values. * * * There are relatively large demands being made by owners of mineral properties to have the Forest Service build roads into these properties or to have the Forest Service extend roads into particular sections of the national forests where minerals in paying quantities are alleged to exist. Obviously, all these demands can be met only to the extent that the program of forest roads needed for the protection and utilization of the Government resources of the national forests may incidentally serve the purposes which the miners have in mind." And, again at a later date:

"The road fund, as now made available to the Forest Service for the construction of truck trails and roads, does not permit the allocation of such funds for roads required primarily for the development of mining properties. Prior consideration must be given the roads needed for the protection and administration of the national forests."

From information that is available in the numerous geological reports on file in your Department, doubtless you are aware of the extent and value of some of the mineral deposits located in areas covered by the national forests. (See USGS Circular No. 9, 1934—Mendenhall—Geology and Ore Deposits of Idaho County.) Many of these mineralized areas have not as yet been examined and reported upon by the Geological Survey.

While I am aware of the valuable and extensive mineral deposits of our Western States, located largely within the boundaries of the national forests, I am more particularly conversant with the mineral resources of our State of Idaho and its record of production of the precious metals—gold and silver—produced from a region which, according to a statement made by Dr. Finch, Director of the Bureau of Mines, is the "greatest undeveloped gold area in the United States."

The importance of the gold deposits of this area (almost wholly within the national forests) has long been recognized by mining authorities. In the October 4, 1929, issue of the Engineering and Mining Journal there appears a treatise by Dr. Francis A. Thomson, now president of the Montana School of Mines, on the gold deposits of central Idaho. I quote from Dr. Thomson's article:

"The Idaho batholith is probably one of the best-known geologic features of the Pacific Northwest. * * *

"From gold veins in the batholith and in its roof were derived the placers of Boise Basin, in south-central Idaho, and of Elk City, Florence, Pierce City, and other camps of north-central Idaho, all of which were so abundantly productive in the sixties and seventies. * * * (Accredited by the United States Geological Survey with a gold production of $250,000,000.)

"The principal ore deposits of the country are steeply dipping fissure veins carrying principally gold and silver in a quartz gangue. * * *

"Such veins compare favorably, so far as size is concerned, with the gold veins of Australia, California, and Cripple Creek. The so-called dike deposits are purposely omitted from the tabulation given above. * * *

"The lack of suitable highways is such that, under existing transporation conditions, only placer mining and the working of bonanza gold viens cou'd be expected to show a profit."

The bill H. R. 6098, under consideration, is designed and has been introduced to construct mining roads in the national forests, to facilitate the development of the mines and the utilization of the forest resources, not otherwise obtainable, similar to a plan that has been followed by the Canadian Government, which is a large factor in the success of the Dominion in increasing its gold production, which has expanded from 1,928,308 ounces in 1929, valued at $39,858,026, to 2,972,000 ounces, valued at $104,020,000 in 1934, and placed Canada for the first time ahead of the United States in gold production.

The Canadian Government has a very liberal policy in assisting miners to develop their properties. I quote from the Mines Development Act of British Columbia, chapter 164:

"2. Where it is shown to the satisfaction of the Minister of Mines that development-work on a mineral or placer claim or group of mineral claims in any mining district has proved the existence of minerals or ore bodies in quantity and of commercial value sufficient to warrant an expenditure of public moneys for the construction of trails, roads and bridges to facilitate the operation and development of such mineral or placer claims, the Minister of Mines may authorize the expenditure of so much of the public moneys as may be required by the Minister of Public Works for the construction of such trails, roads and bridges."

The importance of the development of our gold resources has been emphasized by recent legislation which increased the value of gold $14.33 per ounce. One of the effects of this legislation has been to increase the value of gold mined annually in the British possessions, $225,000,000.

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of developing the gold deposits in this country. When we consider the benefits to be derived by the increase in gold reserves, permanent employment in the mining industry, the stimulation to general business, by the development of these mining areas, and, of particular interest to the Government, additional sources of taxation revenue, by the payment of county, State, and Federal taxes, including capital stock taxes, corporation taxes, and income taxes, the Government, as has been stated by successful mine operators in California, takes about 50 percent of their revenue in the form of taxes. In view of these facts, it is apparent that the development of our mining resources, now isolated within the national forests, is of paramount importance to the whole Nation.

Turning to the statement made in your report, disapproving the bill: "If ores are of commercial value, they can be mined, transported, and marketed at a profit, and, if they can be so mined, transported and marketed, no reason is seen for the use of public funds to increase the profits of the owner of the mine," it is difficult to reconcile the position taken by your Department in this case with liberal policy that has been followed by our Government in the past, in providing means of transportation by the construction of roads, digging canals and harbors, improving waterways, subsidizing the construction of railways, and the operation of steamships and airways, which has contributed so largely to the development of our national resources and our national prosperity.

It is a fact that many mining properties located within the national forests contain ore deposits of commercial value "that can be mined, transported, and marketed at a profit," if the Government will do for these miners what it does for industry everywhere outside of the national forests—provide the necessary roads for transportation. Surely, the Federal Government will not evade the responsibility to provide the necessary roads for mining development, assumed when these areas, containing vast mineral resources and embracing many mining properties privately owned and acquired in good faith, were withdrawn from public domain and placed in the national forests where they are barred from receiving the assistance of the local government of the counties and States by the construction of the necessary roads.

Referring to the contention raised as to the conditions to be considered in approving an application for the construction of mining roads, it is assumed that you have in the personnel of the United States Geological Survey, or will employ, qualified representatives to examine and report on the merits of the property covered by these applications, similar to the plan followed in Canada, and that discretion will be exercised in approving these applications, which is provided for in the bill.

Instead of the bill giving "undue advantage to those having mineral deposits in the forests over others having like deposits similarly situated outside the forests," experience and comparisons will demonstrate that the opposite is the case, and thousands of valuable mining properties—in some cases entire mining districts—are lying idle and inaccessible due to the indifference and neglect of the Government to construct the necessary roads to open up the districts.

In view of the conditions affecting the development of mining properties located within the national forests, and the importance of the development of these mining resources to the prosperity and welfare of the country as a whole, I urge that your report on this bill be reconsidered and that your Department report the bill favorably.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 6, 1936.

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: I have had under consideration your letter of July 27, 1935, urging reconsideration of my unfavorable report of April 24, 1935, on H. R. 6098, introduced by you, entitled "A bill to assist and promote the development of mineral resources located within the national forests of the United States, authorizing the construction of roads by the Secretary of Agriculture for the use of the owners or operators of mining properties, and for other purposes."

As your letter came just before the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress and laid considerable stress on certain publications relating to the mineral resources in Idaho, considerable areas of such resources being in national forests, early reply was deferred pending a study of these publications.

The issue of October 4, 1929, of the Engineering and Mining Journal, as well as issues preceding and following that date, were searched for the treatise referred to by you, written by Dr. Francis A. Thomson, but without success. A treatise on the geology and gold resources of north and central Idaho by Dr. Thomson and Samuel A. Ballard was published as Bulletin No. 7 of the Idaho Bureau of Mines in 1924, and has been examined as well as the publication of the Geological Survey of 1934, relating to ore deposits and geology in certain parts of Idaho, to which apparently you referred.

Conceding, as these publications disclose, the existence of great potential wealth of the lands in Idaho, and in the national forests in that State, for gold, and that development thereof may be to some extent impeded by lack of suitable roads, I am unable to see that these facts present a persuasive argument for the bill presented.

The owners and operators of mining properties in the national forests are not absolutely dependent upon the Federal Government for the construction of roads to afford transportation to the mining districts in which the properties are located, if what is meant is that they are dependent on national forest roads constructed at the expense of the Government and out of the appropriations made to the Secretary of Agriculture for that purpose in order to have access to their mines from without the forests. The act of March 3, 1839, chapter 427, section 1 (30 Stat. 1233, U. S. C., title 16, sec. 525), provides that: "In the form provided by existing law the Secretary of the Interior may file and approve surveys and plats of any right-of-way for a wagon road, railroad, or other highways over and across any national forest when in his judgment the public interest will not be injuriously affected thereby."

Under these provisions the owners of mining properties, or a group of them, may obtain rights to construct roads within the forests, and I am not convinced that the only or the principal factor contributing to idleness of mines or mining districts is due to the indifference and neglect of the Government to construct the necessary roads to open up the district.

The liberal policy you refer to of the Government in the past in providing means of transportation by the construction of roads, digging canals and harbors, improving waterways and subsidizing railroads, the construction of railroads, and the operation of steamships and airways, which have contributed so largely to the development of our national resources and our national prosperity, do not seem to afford sufficient precedents for constructing roads at Government expense for the sole benefit of individual mine owners upon the finding that development on a mineral or placer claim "has proved the existence of mineral or ore bodies in quantity and commercial grade." It is not apparent that the subsidizing or financial aid of the Government authorized under these conditions would contribute to the prosperity and welfare of the country as a whole, as my previous report sought to point out.

Without further comment, my conclusion is that your letter does not meet or remove the major objections assigned heretofore by me to the enactment of this legislation in its present form, and I, therefore, adhere to my previous conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

SECRETARY ICKES' VIEWS 10 YEARS LATER

[From the American magazine, November 8, 1945]

THE WAR AND OUR VANISHING RESOURCES

(By Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior)

(America today is out on a limb, says the custodian of our natural resources. Five years of war have made us a have-not nation in vital minerals. * * * A timely warning to those who feel overconfident about the "inexhaustible" wealth of the United States.)

We may have peacetime conscription. We may retain a tremendous peacetime Navy. But the plain fact is that we cannot afford another prolonged war in 20 or 30 years.

Not that we haven't the men; not that we haven't the will to fight again if we have to; not that we haven't the cash—we just haven't got the oil, the copper, the zinc, and the mercury, which are so vital to the machines and munitions of modern warfare.

The prodigal harvest of minerals that we have reaped to win this war has bankrupted some of our most vital mineral resources. We no longer deserve to be listed with Russia and the British Empire as one of the have nations of the world. We should be listed with the have nots, such as Germany and Japan.

The overwhelming significance of this change from a "have" to a "have not" nation lies in these facts: Without mineral resources, the United States could never have built the ships, the planes, and the guns which have made us the greatest military power in the world. We could never have been more than an agricultural country. We could never have been able to support, at a standard of living that is the envy of the world, the 135,000,000 people now living within our borders.

Does this change in status mean that we are about to become a pushover for other countries, that our standard of living will be greatly reduced, that we shall all become farmers, and horse-and-buggy farmers, at that? This, in fact, is the future that we are now carving out for our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren by our do-nothing policy.

It should be burned into our consciousness that we do not have an inexhaustible supply of minerals—the sinew that makes this country mighty. Our minerals are not inexhaustible and irreplaceable. Unlike wheat and corn, new crops of minerals do not appear from year to year. Further, the faster we grow in industrial strength and military potency, the more rapidly we dissipate our mineral resources—the very basis of our military and industrial power.

To prevent the decline of the United States as a major military and industrial power, and to maintain our high standard of living, we must take immediate positive action to increase our known mineral resources. We must begin at once:

To stock-pile minerals;

To explore our country more extensively than ever before;

To hunt for better methods of recovering metals from scrap;

To have access, in common with other peacefully disposed nations, to minerals in the lands that have been conquered in the recent war, for from now on we shall be increasingly dependent upon imports for our minerals.

The bountiful heritage of minerals and oil with which the United States was originally endowed has tended, unfortunately, to make most of us complacent about these resources, and our time has been spent in patting ourselves on the back for mining such great quantities of them. This puts us in the position of the man who was so happy about the speed at which he was sawing off the limb that he forgot that he was sitting on the limb.

How close we are to cutting off the limb that supports us can be seen by casting up our accounts to ascertain the cost of this war to our mineral resources, and inventorying how much we have left.

Between January 1, 1940, and January 1, 1945, we tore from the earth some 5,000,000,000 tons of minerals. Included in this total are 516,158,500 tons of domestic iron ore, the most astonishing amount ever produced by this or any other nation in a similar period. During this period we mined 3,061,060,000 tons of coal, or enough to cover the whole city of New York with a blanket of coal 12 feet thick.

Here are some figures which will give an idea of the variety and quantity of our mineral resources that have been sacrificed on the altar of the god of war. In the 5-year period from New Year's Day, 1940, we mined:

	Tons
Coal	3,061,060,000
Iron ore	516,158,500
Lead	2,278,000
Zinc	3,642,000
Copper	5,000,000
Bauxite	14,169,000
Tungsten	20,750
Molybdenum	112,000
Sulphur	17,118,000
Salt	68,000,000
Potassium	3,155,000
Petroleum	1,000,000,000

Into the war machine and domestic economy also went 15,700,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas. The tonnage of petroleum mentioned about equals 7,325,000,000 barrels. Some idea of the demands upon our petroleum resources may be measured by the fact that the United States has 36 percent of the known oil reserves of the world, but has been furnishing approximately 60 percent of the petroleum used in the war.

These figures do not encompass our total mineral production during the war; we have also mined large amounts of other minerals, but they do show how great has been our dependence upon our minerals and what great quantities of these limited resources we have used.

If we are to continue as a dominant industrial and military power, the big question is not so much what we have used, but what we have left.

The fact is that some of our "blue chip" minerals have been depleted to the critical point. On the basis of known usable reserves, we have in this country only nine major minerals which, at the 1935-39 rate of use, may be expected to last 100 years or more—nitrogen, magnesium, salt, bituminous coal and lignite, phosphate rock, molybdenum, anthracite, potash, and iron ore. And a hundred years is nothing in the life of a nation.

We have less than a 35-year peacetime commercial supply of 21 minerals. The significance of this is that 35 years are but little more than the usual interval between wars, and among these 21 minerals are petroleum, copper, lead, and zinc, in the production of which we have led the world for many years. The others are sulfur, natural gas, fluorspar, cadmium, gold, lead, silver, bauxite, vanadium, antimony, tungsten, platinum, asbestos, manganese, chromite, nickel, and tin. Our automobile and electrical industries, to mention only two, would not have made the advances that they have made, had they been hampered by shortages in any of these minerals.

So far, I have mentioned coal, iron ore, and petroleum only briefly. Their prime importance—imagine the United States trying to get along without the products made possible by coal and iron and petroleum—merits special consideration, however. Coal is the Nation's No. 1 mineral asset. Iron ore ranks second, and petroleum third.

Just how important coal is to a nation's economy is shown by the fact that the five great centers of industrial and military power—the United States, England, Russia, Japan, and western Europe—have developed on the basis of large coal resources.

Coal is the stuff that spins the wheels of most of our industry. It would appear that we have plenty of coal, but already our reserves of high-grade coking coals, without which it is difficult to make steel, are none too plentiful, and their lack may compel us to seek different and perhaps more expensive ways of making steel, within a comparatively few years.

Despite their fundamental importance, we don't know enough about coking coal resources. In mining almost any bed of coal, a third or more of the coal in that bed is irrevocably lost. Some of this loss is unavoidable, but much of it could be prevented if the cutthroat competition in the industry did not force the mine owners to take the easy pickings and turn to new coal beds, instead of getting all of the coal that there is out of any particular seam. Further, there is no wisdom, from a national viewpoint, in consuming our limited reserves of high-grade coking coals to generate steam for power plants, when these coals are so vital to the making of steel. Steam plants can use lower-grade coals. We have plenty of them.

Iron ore is an outstanding resource in four of the five great centers of industrial power. Much to her regret, Japan is notably deficient in iron ore, and attempted to overcome this weakness through aggression. Our reserves of iron ore do not match those of coal by a wide margin. Originally, some 6,000,000,000 tons of usable ore were to be found in the good earth of this country. About two-thirds of the original cache remains, but, in true American style, we have already licked the icing off the cake, and much of the ore that is left will be harder and more expensive to get.

The high-quality ores which are found in the Mesabi Range in Minnesota will soon

be only a rusty memory. This ore is the cream of our resources, because it can be mined cheaply and because it is so free of other minerals that it can be used directly in the blast furnace, without prior treatment. These high-quality ores account for 50 percent of the total iron production of the country. At the prewar rate of extraction, the remaining tonnage will be exhausted in 22 years.

We must develop our lower-grade ores, and we shall have to build large plants to treat them. Such plants will limit production capacity and will be costly. But to maintain our position of self-sufficiency would justify some extra cost to the public, although the consumer cannot be expected to assume an unreasonable burden, such as paying $10 for an iron frying pan.

As to oil, the daily newspapers give evidence that supplies are far from ample to meet all demands. The American Petroleum Institute estimates known or proved reserves of oil at 20,000,000,000 barrels. Last year we produced 1,700,000,000 barrels of crude oil.

Thus, if future discoveries fail to bring in enough oil, we shall shortly—in 15 to 20 years—be faced with the need for developing sources of oil supply outside of the continental boundaries of the United States. Under peacetime conditions, substantial quantities of oil could be obtained from the Caribbean area and, if necessary, from more distant sources, such as Saudi Arabia and Bahrein. This would seem to be the cheapest solution.

Secondary recovery of domestic supply from apparently depleted oil fields has begun already, and could be increased considerably at higher prices.

Synthetic liquid fuels also offer a feasible, though more costly, solution. Synthetic motor fuel can probably be made from coal at 18 cents a gallon in large plants. The Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior is experimenting in the production of synthetic gasoline in commercial-sized plants. Costs of from 12 to 15 cents are possible after the techniques have been fully developed. The costs of producing gasoline from crude petroleum are approximately 5 cents a gallon.

If we exhaust our readily available domestic reserves of minerals—what experts call our commercial reserves—the car owner, manufacturer, or housewife is directly affected. The consumer's automobile, his electric iron, and his refrigerator will cost more, because we shall be forced to pay the extra cost of shipping these minerals in from abroad, and it will cost more to extract what we call our submarginal resources.

Our submarginal resources of today may be, and frequently are, our commercial reserves of tomorrow, because almost all of the earth which covers the United States contains minerals which could be used if we were willing to pay the price for extracting them. This, of course, could be tremendously expensive and might run the cost of some minerals up to several hundred dollars a pound.

Already technological advances indicate that this possibility is not too remote in some fields. Before the war the aluminum industry, for instance, would not attempt to use bauxite which contained more than 8 percent silica. Bauxite deposits found to have more silica than this were rejected as unfit for use, and this constituted our submarginal supply. New processes have been developed whereby bauxite containing 20 percent silica is being used, and bauxite containing a greater proportion of silica constitutes our submarginal supply. Tomorrow, with improved technology, bauxites containing even more silica may be used.

Because most commercial companies hesitate to spend money in this field, federally financed research along this line would pay big dividends. In inventorying the Nation's mineral resources, I have, however, discounted the possible enlargement of our sources of supply by the discovery of new methods of extraction for two reasons: first, these methods have not yet been found or perfected; and, second, in some cases we just haven't the minerals in submarginal supply.

But, if we are willing to pay the price for them, our potential reserves of iron ore, phosphate rock, molybdenum, potash, and all forms of sulfur are ample for many years to come. Resources of nitrogen, magnesium, and salt, for practical purposes, may be regarded as limitless as the sea and the sky from which they are drawn. There are large submarginal resources of bauxite, manganese, and vanadium. How our submarginal resources of uranium stand will have to await further exploration.

But of such vitally necessary minerals as copper, lead, zinc, tin, nickel, and chromite, little is left. We shall have to import these minerals in larger and larger quantities. Otherwise, we shall be faced with the prospect of a civilization without all of the necessities (batteries, paints, washtubs, plumbing supplies, tin cans, shiny automobile radiators) with which these minerals now provide us.

Even more alarming than the fact that we are coming to the end of some of our known resources is the fact that we are uncovering few, if any, unknown deposits of minerals.

The failure of petroleum discoveries to keep pace with the rapid rate of depletion has received much attention during the war. Discovery of other mineral deposits has declined alarmingly for half a century. No major metal-producing district comparable to Butte, Bisbee, Homestake, or Coeur d'Alene has been brought into production in the United States since 1916. There have been few important copper discoveries in this country during the twentieth century. Most of the large producing deposits were known before 1900. The largest discovery since then has been the United Verde Extension mine at Jerome, Ariz.

New discoveries now depend upon the development of effective and economical means of finding deposits not recognizable from surface indications alone. Large quantities or ore hidden deep in the earth have been found by underground exploration conducted in active mining areas. Geophysical methods have been very successful in locating petroleum deposits. New findings of concealed resources by a combination of these methods are looked for, but we have come to the end of the good old days when digging for water might produce an oil gusher or a gold mine.

In view of our impending "have not" position, should we shut down our mines and preserve the scarce resources remaining in the ground for future emergencies? No. The cost would be too great. It would be wasteful, because much of the unmined portions of developed deposits probably could never be recovered after prolonged shutdowns. The abrupt shut-down would strand thousands of miners and their families in isolated mining areas. Huge capital losses would be incurred. For these reasons, the proposal does not seem to merit serious consideration.

Then what can we do?

Stockpiles should be built up, for this is one of the surest ways of assuring our basic security in minerals in time of need.

A large-scale stockpiling program would provide a reservoir into which domestic materials might be placed in times of depression. This would mean that the Nation would benefit from low costs and the miners would have employment. Such a stockpiling program during the last depression would have given us a substantial inventory that would have eased greatly the job of producing minerals during the war years.

Such minerals as we lack entirely, or whose supply here is insignificant, should be imported and added to our stockpiles.

Our second line of defense is our marginal and submarginal resources. Exploration for new deposits should be carried on vigorously, and plans made for emergency production.

Private industry alone cannot be expected to carry this burden. Since the defense of the Nation is involved, the work of private industry should be aided by Government research and by Government-sponsored explorations. Such a program might lead to the development of new peacetime industries. Interesting possibilities in this direction are offered by our large deposits of manganese-, vanadium-, and aluminum-bearing materials.

We should never again be so prodigal as we have been in the past in bestowing our precious scrap upon nations that may send it back in the form of bullets and bombs. Further, we should spend time and money in seeking new and better ways to recover metals from scrap.

As our mineral resources grow smaller, and as we are compelled more and more to seek raw materials outside of our borders, we must keep our military forces—our Army, Navy, and air arm—strong enough to do our share in maintaining the peace of the world—a peace that is necessary if we are to bring in what we require for our own economy. Without a strong military force, we would be laying open the life lines of raw materials to the first aggressor who could gather a sizable military force about him.

We must encourage and support, morally and financially, the investigations of our research workers and scientists.

If followed, the program that I suggest would prevent or postpone for many years the loss by the United States of its dominant position and its high standard of living.

Such a program would cost money, and, as a Nation, we have been willing to talk a great deal about conservation, but unwilling to put up much cash for it. We have preferred to see millions of cubic feet of an irreplaceable resource—natural gas—flared off—burned up—rather than spend money to store it. We have preferred to waste millions of tons of coal, rather than halt cheap but wasteful methods of mining.

The time has come to face the fact that we can no longer afford to keep our present nonconservation policy. The need in war for modern weapons made from metal and propelled by mineral fuels, mineral shortages that have at times threatened serious repercussions on the battlefront, the scarcity of the modern conveniences to which we have become accustomed, and fuel and gasoline rationing ought to have brought home to us the tremendous importance of minerals in modern life. The situation calls for positive action on a long-range program that will guarantee the Nation's future mineral supply.

Roll Call 278

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD of September 15, 1950, roll call

278 shows that I had a general pair. That was the bill authorizing the appointment of General of the Army George C. Marshall to the office of Secretary of Defense.

I desire that the RECORD clearly show that I favored that appointment and would have voted for the legislation.

Greater Sobriety Will Be Needed To Win World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by the House, I am including an article by Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt, editor of a magazine entitled "The Civic Forum."

The article is entitled "Greater Sobriety Will Be Needed To Win World War III." It follows:

Everyone remembers how the brewers capitalized on World War II. For proof of this we quote the Brewer's Digest of May 1941, as follows: "One of the finest things that could have happened to the brewing industry was the insistence of high ranking officers to make beer available to Army camps. The opportunity presented to the brewing industry by this measure is so obvious that it is superfluous to go into detail. Here is a chance for brewers to cultivate a taste for beer in millions of young men who will eventually constitute the largest beer consuming section of our population."

From the above we see how the young men in the armed services were placed at the mercy of the brewers by the military officers in charge of their training. That was the basest sort of betrayal of the parents who had entrusted the moral training and welfare of their sons to the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines.

The brewers are always seeking new business. Without an increasing army of guzzlers profits might go into a decline. Of that there is no immediate danger according to an address delivered before a convention of brewers by Kenneth Laird, advertising expert, and reported in the Brewer's Journal of March 1947. Here is what Mr. Laird told the brewers: "Consumers demand is in a healthy condition. Ten million GI's have learned to know and to like beer much earlier than they would have done as civilians. Beer has an increased social standing. These factors combine to make good business in the future. For 5 years there has been no need to sell. Uncle Sam has been your sales manager and the best you ever had."

The Army has already opened bars in Alaska—one of America's most important outposts. There could be a second Pearl Harbor in Alaska. Let us learn a lesson from the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. It is now generally conceded that drink was largely responsible for our forces not being on the alert in that hour of crisis.

The outbreak of the Korean War resulted in the extension of selective service for 1 year. Within the past 2 months steps have been taken to induct into service an ever-increasing number of young men registered under the draft law. Many of these will be only 19 and 20 years of age.

The future success of these men as soldiers and later as civilians may depend upon their being shielded from the greedy designs of the brewers, distillers, and vintners. But America's big stake in any war in which she may be engaged will be to win it. Men in battle, especially officers, need clear brains and steady nerves. Can alcohol-befuddled brains be counted upon to win the next big war in which we may become involved?

There are two bills in the House of Representatives which would reenact the provisions against alcohol and vice which obtained in World War I. These bills make it a misdemeanor to have alcoholic beverages in camps or any military or naval establishments. Said bills are H. R. 3114, introduced by Representative EDWARD H. REES, Republican, of Kansas, and H. R. 886, introduced by Representative STEPHEN PACE, Democrat, of Georgia.

It would be a fine thing for churches, Good Templar and other lodges, youth groups, and clubs to adopt resolutions recommending legislation to ban alcoholic beverages from camps and military, air, or naval installations, and to make it a misdemeanor to sell or give alcoholic beverages to members of the armed services.

Farm Subsidy Loss Two Hundred and Forty-nine Million in 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Farm Subsidy Loss Two Hundred and Forty-nine Million in 1950." The article follows:

FARM SUBSIDY LOSS 249 MILLION IN 1950—MEANWHILE, ARMED SERVICES ARE BARRED FROM RECEIVING ANY SURPLUS PRODUCE

WASHINGTON, August 24.—The Commodity Credit Corporation reported today it had a net loss on its farm price-support operations of $249,230,000 for the year ended June 30.

This compares with a net loss of $254,000,000 for the previous 12 months.

Ralph S. Trigg, President of the Corporation, reported that the agency had $3,538,125,000 tied up in price-support-program, loans and inventories June 30.

Of this total, loans outstanding totaled $914,189,000, including $438,444,000 of commodity loans held by lending agencies $471,741,000 held by the CCC and $4,004,000 of loans approved but not fully processed. Inventories acquired under loan, purchase agreement, and direct purchase operations represented an investment of $2,623,935,000.

Price support operations in four commodities, corn, tobacco, cotton, and wheat, accounted for the bulk of the loan total. The loans outstanding on these included $558,125,192 on corn, $125,533,453 on tobacco, $121,037,810 on cotton, and $65,115,226 on wheat.

Mr. Trigg said the net loss in carrying the support program was largely on potatoes, eggs, peanuts, and wheat.

Meanwhile, Agriculture Department officials said nothing would be gained by turning over Government-owned surplus food stocks to the Armed Forces.

The armed services have been buying the bulk of their supplies on the open market. At the same time the Commodity Credit Corporation has been adding to the stocks of food it has taken off the market to support the prices.

The CCC now has in storage more than 190,000,000 pounds of butter, some 103,000,000 pounds of cheese, 400,000,000 pounds of dried milk, and 108,000,000 pounds of dried eggs.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, recently said the Armed Forces had been spending millions of dollars for food that should have been made available from the Government-held stocks.

A spokesman for the Agriculture Department said:

"First of all, the law does not authorize the CCC to give its surplus foods to the Armed Forces. The CCC can sell these surplus foods to the Armed Forces at the same price it sells to other outlets, but there would be no benefit there.

"On butter, for instance, the CCC pays 60 cents a pound for it to support the price and sells it for 63 cents a pound. There is no point in the Army paying 63 cents to the CCC when it can get it at 60 cents on the open market."

Little Men in Big Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of September 7, 1950:

LITTLE MEN IN BIG PLACES

The tragedy of American ineptitude is now being written in blood on the battlefields of Korea. On steep mountain slopes and in soggy rice paddies 6,000 miles from home, brave youths are dying because we, the people, have been the gullible victims of political charlatans.

Day by day the evidence grows that the terrible price America is now paying in an attempt to hold back the godless hordes of communism is traceable in a large degree to the inadequacy of American governmental leadership—to our own stupidity in electing to high office men of insufficient caliber to cope with the crafty and ruthless murderers of the Kremlin.

Little men in big places.

Who is there among us cannot recall that just a few months ago Secretary of Defense Johnson boasted that should Russia attack us at 4 o'clock we would be ready to meet her at 5; that Mr. Acheson, our Secretary of State, ruled out Formosa as none of our business at the very moment the Communists were crowding our Nationalist friends off the mainland of China; that the President himself just shortly before the Red strike in Korea assured us the prospects for peace never were brighter.

And who cannot recall the statements emanating from those in high authority about new and irresistible weapons that would give America dominance over any potential aggressor, and would insure our security—weapons which we now discover were not even in the blueprint stage.

Little men in big places.

What kind of defense guardians, what kind of protectors of the freedoms we so dearly cherish are those guilty of such foolish and stupid—perhaps, even dishonest—remarks concerning our national security? When all the while, as we have learned at such tragic cost, we were wholly unprepared and militarily impotent to cope swiftly and successfully with even a minor Soviet satellite.

Now boys are dying in Korea, youths are being shunted in wholesale numbers into the Armed Forces from their pursuits of peace, and the Nation's resources are being mobilized at a frantic pace to meet the Communist tide. We are paying in blood, sweat, and tears for the sell-out at Yalta and the blundering policy in China and the Far East, climaxed by the tragedy of Korea.

Little men in big places.

While we were being lulled into a sense of false security and the Russians continued to build up the greatest military force in the history of the world, tools of the Kremlin monsters bored from within on the United States home front. To our sorrow we now know of Red infiltration, of stolen Government secrets, and of thefts of data on the atomic bomb, the weapon upon which the hopes for world peace were so largely based. And these revelations brought ridicule upon those who dragged traitors into the open and cries of red herring at every attempt to ferret out Communist spies.

What about the cases of Alger Hiss, Judith Coplon, Klaus Fuchs, Harry Gold, and others? Are they red herrings now?

Little men in big places.

We have been victims of our own stupidity in permitting our affairs of state to remain in the hands of those who squandered our resources in a reckless spending orgy; who disrupted the economy through burdensome taxes, meddlesome Government policies, and the coddling of irresponsible cliques; and who are gradually leading us down the road to a welfare state.

While they feathered their own political nests and squandered billions to further their socialistic schemes, these puny ward politicians who are attempting to fill men's shoes extracted the bone and muscle from our Armed Forces under the guise of economy, and left us almost totally unprepared to meet the strike of a ruthless foe who would destroy freedom everywhere and make men the pawns of the state.

And now they have the effrontery to ask us to continue them in power. How dumb do they think we are? How far down the road of self-reliance and self-respect do they think we have strayed? How much longer do they think we can stomach the fumbling that has brought on the precarious situation in which we now find ourselves?

Little men in big places.

The issue long since has passed the partisan stage. No longer does it matter whether a man is a Republican or a Democrat. We, the people, must demand of the candidate seeking a seat in Congress or other high office whether he stands for the true principles of America, or whether he is an irresponsible apologist for the outrageous scuttling of our ship of state under New Deal-Fair Deal guidance.

True, we are engaged in a vital contest with communism. We must marshal all our resources, all our strength, all our energy to carry on that fight and win the final verdict for peace and freedom.

But while we do this we should not forget the outrageous blunders, the monstrous mistakes of appeasement that brought this fight upon us. We must not condone the appeasers, for men and policies capable of mistakes that cost American lives, do not deserve a second chance.

Letter of the Late Pfc John J. McCormick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN F. JAMES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, richly endowed are those to whom it is given to add even one small leaf to the evergreen garlands of poetry and prose that brings comfort or cheer or promise into the homes where little children live.

Long years ago a humble schoolmaster, unable to afford even a small gift for his children at Christmas, wrote a little story—just for them alone. His story, 'Twas the Night Before Christmas, has lived on through the years to gladden the hearts of countless little ones in all lands, and to bring back to all of us happy memories of Christmases long gone.

A busy editor, magnificently inspired, took the time to answer a query from a doubting tot, Is there a Santa Claus?

Yes; Virginia, there is a Santa Claus, has been printed and reprinted over and over throughout the land with each succeeding Christmas—nor has it to this day lost any of its charm and its power to sustain the faith and hopes of little children.

Another had been added to the long list of those whose inspired messages for children will live and deeply move both young and old.

A young soldier died in combat in Korea, but before he went into battle, he took a piece of note paper from his helmet and wrote a letter to his two small daughters back home. His letter was delivered on September 14. Three days earlier his wife was notified that Pfc John J. McCormick, 28, of Collingdale, Pa.—paratroop veteran of World War II, infantryman in Korea—had been killed in action.

John McCormick, the man, the husband and father, will live in the loving memory of his little family until the end, but his letter may well live on among the finest things written for children.

Mr. Speaker, I include, in extension of my own remarks, the letter by Pfc John J. McCormick to his children, believing that it well merits inclusion in the official RECORD of the Congress:

DEAR JOANNIE AND ROSE MARIE: This is daddy. I want you to listen and pay attention while mummie reads this to you. Just try and make believe I was there talking to you.

Joannie, I don't think you'll remember me because you were a little baby when I had to go away, but I used to sit and hold you a lot, and when you were a bad little girl, I used to make you sit in a chair until you were good, but I always loved you a lot and I was very proud of you.

Rose Marie, you should remember me because I used to take you out with me a lot, and I used to buy you a lot of candy and sodas, and I used to feel so good when people used to say you had eyes like mine. Remember the little puppy I bought you? Your mummie used to tie a little pink ribbon around its neck and you used to carry it in your arms. You looked awfully cute.

I want you both to know that I'd be with you if I could, but there are a lot of bad men in the world, and if they were allowed to do what they wanted to do, little girls like you wouldn't be allowed to go to church on Sunday or be able to go to the schools you wanted to.

So I have to help fight these men and keep them from coming where you and mummie live. It might take a long while, and maybe daddy will have to go and help God in heaven, and if do, I always want you both to be good for mummie because she is the best mummie in the world.

She had always taken care of you while I have been away. You see, kids, I happened to be caught in two wars inside 10 years, and the reason I am where I am today is because I am fighting for what I think is right.

That's one thing I always want both of you to remember. If your conscience tells you something is right, always stand up for it. You might be ridiculed for doing so, but in the long run you'll find out that people respect you more for doing so.

When you grow up to be young ladies, don't ever forget all that mummie has done for you. She has often gone without clothes for herself so that both of you could have nice things. I want you to do as she says—go to church on Sundays and you can always pray for daddy.

So remember, kids, when you grow up, save this letter in case I'm not there to talk to you, and try and remember all I am saying, for its for your good, and because I love you and mummie so much.

I'll be in a hole, fighting, in a few days, in a place called Korea. I carry your picture, and mummie's next to my heart, and if I have to go to help God, you'll know that the last thought I had on this earth was for the two of you and mummie. All my love and kisses. Be good and God bless you.

DADDY.

Americans' Failure To Vote Shames Our Valued Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jacksonville (Ill.) Daily Journal of September 20, 1950. The editorial follows:

AMERICANS' FAILURE TO VOTE SHAMES OUR VALUED FREEDOMS

We Americans don't like to be preached to about our shortcomings. But sometimes there's no other way to stir us up. Take, for instance, this matter of voting. Apparently it doesn't do any good to talk in general terms about voting as a solemn duty or a rare privilege. Lectures along that line have been delivered for years. But in 1948, a presidential election year, only around half of all eligible voters actually went to the polls. If blunt language is needed to make Americans understand the shamefulness of this performance, then it ought to be used.

We think we have the greatest democracy in the world. Yet in free elections in the

past few years, Britain, Australia, Italy, and even west Germany have vastly outstripped us in the basic democratic job of voting. Note that two of these countries had had long experience under dictators. Yet each found more than 80 percent of the people voting when their first real elections were held.

Constantly we have it dinned into our ears nowadays that if we're to lick world communism we must sell democracy abroad. The uncomfortable fact is we haven't been practicing it as well as some of the people we're supposed to be selling it to: the west Germans, for example.

None of this means, of course, that we don't care about freedom and its rights and duties. It just means that we've allowed the complexity and fascination of our big city-industrial life to distract us from our responsibilities.

By now, though, we ought to have seen enough of the world's present perils to realize that our beautiful, gadget-filled existence might be wiped right off the face of the globe if we don't make the right decisions. Those decisions are fundamentally the people's job. And they can only make them at the polls.

November 7 is another voting day, the first general election since 1948. The world will be watching to see whether Americans have learned to prize their voting rights more than another rubber of bridge or a day at the ball game or a regular place on the washing-machine schedule.

Admission of Hawaii to Union as State Would Be Living Example of United States Belief in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present a letter appearing in the New York Times of September 17 from J. B. Atherton, of Honolulu, Hawaii, president of the Mutual Telephone Co. of that city. The letter follows:

ADMITTING HAWAII—INROADS OF COMMUNISM DENIED IN PLEA FOR STATEHOOD

HONOLULU, *September 7, 1950.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your edition of September 3 you published a letter from John Williams, which dwells on certain population statistics for Hawaii, and seems to indicate that an argument against statehood for Hawaii is the effort of Communists in the islands in seeking to turn race against race.

It is my considered opinion that the facts adduced by Mr. Williams strongly support the case for immediate statehood for Hawaii. I head a company which serves all the islands of Hawaii, the fourth largest of the nearly 6,000 independent telephone companies in the United States. I have and do advocate statehood for Hawaii. I submit that I could scarcely be expected to do so if I believed there was even a remote possibility that Communists within Hawaii could endanger private enterprise under statehood.

There is solid evidence that communism is rapidly on the wane in Hawaii, and that at no time did Communist organization in Hawaii make the progress that it has made in certain major areas in continental United States.

TESTIMONY ON MEMBERSHIP

Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the subcommittee of the United States House Un-American Activities Committee which investigated subversive influences in Hawaii earlier this year, testified at a Senate committee hearing on Statehood last May 2 that at the peak of Communist organization in Hawaii in 1946 the Communist Party had only 160 members, and that it had only 90 members as of last April. He said many former members "broke with the Communist Party when they found they were actually in an international movement and not merely members of an organization that was set up * * * to improve the lot of the workers."

Representative WALTER predicted that with increased awareness of the nature of Communism the membership would continue to decline rapidly in Hawaii. He said further the estimate of a membership of only 90 represented months of investigation by the committee's investigators, in which they had the cooperation of the FBI and the Naval and Military Intelligence.

If there are only 90 actual party members in Hawaii, that would indicate only 1 for about 5,100 of population. A few months ago J. Edgar Hoover revealed estimates of Communist Party membership in various States. These estimates indicated 1 member for about 1,400 of population in the State of California, and an even larger membership in relation to population in New York. The House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in Hawaii indicated that the Communist movement in the islands had been inspired, developed, and guided by the party organization in California. It is clear that communism has had little appeal for the people of Hawaii.

LOYALTY OF CITIZENS

It is true that a majority of the citizens of these islands are of Asiatic ancestry, and that the largest single group, on the basis of ancestry, is Japanese. Rather than being an argument against statehood at this time, this situation presents the strongest possible argument for statehood now.

The loyalty of Hawaii's citizens of Japanese ancestry was brilliantly proved in the Second World War by those who worked for American victory in the islands and by the heroism and sacrifice of those who fought with the United States military forces. Even today many island youths of Japanese ancestry are fighting and dying with the United States forces in Korea.

I have lived with these splendid American citizens all my life. I went to school with them. I work with them every day. It is fantastic to question their loyalty, or to imply that they are especially vulnerable to subversive influences.

Hawaii is as proud of her citizens of Asiatic ancestry, as New York is proud of her citizens of European ancestry.

Meanwhile, Communist propagandists are carrying out an intensive campaign throughout Asia to convince peoples there that the United States represents white-supremacy imperialism. There has been alarming evidence for many months now that we have been losing the ideological war in Asia.

What better evidence is there anywhere than in Hawaii that the United States represents true democracy, and offers opportunity to all without respect to race or creed? While Hawaii enjoys a very high degree of local self-government today, this living example to Asia would be greatly strengthened by granting statehood, because in the minds of many territorial status is synonymous with colonialism.

J. B. ATHERTON.

Air-Mail Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House has favorably reported H. R. 9184 to carry out the recommendations of both President Truman and the Hoover Commission to separate subsidies from the air-mail payments of the post office.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote the recommendations for this legislation contained in President Truman's 1951 budget message to the Congress:

At present, direct financial assistance to the airlines is provided through air-mail payments, which are set generally at levels adequate to cover deficiences in the carriers' commercial revenues. Subsidy is thus merged with the fair compensation for carrying mail, making it difficult to evaluate the cost of this aid in relation to its benefits.

The recent rise in total air-mail payments—to an estimated level of about $125,000,000 in 1950—has made it increasingly important that the subsidy element be separately identified.

I recommend, therefore, the immediate enactment of legislation to authorize the separation of subsidy payments from mail compensation. Such subsidies should be paid from funds appropriated to the Civil Aeronautics Board specifically for that purpose.

At the hearings this spring before the transportation subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Member from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] this measure was supported by Secretary Sawyer, the Postmaster General, representatives of the A. F. of L. and CIO, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, and by veterans and other groups. Twelve witnesses favored and only one opposed. The committee deliberated very carefully before favorably reporting H. R. 9184.

This bill will bring about a needed improvement, and should pass overwhelmingly.

Secretary Marshall and the China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Marshall on the Spot," published in the Washington Post of September 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

MARSHALL ON THE SPOT

General Marshall was less than candid in his testimony about China in the hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee—so much so that in the early editions of the New York Times the report was captioned: Marshall Disavows China Policy. He said he had accepted the commission to China at the President's request. "While I was in this room," General Marshall said, referring to the Pearl Harbor hearing in December 1945, "the policy of the United States had been drawn up in the State Department. That policy, of course, speaks for itself." He added that the policy had been proclaimed in Washington when he was en route to China.

We hope the matter will not be left in this most unsatisfactory state. General Marshall gave the Senators the impression that he simply carried out instructions without having discussed those instructions beforehand—let alone having agreed to them. Let us look at the record. General Marshall departed from Washington within an hour or so after the President's announcement of China policy, December 15, 1945. He carried with him not only the documents, but also a personal letter from the President which epitomized the policy in these words:

"Specifically, I desire that you endeavor to persuade the Chinese Government to call a national conference of representatives of the major political elements to bring about the unification of China and, concurrently, to effect a cessation of hostilities, particularly in north China."

Elsewhere in the letter the President said: "I understand that these documents have been shown to you and received your approval." The President restated this policy the following year, on December 18, 1946. In the course of it, he said, "I asked General Marshall to go to China as my representative. We had agreed upon my statement of the United States Government's views and policies regarding China as his directive."

If all this does not mean what it says, then the President owes the public an explanation. He cannot but be embarrassed by General Marshall's incomplete statement—if not disavowal of the President's policy. What General Marshall said will be picked up, as it should be, by his Republican critics as proving that General Marshall was merely a tool—or, as Representative JUDD once put it, a "dupe." The facts are that the Marshall assignment was, in Mr. Byrnes' words when he was Secretary of State, to bring Chungking (the Nationalists) and Yenan (the Communists) together and that, on the President's showing, General Marshall had his eyes open and his mind receptive when he accepted it.

Deduction of Advertising and Propaganda Expense as a Legitimate Cost Before Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to Hon. George J. Schoeneman from Mr. Norman Thomas, on the subject of the deduction of advertising and propaganda expense as a legitimate cost before taxation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHOENEMAN: For a considerable time, there have been advertisements and printed documents sponsored by various corporations which in no way directly advertise their products but carry on political and economic diatribes against something vaguely and usually incorrectly called socialism.

The Warner & Swasey Machine Tool Co. of Cleveland is one of the most diligent of these advertisers. I call your attention to its full-page advertisement in Newsweek of September 18, 1950. It is headed "Who Pays for the Profits of Capitalism?" and it concludes that our American success is all based on incentive-for-profit. The final sentence reads: "The difference—the permanent difference between dreary Russia or England, and prosperous America, is just that simple—but it is that important." A little picture and a Warner & Swasey label fill out the page.

I cite another example of a different but allied procedure. Swift & Co., June 1949, circulated a well-printed pamphlet, mostly I presume to its workers, entitled "This Is Our Problem—Your Freedom Program." It contains on page 7 the viciously incorrect statement that end objective of Socialists and Communists are the same and that both groups believe that the end justifies any means.

These illustrations of a widespread and continuing practice lead me formally to inquire whether corporations are allowed to deduct expenses of this sort of advertising and propaganda as a legitimate cost before taxation. That is, I want to know how much the public pays for this sort of propaganda at a time when the administration is seeking to close the loophole by which corporations and individuals escape taxation.

If your reply is that all this sort of stuff is a legitimate cost, let me ask a second question. Would it be legal for me to publish as an advertisement what I think about democratic socialism and deduct the cost of the advertisement before computing my income tax? I could connect the advertisement with my business, writing and lecturing, at least as well as the Warner & Swasey Co.—let us say by a little picture of myself making a speech.

If you can't answer these questions, to whom should I apply for information?

You will notice that I am not challenging in any way the right of free speech or free press, although I am considering calling the attention of the Federal Trade Commission and other bodies, official and unofficial, concerned for truth in advertising to the outrageous coupling of Russia and England at a time when England is our ally.

It must be remembered that what Warner & Swasey and Swift are really attacking is not the Socialist Party which is not represented in the Government, but the so-called welfare state which in England is fully accepted by the Conservative Party.

At this time, when unity at home and unity with our allies is important, and the Government needs every cent that it can raise from proper taxation, my questions are important. I hope for an early reply, to which I shall expect to give publicity, as well as to this request for information.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS.

Senator Jenner and Secretary Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "BILL JENNER and Secretary Marshall," published in the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail of September 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL JENNER AND SECRETARY MARSHALL

Senator BILL JENNER is getting a lot of heat from the proadministration forces for his attack last Friday on George Marshall, whom President Truman appointed Secretary of Defense. On the basis of consistency of performance, JENNER is absolutely right in his opposition to Marshall.

Almost immediately after VJ-day, Marshall was sent to China to study the chaotic conditions in that country. He was Ambassador, but he was actually much more than that. On his opinions stood the future of the entire Orient.

Chiang Kai-shek, leader of the Chinese Nationalist Government, which had been fighting Communists or Japanese ever since the end of the First World War, knew full well his government could continue to exist only with American support. Chiang had given the Allies the best support possible during the war. He certainly was not the leader of a united nation. China hasn't been a united nation since 1895, but Chiang did have the loyalty of millions of Chinese. Witness the flight of his government from Nanking to Chungking, witness the miracle of the Burma Road, built by manual labor to bring supplies over the highest mountains in the world. He had loyalty, he had support, and he had given his country as good a government as it has ever had. That doesn't mean it was good government in the American conception, but it was the most honest China had had in centuries.

China isn't a nation, it is a collection of nations. We once had dinner in a Cantonese restaurant (in this country) with a Shanghai Chinese. They could not understand each other's language any more than we could. It was just like trying to have a conversation with a Greek and a Norwegian, neither of whom understood the other. That little insignificant incident illustrates conditions in China, and upsets our idea that China is a unified nation like the United States.

War lords have existed in China for a half century, each one supreme in his own area. As American Ambassador, George Marshall apparently looked upon Mao-Tse-Tung, the Communist leader, as just another war lord. Marshall strongly urged Chiang to take Communists into his cabinet, to fraternize with the Reds, to build a strong China by appeasement. Chiang, who knew his country far better than Marshall, refused. Marshall got

mad, came home, upbraided Chiang for failure to cooperate. The result was the quick collapse of the Nationalist Government, the flight to Formosa, and the occupation of all China by the Communists.

This is the big question today—If it was right to fraternize with the Communists in China, as Marshall wanted to do, why are we fighting in Korea today? Why don't we urge the South Koreans to "get together" with the North Koreans? Why are we sending arms and aid to the French in Indochina? Why shouldn't we urge the French to fraternize with the Reds? What are we doing in Berlin, Vienna? Why did we create the North Atlantic Pact? What good is ECA?

When JENNER accuses Marshall of bungling, JENNER is on the very soundest of ground. Marshall's opinion to "write-off" Chiang-Kai-shek opened the door to the Communists. From that minute to the invasion of South Korea the steps are logical, and the results should have been obvious. Marshall's decision in China was probably the biggest blunder of all the blunders of American diplomacy from 1944 to this very minute. JENNER is absolutely right in his opposition.

There is another aspect of the Marshall appointment upon which JENNER did not touch. Marshall is now 69 years old. He retired 2 years ago as Secretary of State on account of ill health. What has happened to give him all the renewed strength and vigor to permit his fulfillment of the biggest job in the Cabinet in a time of extreme crisis?

We saw at Yalta what happens when a sick and senile mind goes up against alert and resourceful minds. President Roosevelt did in truth sell out the Poles, Lithuanians, Latvians, Rumanians, Hungarians, and Czechoslovaks at that momentous conference, but Roosevelt was a sick man, a dying man, a tragic figure in comparison to his opponent Stalin.

We do not need any more old, senile men in high position. We need men alert, vigorous, healthy, in the prime of life. JENNER was too courteous to say this—but it is true just the same.

Story of Naming the Irish Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article from the Current Local, of Van Buren, Mo., of September 14, 1950, on the naming of the Irish Wilderness. The article follows:

STORY OF NAMING THE IRISH WILDERNESS

In last Sunday's Post-Dispatch a story of the Irish Wilderness was published, and the writer dwelt at length on how this thinly settled land got its name. He ended up by leaving his readers to make a choice of half a dozen ways it might have happened, according to legend, well spliced, perhaps, by his imagination (these feature writers are paid so much per word).

What, we believe, is the only true story of the several tales concerning the naming of this romantic tract, was written by the late Allen Hinchey and published in his newspaper, "The Community," of Cape Girardeau, in August 1924. Mr. Hinchey compiled a history of southeast Missouri which is still considered an authority, and habitually ascertained the facts before he jotted them down. Therefore, we believe his version of how this large tract of land came to be called "The Wilderness" is the true one. The story follows:

Out in the Ozarks in the Eleven Point Country there is a little post office called "Wilderness." It lies between Alton in Oregon County and Doniphan in Ripley. It might be interesting to the boys and girls of southeast Missouri to know something about this place and of the fine, happy, and industrious people who settled it.

About the year 1855 or 1856 the grading of the Iron Mountain Railroad from St. Louis to Pilot Knob was completed. The grading of the road had been done by Irish laborers so hundreds were out of employment in a strange country. Many had families with them and had been living in camps during all the time the work of building the road had been going on.

A young Catholic priest from St. Louis spent most of his time with those people, holding services for them on Sundays, giving aid to the sick and burying their dead. He felt sorry for them and got busy in their behalf.

He went to Washington to see the President and visited the United States Land Department in the city, in his efforts to secure homes for his people. At that time there were great stretches of Government land in Missouri and the young priest wanted to form a colony on some of this land.

He worked steadily until at last arrangements were made to permit those homeless people to homestead lands in the Ozarks where they could form a colony. The United States Land Office for Missouri was at that time in Jackson, which was a long way for them to travel to make application for their lands so the young priest opened a temporary branch land office at Potosi for their convenience.

He went to various camps and collected his people, taking them to Potosi. Some of them had teams that they had used at their railroad work. Some had cows, pigs, chickens, ducks, and geese. Most of them had small sums of money left from their wages as railroad laborers. They all had confidence in their young priest who was blessed with the optimism of their race.

After several weeks of legal delays and the unwinding of considerable official red tape, the heads of families and the unmarried men of the party had filed their applications for land and had paid their entry fees.

They had not seen the land to which they were going, but to them it seemed they were going to the "promised land." They were happy to think that in this great country they were to open up farms and build homes of their own.

It was a beautiful day in early summer when these people, several hundred of them, started on their journey for the new country across the mountains.

Into their canvas-covered wagons they loaded their household goods. In coops on the sides and at the rear of the wagons they placed their poultry. Then collecting their cattle and hogs, their sheep and goats into a herd the start was made.

In some cases a shortage of horses made it necessary to use oxen and cows to draw the wagons. The men and boys walked along the road bravely, as did the younger women. The older ones, those who were ill and the small children were given places in the wagons.

It was a journey that inflicted many days of hardship, but to them there was always held out the promise of happiness, peace, and prosperity at the journey's end.

After many days of toils and travels they reached their destination. It was certainly a wilderness, but they were undaunted and began at once the building of their colony. They were a religious people so the first building was a place to worship. Their young priest was with them and all during the wearisome journey he had cheered them on. Now that they had reached their goal he was not only their spiritual adviser but their business leader as well.

Under his direction log homes were built. Fences were built around enclosures for their livestock. Many wild animals infested the wilderness, so it was necessary for the young men to stand guard at night to protect their livestock from marauding beasts.

Gradually small fields were cleared and crops were planted and the wilderness began to look more like a settled country. But they were a long way from any town or trading point. The nearest market was at Doniphan, 20 miles away over almost impassable mountain trials. And Doniphan was only a small pioneer trading post, many miles from Cape Girardeau, its nearest supply point on the Mississippi.

But they were happy, those simple people, happy and industrious, in their wilderness. On the Sabbath they had religious services and the monotony of life in the woods was broken by merrymaking in the cabins. Into their life there came romances and there came sorrow. The young priest was called on to marry the young and to bury the dead. Faithfully he stood by them, cheerfully he encouraged them.

A few years later the sorrows of the Civil War between the North and the South found its way out into the wilderness and the little crops of those simple people were ruthlessly taken and their livestock driven away by scalawags who took advantage of the deplorable conditions of the time.

After their homes were robbed and their crops destroyed the colonists scattered and the country that had begun to smile under their industrious efforts once more became a wilderness.

This story was told to the editor of the Community a number of years ago by "Uncle Billy" Griffin, a respected citizen of Carter County, the last survivor of those colonists. To the writer it seemed a pathetic story and the pathos was all the greater when "Uncle Billy" said: "We came to America, fleeing from persecutions in Ireland. We came far out into the wilderness to make our homes. It was hard for us to understand why Americans, who had always stood for us as the greatest exponents of justice and chivalry, should have robbed us of our homes and our happiness."

United States Errors in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there have been serious military and political errors in Korea that have largely created the present crisis:

First. Wartime agreements that guaranteed the postwar independence of Korea. This is almost an impossible military commitment.

Yalta Conference complicated the commitment when we promised that Russia was to have strategic domination over Manchuria.

While committed to the independence of Korea we could not implement it with-

out a vast effort way out of line to the strategic, economic, and military value of the country.

Second. Korean military policy. We created a South Korean Army, trained and equipped it for internal security only. It could not stop a real invasion. This policy was dictated by attempts to reconcile political commitments but without too great military involvement.

Third. Poor training and organization of South Korean forces. On June 25 the United States commander said it was the best fighting force in Asia. It folded up after the first attack against it. No doubt poor morale, Communist infiltration, bad leadership, unpopular political leaders, inefficient staff work and poor intelligence have produced military chaos.

Fourth. Underestimation of the enemy. An air of superiority was developed.

Fifth. Improper intelligence or a failure by responsible authority to evaluate it. United States staffs in Washington and Tokyo took no action to meet possible invasion threats and were taken by complete surprise.

Sixth. Underestimation of the role of armor in modern war. It was accepted theory that air and naval power alone could stop any threat of aggression. It is always the man on the ground who eventually dominates, occupies and controls objectives.

Seventh. Overestimation of the effectiveness of air power.

Eighth. Overconcentration of one kind of air power at the expense of others.

Ninth. Reduction of Marine ground units and the underestimation of amphibious assault.

Government Publicity and Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a Hoover Commission task force report on Government publicity and propaganda.

As far as I know, this report has never been printed, because of the time limitation fixed by law on the activities of the Hoover Commission. The report follows:

GOVERNMENT PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA

Federal operations in publicity, public relations, and dissemination of Government intelligence cost the taxpayers approximately $105,000,000 a year.

Every agency of Government maintains its public relations staff. Every agency issues printed matter in great or small volume every year for public distribution. Printing costs on Government literature approach $50,000,000 a year, and mailing costs computed at regular postage rates add $40,000,000 a year. Staff salaries in publicity functions were tabulated by the Bureau of the Budget at $13,043,452 for the fiscal year 1948, but this figure does not include editorial and research expense in the preparation of Government intelligence. The Budget Bureau's itemization begins with the preparation of the press release, radio continuity or motion picture script. The research and testing behind the press release are not charged to the publicity function, but rather to the routine administrative expenses of the departments.

In many cases public relations work is concealed entirely from routine accounting review, principally by the device of carrying publicity operatives on the roll as supervisors, administrative assistants, or technical experts. For these reasons, in the present state of Federal budget and accounting procedures, a precise itemization of Government expenditures in this broad field is almost impossible.

WAR EXPANSION

In reporting the Independent Offices Appropriation bill for fiscal 1947, on January 23, 1946 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, No. 8) Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, presented in the House of Representatives a tabulation compiled by the Bureau of the Budget showing a total of 45,778 persons "now employed full or part time on publicity or propaganda work of every kind and description."

Salaries for these services by all agencies for the fiscal year 1946 were reported at $74,829,467.

An earlier report, covering the fiscal year 1940, was presented to the House Appropriations Committee by the Budget Bureau on June 25, 1941. It itemized total publicity salaries at roundly $28,000,000.

A comparable report for the fiscal year 1948, tabulated 2,232 full-time and 1,212 part-time Federal employees engaged in publicity and public-relations work. The combined annual salary rate for these 3,444 Government publicity employees for 1948 was $13,043,452.

But these figures do not include the entire cost of such operations. In each report, the Budget Bureau explained that all costs for research incident to the writing of a report were excluded from the tabulation.

METHODS OF DISTRIBUTION

In addition to the familiar Government bulletins, official reports, and bound annuals, the Federal publicity agencies employ every medium and channel of intelligence. The accounting categories include press service, radio, television, group contacts, paid advertising, traveling exhibits, motion pictures, lantern slides, traveling lecturers, photographic service, individual contacts and direct correspondence with editors and publishers). In addition, several agencies maintain separate sections to conduct programs of educational cooperation with schools, civic bodies, labor organizations, and similar groups.

The table below summarizes publicity and propaganda expenditures of the principal agencies for the fiscal year 1946 as reported by the Budget Bureau:

Department of State	$30,377,000
Treasury	11,104,800
Department of Agriculture	9,295,700
Office for Emergency Management	8,154,021
War Department	5,715,690
Office of War Information	3,772,095
Office of Price Administration	2,572,000
Federal Security Agency	2,043,988
Department of Commerce	2.003,212
Department of Labor	1,440,641
Navy Department	704,000
Veterans' Administration	660,571
Tennessee Valley Authority	245,000

In the totals above charged to the military Departments, the Budget Bureau explained that the figures do not include the pay and allowances of military personnel.

CHALLENGE TO REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

"In my opinion," said Congressman WIGGLESWORTH in presenting this tabulation to the House of Representatives, "the enormous governmental propaganda set-up is not only a gross waste of the people's money, but, over and beyond that, makes for the destruction of the proper exercise of the legislative functions of the Government."

He recalled title 5, section 54 of the United States Code, which provides, in broad terms, that no money appropriated by any act of Congress shall be used for the compensation of any publicity operative unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

"Departure from the philosophy underlying that law, coupled with the surrender in large measure of control of the purse strings by the Congress," Congressman WIGGLESWORTH continued, "leads inevitably to the domination of Congress and the people by the executive branch of the Government. Government work, efficiently performed, needs no paid propaganda campaigns."

In conclusion, Congressman WIGGLESWORTH said: "If we as a Nation are to escape financial disaster, the Congress must resume control over expenditures; the propaganda army of 45,778, recognized by the Bureau of the Budget as a 'tool of executive management' must be disbanded."

HARNESS COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED

In May 1947, the House of Representatives established a special subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to inquire into the whole range of publicity and propaganda operations throughout the executive branch. Under the chairmanship of Representative Forest A. Harness of Indiana, this committee explored in detail the publicity operations of the entire Government.

"Everybody in Washington recognizes," said Congressman Harness, at the outset of the investigation, "that certain information services are an essential part of any institutional operation. But Congress insists that there is a clear line of distinction between the legitimate informational services and those additional operations which tend to build up pressure groups and mass public opinion in favor of more projects, broader programs or Federal intrusions into new spheres of paternal service. It is the latter operations which our committee seeks to itemize as to cost, scope, and influence. At least the people are entitled to know how much they are spending through their Government to educate themselves to more spending."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

In the Department of Agriculture, investigators of the Harness committee found 525 persons engaged in public relations work. Their salaries ranged from $1,888 to $10,000 a year. Only 204 members of this information and publicity staff were located in Washington. The others were employed in permanent branch offices of the Department in Boston; San Francisco; Milwaukee; Raleigh; Dallas; Denver; Albuquerque; Philadelphia; Odgen; Chicago; Atlanta; Juneau, Alaska; San Juan, Puerto Rico; and in eight lesser cities throughout the States and Territories.

The budget for the Office of Information, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1948 was $2,307,000, an increase of $353,000 over the previous year.

In a period of 9 months ending April 1, 1947, Agriculture's Office of Information prepared 1,998 press releases, an average of about 11 every working day. During the same months it released 837 radio scripts. The radio time contributed free of charge for these Government programs was valued, at going commercial rates, at more than

$500,000 a year. During the same 9 months the Department released 17 new motion-picture films, which were distributed directly through 78 film stations established throughout the United States.

The Department's mobile exhibits depicting Federal activities are presented each year at approximately 2,100 State and county fairs. In addition to preparing these exhibits and staffing them, the Department pays half the transportation charges.

The regular services of the Office of Information include a special weekly clipsheet to agricultural journals, another to general magazines, a weekly science letter, a special clipsheet to women's page editors, and a weekly clipsheet to editors of Negro periodicals.

Exclusive of mimeographing and multigraphing, processed in the Department, Agriculture's expenditure for printing and binding in the fiscal year 1947 were $2,260,784.

Among 41 new titles noted in the Department of Agriculture's catalog of farmers' bulletins for the fiscal year 1943 (a war year) were the following: No. 1849, Useful and Ornamental Gourds; No. 1851, Women's Dresses and Slips: a Buying Guide; and No. 1856, The Japanese Beetle and Its Control.

The publication of such titles during wai time, in the face of acute shortages of paper, chemicals, and manpower raises a question touching the whole system of management in the executive agencies. If there is no system or routine for determining relative need in the area of Government publications in times of war or national emergency, the Nation obviously is confronted with a major problem in Federal reorganization.

POSTAL SERVICE BURDENED

In May 1942, the Post Office Department noted the increasing flood of press releases, booklets, and other material placed in the mails under the Government-franking privilege by the administrative agencies. The Department suggested that the rapidly increasing volume of Government mail was interfering with the handling of the normal business of the Department (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 20, 1942, p. A2018, Ludlow).

For the fiscal year 1941 free mail from the Federal agencies was reported at $41,500,000, the amount of postage which would have been collected at normal mailing rates.

MUCH GOVERNMENT MATERIAL NOT WANTED

Much of the material mailed by the departments and agencies to the newspaper and editorial offices is of little value. Illustrating this facet of the problem Representative Philip A. Bennett, of Missouri, told the House of Representatives on January 22, 1942:

"I frequently receive letters from publishers wanting to know if something cannot be done to lessen the vast amount of material sent them by these departments. They tell me they could not give space to one-thousandth part of the material they receive."

OFFICIAL HUMOR

During the war, the Office for Emergency Management expanded its activities to include numerous types of material calculated to support war morale. A considerable staff of Hollywood artists was employed to design posters and cartoons for free distribution. Ilustrating this activity was one official release depicting a scene at the Washington zoo. A small boy, clinging desperately to his toy balloon, was being carried over the housetops, the anguished mother shouting hysterically "Catch him! Catch him! It's rubber."

Another exhibit in official humor presented a sprightly salesgirl in a perfume shop offering to a jaded patron a rare item: "You'll love it—it smells like gasoline."

These exhibits, fairly representative of Federal thought control as developed in the area of subsidized humor in wartime, were distributed in May 1942.

SMALL EQUIPMENT

The most recent survey of mechanical equipment operated by the Government photographic services is found in Senate Report No. 1554, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, July 22, 1942. This survey covered all Federal agencies except the military services. The civilian publicity bureaus reported 8,813 cameras in use, plus 19,978 pieces of auxiliary photographic equipment and 53,717 pieces of photo-processing equipment. The total investment in these combined picture plants was estimated by the Senate committee at something more than $15,000,000.

"The study discloses that this equipment is utilized to a considerable extent in illustrating and fostering the agencies concerned," the report said.

The same committee took inventory of all mimeographs, small printing presses, addressographs and like equipment normally employed in the Federal information offices. Exclusive of the Government Printing Office and the military services, the Federal agencies owned 19,358 pieces of such equipment, of an estimated value of $7,750,000. These figures were not complete, however. The report explained that the Office for Emergency Management, which then employed some 22,000 people "advised the committee that the information requested was not available."

Excluding the nonreporting agencies and the military services, the Senate committee tabulated $22,750,000 worth of photographic and mimeographing plant, all of it employed for the most part in the distribution of official information by the Federal agencies.

MOTION-PICTURE FILMS

Motion-picture films have become an established vehicle of Government education and intelligence. During the war, all Government films were released through the Office of War Information, which was charged with the responsibility of keeping the films in line with the war aims of the administration. Special short subjects were released for bond drives, food conservation campaigns, to reduce absenteeism, and like subjects.

After the war, a new arrangement for distribution of Government films was established by agreement between the American Theaters Association, 1501 Broadway, New York 18, N. Y., and Mr. John R. Steelman, White House Executive Assistant. This new arrangement was announced on July 8, 1946. It was described at the time by S. H. Fabian, president of the American Theaters Association, as "an attempt to unite the industry in a continuation of cooperation extended to the Government in its wartime-information program."

This arrangement had the practical effect of placing all Government film distribution directly under the authority of the President and the White House staff.

It was estimated at that time that a general film release by the Government reached an audience of approximately 90,000,000 persons each week—a powerful instrument in the direction of managed opinion.

Federal agencies which use Government-produced films as a regular part of their operations include the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Standards, Veterans' Administration, Department of National Defense, Public Health Service, Labor Department, State Department, Federal Housing Administration, and the Bureau of Mines. Many other agencies release films occasionally to stimulate special programs, or to launch new ventures in Federal-State cooperation.

BUREAU OF MINES FILMS

The film library of the Bureau of Mines presents a typical pattern of Federal operations in this field. During the fiscal year 1947, this Bureau reported an increase of 20 percent in its film exhibitions as compared with the previous year. More new films were added to the library in 1947 than in any of the previous 6 years. Total screenings for the year were 111,168. The combined audience was 8,100,000. At the end of the year, the Bureau had 5,646 films on its distribution list, an increase of 1,064 copies during the year. Total footage available in this library at the end of the fiscal year 1947 was 4,820,607.

The Bureau of Mines film library is distinctive, however, in one important respect. Its films are devoted chiefly to technical, scientific, safety and first-aid topics. All films are produced under the supervision of the Bureau, but with funds provided largely by the mining industry. This program has been in operation since 1916. The mining industry, over these 32 years, has spent more than $2,500,000 for the production of these films and has provided, without cost to the Bureau of Mines, many thousands of prints for free distribution. Each exhibitor is required to pay round-trip transportation costs and to guarantee the safe return of the film to the library. The cost to the Government is relatively insignificant.

EDUCATION BY GOVERNMENT

The question arises, however, whether such long-term educational programs properly may be regarded as a legitimate function of the Federal establishment. Such work could be carried on with equal effectiveness by any established mining school, safety council, or educational foundation. Closely linked with educational and research institutions, the film library of the Bureau of Mines likely would reflect more readily the latest advances in science and technology. Removal of this work from the Federal establishment would lessen the danger, always present, of subtle propaganda influences supporting official policy.

However efficient and effective a program of Government education may be, the fact remains that mass education is not a constitutional function of the Federal Government. All programs of education by the Government tend eventually to reflect official thought, official opinion, and official aims. In these circumstances, the function of education inevitably is diluted by the pressures of politics and propaganda. The best safeguard possible for the whole process of education is to keep it in the hands of the people themselves, through their own cooperative organizations, and to remove it as far as possible from direction, guidance, and influence by the administrative officials of the Government. All the history of national thought-control agencies in other lands supports this conclusion.

PAMPHLETS

Your task force examined all the publications released by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, during the month of February 1948. This study did not cover the entire department, but merely one bureau, that dealing with crop prospects, price movements, and production costs.

This February list contains 39 new titles for the month on the periodical list and 26 new titles on the list of maps and charts.

This tremendous volume of production far exceeds the practical needs of the agricultural community. By an orderly process of selection over a period of perhaps 5 years, this volume of work probably could be reduced by half. Virtually all the material thus assembled by the Government repre-

sents merely after-the-fact compilation of daily market decisions. Much of the statistical material presented in the periodical surveys for different commodities is merely reference tables reproduced from month to month. Save for the current month and the current year, all these figures are available in the standard reference works, such as the Statistical Abstract of the United States. This continuous reproduction, month after month, in mimeographed form reflects, for the most part, merely the instinctive bureaucratic urge to make work.

Examined alone, each of these items may be justified. But when the production of an entire month or an entire season is put together, the amount of duplication, overlap, and repetition is almost beyond measure.

PRINTING APPROPRIATION SHOULD BE CUT

The only practical approach to this problem of excessive Government literature is through the Appropriations Committees of Congress. Congress has unquestioned power to limit effectively the volume of printing and mimeographing produced for or by any agency. A persistent policy of 10 percent reductions would compel the departments and agencies to reappraise such programs each year on the basis of practical need. No essential function of Government would be impaired by such a policy. If all the printed matter emanating from Federal establishments were reduced by 50 percent over a period of 5 years—assuming a sound basis of selectivity in that period—no segment of the population would be deprived of any vital or beneficial Government service.

WARTIME CURTAILMENTS

The extent of possible curtailment in Government publications in the period of stress is disclosed by a report from the Office of War Information, in September 1942. At that time, OWI Regulation No. 3 decreed the suspension of 239 Federal periodical publications and limited the mailing of 284 additional publications. This list of 523 Federal periodicals—daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, and annually—was the first such official list compiled since 1932. The wartime suspension of 239 publications was dictated by the paper shortage.

But since the war many of these items have been resumed, and practically all of the mailing lists have been expanded.

Approximately half of the publications discontinued by the OWI order were productions of the Department of Agriculture. Another 25 percent were productions of the Department of Commerce. Other suspensions and curtailments of importance from the standpoint of paper consumption were in the Census Bureau, Federal Trade Commission, Interior Department, Labor Department, Maritime Commission, and Treasury Department.

The significance of the OWI survey and action is this: When compelling reasons for economy in paper and printing presented themselves in wartime, a way was found quickly to reduce by more than 50 percent the volume of Government printed matter distributed to the people.

Parenthetically, it should be noted that the paper was not saved, but merely diverted in the Government Printing Office to other Government orders of a strictly wartime character, such as ration books, military manuals, procurement specifications and selective service forms. Without the curtailment of Government publications, however, the wartime needs of the Government Printing Office in paper, ink, and labor could not have been supplied.

FEDERAL PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress has been alert for several years to the organized pressure-group activities which are sponsored, supported and stimulated by the administrative agencies themselves. Fairly representative of the majority attitude toward such activities is the statement of Representative Homer A. Ramey, of Ohio, who told the House of Representatives on May 26, 1948:

"The greatest pressure that we have is from groups in Government, the agencies themselves, telling thousands of people in your district to write you to pass this and that—to spend—to surrender individual liberty to Government control, thus again to spend more money, more money and more money" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6653).

After 15 months' work, Congressman Harness summarized his conclusions on Government pressure groups in these words:

"Everyone in Congress is keenly conscious of the tremendous power of this Government propaganda machine, for he comes in direct personal contact with it every day. He lives with the lobbies, good and bad, which constantly seek to influence the course of legislation, and he can hardly fail to know that the most powerful, most persistent of them all is the Federal lobby. It works around the clock every day of the year.

"Whether the immediate purpose of Government propaganda is good or bad, the fact remains that individual liberty and free institutions cannot long survive when the vast power of Government may be marshaled against the people to perpetuate a given policy or a particular group of office holders. Nor can freedom survive if all Government policies and programs are sustained by an overwhelming Government propaganda.

THE LAW AGAINST FEDERAL PROPAGANDA

As the Harness committee pointed out repeatedly, the diversion of appropriations to propaganda and pressure-group activities is a direct violation of the Federal Criminal Code. The committee reports cite repeatedly section 201, title 18, of the United States Code, enacted July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 68), as follows:

"No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

"Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

INFORMATIONAL SPHERE DEFINED

The Harness Committee drew a clear distinction between the legitimate publicity and information functions of the Federal agencies and those activities which washed over into the area of conditioning public opinion by propaganda techniques.

"It is a duty of representative government to keep the people fully and accurately informed," Representative Harness informed the House. "Administrative officials at policy-making levels are, and should be, entirely free to express their views and discuss policy on any issue. But beyond the routine of releasing such expressions to the regular news channels, no agency properly may go. The information services of the administrative agencies may not lawfully use public funds to promote new projects, to influence legislation, or to mold public opinion for or against any legislative proposal. Federal officials and employees may not lawfully devote their time and talents, paid for from public funds, to mold public opinion. The sole legal functions of a Federal information service is to issue factual, objective, and studiously unbiased information. Unfortunately, however, the law is being violated repeatedly by numerous administrative agencies. In hundreds of ways, some devious, some blatant, Federal officials and employees are ignoring or flouting section 201 of title 18 of the Criminal Code, often for the deliberate purpose of fostering sentiment and support for administration policies and programs.

"The issue is far broader than the merits of any particular piece of legislation. The record reveals clearly the manner in which Government lobbyists operate on the Federal payroll, how they are always at work to expand their fields of interest, to perpetuate themselves in office, and to impose their ideas and systems upon the American people by organized propaganda, paid for entirely by the diversion of public funds from their true purposes to the secret purposes of the top bureaucrats and planners.

"This is the fundamental issue from the legislative standpoint—whether Congress has lost its power to establish and maintain the sort of government the people want; or whether the bureaucrats are supreme and can give the sort of government they want, regardless of Congress, regardless of elections, regardless of public opinion. That's a question that goes to the very roots of popular government. If the bureaucrats are above Congress, and may defy Congress in the way they spend their appropriations, then representative government has become a fiction."

THE FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FOR SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The Harness committee devoted several months, July–October 1947, to an examination of the Social Security Board and the United States Public Health Service. A special report (H. Rept. 786, 80th Cong., 1st sess.) charged "that at least six agencies in the executive branch are using Government funds in an improper manner for propaganda activities supporting compulsory national health insurance." The agencies named as participants in this activity were the United States Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau, the Office of Education, the United States Employment Service, the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Research and Statistics, Social Security Board.

These agencies cooperated in the conduct of a series of "health workshops" arranged throughout the country during 1945 and 1946. The purpose of the health workshops was, the committee said, "to mobilize pressure groups" in behalf of socialized medicine.

"The first meeting in furtherance of these health workshops was held in Washington on November 2, 1945. At that meeting only 10 persons were present, all of them full-time employees of the Federal Government."

This report quoted a letter under date of December 10, 1945, signed by Thomas Parran, M. D., Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. The letter was

addressed to all field and staff men throughout the country. It referred to a special message sent to Congress on November 19, 1945, by President Truman, urging enactment of a national health program. Dr. Parran's letter to the staff alluded to the President's message to Congress as "a subject of the highest importance to every citizen."

His letter continued (transcript, May 28, 1947, p. 88): "The appropriate executive agencies of the Government have been specifically instructed by the President to assist in carrying out this legislative program as presented to Congress. * * * Every officer of the Public Health Service will wish to familiarize himself with the President's message and will be guided by its provisions when making any public statement likely to be interpreted as representing the official views of the Public Health Service."

This letter was challenged immediately by some members of the public health staff as an attempt to mobilize the entire agency aggressively behind the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, then pending before the Senate Labor Committee.

Less than 2 months after the date of this public health staff circular, the first health workshop was held in St. Paul, Minn., February 6 to 10, 1946. Of the 80 persons participating, 15 were employees of the Federal Government, representing seven different agencies having an interest in health and welfare programs. A second, and larger health workshop was held in Jamestown, N. Dak., September 27 to 30, 1946, with 98 persons participating, 18 of whom were Federal employees representing seven Government agencies. The chairman of this meeting was Mayhew Derryberry, Ph. D., of the United States Public Health Service.

The report of the Harness committee states: "Apart from the Federal personnel, there were no doctors of medicine in attendance at this meeting as delegates. The testimony before your committee indicates that no registered doctor of medicine was invited to participate. * * * It is evident from the record that most of the planning was done by the Federal officials in Washington prior to each workshop conference, and that each meeting was devoted to their own purposes, that of organizing pressure groups to agitate for compulsory health insurance, as then pending in Congress."

A report from the General Accounting Office to the Harness committee, disclosed that various Federal agencies approved vouchers to a total of $1,950 for travel expenses of Government employees to and from the Jamestown health workshop. This report revealed that the Jamestown conference took 18 Federal officials away from their desks for a total of 126 man-days. Similar expense accounts were itemized for four other health workshops arranged throughout the country.

The Harness committee later obtained from the Federal Security Agency a complete copy of the instruction sheets distributed by the training officers at the health workshops. Among the topics listed in the program were these:

(a) Techniques for the Organization of Citizen Groups;

(b) Formation of Pressure Groups;

(c) Methods of Bringing About Group Action.

One paragraph of the action program finally approved by the Jamestown conference urged that congressional candidates and incumbents be polled by the committee on their stand on the national health program, and that their opinions be sent to the State organizations for publication.

In summarizing the health workshop technique, as presented in the public hearings before the Harness committee, the committee report said:

"In the opinion of your committee, this recital presents the complete picture of Government propaganda in action. The Federal employees arrange the meeting, invite the delegates, train the delegates, preside at the meetings, and then frame the formal summary of resolutions and actions. And all of this is paid for with public moneys never authorized or approved by Congress for these or any like purposes."

PUBLIC PRESSURE FOR MORE SPENDING

Field investigators for the Harness committee were sent to Nebraska in May 1947 to trace out the propaganda method employed by the Department of Agriculture, through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, to generate pressure on Congress to increase appropriations for the fiscal year 1948.

When the 1948 appropriation bill was in the House, certain reductions were made in the soil-conservation program. On the day the appropriation bill was voted in the House, a telegram was sent from the Department in Washington to all State administrators of the AAA, summarizing the reductions approved. Following receipt of this telegram, the State administrator in Nebraska summoned his eight regional assistants to a meeting at Lincoln. At that meeting a letter was drafted to be sent to the county agents to every farmer in the State. The letters, as finally mailed by the county headquarters, were not identical. But each did contain certain sentences or phrases based on the master telegram sent to the State agents of the AAA from Washington. Investigators for the committee brought back to Washington copies of these letters as mailed out in 25 different counties of Nebraska.

The obvious purpose of this campaign was to stampede the Senate to restore some of the economies voted by the House. It was an organized attempt by the Department of Agriculture, on a Nation-wide scale, by the use of public funds, to influence the course of legislation before Congress. In this instance the campaign was largely successful. Most of the House cuts were restored by the Senate.

The potentialities of such a campaign, looking to a telegraphic drive on Congress for more funds, can best be realized by considering the size and scope of the Department of Agriculture's official network throughout the country. There are 3,029 county agricultural associations in the United States, each with its county offices or headquarters. There are 9,087 county committeemen assisting the county agents. Under these county committeemen are 97,529 community committeemen, employed on a per diem basis. In addition, there are 8,378 paid office personnel serving the county agents and the county committeemen. The direct Federal payroll for personnel hire in these categories for 1947 was $19,536,824. An additional item of $23,760,650 was allocated for travel expenses of these people.

All these local information channels are brought together in each State under the State administrator of the AAA, a full-time officer with headquarters and staff, usually located in the capital city.

As a rule, a regional administrator, also a full-time employee, with office and secretarial staff, is set up for each 10 or 15 counties.

This organization can be converted overnight into a complete network of propaganda and pressure-group activities, which may be set off by the simple device of a single telegram or letter mailed to each of the 48 State administrators from Washington. By calling this organization into action, it has been possible to lay down on Congress as many as 250,000 communications in a single week, all addressed to an identical point of legislation then pending.

The ultimate significance of such an organization is that the pressure is generated, in the first instance, by the framing of a telegram or a letter in the Department in Washington.

In bringing these matters to the attention of Congress the Harness committee concluded:

"The responsibility for correction of this improper and illegal use of Government funds in the Production and Marketing Administration lies directly with the Department of Agriculture. Although our committee first called these violations to the attention of the Department in June 1947, our best information indicates that no disciplinary action of any kind has been taken against the officials involved, and that no real steps have been taken to guard against a recurrence of such abuses in the future."

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION PRESSURE GROUPS

A similar network of organized pressure group activities is maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to resist all attempts to reduce appropriations for irrigation and reclamation works.

It is inherent in the nature of irrigation and reclamation works that people in the immediate locality are anxious to have each project completed as quickly as possible. But there obviously must be an over-all limit on this type of spending each year. When the Appropriations Committees of Congress undertake to keep all projects moving along on an even keel, within the over-all limit of spending, terrific pressures instantly develop in practically all the local projects. Through subtle propaganda devices emanating chiefly from the Bureau of Reclamation in Washington, each locality is given the impression that its work is being retarded for the advantage of some distant community. By this method the Bureau of Reclamation systematically generates new pressures on Congress for more spending each year.

Hearings before the Harness committee in May and June 1948, established clearly that many persons carried on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation as inspectors and supervisors were in fact nothing more than paid pressure-group agents. They traveled from community to community to incite local civic bodies against Congress. They were interviewed in the press, made radio speeches, addressed chamber of commerce luncheons, wrote articles for magazines and newspapers. Such activities are a regular part of the Bureau of Reclamation payroll on every major project. The net result is a well-nigh irresistible pressure upon Congress for ever larger appropriations for this type of work.

In some cases Congress allocated more money to a given project than could be spent in the fiscal year. Carry-over funds ranging up to $20,000,000 at the end of a fiscal year have been discovered by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Yet the pressure for more funds continues from month to month, most of it generated by the Bureau itself.

The propagandists and pressure group leaders employed by the Bureau of Reclamation could never be identified as such by an audit of the payroll. On the rolls they are identified as actual on-the-site inspectors or supervisors of the construction program.

This type of diversion of public funds can be halted only by an arbitrary reduction in the appropriations—a reduction which will compel the Bureau to allocate its funds faithfully to the construction work intended

by Congress. Only by such methods may Congress hope to stop the seepage which now fuels the overwhelming propaganda machine of the Bureau of Reclamation.

On May 14, 1948, Chairman Harness, of the House Committee on Publicity and Propaganda, transmitted to the House Appropriations Committee a summary of his findings and conclusions regarding the Bureau of Reclamation. In illustrating the concealment of funds as an aid to generating propaganda in the field for more funds, Chairman Harness said:

"Perhaps the most serious charge now on record with our committee was the Bureau's repeated statement to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress that its carry-over funds from the fiscal year 1947 would be $44,000,000. Within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year, the carry-over fund was found to be approximately $88,000,000, and is so reported in the President's budget message for 1949 at page 445. * * *

"Whether the Bureau had some willful purpose in misrepresenting the carry-over figure, or whether this was the result of gross negligence, is really immaterial. The gravity of the error is such that those responsible for it should no longer be trusted by the Congress."

The Harness committee also reported in its communication to the House Appropriations Committee that in the Central Valley project in California the hearings indicated a clear design by the Bureau of Reclamation to exhaust all its funds allocated for the Central Valley within the first 6 months of the fiscal year.

By spending the entire year's allocation in 6 months, the Bureau of Reclamation was able to bring about a virtual stoppage of work on the entire Central Valley development. This suspension of work naturally spread great confusion and alarm throughout the territory. When this alarm reached the offices of the Bureau of Reclamation in the form of excited inquiries as to the reasons for the suspension, the answer was given uniformly that Congress had failed to provide adequate funds for the work.

Disclosure of this type of propaganda activity throughout the Central Valley in California led to a demand for the removal of Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. In the debates on this suggestion, Congressman Harness at one point demanded the impeachment of Commissioner Straus. Because these matters did not develop in the record until the last month of the session, in May and June 1948, no conclusive action was taken on them.

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA FOR UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Harness committee also issued two reports tracing out the systematic propaganda campaign conducted by the Department of the Army to generate Nation-wide group pressure for enactment of universal military training. The first report, No. 1073, Eightieth Congress, first session, was dated July 24, 1947. The second, No. 1510, Eightieth Congress, second session, was dated March 4, 1948.

Civilian speakers employed by the War Department conducted their campaign for universal military training through every known avenue of intelligence. Usually these speakers were employed at $25 per diem plus traveling expenses. They conducted radio panels in various cities and appeared before citizens' groups wherever and whenever they could be assembled. The radio panels always were top-heavy with persons selected to speak in favor of universal military training. Material supporting the proposal was prepared in the War Department for distribution to participants in the radio discussions. Frequently the radio discussion ended with an appeal to write to the radio station, which undertook to forward the letters to the proper congressional authorities. One of these discussion leaders was shown to have made speeches or radio addresses in 17 States. When crowded itineraries compelled it, the speakers were carried from point to point in military planes. Yet at no point had Congress authorized such activities, or any diversion of the military budget to such propaganda.

The Harness committee concluded its first report in these words (p. 7):

"It has become apparent to our committee that Government propaganda is designed, in most instances, to make the individual believe he is thinking for himself. In reality, Government propaganda distorts facts with such authority that the person becomes prejudiced or biased in the direction which the Government propagandists wish to lead the national thinking. It is the high authority and the supposed objectivity of Government which leads people to accept without question the words released by Government officials and agencies. Propaganda in its crudest form appeals to emotion only. Government propaganda is frequently only slanted, but accomplishes the same result. An individual may be wary and critical of material coming from a special-interest group. He knows such groups have an ax to grind. But he will consider it gospel truth if the Government says the identical thing, because he regards the Government officials as impartial.

"Your committee therefore reports its firm conclusion that, on the basis of the evidence at hand, the War Department, its personnel and civilian employees, have gone far beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress, and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money, to influence legislation now pending before the Congress."

Another segment of the War Department propaganda for UMT was the production of a special motion picture film for free distribtuion. This film cost $36,000 to produce, and an additional $14,000 was spent to distribute it throughout the country.

In addition, the Army distributed some 125,000 printed pamphlets supporting universal military training. During 1947 the Army likewise distributed 123 press releases relating to universal military training. About 1,500 copies of each press release were distributed.

Immediately after the publication of the first Harness report in July 1947, the War Department propaganda activities in behalf of UMT were reorganized and shaken down considerably. As a result, the second report, on March 4, 1948, observed:

"The committee feels that while there have been some continued violations, the evidence indicates they have diminished considerably since our report of July 24, 1947."

FEDERAL PROPAGANDA FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

The several housing agencies of the Federal Government also carry on systematic propaganda for the enlargement of Federal appropriations and subsidies for housing. The Harness Committee explored these activities in detail in the Los Angeles-San Diego area in California. The Committee reported systematic political activity through the rental offices to encourage election of State and Federal officers pledged to expand the public housing program.

All tenants of Government housing projects are required to pay their rent by the fifth day of the month. In November 1946 this payment period fell in the last week of the general Congressional campaign. Throughout the Los Angeles-San Diego area many of the Federal rental offices were placarded with posters captioned "Save your home." In at least two instances Federal employees in the San Diego housing project were solicited for political contributions, to assist the campaign of State representatives and senators pledged to large government subsidies in the field of housing.

Said the Harness committee report on the Los Angeles-San Diego projects, in June 1948: "Much of the publicity and propaganda favoring public housing emanates from an organization known as the National Association of Housing Officials and the National Public Housing Conference. These organizations have been very active throughout the country. Most of the officials and employees of the Public Housing Authority are also members of one of these associations. Both have been used for propaganda purposes in support of the Wagner Housing bill, which failed of passage in the Eightieth Congress. Federal employees are in close contact with both these associations, and assist in the formulation of operating policies. Both associations have been used to promote State and Federal legislation favorable to public housing."

Representative RALPH W. GWINN, of New York, as a witness before the Harness committee, enumerated 836 local housing authorities for cities, counties, and communities throughout the country. He presented for the record an outline of the propaganda methods employed on a national scale by the various housing authorities, all of which are subsidized in some degree by Federal funds (hearings, p. 54).

Representative GWINN summarized the political implications of this vast propaganda network in these words (H. Rept. 2351; 80th Cong., 2d sess.; June 15, 1948, p. 8):

"The party that builds the public housing selects the tenants. * * * So we have allocation of space in many of these cities on the NKVD American plan. Although our public housing is very new in some parts of the country, the vote runs as high as 92 percent for the party that built the houses. In New York, Detroit, and Cincinnati where we checked we found that true."

The Harness report on this facet of bureaucratic pressure-group activities sustained by Federal appropriations concluded on this note:

"All the evidence before the committee supports the conclusion that the Federal Public Housing Authority in the Los Angeles-San Diego area is systematically organized throughout for political purposes and for propaganda activities in behalf of a vigorous national policy for public-housing appropriations. This political organization extends not only to the administrative officials and civil-service employees of the PHA but also to the tenants, who are granted political favors and privileges in return for their votes and organizational work in the precincts.

"The investigation also demonstrates that this propaganda activity and political work in public-housing projects lowers materially the standards of management and administration all along the line. Administrative costs and management charges on public-housing projects generally run about 25 percent higher than on comparable projects managed by private enterprise. Waste, loose spending, collusion on contracts, and collusion and favoritism on rental privileges are commonplace incidents of public-housing operations.

"We present this detailed picture of one large operation for the attention of Congress, with the recommendation that the appropriate committees in the future give thought

to legislation designed to curb effectively the propaganda and political activities carried on within the Federal housing agencies.

"Several million veterans' families are the first victims of this distortion of the housing program. When housing officials divert their energies and funds to propaganda activities and political organization, they not only deprive the veterans of the homes Congress intended to provide for them but they also bid up the price of all housing, so that the average veteran finds costs beyond his means when he attempts to build privately.

"This vicious circle must be broken if veterans are to have adequate housing. The beginning must be made by rooting out the propaganda activities and political work of the Federal employees in the housing agencies."

FEDERAL PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Below are some of the principal journals listed in the Government Printing Office's official catalogue of Federal periodical publications. The catalogue lists 118 titles published regularly in magazine or bound form, some daily or weekly, but for the most part on a regular monthly basis. Virtually every department of the Federal establishment has its periodical house organ. The Department of Agriculture publishes 12 such periodicals, the titles below fairly suggest the range of this publicity activity: Civil Aeronautics Journal, Department of State Bulletin, Federal Home Loan Bank Review, Foreign Agriculture, Foreign Commerce Weekly, Foreign Service Journal, Internal Revenue Bulletin, Land Policy Review, Monthly Labor Review, Journal of the National Cancer Institute, Naval Medical Bulletin, News for Farm Cooperatives, Consumers' Guide (Department of Agriculture), Postal Bulletin, Public Housing, Public Roads, Reclamation Era, Rural Electrification News, Social Security Bulletin, Soil Conservation, Survey of Current Business, Federal Reserve Bulletin.

Certain periodical publications serve important functions of the Federal Government. Perhaps the best examples of the indispensable titles are the Index of Copyright Entries, the Official Gazette of the Patent Office, the daily weather maps, and the weekly health surveys published by the United States Public Health Service.

The Federal Register, which publishes daily the official texts of all departmental regulations and orders, likewise is an indispensable Federal function. Decisions of the courts, the administrative agencies and the quasi-judicial agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Labor Board, also are essential functions in the field of Federal periodicals. Beyond these, however, the whole field of Federal periodicals merits close study by the appropriations committees of the Congress.

The Federal Government today spends approximately $50,000,000 a year in printing, including forms and tax returns. It spends another $40,000,000 a year for distribution of its printed matter, principally through the mails. Another $15,000,000 is spent annually for direct salaries of public relations officers and staff in the departments and agencies. These items currently aggregate $105,000,000 a year, yet do not include the basic editorial expense in the departments and agencies for the preparation of this tremendous volume of printed matter.

Samuel B. Pettingill, a former Member of the House of Representatives from Indiana, observes: "You can get a Government bulletin on every subject, except on how to reduce the cost of Government.

Congress cannot take time to study and appraise every Government publication each year. It may, however, specify precisely the amount which each department or agency will be authorized to spend for printing, for distribution, for editorial expenses, for research, and for publicity and public relations activities. An arbitrary reduction of 25 percent in these items for each department and agency over the next 2 years would be a practical approach to this aspect of runaway Federal spending.

Such a limitation on Federal publication functions need not impair any essential function of the Federal establishment, if remaining funds were allocated soundly on the basis of relative public value, and the national ability to pay for such services with available public revenues.

A SELLING PROGRAM FOR GOVERNMENT RESEARCH MATERIAL

Much of the material published and distributed by the Federal establishment would pay its own way in book form outside the Federal Government, if sold for a price to all willing to pay for it. The thousands of tons of Government printed matter accepted by the people every year merely because it is free, is beyond measurement.

Congress should give consideration, perhaps, to a law which would facilitate the sale of essential Government publications at a price in line with production costs, including editorial expense. The policy now is to sell Government publications at nominal prices—prices which often do not cover actual printing and mailing expenses.

The advisability of collecting full postage on all Government publications likewise is worthy of attention. If a publication is worth anything to the citizen, it should be worth the actual production and distribution costs. Such an amendment would make important headway against the postal deficit.

The ultimate test of the value of any Government publication to the citizen is to put a price on it. If every Federal publication and periodical were priced to cover all costs, including editorial, mechanical, and distribution, the problem of Government printing soon would be brought under control.

In the meantime, and pending a systematic program of appropriation cuts by Congress in the field of publicity and public relations activities, it is urged that a standing committee of recognized publicists be recruited by the President, on a voluntary basis, to conduct a running audit and constant appraisal of all Government publications and releases.

Our own estimate is that, over a period of 3 to 5 years, Federal expenditures in this field, which have been increasing steadily since 1933, could be reduced by at least $75,000,000 a year, on a permanent basis, without the slightest impairment of any essential Federal function. Over a period of 10 years such a program would lighten the tax burden by $750,000,000. This is our measure of extravagance and duplication in Federal publicity and propaganda today.

For the World's Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "For the World's Children," from the New York Times of September 20, 1950. This editorial brings to our attention the splendid work of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE WORLD'S CHILDREN

One of the most useful and successful activities of the United Nations has been the Children's Fund, known throughout the world as UNICEF. Throughout the difficult postwar struggle to keep the peace the Children's Fund for nearly 4 years now has been busy saving lives, perhaps five or six millions of them. It has spent close to $150,000,000, and it is to the great credit of the United States that the major part of the funds have been supplied by this country without thought of political or economic return. At the present moment emergency feeding programs in such areas as Greece and Yugoslavia, India and the Near East are being conducted by UNICEF, and $500,000 was set aside only a few weeks ago for work in Korea.

But the emphasis has been gradually shifting to longer-range projects primarily in Asia and in Central America. As the critical postwar food shortages in Europe have been ameliorated attention has been turning toward helping governments in the less-developed areas of the world to eliminate disease directly and, perhaps even more important, to train personnel in public health and related matters as they affect mothers and children. In fact, the United States is one of the principal backers of a resolution, to be brought up at this session of the General Assembly, which would formally establish the Children's Fund as a permanent agency of the UN instead of as the emergency body that it is at present.

All of this is by way of saying that it is almost incomprehensible that in approving a $17,000,000,000 supplemental appropriation bill a conference committee of the two Houses of Congress should have completely eliminated the American contribution of $12,500,000 to the Children's Fund for the year 1950–51. If this move was supposed to represent economizing, we can only say that it is economizing of the most misguided sort. Failure to provide these funds will not only seriously cripple UNICEF by making it almost impossible to plan for the coming year but inevitably also will have a depressing effect on contributions from other countries which have always looked to the United States for leadership in this cause.

Presentation of Medal and Citation to Abe S. Berliner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the pleasure of being present at the time that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt presented a medal and citation to Mr. Abe S. Berliner, of Glen Rock, N. J.

Mr. Berliner, a resident of the Seventh Congressional District of New Jersey, has been outstanding for years in his devo-

tion to antinarcotic work. The medal and citation were given by the American Narcotic Defense Association and the New Jersey Narcotic Defense League. I am inserting an article from the Community Press dated June 29, 1950, concerning the valuable service contributed by Mr. Berliner. The article follows:

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO HONOR BERLINER FOR ANTINARCOTICS WORK

(By Elizabeth Hilary)

When Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt return from her trip abroad in a few weeks, one of her first engagements will be a date with Abe S. Berliner, of Glen Rock. Mrs. Roosevelt will take over a happy duty, that of conferring on Berliner a medal and citation given by the United States Government in recognition of his 25 years of volunteer service in antinarcotic work.

When the World Conference on Narcotic Education was formed by Admiral Richmond P. Hobson a quarter of a century ago, Berliner was invited to handle publicity for the new group. Berliner had come to Hobson's attention through his brother, Louis, national track and field star, and member of the 1924 Olympic team.

In 1928, he was invited to the World Narcotic Conference in London, one off-shoot of which was the establishment of the American Narcotic Defense Association, for which Berliner assumed the role of eastern area public relations director. At that time there were no uniform State laws on narcotics, and drug peddling was strictly in the area of Federal court jurisdiction. It was this legal inadequacy which the American Association sought to correct.

Today, each of the 48 States has well-formulated anti-narcotics laws, and offenses occurring within State borders are tried in local courts which have power to condemn, fine, and imprison. Only the interstate, Federal or world "dope" rings are left for Federal handling. Thus, the check on dope peddling within the States is much more far-reaching than it was a quarter of a century ago and credit for the constructive move must go to the American Narcotic Defense Association.

Besides its legislation work, this American group carries on an extensive program designed to stop drug addiction before it starts. Its channels are the usual educative means of pamphlets, pictures, and lectures. Abe Berliner, during his 25 years of activity, has talked before many universities, schools, police associations, and local groups across the Nation, and he is known as a forceful speaker regarding antinarcotic legislation before State legislatures.

But, Berliner says, this is not enough. Recently he called upon Governor Driscoll to establish a bureau of narcotics control in New Jersey. Between the Federal and State narcotic laws stands a gap named by antinarcotic workers "the twilight zone," which is caused by the lack of integration between the two. Through this unblocked alley, many narcotic peddlers who rightfully belong behind bars, are able to escape and to continue their deadly work. Establishment of a bureau of narcotics control would bring much-needed cooperation between State and Federal officials, and, according to United States Commissioner of Narcotics H. J. Anslinger would more efficiently enforce present State laws. Such bureaus are already in operation in New York, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut.

Far from being an alarmist, Berlinger talks quietly and earnestly about the danger of marijuana to young people. "They don't know what they're geting into," he says. "When they smoke a reefer, they're not told what it is. All they hear is that 'it's fun, try it,' and these adolescents, just beginning to feel the first flush of manhood or womanhood, feel very adult about trying this something new. A reefer or two makes them even more adult, they imagine—for its effect is to pep up their egos while at the same time releasing their inhibitions. They feel brave, or amorous, or many other things, and in their hopped-up state commit acts from which they would normally shrink.

"The use of marijuana is habit-forming as is any of the major drugs. As most people know, it is used in cigarettes from which the tobacco is removed, the tube filled two-thirds with marijuana and one-third with tobacco. It is sold in the same packages as popular brand cigarettes, except that the price of 'reefers' runs about $2.50 per pack instead of the 20 cents for the usual cigarettes."

"The means used by dope peddlers for getting these doped cigarettes into the hands of youngsters is sickening. One of the peddlers will hang around a school until he sights a likely looking prospect. 'Hey, feller, want to try something new? Here, give it to you free. Try it. You'll get a kick out of it like you never had before. Pass them around to the boys. You'll have lots of fun—you and the girls." And the carefully picked victim, for any one of a number of reasons, accepts the poison pack and becomes the channel for its distribution in his set.

"The result," says Berliner, "is often that detection comes about after some horrible event has taken place. With police entry into the case, the whole nasty business comes out. The youngsters have to be sent to rehabilitation centers to cure them of the habit, and the broken-hearted parents pick up as best they can and go on from there.

"If that were the end of the story, it would be bad enough. But so often, it isn't. These peddlers are in the business to make money. They follow the youngsters through the law courts, find out what rehabilitation centers they've been sent to, and then go after them again when they are released. Unless the youngster has learned his lesson well and has plenty of willpower, he can be drawn into the net again."

"Marijuana is making dangerous inroads into the lives of our youth," says Berliner. "People need to be alerted about it right here in New Jersey as well as in other States. The Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement is badly needed and its establishment should be sponsored by the peoples of this State."

Berliner also feels that before long, New Jersey will have to provide a hospital for the care and rehabilitation of the "unfortunate victims of narcotic drug addiction."

Of the major drugs—codein, heroin, and morphine, an opium derivative, Berliner talked less. "From these addicts come your major criminals," he said. "Not alone because of the effects of the drug, but because it costs $5 a day for one of these addicts to live. That is the price they have to pay for their daily shot."

He added one startling comment: "It takes only one full shot of any of these drugs to make a man an addict."

Berliner himself has never "tried" any of the drugs, it might be added—not even a single puff of a reefer. A nonsmoker of any kind, he says: "I'm the kind of guy who gets dizzy from a cigar. Imagine what a reefer might do."

All of Berliner's antinarcotic work has been at his own expense. His has been a volunteer capacity, for which he has not only studied and labored, but for which also he has paid the bills. When one considers the scope of his activity, it is not surprising that the United States Government thinks it's time for one good, contributing American citizen to achieve recognition.

But Berliner's civic activities do not end there. An insurance broker by trade, he has been in the forefront of community projects for many years. Last year, he was Bergen County chairman of the heart campaign. In January he was appointed a State trustee of the New Jersey chapter of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults. He has served on the pack committee of the Glen Rock Byrd School cub scout unit, and is immediate past national commander of the Legion of Guardsmen, an organization composed of members of the National Guard.

Last year, in this capacity, he called on President Truman. One of his proudest possessions is a news picture of himself and Truman deep in conversation. "I spent three-quarters of an hour with him," says Berliner. "We had a wonderful talk."

This past weekend was spent at Trenton where he was toastmaster for the annual convention dinner of the New Jersey State Legion of Guardsmen.

Berliner is a graduate of New York University where he majored in journalism. He is a Patersonian by birth, and an American by practice. His scrapbook is studded with striking pictures of Abraham Lincoln, and a mention of Thomas Jefferson will evoke a responsive gleam and an intense statement: "The most wonderful American that ever lived."

Throughout the conversation as he spoke out against lethargy, dishonesty, race prejudice, and crooked politics, we were reminded of a poem which appears in the Poet's Corner of this newspaper this week:

"We care not what his temples or his creeds;
One fact holds clear and fast:
That into his fateful heap of days' deeds,
The soul of a man is cast."

If Berliner has a credo, that—judging by his acts—is what it says.

Lobbying—Secret Propaganda Is Not the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members of this House are familiar with the floods of letters and barrages of telegrams which come to Congress from the Committee for Constitutional Government whenever important legislation is under consideration. Most of the Members, however, are probably not aware that this organization also makes secret mass mailings to Congress without identifying themselves. Secret propaganda is not the American way, and I regret that it is my duty to tell the Members of the House that the Committee for Constitutional Government recently sent Members of Congress anonymous letters in plain envelopes.

Just before the contempt citation of Edward A. Rumely was brought before this body, Members of the House received a flood of mailed "telegrams" which were really only reproductions of

telegrams. These purported to come from several newspaper publishers in Colorado, Florida, and other States. However, the envelopes were postmarked in Washington, D. C., and carried no return address or name.

On July 26, just 4 days before this House cited Edward A. Rumely for contempt, each Member of Congress was sent a letter purporting to come from a doctor in Burley, Idaho. It enclosed a letter which the same doctor had written to me on July 8, condemning me for asking the Committee for Constitutional Government to tell our committee who their big financial angels were.

This letter came in a plain envelope, and was postmarked New York, N. Y. Now I thought that the doctor might have been in New York on a vacation, but most doctors I know use envelopes with their own name and address in the upper right hand corner. My interest was further aroused by the fact that the letter did not bear a stamp, but had been sent through a postage meter. I therefore asked the Postmaster General who used the meter in question, and he answered immediately that the Committee for Constitutional Government used the meter.

Mr. Speaker, I vigorously defend the Committee for Constitutional Government's right to try to influence Congress by mass mailing of reproduction of letters of their supporters, or by any other legal means. I feel, however, that people who try to influence Congress should come out in the open and identify themselves, and not hide behind such subterfuges.

The House Committee on Lobbying does not wish to regulate, prohibit, or hamper in any way attempts to influence legislation, but I believe, and I think that all of the members of the committee agree, that Congress has the right to know the identity of those who spend money to try to influence Congress. At this point in the RECORD I wish to include copies of the two letters from the Idaho doctor, my letter to the Postmaster General, and his reply:

J. R. KIRCHER, M. D.,
Burley, Idaho, July 26, 1950.

HONORABLE and DEAR SIR: Attached hereto is a letter I have written to each Member of Congress.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES R. KIRCHER, M. D.

J. R. KIRCHER, M. D.,
Burley, Idaho, July 8, 1950.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Committee on Lobbying Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The committee, of which you are chairman, has an important job to do. However, when the chairman of any committeet, without consulting the other members, considers himself in a position that he can violate the Constitution—the basic moral principles on which our country was founded—I say to you and to all who will hear: "Let the committee chairman be investigated and if the findings of such investigations indicate, let him also be removed from office according to whatever procedures are legally established for such cases."

I am sure you are acquainted with the unconstitutional violation I mentioned. That is, your submitting of questionnaires to corporations concerning expenditures for advertising, literature, contributions, or any project you may consider to fall within your catch-all definition of lobbying. All this is just another step toward Government control of individual rights.

Your demand that the Committee for Constitutional Government submit a list of those who bought literature for distribution purposes in the true American spirit, and particularly copies of The Road Ahead, is none of your's or anyone else's business. Are you and others afraid of the effect of this book? Are you alarmed at the rising tide of public opinion threatening the insidous growth of piecemeal socialism?

I am proud to tell you that I have, in a small way, helped distribute this enlightening book and other literature. I only wish I could do more. The response has been gratifying and I believe that the people of this area, at least, are getting entirely fed up with subsidies, confiscatory taxes, deficit spending, controls, and encroachments of their personal freedoms.

In regard to lobbying, as you define the term, we are also getting tired of having our money spent for lobbying by Government bureaus, Congress, and the Executive.

I wish to warn you and all members of your committee, that the common people of this country still have the power to dispose of all compromising leaders, socialistic thinkers, and those who believe we are unable to take care of ourselves. The day of reckoning is not too far distant for such men, regardless of what political party they proclaim themselves to be under.

Have you read The Road Ahead? If not, I sincerely hope you will and will spend some thought on the information contained within its pages.

I will continue to aid in the committee's work, and am proud to list my name on the rolls of those who are fighting to protect our liberties for posterity.

Very truly yours,
JAMES R. KIRCHER, M. D.

SEPTEMBER 19, 1950.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DONALDSON: On July 8, 1950, J. R. Kirchner, M. D., of Burley, Idaho, addressed a letter to me relating to the investigation of Edward A. Rumely's Committee for Constitutional Government which was conducted by the House Lobbying Committee. Thereafter, on July 27, 1950, Members of Congress were sent copies of this letter. A forwarding letter was attached to each such copy. It, too, purported to be from Burley, Idaho.

The envelopes in which these letters were mailed, however, were postmarked New York, and contained no return address. Furthermore, the envelopes appeared to have been addressed by stencil plates.

The citizen's right to petition the Members of Congress is one of our most sacred rights, and must be respected. I am not interested in regulating or limiting Dr. Kirchner's rights in any way, nor do we wish to regulate the distribution of Kirchner's letter. However, I believe that this committee and the Congress have a right to know the identity of the person or group who circulated this letter, which appears to be an attempt to influence the vote of the Congress on the contempt citation of Edward A. Rumely. (Kirchner's original letter was written on July 8, 1950. The mailing to Members of Congress was made on July 27, so that the letter would arrive just before the House voted on the contempt citation of Rumely.)

I would therefore appreciate your advising me of the identity of the person or organization which uses Pitney-Bowes Meter No. 173570 at New York, N. Y. This meter number appears on the envelope in question.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Lobbying Activities.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1950.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Lobbying Activities,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of September 19, 1950, requesting that you be advised of the identity of the person or organization using postage meter No. PB 173570 at New York, N. Y.

The permit for the use of this meter is presently held by the Committee for Constitutional Government, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Sincerely yours,
JESSE M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.

Address by Morris L. Ernst Before the Section on Criminal Law, American Bar Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Morris L. Ernst, before the American Bar Association, section of criminal law, on September 20, 1950.

Mr. Ernst is well known throughout legal circles for his outstanding work in the field of civil rights and civil liberties. He was a member of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Secret foreign world-wide organizations have affected the desires of our people to live in peace. They have caused the lowering of our standards of living in order that we may insure our way of life by guns, planes, and bombs—if necessary. It would be paradoxical in the extreme if against this background the jurisprudence of our Nation were to be unaffected by dictators who operate with stealthy wealth and vast fanaticism. Not only are we affected—we are in peril—peril in terms of our machinery of justice. In fact, if we are less than calmly wise we will win the conflict only to lose it by bending, during the struggle, down to the level of Communist and Fascist techniques.

Seldom has our Nation acted with more hysteria and less acumen. We impose oaths to detect those sneaks to whom an oath is an avowed bourgeois irrelevancy, we taint non-Communists as if they were Communists thus aiding the Communists by beclouding

the line between Communists and non-Communists, by economic and social ostracism we make it nigh impossible for people to leave that organization—we do this rather than induce, as we can, at least one-third of the members under 30 years of age to desert it; we impose a kind of attainder, social and economic, on those who years ago joined nonpolitical organizations but later captured by Communist agents; we now deter decent people from joining all organizations thus abdicating all organized efforts to the men and women of the underground; we fire off radio programs actresses without any hearing and shut down the use of halls requested for Communist followers. In bewildered fashion we evoke blanket proscriptions in governmental jobs rather than designate the sensitive jobs in sensitive areas; we seldom distinguish between the ineluctable use of appraisal by association and the abhorrent concept of criminal guilt by mere association. These are only a few samples of our folly—a kind of adolescent noisy folly that deflects our thinking from a sound attack on this social disease, a kind of seemingly effective folly that accomplishes nothing except false headlines in the irresponsible parts of the press and an increase of cynicism and despair. Above all we fail to take counsel from J. Edgar Hoover who heads our national reporting agency, and just because he reports and does not indict or discharge has a position of vantage. His pleas for disclosure instead of suppression should give pause to those who think an iceberg would be less dangerous if all under water.

Everyone has all the answers and no one has the questions because of the historical background. Only a short time ago, the army of Russians was a valuable ally against a similar but less shrewd type of tyranny. Surely this welcomed mass of fighting men accounts for a part of our emotional conflict. Then again, never before in our history have we had to admit that there are severe limiting factors weighing against believers in the First Freedom in any contest of ideas or arms. A dictatorship is equipped to start war. Sheep can be driven to their own slaughter, while free men would rather argue and debate than die or kill. This is as it should be but it presents a handicap even though free men ultimately fight better than slaves. Above all we have had little experience with organized secret mass movements, and the leaders of our national thought have remained too remote and hence ignorant of the pathological workings of those men and women who, benefiting by our pursuit of freedom, joined movements to disrupt liberal forces in the first instance but ever ready finally to subvert our Government. No forum in our land has approached the over-all problem.

I have purposely met on many occasions over the past decades with the heads of underground movements and more particularly with Communist leaders and have reached one conclusion which I use as a springboard for my thinking. It is this—secrecy and mendacity are so closely allied that we cannot put an end to one without destroying the other. In fact, Communists, as is also true of Ku Kluxers, Fascists, and Bundists cannot survive in our climate if in the open and without night shirts. As a corollary may I note that the Communist Party in our economy has, aside from its Negro members, no economic base. It relies for its vast funds, its leaders, and its rank and file on middle- and upper-middle-class folk—men and women who in Freudian terms are transferring their rebellion against parents into abject acceptance of the authority of a new papa—called Stalin. Papa Stalin tells them if the pact with Hitler is good or bad; whether Tito is angel or devil. All regimented secret mass movements invite peculiarly those people who dislike the chore of making decisions. Living on orders from above seems, and maybe is, simpler even though less joyous to those of us who prefer the circuit rides of trial and error.

Against this scant appraisal of background I have time to discuss only four avenues of approach of a legal nature. Don't think that my mention of these four indicates a comprehensive program. To take up four in one-half hour is truly an impertinence. We need dozens of totally new techniques and it's high time that the President appoint a national commission in the nature of a British royal high commission to bring into the arena of public debate a comprehensive program—something which congressional-committee behavior plus the equally shabby headlines of our daily press have totally failed to do.

My first proposal impinges on the matrix of our society—the first amendment, not as conceived in 1787 but as expanded by Supreme Court decisions. The theory of free speech is our national gamble—our governmental religion. We stake our all on an act of faith—truth will win out in the conflict of ideas in the market. But I suggest we must now wake up to realize that truth has slight chance to win out in a market distorted and colored by stealth and anonymity. Stealth in this field is a fraud on the minds of people.

We have traveled far from the days of town meetings when the speaker stood up to say his piece. Now with mass media of communication plus the increasing ease of people joining in organized groups it is imperative that the market place be no longer tainted by speakers for anonymous forces. In a busy world it is essential that we be advised for whom the speaker is talking, who pays for the pamphlet, the radio program, or newspaper advertising. I assume you agree with my faith in the people—that is, we will abide by the people's choice of their rulers whether klansmen or Communists provided the choice results from the clash in clean and open market place.

In 1787 we had secret committees of correspondents but no analogy can be properly drawn between the secret letters of the Adams family and the million dollars raised, for example, in the Scottsboro case, when only $60,000 of the million was spent on the case itself. These are the figures given to me by Earl Browder before he was semideposed by his Papa Stalin. Moreover, there can be no sound legal analogy between the individual spy planted by a foreign government in our midst operating through bribery or other forms of seduction, and the penetration of government by persons with concealed divisions of loyalty and acting through cohesive groups. I suggest that we are making a serious mistake in our legal approaches unless we distinguish between individual behavior patterns and the increasing effectiveness of group activities. This is the first departure we must make in our legal thinking.

We then can look at organized entrance into the market. We have a long history of pursuit of disclosure as opposed to suppression. For example, the Pure Food and Drug Acts, the Securities and Exchange Commission and our postal controls of the second class mails—all are predicated on the theory of caveat vendor rather than caveat emptor. I should guess that in terms of criminal law, the endeavor to suppress ideas will bring none of the results which the most high-minded of the proponents of the concept hope for. For my part I wish we could force the Communist Party to go on the ballot rather than try to suppress it. The most that can be expected from our present approaches to the problem will be that the Communist groups will form a new organization under a new name and disavow in Aesopian language those principles or activities which have been interdicted by the courts. We may find that all we have outlawed is a name. Unlike dictators who are always insecure and afraid of ideas—we must not and should not try to outlaw ideas. But we have open to us very simple and to my mind effective remedies in the nature of disclosure. For whom were the pickets at the White House selling their wares when that $50,000 picket line urged us to play ball with Hitler at a time when Hitler and Stalin were in bed together? I would defend the right of people to picket the President's home but it is shocking that we still do not know for whom the pickets were picketing. For my part I believe that all organizations of mass appeal trying to buy the public mind should make full disclosure of source of income, use of funds and other pertinent facts, along the lines of present disclosure imposed on those users of the mail pouches who seek cheap postage rates, to wit: second class. At present if you can afford first class postage charges you may sneak up on the public. The Washington Post prints several times a year the names of its main stockholders or bondholders but millions of pamphlets can be sent out by Gerald L. K. Smith or Frank Gannett or by anti-Catholic or anti-Semitic bigots, or by Communists raising millions of dollars each year in this Nation, without one particle of disclosure.

Surely you and I would prefer to live, as a matter of taste, in a folkway of personal anonymity with respect to our group activities but the discomfort of group generic disclosure must be suffered in order to meet the conflict of ideas spread by secret subversive groups. Above all, to single out any one group at any one time of history for disclosure is dangerous even if possible at the moment of selection, and may well invite our people to demand sporadic and piecemeal disclosure in fortuitous fashion whenever a particular situation seems to create a particular danger to our folkway. The constitutional base for such controls is indisputably in the post roads power as to anonymity in the mails, and in taxing power as to secrecy of those millions collected each year through underground aegis of Communist, Fascist, or other organizations. We must revise our thinking as to secrecy for those who lobby not to Congress but to the minds of the people. I am not now talking of adherence to ideas but rather adherence to group activity whether the adherence be by membership, contribution, or otherwise. The distinction is important because in a country of our vast dimensions, so far removed from town meeting days, any single individual operating alone is impotent and in fact, the very purpose of group activity is to overcome individual impotence.

As a guide, I refer you to the New York statutes which without outlawry call for disclosure as a condition of operation for groups like the Klan, which statutes presented no constitutional infirmities when reviewed by our highest court. Nor am I disturbed by the argument that such over-all disclosure will make it impossible for unpopular minority groups to be organized. Among other evidence, I point to the fact that President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, of which I happen to have been a member, in a little discussed section of its report, came out for full disclosure of all groups. This, if you please, with the backing of labor, employer, and various racial and religious minority groups such as Catholic, Jews, and Negroes.

Let me shift to a second phase of the problem on which I suggest a new approach.

Eleven men gather in a room and discuss the subversion of a bank on some snowy distant week end. We do not wait until such robbers are at the door of the bank, nor would we listen to a plea of the constitutional rights of the bank subverters under the first amendment. To analogize, I should imagine that the 11 Communists recently tried, insofar as their meetings and words were secret, have no claim whatsoever under the first amendment. I have not read the record in that case and hence I am not talking about the evidence. I am quite clear that I would defend their speech insofar as it was published or spoken openly in the market place with full disclosure for whom the words were uttered. However, I am talking solely of the rule of law to be applied to the facts, and I am fearful that any rule of law other than one based on the distinction between secret and public speech may well turn out to supply a deprivation of our increasingly generous faith in the rights of free exchange of ideas. Surely secret speech is not of the character considered worthy of the high protection written in the first amendment as interpreted by our highest court. Moreover, the type and quality of the overt act needed to supply the necessary bridge from ideas to behavior must be analogized in secret speech cases to the bank robbers rather than to the single disclosed propounder of even what at any one moment of history may be deemed a present and clear danger.

This leads me to a third proposal. We should reconsider the Holmes slogan of clear and present danger. Surely the old judge—a hater of slogans—might today, if alive, ask for a reappraisal. To me "clear and present" are too subjective to be of as great value as the standards used by Judge Brandeis and much overlooked by later jurists. L. D. B. raised two objective tests: Is there time to make answer, and in the ultimate, is there time to call in the police? I suggest this is a safer rule of law to be applied to the curtailment of speech. I take it that a fully disclosed Coxey's army could march on Washington proposing to break every window in the Capitol and we would jeer, shower satire, and give answer. We would not arrest and suppress the army even on entering Washington. We could have police ready and on hand in case of need. This rule takes care of the tired and worn out example of crying fire in a theater, for then there is no time to give answer. With secret speech there is never time to answer. I refer you to Norway's Mr. Quisling. When could the Czechs have been able to find "clear and present" danger before my friend Jan Masaryk was done in? Thus, the rule must be directed toward the very secrecy which denies the opportunity to give answer or even ultimately to use force to protect our structures of life. I suggest that clear-and-present-danger rule is now a clear-and-present danger to free speech.

Of the many approaches I would enjoy discussing I have time only for a fourth, collateral to the questions I have raised. I refer to the unresolved field of law which involves a troublesome technique used by the state to protect the state. I am opposed philosophically to all wire tapping, but I have come to the conclusion that the last half dozen Attorney Generals and Solicitors, and Presidents Roosevelt and Truman were correct in condoning wire tapping by the Federal Government in the fields of espionage and sedition. The FBI only recently has announced that at any one time it taps less than 200 wires in the entire Nation. I think it wholesome that the FBI give reports as to the extent of the practice but I am really not bothered by its tapping under approval of the Attorney General as compared to the tens of thousands of wire taps legally or illegally made by local city and State police each year. The constitution of New York State, for example, purports to legalize, vis-à-vis the Federal Constitution and the preempting of telephone wires by the Federal Government, what in fact is vast indiscriminate invasion of homes and businesses often for the discovery of such minor quaint pursuits as prostitution, gambling, or betting on horses. I suggest that unless we strictly limit such quite distasteful searches without warrants our people will eventually rise up and ask for the abolition of all taps. Moreover, I would think that even in the scant and limited field of Federal tapping to preserve the State, all permits should flow from the Attorney General—even if requested by Treasury, Armed Forces, or other departments. Aside from national security I would have us condone wire tapping only in the field of kidnaping and extortion where life is at stake, and then only on request of affected parties.

The bar has acted on phases of the problem but surely, as presumed leaders of our society, has made no impression on national thinking. We face a research magnificent—an exploration badly needed to help our jurisprudence grow up to the new problems of handling mendacity and secrecy—organized on a world-wide scale. Being a glandular optimist, I am confident the victory is ours as soon as we stop generalizing and smearing and get down to acting as social engineers to cope with the ideas written by two men under a candlelight a century ago.

Congressman John A. McGuire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, as the second session of the Eighty-first Congress draws to a close I should like to say a few words in praise of our colleague the Honorable JOHN A. MCGUIRE, of the Third District of Connecticut. Congressman MCGUIRE is asking the people of that district to reelect him to Congress in November on the basis of the excellent record he has made here.

JOHN MCGUIRE came to the House of Representatives from the town of Wallingford, Conn., where he had served for 16 consecutive years as town clerk. He knows the Third Connecticut District thoroughly and fully understands its problems as a result of his service as chairman of the State Democratic Committee of Connecticut and his eight consecutive 2-year terms as Town Clerk of Wallingford. I can think of no Member of this House who has given more earnest and careful attention to the needs and interests of his constituents than JOHN MCGUIRE. That he will continue to give that kind of service, regardless of his political affiliations, is a foregone conclusion. By his untiring devotion to duty and profound concern with the legislative measures before the House, he has demonstrated not only his ability to cope with the urgent problems with which the Nation must contend, but also his awareness and determination to meet the needs of the constituents he is privileged to serve.

He is a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one of the most powerful committees of the House. The distinguished chairman of that committee, the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, showed his high regard for Congressman MCGUIRE by appointing him as one of the five members of the Subcommittee on War Claims. This important subcommittee has considered some 30 bills on war claims alone during the present session.

The wide range of Mr. MCGUIRE's interests can be seen by some of the bills he has introduced during the past 2 years. They include measures to require the owners of airplanes to be financially responsible for damage caused by such airplanes; to create a committee for the purpose of conducting an investigation and study to determine an appropriate design for the flag of the United States should the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii or both be admitted to the Union.

He has also sponsored legislation to provide for the payment of up to $10,000 to the widows, children, or parents of a member of our Armed Forces who, as a prisoner of war, was illegally killed by the Government of North Korea; to amend the War Claims Act by providing for compensation to prisoners of war held by the North Koreans and any of our soldiers hiding in Korea to avoid capture by the North Koreans; and to establish a War Damage Corporation to provide reasonable protection against loss or damage to property resulting from enemy attack.

In addition he introduced a bill to establish a Federal Small Business Administration for the purpose of helping independent small business enterprises and to make capital and credit for such enterprises more readily available.

He is the author of a resolution that our Government should take such action before the United Nations as may be necessary to insure that Italy may be trustees of those colonies which she possessed prior to World War II, and a resolution calling for an investigation of safety regulations governing air travel.

One of the country's leading labor papers had this to say about Mr. MCGUIRE in a recent issue:

> His industry is amazing. The record shows he has answered more roll calls than any other member of the Connecticut delegation. That is only an example of the way he sticks to his job. On all progressive legislation, and particularly on labor legislation, his record is without a flaw.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN MCGUIRE has made an exceptional record as a first-term Member of this House. He has shown himself to be a man of character, integrity, and action. He has worked hard and faithfully for his district and for Connecticut and for this Nation in a critical period of its history. His constituents will do well to send him back to Congress and so take advantage of the experience and the seniority he has here.

Senator Baker, of Oregon, and the Battle of Balls Bluff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Grant Conway, vice president of the Oregon State Society of Washington, on the subject of Senator Baker, of Oregon, and the Battle of Balls Bluff. This splendid address was given at Balls Bluff, Va., April 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BAKER OF OREGON AND THE BATTLE OF BALLS BLUFF

The Battle of Balls Bluff is known chiefly as the place where Senator Edward Dickinson Baker, of Oregon, was killed. This monument was erected primarily in his memory by Congress. Baker has been largely forgotten in the twentieth century, but in the middle of the nineteenth century he was one of the foremost characters on the American scene, and his likeness may be found between Jefferson and Washington in the rotunda in the Capitol, where it was placed by act of the Forty-second Congress in 1873. Within the past year President Truman made a special trip as the guest of Senator MORSE to pay homage to this now almost forgotten historical personage.[1] There is a small stone on which Baker's name is inscribed outside that fence supposedly marking the spot where he fell. However, he is not buried here. His body was carried from the field of battle by his comrades and services were held in the Senate Chamber where he held office at the time of his death, and then his remains were transported to the State of California, where he was buried in the cemetery on Lone Mountain in San Francisco, a cemetery which he had dedicated 7 years earlier. But his mortal remains have not been permitted to rest in peace. At the close of World War II I was in San Francisco when the Lone Mountain Cemetery gave way to progressive civic planning. A controversy developed as to where he would be reburied. The town of Baker, Oreg., named in honor of Baker, requested that his body be reinterred there. However, the Army took over in this emergency and decreed that the Presidio at the Golden Gate would be the proper place.

FRIEND OF LINCOLN

Baker was perhaps Abe Lincoln's closest friend. They were rival young lawyers in southern Illinois, where Baker was credited as being more in demand as a public speaker. When the cornerstone of the State capitol was laid July 4, 1837, Baker was chosen over other competing orators to deliver the dedication speech.[2] In 1844 Baker and Lincoln opposed each other in the Whig primary and Baker was elected to Congress. While Baker was espousing an unpopular local cause at the Springfield Courthouse he was threatened by a mob of Democrats, and Lincoln came to his rescue on the platform and defended free speech and a riot was avoided.[3] Later Baker resigned his seat in the House while he was taking part in the Mexican War and Lincoln was elected to the office. On his return from the war Baker moved to another congressional district and both Baker and Lincoln were elected to Congress on the Whig ticket.

Before Lincoln was inaugurated for President, Baker visited his own mother at Springfield and Lincoln paid a visit to his home there and expressed himself to Baker. "I'd rather have you elected Senator than any man alive."[4]

Senator Baker introduced Lincoln at the Presidential inauguration. In the Senate Baker acted as the Republican Party whip on administration bills and handled patronage. Lincoln gave Baker the task of convincing Henry Clay that he should accept the Ambassadorship to Russia rather than a cabinet post for his support during the campaign.[5] A delegation with a petition called upon Lincoln to protest the way Baker was handling patronage. Lincoln tore up the petition in their presence, tossed it in a White House fireplace, and dismissed them.[6]

At Baker's death, Willie Lincoln wrote a poetic eulogy. Carl Sandburg best expresses Lincoln's loss when Senator Baker died.[7]

"Gone now forever from Lincoln was a trumpet, a shield, an intimate companion and a bright light of loyalty, namesake of his second born boy, his choice of all men to introduce him for a Presidential inaugural address. Not again would the two of them laugh with glee over Baker's leaving California in 1860 to enter Oregon, form a combination of Republicans and Douglas Democrats and wreck the political status of the secessionists—"

PUBLIC SERVANT OF THE WEST

Baker stumped the State of California in 1856 for the first Republic Presidential candidate, John C. Fremont. The Republicans were an unimportant minority in California and his political future there was dim.

In September 1859, a Republican delegation from Oregon, including three of the State committeemen, invited him to come to Oregon. He was offered support for the United States Senate if he would stump the State for the party. He visited Oregon almost immediately and became convinced that he was both needed and wanted. Returning to San Francisco he closed his law office and sailed February 17, 1860 for Portland on the *Panama*.[8]

On his arrival in Salem, Oreg., he opened a law office and began a whirlwind campaign around the State. By stagecoach, on horseback, and boat he went everywhere possible in the time before the spring primary, pouring out floods of inspiring oratory. The secessionist Democrats could see that they lacked a majority for their candidates in the Oregon State Legislature, the elective body of the time, and slipped away to Uncle Nick Schram's barn where the sergeant-at-arms discovered them and brought back enough of them to secure a quorum and elect Baker and Nesmith with the help of a coalition with the Douglas (Union) Democrats.[9] Baker thereby became the first Republican elected to Federal office from the Pacific coast.

Arriving in San Francisco, October 19, 1860, on the *Brother Jonathan*, he was greeted by a 100-gun salute and a parade. On October 26 he delivered his speech, "Apostrophe to Freedom," which was famous for many years thereafter, at the American Theater. The attendance was reported at 4,000 with twice that number turned away.[10]

Baker, while in the Senate, was credited with helping nip in the bud the movement for a Pacific Confederacy, a movement led by Senators Joe Lane and William M. Gwin. There was a strong secessionist movement in Oregon and California which is not generally known.

Senator Baker used his influence with President Lincoln and Gen. Winfield Scott to have high ranking Army officers of questionable loyalty on the Pacific coast relieved of duty and in some cases arrested. Adjutant General Thomas wrote directly to three Oregon citizens, Thomas R. Cornelius, B. F. Harding, and R. F. Maury, authorizing them to raise one regiment of mounted troops, "* * * unless otherwise ordered, you will be governed by any directions sent to you by Col. E. D. Baker. * * *"[11] A number of Oregon men later served with the Confederate Army. John Lane at West Point, son of Joe Lane, became a colonel, Capt. Thomas Jordan, United States Quartermaster at The Dalles, resigned to serve the South and was believed to have been a colonel in the Culpepper cavalry. Major Garnett resigned from his Army post in Oregon and was commissioned brigadier by Jefferson Davis. John Adair, West Point graduate of 1861, son of the postmaster and collector at Astoria, was commissioned and ordered to Walla Walla. He deserted and was dismissed from the United States Army. J. B. Sykes, Indian agent at Siletz, resigned and served with the rebels.[12]

---

[1] Senator WAYNE L. MORSE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 168 on April 24, 1950: "*Resolved, etc.*, That the Architect of the Capitol, with the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library, is hereby authorized and directed to procure and cause to be affixed to the base of the statue of Edward Dickinson Baker, located in the rotunda of the Capitol, a suitable plaque bearing appropriate references to the life and achievements of the said Edward Dickinson Baker.

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution."

The resolution is followed by a two-column biography of E. D. Baker which may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 24, 1950. Most of the Capitol Building guards know only that Senator Baker was from Oregon. My first inquiry about Baker addressed to a uniformed attendant in the rotunda in 1940 was referred to an "expert," who confused Baker with Senator Joseph Lane. The resolution introduced by Senator MORSE will provide a suitable plaque to inform Capitol visitors of the achievements of Senator Baker of Oregon.

[2] The committee considered Lincoln, Douglas, James A McDougall, John A. Logan, Lyman Trumball, and others and finally chose Baker, who was only 26. Samuel D. Woods, Lights and Shadows of Life on the Pacific Coast, Funk and Wagnalls, New York and London, 1910, p. 93.

[3] Carl Sandburg, Abraham Lincoln, The Prairie Years. Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1927, I:146.

[4] Joseph Wallace, Sketch of the Life and Public Services of Edward D. Baker, Springfield, Ill., 1870, 63–4.

[5] Carl Sandburg, Abraham Lincoln, The War Years, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1939, I:32.

[6] Elijah R. Kennedy, The Contest for California in 1861; How Col. E. D. Baker Saved the Pacific States to the Union, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1912, 203.

[7] Op. cit., Sandburg, War Years, I: 324.

[8] Op. cit., Kennedy, 150–62.

[9] Ibid., from Martin Monahan's Recollections and narrated by Edmond S. Meany in a Seattle newspaper.

[10] T. W. Davenport, Slavery Question in Oregon, Oregon Historical Quarterly, March 1908, 357; Oscar T. Shuck, editor, Eloquence of the Far West, San Francisco, 1899, I, Masterpieces of E. D. Baker (includes Baker's more important speeches). A photostatic copy of this speech and various reports of the speech may be found in the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

[11] Op. cit., Kennedy, 203–10; Rebellion Records, Series I, V, I, Part I, 622.

[12] Hubert H. Bancroft, Oregon, The History Co., San Francisco, 1886, II: 455.

PUBLIC SPEAKER

Baker was a great orator, and spoke in many places on many subjects. As an attorney in California he was successful and fees were high and in line with his reputation as a good lawyer.[13] After winning a case in court, he would sometimes remain and deliver speeches on subjects chosen by his audience. Subjects chosen included: books, art, the life of Robert Burns and the laying of the Atlantic cable.[14] He drew some of the largest audiences of all times in San Francisco, New York, and Washington.[15]

One of his most famous legal cases was in defense of Cora, an Italian gambler arrested for the killing of a United States marshal in San Francisco. Baker saved Cora in court, but the gambler was lynched by the vigilantes on his release. For this case barrister Baker received a retainer fee of $15,000 which he lost the same night playing faro.[16] Baker has been the only man in the history of our country to speak in uniform before both the House and Senate while a Member of each body.[17]

MILITARY SERVICE

Colonel Baker has been attacked for his leadership at Balls Bluff on the ground of lack of military experience.[18] Baker served in the Black Hawk Indian War. He served as a colonel in the Mexican War where he was shot in the throat, and later led troops in the battle of Vera Cruz and at Cerro Gordo. When General Shields was killed at Cerro Gordo, Baker assumed command and led a charge, taking the enemy position. His troops pursued Gen. Santa Anna so closely that they captured his wooden leg which they bore triumphantly back to Illinois.

Early in the Civil War Baker left his seat in the Senate and recruited the California Regiment in Pennsylvania. President Lincoln offered him commissions as a major and brigadier general,[19] but he did not accept.

[13] "Among the lawyers of California Baker was easily chief." Harpers New Monthly Magazine, December 1861, 106.

[14] Oscar T. Shuck, Bench and Bar in California, Occidental Printing House, San Francisco, 1889, 14; op cit., Woods, 93.

[15] Op. cit., Shuck, Masterpieces; see New York Mass Meeting at Union Square.

[16] The gambler's mistress, Belle Cora, agreed to pay Baker $30,000, including an immediate retained fee of $15,000. Herbert Ashbury, The Barbary Coast, Pocket Books, Inc., 79.

[17] Op. cit., Kennedy, 101.

[18] "Colonel Baker had some political reputation and was a brave man, but he had no military experience or knowledge," Charles Lawrence Peirson (Colonel and Brevet Brigadier General), Balls Bluff, The Salem Press Co., Salem, Mass. Also see John D. Baltz, Col. E. D. Baker's Defense in the Battle of Balls Bluff, Inquirer Printing Co., Lancaster, Pa., 1888; see ch. V for charges made against Colonel Baker, and ch. X, General Stone's testimony before the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War and the report of that committee.

[19] From Kennedy; letter to Oregon Sentinel, Jacksonville, Oreg., published November 2, 1861.

HEADQUARTERS, BAKERS BRIGADE,
Camp Advance, Chain Bridge,
September 22, 1861.

DEAR SIR: We are on the eve of a very great battle. I shall endeavor so to do my duty that the State of Oregon shall have no cause to blush for me, being in no wise forgetful of my obligations to represent her everywhere with fidelity and courage. As you have learned before this, the President was pleased to appoint me a brigadier general, an office which my duty to the State of Oregon, in my judgment compelled me to decline. Yesterday I had conferred upon me the appointment of major general. Actuated by the same motive, I shall decline that also. I confess, however, considering the present condition of the Army and the great command this office would devolve upon me, nothing could induce me to decline it, but my deep sense of obligation to the State of Oregon, which it will take me many years of faithful service to repay.

E. D. BAKER.

Also see Baltz, footnote, p. 74. Colonel Baker received the appointment of brigadier general, U. S. Volunteers, August 6, 1861, to rank from May 17, 1861. This he declined August 31, 1861. On September 21, 1861, he was appointed major general, U. S. Volunteers, but at the time of his death he had neither officially accepted or declined. General McClellan at that time was the only officer in the Army of the Potomac holding a rank as high as major general.

That Baker enjoyed political influence there is no doubt and Regular Army officers resented his competition for high military posts. He confided to friends that he did not expect to survive his first battle.[20] The regiment's first task was the preparing of the Ethan Allen Fort, later called Fort Baker, near Chain Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington.

THE BATTLE OF BALLS BLUFF

Now for the bloody battle of Balls Bluff. On the 20th of October 1861, a reconnaissance force, the Fifteenth Massachusetts under Colonel Devons crossed the river with orders to attack a small Confederate camp near Leesburg. They were met by a superior Confederate force and General Stone, in command of the Army of the Potomac in this sector, ordered Colonel Baker with three regiments to cross at Balls Bluff to reinforce Colonel Devon. Transportation across the Potomac was to be supplied Baker's force. Baker arrived at the Potomac and found it swollen from heavy rains, and Balls Bluff with its high cliffs the most treacherous place to cross. Both above and below Balls Bluff, which we will explore, the Virginia shore is lower and the water less swift. But Baker had his orders. For transport he found two scows between the Maryland shore and Harrison Island and one scow, a life-boat and two rowboats between Harrison Island and Balls Bluff. Baker ordered that a canal barge be taken from the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal to the Virginia shore for transporting two howitzers and a field piece, which were set up southwest of the Monument. Baker realized the hopelessness of his position and the fact that not all the 1763 troops under his command could be evacuated at the Bluff. The Confederates were there in superior numbers and more reinforcements were arriving. The Union artillery gunners were killed and the guns were evacuated. The boats were having trouble removing the wounded.[21]

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was a lieutenant with the Twentieth Massachusetts which was known as the Harvard Regiment and formed a portion of Baker's reinforcements. Prior to Balls Bluff they had routine patrol duty along the Chesapeake and Ohio towpath, along where we will walk later today. On the first Rebel charge Holmes fired once and was hit in the stomach with a spent bullet which knocked the wind from him. Finally rising to one knee to take aim he was hit in the chest and his shirt torn from his back. Holmes was evacuated but another skiff carrying wounded capsized and all were drowned.[22]

[20] The following excerpts are from a conversation with Maj. Robert Parish of the California Regiment: "President Lincoln has given me the commission of a major general in the Army to be announced by me at my discretion, but such are the jealousies against me entertained by the Regular Army officers, that I do not expect to survive my first battle." Kennedy, 74–5.

[21] Op cit., Harpers New Monthly, 108–9, 113. Most of the previous references cited include an account of the Battle of Balls Bluff.

Colonel Baker took a position ten paces in front of his men in the open and held it for an hour, rallying his men and quietly criticizing their fighting.

"Lower boys. Steady. Keep cool and fire low."

The Confederates concentrated their fire on Baker and in a charge he was cut down with a fusilade of lead. The charging Confederates tried to take his body but a desperate bayonet countercharge recovered his body and it was taken in one of the last boats to remain afloat to Harrison Island. After Baker's death the Union defense crumpled. One desperate effort was made to break through the attacking forces on the downriver side before the northern troops were driven over the brink of the bluff. No boat replacements arrived. By nightfall of the 21st all the Union soldiers were killed or taken prisoner.

The Battle of Balls Bluff was the most pronounced Confederate victory of the war.[23] Two hundred northern soldiers were killed and as many wounded. The Confederates captured 529 prisoners, and admitted that 300 of their own men were killed and wounded.[24]

The Confederate newspaper in Leesburgh on November 9, 1861, reported a great victory over the "Lincoln vandals." Colonel Baker, the notorious Senator from Oregon, was killed. "He was an Englishman by birth, a brave and skillful officer, as was shown by his service in Mexico, and the loss the Yankee cause suffers from his death is as great as could be inflicted by the death of almost any man on their side." [25]

NOTE

In May, Harold B. Say, local Washington representative of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, called my attention to two bills introduced in the current session of Congress (81st Cong., 2d sess.). They include a provision which would abolish the Balls Bluff National Cemetery. These two bills, S. 2863 by Senator TYDINGS, and H. R. 6807 by Congressman COLE of New York, were introduced at the request of the Army and referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the House Committee on Public Lands.

The Balls Bluff National Cemetery consists of fifty-seven one-thousandths of an acre centered around a stone wall containing a flagpole. It is located on a rocky bluff overlooking the Potomac. A nearby farmer raises and lowers the United States flag daily and mows the grass for which he is paid $450 annually, the regular cost of maintenance of the monument, and an extremely minor item in the Army budget. However, the Army claims that it will be necessary to spend $5,000 for road repair in the coming year if they are required to keep the national cemetery. The 41-passenger, chartered bus which took most of the people to Balls Bluff on the day of the speech experienced no difficulty in traversing the road. Local upkeep for the needs of farmers using the road to Balls Bluff from Virginia Highway No. 15 should also be adequate for the needs of people visiting the monument. The cost of moving the remains of the soldiers to the national cemetery at Culpeper,

[22] C. D. Bowen, Yankee From Olympus, Little, Brown & Co., Boston 152.

[23] Op. cit., Harpers New Monthly, 109.

[24] Ibid., 113.

[25] Virginia Republican, Leesburg, Va., November 9, 1861, 1. Berkely County Court House, Martinsburg, W. Va.

Va., a distance of approximately 65 miles, is estimated at $2,410.

The monument is considered an Oregon shrine in the East. Miss Grace Townsend of the office of Senator CORDON mentioned that the first place outside of Washington where she takes Oregon visitors is Balls Bluff.

Anyone wishing to preserve this small monument should write to either Senators MORSE or CORDON or their local Congressman.

A Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have prepared a report on the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, including a statement of my own activities, which I now present to the House, and which I shall circulate as widely as possible in the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania which I represent.

The Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have the power to make all laws that shall be necessary and proper to carry into effect the specific powers granted to it, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the United States or any department or officer thereof.

The House of Representatives is composed of Members chosen every second year by the peoples of the several States. Since they are the people's Representatives, I think it fitting and proper that as such they should report to those who elected them, so that the people of each Congressional District may know what Congress has done and, also, how their Representative participated in the affairs of Government.

Both the House and the Senate in this Congress have been dominated by Members of the same political party which control the executive branch of our Government. In the House of Representatives, whose total membership is 435, the Democratic Party had a majority of 90 members. Therefore, when the Congress was organized, that party named the Speaker, the chairmen of all committees, and the majority of their Members to each committee. The program of the Congress is contained in the State of the Union messages, the budget message, and such other requests as the President may send to Congress in his various reports. During the sessions of the Eighty-first Congress, the President has urged the continuation of the Marshall plan; demanded the repeal of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; the expansion of a socialized public housing program; the Brannan plan, providing production payments to farmers; compulsory health insurance, commonly referred to as "socialized medicine"; Federal aid to education; a continuation and expansion of the program for valley authorities; the authority to build and operate steel mills, and an economic control bill. He asked that Congress make no cuts in the excise taxes, unless this income could be supplemented by other taxes. He also urged no cuts in Federal expenditures, and then submitted a budget asking for appropriations which would create a deficit House for action.

Since I have become a Member of of approximately $5,000,000,000 per year.

In an effort to carry out this program as outlined by the President, and as developed by the individual Members of Congress, more than 16,000 pieces of legislation have been introduced into the Eighty-first Congress and many of these measures have come to the floor of the Congress, I have conscientiously endeavored to study the program of the legislation called for each week and to inform myself from every possible source the contents of each bill, resolution, or motion that is presented for consideration and action, after which I cast my vote as my best judgment dictates. I have sincerely tried to vote in each instance for what I consider the good of the country and all of the people, regardless of the threats or pleadings of special groups or interests which ask to have legislation enacted favorable to themselves.

It is impossible to give in detail all of the bills which were presented. However, I shall outline briefly some of the principal legislation which was passed during this session of Congress with regard to international affairs, national defense and Federal security, governmental reorganization, national economy, social security, health and welfare, agriculture, veterans, civil rights, and natural resources.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

In order that our country may present a unified front in its dealings with foreign countries, regardless of which political party is in power, I am in favor of a real bipartisan foreign policy which is the result of actual consultation and agreement between the members of both major parties. I regret that today we have a bipartisan foreign policy in name only. As a result, less than 5 years after VJ-day our country is again involved in a war with American men fighting and dying in Korea to stop Communist aggression.

At the end of hostilities of World War II, the Soviet Government controlled 170,000,000 people. Today it controls 800,000,000 people, despite the fact that this country has spent $36,000,000,000 since that time in an effort to stem the flood tide of communism.

I support ECA, or the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Pact. Both of these programs are designed to assist the nations of Europe in combating the "Red menace." I oppose the Mutual Defense Pact because the entire program was to be financed at the expense of our own national defense. We cannot arm the world and if war was as imminent as some people informed us, I felt it much better that our own forces be fully armed rather than place the arms where they could be utilized by forces which might not be friendly to our country. Military experts freely stated that reductions in our appropriations for national defense jeopardized the security of our country and with solemn warning men of authority thought that our own military needs should come first. The passage of a very short time and the happenings of events since that time prove that I was correct.

THE KOREAN CRISIS

Today our American boys are dying in the rice paddies of Korea because of the present administration's weak and vacillating foreign policy in the Far East, and the constant appeasement of the Russians which has resulted in the fall of Manchuria, China and North Korea, and which threatens the entire Continent of Asia, as well as Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines. It must be remembered that Congress itself has nothing to do with formulating the foreign policy of this country. This is entirely within the province of the President and the State Department.

I favor a strong far eastern policy, but Secretary Acheson told us in February 1949 that it was the policy of the administration to "wait for the dust to settle" before deciding on our next move in China. He also stated in January 1950, in his far eastern report, that—

> This defensive perimeter (where the United States will defend in the Far East) runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus.

In other words, that the United States was not interested in the defense of Korea, and that only Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines were in the perimeter of our defense setup, thus announcing to the world that we would not intervene to halt Communist aggression in China, Formosa, or Korea, all three of which lie beyond that perimeter. To the Asiatic peoples, and unquestionably to the Soviet Union, Mr. Acheson's amazing declaration was an open invitation for the Chinese Communists to complete the conquest of China by taking Formosa and South Korea.

We were told by spokesmen of the present administration that South Korea could not be defended if attacked, and that it had no military or strategic value. So we withdrew our troops, leaving $56,000,000 worth of small arms and equipment, light jeeps, clothing, and food. The Republican members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in an official document issued July 26, 1949, protested this withdrawal from Korea as occurring at the very instant when logic and common sense both demanded no retreat from the realities of the situation.

It was on January 19, 1950, exactly 1 week after Mr. Acheson's statement about our perimeter of defense, that a majority of the House Republican Members joined 61 Democrats in rejecting the so-called Korean aid bill containing only economic assistance to Korea, with a warning to the administration that without military aid and appropriate assistance to other critical areas in Asia, the proposed $150,000,000 in economic assistance would not only be useless, but it would enhance the prize dangled before the Communist aggressors by Secretary of State Acheson. Under the terms

of the bill for economic aid, we would have sent fertilizer, seed, and money for building of roads, dams, and the construction of a hydroelectric plant. It simply meant building up a greater and richer prize for the Communists when they took over Korea. What has actually happened in Korea today confirms our fears at that time. None of the economic aid, which was finally voted in February 1950, ever got there; and although $10,000,000 in military aid was voted for Korea, actually only the small amount of $200 worth of Signal Corps wire ever got there. This accounts for the fact that when our boys were first sent to Korea they had only the small arms and equipment, which had been left behind when our troops withdrew, with which to fight the tanks, artillery, and other heavy equipment of the North Koreans, which had been supplied by Russia.

The Truman administration and the State Department have been running the show. Among the top-flight policy makers of the State Department's far-eastern program was Owen Lattimore, who stated "the thing to do is to let South Korea fall—but not to let it look as though we pushed it." The Korean aid bill was never a bona fide effort to save Korea. It was a phony, an attempt to shift the blame of the State Department's blunders for the Communist conquest of Korea, which they expected. If the money was made available they could blame the Koreans—if not, they could blame Congress. Neither the voting of military nor economic aid to Korea was consistent with such a policy. On June 27, 1950, however, President Truman suddenly changed his mind, and our boys were ordered to fight in Korea. It is to be regretted that the mistakes of the Truman administration must now be paid for in the high currency of human blood.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

I have always believed that our country should be strong so as to be able to defend itself from aggression by any other nation. It was that same motive which directed the Members of Congress to pass the Unification Act providing us with a Secretary of Defense who would have charge of the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, and the Marine Corps. The Eighty-first Congress provided $736,000,000 for a 70-group Air Force, which they felt was necessary. This money was impounded by the Secretary of Defense on orders of President Truman. In addition to that authorized expenditure, Congress appropriated many more millions for the purchase of tanks, guns, and other military equipment. Some of this money was not spent, but was ordered impounded by the President. In the last 2 years $1,270,000,000, appropriated by Congress for national defense, was not spent.

This refusal to spend authorized appropriations for national defense was called "fat trimming" by the administration, but in fact the very lifeblood of our national defense was being drained.

REORGANIZATION

The Hoover Commission made extensive recommendations for reorganizing the executive departments. Public Law 109 was passed by Congress authorizing the President to carry out the reorganization of the executive departments in accordance with the Hoover report. The President has submitted 27 plans for such reorganization, 6 of which were rejected by the Senate, and 1 was rejected by the House. Twenty of these reorganization plans recommended by the Hoover Commission have been enacted into law.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

While the need for rent control in many instances has ceased to exist, nevertheless, there are some areas in which rent control is still necessary. Recognizing that fact, Congress passed an optional rent control bill. Any community subject to rent control could, by the action of its governing body, be decontrolled at any time. If the governing body took no action, the community automatically remained subject to rent control until December 31, 1950. If, in the opinion of the local governing body the need for rent control still exists beyond that date, the local authorities have the authority to extend it for another 6 months.

The Federal Deposit and Insurance Act was amended so as to authorize the insuring of bank deposits up to $10,000.

On April 18, 1950, the Postmaster General, Jesse Donaldson, issued an order directing that postal deliveries be limited to one per day. This directive produced the greatest amount of mail received by me since I have been in office, as I received several thousand protests against this action. The Members of the House passed a bill rescinding this order of the Postmaster General; however, at this time, no action has been taken by the Senate.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

In the field of social legislation, the outstanding accomplishment of the Eighty-first Congress was the amendment of the Social Security Act to extend coverage to over 10,000,000 more persons. The amendment also increases old-age and survivorship payments, and brings into balance the public assistance program.

While the benefits payable under this act are increased, there is stiill many examples of inequalities which will require further study and further amendment. I sincerely believe that everyone should contribute to his own pension plan and that as the contributions are increased, the benefits should likewise be increased, so that some day soon, we may have a satisfactory answer to the present problem of old age and insecurity.

The Federal-aid program for hospital construction was extended and the amounts available for this purpose increased.

Congress passed the National Housing Act of 1950, which expands and supplements Federal housing for moderate income families. It also increases the limit on the amount of mortgages that could be purchased by the Government, and liberalizes the financing terms on FHA, insured rental housing and cooperative housing, particularly insofar as veterans were concerned.

AGRICULTURE

Probably the outstanding act passed by the Eighty-first Congress which affects more individuals directly than any other was the law repealing the tax on oleomargarine. This eliminates a heavy tax upon colored oleomargarine. However, the matter will now be considered by the Pennsylvania Legislature as our Commonwealth has an act forbidding the sale of colored oleomargarine.

The President's agricultural program, known as the Brannan plan, received absolutely no consideration. The present price-support program authorizes the continuance of 90-percent parity of farm prices throughout 1950, and thereafter reverts to a sliding scale and new parities. There has been every effort on behalf of the Truman Administration to bring the price-support program into disrepute so that they would be able to place in operation the far more obnoxious and untenable program known as the Brannan plan.

Under the Brannan plan, farmers are guaranteed by the Government a high income for their products, then the farmer produces and sells his products for what he can get for them in the open market. The wholesaler and retailer then sell to the consumer for what they can receive, and finally, the farmer goes to the Government with his records, marketing cards, reports, storage or sales receipts or any other report which the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, and is paid the difference between what he is guaranteed and the amount he received in the open market.

VETERANS

A great many veterans have developed tuberculosis following World War II, and many of these cases were in the advanced stages before they were discovered. However, the law fixed the presumptive period of 1 year. Realizing the many inequities that this caused, Congress fixed at 3 years the presumptive period for World War II tubercular disability cases.

Congress also extended the terms of certain patents of persons who served in World War II. They defined the authority of the Veterans' Administration in carrying out a veteran's education under the GI bill of rights, and gave World War II veterans in the postal service credit toward automatic promotions for time spent in Armed Forces. This last bill, however, was vetoed by the President.

In addition, Congress opposed the giving up of certain hospital facilities by the Department of Defense in its economy program, a part of which were used by the Veterans' Administration. The folly of this type of economy has since

been demonstrated by the Department of Defense again having to reactivate all of the hospitals which they closed.

CIVIL RIGHTS

For many years both political parties have promised statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. After very extensive hearings, the House passed bills admitting Hawaii and Alaska to statehood in the Union. Unfortunately, the Senate has not seen fit to consider these two important measures and they have been pigeonholed by that body.

Our insular possessions have received a great deal of consideration at this session of Congress, and a civil government was provided for Guam, and also the people of Puerto Rico were authorized to organize a constitutional government.

The exclusion from citizenship because of color, which was enacted by a former Congress, has always been recognized as an unjust discrimination. Congress passed a bill removing the restrictions on naturalization of Japanese who entered the United States before 1924. However, this bill was vetoed by the President because of an amendment which provided for the revoking of citizenship, not only of these but of other naturalized citizens for subversive activities.

A bill establishing a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission passed the House, but due to the filibuster procedure authorized in the Senate, this governing body voted not to limit debate so as to permit the discussion of this matter.

NATURAL RESOURCES

A matter which vitally affects this congressional district is the importation of foreign oil. One of the outstanding industries of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District is coal mining, and as a result of the huge importation of foreign oil, many miners were put out of work, and some mines were closed down. Railroaders, who were dependent upon the cars from the coal fields for their livelihoods, were also furloughed because of this existing condition. Notwithstanding the fact that a serious protest was raised by Members of Congress who come from coal-producing areas. the Truman administration's attitude was that the importation of foreign residual fuel oil constituted no threat whatsoever to our economy, and since that time, have continued to allow foreign oil, a large percentage of which was residual fuel oil, to come into this country at the rate of 1,000,000 barrels per day throughout 1950.

A study of the huge importation of foreign oil and its effect upon the bituminous coal industry in this country, especially in view of total war, makes one realize that the failure of the Truman administration to act in this matter for the relief of the coal industry is actually prejudicing our national security.

The Kerr gas bill, which I voted against, was an act to exempt independent producers and gatherers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission and would have resulted in an increase in the cost of natural gas to the consumer. This bill was vetoed by the President.

COMMITTEE WORK

During this session of Congress, I have been a member of the Committee on Public Lands—an important committee for the Representative for this district because it deals with all problems relating to mines and mining, as well as other natural resources. In addition to these fields it covers irrigation and reclamation, national parks and forests, Indian affairs, and territorial and insular affairs.

Because of the broad scope of this committee, almost 800 bills were referred to it during the Eighty-first Congress. The committee, under the able leadership of the Honorable J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, held extensive hearings on many of these measures and reported to the House for action 315 bills. Of this number, 218 have been enacted into law—almost one-third of the legislation passed by this Congress. There are at present 25 of these reported bills pending before the House and 72 before the Senate. It is natural, therefore, that this committee work has required a great deal of my time and study.

MISCELLANEOUS

Although a new Member of Congress, I did introduce some legislation which has become law. Three private bills for persons who were unable to become citizens of the United States were sponsored by me, and all three of these have been enacted into law. The first bill to draft doctors and dentists who received their education at the taxpayer's expense, which bill formed the basis of the legislation finally enacted, was also introduced by me. It was this bill that gave me Nation-wide publicity.

I have introduced a bill to provide for the payment of $10,000 life insurance and 6 months salary to the families of the members of the Twenty-eighth Division of the Pennsylvania National Guard, who were killed in the train wreck on September 11, 1950. Among the other bills which I introduced was one providing for free postage for veterans in veterans' hospitals; a bill providing for the revision of our tax structure, with an elimination of all wartime excise taxes, as well as increased exemptions for personal taxes.

My mail has been unusually heavy. However, I have answered every letter that has come from the Twenty-sixth Congressional District, and I have taken a personal interest in each and every case which has come into my office. While I have never occupied a public office prior to this time, I have always had a desire to be in a position where I could be of service to a large number of people, and I find as a Member of Congress, I have that opportunity. I want the residents of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania to know that my entire staff and I stand ready at all times to serve them.

The Mata Hari of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, the extremes to which Communists go to achieve their objectives is well known to many, but the following report by Drew Pearson on the Mata Hari of Korea illustrates the necessity for constant vigilance our military authorities face. I am confident that 99.9 percent of our occupational forces are moral, loyal Americans, but the following story illustrates the grave dangers that can befall our security when we have one rotten apple in the barrel:

There has been a lot of congressional debate as to who was to blame for our being caught napping in Korea. But no Congressman has touched upon the most amazing story of Korean espionage—the manner in which a Korean Mata Hari lived with an American Army colonel and gave the Communists intimate details on American Army strength.

The lady in question, now executed as a spy, was Kim Soo Im, a vivacious, American-educated Korean girl who was married to one of Korea's top Communists, Lee Kang Kook.

At the same time she was married to Lee she was the mistress of a top American colonel, John E. Baird, who, as provost marshal, was in charge of keeping law and order among American troops in Korea. He was also top adviser to the new Korean Army.

Colonel Baird occupied one of the most elegant houses in Seoul, and for a time Madam Kim lived with him. According to the Korean press, she even bore him a child.

It was well known to Koreans that Kim Soo Im was intimate with the colonel. They were seen together publicly. And it was also known by many Koreans that she was married to one of the top Communists, Lee Kang Kook, who had been hiding from the military government and for whom the authorities had thrown out a dragnet.

However, because of American prestige, Koreans did nothing about the situation. After all, Americans were Korea's benefactors, the trainers of Korean troops, in effect the rulers of the country. Colonel Baird himself was senior adviser to the Korean Army. So it was embarrassing to make any protest.

COUNTERESPIONAGE

When the above facts, plus a great many others, were disclosed officially at the time of Kim Soo Im's trial, Colonel Baird gave the official explanation that he was using the lady as his interpreter and to get information from her.

If so, he was not very successful. For subsequent developments have shown that the Communists knew all about our military operations, while we knew little about them.

Furthermore, when Kim Soo Im was tried, last May, the Koreans amassed such overwhelming evidence against her that she confessed all. Colonel Baird, who had been in intimate day-to-day contact with her, was made to look extremely foolish for not having known the same facts.

It was even reported that Madam Kim had hidden her Communist husband in the

home of the American Army colonel for a few days when the search for him was getting hot. The colonel's house was a big one, so this was not difficult to do without Baird's knowing it.

For more than a year, Lee Kang Kook managed to foil the South Korean police and American military. Eventually, he escaped into North Korea in an American Army jeep—by courtesy of Colonel Baird's mistress.

COMMUNIST HUSBAND ESCAPES

Colonel Baird had given his lady love a new Chrysler. However, she did not use this car to take her husband across the thirty-eighth parallel. Instead, she finagled a jeep from the Army motor pool and had it driven by a trusted Communist driver, Choi Yong Tai.

Lee was disguised as a doctor, and Kim went along to tell the border guards that her mother was desperately ill in North Korea and the doctor was on his way to see her. Thus the No. 2 Communist of Korea escaped—thanks to the United States Army.

On one occasion, when Kim wanted to get an Army jeep for a trip up near the thirty-eighth parallel, Harry Frelinghuysen, son of the GOP ex-Senator from New Jersey, then an Army lieutenant, refused. However, he was overruled by a colonel. Madam Kim got the jeep.

OTHER MATA HARIS

The case of Kim Soo Im and Colonel Baird probably could have taken place in various parts of the world—especially in Japan and Germany, where American troops are stationed far from home and families. And what the Army is worried about right now is that other Communist spies might be planted on American officers.

Colonel Baird, 60 years old, born in Ireland, was a policeman in Rhode Island and a Reserve officer when he joined the Army as a major in 1941. He was stationed in Korea for 4 years, 3 of them as provost marshal, 1 of them as senior adviser to the Korean National Police.

Kim Soo Im, orphaned at an early age, was raised by an American missionary family and educated in an American school. She spoke English perfectly, acquired the vivaciousness of an American girl.

When American troops entered Korea she served as hostess at the Banta Hotel in Seoul, which was General Hodges' headquarters. This was the United States Army's nerve center and it gave her access to all sorts of gossip and tidbits which she relayed to her Communist husband.

During her trial it developed that Kim had given the Communists the complete plans for the withdrawal of United States troops from Korea. It was also revealed that she had a large amount of Japanese yen and was spending it in Seoul, perhaps for bribery, perhaps to create inflation.

Colonel Baird left Korea on June 3, at about the time his mistress was executed. He is now on leave from the Army.

The Late Honorable George J. Bates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay my respects to the late GEORGE BATES, our beloved colleague, who, in my opinion, was one of the most distinguished members of the House of Representatives.

I had the pleasure and privilege of serving on the same committee for 12 years with our late colleague, and I have never known a more conscientious, hard-working man. Mr. BATES, in his position as ranking minority member on the District Committee during my term as chairman of that committee, was always eager and ready to cooperate with me in every instance. Mr. BATES carefully considered every proposed piece of legislation which was presented to the District Committee, and I leaned heavily on his opinion at all times in making my decisions on bills presented to our committee.

Mr. BATES was a statesman, and party lines meant nothing to him when he felt that proposed legislation was worthy of consideration. It was through Mr. BATES' efforts that the majority of the most important legislation enacted by the District Committee received favorable consideration of both the House and the committee.

I know of no man who has ever served in the Congress of the United States who came nearer holding the unanimous respect of all Members of the House, both Republican and Democrat. He was an untiring worker and always accepted any duties placed upon him with a smile. I always knew that when any bill was referred to his subcommittee that it would be thoroughly digested and considered before it was reported to the full committee.

I understand Mr. BATES was one of the leading members of the Armed Services Committee, and I remember when he led a subcommittee through the European countries on an investigation tour during the war, and made an excellent reputation as an untiring worker with the least publicity.

I shall forever be grateful that I had the opportunity to work with and be a friend of a man of Mr. BATES' character and ability. He left an everlasting imprint on my mind and was my ideal of a statesman. The State of Massachusetts, and the United States as a whole, lost one of its most able public servants in the untimely passing of our beloved colleague, Mr. BATES.

Sabotage at Bethany, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, the blast which wrecked the Voice of America transmitter tower of the Crosley Broadcasting Corp. in the Cincinnati area is clearly the work of agents of Moscow. It is striking evidence that sabotage is a part of the plan of the Reds to block all efforts to bring about world peace. It is but a sample of what can be expected in the event of an all-out war with Russia and points up the urgent necessity of legislation to regulate the activities not only of Communists but also of the pinkos and fellow travelers who belong to Communist-front organizations. These enemies of America infest every metropolitan community, and legislation for their regulation is long overdue. Public opinion should be sufficient to deal with those who have been playing "footsie" with the Communists but who may not fall strictly within the above categories. American boys in Korea will see little reason to carry on the fight against Communist aggression abroad unless every possible effort is made to stamp it out at home.

The sabotage committed against the radio tower near Cincinnati is of international significance. I include as a part of my remarks the following editorials from the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Cincinnati Times-Star, and the Cincinnati Post. The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of September 20, 1950]

SABOTAGE AT BETHANY

Two items of international significance both of which have taken place under our noses, have been pointed up by recent news stories. Strange enough, the majority of Cincinnatians hardly were cognizant of either. Millions of persons, thousands of miles distant, knew more about the situation than did we.

Until a sabotage explosion wrecked an antenna on the powerful broadcasting plant at Bethany, 25 miles northeast of Fountain Square, the great transmitter had received but little publicity hereabouts. Yet this station, built by the Crosley Broadcasting Corp. for the United States State Department, is one of the most powerful in the world. It is used to beam Voice of America broadcasts to every corner of the globe.

The second point in the story is one which demands immediate correction. Investigation shows that the Voice of America transmitter, although it plays a vital role in our international program, has gone unguarded since the end of World War II. For some unexplained reason—possibly neglect or lack of funds—the State Department has not felt it necessary to place guards around the group of big antennae. The surrounding cyclone fence had been cut, apparently to allow entrance for the supposed saboteur who did the recent job.

This explosion should give ample warning to all of us, officials included, that the Reds will grasp every opportunity to block the United States program for world peace. It is new evidence of the need for putting every Communist in this country "under wraps" for the duration of the emergency. And it goes without saying that guards should be placed at Bethany immediately—and at all other points where the hand of communism is likely to direct its violence.

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of September 20, 1950]

THE BLAST AT BETHANY

Until the proper authorities come out with some other explanation, if they do at all, the public has every right to regard the blasting

of one of the Voice of America radio towers at Bethany as a pure case of sabotage. All the facts and circumstances argue against its being an accident, especially since this was the second explosion at Bethany this summer.

Radio towers don't just blow up. Nor do they get struck by lightning on a perfectly clear night. Furthermore, the force of the blast and the way in which the tower was demolished point to a human origin. Finally, what more obvious target for sabotage than a radio tower which is beaming programs to the countries behind the iron curtain?

If the blast should prove to be sabotage, as everyone suspects, there are two inferences to be drawn from the incident. In the face of what happened at Bethany no thinking citizen can continue to hide ostrich-like from the threat of his way of life. The Crusade for Freedom takes on a new meaning. And, secondly, an attempt to cripple the Voice of America is proof that this program is having an effect. There would be no need to silence it if it were not reaching the ears of those at whom it is aimed. Truth is a powerful weapon, and the perverters of truth fear it most.

[From the Cincinnati Post of September 20, 1950.]

LOCKING THE STABLE DOOR

Officials of the State Department may find some comfort in the fact that the blast which wrecked the Voice of America transmitter tower at Bethany did not cut off broadcasts overseas.

Nevertheless, it seems surprising to the average man that no steps were taken after the previous explosion last May to guard the tower and other installations. Apparently the property was wide open to anyone seeking to do mischief.

Now, according to the official in charge of this important work of telling America's story to the world, steps will be taken to prevent a third explosion. All one can add to that is—it's about time.

Acheson-Lattimore Dilettante Dabblers in Diplomatic Debacles Brought on Korean Crisis

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, as American blood stains the soil of Korea and American GI's turn the tide of battle and forge ahead in the campaign which may well terminate in the defeat of all Communists in Korea, the American people may well ponder the cost in lives and materials of the war which should never have been necessary.

Who is to blame for the foreign policy which permitted establishment of a Communist regime in the northern half of Korea, and then in the face of the Communist threat across the thirty-eighth parallel deliberately wrote Korea off the books, refused to provide southern Korea with the weapons to build an adequate defense against Communist aggression even after the Congress had appropriated money for this purpose, and withdrew American troops thereby inviting the ultimate invasion of South Korea by the Communists?

The guilt for the complete lack of foresight in our foreign policy in Korea which has cost the lives of American boys and returned to our shores a new grim harvest of veterans with shattered bodies and broken lives must be placed.

Our foreign policy conceived by Acheson and Lattimore, the dilettante dabblers in diplomatic debacles, with the approval of President Truman, is directly responsible for our present involvement in Korea and for all the sacrifices and heartbreak in America that has followed, as ever it must, in the wake of war. And the children now fatherless, the wives newly widowed, and the parents who have lost sons have a right to know who is to blame.

Acheson with the assistance of President Truman has sown to the wind appeasement in our foreign policy which has proved in fact no policy at all in Asia and Korea. The American people are reaping the whirlwind of war.

An intelligent realistic foreign policy in the Far East could have prevented the outbreak of Communist aggression in Korea and could have strengthened the allied position throughout the world. But the Acheson-Lattimore-Truman policy failed.

The following review from the September 15 issue of the Catholic Review gives an excellent analysis of the facts which place the blame for Korea squarely upon the Acheson-Lattimore group:

No matter what the outcome of the Korean war, it will be difficult if not impossible to gloss over, forget, obscure, or ignore the enormous cost it has exacted in life and money. And someone is going to get the blame for it.

The Collier's editorial for September 16 makes it clear that, contrary to a whispering campaign which seems to have its center in Washington, "MacArthur is not to blame." Collier's seems to think discredit should go to Secretary of State Acheson and Louis Johnson, with Acheson well ahead.

Among the candidates for dishonor in connection with the affair are mentioned "the various and badly coordinate intelligence units of the Government, and the persons who evaluate these units' information."

President Truman is practically exonerated on the inferential grounds that any responsibility he might have is attributable to a bill of goods Mr. Acheson may have sold him. There is a growing conviction that the President is not too competent for matters of such moment. He is most unfortunate in the somewhat enforced choice of advisors whose orientation—considering Russia fundamentally Asiatic—has been rather international—if we may parallel or paraphrase Marx and Lenin—than national or American.

We are inclined to exonerate our intelligence units. They were not to blame for Pearl Harbor. They have not been to blame for Communist effectiveness and infiltration in our own country. They are not likely to be blameworthy in the matter of Korea. They report the facts as they find them; they do not decide upon the action indicated.

About "the persons who evaluate" the information submitted we are not so sure. Back in Wilson's time we sent three Ambassadors to Mexico till we got one who submitted the kind of information wanted in Washington. Before the beginning of our share in World War II, we got a lot of information about Jap plans of attack from our own units and from the Koreans; but it suited administration policy to ignore the warnings till an attack justified our going into the conflict through the back door when we had long had ample reason to use the front one.

Ultimately, the information received should determine our foreign policy. When the policy that emerges from the State Department is inconsistent with the information upon which it is presumed to be based, then it is ideological, ideal, unrealistic, or it is political or it is unintelligible. Briefly, it must be based on facts or it is a mess. The Korean policy was a mess.

So we are inclined to agree that the booby prize goes to Secretary Acheson. And if Mr. Truman doesn't want a liberal share of the responsibility for the stupid Far East policy, fathered by Professor Lattimore and sponsored by the dilletante dabbler in diplomatic debacles, he would do well to reconsider his declaration of loyalty to a Secretary whose policy he has already had to discard in the Korean crisis.

Personally, the President may continue to be as loyal to his Secretary of State as the Secretary might be to his own friends. But, unfortunately, no amount of personal loyalty will prove adequate to offset stupidity.

The Far East policy of the Acheson-Lattimore group has proved stupid and may prove disastrous. It has certainly been disastrous for those who have had to be sacrificed and will certainly be so for thousands more. For this, and whatever else may follow from the Korean catastrophe, history will in all probability fasten the blame upon our present Secretary of State.

The only escape from that ignominy lies in the possibility that progressive appeasement of communism may eventually enable Russia to rewrite the textbooks.

Desperate Need for Long-Range Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed with the leadership of the Eighty-first Congress for not providing agriculture with a long-range plan.

Mr. Speaker, I say they have miserably failed the farmer by not enacting a permanent farm legislation.

If there ever was a desperate need for long-range farm legislation it is now. The war in Korea and the demands for high farm production and increased taxes requires stable commodity markets and a high level of farm income.

Mr. Speaker, agricultural income governs national income by a 1-to-7 ratio. Thus, if we want national prosperity we must have a high level of farm income.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic congressional leadership failed to realize the dire necessity of long-range farm planning. The Anderson farm bill with its 90-percent support level is recognized as stop-gap legislation at best by farm leaders.

When the leadership found that the Brannan farm plan did not catch on among farmers, they dropped it like a hot potato. Democratic farm leaders in the House and Senate even refused to hold hearings on it. Most Democratic candidates for Congress refuse to run on it. Even South Dakota Democrats are desperately trying to forget it. They did not even include it in their party platform.

Mr. Speaker, talk about wild promises, the Brannan plan was certainly that.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times about my self-managed, full-parity, self-financing plan for the family-sized farmer. As you know, it would provide full 100 percent of parity without Treasury grants or bureaucratic control. It would operate on a two-price basis with the farmer assured of full parity on his share of normal domestic consumption.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely necessary that farmers receive full 100 percent of parity. Anyone who is against 100 percent of parity for the family-sized farmer either does not like prosperity or he is talking through his hat. The record shows that out of 10,000,000 business units in this country 6,000,000 of them are individually owned and operated farms. Think of the buying power of this segment of our population.

Mr. Speaker, if labor wants high wages and business wants profits and Government wants taxes, the farmer must be prosperous.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership of this Congress has let the dust settle on long-range farm laws just as Secretary of State Dean Acheson did on China and Korea and look what happened. I hope it does not take the same kind of a jolt to shake this dust off of permanent farm legislation.

A Former Capitol Page Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the following copy of a letter to W. Averell Harriman was forwarded to me by one of our former pages here in the House of Representatives. This keen observation, I believe, is worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I include it herewith:

Hon. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN,
The Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HARRIMAN: Your recent venomously bitter attack on Senator Robert A. TAFT, of Ohio, one of the outstanding statesman in the United States Senate, has caused no end of concern throughout the Nation.

Many Americans are alarmed, firstly, because a diplomat, who is allegedly also a statesman of some merit, should, especially in such crucial times, be both willing and capable of conducting himself in a manner becoming the best interests of this Republic at home and abroad and in a manner carrying out the finest traditions of the diplomatic corps of this and other countries. In your unmitigated attack on Senator TAFT, a candidate for reelection in a domestic fight, you have thrown off the honored cloak of diplomatic dignity and statesmanlike worth to engage in name-calling, vituperation, and political demogoguery. You have completely failed to consider and to uphold your official position. As one of America's leading diplomats and as an adviser to the President, you have failed to consider the proprieties of your offices. And certainly, as a scion of one of America's leading families, you should have no difficulty recognizing the difference between dignity and indignity, duty and interference.

Many persons are alarmed, secondly, that you, in whom many have so long trusted as a leader and consultant more or less without political bias, should now choose to participate in the most unworthy manner in a State political campaign. Are you a gentleman who shall handle crucial problems of national and international stature, or are you a typical mudslinger who shall attack politicians when and where you happen to see fit? You cannot be both.

Thirdly, there is alarm on account of the blundering nature of your political attack on Mr. TAFT. Any man who has the faintest knowledge of simple logic can readily discern that if Senator TAFT is aiding the Communists by his conduct in the Senate, then virtually every other Member of Congress, to a greater or lesser extent, is similarly aiding them. Senator TAFT has always supported anti-Communist legislation, but yesterday 50 other Senators likewise voted in favor of such a bill. Senator TAFT has never been wholeheartedly in favor of limitless foreign expenditures, but he has never downright opposed foreign aid. When others, whose names are all too obvious to you and hence require no mention, were betraying this Republic, wittingly or unwittingly, at Yalta and Tehran, where were you, oh peerless judge of other men, and what have you since done to ameliorate conditions and to alleviate these gravest of errors? The words of the Bible are not totally inaccurate when they say: "Judge not, lest ye be judged."

We trust you recognize the difference between a statesman and a politician, and that you will in the future act accordingly. No one is really concerned with what you say or do, except that you have and have had positions of great influence, and there are millions of Americans who are interested in preserving America.

I should like to hear from you in reply.

Faithfully,

MARION E. HARRISON.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1950.